47. Richard Rubenstein has answered that the God of the tradition is dead. See his essays in *After Auschwitz: Radical Theology and Contemporary Judaism* (New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1966).
48. Wiesel, *Night*, op. cit., 109.
49. "Questions and Answers: At Brandeis-Bardin, 1978," [an institute in Simi Valley, California] in *Against Silence: The Voice and Vision of Elie Wiesel*, ed. Irving Abrahamson (New York: Holocaust Library, 1985), vol. 3, p. 246.

6

Embodiment and Redemption

The Human Condition in Ancient Christianity

Paula Fredriksen
with Tina Shepardson

6.1 Introduction

To explore the history of ancient Christianity is already to engage in the comparative study of religion. An energetic subspecies of late Second Temple Judaism, the new movement early on crossed over the borders of its rural, Aramaic-based, overwhelmingly Jewish context-of-origin into the urban, Greek-speaking, ethnically mixed synagogue communities of the eastern Mediterranean. The earliest documentation we have from this period—the letters of Paul, written roughly mid-century—attests to the dynamism of a new social and religious world in the making, to a rich variety of competing interpretations of shared symbols and traditions, and to an extreme internal contentiousness. These traits characterize the new religion from the beginning, continuing without diminution throughout its classical period (first–fifth century) and beyond.

In this chapter, I intend first to survey a range of Christian ideas about the human condition, particularly as these find expression in theological reflection on the nature and status of the body. We shall proceed through various thinkers, texts, and movements in rough chronological order:

first, the apostle Paul in the mid-first century; next, various dualist Christianities and the Catholic responses to them (late first to second century); then Origen through his systematic theology, the *Peri Archōn* ("On First Principles"; early third century); and finally to Augustine and *de civitate Dei* (*City of God*, 413–27).[1] My description will encompass as well an ongoing comparison of these different types of Christianity in terms of theological categories native to it: sin, redemption/resurrection, Christology, canon, and so on. My second, shorter section will survey our terrain through terms that have emerged from group discussion of other traditions: memory; obligation; loyalty; transformation; utopian vision. Any further conclusions I leave to the theorists editing this volume.

6.2 Paul

Paul fervently proclaims to his Gentile communities the Crucified, Risen, and about-to-return Son of God. This message of salvation, so urgently broadcast, brings with it a necessarily gloomy assessment of the circumstances that Paul's listeners would otherwise find themselves in. "Condition" designates too neutrally the target of the dramatic redemption envisaged here: humanity finds itself, in Paul's view, in a terrible, all-but-overwhelming *plight* so severe that nothing less than direct divine intervention—God sending his Son—could turn things around.[2] It is in the obverse of Paul's descriptions of what God has worked in Christ that we find, scattered, his views on the human condition.

People live in a sinister environment, trapped in the sway of "the god of this world" (2 Corinthians 4:4); of pagan gods, who are demons (1 Corinthians 10:20; Galatians 4:8–9); of enemy astral forces (1 Corinthians 15:24; Galatians 4:3), the elements of the universe (Romans 8:38–39); of cosmic rulers so powerful that they have even crucified "the Lord of glory" (i.e., Christ, 1 Corinthians 2:8); of sin, decay, and death. But while Paul speaks specifically to Gentiles who, as former idolaters, had conspired in their own enslavement to "beings that by nature are no gods" (Galatians 4:8), his sweeping characterization of humanity as universally mired in futility must encompass as well that community that God had sanctified, through the giving of the Law, to himself: Israel. Was the Law itself sin (Romans 7:7)? Had God's promise of redemption to Israel, recorded in Scripture and embodied in Torah, been reversed or annulled (cf. Romans 11:29; 15:8)? Impossible, answers Paul. But Law itself, though good because from God, has fallen under the dire influence of Sin, working through the Flesh (Romans 7 passim; 8:2–3). Flesh, Sin, and Death have compromised even God's Law: to defeat these evils, God finally had to send his own Son (Romans 8:3).

As a Jew—indeed, a Pharisee (Philippians 3:6)—Paul held that God was the unique Creator who, upon making the world and everything in it, had pronounced all things "good" (Romans 1:20; Genesis 1:3–31). How, then, had Creation come to such a pass? Paul implies that the cosmos in general and humanity in particular had been negatively transformed by the sin of Adam: "Thus as sin came into the world through one man and death through sin. . . . As one man's trespass led to condemnation for all men. . . . By one man's disobedience many were made sinners" (Romans 5:12,18,19). He nowhere develops this view, or accounts for why God allowed things to go on in this way for so long. He focuses, rather, on the ways that Christ has and will put things right.

In some passages of Paul's letters, Christ undoes the harm done by Adam by behaving in the opposite way: Adam was disobedient, Christ obedient; Adam brought death, Christ brought life, and so on. Elsewhere, Paul appropriates the language of Temple worship whereby through the offering of his death—the ultimate measure of obedience—Christ served as a form of blood sacrifice, expiating sin through his blood (Romans 3:25), thereby making humans "righteous" or "justified" (*dikaiothentes*) (5:9). Through his coming in the flesh (or seeming to),[3] and his dying in the flesh, Christ has begun a transformation of the cosmos and of humanity. The cosmos, subjected to futility and decay, "groans in travail" as it awaits the consummation of the redemption begun in and by Christ's resurrection (Romans 8). Once he returns to complete this work—descending from heaven "with a cry of command, with the archangel's call and the sound of the trumpet of God" (1 Thessalonians 4:16)—Christ will defeat the cosmic powers[4] that have enslaved all things,[5] including and especially the last enemy, Death itself (1 Corinthians 15:26).

Meanwhile, those "in Christ" experience a proleptic liberation through an infusion of God's, or Christ's, Spirit, whether through baptism (thus joining with Christ's cosmic body, the Church[6]) or by eating his body and drinking his blood in the eucharistic meal (1 Corinthians 11:23–27—done with the wrong attitude, a punitive death can result, v. 30). Joining this body means that the believer has "died" with Christ to the evil forces abroad in the world—to sin (Romans 7:20–22), to the Law (8:1–3), to the flesh (Galatians 5:24)—and can thus with confidence look forward, ultimately, to the transformation of his or her own body at Christ's Second Coming (1 Thessalonians 4:13–18; 1 Corinthians 15; Romans 6:5). The infusion of God's Spirit achieved by these means *should* lead to a moral and social transformation in the brief meantime,

in which the *ekklesia* acts as one body (Galatians 3:28; 1 Corinthians 12:13), and individuals sin no more—especially and most important with respect to sexual misconduct (*porneia*) and idolatry, in Jewish perspective the "sins of the flesh" par excellence. But baptism does not in itself effect this transformation, as Paul well knows: his letters swell with exhortations, threats, scoldings, and condemnation as various members of the *ekklesia* fail to live morally as Paul thinks they should.[7] Their righteous conduct, together with their baptism in Christ, guarantees that they will be spared the impending wrath of God.[8]

The human condition, then, according to Paul, is fraught with danger and corruption, destined for wrathful destruction by the Almighty. Those saved in Christ, in the brief period before his return defeats evil and destroys the works of the flesh, can only "groan" as they await their "adoption as sons"—and, most specifically, the redemption of their bodies (Romans 8:23). What does this mean? *The transformation of the human condition will be marked, indeed effected, by the transformation of the believer's body.* The "resurrection like [Christ's]" that the believer will have merited through his mimetic and moral death to this sinful age in and through baptism (Romans 6:5) means that the flesh of his or her "lowly" body will change into a "glorious" or "spiritual" body (Philippians 3:21; 1 Corinthians 15:44). To the degree that Paul holds the resurrection of the dead to be somatic, he is typically Pharisaic; to the degree that he holds the raised body to be spiritual rather than fleshly, he imprints his conviction with his own experience of the Risen Christ (1 Corinthians 15:7). Flesh and blood belong to humanity as constituted in the old aeon; in the new, it has no place. "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God" (15:50).

Paul's ideas—episodically communicated in letters, passionately held, and inconsistently expressed—serve as a peculiar apocalyptic commentary on the book of Genesis: the earlier scriptural figures of Adam and Abraham, of Isaac and Ishmael are all reread in light of his new convictions about Christ. Later generations, both gnostic and catholic, each justly claiming the Pauline legacy, would perforce reread Genesis too. Their views on God, physical creation, Jesus, redemption, *and on Paul himself*, would mark out two different, though coordinate, ways of understanding the human condition.

6.3 Christian Dualism and the High God

In an effort to make Paul consistent and, within an increasing Gentile Greek context, coherent, some later Christians took his condemnation of

judaizing (the controversy in Galatians), his repudiation of "the flesh" (and thus circumcision as a way of glorying in the flesh, Galatians 3:3), and his descriptions of the Law's having been subverted through sin, and understood these as a condemnation of Judaism *tout court*. Thus, they too could subscribe to the view of the universe as fallen under the power of sin, and Christ as God's agent sent to effect humanity's rescue. But their view, different from the historical Paul's, complicated his ideas in interesting ways.

Axiomatic in Greek learned culture was the theological principle that the High God (a.k.a. "the One" or "The Father of All") could not be involved in change. The One was "perfect, free from passion, free from change"[9]—and, accordingly, free from any direct involvement in the physical universe. Taking this, Paul's condemnation of the god of this world, and Genesis, dualist Christians concluded that the god of the Septuagint who formed this cosmos was not, *could* not be God the father of Christ. Christ's father was the God above God, hidden before all the ages, pure spirit, pure love. The busy, jealous, opinionated God of Genesis—the evidently *embodied* god of the Jews—was a lower, inferior creator. God the Father had sent his son into this lower cosmos in the *likeness* of flesh, in the *form* of a man (Philippians 2:7–8) in order to bring saving, transforming knowledge of a God whose revelation could never be inferred from creation.

6.3.1 *Gnosis*

This revelation of hidden knowledge (*gnosis*) saved by awakening the knower to who he really was, and what his situation really was.[10] Who could receive this knowledge? Only he whom the High God elected, or called, or predestined: those whom Paul designated "the perfect" (*teleioi*, 1 Corinthians 2:6). Just as all are not chosen, so all are not redeemable. The issue is not choice, but nature: Only the spiritual man can understand the things of God. He alone can know and understand that his true self, a divine spark or higher spirit, was trapped in the cosmos the lower god, stuck in flesh essentially alien to it. But those in Christ, as Paul had promised, could be free of the power of the flesh. This theology implied an ethic of asceticism (food disciplines, sexual abstinence) in the effort to transcend the body as much as possible while still in it. We might see sexual abstinence as a kind of realized eschatology: absent sexual activity, within the body of Christ, there might really be "neither male nor female" (Galatians 3:28). Salvation, ultimately, was not from mere physical death—of course flesh dies—but from ignorance, torpor, spiritual death, existence *kata sarka*, "according to the flesh." Once the soul broke

free of its immediately hostile material environment, the fleshly body, the "self" of the true gnostic could ascend past the astral spheres, their powers broken by Christ, and be united with him in a higher, spiritual heaven.

6.3.2 *Anti-dualism, Anti-docetism*

The later writings in the New Testament canon attest, in their hostility to it, the early advent of this way of understanding the Christian message. Pseudonymous epistles written in the name, hence on the authority, of first-generation apostles, roundly condemn a universal ethic of celibacy (1 Timothy 4:1–5; cf. 6:20, against "*gnosis* falsely so-called'), and warn that Paul's writings contain "things in them hard to understand" and easily susceptible of heretical interpretation (2 Peter 3:15–16). Those Christians who deny that Christ came in the flesh are not "of God" (1 John 4:2), indeed, are Antichrist (2 John 7). Those who say that the resurrection is already passed (i.e., has already been accomplished spiritually) "swerve from the truth" (2 Timothy 2:18).

The anti-dualist, anti-docetic branch of Christianity eventually won this struggle of interpretation, retroactively establishing itself as "orthodox" (hence the anti-dualist writings in the canon). But the classic heresiologists and apologists—Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Irenaeus, Hippolytus—also stood within the broad stream of Greek high culture, and thus also shared much of the philosophical and ascetic sensibility of their Christian opponents. They too read Paul's gospel as fundamentally anti-Jewish; they too took "flesh" and "spirit" to indicate moral orientation as well as ontology; they too held that same definition of the High God as changeless, asomatic, perfect. But in insisting that the Septuagint was also—indeed actually—*Christian* scripture,[11] these theologians bound created, fleshly reality more directly to their construction of God, of Christ, and of salvation. And while their assessment of the current human condition was no more rosy than that of the dualists, the resolution they imagined emphasized aspects of Scripture and of Paul which the dualists had perforce abandoned.

6.3.3 *Salvation of the Cosmos*

If the High God were ultimately the source of Creation, then Creation, albeit fallen, cannot be essentially alien to God. Unlike the dualist, then, whose soteriology envisaged an individual, spiritual passage through an evil cosmos intractably untransformed by Christ, the catholic imagined redemption as transformation of the cosmos itself. The suffering, ignorance, and evil that marked the human condition, proleptically overcome

for those within the (true) church by the giving of the spirit, would be publicly, historically, communally overcome at Christ's Second Coming, when Creation itself would be healed of Adam's lingering damage and the flesh itself redeemed. Christ himself, therefore, had really had a body, and had shown in his own resurrection what the human flesh would become.[12] So too at his Parousia, the saints would rise in their own bodies, to reign with him for a thousand years in the glorious New Jerusalem of the redeemed and transformed earth.[13]

Where the dualists had taken Paul's contrast of Old Aeon/New Aeon morally and metaphysically, then, catholics retrieved as well his emphasis on time and history. Against the dualist rejection (Marcion) or counter-reading (Valentinus) of the Septuagint, catholics urged a temporal understanding of Old Aeon/New Aeon as Christian supersessionism: the "old age" of the Jews, Israel according to the flesh, had ceded to the "new age" of the Church, Israel according to the Spirit. And in their reading of the classical prophets contained in the book they now claimed as their own, these Christians constructed their own traditions of Christ's apocalyptic kingdom upon the ancient Jewish visions of a just society: this Kingdom would have agriculture, social arrangements, marriage and even births, as well as huge convocations in Jerusalem. God had authored flesh; Christ had assumed it for man's salvation. Salvation would not be realized, then, until flesh itself were redeemed.

6.4 Origen

Much of the Christian writing of the late first and second centuries is the intellectual equivalent of street-fighting: these authors struggle to make their case against the well-established communities they see as rivals—Jews, for the Bible; traditional pagans, for paideia—while continually honing their polemic against myriad other Christian groups as well. Coming to Origen (185–254), we enter a different world. With his massive (and well-placed) intellectual self-confidence, his creative mastery of traditional philosophy, and his command of the full range of biblical texts, Origen marked a new maturity in developing catholic tradition. The full measure of these excellences comes together in his ambitious *Peri Archōn* ("On First Principles"), the church's first systematic theology.[14] In four books—God (I), World (II), Moral Freedom (III), and Biblical Revelation (IV)—he proposes a coherent, indeed compelling, exposition of Christian redemption; and embedded within is a powerful diagnosis and description of the human condition. To grasp this, let us begin where he begins: with God.

6.4.1 *God as Trinity*

God, defined as Trinity, presided over an eternally existing universe of rational beings. These rational beings, though co-eternal, were *contingent* upon God, and distinguished one from the other by "the sole principle of differentiation," body. God, however, is uniquely *asomaton*, non-embodied.[15] (People who understand from Scripture that God has a body only expose their own unfortunate low level of understanding, since they read *kata sarka*—"according to the flesh" or "in a fleshly way"—and thus fail to grasp the true, higher meaning of the text *kata pneuma*, "according to the spirit."[16]) A crucial defining characteristic of these rational beings is their free will. Since they were contingent, they had a sort of built-in distractableness,[17] but this was offset by their moral independence, the freedom of the will that defines the rational being. In the time before time one of these beings, completely of its own free choice, loved God so intensely that it in effect fused with the Godhead: this was Christ.[18] All the rest, insufficiently attentive, lapsed, each to his own particular 'distance' from God.

6.4.2 *Double Creation: Eternal and Spiritual, Temporal and Fleshly*

To accommodate these distinctive and individual levels of merit in his creatures, and also to place them in a propaedeutic situation whereby they could come to choose, freely, to return to him, God graciously and out of nothing called into being the world of matter.[19] Rational souls thus find themselves in fleshly bodies proper to their situation, in respect of choices made before life in the body. Sun, stars, angels, devils, principalities, powers, humans—all are embodied enfleshed instances on a continuum of moral failure, the sin of turning from God. To think "human condition" then, for Origen, is to think too small. The entire visible cosmos is a fraternity in a "condition," one through which God graciously intends to redeem every one.

We must pause here to consider how this theology brilliantly satisfies some of the hoariest conundrums of both philosophical and Christian theology. Origen's doctrine of a "double creation"—one spiritual and eternal; one temporal and fleshly—at once spoke to classical formulations of God's essential changelessness (he was always eternally Father and Creator), asserted his absolute lordship over the physical cosmos (since he created it out of nothing), and relocated the problem of the one and the many to the ethical sphere. Further, his constant insistence on God's absolute fairness, and the will's absolute freedom, enabled Origen

to appropriate the best of Platonic and Stoic thought in service of a Christian theodicy: will was free; each soul was to exercise its mind in pursuit of ultimate moral excellence, the love of God; and historical, situational evil—babies born blind, congenital diseases, the suffering of the innocent—shrinks in the perspective of eternity to a temporary learning situation for the soul.[20]

6.4.3 *Flesh*

Additionally—in light of Origen's intense commitment to a biblical Christianity, unsurprisingly—the status of "matter" or "flesh" is elevated. The dualist Christian and Origen might seem to make similar claims: life in the flesh is a burden, the measure of sin, a punishment; this world is not the native home of the soul; the fleshly body is not an essential part of the self. But where the dualist would denigrate flesh as a cause of the soul's sin, and this lower cosmos as the work of an inferior, hostile god, Origen praises flesh as the medium of redemption, and a dazzling index of the ingenuity of a generous, loving Creator.[21]

6.4.4 *Universal Salvation*

For God wants redemption for all his creatures—eventually, Origen thought, even the Devil would be brought round—and he has all the time in the world. The huge scope required by the capaciousness of this view of redemption was motivated in part by Origen's insistence on understanding God in terms of his two great biblical attributes, justice (all creatures are created exactly the same, and all are morally free) and mercy (God loves all his creatures, and works for their redemption). Yet it has the curious effect of shrinking key elements in the biblical story. "Adam's sin" can only be a figure for the prehistorical lapse of the entire species; Christ's resurrection, an exemplum rather than an epoch-changing event in itself. While history abets salvation, it does not define it.

6.4.5 *Salvation as Education*

The entire thrust of Origen's argument is intellectual, toward the education of the rational soul; and it is in terms of enlightenment that he understands the stark, Pauline contrast of Death and Life. Paul had embedded his description of the apocalyptic defeat of Death in his vision of the transformation of the body, the change from fleshly body to spiritual body by which both living and dead would join with Christ in God's Kingdom (1 Corinthians 15). Origen's variation on the Pauline theme had also retained redeemed bodies, but these have nothing whatever to

do with flesh, which belongs intrinsically to the secondary, temporary order. The soul's body distinguishes it from other souls, and from God who has no body, but this body is literally *meta*physical. The defeat of Death, in this context, means the defeat of faulty understanding, of ignorance; life *kata pneuma* means understanding, and so loving, God. Its focus is not (as with Paul) the transformation of the body, fleshly or otherwise, but the transformation of the *nous*, the mind of the soul.

Hence Origen's principled concern with textual interpretation, and the huge mass of commentaries that he produced.[22] To live *kata pneuma* was to know the correct way to read, and so understand, the Bible: according to its spiritual meaning, which reveals the timeless truths of God. For the *Peri Archōn* faces off not only with Christian dualists; it strikes time and again against a more intimate enemy, those within the Church who understand her teachings and her scriptures *kata sarka*. These are the ones who, misreading the Bible, think that God has a body (I.1,1), that the saints, physically resurrected, will worship him in Jerusalem (I.1,4), that in this city resplendent with precious stones they will eat, marry, and celebrate (II.11,2–3). Such thinking, sighs Origen, is virtually Jewish, the pathetic advertisement of an impoverished intellect and spirituality (loc. cit.). But God is no fundamentalist; and for those trapped in time he wrote a text whose seeming simplicity requires the mind to seek its allegorical meanings. "The letter kills, but the Spirit gives life" (2 Corinthians 3:6), that is, it transforms the reader, and in so doing removes the veil between him and the Law so that "we shall with unveiled face behold in the holy scriptures the glory of God" (I.1,2).

6.5 Augustine

No one, looking around in 390, would have guessed that Augustine would be the next great architect of an innovative theological system. By that point, he had personally covered all these prior positions: raised by a fundamentalist Catholic mother, then joining a dualist Pauline heretical sect, he had flirted briefly with philosophical skepticism before settling into an allegorizing, cosmopolitan Catholicism retailed by Ambrose and shot through with Origen. His earliest post-conversion writings are modeled on philosophical dialogues; his first biblical commentary refutes Manichaean dualism with the standard tools of allegorical interpretation.

But the intellectual restlessness that compelled Augustine through a decade of intense religious reorientation did not subside with baptism. Returning from international Milan to the narrower world of North Africa,

driven in public by a Manichaean interlocutor up against the glibness of his own understanding of evil—especially of that evil so evidently manifest in the human condition—Augustine plunged into a protracted study of the letters of Paul.[23] His new views on the relationship of grace and will, sin and salvation, that emerged from this period would define the tenor of Western Christianity for the next fourteen centuries. We see his most comprehensive statement of these issues in his great masterwork, *The City of God*.

6.5.1 *Fleshly Creation, Fleshly Fall, Fleshly Salvation*

When God created man in the garden, said Augustine, he created him male and female, with bodies of flesh joined *ab initio* to spirit or soul. From this seemingly simple reading of Genesis Augustine drew, for his tradition, radical conclusions. God's sovereign choice to make humans thus—with gendered, fleshly bodies—not only clearly implied that the flesh was the natural and God-willed habitat of the soul *even before the Fall*; it meant as well that God had always intended humans to be sexually active, to "be fruitful and multiply" precisely by the sexual union of male and female. Why else would he have bothered with gender? Paradisiacal sex, however, would have been different than sex has been since. Now, sexual union and, thus, procreation rely on a loss of control in orgasm and, prior, the loss of rationality as the mind (for Augustine always the premier sexual organ) must needs be moved by lust.[24] Then, however,

> without the morbid condition of lust the sexual organs would have been brought into activity by the same bidding of the will as controlled the other organs. Then, without feeling the allurement of passion goading him on, the husband would have relaxed on his wife's bosom in tranquility of mind and with no impairment of his body's integrity. . . . And the male seed could have been dispatched into the womb with no loss of the wife's integrity, just as the menstrual flux can now be produced from the womb of a virgin without loss of maidenhead. (*City of God*, XIV.26)

What had happened? Even though man had complete freedom of will, and was able to choose freely not to sin, he disobeyed the divine command. God thus struck him in the offending agent, the will itself; and, since soul and body stand intimately connected on the same continuum, this injury to the mind or soul manifested itself instantaneously in the flesh: "There appeared in their body a certain indecent novelty which made nakedness shameful, and made them self-conscious and embarrassed" (XIV.17). Whereas prior to the Fall the capacity for physical pleasure would have been coordinate with the will, thereverafter, it escaped

conscious control. This basic disjuncture of body and soul echoed a further disjuncture with which the species, in every generation, was cursed: for the soul, though created to embrace and love the body as marriage partners had been created for one another, would be wrenched, unwilling, from the body at death.

From Adam on, then, humanity has found itself in a penal condition of ignorance and mortality, the affliction of its broken will passed on, precisely and necessarily, through the morbid condition of lust. Worse: not only can the will no longer control the body; as Paul laments in Romans 7, it can no longer control even itself: "The evil I do not want to do I do" (7:19). Wounded, divided, ineffective, the will—which term functions, for Augustine, as a code for the soul's affect—is turned in upon itself. Although the soul naturally longs to love God,[25] it writhes impacted in itself. The Fall turned the soul's natural *amor dei* to *amor sui*, the irretrievable human narcissism that transmutes every effort to genuinely love another into an exercise in (at best, covert) exploitation. Adam's prerogative not to sin (*posse non peccare*) has been replaced by a harrowing, but nonetheless culpable, inability: humanity cannot *not* sin (*non posse non peccare*). Human nature, body and soul, is now "carnal," fleshly, oriented toward ignorance and death. The entire race is a *massa damnata*, literally a lump of perdition.[26]

God justly condemned the entire race. But he has mercifully chosen to elect some individuals for salvation. He does so entirely at his own initiative (*gratia*), and for his own profoundly hidden (*occultissima*) reasons. Put differently: God does not save the just or the righteous, for there are only sinners; it is his grace alone that makes sinners righteous. For Augustine, the parade example of this principle is Paul himself, a murderer and persecutor of the Church, whom God inexplicably called to the Gospel.

But even those who have received grace still struggle with sin; even those God has elected for salvation die. How then, and when, will God resolve the terrible tensions marking the human predicament; how, and when, will he save? If one knows how to read the Bible, answers Augustine, one can know the answer.

6.5.2 *Reading the Bible*

The Bible must be read both for its spiritual meanings (*secundum spiritum*) and for its historical meanings (*ad litteram*). Here Augustine again comes up with arguments of astonishing originality. Against the Manichees who, like their second-century dualist predecessors, renounced the Old Testament and Judaism as carnal, *and* against prior Catholic tradition, which kept the Old Testament if read *secundum*

spiritum but denounced the Jews as carnal, Augustine insisted that the New Testament and the Old, like the soul and the body, were intimately, fundamentally, essentially connected. The Jews had been right to keep the Law *secundum carnem*, literally and not figuratively; the first generation of apostles and Paul himself had realized this, and they, as Jesus himself, had been Torah-observant Jews. Through their actual, physical observance of the Law, the entire people of Israel, like a great prophet, foretold Christ not only in word (i.e., through their Scriptures) but also in deed, through their actions—blood offerings, food laws, Sabbath, and above all and especially circumcision.

6.5.3 *Whence the Saved, Flesh and All?*

This last most especially bespoke God's redemption. By placing his "seal of righteousness," as the Apostle designated it (Romans 4:11), on that most recalcitrant fleshly member and organ of human generation, God had Israel embody the fundamental mystery of Christianity: the *re*generation of humanity through the revelation of God in the flesh, in the Incarnation and Resurrection of Christ.[27] Now, in the Church, those whom God has chosen experience the first resurrection of the saints, which is spiritual, the regeneration effected through baptism. The second resurrection, however, will be physical, when God raises all humanity, body and soul, for judgment, reigning finally with his saints in his eternal Kingdom (XXII.30).

Only this last act of history will serve to finally resolve the human condition. The resurrection, accordingly, *must* be with a body made of flesh: only reunited with the flesh can the soul truly be complete. What then of Paul's pronouncement, that "flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God" (1 Corinthians 15:50)? Of course, Paul was right, says Augustine. But by "flesh" he meant moral orientation, not physical substance. The fleshly body of the saved[28] will be raised spiritual, meaning that with the wound in the will closed and the soul healed, the body of flesh will again, without effort, follow the dictates of the spirit in all things: man will no longer be capable of sinning (*non posse peccare*).

Where do these spirit-directed bodies of flesh go? Where is the habitation of the saints? Millenarian Christians, especially those within Augustine's own North African tradition, in insisting on the redemption of the fleshly body, had likewise insisted on a redeemed earth, especially a redeemed Jerusalem, as the saints' new home. Those who had abandoned visions of terrestrial beatitude were either dualists, who repudiated the material realm altogether as inimical to the True God; or Origen who, though himself no dualist, had held flesh to be a providential and

temporary dwelling-place of the lapsed rational being: the return back to God, for both, meant a permanent farewell to the material world, human flesh included.

Not so Augustine. The human being is raised with his body of flesh; but it will dwell in the heavens, with God. Earth is not redeemed: only humans are.[29] To protests that such a view was simply scientific nonsense—how could the weighty elements of flesh ascend to a realm past the moon?—Augustine counterposed the reciprocal miracle of birth:

> The world is full of souls animating these earthly physical frames, combined and bound up with them in a mysterious fashion. Why, then, if it is the will of the same God who made this living creature, cannot an earthly body be raised up to a heavenly body, if the soul, which belongs to a more exalted order of being than any body, even a heavenly body, could be linked with an earthly body? [. . .] The present state of things . . . has been cheapened by familiarity, but . . . is in fact much more wonderful than that translation which our philosophers find incredible. Why, in fact, are we not more violently amazed that immaterial souls, superior to celestial bodies, are bound within earthly bodies, than that bodies, although earthly, should be exalted to abodes which are material, albeit heavenly? (XXII.4)

6.6 Summary

This completes our quick march through the very variable terrain of ancient Christianity. As we have seen, interpretations of the Christian message, and especially of the human condition, differ significantly. Some points are constant: humans currently are in a dire predicament, caused somehow by an ancient fall; the High God has effected redemption from this predicament by sending his Son to undo this fall; ultimately, at least some—for Origen, all—will be saved. But the predicament is described and imagined variously, as is the definition of 'human' itself.

6.6.1 *Fall and Redemption*

For Paul, all creation has fallen, and all creation will be redeemed when Christ returns to defeat every hostile power and even death itself (Romans 8; 1 Corinthians 15). For dualists, material creation lies outside the scope of Christ's redemption, since God concerns himself exclusively with those whom he has called, the spiritual men (*pneumatikoi*) who can receive the knowledge of salvation. Their Christ does not really have a fleshly body, nor in a sense does the spiritual man: the body is a temporary

incident, the self is the soul. For Origen, too, this material realm is not the object of salvation, but all fallen rational intelligences are. Hence Origen, like Paul, holds that *all* creation, not just humans, will be saved. Since the soul is eternally alive, and the rational being is in reality its soul, the enemy that Christ defeats is not physical death but intellectual death, the death that comes of not knowing God. For Augustine, human beings are by definition flesh and soul together; Christ really assumes flesh, and in doing so really dies, is really raised, and really signals forth the redemption of the flesh. But his soteriology is narrowly androcentric: *only* humans (and, arguably, only *some* humans) are the object of God's love. The rest of creation is backdrop; what remains, at the end, is God and man.

6.6.2 *Practical Renunciation*

What surprises me, in the face of these significantly different ideological orientations toward embodiment, is how similarly all these communities *acted*. The great social innovation of ancient Christianity, often described but never adequately explained, is the practice of permanent sexual renunciation on a large scale. It is this commitment that binds all these groups together, making them behaviorally much more alike than different. Whence the appeal, and the institutionalization of sexual renunciation?[30] Paul in 1 Corinthians 7 endorsed it, but only as a temporary measure, mutually agreed upon by spouses, to concentrate on prayer in preparation for the impending End. Marcion insisted that all members of his church be celibate, and did not baptize those not prepared to take this step. Unlike the Shakers, Marcion's group flourished, being one of the first Christian communities specifically targeted for persecution by Constantine after his conversion (Eusebius, *Life of Constantine* 64).

Catholic piety was likewise peopled with heroic virgins and lifelong renunciants. So serenely self-controlled was Origen that envious coreligionists gave vent to nasty rumors of self-castration and libido-inhibiting drugs.[31] Augustine quite specifically correlated joining the Church to becoming and staying celibate.[32] Like many perfectionist ideals, universal celibacy was, evidently, more honored in the breach; yet remarkably enough, the ideal remained. The Roman church's endorsement of marriage—specifically against the Manichees; and drawn up by celibate men—was typically ambivalent. Marriage was praised as from God; but the model of Christian marriage was the Holy Family, Mary and Joseph in the archtypical *mariage blanc*.

Perhaps, if in Christ the flesh was to be already somehow put off, celibacy for all these different Christians was a way to transcend existence

kata sarka. To renounce sexual activity—as renouncing normal family ties to enter into a new fictive family of choice, the Church—was to escape the human condition despite being still trapped in it in the period before the Parousia. Celibacy within normal time, then, is the social expression of the Now/Not Yet paradox of Christian eschatology—the paradox that is itself the occasion of Paul's letters, the source of his congregations' confusions about behavior, and the measure of the degree to which God's *fixing* the human condition stands at the center of Christian hope.

6.7 Postscript: Terms of Comparison from the Seminar

Thus far, I have compared different forms of Christianity to each other in terms native to all types. How can we consider this religion in light of categories generated by the group's discussion?

6.7.1 *Obligation*

Given the complicated attitudes to concepts like "law" arising from the anti-Judaic reading of Paul and the gospels that marked orthodox Christianity, the vocabulary of the movement features praise of "freedom"—from the Law, from the bonds of sin, and with the anticipated resurrection (however imagined), from the bonds of death and decay. A discourse of obligation remains embedded in ethical behavior rather than theological rhetoric as such. The Christian is, thus, obligated to fulfill the commandment to love God and neighbor, radically extended in the Gospel of Matthew to love of the enemy as well (5:44). Christian apologists in the second century (and too many New Testament scholars in the twentieth!) divided the Law into ethical and "ritual" commands, arguing that the ritual ones, as specifically Jewish, were irrelevant to the Christian, only the ethical ones were still binding. Eventually, Christian culture evolved its own ethos of ritual obligation—feast days, the liturgical year, sacramental obligation, Lent, and so on; monastic communities, as we would expect, articulated and regulated this ethos to a very high degree.

6.7.2 *Loyalty*

I had not thought about the ancient communities that I work on in this way, and it has occasioned some interesting regrouping. The self-identities of groups can be seen as a function of loyalty to a progressively particular set of texts. At first, the great divide was over the status of the

Septuagint: which Christian group held it as sacred as well as revelatory, which groups merely as revelatory. Later textual loyalties called the first Christian canon into being: thus, the dualist Marcion held the Pauline corpus (the seven authentic epistles, plus Ephesians and Colossians) as the true textual patrimony of the Christian, along with one gospel (perhaps some version of Luke's: we don't know). Other Christians countered with allegiance to a larger canon—Paul's letters plus other deutero-paulines (1 and 2 Timothy, Titus, 2 Thessalonians; Hebrews); four gospels, other letters, one apocalypse, and all of the Septuagint. But how was one to interpret these texts and organize one's communities? Enter the creeds.

Two interesting observations. First, the loyalty to a scriptural canon did not produce a similar loyalty to a canon of authoritative commentary and interpretation, as is the case with rabbinic Judaism or with Confucianism. The authority of commentary—and so loyalty to it—rested with the prestige of the commentator. Accordingly, loyalties varied locally as well as temporally: good commentary in the second century (e.g., Irenaeus) would be outgrown by the fourth (hence the passive 'rewriting' of the millenarian fifth book of Irenaeus' *Against All Heresies* by the simple expedient, by the anti-apocalyptic Western church, of dropping that section when copying the manuscripts). Augustine's prestige in the West guaranteed him nothing in the East. Christendom never had anything like the Mishnah and Gemara.

Second, creeds become a sort of loyalty oath. In this regard, they fail: Athanasius was maddened that the Nicene creed, necessarily vaguely worded to pass through committee, could be endorsed by Arians: say what they might, he *knew* that they were *thinking* about Christology differently. And even creeds of supposedly universal import and application met with variable local reception and interest (at Nicea, amid the hundreds of Eastern bishops, we find only two from the Latin West).

Loyalties could cash out along lines of correct ritual, and the North African church, for example, notoriously divided over a disagreement about the admissibility of second baptism. The Donatists indeed are the parade example of the Church's obsession with group loyalty and intellectual uniformity. North African Catholics and Donatists were divided by no doctrinal differences. They shared exactly the same sacraments, the same calendar, the same saints; indeed, to the detriment of local harmony, they claimed the same church buildings and worshipped at the graves of the same martyrs. What separated them was their thought on sacraments and, thus, their practice of (second) baptism for the lapsed. The Christian obsession with a universal loyalty to the minute particulars of interpretation, reflected linguistically in the career of the term *hairesis*,

eventually challenged one of the most conservative forces in late Latin culture, namely Roman law: how one *thought* could become—if one thought wrongly, that is, disloyally to the Church—a state offense.

Finally, loyalty in Christianity (Catholic and Gnostic) was loyalty to the new, fictive family of the members of the community, not to one's biological family with whatever social obligations that might adhere. The Christian hero transcends family bonds, indeed renounces them, even as he (and, with much less opportunity, she) renounces power and social position as well: This is a major theme of conversion stories. The bishop is "father," the head monk is "abba," one's community members are one's true "mother and brothers and sisters," as Mark's Jesus himself had preached (3:33–35).

6.7.3 *Utopian Visions*

Society after Adam, most Catholic Christians would agree, had not been overly marked by justice, peace, and harmony. Exceptions were imagined or allowed. The early *ekklesia*, according to Paul, at least *should* act as one body, with one accord. Cyprian argued that the church, as the unique ark of salvation, should be an orderly obedient community subject to the authority of her bishop. Orders of virgins, desert fathers (and mothers), extravagantly ascetic holy men, the learned literate retirement of *otium liberale* that eventually evolved into the bookish perfectionism of the Western monastery—all these societies saw themselves as proleptic pieces of heaven, their individual members transformed by the shared ethic, community property (hence individual poverty) and sexual celibacy into a *communio sanctorum*. As such, while still in this life, the individual who joined in such a group endeavor might slip the coil of the human condition while still, nonetheless, in the body.

6.7.4 *Memory*

Permit me here to focus on Augustine, because he does so much with this term and this idea. The very fact that we have memory is for Augustine a symptom of the Fall, for it is the measure of the soul's distension in time. Through memory, the turbid *Qi* of recollected loves pools and so compromises the choices of the soul—"my love, my weight." Habit forms through the memory of loves, leading to compulsive and thus inappropriate choices—Augustine's premier argument for the unfreedom of the will and radical necessity of grace. The means out of this predicament is grace alone, which can be solicited by no discipline, no study, no effective effort on the part of the individual who, grace apart, cannot but be misguided. (The *Confessions* is in this sense his demonstration of the truth of this

claim by using the data of his own life: he could not turn to God until God turned him toward Himself.)

6.7.5 *Transformation*

This is the term that encompasses the most dynamic and dramatic forms of Christian address to the Christian construction of the human predicament. The primal negative transformation of Adam's sin, passed from generation to generation as Original Sin, can be turned around solely by the healing transformation of the grace of God through Christ. What does this mean on the level of ritual, community loyalty, and obligation? For starters, one must belong to the correct community: *extra ecclesiam nulla salus*, where 'extra ecclesiam' meant, originally, outside of *Cyprian's* church. The sacraments through which grace is mediated can be given only through the correct human medium—a churchman, however morally flawed himself, ordained in the Spirit because ordained through the correct episcopal hierarchy. Constantine and Theodosius only complicated this issue, but it existed in the Church long before the state took an interest.

The moral and spiritual transformations available in the ecclesia are a mere shadow, of course, to the ultimate transformation of the flesh at the resurrection of the saints. Here orthodox Christianity got to have its millenarian cake and eat it too—while renouncing millenarianism. The original context for the proclamation of bodily resurrection is the kerygma of the early church, an apocalyptic Jewish movement. Centuries and ethnic groups later, the sort of orientation toward time embarassingly captured in the canon—Paul's letters, Mark, Revelation—had been condemned by the hierarchy as heretical and interpreted out of the texts. But the transformation of the flesh as the ultimate measure of redemption, the resolution to the human predicament, remained nonetheless. Without it, Christ's incarnation lacked focus, his resurrection would flirt with gnosticism. *Malgré lui*, the Church kept it and the Resurrected Christ, in turn, stood as the model of saved humanity.

Finally, Christian eschatology expects as well the transformation of the soul. Paul spoke not just of being "in Christ"; he also spoke of Christ being in Paul: "I have been crucified with Christ; *it is no longer I who live, but Christ in me*" (Galatians 2:20). Origen's rational beings, once redeemed, will be back contemplating the Godhead, stripped of all the incidental particulars—gender, race, class—of life in the material cosmos (neither Jew nor Greek, neither slave nor free, neither male nor female). Augustine's saved humans, by contrast, are emphatically individualized, raised with the same flesh they traveled through history with,

still gendered, identifiable as individuals. Yet the essential orientation of their ego will have changed, which accounts for their no longer being able to sin: the love of self, that hallmark of fallen man, will have been replaced by love of God. God replaces ego. Perhaps, then, in the eschatological speculations of these three very different thinkers—the apocalyptic Jew, the speculative theologian, the Late Roman bishop—we find something close to a doctrine of no-self.

Notes

1. My list is idiosyncratic. I am negotiating between my obligation to present a comprehensive sweep of several centuries, my pedagogical instinct to make my points clearly by using high-contrast cases, and my desire to focus on those thinkers whom I find most interesting—hence Paul, Origen, and Augustine. Let this declaration stand as my apology for not including other pertinent theologians (Athanasius and the Cappadocian Fathers being the most conspicuous absentees).

2. See esp. E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977), 442–511, on understanding Paul's soteriology as an instance of the "solution" (i.e., Christ) preceding the "problem" (what Christ must save humanity *from*).

3. Paul is notoriously unclear on this point. Where the imagery of Temple sacrifice prevails, he speaks without complication of Christ's "blood" (again, Romans 3:25, 5:9) and of his "death" (e.g., Romans 6:3, 1 Corinthians 15:3; 2 Corinthians 4:10, and frequently; cf. on his birth, Galatians 4:4, "God sent forth his Son, born of a woman, born under the Law;" fleshly descent, Romans 1:3). Elsewhere, however, Christ is a preexistent cosmic figure, whose descent in obedience requires that he assume a human form (*morphos;* Lat. *forma*) or human likeness (*en homoiomati anthropo;* Lat. *in similitudinem;* Philippians 2:7–8), appearing "in the likeness of sinful flesh" (Romans 8:3). Later Christologies, as we shall see, resolve this ambiguity by rejecting one or the other of its implications.

4. For various lists of who or what these are, Romans 8:38–39; 1 Corinthians 15:24–26.

5. Again, enslaved, but by divine design: "for the creation was subject to futility, not of its own will but *by the will of him who subjected it in hope.*" (Romans 8:20). Presumably this subjection is somehow tied in with the sin of Adam, but Paul does not spell out the connection. My point is that, while Paul scripts "good" and "evil" forces ranged against each other, he is (unlike some of his later commentators) no dualist: the single High God of the Bible stands supreme.

6. On receiving the Spirit through baptism, e.g., 1 Corinthians 1–3 (where Paul segues to Temple imagery, this time applied to the believer, who, as the temple in Jerusalem, is likewise God's temple because "God's spirit dwells in you," 3:16, cf. 6:19); 12:4–29 ("Now you are the body of Christ and individually members of it," v.27).

7. 1 Corinthians 1–3, chiding the Corinthians for their divisiveness; 5:1–7, condemning *porneia* within the congregation; 5:11 warnings not to associate "with anyone who bears the name of brother if he is guilty of *porneia*, or greed, or worships idols"; 6:12 again against *porneia*, specifically sex with a prostitute; 10:14–22 more warnings against idolatry; 11:2–16, confused ravings against a perceived breach of etiquette at worship; Galatians 5:19–24, another sin-list (the "works of the flesh"): "those who belong to Christ Jesus have crucified the flesh with its passions and appetites." By Romans, the last letter we have from him, Paul speaks of this desired moral conduct, tellingly, not in terms of "freedom from sin" but as "slavery to righteousness," 6:20–22.

8. On wrath, condemnation, and the destruction of those who will merit it on the Day of the Lord, 1 Corinthians 1:18; 2 Corinthians 2:15, 4:3; Philippians 3:19; cf. Romans 1:18, and the general warning in 1 Corinthians 10:6–12.

9. Sallustius, *Peri Theōn kai Kosmou* ("On the Gods and the World"), 1.

10. All gnostics were dualists, but not all dualists were gnostics. Marcion, a radical Paulinist (*fl.* c. 140), repudiated allegorical interpretation and, thus, the Septuagint, advancing the idea that Christians should have their own, new canon: more on this below. Gnostics such as Valentinus urged an esoteric interpretation on the Septuagint, and composed many charismatic gospels and revelations, as well as commentaries. Given their mutual polarization of spirit/flesh, High (Spiritual) God/Lower(Jewish, Fleshly) God, the christologies of both were necessarily docetic: the divine Son could never be too intimately juxtaposed to something as degenerate as flesh.

11. E.g., most famously, Justin, *Dialogue with Trypho* 29, where Justin, arguing with a Jew, refers to "your Scriptures" and then corrects himself: "rather, not yours, but ours."

12. These theologians were reading documents that Paul had not, namely, gospels that insisted that Jesus had been raised not simply bodily, but with a fleshly body—hence his eating fish in Luke (24:37–43), and forcing Thomas to touch his wounds in John (20:27–29). Paul, as we have seen, held to the redemption of the body, but not of the flesh per se. For Augustine's ingenious resolution to this problem, see below.

13. E.g., Justin, *Trypho* 81, referring specifically to Isaiah 65 and Apoc 20:4–5; Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* 5.26.1 and 30,3; Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.* 3. For a brief review of these traditions, P. Fredriksen, "Apocalypse and Redemption. From John of Patmos to Augustine of Hippo," *Vigiliae Christianae* 45.2 (1991): 151–83.

14. This masterwork fell victim to the posthumous controversy that surrounded Origen's theological legacy in the centuries after his death. As a result, the text itself is tattered, the scientific edition in *Griechischen Christlichen*

Schriftsteller (22, ed. P. Koetschau; Leipzig: 1913) a pastiche of various Greek fragments, texts from Justinian and the second Council of Constantinople anathematizing Origen in 553, and an early fifth-century Latin targum by Rufinus composed with an eye toward protecting Origen from the objections his work was already attracting. My observations about his arguments, accordingly, will sometimes be tentative. I draw on G. W. Butterworth's English translation of the Koetschau edition, *On First Principles* (New York: Harper and Row, 1966; orig. pub. 1936).

15. E.g., I.2,2; II.2,2.

16. Origen's opening salvo, I.1,1.

17. In the language of traditional theology (pagan and, eventually, Christian), only God is perfect, hence changeless; contingent beings, by definition, are susceptible of change.

18. "But whereas, by reason of the faculty of free will, variety and diversity had taken hold of individual souls . . . that soul . . . clinging to God from the beginning of the creation and ever after in a union inseperable and indissoluble . . . was made with him in a pre-eminent degree one spirit. . . . It is therefore right that this soul . . . because it received the Son of God wholly into itself, should itself be called . . . the Son of God," II.6,3; also II.8,2.

19. II.1,4–2,2.

20. I.8,1.

21. "[T]his matter, which is so great and wonderful as to be sufficient for all the bodies in the world, . . . God willed to exist, and to be at the call and service of the Creator in all things for the fashioning of whatever forms and species he wished, receiving into itself the qualities which he had willed to bestow upon it," II.1,4. Cf. his discussion in III.1,4, on sexual desire and the fundamental cause (*aitia*) of sin, which is choice.

22. With the exception of the systematic theology, and another important work of anti-pagan apologetic, the *c. Celsum*, virtually all of Origen's huge written legacy directly concerned biblical interpretation, whether to establish a scientific text of the Septuagint (the goal of his work of textual analysis, the *Hexapla*), or to comment on the texts themselves. He wrote on all the books in the OT and NT, sometimes on a vast scale: the commentary on John ran to at least 32 books, 8 of which are extant; on Matthew, 25 books, 8 of which survive; on Romans in 15 books; 13 books on Genesis, 46 on forty-one psalms; 30 on Isaiah, and so on—some 2000 treatises in all, according to Jerome. See the entry in J. Quasten, *Patrology* (Westminster: The Newman Press 1953) 2.37–100.

23. For a review of his work on Paul during this period, P. Fredriksen, "Beyond the Body/Soul Dichotomy: Augustine on Paul against the Manichees and the Pelagians," *Recherches augustiniennes* 23 (1988): 87–111, esp. 89–98.

24. "[Sexual] lust . . . disturbs the whole man. . . . So intense is the pleasure that when it reaches its climax there is an almost total extinction of mental alertness; the intellectual sentries are, as it were, overwhelmed . . . and sometimes desire cools off in the body while it is at boiling heat in the mind" (XIV.16).

25. A point beautifully invoked in the opening lines of the *Confessions*: "You have made us for yourself, and our heart is restless until it rests in You" (I.1,1).

26. The image, again, from Paul, Romans 9:19–23, on God as the potter and humans as pots.

27. Augustine spells out the details of this argument in the *c. Faustum*. It serves as the foundation for his more summary presentation of the role of Israel in redemption in *civ. Dei* XV–XVIII. On the novelty of this reading of Judaism, and the ways it creatively articulates his own theological program, P. Fredriksen, "*Excaecati occulta iustitia Dei*: Augustine on Jews and Judaism," *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 3 (1995): 299–324; eadem, "*Secundum carnem*: God, history, and Israel in the theology of Augustine," *The Limits of Ancient Christianity. Essays on Late Antique Thought and Culture in honor of R. A. Markus*, ed. W. Klingshirn and Mark Vessey (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1999), 26–41.

28. Those of the damned will also be raised fleshly, of course; but will proceed to eternal torment.

29. Hence his interpretation of Romans 8:8–24 taking the *creatura* who groan awaiting redemption as man himself, *Propositiones ex epistula ad Romanos* 53,4.

30. The most recent full study is Peter Brown, *The Body and Society. Men, Women, and Sexual Renunciationin Early Christianity* (New York: Columbia University Press 1990); also extremely valuable, Robin Lane Fox, *Pagans and Christians* (New York: Knopf, 1987), esp. his chapter "Living like Angels." In 1965, E. R. Dodds attempted to use psychoanalytic psychology to understand Christian asceticism, *Pagan and Christian in an Age of Anxiety* (New York: Norton, 1965). Ultimately, the effort fails—the theory necessarily sat loose of the unobliging evidence, and the chronological frame wobbled; but Dodds slim effort (138 pages) in no small part provoked the 1200+ pages of the two books cited above.

31. Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* 6.8, for the castration story; Epiphanius, *Panarion* 64.3.11–12, that Origen's remarkable chastity was due to drugs.

32. *Conf.* 6.12,21–15.25; 8:6,13 and passim.