



uOttawa

L'Université canadienne
Canada's university

FACULTÉ DES ÉTUDES SUPÉRIEURES
ET POSTDOCTORALES



FACULTY OF GRADUATE AND
POSTDOCTORAL STUDIES

Stephen Fai

AUTEUR DE LA THÈSE / AUTHOR OF THESIS

Ph.D. (Religious Studies)

GRADE / DEGREE

Department of Classics and Religious Studies

FACULTÉ, ÉCOLE, DÉPARTEMENT / FACULTY, SCHOOL, DEPARTMENT

Body/Temple Metaphor: Early Christian Reconciliation with Roman Architecture

TITRE DE LA THÈSE / TITLE OF THESIS

Reinhard Pummer

DIRECTEUR (DIRECTRICE) DE LA THÈSE / THESIS SUPERVISOR

CO-DIRECTEUR (CO-DIRECTRICE) DE LA THÈSE / THESIS CO-SUPERVISOR

EXAMINATEURS (EXAMINATRICES) DE LA THÈSE / THESIS EXAMINERS

Dominique Côté

Michel Desjardins

Marie-Françoise Guédon

Pierluigi Piovanelli

Gary W. Slater

LE DOYEN DE LA FACULTÉ DES ÉTUDES SUPÉRIEURES ET POSTDOCTORALES /
DEAN OF THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE AND POSTDOCTORAL STUDIES

**BODY/TEMPLE METAPHOR : EARLY CHRISTIAN RECONCILIATION
WITH ROMAN ARCHITECTURE**

Stephen Fai

Thesis submitted to the
Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Ph.D. degree in Classics and Religious Studies

Classics and Religious Studies
Faculty of Arts
University of Ottawa

© Stephen Fai, Ottawa, Canada, 2006



Library and
Archives Canada

Bibliothèque et
Archives Canada

Published Heritage
Branch

Direction du
Patrimoine de l'édition

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence

ISBN: 978-0-494-18106-5

Our file Notre référence

ISBN: 978-0-494-18106-5

NOTICE:

The author has granted a non-exclusive license allowing Library and Archives Canada to reproduce, publish, archive, preserve, conserve, communicate to the public by telecommunication or on the Internet, loan, distribute and sell theses worldwide, for commercial or non-commercial purposes, in microform, paper, electronic and/or any other formats.

The author retains copyright ownership and moral rights in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

AVIS:

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque et Archives Canada de reproduire, publier, archiver, sauvegarder, conserver, transmettre au public par télécommunication ou par l'Internet, prêter, distribuer et vendre des thèses partout dans le monde, à des fins commerciales ou autres, sur support microforme, papier, électronique et/ou autres formats.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur et des droits moraux qui protègent cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this thesis.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de cette thèse.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the thesis.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.


Canada

ABSTRACT

The history of early Christian architecture has been presented as a gradual, typological transformation from undifferentiated residential buildings in the first two centuries, to modified residential buildings in the third, culminating in the monumental Constantinian structures of the fourth century. To rationalize this transformation, a great deal of scholarship has focused on identifying formal, cultural, and programmatic characteristics that might link the *domus* to the *basilica*. However, a long held view is that the *basilica*, along with all monumental church architecture, is a Roman deviation in the evolution of Christianity. To support this argument, proponents read NT passages like the body/temple metaphor of 1 Cor. 3.16-17 and John 2.19-22 as indicative of a Christian rejection of Roman and Jewish material culture. These contrary aspects of early Christianity, the construction of monumental churches and the tacit rebuke of Roman architecture in Christian texts, have been characterized by Paul Corby Finney as iconic and aniconic. In an effort to better understand early Christian architecture, recent studies employ models from cultural theory and sociology to reveal the broader context of church building, demonstrating similar patterns of architectural development among other cultural groups living within the Empire. Richard Krautheimer and L. Michael White are foremost in this field and they have provided a solid foundation for re-evaluating the evidence. While these seminal archaeological and architectural studies have provided us with a chronology of formal and programmatic developments for the beginnings of Christian architecture, they have done little to help us understand how early Christians came to reconcile the conflicting ontological demands of *being* the temple *in* Christ (NT) with *building* the temple *for* Christ (Constantine). In this dissertation, I argue that a reconciliation between NT body/temple metaphor and Imperial Architecture, between the aniconic and iconic characteristics of Christianity, is achieved, in part, through a shift in the tenor of the metaphor that occurs through the second, third, and fourth centuries. The trajectory of this shift is traced from sources in the Gospels and Epistles through the *Epistle of Barnabas*, Clement of Alexandria, and Origen to the panegyric written by Eusebius for the commemoration of Paulinus' church at Tyre in 317. I conclude that the metaphorical vehicle of the body/temple, first used rhetorically to unify and segregate the Christian community, has a hermeneutic function that reveals an architectural model in Christ *Logos*.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my most sincere gratitude to Professor Reinhard Pummer for his guidance in preparing this dissertation, for his patience, and, most of all, for teaching me the sublime pleasure of scholarship. I am indebted to the members of my examining committee for their comments, corrections, and recommendations. Any remaining errors or omissions are mine. Financial support for this research was provided in part through a fellowship from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC).

Jim and Shirley Bennett, I could not have made it here without your support, thank-you for taking me into your family, for the supplies, and for the prayers.

To my father: you were right again.

And Dr. Bennett, thank-you for... everything.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	II
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	III
TABLE OF CONTENTS	IV
ABBREVIATIONS	1
1. INTRODUCTION	2
1.1 THESIS OVERVIEW	2
1.2 THE HISTORIOGRAPHY OF EARLY CHRISTIAN ARCHITECTURE	4
1.3 THE IMPERIAL CITY AND CHRISTIAN ARCHITECTURE	13
1.4 CHRISTIAN ARCHITECTURE AND THE TEMPLE OF JERUSALEM	20
1.5 ARCHITECTURAL METAPHOR	23
1.6 BODY/TEMPLE METAPHOR IN EARLY CHRISTIAN LITERATURE	27
1.7 SUMMARY	30
2. THE ARCHITECTURAL CONTEXT OF BODY/TEMPLE METAPHOR	31
2. (PREFACE) GREEK TEMPLES	32
2.1 VITRUVIUS AND THE <i>DISCIPLINA RATIONIS</i> OF IMPERIAL ARCHITECTURE	38
2.2 TEMPLE ARCHITECTURE	54
2.2.1 ROMAN TEMPLE	54
2.2.1.1 FORUM OF AUGUSTUS AND THE TEMPLE OF MARS ULTOR	56
2.3 IMPERIAL ARCHITECTURE AND HEROD	65
2.3.1 JERUSALEM TEMPLE	73
2.4 ARCHITECTURE, CHRISTIANITY, AND CHRISTIAN ARCHITECTURE	80
2.4.1 GOSPEL NARRATIVE	81
2.4.2 PAULINE SOURCES	85
2.4.3 THE NARRATIVE OF ACTS	86
2.5 DOMUS, DOMUS ECCLESIAE AND THE SPECIAL CASE OF DURA EUROPOS	91
3. THE NATURE OF ARCHITECTURAL METAPHOR IN EARLY CHRISTIAN TEXTS	104
3.1 INTRODUCTION	104
3.2 SUBSTITUTION VERSUS INTERACTION THEORY	106
3.3 THE GREEKS	108
3.4 THE ROMANS	115
3.5 THE CHRISTIANS	120
3.6 THE CONTEXT OF EARLY CHRISTIAN ARCHITECTURAL METAPHOR	135

4.	THE FUNCTION OF BODY/TEMPLE METAPHOR IN EARLY CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.....	138
4.1	INTRODUCTION	138
4.2	BODY/TEMPLE METAPHOR IN THE EPISTLE AND GOSPEL TRADITIONS	139
4.2.1	THE EPISTLES	140
	1 CORINTHIANS 3.10–19.....	140
	1 CORINTHIANS 6.17–20.....	144
	2 CORINTHIANS 6.14–18.....	145
	EPHESIANS 2:19–22.....	149
	1 PETER 2.4–9.....	152
	THE FUNCTION OF THE BODY/TEMPLE METAPHOR IN THE EPISTLES.....	155
4.2.2	THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS AND JOHN	163
	MARK 13.1–2; 14.58	164
	MATTHEW 24.1–2; 26.60–61	167
	JOHN 2.19–22	170
	THE FUNCTION OF THE BODY/TEMPLE METAPHOR IN THE GOSPELS.....	175
4.3	BODY/TEMPLE METAPHOR IN THE APOSTOLIC FATHERS	177
	EPISTLE OF BARNABAS 16.1–10	178
	THE FUNCTION OF THE APOSTOLIC BODY/TEMPLE METAPHOR	182
4.4	BODY/TEMPLE METAPHOR IN ANTE-NICENE LITERATURE	183
	CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA	183
	ORIGEN	191
	EUSEBIUS	199
5.	CONCLUSION	211
6.	REFERENCES	215
	APPENDICES	224

ABBREVIATIONS

Terms are defined when they first appear in the text. The following abbreviations are used upon subsequent citation.

1 Chr.	1 Chronicles
2 Chr.	2 Chronicles
1 Cor.	1 Corinthians
2 Cor.	2 Corinthians
B.C.E.	Before the Common Era
C.E.	Common Era
Comm. sur Jn.	Commentaire sur Saint Jean
E.H.	Ecclesiastical History
Eph.	Ephesians
Ex.	Exodus
Ezek.	Ezekial
Lk.	Luke
LXX	Septuagint
Jn.	John
Mk.	Mark
Mt.	Mathew
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version
NT	New Testament
OT	Old Testament
Phil.	Philippians
Rom.	Romans

1. INTRODUCTION

16 Οὐκ οἶδατε ὅτι ναὸς θεοῦ ἐστε καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν οἰκεῖ; 17 εἴ τις τὸν ναὸν τοῦ θεοῦ φθείρει, φθερεῖ τοῦτον ὁ θεός· ὁ γὰρ ναὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ἅγιός ἐστιν, οἵτινές ἐστε ὑμεῖς. (1 Cor. 3.16-17)

ταύτη δ' οὖν καὶ ὁδε Χριστὸν ὅλον, τὸν λόγον, τὴν σοφίαν, τὸ φῶς ἐν τῇ αὐτὸς αὐτοῦ ἀγαλματοφορῶν ψυχῇ, οὐδ' ἔστιν εἰπεῖν οἷα σὺν μεγαλοφροσύνῃ πλουσία τε καὶ ἀπλήστῳ διανοίᾳ χειρὶ καὶ σὺν οἷα πάντων ὑμῶν φιλοτιμία, τῇ τῶν εἰσφορῶν μεγαλοψυχίᾳ τῆς αὐτῆς αὐτῷ προθέσεως κατὰ μηδένα τρόπον ἀπολειφθῆναι φιλονεικότερον μεγαλοφρονουμένων (Eusebius. *E.H* 10.4.26)

In the 250 years that separate Paul and Eusebius, a distinct Christian architecture emerged from the shadows of the Imperial city. The crowded residential quarters where Paul spoke in Rome, Corinth, and Ephesus gradually gave way to the monumental churches built by Constantine. The great basilicas of Rome, Jerusalem, and Tyre, built shortly after the “triumph” of the new emperor and unprecedented in the Christian tradition, are evidence of a new typology. Archaeology and architectural history have provided us with a chronology of formal and programmatic developments for this new architecture, but they have done little to help us in understanding how early Christians came to reconcile the conflicting demands of *being* the temple *in* Christ (Paul) with *building* the temple *for* Christ (Eusebius). We will argue that this reconciliation is achieved, in part, through an architectural metaphor that first identifies the body of Christ and the Christian community as a temple and, ultimately, associates that metaphorical temple with Christian buildings.

1.1 THESIS OVERVIEW

The body/temple metaphor appears 18 times in the New Testament (NT): Synoptic

Gospels (Matt. 12.6, Matt. 24.1–2 // Mark 13.1–2 // Luke 21.5–6, Matt. 26.61 // Mark 14.58, Matt. 27.40 // Mark 15.38, Matt. 27.51 // Mark 15.38 // Luke 23.45), John (2.19–22), Pauline letters (1 Cor. 3.16–17; 6.19; 2 Cor. 6.16), Deutero-Pauline letters (Eph. 2.21), 1 Peter 2.4–8, and Revelation (3.12; 21.22). The metaphor has two variations. The first, developed primarily in the Pauline and deutero-Pauline texts, identifies the Christian community as God’s temple. The second, developed in the Synoptics and John, associates the body of Christ with the Jerusalem temple. The metaphor functions rhetorically in the Epistles and in the Gospels to unite the Christian community (bringing them together inside of a psychological space) and to segregate the Christian community (locating them outside of any obligation to geographical space). Considering the ubiquitous cosmological order implied by the temple in both Roman and Jewish tradition, the body/temple metaphor offers an alternative topography for Christian cult activity. While the two variations are most probably written independently in the first century, we have evidence that they are read inter-textually at least by the beginning of the second century.¹

In the second and third centuries, the function of the body/temple metaphor in early Christian literature becomes twofold. As rhetoric, the metaphor continues to be used as a technique for conveying ideas of Christian community. Additionally, as an hermeneutic device, the body/temple metaphor is used to create inter-textual relationships between diverse narrative fragments in order to construct a central narrative of Christ as the principle of universal order. Using architecture as a unifying theme, these narrative fragments include references to Christian literature, Jewish tradition, and Greek philosophy. Informed by an expanding “encyclopaedia” of cultural references,² shared to some extent by all people living in the Empire, the body/temple

¹ See “The Epistle of Barnabas,” trans. Kirsopp Lake, *The Apostolic Fathers*, ed. G.P. Goold, vol. 1 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1985) 4.4.1.

² On cultural knowledge as encyclopaedic see: Umberto Eco, *Semiotics and the Philosophy of Language* (Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1984) 127.

proved an effective hermeneutic vehicle for imagining the Christian city.

Drawing on the authority of the Gospels and Paul, the two variations of the body/temple metaphor are employed by the Apostolic Fathers in eleven passages.³ In the ante-Nicene literature, the metaphor is used one hundred and twenty times by fourteen different authors.⁴ Among all references to the body/temple metaphor between the first and early fourth centuries, Eusebius is the first to expand the tenor to include the physical buildings used by the Christian community.⁵ The genealogy of his unique application of the body/temple metaphor can be traced through an exegetic tradition that begins with the pseudonymous *Epistle of Barnabas* and continues through Clement of Alexandria and Origen to Eusebius. Although the metaphor is employed to various ends by other schools of Jewish and Christian thought,⁶ it is in following this narrow trajectory of Alexandrian authors, we argue, that Eusebius attempted to reconcile the presence of Christ with the order of the Imperial City.

1.2 THE HISTORIOGRAPHY OF EARLY CHRISTIAN ARCHITECTURE

³ see Appendix 1.

⁴ see Appendix 1.

⁵ “Panegyric on the building of the churches,” Eusebius, *The Ecclesiastical History*, trans. Kirsopp Lake, The Loeb Classical Library, ed. T.E. Page, 2 vols. (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1959) 10.4.2–72.

⁶ e.g., On temple symbolism in the Qumran community: Bertil Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965) 1–46; also Lawrence H. Schiffman, “Community Without Temple: The Qumran Community's Withdrawal from the Jerusalem Temple,” *Gemeinde ohne Tempel/Community without Temple*, eds. Beate Ego, Armin Lange and Peter Pillhofer (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999); in the Jewish community of Alexandria: Margaret Barker, “Temple Imagery in Philo: An Indication of the Origin of the Logos?” *Templum Amicitiae: Essays on the Second Temple presented to Ernst Bammel*, ed. William Horbury, vol. 48, Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991); in apocryphal Jewish literature: J.T.A.G.M. van Ruiten, “Visions of the Temple in the Book of Jubilees,” *Gemeinde ohne Tempel/Community without Temple*, ed. Armin Lange Beate Ego, Peter Pillhofer (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999); see also “Sibylline Oracles,” trans. J.J. Collins, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha Vol. 1.*, ed. James H. Charlesworth (New York: Doubleday, 1983) 4.8–11; in apocryphal Christian literature: “The Teachings of Silvanus,” trans. Malcolm L. Peel and Jan Zandee, *The Nag Hammadi Library in English*, ed. James M. Robinson (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1988) 7.4.106; 7.4.109; “The Shepherd of Hermas,” trans. Kirsopp Lake, *The Apostolic Fathers* (Cambridge, MA/London: Harvard University Press, 1976) sim. 3.1.3–3.6.6; 9.3.1–9.10.7; 9.13.1 ‘Ο δὲ πύργος, φημί, τίς ἐστίν; ‘Ο πύργος, φησὶν, οὗτος ἡ ἐκκλησία ἐστίν.

Answering the questions of what constitutes a Christian architecture and when it first appears is essential for clarifying the architectural function of the body/temple metaphor. On these questions, typically, historiographers of Christian architecture follow one of two arguments. Either Christian architecture did not exist before Constantine because architecture is antithetical to early Christian ontology or Christian architecture developed along similar cultural patterns as other contemporary cults, synagogues, and *collegia*. These two arguments have been characterized by Paul Corby Finney as aniconic and iconic.⁷

To summarize, the aniconic treatment uses early Christian text sources to develop a normative Christian message that justifies either ambivalence to, or an outright rejection of, symbolic architecture in the early church. The reliance on orthodox texts insures consistency with a pure form of Christianity that is uncontaminated by heretical or Roman influences. The conclusion of the aniconicists is, generally, that a true Christian architecture exists only as an expression of the community in service of the Word. Any architectural reference that is outside of a liturgical function is, therefore, non-Christian. The extension of this argument is that early Christianity does not provide the ontological structure for a symbolic architecture. This opinion makes the Constantinian building program theologically corrupt because Constantine draws on the traditions of Roman architecture and disrupts the natural evolution of Christian building. This functionalist reading ignores the complex social network of which the early Christians were part and the generative potential of architectural metaphor.

The genesis of the aniconic argument is in Jesus' cleansing and threatened destruction of the Jerusalem Temple, furthered by Stephen's vilification of that same building, and by the

⁷ For a review of these two positions see Paul Corby Finney, "Early Christian Architecture: The Beginnings (A Review Article)," *Harvard Theological Review* 81 (1988) 319–339.

pragmatic nature of early Christian meeting places.⁸ Jesus replaces the Temple buildings as the locus of God's presence on earth and he is present wherever Christians gather. The places of gathering, the rooms where Christians come together, are expedient but not significant. Only the presence of Christ is symbolic. This tacit rejection of architecture explains the paucity of archaeological evidence for Christian building in the first three centuries C.E. and demonstrates that the monumental churches of the 4C C.E. are a corruption of the original Christian message by Roman influences. Harold Turner has characterized this corruption as a return to the idea of sacred space as *domus dei* and a lapse in developing the novel Christian concept of *domus ecclesiae*.⁹

Paul Corby Finney identifies the work of F.W. Deichman, Uwe Süsslenbach, and Harold W. Turner as typical of the aniconic position. In Finney's view, these authors see the period before Constantine as representative of a "true" form of Christianity—a Christianity formed by the mystical presence of Christ and inherently opposed to any sort of iconic or architectural representation. Finney criticizes the aniconic view of Christian architecture as "theological."¹⁰ Arguing that it is essentially polemic under the guise of objective history, Finney sees an underlying Calvinist agenda (an agenda propagated by Karl Barth, among others) to rationalize a fundamentalist re-construction of European Protestantism following the Second World War.¹¹ In Finney's opinion, this "Calvinist" history has constructed a flawed theory in order to justify an aniconic Christianity—a position that is not borne witness by historical record.¹² While the

⁸ Turner, 111–116.

⁹ Turner, 154.

¹⁰ Finney, 329.

¹¹ For a Catholic version of this position see Jean Daniélou, *The Presence of God*, trans. Walter Roberts (London: A.R. Mowbray, 1958) 29.

¹² Finney, 319. "...European Christians, both Protestants and Catholics, have been faced with the often daunting task of rebuilding their places of worship. At the same time, they have been at pains to recover the principles of early church planning and design. The themes that have emerged out of this search for the past have had a profound effect in shaping the attitudes of post-war European Christendom."

aniconic position has been widely criticized for an a-historical methodology and theological bias, it remains an influential interpretation in the study of Christian architecture.¹³ To redress problems with the aniconic argument, Finney proposes the work of Richard Krautheimer,¹⁴ L. Michael White,¹⁵ and D. Willy Rordorf.¹⁶ Krautheimer and White are considered essential to the argument put forward in this dissertation.

Richard Krautheimer, one of the foremost scholars in the field of early Christian architecture, maintains that the buildings used for meetings by pre-Constantinian Christians were fundamentally undifferentiated from the urban fabric around them.¹⁷ His conclusions are based on the limited ownership available to early Christians in the Roman socio-economic system,¹⁸ the destruction of Christian property during persecutions, and his considerable archaeological fieldwork.¹⁹ Following Adolf Harnack,²⁰ Krautheimer characterizes the evolution of Christian buildings as occurring in four phases. First, from 50 to 150 C.E., Christians met in the residences

¹³ Henry Chadwick, *The Early Church*, The Pelican History of the Church, ed. Owen Chadwick (Penguin Books, 1987) 277–278; Robin Margaret Jensen, *Understanding Early Christian Art* (London/New York: Routledge, 2000) 13.

¹⁴ Seminal works include: Richard Krautheimer, "The Beginning of Early Christian Architecture," *Studies in Early Christian, Medieval, and Renaissance Art* (New York/London: New York University Press/University of London Press, 1969) 1–20; Richard Krautheimer, *Corpus Basilicarum Christianarum Romae. Early Christian Basilicas in Rome (IV–XI Cent.)*, 5 vols. (Citta del Vaticano: Pontificio Instituto di Archeologia Cristiana, 1937–1970); Richard Krautheimer, *Early Christian and Byzantine Architecture* (Hong Kong: Yale University Press, 1986); Richard Krautheimer, *Three Christian Capitals: Topography and Politics* (Berkeley: University of California, 1983)

¹⁵ L. Michael White, *The Social Origins of Christian Architecture, Volume 1*, Harvard Theological Studies, vol. 42 (Valley Forge, PA.: Trinity Press International, 1990). This is a reworking of White's Yale dissertation referred to by Finney; L. Michael White, *The Social Origins of Christian Architecture, Volume 2*, Harvard Theological Studies, vol. 42 (Valley Forge, PA.: Trinity Press International, 1997); L. Michael White, "Concepts of Space in Greek Thought," *Aperion* 24.2 (1996) 183–197.

¹⁶ Willy Rordorf and André Schneider, *L'évolution du concept de tradition dans l'Église ancienne*, *Traditio Christiana*, vol. 5 (Berne: P. Lang, 1982).

¹⁷ Richard Krautheimer, *Rome: Portrait of a City 312–1308* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1980) 18. This comes close to the aniconic position, but is nuanced in Krautheimer's work.

¹⁸ This argument is disputed by: Wayne A. Meeks, *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1983) 72–73; Rodney Stark, *The Rise of Christianity* (San Francisco: Harper Collins, 1997) 29–47.

¹⁹ e.g., Krautheimer, *Corpus Basilicarum Christianarum Romae. Early Christian Basilicas in Rome (IV–XI Cent.)*

²⁰ A. Harnack, *The Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries*, trans. James Moffatt (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1961). Harnack argues that the charismatic movement in the early church was a competing power with the "officers" of the later church. For a review of Harnack's position and his seminal voice in the historiography of Early Christianity see James Tunstead Burtchaell, *From Synagogue to Church: Public Services and Offices in the Earliest Christian Communities* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1992) 82–87, 146.

of their wealthier members. Second, from 150 to 250 C.E., some of these residential properties underwent renovations necessary to accommodate changing community needs. Third, between 250 and 313 C.E., churches began to occupy and modify larger, more public buildings. While periodic persecutions saw the destruction of some of these buildings, the persecutions also precipitated cycles of architectural development brought on by the need to rebuild. Finally, in Krautheimer's analysis, following Constantine's ascension to the Imperial throne in 313, Christian building received Imperial patronage and was transformed into a distinct and monumental architecture. This fourth phase indicates a dramatic shift in architectural intentions and explains the marked increase in archaeological evidence. In Krautheimer's view, this final phase represents the beginning of a true "Christian" architecture.

In a postscript to his seminal essay of 1939, "The Beginnings of Early Christian Architecture," Richard Krautheimer writes:

But a number of the ideas outlined in this early paper have remained basic to my thinking through all this time: the fundamental contrast between Christian architecture before and after Constantine, the former domestic the later public in function and design; the religious connotations inherent in the function of all "secular" Roman basilicas; the formation of the Christian basilica as a variant on rather than a derivative of Roman public meeting halls; and the variety of church planning under Constantine.²¹

Understanding the nature of this "fundamental contrast" in Christian Architecture provided the impetus to undertake the research for this dissertation. While new evidence has sometimes required a re-evaluation of Krautheimer's conclusions, his work remains invaluable for any study of early Christian architecture.

Building on the archaeological foundations of Richard Krautheimer, social historian L.

²¹ Krautheimer, "The Beginning of Early Christian Architecture," 19–20.

Michael White sees the formal development of Christian architecture as consistent with a more general trend in Roman culture and, unlike Krautheimer, less about distinctions attributable to a nascent Christian culture. White has identified the transformation of domestic buildings for religious purposes as typical of private cults throughout the Empire.²² Roman mystery cults, Jewish synagogues, and Christian house churches used renovated residential buildings as meeting places. The construction of these more specialized buildings required considerable financial sacrifice from members of the cult communities as well as the patronage of wealthy Roman benefactors. The support of cults and *collegia* was a point of prestige for Romans seeking to demonstrate their benevolence and this support was extended to a number of Christian communities. Therefore, Christians had the available resources to build before the mid-second century but chose not to. White's most novel contribution to Krautheimer's history is in the period between the *domus ecclesiae* and the basilica of the Constantinian period. Here, White argues, rather than a simple adaptation of existing public buildings, Christians developed a distinctive, albeit non-monumental, architecture.²³ The *aula ecclesiae*, a term coined by White,²⁴ marks a break from the *domus* and is indicative of a shift in Christian social standing and self-definition. White sees this step as the mediating element between first and fourth century Christian attitudes toward architecture. In White's model, "... local conditions relating to the type of building and the social circumstances of the Christian community played a more central role than abstract notions of architectural style."²⁵ The basilica is not so much a radical departure as a function of "substantial social changes in the status and composition of Christianity."²⁶

White has provided a much needed social depth to Krautheimer's work. His proposed

²² White, *The Social Origins of Christian Architecture, Volume 1* 10–21.

²³ White, *The Social Origins of Christian Architecture, Volume 1* 24–32.

²⁴ White, *The Social Origins of Christian Architecture, Volume 1* 190.

²⁵ White, *The Social Origins of Christian Architecture, Volume 1* 5.

²⁶ White, *The Social Origins of Christian Architecture, Volume 1* 147–148.

aula ecclesiae is a valuable contribution to narrowing the gap between the first three centuries of Christianity and the dramatic changes of the fourth. His characterization of Christian buildings as more similar to their Roman and Jewish neighbors than distinct, is a significant shift from the scholarship of the previous generation and reflects the groundbreaking work of social historians like Wayne Meeks and Peter Brown.²⁷

In summary, the iconic position rejects the premise that the Gospels and Epistles contain a pure form of Christianity. Rather, early Christian literature is as much corrective as it is normative and must be interpreted within the social context that created it. To that end, textual and archaeological evidence is employed within historical, cultural, and social models.²⁸ The current consensus is that, while Christians in the first three centuries did not produce a distinctive “monumental” architecture, they did follow patterns of architectural development that are consistent with other contemporary cultural sub-groups.²⁹ These patterns of inhabitation include the organized use of unmodified domestic rooms, renovated domestic rooms, and modest, purpose-built public rooms.

For Christian communities, Krautheimer and White identify two place-types developed in this early period: 1) the house church (*domus*) and 2) the modified house church (*domus ecclesiae*).³⁰ By the mid-third century C.E., Christian material and visual culture were developed to the point that the architectural patterns of the *domus ecclesiae* are recognizable in the archaeological record.³¹ While details varied from community to community, general patterns of

²⁷ e.g., Peter Brown, *Society and the Holy in Late Antiquity* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1982).

²⁸ Meeks, 1–8.

²⁹ White, *The Social Origins of Christian Architecture, Volume 1* 26–59; for a comprehensive study of this phenomenon see: John S. Kloppenborg and Stephen G. Wilson, eds., *Voluntary Associations in the Graeco-Roman World* (London and New York: Routledge, 1996); Lee I. Levine, *The Ancient Synagogue: The First Thousand Years* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2000).

³⁰ White, *The Social Origins of Christian Architecture, Volume 1* 102–139.

³¹ Krautheimer, *Early Christian and Byzantine Architecture* 27; See M-L. Mussell, “The Oldest Known Christian Churches: Dura Europos and Aqaba,” *Bulletin of the Canadian Society of Mesopotamian Studies* 36 (2001).

architectural development can be identified. In the history of Christian architecture, Dura Europos remains the premier example of church building development prior to the fourth century. Further, Dura demonstrates the similarities shared among Christian, Jewish, and Roman religious buildings.³²

In the late third and early fourth centuries, Christian architecture was increasingly codified in concert with Christian liturgy and theology. Changing social demands necessitated the construction of more architecturally specific and larger assembly halls (*aulae ecclesiae*).³³ White sees this development as part of a more gradual transition from the *domus ecclesiae* to the monumental Constantinian basilicas. For the iconic school, the arrival of Constantine and the monumental churches is not a corruption of the Christian message, but an appropriate and inevitable expression of Christianity in the Imperial context of the fourth century. Returning to Krautheimer:

Modest basilicas may have already been built by Christian congregations in the years preceding the Peace of the Church: S. Crisogono in Rome is an example. But only under Constantine did architects meet the requirements of the Christian ritual by creating new variations on the ever variable type of the genus basilica. From this background the Christian basilica drew three or four features which by A.D. 300 had become essential characteristics common to the majority of basilicas whatever their function: the oblong plan; the longitudinal axis; the timber roof, either open or concealed by a flat ceiling—vaulting, as in the Basilica of Maxentius, having remained exceptional in Roman basilicas; finally the terminating tribunal, whether rectangular or in the form of an apse. Division into nave and aisles and a high clerestory with large windows became preponderant, but they remained optional; galleries remained rare. Within this framework, the

189–199; Gordon F. Snyder, *Ante Pacem: Archaeological Evidence of Church Life Before Constantine* (Macon: Mercer University Press, 2003) 129. Snyder proposes 180 C.E. as a watershed for a distinct Christian material culture; Larry W. Hurtado, “The Earliest Evidence of an Emerging Christian Material and Visual Culture: the Codex, the Nomina Sacra and the Staurogram,” *Text and Artifact in the Religions of Mediterranean Antiquity*, ed. Stephen G. Wilson and Michel Desjardins, vol. 9, *Studies in Christianity and Judaism/Études sur le christianisme et le judaïsme* (Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2000) 276. Hurtado argues that Christians used textual devices to distinguish their community as early as the first century.

³² White, *The Social Origins of Christian Architecture, Volume 2* church 123–134; synagogue 272–293; mithraeum 261–272.

³³ White, *The Social Origins of Christian Architecture, Volume 1* 127–139.

Christian basilica had to be brought into line with the demands for greater dignity and monumentality newly created by the Constantinian spirit of Christianity and had to be adapted to specific liturgical requirements, to the financial mean and the social standing of the patron, and to local building practices—all widely diverging.³⁴

Is Christian architecture a result of the capitulation of Christianity to Roman culture as the aniconicists argue? Or, following the iconicist position, is monumental Christian architecture a reasonable result of cultural processes? Even if we concur with Finney and accept that the aniconic argument is tainted with theological bias, it is difficult to ignore the rhetorical attack on architecture in the Gospels and in the Epistles. This may not be evidence of an original and iconoclastic form of Christianity, but the use of architectural metaphor in these texts does provide a vehicle for Christian self-definition at the expense of Jewish and Roman institutions that are manifest in built form—a practice that continued in Christian literature through the second and third centuries. Krautheimer and White, for their part in the iconic school, have enriched our understanding of the role that architecture played in the formation of Christianity by offering a more complex and nuanced examination of the subject. Based on their work, it is reasonable to assume that early Christianity did have a modest architectural presence by the mid-third century. Responding to changes in the content and context of Christianity, these earliest church buildings underwent a gradual transformation that reached a dramatic turning point with the patronage of Constantine. One aspect of this process that remains to be addressed is the ontological apparatus that informed the transformation of a rhetorical temple into an Imperial monument. Understanding this apparatus is the objective of this dissertation.

³⁴ Krautheimer, *Early Christian and Byzantine Architecture* 43.

1.3 THE IMPERIAL CITY AND CHRISTIAN ARCHITECTURE

The symbolic value of architecture in the Imperial era cannot be overstated. To be a citizen of the Roman Empire was to be a part of a world that had, as its historical, theological, and geographical centre, the city of Rome.³⁵ From the ritually prescribed presence of the gods to the patterns of masonry construction, Rome was idealized as a cohesive system of interdependent phenomena in harmony with nature, the gods, and tradition.³⁶ At the centre of this perfect order was the architecture of the Roman temple.

Varro records that the poets use *templum* in reference to three specific conditions: "... *ab natura in caelo, ab auspiciis in terra, a similitudine sub terra*."³⁷ The origin of the term, he argues, is from *tueri* (to gaze). Modern scholars believe that the root is more appropriately from the Greek τέμνω (I cut or wound).³⁸ For the ancient Greeks, τέμενος was an area associated with a deity or deities and ritually separated from the greater landscape.³⁹ While his etymology may be flawed, Varro identifies the Roman *templum*, like the τέμενος of Greek tradition, as a place set apart from the rest of the world: "*In terris dictum templum locus augurii aut auspicii causa quibusdam conceptis verbis finitus*."⁴⁰ A *templum* is a place on the earth that is set aside by the appropriate ritual for augury or the taking of auspices. Many political functions, like the meeting of Senate, also required a properly consecrated *templum*.⁴¹ Significant for our study, the

³⁵ See Camillus' speech to the people of Rome: Livy, *Ab Urbe Condita*, trans. B.O. Foster, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 1959) 5.51–55.

³⁶ Vitruvius, *De Architectura*, trans. F. Granger, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge MA.: Harvard University Press, 1983) 1.7; 2.8. The reality of urban life in Rome, however, was not idyllic. For example, see: Juvenal, *Satirae*, Loeb Classical Library (New York: 1930) *Sat.*3.

³⁷ Varro, *On the Latin Language*, trans. Roland G. Kent, Loeb Classical Library Series, 2 vols. (Great Britain: Harvard University Press, 1993) 7.6.

³⁸ Varro, *On the Latin Language* see footnote b. 272; see also Joseph Rykwert, *The Idea of a Town* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1988) 45.

³⁹ Walter Burkert, "The Meaning and Function of the Temple in Classical Greece," *Temple in Society*, ed. Michael V. Fox (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1988) 35.

⁴⁰ Varro, *On the Latin Language* 7.8.

⁴¹ Rykwert, *The Idea of a Town* 46.

qualities of both *templum* and τέμενος can be attributed to the city of Rome through the circumstances surrounding her mythical beginnings. In Livy's telling, the founding of Rome, like the location of temples, was a function of augury.

Rhea Silvia was descended from the line of kings that traced their lineage back to Aeneas, the Trojan warrior and son of the divine Venus. Her father, Numitor, though the rightful king, was usurped by his brother Amulius. Incarcerated by her uncle and sentenced to a life of virginity, Rhea Silvia was surreptitiously impregnated by Mars. When Amulius discovered the pregnancy, he ordered that the resulting offspring, twin boys Romulus and Remus, be exposed to the elements. Through a series of events, the boys survived and eventually restored their grandfather to the throne.⁴² In order to exercise their own royal ambitions, they set out to found a city. Romulus chose the Palatine Hill as the site for this new city while Remus chose the Aventine. Remus saw a flight of six vultures and proclaimed that the Aventine was the predestined site for the new city. Romulus, some time later, saw a flight of twelve vultures, and argued that due to the greater number of birds, the Palatine was the favored site for the new city.⁴³ Romulus marked the perimeter of the new city by ploughing a furrow, leaving a ridge on the inside to create a symbolic wall. Remus, angry with his brother, jumped over the wall in order to defile his brother's new city. The transgression of that boundary was deadly:

...Remus, by way of jeering his brother, jumped over the half built walls of the new settlement, whereupon Romulus killed him in a fit of rage, adding the threat 'So perish whoever else shall overleap my battlements'.⁴⁴

Following Varro and Livy, Rome was effectively a *templum* because her boundaries were

⁴² see Livy, *Ab Urbe Condita* 1.3–5.

⁴³ This prodigy was also claimed by Augustus and confirmed his right to refound Rome. Suetonius, *The Twelve Caesars*, trans. Robert Graves (London: Penguin Books, 1989) Aug. 95.

⁴⁴ Livy, *Ab Urbe Condita* 1.7.

revealed by augury. The area identified by Romulus was known as the *pomerium* and considered sacred at least to the end of the Republic. This boundary was reportedly enlarged eleven times on the authority of those individuals who could claim to have expanded Roman territory.⁴⁵ In each case, like Romulus, the Etruscan rite of using the plough was employed to distinguish the city, both physically and symbolically, from the rest of the world.⁴⁶ The primacy of Rome was re-affirmed throughout the empire as each army camp, colony, and conquered city was founded or re-founded in this manner and in the symbolic image of Rome: “...et ideo coloniae nostrae omnes in litteris antiquis scribuntur urbes, quod item conditae ut Roma; et ideo coloniae et urbes conduntur, quod intra pomerium ponuntur.”⁴⁷

Livy’s foundation myth, consistent with other archaizing works published during the Principate,⁴⁸ emphasizes the role of traditional religious practice in balancing the dynamic relationship that existed between nature, gods, and human action. Rome’s imperial authority is justified in this literature by a masterful synthesis of Etruscan, Greek, and Roman tradition that demonstrates the auspicious beginnings of city and empire. As Liebeschuetz has argued in his study of Roman religion, “...ancestral rites always remained the central feature of Roman piety and the maintenance of divine support for the Roman people remained its central concern.”⁴⁹ This concern for tradition is evident in the formalization of Imperial architecture and in the synthetic nature of Roman temple design described by Vitruvius.⁵⁰

⁴⁵ Rykwert, *The Idea of a Town* 222 n.133. For a discussion on the archaeological evidence for the expansion of the *pomerium* see: Lawrence Richardson, *A New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome* (London: The John Hopkins Press, 1992) 293-296. In Richardson’s opinion, only Servius Tullius Claudius, and Aurelian made substantial changes.

⁴⁶ Rykwert, *The Idea of a Town* 132.

⁴⁷ Varro, *On the Latin Language* 5.143.

⁴⁸ e.g., Vergil’s *Aeneid*.

⁴⁹ J.H.W.G. Liebeschuetz, *Continuity and Change in Roman Religion* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996) 307; Eric M. Orlin, *Temples, Religion and Politics in the Roman Republic*, Mnemosyne, ed. W.M. Jongman J.S. Boersma, Ian Morris (Leiden/New York/Köln: E.J. Brill, 1997) 15–18.

⁵⁰ In general, by the time of Augustus, *templum* was used interchangeably to refer to both land consecrated by the

For Vitruvius, the location and form of the temple shared a common order that was influenced by the specific natures of the various gods. For example, Mercury was most appropriately located in the market place because of his association with commerce and Venus near the harbor because of her association with all things moist. This pattern of inhabitation is elaborated by Vitruvius in his architectural treatise, *De Architectura*, and addressed to the first emperor of Rome, Caesar Augustus. Drawing from Greek and Latin sources, Vitruvius sets out guidelines for the proper location and construction of temple buildings. The temple, he argues, is the defining element of urban order and informs architectural design from the smallest construction detail to the arrangement of the entire city. Like the Greeks before him, Vitruvius finds a perfect model for the temple in the proportions of a well-formed human body.⁵¹

This comprehensive and idyllic portrayal of architecture, formulated for an imperial agenda, is characterized by six qualities that Vitruvius proposes as the foundation for a *disciplina rationis*: *ordo*, *dispositio*, *eurythmia*, *symmetria*, *decor*, and *distributio*. In essence, the *disciplina rationis* is intended to guide the Imperial architect in creating buildings and cities that achieve harmony among human action, the gods, and nature. In doing so, the continued prosperity of Empire is assured.

Recent studies by Mark Wilson-Jones and others confirm that, while there are some discrepancies between the archaeological record and Vitruvian details, the text shows a remarkable consistency with the practice of Roman building through the first two centuries of the

augurs and buildings dedicated to the gods (*aedes* or *aedes sacrae*). However, the terms did retain the more distinct connotations of Republican usage in some cases. For example, the *Curia Hostilia*, where the Senate typically met, was a *templum* but not an *aedes*. Conversely, the *aedes Vesta* was not a *templum*. In the case of the *Curia*, as discussed above, some business of Senate had to take place in a consecrated *templum*. Why the *aedes Vesta* was not consecrated as a *templum* is a matter of speculation. See Richardson, *A New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome* 102; 412. See also Rykwert, *The Idea of a Town* 99.

⁵¹ Vitruvius, *De Architectura* 3.1.1.

common era.⁵² Most importantly for our study, *De Architectura* illustrates the explicit cosmological relationship between the ideal Roman body and the Imperial temple. The temple and, by extension, the comprehensive order of the Imperial city informed by the temple, offers both a semantic pattern and an architectural foil for the Christian body/temple metaphor.

Unlike Roman temples, Christian buildings before Constantine were not ritually constituted within the city. The theological, topographical, and geometrical relationships shared by body, temple, and city, explicit in Imperial architecture, were absent in early Christianity. While the Roman temple was located and dedicated through elaborate ritual, for Early Christians, a place in the city was significant only when the Christian community was present.⁵³ Almost as an aside, Gospel and Pauline sources indicate that the majority of these places for early Christian gathering were the private houses of the faithful.⁵⁴

During the periodic persecutions of early Christianity, many of the houses used for meetings were confiscated and their contents destroyed.⁵⁵ When the persecutions ended, some properties were returned and the churches were re-established in the same locations.⁵⁶ There is some evidence that the plans of these simple houses were modified over time, perhaps to accommodate changes in liturgy or an increase in the size of the community.⁵⁷ The oldest known

⁵² Mark Wilson Jones, *Principles of Roman Architecture* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2000) 38; Mark Wilson Jones, "Designing the Roman Corinthian Capital," *Papers of the British School at Rome* 59 (1991) 89–150; William L. MacDonald, *The Architecture of the Roman Empire II: An Urban Appraisal* (New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 1986) 248–249; Karen E. Ros, "The Roman Theatre at Carthage," *American Journal of Archaeology* 100 (1996) 449–489, 449; Roger B. Ulrich, "Contignatio, Vitruvius and the Campanian Builder," *American Journal of Archaeology* 100 (1996) 137–151.

⁵³ e.g., Romans 12:4–5 "For as in one body we have many parts, and all the parts do not have the same function, so we, through many, are one body in Christ and individually parts of one another."

⁵⁴ e.g., Romans 16:3–5 "Greet Prisca and Aquila, my co-workers in Christ Jesus, who risked their necks for my life, to whom not only am I grateful but also all the churches of the gentiles; greet also the church at their house." See appendix 2 for a complete account.

⁵⁵ Eusebius, *The Ecclesiastical History* 8.2.1.

⁵⁶ Eusebius, *The Ecclesiastical History* 9.10.10–11; 10.2.1.

⁵⁷ Krautheimer, *Early Christian and Byzantine Architecture* 27; White, *The Social Origins of Christian Architecture*, Volume 1 vol. 1 102–139.

example is preserved for the archaeological record in the Roman outpost of Dura Europos.⁵⁸ Further, Dura shows us that the practice of adapting residential properties for public meetings was not unique to Christianity. On the same street as the Christian building, there is evidence of similarly renovated properties for the Jewish community and for the cult of Mithras.⁵⁹

By the beginning of the fourth century, the house-church was a symbol of the Christian struggle and victory over the forces of evil.⁶⁰ The continued location of the churches in residential districts, first an implicit rejection of the architectural order of the Roman city and the cosmology that it represented, became a unifying symbol of Christ, the Christian community, and of sacrifice.⁶¹ Following the death of Maximin and a cessation to the persecutions, Eusebius records a period of rapid and dramatic re-construction. From his account, the Christian temples (νεώ)⁶² were re-built with great ceremony and with elaborate rites of consecration.⁶³ While his narrative may be as much rhetorical as historical, it seems clear that Eusebius understands the location and the construction of church buildings to be ecclesiastically significant.

In the panegyric that follows, Eusebius takes the opportunity to praise the re-building of God's house in Tyre by the bishop Paulinus.⁶⁴ In doing so, Eusebius employs the body/temple metaphor eight times to aid in his description of ἀρχέτυπα καὶ τούτων τὰ πρωτότυπα νοητὰ καὶ θεοπρεπῆ παραδείγματα that inform Christ, community, and Christian

⁵⁸ Krautheimer, *Early Christian and Byzantine Architecture* 27; Mussell, "The Oldest Known Christian Churches: Dura Europos and Aqaba,"; Snyder, *Ante Pacem: Archaeological Evidence of Church Life Before Constantine* 128–134; White, *The Social Origins of Christian Architecture, Volume 1* vol. 2 123–131.

⁵⁹ White, *The Social Origins of Christian Architecture, Volume 1* 144.

⁶⁰ Eusebius, *The Ecclesiastical History* 10.2.1.

⁶¹ Eusebius, *The Ecclesiastical History* 10.3.1–4.

⁶² Eusebius, *The Ecclesiastical History* 10.2.1. In discussing the rebuilding program, Eusebius also makes use of the terms τὰ κυριακὰ δὲ τὰ οἰκεία (9.10.10) and προσευκτηρίων (10.3.1). Apparently, he understood these three terms to be synonymous.

⁶³ Eusebius, *The Ecclesiastical History* 10.3.3.

⁶⁴ Eusebius, *The Ecclesiastical History* 10.4.26.

architecture.⁶⁵ Eusebius is the first Christian author to use the body/temple metaphor in reference to church buildings.

After 312 C.E., the course of Christian architecture is radically altered by the patronage of the Roman Emperor Constantine. Richard Krautheimer argues that this event is singular in transforming the domestic character of early Christian house-churches into the monumental structures of an imperial cult.⁶⁶ If we can say that Eusebius set out the intellectual framework for the reconciliation between Roman architecture and Christianity, then Constantine provided the political will and economic investment.⁶⁷

While the Christian Church was a favourite beneficiary, public works and monuments in service of the Empire were expected from the *pater patriae* and Constantine delivered. The Imperial monuments attributed to him are considerable and well documented.⁶⁸ From the completion of the monumental Basilica Nova in the *Forum Romanum* to the construction of an impressive public bath on the Quirinal, it seems apparent that Constantine saw himself as continuing a tradition established by his imperial forefathers.⁶⁹ In the Basilica Nova, Constantine erected a colossus holding a cross and inscribed with words echoing Augustus' intention to re-found Rome.⁷⁰ The senate and people of Rome, for their part, recognized Constantine as a hero and, as with the divine *augusti* before him, he was honored with a triumphal arch.⁷¹

⁶⁵ Eusebius, *The Ecclesiastical History* 10.4.55.

⁶⁶ Krautheimer, *Early Christian and Byzantine Architecture* 37. "Not before Constantine are Christian concepts expressed in the language of the official architecture of the Late Antiquity."

⁶⁷ Eusebius, *The Ecclesiastical History* 10.5.15–20; 10.6.1–5; Krautheimer, *Rome: Portrait of a City 312–1308* 20–30; Ramsay MacMullen, *Christianizing the Roman Empire (A.D. 100–400)* (New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 1984) 49–51; White, *The Social Origins of Christian Architecture, Volume 1* 147.

⁶⁸ Krautheimer, *Early Christian and Byzantine Architecture* 39–67; Krautheimer, *Rome: Portrait of a City 312–1308* 3–31; J.B. Ward-Perkins, *Roman Imperial Architecture*, Pelican History of Art (New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 1994) 428–439.

⁶⁹ Samuel Lieu, "Constantine's 'Pagan Vision': The anonymous panegyric on Constantine (310), Pan. Lat. VII(6)," *From Constantine to Julian: Pagan and Byzantine Views. A Source History*, ed. Dominic Montserrat Samuel N.C. Lieu (New York: Routledge, 1996) 68–70. Constantine traced his lineage to the *gens Claudia*.

⁷⁰ Eusebius, *The Ecclesiastical History* 9.9.11.

⁷¹ Ward-Perkins, *Roman Imperial Architecture* 429–430.

1.4 CHRISTIAN ARCHITECTURE AND THE TEMPLE OF JERUSALEM

While the physical context for the architectural hermeneutic of the body/temple metaphor was the architecture of Imperial Rome, Christians acknowledged a second temple tradition that was accessible to them only through the text of the LXX. The Temple of Jerusalem plays two roles in early Christian literature: First, it is an essentially Roman temple, both politically and architecturally, that is portrayed as abandoned by God; second, a “*Tempelidee*” or “*Tempelkonzept*”⁷² that is understood by Eusebius as an πρωτότυπον of architectural order.⁷³

To illustrate the abandoned Temple, we may consider Paul as he is represented in Acts. Three significant Temple events occur in Paul’s post-conversion life. In Acts 21.26–29, Paul is accused of defiling the Temple by bringing Gentiles into the Court of the Jews. He had gone to the Temple to purify himself and to prove to the Jews (and perhaps the Jerusalem Church) that he still observed the Mosaic Law. The Temple authorities, for their part, cast Paul out, accusing him of polluting the temple, and arrest him. In his defense, Paul rebukes his accusers, arguing that, as a Pharisee, his observation of the Law is unimpeachable.⁷⁴ In 22.17–18, he reveals that Christ appeared to him in the Temple and told him to leave Jerusalem. Paul’s vision confirms that God is present in the temple through Jesus and not because of the Law. The priesthood is blind to this presence. In 22.25, he invokes his rights as a Roman citizen and effectively removes himself from the jurisdiction of the temple officials. Jesus appears again to Paul, this time in prison (23.11), and, affirming Paul’s citizenship, instructs him to go to Rome.⁷⁵ The contrasting parallel between 22.17–18 and 23.11 is significant to our discussion of the

⁷² On *Tempelidee* see: Christfried Böttrich, “‘Ihr seid der Tempel Gottes.’ Tempelmetaphorik und Gemeinde bei Paulus,” *Gemeinde ohne Tempel/Community without Temple*, eds. Beate Ego, Armin Lange and Peter Pillhofer (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999) 410.

⁷³ On πρωτότυπον see: Eusebius, *The Ecclesiastical History* 10.4.55; on Solomon’s Temple see: Eusebius, *The Ecclesiastical History* 10.4.3.

⁷⁴ Acts 22.3.

⁷⁵ Acts 23.11.

architectural tenor of the body/temple metaphor. First, God is present in the Temple through Jesus. Secondly, God's presence, through Jesus, can be manifest in the Temple or in a prison. This leads to two possible conclusions, both consistent with this architectural tenor of the body/temple metaphor: either God has abandoned the Temple and is present in Jesus—regardless of the topography or God is present everywhere.

24 ὁ θεὸς ὁ ποιήσας τὸν κόσμον καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτῷ, οὗτος οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς ὑπάρχων κύριος οὐκ ἐν χειροποιήτοις ναοῖς 25 κατοικεῖ οὐδὲ ὑπὸ χειρῶν ἀνθρωπίνων θεραπεύεται προσδεόμενός τινος, αὐτὸς διδούς πᾶσι ζωὴν καὶ πνοὴν καὶ τὰ 26 πάντα ἐποίησέν τε ἐξ ἑνὸς πᾶν ἔθνος ἀνθρώπων κατοικεῖν ἐπὶ παντὸς προσώπου τῆς γῆς, ὀρίσας προστεταγμένους καιροὺς καὶ τὰς ὁροθεσίας τῆς κατοικίας αὐτῶν (Acts 17.24-25)

For exegetes like Eusebius, God's abandonment of the Jerusalem Temple is evident in the destruction of the building by Vespasian. In *E.H.* 3.5.4, Eusebius recounts the destruction of the Temple as the fulfillment of prophecy (Dan. 9.27) and, in 3.5.7, as God's retribution against the Jews for their "crime against the Christ of God." But while Herod's temple buildings are abandoned and destroyed, the idea of the temple inscribed in the LXX is understood by Eusebius as a *πρωτότυπον*.

Ex. 25.8–9 records that God agrees to dwell among the Jews, as part of the covenant with Moses, if a prescribed order is followed. A similar architectural revelation occurs in 1 Chr. 21.18–19 when God delivers his plan to David. Unlike the corporeal model proposed by Vitruvius, the order of the Tabernacle and the Temple has no physical precedent. It is a first, an archetype [ἀρχέτυπον], a prototype [πρωτότυπον] revealed by God. In 1 Kings 6.11–13, God tells Solomon that the boundaries established by the Temple plan extend beyond the walls of the building and include all of Israel's people:

Now the word of the Lord came to Solomon, “Concerning this house that you are building, if you will walk in my statutes, obey my ordinances, and keep all my commandments by walking in them, then I will establish my promise with you, which I made to your father David. I will dwell among the children of Israel, and will not forsake the people of Israel.

This characterization of the Temple may well have influenced Paul’s understanding of how and where God was made present.

David Renwick, in his book *Paul, the Temple and the Presence of God*, argues that the most distinguishing characteristic of the first century Pharisees is an approach to Judaic law “...leading them to maintain within the walls of their own homes, beyond the Temple walls, the purity appropriate to the Temple.”⁷⁶ While Renwick acknowledges that the extension of this logic is “no temple at all,” he points out that this is not the Pharisaic project. Rather, they sought a continuation of the Law through a purity that is idealized in the Temple. The Jerusalem Temple signifies purity and this purity guarantees the presence of God. However, in this signification, there is a distancing from the Temple as a physical object. The ontological dimension of the building, the architecture of the Temple, is in its power as an idea, not in the physical stones. Following Renwick, Paul’s use of the Temple as a vehicle for his metaphor to teach the Corinthians about the nature of God’s presence in 2 Cor. 2.14–3.18 is rooted in the intention, shared by Pharisees generally “...to recreate the atmosphere of the Temple outside the Temple, and thus to recreate the God-given Biblical conditions within which God delighted to be.”⁷⁷ In Chapter 2, we will discuss how the cultural encyclopaedia of early Christians was informed by both Roman and Jewish temple traditions and how these traditions informed their understanding of body/temple vehicle.

⁷⁶ David A. Renwick, *Paul, the Temple and the Presence of God*, Brown Judaic Studies, vol. 224 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991) 21.

⁷⁷ Renwick, *Paul, the Temple and the Presence of God* 157.

1.5 ARCHITECTURAL METAPHOR

Umberto Eco suggests that at the centre of any discussion on metaphor lies a single tautological premise. “A metaphor is that artifice which permits one to speak metaphorically.”⁷⁸ He argues that the metaphoric process can result in an “epistemic break” that moves the significance of the metaphoric utterance outside of the culturally accepted relationship of sign to referent to reveal something unrecognized or unknown. It is these occurrences that Eco identifies as the proper concern of a theory of metaphor. Chapter 3 is an examination of the early Christian body/temple metaphor in this context.

Theories of metaphor follow two basic structures: substitution and interaction. The substitution theory was first articulated by Aristotle and continues to inform discussion on the subject. In his *Poetics*, Aristotle defines metaphor as “the application of a word that belongs to another thing: either from genus to species, species to genus, species to species, or by analogy.”⁷⁹ Simply put, metaphor is a means of describing one object in terms of another. This principle of transference or borrowing of meaning is fundamental to all metaphor. It is also a matter of some concern for philosophers who question knowledge acquired through what is essentially a misunderstanding or a “lie.”⁸⁰ Plato, for example, recognized the ethical and political dimension of language and expressed his concern over the use of metaphorical language in poetry and rhetoric.⁸¹ Aristotle, however, downplays the potential semantic and, by extension, epistemological disruption that this transfer of meaning can cause.⁸²

Metaphor was a popular rhetorical device in the period under discussion and, following

⁷⁸ Eco, *Semiotics and the Philosophy of Language* 88.

⁷⁹ Aristotle, “Poetics,” trans. Stephen Halliwell, *Poetics/Aristotle. On the Sublime/Longinus. On Style/Demetrius*, ed. Stephen Halliwell, vol. 199, The Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995) 1457b 6–9.

⁸⁰ Eco, *Semiotics and the Philosophy of Language* 89.

⁸¹ See pp. 110–112.

⁸² See pp. 112–116.

the instruction of Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian, to name a few, was used to convey novel ideas and to make speech and literature more engaging. Like their contemporaries, early Christian writers employed metaphor to explain their relationship to their god and to each other. They also used extended metaphors, through parables and allegories, to disguise what they were saying. It is in trying to understand the nature of these extended metaphors that the substitution theory becomes inadequate.

The interaction theory identifies two components of a metaphor. The first is the tenor or the intended meaning. The second is the vehicle or the borrowed terms through which the tenor is conveyed through the semantic interplay of culturally relevant signifiers within a specific discourse. Characterized, in part, as a mis-representation of accepted signifier/signified relationships, a metaphor can only occur if participants in the discourse understand the common meaning or meanings of the words being employed. In chapter 3, we consider what early Christians may have understood a temple to be and how that understanding was linked to the human body. If metaphor is an accumulation of meaning, as the interactionists argue, the catalyst for that cumulative process is in the semantics of the terms employed as the vehicle. Further, following Max Black and Paul Ricoeur, the meanings associated with the constituent parts of the *vehicle* are constructed through both the denotative and the connotative capacity of signs:

By connotative values we mean, with Max Black, the "system of associated commonplaces" which enlarge the meaning of our words, adding cultural and emotional dimensions to the literal values codified by our dictionaries. Of course there are no metaphors in a lexicon, but beyond lexicon there is what Aristotle called the *topoi*, the cultural treasure of meanings. The art of metaphor is to apply a part of this treasure to new subjects, to use it as a screen which not only selects, but which brings forth new aspects in the principal subject.⁸³

⁸³ Ricoeur, "Word, Polysemy, Metaphor: Creativity in Language," 79.

For architectural metaphor, then, meaning is not only drawn from signs that reference objects in the built environment, meaning is also drawn from the web of cultural narratives that are generated by those objects and references. This “labyrinthine” and “encyclopaedic” source for meaning is the key to understanding the generative capacity of metaphor in the interaction model.⁸⁴ Metaphor is not simply a matter of substituting one semantic value for another. Rather, the metaphor draws on a field of referents that are brought forward by the terms of the vehicle. The interpretation of this hyper-semantic event has the potential, following Ricoeur, “...to redescribe reality.”⁸⁵

To unpack all of the cultural treasure of meanings embodied by architectural metaphor is an impossible task. Quite simply, in the context of the interaction model, a metaphor cannot be paraphrased. The success of a metaphor is a function of the socio-cultural format of the interpreting subjects’ encyclopaedia. Metaphors occur within cultural frameworks that have a universe of organized content and networks of interpretation. The function of metaphor, then, is not only a demonstration of knowledge but also a revelation of knowledge evoked by the semiotic complexity of the vehicle:

...for too long it has been thought that in order to understand metaphors it is necessary to know the code (or the encyclopaedia): the truth is that the metaphor is the tool that permits us to understand the encyclopaedia better. This is the type of knowledge that the metaphor stakes out for us.⁸⁶

In the following examination of the early Christian body/temple vehicle, we discuss metaphor within the context of the interaction model and, more specifically, as argued by Eco and Ricoeur,

⁸⁴ Eco, *Semiotics and the Philosophy of Language* 80–84.

⁸⁵ Ricoeur, “Word, Polysemy, Metaphor: Creativity in Language,” 85.

⁸⁶ Eco, *Semiotics and the Philosophy of Language* 129.

as a semantic event that has the capacity to redirect the imagination.⁸⁷

The narrative of Christianity is constructed from a great many small stories that have disparate temporal, geographic, and cultural origins. In constructing their Christian hermeneutic, Eusebius, Origen, Clement, *Barnabas*, and the authors of the Epistles and Gospels are unapologetic about apparent discrepancies and inconsistencies. Sometimes incongruous characters, places, events, and metaphors are understood to be distractions that conceal the Christian message from the ignorant. The oblique nature of the Scriptures requires that the exegete be trained in a “spiritualized” reading. A coherent and unified text is constructed only through the figure of Christ. The texts studied in this dissertation present Christ as the λόγος—a universal pattern revealed to those who are able to understand. This revelation, Paul Ricoeur argues, is a function of metaphor:

...the structure embedding one narrative in another narrative is the fundamental framework for the metaphorical transfer guided by the enigma—expression... The effect of this embedding is twofold: on the one hand, the embedded narrative borrows from the encompassing narrative the structure of interpretation that allows the metaphorization of its meaning; in return, the interpretant (to use an expression taken from C.S. Peirce) is also reinterpreted due to the feedback (*par choc en retour*) from the metaphorized narrative. Metaphorization, therefore, is a process at work between the encompassing narrative and the embedded narrative.⁸⁸

The structure of the hermeneutic vehicle in the body/temple metaphor is in the tension between the “small” stories and the greater narrative—between event and λόγος. Some of these

⁸⁷ “We are prepared to inquire into the power of imagination, no longer as the faculty of deriving ‘images’ from sensory experiences, but as the capacity to let new worlds build our self understanding. This power would not be conveyed by emerging images but by emerging meanings in our language. Imagination, then, should be treated as a dimension of language. In that way, a new link would appear between imagination and metaphor.” Paul Ricoeur, “Metaphor and the Main Problem Of Hermeneutics,” trans. David Pellauer, *Reflection and Imagination: A Ricoeur Reader*, ed. Mario J. Valdés (Toronto/Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1991) 318.

⁸⁸ Paul Ricoeur, “The Bible and the Imagination,” *The Bible as a Document of the University*, ed. Hans Dieter Betz (Chicago: Scholars Press, 1981)55.

“small” stories are extended metaphors (allegories) in their own right.⁸⁹ The substitution of meaning that characterizes Aristotelean metaphor extends here beyond the noun, beyond renaming, to a binding of the various narrative events of the text. The body/temple is a vehicle of extended metaphors whose tenor is the λόγος.

1.6 BODY/TEMPLE METAPHOR IN EARLY CHRISTIAN LITERATURE

The body/temple metaphor is referenced by 19 ante-Nicene authors, both Greek and Latin, in over 130 verses.⁹⁰ While Latin writers employ the body/temple metaphor extensively (Tertullian, Cyprian, Lactantius), it is the quasi-mystical writings of the Alexandrians (Clement, Origen, and finally Eusebius) that most clearly demonstrate a gradual reconciliation with Roman architecture. The consistency among these three Greek writers is not, according to Eusebius, coincidental.⁹¹

In Chapter 4, we trace the development of the body/temple metaphor in Early Christian texts culminating in its use by Eusebius to reconcile Constantinian architecture. In his *Ecclesiastical History*, Eusebius reports that Clement of Alexandria received his instruction from “...men preserving the true tradition of the blessed doctrine, directly from the holy disciples, Peter and James and John and Paul...”⁹² First among these men was Pantaenus. Following Eusebius, Pantaenus headed the catechetical school in Alexandria near the end of the second century C.E. He was well acquainted with Greek philosophy and natural science and passed the

⁸⁹ David Dawson, *Allegorical Readers and Cultural Revision in Ancient Alexandria* (Berkeley, Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1992) 5–6. “Ancient rhetoricians observed that allegory is clearly related to metaphor because both figures make a comparison. But some observed further that allegory is an ‘extended’ metaphor, that is, a metaphor that has been stretched in to a narrative.” See also Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria: The Orator's Education*, trans. Donald A. Butler, The Loeb Classical Library, ed. Donald A Russell and G.P. Goold, 5 vols. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001) 59.2.46.

⁹⁰ see Appendix 1.

⁹¹ Eusebius, *The Ecclesiastical History* 6.6; 6.11.6; 6.13.

⁹² Eusebius, *The Ecclesiastical History* 5.11.5.

value of that tradition on to his student Clement. At the end of the second century, again following Eusebius, Clement may have become the leader of the Alexandrian school before fleeing persecution. The most notable of Clement's students in Alexandria, certainly for our discussion, was Origen. Like Clement, Origen fled from persecution in Alexandria and spent the majority of his life in Caesarea. His influence on the church there was considerable. Origen's work was carefully preserved (and defended) by Pamphilus, another student of the Alexandrian School. Pamphilus established a school in Caesarea, based on the Alexandrian model, where Eusebius became his student. He also assembled a legendary library where Eusebius found the sources for his history of the church. Eusebius was very concerned with genealogies, particularly when they dealt with apostolic authority. By establishing his own authority in a line from Peter, though dubious, Eusebius was able to establish a claim to orthodoxy that would make him one of Constantine's most trusted advisors.

As heir to the teaching of the Alexandrian school, Eusebius could claim a familiarity with a wide range of Christian, Jewish, and classical literature. The philosophy of the Stoics and the Platonists, mocked by Paul, had been transformed and redirected into a counter-attack against the Academies.⁹³ A new allegorical hermeneutic had evolved that offered the possibility of unifying the heterogeneous Christian, Jewish, and philosophical traditions.⁹⁴ While *Barnabas*, Clement, and Origen may not have intended to contribute to the development of Christian Architecture, Eusebius found himself at an historic moment, equipped with the proper hermeneutic tools, and faced with the monumentality of Imperial Architecture. How could Christians reconcile being the temple of Christ with building a temple for Christ? On the question of reconciliation with Roman architecture, the Qumran community, the Pharisees, and the Valentinians were all silent.

⁹³ G. R. Boys-Stones, *Post-Hellenistic Philosophy: A Study of its Development from the Stoics to Origen* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003) 151–175.

⁹⁴ Dawson, *Allegorical Readers and Cultural Revision in Ancient Alexandria* 235–240.

To summarize, in *Stromata* 6.11, Clement outlined a new Christian *paideia* consisting of, arithmetic and number (6.11.84.1–7; 6.11.85.1–4), geometry (6.11.86.1–87.4), music (6.11.88.1–90.2), astronomy (6.11.90.3–4), and philosophy (6.11.94.2–5) all remade in the Christian image. In the example cited (an allegorical reading of the Tabernacle), Clement develops an hermeneutic reading that employs arithmetic, number, and geometry. Like Christ explaining the parables in the Gospels, Clement unpacks the meaning behind the geometrical figures and the relationship of number to the figures. The contemplation and understanding of these objects “conceived by God” leads us out of mere sensual perception to the revelation of “holy things”:

1 Γεωμετρίας δὲ ἔστω μαρτύριον ἡ κατασκευαζομένη σκηνὴ καὶ τεκταινομένη κιβωτός, ἀναλογίαις τισὶ λογικωτάταις, θεαῖς ἐπινοίαις κατασκευαζόμεναι, κατὰ συνέσεως δόσιν, ἐκ τῶν αἰσθητῶν εἰς τὰ νοητὰ μᾶλλον δὲ ἐκ τῶνδε εἰς τὰ ἅγια καὶ τῶν ἁγίων τὰ ἅγια μεταγούσης ἡμᾶς. 2 Τὰ μὲν γὰρ τετράγωνα ξύλα <τῷ> τὸ τετράγωνον σχῆμα πάντῃ βεβηκέναι ὀρθὰς γωνίας ἐπιτελοῦν τὸ ἀσφαλὲς δηλοῖ. Καὶ μῆκος μὲν τριακόσιοι πήχεις τοῦ κατασκευάσματος, πλάτος δὲ ν', βάθος δὲ λ'. καὶ εἰς πῆχυν ἄνωθεν συντελεῖται, ἐκ τῆς πλατείας βάσεως ἀποξυνομένη πυραμίδος τρόπον, ἡ κιβωτός, τῶν διὰ πυρὸς καθαιρομένων καὶ δοκιμαζομένων σύμβολον. 3 Ἡ γεωμετρικὴ αὕτη παρέχεται ἀναλογία εἰς παραπομπὴν τῶν ἁγίων ἐκείνων μονῶν, ὧν τὰς διαφορὰς αἱ διαφοραὶ τῶν ἀριθμῶν τῶν ὑποτεταγμένων μηνύουσιν. (*Strom.* 6.11.86.1–3)

For Origen, the hermeneutic value of geometry is demonstrated in the spiral stair at the centre of Solomon’s Temple. The stair is a “perfect figure” and imitates the ascent of a circle. It links the tripartite, vertical division of the nave and demonstrates how geometry can move the mind from the phenomenal world to the spiritual. Like the shift in perception experienced by the disciples in Jn.16.29–38 when παροιμίαι was “remembered” as παρρησία, geometry reveals things that were once only vaguely imagined.

278 Καὶ ἀνάβασις δέ τις περὶ τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ μὴ γεγωνιωμένη, ἀνακλάσεις εὐθειῶν ἔχουσα. Γέγραπται γάρ· Καὶ ἐλικτὴ ἀνάβασις εἰς τὸ μέσον, καὶ ἐκ τῆς μέσης ἐπὶ τὰ τριώροφα. Ἐλικοειδῇ γὰρ ἔχρῃν εἶναι τὴν ἐν τῷ ναῷ τοῦ θεοῦ ἄνοδον τῆς ἑλικος ἀναβάσει τὸν ἱσαίτατον κύκλον μιμουμένης. 279 Ἵνα δε οὗτος ὁ οἶκος βέβαιος ᾖ, ὥς ἐνι μάλιστα οἰκοδομοῦνται ἔνδεσμοι αὐτῷ δι' ὅλου οἴκου πέντε ἐν πῆχει τὸ ὕψος, ἵνα ἡ ἀπὸ τῶν αἰσθητῶν ἐπὶ τὰς καλουμένας θείας αἰσθήσεις ἄνοδος δηλωθῇ ἐν ὕψει τυγχάνουσα πρὸς κατανόησιν τῶν νοητῶν. (*Comm. sur Jn.* 10.278–279)

Finally, Eusebius praises the young Paulinus, Bishop of Tyre, for the creation of a building, a “temple,” that is a reflection of Christ as Word, Wisdom, and Light. Paulinus is able to achieve this feat by having the image of Christ inside of him. The plan of the temple follows a pattern that is perfect, but invisible to the uninitiated.

ταύτη δ' οὖν καὶ ὁδε Χριστὸν ὅλον, τὸν λόγον, τὴν σοφίαν, τὸ φῶς ἐν τῇ αὐτὸς αὐτοῦ ἀγαλματοφορῶν ψυχῇ, οὐδ' ἔστιν εἰπεῖν οἷα σὺν μεγαλοφροσύνῃ πλουσία τε καὶ ἀπλήστῳ διανοίᾳ χειρὶ καὶ σὺν οἷα πάντων ὑμῶν φιλοτιμίᾳ, τῇ τῶν εἰσφορῶν μεγαλοψυχίᾳ τῆς αὐτῆς αὐτῷ προθέσεως κατὰ μηδένα τρόπον ἀπολειφθῆναι φιλονεικότερον μεγαλοφρονουμένων (*Eusebius. E.H.* 10.4.26).

1.7 SUMMARY

This brief introduction to the history, theory, and function of the body/temple metaphor is meant to provide an overview and framework for the following discussion of early Christian architecture. While this is an architectural history, the focus is less on formal or stylistic changes that are more typically addressed by architectural historians than on the reconciliation between the conflicting images of architecture in the Gospels and the Epistles and the production of Imperial Christian buildings. I argue that this reconciliation is accomplished, in part, by contiguous readings of the body/temple vehicle between the first and the fourth centuries.

2. THE ARCHITECTURAL CONTEXT OF BODY/TEMPLE METAPHOR

In this chapter, we examine the built environment that informs the early Christian body/temple metaphor. The architectural agenda of Imperial Rome is understood as an overall frame for this study and Vitruvius' *De Architectura* is proposed as a manifesto that represents Rome's aspirations to a universal order. Concerning the body/temple vehicle, Vitruvius maintains that the ideal temple is proportioned after a finely formed human body and, in turn, the temple is seen as a model for the city. *De Architectura* is discussed in relation to archaeological evidence in general and, specifically, to the Temple of Mars Ultor in the Forum of Augustus.

Considering the precedents acknowledged by Vitruvius, our review of his treatise is prefaced with a brief overview of the principles that informed Greek architecture. Rather than proposing a radical shift from the antiquity to which Rome saw herself heir, Vitruvius maps out a conservative path that synthesizes Greek and Italic traditions. *De Architectura* recalls the intimate relationship established by the Greeks between the body, architecture, and topography. The ubiquity of architectural order represented in both Roman and Greek temples may have been influential in prompting early Christians to define an alternative understanding of ritualized space.

Also significant to the cultural encyclopaedia informing the body/temple vehicle are two forms of the Jerusalem Temple. The first, built by Herod in Jerusalem and influenced by Imperial Architecture, is the narrative backdrop for the Gospels and Epistles. As a literary foil, it is important for understanding the origin and rhetorical function of the body/temple metaphor. The second form is located in the words of the LXX. Here, the text presents the Temple as a model of ideal order dictated to Moses and Solomon by God. This *Tempelidee* is invaluable for the development of the hermeneutic function of the body/temple in the Apostolic and Ante-

Nicene periods and is referenced in all of the contemporary texts here under discussion.

In addition to the monumental temple buildings that dominated the cities of the Empire, Christians were also familiar with the comparably dense urban environments of Roman cities. The contrast between the splendour of temple buildings and the relative squalor that most Roman city dwellers endured is still palpable in the archaeological remains of Pompey and Ostia. Early Christians first gathered in small houses or apartments indistinguishable from the hundreds or thousands of other local residential buildings. Located on narrow streets with similar quasi-public institutions like synagogues and guildhalls, as well as very public institutions like taverns and bordellos, the urban setting of the early church was the antithesis of the τέμενος. To better understand this urban setting, we consider textual evidence from the Epistles, Gospels, and Acts as well as archaeological evidence of synagogues and *domus ecclesiae*. In concluding, we illustrate the relationship between early Christianity and the Imperial city in the unique archaeological context of *Dura Europos*.

2. (PREFACE) GREEK TEMPLES

As citizens, clients, freemen, and slaves of the Roman Empire, the first Christians lived in the shadows of temples rooted in the rich architectural traditions of Greece. Although the Romans had developed distinctive theories and practices of architecture by the beginning of the first century B.C.E., the monuments of the great Greek and Hellenic cities were still recognized as the standards against which Imperial temples were to be judged. As such, Greek temple architecture remained influential well into the common era.

From Plato, we learn that the Greek temple registers a divine, geographical event.⁹⁵ Typically, these events occur ὄκρον (on high places, furthest places) and κατὰ τὴν ἀγοράν (in the centre of the city, place of assembly, marketplace, or market). The location of a temple is determined by an affinity between the character of the god and the typology of the place.⁹⁶ For example, Athena is appropriately found on the acropolis and Apollo in the market place. In essence, a Greek temple is first a delineated space where gods manifest themselves in time according to their natures. Formal devices, ranging from the fluidity of a forest edge to tectonic elements like columns and walls are used to define the perimeter of the sacred geography. This delineated area, τέμενος, is set apart from the world of human endeavour. The most definitive acts of humanity—sex, birth, and death—are all prohibited within the sacred precinct to preserve temple purity.⁹⁷

At the phenomenal centre of the τέμενος is the image, εἶδωλον, of the deity. The εἶδωλον is the locus of the divine presence and, with the altar, establishes the orientation of the temple. The temple building, addressing the τέμενος through a “permeable boundary”⁹⁸ of columns yet shrouding the deity within the opaque walls of the ναός, or inner sanctuary, is a mediator between τέμενος and εἶδωλον. The god is present in the temple by degrees from the boundary of the τέμενος to the plastic form of the cult image. The relative formal and spatial arrangements of these three elements (τέμενος, ναός, εἶδωλον) are, like the site itself, determined by the character of the god who dwells there. In discussing the Greek temple, then, we must consider a composition of parts that brings together elements at the scale of landscape, of building, and of sculpture. While temple buildings are an important part of celebrating and

⁹⁵ Plato, *Laws*, trans. R. G. Bury, Loeb Classical Library (London/Cambridge MA.: W. Heinemann/Harvard University Press, 1968) 738c.

⁹⁶ Burkert, “The Meaning and Function of the Temple in Classical Greece,” 42.

⁹⁷ Burkert, “The Meaning and Function of the Temple in Classical Greece,” 35.

⁹⁸ Burkert, “The Meaning and Function of the Temple in Classical Greece,” 35.

channelling the presence of the gods, they are tertiary to the influence of geography and cult activity. Vincent Scully argues that:

We must now go further to recognize that, not only were certain landscapes indeed regarded by the Greeks as holy and as expressive of specific gods, or rather as embodiments of their presence, but also that the temples and the subsidiary buildings of their sanctuaries were so formed in themselves and so placed in relation to the landscape and to each other as to enhance, develop, complement, and sometimes even to contradict, the basic meaning that was felt in the land. From this it follows that the temples and other buildings are only one part of what may be called the "architecture" of any given site... Therefore, the specific variations in form which each temple exhibits derive both from its adjustment to its particular place and from its intention to personify the character of the deity which it, too, is imaging there.⁹⁹

It follows that each Greek temple, in synthesizing the specific demands of disparate landscapes, divine powers, and building materials into a unified embodiment of the divine, is, to some extent, unique. The universal order demonstrated by each temple is drawn from the particularities of each local temporal-spatial event.

This reconciliation of disparate phenomena and demonstration of universals is a public event that "...does not raise rivalry or envy because the objects are no longer private property."¹⁰⁰ The temple is shared by the city and contributes to the πόλις. Walter Burkert argues that the Greek temple is an explicit rejection of monarchy and an expression of the Greek democratic state.¹⁰¹ "A temple is the most prestigious and lasting monument into which the surplus of society is transformed—a monument of common identity."¹⁰² The temple proper, including τέμενος and εἶδωλον, binds the order of the city with the order demonstrated by nature. The catalyst for this process is the manifestation of divinity.

⁹⁹ Vincent Scully, *The Earth, The Temple, and The Gods* (New Haven: Yale University, 1979) 1–2.

¹⁰⁰ Burkert, "The Meaning and Function of the Temple in Classical Greece," 43.

¹⁰¹ Burkert, "The Meaning and Function of the Temple in Classical Greece," 42.

¹⁰² Burkert, "The Meaning and Function of the Temple in Classical Greece," 43.

Etymologically, the act of dwelling, house, and where the image dwells all share the same root [νοός]. The god dwells in the building and is manifest through the building. The architecture of the Greek temple, then, is both a place for and a sign of the deity. This coincidence of purpose, a blurring of signified and signifier, is characteristic of the Greek θεός.¹⁰³ The nature of the gods is heterogeneous. For example, while Zeus has dominion over light, he also has the power to conceal light. He is found in the bright sky of day and in the dark sky of night. These apparent contradictions structure a complex cosmology. Jean-Pierre Vernant has observed a comprehensive order that permeates the Greek sense of cosmos.

Thus their religion and their pantheon can be seen to be a system of classification, a particular way of ordering and conceptualizing the universe, distinguishing between multiple types of force and power operating within it. So in this sense I would suggest that a pantheon, as an organized system implying definite relations between the various gods, is a kind of language, a particular way of apprehending reality and expressing it in symbolic terms.¹⁰⁴

The distinction between individual and community, between natural and supernatural, between the various gods, is not fixed in the manner of signifier-signified relationships. The Greek temple, as a mediator and as a sign of divine presence, is at once precise and polysemous. The temple accommodates the specifics of the cult and negotiates order in the multifarious nature of the pantheon.

Two modes of architectural arrangement, initiated in the seventh century B.C.E., proved particularly attractive to the gods and to the Greek imagination.¹⁰⁵ In the Peloponnese, we find the first experiments in what would become the robust and masculine Doric and on the coast of

¹⁰³ Jean-Pierre Vernant, *Myth and Society in Ancient Greece*, trans. Janet Lloyd (New York: Zone Books, 1990) 103.

¹⁰⁴ Vernant, *Myth and Society in Ancient Greece* 104.

¹⁰⁵ J.J. Coulton, "Towards understanding Greek temple design: general considerations," *The Annals of the British School at Athens* 70 (1975) 59–100.

the eastern Aegean, the elegant and feminine Ionic.¹⁰⁶ The Doric and Ionic traditions, as used by the Greeks, offer elastic parameters for expression and composition. Like language, these parameters provide both denotative and connotative referents that signify within limited parameters of interpretation.

At the beginning of the common era, the oldest of these symmetries was believed to be the Doric. It takes its name from an ancient Achaean king. According to Vitruvius, Dorus built a magnificent temple to Juno in Argos. This temple, having “chanced” upon the appropriate symmetries, was so much admired that it became the model for other Dorian temples.¹⁰⁷ Although the Dorians built copies of this temple, they did not rigorously set down the principles of its composition. It was the Athenians, colonizing in Asia Minor, who first laid down the rules for the Doric type. Ion, chosen by Apollo through the Delphic oracle to establish thirteen Athenian colonies in Asia Minor, wished to dedicate a temple to his protector. Remembering the temples of the Dorians, he set out to copy the type in his temple to the Panionian Apollo. Without a pattern of any kind, the Ionians:

*... dimensi sunt probatam haberent venustatem, dimensi sunt virilis pedis vestigium et id rettulerunt in altitudinem. Cum invenissent pedem sextam partem esse altitudinis in homine, item in columnam transtulerunt et, qua crassitudine fecerunt basim scapi, tanta sex cum capitulo in altitudinem extulerunt. Ita dorica columna virilis corporis proportionem et firmitatem et venustatem in aedificiis praestare coepit.*¹⁰⁸

From this, Vitruvius recommends that temples built for Minerva, Mars, and Hercules should employ the Doric symmetry because these gods are expressed in the strength and grace of the male body. Further, their temples should embody these qualities with few embellishments.

¹⁰⁶ Joseph Rykwert, *The Dancing Column: On Order in Architecture* (Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 1996) 212.

¹⁰⁷ Vitruvius, *De Architectura* 4.1.3.

¹⁰⁸ Vitruvius, *De Architectura* 4.1.6.

Vitruvius continues in 4.1.7 by relating that the Ionians then wished to build a temple to Diana. Hoping to honour the goddess, the builders used the same ratio as that used for the Temple of Apollo but based the relationship between the footprint and height on that of a woman—producing a more slender column. The Ionians, then, established the principles for the masculine symmetry of Doric and the feminine symmetry of Ionic.

So functional are the semantics of Greek architecture, Vitruvius tells us, that a shipwrecked Stoic philosopher, Aristippus, is able to recognize that the island on which he has been washed ashore is a Greek colony, locate a city on that island, and find the gymnasium within that city. All of this because he sees a geometric figure in the sand on the beach!¹⁰⁹ This consistency of cultural signs, allegorized by Vitruvius, is indicative of the role that architecture played in classical Greek culture. However, as evidenced in the tremendous variety found in the archaeology of Greek temples, the parameters established by the Doric and Ionic traditions, while maintaining cultural norms, allow for localized variation and even invention.

It is obvious that Vitruvius saw Greek architecture as a precedent for his imperial *disciplina rationis*. The relationships between the characters of the gods and the character of the temples, the ordered assembly of parts, the human body as an architectural model, and the role of the temple in mediating the cosmos are all shared qualities. By appropriating Greek culture, Rome hoped to demonstrate that she was the natural heir to Hellenism and Augustus the heir to Alexander.¹¹⁰ However, there is one distinguishing characteristic of the Greek temple that is particularly relevant to our discussion.

¹⁰⁹ Vitruvius, *De Architectura* 6. Pref.1.

¹¹⁰ Suetonius, *Works*, trans. J.C. Rolfe, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge MA.: Harvard University Press, 1951) Aug. 18.1 *per idem tempus conditorium et corpus Magni Alexandri, cum prolatum e penetrali subiecisset oculis, corona aurea imposita ac floribus aspersis ueneratus est consultusque, num et Ptolemaeum inspicere uellet, regem se uoluisse ait uidere, non mortuos.*

If we contrast Walter Burkert's statement above with our characterization of the Imperial temple, we see two very different traditions. Burkert proposes that the temple is the exemplary sign of Greek democracy in that it demonstrates a selfless act of building community. The Roman temple, from our study, is in every way, a sign of the Emperor. While the Roman temple continues to provide "a monument of common identity,"¹¹¹ that identity is with the *pater patriae* and not the πόλις. A temple built by the community has more in common with 1 Cor. 2.10–18 than with the Temple of Mars Ultor. This memory of the Greek temple may have been another contribution to the cultural encyclopaedia that informed the early Christian body/temple metaphor. Of course, one only has to substitute Christ for *pater patriae* to allow the metaphor to function in the Roman context.

2.1 VITRUVIUS AND THE *DISCIPLINA RATIONIS* OF IMPERIAL ARCHITECTURE¹¹²

De Architectura was written in Rome by Marcus Vitruvius Polio at the beginning of the Imperial era.¹¹³ As the only example of this genre to have survived from antiquity, comparisons are difficult.¹¹⁴ It is a rare, and some say awkward, work of Latin literature that presents the thoughts and experiences of a practising architect at the cusp of an architectural revolution.¹¹⁵ The text is addressed, respectfully, to Octavian: *Imperator Augustus*. The author introduces himself as having served Julius Caesar in the construction of artillery and as being an

¹¹¹ Burkert, "The Meaning and Function of the Temple in Classical Greece," 43.

¹¹² This discussion of Vitruvius is based on the Harleian 2767 manuscript from the British Museum as it is reproduced in Granger's translation for the Loeb Classical Library. Translations in Chapter 2 are by the author of this dissertation unless otherwise noted.

¹¹³ On the dating of *De Architectura* see Granger's "Introduction" (xiv) where he argues for a date before 27 B.C.E. See also Indra Kagis McEwen, *Vitruvius: Writing the Body of Architecture* (Cambridge, MA./London: The MIT Press, 2003) 122. McEwen argues that 29 B.C.E. is the earliest possible date.

¹¹⁴ Hugh Plommer, *Vitruvius and Later Roman Building Manuals* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973) 2. Faventinus, who draws heavily from Vitruvius, produced a book on architecture in the third century C.E.

¹¹⁵ Wilson Jones, *Principles of Roman Architecture* 35.

acquaintance of the Emperor's sister.¹¹⁶ Observing the extensive building program of Augustus and understanding the political value of architecture for the new empire, Vitruvius sets out his "*disciplina rationis*" as a way of addressing the vagaries of current architectural practice.¹¹⁷

While *De Architectura* is not a work of natural science, philosophy, or theology, Vitruvius draws on Greek and, to a lesser degree, Latin sources in these areas to inform his very practical knowledge of construction. His intention is to provide the new Emperor with a concise architectural code that can be easily disseminated.¹¹⁸ Like other Romans trying to rationalize Greek influences in the late Republic and early Empire, he exposes gaps between the world as Roman tradition knows it to be and the world as Greek philosophy proposes it should be.¹¹⁹ In doing so, *De Architectura* presents an imperial "ideal" for Roman architecture—an ideal that encompasses technical, political, and cosmological intentions. For a new empire, the political advantage of such a code is obvious.

The text is organized in ten books that address the three major concerns of Roman architecture: building, sundials, and mechanics. The bulk of the work is taken up with building, which is further subdivided into categories of public and private. Public buildings are those used for defence, religion, and social interaction. The architecture of defence includes city walls, towers, gates and any other machinery "*ratio ad hostium impetus perpetuo repellendos excogitata....*"¹²⁰ Religious architecture locates the gods in the urban or rural landscape following a sympathetic relationship between the god and the place (a point to which we will return). Buildings of convenience accommodate the leisure of the populace and include "*portus, fora,*

¹¹⁶ Vitruvius, *De Architectura* 1.pref.2.

¹¹⁷ Vitruvius, *De Architectura* 1.pref.3.

¹¹⁸ Axel Boëthius, *Etruscan and Early Roman Architecture*, Pelican History of Art, ed. Nikolaus Pevsner (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1978) 214.

¹¹⁹ Mary Beard, "Cicero and Divination: The Formation of a Latin Discourse," *The Journal of Roman Studies* 84 (1994) 33–46.

¹²⁰ Vitruvius, *De Architectura* 1.3.1.

porticus, balinea, theatra, inambulationes, ceteraque, quae isdem rationibus in publicis locis designantur."¹²¹ Finally, private buildings are those for residential use. Our study will focus on Books 1 through 4 as they deal with the idealization of architecture and the building of temples.

Vitruvius begins Book 1 with the education of an architect. As a foundation of that education, the architect must be able to read what has been written on the subject of architecture. The architect must also be well trained in drawing so that ideas can be realized and represented. Knowledge of optics provides an understanding for the proper location of windows. Geometry is important for acquiring a working knowledge of the compass and for understanding the concept of symmetry. Arithmetic is used in the calculation of sums and in tallying measurements. Aside from these rather obvious topics of study, architects should also study history so that they can explain the origin of traditional architectural motifs. Philosophy is required to develop an ethical basis for the work, as well as the value of natural philosophy in understanding physical phenomena. Music teaches an understanding of proportional relationships and acoustics. Some knowledge of medicine is required to help in determining the qualities of a healthy building site. A familiarity with legal matters, particularly as they relate to building regulations and lawsuits that may arise between architect and client, is also important. Finally, to master the construction of clocks, the architect must have a clear understanding of astronomy and the order of the sky.¹²² With the exception of drawing, these subjects of study are consistent with the curriculum of the Roman *artex liberalis* and are derived from the Greek παιδεία.

While giving great value to an academic education, Vitruvius disagrees with his Greek sources on the extent to which architects must be familiar with each field of study. Pythius, who built the temple of Minerva at Priene, held that the architect should excel above even the most

¹²¹ Vitruvius, *De Architectura* 1.3.1.

¹²² Vitruvius, *De Architectura* 1.1.10.

accomplished master in each of the required disciplines. Vitruvius argues that, not only is this unnecessary, it is impossible. What Pythius fails to understand, according to Vitruvius, is that there is a difference between the work of architecture and the reasoning that gives rise to it. While any educated person can study the reasoning that leads to a work and appreciate the subtle qualities of that reasoning, not everyone has the technical skills necessary to make a building. By analogy, both physician and musician share an understanding of the rhythm of the veins and movement of the feet—but who would you ask to heal your wound?¹²³ Vitruvius even goes so far as to say that those who excel in any single one of the arts cannot properly be called an architect. To those individuals is best given the title of “*mathematici*.”¹²⁴ The true architect, the Imperial Architect, understands the necessary unity of theory and craft: “...*encyclios enim disciplina uti corpus unum ex his membris est composita*.”¹²⁵

In the second chapter of Book 1, Vitruvius identifies six qualities that establish architecture as a “*disciplina rationis*:

*Architectura autem constat ex ordinatione quae graece taxis dicitur et ex dipositione hanc autem diathesin vocitant et eurythmia et symmetria et decore et distributione quae graece oeconomia dicitur.*¹²⁶

The first of these qualities, *ordo*, is synonymous with the Greek τάξις. Τάξις is used in Greek literature to describe a precise arrangement. In Epicurean philosophy, it denotes order and regularity. For Vitruvius, *ordo* is employed in establishing appropriate dimensions in the building components and in the building as a whole.¹²⁷ The relationship between the part and the

¹²³ Vitruvius, *De Architectura* 1.1.15.

¹²⁴ Vitruvius, *De Architectura* 1.1.17.

¹²⁵ Vitruvius, *De Architectura* 1.1.12.

¹²⁶ Vitruvius, *De Architectura* 1.2.2.

¹²⁷ *Commoditas*, when used by Cicero, implies “suitability” or “utility.” Cicero, *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, trans. Harry Caplan, Loeb Classical Library, ed. E.H. Warmington (Cambridge, MA/London: Harvard University Press,

whole is accomplished through the use of a consistent building module and insures an overall unity of the work.

Vitruvius recounts that the second inherent quality of architecture is *dispositio* known to the Greeks as διαθεσις. In Greek literature, the term is used to describe composition in a work of art. Vitruvius elaborates:

*Dispositio autem est rerum apta conlocatio elegansque compositionibus effectus operis cum qualitate. Species dispositionis, quae graece dicuntur ideae, sunt hae: ichnographia, orthographia, scaenographia.*¹²⁸

Following the identification and measurement of the essential components of a building, Vitruvius addresses the composition of these components into an elegant whole. The composition is dictated by the “nature” of the building and addresses conditions such as function, site, and climate. The act of composition takes place in the making of architectural drawings that recall the Greek ἰδέα. The drawings and the building share an image or pattern but are of a different nature. Further, the drawings are a product of imagination and invention.

The third quality of Vitruvian Architecture is denoted by a Greek term without a corresponding Latin equivalent—*eurythmia* [εὐρυθμία].¹²⁹ Translated by Granger as “proportion,” *eurythmia* is the most abstract of the qualities discussed so far. It signifies the recognition, comprehension, and construction of the beautiful. Vitruvius understands *eurythmia* as the proper volumetric relationships of the parts of the building. In Greek, the word commonly refers to the presence of rhythm and is also used in association with sensual perception.

1968) 1.11; 2.14.

¹²⁸ Vitruvius, *De Architectura* 1.2.2.

¹²⁹ Vitruvius, *De Architectura* 1.2.3.

Like *eurythmia*, *symmetria* [συμμετρία], the fourth of Vitruvius' six qualities, does not have a Latin equivalent. Granger proposes "symmetry." What is problematic with this term is that it implies, to the modern reader, a bilateral similarity between two halves of a composition. In fact, Vitruvius seems to be referring to a somewhat more complex architectural idea. For the Greeks *symmetria* is one of the characteristics of beauty and harmony. It is a measure of comparison. This understanding is clear from Vitruvius' architectural use of the term. Like the natural relationship between part and whole in the human body, so too in a properly constructed temple (or a well designed boat), *symmetria* demonstrates a harmonious balance that is measured in terms of a relationship between part to whole.¹³⁰

Distinguishing itself from the four preceding qualities, *decor* is not presented with a Greek equivalent. *Decor* is cultural and it is learned through the study of existing temples that represent, by accepted practice or by analogy, the qualities of the god to whom the temple is dedicated. Therefore, temples should be built on a spacious site and be hypethral (open to the sky) if they are dedicated to Jupiter of Lightning, *Caelum* (Sky), *Sol* (Sun), or *Luna* (Moon) because these gods are seen in the world as light. Temples built for Minerva, Mars, and Hercules should employ the Doric style because these gods are aligned with physical strength and their temples should reflect that strength and have few embellishments. The goddesses Venus, Flora, Proserpine, *Fons Lymphae* are appropriately represented by slighter proportions and embellishments of foliage and spirals and so their temples should be built using the Corinthian symmetry. For gods like Juno, Diana, and *Liber Pater*, temples should be built in the Ionic style to reflect a character somewhere between the austerity of the Doric and the overtly feminine Corinthian. A "natural" *decor* is maintained if temples for gods that are connected with healing,

¹³⁰ Vitruvius, *De Architectura* 1.2.4.

such as Aesculapius and Salus, are built on sites that are *saluberrima* and have suitable natural springs.

In discussing the last of the six qualities of architecture, Vitruvius returns to the use of Greek terms to augment the Latin. In this case, he translates *distributio* as οἰκονομικός—the management of resources. In the Epicurean use of the term, it suggests fiscal regulation. The idea of resource management being important to architecture becomes clear in Vitruvius' elaboration of the subject. The control of expenditure is achieved through the architect's careful consideration of appropriate material for the job including the choice of local materials to reduce the cost of transportation and the choice of materials most suitable for a specific application. The second concern of *distributio* is the appropriate relationship between the building and the patron. The appropriate building must address both the patron's needs and social stature.

To summarize, Vitruvius sets out six qualities that are inherent in any true work of architecture. They are achieved through the balanced application of the architect's knowledge and imagination. The six qualities establish a process for design that is consistent in concept with the architecture that it proposes. *Ordinatio* measures out the component parts and the whole of a building “*ad symmetriam comparatio*,” including physical dimensions, function, and type of detail.¹³¹ The goal of *ordinatio* is to assure symmetry in the relationships of part to whole. *Dispositio* is the elegant composition of the component parts of a design. This composition is governed by the “nature” of the building. To develop the composition, the architect uses drawings. These drawings facilitate thinking about the building in a coherent way and are used to solve any problems that may arise. The recognition of beauty in proportional relationships, *eurythmia*, aids in developing consistency in the composition and in achieving *symmetria*.

¹³¹ Vitruvius, *De Architectura* 1.2.2.

Symmetria is revealed in a building as the quality of balance that permeates nature. *Decor* is demonstrated when the composition is consistent with cultural expectations. *Decor* assures that buildings are appropriate for their location and function. The final quality, *distributio*, is concerned with the economical construction of the building. The architect must select materials that are appropriate to the nature of the project so as not to incur extraneous costs or delays while insuring that the building is architecturally consistent with the social stature of the client. Roman architecture, consistent and harmonious with nature and, as an extension of nature, with Roman tradition, demonstrates *firmitas*, *utilitas*, and *venustas*.¹³² The *disciplina rationis* is evidenced in the integrity of construction, consistency with the demands of Roman culture, and graceful beauty.

In a rambling conclusion to the first book, Vitruvius addresses such diverse matters as the geographical factors that make for an appropriate site (including wind, sun, and topographical features),¹³³ and the examination of the viscera of animals living on the site in order to determine the fecundity of the locale.¹³⁴ What links these disparate topics is Vitruvius' unquestioning reverence for Nature. Whether considering the mythic discovery of the Greek symmetries, the quality of sand used in mortar mix, or the planning of a city, architectural order is patterned on the natural order of things.

Vitruvian architecture, as a function of the natural world, is a cohesive system of interdependent objects and phenomena. The continued and meaningful order of the city is an extension of the continued and meaningful order of the natural world. The model for the ideal city and the physical centre of the Empire is the idealized Rome, a pious Rome, protected and nurtured by the gods. At the centre of this ideal city is the Roman temple:

¹³² Vitruvius, *De Architectura* 1.3.2.

¹³³ Vitruvius, *De Architectura* 1.4.1–6.

¹³⁴ Vitruvius, *De Architectura* 1.4.9–10.

*Aedibus vero sacris, quorum deorum maxime in tutela civitas videtur esse, et Iovi et Iunoni et Minervae, in excelsissimo loco unde moenium maxima pars conspiciatur, areae distribuuntur. Mercurio autem in foro, aut etiam ut Isidi et Serapi in emporio; Apollini Patrique Libero secundum theatrum; Herculi, in quibus civitatibus non sunt gymnasia neque amphitheatra, ad circum: Marti extra urbem sed ad campum; itemque Veneri portum.*¹³⁵

The gods participate in the architectural order of the city, both inside and outside of the city walls, according to the attributes that they share with various urban and extra-urban conditions.

Roman gods show themselves through both mundane and spectacular events.¹³⁶ Similar to Greek practice, the location of these events is dependent on the unique relationship of each god with the physical world. For example, *De Architectura* 1.7.1 assigns the temple of Mercury to the business quarter, linking Mercury with commerce. This is consistent with Livy's description of the dedication of the first temple of Mercury in Rome where the responsibilities of that temple are "to have charge of the corn supply, to establish a guild of merchants, and to perform the solemn rites in the presence of the pontifex."¹³⁷ Locating the temple of Mercury in the Forum synchronizes the order of Nature with the order of the city. Like the tradition recorded in Livy, Vitruvius advocates a pattern for the presence of the gods in the city that is determined by sympathetic relationships. The Roman temple simultaneously represents and invokes the presence of the deity. The *templum* localizes a phenomenal power that symbolizes the god and channels that power back into the world. *De Architectura* advises the Emperor, and the architect, on how that power can be channelled by architecture.

Drawing on Pythagorean and Epicurean philosophy, the natural world is comprised of form and matter in a continuous, balanced, and rational set of relationships from the smallest to

¹³⁵ Vitruvius, *De Architectura* 1.7.1.

¹³⁶ Georges Dumézil, *Archaic Roman Religion*, trans. Philip Krapp, 2 vols. (Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996) 439.

¹³⁷ Livy, *Ab Urbe Condita* 2.27.

the largest parts.¹³⁸ Atoms compose elements, elements compose materials, materials compose architectural elements, architectural elements compose buildings, buildings compose cities. From atom to empire, the *naturales res* is seamless. However, the stability of the cosmos is not a given and must be maintained.

In Book 2, Vitruvius addresses *naturales res*. He begins with a narrative on the origins of Architecture.¹³⁹ The genesis of the discipline, Vitruvius argues, is the domestication of fire. Fire distinguishes humans from animals by engendering language and a sense of the social that extends beyond small family groups. The desire for communal living requires the invention and the construction of new dwelling types. While caves and burrows had provided expedient shelter from the elements, they could not address the more complex existential demands of community. Making buildings is something that the human body is naturally and uniquely equipped to do. A variety of building types are attributable to primitive builders, reflecting available resources, craftsmanship, and local traditions. Gifted with a will for history and guided by Nature, the builders developed methods of construction and applications for materials that could last beyond the life of individual members of the community: clay for bricks,¹⁴⁰ sand and lime for mortar,¹⁴¹ *pozzolana* for concrete,¹⁴² stone,¹⁴³ techniques for arranging these materials as walls,¹⁴⁴ and finally, wood for a roof.¹⁴⁵ These are the basic materials provided by nature, used by the mythic first builders at the birth of architecture and now arranged in the text as they would be on the construction site. This is the substance of Roman architecture. The pious knowledge of materials and economical craft of these primitive craftsmen is the ideal model for the Imperial architect.

¹³⁸Vitruvius, *De Architectura* 2.2.1–2.

¹³⁹Vitruvius, *De Architectura* 2.1.1.

¹⁴⁰Vitruvius, *De Architectura* 2.3.

¹⁴¹Vitruvius, *De Architectura* 2.4; 2.5.

¹⁴²Vitruvius, *De Architectura* 2.6.

¹⁴³Vitruvius, *De Architectura* 2.7.

¹⁴⁴Vitruvius, *De Architectura* 2.8.

¹⁴⁵Vitruvius, *De Architectura* 2.9; 2.10.

The *disciplina rationis* is a historical reality, an essential component of civilization, and a product and function of nature.

In Book 3, Vitruvius returns to the quality of *symmetria* first discussed in Book 1. He argues that the composition of a temple must begin with symmetry. Symmetry is derived from proportion (*analogia*). Proportion, in turn, relies on the proper relationship between the parts of the building and the work as a whole. The pattern provided by Nature for the proper arrangement of the temple is found *ad hominis bene figurati*.¹⁴⁶ This pattern is the distinguishing characteristic of the ancient monuments.

*Ergo si ita natura composuit corpus hominis, uti proportionibus membra ad summam figurationem eius respondeant, cum causa constituisse videntur antiqui, ut etiam in operum perfectionibus singulorum membrorum ad universam figurae speciem habeant commensus exactionem. Igitur cum in omnibus operibus ordines traderent, maxime in aedibus operibus ordines traderent, maxime in aedibus deorum, operum et laudes et culpae aeternae solent permanere.*¹⁴⁷

As revealed by nature and sanctioned by history, temples are most appropriately proportioned according to the relationships manifest in a well-formed human body. As the human body is composed of parts that are appropriate to the balance of the whole, so too should a temple be composed of parts that are proportionate. Vitruvius continues:

*Ergo si convenit ex articulis hominis numerum inventum esse et ex membris separatis ad universam corporis speciem ratae partes commensus fieri responsum, relinquitur, ut suscipiamus eos, qui etiam aedes deorum immortalium constituents ita membra operum ordinauerunt, ut proportionibus et symmetris separatae atque universae convenientesque efficerentur eorum distributiones.*¹⁴⁸

¹⁴⁶ Vitruvius, *De Architectura* 3.1.1.

¹⁴⁷ Vitruvius, *De Architectura* 3.1.4.

¹⁴⁸ Vitruvius, *De Architectura* 3.1.9

In the fifth chapter of Book 3 and in Book 4 of *De Architectura*, Vitruvius presents the appropriate relationships for establishing the different types of symmetry. To do this, he refers to the Greek models of Ionic, Doric, and Corinthian. Vitruvius acknowledges that there are hybrids of these types and, although he feels it inferior, he also later identifies the indigenous “Tuscan” symmetry.¹⁴⁹ Each symmetry is given a thorough description and instructions for composition with explicit geometrical and arithmetic relationships. That said, there is some latitude afforded to the architect in identifying and applying the appropriate *symmetria*.

Tradition dictates that temples are arranged around seven types: *in antis*, *prostyle*, *amphiprostyle*, *peripteral*, *pseudodipteros*, *dipteros*, *hypaethral*.¹⁵⁰ These arrangements determine the number of columns and their distribution in relation to the *cella*. In addition to the seven temple types, tradition has established that temples are organized into five *species*: *pyncostyle*, *systyle*, *diastyle*, *areaeostyle*, and *eustyle*.¹⁵¹ These guide the proportions between the diameter, spacing, and height of columns. Vitruvius judges the *pyncostyle* (Temple of the Deified Julius Caesar, Temple of Venus in the Forum of Caesar) and the *systyle* (Temple of Equestrian Virtue) to be unsuitable because the small spaces between the columns impede access to the temple and block views of the cult statue. The *diastyle* (Temple of Apollo and Diana), because of the wide spacing between columns, is prone to structural problems. The *areaeostyle* (based on Etruscan models and represented in Rome by the Temple of Ceres in the Circus Maximus, the Temple of Hercules built by Pompey, and in the ancient Temple of Jupiter on the Capitoline) has too much space between the columns and affects the graceful appearance of the building. These first four of the five *species* discussed by Vitruvius are, by his examples, commonly used in Rome. But it is the *eustyle*, found in Hermogenes’ Temple of Liber at Teos,

¹⁴⁹ Vitruvius, *De Architectura* 4.8.4.

¹⁵⁰ Vitruvius, *De Architectura* 3.2.1.

¹⁵¹ Vitruvius, *De Architectura* 3.3.1.

that Vitruvius identifies as containing the ideal *symmetria* and, thus, it is on the authority of the Greek architect that Vitruvius builds his argument on proportions.

Vitruvius credits Hermogenes with an extraordinary natural ability and an understanding of tradition that is so complete that he is able to transcend the authority of common practice. The principles revealed by him are represented as a series of numerical relationships that guide the calculation of *modulae* in confirming the natural proportions of temples. “*Ergo quod oculus fallit,*” Vitruvius cautions, “*ratiocinatione est exequendum.*”¹⁵²

In the fifth chapter of Book 3 and in Book 4, Vitruvius presents the proportions for composition of the symmetries established by tradition. Vitruvius identifies his Greek models as *aedium ionicarum, doricarum, and corinthiarum*.¹⁵³ The traditional symmetries can only be realized through their proper execution by a naturally gifted and trained architect.¹⁵⁴ The Greeks, particularly in the Ionian examples of Hermogenes, “*(o)mnia enim certa proprietate et a veris naturae deducta moribus transduxerunt in operum perfectiones...*”¹⁵⁵ The first Greek temples, like Roman temples conceived within the *disciplina rationis*, are an extension of Nature. Almost as an afterthought, Vitruvius also provides a short description of the *tuscanicus dispositio*.¹⁵⁶

The setting out of proper interior dimensions for temples is established in 4.4. Vitruvius puts the ideal width of the temple to be one half of its length. The *cella* should be longer than its width by one fourth. Again, these proportions can be adjusted at the discretion of the architect.¹⁵⁷ The appropriate proportioning of the masonry, under the guidance of the architect, will determine the stability of the structure because “*...quod media coagmenta medii lapides*

¹⁵² Vitruvius, *De Architectura* 3.3.11.

¹⁵³ Vitruvius, *De Architectura* 3.5.15.

¹⁵⁴ Vitruvius, *De Architectura* 4.2.1. See 1 Cor.3.10–15.

¹⁵⁵ Vitruvius, *De Architectura* 4.2.6.

¹⁵⁶ Vitruvius, *De Architectura* 4.7.

¹⁵⁷ Vitruvius, *De Architectura* 4.4.3.

continents firmiorem facient omnis operas perfectionem.”¹⁵⁸ As with metaphorical structure of the early Church, the stability of the whole work is dependant upon the skilled placement of each stone.¹⁵⁹

In 4.6 of *De Architectura*, Vitruvius discusses the symmetry of Tuscan temples. Like the Doric, Ionic, and Corinthian, Tuscan temples are set out using simple arithmetical proportions. A unique feature of the Tuscan arrangement is the triple *cella*. This arrangement is the oldest known in Rome and is the original configuration of the great temple of Jupiter Opitmus Maximus on the Capitoline. Vitruvius does not attribute the same authority to the Tuscan as he does to the Greek symmetries. An imperial architecture must transcend local idiosyncrasies.

The proper construction of round and “hybrid” temples is discussed in 4.8. All temple types can be modified to accommodate specific ritual requirements.¹⁶⁰ Temples should be made differently for each god because each god has specific characteristics. Insofar as altars, in addition to an eastern orientation as prescribed in 4.5, the suppliant should be made to look up to the deity.¹⁶¹ The necessary harmony between part and whole is again recognized in that the height of the altar, like the location of the temple, is relative to the nature of the deity. For example, the altar of Jupiter and other celestial deities should be very high while those of Vesta, earth, and sea should be somewhat lower.

De Architectura portrays the temple as a kind of mediating device that assures a controlled and orderly continuity between nature, manifestations of the divine, and human endeavour. The location of a temple, ideally, is indicated by a kind of rupture that occurs in the order of things when and where a god shows itself. The architect reacts to this rupture according to the universal

¹⁵⁸ Vitruvius, *De Architectura* 4.4.4.

¹⁵⁹ see 1 Cor. 3.10; Eph. 2.20–22.; 1 Pet. 2.4–5.

¹⁶⁰ Vitruvius, *De Architectura* (4.8.6).

¹⁶¹ Vitruvius, *De Architectura* 4.9.

truths demonstrated by Nature and tradition and by the necessary adjustments that creative intelligence allows to channel the power of the divine and to maintain cosmological order. The pattern for this order is found *ad hominis bene figurati*.

*Namque non potest aedis ulla sine symmetria atque proportione rationem habere compositionis, nisi uti ad hominis bene figurati membrorum habuerit exactam rationem.*¹⁶²

The disposition of the parts of a well-formed human body reveal the key to a balanced whole. It is through the relationship of the various parts, *proportione*,¹⁶³ and in the appropriate relationship of the parts to the whole, *symmetria*, that the temple is distinguished from all other buildings. While the types and locations of temple buildings for the various deities are determined in relation to the character of the god, all temples are ordered by proportions derived from the human body. Vitruvius emphasizes the pivotal role of temple architecture in the order of the city by advising that all other civic buildings are to be checked against the proportions established in temples.¹⁶⁴

The relationship between body and temple in *De Architectura* is less metaphorical, although it does rely on the common trope of the body as a unified whole made of distinct parts,¹⁶⁵ than it is metaphysical. Vitruvius does not argue that the temple is a body or that the body is a temple as we find in the Gospels and the Epistles. Rather, a temple derives its

¹⁶² Vitruvius 3.1.1.

¹⁶³ "... quae graece analogia dicitur." Vitruvius 3.1.1.

¹⁶⁴ For example, bk 5, on the building of the forum or the basilica, refers the reader back to bk 3, for column size and proportion.

¹⁶⁵ This metaphor appears to have been common in Roman rhetoric. See: Livy, *Ab Urbe Condita* 2.32.8–12. *Placuit igitur oratorem ad plebem mitti Menenium Agrippam, facundum uirum et quod inde oriundus erat plebi carum. is intronissus in castra prisco illo dicendi et horrido modo nihil aliud quam hoc narrasse fertur: 9 tempore quo in homine non ut nunc omnia in unum consentiant, sed singulis membris suum cuique consilium, suus sermo fuerit, indignatas reliquas partes sua cura, suo labore ac ministerio uentri omnia quaeri, uentrem in medio quietum nihil aliud quam datis uoluptatibus frui; 10 conspirasse inde ne manus ad os cibum ferrent, nec os acciperet datum, nec dentes quae acciperent conficerent. hac ira, dum uentrem fame domare uellent, ipsa una membra totumque corpus ad extremam tabem uenisse. 11 inde apparuisse uentris quoque haud segne ministerium esse, nec magis ali quam alere eum, reddentem in omnes corporis partes hunc quo uiuimus uigemusque, diuisum pariter in uenas maturum confecto cibo sanguinem. 12 comparando hinc quam intestina corporis seditio similis esset irae plebis in patres, flexisse mentes hominum.*

authority from sharing the essential aspects of universal order that are contained in the human body. The propriety of this order is verified by Nature and in the beauty of the ancient temples that rely on these numerical and geometrical relationships.

*Ergo si ita natura composuit corpus hominis, uti proportionibus membra ad summam figurationem eius respondeant, cum causa constituisse videntur antiqui, ut etiam in operum perfectionibus singulorum membrorum ad universam figurae speciem habeant commensus exactionem.*¹⁶⁶

The inextricable union of architecture with both Roman cosmology and ontology that is portrayed in *De Architectura* is important for our discussion of the Christian relationship with the Roman city. How could Christianity, as a primarily urban religion,¹⁶⁷ find a place for itself in cities so completely informed by the sympathetic forces of *mos maiorum*, Empire and Nature? The city is designed from the ideal proportions of the Roman body for the protection of the Roman body and for the health of the Roman body. That body is the architectural model for the temple and it is after the order of the temple that the entire city is ordered. The architecture of the city, in all of its physical and metaphysical dimensions, is an extension of the ideal body of the ideal Roman citizen. To be a citizen of Rome is to participate in these relationships. Accordingly, *De Architectura* describes the subtle and complex relationship between being in the world and building the world. While exceptions to Vitruvian planning and building certainly exist,¹⁶⁸ the text captures a vision of an architecture that is at once uniquely Roman and universal. Imperial Architecture, as imagined by Vitruvius, is the reconstruction of the world in the image of the *pater patriae*. It is a natural and living extension of *Caesar Augustus*, the perfect Roman body, and most clearly demonstrated in the *symmetria* of the Roman temple.

¹⁶⁶ Vitruvius, *De Architectura* 3.1.4.

¹⁶⁷ Meeks, *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul* 9–50.

¹⁶⁸ Ward-Perkins, *Roman Imperial Architecture* 307–309.

2.2 TEMPLE ARCHITECTURE

2.2.1 ROMAN TEMPLE

It is evident from archaeological excavations, and from Vitruvius' occasional vitriol, that Roman architecture at the beginning of the Empire was in a state of radical transformation.¹⁶⁹ Within one generation, Rome would reinvent herself as a new imperial capital. The Augustan transformation of Rome, from a city of brick to a city of marble,¹⁷⁰ required the mobilization of all local resources as well as the importation of materials, labour, and expertise from the far corners of the Empire. This meant the introduction of competing theories and techniques that were sometimes contrary to Roman tradition.¹⁷¹ Despite this heterogeneous environment, or perhaps because of it, an Imperial Architecture did coalesce. The architectural example set by Augustus, preserved in his many projects and, more abstractly, in *De Architectura*, remained influential throughout the imperial period. As Ward-Perkins observes:

... the size, the quality, and the variety of the great Augustan building program made it an unfailing source of inspiration to successive generations of architects; the circumstances of its creation gave it a unique authority; and it was the school in which the builders of the next generation learned the mastery of the materials which they were to put to such new and revolutionary uses. In architecture, as in so much else, the real significance of the reign of Augustus lay in the fact that it set the stage for the age that was to come.¹⁷²

Roman Imperial architecture, and in particular Imperial temple architecture, can be characterized by an underlying sense of order that transcends stylistic similarity. While not all temples look the same, Vitruvius insists that they be derived from a common source and share a common essence. Variations are necessary to accommodate more immediate concerns such as

¹⁶⁹ Vitruvius, *De Architectura* 3 pref. 1–3.

¹⁷⁰ Suetonius, *Works* Aug.28.3.

¹⁷¹ Ward-Perkins, *Roman Imperial Architecture* 40–41.

¹⁷² Ward-Perkins, *Roman Imperial Architecture* 44.

an irregular site, the client, or cost. Vitruvius allows for, and even invites, variation within the limits set by Nature and tradition. This elasticity is written into the *disciplina rationis*.

Richard Padovan, following H. van der Lann, sees a bipartite split in the 6 principles of Vitruvius that establishes a balance between the universal and the unique.¹⁷³ He reads *ordo*, as the function of *symmetria* and *eurythmia*, to be the consideration of the universal. *Dispositio*, on the other hand, is the domain of the architect's imagination and is the reconciliation of local propriety (*decors*) and local building constraints (*oeconomia*) with universal order.

Mark Wilson Jones proposes a tripartite reading that he argues is more consistent with the numerical patterns of *De Architectura*.¹⁷⁴ Suggesting that Vitruvius might see a distinction between "processes of design" and the "attributes they produce," Wilson Jones sets out the principles of architecture as:

Act of Design	Attribute of Result	Nature of Conception
<i>ordinatio</i>	<i>symmetria</i>	the project as number form and mathematical harmony
<i>dispositio</i>	<i>eurythmia</i>	the project as composition and visual harmony
<i>distributio</i>	<i>decor</i>	the project as appropriate to its social and physical context.

The proper order, found in the human body and translated by number and geometry, brings about symmetry. Symmetry may need to be adjusted, by arrangement through drawing, to clarify the inherent beauty of proper order. Finally, *symmetria* must be balanced with social, economic, and material demands.

Padovan and Wilson Jones acknowledge that the *disciplina rationis* is a comprehensive theory of architecture designed to mediate between human endeavour and Nature. Whether the six qualities of Imperial Architecture are considered in a bipartite or tripartite arrangement, or simply as the list that is preserved for us in the manuscript tradition, it is evident that *symmetria*

¹⁷³ Richard Padovan, *Proportion: Science, Philosophy, Architecture* (London: E & FN Spon, 1999) 160.

¹⁷⁴ Wilson Jones, *Principles of Roman Architecture* 40.

is the essential principle for achieving this mediation. As we read in 3.1.1, this is explicit in the case of temple planning. Only through geometry and number can a balance of the various parts of the composition with the whole work be achieved.¹⁷⁵ The principle of *symmetria* as recorded in *De Architectura* is a general rule for the temple architecture of the first two centuries C.E. and is recognized in the production of column capitals as late as the Constantinian period.¹⁷⁶

In 2 B.C.E., at the age of 61 years and in his thirteenth consulship, Augustus recorded the accomplishments of his life in the *Res Gestae*. The scrolls were sealed and placed in trust with the Vestal Virgins until the time of his death. At the Emperor's demise in 14 C.E., the *Res Gestae* was inscribed on two bronze columns at the entrance to his mausoleum in Rome and on the walls of temples dedicated to Rome and Augustus throughout the Empire.¹⁷⁷ Caesar, humbly, took credit for the restoration of 82 temples and for the construction of 14 new temples during his term as consul.¹⁷⁸ Of these new buildings, the Forum Augustum with its temple of Mars Ultor has been singled out as "Augustus's greatest architectural achievement..."¹⁷⁹ and "...the supreme architectural statement of the ideology of the Augustan regime."¹⁸⁰

2.2.1.1 FORUM OF AUGUSTUS AND THE TEMPLE OF MARS ULTOR

¹⁷⁵ Wilson Jones, *Principles of Roman Architecture* 41. "... *symmetria* reflected a cosmic order that reduced ultimately to whole numbers."

¹⁷⁶ Wilson Jones, *Principles of Roman Architecture* 152.

¹⁷⁷ Suetonius, *Works Aug.* 101.4.

¹⁷⁸ Augustus, "Res Gestae Divi Augusti," trans. Frederick W. Shipley, *Velleius Paterculus and Res Gestae Divi Augusti*, ed. E. Capps et. al., Loeb Classical Library (London: William Heinemann, 1924) 4.20.

¹⁷⁹ Richardson, *A New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome* 160.

¹⁸⁰ J.W. Rich, "Augustus's Parthian Honours, the Temple of Mars Ultor and the Arch in Forum Romanum," *Papers of the British School at Rome* 66 (1998) 71-128. See also Wilson Jones, *Principles of Roman Architecture* 66; 143; 154.

Augustus vowed the temple in 42 B.C.E. while avenging the assassination of Julius Caesar at the Battle of Philippi.¹⁸¹ Construction did not begin, however, until 19 B.C.E. following the Emperor's recovery of the military standards lost by Crassus to the Parthians.¹⁸² Like Romulus in his foundation of the temple of Jupiter Feretrius, Augustus needed a suitable shrine to house these spoils of war. The temple of Mars the Avenger, then, could commemorate both his familial revenge for the murder of Caesar and the revenge of the Roman state for the shame suffered in the loss of a military campaign. The temple was built *ex manubiis* from the booty of German and Spanish campaigns and work was substantially completed in time to celebrate Augustus' final consulship in 2 B.C.E.¹⁸³

Suetonius records that the Forum Augustum was initially planned to accommodate the overflow of legal cases from the Forum Iulium.¹⁸⁴ Based on evidence from Suetonius, Cassius Dio, and inscriptions, James Anderson summarizes the programme of the Forum to include:¹⁸⁵

1. the dedication of trophies to Mars Ultor following successful military campaigns.
2. the ceremonial departure point for diplomats going to regions of armed conflict.
3. meetings of Senate that dealt with declarations of war and the awarding of triumphs.
4. exceptional legal cases presided over by the Emperor.

The programmatic activity of the Forum was consistent with the character of Mars Ultor. It echoed the military power demonstrated by Augustus in his recovery of the Standards of Crassus. Why go to battle if the enemy would capitulate on declaration? Mars Ultor was not the

¹⁸¹ Rich, "Augustus's Parthian Honours, the Temple of Mars Ultor and the Arch in Forum Romanum," 88.

¹⁸² James C. Anderson, *The Historical Topography of the Imperial Fora*, Collection Latomus, vol. 182 (Bruxelles: Latomus revue d'études Latines, 1984) 67.

¹⁸³ Richardson, *A New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome* 160.

¹⁸⁴ Suetonius, *Works* (Aug) 29.1.

¹⁸⁵ Anderson, *The Historical Topography of the Imperial Fora* 89.

primitive Mars of Etruscan antiquity, celebrated in the Campus Martius by naked priests beating on shields. This was the Mars of Imperial authority.

The forum and temple were, by all accounts, architecturally stunning and in marked contrast to the brick and tufa buildings that made up much of Republican Rome. The Forum Augustum was located to the northeast of the Forum Romanum adjacent and perpendicular to the Forum Iulium. At the extreme northeast, the precinct wall was 30 m. high and carved an uneven line into the hill below the *subura*. The northwest precinct wall followed a line that defined the edge of the Republican city—the Servian Wall. The parallel precinct walls ran an estimated 125 m. northeast to southwest and averaged 85 m. across.¹⁸⁶ The piazza was paved with coloured marbles and flanked by ornate Corinthian colonnades, also reveted with coloured marble. The colonnades were 20 m. deep and roofed to accommodate various offices of government. Semicircular *exedrae*, open to the sky with radii of approximately 15 m., opened out behind the sections of the colonnades that ran beside the temple, expanding the sense of space. Along the walls of the *exedrae* and along the colonnades were niches fitted with statues and *eulogia* of the great characters of Roman tradition. Larger niches in the centre of the *exedrae*, perpendicular to the temple façade, framed, on the north-west, a statue of Aeneas flanked by the Alban kings and members of the *gens Iulia* and, on the south-east, the figure of Romulus stood in the middle of the Republican heroes. These images of Aeneas and Romulus were widely copied throughout the empire.¹⁸⁷ In the centre of the piazza was a bronze *quadriga*, a gift from the Senate for Augustus' success with the Parthians, and inscribed *Pater Patriae*. Numismatic evidence suggests that the chariot was empty. This was a rare but prestigious honour that would have

¹⁸⁶ Anderson, *The Historical Topography of the Imperial Fora* 73–4.

¹⁸⁷ Rich, "Augustus's Parthian Honours, the Temple of Mars Ultor and the Arch in Forum Romanum," 93.

been consistent with the Emperor's much vaunted modesty.¹⁸⁸ The south-western edge of the piazza was terminated by a right angle intersection with the Forum Iulium. While the details of this intersection have not been excavated, the prevailing opinion is that this wall or colonnade served as the principal entrance to the Forum Augustum.¹⁸⁹

The temple of Mars Ultor would have been an imposing presence inside the relatively square open space of the forum. While the architectural details borrowed heavily from Greek precedents, the plan, facade, and treatment of the site were decidedly Roman. Set out on an octastyle, peripteral *sine postico* plan, the temple was raised on a podium roughly 4 m. above the paving of the piazza. The rear wall of the temple cut into the landscape, showing little sympathy for surrounding topography. The Corinthian columns and capitals, richly carved in white Luna marble, stood 17.8 m. from plinth to entablature. The generous *pronaos* was 3 intercolumniations in depth with a deeply coffered ceiling. Typical of Roman and Etruscan temples, it was approached by a stair that extended into the piazza from the temple façade. The altar was located in the centre of these steps. The pediment featured Mars flanked by pairings of Venus and Fortuna, Romulus and Roma, and, finally, Palatinus Mons and Tiberinus Pater.¹⁹⁰

The temple interior was almost square. Colonnades along the inside walls were composed of 7 Corinthian columns, each backed with a matching pilaster, and carrying a high plinth for the vaulted ceiling. The entire back wall, almost 9 m. wide, was extended into an apse. A stepped base was set into the apse for the cult images. The base was almost as wide as the apse and supported Mars in full armour accompanied by Venus to his right and the deified Julius Caesar to his left. The grouping also included the Standards of Crassus.¹⁹¹

¹⁸⁸ Rich, "Augustus's Parthian Honours, the Temple of Mars Ultor and the Arch in Forum Romanum," 115–125.

¹⁸⁹ Anderson, *The Historical Topography of the Imperial Fora* 78–79.

¹⁹⁰ Richardson, *A New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome* 162.

¹⁹¹ Anderson, *The Historical Topography of the Imperial Fora* 70.

Dedicated some twenty-five years after the writing of *De Architectura*, one could expect the temple of Mars Ultor to be a textbook illustration for the *disciplina rationis*. Vitruvius tells us four things about temples dedicated to Mars:

1. “*Minervae et Marti et Herculi aedes doricae fient; his enim diis propter virtutem sine deliciis aedificia constitui decet.*”¹⁹²
2. “*Divisis antiportis et plateis constitutes arearum electio ad opportunitatem et usum communem civitatis est explicanda... Marti extra urbem sed ad campum...*”¹⁹³
3. “*Id autem etiam Etruscis haruspibus disciplinarum scripturae ita est dedicatum, extra murum Veneris, Volcani, Martis fana ideo conlocari, uti non insuescat in urbe adulescentibus, seu matribus familiarum veneria libido...*”¹⁹⁴
4. “*Martis vero divinitas cum sit extra moenia dedicata, non erit inter cives armigera dissensio, sed ad hostibus ea defensa a belli periculo conservabit.*”¹⁹⁵

To summarize, contrary to Vitruvius, the temple of Mars Ultor is built using the feminine Corinthian symmetry rather than the masculine Doric. While the god is most appropriately housed outside of the city walls (in order to protect young men and modest women from licentious pleasures and to protect the walls of the city in the event of war) Augustus places Mars in the heart of the city. While discrepancies like these raise questions about the relevance of *De Architectura*, they, in fact, help in understanding how the *disciplina rationis* actually functioned in the production of buildings.

Archaeological evidence indicates that the first comprehensive use of the Corinthian symmetry was in the temple of Olympic Zeus in Athens.¹⁹⁶ Designed in the 170s B.C.E. for Antiochus IV Epiphanes by Cossutius, a Roman citizen, the temple was so impressive that, when

¹⁹² Vitruvius, *De Architectura* 1.2.5.

¹⁹³ Vitruvius, *De Architectura* 1.7.1.

¹⁹⁴ Vitruvius, *De Architectura* 1.7.1.

¹⁹⁵ Vitruvius, *De Architectura* 1.7.1.

¹⁹⁶ Rykwert, *The Dancing Column: On Order in Architecture* 347.

Sulla conquered the city in 86 B.C.E., he transported some of the columns back to Rome.¹⁹⁷

Joseph Rykwert has identified Sulla's Corinthian trophy as a pivotal influence on the future of Roman architecture.

The Corinthian column then was to become the column of late Republican Rome and of Imperial architecture. In view of the development of religion in the Roman Empire, this can hardly be surprising. Its popularity may be due to the Roman fondness for elaborate and flowery ornament (as most authorities have suggested), but it may also have something to do with the way this last column isolated and represented a new and essential aspect of religious life: the emphasis on the immortality of the soul.¹⁹⁸

The slender and maidenly Corinthian, like the Ionic, takes its symmetry from the female body.¹⁹⁹

Vitruvius recounts the story of a young Corinthian girl who was struck down by disease as she came of marrying age. In grieving, the girl's nurse placed a basket of funerary offerings on the grave. As time passed, acanthus leaves grew up around the basket. An Athenian sculptor, Callimachus, saw the basket and the leaves and was struck by the beauty of the arrangement. He developed a set of principles based on what he saw and proceeded to carve architectural details based on these new principles. Here Vitruvius relays the genesis of the Corinthian symmetry as an allegory of the human condition. The death of the virgin girl and the verdant growth of acanthus that covered her grave symbolize the painful, inevitable, and beautiful cycle of life and death that all of us are forced to accept. Callimachus, because of his natural ability and training, was able to recognize the symmetry of the arrangement and to record it.

The Corinthian symmetry worked within a complex system of symbolic associations. First, we should recall that it was Cossutius, a Roman, that had produced the finest example of a

¹⁹⁷ The temple was not completed until the mid 2nd C. C.E. The benefactor was Hadrian.

¹⁹⁸ Rykwert, *The Dancing Column: On Order in Architecture* 349.

¹⁹⁹ Vitruvius, *De Architectura* 4.1.8.

Corinthian temple in the ancient world. While Greek in origin, the Corinthian symmetry did have a place in Roman tradition. This tendency to blur Greek and Roman history is not only evidenced in architecture but can also be seen in Imperial theology, philosophy, and literature.²⁰⁰ Second, the narrative of the Corinthian maiden was sympathetic with the sacrificial character of the Vestals who personified the piety of Rome. The virgin priesthood maintained the sacred flame that one version of the Romulus myth held was the vehicle for the phallus of Mars. Finally, Mark Wilson Jones has observed that the foliage of the acanthus "... stood not for the triumph of death, but the triumph over death, and so for cycles of life, rebirth and regeneration."²⁰¹ On the *Ara Pacis Augustae*, where Mars watches over Romulus and Remus as they suckle the she-wolf, acanthus transforms into grape vines, then ivy, and becomes acanthus again—all regulated by a subtle geometry.²⁰² On the altar, as in the Forum Augustum, the Emperor is portrayed as the new founder of Rome accompanied by the mythical first founders. While not exhaustive, these qualities of tradition, piety, and renewal could be understood as attributes of the first incarnation of Mars Ultor.²⁰³

Mars is an ancient Roman deity associated with warfare.²⁰⁴ He is the father of Romulus and Remus, having raped their mother Rhea Silvia, and thereby intimately connected to the mythical foundation of Rome.²⁰⁵ A large tract of land on the east bank of the Tiber, north and west of the Forum Augustum, was dedicated to him in Rome's prehistory.²⁰⁶ Known as the Campus Martius, outside of the walls of the city, this was the site of the first cult centre

²⁰⁰ E.g., Virgil's *Aeneid*.

²⁰¹ Wilson Jones, *Principles of Roman Architecture* 136–138

²⁰² On the reading the symbolism of the *Ara Pacis Augustae* see Barbara A. Kellum, "What we see and what we don't see. Narrative structure and the Ara Pacis Augustae," *Art History* 17.1 (1994) 26–45.

²⁰³ Augustus was the first to dedicate a temple to Mars "the Avenger."

²⁰⁴ Dumézil, *Archaic Roman Religion* 205–245.

²⁰⁵ Kellum, "What we see and what we don't see. Narrative structure and the Ara Pacis Augustae," Mars is portrayed watching over his sons suckling the she-wolf.

²⁰⁶ The Campus Martius is bounded on the west by the Tiber, the east by the Pincian, the southeast by the Quirinal, and the Capitoline on the south.

dedicated to the warrior god. Livy records that Pompilius Numa, the legendary second king of the city and the father of Roman religion, built an altar on the site. The *ara Martis* was not part of a *templum* proper and recognized the more chthonian aspects of the deity. As the Campus Martius was developed, the altar was incorporated into the Villa Publica and, after a fire in 80 C.E., it may have been included in the Divorum.²⁰⁷ Although it was the most significant site dedicated to Mars in Rome, the *ara Martis* was never developed with a temple building. An *aedes* was dedicated in the Campus, between the Circo Flaminio and the Tibur, in the first half of the 2nd C. B.C.E. It was designed by the Greek architect Hermodorus of Salamis and used imported Greek marble. The most significant *aedes Martis* of the Republican period was dedicated by T. Quinctius following the expulsion of the Gauls in 388 B.C.E.²⁰⁸ It was located outside of the city, through the Porta Capena, on the via Appia near the encampment of regiments preparing for campaigns to the south of Rome.²⁰⁹ All of these monuments are consistent with Vitruvius' instructions for locating Mars outside of the city walls. Is the Temple of Mars Ultor an exception?

In his description of the proper location of the various temples, Vitruvius is clear that the temperament of the deity determines the appropriate symmetry and location inside or outside of the city. The character of Mars Ultor, while still associated with war, is also related to the ancient foundation of Rome and to the re-founding of the city as the centre of the Empire. The Corinthian symmetry, with the symbolic associations of tradition, piety, and renewal discussed above, is consistent with these aspirations. Further, while the temple of Mars Ultor was not *extra muros*, the northwest wall of the Forum Augustum followed the line of the Republican *pomerium*. Attributed by tradition to Servius Tullius, the *pomerium* marked the ritual limit of the

²⁰⁷ Richardson, *A New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome* 245.

²⁰⁸ Livy, *Ab Urbe Condita* 6.5.7.

²⁰⁹ Richardson, *A New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome* 244; Dumézil, *Archaic Roman Religion* 206.

city and, except for some minor changes by Sulla, remained unchanged until the reign of Claudius.²¹⁰ If the Forum of Augustus was understood as a portal between Rome and the Empire, an assumption that is supported by the official business that was conducted there, then the temple is neither inside nor outside but on the wall. This would reflect the role of Mars as the protector of the city wall. Further, this section of the wall is adjacent to the Campus Martius. While we have no way of knowing definitively if this adjacency played a role in the location of the temple, *De Architectura*, *Ab Urbe Condita*, and Republican Temple precedent suggest that choosing a temple site was not a haphazard undertaking. If this was part of Augustus' plan, Mars Ultor and Venus Genetrix, the father of Romulus and the mother of Aeneas, stood at the gate of the Imperial city and the Empire.

Vitruvius reveals this allegorical character of temple architecture and the capacity for architecture to narrate the *symmetria* of Roman tradition, including the Gods, and Nature. As Mark Wilson Jones argues: *De Architectura* is not a handbook for construction, it is a cosmological map.

A major current of Greek thought was founded upon the belief that underlying the changing phenomena of the world was order, an order that could be expressed essentially in terms of numbers and quantities. *Symmetria* is the concept that relates numbers, measures and proportions to artistic and philosophical questions. It has been described as "commensurability of parts," but any such shorthand definition is bound to limit a full understanding of everything it entails."²¹¹

The location, construction, and conceptual frame that make up the temple of Mars Ultor convey the history and the promising future of Imperial Rome. The components of the composition—architecture, sculpture, inscription—comprise an allegory in which the Emperor is portrayed as the locus of Roman piety.

²¹⁰ Richardson, *A New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome* 295.

²¹¹ Mark Wilson Jones, "Designing the Roman Corinthian Order," *Journal of Roman Archaeology* 2 (1989) 35-69.

While the historical and technical veracity of *De Architectura* may sometimes be questioned, Vitruvius portrays the symbolic and allegorical role of architecture in the cultural narrative of Imperial Rome. To what extent this narrative was generally understood is demonstrated by the proliferation of Imperial buildings in the Roman provinces and client states.

Specifically Roman uses of architecture for urban purposes gained footholds in the provinces early on. By Augustus' death the framework for this had been well laid, particularly in northern Italy, Spain, and southern Gaul; south central Anatolia may have been penetrated as well. Veterans colonies, particularly in Africa, imperial gifts to numerous cities and towns around the Mediterranean, and locally sponsored pro-Roman projects speeded the process. In the east, client rulers helped, none more than Herod the Great, relics of whose immense building programs extend from the Nicopolis in Epirus and Pergamon to Masada.²¹²

2.3 IMPERIAL ARCHITECTURE AND HEROD

During the historical period described in the Gospel narrative, the architecture of Judea was undergoing a revolution at the hand of Herod. The Jewish King, a client of Julius Caesar, Marc Antony, and finally Augustus, had visited Rome several times and recognized the political value of architecture.²¹³ Herod's buildings included cities, palaces, fortifications, temples of the Imperial Cult, and, significant for our discussion, a rebuilding of the Jerusalem Temple.²¹⁴ For the temple project, Herod did not adopt Solomon's Syro-Phoenician typology. Rather, he opted for an architecture that utilized the symmetry and construction techniques of his Roman friends.

²¹² MacDonald, *The Architecture of the Roman Empire II: An Urban Appraisal* 263; See also: Ronald Mellor, *The Worship of the Goddess Roma in the Greek World* (Germany: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975) 198–200; J.B. Ward-Perkins, *Studies in Roman and Early Christian Architecture* (London: Pindar Press, 1994) 53–71.

²¹³ Duane W. Roller, *The Building Program of Herod the Great* (London, Berkeley, Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1998) 87. "Herod's innate astuteness and political sense recognized the importance of architectural largesse, especially to one trying to make his mark on the world."

²¹⁴ For an overview of Herod's architecture, see: Roller, *The Building Program of Herod the Great* 85–124; Ward-Perkins, *Roman Imperial Architecture* 309–314; Richardson, *Herod: King of the Jews, Friend of the Romans*.

The Romans first arrived in Palestine as a political power in 63 B.C.E. during Pompey's campaign to establish Syria as a Roman province. Pompey was called to Jerusalem to resolve a conflict between rival Hasmonean camps led by Aristobulus and Hyrcanus. Aristobulus refused to capitulate to Pompey's mediation and the Romans marched on Jerusalem. Pompey was given access to the city by Hyrcanus and put siege on Aristobulus in the Temple.²¹⁵ The Romans caused significant physical damage to the Temple and defiled the sanctuary. Further, as retribution, Pompey made Jerusalem a tributary to the Romans and took away the territories held by the city. Josephus tells us that, following his victory in Jerusalem and before his return to Rome, Pompey rebuilt the city of Gadara and returned "to their inhabitants" the cities taken during his march to Jerusalem.²¹⁶

In 57 B.C.E., Rome sent Aulus Gabinius to resolve continuing unrest in Syria. Alexander, the son of Aristobulus, had raised an army against the Romans in order to revenge his father. Gabinius, with Marc Antony and Antipater,²¹⁷ attacked Alexander at Jerusalem and defeated him. Following this victory, Gabinius gave orders "...to rebuild all of the cities he met with that had been demolished; at which time were rebuilt Samaria, Ashdod, Scythopolis, Anthedon, Raphia, and Dora; Marissa also, and Gaza, and not a few others besides..."²¹⁸ Gabinius then appointed Hyrcanus as Head Priest and divided the administration of Palestine into five regional councils.²¹⁹

²¹⁵ Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities*, trans. H. St. J. Thackeray, Loeb Classical Library (London/Cambridge MA.: W. Heinemann/Harvard University Press, 1961) 14.38

²¹⁶ Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities* 14.69.

²¹⁷ Herod's father.

²¹⁸ Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities* 14.86.

²¹⁹ Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities* 14.89.

In turn, Hyrcanus, with Antipater, played a key role in Julius Caesar's campaign against Egypt.²²⁰ Caesar repaid their support by confirming Hyrcanus' priesthood, effectively naming him King of Jerusalem, and by conferring Roman citizenship and the procuratorship of Judea to Antipater. These appointments were confirmed by the Roman Senate. When Caesar left Syria, Antipater restored the walls of Jerusalem from the damage they had incurred under Pompey's siege.²²¹ Concerned with Hyrcanus' abilities as an administrator, Antipater appointed his eldest son, Phasael, the governor of Jerusalem. He also named his second son, Herod, governor of Galilee.

Herod proved himself an efficient, if occasionally brutal, politician and soldier and these attributes did not go unnoticed by Rome. In the civil war that followed the assassination of Julius Caesar, Herod was made a general of the Roman forces in Celesyria under the patronage of Cassius. He was promised the kingdom of Judea for his services. Herod's political future was temporarily jeopardized when Cassius was deposed by Marc Antony, but with Hyrcanus' intervention, Herod and Phasel were made Tetrarchs of Judea. This new administration was short lived. Alexander, this time supported by the Parthians, attacked and captured Judea. Herod fled to Rome in shame and his brother Phasael committed suicide in prison. Outraged at the atrocities against Herod's family and at Parthian incursion into Judea, the Roman Senate decreed that Herod be named King of Judea in 40 B.C.E.²²² Josephus tells us that Herod left the senate house with Antony and Octavian to offer sacrifice on the Capitoline and to feast.²²³

While in Rome, Herod was witness to the city's awakening as an imperial power and architecture was clearly an agent of that transformation. Julius Caesar had announced his plans

²²⁰ Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities* 14.127.

²²¹ Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities* 14.156.

²²² Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities* 14.381–382; date from Kenneth G. Hollum, et al., *King Herod's Dream: Caesarea on the Sea* (New York and London: W.W. Norton & Company, 1988) 56.

²²³ Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities* 14.388–389.

to transform Rome in a letter to Cicero in 54 B.C.E. While tufa and travertine were still more common than marble in the mid-first century, the city was on the verge of an architectural revolution.²²⁴ Caesar intended to enlarge the Forum, rebuild the Curia (used by the senate for meetings), reorganize the Comitium (the space for public assembly in the Republic), and construct the Saepta in the Campus Martius.²²⁵ Construction of the Forum Iulium, to the North East of the senate house, was largely complete by 46 B.C.E.²²⁶ The beauty of this monumental project (160 x 75 m) is confirmed by Vitruvius, Pliny, Ovid,²²⁷ and Cassius Dio.²²⁸ Construction of the Curia, the senate house that linked the Forum Romanum to the Forum Iulium was started in 44 B.C.E. and completed by Augustus and dedicated in 21 B.C.E. It is unclear whether Herod was introduced to the Senate in this building, but the planning and construction would have been unavoidable to anyone visiting the Forum. This was the beginning of an architectural transformation of Rome that, over the next century, would radically alter the character of the city. It is significant that Herod visited Rome at this time and that he was a colleague of the individuals most responsible for this change. This visit had a decisive impact on Herod's understanding of architecture as a political and cultural medium.

Following a decree by the Roman Senate, Herod returned to Judea and gathered an army. However, with only tacit support from Rome, his war with the sons of Aristobulus dragged on for three years. In 37 B.C.E., after a five month siege of Jerusalem, the Romans finally arrived with military support.²²⁹ The Parthians were driven out, the Asmonaeans executed, and Herod

²²⁴ Boëthius, *Etruscan and Early Roman Architecture* 139.

²²⁵ Anderson, *The Historical Topography of the Imperial Fora* 9.

²²⁶ Anderson, *The Historical Topography of the Imperial Fora* 43.

²²⁷ Anderson, *The Historical Topography of the Imperial Fora* 44.

²²⁸ Dio Cassius, *Dio's Roman History*, trans. Earnest Cary, Loeb Classical Library, 5 vols. (London: W. Heinemann, 1914-1927) 43.22.2.

²²⁹ Holum, *King Herod's Dream: Caesarea on the Sea* 56; see also note a in Flavius Josephus, *The Works of Josephus*, trans. William Whiston (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1999) 396.

assumed his role as king. Josephus, though generally supportive of Herod, reports on this victory:

... at the same time the rule of the Asmonaeon line came to an end after a hundred and twenty-six years. Theirs was a splendid and renowned house because of both their lineage and their priestly office, as well as the things which its founders achieved on behalf of the nation. But they lost their royal power through internal strife, and it passed to Herod, the son of Antipater, who came from a house of common people and from a private family that was subject to the kings. Such, then, is the account we have received of the end of the Asmonaeon line.²³⁰

Seven years after his victory at Jerusalem, Herod received news that Octavian had defeated Marc Antony at Actium. Herod had offered his army to Antony against Octavian, but the offer had been declined. With understandable apprehension, Herod made his way to Rhodes for an audience with the soon-to-be Caesar. In Josephus' account of this meeting, Herod offered Octavian his diadem but made no apology for his friendship with Antony. Rather, Herod blamed the war on Cleopatra.²³¹ Impressed, Octavian placed the diadem back on Herod's head.

Herod received Octavian and his garrison in Judea and helped them prepare for war on Egypt. In return, Octavian added Gadara, Hippos, and Samaria to Herod's kingdom and the maritime cities of Gaza, Anthedon, Joppa, and Strato's tower.²³² After years of war and natural disaster in Judea, with the addition of these new territories and with the economic benefits of his Roman friendships, Herod was now in a position to begin building his building campaign.

Herod's first architectural projects in Jerusalem, recorded by Josephus, are the construction of two typical Roman building types—a theatre and an amphitheatre.²³³ Peter

²³⁰ Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities* 14.490–491.

²³¹ Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities* 15.191–192.

²³² Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities* 15.217.

²³³ Richardson, *A New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome* 6.

Richardson dates these projects to 28 B.C.E.²³⁴ These buildings were the first of their kind in the city and viewed by some Jews as a violation.²³⁵ Josephus mentions the Temple fortress of “Antonia” as Herod’s next project, but it is in the transformation of the ancient Jewish city of Samaria into the Roman city of Sebaste that the King of the Jews first showed his penchant for Roman monumentality.²³⁶ In his building of Sebaste, Herod:

...surrounded the city with a strong wall, using the steep slope of the place as a means of strengthening it. And he enclosed an area that was not of the same size as that of the former city but did not fall short of that of the most renowned cities for it was twenty stades (in circumference). Within it, at its centre, he consecrated a precinct of one and a half stades (in circumference), which was adorned in a variety of ways, and in it he erected a temple which in size and beauty was among the most renowned. The various parts of the city he also adorned in a variety of ways, and seeing the necessity of security, he made it a first-class fortress by strengthening its outer walls. He also made it splendid in order to leave to posterity a monument of the humanity that arose from his love of beauty.²³⁷

This account, as it outlines the process of establishing a city, is very much in keeping with Vitruvius.²³⁸ While there is no way of knowing if Herod had any knowledge of *De Architectura*, his urban projects demonstrate a decidedly Roman manner in building typology and planning.²³⁹

Of all Herod’s urban projects, Caesarea Maritima is one of the most and ambitious and, fortunately, one of the most thoroughly excavated.²⁴⁰ Initiated in 22 B.C.E, five years after Sebaste and about the same time as Vitruvius wrote *De Architectura*, the project was a re-

²³⁴ Peter Richardson, *Herod: King of the Jews and Friend of the Romans* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999) 197.

²³⁵ Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities* 15.268.

²³⁶ P. Richardson gives a date of 37–35 B.C.E. for the Antonia fortifications. He dates the construction of Sebaste as 27–12 B.C.E.

²³⁷ Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities* 15.297–298.

²³⁸ Vitruvius, *De Architectura* 1.3.1–2. “Now the assignment of public buildings is threefold: one, to defence; the second, to religion; the third to convenience... Now these should be so carried out that account is taken of strength, utility, and grace.”

²³⁹ Roller, *The Building Program of Herod the Great* 93–94.

²⁴⁰ For a general review of the excavations, see: Hollum, *King Herod's Dream: Caesarea on the Sea*; Avner Raban, *Caesarea Maritima: A Retrospective After Two Millenia* (Leiden: Brill, 1996).

founding and massive reconstruction of Strabo's Tower, one of the coastal cities given to Herod by Octavian.

Such a combination of palace with public and theatrical areas may have been inspired by his visits to Alexandria (40, 31 B.C.E.), Antioch (30 B.C.E.), or the Campus Martius and Palatine of Rome (40 and 17 B.C.E.). Yet Herod, a ruler-builder, copied no form outright. Our investigations of the palace have impressed us with his ability to design for the particular demands and ambitions of his reign, while creating a structure of exceptional magnificence...²⁴¹

Caesarea Maritima featured all of the appropriate attributes of the Imperial city with some politically motivated improvisations.²⁴² It boasted a magnificent commercial harbour, a theatre, hippodrome, a grid of residential streets, and a luxurious palace with seaside pool. It also featured a monumental Corinthian Temple to Roma and Augustus located prominently in the harbour.²⁴³ Even though the temple was not on Jewish territory, it did not go unnoticed by the Jews. They accused Herod of transgressing Mosaic law and of excessive submission to the Romans.²⁴⁴ Herod responded "...that he was doing these things not on his own account but by command and order, while he sought to please Caesar and the Romans by saying that he was less intent upon observing the customs of his own nation than upon honouring them."²⁴⁵ Whatever motivated his passion for architecture, Herod's efforts continued to increase his stature with the Emperor. In 20 B.C.E. he was made a procurator of Syria and was counted by Josephus as one of the three most powerful men in the Empire.²⁴⁶

²⁴¹ Kathryn L. Gleason, "The Promontory Palace at Caesarea Maritima: Preliminary Evidence for Herod's Praetorium," *Journal of Roman Archaeology* 11 (1998) 23–52.

²⁴² These exceptions include a temple on the harbor dedicated not to Jupiter, as per the Vitruvian formula in this case, but to the new power on earth: Rome and the Emperor.

²⁴³ Stephen Fai, "Architecture and Conflict in Caesarea Maritima," *Religious Rivalries and the Struggle for Success in Caesarea Maritima*, ed. Terry Donaldson (Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier Press, 2000).

²⁴⁴ Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities* 15.328–329.

²⁴⁵ Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities* 15.330.

²⁴⁶ P. Richardson thinks this claim may be slightly exaggerated. Richardson, *Herod: King of the Jews and Friend of the Romans* 234.

Herod returned to Rome in 17 B.C.E. to pay tribute to Octavian, now Augustus, who was celebrating the tenth year of his principate. It was an opportunity for Herod to strengthen his ties with Augustus and to witness first hand the architectural transformation of Rome.²⁴⁷ Ongoing projects included the re-development of the Campus Martius, the rebuilding of several prominent temples, and the construction of the Forum of Augustus with the Temple of Mars Ultor. Following this visit, Herod took the initiative to expand his own contribution to the architecture of the Empire even in territories beyond his legal responsibility.

Peter Richardson identifies ten cities in Syria and fourteen cities in Asia Minor and Greece that were the beneficiaries of Herod's architectural program.²⁴⁸ The buildings in Asia minor and Greece were associated with Agrippa's military campaign in Pontus in 14 B.C.E. Herod joined his friend on the campaign and distinguished himself by the munificence he showed to those living under Roman rule.²⁴⁹ While these acts of generosity may have been Herod's attempt to ingratiate himself with the diaspora Jews,²⁵⁰ all citizens benefited. Agrippa acknowledged Herod's generosity to Rome by granting the Jews of Asia the right to observe their traditional customs without prejudice.²⁵¹

In 12 B.C.E., Herod was again in Rome to ask Augustus's help in settling a dispute that had arisen between him and his sons. In order to shore up his reputation, Herod sponsored shows and gave generous gifts to Rome and to Caesar.²⁵² In turn, Caesar granted Herod the right to name his successor. This was a significant gesture and indicated Caesar's trust in Herod's abilities as a king. Herod returned to Judea and announced, at the Temple, that his sons,

²⁴⁷ See Ward-Perkins, *Roman Imperial Architecture* 21–44,

²⁴⁸ Richardson, *Herod: King of the Jews and Friend of the Romans* 201–202.

²⁴⁹ Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities* 16.12–62.

²⁵⁰ See Richardson, *Herod: King of the Jews and Friend of the Romans* 176.

²⁵¹ Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities* 16.60. See: Richardson, *Herod: King of the Jews and Friend of the Romans* 229.

²⁵² Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities* 16.128.

Aristobulus, Alexander, and Antipater, all educated in Rome under the patronage of Augustus, would rule after him.

After Herod's death Roman rule became increasingly oppressive and, in 66 C.E., a Jewish revolt broke out. Four years later, in 70 C.E., Titus sacked Jerusalem and destroyed the Temple. Jews were forbidden to enter the city, and, until a rebuilding by Hadrian in the second century, Jerusalem was reduced to a small provincial town.

Peter Richardson has characterized Herod as a “Romanophile.”²⁵³ While this is not the only dimension to his character, as Richardson points out, it is an apt description that underscores our overview of his architectural projects and in particular, the reconstruction of the Jerusalem Temple. It is necessary to understand the scale of Herod's enterprise and his affinity with the Empire in order to appreciate the contrast presented in John 2.20–21 between Herod's Temple and Jesus' ναὸς τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ. The Temple built by Herod is the architectural and literary foil to Jesus as the true Temple and locus of Israel. Herod's claim to the throne, his political affinity with Rome, his murderous character (Mt. 2.16), and his degenerate (Mt. 14.3–4//Mk.6.17–18) and ineffectual (Lk 23.6–16) family, clearly distinguish him from the builder of the first Temple. Solomon, the son of David, had received his architectural model from God—not Rome. Like Solomon, Jesus was descended from the House of David.

2.3.1 JERUSALEM TEMPLE

For early Christians, there were, effectively, two Jewish temples. The first was made of words and found in the LXX. The second was a temple of stone that served as a backdrop for the Gospel narrative and Acts. In the first case, the temple is understood as a πρωτότυπον and

²⁵³ Peter Richardson, “Law and Piety in Herod's Architecture,” *Studies in Religion* 15.3 (1986) 347–360.

ἀρχέτυπον given to Moses, David, and Solomon by God.²⁵⁴

And have them make me a sanctuary, so that I may dwell among them. In accordance with all that I show you concerning the pattern of the tabernacle and of all its furniture, so you shall make it. (Ex. 25.8–9)

Then the angel of the Lord commanded Gad to tell David that he should go up and erect an altar to the Lord on the threshing floor of Ornan the Jesubite. So David went up following Gad's instructions which he had spoken in the name of the Lord. (1 Chr. 21.18–19)

Now the word of the Lord came to Solomon, "Concerning this house that you are building, if you will walk in my statutes, obey my ordinances, and keep all my commandments by walking in them, then I will establish my promise with you, which I made to your father David. I will dwell among the children of Israel, and will not forsake the people of Israel. (1 Kings 6.11–13)

God agreed to dwell among the chosen people only if a prescribed order was followed in the construction of a dwelling place. In 1 Kings 6.3–22, we learn that the dimensions of the temple were 60 cubits in length, 20 cubits in width, and 30 cubits high. A porch on the front of the temple extended the entire width of the building and was 10 cubits in depth. The roof was built of cedar. The length of the interior was divided such that 20 cubits were enclosed in a perfect cube of cedar, while the remaining 40 cubits served as a nave between the porch and the inner sanctuary. The nave received natural light through lattice-framed windows. Finally, the entire structure was overlaid with gold. When Solomon had finished the construction of the temple, God expressed pleasure:

I have heard your prayer and your plea, which you made before me; I have consecrated this house that you have built, and put my name there forever; my eyes and my heart will be there for all time. As for you, if you will walk with me, as David your father walked, with integrity of heart and uprightness, doing according to all that I have commanded you, and keeping my statutes and

²⁵⁴Eusebius, *The Ecclesiastical History* 10.4.55.

ordinances, then I will establish your royal throne over Israel forever... (1 Kings 9.3–5)

While there is no way of knowing if the information given in 1 Kings and 2 Chr. 3.1–15 reflects the temple that Solomon built, the *Tempelidee* contained in the text was understood by *Barnabas*, *Clement*, *Origen*, and *Eusebius* to represent the true dwelling place of God.

Unlike the temple of Mars Ultor, Solomon's Temple could not be prefigured in a model like the human body. Rather, God, as the source of universal order (Gen. 1–2; Jn. 1.1–3), revealed the *symmetry* of the Temple directly to the temple builders as λόγος. As the Word of God, the temple pattern is primal or a First in the sense developed by Plato and Origen and exists outside of matter.²⁵⁵ The temple as ἄρχέτυπον rather than τόπος suggests that the temple exists wherever the pattern is present. Since θεός and λόγος are one, God is present wherever the ἄρχέτυπα are established. This understanding of the Temple was shared, to varying degrees, by the Qumran community and, as discussed in 1.2.2, above by the Pharisees.

At Qumran, the temple ἄρχέτυπα was maintained by shifting some aspects of priestly responsibility to the whole community.²⁵⁶ While a hierarchy reminiscent of Jerusalem remained in place, the state of purity reserved for the dynasty of Temple priests was now available to all who demonstrated their passion for the Law.²⁵⁷ However, the elevation of the Law [νόμος] above cult practice de-centered the structure of Israel. In order to address this, the community redirected the function of the temple to the community itself. Bertil Gärtner argues that this was achieved through a “conviction that the ‘presence’ of God, the Spirit of God, was no longer

²⁵⁵ Plato, "Timaeus," trans. R. G. Bury, *Timaeus; Critias; Cleitophon; Menexenus; Epistles* (London/Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 1999) 69.c; Origen, *Commentaire sur Saint Jean: livres i-v*, trans. Cécile Blanc, Sources Chrétiennes, vol. 120 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1966) 1.19–20.

²⁵⁶ Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament* 5.

²⁵⁷ Florentino García Martínez, "Priestly Functions in a Community without Temple," *Gemeinde ohne Tempel/Community without Temple*, ed. Armin Lange Beate Ego, Peter Pillhofer (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999) 303. Martínez disputes this point, "At Qumran there is nothing similar to the 'universal priesthood' that appears in the New Testament interpretation of Ex. 19.6..."

bound to the temple in Jerusalem but to the true and pure Israel represented by the community.”²⁵⁸ Gärtner recognizes a similar attitude in Pharisaism.

The Pharisees understood God’s presence in this sense to be a function of the Law that extended beyond the walls of the Temple proper and into the community. In summarizing this position, David Renwick states:

...the presence of God was consequently a pervasive one in ancient Judaism. Furthermore, this was true in particular of the pre-70 c.e. Pharisees, and provides the key to understanding their passionate interest in keeping the precepts of the Law. Through the Law, understood as a gracious gift from God, their intent was to re-create the atmosphere of the Temple outside the Temple, and thus to re-create the God-given Biblical conditions within which God delighted to be present.²⁵⁹

Further, Renwick and Gärtner propose that this understanding of Temple boundaries was influential in Paul’s use of the body/temple metaphor in 2 Corinthians.²⁶⁰

Addressing the *tempelidee* in Paul, Christfried Böttrich argues that unlike Qumran, Paul was not rejecting the physical temple. Rather, as a Pharisee, he understood the Jerusalem Temple to represent a model of God’s presence.²⁶¹ The coming of Christ had simply made the temple cult insignificant. Böttrich sees this illustrated in Paul’s use of the body/temple metaphor in the Corinthian correspondence where the mixed community would have had a limited, if any, experience of Jerusalem. In addressing the Gentile members of the church, Paul could only rely on their understanding of *ναός* as it was informed by the numerous Roman temples in Corinth. Böttrich concludes that for Paul and for the Corinthian church, the Temple buildings were essentially irrelevant.

²⁵⁸ Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament* 16,

²⁵⁹ Renwick, *Paul, the Temple and the Presence of God* 157.

²⁶⁰ Renwick, *Paul, the Temple and the Presence of God* 158–160; Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament* 49–56.

²⁶¹ Böttrich, "Ihr seid der Tempel Gottes". Tempelmetaphorik und Gemeinde bei Paulus," 414.

The *tempelidee* or temple ἄρχέτυπα can be summarized as a recognition and reverence for the underlying order of the Temple as it was disclosed to Moses, David, and Solomon and recorded in the LXX. The genesis of this idea lay in a Judaic understanding of God's presence as interpreted by groups questioning the exclusive authority of the Jewish priesthood. These groups included the Qumran community, Pharisees, and Christians. As we have seen, while the *tempelidee* does not suggest a rejection of architecture *per se*, it does generate a tension between architectural ideas and buildings. As we shall discuss in chapter 4, this tension is employed rhetorically by the Epistles and the Gospels to develop a sense of Christian community and to locate the presence of God in Christ and the Church. As ἄρχέτυπα, the *tempelidee* provides the later exegetes with a hermeneutic key for unlocking the numeric and geometric codes that unite the LXX with Paul and the Evangelists.

A characterization of the temple ἄρχέτυπα must also consider the role of Herod's Temple as the antithesis of the First Temple. Identified in 1.2.2 as the "abandoned temple," it portrays the corruption and ritual pollution that Christ has come to remedy. Where the temple of the LXX is a model for a Christian ontology, the temple buildings in the Gospel narrative are a symbol of what Christians must separate themselves from.

Between 20 and 23 B.C.E., Herod announced his decision to rebuild the Jerusalem temple.²⁶² Peter Richardson argues this may have been prompted by a desire to prove his commitment to Judaism and to address criticism about his relationship with Rome. Josephus records Herod's intention to correct the errors of the second temple and re-establish the plan established by God:

But that the enterprise which I now propose to undertake is the most pious and beautiful one of

²⁶² See Richardson, *Herod: King of the Jews and Friend of the Romans* 245.

our time I will now make clear. For this was the temple which our fathers built to the Most Great God after their return from Babylon, but it lacks sixty cubits in height, the amount by which the first temple, built by Solomon, exceeded it. And yet no one should condemn our fathers for neglecting their pious duty, for it was not their fault that this temple is smaller. Rather it was Cyrus and Darius, the son of Hystaspes, who prescribed these dimensions for building, and since our fathers were subject to them and their descendants and after them to the Macedonians, they had no opportunity to restore this first archetype of piety (εὐσεβείας ἀρχέτυπον) to its former size.²⁶³

When Herod made this announcement, he was also preparing to build the port city of Caesarea Maritima. The Jews were concerned that Herod might demolish the Temple as it stood, start construction, and distracted by the demands and expense of Caesarea, leave the Temple project uncompleted. To ease their fears, Herod agreed not to begin demolition until he had all materials and labour in place to begin construction.

Josephus records that Herod procured one thousand wagons for the transportation of materials and secured the service of ten thousand of the most skilled workmen.²⁶⁴ He also trained one thousand priests as stonecutters and carpenters. The priests were responsible for the construction of the court of Priests, the temple proper, and the inner sanctuary. Astonishingly, the priests completed their part of the work in a year and a half.²⁶⁵ If we accept Herod's expressed concern over the proportional shortcomings of the second temple and Josephus' description of the plan, we can assume that the inner sanctuary was built to approximate the First Temple.²⁶⁶ However, from the information left to us by Josephus, the ornament and the planning of the temple compound did not. Josephus is explicit in reporting that the Temple precinct was

²⁶³ Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities* 15.385–387.

²⁶⁴ Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities* 15.390.

²⁶⁵ Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities* 15.521.

²⁶⁶ Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities* 15.419.

detailed using the Corinthian symmetry.²⁶⁷ As discussed above, the Corinthian symmetry was appropriated by Augustus as the ideal architectural expression of the new Empire. Herod was certainly aware of what was happening in the Fora of Caesar and Augustus from his visits to Rome. He demonstrated this in his use of the Corinthian order in his Temple of Rome and Augustus in Sabaste.²⁶⁸ Considering the allegorical use of architecture described in *De Architectura*, Herod may have understood the construction of the Jerusalem Temple to play some part in the greater Imperial project.

In his reconstruction of the Jerusalem Temple, Herod radically transformed the court of the Gentiles by doubling the enclosed area and re-developing the edge condition.²⁶⁹ The perimeter of the temple complex was defined by four *stoa* detailed in the Corinthian order. Lee Levine has argued that this was done to accommodate a transfer of public functions, similar to those of the Greek agora or the Roman Forum, to the Temple.²⁷⁰ The arrangement of the southern *stoa* were particularly impressive with three rows of columns and a row of pilasters on the south wall. This enclosure acted as kind of porch from the south gate and framed an oblique view of the Temple. With its highly articulated *templum* enclosing the *aedes* located within, Herod's composition of the Temple complex bore a striking resemblance to the Imperial Forum of Augustus.²⁷¹

The destruction of the Temple in 70 C.E. was seen by Christian exegetes as the final justification for vilifying of Herod's project. Writing in the late first or early second century, the

²⁶⁷ Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities* 15.414.

²⁶⁸ Ward-Perkins, *Roman Imperial Architecture* 310.

²⁶⁹ Ward-Perkins, *Roman Imperial Architecture* 310.

²⁷⁰ Levine, *The Ancient Synagogue: The First Thousand Years* 39–40.

²⁷¹ See Richardson, "Law and Piety in Herod's Architecture," 350. "It is surprising, however, that the building form itself did not cause any controversy, because that form is strongly Hellenistic, especially in the new features that Herod introduced in the rebuilding." Richardson argues that Herod and Augustus were very different in their architectural intentions. Augustus was building with a sense of Roman piety and Herod, although with some sense of Jewish piety, was building primarily for power and pleasure (349).

author of *Barnabas* writes:

3 Furthermore, he says again, "Lo, they who destroyed this temple shall themselves build it." 4
That is happening now. For owing to the war it was destroyed by the enemy; at present even the
servants of the enemy will build it up again.²⁷²

2.4 ARCHITECTURE, CHRISTIANITY, AND CHRISTIAN ARCHITECTURE

Krautheimer and White have argued that the limited archaeological record for Christian buildings in the centuries before Constantine suggests that, like many other cult, trade, and cultural associations in the Roman world, the Church used private residences as expedient places to meet.²⁷³ Understated on the exterior and typically indistinguishable from the surrounding urban fabric, house churches were transformed gradually through renovation and reconstruction into dedicated public or semi-public spaces as local needs arose. During periodic persecutions, many of the early house churches were confiscated or destroyed.²⁷⁴ As the cycles of persecution ended and properties were returned, church buildings were often triumphantly re-established or rebuilt within residential districts.²⁷⁵ By the fourth century, this pattern of inhabitation and re-inhabitation in residential quarters, first a matter of expedience, was symbolic of the church's struggle and victory over the forces of evil.²⁷⁶

The practice of meeting in domestic spaces is recorded in the earliest Christian literature. While this is consistent with what we know to be customary in the Roman world and contributes

²⁷² Barnabas, "The Epistle of Barnabas," trans. Kirsopp Lake, *The Apostolic Fathers*, ed. G.P. Goold, vol. 1 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1985) 16.1-5. For Greek text see dissertation Chapter 4.4.1.

²⁷³ Krautheimer, *Early Christian and Byzantine Architecture* 23; White, *The Social Origins of Christian Architecture, Volume 1* 140-148.

²⁷⁴ Eusebius, *The Ecclesiastical History* 8.2.

²⁷⁵ Eusebius, *The Ecclesiastical History* 10.2.

²⁷⁶ Eusebius, *The Ecclesiastical History* 10.3.

to our understanding of the history of Christian meeting places, this same literature identifies other place-types that situate significant narrative events. The following is a brief survey of architectural, urban, and rural place-types identified in the Gospels, Pauline Epistles, and Acts. While this study is not exhaustive, it does indicate some historical and symbolic patterns that are significant to reading the body/temple vehicle.

2.4.1 GOSPEL NARRATIVE

A study of the places used by Jesus for prayer, healing, and teaching needs to be considered in the context of both Gospel rhetoric and history. The Gospels identify very specific historical places (e.g., Jerusalem, Capernaum, Nazareth) and more general place types that we know from other sources to be consistent with the period (e.g. synagogues, temples, *fora*). While evidence for Gospel events that occurred at these places cannot always be tested, the place names and types do provide a geographical and temporal context for the narrative. Further to this, as a setting for the Gospel narrative, architecture is essential in establishing a Roman political and cultural presence. The rhetorical use of architecture in the text relies on the monumental infrastructure of the Imperial building program as a foil. It is critical, then, to understand the extent of Rome's architectural influence in Judea, Galilee, and Jerusalem at the beginning of the first millennium.

Matthew and Luke identify the birthplace of Jesus as Bethlehem, the "City of David." Matthew makes a genealogical link between Jesus and David through Joseph.²⁷⁷ Luke also identifies Joseph as the descendant of David and it is because of this connection that Joseph takes his family to Bethlehem.²⁷⁸

²⁷⁷ Mt. 1.1–17. David is said to be the first priest/king of Israel.

²⁷⁸ Lk. 2.4.

Luke is the only Gospel to identify a stable or manger as the specific building type associated with the birth.²⁷⁹ Matthew has the magi visiting a house to pay their respects.²⁸⁰ While there are obvious differences among the nativity narratives, symbolic associations with places and place types are quite consistent. Jesus' right to the title of king and priest is established by his genealogy and the city of his birth is tied to that genealogy. It is important to the Gospel narrative that Jesus was not born in Jerusalem or in any of the Hellenised or Roman cities in Herod's kingdom. He was born "outside" of the Roman cities established by Pompey and Herod in Judea and in Galilee. From the narrative, Jesus is intimately connected to the Temple. His connection is through blood to the first kings and the First Temple builders. Implicit is that Jesus has a more legitimate claim to the throne than Herod.²⁸¹ This genealogy informs the body/temple vehicle by attributing to Jesus the birthright of king, priest, and, in the tradition of Solomon, temple builder.

Luke's Jesus was first brought to Jerusalem one month after his birth and, in accordance with Mosaic Law, presented to God in the Temple. Simeon, a man who was "righteous and devout, looking forward to the consolation of Israel" recognized Jesus as the saviour of both Jews and Gentiles.²⁸² Anna, an aged prophet who never left the Temple, praised God and began to tell others that the messiah had arrived.²⁸³ Following this initial recognition, Jesus and his family returned home to Nazareth, but continued to visit the Temple annually for Passover.²⁸⁴ The next incident of note occurs when Jesus was twelve years old. Following the annual Passover visit, Jesus stayed behind in the Temple for three days speaking with the rabbis. When

²⁷⁹ Lk. 2.7; 2.16.

²⁸⁰ Mt. 2.11.

²⁸¹ To understand just how seriously Matthew considered this threat, we have only to read his description in Mt. 2.13–18.

²⁸² Lk. 2.27–35.

²⁸³ Lk. 2.36–38.

²⁸⁴ Lk. 2.41.

his parents scolded him for running off, Jesus reprimands them, in turn, for not understanding the reason for his presence in the Temple.²⁸⁵ These are the first recorded words of Jesus. His filial responsibilities are not to Joseph but to God. Accordingly, he must dwell where his father dwells. These two stories, the presentation and the boy in the Temple, reinforce Jesus' connection to the history of Israel and to his birthright as king and priest. Jesus was recognised in the Temple, not by the priests, but by prophets. The priesthood was corrupted by the political will of Herod and the Romans and could no longer function naturally. Jesus does not reject the Temple, nor is he rejected by it. What he rejects, and this is made explicit in the "Temple cleansing," is the influence and authority over the institution being exercised by a false king and priesthood.²⁸⁶ If we examine where Jesus and his followers gather, we can see that the rejection of civic spaces and places forms a pattern in the Gospels. These places were integral to the Imperial building campaign undertaken by Rome and Herod.

The topography of Gospel place-types can be arranged into 5 categories.²⁸⁷ Ranked by frequency, they are:

1. extra-urban.
2. house.
3. Jerusalem Temple.
4. synagogue.
5. civic space.

Of all place-types identified, the majority are "extra-urban." Extra-urban sites are outside of the city walls and include mountains, wilderness, deserts, open fields, the sea and sea shore, roads, tombs, caves, and gardens. Areas at the edge of the city or near the city gate are also included in

²⁸⁵ Lk. 2.49.

²⁸⁶ Mt. 21.12–13//Mk. 11.15–19//Lk. 19.45–48//Jn.2.13–16.

²⁸⁷ See Appendix 2.

this category. “Houses” would include both typical middle eastern courtyard houses in towns and multi-story buildings in Jerusalem. While the distinction between houses, as meeting places, and synagogues is clear in the Gospels, the architectural differences may not have been so apparent. Some of this clarity may be rhetorical and reflect the time of the Gospel writers rather than an historical condition. Nonetheless, this distinction is important for our project of reconstructing the architectural imagination of early Christians. The Jerusalem Temple is important as a place-type, but is identified less than half as many times as the extra-urban sites as a meeting place. Synagogues, while important in the Gospels, are identified less frequently than in Acts. Again, this is probably more a function of the text than history. The least identified place-type in the Gospels is civic space. Considering that the same texts acknowledge 24 different cities, a polemic against Roman urbanity is a reasonable assumption.²⁸⁸

In the Gospel of Matthew, 21 separate place-types can be clearly identified. Of these, 8 are extra-urban, 6 are houses, 3 are the Temple, and 4 are synagogues. Matthew identifies no civic spaces as a location for Christian meeting. Mark identifies 32 place-types: 10 extra-urban, 10 houses, 4 in the Temple, 4 synagogues, and 4 civic spaces. Luke identifies 46 place-types. Almost half of the place-types in Luke, 20, are extra-urban. Houses count for 13, the Temple for 6, and synagogues for 6. One dubious public place is recorded—a prison. While Christians do not gather at the jail in the narrative, this is the first record of someone (John the Baptist) associated with the Christian group to be jailed.

The narrative of the Gospel of John differs from the synoptics in its topographical pattern. Where the synoptic Gospels have the majority of Jesus’ ministry occurring in Galilee and culminating in a triumphant arrival in Jerusalem, John divides Jesus’ time between the two

²⁸⁸ See Appendix 2.

principates almost equally. Of the 21 space types identified: 11 are extra-urban, 3 are houses, 6 are associated with the Temple, 1 is a synagogue, and 1 very significant civic space is used in Jesus' triumphal entry into Jerusalem.

Cumulatively, in all 4 gospels, we can identify 120 instances where Jesus interacts with the public in some way in a discernable place or place-type. Of these, 49 are extra-urban, 32 are in houses, 19 occurred in the Temple, 15 occurred in synagogues, and 6 occurred in civic spaces.

2.4.2 PAULINE SOURCES

In the uncontested letters of Paul, specific places for Christian meetings are alluded to only three times.²⁸⁹ Two of these passages appear to reference a single building—the house of Prisca and Aquila. The third mention of Christian meeting in a private residence is in the house of Philemon of Colossae.²⁹⁰ These private residences, as places of Christian meeting, represent a significant contribution to our understanding of the structure of early Christianity. However, what is curious, when trying to understand the role of architecture in the early Church, is that, in the same uncontested letters, Paul used architectural metaphor in at least ten separate passages. If we compare the frequency of description of physical occupancy relative to the frequency of architectural metaphor, Paul places little importance on where the churches are meeting physically. The significance is in the act of Christian meeting.

²⁸⁹ “Greet Prisca and Aquila, my co-workers in Christ Jesus, who risked their necks for my life, to whom not only am I grateful but also all the churches of the Gentiles; greet also the church at their house.” Romans 16:3–5. “The churches of Asia send you greetings, Aquila and Prisca together with the church at their house send you many greetings in the Lord.” 1 Corinthians 16:19.

²⁹⁰ “...to Philemon, our beloved and our co-worker, to Apphia our sister, to Archippus our fellow soldier, and to the church at your house” Philemon 1-3.

2.4.3 THE NARRATIVE OF ACTS

The architectural content of Acts begins with the heroic tale of the martyr Stephen. Stephen, one of seven Greek-speaking Jews chosen by the Jerusalem Church to help the twelve disciples with administrative tasks, is accused by the Jews of teaching that Jesus would destroy the Temple and corrupt the Mosaic tradition. For this, Stephen is brought before the Sanhedrin to defend himself against charges of blasphemy. At the end of his address to the court, Stephen sketches a history of Israel that illustrates the historical importance of the Temple. The Temple signifies, through its historical association with the Ark, a covenant between the Jews and God. Stephen states that, although Solomon built a house for God, "...the Most High does not dwell in houses made with human hands."²⁹¹

Stephen argues that it is the symbolic value of the Temple in relation to the Covenant that is significant, not the Temple as an object or place. If the Temple is destroyed, the Covenant would remain. Stephen accuses his accusers of being like the Israelites that called to Aaron to make gods that they could see. Stephen is not arguing against the Temple, but against the inscription (or literal depiction) of God that the Temple had come to represent. In the crowd, and later watching over the cloaks of those who stoned Stephen, was a young Pharisee named Saul.

Acts goes on to tell us that Saul went from house to house in Jerusalem routing out the Christians for imprisonment. From the high Priest in Jerusalem, he receives letters addressed to the synagogues in Damascus sanctioning the persecution of the Christian sect. On the way to Damascus, Paul is converted and, rather than persecute the Christians, he proclaims in the synagogues that Jesus is the Christ.

²⁹¹ Acts 7.48.

From these few short passages we can speculate that, in the experience of the author of Acts at the end of the first century, Christians met in any one of three place-types:

1. In the proximity of the Jerusalem temple. (Stephen was preaching near the Temple.)
2. In synagogues. (Paul was going to look for Christians in the synagogues and he spoke in the synagogues after his own conversion.
3. In residential dwellings. (Paul went from “house to house” to find Christians.)

The following table is a summary of place-types identified in Acts:

Location	Acts
Synagogue (8)	9.20 13.5 13.14 14.1 17.1–2 17.16 18.19 19.8
House (6)	16.13–16 16.34 16.40 18.3 20.7 28.23
Prison (2)	16.24–25 23.11
Temple (2)	21.26 22.17
Civic space (3)	17.16 (Public Square) 17.22 (Areopagus) 19.9 (Lecture Hall)

In Acts 18, we learn that, while Paul is in Corinth, he stays at the house of a Jewish family exiled from Rome by the Emperor Claudius and that he is a tent maker by trade. We learn that the Apostle tries to convince the Jews at the Corinthian synagogue that Jesus is the Messiah but they are not convinced. Paul leaves the synagogue and goes to the house of Titus Justus. Two points should be noted. The first point is geographic. Titus Justus lives next door to the synagogue; therefore, the synagogue must be in a residential area. The second point is symbolic. Paul leaves the synagogue to preach in a house. Unlike the Roman temples described by the Vitruvius, synagogues buildings are part of the undifferentiated residential fabric. This reading agrees with existing archaeological evidence.²⁹² Nonetheless, though located physically in the same urban topography, the private residence and the synagogue are differentiated by Jewish custom.²⁹³ Symbolically, Paul's leaving the synagogue for a house could be read as a turning away from the Jewish community. In the narrative, following Paul's action, the synagogue official, Crispus, and all of his household accept Jesus as the Messiah. Any authority assigned to the synagogue as a Christian institution is undermined by this conversion. Paul's initial missionary journey took him into the synagogues of the Diaspora. He was not always greeted with open arms. In the synagogues he met opposition and is subsequently invited into the homes of sympathetic Jews. These may be the foundations of some of the first houses-churches.

Acts specifically states that Paul visits the synagogues at Damascus, Salamis, Antioch in Pisidia, Beroea, Athens, Corinth, and Ephesus. In Corinth, Jews and "God-fearers" are present at synagogue debates. In Acts, the synagogue is an access point to existing Jewish communities,

²⁹² J. Gutmann, ed., *The Synagogue: Studies in Origins, Archaeology and Architecture* (New York: KTAV Publishing House, 1975) xii–xiii.

²⁹³ Marilyn Chiat, "First Century Synagogue Architecture: Methodological Problems" *J. Gutmann, ed., Ancient Synagogues: The State of Research* (Chico, California: Scholars Press, 1981) 55.

and, through those communities, to sympathetic Jews and Gentiles. Paul's reputation as a Pharisee guaranteed his initial acceptance by the community.

Acts 20.7 has Paul breaking bread and boring those with him in an upstairs room of a residential building. A young boy falls asleep and falls out of the window to his death. Paul throws himself on the youth and declares him alive. Though not explicit, the presence of Christ is with Paul. Paul is like Christ in his ability to restore life to the young Eutychus. No intermediary device, such as a temple, is required for the manifestation of God's power.

Acts also records two significant Temple events in Paul's post-conversion life. In Acts 21:26–29, we learn that Paul is arrested for defiling the Temple by bringing non-Jews into the sacred precinct and violating laws of purity. He had gone to the Temple to purify himself, to prove to the Jews (and perhaps the Jerusalem Church) that he still observed the Mosaic Law. In his defence, Paul addresses his accusers claiming that Christ appeared to him in the Temple and told him to leave Jerusalem. He was instructed to go out to the Gentiles because the Jews would not accept Jesus as the messiah.²⁹⁴ Allegorically, Paul's vision in the Temple affirms the divinity of Christ and of the Christian experience. But Paul is cast out of the Temple. When Jesus appears to him a second time, in prison, it suggests that God is no longer concerned about the purity of place, but with the purity of the individual.²⁹⁵

The God who made the world and all that is in it, the Lord of heaven and earth, does not dwell in sanctuaries made by human hands, nor is he served by human hands because he needs anything... He made from one the whole human race to dwell on the entire surface of the earth, and he fixed the ordered seasons and the boundaries of their regions.²⁹⁶

²⁹⁴ Acts 27.7.

²⁹⁵ Acts 23.11.

²⁹⁶ Acts 17.24.

The *topos* of religious gathering had shifted from a public place to private place: the heart of the individual. As Renwick concludes: “Thus, to be “in Christ” was to be in the Temple, or, more precisely, to stand upon the eschatological temple which God himself was building without human hands.”²⁹⁷

In concluding our study of place-types, it is clear that while the domestic environment is prominent (32), the Gospels tend to locate Jesus’ ministry outside of the city (49). Following these two dominant place-types, the Temple is identified 19 times, the synagogue 15 times, and civic spaces 6 times.²⁹⁸ If we consider this in the context of the Gospel narrative and Jesus’ arrival, trial and execution in Jerusalem, an anti-urban pattern begins to emerge. In the Epistles, on the other hand, place-type is rarely mentioned and when it is, it is exclusively domestic and very much urban. If we follow Wayne Meeks’ argument, that Christianity after Paul is essentially an urban religion, is there a contradictory message between the Gospels and Acts and the Epistles?²⁹⁹ Historically the answer is quite simple. The disciples and other followers of Jesus did not need a formal place to meet because they were not a distinct cult. The places where events occur are incidental to what Jesus says. The Epistles address diverse groups of individuals who are trying to establish the parameters for a community in the Roman world. They are trying to find a place for themselves. However, once we consider the Gospels and the Epistles as two versions of the same story, as the author of *Barnabas* does, the answer is much more elusive.

In the Gospels and Epistles, there is a tension between an architecture of imperial presence and an architecture of Christian presence. We have characterized the imperial presence as an architectural will to universal order that is arranged according to a pattern that is common

²⁹⁷ Renwick, *Paul, the Temple and the Presence of God* 159.

²⁹⁸ See Appendix 2.

²⁹⁹ Meeks, *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul* 9-50.

to all citizens. The Christian presence, on the other hand, is the recipient of an architectural order—created by God for a chosen few. In the following chapter section, we will examine this tension in the context of our Roman city to illustrate how the intertextual reading of the body/temple vehicle informed Christian architecture prior to Constantine.

2.5 DOMUS, DOMUS ECCLESIAE AND THE SPECIAL CASE OF DURA EUROPOS

Despite references in Acts, the Epistles and early Christian literature, there is no archaeological evidence for Christian cult buildings prior to the mid-third century. This is not surprising when we consider the function of the body/temple metaphor in the early church as a means of locating the presence of God and defining the boundaries of the community. In Roman architecture, these were the functions of the *aedes* and the *templum* and because of this, the temple was a critical element in the Roman cosmological structure. For early Christians, the Church, a community defined spatially by the body/temple metaphor, played that cosmological role. However, in the mid-third century, there is evidence that for some Christians, physical space had begun to take on some significance.

Evidence of this newfound significance is contemporary with Origen and can be dated to 241 C.E. The site is a provincial Roman military outpost called Dura Europos.³⁰⁰ This is the earliest example of a Christian building and it has served as the model for all modern theories of house churches and *domus ecclesia* before Constantine.³⁰¹ This evidence is supplemented by text sources³⁰² and comparable data from similar building types, most commonly, the diaspora

³⁰⁰ White, *The Social Origins of Christian Architecture, Volume 2* 123–134. White dates the site to 241–254.

³⁰¹ Krautheimer, *Early Christian and Byzantine Architecture* 27; Mussell, "The Oldest Known Christian Churches: Dura Europos and Aqaba," 189.

³⁰² White, *The Social Origins of Christian Architecture, Volume 2* 33–120. White identifies 35 sources, including four from the NT and five from *E.H.*

Synagogue and Mithraeum.³⁰³ Dura is also the only archaeological site from this period to contain all three building types.

The city of Dura Europos is often characterized as a rather typical Roman military outpost.³⁰⁴ In fact, Dura has a distinctive history that predates the Roman occupation by almost four centuries.³⁰⁵ With the death of Alexander at the end of the fourth century B.C.E, his vast Empire was torn into pieces and divided among his generals. The geographically largest of these new kingdoms, controlled by the Macedonian Seleukos, became the Seleucid Empire. The Seleucid territory stretched eastward from the Euphrates, covering much of Syria and Mesopotamia and into modern India, reaching as far as the borders of China. Under the auspices of their emperor, the Seleucid military founded a series of cities in order to develop defensive capabilities and to attract Greek and Macedonian settlement. Many of these new cities were built along the Euphrates on the western frontier of the empire. One of these cities, Europos, was named in honour of Seleukos' birthplace in Macedonia.

Europos was founded sometime after 300 B.C.E. and followed a typical Hellenistic grid plan with a central agora, a temple precinct, and rectilinear blocks of housing. The rigorously geometric planning of the town was superimposed over a rugged and irregular landscape. Europos sat on a high plateau and was protected on the east by a sharp drop to the Euphrates below and by steep ravines on the north and south and by the desert on the west. In addition to these natural defences afforded Europos, a wall with towers circled the entire city. The two principal streets intersected at the agora. The temple precinct was located just south of the agora

³⁰³ White, *The Social Origins of Christian Architecture, Volume 2* 259–429. White identifies six comparable synagogues and six mithraea.

³⁰⁴ Annabel Jane Wharton, "Good and bad images from the synagogue of Dura Europos: Contexts, subtexts, intertexts," *Art History* 17.1 (1994) 1–25.

³⁰⁵ Susan B. Matheson, *Dura-Europos: The Ancient City and the Yale Collection* (New Haven: Yale University Art Gallery, 1982) 3.

where temples following the Greek plan were dedicated to the Seleucid dynastic gods: Artemis, Zeus Olympios, and Apollo. Blocks of housing surrounded the public spaces. A necropolis was built outside of the walls in the desert. Architecturally, Europos was founded as a Hellenic city.

In the third century B.C.E, civil war within the Seleucid Empire resulted in the cession of the Iranian province of Parthia and the eventual creation of the Parthian kingdom. By 141 B.C.E, the Parthians controlled Babylon and began a campaign up the Euphrates that sometime around 113 B.C.E brought Europos under their control. As with most cities under Parthian rule, Europos was allowed to keep her own laws and constitution. As a result of this semi-autonomy, Greek remained the official language of the city and Greek was used on currency and in the writing of legal documents.

Despite legal and linguistic continuity with the founding Hellenic culture, temple construction and reconstruction in Europos underwent some uniquely Parthian modifications. Two features distinguish the Parthian temples from their Seleucid precursors: the use of wall murals rather than sculpted images to depict the gods and a change in the temple plan from an open courtyard with altar and Doric ordering to a walled sanctuary complex where the major shrine was on axis with the principal entrance.³⁰⁶ Murals and drawings delineating devotional sacrifice were arranged on the sidewalls of the shrines in registers that used Parthian frontal poses in the depiction of the figures. Scale shifts between the figures indicated hierarchal relationships. The Temple of Artemis, rebuilt after a fire in the mid first century B.C.E. and rededicated to Artemis Nanaia, exemplifies this temple plan type. Eight other temples built during the Parthian period followed this arrangement.

Europos underwent two periods of Roman economic influence.³⁰⁷ While under Parthian

³⁰⁶ Matheson, *Dura-Europos: The Ancient City and the Yale Collection* 9–11.

³⁰⁷ Matheson, *Dura-Europos: The Ancient City and the Yale Collection* 15; Carl H. Kraeling, *The Synagogue* (New

government between 50 and 165 C.E., the city was the beneficiary of increased trade between Rome and her Syrian province. During this period, a *sukh* gradually replaced the Greek agora at Europos' economic centre. This suggests that the cultural independence fostered by the Parthians and the increasingly cosmopolitan population was beginning to affect the Greek planning of the city. Houses built in this period begin to assume an eastern courthouse plan with irregularly shaped rooms and a non-axial entrance to the courtyard. All of these features of eastern architectural tradition were then stylised with Greek decoration. Curiously, despite the fact that Europos was the centre of the provincial governor and that Europos was prosperous and peaceful for two centuries under Parthian rule, no administrative buildings were built under the Parthians. Instead, commercial buildings were converted to administrative use contributing to an economy of adaptive reuse for existing buildings as an alternative to building new public architecture.

Generally, Parthian peace with Rome meant security and trade for Europos, with some exceptions. Prior to the Imperial period, the Romans undertook two campaigns to take the city—the first by Crassus and the second by Marc Antony. Both attempts ended in disaster.³⁰⁸ Augustus made a treaty with Phraates IV that held until Trajan undertook his expansion of the Empire to the east. Trajan captured Dura in 116 C.E. and erected a triumphal arch. In the next year, following Trajan's death, Hadrian restored the old borders by re-establishing peace with the Parthians and Dura was once again under Parthian rule. The Romans undertook another campaign in 162 under Lucius Verus (the adopted brother of and co-emperor with Marcus Aurelius) and in 165, after a decisive battle at Europos, the Romans took control of Mesopotamia. The Romans established a military garrison in Europos, expropriating the

Haven: Yale University Press, 1979) 322.

³⁰⁸ In Crassus' defeat to the Parthians, the Legions standards were taken hostage. It is the recovery of these standards that was recognized at the dedication of the Temple of Mars Ultor. See 2.2.1.

northern quarter of the city for their use as a defensive stronghold. It was shortly after this occupation by the Romans that the city known as Europos came to be known as Dura—a Semitic term meaning fortress.

Under Caracalla (211-217 C.E.) Dura became a Roman colony. More houses in the northwest sector of the city were demolished to make way for the Roman military headquarters. New construction in that portion of the city included a *praetorium*, officer's quarters, a bath, *campus martius*, and barracks for the rank and file. Two temples were left standing in the military zone: Azzanathkona and Bel. A new temple was constructed to honour Jupiter Dolichenus—a deity popular among the Syrian legions that were quartered at Dura. A shrine to Mithras was constructed in this area in 168-71, elaborated and expanded in 209-11, and again in 240. The Mithraeum was decorated with the epic murals characteristic of local Parthian Temples.³⁰⁹ In 216, the military erected the city's first amphitheatre and a colonnade was built near the agora. The last major building to be constructed in Dura was the Palace of the *Dux Ripae*—the residence of the Roman officer responsible for the Empire's eastern frontier. The Palace was constructed in Roman style with two peristyle courtyards.

The residential sectors of the city experienced the least impact in Dura Europos' transition to a Roman city, although they were not completely untouched. Two new baths were constructed in predominantly residential areas. One bath was built just south of the main gate on the western wall, one block north of the *domus ecclesiae*. The other was nestled among the larger houses at the eastern edge of the city along the principal east-west axis. Several larger residences, rebuilt or redecorated in the Roman period, have been excavated in the southeast corner of the city near the local governmental and administrative functions. The Roman manner

³⁰⁹ Matheson, *Dura-Europos: The Ancient City and the Yale Collection* 22.

of these houses, despite the Syrian ancestry of the owners, demonstrates the impact of Roman architectural ideas on these provincial Romans. In 256 C.E., the Sassanians laid siege to Dura Europos and were successful, despite extraordinary defensive preparations by the Romans, in sacking the city. The history of Dura Europos paused here until her rediscovery by British soldiers in 1920.

The Roman contribution to the architecture of Dura Europos is impressive considering the relatively short period of influence (165-256). The differences between the Parthians and the Romans in their approach to public buildings is telling and consistent with our characterization of Roman Imperial architecture. The Parthians invested virtually nothing in the articulation of public space. This may reflect their policy of non-interference in local affairs but also it demonstrates a markedly different architectural tradition from that of the Hellenistic Seleucids and the Imperial Romans. What influence did these varying architectural traditions have on the order of the city and how did these shifts in ideas of order affect the people of Dura-Europos, particularly the Christian community?

The religious life at Dura was diverse. Many of the Greek gods that had come to the city with the Seleucids were still worshipped in the time of the Roman occupation. The tyche of Dura was Zeus Olympios, the patron god of both Seleukos and Alexander. Other Greek gods still worshipped in the Roman period were Herakles, Artemis, and Aphrodite. Semitic gods were also popular: Atargatis and Hadad, Bel, Iarhibol and Aphlad. Many of these temples, including the Temples of Artemis-Nanaia and Zeus-Megistos, were repaired by the Romans after an earthquake in 160 C.E. Into this already rich mix were added the Roman pantheon, including the deified emperors. Members of the Roman legions, mainly of Syrian birth, observed all of the

Imperial festivals at the same time as their Italian born counterparts.³¹⁰ Many other cults were also well established in Dura. As mentioned above, the Roman Legions brought Mithras with them and built a Mithraeum along the west wall in the military quarter. Christians occupied and renovated a residential building, also along the west wall, two blocks south of the main gate. Two blocks north of the main gate, again beside the west wall, was a richly decorated Jewish synagogue.

This part of the city was scantily populated during the Seleucid settlement of Europos. Between the second and third centuries C.E., however, it had developed into a relatively dense residential neighbourhood. It is apparent from archaeological findings that the Roman military occupation led to overcrowding in the city. Due to the geographical situation of Dura, expansion was impossible. The geological impediments to the north and south, the river to the east, and the necropolis to the west all blocked the suburban development so typical of Roman cities of this era. This must have put property ownership at a premium.

Generally, the exterior of these residential buildings were rather mute, with large, unadorned mud or plaster walls punctuated only by small windows near the ceiling of the *diwan* or main room. Occasionally the single doorway from the street was treated with a decorative frame. From the doorway, a narrow passage normally opened into a courtyard that serviced all of the rooms of a single dwelling. The number and quality of rooms varied with the social rank of the owner. For example, the houses of the wealthy could have several courtyards and proportionally several more rooms. Two rooms that were common to all social classes were the *diwan* and a second room (accessible through the *diwan*) that may have been both storeroom and bedroom. The *diwan* proper was entered from the courtyard by a formal doorway. It was in the

³¹⁰ Matheson, *Dura-Europos: The Ancient City and the Yale Collection* 31.

diwan that the life of the family, and especially the master of the house, had its centre. Typically, this main room was furnished with wood or masonry benches around three walls to accommodate visitors. Kraeling speculates that the meetings of Jewish, Christian, or the Mithras cult would have most probably occurred in the *diwan* of the wealthiest member.³¹¹ Of these three groups, the Jewish community had the longest history in Dura.

Numismatic evidence suggests that Jews had visited Dura from as early as 135 B.C.E., during the reign of John Hyrcanus. It is possible that these coins date from Hyrcanus' campaign against the Seleucids. Other coins dating up to the Jewish revolt have also been found. Kraeling believes that these traces suggest a transitory Jewish presence in Dura that coalesced into a small community in the late Parthian period.³¹² The house along the western wall that eventually became the centre for this Jewish community at Dura was built sometime between 50-150 C.E.³¹³ The synagogue site was part of a block of residential dwellings all built at roughly the same time.

The synagogue at Dura is characterized as having three distinct stages in its development. The first of these stages is speculative and involves the undistinguished use of residential property immediately adjacent to the western wall of the city. No archeological data is available to prove that Jews used the site prior to the architectural changes that made it distinctively a synagogue. Typical of other dwellings in the neighbourhood, the Jewish meeting house was part of a block of contiguous courtyard houses that contained up to ten private dwellings. Kraeling has observed that the residences in this area were of lower quality than residences in the southeastern part of the city. From these observations, he has concluded that the area where the Jewish meeting-house was located represents a typical "middle class" neighborhood in Dura.

The second stage in the development of the Dura synagogue was the renovation of the

³¹¹ Kraeling, *The Synagogue* 326–327.

³¹² Kraeling, *The Synagogue* 326.

³¹³ Kraeling, *The Synagogue* 327.

residential property into a small space dedicated for public assembly. At this point the community may have numbered over ten adult males—the number necessary to establish a synagogue. The transition of this typical house into a more dedicated cult space is dated between 165-200 C.E., in the early days of the Roman occupation. While no exterior changes were carried out to the house, the architectural modifications to the interior were significant. Two smaller rooms, perhaps a *diwan* and its adjacent service space, were combined into one large room for group assembly making the assembly space roughly twice as wide as it was long. The ceilings were coffered and the walls decorated with geometric patterns in fresco and a decorated niche.³¹⁴ Archeological evidence shows us that the first iteration of the niche was applied to the wall as part of the overall surface treatment—perhaps little more than a line drawing. Progressively, it was build up into the elaborate Torah shrine of the later synagogue. Also added at this time was the peristyle in the courtyard. This would have contributed to the overall public nature of the building, allowing visitors a place to stand out of the sun before or after assembly and perhaps serving as a place for proselytes not yet fully initiated. The courtyard was also paved at this time and a laver basin was built in the NE corner. Because of the size and location of the first synagogue building, Kraeling speculates that the community was neither a large nor a wealthy one.³¹⁵ Allowing 0.45m/person, the original meeting room would have accommodated 41 people in the main room and a second room which could have seated 17. The remaining rooms in the house were apparently used as a domicile. On the eastern end of the courtyard was the traditional *diwan*, with adjacent room. Another small room along the southern wall, accessible from the courtyard, may have been used as a sleeping area for travellers. If this room was designated for visitors, it would suggest that the community had at least some contact with other

³¹⁴ White, *The Social Origins of Christian Architecture, Volume 1* 94.

³¹⁵ Kraeling, *The Synagogue* 328.

Jews of the Diaspora. That said, Kraeling argues that there was "...nothing whatsoever to suggest that the community was anything but oriental in its life and outlook..."³¹⁶ The renovated residential building along the western wall gradually became the centre for Jewish social and religious life in Dura.

Sometime before the middle of the third century, adjacent residences came into the possession of the Jewish community. Commemorative inscriptions suggest that a third phase of synagogue building was undertaken between 244-5.³¹⁷ In particular, the immediately adjacent to the east, was incorporated into the Synagogue and seems to have assumed all of the domestic functions of the earlier building. The area of the earlier synagogue/residence was now available exclusively for community purposes. The additional space allowed 65 persons to be comfortably seated in the main assembly room. More fitting of a public building, the assembly room also boasted a new lofty coffered ceiling. This increased volume required significant structural changes to the earlier synagogue. Structural supports for the roof would have had to nearly double and this would have increased static demands on the exterior walls. The entrance to the Synagogue forecourt was moved from the wall street to a sequence of courtyards that were entered from a narrow passage off of the next parallel street. This passage opened onto the street with an entrance only just wider than a normal domestic entrance.

The debate over the wall paintings at Dura is a contentious one.³¹⁸ Annabel Wharton suggests that the Jewish prohibition against images may have been flexible for all diaspora Jews. Pictorial representation was certainly an acceptable means of expression for Diaspora Jews in Dura by the third century C.E. The development of the figural murals are, like the Synagogue

³¹⁶ Kraeling, *The Synagogue* 329.

³¹⁷ White, *The Social Origins of Christian Architecture, Volume 1* 95.

³¹⁸ For a concise summary, see Wharton, "Good and bad images from the synagogue of Dura Europos: Contexts, subtexts, intertexts" (*Art History* 17.1, 1994) 1-24.

building itself, a gradual process that seems to integrate and synthesize the various cultural influences to which the Jewish community was exposed in Dura.

For our discussion we need consider the paintings only insofar as they are integral to the architecture of the Synagogue. What seems obvious from the incorporation of figural decoration in the architecture is that the community understood their variety of Diaspora Judaism very much in the context of the time and place that they found themselves. The fact that this type of decoration was an accepted part of Parthian Temple dedication contributes to our understanding of the inclusion of paintings of this type in a Jewish building. Frescoes of this kind may have been an accepted type of gift to a temple or cult centre in Dura, in return for a patron's good fortune. Certainly the crafts people required to do the work were available.

Kraeling assumes a relative homogeneity of the residential buildings within the various economic subgroups of Dura. For example, the houses of the more wealthy, as a type, are assumed distinguishable from those of middle and poorer classes. If this distinction existed, a renovation of this size, quality and complexity could not have gone unnoticed in the city. The Jewish community at Dura were established as a legitimate presence in the city. White and Kraeling see this as a sign that the community was growing in number, wealth, and possibly, influence.³¹⁹ While these points are no doubt valid, the Synagogue also suggests an acceptance of architecture as a valid means of expression by the Jewish community.

The development of the Christian building follows a very similar, if abbreviated, pattern to its Jewish neighbour. The original residential structure was typical of the area and built in 232–233 C.E.³²⁰ It was located three blocks south of the synagogue in a block between the western city wall and first north/south street. In 240–241, the house was renovated for liturgical

³¹⁹ White, *The Social Origins of Christian Architecture, Volume 1* 96-97; Kraeling, *The Synagogue* 335.

³²⁰ White, *The Social Origins of Christian Architecture, Volume 2* 123.

functions and no longer used as a residence. Typologically, for White, the Dura project qualifies as a *domus ecclesiae*.³²¹ In his four part development of Christian buildings, White proposes that “...since we have defined the unrenovated space of the Pauline period as the house church, we may call a specially adapted building the house of the church, hence a *domus ecclesiae*.”³²² While it is possible that the house was used by Christians prior to the renovation, no evidence exists to support that assumption.

In summary, the renovations to the residential property were significant. The exterior dimensions of the house were trapezoidal (17.35 x 17.45 m) and remained essentially indistinguishable from the neighbouring houses. On the interior, the Church transformed two rooms on the south side of the house into a large, rectangular assembly hall (12.9 x 5.15 m). A room in the northwest corner was transformed into an elaborate baptistery (6.6 x 3.1 m) that featured painted murals common to Dura.³²³ The paintings include depictions of Jesus’ miracles and scenes from the OT.³²⁴ The courtyard was also levelled, repaved, and refurbished. Like the Synagogue project, the renovation could not have gone unnoticed by the neighbours or civic officials.

Between 244-256, hostilities between the Sassanians and the Romans began to escalate. As a significant military target on the Eastern frontier, the citizens of Dura no doubt experienced a great deal of anxiety. The wealth of the city, including the Jewish community, was directly related to trade brought about by the Roman occupation. Rome’s fortune in the area, however, was anything but stable. In 256 C.E., the city was sacked by the Sassanians and left buried in the sand.

³²¹ White, *The Social Origins of Christian Architecture*, Volume 2 124.

³²² White, *The Social Origins of Christian Architecture*, Volume 1 111.

³²³ White, *The Social Origins of Christian Architecture*, Volume 2 129.

³²⁴ White, *The Social Origins of Christian Architecture*, Volume 2 131.

The transformation from domestic space to *domus ecclesiae* is consistent with local practice and tradition. While it does suggest some adaptations to specific liturgical requirements, the depictions of Jesus' miracles are decidedly Christian. There is very little in the *domi ecclesiae* of Dura to suggest a reconciliation with the monumental architecture of the Empire. Not intending to be derogatory, the Church building at Dura is a provincial architecture set out to meet local concerns through local resources. The difficulty in identifying other *domus ecclesiae* may be due, at least partially, to the regional diversity of Christianity and local building traditions that remained typical to the residential districts under the Empire. The intellectual apparatus necessary to understand Christian building in terms of universal order was yet to be finally resolved. While Clement and Origen were successful in developing the body/temple metaphor as a hermeneutic tool for understanding the relationship between the order of the Jerusalem temple and the Roman world, the final reconciliation between a Christian architecture and Imperial city was still to be developed by Eusebius.

3. THE NATURE OF ARCHITECTURAL METAPHOR IN EARLY CHRISTIAN TEXTS

3.1 INTRODUCTION

Umberto Eco, in his *Semiotics and the Philosophy of Language*, argues that the metaphoric process has the potential to so radically transform an accepted signifier/signified relationship that it constitutes an “...epistemic break, allowing the concepts to drift toward new territories—ever so slightly, but just enough.”³²⁵ Considering this inherent capacity of metaphor for “semantic innovation,” what role did architectural metaphor play in generating a new understanding of architecture for early Christians?³²⁶

Eco characterizes metaphor as framed by divergent epistemologies. In the first instance, “...language is by nature, and originally, metaphorical, and the mechanism of metaphor establishes linguistic activity, every rule or convention arising thereafter is in order to discipline, to reduce (and impoverish) the metaphORIZING potential...”³²⁷ Alternately, “...language (and every other semiotic system) is a rule-governed mechanism, a predictive machine that says which phrases can be generated and which not, and which from those able to be generated are “good” or “correct,” or endowed with “sense.”³²⁸ Either language is born of metaphor and must be systematized to facilitate functional communication or language is an arbitrary, social construct that can be destabilized by semantic deviations like metaphor. In both cases, metaphor is an aberration of language and must be kept in check by a semantic authority. The problem for Greeks, Romans, and early Christians was who, or what, had this authority?

³²⁵ Eco, *Semiotics and the Philosophy of Language* 88.

³²⁶ “Semantic innovation” is a used by Ricoeur to describe the function of metaphor.

³²⁷ Eco, *Semiotics and the Philosophy of Language* 88.

³²⁸ Eco, *Semiotics and the Philosophy of Language* 88.

Semantic authority, because it claims jurisdiction over the relationship between words and things, is intimately connected to political authority. Plato is the first to express concern over the political dimension of language in the ancient world. Language is so powerful, he argues, that all citizens involved in occupations like poetry and rhetoric, occupations that capitalize on the instability of language to bring forth new ideas (*poesis*), should be kept from political office.

Kojin Karatani identifies the rhetorical function of architectural metaphor to be born out of a recurring crisis in the western intellectual tradition that calls for a retreat from chaos toward a clear sense of order and authority.³²⁹ This is not an architecture of stone, but an image of order and authority first found in Plato. In Plato, this “will to architecture” is a trope for the act of creation—*poesis*.³³⁰ Architecture is an ordering that is in a perpetual state of becoming, never fully “being” and consequently avoiding the inevitable corruption of matter:

All this demonstrates the impossibility of the *being* of the *ideal* and yet, at the same time, it repeatedly invokes the *will to architecture* by asserting that the impossible, the *being* of the *ideal*, can be realised. The *will to architecture* is the foundation of western thought.³³¹

In this chapter, our discussion of the nature of architectural metaphor in early Christian literature addresses the question of semantic authority from the Greek (Gorgias, Plato, Aristotle), Roman (Cicero, Quintilian), and early Christian (Paul, Apostolic Fathers, Origen, Eusebius)

³²⁹ Kojin Karatani, *Architecture as Metaphor*, trans. Sabu Kohso, Writing Architecture, ed. Michael Speaks (Cambridge, MA/London: MIT Press, 1995) 18.

³³⁰ See Plato, “The Republic,” trans. W.H.D. Rouse, *Great Dialogues of Plato*, eds. Eric H. Warmington and Philip G. Rouse (New York/Toronto: New American Library/Penguin, 1984) and “Symposium.”

³³¹ Karatani, *Architecture as Metaphor* xxxiv.

perspectives. First, we will discuss the function of architectural metaphor within the framework of both “substitution” theory and “interaction” theory.³³²

Assuming that early Christian writers were educated in the Greek *paideia*, substitution theory allows us to speculate on what they may have intended to accomplish by using metaphor. As a rhetorical device, metaphor would have been understood as a technique to convey new ideas and to make an argument more compelling. While the intention of these texts may have been rhetorical, we will argue, using the interactionist theory, that the influence of architectural metaphor on the early Christian imagination in fact contributed to a new and possibly unexpected result—a reconciliation—between Christian ontology and Roman architecture.

3.2 SUBSTITUTION VERSUS INTERACTION THEORY

In its most basic form, the substitution theory defines metaphor as the transfer of one signifier (A) to another signifier (B) where the original signifier-signified relationships ($A=a$, $B=b$) are deliberately confused ($B=a$). This confusion of signification demands not only a re-evaluation of denotative qualities of the noun, but also of connotative relationships. Further, the two terms must share some culturally recognized similarities for this substitution to function as a metaphor. While semantic substitution occurs at its most fundamental level in the substitution of nouns, metaphor affects the entire sentence and may, ultimately, reframe the range of possible interpretations for an entire text or a group of associated texts. The purpose of this substitution is to aid in communicating new or complex ideas and to make language more pleasurable. Not unlike a riddle, part of this pleasure is derived from the recognition of the semantic connection between (A) and (B). This recognition is central to the success of the metaphor. If the two terms

³³² See Deborah Steiner, *The Crown of Song: Metaphor in Pindar* (London: Gerald Duckworth & Co., 1986) 9–10.

are not recognized as sharing like qualities, the metaphor cannot be understood. If the terms are too similar, the metaphor will not be effective. Further, if improperly used, metaphor becomes disruptive or even “dangerous.” This characterization of metaphor as a function of substitution, first put forward by Aristotle, went largely unchallenged until Max Black and Ivor A. Richards first advanced the interaction theory.³³³

As elaborated by I.A Richards, the interaction theory holds that the meaning or sense of a metaphor (tenor) is not simply a result of the substitution of signification from “this” to “that” ($A=b$), but that the two terms (vehicle), (A) and (B), contribute connotations of their original meanings as well as the meanings that arise from their juxtaposition.³³⁴ The semantic coupling of A and B retain aspects of their common usage and combine to create a new meaning within the text. Expanding on the model used above: $A=ab$. Metaphor, then, is an accumulation of meaning from the vehicle within a semantic context. The range of possible inferences is infinite. The limit of interpretation lies in the imagination of the reader/listener.³³⁵ Unlike Aristotle, Umberto Eco and Paul Ricoeur, along with other interactionists, welcome the instability that metaphor brings to language and see, in this accumulation of meaning, the essence of *poesis*. In contrast to substitution theory, interaction theory proposes that metaphor does not simply explain new ideas—it creates them.

³³³ Max Black, *Models and Metaphors: Studies in Language and Philosophy* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1962).

³³⁴ See I.A. Richards, *The Philosophy of Rhetoric* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1979) 96.

³³⁵ Umberto Eco, "Interpretation and History," *Interpretation and Overinterpretation*, ed. Stefan Collini (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1992) Chapter 1-3.

3.3 THE GREEKS

At the beginning of the common era, to study the proper interpretation and application of language was an essential part of being Greek. To be educated was to have read the ancient authors and mastered the particularities of their dialects.³³⁶ A well-developed trade in the transcription and sale of books assured availability of the so-called classical authors from the 5th century B.C.E through the Imperial period.³³⁷ The promulgation of certain texts developed into a body of knowledge that formed the basis of a standard curriculum. Grammar, athletics, mathematics, and music were the elements of a compulsory education—the *paideia*—for all young Greek men. For a select few, this fundamental education was augmented in the *gymnasia* with advanced studies in rhetoric and philosophy.

Despite a highly developed use of metaphor in the poetry of Homer, the foundation for a theory of metaphor was not laid until the fifth century B.C.E. as part of the structuring of rhetoric in Athens. In a city known for its sacrifices to the goddess of persuasion, Athens understood and respected the power of language. According to a tradition that dates at least to the time of Aristotle, two Sicilians, Corax and Tisias, developed rhetoric as a system of argument for courts of law.³³⁸ Corax, for his part, is credited with setting down the first handbook of rhetoric. Tisias is said to have instructed Gorgias, a Sicilian ambassador, who took the practice to Athens. Gorgias (483–376 B.C.E.), like other Sophist practitioners of rhetoric, was known for his stylized technique, neologisms, and indifference to the ethical responsibilities of a well-constructed argument. It is because of these ethical responsibilities that rhetoric, and by association metaphor, became a point of philosophical inquiry in Athens.

³³⁶ P.E. Easterling, "The Hellenistic and Imperial Periods," *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature*, ed. P.E. Easterling and B.M.W. Knox, vol. 1 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985) 26–27.

³³⁷ Easterling, "The Hellenistic and Imperial Periods," 35–37.

³³⁸ Peter Dixon, *Rhetoric: The Critical Idiom*, ed. John D. Jump (London/New York: Routledge, 1990) 7–8.

Isocrates (436–338 B.C.E.) is the first Greek philosopher to identify metaphor as an object of literary criticism. A student of Gorgias and Socrates, he is concerned with proper rhetorical technique but critical of the Sophist indifference to truth. Isocrates disparages speculative philosophy and reconstructs public argument into the “art of speech.” The authority of the orator is based on the public’s trust in his moral character—a kind of social contract. Metaphor, though consistent with the Sophist predilection for appealing to the emotions, is not suitable for rhetoric because it invites interpretation and therefore puts words out of the orator’s control. If words are not controlled in the production of an argument, there can be no assurance of truth.

In contrast to Isocrates, Plato (427–347 B.C.E.), also a student of Socrates, maintains a fundamental distrust for all rhetorical practice. Upon mastering rhetoric, he argues, a skilled orator can convince the citizenry to accept a false statement as true. Plato sees this as immoral and openly criticizes the Sophists in a number of dialogues, including Gorgias. When Socrates states: “Thus rhetoric, it seems, is a producer of persuasion for belief, not for instruction in the matter of right and wrong.” Gorgias answers simply: “Yes.”³³⁹ It is philosophers, Plato argues, not orators, that guide the public good. Truth is not something that is relative to an individual’s disposition or moral character. Truth is absolute, transcendent, and eternal and can only be understood through rigorous philosophical practice. Language does not contain truth; it is an instrument to discover truth.

Plato’s basic distrust of language, both written and spoken, extends to poetry as well as to rhetoric. In the *Republic*, Plato justifies banishing poetry because “...if you receive the honeyed Muse in lyric or epic, be sure that pleasure and pain will be kings in your city, instead of law and

³³⁹ Plato, *Lysis, Symposium, Gorgias*, trans. W.R.M. Lamb, Loeb Classical Library, ed. G.P. Goold (Cambridge, MA/London: Harvard University Press, 1996) 455 A.

whatever reasoned argument the community shall approve in each case to be the best.”³⁴⁰ Like rhetoric, poetry appeals to emotion and posits truth as something that is relative. Poetry capitalizes on the polysemous potential of words, exacerbating the fundamental flaw of language that Plato worked so diligently, through philosophy, to contain.

The philosophically mediated relationship between words and things is critical to Plato in establishing a basis for truth through dialectic. Words, as representations of the transient phenomena that constitute human experience, are twice removed from the reality of *ideae* and, if not used carefully, can destroy the fragile structure of the *polis*. In *Cratylus*, the protagonist argues for a natural relationship between words and the things that they represent.³⁴¹ A word is appropriate to an object when it is able to reveal something of the true nature of the thing. The word can convey the essence of a thing and, when used properly, cannot be false. In this sense, each word can have only one true meaning. Socrates ridicules natural language by constructing false etymologies that disprove Cratylus' argument and establishes that language is a matter of consensus among citizens.³⁴²

In his critique of rhetoric and poetry, Plato does not discuss metaphor (*metaphora*) directly.³⁴³ He does, however, develop a theory of “images” (*eikones*) and “models” (*paradeigmata*) for use in the ordered practice of dialectic and the function of the imagination. The *eikon* shares a resemblance or likeness with a phenomenon. If dialectic reveals a structural relationship between the image and the phenomenon, the image can be understood as a model.³⁴⁴ In this sense, *eikones* and *paradeigmata*, though cognitively distinct, function very much like

³⁴⁰ Plato, "The Republic," 10.

³⁴¹ Plato, *Cratylus*, trans. C.D.C. Reeve (Indianapolis: Hackett Pub. Co., 1998) 429c.

³⁴² Plato, *Cratylus* beginning at 429c.

³⁴³ E.E. Pender, "Plato on Metaphors and Models," *Metaphor, Allegory and the Classical Tradition*, ed. G. R. Boys-Stones (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003) 55.

³⁴⁴ "The working out of an extended structural framework requires sustained comparison, a cognitive process very different from that of interpreting an individual image or metaphor, which is typically a brief statement." Pender, "Plato on Metaphors and Models," 72.

metaphors in that they borrow the meaning of one thing to describe another. *Paradeigmata* also share with the interactionist concept of metaphor the power to reveal meaning and to generate conceptual innovation. Plato's characterization of language is fundamental for understanding the ontological dimension of language in the ancient world and the destabilizing and transformative power of metaphor. It is Aristotle (384–322 B.C.E.), however, who is credited with theorizing the nature of metaphor, or as Ricoeur argues, its two natures, represented by poetry and philosophy.

Aristotle's first definition of metaphor is in the context of poetry.³⁴⁵ In the *Poetics*, metaphor is “the ‘application’ (ἐπιφορά) of a ‘word’ (ὄνομα) that belongs to ‘another thing’ (ἄλλότριον): either from genus to species, species to genus, or from species to species, or by analogy.”³⁴⁶ Metaphor is a process of movement, borrowing and substitution. The substitution employs a term that is ἄλλότριον—alien to the term that is commonly used. The common or, to use Halliwell’s translation, “standard” term, is the term that is “used by the community.”³⁴⁷ Metaphor is particularly suited to poetry because it elevates language above the banality of common speech.³⁴⁸ Still, metaphor must be used with discretion or the result will not be poetry but a riddle.

Aristotle is clear in differentiating the language of poetry from the language of oratory. Where poetry is concerned with engaging the emotions through a process of *poiesis-mimesis-catharsis*, oratory serves politics and philosophy by appealing to the intellect through a measured argument of *rhetoric-proof-persuasion*.³⁴⁹ While metaphor is used in rhetoric to enhance style or

³⁴⁵ See Stephen Halliwell’s conclusion in his preface to *Poetics*: “All in all, it is highly plausible that the *Poetics*, whatever its history of composition, was at any rate available for use during the final phase of Aristotle's career, after the founding of his own School, the Lyceum, at Athens in 335.” Aristotle, “*Poetics*,” 5.

³⁴⁶ Aristotle, “*Poetics*,” 1457b 6–9.

³⁴⁷ Aristotle, “*Poetics*,” 1457b 4.

³⁴⁸ Aristotle, “*Poetics*,” 1458a 4.

³⁴⁹ This argument is advanced in Paul Ricoeur, *The Rule of Metaphor*, trans. Robert Czerny, Kathleen McLaughlin and John Costello (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1977) 13.

meaning, it is more effective and, given its elusive nature, it more properly belongs, to the realm of poetry.

Mimesis is a representation that maintains a qualitative relationship with the object being represented. The mimetic image, like the vehicle of a metaphor, must bear some resemblance to the object to which it refers. Although it is our most primitive mechanism of learning, it guides the imagination away from the impossible toward the natural.

For it is an instinct of human beings to engage in mimesis (indeed, this distinguishes them from other animals: man is the most mimetic of all, and it is through mimesis that he develops his earliest understanding); and equally natural that everyone enjoys mimetic objects. A common occurrence indicates this: we enjoy contemplating the most precise images of things whose actual sight is painful to us, such as the vilest animals and of corpses. The explanation of this too is that understanding gives great pleasure not only to philosophers but likewise to others too, though the latter have a smaller share in it. This is why people enjoy looking at images, because through contemplating them it comes about that they understand and infer what each element means, for instance that "this person is so-and-so." For, if one happens not to have seen the subject before, the image will not give pleasure *qua* mimesis but because of its execution or colour or for some other reason. (Aristotle 1448b.4)

Aristotle, like Plato, considers *mimesis* a property that is shared by all of the arts that provides a means of translation between different types of representation.³⁵⁰ While *mimesis* refers to the world of things, it is also speculative and corrective. As a function of *poiesis*, *mimesis* transforms the general into the specific and makes even the most intimate details of a private life

³⁵⁰ Aristotle, "Poetics," 1460b.25. "Since the poet, like the painter or any other image-maker, is a mimetic artist, he must represent, in any instance, one of three objects: the kind of things which were or are the case; the kind of things that people say and think; the kind of things that ought to be the case."

into a universal pattern.³⁵¹ This pattern is revealed not through a simple substitution, but through the ontological narrative, the *μῦθος*, that is generated by metaphor.³⁵²

In the *Art of Rhetoric*, Aristotle elaborates his definition of metaphor and establishes parameters for its use in oratory. Proper rhetoric has three qualities: *inventio*, *elocutio*, and *compositio*.³⁵³ This structure guards against Sophist immorality, and the problematic evaluation of the personal morality of orators, by establishing objective criteria for establishing semantic authority. Aristotle synthesizes the art of speech and a rigorous intellectual framework as means to bring rhetoric to the service of philosophy. Paul Ricoeur identifies one of Aristotle's greatest contributions to the western intellectual tradition as "...this link between the rhetorical concept of persuasion and the logical concept of the probable, and in constructing the whole edifice of a philosophy of rhetoric on this relationship."³⁵⁴ Truth, the authority of meaning, can be demonstrated by logic through rhetoric. Truth is not dependent on the orator. It is eternal and, like Plato's dialogue, can be revealed through language

While Aristotle seems to appreciate the transformative power of metaphor in poetry, he sees it as a dangerous quality for politics. His philosophy of rhetoric limits the applicability of metaphor to prevent it from doing harm to the clarity of persuasion and grants semantic authority to logic. To summarize Aristotle's theory of metaphor, Ricoeur identifies five characteristics:

- i) "...metaphor is something that happens to the noun."³⁵⁵

In *Poetics* 1457b.6, discussing the classification of nouns, Aristotle describes metaphor as the "application of a word that belongs to another thing..."³⁵⁶

³⁵¹ A.A. Long, "Aristotle- Poetics," *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature*, ed. P.E. Easterling and B.M.W. Knox, vol. 1 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985) 536.

³⁵² Ricoeur, *The Rule of Metaphor* 239–246.

³⁵³ Ricoeur, *The Rule of Metaphor* 9.

³⁵⁴ Ricoeur, *The Rule of Metaphor* 12.

³⁵⁵ Ricoeur, *The Rule of Metaphor* 16.

ii) "...metaphor is defined in terms of movement."³⁵⁷

The "application of a word" takes place as a movement (ἐπιφορά) of meaning between two terms.

iii) "...metaphor is the transposition of a name that Aristotle calls alien (ἀλλότριον)."³⁵⁸

Based on his reading of ἀλλότριον as having a dual inference (*borrowed* and *alien*), the *borrowed* term has a sense of not fully or permanently belonging to its new semantic situation. While it is being used to describe one thing, it still, as a name, belongs to another thing. The metaphor uses one term to identify two things. This is contrary to the "common" function of language and, in particular, the function of the proper noun. Ricoeur identifies *alien* as an inferred deviance that undermines the common function of language. It is these two aspects of Aristotelian metaphor, *borrowed* and *alien*, that inform our interpretation, understanding, and definition of early Christian architectural metaphor.

iv) "...a typology of metaphor is outlined in the continuation of the definition."³⁵⁹

The *alien* aspect of metaphor is lost as the borrowed term becomes an accepted signifier rather than a *borrowed* term. There is a tendency in language to return to a normal state of a common and stable signifier/signified relationship.

v) Likeness—in order to be a "good" metaphor, the transference of name must occur between two things that have recognizable similarities.³⁶⁰

The metaphor must equate two terms that are recognized as sharing like qualities if it is to be understood effectively by its audience.

³⁵⁶ Aristotle, "Poetics," 1457b.6.

³⁵⁷ Ricoeur, *The Rule of Metaphor* 17.

³⁵⁸ Ricoeur, *The Rule of Metaphor* 18.

³⁵⁹ Ricoeur, *The Rule of Metaphor* 20.

³⁶⁰ Aristotle, "Poetics," 1459a.

3.4 THE ROMANS

Aristotle's theory of metaphor was brought to Rome in the second century B.C.E. by two prisoners of war from Asia Minor: Tyrannion (the Elder) of Amisus, and Pathenius of Nicaea. Tyrannion established himself as teacher of rhetoric to the Patrician families and Pathenius as a poet of some renown. Like all Greek culture imported by Rome, literary theory was adapted to the particularities of the Roman imagination. While individuals like Cato (234–149 B.C.E.), worked to protect the *mos maiorum* from the corrupting influence of Greek culture, the Romans appropriated poetry and rhetoric as the proper concerns of a world power.³⁶¹

The Patrician families understood, like Plato and Aristotle before them, that language was political and that the control of poetry and rhetoric was necessary to control the Plebs. In 92 B.C.E., censors Crassus and Gnaeus Domitius Ahenobarbus, closed Plotius Gallus' school of rhetoric because of its pro-democratic disposition.³⁶² Young men from all classes were invited to attend the school. Fees were low and no prior knowledge of Greek was required. The Censors were concerned that popular leaders would, through their eloquence, rise up and convince the citizens of Rome to reject the political authority of the aristocracy. They intended that instruction in rhetoric should be available only through expensive Greek teachers following a basic Greek education. The Plebeian interest in rhetoric was, however, sustained by textbooks like the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*.³⁶³

Written by an unknown author in the decade following the closing of Plotius' school, the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* synthesized the Greek schools and the demands of Roman public life.

³⁶¹ [re: *De agri cultura*] "...one can infer the salient features of the Catonian ethic, which are the same ones that the late Republic would come to regard as making up the *mos maiorum*: virtues such as *parsimonia*, *duritia*, *industria*, the disdain for riches, and resistance to the seductiveness of pleasure..." Gian Biagio Conte, *Latin Literature: A History*, trans. Joseph B. Solodow (Baltimore/London: The John Hopkins University Press, 1994)89.

³⁶² Conte, *Latin Literature: A History* 120.

³⁶³ Conte, *Latin Literature: A History* 120.

In so doing, it prefigured a systematic application of Greek theory to Roman linguistic practice. Perhaps most significantly for the politics of metaphor, this text influenced Cicero (106–43 B.C.E.) in his development of a distinctive Roman oratory and literature.³⁶⁴

In *De Oratore*, Cicero adopts the Platonic dialogue as a vehicle for teaching the art of rhetoric.³⁶⁵ He portrays the orator as a well-educated generalist who, though firmly in control of his rhetorical technique, was versed in moral philosophy, law and history.³⁶⁶ Recalling the concerns and proscriptions of the sophist Gorgias, Cicero presents philosophy as the only discipline that can protect the public from the dangers of language. The orator must possess *probitas* and *prudentia* to be safely entrusted with the power of rhetoric. Finally, the harmony of thought and gesture is achieved through a moderate life and manifested as *decorum*.³⁶⁷ Cicero describes a seamless connection between *decorum* demonstrated in the orator's craft and as exemplified in the way the orator lives. In *De Officiis*, for example, he describes the house of the aristocrat as large and elegant, but without excessive luxury.³⁶⁸ In describing the nature of language, Cicero argues that the subject (*res*) of "speech" is inseparable from the "words" (*verba*) that make speech possible. Taking *mimesis* to its logical conclusion, "expression and thought are indivisible."³⁶⁹ To change the way something is said, is to change the content of what is being said. Language can persuade and it can control. It can bring together a city and calm the passions of the mob.³⁷⁰ To these ends, metaphor is both invaluable and unpredictable.

³⁶⁴ *Rhetorica ad Herennium* was attributed to Cicero until the late 15th century. It was the most widely read style manual of the middle ages. See Dixon, *Rhetoric: The Critical Idiom* 21.

³⁶⁵ Conte, *Latin Literature: A History* 187.

³⁶⁶ Conte, *Latin Literature: A History* 186.

³⁶⁷ As exemplified in the ethical system of the *De Officiis*. Conte, *Latin Literature: A History* 197.

³⁶⁸ Conte, *Latin Literature: A History* 198. This concern for *decorum* and its relationship to architecture is further developed by Vitruvius in *De Architectura*.

³⁶⁹ Dixon, *Rhetoric: The Critical Idiom* 17.

³⁷⁰ Conte, *Latin Literature: A History* 177.

Building on the synthesis of Greek theory and Roman ethics in Cicero, Quintilian (35–90+ C.E.) recognizes the function of metaphor in the communication and formation of new ideas.³⁷¹ Like Aristotle’s “borrowed” and “alien” terms, Quintilian identifies two types of words, “*propria*” and “*translata*.”³⁷² Words are “proper” when they are used according to their natural meaning and they are “metaphorical” when used contrary to nature. Quintilian’s metaphor also involves “borrowing” (*mutuatio*) and “movement” (*translatio*)³⁷³ and defines metaphor as deviant, or at least “dangerous” (*pericula*).³⁷⁴

Quintilian offers two unique contributions to the substitution theory of metaphor essential to the arguments put forward in this thesis. Unlike Aristotle, metaphor is not restricted to nouns or the names of things, but also applies to verbs. Further, Quintilian acknowledges the ontological impact of metaphor noting that “...it is not only the forms of words that undergo change, but also the forms of sentences and of Composition.”³⁷⁵ Unlike his Greek sources, the transformative function of metaphor, particularly as a rhetorical device, is not feared as an ethical calamity or a simple demonstration of skill; rather, metaphor is a means of understanding the world in a new way. Metaphor can be generative. Quintilian’s second contribution to our argument lies in his distinction between speech and text as discrete types of language.³⁷⁶ While general rules of language apply to both types, the deployment and function of metaphor is affected by this difference. The general rules of language are derived from “reason” (*ratio*), “antiquity” (*vetustas*), “authority” (*auctoritas*), and “usage” (*consuetudo*).³⁷⁷ These rules reveal prevalent themes of imperial aspirations. In their elaboration, Quintilian identifies “analogy” and

³⁷¹ Conte, *Latin Literature: A History* 514.

³⁷² Quintilian, v.1, 1.5.71.

³⁷³ Quintilian, v.3, 8.6.5.

³⁷⁴ Quintilian, v.1, 1.5.71, v.3, 8.6.11.

³⁷⁵ Quintilian, v.3, 8.6.2.

³⁷⁶ Quintilian, v.1, 1.6.1.

³⁷⁷ Quintilian, v.1, 1.6.1.

“etymology” as the parameters for *ratio*. He acknowledges the sanctity of antiquity that is common to the Roman imagination, particularly in the first century of the Empire. Authority is granted to those who have studied language, such as orators and historians. But the most significant rule is the consensus of users: “...we should treat language like money marked with the public stamp.”³⁷⁸ All of these rules point back to Aristotle's concern for the appropriate use of language and acknowledge the need for a social contract to establish meaning. It is significant that Quintilian, like Aristotle, is not concerned about the listener/reader or the act of interpretation. There is an implicit assumption that an educated mind will understand if the speech/text is properly delivered. Following Plato and Aristotle, Imperial semantics was a matter of consensus among a clearly defined group. In this way, the use of analogy as a measure of appropriateness through history, authority, and common parlance is possible because these rules identify a discrete set of variables.³⁷⁹ These rules control meaning. In the cultivated consistency of the Roman cosmos, metaphor had the potential to break the connection between words and things and for this reason was dangerous.

Before addressing the subject of metaphor, Quintilian dismisses debate over the *species* and *genera* of the various *Tropes* identified in rhetorical manuals. Tropes are “artistic alterations” applied to words or phrases and they are employed for the purposes of enhancing meaning or style.³⁸⁰ Further, tropes arise from words used properly and from words used metaphorically and, significantly:

that it is not only the forms of words that undergo change, but also the forms of sentences and of Composition. I think therefore that writers who have held that the only Tropes are those in which one word is substituted for another are mistaken. (Quintilian, v3, 8.6.3)

³⁷⁸ Quintilian, v.1, 1.6.3.

³⁷⁹ See Quintilian, v.1, 1.6.3 regarding the use of the analogy.

³⁸⁰ Quintilian, v.3, 8.6.2.

Here, Quintilian takes leave of a simple reading of the Aristotelian definition of metaphor as substitution and acknowledges the trope for its impact on epistemology and ontology. The trope affects not only the structure of the argument developed by the orator but “thought” and “discourse.” While this may be implicit to the Aristotelian definition, Quintilian is unambiguous. Aristotle’s clear separation of poetic from rhetorical metaphor is undermined by Quintilian’s willingness to accept *mimesis* as an accessory to logic.

Quintilian shares with Isocrates, Aristotle, and Cicero a concern for the proper training of an orator.³⁸¹ He believes that the ideal practitioner is naturally inclined to the art but must also be well-educated. This education is an elaboration of the program set out by Aristotle and consists of 5 parts: “invention” (*inventio*), “arrangement” (*dispositio*), “expression” (*elocutio*), “memory” (*memoria*), and “delivery” (*pronuntiatio*) or “action” (*actio*).³⁸² Quintilian sees oratory as a comprehensive education.

The notion of a general education as preparation for life as a professional is significant for our discussion of metaphor in that it sets out to define a set of shared referents. This set of shared referents is the foundation of communication and the affirmation of a semantic authority based on the consensus of a community. It is inclusive of those who share the curriculum and exclusive of those who do not. Because language is the *a priori* of Greek society, and the extension of Greek culture through Rome, a breakdown in communication indicates, or leads to, a breakdown of the social structure. In this sense, for the Greeks and the Romans, language prevented the return of the world to its original state of chaos.

³⁸¹ Quintilian, v.1, 2.19.1.

³⁸² Quintilian, v.3, 3.3.1.

3.5 THE CHRISTIANS

Paul, the Pharisee and the first Christian writer, was educated as a first century, provincial Greek. Even his instruction in Torah used the Greek Septuagint.³⁸³ His command of the *koine* is clear and forceful, rarely elegant, and suggests a modest education.³⁸⁴ While the details of Paul's professional training remain the subject of academic speculation, his natural ability as a communicator is evident in his success in spreading the Christian message.³⁸⁵ The extent of his exposure to Greek rhetoric and philosophy is unknown, but it is unlikely that he advanced to the gymnasium. It is likely that he was familiar with Jewish textual exegesis and it may be the synthesis of Greek and Jewish hermeneutics that Paul makes his greatest contribution to the function of metaphor.³⁸⁶ Paul does not propose a theory of metaphor *per se*, but his letters contribute to Christian attitudes toward rhetoric, poetry, and the transformative power of language. Most importantly, Paul establishes the Holy Spirit as the authority in all questions of Christian semantics.

All of the extant letters of Paul are addressed to mixed communities of urban Jews and Gentiles living outside of Palestine. Formally educated members of the church would have studied a similar curriculum to Paul, modelled on the Greek *paideia*. Even those without a formal education participated in Greek culture through architecture, theatre, public games, and rhetorical performance.³⁸⁷ For Jews, Rodney Stark argues, the overwhelming majority living in these communities:

³⁸³ Calvin J. Roetzel, *The Letters of Paul: Conversations in Context*, 3rd ed. (Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1991) 24.

³⁸⁴ E.P. Sanders, *Paul, Past Masters*, ed. Keith Thomas (Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 1991) 10.

³⁸⁵ Werner Jaeger, *Early Christianity and Greek Paideia* (Cambridge, MA/London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1995) 105.

³⁸⁶ Conte, *Latin Literature: A History* 597.

³⁸⁷ Easterling, "The Hellenistic and Imperial Periods," 24.

...read, wrote, spoke, thought and worshipped in Greek. Of the inscriptions found in the Jewish catacombs in Rome, fewer than 2 percent were in Hebrew or Aramaic, while 74 percent were in Greek and the remainder were in Latin (Finegan 1992: 325–326). Many Jews in the diaspora had taken Greek names, and they had incorporated much of the Greek enlightenment into their cultural views, just as emancipated Jews responded to the eighteenth-century Enlightenment. Moreover, many Hellenised Jews had embraced some elements of pagan religious thought. In short, large numbers were no longer Jews in the ethnic sense and remained only partly so in the religious sense. (Goldstein, 1981; Frend, 1984; Green, 1985)³⁸⁸

This is not to suggest that Judaism was consumed by the dominant Greek and Roman cultures or that Jewish communities did not maintain degrees of separation in the Gentile cities that they shared. Jewish residential neighbourhoods were typically set apart and Jews maintained dietary restrictions and male circumcision. The memory of the Temple and the Torah were central to forming Jewish identity in the diaspora.³⁸⁹ However, the philosophical works of Philo, the histories of Josephus, and the letters of Paul suggest the range of ongoing cultural synthesis.³⁹⁰ Even within the borders of Palestine, the influence of Greek and Roman culture was widespread.

For Christianity, the influence of Greek intellectual practice is well illustrated by Acts 17.16 where Paul is portrayed as a philosopher addressing the citizens at the Aeropagus in Athens. Paul plays the role of a Greek orator at ground zero of the Greek rhetorical tradition. While it is unlikely that Paul actually spoke on the Aeropagus as recorded in Acts, this narrative, combined with the powerful rhetoric of his letters, established his status as an intellectual in the classical tradition by end of the first century.³⁹¹ But while Paul and his Jewish and Gentile contemporaries share exposure to rhetoric and the institutions of the Greek city, the epistemology that informs Greek rhetoric (and architecture) is challenged by the Christian message. For

³⁸⁸ Stark, *The Rise of Christianity* 54.

³⁸⁹ Conte, *Latin Literature: A History* 597.

³⁹⁰ Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition: The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition (100–600)* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984) 33.

³⁹¹ Jaeger, *Early Christianity and Greek Paideia* 10–12.

Christians, the authority of language is not controlled by culture or by the authority of the orator, but by the Holy Spirit manifest through language.³⁹²

The Apostle develops four thematic metaphors through his letters: military service, public games, agriculture, and classical architecture.³⁹³ In developing these metaphors, Paul establishes an exegetical frame for Christian literature. While Paul assumes the moral authority of a philosopher, his rhetoric is less concerned with persuading through logic than it is with persuading through faith. Rhetoric can lead us to truth made evident through revelation and this revelation is a result of a proper interpretation that is guided by “the Spirit.”³⁹⁴ God’s wisdom is “secret” and “hidden.”³⁹⁵ Only those who are chosen by God can truly understand his message.

And we speak of these things in words not taught by human wisdom but taught by the Spirit, interpreting spiritual things to those who are spiritual. Those who are unspiritual do not receive the gifts of God’s Spirit, for they are foolishness to them, and they are unable to understand them because they are spiritually discerned. Those who are spiritual discern all things, and they themselves are subject to no one else’s scrutiny. “For who has known the mind of the Lord so as to instruct him?” But we have the mind of Christ. (1 Cor. 2.13–16)

The Christian community is one body animated by Christ.³⁹⁶ Each Christian knows the true word just as a heart knows when to beat. Unlike the Imperial citizen, to be part of Christ does not require participation in the Greek *paideia*. Nor does it require attention to the laws of Moses. In fact, the value of philosophy and Judaism are both called into question:

Where is the one who is wise? Where is the scribe? Where is the debater of the age? Has not

³⁹² See 1 Cor. 4.14–21 in which Paul admonishes the Corinthian Church for not imitating him.

³⁹³ This argument belongs to John Saul Howson, *The Metaphors of St. Paul* (London: Strahan, 1868). In this thesis, architectural metaphor was found in 15 separate instances. See Appendix 1.

³⁹⁴ 1 Cor. 12.1–11.

³⁹⁵ 1 Cor. 2.7.

³⁹⁶ 1 Cor. 12.12–13.

God made foolish the wisdom of the world? For since, in the wisdom of God, the world did not know God through wisdom, God decided, through the foolishness of our proclamation to save those who believe. For Jews demand signs and Greeks desire wisdom, but we proclaim Christ crucified, a stumbling block to Jews and foolishness to Gentiles, but to those who are the called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God. For God's foolishness is wiser than human wisdom and God's weakness is stronger than human strength. (1 Cor. 1.20–25)

Truth is revealed to each individual through participation in the body of Christ. Paul is building, on the foundations of his Greek education, a new *paideia* that finds its truth in theology rather than philosophy. Rhetoric, for its part, is assigned a very different role from the classical model.

Paul distances himself from classical rhetoric and emphasizes that he is a humble person, warning the Christian communities to be wary of those who by “smooth talk and flattery” win hearts over.³⁹⁷ Contrary to the authority of the classical orator, earned through living a moral life, the Christian orator is chosen by God and lives a moral life because of it. Paul himself had persecuted Christians and is now their leading spokesperson to the Gentiles. Paul is clear on rules to guide “the flesh.”³⁹⁸ But ultimately, human action is irrelevant. While a Christian must live a good life, that good life does not guarantee God's mercy.³⁹⁹ Salvation is the result of God's grace, not human action. While this detachment of human action from the divine may have made some sense to Plato, for the Imperial imagination it was problematic.⁴⁰⁰ How could these ideas, new in the context of Christianity, be explained? Like Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian before him, to explain new ideas, Paul turns to metaphor.

In the Christian model, rather than limiting the meaning of metaphor, Paul welcomes the instability of polysemy and synthesizes the rhetorical and poetic dimensions of metaphor as a

³⁹⁷ Rom. 16.18.

³⁹⁸ Rom. 12.1–15.6; 1 Cor. 7.1–8.13.

³⁹⁹ Rom. 3.28.

⁴⁰⁰ On the underlying theology in Plato, see Michael Pantazakos, “The Unlying God: Law Inspired and Inspiring in Plato's *Ion* and St. Paul's *Letter to Titus*,” *Law and Critique* 15 (2004) 79–80.

means to revelation. Styled as oratory, *rhetoric-proof-persuasion*, his letters present the resurrection of Christ as the main “proof” of the Christian message.⁴⁰¹ The Christian message cannot be fully understood, however, without a kind of *catharsis* brought about by “identifying oneself” (*mimesis*) with Christ.⁴⁰² Not unlike philosophical schools, Christians prepare themselves for revelation through proper instruction and a moral life—they endeavour to be “like” Christ. But God’s grace is revealed, not learned. “And we speak of these things in words not taught by human wisdom but taught by the Spirit, interpreting spiritual things to those who are spiritual.”⁴⁰³ Understanding their relationship to Christ and to the Church metaphorically as members of one spiritual body, all members of the community have the potential to participate in the Word. The “danger” of metaphor, of such concern for Plato and Quintilian, is mitigated by an absolute, external moral authority—the Holy Spirit.

A Christian faith based on the absolute authority of the Word and revealed through the Holy Spirit posed problems for establishing orthodoxy. These problems are evident from the beginning of Christian theology and are of concern even to Paul. Both of his letters to the Corinthians address issues related to apostolic authority.⁴⁰⁴ Some system was required to determine the authenticity of God’s voice. Who had the “right” interpretation? This brings us back to Plato’s suspicion toward rhetoric and poetry. While unlimited semiosis is conducive to poetic creation, or spiritual revelation, it can also lead to political and social chaos. In 1 Cor 14, Paul encourages those who speak in tongues to speak to God rather than to their fellow Christians.⁴⁰⁵ To those with the gift of prophecy, they are to use it only for the “building up” of the Church. Revelation must be channelled for the good of the whole community, not for

⁴⁰¹ e.g., Rom. 1.4.

⁴⁰² e.g., Rom. 8.

⁴⁰³ 1 Cor. 2.13.

⁴⁰⁴ 1 Cor. 1:10–15; 2 Cor. 12:11–13.

⁴⁰⁵ 1 Cor. 14.1–40.

individual advancement. While truth is revealed by God's will, some rules of order are necessary to keep the Church functioning as a community of men and women.

But Paul's admonitions were not enough to contain the polysemy of metaphorical language. As the Christian communities grew in number, so did the varieties of Christianity. Reflecting a predilection for revelation over orthodoxy, some of these groups, pejoratively called "Gnostics" by their detractors, claimed to possess revelations that were independent from the message taught by the Disciples. To address this crisis of authority, Christian writers, in the two centuries following Paul, were preoccupied with establishing a mechanism to maintain semantic authority.⁴⁰⁶ The challenge for Christianity was to develop an armature that could withstand the vagaries of poetic language and still provide answers to difficult theological questions. For this purpose classical rhetoric and philosophy were ill-equipped, but were the only tools available. Christian intellectuals, drawing on Paul's example, adapted techniques of rhetoric and philosophy into a critical hermeneutic for the exposition of the Church. The *a priori* for the new Christian exegesis was a collection of texts and practices established by "tradition." In the words of J.N.D Kelly:

...by tradition, the fathers usually mean doctrine which the Lord or his apostles committed to the Church, irrespective of whether it was handed down orally or in documents, and in the earlier centuries at any rate they prefer to employ other words or phrases to designate the Church's unwritten traditional teaching. The ancient meaning is well illustrated by Athanasius's reference (*Ad Serap. I, 28.*) to "the actual original tradition, teaching and faith of the Catholic Church, which the Lord bestowed, the apostles proclaimed and the fathers safeguarded."⁴⁰⁷

⁴⁰⁶ William C. Placher, *A History of Christian Theology* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1983) 44; Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines* 29.

⁴⁰⁷ Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines* 30–31.

In the generation following the disciples, intellectuals continued to work on formalizing Christian traditions. This period is characterized by the work of the latin speaking Apostolic Fathers (Clement of Rome, Ignatius, Polycarp, the unknown author of 2 Clement, “Barnabas,” “Hermas”) and the Greek Apologists (Aristides, Justin, Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus).⁴⁰⁸

Through the Apostolic Fathers and the Apologists, the Church clarified its relationship to Judaism, declaring the “Old Testament” a preamble to the revelation of Christ. In this period, the Old Testament (OT) is the primary object of Christian exegesis. Ignatius argues that Christ, “...taught us, and interpreted the prophecies which were not yet understood as was foretold by the holy and divine Spirit of prophecy through Moses.”⁴⁰⁹ The Jews misunderstood the Torah and failed to recognize Jesus as the Messiah. Jesus provided a new lens through which to view the ancient revelation of the Jewish prophets. This appropriation of Israel was not a job for fishermen and required the literary and rhetorical skills of classically educated men. As the catholic hierarchy began to take shape and to assert its jurisdiction over the interpretation of the Christian message, the profile of its leaders began increasingly to resemble a school of philosophy.⁴¹⁰

By the end of the second century, the corpus of documents that would later become the NT was established and linked inter-textually through shared metaphors with the OT. Christian history, from Genesis to God’s reconciliation with humanity through Christ, was seamless. Christ, the λόγος, was the sign that bound together the old and the new covenants. He was eternal and coincidental with the Father. He was, for a short time, simultaneously human and divine. As a human being, Jesus had passed his teachings on to other human beings and these, in

⁴⁰⁸ Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines* 31.

⁴⁰⁹ Justin, “The Epistle of Ignatius to the Magnesians Shorter and Longer Versions,” *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the Writings of the Fathers down to A.D. 325*, ed. Rev. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, vol. 1 (Edinburgh/Grand Rapids, MI: T&T Clark/ Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1985) 32.

⁴¹⁰ Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines* 35.

turn, had taught others in a continuous and uninterrupted line that led to the Episcopate of the late second century. Christian tradition was a matter of established practice informed by text and oral teaching.

Writing at the turn of the third century, Tertullian is adamant that Christians adhere to apostolic authority and not simply pick and choose doctrines that suit them best.⁴¹¹ Concerned with the growth of “gnostic” alternatives to “catholic” tradition and suspicious of the encroachment of Greek philosophy on Christian teaching, Tertullian asks: “What has Athens to do with Jerusalem?”⁴¹² Apostolic succession is the only way to assure that the unwritten teachings are accurately transmitted. Determining orthodoxy, therefore, is the responsibility of duly appointed presbyters who are part of an unbroken line beginning with Christ.

As the guardians of orthodoxy, church officials were forced to develop an increasingly comprehensive approach to exegesis and hermeneutics. In the generation following Tertullian, Origen, a student of Clement of Alexandria, draws on both Christian tradition and techniques from Greek philosophy to address apparent contradictions and inconsistencies in the Old and New Testaments. Starting with the premise that the Scriptures, as the Word of God, are necessarily flawless, Origen applies what Mark Edwards calls a “homeopathic remedy.”⁴¹³ Rather than check the logic of the Scriptures against external criteria like history or geography, Origen looks within the Book itself to establish an internal, Christian logic. All ambiguities of meaning are resolved from within the corpus of the Scriptures. As the embodiment of Christ, the

⁴¹¹ Tertullian, “The Prescription Against Heretics,” trans. Rev. Peter Holmes, *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the writings of the fathers down to A.D. 325*, ed. Rev. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, vol. 3 (Edinburgh/Grand Rapids, MI: T&T Clark/ Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1985) 13; See also Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines* 36; Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition: The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition (100–600)* 118.

⁴¹² Tertullian, “The Prescription Against Heretics” 7.

⁴¹³ Mark Edwards, “Origen on Christ, Tropology, and Exegesis,” *Metaphor, Allegory and the Classical Tradition*, ed. G.R. Boys-Stones (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003) 241; see also Morweena Ludlow, “Theology and Allegory: Origen and Gregory of Nyssa on the Unity and Diversity of Scripture,” *International Journal of Systematic Theology* 4.1 (2002) 45–66.

Bible contains all knowledge: “And it is fitting to believe that not a single title of the sacred Scriptures is without something of the wisdom of God.”⁴¹⁴ The wisdom of God is, sometimes, intentionally hidden in metaphor or the extended metaphor of allegory to keep secrets hidden from eyes that should not see.

... the Scriptures were written by the Spirit of God, and have a meaning, not such only as is apparent at first sight, but also another, which escapes the notice of most. For those (words) which are written are the forms of certain mysteries and the images of divine things. Respecting which there is one opinion throughout the whole Church, that the whole law is indeed spiritual; but that the spiritual meaning which the law conveys is not known to all, but to those only on whom the grace of the Holy Spirit is bestowed in the word of wisdom and knowledge. (Origen, *De Principiis*, Preface 8)

Origen, working from Paul’s tripartite understanding of human ontology, sees the scriptures inextricably linked to the human condition through a shared structure of body, soul, and spirit.⁴¹⁵ Like the physical body, the written word, the “body” of the Word, cannot in and of itself lead to revelation, but provides a “common and historical” sense of the Christian story.⁴¹⁶ Rational exegesis of the written word demonstrates the internal logic of Scripture and informs the soul of the exegete of the potential for Christian revelation. This exegesis is adequate for “somatic” Christianity, the Christianity of the flesh “...in which a man says to those who are carnal that he knows nothing but Jesus Christ and Him crucified...”⁴¹⁷ But, necessary as it is for

⁴¹⁴ Origen, *The Philocalia of Origen*, trans. Rev. George Lewis (Edinburgh/New York: T&T Clark/Charles Scribner's Sons, 1911) 1.28. See also Ludlow, "Theology and Allegory: Origen and Gregory of Nyssa on the Unity and Diversity of Scripture," 46.

⁴¹⁵ Edwards, "Origen on Christ, Tropology, and Exegesis," 242–251. See also 1 Thess. 5:23; Origen, "De Principiis," *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the writings of the fathers down to A.D. 325*, ed. Rev. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, vol. 4 (Edinburgh/Grand Rapids, MI: T&T Clark/ Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1985) 4.1.11. On the three levels of Origen’s exegesis, see Ludlow, "Theology and Allegory: Origen and Gregory of Nyssa on the Unity and Diversity of Scripture," 46–52.

⁴¹⁶ Origen, "De Principiis," 4.1.11.

⁴¹⁷ Origen, "Commentary on the Gospel according to John," trans. Alan Menzies, *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the writings of the fathers down to A.D. 325*, ed. Rev. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, vol.

moral instruction, the full revelation of Christ is not found in this second level of interpretation: “The spiritual truth was often preserved, as one might say, in the material falsehood.”⁴¹⁸ It is beyond the rational reading, in the “spiritual” hermeneutic, that the true revelation of the text lies: “But should we find those who are perfected in the spirit, and bear fruit in it, and are enamoured of the heavenly wisdom, these must be made to partake of that Word which, after it was made flesh, rose again to what it was in the beginning, with God.”⁴¹⁹ The Holy Spirit reveals itself during mystical contemplation of the text.⁴²⁰ Only those who are “perfect,” infused with the Spirit, realizing the unification of the physical body and the soul, can receive the fullness of Scripture:

The perfect man, again, and he who resembles those spoken of by the apostle, when he says, "We speak wisdom among them that are perfect, but not the wisdom of the world, nor of the rulers of this world, who come to nought; but we speak the wisdom of God in a mystery, the hidden wisdom, which God hath ordained before the ages, unto our glory," (may receive edification) from the spiritual law, which has a shadow of good things to come. For as man consists of body, and soul, and spirit, so in the same way does Scripture, which has been arranged to be given by God for the salvation of men. (Origen, *De Principiis*, 4.2.4)

Mark Edwards sees this threefold process of interpretation as analogous to three rhetorical tropes: metaphor, metonymy, and synecdoche.⁴²¹ The first revelation of the text is ethical and is manifest through *mimesis*. The exegete, upon receiving the Word, seeks to imitate Christ and his disciples. This is the crudest form of understanding, but necessary for initiates,

10 (Edinburgh/Grand Rapids, MI: T&T Clark/ Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1985) 1.9.

⁴¹⁸ Origen, "Commentary on the Gospel according to John," 10:4.

⁴¹⁹ Origen, "Commentary on the Gospel according to John," 1:9.

⁴²⁰ Kathleen E. McVey, "The Domed Church as Microcosm: Literary Roots of an Architectural Symbol," *Art, Archaeology, and Architecture of Early Christianity*, ed. Paul Corby Finney (New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1993) 202. This is discussed further below.

⁴²¹ Edwards, "Origen on Christ, Tropology, and Exegesis," 249–251. Metonymy—substituting the name of an attribute for the name of the thing: the *crown* for the *monarchy*. Synecdoche—identifying the whole by a part or vice versa: *a new face*.

and often the only form available to the uneducated. Metonymy, an attempt to stabilize meaning through extended definitions within a given paradigm, provides the exegete with a revelation of the true nature of Christ. This revelation of the “Second Person of the Trinity... described by Origen as the Soul of God”⁴²² brings an understanding of the human soul, its relationship to the body and to the community of souls in Christ. The synecdoche is the apogee of Christian revelation where the exegete, fully conscious that body and soul are part of the wholeness of God, shares in the Holy Spirit through a unity with their own Spirit.

This method of exegesis approaches the text as “an interlocking arrangement of many units, each one connected with several others, as opposed to the order found in a sequence of units.”⁴²³ The apparent disorder of the narrative, a roadblock for non-Christians, must be built up by the exegete and “gathered together into a harmonious sequence.”⁴²⁴ Morwenna Ludlow argues that Origen understands the Bible to have a “form” (τάξις) that is independent from its “sequence” (ἀκολουθία) and that the meaning of text is tied to this form. With the guidance of the Holy Spirit, the Bible reveals its form and its meaning through a hermeneutic process that engages reader and text in an analogous dialogue.

Origen’s reading of Scripture has affinities with Aristotle’s characterization of Greek tragedy, the highest form of Greek poetry. In *Poetics*, the overall “sense” or meaning of tragedy is conveyed by the coherence of the plot (μῦθος). Coherence of plot is separate from linear narrative. Paul Ricoeur argues:

...the *mythos* must have a unity and coherence and make of the actions represented something “entire and complete.” As such, the *mythos* is the principal “part” of the tragedy, its “essence;” all the other “parts” of the tragedy—the “characters,” the “thoughts,” the “diction,” the

⁴²² Edwards, “Origen on Christ, Tropology, and Exegesis,” 250, referring to Origen, *De Principiis*, 2.8.5.

⁴²³ Ludlow, “Theology and Allegory: Origen and Gregory of Nyssa on the Unity and Diversity of Scripture,” 50.

⁴²⁴ Ludlow, “Theology and Allegory: Origen and Gregory of Nyssa on the Unity and Diversity of Scripture,” 52.

“spectacle”—are connected to the *mythos* as the means or the conditions or the performance of the tragedy as *mythos*.⁴²⁵

In Greek poetry, meaning is revealed through a coherence of discrete parts united by *mythos*, regardless of linear narrative. These discrete parts, defined by Aristotle as diction (λέξις), include metaphor and are meaningful, in circular fashion, only within the context of μῦθος: “Now, what makes the unity of the *lexis*? Only its *function* in poetry.”⁴²⁶ The part is relative only within the whole and the whole is defined by its parts. This synecdochal relationship, part to whole, is essentially metaphorical.⁴²⁷ Origen’s project can be understood, in classical terms, as an attempt to reveal the Christian *mythos*. Deferring to Ricoeur’s analysis of Aristotle’s *Poetics*:

Why do poets write tragedies, elaborate fables and plots, and use such ‘strange’ words as metaphors? Because tragedy itself is related to a more fundamental project—that of *imitating* human action in a *poetic* fashion.⁴²⁸

Origen’s absolute faith in the Scriptures assures him that Christians have nothing to fear from rhetoric or philosophy. He encouraged his students to read all forms of Greek and Latin literature, with the exception of atheistic texts, knowing that the truth of the Christian message will be revealed to the faithful.⁴²⁹ Like Plato, Origen understood the intellect as a vehicle to knowing God. Although Plato distrusted language because it was often used to hide, rather than reveal the truth, he understood that it was integral to the development of the intellect. Language

⁴²⁵ Ricoeur, “Metaphor and the Main Problem of Hermeneutics,” 316.

⁴²⁶ Ricoeur, “Metaphor and the Main Problem of Hermeneutics,” 316.

⁴²⁷ Eco argues that metonymy and synecdoche are, essentially, metaphors.

⁴²⁸ Ricoeur, “Metaphor and the Main Problem of Hermeneutics,” 317.

⁴²⁹ See also Eusebius, *The Ecclesiastical History* 6.18.3: “For when he perceived that any persons had superior intelligence he instructed them also in philosophic branches—in geometry, arithmetic, and other preparatory studies—and then advanced to the systems of the philosophers and explained their writings. And he made observations and comments upon each of them so that he became celebrated as a great philosopher even among the Greeks themselves.”

had to be carefully controlled. Words were shadows of shadows. Truth could never be fully realised through the flesh. Unlike Plato's characterization of the divine, Origen's Christian God was not wholly transcendent. To know God was a unification of the body, soul, and spirit. Origen's world was made by God and everything that God made was good. Words, in particular those words that came directly from God, were not copies of Truth, they were Truth. Language did not need to be controlled so much as properly interpreted.

After he left Alexandria, Origen spent much of the remainder of his life in Caesarea. He was ordained there and his influence on the Caesarean church was considerable.⁴³⁰ When his work was questioned during the Christological debates of the latter third century, it was the respected bishop of Caesarea, Pamphilus and his student Eusebius that came to his defense. In Pamphilus' library, Eusebius found not only material to support Origen, but the sources for his history of the church.⁴³¹ Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History* is the first extensive work of Christian history and it is the definitive record of the saints and of the "victory" of Christianity through Constantine. Eusebius argues that the transformation of Christianity from a state persecuted to a state sanctioned religion reflects the natural unfolding of God's will.⁴³² He continues the work of the "Fathers" by defending the authority of tradition and apostolic succession. As in the preceding centuries, the construction of a continuous line of transmission is essential for claiming orthodoxy.⁴³³

⁴³⁰ Eusebius, *The Ecclesiastical History* 6.23.4.

⁴³¹ Pamphilus and Eusebius co-wrote a (now lost) defense of Origen: *The Ecclesiastical History* 6.23.4.

⁴³² Eusebius, "The Church History of Eusebius," trans. Arthur Cushman McGiffert and Ernest Cushing Richardson, *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, ed. Philip Schaff and Henry Wace, vol. 1 (Edinburgh/Grand Rapids, MI: T&T Clark/Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1991) 7.32.32: "Having written out in these books the account of the succession from the birth of our Saviour to the destruction of the places of worship—a period of three hundred and five years," Eusebius brings us to his own period and the persecution of Diocletian.

⁴³³ See R. Markus, *The End of Early Christianity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991) 90–92.

While Eusebius is remembered primarily as an historian, he is also a talented exegete in the tradition of Origen.⁴³⁴ Origen saw Scripture as a weaving of allegory and history.⁴³⁵ And, as discussed above, his method of exegesis is designed to demonstrate God's presence in both the literal meaning of the text and in those portions obscured by metaphorical language. Eusebius worked to ground the Scriptures in the world through history and geography. He begins his history with the history of Israel, the genesis of the Christian nation and the source of Church authority.

That the Hebrew nation is not new, but is universally honoured on account to its antiquity, is known to all. The books and writings of these people contain writings of ancient men, rare indeed and few in number, but nevertheless distinguished for piety and righteousness and every other virtue. Of these, some excellent men lived before the flood, others of the sons and descendants of Noah lived after it, among them Abraham, whom the Hebrews celebrate as their own founder and forefather. If anyone should assert that all those who have enjoyed the testimony of righteousness, from Abraham himself back to the first man, were Christians in fact if not in name, he would not go beyond the truth. (Eusebius, *Church History*, 1.4.5–6)

The ancient Jews were proto-Christians and this is demonstrated by their righteousness. Unlike the Jewish prophets that preceded Jesus, however, the revelation of Christ is not mediated by signs or symbols.

Although he received no symbols and types of high priesthood from any one, although he was not born of a race of priests, although he was not elevated to a kingdom by military guards, although he was not a prophet like those of old, although he obtained no honor, no pre-eminence among the Jews, nevertheless was adorned by the Father with all, if not with the symbols, yet with the truth itself. (Eusebius, *Church History*, 1.3.11)⁴³⁶

⁴³⁴ See Erica Carotenuto, "Five Egyptians Coming From Jerusalem: Some Remarks on Eusebius, *De Martyribus Palaestinae* 11.6–13," *Classical Quarterly* 52.2 (2002) 500–506.

⁴³⁵ Origen, "De Principiis," 4.3.1.

⁴³⁶ See also Williamson's translation: "No longer does He communicate to His followers patterns or images but fully revealed virtues and a heavenly life with the very doctrines of truth; and he has received the chrism, not that

Eusebius claims the authority and validation of Jewish history but not its outward signs. The existing order of things obscures God's revelation. The old covenant must be reinterpreted if it is to be properly understood. Scriptures, Priesthoods, Jerusalem, Rome, Temples, all of these signs have lost their meaning. This argument is consistent with the apocalyptic voice of Paul in 1 Corinthians and Romans, and with Stephen in Acts.⁴³⁷ What Eusebius contributes to the ongoing development of Pauline rhetoric is an extension of the "text" from words, the historical narrative and metaphor of Scripture, to include phenomena. The world is the text. Eusebius must capitalize on the radical essence of the Christian message if he is to make sense out of the Church's new Imperial patronage. To do this, he adapts Origen's understanding of Scripture as a collection of interlocking pieces to include all of God's creation.

Paul's proud defence of the "foolishness" of the cross underlines one of the most philosophically and theologically challenging problems for Christianity in the Greek and Roman world. Jesus was human and died a criminal's death. At the same time, he was God. This "mystery" fixes Christ's humanity as an integral part of the Christian narrative and sanctifies the physical world as God's creation. Unlike the Gnostics' neo-platonic interpretation of God marginalizing the significance of Jesus as a person, the Catholic tradition promotes Christ's humanity as the key Christian ontology.

Eusebius addresses the dual nature of Christ and his relationship to the "Father" in the first book:

...for the sake of our salvation, [Christ] put on human nature with the same passions as our own—the following work will be complete only if we begin with the chief and lordliest events of all his history. In this way will the antiquity and divinity of Christianity be shown to those who

prepared with physical materials, but the divine chrism with the spirit of God, by sharing in the begotten divinity of the Father." Eusebius, *The History of the Church*, trans. G.A. Williamson (London: Penguin, 1989) 1.3.11.

⁴³⁷ e.g., Rom. 4.1; Cor. 10.1–5; Acts 7.47–50.

suppose it of recent and foreign origin. (Eusebius, *Church History*, 1.2.1)

Not only did God make the world, He came to dwell in it as a person. The relationship between God and the physical world implies that God's presence permeates all things.⁴³⁸ If God is present in all things, all things can reveal his presence if properly understood.

In his panegyric on the consecration of the Cathedral of Tyre,⁴³⁹ Eusebius uses Scripture, builder, and building in his exegesis to construct a rich, intertextual hermeneutic on Christians, Christ, and Christian architecture. The panegyric, discussed in more detail in the following chapter, draws object and place into the hermeneutic circle along with the text. Significant for our discussion, Eusebius, like Origen before him, employs metaphor to link the various elements of biblical narrative and revealed text in the construction of his reading. What differs from Origen, is that some of the narrative elements are not words. Rather, Eusebius uses architecture as an object for the exegetical process. A Christian building, like Scripture, is a manifestation of Christ and reveals God's presence.

3.6 THE CONTEXT OF EARLY CHRISTIAN ARCHITECTURAL METAPHOR

Like classical rhetoric, what characterizes a work of classical architecture is the obvious use of compositional rules. And, like classical rhetoric, the purpose of these rules is to bring order to an otherwise chaotic world. The erudite Greek, or any person educated in the *paideia*, is able to recognize this order as a continuous, balanced, and interdependent system that connects sand to cities and signifiers to the signified.

⁴³⁸ On the Pharisaic origin of this idea in Christianity, see Renwick, *Paul, the Temple and the Presence of God* and discussion in Chapter 3 of this thesis.

⁴³⁹ Eusebius, "The Church History of Eusebius," 10.42–72.

The philosopher Aristippus, a follower of Socrates, was shipwrecked on the coast of Rhodes, and observing geometrical patterns drawn upon the sand, he is said to have shouted to his companions: "There are good hopes for us; for I see human footsteps!" Forthwith he made for the city of Rhodes and came straight to the gymnasium. There he disputed on philosophical topics and was so richly rewarded that he not only fitted himself out, but supplied his companions with clothing and other necessities of life. (Vitruvius, 3 6.Preface.1)

Aristippus is able to find his way to the gymnasium in a strange city, in a strange landscape, because he sees geometrical signs in the sand. He does not read the geometrical figures for their denotative values (circle, square, triangle) but understands them as a sign connoting civilization that, in turn, connotes the architectural and social order of a Greek city. Geometry is a metaphor, in the Aristotelian sense of substitution and similarity, for *civitas*. But this is not the simple transfer of a signifier. While the structure of the metaphor is based on Aristotle's substitution model, we can also see how metaphor triggers a cascade of references from a simple figure drawn in the sand to the complexity of the *polis*.

Returning to our discussion about the substitution and interaction theories of metaphor, we can see that, in keeping with the interaction theory, the geometrical figure comes to stand for geometry as a metaphor of order. In turn, geometry and order are metaphors of Greek civilization. Greek civilization is represented by the Greek city, again, a relationship through metaphor. The story of Aristippus, told to us by Vitruvius, suggests that, despite the efforts of Aristotle and Cicero, metaphor in the Imperial era was not mediated by the clarity of rhetoric. Rather, the mimetic and synecdochal capacities of metaphor were understood to connect local events to the cosmological in a manner more consistent with poetry. What limited the interpretation of metaphor was not semantic rules, but the semantic potential afforded by the range of recognizable, culturally shared signifier/signified relationships. Polysemous terms were

limited by the (possibly) extensive, but nonetheless finite, referents recognized by the *koine*. It was this “common” understanding of metaphor that apparently informs Origen’s exegesis. Able to answer the question of authority through the presence of the Holy Spirit and verifying the presence of the Holy Spirit through apostolic succession, Origen was free to take his hermeneutic reading to the limits of interpretation. With this understanding of the nature of architectural metaphor in early Christian texts, we now turn to an analysis of the role of the body/temple vehicle in the reconciliation of the rhetorical temple described in the Gospel narrative and in the Epistles with the architecture of Imperial Rome.

4. THE FUNCTION OF BODY/TEMPLE METAPHOR IN EARLY CHRISTIAN LITERATURE

4.1 INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, we trace the architectural tenor of the Christian body/temple metaphor by following a single exegetical tradition from the second to the early fourth centuries. The source for this tradition is found in the Pauline and deuterio-Pauline letters, 1 Peter, and in the Gospels. In the Epistles, the body/temple vehicle is used to develop a sense of Christian community and to explain the presence of God in that community. In the Gospels, the metaphor relocates the presence of God from the Jerusalem Temple to the body of Christ. In both cases, the body/temple is used rhetorically as an antithesis to temple architecture and to the urban order that temple buildings imply. We will examine how the two variations of the metaphor are transformed in the second and third centuries through the inter-textual hermeneutics of the pseudonymous *Epistle of Barnabas*, Clement of Alexandria's *Stromata*, and Origen's *Commentary on the Gospel of John*. At the centre of this transformation is an increasing use of number and geometry to illustrate the universal order represented by Christ. For our study, the culmination of this exegesis is an oration celebrating Christ's νεὼν πανίερος in the *Ecclesiastical History* of Eusebius.⁴⁴⁰ Considering the pivotal role of Eusebius, the provenance of the texts considered will, for the most part, be framed within the context of his history.

This discussion of the body/temple is framed by Paul Ricoeur's theory of metaphor as "...an emergence of meaning..."⁴⁴¹ and by his discussion of inter-textual metaphorization as "a process at work between the encompassing narrative and the embedded narrative."⁴⁴² Further, while architectural metaphor is used to various ends in other early Christian traditions, this study

⁴⁴⁰ Eusebius, *The Ecclesiastical History* 10.4.56.

⁴⁴¹ Ricoeur, "Word, Polysemy, Metaphor: Creativity in Language," 65.

⁴⁴² Ricoeur, "The Bible and the Imagination," 53–56.

is concerned with the function of the metaphor in the reconciliation of Christian ontology with what Richard Krautheimer has called “the official architecture of Late Antiquity.”⁴⁴³

In the exegetical tradition under consideration, architectural metaphor functions in two ways: rhetorically and hermeneutically. Used rhetorically, architectural metaphor is consistent with Greek practice and conveys new ideas and makes arguments more interesting. Examples are found in 1 and 2 Corinthians, Ephesians, 1 Peter, and in the gospels of Matthew, Mark, and John. Hermeneutically, architectural metaphor is used to construct inter-textual relationships between the various narrative strands of early Christian literature as a means to build a central narrative with Christ λόγος as a model of universal order. Examples of this hermeneutical use of metaphor are found in *Barnabas*, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and Eusebius.

4.2 BODY/TEMPLE METAPHOR IN THE EPISTLE AND GOSPEL TRADITIONS

The body/temple metaphor under discussion has two variations at its source. The first is found in Paul’s letters to the Corinthians (1 Cor. 3.16, 1 Cor. 6.19, 2 Cor. 6.16), the Deutero-Pauline letter to the Ephesians (Eph. 2.21), and the “Catholic” letter 1 Peter (2.4–8). To summarize the tenor of this variation, the body of believers (both individually and as the corporate body of the church) is identified as the ναὸς θεοῦ. First Peter 2.4–8 adds an interesting dimension in that the place of Christ’s dwelling is referred to as οἶκος πνευματικός.

The second variation of the body/temple metaphor is paralleled in the synoptic gospels of Mark (13.1–2; 14.58) and Matthew (24.1–2; 26.61) and developed most fully in the Gospel of John (2.19–22).⁴⁴⁴ In the Gospel variation, the body of Christ is assigned the authority of the Jerusalem temple. Jesus is recorded as saying that the temple will be destroyed and then rebuilt

⁴⁴³ Krautheimer, *Early Christian and Byzantine Architecture* 37.

⁴⁴⁴ The gospel variation is echoed in Acts 6.13–14.

in three days. In John, the disciples understand the true meaning of the underlying metaphor behind Christ's statement only after his death and resurrection. Of the three Gospel sources, only John is explicit about the metaphorical relationship between the body of Christ and the temple.

4.2.1 THE EPISTLES

1 CORINTHIANS 3.10–19

10 Κατὰ τὴν χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν δοθεῖσάν μοι ὡς σοφὸς ἀρχιτέκτων θεμέλιον ἔθηκα, ἄλλος δὲ ἐποικοδομεῖ. ἕκαστος δὲ βλεπέτω πῶς ἐποικοδομεῖ. 11 θεμέλιον γὰρ ἄλλον οὐδεὶς δύναται θεῖναι παρὰ τὸν κείμενον, ὅς ἐστιν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός. 12 εἰ δέ τις ἐποικοδομεῖ ἐπὶ τὸν θεμέλιον χρυσίον, ἀργύριον, λίθους τιμίους, ξύλα, χόρτον, καλάμην, 13 ἑκάστου τὸ ἔργον φανερόν γενήσεται, ἡ γὰρ ἡμέρα δηλώσει· ὅτι ἐν πυρὶ ἀποκαλύπτεται, καὶ ἑκάστου τὸ ἔργον ὁποῖόν ἐστιν τὸ πῦρ αὐτὸ δοκιμάσει. 14 εἴ τις τινος τὸ ἔργον μενεῖ ὃ ἐποικοδόμησεν, μισθὸν λήμψεται. 15 εἴ τις τινος τὸ ἔργον κατακαήσεται, ζημιωθήσεται, αὐτὸς δὲ σωθήσεται, οὕτως δὲ ὡς διὰ πυρός. 16 Οὐκ οἶδατε ὅτι ναὸς θεοῦ ἐστε καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν οἰκεῖ; 17 εἴ τις τὸν ναὸν τοῦ θεοῦ φθείρει, φθερεῖ τοῦτον ὁ θεός· ὁ γὰρ ναὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ἅγιός ἐστιν, οἵτινές ἐστε ὑμεῖς. 18 Μηδεὶς ἑαυτὸν ἐξαπατάτω· εἴ τις δοκεῖ σοφὸς εἶναι ἐν ὑμῖν ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ, μωρὸς γενέσθω, ἵνα γένηται σοφός. 19 ἡ γὰρ σοφία τοῦ κόσμου τούτου μωρία παρὰ τῷ θεῷ ἐστίν· γέγραπται γάρ· ὁ δρασσόμενος τοὺς σοφοὺς ἐν τῇ πανουργίᾳ αὐτῶν·

10 According to the grace of God given to me, like a skilled master builder I laid a foundation, and someone else is building on it. Each builder must choose with care how to build on it. 11 For no one can lay any foundation other than the one that has been laid; that foundation is Jesus Christ. 12 Now if anyone builds on the foundation with gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, straw— 13 the work of each builder will become visible, for the Day will disclose it, because it will be revealed with fire, and the fire will test what sort of work each has done. 14 If what has been built on the foundation survives, the builder will receive a reward. 15 If the work is burned up, the builder will suffer loss; the builder will be saved, but only as through fire. 16 Do you not know that you are God's temple and that God's spirit dwells in you? 17 If anyone destroys God's temple, God will destroy that person. For God's temple is holy and you are that temple. 18 Do not deceive yourselves. If you think that you are wise in this age, you should become fools so that you may become wise. 19 For the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God.

First Corinthians was written by Paul in Ephesus sometime between 52 and 55 C.E.⁴⁴⁵ He had spent a year and a half in Corinth before moving on to Ephesus and his tribulations in Corinth were no doubt still fresh in his mind.⁴⁴⁶ It was in Corinth that Paul declared that he was leaving the Jews and committed his ministry to the Gentiles. Acts 18.6–10 records that Paul left the Corinthian synagogue and went next door to the house of Titus Justus to continue his teaching. Members of the synagogue followed him there and became the first members of the church. From this, we can assume that the church at Corinth, like the synagogue, was located in a residential quarter of the city.⁴⁴⁷

Despite the nomenclature, this is not Paul's first letter to the Corinthians.⁴⁴⁸ An earlier letter had raised questions and was now causing dissension within the church. Paul was made aware of these and other problems in reports from ὑπὸ τῶν Χλόης⁴⁴⁹ and in a letter he received from the church asking for clarification on issues of Christian practice and faith.⁴⁵⁰ To resolve these problems, Paul wrote the letter we know as 1 Corinthians. In 1 Cor. 3, Paul addresses the issue of authority within the Corinthian church. He points out that, while it was he who first brought the word of Christ to Corinth, it is the message, and not the messenger, that is important. Whether the word comes from Paul or from others, it is still the word of God. Calling the community θεοῦ οἰκοδομῇ⁴⁵¹ Paul argues that the work of each apostle builds on the work of their predecessors: Κατὰ τὴν χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν δοθεῖσάν μοι ὡς σοφὸς ἀρχιτέκτων

⁴⁴⁵ Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Paul and His Theology: A Brief Sketch*, 2nd ed. (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1989) 13; Roetzel, *The Letters of Paul: Conversations in Context* 87.

⁴⁴⁶ Roetzel, *The Letters of Paul: Conversations in Context* 87–89.

⁴⁴⁷ Richard A. Horsley, "1 Corinthians: A Case Study of Paul's Assembly as an Alternative Society," *Paul and Empire: Religion and Power in Roman Imperial Society*, ed. Richard A. Horsley (Harrisburg, PA.: Trinity Press International, 1997) 245.

⁴⁴⁸ 1 Cor. 5.9. Paul mentions an earlier letter that he wrote to the community.

⁴⁴⁹ 1 Cor. 1.11.

⁴⁵⁰ 1 Cor. 7.1.

⁴⁵¹ 1 Cor. 3.9.

θεμέλιον ἔθηκα, ἄλλος δὲ ἐποικοδομεῖ.⁴⁵² Christ is the foundation of this metaphorical construction and the ultimate source of apostolic authority. The skill of the ἀρχιτέκτων is tested by fire at the end of days and judged on the post-apocalyptic durability of their construction. Paul then asks:

16 Οὐκ οἶδατε ὅτι ναὸς θεοῦ ἐστε καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν οἰκεῖ; 17 εἴ τις τὸν ναὸν τοῦ θεοῦ φθείρει, φθερεῖ τοῦτον ὁ θεός· ὁ γὰρ ναὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ἅγιός ἐστιν, οἳτινές ἐστε ὑμεῖς. (1 Cor. 3.16–17)

Used rhetorically, the metaphor locates the presence of God in the Corinthian community. Referring to the members of the church both corporately and individually, Paul argues that because τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν οἰκεῖ⁴⁵³ the community is *de facto* the Temple of God. Considering our discussion of both Roman temples and the Jerusalem Temple in Chapter 2, Paul is asking the church, both symbolically and socially, to set themselves apart from their fellow citizens. This is made explicit in 2 Cor 6.17. Whether this assertion had overt political motives and, as Richard Horsley argues, represents Paul's intention to establish the Church as an autonomous community similar to Qumran or, to follow Wayne Meeks, is more akin to the porous boundaries of voluntary associations and *politeuma*, is a matter of debate.⁴⁵⁴ Whatever the extent of his plan, there is consensus that Paul intended to create a community that was distinct within Roman society.

The Corinthian Church was comprised of both Jews and Gentiles suggesting that

⁴⁵² 1 Cor. 3.10. On foundations for temples, see Vitruvius 3.4.1: "*Fundationes eorum operum fodiantur, si queat iuveneri, ab solido et in solidum, quantum ex amplitudine operas pro ratione videbitur, extruaturque structura totum solum quad solidissima.*"

⁴⁵³ 1 Cor 3.16.

⁴⁵⁴ Horsley, "1 Corinthians: A Case Study of Paul's Assembly as an Alternative Society," 242–252; Meeks, *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul* 169.

interpretation of the metaphor within the community drew from both sources.⁴⁵⁵ In the Jewish tradition, as we have discussed, the Temple signified God's presence as it was promised to Moses.⁴⁵⁶ The possible extension of this presence beyond Jerusalem was championed by the Pharisees at the time that Paul was writing to the Corinthians and, by extension, it is very possible that Paul brought this understanding to his formulation of Christian thought.⁴⁵⁷ Gordon Fee proposes that a Jewish interpretation was further nuanced by the eschatological role of the Temple in Jewish apocryphal literature (i.e., Isa. 28.16; Ezek. 40–48; Jub. 1.17; 1 Enoch 91.13; 4QFlor):

The Corinthians' experience of the eschatological Spirit, as indwelling the believer and present in the gathered community, is the key to the transfer of images. The spirit was how Isaiah 63 understood God to be present among his ancient people and how Paul understands God to be present among his newly constituted eschatological people.⁴⁵⁸

Pausanias makes clear that the gods were well represented in Corinth.⁴⁵⁹ The re-founding of the city by Julius Caesar and the ongoing patronage of the Principate suggest the city was very much part of the Imperial architectural project.⁴⁶⁰ For the Gentiles of the Corinthian Church, as for all Romans, the temple served as a sign of universal order. Gods, nature, and the city were maintained in a balance that was both represented by and maintained through the temples. What

⁴⁵⁵ From Acts (18.6–10), we know that some members of the church were Jewish because members of the synagogue followed Paul when he left. The participation of gentiles is suggested in the same passage and further in 1 Cor. 8 where Paul admonishes those who continue to participate in temple banquets.

⁴⁵⁶ Exod. 33:15–16, “And he said to him, “If your presence will not go, do not carry us up from here. For how shall it be known that I found favour in your sight, I and your people, unless you go with us? In this way we shall be distinct, I and your people, from every other people on the face of the earth.”

⁴⁵⁷ Renwick, *Paul, the Temple and the Presence of God* 23.

⁴⁵⁸ Gordon D. Fee, *God's Empowering Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1994) 115.

⁴⁵⁹ Pausanias, *Description of Greece*, Loeb Classical Library, ed. T.E. Page, 5 vols. (Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 1961) 2.2–5.

⁴⁶⁰ Corinth was sacked by Rome in 146 B.C.E. and completely destroyed. Julius Caesar re-founded the city in 44 B.C.E. as a colony and populated it with veterans and freed slaves. See Meeks, *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul* 47–49.

distinguished the Christian temple, as informed by the body/temple metaphor, is, that while it located its deity in a sympathetic landscape, that location was not topographical. Borrowing from the Pharisaic tradition, the presence of the Christian God was not defined by a *templum* or *τέμενος*. Christ was present in the community of Christians wherever they met.

1 CORINTHIANS 6.17–20

17 ὁ δὲ κολλώμενος τῷ κυρίῳ ἐν πνευμᾷ ἐστίν. 18 φεύγετε τὴν πορνείαν· πᾶν ἁμάρτημα ὃ ἐὰν ποιήσῃ ἄνθρωπος ἐκτὸς τοῦ σώματός ἐστιν, ὃ δὲ πορνεύων εἰς τὸ ἴδιον σῶμα ἁμαρτάνει. 19 ἢ οὐκ οἶδατε ὅτι τὸ σῶμα ὑμῶν ναὸς τοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν ἁγίου πνεύματος ἐστίν, οὗ ἔχετε ἀπὸ θεοῦ; καὶ οὐκ ἐστὲ ἑαυτῶν, 20 ἠγοράσθητε γὰρ τιμῆς· δοξάσατε δὴ τὸν θεὸν ἐν τῷ σώματι ὑμῶν.

17 But anyone united to the Lord becomes one spirit with him. 18 Shun fornication! Every sin that a person commits is outside the body; but the fornicator sins against the body itself. 19 Or do you not know that your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit within you, which you have from God, and that you are not your own? 20 For you were bought with a price; therefore glorify God in your body.

Paul's letter is intended to address errors of faith in the Corinthian Church. Specifically, in the passage cited, he is concerned about the belief that the body is absolutely corrupt and that only the spirit enjoys resurrection.⁴⁶¹ For some members of the church, actions taken by the body are irrelevant for salvation. Sins of the flesh are understood to be distinct from sins of the spirit. Rhetorically, Paul paraphrases the Corinthian position: "πᾶν ἁμάρτημα ὃ ἐὰν ποιήσῃ ἄνθρωπος ἐκτὸς τοῦ σώματός ἐστιν."⁴⁶² Paul defends the human body as part of God's creation and as vital to the resurrection:

⁴⁶¹ See Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, "The First Letter to the Corinthians," *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary*, eds. Raymond E. Brown, Joseph A. Fitzmyer and Roland E. Murphy (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1992) 804.

⁴⁶² 1 Cor. 6.18.

13 τὸ δὲ σῶμα οὐ τῇ πορνείᾳ ἀλλὰ τῷ κυρίῳ, καὶ ὁ κύριος τῷ σώματι· 14 ὁ δὲ θεὸς καὶ τὸν κύριον ἡγειρεν καὶ ἡμᾶς ἐξεγερεῖ διὰ τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ. 15 οὐκ οἶδατε ὅτι τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν μέλη Χριστοῦ ἐστίν; (1 Cor. 6.13–15)

Significant for our discussion, Paul shifts the location of Christ from the corporate body of the church (3.16) to the body of individual Christians (6.18–19). The action of the individual affects the presence of the Holy Spirit. God dwells in the whole community and in each member of the community. Like the *symmetria* between whole and part idealized in Imperial architecture, Paul identifies Christ as the perfect order that builds a community from individual Christians.

The temple metaphor in 1 Corinthians is the earliest in Christian literature and the source for all subsequent adaptations of the “church as temple” variation. The metaphor invites the Corinthian church to imagine itself as participating in time and space, as participating architecturally, in a sacred event. They can imagine this event, at least in part, because of their familiarity with the temples that gave order to their cities—Jewish, Greek and Roman. The community is united by this event, not just through ritual participation, but, like the Vitruvian ideal, as individual parts of an integrated whole.

2 CORINTHIANS 6.14–18

14 Μὴ γίνεσθε ἑτεροζυγούμενοι ἀπίστοις· τίς γὰρ μετοχὴ δικαιοσύνης καὶ ἀνομίας, ἢ τίς κοινωνία φωτὶ πρὸς σκότος; 15 τίς δὲ συμφώνησις Χριστοῦ πρὸς Βελίαρ, ἢ τίς μερὶς πιστῷ μετὰ ἀπίστου; 16 τίς δὲ συνκατάθεσις ναῶ θεοῦ μετὰ εἰδώλων; ἡμεῖς γὰρ ναὸς θεοῦ ἐσμὲν ζῶντος· καθὼς εἶπεν ὁ θεὸς ὅτι ἐνοικήσω ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐμπεριπατήσω, καὶ ἔσομαι αὐτῶν θεός, καὶ αὐτοὶ ἔσονται μοι λαός. 17 διὸ ἐξέλθατε ἐκ μέσου αὐτῶν, καὶ ἀφορίσθητε, λέγει Κύριος, καὶ ἀκαθάρτου μὴ ἄπτεσθε· κἀγὼ εἰσδέξομαι ὑμᾶς· 18 καὶ ἔσομαι ὑμῖν εἰς πατέρα, καὶ ὑμεῖς ἔσεσθέ μοι εἰς υἱοὺς καὶ θυγατέρας, λέγει Κύριος Παντοκράτωρ.

14 Do not be mismatched with unbelievers. For what partnership is there between righteousness

and lawlessness? Or what fellowship is there between light and darkness? **15** What agreement does Christ have with Beliar? Or what does a believer share with an unbeliever? **16** What agreement has the temple of God with idols? For we are the temple of the living God; as God said, "I will live in them and walk among them, and I will be their God, and they shall be my people." **17** Therefore come out from them, and be separate from them, says the Lord, and touch nothing unclean; then I will welcome you, **18** and I will be your father, and you shall be my sons and daughters, says the Lord Almighty.

The composition of 2 Corinthians is the subject of some debate. Arguments have been made that it is a:

- a) complete and legitimate work written by Paul;⁴⁶³
- b) composite work built up of writings by Paul;⁴⁶⁴
- c) composite work that includes Pauline and non-Pauline sources.⁴⁶⁵

For those holding the composite view, 2 Cor. 1–9 and 10–13 are generally read as evidence of two distinct letters. For those who read non-Pauline sources, 2 Cor. 6.14–7.1 is identified as an interpolation or redaction. The body/temple metaphor under discussion in 2 Corinthians is part of this possible interpolation.

The possibility of a non-Pauline interpolation has several sources.⁴⁶⁶ There is the question of an inconsistency with the language common in the extant letters of Paul.⁴⁶⁷ The

⁴⁶³ See Ayodeji Adewuja, *Holiness and Community in 2 Corinthians 6.14–7.1. Paul's View of Communal Holiness in the Corinthian Correspondence*, Studies in Biblical Literature, vol. 40 (New York: Peter Lang, 2001); Michael Goulder, "2 Cor 6:14–7:1 as an Integral Part of 2 Corinthians," *Novum Testamentum* 36 (1994) 47–57; James M. Scott, "The Use of Scripture in 2 Corinthians 6.16c–18 and Paul's Restoration Theology," *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 56 (1994) 73–99.

⁴⁶⁴ See M.E. Thrall, *The First and Second Letters of Paul to the Corinthians* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965); Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, "The Second Letter to the Corinthians," *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary*, eds. Raymond E. Brown, Joseph A. Fitzmyer and Roland E. Murphy (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1992) 816–817; Albert A.L. Hogeterp, "Paul and God's Temple. A Historical Interpretation of Cultic Imagery in the Corinthian Correspondence," Ph.D, University of Groningen, 2004.

⁴⁶⁵ Stephen J. Hultgren, "2 Cor 6.14–7.1 and Rev 21.3–8: Evidence for the Ephesian Redaction of 2 Corinthians," *New Testament Studies* 49 (2003) 39–56; J.R. Walker and O. William, "2 Cor. 6.14–7.1 and the Chiastic Structure of 6.11–13; 7.2–3," *New Testament Studies* 48 (2002) 142–144.

⁴⁶⁶ For a summary, see Hultgren, "2 Cor 6.14–7.1 and Rev 21.3–8: Evidence for the Ephesian Redaction of 2 Corinthians," 39–44.

⁴⁶⁷ On ἁπαξ λεγόμενα in 2 Cor. see: Walker and William, "2 Cor. 6.14–7.1 and the Chiastic Structure of 6.11–13;

affinity of language between 2 Cor. 6.14–7.1 and Qumran literature has raised the possibility that there is an Essene influence at work in this portion of the text.⁴⁶⁸ A third argument proposes that the redactors are eschatological Jewish Christians living in Ephesus and editing a collection of Paul's letters.⁴⁶⁹ All of these studies address the apparent contradiction between the inclusionary language of 1 Cor. 12.13–14 and the exclusionary proscriptions of 2 Cor. 6.14–16. In the context of our discussion, the architectural narrative of 2 Cor. 6.14–7.1 is consistent with, and builds upon, 1 Cor. 3.10–19 and 6.17–20. The consistency between 1 and 2 Cor. is assumed by Eusebius in rationalizing the church in Tyre and contributes to the development of his panegyric.⁴⁷⁰

2 Cor. 6.14–7.1 instructs Christians in their new physical and spiritual relationship to the Roman city of Corinth. Paul wants the Corinthians to understand that the Christian body and the Roman city no longer share the ontological relationship that is made explicit in Roman architectural theory. Rather, the Christian body, prefigured in the risen Christ, is a citizen of a pending, eschatological city. Paul demonstrates Karatani's "will to architecture," using architectural metaphor to construct an image of a solid and integrated cosmology. This argument, establishing clear boundaries for being Christian, resonates with the community building of 1 Corinthians, and segregates the church within the city.

Essentially, 2 Cor. confirms the message of 1 Cor. by unifying the community through images of temple and of Christ's body. In 2 Cor. 4.7–10:

7.2–3," 142–144.

⁴⁶⁸ Joseph Fitzmyer, "Pauline Theology," *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary*, eds. Raymond E. Brown, Joseph A. Fitzmyer and Roland E. Murphy (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1992); Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament* 49–56.

⁴⁶⁹ Stephen Hultgren suggests the redaction may be as late as the first half of the 90s and he identifies the authors as Jewish Christians in Ephesus. See Hultgren, "2 Cor 6.14–7.1 and Rev 21.3–8: Evidence for the Ephesian Redaction of 2 Corinthians," 54–56.

⁴⁷⁰ For example, Eusebius quotes 2 Cor. 6.16 in his panegyric on the church of Tyre. Eusebius, *The Ecclesiastical History* 10.4.56.

7 Ἔχομεν δὲ τὸν θησαυρὸν τοῦτον ἐν ὀστράκinois σκεύεσιν, ἵνα ἡ ὑπερβολὴ τῆς δυνάμεως
ῆ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ μὴ ἐξ ἡμῶν· 8 ἐν παντὶ θλιβόμενοι ἀλλ' οὐ στενοχωρούμενοι, ἀπορούμενοι
ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐξαπορούμενοι, 9 διωκόμενοι ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐγκαταλείπομεν, καταβαλλόμενοι ἀλλ'
οὐκ ἀπολλύμενοι, 10 πάντοτε τὴν νέκρωσιν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐν τῷ σώματι περιφέροντες, ἵνα
καὶ ἡ ζωὴ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐν τῷ σώματι ἡμῶν φανερωθῇ. (2 Cor. 4.7-10)

7 But we have this treasure in clay jars, so that it may be made clear that this extraordinary power
belongs to God and does not come from us. 8 We are afflicted in every way, but not crushed;
perplexed, but not driven to despair; 9 persecuted, but not forsaken, struck down but not
destroyed; 10 always carrying in the body the death of Jesus so that the life of Jesus may also be
made visible in our bodies.

This explicit link between the Christian community and the body of Christ is significant for later
exegesis in connecting the Pauline body/temple metaphor to the tenor of the Gospel variation. In
John 2.19–22, the body of Jesus is the temple. In 1 Cor. 3.11, Christ is implicitly part of the
temple because he is the foundation upon which the church is built. In 1 Cor. 6.15, the members
of the community are identified as members of Christ's body. The presence of Christ in the body
of each Christian implies a shared experience of God's presence that is facilitated by Jesus.

For Paul, the order of the Roman world is something to be endured but with images that
resonate in the imagination of his audience.

16 Διὸ οὐκ ἐγκακοῦμεν, ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ ὁ ἔξω ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος διαφθείρεται, ἀλλ' ὁ ἔσω ἡμῶν
ἀνακαινοῦται ἡμέρα καὶ ἡμέρα. 17 τὸ γὰρ παραυτίκα ἑλαφρὸν τῆς θλίψεως καθ'
ὑπερβολὴν εἰς ὑπερβολὴν αἰώνιον βάρος δόξης κατεργάζεται ἡμῖν, 18 μὴ σκοπούντων
ἡμῶν τὰ βλεπόμενα ἀλλὰ τὰ μὴ βλεπόμενα, τὰ γὰρ βλεπόμενα πρόσκαιρα, τὰ δὲ μὴ
βλεπόμενα αἰώνια. (2 Cor. 4.16–18)

The physical body is a temporary dwelling—the dwelling of a traveler, the dwelling of a soul on
its way to some other place. The body is a dwelling that is outside of the new kingdom. The

body is a dwelling in the desert.

οἶδαμεν γὰρ ὅτι ἐὰν ἡ ἐπίγειος ἡμῶν οἰκία τοῦ σκήνους καταλυθῇ, οἰκοδομὴν ἐκ θεοῦ
ἔχομεν οἰκίαν ἀχειροποίητον αἰώνιον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. (2 Cor. 5.1)

But the body is not evil; it is the home away from home.⁴⁷¹ The presence of Christ in the Christian body locates Christ in a sympathetic environment not unlike the relationship between the Roman gods and their temples. However, unlike the Roman temple, the location of that presence is not geographic but anthropographic.

In summary, Paul's letters to the Corinthian church address specific and local concerns. His choice of language reflects what he understood to be the most effective way to deal with those concerns. In choosing the body/temple metaphor to express rhetorically both the cohesiveness of the community and its distinction from the Roman world, Paul appeals to an architectural metaphor that is not only recognized by his audience but provides a valuable inter-textual link with the Gospels for the exegetes of the second and third centuries.

EPHESIANS 2:19–22

19 Ἄρα οὖν οὐκέτι ἐστέ ξένοι καὶ πάροικοι, ἀλλὰ ἐστέ συνπολίται τῶν ἁγίων καὶ οἰκεῖοι τοῦ θεοῦ, **20** ἐποικοδομηθέντες ἐπὶ τῷ θεμελίῳ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ προφητῶν, ὅντος ἀκρογωνιαίου αὐτοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, **21** ἐν ᾧ πᾶσα οἰκοδομὴ συναρμολογουμένη αὖξει εἰς ναὸν ἅγιον ἐν κυρίῳ, **22** ἐν ᾧ καὶ ὑμεῖς συνοικοδομεῖσθε εἰς κατοικητήριον τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν πνεύματι.

19 So then you are no longer strangers and aliens, but you are citizens with the saints and also members of the household of God, **20** built upon the foundations of the apostles and prophets, with Christ Jesus himself as the corner stone. **21** In him the whole structure is joined together and grows into a holy temple in the Lord; **22** in whom also you are built together spiritually into a

⁴⁷¹ 2 Cor. 5.6–10.

dwelling place for God.

The end of the first century was a time of rapid growth and radical change for Christianity. Significant Churches were established in seven of the Empire's ten largest cities by 100 C.E.⁴⁷² With Christians gathered in houses and in synagogues, the cities of Rome, Alexandria, Ephesus, Antioch, Pergamum, Sardis, Corinth, Smyrna, Caesarea Maritima, Damascus, Salamis, and Athens were all a part of the new, universal, "holy temple in the Lord." While the majority of Christians at this time were probably coming to the church through Judaism, the number of "Gentile" Christians was also increasing. The impact of this shift can be read in the changing tone from the Pauline to the Deutero-Pauline letters. While Paul argued for the equality of Gentile and Jew in the church (e.g., Rom. 3), the author of Ephesians seems to be urging Gentiles to be tolerant of Jewish Christians.⁴⁷³ This would suggest that, if not in the majority, the intended audience for the Letter to the Ephesians had, at the very least, a significant minority of non-Jewish Christians.

Opinion on the authorship and provenance of Ephesians remains divided between "traditionalists," who maintain that Paul composed the letter, and a growing number of scholars who argue in favour of a Deutero-Pauline composition. F.F. Bruce names Paul as author and dates the composition of the text to around 60 C.E. during the Apostle's imprisonment in Rome.⁴⁷⁴ Following Henry Chadwick and others, Bruce acknowledges formal and theological differences between Ephesians and the accepted Letters of Paul but does not believe that the evidence substantiates a challenge to the "traditional" position of Paul's authorship.

⁴⁷² Stark, *The Rise of Christianity* 134.

⁴⁷³ Roetzel, *The Letters of Paul: Conversations in Context* 143.

⁴⁷⁴ F.F. Bruce, *The Epistles to the Colossians, to Philemon, and to the Ephesians*, The New International Commentary on the New Testament, ed. F.F. Bruce (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1984) 240–44.

In a more recent commentary supporting the Deutero-Pauline position, Margaret MacDonald finds the comprehensive treatment of Pauline Christianity in Ephesians to be suggestive of an author who was able to reference a collection of Pauline writings. In particular, MacDonald points to the apparent inter-textual relationship between Colossians (understood to be the earliest Deutero-Pauline text) and Ephesians. Logically, if Ephesians refers to Colossians, then it follows that Ephesians must have been written after Colossians. Deutero-Pauline authorship dates the composition of the letter to between 80–90 C.E. MacDonald speculates that “the traditional association of the document with Ephesus, the connection to Colossians, and the general ethos of the document suggest that we should look toward Asia Minor as providing a setting for the epistle’s composition.”⁴⁷⁵ Furthermore, the author of the letter, if Deutero-Pauline, would be a Jewish born Christian.⁴⁷⁶

While authorship and provenance of Ephesians remain contentious, most commentators agree that the letter was not originally addressed to the church at Ephesus. Rather, the letter was written for a group or groups in Asia Minor that had never met Paul. The letter may have been composed for the church in Laodiceia or composed as an encyclical for the churches of the Lycus Valley.⁴⁷⁷ Most significantly, for the hypothesis put forward in this dissertation, commentators agree that the intended audience was Gentile Christians.⁴⁷⁸

Based on these arguments for authorship, provenance, and audience of Ephesians as summarized above, we can agree on the following conclusions:

1. the author of the letter is a “Jewish” Christian (whether it was Paul or

⁴⁷⁵ M.Y. MacDonald, *The Pauline Churches: A Socio-historical Study of Institutionalization in the Pauline and Deutero-Pauline Writings* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988) 18.

⁴⁷⁶ MacDonald, *The Pauline Churches: A Socio-historical Study of Institutionalization in the Pauline and Deutero-Pauline Writings* 17.

⁴⁷⁷ Bruce, *The Epistles to the Colossians, to Philemon, and to the Ephesians* 230.

⁴⁷⁸ Bruce, *The Epistles to the Colossians, to Philemon, and to the Ephesians* 230; MacDonald, *The Pauline Churches: A Socio-historical Study of Institutionalization in the Pauline and Deutero-Pauline Writings* 19; Roetzel, *The Letters of Paul: Conversations in Context* 143.

“unknown).”

2. the letter is written in the latter half of the first century C.E.
3. the geographical context of the letter is Asia Minor.
4. the intended audience is Gentile Christians.

Further, from our reading, the author of Ephesians understands the literary and rhetorical functions of metaphor in developing an argument and exhibits a facility in their use. It is implicit that the intended audience also accepted metaphor as an acceptable means of communication.

Ephesians builds upon the unification/segregation of the community that was established in 1 and 2 Corinthians and toward a more explicit relationship between the body Christians and the body of Christ put forward in 1 Peter. The members of the church share the commonwealth and fraternity of citizenship. Those who were “strangers and aliens” in the Roman city are now part of a Christian community with the martyrs (2.19). Christians are “members of Christ’s household”—a household built on the “foundation of the apostles” (see 1 Cor. 3.10) and the prophets (see 2 Cor. 16c–18). Unlike 1 Cor. 3.11, Christ is not the foundation, but the cornerstone of this construction. This use of language parallels 1 Peter 2.6 discussed below. Further, Christ is the order that brings all parts of the edifice (all members of the church) into a unified whole and, through that unity, a dwelling place for God is created.

1 PETER 2.4–9

4 πρὸς ὃν προσερχόμενοι, λίθον ζῶντα, ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπων μὲν ἀποδοκιμασμένον παρὰ δὲ θεῷ ἐκλεκτὸν ἔντιμον, 5 καὶ αὐτοὶ ὡς λίθοι ζῶντες οἰκοδομεῖσθε οἶκος πνευματικὸς εἰς ἱεράτευμα ἅγιον, ἀνενέγκαι πνευματικὰς θυσίας εὐπροσδέκτους θεῷ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ· 6 διότι περιέχει ἐν γραφῇ· ἰδοὺ τίθημι ἐν Σιών λίθον ἐκλεκτὸν ἀκρογωνιαίον ἔντιμον, καὶ ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ’ αὐτῷ οὐ μὴ κατασυνθῇ. 7 ὑμῖν οὖν ἡ τιμὴ τοῖς πιστεύουσιν· ἀπιστοῦσιν δὲ λίθος ὃν ἀπεδοκίμασαν οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες οὗτος ἐγενήθη εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνίας· 8 καὶ λίθος προσκόμματος καὶ πέτρα σκανδάλου· οἱ προσκόπτουσιν τῷ λόγῳ ἀπειθοῦντες·

4 Come to him, a living stone, though rejected by mortals yet chosen and precious in God's sight, and 5 like living stones, let yourself be built into a spiritual house, to be a holy priesthood, to offer spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ. 6 For it stands in scripture: "See, I am laying in Zion a stone, a cornerstone chosen and precious; and whoever believes in him will not be put to shame." 7 To you then who believe, he is precious; but for those who do not believe, "The stone that the builders rejected has become the very head of the corner," 8 and "a stone that makes them stumble, and a rock that makes them fall".

Accepted by Eusebius as the authentic word of the disciple,⁴⁷⁹ it is now generally understood that 1 Peter is pseudonymous.⁴⁸⁰ What remains contentious is:

1. the influence of the Pauline tradition on the writing of 1 Peter.
2. the existence of a Petrine school.⁴⁸¹
3. why, if Peter did not write the letter, was his name attached to it?

On the first point, David Horrell reads Paul's influence on 1 Peter in the epistolary frame of the letter, shared terminology, shared phraseology, and shared church practice.⁴⁸² These similarities have led some commentators to attribute 1 Peter to the Deutero-Pauline tradition.⁴⁸³

On the other hand, distinctive qualities of 1 Peter are interpreted by some readers as proof for an unique tradition. Arguing for this independent school, J. H. Elliott, while acknowledging problems,⁴⁸⁴ writes that 1 Peter is "...authentically Petrine in the sense that it expresses the

⁴⁷⁹ Eusebius, *The Ecclesiastical History* 3.3.1.

⁴⁸⁰ David G. Horrell, "The Product of a Petrine Circle? The Reassessment of the Origin and Character of 1 Peter," *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 86 (2002) 29–60; A.R.C. Leaney, *The Letters of Peter and Jude. A Commentary on the First Letter of Peter, a Letter of Jude and the Second Letter of Peter*, The Cambridge Bible Commentary, eds. P.R. Ackroyd, A.R.C. Leaney and J.W. Packer (London: Cambridge University Press, 1967). 12; See also William J. Dalton, "The First Epistle of Peter," *New Jerome Biblical Commentary*, eds. Raymond E. Brown, Joseph A. Fitzmyer and Roland E. Murphy (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1992) 903 who argues that the letter was written prior to Peter's death, i.e., 65 C.E. implying that it could have been dictated by him.

⁴⁸¹ J.H. Elliott, *1 Peter: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (New York: Doubleday, 2000) 127–130.

⁴⁸² Horrell, "The Product of a Petrine Circle? The Reassessment of the Origin and Character of 1 Peter," 33–36.

⁴⁸³ F.W. Beare, *The First Epistle of Peter* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1970) 44–45.

⁴⁸⁴ See also Leaney, *The Letters of Peter and Jude. A Commentary on the First Letter of Peter, a Letter of Jude and the Second Letter of Peter* 7–12.

thoughts, the theology, and the concerns of the apostle Peter as shared, preserved and developed by the group with which he was most closely associated.”⁴⁸⁵ Further, Marion Soards promotes 2 Peter and Jude as additional examples of a distinct Petrine corpus.⁴⁸⁶

Finally, as an alternative to an exclusively Pauline or Petrine origin, Horrell proposes that 1 Peter represents a synthesis of Jewish-Christian and Pauline ideas by the church in Rome.⁴⁸⁷ Peter is identified as the author to bring a voice of authority to the letter, an authority drawn from Peter’s prominence in the early Jerusalem church and his historical association with Rome. Considering the consistency between 1 Pet., 1 and 2 Cor. and Eph. in the use of the body/temple metaphor, we include it in our discussion of the Pauline tradition.

First Peter parallels the letters to the Corinthians and Ephesians in identifying the gathering of the community as the site of Christ’s dwelling (1 Pet. 2.5//1 Cor. 16–17//2 Cor. 6.16b//Eph. 2.22). First Peter also shares with 1 Cor. 3.10//Rom. 9.33 the reference to Isa. 28.16 identifying Christ as the foundation of the church. This reference, further elaborating Christ as the cornerstone—the first and most significant element of a foundation—is also found in Eph. 2.20.⁴⁸⁸ As Christ is the cornerstone, 1 Peter identifies each Christian as a stone. These stones join together, when they gather as members of the church, and constitute a dwelling place for God. Unique to 1 Peter, in the Pauline context, is the identification of this dwelling place as an οἶκος πνευματικός rather than a ναὸς θεοῦ.⁴⁸⁹

⁴⁸⁵ J.H. Elliott, "Peter, Silvanus and Mark in 1 Peter and Acts: Sociological-Exegetical Perspective on a Petrine Group in Rome," *Wort in der Zeit: Neutestamentliche Studien. Festgabe für Karl Heinrich Rengstorff zum 75. Geburtstag*, ed. W. Haubeck and M. Bachmann (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1980) cited in Horrell, "The Product of a Petrine Circle? The Reassessment of the Origin and Character of 1 Peter," 31.

⁴⁸⁶ M.L. Soards, "1 Peter, 2 Peter and Jude as Evidence for a Petrine School," *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II.25.5 (1988) 3827–3849 cited in Horrell, "The Product of a Petrine Circle? The Reassessment of the Origin and Character of 1 Peter," 32.

⁴⁸⁷ Horrell, "The Product of a Petrine Circle? The Reassessment of the Origin and Character of 1 Peter," 50–53.

⁴⁸⁸ Also referenced in the Parable of the Wicked Tenants in Mark 12.10–11.

⁴⁸⁹ The shared signification of ‘house’ and ‘temple’ is also found in the Qumran literature, i.e., 1QS v.5. See Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament* 25.

Troy Martin has linked οἶκος πνευματικός to a metaphoric cluster that identifies the Christian community as the “elect household of God.”⁴⁹⁰ The cluster is comprised of 5 metaphors that Martin summarizes as: 1.14–16 “obedient children”; 1.17–21 “under a new *pater potestas*”; 1.22–25 “children in a new brotherhood”; 2.1–3 “new-born babies”; 2:4–10 “living stones forming a new temple.” All of the metaphors resonate with the sense of cultural distinction generally held by Diaspora Jews, as well the qualities of a successful household within the Empire. To focus the meaning of the cluster, Martin identifies οἶκος as a Greek word that evokes household, house, and temple. In concluding his discussion on the metaphoric structure of 1.14–1.10, the author writes:

By using the concept of the οἶκος in the first section of the body-middle, the author has attempted to accomplish his twin objectives of explicating conduct befitting his readers on their journey and of encouraging them to continue their journey and not to defect. He has described his readers as belonging to a new family, the family of God.⁴⁹¹

THE FUNCTION OF THE BODY/TEMPLE METAPHOR IN THE EPISTLES

Paul spends very little time describing the places where Christians meet. The uncontested letters refer to specific locations only three times and two of these references appear to identify the same house.⁴⁹² This would suggest that these places had little or no symbolic value for the churches of the mid-first century. His use of architectural metaphor, on the other hand, is more pronounced. Paul’s use of the body/temple vehicle demonstrates a “will to architecture” that appropriates the cultural authority of temple architecture without assuming the

⁴⁹⁰ Troy W. Martin, *Metaphor and Composition in 1 Peter*, SBL Dissertation Series, ed. Pheme Perkins, vol. 131 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992) 161–188. For a succinct diagram of the structure of the cluster, see 187.

⁴⁹¹ Martin, *Metaphor and Composition in 1 Peter* 187–188.

⁴⁹² Rom. 16.3–5; 1 Cor. 16.19; Phil. 1–2.

imperial connotations of temple buildings.⁴⁹³ The metaphor invokes *ordo*, *symmetria*, and *traditio* to unify the community. At the same time, the vehicle sets Christians apart from imperial society by drawing on the cosmological distancing traditionally associated with *templum* (τέμενος).

Bertil Gärtner argues that this shift from a physical to metaphysical temple found in the Pauline letters has parallels in the Qumran literature.⁴⁹⁴

The temple symbolism of Qumran and the New Testament was thus based on three factors: criticism of the Jerusalem temple and its sacrifices; a belief that the last days had begun; and the belief on the part of both groups that God had come to dwell with them.⁴⁹⁵

On this last point, Gärtner is unable to find any other Jewish sect that shares this idea of God's dwelling within the community. He argues that these similarities demonstrate a shared tradition between the Qumran community and the early church that diverges with changes in context and varied external influences.⁴⁹⁶ For Qumran, this results in a "spiritualized" temple that temporarily locates God in the community until the new temple can be realized. For the early church, on the other hand, the temple is ultimately relocated in the body of Christ. Gärtner acknowledges that the Pauline sources distinguish themselves from Qumran in the connection of images of body, temple, and Christ. He identifies 1 Cor. 6.15–19 as the source of this association.⁴⁹⁷ Further, Gärtner argues the temple and body symbolism of the Pauline letters is of

⁴⁹³ Karatani, *Architecture as Metaphor* 5 "Western thought is marked by a will to architecture that is reiterated and renewed at times of crisis."

⁴⁹⁴ Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament* 26 identifies 1QS 5.5ff; 1QS 8.4ff; 1QS 9.3ff.

⁴⁹⁵ Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament* 100.

⁴⁹⁶ Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament* 101.

⁴⁹⁷ Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament* 140–42.

Palestinian rather than Hellenistic origin.⁴⁹⁸ Based on our discussion of the relationship between the symbolic body and architectural order, the Roman presence in Palestine and Judea, and the mechanics of architectural metaphor, I would argue that the success of the temple and body association is better understood as a synthesis of the two traditions.

Within the Jewish tradition, following David Renwick, the most distinguishing characteristic of the first century Pharisees is an approach to the Law “...leading them to maintain within the walls of their own homes, beyond the temple walls, the purity appropriate to the temple.”⁴⁹⁹ Renwick acknowledges that while the extension of this logic is the dissolution of the temple, this was not the Pharisees’ objective.⁵⁰⁰ Rather, the properly maintained function of the Temple illustrates the purity necessary for God’s dwelling. The order of the Temple, like the Torah, is given by God to teach and to assure Israel. The *locus* of the Temple remains important, but more as a model for a properly ordered world than the single point of God’s earthly presence. The Temple is no longer the awesome, bloody, and monumental “dwelling place of the Lord,” but the cool, abstract, and rational sign of God’s presence. The ontological dimension of the building, the architecture of the Temple, lies in the power of the underlying order and not in the physical stones.

For the Greeks and Romans of the first century, and for Hellenized Jews, the relationship between temple buildings and the human body was apparently well-established. As discussed in Chapter 2, Vitruvius records two Greek traditions that link the body, through number, to temple architecture. In the first, the body is understood as a perfect creation of nature and as the *de facto* measure of beauty. As such, the body carries with it a series of proportional relationships (*analogia*) that are revealed by geometry. Each part of the body has a proportional relationship

⁴⁹⁸ Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament* 142.

⁴⁹⁹ Renwick, *Paul, the Temple and the Presence of God* 21.

⁵⁰⁰ Renwick, *Paul, the Temple and the Presence of God* 22–23.

to the whole. For example, the head is a tenth of the body's height and the foot a sixth.

Reliqua quoque membra suas habent commensus proportiones, quibus etiam antiqui pictores et statuarii nobiles usi magnas et infinitas laudes sunt adsecuti. Similiter vero sacrarum aedium membra ad universam totius magnitudinis summam ex partibus singulis convenientissimum debent habere commensus responsum. (Vitruvius 3.1.2–3)

The other limbs also have their own proportionate measurements. And by using these, ancient painters and famous sculptors have attained great and unbounded distinction. In like fashion the members of temples ought to have dimensions of their several parts answering suitably to the general sum of their whole magnitude.⁵⁰¹

Just as the parts of the body have a proportional relationship to the body as a whole, the body as a whole demonstrates a set of fixed geometrical relationships.

Namque si homo conlocatus fuerit supinus minibus et pedibus pansis circinque conlocatum centrum in umbilico eius, circummagendo rotundationem utrarumque manuum et pedum digiti linea tangentur. Non minus quemadmodum schema rotundationis in corpore efficitur, item quadrata designatio in eo invenietur. Nam si a pedibus imis ad summum caput mensum erit eaque mensura relata fuerit ad manus pansas, modum areae quae ad normam sunt quemadmodum areae quae ad normam sunt quadratae. (Vitruvius 3.1.3)

For if a man lies on his back with his hands and feet outspread, and the centre of a circle is placed at his navel, his fingers and toes will be touched by the circumference. Also, a square will be found described within the figure, in the same way as a round figure is produced. For if we measure from the sole of the foot to the top of the head, and apply the measure to the outstretched hands, the breadth will be found equal to the height, just like sites that are squared by the rule.

To summarize this first theory of body/temple relationships in the Greek aesthetic tradition:

Ergo si convenit ex articulis hominis numerum inventum esse et ex membris separatis ad

⁵⁰¹ English translations of the following passages are from: Vitruvius. *De Architectura*. Trans. F. Granger. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge MA.: Harvard University Press, 1983.

universam corporis speciem ratae partis commensus fieri responsum, relinquitur, ut suscipiamus eos, qui etiam aedes deorum immortalium constituentes ita membra operum ordinauerunt, ut proportionibus et symmetriis separatae atque universae convenientesque efficerentur eorum distributions. (Vitruvius 3.1.9)

Therefore, if it is agreed that number is found from the articulation of the body, and that there is a correspondence of the fixed ratio of the separate members to the general form of the body, it remains that we take up those writers who in planning the temples of the immortal gods so ordained the parts of the work that, by the help of proportion and symmetry, their several and general distribution is rendered congruous.

This idea of the body bears a striking resemblance to Paul's description of the church in 1 Cor.

12.12–13 as a body made up of many parts:

12 Καθάπερ γὰρ τὸ σῶμα ἓν ἐστὶν καὶ μέλη πολλὰ ἔχει, πάντα δὲ τὰ μέλη τοῦ σώματος πολλὰ ὄντα ἓν ἐστὶν σῶμα, οὕτως καὶ ὁ χριστός· **13** καὶ γὰρ ἐν ἑνὶ πνεύματι ἡμεῖς πάντες εἰς ἓν σῶμα ἐβαπτίσθημεν, εἴτε Ἰουδαῖοι εἴτε Ἕλληνες, εἴτε δούλοι εἴτε ἐλεύθεροι, καὶ πάντες ἐν πνεύμα ἐποτίσθημεν. (1 Cor. 12.12–13)

For just as the body is one and has many members, and all the members of the body, though many, are one body, so it is with Christ. For in the one spirit we were all baptized into one body—Jews, Greeks, slaves or free— we were all made to drink with one spirit.

The general form of the Christian body, the governing order, is directed by God through Christ.

In 1 Cor. 12.24–27:

24 τὰ δὲ εὐσχήμονα ἡμῶν οὐ χρεῖαν ἔχει. ἀλλὰ ὁ θεὸς συνεκέρασεν τὸ σῶμα, τῷ ὑστερουμένῳ περισσοτέραν δοῦς τιμὴν, **25** ἵνα μὴ ἡ σχίσμα ἐν τῷ σώματι, ἀλλὰ τὸ αὐτὸ ὑπὲρ ἀλλήλων μεριμνῶσι τὰ μέλη. **26** καὶ εἴτε πάσχει ἓν μέλος, συμπάσχει πάντα τὰ μέλη· εἴτε δοξάζεται μέλος, συγχαίρει πάντα τὰ μέλη. **27** ὑμεῖς δέ ἐστε σῶμα Χριστοῦ καὶ μέλη ἐκ μέρους.

24 But God has so arranged the body, giving the greater honour to the inferior member, **25** that there may be no dissension within the body, but the members may have the same care for one another. **26** If one member suffers, all suffer together with it; if one member is honoured, all rejoice together with it. **27** Now you are the body of Christ and individually members of it.

The author of Ephesians confirms the nature of the Christian body:

4 ἓν σῶμα καὶ ἓν πνεῦμα, καθὼς καὶ ἐκλήθητε ἐν μιᾷ ἐλπίδι τῆς κλήσεως ὑμῶν· **5** εἷς κύριος, μία πίστις, ἓν βάπτισμα· **6** εἷς θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ πάντων, ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων καὶ διὰ πάντων καὶ ἐν πάσιν. **7** Ἐνὶ δὲ ἐκάστῳ ἡμῶν ἐδόθη ἡ χάρις κατὰ τὸ μέτρον τῆς δωρεᾶς τοῦ Χριστοῦ. (Eph. 4.4–7)

4 There is one body and one Spirit, just as you were called to the one hope of your calling, **5** one Lord, one faith, one baptism, **6** one God and Father of all, who is above all and through all and in all. **7** But each of us was given grace according to the measure of Christ's gift.

The classical body, as the measure of beauty, is transformed in the Pauline context, but not erased. The ideal body is not the Greek hero of myth but Christ crucified and resurrected. By extension, the imitation of Christ, through membership in the Church, allows individual Christians to participate in the divine order revealed by God and to participate in the beauty, the perfect order that is the body of Christ, now extant in the community of the Church.

Vitruvius identifies a second Greek tradition of body/temple relationships that draws on the more abstract mathematics of Plato and Pythagoras:

Nec minus mensurarum rationes, quae in omnibus operibus videntur necessariae esse, ex corporis membris collegerunt, uti digitum, palmum, pedem, cubitum, et eas distribuerunt in perfectum numerum, quem Graeci teleon dicunt. Perfectum autem antiqui instituerunt numerum qui decem dicitur; namque ex minibus digitorum numerum; ab palmo pes est ab natura decem sunt perfecti, etiam Platoni placuit esse eum numerum ea re perfectum, quod ex singularibus rebus quae monades apud Graecos dicuntur, perficitur decusis. (Vitruvius, 3.1.5)

Moreover, they collected from the members of the human body the proportionate dimensions which appear necessary in all building operations; the finger or the inch, the palm, the foot, the cubit. And these they grouped into the perfect number which the Greeks call *teleon*. Now the ancients determined as perfect the number which is called ten. For from the hand they took the number of the inches; from the palm, the foot was discovered. Now while in the two palms with their fingers, ten inches are naturally complete, Plato considered that number perfect, for the reason that from the individual things which are called *monads* among the Greeks, the decade is perfected.

In the *Republic*, Plato records a mystical relationship, derived from Pythagoras, between number and human conception.⁵⁰² The perfect human body is prefigured by the ideal cosmological relationship—a relationship that is regulated by number. The perfect number, as calculated by the Pythagoreans, is 10.⁵⁰³ Proof of the legitimacy of the number 10 is found in the natural divisions of the body—like toes and fingers. However, Vitruvius points out that there are discrepancies in the ancient sources. Not only is the number 10 recognized for its obvious relationships to the human body, so is the number 6.

Mathematici vero contra disputantes ea re perfectum dixerunt esse numerum qui sex dicitur, quod is numerus habet partitiones eorum rationibus sex numero convenientes sic: (Vitruvius 3.1.6)

But mathematicians disputing on the other side have said that the number six is perfect for the reasons that this number has divisions which agree by their proportions with the number six...

As it relates to the body, the number 6 establishes the proportional relationship of the foot to the height of a person (6:1). The number is also used by the Greeks in the surveying of cities where 6 palms = 1 cubit. Even Greek currency, the *drachma*, works on a base of 6.⁵⁰⁴ Finally the

⁵⁰² Plato, *The Republic*, trans. Paul Shorey, Loeb Classical Library, ed. T.E. Page, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1963) 8.546.

⁵⁰³ Vitruvius, *De Architectura* (see translator's note #1, 162–163).

⁵⁰⁴ Vitruvius, *De Architectura* 3.1.7.

ancients were forced to agree that both the numbers 10 and 6 are perfect and that, together, they make the most perfect number of 16.⁵⁰⁵ In concluding, Vitruvius writes:

Ergo si convenit ex articulis hominis numerum inventum esse et ex membris separatis ad universam corporis speciem ratae partes commensus fieri responsum, relinquiter, ut suscipiamus eos, qui etiam aedes deorum immortalium constituents ita membra operum ordinaverunt, ut proportionibus et symmetris separatae atque universae convenientesque efficerentur eorum distributions. (Vitruvius 3.1.9)

Therefore, if it is agreed that number is found from the articulation of the body, and that there is a correspondence of the fixed ratio of the separate members to the general form of the body, it remains that we take up those writers who in planning the temples of the immortal gods so ordained the parts of the work that, by the help of proportion and symmetry, their several and general distribution is rendered congruous.

Imperial Architecture is characterized by the hierarchical arrangement of clearly articulated parts. No where is this more evident than in the construction of temples following the pattern established by the human body.

To summarize, the function of the body/temple metaphor in the Epistles is rhetorical and it is used to convey two aspects of Christian identity. In 1 Corinthians and 1 Peter, the metaphor helps the community to understand how they are united despite their apparent differences. Like the different architectural pieces that are brought together in an orderly way to create a temple building, individual Christians are united as one body to form the temple where “God’s spirit” dwells.⁵⁰⁶ In Ephesians 2.19–20, the underlying pattern that gives form to this temple is Christ. The first function of the metaphor, then, is concerned with building a cohesive Christian community in the image of Christ. The second function of the body/temple metaphor in the

⁵⁰⁵ Vitruvius, *De Architectura* 3.1.8.

⁵⁰⁶ 1 Cor. 12.24–27.

Epistles is to create some sense of separation of the Christian community from society at large. In 2 Corinthians, Paul tells the community to set themselves apart from “unbelievers” because they are the “temple of the living God.” As a temple in the Imperial context, the Christian community must be arranged following a perfect model and be ritually set aside. For the Jews and some Roman cults, this was a matter of ritual purity.⁵⁰⁷ Like the Jerusalem Temple and the temples of Greek and Roman divinities, the Christian ναός is set apart from the pattern of everyday life. Conceptually, it is a *templum* (τέμενος) ritually established for the divinity. Practically, however, it is contrary to the *templum* because it is not defined by geographical or astronomical boundaries. The function of the Pauline body/temple metaphor lies first in uniting the community and second in establishing a distinct identity for that community within the greater cultural milieu. This twofold function is consistent with the use of metaphor in classical rhetoric to convey a new idea.

4.2.2 THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS AND JOHN

The body/temple in the synoptic tradition and in the Gospel of John draws on the body of Christ and the Jerusalem temple as a metaphorical vehicle. The most immediate tenor of the trope is that the divine presence of God and the authority of the Temple have been transferred to the person of Jesus. This relationship remains implicit in the Synoptics. In both Mark and Matthew, Jesus predicts the destruction of the Temple and a rebuilding of the edifice in three days. Based on this (presumably) metaphorical utterance, he is charged by Temple authorities with sedition. Only in the Gospel of John is there an explicit reference that identifies Christ’s body as the Temple.

⁵⁰⁷ See Renwick, *Paul, the Temple and the Presence of God* ; Rykwert, *The Idea of a Town* 93–95.

MARK 13.1–2; 14.58

1 Καὶ ἐκπορευομένου αὐτοῦ ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ λέγει αὐτῷ εἰς τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ διδάσκαλε, ἴδε ποταποὶ λίθοι καὶ ποταπαὶ οἰκοδομαί. 2 καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Βλέπεις ταύτας τὰς μεγάλας οἰκοδομάς; οὐ μὴ ἀφεθῇ λίθος ἐπὶ λίθον ὃς οὐ μὴ καταλυθῇ.

1 As he came out of the Temple, one of his disciples said to him: “Look, Teacher, what large stones and what large buildings!” 2 Then Jesus asked him, “Do you see these great buildings? Not one stone will be left here upon another; all will be thrown down.”

58 ὅτι ἡμεῖς ἠκούσαμεν αὐτοῦ λέγοντος ὅτι ἐγὼ καταλύσω τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον τὸν χειροποίητον καὶ διὰ τριῶν ἡμερῶν ἄλλον ἀχειροποίητον οἰκοδομήσω.

58 We heard him say, ‘I will destroy this temple that is made with hands, and in three days will build another, not made with hands.’

According to Eusebius, during the reign of Claudius, the church in Rome begged Mark to make a written record of the words that Peter had spoken to them. Peter found out about the text and gave it his blessing. Eusebius cites Papias and Clement of Alexandria as the source for his account.⁵⁰⁸ Origen is also said to have confirmed Mark’s relationship to Peter.⁵⁰⁹ For these early commentators, the authority and providence of the Gospel of Mark was apparently unquestioned. Significantly, in tracing the architectural tenor of the body/temple metaphor, Eusebius identifies Mark as the first of the apostles to go to Egypt and as the founder of churches in Alexandria.⁵¹⁰

The narrative of Mark follows a linear path between two geographically based episodes, the first in Galilee (1.16–9.49) and the second in Jerusalem (11.1–16.9). Mark 10.1–52 records

⁵⁰⁸ Eusebius, *The Ecclesiastical History* 2.15; 3.39.15.

⁵⁰⁹ Eusebius, *The Ecclesiastical History* 6.24.5.

⁵¹⁰ Eusebius, *The Ecclesiastical History* 2.16.1; 2.24

the journey between. Mark portrays the countryside around Galilee as sympathetic to the teaching of Jesus. This is in marked contrast to the betrayal, torture, and crucifixion of Jesus in the city.⁵¹¹ The body/temple metaphor is developed in the context of a Jerusalem under Imperial influence and ongoing temple construction initiated by Herod. The disciples, like country bumpkins, marvel at the majesty of Herod's temple in Mark 13.1. In Mark 13.2, Jesus, scorning the city, undermines the authority of the temple by announcing that they will be destroyed. Although his claim to rebuild the temple in three days, without the corruption of human hands, is not recorded in 13.2, this is one of the two charges brought against Jesus by the authorities in Mark 14.58.

The body/temple metaphor in Mark is fully functional only when read in parallel with Matthew and, in particular for our argument, with John 2.19–22. No where in Mark do we read explicitly that Christ's body is the Temple. However, if we read Mark and John inter-textually, it appears that they are referencing the same events.

Mark provides us with a first look at the more general function of metaphor in the Gospels. In Mark 4.11–12,⁵¹² following the Parable of the Sower, Jesus is asked by the twelve why he speaks in parables. Jesus responds:

11 καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς· Ὑμῖν τὸ μυστήριον δέδοται τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ· ἐκείνοις δὲ τοῖς ἔξω ἐν παραβολαῖς τὰ πάντα γίνεται, 12 ἵνα βλέποντες βλέπωσι καὶ μὴ ἴδωσιν, καὶ ἀκούοντες ἀκούωσι καὶ μὴ συνίωσιν, μή ποτε ἐπιστρέψωσιν καὶ ἀφεθῇ αὐτοῖς.

11 To you has been given the secret of the kingdom of God, but for those outside, everything comes in parables; 12 in order that they may look, but not perceive, and may indeed listen, but not understand; so that they may not turn again and be forgiven.

⁵¹¹ see Appendix 3.

⁵¹² Paralleled in Matthew 13.10–15 and Luke 8.9–10.

⁵¹³ Mark 4.10–13

Parables [παραβολαί] reveal a hidden truth to those who know how to interpret metaphoric language and, simultaneously, they conceal that truth from those who are outside of the community. In 4.13, Jesus asks: “καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς οὐκ οἶδατε τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην, καὶ πῶς πάσας τὰς παραβολὰς γνώσεσθε;” What follows is a careful explication of the parable of the sower (4.13–20).⁵¹⁴ In this passage, Jesus teaches a select few how to interpret, line by line, the language of παραβολή. The lesson is complemented with 3 new parables (4.21–32). At the end of the lesson, the narrator states:

33 Καὶ τοιαύταις παραβολαῖς πολλαῖς ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς τὸν λόγον, καθὼς ἠδύναντο ἀκούειν· 34 χωρὶς δὲ παραβολῆς οὐκ ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς, κατ’ ἰδίαν δὲ τοῖς ἰδίοις μαθηταῖς ἐπέλυεν πάντα. (Mark 4.33–34)

33 With many such parables he spoke the word to them as they were able to hear it; 34 he did not speak to them except in parables, but he explained everything in private to his disciples.

David Brakke refers to this type of explicit instruction, reserved typically in the Gospels for those closest to Jesus, as παρρησία or “plain speech.”⁵¹⁵ In Mark 8.31–33, Peter, apparently fearing reprisal from the temple authorities, rebukes Jesus for speaking too openly (παρρησία τὸν λόγον ἐλάλει) about his imminent death and resurrection. Jesus silences Peter and calls out to the crowd that had gathered around the disciples. Returning to metaphoric language in 8.34, he asks all present to take up their cross (ἄράτω τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ) and to follow him. The alternating use of παρρησία and παραβολή continues with Jesus returning to plain speech in 9.30–32 and 10.32–34 to describe what was about to happen to him in Jerusalem.

⁵¹⁴ Paralleled Matthew 13.18–23; Luke 8.11–15.

⁵¹⁵ David Brakke, “Parables and Plain Speech in the Fourth Gospel and the Apocryphon of James,” *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 7.2 (1999) 187–218.

The Gospel of Mark legitimizes metaphor as tool for both protecting and teaching the mysteries of Christianity. But not all Christians are equipped with the same tools for interpreting the λόγος. The disciples receive specific instruction that distinguishes them from the rest of the community and establishes their authority over the meaning of Christian metaphor.

MATTHEW 24.1–2; 26.60–61

1 Καὶ ἐξελθὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱεροῦ ἐπορεύετο, καὶ προσῆλθον οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἐπιδείξαι αὐτῷ τὰς οἰκοδομὰς τοῦ ἱεροῦ· 2 ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Οὐ βλέπετε ταῦτα πάντα; ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ ἀφεθῇ ὧδε λίθος ἐπὶ λίθον ὃς οὐ καταλυθήσεται.

1 As Jesus came out of the Temple and was going away, his disciples came to point out to him the buildings of the Temple. 2 Then he asked them, “You see all these do you not? Truly I tell you, not one stone will be left here upon another. All will be thrown down.”

60 ὕστερον δὲ προσελθόντες δύο 61 εἶπαν· οὗτος ἔφη· δύναμαι καταλῦσαι τὸν ναὸν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ διὰ τριῶν ἡμερῶν οἰκοδομῆσαι.

60 At last two came forward 61 and said, “This fellow said, ‘I am able to destroy the temple of God and rebuild it in three days.’ ”

According to Eusebius, the apostle Matthew wrote this gospel at the request of his Hebrew-speaking congregation before he left them to evangelize “other peoples.”⁵¹⁶ Concerned with forgetting or distorting Matthew’s teaching, the community asked for a written account of his words. Papias, Irenaeus, Pantaeus, and Jerome all confirm that the text was originally composed in Hebrew.⁵¹⁷ Further, Eusebius records that Origen identified Matthew as the first

⁵¹⁶ Eusebius, “The Church History of Eusebius,” 3.24.6–7.

⁵¹⁷ See footnote 5, Eusebius, “The Church History of Eusebius,” 153–153. On the original Hebrew composition of Matthew see Eusebius, “The Church History of Eusebius,” assertion that Papias 3.39.16; Irenaeus 5.8.2; Pantaeus 5.10.3 saw the text in India.

gospel to be written and that it was composed in Hebrew for Jewish converts.⁵¹⁸ For early church authorities, the authenticity and authorship of Matthew was unquestioned.

The gospel begins with a genealogy that links Jesus to Abraham and David through the “husband of Mary.”⁵¹⁹ In unravelling this lineage, a numerological pattern is revealed: “So all of the generations from Abraham to David are fourteen generations; and from David to the deportation to Babylon, fourteen generations; and from the deportation to Babylon to the Messiah, fourteen generations.” Matthew’s narrative unfolds as linear history of Jesus: birth and infancy (1.18–2.19), reconciliation with his fate (3.1–4.11), ministry in Palestine (4.12–20.34), ministry in Jerusalem (21.1–26.75), torture and crucifixion (27.1–61), resurrection (27.62–28.15), and return to Galilee (28.16–20). Similar to Mark, the city is portrayed as essentially evil.⁵²⁰ In Matt. 23:37–38, Jesus laments: “Jerusalem, Jerusalem, the city that kills the prophets and stones those who were sent to it! How often have I desired to gather your children together as a hen gathers her brood under her wings, and your house (οἶκος) is left to you, desolate.”

Like the body/temple metaphor in Mark, Matt. 24.1–2 and Matt. 26.61 function when considered inter-textually with John 2.19–22. The narrative sequence of Matthew parallels Mark with Jesus predicting the destruction of the Jerusalem Temple in response to the disciples’ awe over the grandeur of Herod’s temple buildings.⁵²¹ This exchange is then followed by the accusation by the Jews that Jesus has threatened to destroy the temple and rebuild it in three

⁵¹⁸ Eusebius, *The Ecclesiastical History* 6.25.4.

⁵¹⁹ Matt. 1.16.

⁵²⁰ Warren Carter, “Matthew and the Gentiles: Individual Conversion and/or Systematic Transformation?” *JSNT* 26.3 (2004) 259–282. Carter argues that Matthew sees Jerusalem as a sign of the Roman occupation. In particular, see 266–272.

⁵²¹ Matt. 24.1–2.

days.⁵²²

Matthew parallels Mark 4.10–12 with Jesus explaining in a plain, explicit manner why he speaks in the metaphoric language of παραβολαί:

10 Καὶ προσελθόντες οἱ μαθηταὶ εἶπαν αὐτῷ· διὰ τί ἐν παραβολαῖς λαλεῖς αὐτοῖς; **11** ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν ὅτι Ὑμῖν δέδοται γινῶναι τὰ μυστήρια τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν, ἐκείνοις δὲ οὐ δέδοται. **12** ὅστις γὰρ ἔχει, δοθήσεται αὐτῷ καὶ περισσευθήσεται· ὅστις δὲ οὐκ ἔχει, καὶ ὁ ἔχει ἀρθήσεται ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ. **13** διὰ τοῦτο ἐν παραβολαῖς αὐτοῖς λαλῶ, ὅτι βλέποντες οὐ βλέπουσιν καὶ ἀκούοντες οὐκ ἀκούουσιν οὐδὲ συνίουσιν· ὅτι βλέποντες οὐ βλέπουσιν καὶ ἀκούοντες οὐκ ἀκούουσιν οὐδὲ συνίουσιν. **14** καὶ ἀναπληροῦται αὐτοῖς ἡ προφητεία Ἡσαίου ἡ λέγουσα· << ἀκοῇ ἀκούσετε καὶ οὐ μὴ συνῆτε, καὶ βλέποντες βλέψετε καὶ οὐ μὴ ἴδητε. **15** Ἐπαχύνθη γὰρ ἡ καρδία τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου, καὶ τοῖς ὠσὶν βαρέως ἤκουσαν, καὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν ἐκάμμυσαν· μή ποτε ἴδωσιν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς καὶ τοῖς ὠσὶν ἀκούσωσιν καὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ συνῶσιν καὶ ἐπιστρέψωσιν, καὶ ἰάσομαι αὐτούς.>> (Matt. 13.10-15)

10 Then the disciples came and asked him, “Why do you speak to them in parables?” **11** He answered, “To you it has been given to know the secrets of the kingdom of heaven, but to them it has not been given. **12** For to those who have, more will be given, and they will have an abundance; but from those who have nothing, even what they have will be taken away. **13** The reason I speak to them in parables is that seeing they do not perceive, and hearing they do not listen, nor do they understand. **14** With them indeed is fulfilled the prophecy of Isaiah that says: “You will indeed listen but never understand and you will indeed look, but never perceive. **15** For this people’s heart has grown dull, and their ears are hard of hearing, and they have shut their eyes; so that they might not look with their eyes, and listen with their ears, and understand with their heart and turn—and I would heal them [Isa. 6.9–10].”

Not paralleled in Mark, Jesus tells the disciples that they are blessed by this gift of interpretation:

16 ὑμῶν δὲ μακάριοι οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ὅτι βλέπουσιν, καὶ τὰ ὥτα [ὑμῶν] ὅτι ἀκούουσιν. **17** ἀμὴν γὰρ λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι πολλοὶ προφῆται καὶ δίκαιοι ἐπεθύμησαν ἰδεῖν ἃ βλέπετε καὶ οὐκ

⁵²² Matt. 26.61.

εἶδαν, καὶ ἀκούσαι ἃ ἀκούετε καὶ οὐκ ἤκουσαν. (Matt. 13.16–17)

16 But blessed are your eyes, for they see, and your ears, for they hear. **17** Truly I tell you, many prophets and righteous people longed to see what you see, but did not see it, and to hear what you hear, but did not hear it.

The disciples ask Jesus once more (13.36) to explain the meaning of a parable. Using παρρησία, he explains the parable of the weeds. He follows this explanation with three additional parables. Jesus then asks: Συνήκατε ταῦτα πάντα (13.51). When they answer yes, he responds with another parable: διὰ τοῦτο πᾶς γραμματεὺς μαθητευθεὶς τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν ὅμοιός ἐστιν ἀνθρώπῳ οἰκοδεσπότῃ ὅστις ἐκβάλλει ἐκ τοῦ θησαυροῦ αὐτοῦ καινὰ καὶ παλαιά (13.52). As we have observed in Mark, the function of metaphoric language is understood to conceal the true meaning of Jesus' message from those who are not prepared to understand. For those whose eyes and ears have been opened, the word is revealed.

JOHN 2.19–22

19 ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· <<λύσατε τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον, καὶ ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις ἐγερῶ αὐτόν.>> **20** εἶπαν οὖν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι· <<τεσσεράκοντα καὶ ἕξ ἔτεσιν οἰκοδομήθη ὁ ναὸς οὗτος, καὶ σὺ ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις ἐγερεῖς αὐτόν; >> **21** ἐκεῖνος δὲ ἔλεγεν περὶ τοῦ ναοῦ τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ. **22** ὅτε οὖν ἠγέρθη ἐκ νεκρῶν, ἐμνήσθησαν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ὅτι τοῦτο ἔλεγεν, καὶ ἐπίστευσαν τῇ γραφῇ καὶ τῷ λόγῳ ὃν εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς.

19 Jesus answered them, "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up." **20** The Jews then said, "This temple has been under construction for 46 years, and you are going to raise it up in three days?" **21** But he was speaking of the temple of his body. **22** After he was raised from the dead, his disciples remembered that he had said this; and they believed the scripture and the words that Jesus had spoken.

Eusebius names the apostle John, the son of Zebedee, as the author of the fourth

gospel.⁵²³ Identified as the last of the gospels to be written, Eusebius attributes this tardiness to John's preference for a traditional ministry of the spoken word.⁵²⁴ Addressing questions of incongruity with the other evangelists, he insists that John was familiar with the synoptics and wrote his gospel to address a lacuna in the three earlier narratives.⁵²⁵ In the case of the body/temple metaphor, Eusebius' assertion is reasonable. John is the only gospel that explicitly associates the body of Christ with the Temple. John 19–22 informs the intertextual reading of the Synoptic body/temple vehicle in *Barnabas*, Clement, and Origen.

Eusebius defends the unity of the 4 gospels in order to address an ongoing debate in the early Church over heretical readings of John. Popular with Heracleon and other "Gnostics," the polysemic nature of John's text was problematic for maintaining apostolic authority over its interpretation.⁵²⁶ Clement's reading of John as a "spiritual" gospel written to enhance the more matter of fact details of the Synoptics is evidence of an early reaction to more radical exegesis.⁵²⁷ This position is shared by Origen, who argues:

What John calls the eternal Gospel, and what may properly be called the spiritual Gospel, presents clearly to those who have the will to understand all matters concerning the very Son of God, both the mysteries presented by his discourses and those matters of which His acts were the enigmas.⁵²⁸

The problem of interpreting the words of Jesus is not unique to John. As discussed above, both Mk. 4.10–13 and Matt. 13.10–15 relay the confusion of the disciples in trying to

⁵²³ Eusebius, *The Ecclesiastical History* 3.24.1; also 7.25.7.

⁵²⁴ Eusebius, *The Ecclesiastical History* 3.24.2–7.

⁵²⁵ Eusebius, *The Ecclesiastical History* 3.24.7–14.

⁵²⁶ Irenaeus, "Against Heresies," *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the writings of the fathers down to A.D. 325*, ed. Rev. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, vol. 1 (Edinburgh/Grand Rapids, MI: T&T Clark/ Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1985) 3.11; See also Kurt Rudolph, *Gnosis: The Nature and History of Gnosticism*, trans. Robert McLachlan Wilson et al. (San Francisco: Harper, 1987) 17.

⁵²⁷ Eusebius, *The Ecclesiastical History* 6.14.7.

⁵²⁸ Origen, "Commentary on the Gospel according to John," 1.9.

unravel the metaphoric language of παραβολή. In the Synoptics, meaning is clarified by Jesus' instruction using plain speech [παρρησία]. Similarly, David Brakke identifies a pattern in John (6.60–71; 7.1–9; 11.1–16; 16.25) where the misunderstandings that result from Jesus' teaching "in parables" [ἐν παροιμίαις] are resolved through his use of plain speech [παρρησία].⁵²⁹ However, what distinguishes John is that the occasion of παρρησία is not the result of instruction, but a revelation following the death and resurrection of Christ.⁵³⁰

In 16.13, Jesus tells the disciples that his voice will be replaced by the "Spirit of Truth" [πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας] and that the Spirit "will guide you into all the truth" [ὁδηγήσει ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν ἀλήθειαν πᾶσαν]. The disciples become confused and begin to talk among themselves:

17 Εἶπαν οὖν ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ πρὸς ἀλλήλους· Τί ἐστὶν τοῦτο ὃ λέγει ἡμῖν· Μικρὸν καὶ οὐ θεωρεῖτέ με, καὶ πάλιν μικρὸν καὶ ὄψεσθέ με; καὶ ὅτι ὑπάγω πρὸς τὸν πατέρα; 18 ἔλεγον οὖν τί ἐστὶν τοῦτο ὃ λέγει μικρόν; οὐκ οἶδαμεν τί λαλεῖ. 19 ἔγνω Ἰησοῦς ὅτι ἤθελον αὐτὸν ἐρωτᾶν, καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Περὶ τούτου ζητεῖτε μετ' ἀλλήλων ὅτι εἶπον· μικρὸν καὶ οὐ θεωρεῖτέ με, καὶ πάλιν μικρὸν καὶ ὄψεσθέ με; (Jn. 16.17–19)

17 Then some of his disciples said to one another, "What does he mean by saying to us, 'A little while, and you will no longer see me, and again a little while and you will see me'; and 'because I am going to the Father'?" 18 They said, "What does he mean by a this 'a little while'? We do not know what he is talking about." 19 Jesus knew that they wanted to ask him, so he said to them, "Are you discussing among yourselves what I meant when I said, 'A little while and you will no longer see me, and again a little while and you will see me'?"

⁵²⁹ Brakke, "Parables and Plain Speech in the Fourth Gospel and the Apocryphon of James," 197. PHEME PERKINS observes that "misunderstanding" Jesus is common in John: Involvement of Jews (John 2.19–21; 3.3–5; 6.32–35; 6.51–53; 7.33–36; 8.21–22; 8.31–35; 8.51–53; 8.56–58; 12.32–34), Samaritan woman (John 4.10–15), and disciples (John 4.31–34; 11.11–15; 11.23–25; 13.36–38; 14.4–6; 14.7–9; 16.16–19). See PHEME PERKINS, "The Gospel According to John," *New Jerome Biblical Commentary*, eds. Raymond E. Brown, Joseph A. Fitzmyer and Roland E. Murphy (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1992) 947.

⁵³⁰ Brakke, "Parables and Plain Speech in the Fourth Gospel and the Apocryphon of James," 202.

This confrontation between Jesus and his disciples over the use of parables is similar to Mk. 4.10–13 and Matt. 13.10–15. But unlike Mk. and Matt., Jesus does not respond by explaining the metaphors to them in simple terms that they can understand. Rather, he postpones their ability to decipher his words until after his death:

25 Ταῦτα ἐν παροιμίαις λελάληκα ὑμῖν· ἔρχεται ὥρα ὅτε οὐκέτι ἐν παροιμίαις λαλήσω ὑμῖν ἀλλὰ παρρησίᾳ περὶ τοῦ πατρὸς ἀπαγγελῶ ὑμῖν. 26 ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου αἰτήσεσθε, καὶ οὐ λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι ἐγὼ ἐρωτήσω τὸν πατέρα περὶ ὑμῶν· 27 αὐτὸς γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ φιλεῖ ὑμᾶς, ὅτι ὑμεῖς ἐμὲ πεφιλήκατε καὶ πεπιστεύκατε ὅτι ἐγὼ παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐξῆλθον. 28 ἐξῆλθον ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ ἐλήλυθα εἰς τὸν κόσμον· πάλιν ἀφίημι τὸν κόσμον καὶ πορεύομαι πρὸς τὸν πατέρα. (Jn. 16.25–28)

25 “I have said these things to you in figures of speech. The hour is coming when I will no longer speak to you in figures but I will tell you plainly of the Father.” 26 On that day you will ask in my name. I do not say that I will ask the Father on your behalf; 27 for the Father himself loves you, because you have loved me and have believed that I came from God. 28 I came from the Father and have come into the world: again, I am leaving the world and am going back to the Father.

Following Jesus death, παροιμίαι will be known through παρρησία. But this will not occur through verbal instruction. Rather, παρρησία is a function of revelation by the πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον.⁵³¹ This is the message that concerned Clement, Origen, and Eusebius. Who had the authority to determine the legitimacy of the Spirit’s voice? The power of the revelation proposed by John’s narrative is illustrated by 16.29–30. As Jesus enters into an irreversible series of events that lead to his death,⁵³² the disciples are suddenly able to understand what he has said to them and, in addition, they remember⁵³³ everything he has taught them :

⁵³¹ Jn. 14.26 ὁ δὲ παράκλητος, τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ὃ πέμψει ὁ πατὴρ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου, ἐκεῖνος ὑμᾶς διδάξει πάντα καὶ ὑπομνήσει ὑμᾶς πάντα ἃ εἶπον ὑμῖν ἐγώ.

⁵³² Jesus says a prayer for the disciples (Jn. 17.1–26) and is arrested (Jn. 18.3–9). This begins the narrative of his death and resurrection.

⁵³³ Jn. 11.14 reminded [ὑπομνήσει]; see also Brakke 198.

29 Λέγουσιν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ· ἴδε νῦν ἐν παρρησίᾳ λαλεῖς, καὶ παροιμίαν οὐδεμίαν λέγεις. **30** νῦν οἶδμεν ὅτι οἶδας πάντα καὶ οὐ χρεῖαν ἔχεις ἵνα τίς σε ἐρωτᾷ· ἐν τούτῳ πιστεύομεν ὅτι ἀπὸ θεοῦ ἐξηλθες. (Jn. 16.29–30)

29 His disciple said, “Yes, now you are speaking plainly, not in any figure of speech! **30** Now we know that you know all things, and do not need to have anyone question you; by this we believe that you came from God.”

This characterization of John’s Gospel, advocating revelation as a legitimate means to knowledge, is important to our understanding of the architectural tenor of body/temple metaphor in the Gospels and subsequent exegesis. John 2.19–22 follows the pattern of confusion that is illustrated by 16.13–30. In 2.19, Jesus speaks in metaphoric language: Λύσατε τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον καὶ ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις ἐγερῶ αὐτόν. In 2.20, the Jews state that they have misunderstood him and ask for clarification: Τεσσαράκοντα καὶ ἕξ ἔτεσιν οἰκοδομήθη ὁ ναὸς οὗτος. At this juncture, rather than following the pattern that would have Jesus responding to the question, the voice of John takes us out of the narrative:

21 ἐκεῖνος δὲ ἔλεγεν περὶ τοῦ ναοῦ τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ. **22** ὅτε οὖν ἠγέρθη ἐκ νεκρῶν, ἐμνήσθησαν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ὅτι τοῦτο ἔλεγεν, καὶ ἐπίστευσαν τῇ γραφῇ καὶ τῷ λόγῳ ὃν εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς. (Jn. 2.21–22)

21 But he was speaking of the temple of his body. **22** After he was raised from the dead, his disciples remembered that he had said this; and they believed...

The revelation in 2.21–22 comes out of the same series of events that inspired 16.29–30. The disciples are unable to understand his words before the resurrection because of Jesus’ ongoing instruction in παροιμίαι. Following his death, they realize that the presence of God is no longer

in the Temple of Jerusalem, but in the person of Christ. This understanding of God's indwelling in the λόγος is nuanced by Jn. 14.10 and 14.17.

THE FUNCTION OF THE BODY/TEMPLE METAPHOR IN THE GOSPELS

In the Synoptic Gospels, Jesus predicts the destruction of the temple near the end of his life. One of the charges brought against him by the temple authorities is that his prediction was actually a threat. The Gospel of John places the body/temple metaphor immediately following the temple cleansing near the beginning of Christ's ministry. In John, Jesus is not charged with threatening to destroy the temple. While this repositioning in the narrative has no impact on our argument—in all cases, Jesus says he will destroy the temple and raise it again in three days—what is unique in John is the explicit relationship between the destruction/rebuilding of the temple and the death/resurrection of Christ.

As in the Pauline letters, the body/temple metaphor is used rhetorically in the Gospels to convey a novel idea. The Epistles employ the metaphor to elaborate the nature of the Christian community and the relationship of that community with Christ. The dwelling place of Christ is both the Christian individual and the Christian collective that, like a temple, is unified within itself and ritually set apart from others. In the Gospel of John, and by extension in the synoptics, the body of Christ replaces the Jerusalem temple as God's dwelling place on earth. Like Plato, a temple "made by human hands" is understood as a corruption of the pure architectural idea. In the gospels, then, the primary function of the architectural metaphor is the relocation of God's presence from the Jerusalem temple and the old covenant to the body of Christ and the new covenant.

Bertil Gärtner contrasts the Gospels with the Epistles in relation to the Qumran

community. The Gospels, in redirecting God's presence from the Jerusalem Temple to the body of Christ, show a marked difference from the Qumran literature. The Synoptics and John suggest that Christ is now the permanent dwelling place of God. Christ is effectively the "new" temple."⁵³⁴ Qumran locates God's presence in the community as a temporary dwelling place until the advent of the new temple. Like the tent used by the Jews to shelter the tabernacle during the Exodus, the community gives form to God's presence until a new Jerusalem can be established. Gärtner hypothesizes that "...Jesus knew of Qumran's sharp criticism of the Jerusalem temple and its cultus, and knew also that they claimed to be the true temple of God."⁵³⁵ He adopted the Qumran policy of criticism and replacement, but, uniquely, shifted that replacement from a new temple to himself. Thus, Paul's use of the metaphor is, effectively, a return to the Qumran tradition and a departure from Jesus' unique interpretation. Gärtner's hypothesis highlights the conceptual distance between the two variations of the body/temple metaphor in the NT. However, he acknowledges that 1 Cor. 6.15–19 provides a possible link between the two:

The close connection of the temple image with the image of the body in the teaching of Jesus makes it easier for us to understand the two. We cannot of course go so far as to say that the Pauline doctrine of the body of Christ is based on this temple symbolism; but there is certainly a close relationship between the two. It is highly likely that other concepts have had their share in influencing the idea of the Church as the body of Christ, but at the same time we cannot entirely overlook the fundamental association between this idea and that of the temple.⁵³⁶

While Gärtner offers valuable insight into the nature of body/temple metaphor used in the NT, it is difficult to concur with his conclusion that the context for this metaphor is "... in the

⁵³⁴ Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament* 121.

⁵³⁵ Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament* 122.

⁵³⁶ Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament* 142.

Palestinian rather than the Hellenic background.”⁵³⁷ As discussed, in the context of the Pauline corpus, the gospel metaphor resonates with Pharisaic, Greek, and Roman thought as well as with ideas expressed in the Qumran literature. In fact, the gospel narratives confirm that Jesus is familiar with all of these groups except the Qumran community. Rather than look for a common Palestinian or Greek origin to resolve the semiotic tension between the two variations of the body/temple metaphor, it is more consistent with the language of the NT to search for a metaphorical relationship between the “temple as Christ” and the “temple as Christians.” First Cor. 6.15–19, both uniting the Christian community and setting them apart by connecting them to the purity of Christ’s body, is the first example of how the “two” temples, or perhaps more correctly, the “two halves” of the temple might be joined or reconciled. This question is addressed by the generation of Christian writers who followed the authors of the NT and by each subsequent generation leading to the Council of Nicea and is the subject of our next section.

4.3 BODY/TEMPLE METAPHOR IN THE APOSTOLIC FATHERS⁵³⁸

The body/temple metaphor is referenced eleven times in the literature of the Apostolic Fathers.⁵³⁹ Of these references, nine refer to the Pauline variation, one to the Gospel variation, and one, the *Epistle of Barnabas*, addresses both variations. In *Barnabas*, we find the first hermeneutic use of the body/temple vehicle. The text uses the metaphor to build the Gospels, the Pauline letters, and the OT into an epistemological structure that can accommodate increasingly complex theological, philosophical and cultural questions. Like the Epistles and the Gospels, *Barnabas* is concerned with both revealing and concealing the Christian message.

⁵³⁷ Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament* 142.

⁵³⁸ As defined by Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines* 31, the Apostolic Fathers are: Clement of Rome, Ignatius, Polycarp, the author of 2 Clement, Barnabas, and Hermas.

⁵³⁹ see Appendix 1.

EPISTLE OF BARNABAS 16.1–10

1 Ἔτι δὲ καὶ περὶ τοῦ ναοῦ ἐπὶ ὑμῖν, ὡς πλανώμενοι οἱ ταλαίπωροι εἰς τὴν οἰκοδομὴν ἤλπισαν, καὶ οὐκ ἐπὶ τὸν θεὸν αὐτῶν τὸν ποιήσαντα αὐτούς, ὡς ὄντα οἶκον θεοῦ. 2 σχεδὸν γὰρ ὡς τὰ ἔθνη ἀφιέρωσαν αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ ναῷ. ἀλλὰ πῶς λέγει κυριὸς καταργῶν αὐτόν, μάθετε· Τίς ἐμέτρησεν τὸν οὐρανὸν σπιθαμῇ ἢ τὴν γῆν δρακί; οὐκ ἐγώ; λέγει κύριος· Ὁ οὐρανός μοι θρόνος, ἡ δὲ γῆ ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν μου· ποῖον οἶκον οἰκοδομήσετέ μοι, ἢ τίς τόπος τῆς καταπαύσεώς μου; ἐγνώκατε, ὅτι ματαία ἡ ἐλπίς αὐτῶν. 3 πέρας γέ τοι πάλιν λέγει· Ἰδού, οἱ καθελόντες τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον αὐτοὶ αὐτὸν οἰκοδομήσουσιν. 4 γίνεται. διὰ γὰρ τὸ πολεμεῖν αὐτοὺς καθηρέθη ὑπὸ τῶν ἐχθρῶν· νῦν καὶ αὐτοὶ οἱ τῶν ἐχθρῶν ὑπηρεταὶ ἀνοικοδομήσουσιν αὐτόν. 5 πάλιν ὡς ἔμελλεν ἡ πόλις καὶ ὁ ναὸς καὶ ὁ λαὸς Ἰσραὴλ παραδίδοσθαι, ἐφανερώθη. λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή· Καὶ ἔσται ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν, καὶ παραδώσει κύριος τὰ πρόβατα τῆς νομῆς καὶ τὴν μάνδραν καὶ τὸν πύργον αὐτῶν εἰς καταφθοράν. Καὶ ἐγένετο καθ' ἃ ἐλάλησεν κύριος. 6 ζητήσωμεν δέ, εἰ ἔστιν ναὸς θεοῦ. ἔστιν ὅπου αὐτὸς λέγει ποιεῖν καὶ καταρτίζειν. γέγραπται γάρ· Καὶ ἔσται, τῆς ἑβδομάδος συντελουμένης οἰκοδομηθήσεται ναὸς θεοῦ ἐνδόξως ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι κυρίου. 7 εὕρισκω οὖν, ὅτι ἔστιν ναὸς. πῶς οὖν οἰκοδομηθήσεται ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι κυρίου, μάθετε. πρὸ τοῦ ἡμᾶς πιστεῦσαι τῷ θεῷ ἦν ἡμῶν τὸ κατοικητήριον τῆς καρδίας φθαρτὸν καὶ ἀσθενές, ὡς ἀληθῶς οἰκοδομητὸς ναὸς διὰ χειρός, ὅτι ἦν πλήρης μὲν εἰδωλολατρείας καὶ ἦν οἶκος δαιμονίων διὰ τὸ ποιεῖν, ὅσα ἦν ἐναντία τῷ θεῷ. 8 Οἰκοδομηθήσεται δὲ ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι κυρίου. προσέχετε δέ, ἵνα ὁ ναὸς τοῦ κυρίου ἐνδόξως οἰκοδομηθῇ. πῶς, μάθετε. λαβόντες τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ ἐλπίσαντες ἐπὶ τὸ ὄνομα ἐγενόμεθα καινοί, πάλιν ἐξ ἀρχῆς κτιζόμενοι· διὸ ἐν τῷ κατοικητηρίῳ ἡμῶν ἀληθῶς ὁ θεὸς κατοικεῖ ἐν ἡμῖν. 9 πῶς; ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ τῆς πίστεως, ἡ κλήσις αὐτοῦ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας, ἡ σοφία τῶν δικαιωμάτων, αἱ ἐντολαὶ τῆς διδαχῆς, αὐτὸς ἐν ἡμῖν προφητεύων, αὐτὸς ἐν ἡμῖν κατοικῶν, τοὺς τῷ θανάτῳ δεδουλωμένους ἀνοίγων ἡμῖν τὴν θύραν τοῦ ναοῦ, ὃ ἐστὶν στόμα, μετάνοιαν διδούς ἡμῖν, εἰσάγει εἰς τὸν ἄφθαρτον ναόν. 10 ὁ γὰρ ποθῶν σωθῆναι βλέπει οὐκ εἰς τὸν ἄνθρωπον, ἀλλ' εἰς τὸν ἐν αὐτῷ κατοικοῦντα καὶ λαλοῦντα, ἐπ' αὐτῷ ἐκπλησσομένους, ἐπὶ τῷ μηδέποτε μήτε τοῦ λέγοντος τὰ ῥήματα ἀκηκοέναι ἐκ τοῦ στόματος μήτε αὐτὸς ποτε ἐπιτεθυμηκέναι ἀκούειν. τοῦτό ἐστιν πνευματικὸς ναὸς οἰκοδομούμενος τῷ κυρίῳ. (Barnabas 16.1–10)

1 I will also speak with you concerning the Temple, and show how the wretched men erred by putting their hope on the building, and not on the God who made them, and is the true House of God. 2 For they consecrated him in the temple almost like the heathen. But learn how the Lord speaks, bringing it to naught, “Who has measured the heaven with a span, or the earth with his outstretched hand? Have not I?” Saith the Lord. “Heaven is my throne, and the earth is my

footstool, what house will ye build for me, or what is the place of my rest? You know that their hope was in vain.” 3 Furthermore, he says again, “Lo, they who destroyed this temple shall themselves build it.” 4 That is happening now. For owing to the war it was destroyed by the enemy; at present even the servants of the enemy will build it up again. 5 Again, it was made manifest that the city and the temple and the people of Israel were to be delivered up. For the scripture says, “And it shall come to pass on the last days that the Lord shall deliver the sheep of his pasture, and the sheep-fold, and their tower to destruction.” And it took place according to what the Lord said. 6 But let us inquire if the temple of God exists. Yes, it exists, where he himself said that he makes and perfects it. For it is written, “And it shall come to pass when the week is ended that a temple of God shall be built gloriously in the name of the Lord.” 7 I find then that a temple exists. Learn then how it will be built in the name of the Lord. Before we believed in God the habitation of our heart was corrupt and weak, like a temple really built with hands, because it was full of idolatry, and was the house of demons through doing things which were contrary to God. 8 “But it shall be built in the name of the Lord.” Now give heed, in order that the temple of the Lord may be built gloriously. Learn in what way. When we received the remission of sins, and put our hope on the Name, we became new, being created again from the beginning; wherefore God truly dwells in us, in the habitation which we are. 9 How? His word of faith, the calling of his promise, the wisdom of the ordinances, the commands of the teaching, himself prophesying in us, himself dwelling in us, by opening the door of the temple (that is the mouth) to us, giving repentance to us, and thus he leads us, who have been enslaved to death in to the incorruptible temple. 10 For he who desires to be saved looks not at the man, but at him who dwells and speaks in him, and is amazed at him for he has never either heard him speak such words with his mouth, nor has he himself ever desired to hear them. This is a spiritual temple being built for the Lord.⁵⁴⁰

Clement of Alexandria identifies Barnabas as the companion of Paul mentioned in Acts and as one of the seventy disciples sent out by Jesus.⁵⁴¹ This would date the letter to the last two decades of the first century. Clement is the first to cite the epistle and accepts it as apostolic. Origen refers to the text but does not comment on its authenticity. Eusebius acknowledges that

⁵⁴⁰ English translations of these passages are from “The Epistle of Barnabas.”

⁵⁴¹ Clement, “Stromata,” *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the writings of the fathers down to A.D. 325*, ed. Rev. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, vol. 2 (Edinburgh/Grand Rapids, MI: T&T Clark/ Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1985) 2.20.

some accept the epistle as authentic, but he lists it among the “rejected writings.”⁵⁴²

Barnabas 16.1–10 is the first text to reconcile the two variations of the body/temple metaphor. For temple imagery, 16.1–7 draws on OT Prophets (Is 40.12; 66.1; 49.17) and Pseudepigrapha (Enoch 89; 55; 66; 67), the Gospels, Paul, and Acts.⁵⁴³ In 16.1, *Barnabas* condemns the Jews for their piety toward the temple buildings and for their ignorance of the true οἶκος θεοῦ: “I will also speak with you concerning the Temple, and show how the wretched men erred by putting their hope on the building, and not on the God who made them, and is the true House of God.” Following the Gospels, *Barnabas* locates the true temple, the house of God, in the body of Christ who is God incarnate. The Jews condemned Jesus to death because they saw him as a threat to the temple and therefore “put their hope” in the building rather than in God. To underscore that God no longer dwells in the Jewish temple, *Barnabas* (16.2) cites Is. 66.1, a passage also found in Acts 7.48–49: “Heaven is my throne, and the earth is my footstool, what house will ye build for me, or what is the place of my rest?”

In 16.7, *Barnabas* states that the temple of God still exists. It cannot be the temple of Jerusalem, however, because, as he acknowledges in 16.4, the temple of the Jews is destroyed. Rather, God inhabits “our heart” and in 16.8, “...God truly dwells in us, in the habitation which we are.” *Barnabas* is relying on the in-dwelling God of the Pauline letters to support his argument. How does God dwell in the community? In 16.9, “His word of faith,”⁵⁴⁴ the calling of his promise, the wisdom of his ordinances, the commands of the teaching, himself prophesying in us.” God dwells in the community through faith in the resurrection, tradition, the written word, and prophecy.⁵⁴⁵ In other words, he is present in all things that make a Christian

⁵⁴² Eusebius, *The Ecclesiastical History* 3.25.4.

⁵⁴³ “The Epistle of Barnabas,” 396 re: Lake’s annotations.

⁵⁴⁴ λόγος πίστεως.

⁵⁴⁵ First stated: “The Epistle of Barnabas,” 1.6–8.

community distinctive. Christ, the λόγος, the principle of order in the cosmos, gives form to the community so that God may dwell there.⁵⁴⁶

In 9.1–3, *Barnabas* reminds his readers that their hearts and ears are circumcised “so that we can hear the word and believe.”⁵⁴⁷ The λόγος is revealed through the word to those who have faith. Calling on the authority of the prophets of the OT, reminding the Jews that they are “uncircumcised in the heart,”⁵⁴⁸ *Barnabas* claims Abraham initiated the circumcision in anticipation of Jesus. But it was not the circumcision practiced by the Jews, a circumcision of the flesh introduced by an “evil angel”⁵⁴⁹; rather, the true circumcision of Abraham participates in the λόγος. The proof of this is hidden in the text and is revealed to Barnabas who in turn reveals it to all Christians who can hear:

7 μάθετε οὖν, τέκνα ἀγάπης, περὶ πάντων πλουσίως, ὅτι Ἀβραάμ, πρῶτος περιτομὴν δούς, ἐν πνεύματι προβλέψας εἰς τὸν Ἰησοῦν περιέτεμεν, λαβὼν τριῶν γραμμάτων δόγματα. 8 λέγει γάρ· Καὶ περιέτεμεν Ἀβραάμ ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου αὐτοῦ ἄνδρας δεκαοκτῶ καὶ τριακοσίους. Τίς οὖν ἡ δοθεῖσα αὐτῷ γνῶσις; μάθετε, ὅτι τοὺς δεκαοκτῶ πρώτους, καὶ διάστημα ποιήσας λέγει τριακοσίους. τὸ δεκαοκτῶ ἰ´ δέκα, ἡ´ ὀκτώ· ἔχεις Ἰησοῦς. ὅτι δὲ ὁ σταυρὸς ἐν τῷ ταῦ ἤμελλεν ἔχειν τὴν χάριν, λέγει καὶ τοὺς τριακοσίους. δηλοῖ οὖν τὸν μὲν Ἰησοῦν ἐν τοῖς δυσὶν γράμμασιν, καὶ ἐνὶ τῷ ἐνὶ τὸν σταυρόν. 9 οἶδεν ὁ τὴν ἔμφυτον δωρεάν τῆς διδαχῆς αὐτοῦ θέμενος ἐν ἡμῖν. οὐδεὶς γνησιώτερον ἔμαθεν ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ λόγον· ἀλλὰ οἶδα, ὅτι ἄξιόί ἐστε ὑμεῖς. (*Barnabas* 9.7–9).

Learn fully then, children of love, concerning all things for Abraham, who first circumcised, did so looking forward in the spirit to Jesus, and had received the doctrines of three letters. For it says, “And Abraham circumcised from his household eighteen men and three hundred.” What then was the knowledge that was given to him? Notice that he first mentions the eighteen, and after a

⁵⁴⁶ On λόγος in Greek thought, see F.F. Bruce, *The Gospel of John 1*, trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley, ed. Walter Furst (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 1986) 20. “...logos denoted the principle of reason or order immanent in the universe, the principle which imposes form on the material world and which constitutes the rational soul in man.”

⁵⁴⁷ λόγον πιστεύσωμεν ἡμεῖς.

⁵⁴⁸ See Jeremiah 9.25–26.

⁵⁴⁹ “The Epistle of Barnabas,” 371 (9.4).

pause the three hundred. The eighteen is I (=10) and H (=8)—you have Jesus—and because the cross was destined to have grace in the T he says “and three hundred.” So he indicates Jesus in the two letters and the cross in the other. He knows this that placed the gift of his teaching in our hearts. No one has heard a more excellent lesson from me, but I know that you are worthy.⁵⁵⁰

Scripture conceals and reveals. What it reveals, through authoritative guidance, is the ubiquity of the λόγος. Words, numbers, history, all things are ordered by God.

THE FUNCTION OF THE APOSTOLIC BODY/TEMPLE METAPHOR

The *Epistle of Barnabas* 16.1–10 is the first example of the hermeneutic function of the Christian body/temple metaphor. The author of *Barnabas* draws on the text sources at his disposal and weaves them together with poetic language to “proclaim” the Christian message. In the use of the body/temple metaphor, the author employs the Pauline and Gospel variations as part of an instruction on the proper order of a Christian community. The message is buried in the relationship between the figures of Christian(s) = Temple and Christ = Temple. To reveal this message, *Barnabas* constructs an inter- textual metaphor where the tenor is the universal pattern of the λόγος and the vehicle is a synthesis of both the Pauline and Gospel variations of the body/temple metaphor. The symmetry between the Church and Christ is a function of the universal order of the λόγος. This is more than a substitution of terms in the classical sense of metaphor. The polysemic potential of this construct—a metaphor that metaphorizes two metaphors—is enormous and, as we shall discuss, is the source of Clement’s and Origen’s allegorical exegesis. As such, *Barnabas* is an essential component in the Christian reconciliation with Imperial architecture.

⁵⁵⁰ Following Lake’s notes, “The Epistle of Barnabas,” IH are the first two letters in the Greek spelling of Jesus. As the text implies, Greek letters can also be read as numerals. In this system, T (tau) = 300. See also Dawson, *Allegorical Readers and Cultural Revision in Ancient Alexandria* 153–154.

4.4 BODY/TEMPLE METAPHOR IN ANTE-NICENE LITERATURE

In the ante-Nicene literature, the body/temple metaphor is used explicitly in 120 verses by 14 authors.⁵⁵¹ While all of these texts contribute to our understanding of the semantic interplay between concepts of body and temple in early Christianity, this present study is focused on select works that demonstrate changes in the architectural tenor of the metaphor. To that end, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and Eusebius are used to illustrate the transformation of the body/temple metaphor through the second, third, and early fourth centuries respectively. All of these authors are associated with the exegetical tradition and catechetical school of Alexandria.⁵⁵²

In the *History*, Eusebius constructs a genealogy of apostolic authority for the Alexandrian church. Beginning in 2.16, 4.1.1, 5.11.2–5; 6.1.1–3.13 (Origen); 6.6.1 (Pantaenus was succeeded by Clement) 6.26 (Origen to Heraclas) 7.38.29 that links the apostle Peter, through Mark, to Pantaenus, Clement, Origen, Pamphilus and implicitly, to himself.⁵⁵³

CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA

Clement employs the body/temple metaphor in 17 verses.⁵⁵⁴ The majority of these, 14, are found in his *Stromata*. The *Stromata* addresses diverse questions of Christian *gnosis* and is part of a trilogy composed for the instruction of Christians.⁵⁵⁵ Eusebius records its full title as

⁵⁵¹ see Appendix 1.

⁵⁵² The history and constitution of the School is widely debated. See: Judith L. Kovacs, "Divine Pedagogy and the Gnostic Teacher according to Clement of Alexandria," *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 9.1 (2001) 3–25 fnt 9; Joseph Wilson Trigg, *Origen: The Bible and Philosophy in the Third-century Church* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1983) 54; Walter H. Wagner, "Clement of Alexandria," *Encyclopedia of Early Christianity*, ed. Everett Ferguson, Michael P. McHugh, Frederick W. Norris, 2 ed. (New York: Garland Publishing, 1999) 262–263 suggests caution in using Eusebius. For a more conventional view of Eusebius, see Stephen C. Carlson, "Clement of Alexandria on the 'Order' of the Gospels," *New Testament Studies* 47 (2001) 118–125; Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines* 153–158.

⁵⁵³ Dawson has serious doubts about the authenticity of Eusebius' narrative and constructs his own "hypothetical" account, Dawson, *Allegorical Readers and Cultural Revision in Ancient Alexandria* 219–221.

⁵⁵⁴ see Appendix 1.

⁵⁵⁵ *Protrepitkos*, *Paidagogos* and *Stromateis*, Wagner, "Clement of Alexandria," 262. Pelikan argues that *Protrepitkos* is addressed to Clement's colleagues who were philosophers, while the other two works are addressed

“Titus Flavius Clement’s *Stromata* of Gnostic Notes on the True Philosophy.” He knew of eight books that formed the whole work, but only seven are available to us.⁵⁵⁶ A chronology of Roman emperors in 1.21 suggests a date of composition as early as 193 C.E.⁵⁵⁷

Clement relies on Paul as a source for his use of the body/temple metaphor in all but 2 of 17 cases. The exceptions are *Stromata* 2.20, where he refers to *Barnabas* 16 (discussed above), and *Stromata* 7.11 where he brings together the Gospel and Pauline variations.⁵⁵⁸ Like *Barnabas*, Clement understands the λόγος as a unifying force that arranges the parts of the church body into a functioning whole. He characterizes this arrangement as οἰκονομία.⁵⁵⁹ God dwells through the “word of his faith” both in the community and in the body of Jesus.⁵⁶⁰ Exhorting Christians to lead a moral life, Clement follows 1 Cor. 6.19 in establishing the purity of the temple in the community and maintaining the purity of the temple in Christ’s body.

In *Stromata* 7.10, Clement describes faith as a revelation of the essential elements of the λόγος. Through guided study, *gnosis* (knowledge) confirms the revelation received through faith. Ultimately, faith and knowledge lead to “love” and to a mystical union with the divine.⁵⁶¹ Clement argues for the superiority of *gnosis* over *sophia* (wisdom) by disparaging wisdom as learned through instruction and therefore unable to reveal a true understanding of God.

In *Stromata* 7.11.4–7, the “gnostic soul” is identified as the temple of the Holy Spirit.⁵⁶²

to a more general audience. Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition: The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition (100–600)* 46.

⁵⁵⁶ Eusebius, *The Ecclesiastical History* 6.13.1.

⁵⁵⁷ 229, see commentary 2.

⁵⁵⁸ In his “*Stromata*,” Clement acknowledges Barnabas 8 times: 2.6; 2.7; 2.15; 2.18; 2.20; 5.8; 5.10; 6.8 and, in 2.20, identifies him as “one of the seventy and a fellow worker of Paul.” Clement, “*Stromata*,” 355, 356, 363, 367, 373, 457, 460, 496.

⁵⁵⁹ See Kovacs, “Divine Pedagogy and the Gnostic Teacher according to Clement of Alexandria,” and her reading of “*Stromata*” 7.2.

⁵⁶⁰ Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines* 153–154. Clement was accused of Docetism by Photius, but Kelly dismisses this accusation based on Clement’s defence of the incarnation.

⁵⁶¹ Clement, “*Stromata*,” 7.10.

⁵⁶² Clement, “*Stromata*,” 7.10; see also Fitzmyer, *Paul and His Theology: A Brief Sketch* 82–84. Paul discusses the body, particularly the body of the resurrection, in terms of *soma* (body), *sarx* (flesh), *psyche* (soul), *pneuma* (spirit),

4 Ἐστὶν οὖν ἐν πάσῃ περιστάσει ἐρρωμένη τοῦ γνωστικοῦ ἡ ψυχὴ, οἷον ἀθλητοῦ τὸ σῶμα ἐν ἄκρᾳ εὐεξίᾳ καὶ ῥώμῃ καθεστηκυῖα. 5 Εὐβουλος μὲν γὰρ ὑπάρχει περὶ τὰ ἀνθρώπων, τῷ δικαίῳ τὸ πρακτέον γνωματεύουσα, τὰς ἀρχὰς θεόθεν ἄνωθεν καὶ πρὸς τὴν θεϊὰν ἑξομοίωσιν πραότητα ἡδονῶν καὶ λυπῶν σωματικῶν περιπεποιημένη· κατεξανίσταται δὲ τῶν φόβων εὐθαρσῶς καὶ πεποιθὲς ὡς τῷ θεῷ. 6 Ἀτεχνῶς οὖν ἐπίγειος εἰκὼν θείας δυνάμεως ἡ γνωστικὴ ψυχὴ, τελείᾳ ἀρετῇ κεκοσμημένη, ἐκ πάντων ἅμα τούτων, φύσεως, ἀσκήσεως, λόγου, συνηυξημένη. 7 Τοῦτο τὸ κάλλος τῆς ψυχῆς νεὼς γίνεται τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ὅταν διάθεσιν ὁμολογουμένην τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ κατὰ πάντα κτήσῃται τὸν βίον. (Clement, 7.11.64.4–7)

4 In all circumstances, then, is the soul of the Gnostic strong, in a condition of extreme health and strength like the body of an athlete. 5 For he is prudent in human affairs, in judging what ought to be done by the just man; having obtained the principles from God from above, and having acquired, in order to the divine resemblance, moderation in bodily pains and pleasures. And he struggles against fears boldly, trusting in God. 6 Certainly, then, the gnostic soul, adorned with perfect virtue, is the earthly image of the divine power; its development being the joint result of nature, of training, of reason, all together. 7 This beauty of the soul becomes a temple of the Holy Spirit, when it acquires a disposition in the whole of life corresponding to the Gospel.⁵⁶³

The *gnostic* soul is the image of God. It is formed by nature (the revelation of the λόγος as the order of God's creation), through training (clarification and confirmation of the legitimacy of God's revelation), and through reason (comprehending the relationship between revelation and training). This "image," the true Christian body and community prefigured in the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus "(the Gospel)," is the temple of the Holy Spirit because it shares an essential relationship, a "disposition," with the divinity. Like the temples of the Roman gods, described by Vitruvius, the Christian temple and the Christian God share fundamental,

nous (mind), and *kardia* (heart).

⁵⁶³ Greek passages are from Clément. *Les Stromates: Stromate IV*. Trans. Claude Mondésert. Sources Chrétiennes. Vol. 463. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 2001; *Les Stromates: Stromate VI*. Trans. Patrick Descourtieux. Sources Chrétiennes. Vol. 446. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1999; *Les Stromates: Stromate VII*. Trans. Alain le Boulluec. Sources Chrétiennes. Vol. 428. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1997. English translations of these passages are from Clement. "Stromata." *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the writings of the fathers down to A.D. 325*. 1867. Ed. Rev. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. Vol. 2. Edinburgh/Grand Rapids, MI: T&T Clark/ Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1985.

discernable qualities.⁵⁶⁴ Further, both temples conform to patterns of order that are determined by an absolute, divine, and natural order. In both cases, this order is revealed an “ideal” body.

David Dawson describes Clement’s anthropology of the Christian body as an evolutionary process that begins with creation in the “image and likeness” of God,⁵⁶⁵ passing through the perfection of the “image and likeness” revealed in Christ as the λόγος and, finally, toward an eschatological union of the “likeness” (the *gnostic* soul) with the “image” (λόγος).⁵⁶⁶ The body of Christ as the image of God is established through a typology of characters that appear throughout the OT narrative as a *trope* for Christ. For example, Isaac is a type of Christ because his father, Abraham, is willing to sacrifice him. Clement’s “revisionary reading” of the Hebrew scripture aligns the OT with the Gospel of John and identifies the λόγος as a pattern that exists prior to Genesis and informs the creation of the human body. Christian revelation and knowledge transform God’s “likeness” as found in the human body to God’s “image” as it is revealed through Christ. The Christian body, or *gnostic* soul, and the body of Christ share a common nature as λόγος. This is also expressed by Clement:

4 Καὶ ἡ μὲν τελεία κληρονομία τῶν εἰς ἄνδρα τέλειον ἀφικνουμένων κατ’ εἰκόνα τοῦ κυρίου, ἡ δὲ ὁμοίωσις οὐχ, ὥς τινες, ἡ κατὰ τὸ σχῆμα τὸ ἀνθρώπειον 5 (ἄθεος γὰρ ἦδε ἡ ἐπιφορά) οὐδὲ μὴν ἡ κατ’ ἀρετὴν, ἡ πρὸς τὸ πρῶτον αἴτιον· ἀσεβῆς γὰρ καὶ ἦδε ἡ ἔκδοσις, τὴν αὐτὴν ἀρετὴν εἶναι ἀνθρώπου καὶ τοῦ παντοκράτορος θεοῦ προσδοκῶντων· Ὑπέλαβες, φησὶν ἀνομίαν, ὅτι ἔσομαί σοι ὅμοιος· ἀλλ’ ἀρκετὸν γὰρ τῷ μαθητῇ γενέσθαι ὡς ὁ διδάσκαλος, λέγει ὁ διδάσκαλος. 6 Καθ’ ὁμοίωσιν οὖν τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ εἰς υἱοθεσίαν καὶ φιλίαν τοῦ θεοῦ γίνεται, ἐάν, καθὼς αὐτὸς ἐδίδαξεν ὁ κύριος, κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τελειωθῇ. (Clement, 6.14.114.4–6)

4 And the perfect inheritance belongs to those who attain to "a perfect man," according to the

⁵⁶⁴ See Vitruvius, *De Architectura* 3.1.1–2.

⁵⁶⁵ Gen. 11.26.

⁵⁶⁶ Dawson, *Allegorical Readers and Cultural Revision in Ancient Alexandria* 210 reading “Stromata” 7.10.

image of the Lord. And the likeness is not, as some imagine, that of the human form; **5** for this consideration is impious. Nor is the likeness to the first cause that which consists in virtue. For this utterance is also impious, being that of those who have imagined that virtue in man and in the sovereign God is the same. "Thou hast supposed iniquity," He says, "[in imagining] that I will be like to thee." But "it is enough for the disciple to become as the Master," saith the Master. **6** To the likeness of God, then, he that is introduced into adoption and the friendship of God, to the just inheritance of the lords and gods is brought; if he be perfected, according to the Gospel, as the Lord Himself taught.

In the context of our discussion, God is present in both the temple of the Christian body and the temple of Christ's body through the λόγος. Clement's assertion in *Stromata* 7.11.7, bridges the Pauline and Gospel body/temple metaphorically: "Τοῦτο τὸ κάλλος τῆς ψυχῆς νεὼς γίνεται τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ὅταν διαθέσιν ὁμολογουμένην τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ κατὰ πάντα κτήσῃται τὸν βίον." As in *Barnabas*, the tenor of the metaphor, the cosmological order explicit in the λόγος, is conveyed in the vehicle of the body/temple metaphor of Paul and the Gospels. Inferred by *Barbabas* and elaborated through Clement's anthropology, the metaphor identifies Christ as the pattern that reveals the λόγος. Just as Clement sees the Christian λόγος in Jewish scripture, he also finds it hidden in the *paideia* of the Greeks.⁵⁶⁷

All then, in a word, who have spoken of divine things, both Barbarian and Greeks, have veiled the first principles of things, and delivered the truth in enigmas, and symbols, and allegories, and metaphors, and such like tropes.⁵⁶⁸

In *Stromata* 6.11, Clement reconsiders Greek education in terms of Christian *gnosis*. In doing so, he acknowledges the value of arithmetic, geometry, music, astronomy, philosophy, and

⁵⁶⁷ See Dawson, *Allegorical Readers and Cultural Revision in Ancient Alexandria* 205 for other examples of Clement's use of Greek sources.

⁵⁶⁸ Clement, "Stromata," 5.4.

grammar (reading and writing). Architecture is identified as a function of geometry.⁵⁶⁹

Following the “excellent lesson” of *Barnabas*,⁵⁷⁰ Clement identifies the narrative of Abraham as an example of the value of numbers for Christian exegesis.

Καθάπερ οὖν ἐπὶ τῆς ἀστρονομίας ἔχομεν ὑπόδειγμα τὸν Ἀβραάμ, οὕτως ἐπὶ τῆς ἀριθμητικῆς τὸν αὐτὸν Ἀβραάμ. 2 Ἀκούσας γὰρ ὅτι αἰχμάλωτος ἐλήφθη ὁ Λώτ, τοὺς ἰδίους οἰκογενεῖς τῇ ἀριθμήσας καὶ ἐπεξελθὼν πάμπολυν ἀριθμὸν τῶν πολεμίων χειροῦται. 3 Φασὶν οὖν εἶναι τοῦ μὲν κυριακοῦ σημείου τύπον κατὰ τὸ σχῆμα τὸ τριακοσιοστὸν στοιχεῖον, τὸ δὲ ἰῶτα καὶ τὸ ἦτα τοῦνομα σημαίνειν τὸ σωτήριον. 4 Μηνύεσθαι τοίνυν τοὺς Ἀβραάμ οἰκείους εἶναι κατὰ τὴν σωτηρίαν, τοὺς τῷ σημείῳ καὶ τῷ ὀνόματι προσπεφευγότας, κυρίου γεγονέναι τῶν αἰχμαλωτιζόντων καὶ τῶν τούτοις ἀκολουθούντων παμπόλλων ἀπίστων ἐθνῶν. 5 Ἦδη δὲ ὁ μὲν τριακόσια ἀριθμὸς τριάς ἐστὶν ἐν ἑκατοντάδι, ἡ δεκάς δὲ ὁμολογεῖται παντέλειος εἶναι. 6 Ὁ δὲ ὀκτώ, κύβος ὁ πρῶτος, ἡ ἰσότης ἐν ἀπάσαις ταῖς διαστάσεσι, μήκους, πλάτους, βάθους. (Clement, 6.11.84.1–6)

1 As then in astronomy we have Abraham as an instance, also in arithmetic we have the same Abraham. 2 "For, hearing that Lot was taken captive, and having numbered his own servants, born in his house, 318," he defeats a very great number of the enemy. 3 They say, then, that the character representing 300 is, as to shape, the type of the Lord's sign, and that the Iota and the Eta indicate the Saviour's name; 4 that it was indicated, accordingly, that Abraham's domestics were in salvation, who having fled to the Sign and the Name became lords of the captives, and of the very many unbelieving nations that followed them. 5 Now the number 300 is, 3 by 100. Ten is allowed to be the perfect number. 6 And 8 is the first cube, which is equality in all the dimensions—length, breadth, depth.

The 318 circumcised servants reveal the name Jesus (IE) and the sign of the cross (T). In addition we learn that the sign of the cross is 3 x 10 x 10 and that 10 is a “perfect number.” Clement follows this lesson with several other examples of the λόγος as it is revealed through number and this brings him to geometry:

⁵⁶⁹ Clement, "Stromata," 6.11.

⁵⁷⁰ "The Epistle of Barnabas," 9.7–9.

86.1 Γεωμετρίας δὲ ἔστω μαρτύριον ἡ κατασκευαζομένη σκηνὴ καὶ τεκταινομένη κιβωτός, ἀναλογίαις τισὶ λογικωτάταις, θείαις ἐπινοίαις κατασκευαζόμεναι, κατὰ συνέσεως δόσιν, ἐκ τῶν αἰσθητῶν εἰς τὰ νοητά, μᾶλλον δὲ ἐκ τῶνδε εἰς τὰ ἅγια μεταγούσης ἡμᾶς. **2** Τὰ μὲν γὰρ τετράγωνα ξύλα <τῶ> τὸ τετράγωνον σχῆμα πάντῃ βεβηκέναι ὀρθὰς γωνίας ἐπιτελοῦν τὸ ἀσφαλὲς δηλοῖ. Καὶ μήκος μὲν τριακόσιοι πήχεις τοῦ κατασκευάσματος πλάτος δὲ ν', βάθος δὲ λ'. καὶ εἰς πῆχυν ἄνωθεν συντελεῖται, ἐκ τῆς πλατείας βάσεως ἀποξυνομένη πυραμίδος τρόπον, ἡ κιβωτός, τῶν διὰ πυρὸς καθαιρομένων καὶ δοκιμαζομένων σύμβολον. **3** Ἡ γεωμετρικὴ αὕτη παρέχεται ἀναλογία εἰς παραπομπὴν τῶν ἀγίων ἐκείνων μονῶν, ὧν τὰς διαφορὰς αἱ διαφοραὶ τῶν ἀριθμῶν τῶν ὑποτεταγμένων μηνύουσιν.

87.1 Οἱ δὲ ἐμφερόμενοι λόγοι εἰσὶν ἑξαπλάσιοι ὥς τὰ τριακόσια τῶν ν', καὶ δεκαπλάσιοι ὥς τῶν λ' δεκαπλάσια τὰ τριακόσια, καὶ ἐπιδίμοιροι· τὰ γὰρ ν' τῶν λ' ἐπιδίμοιρα. **2** Εἰσὶ δ' οἱ τοὺς τριακοσίους πήχεις σύμβολον τοῦ κυριακοῦ σημείου λέγουσι, τοὺς ν' δὲ τῆς ἐλπίδος καὶ τῆς ἀφέσεως τῆς κατὰ τὴν πεν τηκοστήν, καὶ τοὺς λ' ἢ, ὥς ἔν τισι δώδεκα τὸ κήρυγμα δηλοῦν ἱστοροῦσιν, ὅτι τριακοστῶ μὲν ἐκήρυξεν ὁ κύριος ἔτι, ἰβ' δὲ ἦσαν οἱ ἀπόστολοι, καὶ εἰς πῆχυν συντελεῖσθαι τὸ κατασκευάσμα, εἰς μονάδα τελευτώσης τῆς τοῦ δικαίου προκοπῆς καὶ εἰς τὴν ἐνότητα τῆς πίστεως. (Clement, 6.11.87.1–87.2)

1 And let the testimony of geometry be the tabernacle that was constructed, and the ark that was fashioned, constructed in most regular proportions, and through divine ideas, by the gift of understanding, which leads us from things of sense to intellectual objects, or rather from these to holy things, and to the holy of holies. **2** For the squares of wood indicate that the square form, producing right angles, pervades all, and points out security. And the length of the structure was three hundred cubits, and the breadth fifty, and the height thirty; and above, the ark ends in a cubit, narrowing to a cubit from the broad base like a pyramid, the symbol of those who are purified and tested by fire. **3** And this geometrical proportion has a place, for the transport of those holy abodes, whose differences are indicated by the differences of the numbers set down below.

87.1 And the numbers introduced are sixfold, as three hundred is six times fifty; and tenfold, as three hundred is ten times thirty; and containing one and two-thirds (*epidimoiroi*), for fifty is one and two-thirds of thirty. **2** Now there are some who say that three hundred cubits are the symbol of the Lord's sign; and fifty, of hope and of the remission given at Pentecost; and thirty, or as in some, twelve, they say points out the preaching [of the Gospel]; because the Lord preached in His thirtieth year; and the apostles were twelve. And the structure's terminating in a cubit is the

symbol of the advancement of the righteous to oneness and to "the unity of the faith."

In Clement's reading, geometry leads the mind away from earthly things toward an understanding of the λόγος. This is evidenced, he argues, in the divine proportions given to Moses for the construction of the Ark and the Tabernacle. Geometry reveals the οἰκονομία as it is expressed in the first dwelling place of God among His chosen people.⁵⁷¹ Like the character of Isaac who prefigures Christ as the Father's sacrifice, the Tabernacle prefigures Christ as the dwelling place of God on earth. Like Isaac and Moses, the tabernacle, and by extension the temple, is a "type" of the incarnation of Christ.

Clement returns to the sign of the cross, represented in the Greek *tau* (T), as the key to interpreting the proof of Christ that lies hidden in the text of Exodus. The sign of the cross, 300, is revealed through the "perfect" number of 10 and through the number 6. These numbers, 10 and 6, are identified by Vitruvius as derived from the ideal body and, therefore, the origin of architectural proportion.⁵⁷² The "security" of the square and the fire symbolism of the triangle are borrowed from Plato's *Timaeus*.⁵⁷³ Clement is unapologetic about his appropriation of the subjects of philosophical inquiry like arithmetic and geometry, arguing "...the studies of philosophy, therefore, and philosophy itself, are aids in treating of the truth."⁵⁷⁴ In establishing the Christian *paideia*, Clement provided for the faithful the training necessary to affirm the presence of Christ, the order of the λόγος, in all things.⁵⁷⁵ The Wisdom of Solomon taught him: "For from the greatness and beauty of created things comes a corresponding perception of their

⁵⁷¹ Ex 25.10 Ark: 2.5 long x 1.5 wide x 1.5 high (cubits); Ex 26.1-2 Tabernacle: (10 curtains x 28 cubits) long x (1 x 4 cubits) 'wide'; Ex 26.7 Tabernacle Tent: (11 curtains x 30 cubits) x (1 x 4 cubits) wide [1 curtain doubled over]. Ex. 37.1 Ark: 2.5 long x 1.5 wide x 1.5 high (cubits); Ex. 36.8 Tabernacle: (10 cubits curtains x 28 cubits) x (1 x 4 cubits).

⁵⁷² Vitruvius, *De Architectura* 3.1.5.

⁵⁷³ Plato, *Timaeus and Critias*, trans. Desmond Lee (Middlesex: Penguin, 1987).

⁵⁷⁴ Clement, "Stromata," 6.1.

⁵⁷⁵ See Kovacs, "Divine Pedagogy and the Gnostic Teacher according to Clement of Alexandria," 3-25.

creator.”⁵⁷⁶

ORIGEN

In the writings of Origen, the body/temple metaphor is used in 14 verses.⁵⁷⁷ Eight of these verses are found in the *Commentary on the Gospel of John* and six verses in his apologetic *Against Celsus*. *Commentary* refers to the Gospel metaphor in three verses, the Pauline variation as it is developed in 1 Peter is found in one verse (10.26), and combined Pauline/Gospel variations appear in four separate but consecutive verses. *Against Celsus* refers to the Gospel variation in two verses, the Pauline variation in three verses, and a combination of the two variations in 8.19. We will limit our discussion here to the Gospel of John as the exemplary work of Origen’s exegetical method.

According to Eusebius, the first five books of the *Commentary* were written while Origen was in Alexandria. Questions raised by Heracleon about John and the unity of the Gospels may have been the reason why Origen undertook his commentary.⁵⁷⁸

In his reading of John 2.18–22 beginning in *Comm. sur Jn.* 10.35.228, Origen acknowledges both body/temple variations and observes that both the temple and the body of Jesus are used by John as “types” of the Church:

228 Ἀμφότερα μέντοι γε, τό τε ἱερὸν καὶ τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, κατὰ μίαν τῶν ἐκδοχῶν τύπος μοι εἶναι φαίνεται τῆς ἐκκλησίας, τῷ ἐκ λίθων ζώντων οἰκοδομεῖσθαι αὐτήν, οἶκον πνευματικὸν εἰς ἱεράτευμα ἅγιον γινομένην, ἐποικοδομουμένην << ἐπὶ τῷ θεμελίῳ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ προφητῶν, ὄντος ἀκρογωνιαίου Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ >>, χρηματίζουσιν << ναόν >>. (Origen, *Comm. sur Jn.* 10.35.228)

⁵⁷⁶ Wisdom of Solomon 13.5.

⁵⁷⁷ see Appendix 1.

⁵⁷⁸ Trigg, *Origen: The Bible and Philosophy in the Third-century Church* 149. These issues are addressed in our discussion of Clement and Origen.

Now, both of these two things, the temple and the body of Jesus, appear to me, in one interpretation at least, to be types of the Church, and to signify that it is built of living stones, a spiritual house for a holy priesthood, built on the foundation of the Apostles and prophets, Christ Jesus being the head corner-stone; and it is, therefore, called a temple.⁵⁷⁹

Because Christ is a type of the Church, his resurrection is the resurrection of all members of the community. It is in the resurrection that all members of the body are brought together in a perfect arrangement.

236 "Ότε δε γίνεται αὕτη ἡ ἀνάστασις τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ καὶ τελειοτέρου Χριστοῦ σώματος, τότε τὰ μέλη τοῦ Χριστοῦ τὰ νῦν, ὡς πρὸς τὸ μέλλον, ξηρὰ ὅστᾳ συναχθήσεται, ὁστοῦν πρὸς ὁστοῦν καὶ ἀρμονία πρὸς ἀρμονίαν, οὐδενὸς τῶν ἐστερημένων ἀρμονίας καταντήσοντος εἰς τὸν τέλειον ἄνδρα, << εἰς τὸ μέτρον τῆς ἡλικίας τοῦ πληρώματος >> τοῦ σώματος << τοῦ Χριστοῦ >>. (Origen, *Comm. sur Jn.* 10.36.236)

But when the resurrection itself takes place of the true and more perfect body of Christ, then those who are now the members of Christ, for they will then be dry bones, will be brought together, bone to bone, and fitting to fitting (for none of those who are destitute of fitting (*harmonia*) will come to the perfect man), to the measure of the stature of the fullness of the body of Christ. And then the many members will be the one body, all of them, though many, becoming members of one body.

Like the *module* used for the design of Roman temples, each part of this new structure shares an essential consistency, a harmony, with the whole.⁵⁸⁰ The Christian temple is built up from the individual temples that are the bodies of each member of the community and they are united as

⁵⁷⁹ English translations of these passages are from: Origen. "Commentary on the Gospel according to John." Trans. Alan Menzies. *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the writings of the fathers down to A.D. 325.* 1867. Ed. Rev. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. Vol. 10. Edinburgh/Grand Rapids, MI: T&T Clark/ Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1985.

⁵⁸⁰ "The planning of temples depends on symmetry: and the method of this architects must diligently apprehend. It arises from proportion (which in Greek is called *analogia*). Proportion consists in taking a fixed module, in each case, both for the parts of a building and for the whole, by which the method of symmetry is put into practice. For without symmetry and proportion no temple can have a regular plan; that is, it must have an exact proportion worked out after the fashion of the members of a finely-shaped human body." Vitruvius, *De Architectura* 3.1.1–2.

one perfect temple after the resurrection. What determines the proportion and symmetry of this temple *module* is the idealized body of the resurrected Christ.

Origen is sensitive to possible discrepancies between the two variations of the body/temple metaphor in the Scriptures. Characteristically, he reads this as an indication that some hidden meaning is buried at their intersection:

263 Εἰ τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ναὸς αὐτοῦ εἴρηται, ζητῆσαι ἄξιον πότερον ἀπλούστερον τοῦτο ἐκδεκτέον, ἢ ἕκαστον τῶν ἀναγεγραμμένων περὶ τοῦ ναοῦ φιλοτιμητέον ἀνάγειν εἰς τὸν περὶ τοῦ σώματος Ἰησοῦ λόγον, ἥτοι οὗ εἵληφεν ἐκ τῆς παρθένου, ἢ τῆς ἐκκλησίας σώματος αὐτοῦ λεγομένης εἶναι, ὥς καὶ ἡμᾶς μέλη τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ παρὰ τῷ ἀποστόλῳ ὀνομάζεσθαι. 264 Ὁ μὲν οὖν τις πραγμάτων αὐτὸν ἀπαλλάττων τῷ ἀπογινώσκειν ἕκαστον δύνασθαι τῶν κατὰ τὸν ναὸν ἀναφέρειν ἐπὶ τὸ σῶμα, ὁποτέρως ἂν ἔχη, ἐπὶ τὸ ἀπλούστερον καταφεύξεται, λέγων διὰ τοῦτο σῶμα ἑκατέρως νοούμενον τὸν ναὸν ὠνομάσθαι, ἐπεὶ ὥσπερ ὁ ναὸς δόξαν εἶχεν θεοῦ κατασκηνοῦσαν ἐν αὐτῷ, οὕτως εἰκόνα καὶ δόξαν θεοῦ ὑπάρχοντα τὸν πρωτότοκον πάσης κτίσεως, τὸ σῶμα ἢ τὴν ἐκκλησίας ἀγαλματοφοροῦντα ναὸν εὐλόγως εἰρησθαι θεοῦ. (Origen, *Comm. sur Jn.* 10.39.263-264)

It may be asked whether this is to be taken in its plain sense, or whether we should try to connect each statement that is recorded about the temple, with the view we take about the body of Jesus, whether the body which He received from the Virgin, or that body of Christ which the Church is said to be, as we are said by the Apostle to be all members of His body. One may, on the one hand, suppose it to be hopeless to get everything that is said about the temple properly connected with the body, in whatever sense the body be taken, and one may have recourse to a simpler explanation, and say that the body (in either of these senses) is called the temple, because as the temple had the glory of God dwelling in it, so He who was the image and glory of God, the first-born of every creature, could rightly be called, in respect of His body or the Church, the temple containing the image.

For those not up to the onerous, perhaps impossible, task of mastering all of the sources necessary for a rational association of the body and the temple, Origen offers a rhetorical connection through metaphor—the body is a temple because God dwells within it. This is true

of both the Pauline and Gospel variations and it is resonant with the depiction of God's presence in the OT. While it is understood explicitly in the context of the Temple of Solomon, Origen expands the tenor of the metaphor to include the more tangible temples of the Roman city in the third century. Origen goes on to say that Christ contains the "image" of God. The intimacy of divine image and space, explicit in Roman temple design, is transferred to the body of Christ.

Alternatively, for those who are not content with a rhetorical reading of the body/temple metaphor, Origen offers up another method of interpretation:

266 Πλὴν ἐν τοῖς τοιούτοις μάλιστα διὰ τὸ ὑπὲρ τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην εἶναι φύσιν καὶ κατὰ τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ σοφίαν τὸ ἴδιον τῆς θεοπνεύστου γραφῆς ἐμφαίνεσθαι πειθόμενοι, σοφίαν ἐν μυστηρίῳ τὴν ἀποκεκρυμμένην, ἣν οὐδεὶς τῶν ἀρχόντων τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου ἔγνωκεν, παρίστασης, καὶ καταλαμβάνοντες ἐξαιρέτου πνεύματος σοφίας ἑαυτοὺς δεομένους πρὸς τὸ τὰ τηλικαῦτα ἱεροπρεπῶς νοῆσαι, ὥς ἐνι μάλιστα δι' ὀλίγων τὴν περίνοιαν τῶν κατὰ τὸν τόπον διαγράψαι πειρασόμεθα (Origen, *Comm. sur Jn.* 10.39.266)

We also have a strong conviction that in such matters, which transcend human nature, it must be the work of divine wisdom to make plain the meaning of inspired scripture, which is hidden in mystery, which none of the rulers of this world knew. We are well aware, too, that we need the assistance of that excellent spirit of wisdom, in order to understand such matters as they should be understood by ministers of sacred things; and in this connection we will attempt to describe as shortly as we may, our view of what belongs to this subject.

A rational exegesis cannot reveal the truth hidden in Scriptures and a rhetorical reading, even for the faithful, does not capture the full depth of its mysteries. Recalling the model established by Clement's "*Gnostic*," Origen calls for a structured reading of the body/temple metaphor as an "informed" revelation. Faith and knowledge unite the body and soul for a spiritual reading of the text that confirms the historical and ontological legitimacy of the Christian λόγος. To this end, Jesus is prefigured in the OT by characters like Moses and Solomon who are a "type" of Christ:

σῶμα τὴν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ οἶκον θεοῦ ἐκ λίθων ζώντων οἰκοδομούμενον, οἶκον πνευματικὸν εἰς ἱεράτευμα ἅγιον μαρτυροῦντες ἀπὸ τοῦ Πέτρου τυγχάνειν, ὡς τὸν οἰκοδομοῦντα τὸν ναὸν υἱὸν Δαβὶδ κατὰ τοῦτο Χριστοῦ εἶναι τύπον μετὰ τοὺς πολέμους εἰρήνης βαθυτάτης γεγεννημένης οἰκοδομοῦντα εἰς δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ τὸν ναὸν ἐν τῇ ἐπιγείῳ Ἱερουσαλὴμ, ἵνα μηκέτι παρὰ μετακινήτῳ πράγματι τῇ σχηνῇ < ἡ > λατρεία ἐπιτελῇται.

267 Ἐκαστον < δὲ > τῶν κατὰ τὸν ναὸν ἐπὶ ἐκκλησίαν ἀνάγειν πειρασόμεθα. (Origen, *Comm. sur Jn.* 10.39.266–267)

The body is the Church, and we learn from Peter that it is a house of God, built of living stones, a spiritual house for a holy priesthood. Thus the son of David, who builds this house, is a type of Christ. He builds it when his wars are at an end, and a period of profound peace has arrived; he builds the temple for the glory of God in the Jerusalem on earth, so that worship may no longer be celebrated in a moveable erection like the tabernacle. Let us seek to find in the Church the truth of each statement made about the temple.

Both Solomon and Christ are temple builders and sons of David.⁵⁸¹ Both know God's plan for the temple. The plan of the Temple is a "type" of the λόγος and, properly interpreted, reveals the pattern of the Church. This pattern arranges the "living stones" into a harmonious structure fashioned after the perfect body of Christ.

268 Καί τότε ἕκαστος τῶν ζώντων λίθων κατὰ τὴν ἀξίαν τοῦ ἐνταῦθα βίου ἔσται τοῦ ναοῦ λίθος, ὁ μὲν τις ἐν τῷ θεμελίῳ ἀποστόλος ἢ προφήτης βαστάζων τοὺς ἐπικειμένους, ὁ δὲ τις μετὰ τοὺς ἐν τῷ θεμελίῳ ὑπὸ μὲν τῶν ἀποστόλων βασταζόμενος καὶ αὐτὸς σὺν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις συμβαστάζων τοὺς ὑποδεεστέρους· (Origen, *Comm. sur Jn.* 10.39.268)

And then each of the living stones will be, according to the work of his life here, a stone of that temple, one, at the foundation, an apostle or a prophet, bearing those placed upon him, and another, after those in the foundation, and supported by the Apostles, will himself, with the Apostles, help to bear those in more need.

⁵⁸¹ The genealogy of Jesus is found in Mat. 1.1–16 and in Luke 3.23–38. It does not appear in John.

In the remaining verses of 10.39, Origen reflects on the temple builders and resolves problems of logic apparent in the OT text through his method of allegorical hermeneutic. He reads a series of secret numbers, hidden in the text, that include: one, two, three, six, eight, and ten.⁵⁸² In 10.40, Origen continues his exegesis of Solomon's project and sees in the careful preparation of the masonry a "type" of stone that is more appropriately understood as the "living stones" that form the Christian temple. Doubting the possibility of shaping the "hard white stones" of the temple on site without the luxury of iron tools, he reads the stones of Solomon's temple as a trope for the individual members of the Christian community metaphorized in Paul and 1 Peter.

In 10.40.278, Origen continues his exegesis of the Temple. In this verse, however, it is not the "building up" of the Temple that concerns him but the affect of the architecture itself on the faithful. Solomon's central stair, a perfect geometrical object with a spiral section and circular plan, provides Origen with a vehicle to move his reading of John out from words in to the world of phenomena. Geometry, as architecture, is not just the revelation of the λόγος as in 10.39; here, architecture is the means to revelation:

278 Καὶ ἀνάβασις δέ τις περὶ τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ μὴ γεγωνιωμένη, ἀνακλάσεις εὐθειῶν ἔχουσα. Γέγραπται γάρ· << Καὶ ἐλικτὴ ἀνάβασις εἰς τὸ μέσον, καὶ ἐκ τῆς μέσης ἐπὶ τὰ τριώροφα. >> Ἐλικοειδὴ γὰρ ἐχρῆν εἶναι τὴν ἐν τῷ ναῷ τοῦ θεοῦ ἀνοδὸν τῆς ἑλικὸς ἀναβάσει τὸν ἰσαίτατον κύκλον μιμουμένης. 279 Ἵνα δὲ οὗτος ὁ οἶκος βέβαιος ᾖ, ὥς ἐνι μάλιστα οἰκοδομοῦνται ἔνδεσμοι αὐτῷ δι' ὅλου οἴκου πέντε ἐν πήχει τὸ ὕψος, ἵνα ἡ ἀπὸ τῶν αἰσθητῶν ἐπὶ τὰς καλουμένας θείας αἰσθήσεις ἀνοδος δηλωθῇ ἐν ὕψει τυγχάνουσα πρὸς κατανόησιν τῶν νοητῶν. (Origen, *Comm. sur Jn.* 10.40.278–279)

And there is some sort of an ascent about the temple of God, not with angles, but with bends of straight lines. For it is written "And there was a winding staircase to the middle, and from the

⁵⁸² This series has several combinatory possibilities: 1+2=3 (the eternal interval, the triad); 1+2+3= 6 (acknowledged by Clement, Origen, and Vitruvius as a significant number); 1+2+3+6 = 12 (the number of the apostles); 1+2+3+6+8+10 = 30 (3 x 10). Ten is also recognized by Clement, Origen (in 10.1), and Vitruvius as a significant number.

middle to the third floor;” for the staircase in the house of God had to be spiral, thus imitating in its ascent the circle, which is the most perfect figure. But that this house might be secure five ties are built in it, as fair as possible, a cubit high, that on looking up one might see it to be suggested how we rise from sensible things to the so-called divine perceptions, and so be brought to perceive those things which are seen only by the mind.

For Origen, as for Clement, the contemplation of geometry leads the mind to higher things.⁵⁸³ As a function of geometry, architecture leads the mind beyond “sensible things” to inform “divine perceptions.” Architecture is an extension of Scripture and shares in the geometrical pattern of the λόγος.

In 10.41.286f, architectural details are used metaphorically to illustrate how the mystery of God’s presence is revealed:

286 ἐν ᾧ καὶ [i.e. temple] θυρίδες παρακυπτόμεναι κρυπταὶ κατασκευάζονται πρὸς < τὸ > τὰς ἐλλάμψεις τοῦ φωτὸς τοῦ θεοῦ σωτηρίας δυνηθῆναι χωρῆσαι, καὶ—τί με δεῖ λέγειν καθ’ ἕκαστον;—ἵνα εὑρεθῇ τὸ σῶμα Χριστοῦ ἢ ἐκκλησία τὸν λόγον ἔχουσα τοῦ πνευματικοῦ οἴκου καὶ ναοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ. Ὡς γὰρ προεῖπον, τῆς ἐν μυστηρίῳ ἀποκεκρυμμένης δεόμεθα σοφίας, χωρητῆς τυγχανούσης μόνῳ τῷ δυναμένῳ εἰπεῖν· << Ἡμεῖς δὲ νοῦν Χριστοῦ ἔχομεν >>, ἵνα κατὰ τὸ βούλημα τοῦ οἰκονομήσαντος ταῦτα γραφῆναι πνευματικῶς ἐκλάβωμεν ἕκαστον τῶν εἰρημένων. 287 Ἄλλως δὲ καὶ οὐ κατὰ τὸ παρόν ἐστὶν ἀνάγνωσμα ἕκαστον τούτων ἀναπλῶσαι. Καὶ ταῦτα οὖν αὐτάρκη πρὸς τὸ ἰδεῖν πῶς << ἐκεῖνος δὲ ἔλεγεν περὶ τοῦ ναοῦ τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ >>. (Origen, *Comm. sur Jn.* 10.41.286–287)

In this temple there are also windows, placed obliquely and out of sight, so that the illumination of the divine light may enter for salvation, and—why should I go into particulars?—that the body of Christ, the Church, may be found having the plan of the spiritual house and temple of God. As I said before, we require that wisdom which is hidden in a mystery, and which he alone can apprehend who is able to say, “But we have the mind of Christ,”—we require that wisdom to interpret spiritually each detail of what is said in accordance with the will of Him who caused it to be written. To enter into these details is not in accordance with our present subject. What has

⁵⁸³ Clement, “Stromata,” 6.1 discussed above.

been said may suffice to let us understand how "He spoke about the temple of His body."

Like *Barnabas* and Clement, Origen reads the seemingly disparate temple and body references of Scripture as a unified whole. Origen's exegesis on the body/temple metaphor develops fully Paul's unification and segregation of the Christian community. The presence of Christ in the community unites individuals into a single body. The form of that body, arranged after the pattern of Christ, distinguishes itself from the order of people by God's indwelling. From John, it is clear that the image of that perfect order is the body of Christ. The perfect arrangement of this body in the image of Christ, prefigured in the OT as the Temple of Solomon, becomes the Christian temple and the earthly abode of God. The temple of the Christian community and the temple that is Christ's body share with the temple of the OT the order of the λόγος, an order that is revealed in number and geometry. Origen's use of the body/temple metaphor is rhetorical and instructive, but it is also a hermeneutic for revelation. In identifying architecture as a type of geometry, Origen extends his hermeneutic beyond the architectural images of Scripture to works of architecture.⁵⁸⁴

Origen's central thesis, identifying Christ's soul as an essentially mysterious meeting of the λόγος and humanity,⁵⁸⁵ is the epistemological basis for his hermeneutic. This is clear, we have argued, in his reading of the body/temple metaphor. Christ's body, informed by the λόγος, is an ideal type that demonstrates the pattern of God's divine order on earth. It is the perfect demonstration of God's presence in the material world and reveals the unity of Christ and Church. The pattern of the λόγος "builds up" and, as evidenced in the geometry of Solomon's temple, produces proportional and harmonious architectural relationships. As such, body/temple

⁵⁸⁴ As we have discussed in Chapter 3.5.1, architecture is established by Clement as a function of geometry in the Alexandrian School.

⁵⁸⁵ Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines* 158.

metaphor establishes a system of architectural order that is alternative to, but resonant with, Vitruvius' *De Architectura*.

Kathleen McVey identifies Origen as the source for a 6th C. Byzantine tradition of architectural contemplation (*theoria*) that leads to mystical revelation. She bases her attribution to Origen's formulation of the Christian mysteries as beginning where "the temporal or material phenomena participate in varying degrees in God."⁵⁸⁶ While McVey does not discuss body/temple metaphor, she sees the genesis of architectural contemplation in the association of the Church with a pre-existing order and the appropriation from the OT of images like the tabernacle.⁵⁸⁷ She acknowledges, as we have, the influence of *Barnabas* and Clement on Origen's reading of architecture. Further, McVey identifies Eusebius as the heir to the Alexandrian tradition of architectural *theoria*.⁵⁸⁸

EUSEBIUS

Eusebius uses the body/temple metaphor in 11 separate verses. All of these are found in a panegyric written for the dedication of the new cathedral in Tyre.⁵⁸⁹ Built by the bishop Paulinus, the cathedral replaced church buildings destroyed during the Diocletian persecutions. Eusebius does not tell us when the original buildings in Tyre were destroyed, but earlier in the *E.H.* he reports the destruction of churches in the "nineteenth year of the reign of Diocletian"⁵⁹⁰ and of martyrdoms in Tyre.⁵⁹¹ The panegyric may have been written as early as 317 and

⁵⁸⁶ McVey, "The Domed Church as Microcosm: Literary Roots of an Architectural Symbol," 202.

⁵⁸⁷ McVey, "The Domed Church as Microcosm: Literary Roots of an Architectural Symbol," 203.

⁵⁸⁸ McVey, "The Domed Church as Microcosm: Literary Roots of an Architectural Symbol," 205.

⁵⁸⁹ Eusebius, *The Ecclesiastical History* 10.4.

⁵⁹⁰ Eusebius, *The Ecclesiastical History* 8.2.4. 302–303 C.E.

⁵⁹¹ Eusebius, *The Ecclesiastical History* 8.8.2.

certainly before the council of Nicea was convened in the summer of 325.⁵⁹²

Eusebius' exegesis is based on a canon of texts that he identifies collectively as the New Testament [καινή διαθήκη].⁵⁹³ The accepted books are:

In the first place should be put the holy tetrad of the Gospels. To them follows the writing of the Acts of the Apostles. After this should be reckoned the Epistles of Paul. Following them the Epistle of John called the first, and in the same way should be recognized the Epistle of Peter. In addition to these should be put, if it seems desirable, the Revelation of John, the arguments concerning which we will expound at the proper time. These belong to the recognized books. [καὶ ταῦτα μὲν ἐν ὁμολογουμένοις.]⁵⁹⁴

Eusebius also acknowledges a group of writings that are disputed but known to most commentators. These books include: the Epistle of James, Epistle of Jude, 2 Peter, and the second and third Epistles of John.⁵⁹⁵ Returning to the point of John's authorship of Revelations and recalling the Gospel of the Hebrews, he adds: "For, as I said, some reject it, others count it among the Recognized Books. Some have also counted the Gospel according to the Hebrews in which those Hebrews who have accepted Christ take a special pleasure. These would all belong to the disputed books."⁵⁹⁶

Finally, Eusebius identifies the books that are decidedly not part of the καινή διαθήκη: "...the Acts of Paul, the work entitled the Shepherd, the Apocalypse of Peter, and in addition to them the letter called *Barnabas* and the so-called Teachings of the Apostles."⁵⁹⁷ And further, all writings that: "...are put forward by the heretics under the name of the apostles containing gospels such as those of Peter, and Thomas, and Matthias, and some others besides, or Acts such

⁵⁹² White, *The Social Origins of Christian Architecture, Volume 1* 136.

⁵⁹³ Eusebius, *The Ecclesiastical History* 3.25.1.

⁵⁹⁴ Eusebius, *The Ecclesiastical History* 3.25.1–3.

⁵⁹⁵ Eusebius, *The Ecclesiastical History* 3.25.3.

⁵⁹⁶ Eusebius, *The Ecclesiastical History* 3.25.4–5.

⁵⁹⁷ Eusebius, *The Ecclesiastical History* 3.25.4.

as those of Andrew and John and the other apostles.”⁵⁹⁸ This final type of text should not be considered simply spurious but: ἀλλ’ ὥς ἄτοπα πάντα καὶ δυσσεβῇ παραιτητέον.⁵⁹⁹ The authority of the canon is determined by the διαδοχαὶ ἐκκλησιαστικῶν.⁶⁰⁰

In the panegyric, it is impossible to separate the Pauline and Gospel variations of the body/temple metaphor. The exegesis of *Barnabas*, Clement, and Origen, all working to unite the Church and Christ’s body, is fully resolved in Eusebius. He accepts the Christian body/temple as a seamless whole fused together by the λόγος and develops a second level of metaphor by employing the body/temple as a vehicle for a new understanding of God’s Temple. In the panegyric, the analogous architectural order that unites the temple of Christians and the temple of Christ extends to a physical building. The λόγος that formed Solomon’s temple, the body of Christ, and the community of Christians now guides the construction of Christian buildings. Eusebius uses the body/temple metaphor as a vehicle to explain the general relationship between the Christian communities and their new church buildings following the persecutions of the early fourth century.

Ἐπὶ δὴ τούτοις τὸ πᾶσιν εὐκταῖον ἡμῖν καὶ ποθούμενον συνεκροτεῖτο θέαμα, ἐγκαινίων ἑορταὶ κατὰ πόλεις καὶ τῶν ἄρτι νεοπαγῶν προσευκτηρίων ἀφιερώσεις, ἐπισκόπων ἐπὶ ταῦτόν συνηλύσεις, τῶν πόρρωθεν ἐξ ἄλλοδαπῆς συνδρομαί, λαῶν εἰς λαοὺς φιλοφρονήσεις, τῶν Χριστοῦ σώματος μελῶν εἰς μίαν συνιόντων ἀρμονίαν ἔνωσις.
(Eusebius, *E.H.* 10.3.1)

After this there was brought about that spectacle for which we all prayed and longed: festivals of dedication in the cities and consecrations of the newly-built houses of prayer, assemblages of bishops, comings together of those from far off foreign lands, kindly acts on the part of laity towards laity, union between the members of Christ’s body as they met together in complete

⁵⁹⁸ Eusebius, *The Ecclesiastical History* 3.25.6.

⁵⁹⁹ Eusebius, *The Ecclesiastical History* 3.25.7.

⁶⁰⁰ Eusebius, *The Ecclesiastical History* 3.25.6.

harmony.⁶⁰¹

The members of Christ's body are the members of the rebuilt church community. As the body of Christ is resurrected after crucifixion, so too is the church community resurrected after persecution. In the following verse, Eusebius invokes Ezekiel 37.⁶⁰²

συνήγετο γοῦν ἀκολούθως προρρήσει προφητικῇ μυστικῶς τὸ μέλλον προσημαινούση
ὀστέον πρὸς ὀστέον καὶ ἁρμονία πρὸς ἁρμονίαν καὶ ὅσα θεσπίζων ὁ λόγος δι'
αἰνιγμάτων ἀψευδῶς προαντεΐνατο. (Eusebius, *E.H.* 10.3.2)

Certainly, in accordance with a prophetic prediction that mystically signified beforehand what was to come, there came together bone to bone and joint to joint, and all that the oracular utterance in dark speech truly foretold.

To follow Ezekiel:

Thus says the Lord God: I am going to open your graves, O my people; and I will bring you back to the land of Israel. And you shall know that I am the Lord, when I open your graves, and bring you up from your graves, O my people. I will put my spirit within you, and you shall live, and I will place you on your own soil; then you shall know that I, the Lord, have spoken and will act," says the Lord. (Ezek. 37.12–14)

By the Word of God, these bones grow new flesh and their spirits are renewed. God tells the prophet:

My dwelling shall be with them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. Then the nations shall know that I the Lord sanctify Israel when my sanctuary is among them forevermore. (Ezek. 37.27–28)

⁶⁰¹ English translations of these passages are from Eusebius. *The Ecclesiastical History*. 1926. Trans. Kirsopp Lake. The Loeb Classical Library. Ed. T.E. Page. 2 vols. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1959.

⁶⁰² Ezek 37.7 "...suddenly there was a noise, a rattling, and the bones came together, bone to its bone..."

Within the first few verses of the panegyric, Eusebius establishes his premise. Christ, as Paul tells us, is the end of the old covenant. Christ is the first risen of the dead. The members of the church share in that resurrection because they are each a part of Christ's body. Since the body of Christ is a community, the place of gathering—where the body of the resurrected dwells—is where God dwells. Through the body/temple metaphor, it becomes possible to understand the presence of God in connection with a place and consequently with a building. What this building desires to be is the untainted body of Christ.

Like Origen, Eusebius reads a prototype of Christian architecture in the Tabernacle of Moses and in the Jerusalem Temple. In 10.4.2–3, Eusebius compares Paulinus with Bezalel, the master craftsman to whom Moses relates God's instructions for the construction of God's "dwelling place" in Exodus 31. In 10.4.2, he compares Paulinus to Solomon and Zerubabel, builders of the Jerusalem Temples:

ὦ νέον ἁγίου νεῶ θεοῦ σεμνολόγημα, γεραιρᾷ μὲν φρονήσει παρὰ θεοῦ τετιμημένε, νέας δὲ καὶ ἄκμαζούσης ἀρετῆς ἔργα πολυτελῆ καὶ πράξεις ἐπιδεδειγμένε, ὧ τὸν ἐπὶ γῆς οἶκον αὐτὸς ὁ τὸν σύμπαντα κόσμον περιέχων θεὸς δείμασθαι καὶ ἀνανεοῦν Χριστῷ τῷ μονογενεῖ καὶ πρωτογενεῖ δὲ αὐτοῦ λόγῳ τῇ τε ἁγίᾳ τούτου καὶ θεοπρεπεῖ νύμφῃ γέρας ἐξαίρετον δεδώρηται, εἴτε τις νέον σε Βεσελελ θείας ἀρχιτέκτονα σκηνῆς ἐθέλοι καλεῖν εἴτε Σολομῶνα καινῆς καὶ πολὺ κρείττονος Ἱερουσαλὴμ βασιλέα εἴτε καὶ νέον Ζοροβαβελ τὴν πολὺ κρείττονα δόξαν τῆς προτέρας τῷ νεῷ τοῦ θεοῦ περιτίθεντα. (Eusebius, *E.H.* 10.4.2)

...O youthful pride of God's holy temple, honoured indeed by God with revered wisdom, yet noted for the choice deeds and acts of a youthful virtue that cometh to its prime, upon whom He who has compassed the whole world hath bestowed the especial honour of building His house upon earth and restoring it for Christ His only begotten and first born Word and for Christ's holy and reverend Bride—whether one should call you a new Bezalel the architect of a divine tabernacle, or Solomon the king of a new a far goodlier Jerusalem, or even a new Zerubbabel who bestowed upon the temple of God that glory which greatly exceeded the former.

The Church at Tyre is the new Temple of Jerusalem—the architecture of the new covenant and, implicitly, the heir to the history of the covenant of Moses. But unlike the Temple of the Old Covenant, the Temple of the New Covenant, while connected to a place (as we have discussed above), understands that place in relation to the manifestation of Christ’s body through the gathering of a congregation. The significant place, it would seem at this point in Christian architecture, is significant because Christians gather there. It is not a question of architectural form, but what permeates that form—the λόγος.

Θαῦμα μὲν οὖν μέγιστον τοῦτο καὶ πέρα πάσης ἐκπλήξεως, μάλιστα τοῖς ἐπὶ μόνῃ τῇ τῶν ἔξωθεν φαντασίᾳ τὸν νοῦν προσανέχουσιν· θαυμάτων δὲ θαυμασιώτερα τὰ τε ἀρχέτυπα καὶ τούτων τὰ πρωτότυπα νοητὰ καὶ θεοπρεπῆ παραδείγματα, τὰ τῆς ἐνθέου φημὶ καὶ λογικῆς ἐν ψυχᾷς οἰκοδομῆς ἀνανεώματα· ἦν αὐτὸς ὁ θεόπαις κατ’ εἰκόνα τὴν αὐτὸς αὐτοῦ δημιουργήσας πάντῃ τε καὶ κατὰ πάντα τὸ θεοείκελον δεδωρημένος, ἄφθαρτον φύσιν, ἀσώματον, λογικὴν, πάσης γεώδους ὕλης ἄλλοτρίαν, αὐτονοερὰν οὐσίαν, ἅπαξ τὸ πρῶτον ἐκ τοῦ μὴ ὄντος εἰς τὸ εἶναι συστησάμενος, νύμφην ἁγίαν καὶ νεῶν πανίερον ἑαυτῷ τε καὶ τῷ πατρὶ κατειργάσατο· ὃ καὶ σαφῶς αὐτὸς ὁμολογῶν ἐκφαίνει, λέγων ἐνοικήσω ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἑμπεριπατήσω, καὶ ἔσομαι αὐτῶν θεὸς καὶ αὐτοὶ ἔσονται μοι λαός· καὶ τοιαύτη μὲν ἡ τελεία καὶ κεκαθαρμένη ψυχὴ, ἀρχήθεν οὕτω γεγεννημένη, οἷα τὸν οὐράνιον λόγον ἀγαλματοφορεῖν. (Eusebius *E.H.* 10.4.55–56)

A mighty wonder truly is this, and surpassing all amazement, especially in the eyes of such as take heed only to the appearance of outward things. But more wonderful than the wonders are the archetypes, the rational prototypes of these things, and their divine models, I mean the renewal of the God-given, spiritual edifice in our souls. This edifice the Son of God Himself created in his own image, and everywhere and in all things hath bestowed upon it the divine likeness, an incorruptible nature, an essence incorporeal, spiritual, a stranger to all earthly matter and endowed with intelligence of its own; once for all at the first He formed it into being from that which was not, and hath made it a holy bride and a sacred temple for himself and the Father. And this also He Himself clearly sheweth, when He thus confesseth: “I will dwell in them, and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. Such then is the perfect and purified soul, thus begotten from the beginning so as to bear the image of the heavenly Word.

Each of the Christian Temples, as place, participates in the greater whole of the ultimate place—the city of God. Harmonious and ethereal like the harmonies of music, the miraculous dwelling places of Christ’s body form His Father’s city. Like the Roman architecture described by Vitruvius, Christian architecture participates in a universal order.

ποίη δὲ πόλει ἢ τῇδε τῇ νεοπαγεῖ καὶ θεοτεύκτω; ἥτις ἐστὶν ἐκκλησία τοῦ ζῶντος, στῦλος καὶ ἐδραίωμα τῆς ἀληθείας, περὶ ἧς καὶ ἄλλο τι θεῖον λόγιον ᾧδὲ πως εὐαγγελίζεται ‘δεδοξασμένα ἐλαλήθη περὶ σοῦ, ἡ πόλις τοῦ θεοῦ’· ἐφ’ ἣν τοῦ παναγάθου συγκροτήσαντος ἡμᾶς τοῦ μονογενοῦς αὐτοῦ χάριτος, τῶν ἀνακεκλημένων ἕκαστος ὑμνεῖτω μόνον οὐχὶ βοῶν καὶ λέγων ‘εὐφράνθην ἐπὶ τοῖς εἰρηκόσιν μοι Εἰς οἶκον κυρίου πορευσόμεθα’ καὶ ‘κύριε, ἡγάπησα εὐπρέπειαν οἴκου σου καὶ τόπον σκηνώματος δόξης σου,’ καὶ μὴ μόνον γε ὁ καθεὶς, ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ πάντες ἀθρώως ἐνὶ πνεύματι καὶ μιᾷ ψυχῇ γεραίροντες ἀνευφημῶμεν, ‘μέγας κύριος’ ἐπιλέγοντες ‘καὶ αἰνετὸς σφόδρα ἐν πόλει τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν, ἐν ὧρει ἁγίῳ αὐτοῦ.’ καὶ γὰρ οὖν μέγας ὡς ἀληθῶς, καὶ μέγας ὁ οἶκος αὐτοῦ, ὑψηλὸς καὶ ἐπιμήκης καὶ ὠραῖος κάλλει παρὰ τοὺς υἱοὺς τῶν ἀνθρώπων· (Eusebius, *E.H.*10.4.7-8)

And in what city, if it be not the new-made city that God hath builded, which is the church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth (I Tim 3.15); of which also another divine oracle speaketh good tidings, somewhat on this manner: “Glorious things are spoken of thee, O city of God.” (Psa 87.3). To which city since the all gracious God hath gathered us, through the grace of His Only begotten, let each to the guests sing, yea all but shout, and say “I was glad when they said unto me, we will go unto the house of the Lord”; and “ Lord, I have loved the beauty of thy house, and the place where thy glory dwelleth.” And let not only each one by himself, but also all together with one by himself, but also all together with one spirit and one soul, give honour and praise saying: “Great is the Lord, and highly to be praised, in the city of our God, in his holy mountain.” Yea verily, He is truly great, and great is His house, lofty and large; and more lovely in beauty than the sons of men.

Eusebius builds the link between the City of God and the architecture of the church through a complex set of metaphorical relationships. As the church building is part of the City of God, so too the City is present in the architecture of each church building. Neither City nor

Church exists within measurable bounds. The City is all of the Churches of Christ resurrected. The church extends through all of its members and further through their potential for resurrection. Just as the material body participates in the ideal body of the resurrected Christ, the material building participates in the architecture of the ideal City. The metaphor of temple/body is extended through church/congregation to the City of God/church architecture by way of the resurrection. Christ's risen body is the new body promised to all Christians. The new Christians will live in the City of God through their new bodies. The church, as a group of individuals, is the new body of Christ. Where the new body dwells is the city of God.

In 10.14, Eusebius allegorizes Rome as the beast that attacked and tried to destroy the Church and the church buildings. But while Rome thought "he" was destroying the Church, he was in fact only toppling some stones. Eusebius is careful to maintain the differences, as well as the similarities between the material and the transcendent worlds. The allegory of Rome and the Church portrays Rome as a beast, while the architectural power of Rome is analogous to the City of God. While the Cathedral of Tyre is analogous to the City of God, the building is just stone. The architecture of the Cathedral is not in the stones of the building but in the presence of the body of Christ. What is implied, as a logical extension of the argument, is that the final resurrection will transform even banal stone into architecture; things will become their ideal.

The Christian understanding of place, and the understanding of significant places as manifestations of Christ's presence, are developed further through an analogy between Constantine and Christ. Eusebius suggests that a pagan shrine existed or had been erected on the site of the church in Tyre.⁶⁰³ As Constantine conquered Rome and placed his own monuments in that pagan city as trophies to his own glory and to the glory of Christ, so too Christ was able to

⁶⁰³ Eusebius, *The Ecclesiastical History* 10.4.14.

recapture the site of Tyre and establish the Church as his trophy to the glory of God. Christ's victory at Tyre as the victory of the ideal City of God is analogous to Constantine's victory as that of the Mythic Rome. Constantine's victory is the victory of the mythic Rome over the beast of Rome. Christ's victory is the victory of the City of God over the City of Humans.

τίς βασιλέων ἔς τοσοῦτον κρατεῖ καὶ στρατηγεῖ μετὰ θάνατον καὶ τρόπαια κατ' ἐχθρῶν ἵστησιν καὶ πάντα τόπον καὶ χώραν καὶ πόλιν, Ἑλλάδα τε καὶ βάρβαρον, βασιλικῶν οἰκῶν αὐτοῦ πληροῖ καὶ θεῶν ναῶν ἀφιερώμασιν, οἷα τάδε τὰ τοῦδε τοῦ νεῶς τερिकाλλῇ κοσμήματά τε καὶ ἀναθήματα; (Eusebius, *E.H.* 10.4.20)

Which of the kings exerciseth so great a sway, taketh the field after death, triumpheth over enemies, and filleth every place and district and city, both with votive offerings of his royal houses and divine temples, such as the fair ornaments and offerings that we see in this temple?

God created the world from nothing as Christ created the Church from his death and resurrection. The building of the Church is at the command of Christ. The construction of these buildings, in harmony with the pattern of the λόγος, is at the command of the emperor. While this is likely, in part, due to Eusebius' tribute to the generosity of the emperor, it also strengthens the analogous relationship between Rome and the heavenly City and further illustrates a relationship between heaven and earth acceptable to Christians less inclined to philosophical inquiry.

In the next verse, Eusebius returns to the body/temple metaphor with which he began his panegyric. In a close paraphrase of 1 Cor. 3.16, the members of the church are the living stones of the temple of God and Christ is the cornerstone:

οὐ μὴν ὅσα καὶ οἷα τὰ τῆς τῶν πεπονηκότων προθυμίας κέκριται παρ' αὐτῷ τῷ θεολογουμένῳ τὸν ἔμψυχον πάντων ὑμῶν καθορῶντι ναὸν καὶ τὸν ἐκ ζώντων λίθων καὶ βεβηκότων οἶκον ἐποπτεύοντι εὖ καὶ ἀσφαλῶς ἰδρυμένον ἐπὶ τῷ θεμελίῳ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ προφητῶν, ὅντος ἀκρογωνιαίου λίθου αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὃν ἀπεδοκίμασαν μὲν

οὐχ οἱ τῆς παλαιᾶς καὶ μηκέτ' οὔσης ἐκείνης μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς εἰς ἔτι νῦν τῶν πολλῶν ἀνθρώπων οἰκοδομῆς κακοὶ κακῶν ὄντες ἀρχιτέκτονες, δοκιμάσας δ' ὁ πατὴρ καὶ τότε καὶ νῦν εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνίας τῆσδε τῆς κοινῆς ἡμῶν ἐκκλησίας ἰδρύσατο. τοῦτον δὲ οὖν τὸν ἐξ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν ἐπεσκευασμένον ζῶντος θεοῦ ζῶντα ναόν, τὸ μέγιστον καὶ ἀληθεῖ λόγῳ θεοπρεπὲς ἱερεῖόν φημι, οὗ τὰ ἐνδοτάτω ἄδυτα τοῖς πολλοῖς ἀθεώρητα καὶ ὄντως ἅγια καὶ τῶν ἁγίων ἅγια, τίς ἂν ἐποπτεύσας ἐξειπεῖν τολμήσειεν; τίς δὲ κἂν εἰσκύψαι περιβόλων ἱερῶν εἴσω δυνατός, ὅτι μὴ μόνος ὁ μέγας τῶν ὅλων ἀρχιερεὺς, ὥς μόνῳ θέμις πάσης λογικῆς ψυχῆς τὰ ἀπόρρητα διερευνᾶσθαι; (Eusebius. *E.H.*10.4.21–22)

Yet in deed the zeal of those who have laboured is not so great or so noble in the judgement of Him whom we address as God, when he looketh in to the lively temple which we all compose, and viewest the house formed of living and firmly set stones, well and securely grounded upon the foundations of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone; which stone the master-builders rejected, not only of that old building which is no more, but also of that building which compriseth the more part of mankind to the present day, evil workmen as they were of evil things; but the Father approved it, and then and now builded it into the head of the corner of this our common Church. This living temple, then, of a living God formed out of ourselves, I mean the greatest sanctuary and truly reverend, whose innermost shrine may not be seen by the common eye, for verily holy if it is and a holy of holies—who that viewed it would dare to describe? Who is able even to peer into the temple buildings that surround it, save only the great High Priest of the universe, to whom alone it is permitted to search the hidden mysteries of every rational soul?

What is significant in this verse is that it clearly represents the place of the individual within the Heavenly City. The individual soul is the Holy of Holies in the Jerusalem Temple—it is the unapproachable essence and purpose of the temple compound. This Holy of Holies participates in the heavenly and the earthly realms. It is holy because it is part of the body of Christ. This Holy of Holies is housed in the physical human body as the body of Christ is housed in the physical body of the Church.

ταύτῃ δ' οὖν καὶ ὁδε Χριστὸν ὅλον, τὸν λόγον, τὴν σοφίαν, τὸ φῶς ἐν τῇ αὐτὸς αὐτοῦ ἀγαλματοφορῶν ψυχῇ, οὐδ' ἔστιν εἰπεῖν οἷα σὺν μεγαλοφροσύνῃ πλουσία τε καὶ ἀπλήστῳ διανοίᾳ χειρὶ καὶ σὺν οἷα πάντων ὑμῶν φιλοτιμία, τῇ τῶν εἰσφορῶν

μεγαλοψυχία τῆς αὐτῆς αὐτῷ προθέσεως κατὰ μηδένα τρόπον ἀπολειφθῆναι
φιλονεικότερον μεγαλοφρονουμένων. (Eusebius. *E.H.* 10.4.26)

After this manner, then, this man also, bearing in his own soul the image of Christ entire, the Word, the Wisdom, the Light, hath formed this magnificent temple of God most high, answering in its nature to the pattern of that which is better, even as the visible answereth to the invisible.

The Cathedral of Tyre is the pattern of an invisible truth, the λόγος. The architecture is endowed with a meaning similar to a text—a meaning that is written into the building by God and can be read from the building by an individual. Architecture is ordered by the Word and shelters the holy soul. Authority of the διαδοχαὶ ἐκκλησιαστικῶν⁶⁰⁴ is extended implicitly to include church building.

THE FUNCTION OF ANTE-NICENE BODY/TEMPLE METAPHOR

For Christians in the first century, the body/temple metaphor serves two rhetorical functions. First, in the Epistles, the metaphor unifies the members of the church and sets them apart from Imperial culture. Second, in the Gospels, the metaphor locates God's presence in the body of Christ. As rhetoric, the metaphor conveys a new understanding, here ontological, using figurative language. This use of metaphor is consistent with Aristotle's theory of tropes.

In an effort to discover the subtle and hidden meaning in the words of the Epistles and the Gospels, Christian writers of the second and third centuries explored hermeneutic techniques that unified the two variations of body/temple metaphor into a coherent model that could explain the relationship between Christ, Church, and God. The Epistle of Barnabas is the first Christian text to metaphorize "Christians as temple" and "Christ as temple" through a common tenor—λόγος. Following Barnabas, this "metaphor made of metaphors," is further transformed by Clement of

⁶⁰⁴ Eusebius, *The Ecclesiastical History* 3.25.6.

Alexandria and Origen. Developing an increasingly intricate and erudite hermeneutic, these ante-Nicene intellectuals reveal the λόγος in the text of the OT, in the Gospels, and in the Epistles through number and proportion. Origen sees the λόγος as the pattern that informs all of creation. This implies that God's divine order can be manifest in physical objects—as it seen in the temple of Solomon. In constructing their Christian hermeneutic, Clement and Origen are unapologetic about apparent discrepancies and inconsistencies between the various texts. Incongruities are dismissed as distractions that intentionally conceal the Christian message from the uninitiated. The oblique nature of the Scriptures requires a “spiritualized” reading that, when properly executed, reveals the full meaning of the text. This revelation, Paul Ricoeur argues, is a function of metaphor.

For our discussion of early Christian Architecture, the culmination of this hermeneutic is found in the panegyric for the Cathedral of Tyre. Eusebius praises the young Paulinus, Bishop of Tyre, for creating a building for his church, a “temple,” that embodies Christ as Word, Wisdom, and Light. Paulinus is able to realize this spiritualized architecture because he has recognized his affinity with the λόγος and carries the image of Christ inside of him. The plan of the temple follows the pattern of the λόγος, but, like the true meaning of text, remains invisible to the uninitiated.

Eusebius is the first Christian writer to extend the tenor of the body/temple metaphor, the λόγος, to a work of architecture. While the panegyric does not constitute an architectural theory in and of itself, it did reveal an opportunity to reconcile Constantine's Church with the ordered cosmology that so concerned Vitruvius.

5. CONCLUSION

Through this dissertation, I have demonstrated that a tension exists between the tenor of the body/temple metaphor developed in the NT and the monumental churches of Constantine. This tension can be attributed to conflicting expectations and demands that I have characterized as “*being* the temple *in* Christ” (Gospels and Epistles) and “*building* the temple *for* Christ” (Imperial Christian Architecture). I have argued that this tension is reconciled, at least in part, through a shift in the tenor of the body/temple vehicle as put forward by Eusebius in his panegyric for the dedication of Paulinus’ Church at Tyre in 317.

In my characterization of Imperial Architecture, I have identified Vitruvius’ *De Architectura* as an idealised model that connects Rome to a mythic past and provides an allegorical structure for creating new architectural narratives conducive to the promulgation of the Empire. What links these new narratives together is an underlying natural order that can be engaged through number and proportion. Vitruvius’ comprehensive theory of architecture, formulated for the imperial agenda, is organized by six qualities that he proposes as the foundation for a *disciplina rationis*. Citing Greek sources, Vitruvius finds evidence of a universal order in Nature’s most perfect creation—the well-formed human body. As we have seen in the Forum of Augustus, this understanding of the body extends beyond the corporeal. Augustus uses architecture to demonstrate his divine genealogy and to evoke the historical veracity of his claim to the title of *pater patriae*. The empire, the emperor, and the temple are presented as parts of a carefully balanced cosmology.

The Jerusalem Temple, as rebuilt by Herod, is in many ways consistent with the *disciplina rationis*. As such, it serves as a theological and political foil for the body/temple metaphor in the Gospel narrative. But there is a second understanding of the Jerusalem Temple,

the *Tempelidee* or conceptual temple, that informs the Gospels, Epistles, and later Christian exegesis. The *Tempelidee* is born out of a Pharisaic tradition that sees the presence of God and Temple purity extending beyond the temple walls. The logic supporting this observation is basic: if God created the world, then the world must follow a divine plan. This plan was revealed to Solomon for the foundation of the Temple. Effectively, the Temple as revealed and recorded in the LXX is a cosmological model. While Christians understood the destruction of the Temple in 70 C.E. as justification for vilifying Herod's project, the Temple of Solomon was understood as a *πρωτότυπον* of God's creation.

In the exegetical tradition explored in this dissertation, the body/temple metaphor is informed by a synthesis of Roman architectural theory and the *Tempelidee*. In the NT, the body/temple metaphor appears in two variations. For the Pauline and Deutero-Pauline churches, including 1 Peter, the metaphor is used to unify the community and to distinguish the church from the greater Roman culture. In the Gospels, particularly the Gospel of John, the metaphor is used to identify the body of Jesus as the new dwelling place of God on earth—replacing the old temple and the old covenant. In both variations, the metaphor is employed rhetorically and is used to convey novel ideas with figurative language. This is consistent with the role of metaphor outlined by Aristotle.

In the context of the NT narrative, the body/temple metaphor is a tacit rejection of Imperial Architecture in that the structure of the vehicle (Christ's body and the Church as a temple or the Temple) posits the imperial temple and the Jerusalem Temple as antithetical to the true dwelling place of God. To follow the logic of the NT body/temple metaphor, Christians are no longer obliged to participate in the cosmological order represented by Rome or Jerusalem. Rather, they are citizens of a parallel world that is given order by God through the body of

Christ. This is consistent with our discussion of the *Tempelidee*. For the most part, church members continued to function in society, attending to the responsibilities of their alternative citizenship while abstaining from the ritual activities of the state.⁶⁰⁵ The significance of this abstinence for a study of Christian architecture is clear when we appreciate the role of architecture in the Roman imperial project.

From the beginning of the second century to the end of the third, early Christian writers endeavoured to weave these two variations of body/temple metaphor into a coherent figure within the Christian narrative. Rather than using the body/temple metaphor rhetorically, exegetes discovered that the trope was a valuable hermeneutic tool. The *Epistle of Barnabas* is the first Christian text to bring the two NT variations together through a common tenor. Using the metaphor to demonstrate the symmetry of Christ and the Church, the Gospels and the Epistles, the author recognizes the λόγος as an underlying order that informs all Christian literature. Following *Barnabas*, Clement of Alexandria reads geometry as further evidence of the λόγος giving order to the Christian narrative. The plan of the Tabernacle, arranged according to numbers and proportions revealed by God, prefigures Christ as God's dwelling place. Origen develops Clement's argument, reading the Temple and the Church as "types" of the λόγος. He also agrees that the contemplation of geometry can lead to an understanding of higher things. Architecture, as a manifestation of geometry, shares this potential.

Eusebius, writing at the beginning of the fourth century, following the victory of Constantine, sees evidence of the λόγος in both the ascension of a sympathetic Emperor and in the construction of new church buildings under Imperial patronage. Using the body/temple metaphor as it is developed through Origen, Eusebius presents a seamless continuity between

⁶⁰⁵ White, *The Social Origins of Christian Architecture*, Volume 1 140-141.

text and architecture in the new cathedral of Tyre. Written before the council of Nicea, Eusebius' panegyric recognizes Christian architecture as a distinct type arranged after a divine pattern. He sees a consistent proportional relationship, a *πρωτότυπον* informed by *λόγος*, permeating the architecture of the church, the community of the church, and the body of Christ. In Eusebius' panegyric, this *πρωτότυπον* informs the symmetry of the Christian temple, to borrow from Vitruvius, and demonstrates God's presence as a single universal order that reconciles the Christian community with the Roman world. Like the natural order that guides the *disciplina rationis* of Vitruvius, the *λόγος* is at once architectural, theological and political.

In the course of this study, I have relied on the substantial contributions of Richard Krautheimer and L. Michael White to map out a history of Christian architecture. Both Krautheimer and White see this history as a series of typological transformations, not always contiguous, that proceed from *domus* to basilica. While this typological history is a valuable tool for understanding formal and programmatic changes, it does not address the necessary ontological and cosmological questions that are fundamental to the architecture of this period. In my opinion, a discussion of the reconciliation between the NT and Imperial Architecture, addressing the nature of Christ's presence in the Christian community and the equally challenging notion of Christ's presence in monumental architecture, provides us with a more nuanced understanding of early Christian Architecture. I have argued that this reconciliation is achieved, in part, through a synthesis of Roman and Pharisaic architectural discourse. This synthesis, realized through the metaphorical vehicle of the Christian body/temple, is a function of what Paul Ricoeur has characterized as the generative capacity of metaphor, a "...semantic innovation, an emergence of meaning."⁶⁰⁶

⁶⁰⁶ Ricoeur "Word, Polysemy, Metaphor: Creativity in Language" 65.

6. REFERENCES

PRIMARY SOURCES

- Aristotle. "Poetics." Trans. Stephen Halliwell. *Poetics/Aristotle. On the Sublime/Longinus. On Style/Demetrius*. Ed. Stephen Halliwell. Vol. 199. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995.
- Augustus. "Res Gestae Divi Augusti." Trans. Frederick W. Shipley. *Velleius Paterculus and Res Gestae Divi Augusti*. Ed. E. Capps et. al. Loeb Classical Library. London: William Heinemann, 1924.
- Barnabas. "The Epistle of Barnabas." Trans. Kirsopp Lake. *The Apostolic Fathers*. Ed. G.P. Goold. Vol. 1. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1985.
- . *The Gospel of John 1*. Trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Ed. Walter Furst. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 1986.
- Cassius, Dio. *Dio's Roman History*. Trans. Earnest Cary. Loeb Classical Library. 5 vols. London: W. Heinemann, 1914-1927.
- Cicero. *Rhetorica ad Herennium*. 1954. Trans. Harry Caplan. Loeb Classical Library. Ed. E.H. Warmington. Cambridge, MA/London: Harvard University Press, 1968.
- Clement. "Stromata." *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the writings of the fathers down to A.D. 325*. 1867. Ed. Rev. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. Vol. 2. Edinburgh/Grand Rapids, MI: T&T Clark/ Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1985.
- Clément. *Les Stromates: Stromate IV*. Trans. Claude Mondésert. Sources Chrétiennes. Vol. 463. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 2001.
- . *Les Stromates: Stromate VI*. Trans. Patrick Descourtieux. Sources Chrétiennes. Vol. 446. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1999.
- . *Les Stromates: Stromate VII*. Trans. Alain le Boulluec. Sources Chrétiennes. Vol. 428. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1997.
- "The Epistle of Barnabas." Trans. Kirsopp Lake. *The Apostolic Fathers*. Ed. G.P. Goold. Vol. 1. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1985.
- Eusebius. "The Church History of Eusebius." Trans. Arthur Cushman McGiffert and Ernest Cushing Richardson. *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*. 1890. Ed. Philip Schaff and Henry Wace. Vol. 1. Edinburgh/Grand Rapids, MI: T&T Clark/Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1991.
- . *The Ecclesiastical History*. 1926. Trans. Kirsopp Lake. The Loeb Classical Library. Ed. T.E. Page. 2 vols. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1959.
- . *The History of the Church*. Trans. G.A. Williamson. London: Penguin, 1989.
- Goold, G.P. ed. "The Shepherd of Hermas." Trans. Kirsopp Lake. *The Apostolic Fathers*. Cambridge, MA/London: Harvard University Press, 1976. 2-305.
- Irenaeus. "Against Heresies." *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the writings of the fathers down to A.D. 325*. Ed. Rev. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. Vol. 1. Edinburgh/Grand Rapids, MI: T&T Clark/ Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1985.
- Josephus. *Jewish Antiquities*. Trans. H. St. J. Thackeray. Loeb Classical Library. London/Cambridge MA.: W. Heinemann/Harvard University Press, 1961.
- Josephus, Flavius. *The Works of Josephus*. Trans. William Whiston. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1999.
- Justin Martyr. "The Epistle of Ignatius to the Magnesians Shorter and Longer Versions." *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the Writings of the Fathers down to A.D. 325*.

1867. Ed. Rev. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. Vol. 1. Edinburgh/Grand Rapids, MI: T&T Clark/ Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1985.
- Juvenal. *Satirae*. Loeb Classical Library. New York, 1930.
- Livy. *Ab Urbe Condita*. Trans. B.O. Foster. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 1959.
- Origen. *Commentaire sur Saint Jean: livres i-v*. Trans. Cécile Blanc. Sources Chrétiennes. Vol. 120. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1966.
- . "Commentary on the Gospel according to John." Trans. Alan Menzies. *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the writings of the fathers down to A.D. 325*. 1867. Ed. Rev. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. Vol. 10. Edinburgh/Grand Rapids, MI: T&T Clark/ Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1985.
- . "De Principiis." *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the writings of the fathers down to A.D. 325*. 1867. Ed. Rev. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. Vol. 4. Edinburgh/Grand Rapids, MI: T&T Clark/ Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1985.
- . *The Philocalia of Origen*. Trans. Rev. George Lewis. Edinburgh/New York: T&T Clark/Charles Scribner's Sons, 1911.
- Pausanias. *Description of Greece*. Loeb Classical Library. Ed. T.E. Page. 5 vols. Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 1961.
- Plato. *Cratylus*. Trans. C.D.C. Reeve. Indianapolis: Hackett Pub. Co., 1998.
- . *Laws*. Trans. R. G. Bury. Loeb Classical Library. London/Cambridge MA.: W. Heinemann/Harvard University Press, 1968.
- . *Lysis, Symposium, Gorgias*. 1925. Trans. W.R.M. Lamb. Loeb Classical Library. Ed. G.P. Goold. Cambridge, MA/London: Harvard University Press, 1996.
- . "The Republic." Trans. W.H.D. Rouse. *Great Dialogues of Plato*. Eds. Eric H. Warmington and Philip G. Rouse. New York/Toronto: New American Library/Penguin, 1984. 118–422.
- . *The Republic*. 1930. Trans. Paul Shorey. Loeb Classical Library. Ed. T.E. Page. 2 vols. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1963.
- . "Timaeus." Trans. R. G. Bury. *Timaeus; Critias; Cleitophon; Menexenus; Epistles*. London/Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 1999.
- . *Timaeus and Critias*. Trans. Desmond Lee. Middlesex: Penguin, 1987.
- Quintilian. *Institutio Oratoria: The Orator's Education*. Trans. Donald A. Butler. The Loeb Classical Library. Ed. Donald A. Russell and G.P. Goold. 5 vols. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001.
- Robinson, James M. ed. "The Teachings of Silvanus." Trans. Malcolm L. Peel and Jan Zandee. *The Nag Hammadi Library in English*. San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1988. 379–395.
- Charlesworth, James H. ed. "Sibylline Oracles." Trans. J.J. Collins. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha Vol. 1*. New York: Doubleday, 1983.
- Suetonius. *The Twelve Caesars*. Trans. Robert Graves. London: Penguin Books, 1989.
- . *Works*. Trans. J.C. Rolfe. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge MA.: Harvard University Press, 1951.
- Tertullian. "The Prescription Against Heretics." Trans. Rev. Peter Holmes. *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the writings of the fathers down to A.D. 325*. 1867. Ed. Rev. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. Vol. 3. Edinburgh/Grand Rapids, MI: T&T Clark/ Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1985.

- Thaumaturgus, Gregory. "The Oration and Panegyric addressed to Origen." *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the writings of the fathers down to A.D. 325*. 1867. Ed. Rev. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. Vol. 6. Edinburgh/Grand Rapids, MI: T&T Clark/ Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1985.
- Varro. *On the Latin Language*. Trans. Roland G. Kent. Loeb Classical Library Series. 2 vols. Great Britain: Harvard University Press, 1993.
- Vitruvius. *De Architectura*. Trans. F. Granger. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge MA.: Harvard University Press, 1983.

SECONDARY SOURCES

- Adewuja, Ayodeji. *Holiness and Community in 2 Corinthians 6.14–7.1. Paul's View of Communal Holiness in the Corinthian Correspondence*. Studies in Biblical Literature. Vol. 40. New York: Peter Lang, 2001.
- Anderson, James C. *The Historical Topography of the Imperial Fora*. Collection Latomus. Vol. 182. Bruxelles: Latomus revue d'études Latines, 1984.
- Barker, Margaret. "Temple Imagery in Philo: An Indication of the Origin of the Logos?" *Templum Amicitiae: Essays on the Second Temple presented to Ernst Bammel*. Ed. William Horbury. Vol. 48. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991. 70–102.
- Beard, Mary. "Cicero and Divination: The Formation of a Latin Discourse." *The Journal of Roman Studies* 84 (1994): 33–46.
- Beare, F.W. *The First Epistle of Peter*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1970.
- Black, Max. *Models and Metaphors: Studies in Language and Philosophy*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1962.
- Boëthius, Axel. *Etruscan and Early Roman Architecture*. Pelican History of Art. Ed. Nikolaus Pevsner. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1978.
- Boys-Stones, G. R. *Post-Hellenistic Philosophy: A Study of its Development from the Stoics to Origen*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Brakke, David. "Parables and Plain Speech in the Fourth Gospel and the Apocryphon of James." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 7.2 (1999): 187–218.
- Brown, Peter. *Society and the Holy in Late Antiquity*. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1982.
- Bruce, F.F. *The Epistles to the Colossians, to Philemon, and to the Ephesians*. The New International Commentary on the New Testament. Ed. F.F. Bruce. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1984.
- Burkert, Walter. "The Meaning and Function of the Temple in Classical Greece." *Temple in Society*. Ed. Michael V. Fox. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1988. 27–47.
- Burtchaell, James Tunstead. *From Synagogue to Church: Public Services and Offices in the Earliest Christian Communities*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1992.
- Böttrich, Christfried. "Ihr seid der Tempel Gottes! Tempelmetaphorik und Gemeinde bei Paulus." *Gemeinde ohne Tempel/Community without Temple*. Eds. Beate Ego, Armin Lange and Peter Pillhofer. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999. 303–319.
- Carlson, Stephen C. "Clement of Alexandria on the 'Order' of the Gospels." *New Testament Studies* 47 (2001): 118–125.

- Carotenuto, Erica. "Five Egyptians Coming From Jerusalem: Some Remarks on Eusebius, *De Martyribus Palaestinae* 11.6–13." *Classical Quarterly* 52.2 (2002): 500–506.
- Carter, Warren. "Matthew and the Gentiles: Individual Conversion and/or Systematic Transformation?" *JSNT* 26.3 (2004): 259–282.
- Chadwick, Henry. *The Early Church*. The Pelican History of the Church. Ed. Owen Chadwick. Penguin Books, 1987.
- Conte, Gian Biagio. *Latin Literature: A History*. Trans. Joseph B. Solodow. Baltimore/London: The John Hopkins University Press, 1994.
- Coulton, J.J. "Towards understanding Greek temple design: general considerations." *The Annual of the British School at Athens* 70 (1975): 59–100.
- Dalton, William J. "The First Epistle of Peter." *New Jerome Biblical Commentary*. Eds. Raymond E. Brown, Joseph A. Fitzmyer and Roland E. Murphy. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1992.
- Daniélou, Jean. *The Presence of God*. Trans. Walter Roberts. London: A.R. Mowbray, 1958.
- Dawson, David. *Allegorical Readers and Cultural Revision in Ancient Alexandria*. Berkeley, Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1992.
- Dixon, Peter. *Rhetoric: The Critical Idiom*. Ed. John D. Jump. London/New York: Routledge, 1990.
- Dumézil, Georges. *Archaic Roman Religion*. Trans. Philip Krapp. 2 vols. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996.
- Easterling, P.E. "The Hellenistic and Imperial Periods." *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature*. Ed. P.E. Easterling and B.M.W. Knox. Vol. 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- Eco, Umberto. "Interpretation and History." *Interpretation and Overinterpretation*. Ed. Stefan Collini. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1992. 23–43.
- . *Semiotics and the Philosophy of Language*. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1984.
- Edwards, Mark. "Origen on Christ, Tropology, and Exegesis." *Metaphor, Allegory and the Classical Tradition*. Ed. G.R. Boys-Stones. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Elliott, J.H. *1 Peter: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. New York: Doubleday, 2000.
- . "Peter, Silvanus and Mark in 1 Peter and Acts: Sociological-Exegetical Perspective on a Petrine Group in Rome." *Wort in der Zeit: Neutestamentliche Studien. Festgabe für Karl Heinrich Rengstorff zum 75. Geburtstag*. Ed. W. Haubeck and M. Bachmann. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1980.
- Fai, Stephen. "Architecture and Conflict in Caesarea Maritima." *Religious Rivalries and the Struggle for Success in Caesarea Maritima*. Ed. Terry Donaldson. Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier Press, 2000. 267–278.
- Fee, Gordon D. *God's Empowering Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1994.
- Finney, Paul Corby. "Early Christian Architecture: The Beginnings (A Review Article)." *Harvard Theological Review* 81 (1988): 319–339.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph. "Pauline Theology." *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary*. Eds. Raymond E. Brown, Joseph A. Fitzmyer and Roland E. Murphy. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1992.

- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *Paul and His Theology: A Brief Sketch*. 1967. 2nd ed. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1989.
- Gleason, Kathryn L. "The Promontory Palace at Caesarea Maritima: Preliminary Evidence for Herod's Praetorium." *Journal of Roman Archaeology* 11 (1998): 23–52.
- Goulder, Michael. "2 Cor 6:14–7:1 as an Integral Part of 2 Corinthians." *Novum Testamentum* 36 (1994): 47–57.
- Gutmann, J., ed. *Ancient Synagogues: The State of Research*. Chico, California: Scholars Press, 1981.
- , ed. *The Synagogue: Studies in Origins, Archaeology and Architecture*. New York: KTAV Publishing House, 1975.
- Gärtner, Bertil. *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965.
- Harnack, A. *The Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries*. Trans. James Moffatt. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1961.
- Hogeterp, Albert A.L. "Paul and God's Temple. A Historical Interpretation of Cultic Imagery in the Corinthian Correspondence." Ph.D. University of Groningen, 2004.
- Hollum, Kenneth G., et al. *King Herod's Dream: Caesarea on the Sea*. New York and London: W.W. Norton & Company, 1988.
- Horrell, David G. "The Product of a Petrine Circle? The Reassessment of the Origin and Character of 1 Peter." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 86 (2002): 29–60.
- Horsley, Richard A. "1 Corinthians: A Case Study of Paul's Assembly as an Alternative Society." *Paul and Empire: Religion and Power in Roman Imperial Society*. Ed. Richard A. Horsley. Harrisburg, PA.: Trinity Press International, 1997. 242–252.
- Howson, John Saul. *The Metaphors of St. Paul*. London: Strahan, 1868.
- Hultgren, Stephen J. "2 Cor 6.14–7.1 and Rev 21.3–8: Evidence for the Ephesian Redaction of 2 Corinthians." *New Testament Studies* 49 (2003): 39–56.
- Hurtado, Larry W. "The Earliest Evidence of an Emerging Christian Material and Visual Culture: the Codex, the Nomina Sacra and the Staurogram." *Text and Artifact in the Religions of Mediterranean Antiquity*. Ed. Stephen G. Wilson and Michel Desjardins. Vol. 9. Studies in Christianity and Judaism/Études sur le christianisme et le judaïsme. Waterloo: Wilfred Laurier University Press, 2000. 270–288.
- Jaeger, Werner. *Early Christianity and Greek Paideia*. Cambridge, MA/London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1995.
- Jensen, Robin Margaret. *Understanding Early Christian Art*. London/New York: Routledge, 2000.
- Karatani, Kojin. *Architecture as Metaphor*. Trans. Sabu Kohso. Writing Architecture. Ed. Michael Speaks. Cambridge, MA/London: MIT Press, 1995.
- Karris, R.J. "The Gospel According to Luke." *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary*. Eds. Raymond E. Brown, Joseph A. Fitzmyer and Roland E. Murphy. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1992.
- Kellum, Barbara A. "What we see and what we don't see. Narrative structure and the Ara Pacis Augustae." *Art History* 17.1 (1994): 26–45.
- Kelly, J.N.D. *Early Christian Doctrines*. London: A&C Black, 1989.
- Kloppenborg, John S., and Stephen G. Wilson, eds. *Voluntary Associations in the Graeco-Roman World*. London and New York: Routledge, 1996.

- Kovacs, Judith L. "Divine Pedagogy and the Gnostic Teacher according to Clement of Alexandria." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 9.1 (2001): 3–25.
- Kraeling, Carl H. *The Synagogue*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1979.
- Krautheimer, Richard. "The Beginning of Early Christian Architecture." *Studies in Early Christian, Medieval, and Renaissance Art*. New York/London: New York University Press/University of London Press, 1969.
- . *Corpus Basilicarum Christianarum Romae. Early Christian Basilicas in Rome (IV–XI Cent.)*. 5 vols. Citta del Vaticano: Pontificio Istituto di Archeologia Cristiana, 1937–1970.
- . *Early Christian and Byzantine Architecture*. Hong Kong: Yale University Press, 1986.
- . *Rome: Portrait of a City 312–1308*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1980.
- . *Three Christian Capitals: Topography and Politics*. Berkley: University of California, 1983.
- Leaney, A.R.C. *The Letters of Peter and Jude. A Commentary on the First Letter of Peter, a Letter of Jude and the Second Letter of Peter*. The Cambridge Bible Commentary. Eds. P.R. Ackroyd, A.R.C. Leaney and J.W. Packer. London: Cambridge University Press, 1967.
- Levine, Lee I. *The Ancient Synagogue: The First Thousand Years*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2000.
- Liebeschuetz, J.H.W.G. *Continuity and Change in Roman Religion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Lieu, Samuel. "Constantine's 'Pagan Vision': The anonymous panegyric on Constantine (310), Pan. Lat.VII(6)." *From Constantine to Julian: Pagan and Byzantine Views. A Source History*. Ed. Dominic Montserrat Samuel N.C. Lieu. New York: Routledge, 1996.
- Long, A.A. "Aristotle- Poetics." *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature*. Ed. P.E. Easterling and B.M.W. Knox. Vol. 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- Ludlow, Morweena. "Theology and Allegory: Origen and Gregory of Nyssa on the Unity and Diversity of Scripture." *International Journal of Systematic Theology* 4.1 (2002): 45–66.
- MacDonald, M.Y. *The Pauline Churches: A Socio-historical Study of Institutionalization in the Pauline and Deutero-Pauline Writings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- MacDonald, William L. *The Architecture of the Roman Empire II: An Urban Appraisal*. New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 1986.
- MacMullen, Ramsay. *Christianizing the Roman Empire (A.D. 100–400)*. New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 1984.
- Markus, R. *The End of Early Christianity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Martin, Troy W. *Metaphor and Composition in 1 Peter*. SBL Dissertation Series. Ed. PHEME Perkins. Vol. 131. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.
- Martínez, Florentino García. "Priestly Functions in a Community without Temple." *Gemeinde ohne Tempel/Community without Temple*. Ed. Armin Lange Beate Ego, Peter Pillhofer. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999.
- Matheson, Susan B. *Dura-Europos: The Ancient City and the Yale Collection*. New Haven: Yale University Art Gallery, 1982.
- McEwen, Indra Kagis. *Vitruvius: Writing the Body of Architecture*. Cambridge, MA./London: The MIT Press, 2003.
- McVey, Kathleen E. "The Domed Church as Microcosm: Literary Roots of an Architectural Symbol." *Art, Archaeology, and Architecture of Early Christianity*. Ed. Paul Corby Finney. New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1993. 183–213.

- Meeks, Wayne A. *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1983.
- Mellor, Ronald. *The Worship of the Goddess Roma in the Greek World*. Germany: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975.
- Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome. "The First Letter to the Corinthians." *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary*. Eds. Raymond E. Brown, Joseph A. Fitzmyer and Roland E. Murphy. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1992.
- . "The Second Letter to the Corinthians." *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary*. Eds. Raymond E. Brown, Joseph A. Fitzmyer and Roland E. Murphy. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1992.
- Mussell, M-L. "The Oldest Known Christian Churches: Dura Europos and Aqaba." *Bulletin of the Canadian Society of Mesopotamian Studies* 36 (2001): 189–199.
- Neirynck, F. "Synoptic Problem." *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary*. Eds. Raymond E. Brown, Joseph A. Fitzmyer and Roland E. Murphy. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1992.
- Orlin, Eric M. *Temples, Religion and Politics in the Roman Republic*. Mnemosyne. Ed. W.M. Jongman J.S. Boersma, Ian Morris. Leiden/New York/Köln: E.J. Brill, 1997.
- Padovan, Richard. *Proportion: Science, Philosophy, Architecture*. London: E & FN Spon, 1999.
- Pantazakos, Michael. "The Unlying God: Law Inspired and Inspiring in Plato's *Ion* and St. Paul's *Letter to Titus*." *Law and Critique* 15 (2004): 79–80.
- Pelikan, Jaroslav. *The Christian Tradition: The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition (100–600)*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984.
- Pender, E.E. "Plato on Metaphors and Models." *Metaphor, Allegory and the Classical Tradition*. Ed. G. R. Boys-Stones. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Perkins, Pheme. "The Gospel According to John." *New Jerome Biblical Commentary*. Eds. Raymond E. Brown, Joseph A. Fitzmyer and Roland E. Murphy. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1992.
- Placher, William C. *A History of Christian Theology*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1983.
- Plommer, Hugh. *Vitruvius and Later Roman Building Manuals*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973.
- Raban, Avner. *Caesarea Maritima: A Retrospective After Two Millenia*. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- Renwick, David A. *Paul, the Temple and the Presence of God*. Brown Judaic Studies. Vol. 224. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991.
- Rich, J.W. "Augustus's Parthian Honours, the Temple of Mars Ultor and the Arch in Forum Romanum." *Papers of the British School at Rome* 66 (1998): 71–128.
- Richards, I.A. *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*. 1936. New York: Oxford University Press, 1979.
- Richardson, Lawrence. *A New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*. London: The John Hopkins Press, 1992.
- Richardson, Peter. *Herod: King of the Jews and Friend of the Romans*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999.
- . "Law and Piety in Herod's Architecture." *Studies in Religion* 15.3 (1986): 347–360.
- Ricoeur, Paul. "The Bible and the Imagination." *The Bible as a Document of the University*. Ed. Hans Dieter Betz. Chicago: Scholars Press, 1981.
- . "Metaphor and the Main Problem Of Hermeneutics." Trans. David Pellauer. *Reflection and Imagination: A Ricoeur Reader*. Ed. Mario J. Valdés. Toronto/Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1991. 303–319.

- . *The Rule of Metaphor*. Trans. Robert Czerny, Katherine McLaughlin and John Costello. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1977.
- . "Word, Polysemy, Metaphor: Creativity in Language." Trans. David Pellauer. *Reflection and Imagination: A Ricoeur Reader*. Ed. Mario J. Valdés. Toronto/Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1991. 65–85.
- Roetzel, Calvin J. *The Letters of Paul: Conversations in Context*. 3rd ed. Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1991.
- Roller, Duane W. *The Building Program of Herod the Great*. London, Berkeley, Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1998.
- Rordorf, Willy, and André Schneider. *L'évolution du concept de tradition dans l'Église ancienne*. Traditio Christiana. Vol. 5. Berne: P. Lang, 1982.
- Ros, Karen E. "The Roman Theatre at Carthage." *American Journal of Archaeology* 100 (1996): 449–489.
- Rudolph, Kurt. *Gnosis: The Nature and History of Gnosticism*. Trans. Robert McLachlan Wilson et al. San Francisco: Harper, 1987.
- Rykwert, Joseph. *The Dancing Column: On Order in Architecture*. Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 1996.
- . *The Idea of a Town*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1988.
- Sanders, E.P. *Paul*. Past Masters. Ed. Keith Thomas. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Schiffman, Lawrence H. "Community Without Temple: The Qumran Community's Withdrawal from the Jerusalem Temple." *Gemeinde ohne Tempel/Community without Temple*. Eds. Beate Ego, Armin Lange and Peter Pillhofer. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999. 267–284.
- Scott, James M. "The Use of Scripture in 2 Corinthians 6.16c–18 and Paul's Restoration Theology." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 56 (1994): 73–99.
- Scully, Vincent. *The Earth, The Temple, and The Gods*. New Haven: Yale University, 1979.
- Snyder, Gordon F. *Ante Pacem: Archaeological Evidence of Church Life Before Constantine*. Macon: Mercer University Press, 2003.
- Soards, M.L. "1 Peter, 2 Peter and Jude as Evidence for a Petrine School." *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II.25.5 (1988): 3827–3849.
- Stark, Rodney. *The Rise of Christianity*. 1996. San Francisco: Harper Collins, 1997.
- Steiner, Deborah. *The Crown of Song: Metaphor in Pindar*. London: Gerald Duckworth & Co., 1986.
- Thrall, M.E. *The First and Second Letters of Paul to the Corinthians*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965.
- Trigg, Joseph Wilson. *Origen: The Bible and Philosophy in the Third-century Church*. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1983.
- Ulrich, Roger B. "Contignatio, Vitruvius and the Campanian Builder." *American Journal of Archaeology* 100 (1996): 137–151.
- van Ruiten, J.T.A.G.M. "Visions of the Temple in the Book of Jubilees." *Gemeinde ohne Tempel/Community without Temple*. Ed. Armin Lange Beate Ego, Peter Pillhofer. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999. 215–227.
- Vernant, Jean-Pierre. *Myth and Society in Ancient Greece*. 1974. Trans. Janet Lloyd. New York: Zone Books, 1990.

- Viviano, B.T. "The Gospel According to Matthew." *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary*. Eds. Raymond E. Brown, Joseph A. Fitzmyer and Roland E. Murphy. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1992.
- Wagner, Walter H. "Clement of Alexandria." *Encyclopedia of Early Christianity*. Ed. Everett Ferguson, Michael P. McHugh, Frederick W. Norris. 2 ed. New York: Garland Publishing, 1999. 262–264.
- Walker, J.R., and O. William. "2 Cor. 6.14–7.1 and the Chiastic Structure of 6.11–13; 7.2–3." *New Testament Studies* 48 (2002): 142–144.
- Ward-Perkins, J.B. *Roman Imperial Architecture*. Pelican History of Art. New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 1994.
- . *Studies in Roman and Early Christian Architecture*. London: Pindar Press, 1994.
- Wharton, Annabel Jane. "Good and bad images from the synagogue of Dura Europos: Contexts, subtexts, intertexts." *Art History* 17.1 (1994): 1–25.
- White, L. Michael. "Concepts of Space in Greek Thought." *Aperion* 24.2 (1996): 183–197.
- . *The Social Origins of Christian Architecture, Volume 1. Building God's House in the Roman World*. Harvard Theological Studies. Vol. 42. Valley Forge, PA.: Trinity Press International, 1990.
- . *The Social Origins of Christian Architecture, Volume 2. Texts and Monuments for the Christian Domus Ecclesiae in its Environment*. Harvard Theological Studies. Vol. 42. Valley Forge, PA.: Trinity Press International, 1997.
- Wilson Jones, Mark. "Designing the Roman Corinthian Order." *Journal of Roman Archaeology* 2 (1989): 35–69.
- . "Designing the Roman Corinthian Capital." *Papers of the British School at Rome* 59 (1991): 89–150.
- . *Principles of Roman Architecture*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2000.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Body/Metaphor in the New Testament and ante-Nicene Literature

AUTHOR	TEXT	COMPOSED	DATE	LANG	BK	CH	VS
Paul	1Cor 3:10-17						
Paul	1Cor 6:19-20						
Paul	2 Cor 6:16-18						
	Eph 2:19-22						
	1Peter 2:4-8						
	Revelation 3:12						
	Revelation 21:22						
	Matt. 12:6						
	Matt. 24:1-2						
	Matt. 26:61						
	Matt. 27:40						
	Matt. 27:51.						
	Mark 13:12-2						
	Mark 14:58						
	Mark 15:29						
	Mark 15:38.						
	John 2:19-22.						
	Acts 17-24;						
Ignatius of Antioch	The Epistle of Ignatius to the Ephesians	Smyrna	35-107	Greek		IX	
						XV	2
						XVI	
	The Epistle of Ignatius to the Magnesians	Smyrna	?	Greek		VII	
	The Epistle of Ignatius to the Philadelphians	Troas	?	Greek		VII	
	The Epistle of Ignatius to the Smyraeans	Troas	?	Greek		II	
		Troas	?	Greek		III	
	The Epistle Of Ignatius to Hero			Greek		VI	
Barnabas (attrib)	The Epistle of Barnabas	Cyprus?	130?	Greek		IV	
						VI	
						XVI	
Justin Martyr	Other Fragments from the Lost Writings	?	?	Greek		X	
Irenaeus	Against Heresies	Lyon?	182-88	Greek	IV	VIII	3
						IX	2
					V	VI	2
						IX	4
	Fragments from lost writings				XL		

									XVIII
									XIX
									XX
									XXI
Minucius Felix	The Octavius								XXXII
Origen	Contra Celsus			Caesarea	210anf	244?	Latin	II	X
							Greek	III	XXXII
								VIII	XVII
									XVIII
									XIX
									XX
Origen	Commentaries of Origen			Caesarea	231-254		Greek	10	1
								10	20
								10	21
								10	23
								10	24
								10	25
								10	26
								10	27
Hippolytus	The Refutation of All Heresies			Rome	?-236		Greek	V	XIV
	Exegetical Fragments from Commentaries on Various Books of Scripture			Rome	?		Greek	GEN	XLIX
								PROV	IX
	Dogmatical and Historical Treatise on Christ and Antichrist			Rome	?		Greek		XX
	On the End of the World (spurious)								XX
Cyprian	Epistle I			Carthage	246-251		Latin		XV
	Epistle VI				?-258		Latin		V
	Epistle LI						Latin		XXVI
									XXVII
	Epistle LIX					252	Latin		II
	Epistle LXXII					252	Latin		XII
	Epistle LXXIII					252	Latin		V
	Epistle LXXV					252	Latin		XI
	Epistle LXXVI					254	Latin		II
	Epistle LXXX					250/257	Latin		I
	Treatise II On the Dress of Virgins						Latin		II
	Treatise III On the Lapsed					251	Latin		X
									XXXV
	Treatise IV On the Lord's Prayer						Latin		XI
	Treatise VI On the Vanity of Idols					246 anf	Latin		IX

	Treatise IX On the Advantage of Patience			Latin		XIV
	Treatise X On Jealousy and Envy			Latin		XIV
	Treatise XII Three Books of Testimonies Against the Jews.		246 anf	Latin	I	XV
					II	XXVII
Novatian	Concerning the Trinity	Rome	257 anf	Latin		VI
						XXI
						XXIV
Gregory Thaumaturgus	Sectional Confession of Faith	Pontus	260-270	Greek		VII
						XXI
	The Second Homily on the Annunciation of the Holy Virgin Mary			Greek		
	The Third Homily			Greek		
Archelaus	The Acts of Disputation with the Heresiarch Manes					XIX
Methodius	The Banquet of the Ten Virgins. Discourse I: Marcella	Olympus, Lycia	?-311			I
	Discourse VIII: Thecla					V
	Discourse XI: Arete					III
	Concerning Free Will					
	From the Discourse on the Resurrection					V
	Oration Concerning Simeon and Anna					VI
						IV
Lactantius	Divine Institutes	Nicomedia	303-311	Latin	I	XX
					IV	I
						X
						XI
						XIII
						XIV
						XVIII
					V	VIII
					VI	XXV
	The Epitome of the Divine Institutes	Trier		Latin		LXVI
	A Treatise on the Anger of God	?		Latin		II
						XXIII
	On the Manner in Which the Persecutors Died	?		Latin		XV
Victorinus	Commentary on the Apocalypse of the Blessed John	Petabium, Styria	?-303	Latin		XI
Constitutions of the Apostles	On Virgins				IV	XIV
Clement	2nd Epistle: The Homily					IX
n/a	The Gospel According to Peter		190		sec32	
n/a	The Second Epistle of Clement					9
Eusebius	The Church History	Caesarea	260?-341?	Greek	X	IV
						2 to 7
						21

									22
									26
									56
									63
									65
									66
									69
	The Oration of Eusebius		Constantinople?	335/336				XIV	3
								XIV	4
								XV/III	
Sozomenus	Ecclesiastical History						VIII	XII	

	wilderness: Mark 1.12–13	temptation of Jesus
	synagogue: Mark 1.21–24/Luke 4.31–33	
h	house: Mark 1.29	
	country/outside the city: Mark 1.44–45	
h	house/home in Capernaum: Mark 2.1	teaching/healing
	sea shore: Mark 2.13	teaching
h	tax collector's house: Mark 2.15	
	synagogue: Mark 3.1	healing on Sabbath
	mountain: Mark 3.13	
	seashore/boat: Mark 4.1	
p	Decapolis: Mark 5.20	
	seashore: Mark 5.21	
	synagogue: Mark 5.37	
	synagogue (hometown): Mark 6.2	
h	house: Mark 6.10	
	deserted place (by boat): Mark 6.31–32	
p	marketplaces: Mark 6.56	
h	house: Mark 7.17	
h	house in Tyre: Mark 7.24	
p	Decapolis: Mark 7.31	
	mountain: Mark 9.2	
	offer by Peter to build dwellings: Mark 9.2	
h	house: Mark 9.28	
h	house in Capernaum: Mark 9.33	
h	house in Judea: Mark 10.10	
	no one has left house or family in the next life: Mark 10.10.28	
	brief (romantic) visit to the Temple: Mark 11.11	
	cleansing of the temple/temple as house: Mark 11: 17	
	rejected corner stone (ref OT): Mark 12.10	the stone that the builders rejected has become the cornerstone
	Jesus teaches in the temple: Mark 12.31	
	Jesus condemns scribes who like to greeted in marketplace and best seats in synagogues: Mark 12:38–9	
	scribes consume widow's houses: Mark 12:40	
	Jesus and apostles at Gethsemane: Mark 14:32	
	Jesus accused of saying he will destroy temple: Mark 14:58	
p	Jesus humiliated in the courtyard of the imperial palace: Mark 15:16	
	Jesus taunted. Destroyer of temple come down from the cross: Mark 15.29–30	
	tomb hewn out of rock: Mark 15.46	
	empty tomb: Mark 16.5–8	

	Jesus appears to two disciples walking in the country: Mark 16.12	
h	Jesus appears to the 11 while they are 'at the table': Mark 16.14	
	in a manger, no room in the inn: Luke 2.7	
	shepherds visit manger: Luke 2.16	
	presentation of Jesus in the temple: Luke 2.22-27	
	12 yr old Jesus spends three days in temple speaking to scribes: Luke 2.46	
	temple as 'my father's house': Luke 2.49	
	John receives the word of God in the wilderness: Luke 3.2	
p	John put in prison: Luke 3.20	
	Jesus spends 40 days in the wilderness: Luke 4.2	
	devil puts Jesus on pinnacle of the temple: 4:9	
	Jesus begins to teach in the synagogues: Luke 4:15	
	reads in the synagogue on the sabbath: Luke 4.16	
	Jesus thrown out of the synagogue and driven out of his home town: Luke 4.28-29	
	Jesus teaches in the synagogue at Capernaum: Luke 4.33	
h	Jesus heals in the house of Simon: Luke 4.38-40	
	Jesus go to deserted place: Luke 4:42	
	Jesus teaches in the synagogues of Judea: 4.44	
	Jesus by a lake, calls Simon Peter, James, and John. Gets in their boat: Luke 5.1-3	
	Jesus heals a leper in 'one of the cities': Luke 5.12	
	Jesus prays in deserted places: Luke 5.16	
h?s?	paralytic lowered through roof to Jesus: Luke 5.19	
h	banquet at the house of Levi, tax collector Luke 5.29	
	Jesus heals in the synagogue: Luke 6.6	
	Jesus prays on a mountain then chooses 12 apostles: Luke 6.12	
	Jesus speaks and heals on a 'level place': Luke 6.17	
	parable of the well built house (foundations): Luke 6.48-49	
	Jesus heals in Capernaum: Luke 7.1	
ex m	Jesus raises the dead outside the city gate at Nain: Luke 7.11-14	
	those who put on soft robes and live in luxury are in royal palaces unlike Jesus and John: Luke 7.25	
h	Jesus eats at house of Phairsee Simon, feet washed with tears: Luke 7.36-38	
	preaching through cities and villages: Luke 7.8	
	calms a storm while in a boat: Luke 8.22	
	Jesus casts out demons from a city man on the shore of a lake: Luke 8.22//Mt. 8.28-9.1// Mk 5.1-20	
h	Jesus visits the house of the leader of the synagogue and raises his dead daughter: Luke 8.51	
h	12 charged to go out, teach and heal, take nothing — 'whatever house you enter, stay there...': Luke 9.4	
	feeding of the five thousand in a 'deserted place': Luke 9.12//Mt. 14.13-21//Mk.6.30-44//Jn. 6.1-15	

	Jesus prays on a mountain (transfiguration): Luke 9.28	
	peter offers to build 3 'dwellings' following transfiguration: Luke 9.33	
	the son of man has nowhere to lay his head: Luke 9.58	
h	70 sent out. Take nothing. Stay in houses: Luke 10.5–12	
	woe to unrepentant cities: Luke 10.13–15	
h	Jesus visits the house of Mary and Martha: Luke 10.38	
h	the body as a house for demons: Luke 11.24	body as dwelling place
	the light of the body: Luke 11.33	
	Jesus to the lawyers—you build the tombs of the prophets who your ancestors killed: Luke 11.47	
	Jesus tells the crowd—sell your possessions and give alms: Luke 12.33	
	Jesus teaches/heals in the synagogue on the sabbath: Luke 13.10	
	Jesus goes through towns and villages teaching as he makes his way to Jerusalem: Luke 13.22	
h	Jesus eats/heals at the house of a leader of the Pharisees on the sabbath: Luke 14.1	
	metaphor—builder must estimate the cost of building a tower: Luke 14.28–29	building metaphor; christianity as a building
h	Jesus stays at the house of Zacchaeus: Luke 18.5	
	Jesus weeps over Jerusalem: Luke 19.41	
	Jesus cleanses and teaches in the temple: Luke 19.45–47	
	Jesus teaches in the temple: Luke 20.1	
	the stone that the builders rejected has become the cornerstone: Luke 20.17	building metaphor
	Jesus predicts the destruction of the temple: Luke 21.6	
t/n	Jesus teaching by day in the temple and spending nights on the Mount of Olives: Luke 21.37	
h	preparations for the passover meal in upper room: Luke 22.12	rented room
	Mount of Olives: Luke 22.39	went there 'as was his custom'
	empty tomb: Luke 24.1–3	
	resurrected Jesus appears to two believers on the road between Jerusalem and Emmaus: Luke 24.15	
h	resurrected Jesus breaks bread in Emmaus: Luke 24.29–31	
h	resurrected Jesus appears to the 11 in Jerusalem: Luke 24.36.	
	resurrected Jesus takes the 11 out of Jerusalem to Bethany for ascension: Luke 24.50–51	
	the apostles return to the city (Jerusalem) and Temple after the ascension: Luke 24.53	
	The Baptist responds to the questions by the Scribes in Bethany: John 1.19–28	
	Holy Spirit descends on Jesus in Bethany: John 1.32	
	cleansing of the temple: John 2.14–16	
	Jesus and disciples go into Judean countryside John 3.22	
ex m	Jesus speaks to the Samaritan woman at Jacobs well: John 4.21–23	"the hour is coming when you will worship the father neither on this mountain nor in Jerusalem."
ex m	Jesus heals near the sheep gate at the 5 porticoed pool of Bethesda: John 5.2	an angel was said to come occasionally and heal those in the water, Jesus makes the place and the water irrelevant to the healing.

	five thousand follow Jesus to the Sea of Galilee: John 6.1-2		Jesus went up the mountain and sat with his disciples.
	Jesus withdraws by himself to the mountain: John 6.15.		Jesus fears that the crowd will seize him and make him king.
	the crowd compares themselves to the people of Moses- eating mana in the wilderness: John 6.31		
	"Those who eat my flesh and drink my blood abide I me and I in them: John 6.56		bread/flesh not like ancestors ate... wilderness as link?
	Jesus teaches in the synagogue at Capernaum: John 6.59		
n / t	Jesus goes up, secretly, to the Jerusalem temple to teach...they try to arrest him: John 7.14		v9 he is in Galilee? Festival of Booths/Tabernacles in Jerusalem?
	Jesus comes down from the Mt of Olives and teaches in the temple: John 1-2		
	Jesus teaches in the treasury of the temple: John 8.20		
ex m	Jesus stoned by the Jews in the Temple: John 8.59		
	raising Lazarus from the dead and out of a cave in Bethany: John 11.17-18 and 38-44		
	Jesus fears for his life and leaves Jerusalem for the village of Ephraim 'near the wilderness': John 11.54		
h	Jesus has dinner with followers in Bethany at the house of Martha, sister of Lazarus: John 12:1-2		
p	triumphal entrance into Jerusalem: John 12.12-15		
	my father's house has many dwelling places: John 14.1-3		house as metaphor of heaven
	the father who dwells in me: John 14.10		
	you do not belong in the world: John 15.19		
	garden in the Kidron Valley: John 18.1		regular meeting place of Jesus and disciples
	empty tomb: John 20.1		
	2 angels by tomb: John 20.12		
h	resurrected Jesus visits disciples hiding in house behind locked doors: John 20.19		
h	resurrected Jesus visits same house one week later: John 20.26		
	resurrected Jesus on the shore the Sea of Galilee: John 21.1-5		
h	House Acts 4.23		
	Synagogue Acts 9.20		
	Synagogue Acts 13.5		
	Synagogue Acts 13.14		
	Synagogue Acts 14.1		
h	House Acts 16:13-16		
h	House Acts 16.34		
h	House Acts 16.4		
p	Prison Acts 16.24-25		
	Synagogue Acts 17.1-2		
p	Public square Acts 17.16		
	Synagogue Acts 17.16		
p	Areopagus Acts 17.22		
h	House Acts 18.03		
	Synagogue Acts 18.19		

	Synagogue Acts 19.8		
p	Lecture hall Acts 19.9		
h	House Acts 20.07		
	Temple Acts 21.26		
	Temple Acts 22.17		
p	Prison Acts 23.11		