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CHAPTER 1:
A HISTORY OF RESEARCH

Paul exists in at least three worlds and interacts with three rich, overlapping heritages: Judaisms, Hellenisms, and Roman Empire. The “new perspective(s) on Paul” redefined the relationship of Paul’s theology within first century Judaism(s) and therefore questioned the former understandings of justification by faith as the center of Pauline theology. E. P. Sanders initiated a “Copernican turn” in Pauline scholarship by reviewing a wide variety of Palestinian Jewish literature and arguing for a pattern of

---


Jewish religion comprising “covenental nomism.” The sharpest criticism of Sanders came from Jacob Neusner, who demonstrated that Sanders’s use of rabbinic material is fundamentally flawed due to his neglect of rabbinic exegesis and the late date of these materials. Neusner also points out that Sanders’s definitions of the Pharisees are incorrect, and one cannot speak of a singular “Judaism” of the first century, given that there is no single unifying tradition.

N. T. Wright and James Dunn became the most distinguished proponents and refiners of Sanders’s theories, and the “new perspective(s) on Paul” generated a vast

---


theology and exegesis. Scholars representing the “new perspective(s) on Paul” have consistently argued that we should seek to understand Paul not through later confessions but through his first century contexts, particularly in light of their reconstructions of the relationships between Paul and Judaism(s). Other scholars have argued against the “new perspective(s) on Paul” on historical, exegetical, and theological grounds.

With the discussion of Paul’s Jewish contexts in full force, it has become a methodological concern to broaden the horizons on Pauline studies to include his imperial and Hellenistic contexts. Significant changes in understanding brought about a new perspective on the construction of Paul and his contexts. The questions concerning Paul’s use of Greco-Roman rhetorical conventions and epistolary form, moral philosophy, and his interaction with the Roman Empire (including Hellenistic religions, patronage, family structures, and politics) needed to be revisited in light of these “new perspective(s) on Paul” debates. Many scholars sought to view Paul as subversive to the


Roman imperial order, criticizing its politics, economics, and family structures. John Elliot’s works on social-science criticism and Richard Horsley’s *Paul and Empire* sparked interest specifically in how Paul accepts, rejects, or adapts contemporary Roman political ideologies and especially how Christians can use Paul’s political ideas today. The work of scholars who use social-scientific methods to study the NT usually attempts to frame Paul’s viewpoints within Mediterranean social and anthropological frameworks (such as patronage, honor/shame, family structures, magic and ritual). These valuable studies often focus on reading Paul with a concern for applying his thought to contemporary ideologies such as feminism, social and economic justice, libertarianism, and sexual equality.

Others have sought to foreground Hellenistic contexts and locate Paul primarily in these milieus employing historical methods such as philology, rhetorical criticism, and the situating of Paul within popular moral philosophy. Scholars who study Paul’s ideas only within his Jewish and Imperial contexts run the risk of obscuring his place within rhetorical, literary, philosophical and political conventions, and within greater Hellenistic culture. Studies of Paul’s use of Greco-Roman rhetoric and philosophy have spanned all the major movements in Pauline studies – from the writings of Justin Martyr and the

---


14 See above, n. 3.

apologists to Augustine to the Reformers to Bultmann, through the New Perspective to feminist and post-colonial studies. The greatest achievements of modern rhetorical criticism, which began in earnest in the 1960s, comprise the analyses of Paul’s epistles as speeches and the identification of various rhetorical devices using ancient rhetorical handbooks and instructions from philosophers, rhetoricians, and other ancient witnesses concerning the art of persuasion. Paul’s usage of the diatribe has received the most attention, but rhetorical critics have scrutinized the New Testament using rhetorical

---


18 For history and bibliography, see Rudolf Bultmann, Der Stil der paulinischen Predigt und die kynisch-stoische Diatribe (Göttingen: Vanderhoek, 1910); Abraham Malherbe, “MH ΓΕΝΟΙΤΟ in the Diatribe and Paul,” HTR 73, no. 1/2 (1980): 231-40, note that page 236 is reprinted as it should have appeared in HTR 74, no. 1 as “Erratum: MH ΓΕΝΟΙΤΟ in the Diatribe and Paul;” Stanley K. Stowers, The Diatribe and Paul’s Letters to the Romans (Chio: Scholars Press, 1981); Changwon Song, Reading Romans as a Diatribe (New York: Peter Lang, 2004).
methods with both historical and contemporary interests. The challenges of rhetorical criticism concern identifying form (epistles are not speeches) and adopting a methodology (while there are ancient works that describe how to construct a speech, there are none that instruct us how to analyze a speech).

Scholars have also contextualized Paul within popular Hellenistic moral philosophy and religion, and it is within this scholarly tradition that I situate my study of the reception of 1 Corinthians by philosophically educated women. I will review the scholarly tradition, beginning with the contributions to the *Corpus Hellenisticum*, the publications of the Hellenistic Moral Philosophy and Early Christianity Section of the

---


22 The *Corpus Hellenisticum* is an international research project whose objective is to collect all of the parallels to the New Testament that appear in Greek and Latin literature. W. C. Van Unnik cryptically wrote, “So for the past few years here in Utrecht we have again taken up the thread of this work (that of Wettstein and others discussed below),” “Corpus Hellenisticum Novi Testamenti,” *JBL* 83, no. 1 (1964): 18.
SBL, and related conversations regarding Greco-Roman moral philosophy and Paul.

Finally, I will situate my study in the current conversation regarding the participation of women in philosophy.

Paul within the Corpus Hellenisticum

The systematic collection of Greco-Roman writings for the interpretation of early Christian writings begins with the work of J. J. Wettstein, who collected parallels from Jewish and classical writers for forty years. Following decades of disinterest, the search for parallels was renewed in the nineteenth century by C. F. Georg Heinrici (1844-1915), Ernst von Dobschütz (1870-1934), Hans Windish (1881-1935), Adolf Deissmann (1866-1937), and Hans Lietzmann (1875-1942), who influenced NT scholarship concerning the nature of early Christianity and its relationships with Judaism and Hellenism. Heinrici argued that Paul’s concept of self-awareness has its roots (οἶκειοις / appetitus societatis) in Socratic, Stoic, and Philonic thought, that early Christian groups resemble Roman associations, and that Paul used the form of the Cynic-Stoic diatribe. Ernst von Dobschütz was critical of the methods of the history of religions school that emphasized the similarities of Christianity with Greco-Roman thought and sought to bring out its

---


distinctiveness, arguing that Paul goes beyond the requirements of popular Hellenistic morality.\textsuperscript{25} Windisch is best known for his argument concerning the \(\theta\acute{e}i\,\alpha\nu\eta\rho\): by providing examples from classical writers, he extended the nature of its usage in John’s Gospel for Jesus to how Paul describes himself.\textsuperscript{26} Windisch further postulated that Paul’s opponents in Corinth are gnostic pneumatics and Jewish preachers.\textsuperscript{27} Deissmann famously concluded that the Greek of the NT is that of the lower classes, defined Paul’s corpus as letters (non-literary, real communications to real people) instead of epistles (moral essays in the form of a letter), and argued that Pauline Christianity was a movement exclusively of the lower class.\textsuperscript{28} Lietzmann argued that Paul’s opponents simply adopted the Platonic anthropology of the immortality of the soul and therefore rejected Paul’s teachings concerning the resurrection.\textsuperscript{29} These scholars made important contributions to what would later become the \textit{Corpus Hellenisticum} project and to related studies. Death and war continually interrupted the project until Kurt Aland suggested in

\textsuperscript{25} Ernst von Dobschütz, \textit{Christian Life in the Primitive Church} (Boston: American Unitarian Association, 1904), 1-10.

\textsuperscript{26} Windisch, \textit{Paulus und Christus: Ein biblisch-religionsgeschichtlicher Vergleich UNT 24} (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1934), 143.

\textsuperscript{27} Windisch, \textit{Der zweite Korintherbrief}, 9\textsuperscript{th} ed, KEK (Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1924, 1970).


\textsuperscript{29} Hans Lietzmann and W. G. Kümmel, \textit{An Die Korinther 1/2} (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1969), 9.
his review of the project in 1955 that an international team of scholars systematically review the *Corpus Hellenisticum*.\(^{30}\)

The first publication of the *Corpus Hellenisticum* preceded Alland’s call by nine years, appearing in 1946. Helge Almqvist’s *Plutarch und Das Neue Testament: Ein Beitrag zum Corpus Hellenisticum Novi Testamenti* begins with a detailed outline of the shared culture of Plutarch and the writers of the NT.\(^{31}\) Almqvist selected the parallels himself (instead of simply reviewing Wettstein’s collection) according to the following categories:

- those which show cultural-historical reference, those which throw light on religion, on ethics, those which belong to the area of literary style - further subdivided into style of narration, diatribe or dialogue, minor features of rhetorical emphasis, phrases or turns of expression, and major figures of speech.\(^{32}\)

For example, Almqvist finds a parallel with the cosmology of Plutarch (*Mor.* 282b) and Paul (*Rom.* 1:20), both referring to the seen and unseen nature of elements in the cosmos. He also identifies a parallel between Paul (*Rom.* 2:1) and Plutarch’s (*Mor.* 863a) ethical rule not to judge others. Elements of the diatribe occur throughout; one example being *Rom* 9:19 that parallels *Mor.* 101c, 958e, and 1055a.

Hans D. Betz made his first contribution to the *Corpus Hellenisticum* in 1961 with his revised dissertation, which briefly identifies parallels of a religious nature between the


NT and Lucian.\textsuperscript{33} He gives much attention to the θεῖος ὁμορρ, the strongest parallels being in Lucian’s description of Heracles in \textit{Cynic} 13 and the \textit{Death of Peregrinus} 6.\textsuperscript{34} Lucian describes Heracles as the divine man, one who had self-control and helped the poor, and he laments Peregrinus not as the loss of a Pythagoras or a Socrates, but as a god who had had died.\textsuperscript{35}

The first methodological essay and very detailed history of the project in English appears in 1964 by W. C. Van Unnik.\textsuperscript{36} Van Unnik calls for a systematic and historical/scientific review of all Greek and Latin literature, noting that Wettstein’s vast collection in his \textit{Novum Testamentum Graecum} is incomplete and arbitrary, necessitating original research. Van Unnik gives particular attention to the problem of defining and identifying parallels. He writes that scholars must not look for parallels only in the contemporaries of Paul because many formative writers and philosophers shaped the


contemporary ethos, and later writers preserve this material as well. The evaluations should be done with an historical outlook:

Of course in the evaluation of data one must reckon with the fluctuations and currents in the religious, social, and political realms, but in general it must be stated that everything preserved to us from the classical world ought to be investigated for its eventual contribution to this Corpus.\(^{37}\)

Furthermore, a “parallel” need not be the usage of a particular word or its cognates and various forms,\(^{38}\) because a parallel idea can be expressed with different words (and in different languages). However, a supposed parallel is stronger with more exact word order, form, and historical situation. Van Unnik later describes this strength: “there must be a relation in substance with the N.T.”\(^{39}\) This “relation in substance” means applying a hermeneutic to both passages that comprises “reading in ‘context,’ which is not only the immediate passage from which the words are taken, but also the whole fabric of thought.”\(^{40}\)

Following Van Unnik’s call for methodological reflection, several volumes in the monograph series *Studia ad corpus hellenisticum Novi Testamenti* reflect deeply on the relationships between classical sources and Paul. G. Petzke made the first contribution, 


\(^{38}\) This project had already been done in the work of the BGAD and TDNT.


\(^{40}\) Van Unnik, “Words Come to Life,” 206.
writing on Apollonius of Tyana. Petzke’s work includes scant parallels to Paul’s writings, being more concerned with stories concerning Jesus and Apollonius and the “divine man” concept in Hellenism.⁴¹ Reimer criticized Petzke for not offering much interpretation of the significance of the data,⁴² but Petzke’s arguments concerning the contact between Jesus as the Son of God and the “divine man” in Hellenistic traditions remain convincing.

In the second volume of the *Studia ad corpus hellenisticum Novi Testamenti*, G. Mussies in *Dio Chrysostom and the New Testament* briefly introduces Dio and then presents parallels with little or no comment, although his notes give a rationale for the identification of a parallel when present. Mussies’s focus is to provide parallels of a religious or philosophical nature, and leave out lexical or grammatical notes. Despite Unnik’s call for a more substantive discussion of the parallels, Mussies does not give explanation and interpretation of his parallels, claiming that the parallels themselves need to be a part of scholarly discourse. The number of parallels in this volume is quite massive, and a detailed interpretation of each parallel would call for a multi-volume work with several contributing scholars. Among various parallels, Mussies finds parallels in 1 Cor 1:22 and Cass. Dio 11.39, where Dio says that the Greeks are leaders seeking philosophy and educating their people, and in 37.26 where Favorinus lauds the Corinthians specifically for their learning and other important accomplishments.

---


Elsewhere Dio says that to win a war, soldiers must be saved but at the same time good men have to die, which is similar to what Paul says in Romans 5:7.

The third volume, *Plutarch’s Theological Writings and Early Christian Literature*, comprising ten different essays on various treatises in the *Moralia*, broke new ground in 1975 with its ambitious scope. Many of the parallels found in this work are important for highlighting the significance of philosophical terms in Paul’s writings, but with the notable exceptions of Morton Smith and David Aune, the contributors do little to elaborate on these themes.\(^{43}\) Morton Smith finds similarity between the knowledge of God and lack of it in *Mor*. 164e and Gal. 4:8-9; 1 Cor. 8:2, 15:34; but Paul differs from Plutarch in that he believed pagan belief leads to destruction (2 Thess. 2.2-12).\(^{44}\) David Aune focuses on the diatribe style of Paul and its use in 1 Cor. 15:29-34, noting the extensive use of poets and sages in Plutarch’s treatise and Paul’s quotation of Menander in 1 Cor. 15:33. Aune further argues that both Paul and the early Christian writers who favored the diatribe style used quotations from the Old Testament instead of the appeals to the sages and poets in the Cynic-Stoic diatribe.\(^{45}\)

Volume 4, *Plutarch’s Ethical Writings and Early Christian Literature*, followed in 1978, finally adding substantial discourse with wider scholarship, as the contributors


included classicists, historians, and NT interpreters. The articles in this volume include detailed descriptions of parallels between several essays in the *Moralia* and early Christian thought followed by a list of less important parallels with little or no explanation. As a whole, it appreciates the methodological concerns raised by Van Unnik, describing substantive parallels in an historical background.

Volume five appeared in 1979 being *Corpus Hermeticum XIII and Early Christian Literature*, a revised dissertation by W. C. Grese directed by H. D. Betz. *Corpus Hermeticum XIII* is unique in Hermetic literature because it focuses on regeneration, the change from humanity to divinity. Dated between the middle of the second century to late third century CE, *Corpus Hermeticum XIII* possibly carries both Jewish and Christian influences. Grese provides a detailed analysis of *Corpus Hermeticum XIII*, noting many parallels to Paul. Interestingly, there are two negative parallels: the early Christian communities were open to outsiders (unlike the Hermetic mysteries) and the transition from human to divine (e.g., Jesus) was not as smooth as in *Corpus Hermeticum XIII*. Paul’s use of the term “father” is similar to the widespread use of “father – son” terminology used to indicate a teacher/student relationship and used

---


48 Grese, *Corpus Hermeticum*, 64-5.
in mystery religions for the initiator/initiated. Grese observes that in both CH XIII and Pauline thought, regeneration occurs through God’s initiative.

P. W. Van Der Horst contributed volume six with *Aelius Aristides and the New Testament* in 1980. Van Der Horst very briefly introduces Aristides and lists parallels between the writings of Aristides and various NT writings. In his opinion the most significant parallels to Paul are in the hymn to Athena and 1 Cor. 1.24. Aristides (37, 28) calls Athena δύναμιν τοῦ Διός and Paul says of Christ: Χριστὸν θεοῦ δύναμιν. Aristides (50, 71-93) describes in some length letters of recommendation (2 Cor. 3:1; Philemon). Van Der Horst finds parallels between 1 Cor. 1.22 “the Greeks seek wisdom” and with the Athenians “being leaders of all education and learning” in Arist. 330; and between the crown metaphor of the *agon* motif (1 Cor. 9:25) and Arist. 402.

In their 1971 article “Contributions to the Corpus Hellenisticum Novi Testamenti: I: Plutarch, de e apud delphos,” Hans D. Betz and Edgar Smith outline many parallels between Plutarch and 1 Corinthians. The entire discourse concerns γνώθι σαυτόν

---

49 Grese, *Corpus Hermeticum*, 67. Cf., CH XIII 1.1; 1 Cor. 4:14, 15, 17; 2 Cor. 6:13.

50 Grese, 84. CH XIII 3.1.7-3.1.8.3.2; Rom. 8:29-30; 9:6-29; Gal. 1:15-6; 1 Thess. 5:9; 2 Thess. 2:13-4.


52 Hans D. Betz and Edgar W. Smith, Jr., “Contributions to the Corpus Hellenisticum Novi Testamenti: I: Plutarch, de e apud delphos,” *NovT* 13, no. 3 (1971): 217-35. The most significant parallels from 384e to 1 Corinthians include the contrast of ‘spiritual’ and ‘material’ gifts in 1 Cor. 9:11; the combination of λόγος and σοφία in 1:17; the metaphorical use of ἀπαρχή, the technical term for sacrificial cults in 1 Cor.
(know thyself) which Betz and Smith interpret in light of its companion maxim μηδὲν ἀγαπεῖ (in nothing to excess).\(^{53}\) For example, in 385d the phrase γνωσθεὶ σουτόν appears, which has a parallel in 1 Cor. 3:4, with Betz and Smith writing of μηδὲν ἀγαπεῖ:

The maxim is not expressly reflected in [Early Christian Literature]. However, cf. Ro xii 3; 2 Cor x.12f; Eph iv 7, 13, i6. In the Pauline tradition there is a clear opposition to any tendency by man to overextend himself, e.g., Paul’s opposition to the θείος ἀνήρ of Christianity, and to the gnostics (I Cor iv 8; 2 Cor xii I-4, 7).\(^{54}\)

Peter Van Der Horst’s essays on the neo-Platonist Macrobius (1973) and the Stoic philosophers Musonius Rufus (1974), Hierocles (1975),\(^{55}\) Cornutus (1981), and the novelist Chariton (1983) provide a list of parallels and briefly introduce the authors but do not offer extensive discussion.\(^{56}\) Like other contributors to the *Corpus Hellenisticum*, Van Der Horst finds substantial parallels between Paul and these ancient authors.

---

15:20, 23 and 16:15; and the usage of απορία in 1 Cor. 7:32-5. Equally significant are the parallels in Plutarch’s theology in 384; Paul’s use ὁρείς in Rom. 1:27 and φύσει in Rom. 1:27; 2:14, 27; 11.21, 24; and Gal. 2:15. From 385a, αἶνιγματα “riddle” appears only in ECL in 1 Cor. 13:12, where it has to do with revelation.


\(^{54}\) Betz and Smith, “Plutarch,” 223.


Macrobius, for example, notes in *Commentary* 1.1.5-6 that Plato argued in *Phaedo* and *Georgias* that there is divine justice, which can be parallel to Rom. 2:6. There is a parallel in Rom. 8:14 and Macrobius’s comment in *Saturnalia* 1.23.13 that the spirit of the god led men bearing the images of the gods in the procession to the Circensian Games. Paul’s description of his pursuance of Christ in 1 Cor. 2:2 is parallel to Macrobius’s description of the wise man who seeks wisdom in Commentary 1.8.3. And 1 Cor. 7:4; 32-4 is also similar to Musonius’s essay on the “Chief End of Marriage,” when he explains that a marriage must have mutual love between husband and wife.57 Both Hierocles and Paul agree that man exists in the image of god (1 Cor. 11:7 // Stob. 4.25.23). Cornutus (Corn. 20 p. 39, 15) has the phrase τοῦς ... πρῶτος ἐκ γῆς γενομένους ἀνθρώπους, similar to Paul’s ὁ πρῶτος ἀνθρώπος ἐκ γῆς (1 Cor. 15:47). Van Der Horst suggests that Dionysus’s presence in his absence in Char. 8.4-5 is parallel to 1 Cor. 5:3. Furthermore, God’s mercy in Phil. 2:27 is comparable to the mercy of Aphrodite in Char. 8.1.3. The phrase μηδεὶς ἐαυτὸν ἐξαπατάτω has parallel in Char. 6.1.10: μὴ ἐξαπατᾶτα σεαυτόν.

David L. Balch contributed an article to the *Corpus Hellenisticum* in 1992 that begins with an excellent introduction to Pythagoreanism and neo-Pythagoreanism. Balch

57 Lutz, 89. Furthermore, Musonius and Paul agree that men’s hair should be cut short. Musonius actually uses the beauty of women in cutting their hair as an example for men; however, unlike Paul, Musonius applies the argument from nature to men and not women. Other parallels are Musonius’s notion of self-control of an ideal king and Paul’s sense of order in worship and Musonius’s treatment of the question of the wise-person persecuting those who treat her with contempt and Paul’s fighting the wild beasts in Ephesus. Paul’s appeal to nature in 1 Cor. 11:14 is parallel to Hierocles (pg 15 col 2, 51). A fragment of Heirocles (Stob. 4.27.20) parallels Paul’s command not to repay evil with evil in Rom 12:17.
translates and interprets many neo-Pythagorean texts that reference household codes. Balch finds neo-Pythagorean parallels to the Pauline idea that wives should submit to their husbands. Significantly, Balch concludes that the neo-Pythagorean household codes are more similar to the NT codes in Colossians 3:18-4:1 and Ephesians 5:21-6:9 than are the Stoic and Hellenistic Jewish parallels that NT scholars usually cite.

The scope and depth of the two volumes of the Neuen Wettstein, first published in 1996 and edited by Udo Schnelle, update and revise the parallels that Wettstein collected. The first volume appears in two parts: the first covering the epistles of the NT in canonical order to 1 Tim., and the second covering the remainder of the epistles and the Apocalypse. The second volume is dedicated to the Gospel of John. Matthew and Acts are planned, but the publication date has not been announced. The parallels in the Neuen Wettstein are chosen primarily on the similarity in style, and include Hellenistic, Jewish

---


60 Balch, “Neopythagorean Moralists,” 409.
(both Greek and Hebrew), and early Christian texts. The parallels appear in German with a few notes on their significance with relevant Greek phrases.

While the *Neuen Wettstein* was being compiled and edited, Klaus Berger and Carsten Colpe were working with Eugene M. Boring to translate and update a similar project, the *Religionsgeschichtliches Textbuch zum Neuen Testament*. 61 The *Hellenistic Commentary to the New Testament* added about 300 parallels to the original work, and unlike the *Neuen Wettstein*, this project focused on locating and briefly explaining parallels to the NT that are from Greco-Roman literature rather than early Christian or Jewish literature, with an interest in cultural backgrounds (usually focused on religious and philosophical ideas) instead of style. The NT text and Greco-Roman parallels appear in English, almost exclusively by translations cited in the bibliography, with very brief explanations of the significance of the parallel and relevant untranslated Greek.

By their nature, both the *Neuen Wettstein* and the *Hellenistic Commentary of the New Testament* are incomplete and somewhat arbitrary because both works almost never situate parallels within their own literary and historical contexts. Similar phrases from the author of a parallel are almost never referenced, and parallels from other Greco-Roman authors are not presented. A significant point of the *Hellenistic Commentary of the New Testament* project is to demonstrate that the NT writings do not appear in a vacuum, but the parallels themselves are not set within any kind of framework other than the criteria used to select them. This leaves a wide gap for scholars to locate other

---

parallels in both the author that is cited in either work or in another author’s work that fits the same criteria. Therefore, there will be a need to continue to identify and review parallels to the New Testament and Greco-Roman literature with fresh research.\textsuperscript{62}

**Hellenistic Moral Philosophy and Early Christianity of the SBL**

Also concerned with the relationship between Paul and Hellenistic morality is the work produced by the Hellenistic Moral Philosophy and Early Christianity Section of the Society of Biblical Literature (HMPECS). This work has been particularly concerned with connections between moral philosophy and the Pauline communities. Abraham Malherbe and E. A. Judge played a significant role in developing this line of inquiry and mentored many of the contributors.\textsuperscript{63} Malherbe and Judge,\textsuperscript{64} among others (such as


Helmut Koester, Hans D. Betz, and Wayne Meeks)\textsuperscript{65} laid the groundwork for the significant contemporary argument that the Christian community at Corinth was socially diverse and that Paul’s opponents there had beliefs that were not necessarily “gnostic.”\textsuperscript{66}

The Hellenistic Moral Philosophy and Early Christianity Section of the Society of Biblical Literature (HMPECS) has produced seven monographs most of which discuss friendship and patronage as important dynamics in Pauline communities. The group published its first collection of essays in 1996 on friendship and flattery in the ancient world, with another volume on friendship in 1997, both edited by John T. Fitzgerald.\textsuperscript{67}

*Greco-Roman Perspectives on Friendship* (1996) is a collection of essays that examines friendship from before Aristotle to such near contemporaries of Paul as Cicero, Plutarch, Lucian, the neo-Pythagoreans, Chariton, and Philo, as well as epigraphic evidence such


\textsuperscript{66} Contra Adolf Deissmann (1895, 1923) on one hand and Walter Schmithals (1956) on the other. Deissmann had argued that Christianity was exclusively a movement of the lowest social class based on his review of newly discovered documentary papyri, and Schmithals had characterized Paul’s opponents as exclusively Gnostic. Cf., Deissmann, *Bibelstudien: Beiträge, zumeist aus den Papyri und Inschriften, zur Geschichte der Sprache, des Schrifttums und der Religion des hellenistischen Judentums und des Urchristentums* (Marburg: Elwert, 1895); Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten. Das Neue Testament und die neuentdeckten Texte der hellenistisch-römischen Welt* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1923); and Schmithals, *Die Gnosis in Korinth; eine Untersuchung zu den Korintherbriefen* (Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956). For history and bibliography of the problem of Paul’s opponents, see Stanley E. Porter, ed., *Paul and his Opponents*, SBL Pauline Studies 2 (Leiden: Brill, 2005).

as honorary inscriptions and documentary papyri. *Friendship, Flattery, and Frankness of Speech* (1997) follows an entirely different format, first presenting three essays that define friendship, frankness, and flattery principally in Philodemus and Plutarch. A detailed examination of friendship language in Phil. 4 follows, identifying this chapter as a friendship letter, the function of friendship language in Phil. 4:10-20, and specifically the significance of self-sufficiency in Phil. 4:11. The volume concludes with discussions concerning the usage of frank speech in the Pauline epistles, Acts, and the Johannine Corpus. In 1998, David Konstan led a team of contributors that produced the sourcebook *Philodemus on Frank Criticism: Introduction, Translation, and Notes*, which introduces a critical source that these contributors to the HMPECS regularly utilize when studying Epicureanism and ancient ideas concerning friendship.\(^68\)

A volume of comparative studies in honor of Abraham J. Malherbe appeared in 2003, and revisits several issues related to previous work.\(^69\) The editors organized the essays according to *graphos* (semantics), *ethos* (ethics and moral characterization), *logos* (rhetoric and literary expression), *ethnos* (self-definition and acculturation), and *nomos* (law and normative values).\(^70\) In their methodological essay, White and Fitzgerald


present a detailed history of *Corpus Hellenisticum* and the HMPECS, and review the criticisms from scholars that highlight the weaknesses of “parallels,” emphasizing instead the unique nature of the Christian message rather than its similarity to popular philosophy and other Hellenistic literature.\(^{71}\) Such criticisms have been theological, lexical, and methodological in nature.\(^{72}\) In response to these criticisms, White and Fitzgerald suggest the studies of parallels should critically engage debates concerning backgrounds and contexts. The backgrounds include studies on culture, social interactions, and history. The contexts include the focus on Hellenistic religions and Judaisms, philosophical and intellectual traditions (specifically Philo, Hellenistic moralists, and the Second Sophistic), and “social world” studies.

A further volume, *Philodemus in the New Testament World*, appeared in 2004, with essays directed towards friendship and rhetoric.\(^{73}\) J. Paul Sampley argues that Paul uses frank speech according to the conventions set forth by Plutarch and Philodemus,


varying the degree of his frankness according to how he perceives the situation.74

Similarly, Bruce Winter argues that Paul denounces the rhetorical delivery (as described by Philodemus) of “megastar orators” in Corinth that distracted the Corinthian church.75

While the volumes produced by the HMPECS are useful in identifying and interpreting Paul’s usage of friendship and patronage language, the conversation concerning contextualization of Paul within popular Hellenistic philosophy has a much wider scope.

**Popular Hellenistic Philosophy and Paul**

There is much conversation on the relationship between Paul and the popular philosophies of the first century, and interest in this topic spans every generation of Pauline scholarship, from the earliest interpreters to today. These studies help to reconstruct the philosophical and rhetorical milieu of Paul and his audiences. These popular philosophies include Cynicism, Stoicism, Epicureanism, Platonism, and neo-Pythagoreanism.

It may not be immediately obvious why it is useful to compare Paul and philosophers beginning with figures which pre-date Paul by hundreds of years such as the

---


pre-Socratics, Pythagoras, Socrates, the Academy and other Greek schools, such as the Cynics, Stoics, and Epicureans. The popularity of these schools rose and fell in the course of history – and mostly were unpopular – until the rise of rhetoric and education in the first century BCE. These schools become especially important when NT scholars use writers such as Cicero, Plutarch, and Seneca and other later witnesses to interpret Paul. The ancient writers most often used to interpret Paul knew not only Greek philosophies but also their Roman incarnations, poets, historians, and mythologies. When interpreting Paul in light of Cicero, Seneca, and Plutarch, we are also interpreting Paul in light of the more ancient traditions that have influenced these writers.

On this point, NT scholars have traced Paul’s usage of common elements of moral philosophies such as the household codes, the wise-person, suicide, the image of God, self-definition, divine inspiration, divorce and remarriage through the history


77 Malherbe, “Hellenistic Moralists,” 293-301.

78 Arthur J. Droge argues that Paul’s attitude towards life and death can be traced back through various schools of philosophy to Socrates: he is willing to commit a noble suicide if he must, but he would consider it a martyrdom “Mori Lucrum: Paul and Ancient Theories of Suicide,” NovT 30, no. 3 (1988): 263-86.


of philosophy (from Paul’s contemporaries back to ancient schools) and examined the relationship of Paul’s views with several different schools. This process raises some very important questions: what did Paul know and how did he learn it? What about his audiences? If we determine that either Paul or his audiences were educated, what does this imply about their social status?

Rhetorical critics generally assume that Paul and his audiences would have been aware of rhetorical conventions and popular moral philosophy due to the social contexts and conventions that they identify in his letters. Historians usually classify Greek and Latin education during the first century - at least for elite boys - as primary and secondary. Primary education would include basic grammar and the memorization of some definitive philosophical sentences and poetry. Secondary education would include a more advanced study of style, rhetoric, and important Greek and Latin traditions. Stanley Stowers has suggested that “Paul’s Greek educational level roughly equals that of someone who had primary instruction with a grammaticus, or teacher of letters, and then

Sperduti observes that Homer uses the same words (διοί, θείοι, διοτρεφείς, and διογενείς) to describe poets, seers, and kings: Il. 1.176; 2.196, 445; Od. 1.65, 196, 284; 2.27, 233, 394; 3.121; 4.17; 621, 691; 8.87, 539; 16.252; 17.359; 23.133; 143. “As the scepter of the king comes from Zeus and fillets are conferred upon holy men by Apollo, so, too, the words of the poets come from the gods,” Sperduti, “Divine Nature,” 209.

83 The availability of education to women is largely ignored and will be discussed below.
84 Henri Marrou, A History of Education in Antiquity (London: Sheed & Ward, 1956); Stanley F. Bonner, Education in Ancient Rome from the Elder Cato to the Younger Pliny (London: Methuen, 1977). Education for elite women is less studied but reflected in ancient monuments, letters, and other literary sources that will be examined in detail in chapter two.
had studied letter writing and some rhetorical exercises.”

However, other scholars have reviewed the same body of evidence and conclude on the basis of Paul’s extensive use of Greek philosophy and rhetoric that his education must be more extensive than Stowers suggests. Udo Schnelle, Ronald Hock, and Troels Engberg-Pederson have argued that Paul had a full Greek education. E. P. Sanders has most recently argued that Paul had an excellent education in the LXX, memorizing most of it at an early age, and a basic education in Greek language and the classics. The strongest argument for Paul’s education is his competent use of ancient rhetorical methods. However, Paul only quotes three fragments of Greek poets – which he may have learned without a Greek education – and instead he quotes traditions from Jewish heritage. Loveday Alexander argues that Paul cites the Greek poets and Jewish traditions in the manner taught on the secondary level. At the same time, Paul’s grammar and style do not demonstrate more advanced knowledge in Greek. For this reason, I am skeptical that Paul received a full Greek education. It seems most likely to me that Paul memorized the LXX at an early age, was


87 Sanders, Between Judaism and Hellenism, 80.

exposed to rhetoric and popular philosophy in the forums, and applied his Jewish theological insights in the manner that he understood to be most persuasive. 89

This assessment of Paul differs from two earlier trends in Pauline scholarship. First, if Paul’s knowledge of Greco-Roman philosophy came from a rudimentary education and exposure in the forums, his usage of philosophical concepts does not require an introduction of these ideas from his exposure to “gnostic” ideas or other Corinthian opponents. 90 Second, Paul’s Hellenism does not need to be mediated through contact with Philo or other constructions of Hellenized Judaism. 91

Then we come to the problem of the educational level of Paul’s audiences, and we rely on similar arguments and assumptions. Many NT scholars assume that at least some people in Paul’s audiences would have picked up on his usage of popular morality and rhetorical devices. This does not mean that the Pauline community at Corinth was a


91 For emphasis on “gnostic” ideas, see J. Jeremias, ἀνθρωπός, ἀνθρωπίνος,’ *TDNT* 1:364-7; R. Bultmann, *Der zweite Brief an die Korinther*, ed. E. Dinkler (Göttingen: Vandenhoek & Ruprecht, 1976), 126-9.

philosophical school, although it did have some resemblance to Hellenistic schools. Rather it suggests some degree of social stratification of Paul and his audiences because formal education was mostly reserved for the elite. It is possible that the elite were not in the Pauline community; however, they would be the most likely candidates to receive some education. What is critical, however, is some contact with the patronage system within the city. The access of Christians to homes in Galatia, Corinth, Philippi, and Rome evidences sustained interaction between elites and non-elites. The significance of this access to a home means that Paul’s audiences had access to all the benefits that the home provides: some measure of access to goods and services like legal protection, food, health care, art, music and education, regardless of social status. Because several of


Paul’s churches had access to these necessities, NT scholars generally consider that Paul could have been from a wealthier family and the early churches were economically diverse. At the same time, there is no small debate about Paul’s background.

The ongoing debate between Justin Meggitt, Dale Martin, Gerd Theissen and others demonstrates that Meggitt has not been successful in defeating previous thinking about Paul’s social status. He did, however, initiate a need for much clarification. It is worth noting that Balch has recently argued against Meggitt’s idea that the elite “1% lived entirely different lives than the other 99%” of the population based on the housing situation in Pompeii and Herculaneum. Bruce Winter has argued that the usage of

---


96 Here I do not specify Paul or the Corinthian community’s social position because the sources that I am reviewing do not agree on these specifics, but generally do agree that Paul and some members of the community are not without some means. Cf., P. Marshall, *Enmity in Corinth: Social Conventions in Paul’s Relations with the Corinthians* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1987); Daniel Schowalter and Steven Friesen, eds., *Urban Religion in Roman Corinth* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2005).


for the meeting places itself suggests an inner room of the home of an elite.  

However, it is not the simple mentioning of households in the Pauline literature that sustains the theory that the Pauline communities were socially stratified. Paul’s household management and structure reflects the management and structure of elite homes (father, wife, children, slaves hierarchy). The usage of καλέω in an invitation formula in 1 Cor. 10:27 parallels the elites’ invitations to dinner as preserved in papyri.

G. R. Horsely pointedly summarizes the importance of these papyri:

An interesting verbal affinity in the NT is 1 Cor. 10:27 εἰς τις καλέι ὑμᾶς τῶν ἀπίστων (εἰς δείπνον – these words only in D* G) κτλ. Further, the situation in 1 Cor. 8:10 may be seen in illuminating the perspective when the kline invitations are taken into account. The latter, too, may be brought to bear on the elucidation of 1 Cor. 11:17-22. The papyrus invitations, then, document in quite a striking manner the situation which would have been known as normal and everyday by the recipients of Paul’s letters at Corinth, and no doubt elsewhere.

In fact, connection to some wealthy patron in various cities may have been an important part of Paul’s missionary strategy. As Paul moved from city to city, he attempted to secure patrons who could provide various services to the young community.

---


100 John Stambaugh and David Balch, The New Testament in its Social Environment, ed. Wayne Meeks (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986), 140. Furthermore, Stambaugh and Balch note that the household structure that Paul demands is that of the upper class, with marriage and slaves, 124.


102 New Docs 1:9.
of Christ believers. These patronesses include Euodia and Syntyche (Phil. 2:2-3) in Philippi, as well as the tradition of Lydia, who while she may not be historical, is a testament to the memory of patronal support of Paul (Acts 16:14-15). The household contexts that indicate some connection with wealth are referenced in the letters to Galatia, Corinth, and Rome but contrast with the absence of households in the Thessalonian correspondence, a city in which Paul failed to secure a patron.

The book of Acts presents a level of support for Paul that is completely foreign to the Thessalonian epistles but comparable to the Corinthian correspondence. While not historically valuable in reconstructing Paul’s experiences, Acts does present an important scenario in which Paul’s mission could thrive: the critical support of benefactors. Acts indicates that wealthier women in Thessalonica and Jason (Acts 17:5-7) supported the church there, Beroea enjoyed the support of men and women, and Dionysius and Damaris were among Paul’s benefactors in Athens (Acts 17:4, 12, 34).

Paul was especially fortunate in Corinth: Phoebe of Cenchrae (Rom. 16:1-2), Gaius (Rom. 16:23; 1 Cor. 1:14), and Stephanus (1 Cor. 1:16, 16:15-17). Because the elite household – which included women, children, clients, slaves, and freedpersons - was just as much a source of education as the forum, we should not imagine that Paul’s


audiences knew of popular morality and rhetoric only from the public interaction of the male heads of the households. The οἶκος provided a medium by which everyone connected to it (wife, son, daughter, slaves and freedpersons) could have access to its benefits, among these being listening to philosophical discussions at the symposium, learning from a tutor, or being a tutor oneself. These discussions and teachings were most likely eclectic, drawing from a wide variety of philosophical traditions (Plato, Aristotle, Epicurean, Stoic, neo-Pythagorean) that have had an impact on New Testament studies. New Testament research has considered the importance of Pythagorean texts, Platonism, Cynicism, Stoicism, and Epicureanism in interpreting Paul. I will consider each of these briefly in turn.

Pythagoreanism

The history of the Pythagoreans is the most difficult and fragmentary in the history of philosophy due to its antiquity and the nature of the available sources. According to tradition, the original school consisted of Pythagoras and his family, and he forbade the teaching of his philosophy to outsiders, which eventually led to the important tradition of mothers passing on writings to their daughters. In the first century, interest in Pythagoras revived with the availability of Pythagorean sentences, the ἄκουσμα or

105 The most important works in English are Holger Thesleff, An Introduction to the Pythagorean Writings of the Hellenistic Period (Åbo: Åbo Academi, 1961); J. A. Philip, Pythagoras and the Early Pythagoreanism (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1966); Walter Burket, Lore and Science in Ancient Pythagoreanism (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1972); for texts see Holger Thesleff, The Pythagorean Texts of the Hellenistic Period; for translations of the Pythagorean corpus see Kenneth Gutherie, The Pythagorean Sourcebook and Library: An Anthology of Ancient Writings with Relate to Pythagoras and Pythagorean Philosophy (Grand Rapids: Phaney, 1988).
The most important sources for these sentences are the now lost commentaries by Aristotle and Androcydes the Pythagorean, hinting at both their antiquity and genuine association with Pythagoras or his followers. The writings of the Pythagorean pseudepigraphon are impossible to date, but many of the Pythagorean "akousma" or "aivigmata" which appear in the NT (only by parallel) and in many other first century and later writers such as Alexander Polyhistor, Plutarch, Clement of Alexandria, Hippolytus of Rome, Porphyry, and Iamblichus may be genuinely Pythagorean and indicate a renewal of Pythagorean traditions. This developing Pythagorean tradition may have had an impact on first century thought. It seems to me, that the pre-Socratic Pythagoreanism, Hellenistic neo-Pythagoreanism, and


108 Robert Grant’s review of Pythagoreanism in the NT is reduced to parallels only and no direct Pythagorean sentences appear, “Dietary Laws Among the Pythagoreans, Jews, and Christians,” HTR 73 (1980), 299-310. See also the studies referenced below. Cf., Burket who demonstrates that the curious Pythagorean diet is in the oldest traditions, Lore and Science, 180-5.


110 There is widespread consensus that the Pythagorean pseudepigraphon - that is, the collection of Hellenistic of writings which are attributed to classical Pythagorean philosophers - is evidence for a revived interested in Pythagoreanism in the first to
Christianities and Judaisms all had complex - albeit very slight - interweaving influences on one another. Johan Thom calls the Pythagorean influence on Hellenistic Judaisms “tangential,” and the references are slim. Philo attributes the saying “Do not walk on the highways” to “that saintly community of the Pythagoreans.” Louis Feldman suggests that Josephus makes Abraham parallel to Pythagoras, but the parallel does not have much force: like Pythagoras, Abraham goes to Egypt, but this is a familiar schema in traditions related to wise-persons. Robert Grant also notes that

second centuries. All related details, including the precise dating of the documents and whether or not there were neo-Pythagorean communities is widely disputed, for examples see C. J. De Vogel, Greek Philosophy, vol. III: The Hellenistic-Roman Period (Leiden: Brill, 1959), 340-53. It is critical here to distinguish between the neo-Pythagorean movement and the Pythagorean pseudepigraphon. The neo-Pythagorean movement was a movement in philosophy in the first century with renewed interest in genuine Pythagoreanism, and the Pythagorean pseudepigraphon arose out of this renewed interest but does not share a connection with Pythagorean philosophy.

111 See, for example the similarities and differences between genuine Pythagorean communities and the Essenes established in Justin Taylor, Pythagoreans and Essenes: Structural Parallels (Paris: Peeters, 2004).

112 Johan Thom, “Pythagoreanism,” ABD 5.564.

113 Philo, Quod omn. prob. 2. See the study by Erwin Goodenough, A neo-Pythagorean Source in Philo Judaicus (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1932). Eduard Schweizer discusses Pythagorean influences in Philo, Josephus, and Plutarch and argues that these elements have impact on how we should interpret Galatians and Colossians, “Slaves of the Elements and Worshipers of Angels: Gal 4:3, 9 and Col 2:8, 18, 20,” JBL 107, no. 3 (1989): 459. Schweizer suggests that Paul in Galatians and whoever wrote Colossians were responding to neo-Pythagorean influences, 466.


Josephus thought that Jewish dietary regulations came from Egypt.\textsuperscript{116} With regards to parallels, David Balch’s studies in the neo-Pythagorean writings and the NT household codes are the most important.\textsuperscript{117} On this point, it is necessary to emphasize that the neo-Pythagorean writings are “Pythagorean” only in the sense that they bear the names of known and unknown ancient Pythagoreans but contain no Pythagorean philosophy (such as music theory, geometry, doctrine of the soul and reincarnation, dietary restrictions) other than popular morality.

**Platonism**

Most of the conversation regarding Platonic influence on Paul centers on anthropological viewpoints expressed in Paul and his contemporaries. Precisely how Paul adopts Platonic divisions of the soul has significant impact on how interpreters approach Paul’s understanding of the human condition, the effects of sin, the meaning of salvation, the resurrection of the body, and freewill. Methodological problems arise from the fact that both Pauline and Platonic interpretations are constantly in flux, and the writings of both of these writers express developments on almost every important concept. Plato contradicts himself on almost everything (reflecting both his dialogical style and development of thought),\textsuperscript{118} and the development of Paul’s theologies and


anthropologies are not without dispute in NT scholarship. Nevertheless, some scholars trace some of Paul’s concepts to Plato. For example, Roy Bowen Ward argues that Paul’s view of homosexual contact as being “unnatural” in Romans 1:26-7 has its roots in *Timaeus* rather than *Laws*, and Ward concludes that Paul is arguing that sex κοτα φύσιν is only heterosexual and for procreation only. Navigating through the differing interpretations of both the apostle and Plato, several scholars have argued that Paul’s concept of the inner human being (ὁ ἐσω ἀνθρωπος) has its origins in Plato. Betz argues that Paul’s anthropology has its origins in Plato, but it was most likely developed in conversation with his collaborators rather than with his opponents (gnostic or


otherwise) or by interaction with ideas present in Philo. Emma Wassermann demonstrates that Paul’s notion of sin in Romans 6-8 is an appropriation of apocalyptic thought to a notion of Platonic immortality.

In contrast to scholars who have found concepts in Paul’s thought which may have originated in Plato, Athenagoras Ch. Zakopoulos reviews the supposed relationships between Plato and Paul and concludes that Paul has a monistic view of humanity that is completely uninfluenced by Plato. Instead, Paul embraces a Hebraic view that he expressed in Greek philosophical terms without adhering to their traditional philosophical meanings. Therefore, Paul could utilize and/or modify philosophical terms without commitment to a philosophical tradition and use them according to his specific needs.

The importance of Aristotle for the interpretation of Paul comes into play with his influence on later writers such as Cicero, Plutarch, and Seneca. Therefore, Aristotle’s works on ethics are the starting point of discussions regarding popular moral attitudes such as slavery, marriage and family life, and friendship. Similarly, Aristotle’s works

---


on poetics and rhetoric are the starting point for rhetorical studies, being influential in later sources such as Cicero and Quintilian.\textsuperscript{125}

Cynicism

Abraham Malherbe has consistently argued for locating Paul within Cynicism, concluding that Paul more closely aligned himself with moderate Cynics in his ethics and with the Epicureans in his concern for community. Malherbe situates Paul’s description of himself in 1 Thess as a specific type of ideal Cynic (a moderate rather than a highly ascetic) as described by Dio Chrysostom and pseudo-Diogenes.\textsuperscript{126} Dio says that some Cynics do not really enter the struggle \textit{(agon)} of life that Cynicism claims, preaching for money or self-gratification, using flattery and frank speech inappropriately. Like Paul’s, Dio’s ideal Cynic, such as Musonius or Demonax, is frank but gentle as a nurse. Malherbe further notes that many New Testament scholars use the problematic term “Cynic-Stoic” when referring to elements of Greco-Roman philosophy. He more clearly


defines self-sufficiency as moderately Cynic when he describes Paul’s notion of it in Phil. 4.\textsuperscript{127} Using the Cynic epistles, Malherbe again argues that the Cynics themselves did not hold to a unified canon of doctrine, but adjusted their behavior to suit their context, strengthening his position that Paul represents a more moderate view.\textsuperscript{128} Ronald Hock has suggested that Paul’s references to work and his refusal to accept payment from the Corinthians has Cynic connotations.\textsuperscript{129}

Stoicism

Early Christian interest in Stoicism is enduring. Marcia Colish has surveyed early Christian scholarship (from the fathers through scholasticism) on Stoicism and Paul, demonstrating early Christian affinity for Stoicism and how it complements Paul.\textsuperscript{130} Benjamin Fiore situates 1 Cor. 5-6 in philosophical discussion with Plutarch’s *Dialogue*


on Love.  

Biore compares Paul’s indifference to life and death (with respect to their impact on virtue and devotion to Christ) to the Stoic ἀδιάφορος  

– the external things that do not matter to the Stoic for happiness. Dale B. Martin has demonstrated that Paul’s idea of “the [Corinthian] body” embraces a Stoic anthropology. Troels Engberg-Pederson is the leading scholar on the relationship between Paul and the Stoics, arguing historical, exegetical, hermeneutical, and theological relationships between Paul and the Stoics. His primary focus is Paul’s usage of Stoic argumentation, concluding that Paul uses a distinctly Stoic form to implement his theology. Albert V. Garcilazo recently argued that the problems in Corinth are rooted in Stoic influences exerted by the higher status members of the community who adopted Stoic views concerning dualistic anthropology and cosmology. Engberg-Pederson has more recently argued that Paul’s cosmology of body and spirit (the pneuma is tied directly to heaven) finds a parallel in Stoicism (the idea that reason, heaven, and body are interconnected) and nowhere else.


Paul and Seneca

The relationship between Paul and Seneca in particular has been a favorite topic of conversation because of the striking similarities between the two and the historical connection whereby Acts 12:18 places Paul before Seneca’s brother, Gallio.\(^{137}\) Linus, Augustine, and Jerome wrote of correspondence between Seneca and Paul. Thirteen epistles exist that appear to document such correspondence, but the overwhelming consensus is that these epistles are forgeries. Kreyher has suggested that early Christian scholars knew of other letters that are now lost.\(^{138}\) The recent conversation on Seneca and Paul has focused on the similarities and differences in their theology, anthropology, and ethics. J. N. Sevenster structures his monograph around these questions.\(^{139}\) Engberg-


\(^{138}\) Kreyer, *Seneca*, 178.

Pederson has demonstrated that Paul uses the structures set out in Seneca’s system of benefaction in *De Beneficiis*.\(^{140}\)

**Epicureanism**

The discussion of Paul and Epicurean thought mostly relates to his anti-Epicurean tendencies.\(^{141}\) Abraham Malherbe situated Paul’s rhetoric in 1 Cor. 15:32 within anti-Epicurean polemic, which characterizes the Epicureans as “beasts.”\(^{142}\) Malherbe also understands the command to “work with your hands” as a correction to Epicurean and Cynic distaste for manual labor.\(^{143}\) Norman DeWitt is the leading authority on Epicurus and Paul, and consistently argues that Paul is Epicurean in theory and anti-Epicurean in practice.\(^{144}\) It is critical to note that DeWitt insists that Paul knew of the “Canon of Epicurus” (the basic tenants of Epicureanism) and accepted several of their theories but


guided his audiences away from Epicurean philosophy.\textsuperscript{145} For example, the Epicurean teaching that one can trust the senses to learn of reality appears in Paul’s notion of face to face knowledge (1 Cor 13:12) but in Colossians Paul warns the reader against the one who is “taking his stand on what he has seen.”\textsuperscript{146} Polemicists often ridiculed the Epicureans as a group that based their entire system of philosophy on their understanding of the ἀτομος: their entire cosmology and ethics rested on the smallest indivisible unit, giving the appearance of great weakness. Paul likewise directs his attention to “the weak and beggardly elements” but describes the resurrection with ἀτομος, which DeWitt notes that several scholars translate “in a moment.”\textsuperscript{147} Clarence Glad has produced a study on psychagogy (moral guidance for neophytes) in Paul and Philodemus. Like DeWitt, Clarence Glad suggests that Paul may have known about Epicurean principles of friendship and frankness as described in Philodemus and applied them in varying degrees to the “weak” and “strong” character types in 1 Corinthians and Romans.\textsuperscript{148} Malherbe argues that Paul’s ideas in 1 Thess are anti-Epicurean in many ways: Paul emphasized brotherly love rather than friendship language, the apostles are God-taught rather than self-taught, and his exhortation to live a quiet life is exclusive of the Epicurean ideal.

\textsuperscript{145} DeWitt, \textit{Paul and Epicurus}, 10.

\textsuperscript{146} The translation and assumption that both Corinthians and Colossians are genuinely Pauline belong to DeWitt, \textit{Paul and Epicurus}, 10.


community. Paul Holloway argues that Paul’s consolations in Phil 4.6-9 constitute a single consultation in the Epicurean style described by Cicero and implemented often by Plutarch.

**Evaluation**

In the first three sections of this chapter, I have briefly discussed the *Corpus Hellenisticum*, the publications of the *Hellenistic Moral Philosophy and Early Christianity Section of SBL* and current conversations regarding Paul and popular Hellenistic moral philosophy. Wettstein’s collection of Jewish, Greek, and Latin parallels to the New Testament inspired later scholars to review systematically Hellenistic references in the *Corpus Hellenisticum*. Contributions to the *Corpus Hellenisticum* have focused on bringing to light parallels regarding style as well as religious and political ideas. Most of the contributions to this project briefly but critically introduce a writer that is a near contemporary of Paul and then list parallels. W. C. Van Unnik suggested in 1964 that contributors work to provide both clear criteria for choosing a parallel and explanation of it in light of various contexts. This call for methodological reflection was not substantially observed until the volumes on Plutarch

---


151 Peter Van Der Horst is particularly fond of this method.
edited by Hans D. Betz appeared more than ten years later. In many ways, the work of the *Corpus Hellenisticum* culminated in the *Neuen Wettstein* and related studies, but scholars are continually working to discover and interpret similarities between Hellenistic writings and Paul. The great achievement of these studies is that they serve as one starting point for situating Paul within Hellenistic culture.

The Hellenistic Moral Philosophy and Early Christianity Section of the Society of Biblical Literature has produced four volumes of essays that describe the nature of friendship and patronage in the Pauline communities. These essays offer critical descriptions of friendship and patronage from the writings of Aristotle, Cicero, Plutarch, Seneca, and Philodemus that are invaluable in interpreting Paul’s writings. The group also published a collection of articles in honor of Abraham Malherbe which offers methodological insights and further exegesis of the New Testament in its Hellenistic contexts.

Further conversation concerning Paul and popular Hellenistic philosophy has produced important resources for identifying similarities and differences between Paul and all of the popular schools. The ancient Greek schools are important because Paul’s near contemporaries used these earlier schools to shape their thinking. Therefore, works on rhetoric and epistolary theory that use Quintilian, Cicero, and pseudo-Libanius begin with Aristotle’s *Rhetoric* and *Poetics*. Studies of Pauline ethics identify parallels in Cicero, Seneca, and Plutarch that have their roots in earlier Stoic, Epicurean, Cynic, Aristotelian, and Platonic ethics. The great achievement of these studies is the placement of Paul in contemporary moral conversations that have both precedence and antecedence in Greek and Roman thought.
While as a whole these approaches are invaluable, nevertheless, these conversations pay little attention to matters of gender, particularly the participation of women in these philosophical traditions. There is little consideration of the traditions of philosophically educated women in the ancient world and the possible involvement of such women in the Pauline communities as interpreters of Paul. With few exceptions, interest in such questions has been tangential at best in both New Testament and classical scholarship.

**The Conversation Concerning Women in Greco-Roman Philosophy**

The conversation regarding the history of scholarship on women in ancient philosophy is quite limited. The histories of the female teachers and students – as well as the wives, sisters, and daughters of male philosophers and women philosophers – are a neglected topic. The standard histories of philosophy, for example, are often silent regarding philosophically educated women. Alfred Weber shows no interest in the history of women in ancient philosophy, and neither do Alexander, Thilly, Webb, Durant, Alpern, Bréhier, Fuller, and Mascia. Copleston dismisses the lives of Pythagoras in his

---


biographers (who indicate that the early Pythagoreans passed on their teachings from mother to daughter), saying that they “can hardly be said to afford us reliable testimony, and it is doubtless right to call them romances.”154 Even works produced during the rise of feminism and onwards do not mention the most famous female philosophers (Theano, Diotima, and Hipparchia) or poets (Sappho, Erinna, and Nossis).155 Bertrand Russell mentions Hypatia but takes no interest in the ancient female philosophers.156 Ralph M. McInerny intimates that all of the biographical information concerning Pythagoras is legend (but seems to accept traditions related to the community from the same sources) and that Xanthippe is also a rhetorical figure.157 Stephen R. L. Clark mentions parenthetically that Crates’ wife Hipparchia accompanied him, but other than this note makes no mention of the involvement of women in ancient philosophy.158

Disinterest limits scholarly discussion and consideration of the roles of women in the history of philosophy. Historians of philosophy know their sources well and therefore


have read about the mothers, female teachers, students, wives, sisters, and daughters of
the philosophers – and about the traditions of intense female involvement in
Pythagoreanism, Epicureanism, or Stoicism - so it does not appear to be ignorance that
accounts for the silence of historians concerning philosophically educated women. The
scope of most histories of Hellenistic philosophies is limited to important shifts in Greek
thinking, and because these historians have identified no woman who founded a school or
made a significant contribution to shaping Greek thought, the activity of women in
philosophy is ignored. Nevertheless, the sources that historians have used to
reconstruct the thinking of ancient philosophers contain witness to the activity of women
that is useful for reconstructing the history of philosophically educated women.

There are, however, a few scholars who have directed their attention to the
question of the history of women’s involvement in philosophy. The interest in the topic
begins in our time with Mary Beard’s germinal work, which inspired later generations of
scholars to begin to recover the roles of women in ancient history. However, most
studies on women and the history of philosophy deal with the idea of woman in
philosophy, the ideology of women’s liberation, or women who were active after the
third century CE (e.g., Hypatia and beyond). Aegidius Menagius’s seventeenth

---


161 Nancy Tuana, *Woman and the History of Philosophy* (New York: Paragon House, 1992); Linda McAlister, ed. *Hypatia’s Daughters: Fifteen Hundred Years of*
century work *Historia Mulierum Philosopharum*, translated by Beatrice Zeller, in 1984 caused renewed interest in the topic of philosophically educated women.¹⁶² Sarah B. Pomeroy has reviewed the literary and archeological evidence for the education of women in the ancient world, but her work seems completely ignored by historians of philosophy.¹⁶³ Richard Hawley wrote a brief article on the problems related to reconstructing the histories of women in ancient philosophy, noting the challenges presented by the close association of female philosophers with men – either they are the wives, daughters, or lovers of the philosophers and all of the traditions are preserved by male writers.¹⁶⁴ Kathleen Wilder produced an article on ancient women philosophers, but her work does not improve on that of Ménage.¹⁶⁵ Mary Ellen Waithe is uncritical in her identification of many philosophers and their teachings in her *Ancient Women Philosophers, 600 B.C.-500 A.D*, which, being little more than a translation of neo-
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Pythagorean pseudepigraphon, has not been well received because of its unreliability.\footnote{166} Ethel M. Kersey produced a sourcebook of women philosophers that is almost exclusively reliant on Ménage and Waithe for ancient sources, and Kersey offers minimal critical notes.\footnote{167} Sarah B. Pomeroy’s review of the status of research on women in the ancient world mentions none of these studies, nor any other that specifically addresses the history of philosophically educated women.\footnote{168} Kate Lindemann owns and operates a website that has a credible list of female philosophers from all over the world with minimal critical notes.\footnote{169} Another collaborative bibliography on women in philosophy with a corresponding website that posts updates to the work appears to be abandoned.\footnote{170}


\footnote{167} Ethel M. Kersey, \textit{Women Philosophers: A Bio-Critical Source Book} (New York: Greenwood, 1989). Unfortunately, Kersey does not expand on the social characteristics of women in the ancient world farther than the seclusion of Athenian women in 5\textsuperscript{th} century BCE.


\footnote{170} E. M. Barth, \textit{Women Philosophers: A Bibliography of Books Through 1990} (Bowling Green, Ohio: Philosophy Documentation Center, 1992); Noël Hutchings and William D. Rumsey, eds., \textit{The Collaborative Bibliography of Women in Philosophy} (Bowling Green, Ohio: Philosophy Documentation Center, 1997). The vision of the \textit{Collaborative Bibliography} was broad: to create an international bibliography of female philosophers together with a list of their works. Unfortunately this project seems to be
Ancient papyri, monuments, and other literary sources indicate the education of women from various social status during our time period.\textsuperscript{171} As a whole, modern critical review of the history of women in philosophy and scholarly dialogue on the topic are limited to a smattering of articles and a few monographs.\textsuperscript{172} The most recent study of the history of abandoned. The online database \url{http://billyboy.ius.indiana.edu/WomeninPhilosophy/WomeninPhilo.html} is no longer accessible (last attempted Feb 6, 2012), and no further editions of the bibliography have been produced.


women in philosophy appears in a chapter of Joan E. Taylor’s *Jewish Women Philosophers of First Century Alexandria*. Taylor reviews the primary sources of Menagius and Waithe and concludes that the traditions of women in philosophy are encased in misogynistic rhetoric. Nevertheless, misogynistic rhetoric of ancient philosophers does not nullify the usefulness of these sources concerning historicity of philosophically educated women because archaeological and papyrological evidence supports the methods of education found in these literary sources. Furthermore, there is evidence of woman-to-woman sharing of philosophical reflections and female heads of households bringing into the home whatever they desire – be it slaves, art, poetry, or philosophers.

**Philosophically Educated Women Reading Paul: A Neglected Topic**

Some contributors to the *Corpus Hellenisticum* and the Hellenistic Moral Philosophy and Early Christianity Section of the SBL have highlighted similarities between ancient literature and Paul that have some relevance to the question of educated women in the community. Where the contributors have demonstrated some important similarities between Paul and important sources for reconstructing ancient philosophically educated women, scholars typically neglect interpreting Paul in light of this important context. For example, *Plutarch’s Ethical Writings and Early Christian and Rome*, ed. Martha C. Nussbaum and Juha Sihvola (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002), 222-82.


174 This evidence will be presented and evaluated in chapter three.
Literature contains Plutarch’s essays “On Consolation to his Wife,” “The Virtues of Women,” and the “Dinner of the Seven Sages.” These dialogs offer rich insight as to how women had access to philosophy and the nature of dinner parties in the ancient world. Hubert Martin, Jr., and Jane E. Philipps situate Plutarch’s consolation to his wife within Greco-Roman rhetoric and philosophy, concluding that he follows pseudo-Dionysius’s Rhetoric for its form and common philosophical themes for its content. In her review of “The Virtues of Women,” Kathleen O’Brien Wicker does not consider the social status of women when interpreting Paul’s instructions, as does Plutarch in his “Advice to the Bride and Groom,” where wealthier women are exempt from moral norms associated with women of lower status. David Aune observes that Plutarch in “Dinner of the Seven Sages” and Paul in 1 Corinthians share the same interest in behavior at the symposium. Related to the silence of women and order in the church, Betz and Smith note that in 1 Cor. 14:33-4 there are two parallels to Plutarch, Moralia 385c which includes: πανταχὼν τριῶν νομιζομένων ([the Muses] are understood as three) and τὸ μηδεμιᾶ γυναικὶ πρὸς τὸ χρηστήριον εἶναι προσέλθεῖν (no woman is allowed to approach the oracle) – the argument for unity (1 Cor. 4:14; 7:17) and sacred law (cf., 1 Clem. 23:1; 29:1). Finally, Balch’s articles concerning the neo-Pythagoreans often

178 Betz and Smith, “The Delphic Maxim,” 223.
address writings attributed to women, but he does not imagine philosophically educated women encountering Paul.

The publications of the *Hellenistic Moral Philosophy and Early Christianity Section of SBL* occasionally address issues related to ancient women. *Philodemus in the New Testament World* has an essay devoted to women in the Garden of Epicurus. In it, Pamela Gordon argues that most of the women that we know of were in the first generation of the Garden, although the practice survived for hundreds of years.\(^\text{179}\) Unfortunately, she does not consider how this tradition relates to Diogenes of Oenoanda, who wrote a letter to his mother explaining how she should practice Epicurean philosophy.\(^\text{180}\) Fragment nine of David Konstan’s translation of *Philodemus: On Frank Criticism* preserves a teaching of Leontion without comment.

Recent examples that specifically address popular Hellenistic philosophy in 1 Corinthians do not fare better than classical studies.\(^\text{181}\) For example, John T. Fitzgerald’s study of the quite popular teaching concerning hardships that the ideal teacher overcomes (fear of death, loss of wealth, exile, loss of honor, etc.) gives attention to Stoic elements in 1 Cor. 4:7-13 but does not address how philosophically educated women would


\(^{180}\) C. W. Chilton, *Diogenes of Oenoanda, The Fragments* (London: Oxford University Press, 1971). Fragment 52 preserves a letter of Epicurus to his mother, in which he asks her to interact with his philosophy, see Chilton, *Diogenes*, 19; 108-13; see especially 130, ‘the author is emphasizing the necessity of pursuing philosophy in order to dispel fear (of death and/or the gods?) and attain perfect happiness.’

respond to this content. Stanley Stowers discusses Paul’s usage of self-mastery (1 Cor. 7:9; 9:25) and the lack of it (1 Cor. 7:5), without reference to how the same principles are applied to women in Seneca and Musonius Rufus. The nature of Paul’s application of self-control in his usage of the agon motif (1 Cor. 9:24-7) has received attention by Pfitzner and Brändl, and again women’s interpretation of the text is not addressed. Robert Grant has identified some philosophical terms in 1 Corinthians that pertain to women: the use of “shameful” and “beneficial” in 1 Cor. 11:5-6 (head-coverings and the participation of women in worship) and 14:35 (women speaking in church). Grant, however, does not consider how philosophically educated women might engage 1 Cor 11-14. He does note that the form and content of the marriage regulations in 1 Cor 7 have important parallels to Diogenes Laertius 6.29 and Epictetus, Diss 3.24.60; 6.1.159. Grant also concludes that Paul’s use of “conscious scruples” in 1 Cor. 10:27-9 is not specifically Stoic, “but it is part of the baggage carried by an ordinary educated Greco-Roman man.” Jeffery Asher has traced the concept of the anthropogenic metaphor (sowing as the origin of humanity) in 1 Cor. 15:42-44 through Greco-Roman thought,

182 The importance of self-sufficiency in the Corinthian correspondence is made evident by John T. Fitzgerald, Cracks in an Earthen Vessel: An Examination of the Catalogues of Hardships in the Corinthian Correspondence (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988), 117-84.


concluding that Paul’s *male* readers would have been familiar with the metaphor that is common in mythology and philosophy. While these studies make significant contributions to understanding Paul and his sources in their Hellenistic context, the question of how philosophically educated women would interact with these texts remains unasked. One possible reason for this unasked question may be due to the disinterest in philosophically educated women in classical scholarship. However, another important work on women in the Corinthian church requires special attention.

**The Corinthian Women Prophets and the Philosophically Educated Women**

Antionette Wire’s valuable work *The Corinthian Women Prophets: A Reconstruction through Paul’s Rhetoric* addresses the activity of women prophets in the Corinthian church. Wire describes the women prophets as poor, uneducated, and low-born, but rising in status and builds an interpretation of 1 Corinthians with an interest in these women. In contrast to the women prophets, Paul held a higher status before he preached the gospel; however, at the time of writing 1 Corinthians, he was in a state of status loss. The rising status of the Corinthian women stems from the wisdom and power attributed to them by the community because of their roles as prophets in the church. Wire argues that the women prophets are among “the many” that Paul refers to in 1 Cor. 1:26, and those that Paul mentions as owning homes were most likely artisans. Wire also writes, “A society where women are not found in schools, courts, or councils could not

---


have produce many learned or politically powerful women for religious recruitment.\textsuperscript{188} I will argue that there indeed were women found in schools, courts, and active in poetry, philosophy, and other intellectual arts. Furthermore, philosophical schools that were traditionally open to the involvement of women were active in Corinth in the first century, and were available for religious recruitment. Because of these contexts, we should consider how such women would read the text.

The most important departure from Wire is that this dissertation examines 1 Corinthians with an interest in how two philosophically educated patronesses would read the text. All of our texts overlap: this dissertation interprets 1 Corinthians 1-4, Paul’s teachings on divorce and marriage in chapter 7, and the \textit{agon} motif in chapter 9. As a secondary focus, other issues in 1 Corinthians will be examined for what they can say about philosophically educated women and their contexts: the situation relating to the step-mother and step-son in chapter 5, lawsuits in chapter 6, the nature of household worship, and head-coverings. These texts of course say different things about women prophets. When Wire examines these issues, she does so with an interest in what these texts have to say about her women prophets within their social contexts. Our interest will be in how higher status philosophically educated women would read the same texts, and what is true for women prophets may not be true for philosophically educated women: they are two different groups of women who experience and interact with the text differently. Therefore, there are many points of agreement and disagreement between this

\textsuperscript{188} Wire, \textit{Corinthian Women Prophets}, 63, then on page 76 she says that the appearance of women in courts is rare.
dissertation and Wire’s work because they both address women in 1 Corinthians, the most significant of which will be noted as they appear below in chapters 5, 6, and 7.

In this dissertation, I identify “philosophically educated women” as women who have come into contact with enough philosophical teaching from any school to identify and interact with components of 1 Corinthians which have points of connection with basic tenets of Greco-Roman philosophy. “Women philosophers” were of course “philosophically educated women,” but male philosophers were obviously not. That is the only distinction that I make between “philosophically educated women” and male philosophers. I use the term “philosophically educated women” because they are the topic of the dissertation and the focus of my argument. That is, I am not arguing that women philosophers were in the Corinthian community, and if that were the case, the term “women philosophers” would replace “philosophically educated women.” On that note, it is very important to clarify that the New Testament was ridiculed by many Roman thinkers: the philosopher Celsus (2nd CE),\textsuperscript{189} Porphyry the neo-Platonist, Macarius Magnes the neo-Platonist (4th CE), Sossianus Hierocles (a Roman aristocrat, fl. early 4th CE) and Julian the neo-Platonist (emperor, 331-363). Christianity was also criticized by Pliny the Younger (61-112 CE), Lucian (125-80 CE), and Galen (c. 129-217 CE).\textsuperscript{190} Because these thinkers rejected Christianity based on their understanding of Greek and Roman philosophy, we can expect women philosophers representing these schools


would also be hostile to Paul’s message. It is safe to assume that a woman philosopher would not be attracted to Christianity, but a philosophically educated woman who has broad intellectual interests could identify with and engage popular philosophical teachings embedded in Paul’s teachings and letters.

**Moving Forward**

In this dissertation, I will show that the history of the involvement of women in philosophy, according to a variety of important sources, indicates that a wide variety of women could have received some degree of philosophical education: elite women, freedwomen, wives and daughters of traveling philosophers, and slaves. I will argue that the least that we could expect these women to know well comprises three themes: patronage, marriage and family, and self-sufficiency. First, I will demonstrate that friendship and patronage are common in philosophical writings addressed to and written by women and are important for the interpretation of 1 Corinthians. Second, each philosophical school had teachings related to family life. Finally, each school had some concept of the ideal teacher that was characterized by some level of self-control. The Cynic-Stoic doctrine of self-sufficiency, along with its most common usage in the *agon* motif, stands at the intersection of the most popular philosophies in the first century. The *agon* motif is the common athletic metaphor that philosophers used to explain the importance of training oneself to have adequate mental and physical self-control to live the good life that is marked by self-sufficiency. I will address the question of how philosophically educated women familiar with these four themes would interact with 1 Corinthians concerning the presentation of Paul as ideal teacher, self-sufficiency and
Paul’s apostleship, Paul’s use of friendship language, and his teachings on marriage and family life.

In chapters two and three, I will review the history of women in philosophy as described in ancient sources and reconstruct what education we could expect such women to have. Chapter four will describe the state of philosophy in Corinth in the early part of the first century and its significance for understanding 1 Corinthians as well as discuss and evaluate the place of women among the Corinthian believers. Chapters five, six, and seven will address the results of chapters two, three, and four in light of how philosophically educated women might engage Paul’s material that has parallels in the most popular philosophical teachings: (1) friendship and patronage and Paul’s relationships with people who were connected to the patronage systems in Corinth, (2) teachings concerning marriage that Paul applies to worship regulations, and (3) self-sufficiency and Paul’s usage of the *agon* motif. The final chapter will review the work as a whole, illustrating the significance of philosophically women interacting with certain elements of popular moral philosophy employed by Paul in 1 Corinthians.
CHAPTER 2:
EDUCATED WOMEN IN THE ANCIENT WORLD

This dissertation approaches three major elements in 1 Corinthians in light of what can be known about philosophically educated women in the ancient world. Many New Testament scholars have already identified strong relationships and parallels between Pauline thought and ancient philosophies. The ongoing Corpus Hellenisticum project has focused on the Stoic Hierocles and the neo-Pythagorean pseudepigraphon, but its contributors have not considered how philosophically educated women would have read 1 Corinthians. Similarly, the members of the Hellenistic Moral Philosophy and Early Christianity Section of SBL and other scholars who have found parallels to Paul in Pythagorean, Platonism, Cynicism, Stoicism, and Epicureanism have not addressed this question. The histories of philosophically educated women are severely marginalized in classical scholarship.

In chapters two and three, I will review the histories of philosophically educated women in both Greece and Rome. It is important to consider the women philosophers of the classical period because thinkers of the Roman period refer to these women as examples and inspiration for women of their time. I will argue that the histories of philosophically educated women indicate a strong tradition of the involvement of women in every school of popular philosophy which NT scholars have found useful for interpreting Paul: (neo-)Pythagoreanism, Platonism, Cynicism, Stoicism, and Epicureanism. I will also argue that the tradition indicates that women from a broad
social background had access to philosophy: female teachers who were poor, women who were married or related to poor teachers, elite women who were educated as girls, and elite patronesses who supported philosophers and could bring teachers into their homes. In this chapter I will discuss the education of women; in chapter three the active involvement of women in philosophy.

**Educated Women in the Ancient Greece and Rome**

The evidence for the education of women needs to be addressed in the context of education in general, and the scope of this chapter requires a brief discussion of early Greek education as well as education during the Roman period. These next two chapters will prepare for the subsequent discussion of 1 Corinthians by examining the education of women in the ancient world. Considering that women were involved in all other aspects of Greek and Roman education, we can expect that some women would receive some education in philosophy. The female students and teachers of Pythagoras, Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle for example, should be contextualized in the early Greek art and papyri that testify to the education of women during those time periods. Similarly, the later traditions of the involvement of women in philosophy as students and teachers can be contextualized in monuments, statues, and letters written to and by women during the Roman period. In this chapter, I will discuss the involvement of women in every
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form of education: primarily medicine, writing, and poetry [which may require literacy], and secondarily dance, athletics, oratory, and music [which does not require literacy], and finally their participation in philosophy. A word of caution is needed at this juncture: the historical record is partial and frequently more interested in men than women. Of necessity, our approach will therefore be wide-ranging and eclectic. Nevertheless, a picture emerges of women educated in various disciplines and for a range of tasks.

I will ask several questions of this large body of research. First, what is the reliability of the historical existence of philosophically educated women? In other words, how historically reliable are the ancient witnesses, both epigraphic and in some cases, portraits and depictions of education concerning philosophically educated women? Secondly, what did these women know and how did they learn? The questions, of course, overlap, and I will attempt to untangle it in such a way that demonstrates that philosophically educated women would have heard and interacted with 1 Corinthians.

**The Educated Woman at Work: Doctors, Scribes, and Merchants**

Education during the Greek and Roman periods can be measured in two interwoven ways: evidence for literacy, and evidence of learning and teaching. We know that the ability to read and write may not include education in science, logic, 192

---

mathematics, and philosophy. Some philosophers and other thinkers could not read or write, having memorized texts that were read to them, and employed literate slaves or freedpersons to read and write for them.

William Harris argues, along with several other scholars, that literacy in the Greek and Roman worlds can be divided into three types: literacy, semi-literacy, and illiteracy.\textsuperscript{193} Literacy is described as the full literacy of a portion of the (typically) elite – they were able to read literature and philosophy. An example of a fully literate woman is the first century historian Pamphila of Epidaurus. She is a scholar who is said to have produced 33 books on Greek history (of which 11 fragments remain), and showed an interest in Greek historians, philosophers, and politicians.\textsuperscript{194} Like other philosophically educated women, she learned from a family member and then practiced philosophy herself. One fragment of her writing indicates that she learned from her husband, but Plant points out that she must have also had access to a great library, and produced much of her work on her own.\textsuperscript{195} Semi-literacy is a quite broad category into which most literate people in the ancient world fit: it was the level of literacy that was required of artisans to do their jobs, including but not limited to accounting, recording inventory, and writing receipts, and even the person who could read graffiti or make a single letter on an ostraca to vote. The great majority of people in the ancient world were illiterate.

\textsuperscript{193} For bibliography see Harris, \textit{Ancient Literacy}, 7-8, 327-8. These levels of literacy are a common theme in the book, and Harris provides many examples. Cf., Nicholas Hornfall, “Statistics or State of Mind,” in \textit{Literacy in the Roman World}, ed. Mary Beard, et al. (Ann Arbor, Mich.: Journal of Roman Archaeology, 1991): 59-76.


\textsuperscript{195} Plant, \textit{Women Writers}, 127.
Literacy is most clearly associated with occupations that required some literacy.\(^{196}\)

Some level of literacy is required of scribes, medical practitioners (doctors, midwives, and nurses), and merchants; women served in all of these capacities.\(^{197}\) Female scribes in the ancient world were mostly of the lower class, serving as slaves or freedpersons in a household or in a public setting.\(^{198}\) K. Haines-Eitzen has found eleven female scribes in CIL, all of them dated 1\(^{st}\) BCE to 2\(^{nd}\) CE. Some examples are useful to mention:

In these inscriptions we meet with Hapate, a shorthand writer of Greek (notariae Grece) who lived twenty-five years (CIL 6.33892); Corinna, who was a storeroom clerk or scribe, cell(ariae) libr(ariae) (CIL 6.3979); and Tyche, Herma, and Plaetoriae, all three of whom are identified as amanuenses (CIL 6.9541; CIL 6.7373; CIL 6.9542). We also find four women who are identified by the title


libraria, a term that not only denoted a clerk or secretary, but also more specifically a literary copyist.\textsuperscript{199}

These scribes were not mindless copyists:\textsuperscript{200} they interacted with the text, correcting grammatical and syntactical errors, and sometimes even revising the texts to their liking.\textsuperscript{201} Furthermore, female scribes sometimes worked for female patrons:

...a certain Grapte is identified in one inscription as the amanuensis of Egnatia Maximilla—a woman who, according to Tacitus, accompanied her husband, Glitius Gallus, when he was exiled by Nero. Furthermore, we know that this Egnatia Maximilla had a substantial personal fortune; it should not be surprising, therefore, that she had her own personal amanuensis.\textsuperscript{202}

Haines-Eitzen’s analysis of the inscriptions brings several important points to light. Most of the female scribes were lower class slaves or freedpersons, all of them were in urban contexts, were educated at home or from an apprenticeship, and were typically supported by patrons or patronesses who were wealthy.

Rebecca Fleming has recently analyzed the evidence relating to female physicians in the ancient world, concluding that several female physicians from all around the Mediterranean were literate and contributed to medical knowledge through writing in the


\textsuperscript{202} Haines-Eitzen, “Scribes,” 635; Tac. \textit{Ann.} 15.71
Roman period. Two examples are instructive of the role that educated women played in the practice of medicine:

The funerary stele of ‘Mousa, physician, daughter of Agathocles’, from Hellenistic Byzantium, for example, shows her holding a book-roll (as do a handful of representations of male physicians); and, in early imperial Rome, the freedwoman Naevia Clara is labeled ‘physician and scholar’ (medica philologa) on the stele that commemorates both her and her husband L. Naevius, also a freedman, and ‘physician and surgeon’ (medicus chirurgus).

There are a few monuments that attest to female doctors:

\begin{quote}
'\text{Αντιοχίς Διοδότο\(\nu\)} | \text{Τλω\(\iota\)ς μαρτυρη\(\tau\iota\) \(\tau\iota\iota\)}
\text{σα ύπο τ\(\iota\)ς Τλω\(\iota\)\(\omicron\)\(\omicron\)\(\omicron\)ων} | \text{Βουλ\(\iota\)ς κα\(\iota\) τ\(\omicron\)\(\omicron\) δ\(\omicron\)\(\omicron\)}
\text{μο\(\iota\) \(\epsilon\iota\pi\iota\)} \(\tau\iota\iota\) \(\pi\iota\iota\) \(\tau\iota\iota\iota\)
\text{\(\chi\nu\iota\nu\) \(\epsilon\iota\pi\iota\iota\iota\) \(\iota\iota\iota\iota\)}
\text{\(\epsilon\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\)} \(\tau\iota\iota\) \(\alpha\nu\)
\text{\(\delta\rho\iota\iota\iota\iota\)} \(\epsilon\alpha\omega\tau\iota\iota\).
\end{quote}

Antiochis, daughter of Diodotus, of Tlos, marked by the council and people of Tlos for her achievement in the medical art, erected this statue of herself.

The Empiricist Heraclides of Taras addresses Antiochis as a colleague in a letter.

Soranus of Ephesus (1\textsuperscript{st} century CE) writes that the midwife should be trained in theory

\begin{thebibliography}{9}


\end{thebibliography}
by reading books and by practice. How these women learned medicine is important to my argument. Antiochis is referenced in Galen as an authority for various remedies (12.691 and 13.250, 13.341). Most likely, her father taught her the art of medicine. Antiochis’s father, Diodotus, is almost certainly the notable physician Diodotus mentioned in Dioscorides. The father teaching sons or daughters his craft could be indicative of the poor artisan, whereas the wealthier doctors could learn from books, slaves, or famous doctors.

Soranas describes the qualifications of an ideal midwife, which includes literacy and a quick intellect:

ἐπιτήδειος δὲ ἐστὶν ἡ γραμμάτων ἔντος, ἀγχίνους, μνήμων, φιλόπονος, κόσμιος καὶ κατὰ τὸ κοίνον ἀπαρεμπόδιστος ταῖς αἰσθήσεις, ἀρτιμελής, εὐτυνός, ὅς δ’ ἐνιοί λέγοσιν καὶ μακροὺς καὶ λεπτοὺς ἔχουσα καὶ τοὺς τῶν χειρῶν δακτύλους καὶ ὑπεστάλκοτας ταῖς ῥάξιν του ὀνύχας. γραμμάτων μὲν ἕντος εἶναι, ἵνα καὶ διὰ θεωρίας τὴν τέχνην ἱσχύσῃ παραλαβεῖν ἀγχίνους δὲ πρὸς τὸ ῥαξίν τοῖς λεγομένοις καὶ γινομένοις παρακολουθεῖν μνήμων δὲ, ἵνα καὶ τῶν παραδιδομένων ἀποκρατῆ μαθημάτων μάθησις γὰρ ἐκ μνήμης γίνεται καὶ καταλήψεως.

A suitable person will be literate, have her wits about her, possessed of a good memory, loving work, respectable and generally not unduly handicapped as regards

---


208 The 1st CE doctor Cleopatra the Physician was also used extensively by Galen, 12.235, 381, 405, 446. Plant notes that she is known to Titus Statilus Crito (2nd CE), Galen (3rd CE), Aëtus of Amida, 8.6 (6th CE), Paulus of Aegina 3.2.1 (7th CE), and John Tzetes (17th CE). Nothing is known concerning her biography.

her senses, sound of limb, robust, and according to some people, endowed with long slim fingers and short nails at her fingertips. She must be literate in order to be able to comprehend the art through theory too; she must have her wits about her so that she may easily follow what is said and what is happening; she must have a good memory to retain the imparted instructions (for knowledge arises from memory of what has been grasped).\textsuperscript{210}

Generally speaking, most ancient medical practitioners were of lower social status, and doctors were often viewed as untrustworthy and unreliable.\textsuperscript{211} However, some higher status writers remember women doctors who were, at least in their opinion, gifted healers. Galen (c. 129-217 CE) attributes many remedies to women, some of which were written by women.\textsuperscript{212} Other writers refer to the contributions of women for their understanding of medicine: Pliny the Elder (\textit{NH} 28.38, 28.83, 28.81, 20.226), pseudo-Galen (19.767), and Aetius (16.12).\textsuperscript{213} Other women doctors are attested in ancient sources: Philinna of Thessaly, Salpe of Lesbos (Plin. \textit{HN} 28.7), Laïs of Corinth (late 1\textsuperscript{st}

\begin{flushright}

\textsuperscript{211} Darrell W. Amundsen presents several well-known references from Greek and Roman writers concerning the mistrust for doctors in ancient times, famous for killing or extorting people using the knife or poisons, “The Liability of the Physician in Roman Law,” in \textit{International Symposium on Society, Medicine, and the Law}, ed. H. Karplus (Amsterdam: Elsevier, 1973), 17-31. S. L. Mohler suggests that most doctors in the ancient world were freedmen, and slave boys were their apprentices, “Slave Education in the Roman Empire,” \textit{TAPA} 71 (1940), 265 n. 6. Laws concerning doctors were often combined with supersticions concerning magic, Clyde Pharr, “The Interdiction of Magic in Roman Law,” \textit{TAPA} 63 (1932): 269-95.


Women learning medicine from a family member (at least in part) reflects the fact that while there were “ancient medical schools” in Cos, Cnidus, Alexandria, Rome, Pergamon, Symrna, and Ephesus, most doctors learned medicine in an apprenticeship to a member of the family (a father or spouse) or one’s master (whether the student is a male or female slave). The physician Glycon honored his wife Panthea, also a physician, with the inscription, “[you] raised high our common fame in healing – though you were a woman you were not behind me in skill.” Restituta (Rome, 1st CE) learned medicine as a freedwoman or slave under her patron, and Aurelia Alexandria Zosime and Auguste most likely learned from their husbands (who are mentioned in their inscriptions). There may even be an example of a woman teaching another woman medicine. Terentia Prima is known as a medica in Rome in the first or second century CE, and she perhaps had a freedwoman apprentice. Minucia Asste, also a medica, may


have learned medicine from her matron.\textsuperscript{217} This is not unlike how women and men would learn philosophy (and indeed, the histories of medicine and philosophy significantly overlap). The medical historian Plino Pioreschi writes, “medicine did not develop by itself, in a vacuum, on the basis of purely empirical evidence, but was first an integral part of philosophy.”\textsuperscript{218}

In both the Greek\textsuperscript{219} and Roman\textsuperscript{220} periods, women served other vocations that required some level of literacy and education. Three fourth century BCE inscriptions mention female grocers: Mania,\textsuperscript{221} Thraitta,\textsuperscript{222} and Parthenia.\textsuperscript{223} A mid-second century CE relief shows a butcher at work, with his wife seated, keeping the books.\textsuperscript{224} Two late

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{217} Rome 1\textsuperscript{st} BCE or 1\textsuperscript{st} CE. CIL 6.9615 (33812); Gummerus, Ärztestand, no. 112; Korpela, Medizinalpersonal, no. 43.}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{218} Plino Pioreschi, A History of Medicine, 2\textsuperscript{nd} ed. (Omaha: Horatius, 1996), 2:204; Philip J. Van der Eilk has contributed many essays concerning this inter-relationship in his book Medicine and Philosophy: Doctors and Philosophers on Nature, the Soul, Health and Disease (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{219} Susan I. Rotroff and Robert D. Lamberton, Women in the Agora (Athens: The American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 2006).}


\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{221} IG 3.387.G. Lefkowitz and Fant, Women’s Life, 324.}


\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{224} Dresden, Staatliche Kuntstsammlungen, Inv. ZV 44. Eve D’Ambra, Roman Women (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 137.}
second century CE reliefs found at Ostia depict women selling a wide variety of items.\textsuperscript{225} A grocer in Greek or Roman times would have to manage several relationships: their many wholesalers, customers, and their patron who may lease a place to sell at the markets. Some sizable transactions would likely have been written for bookkeeping and legal reasons.\textsuperscript{226}

\textbf{The Educated Woman: Greek and Roman Poets}

The education of women in the ancient world is demonstrated most clearly in poetry.\textsuperscript{227} Greek and Roman female poets were quite popular in ancient life, and the traditions related to female poets are as old as Homer.\textsuperscript{228} Sappho of Lesbos is perhaps most intriguing because she is the most ancient female poet and enjoys enduring popularity.\textsuperscript{229} In her lifetime, it is likely that she ran a school of poetry for girls.\textsuperscript{230}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Harris, \textit{Ancient Literacy}, 200.
\item For text, translation, and critical commentary on many of the poets mentioned in this section, see Kathryn J. Gutzwiller, \textit{Poetic Epigrams: Hellenistic Epigrams in Context} (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998); for the general context of poetry without a focus on women, particularly the competitive and symposium contexts, see Derek Collins, \textit{Master of the Game: Competition and Performance in Greek Poetry} (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004).
\item Sappho’s biographical information is preserved in P. Oxy. 1800 and the \textit{Suda}, ‘Sappho;’ cf., OCD, “Sappho.” Bibliography and online text and translation for the \textit{Suda} is available by Raphael Finkel et al, “Suda On Line: Byzantine Lexicography,” \textit{Suda On}
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
poetry was cited by a wide variety of ancient poets, philosophers, and thinkers.\textsuperscript{231}

Maximus of Tyre says that Socrates learned of love from a foreigner: either Sappho of Lesbos (the poet = Pl. \textit{Phaedr.} 230e, 235c) or from a woman from Mantinea (the philosopher Diotima = Pl. \textit{Symp.} 201d).\textsuperscript{232} Ancient tradition links Sappho with Corinth: the first century BCE poet Antipater of Sidon tells us that Sappho died there (EG 3448).

Sappho’s popularity is demonstrated by her early and frequent depictions in art. She is found on ancient vases, coins, and mosaics.\textsuperscript{234} Christodorus of Thebes (late 5th BCE, gymnasium Zuexippos, Constantinople), Cicero (Sialion, 4th BCE, Syracuse).


\textsuperscript{232} Maximus of Tyre, 18.7.


\textsuperscript{234} For art depicting Sappho, I am following Richter, \textit{Portraits of the Greeks}, 194-96.
Antipater (1st BCE, Pergamon), indicate that statues were made of Sappho though none survive.\textsuperscript{235} There are three painted vases from the fifth century BCE that depict Sappho in action, reciting her poetry or playing the lyre. Some coins dated in the first through the third centuries CE from Mytilene and Eresos are stamped with a likeness of Sappho, sometimes with an inscription.\textsuperscript{236}

While the context of most early Greek poetry was in competitions, Sappho’s performances were mostly restricted to the symposia.\textsuperscript{237} Although Sappho’s poems were compiled into nine books in antiquity, only one poem survives intact, and like so many other early figures, the remainder of our information comes from secondary sources that offer conflicting information.\textsuperscript{238} Sappho’s poetry is important for our understanding of

\textsuperscript{235} Christodorus in Anth. Pal. 2.69; Cic. Verr. 2.4.126; for Antipater, see M. Fränkel and C. Habicht, eds., Die Inschriften von Pergamon, Altertümer von Pergamon 8.1-2 (Berlin: Spemann, 1890-95), no. 198.

\textsuperscript{236} Richter, Portraits of the Greeks, 194.


\textsuperscript{238} While Sappho wrote in 6\textsuperscript{th}-7\textsuperscript{th} BCE, the popularity of her work is endearing. Plutarch comments on the value of her poetry in Mor. 397a and 406a. Several of the famous first century Latin poets either mention Sappho explicitly or rely on her work. Martial alludes to Sappho in Epigrams 7.69.9 and 10.35.15; Catullus 11.21-24, 51.62, and 65.19-24 and his usage of Lesbia rely on Sappho. Ovid applauds her in Ars amatoria 3.331; cf., the pseudo-Ovidian Épistle of Sappho to Phaon available in English in The Songs of Sappho, trans. Marion Mills Miller and David Moore Robinson (New York: Frank-Maurice, 1925). M. J. Edwards argues for her influence on Juvenal, “A Quotation of Sappho in Juvenal Satire 6,” Phoenix 45, no. 3 (1991): 255-7. Given the context of the Satire as seething with hatred for women, we should not consider this quotation as a compliment. Juvenal complains about the education of women in Satire 6: those conversant in Homer, Virgil, and many others.
ancient female sexualities, but is especially valuable due to her clear distinction between the loved and beloved. Sappho portrays a woman that is different from Aristotle’s view which would later become dominant in Western philosophy: women are only able to participate in life as a human being as a mutilated male striving for maleness.

According to Pausanias, Telesilla was a fifth century BCE warrior-poetess who was renowned for her lyric poetry and military prowess. Her military might is mentioned in Plutarch (46-120 BCE/CE, Mor. 245d-e) and Pausanias (fl. 2nd CE, 2.9-11), and her poetry is remembered also by several other writers. Eight tiny fragments of her poetry are extant. Snyder suggests that her poetry was composed for the singing by girls at festivals. The popularity of Telesilla’s poetry is enduring – she is known from Eusebius of Caesarea (263-309 BCE, Chronicon, Olympiad 82.4), Antipater of Thessaloniki (fl. 15CE, Anth. Pal. 9. 26), Apollodoros (fl. late 1st BCE, Biblioteka 3.5.5),

---


242 Euseb. Chron. 82. 4 [449 B.C.]; Maximus of Tyre, Dissertations 37.5; Heph. 11.2; Ath. 11. 437; 14.619b; Hesychius, Glossary, “beltiotas;” Julius Pollux, Onomastikon 2. 223; Scholiast on the Od. 13.289. The classical references are collected in translation by Professor John Paul Adams at www.csun.edu/~hcfl004/telesilla.html, accessed Feb 6, 2012.

243 Snyder, Lyre, 60.

> Οὔδενος δὴ ἤττον ἐνδοξὸν ἔστι τῶν κοινῆς διαπεπραγμένων γυναικῶν ἔργων ὁ πρὸς Κλεομένη περὶ Ἀργοῦς ἀγών, οὐ ἡγούμεναι τῇ Τελεσίλλης ποιητρίας προτεραιότητι. ταύτην δὲ φασίν οἰκίας οὖσαν ἐνδόξου τῷ ἐν σώματι νοηματικὴν εἰς θεοῦ πέμψας περὶ ἴδιαιτερας καὶ χρησθέν αὐτῇ Μοῦσας θεραπεύειν, πειθομένην τῷ θεῷ καὶ ἐπιθεμένην ὧδη καὶ ἀρμονία τοῦ τε πάθους ἀπαλλάγην ταχὺ καὶ θαυμάζεθαι διὰ ποιητικῆς ὑπὸ τῶν γυναικῶν.

Of all the deeds performed by women for the community none is more famous than the struggle against Cleomenes for Argos, which the women carried out at the instigation of Telesilla the poetess. She, as they say, was the daughter of a famous house but sickly in body, and so she sent to the god to ask about health; and when an oracle was given to her to cultivate the Muses, she followed the god’s advice, and by devoting herself to poetry and music she was quickly relieved of her trouble, and was greatly admired by the women for her poetic art.²⁴⁴

Pausanias writes that on top of Mount Coryphum there is a sanctuary of Artemis

Coryphea, which Telesilla mentions in a poem. Pausanias relates the tradition concerning

Telesilla that corresponds with Herodotus:

> ὑπὲρ δὲ τὸ θέατρον Ἀφροδίτης ἐστὶν ἱερὸν, ἐμπροθεὶν δὲ τοῦ ἔδους Τελεσίλλη ἡ ποιήσασα τὰ σάματα ἐπείρασαι στήλη καὶ βιβλία μὲν ἐκείνα ἔρριπται οἱ πρὸς τὸς ποιήσαντα, αὐτὴ δὲ ἐς κράνος ὀρὰ κατέχουσα τῇ χειρὶ καὶ ἐπιτίθεσθαι τῇ κεφαλῇ μέλλουσα.

Above the theater is a sanctuary of Aphrodite, and before the image is a slab with a representation wrought on it in relief of Telesilla, the lyric poetess. Her books lie scattered at her feet, and she herself holds in her hand an helmet, which she is looking at and is about to place on her head.²⁴⁵

²⁴⁴ Plut. *Mor.* 245c-e (Babbitt, LCL).

²⁴⁵ Paus. 2.20.8 (Jones and Ormerod, LCL). Reference to Herodotus 6.77.
Pausanius tells us that there was a monument to Telesilla that memorializes her intellect with a book and her military accomplishments with a helmet.\textsuperscript{246} We should note, I think, that the educated woman and her military conquests are done in the guise of men. Like the female philosophers who come later, the female poets and their soldiers acting in the domain of men wear the clothing of men.

Many female poets were active in the fourth century BCE. The most influential being Corinna, Erinna, and Nossis. Corinna of Tanagra enjoyed popularity in the ancient world, but she is notoriously difficult to date. The arguments have been for the late fifth century BCE (following Plutarch, Pausanias, and Aelian)\textsuperscript{247} or the early third century (following critical examinations of the extant poetry). It is attractive to conclude that the early third century is more appropriate based on the nature of Corinna’s usage of what may be considered third century BCE Greek morphology and syntax.\textsuperscript{248} This would mean that Corrina’s claim to fame - her defeat of Pindar – is most likely not historical but a later tradition from readers who thought that her poetry was technically superior.\textsuperscript{249}


\textsuperscript{247} Plut., \textit{Mor.} 347f-348a; Paus. 9.22.3. Ael. \textit{Var. hist.} 13.25. Cf. also Eustath. \textit{ad Hom. Il.} 326.43; Pind. \textit{Ol.} 6.90.


\textsuperscript{249} Gillian Clark, “Roman Women,” \textit{G&R}, 2\textsuperscript{nd} ser. 28, no. 2, Jubilee Year (1981): 193-212; 48cm high marble statue of Corinna in Richter, \textit{Portraits}, pl.116. Pausanius (9.22.3) says that there was a portrait of her made; Tatian (\textit{Oratio ad Graecos}}
Citing the vocabulary, meter, style, and the fact that no fifth century writer mentions her, D. L. Page takes an agnostic approach for an exact date that is followed by Skinner and others.\textsuperscript{250} However, there survives a 48cm tall marble statuette of a woman reading from an open scroll with \textit{KOPINNA} inscribed on the base. Richter believes that the statuette has features that indicate it may be a copy from a fourth century piece, but it does not reflect the quality expected from a Silanion (as Tatian says in \textit{Oratorio ad Graecos} 34.16).\textsuperscript{251}

The counter-argument to the late dating for Corinna depends on the reliability of ancient sources. Pausanias (fl. 2\textsuperscript{nd} CE) preserves contemporary traditions concerning Corinna that were popular in Tangra, and Plutarch those of Boeotia (being from there), and it seems unlikely that these witnesses would be so mistaken in such a short time after her supposed death, so the fifth century date seems more likely.\textsuperscript{252} Pausanias tells us that he saw a memorial in the gymnasium depicting Corinna crowning herself in victory over Pindar, attributing the victory to her usage of the Doric dialect and her beauty (9.22.3).\textsuperscript{253} Corinna is remembered in the second century CE P.Oxy 2438.1-4 (Gallo 1968, 49).

“according to Corinna and other poetesses [Pindar] was the son of Scopelinus; according

\textsuperscript{33} refers to a sculpture by Silanion. P. Oxy. 2438.1-4 mentions Corinna who gives biographical info concerning Pindar; cf., Ael. \textit{Var. hist.} 13.25.


\textsuperscript{251} Richter, \textit{Portraits}, 156.


\textsuperscript{253} For women competing in poetry, see Lefkowitz, \textit{Greek Poets}, 64-5.
to most poets he was the son of Daiphantus.\textsuperscript{254} The Roman poets Propertius (b. between 54 and 47BCE, d. 2BCE), and Statius (c. 45-83CE) were also aware of Corinna.

In praise of his beloved, Propertius (c. 50-15 BCE) compares her beauty to the beloved, referring to the poetry of Sappho, Corinna, and Erinna:

\begin{quote}
nec me tam facies, quamvis sit candida, cepit (lilia non domina sint magis alba mea; ut Maeotic nix minio si certet Hibero, utque rosae puro lacte natant folia), nec de more comae per levia colla fluentes, non oculi, geminae, sidera nostra, faces, nec si qua Arabio lucet bombyece puella (non sum de nihilo blandus amator ego): quantum quod posito formose saltat Iaccho, egit ut euhantis dux Ariadna choros, et quantum, Aeolio cum temptat carmina plectro, par Aganippeae ludere docta lyrae; et sua cum antiquae committit scripta Corinnae, carmina quae quivis non putat aequa suis.
\end{quote}

It was not her face, bright as it is, that won me (lilies are not more white than my lady; as if Maeotic snows contended with the reds of Spain, or rose-petals swam in purest milk) nor her hair, ordered, flowing down her smooth neck, nor her eyes, twin fires, that are my starlight, nor the girl shining in Arabian silk (I am no lover flattering for nothing): but how beautifully she dances when the wine is set aside, like Ariadne taking the lead among the ecstatic cries of the Maenads, and how when she sets herself to sing in the Sapphic style, she plays with the skill of Aganippe’s lyre, and joins her verse to that of ancient Corinna, and thinks Erinna’s songs inferior to her own.\textsuperscript{255}

The second most famous poetess from ancient Greece is Erinna, dated 353 BCE,\textsuperscript{256} at about the time that Socrates defined the goal of poetry as that which makes the soul of all people better:

\textsuperscript{254} Lefkowitz, Greek Poets, 62; I. Gallo, \textit{Una nuova biografia di Pindaro (P. Oxy. 2438)} (Salerno: Di Giacomo, 1968).

\textsuperscript{255} Prop. 2.3.1-54 (Goold, LCL); Stat. \textit{Silv.} 5.3.158 (his father taught the poetry of Corinna at Naples).

νῦν ἂρα ἡμεῖς ἡρήκαμεν ῥητορικήν τινα πρὸς δῆμον τοιοῦτον ὀδὸν παίδων τε ὦμου καὶ γυναικῶν καὶ ἄνδρων, καὶ δούλων καὶ ἐλευθέρων, ἢν οὐ πάνυ ἀγάμηθα· κολακικὴν γὰρ αὐτὴν φαμεν εἶναι.

So now we have found a kind of rhetoric addressed to such a public as is compounded of children and women and men, and slaves as well as free; an art that we do not quite approve of, since we call it a flattering one.²⁵⁷

Antipater of Thessalonica (fl. 20 BC) listed her along with Sappho as one of the nine “early Muses.”²⁵⁸ Antipater writes, “Sappho exceeded Erinna in lyric poetry by just so much as Erinna exceeded Sappho in hexameters.”²⁵⁹ Her fame is a bit curious, because all traditions point to a low output: only one composition of 300 lines, the Distaff, and perhaps a few epigrams. Erinna is the subject of epigrams by Asclepiades of Amos (fl. 270 BCE, Anth. Pal. 7.11), Leonidas of Tarentum (c. 3rd BCE, Anth. Pal. 7.13), and Antipater of Sidon (fl. 2nd BCE, Anth. Pal. 7.713), and she is associated with Callimachus (c. 305-240 BCE) by Aristophanes (446-386 BCE):

εἰς Ἠρώη δὲ κομώντες,
πικροὶ καὶ ἦροι Καλλιμάχου προκύνες

proud of your Erinna
bitter and harsh barkers at Callimachus’s command.²⁶⁰

Errina’s “distaff” is the “spindle of the Fates,” and this imagery could speak to her life as a woman: the expected doing of domestic duties and lamenting the early death of her

²⁵⁷ Pl. Gorg. 502d (Lamb, LCL).
²⁵⁹ Anth. Pal. 9.190 (Paton, LCL).
beloved, and in the case of the inspired, the writing of poetry. However, it should be noted that the two common metaphors for the doing of poetry are carpentry and weaving. For Erinna, her inspiration was the spindle of the Fates; for others it was the Muses or the \( \varepsilon \rho \omega \tau \varepsilon \).\(^{262}\)

Like Corinna, the date of Erinna is in dispute.\(^{263}\) The sources used to date Erinna are the traditions in the *Anthology*, Eusebius, Tatian, and the *Suda* as well as the critical analyses of poetry attributed to her.\(^{264}\) West has argued that a girl on an island in the fourth century BCE could not have had the education to write such sophisticated poetry, and concludes that she did not even exist.\(^{265}\) The analyses of Gow and Page date Erinna in the third century, and Donado dates her in the late fifth or early fourth century.\(^{266}\) The poetry of Errina is indeed complex: Marilyn Skinner has demonstrated that Erinna used a prototype from the *Iliad*. Erinna’s frequent cries of misery follow a specific type:

The impassioned wailing of Briseis over the fallen Patroclus, of Hector’s wife seeing his corpse dragged by Achilles, and of Andromache, Hecuba and Helen at


\(^{262}\) Averil Cameron and Alan Cameron, “Erinna’s Distaff,” *CQ* n.s. 19, no. 2 (1969): 286.


\(^{264}\) She is also known in Plin. *HN* 34.57-58 and Meleager of Gadara in *Anth. Pal*. 4.1.12.


Hector’s wake are all artistic recreations of the goos, the dirge ordinarily chanted at the prothesis by the nearest female relations of the deceased.\textsuperscript{267}

While West has argued that Erinna is a literary construct, Sarah Pomeroy has demonstrated from terracotta and inscriptions that the education of women in fourth century Greece was improving, providing an historical plausibility of her existence.\textsuperscript{268} Furthermore, Pomeroy notes that Errina’s hometown of Teos has epigraphic evidence of educated women.\textsuperscript{269} Pomeroy surmises that the emphasis on the distaff is rooted in the historical fact that wealthier educated women of this time period were expected to spend at least a little time weaving. She compares the tradition of Erinna with the story of Hipparchia, who when she studied Cynicism, was asked why she was not spending a little time weaving.\textsuperscript{270} Marilyn B. Arthur notes that while Erinna claims in her poem that she was nineteen years old when she composed it, she could have cast herself as a young...

\textsuperscript{267} Marilyn B. Skinner, “Briseis, the Trojan Women, and Erinna,” \textit{CW} 75, no. 5 (1982): 265-269

\textsuperscript{268} Pomeroy, “\textit{Technikai kai mousikai},” 51-68.

\textsuperscript{269} Citing SIG\textsuperscript{3} 578 (2\textsuperscript{nd} BCE). M. M. Austin notes that despite Pomeroy’s point, SIG\textsuperscript{3} 578 does not explicitly exclude girls, but neither does it explicitly include the education of girls, \textit{The Hellenistic world from Alexander to the Roman conquest: a selection of Ancient Sources in Translation}, 2\textsuperscript{nd} ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 262.

woman when actually she could have been much older.\textsuperscript{271} Arthur also notes that Greek vases of the period depict girls reading from scrolls.\textsuperscript{272}

Anyte of Tegea also wrote at the beginning of the third century BCE, and is recognized as the creator of the pastoral epigram. The \textit{Greek Anthology} preserves about twenty of her epigrams that have mostly women, children, or animal subjects. I. M. Plant suggests that Anyte herself published a book of her poetry.\textsuperscript{273}

Nossis of Locri in Italy lived about the same time and imitated Sappho, writing to women concerning women.\textsuperscript{274} Marilyn B. Skinner convincingly suggested that Nossis is from an aristocratic family.\textsuperscript{275} In one of her poems (\textit{Anth. Pal.} 6.265), Nossis claims to be part of the elite women who present linen to Hera, which could be parallel to the elite women in Athens who present Athena with a woven \textit{peplos}. Like other educated women, Nossis gives us a clue as to her education: she names her mother as her teacher.\textsuperscript{276} As a


\textsuperscript{273} Plant, \textit{Women Writers}, 56.

\textsuperscript{274} Snyder, \textit{Woman and the Lyre}, 77-84.


whole, these women poets may portray women in a kinder light than their male counterparts.\(^{277}\)

In times closer to Paul, there are several examples of well-known female poets.\(^{278}\) Pompey the Great (106-48 BCE) decorated his garden with almost all the known statues of Greek poetesses, many of whom are preserved in the *Greek Anthology*.\(^{279}\) The list of female poets in Pompey’s Garden that Tatian (c.120-180 CE) provides in *Address to the Greeks 33* is quite comprehensive:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Πράξιλλαν μὲν γὰρ Λύσιππος ἐχαλκούργησεν μηδὲν εἰπόοσαν διὰ τῶν ποιησάτων χρήσιμον, Λεαρχίδα δὲ Μενεστράτος, Σιλανίων δὲ Σαπφώ τὴν ἔταιραν, Ἡρίναν τὴν Λεβίταν Ναυκύδης, Βοῖσκος Μυρτίδα, Μυρῶ τὴν Βυζαντίαν Κηφισόδοτος, Γομφὸς Πραξιγόριδα καὶ Ἀμφιστράτος Κλειτώ.}
\text{τὶ γὰρ μοι περὶ Ἀντώς ἠγείρει Τελεσίλλης τὲ καὶ Νοσσίδας; τῆς μὲν γὰρ Ἐὐθυκράτης τὲ καὶ Κηφισόδοτος, τῆς δὲ Νικήματος, τῆς δὲ Ἀριστοδότου εἰσὶν οἱ δημιουργοὶ: Μυσσαρχίδος τῆς Ἐφεσίας Ἐὐθυκράτης, Κορίνης Σιλανίων, Ῥαλιαρχίδος τῆς Ἀργείας Ἐὐθυκράτης.}
\end{align*}
\]

For Lysippus cast a statue of Praxilla, whose poems contain nothing useful, and Menestratus one of Learchis, and Selanion one of Sappho the courtezan, and Naucydes one of Erinna the Lesbian, and Boiscus one of Myrtis, and Cephisodotus one of Myro of Byzantium, and Gomphus one of Praxigoris, and Amphistratus one

---


of Clito. And what shall I say about Anyta, Telesilla, and Mystis? Of the first Euthycrates and Cephisodotus made a statue, and of the second Niceratus, and of the third Aristodotus; Euthycrates made one of Mnesiarchis the Ephesian, Selanion one of Corinna, and Euthycrates one of Thalarchis the Argive.²⁸⁰

Tatian’s description of Pompey’s Garden²⁸¹ preserves the memory of several female poets and philosophers. Many of the female poets that he mentions are discussed above, and other poets are attested only here (and therefore dates are unknown): Learchis, Praxigoris, Clito, Mnesiarchis the Ephesian, Mystis, and Thalarchis the Argive. Three poets not mentioned above have only a handful of fragments from the fifth century BCE: Praxilla (8 frgs) and Myrtis (summary of views in Plut. Mor. 300d-f), Anyta (fragments in Carmina novem poetaarum foeminarum, Antwerp, 1565, repr. Hamburg, 1734). Most of the sculptors listed above were well known in the ancient world: Lysippus,²⁸² Selanion,²⁸³ Naucydes,²⁸⁴ Euthycrates,²⁸⁵ and Cephisodotus.²⁸⁶ While these sculptors were known for


²⁸² Lysippus flourished in 4th BCE. Pliny HN 34.51, 36.41; Mart. 9.44, Statius, Silvae 4.6.32; Plut. Alex. 4; Paus. 6.1.4; Quint. 12.10.1-10; Ath. 2.784; Strabo 6.3.1; cf., Nigel Guy Wilson, Encyclopedia of Ancient Greece (New York: Routledge, 2006), 437-8.

their other works, only Tatian knew of their statue of a female poet with the notable exception of Selanion that is mentioned by Cicero (Verr. 4, 57, 125). Other sculptors are only attested here: Boiscus, Menestratus, and Gomphus. Tatain continues his description of Pompey’s Garden by listing statues of coutezans, lyre players, and women from Greek mythology.  

His description concludes with Melanippe the Wise woman whose statue was made by Lysistratus (Plin. HN 35.44).  

Antipater of Thessalonica (fl. 1st CE) gives a very similar list of female poets: 

Τάσδε θεογλώσσους Ἐλικών ἔθρεψε γυναῖκας ύμνοις καὶ Μακεδών Πιερίας σκόπελος, Πρήξιλλαν, Μοιρώ, Ἀνυτής στόμα, θηλων Ὅμηρον, Λεοβίαδον Σατρφώ κόσμον ευπλοκάμον, Ἡριναν, Τελέσιλλαν ἀγακλέα καὶ σέ, Κόριννα, θυρίν Ἀθηναῖς ἀσπίδα μελιαμέναν, Νοσσίδα τηλύγωσσον ἱδὲ γλυκουαχέα Μύρτιν, πᾶσος ἀνώων ἐργάτιδας σελίδων, ἐνέα μὲν Μούσας μέγας Ὅμρανός, ἐνέα δ’ αὐτάς Γαία τέκεν θνατοῖς ἀρβιτοῦ εὐφροσύναν.  

These god-tongued women were with song supplied 
From Helicon to steep Pieria’s side:  
Prexilla, Myro, Anyte’s grand voice – 
The female Homer; Sappho, pride and choice 
Of Lesbian dames, whose locks have earned a name, 

284 Naucydes was a 5th century BCE sculptor known for athletic statues according to Ernest Arthur Gardner, A Handbook of Greek Sculpture, vols 1-2 (London: Macmillan, 1896), 338. Plin. HN 34.19; Paus. 2.17.5, 2.22.7, 6.1.3, 6.6.2, 6.8.4, 6.9.3.  

285 Plin. HN 134.  

286 Paus. 9.30.1 (Muses); Plin. HN 34.8.19 (Minerva), 36.4.6; Plut. Phoc. 19.  

287 Glaucippe (myth, Herodotus, Library 2.1.5) by Niceratus, Phryne the courtesan (Plin. HN 34.71) by Praxiteles and Herodotus; Panteuchis by Euthycrates, Besantis by Dinomenes; Gycera the courtesan and Argeia the lyre player by Herodotus; Pasiphae by Bryaxis.  

288 From Euripides, Melanippe the Wise.
Erinna, Telesilla known to fame. And thou, Corinna, whose bright numbers yield
A vivid image of Athene’s shield. Soft-sounding Nossis, Myrtis of sweet song,
Work-women all whose books will last full long. Nine Muses owe to Uranus their birth,
And nine – and endless joy for man – to Earth.\textsuperscript{289}

There is a tendency in the commentaries on Tatian to approach this section with
disinterest. However, Jane DeRose Evans argues, mostly on the basis that courtesans
would not be celebrated in Pompey’s Garden during Tatian’s time, that the statues in the
Garden consisted of famous poets and comedic heroines. Evans is almost certainly
correct when she concludes that most of the statues in the Garden would have been loot
from Pompey’s conquests. As was common practice during this period, most of them
would have been renamed, attested to famous sculptors, and possibly even repainted and
restored to carry the names of the women that Pompey wanted to memorialize.\textsuperscript{290} In their
former lives, many of these statues may have been Muses, goddesses, or patronesses. As
people walked through Pompey’s Garden, they could be inspired by the educated women
of ancient Greece – which was lamented by the poets in their misogynistic interpretations
of the statues.\textsuperscript{291} Several other poets referenced the inspiration and possible allure of the
Garden.\textsuperscript{292}


\textsuperscript{290} Pompey’s intentions for the statues in the Garden are unclear, particularly because the earliest connection between Tatian and the Garden was not made in ancient times.

Sulpicia is the only Roman female poet who wrote in Latin whose work is extant, and she was active during the reign of Augustus (31 BCE – 14 CE). Plant identifies her as the grand-daughter of the orator Servius Sulpicius Rufus (106-43 BCE), the friend of Cicero (106-43 BCE). Sulpicia was apparently in the patronage of her uncle Marcus Valerius Messalla Corvinus (64-8 BCE), who also supported Ovid (c. 43-18 BC) and Tibullus (55-19 BCE). Her education compliments Cicero’s witness for the process of education of Roman women, which included instruction by parents before marriage and by the husband after marriage. There were also women writing poetry in Greek during

---

292 Mart. 11.47; Ov. Am. 1.67, 3.387; Prop. 2.32.11-12; cf., Plin. Ep. 35.59.

293 Plant, Women Writers, 106.


---
this period. In first century Ephesus, the priestess Claudia Trophime dedicated some lines to Hestia in a prominently placed inscription.296

Some women were itinerant poets in the ancient world.297 The clearest examples of such poetess are Aristodama of Smyrna (c.218 CE) and Alcione of Thronion (3rd BCE).298 Two honorary inscriptions dedicated to Aristodama have been analyzed by Ian Rutherford. The following inscription allows us to date Aristodama between 218 and 71 BCE because of the mention of Agetas of Kallipois, who appears in Polybius (200-118 BCE) 5.91.1:

When Agetas of Kallipois was general (strategos) of the Aetolians. With good fortune. Resolved by [the city] of Lamia. Since Aristodama, daughter of Amytas, of Smyrna, an epic poetess from [Ionia], came to the city and gave several [readings] / of her own poems, in which she made worthy mention of the Aetolian people [and] of the ancestors of the nation, delivering her performance with zeal, that she should be made [proxenos] and benefactor (euergetes) of the city and that she should be granted citizenship, the right to acquire land and [property], the right of grazing (epinomia); immunity (asylia) and security by land and by [sea] / both in war and in peace, for herself, her children and possessions for [all] time, as well as all the rights which are granted to other proxenoi and benefactors. Let proxenia, citizenship, and asylia be granted also to O… her brother and his children. In the


archonship of Python, Neon, and Antigenes, when Epigenes was general (strategos) and Cylus the hipparch. Guarantor of the proxenia was / Python son of Athenaeus.\textsuperscript{299}

SEG 2 also tells us that Aristodama received honors from Chalasios: a proxeny and 100 drachmas.\textsuperscript{300}

Aristodama daughter of Amyntas from Smyrna in Ionia, epic poetess, arrived here and commemorated [our city]. So that we are seen to honor her appropriately, (it is resolved) to praise her for the piety which she has to the god and for her good-will to the city and to crown her with a garland of sacred laurel from the god, as is traditional for Khalion. The proclamation about the garland is to be made at the Poitropia. And there should be sent to her from our city a prerogative from Apollo’s sacrifice, a share of [meat to the hearth] of Smyrna. She should be proxenos and benefactor of the city. And there should be given to her and her offspring from the city possession of land, immunity, inviolability by war and peace by land and sea and everything else that goes to other proxenoi and benefactors. And there should be sent to her one hundred drachmas as a guest-gift. Her brother Dionysius should have proxenia, citizenship, and immunity. So that it is manifest to all who arrive in the sanctuary that Khaleion values highly those who choose to speak or write about the god, the decree is to be set up in the shrine of Apollo Nasiōtas, the other in Delphi.\textsuperscript{301}

Both Burstein and Austin suggest that Aristodama was a travelling poetess perhaps accompanied by her brother.\textsuperscript{302} Alcinoe of Thronion received similar honors from the


\textsuperscript{301} FD 3.2.145. Translation in Rutherford, “Aristodama,” 239.

\textsuperscript{302} Burstein, Hellenistic, 87. Austin, Hellenistic World, 295.
city of Tenos. Rutherford argues that there are few female poets in the Roman period: Hedea of Tralles, an unknown woman of Alexandria and Cos, and Auphria of unknown city, and Damo and Julia Balbilla are weaker examples.

There are further examples of vases, cups and other plastic arts depicting the education of women and girls in every facet of Greek education: discussion, reading

---


304 FD 3.1.533-4.


307 Balbilla is an example of a Roman woman writing poetry in Greek. She was commissioned by Hadrian to memorialize a visit to Colossi and the activity of Memnon there, and her text was reconstructed in 1925 by J. M. Edmonds, “The Epigrams of Balbilla,” CR 39, no. 5 (1925): 107-110.


and/or writing, music, dance, and athletics. To illustrate the activity of women in reading and discussing, the best example is the Sarcophagus of Lucius Publius Peregrinus, where a woman is holding a scroll, listening and looking at an open scroll held by the philosopher. The sarcophagus of Plotinus is very similar, with two women looking on (very close to the philosopher), one holding a scroll, and the other intently listening. A fifth century BCE Attic hydra in the kalpis shape shows a woman reading, a tablet with stylus, a chest full of scrolls, and a music contest. There are several other examples of women reading that decorate Greek vases. A Roman copy of a third century BCE original depicts Klio with a stylus and a scroll. Several fifth century Greek hydrias and calyx-craters also show girls dancing and playing musical

---

310 Klio holds a scroll and stylus in Stewart, *Greek Sculpture*, 766 (Roman copy); Kliener, 250 (man and wife with scroll); Beck, “Schooling of Girls,” 399b (woman with scroll).

311 Beck, “Schooling of Girls,” 396-405 (women playing the flute, lyre, and cithara).

312 Brunilde Sismondo Ridgway, *Hellenistic Sculpture* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1990-2002), 1:219, pl. 102; cf., 3:160-1, pls. 66a-d, 67a, and 68a-d, the five bronze ‘Dancers’ from the Villa of the Papyri at Herculaneum, 1st CE.


314 Rome, Museo Torlonia, inv. 424.

315 Vatican Museo Gregoriano Profano 9504.

316 Beck, *Greek Education*, pl. 399b, cf., 60.


318 Stewart, *Greek Sculpture*, pl. 766.
instruments. 319 A third century BCE terra cotta female dancer called the Baker Dancer after her donor to the New York Metropolitan Museum of Art is an exquisite piece from this period. 320 Two terracotta depicting literacy include a third century BCE girl reading from a scroll on her lap and a girl from the late Hellenistic period carrying some writing tablets. 321 Another third century BCE terracotta depicts two dancing girls holding hands. 322 Examples from the fourth and fifth century BCE of girls in athletics are rare. Beck preserves three examples: two vases depict girls in the gymnasium, and there is one statue of a female Olympic runner. 323

Most of these aspects of education were put to the test in the pan-Hellenic games 324 – including the Isthmian games in Corinth – in which girls participated. Plutarch writes that Aristomache of Erythrae competed in poetry at Isthmia, twice winning first prize. 325 There are further examples of girls winning prizes in the pan-Hellenic games for poetry, and a vase depicts a woman in a reading contest. 326 Girls also participated in

---

319 Beck, *Greek Education*, dancing: pl. 391a-b; 392a-b; 393; 395a-b: music: pls. 396-405.

320 Ridgway, *Hellenistic Sculpture* 1: 219, pl. 102

321 Beck, *Greek Education*, pl. 358. Several more examples of girls and women reading are provided in plates 349-373.4

322 Beck, *Greek Education*, pl. 394.


324 Beck, *Greek Education*, pls. 223-60.

325 Plut. *Mor.* 675b; Ath. 6.234d; 10.436d. Cf., Plut. *Mor.* 645a, a girl won a poetry contest at funeral games held in honor of Pelias.

326 “Girls’ names appear in the victory-lists from Pergamon of the third-second-century B.C.: one gained a prize in recitation of epic, elegiac and lyric poetry and in
ritual, athletics, music, and dance in and around the Isthmian games. There are examples of women learning, teaching, and referenced as authorities in medicine in the Greek and Roman periods. This evidence provides the context for women learning philosophy. Like poetry, medicine, liberal education, and literacy, philosophically educated women learned from family members or tutors in a household context.

Women’s Interest in Education: Papyri and Beyond


critical notes support premises that are central to my argument: some women were positioned to control the education of themselves and their children, and education was available to lower class slaves and freedpersons who functioned as scribes and teachers. The home, as mentioned above, is the epicenter of education, but one may have to leave the house to follow a well-known rhetor, philosopher, or talented grammarian. BGU 1.332 (dated 2nd to 3rd century) indicates the presence of a household teacher as a mother sends a letter to her children.


(hand 2) ἀπόδο(ος) Πτολεμαίῳ ἀδει(λ)φῷ Ἀπολίναρίᾳς.
(hand 1) ἀπόδος Πτολεμαίῳ(*) τῷ τέκνῳ.
ἀσπάζομαι . . . . .

Serapias to her children Ptolemaios and Apolinaria and Ptolemaios, many greetings.


Before all I pray that you are well, which is the most important of all for me. I make your obeisance before the lord Serapis, praying to find you well, as I pray that (you) have been successful. I was delighted to receive a letter to the effect that you have come through well. Greet Ammonous with her children and husband, and those who love you. Kyrrilla greets you, and the daughter of Hermias, Hermias, Hermanoubis the nurse, Athenais the teacher, Kyrrilla, Kasia, . . ., S-anos, Empis, all those here. Please write me about what you’re doing, knowing that if I receive a letter from you I am happy about your well-being. I pray for your health.

(Address in second hand): Deliver to Ptolemaios the brother of Apolinaria.

(Address in first hand): Deliver to Ptolemaios her son. Greet . . .

Specifically for literacy and education, the editors of Women’s Letters compile P.Athen. 60, P.Oxy. 6.930, P.Oxy. 56.3860, but many other papyri cited in the book demonstrate interest in education. 332

P.Brem. 63 (July 117 CE) is a letter from a mother to a daughter, and refers to an educated girl. 333 Also from the second century is the letter from Diogenis to Kronion, instructing Isidora to go to a woman teacher.

Διογενίς Κρονίωι τῶι
φιλτάτωι χαίρειν.
Καμε ἀνελθοῦσαν πρὸς ὑ—
μᾶς ἐν Ταλεὶ προςδέχε—
σθε ἀλλ’ εὐχομαι παρά—
γενομένη ἐν μηδενὶ
μᾶς μεμψοσθαι, ὅπερ
ἐλπίζω μηδὲν τοῦτων
γενήσοσθαι. πάντα δὲ
τὰ κατ’ ἐμὲ Λουσίριος

331 BGU 1.332. Translation from Bagnall, Cribiore, and Ahtaridis, Women’s Letters. For the use of δέσκαλος (δέσκαλή) for female teachers, see Cribiore, Writing, 23-4, who traces the use of the word from antiquity to modern use; Cf. BL 1.39 (on lines 1, 11, and 12–13); 5.11 (on δέσκαλος); See also J. Rowlandson, Women and Society in Greek and Roman Egypt: A Sourcebook (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

332 Cribiore, Letters, 266-9.

333 Cribiore, Letters, 41.
Diogenis to her dearest Kronion, greeting.

Be expecting me when I come up to you at Tali. But I pray that once I am there I will not find you at fault in anything: I hope that none of these things will happen. My brother Lourios will communicate to you everything concerning me.

(second hand) I hope that you are well. Salute all my relatives and Isidora, and let her go to a woman teacher. 

Further letters exemplify that mothers are concerned with the education of their children. In P.Oxy 6.930 (2nd-3rd CE), a mother expresses concern that her son’s paidgagos Diogenes had found better work (presumably in Alexandria?) and her child was in need of a new teacher, which Diogenes should arrange. It is very interesting that the mother learns of this from Diogenes’s daughter, who had access to his learning.

Diogenes’s dependence on the author’s patronage and his need for more support indicate his lower status and that of his daughter.

---

334 The girl may also be mentioned in P. Mil. Vogl. 77. Cf. P. Mil. Vogl. 6.297 and 298.
γὰρ περὶ αὐτοῦ εἰδύναι δ—
ti katὰ δύν[α]μην μέλλει
σοι προσέχειν. ἐμέλησε
dὲ μοι πέμψαι καὶ πυθέ—
σθαι περὶ τῆς ὑγείας σου καὶ
ἐπιγνώναι τί ἀναγινώ—
sκεις. καὶ ἔλεγεν τὸ ξῆτα,
ἐμαρτύρει δὲ πολλὰ πε—
ρὶ τοῦ παιδαγωγοῦ σου.
ὡςτε οὖν, τέκνον, μελη—
sάτω σοὶ τε καὶ τῷ παιδα—
γωγῷ σου καθήκοντι κα—
θηγητῇ σε παραβάλλειν.
ἀσπάζονται σε πολλὰ αἱ
ἀδελφαὶ σου καὶ τὰ ἀβᾶς—
καντα παιδιὰ Θεονίδους
καὶ οἱ ἡμέτεροι πάντες
κατ’ ὄνομα. ἀσπασαὶ τὸν
τιμωτάτου— παιδαγω—
γὸν σου Ἐρωτά.


. . do not hesitate to write to me also about whatever you need from here. I was
grieved to learn from the daughter of our teacher Diogenes that he had sailed
downriver, for I was free from care about him, knowing that he would look after
you as far as possible. I took care to send and inquire about your health and to learn
what you were reading. And he said the 6th book, and he testified a great deal
concerning your paidagogos. So now, child, you and your paidagogos must take
care to place you with a suitable teacher. Your sisters and the children of Theonis,
whom the evil eye does not touch, and all our people greet you individually. Greet
your esteemed paidagogos Eros . .335

The editors note that the author of this letter is female because of the participle use, and
she demonstrates her education by referring to the Iliad simply by zeta according to
common practice.

335 P. Oxy. 6.930 = Bagnall, Letters, 267.
Teachers and Students

While what we may call “formal education” was reserved for the elite boys\textsuperscript{336} in all time periods relevant to this study,\textsuperscript{337} the teacher was usually a slave\textsuperscript{338} or a person of low status.\textsuperscript{339} In the Roman period, elite boys and sometimes girls would attend a grammar school for elementary education (basic reading, writing, and mathematics). Higher education such as advanced mathematics, astronomy, music, dance, athletics, rhetoric or philosophy would require the tutelage of a teacher who has mastered one or many of these disciplines. For both the grammar school and the advanced teaching, the teacher was almost always a slave or freedperson brought into the home, and a more famous teacher may instruct the children of his patron’s friends at the same time. P. Mich 1.77.5 (3\textsuperscript{rd} BCE) is a letter in which the writer Apollonios consoles Zenon for receiving a slave who was older than he thought he would be – he is a φίλων διδάσκαλος – and therefore had some worth because he was a talented teacher. Sometimes teachers were viewed with a lack of respect (Demosthenes, 384-322 BCE, \textit{On the Crown} 285). Aeschines (389-314 BCE) writes that there is a law for when students should come and go to school.

\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}
because no one trusts the schoolmaster to be alone with the pupils after dark (*Against Timarchus*, 9). Teachers of the sort that Gellius railed against, however, do not seem to be the norm.\(^{340}\) The balance of the literature concerning teachers seems to point in the direction of respect.

There is some evidence for both male and female teachers teaching girls. In a private letter (P. Giss. 1.80, 2\(^{nd}\) CE), a man requests that the καθηγητής of his daughter is to be paid in some leftover pigeons and birds so that he will pay attention to her. There is a letter to Theon in which the καθηγητής of a girl is paid in oil and grapes (P. Oslo. 3.156, 2\(^{nd}\) CE). Some scholars have presented the famous painted inscription, “Ερμιώνη γραμμάτική,” as evidence a female teacher, but it is possible that the 19 year old woman was an avid student rather than a teacher.\(^{341}\)

In most cases, the home is the center of education, and girls were typically educated in subjects that were useful in domestic life: spinning and household management. Xenophon (430-354 BCE) records the story where Ischomachus discusses the education of his wife in the manner that her parents should have, and he should learn from her in


\(^{341}\) E. G. Turner suggests that we should translate γραμμάτική as “literary lady” rather than “teacher,” *Greek Papyri: An Introduction* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968), 77. A copy of the *Iliad* was “found rolled up and placed under the mummy of a lady” – this could indicate that she was literate and this was her most prized possession, or it could be a tool in the afterlife. It seems more convincing to me that she was literate because why would they expect her to be illiterate in this life and literate in the next? Dominic Montserrat argues that it is praise for the young woman’s learning, “Heron ‘Bearer of Philosophia’ and Hermione ‘Grammatike,’” *JEA* 83 (1997): 223-226.
matters that she knows more about (Oec. 7.42). She was only fourteen years old when they married, and Ischomachus says that she barely knew how to spin but she had excellent control over her appetites (Oec. 7.6). Ischomachus then says that he instructed her on the household duties that he expected and encouraged her to teach those who know less than her and learn from those who know more (Oec. 7.41, 10.10). Aside from the husband teaching his wife, Aristophanes (c. 446-386 BCE) describes how a girl in Athens could receive some education:

εγὼ γυνὴ μέν εἰμι, νοῦς δ’ ἐνεστί μοι, 
αὐτὴ δ’ ἐμαυτὴς οὕτως γνώμης ἔχω, 
τοὺς δ’ ἐκ πατρὸς τε καὶ γεραιτέρων λόγους 
pολλοὺς ἀκούσας’ οὐ μεμονωσμαι κακῶς.

I am a woman, but I’m not a fool. 
And what of natural intelligence I own 
Has been filled out with the remembered precepts 
My father and the city-elders taught me.  

Sparta did have a full course of education for girls that Plato and others admired – and the goal of this program was the same as for boys – to produce hearty citizens to defend and preserve the state. This educational program may be one of the reasons why most Pythagorizing women are from Sparta. Women in Athens learned at home, but both in Athens and in other parts of the ancient world, women were students and teachers

---


in every major school of philosophy, as both Tatian\(^{345}\) (120-180 CE) and Clement of Alexandria\(^{346}\) (150-215 CE) remember.

We receive a glimpse of education of elite boys in the Roman period when Plutarch (46-120 CE) describes the education of Cato’s son. Cato (234-149 BCE) taught him how to read at home, and he also used Chilo to teach his son, a slave that was an exemplary grammarian.\(^{347}\) In pseudo-Plutarch’s essay on the education of free-born children, the focus is on elite boys, and he emphasizes the need for fathers to find competent teachers rather than entrusting the education of a son to an unqualified friend.\(^{348}\)

Nevertheless, pseudo-Plutarch begins and ends the essay on education with the importance of women in the education. At the end of his essay, pseudo-Plutarch writes that parents should emulate the practice of Eurydice of Hierapolis (Alexander the Great’s grand-mother), whose inscription\(^{349}\) reads:

\[^{345}\text{Tat. Ad Gr. 33.}\]
\[^{346}\text{Clem. Al. Strom. 4.7}\]
\[^{347}\text{Plut. Cat. 20.3.}\]
\[^{349}\text{There are two other interesting inscriptions related to Eurydice. In 1992, at the Eucleia temple site in Vergina, a statue base was found with the inscription “Eurydice, daughter of Sirras, to Eucleia.” Eight years later, a similar inscription was found. See A. Oikonomides, “A New Inscription from Vergina and Eurydice Mother of Philip II,” AncW 7 (1983): 52-54; Manolis Andronicos, Verghina, the Royal Tombs and the Ancient City (Athens: Ekdotike Athenon, 1984), 49-51; Chryssoula Saatsoglou-Paliadeli, “In the Shadow of History: The Emergence of Archaeology,” The Annual of the British School at Athens 94 (1999), 353-367, Saatsoglou-Paliadeli “Εўρυδίκα Σιππα Εўκλιά” εν Αμητός: Τιμητικός για του ΚατΘηγητή Μανόλη Ανδρόνικο (Thessaloniki, 1987), 733-44; AR 1983: fig. 84, AR 1990: fig. 91; Ergon 1990: 83-85; 1991: 65-68. A headless}
Eurydice of Hierapolis
Made to the Muses this her offering
When she had gained her soul’s desire to learn.
Mother of young and lusty sons was she,
And by her diligence attained to learn
Letters, wherein lies buried all our lore.\

Of course in order for a mother to be able to teach her sons letters, she herself would need to know them, thus daughters would need to be instructed also. Plutarch and pseudo-Plutarch’s instructions and thoughts fit within the works of thinkers such as Cicero, Seneca, Musonius Rufus, Heirocles, and others between 100 BCE and 200 CE who valued the education of women and used traditions regarding the involvement of

statue of Eucleia was discovered near the second inscription.” Elizabeth Donnelly Carney, *Women and Monarchy in Macedonia* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2000), 41 n. 10, 44 n. 28.


Alexander II, Perdicas, and Philip of Macedon. She also had a daughter, Eurynoe.
women in medicine, poetry, and philosophy to make their case.\textsuperscript{352} These writings will be considered in chapter three, where our discussion will especially focus on women educated in philosophical traditions.

\textsuperscript{352} Cornelia was also used by Plutarch and others as an exemplary educated women who cared deeply about the education of her sons, see Plut. \textit{Tib. Gracch.} 1; Tat. \textit{Or.}, 28. Plant, \textit{Women Writers}, 101; Hemelrijk, \textit{Educated Women}, 64-8.
CHAPTER 3: 
WOMEN IN PHILOSOPHY

In chapter two, I surveyed evidence that attests to the education of women and girls in a wide range of disciplines and tasks. In this chapter, I will argue that women were active in almost every ancient philosophical tradition. But these women philosophers are typically not considered in classical or New Testament studies. New Testament scholars have recognized the importance of a wide variety of ancient thought but have not considered how philosophically educated women might have interacted with Paul’s epistles. In this chapter, I will explore traditions that bear witness to the activity of women in philosophy in every major school that is considered important to New Testament studies. It is true that the evidence is varied and scattered over many time periods, but several constants emerge. I will argue that women could learn philosophy in a wide variety of contexts. We will see that philosophical education was most available to women who were connected to a wealthy household. Slaves and freedpersons who were connected to a wealthy household were sometimes encouraged to learn philosophy. Wealthy women were educated as girls by a tutor that was brought into the home, and participate in philosophical debate and discussion as young women and adults.

Women in the History of Philosophy

In the late seventeenth century, the French scholar Gilles Ménage scoured classical literature searching for women remembered as philosophers, women who were
disciples or relatives of known philosophers, and women who contributed to intellectual interests similar to philosophy. A woman would be a philosopher if she met any one of these criteria, and Ménage found sixty-six women philosophers. This number may become less impressive, though, when one considers that at least seventeen of these women come from one list in Iamblichus (c. 245-325 CE, VP 36.267), another is the daughter of a Centaur, and a few others are simply known associates of philosophers.

The following table lists Ménage’s women philosophers and the ancient sources that he used.

Table 1. Ménage’s Women Philosophers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Philosopher</th>
<th>Era</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Hippo</td>
<td>12th BCE</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>daughter of Chiron (or Cheiron) the Centaur</td>
<td>practiced astronomy // prophetess</td>
<td>Clem. Al. Strom. 4.15; Cyril against Julian 4; cf., Plut. Mor. 1145e-1146b (does not mention Hippo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Cleobulina</td>
<td>fl. 570BCE</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>daughter of Cleobulus</td>
<td>composer of riddles</td>
<td>Arist. Rh. 3.2; Plut. Mor. 148d, 150e; Clem. Strom. 4.19; Ath. 4.21, 10.448b; Diog. Laert. 1.89; Pollux 7.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Diotima</td>
<td>5th BCE</td>
<td>Mantenia</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>taught philosophy of love to Socrates</td>
<td>Plato, Sym. 201d; Lucian, Images 18.2, [Eunuchus 7.7]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


355 The content of this table was taken from Ménage’s book. I have updated the references to make it easier for the reader to locate sources from modern editions.
<p>| 5. Beronice | unknown | unknown | unknown | philosopher | Phot. <em>Bibl.</em> 144a |
| 6. Pamphila | 1st CE | Epidaurian from Egypt | daughter of Soteridas, grammarian | philosopher | Phot. <em>Bibl.</em> “Sopater” and “Pamphila”, Sudias “Pamphila” and “Soteridas”; Diog. Laert. often uses her works 1.24.11, 1.68.7, 1.76.1, 1.98.11, 2.24.9, 3.23.4, 5.36.9; <em>Gell.</em> NA 15.17, 23. |
| 10. Myro | unknown | Rhodesian | unknown | philosopher | Sudias, “Myro” and Athen. 2.70. |
| 12. Aganice (Aglaonice) | unknown | unknown | daughter of Hegetor the Thessalian | successfully calculated times of eclipse | Plut. <em>Mor.</em> 145d [“Conjugal Precepts”] |
| 13. Eudocia (Athenais) | 401-460CE | Athens | daughter of Heraclitus or Leontius, wife of Theodosius the Younger | scholar | <em>Paschal Chronicle</em>, Olympiad CCC; Socrates, <em>Ecc. Hist.</em> 7.21 |
| 15. Anna Comnena | 1083-1148 CE | Alexandria | daughter of Emperor Alexius, wife of Nicephorus Brynnius Caesar | scholar / philosopher | Simeon Metaphrastes |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Era</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Eudocia</td>
<td>11th CE</td>
<td>Constantinople</td>
<td>wife of despot Constantine Palaeologus</td>
<td>philosopher</td>
<td>Nicephorus Gregoras, <em>History</em> 8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Panypersebasta</td>
<td>14th CE</td>
<td>Constantinople</td>
<td>wife of Emperor’s nephew John Panypersebastus</td>
<td>scholar / philosopher</td>
<td>Nicephorus Gregoras, <em>History</em> 8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Novella</td>
<td>14th CE</td>
<td></td>
<td>daughter of philosopher John Andrea</td>
<td>lawyer</td>
<td>Christine Pisan, <em>City of Women</em>, part 2 ch. 16.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Heloise</td>
<td>1101-1164 CE</td>
<td>Notre-Dame</td>
<td>wife of Peter Abelard, theologian</td>
<td>instructed by husband in philosophy</td>
<td>Francis Ambrosius, <em>Apologetic Preface for Abelard</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Platonists</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Hypatia</td>
<td>370-415 CE</td>
<td>Alexandria</td>
<td>daughter of Theon of Alexandria</td>
<td>philosopher</td>
<td>Eunapis, &quot;Ionicus&quot; (for Theon); Socrates, <em>Ecclesiastical History</em> 7.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Academicians</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Caerellia</td>
<td>1st CE</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>scholar / philosopher</td>
<td>Cic. <em>Att.</em> 12.51; <em>Letters to His Friends</em> 13.72; Cass. Dio 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Dialecticians</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Argia</td>
<td>4th BCE</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>daughters of the rhetorician Diodorus Cronus (Megarian)</td>
<td>philosopher / rhetorician</td>
<td>Clem. Al. <em>Strom.</em> 4.19; Jerome, <em>Against Jovinianus</em> 1 (cites Philo the Dialectician, disciple of Diodorus Cronus and Zeno of Citium – who said that there were five daughters and he wrote a history of them)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Theognida</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Artemisia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Pantaclea</td>
<td>4th-3rd BCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Cyrenaics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cynics</strong></td>
<td>32. Hipparchia</td>
<td>300 BCE</td>
<td>Maroneia</td>
<td>wife of Crates</td>
<td>philosopher</td>
<td>Antipater Anth. Pal. book 3; Clem. Al. Strom. 4; Diog. Laer. “Hipparchia”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peripatetics</strong></td>
<td>33. Unnamed Daughter of Olympiodorus</td>
<td>5th CE</td>
<td>Daughter of Olympiodorus; wife of (his disciple) Proclus of Lycia</td>
<td>taught philosophy by her father</td>
<td>Marinus of Naples “Proclus”; Suidas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Theodora</td>
<td>6th CE</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>scholar / philosopher</td>
<td>Photius Codex 118 Bekker page 125b line 33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Epicureans</strong></td>
<td>35. Themiste</td>
<td>4th-3rd BCE</td>
<td>Lampascus</td>
<td>wife of Leontius of Lampascus, daughter of Zoilus of Lampascus</td>
<td>philosopher</td>
<td>Clem. Al. Strom. 4; Lactant. 3.25.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Theophila</td>
<td>4th-3rd BCE</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>scholar / philosopher</td>
<td>Martial book 8 [7.69]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Arria</td>
<td>42 BCE; fl. 66CE; d.c. 108CE</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>mother, daughter, granddaughter</td>
<td>philosopher</td>
<td>Plin. Ep. 31, 34, 101; Dio Cass. 60.16.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Arria</td>
<td>41. Fannia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pythagoreans</strong></td>
<td>42. Themistoclea</td>
<td>6th BCE</td>
<td>sister of Pythagoras</td>
<td>taught Pythagoras morals</td>
<td>Diog. Laer. “Pythagoras” = Theoclea in Suidas = Aristoclea in Porphyry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Era</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Sources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Theano</td>
<td>6th BCE</td>
<td>wife of Pythagoras philosopher</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hermesianax Frg. 7.85; Plut. Mor. 145e [&quot;Nuptial Precepts&quot;], Lucian, Images 19.6; Porph. Plot. 4.2, 19.4; Diog. Laert. 8.43.4-6 [&quot;Pythagoras&quot;], Photius codex 177, Bekker page 114b.1; Libanius to Aristaetus; Theodoritus, Therapeutica 2.23.2, 12.73.7; Clem. Al. Strom. 4.19; cf., Herodotus, Persian, book 1; Iamblichus 28.146.13; Anth. Pal. 14.138.4; Athen. 13.71; Pollux 10.21.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Myia</td>
<td>6th–5th BCE</td>
<td>daughter of Pythagoras and Theano philosopher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Damo</td>
<td>6th–5th BCE</td>
<td>daughter of Pythagoras keeper of the sacred Pythagorean writings</td>
<td></td>
<td>Porphyry; Diog. Laert.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>6th–5th BCE</td>
<td>daughter of Pythagoras family relation?</td>
<td></td>
<td>anonymous author of Life of Pythagoras</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Timycha</td>
<td>c. 4th BCE Lacedemonian wife of Myllias of Crotona philosopher</td>
<td></td>
<td>Iamblichus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Philtatis</td>
<td>unknown Crotona daughter of Theoplis of Crotona sister of Bynthanichus philosopher</td>
<td></td>
<td>Iamblichus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Occello</td>
<td>unknown Lucania unknown philosopher</td>
<td></td>
<td>Iamblichus; cf., Censorinus, Natal Day, ch. 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Ecello</td>
<td>unknown Lucania unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Iamblichus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Chilonis</td>
<td>6th BCE Lacedemonia daughter of Chilo of Lacedemonia philosopher</td>
<td></td>
<td>Iamblichus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Theano</td>
<td>6th BCE Metapontium wife of Brontius of Metapontium philosopher</td>
<td></td>
<td>Iamblichus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Lasthenia</td>
<td>4th BCE Arcadia may be the same woman mentioned in Plato philosopher</td>
<td></td>
<td>Iamblichus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Abrotella</td>
<td>unknown Tarentum daughter of Arboles of Tarentum philosopher</td>
<td></td>
<td>Iamblichus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Echecratia</td>
<td>3rd BCE Philasia unknown philosopher</td>
<td></td>
<td>Iamblichus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Tyrsene</td>
<td>unknown Sybaris unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Iamblichus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Bisorronde</td>
<td>unknown Tarentum unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Iamblichus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Era/Place</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nestheadusa</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Lacedemonia, philosopher</td>
<td>Iamblichus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byo</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Argus, philosopher</td>
<td>Iamblichus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bablyma</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Argos, philosopher</td>
<td>Iamblichus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleachma</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Lacedemonia, philosopher, sister of</td>
<td>Iamblichus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Autocharidas of Lacedemonia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phintys</td>
<td>3rd BCE</td>
<td>Athens?, daughter of Callicrates, philosopher</td>
<td>Stobaeus 72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perictione</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown, unknown</td>
<td>Sobaeus; Photius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Pierciones)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown, philosopher</td>
<td>letter from Melissa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to Clareta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhodope</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown, unknown</td>
<td>letter from Theano</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to her “the philosopher”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemais</td>
<td>2nd-3rd CE</td>
<td>Cyrene, unknown, philosopher</td>
<td>Porphyry Commentary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>on the Harmony of Ptolemy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a whole Ménage’s work is still a useful starting point as a sourcebook for classical references to women philosophers. At the same time, there are some significant oversights in Ménage. He completely ignores the epistles of Seneca (c.8-65 BCE/CE) to Helvia and Marcia, and does not fully explore Plutarch’s (c.46-120 BCE) exhortations to Eurydice. This is puzzling because he does acknowledge Cicero’s (106-43 BCE) admiration of Caerellia.³⁵⁶

More recent examinations of women in philosophy are incomplete and do not significantly improve on Ménage. In 1987, Mary Ellen Waithe published a history of

³⁵⁶ Ménage, Philosophers, 7, 31; Cicero favorably mentions Caerellia in Fam. 13.72; and less favorably in Att. 13.21.5, 14.19, and 15.1.4. Cicero was not happy that Caerellia was able to obtain a copy of de Finibus before it was published (but he said that she was inspired by a love of philosophy to do so), and frustrated by her attempt to heal the rift between Cicero and Publilia. Some fragments of his letters to her are preserved by Quint. 6.3.112.
women in philosophy. The following table illustrates the few philosophers that are addressed by the contributors to Waithe’s history.

Table 2. Wathie’s Philosophers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Philosopher</th>
<th>Era</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Thesistoclea</td>
<td>600 BCE</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pythagoras’s sister</td>
<td>taught Pythagoras morals</td>
<td>Pythagorean</td>
<td>Diog. Laert. “Pythagoras” wrote “On Pity” [Hesleff]; Stob. 268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Arignote</td>
<td>550 BCE</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pythagoras’s daughter</td>
<td>philosopher</td>
<td>Pythagorean</td>
<td>Letter to Phyllis [Thesleff / Hercher]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Myia</td>
<td>550 BCE</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pythagoras’s daughter</td>
<td>philosopher = harmonia</td>
<td>Pythagorean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Damo</td>
<td>550 BCE</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pythagoras’s daughter</td>
<td>entrusted with writings</td>
<td>Pythagorean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Phynitis</td>
<td>300 BCE</td>
<td>Sparta</td>
<td>daughter of Kallicrates the Pythagoran</td>
<td>philosopher</td>
<td>Pythagorean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Pericitione I</td>
<td>300 BCE</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>philosopher</td>
<td>Pythagorean</td>
<td>On the Harmony of Women [Thesleff]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Aspasia</td>
<td>450 BCE</td>
<td>Miletus</td>
<td></td>
<td>philosopher</td>
<td>Periclean</td>
<td>speech in Plato <em>Menexes</em> 241c; Pericles funeral oration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table was created from data presented in Waithe’s book. All dates are her own, and where no location was listed I left the entry blank. The term “philosopher” indicates that Waithe claims that the person engaged in philosophy or was philosophically educated.
<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. Diotima</td>
<td>450 BCE</td>
<td>Matinea</td>
<td>not an historical person</td>
<td>fictitious creation by Plato</td>
<td>speech in Plato <em>Symposium</em> 205a-206a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Makrina</td>
<td>300 CE</td>
<td></td>
<td>sister of Gregory of Nyssa</td>
<td>philosopher</td>
<td>P.G. 46, 29b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Hypatia</td>
<td>400 CE</td>
<td>Alexandria</td>
<td>daughter of aristocrats Basilus and Emmelia</td>
<td>philosopher</td>
<td>Christian Neo-Platonist, well documented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Asclepeigenia</td>
<td>400 CE</td>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>daughter of Plutarch the Younger</td>
<td>philosopher</td>
<td>Syncretism, well documented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Axiothea</td>
<td>350 BCE</td>
<td>Philesia</td>
<td>student of Plato</td>
<td>philosopher</td>
<td>Themistius Or. 23.295c; Dicaearchus, frg. 44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Waithe’s work is heavily concentrated on philosophically educated women in Pythagorean traditions, and is useful for its translations of Thesleff’s\textsuperscript{358} Pythagorean texts, but it is overshadowed by Guthrie’s work in 1920.\textsuperscript{359} There are some notes on the historical situation of these women, but these notes have not been well received in scholarship. For example, Mary Anne Warren complains of the lack of critical notes and transitions from one philosopher to the next.\textsuperscript{360} Gillian Clarke posits that Waithe’s understanding of the ancient world lacks an historical method, and Waithe ignored recent scholarship.\textsuperscript{361} R. M. Dancy writes in his critique, “apart from a few displays of thorough and competent research, it is generally based on substandard scholarship.”\textsuperscript{362} Monica Green is troubled by the complete lack of reference to the immense amount of scholarship both on the historical and conceptual context of the subject, concluding that


\textsuperscript{359} Kenneth Sylvan Guthrie, \textit{Pythagoras: Sourcebook and Library. Contains all Available Material about Pythagoras and Complete Collection of Writings of his Disciples. First Rehabilitation of Pythagoreanism for 2400 Years Since the Tragic Burning of the House in which his School was Assembled in Crotona, about 500 B.C.} (Yonkers, N.Y.: Platonist Press 1920).


Waite’s book is a compilation of translations rather than a history of women in philosophy.\textsuperscript{363}

Many other scholars have critically addressed topics that relate to philosophically educated women, but the most important work that critiques Waite and Ménage is Ethel M. Kersey. Kersey’s work is the only modern comprehensive review of ancient female philosophers, but her focus is on the rhetorical portrayal of philosophically educated women in ancient sources rather than establishing reconstructions of the history of educated women.\textsuperscript{364} I. M. Plant has collected many writings of women in the ancient world, including many philosophers that will be very useful for this study due to the depth of study and quality of scholarship.\textsuperscript{365} I will again review the original sources for the best evidence for philosophically educated women and identify their social contexts. I will attempt to show the strength of traditions concerning philosophically educated women in a variety of schools, from the founding of the schools through the second century CE.

\textbf{Women in the Pre-Socratics}

It is said that in the 6\textsuperscript{th} century BCE Bias of Priene ransomed some young women from Messina, educated them like they were his own daughters, and sent them back to


their fathers (Diog. Laert. 1.82). Diogenes Laertius (fl. 3rd CE) also says that Cleobulus of Lindus (6th BCE) had a daughter named Cleobulina, who wrote enigmas in hexameter verse and is mentioned in a play by Cratinus (518-422 BCE).\footnote{366} “[Cleobulus] used to say that men ought to give their daughters in marriage while they were girls in age, but women in sense; as indicating that girls ought to be well educated.”\footnote{367} The riddles of his daughter Cleobulina (fl. early 7th BCE) are preserved in Aristotle (384-322 BCE, Poetics 1458a, not explicitly attributed to Cleobulina), Plutarch (fl. 46-120 CE, Mor. 150e), the Greek Anthology, and Athenaeus (fl. late 2nd CE, 10.448b).\footnote{368} Her riddles were most likely used as subjects of discussion at dinner parties.\footnote{369} Because the fragment in Aristotle is spurious, it is best to regard these women as non-historical predecessors of later philosophically educated women.

The First Philosophically Educated Women: The Pythagorizing Women

Like some other later philosophers, it is said that Pythagoras was taught by a woman. In his case, Diogenes Laertius (fl. 3rd CE) says that Pythagoras (570-495 BCE) 

\footnote{366} Diog. Laert. 1.89; cf., Plut. Mor. 148d.3; Clem. Al. Strom. 4.19.  
\footnote{367} Diog. Laert. 1.91.  
\footnote{368} Plant, Women Writers, 29-32. The biographical information concerning Cleobulina is contradictory, but Plant argues that we should not entirely dismiss her historicity.  
learned ethics from the priestess Themistoclea.\textsuperscript{370} Women were important in Pythagoreanism from its beginnings and these traditions were remembered hundreds of years later.

The traditions concerning Pythagoras’s wife Theano are very early.\textsuperscript{371} Three fragments from ancient poets mention her: Euripides (480-406 BCE, frag. 823 = Stob. 4.23.32 [53] TLG) mentions her simply as Θεσαποκινήτης; in Hermesianax she is Theano of Thebes who speaks in riddles (fl. 330 BCE, frag. 7.85 = Athen.13.10.6); and Empedocles (490-430 BCE, frag. 155.5 = Diog. Laert. 8.43) says she is the wife of Pythagoras. While Cicero (106-43 BCE)\textsuperscript{372} and Seneca (1-65 CE)\textsuperscript{373} knew about many Pythagorean traditions, they do not mention any traditions concerning women in

\textsuperscript{370} Diog. Laert. 8.1.

\textsuperscript{371} The name Theano was very important for Greek cultic traditions. Joan Brenton Connelly traces the traditions of the name Theano as a priestess from Homer onwards in her \textit{Portrait of a Priestess: Women and Ritual in Ancient Greece} (Princeton: University Press, 2007).

\textsuperscript{372} To my knowledge, Cicero does not mention any traditions of women in Pythagoreanism. Pythagoras was important to Cicero due to his interest in friendship (\textit{Off.} 1.56). He mentions persecution of Pythagoreans but nothing of their families (\textit{Off.} 3.10.45). Cicero knows of the tradition of Pythagoras’ remarkable memory (\textit{Sen.} 78, cf. 92). He says that he is irritated with Pythagoreans who quote the philosopher as “the master” (\textit{Nat. D.} 1.26). He argues against the Pythagorean dogma concerning the unity of the human soul with God (\textit{Nat. D.} 1.40, cf. 3.314), he knows of their tradition of secrecy 1.74, and he follows the tradition of Pythagoras sacrificing a goat when he made a discovery in geometry 3.339. In \textit{Or.} 9.31 he sarcastically asks if a woman had read Plato or Pythagoras (otherwise she would be free from her lusts). In \textit{Rep.} there is a musing about Plato learning from the Pythagoreans, 3.301; Pythagoras is dated in the 63\textsuperscript{rd} Olympiad in 2.560.

\textsuperscript{373} Seneca knows of Pythagorean reincarnation, \textit{Ben.} 7.20.5; silence for five years, \textit{Ep.} 52; Pythagorean spiritual teachings in \textit{Ep.} 94; Sotion’s Pythagorean teachings inspired him to be a vegetarian (even though he did not adopt a Pythagorean rationale), \textit{Ep.} 108. Cf., Brad Inwood, “Seneca in His Philosophical Milieu,” \textit{HSCP} 97 (1995): 69-70.
Pythagoreanism. The biographers of Pythagoras, who may be relying on a lost work of Aristotle, trace the origins of some of his teachings to women. Plutarch (c. 46-120 CE) mentions Theano in using her teachings to instruct Eurydice in the womanly virtues of modesty, silence, and learning.\textsuperscript{[374]} Julius Polloxy (2\textsuperscript{nd} CE) mentions Theano as the author of the epistle to Timaretan.\textsuperscript{[375]} Athenaeus (fl. late 2\textsuperscript{nd} CE) has an interest in Theano due to the association of Pythagoreans with an odd diet.\textsuperscript{[376]} Lucian of Samosata (125-180 CE), in his \textit{Dialogue on Male and Female Love} briefly mentions Theano as the daughter of Pythagoras.\textsuperscript{[377]} Photius (810-893 CE) preserves an anonymous biography of Pythagoras which indicates that Theano was a disciple who was \textit{like} a daughter.\textsuperscript{[378]} Theano’s entry in the Suda (10\textsuperscript{th} CE) identifies her as a Pythagorean philosopher who authored a few lost works.\textsuperscript{[379]}

There are seven letters attributed to Theano in the neo-Pythagorean pseudepigraphon which are all addressed to women. However, these letters do not

\textsuperscript{[374]} Plut. \textit{Mor}. 142c. For detailed discussion and bibliography, see Sarah B. Pomeroy, \textit{Advice to the Bride and Groom} (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999).

\textsuperscript{[375]} Julius Polloxy, \textit{Onomasticon}, 10.21.7. This letter is preserved in Thesleff, but is certainly not the Pythagorean Theano.

\textsuperscript{[376]} Ath. 8.21.36; 13.6.31; 13.10.6; 2.2.102.8; 2.2.102.17.

\textsuperscript{[377]} Lucian, \textit{Erotes}, 30.

\textsuperscript{[378]} Thesleff, \textit{Pythagorean Texts}, 237.15.

\textsuperscript{[379]} Burkert explains that the different roles of Theano as wife, daughter, or student of Pythagoras is related to the conflicting theories of whether or not he was celibate in \textit{Lore and Science}, 114. I will note here that Robert Garland suggests that there was not much room in antiquity for women with brains, \textit{Celebrity in Antiquity: From Media Tarts to Tabloid Queens} (London: Duckworth, 2006), 127. Within Pythagorean families, as well as within the families of Seneca, Plutarch and Pliny, intelligent women were highly valued.
contain any meaningful continuity with the doctrines of Pythagoreanism, none has the preserved teachings of Theano, and some have no contact with any other known philosophy. The letters are considered “neo-Pythagorean” only because some letters are written by or addressed to names traditionally associated with Pythagoreanism. It is important that these letters appear at about the time of Paul: it was feasible for women to be active in philosophy, even if it was restricted to popular morality concerning patronage, marriage and family, and self-sufficiency as I will demonstrate in chapters 5-8.

Pythagoreanism and Early Christianity

Justin Martyr (103-165 CE) is the first Christian apologist to mention Pythagoras, but it is almost in passing and includes no specific reference to his teachings or traditions concerning women. Justin tells us that he tried to be a student of an illustrious Pythagorean but was not qualified; in fact, this is the only instance in Justin where

---

380 The text of the letters are preserved in Thesleff, *Pythagorean Texts*, 195-201. An English translation and some very brief commentary is available by Vicki Lynn Harper in Wain, *Women Philosophers*, 41-55. Discussion of this letter is available in New Docs 6:18-23; Pomeroy, *Women in Hellenistic Egypt: From Alexander to Cleopatra*, 64-8; Treggiari, *Roman Marriage*, 193. English translation available in Malherbe, *Moral Exhortation*, 82-5. I do not exclude the possibility that these were written by neo-Pythagorean women who may have taken names of early Pythagorean philosophers because they reinforce traditional misogynistic ideals. Therefore, we may need to consider that these writings were not liberating for women. For later traditions see Patricia A. Rosenmeyer, *Ancient Epistolary Fictions: The Letter in Greek Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 201–2, 206–8.

Pythagoras or Pythagoreans are not lumped together with Plato or other schools. Tatian (120-180 CE) uses Pythagoras’s teaching concerning reincarnation as part of a polemic against the various teachings of Greek philosophers concerning the doctrine of the soul.

Theophilus of Antioch (d. 181 CE) briefly mentions Pythagoras, but similarly to Tatian it is sounding within his polemic against other philosophers; Pythagoras is attacked for teaching that no god should be worshipped. Hippolytus of Rome (170-235 CE) identifies Valentinus (d. 150 CE) as a Pythagorean, tracing his views back to Timaeus’s method in Plato’s Timaeus.

Being the first Christian apologist to have a knowledgeable and somewhat favorable disposition to the philosopher, Clement of Alexandria (150-215 CE) preserves twelve Pythagorean ἀκουσμα and considered Philo a Pythagorean. Clement is of

---

382 Just. Dial. 2; cf. 5 and 6. To modern scholars, Justin’s teacher would be considered a neo-Pythagorean.

383 Tat. Ad. Gr. 25. Tatian dates Pythagoras in the 62nd Olympiad in ch. 41; Diog. Laert. 8.45 places him in the 60th. Diogenes Laertius says that Pythagoras thought that he was the reincarnated Aethalides, the son of Hermes who could remember everything, Diog. Laert. 8.4. For the theological method of Tat. see Robert Grant, “Studies in the Apologists,” HTR 51, no. 3 (1958): 123-28.


course not always favorable in his references to Pythagoreanism and Platonism, comparing both schools to Marcion in their hatred for being born into the world and decrying marriage.\(^\text{387}\) In addition to this, Clement contrasts the way that humans acquire knowledge of the divine in Christianity and philosophy.\(^\text{388}\) However, keeping with the apologetic tradition of dating Moses before the philosophers, Clement believes that Pythagoras borrowed many teachings from Moses.\(^\text{389}\) Clement (150-215 CE) also knows of the secret nature of Pythagorean teachings, citing for example the expulsion of Hipparchus (c. 380 BCE).\(^\text{390}\) It is the secret nature of the Pythagorean teachings which would give an ideal context for the participation of women in Pythagoreanism as preservers and guardians of secret philosophical tradition within families. Some of

Pythagorean practices and teachings in *Strom.* 1.1.10; 1.10.6 referring to Muses and Sirens; 1.14.62-3 includes important biographical information for Pythagoras but is lacking mention of women (cf., 6.2.27); 1.15.69-70 continues biographical information; 4.3.9 God alone is wise; 4.22.144 hope after death; 4.26.144 the Christian makes use of the Pythagorean teaching of threefold good things and their method of prayer (two references); 5.8.50 Clement sees value in the symbolic interpretation of some words by Androcydes the Pythagorean; 5.11.67 silent reflection applauded; cf., *Paed.* 1.10.94; 2.1.11.

\(^{387}\) *Strom.* 3.3.12-24.

\(^{388}\) *Strom.* 5.13.88 and 6.7.57; cf., 6.8.1. In 5.14.89 Clement challenges Pythagoras and other philosophers on their concept of matter. Pythagoras’ concept of the transmigration of the soul is discarded in 2.20.114; 7.6.32.

\(^{389}\) *Strom.* 1.21 has some biographical information as Clement argues for the primacy of Moses; cf., 1.22.3; 2.18.79.

\(^{390}\) *Strom.* 5.9.57; the expulsion of Hipparchus is also known to Iambl. 17.75. Iamblichus quotes part of the letter by Lysis to Hipparchus; Diogenes Laertius also knows of this letter. Michel Tardieu demonstrates that Clement and the letter of Lysis (in Thesleff, 111-14) quote from the same source, “La Lettre à Hipparque et les réminiscences pythagoriciennes de Clément d’Alexandrie,” *VC* 28, no. 4 (1974): 241-7. Cf., Burkert, *Lore and Science,* for the secret nature of the original Pythagoreans (from Aristotle), 178-9; cf., further discussion in 219-24; for the letter of Lysis, 459.
Clement’s references to Pythagoras (and his teachings and followers) touch on issues related to women,\(^{391}\) culminating in his four references to Theano.\(^{392}\)

All of Clement’s references to Theano are complimentary and most of them are known by other ancient sources that will be discussed below. Clement mentions, as do other writers, that Theano was the first woman to philosophize:

\[
\text{Δίδυμος δὲ ἐν τῷ περὶ Πυθαγορικῆς φιλοσοφίας Θεανῷ τῇ Κροτωνίατιν πρώτην γυναικῶν φιλοσοφῆσαι καὶ ποιήματα γράψαι ιστορεῖ. Ἡ μὲν οὖν Ἑλληνικὴ φιλοσοφία, ὃς μὲν τινες, κατὰ περὶ πτῶσιν ἐπηβολος τῆς ἀληθείας ἀμὴ γέ μη, ἀμυδρὸς δὲ καὶ οὗ πασης, γίνεται ὃς δὲ ἀλλοι βουλονται, ἐκ τοῦ διαβόλου τῆν κίνησιν ἱσχει. ἦνοι δὲ δυναμες τινας υποβεβηκίως ἐμπνεύσαι τὴν πᾶσαν φιλοσοφίαν ὑπειλήφασιν.}
\]

Didymus, however, in his work On the Pythagorean Philosophy, relates that Theano of Crotona was the first woman who cultivated philosophy and composed poems. The Hellenic philosophy then, according to some, apprehended the truth accidentally, dimly, partially; as others will have it, was set a-going by the devil. Several suppose that certain powers, descending from heaven, inspired the whole of philosophy.\(^{393}\)

---

\(^{391}\) Clement uses Pythagoras and the Hebrew Bible to argue against the practice of exposure in 2.18.92-3 and compares the care of animal mothers to their offspring as a calling for human mothers to care for theirs; cf. 5.1.8; 5.14.


Clement (150-215 CE) appeals to Theano alongside several other philosophers as having a grasp on the truth of the afterlife in 4.7.44, “Θεανὼ γὰρ ἡ Πυθαγορική γράφει· ἤν γὰρ ἄν τῷ ὁμντι τοῖς κακοῖς εὔωχία ὁ βίος πονηρευσαμένοις· ἐπείτα τελευτῶσιν, εἰ μὴ ἦν ἄθανα τος ἡ ψυχή, ἔρμαιον ὁ θάνατος,” “For the Pythagorean Theano writes, ‘Life were indeed a feast to the wicked, who, having done evil, then die; were not the soul immortal, death would be a godsend.”’

In his third reference to Theano, Clement points to many great women who were popular in Christian traditions - Judith and Esther - as well as Greek (female) philosophers, poets, and artists:

Did not Theano the Pythagorean make such progress in philosophy, that to him who looked intently at her, and said, “Your arm is beautiful,” she answered “Yes, but it is not public.” Characterized by the same propriety, there is also reported the following reply. When asked when a woman after being with her husband attends the Thesmophoria, said, “From her own husband at once, from a stranger never.” Themisto too, of Lamphacus, the daughter of Zoilus, the wife of Leontes of Lamphacus, studied the Epicurean philosophy, as Myia the daughter of Theano the Pythagorean, and Arignote, who wrote the history of Dionysius.395

---

394 I have been unable to locate another ancient author who preserves this tradition, Cf., *Strom. 4.8* (Translation from ANF Roberts-Donaldson), where Clement argues that women should philosophize just like men, although he asserts the superiority of men in all things. Clement mentions two exemplary Pythagoreans in his introduction to this section.

395 *Strom. 4.19.122*. Translation from ANF Roberts-Donaldson.
Theano’s exposed arm, her wit, and her modesty were previously highlighted by Plutarch (46-120 CE). He uses the first teaching to exhort Eurydice to remain silent outside of the home, having her speech modestly covered like her body in *Advice to the Bride and Groom*:

> Ἡ Θεανὼ παρέφημε τὴν χείρα περιβαλλομένη τῷ ιμάτιον. εἰπόντος δὲ τινὸς “καλὸς ὁ πίθυς,” “ἀλλ’ οὐ δημόσιος,” ἔφη, δεῖ δὲ μὴ μόνον τὸν πίθυν ἀλλὰ μηδὲ τὸν λόγον δημόσιον εἶναι τῆς σωφροσύνης, καὶ τὴν φωνήν ὡς ἀπογύμνωσιν αἰδεῖσθαι καὶ φυλάττεσθαι πρὸς τοὺς ἐκτὸς· ἐνορᾶται γὰρ αὐτῇ καὶ πάθος καὶ ἡθὸς καὶ διάθεσις λαλοῦσης.

Theano, in putting on her cloak about her, exposed her arm. Somebody exclaimed, ‘A lovely arm.’ ‘But not for public,’ said she. Not only the arm of the virtuous woman, but her speech as well, ought to be not for the public, and she ought to be modest and guarded about saying anything in the hearing of outsiders, since it is an exposure of herself; for in her talk can be seen her feelings, character, and disposition.396

For Plutarch (c. 46-120 CE), the use of philosophy by women is understood as both pragmatic (for modesty and practical living) as well as for the enrichment of the soul (e.g., philosophical reflection). Her husband, Pollianus is to seek teachers outside of the home and to bring to his wife both what he thinks that she needs and what interests her.397


397 In the case that the husband is younger and marries an older, more educated woman, she is to teach him, *Mor.* 754d; cf., Gillian Clark, “Roman Women,” *G&R*, 2nd ser. 28, no. 2, Jubilee Year (1981): 193-212.
Besides, Pollianus, you already possess sufficient maturity to study philosophy, and I beg that you will beautify your character with the aid of discourses which are attended by logical demonstration and mature deliberation, seeking the company and instruction of teachers who will help you. And for your wife you must collect from every source what is useful, as do the bees, and carrying it within your own self impart it to her, and then discuss it with her, and make the best of these doctrines her favourite and familiar themes. For to her, “Thou art a father and precious-loved mother, Yea, and a brother as well.” No less ennobling is it for a man among other things hear his wife say, “My dear husband, Nay, but thou art to me guide, philosopher, and teacher in all that is most lovely and divine.” Studies of this sort, in the first place, divert women from all untoward conduct; for a woman studying geometry will be ashamed to be a dancer, and she will not swallow any beliefs in magic charms while she is under the charm of Plato’s or Xenophon’s words. And if anybody professes power to pull down the moon from the sky, she will laugh at the ignorance and stupidity of women who believe these things, inasmuch as she herself is not unschooled in astronomy, and has read in the books about Aglaonice, the daughter of Hegetor of Thessaly, and how she, through being thoroughly acquainted with the periods of the full moon when it is subject to eclipse, and, knowing beforehand the time when the moon was due to be overtaken by the earth’s shadow, imposed upon the women, and made them all believe that she was drawing down the moon.

After citing a number of exemplary women, Plutarch (c. 46-120 CE) asserts that she is to learn Plato and Xenophon in order to help her live according to reason instead of being

---

398 Plut. Mor. 145b-c (Babbitt, LCL).
attracted to dancing or magic (145c). Plutarch indicates that Eurydice learned some philosophy at home from her parents before she was married and she is to continue that education under the direction of her husband. As a married woman, she is to adorn herself with the teachings of Theano, heroic women, and Cornelia (who educated her sons) rather than with jewels (145e).

The fourth reference in Clement (c. 150-217 CE) is very well-known. It is extant only as its chreia form and could have as its source an original moral teaching from Theano herself. This teaching was identified as a chreia by the ancient rhetorician Aelius Theon (early 2nd CE).

\[\text{ἡ δὲ πυθαγορικὴ τοιαύτη ἑστίν, οἶνον Θεανώ η Πυθαγορικὴ φιλόσοφος ἐρωτηθεῖσα ὑπὸ τινός, ποσταία γυνὴ ἀπὸ ἀνδρὸς καθαρὰ ἐϊς τὸ θεσμοφορεῖον κάτειν, εἰπεν, ἀπὸ μὲν τοῦ ἰδίου παραχρῆμα, ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ ἀλλοτρίου οὐδὲποτε.}\]

The chreia with an inquiry is like this, for example: Theano, the Pythagorean philosopher, on being asked by someone how long after intercourse with a man does a woman go in purity to the Thesmorphorion, said: ‘With your own, immediately; with another’s, never.’

\[\text{399 See below, section 3.3.}\]

\[\text{400 The picture painted here - that women learned philosophy from their fathers or husbands - is not intended to be one-sided. It is my understanding that wealthy women, particularly widows, were well-positioned in the first century to do whatever they wanted and were therefore certainly able to find teachers (whether male or female) willing to come into their home and teach them and their children.}\]

\[\text{401 For a detailed study on chreia, see Ronald Hock and Edward O’Neil, The Chreia in Ancient Rhetoric, SBL Texts and Translation Series, ed. Hans Dieter Betz and Edward O’Neil, vol. 27 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986); for the conversion of quotes into chreia in ancient epistles see the excellent discussion and examples in M. Luther Stirewalt, Studies in Ancient Greek Epistolography, ed. Marvin A. Sweeney (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993), 43-64.}\]

\[\text{402 Text and translation is from Hock and O’Neil, The Chreia in Ancient Rhetoric, pg 86; cf., James Butts’ dissertation, “The ‘Progymnasmata’ of Theon” (PhD diss.,}\]
Significantly, everywhere the quotation appears in antiquity except for Iamblichus, a question is part of the formula. In Clement (150-215 CE, Stom. 4.19.122), Aelius Theon (fl. mid 1st CE, 98.3), and Diogenes Laertius (fl. 3rd CE, Diog. Laert. 8.22) this teaching of Theano always is in the form of the question. The teaching appears in Iamblichus VP 132,\textsuperscript{403} but he is uncertain who said it, which may explain why there is no question. This consistency demonstrates the role of Theano as a wise-person: one to whom questions are asked and wisdom is derived. In Aelius Theon, Theano is quoted along with the renowned Greek philosophers Plato, Socrates, and Diogenes the Cynic, not to mention Pythagoras himself (the quote from Pythagoras is not in close proximity to Theano). Aelius Theon remembers Theano not as the student, wife, or daughter of Pythagoras, but simply as a Pythagorean philosopher.

**Biographers of Pythagoras: More Teachings of Theano**

The first century and Pythagorean\textsuperscript{404} and neo-Pythagorean\textsuperscript{405} traditions concerning women in Pythagoreanism are certainly related to the memory of Pythagoras himself as reflected both in his biographers and other ancient references. Pythagoras had

\textsuperscript{403} Text and translation for Iamblichus is from De Vita Pythagorica, trans. John Dillon (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991).

\textsuperscript{404} As previously identified and discussed above in Cicero (106-43 BCE), Seneca (1-65 CE), and Plutarch (46-120 CE).

\textsuperscript{405} As preserved in the neo-Pythagorean corpus which include letters attributed to women.
many biographers, but only three are largely extant: the biographies of Diogenes Laertius (fl.c. 3rd CE); Iamblichus (280-333 CE), Porphyry (233-306 CE).\textsuperscript{406} Many other biographies existed in ancient times and all extant biographers preserve important traditions related to women in Pythagoreanism and obviously depend on more ancient sources. Most important is Aristotle’s lost work on Pythagoras. J. A. Philip argues from the fragments that Aristotle actually wrote two monographs on Pythagoras.\textsuperscript{407} Philip also introduces the possibility that the root material concerning Pythagoras in the biographers could have Aristotle’s monographs as their ultimate source.

Pythagorean women were leading characters in Old Comedy due to peculiar dietary habits according to Athenaeus (fl. late 2nd CE).\textsuperscript{408} Diogenes Laertius (fl. 3rd CE) preserves several traditions regarding Pythagorean women. He notes that the involvement of women in Pythagoreanism was satirized by Cratinus in the \textit{Pythagorizing Woman} (the only extant fragment of this play is Diog. Laert. 8.37).\textsuperscript{409} Diogenes (fl. 3rd CE) says that Pythagoras entrusted his teachings to his daughter Damo, exhorting her not

\textsuperscript{406} Photius (c.820-c.891 CE) is also available but much later than our time period.


\textsuperscript{408} Walter Burkett, \textit{Lore and Science}, 198

\textsuperscript{409} There were two plays in the classical period, both are not extant, entitled \textit{Pythagorizousa}, one by Cratinus (see in TLG Kock frag. 6; Mieneke Pyth 1) and one by Alexis (pokes fun at the Pythagorean diet, cf., frags. 196-99 Kock; Pyth. 1-3 in Mieneke). Taylor also writes that Philochorus also dedicated a work to Pythagorean women according to \textit{FGrHist} 328 T 1 (ed. Jacoby), \textit{Pythagoreans}, 33. However, I think that Taylor has confused his citation because I cannot verify from \textit{FGrHist} 328 T 1 that it has anything to do with Pythagorean women, cf., Lawrence J. Bliquez, “A Note on the Didymus Papyrus XII.35,” \textit{CJ} 67, no. 4 (1972): 356.
to make the teachings public (Diog. Laert. 8.42), citing the letter of Lysis to Hipparchus as his source. Damo said that she was faithful to her father’s wishes because “she was only a woman.” This tradition is apparently ancient and popular. An extant letter of Lysis to Hipparchus in Thesleff does not mention Theano, but says that Pythagoras entrusted his teachings to Damo and she in turn taught them to her daughter Bistala.410

According to Diogenes, Pythagoras’s son Telauges succeeded his father but wrote nothing. Pythagoras’s wife Theano, on the other hand, did write and is remembered by her philosophy with the familiar teaching:

They also had a son Telauges, who succeeded his father and, according to some, was Empedocles’s instructor. At all events Hippobotus makes Empedocles say: Telauges, famed son of Theano and Pythagoras. Telauges wrote nothing, so far as we know, but his mother Theano wrote a few things. Further, a story is told that being asked how many days it was before a woman becomes pure after intercourse, she replied, ‘With her own husband at once, with another man never.’ And she advised a woman going in to her own husband to put off her shame with her clothes, and on leaving him to put it on again along with them. Asked, ‘Put on what?’, she replied, ‘What makes me to be called a woman.’411

410 Lysis, Ep. 114.5.

411 Diog. Laert. 8.43 (Hicks, LCL). The shame of a married woman appearing naked before a man other than her husband is discussed in Douglas L. Cairns, “‘Off with her AIDWS’: Herodotus 1.8.3-4,” CQ 46, no. 1 (1996): 78-83.
Diogenes also says that Hermippus writes that as Pythagoras was dying, men sent their wives to him to learn his philosophy and they were known as the “Pythagorean women” (Diog. Laert. 8.1.41).

Iamblichus (245-325 CE) presents a Pythagoras who is persuaded by his wife Theano (or another woman) to end marital infidelity in Croton.

He is said also to have freed the Crotoniates entirely from concubines and from intercourse with unwedded women. For to Deino, wife of Brontinus, one of the Pythagoreans, a woman of wise and exceptional spirit, to whom also belongs a saying noble and admired by all: 'the wife ought to sacrifice on the very day she arose from sleep with her own husband.' (which saying some ascribe to Theano); to her, then, the wives of the Crotoniates came, and requested her to join them in persuading Pythagoras to talk about the chastity due them for their own husbands. This, in fact, came about: the women passed on the message, Pythagoras spoke to the Crotoniates, and the were persuaded to altogether abolish the licentiousness then prevalent.412

It is important that Iamblichus has Pythagoras teach marital fidelity, something that both philosophers, ancient law, and practice are divided on according to time period and geography. It is well known that the prevailing view in the ancient world from the point of view of law and some moralists was that the wife had to be chaste in a marriage, but

412 VP 27.132
the husband could be free in his sexual activity. Indeed, the so-called neo-Pythagoreans present separate views on this issue.

Iamblichus (245-325 CE) preserves the tradition mentioned above that Pythagoras left his writings to his daughter Damo who entrusted the writings to her daughter Bitale. Telauges is unknown to Iamblichus’s source. Iamblichus tells us that due to persecutions, Pythagorean philosophy was passed on from parents to children, and daughters and wives were crucial to this process. Iamblichus also remarks on the education of Pythagoras’s daughter:

gίμαντα δὲ τὴν γεννηθέσαν αὐτῷ θυγατέρα, μετὰ ταύτα δὲ Μένου τῷ Κροτωνίαττι συνοίκησαν, ἀγογείν οὖτως, ὡστε παρθένοι μὲν οὔσαν ἤγεισθαι τῶν χορῶν, γυναῖκα δὲ γενομένην πρώτην προσέναι τοῖς βωμοῖς

---


415 VP 28.146.

416 VP, pg 163 n. 23

“Also when he married, he so educated the daughter that was born to him, and who afterwards married the Crotonian Meno, that while unmarried she was a choir-leader, while as wife she held the first place among those who worshipped at altars.” 418

Iamblichus crowns his De Vita Pythagorica with a list of 218 male and 17 female Pythagorean philosophers. 419

The most illustrious Pythagorean women are Timycha the wife of Myllias the Crotonian; Phyltis the daughter of Theorphius the Crotonian; Byndacis the sister of Ocellus; Lucanians; Chilonis the daughter of Chilon the Lacedononian; Cratesiclea the Lacedemonian the wife of the Lacedemonian Cleanor; Theane the wife of Brontinus of Metapontum; Mya, the wife of Milon the Crotonian; Lasthenia the Arcadian; Abrotelia the daughter of Abroteles the Tarentine; Echecratia the Phliasian; Tyrsenis the Sybarite; Pisirrhonde the Tarentine; Nisleadusa, the Lacedemonian; Byro the Argive; Babelyma the Argive, and Cleaechma the sister of Autocharidas the Lacedemonian. 420

 Nine of these women have their husbands or family members listed with them as philosophers: Tmycha, Phyltis, Byndacis, Chilonis, Cratesiclea, Theane, Mya, Abrotelia, and Cleaechma. Six are listed strictly on their own merit: Lucanians, Lasthenia,

Echecratia, Tyrsenis, Pisirrhonde, Nisleadusa, Byro, Babelyma. All of these women are

418 Iambl. VP 30.170.5 (Dillon and Hershbell, 185).

419 For notes and bibliography on this list, see Burkett, Lore and Science, 105 n 40; Sarah Pomery, Spartan Women (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 11. Iamblichus’s student Sopater has a similar list in Photius, 161; Christian Walz, Rhetores Graeci, vol 8.

420 Iambl. VP 36.258 (Dillon and Hershbell, 259).
known to us only through Iamblichus. Because he gives nothing more than names, and they are available nowhere else, it is unfortunately impossible to do anything but note that he presents the list. The most Iamblichus (c. 245-325 BCE) can tell us, in my opinion, is that neo-Pythagoreans of his day and recent memory had been friendly to the idea that women played an important role in the history of that school.

The entrusting of writings to family rather than friends may indicate that Pythagoreans either in the time of Iamblichus in particular or possibly Pythagoras himself were not integrated into their communities. This lack of integration would be caused by the secret nature of Pythagorean teachings, the strange diet,421 and displacement caused by wars and changing rulers. All of these factors would cause alienation from friends and motivate the Pythagoreans to pass on their teachings strictly to students (i.e., members of the community) and especially family members. The production of texts within families is a deviation from the production of literature in the first century by Cicero, Pliny the Younger, and Maecenas, who were integrated into patronage relationships.422 We see the alienation of Pythagoreans from their communities due to their secrecy and diet in Iamblichus,423 where an expectant mother, Timycha, bites off her tongue rather than share Pythagorean philosophy. Iamblichus concludes, “οὐτός δεισουγκατάθετοι πρὸς

421 Seneca himself experienced alienation due to his meatless diet which was inspired by Pythagorean teachings, Ep. 108.


423 Burkert discusses problems in the earliest Pythagorean communities in Lore and Science, 106.
Porphyry (234-305 CE) indicates that the magistrates of Croton ordered the boys and girls and women to learn from Pythagoras. Theano is particularly noted as an illustrious Crotonian woman, but Porphyry does not include any of her teachings. Porphyry writes that an association of women was formed for the purpose of learning from Pythagoras (καὶ γυναικῶν σύλλογος αὐτῶ κατασκευάσθη) and they also learned his philosophy alongside men and children. Pythagoras’s teachings concerning reincarnation and the secrecy that he enjoined on his followers is also noted (19).

As late as the 16th century CE, the Pythagorizing women are remembered in Holinsherd’s Chronicles (chapter 10, published 1586):

But sith those bookes are now perished, and the most of the said Ilands remaine vterlie vnknowen, euen to our owne selues (for who is able in our time to say where is Glota, Hiucron, Etta, Iduna, Armia, Aesarea, Barsa, Isiandium, Icdelis, Xantisma, Indelis, Siata, Ga. Andros or Edros, Siambis, Xanthos, Ricnea, Menapia, whose names onelie are left in memorie by ancient writers, but I saie their places not so much as heard of in our daies) I meane (God willing) to set downe so manie of them with their commodities, as I do either know by Leland, or am otherwise instructed of by such as are of credit.

Women Associated with Socrates and the Academy

There are three women that Socrates (469-399 BCE) claims as his teachers:

Phaenerete, Diotima, and Aspasia of Miletus. In an argument concerning pregnancy

---

424 VP 31.192-94 (Dillon and Hershbell, 201). Note the friendship/patronage language in the passage.

425 Porph. VP 18-19.

426 Cheryl Glenn, *Rhetoric Retold: Regendering the Tradition from Antiquity through the Renaissance* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1997), n. 17:
and birth, Socrates claims to have authority based on training in midwifery that he received from his mother, Phaenerete. Unlike other traditions concerning ancient philosophically educated women (such as Perictione in the neo-Pythagorean pseudepigraphon), the teachings of Diotima and Aspasia are connected with their earliest appearance in the tradition. Diotima gained fame in Socrates’s representation of her in Plato’s *Symposium*.

Aspasia of Miletus is remembered as an apt rhetorician by Plato (429-347 BCE), Xenophon (430-354 BCE), Cicero (106-43 BCE), Plutarch (50-120 CE), and Athenaeus

---

“Most scholars (Edmund F. Bloedow, Robert Flaceliere, David M. Halperin, Roger Just, Eva C. Keuls, Hans Licht, Josiah Ober, for instance) have labeled Aspasia a courtesan, schooled in intellectual and social arts. But both Eve Cantarella and William Courtney argue that the Athenian suspicion and misunderstanding of such a powerful, political, non-Athenian, unmarried woman living with their controversial leader, Pericles, led automatically to the sexualized and undeserved label of hetaera; Nicole Loraux refers to Aspasia as a foreigner and as a nonpolitician (Invention); Mary Ellen Waithe calls her ‘a rhetorician and a member of the Periclean philosophic circle,’ *History*, 75; and Susan Cole writes only of Aspasia’s intellectual influence and measure of literacy, 225.”


429 Harry Neumann, “Diotima’s Concept of Love,” *AJP* 86, no. 1 (1965); F. C. White, “Love and Beauty in Plato’s Symposium,” *JHS* 109 (1989): 149-57; Amélie Oksenberg Rorty, “As Diotima Saw Socrates,” *Arion* 4, no. 3 (1997); Pl. *Sym.* 208. Diotima’s speech is from 210d-212a. Diotima may be a real person or a rhetorical creation of Plato. Her existence, however, cannot be dismissed on the basis that women did not participate in philosophy. The best explanation in my opinion is that she is a fictional character based on an actual female philosopher, but there is no conclusive evidence for either side of the issue.
In Plato’s *Menexenus*, Socrates claimed to have learned rhetoric from Aspasia who taught many others, including Pericles (235e). In the first century, Plutarch takes this situation as historical (*Per. 24.7*). The sexual availability of the male philosophers with one another and their students could have contributed to the ideal of the educated *hetaira*. The overwhelming scholarly consensus is that Aspasia was a prostitute and ran a brothel in Athens. However, Anthony J. Podlecki has demonstrated that the evidence for this is not very strong: the argument is based on sources that either “tell the truth in jest” or are openly attacking the Socratic circle by casting it in terms of sexual disrepute. It is significant that Aspasia is not an Athenian subject to the strict ideals of the secluded and chaste wife. Tradition indicates that somehow she read Plato and came to Athens to learn from him and subsequently started her own school for girls, and at the same time the school was considered a brothel. Of equal importance is the Platonic concept that women should be held in common and rule of the city should be done by wise men and women – this sexual availability can certainly lead to the conceptualization of Aspasia’s school as a brothel. The atmosphere of philosophical discussion in Athens encouraged and glorified sexual activity between men

---


432 Madeline M. Henry is the most ardent champion of the point of view that Aspasia is completely lost in the rhetoric of men, *Prisoner of History: Aspasia of Miletus and her Biographical Tradition* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995).

and their companions – be they male or female students. The appearance of women in public in classical Athens sexualizes the woman, to the point that Aspasia and her prostitutes were seen as the cause of war. The earliest writer that says Aspasia ran a brothel is in Antisthenes (444–365 BCE), Acharnians 524, and he makes a similar accusation of Pericles’s son, Xanthippos, who lived with Archestratos, who “plied a trade similar to that of women in the cheaper brothels.”

Considering these points, it is best to remember Aspasia as the beloved wife of Pericles, which may conflict with her reputation as a courtesan. Her reputation as a courtesan may well be the result of her public activity in the Socratic circle, which gave men the opportunity to oversexualize her memory. Athenaeus (fl. late 2nd CE) writes of Aspasia:

καὶ Ἀσπασία δὲ ἡ Ἰωκράτικη ἐνεπορεύετο πλήθη καλῶν γυναικῶν, καὶ ἐπλήθυσεν ἀπὸ τῶν ταυτίς ἐπαιρίδον ἡ Ἑλλάς, ὡς καὶ οἱ χαρίεις Ἀριστοφάνης παρασημαίνει τε, λέγων [τὸν Πελοπονησιακὸν πόλεμον] ὀτι Περικλῆς διὰ τὸν Ἀσπασίας ἐρώτα καὶ τὸς ἀρπασθείας ἀπ’ αὐτῆς θεραπαίνας ὑπὸ Μεγαρέων ἀνερρίπτεσεν τὸ δείνον.

And Aspasia, the friend of Socrates, imported great numbers of beautiful women, and Greece was entirely filled with her courtesans; as that witty writer

---


Aristophanes relates [Acharn 524], saying that the Peloponnesian war was excited by Pericles, [570] on account of his love for Aspasia, and on account of the girls who had been carried away from her by the Megarians.  

According to Xenophon (430-354 BCE), Socrates learned about marriage from Aspasia:

Δ’ ούχ ώς ποτε ἔγιν᾽ Ἀσπασίας ἡκουσα: ἐφ’ γὰρ τὰς ἀγάθας προμηθείας μετὰ μὲν ἀληθείας τάγαθα διαγγέλλουσας δεινὰς εἶναι συνάγειν ἀνθρώπους εἰς κηδεῖα, ἰδιαίτερον δ’ οὐκ ἠθελεὶ ἐπαινεῖν τοὺς γὰρ ἑξαπατηθέντας ὧμα μισεῖν ἀλλήλους τε καὶ τὴν προμηθείαν. ᾧ δὴ καὶ ἐγὼ πειθεῖς ὀρθῶς ἔχειν ἤγουμαι οὐκ ἐξεῖναι μοι περὶ σοῦ λέγειν ἐπαινοῦντι οὕδεν ὦ τι ἢ μὴ ἀληθεῖα.

“Not so indeed: I can quote Aspasia against you. She once told me that good matchmakers are successful in making marriages only when the good reports they carry to and fro are true; false reports she would not recommend, for the victims of deception hate one another and the matchmaker too. I am convinced that this is sound, and so I think it is not open to me to say anything in your praise that I can’t say truthfully.”

And on the relationships between husbands and wives, Socrates says:

Οἶς δὲ σὺ λέγεις ἀγαθὰς εἶναι γυναῖκας, ὁ Σῶκρατες, ἥ αὐτοὶ ταῦτα ἐπαιδεύεισαν; Οὕδεν οίον τὸ ἐπισκοπεῖσθαι. συστήσας δὲ σοὶ ἔγω καὶ Ἀσπασίαν, ἡ ἐπιστημονέστερον εἰμὸν σοὶ ταῦτα πάντα ἐπιδείξει. νομίζω δὲ γυναῖκα κοινωνών ἀγαθὴν οἰκοῦ οὕσιν πάνυ ἀντίρροπον εἶναι τοῖς ἀνδρί ἐπὶ τὸ ἀγαθὸν. ἔρχεται μὲν γὰρ εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν διὰ τῶν τοῦ ἀνδρὸς πράξεων τὰ κτίματα ως ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ, δαπανᾶται δὲ διὰ τῶν τῆς γυναίκος ταμιευμάτων τὰ πλείστα· καὶ εὖ μὲν τούτων γιγνομένων αὐξεῖται οἱ οίκοι, κακῶς δὲ τούτων πραττομένων οἱ οίκοι μειοῦνται. οἴμαι δὲ σοὶ καὶ τῶν ἀλλών ἐπιστημῶν τοὺς ἄξιο̑ς λόγου ἐκάστην ἐργαζόμενους ἔχειν ἀν ἐπιδείξαι σοι, εἰ τι προσδείχθαι νομίζεις.

‘But what of the husbands who, as you say, have good wives, Socrates? Did they train them themselves?’ ‘There’s nothing like investigation. I will introduce Aspasia to you, and she will explain the whole matter to you with more knowledge than I possess.’ ‘I think that the wife who is a good partner in the household

437 Ath. 13.25.24. Translation in Athenaeus, The Deipnosophists or, Banquet of the learned of Athenaeus, trans. C. D. Yonge, 3 vols (London: H.G. Bohn, 1853-1854). She is also mentioned in Plut. Per. 24.2; Arist. Ach. 527; Thuc. 3.19; D.S. 12; Pl. Mx. 235e. A herm is in the Sala delle Muse, Vatican (inv. 272) with Ἀσπασία inscribed on the lower shaft, and due to the unlikely location of the inscription and the period clothing, the statue is dated in the fifth century BCE. Richer, Portraits, pl. 64 [pg 99].

438 Xen. Mem. 2.6.36 (Marchant, LCL).
contributes just as much as her husband to its good; because the incomings for the most part are the result of the husband’s exertions, but the outgoings are controlled mostly by the wife’s dispensation. If both do their part well, the estate is increased; if they act incompetently, it is diminished. If you think you want to know about other branches of knowledge, I fancy I can show you people who acquit themselves creditably in any one of them.\footnote{Xen. \textit{Oec.} 3.15 (Marchant, LCL).}

Socrates quotes Aspasia here in a discussion with his friends concerning the nature of marriage. Socrates has Aspasia say that the wife is just as important as the husband in a marriage: the wife is in control of the outgoings of the house, and the incoming is the responsibilities of the husband. We should note well:

The Socratic/Aspasian speech also quotes the proverb, “Nothing in excess” (247e) and urges survivors to practice self-reliance. The speech explains that depending on oneself is the best route to happiness. Be temperate (\textit{sophron}) as well as courageous and wise (\textit{andreios kai phronimos}) it counsels (248a).\footnote{S. Sara Monoson, “Remembering Pericles: The Political and Theoretical Import of Plato’s Menexenus,” \textit{Political Theory} 26, no. 4 (1998): 489-513.}

The speech in \textit{Menexenus} attributed to Aspasia and Socrates refers to events long after their deaths, and the attribution of the speech to her was seen as a joke, but her reputation as a philosopher and teacher of rhetoric is undeniable.\footnote{Lucinda Coventry, “Philosophy and Rhetoric in the Menexenus,” \textit{JHS} 109 (1989), 5; Susan D. Collins and Devin Stauffer, “The Challenge of Plato’s ‘Menexenus,’” \textit{The Review of Politics} 61, no. 1 (1999): 89-90.} Furthermore, while the rhetorical usage of her tradition is obvious in \textit{Menexenus} (particularly the juxtaposition of philosophy [male] and rhetoric [female]), this does not preclude an historical Aspasia which is closely related to the figure that is so prominent in the conceptualization of the beginnings of philosophy by the ancients.
The other notable woman connected with the Socratic tradition is Diotima of Mantinea. Her speech defines true *eros* in Plato’s *Symposium*. Diotima’s speech takes such a dominant role in the dialogue that Andrea Nye argues that Diotima was the host of the dinner and not Agathon. The speech climaxes with the description of the philosopher as a type of *Eros*, the *daemion* who brings unity to life:

"But—who then, Diotima,” I said, “are the lovers of wisdom, if they are neither the wise nor the foolish?” “A child may answer that question,” she replied; “they are those who are in a mean between the two; Love is one of them. For wisdom is a most beautiful thing, and Love is of the beautiful; and therefore Love is also a philosopher: or lover of wisdom, and being a lover of wisdom is in a mean between the wise and the ignorant. And of this too his birth is the cause; for his father is wealthy and wise, and his mother poor and foolish. Such, my dear Socrates, is the nature of the spirit Love. The error in your conception of him was very natural, and as I imagine from what you say, has arisen out of a confusion of love and the beloved, which made you think that love was all beautiful. For the beloved is the truly beautiful, and delicate, and perfect, and blessed; but the principle of love is of another nature, and is such as I have described.”


444 Pl. *Symp.* 204b-c (Jowett, LCL).
Diotima characterizes Eros as the son of Poverty (mother) and Means (father). Eros, as an ideal philosopher, is ever seeking the perfect balance between these two natures.

Luce Igigaray interprets this section of the speech as:

He is bare-foot, going out under the stars in search of an encounter with reality, seeking the embrace, the acquaintance [connaissance] (co-birthing) of whatever gentleness of soul, beauty, wisdom might be found there. This incessant quest he inherits from his mother. He is a philosopher through his mother, an adept in invention through his father. But his passion for love, for beauty, for wisdom, comes to him from his mother, and from the date when he was conceived. Desired and wanted, besides, by his mother.\textsuperscript{445}

Like Aspasia, Diotima’s historical essence is deeply embedded in Plato’s rhetoric, so much so that some think that she is entirely fictitious, though most scholars seem to at least assent to some type of historical existence.\textsuperscript{446}

To these women we should also add Socrates’s wives Xanthippe and Myrto, who had ample opportunity to share in Socrates’s indefatigable curiosities. In Xenophon (430-354 BCE), Socrates engages Theodote in philosophical reflection concerning beauty.\textsuperscript{447} There are also nameless women that Socrates mentions: he learns from unnamed priestesses as well as priests (\textit{Meno} 81a). Socrates appeals to divine revelation concerning the doctrine of the immortality of the soul:

\begin{verbatim}
O\'i \mu\'n \lengun\'t\'es \iota\'i \tau\'\ou\' \iota\'epe\'w\'on te kai \tau\'\ou\' \iota\'epe\'w\'on \\'\omega\'s\'o\'s\' me\'me\'l\'i\'ke pe\'ri \\'\ou\'u\' me\'ta\'ch\'e\ir\'i\'z\'o\'nta\'i \lengon o\'i\'o\'s \tau' e\'i\'nai di\'do\'nai\'i l\'e\'gei de kai \Pi\'i\'ndaroj kai \\'\a\'l\'loj pol\'loj \tau\ou\' \p\'i\'et\'w\'on \\'o\'s\'o\'i \t\'e\'i\'o\'i e\'i\'s\'in. \a\' de l\'e\'g\'ou\'s\'i\'n, t\'a\'ut\'i \e\'s\'i\'n, \\'\a\'l\'la sk\'o\'p\'e\'i \e\'i soi \d\'ok\'o\'s\'i\'n \a\'l\'h\'e\'i l\'e\'g\'e\'i\'n. fa\'si \g\'a\r \t\'i\'n \p\'s\'b\'h\'i\'n t\'o\'u
\end{verbatim}


They were certain priests and who have studied so as to be able to give a reasoned account of their ministry; and Pindar also and many another poet of heavenly gifts. As to their words, they are these: mark now, if you judge them to be true. They say that the soul of man is immortal, and at one time comes to an end, which is called dying, and at another is born again, but never perishes. Consequently one ought to live all one’s life in the utmost holiness. "For from whomsoever Persephone shall accept requital for ancient wrong, the souls of these she restores in the ninth year to the upper sun again; from them arise" "glorious kings and men of splendid might and surpassing wisdom, and for all remaining time are they called holy heroes amongst mankind."

Diotima participated in the reciprocation of eros in the philosophical circle and in philosophic thought. There is no shortage of interpretations of the Symposium, and to interpret the Symposium is to interpret Diotima.

Socrates further claims that there are women in Sparta and Crete that are proud of their education and connects them together to the heritage of the famous Delphic maxims:

448 Pl. Men. 81a-b (Lamb, LCL); Pind. frag. 133.

In those two states there are not only men but women also who pride themselves on their education... Such men were Thales of Miletus, Pittacus of Mytilene, Bias of Priene, Solon of our city, Cleobulus of Lindus, Myson of Chen, and last of the traditional seven, Chilon of Sparta. All these were enthusiastic lovers and disciples of the Spartan culture; and you can recognize that character in their wisdom by the short, memorable sayings that fell from each of them they assembled together and dedicated these as the first-fruits of their lore to Apollo in his Delphic temple, inscribing there those maxims which are on every tongue—"Know thyself" and "Nothing overmuch." To what intent do I say this? To show how the ancient philosophy had this style of laconic brevity; and so it was that the saying of Pittacus was privately handed about with high approbation among the sages—that it is hard to be good. 450

Socrates says here (through Plato) that both Spartan men and women – who did not engage in philosophical discourse – actually did practice philosophy because of the way that they lived their lives. Socrates argues that in their manner of living, the Spartans followed the Delphic maxims “Know thyself” and “Nothing in excess.”

According to early tradition, Plato (c. 428-347 BCE) had two female students in spite of his complicated views concerning women. 451 Later traditions in the pseudo-Pythagorean corpus attribute writings to Plato’s mother, Perictone.

450 Pl. Prot. 342d-343b (Lamb, LCL).

The Cyrenian School

Aristippus of Cyrene (435-356 BCE), a student of Socrates, founded the Cyrenian school. According to some traditions, his daughter Arete took over as head of the school until her son, Aristippus the Younger (late 4th BCE) took over. Significantly, the tradition of Arete first appears in the first century CE pseudo-Socratic letters, but most likely has earlier sources. Interestingly, the letters contain some material that corresponds with Diogenes Laertius (fl. c. 3rd CE), writing about 200 years later than the epistles:

Now the pupils of Aristippus were his own daughter Arete, and Aethiops of Ptolemais, and Antipater of Cyrene. Arete had for her pupil the Aristippus who was surnamed métrodidantos, whose disciple was Theodorus the atheist, but who was afterwards called theos. Antipater had for a pupil Epitimedes of Cyrene who was the master of Pyraebates, who was the master of Hegesias, who was surnamed peisithanatos (persuading to die), and of Anniceris who ransomed Plato.  

Similarly, Diogenes writes “He gave admirable advice to his daughter Arete, teaching her to despise superfluidity.” Diogenes also knew of a letter from Aristippus to his daughter Arete, but he apparently does not quote from the extant version as an authority for his writings. Strabo (c. 63-24 CE) also writes that Arete was the head of the school, and taught her son Aristippus surnamed métrodídantoς, who in turn took his mother’s

---

452 Aristippus to Arete. Malherbe, Cynic Epistles, 282-85.

453 Diog. Laert. 2.86 (Hicks, LCL).

454 Diog. Laert. 2.72 (Hicks, LCL). Cf., Aristippus to Arete 27.2 = Malherbe, Cynic Epistles, 285.
place. Her story is known by Aelius (fl. 1st CE, \( \text{NA} \) 3.40.1), Clement of Alexandria (c.150-215 CE, \( \text{Strom} \). 4.19.22), Theodoret of Cyrus\(^ {456} \) (393-457 CE, \( \text{Graecarum affectionum curatio} \) 11.1), Strabo, (63-24 BCE/CE, \( \text{Geo.} \) 17.3.22.11), Suda (10th CE, \( \text{'}}\text{ριττιππος} = 3908 \)); Aristocles (fl. 1st CE, frg. v.3 line 16 = Euseb. \( \text{praep. ev.} \) 14.18.31-2).

The Epicurean Women

Norman DeWitt speculated, “If the history of Epicureanism were as well understood as the history of Stoicism, we might discover that there is more of Epicureanism than of Stoicism in the New Testament.”\(^ {457} \) There is a long history of a qualified Christian acceptance of Epicureanism, but the first mention of a woman Epicurean philosopher does not appear until Clement of Alexandria (c. 150-217CE).\(^ {458} \)

\(^{455}\) Clem. Al. \( \text{Strom.} \) 3.17.22. Malherbe, \( \text{Cynic Epistles}, \) 27. Diog. Laert. 2.72, 83, 86; Eus. \( \text{PE} \) 19.18. Cf. Clem. Al. \( \text{Strom.} \) 4.122; Strabo, 27.3. 22; Ael. \( \text{NA} \) 3.40; Theodoret, \( \text{Therapeutike}, \) 11.1; Them. Or. 21.244.


\(^{458}\) Richard Jungkuntz, “Epicureanism and the Church Fathers” (PhD diss., University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI), 1961; Richard P. Jungkuntz, “Christian Approval of Epicureanism,” \( \text{American Society of Church History} \) 31, no. 3 (1962). Clement’s affinity for Epicureanism is limited. Highly favoring Platonism, Clement identifies Epicureanism and Stoicism as the schools that Paul rejects in 1 Cor 3:19-20, and it is again rejected by Paul in Acts 15:18 because it “abolishes providence and defies pleasure.” Clement argues that Paul indicated that the Stoics taught that “the Deity, being
Clement highly values philosophical education: “Women are therefore to philosophize equally with men, though the males are preferable at everything, unless they have become effeminate.”  

Clement uses Themisto, the student of Epicurus (341-270 BCE), as an example of a woman who studied philosophy, “Themisto too, of Lampsacus, the daughter of Zoilus, the wife of Leontes of Lampsacus, studied the Epicurean philosophy.”

The Epicurean Garden freely admitted women as well as rich or poor, and these traditions become important to later writers and philosophers. Leontion (lioness), the companion of Metrodorus, is known to Cicero (106-43 BCE), Pliny the Elder (23-79 CE), and Athenaeus (fl. 250 CE).

Athenaeus (fl. 2nd century) writes:

{oûtós oûn o Ἐπίκουρος οú Λεόντιον εἶχεν ἐρωμένην τὴν ἐπὶ ἔταιρεία διαβοήτου γενομένην; ἥ δὲ οὐδ' ὁτὲ φιλοσοφεῖν ἥρξατο ἐπαύσατο ἔταιρούσα, πᾶσι δὲ τοῖς Ἐπικουρείοις συνήν ἐν τοῖς κήποις, Ἐπικούρῳ δὲ

a body, pervades the vilest matter. He calls the jugglery of logic the ‘tradition of men,’” Strom. 1.11 (Roberts-Donaldson, ANF).

459 Strom. 4.7 (Roberts-Donaldson, ANF).
460 Strom. 4.19.1332a (Roberts-Donaldson, ANF).

462 Cic. ND 1.33, 93; Pliny, HN 29, 35.99; Ath. 13.588, 593; cf., Diog. Laert. 10.5, 23; Cf., Laura McClure has a study on the cultivated hetaera “Subversive Laughter: The Sayings of Courtesans in Book 13 of Athenaeus’ Deipnosophistae,” AJP 124, no. 2 (2003): 259-94. See also Seneca’s description early Epicureanism in Ep. 20.9; cf., 6.6; 52.3.
καὶ ἀναφανδόνες οὕτως ἐκεῖνον πολλὰν φροντίδα ποιούμενον αὐτῆς τοῦτ’ ἐμφανίζειν διὰ τῶν πρὸς Ἁμορχὸν Ἐπιστολῶν (frag. 121 Usner).

Now, had not this very Epicurus Leontium for his mistress, her, I mean, who was so celebrated as a courtesan? But she did not cease to live as a prostitute when she began to learn philosophy, but still prostituted herself to the whole sect of Epicureans in the gardens, and to Epicurus himself, in the most open manner; so that this great philosopher was exceedingly fond of her, though he mentions this fact in his letters to Hermarchus.

There is a traditional list of other women in the Epicurean Garden: Mammarion, Hedeia, Erotion, and Nikidion, and Boidion. Plutarch (c. 46-120 CE) is critical of Epicurus at every mention of the Epicurean women, including individual references to Leontion (Mor. 1129b) and Hedia (Mor. 1089c), using their reputation as prostitutes to rhetorically attack the character of Epicureans. A fragment of Philodemus (c.110-40 BCE) simply says that what Epicurus learned from Leontion might be ascribed to Colotes (9.3).

463 In Athenaeus’s time, there may have been a collection of letters entitled “Letters to Hermarchus.” Athenaeus says of Leontium, “and even before the very eyes of Epicurus; wherefore he, poor devil, was really worried about her, as he makes clear in his Letters to Hermarchus,” 13.522b. The only extant letter from Epicurus to Hermarchus is preserved in Cic. Fin. 2.30.96 and it does not mention Leontium.

464 Ath. 13.53 (Yonge, LCL).


... in general such and such of their (sc. the students’) errors and what Epicurus learns from Leontium he will {hypothetically} ascribe to Colotes. Since the wise man will also sometimes transfer to himself an intemperate error, {saying} that it occurred in his youth.

Diogenes Laertius (fl. 3rd CE) says that Epicurus wrote many letters to Leontion, and she wrote back (10.5-7). This tradition continues in Alciphr

Leontion is then the most famous Epicurean woman (followed closely by Themista) as we see in the references to her in Philodemus (c. 110-40 BCE) and

---


468 Alciphr. Ep. 17.5 (Benner and Fobes, LCL). In this epistle, Leontium depicted writing to Lamia.
Some traditions indicate that Leontion had a philosophically educated daughter Danaë, who was executed for attempting to thwart the murder of Sophron the governor of Ephesus by Laodice. In this context, Athenaeus preserves a teaching from Danaë concerning the Divine, a common topic in Epicureanism:

Well, did not this same Epicurus keep Leontium as his mistress, the woman who had become notorious as a courtesan? Why! Even when she began to be a philosopher, she did not cease her courtesan ways, but consorted with all the Epicureans in the Gardens, and even before the very eyes of Epicurus; wherefore he, poor devil, was really worried about her, as he makes clear in his Letters to Hermarchus… and they say that Danaë, when she perceived the danger which was impending over her, was interrogated by Laodice, and refused to give her any answer; but, when she was dragged to the precipice, then she said, that “many people justly despise the Deity, and they may justify themselves by my case, who having saved a man who was to me as my husband, am requited in this manner by the Deity. But Laodice, who murdered her husband, is thought worthy of such honour.”

As can be seen from Athenaeus’s criticism of Leontium in the quote above, many of the women in the school were considered courtesans (hetaerae) and the school endured a

---

470 Seneca, On Marriage, frag. 45 (= Jerome, Against Jovinianus, 1.48); cf., Clement of Alexandria, Proof of the Gospels, 2.23; Theodoretus, Remedies for the Errors of the Greeks [p. 479 Gaisf.].

471 Ath. 13.64 (Yonge, LCL).
good deal of heckling from polemicists. The Stoic Diotimus, for example, supposedly published fifty letters by Epicurus and his mistresses. Cicero (106-43 CE, *Nat. D.* 1.93) rebuked Leontion for her work against Theophrastus. Pliny (61-112 CE) tells us that Aristides of Thebes painted a portrait of her listing, “Leontium, the mistress of Epicurus, in an attitude of meditation.” The sister of Metrodorus, Batis wife of Idomeneus, was a first generation Epicurean and wrote a letter to her niece Apia, and other letter fragments survive as well. Batis of Lampscus was known to Seneca (c. 4-65 CE). “For this very reason I regard as excellent the saying of Metrodorus, in a letter of consolation to his sister on the loss of her son, a lad of great promise: ‘All the Good of

---

472 Diog. Laert. 10.3.

473 Cicero merely says that while she wrote in excellent Attic, the substance of her work is ridiculous. Pliny the Elder (*Praefatio* 29) indicates simply that a woman wrote against Theophrastus even though he was a respected rhetor.

474 Plin. *HN* 35.99, “…et leontion epicure et anapauomenen propter fratis amorem…”

475 Strab. 13; Cic. *Nat. D.* 1.40, *Tusc.* 5.9; *Fin.* 2.28, 92; Plut. *Mor.* 1087a, 1094d; 1117b; Diog. Laert. 10.22; Ath. 12.


478 Diog. Laert. 10.23.
mortal.” Cleomedes (between 1st-4th CE) remembers Leontion along with Philainis as he criticizes Epicurus for having failed in philosophy. Epicurus (341-270 BCE) and his followers endured harsh criticism from other schools for admitting women, and this polemic continued throughout the Hellenistic period. Lactanies (c. 240-320 CE) only remembers Themista:

Denique nullas unquam mulieres philosophari docuerunt, praeter unam ex omni memoria Themisten.

Finally, they never taught any women to be philosophers except one, from all memory: Themista.

Themista is also remembered in P. Herc. 176, which is considered to be an authentic epistle authored by an early Epicurean. The following is addressed to a child, referencing their “mommy” (μ[ά]μμη [σ]οὺ).

Pythocles, Hermarchus and I have reached Lampascus safe and sound. We found Themista and the rest of our friends there in good health. I hope you are well too,

---

479 Sen. Ep. 98.9 (Gummere, LCL).

480 Cleom. 2.1.

481 Lactant. Div. inst. 3.25.4.


Epicureanism gained some influence in Lycia. In the second century CE, Diogenes of Oenoanda erected a huge monument there with inscriptions of Epicurean philosophy. It is currently preserved in 224 fragments. Some fragments were discovered that are part of a *Letter to Mother*.\footnote{C. W. Chilton renewed interest in Diogenes of Oenoanda with a germinal article in 1963, inspiring Martin Ferguson Smith to search for more fragments at the original site.\footnote{Smith produced several articles and books as the fragments were discovered and edited, and repeatedly argues that the *Letter to Mother* is written by Epicurus rather than Diogenes.}\footnote{Smith writes, “To sum up: the *Letter to Mother*}
Mother is almost certainly addressed to Epicurus’s mother; it is possible that it is either a genuine letter, or an adaptation of a genuine letter, of Epicurus. Chilton suggests that ‘the author is emphasizing the necessity of pursuing philosophy in order to dispel fear (of death and/or the gods?) and attain perfect happiness.’

The exhortation for women to utilize Epicurean philosophy is clear in the Letter to Mother in the Diogenes inscription, which will be presented in total:


(to cause the greatest concern about them. For the appearance of those who are absent, independent from sight, instills very great fear, whereas if they are present with us it causes not the least of dread. But if you carefully examine their nature (the appearances) of the absent are exactly the same as those of the present. For being not tangible but intelligible they have in themselves the same capacity towards those present when they arose, their subjects being present also. Therefore, Mother, take heart; you must not regard visions of me as evil. Rather consider that I am daily acquiring useful help towards advancing happiness. Not slight or of no avail are the advantages that accrue to me, such that they make my condition equal


488 Chilton, Diogenes, 130.
to the divine and show that not even mortality can make me inferior to the indestructible and blessed nature. For as long as I live I rejoice even as do the gods...  


... the same, if he suffers diminution; but if he has no sensation, how is he diminished? Surrounded by such good things, then, think of me, mother, as rejoicing always and have confidence in how I am faring. But in heaven’s name be sparing with the remittances you are constantly sending me. I do not wish you to be in need so that I may have abundance, I would rather suffer need so that you should not; and yet I am living in plenty in every respect thanks to friends and father continually sending me money; indeed only recently Cleon sent me nine minae. So neither one nor other of you should worry about me but enjoy each other’s company.  

There is general consensus that the fragments that comprise Letter to Mother are either authentic Epicurus or from a first generation Epicurean. The first fragment of the Letter to Mother (frag. 124) centers on the Epicurean teachings concerning dreams. The author comforts his mother who has visions or dreams of her son, and tells her that

\[\text{489} \text{ Frag. Ch 52 = Smith frag. 125}
\[\text{490} \text{ Frag. Ch 53 = Smith frag. 126.}
\[\text{491} \text{ Smith, The Epicurean Inscriptio, 555-8.}

these apparations are a good thing.\textsuperscript{493} Pamela Gordon argues that the \textit{Letter to Mother} (frag. 125) is fictional and fits with a common genre of philosophical writing that Gordon calls “philosopher’s demurrals,” also found in the Cynic epistles. In \textit{Letter to Mother}, Epicurus tells his mother not to send him anything, and in the Cynic Epistles, Crates often requests that the addressee – including his wife Hipparchia – to withhold gifts.\textsuperscript{494} Besides Diogenes of Oenoanda, other Roman Epicureans include Amafinius (late 2\textsuperscript{nd} or early 1\textsuperscript{st} BCE, Cic., \textit{Acad.} 1.2.5),\textsuperscript{495} Rabirius (1\textsuperscript{st} BCE, Cic., \textit{Acad.} 1.2.5), Catius,\textsuperscript{496} Pompilius Andronicus (fl. 1\textsuperscript{st} CE; Ath. 12.68) Titus Albucius (fl. mid 2\textsuperscript{nd} BCE);\textsuperscript{497} Gaius Velleius (d. 41 BCE = \textit{Vell. Pat.} 2.26.1, grandfather of the senator Gaius Cassius Paterculus (Cic. \textit{Nat. D.} 1.6.15), Longinus (before 85-42BCE; Cic. \textit{Fam.} 15.16, 19; Plut., \textit{Brut.} 37.2, 39.6); Demetrius the Laconian (2\textsuperscript{nd} CE; Diog. Laert. 10.26; Strabo 14.2.20; Sext. Emp., \textit{Math.}, 10.219-27).\textsuperscript{498} The Epicurean Titus Pomponius Atticus (c. 112-32BCE), a friend of Cicero, gave his daughter Pomponia Caecilia Attica an excellent liberal education which included philosophical training.\textsuperscript{499} Attica’s education included

\textsuperscript{493} Epic. \textit{Hdt.} 49-52; Lucr. 4.29; 722-822, 962-1036; frag. 9-10, 43. Cf., Plut. \textit{Mor.} 1091.

\textsuperscript{494} Gordon, \textit{Epicurus in Lycia}, 66-93; cf., Gordon, “Remembering the Garden,” 76.

\textsuperscript{495} Cic. \textit{Fam.} 15.19.2; \textit{Acad. Post.} 1.5; cf., \textit{Tusc.} 1.6, 2.7, 6.7.

\textsuperscript{496} Insubrian Gaul from Ticinum (Pavia). Cic. \textit{Fam.} 15.16; Qunt. \textit{Inst.} 10.1.24; Pliny \textit{Ep.} 4.28.

\textsuperscript{497} Cic. \textit{Brut.} 35.131; \textit{Fin.} 1.3, 8; \textit{Orat.} 3.

elementary training by a slave *paedagus* (*Att. 12.33*) and the freedman *grammaticus* Q. Caecilius Epirotâ for advanced grammar. Similarly, Pliny the Younger’s (61-112 CE) friend Marcellinus retained a *paedagus* and a *praecipitores* for the education of his daughter (*Ep. 5.16*). While the early rules of the Garden provided many opportunities for women to learn philosophy, the encouragement to practice philosophy in the household is a guide for later Epicureans:

> Γελᾶν ἀμα δεί καὶ φιλοσοφεῖν καὶ οἰκουμείν καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς οἰκείῳμασι χρήσαται καὶ μηδαμῇ λήγειν τας ἐκ τῆς ὀρθῆς φιλοσοφίας φωνὼς ἀφίέντας.

All at the same time we must laugh and practice our philosophy, applying it in our own households, taking advantage of our other intimacies to this end, and under no circumstances whatever falter in making our utterances consistent with the true philosophy.  

The Cynic: Crates and Hipparcia

Hipparchia of Maroneia (c. 300 BCE), the wife of Crates, the famous student of Diogenes the Cynic (412-323 BCE) is remembered in the following epigram (dated in as early 3rd BCE and as late as 1st BCE):

> Οὐχὶ βαθυστόλμων Ἰππαρχίς ἐργα γυναικῶν,
> τῶν δὲ Κυκών ἐλόμαν ῥωμαλέον βίοτον·
> οὔδε μοι ἀμπέχοναι περονήτιδες, οὐ βαθύπελμος

---


502 Born c404-323 BCE who lived in Corinth near the end of his life.
I, Hipparchia, chose not the tasks of amply-robed woman, but the manly life of the Cynics. Nor do tunics fastened with brooches and thick-soled slippers, and the hair-caul wet with ointment please me, but rather the wallet and its fellow-traveler the staff and the course double mantle suited to them, and a bed strewn on the ground. I shall have a greater name than that of Archadian Atlanta by so much as wisdom is better than racing over the mountain.\footnote{This indicates that Hipparchia has to join the world of men in order to participate in philosophy. Most traditions remember Hipparchia as no longer effeminate, but masculine, and expresses her sexuality in masculine terms: she dresses and speaks like a male Cynic, and there is no more need for her to be modest, chaste, or quiet in public. Plutarch (c. 46-120 CE) mentions her as one of the many philosophers that Epicurus slanders in \textit{Mor.} 1086e.}{504}

\begin{Greek}
εὐμαρίς, οὐ λιτόων εὗαδε κεκρύφαλος.
οὐλας δὲ σκιπωνι συνεμπορος, ἀ τε συνωδός ἀμμὶ δὲ Μανιλαίας κάρρων ἀμιν Ἄταλάντας
tόσσον, ὅσον σοφία κρέσσον ὀρίδρομιας.
\end{Greek}

\begin{Latin}
I, Hipparchia, chose not the tasks of amply-robed woman, but the manly life of the Cynics. Nor do tunics fastened with brooches and thick-soled slippers, and the hair-caul wet with ointment please me, but rather the wallet and its fellow-traveler the staff and the course double mantle suited to them, and a bed strewn on the ground. I shall have a greater name than that of Archadian Atlanta by so much as wisdom is better than racing over the mountain.\footnote{This indicates that Hipparchia has to join the world of men in order to participate in philosophy. Most traditions remember Hipparchia as no longer effeminate, but masculine, and expresses her sexuality in masculine terms: she dresses and speaks like a male Cynic, and there is no more need for her to be modest, chaste, or quiet in public. Plutarch (c. 46-120 CE) mentions her as one of the many philosophers that Epicurus slanders in \textit{Mor.} 1086e.}{504}

This indicates that Hipparchia has to join the world of men in order to participate in philosophy. Most traditions remember Hipparchia as no longer effeminate, but masculine, and expresses her sexuality in masculine terms: she dresses and speaks like a male Cynic, and there is no more need for her to be modest, chaste, or quiet in public. Plutarch (c. 46-120 CE) mentions her as one of the many philosophers that Epicurus slanders in \textit{Mor.} 1086e.\footnote{This indicates that Hipparchia has to join the world of men in order to participate in philosophy. Most traditions remember Hipparchia as no longer effeminate, but masculine, and expresses her sexuality in masculine terms: she dresses and speaks like a male Cynic, and there is no more need for her to be modest, chaste, or quiet in public. Plutarch (c. 46-120 CE) mentions her as one of the many philosophers that Epicurus slanders in \textit{Mor.} 1086e.}{504}

\begin{Greek}
καὶ ὁ Θέων εἰτ’ οὐκ ἔλεγεν ἐκεῖνον ὅ Κωλώτης
παραβαλλόμενος εὐφημότατος ἄνδρῶν φαίνεται; τὰ γὰρ ἐν ἄνδρῶποις
σίχιστα ῥήματα, βαμολοχίας ληκυθωμιῶς ἀλαζονείας εὐαιρήσεις
ἀνδροφοινίας, βαρυστόνους πολυθόρους βαρμεγκέφαλους συμαγαγόντες
Ἀριστοτέλους καὶ Σωκράτους καὶ Πυθαγόρου καὶ Πρωταγόρου καὶ
Θεοφράστου καὶ Ἡρακλείδου καὶ Ἰππαρχίας καὶ τίνος γὰρ οὕχι τῶν
ἐπιφανῶν κατεσκέδασαν
\end{Greek}

Here Theon put in: “And you didn’t reply that by their standard Colotes looks like a paragon of measured speech? For they made a collection of the most disgraceful terms to be found anywhere – ‘buffoonery,’ ‘hollow booming,’ ‘charlatanism,’ ‘prostitution,’ ‘assassin,’ ‘groaner,’ ‘hero of many an adventure,’ ‘nincompoop,’ – and show erred it on Aristotle, Socrates, Pythagoras, Protagoras, Theophrastus, Heraclides, Hipparchia – indeed what eminent name have they spared?”

Sextus Empiricus (c. 160-210 CE) tells us that Hipparchia and Diogenes had sexual intercourse in public, “ἀγωγή δὲ ἐθος ἢς τιτίθεται, ὅταν οἱ μὲν πολλοὶ ἀνθρώποι ἀναχωροῦντες μιγνύονται ταῖς ἐαυτῶν γυναιξίν, ὁ δὲ Κράτες τῇ Ἰππαρχίᾳ δημοσίᾳ, καὶ ὁ μὲν Διογένης ἀπὸ ἔξωμίδος περιήει, ἡμεῖς δὲ ὡς εἰσόθημεν,” “And habit is opposed to rule of conduct when, whereas most men have intercourse with their own wives in retirement, Crates did it in public with Hipparchia; and Diogenes went about with one shoulder bare, whereas we dress in the customary manner.”

The Stoic Epictetus (55-135 CE) whose teacher Musonius Rufus (c. 25-100 CE) believed that women should be philosophically educated, used her as an example for the Cynic lifestyle. Epictetus writes:

---

505 Plut. Mor. 1086e


Consider what we are bringing the Cynic down to, how we are taking his royalty from him. — Yes, but Crates took a wife. — You are speaking of a circumstance which arose from love and of a woman who was another Crates. But we are inquiring about ordinary marriages and those which are free from distractions, and making this inquiry we do not find the affair of marriage in this state of the world a thing which is especially suited to the Cynic. 509

Epictetus provides the one exception to the Cynic opposition to marriage: if both partners in the marriage are Cynic philosophers, then it is possible for both philosophers to still embrace the Cynic lifestyle. And according to the tradition, Hipparchia did embrace the Cynic philosophy and its extreme disconnect from society. The Cynic marriage between Hipparchia and Crates could happen only because they had both achieved the Cynic ideal.

In his Commentary on Epictetus, Simplicius (6th CE) simply writes, "Ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ οἶκους οὕτως ἔχειν χρή. Κράτητι μὲν ὁ πίθος ἤρκεσεν εἰς οἴκησιν, καὶ γαμετὴν ἔχοντι τὴν καλὴν Ἰππαρχίαν," “Crates was satisfied with a tub for his housing, even though he had a wife, the lovely Hipparchia.” 510 According to Diogenes Laertius (fl. 3rd CE, who seems more or less reliable in this case), 511 Hipparchia fell in love with Crates and his way of life and married him against her parent’s wishes, and

---

509 Epict. Disc. 3.22.76.


Crates married her reluctantly. She attended dinner-parties with him and participated in philosophical debate with their colleagues.

Hipparchia is the only philosophically educated woman who received a chapter in Diogenes Laertius (6.7). Diogenes says that Hipparchia was the sister of the Cynic Metrodorus. Both her family and Crates did not want a marriage, but she persisted until finally:

Καὶ ἦρα τοῦ Κράτητος καὶ τῶν λόγων καὶ τοῦ βίου, οὐδένος τῶν μνηστευομένων ἐπιστρεφομένη, οὐ πλούτου, οὐκ εὐγενείας, οὐ κάλλους· ἀλλὰ πάντ’ ἦν Κράτης αὐτή, καὶ δὴ καὶ ἤπείλει τοῖς γονεύσιν ἀναίρησειν αὐτήν, εἰ μὴ τούτῳ δοθείη. Κράτης μὲν οὖν παρακαλούμενος ὑπὸ τῶν γονέων αὐτῆς ἀποτρέψας τὴν παῖδα, πάντ’ ἐποίει, καὶ τέλος ἐκ πείθων, ἀναστάς καὶ ἀποθέμενος τὴν ἐαυτοῦ σκευήν ἀντικρυ ἀυτῆς ἔφη, “ὁ μὲν νυμφίος οὗτος, ἡ δὲ κτήσις αὐτῆς, πρὸς ταῦτα βουλέων· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐσσεθαί κοινωνός, εἰ μὴ καὶ τῶν αὐτῶν ἑπιτηθεμάτων γεννηθείς.” Εἶλετο ἡ παῖς καὶ ταύτων ἀναλαβόσα σχῆμα συμπεριήγη τάνδρι καὶ ἐν τῷ φανερῷ συνεγίνετο καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ δείπνα απέρει.

Crates accordingly, being entreated by her parents to dissuade her from this resolution, did all he could; and at last, as he could not persuade her, he rose up, and placing all his furniture before her, he said, “This is the bridegroom whom you are choosing, and this is the whole of his property; consider these facts, for it will not be possible for you to become his partner, if you do not also apply yourself to the same studies, and conform to the same habits that he does.” But the girl chose him; and assuming the same dress that he wore, went about with him as her husband, and appeared with him in public everywhere, and went to all entertainments in his company.512

Diogenes says that after their marriage, Hipparchia wore the clothing of a male Cynic accompanying Diogenes wherever he went, and participated in philosophic dialog. Interestingly, Diogenes Laertius knew of extant letters to and from Hipparchia, Crates,

512 Diog. Laert. 6.96.
and other Cynics. From Diogenes (fl. 3rd CE), one teaching from Hipparchia is preserved in its context:

And once when she went to sup with [king] Lysimachus, she attacked Theodorus, who was surnamed the Atheist; proposing to him the following sophism; “What Theodorus could not be called wrong for doing, that same thing Hipparchia ought not to be called wrong for doing. But Theodorus does no wrong when he beats himself; therefore Hipparchia does no wrong when she beats Theodorus.” He made no reply to what she said, but only pulled her clothes about; but Hipparchia was neither offended nor ashamed, as many a woman would have been; but when he said to her:

“Who is the woman who has left the shuttle
So near the warp?”

“I, Theodorus, am that person,” she replied; “but do I appear to you to have come to a wrong decision, if I devote that time to philosophy, which I otherwise should have spent at the loom?” And these and many other sayings are reported of this female philosopher.

---


514 Diog. Laert. 6.98 (Hicks, LCL).
It is interesting that in this text, Theodorus the Atheist is silent. Hipparchia, in true Cynic form, sharply rebuked Theodorus without provocation. Diogenes Laertius (fl. 3rd CE) refers to two reliable sources for Hipparchia: Eratosthenes of Cyrene (276-194 BCE)\(^{515}\) and Diocles of Parethus (fl. late 4th BCE).\(^{516}\)

**The Roman Tradition**

Having discussed Greek traditions about women in various philosophical traditions, we move on to Roman traditions. Many of the notable Roman philosophers had close interwoven relationships. For example, in late second century Rome, Gaius Laelius was a disciple of Diodes and Panaetius of Rome\(^{517}\) (all members of the Scipionic Circle).

---

\(^{515}\) Eratosthenes was an eminent librarian of Alexandria who produced [now lost] works including poetry, philosophy, and mathematics. He is most known by his calculation of the circumference of the earth. See his article in the Suda and OCD.


\(^{517}\) 185-109 BCE. Son of Nicagoras from Rhodes. M. van Straaten, *Panaetti Rhodii Fragmenta* (Leiden: Brill, 1962). Succeeded Antipater as the head of the school in 129 BCE; student was Hecaton.
Rutilius Rufus, Aelius Stilo, Quintus Mucius Scaevola Augur were also students of Panaetius of Rome and produced the notable students Cicero and Atticus. Scaevola himself married Laelia, the daughter of Lelius, and his wife, daughters, and grand-daughters were famous for their excellent Latin. Quintilian (c. 35-100 CE) tells us that Cornelia, the mother of the Gracci, was well educated and skillful in rhetoric. Laelia and Hortensia were accomplished rhetors who learned the art from their fathers:

Nec de patribus tantum loquor: nam Grachorum eloquentiae multum contulisse accepimus Corneliam matrem, cuius doctissimus sermo in posteros quoque est epistulis traditus, et Laelia C. filia reddidisse in loquendo paternam elegantiam dicitur, et Hortensiae Q. filiae oratio apud triumviro habita legitur non tantum in sexus honorem.

We are told that the eloquence of the Gracchi owed much to their mother Cornelia, whose letters even to this day testify to the cultivation of her style. Laelia, the daughter of Gaius Laelius, is said to have reproduced the elegance of her father’s language in her own speech, while the oration delivered before the triumvirs by Hortensia, the daughter of Quintus Hortensius, is still read and not merely as a compliment to her sex.522

518 Cic. Brut. 205-7, Leg. 2.23, 59; Suet. Gram. 2; Gell. 3.1.12; Quint. 10.1.99.


520 Cf., Cic. Brut. 101, 211.

521 Valerius Maximus, Factorum et dictorum memorabilium libri 8.3.3; Appian, Civil Wars 2.32-4. Notably missing from OCD. See Plant, Women Writers, 104-5. Hortensia is famous for her speech against the taxes levied on the 1400 richest women in Rome in 42 BCE (Liv. 34.1). Cf., Richard A. Bauman, Women and Politics in Ancient Rome (London: Routledge, 1992), 81-3; W. Warde Fowler, Social Life at Rome in the Age of Cicero. A similar incident, the Oppian Law, occurred in 195 BCE. The situation was parodied by Poenulus, see Patricia A. Johnston, “Poenulus I, 2 and Roman Women,” TAPA 110 (1980): 143-159.

522 Quint. 1.1.6.
The practice of philosophers teaching their daughters has a long precedence. For example, Quintilian (c. 35-100 CE) tells us that Chrysippus (279-209 BCE) believed that ideally a girl should be trained in philosophy (1.1.4-5). Diodorus Cronus (d. c.284 BCE), the Megarian philosopher, taught his five daughters Menexene, Argia, Theognis, Artemesia, and Pantaclea, who were known as skilled dialecticians.\(^{523}\) Diogenes of Babylon\(^{524}\) (c. 240-152 BCE) the teacher of Laelius,\(^{525}\) the teacher of Quintus Lucilius Balbus (100 CE)\(^{526}\) followed Zeno of Tarsus (fl. 200 BCE) as head of the Stoa. Diogenes of Babylon and Crates of Mallus at Pergamum taught Panaetius (c.185-109 BCE), who taught Hecaton. The Stoic Diodotus lived in the house of Cicero, who no doubt taught his daughter Tullia (\textit{Att.} 2.20.6). Areus Didymus (fl. late 1\textsuperscript{st} BCE/ 1\textsuperscript{st} CE) taught in the household of Augustus, and comforted the Empress Livia at the death of her son.\(^{527}\)

Several elite Roman women in the first century BCE and CE oversaw their sons’ education: Cornelia for Tiberius and Caius Gracchus (Cic. \textit{Brut.}\ 104), Aurelia for Caesar (Tac. \textit{Dial.} 28), Atia for Octavius (Tac. \textit{Dial.} 28) and Iulia Procilla for Iulius Agricola (Tac. \textit{Agr.} 4.2-3).


\(^{524}\) Known only from the Herculaneum papyri. OCD, 474.


\(^{526}\) Cic. \textit{Nat. D.}\ 1.6, 3.40; \textit{Div.}\ 1.5.

Pliny the Younger

In the first century CE, Pliny the Younger praises the education and abilities of a young female relative and relishes in discourse with his wife. In one of these letters, Pliny praises Calpurnia Hispulla for her excellent job in educating his third wife, Calpurnia. Pliny rejoices in his wife’s continued participation in education: reading his books and speeches listening to philosophical discussions.

Accedit his studium litterarum, quod ex mei caritate concepit. Meos libellos habet, lectitat, ediscit etiam. Qua illa sollicitudine, cum, videor acturus, quanto, cum egi, gaudio addictur! Disponit qui nuntient sibi, quem adsensum, quos clamores excitarim, quem eventum iudicii tulerim. Eadem, si quando recito, in proximo discreta velo sedet laudesque nostras avidissimis auribus excipit. Versus quidem meos cantat etiam formatque cithara non artifice aliquo docente, sed amore, qui magister est optimus.

Her affection to me has given her a turn to books; and my compositions, which she takes a pleasure in reading, and even getting by heart, are continually in her hands. How full of solicitude is she when I am entering upon any cause! How kindly does she rejoice with me when it is over! When I am pleading, she stations messengers to inform her from time to time how I am heard, what applauses I receive, and what success attends the cause. When at any time I recite my works, she sits close at hand, concealed behind a curtain, and greedily overhears my praises. She sings my verses and sets them to her lyre, with no other master but Love, the best instructor.

This is a rare and important instance of a wealthy woman educating another woman, but the pattern of being educated in a wealthy household and furthering that education in her

---


529 Pliny’s description of his wife’s education seems more or less historical. See Hemelrijk, Matrona docta, 33; cf., Beryl Rawson, Children and Childhood in Roman Italy (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 242-3

husband’s home is familiar. Elsewhere, Pliny eulogizes the patroness Quadratilla for her continued interest in the education of her grandson, which reflects that of the papyri listed above.\textsuperscript{531}

Seneca

Seneca (c. 4-65 CE)\textsuperscript{532} cites philosophically educated women as he writes to his mother Helvia and close friend Marcia advising them not to neglect the study of philosophy because of their gender.\textsuperscript{533} He encourages both women to apply Stoic philosophy to their lives, notably applying well-known qualities self-control and self-sufficiency, the defining characteristics of the ideal wise-person and student of

\textsuperscript{531} Plin. Ep. 7.24.


\textsuperscript{533} Seneca, De Consolatione ad Helvium and De Consolatione ad Marcium. Rebecca Langlands analyzes the manner in which Seneca adapts to his female audience in “A Woman’s Influence on a Roman Text,” in Women’s Influence on Classical Civilization (London: Routledge, 2004), 115-26. We can read this in contrast to On Mercy 1.5.4 where he writes “Muliebre est furere in ira, ferarum vero nec generosarum quidem preamordere et urguere proiectos,” “It is for women to rage in anger, for wild beasts doubtless - and not even the noble sort of these - to bite and worry their prostrate victims,” (Basore, LCL).
philosophy. Seneca writes to Marcia, the daughter of the late historian Cremutius Cordus, consoling her on the death of her son:

Non dubito quin Iuliae Augustae, quam familiariter coluisti, magis tibi placeat exemplum: illa te ad suum consilium uocat. Illa in primo feruore, cum maxime inpatientes feroesque sunt miseriae, consolandam se Areo, philosopho uiri sui, praebuit et multum eam rem profuisse sibi confessa est, plus quam populum Romanum, quem nolebat tristem tristitia sua facere, plus quam Augustum, qui subducto altero adminiculo titubabat nec luctu suorum inclinandus erat, plus quam Tiberium filium, cuius pietas efficiebat ut in illo acerbo et defleto gentibus funere nihil sibi nisi numerum deesse sentiret.

I doubt not that the example of Julia Augusta, whom you regarded as an intimate friend, will seem more to your taste than the other; she summons you to follow her. She, during the first passion of grief, when its victims are most unsubmissive and most violent, made herself accessible to the philosopher Areus, the friend of her husband, and later confessed that she had gained much help from that source - more than from the Roman people, whom she was unwilling to sadden with this sadness of hers; more than from Augustus, who was staggering under the loss of one of his main supports, and was in no condition to be further bowed down by the grief of his dear ones; more than from her son Tiberius, whose devotion at that untimely funeral that made the nations weep kept her from feeling that she had suffered any loss except in the number of her sons.

Seneca then imagines what Areus would have said to Julia Augusta and urges Marcia to follow the same advice, “It was your trouble, Marcia, that was dealt with there, it was at

---

534 Some defining qualities of self-sufficiency are fearlessness of death and poverty, able to renounce a good reputation, and invincibility. Teles Πείρα παρακείας 5H-20H; Cic. Off. 1.90, Tusc. 5.10.30; Epict. Disc. 4.5.4; and Sen. Const. 8-18. Cf. Diog. Laert. 2.27. The importance of self-sufficiency in the writings of Paul is made evident by Fitzgerald, Cracks in Earthen Vessels, 117-84; in the Thessalonian letters by Malherbe, “Gentle as a Nurse,” 203-17; and in Philippians by Malherbe, “Paul’s Self-sufficiency (Philippians 4:11),” 125-39. Musonius Rufus also applies the essential qualities of self-sufficiency to women in 3, 4, 13a.


536 Sen. Cons. Marc. 3.4.2 (Basore, LCL).
your side that Areus sat; change the role - it was you that he tried to comfort.” Seneca goes on to explain that the meaning of the oracle “Know Thyself” is realizing one’s mortality, and therefore philosophy will prepare her for any type of hardship.

When Seneca was exiled by Caligula in 41 CE, he wrote a consolatory letter to his mother using similar arguments. He writes that Helvia had some philosophical education, and she should take refuge in what she knows as well as what she can still learn:

Vtinam quidem uirorum optimus, pater meus, minus maiorum consuetudini deditus uoluisse te praeceptis sapientiae erudiri potius quam inbui! non parandum tibi nunc esset auxilium contra fortunam sed proferendum. Proprie quas litteris non ad sapientiam utuntur sed ad luxuriam instruuntur minus te indulgere studiis passus est. Beneficio tamen rapacis ingenii plus quam pro tempore hausisti; iacta sunt disciplinarum omnium fundamenta: nunc ad illas reuertere; tutam te praestabunt.

Would that my father, truly the best of men, had surrendered less to the practice of his forefathers, and had been willing to have you acquire a thorough knowledge of the teachings of philosophy instead of a mere smattering! In that case you would now have, not to devise, but merely to display, your protection against Fortune. But he did not suffer you to pursue your studies because of those women who do not employ learning as a means to wisdom, but equip themselves with it for the purpose of display. Yet, thanks to your acquiring mind, you imbibed more than might have been expected in the time you had; the foundations of all systematic knowledge have been laid. Do you return now to these studies; they will render you safe.

Helvia is also instructed to teach the principles of Stoicism to her granddaughter Novatilla, who was an adult who had just lost her mother.

Seneca (c. 4-65 CE) assures his mother that he is approaching his exile with Stoic resolve, but he indicates elsewhere that he failed in this regard. Arther Ferrill writes:

---

537 Sen. Cons. Marc. 3.4.2 (Basore, LCL).
538 Sen. Cons. Helv. 17.5 (Basore, LCL).
539 Sen. Cons. Helv. 18.7-8 (Basore, LCL).
Seneca hated Corsica. He referred to it as *Corsica terribilis* and spoke of himself as though he were among the living dead. His loneliness was overpowering: ‘*Hic sola haec duo sunt: exul et exilium.*’ It was in this atmosphere that Seneca wrote the *Ad Helviam*, and every word of it was written with an eye to recall.\(^{540}\)

Ferrill goes on to argue that Seneca wrote *ad Helviam* not to comfort his mother, but in order to promote his feigned disinterest in politics so that he could be recalled from exile. Ferrill’s argument excludes the fact that many writers, including Seneca, wrote letters that were intended to be published. Pliny the Younger published his letters written from 95-108CE up to ten years after they were written. Unlike the letters of Cicero, which were spontaneous in nature, Pliny utilized a literary form that could be published later.\(^{541}\)

Musonius Rufus and Heirocles

The Stoics Musonius Rufus (fl. 1\(^{st}\) CE) and Hierocles (fl. 2\(^{nd}\) CE) both share a similar attitude towards a woman learning philosophy. Together, these thinkers give theoretical justification for what philosophers had been practicing for hundreds of years. Musonius Rufus writes that there is no significant difference between a woman and a man, at least in as much as gender does not hinder philosophical reflection: “Women as well as men have received from the gods the gift of reason, which we use in our dealings with one another and by which we judge whether a thing is good or bad, right or

---


In fact, Musonius (fl. 1st CE) exhorts women to learn philosophy so that they can better carry out their duties at home.\(^{543}\)

Musonius argues that the philosophically educated woman will be more mild-tempered, self-controlled, courageous, and chaste than an uneducated woman. This argument uncovers his bias that Stoic philosophy is most useful for anyone, but also that a woman could learn it and apply it to the common situation of women in the ancient world: the household. Apparently, philosophically educated women were such a common occurrence that Musonius goes on to address related questions:

\(^{542}\) Muson. 3.36 (That Women too Should Study Philosophy). Lutz, 34.


\(^{544}\) Muson. 3.30. Lutz, 43.
Yes, but I assure you, some will say, that women who associate themselves with philosophers are bound to be arrogant for the most part and presumptuous, in that abandoning their own households and turning to the company of men they practice speeches, talk like sophists, and analyze syllogisms, when they should be at home spinning. I should not expect women to study philosophy to shirk their appointed tasks for mere talk any more than men, but I maintain that their discussions should be conducted for the sake of personal application.545

Musonius Rufus assures his readers that he does not think that women should abandon their traditional roles in the household and practice philosophical discourse with men in the forums, debate in the symposia, and public teaching. This idea is related to the expectation that the poetess still do her household chores, the negative tradition that Hipparchia completely refused to be a common housewife, and the depiction of women philosophers in Epicureanism as prostitutes. An underlying theme in Musonius Rufus is that philosophically educated women – like other educated women – have the tools to be liberated from the inhuman position of women idealized by Roman society.

Like Musonius Rufus (fl. 1st CE), Hierocles the Stoic (fl. 2nd CE) believed that the wiseman should marry and be one with his wife in the pursuit of virtue. Illaria Ramelli writes:

Hierocles touches on his most important point: marriage is not only a duty but it is also a beautiful thing, of καλόν, since it is orientated toward the pursuit of virtue. This idea of sharing the path of virtue is no longer the privilege only of philosophers who are friends with one another but also of wives and husbands, in

545 Muson. 3.56. Lutz, 43.
communion that, for Hierocles as well as for Musonius, is not just one of bodies with a view to procreation but still more one of souls, carrying with it a moral commitment: marriage becomes a spiritual bond in the pursuit of virtue, which is the goal of philosophy itself, according to the Stoics.\textsuperscript{546}

Musonius Rufus and Heirocles have similar views on the role of philosophy in the lives of women. They both appear to have a somewhat egalitarian view of education, but both relegate men and women to their traditional roles. The redeeming quality of their application of Stoicism to family life is their shared belief that philosophy helps people to live the best possible life, whether in traditional male or female roles.

\textbf{Summary of Conclusions: Women in the History of Philosophy}

In chapter three, I presented evidence for the activity of women in the history of philosophy. All of the popular schools that were active in the first century had a rich history of the participation of women in their philosophical heritage. There were different levels of philosophical education. Some women were remembered as influential philosophers in their own right: Theano the Pythagorean, Hipparchia the Cynic, Laodice the Epicurean, and Arete the Cyrenian. These earlier traditions were alive in the first century BCE/CE. Several pseudo-Pythagorean letters present themselves as authored by and written to philosophically educated women. The Socratic and Cynic epistles also include writings from philosophers to their female colleagues. Seneca, Musonius Rufus, and Heirocles – Paul’s Stoic contemporaries – supported the philosophical education of

women so that they could most effectively live as women in their first century social constructs.

A few notable examples indicate that philosophically educated women taught other women, and others criticized their male counterparts. The Pythagorean philosopher Damo taught the secret tenents of Pythagoreanism to her daughter Bistala. While only a fragment remains, Batis the Epicurean wrote a letter to her niece Apia. Seneca encouraged Helvia to teach Stoic principles to her grand-daughter Novatilla to help her grieve properly for the loss of her mother. Calpurnia Hispulla was responsible for educating her niece, Calpurnia, and Pliny the Younger is thankful for her preparedness to participate in philosophical discussions with him.

Most philosophically educated women learned from family members in a wealthy household. This is especially true in the sources contemporary to Paul: Pliny the Younger, Seneca, Musonius Rufus, and Heirocles describe the educational activities of women near the top of the social strata. Seneca, who was a friend to emperors and their families, encouraged his mother Helvia and the daughter of a historian of senatorial rank to utilize Stoic philosophy to overcome loss. Pliny the Younger, a senator, rejoices in his wife’s company. Musonius Rufus and Heirocles provide instructions for how wealthy women could use Stoic principles to best manage their households. Similarly, the pseudo-Pythagorean letters present themselves as instructions for the management of a wealthy household.

Most philosophically educated women were educated by their fathers, and sometimes their learning was continued with their husbands. However, there are three examples of philosophically educated women who taught their sons and other men.
Theano teaches both Pythgoras and their son; Diotima and Aspasia teach Socrates and his associates; and Arete the Cyrenian taught her son. Some women philosophers argued against male thinkers. Hipparchia the Cynic sharply rebuked Theodorus the Atheist for criticizing her participation in philosophical discourse. Leontion the Epicurean wrote a book criticizing Theophrastus.

When Paul wrote his epistles to the Corinthians, philosophical education was available to many different types of women. They could be educated by a female relative or her father, husband, son, a tutor, or a philosopher that she brings into the household herself. These women were typically connected to a wealthy household: either the woman is a member of a wealthy family or attached to one as the relative of someone dependent such a household. She could learn from any combination of schools that were active in the Roman world: neo-Pythagoreanism, middle-Platonism, Cynicism, Epicureanism, and Stoicism. In chapter four, I will discuss the many contacts of these schools to Corinth to build an argument for the presence of philosophically educated women there.
CHAPTER 4:  
CORINTH AND ITS PHILOSOPHERS

In chapters two and three, I reviewed the evidence for educated women and girls, and specifically, in chapter three, of philosophically educated women. I have argued that such women learned philosophy from a variety of media: they attended schools, learned from their husbands or fathers, or received teaching from a tutor in the household. I have also shown that philosophy was not the only education that women received. The archeological and literary records indicated that women were involved in the full spectrum of Greek education, including athletics and dance. Women were also involved in occupations which required some literacy: poetry, medicine, and being a scribe or grocer. Establishing the existence of philosophically educated women has been a necessary step toward considering how women in Corinth might have engaged 1 Corinthians.

In this chapter, our focus centers on Corinth and the community of Jesus-believers in the city. I will discuss the history of the city of Corinth, giving some attention to its social structures and to the existence and roles of philosophically educated women. Then, I will review the nature of philosophy at Corinth as described by ancient writers. Corinth has a heritage of being a refuge where philosophers and orators could engage in open debate without fear of persecution. Before its destruction in 146 BCE by the Romans, deposed tyrants and exiled philosophers who faced death for their views in other cities were able to live peacefully in Corinth. After Corinth was re-founded in 46 BCE as
a Roman colony, the popular schools continued to maintain representation. It is significant that the history of philosophy in Corinth has contact with all the schools that have strong traditions of philosophically educated women. The Corinthian church is situated within these contexts. In order to establish the likelihood of philosophically educated women engaging the writing we know as 1 Corinthians, I will examine the presence of women in the community, issues of social status, and the importance of households in locating philosophically educated women. Considering the nature of some of the problems that Paul faced in Corinth, it is likely that women indeed had access to philosophical education.

**Classical Corinth**

The city of Corinth was founded in the 900s BCE, and the area had been inhabited since 5200 BCE. The area of land that Corinth controlled in classical times was 559.234m² (900km²). The land was fertile, and the earth produced enough wealth so that the early Corinth was known for its wealth before the city was known for both land and sea trade. Trade from the north and south of Greece had to pass through Corinth, and the Isthmus connected Asia to Italy. Because of the abundance of natural resources from which the Corinthians fashioned their legendary bronze, the control over trade

---


549 Strab. 8.6.20.
The Corinthians participated in a number of wars, with its final mistake being aggression towards Sparta which resulted in its destruction in 146 BCE by Mimmius. While the destruction was proverbial, it is likely that there were people living among the ruins throughout its 100 years of desolation. The Isthmus was still being used for both private and military purposes, and the Isthmian games were kept alive by nearby Sikyon.

Classical Corinth was very accommodating to religious worship, having numerous sanctuaries or temples dedicated to various gods. The most prominent religions in Corinth consisted of hero and heroine worship, the usual gods of the

---


Pantheon, and their patron gods Demeter and Poseidon. The Isthmian games as religious celebrations were dedicated to Poseidon, but the heroes and other gods played a prominent part in worship and entertainment. These biennial games included sometimes fatal combat sports such as wrestling and boxing, foot races, chariot races, the pancration, pentathlon, and perhaps a ship race. Prizes included not only first place (typically celery or pine crowns), but second place and lower (prizes ranged from


563 A five-contest event including the long jump, javelin throw, and discus throw, the stadion, and wrestling.


honors to monetary rewards, as it was with other Pan-Hellenic games. Slaves and freedmen were a part of the games, either as trainers, attendents, or (rarely) as athletes [typically associated with the household of a weathly person]. Women and girls competed in a parallel festival, which included poetry contests. “Aristomache of Erythra had been twice victorious in epic poetry at the Isthmia in the third century BCE.” Festivities at the Isthmian games included choral singing, poetry and musical contests, and philosophical debates.

**Roman Corinth**

The Corinth that Paul saw was a Roman Corinth, founded as *Colonia Laus Iulia Corinthiensis* in 46 BCE. The process of Roman colonization in Corinth is important to consider because it sets the background for the organization and population of the city when Paul arrives 100 years later. Like the *curiae* in Spain, Roman Corinth was

---

566 Nigel B. Crowther, “Second-Place Finishes and Lower in Greek Athletics (Including the Pentathlon),” *ZPE* 90 (1992): 97-102. This continued through the Roman period.


organized according to tribes usually associated with the ruling class in Rome. L. R. Dean has found in the inscriptions at Corinth that the “names which have been preserved are Aelia, Antonia, Antoniniana, Augusta, Aurelia, Caelestia, Commoda, Iovia, Iulia felix, Papiria, Sabina, Saturnia, Severiana, and Traiana.” Strabo (c. 63-24 BCE/CE) tells us that most of the colonists were freedmen, many of whom gained wealth through digging up pottery, brass, and other valuables and selling them back to Rome. The sons of these freedmen would have become Roman citizens and perhaps a few of these Corinthians moved up through the ranks of public office, status, and wealth. The expulsions of some Jews from Rome in 19 CE by the Roman Senate and by Claudius in

---


49 CE may have supplied the new Roman colony with the majority of its early Jewish inhabitants.\(^{575}\)

Roman Corinth continued to worship the same gods as the pre-Roman Corinthians.\(^{576}\) The Romans worshipped both the Greek pantheon as well as the Roman gods, and continued the worship of Demeter and Poesidon as patron gods.\(^{577}\) The Roman games were integrated, as were all things, into the patronage system.\(^{578}\) The Isthmian games were revived at about the time that Corinth was founded as a colony.\(^{579}\)

**Philosophers in Corinth**

Philosophers were active in both classical and Roman Corinth, and unfortunately the evidence concerning their lives and teachings is fragmentary. While it was nowhere near the stature of Athens, the hub of ancient philosophy, Corinth served as a place where ideas could be exchanged freely. Perhaps the earliest sources are legends regarding the wisdom of Periander, a 7\(^{th}\) century BCE tyrant of Corinth.\(^{580}\) Cicero tells us that

---


\(^{580}\) Diod. Sic. 9.7 tells us that Periander was removed from the Seven Wise Men because he had become a tyrant.
Dicaearchus (fl. 320-300 BCE), a pupil of Aristotle, held a philosophical discussion on the soul in Corinth:

Dicaearchus autem in eo sermone, quem Corinthi habitum tribus libris exponit, doctorum hominum disputantium primo libro multos loquentes facit; duobus Pherecratem quendam Phthiotam senem, quem ait a Deucalione ortum, disserentem inducit nihil esse omnino animum, et hoc esse nomen totum inane, frustraque animalia et animantis appellari, neque in homine inesse animum vel animam nec in bestia, vimeque omnem eam, qua vel agamus quid vel sentiamus, in omnibus corporibus vivis aequabiliter esse fusuam nec separabilem a corpore esse, quippe quae nulla sit, nec sit quicquam nisi corpus unum et simplex, ita figuratum ut temperatione naturae vigeat et sentiat.

But Dicaearchus, in that discourse of some learned disputants, held at Corinth, which he details to us in three books—in the first book introduces many speakers; and in the other two he introduces a certain Pherecrates, an old man of Phthia, who, as he said, was descended from Deucalion; asserting, that there is in fact no such thing at all as a soul, but that it is a name without a meaning; and that it is idle to use the expression “animals,” or “animated beings;” that neither men nor beasts have minds or souls, but that all that power by which we act or perceive is equally infused into every living creature, and is inseparable from the body, for if it were not, it would be nothing; nor is there anything whatever really existing except body, which is a single and simple thing, so fashioned as to live and have its sensations in consequence of the regulations of nature.  

Unfortunately, this episode is only mentioned here in ancient literature. The most important thing that this passage tells us is that Cicero thinks it appropriate to place a well-known student of Aristotle in Corinth with other debating learned people concerning the nature of the soul.

---

581 Cic. Tusc. 1.21 (Yonge, LCL).

582 It appears that this work is lost and no other writer in the ancient world mentions it, cf., W. Fortenbaugh and E. Schüttrumpf, Dicaearchus of Messana: Text, Translation, and Discussion (New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 2001), 19.

Themistius, quoting a lost work of Aristotle, tells us that a Corinthian farmer was so impressed with *Gorgias* that after reading it, he went to Athens to be a student of Plato. Several sources suggest that Dionysius, the tyrant of Syracuse, fled to Corinth to become a school teacher. For example, Philo, a contemporary of Paul, writes:

> ἀρχαὶ βασιλέων αἱ μέγισται καθηρέθησαν βραχεία καιροῦ ῥοπη. ἐγγυαίται μου τὸν λόγον Διονύσιος ὁ ἐν Κορινθῷ, ὁς Σικελίας μὲν τύραννος ἦν, ἐκπέσων δὲ τῆς ἡγεμονίας εἰς Κόρινθον καταφεύγει καὶ γραμματιστὴς ὁ τοσοῦτος ἡγεμὸν γίνεται.

The most mighty powers and authority of kings have been overthrown, and have disappeared in a very brief moment of time. There is an example to testify to the truth of my argument in Dionysius, who lived at Corinth, who had been tyrant of Sicily, and who, after he was expelled from his dominions, took refuge in Corinth; and though he had been so mighty a sovereign, became a schoolmaster.

P. Oxy. 12 is a chronology of various events during the fourth century CE, and this papyrus contains a similar history of Dionysius:

> [Ὀλυμπίας ἔτη καὶ ἕκαστη | ἔνικα στάδιον Ἀριστόλυκος | Ἀθηναίος ἦρχαν δὲ Ἀθηναὶ | Λυκίας Πυθοδότης Σωσίγειρη | Νικόμαχος ταύτης | κατὰ δὲ τὸ δεύτερον ἦτος Διονύσιος ὁ δεύτερος τῆς Σικελίας | τύραννος ἐκπέσων τῆς | ἀρχής κατέπλευσεν εἰς Κόρινθον καὶ ἐκεί κατέμεινε | γράμματα διδάσκον, κατὰ δὲ | τὸν τέταρτον Βαγγέλας | εὐσύχος Ὁχόν τοῦ βασιλέα τῶν Περσῶν δολοφόνησας τὸν νεώτατον αὐτοῦ τῶν | υἱὸν Ἀρσίνος κατέστησε βασιλέα, αὐτὸς πάντα διοικῶν.

[In the 109th Olympiad] [344 B.C.] Aristolycus [of Athens won the stadion race], and the archons at Athens were [Lyciscus], Pythodotus, Sosigenes and Nicomachus. In the second year Dionysius II, tyrant of Sicily, fell from power and sailed off to Corinth, where he survived as a schoolteacher. In the fourth year the eunuch Bagoas murdered Ochus, the king of the Persians, and set up Arses who

---


was the youngest of Ochus’ sons as king, while he himself controlled the whole government.\textsuperscript{586}

Plutarch (c. 46-120 CE) associates Dionysius with Plato, “Εκπεσών δὲ τῆς ἀρχῆς πρὸς μὲν τὸν εἴποντα 'τι σὲ Πλάτων καὶ φιλοσόφια ὁφέλησε;' 'τὸ τηλικαύτην' ἐφ᾽ 'τύχης μεταβολὴν ῥαδίως ὑπομένειν,’” “When he was deposed from his government, and one asked him what he got by Plato and philosophy, he answered, ‘That I may bear so great a change of fortune patiently.’”\textsuperscript{587} There are even some unreliable traditions that Plato himself wrestled at the Isthmian games, winning twice.\textsuperscript{588} Athenaeus (fl. late 2\textsuperscript{nd} CE) writes that Dionysius participated in some attacks on the school at Athens, notably using Lastheneia against them.

Διονύσιος γοῦν ὁ τῆς Σικελίας τύραννος ἐν τῇ πρὸς αὐτὸν Ἐπιστολῇ κατὰ τῆς φιλοσοφίας αὐτοῦ εἰπὼν καὶ φιλαργυρίαν αὐτῷ ὀνειδίζει καὶ τὸν Λασθενείας τῆς Ἀρκαδίκης ἔρωτα, ἡτὶς καὶ Πλάτωνος ἦκηκόει.

At all events Dionysius, the tyrant of Sicily, in his letter to [Speusippus] blaming him for his fondness for pleasure, reproaches him also for his covetousness, and for his love of Lastheneia the Arcadian, who had been a pupil of Plato.\textsuperscript{589}

Corinth produced many Cynic philosophers. In the fourth century BCE, Xeniades of Corinth purchased Diogenes of Sinope and later convinced Monimus, another slave, to

\textsuperscript{586} P. Oxy 12.4 = FGrH 255.4.

\textsuperscript{587} Plut. Mor. 176.

\textsuperscript{588} Diog. Laert. 3.4. Alice Swift Riginos notes that the earliest tradition of Plato’s competing in the pan-Hellenic games places him at Isthmia. Later traditions place him in one or more of the three other games, and his winning is also a later development, Platonica: The Anecdotes Concerning the Life and Writings of Plato (Leiden: Brill, 1976), 41. David C. Young asserts that there is no record anywhere in ancient literature of a person being both a superior intellectual and athlete, A Brief History of the Olympic Games (Oxford: Blackwell, 2004), 81.

\textsuperscript{589} Ath. 12.66.15. See also 7.10.9.
follow his Cynic teachings. There is a tradition recorded by Diogenes Laertius (fl. 3rd CE) that Aristippus of Cyrene (c. 435 - c.356 BCE), whose grandson was taught by his mother, Arete, visited Corinth twice:

Τοιόύτως μὲν ὁ Θεόδωρος κἀκεῖτος. τελευταίον δ’ εἰς Κυρήνην ἀπελθών καὶ Μάγας συμβίουσ ἐν πάσῃ τιμῇ διετέλει τυχάνων. ἐνθεὶ το πρῶτον ἐκβάλλομένος λέγεται χάριν τι εἰπεῖν· φησί γὰρ, “καλῶς ποιεῖτε, ἄνδρες Κυρῆναιοι, ἐκ τῆς Λιβύης ἐκ τῆς Ἑλλάδας με ἐξορίζοντες.”

They say also that on one occasion he came to Corinth, bringing with him a great many disciples; and that Metrocles the Cynic, who was washing leeks said to him, “You, who are a Sophist, would not have wanted so many pupils, if you had washed vegetables.” And Theodorus, taking him up, replied, “And if you had known how to associate with men, you would not have cared about those vegetables.”

Εἰς Κόρινθον αὐτῷ πλέοντι ποτὲ καὶ χειμαζομένῳ συνεβη ταραχθῆναι. πρὸς οίνῳ τον εἶποντα, “ἡμεῖς μὲν οί ἰδιώται οὐ διδόκαμεν, ἡμεῖς δ’ οἱ φιλόσοφοι δειλιᾶτε,” “οὐ γὰρ περί ὁμοίας,” ἐφε, “ψυχῆς ἀγωνιῶμεν ἑκαστοὶ.”

Once it happened, that when he was sailing to Corinth, he was overtaken by a violent storm; and somebody said, “We common individuals are not afraid, but you philosophers are behaving like cowards;” he said, “Very likely, for we have not both us the same kind of souls at stake.”

The same Theodorus who challenges Metrocles the Cynic in Corinth also criticized his sister Hipparchia the Cynic.

Corinth was a safe-haven for Xenophon of Athens and his children (c. 394 BCE), and he remained there until his death. Antipater of Sidon (fl. 2nd BCE) preserves this event:

---

[590] Diog. Laert. 2.103.


[592] In both traditions he is referred to as Theodorus the Atheist (Diog. Laert. 2.85; 6.97).
If the citizens of Cranaus and Cecrops condemned you, Xenophon, to exile because of your friend Cyrus, yet hospitable Corinth received you, with which you were so pleased and content, and decided to remain there.\(^{593}\)

In the first century, Demetrius of Corinth was a well-known Cynic and friend of Seneca the Younger.\(^{594}\) Demetrius was born in Corinth and educated in Athens (fl. 37-71 CE) – he was considered the ideal philosopher by Seneca\(^{595}\) and Epictetus.\(^{596}\)

Demetrius of Corinth was also friends with the famous senator Thrasea, a Stoic. There are many traditions that associate Demetrius with philosophically educated women. The story of Thrasea’s death, a forced suicide by Nero, was quite popular in the ancient world. When one of his closest friends, Domitius Caecilianus, brought Thrasea the news of his condemnation by Nero, he found him in philosophical discussion with Demetrius in the presence of many hearers.

Tum ad Thrasea in hortis agentem quaestor consulis missus vesperascente iam die. inlustrium virorum feminarumque coetus frequentis egerat, maxime intentus Demetrio Cynicae institutionis doctori.

Then, as evening approached, the consul’s quaestor was sent to Thrasea, who was passing his time in his garden. He had had a crowded gathering of distinguished

\(^{593}\) *Anth. Pal.* 7.98.


\(^{595}\) Sen. *Ben.* 7.8.

men and women, giving special attention to Demetrius, a professor of the Cynic philosophy.\footnote{Tac. Ann. 16.35. Thrasea continually aggravated Nero, which led to his death. Cf., Tac. Ann. 13.49; 14.12 (walked out of the Senate during Agrippina’s case); 15.20-22 (short speech to the senate); 16.21-35 (Nero kills him for the Agrippina incident and not supporting the Juvenile games); Hist. 2.91, 5.5; Dio Cass. 62.15; cf., Juv. 5.36. Toynbee, “Dictators and Philosophers,” 49-58.}

Tacitus makes it clear that Thrasea knew he was going to die, so it is appropriate that he gathered his friends together to discuss with Demetrius the nature of the soul and the separation of spirit and body.\footnote{Tact. Ann. 16.34.} Because Thrasea was a senator,\footnote{Oswyn Murray provides a detailed review of Thrasea’s career in “The ‘Quinquennium Neronis’ and the Stoics,” Historia 14, no. 1 (1965): 41-61.} it is likely that the discussion group consisted of his elite (“distinguished”) friends and their wives, but widows and unaccompanied wives could have attended as well. As for what Thrasea himself may have taught, it certainly aligns with his Stoic outlook:

\begin{quote}

Εἶλεγε γὰρ ὅτι “ἳ ἐὰν ἐμὲ μόνον οὐρανός φονεύσειν ἐμελλεῖ, πολλὴν ἄν ἐμὸν τοῖς ἀλλοίς ὑπερκολακεύσουσιν αὐτὸν συγγνώμην, ἐί δὲ καὶ ἐκεῖνοι τῶν σφόδρα αὐτὸν ἐπαινοῦντας πολλοὺς τοὺς μὲν ἀνάλοξα τοὺς δὲ καὶ ἀπολείποντος μὲν τοῖς ἀρχαῖοι ἀσχημονοῦντα δουλοπροσφεύγειν φθαρήναι, ἐξὸν ἔλευθερον ἀποδοῦναι τῇ φυσίν τοῦ διδακτόνον; ἔμοι μὲν γὰρ πέρι καὶ ἐπιτα λόγος τις ἐσται, τούτῳ δέ, πλὴν κατ’ αὐτὸ τότῳ ὡς ἐσφάγησαν, οὔεϊς.” τοιότου μὲν ὁ Ῥασέας ἐγένετο, καὶ τούτῳ αἰτὶ πρὸς ἑαυτὸν ἐλεγεν “ἐμὲ ἄν ποιτείναι μὲν δύναται, βλάψαι δὲ οὐ.”

He used to say, for example: “If I were the only one that Nero was going to put to death, I could easily pardon the rest who load him with flatteries. But since even among those who praise him to excess there are many whom he has either already disposed of or will yet destroy, why should one degrade oneself to no purpose and then perish like a slave, when one may pay the debt to nature like a freeman? As for me, men will talk of me hereafter, but of them never, except only to record the fact that they were put to death.” Such was the man that Thrasea showed himself to be;

\end{quote}
and he was always saying to himself: “Nero can kill me, but he cannot harm me.”

Thrasea would not indulge Nero by supporting his games, or listening to him at the theatre, and he had a bad habit of walking out of the Senate – or not appearing at all – demonstrating that he did not like the laws which were passed to flatter Nero. For these reasons Dio Cassius tells us that Nero killed him. Pliny the Younger took care of Thrasea’s wife and daughter after his death. Thrasea’s step-son Helvidius Priscus was also an outspoken Stoic senator and at least one scholar thinks that he led Thrasea’s “philosophical band” after his execution.

Demetrius of Corinth was criticized by Dio Cassius:

Inasmuch as many others, too, including Demetrius the Cynic, actuated by the Stoic principles, were taking advantage of the name of philosophy to teach publicly many doctrines inappropriate to the times, and in this way were subtly corrupting some of

---

600 Dio Cass. 61c.15.3-4
their hearers, Mucianus, prompted rather by anger than by any passion for philosophy, inveighed at length against them and persuaded Vespasian to expel all such persons from the city.…

καὶ πάντας αὐτίκα τοὺς φιλοσόφους ὁ Οὐσεπασιάνος, πλὴν τοῦ Μουσώνιου, ἐκ τῆς Ῥώμης ἔξεβαλε, τὸν δὲ δὴ Δημητρίον καὶ τὸν Ὀστιλιανὸν καὶ ἐς νήσους κατέκλεισε, καὶ ὁ μὲν Ὀστίλιος εἰ καὶ τὰ μᾶλλον μὴ ἐπαύσατο περὶ τῆς φυγῆς ἀκούσας ἐτυχε γὰρ διαλεγόμενος τινὶ ἄλλα καὶ πολλῷ πλείῳ κατὰ τῆς μοναρχίας κατέδραμεν, ὅμως παραχρῆμα μετέστη· τῶ δὲ Δημητρίῳ μηδ’ ὡς ὑπείκουτι ἐκέλευσεν ὁ Οὐσεπασιάνος λεξῆναι ὅτι “οὐ μὲν πάντα ποιεῖς ἵνα σε ἀποκτείνω, ἐγὼ δὲ κύνα ἔμικτοῦντα οὐ φονεύω.”

And Vespasian immediately expelled from Rome all the philosophers except Musonius; Demetrius and Hostilianus he even deported to islands. Hostilianus, though he decidedly would not desist when he was told about the sentence of exile (he happened to be conversing with somebody), but merely inveighed all the more strongly against monarchy, nevertheless straightway withdrew. Demetrius, on the contrary, would not yield even then, and Vespasian commanded that this message should be given to him: “You are doing everything to force me to kill you, but I do not slay a barking dog.”

Philostratus says that Pancrates the Cynic taught philosophy at the Isthmus in the early second century. Nothing is known about Pancrates other than he lived in Athens for a while and escaped stoning by stunning the crowd with the saying, “Lollianus does not sell bread but words.”

Stoicism was well represented in Corinth. At least one tradition indicates that the Megarian philosopher, Thrasymachus of Corinth (fl. 4th BCE), taught Stilpo (c. 360-c. BCE).
280 BC) who taught Zeno of Citium (334 BC - 262 BC), the founder of Stoicism. The destruction of Corinth and the subsequent rise in value of Corinthian bronze became proverbial in the writings of Cicero, Servius Sulpicius Rufus (106-43 BCE), and Seneca. Cicero gives a testimony concerning his visit in 77 BCE before the city was rebuilt, “at Corinth the sudden sight of the ruins had more effect on me that upon the actual inhabitants, for long contemplation had the hardening effect of length of time upon their souls.”

Several years later, Servius Sulpicius wrote to Cicero, “As I sailed across, I began to look at the places roundabout; behind me was Aegina, before me Megara, on the right Piraeus, on the left Corinth: they were once flourishing towns, now they lie in ruins, flattened (45 BCE).” Seneca uses the following metaphor, “Therefore, let just as many books be acquired as are enough, but not for mere show. ‘It is more respectable,’ you say, ‘to squander money on these than on Corinthian bronzes and on pictures.’”

The well-known Stoic Musonius Rufus (25-101 CE) was exiled to the island of Gyaros by Nero in 65 CE, and according to Philostratus he was sent to work along with the aforementioned Demetrius the Cynic on the canal of the Isthmus of Corinth two years

---

609 Diog. Laert. 2.113 (Life of Stilpo 1.1).
610 Cic. Tusc. 3.53. He says elsewhere that the city was completely razed because the Romans feared that the people would one day recover from their defeat, Off. 1.9.35.
612 Sen. Tran. 9.5. Cf., On the Shortness of Life, 12.2. In Polyb. 1.1, Seneca argues that it is folly to mourn over the loss of cities when the entire universe will eventually perish.
later.\textsuperscript{613} Arrian addresses the discourses of Epictetus to the Corinthian aristocrat Lucius Gellius Menander.\textsuperscript{614}

The Stoic / eclectic philosopher and orator Dio Chrysostom (40-120 CE) gives us a view of philosophical debates among the pandemonium of the crowds during the Isthmian Games.\textsuperscript{615}

\begin{quote}
καὶ δὴ καὶ τὸτε ἦν περὶ τῶν νεὼν τοῦ Ποσειδῶνος ἀκούειν πολλῶν μὲν σοφιστῶν κακοδαιμόνων βοῶντων καὶ λοιδορουμένων ἄλληλοις, καὶ τῶν λεγομένων μαθητῶν ἄλλου ἄλλα μαθημάτων, πολλῶν δὲ συγγραφέων ἀναγινωσκόντων ἀναισθήτα συγγραμμάτα, πολλῶν δὲ ποιητῶν ποιήματα ἀδύνατων, καὶ τῶν κατατυπωτῶν ἐπίτηδον, πολλῶν δὲ ὀμνιστών ἔρωτον, πολλῶν δὲ ἑαυτός ἀχθῶν ἀπεικόνισεν, πολλῶν δὲ τραυματισθῶν τέρατα κρινόντων, μυρίων δὲ ῥητόρων δίκαι ἐπερεύχων, όπι ὁλίγων δὲ κατάληκαν διακατηλεύοντος ὦ, τι τύχοιον ἐκαστος. εὐθὺς όν καὶ αὐτῷ τινες προσήλθον, των μὲν Κορινθίων οὔδεὶς, οὔδε γὰρ ἐξ ὀντόν οὐδὲν ὑφεληθήσασθαι, ὡστε καθ’ ἡμέραν ἑώραν αὐτὸν ἐν Κορίνθῳ, τῶν δὲ ἕξεσαν ἥσαν οἱ προσεῖντες
\end{quote}


\textsuperscript{615} The earlier Greek philosophers appeared at many pan-Hellenic games. The Olympic games were especially important: Pythagoras revealed his golden thigh at the Olympic games (Ael. \textit{Hist}. 2.21), Plato won some disciples in Olympia (Ael. \textit{Hist}. 4.9), Empedocles recruited disciples there, Gorgias was often invited to speak at the Olympic games, and Ion (at Isthmia, Plut. \textit{Mor}. 79d), Antisthenes gave an oration at Isthmia (Diog. Laert. 6.1), Lysias gave an Olympic oration (Plut. \textit{Mor}. 836d), Isocrates gave a lecture there (\textit{Isoc}. 4), Hippias (Pl. \textit{Hip. mai.} 363c) frequented the games to engage in philosophical debate. Håkan Tell examines the role of intellectual pursuits at the games in “Sages at the Games: Intellectual Displays and Dissemination of Wisdom in Ancient Greece,” \textit{Cl Ant} 26, no. 2 (2007): 249–52; W. K. C. Guthrie, \textit{The Sophists} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971), 44-5; Victoria Jennings, \textit{The World of Ion of Chios} (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 338.
So, when the time for the Isthmian games had arrived, and everybody was at the Isthmus... That was the time when one could hear Poseidon’s temple shouting and reviling one another, and their disciples, as they were called, fighting with one another, many writers reading aloud their stupid works, many poets reciting their poems while others applauded them... Naturally a crowd gathered around him immediately. No Corinthians, however, for they did not think it would at all be worth their while, since they were accustomed to see him every day at Corinth. The crowd that gathered around him were strangers.\footnote{Dio Chrys. Or. 8.7.9.}

This speech claims to describe the nature of the attendance of Diogenes the Cynic (c. 420-323 BCE) at the games, but Chrysostom most likely describes his experience in the first century because it compliments monuments and other artifacts found in the area of that time.\footnote{Oscar Broneer, “The Apostle Paul,” 18; see also Murphy-O’Conner, \textit{Corinth}, 97.} Bruce Winter argues that Dio chose the figure of Diogenes to criticize the sophists of his time because Diogenes was a volatile character that made a good platform for criticism. Winter suggests that the speech describes Dio’s attendance at the games during a visit to Corinth during his exile in 89-96 CE.\footnote{Winter, \textit{After Paul Left Corinth}, 32.}

Dio Chrysostom provides one of the many contexts in which philosophically educated women would participate in discourse with other philosophers. In the context of the games, there was public discourse – and we know that women were present because they competed in and supported the games. Cicero and his friends preferred to stay indoors to have philosophical discussions during the Pythian games, and that also seems to be the case with Plutarch.

Plutarch visited Corinth at the time of the Isthmian games and participated in a philosophical discourse with other learned guests. Apparently, Plutarch and his
associates preferred to gather with fellow intellectuals rather than celebrate the celebrate feasts hosted by Sospis:

`Ioθμίων ἄγομένων ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ τῶν Σώσπιδος ἄγωνοθεσίων τάς μὲν ἄλλας έστιάσεις διεφύγομεν, έστιάσεις αὐτοῦ πολλοὺς μὲν ἀμα έξενος πάντας δὲ πολλάκις τοὺς πολίτας· ἀπαξ δὲ τοὺς μάλιστα φίλους καὶ φιλολόγους οίκοι δεχομένου καὶ αὐτοὶ παρῆμεν. ἀπηρμένου δὲ τῶν πρώτων τραπεζῶν ἤκεν τίς 'Ηρώδη τῷ ῥήτορι παρά γνωρίμου νενικηκότος ἐγκώμιοι φοίνικα καὶ στέφανον τινα τῶν πλεκτῶν κομίζων.

The Isthmian games being celebrated, when Sospis was the second time director of the solemnity, we avoided other entertainments,—he treating a great many strangers and often all his fellow-citizens,—but once, when he entertained his nearest and most learned friends at his own house, I was one of the company. After the first course, one coming to Herodes the rhetorician brought a palm and a wreathed crown, which one of his acquaintance, who had won the prize for an encomiastic exercise, sent him.619

Borimir Jordan provides several references for gatherings like this one at Isthmia.620

Cicero (106-43 BCE) and his friends chose to gather outside of Rome for philosophical discussion during the games.621 Pliny the Younger (c. 61-112 CE) was delighted when Tacitus (56-117 BCE) was mistaken for him by a Roman knight during a conversation at the Circensian games.622 Reflecting later the same well-established traditions of philosophical discourse at the games, other sophists who were attracted to the pan-Hellenic games in the second century include: Polemo (90-144 CE, Olympic, patron was Herodes Atticus and he interacted with Favorinus, Philostratus 538, 442, 491), Herodes

619 Plut. Mor. 723a.

620 Borimir Jordan provides several references for earlier gatherings like this at Isthmia, “Isthmian Amusements,” Classics Ireland 8, (2001): 32-67; Pind. Pyth. 4.294; Nem. 9.48; Isthm. 6.1 and Scholium on Ol. 10.55; Dem. 19.195.

621 Cic. Orat. 7.

Atticus (101-177 CE, Olympia, Philostratus 557), Herodes’s father (fl. late 2nd BCE, Olympia, Philostr. V S 1.25, 539) and Antipater of Hierapolis (fl. 200 CE, Olympic and Panathenaic, Philostr. V S 24.1). The games were attractive to many intellectuals and philosophers because they served as a platform for orations and debate. Robert Weir finds in the inscriptions at Delphi two second century CE intellectuals who travelled to the Pythian games: P. Cornelius Lupus of Nikopolis (c. 95-100 CE) and Isocrates of Athens (c. 80-90 CE).623

Favorinus was important philosopher with close ties to Corinth. A distinguished student of Dio Chrysostom (c. 40-120 CE), Favorinus (ca. 80-150 CE)624 authored some discourses which are preserved under his master’s name.625 Favorinus,626 an Academic philosopher, was also a pupil and friend of Plutarch and a teacher of Herodes Atticus,

---


624 Cf., Winter, Paul among the Sopists, 128.


who was a notable patron in Corinth.\footnote{Paus. 1.7; J. L. Moles, “The Career and Conversion of Dio Chrysostom,” \textit{JHS} 98 (1978): 79-100; H.C. Rutledge, “Herodes the Great: Citizen of the World,” \textit{CJ} 56, no. 3 (1960): 97-109.} Herodes Atticus himself had a notable student, Sceptus of Corinth (fl. 2nd CE).\footnote{Philostr. \textit{VS} 573, 585.} Favorinus has a part in Plutarch’s \textit{Table Talk}, which includes a lengthy discussion on love.

Philostratus (c. 170-247 CE) tells us that a statue of Favorinus (c. 80-160 CE) was placed in the public library of Corinth to encourage the youth to imitate his eloquence.\footnote{Philostr. \textit{VS} 1.8. [remember ‘philosophers who were skilled at rhetoric’]. Saul S. Weinberg, \textit{Corinth: The Southeast Building, the Twin Basilicas, The Mosaic House}, ASCSA 1.5 (Princeton, NJ: The American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1960), 11-12 (28).} Some scholars believe that when Favorinus agitated Hadrian, the Corinthians removed the statue.\footnote{Bruce Winter, “The Toppling of Favorinus and Paul,” in \textit{Early Christianity and Classical Culture: Comparative Studies in Honor of Abraham J. Malherbe}, ed. John T. Fitzgerald, Thomas H. Olbricht, & L. Michael White (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 291-306.} Simon Swain believes that, on the basis of Favorinus’s \textit{Corinthian Oration} (32-35), that the Corinthians pulled down the statue because of a rumor that he had committed adultery.\footnote{Simon Swain, “Favorinus and Hadrian,” \textit{ZPE} 79, (1989), 154.}

A word on the library at Corinth, where a statue of Favorinus (c. 80-160 CE) was erected, would be helpful because it may well have been a source of education in Corinth, perhaps for some in the Pauline community. The concept of “public libraries” was developed in the first century BCE. The sources are inconclusive as to who exactly had access to “public libraries.” Certainly the wealthy had easier access to these books, but
libraries were often attached to very public points such as baths and porticos, suggesting a slightly larger readership than wealthy book collectors. In any case, literary patronage experienced a shift from private—patrons lending books to wealthy friends or clients—to patrons constructing libraries for a wider audience.

Favorinus’s (c. 80-160 CE) learning was praised by Demetrius the Cynic (fl. 1st CE), Cornelius Fronto (c. 100-170 CE), Cassius Dio (c. 155-229 CE; 69.3.6), and Aulus Gellius (125-180 CE; 2.12.15, 16.1.3). Galen (c. 129-217 CE) wrote two lost treatises against Favorinus: To Favorinus on the Best Teaching and To Favorinus, Concerning Epictetus. In his oration on Fortune, Favorinus alludes to many educated women:

Furthermore, men even reproach Fortune for some of their own emotional weaknesses — Medea for her passion, Midas for his prayer, Phaedra for her false accusation, Alcmaeon for his wandering, Orestes for his madness. But I will tell you also a certain Cyprian tale if you wish. The days of old produced women of distinction as well as men — Rhodogunê the warrior, Semiramis the queen, Sappho the poetess, Timandra the beauty; just so Cyprus too had its Demonassa, a woman gifted in both statesmanship and law-giving. She gave the people of Cyprus the

---


633 Anna Maria Ioppolo, “Favorinus,” 183-213.
following three laws: a woman guilty of adultery shall have her hair cut off and be a harlot — her daughter became an adulteress, had her hair cut off according to the law, and practised harlotry; whoever commits suicide shall be cast out without a burial — this was the second law of Demonassa; third, a law forbidding the slaughter of a plough-ox. 634

Some scholars believe that Favorinus is not simply mentioning Sappho but that her poetry influenced him. 635  Sometime in the first century, the Corinthians honored another rhetor with a statue with the inscription: “By decree of the city council, Corinth the mother city (set up this monument in honor of) Peducaeus Cestianus the Apollonian orator.” 636

There may be some memory of (neo-)Pythagoreans in Corinth preserved in a biographer of Phytagoras. Iamblichus (c. 245-325 CE) tells us of the remarkable

634 Dio Chrys. 64.2; Ael. VH 5.14: “This also was observed by them; A ploughing Oxe, that laboureth under the yoak, either with Plough or Cart, sacrifice not. For he also is a Tiller of the earth, and partakes with men of their labour.”


friendship that the Pythagoreans Phintias and Damon practiced in Corinth (4th BCE).\textsuperscript{637} Iamblichus also lists Chrysippus of Corinth as a notable Pythagorean.\textsuperscript{638}

There is no direct evidence for contact between Epicureanism and Corinth, but the inscriptions of Diogenes of Oneoanda – which includes the \textit{Letter to Mother} (see above chapter 3) – were installed just 50 miles north of the city in the second century CE. There must have been an Epicurean community in Oneoanda, and it is not unreasonable to assume that members of that community travelled to Corinth for the Isthmian games, to visit friends, or conduct business. C. W. Chilton, in the introduction to his translation of the Oneoanda fragments, writes, “one cannot doubt that there were Epicurean communities in many of these towns, communities which Paul might well have hoped to convert.”\textsuperscript{639}

The work of Norman DeWitt must be addressed due to its wide usage in older scholarship. DeWitt argues that Paul specifically addresses Epicureans in Corinth.\textsuperscript{640} DeWitt begins his analysis with the assumption that as Paul made himself a Greek to the Greeks, so he must have made himself an Epicurean to the Epicureans.\textsuperscript{641} From such a

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{637} Iamb. \textit{VP} 33.3. Iamblichus attributes the story to Aristoxenus (b. 370 BCE), Porphyry (\textit{VP} 59-61) attributes it to Nichomachus. It was known to Cicero, \textit{Cic. Off.} 3.45; \textit{Tusc. Disp.} 5.22. Cicero and Diodorus Siculus place the time of the event at the time of Dionysius the Elder in Syracuse, 405-367 BCE. Iamblichus places the event in the time of Dionysius the Younger in Corinth, LCL, Oldfather, 59 n. 8.
\item \textsuperscript{638} \textit{VP} 36.267. Unfortunately, Iamblichus gives no indication of date.
\item \textsuperscript{640} DeWitt, \textit{Paul and Epicurus}, 113.
\item \textsuperscript{641} DeWitt, \textit{Paul and Epicurus}, 106.
\end{itemize}
starting point, there is nowhere to go but deeper into Epicureanism with nothing to temper one’s gaze. DeWitt argues that there was no competition from Platonists or Stoics, so the only popular philosophy that the Corinthian church would be exposed to is Epicureanism:

The other Greek philosophies were offering no competition. Platonism was always for the intellectual few. Neither were the followers of Aristotle numerous and their interest was less in human beings than in plants and animals. Stoicism with its high pretentions attracted the “silk cushion” class and disqualified itself for the multitude by its asperity.642

DeWitt’s analysis, his assumption notwithstanding, is a good starting place inasmuch as he argues that Paul is using Greco-Roman rhetoric and parts of philosophy to argue against rhetoric/philosophy. However, DeWitt’s argument concerning the pervasive influence of Epicureanism on Paul is overstated in the extreme. Without support, he argues that Paul was an Epicurean early in life and whatever Paul writes that is not Epicurean, he does so as an ex-Epicurean.643 DeWitt also assumes that Paul’s audience was literate and of higher status.644 DeWitt has made several contributions to identifying Epicurean elements and parallels in Paul, but his conclusion related to the significance of these parallels do not recognize the eclectic nature of Paul’s use of philosophy. The best research concerning Paul and Epicureanism is the work on Philodemus edited and written by David Konstan. This work focuses on friendship and will be discussed as needed in chapters 5-7 when Paul uses or addresses elements of

642 DeWitt, Paul and Epicurus, 106.

643 DeWitt, Paul and Epicurus, 177.

friendship that would be relevant to a philosophically educated woman with Epicurean sympathies.\textsuperscript{645}

Corinth produced many philosophers, beginning with the legacy of Diogenes the Cynic (c. 412-323 BCE). Other Cynics include Monimus (fl. 4\textsuperscript{th} BCE), Metrocles (fl. 325 BCE), and Demetrius (fl. 1\textsuperscript{st} CE). The Neo-Pythagorean Iamblichus (c. 245-325 CE) remembers three Pythagoreans from Corinth: Phintias (4\textsuperscript{th} BCE), Damon (4\textsuperscript{th} BCE), and Chrysippus (date unknown). Representing Epicureanism, fifty miles north of Corinth, the wealthy parton Diogenes of Oneoanda (fl. 2\textsuperscript{nd} CE) erected a huge monument to his beloved philosophy, possibly demonstrating that there was an Epicurean community there. The great orator and Skeptic philosopher Favorinus (ca. 80-150 CE) was honored with a statue in the Corinthian library, only to have it torn down for political reasons, and possibly restored after a subsequent oration. Favorinus (ca. 80-150 CE) taught the notable Corinthian patron Herodes Atticus (101-177 CE) who himself had a well-known student, Sceptus of Corinth (fl. 2\textsuperscript{nd} CE). Some affection for Stoicism was alive in Corinth, because it was to the Corinthian patron Lucius Gellius Menander that Arrian addressed the works of Epictetus. There is also a legend that Musonius Rufus helped build the Isthmus of Corinth while in exile.

The Isthmian games attracted philosophers and other intellectuals to Corinth for discussion and debate. Dio Chrysostom (c. 40-120 CE) describes an incident in the life of Diogenes the Cynic (c. 412-323 BCE) where intellectuals gathered for debate, but this oration seems to more accurately describe a first century situation. Plutarch (c. 46-120 CE) also relates a debate at the Isthmian games during the first century, but the setting of

\textsuperscript{645} Konstan, Philodemus; Konstan, Friendship.
his account is a home. A few other records of philosophers attending other Pan-Hellenic
games also survive in Cicero (106-43 BCE, Cic. Orat. 7) and Pliny the Younger (61-112
CE; Plin. Ep. 104.), and in epigraphical evidence.646

These traditions are important because most of these philosophical schools have
women who are associated with their founding: Theano the Pythagorean; Arete the
Cyrenaic; Lasthenia, Diotima, and Aspasia the teachers of Socrates; Hipparchia the
Cynic; and Leontion the Epicurean. The tradition of philosophically educated women
continues in the Roman period, and it expands to other schools: the female students of the
the first century Stoics Porcia, Arria and her daughter, and Fannia, Julia Domna (170-217
CE) the scholar, and neo-Platonist Plotinus (c. 204–270 CE). The tradition of women’s
involvement in Pythagoreanism continues into the Roman period with the Pythagorean
pseudepigraphal works which are attributed to the famous Pythagorean women including:
Theano, Perictione (in this case, the name of Plato’s mother), and Myia. Crowning this
list are the philosophically educated women who are celebrated in Paul’s near
contemporaries Tullia and Caerellia (Cicero), Marcia and Helvia (Seneca), Eurydice
(Plutarch), and Pliny the Younger (Calpurnia). In light of the philosophical heritage of
Corinth and the long traditions of philosophically educated women in the schools
represented there, the possibility that there were such women in the community of Christ
believers is quite strong. I will argue in the next section that the various contexts of 1
Corinthians indicate the presence of philosophically educated women.

646 Weir, Roman Delphi, 115.
Philosophically Educated Women in the Corinthian Church

For the purposes of this dissertation, a philosophically educated woman is a woman who has come into contact with enough philosophical teaching from any school to identify and interact with components of 1 Corinthians which have points of connection with Greco-Roman philosophy. In chapter two, we saw that some women throughout the Greek and Roman periods received the full compliment of ancient education including poetry, medicine, athletics, dance, music, and literacy. In chapter three, I reviewed the histories of women in philosophy. Women were instrumental in the founding of most major schools of philosophy including Pythagoreanism, Platonism, Cynicism, Epicureanism, and Stoicism. Women were involved in these schools until the first century and beyond. In the first half of chapter four, I have shown that all of these schools have a long history in Corinth. Several themes develop when we look at the histories of the education of women in general and philosophical education in particular.

It is critical to remember that the ancient wealthy household provides the central conduit for philosophical education. This does not mean that all philosophers were wealthy. It means that most of the traditions indicate that philosophically educated women were taught by their wealthy fathers or husbands. Wealthy people also brought philosophers into their houses to tutor their children and entertain their wealthy guests at dinner parties. These tutors may have been slaves or freedpersons themselves and could have taught slaves in the household who might later be freed. Other philosophers, such many Cynics and some Stoics, chose to live in poverty and taught their wives and daughters to do the same.

Therefore, it makes sense to examine 1 Corinthians for women who share similar circumstances. In this section, I will argue that the social structures of the Corinthian
church compliments the historical contexts in which philosophically educated women thrived. Paul’s primary focus of address is churches that meet in households which included a diverse cross-section of people. Because education is centered on wealthy households in most philosophical traditions (Platonism, Epicureanism, and [neo-] Pythagoreanism) I will examine the women of 1 Corinthians looking for signs of wealthy households and corresponding philosophical content. The best place to start are the persons whom we know were participants in the Corinthian community.

Some notes on the relationship between 1 Corinthians and Romans are necessary before we begin. Paul wrote the epistle to the Romans from Corinth, and concludes the letter with greetings from several Corinthians, some of whom may indicate the presence of philosophically educated women in the community of Jesus believers there. These names include Tertius, Gaius, Erastus, and Quartus. The entire chapter of Romans 16 is a letter of recommendation for Phoebe, who is generally considered to be the courier, reader, and theological interpreter of the epistle to the Romans. Aquila and Priscilla, who apparently were in Rome at the time of the delivery of the epistle, also worked with Paul in Corinth.

---


649 A detailed discussion of Phoebe will follow.

650 Aquila and Priscilla will be discussed in detail below.
In addition to the epistle to the Romans, some members of the Corinthian community are mentioned in Acts. This of course presents other challenges related to the questionable historicity of Acts. The description of Paul’s activity in Corinth in Acts 18 includes Titus Justus, Crispus, Sosthenes, and Priscilla and Aquila. Because the historicity of Acts is dubious, I will approach its information tentatively and argue that it may indicate something about the community at Corinth. The only information relevant to this dissertation that is unique to Acts is the question of the office of synagogue leader held by Crispus and Sosthenes, and I will therefore argue that this information could point to wealthy households in the Corinthian community. All other information concerning Corinthians will be gleaned from 1 Corinthians and Romans. The remainder of this chapter will comprise a review of the names mentioned in 1 Corinthians and the relevant people mentioned in Romans and Acts, with the purpose of looking for indications of wealth and household contexts that signify the possibility of philosophically educated women in the Corinthian community of Jesus believers.


652 I will dismiss from the outset all persons named that have no corresponding information.

A Corinthian Christian in Public Office: Erastus

In the first chapter of 1 Corinthians, Paul indicates that there were some unspecified Christ believers who were educated, wealthy, and of noble birth (1 Cor. 26-29). Interpreting 1 Cor. 1:26-9 have led several scholars to conclude that the Christian community at Corinth was socially stratified, with most of the people being of low social status and some being of a higher social status. Andrew Clarke nicely characterizes this interpretation:

It is clear from the verse in question, Βλέπετε γὰρ τὴν κλησίν ὑμῶν, ἄδελφοί, ὅτι οὐ πολλοὶ σοφοὶ κατὰ σάρκα, οὐ πολλοὶ δυνατοὶ, οὐ πολλοὶ εὐγενεῖς, that these two perspectives are not mutually exclusive. Paul’s statement that there are not many wise in human terms, not many powerful and not many of noble birth demonstrates that there were, at the least, some who fitted these categories; equally, however, there were some who could not be classified as wise, influential, or well-born. The Corinthian church, it seems clear, contained a social mix.

Several aspects of 1 Corinthians, which will be discussed in later sections of this dissertation, confirm this social mix in a general sense: Paul’s affirmation that there were a few wealthy participants in the community (1 Cor. 1:26-8), the household context of worship in the form of love feasts, the invitation of Christ believers to eat with outsiders, and participation in courts. Erastus is generally considered to be a wealthy patron of the church, but there are several problems with the identification of his social status.

---

654 There is an extensive bibliography on the exegetical and theological problems posed by 1 Cor. 1:26-9 in Thiselton, *Corinthians*, 176-8.


Erastus (Acts 19.22; Rom. 16:23⁶⁵⁷) deserves some discussion because he is the only person mentioned in the Corinthian community who is explicitly identified as holding a public office: οἰκονόμος τῆς πόλεως (city treasurer). If Erastus moved up the social ladder by serving in higher offices throughout his career, he may have been from a wealthy family and able to support the church as a patron. His household would, then, be a leading location for educated and philosophical discourse and the likely presence of philosophically educated women.

The difficulty, though, is a lack of certain information about Erastus. There are few clues about Erastus’s position in early Christian writers. Origen (CER 5:278)⁶⁵⁸ simply references the office of Erastus with no explanation. However, John Chrysostom expresses his opinion clearly:

Paul mentions the Erastus’s title with the purpose that the Gospel had taken hold of the great as well as among the rest of the population.⁶⁵⁹

For many scholars, Chrysostom’s opinion was substantiated on April 15, 1929, when an inscription was discovered in Corinth indicating that an Erastus served as aedile:

praenomen nomen ERASTVS · PRO · AEDILITaeE
vac S · P · STRAVIT vac

[praenomen nomen] Erastus pro aedilit[ae]
s (ua) p(ecunia) stravit

“[ ] Erastus in return for his aedileship laid the pavement at his own expense.”⁶⁶⁰


⁶⁵⁸ Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans.

⁶⁵⁹ Homilies on Romans 32; NPNF 1 11:561.

⁶⁶⁰ Kent, Inscriptions, 232.
Many have concluded that the Erastus of Romans 16:23 is the Erastus of the
inscription since the name does not appear anywhere else in the Corinthian inscriptions,
the pavement can be dated sometime in the first-second century, and Paul’s designation
of Erastus as οἰκονόμος may describe the office of aedile. The identification of
Erastus the οἰκονόμος and Erastus the aedile is not without its challenges.

Several objections have been raised as to the rarity of Erastus’s name, the date of
the inscription, and the relationship between aedile and οἰκονόμος. The name Erastus is
not exceptionally rare as some have claimed. It is common enough in inscriptions, close
to the date of the Erastus inscription, and over a wide geographical area. Andrew
Clarke has noted that there is another inscription in Corinth, found in 1960, dated in the
second century CE:

[Óí] Βίτελλιοι
[Φρο]νείνος
[καί · Ε]ραστος
[τῶ · − − ]
[ − − −]τ

[The] Vitellii
[Fr]ontinus
[and E]rastus
(dedicate this) [to] –


Clarke and Gill have found the following examples: SEG 11, 622 (Laconia) and 994 (Messenia); SEG 24, 194 (Attica): SEG 25, 194 (Attica); SEG 28, 1010 (Bithynia); CIG 269; 1241 (Sparta); 1249 (Sparta); 6378; Andrew D. Clarke, *Secular and Christian Leadership in Corinth: A Socio-Historical l and Exegetical Study of 1 Corinthians 1-6* (New York: Brill, 1993), 54.
The two Erastus inscriptions in Corinth do indicate men who were unquestionably wealthy. And of course we know that the inscriptions belong to two different men, chiefly because the second inscription is dated about 100 years later than the aedile inscription. But the relative commonality of the name of Erastus precludes a ready identification with the Erastus of Romans 16:23.

Then, there is the challenge of determining a connection between ὀίκονόμος and aedile. Several attempts have been made to make such a connection, but these attempts have been convincingly rejected. First, the Greek term ὀίκονόμος is not the usual term for the Latin aedile, probably because the former is a much lower status position than the latter. The position of ὀίκονόμος was typically held by a slave or lowly freeman and not a wealthy freedman or citizen. Erastus could have held the office at the beginning of his public career, and moved on to higher and more decorated positions, but the distance between the two offices in the city hierarchy is so great that it seems unlikely. Kent suggests that Paul may have referred to Erastus as ὀίκονόμος instead of ἀγορανόμος because the aedile in Corinth oversaw local economic affairs. The

---


argument of Kent has been very influential among scholars who have come to similar conclusions. The wealth of Erastus is uncertain because of the low position of ὀἰκονόμος, and the identification of the Erastus in Romans with the Erastus inscription is tentative at best. In this case, Erastus would have been one of the many Christ believers who were low-born, uneducated, and not influential. After considering the weak archaeological evidence concerning the Erastus inscription and a detailed exegesis, Steven Freisen argues that Erastus was not even a believer based on Paul’s deliberate refusal to identify him as such in Romans 16.668

It has been very attractive for scholars to use Erastus the ὀἰκονόμος as a starting point for identifying social stratification in the Corinthian community. If indeed Paul’s Erastus was a wealthy office-holder in Corinth, he certainly would have been a valuable asset, providing the church with money, a place to meet, a patron for education, and even legal protection. However, the office of ὀἰκονόμος is simply too low a position for someone of wealth, and it is not possible to connect Paul’s Erastus with the aedile of the inscription. Unfortunately, we cannot look to Erastus as a certain proof of the presence of wealthy Christians in the Corinthian church.

Another type of office which would indicate wealth is that of the synagogue leader. There may have been a few synagogue leaders who participated in the Corinthian church. Acts 18:8 preserves the story of the baptism of Crispus, a synagogue leader:

Κρίσπος δὲ ὁ ἀρχισυνάγωγος ἐπίστευσεν τῷ κυρίῳ σὺν ὅλῳ τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ, καὶ πολλοὶ τῶν Κορινθίων ἀκούοντες ἐπίστευον καὶ ἐβαπτίσθησαν.

Crispus, the ruler of the synagogue, believed in the Lord, together with his entire household. And many of the Corinthians hearing Paul believed and were baptized.

There are two indicators of wealth in Crispus’s single verse in the NT: his entire household believed and many others believed the Gospel because of his influence. It is widely understood that the role of ἀρχισυνάγωγος probably indicates wealth, and Acts indicates that many Corinthians followed Paul after the baptism of Crispus, remembering him as man of some status.

The primary role of the ἀρχισυνάγωγος was to fund or raise funds for the building and restoration of synagogues, and sometimes may have been responsible for the


670 Translation from the ESV.

671 Chow believes that the status of Crispus is “ambiguous,” Patronage and Power, 90. Several other scholars also believe ἀρχισυνάγωγος is an indicator of wealth: Theissen, Social Setting, 75; Meeks, Urban Christians, 57; Lee I. Levine, The Ancient Synagogue: The First Two Thousand Years (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000), 390-403; Burtchaell, From Synagogue to Church, 244.
reading of the law to the people when they could not bring in someone else to preach or teach. Several reviews of epigraphic evidence confirm this assessment.

If this is the same Crispus as prominently mentioned in 1 Cor. 1:15, he would likely be a wealthy patron of the church. If this is a credible identification, any women in his household would be the likely recipients of a philosophical education. This would include any woman (wife, daughter, female relative, slave, freedperson) interested in philosophy that the head of the household takes an interest in educating. However, the


674 Rajak and Noy found a three year old archisynagogue in the 5th CE in Venosa, Italy. This is evidence that in some cases the archisynagogue was a non-functional title for a wealthy, high status person. Rajak and Noy, “Archisynagogoi,” *87*, 90. *CIJ* 587; *JIWE* 1.53. Cf., Thomas Wiedemann, “Children and Benefactors in the Eastern Part of the Roman Empire,” *POLIS. Revista de ideas y formas políticas de la Antigüedad Clásica* 18 (2006): 163-186.
best way to approach Crispus is that he is remembered as a synagogue leader in Acts.

The value of this memory is not in its direct historicity, but in that the writer of Acts places a wealthy synagogue leader in the Corinthian community. This memory raises the question: were there wealthier members of the Corinthian community that we can examine that are more historically reliable?

Christians in Court: The Affair

A very strong indicator of the presence of high status, powerful, wealthy people in the Corinthian church is the activity that Paul refers to in 1 Cor 6. There is overwhelming consensus among New Testament scholars that participation in the Roman courts is an indicator of the wealth of at least one of the litigants. The court processes

---


in Roman Corinth, as throughout the empire, were the privilege of the wealthy.\textsuperscript{677} The processes are quite clear and differ according to status,\textsuperscript{678} but the practice of law in court was almost wholly dictated by wealth and power.\textsuperscript{679} Women were permitted to plead their case on their own, but typically had a male accompany them or serve as representation, or even sent letters to magistrates.\textsuperscript{680} The letters sent to magistrates by women include affidavits for divorce (BGU 4.1102, 13 BCE; P.Oxy. 2.281, 20-50 CE) and other complaints (P.Oxy. 54.3770, 334 CE). Valerius Maximus (8.1) tells us the story of Maesia of Sentinum, who successfully defended herself from an unmentioned charge in the first century BCE.\textsuperscript{681} Valerius also preserves Gaia Afriana whose participation in court as a prosecutor brought about the need for legislators to ban women from such cases.

\textsuperscript{677} Peter Garnsey, “Legal Privilege in the Roman Empire,” \textit{P&P} 41 (1968): 3-24; “The legal system dealt mainly with disputes between those of at least some wealth; the more downtrodden members of society had less property to disagree over, and little time to struggle through the system,” Bablitz, \textit{Actors and Audience}, 74.

\textsuperscript{678} David Johnston, \textit{Roman Law in Context} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 113-32.


\textsuperscript{680} For examples, see Judith Evans Grubbs, \textit{Women and the Law in the Roman Empire: A Sourcebook on Marriage, Divorce, and Widowhood} (New York: Routledge, 2002); Antti Arjava, \textit{Women and Law in Late Antiquity} (Oxford: Clarendon University Press, 1996), 245.

activity. Slaves and children, of course, could not participate in court as a prosecutor or defence lawyer.

Since 1 Corinthians 1:26-9 identifies most of the Corinthian believers as of low status and possibly impoverished, few people in Paul’s community at Corinth would have been wealthy enough to risk the loss of what little they had in litigation. Therefore, it was not beneficial for wealthy people to sue the poor because there would be no gain. The Roman “justice” system was designed for the rich and powerful to destroy or severely weaken their comparatively rich and powerful opponents. In order to have a chance at winning, the litigant would need to hire an advocate trained in forensic rhetoric or be educated in this art her/himself. Advocates could gain fortune and status by their ability to capture both the judge and audience and were therefore motivated to represent their clients effectively. It was much more important to be an impressive rhetor than be knowledgeable about the law because a judge can be persuaded by an effective appeal to emotion. Furthermore, the litigant could bribe the judge, hire people to cheer for his advocate at appropriate times, and pay people to testify to his/her good reputation. It was customary for defendants to wear mourning attire from the time they are notified of

---

682 Val. Max. Fact. dict. mem. 8.3; Dig. Just. 3.1.1.5.


684 Mart. 2.13; Tac. Ann. 1.75.1, 2.34.1; Juv. 13.1-4; Seut. Tib. 33.1, Dom. 8;

685 Pliny, Ep. 2.14.4-8; hired by an advocate, Mart. 2.27, Quint. 11.3.131. Cf., Bablitz, Actors and Audience, 126-32.

686 Quint. 5.10.26.
an accusation until the end of the trial.\textsuperscript{687} Enemies were known to bring up an accusation and then leave town, forcing the defendant to be dishonored for an extensive amount of time.\textsuperscript{688}

In relation to 1 Cor. 6, some scholars have suggested that at least part of the motivation for the injunction against participation in Gentile law courts is the result of legal action that was the direct result of the affair mentioned in chapter 5.\textsuperscript{689} Another member of the community may have taken advantage of the breakup of the household to lay claim to property owned by the woman or her step-son that was passed on to them by the death of her husband.\textsuperscript{690} The whole situation could indicate that the unnamed woman who had an affair with her step-son was wealthy and therefore be a candidate for philosophical education.\textsuperscript{691} Being a widow, she was able to control whatever wealth her

\textsuperscript{687} Tac. Dial. 12.1; Juv. 15.131-35.

\textsuperscript{688} Bablitz, Actors, 84-5.


\textsuperscript{691} Wire accepts the possibility that the step-mother is a responsible member of the community, but does not explore the nature of the relationship in detail, Corinthian Women Prophets, 74.
late husband left to her, and perhaps initiated the affair with her late husband’s son (being the party of higher status). Such a situation was a part of the elite Greek and Roman psyche. This situation would explain why only the son was rebuked by Paul while the widow remained unscathed: she was a powerful patroness that he could not afford to frustrate.

It is likely that this woman was a member of the church. Roman households typically shared the religion of the patriarch, so families typically joined the church together (Stephanas in 1 Cor. 1:16 and 16:15, for example). When a person converted to a religion – especially a new foreign one – they could face alienation from their families, unless the entire household converted as well. Marriages between believers and unbelievers were apparently strained: Paul allowed divorce if an unbelieving partner asked for it. The step-son certainly was not alienated from his step-mother, so she must have either been unusually tolerant of her step-son’s refusal to participate in the typical Roman religion or she was a member of the church herself. This also could indicate that Paul did not mention her part in the affair because he did not want to further irritate a patroness of the church.

---


As a wealthy widow, the step-mother would most probably have access to philosophical education either in her father’s house, from her husband, or she could bring a philosopher into her home after she was widowed. It is likely that when she was younger that she received her education in her father’s house before she got married as did other girls of her status. After marriage, her husband could encourage philosophical education in a number of ways: including her in discussions with philosophically educated persons in the household, teaching her himself, or simply not interfering with her intellectual interests. Later in life, as a member of the church, she no doubt heard 1 Corinthians being read aloud in front of the entire church, and was able to interact with it, utilizing the benefit of her education.

**Stephanas and Gaius**

Paul says in 1 Cor. 1:16 that he was thankful that he only baptized a few Corinthians himself, one group including the household of Stephanas, who proved to be a valuable asset (1 Cor. 16:17). The wealth, status, and power of Stephanas and Gaius is so widely accepted in scholarship that most commentators simply take it for granted rather than presenting a case for it. Raymond Collings concludes on the basis of Paul’s description of Gaius’s house that it was able to support the “whole church” (Rom. 16:23).\(^\text{694}\) Alan F. Johnson and others assert that Paul wrote the epistle to the Romans

---

from Gaius’s house and of course the church met there. It is the home ownership of Gaius that is the reason for NT scholars to believe that he is wealthy, of high status, and powerful. Likewise, Paul mentions the “τὸν Στεφάναν οἰκον” twice (1 Cor. 1:16 and 16:15), quite possibly referring to the wealthy, powerful, and high status ancient household that includes wives, children, slaves, and clients. This presumption is supported by the assistance that Stephanas renders in 1 Cor. 16:16. An assembly of Christians also met in the house of Prisca and Aquila (1 Cor. 16:19; Rom. 16:3-5). But in what kind of dwellings did the Corinthians meet? Such characteristics can also assist in identifying the wealth and status of some members of the community.

The ancient wealthy household was organized in a patriarchal fashion that was reinforced by Roman law and custom and included wives, children, and slaves. This type of household afforded the interaction of the entire spectrum of social status, including the wealthy homeowner and his/her friends, clients, freedpersons, and slaves.

---


695 Johnson, *Corinthians*, 52.


The Roman home was a place of business for the elite and workshops for the poor.\textsuperscript{699} The wealthier Roman home could facilitate a gathering of about forty people or perhaps many more,\textsuperscript{700} and the homeowner would be positioned to offer the church legal and financial stability.

In urban conditions, there is an additional structure that could facilitate the worship situation that is laid out in 1 Corinthians, namely the tenement\textsuperscript{701} housing rented by the rest of the population.\textsuperscript{702} Paul, however, describes a situation that lends itself more towards a household setting, primarily with the communal meal and the problems which arose out of that practice.\textsuperscript{703}

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{703} Ciampa and Rosner, \textit{Corinthians}, 546 (1 Cor. 11:22).
\end{itemize}
The situation in Corinth can be contrasted with that of another Pauline community that was not integrated into a wealthier household and the benefits that such a relationship entails. When Paul arrived at Corinth, he was a seasoned preacher and church founder. Because of this, he was able to connect with at least a few people who had access to wealth who offered their support to his cause.  

The hosts of Christian house churches functioned in a way analogous to that of such patrons. At Corinth, Stephanas seems to have been such a patron (1 Cor. 16:15-18), and at nearby Cenchreae, Phoebe is identified as διακόνος προστάτης (Rom. 16:1–2). The latter term probably denotes a woman who functions as patroness to some society.

Unlike Paul’s experience in Corinth, in Thessalonica he seems to have preached his Gospel without being sensitive to establishing patronal support, agitating wealthy citizens with frank speech rather than attracting them in a more friendly fashion. As a result, the Pauline community suffered persecution and was not protected by anyone with access to wealth. Therefore, Thessalonians had no patron to provide a home and a love feast; instead, they met in their crowded tenement houses and were vulnerable to all external threats. If there was some integration into the Thessalonian community, there would have been mention of some patron in the Thessalonian correspondence as there is

---

704 Still, Conflict, 239. Some type of beneficial relationship would be required to share a house, whether it was provided by a patron directly or indirectly, Balch and Osiek, Families in the New Testament World, 54; Meeks, Urban Christians, 75–8.

705 Stambaugh and Balch, Social Environment, 140


in most other Pauline letters (Phil. 4.22; Rom. 16.1; 1 Cor 1:16; Philem. 2). On the other hand in Corinth we do not see any persecution from outsiders, people are taking each other to court (1 Cor. 6:1-8),\textsuperscript{708} members of the church are being invited to meals (1 Cor. 10:27),\textsuperscript{709} and worship described in 1 Cor. 11 is often understood as occurring in the house of a wealthy person.\textsuperscript{710}

Several aspects of the Corinthian church point toward the participation of at least some wealthy people who could have facilitated the philosophical education of women. The household contexts of Christian worship, participation in court, serving as synagogue leader, and the intrigue of the affair all indicate there were some households that could have produced philosophically educated women. From what we learn from the histories of women in philosophy, most access to philosophical education is connected to the wealthy household. Philosophical education was provided to some slaves (Epictetus, for example), a tutor could be brought into the household to teach the master’s family and teach her own daughters as well, and freed grammarians taught their partners and daughters. The wealthy Roman household provided a variety of contexts in which women in many different conditions could learn some philosophy.

\textsuperscript{708} Richard B. Hays, \textit{First Corinthians} (Louisville: John Knox Press, 1997), 94.

\textsuperscript{709} For review of the issues related to food offered to idols and relevant bibliography, see John Fotopoulos, \textit{Food Offered to Idols in Roman Corinth: A Social-rhetorical Reconsideration of 1 Corinthians 8:1-11:1} (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003); Richard Liong-Seng Phua, \textit{Idolatry and Authority: A Study of 1 Corinthians 8.1-11.1 in the light of the Jewish Diaspora} (London: T&T Clark, 2005).

Aquila and Prisca

According to 1 Corinthians, Romans, and Acts, Aquila and Prisca moved their tentmaking business and established households in three cities in the ancient world: from Rome to Corinth to Ephesus and back to Rome. Some scholars have argued that this travel indicates that Aquila and Prisca had access to some wealth. In light of the historical evidence, however, these arguments are not convincing. Travel in the ancient world was dangerous for everyone, but particularly so for the wealthy who actually had goods and money for bandits to steal. Even travelers who were able to hire a contingent of bodyguards attracted bandits who would plunder and maybe even kill everyone in the party. Perhaps the most successful travelers were people who were poor – or looked the part – and slipped by danger due to their humble appearance. Because of the dangers associated with travel, a good deal of travel was done only by people who absolutely


needed to do so: the military and merchants. Travel was by no means restricted to the elite and therefore it is not a signifier of wealth. Peter Lampe has shown that humble tentmakers’ earnings could have easily funded all of the travels of Aquila and Prisca.

Although Ronald Hock’s work has focused on Paul in his studies on tentmaking, his researches are applicable to the occupations of Aquila and Prisca. Hock argues that tentmaking can easily be a mobile trade because it only requires few tools to transport. Todd Still has challenged the widely accepted views of Hock, but for the most part his critique finely tunes Hock’s work with respect to Paul’s social status. Of course, other


views about Paul and poverty have further questioned the nature of Paul’s social status. For Paul, one must reconcile the nature of Paul’s education with his lowly position as a tentmaker. For Hock and others, this problem is resolved by noting that Paul has an aristocratic view towards work and he chose a profession much like a wise-man would do to demonstrate his self-sufficiency and freedom from the will of a patron. For Aquila and Prisca, there is no hint that they were educated as Paul was, but they did have a church meeting in their home (perhaps a tenement house rented by low-status, poorer people) and traveled extensively. Nevertheless, since we have no indication of wealth in Prisca and Aquila’s tenement home, there is no context for education, and nothing else indicates the presence of philosophically educated women. It is likely that Prisca and Aquila did enjoy some status in the community of Christ believers because of their close association with Paul.

Phoebe the Patroness

Because Paul gives two titles to Phoebe in Romans 16:1 which have a wide range of meanings, there is no shortage of views concerning the nature of her roles. In this section I will present the central arguments concerning the nature of Phoebe with a special interest in Paul’s description of her as his prostatis. The term prostatis has been translated “patroness,” “helper,” or “protector.” The current trends point toward Phoebe

---

720 Steven J. Friesen writes the apostle “may have chosen a life of downward mobility, “Poverty in Pauline Studies: Beyond the So-called New Consensus,” JSNT 26 (2004), 359. With respect to the economic conditions of Paul’s converts, John M. G. Barclay comments, “I doubt we will ever be able to reach more than tentative and imprecise conclusions,” “Poverty in Pauline Studies: A Response to Steven Friesen,” JSNT 26 (2004), 365. See also Horrell, Social Ethos, 203.
as a wealthy patroness.\footnote{721} R. A. Kearsley has argued on the basis of the careers of Junia Theodora and Claudia Metrodora (in contrast to Ernst Käsemann\footnote{722}) that wealthy women in Kenchreai “could and did hold influential positions in the society of Paul’s lifetime, and that the title \textit{prostatis} and cognate words designated such actions.”\footnote{723} Junia Theodora is by far the most important example of the wealthy \textit{prostatis} / patroness but scholars also point to the wealthy mother charged with providing for her orphaned son as

\footnote{721} Meeks, \textit{First Urban Christians}, 60, 79; Stambaugh and Balch, \textit{Social Environment}, 140; Witherington, \textit{Conflict and Community}, 35; Roman Garrison, “Phoebe, the Servant-benefactor and Gospel Traditions,” in \textit{Text and Artifact in the Religions of Mediterranean Antiquity: Essays in Honor of Peter Richardson}, ed. Stephen G. Wilson and Michel Robert Desjardins, Studies in Christianity and Judaism 9 (Ontario: Wilfrid University Press, 2000), 63-73. On the other hand, Esther Yue L. Ng argues that Phoebe was not necessarily wealthy or influential and certainly did not have a typical patronal relationship with Paul, who showed contempt for such things, “Phoebe as \textit{Prostatis},” \textit{TRINJ} 25, n.s. (2004): 3-13. Ng is unconvincing because she relies exclusively on Paul’s rhetoric in 1 Cor. 9:1-18 and 2 Cor. 11:9-10 as rationale that Paul could not have entered into a patronal relationship. However, Romans often masked their patronal relationships in such rhetoric to create an air of artistic or academic freedom in spite of the financial support that they received: Horace, \textit{Od.} 3. For the patrons who give a similar view on artistic freedom and the friendship nature of literary patronage see Cic. \textit{Arch.} and Plin. \textit{Ep.} 3.21.


his *prostatis* with parallel examples.\textsuperscript{724} In addition to patron and guardian, there is also the usage of the term as president of an association.\textsuperscript{725} Ross Shepard Kraemer notes that the association at Aphrodisias may have had a *prostatis*, a woman patron.\textsuperscript{726} While the precise shade of meaning might be muddled by the relative rarity of *prostatis* and its apparent wide range of meaning, it is clear that the term denotes someone of either real or attributed wealth and power, and Paul is expressing his social inferiority and reliance on the assistance of Phoebe.\textsuperscript{727} In this respect, Paul is acknowledging her as his patron at least in an informal sense, but probably not the legal sense.\textsuperscript{728}

Joan Cecelia Campbell has written a monograph on Phoebe, setting her within the many contexts of the wealthy first century Roman woman.\textsuperscript{729} Elizabeth Schüssler-

\textsuperscript{724} P.Med.Bar. 1 = SBXVI 1270.1-20, 142 BCE. Translation in Rowlandson, *Women and Society*, 125. Judith Evans Grubbs notes that the *prostatis* mother-guardian relationship changed later to *epitropos*, *Women and the Law in the Roman Empire: A Sourcebook on Marriage, Divorce and Widowhood* (London: Routledge, 2002), 254. Grubbs’s examples include P.Oxy. 7.898, 123 CE and P.Oxy. 3.496, 127 CE. Van Bremen demonstrates that the *epitropoi* usually are the guardians of their own children and always act under the authority of their own *kyrios*: *I.Erythrai* 201; *Milet* 13.147 and *Milet*, no. 151. For comment by New Testament scholars, see Witherington, *Conflict and Community*, 34 and Judge, “Cultural Conformity,” 21.


\textsuperscript{726} Kraemer, *Unreliable Witnesses*, 232.


\textsuperscript{729} Joan Cecelia Campbell, *Phoebe: Patron and Emissary* (Collegeville: Liturgical, 2009).
Fiorenza has repeatedly examined the modern interpretations of Phobe’s role in the early church, demonstrating the need for a more balanced approach that does not come from the dominant patriarchal perspectives. Schüssler-Fiorenza’s method frees the interpreter to approach the text concerning Phoebe without the constraints of male-centered assumptions that baselessly exclude the possibilities of Phoebe’s leadership roles. Wendy Cotter argues that the service of women in the Pauline churches fits within cultural norms for the wealthy, but the egalitarian description of their service in the church is counter-cultural. Caroline F. Whelan says of Phoebe:

[she was] a wealthy and independent woman, likely educated, and patron to one or more clubs, undoubtedly moved in more elite circles than Paul and his church, among those of her social rank. As a member of the upper classes, she was able to secure connections for Paul and his church connections which, in a status-conscious like the Roman world where wealth and power went hand in hand, could only be beneficial.


Robert Jewett goes so far as to argue that Phoebe was essential to establishing the Spanish mission by helping Paul develop relationships with wealthy patrons there. On the basis of being true to the role of women as patronesses in Kenchreai, I will agree with Theissen and many others that *prostatis* is an indicator of wealth for Phoebe, and therefore she would be a good candidate for a philosophical education either as a child or an adult.

**Divorce in 1 Cor. 7:1-16**

In 1 Cor. 7:1-16, Paul gives instructions on marriage and divorce for both men and women. This section will remain focused on the issue of the presence of philosophically educated women in the Corinthian community. The question that I will ask of 1 Cor. 7:1-16 is simply this: does this material offer any suggestion that households which could facilitate the philosophical education of women were active in the Corinthian community? To address this question, I will examine Paul’s instructions concerning marriage and divorce for signs of wealthy households within the church. Some of these signs could include the practices of divorce described in the text, possible interest in the stability of the wealthy Roman home, and parallels to Roman philosophy.

Unfortunately, it is customary for scholars not to address questions of wealth and status when interpreting 1 Cor. 7:1-16, and no one looks for philosophically educated

---

women. This practice is particularly distressing for two reasons: the widespread consensus among scholars that the Corinthian church was socially stratified (1 Cor. 1:26) and what we know about marriage and divorce in the Roman period. It is common for scholars who argue that 1 Cor. 1:26 indicates that there were at least some wealthy people in the Corinthian community to not consider this interpretation when they examine 1 Cor. 7:1-16. It is also common for scholars who contextualize the social setting of divorce and remarriage in the Roman period to use materials that are exclusively written by and for the elite and do not address what this context may say about the social setting of women in the church. Most of these scholars do not even ask the question regarding whether or not Paul is addressing at least some wealthier members of the church, even though his instructions and the practices of the church obviously share characteristics of the Roman elite with regard to marriage and divorce as indicated by their studies.


However, some interpreters have indicated that 1 Cor. 7:1-16 does have something to do with the marriage practices of wealthy women. Divorce was common in the upper classes, and it is very difficult to determine how legal categories of marriage and divorce pertained among the poor. Rodney Stark argues from the patristics and other later evidence that wealthy Christian women had managed to convert their husbands with increasing frequency in the first five centuries. Lynn H. Cohic argues that Paul directs his instructions concerning marriage and divorce to wealthy men and women, who have the most to gain or lose from such actions. With regard to the possibility of philosophically educated women, the phrase “It is good for a man not to touch a woman” is likely an ascetic slogan from those Christians who were “wise” and “strong.” This interpretation nicely compliments Wire, who argues that the slogan

---


\[ \text{This discourse had effect also on marital fidelity, to an extent such that in the Crotonan region connubial faithfulness became proverbial; (thus imitating) Ulysses who, rather than abandon Penelope, considered immortality well lost. Pythagoras encouraged the Crotonian women to emulate Ulysses, by exhibiting their probity to their husbands. In short, through these (social) discourses Pythagoras acquired great fame both in Crotona, and in the rest of Italy.} \]

Iamblichus also tells us that the Pythagoreans strictly practiced sexual intercourse within marriage, and then only for reproduction.\footnote{Iambl. VP 47-8, 57, 210; Kathy L. Gaca, “The Reproductive Technology of the Pythagoreans,” \textit{C Phil} 95, no. 2 (2000): 117.} It is possible that 7.1b may have Cynic
connotations that Paul seeks to correct.\textsuperscript{745} William Klassen finds parallels between Paul and Epictetus’s (55-135 CE) description of the ideal Cynic.\textsuperscript{746} Paul also may be expressing Stoic attitudes similar to of Musonius Rufus (fl. 1\textsuperscript{st} CE), Epictetus (55-155 CE), and Hierocles (fl. 2\textsuperscript{nd} CE).\textsuperscript{747} The result of Paul’s teaching is a religious group that encourages marriage between believers and prohibits divorce: such a practice contains immorality.\textsuperscript{748} Paul’s advice is therefore precisely opposite of the Epicurean Metrodorus (c. 331-278 BCE) who wrote to Pythocles (c. 340-285 BCE):

\begin{quote}
Πυθάνομαι σου τὴν κατὰ σάρκα κίνησιν ἀφθονώτερον διακείθηκα πρὸς τὴν τῶν ἁφροδισίων ἐντευξίαν. οὐ δὲ ὅταν μὴν τοὺς νόμους καταλίθης μὴν τῶν πλησίων τινὰ λυπῆς μὴν τὴν σάρκα καταξάνης μὴν τὰ ἀναγκαία καταναλίσκης, χρώ ὡς βουλεῖς τῇ σεαυτῷ προσέσει ἀμηχανον μὲντοι γε τὸ μὴ ὁμοί ἐνί γε τινὰ τοῦτον συνέχεσθαι ἁφροδίσια γὰρ οὐδέποτε ὑμησεν· ἀγαπητὸν δὲ μὴ ἐβλαψον.
\end{quote}


You tell me that the movement of your flesh is too inclined towards sexual intercourse. So long as you do not break the laws or disturb the established or distress any of your neighbours or ravage your body or squander the necessities of life, act upon your inclination any way you like. Yet it is impossible not to be constrained by at least one of these. For sex is never advantageous, and one should be content if it does not harm.\(^{749}\)

Metrodorus views sexual intercourse in itself as a natural, morally neutral act. Because sexual intercourse is not inherently harmful, sexual desire can be expressed without any kind of penalty. For Paul, sexual desire is something that must be controlled, and sexual intercourse should only occur with one’s husband or wife. Paul’s advice to Pythocles would be much different that of the Epicurean Metrodorus: either practice self-control or get married.

Head-coverings and Status, Wealth, and Power

In 1 Cor. 11:2-16, Paul gives instructions concerning head-coverings to both men\(^ {750}\) and women in the Corinthian church, with a special interest in behavior during worship. The issue of head-coverings for women prophets is naturally an important one in Antionette Wire’s *The Corinthian Women Prophets*. As I noted above in section 1.8, Wire situates her woman prophets as precisely the social opposite to most philosophically


\(^{750}\) Winter, *After Paul Left Corinth*, 121-2.
educated women. Beginning from this point of departure, this dissertation is orientated towards how Paul’s instructions would foreground two wealthy philosophically educated women instead of a group of poor uneducated women prophets.

There has been some discussion as to whether or not 1 Cor. 11:2-16 is Pauline, but multi-disciplinary examinations have demonstrated that this passage is genuine. There is also some debate concerning the nature of the head-covering, whether it is a hairstyle or some type of veil. Another debate centers on the question of the

---


753 Jerome Murphy-O’Connor, “The Non-Pauline Character of 1 Corinthians 11:2-16?,” JBL 95, no. 4 (1976): 615-621; Murphy-O’Connor argues that 1 Cor. 11:2-16 is Pauline and not an interpolation, “Interpolations in 1 Corinthians,” CBQ 48, no. 1 (1986): 81-94.


meaning and significance of κεφαλή,\textsuperscript{756} whether it means “authority / leader,”\textsuperscript{757} or “source.”\textsuperscript{758} What 1 Cor. 11:2-16 doubtlessly shows is that women were active in worship – along with men – and Paul attempted to regulate their activity according to his own sensibilities.\textsuperscript{759} Apparently, the Corinthians were muddling the outer differences between the sexes by switching what Paul considered normal attire for worship: women were not wearing their head-coverings and men wore something on their heads.\textsuperscript{760} This muddling of the sexes has caused some interpreters to conclude that the issue had


\textsuperscript{758} Wayne A. Grudem reviews this perspective and convincingly argues against it in “The meaning of kephalē (“head”): A Response to Recent Studies,” TrinJ, n.s. 11, no. (1990): 3-72; Richard E. Oster, “Use, Misuse and Neglect of Archaeological Evidence in Some Modern Works on 1 Corinthians (1 Cor 7,1-5, 8,10, 11,2-16, 12,14-26),” ZNW 83, no. 1 (1992): 52-73.

\textsuperscript{759} Harold R. Holmyard, III., “Does 1 Corinthians 11:2-16 Refer to Women Praying and Prophesying in Church?,” BSac 154 no. 616 (1997): 461-472.

something to do with male or female homosexuality.⁷⁶¹ For women, the absence of the
veil has also been associated with the attire of prostitutes and otherwise sexual
availability of women, so one of Paul’s motivations for writing this passage is a concern
for modesty.⁷⁶² While Paul is almost certainly addressing issues related to modesty and
sexual differentiation, it is evident from epigraphy and archaeology that Corinthian
women wore veils only on certain occasions and were free to appear in public without a
veil.⁷⁶³ However, for Paul, prophesying without a veil is immodest and sexually
immoral.⁷⁶⁴

In 1 Cor. 11:2-16, Paul seeks to correct these behaviors, encouraging the
Corinthians to adhere to his views regarding proper attire in a worship setting. At this
point, I will ask of 1 Cor. 11:2-16 simply this: does this material offer any suggestion that
wealthy households were active in the Corinthian community? Can head-coverings
somehow point to wealth? Unfortunately, scholars who interpret this passage normally

---

⁷⁶¹ Gillian Townsley, “Gender Trouble in Corinth: Que(e)rying Constructs of
Gender in 1 Corinthians 11:2-16,” Bible & Critical Theory 2, no. 2 (2006); Kirk R.
MacGregor, “Is 1 Corinthians 11:2-16 a Prohibition of Homosexuality?,” BSac 166, no.

⁷⁶² Prostitutes and other sexually available or otherwise disgraced women were
instantly recognizable not due to the lack of a veil but because they wore the toga. Julia
Heskel, “Cicero as Evidence for Attitudes to Dress in the Late Republic,” in The World of
Roman Costume, ed. Judith Lynn Sebesta and Larissa Bonfante (Madison: The
University of Wisconsin Press, 2001), 141; Norma Goldman, “Reconstructing Roman
Clothing,” in Roman Costume, 228.

⁷⁶³ Elaine Fantham, “Covering the Head at Rome,” in Roman Dress and the
Fabrics of Roman Culture, ed. Jonathan Edmondson and Allison Keith (Toronto:
University of Toronto Press, 2008), 228.

⁷⁶⁴ “Veiled Exhortations Regarding the Veil,” in Rhetoric, Ethic, and Moral
do not address questions of wealth, status, and power; although many studies focus on 
sources that are exclusively describe the sensibilities and practices of the elite.\textsuperscript{765} Other 
scholars, however, have realized that the material that informs us about Roman custom, 
fashion, and moral sensibilities relate only to the elite, so Paul’s regulation of this issue 
must be given to elite women.\textsuperscript{766} Some lower class women die not wear veils because 
such clothing would hinder manual labor.\textsuperscript{767} This is significant because if Paul is 
addressing lower class prophesying women – as Wire imagines – then he could be 
insulting their plight by demanding that they do something that they could never afford 
due to their humble circumstance.\textsuperscript{768}

The popular moral philosophers in the schools that were associated with Corinth 
were also concerned with the modesty of women. The teachings of the Pythagorean 
Theano (fl. 6\textsuperscript{th} BCE) are used by Plutarch (\textit{Mor.} 142c; 46-120 CE) and Clement of 
Alexandria (\textit{Strom.} 4.19.122; c. 150-217 CE) as a model for how women should practice

\textsuperscript{765} David K. Lowery, “The Head Covering and Lord’s Supper in 1 Cor 11:2-34,” 
(Collegeville: Liturgical, 1992): 9-39; David Gill, “In Search of the Social Elite in the 

\textsuperscript{766} Gail P. Corrington, “The ‘Headless Woman’: Paul and the Language of the 
Body in 1 Cor 11:2-16,” \textit{PRS} 18, no. 3 (1991): 223-231; Craig S. Keener, \textit{Paul, Women, 
and Wives} (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1992), 45; Luise Schottroff, “Holiness and Justice: 
(2000): 51-60; Mark Finney, “Honour, Head-coverings and Headship: 1 Corinthians 11.2-

\textsuperscript{767} Kelly Olson, \textit{Dress and the Roman Woman: Self-presentation and Society} 
(London: Routledge, 2008), 45-7; For precisely the opposite view, see Ramsey 
MacMullen, “Women in Public,” \textit{Historia} 29, no. 2 (1980): 217-8; Catherine Kroeger, 

\textsuperscript{768} Wire, \textit{Corinthian Women Propsents}, 65.
modesty. The Pythagorean pseudipigrapha regularly addresses women’s dress, and is mostly orientated towards modesty and self-control. For example, Perictione (c. 350 BCE?) writes:

For the body wants neither to shiver nor to be naked (for the sake of decency), and needs nothing else. But human opinion, with its ignorance, rushes into what is empty and excessive. So she will not wear gold nor Indian stone nor will she plait her hair with great skills, nor anoint herself with Arabian perfumes, nor will she paint her face, whitening or roughing it, nor blacken her eyebrows and eyelashes and treating her gray hair with dyes, nor will she bathe too often. For a woman who seeks these things seeks an admirer of feminine weakness. For beauty from intelligence, and not from these things, pleases women who are well born. 

Similarly, Melissa argues that the ideal wife is concerned with how to please her husband and the economy of her household instead of spending money on expensive clothes. Melissa’s conclusion is that “She should trust the beauty and richness of her soul rather than that of her appearance and wealth; for envy and illness remove the later, but the former extend right up to her death,” “πιστεύειν γὰρ χρη τῶ τῶς ψυχᾶς κάλλει τε καὶ πλούτω μᾶλλον ἢ τῶ τῶς όψεως καὶ τῶν χρημάτων τὰ μὲν γὰρ φθόνος καὶ νόοσος παραρέεται, τὰ δὲ μέχρι θανάτω πάρεντι ἐκτεταμένα.” Phyntis also thinks that women should find their fulfillment in virtue and not the various

---


ornamentations of the body.\textsuperscript{771} When Iamblichus describes the self-control of the Pythagoreans, he writes that the early communities did not allow free-born women to wear gold (33.187; cf., 11.56).

Cicero (106-43 BCE) often criticized both men and women for wearing inappropriate and immodest clothing.\textsuperscript{772} Seneca (4-65 CE) compliments to his philosophically educated mother Helvia for her modesty:

\begin{quote}
non faciem coloribus ac lenociniis polluisti; numquam tibi placuit vestis, quae nihil amplius nudaret, cum poneretur. Unicum tibi ornamentum, pulcherrima et nulli obnoxia aetati forma, maximum decus visa est pudicitia.
\end{quote}

you have not defiled your face with paints and cosmetics; never have you fancied the kind of dress that exposed no greater nakedness by being removed. In you has been seen that peerless ornament, that fairest beauty on which time lays no hand, that chiefest glory which is modesty.\textsuperscript{773}

Epictetus (55-135 CE) discusses the importance of dressing appropriately, appealing to nature:

\begin{quote}
οṅὴρ εἰ ἡ γυνὴ; Ἄνηρ. Ἄνδρα οὐν καλλωπιζε, μὴ γυναῖκα. ἐκεῖνη φύσει λεῖα γέγονε καὶ τρυφερὰ· καὶ ἐξὴ τρίχας πολλὰς, τέρας ἦστι καὶ ἐν τοῖς τέρασιν ἐν Ρώμῃ δεικνυται. τούτῳ δὲ ἐπὶ ἀνδρὸς ἦστι τὸ μὴ ἔχειν· κἂν μὲν φύσει μὴ ἔχῃ, τέρας ἔστιν, ἀν δ’ αὐτὸς ἐαυτοῦ ἐκκόπτῃ καὶ ἀποτίλλῃ, τί αὐτῶν ποιήσωμεν; ποῦ αὐτὸν δειξόμεθα καὶ τὶ προγράψωμεν; ἰδεῖξω υμῖν ἄνδρα, ὃς θέλει μᾶλλον γυνῆ εἶναι ἡ ἄνηρ.
\end{quote}

Are you a man or a woman? A man. Then adorn yourself as a man, not as a woman. A woman is naturally smooth and delicate, and if hairy, is a monster, and shown among the monsters at Rome. It is the same thing in a man not to be hairy; and if he is by nature not so, he is a monster. But if he depilates himself, what shall we do with him? … Of what have you to accuse your nature, sir, that it has made

\textsuperscript{771} Phyntis, \textit{On Women’s Temperance}. Text is Stob. 4.23.61a = Thesleff, \textit{Pythagorean Texts}, 153. Translation from Gutherie, \textit{The Complete Pythagoras}.


\textsuperscript{773} Sen. \textit{Helv.} 16:3-6.
you a man? Why, were all to be born women, then? In that case what would have been the use of your finery? For whom would you have made yourself fine, if all were women? But the whole affair displeases you. Go to work upon the whole, then. Remove your manhood itself and make yourself a woman entirely, that we may be no longer deceived, nor you be half man, half woman. 

Like Paul in Gal. 5:12, Epictetus suggests that men go all the way and castrate themselves if they want to pretend that they are something that they are not. 

Silence in Worship: 1 Cor. 14:33b-5

It appears that Paul again regulates the activity of women in worship in chapter 14. While Paul affirms in chapter 11 the activity of prophesying women in worship as long as their heads are covered, women are to be silent during the prophetic activity of the church. Several interpreters have attempted to resolve this apparent contradiction. First, interpreters have questioned whether or not this teaching is Pauline and a later interpolation. P. B. Payne has been a consistent voice for text-critical argument that

\[774\] Epict. Disc. 3.1.


there is a gap in the text from the end of 1 Cor. 14:33 to verse 36. Payne summarizes
the rationale for the exclusion of the text by comparing it to John 7:53-8:1:

1. In both, the doubtful verses occur at different locations in the text.
2. Manuscripts of both display a high concentration of textual variations.
4. In both, the doubtful verses disrupt the narrative or topic of the passage.
5. In both, marginal symbols or notes indicate scribal awareness of a textual
problem. In particular, Vaticanus has a distigme at the beginning of both
passages.778

Feminist scholars divide over the nature of 1 Cor. 14:33-5, with a few important
scholars convinced by the textual arguments mentioned above.779 The majority of
feminist interpreters approach this text as Pauline.780 Wire notes that the textual

---


778 Payne, Man and Woman, 235.


approaches that critics use to exclude 1 Cor. 14:34-5 from the original text come from one widely copied family of manuscripts. The Latin traditions, however, include 1 Cor. 14:34-5 in its canonical position, indicating that it is old enough and strong enough to be what Paul actually wrote.\textsuperscript{781}

Once the issue of authenticity is settled, the reading of the text is straightforward. If the text is authentic, the primary issue obviously is the question of its relationship with 1 Cor. 11. However, the arguments that 1 Cor. 14:33-5 is a non-Pauline interpolation withstand all counter-arguments. The presence of the verses in the manuscripts demonstrates that the scribes knew of the textual problems. Combined with the non-Pauline vocabulary, all other points are secondary and make the central argument all the more convincing. Since the text is not Pauline, it says nothing about the presence or role of philosophically educated women in Corinth.

**Summary of Conclusions**

In this chapter, I have discussed the philosophical heritage of classical and Roman Corinth and examined the social conditions of the Pauline community there in order to demonstrate that it had ideal conditions for the presence of philosophically educated women. These conditions included the presence of wealthy, powerful, and high status persons in Corinth who supported philosophical schools that had a heritage of philosophically educated women, the wide exchange of philosophical ideas at the

---

\textsuperscript{781} Wire, *Women Prophets*, 149-53.
Isthmian games, the presence of all the popular schools during the Roman period, and a long history of philosophical interest since the pre-Socratics to long after the first century CE. The city of Corinth had always been a city that was tolerant of the popular philosophies that are covered in this dissertation: Pythagoreanism, Cynicism, Platonism, Stocism, and Epicureanism and their first century incarnations. The Isthmian games attracted philosophers from all of these schools for oratory and debate, and Corinth produced many Cynics and Stoics. Moreover, I have argued that the Pauline community could sustain the presence of philosophically educated women.

The Christian community in Corinth was socially stratified, having both poor and wealthy participants. This is significant because the strongest signifier of the availability of education and the presence of philosophically educated women is wealth. To show this social stratification, I examined the Corinthians mentioned in 1 Corinthians, Romans, and Acts for indicators of wealth. These indicators include holding public office, being a public benefactor, participating in the public court system, and owning a household. I dismissed Erastus’s office as an indicator of wealth, status, and power, but Crispus’s position as a synagogue leader probably does mean that he is wealthy - if Acts is reliable on this point. The situation concerning the unnamed woman who was in a sexual relationship with her step-son may have caused lawsuits with other wealthy members of the community. The householders Gaius and Stephanas, along with Phoebe were most likely patrons of the church. I dismissed the criterion of travel as an indicator of wealth because both elites and non-elites in the Roman world were able to travel, and it was uncomfortable and dangerous for everyone. Finally, the instructions concerning head-coverings speak not only to women prophets in their social and theological contexts, but
also to philosophically educated patronesses. The higher status women may cover or uncover their heads for differing theological and social reasons, but Paul presents a redemptive, fictive equalizing message: all women should cover their heads and all men should uncover their heads in worship.

The importance of this chapter is to demonstrate that philosophers in Corinth were active in the first century, and many women in the Pauline community were in the perfect social situation to receive a philosophical education. This would include women in the households of Gaius and Stephanas, Phoebe, and the unnamed step-mother in chapter 5. If one of these householders had an interest in one or more of the various philosophical schools that were active in Corinth in the first century, any members of the household would have had access to a philosophical education. These members would include wives, sisters, daughters, slaves, freedpersons, and clients. In the next three chapters, I will apply these concepts to three important situations that are addressed in 1 Corinthians: self-sufficiency and Paul’s usage of the agon motif, friendship and patronage and Paul’s relationships with people who were connected to the patronage systems in Corinth, and teachings concerning marriage that Paul applies to worship regulations.
CHAPTER 5: 
PATRONAGE AND PHILOSOPHICALLY EDUCATED WOMEN

In chapters 5, 6, and 7, I will shift the focus from the question of context (does the situation in Corinth support the presence of philosophically educated women?) to reading 1 Corinthians with philosophically educated women. In chapter 1, I discussed the various efforts by New Testament scholars to identify and interpret parallels between Paul and the popular philosophers. While these studies established relationships between Paul and philosophy, they did not expand to philosophically educated women. In chapter 2, I argued that philosophically educated women fit into a broader context of educated and active women including poets, physicians, merchants, and activity in education. Furthermore, these women received their education in the household, learning from their fathers, husbands, or teachers in the home. I reviewed the history of women in philosophy in chapter 3, giving attention also to how these women learned and what they believed. In chapter 4, I discussed the nature of philosophy in Corinth and the social contexts of philosophically educated women in the Corinthian churches.

The household context is of great importance for the education of women because some relationship to wealth is the single most reliable indicator that education was at least available to women. Therefore, I examined the history of philosophy in Corinth and argued that every philosophical school with a history of producing educated women has some connection with that city. Moreover, I identified several households in the Corinthian church that could have facilitated the philosophical education of women:
Gaius, Stephanas, and Phoebe. There were also unnamed households that could have supported the education of women: those able to spend money on law suits, divorce, and head-coverings. These chapters have established that Paul’s writings interacted with the popular philosophies that both produced educated women and were present in Corinth, and the church provided an adequate context in which such women were found. Finally, the question remains, “how do we read 1 Corinthians with philosophically educated women?” To address this question, I have chosen three widely discussed issues in popular moral philosophers that would be basic knowledge for women educated in any popular school and that have some resonance with content in 1 Corinthians: patronage in chapter 5, marriage and family in chapter 6, and the agon or contest motif in chapter 7.

In chapter 5, I will examine how two philosophically educated women – Sophia and Fortuna - would interact with Paul’s notion of patronage. As wealthy widows, Sophia and Fortuna fit the best historical context for a broad philosophical education and patronesses of the church. Reading selections of 1 Corinthians with these two women will produce both complementary and contrasting understandings according to Paul’s persuasiveness and their philosophical sympathies.

As the material above indicates, most philosophically educated women were either wealthy or attached to wealthy households. Because of this history, it is safe to imagine that if philosophically educated women were somehow connected to Paul’s Corinthian community, they would be patronesses of the churches. Paul’s interaction with philosophically educated women and the men that they influenced could therefore determine possible meeting places for followers, legal representation, monetary support, and the various other benefits that patronesses bestowed on their clients. These
patronesses are unmentioned in the epistle because Paul does not want to appear controlled by them or unduly attached to them, but they are not invisible because their presence can be drawn out of the content of the letter. In 1 Corinthians, Paul the apostle interacts with his philosophically educated patronesses like a poet or philosopher who appeals to his inspired divine right to instruct, correct, admonish, and exhort both patronesses and persons in the church that these wealthy women influenced. At the outset, it appears that Paul threatens both sides of the patron/client relationships in Corinth by using his apostleship to instruct both the rich and poor of the community. This kind of behavior is somewhat expected from a Roman who values freedom and friendship, as well as a poet or philosopher who gives sharp rebuke to their patron. However, Paul is also careful to give adequate praise at the appropriate time (1 Cor. 1:3-9; 3:21-23). I will argue in this chapter that the philosophically educated patronesses of the Corinthian church valued Paul for his inspired speech and teaching, which allowed some toleration for frank (corrective) speech, but these patronesses would also value Paul’s dutiful praise.\footnote{Cf., Kloppenborg, Voluntary Associations, 278.}

**Philosophical Patronage**

Patronage was an important economic, legal, and social part of Roman life during the time of Paul.\footnote{See above, n. 94.} Typically, the patron/client relationship existed between a

\footnote{William Alexander Hunter, A Systematic and Historical Exposition of Roman Law in the Order of a Code, trans. J. Ashton Cross (London: Maxwell & Son, 1885),}
wealthy, powerful, and influential person and a somewhat inferior person who did not possess the wealth, power, or influence needed to advance or simply exist in the Roman world. Most influential philosophers were a part of this system but their efforts were not always successful. For example, the philosophers Philodemus (c. 110-35 BCE) and Lucretius (c. 99-55 BCE) had a difficult time securing patrons. Lucretius had a tenuous relationship with Memmius and Philodemus enjoyed some support from Torquatus and


787 John Stearns suggested that Lucretius originally was enthusiastic about his patron Memmius when he promised to construct a building for the Epicureans, and later Lucretius had a change of heart when Memmius reneged on his promise, “Lucretius and Memmius,” CW 25, no. 9 (1931): 67-68. It is also likely that Lucretius viewed his ‘patron’ Memmius with the same kind of derision as everyone else, see Duane W. Roller, “Gaius Memmius: Patron of Lucretius,” C Phil 65, no. 4 (1970): 246-248.
However, neither philosopher was able to attach himself to one patron. Such patronage was important, and wealthy philosophically educated women actively supported their intellectual interests.

Two imperial women lavishly supported their philosophical interests. Pompeia Plotina (d. c. 122 CE), the wife of Trajan, was a well-known patron of the Epicureans. She likely made more than one trip to Athens with Hadrian - or on her own - in which her study of philosophy could have taken place. Plotina may have started out as a neo-Pythagorean due to a connection with Nicomachus of Gerasa and probably converted to Epicureanism later in life. The neo-Pythagorean Nicomachus of Gerasa wrote his

---


791 Hemelrijk suggests that Plotina employed Nicomachus as a teacher before he wrote his *Enchiridion*, “τὴν δὲ ἄρχην ἐκείθεν ποθὲν ποιήσομαι ῥόσονος ἕνεκα παρακολούθησαις, οὕτω καὶ ήμικα ἔξογομην σοι περὶ αὐτῶν τούτων τὴν τῆς διδασκαλίας ἐποιησομὲν ἄρχην,” “But now, to make my exposition easier to follow, I shall begin from the same place where I began my instruction to you in person.” *MSG* 238.12-15; translation in A. Barker, *Greek Musical Writings, vol. 2: Harmonic and Acoustic Theory* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).

*Enchiridion* at the request of an unnamed patroness, often identified as Plotina.⁷⁹³ In 121 CE she petitioned Hadrian, whose education she oversaw, requesting on behalf of the Epicurean Pompillius Theotimus to exempt the school from the government appointment of the head of the school.⁷⁹⁴ If Plotina was not a neo-Pythagorean or an Epicurean, she was certainly an important patroness of both schools, with an interest in learning philosophy and championing its causes.

Julia Domna (170-217 CE) was a part of a philosophic circle. The members of this literary/intellectual circle may have included Aelius Antipater (sophist/rhetorician), Philostratus (sophist/biographer), Serenus Sammonicus (polymath), Dio Cassius (historian), Asinius Quadratus (historian), and perhaps Philiscus (sophist), Papinian (jurist), Ulpian (jurist), Paulist (jurist), and Galen (physician/philosopher).⁷⁹⁵ Julia herself enjoyed participating in the learned discussions with these intellectuals.⁷⁹⁶ She commissioned the sophist Philostratus (c. 170-250 CE) to write the biography of the neo-

---


⁷⁹⁶ Bowerstock, “Julia Domna,” 103.
Pythagorean Apollonius of Tyana (c. 15-100 CE). Philostratus tells us the story of how a certain Damis came to be supported by Julia Domna:

There was a man, Damis, by no means stupid, who formerly dwelt in the ancient city of Nineveh. He resorted to Apollonius in order to study wisdom, and having shared, by his own account, his wanderings abroad, wrote an account of them. And he records his opinions and discourses and all his prophesies. And a certain kinsman of Damis drew the attention of the empress Julia to the documents hitherto unknown. Now I belonged to the circle of the empress, for she was a devoted admirer of all rhetorical exercises; and she commanded me to recast and edit these essays…

Philostratus also wrote a letter to Julia Domna that reveals her interest in Plutarch and possibly Platonism (Ep. 73). In this letter, Philostratus exhorts Julia Domna (170-217 CE) to persuade Plutarch (46-120 CE) not to be angry with the sophists, perhaps in response to her reading of Plutarch’s Gorgias or another lost work. Obviously, she could not persuade Plutarch of anything because he had died half a century before she was born. Philostratus’s lack of concern for chronology does not threaten the letter’s

---


798 Philostr. V S 1.3.

authenticity. Philostratus would not choose a friend of Julia’s to express this idea because “it is part of a strategy to establish a communality of feeling and opinion between Julia, himself, and his readers.” Philostratus is responding to a work by Plutarch that threatened to sway her against sophists, which comprised a good portion of her intellectual friends. The best reading of this exhortation is “Do not let Plutarch persuade you to be angry with the sophists.” If this interpretation is correct, then Philostratus’s statement seems to be in jest or sarcastic because of Julia’s consistent favor towards the great sophists of her time.

In this section, we looked at the philosophical support of women at the very top of Roman society: the wife of the Emperor Trajan (53-117 CE), Pompeia Plotina (d. c. 122 CE), and the wife of the Emperor Septimius Severus (145-211 CE), Julia Domna (170-217 CE). Pompeia supported both neo-Pythagorean and Epicurean causes. Julia Domna’s interests were very broad: she participated in a philosophical circle that included the brightest minds of her day. These two women serve as a starting point for the examination of non-imperials in and near Corinth who supported their intellectual and political interests.

---


801 Bowersock, Greek Sophists, 101-09.
Patronage in 1 Corinthians

Just as a young aristocrat can gain wealth and power through moving up to more distinguishing offices of the city, the city of Corinth itself moved from “colony” to “free city” with astonishing speed. The close relationship with Rome doubtlessly helped both the city itself and its elite move up through the ranks. Many dedicatory inscriptions in Corinth indicate some relationship to the imperial family. Patrons in first century Corinth include (but are not limited to) Erastus the aedile (discussed above in 4.6.5), Gn. Babbius Philinus, Tiberius Claudius Dinippus, L. Castricius Regulus, T.

---


803 Chow, *Patronage and Power*, 44.


Manlius Juvencus, Herodes Atticus (mentioned above), Lucius Gellius Menander, and Junia Theodora (discussed below).

John K. Chow’s analysis of 1 Corinthians indicates that patron/client relationships may be behind many problems in the Christian community at Corinth, including Paul’s apostleship, eating meat sacrificed to idols, Paul’s clarification of his relationship to patronage, and the problem of unity in the church. Paul’s presentation of himself as apostle asserts the divine authority that he needs to admonish the church’s patrons (1 Cor. 1:1, 16:22). The civic rites in which some of the Corinthians participated, and which sacrificial meat was likely offered could have been dedicated to the Roman emperor, the ultimate patron (1 Cor. 10). Paul defends his apostleship against patrons who may have been investigating him, claiming that he serves God alone—not the Corinthians or himself (1 Cor. 4:1-5). Paul further defends himself in 1 Cor. 9:1-23.

---


refusing to accept payment (μισθός) that patrons normally owe their inferiors. Yet Paul’s teaching that the church is a body (1 Cor. 12:18-29) supports the patronage system because it reinforces the current social and economic makeup of the community. The metaphor of the unity of the body and its parts was often used by ancient writers to support the extreme social distance between the rich and the poor. In 1 Cor. 16:22, Paul utilizes friendship language that has patronal overtones, and perhaps this is intentional as φίλαξιν appears only here in the Pauline corpus. Chow goes on to argue that many of the problems in the Corinthian church are rooted in strained patronal relationships. Paul’s refusal to accept money (1 Cor. 9:1-27), the possible wealth of the litigants in court (1 Cor. 6:1-8), the issue with the step-mother (the man was seeking power and influence through the sexual relationship in 1 Cor. 5:1-5), and the situation with disunity related to the problem of idol food (8:1-11:1) all point to disruptions in relationships between patrons and the church.

There is another factor to consider with respect to the relationships between Paul and his patronesses: the organization of the church. If the church can be somewhat

---


813 Chow, Patronage and Power, 176; Sen. Clem. 1.3.5; 1.4.3; 1.5.1 (the Emperor is the head); cf., Plut. Mor. 478d, 797e; Philo. Praem. 125; Dio Chrys. Or. 3.104-7; Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 6.86.2.

814 John 19:12; Marshall, Enmity, 131; Garnsey and Saller, Roman Empire, 148-50, 154-6.
likened to a *collegia*, then the support of the *collegia* by patronesses might provide some understanding for the dynamics between the patronesses of the church and Paul.

The Corinthian community shares several similarities with the *collegia*: patronal support, a high population of freedmen, and high ranking offices held by long-term members. Robert Wilken has noted that Pliny the Younger (c. 61-112 CE, *Ep. 10.96*) interpreted the early Christian groups as voluntary associations. Similarly, Celsus (fl. 2nd CE) asserted that Christianity had no right to exist as a voluntary association because of its secret nature. In chapters 38-9 of his *Apologeticum*, Tertullian (c. 160-225 CE) argued that churches of his time should be regarded as *collegia*, indicating that there was still a

---


816 Bengt Holmberg, “The Methods of Historical Reconstruction in the Scholarly Recovery of Corinthian Christianity,” *Christianity at Corinth: The Quest for the Pauline Church*, 266.

817 Wilken, *Christians as the Romans Saw Them*, 32.

struggle for Christians to be accepted by their peers.\textsuperscript{819} However, in my opinion, the earliest churches lacked the organizational structure of the collegia:

(1) they often incorporated persons who shared a common trade or craft being thus more homogeneous in terms of status; (2) they engaged in common meals which were graced with the oratory of guest rhetors and provided the necessary context trade for socio-economic advancement; (3) they participated in rituals and cultic activities; and (4) they were able to function because of the beneficence of wealthier persons who acted as patrons.\textsuperscript{820}

While Christian practices and organization had not yet solidified, the wealthy women of the church who supported other collegia may have interacted with Paul and the church within a similar framework.

**Junia Theodora and Claudia Metrodora**

Junia Theodora, doubtless a Corinthian of higher status and greater wealth than anyone in the early church, served as patroness for many cities in Lycia in the first century. She is significant for this study because Junia is the only woman from first century Corinth that is honored as *prostatis*, the same term that Paul uses for Phoebe (Rom. 16:2). A similar patroness, Claudia Metrodora, is important because she serves as a parallel to Junia’s influence; however, the term *prostatis* does not appear in her dedicatory inscriptions. While these two women are of higher status than any woman that we would expect to find in the Pauline churches, their behavior as patronesses greatly illuminates our understanding of the situation in Corinth. These women were in

\textsuperscript{819} Wilken, “Collegia,” 283-6.

\textsuperscript{820} Mihaila, *The Paul-Apollos Relationship*, 101.
control of their wealth and used it according to their political, intellectual, and economic interests.

In 1954, a French archaeological team discovered a re-used stele in a late Roman tomb near Corinth with five inscriptions on it concerning the benefactions of Junia Theodora. Despite its importance in illuminating the world of Paul as a very intriguing piece of epigraphy, it has not received the scholarly attention or popular fame of other familiar inscriptions regarding important males such as Gallio, Erastus the aedile, and the possible epigraphic evidence of a synagogue in Corinth. R. A. Kearsley has provided the most recent edition of the text of the Junia Theodora inscriptions with several germinal comments regarding its importance for the study of women in the first century and its impact on New Testament studies.

Junia Theodora received high honors from several Lycian cities: two from a federal assembly of the Lycian cities, Myra, Patara, and Telmessos. Junia protected the

---


822 Murphy-O’Connor, *St. Paul’s Corinth*, commentary 149-60, text 179-82.

823 James Wiseman, “Corinth and Rome 1: 228 BC-AD 267,” *ANRW* 2.7.1:438-548 (pl. 5, no. 8).

Lycians when they rebelled against their governor. During this time of political transition, Junia’s home served as a safe haven for important Lycians. Junia also assisted several citizens of Myra, Patara, and Telmessos when they visited Corinth. We find in Junia Theodora a woman controlling her resources, interested in the political aspirations of the wealthy citizens of several Lycian cities, and willing to serve as their patroness.\(^{825}\)

It is significant that the Lycian cities that honor Junia are no strangers to honoring their female athletes, physicians, wives, office-holders, and patronesses.\(^{826}\) Junia Theodora is not to be placed among the mothers, wives, or concubines of the Emperors and Senators who famously (or infamously) influenced Roman history, but with her sisters who contributed to provincial Greek life by serving in the provinces as patrons (here we place priestesses and various office-holders), athletes, philosophers, and physicians.\(^{827}\) Herodotus and other early witnesses tell us that Lycians were a matrilineal

---

\(^{825}\) Murphy-O’Connor, *St. Paul’s Corinth*, 82.

\(^{826}\) In his *Epigraphica II*, Pleket presents other inscriptions that concern the social activity of women in Lycia, several of which are presented above. For example, the physician Antiochis, mentioned above, is from Lycia (Pleket, *Epigraphica*, no. 12), then there is the chase Asē (Pleket, *Epigraphica*, no. 15) and the gymnasiarch Lalla of Arneae (Pleket, *Epigraphica*, no. 14).

However, the matrilineal nature of the Lycian cities does not indicate that they were matriarchal or that women there enjoyed more freedoms from abuse and neglect.

One of the curiosities of the Junia Theodora inscription is its *apotheosis* motif:


By an honorific decree made in favor of Junia Theodora, living among you, it is voted to grant her both the crowning with a golden crown and the offering of a portrait for her deification after her death, and we have sent you a copy (of the decree) sealed with the public seal so as to inform you at the same time.

The *apotheosis* motif was originally used to honor patronesses and patrons associated with the imperial cult, but the term became so popular in funerary inscriptions that it means simply “buried.” However, in Junia Theodora’s case, the *apotheotic* formula is clearly an honor intended to persuade her to continue her many benefactions. The inscription from Telmessos reads “and invite her, living with the same intentions, to always be the author of some benefit towards us, well knowing that in return our city recognises and will acknowledge the evidence of her goodwill,” “παρακαλεῖν τε αὐτήν μένουσαν ἐπὶ τῇ ἀυτῆς ὑπὸ τάσεως ἀεί τινος ἀγαθοῦ παραιτίαν γείνεσθαι πᾶσιν ἴμεῖν εἰδιμαν ὦτ[ι καὶ ἡ πόλις] ἱμῶν εὐχαριστος ἀποδώσι αὐτῆ πάλιν τὰς

---


καθηκο[ύσας] μαρτυρίας. These inscriptions were presented to Junia and her heir, both are explicitly said to be living: Junia (from Lycian cities, no. 1 ll. 1-2; the second Lycian inscription “living among you,” “κατοικούσῃ παρ’ ὑμεῖν ἔξαπεστα,” no. 4, l. 45) and Sextus Iulius (who will receive one of the inscriptions from the Lycian federal assembly, no. 4 l. 53). One important parallel to this honor is the *apotheotic* image on the Arch of the Sergii.

The Roman patroness Salvia Postuma funded the building of an arch in Pula, Croatia in the first century BCE. Scholars still debate the significance of the monument. Importantly for our purposes, Magaret Woodhull discusses the scene of *apotheosis* on Salvia Postuma’s arch and the significance of her patronage. Woodhull’s basic argument is intriguing:

By inclusion on the Arch of the Sergii, the panel implied for its viewer that the Sergii deserved to be honored with apotheosis for lifetime accomplishments marked by their civic and military deeds noted in the inscriptions. They were, in effect, heros of the town. Moreover, the apotheotic iconography functioned kinetically within the monument’s design to activate a theatrical dramatization of this event: approaching the arch, the viewer would first see the portraits; then, moving in closer, she would read the inscriptions accrediting civic and military valour; finally, passing under the arch, she would look up and note the eagle in the soffit, wings spread, ‘bearing’ the figures just seen on the arch’s attic heavenwards. The arch’s continual use recreated the moment of apotheosis each time a person passed through the arch. Much as Augustus had joined the tutelary gods at Rimini, here Salvia made her family, now members of a heavenly realm, perpetual guardians of her fellow citizens.

---


834 Woodhull, “Matronly Patrons,” 89.
Woodhull argues that Salvia Postuma’s *apotheosis* is implied by the *apotheotic* symbolism and her dedication of the arch, which makes the explicit *apotheosis* of Junia Theodora even more impressive.

Claudia Metrodora was an influential patroness in Asia Minor. R. A. Kearsley presents text, translation, and commentary along with discussion of Metrodora’s importance to the Pauline community via Phoebe.835 Like Junia Theodora, Metrodora received honors from various cities for her patronage: three inscriptions in six fragments are extant from Chios,836 another honorific inscription made by a private group,837 and a building in Ephesus preserves her memory.838 Metrodora held the office of *stephanephros* twice, *gymnasiarch* four times, *agonothete* three times, named queen of the thirteen cities of the Ionian federation, and priestess for life of Aphrodite Livia.839 She gave oil to the city twice for the Heraclean games and erected and dedicated a building along with her husband (whose name does not survive in the inscription).840 Kearsley convincingly argues that the various offices and gifts to the city are credited to

---


Metrodora herself – and not to her tutor or male relatives – indicates that Metrodora controlled her property and used it to advance her interests.\footnote{Kearsley, \textit{Women in Public Life}, 200-1. Cf., Winter, \textit{Roman Wives}, \textit{Roman Widows}, 182; Dutch, \textit{Educated Elite}, 143; Jorunn Økland, \textit{Women in their Place: Paul and the Corinthian Discourse of Gender and Sanctuary Space} (New York: T&T Clark International, 2004), 293.}

The epigraphic evidence indicates that some women in the Greek East were active and influential in urban life. Junia Theodora’s inscriptions indicate that several cities in Lycia had a positive relationship with Corinth and that the Lycians were no strangers to honoring important women for their various contributions. A woman of Junia Theodora’s wealth, power, and influence is by no means singular: Claudia Metrodora is a parallel example from Chios.

\textbf{Pleasing the Patroness: Literary Patronage as Pattern}

We have seen in the patronesses of philosophy that their philosopher-clients often wrote and dedicated works to them. These philosophers did not fill their works with excessive praise for the patroness and there is no indication that the patroness, while very rich and powerful, controlled the philosopher’s every word and thought. It is possible then that Paul could be dependent on one or more patron/patroness for both himself and the churches and still retain his apostolic authority and freedom. In this section, I will explore literary patronage as a clue for understanding Paul’s relationship with his named and unnamed patrons. I will argue that the interpretative key for this issue lies in what Paul’s patroness expects from him and the liberalities he can take (such as corrective, frank speech) as an apostle without jeopardizing the relationship.
A writer - especially a good one - possessed the unique ability to immortalize their patrons in either a positive or a negative light. The most important similarity between Paul and the poets is they both understand themselves to be inspired by the divine. However, despite the declaration of independence due to inspiration, both the poet and Paul give the obligatory praise and thanksgivings to their patrons in return for services rendered and desired (1 Cor. 1:3-9; 3:21-23). Paul’s divine inspiration is expressed in his roles as a genuine apostle: preaching the word of God, correcting loose morals, being a model for imitation, and giving instructions from God for the community. In the following subsections, I will argue that if a patron was to delve too deeply into the business of the apostle or of writing (in the case of the poet), both Paul and the poets would declare freedom by means of the written word – a power that few other clients were fortunate enough to possess.

842 Direct eulogy was not necessary to immortalize patrons and fulfill this obligation. A favorite technique of the Roman writers was to pass the task of praise on to someone else, M. L. Clarke, “Poets and Patrons at Rome,” G&R 251, no. 1 (1978), 48. For Paul, see John K. Chow when he discusses the special nature of literary patronage in “Patronage in Roman Corinth,” in Paul and Empire: Religion and Power in Roman Imperial Society, ed. Richard Horsley (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1997), 121; discussion of what patrons would provide churches, 124.

843 Dio Chrys. 1.30; 13.21; 31.14, 65. “Dio Chrysostom is especially indignant at people being ungrateful towards benefactors,” Mussies, Dio Chrysostom, 41. Sen. Ben. 23: “The ungrateful [person] tortures and torments [her or] himself; [she or] he hates the gifts which [she or] he has received. And what is more wretched than a [person] who forgets [her or] his benefits and clings to [her or] his injuries?”

The Poet and the Apostle

As an apostle, Paul participates in reciprocal friendships. While Paul did not normally ask for gifts for himself, he did maintain relationships with benefactors and patrons of many cities as part of his missionary strategy. Unlike many philosophers and poets, and indeed other apostles, Paul did not attach himself to the house of any of his patrons or the patrons of the house-churches, instead choosing to work with his hands, doing the work of a tent-maker. What Paul did expect in return for his work as an apostle was faithfulness to his message (1 Cor. 1:21, 2:11-16; 3:1-3, 16-17; 9:24-7; 14:36-8; especially 15:2) and the imitation of his character (1 Cor. 4:15-21; 11:1) from the entire believing community as well as other critical benefits from those of higher status (support of himself, which he did not accept, 1 Cor. 9:1-19; a place to meet for the Lord’s Supper, provision of food and drink, 1 Cor 11:17-34; giving money 1 Cor. 16:1-3).

Most poets needed patrons in order to survive, and the relationships they had with their patrons are similar to Paul. Literary clients needed resources, defense in court and from other forms of attack, and the means needed to pursue their art. One of the

---


features that make Paul’s writings unique is that he maintained relationships with several newly founded groups by utilizing the epistle. 848 He used this common tool in an uncommon way, writing to create and maintain identity 849 within these new groups which needed patrons in order to survive. 850 Paul expected patrons to provide a meeting place for the house-churches, read the letters to the community, defend Paul’s integrity and teaching, 851 and provide financial support for the church (1 Cor. 16:1-3; the support is not for himself, according to Paul in 1 Cor. 9:11-18 and 2 Cor. 11:7-10). Patrons expected, and indeed needed praise, flattery, and/or otherwise have their beneficence reciprocated by the apostle.

848 Abraham Malherbe concludes that there is no exact analogy for Paul’s use of the epistle as maintaining a newly created community, Social Aspects, 48. The closest analogy in my opinion is the administration of the Roman army and interests, which in part used letters as illustrated by Ael. Ep. 30, “There is therefore no need for [the Emperor] to wear himself out by journeying over the whole empire, nor by visiting different people at different times to confirm individual matters, whenever he enters their land. But it is very easy for him to govern the whole inhabited world by dispatching letters without moving from the spot. And the letters are almost no sooner written than they arrive, as if borne by winged messengers.” Translation from The Complete Works, trans. Charles A. Behr (Leiden: Brill, 1981), 80. Aristides describes in detail some of these letters (noting that he received special treatment due to his practice in oration) in 50.71-93, which P. W. van der Horst identifies as parallel to Romans 16 in Aelius Aristides, 51. Aristides uses his special relationship with the gods to compose poetry (50.31) and because of his recognized skill in oratory he is able to persuade benefactors to give him what he wants (50.80-87). Cf. Collin Wells, The Roman Empire, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992), 234.

849 Philip Esler states that Paul by writing the epistle to the Romans is an “entrepreneur of identity,” Conflict and Identity in Romans: The Social Setting of Paul’s Letter (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003), 109.


851 Rom. 16:17-18; 1 Cor 1:10-16; Gal. 1:6-9; 1 Thess. 2:1-13.
Despite the fact that the church could not survive without patrons, Paul exercised his power to punish patrons that overstepped their role or otherwise failed in their duty to provide for the church and for Paul’s needs. One tool used by literary clients and Paul was the written curse.\(^{852}\) Paul utilizes the curse twice in 1 Corinthians (1 Cor 5.1-5; 16.22).\(^{853}\) In 1 Cor. 5:5, Paul instructs the Corinthians to eject the sinful man from the community, delivering his flesh over to Satan to be destroyed so that his soul might be saved. While the use of the curse in 1 Cor. 5:5 is not directed at a patron, it certainly demonstrates that Paul has the authority to call down a type of divine judgment on someone in the community. Furthermore, if the man had a relationship with a wealthy widow as I argued above in 4.5.3, the curse does effect a patroness by proxy and other wealthy persons in the community would have taken note.

The other curse appears near the conclusion of the letter, where Paul marks unbelievers as enemies, plainly saying that they are cursed (1 Cor. 16:22). In both 1 Cor. 5:5 and 16:22, Paul utilizes the ancient generic curse form found in other curses at Corinth, which are characterized by a person invoking divine judgment or punishment on

\(^{852}\) Mary Beard argues that the power of a written curse adds to its potency, “The Function of the Written Word in Roman Religion,” in \textit{Literacy in the Greco-Roman World}, ed. J. M. Humphery (Ann Arbor: JRA, 1991), 37. Paul wrote several of them: 1 Cor. 5:1-5; 16:22; Gal. 1:8; 3:10; cf. 2 Thess. 1:5-12. Cf. \textit{TDNT} 1: 354. It is interesting that the curse in 1 Cor. 16:22 is in close proximity to the commendation of several patrons. Whether or not Paul actually cursed former benefactors of the church is not explicitly clear, although Chow identifies the sexually deviant man in 1 Cor. 5 as a patron, \textit{Patronage and Power}, 123-30. Paul’s cursing activity certainly serves as a warning to the entire church to remain faithful to his message and character.

an enemy. As such, the enemies are excluded from fellowship in the community. If Paul really did have the authority to cause the community to withdraw fellowship from a member, that indeed would be a powerful weapon to discipline patrons. As stated above, the two most important features of writers that gave them special standing with their patrons is their divine inspiration and ability to immortalize their patrons. Both the poets and Paul openly claimed both of these powers, and used them decisively.

---

854 Although Bruce Winter focuses his discussion on Corinthian curses on 1 Cor. 12:3, he has a very useful bibliography and review of the archaeological evidence in After Paul Left Corinth, 164-79.

855 M. L. Clarke notes that Vitruvius’ work on architecture is dedicated to Augustus in response to being appointed to an important post and Quntilian’s Institutio is dedicated to his friend Marcellus Victorius. While Quintilian was writing the Institutio, he was appointed to a post and inserted some adulatory remarks to Domitian in book 4, “Poets and Patrons at Rome,” n. 12.

856 The tradition of poetic inspiration is at least as old as Homer who describes poets as he does kings and princes in the Iliad. A very detailed discussion of the divine nature of poetry in Greek thought and its development in Roman thought is available in an article by Sperduti, “Divine Nature” 209-40. A few notes are useful here. Sperduti observes that Homer uses the same words (διοί, θείοι, διοτρεφέεις, and διογενεέες) to describe poets, seers, and kings: Il. 1.176; 2.196, 445; Od. 1.65, 196, 284; 2.27, 233, 394; 3.121; 4.17; 621, 691; 8.87, 539; 16.252; 17.359; 23.133; 143. “As the sceptre of the king comes from Zeus and fillets are conferred upon holy men by Apollo, so, too, the words of the poets come from the gods,” Sperduti, “Divine Nature,” 209. Cf. Kathleen Freeman, “Plato: The Use of Inspiration,” G&R 49, no. 27 (1940): 137-49 and Murray, “Poetic Inspiration,” 87-100.

857 The tradition of Pauline inspiration is evident in but not limited to the nature of his description of his apostolic calling, the practice of blessing and cursing, apostolic prayers, the exercising of his apostolic office as giving the words of God, and the reading of the Pauline letters in worship. Udo Schnelle writes that Paul understood himself to be “one grasped by the πνεῦμα” like the First Testament prophets, Paul, 159. Cf. Richard Longnecker, Galatians, Word Biblical Commentary 41, ed. Ralph P. Martin (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1990), 30. The reading of the Pauline epistles likely takes the place of the reading of poetry or the discussion of philosophy in the Greco-Roman symposium after which the early Christian worship services are patterned. Cf. Dennis Smith, From Symposium to Eucharist: The Banquet in the Early Christian World (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002), 138-9.
Horace: A Client like Paul

I will now examine the relationship between Horace and Maecenas, which will serve as an example for how Paul might interact with his supporters. An important pattern will emerge: the value of the poet to his patron is the poet’s inspiration and this quality serves as an equalizing force, allowing the poet to be a friend and engage in corrective or frank speech. Horace is one of the many Roman poets of the Augustan age who were clients of Maecenas, an ideal literary patron. While Maecenas had many poets in his retinue, Horace is most attractive for this study because he garners more scholarly attention with regard to the relationship between Maecenas and his literary clients.

All of Horace’s works are dedicated to Maecenas; the first book of the Sermones, Odes, and Poems include a statement of praise to him. Horace wanted Maecenas to be pleased with his work, which is indicative of the friendship that he sought to maintain.

---


859 Dalzell, “Maecenas,” 151. Dalzell notes here the many other literary clients of Maecenas.

860 Aristotle affirms that true friends are very intimate, “καὶ μίαν ψυχὴν εἶναι τοῖς ἀληθῶς φίλοις,” “True friends are one spirit,” Eth. Eud. 7.1240b.3. (Rackham, LCL). Aristotle goes on to say that in such closeness two people want to both live and
This desire is explicit in Satire 1.10.81, “Plotius et Varius, Maecenas Vergiliusque/ Valgius et probet haec Octavius optimus atque/ Fuscus et haec utinam Viscorum laudet uterque/ ambitione relegata,” “Let but Plotius and Varius approve of these verses; let Maecenas, Virgil, and Valgius; let Octavius and Fuscus, best of men; and let but the Viscus bothers give their praise!” According to Suetonius, who preserves the verses from Maecenas dedicated to Horace, he was successful in this venture:

Ni te visceribus meis, Horati,  
Plus iam diligo, tu tuum sodalem  
Ninnio videas strigosoiorem

If that I do not love you, my own Horace, more than life itself, behold your comrade leaner than Ninnius.861

The tone of Horace’s references to Maecenas is almost always positive and cordial. Horace was critical of Maecenas before becoming his client, but his new patron allowed the criticisms to remain: “Wickam862 thought that Sermones 1.2 must then have been written before Horace made the acquaintance of Maecenas and suggests that it was the express request of Maecenas himself that the lines were left unchanged, in order, one may suppose, to avoid the odium of exercising improper influence on his friend’s literary product.”863 We should note that Horace never explicitly thanks his patron.864

die together, not ever wanting to separate. Cf. Pl. Lysis 207c; Sen. Ep. 3.2; Cic. De Amic. 80.

861 Suet. Vita Hor.


Matthew Santirocco argues that in the *Odes*, the relationship of Horace to Maecenas develops from one of dependence to a declaration of independence. This theory is sustained by references and allusions to the relationship in the *Sermones*, *Poems*, and *Epistles*. Santirocco notes that book one of the *Odes* emphasizes the vast material difference between patron and poet. Then, in book two, Horace outlines a spiritual dimension, as Horace’s poverty is symbolic of his artistic inspiration that sets him apart from others - including Maecenas. In book three, Santirocco suggests that Horace is superior to Maecenas in his independence from the anxieties of wealth and Horace therefore becomes a spiritual patron of Maecenas. As a whole, Santirocco’s conclusions suggest that the poet can express both dependence on a patron and literary

---


867 The social position of Horace is explored by Lily Ross Taylor, “The Equestrian Career of Horace,” *AJA* 46, no. 2 (1925): 164-70. Ross examines the writings of Horace and concludes that as a son of a freedman he was disqualified for equestrian service and thus well below the social position of Maecenas, 164. As the scribe of a powerful knight, he enjoyed several privileges: he attended the *ludi* with Maecenas, sitting in seats in the theater reserved for knights (*Serm*. 2.6.48; Taylor, “Equestrian Career,” 163); and Horace wore the knight’s ring and garb (*Serm*. 2.7.53-55; Taylor, “Equestrian Career,” 166).
independence at the same time because of their (both the patron and the poet) understanding of inspiration. Santirocco concludes, “While consistently affirming Horace’s sincere affection for Maecenas, these odes, by their dynamic disposition, also create a certain distance and enable their author to maintain a high degree of personal and artistic freedom.”

Horace declares independence by virtue of his inspiration. This claim is evident in *Ode 3*, where Horace expresses his close friendship with Maecenas, their economic separation, as well as Horace’s immortality.

Cur me querellis exanimas tuis? nec dis amicum est nec mihi te pruis obire, Maecenas, mea mearum grande decus columnque rerum. a! te meae si partem animae rapit maturior vis, quid moror altera, nec carus aeque nec superstes integer? ille dies utramque ducet ruinam. non ego perfidum dixi sacramentum: ibimus, ibimus, utcunque praecedes, supernum carpere iter comites parati. me nec Chimaerae spiritus igneae nec, si resurgat, centimanus Gyas divellet unquam: sic potenti Iustitiae placitumque Parcis. seu Libra seu me Scorpios adspicit formidolosus pars violentior natalis horae seu tyrannis Hesperiae Capricornus undae, utrumque nostrum incredibili modo consentit astrum. te Iovis impio tutela Saturno refulgens eripuit voluerisque Fati tardavit alas, cum populus frequens laetum theatris ter erepuit sonum; me truncus inlapsus cerebo sustulerant, nisi Faunus ictum dextra levasset, Mercurialium custos viorum. reddere victimas aedemque votivam memento; nos humilem feriemus agnam

Why doest thou crush my life out of complaints? ‘Tis the will neither of the gods nor of myself that I should pass away before thee, Maecenas, the great glory and prop of my own existence. Alas, if some untimely blow snatches thee, the half of my own life, away, why do I, the other half, still linger on, neither so dear as before nor surviving whole? That fatal day shall bring the doom of both of us. No false oath have I taken; both, both together, we will go, whene’er thou leadest the way, prepared as comrades to travel the final journey. Me no fiery breath of the

---

868 Santirocco, “Maecenas,” 253. Santirocco does not believe that Maecenas is a poet, but I think that his argument and conclusions are still important. Horace interacted with Maecenas as a poet, albeit not a one as gifted as himself. For Maecenas described as a poet - and indeed not a good one - see Dalzell, “Maecenas,” 161.
Chimaera, nor hundred-handed Gyas, should he rise against me, shall ever tear from thee. Such is the will of mighty Justice and the Fates. Whether Libra or dread Scorpio or Capricornus, lord of the Hesperian wave, dominates my horoscope as the more potent influence of my natal hour, the stars of us twain are wondrously linked together. To thee the protecting power of Jove, outshining that of baleful Saturn, brought rescue, and stayed the wings of swift Fate what time the thronging people thrice broke into glad applause at the theatre. Me the trunk of a tree, descending on my head, had snatched away, had not Faunus, the protector of poets, with his right hand warded off the stroke. Remember then to off the victims due and to build a votive shrine! I will sacrifice a humble lamb.  

Horace expresses his dependence on Maecenas in no uncertain terms. He declares that Maecenas will die before him, and it will destroy Horace because they are true friends: Maecenas is half of Horace. While Maecenas will be honored greatly when he dies, unlike his wealthy friends, Horace will only be able to sacrifice a lamb. This declaration of affection demonstrates to Maecenas that Horace will be faithful to his obligation to reciprocate his many gifts.

The independence of Horace is clearly expressed in his refusal to acquiesce to the requests of Maecenas. Horace refuses to publish the Epods when asked (Epod. 14) or to celebrate Augustus’s victories (Carm. 2.12). Horace discusses literary patronage:

Multa quidem nobis facimus mala saepe poetae (ut vineta egomet caedam mea), cum tibi librum sollicito damus aut fesso; cum laedimus, unum si quis amicorum est ausus reprehendere versum; cum loca iam recitata revolvimus irrevocati;

---

869 In this Ode, Horace is encouraging Maecenas to commit to the present and celebrate it due to the uncertainness of the future, Steele Commager, “The Function of Wine in Horace’s Odes,” TAPA 88 (1957): 71. Horace speaks only of Maecenas with tender affection: Ode 3.16.20, with the possible exception of Epod. 3, where he playfully criticizes Maecenas’ sexual appetite and Ode 3.19.1, a criticism of the extravagance that we know Maecenas to enjoy. A celebration of Maecenas’ birthday with poetry and divine blessings, which the poet honors almost more than his own, Ode 4.11. Support and praise for Maecenas’ military valor and a vow to support him, Epod. 1 and 9.

cum lamentamur non apprare labores
nosotros et tuni deducta poema filo;
cum speramus eo rem venturam ut, simul atque
carmina rescieris nos fingere, commodus ul tuo
arcessas et egere vetes et scribere cogas.

We poets doubtless often do much mischief to our own cause - let me hack at my own vines - when you are anxious or weary and we offer you our book; when we are hurt if a friend has dared to censure a single verse; when, unasked, we turn back to passages already read; when we complain that men loose sight of our labours, and of our poems so finely spun; when we hope it will come to this, that, as soon as you hear we are composing verses, you will go so far as kindly to send for us, banish our poverty, and compel us to write.871

Here Horace describes a literary patron / client relationship. The poet appreciates patronage but shields himself from censure. The reciprocation of patronage is the literary work itself, and the writer is the best person to shape it according to their talents. The writer does desire a patronal relationship, but like a friend seeking a friend, the poet wants the patron to actually enjoy (rather than shape) their literary work for what it is.

Horace’s expresses his independence, by defining the nature of his relationship with his patron. In *Satire* 1.9, Horace praises Maecenas for his literary taste and suggestions that the attention of a man of his stature should not be easily earned: he should not allow just anyone to be a literary client.872 Horace goes on to criticize


872 In this *Satire*, Horace is harassed in the market by a less gifted poet who wishes to be introduced to Maecenas. The pest says that Horace is lucky to have this friendship, which Horace denies in 1.6.52 and 2.6.49 - it is because of Horace’s talent and relationship with the gods combined with Maecenas’ ability to recognize and enjoy such gifts that is the cause of the friendship. Cf., E. Courtney, “Horace and the Pest,” *CJ* (1994): 4f. There is a long tradition of testing a friend before entrusting one’s soul to them, particularly when one is superior to another. Cf., Arist. *Eth. Eud.* 7.1237b.19; 7.12.39a.20; Cic. *Amic.* 63; Sen. *Ep.* 3.2; Plut. *Mor.* 48e-74e (*How To Tell a Flatterer from a Friend*).
Alexander the Great for paying an unskilled poet. Alexander presented money to the poet Chœrilus as a gratia (Ep. 2.1.232) for his poetry, as well as requiring Lyssipus to only cast bronze sculptures of Alexander, and ordering that Apelles paint no one but him. Horace then writes that it is foolish to support ungifted poets because their poems will soon become useless slips of paper (Ep. 2.1.270). Talented poets such as Virgil, Varius, and himself instead should be supported (Ep. 2.1.245-70).

Despite his claim to independence, Horace’s dependence on Maecenas is clearly displayed in the description of his servitude in Satire 1.6.

The critical question then arises, what was the quid pro quo? Horace did not live in Maecenas’ house, nor did he pay him the salutationes in the early morning. But comparison of Satires 2.6, in praise of the Sabine farm, with the earlier city-idyll of 1.6 shows that in time life in Rome became more complicated for the friend of Maecenas. Horace’s days began to be wasted, as he says, in officia, and most of these revolved around Maecenas. He was forced to commute to Rome even in the malarial season, to visit the Esquiline, to carry letters for Maecenas to sign and to perform various other commissions for his patron. He was jostled in the crowded streets, he was pounced upon by ambitious flatterers and envious gossips, and all the time he longed to be back on the Sabine farm. By fulfilling his social duties in the face of these annoying inconveniences, he paid part of his debt. At the same time, however, as he was bitterly satirizing the irritations of the city, he was also endowing Maecenas and his circle with ideal attributes.

Horace eventually received a farm from Maecenas, which provided for some of his needs, but he still was required to serve his friend as a client in the marketplace and morning salute. Furthermore, despite any claim to superiority to his patron, the wealth,

---


status and power clearly elevated Macenas. He writes in *Satire* 6.1, “Though all of the Lydians that are settled in the Tuscan lands none is of nobler birth than you, and though grandsires of yours, on your mother’s and father’s side alike, commanded mighty legions in the days of old, yet you, Maecenas, do not, like most of the world, curl up your nose at men of unknown birth, men like myself, a freedman’s son.”

This separation in status is also evident when Horace refers to Maecenas as *rex paterque* to refer to Maecenas in *Ep.* 1.7.37.

Perhaps late in his career Horace was free from the menial servitude that he resented.

The very intimate connection between Horace and Maecenas is complimented by the Greco-Roman friendship literature. Horace writes that Maecenas is his other half - and this is the very definition of a friend: someone with whom one can share one’s soul.

Horace refers to their relationship as friendship in *Epod.* 1.2; *Serm.* 1.6.50, 53,

---

875 Hor. *Sat.* 1.6.1; cf. 1.1.1. Horace mentions his low status again as he predicts his own immortality in *Ode* 2.20.

876 Juvenal often uses *rex* or *dominus* to refer to patrons, *Sat.* 5.14, 130, 137, 161; 7.45; 10.161. With John E. B. Mayor, *Thirteen Satires of Juvenal* (New York: Macmillan, 1889), 265, we can compare this use of *rex* in Martial 2.18.5-8 and *orbus* in Plin. *Ep.* 4.15.3. Horace is not a burden to Maecenas because he provides reciprocity in friendship and poetry.

877 Richard Saller writes in “Martial on Patronage and Literature,” *CQ* 33, no. 1, 448, that “every time Martial mentions Maecenas as an ideal patron, the reason is that his support gave Horace and Virgil *otium* in the form of an estate large enough to provide an adequate income.” See Mart. 1.107; 8.56; 11.3; 12.4. Francis L. Jones provides an excellent selection of citations from Martial highlighting his aversion to services rendered by clients in “Martial, the Client,” *CJ* (1935): 355.

878 The definition of a friend is being of one mind (*φρονέω*), Hom. *Il.* 4.359-61; it is used as a contrast in 22.262-265; cf., *Odyssey* 6.180-85; 15.195-98; Aristotle, *Eth. Nic.* 1166a “ἐστι γὰρ ὁ φίλος ὄλλος ὁμός,” “for the friend is another self;” cf., Phld. frag. 8; Cic. *De Amic.* 6.1-7.23; Sen. *Ep.* 3; the reason why the flatterer is so dangerous is his counterfeiting such closeness, Plut. *Mor.* 51c; cf., *Alc.* 203c. In a letter to another friend,
There is also a tradition of testing a person’s integrity before entrusting them with intimacy much as a literary patron should test the integrity of a poet’s work before rewarding him with patronage.\textsuperscript{879}

Two applications to 1 Corinthians are apparent. First, the nature of Paul’s apostleship is comparable to poetic inspiration,\textsuperscript{880} in the sense that both the apostle and the poet were allowed the freedom to criticize their patrons because of the nature of the services that they provide. The ideal patronal relationship with the poet allows for some artistic license and freedom, which allows the poet to criticize and attempt to correct their patron’s bad habits which may include complaints concerning the level of support that the patron is giving the client. So Paul can give very high praises to the Corinthian patrons (Stephanas in 1 Cor. 16:15-7; Phoebe in Romans 16:2) while disciplining their beliefs and behaviors along with everyone else (1 Cor. 1:17-31; 2:6-8, 18-20; 4:17-21; 5:1-13; 6:1-11, 19; 10:27; 11:1-16). Paul can also discipline his patrons by declaring his freedom from the usual reciprocity that their gifts entail (1 Cor. 9:1-23). At the same time, poetic inspiration is what the patron values most of all: if the poet is truly inspired, the patron will be immortalized in the client’s writing. In this case, Maecenas and Phoebe got an excellent return on their investments.

he may be referring to himself and Maecenas in a story about a client and a parton, Ep. 1.7.46-95, see especially 75 and 92.

\textsuperscript{879} Arist. \textit{Eth. Eud.} 7.1237b.19; 7.1239a; cf. Phild. frag. 88; Cic. \textit{Amic.} 63; Sen. \textit{Ep.} 3.2; Plut. \textit{Mor.} 49e.

\textsuperscript{880} This description of the nature of Paul’s apostleship is not to the exclusion of Christopher Mount’s notion of Paul’s “spirit possession,” “1 Corinthians 11:3-16,” 313-340.
Secondly, other artistic clients were clamoring for the support of Maecenas, and Horace was quick to attack his competition and urge Maecenas to continue his level of support for the truly talented poet. After discussing this artistic patron/client relationship, I will discuss what patrons said of the institution, and present some expectations and disappointments that patrons and clients had in their “friendships.” I will then discuss how in the first four chapters of 1 Corinthians, Paul defends his apostleship and Gospel against the ideal qualities of the travelling sophist – a person that some philosophically educated women may support if they are impressed with his rhetoric. The sophists worked as public lawyers (using forensic rhetoric),\textsuperscript{881} competed\textsuperscript{882} publically in rhetorical contest for disciples, students, and patronal support, and honors from cities.\textsuperscript{883} I will also examine how Paul positions himself against the sophist, places his knowledge of God outside of philosophical inquiry, and embodies the true nature of the ideal wise-person (a concept that receives more elaboration in chapter seven). However, I will first address the nature of patronage as described by literary patrons themselves.

**The Patrons Speak**

The review of Horace and Maecenas relies mostly on the point of view of the literary client. We are also fortunate enough to have the perspective of literary patrons Cicero and Pliny the Younger. In these two literary patrons, the same pattern emerges as

\textsuperscript{881} Dio Chrys. Or. 8.9; cf., Winter, *After Paul Left Corinth*, 37.


\textsuperscript{883} Winter, *Seek the Welfare of the City*, 26-33. One honor includes a golden crown.
above, but from a different perspective. The patron expects pleasure from the client in the form of a good literary product and provides the usual critical support of gifts, legal protection, and other benefits of friendship.

Cicero defends both the practice of literary patronage and practices it as he defends his client, the gifted poet Archias in his speech *Pro Archia*. In this forensic speech, Cicero defends the Roman citizenship of his friend on the basis of his lineage and inspiration as a poet.

Qua re quis tandem me reprehendat, aut quis mihi iure suscenseat, si, quantum ceteris ad suas res obeundas, quantum ad festos dies ludorum celebrandos, quantum ad alias voluptates et ad ipsum requiem animi et corporis conceditur temporum, quantum aliis tribuunt tempestivis conviviis, quantum denique alveolo, quantum pilae, tantum mihi egomet ad haec studia recolenda sumpsero? Atque hoc ideo mihi concedendum est magis, quod ex his studiis haec quoque crescit oratio et facultas; quae, quantacumque in me est, numquam amicorum periculis defuit. Quae si cui levior videtur, illa quidem certe, quae summa sunt, ex quo fonte hauriam sentio. Nam nisi multorum praeceptis multisque litteris mihi ab adulescentia suasissem, nihil esse in vita magno opere expetendum nisi laudem atque honestatem, in ea autem persequendae omnis cruciatus corporis, omnia pericula mortis atque exsilii parvi esse ducenda, numquam me pro salute vestra in tot ac tantas dimicationes atque in hos profligatorum hominum cotidianos impetus obiecisse. Sed pleni omnes sunt libri, plenae sapientium voces, plena exemplorum vetustas: quae iacerent in tenebris omnia, nisi litterarum lumen accederet.

How then can I justly be blamed or censured, if it shall be found that I have devoted to literature a portion of my leisure hours no longer than others without blame devote to the pursuit of material gain, to the celebration of festivals or games, to pleasure and the repose of mind and body, to protracted banqueting, or perhaps to the gaming board or to ball-playing? I have the better right to indulgence herein, because my devotion to letters strengthens my oratorical powers, and these, such as they are, have never failed my friends in their hour of peril. Yet insignificant though these powers seem to be, I fully realize from what source I draw all that is highest in them. Had I not persuaded myself from my

---

884 Martial likewise needed defense, but for a different reason: poets published works in his name; see 7.72.12-16. Saller, “Martial,” 247.

youth up, thanks to the moral lessons derived from a wide reading, that nothing is to be greatly sought after in this life save glory and honour, and that in their quest all bodily pains and dangers of death or exile should be lightly accounted, I should never have borne for the safety of you all the brunt of many a bitter encounter, or bared my breast to the daily onsets of abandoned persons. All literature, all philosophy, all history, all abounds with incentives to noble action which would be buried in black darkness were the light of the written word not flashed upon them.\footnote{\textit{Cic. Arch.} 6.13-14.}

In his apology for literary patronage, he emphasizes the practical nature of the Roman interest in moral lessons. Cicero claims that people do not criticize each other for supporting ventures from which they enjoy some type of material gain. No one can look down on his support of the arts which produces an abundance of virtue. Cicero goes on to write that there is no shame in supporting an inspired poet because engaging in literary study and its moral lessons shaped and strengthened him for his successful career. Cicero therefore supports literacy due to its moral value while defending his participation in literary patronage as well as encouraging his audience to do the same.

\textit{Quae vero accurate cogitateque scripsisset, ea sic vidi probari, ut ad veterum scriptorum laudem perveniret. Hunc go non diligam, non admirer, non omni ratione defendendum putem? Atqui sic a summis hominibus eruditissimisqu accepimus, ceterarum rerum studia et doctrina et praeceptis et arte constare, poëtam natura ipsa valere et mentis viribus excitari et quasi divino quodam spiritu inflari.}

To his finished and studied work I have known such approval accorded that his glory rivalled that of the great writers of antiquity. Does not such a man deserve my affection and admiration? Should I not count it my duty to strain every nerve in his defense? And yet we have it on the highest and most learned authority that while other arts are matters of science and formula and technique, poetry depends solely upon an inborn faculty, is evoked by a purely mental activity, and is infused with a strange supernatural inspiration.\footnote{\textit{Cic. Arch.} 8.18. Perhaps Cicero is referring to Plato or Aristotle’s views on poetic inspiration.}
Inspiration of the poet is evident in the quality of the work and not in an experiential affirmation of divine presence when reading the poetry. Incidentally, the quality of the poetry is what gives it enduring life and therefore immortality to the patrons who support it. Because of the inspired work that Archia in particular has produced, Cicero feels obliged to defend him:

Sit igitur, iudices, sanctum apud vos, humanissimos homiens, hoc poëtae nomen, quod nulla umquam barbaria violavit. Saxa et solitudines voci respondent, bestiae saepe immanes cantu flectuntur atque consistunt: nos institui rebus optimis non poëtarum voce moveamur?

Holy then, [ladies and] gentlemen, in your eyes let the name of the poet be, inviolate hitherto by the most benighted of races! The very rocks of the wilderness give back a sympathetic echo to the voice; savage beasts have sometimes been charmed into stillness by song; and shall we, who are nurtured upon all that is highest, be deaf to the appeal of poetry? 888

Cicero goes on to submit that poets should be called “sanctum,” holy because of their special relationship with God.

Cicero reasons that while many potential patrons have the desire to study for themselves, not everyone is gifted with poetic inspiration. 889 “Quod si ipsi haec neque attingere neque sensu nostro gustare possemus, tamen ea mirari deberemus, etiam quum in aliis videremus,” “But it may happen that we ourselves were without literary tastes or attainments; yet even so, it would be incumbent on ourselves to reverence their

888 Cic. Arch. 8.19.
889 Cicero, like Maecenas after him, not only enjoyed poetry but dabbled in it a bit himself. If Cicero could claim divine inspiration for himself, other writers did not attribute it to him. Cf. Cic. Div. 1.17-22. Plutarch writes, “His fame for oratory abides to this day, although there have been great innovations in style; but his poetry, since many gifted poets have followed him, has altogether fallen into neglect and disrepute,” Cicero 2.4. Cf. John Spaeth, “Cicero the Poet,” CJ (1931): 500, and the many more contemporary references, 510. An analysis of the literary activity of Maecenas is available in Dalzell, “Maecenas,” 157.
manifestation in others." As a literary patron, Cicero longed for a poet to immortalize his consulship in Rome in 63 BCE - something that he ended up doing himself in Greek. Cicero comments on the eternal reward for such patronage: “Neque enim quisquam est tam aversus a Musis qui non mandari versibus aeternum suorum laborum facile praeconium patiatur,” “For indeed that is no man to whom the Muses are so distasteful that he will not be glad to entrust to poetry the eternal emblazonment of his achievements.”

In a letter to his friend Cornelius Priscus (dated around 104 CE), the younger Pliny writes of an exchange with Martial. In exchange for Martial’s verses, Pliny funds his journey from Rome to Bilbilis in Spain. Even after Martial’s death, Pliny shows off his prize to another friend and reasons:

Meritone eum qui haec de me scripsit et tunc dimisi amicissime et nunc ut amicissimum defunctum esse doleo? Dedit enim mihi quantum maximum potuit, daturus amplius si potuisset. Tamestsi quid homini potest dari maius, quam gloria et laus et aeternitas? At non erunt aeterna quae scripsit: non erunt fortasse, ille tamen scriptsit tamquam essent futura.

Was I right then to part on such friendly terms from the author of these verses about me? Am I right to mourn his death of one of my dearest friends? He gave me of his best, and would have given me more had he been able, though surely nothing

890 Cic. Arch. 7.17.

891 Cic. Att. 1.19.10; and in 2.1.1 he confesses that the poem is rather amateurish. Cf., Spaeth, “Cicero the Poet,” 507.

892 Cic. Arch. 9.19; Cf. 9.22 and 26, where Cicero claims that Metellus sought to have his deeds immortalized by Archias.

more can be given to a man than a tribute which will bring him fame and immortality. You may object that his verses will not be immortal; perhaps not, but he wrote them with that intention.\textsuperscript{894}

Pliny supposes that since Martial wrote verses about him with the intent that the words last forever, Martial was reciprocating Pliny’s patronage adequately.\textsuperscript{895} Of course, Pliny knew that Martial was quite talented and his verses would most likely endure, and he made certain of that because he published it in his own epistles. Martial’s gift was nothing less than an invocation for the Muse to approach Pliny’s house on the Esquiline with respect:

\begin{verbatim}
Sed ne tempore non tuo desertam
pulses ebria ianaum, videto.
Totos dat tetricae dies Minervae,
dum centum studet auribus virorum
hoc, quod saecula posterique possint
Arpinis quoque comparare chartis.
Seras tutor ibis ad lucernas:
haec hora est tua, cum furit Lyaeus,
cum regnat rosa, cum madent capilli.
Tunc me vel rigidi legant Catones.
\end{verbatim}

But take heed you give no drunken knock on Eloquence’s [Pliny’s] door at a time that is not yours; all the day he devotes to serious study, while he prepares for the ears of the Hundred Court that which time and posterity may compare even with Arpinum’s [Cicero’s] pages. Safer will you go at the time of the late-kindled lamps; that hour is yours when Lyaeus is in revel, when the rose is queen, when locks are drenched. Then let even unbending Catos read me.\textsuperscript{896}

\textsuperscript{894} Plin. Ep. 3.21 (Radice, LCL). Peter White in his, “Amicitia and the Profession of Poetry in Early Imperial Rome,” JRS 68 (1978): 84, notes that Martial receives less attention than other necrologies; compare Silius Italicus in 3.7 and Domitius Tullus in 8.18.

\textsuperscript{895} John Garthwaite, “Patronage and Poetic Immortality in Martial, Book 9,” Mnemosyne, 4\textsuperscript{th} ser. 51, no. 2 (1998): 161-175.

\textsuperscript{896} Mart. 10.19 (Bailey, LCL). Pliny is also favorably mentioned in 5.81.13 and 7.84.1
We should note that Pliny was not interested in an ongoing relationship with Martial - he simply recognized the poet’s ability to write and paid him for a poem that honored him.\textsuperscript{897}

**Expectations and Disappointments**

From his philosophically educated patronesses,\textsuperscript{898} Paul would expect one simple thing first: faithfulness to himself and his teachings before any other teacher or philosophical idea. Faithfulness to Paul’s message and specific imitation of his character are a major theme in 1 Corinthians (1 Cor 4:16; 11:1) and in the other undisputed epistles.\textsuperscript{899} This imitation is a direct result of receiving Paul as an apostle who gives the words of God (1 Cor 4:15).\textsuperscript{900} If the audience is faithful to Paul’s message, then it is

\textsuperscript{897} There are some other letters of Pliny that tell us of the patron’s interpretation of his role. Pliny knew of Cicero’s generosity in supporting poetry and he committed himself to the criticism of a friend’s poetry (3.15). Pliny exchanged his works with Cornelius Tacitus, whom he considered to be his friend and social equal, so that they could critique one another’s work (7.20 and 6.6.3). Pliny also passes literary works on to his friends (1.16 and 4.27.5).

\textsuperscript{898} As indicated above, I will be exploring the most likely candidates for a philosophical education: the wealthy widow. Certainly such women (wealthy widows) existed in the Pauline community at Corinth. My research affirms that women of a variety of social status could have received a philosophical education: women with philosophers in the immediate family who may or may not be attached to a wealthy household. This would include wives and slaves of philosophers. At the same time, however, the overwhelming amount of existing evidence speaks to women of higher status.

\textsuperscript{899} 1 Thess. 1:5-6; 2:14-16; Gal. 4:12; Phil. 3:17; 4:9

\textsuperscript{900} See also 1 Thess. 1:5; Gal. 4:13-14; Phil. 3:1-16 and Benjamin Fiore, “Paul, Exemplification, and Imitation,” in *Paul in the Greco-Roman World*, ed. J. Paul Sampley (New York: Trinity, 2003), 240.
evidence that Paul did not do this work in vain (κενός in 1 Cor 15.10). In all of these instances, Paul is addressing the entire audience, motivated by a variety of reasons to reaffirm the nature of his apostleship so as to obligate his hearers to do what he wants them to do. Paul’s insistence on faithfulness rather than personal benefits (1 Cor. 4:12-3), like attaching himself to a household, likely caused some confusion and frustration from the wealthier people in the community who felt obligated to reciprocate his ministries (1 Cor. 9:12).

Despite his refusal to participate in personal patronage, Paul did expect critical benefits from people of higher status, and philosophically educated women would be connected to wealth in some way, whether directly or by means of influence within their household. Monetary gifts to the churches, defense in court, providing a place for the church to meet, and exchanging and reading his letters to the churches are benefits that would normally require higher class benefactors.

Another benefit that Paul expected from higher status community members was the facilitation of letter exchange, which a philosophically educated woman could frustrate if she were unhappy with its content. There is one such exchange in the New Testament: the churches of Colossae and Laodicea were instructed to circulate their

---

901 Cf., κενός in 1 Thess. 2.1; Phil. 2.16 and εἰκόνιον in Gal. 4.11.

902 Hock, Tentmaking, 65. Because Paul did not attach himself to a household, he may have encountered resistance, frustration, or confusion; Chow, Patronage and Power, 109.

903 Jewett, “Phoebe,” 152.

epistles (Col. 4:16), a role that Horace expected from his patron Maecenas and that Cicero and Pliny practiced. Nympha was perhaps responsible for having it read in Laodicea, providing a house in which the church met (Col. 4:15). Paul expected the largest audience possible for all of his letters, consistently addressing the widest cross-section of potential hearers within the churches. This is significant because the epistle, with its thanksgivings, blessings, praises, and curses, would be read aloud repeatedly to the largest audiences possible, which greatly enhances the power and severity of both positive and negative speech.

One source of the fragility between Paul and a philosophically educated patroness would be the confusing and non-standardized methods of ascertaining a fictional equality of status. In the Roman world, the patron is always superior, but the patron/client relationship can express the superiority of the client by means of virtue and the patron by means of service. Because of this dynamic, the ancients could describe the patron/client relationship as “friendship.” Aristotle theorizes that friendship only exists between equals, but superiors and inferiors can compensate the difference in status. In order for “true” friendship between unequals to occur, fictive equality must be established, and an inferior can rise to the status of the superior on the basis of the inferior’s goodness.

905 Hor. Ep. 2.1.245-70.
909 This can be seen in the claims of certain poets or philosophers as rising to the status of their patrons, kings, or gods on the basis of their relationship or commission by the god(s) or muse(s).
So if there is any inequality, as there is between a god and a human being or a ruler and a subject, the inferior one compensates for inferiority by honoring the superior. The superior then reciprocates the honor received by giving a benefit that she reckons equal to the honor received. There is no set scale by which a person can determine proportional equity, which will cause disruption in friendships and perhaps even lawsuits if the persons involved do not base their relationship on goodness.910

Paul’s calling as teacher/apostle – at least in his mind - set him in a higher status than anyone in the church: he is uniquely called by God to do everything that he does (sometimes one gets the feeling that Paul is making it up as he goes along). This unique calling is emphasized especially in his record of his divine calling and subsequent correction of Peter in Galatians,911 the patterning of his self-description after the Christ-hymn in Philippians,912 and his consistent self-sufficiency.913 Paul often compensates for

910 Arist. Eth. Eud. 7.1243b.25 and following. Occasionally, the reciprocal relationship may be violated - especially when monetary transactions are involved, and friends may sue one another in court. The moral way to resolve a conflict, according to Aristotle, is to solve issues voluntarily instead of in a court of law, Eth. Eud. 7.1243a.7-14.


913 According to Malherbe’s analysis, Paul associates himself with the Cynic ideal philosopher in both 1 Thess 2 and in Phil 4. Cf., Malherbe, “Gentle as a Nurse,” 203-17; Malherbe “Paul’s Self-Sufficiency,” 125-39.
his assertions of superiority\textsuperscript{914} with terms like co-worker (1 Cor. 3:9; 2 Cor. 1:24), co-prisoner (Rom. 16:7),\textsuperscript{915} and king (1 Cor. 4:8) by honoring and praising the community and individuals who would otherwise be disqualified for friendship due to inequality. In 1 Cor. 3:9, Paul equates himself with Apollos as co-workers of God, so that there can be unity between those who claim to follow both teachers. Paul humbles himself to the level of Andronicus and Junia, his fellow-prisoners in Romans 16:7. Elsewhere, Paul uses βασιλεύω similarly to rex, the client’s word for a rich patron (1 Cor. 4:8).\textsuperscript{916} Similarly, Paul humbles himself by referencing his voluntary poverty, compensating for the inferiority of his patrons (their wealth has made them inferior to Paul because they have become proud and indulgent) and general audience (1 Cor. 4:9-13).\textsuperscript{917} Because Paul compensates for his superiority by referencing the foolishness of his Gospel and the sufferings that he has to endure, he is able to practice corrective speech, frankness that is only possible after friendship is established. Paul reminds the Corinthians of his established friendship with them by referencing his previous visits. Paul’s frank, corrective speech manifests itself in his disapproval of their human wisdom (1 Cor. 1:17-18).

\textsuperscript{914} Joubert, Paul as Benefactor, 216; 162.

\textsuperscript{915} Cf., Col. 4:10 and Phlm. 23.


\textsuperscript{917} Hock, Tentmaking, 60; Harrison, Paul’s Language of Grace, 325. His self-description as a slave of Christ fits here as well, Joubert, Paul as Benefactor, 81.
moral failures (1 Cor. 5:1-5; 6:1-11), disunity (1 Cor. 1:10-16; 3:3-4 11:17-20), and the inferiority of their calling (1 Cor. 1:16-9). Paul will always be superior to the community by way of his calling as apostle (2:12-16; 3:10; 4:9-13; 9:1-27). It is these issues that Paul addresses with corrective, frank speech.

To understand better Paul’s use of frank speech, the corrective words of a friend, we must look to the writings of his contemporaries. The most useful insights into frank/corrective speech are in the fragments of Philodemus’s Περὶ παρρησίας and Plutarch’s How to Tell a Flatterer from a Friend. These documents demonstrate without doubt that frank speech is corrective speech. Because false friends of inferior status or character could compensate for their inferiority by flattering/praising/honoring their superiors, and indeed many people of superior status enjoyed this attention, the moralists taught that the true character of a friend was corrective speech. And in this spirit of correction, school, kinship and medical terms are often used.

The fragments of Philodemus preserve for us the remains of the only known work by any author entitled Περὶ παρρησίας (Concerning Frank Speech).

\[
\tau\nu\nu \gamma\alpha\rho \acute{\alpha}g\alpha\theta\dot{\omega}\sigma[n \acute{e}n\acute{e}k\acute{a} \mu\acute{e}t\acute{a}p\acute{o}i\acute{m}e\sigma[m\u\acute{e}n]\nu \acute{\omicron}\acute{i}\lambda\acute{\alpha} < i > \acute{g}\nu\nu\nu[\mu\acute{e}n\nu]\nu \acute{\phi}\acute{i}\acute{l}[\omega]\nu \tau\acute{r}\acute{p}\acute{o}n\nu \acute{i} di \acute{\acute{g}}\acute{a}g\acute{\acute{a}}\theta\acute{i}\acute{\omega}\nu, \pi\acute{\omega}\acute{\omega} \acute{\acute{o}}\acute{\acute{u}}\acute{\acute{c}}\acute{\acute{i}} \acute{\acute{k}}\acute{a}i \tau\nu\nu \acute{\kappa}\acute{k}\acute{\kappa}\acute{\omega}\nu; \acute{\omega}\acute{\omega} \gamma\acute{\alpha}r \acute{\acute{e}}\acute{\acute{v}}\acute{i}\acute{\acute{\acute{e}}w}n,\]
\]


919 Philodemus uses medical terminology in frag. 63, 64, 69, and 67; cf., Plut. Mor. 69c-e.
ou̱tɔ́  kάi  τόυτων  προσήκει  συνπαθίας  χάριν,  δι'  ἦν  βοήθουμεθα.  καὶ  γὰρ  ἔ Ῥ
μεν  ἔστι  παράρρησιάς  μείναι  ἐπὶ  τῶν  αὐτῶν,  ἐι  μηθέν  ἐξε[15],  σωσ[ε15]  ἀνδ[ρα  φίλου]

...<[for, on account] of {our} good qualities, we shall [reform the] character of [friends]> as it will come to be <by means of {our} conversation>. But if {on account} of [{our} good {qualities}], how not also of {our} bad ones? For, just as it is suitable on account of the good cheer of the former, so too is thanks to sympathy for the latter, through which we are helped. <For in fact if it is possible for you, having spoken frankly, to stay in the same {condition} - if you withhold nothing - [you will] save a man [who is a friend]>...920

Sharp frank speech may offend (frag. 60) because it could appear to be an insult. Frank speech properly applied is like the work of a doctor (frag. 63, 64, 69, cf., 67; cf., Plutarch Mor. 66a) - a metaphor that Philodemus uses both positively and negatively. Many of Philodemus’s fragments are in the context of the wise-person correcting students or the general public with the proper use of frank speech. Paul’s frank speech in 1 Corinthians could certainly be taken as insults: their inability to unify (1 Cor. 1:10-3), Paul had to feed them ‘milk’ due to their immaturity (3:1-4), they did not have the foresight to handle judgment properly (5:1-5; 6:1-11), and had disunity in worship (11:17-34). Like Philodemus (On Frank Criticism XXIa), Paul states that is not his intention to offend and grieves over the possible strain that his corrective speech would put on their relationship (7:8-9). It may be painful, like a medical procedure, but frank speech is intended to improve one’s friend (Plut. Mor. 51c; Phld. frag. 32, col. 17b; Dio Chrys. Or. 32.5, 7, 11).921

920 Phld. frag. 43.

So far in this chapter, I have examined philosophical patronage, the question of patronage in 1 Corinthians, the possibility of wealthy members of the Pauline community in Corinth, and the similarities of the literary patron/client relationship and what that could mean for Paul’s interaction with his wealthy supporters. Most philosophers in the Roman period participated in patronage relationships (whether or not they praised the institution itself), and many patrons and patronesses enjoyed supporting them. Supporting philosophy was one of the means by which a wealthy woman could secure a philosophical education for herself and her children. Some of the members of the Pauline community – both named and unnamed - could have had some wealth and supported their artistic/philosophical interests as well as Paul and the church as they would a voluntary association or a philosophical school. Literary/artistic clients enjoyed some measure of artistic freedom: philosophers, poets, rhetors, and other artists were somewhat free to criticize their patrons and even show contempt for the patron/client relationship in general. This is important for Pauline studies because while he claims to be completely self-reliant, he may indeed participate in some informal reciprocal relationship with a wealthy member of the Corinthian community.\(^{922}\)

All of this is meant to bring two characters into focus: Sophia and Fortuna, philosophically educated women who read 1 Corinthians from their unique point of view. Both are wealthy, widowed, and have the broad philosophical education of a woman who has participated in many philosophical discussions in her home. These women represent the most likely type of philosophically educated women that Paul would encounter in

\(^{922}\) I have no interest here in describing the Christ cult as an artistic movement, but merely to show how a client can lay claim to freedom to criticise their patron and the patronage system while participating in patron/client relationships.
first-century Corinth. The wealthier widows had more control of their own property and therefore were able to support and bring philosophers and thinkers into their home as they pleased, and when they encountered Paul they evaluated him based on their philosophical preference and possibly even on the opportunity to secure or improve their standing with their friends. Because these women are wealthy, there is much at stake for Paul. It is in his best interest to persuade them without alienating them or otherwise frustrating their sympathies. With that being said, we are ready to begin reading 1 Corinthians with two philosophically educated women.

**Reading 1 Corinthians 1-4 with Sophia and Fortuna**

In the following section, we will read 1 Corinthians chapters 1-4 with two philosophically educated women. This specific type of woman is a wealthy patroness of the church who was fortunate enough to be familiar with the popular philosophical schools of her day. Wealthier women were much more likely to be educated and financially able to pursue their philosophical interests, which could be quite broad. At the same time, there are simply too many known and unknown variables to anticipate exactly how a given person would read a text, because a person can inexplicably choose to break conventions at any time. For example, a woman educated by an Epicurean could choose to break away from the basic tenants of Epicureanism when she hears Paul’s epistle read to the church. A Stoic could suddenly turn neo-Pythagorean or Platonist, and then inexplicably accept Paul’s teaching at the same time. But our philosophically

---

923 For rhetorical devices in these chapters, see Benjamin Fiore, “‘Covert Allusion’ in 1 Corinthians 1-4,” *CBQ* 47 no. 1 (1985): 85-102.
educated women, having a broad philosophical experience and no commitment to a specific school, interact with Paul from this liberal perspective, valuing Paul according to these interests.

Another element that should be discussed at the outset is the method of reading.

We will read 1 Corinthians in a somewhat strict canonical order, the divisions being 1:18-2:5; 2:6-3:4; 3:5-4:5; 4:6-21. That is, modern interpreters read 1 Corinthians 1-4 with the entire Corinthian correspondence in mind, sometimes in a highly creative chronological order, with the various interpretative tools in mind such as textual criticism, letter form, rhetorical criticism, etc. We will read 1 Corinthians 1-4 with philosophically educated women as they would have heard the epistle being read for the first time, trying to understand with each woman the meaning as she would have heard it from her various contexts.

There are, of course, limits to this discussion. Like all other dissertations, this work will not be many more things than it is. Most importantly, this dissertation will not be written from the perspective of Antoinette Wire: she addresses women prophets who are of low social status, and I am examining women philosophically educated women of higher status, so my interpretations will start from these points of departure. My work does not seek to correct or challenge Wire’s work, but to offer a complimentary study that focuses on two wealthy philosophically educated women rather than a group of

---


925 See above, chapter 1.
poor women prophets. There were few people in the Corinthian community who were the same status as Sophia and Fortuna, which is why I am not arguing that philosophically educated women were some kind of dynamic group like Wire’s women prophets. While it is entirely possible that some of the Corinthian women prophets were philosophically educated because such education was available to women of lower status, this dissertation will focus on wealthier women because most of the evidence for philosophically educated women is concentrated on higher status women. Because Wire’s work and my own both address women in the Corinthian community, there is significant overlap in the texts that we interpret. However, we should expect that philosophically educated women and Wire’s women prophets would experience the text in quite different ways.

Another significant limitation is the subjectivity of the interpreter, myself. I can attempt to set aside myself and my contexts as far as possible to try and understand the world of the Corinthian church using the fragmentary evidence from the past, but I will always be present in an alien culture with everything that defines me as a person and a scholar. I cannot stop being a 21st century male, indoctrinated my entire life by the ideals of my cultures, and educated in religion and historical methods for my entire adult life. While I imagine the past, the positive and negative elements of my contexts will always be either in the foreground or background. So my subjectivity is defined by my limited understanding of myself and my contexts: I do not assume that I can know myself well enough to proclaim a grasp of positive knowledge, especially of people of the past. However, having observed the philosophical education of women in the ancient world the best that I can, it is appropriate to apply that knowledge to similar women in the
Corinthian community and how they would interpret the New Testament. An important underlying interpretative theory behind this work is an awareness that the author exists only in his present contexts, and any access that the author has to his subject is provided by a wide range of ancient and modern primary and secondary sources.

Because there is no record of philosophically educated women reading the New Testament, if we want to read 1 Corinthians with them, we must use some historical imagination. It is historically plausible that there were such women in the church – they simply need to be brought to the foreground with a reading that is as true as possible to their historical contexts. The following sections will not be a full exegesis of 1 Corinthians, but an imaginative exploration of how a specific type of woman would read certain portions of the text which might apply or appeal to, puzzle, or offend her because of her education and social status. I will attempt to read selections from 1 Corinthians from the perspectives of two hypothetical philosophically educated women: Sophia and Fortuna. I have constructed these perspectives by situating them in the context of ancient education (connection to a wealthy household), the schools with traditions of women in philosophy and the social status that are associated with Corinth (neo-Pythagoreans, Stoics, Cynics, Epicureans, and (middle-) Platonism), and read 1 Corinthians from that location.

Amidst all uncertainties, I am constructing two specific women, using the evidence gathered in the first four and a half chapters of this dissertation. I have written above that a philosophically educated woman is a woman who has come into contact with enough philosophical teaching from any school to identify and interact with components of 1 Corinthians which have points of connection with Greco-Roman philosophy. This
woman does not have to adhere to a particular school or even remember everything that she learned from her teachers or friends (or whatever circumstance that she came in contact with philosophy). Because a philosophically educated woman would typically have been connected to a wealthy household or be wealthy herself, we will read 1 Corinthians with a wealthy woman who has broad intellectual interests like Julia Domna and can give patronal support for the Paul and the church, like Phoebe. We will look at 1 Corinthians 1-4 with two hypothetical patronesses. Our first philosophically educated woman will be named Sophia, who is generally sympathetic to Paul’s message. Alongside Sophia, we will read with Fortuna, a philosophically educated woman who is generally unsympathetic to Paul’s message. Both Sophia and Fortuna are best described as “municipal elites” in Bruce Longnecker’s scale, which includes most decurial families, wealthy men and women who do not hold office, and some freedpersons, retainers, veterans, and merchants. I refer to Sophia and Fortuna as “wealthier,” “wealthy,” or of “higher status” with respect to their status relative to most other members of the church, who were ES 5, 6, and 7 (just above, at, and below sustenance level). Paul was most likely from the “municipal elite” before he willingly (to serve as an apostle) or unwillingly (because he served as an apostle) lost his status. The similar backgrounds of Paul, Sophia, and Fortuna facilitate an environment for understanding, particularly regarding Paul’s usage of popular philosophy and patron/client relationships.

---


Like other literary clients, Paul appears indifferent to personal patronal support; however, patronage was needed for the church to thrive in Corinth and wealthier women were active in the community. Eager to participate in or support the latest artistic/intellectual trend, the patroness was financially able to support both Paul and his opponents. But the pressure to keep the support secure was evidently too much for Paul to bear: he could no longer risk losing support due to the threat of his opponents, who his patronesses could chose to exclusively support at any time.

In 1 Corinthians 1-4, Paul gets right to the point and distinguishes himself from his perceived competition by elevating himself and his message far beyond what a mere sophist\(^{928}\) or wise-person could do.\(^{929}\) Paul begins by distinguishing himself as the apostle called by God.\(^{930}\) Paul was sent by Christ to preach the good news as opposed to sophistic discourse (1 Cor. 1:17), he is the founder of the church in Corinth (1 Cor. 3:5, 10, 9:1) and as the apostle, he has the highest calling in the church (1 Cor. 12:28). Furthermore, Paul renounces his right as apostle to payment (and his sophist opponents

---

\(^{928}\) Timothy H. Lim notes the lack of clarity here: a ‘sophist’ can be either a professional speaker or one who picked up the sensibilities of a travelling orator, “Not in Persuasive Words of Wisdom, but in the Demonstration of the Spirit and Power,” *NovT* 29 no. 2 (1987): 145. What is not in dispute is that Paul’s opponents did embrace sophistic tendancies, however they came by them.


Paul therefore never demands payment for himself, but he does expect wealthier members of the community to support the church, providing a place for the church to meet, monetary gifts, and legal protection. Positioning himself against his opponents, Paul asserts that the God who called him to be an apostle, has made the wise foolish. These comments are directed specifically toward his opponents and address whatever views they may have held, and make no comment on any other school or beliefs, regardless of who holds them. That is, a sympathetic philosophically educated woman may well hold to the same teachings that Paul opposes, but in courting her favor Paul feels it necessary to distinguish himself from other sophists in the church. An unsympathetic philosophically educated woman would be constantly frustrated throughout the first four chapters of 1 Corinthians, particularly by Paul’s artificial separation of the wisdom that she identifies with and his divine wisdom.

Both Sophia and Fortuna were initially attracted to Paul because of the theology of freedom embodied in his message of the cross. Paul’s teachings concerning the cross were liberating both in theological and social dimensions. Through the cross, God brought all people to the same fictive social level, and freed everyone – male and female, rich and poor, Greek and Jew, powerful and powerless, educated and illiterate – to

---


932 See above, n. 94.


experience God and the community without normative social constraints (at least in theory). Paul embraced what may have already been a familiar social message in some voluntary associations: that within the community, social patterns can be reversed or achieve a kind of fictive equality. Paul’s teachings on this concept, however, were a bit more aggressive and comprehensive than other *collegia*. The difference between Paul’s community and other voluntary associations and religious cults in Corinth was that it was more open to the public participation of women who were not priestesses.

Following the pattern of self-sacrificing love exemplified in the cross, Sophia and Fortuna expressed their freedom by participating with other men and women in worship, prophesy, hosting meals, supporting the church financially, engaging in intellectual

---

935 A list of members in a cultic association in Attica (135 BCE?) includes men, women, and slaves of different social status. John S. Kloppenborg and Richard Ascough, *Greco-Roman Associations: Texts, Translations, and Commentary: I Attica, Central Greece, Macedonia, Thrace* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011), no. 40 = IG II² 2358; cf., no. 43, 52, 53, 68, and 72. There was a household-based association led by a certain Dionysios, who established rules for the association that allowed for the participation of “men, women, free people and slaves,” ILYdiaKP III 18 = SIG³ 985. For notes and bibliography, see Philip Harland, *Associations, Synagogues, and Congregations: Claiming a Place in Ancient Mediterranean Society* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003), 30-1. For more on gender and social rank in the associations, see Richard S. Ascough, *Paul’s Macedonian Associations*, WUNT 2.161 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 47-59.


937 *ILS* 4203 and 4215 (slave and free). R. H. Barrow does argue that most slaves only participated in the collegia that consisted of slaves and freedpersons, *Slavery in the Roman Empire*, 166.

interests, and by means of their philosophical education choose for themselves how to interpret Paul’s teachings concerning patronage, instructions regarding marriage and divorce, and the *agon* motif.

Reading 1 Cor. 1:18-2:5 with Sophia

In this section and throughout chapters 1-4, Paul distinguishes himself from his opponents, “those of Apollos.”939 These “opponents” may well only be opponents to Paul in his mind and not aware that their thinking and practices go against Paul’s teaching. Paul’s critique of *sophia* in 1 Cor. 1:18-31 goes directly against many common sophistic and philosophical ideals concerning wisdom, but that does not need to complicate his relationship with a philosophically educated patroness such as Sophia, who sees little difference between her wisdom and Paul’s divine wisdom.940 Paul declares that human wisdom941 ("wisdom of the world,” σοφίαν τοῦ κόσμου) is

939 Joop F. M. Smit argues that chapters 1-4 are a coherent unit based on their syntax, semantics, and pragmatics, and that Paul is defending himself against the opinions that the followers of Apollos had of him, “‘What is Apollos? What is Paul?’ in Search for the Coherence of First Corinthians 1:10-4:21,” *NovT* 44 no. 3 (2002): 231-251; Morton Smith, “Paul’s Arguments as Evidence of the Christianity from Which He Diverged,” *HTR* 79, no. 1/3 (1986): 255; cf., Mihaila, *The Paul-Apollos Relationship*, 181-212.


insufficient for the knowledge of God (1 Cor. 1:18-19). Moreover, it is something that God destroys and confuses (1 Cor. 1:19-20). Paul goes on to assert that God’s wisdom is different from this human wisdom (1 Cor. 1:21) and human wisdom approaches Paul’s message as foolishness (1 Cor. 1:18, 1:23). Furthermore, the lowly things of the world will shame the wise (1 Cor. 1:27). This Christ whose message and work appear foolish is actually the wisdom of God (1 Cor. 1:30). Paul specifically identifies this wisdom as Greek wisdom ("Ελληνες σοφίαν ζητοῦν; the Greeks seek wisdom) with a phrase that encompasses not only the sophists but the popular philosophies that also have a distinct Greek heritage and hold similar values. 

Despite his critique of human wisdom, Paul nevertheless plays on what a philosophically educated patroness like Sophia would expect from him. The reciprocal relationship would be something like this: Sophia would give Paul and/or his opponents substantial support for substantial teaching. There would be great reward if the teaching is received as substantial, inspired, or if the patroness is convinced that the teaching will memorialize her gift in perpetuity. In chapters 1-4, Paul makes it clear that he can


accomplish exactly that, and his opponents cannot, no matter how learned or eloquent they are (1 Cor. 1:17-21).

In chapter 2:1-5 (and beyond), Paul continues his contrast between human wisdom and divine wisdom. Paul appeals to his previous visit with the Corinthian community: originally Paul proclaimed “the testimony of God” without lofty speech or wisdom (1 Cor. 2:1). Evidently, he did impress Sophia and Fortuna with his presentation of his Gospel in spite of whatever sympathies they had with sophism or popular moral philosophy. Again Paul alludes to the cross of Christ, putting it in opposition to the “lofty speech and wisdom,” which Paul perceives or characterizes that his audience views as “strength.” The repeated appeal to the cross and knowing God through this divine foolishness may simply be a repeat of what Paul taught to Sophia and Fortuna in the first place, so his appeal to this original teaching that attracted them to the church is not so shocking as it would be if they heard this message for the first time upon hearing the epistle.⁹⁴⁵ In his opinion, Paul’s original message of the cross was delivered to the Corinthians in weakness, fear, and trembling instead of the strong, forceful, and convincing rhetoric of the sophist or moral philosopher who sought wealth, power, or disciples. This means that Paul is distinguishing himself from a certain type of rhetor that the Corinthians knew well: one that used his/her power of speech for wealth and fame. Paul’s speech and message was not in “plausible words of wisdom, but as he says,

---

in the demonstration of the Spirit and power - so that their faith might not rest in human wisdom but in the power of God.\footnote{A. van Roon, “Relation between Christ and the Wisdom of God according to Paul,” \textit{NovT} 16 no. 3 (1974): 207-239.}

Because of the dynamics of a literary/artistic patron/client relationship, Sophia would be able, and possibly willing, to lend support to both Paul and his opponents. When Paul discusses σοφία and the nature of God in 1 Cor. 1:18-31, Sophia’s philosophical education would not be threatened but reinforced. The tension between human σοφία and God’s wisdom that Paul describes can be easily overcome if she understands her σοφία to come from God. Pythagoras, with his wife Theano and daughter Damo, was remembered as the founder of a religious sect and the divine was critical to his philophizing.\footnote{Gregory Vlastos, “Theology and Philosophy in Early Greek Thought,” \textit{PQ} 2, no. 7 (1952): 97-123; for the theology of Pythagoras see Adam Drozdek, \textit{Greek Philosophers as Theologians: The Divine Arche} (Burlington: Ashgate, 2007), 53-70.} Epicurus, who had in his original school a large circle of women, had high regard for the divine as a foundation for ethics, but did not believe that the gods themselves interfered with the affairs of humans.\footnote{Jaap Mansfeld, “Aspects of Epicurean Theology,” \textit{Mnemosyne}, 4\textsuperscript{th} ser., 46, no. 2 (1993): 172-210; Dominic Scott, “Epicurean Illusions,” \textit{CQ} n.s. 39, no. 2 (1989): 360-374.} The Epicurean Diogenes of Oneoanda, who preserved Epicurus’s \textit{Letter to Mother}, also affirmed the divine but with great restraint.\footnote{George Depue Hadzsits, “The Personality of the Epicurean Gods,” \textit{AJP} 37, no. 3 (1916): 318; cf., Kirk Summers, “Lucretius and the Epicurean Tradition of Piety,” \textit{C Phil} 90, no. 1 (1995): 32-57.} Cicero, who valued the philosophical education of women, could – at
least in some of his writings – hold belief in a god in high regard.\footnote{Eli Edward Burris, “Cicero and the Religion of His Day,” \textit{CJ} 21, no. 7 (1926): 524-532; Ursula Heibges, “Cicero, a Hypocrite in Religion?,” \textit{AJP} 90, no. 3 (1969): 304-312.} Seneca – who encouraged Helvia and Marcia to apply his philosophy to their lives - understood that the role of philosophy is to understand the divine and the human, and the wise-person can only accomplish this with help from the divine.\footnote{Henry F. Burton, “Seneca’s Idea of God,” \textit{AJT} 13, no. 3 (1909): 350-369; Aldo Setaiolli, “Seneca and the Divine: Stoic Tradition and Personal Developments,” \textit{IJCT} 13, no. 3 (2007): 333-368.} Generally, the authors of the neo-Pythagorean pseudepigraphon (which claimed to be authored by well known women philosophers), carried on the emphasis that Pythagoras had placed on the divine. Iamblichus, however, specifically believed that the wise-person could not achieve \textit{harmonia} unless she had help from the gods.\footnote{Andrew Smith, \textit{Porphyry’s Place in the Neo-Platonic Tradition: A Study in Post-Plotinian Neo-Platonism} (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1974); for the general history of the neo-Pythagoreans see Charles K. Kahn, \textit{Pythagoras and the Pythagoreans} (Indianapolis: Hackett, 2001), 94-138.}

All that is to say that because Sophia received a general education from the active schools in first century Corinth, she can quite easily identify with Paul’s situation of wisdom and with him see “human wisdom” as at least incomplete for her purposes. Furthermore, if she reads this section as an indictment against Paul’s opponents, as he intends, she can congratulate herself by recognizing and appreciating Paul’s unique potential and support him and the church accordingly. Despite her sympathy for Paul’s message, though, Sophia is likely more than a little shocked at Paul’s identification of intolerable division in the church and that the various divisions must unite under Paul’s
banner. However, as a sympathetic reader, she identifies with Paul’s divine wisdom, respects his apostolic authority as founder of the Corinthian church, and at least tolerates his request for his style of unity.

Paul positions himself between followers of divine and human wisdom, Jews and Greeks, and the rich and poor by bringing everyone to the same starting point (1 Cor. 1:18-31). Every possible advantageous position: being a non-Jew, a Jew (favor with God), a wealthy and powerful person, and finally even the poor are brought to nothing by the power and wisdom of God. This lack of being – however exactly Paul imagines it and the church interprets it – is the ultimate rhetorical equalizer so that friendship can exist between Paul, philosophically educated women, and the rest of the church. At the very least, despite the fact that Paul has rhetorically aligned himself with the futility of both Greek and non-Greek wisdom, he too has to experience divine wisdom from his divine source. Although Paul is nothing and experiences this divine wisdom through his calling as an apostle, the Corinthians are nothing and can experience his divine wisdom by following his teaching. As a sympathetic reader, Sophia is able to balance her philosophical interests and the divine roots of these teachings with Paul’s understanding of the nature of his.

Moving on to 1 Cor. 2:1-5, Sophia is reminded of Paul’s visit and the Gospel that he preached. Paul then continues to separate the human wisdom of his opponents from divine wisdom of God that is in the word of the cross. As a student of popular moral philosophy, Sophia recognizes Paul’s characterization of his opponents as having the less attractive qualities of the sophists that Corinth knew well. Paul characterizes the sophists

---

953 Wire offers a similar interpretation, *Corinthian Women Prophets*, 51.
by an insatiable lust for fame, influence, and fortune.954 Their grandiose speech was intended to persuade crowds to do or think anything that is to the speaker’s pleasure. It would be easy for a sympathetic reader like Sophia to disassociate herself from Paul’s opponents, even if she did not think that they were as bad as Paul makes them out to be.955 Sophia can recognize the threat that Paul is addressing: if she identifies herself with his opponents, she would be compromising the freedom appropriated to her through the wisdom of the cross. Sophia also detects that Paul is addressing only one offensive practice: the common offenses of the sophists. It makes sense to Sophia that the selfish preaching of the sophists that Paul opposes challenges the concept of selfless love that characterizes the wisdom of the cross.

Reading 1 Cor. 1:18-2:5 with Fortuna

Another aspect needs to be examined: Paul’s opponents could include philosophically educated women. Philosophically educated women openly challenged men of their time. For example, Hipparchia the Cynic opposed Theodorus the Atheist at a dinner party and Leontion the Epicurean composed a work against Theophrastus.956 In the late second - early third century CE, the sophist Philostratus was concerned about the security of the patronage of the empress Julia Domna for the sophists after she read a treatise by Plutarch.

954 Witherington, Conflict and Community, 349.


956 Cic. Nat. D. 1.93; Pliny the Elder (Praefatio 29) indicates simply that a woman wrote against Theophrastus even though he was a respected rhetor.
For this discussion, I will use Fortuna as a hypothetical example of a philosophically educated woman who is an unsympathetic reader of 1 Corinthians. This is an entirely different interpretative paradigm from that discussed above, because Paul would be pitting himself against a philosophically educated woman rather than attempting to secure their patronage. Paul was opposed from within\textsuperscript{957} the church and not from without:\textsuperscript{958} at some point Fortuna was sympathetic enough to Paul’s message to join Paul’s Corinthian community. Therefore, either she has changed her mind or Paul could no longer tolerate her and the opposition that she supported. Before this falling out, Fortuna supported both Paul and his opponents and was later irritated with him for some reason: possibly his lack of commitment to a philosophical school, his inability to get along with his opponents (her allies), or his strange moral teachings.\textsuperscript{959} However, all that Paul is willing to admit is that his opponents expect him to be a good sophist/philosopher\textsuperscript{960} and question his apostolic authority.\textsuperscript{961} Embracing the independent spirit of the philosophically educated woman and asserting her responsibility


\textsuperscript{959} Many scholars believe that Paul is dismissing sophistic values, Winter, *Philo and Paul*, 116-44; Sigurd Grindheim, “Wisdom for the Perfect,” 689-709.


\textsuperscript{961} Welborn, *Politics and Rhetoric*, 83.
to think for herself, Fortuna is unimpressed with Paul’s separation of himself from the other sophists in the Corinthian church – possibly in person during his earlier visits (1 Cor 2:1-5) and epistles (1 Cor. 5:9).962

We saw with Sophia in 1 Cor. 1:18-31 that Paul attempted to separate himself from his opponents by the way that he describes what human wisdom cannot do, and that only the Christ of his message can accomplish what sophists claimed that their philosophy was capable of achieving. Sophia was able to tolerate Paul’s message because like Paul, she and those whom she supported also viewed their wisdom to come from a divine source. Fortuna, however, is frustrated by Paul’s message in 1 Cor. 1:18-31 for precisely the same reason. She reads Paul attacking the divine source of her wisdom by exclusively associating his divine source with the message of the cross. In other words, according to Paul the divine power of the foolishness of God, the work of the cross, accomplishes what her wisdom cannot do: σῶσαι τοὺς πιστεύοντας (1 Cor. 1:21).

Like Sophia, Fortuna considers her wisdom to be “godly wisdom” rather than Paul’s “human wisdom.” With a broad philosophical education, Fortuna is already aware of several contradictory philosophies that claim divine origin, but Paul’s characterization of “Greek wisdom” into one homogenous term is unfair and his claim to an exclusive superiority over all of them is quite alarming. The Cynic, Epicurean, Stoic, Platonic, and Pythagorean wisdom, all with claims of knowledge of the divine to some degree, are not

homogenous in their failure to overcome human passion and actualize a relationship with the divine. Fortuna would have a hard time believing that all of these schools has failed so completely, and that Paul could circumvent every means of philosophical enquiry and still attain access to wisdom by means of his calling, bearing the gospel of the crucified Christ (1 Cor. 1:23). However, because of her importance in the community and sympathy for Paul’s opponents, she is able to receive Paul’s hostility with the aloofness of a powerful matron.

The presence of Paul’s opponents could actually work in Paul’s favor, if his goal is to retain support for the church from their patroness. Fortuna can support Paul’s opponents, disagree with his teachings and moral philosophy, and the church can still enjoy the benefits that they would receive if she supported Paul alone (and therefore withdraw her support because of his hostility). The direct benefit for Paul is that he can criticize his opponents and the patroness of the church as sharply as he desires without fear of reprisal. Perhaps his apostolic boldness is rooted in the security of a philosophically educated patroness who supports the church due to her interest in his opponents.

As Paul develops his argument in 1 Cor. 2:1-5, it can only serve to further alienate Fortuna. She sees it as a great offense that Paul characterizes his “opponents” as people who follow philosophers, rhetoricians, and sophists just because they are captivated by some kind of empty human whim. The moral philosophers condemned the professional rhetoricians much like Paul does in 1 Corinthians, and Fortuna would not appreciate Paul lumping her with a common rhetor. Further, the “weakness” of the cross in itself did not frustrate Fortuna as a philosophically educated woman when she was initially attracted to
Paul’s Gospel. Fortuna had no issue with the weak of the world triumphing over the strong: this kind of social status / gender / intellectual / religious inversion is welcome and valuable. While she is not the most defenseless or poorest person in the community, she can identify herself with the “weak” because she lives in a world of injustices directed towards her because of her social status (she is not highest in the social pecking order), gender, and intellectual interests.

In Fortuna’s theology, the wisdom of the cross was accessible to people who valued what Paul calls “human wisdom” and isolates from “divine wisdom.” She was attracted to the community and supported it because of its broad tolerances: the activity of both male and female prophets, the participation of people of different social status, and the co-existence of different theologies and practices. After Paul could no longer tolerate these diversities within the community, she does not appreciate her philosophical sensibilities being contrasted with the the preaching of the cross.

Reading 1 Cor. 2:6-3:4 with Sophia

Paul continues his distinction between himself and his opponents in 1 Cor. 2:6-3:4, following the line of thought in 1:18-2:5. Paul again refers to the cross in 2:6-8 in order to distinguish himself from his “opponent.” He begins by strongly insinuating that only the mature accept his message (1 Cor. 2:6a), and of course his opponents are immature in their enslavement to human passion. Sophia is delighted to be counted among the mature: Paul’s designation matches her self-perception. In contrasting the human wisdom that his opponents seek and divine wisdom, he associates their human wisdom with the doomed thinking of the rulers of the age who crucified Jesus (1 Cor. 2:6b). We can follow the interpretation of “human wisdom” and interpret “τῶν
ἀρχόντων τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου” as “human rulers of this age.” Because these rulers follow doomed human wisdom and not the divine wisdom of God (according to Paul), they did not recognize the divine and crucified the Lord of glory (1 Cor. 2:8).

In 1 Cor. 2:9-11, Paul describes the hidden nature of the wisdom of God, which here is that which “God has prepared for those who love him,” who are in this case those who are committed to the gospel of the cross: Paul’s teachings. Paul undermines major forms of human discovery - sight, hearing, and imagination (1 Cor. 2:9) - as a means by which his audience can access the wisdom of God. And then, Paul discusses the difference between the natural and the spiritual (1 Cor. 2:14), on the same line of thought as “human wisdom” (associated with the ‘natural’) and “divine wisdom” (associated with the Spirit of God). Thiselton captures this idea of human wisdom in describing it as “the person who lives on an entirely human level.”

Paul’s wisdom is received and imparted by means of wisdom taught by the Spirit and does not comprise the wisdom gained by human means and imparted with human rhetoric and sophistry (plausible words of wisdom). The person who values human wisdom is “natural” and cannot receive Paul’s wisdom because his message must be spiritually and not naturally evaluated and received. But Paul and his companions have the mind of Christ and therefore can access and proclaim the words of the wisdom of God. Sophia is not threatened by Paul’s isolation of divine wisdom from the senses, primarily because she understands that he is clearly addressing those who seek human wisdom and not those (like Sophia) who have divine wisdom.

---

963 Thiselton, Corinthians, 269.
In 3:1-4, Paul refers again to a previous visit with the Corinthians, saying that he could not address them as spiritual people (except for the mature ones like Sophia who can receive the words of the cross, the wisdom of God) but as “people of the flesh” and “infants in Christ.” The “people of the flesh,” who apparently can only follow their bodily desires, clarifies nicely the demonization of human wisdom. The moral philosophers often characterized their opponents as people who can only follow their stomachs or passions. The Epicureans (notorious for following their human passions) and sophists (equally notorious for seeking wisdom to fulfill their lust for money) got the brunt of this beating, but of course all was fair in rhetorical polemic.\footnote{For the anti-Epicurean polemic of the 1\textsuperscript{st} century BCE, see Phillip DeLacy, “Cicero’s Invective against Piso,” \textit{TAPA} 72 (1941): 49-58; cf. Tadeusz Maslowski, “The Opponents of Lactantius [Inst. VII. 7, 7-13],” \textit{California Studies in Classical Antiquity} 7, (1974): 187-213; P. A. van der Waerdt, “The Justice of the Epicurean Wise Man,” \textit{CQ}, n.s., 37, no. 2 (1987): 402-422; Pamela Gordon, “Some Unseen Monster: Reading Lucretius on Sex,” in \textit{The Roman Gaze: Vision, Power, and the Body}, ed. David Frederick (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002), 86-109; Geert Roskam, \textit{A Commentary on Plutarch’s De latenter vivendo} (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2007); Henry Dyson, “Pleasure and the Sapiens: Seneca De vita Beata 11.1,” \textit{C Phil} 105, no. 3 (2010): 313-318. For sophists, see Winter, \textit{Philo and Paul}, 116-25.} In 1 Cor. 3:3, Paul declares that this human wisdom is the cause of jealousy and strife that divided the Corinthians into those who followed Paul and those who claimed Apollos. But Sophia was a member of the faith community, apparently valuing Paul’s message of the cross while pursuing her other intellectual interests. Just as she associates her divine wisdom with Paul’s and she does not affiliate herself with the “rulers of the world” who embraced human wisdom and crucified Jesus, she also understands that her divinely inspired wisdom cannot cause division in the church. In fact, Paul’s preaching complimented the wisdom that she already had, containing within it both affirmations and criticisms of
popular moral philosophy. With her broad education, Sophia is accustomed to learning a philosophy and hearing a dedicated teacher or educated friend criticize other schools, sometimes perhaps harshly. In spite of this, like other patrons of the arts, she could support a teacher or be friends with a person who criticizes philosophical teachings that she embraces.

Reading 1 Cor. 2:6-3:4 with Fortuna

Fortuna reads Paul as undermining her philosophical interests. As in 1 Cor. 1:21, where Paul declares that the knowledge of God is inaccessible to “human wisdom,” in 1 Cor. 2:7, Paul plainly states that the wisdom that he imparts is the secret and hidden wisdom of God. It is not human wisdom, but divine wisdom that apparently only Paul and his companions can impart, and no one can have access to divine wisdom unless Paul mediates it. The sustained disassociation of human wisdom with divine wisdom in 1 Cor. 2:6-3:4 (and beyond) is infuriating and increasingly nonsensical to Fortuna - who is tolerant of “human” wisdom because of her interest in Epicureanism, but attentive to the gods and the sources of divine wisdom in philosophical schools like Stoic, neo-Pythagoreanism, and Platonic thought. The stark opposition that Paul tries to establish between the “human wisdom” and “divine wisdom” is made even more offensive because of the association of “human wisdom” with the “human rulers” of this word that crucified the Lord of Glory (1 Cor. 2:8).

Fortuna possibly detected a glimmer of hope when Paul explains that the divine wisdom that he associates himself with is prepared for the ones that love God in 1 Cor. 2:9. Fortuna certainly identified herself as lover of wisdom and a lover of God – maybe not in the sense that Paul would prefer - so this passage can cause some confusion
because of how Paul applies it in 1 Cor. 2:12-14. If Fortuna and Paul’s “opponents” consider themselves to be lovers of God, why would Paul take issue with them? And Paul takes issue violently, attacking them in familiar fashion: it is symptomatic of human wisdom that those who seek it must live by their base human passions and because of this they do not have access to divine wisdom (1 Cor. 2:14). As such, they put themselves at odds with God’s wisdom, and are divided because of this weakness (1 Cor. 3:3). So not only are Paul’s opponents unable to access divine wisdom, they are affiliated with the rulers of this age who crucified Christ and responsible for divisions in the church because of their tendency to follow human wisdom. Paul’s isolation of human wisdom from divine wisdom is an unbearable restraint on Fortuna’s intellectual and spiritual freedom rooted in her theology of the cross. Paul’s teaching here corrects Fortuna’s theology of the cross: she does not have the freedom to support his opponents and have a correct relationship with crucified Christ. If so, Paul argues that Fortuna will be more like the rulers of the world that crucified Christ rather than a believer who participates in the freedom of the cross. Fortuna, along with her allies, simply cannot accept the nature of Paul’s polemic, other than recognizing that he is denigrating members of the group to increase his own credibility. Although many of them had heard it before, the sting of being on the receiving end of this kind of polemic was an alienating experience.

Reading 1 Cor. 3:5-4:5 with Sophia

Like most of the epistle, 1 Cor. 3:5-4:5 was likely viewed quite differently by Paul and those whom he opposed – some may well have better identified with Apollos - but like Paul, understood Apollos and Paul to be unified in such a way that to identify with one is to identify with the other. Sophia (and Fortuna) probably understood the
factions as believers that could exist in unity, just as in Paul’s mind he and Apollos were workers toiling together with the same divine purpose: to build the Corinthian church, which is a building of God (1 Cor. 3:9).

The reception of these two different characters from the Corinthian community’s perspective, however, likely could have been quite a bit different than the unity that Paul imagines. Paul uses a familiar Socratic τί ... construction “what is x (or x-ness)” in 1 Cor. 3:5, “τί οὖν ἐστιν Ἀπολλωνᾶς; τί δὲ ἐστιν Παύλος.”

For Paul, he and Apollos are both servants of God with a different role, explained metaphorically as Paul planting, Apollos watering, and God giving growth (1 Cor. 3:6-9). This metaphor is extended to clearly reinforce Paul’s superior apostolic authority. Paul presents himself as the master builder who lays the foundation and Apollos built on the excellent foundation that Paul laid (1 Cor. 3:11-15). This building, the people of the church, is not just any building but a holy temple of God, and the sanctity (or unity) of the church is sealed with the assured destruction for those who are hostile to it (1 Cor. 3:16-17), especially those who value a wisdom that Paul does not (1 Cor. 3:18-20): his idea of “worldly wisdom”

965 Some scholars use the letter F instead of the letter X so as not to confuse the reader who may think of the mathematical x. For bibliography on the “what is x(-ness)” question, see Hugh H. Benson, Socratic Wisdom: The Model of Knowledge in Plato’s Early Dialogues (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 100; cf., Thiselton, Corinthians, 299; Robertson and Plummer, Corinthians, 56.


967 Cf., Wire, Corinthian Women Prophets, 43.
(human wisdom). After all, the Lord has found out the thoughts of the ones who seek worldly wisdom, and their wisdom is futile (1 Cor 3:20).968

At first it seems prudent to examine how Sophia would read Paul’s usage of the Socratic construct “what is x?” in 1 Cor. 3:5. Unfortunately, not much can be read into the “what is x” construct because Paul does not peer into the heart of a matter using a Socratic query into x-ness (what is good, what is being, etc). Sophia’s broad philosophical education would have exposed her to any number of varieties of this type of query.969 However, by the time Sophia received her philosophical education, the Socratic “what is x” query had been grafted so much into the particular philosophical schools970 that one can no longer attribute meaning to the construct beyond its rhetorical usage by Paul, which does not carry with it any type of philosophical query.

In the metaphors of the planting, builder // building, and the temple, the roles of Paul, Apollos, and God seamlessly flow together, with Paul explaining that he and Apollos are nothing because only God gives the growth and Jesus is the foundation. While Sophia acknowledges God as the source of wisdom, Paul characterizes these


969 Epict. *Disc.* 4.1.41; cf., 2.11.

opponents as severely handicapped by human thinking that causes separation from his teaching and therefore they are divorced from whatever interaction with God that one can achieve by receiving his message as he intends it to be received (1 Cor. 3:18-21a).

Unity and harmony in the community are not foreign ideas to Sophia. In fact, the concept of unity as described by Paul is likely the most significant point of confusion for her as a philosophically educated patroness. As long as she supported the church, the community would be unified under her care, and she would make certain that no immoral thing would be going on inside of her household. The kind of disunity that Paul speaks of is rooted in human wisdom that is gained by following human passions. In popular moral philosophy, the unbridled following of human passion is what leads to every kind of immorality – the kind of things that could cause unpleasant consequences for Sophia if she continued to support the kind of unruly group that Paul portrays his opponents to be. While Paul’s characterization of his opponents is rhetorical, it does seem that at least part of it is true, at least from Paul’s point of view. There probably was sexual immorality, boasting, and criticism of Paul because he did not embody sophistic values. Paul did explain that their bad behavior came from their bad thinking, and that correct thinking would help fix the problem. The idea is that correct thinking leads to correct behavior and a correct relationship with the divine (often because correct thinking comes from the divine). The problem is that there was wide disagreement as to what correct thinking was, and this struggle is definitely something that makes perfect sense to Sophia.
Paul exhorts the Corinthians not to boast in human beings (1 Cor. 3:21), who are at best the source of human wisdom.\footnote{See the discussion in Winter, \textit{Philo and Paul}, 186-202.} Interesting is that Cephas is mentioned again without warning, further confirming that Paul is attacking the followers of Apollos in his separation of human wisdom and divine wisdom. Paul’s divisions of the Corinthians into followers of himself, Apollos, Cephas, and Christ are almost certainly intentionally artificial. By choosing these labels and then rhetorically unifying these figures in divine purpose, and their product into one temple, Paul is tactfully addressing corresponding issues.\footnote{Collins suggests that the early Corinthian Christians knew of Cephas only by reputation and Paul’s use of the name to designate a certain person or group was in itself tactful and unifying: there is no difference between Paul and Cephas, so it is an appeal for unity rather than a description of a Petrine group, \textit{Corinthians}, 80. Cf., J. Paul Sampley, “Forward,” in \textit{Paul and Rhetoric}, ed. J. Paul Sampley and Peter Lampe (New York: T&T Clark, 2010), xii.} However, while the Cephas and Christ groups may not have existed, there were certainly opponents that Paul characterizes as followers of Apollos who valued human wisdom.\footnote{Smit, “Who is Apollos, What is Paul?,” 231-51.}

Even though Paul mentioned the divisions in 1 Cor. 1:12, it is a bit late in the epistle to paint his opponents in a positive light by rhetorically uniting hypothetical groups that may follow himself, Christ, and Apollos. If Paul had not spent so much time characterizing the human wisdom of the followers of Apollos so negatively, making it impossible for them to have knowledge of God and access to morality, his tactful arguments for unity might be a bit more convincing. Can it really be said by Paul that his opponents, the followers of Apollos, are so unified with the community that they can be
thought of as one temple, one building, and one work of God? Can it really be said that Paul’s opponents, who, he argues, are severely handicapped by the follies of human wisdom, comprise the ones for whom Paul laid the foundation, Apollos watered, and God caused to grow, along with everyone else? Sophia can certainly understand the importance of unity and the ability for Paul’s “opponents” to coexist with the rest of the community. The confusing aspect is that Paul can engage in polemic with people in the community and then declare that they are indeed unified.

When Paul writes “all things belong to you,” in 1 Cor. 3:21 Sophia could understand him to be employing intentionally the Stoic maxim “all things belong to the wise-person.” 974 This maxim is found in Seneca, Cicero, and Diogenes Laertius – all of whom are important sources for women in philosophy. A critical issue is the question of whom Paul is addressing here. It is possible that Paul is using a maxim from human philosophy in an ironic fashion – those who truly claim Apollos, Cephas, and Christ actually are unified when they follow the teachings of Paul – and it is the one who follows Paul’s idea of divine wisdom and not human wisdom who receives the reward and promises of both types of wisdom. Or is Paul addressing all the believers / hearers of the epistle? 975 Whoever Paul is addressing belongs to Christ’s and Christ is God’s. Paul here extends the idea of the Stoic wise-person “all things belong to you” to the

---


community of believers in general, which is significant because it is the general believer who achieves wisdom and not only the one who seeks worldly wisdom.

The Stoic maxim that Paul uses is unmistakeable to Sophia. The most basic philosophical education would include the definition of the person who actualizes wisdom: the wise-person. When a philosopher describes their particular school’s wise-person, it is often explained in terms of contrast with the wise-person of another school. According to tradition, Diogenes the Cynic “reasoned that all things belong to the gods; the wise are friends of the gods; since friends have all things in common, all things belong to the wise.” The Stoics used the maxim “all things belong to the wise man” as opposed to the Epicurean position. For example, Seneca argues against an unnamed Epicurean who includes the use of prostitutes in “all things that belong to the wise man”:

"Is," inquit, " cuius prostitutae sunt, leno est; omnia autem sapientis sunt ; inter omnia et prostitutae sunt ; ergo prostitutae sapientis sunt. Leno autem est, cuius prostitutae sunt ; ergo sapiens leno est," Sic illum vetant emere, dicunt enim: " Nemo rem suam emit ; omnia autem sapientis sunt ; ergo sapiens nihil emit." Sic vetant mutuum sumere, quia nemo usuram pro pecunia sua pendat. Innumerabilia sunt, per quae cavillantur, cum pulcherrime, quid a nobis dicatur, intellegant.

“He to whom courtezans belong,” argues our adversary, “must be a procurer: now courtezans are included in all things, therefore courtezans belong to the wise man. But he to whom courtezans belong is a procurer; therefore the wise man is a procurer.” Yes! by the same reasoning, our opponents would forbid him to buy anything, arguing, “No man buys his own property. Now all things are the property of the wise man; therefore the wise man buys nothing.” By the same reasoning they object to his borrowing, because no one pays interest for the use of his own money. They raise endless quibbles, although they perfectly well understand what we say.


977 Sen. Ben. 7.4.
In 1 Cor. 4:1-5, Paul dictates to the Corinthians how they should regard him and his associates. Paul and his associates, being bearers of divine wisdom, are “servants (ὑπηρέτας) of Christ and stewards (οἰκονόμους) of the mysteries of God.” The idea of stewardship extends the idea of Paul and his associates as planters and builders, and God as the one who causes growth and Jesus Christ is the foundation. As a steward Paul probably has a slave in mind who manages their master’s property according to their master’s liking. The lowly position of Paul and his associates receives elaboration later in the chapter (1 Cor. 4:9-13). Like a slave in the house of God, Paul has intimate access to the wisdom of God and manages its distribution according to God’s purpose. As servants of God and Christ, no one in the community or outside of it can judge or challenge the nature of the divine wisdom and practice of Paul and his associates.

Sophia is only slightly insulted that Paul associates himself with the lowest public position in the city, and even on the level of a slave. Yet Paul says that he is the steward of the mysteries of God: he is the teacher of the divine wisdom that his opponents cannot touch. Indeed, because of his access to divine wisdom that he can be indifferent to the worldly power and status. This is a virtue that Sophia can value.

Paul’s teachings here set some boundaries to Sophia’s freedom. However, the boundaries are tolerable and familiar. Paul’s concept of self-control is a familiar and welcome constraint on freedom: the loss of self-control isolates one from divine wisdom.

---

978 The same term that Paul uses with Erastus in Rom. 16:23.


980 TDNT 8:542.
Self-control brought about by philosophical discipline and fellowship with the divine have defined Sophia’s intellectual pursuits, so Paul’s criticism of the lack of these virtues is welcome.

Reading 1 Cor. 3:4-4:5 with Fortuna

Paul’s discussion of the nature of Apollos, himself, and the divine is confusing for Fortuna. Paul has just said in 1 Cor. 3:3-4 that the followers of human wisdom are the cause of division – when in fact it is possible that no division actually exists – and then in 1 Cor. 3:10-17 he claims that everyone in the community, no matter who they would hypothetically claim as their inspiration, are actually unified because they are one sacred building built on one divine foundation. From Paul’s perspective, the metaphors of the field, the building, and the temple in 1 Cor. 3:5-17 are all in direct response to the jealousy and division brought about by the lack of self-control of the seekers of human wisdom in 1 Cor. 3:3-4, and he immediately returns to this theme in 1 Cor. 3:18-21a. Fortuna understands that her wisdom comes from a divine source, but since it is not necessarily Paul’s interpretation of divine wisdom, there is plenty of room for an unsympathetic reading here, particularly because Paul has frustrated Fortuna from the beginning of the epistle with his juxtaposition of human and divine wisdom.

It is offensive to Fortuna that Paul uses tidbits of philosophical ideas and constructs, yet claims to have the benefits of mastering a philosophical method while characterizing “human wisdom” as completely different from his “divine wisdom.” If Fortuna caught the Socratic construction, it serves as a definite sign that Paul has no intention of pursuing any concept even remotely related to philosophical inquiry. Paul then can declare that “all things belong to you,” that is, those who have not followed
philosophical inquiry to explore God, themselves, and anything else. It is impossible that those who inquire about God through the popular philosophical schools can actually know God, but Paul uses a Stoic maxim related to the wise-person to describe people in the community whose understanding of wisdom that he can tolerate. Not only can his opponents not know God – they do not have access to the desired outcome of their philosophy – this to Fortuna is deeply divisive and insulting.

Fortuna sees Paul constraining freedom so severely that an entire group of believers who were attracted to the community based on this theology of the cross are now excluded from their method of understanding God and themselves. The exercise that enabled Fortuna to participate in the community while retaining her philosophical heritage was dismissed by Paul. Human wisdom was much more than half of Fortuna’s philosophical experience. Her philosophical methods – human wisdom - were the means by which she exercised self-control and became aware of the divine. Because of her intellectual freedom, she was able to value competing philosophies and incorporate Pauline teachings into this experience. This freedom works both ways: her philosophical experience can tolerate her Christian experience, and her Christian experience compliments her philosophical education. Paul chooses to upset this balance by artificially separating divine and human wisdom and philosophical outcomes from philosophical (human/divine) methods.

Reading 1 Cor. 4:6-21 with Sophia

As a supporter of Paul, Sophia is likely familiar with the ways in which Paul’s ministry differs from the values of the sophists. In 1 Cor. 4:6-13, Paul expands on his lowly status by contrasting it with the status of his opponents. Paul has already
associated divine wisdom as appearing foolish to those who value human wisdom, and now the deliverer of this divine wisdom is made low in every way. Paul refers to his opponents as kings and wealthy (1 Cor. 4:8), perhaps indicating the wealth of his educated patroness, Sophia. Perhaps a plea for unity with Fortuna – who he knows may well be frustrated by this epistle - is in Paul’s wish that his opponents could actually rule so Paul could be elevated from his lowly state and rule with them (1 Cor. 4:8b). In contrast to the weathly and powerful people in the community – especially his opponents who seek human wisdom - Paul presents himself and his associates as publically humiliated in the extreme, and they are fools for the sake of their audience. The apostles are hungry and thirsty, inadequately clothed, abused and homeless, they work with their hands, they are despised, reviled, prosecuted, and slandered (1 Cor. 4:11-3).\footnote{1 Cor. 4:11-3 has been identified as a Stoic hardship list by Fitzgerald, \textit{Cracks in an Earthen Vessel}; Garcilazo, \textit{The Corinthian Dissenters}, 8.}

When Paul contrasts himself with the Corinthians as “kings,” Sophia\footnote{It is critical to note once again that the focus here is on how Sophia - a wealthy philosophically educated woman - would read 1 Corinthians. Her reading does not speak for Paul's entire audience, or what this passage says about other readers.} can read Paul as saying that the Corinthians are not in reality as powerful as they think they are.\footnote{Wire's focus on the Corinthian women prophets produces a different reading than Sophia, a wealthy philosophically educated woman.}

Paul would be contrasting a metaphor – the authority, power, and wealth of the Corinthians, the “kings” – with the actual suffering of the apostles. This metaphor brings Paul’s loss of status in sharp contrast to the rising status of some of his audience.\footnote{Cf., Wire, \textit{Corinthian Women Prophets}, 188-9.} In spite of Paul’s rhetoric and Sophia’s sympathies toward Greek philosophy, she
recognizes that Paul is focusing his invective on his opponents, not her. Sophia does not think of herself as an all-knowing and all powerful queen while Paul suffers without her help. Paul associates himself with poverty, and his suffering highlights his need for and value of her continued support of the church.

According to Paul, the actual suffering of the apostles and the metaphor of the Corinthians as kings were not meant to shame the Corinthians (however, Paul makes it clear that he is actually mocking them by calling attention to it in 1 Cor. 4:14). Paul then presents himself as a kind of idealistic father who lovingly admonishes his children rather than shames them when they need discipline (1 Cor. 4:15). So, as their father in Jesus Christ through the Gospel, they are to imitate him (1 Cor. 4:16; 11:1). The appeal to the role of the father is an unmistakable appeal to authority, and imitation is as important concept in Paul’s apostle as it is in ancient philosophy. At this point, it seems that the love of the father is a very thin veil over an exhortation to follow more closely after Paul’s teaching rather than that of his opponents. Paul sent Timothy specifically for the purpose of reminding them of Paul’s previous visits, which is what Paul referred to himself earlier in the epistle (1 Cor. 4:17). Apparently, Paul was very confident that his presence - whether in person, through Timothy, or by way of rhetoric – is an unstoppable unifying force (1 Cor. 4:18-21). Paul argues that if he were present, then his opponents

985 Clarke, Serve the Community, 218-27.

would be reminded of his authority and the power of his gospel would bring everyone into the kind of unity that Paul can tolerate.

Again Paul uses a format that would be familiar to Sophia: the Stoic hardship list in 1 Cor. 4:9-13. The hardship list points to the prestige of the wise-person, who can withstand any hardship with magnanimity. It is difficult to imagine that Sophia did not know such a basic concept, especially due to its popularity and the debates that the popular schools had concerning the nature of the wise-person. Paul’s endurance of hardship is something that she can respect: he is able to achieve the status of a Stoic wise-person without actually being a Stoic sage. His faithfulness to his calling has achieved a truly brilliant outcome, and she and the community have access to the divine power that enabled such an accomplishment if they imitate him. Sophia knows that her wisdom comes from a divine source, and if she actualizes it properly, she too can endure hardship with magnanimity like Paul. If she dares to believe that Paul is a successful pattern, she could value his company as a partner in dialog.

Reading 1 Cor. 4:6-21 with Fortuna

Just as Paul can use the Stoic maxim “all things belong to the wise-person” (1 Cor. 3:21) to people who have not followed a philosophical method to achieve wisdom, he applies the qualities of the Stoic wise-person to himself (1 Cor. 4:9-13), when he had no right. Fortuna knew about Diogenes the Cynic, famous in Corinth, who said that all things belong to the gods, and because the wise-person is friends with the gods and friends hold all things in common, that all things belong to the wise-person. However,

987 See especially Fitzgerald, Cracks in an Earthen Vessel.
Paul is no Diogenes. While Diogenes’s reasoning works well with Paul to a point, there is a significant difference in how one becomes friends with God. Fortuna understands that for Paul, it is his calling as an apostle that enables him to preach the word of the Gospel, which is the foolishness of the cross, the wisdom of God (1 Cor. 1:21). Because of his calling as apostle, Paul claims that he is able to endure the hardships of the wise-person (1 Cor. 4:9). If Paul had not completely alienated Fortuna by this point of the letter, perhaps she could be sympathetic to Paul’s rhetorical or actual suffering (1 Cor. 4:11-13). But to claim the identity and virtues of the Stoic wise-person without actually following their teachings\(^\text{988}\) has no persuasive power for Fortuna.

Paul’s reference to his personal visits to Corinth, while they may have been pleasant experience for her, is probably not the most effective rhetorical tactic that he could have used to capture Fortuna’s favor. This sentiment is compounded by Paul’s reasoning for sending Timothy and his threat of a future visit (1 Cor. 4:14-21). After repeatedly devaluing her philosophical experience, positively applying the desired outcome to people who did not even discipline themselves according to a popular school, and then applying qualities of a wise-person to himself, a good memory of Paul’s visit or the threat of his coming would have little persuasive effect for Fortuna. She will continue to support the Christian community at Corinth because of the unity that she valued before Paul wrote this epistle, and the unity in diversity that the other members of the community enjoy, but Paul’s rhetoric was simply unsuccessful with her.

Conclusion: Reading 1 Corinthians 1-4 with Sophia and Fortina

In chapter 5, we have read the first four chapters of 1 Corinthians with two hypothetical philosophically educated women: Sophia and Fortuna. Their backgrounds share some similarities. First, they are both wealthy widows who are patronesses of the church. As such, they are able to control their wealth and more freely engage in philosophical discourse. Second, both women have broad philosophical interests and are aware of the basic teachings of the popular philosophical schools: Cynicism, Stoicism, Epicureanism, Platonism, and neo-Pythagoreanism. Third, both women were attracted to Paul’s theology of the cross that brings social and theological freedom to the community.

When Paul distinguishes divine wisdom from human wisdom, and as an expression of freedom to balance philosophical education and a theology of the cross, both Sophia and Fortuna understand that they already possess a balance of human and divine wisdom. However, as Paul further develops his arguments, Sophia continues to identify with Paul’s divine wisdom but Fortuna is frustrated by his sustained division of divine and human wisdom. Fortuna is further alienated by Paul as he uses philosophical teachings and claims to have qualities of the ideal wise-person without following a philosophical method. In chapter six, I will discuss how Sophia and Fortuna would read Paul’s teachings concerning marriage and worship.
CHAPTER 6:  
MARRIAGE, FAMILY, AND WORSHIP IN 1 CORINTHIANS

In this chapter, I will focus on the question of what would Sophia and Fortuna know about marriage if they had the broad philosophical education of a wealthy Corinthian patroness. What might these women be exposed to at the Isthmain games or a dinner party that feature discussion by a variety of people in an intellectual circle? These questions will be addressed by outlining the views of the popular schools regarding marriage. Then, I will read Paul’s material related to marriage and family in 1 Corinthians with Sophia and Fortuna, with special emphasis on how Paul uses this material to encourage unity in Christian worship.

This chapter will review Paul’s teachings on marriage (1 Cor. 5:1-13; 6.9-20; 7.1-40), especially with respect to the nature of household worship (1 Cor. 11:1-16). Every time that Paul addresses worship in 1 Corinthians, he does so in the context of teachings concerning marriage and family. In 1 Cor 11:3, Paul explains that the head of the wife is the husband, he gives his teaching concerning the role of women prophets in Christian worship. In 1 Cor. 14:26-40, Paul gives further instructions concerning the role of prophets in Christian worship, followed by a teaching concerning the silence of women in the churches and that husbands should teach their wives at home.

\[989\] In 4.5.9, I addressed the 1 Cor. 14:33-5 and argued that it was not Pauline and therefore not an issue for further discussion.
Marriage and Family in the Popular Philosophers

Instructions concerning marriage and family were common topics in both the popular philosophers and some philosophically educated women. Teachings concerning the passions played no small role in addressing these issues.990 There are parallels to Paul’s approach in the philosophers who teach and encourage women to practice philosophy but relegate them to their contemporary gender roles. In the following sections, I will address writings of the Pythagoreans and neo-Pythagoreans as well as the Roman Epicureans, Stoics, Cynics, and Platonists.

The Pythagoreans and neo-Pythagoreans

There is some material in the older Pythagorean writers that address marriage and family and while the neo-Pythagorean corpus has strained connections with the earliest groups, the traditions concerning the importance of marriage is intact. For that reason, I will begin with the older traditions (such as the teachings of Theano which may have their source in Aristotle) and then focus on the writings which may reflect the knowledge or opinions of a first century follower of the school. The Neo-Pythagoreans inherited a rich tradition of focus on the family from legends concerning Pythagoras and his earliest followers. The legacy of these followers, led by his disciple wife Theano and his daughter Damo, inspired later writers to author works in their name. The precise date of the Pythagorean pseudopigrapha is unknown, but as a whole it reflects popular 1st century values. The difficulty with these writings, other than date, is that they contain no

relationship with any philosophy except that they are attributed to well-known philosophically educated women. From these writings we can see that Pythagorean women were fondly remembered by some writers and their audiences, and there indeed are some parallels with Paul’s moral teachings.991

Several writings/sayings are attributed to the Pythagorean Theano, who lived in the sixth century BCE but some of the extant writings are dated as late as second century CE. The works attributed to Theano are *Pythagorean Apopthems, Female Advice, On Piety, On Pythagoras, Philosophical Commentaries* and *Letters*. Of these, all except the *Letters* survive in a handful of fragments. And it is in the *Letters* that we find the most substantive similarity to Paul, specifically the letter to Eurydice (dated 3rd BCE). In this epistle, Theano gives instructions regarding how she should handle the problem of her husband sleeping with a prostitute.

In a similar manner, Theano (3rd BCE) says that Eurydice should not be a jealous wife but inspire her husband by her virtue to change his ways. Theano addresses the same issue in her epistle to Nicostrate, using the metaphor of the body:

> γαμετής γὰρ ἅρετή ἐστιν οὐχ ἡ παρατήρησις ταῦνδρος, ἀλλ’ ἡ συμπεριφορά· συμπεριφορά δὲ ἐστι τὸ φέρειν ἄνοιαν. Εἰ ἔταϊρα μὲν πρὸς ἴδιον ὁμιλεῖ, γαμετὴ δὲ πρὸς τὸ συμφέρον· συμφέρον δὲ κακοὶς κακάμη
> μίσγειν, μηδὲ παρανοία παρανοιαι ἐπάγειν...ἐαυτὴν δὲ παρεκτέον ἐπιτηδείαν ταῖς διαλλαγαῖς· τὰ γὰρ καλὰ ἡθή καὶ παρ’ ἐχθροῖς εὗροιν
> φέρει, φίλη, καὶ μόνης καλοκαγαθίας ἐργον ἐστίν ἡ τιμὴ, ταυτὴ δὲ καὶ δυνατὸν ἀνδρὸς ἐξουσίαν καθυπερέχειν γυναικί, καὶ τιμάσθαι πλέον ἢ
> θεραπεύειν τον ἐχθρόν.

For the virtue of a wife is not in watching over her husband, but bearing things in common with him. And bearing things in common with him is to bear his madness. If he mixes with a prostitute for his pleasure, he does so with his wife for his advantage. It is an advantage not to mix evils with evils, nor to add madness

---

with madness… prepare yourself for reconciliation. For a fine character and high regard even from enemies, my friend, and honor is the outcome of a true nobility. Through this it is possible for a woman’s authority to exceed a man’s, and for her to be honoured even more, rather than serve her enemy.\footnote{Perictione (3rd BCE) – taking the name of Plato’s mother - notes that adultery is a pleasure for men only, because women and not men are punished for it.\footnote{Theano to Nicostrate (Theano, Fragmenta, TLG pg 198, 199).} 992}

Perictione (3rd BCE) – taking the name of Plato’s mother - notes that adultery is a pleasure for men only, because women and not men are punished for it.\footnote{Perictione, On the Nature of Women (Perictione, Fragmenta TLG pg. 104 = Stob. 4.28.19).}\footnote{993}

The importance of marriage and family life in Pythagoreanism is expressed in many ways as Iamblichus (245-325 CE) tells the story of Pythagoras (c. 570-495 BCE) and his early followers. According to Iamblichus, Pythagoras taught that husbands and wives should be faithful to each other and win the affection of children through affection and not force.\footnote{Iambl. VP 9.48.}\footnote{994} It is also relevant to note that Pythagoras successfully persuaded women to dress with humility and assigned divine rank to three parts of a woman’s life: “the unmarried woman was called Core, or Proserpine, a bride Nympha, a matron, Mother, in the Doric dialect, Maia.”\footnote{Porphyry (284-305 CE) writes that women participated as hearers of Pythagoras’s early lectures: “Through this he achieved great reputation, he drew great audiences from the city, not only of men, but also of women, among whom was a specially illustrious person named Theano” (6th BCE), “\text{γενωμένων δὲ τούτων μεγάλη περὶ αὐτοῦ ημύνῃ δόξα, καὶ πολλοὺς μὲν ἐλαβεν ἐξ αὐτῆς τῆς πόλεως ὀμιλητὰς οὐ μόνον ἀνδρὰς ἀλλὰ καὶ γυναῖκας, ὃν μίᾶς γε Θεανοῦς.”\footnote{Porph. VP 19.4.}}\footnote{995} Porphyry (284-305 CE) writes that women participated as hearers of Pythagoras’s early lectures: “Through this he achieved great reputation, he drew great audiences from the city, not only of men, but also of women, among whom was a specially illustrious person named Theano” (6th BCE), “\text{γενωμένων δὲ τούτων μεγάλη περὶ αὐτοῦ ημύνῃ δόξα, καὶ πολλοὺς μὲν ἐλαβεν ἐξ αὐτῆς τῆς πόλεως ὀμιλητὰς οὐ μόνον ἀνδρὰς ἀλλὰ καὶ γυναῖκας, ὃν μίᾶς γε Θεανοῦς.”\footnote{Porph. VP 19.4.}}\footnote{996} Porphyry (284-305 CE) writes that women participated as hearers of Pythagoras’s early lectures: “Through this he achieved great reputation, he drew great audiences from the city, not only of men, but also of women, among whom was a specially illustrious person named Theano” (6th BCE), “\text{γενωμένων δὲ τούτων μεγάλη περὶ αὐτοῦ ημύνῃ δόξα, καὶ πολλοὺς μὲν ἐλαβεν ἐξ αὐτῆς τῆς πόλεως ὀμιλητὰς οὐ μόνον ἀνδρὰς ἀλλὰ καὶ γυναῖκας, ὃν μίᾶς γε Θεανοῦς.”\footnote{Porph. VP 19.4.}}\footnote{996} Porphyry (284-305 CE) writes that women participated as hearers of Pythagoras’s early lectures: “Through this he achieved great reputation, he drew great audiences from the city, not only of men, but also of women, among whom was a specially illustrious person named Theano” (6th BCE), “\text{γενωμένων δὲ τούτων μεγάλη περὶ αὐτοῦ ημύνῃ δόξα, καὶ πολλοὺς μὲν ἐλαβεν ἐξ αὐτῆς τῆς πόλεως ὀμιλητὰς οὐ μόνον ἀνδρὰς ἀλλὰ καὶ γυναῖκας, ὃν μίᾶς γε Θεανοῦς.”\footnote{Porph. VP 19.4.}}\footnote{996} Ocellus
Lucanus, a 5th BCE Pythagorean, wrote that husbands should marry women their age and status – and more importantly – a woman who is not wealthier:

Γυναίκα δε τὴν κατὰ νόμους ἔκαστος στεργέτας καὶ ἐκ ταύτης τεκνοποιεῖσθα, εἰς άλλο δὲ μὴ χρείαν προίκασθω τέκνων τῶν συντόνων μηδὲ τὸ φυσικὰ καὶ νόμων τίμιον ἄνόμως ἀνάληκτω καὶ ὑβριζέτω. ἦ γὰρ τὸ σπέρμα τεκνοποίεσθαι ἐνεκεν, οὐκ ἀκολούθησε τὴν σπέρμαν. Γυναίκα δὲ σωφρονεῖν χρῆ καὶ μὴ προσδέχεσθαι συνωσίαν ἀσεβῆ παρ’ ἄλλους ἄνδραν, ὡς ἀπαντώσῃς νεμέεσθαι παρὰ δαιμόνων ἐξοικιστῶν καὶ ἐχθροποιῶν.

Let every one dearly love his lawful wife and beget children by her. But let none shed the seed due his children into any other person, and let him not disgrace that which is honorable by both nature and law. For nature produced the seed for the sake of producing the children, and not for the sake of lust. A wife should be chaste, and refuse impious connection with other men, as by so doing she will subject herself to the vengeance of the geniuses, whose office it is to expel those to they are hostile from their houses, and to produce hatred.

Charondas is mentioned here because of his later association with Pythagorism which appears rather thin because it was common practice for the ancients to associate the


famous law-givers with Pythagorianism. However, the writer who attributed this writing to him as a Pythagorean preserves common Pythagorean traditions.

As Pythagoras taught his daughter philosophy, the neo-Pythagorean Callicratidas (date unknown) wrote that husbands – as a duty of managing their wives - should teach their wives:

\[
\text{ποτί λόγον δὲ μυστεροσάμενων τὸν γάμον δεὶ καὶ ἐπίτροπων καὶ κύριων ἐπιστάσαν τὰς αὐτῶν γυναικὸς εἰμεν ἐπίτροπον μὲν τῶν φροντίζειν τῶν ἐκεῖνας, κύριον δὲ τῶν ἀρχευν καὶ κυριεύειν, διδάσκαλοι δὲ τῶ διδάσκειν τὰ δέουτα.}
\]

The husband should be his wife’s regulator, master and preceptor. Regulator, in paying diligent attention to his wife’s affairs; master, in governing, and exercising authority over her, and preceptor in teaching her such things as are fitting for her to know.

The importance of harmony in the state and the home is critical to Callicratidas (Stob. 4.28.17 = TLG pg 106). This concept is expressed again in Polus the Pythagorean:

\[
\text{ἐν κόσμῳ μὲν ἄν αὐτὰ τὰν ὅλαν ἀρχὰν διαστραταγοῦσα πρόνοια τε καὶ ἁρμονία καὶ δίκα καὶ νῶς τινὸς θεῶν οὕτως ψαφιξιασμένω, ἐν πόλει δὲ εἰράνα τε καὶ εὐνομία δικαίως κέκληται. ἐν οἴκῳ δ’ ἐστὶ ἄνδρος μὲν καὶ γυναῖκος ποτ’ ἄλλας όμοφρούνα, οἰκετάν δὲ ποτὶ δεσπότας εὐνόια, δεσποτάν δὲ ποτὶ θεράποντας καδεμονία. ἐν σώματι δὲ καὶ ψυχᾷ πράτα θεράποντας καδεμονία.}
\]

It conducts the whole world government and is called providence, harmony, and vengeance, by the decrees of a certain kind of geniuses. In a city it is justly called peace, and equitable legislation. In a house, it is the concord between husband and wife; the kindliness of the servant towards his master, and the anxious care of the

---

999 Kahn, Pythagoras and Pythagoreans, 70; cf., J. S. Morrison, “Pythagoras of Samos,” CQ n.s. 6, no. 3 (1956): 143.

1000 Balch, “Neopythagorean Moralists,” 391.

master for his servant. In the body, likewise, which to all animals is the first and
dearest thing, it is the health and wholeness of each part.  

The Pythagoreans and neo-Pythagoreans do not always teach exactly the same
thing about marriage, but they are unified in the worth of marriage and its preservation.
The family is very important to the preservation of Pythagorean teachings because they
were originally kept in the family, passed from father to son or even mother to daughter.
Iamblichus writes that Pythagoras persuaded the inhabitants of Croton to give up adultery
and prostitution, and works that are attributed to Pythagorean women encourage
faithfulness in marriage. Neo-Pythagoreans may have been rare in Corinth in the first
century, but their morality parallels other schools that were prevalent that taught self-
control and applied it to the marriage relationship. Epicureans, of course, were the
exception to this rule.

Epicureans and Marriage

Epicurus (341-270 BCE) did not encourage marriage because it threatened his idea
of συτάρκεια (self-sufficiency).  Casual sex, however, was permissible and
encouraged because it was a natural pleasure – without the marital commitment that put

---

1002 Stob. 3.9.51. Translation in Gutherie, Complete Pythagoras, 205.

1003 Martha C. Nussbaum, The Therapy of Desire: Theory and Practice in
Hellenistic Ethics (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), 152. For this section of
the paper, Hans-Josef Klauck’s work has been particularly helpful in locating sources and
relating ancient philosophical thought to the New Testament, The Religious Context of
York: T&T Clark, 2003), 331-416.
This teaching can explain the popularity of courtesans in the history of Epicureanism. The ideal Epicurean wise-person should not marry but can engage in as many sexual encounters as he or she wants because it is an act according to nature, as long as he remains unconnected to anyone or anything. This may sound Cynic on the outset, but while Epicureans did not participate intimately in the livelihood of the city by establishing a household or serving the city, they were free to exploit existing systems for personal enjoyment. Expressing some form of distaste towards marriage was quite popular in philosophy. Stobaeus collects 38 sayings from 35 different ancient thinkers who opposed marriage including notables such as Menander, Euripides, Socrates, Plato, and Solon. Pseudo-Diogenes takes up this cause in an epistle addressed to Zeno, teaching that marriage should be avoided as a human weakness.

After Epicurus, not many Epicureans give an opinion about marriage. Philodemus of Gadara (c. 110-35 BCE) refers to the Epicurean way while he discusses

---


1008 Ep. 47 in Malherbe, *Cynic Epistles*.
other approaches to household management. Lucretius (c. 99-55 BCE) continues the Epicurean tradition that the wise-person should not marry, but under certain circumstances he can take a wife and genuine friendship can result from the union. Diogenes of Oenoanda (fl. 2nd CE) briefly mentions marriage but gives no opinion on it in what remains as a fragment. Epictetus (c. 55-135 CE) writes that the Epicurean wise-person will not marry (3.7.19), raise children, or participate in politics (1.23). Similarly, Paul’s ideal follower of Christ, following his example, will not marry (1 Cor. 7:8). However, just as Paul provides an exception for marriage for those who cannot practice self-control (1 Cor. 7:9), a highly disputed text in Diogenes Laertius (10.119) says that Epicurus taught that the wise-person could marry under certain (unknown) circumstances, but this exception is only found here and contradicts all other extant teachings of Epicurus on the subject.

---


1011 Diogenes of Oneoanda, frag. 25.

Cynics and Marriage

With the notable exception of Crates and Hipparchia, there is no record of marriage in the history of the Cynics. Marriage goes against the grain of the extreme individualism of Cynicism: the complete freedom from all constraints. Epictetus, for example, writes that the Cynic “ought to be free from distraction, wholly devoted to the service of God, free to be among the people, not tied down by the private duties of men, nor involved in relationships which he cannot violate.” The Cynics and Stoics engaged in ongoing debate about marriage.

The Stoics and Marriage

The Stoics supported traditional marriage with the exception of Zeno (c. 334-262 BCE), who taught that there should be a community of wives for the ideal Stoic community (Diog. Laert. 7.131, following Pl. Rep. 423e, 457a-b, 462). Cicero took his own advice and married to his advantage: he was married twice, and relished his
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1015 Deming, Paul on Marriage, 48.

1016 Epictetus explains that this is another form of marriage, “καὶ ὅλλο τι εἴδος γόμου ἐιςφέρων,” frag. 15. Elizabeth Asmis believes that this is an indication that the community of wives also participated in philosophical discourse and education, “The Stoics on Women,” in Ancient Philosophy and Feminism, ed. J. Ward (New York: Routledge, 1996), 68–94.
interactions with daughter Tullia and his second wife Terentia. Although it may be a fanciful interpretation of the historical data, it is possible Seneca (c. 4 BCE-65 CE) not only valued marriage, but engaged in philosophical discussion regularly with the sisters of Caligula: Agrippina the Younger, Julia Drusilla, and Julia the Elder. Hierocles and Musonius Rufus supported marriage, but with the careful qualification that women are only superficially equal to men on a theoretical level, but the traditional household duties are actively reinforced.

Plutarch, the “Middle Platonist”

Represented by Plutarch, the so-called “middle Platonists” believed that the philosopher was to be fully integrated into society, taking a wife, establishing a household, and serving the city in public offices. Plutarch is the first century representative of Middle Platonism, and the primary resources from his writings on this topic are his Advice to Bride and Groom and On Consolation to his Wife. In the Advice to the Bride and Groom, Plutarch expresses his belief that it was wrong for husbands to


1018 It was Agrippina who secured Seneca’s return from exile so that he could teach Nero, Judith Ginsburg, Representing Agrippina: Constructions of Female Power in the early Roman Empire (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 20.


irritate their wives with the slight pleasure of adultery. Plutarch writes of his wife:

“Every philosopher who has been in our company has been amazed at the simplicity of your person and the unpretentiousness of your life,” “ἐὐτελείᾳ μὲν γὰρ τῇ περὶ τὸ σώμα καὶ ἀθρυπσίᾳ τῇ περὶ διαίταις οὐδείς ἐστι τῶν φιλοσόφων.” The ideal wife, according to Plutarch, is philosophically educated:

Σὺ δ’ ὡς Ἐυρυδίκη μάλιστα πειρώ τῶν σοφῶν καὶ ἁγαθῶν ἀποφθέγμασιν ομιλεῖ καὶ δία στόματος αἰεὶ τὰς φωνὰς ἔχειν ἐκεῖνας οὖν καὶ παρθένος οὕσα παρ’ ἡμῖν ἀνελάμβανες, ὅπως εὐφραίνησας μὲν τὸν ἄνδρα, θαυμάζῃ δ’ ὑπὸ τῶν ἄλλων γυναικῶν, οὕτω κοσμομυμένη περιττῶς καὶ σεμινὸς ἀπὸ μθένος. τοὺς μὲν γὰρ τῆς πλουσίας μαργαρίτας καὶ τὰ τῆς ἐξῆς σηρικὰ λαβεῖν οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδὲ περιθέαθαι μὴ πολλοῦ πραιμένην, τὰ δὲ Θεανοῦς κόσμια καὶ Κλεοβουλίνης καὶ Γόργης οὕς τῆς Λεωνίδου γυναικὸς καὶ Τιμοκλείας τῆς ἀδελφῆς καὶ Κλαυδίας τῆς παλαιᾶς καὶ Κορνήλίας τῆς Σκιπίωνος καὶ οἱ σαν ἐγένοντο θυμασταὶ καὶ περιβότοι, ταῦτα δ’ ἔζεστι περικείμενη προῖκα καὶ κοσμομυμένην αὐτόις ἐνδόξως ἀμα βιοῦν καὶ μακαρίας. Θεαγένους ἀδελφῆς καὶ Κλαυδίας τῆς παλαιᾶς καὶ Κορνήλιας τῆς Σκιπίωνος καὶ οἱ σαν ἐγένοντο θυμασταὶ καὶ περιβότοι, ταῦτα δ’ ἔζεστι περικείμενη προῖκα καὶ κοσμομυμένην αὐτόις ἐνδόξως ἀμα βιοῦν καὶ μακαρίας.

And as for you, Eurydice, I beg that you will try to be conversant with the sayings of the wise and good, and always have at your tongue’s end those sentiments which you used to cull in your girlhood’s days when you were with us, so that you may give joy to your husband, and may be admired by other women, adorned, as you will be, without price, with rare and precious jewels. For you cannot acquire and put upon you this rich woman’s pearls or that foreign woman’s silks without buying them at a high price, but the ornaments of Theano, Cleobulina, Gorgo the wife of Leonidas, Timocleia, the sister of Theagenes, Claudia of old, Cornelia, daughter of Scipio, and of all other women who have been admired and renowned,

---


1023 Plut. Mor. 609c. Translation by Donald Russell in Plutarch’s Advice, 59-63.
you may wear about you without price, and, adorning yourself with these, you may live a life of distinction and happiness.  

Plutarch gives us important information concerning how a woman could gain access to philosophical education. Eurydice learned philosophical maxims when she was a child in Plutarch’s house, which included lines from poetesses, stories of female heros, and sayings of women philosophers. As a wife, she is to remember these lessons and is encouraged to learn more.

Pseudo-Plutarch’s essay on love (Mor. 748e-771e) is also relevant here, because the author, pretending to be his son, presents Plutarch’s view as the writer understands it.

The dialog centers on the question of the marriage of a young man, Bacchon, and a wealthy widow that was a bit older. The dialogue embodies Plutarch’s views concerning marriage and it is modeled after Plato’s Symposium, so older traditions are represented in the debate. The dialog reveals that Plutarch thought that the foundation of marriage was love between a man a woman. For these reasons, pseudo-Plutarch will receive more discussion than some of the other ancient works.

Pseudo-Plutarch’s Dialogue on Love contains many conflicting views about love: its object (whether one can love men or women physically or only inner beauty), when

---

1024 Plut. Mor. 145e-f (Babbitt, LCL).


and who one should marry, and how women are to act in relationship to others. While these issues are debated, Ismenodora, a wealthy widow in love with a young man, acts according to her will to achieve her own purposes. She asserts her love for the young man, which causes heated debate among the older male lovers and other men who are involved in his life. While they discuss whether he should marry her or not, Ismendora kidnaps and marries Bacchon in her home. While this kidnapping and forced marriage is intended as playful and the men are willing participants, there is definitely an undercurrent of Ismendora’s power over Bacchon and the other men of the group. Perhaps the activities of Ismendora in Plutarch’s *Dialogue on Love* can serve as a model of how wealthy women in the Pauline churches could have moved and acted according to their will while the idealistic views of the activity and role of women in the church was subject to debate. At least by analogy, it shows us the activity of a wealthy woman in the lives of men outside of the royal circle.

Ismendora’s character is considered excellent by everyone present, and she fell in love with Bacchon when she was trying to introduce him to one of her friends (749d-e). More importantly, she is the aggressor in the relationship, seeking him as her husband. Bacchon’s friends of the same age make a joke of the idea of him marrying her because of her superiority: her age, wealth, power, authority, and previous marriage. Because of these concerns, Bacchon’s elder friends and family enter into serious debate as to the dynamics of such a marriage. Many people had an opinion about the marriage, but the decision was left up to Anthemion (an elder cousin of Bacchon) and Pisias (the most

---

1027 For the dynamics of friendship and pederasty in the ancient world, see Marc D. Schachter, *Voluntary Servitude and the Erotics of Friendship from Classical Antiquity to Early Modern France* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2008), 23-38.
sober of Bacchon’s lovers = ὁ δὲ Πεισίς σύστηρότατος τῶν ἐραστῶν). Plutarch is nominated as a moderator of this debate, and offers his own views at the close, which is comparable in length to everything that precedes it.

The argument for pederasty/homoerotica as the highest form of love comes principally from Pisias, a man in a pederastic relationship with Bacchon.1028 His argument is not entirely rejected by the others, but he does take more than a little bit of flack for his obvious bias (from Anthemion 749f; from Daphnaeus 750b). Protogenes, however, will agree with him. Protogenes asserts that love has nothing to do with women because a man is only acting according to nature (the desire to produce children, and possibly the force of sexual attraction) when he interacts sexually with women. Protogenes insists that the most noble form of love is the love of boys, which goes against these natural urges and therefore cultivates true friendship and virtue (750d-e).

Protogenes argues that the love of freeborn boys is the only genuine love (εἰς Ἐρως ὁ γυνής ὑπὸ παιδίκος ἐστιν in 751a is qualified in 751b to exclude slave boys). At this point, Daphnaeus interrupts Protogenes and declares (after a jest insinuating that Protogenes himself is bewitched by infatuation) that women’s yielding to men sexually is called “favor” by the poets, but the unnatural yielding of boys to men or adults to men is violent if involuntary or effeminate if it is voluntary. Daphnaeus does not wholly do away with pederasty as a normative mode of affection, but wants to force Protogenes to admit that if unnatural activity is hailed as such, natural expressions must be accepted as

---

well, particularly because natural intercourse wins immortality for the human race (from 751f-752e).

Pisias then expresses a familiar standard: “ἐπεὶ ταῖς γε σώφροσιν οὐτ’ ἔραν οὐτ’ ἔρασθαι δῆπον προσηκόν ἐστιν,” “Decent women cannot, of course, without impropriety either receive or bestow a passionate love” (752c). To this Plutarch interjects with a very interesting rebuttal, placing marriage within the context of friendship:

καὶ νὴ Δία Δαφνοίῳ συνδίκους ἡμᾶς προστίθησιν οὐ μετριάζων ὁ Πεισίας, ἀλλὰ τοῖς γάμοις ἀνέραστον ἑπάγων καὶ ἐμοιρὸν ἐνθέου φιλίας κοινωνίαν, ἡ τῆς ἐρωτικῆς πείθος καὶ χάριτος ἀπολιπούσης μονονοῦ ἔγονος καὶ Δ. χαλινοὶς ὑπ’ αἰσχύνης καὶ φόβου μάλα μόλις συνεχομένην ὄρβαμεν.

‘I swear that it is Pisias’ lack of moderation that makes me join forces with Daphnaeus. So marriage is to be a loveless union, devoid of its god-given friendship!’ Yet we observe that a loveless union, once it is deserted by courtship and ‘favor,’ can scarcely be held together by such yokes as shame and fear.1029

Because friendship must be between equals - and several ancient writers of this time want to apply the principals of friendship to many unequal relationships like patronage, kingship, kinship, and marriage - Plutarch must find a way to make husband and wife “equal.” Plutarch defends marriage, addressing the two ways that women can often be superior to men in general: in beauty and wealth, and gives examples of how both have destroyed men.

Pisias asserts again that women have no part at all in love, and because of this wealthy and beautiful women are particularly dangerous. He explicitly attacks Ismenodora, saying that she is only seeking to dominate a boy younger and less wealthy than herself (752e-f). Pisias argues that women only feel passion and not true love, being lead only by the baser part of the soul. He restates the position asserted by Protogenes

1029 Plut. Mor. 752c (Minar, Sandbach, and Hemhold, LCL).
above: “ἐραν δὲ φάσκουσαν γυναικεῖα φυγεῖν τις ἂν ἔχοι καὶ βδελυχθείν, μήτι γε λάβοι γάμου ποιησάμενος ἀρχὴν τὴν τοιούτην ἀκρασίαν,” “For if a woman makes a declaration of love, a man can only take to his heels in utter disgust, let alone accepting and founding a marriage on such intemperance.”1030

In this case, the age difference also has to be addressed. First, Plutarch submits that not all married men are unhappy with the companionship of women and do not seek to be freed from it (753c). Some women are worthless to men and destroy them with their wealth and beauty, but if a man brings his wife down to his level by degrading her wealth and beauty, he will also demean himself. Plutarch therefore says:

“Ο δὲ συστέλλων τὴν γυναῖκα καὶ συνάγων εἰς μικρόν, ὥσπερ δακτύλιον ἵσχυσι ἄν μὴ περιρρή δεδίκτος, ὁμοίος ἔστι τοῖς ἀποκείμενοι τὰς ἱπποὺς εἴτε πρὸς ποταμὸν ἢ λίμνην ἄγουσι, καθορώσαν γὰρ ἐκάστην τὴν εἰκόνα τῆς ὑψίως ἀκαλλή καὶ ἀμορφοῦν ἀφίνει τὰ φυσάματα λέγεται καὶ προσδέχεσθαι τάς τῶν ὑδάτων ἐπίβασεῖς.

“The man who cramps and diminishes his wife (as a thin man does his ring for fear that it may fall off) is like those who shear their mares and then lead them to a river or a pool: when the poor beast sees how ugly she looks in the reflection, ugly and unsightly, they say that she abandons her haughty airs and allows asses to mount her.”1031

The equality which is requisite to friendship occurs not by the man degrading the wealth and beauty of his wife, but by the enhancement of the husband’s character. His character is enhanced not by shunning his wife, or by making her poor or ugly, but by bearing all of her advantages with dignity. It is the husband’s own will not to serve his more powerful wife that makes him strong.
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The husband, however, of a rich or beautiful woman must not make her unsightly or poor; rather by his own self-possession and prudence, as well as by the refusal to be over-awed by any of her advantages, he must hold to his own without servility.1032

Perhaps even more remarkable, in light of other passages regarding the education of women in Cicero, Seneca, Plutarch, and Diogenes Laertius, is that the elder wife educates the younger husband. Cicero, Seneca, and Plutarch together bear witness to the education of elite women by their husbands. Yet Plutarch notes that a more educated woman should teach her husband:

\[
\text{εἰ δὲ ἂρχει βρέφους μὲν ἡ τίτθι καὶ παιδὸς ὁ διδάσκαλος ἐφήβου δὲ γυμνασιάρχος ἔρασθὶ δὲ μειρακίου γενομένου δὲ ἠλίκια νόμος καὶ στρατηγὸς οὐδεὶς δὲ ἀναρκτὸς οὐδὲ αὐτοτελὴς, τί δεινὸν εἰ γυνὴ νοὺν ἔχουσα πρεσβυτέρα κυβέρνησιν ἰσχεὶ νέου βίον ἀνδρὸς, ὁφέλιμος μὲν οὖσα τῷ φρονεῖν μᾶλλον ἠδεία δὲ τῷ φιλεῖν καὶ προσηνής}
\]

The nurse rules the infant, the teacher the boy, the gymnasiarch the youth, his admirer the young man who, when he comes of age, is ruled by law and his commanding general. No one is his own master, no one is unrestricted. Since this is so, what is there dreadful about a sensible older woman piloting the life of a young man? She will be useful because of her superior intelligence; she will be sweet because she loves him.1033

At this point, Ismendora asserts her power by summoning all the young men and young ladies loyal to her to help her to kidnap Bacchus. Apparently, Bacchus was in the habit of walking by her house at a certain time of day, and some other young men brought him in to the house and the party dressed him in wedding clothes and they

1032 Plut. Mor. 754b (Minar, Sandbach, and Hemhold, LCL).
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proceeded with the ceremony. Upon hearing this news, Pisias loses his mind and leaves the debate to call upon the gymnasiiarchs to settle the matter, and Protogenes follows to calm him down (755c).

It appears to me that the rest of the persons participating in the discussion were amused with Ismendora and end up associating her with other great male and female lovers. With the most passionate defenders of pederasty now out of the debate, Pemptides appeals to the group again to discuss the topic at hand, appealing to the analogy of two people finding an asp and wanting to keep it for good luck: whether love can be found with men or women or both (755e-f). Plutarch was just about to open his mouth to answer when Ismendora again asserts her power: she summons Anthemion, the one other moderator from the debate, to come to her house to help her settle the uproar. Anthemion therefore leaves the group of men at the request of a woman (756a), which is very significant: Ismendora forces her will on Bacchon – the younger, inexperienced man – and then on Athemion, his elder, who may well be her superior in age and wealth.

Plutarch begins his answer with a long sermon (756b-757c) declaring the divinity of Eros and Ares. Plutarch asserts that Eros guides the older male lovers of young boys - when friendship is their goal - and therefore does not undermine pederasty in the slightest (758b-c; again lauded quite a bit in 760e-761e). In this case, one should guard against following one’s lust, because pederasty is criticized when the object of the elder man’s affection is not beauty of soul and the enjoyment of the body. It is in this balance that Plutarch can argue both for pederasty, adult male homoeroticism, and then the expression of love with women/wives (759f-760b). Women in general have done courageous deeds in the name of love, he declares (761e).
Pederasty again seems to be the type of love praised by in 762b-f. It makes the slow-witted man clever, every man generous, and happy to give (examples are given of pederastic men who change while in love with boys). Zeuxippus continued this point by offering his own example, and then appealed to Sappho who gives an example of the same thing happening to women when they see their beloved (763a).

In the midst of another long speech by Plutarch, he mentions Plato’s doctrine of love (764a; as mentioned in the Symposium). In Plato’s doctrine of love, the object of affection is the soul. For Plutarch, the object of affection is also the beauty of the soul, but there is appreciation for physical beauty. As a god, Eros graciously leads the person to love the soul while the lover longs to be united sexually with the beloved, be they male or female (765a-b). This concept is elucidated by the following quote:

εὐφυός δ’ ἔραστοι καὶ σῴφρονος ἄλλος τρόπος· ἔκει γὰρ ἀνακλάται πρὸς τὸ θείον καὶ νοητὸν καλὸν· ὅρατος δὲ σώματος ἐντυχῶν κάλλει καὶ χρωμένος σίον ὀργάνῳ τινὶ τῆς μνήμης ἀσπάζεται καὶ ἀγαπᾷ, καὶ συνῶν καὶ γεγηθῶς ἔτι μᾶλλον ἐκφλέγεται τὴν διάνοιαν.

But the noble and self-controlled lover [of either men or women] has a different bent. His regard is refracted to the other world, to Beauty divine and intelligible. When he encounters beauty in a visible body, he treats it as an instrument to memory. He welcomes and delights in it, yet the pleasure of its company only serves the more to inflame his spirit.\footnote{1034}

Pseudo-Plutarch has received much attention in this section because of its value for understanding the historical, cultural milieu, and the philosophical landscape. The dialog presents us with a limited variety of first century views concerning pederasty, love, and marriage. Some considered love between males as the ideal because only males were equipped to be free from their natural impulses and cultivate virtue. Others

\footnote{1034} Plut. Mor. 766a (Minar, Sandbach, and Hemhold, LCL).
considered love between men and women as expressed in marriage to be ideal. Isomendora, an older and wealthier woman exerts her will on a younger man as well as an older and wealthier man. Like an empress, she appears to be perfectly in control of her destiny in this episode. She is a threat to the younger Bacchon because the older men know from experience that wealthier women can control their husbands. In the end, Plutarch gives the final judgment: love between men and women, even between social “unequals” is not only possible, but can be successful and foster virtue. Finally, we can highlight Plutarch’s suggestion that a more educated wife should teach her husband, and the husband therefore should consider her greater education to be an advantage.

**Paul and Marriage**

After discussing the opinions on the various popular philosophers on marriage, we move on to Paul. All of these schools had a history of teaching women, and all of them had some kind of presence in Corinth. Therefore, we should expect that some women in the Corinthian community would understand Paul’s teachings in light of what they had learned in their philosophical education. In this section, I will review Paul’s teachings concerning marriage in 1 Corinthians and then examine how two philosophically educated women would read his teachings.

**How not to do Marriage: Improper Union with the Step-mother (1 Cor. 5:1-5) and Prostitutes (6:12-16)**

I addressed this issue in section 4.5.3 because Paul is most likely speaking to a somewhat common problem of a wealthy widow co-habitating with her step-son. Paul completely rejects this situation as an appropriate expression of Christian love or
marriage, and it disrupts Christian fellowship so severely that the step-son must be expelled from the community. Nothing is said of the woman – most readers of 1 Corinthians take this silence to mean that she is not a member of the community – if she is considered at all. 1035 If so, Paul could be risking the alienation of wealthier members of the Christian community with their higher status friends – something that Paul does not seem interested in at all in 1 Corinthians. 1036 Paul’s teachings in 1 Cor. 10:27 allow for the wealthier members of the community to continue their relationships with their “unbelieving” friends because they can invite and be invited to dinner parties without dietary restrictions. 1037 These teachings also allow the wealthier members to host the community in their households without censure from their wealthy friends because of the strange dietary restrictions of the community. 1038 It was the secretive nature of early Christian meetings that later brought criticism from their polemicists, who let their imaginations run wild with assumptions as to what the Christians might be doing behind closed doors. 1039 If Paul can convince his followers to be above suspicion, that is one less

1035 Robertson and Plummer, Corinthians, 96; Barrett, Corinthians, 121; Witherington, Conflict and Community, 158; Fitzmyer, Corinthians, 234; Chow, Patronage and Power, 114.

1036 Cf., Ciampa and Rosner, Corinthians, 203.

1037 For discussion, see Horrell, Social Ethos, 108. Hays writes that Paul prefers that the “strong” join him with the “weak” and avoid meat altogether if nessesary, Corinthians, 142-3. However, if no one at the table is offended, it seems that the “strong” can eat meat as they please. Cf., Fotopoulos, Food Offered to Idols, 253; Chow, Patronage and Power, 156-7.

1038 Martin, Corinthian Body, 75; cf., Witherington calls it a “qualified endorsement” of both positions, Conflict and Community, 191-2; Lull and Beardslee, Corinthians, 81, 89-92.
thing for the patrons of the church to worry about. It would be an incentive for the wealthy members of the community – both insiders and outsiders - to begin or continue supporting the church.

However, if the step-mother in 1 Cor. 5:1-5 is a member of the community, she would have more sympathetic relationship to Paul than an outsider, and the expulsion of her step-son from the community may have been to her advantage and perhaps beneficial for the rest of the community. The questions surrounding the death of a wealthy man and the precise division of that wealth and settlements of debt is a time of tremendous vulnerability, and other members of the Christian community perhaps could not resist such a temptation. The expulsion of the step-son in 1 Cor. 5:1-5 combined with forbidding lawsuits in public courts nicely solves these problems. The public shaming of the step-mother may cause more problems that it solves, unless the separation works out to her advantage (discourages lawsuits, publically dissolves a problematic relationship, and secures her claim to her husband’s wealth).

Paul addresses the problem of the union of men and women
to the Christian community with prostitutes in 1 Cor. 6:12-16. Paul focuses on the unity of the Christian body, utilizing the “one body many parts” metaphor. The metaphor is deceptive in its

---


1040 In the Roman world, both men and women exploited prostitutes who were typically slaves (both adults and children). There is no reason to assume that Paul is restricting this teaching to men alone, unless Paul does not think that a female can unite the body of Christ with a prostitute. For references and bibliography, see below section 6.4.1.
simplicity: the strength of the body is determined by the unity of the members, which are useless if they stand alone. That is simple enough, but the metaphor is exclusively used in antiquity to explain that the rich and poor are unified in one body, and the poor should continue happily in their servile position. Because the Christians are unified with one another and with Christ, sexual intercourse with a prostitute is much more than simply one person indulging himself or herself by sexually exploiting another person. The unity that the Christian enjoys with Christ and the community is disrupted when this unity is extended by means of a sexually immoral activity to a prostitute. Paul seeks to motivate his audience to preserve this unity by warning them that they are uniting Christ with the prostitute in sexual immorality.

Paul’s Regulations for Marriage: 1 Cor. 7:1-40

In 1 Cor. 7:1-40, Paul gives the community his regulations for marriage. Apparently, some members of the community were married but thought that it was best not to engage in sexual acts within that marriage. Paul begins his teaching on marriage with a negative motivation: people should marry because of the temptation to sexual immorality (7:2). Paul goes on to give his understanding of conjugal rights: the husband and wife should not deprive one another sexually (7:3). He seems to reject the idea that sexual union is reserved for procreation, and gives both the male and female over to their natural lusts. Then Paul expresses the ideal to be imitated: to be unmarried and in
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1041 Martin, Corinthian Body, 95; Mitchell, Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation, 157-64.

1042 For interpretative issues and bibliography, see below in section 6.4.3.
complete control over the passions (7:9). However, if a person cannot maintain self-control, then they should marry (7:10).

Paul teaches that a man and wife should not divorce one another, and if they do separate, they should not remarry but reconcile to each other (7:10-11). The prohibition on divorce is unqualified, and supported by the superlative example: even if one has an unbelieving spouse, the believing partner should not initiate divorce and make their partner and their children holy. Remarriage is forbidden for a woman who does leave her husband, the only option that Paul gives is reconciliation. The only divorce that is sanctioned is when an unbelieving spouse asks for one. Paul then gives more justification for remaining unmarried: the present distress (7:26) and the added anxieties of marriage that distract one from serving the Lord (7:32-34). However, marriage and betrothal are not sins in themselves (7:28). Paul concedes that if done properly (ie, with both persons practicing acceptable levels of self-control) marriage and betrothal are good, but remaining unmarried is better (7:38). Paul concludes by giving instruction specifically to women: they should not divorce or remarry as long as their first husband lives, but if he dies, then she can remarry someone in the Christian community.

---

Deming suggests that Paul is following a Jesus tradition that prohibits divorce and interprets 1 Cor. 7:11 as speaking to separation and not necessarily divorce, *Paul on Marriage*, 218. However, Paul is not allowing for divorce or qualifying his prohibition on it by recognizing that it will happen in the community (1 Cor. 7:11) but gives instructions for what should be done if divorce or separation should occur (reconciliation and no remarriage).
Paul’s Regulations in Worship: 1 Cor. 11:1-17

In 1 Corinthians 11:1-17, Paul uses his concept of marriage to give instructions concerning the use of head-coverings in worship.¹⁰⁴⁴ These instructions comprise the concept of “headship”: the head of the wife is the husband, the head of the husband is Christ, and the head of Christ is God (11:2). Paul moves on to the regulation of worship, elaborating on the idea of “headship” with instructions concerning head-coverings. Men are to pray and prophesy with their heads uncovered, and women are to pray and prophesy with their heads covered. Men should remain uncovered because men are the image and glory of God, women are the image of men. Paul elaborates further on unity: men and women are made for each other and are interdependent. Paul concludes discussion on the topic of head-coverings by an appeal to nature: if a man wears long hair, it is against nature, and if a woman has long hair, it is perfectly natural so she should wear a head-covering.

Sophia and Fortuna on Marriage

We have seen in chapter five that Sophia and Fortuna have approached Paul from different perspectives. Both readers have difficulties, confusion, and points of departure from his arguments, but they also find that they can appreciate him for their own reasons. Paul’s teachings concerning human and wisdom in chapters 1-4 were understandable to both Sophia and Fortuna, who both identify with his teachings concerning divine wisdom. The confusing nature of Paul’s understanding of division within the church and the sharp contrast between divine and human wisdom is troublesome to both women.

¹⁰⁴⁴ For exegetical questions and bibliography, see chapter 4 above.
However, Sophia’s sympathetic reading allows her to identify with Paul and approach his rhetoric as directed toward the human wisdom of his opponents and not her own. Paul’s persistence on the issue and especially his claim to attain self-sufficiency without a philosophical method eventually alienate Fortuna. At the same time, however, the less sympathetic Fortuna intends to continue her support to the church and despite the shortcomings of Paul’s arguments. In this chapter, we will explore how Sophia and Fortuna would read Paul’s regulations concerning marriage and worship.

Reading 1 Cor. 5:1-5 and 6:12-16 with Sophia

Paul’s teachings concerning marriage address the problem of unity. I have argued that the problem of the step-mother and step-son provides the perfect conditions for serious discord in the community. The step-son is usually seen as the person in control of the wealth, but the larger share in the property may well have passed to his step-mother who can leave him disinherited should he leave the house. Even if the consequence is not quite that severe, the property situation could be a powerful motivation to maintain a continued positive relationship with her. Not much needs to be said about this issue except for the threat that it can present to the wealthy patroness: if the church acts according to Paul’s command, then he is exerting authority on a very intimate aspect of her household. Paul himself is not ejecting the man from the household, but is calling for the community to remove him from a group that he may care

---

1045 Keener, 1 & 2 Corinthians, 49; Garland, Corinthians, 162-3.

1046 Cf., Gardner, Women in Roman Law, 163-204.

1047 Cf., Clarke, Secular and Christian Leadership, 81.
deeply about. The problem that Sophia may encounter is the threat that Paul may attempt to exert the same kind of authority in an area of her life that only she should determine. Paul’s evident lack of concern for the goodwill of a wealthy woman demonstrates a gross lack of respect for the people who are providing the church with critical support. However, Sophia can support Paul’s expulsion of the step-son on the basis of his promotion of self-control and unity within the community. This episode is not merely one that highlights one woman’s home and an improper sexual relationship, but is a matter that effects the entire community. Paul’s action could have worked to the benefit of the step-mother, removing the temptation for other people in the community to take advantage of her vulnerability in court by attacking her character. In this case, Sophia can approach Paul’s handling of this situation in an entirely appropriate manner: he is teaching self-control and ridding the community of a very real problem.

Paul addresses the problem of the unification of the church in a strange manner: sex with prostitutes. The principle sources for prostitution were exposed children, female and male slaves, and female and male freedpersons who sold themselves into slavery. Most prostitutes were forced into prostitution by their masters or families, which complicates the ethical situation that Paul addresses. From the literary sources, prostitution was rarely practiced by choice. Prostitution was a problem for Roman women and men because by exploiting prostitutes, men could both displease their wives and produce illegitimate heirs that threaten their fortunes. Wealthy Roman women could participate in prostitution as either a buyer or a seller, and that could cause legal problems

for her husband and destitution or death for herself, provided that her husband followed the law himself or his friends or enemies see to it that the law is enforced. The first problem is addressed by the neo-Pythagorean philosophers, who encourage women to bear this hardship with magnamity. The concepts presented in these neo-Pythagorean writers could have been expressed by any Stoic or Middle Platonist. The popular philosophers and other ancient writers also used the metaphor of the body to reinforce social unity. Sophia is glad to hear that Paul prohibits sex with prostitutes because of her experience as a wife and widow and especially because of her philosophical education. For Sophia, it is good that both men and women are taught to practice self-control not only with respect to prostitutes but in every other area of life.

Reading 1 Cor. 5:1-5 and 6:12-16 with Fortuna

As with Sophia, there is not much to say about Fortuna’s reading of the incident concerning the inappropriate relationship between the woman and her step-son. The challenge of the situation for Fortuna would doubtless be Paul’s undue influence on one of their peers’ household. Like the step-mother, Fortuna is a wealthy patroness of the


1050 Both men and women of various status participated as both consumers and prostitutes. For women paying male prostitutes, see John Clarke, *Looking at Lovemaking: Constructions of Sexuality in Roman Art* 100BC-AD 250 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001), 226; ancient sources in Johnson and Ryan, *Sexuality in Greek and Roman Society*, 87-109. Contra Wire, who asserts that this text cannot apply to women because they never paid male prostitutes, *Corinthian Women Prophets*, 74.
church. If Paul can impose his will on one of her sisters, showing an unforgivable lack of gratitude and cowardly use of the church to expel the step-son instead of taking a more sublte, private approach to the situation, then someday he could betray her in a similar manner. Fortuna suspects that if Paul can suddenly find fault with her, perhaps she would face a similar embarrassment.

Fortuna is pleased that Paul calls for self-control of men and women with respect to prostitutes. However, she finds it useless to attempt to reform the sexual behaviors of people who for all their lives they had seen nothing wrong with Paul’s version of sexual “immorality.” For Fortuna, however, self-control is attained by disciplined commitment to a philosophical method. By its nature, the self-control that Paul requires of the entire community is only available to the disciplined few who have the stamina to follow the rigors of good teachings. Although the prohibition is something of a trite criticism in her opinion, if Paul persuades some people to avoid prostitutes and it does settle some discord in the community, then the prohibition is good for everyone.

Reading Regulations for Marriage in 1 Cor. 7:1-40 with Sophia

The entire chapter of 1 Cor. 7 addresses the issue of marriage and divorce.1051 Within this block of text there are many issues and questions. Within 1 Cor. 7:1-16, there


Wire, Corinthian Women Prophets, 72-9.


teaching of Jesus,\textsuperscript{1058} Jewish background,\textsuperscript{1059} Paul's teachings of slavery and social status (1 Cor. 7:17-24),\textsuperscript{1060} Paul's rhetoric,\textsuperscript{1061} and questions related to the betrothed.\textsuperscript{1062}


Somewhere beneath all of these arguments, interpretations, and readings, are our philosophically educated women, who heard 1 Corinthians being read with as much noise as a modern reader who is aware of all these arguments. Sophia and Fortuna read 1 Corinthians from their multi-valent backgrounds (wealth, status, power, education, sense of style and tradition, etc.), and I will continue to focus on their readings from their perspective as wealthy philosophically educated women.

Paul opens his discussion with a very low view of marriage: it is permissible only because people are weak and cannot control their passions. While he expresses this negative sentiment three times (1 Cor. 7:2, 9, 36), Paul qualified it by saying that marriage and betrothal are not sins. Therefore, the ideal is the person who has a self-control that can successfully overcome passion. For everyone else who cannot attain this ideal, marriage is a concession. The regulations concerning marriage are that it is a lifetime commitment for a woman, divorce is forbidden for both men and women who are members of the community, but believers should grant unbelievers a divorce if the unbeliever requests it on account of religion. If a couple within the community does divorce, they are encouraged to reconcile but forbidden to marry anyone else.

These teachings do not apply directly to Sophia because she is a widow. She is unmarried and her husband is dead, so she meets the only explicit criteria for remarriage (perhaps a loophole in Paul’s thinking is the question concerning whether or not people who agreed to divorce their partners because they did not want to be married to a Christian could remarry). Of slight interest to Sophia are the parallels in Paul’s thinking

---

to other philosophers who prohibit or make marriage a concession for someone who lacks self-control. For Sophia, it is self-control that captures her imagination, not Paul’s concept of marriage itself. It is of no consequence to Sophia whether or not the members of the community marry (unless the union somehow effects her), but she can celebrate being a part of community that strives together for the virtue of mastering the self.

Reading Regulations for Marriage in 1 Cor. 7:1-40 with Fortuna

Fortuna receives Paul’s regulations concerning marriage with complete disinterest. Fortuna is slightly amused that Paul offers marriage as a concession to self-control: instead of developing an environment that encourages self-control, Paul allows for a context where people can live a less than ideal life (1 Cor. 7:7, 32-4). At least Paul is consistent and teaches that both the husband and wife should willingly participate in sexual relations except for an agreed-upon time of prayer (1 Cor. 7:5). That is, marriage is for those who are not self-controlled, therefore one should not allow their partner to “burn” with passion (7:9). If Paul tells people to marry who lack control of their passions, it would completely defeat the purpose if he did not allow for these passions to be somehow expressed within marriage, his remedy to the problem. This approach to sex and restraint within marriage seems to be an attempt to appease those who said that it was good for a man not to “touch” a woman (a euphemism for sex\textsuperscript{1063}), but instead of a lifestyle, the mutual choice to refrain from sex should be brief (7:5).

The only possible benefit for Fortuna would be the possibility of the approval of her patronage of the Pauline community from her friends, because of the stability that the prohibition of divorce in 1 Cor. 7:10-17 could bring to the community. However, this benefit is slight because her friends – should they discover the prohibition – would be more alarmed and amused than anything else. While we know of several couples from monuments and other sources in the Roman world who were committed to each other for life, no other Greek or Roman teacher had ever prohibited divorce (although some leaders like Augustus in his lex Iulia discouraged it). If the prohibition of divorce somehow gained popularity – or perhaps even in Fortuna’s circle of Christian friends - it would threaten the ambitions of entire families. As families sought to better their status, secure their estate, and gain wealth and power, divorce and remarriage were simply used as means to that end. Sexual gratification and fulfillment for both elite men and women were found elsewhere: in the exploitation of children, slaves, prostitutes, clients, freed persons, and other unmarried and married people outside of the marriage.

1064 There were a few other teachings that prohibited divorce (not to mention the Jesus tradition, but Paul makes no indication that he has shared this with the Corinthians before), see David Horrell, *Solidarity and Difference: A Contemporary Reading of Paul’s Ethics* (London: T&T Clark, 2005), 156.

1065 Kate Cooper, *The Fall of the Roman Household* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), xii.

Reading Regulations for Worship in 1 Cor. 11:1-17 with Sophia

Like all other sections of 1 Corinthians, there are many exegetical and theological problems in 1 Cor. 11:1-7. I have already addressed the scholarly debates on 1 Cor. 11:2-16 above in 4.6.8 concerning the question of Pauline authenticity, the role of the veil in worship, and the nature of the head-covering (hairstyle or veil?), and the significance of κεφαλή (source or authority?). I am approaching this text from the perspective that it is Pauline, women were active in community worship, Paul wanted the women to wear veils and the men not to wear veils in worship, and Paul used an unusual argument from nature to support his teaching.

As a philosophically educated woman, Sophia is familiar with the various attempts by the philosophers (both male and female) to regulate her dress and every other part of her life. Since she had been a member of the community, no regulation concerning head-coverings had been given to her. Before reading this epistle, she could pray, prophesy, or otherwise participate in worship without such restraint, exercising the freedom that defines the theology of the cross. Even after the receipt of this epistle, her own sense of fashion and common practice for women of her status would have much more influence on her choice than Paul’s unconvincing theological rationale for the use of head-coverings.\footnote{The same can be said of men of her status, who were equally cognizant of style and common practice – and would equally be dismissive of Paul’s theological virtues concerning their clothing. Portraits of women with and without headcoverings are found in the same context, suggesting that it is a matter of choice rather than social pressure that dictates dress, Luise Schottroff, \textit{Let the Oppressed Go Free: Feminist Perspectives on the New Testament} (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1992), 109; Kelly Olson, “\textit{Matrona} and Whore: Clothing and Definition in Roman Antiquity,” in \textit{Prostitutes and Courtesans in the Ancient World}, ed. Christopher A. Faraone and Laura K. McClure (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2006), 193.} The dynamics of Sophia’s choice on this matter are the same
before she hears Paul and after she hears Paul. This is a matter of freedom for women (and men) of her status: she wears what she desires as is appropriate to display wealth and power. Like anyone else of her status, if she allows someone of inferior status to dictate her dress, she would be heroically humbling herself, especially when they are using a weak theology that she had likely never heard before.

As with many other points like eating together and refraining from idol meat, the tangible benefit for uniform dress would be at least the outer expression of economic unity. It is entirely possible that women demonstrated their wealth and style with their hair and head-coverings.\textsuperscript{1068} If by some miracle, all of the women in the community were both convinced by Paul to wear a head-covering to every worship meeting and they were able to do so, there is the slight possibility that everyone would be enriched by the sense of unity that Paul desires. It is also interesting to note here that some women were prohibited by law from wearing the veil: anyone who had ever been a prostitute and anyone who had ever committed adultery.\textsuperscript{1069} In that case, Paul’s requirement for all women to wear a veil can be read as redemption: all women, no matter what their condition are to enjoy a certain equality and unity with everyone else. However, it is impossible to gloss over the profound economic/power/status differences in the community that will forever be apparent to everyone in the community. No matter what theological justification Paul uses, these differences cannot be veiled.

\textsuperscript{1068} Ruden, Paul Among the People, 87. Cf., Neil Elliot, Liberating Paul: The Justice of God and the Politics of the Apostle (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2006), 209; Ciampa and Rosner, 1 Corinthians, 541; Murphy-O’Connor, Keys to 1 Corinthians, 180.

Reading Regulations for Worship in 1 Cor. 11:1-17 with Fortuna

Fortuna is a bit confused concerning Paul’s regulations concerning head-coverings. For Fortuna, these regulations are useless. The argument for unity between men, women, and Christ is easy enough to follow and it is welcome. That this unity depends on what Fortuna and other women wear on their heads as well on what men do not wear is not convincing. Fortuna is aware that temples, associations, and philosophical schools have their own customs concerning dress. However, Paul’s introduction of a new theologically based regulation after years of disinterest makes no sense. If their hairstyles had caused such a disruption in worship, how is it that she and other women were able to enjoy fellowship with other believers until now? Paul is not persuasive because his attempt to correct fashion trends with ineffective theology, and his timing did not help. There is no man that is the head of Fortuna. Like many philosophically educated women before her, Fortuna has declared her relative equality with and independence from men. She is quite free to reject Paul’s unconvincing arguments and even less inclined to have him dictate to her the virtues of her sense of style.

Furthermore, Paul’s argument for head-coverings threatened Fortuna’s theology, which she adopted from Paul’s earlier teachings in Corinth. Fortuna was attracted to the Pauline community because she could express her freedom in a number of ways that Paul

---


1071 Martin, “Veiled Exhortation,” 263.
would later find intolerable. One way that Fortuna expressed her freedom was in her
dress, and Paul’s theological argument for head-coverings is far less important than the
theology that attracted her to the community in the first place.

**Conclusion: Reading Paul on Marriage with Sophia and Fortuna**

Most of the popular moral philosophies celebrated marriage with varying degrees
of emphasis. The Epicureans did not encourage marriage because it threatened the
disconnection from attachment that characterizes the ideal wise-person, and the wise-
person (be they male or female\(^\text{1072}\)) could indulge in sex acts with anyone – as long as
this act broke no law and harmed no one – because sex was natural. With the exception
of Crates and Hipparchia, the Cynics did not marry because of their separation from
human society unless they marry another Cynic. Stoics celebrated marriage as an
enriching union between man and woman that the wise-person uses to better herself, her
situation, and society. The neo-Pythagorean Theano and Perictione\(^\text{1073}\) taught wife
should tolerate her husband’s use of prostitutes because of her self-control (controlling
anger) and in hopes of changing his behavior through her virtue. Plutarch, our first-
century Middle-Platonist, celebrates marriage as the best way to express human love.

Paul’s teachings on marriage focus on strengthening the unity of the community.
Paul gives instructions to the community on how not to do marriage: the step-mother’s
affair with her step-son, and men using prostitutes. Paul has a view of marriage that is far

\(^{1072}\) This female sexual activity could be a reason why Epicurean women philosophers are portrayed as prostitutes. See discussion in chapter 3 above.

\(^{1073}\) For discussion, see chapter 6 above.
below the Stoics and Plutarch. He teaches that the ideal Christian does not marry, but if a person cannot control herself/himself then she/he should marry. A consolation – that married persons can practice some small measure of self control - is that the husband and wife should not withhold their bodies from one another unless they mutually agree for a short period of time. Furthermore, husbands and wives should not initiate divorce for any reason but they can grant a divorce to unbelievers who ask for one, and remarriage is forbidden for everyone but widows who lack self-control. Finally, women should wear head-coverings in worship. The rationale for all of these teachings is that no one stands alone: the affair, sex with prostitutes, and divorce all disrupt the unity of the community because everyone is unified with the body of Christ.

Some issues effect Sophia and Fortuna in the same way. With regard to the stepmother, Paul is treating someone of their status with more than a little contempt. Instead of being thankful for patronage, Paul seeks to control a wealthy women by requiring the community to expel her step-son from the fellowship. This is a threat to any other patron: Paul has demonstrated that he is an ungrateful beneficiary. The issue concerning prostitutes is welcome because it encourages self-control, but trite because neither Sophia nor Fortuna is convinced that enough people in the church will submit to this teaching for it to be worth Paul’s trouble. Both Sophia and Fortuna are amused with Paul’s teaching concerning head-coverings, mostly because of Paul’s disinterest in it during previous visits and epistle(s).¹⁰⁷⁴ Paul’s teaching concerning marriage and divorce is a bit strange,

but it does compliment self-control. Paul shares some parallels with philosophical
moralists, and if he is able to convince the church to be self-controlled in marriage (1
Cor. 7:1-5), divorce (1 Cor. 7:10-16), prostitutes (6:13-18), and head-coverings (1 Cor.
11:2-16), then Sophia and Fortuna can have an easier time supporting the church as
patronesses because the church would not bring them shame.

1998); for bibliography and analysis of the epistles to Corinth, see Yeo, *Rhetorical
Interaction*, 75-80; Ciampa and Rosner, *Corinthians*, 19-21; Fitzmyer, *Corinthians*, 50-
53.
CHAPTER 7:
SELF-SUFFICIENCY IN PAUL AND THE POPULAR PHILOSOPHERS

In chapter five, we explored the ways that Sophia and Fortuna would read 1 Corinthians chapters 1-4. These first chapters of 1 Corinthians separate divine wisdom from human wisdom in such a way that completely alienates Fortuna, but Sophia’s understanding of her divine wisdom enhances her sympathy for Paul’s arguments. In chapter six, we explored how Sophia and Fortuna would read Paul’s teachings concerning marriage. While Fortuna reads Paul from an increasingly hostile point of view, like Sophia she can appreciate Paul’s attempt to unify the church through self-control with respect to the affair, prostitutes, head-coverings, and marriage and divorce. In this chapter, we will examine how Sophia and Fortuna would interact with Paul’s usage of the defining characteristic of the ideal wise-person in popular philosophy: self-sufficiency in 1 Cor. 9:24-7. Then, we will read 1 Cor. 9:24-7 with Sophia and Fortuna in light of their philosophical and social background.

Philosophically educated women like Sophia and Fortuna would be very familiar with the Cynic-Stoic doctrine of self-sufficiency. Its most common usage in the agon motif stands at the intersection of the most popular philosophies in the first century.\textsuperscript{1075}

\textsuperscript{1075} For Paul’s use of the \textit{agon motif}, see Victor C. Pfitzner, \textit{Paul and the Agon Motif: Traditional Athletic Imagery in the Pauline Literature} (Leiden: Brill, 1967), 76-129. Pfitzer suggests that Paul’s usage of the \textit{agon motif} is not limited to an internal struggle, 111. I agree with Ronald Hock that Paul’s struggles in Corinth were related to patronage. That is, the church desired to bring Paul into their homes like other teachers to reciprocate his ministry. Because Paul did not accept payment, he suffered by means
The *agon* motif is a common athletic metaphor that philosophers used to explain the importance of training oneself to have adequate mental and physical self-control to successfully live the good life. At the same time, the doctrine of self-sufficiency\(^{1076}\) or self-control is a central component to how popular philosophies approached many other issues such as friendship and patronage,\(^{1077}\) the ideal teacher, and family life. Despite the claim from several philosophers that women can and should possess the qualities of self-sufficiency (which will be discussed below), there is not the slightest hint of this in the works that address self-sufficiency and Paul.

This chapter begins with a discussion concerning Paul’s usage of the *agon* motif in 1 Corinthians 9. This discussion is followed by a brief summation of the *agon* motif - the struggle of the wise-person / student for self-control as an athlete struggles for a of his employment, the church suffered some confusion on how to reciprocate his patronage, and some members may have actively sought retribution for this offense. Hock, *Social Context*, 29; Hock, “Paul’s Tentmaking,” 558.


\(^{1077}\) In the *TNDT* entry for στέφανος there is no indication that women or girls could have interacted with the metaphor, *TDNT* 7:615-36. For Paul’s use of στέφανος in conjunction with the *agon* motif, see Pfizter, *Agon motif*, 77; for patronage see page 106: “But by their continual faithfulness they ensure for him a crown on the day when the final word will be spoken on his apostolic work...”
crown - in Greek and Roman philosophy and its appearance in 1 Cor 9:24-7.1078 Then, I will discuss how Sophia and Fortuna would interact with Paul’s image of the crown in 1 Corinthians 9 both as philosophically educated women and patronesses. As philosophically educated women, Fortuna and Sophia were equipped to interact with the metaphor. As wealthy patronesses, they were able to interact with the more concrete aspects of *agon* motif. These women helped fund the Isthmian games and were eligible to be rewarded for their patronage with an imperishable crown of gold rather than a perishable crown of celery that they earned in races or poetry competitions when they were girls. Both aspects are important to consider – the philosophical background as well as their social context as patronesses – when imagining how Sophia and Fortuna would read 1 Cor. 9:24-7. The discussion will be centered on the heart of the *agon* motif, the means by which people discipline themselves to win the imperishable crown: self-sufficiency.

**Setting up the *agon* motif: 1 Corinthians 9:1-23**

Philosophical traditions that either parallel or influence 1 Cor 9.24-7 are widely known and recognized by New Testament scholars.1079 However, before addressing the


nature of self-sufficiency in the popular philosphers, its setting in 1 Corinthians chapter 9 needs to be examined.

Paul begins chapter 9 by explaining his relationship to wealthier members of the church, and he does so in a manner that clearly demonstrates an independence from the undue influences of personal patronage (1 Cor. 9:1-18). After Paul argues by analogy to a vinedresser, soldier, and a shepherd (1 Cor. 9:7) that he has the right to receive all of the benefits of personal patronage from the Corinthians (payment, meals, other material benefits, and perhaps a beneficial marriage), he volunteers his apostolic services for free, and in this service his full freedom is expressed (1 Cor. 9:18). Paul’s free service is seemingly in contrast to his opponents (‘rightful claim’ is from their point of view, not Paul’s, 1 Cor. 9:12), other apostles (1 Cor. 9:12), and meant to shame the Corinthian patrons who evidently were taking pride in supporting them. Furthermore, the wealthy Corinthians were taking advantage of their rights by taking other believers to court, eating meat sacrificed to idols, marrying and divorcing to their advantage like other elites, and supporting rhetors that agitated Paul’s sensibilities.

Everything that leads up to the agon motif in 1 Cor. 9 serves to present Paul as a self-controlled person in contrast to his opponents and at least some of the wealthy members of the community. Paul is not dependent on a personal patron and corrupted by


\[1081\] Cf., Collins and Harrington, *Corinthians*, 330.

\[1082\] For bibliography on the identification of the “strong” with higher status and the “weak” with lower status see Thiselton, *Corinthians*, 644.

\[1083\] Garland, *Corinthians*, 398 n. 5.
the influence of a patron’s wealth and power. Instead, he is content to survive by working with his hands like a poor, powerless person. Moreover, Paul has made himself a servant to “everyone”: Jews, Gentiles, and the weak (1 Cor. 9:20-22). We should observe that Paul clarifies the Jews as those under the law and the Gentiles as those not under the law – but he does not pair the weak with the strong. Paul identifies himself with Jews and Gentiles as well as the poor (weak) but not the rich (strong). This point cannot be emphasized enough: while Paul does not participate in personal patronage (eg., attach himself to the house of a patron), he never shows discontent with patronage of the community (ie., wealthier people giving to the community). However, his contempt for personal patronage may well discourage people from giving to the community that values his teaching. It is within this framework that Sophia and Fortuna read the important philosophical concept of self-sufficiency and the agon motif 1 Corinthians 9.

**Self-sufficiency in Popular Philosophy**

The concept of self-sufficiency is an important one in popular philosophy because it was used to describe the characteristics of someone who has mastered philosophy: the wise-person. Self-sufficiency is the result of an inner control of the self rather than a seclusion from the community, friendship, and inspiration from God. The importance of self-sufficiency in a study of 1 Corinthians is that Paul utilizes this ideal – as he does

---

1084 Collins and Harrington, *Corinthians*, 331; Ciampa and Rosner, *Corinthians*, 411.

1085 Hays, *Corinthians*, 154; Collins and Harrington, *Corinthians*, 325; Ciampa and Rosner offer a description of the “weakness motif” in 1 Corinthians, *Corinthians*, 429; Malina and Pilch write that in some Hellenistic contexts, “the weak” denotes a person unfamiliar with the sophistication of elite life, *Corinthians*, 94.
elsewhere – to assert his authority as apostle (1 Cor 7:4, 9; 9:24-7). From his perspective, Paul has attained the level of self-control that is characteristic of a philosophical sage even though he claims not to have come to the Corinthians “in wisdom.” As such, 1 Cor. 9:24-7 can be an effort by Paul to convince Sophia and Fortuna that he has realized the ideal of being a self-sufficient teacher so that they will recognize his authority to instruct and correct. Before this issue is explored, self-control and its role in the achievement of self-sufficiency needs to be examined.

Self-control (often with the discipline like an athlete in the *agon* motif) is the method by which a person achieves self-sufficiency. While the popular philosophers debated the definitions of self-control and self-sufficiency, the discipline that it takes to achieve the desired goal is highly praised. For example, Aristotle (384-322 BCE) teaches that the self-controlled person is the ideal good person, “For it is a fundamental assumption with us, and a general opinion, that wickedness makes men more unrighteous; and lack of self-control seems to be a sort of wickedness.”

Already in Aristotle’s time (384-322 BCE), the Cynic wise-person was characterized by the ideal of αὐτάρκεια. There are two examples of self-sufficiency from the Cynics that are applicable here. First, there is an epistle attributed to Diogenes

---


1088 Teles, *Περὶ αὐτάρκείας* 5H-20H.
the Cynic (of Corinth), who met the champion Cicermus on the road to Olympia.

Diogenes convinced Cicermus to disregard his crown and pursue self-sufficiency:

ήκε δὲ ἐπὶ τὰ ὄντως καλὰ καὶ μάθε μὴ ὑπὸ ἀνθρωπίων τυπτόμενος κατερεῖν, ἀλλ’ ὑπὸ τῆς ψυχῆς, μηδ’ ἰμάσι μηδὲ πυγμαίς, ἀλλὰ πενία, ἀλλ’ ἄδοξία, ἀλλὰ δυσγενεία, ἀλλὰ φυγαδεία. τούτων γὰρ ἁσκήσεως καταφρονεῖν μακαρίως μὲν ᾿Ζήσεις, ἀνεκτῶς δὲ ἀποθανή’ ἐκεῖνα δὲ ζηλῶν ζήσεις ταλαιπώρως.

learn to be steadfast under blows, not by puny men, but of the spirit, not under leather straps or fists, but through poverty, disrepute, lowly birth, and exile. For when you have trained to despise these things, you will live happily, and will die in a tolerable way. 1089

The *agon* motif is not directly applied to women when male or female philosophers address women and self-control or self-sufficiency. It is not present in the other Cynic epistles, the Pythagorean letters attributed to women, the works by Seneca addressed to Helvia and Marcia, the Diogenes of Oneoanda inscriptions, the essays by Musonius Rufus concerning the philosophical education of women, nor does Heirocles address it when he writes about marriage. However, in all of these works there is some emphasis on a philosophically motivated self-control that would prepare Sophia and Fortuna to interact with Paul’s usage of the *agon* motif in 1 Corinthians.

Second, there is one example in the history of women in philosophy that applies an athletic metaphor to a woman. An epistle attributed to the Cynic Crates (c. 365-285 BCE) to his wife Hipparchia, “You believe, it seems, that toiling is the cause of of your not having to toil. For you would not have given birth so easily, unless, while pregnant, you had continued to toil as athletes do,” “πέπεισαι ἄρα ὅτι τὸ πονεῖν αἰτίὸν ἐστι

1089 Diogenes to Phaenylus 4; Malherbe, *Cynic Epistles*, 137.
Self-sufficiency is achieved by the mastery of self-control: the ability to renounce one’s reputation, fearlessness of death, the ability to be generous in wealth and content in poverty; and the achievement of these qualities makes the wise-person invincible. Paul’s hardship list in 1 Cor. 4:9-13 nicely matches these qualifications: Paul and the apostles are hungry and thirsty, inadequately clothed, abused and homeless, they work with their hands, they are despised, reviled, persecuted, and slandered, but are able to endure all of these hardships because of their appropriate relationship with divine wisdom.

It is critical to note that in the popular philosophers, the achievement of self-sufficiency is more valuable than the specific methodology that characterizes a particular school. As the popular philosophers describe self-sufficiency, they consistently present one person as their exemplar who pre-dates all of their methods, Socrates. So while the moral philosophers may boast in their Cynic, Stoic, or other methodology, what they truly value is the outcome. This is very useful when Paul claims to be made self-sufficient with the help of Christ: the highly valued outcome has been achieved in him through Christ (cf., Phil. 4:11-13). He has not followed a Cynic or Stoic methodology (which did not exclude help from the divine), but has been made self-sufficient and he

1090 Crates to Hipparchia 33.1; Malherbe, Cynic Epistles, 83.

lives a life without care for his reputation, he is unafraid of death, and he lives a selfless life. It is likely that Seneca (4 BCE - 65 CE) and others would have commended Paul for his manner of living.\textsuperscript{1092} They would value Paul’s refusal to accept payment for his preaching, admire his ability to suffer for the sake of his teachings, and appreciate the concern and sacrifice that he made for his friends.

The practice of the self-sufficient life does not preclude friendship: Paul, Sophia, and Fortuna could all practice self-control and a renouncement of the excesses of elite life while also practicing friendship. Because the wise-person claimed self-sufficiency, Aristotle notes that there were some people who thought that such a person would not desire friends nor be able to selflessly practice friendship (7.1244b).

\[
\text{ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ τὸν φανερὸν ἄν εἴναι δόξειν ύστο χρήσεως ἕνεκα ὁ φίλος οὐδ’ ὤφελείας, ἀλλὰ δὴ ἁρετὴν φίλος μόνος. ὅταν γὰρ μηθένος ἐνδειής \text{ὡ}μεν, τὸ τοὺς συναπλασσομένους ζητοῦσι πάντες, καὶ τοὺς εὗ \text{πεισομένους μᾶλλον ἡ τοὺς ποιήσωντας. ἀμείνω δὲ ἔχομεν κρίσιν αὐτάρκεις \text{ὀντες ἢ μετ’ ἐνδειας, ὅτε μάλιστα τῶν συζήν \text{ἄξιων δεόμεθα φίλων.}}}
\]

But assuredly even his case would seem to show that a friend is not for the sake of utility or benefit but the only real friend is the one loved on account of goodness. For when we are not in need of something, then we seek all people to share our enjoyments, and beneficiaries rather than benefactors; and we can judge them better when we are self-sufficing than when in need, and we most need friends who are worthy of our society.\textsuperscript{1093}

Aristotle (384-322 BCE) affirms that the self-sufficient person will not seek a friend for utility or society because she is sufficient to herself for these benefits. Such a person is the best equipped to seek out a friend for the sake of goodness alone. Cicero (106-43 BCE) will insist that the good person alone can be a friend, and this good person is self-...

\textsuperscript{1092} I do not agree with Malherbe that Paul’s modifications to the methodology would have been shocking to his audience, “Exhortation in 1 Thessalonians,” 249.

\textsuperscript{1093} Arist. \textit{Eth. Eud.} 7.1244b.15-20 (Rackham, LCL).
controlled. The one who needs nothing - the self-sufficient wise-person - is the only one who can pursue friendship selflessly. Another threat to friendship, because of the supposed lack of participation in the giving and receiving of gifts, is the teaching that the wise-person “lacks nothing that he can receive as a gift” (nihil deest quod accipere possit loco muneris).

In his essay *On the Constancy of the Wise-Person*, Seneca explains that self-sufficiency is a matter of self-control. Once a person realizes that death is not an injury, Seneca argues, all other pains and injuries are easier to bear: losses and pains, disgrace, changes of abode, bereavements, and separations (8.3). Seneca discusses the possible injuries that can befall a person: losing a long-chased prize like his legacy or the goodwill of a lucrative house (9.2). To support the commonality of his claim, Seneca writes that even Epicurus assents that the wise-person is invincible (15.4-16.1). The wise-person is unafraid of insult (15.5); Socrates is listed as a general example of how a wise-person can endure the insults of comedies that were written that scoffed at him as well as his wife drenching his head with sewage (18.5). Seneca’s conclusion concerning the nature of the wise-person is, ““But his virtue has placed him in another region of the universe; he has nothing in common with you” (“Non obruetur eorum coetu et qualis singulis, talis universes obsistet”).

---

1094 Cic. *Off.* 1.90.
1095 Cic. *Amic.* 65.
1098 Sen. *Constant.* 8.2 (Basore, LCL).
According to Seneca, the wise-person seeks friends in order to practice friendship. Epicurus taught that the wise-person seeks friends so that, in the words of Seneca, “‘that there may be someone to sit beside him when he is ill, to help him when he is in prison or in want,’ ‘ut habeat, qui sibi aergo adsideat, succurrat in vincula coniecto vel inopī.’”

Seneca, however, says that the wise-person has friends so that he may have someone to care for: someone to sit by when they are ill and free from prison when they are in hostile hands (9.7). Furthermore, the one who enters into friendship only to have someone serve them is practicing friendship for the wrong reason (9.8-9). Such a person is most likely a fair-weather (temporarias populus) friend. As a self-sufficient person, Seneca seeks a friend so that he may have someone to die for or follow into exile – not someone with whom he wants to strike a bargain (9.10).

It is critical to note that for Paul his philosophically educated readers, self-sufficiency is a rise above fortune (eg, circumstances) that is not threatened by help from the divine. Although it may seem like self-sufficiency is achieved without any aid, Seneca (c. 4 BCE – 65 CE) writes: “The Supreme Good calls for no practical aids from the outside; it is developed at home, and arises entirely within itself. If the good seeks any portion of itself from without, it begins to be subject to the play of Fortune”

---

1099 Sen. Ep. 9.7 (Gummere, LCL).

1100 There are differences between the Stoic pantheism of Seneca and the theology of Paul, especially as outlined by Lightfoot, Philippians, 270-328. However, the distinction between an experimental external reality with a personal Deity and following nature as expressed by the divine seems rather artificial, particularly when one must follow the same general methodology. Paul must deny himself in order to follow Christ, who we are told empowers him. Whether or not that is true is altogether a different issue. I cannot imagine Seneca or Epictetus objecting to Paul receiving help from Christ to maintain his self-sufficiency.
Incipit fortunae esse subiectum, si quam partem sui foris quaerit”).

Seneca clarifies himself a bit further:

Non sunt ad caelum elevande manus nec exorandus aedituus, ut nos ad aereum simulacri, quasi magis exaudiri possimus, admittat; prope est a te deus, tecum est, intus est. Ita dico, Lucili: sacer intra nos spiritus sedet, malorum bonorumque nostrorum observator et custos. Hic prout a nobis tractatus est, ita nos ipse tractat. Bonus vero vir sine deo nemo est; an potest aliquis supra fortunam nisi ab illo aditus exurgere?

We do not need to uplift our hands towards heaven, or beg to the keeper of the temple to let us approach the idol’s ear, as if in this way our prayers were more likely to be heard. God is near you, he is with you, he is within you. This is what I mean, Lucilius: a holy spirit indwells within us, one who marks our good and bad deeds, and is our guardian. As we treat this spirit, so we are treated by it. Indeed, no man can be good without the help of God. Can anyone rise superior to fortune unless God helps him to rise?

Seneca believes that the wise-person can only achieve self-sufficiency with the help of God. In Epistle 41, Seneca says that if we see a person who is fearless in the face of troubles, not following his desires, and happy and peaceful in a storm, we say “A divine power has descended upon that man” (“Vis isto divina descendit”).

Animum excellentem, modernatum, omnia tamquam minora transeuntem, quicquid timemus optamusque ridentem, caelestis potentia agitat. Non potest res tanta sine adminiculo numinis stare.

When a soul rises superior to other souls, when it is under control, when it passes through every experience as if it were a small account, when it smiles at our fears and our prayers, it is stirred by a force from heaven. A thing like this cannot stand upright unless it be propped by the divine.

1101 Ep. 9.15 (Gummere, LCL).
1102 Ep. 41.1-2 (Gummere, LCL).
1103 Ep. 41.5 (Gummere, LCL).
Not only is self-sufficiency attained with the help of the divine, Seneca concludes that the wise-person can only retain the qualities of self-sufficiency with divine help.

It is significant that other schools such as the Pythagoreans\textsuperscript{1104} and Epicureans\textsuperscript{1105} did not reject this ideal of self-control and self-sufficiency as it became popular with the Stoics and Cynics. On the contrary, other schools debated with the Stoics as to precisely what self-sufficiency and its method meant for the sage.\textsuperscript{1106} Therefore, women who were exposed to the popular philosophies, not just Stoicism and Cynicism, could have interacted with the way that Paul expressed himself using his model of self-control and self-sufficiency. The Pythagorean Ecphantus the Crotonian (c. 400 BCE) wrote that a king and his subjects should imitate God and seek self-sufficiency for the good of the community.\textsuperscript{1107} Diogenes Laertius (fl. 3\textsuperscript{rd} CE) says that Pythagoras contrasted the crown – along with other rewards – with philosophers, who search for truth and not fame.\textsuperscript{1108} Philosophically educated women also wrote concerning self-sufficiency. From the pseudo-Pythagorean corpus, Perictione (late 4\textsuperscript{th} BCE?) writes:

---

\textsuperscript{1104} Allen, Concept of Woman, 142-51; C. J. De Vogel, Pythagoras and Early Pythagoreanism (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1956), 105-6, 111.


\textsuperscript{1106} Sen. Constan. 15.4.

\textsuperscript{1107} Ecphantus, On Kings.

\textsuperscript{1108} Diog. Laert. 6.
It is necessary to consider the harmonious woman full of intelligence and moderation. For it is necessary for a soul to be extremely brave and intelligent and well decorated with self-sufficiency and hating baseless opinion. For from this comes great benefit for a woman, for herself as well as her husband and children and her house, often too for her city, if such a woman rules cities and peoples, as we see in kingdoms.\footnote{1109} Epicurus (341-270 BCE) references the rewards of self-control and self-sufficiency, “The wise man when he has accommodated himself to straits knows better how to give than to receive: so great is the treasure of self-sufficiency which he has discovered.”\footnote{1110}

Cicero and Seneca utilized the metaphor of the crown to express their ideals concerning friendship. Cicero used the metaphor of the crown to typify Stoic friendship:

And yet we are not required to sacrifice our own interest and surrender to others what we need for ourselves, but each one should consider his own interests, as far as he may without injury to his neighbour’s. “When a man enters the foot- race,” says Chrysippus with his usual aptness, “it is his duty to put forth all his strength and strive with all his might to win; but he ought never with his foot to trip, or with his hand to foul a competitor. Thus in the stadium of life, it is not unfair for anyone

\footnote{1109} Perictione, \textit{On the Harmony of Women} 1 = Stob. 4.25.50. Translation from Plant, \textit{Women Writers}, 76.

\footnote{1110} Epicurus, \textit{Fragmenta}, 44; cf., 34, 45, 70, 77.
to seek to obtain what is needful for his own advantage, but he has no right to wrest it from his neighbour.\textsuperscript{1111}

Seneca also uses the metaphor of the crown to teach an important aspect of friendship:

\textit{Qui gratus futurus est, statim, dum accipit, de reddendo cogitet. Chrysippus quidem ait illum ululut in certamen cursus compositum et carceribus inclusum opperiri debere tempus suum, ad quod ululut dato signo prosiliat; et quidem magna illi contentione opus est, magna celeritate, ut consequatur antecedentem.}

The man who intends to be grateful, immediately, while he is receiving, should turn his thought to repaying. Such a man, declares Chrysippus, like a racer, who is all set for the struggle and remains shut up within the barriers, must await the proper moment to leap forth when, as it were, the signal has been given; and, truly, he will need to show great energy, great swiftness, if he is to overtake the other who has the start of him.\textsuperscript{1112}

In \textit{On Providence}, Seneca explains that the Olympic crown is worth nothing, but the reward of pursuing philosophy is true strength that can withstand any opponent.\textsuperscript{1113}

Plutarch, when discussing why it is proper to have debates at the dinner table, quotes Strato:

\textit{καὶ Στράτων ὁ φυσικός, ἀκούσας ὅτι πολλαπλασίως ἔχει Μενέδημος μαθητὰς, ‘τί οὖν ἡ ἡθομαστὸν, εἰ πλείονες ἐίσιν οἱ λούσθαι τῶν ἀλείφθαι βουλομένων;}

And Strato, the natural philosopher, when he heard that Menedemus had many more pupils than he himself had, said, “Why be surprised if there are more who wish to bathe than to be anointed for the contest?”\textsuperscript{1114}

The concept of self-sufficiency was also applied to women by the philosophers. The earliest application of self-sufficiency to women appears in Teles the Cynic. Teles

\textsuperscript{1111} Cic. \textit{Off.} 3.42 (Miller, LCL).

\textsuperscript{1112} Sen. \textit{Ben.} 2.25 (Basore, LCL).


\textsuperscript{1114} Plut. \textit{Mor.} 472e (Helmbold, LCL).
applies the attributes of self-sufficiency to exemplary women who grieved properly for the loss of their sons in battle. Grieving must not be done in excess but self-controlled and tempered by reason. This kind of application is also found in Seneca when he consoles Helvia and Marcia, encouraging them to approach the contests of life strengthened by the principles of Stocism.

In convincing Marcia to cling to Stoic philosophy in her time of loss, Seneca contrasts two female role models: Octavia, who has no self-control, and Livia, who is self-controlled. We see that he applies the qualities of self-sufficiency as the solution to the problem to excessive grieving: the self-control that allows a person to be fearless of death and exile, able to have success in both wealth and poverty, and so on. According to Seneca, by adopting his Stoic mindset, Marcia will be able to grieve the loss of her son in a healthy, natural way.

Similar reasoning is used in Seneca’s letter to his mother. He applies the qualities of self-sufficiency to himself and then advises his mother to adopt the same philosophy. He exempts her from common vices of sexual immorality and

---

1115 Teles 57H-60H. Teles does not name the women but contrasts nameless women from Attica, Laconia, and Sparta who all reacted differently to the loss of their sons. It is almost certainly rhetoric against women in Attica who have not lived up, at least in his eyes, to the legendary women of Laconia and Sparta. It is nevertheless intriguing that women are examples of how the philosopher should grieve.


1117 Sen. Marc. 2.2-4.

1118 Sen. Marc. 9.1-10.5.

1119 Sen. Helv. 5.2-6.1; 10.3
encourages her to follow the example of Cornelia and Rustilia, who bore similar loss with his (moderate) Stoic resolve. He reminds his mother that she never participated in several vices and therefore could not blame excessive grief on her feminine weakness. Instead, Helvia should take refuge in philosophy.

Itaque illo te duco, quo omnibus, qui fortunam fugiunt, confugiendum est, ad liberalia studia. Illa sanabunt vulner tuum, illa omnem tristitiam tibi evellent. His etiam si numquam adsuesses, nunc utendum erat; sed quantum tibi patris mei antiquus rigor premisit, omnes bonas artes non quidem comprehendisti, attigisti tamen.

And so I guide you to that in which all who fly from Fortune must take refuge - to philosophic studies. They will heal your wound; they will uproot your sadness. Even if you had not been acquainted with them before, you would need to use them now; but so far as the old-fashioned strictness of my father permitted you, though you have not indeed fully grasped all the liberal arts, still you had some dealings with them.

Like Seneca, Musonius Rufus teaches that women should learn Stoic philosophy and apply it to their lives. While he does not envision roles for women aside from their roles as wives and mothers, he invites women to enter the struggle of the self-controlled life:

\begin{equation}
\text{ēîta de ēmpoītēteon aīdō proś ap' pan ai̇schrōn' o̓n ēγγενομένων ānāγke sōphronas ēinai kai ānērā kai gynαïkα. kai mēn ton paideúmenon orhās, ōstis ān ē, eîte ārrhēn eîte bēlēia, ēbistētōn mēn ānēkhētai pōnou, ēbistētōn de mē phobeūthai thānatō, ēbistētōn de mē tāpeinousthai prōs sμmforān μηδεμίαν' di' òsōn ān tīs eîh āndrēios}.
\end{equation}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{Sen. Helv. 16.6-7.}
\item \textit{Sen. Helv. 16.1-5.}
\item \textit{Sen. Helv. 27.3-4 (Basore, LCL).} Seneca goes on to say that if his father had been thorough in educating his mother, that she would have been fully equipped to handle anything in life. His father withheld a complete education from her because he thought some women learned only so they could impress others and not to enricht their lives. Cf., Juv. Sat. 6.242.
\end{itemize}
When these two qualities have been created within them, man and woman are of necessity self-controlled. And most of all, the child who is trained properly, whether boy or girl, must be accustomed to endure hardship, not to fear death, not to be disheartened in the face of any misfortune; he must in short be accustomed to every situation which calls for courage.1123

Musonius concludes, “I only urge that they [women] should acquire from philosophy goodness in conduct and nobility of character. Now in very truth philosophy is training in nobility of character and nothing else,” “ἀλλ’ ὁτι ἡθους χρηστότητα καὶ καλοκάγαθίαν τρόπου κτητέου ταῖς γυναιξίν ἐπειδὴ καὶ φιλοσοφία καλοκάγαθίας ἐστὶν ἐπιτήδευσι καὶ οὐδὲν ἐτερον.”1124

In this section, we have seen that in the popular philosophers, self-sufficiency is highly valued: it is often the defining characteristic of the wise-person. There are several critical parallels to the type of self-sufficiency that Paul practices: the method is self-control in all circumstances in life, the self-sufficient person can practice friendship, and it is achieved and maintained with help from the divine. Paul attributes these qualities to himself throughout 1 Corinthians, but in 1 Cor. 9:24-7, he utilizes the agon motif to compare his struggle for self-control to the successful athlete. Because he has mastered self-control, he has achieved the ideal that is valued by many other teachers: self-sufficiency. An examination of the philosophical traditions of agon motif will further explain the importance of its appearance in 1 Cor. 9:24-7 and how philosophically educated women would read this passage.

1123 Muson. 4.79-82 (Lutz, 48-9).
1124 Muson. 4.98-100 (Lutz, 49).
Philosophical Traditions of the *agon* motif

The *agon* motif is used by many schools to illustrate the internal and external suffering of the sage as she trains herself regarding self-mastery.\(^{1125}\) According to Plato, Socrates likens the thoughtful life to a contest (*agon*), “...And I invite all other men likewise, to the best of my power, to this life and this contest, which I say is worth all other contests on this earth,” “παρακαλῶ δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους πάντας ἀνθρώπους, καθ’ ὅσον δύναμι, καὶ δὴ καὶ σὲ ἀντὶπαρακαλῶ ἐπὶ τοῦτον τὸν βίον καὶ τὸν ἀγώνα τοῦτον, ὃν ἔγώ φημι ἀντὶ πάντων τῶν ἐνθάδε ἀγώνων εἶναι,”\(^{1126}\) This life, of course, is the struggle to train oneself in virtue. According to Plutarch, Epicurus taught that people should strive for the crown of ἀταραξία (impassiveness).\(^{1127}\) Lucretius reflects his struggle to be an Epicurean poet:

\[\text{tu mihi supremae praescripta ad candida callis currenti spatium praemonstra, callida musa Calliope, requies hominum divomque voluptas, te duce ut insigni capiam cum laude coronam.}\]

As I race toward the white line that marks the end of my course, do you, clever Muse Calliope, repose of human beings and delight of the gods, point out the track to me, and under your guidance I may win the garland of victory with glorious praise.\(^{1128}\)

---

\(^{1125}\) The most obvious explanation for the wide-spread use of this metaphor is rooted in the observation that education occurred in the *gymnasia*, see Pfitzner, *Agon motif*, 23.

\(^{1126}\) Pl. *Grg.* 526d (Lamb, LCL).

\(^{1127}\) Plut. *Mor.* 1125c.

\(^{1128}\) Lucretius 6.94 (Smith, *Lucretius*, 91).
The reward for the athlete who undergoes hardship and gains the victor’s crown is often contrasted with the philosopher and student who discipline themselves for a more beneficial reward. Seneca the Younger, Musonius Rufus, and Epictetus represent first century Stoic philosophers who followed this ancient tradition. Seneca writes that athletes punish their bodies only to receive a crown, but the Stoic who punishes it for philosophy receives everlasting peace.

Athletae quantum plagarum ore, quantum toto corpore excipiunt! ferunt tamen omne tormentum gloriae cupiditate nec tantum quia pugnant ista patiuntur, sed ut pugnent: exercitatio ipsa tormentum est. Nos quoque evincamus omnia, quorum praemium non corona nec palma est nec tubicen praedicationi nominis nostri silentium faciens, sed virtus et firmitas animi et pax in ceterum parta, si semel in aliquo certamine debellata fortuna est.

What blows do athletes receive on their faces and all over their bodies! Nevertheless, through their desire for fame they endure every torture, and they undergo these things not only because they are fighting but in order to be able to fight. Their very training means torture. So let us also win the way to victory in all our struggles, - for the reward is not a garland or a palm or a trumpeter who calls for silence at the proclamation of our names, but rather virtue, steadfastness of soul, and a peace that is won for all time, if fortune has once been utterly vanquished in any combat.\textsuperscript{1129}

In his description of the Stoic wise-person in his essay \textit{On Firmness}, Seneca again utilizes the \textit{agon} motif. Because the wise-person practices the self-control in virtue like an athlete, the wise-person is seeking to be free from the vanity that would cause distress over misfortune:

\begin{quote}
Nam si tangit illum iniuria, et mouet et inpellit; caret autem ira sapiens, quam excitat iniuriae species, nec aliter careret ira nisi et iniuria, quam scit sibi non posse fieri. Inde tam erectus laetusque est, inde continuo gaudio elatus; adeo autem ad offensiones rerum hominumque non contrahitur ut ipsa illi iniuria usui sit, per quam experimentum sui capet et uirtutem temptat.
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{1129} Sen. \textit{Ep. 78.16} (Gummere, LCL).
Our aim is not that you may be prevented from doing injury, but that the wise man may cast all injuries far from him, and by his endurance and his greatness of soul protect himself from them. Just so in the sacred games many have won the victory by wearing out the hands of their assailants through stubborn endurance.¹¹³⁰

Musonius Rufus (fl. 1st CE) laments that some athletes risk their lives in contest but do not train their bodies and minds in philosophy.¹¹³¹ Epictetus (55-135 CE), a student of Musonius Rufus, is also fond of the metaphor.¹¹³²

In light of the evidence presented above, Sophia and Fortuna were well positioned to interact with an idea as basic as self-control - the point of the athletic metaphor in 1 Cor 9:24-7 - and determine for themselves how Paul adopts, modifies, or challenges the precise view that they hold. The metaphor may call to mind specific challenges which were relative to their lives: the loss of friends and family, the embarrassment of lawsuits, or whether to continue to support Paul’s ministry. The question arises, then, how would Sophia and Fortuna interact Paul’s usage of this popular motif?

Sophia and the Philosophical Tradition

The most important concept to glean from popular philosophy is that the outcome of self-sufficiency is more important than the method. However, the self-control of a champion athlete in training is a good metaphor for the self-discipline that achieves and characterizes self-sufficiency. Self-sufficiency is not only the defining characteristic of

¹¹³⁰ Sen. Constant. 10.1 (Basore, LCL).


¹¹³² Epict. Disc. 3.22.57; 3.26.31; 4.10.10.
the wise-person, it prepares someone to be a selfless friend and patron. Sophia or Fortuna would not need to isolate themselves from the community both in personal fellowship and patronage because they valued or attempted to achieve a sort of self-sufficiency.

Self-sufficiency is also not prohibitive of participation in the divine nature of Paul’s wisdom. Sophia can embrace both the qualities of the self-controlled wise-person without being overly concentrated on herself that she cannot attribute some credit to God for helping her attain wisdom. As such, she can accept Paul’s claim to the attainment of the qualities of the Stoic wise-person because of his calling as an apostle. It naturally follows that if Paul has a unique relationship with the divine, he has a unique relationship with divine wisdom, which produces an outstanding result: the realization of self-sufficiency. However, it would be difficult for any patroness to read about Paul’s independence from patronage. It certainly appears that Paul is utterly ungrateful for any support that Sophia might give or want to give him for his valued services.

Fortuna and the Philosophical Tradition

Fortuna’s frustration with Paul is further aggravated by his outright claim to something that he intimated before: the realization of the qualities of the ideal wise-person. And at this point it’s a double insult: Paul appears to show no appreciation for her sustained support for himself or the church. Paul declares in 1 Cor 9:2-6 that as apostles, he and his associates have the right to food and drink without working for a living. Despite this basic right (continued with many examples in 1 Cor. 9:6-18) – not unlike any other client who would attach him/herself to a household – Paul and his associates instead choose the high road and reject personal support from wealthier
members of the Corinthian community. In fact, Paul claims that he is not writing to secure such support (1 Cor. 9:15). Quite the contrary: he associates his Gospel with his independence from personal patronage, and he is bound to preach the Gospel (1 Cor. 9:16). Instead, Paul’s reward is not in the support of patronesses but in boasting that he preaches the Gospel both free of charge and free from undue influence from an outside source.

Reading 1 Corinthians in this light – from the perspective of Fortuna, a distanced philosophically educated woman – it may seem as if Paul is sharing with the struggles of the poor instead of enjoying the gifts of the wealthy. Paul writes that he became a servant of everyone: those outside the law, the Jews, and the weak, and everyone else (1 Cor. 9:19-22) except for people like Fortuna who could provide support (the strong). And he makes this sacrifice for the Gospel so that he can share with them its blessings (1 Cor. 9:23). The sharing in the blessings of the Gospel with everyone but the strong (1 Cor. 9:19-22) can be contrasted with Paul’s metaphor of the wealthy Corinthians as kings so that he can rule with them (1 Cor. 4:8). If Paul cannot personally appreciate her support, Fortuna finds no motivation to continue supporting the church according to his interests.

Paul then has opportunity to withstand all of the sufferings due to poor patronal support that he claims to have willingly refused. He then gives the means by which he endures every trial: he “runs” like the champion who wins the race, seeking the imperishable rather than the perishable crown. Fortuna can appreciate that Paul encourages the community to practice self-control. If the more serious offenses of the Christian community (or even rumors of it) were made known to Fortuna’s friends, she could suffer some embarrassment. These offenses would include strange sexual
practices, mysterious and rowdy religious practices, and lawsuits between group members. Fortuna is relieved to hear that a philosophical discipline of self-control is being taught by Paul as a noble act, earning the self-controlled person an imperishable crown. The problem is, Paul is claiming to realize this ideal.

The agon motif and Female Athletes in the Greek East

In the epigraphic evidence, victories of female athletes and the terminology of the “crown” that they contain is important evidence that wealthier women like Paul’s patronesses could relate to Paul’s athletic metaphors. From the earliest pan-Hellenic games, women participated as competitors, and the imperial period saw women as patrons and presidents of the games as well. Pausanias says that there was a hero shrine to Cynisca along with several others in Laconia, and that she bred the horses that led her to victory.\textsuperscript{1133} Also in Olympia there was a crown, bronze horses, a statue made by Apelles, and the epigram by an unknown poet to celebrate her victories.\textsuperscript{1134}

\begin{quote}
Σπάρτας μὲν βασιλέες ἐμοὶ πατέρες καὶ ἀδελφοί. ἀρμασὶ δ’ ὀκυπόδων ἰππῶν νικῶσα Κυνίσκα ἐκόνα ταύδ’ ἔστησα. μόναν δὲ μὲ φαμὶ γυναικῶν Ἑλλάδος ἐκ πάσας τόνδε λαβεῖν στέφανον.
\end{quote}

Kings of Sparta were my fathers and bothers, and I, Cynisca\textsuperscript{1135}, winning the race with my chariot of swift-footed horses,\textsuperscript{1136} erected this statue. I assert that I am the only woman in all Greece who won this crown.\textsuperscript{1137}

\textsuperscript{1133} Paus. 3.15.1.

\textsuperscript{1134} Paus. 5.12.5; cf., 6.1.6.

\textsuperscript{1135} Cynisca is mentioned by Xen. Ages. 9.6 and Paus. 3.8.1, 15.1; 5.12.5; 6.1.6. The name Cynisca, “little hound,” may be a nickname for a tomboyish woman. Sarah Pomeroy suggests that Cyniska may have been as old as 50 when she won the race, Spartan Women (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 21. For studies on the unique position of women in Sparta, see Thomas Scanlon, “Virgineum Gymnasium. Spartan
Pausanius identifies Cynisca as the daughter of king Archidamas and her epigram as one of only two poems that celebrate royal Spartans.\footnote{1138} Xenophon and Plutarch attribute Cynisca’s victory to the influence of her powerful family, while Pausanius seems to indicate that she won on her own merit.\footnote{1139} The victory of Cynisca belongs to the games of old,\footnote{1140} whereas the inscription found at Delphi honoring three other female victors in the Isthmian games - Tryphosa, Hedeia, and Dionysia - belongs to Paul’s day.\footnote{1141}

---

\footnote{1136} Cf, Ath. 13.567e-f.

\footnote{1137} \textit{Anth. Pal.} 13.16 (Paton, LCL). Juvenal shows more than a little contempt for female athletes - and women in general - in \textit{Satire} 6.242. There has been some attempt to free Juvenal from misogyny by S. H. Braund, “Juvenal -- Misogynist or Misogamist?,” \textit{JRS} 82 (1992) 71-86.

\footnote{1138} Paus. 3.8.1.

\footnote{1139} Xen. \textit{Ages.} 9.6; Plut. \textit{Ages.} 20.1.

\footnote{1140} Paus. in 5.16.1 writes that the women competed with the right breast exposed, which archaeological finds compliment. The well-known statue of a running Spartan woman belonging to Cynisca’s era (about 520 BCE) fits this description; cf., J. Swaddling, \textit{The Ancient Olympic Games}, 3\textsuperscript{rd} ed. (London, The British Museum Press, 2004), 42-43. The tradition of women competing with the right breast exposed is also preserved in the mosaics in Piazza Armerina, Villa del Casale (4\textsuperscript{th} CE). Photographs of the mosaics are available in Barbara McManus, “Index Of Images, Part III,” \textit{Vroma: A Virtual Community For Teaching And Learning Classics, www.vroma.org/images/mcmanus_images/index3.html}, accessed Feb. 6, 2012). It is interesting that women of a later time period are shown crowing one another and themselves, and one female giving a crown has her right breast exposed.

Hermesianax, son of Dionysius, of Caesarea in Tralles and of Corinth, for his daughters, who also have the same citizenships. Tryphosa each time was first in the girls’ single-course race at the Pythian Games with Antigonus and Cleomachus as judges, and at the Isthmian Games with Juventius Proculus as president. Hedeia won the race in armor and the chariot race at the Isthmian Games with Cornelius Pulcher as judge; she won the single-course race at the Nemean Games with Antigonus as president, likewise in Sicyon with Menoites as president. She also won the children’s lyre contest at the Augustan games in Athens with Nuvius son of Philinus as president. She was first in her age group . . . Dionysia won . . . the single-course race at the Asclepian Games at the sanctuary of Epidaurus with Nicoteles as president.  

Female athletes such as these were not the only women crowned at the games; the Greeks were fond of crowning their poets and musicians at their agonistic festivals.

In Delphi in 86 BCE, the Thebean harpist Polygonta was crowned and awarded several other honors for her services to the city. I do not know of a poetess receiving a crown in the festivals, but there are certainly some famous Greek poetesses who would have

---


1143 Irene Ringwood Arnold discusses the importance of poetry in the games of the imperial period, “Agonistic Festivals in Italy and Sicily,” AJA (1960): 248.

1144 Pleket, Epigraphica, 6.
been candidates.\footnote{Sylvia Barnard, “Hellenistic Women Poets,” CJ 73, no. 3 (1978): 204-13.} As we have seen above, Greek women poets were widely read in the first century: Sappho, Nossis, and Erinna. Sulphicia, mentioned in Martial, Epigrams 10.35 is an example of a first century Roman poet. In first century Ephesus, the priestess Claudia Trophime dedicated some lines to Hestia in a prominently placed inscription.\footnote{Inscr. Eph. 1062. Translation available in Mary Lefkowitz and Fant, Women’s Life, 9.}

Paul’s usage of the metaphor of the crown is not strictly limited to athletic imagery, but is connected simultaneously to patronage and the concept of the ideal wise-person or teacher in popular philosophies. The games themselves in the imperial period were inextricably tied to patronage: patrons and patronesses were needed to provide oil, maintain the facilities, and preside over the games.\footnote{The bond of the games with patronage is quite obvious with the infamous victories of Nero at the games; see Suet. Ner.12.3; 22.3.} Both the male and female athletes competed for perishable crowns of withered celery (more precisely, already perished),\footnote{Oscar Broneer, “Crown,” 260; cf., Broneer, “The Apostle Paul,” 1-31.} but patronesses of the Greek East competed with one another for the imperishable crown of the reciprocated honor due them upon the completion of their liturgies.

Many women in the Greek East received honors for their patronage. Phyle of Priene tells us in her inscription that she is first female \textit{stephanephorus} of her city, an office that allows the wearing of the crown while the person is in service.\footnote{Pleket, \textit{Epigraphica}, 5.} This office

\footnote{1145 Sylvia Barnard, “Hellenistic Women Poets,” CJ 73, no. 3 (1978): 204-13.}
\footnote{1146 Inscr. Eph. 1062. Translation available in Mary Lefkowitz and Fant, Women’s Life, 9.}
\footnote{1147 The bond of the games with patronage is quite obvious with the infamous victories of Nero at the games; see Suet. Ner.12.3; 22.3.}
\footnote{1149 Pleket, \textit{Epigraphica}, 5.}
was bestowed on other generous patronesses and their husbands.\footnote{For a detailed discussion, see Reit van Bremen, \textit{The Limits of Participation: Women and Civic Life in the Greek East in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods} (Amsterdam: Gieben, 1996), 31.} We saw above that the honorary inscriptions to Junia Theodora in Corinth, an illustrious patron living in Paul’s day, indicates that she received a golden crown and a portrait for her apotheosis in return for her services to several cities in the Lycian League.

The significance of wearing a crown is the designation of leadership; the one who wears it is the pattern which others are encouraged to follow. In the fourth inscription to Junia Theodora, her heir is said to mimic her excellent qualities. “... Σέκτον Ἰούλιον Ῥωμαίον ἄνδρα ἀγαθὸν ὄντα καὶ τῇ ὑπερβαλλούσῃ εὐνοίᾳ κρατέοντα καὶ σπουδὴ πρὸς τὸ ἐνθὸς ἡμῶν στοιχέουντα τῇ ἀνωθὲν ἱουνίας πρὸς ἡμᾶς εὐνοίᾳ,” “...Sextus Iulius, a Roman, a good man also behaving with surpassing goodwill and zeal towards our nation, imitating the devotion of Junia towards us which was mentioned above.”\footnote{Lines 54-56. Text and translation from Kearsley, “Women in Public,” 206.}

The verb στοιχέω, which usually is used in the sense of “falling in line,” certainly also calls to mind a student following a teacher. It does not appear in its verbal form in many important philosophical writings (such as Plato, Aristotle, Xenophon - who does use it twice outside of a philosophical context - or Epictetus) or poets (Homer, Hesiod, Euripides, Pindar). However, it does appear in the context of philosophy by the time of Musonius Rufus,\footnote{Musonius Rufus, with reference to following the words of Socrates, \textit{Dissertationum a Lucio digestarum reliquiae}, 18b, line 48; cf., 8 line 5; \textit{Fragmenta minora} 42.5.} the first century Roman Stoic who advocated teaching philosophy to women. We also see it in Sextus Empiricus, “ἐν φιλοσοφίᾳ μὲν τῆ τῶν φιλοσοφῶν
στοιχήσομεν,” “in philosophy we will follow the philosophers.”

It is used in the New Testament five times as a synonym for the often used περιπατέω, which appears 95 times. In Romans 4:12, Paul uses στοιχέω to refer to following Abraham, and in Gal. 5:25, it refers to the Holy Spirit. In Phil 3:17, Paul uses it to prepare for the audience’s imitation of himself. Paul uses the popular agon motif both to bolster his claims of apostleship – he has realized the self-sufficiency of the wise-person – and to encourage his audience to imitate his success.

Reading 1 Cor. 9:24-27 with Sophia

Paul begins his usage of the agon motif by encouraging his audience to run as if they were the only one who would win the race: the only one in the race who will receive a crown. If Paul has in mind that the outcome of such discipline would result in self-sufficiency without following a philosophical method, this statement is an affront to the philosophical schools. However, since self-discipline is the method and self-sufficiency is the goal, Paul’s admonition for the community to practice self-discipline would be familiar and welcome to both Sophia and Fortuna. As patronesses who supported the churches and Paul himself, they may well have previously competed in the Isthmian games as children and were competing for honors and crowns as adult patronesses. As such, both Fortuna and Sophia could certainly understand in a very intimate way the contrast between struggling for a perishable and imperishable crown.

---

1153 Sext. Emp. Math. 11.59 (Bury, LCL).
1154 TDNT 7:667.
Part of growing up in a wealthy family in first century Corinth included participation in the Isthmian games. One aspect of the games included the races that won a perishable crown of celery. Another important aspect of participation was patronage of the games that could help the patroness earn an imperishable golden crown in gratitude of her gifts. Before she met Paul, Sophia could participate in philosophical learning and support that and her other interests, enjoying reciprocating patronal relationships with these persons and groups according to her interests. Now, in Paul’s usage of the *agon* motif, Sophia again sees Paul’s claim to have realized the distinction of an ideal self-controlled philosopher. His language of the crown may have reminded her of her competitions in the Isthmian games as a little girl, and certainly of the competitive nature of patronage: the race to give the best benefactions to the people of Corinth. Sophia could understand in a very intimate way the contrast between struggling for a perishable and imperishable crown.

Reading 1 Cor. 9:24-27 with Fortuna

Paul then applies the *agon* motif to himself (1 Cor. 9:26-7): his work is not aimless because he disciplines his body so he will not be disqualified and win the race. It seems that as he presents himself in contrast to his audience, Paul has actually achieved the level of self-discipline that he needs to qualify for the race and only needs to persevere. This is where Sophia and Fortuna part company. As a sympathetic reader, Sophia is not disturbed by Paul claiming the qualities of the wise-person without devoting himself to a particular school. Fortuna, however, remains unconvinced that Paul’s apostleship escorts him to the most desired outcome of moral philosophy: to be a
wise-person like Socrates, a person who is in complete control of their passions and able
to withstand any challenge or hardship with magnanimity.

In light of Paul’s apparent lack of concern for personal patronage, perhaps Fortuna can read Paul as contrasting his reward (imperishable reward from God) and her reward (the reciprocation of her patronage). In this regard, Paul’s writing is very divisive. Paul’s opponents are at least thankful for Fortuna’s benefactions: she allows them to meet in her home, provides food for the meetings, and risks her relationships with outsiders who may suspect her of supporting a foreign religion. Fortuna’s two major problems with Paul: his repeated claims concerning wisdom and the ideal wise-person and his ingratitude are more than enough to completely alienate Fortuna.

**Conclusion: Reading the agon motif with Sophia and Fortuna**

Sophia and Fortuna approach Paul’s usage of the agon motif with more than enough philosophical education and life experience to be able to interact with what Paul is trying to communicate. They knew what it meant to train for athletic competitions, and the meanings of self-sufficiency in different schools from participation in philosophical debates, and can appreciate the rewards of both endeavors. Furthermore, both Sophia and Fortuna could receive a crown because of their patronage to the city, whether it is the temporary crown of the stephanephorus or the permanent golden crown for her apotheosis. Paul’s plea for the church to practice self-control is appreciated by Sophia, but Fortuna cannot overcome Paul’s claim to have actually achieved the ideal quality of the wise-person without following any philosophical method.
CHAPTER 8:
SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

In this dissertation I have reconstructed a reading of selected passages of 1 Corinthians with philosophically educated women: 1 Cor. 1-4 with an emphasis on patronage, Paul’s regulations concerning marriage and divorce in 1 Cor. 7, and finally the agon motif in 1 Cor. 9. This project is situated in Pauline studies that examine his many Hellenistic contexts that include his relationship to expressions used in other ancient writings (parallels), the ancient rhetorical and epistolary theorists, and especially popular moral philosophy. The popular schools included in this dissertation are (neo)Pythagoreanism, Cynicism, Epicureanism, Stoicism, and Middle Platonism, and all of these schools have a substantial history of including women. Furthermore, all of these schools had some connection with Corinth.

In reconstructing the philosophically educated women, I have discussed other areas of ancient intellectual life that women contributed to: poetry, medicine, music, and oratory. In the other areas of intellectual life as well as in philosophy, women learned their art as a member of or someone connected to a wealthy household. Therefore, I chose to reconstruct a philosophically educated woman who was a wealthy widow who was in control of her own property and who could more easily participate in intellectual life.

A wealthy widow would naturally serve as a patroness of the church, so I reviewed patronage in Corinth and argued that because the women honored for patronage
in the ancient world were more wealthy and powerful than their male counterparts, there
is much at stake for Paul in the presentation of himself and his arguments. After a review
of patronage in Corinth, I examined the nature of the patronal relationship between the
poet Horace and his patron Maecenas. I argued that as the poet’s inspiration gives him the
ability to criticize his patron and patronage, Paul’s calling as apostle gives him similar
privileges. This dynamic prepares us for Paul’s apparent refusal to participate in personal
patronage in 1 Cor. 9. We should not imagine that wealthier members of the community
would be unwilling to support him or the church because of Paul’s attitude – provided
that at some point he appeals to their sympathies (need for praise or other reciprocation).
So after foregrounding Sophia and Fortuna within the historical traditions of
philosophically educated women and in their social status as wealthy women I move on
to address how they would read 1 Corinthians.

**Reading 1 Corinthians with Sophia and Fortuna**

I chose to read 1 Corinthians with two reconstructions of philosophically educated
women: Sophia and Fortuna. Both of these women are wealthy widows and patronesses
of the church, so there is much to gain or lose if Paul manages to balance his teachings
with their philosophical sympathies. Sophia and Fortuna both have a broad philosophical
education in the popular schools and are of the same social status. The difference
between the two women is that Sophia reads 1 Corinthians with a perspective that is
sympathetic to Paul’s argument. Fortuna, however, upon reading 1 Corinthians 1-4,
becomes unsympathetic to Paul’s argument and is increasingly distanced and frustrated
as Paul develops his presentation of himself in contrast to his opponents. Sophia
identifies herself as a follower of a divine wisdom like Paul, and is able to listen to what
he has to say in the rest of the epistle. While Sophia is the more sympathetic reader, she is still confused with some of Paul’s teachings and mildly annoyed at times. Similarly, Fortuna is consistently frustrated by Paul, beginning with his distinction between human and divine wisdom which culminates in his characterization of himself as a wise-person without using a method from any philosophical school.

Some of Paul’s teachings are read similarly by both Sophia and Fortuna. A large portion of 1 Corinthians is dedicated to moral teachings such as lawsuits, dietary issues, usage of prostitutes, and regulations concerning marriage and divorce. Sophia and Fortuna would be equally confused that Paul prohibits divorce and remarriage, which was typically essential to the security of wealth and status. Both women can value Paul’s emphasis on self-control. Furthermore, Sophia and Fortuna may have issue with Paul’s method or be confused by the uselessness of prohibiting the use of prostitutes (1 Cor. 6:12-16) and divorce/remarriage (1 Cor. 7:1-40), if the community can be united and reasonably moral, it would reflect well on its patronesses if their friends have a high moral standard.

Sophia is able to connect with precisely the concept that seals Fortuna’s alienation from him, his claim to the actualization of self-sufficiency. This self-sufficiency is best expressed in Paul’s usage of the agon motif in 1 Cor. 9:24-7. I explored two perspectives that could impact Sophia and Fortuna’s reading of the agon motif: their philosophical education concerning self-control, and their familiarity with the games. I argued that in popular philosophy, self-control is the common method to achieve self-sufficiency, and the struggle to attain this virtue is often compared to the athlete’s effort to win the crown, the agon motif. While the agon motif is rarely applied directly to women, self-control
and self-sufficiency are quite commonly attributed to women, so Sophia and Fortuna are well prepared to read 1 Cor. 9:24-7. Another context that prepares Sophia and Fortuna to read the *agon* motif is their proximity to the Isthmian games and their involvement in patronage: two fields in which these women competed for crowns. These women knew what it meant to struggle for material and philosophical rewards, and Paul’s claim to the mastery of self-control is either laudable or offensively arrogant. Despite both of their frustrations with Paul, Sophia and Fortuna both continue to support the church because of their ongoing commitment to the community.

**Suggestions for Further Research**

This project calls for further studies because of its many limitations due to its scope and methods. I read portions of 1 Corinthians with two constructions of philosophically educated women: Sophia and Fortuna. Both were wealthy widows who were patronesses of the church, and the nature of their philosophical education is broad. These two constructs cannot possibly represent the depth of the histories of women in philosophy. There were women in the ancient world, perhaps even in Corinth, who were committed to one philosophical school and had a hostility to all other schools of thought. There were also women of lower status who had access to philosophical teachings, namely the wives and children of Cynics who idealized the life of poverty, other wandering philosophers, and those women somehow connected to tutors in wealthy households. From these variables, there are many different ways to read 1 Corinthians – there are five popular schools and even more social settings – and from these choices we can construct many different philosophically educated women and even more readings.
The other limitation is the text. I did not examine all of the philosophical parallels in 1 Corinthians, but I did choose issues that are most common in the histories of women in philosophy. So 1 Corinthians can be examined more broadly and read in total by Sophia and Fortuna and other philosophically educated women. Of course, 1 Corinthians is not the only Pauline epistle that has important passages that would attract the attention of philosophically educated women. By the same token, the philosophical texts written by and attributed to women can be examined thoroughly for important issues that are unique to a single text rather than concepts related to the balance of the sources. There is much to explore related to the question: how would philosophically educated women read Paul?
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