Article

Paul's Iconic Christ among Mediterranean Cult Statues: A Comparison of Divine Images

Journal for the Study of the New Testament
2025, Vol. 47(4) 676–713
© The Author(s) 2025

Article reuse guidelines:
sagepub.com/journals-permissions
DOI: 10.1177/0142064X241303439
journals.sagepub.com/home/jnt


Alexander Chantziantoniou
Faculty of Divinity, University of Cambridge, UK
Department of Religious Studies, Crandall University, Canada

Abstract

While scholars continue to debate whether Paul ever explicitly called the messiah a god, there can be no question that he called the messiah an image of a god (2 Cor. 4.4). Even so, there has been no shortage of comparative studies that situate Paul's messiah among ancient Mediterranean gods, including the Jewish god himself, whereas what is arguably more proximate comparanda for Paul's iconic claims tend not to be taken into consideration, namely, ancient Mediterranean images of gods. Taking for granted that Paul's god—the Jewish god—was a Mediterranean god among others, in this article I redescribe Paul's messiah as a Mediterranean cult image among others. By exploring the relation between gods and their images, between divinity and materiality, with images of gods as material media that make present the gods they image, new light is cast on the debated relation between the Jewish god and his christological image in Paul's letters.

Keywords

Cult statues, divine images, image christology, Paul, materiality

Corresponding author:
Alexander Chantziantoniou, Faculty of Divinity, University of Cambridge, West Road, Cambridge, CB3 9BS, UK.
Department of Religious Studies, Crandall University, 333 Gorge Road, Moncton, NB, E1G 3H9, Canada.
Emails: alexander.chantziantoniou@crandallu.ca; anc49@cantab.ac.uk

Introduction: The *Status Quaestionis* of the Iconic Christ

In the letter that has come to be known as 2 Corinthians, Paul tells his gentile followers that the Jewish messiah is an image of the Jewish god.[1] 'The god of this age has blinded the minds of the unfaithful, to keep them from seeing the light of the good news of the glory of the messiah, who is an image of god' (ὅς ἐστιν εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ, 2 Cor. 4.4). As such, it is in the materiality of this messiah that the luminous presence of the Jewish deity is seen and known. 'For it is the god who said, "Let light shine out of darkness", who has shone in our hearts to give the light of knowledge of the glory of god (τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ) in the face (προσώπῳ) of the messiah' (2 Cor. 4.6 NRSV, slightly modified). While this is the only instance in the undisputed letters of Paul where Jesus is explicitly dubbed a divine image (implicitly, 1 Cor. 15.49; 2 Cor. 3.18; Rom. 8.29; cf. Col. 1.15; 3.10), the basic concept has had a disproportionate reception history, informing centuries of christological debate about the humanity of Jesus and its relation to divinity.[2] In this article, I bring new comparanda to an old debate by drawing from a hitherto neglected body of relevant scholarship, namely, classical and art-historical studies on images of gods in the visuality of everyday Greeks and Romans in ancient Mediterranean material culture.[3] The result is to open up fresh avenues for understanding Paul's iconic claims about the Jewish messiah

1. On the Jewishness of Paul's god, see Fredriksen 2018, 2019. On the ethno-religious identification of Paul's Corinthian audience, see Concannon 2014, 2016.
2. On the popularity and importance of conceptualizing the messiah as a divine image in early Christian debates about his humanity and divinity, especially as developed in Col. 1.15, see Strawbridge 2015: 135–49; 2018.
3. On this point, I build on the work of George van Kooten (2008b), who is one of the few exceptions of which I am aware, but whose attention remains largely at the level of philosophical discourse and its relation to Paul's anthropology: 'it is very important to understand the expression "image of God" in the context of the pagan discourse about the material images of the gods. … The various discourses about the image of God are, at their core, strongly linked to the most basic discourse, that of physical, tangible images of gods, used in pagan cult. The basic discourse of cultic images reflects the everyday importance of such images in Antiquity and permeates all other discourses' (117). By 'images of gods', I refer to two- or three-dimensional material media of visual art and iconography depicting the gods, such as sculptures, reliefs, portraits, paintings, and so on. By appealing to such images as comparanda for Paul's claims about the messiah, the approach adopted here closely aligns with what Jane Heath (2009: 271–72) calls an 'iconographic approach', although I prefer to view it more broadly as 'a materialist approach' (following Stavrakopoulou 2013). While Heath fruitfully applies such an approach to Paul himself as an image of the messiah in 2 Cor. 4.7–12 (Heath 2009; cf. Mitchell 2004: 187–91) and the 'metamorphosis of the beholder' into that same image in 2 Cor. 3.18 (Heath 2013), I apply it instead to Paul's messiah as an image of god in 2 Cor. 4.4–6 and elsewhere. C. Kavin Rowe (2005) has done similarly, but he does not appeal to ancient Greek and Roman iconography as comparanda by which to illuminate the 'early Christian iconography' he finds to cohere with Paul's iconic claims.

in light of wider ritual perceptions of divine images and their material entanglement with the gods they image.[4]

In recent decades, a strong majority of scholars have appealed to Paul's ancestral Jewish heritage to elucidate the alleged 'origins' of his so-called 'image christology'. Some have pointed to 'merkabah mysticism' and visionary texts about divine 'glory' (כבוד, δόξα) in the Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, or hekhalot literature (most famously, Kim 1981: 136–268; 2002: 165–213; cf. Newman 1992).[5] Others have pointed to a 'wisdom' or 'word' tradition attested in Pseudo-Solomon and Philo of Alexandria (most recently, Kugler 2020: 111–48).[6] And still others have pointed to a wider constellation of early Jewish texts about humanity writ large, involving traditions about Adam, Moses, Israel, the high priest, the son of man, or some combination of any or all the above (most fully, Fletcher-Louis 1999, 2000, 2002, 2004a, 2004b, 2007, 2015).[7] Whatever one makes of such claims, it is clear that, with only a few notable exceptions,[8] the older agenda of the *religionsgeschichtliche Schule* to pinpoint the Greek and Roman philosophical 'roots' of Paul's claims—be they gnostic redeemer myths (Bousset 1913; Jervell 1960; Schwanz 1970) or Middle Platonic intermediaries

4. In this article, I use 'iconic' and 'iconicity' to refer to social practices involving images of gods or other nonobvious beings, which I take to include the textual production of mythmaking about such images. Further on mythmaking as a social practice of religious experts (including Paul), see Stowers 2011b; Young 2016; Wendt 2016, 2022. There is longstanding debate about the relation between μορφή and the wider image lexicon, and, subsequently, whether μορφὴ θεοῦ (Phil. 2.6) should be treated alongside εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ (2 Cor. 4.4); on which, see Steenburg 1988 (against it) and van Kooten 2008a (for it). But even if μορφή and εἰκών regularly reoccur in a common idiom of Platonic philosophizing about 'the forms of images' (cf. 2 Cor. 3.18: τὴν αὐτὴν εἰκόνα μεταμορφούμεθα), as van Kooten (2008a: 221–37) eloquently argues, it seems unlikely that the two terms—much less the full pronominal phrases ὃς ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων (Phil. 2.6) and ὃς ἐστιν εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ (2 Cor. 4.4)—are 'synonymous' in Paul's mythmaking about the messiah before/during his terrestrial existence (Phil. 2.6–11) and the messiah in his post-resurrection pneumatic existence (2 Cor. 3.17–18; cf. 1 Cor. 15.35–58). *Pace* van Kooten 2008a: 238. Further on μορφή, see Stroumsa 1983; Bockmuehl 1997.

5. E.g., Ezek. 1; Dan. 7; *1 En*. 14; 46; *4 Ezra* 13; *Apoc. Ab*. 17–18; *T. Ab*. (A) 11–12, 16; Rev. 1; 4–5.

6. On 'wisdom', see Wis. 7.22–30; Philo, *Alleg. Interp*. 1.43; *Migration* 40; *Heir* 112. On 'word', see Philo, *Alleg. Interp*. 3.96; *Confusion* 97, 147; *Dreams* 1.75, 239; 2.45; *Spec. Laws* 1.81; *Flight* 101.

7. E.g., Gen. 1–3; Exod. 34.29–35; Ps. 8.5–9; Ezek. 36–37; Dan. 7.13–14; Sir. 49.16–50.1; *1 En*. 46.1; 48.5; 62.6–9; *LAE* 13.3; 14.1–2; 15.2; *LAB* 26.10–13; *Exagoge* 68–81; Josephus, *Ant*. 11.331–35; 1QS 4.22–23; 1QH[a] 4.14–15; CD 3.19–20; 4Q171 3.1–2; 4Q374 frag. 2; 4Q381; 4Q504 frags. 1–2, 8.

8. Two recent exceptions include van Kooten 2008b and Kugler 2020, both of whom argue that the *imago Dei* tradition articulated in Paul's 'Adam christology' (van Kooten) and/or 'wisdom christology' (Kugler) was derived from various elements of (Middle) Platonism.

(Eltester 1958; Colpe 1961; Larsson 1962)—has been outpaced by that of the so-called 'new' *Schule*, which, in the words of Wayne Meeks (2001: 21), is 'to demonstrate the distinctiveness of Christianity against its pagan environment' by appealing to 'the distinctiveness it shared' with ancient Israel and/or early Judaism.[9] Indeed, even Chris Kugler (2020: 24), who frames his recent analysis as developing insights from the 'old' *Schule* by highlighting Middle Platonic elements in Jewish wisdom traditions, nevertheless insists on 'the crucial ways in which Paul's *imago Dei* theology differs radically from the philosophical *imago Dei* traditions'.

In this article, by contrast, I am not concerned with the questions that so preoccupied the *religionsgeschichtliche Schule* in both its older and newer varieties, that is, questions fixated on origins, borrowings, backgrounds, or influences (whether Greek, Roman, Jewish, or otherwise).[10] Rather, the present article takes its point of departure with what Jennifer Eyl (2019: 2) has argued should 'go without saying': Paul was intelligible and recognizable to his own gentile followers within the wider world of ancient Mediterranean religion.[11] In other words, I treat Paul not as a singular, isolated figure set against any one particular 'background' but as 'one among many',[12] whose letters provide 'evidence for ancient Mediterranean religion' more broadly as one peculiar case relative to widely recognizable modes of social practices and cognitive processes involving the gods and their presence among mortals (Wasserman 2022: 217, 219).[13] So,

9. For a full survey and incisive critique of Pauline scholarship on εἰκών—from 'old' to 'new' *Schulen*—see esp. Lorenzen 2008: 1–16.
10. For a recent methodological critique of such approaches, see Braun 2020.
11. See also Stowers 2011b: 105–6, 107; Dingeldein 2014: 5–7, 10, 13, 15, 70; Young 2016: 37–66; Wendt 2016: 146–48, 150–51, 160, 168–69, 188–89. Building on the fundamental insights of Jonathan Z. Smith (1982: xi), the concept of 'religion' has been deeply problematised in recent years as a descriptive, first-order concept in the study of antiquity (e.g., Nongbri 2013; Barton and Boyarin 2016), not least as it relates to biblical (Goldenberg 2019) and specifically Pauline (Nongbri 2015) scholarship. As a result, I follow Eyl (2019: 35–44) and others who draw from an increasingly influential typology of multiple 'modes of religiosity' developed over the past 15 years in the voluminous work of Stanley Stowers (2008a, 2008b, 2011a, 2011b, 2016, 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2024a, 2024b), who carefully theorises 'religion' as a second-order, redescriptive category of human cognition and variously linked social practices involving the gods, set alongside other ordinary human modes of cultural production rather than treated as a *sui generis* category. For an excellent overview of the issues involved, see now Wasserman 2022.
12. So Johnson-DeBaufre and Nasrallah 2011; cf. Concannon 2014: 9, 18, 24–25, 45–46.
13. While Paul himself participated in the textual production of reflective, cognitively costly, and often counterintuitive knowledge (as did other intellectualizing religious experts), I focus mainly on the intuitive, cognitively optimal, and minimally counterintuitive knowledge of so-called 'lived religion' among everyday Greeks and Romans (what Stowers calls 'the religion of everyday social exchange'). See Larson 2016: 11–14; Stowers 2016; and the discussion

while I take for granted that Paul lived and died a Jew 'within Judaism', and that his letters should be treated as primary evidence for Jewish religious expertise promoting a foreign god—the Jewish god—among gentiles (Wendt 2016: 146–89), I further insist that Paul, like other early Jews, actively participated in and creatively contributed to widely shared social practices, ritual perspectives, visual resources, and material technologies that were otherwise common to Greeks and Romans, no less than Jews.[14]

By introducing comparanda from the study of Greek and Roman cult images, then, I intend no categorical dichotomy with Jewish sources. On the contrary, it is my contention that the latter (Paul's letters included) are themselves better understood as operating within the same set of variously linked social practices and cognitive processes involving divine images as the former—deliberately cutting across traditionally disparate categorizations to treat the whole as ethnically coded examples of ancient Mediterranean religion.[15] So, while I begin by focusing on images in the visuality of everyday Greeks and Romans in the pragmatic flow of my argument, I do so with the aim of defining the redescriptive terms that I go on to apply to Jews, too.[16] Far from reinscribing an implicit divide between them, this offers one way of demonstrating that Greeks, Romans, and Jews alike can be understood within the porous and permeable boundaries of ancient Mediterranean religion, working towards what Eyl (2020) has called 'a kind of integrated Greco-Romano-Judeanness'.

This article thus proceeds as a comparative experiment of redescription and contextualization.[17] In what follows, I construe Paul's claim that the messiah is

---

in Gasparini et al. 2020; Eidinow et al. 2022. It is generally agreed that the critical perspectives of philosophers and other intellectualizing experts on divine images do not represent the intuitive logic or ritual-orientated visuality of nonexperts (e.g., Clarke 2003: 73–94; Rüpke 2016: 42–63; Kiernan 2020: 13–14). As Stowers (2016) makes clear, this should not be misconstrued as a dichotomy between 'the elite' and 'the popular' (*pace* Bevan 1940: 29–30), but understood to reflect dual-process models of human cognition that are not mutually exclusive.

14. Further on 'technology' (a subcategory of 'media'), with special attention to materiality and divine epiphany, see now Bur 2020.
15. On early Judaism as an instance of ancient Mediterranean religion, see Stowers 2016; Wendt 2016: 30–34, 76–100; cf. Fredriksen 2022: 326, 380. On Paul and his Judaism as an instance of ancient Mediterranean religion, an approach that has heuristically come to be called 'Paul within paganism', see Chantziantoniou, Fredriksen, and Young (forthcoming); cf. Stowers 2024a: 10–24 and, more fully, 2024b.
16. This is standard procedure in redescriptive models of comparative religion (see below).
17. 'Redescription' is from the comparative method developed by Jonathan Z. Smith. It can be defined, most basically, as the attempt 'to construe one thing in terms of another (most usually that which is problematic in terms of that which is better understood) so that we may see things in a new, and frequently unexpected, light' (Smith 2004: 29; cf. 2000). The method further functions as an experimental act of contextualization, since, by taking two (or more) comparanda and 'dropping one in the other's pond to see what happens', the comparativist

an image of the Jewish god in terms of concepts and categories derived from wider ritual perspectives involving images of other Mediterranean gods among everyday Greeks and Romans. I do so in the attempt to pose historical boundaries for a disciplined imagination of how to understand the relation between the Jewish god and his christological cult image within the wider world of ancient Mediterranean religion. In the first half of this article, I draw from recent classical and art-historical scholarship on ancient Mediterranean cult statues in order to probe the relation between gods and their images. This then supplies the concepts and categories for a redescription of Paul's iconic Christ in similar terms in the second half of this article, in which I offer an 'iconographic' or 'materialist' approach to Paul's claims about the messiah as an image of god. In so doing, I argue that the materiality of the messiah can be viewed as a technology of divine epiphany comparable to the statuary of cult images, both of which serve as material media of presencing gods among mortals. In this way, I hope to show that, notwithstanding Paul's polemics against images of gentile gods elsewhere in his letters (e.g., 1 Thess. 1.9–10; 1 Cor. 8.1–11.1; 12.2; 2 Cor. 6.14–7.1; Rom. 1.18–32), his iconic claims about the messiah as an image of the Jewish god can be understood to operate within and innovate upon widespread ritual perceptions of the visuality of the gods and epiphanic strategies involving the presence of those gods vis-à-vis their images.

Ancient Mediterranean Cult Statues: Deity, Statuary, and Material Epiphany

In recent decades, the so-called 'material turn' has continued to gain prominence across the humanities, not least in the study of Mediterranean antiquity. Following increased attention to the materiality of 'things', the production of presence, and the co-constitutive assemblage of nonhuman objects and human/superhuman agents, there has been a resurgence of interest among classicists and art historians in images of gods in ancient Mediterranean cult and material culture. As scholars now regularly acknowledge, previous scholarship as far back as the father of classical art history and archaeology himself—Johann Joachim Winckelmann (1764)—has long been prejudiced by the legacy of Jewish and Christian polemics against 'idolatry' (Donohue 1988: 85–103, 175–231; Rives 2007: 32–34; Squire 2009: 15–89). Alice Donohue (1997: 42) put it bluntly: 'On the whole, the scholarly imagination has been iconoclastic, and few analyses have moved far enough away from the iconoclastic position to entertain

effectively *creates a new context* in which to understand one exemplum in light of the other: 'in a certain sense [we] change its context, because now that context is that other thing that [we] brought it to' (Sinhababu and Smith 2018: 14).

seriously the possibility of approaching the images as the images that the Greeks insisted they were'.[18]

Over the past twenty years, however, scholars have increasingly wrestled with 'questions of agency and the degree to which Graeco-Roman viewers ascribed to material artefacts the capacity for presence, sentience, and the exertion of power', precisely in the attempt to interrogate 'emic conceptions of materialist thought' about images among Greeks and Romans themselves (Gaifman and Platt 2018: 406–7).[19] This has necessarily led to a critical re-examination of a dizzying array of literary, artistic, and archaeological evidence, from the archaic period well into the so-called Second Sophistic, informed especially by theoretical advancements in visual anthropology, cognitive archaeology, and materiality studies.[20] Such studies take seriously the material agency of 'things', their active participation in public life, and their dynamic entanglement in networks of human, non-human, and superhuman actors. As a result, it was once common for classicists—and is still relatively common for biblical scholars[21]—to interpret such evidence with reference to a dualistic model of 'representation', which firmly maintains that Greeks and Romans did not conflate or equivocate between images (as 'signifiers') and gods (as 'signified'). Many have since come to conclude that this model is largely indebted to later Christian semiotics, which do not adequately reflect the complex material entanglement and continual cognitive renegotiation between gods and their images in the ritual-orientated visuality of everyday Greeks and Romans.[22] In this section, I survey a selection of the

18. Donohue (1988: 85 n. 203) uses 'iconoclastic' to refer to 'the entire range of feeling against religious images, not simply their destruction'.

19. For full-length treatments of ancient Greek images since the turn of the millennium, see Scheer 2000; Bettinetti 2001; Steiner 2001; Tanner 2006; Squire 2009; Neer 2010a; Eich 2011; Platt 2011; Gaifman 2012; Hölscher 2017. For full-length treatments of ancient Roman images, see Stewart 2002; Elsner 2007; Bussels 2012; Kiernan 2020; cf. Ando 2008: 21–42; Lipka 2009: 88–102; Rüpke 2016: 42–63. See also the discussions in Eliav et al. 2008; Mylonopoulos 2010; Arnhold et al. 2018; Dietrich and Squire 2018; Gaifman and Platt 2018.

20. On those theoretical advancements, see, e.g., Brown 2001; Latour 2005; Meskell 2005; Miller 2005; Bennett 2010; Olsen 2010; Hodder 2012; Malafouris 2013.

21. See the examples cited and discussed in Gupta 2014: 705–6; Anderson 2016: 130–31; cf. Levtow 2008: 5–9.

22. This point is regularly repeated in the bibliography cited in n. 19 above. See, most fully, Squire 2009: 15–89. Against the once-popular privileging of dualistic categories under the guise of Platonic or Aristotelian formalism in the interpretation of ancient Greek art and iconography, see now Porter 2010 and 2016, who traces a thoroughgoing materialism in the discourse of art from Homer to late antiquity. Moreover, Dale Martin (1995: 3–15) has argued that the dualism of Plato and his followers is often misconstrued by scholars through the lens of Cartesian metaphysics, and that it is better understood as a radically hierarchical cosmology. Further on cosmic hierarchies in Middle Platonism and Neoplatonism, see van Nuffelen 2011: 99–176.

evidence reassessed by scholars to probe the relation between deity and statuary, and then outline the now dominant category by which classicists and art historians have come to interpret such evidence and its role in the production of divine presence.

Between Deity and Statuary

The complexity of Greek and Roman 'visual theologies' of images is aptly portrayed in ancient art, in which the relation between gods and images is visually depicted in a wide variety of ways (see esp. Gaifman 2016; cf. Scheer 2015). But it is also reflected in ancient ekphrasis, which conveniently interprets the images depicted in visual art.[23] In a now famous example, Richard Gordon (1979) observes that Pausanias could often write of the 'statue of *x*' (usually, ἄγαλμα + the name of a god in the genitive), but that he just as readily refers to the deity directly. 'A statue of Aphrodites (Ἀφροδίτης ἄγαλμα) stood under the first tripod', Pausanias writes at one place, 'and Artemis (Ἄρτεμις) under the second' (*Description of Greece* 3.18.8). As Gordon (1979: 7) points out, scholars subtly correct the seemingly 'false' equivocation between the statue of Artemis and the goddess Artemis herself by glossing the text to read: 'The first tripod is supported by an image of Aphrodites, the second by *one of* Artemis' (trans. Jones 1895: 26, emphasis added)—despite the fact that Ἄρτεμις is in the nominative, not the genitive. In other words, scholars insert a statue of Artemis into Pausanias's ekphrasis when, strictly speaking, there is 'a statue of Aphrodites' (Ἀφροδίτης ἄγαλμα), and then there is simply 'Artemis' (Ἄρτεμις).

Similarly, when Pausanias transcribes an inscription from a wooden horse at Delphi, listing 'images' (εἰκόνας) of gods and heroes dedicated from the spoils of war, he unequivocally states: 'These *are* Athena and Apollos' (εἰσὶ δὲ Ἀθηνᾶ τε καὶ Ἀπόλλων, 10.10.1). But once again Gordon (1979: 7) cites scholars who 'correct' the presumed 'failure' to distinguish between gods and images by glossing the Greek to read: 'These *represent* Athena and Apollos' (trans. Jones 1895: 96–7, emphasis added). Thus, Gordon (1979: 8) concludes: 'It is we who introduce the concept of "representation", where Pausanias says "they are …"'. This fundamental observation about the 'ambiguous status of the art object' (Gordon 1979: 10–11) has since been followed and further developed by scholars with respect to a range of other Greek and Latin texts, to the point where it is now largely taken for granted.[24] Clifford Ando (2008: 22–27) thus concludes that by

23. On the theory and practice of ekphrasis, which refers to the textual description and/or interpretation of visual phenomena, including art and iconography, see Elsner 1996: 24–29.

24. See, e.g., Gladigow 1985/1986; Versnel 1987: 46–47; Vernant 1991: 27–49; Donohue 1997: 44–5; Lapatin 2001: 5–6; Steiner 2001: 99–104; Tanner 2006: 48; Elsner 2007: 30–32; Platt 2011: 77–78.

glossing over the semantic tension between deity and statuary in Greek and Roman writings about images, and by projecting a semiotic theory of 'representation' onto evidence where there is none, we mask an important feature of ancient ekphrasis, namely, the ability to depict images of the gods *both* as images *and* as gods.

This artistic and ekphrastic phenomenon is further reinforced by the ways in which statues are described in inscriptions. Joseph Day (2010) has identified two common patterns whereby epigrams textualize the ritual performance of dedication and frame visual encounters with the image. Most often, epigrams follow a 'narrative sequence' involving the dedicant (subject), the act of dedicating (verb), the dedication itself (direct object), and the divine recipient (indirect object): 'person *x* set up dedication *y* for god *z*' (Day 2010: 6, slightly modified; citing *DVA* 111–28 and *ThesCRA* 1.269–78). In these cases, the statue *of* the god is offered as a gift *to* the god, who is, as a result, presumably distinguished from the votive statue as its recipient. Less often, but not uncommonly, epigrams are written from the perspective of the dedicated statue, rather than the human dedicant, which addresses readers directly and identifies itself either as the god (i.e., a divine name in the nominative, sometimes with εἰμί), or as belonging to the god (i.e., a divine name in the genitive, sometimes with εἰμί, sometimes with the substantive ἱερόν): '(I am) god *x*', or '(I am) (the consecrated object) of god *x*' (Day 2010: 6–7; citing *CEG* 251, 302, 354, 400; cf. 407). Blending these two common patterns together, other inscriptions follow the sequence of the first but narrate it from the perspective of the statue as in the second: 'person *x* set me up, dedication *y*, for god *z*' (*CEG* 190, 207, 259, 281, 363). In these latter two cases, the distinction between the image and the god is blurred nearly to the point of erasure, with the deity ostensibly present as a public interlocutor with its viewers in the form of its statue (see further Day 2010: 130–80). To look at a cult statue is to see 'a being who *looked back*' (Platt 2011: 78, emphasis original), and to read its accompanying inscription is to hear that being speak.

Finally, as with art, ekphrasis, and epigrams, so also with dreams and their interpretation.[25] The fluidity and instability of dreams—or what Patricia Cox Miller (1994: 30) calls 'the oneiric imagination'—provide a medium of visuality capable of bending conventional ontological categories, making them well suited to probe the already fuzzy relation between gods and their images. In dream visions, gods and other nonobvious divine beings often appear in the form of their statues. For instance, when three nymphs appear to Daphnis in a dream, they are described as 'tall and beautiful ladies, semi-clothed and barefoot, looking like their statues' (τοῖς ἀγάλμασιν ὅμοιαι, Longus, *Daphnis and Chloe* 2.23). In other cases, gods do not merely *look like* their statues; they quite simply *are*

25. On which, see Cox Miller 1994, who compares ancient art with dream visions as 'a form of iconization' (28). See further Platt 2011: 253–92; Petridou 2016: 54–55.

animated statues (Cox Miller 1994: 28–31). According to Artemidorus, an ancient expert on dreams and divination, this should not be wholly surprising: 'statues of the gods have the same meaning as the gods themselves' (*Interpretation of Dreams* 2.39.9). When Artemis appears in a dream vision, Artemidorus claims that 'it makes no difference whether we see the goddess herself, as we have imagined her to be, or whether we see her statue (ἄγαλμα αὐτῆς). For whether gods appear in the flesh (σάρκινοι) or as statues (ἀγάλματα) fashioned out of some material, they have the same meaning' (2.35). While there is a material difference between gods ('in the flesh') and statues ('fashioned out of some material'), Artemidorus insists that there is 'no difference' at the level of visual encounter (Platt 2011: 285). He goes on to apply this same logic to (statues of) Zeus (2.35); Heracles (2.37); Poseidon, Amphitrite, and Nereus (2.38); Serapis, Isis, Anubis, and Harpocrates (2.39). So, it would seem, in response to the question posed in the title of H. S. Versnel's famous essay, 'What Did Ancient Man See When He Saw a God?' (1987), one answer would be, quite simply, its cult statue.

Material Media of Divine Epiphany

In light of recent reevaluations of the sort of evidence discussed above, the view that has come to dominate the fields of classical and art-historical scholarship in recent decades is that a cult image constitutes the *material epiphany* of a god.[26] In other words, an image of a god is a material 'mode of presencing' the god among mortals: it makes seen and accessible normally nonobvious beings, who are, for all intents and purposes, out of sight and out of touch to most mortals most of the time.[27] In fact, this view was anticipated already by Donohue and others,

26. I follow the definition of 'epiphany' outlined in Petridou 2016: 2: 'Epiphany denotes the manifestation of a deity to an individual or a group of people, in sleep or in waking reality, in a crisis or cult context. The deity (of Panhellenic or local stature) may appear in an anthropomorphic, enacted, *effigies*, *pars pro toto*, or zoomorphic form; it may also appear as a φάσμα or in the form of unexpected and extreme natural disasters (amorphous). The perception of the deity's epiphany may be sensorial (i.e. the perceiver may see, hear, feel, or even smell the deity) or intellectual (i.e. the perceiver may be aware of the deity's presence without seeing or hearing, etc. anything). Witnesses to epiphany might be humans, animals, other gods, or even the natural world as a whole'.

27. The language adopted here ('mode of presencing') is from Zainab Bahrani's (2003: 137) groundbreaking study of ancient Mesopotamian cult images, which I use interchangeably with the language of 'presentification', coined in Vernant's (1991) equally influential work on ancient Greek cult images. Recent research has highlighted significant overlap between ancient West Asian and Mediterranean material cultures, including art and iconography, such that Ann Gunter (2012) has sought to problematise any firm dichotomy between the two. For a fruitful comparison between West Asian and Mediterranean cult images, specifically with respect to the production of divine presence, see Schaper 2019: 56–65.

who suggested that 'the phenomenon of epiphany is central', lying at 'the heart of Greek iconism' and providing the 'key to understanding the Greek images of the gods' (Donohue 1997: 44–45; cf. Gladigow 1985/1986, 1990, 1994; Versnel 1987). But it has since been developed most fully by Verity Platt (2011: 77–123) and Georgia Petridou (2016: 49–64), who built on the earlier work of Jean-Pierre Vernant (1983, 1991) and the so-called *École de Paris* that pooled around him, which pioneered the academic study of the physiology of the gods and its manifestation among mortals.[28]

On this epiphanic approach, the relation between deity and statuary is not one of dualistic *representation*; nor is it one of straightforward *identification*. It is, in a sense, both and neither. In the famous coinage of Vernant, a cult statue is a technology of *presentification*, providing one epiphanic strategy of many in the ancient Mediterranean, which facilitates the material production and visual perception of divine presence for ritual interaction and social exchange at local sites. Vernant (1991: 153) explains: 'the idea is to establish real contact with the world beyond, to actualize it, to make it present, and thereby to participate intimately in the divine; yet by the same move, it must also emphasize what is inaccessible and mysterious in divinity, its alien quality, its otherness'.[29] In this way, the category of presentification *both* collapses *and* reinforces the cognitive dissonance between deity and statuary in a way that generates 'a play of presence and absence, reality and representation, in which godhead can be apprehended not only in multiple images, but also on multiple ontological planes' (Platt 2011: 199–23). The image both is and is not the god, and the complex entanglement between deity and statuary is such that gods simultaneously can and cannot be neatly distinguished from their images.[30] Michael Squire (2011: 159) put it thus:

> images did not simply *re-present* the divine, then, but could also render deities literally *present* before a viewer's eyes. Greek and Roman art, in short, made a nonsense of

28. On the legacy of Vernant in art-historical scholarship on images, see Neer 2010b.

29. Cf. Platt 2011: 122: 'it is important to emphasise that the ritual model of image *as* epiphany (in which viewing a cult image was akin to an encounter with the deity it represented) existed alongside other epiphanic models'. Along these lines, Petridou (2016: 29–106) identifies multiple modes of divine epiphany (listed in n. 26 above). Of these epiphanic models, I focus on what Platt (2011: 77) calls 'material epiphany' (2011: 77) or what Petridou (2016: 49) calls '*effigies* epiphany'.

30. This may seem like a meaningless contradiction at first glance, but recent scholarship on ancient West Asian and Mediterranean divine images has drawn from cognitive theories of religion to show that the human mind is indeed capable of holding seemingly contradictory views on cult statues through dual-processing models of cognition (Larson 2016: 70–73; Levtow 2015; Maiden 2020: 177–210). The person-like agency of gods can be detected and identified in/as their images through the 'intuitive knowledge' of the religion of everyday social exchange, while images can nevertheless be distinguished from the gods they image through the 'reflective knowledge' of the religion of intellectualising experts.

> twentieth century semiotic jargon, predicated on rationalist Christian theology: visual 'signifiers' did not 'signify' the divine 'signified'; the divine 'signified' *was* in some sense the 'signifier', and so too was the 'signifier' the 'signified'. (emphasis original)

Unsurprisingly, perhaps, the phenomenon of material epiphany could be conceptualized in a variety of different ways in the visuality of different viewers (so Scheer 2015: 175–76). As a result, we should resist the impulse to identify 'a single, consistent ancient explanation' for conceptualizing the precise epiphanic relation between a god and its image (Johnston 2008: 449–50).[31] Scholars have convincingly shown, for instance, that some could view cult images as empty 'vessels' or 'receptacles', which housed the presence of divinity within them, like 'containers' filled with πνεῦμα or *numen* (Faraone 1992: 18–35, 94–223; Steiner 2001: 120–34; Neer 2010a: 109–21). But others could see them as 'seats' temporarily facilitating divine presence upon them (Scheer 2000: 21–23, 143–45; Bettinetti 2001: 52–54), or as statuary 'disguises' akin to bodily metamorphosis, concealing divine presence for safe interaction with unsuspecting mortals (Petridou 2016: 62–64), or as living 'doubles' or 'second like objects', standing in for the deity as an avatar (Vernant 1983: 305–20, 1991: 164–85, 186–92). Still others could intellectualize images with a clearer distinction between the stuff of divinity (e.g., πνεῦμα/*numen*, power, immortality) and that of statuary (e.g., wood, stone, gold, ivory), while nevertheless conceding their epiphanic utility in making distant deities visually present for mundane interaction with mortals (cf. Rives 2007: 36–37; Ando 2008: 31–34). What is important for our purposes is that the ritual perspective of cult images as material media of presencing the gods remains consistent (however construed) in the ritual-orientated visuality of everyday Greeks and Romans.

There were, however, different kinds of divine image, each of which, precisely *as* technologies of material epiphany, represent different strategies of 'presentification' (so Platt 2013). This is an important final point to consider when exploring the relation between deity and statuary. Depending on their artistic style and formal architecture—ranging from the figural (or semi-figural) to the non-figural (or 'aniconic')—the materiality of images could be manipulated in various ways to evoke the presence of gods through various means. The Athenian Acropolis provides an illuminating example, which housed not one but a few celebrated statues of the goddess Athena. Most famously, this includes Phidias's colossal, naturalistic, chryselephantine statue of the Athena 'Parthenos', and a smaller, cruder, archaic, olive-wood *xoanon* of the Athena 'Polias'.[32] Both were

31. For a range of different theories of ritual perspective vis-à-vis cult statues, see Eich 2011: 56–92.

32. Further on the Parthenos, see Leipen 1971; Lapatin 1996, 2010; Nick 2002; Gaifman 2006; Platt 2011: 86–91. Further on the Polias, see Kroll 1982; Mansfield 1985: 135–88; Romano

variously dubbed 'the statue' (τὸ ἄγαλμα), 'the statue of Athena' (τὸ ἄγαλμα τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς), 'the Athena' (ἡ Ἀθήνη), or simply 'the goddess' (ἡ θεός) (see Ridgway 1992). And both facilitated a visual encounter with the deity as 'a locus of presence'.[33] But, as Platt (2011: 83–123) has argued, the material quality, ritual function, and artistic technique (τέχνη) deployed in the production and perception of the image exemplify different epiphanic strategies to facilitate such an encounter. For chryselephantine statues, such as the Parthenos, not only were gold and ivory widely considered to have magical properties well suited to conjure divine presence, but they were also among the purest, brightest, finest, smoothest, rarest, and priciest materials known to antiquity—best able to convey the sublime materiality that constituted the physiology of 'godsbodies' (Lapatin 2001; 2010: 139–42, 150).[34] Furthermore, the naturalistic forms, colossal proportions, and reflective surfaces of chryselephantine statues impressed upon viewers the anthropomorphic, supersized, and luminous characteristics of divine bodies, visually eliding the god and the image through naturalistic mimesis. But for materially crude, archaic, and semi- or non-figural *xoana*, such as the Polias, the presence of the divine was visually evoked not through mimetic approximation but through ritual performances that reified the detection of divine agency, such as bathing, feeding, drinking, or clothing (Gladigow 1985/1986, 1990, 1994), combined with aetiological myths about their celestial origins (e.g., Pausanias, *Description of Greece* 1.26.6). Thus, Platt (2011: 119) concludes that archaic images (including the Polias) acted as 'material markers of divine presence' when activated as such through ritualization and mythmaking, whereas naturalistic images (including the Parthenos) might have 'no specific ritual function' but visually elided the god and the image to varying degrees (and to varying levels of success) by approximating the likeness of godsbodies through mimesis.

To summarize: images of the gods served as material media of divine epiphany; but different kinds of images deployed different epiphanic strategies in the production and perception of divine presence. Such strategies manipulated materiality as a technology of 'presentification', which could be conceptualized in a variety of ways and achieved through a variety of means, including visual approximation, ritualization, and mythmaking. So, to return to Paul, we now ask:

1988. For comparative analyses between the two, see Herington 1955; Ridgway 1989; Platt 2011: 83–85, 105–114; 2020.

33. Platt 2020: 26: 'if we understand the Athena Parthenos as a sequence of frames and material surfaces that together create a visual encounter with divine body and construct the interiority of the statue as a locus of presence, we might venture the (rather heretical) claim that she is not, in fact, significantly different from the Athena Polias'.

34. 'Godsbodies' is from Osborne 2011: 185–215. Martin (1995: 3–36) has shown that the 'pneumatic bodies' of gods are indeed material bodies, consisting of superfine, rarified, celestial stuff. See further Engberg-Pedersen 2010.

How might the materiality of the messiah as an image of the Jewish god fit into this wider world of divine images as technologies in the production of divine presence? And what might it say about the relation between Paul's iconic Christ and the Jewish god he images?

The Iconic Christ in the Letters of Paul: Images of the Jewish God and the Materiality of the Messiah

Images of the Jewish God

In the history and anthropology of religion, the use or non-use of divine images has long served as a bright line dividing Jews from non-Jews throughout the ancient Mediterranean basin and beyond. On this view, ritual aniconism (the *de facto* absence of figural divine images) and rhetorical anti-iconism (the programmatic antagonism towards figural divine images) together constitute a veritable poster child for early Jewish (and, subsequently, Christian) uniqueness in the 'sculptural environment' of the Graeco-Roman Mediterranean.[35] As Jaś Elsner once put it: 'Images were at the centre of traditional religion in the Graeco-Roman world' (1998: 119), whereas early Judaism, in stark contrast to the wider world it inhabited, was 'the most un-iconic (indeed anti-iconic) of religions' (1998: 215). Setting aside, for the moment, the historiographical issues with such claims and the material evidence for early Jewish art and iconography,[36] as well as widespread traditions of aniconism and anti-iconism among Greeks, Romans, and other non-Jews throughout West Asian and Mediterranean antiquity,[37] a growing number of scholars have come to argue that the Jewish god, no less than his 'pagan' contemporaries, in fact always had divine images, by which he, too, was made present among his people.[38] In other words, non-Jews could be aniconic, even anti-iconic, just as Jews could be iconic. As Milette Gaifman and other art historians have been at pains to point out, aniconism, anti-iconism, and

35. The bibliography articulating this view (or assuming it as a settled point of departure) is vast. For a recent restatement and defence against its modern detractors, see Levine 2012: 31–65. On its legacy in the history of comparative religion, from the seventeenth century onwards, see the programmatic essay of Smith 2004: 179–96; further developed by Masuzawa 2005: 37–71; Barbu 2016: 89–128. The phrase 'sculptural environment' is from Eliav 2002: 413, which refers not only to the ubiquity and materiality of statues, but also to 'the political, religious, and social implications, interactions, and tensions associated with them' as an 'important feature of daily life in the Roman world'.
36. On which, see Schroer 1987; Freedberg 1989: 54–81; Bland 2000; Olin 2001; Fine 2005.
37. On which, see Patrich 1990; Mettinger 1995; Healey 2001; Gaifman 2012; Doak 2015; Shenkar 2014; Kiernan 2020.
38. Most recently, see Lewis 2020; McClellan 2022. The groundbreaking book that started it all (despite its widely recognized shortcomings) is the multivolume work of Erwin R. Goodenough (1953–1968).

iconism were not mutually exclusive: they can and did coexist, even in the same ancestral tradition—whether Greek (Gaifman 2012), Roman (Kiernan 2020), Persian (Shenkar 2014), Phoenician (Doak 2015), Nabatean (Patrich 1990; Healey 2001), or, I suggest, Jewish.[39]

If, as Paula Fredriksen (2006: 241) boldly put it, 'in antiquity, all gods exist', I would want to add that, in antiquity, all gods have images. Paul's god—the Jewish god—was no great exception. Like those of Greek and Roman gods, images of the Jewish god took a number of different material forms in the service of a number of different epiphanic strategies. They ranged from standing stones, vacant spaces, and empty thrones (Mettinger 1995: 135–97; Levtow 2008: 132–43; Doak 2015: 125–32; McClellan 2022: 133–46) to law tablets, torah scrolls, and 'iconic books' (van der Toorn 1997; Parmenter 2011; Stavrakopoulou 2013; Watts 2017, 2018; 2020; McClellan 2022: 175–93; cf. Watts 2013; Watts and Yu 2021).[40] Each of these images effectively serve as material media that made the Jewish god present among his people for human-divine interaction, whether for ritualized warfare, reciprocal exchange, or communication. Daniel McClellan (2022: 199) has gone so far as to suggest (rightly, in my view) that it is within this diverse spectrum of Jewish iconicity that literary depictions of god's 'wisdom' (σοφία), god's 'word' (λόγος), and perhaps also god's 'spirit' (πνεῦμα) can also be understood as 'presencing media' in a textual mode, promoted as images of the Jewish god in the mythmaking of religious experts.[41]

Perhaps the most famous image of the Jewish god, however, still well known as such to most scholars today, is more specifically anthropomorphic, even anthropological: not merely human-like statuary but humanity itself.[42] 'God

39. Gaifman's influential study was anticipated already by Gordon 1979: 12: 'the two modes, aniconic and iconic, were not conceived in opposition to each other'. For other early precursors, see de Visser 1903; Metzler 1986.

40. One may reasonably wonder whether it is indeed appropriate for scholars to redescribe torah scrolls or law tablets in terms of 'images', comparable to the use of cult statues among non-Jews. But it worth noting that Jews themselves could refer to 'the images (εἰκόνας) of the commandments' and the 'shapes and forms' (τύπους καὶ μορφάς) of god's 'laws' (νόμους) as 'cult statues' (ἀγάλματα) enshrined in the soul (Philo, *Embassy to Gaius* 210–10). Jews could also explicitly (and positively) compare their own use of 'the book of the law' (τὸ βιβλίον τοῦ νόμου) to the ways 'the gentiles' (τὰ ἔθνη) consult 'the likenesses of their images' (τὰ ὁμοιώματα τῶν εἰδώλων αὐτῶν, 1 Macc. 3.48).

41. On σοφία and λόγος, see the texts cited in n. 6 above. On 'spirit' as a conceptualisation of divine presence in the Hebrew Bible, see MacDonald 2013.

42. van Kooten (2008b: 93–118) has convincingly shown that Greek and Roman philosophers could also refer to humanity in general (and certain kinds of humans in particular) as 'an image of god' (εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ) in a way that 'proves to be synonymous with terms which denote idols, statues of the gods used in pagan cult'. He concludes as a result that 'in ordinary pagan language the term "image of God" (singular) would have been immediately associated, either positively or negatively, with the images (plural) of the gods' (109).

made humankind (τὸν ἄνθρωπον); according to an image of god (κατ᾽ εἰκόνα θεοῦ), he made him; male and female, he made them' (LXX Gen. 1.27). In what is popularly dubbed the *imago Dei* tradition, humans have been traced throughout the Hebrew Bible and early Jewish literature—from the Septuagint to the Mishnah—as *de facto* cult statues, animated by the reception of divine *pneuma* and thereby facilitating the production of divine presence.[43] In this sense, humanity is to the Jewish god what statuary is to gentile gods.[44] And like statuary, I suggest, the materiality of humans could be manipulated as a technology of 'presentification' in the service of different epiphanic strategies, with the result that different kinds of humans effectively functioned as different kinds of divine images, which produced divine presence in different kinds of ways. So, as Stephen Herring (2013) has argued, humanity in general is one kind of image of the Jewish god (87–127), but Israel in particular is another kind of divine image (164–208), Moses still another (127–63), and so on. The messiah is, for Paul, one such kind of image.

But what do we make, then, of early Jewish polemics against so-called 'idols' (e.g., Jer. 10.1–16; Isa. 44.9–20; Pss. 115.1–8; 135.15–18; Wis. 13–15; Bel; Let. Jer.), Paul's not least among them (e.g., 1 Thess. 1.9–10; 1 Cor. 8.1–11.1; 12.2; 2 Cor. 6.14–7.1; Rom. 1.18–32)? After all, many scholars still tend to appeal to 'anti-idolism' as a point of 'wholesale incompatibility' that demarcates early Judaism from so-called 'paganism' (Fine 2005: 79; cf. Halbertal and Margalit 1992: 236).[45] One way scholars have sought to avert this seeming dichotomy is by arguing that the discourse of 'idolatry' is exactly that: *a discourse* (Anderson 2016; Barbu 2016). More specifically, as I have argued elsewhere, it is a discourse designed by 'ethnically coded experts in foreign religion' (or 'ethnopolitical entrepreneurs') to create and categorize ethnic difference, not necessarily to reflect it or describe it (Chantziantoniou 2023: 69–79).[46] As such, Jewish polemics against images of gentile gods proceed as an ethnic group-making strategy of social formation (what Brubaker 2004 calls ethnic 'groupism'), which produces the perception of alterity and glosses over possible points of similarity by creating, categorizing, and

43. See Kutsko 2000; Garr 2003; Herring 2013; Lorberbaum 2015; McDowell 2015; Putthoff 2020: 118–55. See the texts cited in n. 7 above.

44. Paraphrasing Fletcher-Louis 1999: 128: 'Adam is worshipped [in *LAE*] because he is to the One true living God what a statue is to a pagan god'. Fletcher-Louis limits this claim, however, such that it applies only to certain humans (e.g., Adam, the high priest, the messiah), not to humanity as such.

45. Fine (2005: 79) defines 'anti-idolism' as 'the Jewishly objectionable visual aspects of non-Jewish religiosity'.

46. Following Levtow 2008: 170: 'These categories appear descriptive, but they are interpretive. They are not about categorical difference; they are about categorizing difference'. On 'ethnically coded experts in foreign religion', see Wendt 2016: 74–113. On 'ethnopolitical entrepreneurs', see Brubaker 2004: 7–18.

differentiating ethnic groups through totalized stereotypes of their ancestral images.[47] In fact, this strategy was common among Greeks and Romans, no less than Jews, who similarly stereotyped the images of others to facilitate self-definition and differentiation from ethnic foreigners (e.g., Persians, Scythians, Nabateans, Phoenicians, and other so-called 'barbarians').[48] As a result, it would be a mistake to treat discursive *claims to difference* as sociological *evidence of difference*, reifying ancient ethnic stereotypes as modern historiographical facts, and, in the process, dismissing evidence of 'a spectrum of iconicity' that exists alongside that of 'a spectrum of the aniconic' in early Judaism itself, due to performative rhetoric about the images of others.[49] Put simply, Paul's negative polemicizing against images of gentile gods need not detract from his positive mythmaking about images of the Jewish god, which coexisted in his mission to turn gentiles from the former to the latter.

The Materiality of the Messiah

It is in this sense that Paul, too, can be understood as 'deeply iconic' (Rowe 2005: 301). The messiah, he says in no uncertain terms, 'is an image of god' (ἐστιν εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ, 2 Cor. 4.4; cf. Col. 1.15). And, as such, 'the glory of god' (τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ) is seen and known 'in the face of the messiah' (ἐν προσώπῳ Χριστοῦ, 4.6). In these texts, δόξα functions as an epiphanic category referring to the luminous presence of the Jewish god, and πρόσωπον functions as a somatic category referring to the physical body of the messiah (specifically his face), quite precisely as a figural, three-dimensional, anthropomorphic image (εἰκών) of god (Lorenzen 2008: 139–256).[50] The relationship between the use of δόξα in early Jewish literature (including Paul's letters) and the wider history of the term in postclassical Greek is a lexicographical puzzle in need of further interrogation, especially the 'semantic shift' it apparently underwent through Greek translations of כבוד in the Septuagint (Aitken 2014: 193; cf. Frey 2014).[51] But Carey

47. The model of 'image politics' signalled here and developed more fully in Chantziantoniou 2023 builds on the important work of Nathaniel Levtow (2008).
48. In addition to the evidence I collect and discuss in Chantziantoniou 2023: 112–26, see Gaifman 2008, 2010, 2012: 77–130.
49. 'Spectrum of iconicity' and 'spectrum of the aniconic' are adopted from Gaifman 2012: 44–45.
50. Further on the face (or facial features) as an image of god in early Jewish texts, see Neis 2007; Orlov 2021.
51. Even John A. L. Lee (1983: 30) concedes that the use of δόξα in early Jewish texts appears to be 'peculiar to the Greek of Hellenistic Jews'. Rainer Schwindt (2007: 37) suggests that Greek-speaking Jews may have relied on a semantic link between δόξα as denoting 'good repute' and the connotations involved with the appearance of that 'good repute', which he views as part of a competitive rhetorical strategy that uses δόξα to refer to an epiphany of the Jewish god while

Newman (1992) and others (Gaventa 2014; Grindheim 2017; Jackson 2018a, 2018b) have convincingly shown that the term appears to refer to the radiant presence of the Jewish god.[52]

Newman (1992: 134–53) goes so far as to suggest that the phrase δόξα θεοῦ (or δόξα κυρίου) is a 'technical term' denoting the visible, mobile, manifest presence of Israel's god, closely corresponding to כבוד יהוה in the Hebrew Bible. M. David Litwa (2012: 123–26) goes further still, emphasizing rather more strongly the pneumatic physiology and celestial illumination that characterizes the manifest presence of divinity, leading him to argue that τῆς δόξα τοῦ θεοῦ in 2 Cor. 4.6 evokes 'a visible, luminous, and divine corporality' made present among mortals in the human face of the messiah. Either way, this is quite precisely an instance of material epiphany: a divine image facilitates the presence of a deity, and it does so as a property of its materiality. As an image of the Jewish god, it is the human physiology of the messiah that constitutes the material medium of divine epiphany. So, while Paul never refers to divine 'epiphany' (ἐπιφάνεια) in his undisputed letters, strictly speaking, he does refer to divine 'glory' (δόξα); and, not insignificantly, he often does so in close connection with εἰκών (1 Cor. 11.7; 15.39–49; 2 Cor. 4.4–6; Rom. 1.23; cf. 8.29–30, δοξάζω).[53] This does not suggest an alleged synonymity between δόξα and εἰκών (*pace* Kim 1989: 230), but it does seem to elide a firm distinction between divine presence and divine image.

Indeed, in what Margaret Mitchell has called the 'epiphanic logic' of Paul's argument throughout 2 Cor. 2.14–7.4—a main concern of which is how the messiah is perceived through the senses (so Heath 2013: 193–97)—Paul portrays himself as an 'epiphanic envoy' who carries around the messiah like a cult statue paraded in iconic ritual procession during epiphanic festivals (Mitchell 2004: 187–91; cf. Duff 1991a, 1991b, 2008, 2015: 93–98, 117–20).[54] Immediately after Paul refers to the messiah as an image of god (4.4–6), he refers to himself in no uncertain terms as carrying around (περιφέρω) and making visible (φανερόω) that image in his own mortal body (4.7–11) as 'an aural-visual icon of Christ crucified' (Mitchell 2004: 189). 'We have this treasure in earthen vessels', Paul says, 'always carrying around (περιφέροντες) the dying of Jesus in the

deliberately avoiding the conventional language of 'epiphany' (e.g., ἐπιφάνεια, φαντασία) to distinguish the presence of the Jewish god from that of gentile gods. But see Newman 1992: 151: 'The translators [of the Septuagint] may well have chosen δόξα over ἐπιφάνεια because they did not want to use a technical term associated with pagan theophanies; but δόξα was not "outside the sphere of the pagan theophanies". Quite to the contrary. Δόξα was part of the same semantic field as revelatory words and technical "epiphany" language'.

52. See the litany of sources cited in Jackson 2018a: 59–60.
53. In contrast, ἐπιφάνεια does occur in the disputed Pauline epistles (1 Tim. 6.14; 2 Tim. 1.10; 4.1, 8; Tit. 2.13), and in close connection to δόξα no less (ἐπιφάνειαν τῆς δόξης, Tit. 2.13). I am grateful to Emily Gathergood for pointing this out to me. See further Mitchell 2004: 196–201.
54. Further on epiphanic festivals and the role of images within them, see Petridou 2016: 272–81.

body, so that the life of Jesus might also be made visible (φανερωθῇ) in the body' (4.7, 10). As Paul Duff (1987, 1991a, 2008: 776–79) has demonstrated at length and in detail, Paul here uses language and imagery that commonly refers to parading the presence of gods by carrying around their images in iconic ritual procession, which was a practice designed to evoke their presence and power to the public (e.g., Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Roman Antiquities* 7.72.13; Plutarch, *Isis and Osiris* 357f, 365b; Athenaeus, *Learned Banqueters* 5.197c–203b; Pausanias, *Description of Greece* 9.22.1–2).[55] So, it would seem, in 'Paul's visual piety' (Heath 2013's apt phrase, adopted from Morgan 1998), the Jewish god indeed has a cult image, and that image is the dead and deified messiah whom Paul himself proclaims and parades.

To be sure, elsewhere in his Corinthian correspondence, Paul affirms that 'a man' (ἀνήρ)—that is, a gendered male mortal—is also 'the image and glory of god' (εἰκὼν καὶ δόξα θεοῦ, 1 Cor. 11.7).[56] Some scholars view this text as 'untypical' of Paul's claims about divine images and divine presence (e.g., Dunn 1989: 105), due to his insistence elsewhere that 'all … lack the glory of god' (πάντες … ὑστεροῦνται τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ, Rom. 3.23), having exchanging it for an image (εἰκόνος) of humans or animals (1.23) and only recovering it through conformity to the image (εἰκόνος) of the messiah (8.29–30; cf. 2 Cor. 3.18).[57] But I see no good reason not to assume that Paul took for granted that gods had many different kinds of images, each of which served different kinds of epiphanic strategies. Hence, in the same letter where Paul denies divine presence among immoral humans (Rom 3.23) and chronicles the gentile exchange of god's presence for images of their own (1.23), he nevertheless affirms that 'the glory' (ἡ δόξα) continues to belong to his Israelite kinsfolk (9.4), presumably referring to the divine presence residing in the innermost sanctuary of the Jerusalem temple (so Stowers 1994: 130–31; Fredriksen 2017: 35), where the Jewish deity was made present through a form of iconography that Tryggve Mettinger (1995: 18–27) famously dubbed 'empty-space aniconism'.[58]

55. van Kooten (2008b) points more specifically to texts in which divine images are metaphorically carried in iconic ritual processions or housed in temples within the bodies or minds of various humans (e.g., idealised rulers, priests, or the wise), each of whom function as 'living images'. See, e.g., Plutarch, *Themistocles* 27.3; *To an Uneducated Ruler* 780e–f; Porphyry, *To Marcella* 11. See also the anonymous dialogue, *On Political Science* 50.

56. On this text and the gendered issues involved, see esp. Gathergood 2022: 269–83; cf. Lakey 2010.

57. On the translation of ὑστερέω as 'to lack' (rather than 'to fall short') in Rom. 3.23, see Cirafesi 2012; Jackson 2018b. Jackson (2018b) further argues, convincingly in my view, that Rom. 3.23 refers specifically to divine presence.

58. While scholars generally agree that ἡ δόξα in Rom. 9.4 refers to god's presence among the people of Israel, some associate this presence with the giving of the law at Sinai rather than the Jerusalem temple (e.g., Grindheim 2017: 458). Since 'the lawgiving' (ἡ νομοθεσία) and 'the cult' (ἡ λατρεία) are both listed alongside ἡ δόξα in Rom. 9.4, either reading is possible. But favouring an association between δόξα and lawgiving, rather than the standard association

Even so, it is clear that, at least so far as human images of the Jewish god are concerned, there is another step involved: humans, for Paul, bear the image of an image.[59] Either they bear the image of Adam, a living but mortal being with a *terrestrial materiality* (i.e., 'the image of the terrestrial', τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ χοϊκοῦ), or they bear the image of the last Adam, Jesus, who at the resurrection became a life-giving and immortal πνεῦμα with a *celestial materiality* (i.e., 'the image of the celestial', τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ ἐπουρανίου, 1 Cor. 15.42–49).[60] It is in this latter sense that the resurrected messiah, as a pneumatic being (cf. 2 Cor. 3.17), constitutes a divine image of a different kind *with different material qualities* than the terrestrial body of ordinary mortals—one to which the latter ultimately ought to conform (2 Cor. 3.18; Phil. 3.20–21; Rom. 8.29; cf. Col. 3.10). As such, the materiality of mortal humans and the materiality of the immortal messiah facilitate the presence of god in different ways and to different degrees. As Paul himself makes clear: 'There are both celestial bodies (σώματα ἐπουράνια) and terrestrial bodies (σώματα ἐπίγεια), but the glory of the celestial (ἡ τῶν ἐπουρανίων δόξα) is one thing, and that of the terrestrial (ἡ τῶν ἐπιγείων) is another' (1 Cor. 15.40). As a result, for bearers of the image of the messiah to be conformed to that same image can be understood as moving 'from glory to glory' (ἀπὸ δόξης εἰς δόξαν, 1 Cor. 3.18). A change in divine image necessarily constitutes a change in material medium of divine presence.

For Paul, then, both mortal humans and the immortal messiah are divine images. And, as such, both are technologies of divine epiphany. But they represent different kinds of epiphanic strategy, which proceed on the basis of different kinds of materiality. As argued in the previous section, the more naturalistic an image in its visual approximation of a deity, the more mimesis and material quality play into the production of divine presence (Platt 2011: 113–23; cf. Neer

---

between δόξα and the temple, seems to rely too heavily on Paul's claims in 2 Cor. 3 and tenuous intertextual allusions in Rom. 1, and too quickly dismisses the ongoing significance of the Jerusalem temple for Paul; on which, see Fredriksen 2010: 244–49; 2014: 26–31.

59. Clement of Alexandria (*Prot.* 10.23–36) argues that Phidias's famous chryselephantine statue of Olympian Zeus is 'an image of an image' (εἰκόνος εἰκών), since it is 'the work of dull Attic hands' fashioned in the likeness of Phidias's own mental notions of the divine. In contrast, he denies this designation for the messiah, since 'the image of god is his word' (εἰκὼν μὲν γὰρ τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ), and 'the image of the word' (εἰκὼν δὲ τοῦ λόγου) does not conform to a human-made notion about the divine but comes directly from god himself. See also εἰκὼν εἰκόνος in Philo, *Opif.* 25. I do not use 'image of an image' in the sense that Clement applies to Zeus and denies of the messiah. I simply mean to say that followers of the messiah are conformed to the image of the messiah, who is himself an image of god, while others correspond to the image of Adam, who is himself another image of god. Hence, they are images of an image of a god.

60. On the messiah as a life-giving πνεῦμα, see esp. Bazzana 2020: 111–24. Litwa (2012: 131) similarly argues that πνευματικός in 1 Cor. 15.44 is 'best thought of along these physical lines, namely, as describing the "stuff" of the body'.

2010a). So, too, in the case of the messiah, the immortality, imperishability, and pneumatic physiology of his celestial body blurs the visual and material distinctions between the image and the deity—so much so that it is possible to view Paul's imagemaking as a kind of deification, both as it applies to the messiah (Litwa 2014) and as it applies to those who conform to the image of that messiah (Litwa 2012). As a result, Paul's iconic Christ both is and is not divine, and the complex entanglement between the presence of god and the materiality of the messiah is such that Paul's god simultaneously can and cannot be neatly distinguished from his christological image.

Conclusion

Approaching longstanding christological debates about the humanity of Jesus and its relation to divinity from the perspective offered here has several benefits. Scholars still debate whether Paul ever explicitly calls the messiah a *god* (Rom. 9.5).[61] But there can be no question that he calls the messiah an *image* of a god (2 Cor. 4.4). While scholarly comparisons between Jesus and other Mediterranean gods may be fruitful in many respects, I suggest that a productive way forward would be to compare Jesus with what is arguably more proximate comparanda for Paul's iconic claims, namely, *images* of other Mediterranean gods. This is by no means to suggest that Greek and Roman sources are somehow more (or less) proximate to Paul's iconic claims than Jewish ones. Rather, it is more simply to suggest that literary, artistic, and archaeological evidence involving *images* of gods (whether Greek, Roman, Jewish, or otherwise) may prove more illuminating than that involving *gods* as such (again, whether Greek, Roman, Jewish, or otherwise). This is a practice-orientated approach that focuses on the iconic content of the comparanda rather than their ethno-religious classification, cutting across disparate categories towards 'a kind of integrated Greco-Romano-Judeanness' (Eyl 2020). In so doing, it demonstrates that social practices and cognitive processes that inform the visuality of everyday Greeks and Romans can also be understood to inform that of Jews, including Paul.

When Paul's iconic claims about Christ are redescribed and contextualized in terms derived from such comparanda, it becomes possible to conclude that the messiah is no mere *representation* of the Jewish god, indexing a human 'signifier' of the divine 'signified' with a hard and fast distinction between them. Nor is there a straightforward *identification* of the messiah with or as the Jewish god himself, contained within 'the unique identity of the one God' (Bauckham 2020: 146), as somehow one and the same by virtue of shared acts, attributes, or prerogatives. Rather, Paul's iconic Christ can be understood more precisely as a

61. Most fully and most recently, Carraway 2013. But see Fredriksen 2020.

presentification of the Jewish god, making visually present and locally accessible a deity who is normally nonobvious to human sense perception. Put simply, the messiah is not the Jewish god; he is an image of that god. But, precisely as such, he is a living 'proxy' or 'cult manifestation' of divine presence, power, agency, and action, serving as a site for ritualized acts such as invocation, petition, meals, and so on (Novenson 2019: 13), while nevertheless remaining entangled with but distinguished from the god he images.[62]

The point is well illustrated by Plato's dialogue between Socrates and Cratylus.

> If there were two things, such as Cratylus and an image (εἰκών) of Cratylus, if someone of the gods not only were to make it with regard to your color and shape just as painters do, but also were to make all the internal qualities like yours … and were to place inside it the movement and life and thought such as you have … and were to stand this other thing close to you, would there then be Cratylus and an image (εἰκών) of Cratylus, or two Cratyluses? (*Cratylus* 432b-c; trans. Steiner 2001: 69, slightly modified)

Cratylus, of course, concedes the point. The image, while always remaining nothing less than an image, has effectively become something more: a 'double' or a 'second like object'. The same logic applies to cult statues. In a guidebook to the seven wonders of the ancient world, attributed to Philon of Byzantium, the author claims that, by fashioning an image of the god Helios out of a quality of material that corresponds to the splendour of the god himself, the imagemaker 'made the god equal to the god' (τῷ θεῷ τὸν θεὸν ἴσον ἐποίησεν), and 'in this way he achieved a great work … since he established for the world a second Helios' (*On the Seven Wonders of the World* 4.6).[63] As it happens, the Greek word commonly used to connote this kind of image (i.e., a 'double' or 'second like object') is εἴδωλον, popularly known by its transliteration into English as 'idol'.[64] So, I conclude, provocatively perhaps, that Paul's iconic Christ may well be redescribed in other terms as a true and living idol. Or, in descriptive terms closer to Paul's own, the messiah is a cult image of the Jewish god.

62. I am grateful to Paula Fredriksen for pushing me to think harder about this point. She is right to insist that, for Paul, cult is offered *to* god *through* the messiah (e.g., Phil. 2.11). But I view this as more or less compatible with a point that other intellectualizing experts often made when clarifying (or criticising) the cult of images: when cult is offered to gods through their images, it is the 'living gods beyond' who ultimately receive it and respond to it (Plato, *Laws* 931a).
63. Cited in van Kooten 2008b: 116.
64. On which, see esp. Vernant 1983: 305–20; 1991: 164–85, 186–92. Further on the use of εἴδωλον in early Jewish texts (including Paul's letters) as a generic, non-pejorative word for an image of a god, see Chantziantoniou (forthcoming).

Author's Note

Earlier versions of this article were presented in the Paul Seminar at the British New Testament Conference, hosted by the University of St Andrews, and in the New Testament Colloquium at Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, both in 2022.

Acknowledgement

I am deeply grateful to the chairs and the participants at the seminars above for their valuable feedback, with special thanks to Loren Stuckenbruck for his generous invitation to present at LMU Munich in the first place. Numerous others read the article at various stages and discussed its contents with me at some length. In particular, I am indebted to Ryan Collman, Crispin Fletcher-Louis, Emily Gathergood, George van Kooten, Matthew Novenson, Logan Williams, and, above all, Paula Fredriksen and Simon Gathercole. This article would not be what it is without their kind support and incisive criticism. Finally, the editors and anonymous reviewers at *JSNT* much improved the piece and saved me from far too many errors. I thank them for their impressive attention to detail and for seeing this project through to the end.

ORCID iD

Alexander Chantziantoniou https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8878-6228

References

Aitken, James K.

2014 'Outlook', in Eberhard Bons, Ralph Brucker, and Jan Joosten (eds), *The Reception of Septuagint Words in Jewish-Hellenistic Christian Literature* (WUNT II 367; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck): 183–94.

Anderson, Sonja Gayle

2016 'Idol Talk: The Discourse of False Worship in the Early Christian World' (PhD diss., Yale University).

Ando, Clifford

2008 *The Matter of the Gods: Religion and the Roman Empire* (Transformation of the Classical Heritage 64; Berkley: University of California Press).

Arnhold, Marlis, Harry O. Maier, and Jörg Rüpke (eds)

2018 *Seeing the God: Image, Space, Performance, and Vision in the Religion of the Roman Empire* (CRPGRW 2; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Barbu, Daniel

2016 *Naissance de l'idolâtrie: Image, identitié, religion* (Collection religions 7; Liège: Presses Universitaires de Liège).

Barton, Carlin, and Daniel Boyarin

2016 *Imagine No Religion: How Modern Abstractions Hide Ancient Realities* (New York: Fordham University Press).

Bahrani, Zainab

2003 *The Graven Image: Representation in Babylonia and Assyria* (Archaeology, Culture, and Society; Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press).

Bauckham, Richard

2020 'Confessing the Cosmic Christ (1 Corinthians 8:6 and Colossians 1:15–20)', in Matthew V. Novenson (ed.), *Monotheism and Christology in Greco-Roman Antiquity* (NovTSup 180; Lieden: Brill): 139–71.

Bazzana, Giovanni B.

2020 *Having the Spirit of Christ: Spirit Possession and Exorcism in the Early Christ Groups* (Synkrisis; New Haven: Yale University Press).

Bennett, Jane

2010 *Vibrant Matter: A Political Ecology of Things* (Durham: Duke University Press).

Bettinetti, Simona

2001 *La statua di culto nella pratica rituale greca* (Le rane 30; Bari: Levante).

Bevan, Edwyn

1940 *Holy Images: An Inquiry into Idolatry and Image-Worship in Ancient Paganism and in Christianity* (London: G. Allen & Unwin).

Bland, Kalman P.

2000 *The Artless Jew: Medieval and Modern Affirmations and Denials of the Visual* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).

Bockmuehl, Markus

1997 '"The Form of God" (Phil. 2:6): Variations on a Theme of Jewish Mysticism', *JTS* 48.1: 1–23.

Bousset, Wilhelm

1913 *Kyrios Christos: Geschichte des Christusglaubens von den Anfängen des Christenums bis Ireneus* (FRLANT 21; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

Braun, Willi

2022 *Jesus and Addiction to Origins: Toward an Anthropocentric Study of Religion* (NAASR Working Papers; London: Equinox).

Brown, Bill

2001 'Thing Theory', *Critical Inquiry* 28.1: 1–22.

Brubaker, Rogers

2004 *Ethnicity without Groups* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press).

Bur, Tatiana

2020 'Manufacturing the Marvellous: Technology and Divine Presence in Ancient Greek Religion' (PhD diss., University of Cambridge).

Bussels, Stijn

2012 *The Animated Image: Roman Theory on Naturalism, Vividness, and Divine Power* (Studien aus dem Warburg-Haus 11; Leiden: Leiden University Press).

Carraway, George

2013 *Christ Is God Over All: Romans 9:5 in the Context of Romans 9–11* (LNTS 489; London: T&T Clark).

Chantziantoniou, Alexander

2023 'Paul and the Politics of Idolatry: Ancient Mediterranean Cult Images and Iconic Ritual in the Letters of Paul' (PhD diss., University of Cambridge).

Forthcoming ‘Are Εἴδωλα Idols? Probing a Lexicographical Trope’, *JSJ*.

Chantziantoniou, Alexander, Paula Fredriksen, and Stephen L. Young (eds)

Forthcoming *Paul within Paganism: Restoring the Mediterranean Context to the Apostle* (Minneapolis: Fortress).

Cirafesi, Wally V.

2012 ‘”To Fall Short” or “To Lack”? Reconsidering the Meaning and Translation of ΥΣΤΕΡΕΩ in Romans 3:23’, *ExpTim* 123:429–34.

Clarke, John R.

2003 *Art in the Lives of Ordinary Romans: Visual Representation and Non-Elite Viewers in Italy, 100 BC–AD 315* (Berkley: University of California Press).

Colpe, Carsten

1961 *Die religionsgeschichtliche Schule: Darstellung und Kritik ihres Bildes vom gnostischen Erlösermythus* (FRLANT 78; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

Concannon, Cavan

2014 *‘When You Were Gentiles’: Spectres of Ethnicity in Roman Corinth and Paul’s Corinthian Correspondence* (Synkrisis; New Haven: Yale University Press).

2016 ‘Negotiating Multiple Modes of Religion and Identity in Roman Corinth’, in James R. Harrison and L. L. Welborn (eds), *The First Urban Churches 2: Roman Corinth* (Writings from the Greco-Roman World Supplement 8; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature): 85–104.

Cox Miller, Patricia

1994 *Dreams in Late Antiquity: Studies in the Imagination of a Culture* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).

Day, Joseph W.

2010 *Archaic Greek Epigram and Dedication: Representation and Reperformance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Dietrich, Nikolaus, and Michael Squire (eds)

2018 *Ornament and Figure in Graeco-Roman Art: Rethinking Visual Ontologies in Classical Antiquity* (Berlin: De Gruyter).

Dingeldein, Laura

2014 ‘Gaining Virtue, Gaining Christ: Moral Development in the Letters of Paul’ (PhD diss., Brown University).

Doak, Brian R.

2015 *Phoenician Aniconism in Its Mediterranean and Ancient Near Eastern Contexts* (ABS 21; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature).

Donohue, Alice A.

1988 *Xoana and the Origins of Greek Sculpture* (American Classical Studies 15; Atlanta: Scholars Press).

1997 ‘The Greek Images of the Gods: Considerations on Terminology and Methodology’, *Hephaistos* 14: 31–45.

Duff, Paul B.

1987 ‘The Transformation of the Spectator: Power, Perception, and the Day of Salvation’, in K. H. Richards (ed.), *SBLSP* 26 (Atlanta: Scholars Press): 233–43.

1991a ‘Apostolic Suffering and the Language of Processions in 2 Cor 4:7–10’, *BTB* 21.4: 158–65.

1991b ‘Metaphor, Motif, and Meaning: The Rhetorical Strategy behind the Image “Led in Triumph” in 2 Corinthians 2:14’, *CBQ* 53.1: 79–92.

2008 ‘“Transformed from Glory to Glory”: Paul’s Appeal to the Experience of His Readers in 2 Cor 3:18’, *JBL* 127.4: 757–78.

2015 *Moses in Corinth: The Apologetic Context of 2 Corinthians 3* (NovTSup 159; Leiden: Brill).

Dunn, James D. G.

1989 *Christology in the Making: A New Testament Inquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation* (2nd edn; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans).

Eich, Peter

2011 *Gottesbild und Wahrnehmung: Studien zu Ambivalenzen früher griechischer Götterdarstellungen (ca. 800 v. Chr. – ca. 400 v. Chr.)* (Potsdamer altertumswissenschaftliche Beiträge 34; Stuttgart: Steiner, 2011).

Eidinow, Esther, Armin Geertz, and John North (eds)

2022 *Cognitive Approaches to Ancient Religious Experience* (Ancient Religion and Cognition; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Eliav, Yaron Z.

2002 ‘Viewing the Sculptural Environment: Shaping the Second Commandment’, in P. Schäfer (ed.), *The Talmud Yerushalmi and Graeco-Roman Culture III* (Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 93; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck): 411–33.

Eliav, Yaron Z., E. A. Friedland, and S. Herber (eds)

2008 *The Sculptural Environment of the Roman Near East: Reflections on Culture, Ideology, and Power* (Interdisciplinary Studies in Ancient Culture and Religion 9; Leuven: Peeters).

Elsner, Jaś

1996 ‘Image and Ritual: Reflections on the Religious Appreciation of Classical Art’, *CQ* 46.2: 515–31.

2007 *Roman Eyes: Visuality and Subjectivity in Art and Text* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).

Eltester, Friedrich-Wilhelm

1958 *Eikon im Neuen Testament* (ZNW 23; Berlin: Verlag Alfred Töpelman).

Engberg-Pedersen, Troels

2010 *Cosmology and Self in the Apostle Paul: The Material Spirit* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Eyl, Jennifer

2019 *Signs, Wonders, and Gifts: Divination in the Letters of Paul* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

2020 ‘Putting the End Back into the Beginning: Paula Fredriksen, Eschatology, and *Paul: The Pagans’ Apostle*’. Syndicate.network, https://syndicate.network/symposia/theology/paul-the-pagans-apostle/.

Faraone, Christopher A.

1992 *Talismans and Trojan Horses: Guardian Statues in Ancient Greek Myth and Ritual* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Fine, Steven

2005 *Art and Judaism in the Greco-Roman World: Toward a New Jewish Archaeology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Fletcher-Louis, Crispin

1999 'The Worship of Divine Humanity as God's Image and the Worship of Jesus', in Carey C. Newman, James R. Davila, and Gladys S. Lewis (eds), *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism: Papers from the St. Andrews Conference on the Historical Origins of the Worship of Jesus* (JSJSup 63; Leiden: Brill): 112–28.

2000 'Wisdom Christology and the Parting of the Ways between Judaism and Christianity', in Stanley E. Porter and Brook W. R. Pearson (eds), *Jewish-Christian Relations through the Centuries* (JSNTSup 192; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press): 52–68.

2002 *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 42; Leiden: Brill).

2004a 'The Temple Cosmology of P and Theological Anthropology in the Wisdom of Jesus ben Sira', in Craig A. Evans (ed.), *Of Scribes and Sages: Early Jewish Interpretation and Transmission of Scripture* (LSTS 50; SSEJC 9; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press): 69–113.

2004b 'God's Image, His Cosmic Temple and the High Priest: Towards an Historical and Theological Account of the Incarnation', in T. Desmond Alexander and Simon Gathercole (eds), *Heaven on Earth* (Carlisle: Paternoster): 81–99.

2007 'Humanity and the Idols of the Gods in Pseudo-Philo's *Biblical Antiquities*', in Stephen C. Barton (ed.), *Idolatry: False Worship in the Bible, Early Judaism, and Christianity* (Edinburgh: Continuum): 58–72.

2015 *Jesus Monotheism: Volume 1. Christological Origins: The Emerging Consensus and Beyond* (Eugene/Toddington: Wipf & Stock/Whymanity).

Fredriksen, Paula

2006 'Mandatory Retirement: Ideas in the Study of Christian Origins Whose Time has Come to Go', *Studies in Religion/Sciences Religieuses* 35.2: 231–46.

2010 'Judaizing the Nations: The Ritual Demands of Paul's Gospel', *NTS* 56: 232–52.

2014 'How Later Contexts Affect Pauline Content, or: Retrospect is the Mother of Anachronism', in Peter J. Tomson and Joshua J. Schwartz (eds), *Jews and Christians in the First and Second Centuries: How to Write Their History* (CRINT 13; Leiden: Brill): 17–51.

2017 *Paul: The Pagans' Apostle* (New Haven: Yale University Press).

2018 'How Jewish Is God? Divine Ethnicity in Paul's Theology', *JBL* 137.1: 193–212.

2019 'God Is Jewish, but Gentiles Don't Have to Be: Ethnicity and Eschatology in Paul's Gospel', in František Ábel (ed.), *The Message of Paul the Apostle within Second Temple Judaism* (Landham: Lexington): 3–20.

2020 'How High Can Early High Christology Be?' in Matthew V. Novenson (ed.), *Monotheism and Christology in Greco-Roman Antiquity* (NovTSup 180; Lieden: Brill): 293–319.

2022 'What Does It Mean to See Paul "within Judaism"?', *JBL* 141.2: 359–80.

Freedberg, David

1989 *The Power of Images: Studies in the History and Theory of Response* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).

Frey, Jörg

2014 'The Use of δόξα in Paul and John as Shaped by the Septuagint', in Eberhard Bons, Ralph Brucker, and Jan Joosten (eds), *The Reception of Septuagint Words in Jewish-Hellenistic Christian Literature* (WUNT II 367; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck): 85–103.

Gaifman, Milette

2006 'Statue, Cult, and Reproduction', *Art History* 29.2: 258–79.

2008 'The Aniconic Image of the Roman Near East', in T. Kaizer (ed.), *The Variety of Local Religious Life in the Near East: In the Hellenistic and Roman Periods* (Religions in the Graeco-Roman World 164; Leiden: Brill), 37–72.

2010 'Aniconism and the Notion of the "Primitive" in Greek Antiquity', in Joannis Mylonopoulos (ed.), *Divine Images and Human Imaginations* (RGRW 170; Leiden: Brill): 63–86.

2012 *Aniconism in Greek Antiquity* (Oxford Studies in Ancient Culture and Representation; Oxford: Oxford University Press).

2016 'Theologies of Statues in Classical Greek Art', in Esther Eidinow, Julia Kindt, and Robin Osborne (eds), *Theologies of Ancient Greek Religion* (Cambridge Classical Studies; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press): 249–80.

Gaifman, Milette, and Verity Platt

2018 'Introduction: From Grecian Urn to Embodied Object', *Art History* 41.3: 402–19.

Garr, W. Randall

2003 *In His Own Image and Likeness: Humanity, Divinity, and Monotheism* (CHANE 15; Lieden: Brill).

Gasparini, Valentino, Maik Patzelt, Rubina Raja, Anna-Katharina Rieger, Jörg Rüpke, and Emiliano Urciuoli (eds)

2020 *Lived Religion in the Ancient Mediterranean World: Approaching Religious Transformations from Archaeology, History, and Classics* (Berlin: De Gruyter).

Gathergood, Emily J.

2022 'The Midwifery of God: Tokological Deliverance in 1 Timothy 2:15 in Light of Early Jewish and Christian Readings of Genesis 3:16' (PhD diss., University of Nottingham).

Gaventa, Beverly Roberts

2014 'The "Glory of God" in Paul's Letter to the Romans', in Jason A. Whitlark, Bruce W. Longenecker, Lidija Novakovic, and Mikeal C. Parsons (eds), *Interpretation and the Claims of the Text: Resourcing New Testament Theology: Essays in Honor of Charles H. Talbert* (Waco: Baylor University Press): 35–46.

Gladigow, Burkhard

1985/1986 'Präsenz der Bilder—Präsenz der Götter: Kultbilder und Bilder der Götter in der griechischen Religion', *Visible Religion* 4/5: 114–33.

1990 'Epiphanie, Statuette, Kultbild: Griechische Gottesvorstellungen im Wechsel von Kontext und Medium', *Visible Religion* 7: 98–121.

1994 'Zur Ikonographie und Pragmatik römischer Kultbilder', in H. Keller and N. Staubach (eds.), *Iconologia sacra: Mythos, Bildkunst und Dichtung in der Religions- und Sozialgeschichte Alteuropas. Festschrift für Karl Hauck zum 75. Geburtstag* (Arbeiten zur Frühmittelalterforschung 23; Berlin: De Gruyter, 1994), 9–24.

Goldenberg, Naomi

2019 'There Is No Religion in the Bible', *Implicit Religion* 22.1: 13–29.

Goodenough, Erwin R.

1953–1969 *Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period* (New York: Pantheon).

Gordon, Richard L.

1979 'The Real and the Imaginary: Production and Religion in the Greco-Roman World', *Art History* 2.1: 5–34.

Grindheim, Sigurd

2017 'Paul's Theology of Glory: Paul's Use of Δόξα Terminology in Romans', *JBL* 136.2: 451–65.

Gunter, Ann

2012 *Greek Art and Orient* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Gupta, Nijay K.

2014 '"They Are Not Gods!": Jewish and Christian Idol Polemic and Greco-Roman Use of Statues', *CBQ* 76: 704–19.

Halbertal, Moshe, and Avishai Margalit

1992 *Idolatry* (trans. N. Goldblum; Cambridge: Harvard University Press).

Healey, John F.

2001 *The Religion of the Nabataeans: A Conspectus* (RGRW 136; Leiden: Brill).

Heath, Jane M. F.

2009 'Corinth, a Crucible for Byzantine Iconoclastic Debates? Viewing Paul as an Icon of Christ in 2 Cor 4,7–12', in R. Hirsch-Luipold, J. Görgemanns, M. von Albrecht, and M. von Tobias Thum (eds), *Religiöse Philosophie und philosophische Religion der frühen Kaiserzeit: literaturgeschichtliche Perspektiven* (STAC 51; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck): 271–84.

2013 *Paul's Visual Piety: The Metamorphosis of the Believer* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Herington, C. H.

1955 *Athena Parthenos and Athena Polias: A Study in the Religion of Periclean Athens* (Publications of the Faculty of Arts of the University of Manchester 7; Manchester: Manchester University Press).

Herring, Stephen L.

2013 *Divine Substitution: Humanity as the Manifestation of Deity in the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East* (FRLANT 247; Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

Hodder, Ian

2012 *Entangled: An Archaeology of the Relationships between Humans and Things* (Oxford: John Wiley & Sons).

Hölscher, Fernande

2017 *Die Macht der Gottheit im Bild: Archäologische Studien zur griechischen Götterstatue* (Heidelberg: Verlag Antike).

Jackson, W. Daniel

2018 'Glory in the Letter of Paul to the Romans: Purity, Honor, and Eschatology' (PhD diss., University of Edinburgh).

2018 'The Logic of Divine Presence in Romans 3:23', *CBQ* 80.2: 293–305.

Jervell, Jacob

1960 *Imago Dei: Gen. 1,26f. im Spätjudentum, in der Gnosis und in den paulinischen Briefen* (FRLANT 76; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

Johnson-DeBaufre, Melanie, and Laura Nasrallah

2011 'Beyond the Heroic Paul: Toward a Feminist and Decolonizing Approach to the Letters of Paul', in Christopher D. Stanley (ed.), *The Colonized Apostle: Paul through Postcolonial Eyes* (Paul in Critical Contexts; Minneapolis: Fortress): 161–74.

Johnston, Sarah Iles

2008 'Animating Statues', *Arethusa* 41.3: 445–77.

Jones, H. Stuart

1895 *Passages from Ancient Writers Illustrative of the History of Greek Sculpture* (London: MacMillan).

Kiernan, Philip

2020 *Roman Cult Images: The Lives and Worship of Idols from the Iron Age to Late Antiquity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Kim, Seyoon

1981 *The Origins of Paul's Gospel* (WUNT II 4; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

2002 *Paul and the New Perspective: Second Thoughts on the Origin of Paul's Gospel* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans).

Kroll, John H.

1982 'The Ancient Image of Athena Polias', in *Studies in Athenian Architecture, Sculpture, and Topography: Presented to Homer A. Thompson* (Hesperia Supplement 20; Princeton: American School of Classical Studies at Athens): 65–76.

Kugler, Chris

2020 *Paul and the Image of God* (Lanham: Lexington Books/Fortress Press).

Kutsko, John F.

2000 *Between Heaven and Earth: Divine Presence and Absence in the Book of Ezekiel* (BJSUCSD 7; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns).

Lakey, Michael J.

2010 *Image and Glory of God: 1 Corinthians 11:2–16 as a Case Study in Bible, Gender, and Hermeneutics* (LNTS 418; London: T&T Clark).

Lapatin, Kenneth

1996 'The Ancient Reception of Pheidias' *Athena Parthenos*: The Physical Evidence in Context', in Lorna Hardwick and Stanley Ireland (eds.), *The Reception of Classical Texts and Images*: *The January Conference 1996 held at the Open University, Milton Keynes, 3/4 January 1996: Select Proceedings* (Milton Keynes: Open University Department of Classical Studies): 1–20.

2001 *Chryselephantine Statuary in the Ancient Mediterranean World* (Kernos 16; Oxford: Oxford University Press).

2010 'New Statues for Old Gods', in Jan Z. Bremmer and Andrew Erskine (eds), *The Gods of Ancient Greece: Identities and Transformations* (Edinburgh Leventis Studies 5; Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press): 126–51.

Larson, Jennifer

2016 *Understanding Greek Religion: A Cognitive Approach* (Understanding the Ancient World; Abingdon: Routledge).

Larsson, Edvin

1962 *Christus als Vorbild: Eine Untersuchung zu den paulinischen Tauf- und Eikontexten* (ASNU 23; Uppsala: C. W. K. Gleerup).

Latour, Bruno

2005 *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory* (Clarendon Lectures in Management Studies; Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Lee, John A. L.

1983 *A Lexical Study of the Septuagint Version of the Pentateuch* (SCS 14; Chico: Scholars Press).

Leipen, Neda

1971 *Athena Parthenos: A Reconstruction* (Toronto: Royal Ontario Museum).

Levine, Lee I.

2012 *Visual Judaism in Late Antiquity: Historical Contexts of Jewish Art* (New Haven: Yale University Press).

Levtow, Nathaniel B.

2008 *Images of Others: Iconic Politics in Ancient Israel* (BJSUCSD 11; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns).

2015 'Cognitive Perspectives on Iconoclasm', in Saul M. Olyan (ed.), *Ritual Violence in the Hebrew Bible: New Perspectives* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016): 93–106.

Lewis, Theodore J.

2020 *The Origin and Character of God: Ancient Israelite Religion through the Lens of Divinity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Lipka, Michael

2009 *Roman Gods: A Conceptual Approach* (RGRW 167; Leiden: Brill).

Litwa, M. David

2012 *We Are Being Transformed: Deification in Paul's Soteriology* (BZNW 187; Berlin: De Gruyter).

2014 *Iesus Deus: The Early Christian Depiction of Jesus as a Mediterranean God* (Minneapolis: Fortress).

Lorberbaum, Yair

2015 *In God's Image: Myth, Theology, and Law in Classical Judaism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Lorenzen, Stefanie

2008 *Das paulinische Eikon-Konzept: Semantische Analysen zur Sapientia Salomonis, zu Philo und den Paulusbriefen* (WUNT II 250; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Maiden, Brett E.

2020 *Cognitive Science and Ancient Israelite Religion: New Perspectives on Texts, Artifacts, and Culture* (SOTS Monographs; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Malafouris, Lambros

2013 *How Things Shape the Mind: A Theory of Material Engagement* (Cambridge: MIT Press).

Mansfield, John Magruder

1985 'The Robe of Athena and the Panathenaic Peplos' (PhD diss., University of California, Berkeley).

Martin, Dale B.

1995 *The Corinthian Body* (New Haven: Yale University Press).

Masuzawa, Tomoko

2005 *The Invention of World Religions: Or, How European Universalism Was Preserved in the Language of Pluralism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).

MacDonald, Nathan

2013 'The Spirit of YHWH: An Overlooked Conceptualization of Divine Presence in the Persian Period', in Nathan MacDonald and Izaak J. de Hulster (eds), *Divine Presence and Absence in Exilic and Post-Exilic Judaism* (FAT II 21; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck): 95–120.

McClellan, Daniel O.

2022 *YHWH's Divine Images: A Cognitive Approach* (Ancient Near East Monographs 29; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature).

McDowell, Catherine L.

2015 *The Image of God in the Garden of Eden: The Creation of Humankind in Genesis 2:5–3:24 in Light of* mīs pî, pīt pî, *and* wpt-r *Rituals of Mesopotamia and Ancient Egypt* (Siphrut 15; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns).

Meeks, Wayne

2001 'Judaism, Hellenism, and the Birth of Christianity', in Troels Engberg-Pedersen (ed.), *Paul beyond the Judaism/Hellenism Divide* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press): 17–28.

Meskell, Lynn (ed.)

2005 *Archaeologies of Materiality* (Oxford: Blackwell).

Miller, Daniel (ed.)
2005 *Materiality* (Durham: Duke University Press).
Mitchell, Margaret M.
2004 'Epiphanic Evolutions in Earliest Christianity', *Illinois Classical Studies* 29: 183–204.
Mettinger, Tryggve N. S.
1995 *No Graven Image? Israelite Aniconism in Its Ancient Near Eastern Context* (Old Testament Series 42; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International).
Metzler, Dieter
1986 'Anikonische Darstellungen', *Visible Religion* 5: 96–113.
Morgan, David.
1998 *Visual Piety: A History and Theory of Popular Religious Images* (Berkley: University of California Press).
Mylonopoulos, Joannis
2010 *Divine Images and Human Imaginations in Ancient Greece and Rome* (Religions in the Graeco-Roman World 170; Lieden: Brill).
Neer, Richard
2010a *The Emergence of Classical Style in Greek Sculpture* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).
2010b 'Jean-Pierre Vernant and the History of the Image', *Arethusa* 43.2: 181–95.
Neis, Rafael Rachel
2007 'Embracing Icons: The Face of Jacob on the Throne of God', *Images: A Journal of Jewish Art and Visual Culture* 1: 36–54.
Newman, Carey
1992 *Paul's Glory-Christology: Tradition and Rhetoric* (NovTSup 69; Leiden: Brill).
Nick, Gabriele
2001 *Die Athena Parthenos: Studien zum griechischen Kultbild und seiner Rezeption* (Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Athenische Abteilung 19; Mainz: von Zabern).
Nongbri, Brent
2013 *Before Religion: A History of a Modern Concept* (New Haven: Yale University Press).
Novenson, Matthew V.
2019 'Messiahs and Their Messengers', *STK* 95.1: 3–16.
Olin, Margaret Rose
2001 *The Nation without Art: Examining Modern Discourses on Jewish Art* (Texts and Contexts; London: University of Nebraska Press).
Olsen, Bjørnar
2010 *In Defense of Things: Archaeology and the Ontology of Objects* (Archaeology in Society; Lanham: Altamira Press).

Orlov, Andrei A.

2021 'Face as the Image of God in the Jewish Pseudepigrapha', in Igor Dorfmann-Lazarev (ed.), *Apocryphal and Esoteric Sources in the Development of Christianity and Judaism: The Eastern Mediterranean, the Near East, and Beyond* (Texts and Studies in Eastern Christianity 21; Leiden: Brill, 2021): 206–16.

Osborne, Robin

2011 *The Written History on the Classical Body* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Parmenter, Dorina Miller

2006 'The Bible as Icon: Myths of the Divine Origins of Scripture', in Craig A. Evans and H. Daniel Zacharias (eds), *Jewish and Christian Scripture as Artifact and Canon* (SSEJC 13; LSTS 70; London: T&T Clark): 298–309.

Patrich, Joseph

1990 *The Formation of Nabatean Art: Prohibition of a Graven Image among the Nabateans* (Jerusalem: Magnes).

Petridou, Georgia

2016 *Divine Epiphany in Greek Literature and Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Platt, Verity

2011 *Facing the Gods: Epiphany and Representation in Graeco-Roman Art, Literature, and Religion* (Greek Culture in the Roman World; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

2013 'Cult Image, Greek', in Roger S. Bagnall, Kai Brodersen, Craige B. Champion, Andrew Erskine, and Sabine R. Huebner (eds), *The Encyclopedia of Ancient History* (Oxford: Blackwell): 1857–58.

2020 'Bodies, Bases, and Borders: Framing the Divine in Greco-Roman Antiquity," in Jaś Elsner and Rachel Wood (eds), *Imagining the Divine: Exploring Art in Religions of Late Antiquity across Eurasia* (Research Publication 234; London: British Museum Press, 2021): 19–36.

Porter, James I.

2010 *The Invention of Aesthetic Thought in Ancient Greece: Matter, Sensation, and Experience* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

2016 *The Sublime in Antiquity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Putthoff, Tyson L.

2020 *Gods and Humans in the Ancient Near East* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Ridgway, B. S.

1992 'Images of Athena on the Akropolis', in Jenifer Neils (ed.), *Goddess and Polis: The Panathenaic Festival in Ancient Athens* (Hanover: Hood Museum of Art): 119–42.

1989 'Parthenon and Parthenos', in Nezih Basgelen and Mihin Lugal (eds), *Festschrift für Jale Inan Armagani* (Istanbul: Arkeoloji ve Sanat Yayinlari): 295–305.

Rives, James

2007 *Religion in the Roman Empire* (Blackwell Ancient Religions; Oxford: Blackwell).

Romano, I. B.

1988 'Early Greek Cult Images and Cult Practices', in R. Hägg, N. Marinatos, and G. C. Nordquist (eds), *Early Greek Cult Practice: Proceedings of the Fifth International Symposium at the Swedish Institute at Athens, 26–29 June 1986* (Skrifter utgivna av Svenska institutet i Athen 40; Stockholm: Svenska Institutet i Athens): 127–34.

Rowe, C. Kavin

2005 'New Testament Iconography? Situating Paul in the Absence of Material Evidence', in Annette Weissenrieder, Friederike. Wendt, and Petra von Gemünden (eds), *Picturing the New Testament: Studies in Ancient Visual Images* (WUNT II 193; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck): 289–312.

Rüpke, Jörg

2016 *On Roman Religion: Lived Religion and the Individual in Ancient Rome* (Cornell Studies in Classical Philology; Ithaca: Cornell University Press).

Schaper, Joachim

2019 *Media and Monotheism: Presence, Representation, and Abstraction in Ancient Judah* (Orientalische Religionen in der Antike 33; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Scheer, Tanja

2000 *Die Gottheit und ihr Bild: Unteruchungen zur Funktion griechischer Kultbilder in Religion und Politik* (Zetemata 105; München: C. H. Beck).

2015 'Art and Imagery', in Esther Eidinow and Julia Kindt (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Ancient Greek Religion* (Oxford: Oxford University Press): 165–78.

Schroer, Silvia

1987 *In Israel gab es Bilder: Nachrichten von darstellender Kunst im Alten Testament* (OBO 74; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

Schwanz, Peter

1970 *Imago Dei als christologisch-anthropologisches Problem in der Geschichte der Alten Kirche von Paulus bis Clemes von Alexandria* (Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte und Religionswissenschaft 2; Halle: Niemeyer).

Schwindt, Rainer

2007 *Gesichte der Herrlichkeit: Eine exegetisch-traditionsgeschichtliche Studie zur paulinischen und johanneischen Christologie* (Herders biblische Studien 50; Freiburg: Herder).

Shenkar, Michael

2014 *Intangible Spirits and Graven Images: The Iconography of Deities in the Pre-Islamic Iranian World* (Magical and Religious Literature of Late Antiquity 4; Leiden: Brill).

Sinhababu, Supriya, and Jonathan Z. Smith

2018 'The Chicago Maroon: Interview with Jonathan Z. Smith (2008)', in Willi Braun and Russell T. McCutcheon (eds), *Reading J. Z. Smith: Interviews and Essay* (Oxford: Oxford University Press): 3–28.

Smith, Jonathan Z.

1982 *Imagining Religion: From Babylon to Jonestown* (CSHJ; Chicago: Chicago University Press).

2000 'The "End" of Comparison: Redescription and Rectification', in Kimberley C. Patton and Benjamin C. Ray (eds), *A Magic Still Dwells: Comparative Religion in the Postmodern Age* (Berkley: University of California Press): 237–41.

2004 *Relating Religion: Essays in the Study of Religion* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).

Stavrakopoulou, Francesca

2013 'Materialist Reading: Materialism, Materiality, and Biblical Cults of Writing', in Katharine J. Dell and Paul M. Joyce (eds), *Biblical Interpretation and Method: Essays in Honour of John Barton* (Oxford: Oxford University Press): 223–42.

Steenburg, Dave

1988 'The Case against the Synonymity of *Morphē* and *Eikōn*', *JSNT* 34: 77–86.

Steiner, Deborah Tarn

2001 *Images in Mind: Statues in Archaic and Classical Greek Literature and Thought* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).

Stewart, Peter

2002 *Statues in Roman Society: Representation and Response* (Oxford Studies in Ancient Culture and Representation; Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Stowers, Stanley

1994 *A Rereading of Romans: Justice, Jews, and Gentiles* (New Haven: Yale University Press).

2008a 'The Ontology of Religion', in Willi Braun and Russell T. McCutcheon (eds), *Introducing Religion: Essays in Honor of Jonathan Z. Smith* (London: Equinox): 434–49.

2008b 'Theorizing the Religion of Ancient Households and Families', in John Bodel and Saul M. Olyan (eds), *Household and Family Religion in Antiquity* (Malden: Wiley-Blackwell): 5–19.

2011a 'The Religion of Plant and Animal Offerings versus the Religion of Meanings, Essences, and Textual Mysteries', in Jennifer Wright Knust and Zsuzsanna Várhelyi (eds), *Ancient Mediterranean Sacrifice: Images, Acts, Meanings* (Oxford: Oxford University Press): 35–56.

2011b 'Kinds of Myth, Meals, and Power: Paul and the Corinthians', in Ron Cameron and Merrill P. Miller (eds), *Redescribing Paul and the Corinthians* (ECL 5; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature): 105–49.

2016 'Why Expert versus Nonexpert Is Not Elite versus Popular Religion: The Case of the Third Century', in Nathaliel P. DesRosiers and Lily C. Vuong (eds), *Religious Competition in the Greco-Roman World* (Writings from the Greco-Roman World Supplement 10; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature): 139–53.

2018 'Why "Common Judaism" Does Not Look Like Mediterranean Religion', in Michael L. Satlow (eds.), *Strength to Strength: Essays in Appreciation of Shaye J. D. Cohen* (BJS 363; Providence: Brown Judaic Studies): 235–55.

2019 'Locating the Religion of Associations', in Taylor G. Petrey (ed.), *Re-Making the World: Christianity and Categories: Essays in Honor of Karen L. King* (WUNT 434; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck): 301–24.

2020 'Religion as Social Kind' (pre-circulated paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, Redescribing Christian Origins Seminar, virtual).

2021 'What Is the Relation of God to the Ghost that Saul Did Not See?', in T. M. Lemos, Jordan D. Rosenblum, Karen B. Stern, and Debra Scoggins Ballentine (eds), *With the Loyal You Show Yourself Loyal: Essays on Relationships in the Hebrew Bible in Honor of Saul M. Olyan* (AIL 42; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature): 385–99.

2024a *Christian Beginnings: A Study in Ancient Mediterranean Religion* (Edinburgh Studies in Religion in Antiquity; Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press).

2024b *History and the Study of Religion: The Ancient Mediterranean as Test Case* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Strawbridge, Jennifer

2015 *The Pauline Effect: The Use of the Pauline Epistles by Early Christian Writers* (Studies of the Bible and Its Reception 5; Berlin: De Gruyter).

2018 'The Image and Unity of God: The Role of Colossians 1 in Theological Controversy', in Christopher A. Beeley and Mark E. Weedman (eds), *The Bible and Early Trinitarian Theology* (CUA Studies in Early Christianity; Washington: Catholic University of America Press): 172–90.

Stroumsa, Gedaliahu G.

1983 'Form(s) of God: Some Notes on Metatron and Christ', *HTR* 76.3: 269–88.

Squire, Michael

2009 *Image and Text in Graeco-Roman Antiquity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Tanner, Jeremy

2006 *The Invention of Art History in Ancient Greece: Religion, Society, and Artistic Rationalisation* (Cambridge Classical Studies; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

van der Toorn, Karl (ed.)

1997 'The Iconic Book: Analogies between the Babylonian Cult of Images and the Veneration of the Torah', in Karl van der Toorn (ed.), *The Image and the Book: Iconic Cults, Aniconism, and the Rise of Book Religion in Israel and the Ancient Near East* (CBET 21; Leuven: Peeters): 229–48.

van Kooten, George H.

2008a 'Image, Form, and Transformation: A Semantic Taxonomy of Paul's "Morphic" Language', in Rieuward Buitenwerf, Harm W. Hollander, and Johannes Tromp (eds), *Jesus, Paul, and Early Christianity: Studies in Honour of Henk Jan de Jonge* (NovTSup 130; Leiden: Brill): 213–42.

2008b *Paul's Anthropology in Context: The Image of God, Assimilation to God, and Tripartite Man in Ancient Judaism, Ancient Philosophy, and Early Christianity* (WUNT 232; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

van Nuffelen, Peter

2011 *Rethinking the Gods: Philosophical Readings of Religion in the Post-Hellenistic Period* (Greek Culture in the Roman World; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Vernant, Jean-Pierre

1983 *Myth and Thought among the Greeks* (trans. J. Lloyd with J. Fort; London: Routledge).

1991 *Mortals and Immortals: Collected Essays* (trans. F. I. Zeitlin; Princeton: Princeton University Press).

Versnel, H. S.

1987 'What Did Ancient Man See When He Saw a God?', in Dirk van der Plas (ed.), *Effigies Dei: Essays on the History of Religions* (Studies in the History of Religions 51; Leiden: Brill): 42–55.

de Visser, Marinus Willem

1903 *Die nicht menschengestaltigen Götter der Griechen* (Leiden: Brill).

Wasserman, Emma

2022 'Paul and Religion', in Matthew V. Novenson and R. Barry Matlock (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Pauline Studies* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2022): 217–34.

Watts, James W.

2017 *Understanding the Pentateuch as Scripture* (Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons).

2018 'From Ark of the Covenant to Torah Scroll: Ritualizing Israel's Iconic Texts', in Nathan MacDonald (ed.), *Ritual Innovation in the Hebrew Bible and Early Judaism* (BZAW 468; Berlin: De Gruyter): 21–34.

2020 'Ritualizing Iconic Jewish Texts', in Samuel E. Balentine (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Ritual and Worship in the Hebrew Bible* (Oxford: Oxford University Press): 240–55.

Watts, James W. (ed.)

2013 *Iconic Books and Texts* (Comparative Research on Iconic and Performative Texts; Sheffield: Equinox).

Watts, James W. and Yo-han Yu (eds)

2021 *Books as Bodies and as Sacred Beings* (Comparative Research on Iconic and Performative Texts; Sheffield: Equinox).

Wendt, Heidi

2016 *At the Temple Gates: The Religion of Freelance Experts in the Roman Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

2022 'Mythmaking and Exegesis', in Ryan S. Schellenberg and Heidi Wendt (eds), *T&T Clark Handbook to the Historical Paul* (London: T&T Clark): 199–214.

Young, Stephen

2016 'Paul the Mythmaker' (PhD diss., Brown University).