

TRAVIS R. NILES

# The Image of the Invisible God

*Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen  
zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe*  
599

---

**Mohr Siebeck**

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen  
zum Neuen Testament · 2. Reihe

Herausgeber / Editor

Jörg Frey (Zürich)

Mitherausgeber/Associate Editors

Markus Bockmuehl (Oxford) · James A. Kelhoffer (Uppsala)

Tobias Nicklas (Regensburg) · Janet Spittler (Charlottesville, VA)

J. Ross Wagner (Durham, NC)

599





Travis R. Niles

# The Image of the Invisible God

An Exegetical Study of Colossians 1:15–20

Mohr Siebeck

*Travis R. Niles*, born 1989; 2021 PhD in Theology at the University of Bern; postdoctoral researcher at the Institute for New Testament Studies of the University of Bern.  
orcid.org/0000-0001-7286-2740

Published with the support of the Swiss National Science Foundation.

ISBN 978-3-16-161473-6/eISBN 978-3-16-162557-2

DOI 10.1628/978-3-16-162557-2

ISSN 0340-9570/eISSN 2568-7484

(Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 2. Reihe)

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data are available at <https://dnb.de>.

2023 Mohr Siebeck Tübingen, Germany. [www.mohrsiebeck.com](http://www.mohrsiebeck.com)

This work is licensed under the license “Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International” (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0). A complete version of the license text can be found at: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>. Any use not covered by the above license is prohibited and illegal without the permission of the publisher.

The book was printed by Laupp & Göbel in Gomaringen on non-aging paper and bound by Buchbinderei Nädele in Nehren.

Printed in Germany.

*For my parents,  
Bob and Suzanne Niles*



## Preface

Composing a doctoral thesis often feels like crossing a glacier in a whiteout. Getting one's bearings is difficult and whether the goal is up to the summit or down to high camp, you need to keep moving. But it's also because such a trek is no solo expedition: without competent instructors, one cannot learn the craft of mountaineering properly, and without the companionship of a good rope team, there is a chance you won't get off the glacier at all. And so, I am grateful for a minimalist index card that has hung on my wall throughout this whole doctoral ascent. It was given to me by my friend Mark J. Edwards, a steady companion during my time at Princeton Theological Seminary who also introduced me to the world of mountaineering in British Columbia where, in a former life, I was a glacier-crossing backpacking guide. His card simply reads, "Travis – Climb on."

Now, the climb is over: the present monograph is a revised version of my doctoral dissertation, which I defended before the Faculty of Theology at the University of Bern on November 11, 2021. By the time I submitted the thesis, I had had the unusual but good fortune of having two *Doktorväter*: Prof. Reinhard Feldmeier (Göttingen) and Prof. Rainer Hirsch-Luipold (Bern). Following Prof. Feldmeier's retirement, I transferred to the University of Bern and Prof. Hirsch-Luipold took the reins as the primary advisor. Through numerous conversations in formal and informal settings, they taught me the craft of New Testament exegesis, and their interest in combining exegetical issues with religious-philosophical history and theological questions was exemplary. At every step along the way, they displayed their magnanimity, not only in the collegiality necessary for 'sharing' an advisee, but also by their constant availability for my questions and concerns. Time and again, they embodied Bonhoeffer's notion of "being there for others" (*Dasein für Andere*).

Without the exceptional cadre of colleagues who helped me along the way, this book wouldn't be half of what it currently is. In Göttingen, Jan Basczok, Matthias Becker, Jens-Arne Edelmann, and Michael Wandusim not only showed interest in my work but also were constant friends. The broader circle of colleagues involved in the Göttingen New Testament research colloquium offered constructive feedback. Among those involved, Prof. Florian Wilk and Prof. Jürgen Wehnert deserve special mention. In Bern, I gained new friends and colleagues who accompanied me in the home stretch: Stefano De Feo and David Staub. Here, too, the members of the New Testament research



colloquium offered significant help. Both within and outside of the framework of the colloquium, both Prof. Benjamin Schliesser and Prof. em. Samuel Volenweider were valuable resources. Special thanks are due to Alma Brodersen and Nancy Rahn for reading the section “The Hebrew Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls” and offering helpful remarks.

This monograph was also made possible through various means of institutional support. The research group “Stratification Analyses of Mythic Plots and Texts in Ancient Cultures,” funded by the German Research Foundation and spearheaded by Prof. Annette Zgoll and Prof. Christian Zgoll (Göttingen), provided funding for the project. The Swiss National Science Foundation generously provided funding for open access publication of the work. In addition, various staff members of the theological faculties of Göttingen and Bern played a key role: Susanne Matthies, Elke Schikora, the late Petra God, Marcus Hase, Frank Schleritt, Simone Häberli, and Markus Isch.

This book also wouldn’t be in your hands if it weren’t for the kind acceptance of the manuscript for publication in the second series of *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament* by Prof. Jörg Frey and the assistance of Elena Müller, Markus Kirchner, Matthias Spitzner, and Sara Contini at Mohr Siebeck. Many thanks to you all.

Finally, I would like to thank my friends and family: my parents Bob and Suzanne Niles, to whom this book is dedicated because their love and support never wavered, even when pursuing this project meant moving across the Atlantic; Prof. em. James R. Edwards and his wife Janie, a couple of Germanophiles who kindled my interest in German language and culture; Mark J. and Janine Edwards, who were always there for me during my time in Princeton; Rolf-Joachim Erler-McLean, whose door is always open; and Dylan Johnson, for his camaraderie. Last but not least, for her selflessness and warm spirit, Anni Seeger deserves more thanks than I can give.

Bern,  
September 2023

## Table of Contents

Preface .....	VII
Abbreviations .....	XV
Translations .....	XIX
Introduction.....	1
<i>A. Homo Pictor?</i> .....	1
<i>B. Working Assumptions of the Study</i> .....	6
I. Discourse Analysis.....	6
II. Which Traditions?.....	8
III. Religion or Philosophy?.....	11
<i>C. Outline of the Study</i> .....	18
Chapter 1: Image Discourses .....	19
<i>A. The Hebrew Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls</i> .....	19
I. The Aniconic Discourse .....	20
II. The Iconic Discourse.....	28
III. Are They Connected?.....	32
Excursus: The Septuagint's Translation of the Previously Discussed Texts .	34
IV. Qumran .....	34
V. The Biblical Traditions: Moving Forward.....	39
<i>B. Plato of Athens</i> .....	40
I. What is an Image?.....	44
II. The Nature of Reality: The Sun, the Line, and the Mathematical Cosmos.....	49
III. Public Discourse, Ethics, Politics.....	55
IV. Summary .....	56

<i>C. The Wisdom of Solomon</i> .....	58
I. Images of God's Eternity and Goodness .....	59
II. Summary .....	68
<i>D. Philo of Alexandria</i> .....	68
I. "His Invisible Image, the Most Holy Logos" ( <i>Conf.</i> 147) .....	70
II. Summary .....	78
<i>E. Plutarch of Chaeronea</i> .....	78
I. "Generation in Matter is an Image of Being" ( <i>Is. Os.</i> 372f) .....	80
II. The Philosophically Educated Ruler as εἰκὼν θεοῦ .....	87
III. Summary .....	94
<i>F. Dio Chrysostom's Olympic Discourse (Oratio 12)</i> .....	95
I. A Single, Immovable, and Enduring Form .....	96
II. Summary .....	103
<i>G. Three Stoics of the First Century A.D.</i> .....	104
I. Seneca the Younger .....	104
II. Musonius Rufus .....	107
III. Epictetus .....	109
IV. Summary .....	112
<i>H. The Apostle Paul</i> .....	113
I. The Outliers: Romans 1:23 and 1 Corinthians 11:7 .....	115
II. From Adam to Christ .....	116
1. 1 Corinthians 15 .....	116
2. 2 Corinthians 5 .....	121
3. Romans 5 and 8 .....	122
III. From Moses to Christ .....	128
IV. Summary .....	133
<i>I. Image Discourses: Résumé</i> .....	135
I. The Hebrew Bible and Plato .....	135
II. The Early Roman Imperial Era .....	136
1. The Restrictive Application of εἰκὼν θεοῦ .....	136
2. Proximity and Distance in the Relation between Model and Image .....	137
3. The Theological, Soteriological, and Ethical Value of Images .....	138

Chapter 2: Exegetical Prolegomena for Colossians 1:15–20 ....	140
<i>A. Textual Criticism</i> .....	140
I. Verse 16 .....	141
II. Text to be Used for Exegesis.....	144
<i>B. Origin of the Text</i> .....	144
I. Author of Colossians .....	144
1. External Evidence .....	144
2. Internal Evidence .....	146
3. Evaluation .....	151
II. Author of Colossians 1:15–20.....	153
III. Addressees .....	158
1. External Indications .....	158
2. Internal Indications .....	160
3. Evaluation .....	160
IV. Place and Time of Composition .....	160
V. Target Location.....	162
VI. Situation: The Question of the ‘Opponent’ .....	164
<i>C. Anatomy of the Text</i> .....	167
I. Introduction: The Colometric Printing of Colossians 1:15–20 .....	167
II. Outline: The Place of Colossians 1:15–20 in the Letter as a Whole.....	170
1. The Supremacy and Relevance of Christ: Colossians 1:1–3:17 .....	170
2. The Unity of Colossians 1:1–23 – An ‘Out and Back’ .....	171
III. Function of Colossians 1:15–20 .....	175
1. Laudatory Function .....	175
2. Didactic-Paraenetic Function .....	176
IV. Genre of Colossians 1:15–20 .....	179
1. Prioritizing Function over Form: One Modern and Three Ancient Examples .....	184
Excursus: A Note on Generic Hybridity and Formgeschichte .....	187
2. Conclusion .....	190
Chapter 3: Exegesis of Colossians 1:15–20.....	191
<i>A. Verses 15–16: What is the “Image of the Invisible God”?</i> .....	192
I. 15a: Image of the Invisible God.....	192
II. 15b: Firstborn of All Creation.....	196

III. 16: All Things Created in, through, and unto Him .....	200
1. ἐν αὐτῷ, δι' αὐτοῦ, εἰς αὐτόν .....	203
2. Proposal.....	216
3. Conclusion: Verses 15–16.....	216
<i>B. Verse 17: The Supremacy of Christ</i> .....	217
I. 17a: He is before All Things .....	217
II. 17b: All Things Hold Together in Him .....	219
<i>C. Verse 18a: The Head of the Body, Which is the Church</i> .....	223
<i>D. Verses 18b–20: Restorative Reconciliation</i> .....	227
I. 18b: The Beginning, Firstborn of the Dead.....	228
II. 19: All the Fullness .....	229
III. 20: All Things .....	232
IV. 20a: The Term ἀποκαταλλάσσω.....	232
V. Christ as the Prototypical Human: The “Beginning” and “Firstborn of the Dead” in Colossians 1:18b–20 .....	239
 Chapter 4: Colossians among its Contemporaries.....	242
<i>A. The Image Concept of Colossians</i> .....	242
I. The Image, Creation, and Restorative Reconciliation .....	242
II. The Image and the Knowledge of God.....	245
III. The Image as Ethical Model.....	246
<i>B. Situating Colossians in the Image Discourse of the First Century A.D.</i> ..	247
I. Dio Chrysostom and the Three Stoics .....	247
II. The Wisdom of Solomon, Philo, Plutarch, and Paul .....	249
<i>C. Résumé</i> .....	253
 Concluding Reflections: “As We Catch Sight of the Sun in the Water” .....	256
<i>A. The Problematic Nature of Images</i> .....	256

*B. Inclusion in the Image: A Positive Estimation of the Discrepancy  
between Model and Image*..... 259

*C. All Things Hold Together in Him* ..... 261

Bibliography ..... 267

Index of References ..... 295

Index of Modern Authors ..... 307

Index of Subjects ..... 309



## Abbreviations

<i>AAS</i>	<i>Acta Apostolicae Sedis</i>
<i>AB</i>	Anchor Bible
<i>ABD</i>	<i>The Anchor Bible Dictionary</i>
<i>AJP</i>	<i>The American Journal of Philology</i>
AnBibS	Analecta Biblica Studia
<i>ANRW</i>	<i>Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung</i>
ARGU	Arbeiten zur Religion und Geschichte des Urchristentums
ASBF	Analecta Studium Biblicum Franciscanum
ASNU	Acta seminarii neotestamentici upsaliensis
<i>ASR</i>	<i>Annali di scienze religiose</i>
<i>BA</i>	<i>The Biblical Archaeologist</i>
BBB	Bonner biblische Beiträge
BDR	Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch
BPS	Brill's Plutarch Studies
BU	Biblische Untersuchungen
BVR	Bausteine zur Volkskunde und Religionswissenschaft
<i>BZ</i>	<i>Biblische Zeitschrift</i>
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
BZNW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
CBET	Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology
<i>CGCG</i>	Cambridge Grammar of Classical Greek
COMES	Civitatum Orbis MEditerranei Studia
ConBOT	Coniectanea biblica: Old Testament Series
<i>DK</i>	<i>Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker (Diels/Kranz)</i>
<i>DNP</i>	<i>Der Neue Pauly</i>
DSSEL	Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Library
ÉBib	Études bibliques
<i>EC</i>	<i>Early Christianity</i>
EKK	Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
ELCH	English Literary and Cultural History
ESV	English Standard Version
<i>EWNT</i>	<i>Exegetisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament</i>
FAT	Forschungen zum Alten Testament
<i>FoiVie</i>	<i>Foi et Vie</i>
<i>FPG</i>	<i>Fragmenta Philosophorum Graecorum</i>
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments



FTS	Frankfurter Theologische Studien
HALOT	<i>The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament</i>
HCS	Hellenistic Culture and Society
HDAC	Histoire des doctrines de l'Antiquité classique
HTKAT	Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Alten Testament
HUT	Hermeneutische Untersuchungen zur Theologie
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
KEK	Meyers Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament
KST	Kohlhammer Studienbücher Theologie
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
<i>LSJ</i>	<i>A Greek-English Lexicon: With a Revised Supplement</i>
MNS	Mnemosyne Supplements
NA <sup>28</sup>	Nestle-Aland: Novum Testamentum Graece, 28th ed.
NEchtB	Neue Echter Bibel
NewDocs	New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity
NICNT	New International Commentary on the New Testament
NIGTC	New International Greek Testament Commentary
NIV	New International Version
NKJV	New King James Version
<i>NovT</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
NovTSup	Novum Testamentum Supplements
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version
NTD	Das Neue Testament Deutsch
NTL	New Testament Library
NTOA	Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus
<i>NTS</i>	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
NVBTA	Nuova versione della Bibbia dai testi antichi
OBO	Orbis biblicus et orientalis
<i>OGIS</i>	<i>Orientalis graeci inscriptiones selectae</i>
ÖTK	Ökumenischer Taschenbuch-Kommentar
<i>PEG</i>	<i>Poetae Epici Graeci</i>
<i>PG</i>	<i>Patrologiae graecae cursus completus</i>
PNTC	Pillar New Testament Commentary
QD	Quaestiones Disputatae
<i>RAC</i>	<i>Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum</i>
<i>RGG4</i>	<i>Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart</i> , 4th ed.
RNT	Regensburger Neues Testament
SAPERE	Scripta Antiquitatis Posterioris ad Ethicam RELigionemque pertinentia
SBAB	Stuttgarter biblische Aufsatzbände
SBM	Stuttgarter biblische Monographien
Sieenthal	Griechische Grammatik zum Neuen Testament
SNT	Studien zum Neuen Testament
SPA	Studies in Philo of Alexandria
SPhilo	Studia Philonica Annual
STAR	Studies in Theology and Religion
STDJ	Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah
SUNT	Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments
<i>SVF</i>	<i>Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta</i>

<i>TBl</i>	<i>Theologische Blätter</i>
TEG	Traditio Exegetica Graeca
THKNT	Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament
ThKNT	Theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
TOBITH	Topoi Biblischer Theologie / Topics of Biblical Theology
TSAJ	Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum
<i>TWNT</i>	<i>Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament</i>
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
WSA	Würzburger Studien zur Altertumswissenschaft
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
<i>ZNW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
<i>ZTK</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche</i>

Abbreviations of the titles of ancient works derive from Patrick H. Alexander et al., eds., *The SBL Handbook of Style: For Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical, and Early Christian Studies*, 2nd ed. (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1999).



## Translations

Unless otherwise noted, all translations are my own. The translations of Hebrew and Aramaic texts either derive from or follow those found in the *New Revised Standard Version* and the Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Library.



# Introduction

## A. Homo Pictor?

Within the last thirty years, the “iconic turn” has emerged as a significant development in the humanities. Also known as “iconic criticism” or “image science,” this research approach seeks to analyze the nature and function of images in the history of human culture, the practice of visual communication, the impact of images in mass media, and the manner in which images not only convey but even constitute meaning.<sup>1</sup> The advent of iconic criticism is not only a reaction to the twentieth-century explosive proliferation of images confronting the consumer due to the rise of mass media but emerges rather from greater depths: the insight that language itself, by and large the chief medium of human communication, depends on the human ability to re-present, to de-pict one thing as another by way of a construed sign. In this sense, not only language, but even thought is “bound to be metaphorical” (*metaphernpflichtig*),<sup>2</sup> for in our thought and speech, “something becomes visible and plausible *as* something [else]”:<sup>3</sup>

“Das stupende Phänomen, daß ein Stück mit Farbe beschmierter Fläche Zugang zu unerhörten sinnlichen und geistigen Einsichten eröffnen kann, läßt sich aus der Logik des Kontrastes erläutern, vermittels derer etwas als etwas ansichtig wird. Was der Satz (der ‘Logos’) kann, das muß auch dem bildnerischen Werke zu Gebote stehen, freilich auf seine Weise. Das tertium beider, zwischen Sprachbildern (als Metaphern) und dem Bild im Sinne der bildenden Kunst, repräsentiert, wie wir sahen, die Struktur des Kontrastes.”<sup>4</sup>

As Belting puts it, the ability of images to speak to humans and that of humans to connect with images is grounded in the realization that humans are the

---

<sup>1</sup> The three scholars most readily identified with the origin of this approach are W.J.T. Mitchell, the herald of the “pictorial turn,” Gottfried Boehm, the chief architect of the “iconic turn,” and Hans Belting, who has called for a transition from a history of art to a history of *images*. The landmark studies by these three authors are: W.J.T. Mitchell, *Iconology: Image, Text, Ideology* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1986); Gottfried Boehm, ed., *Was ist ein Bild?* (Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1994); Hans Belting, *Bild und Kult: Eine Geschichte des Bildes vor dem Zeitalter der Kunst* (Munich: C.H. Beck, 1990).

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Gottfried Boehm, “Die Wiederkehr der Bilder,” in *Was ist ein Bild?*, ed. Boehm (Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1994), 11–38, 26–29.

<sup>3</sup> Boehm, *ibid.*, 29: “[...] etwas wird *als* etwas sichtbar und plausibel.”

<sup>4</sup> Boehm, *ibid.*, 31.

“place” of images: “Natürlich ist der Mensch der *Ort der Bilder* [...] ein lebendes Organ für Bilder [...] allein [er] der Ort, an dem Bilder in einem lebendigen Sinne [...] empfangen und gedeutet werden [...]”<sup>5</sup> Similar conclusions had been drawn previously by Mitchell<sup>6</sup> and Hans Jonas. The latter’s essay *Homo Pictor: Von der Freiheit des Bildens* (1994) argues that the *differentia specifica* of the human vis-à-vis other animals is the ability to depict objects and experiences of the world in which it lives; this presupposes a capacity for eidetic abstraction from disparate phenomena – the cave dweller does not paint this or that buffalo, but *the* buffalo – which is itself the germ of further stages of rationality. Even though the implementation of such an ability may remain on a relatively primitive level – the cave painting is not the Sistine Chapel – the basic ability to represent one’s world in images constitutes the “transanimal freedom” and basic criterium of the human.<sup>7</sup> If Hans Jonas is correct to identify the *homo pictor* as the foundation of the *homo sapiens*, then the “turn” towards images advocated by Mitchell, Boehm, and Belting reveals itself as a logical development of the attempt to reflect upon the conditions of human knowledge.<sup>8</sup>

The rise of iconic criticism has also left its mark on theological studies, as can be seen in numerous publications, such as the series *IKON. Bild + Theologie* (Ferdinand Schöningh/Brill, est. 1999), the anthologies *Bild und Tod: Grundfragen der Bildanthropologie*<sup>9</sup> and *Die Zeit der Bilder: Ikonische Repräsentation und Temporalität*,<sup>10</sup> the monographs *Christologie der Bilder im Johannesevangelium*<sup>11</sup> and *Das andere Bild Christi: Spätmoderner*

---

<sup>5</sup> Hans Belting, *Bild-Anthropologie: Entwürfe für eine Bildwissenschaft*, 2nd ed. (Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 2002), 57.

<sup>6</sup> Mitchell said of the relationship between the physical world on the one hand and images as a phenomenon of human consciousness on the other: “If there were no more minds, there would be no more images, mental or material. The world may not depend upon [human] consciousness, but images in (not to mention *of*) the world clearly do” (*Iconology*, 17).

<sup>7</sup> Hans Jonas, “Homo Pictor: Von der Freiheit des Bildens,” in Boehm, *Was ist ein Bild?*, 105–24, 106–7, 120–24.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Gottfried Boehm and W.J.T. Mitchell, “Pictorial versus Iconic Turn: Two Letters,” in *The Pictorial Turn*, ed. Neal Curtis (London: Routledge, 2010), 8–26, 10.

<sup>9</sup> Philipp Stoellger and Jens Wolff, eds., *Bild und Tod: Grundfragen einer Bildanthropologie*, HUT 68, 2 vols. (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016).

<sup>10</sup> Michael Moxter and Markus Firchow, eds., *Die Zeit der Bilder: Ikonische Repräsentation und Temporalität*, HUT 73 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018).

<sup>11</sup> Ruben Zimmermann, *Christologie der Bilder: Die Christopoetik des vierten Evangeliums unter besonderer Berücksichtigung von Joh 10*, WUNT 171 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004). In this case, we are not dealing with an attempted appropriation of iconic criticism for NT exegesis; nevertheless, it seems clear that the iconic turn at least provided an impetus for this study (see the chapter “Bild und Bildersprache,” *ibid.*, 61–87).

*Protestantismus als kritische Bildreligion*,<sup>12</sup> and the chapter dedicated to the interpretation of the New Testament through the use of images – influenced by the iconic turn – in Ulrich Luz’s *Theologische Hermeneutik des Neuen Testaments*.<sup>13</sup> In addition, the four-volume *Handbuch der Bildtheologie* (2007–2020) aims to remedy the differing levels of attention and methodological precision applied to images in the various fields of theology by offering a research tableau wherein such efforts find common theoretical ground and points of departure for the further study of images in a theological context.<sup>14</sup>

Yet although the academic study of theology has been influenced by the iconic turn, it would be a mistake to think that the increased occupation with images can be attributed only to the theories of Mitchell, Boehm, and Belting. The late Roman Catholic theologian Alex Stock, professor emeritus at the University of Cologne, had pursued *Bildtheologie* in his publications as early as 1979<sup>15</sup> and made it to be the center of his scholarly work until his passing in 2016. In addition to publishing works on the theology of images prior to the pictorial and iconic turns, he founded a research department for *Bildtheologie* at the University of Cologne in 1998, the aforementioned series *IKON. Bild + Theologie* in 1999, and composed an eleven-volume *Poetische Dogmatik*<sup>16</sup> in which the poems, literature, and images of the Christian tradition become sources for constructive theology. Such a theological use of images would be unimaginable if *Bildtheologie* were grounded solely in modern aesthetical theory, the *Bilderflut* of modernity, or a particular predilection for art. To place the endeavor on that footing would evince, at the very least, a nonchalant or naïve disregard for the history of theological conflict over the propriety of visual depictions of God.<sup>17</sup> The precedent of the liturgical use of images throughout the history of the Christian churches would be a stronger footing, but perhaps still not sufficient from a Protestant theological perspective. In contrast to this anthropologically determined viewpoint, Alex Stock proposes seeing the history of images in the Christian churches as a history of God’s self-revelation:

---

<sup>12</sup> Malte Dominik Krüger, *Das andere Bild Christi: Spätmoderner Protestantismus als kritische Bildreligion*, Dogmatik in der Moderne 18 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017).

<sup>13</sup> Ulrich Luz, *Theologische Hermeneutik des Neuen Testaments* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2014), 313–57.

<sup>14</sup> Reinhard Hoeps, “Einleitung,” in *Handbuch der Bildtheologie*, ed. Hoeps, vol. 1, *Bild-Konflikte* (Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 2007), 7–23.

<sup>15</sup> Alex Stock, “Bildersturm und Augenweide: Theologische Aspekte der Kunst,” *Diakonia* 10 (1979): 378–87.

<sup>16</sup> Alex Stock, *Poetische Dogmatik*, 11 vols. (Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1995–2020).

<sup>17</sup> For an historical overview of the topic, see Reinhard Hoeps, ed., *Handbuch der Bildtheologie*, vol. 1, *Bild-Konflikte*.



“Die Geschichte der Kunst ist in ihrem gesamtem Ablauf Offenbarungsgeschichte. Die Gottesbilder dieser vom 4.–18. Jahrhundert währenden Geschichte stehen in einem Zusammenhang, dessen einheitsstiftende Instanz nicht bloß ein wie immer geartetes Kollektiv (z.B. das Abendland), sondern Gott selbst ist. Insofern ein und dasselbe Subjekt in der Abfolge der Kunstwerke seine Geschichte hat, ist diese als ein in Phasen gegliedertes Epiphaniestikontinuum wahrzunehmen.”<sup>18</sup>

Stock knows, however, that the linguistic and iconic worlds mutually condition each other and that the ability to identify particular moments and features in this revelatory history depends on the knowledge one gains from the Bible, other religious literature, and the history of religions.<sup>19</sup> One could support this statement from a Protestant theological viewpoint and say that if there is any solid foundation for the notion that the divine may reveal itself in images, then it must be found in the earliest Christian sources. Image-theologians such as Alex Stock and Reinhard Hoeps are aware of this, and therefore it is not surprising to find references and allusions to the Letter to the Colossians of the New Testament strewn throughout scholarly discussions of a theology of images. Specifically, this means the claim of Col 1:15 that Jesus Christ is the “image of the invisible God.”

Although the presence of such a statement in the New Testament by no means suggests that the propriety of visual depictions of God is guaranteed without further ado, the idea that Jesus Christ is somehow the “image of the invisible God” cracks open the door for just such a discussion. That this and other New Testament verses such as 2 Cor 4:4 and John 1:14 were received in this way, at the very least in the history of Christian images, can be seen in the medieval phenomenon of Christomorphism: “Die Gestalt Christi wird zum Gottes- und eben auch zum Gottvaterbild des Mittelalters. Bis über das Jahr 1000 hinaus gibt es die Darstellung Gott Vaters nahezu ausschließlich im Typus Christi, in Christomorphie.”<sup>20</sup> That Col 1:15 was important not only in the practice of crafting images, but also in theological reasoning can be seen by the intensive reception of Col 1:15–20 by patristic theologians generally and during the Arian controversy in particular.<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> Alex Stock, *Poetische Dogmatik*, vol. 7, *Gotteslehre: Bilder* (Paderbon: Ferdinand Schöningh, 2007), 129. The context of this statement is the discussion of an epochal art-historical thesis of the late German art historian Wolfgang Schöne, and perhaps some minutiae in the formulation would be different if Stock had presented a list of his own theses. It is clear from the further development of his argument, however, that the theology of revelation embedded in the larger statement is indeed Stock’s own position; cf. *op. cit.* 130–31.

<sup>19</sup> Stock, *Gotteslehre: Bilder*, 134.

<sup>20</sup> Thomas Sternberg, “Bilderverbot für Gott, den Vater?,” in *Bilderverbot: Die Sichtbarkeit des Unsichtbaren*, ed. Eckhard Nordhofen (Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 2001), 59–115, 70. Sternberg points out that in some instances, the Holy Spirit as well was depicted Christomorphically (83).

<sup>21</sup> Alois Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche*, vol. 1, *Von der Apostolischen Zeit bis zum Konzil von Chalcedon (451)* (Freiburg: Herder, 1979), 102: “Kein

Yet what exactly does Colossians mean to convey by the statement that Jesus Christ is the “image of the invisible God”? To begin with, this statement is a twofold interpretation of the man Jesus of Nazareth: in the first instance, that he is the “Christ,” God’s Messiah, and in the second instance that he is this God’s image. Colossians and other New Testament writings provide us a record of some of the earliest interpretations of Jesus of Nazareth offered by his followers, interpretations presented by a multiplicity of authors, conveyed in a variety of modes – narrative text, epistle, apocalyptic literature – and with a broad array of motifs and themes. Common to them all is the articulation of the identity and significance of Jesus of Nazareth. These sources, however, display that such an interpretation is anything but straightforward.

The man known as Jesus of Nazareth lived ca. 4 B.C. to A.D. 30 and, as innumerable others before and after him, was executed upon a cross by the Roman authorities administering Judea. In the roughly three years preceding his death, he managed to accrue a number of followers, supporters, and sympathizers; according to the portrayal of all four gospels, he even found sympathizers in the highest circles of the Jewish and Roman authorities.<sup>22</sup> Extant literary sources concerning his life paint a picture of a man who wandered about the territories of Galilee and Judea – with isolated episodes in Samaria and the Decapolis – teaching, engaging in debates with religious authorities, and performing healing miracles and exorcisms. The support he gained throughout the period of his public activity is only one side of the medallion: the devotion given by some was mirrored by fierce opposition from others, the latter being the precondition of the political will generated in favor of his execution.<sup>23</sup> Rather than simply denying his importance, some of Jesus’ opponents attempted to detract from his legitimacy by attributing his power to demonic forces (cf. Mark 3:22) or chose instead to plot his ruin (cf. Matt 12:14; Mark 3:6). Even his own family doubted his sanity (Mark 3:21). In sum: the response to Jesus of Nazareth was not uniform. A fine theological point is put on the issue in the

---

anderer der christologischen Hymnen des Corpus Paulinum hat in einem so viele Themen kontinuierlicher Diskussion unter Vätern abgegeben wie Kol 1,15-20. Es geht um *eikon*, *protokolos* und *archē*; Christus als Haupt war weniger umstritten [...] [Der] Kol-Hymnus hat in besonderer Weise dazu beigetragen, die Problematik der nicaenischen Zeit auszudrücken und – nach Überwindung des Arianismus – die Christologie des Nicaenums auszubauen. Dieser Hymnus kommt damit erst recht in seine theologische Rolle hinein.”

<sup>22</sup> Nicodemus, a Pharisee and “ruler of the Jews” (John 3:1, ἄρχων τῶν Ἰουδαίων; cf. 7:47, 50–52); Joseph of Arimathea, stylized variously as a “rich man,” a “disciple of Jesus,” and a “member of the council” (Matt 27:57; Mark 15:43; Luke 23:50–51; John 19:38); and Pilate’s wife, who refers to Jesus as “that righteous man” (Matt 27:19, τῷ δικαίῳ ἐκείνῳ).

<sup>23</sup> Of course, it is not as though a mere dichotomy of ‘firm support’ or ‘fierce opposition’ existed, for there were various degrees of interest and commitment. This is alluded to in the “crowd” (ὄχλος) who may have only been interested in him for the material benefit of his miracles (cf. John 6:22–26) and the followers who turned away from him for the difficulty of his teaching (John 6:60, 66).

account of Jesus asking his disciples first who the general public considers him to be and subsequently asking them, “But who do you say that I am?” (Mark 8:27–30). The Gospel accounts of the New Testament, which are themselves interpretations of Jesus, do not obscure the necessity of interpreting Jesus of Nazareth and his significance, but recount it as a basic feature of his life story.

The Corpus Paulinum, of which Colossians is a part, knows this as well. Paul was aware that his presentation of Jesus as the crucified Christ was “foolishness to those who are perishing, but to [those] who are being saved it is the power of God” (1 Cor 1:18, cf. 22–23), that he and those who spoke of Jesus in this way gave off a particular “fragrance,” albeit a “fragrance unto death” to some and a “fragrance from life unto life” to others (2 Cor 2:15–16). The Lukan portrayal of Paul’s missionary activity shows a man arguing with his Jewish brothers and sisters to accept his understanding of Jesus,<sup>24</sup> a matter which many of them rejected, as did certain Romans either out of fear (Acts 24:24–25) or because the issue was not immediately intelligible to them (Acts 23:29; 25:19). This demonstrates, anecdotally, that no statement made about the identity and significance of Jesus of Nazareth can be considered a given or a simple matter of course.<sup>25</sup>

The driving question of this historical study, therefore, will be, “What does Col 1:15 mean by the appellation ‘image of the invisible God’ and how does it relate to the image discourse of the world in which it was written?”

## B. Working Assumptions of the Study

### I. Discourse Analysis

Colossians is of course not the only document of the first century A.D. to employ some notion of an image of God. As I hope to demonstrate, the use of such a notion places Colossians within a broader contemporary discourse concerning the topic, one which transcends linguistic, religious, and regional borders. A discourse, however, is not only constituted by concrete statements made about and sustained reflection offered on a given topic, but is also something more, for any given discourse is a hypothetical structural connection that

---

<sup>24</sup> Acts 13:5, 13–52; 14:1–6; 17:1–5, 10–11, 17; 18:4–5; 19:8; 20:21; 22:1–21; 24:14; 26:19–29; 28:23.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. the remarks of Udo Schnelle, *Paulus: Leben und Denken*, 2nd ed. (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2014), 1–25, where he notes that the sources historians use are themselves already constructions of meaning: “Schließlich sind jene Nachrichten, die als historische ‘Fakten’ in jede historische Argumentation einfließen, in der Regel auch schon Deutungen vergangenen Geschehens” (4). Schnelle applies this to Paul (8) while also rejecting the notion that the construal of history in general or in Paul’s case in particular is necessarily subjectivistic (4) or that one must necessarily accept the ontological implications of constructivism (16).

underlies disparate semiotic events: “Diskurse regeln also das Sagbare, Denkbare und Machbare. Sie organisieren Wirklichkeit.”<sup>26</sup> Because a discourse represents the subconscious substructure of the knowledge that informs intellectual conversation, intellectuals are often not aware of it; one may think here of Foucault’s concept of an “archaeology” of knowledge.<sup>27</sup> The foundations of a discourse are therefore not necessarily the direct object of reflection. For this reason, we must examine linguistic and semiotic usage in order to reconstruct the discourse constituted by the shared assumptions of a particular socio-cultural group, and this reconstruction is always hypothetical. What the philologist and New Testament scholar Matthias Becker has written in the introduction to his comparative study of Luke-Acts with the corpus of Dio Chrysostom may be applied, *mutatis mutandis*, to our study as well:

“Bei der vergleichenden Inbezugsetzung von Texten aus der paganen Gebildeten-schicht und des Neuen Testaments können Begriffs- und Motivanalysen zum Bestandteil einer Diskursanalyse werden. Denn sowohl pagane Autoren als auch neutestamentliche Schriftsteller stehen als Kinder ihrer Zeit in breiteren Diskurszusammenhängen, die unbeschadet differierender Denksystematiken, Sondersprachen und Abgrenzungsversuche thematische Überschneidungen erkennen lassen.”<sup>28</sup>

The purpose of the following analysis, therefore, is not to assert religious-historical “parallels” nor to posit hypothetical literary or philosophical dependencies of one thinker upon another, as though one were drafting a manuscript stemma.<sup>29</sup> Instead, the purpose is to determine the uniting characteristics of this discourse in the hopes of elucidating more clearly the peculiarities of the various thinkers and documents under consideration, with the ultimate goal of gaining a clearer understanding of what Colossians means when it names Jesus the “image of the invisible God.”<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup> Achim Landwehr, *Historische Diskursanalyse*, Historische Einführungen 4, 2nd ed. (Frankfurt am Main/New York: Campus, 2018), 20–21.

<sup>27</sup> Landwehr, *ibid.*, 64–66.

<sup>28</sup> Matthias Becker, *Lukas und Dion von Prusa: Das lukanische Doppelwerk im Kontext paganer Bildungsdiskurse*, Studies in Cultural Contexts of the Bible 3 (Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 2020), 47.

<sup>29</sup> On the issue of the foolhardy construction of parallels and dependencies, see Samuel Sandmel, “Parallelomania,” *JBL* 81, no. 1 (1962): 1–13.

<sup>30</sup> What NT scholar Florian Wilk has said of the comparison of Philo’s *De migratione Abrahami* with Paul’s allegorical interpretation in Gal 4:21–5:1 can also be applied to the comparison of Colossians with its contemporaries: “Gerade das Gemenge von Gemeinsamkeiten und Divergenzen aber hilft dazu, das besondere Profil der paulinischen Allegorese der Erzählung von Abrahams ersten beiden Söhnen und ihren Müttern zu erfassen [...]” (Florian Wilk, “De migratione Abrahami als Kontext des Neuen Testaments,” in *Abrahams Aufbruch: Philon von Alexandria, De migratione Abrahami*, SAPERE 30, eds. Maren R. Niehoff and Reinhard Feldmeier [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017], 219–44, 238).

## II. Which Traditions?

Yet who should be considered in such a discourse analysis? To begin with, it must be pointed out that this is not an exhaustive study on the theory and use of images and divine images in antiquity. Because the study aims to elucidate Colossians, a document of the first century A.D., the image theory of writers who were active beyond the first half of the second century A.D. will not be considered. Any references to such thinkers will be the exception rather than the rule. Secondly, we will focus on texts that contain reflection on the nature of images and of divine images. Material culture such as the political use of images on the part of Roman emperors or other rulers will be mentioned when appropriate, but will not be a primary focus. Thirdly, the traditions with which Colossians will be brought into dialogue must be determined by the context of the first century A.D. This encompasses two aspects: (1) Colossians as a member of the Corpus Paulinum and thus an early Christian document, and (2) currents in the broader intellectual world of the first century A.D.

As a member of the Corpus Paulinum, Colossians will be read against the background of other Pauline writings that deal with the topic of images. This will not presume any necessity of continuity of Colossians with the protopauline letters nor will it be concerned with multiplying distinctions between them, but rather with elucidating more clearly the meaning of Colossians. Further, as the Corpus Paulinum itself belongs to the emerging Christian movement, we must also consider relevant traditions from the Hebrew Bible and other writings present within the context of ancient Judaism.

Secondly, because Colossians is a religious-philosophical document of the first century A.D., any study of it must consider developments and tendencies within the broader intellectual world of that time. The first significant trend, as it concerns our topic, is the resurgence of an interest in Plato's writings. Until the closure of the philosophical schools in Athens in 86 B.C. at the hands of Sulla, the official teachings of the various schools – excepting the Epicureans<sup>31</sup> – were determined largely by the scholars running them. The texts of the founders of the various schools – Plato, Aristotle, Zeno – played a secondary role to the interpretations of institutional personnel. The closure of the schools and concomitant removal of the scholars significantly changed the situation. What counted as “Platonic” or “Stoic” now had to be gleaned from written

---

<sup>31</sup> Michael Erler has pointed out that the development sketched here had already existed in a slightly altered form among the Epicureans: following the death of Epicurus and the last of his original students and thus as early as the second cent. B.C., the *scripta et dicta* of Epicurus assumed an outsized importance and the philosophical philology conducted upon them evinced “noteworthy parallels” to the exegesis of Plato's texts in the Imperial era (“Philologia Medicans: Wie die Epikureer die Texte ihres Meistes lasen,” in *Vermittlung und Tradierung von Wissen in der griechischen Kultur*, ScriptOralia 61, eds. Wolfgang Kullmann and Jochen Althoff [Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 1993], 281–303, 289, 303).

sources. Constructive philosophical work took the form of exegesis and in the case of the Platonic corpus, it even attained a spiritual dimension.<sup>32</sup> Though the practice of constructive exegesis and commentary itself was no novum,<sup>33</sup> the increased application of it to the founders of the great philosophical schools was.<sup>34</sup> As Harold Tarrant has put it, Platonic texts shifted from “fringe reading” to “core curriculum” by the second century A.D., which itself depended in large part on the “infrastructure” developed in the two centuries prior.<sup>35</sup> The decentralized nature of the resurgence led, as one might expect, to a multifaceted Platonism. As Mauro Bonazzi points out, the Platonism of the early Roman imperial period can be compared to a “battlefield” in which diverse interpretations of Plato clashed with each other in an attempt to gain hegemonic significance.<sup>36</sup> We gain a glimpse of this at the outset of Plutarch of Chaeronea’s *De animae procreatione in Timaeo*, where he states that his opinion on the origin of the soul diverges from that of “most of the Platonists” and must be defended (*An. procr.* 1012b). By mentioning the *Timaeus*, we happen upon that dialogue which generated the most interest among readers of Plato.<sup>37</sup>

---

<sup>32</sup> Gábor Betegh, “The Transmission of Ancient Wisdom: Texts, Doxographies, Libraries,” in *The Cambridge History of Philosophy in Late Antiquity*, 2 vols., ed. Lloyd P. Gerson (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2010), 1:25–38, 26.

<sup>33</sup> One may think here of the Derveni Papyrus, a fourth cent. B.C. document that perhaps goes back to an original from the fifth cent. and which offers an allegorical exegesis of an Orphic cosmogony (cf. Mirjam E. Kotwick, “Einleitung,” in *Der Papyrus von Derveni*, Sammlung Tusculum, ed. Kotwick [Berlin: De Gruyter, 2017], 11–63, 14–17). Cf. further Irmgard Männlein-Robert and Christoph Riedweg, “Hauptsächliche literarische Gattungen philosophischer Wissensvermittlung,” in *Philosophie der Kaiserzeit und der Spätantike*, vol. 5.1 of *Die Philosophie der Antike*, Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie, eds. Christoph Riedweg, Christoph Horn, and Dietmar Wyrwa (Basel: Schwabe, 2018), 64–83, 78–79.

<sup>34</sup> Mauro Bonazzi, *Il platonismo* (Turin: Einaudi, 2015), 75, notes that the philosophy of the early Roman imperial era consisted in a “return to the ancients” (i.e., Plato, Aristotle, Pythagoras, and even Pyrrhus) in the conviction that the truth had been revealed at an earlier time and the contemporary philosophical task was to bring it to light.

<sup>35</sup> Harold Tarrant, “From Fringe Reading to Core Curriculum: Commentary, Introduction and Doctrinal Summary,” in *Brill’s Companion to the Reception of Plato in Antiquity*, eds. Tarrant et al. (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2018), 101–14, 101–2.

<sup>36</sup> Bonazzi, *Il platonismo*, 87; cf. also Mauro Bonazzi, “Plutarch’s Reception in Imperial Graeco-Roman Philosophy,” in *Brill’s Companion to the Reception of Plutarch*, eds. Sophia Xenophontos and Katerina Oikonomopoulou (Leiden: Brill, 2019), 56–65, 60. See also Franco Ferrari, “Metafisica e teologia nel medioplatonismo,” *Rivista di Storia della Filosofia* 70, no. 2 (2015): 321–38, *passim*, on the differing opinions of Middle Platonists regarding the relations of Demiurge of the *Timaeus* to the idea of the Good in the *Republic*.

<sup>37</sup> Cf. Thomas A. Szlezák, *Platon: Meisterdenker der Antike* (Munich: C.H. Beck, 2021), 458–59; Gretchen Reydams-Schils, *Demiurge and Providence: Stoic and Platonist Readings of Plato’s Timaeus*, *Monothéisme et Philosophie* 2 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1999), 14; Männlein-Robert and Riedweg, “Hauptsächliche Gattungen philosophischer Wissensvermittlung,” 79; Bonazzi, “Plutarch’s Reception in Imperial Graeco-Roman Philosophy,” 56–

Plutarch, in addition to his aforementioned essay,<sup>38</sup> dealt with material from the *Timaeus* in five of his ten *Quaestiones Platonicae* (2, 4, 5, 7, 8). In the first century B.C., Cicero provided a (perhaps intentionally)<sup>39</sup> partial translation of the *Timaeus* and treated Platonic thought in *De natura deorum*.

Among the writings of the Jewish philosopher Philo of Alexandria, who interpreted the Holy Scriptures of his people with the aid of Greek philosophical traditions, the treatise *De opificio mundi* evinces strong influence by the *Timaeus*. When one inspects Philo's other writings, one might conclude, in the words of David T. Runia, that Philo "had direct access to the actual text of the dialogue and was intimately acquainted with its contents."<sup>40</sup>

Yet why is the renewed interest in Plato's writings in the first century A.D. important for our study? It is grounded in the subject matter itself: Plato's *Timaeus* and *Republic* deliver key remarks and analogies concerning the nature of images, and when one considers the *Cratylus*, *Theaetetus*, and *Sophist* dialogues, one is compelled to conclude that more than any other ancient author, Plato offered the most sustained reflection on the topic. If one were to study a New Testament text in its own context, which includes writers like Philo and Plutarch who adopt and reshape Plato's thought, then it would be reasonable to expect from the exegete at least an elementary awareness of Plato's writings. When it comes to the topic of images, this is doubly true. This does not mean that Platonizing writers of the first century A.D. were always in lockstep with Plato, but simply that any consideration of their writings cannot leave Plato completely out of the picture. And Philo and Plutarch, as we shall see, put the concept of an "image" to serious theological use in their writings.

This leads us to the second noticeable trend of the first century A.D., namely an increased interest in *images*, especially the use of the term εἰκόν in a religious-philosophical context. This can be seen not only in the writings of the aforementioned Platonizing writers, but also in the *Olympic Discourse* (*Or.* 12) of Dio Chrysostom, which concerns figural images in the context of theological

---

57. Franco Ferrari, "Interpretare il *Timeo*," in *Plato's Timaeus and the Foundations of Cosmology in Late Antiquity, the Middle Ages and the Renaissance*, Ancient and Medieval Philosophy 1/34, eds. Thomas Leinkauf and Carlos Steel (Leuven: Leuven Univ. Press, 2005), 1–12, 1, stakes the claim that the *Timaeus* was the Platonic dialogue that contributed the most to the formation of 'Platonism' as a system.

<sup>38</sup> On this categorization of Plutarch's *De animae proc.* and commentary on it, cf. Jan Opsomer, "Plutarch's *De Animae Procreatione in Timaeo*: Manipulation or Search for Consistency?," in *Philosophy, Science and Exegesis in Greek, Arabic and Latin Commentaries*, BICS Supplements 83, 2 vols., eds. Peter Adamson, Hans Baltussen, and M.W.F. Stone (London: Institute of Classical Studies, 2004), 1:137–62, 139.

<sup>39</sup> Karl Bayer and Gertrud Bayer, "Einführung," in *Marcus Tullius Cicero: Timaeus. De universitate/Timaeus. Über das Weltall*, Sammlung Tusculum, eds. Bayer and Bayer (Düsseldorf: Patmos, 2006), 93–124, 96.

<sup>40</sup> David T. Runia, *Philo of Alexandria and the Timaeus of Plato*, Philosophia Antiqua 44 (Leiden: Brill, 1986), 371.

## Index of References

Italicized references indicate an extended analysis of a given text.

### Hebrew Bible

<i>Genesis</i>		5:7–10	26–27
1:26–29	37	5:8	32
1:26–27	28–31, 32–33, 34	12:2–7	22
1:27	116, 137	16:21–22	22
1:28–30	30	<i>Psalms</i>	
5:1	29, 30, 35, 37	89:27	198
5:3	29, 30, 37	<i>Proverbs</i>	
9:6	30–31, 37	8:22–25	66, 138n419
<i>Exodus</i>		<i>Isaiah</i>	
33:20	193	6:5	193
<i>Numbers</i>		40–48	23–26
12:6–8	71n202, 77	46:3–4	25
<i>Deuteronomy</i>		<i>Hosea</i>	
4:10–14	27	8:6	21
4:33	27		

### Septuagint

<i>Genesis</i>		<i>Deuteronomy</i>	
1:26–27	34, 71, 191	5:8	71
5:3	120	<i>Judges</i>	
<i>Exodus</i>		10:18	224
4:22	198	<i>Psalms</i>	
22:28	198	88:28	198
34:19	199n27	103:24	206n59
34:34	129		



<i>Proverbs</i>		7:14	66
3:19	206n59	7:15	67
8:22–31	219	7:21	66
8:32–34	219n102	7:23	66
		7:26	34, 59, 65, 66, 67, 68n183
<i>Wisdom of Solomon</i>		7:27	66
1:1	59, 61n169	8:1	66
1:12–15	60	8:4	67
1:13	66	8:7	66
2:1–9	60–61	8:13	66
2:11	61, 61n169	8:17	66
2:21–24	62	8:19	64
2:23	34, 59, 64, 65n178	8:21	67
2:24	60, 66	9:1–2	206n59
3:1–4	64	9:2	65n176
3:1–15	62	9:9	66
4:1–9	63	9:18	67
4:13–19	63	13:17	137
5:1	63	13:13	34
5:7–8	63	13:16	34
5:13	63	15:3	64
5:15	63, 64		
6:12	65	<i>Isaiah</i>	
6:18	65	40:19–20	34
6:18–19	65–66		
6:21	66	<i>Jeremiah</i>	
6:22	67	38:1–4	198
6:23	60, 66	38:9	198
7:8–9	66		

## New Testament

<i>Matthew</i>		9:26	161
22:20	192	11:27–30	161
		19:21–41	161
<i>Mark</i>		19:29	161
12:16	192		
<i>Luke</i>		<i>Romans</i>	
20:24	192	1:23	34, 115, 192, 193
		4:17	138
<i>John</i>		4:20–25	122
1:14	4	5:1–21	122–123, 124
		5:9	207n61
<i>Acts of the Apostles</i>		5:12–21	127
22:3	113	5:19	227
9:1–9	114	6:5–11	123–124
		6:6	203n43

6:11	124	4:7	133
7:12–13	124	5:5	125
7:24	203n43	5:11–21	121–122
8:1–30	124–127	5:18	208n62
8:18–30	199, 200	5:18–19	233, 237
8:29	199, 200, 243	5:18–20	235
8:38	229	5:20	234
11:1	114	11:22	114
11:36	154, 155n65, 156n69, 204, 211, 213	12:1–4	250n15
12:4–5	225	<i>Galatians</i>	
13:10	229	1:11–12	114
15:24	161	1:15–16	114
<i>1 Corinthians</i>		1:1–5	175
1:11–19	117	3:28	260n8
1:17–30	166	4:4	215, 228, 230
1:26–31	117	<i>Ephesians</i>	
2:6–10	196n16	1:21	202
2:7	117	2:16	234
4:1–13	116	<i>Philippians</i>	
6:12–20	224	1:12–14	148
8:6	154, 204, 211–212, 213, 252	1:26	148
9:1	114	2:5–11	168, 169
10:16–17	224	3:5	114
11:2–16	115	3:21	121
11:7	115–116, 137, 193, 255n22	<i>Colossians</i>	
12:2	138	1:1–23	171–175
12:12–17	225	1:2	160
12:12–27	225	1:3–8	147, 160
15:1–58	116–121	1:3–3:17	170–171
15:8	114	1:4	262
15:20	125	1:9	166
15:20–22	213	1:12	216
15:20–28	212n74	1:12–20	154, 169
15:22	227	1:13	177, 237, 243, 244, 245
15:24	229	1:14	192, 245, 262
15:45	227, 263	1:15	59
15:47–49	213	1:15–16	192–216
15:49	125	1:15–18a	154–155, 228
15:50	260	1:15–20	4, 148, 153, 157, 167, 175, 176, 179, 181, 190, 252, 256, 262, 265
<i>2 Corinthians</i>		1:16	141–144, 250
1:22	125	1:16–17	178
3:4–4:6	128–133		
4:4	4, 34		

1:17	217–223, 261	3:2	246
1:18a	223–227	3:3	240, 243
1:18b–20	156–157, 227–241, 253	3:5	213, 253
1:20	253	3:5–6	214
1:21	160, 214	3:5–9	251, 260
1:21–22	234	3:5–17	177, 246–247, 255
1:21–3:17	178	3:9–11	212, 240, 246, 260n8
1:22	147	3:10	255
1:23	166, 246	3:10–11	216, 248, 251
1:24	147	3:10–17	260
1:24–29	160	3:11	205
1:26	178	3:12–17	251, 261
1:26–27	196, 245, 257	3:12–14	253
1:27	160, 178	3:14	251
1:28	147, 166	3:16	167, 177, 182
2:2–3	177, 245	3:17	213
2:3	166, 196, 246, 251	3:18–4:1	260n8
2:4	245n10, 246	3:24	237
2:6	255	4:3	147
2:6–23	148	4:5	167
2:6–7	212	4:10	148, 161
2:7	177	4:11	160
2:8	181, 246	4:18	148, 149
2:8–10	179		
2:8–23	164–167	<i>1 Thessalonians</i>	
2:9	196, 225, 231, 253	4:13–18	119n369
2:10	202, 229	4:14	119
2:12–13	255		
2:14–15	253	<i>2 Thessalonians</i>	
2:15	157	2:2	144
2:16	163n98		
2:16–21	225	<i>Philemon</i>	
2:16–23	177, 178	1	161
2:19	177, 179, 226, 246, 250	22	161
2:20	213, 246	<i>Hebrews</i>	
2:22–23	226, 246	10:1	193n6
2:23	246		
3:1	213, 246	<i>James</i>	
3:1–3	226	5:12	217

## Dead Sea Scrolls

*1Q20 (Genesis Apocryphon)*

36

*4Q180–181 (Ages of Creation)*

36

<i>4Q206 (Book of Jubilees)</i>		<i>4Q305 (Meditation on Creation)</i>	
VII,2	37	ii,2	36
<i>4Q252–254 (Commentary on Genesis)</i>		<i>4Q504 8 (Words of the Luminaries)</i>	
	36	I,4	35
		I,5	36

### Rabbinic Literature

<i>Targum Neofiti</i>		5:3	38
1:26–27	38	9:6	38
5:1	38		

### Hellenistic Jewish Literature

Philo of Alexandria		<i>De mutatione nominum</i>	
<i>De Abrahamo</i>		223–224	76
69	201	<i>De opificio mundi</i>	
<i>De cherubim</i>		17–20	74
125–127	208–209	24–25	71–72, 74, 78
<i>De confusione linguarum</i>		25	71
15	73	69	73, 194
41	74	69–71	77
43	74	71	78
62–63	75n213	131	220
97	71	135	73
145–148	74	144	14
146	71, 229	145–146	73
146–147	71n200	172	15
<i>De congressu eruditionis gratia</i>		<i>De posteritate Caini</i>	
144–145	201	15	77, 194
<i>De fuga et inventione</i>		<i>De praemiis et poenis</i>	
63	14	44–46	194
101	71n201, 76, 252	45	77
110	206n59	<i>De somniis</i>	
<i>De gigantibus</i>		1.62	206
6	201n38	1.72	194n10
<i>De migratione Abrahami</i>		1.75	231
183	194n10, 219	1.241	206n59
		2.45	71n201, 75

<i>De specialibus legibus</i>		1.43	71n201
1.81	75, 209	3.5	219
1.279	201	3.96	75
1.302	201	3.97–103	77
		3.100	77
<i>De virtutibus</i>		3.103	71n202
205	73n206	3.176–177	78
		3.206–208	78
<i>De vita Mosis</i>			
2.65	73n206	<i>Quis rerum divinarum heres sit</i>	
		230–231	72–73, 254n20
<i>Legum allegoriae</i>		<i>Quod deterius potiori insidari soleat</i>	
1.31–32	73	54	206n59
1.39–40	73	146	209n67
1.40–41	209		

### Greco-Roman Literature

Aeschylus		994b.10, 13 (2.2.9)	
			215n88
<i>Agamemnon</i>		994b.30–31 (2.2.13)	
709	180		215n87
		1072b.2–4 (12.7.4)	
Alcinous			216n90
<i>Epitome doctrinae platonicae</i>		<i>Physica</i>	
164.31	195n15	198b.9–10 (2.7)	215n89
165.5	195n15	<i>Politica</i>	
165.16–34	195n15	1253a.4 (1.1.9)	203n42
Anthologia Graeca		<i>Rhetorica</i>	
9.213	197n21	1408b.21–31 (3.8.1–3)	
			183n159
Apuleius		1409a.27–1409b.25 (3.9.1–4)	
<i>De deo Socratis</i>			171n121
3.4–6	195n15	Ps.-Aristotle	
<i>Metamorphoses</i>		<i>De mundo</i>	
11.5	71n201	401a	46n114
Aristotle		Callimachus	
<i>Ethica nicomachea</i>		<i>Hymnus in Delum</i>	
1179a22–24	13n48	86–98	185n173
<i>Metaphysica</i>			
983a.32–33 (1.3.1–2)			
	216n90		

<i>Hymnus in Dianam</i>		12.44	98
6–7	71n201	12.45–46	99
		12.46	99
Cicero		12.47	96, 98n294, 99, 104, 248
<i>De finibus</i>		12.51–52	99
4.14–15	211n72	12.54	99n298, 101n302
		12.55	96, 100
<i>De legibus</i>		12.57	100
1.58–61	112n347	12.59	100, 101, 101n302, 212, 247
<i>De natura deorum</i>		12.62	100n301
1.62–63	222n119	12.64	101
1.90	222n119	12.65	101
2.2–44	249n13	12.70	104, 191, 248
2.29	222n117	12.70–71	101
2.36	222n118	12.73	101n303
2.153	249n13	12.75–76	102
3.20–21	222n119	12.77–78	103
		12.78–79	103
<i>De oratore</i>		36.40	76n214
221–222 (1.51–52)	171n121	70.7	14
Cleanthes			
<i>Hymnus in Jovem</i>		Diodorus of Aspendus	
1	222n118	Frg. 1	57n155, 93n275
Cleomedes		Diogenes Laertius	
<i>Caelestia</i>		<i>Vitae philosophorum</i>	
1.1–2	232n154	2.106	71n201
		3.49–50	187
Cornutus		3.63–64	42n99
<i>De natura deorum</i>		5.5–6	181n153, 182n156
2.1	221n116	6.51	57n156, 93
		7.86–88	222n119
		7.87	211n72
Dio Chrysostom		7.134	228n139
<i>Orationes</i>		7.135	71n201
12.1–15	96	7.136	221n114
12.20	96	7.142–143	76n215
12.22	97	7.147	46n114
12.25	97	10.123–124	14n51
12.27	97, 247		
12.34	92n270	Epictetus	
12.36–37	99n297	<i>Diatribae</i>	
12.39	95n286, 97, 98	1.3.1	110
12.42	98	1.3.3	109n334
12.43	98	1.3.3–4	110n336

- |                        |                   |                       |                        |
|------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| 1.9.4                  | 110n339           | Marcus Aurelius       |                        |
| 1.9.10–15              | 110n338           | <i>Meditationes</i>   |                        |
| 1.9.16                 | 110n340           | 4.23                  | 155n65, 156n68,<br>211 |
| 1.9.25                 | 111n342           |                       |                        |
| 2.5.26                 | 110n339           | Maximus of Tyre       |                        |
| 2.8.2–3                | 109n335, 111, 112 | <i>Dissertationes</i> |                        |
| 2.8.11–13              | 111               | 2.10                  | 101n302, 195           |
| 2.8.18                 | 111               | Musonius Rufus        |                        |
| 2.8.20                 | 111n345           | <i>Diatribae</i>      |                        |
| 2.8.21                 | 111               | 2 p.6, l. 5–6         | 107n319                |
| 2.8.24                 | 111               | 2 p. 6, l. 16–18      | 107n321                |
| 2.8.25                 | 111               | 2 p. 8, l. 1–2        | 107n320                |
| 2.8.25–26              | 112n346           | 3 p. 9, l. 14–15      | 107n322                |
| 4.1                    | 110n341           | 17 p. 89, l. 2–3      | 108                    |
|                        |                   | 17 p. 89, l. 3–8      | 108                    |
| <i>Encheiridion</i>    |                   | 17 p. 90, l. 4–6      | 108                    |
| 1.1                    | 109n332           | 17 p. 90, l. 13–15    | 109n327                |
| 10                     | 109n333           | 17 p. 91, l. 1–2      | 109n328                |
| Hesiod                 |                   | Oracula Sibyllina     |                        |
| <i>Theogonia</i>       |                   | 3.11–12               | 194                    |
| 26–28                  | 50n133            | Orphica               |                        |
| 116                    | 256               | <i>Fragmenta</i>      |                        |
| Homer                  |                   | 14                    | 218n100                |
| <i>Odyssea</i>         |                   | <i>Hymni orphici</i>  |                        |
| 8.429                  | 180               | 30, p. 24, l. 2       | 197n21                 |
| Ps.-Homer              |                   | Pindar                |                        |
| <i>Hymni homerici</i>  |                   | <i>Olympionikai</i>   |                        |
| 2.18                   | 71n201            | 3.2                   | 180                    |
| 2.32                   | 71n201            | <i>Pythionikai</i>    |                        |
| Ps.-Longinus           |                   | 6.7                   | 180                    |
| <i>De sublimitate</i>  |                   | Plato                 |                        |
| 15.2                   | 186               | <i>Cratylus</i>       |                        |
| 16.1–2                 | 186               | 388b–c                | 46n117                 |
| 33.5                   | 186, 186–187      | 390e                  | 46n115                 |
| 35                     | 186               | 395e–396b             | 45–46                  |
| 36.1                   | 186               | 423e                  | 46n116                 |
| Lucretius              |                   | 425d–426b             | 50n134                 |
| <i>De rerum natura</i> |                   |                       |                        |
| 1.50–79                | 14n51             |                       |                        |

431d	45n109	6.509b	51
430c	45n112	6.509d–511e	52–53
430e	45n110	6.515a	43
432b–c	44	6.517b	51n137
432d–433a	46–47, 258	7.516b–c	52
435c	47n122	7.517b–c	52
436b	48n123	7.524d	191
438d	48	10.607a	180, 182n156
439a–b	49, 256	10.607b–c	13
<i>Gorgias</i>		<i>Sophista</i>	
483b–e	263n15	231a	42n94
483d	61	234c	56
507a	13	235b–236c	42n98
		236a	44n107, 48n124
<i>Ion</i>		240a	44n106
533d–534b	186	241a	45
		241e	43
<i>Meno</i>		242d–e	264n16
81a–e	12	246b	50
		260c	43, 45
<i>Phaedo</i>		<i>Symposium</i>	
60c–61b	182n156	178b–c	218
		210e–212a	50n132
<i>Phaedrus</i>		<i>Theaetetus</i>	
242c	13	149a	42n96
247a	60n167	157b	49n127
247b–c	42n95	176b–c	13
250d	42	176a–177a	79
257a–b	13	182d	49
261f–262c	42	183e	49n126
263a	56n150	185c–d	50n129
		186c	50n128
<i>Philebus</i>		186d	50n131
16b–17a	13	187a	50n130
20b–c	13	191d	42n97
22b	13	202b	47n121
39c	44n108		
		<i>Timaeus</i>	
<i>Respublica</i>		22b–23c	12n46
1.343b–c	61	27c	13
3.399e–400e	186	29a–b	53
2.365a–b	61	29e–30a	60n167
6.486a	13	30b–c	221
6.487e	43	31c	53
6.504b–d	60n164	35b–36b	54
6.505a	55, 61n169	36a–37a	201n33
6.508d–e	51		
6.509a	43, 51n135		



- 37d 54, 64n173  
 39e 74n209  
 41a–b 220–221  
 47a–c 92n270  
 53d–55a 54  
 92c 43n103, 54, 85n247,  
 191
- Plutarch
- Ad principem ineruditum*  
 779a–780b 91  
 779f 91  
 780b 91n266  
 780c 91  
 780d 91  
 780e 91, 92, 92n268  
 780e–f 251  
 780e–781a 90–91  
 780f 80, 92  
 781a 92  
 781f 92  
 781f–782a 92
- Amatorius*  
 756b 15, 78n222  
 756e–f 218  
 757b 78n222  
 761e–762a 78n222  
 765a–b 88  
 766e 88n259
- De Alexandri magni fortuna aut virtute*  
 336c–d 94n278
- De animae procreatione in Timaeo*  
 1012 9
- De defectu oraculorum*  
 410b 15  
 416d 80
- De E apud Delphos*  
 393d 80, 86  
 393e–f 222  
 394c 83
- De facie in orbe lunae*  
 944e 80
- De Iside et Osiride*  
 351c–d 15  
 351c–e 82  
 351d 90, 94  
 351e 64n174, 82  
 351e–f 15, 80, 81  
 351f 83–84  
 352a 82  
 352b 84  
 354b–c 83  
 355a 85n251  
 354e–355a 85  
 355c 80  
 355c–d 15, 81  
 364e 80  
 371b 85  
 372e–f 84–85, 191  
 373a–b 85, 86  
 373b 86  
 377a 85n249  
 378a 87  
 381b 80n232, 194  
 382a–c 85, 86n252, 137  
 382b 86n252, 93  
 382d 87
- De Pythiae oraculis*  
 400d 86  
 404c–d 131n404
- De sera numinis vindicta*  
 550d 14, 92n270  
 550d–e 79  
 560b 89n261
- De tranquillitate animi*  
 477c–d 80, 86, 137
- Marcus Coriolanus*  
 38.4 88n257
- Numa*  
 4.3 88n258  
 8.7 193n7
- Quaestiones platonicae*  
 1000e 89  
 1001a–c 89  
 1001c 90

1002f	89	95.50	105
1003a	89, 90		
1007c–d	80		
1007d	80n231		
<i>Quomodo adolescens poetas audire debeat</i>		Sextus Empiricus	
30f	88n258	<i>Adversus mathematicos</i>	
		10.7	204n48
		<i>Adversus physicos</i>	
		2.1.19	256
<i>Themistocles</i>		Strabo	
27.4–5	93	<i>Geographica</i>	
		14.5.13	164n100
Quintilian		Tacitus	
<i>Institutio oratoria</i>		<i>Annales</i>	
9.4.124–145	171n121	4.55	162n95
		14.27	158
Seneca		Varro	
<i>De clementia</i>		<i>Antiquitates rerum divinarum</i>	
1.4.3	224n131	6	77n219
		6–11	98n294
<i>De ira</i>		8	77n219
2.35.3–4	104, 113	15–16	33n65
2.36.1–2	105	Virgil	
		<i>Aeneid</i>	
<i>Epistulae morales ad Lucilium</i>		8.184–305	106
31.8	107n315	8.313–358	106
31.9–11	106	8.370–453	106
31.11	107, 255n21	Xenophon	
41.1–2	12n43, 105	<i>Memorabilia</i>	
41.3–5	105	4.3.13–14	193n7
58.27–28	221n113		
65.8	206n56		
65.24	221n116		
73.11	105n313		
73.13–14	105n314		
73.16	105, 255n21		
92.1	105n312		
95.47–50	12n43		

### Patristic Sources

Athanasius of Alexandria

*Synopsis scripturae sacrae*  
P. 292, 44–45      145n17

Basil of Caesarea

*De spiritu sancto*  
26.64      257n2

Cyril of Jerusalem

*Catecheses ad illuminandos*

14.29.1.14      145n18

John Chrysostom

*In epistulam ad Colossenses*

1 (p. 301, l. 3–5)    166n109

Theodoretus

*Interpretatio in xiv epistulas sancti Pauli*

P. 592, l. 13–14    146n21

## Index of Modern Authors

- Albani, Matthias 24n26  
Aletti, Jean-Noël 232n153  
Allo, Ernest-Bernard 134–135  
Andersen, Francis I. 22
- Barbaglio, Giuseppe 131n405, 132n408  
Becker, Matthias 7  
Belli, Filippo 244  
Belting, Hans 1 n. 1, 3  
Berger, Klaus 189  
Betegh, Gabór 12n43  
Biancalani, Alessandro 119  
Blank, Rainer 189  
Blischke, Folker 58n160  
Blischke, Mareike 59n163, 60n166  
Bloch, René S. 39n86  
Boehm, Gottfried 1 n. 1, 3  
Bonazzi, Mauro 9, 14n52, 81, 83  
Borgen, Peder 74n210  
Breytenbach, Cilliers 233n156, 233n157  
Brisson, Luc 54n145  
Broer, Ingo 158n78  
Brucker, Ralph 154, 183–184  
Bujard, Walter 149  
Bultmann, Rudolf 189, 190  
Buscemi, Alfio Marcello 149n37, 158n75
- Cadwallader, Alan H. 158, 159, 165  
Clark, Bruce T. 147n27  
Clay, Jenny Strauss 181n154, 185  
Cosgrove, Charles 154n60, 157n71, 183–184
- Dettwiler, Andreas 151n47, 177n137, 227n137, 238n175  
Dibelius, Martin 189  
Dienstbeck, Stefan 249n14  
Dohmen, Christoph 30
- Dübbers, Michael 155  
Dunn, James D.G. 157
- Egger, Wilhelm 190  
Eltester, Friedrich-Wilhelm 252  
Erler, Michael 57n153
- Feldmeier, Reinhard 16n59, 127n390, 166n111, 223n122, 257n3  
Ferrari, Franco 14n52, 52n139  
Feuillet, André 258n4  
Finnern, Sönke 190  
Forschner, Maximilian 221n115  
Foucault, Michel 7  
Freedman, David Noel 22  
Frey, Jörg 114n351
- Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von 263n14  
Görgemanns, Herwig 79n225, 82  
Grotius, Hugo 219n104, 258  
Grünschloß, Andreas 176n135, 178n143
- Hampson, Daphne 259n7  
Hegel, Georg W.F. 243n1  
Hengel, Martin 182n157, 183  
Hirsch, Barbara 131n404, 132, 133n411  
Hirsch-Luipold, Rainer 86n253, 91n265, 131n404, 132, 133n411  
Hoeps, Reinhard 4  
Holtzmann, Heinrich Julius 150  
Houlden, James 140
- Janowski, Bernd 30n53  
Jervell, Jacob 69n192  
Jonas, Hans 2
- Karfik, Filip 54n146  
Käsemann, Ernst 154–155

- Klauck, Hans-Josef 81, 99n297,  
103n305
- Klausnitzer, Wolfgang 255
- Koziel, Bernd Elmar 255
- Kürzinger, Josef 126n389, 127n392
- Larcher, Chrysostome 65, 65n178,  
67n182
- Larsson, Edvin 132n408
- Ledbetter, Grace 43n100
- Lohmeyer, Ernst 210
- Lorenzen, Stefanie 120, 134n413
- Luz, Ulrich 150, 153n57, 164
- Macé, Arnaud 54n145
- Männlein-Robert, Irmgard 182n156
- Mayerhoff, Ernst Theodor 150
- Mazzinghi, Luca 61n168
- Mettinger, Tryggve N.D. 19n1, 21,  
21n13
- Mitchell, William John Thomas 1 n.1, 3
- Müller, Peter 237n171
- Müller-Dyes, Klaus 188n179
- Neher, Martin 68n183
- Niebuhr, Karl-Wilhelm 58n160, 152
- Niemand, Christoph 125
- Nikolsky, Boris 104n308
- Norden, Eduard 153–154
- Opsomer, Jan 15
- Orth, Wolfgang 162n92
- Petersen, Anders Klostergaard 11n42
- Poetsch, Christoph 41n92, 44n105, 120
- Pöhlmann, Wolfgang 182n158
- Porębski, Czesław 55n149
- Price, Simon R.F. 163n96
- Riedweg, Christoph 182n156
- Rüggemeier, Jan 190
- Runia, David T. 10
- Sacchi, Alessandro 265
- Santas, Gerasimos 55n149
- Schleiermacher, Friedrich D.E. 203n44,  
214n83
- Schmeller, Thomas 131n406
- Schnelle, Udo 6n24, 11n42, 114n353,  
150, 164
- Schroer, Silvia 68n188
- Schweikle, Günther 188n178
- Schweizer, Eduard 152, 164, 181n152,  
202, 205n49
- Seibel, Klaudia 188–189
- Smith, Nicholas D. 55n148
- Speyer, Wolfgang 145n12
- Spieckermann, Hermann 223n122
- Standhartinger, Angela 177n137
- Sterling, Gregory E. 58, 210
- Stettler, Christian 152, 153n56,  
230n147
- Stock, Alex 3–4
- Stolz, Fritz 247n11
- Szlezák, Thomas A. 12, 14n50, 41n91
- Tarocchi, Stefano 178n142, 239n180
- Tarrant, Harold 9
- Tennyson, Alfred 263n13
- Uehlinger, Christoph 32
- Van Nes, Jermo 148
- Vanni, Ugo 245n8
- Ventrella, Gianluca 102n304, 103n306
- Vollenweider, Samuel 127n391,  
129n399, 131n403, 134n414,  
157n74, 183, 190n190, 248n12,  
258n4
- Von Harnack, Adolf 218n99
- Wagner, Andreas 27n36, 30
- Wenzel, Peter 188n183
- Wick, Peter 190
- Wilk, Florian 7n30
- Wink, Walter 202n41
- Wolff, Christian 130n402
- Wolter, Michael 124
- Wyrwa, Dietmar 17n64
- Zahn, Molly M. 37
- Zeller, Dieter 126n387
- Žižek, Slavoj 262n12

## Index of Subjects

- Abraham 122  
Adam 35, 37, 58, 114, 116–127, 134, 227  
– last ~ 118, 120, 122, 134, 227, 263  
– second ~ 124, 127  
Aeneas 106  
Aëtius 220n110  
Alexandria 58n157  
aniconism 19–28, 32–33, 39, 100n299, 136  
Apuleius 15, 87n255  
Arian controversy 4  
Aristotle 215–216, 220n110  
Asia Minor 113, 162–164
- Basil of Caesarea 257  
beginning 228–229, 239–241, 243, 265  
body 223–227
- cause  
– exemplary ~ 206n56  
– final ~ 215–216, 246  
– formal ~ 215  
Christomorphism 4  
church 223–227  
Colossae 158–160  
Corinth 117  
Corpus Paulinum 6, 8, 145, 175, 200, 204, 229, 233, 236, 260  
creation 29–31, 35–36, 60, 62, 71–72, 75, 78, 198–200, 200–216, 239, 242–244, 265  
– mediation of ~ 65–68, 71–72, 75, 78, 143–144, 203–216, 242–244, 262  
– new ~ 121  
Creator/creature distinction 23–26, 136, 250  
Cynicism 95
- Dead Sea Scrolls 34–39, 136  
Decalogue 20, 26, 27  
Demiurge 54n146, 60, 135, 220–221  
Dio Chrysostom 10, 14, 76, 95–104, 137, 196, 247–249  
Diodorus of Aspendus 57, 93  
Diogenes Laertius 42n99, 187  
Diogenes of Sinope 57, 93
- Empedocles 220, 262  
envy 60  
Ephesus 161  
Epictetus 11, 109–112, 139  
Epicurus 256  
epistemology 57, 94, 104–105  
– theological ~ 10–11, 17, 67, 7–78, 86, 92, 95–104, 128–133, 134, 138, 245–246, 248, 253, 264  
epoptic vision 87, 250, 257  
eschatology 116, 118n366, 121, 124–126, 133, 135, 228, 239
- final judgment 63  
firstborn 196–200, 228–229, 239–241, 243  
Formgeschichte 187–190  
fullness 229–232
- generic hybridity 187–190
- head 223–227  
Hebrew Bible 19–34, 135–136, 137, 244  
Hercules 106  
hymn(s) 141, 157, 178, 179–187  
– Christ-~ 169, 179, 183
- iconic criticism 1–3  
iconoclasm 22

- image(s) 17, 38, 41, 59, 114, 191, 206, 244  
 – human being and ~ of God 28–32, 33–34, 36, 37, 38, 39, 57, 59–65, 70, 71, 72, 87–94, 105, 111, 112, 115–116, 134, 192, 259–261  
 – ~ of Christ 125, 133, 139, 260–261  
 – ~ of God 70, 71–78, 80, 96–99, 103, 128–133, 134, 138, 139, 240  
 – ~ of the invisible God 5, 128, 191, 192–216, 242–247, 253–255, 256, 260  
 – ~ prohibition 21, 22–23, 26–28  
 – philosophy of ~ 41–57  
 – problematic nature of ~ 44–50, 53, 77–78, 86–87, 256–259  
 – theology of ~ 2–4, 10–11  
 imitation 45, 53, 108–109  
 invisibility 193–196, 200–201, 245, 247  
 Isis 80–87
- Jerusalem 113  
 Jesus of Nazareth 5–6, 262, 265  
 justification 122, 126
- likeness 42, 44–45, 56  
 – ~ of God 35  
 Luke the Evangelist 113, 114  
 Logos 58, 59, 71–78, 83–84, 86, 138, 139, 209, 211, 221, 229, 250, 252  
 Ps.-Longinus 186–187
- Maximus of Tyre 15, 101n302, 196  
 Menander Comicus 93  
 metaphor 1  
 metaphysics 14, 49–55, 83, 94, 250  
 – propositional ~ 203–216  
 model 53, 73, 79, 109, 120, 259–260  
 – Logos as ~ 73–75  
 monotheism 23–24  
 – Christological ~ 134  
 – polylatric ~ 86  
 Moses 22, 27, 58, 69, 114, 123, 128–133, 134  
 Musonius Rufus 11, 95, 107–109, 139
- Orphic literature 218  
 Osiris 80–87
- Paul the Apostle 6, 40, 58n160, 113–135, 138, 160–161, 166, 224, 229–230, 233, 249–253, 255, 260  
 Philo of Alexandria 10, 11, 16, 17, 40, 59, 68–78, 79, 115, 138–139, 194, 196, 200, 208, 220, 228, 249–253, 256  
 philosophy 164–167, 253  
 – ~ and poetry 13  
 – ~ and religion 11–16, 80, 81, 248  
 Plato 11–12, 16, 40–57, 79, 86, 87, 89, 135–136, 185–186, 218, 221, 256, 262  
 Platonism 8–10, 11–12, 14, 41, 69, 70, 95  
 Plutarch 9, 15, 64n174, 78–94, 95, 137–139, 194, 196, 218, 222, 249–253, 256, 260  
 Protagoras 55, 56  
 protology 200, 213, 239, 243, 255
- reconciliation 121–122, 124, 133, 227–241, 242–244, 245, 246, 252, 262  
 religion  
 – ~ and philosophy 11–16, 80, 81, 248  
 – popular ~ 12n43  
 resurrection 116–121, 123  
 revelation 50, 71n202, 196  
 – divine self~ 3–4, 245–246, 250, 253  
 righteousness 59–64, 122–124
- salvation history 114, 128, 229–230, 236  
 Seneca the Younger 11, 16, 104–107, 139  
 Septuagint 34, 70, 192, 197, 198, 223–224  
 Sextus Empiricus 256  
 spirit 58, 66, 221, 226  
 – Holy Spirit 117, 124–127, 257  
 Socrates 12, 13, 42, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 110, 263n15  
 soteriology 92, 138–139, 249–251, 257–258, 265  
 Stoicism 62n172, 69, 76, 88n256, 95, 103, 104–113, 139, 205, 211, 221–222, 229, 247–249, 255, 262  
 Sibylline Oracles 194, 196

Tarsus 113, 163–164

textual criticism 140–144

Virgil 106

virtue(s) 59, 61n169, 62, 62n172, 63,

79, 91, 107–109, 251

– cardinal ~ 59, 60n164, 108

Wisdom 58–68, 71, 250, 251, 252

– ~ of Solomon 11, 40, 58–68, 115, 137,  
138–139, 249–253

Zeus 90–91, 98, 102, 218, 251

– Pheidian ~ 97, 99–100