SEMINAR PAPERS



SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE

ANNUAL MEETING 1996

Scholars Press

SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE

1996 Seminar Papers

Society of Biblical Literature
Seminar Papers Series

Number 35
Society of Biblical Literature
1996 Seminar Papers

Society of Biblical Literature
1996 Seminar Papers

One hundred Thirty-second Annual Meeting
November 21–28, 1996
New Orleans Marriott
New Orleans, Louisiana

Scholars Press
Atlanta, Georgia

Society of Biblical Literature
1996 Seminar Papers

© 1996
Society of Biblical Literature

Indexed in *Religion Index Two: Multi-Author Works*
published by the American Theological Library Association, Evanston, Illinois.
Indexing also available in the ATLA Religion Database
accessible through Dialog Information Services, Palo Alto, California.
Also available for compact-disk searching through ATLA.

ISBN: 0-7885-0292-1
ISSN: 0145-2711

Printed in the United States of America

Contents

S1 Q Bibliography and Supplement VII: 1996
David M. Scholer 1

S53 Assaying the Endings of the Apocryphon of John
Richard L. Arthur 8

S53 Peter and Philip Upside Down: Perspectives on the Relation of the *Acts of Philip* to the *Acts of Peter*
Christopher R. Matthews 23

S53 La composition de l'*Evangile selon Philippe* (NH II,3): une analyse rhétorique
Louis Painchaud 35

S60 Finding Its Niche: The Historical and Rhetorical Species of Acts
Dr. Ben Witherington III 67

S79 The Beginning of a Narrative Commentary on the Gospel of Mark
Elizabeth Struthers Malbon 98

S85 Two Early Jewish Approaches to Wisdom: Sirach and Qumran Sapiential Work A
Daniel J. Harrington 123

S85 Putting the Puzzle Together: Some Suggestions Concerning the Social Location of the Wisdom of Ben Sira
Benjamin G. Wright III 133

S113 The Significance of Matthew's Eschatology for Biblical Theology
James D.G. Dunn 150

S113 Matthew's Eschatology
Donald A. Hagner 163

S113 The Significance of Matthew's Eschatology for Systematic Theology
Hans Schwarz 182

S117 Reading the Book of Isaiah as Christian Scripture
Roy F. Melugin 188

S117 Isaiah as Scroll or Codex within Jewish and Christian Scripture
Gerald T. Sheppard 204

S117 The Scroll of Isaiah as Jewish Scripture, Or, Why Jews Don't Read Books
Benjamin D. Sommer 225

S188 Melchizedek the Liberator: An Early Interpretation of Genesis 14?
Anders Aschim 243

S188 Melchizedek, Michael, and War in Heaven
James R. Davila 259

S192 From Fiction to History: Contextualizing *Joseph and Aseneth*
Gideon Bohak 273

S192 From Text to Context: The Social Matrix of *Joseph and Aseneth*
Randall D. Chesnutt 285

S192 From Fictional Text to Socio-Historical Context: Some Considerations from a Textcritical Perspective on *Joseph and Aseneth*
Angela Standartinger 303

S210 Paul's Hearing at Caesarea: A Preliminary Comparison with Legal Literature of the Roman Period
H. Stephen Brown 319

S210 The Persuasive Moment: Rhetorical Resolutions in Paul's Defense Before Agrippa
Frank Crouch 333

S210 The Unknown Paul: Philosophers and Sophists in Acts 17
Mark D. Given 343

S210 Narrative as Persuasion: Epideictic Rhetoric and Scribal Amplification in the Stephen Episode in Acts
Todd C. Penner 352

S210 Narrative in Ancient Rhetoric and Rhetoric in Ancient Narrative
Vernon K. Robbins 368

S217 Some Observations about Mysticism and the Spread of Notions of Life After Death in Hebrew Thought
Alan F. Segal 385

S238 Plot and Matthew
Kathleen Weber 400

S240 The Apostle Philip, The Viper, The Leopard, and the Kid. The Masked Actors of a Religious Conflict in Hierapolis of Phrygia (Acts of Philip VIII-XV and Martyrdom)
Frédéric Amsler 432

S240 The Influence of 1 Corinthians on the *Acts of Paul*
Peter W. Dunn 438

S240 The *Acts of Titus*: A Preliminary Translation with an Introduction, Notes, and Appendices
Richard I. Pervo 455

S265 "Who is wise and understanding among you?" (James 3:13), An Analysis of Wisdom, Eschatology and Apocalypticism in the Epistle of James
Patrick J. Hartin 483

S265 A Letter to the Twelve Tribes in the Diaspora: Wisdom and 'Apocalyptic' Eschatology in the Letter of James
Matt A. Jackson-McCabe 504

Q Bibliography Supplement VII: 1996

David M. Scholer
Fuller Theological Seminary

Introduction

This brief listing supplements the Q bibliographies that have appeared in the Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers volumes since 1986. This Supplement contains an additional eighty-three items. It is still the plan to publish within the next year or two a comprehensive Q bibliography in a work on Q edited by James M. Robinson, John S. Kloppenborg and Paul Hoffmann. I thank all those scholars who have assisted me by sending information; I am especially indebted to John S. Kloppenborg.

Books and Reviews

Bergmann, T. Q auf dem Prüfstand....

Best, E. Expository Times 105 (1993/94), 300.

Fuchs, A. Studien zum Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt 19 (1994), 210-13.

Kloppenborg, J. S. Journal of Biblical Literature 114 (1995), 325-27.

Carruth, S. and Garsky, A. The Database of the International Q Project: Q 11:2b-4. (Documenta Q.... 1 [Vol. ed. S. D. Anderson.) Leuven: Peeters, 1996.

Catchpole, D. R. The Quest for Q....

Chilton, B. Sewanee Theological Review 38 (1994/95), 287-88.

Goulder, M. Novum Testamentum 36 (1994), 204-07.

Hartin, P. J. Neotestamentica 28 (1994), 260-63.

Klutz, T. Journal for the Study of the New Testament 58 (1995), 115.

Neirynck, F. Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses 70 (1994), 164-67.

Telford, W. R. Theology 98 (1995), 308-09.

Fleddermann, H. T. Mark and Q: A Study of the Overlap Texts. With an Assessment by F. Neirynck. (BETL 122.) Leuven:

University Press/Peeters, 1995.

Hartin, P. J. James and the Q Sayings....

Hüneburg, M. Theologische Literaturzeitung 119 (1994), 1078-80.

Hoffmann, P. Tradition und Situation....

Hock, R. F. Religious Studies Review 22 (1996), 68.

Neirynck, F. Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses 71 (1995), 463.

Kloppenborg, J. S. Conflict and Invention: Literary, Rhetorical, and Social Studies on the Sayings Gospel Q. Valley Forge: Trinity Press International, 1995.

Kloppenborg, J. S. et al. Q Thomas Reader....

Winterhalter, R. Journal of Religion and Psychical Research 17 (1994), 51-52.

Mack, B. L. The Lost Gospel....

Bechtler, S. R. Princeton Seminary Bulletin 14 (1993), 302-04.

Bockmuehl, M. Theological Book Review 6:3 (June 1994), 24.

Fairchild, M. R. Christian Scholar's Review 24 (1994), 93-95.

McIver, R. K. Andrews University Seminary Studies 33 (1995), 132-34.

Meadors, E. P. Jesus the Messianic Herald of Salvation. (WUNT 2/72.) Tübingen: Mohr-Sieback, 1995.

Piper, R. A. The Gospel Behind the Gospels....

Burnett, F. Religious Studies Review 22 (1996), 68.

Morgan, R. Theological Book Review 1:3 (May 1989), 12.

Schüling, J. Studien zum Verhältnis von Logienquelle....

Fuchs, A. Studien zum Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt 19 (1994), 213-14.

Viviano, B. T. Revue Biblique 101 (1994), 618-19.

Sevenich-Box, E. Israels Konfrontation...Logienquelle....

Ebner, M. Biblische Zeitschrift 38 (1994), 278-81.

Fusco, V. Rivista Biblica 42 (1994), 224-26.

von Lips, H. Theologische Revue 90 (1994), 289-91.

Tuckett, C. M. Journal of Theological Studies 46 (1995), 255-57.

Uro, R. Journal of Biblical Literature 114 (1995), 514-16.

Tuckett, C. M. Q and the History of Early Christianity. Edinburgh: T & T Clark/Peabody: Hendrickson, 1996.

Vaage, L. E. Galilean Upstarts....

Brehm, H. A. Southwestern Journal of Theology 38:1 (Fall 1995), 54.

Denaux, A. Journal of Biblical Literature 115 (1996), 136-38.

Vidal Manzanares, C. El primer Evangelio: el documento Q. (Documento 325.) Barcelona: Planeta, 1993.

Articles

Anonymous. "The International Q Project," Bulletin of the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity 22:2 (July 1995), 4-5.

Arnal, W. "Gendered Couplets in Q and Legal Formulations from Rhetoric to Social History," AAR/SBL Abstracts 1995 (1995), 116.

Arnal, W. "Redactional Fabrication and Group Legitimation: The Baptist's Preaching in Q 3:7-9, 16-17," Chapter 10 in Kloppenborg, Conflict and Invention.... (1995), 165-80.

Batten, A. "Patience Breeds Wisdom: Q 6:40 in Context," AAR/SBL Abstracts 1995 (1995), 116-17.

Bjorndahl, S. G. "An Honor Map of Q," AAR/SBL Abstracts 1995 (1995), 117.

Carruth, S. "Strategies of Authority: A Rhetorical Study of the Character of the Speaker in Q 6:20-49," Chapter 6 in Kloppenborg, Conflict and Invention.... (1995), 98-115.

Cotter, W. "'Yes, I Tell You, and More Than a Prophet': The Function of John in Q," Chapter 8 in Kloppenborg, Conflict and Invention.... (1995), 135-50.

Douglas, R. C. "'Love Your Enemies': Rhetoric, Tradents, and Ethos," Chapter 7 in Kloppenborg, Conflict and Invention.... (1995), 116-31.

Downing, F. G. "A Genre for Q and a Socio-Cultural Context for Q: Comparing Sets of Similarities with Sets of Differences," Journal for the Study of the New Testament 55 (1994), 3-26.

Downing, F. G. "Word-processing in the Ancient World," AAR/SBL Abstracts 1995 (1995), 16.

Dunderberg, I. "Q and the Beginning of Mark," New Testament Studies 41 (1995), 501-11.

Fuchs, A. "Das Elend mit der Zweiquellentheorie: Eine Auseinandersetzung mit zwei neueren Dissertationen zum Thema der minor agreements," Studien zum Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt 18 (1993), 183-243.

Gibson, J. B. "Jesus' Wilderness Temptation According to Q," Chapter 3; and "The 'Sign' Demand Temptation According to Q," Chapter 6 in The Temptations of Jesus in Early Christianity (JSNT Supplement Series 112;1 Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 83-118; 196-211 [explicit subsections on Q in other chapters of the book are found on the following pages: 32-37 ("The Extent of the Q Version of the Wilderness Temptation"); 127-36 ("The Extent and Wording of the Q Version of the 'Sign' Demand Temptation"); and 156-57 ("Mark 8.1-13 and Q")].

Hartin, P. J. "The Wisdom and Apocalyptic Layers of the Sayings Gospel Q: What Is Their Significance?" Hervormde Teologiese Studies 50 (1994), 556-82.

Hartin, P. J. "'Yet Wisdom Is Justified by Her Children' (Q 7:35): A Rhetorical and Compositional Analysis of Divine Sophia in Q," Chapter 9 in Kloppenborg, Conflict and Invention.... (1995), 151-64.

Hoffmann, P. "Q 6,22 in der Rezeption durch Lukas," Nach den Anfängen Fragen: Festschrift Gerhard Dautzenberg (hrsg. C. Mayer, K. Müller, G. Schmalenberg; Giessener Schriften zur Theologie und Religionspädagogik 8; Giessen, 1994), 293-326.

Horsley, R. ""Social Conflict in the Synoptic Sayings Source Q," Chapter 3 in Kloppenborg, Conflict and Invention.... (1995), 37-52.

Jenkins, G. "A Written Jerusalem Gospel 'Y': Reflections on the Socio-Politics of the Synoptic Problem," Pacifica 7 (1994), 309-23.

Kirk, A. "Composition and Macro-Structure in the Last Section of Q (Q 12:2-22:30)," AAR/SBL Abstracts 1995 (1995), 16.

Kloppenborg, J. S. "Conflict and Invention: Recent Studies on Q," Chapter 1 in Kloppenborg, Conflict and Invention.... (1995), 1-14.

Koester, H. "Jesus' Presence in the Early Church," Cristianesimo nella storia 15 (1994), 541-57 ["1. The Tradition of Jesus' Sayings," 541-46].

Kuhn, H.-W. "Bethsaida in the Gospels: The Feeding Story in Luke 9 and the Q Saying in Luke 10," Bethsaida: A City by the North Shore of the Sea of Galilee (ed. R. Arav and R. A. Freund; Bethsaida Excavations Project 1; Kirksville, MO: Thomas Jefferson University Press, 1995), 243-56.

Linnemann, E. "Is There a Gospel of Q?" Bible Review 11:4 (August 1995), 18-23, 42-43.

Mack, B. L. "The Sayings Gospel Q," a section in Chapter 2 ["Teachings from the Jesus Movements"]; and "The Contents of Q," Appendix B in Who Wrote the New Testament? The Making of the Christian Myth (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1995), 47-60 [Chapter 2, 43-73]; 312-13.

Mattila, S. L. "A Problem Still Clouded: Yet Again -- Statistics and 'Q,'" Novum Testamentum 36 (1994), 313-29.

Moreland, M. C. and Robinson, J. M. "The International Q Project Work Sessions 23-27 May, 22-26 August, 17-18 November 1994," Journal of Biblical Literature 114 (1995), 475-85.

Neirynck, F. "Assessment," in Fleddermann, Mark and Q.... (1995), 261-307.

Neirynck, F. "The Divorce Saying in Q 16:18," Louvain Studies 20 (1995), 201-18.

Neirynck, F. "The First Synoptic Pericope: The Appearance of John the Baptist in Q?" Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses 72 (1996), 41-74.

Neirynck, F. "Luke 10:25-28: A Foreign Body in Luke?" Crossing the Boundaries: Essays in Biblical Interpretation in Honour of Michael D. Goulder (ed. S. E. Porter, P. Joyce and D. E. Orton; Biblical Interpretation Series 8; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994), 149-65.

Neirycnk, F. "Q: From Source to Gospel," Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses 71 (1995), 421-30.

Nel, G. C. L. and van Aarde, G. "Die etiek van Jesus in die lig van Q: Eskatologies of wysheidsteologies begrond?" Hervormde Teologiese Studies 50 (1994), 936-52.

Patterson, S. J. "Wisdom in Q and Thomas," In Search of Wisdom: Essays in Memory of John G. Gammie (ed. L. G. Perdue, B. B. Scott, W. J. Wiseman; Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1993), 187-221.

Patterson, S. J. "Yes, Virginia, There Is a Q," Bible Review 11:5 (October 1995), 39-40.

Piper, R. A. "The Language of Violence and the Aphoristic Sayings in Q: A Study of Q 6:27-36," Chapter 4 in Kloppenborg, Conflict and Invention.... (1995), 53-72.

Polag, A. "The Theological Center of the Sayings Source," The Gospel and the Gospels (ed. P. Stuhlmacher; Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1991), 97-105.

Racine, J.-F. "Trois approches de la situation des femmes dans le document Q: Hal Taussing, Luise Schottroff et Amy-Jill Levine," Des Femmes aussi faisaient route avec lui: Perspectives féministes sur la Bible (Sciences bibliques 2; Montreal: Médiaspaul, 1995), 133-52.

Reed, J. L. "The Social Map of Q," Chapter 2 in Kloppenborg, Conflict and Invention.... (1995), 17-36.

Robinson, J. M. "The Incipit of the Sayings Gospel Q," Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses 75 (1995), 9-33 (English summary, 149).

Robinson, J. M. "The Son of Man in the Sayings Gospel Q," Tradition und Translation: Zum Problem der interkulturellen Übersetzbarkeit religiöser Phänomene; Festschrift für Carsten Colpe zum 65. Geburtstag (hrsg. C. Elsas et al.; Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1994), 315-35.

Scholer, D. M. "Q Bibliography Supplement VI: 1995," Society of Biblical Literature 1995 Seminar Papers (ed. E. H. Lovering, Jr.; SBLSPS 34; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), 1-5.

Schröter, J. "Q and the Oral Gospel Tradition," AAR/SBL Abstracts 1995 (1995), 16-17.

Schürmann, H. "Zur Kompositionsgeschichte der Redenquelle: Beobachtungen an der lukanischen Q-Vorlage," Jesus: Gestalt und Geheimnis (hrsg. K. Scholtissek; Paderborn: Bonifatius,

1994), 398-419.

Stanton, G. "Q: A Lost 'Gospel'?" Chapter VI in Gospel Truth? New Light on Jesus and the Gospels (London: HarperCollins and Valley Forge: Trinity Press International, 1995), 63-76.

Vaage, L. E. "Composite Texts and Oral Mythology: The Case of the 'Sermon' in Q (6:20-49)," Chapter 5 in Kloppenborg, Conflict and Invention.... (1995), 75-97.

Vaage, L. E. "More Than a Prophet, and Demon-Possessed: Q and the 'Historical' John," Chapter 11 in Kloppenborg, Conflict and Invention.... (1995), 181-202.

Wire, A. C. "'All Wisdom's children do her proud': A Theology of Rejected and Vindicated Wisdom for a Plural World," AAR/SBL Abstracts 1995 (1995), 117.

Wire, A. C. "The God of Jesus in the Gospel Sayings Source," Reading from This Place; Volume I: Social Location and Biblical Interpretation in the United States (ed. F. F. Segovia and M. A. Tolbert; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995), 277-303.

Dissertation

Syx, R. "Gebruikte Marcus de Q-bron? Een onderzoek van de Beëlzebul-controverse (Mc 3,20-30 en par)." S.T.D. dissertation, Flemish-English Faculty of Theology, Leuven, 1994.

ASSAYING THE ENDINGS OF THE APOCRYPHON OF JOHN

by
Richard L. Arthur

Well might *the Gospel of Philip* have said to *the Apocryphon of John* "When we were Hebrews, we were orphans, and had only our mother, but when we became Christians we had father and mother" (II 52,21-24), from which we could imagine that some kind of ultimate syzygy existed in the mind of our Nag Hammadi author. Indeed, the gnostics had been accused of going beyond the limits of propriety with their sexual imagery, so it should not be surprising to find their deity described as, "*mother-father*".

The Greek word μητροπάτωρ, a word which properly means "mother's-father", occurs in the Codex II-IV version of the Apocryphon of John in six passages but never at all in the BG- or Codex III version. The contexts in the Apocryphon of John assure the meaning "mother-father".[1]

There is a Coptic equivalent, ⲙⲁⲁⲩⲛ̄ⲉⲓⲱⲧ literally, "fatherly-mother", which makes one appearance in the BG-Codex III versions (BG 75,11; III 39,11-12), in the ending where there is no exact equivalent in the Codex II-IV version.

ⲧⲉⲧⲉ ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲧⲥ ⲃⲉ ⲉⲧⲉ ⲧⲙⲁⲁⲩ ⲛ̄ⲉⲓⲱⲧ ⲧⲉ ⲉⲧⲉ ⲛⲁϣⲉ ⲡⲉⲥⲛⲁ (BG 75,10-12)

She who is blessed, then, that is, the (f.) Mother-Father, great in her (f.) mercy,

ⲁⲛⲟⲕ ⲃⲉ ⲧⲡⲣⲟⲛⲟⲓⲁ ⲉⲧ̀ⲭⲏⲕ̀ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ (II 30,11-12).

I am the perfect Pronoia . . . .

Comparison of the BG-version with its sister Codex III *AJ* text which has ⲧⲙⲁⲕⲁⲣⲓⲟⲥ ⲟⲩⲛ ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲁⲩ [ⲛⲉⲓⲱ]ⲧ ⲧⲉⲧⲉ ⲛⲁϣⲉ ⲡⲉⲥⲛⲁⲉ . . . possibly indicates an agreement on the Greek level of μακαρία οὖν ἡ μητροπάτωρ. Yet I will argue that this occurrence of μητροπάτωρ is ultimately due to interference on the Coptic level.[2]

It is noteworthy that neither of these expressions, the Greek μητροπάτωρ nor the Coptic ⲙⲁⲁⲩⲛ̄ⲉⲓⲱⲧ, nor any combination of these two expressions, occurs in a joint reading of any passage in *AJ*. We are probably justified, therefore, in drawing the conclusion that the expression "*mother-father*" is a redactional phrase, manufactured late in the course of development of the texts of *AJ*, and manufactured for a particular reason. The particular reason that will be suggested here is that the Christianization of the tractate produced some powerful gender contradictions in the text.

Specifically, Barbelo, very important in the Sethian-like source document, is called "*mother-father*" in II 5,6, while the Father himself is called "*mother-father*" in II 6,14-16 and II 20,9. In addition to being applied to Barbelo and to the Father, the epithet "*mother-father*" is also used of "the Son", that is, of the first man, called "Seth" (II 14,13-23), as well as of the feminine revealer figure, a teacher called the "Epinoia of light" (BG 71,9; cf. III 36,22 & II 27,33-34), who awakens the thought of those persons who belong to her "immovable" and "perfect" race.

When the anonymous recipient of the revelation asks about the origin of the "counterfeit spirit" (in Codex II-IV, the "hateful spirit"), he is answered:

> "The μητροπάτωρ, rich in her mercy, the Holy Spirit, who suffers with us, who is the Epinoia of the shining Pronoia, she raised up the thinking of the people of the immovable race of the perfect, immortal Light-Man".

The foregoing is a slightly-modified reading, which combines elements of Codex II 27,33-28,5 with III 36,18-37,1. The term "Holy Spirit", of masculine gender in Coptic, has affected some of the grammatical forms, but clearly it is the ⲙⲏⲧⲣⲟⲡⲁⲧⲱⲣ who looks after the chosen "immovable" race. In fact, the BG- Codex III version has here "mother", ⲙⲁⲁⲩ, in place of the "*mother-father*", ⲙⲏⲧⲣⲟⲡⲁⲧⲱⲣ, of Codex II.[3]

We can say, then, that "*mother-father*", μητροπάτωρ, in Codex II-IV can stand for at least four of the major players in *AJ*, viz., the Father, the Mother, the Son, and the Revealer, also called "the Mother".[4]

Was the term μητροπάτωρ in the original Greek which is posited for *AJ*? Probably not. This is indicated by the lack of its occurrence outside of the text of Codex II-IV and by its function in being applied rather indiscriminately to members of a set of divine figures. μητροπάτωρ sounds like a committee report, drafted to please everyone, but presenting as much of ambiguity as possible.

Lest we be too hard on the committee, we should remind ourselves that they were no doubt comprised of a gentle sort of indigenous Egyptian cenobite being exposed to a rather confusing jargon of Greek gnostic-sounding theological terms which we ourselves have not yet well sorted out. For them, μητροπάτωρ could cover the ultimate male-female syzygy which creates everything, as well as the mysterious feminine figure whose revelations are presented as reflections of that primal light, and then, too, of that light-force immanent in the world as source of the awakening.

The following is a detailed explanation of the six occurrences of μητροπάτωρ in Codex II, with the parallels, followed by a discussion of the several endings of *AJ*, at the beginning of which we find the cognate term ⲧⲙⲁⲁⲩⲛ̄ⲉⲓⲱⲧ (BG 75,11 and III 39,11-12).

Occurrence 1

BG 27,14-17: ⲧⲃⲁⲣⲃⲏⲗⲱ ⲡⲁⲓⲱⲛ ⲉⲧⲭⲏⲕ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲟⲟⲩ

ⲉⲥ† ⲉⲟⲟⲩ ⲛⲁϥ ⲭⲉ ⲁⲥⲟⲩⲱⲛϩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛ̄ϩⲏⲧ̄ϥ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲥⲛⲟⲉⲓ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟϥ ⲛ̄ⲧⲟⲥ ⲧⲉ ⲧⲉϩⲟⲩⲉⲓⲧⲉ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲛⲛⲟⲓⲁ ⲧⲉϥϩⲓⲕⲱⲛ.

II 4,36-5,9: ⲡⲉⲟⲟⲩ ⲛ̄ⲃⲁⲣⲃⲏⲗⲱ ⲡⲉⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲧⲭⲏⲕ ⲉⲃⲟ[ⲗ] ϩⲛ ⲛⲁⲓⲱⲛ ⲡ̣ⲉⲟⲟⲩ ⲙ̄ⲡⲟⲩⲱⲛϩ̄ ⲉⲃⲟ[ⲗ] ⲭ̣[ⲥ]† ⲉⲟ[ⲟ]ⲩ ⲙ̄ⲡ[ⲡ]ⲁⲣⲑⲉⲛⲓⲕⲟⲛ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲁ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲥⲥⲙ̣ⲟⲩ ⲉⲣⲟϥ̀ ⲭⲉ ⲉⲧⲃⲏⲧϥ̀ ⲁⲥⲟⲩⲱⲛϩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲡⲁⲓ̈ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲱⲟⲣⲡ̀ ⲙ̄ⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉϥϩⲓⲕⲱⲛ̣ ⲁⲥⲱⲱⲡⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲏⲧⲣⲁ ⲙ̄ⲡⲧⲏⲣϥ̀ ⲭⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲟⲥ ⲉ[ⲥ]ⲟ ⲛ̄ⲱⲟⲣⲡ̀ ⲉⲣⲟⲟⲩ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ· ⲧⲙ̄ⲏⲧⲣⲟⲡⲁⲧⲱⲣ ⲡⲱⲟⲣⲡ̀ ⲛ̄ⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲡⲛⲁ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ· ⲡⲱⲟⲙⲧ̀ <ⲛ>ϩⲟⲟⲩⲧ ⲧⲱⲟⲙⲧⲉ ⲛ̄ⲟ́ⲟⲙ ⲡⲱⲟⲙⲧ̀ ⲛ̄ⲣⲁⲛ ⲛ̄ϩⲣ̣[ⲟ]ⲩⲧⲥϩⲓⲙⲉ . .

Barbelo, the perfect aeon of glory,
glorifying him,

since she was revealed through him, and
she knows him - his Icon.

The glory of Barbelo, the perfect glory in the aeons, the glory of the revelation, she glorified the virginal spirit and she praised him, for because of him she had been revealed. She is the first thought, his Icon; she became the womb of the universe, for she is before everything, the (f,) μητροπάτωρ (lacks, BG-III), the first man, the Holy Spirit, the triple-male, the triple-power, the triple-name, an androgyne . . . .

This first occurrence of the epithet μητροπάτωρ is introduced within a lengthy description of Barbelo, beginning at II 4,20, "the light which surrounds him, the spring of living water" ("the light filled with purity, the spring of the Holy Spirit . . ." BG-III).[5] Barbelo is described as the origin of the Icon of God, because she is "the spring of living water" in which he contemplates himself (II 4,19-21).

All of the above would seem to belong to old traditions about Barbelo, a divine being, who is the image of the invisible spirit.[6] The word μητροπάτωρ, however, occurs at the end of what must have been a redactional addition of about two lines:

> "She became the Womb of the Universe, for she is before everything, the (f.) μητροπάτωρ." (II 5,5-7).

Here the word μητροπάτωρ, as well as the word μήτρα, "womb", are not typical of the Barbelo tradition.

The deity Barbelo is in a tenuous position in the emerging Gnosis associated with the *Apocryphon of John*. She can be identified with the Holy Spirit as a second-person of a gnostic trinity (II 2,14), but she cannot be harmonized with the unstable figure of Sophia. It is also clear in *AJ* that Barbelo is not a redeemed-redeemer, nor the revealer figure. Indeed, the revealer figure, "the Mother" in BG 76,1, testifies to "the blessed One, the Mother-Father (ⲧⲙⲁⲁⲩⲛ̄ⲉⲓⲱⲧ), rich in her mercy, who takes form in her seed" (BG 75,10-13).[7] This passage makes a distinction between the noumenal Barbelo and the forms she takes in the world, one of which would seem to be the first-person revealer, an I-personage ("and now I ascend to the perfect aeon", BG 75,14-15).

This first occurrence of μητροπάτωρ begins a series of allusions to the Godhead which seems to be designed to control an emerging dominance of the male deity. By first affirming that Barbelo, the second person of the Godhead, can take the designation of the ultimate syzygy, then the application of the same term to the Father prevents Barbelo from being totally obscured. This committee idea, nevertheless, did not enjoy much success among the Nag Hammadi scribes and authors.

Occurrence 2:

BG 29,17-30,9 ⲉⲧⲉ ⲛⲧⲟⲕ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲉⲓⲱⲧ ⲙ̄ⲡⲁⲅⲉⲛⲏⲧⲟⲥ ⲛⲉⲓⲱⲧ ⲁⲥⲃⲱϣ̄ⲧ̄ ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲣⲟⲕ ⲉⲙⲁⲧⲉ ⲛⲟⲓ ⲧⲃⲁⲣⲃⲏⲗⲱ ⲡⲓⲧⲃ̄ⲃⲟ ϩⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲟⲩⲓⲛ ⲁⲥⲕ[ⲟ]ⲧⲥ ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲣⲟⲕ ⲁⲥⲭⲡⲟ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲥⲡⲓⲛⲑⲏⲣ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲓⲛ ⲙⲙⲁⲕⲁⲣⲓⲟⲛ

ⲛⲉⲕϣⲏϣ ⲁⲉ ⲟⲩⲃⲏⲥ ⲁⲛ ϩⲛ̄ ⲧⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲛⲟⲃ ⲡⲁⲓ̈ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲙⲟⲛⲟⲅⲉⲛⲏⲥ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁϥⲟⲩⲱⲛϩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲙⲡⲓⲱⲧ ⲡⲁⲩⲧⲟⲅⲉⲛⲏⲧⲟⲥ ⲛⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲡϣⲏⲣⲉ ⲛϣⲣ̄ⲡ ⲙ̄ⲙⲓⲥⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲧⲏⲣϥ ⲛⲧⲉ ⲡⲉⲡ̄ⲛⲁ ⲙⲡⲟⲩⲟⲩⲓⲛ ⟨ⲛ⟩ⲁⲗ[ⲓ]ⲕⲣⲓⲛⲉⲥ

. . . which is the Father of the unbegotten Father. Barbelo gazed intently into him, the pure light. She turned herself to him, and gave birth to a spark of blessed light, but he is

not equal to her majesty. This is the only-begotten One,
who came forth from the Father, the

self-begotten God - the first-born Son of the universal spirit of pure light.

II 6,9-18 ⲉⲧⲉ ⲡⲁⲓ̈ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲉ[ⲓ]ⲱⲧ` ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁϥⲃⲱϣ̄ⲧ` ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ ϩⲛ̄ ⲧⲃⲁⲣⲃⲏⲗⲱ ϩⲙ̄ ⲡⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲛ` ⲉ[ⲧ]ⲧⲃ̄ⲃⲏⲩ ⲉⲧⲕⲧⲏⲩ ⲁⲡⲁϩⲟⲣⲁⲧⲟⲛ` ⲙⲡⲛⲁ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲡⲉϥⲡ̄ⲣⲣⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲥⲭⲉ ⲟⲩⲱ [ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲁ]ϥⲭⲡⲟ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩ†ⲕ̄ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲛ` ϩⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓ[ⲛ]ⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲙⲁⲕⲁⲣⲓ[ⲟⲥ] ⲛ̄ⲉⲓⲛⲉ· ⲉϥϣⲏϣ ⲁⲉ [ⲁⲛ] ⲙⲛ ⲧⲉϥⲙ̄ⲛⲧⲛ[ⲟ]ϭ ⲡⲁⲓ̈ ⲛⲉⲟⲩϣⲣ̄ⲟⲩⲱⲧ [ⲡⲉ] ⲛ̄ⲧⲙⲏⲧⲣⲟⲡⲁⲧⲱⲣ ⲉⲁϥⲟⲩⲱⲛϩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲉⲧⲉ [ⲡⲁⲓ̈] ⲡⲉ ⲡⲉϥⲭⲡ[ⲟ] ⲟⲩⲁⲁⲧϥ` ⲡϣⲣ̄ⲟⲩⲱⲧ ⲛ̄[ⲧ]ⲉ [ⲡ]ⲉⲓⲱⲧ [ⲡⲟⲩ]ⲟⲉⲓⲛ ⲉⲧⲧⲃ̄ⲃⲏⲩ

. . . which is the Father.
He gazed upon Barbelo and the pure light which surrounds the invisible spirit and its glow, and she conceived for him. He begot a spark of light, with a light resembling blessedness, but not equal to his own majesty. This was an only-begotten One of the μητροπάτωρ, which had come forth, that is, his only offspring, the only-begotten One of the Father, the pure light.

Here it is clear that the μητροπάτωρ, though provided with a feminine article, is really the primal Father. The parallels in the BG-III versions read "only-begotten One (μονογενής) who came forth from the Father." Certainly BG-III has the more original text as can be seen by comparing it with the redundancy of Codex II: "only-begotten One of the μητροπάτωρ . . . only begotten One of the Father."

> The interpolation of ⲧⲙⲏⲧⲣⲟⲡⲁⲧⲱⲣ also occasioned a non sequitur with the next words, ⲉⲁϥⲟⲩⲱⲛϩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ. As it stands now, "which had come forth" appears to apply to the (f.) μητροπάτωρ. This phrase must originally have translated ὁ ἀποκαλυφθείς and would have referred to ὁ μονογενής (line 15). The words ⲉⲧⲉ ⲡⲁⲓ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲉϥⲭⲡⲟ ⲟⲩⲁⲁⲧϥ, "that is, his only offspring", sound like an explanatory gloss. The Coptic of Codex II might have read something like this before the insertion of ⲧⲙⲏⲧⲣⲟⲡⲁⲧⲱⲣ :

II 6,14-18. ** ϵqϣhϣ ⲇϵ ⲁⲛ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲧϵqⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲛⲟϭ ⲡⲁⲓ ⲛϵⲟⲩϣⲣⲟⲩⲱⲧ ⲡϵ ϵⲁqⲟⲩⲱⲛϩ ϵⲃⲟⲗ ⲛ̄ⲧϵ ⲡϵⲓⲱⲧ ⲡⲟⲩⲟϵⲓⲛ ϵⲧⲧⲃⲃⲏⲩ ** (but he was not equal to His majesty; this was an only-begotten one who had been revealed from the father, the pure light).

Μητροπάτωρ is an equal-opportunity term for either member of the ultimate syzygy.

Occurrence 3:

BG 47,14-48,4

ⲁⲩⲥⲙⲏ ϵⲓ ϣⲁⲣⲟⲥ ϫϵ qϣⲟⲟⲡ ⲛ̄ⲟⲓ

ⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡϣⲏⲣϵ ⲙⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲁqⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄ ⲇϵ ⲛ̄ⲟⲓ ⲡϵϩⲟⲩϵⲓⲧ ⲛⲁⲣⲭⲱⲛ ⲓⲁⲗⲇⲁⲃⲁⲱⲑ ⲛϵqⲙⲉⲉⲩϵ ϫϵ ⲧⲉⲥⲙⲏ ⲛⲟⲩϵⲓ ⲁⲛ ϵϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲧϵ ϵ⟦ⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲙ ⲡϫⲓⲥϵ ⲁⲧⲥⲁⲃ⟧ⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲛ̄ⲟⲓ ⲡⲉⲓⲱⲧ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲃ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲗⲉⲓⲟⲥ

ⲡϵϩⲟⲩϵⲓⲧ ⲛ̄ⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲥⲙⲟⲧ ⲛⲟⲩⲣⲱⲙⲉ

A voice came to her, 'The Man exists and the Son of Man!' And the chief archon, Ialdabaoth, heard it. He was thinking that the voice was not something coming from on high.

He (the Man) taught them (the archons) about him (Ialdabaoth), namely, the holy and perfect Father,

the first Man of human form.

II 14,13-24

ⲁⲩⲱ ⲟⲩⲥⲙⲏ ⲁⲥⲉⲓ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲛ̄ ⲧⲡⲉ ⲛ̄ⲁⲓⲱⲛ ⲉⲧϫⲟⲥⲉ ϫϵ qϣⲟⲟⲡ` ⲛ̄ⲟⲓ ⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡϣⲏⲣϵ ⲙ̄ⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲁqⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄ ⲇϵ ⲛ̄ⲟⲓ ⲡⲣⲱⲧⲁⲣϫⲱⲛ ⲓⲁⲗⲧⲁⲃⲁⲱⲑ· ϵqⲙⲉⲉⲩϵ ϫϵ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁ†ⲥⲙⲏ ϣⲱⲡϵ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲓⲧⲛ̄ ⲧϵqⲙⲁⲁⲩ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲙⲡϵq`ⲙ̄ⲙⲉ ϫϵ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲥⲉⲓ ⲧⲱⲛ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲧⲥⲉⲃⲟⲟⲩ ⲛ̄ⲟⲓ ⲡⲙⲏⲧⲣⲟⲡⲁⲧⲱⲣ` ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲧⲉⲗⲉⲓⲟⲥ ⲧⲉⲡⲣⲟⲛⲟⲓⲁ· ⲉⲧϫⲏⲕ` ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲧϩⲓⲕⲱⲛ ⲙ̄ⲡⲓⲁϩⲟⲣⲁⲧⲟⲥ ⲉⲧⲉ ⲡⲁⲓ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲉⲓⲱⲧ` ⲙ̄ⲡⲧⲏⲣϥ ⲡⲁⲓ ⲉⲛⲧⲁⲡⲧⲏⲣϥ` ϣⲱⲡϵ ⲛ̄ϩⲏⲧϥ` ⲡϣⲟⲣⲡ` ⲛ̄ⲣⲱⲙⲉ ϫϵ ϩⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲧⲩⲡⲟⲥ ⲛ̄ⲁⲛⲇⲣⲉⲁⲥ ⲁϥⲟⲩⲱⲛϩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲙ̄ⲡϵq`ⲉⲓⲛⲉ

And a voice came forth from above the highest aeon, 'The Man exists and the Son of Man.' And the chief archon, Yaldabaoth, heard it and thought that the voice had come from his Mother. And he did not know from where it came. And he (the Man or 'voice') taught them (the archons), namely, the holy and perfect μητροπάτωρ, the perfect Pronoia (Barbelo), the image of the invisible One (Father), that is, the Father of the universe through whom everything came into being, the first Man, for in a masculine form he revealed his image.

It is this passage which applies the term μητροπάτωρ to the third person of the triad, Father-Mother-Son. Surely the short reading in BG 47,18f is the more original:

> ". . . he (Ialdabaoth) was thinking that the voice was not something coming from on high. He (the Man, or the 'voice') taught them (the archons) about him (Ialdabaoth, or 'it'), namely, the holy and perfect father, the first man of human form."

Here, the Man (Adam) with one sentence has shattered the universe of Ialdabaoth. Adam's statement is directed to the archons. A corresponding scene occurs in *Orig. World* 112,27-31:

> ". . . they (the archons) laughed at the Archigenetor, because he had lied when he said, 'I am God and no one else exists besides me!' When they came to him, they said, 'Is not this the god who has destroyed our works?'"[8]

This passage in *AJ*, beginning "he taught them", is elliptical and not readily understandable without some following comment. The shorter BG-III version explains that "he" is Adam being used as the voice of the Father: "namely, the holy and perfect father, the first Man of human form." Possibly, "father" refers to Adam as father of the human race.

Codex II goes far beyond the shorter BG-III reading and expends four lines expanding the description of the subject indicated by the ⲛ̄ⲑⲓ, "namely', of line 19.

> . . . namely, the μητροπάτωρ, holy and perfect, the perfect Pronoia, the Icon of the invisible One, that is, the Father of the universe, through whom everything came into being . . . . (II 14,19-22).

At this point, Codex II, rather lamely, returns to the original subject, the Man:

> : . . . the first Man, for in a masculine (sic) form, he (Father) revealed his image (II 14,19.23).

Obviously, ⲡⲙⲏⲧⲣⲟⲡⲁⲧⲱⲣ is here used as a redactional substitute for "Father" in BG 48,1 and III 21,22.[9] Yet the bottom line here is that it is the voice of Adam which instructs the archons that their leader is not the sole god. Once again, μητροπάτωρ does not seem to stem from an original Greek text. The redactor of Codex II, probably working on the Coptic level, introduces μητροπάτωρ to indicate that the revelatory voice of Adam ultimately comes from a male-female being in which Barbelo, "the perfect Pronoia, the image (εἰκών) of the invisible One" is the feminine component.

It is interesting to observe that the display of the image of the Man on the waters is the dramatic crux of the AJ narrative, because from this point on the salvific process is set in motion, and the remedy for the "fault" of Sophia begins to appear. Immediately upon the words, "the Man exists and the Son of Man" (II 14,14-15), the archons see in the water the "stamp" (τύπος) of the "image" (εἰκών), in 14,34.

We learn that "the whole aeon of the Protarchon trembled, and the foundations of the abyss shook" (line 25-26). The BG-III version is even more descriptive, "the entire archontic array of the seven rulers bent down and they saw in the water the form of the image."

Sadly we are not told whether the image belongs to Barbelo, Sophia, or to the model man. In the *Hypostasis of the Archons* (87,13-14), however, the image is that of Sophia:[10]

> "Her image appeared in the waters, and the powers of darkness fell in love with her (sic)."

Of course, the "image" (εἰκών, ἰδέα) is a strong thread in *AJ*. The very origin of Barbelo is depicted as an icon of the invisible one reflecting on "the light-water which surrounds him" (II 4,26 and par.). Probably, the redactor of Codex II understands this divine image as the source of being for both Barbelo and the model Man, so that the image which the archons see is in effect "the image of the image."

Using the "image" to build the creation is also understood in Codex II to be the method employed by Ialdabaoth: commenting on the text before him, "He organized everything according to the model of the first aeons which had come into being . . . ", a scribe wrote: "Not that he himself had seen the indestructible ones, but the Power which was in him which he had taken from his mother (Sophia) produced in him the image (ϵιnϵ) of the cosmos" (II 12,34-13,5).

We might suggest an earlier form for II 14,14-23:

> ϥϣοοπ ⲛ̄ⲑⲓ ⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡϣⲏⲣⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲁϥⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄ ⲇⲉ ⲛ̄ⲑⲓ ⲡⲣⲱⲧⲁⲣⲭⲱⲛ ⲓⲁⲗⲧⲁⲃⲁⲱⲑ ⲉϥⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ ϫⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁ†ⲥⲙⲏ ϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲧⲱⲛ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁϥⲧⲥⲉⲃⲟⲟⲩ ⲛ̄ⲑⲓ ⲡⲉⲓⲱⲧ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲧⲉⲗⲉⲓⲟⲥ ⲛ̄ϣⲟⲣⲡ ⲛ̄ⲣⲱⲙⲉ.
>
> 'The Man exists and the Son of Man!' And the chief archon, Ialtabaoth, heard it and thought, 'Where did this voice come from?' And he taught them, namely the holy father, the perfect first Man.

Occurrence 4:

BG 51,2-14 [ⲁⲥⲣ ϩⲛⲁⲥ ⲉϫⲓ] ⲛⲧⲃⲟⲙ ⲛⲧⲁⲥⲧⲁⲁⲥ ⲙⲡⲁⲣⲭⲱⲛ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉ ⲡⲉⲡⲣⲟⲩⲛⲓⲕⲟⲥ ⲁⲥⲉⲓ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲛ ⲟⲩⲙⲛⲧⲁⲧⲕⲁⲕⲓⲁ ⲁⲥⲥⲟⲡⲥ ⲙⲡⲉⲓⲱⲧ ⲛⲛⲓⲡⲧⲏⲣϥ ⲉⲧⲉ ⲛⲁϣⲉ ⲡⲉϥⲛⲁⲉ ⲙ̄ⲛ̄ ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲛ ⲁϥⲧⲛⲛⲟⲟⲩ ϩⲛ ⲟⲩϣⲟϫⲛⲉ ⲉϥⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ ⲙⲡⲓⲁⲩⲧⲟⲅⲉⲛⲏⲥ ⲙ̄ⲛ̄ ⲡⲉϥⲧⲟⲟⲩ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲓⲛ ϩⲙ ⲡⲉⲥⲙⲟⲧ ⲛ̄ⲛⲁⲅⲅⲉⲗⲟⲥ ⲙⲡⲉϩⲟⲩ<ⲉⲓ>ⲧ ⲛⲁⲣⲭⲱⲛ ⲁⲩ† ϣⲟϫⲛⲉ ⲛⲁϥ ϩⲱⲥⲧⲉ ⲛ̄ⲥⲉⲓⲛⲉ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛ̄ϩⲏⲧϥ ⲛⲧⲃⲟⲙ ⲛⲧⲙⲁⲩ

. . . [she wanted to retrieve] the power which she had given to the archon of sexual desire. She came in innocence and prayed the Father of the universe, whose mercy is great, and the God of light. He sent by means of a holy decree Autogenes with four lights in the form of angels of the first archon. They advised him so that he might bring forth from within him the power of the Mother.

II 19,15-22 ⲧⲙⲁⲩ ⲇⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲣⲉⲥⲟⲩⲱϣⲉ ⲁϫⲓ ⲛ̄ⲧⲃⲟⲙ ⲉⲛⲧⲁⲥⲧⲁⲁⲥ ⲙ̄ⲡⲓϣⲟⲣⲡ̀ ⲛ̄ⲁⲣⲭⲱⲛ ⲁⲥⲥⲟⲡ⳪ ⲙ̄ⲡⲙⲏⲧⲣⲟⲡⲁⲧⲱⲣ ⲙ̄ⲡⲧⲏⲣϥ̀ ⲡⲁⲡⲛⲟⲃ ⲛ̄ⲛⲁⲉ ⲁϥⲧⲛ̄ⲛⲟⲟⲩ ⲛ̄†ⲟⲩ ⲙ̄ⲫⲱⲥⲧⲏⲣ̀ ϩⲙ ⲡϣⲟϫⲛⲉ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ̀ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲉϫⲙ̄ ⲡⲧⲟⲡⲟⲥ

ⲛ̄ⲛ̄ⲁⲅⲅⲉⲗⲟⲥ ⲙ̄ⲡⲣⲱⲧⲁⲣⲭⲱⲛ ⲁⲩϫⲓ ϣⲟϫⲛⲉ ⲛⲁϥ̀ ϩⲱⲥⲧⲉ ⲁⲧⲟⲩⲉⲓⲛⲉ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛ̄ⲧⲃⲟⲙ ⲛ̄ⲧⲙⲁⲩ

. . . And when the Mother (Sophia) wanted to retrieve the power which she had given to the chief archon, she prayed to the μητροπάτωρ of the universe, whose mercy is great. And he sent by means of holy decree the five lights down to the place of the angels of the chief archon. And they advised him so that they might bring forth the power of the Mother.

The pattern here is the same as that of the previous passage: μητροπάτωρ is being used as a substitute for "the Father", who appears in both BG 51,5 and III 23,22. Possibly, the Coptic redactor of Codex II wanted to avoid the contrast of the Mother (Sophia) "praying to the Father" because of the context of advocacy of an ultimate syzygy of Mother and Father. Perhaps there was some unease in the Christian gnostic sect about what seems to have been a degradation of the role of the Mother, because Barbelo is being absorbed and Sophia is being downgraded to the harlotry of "Prunikos".[11]

Notice that the Codex II version omits the references to "innocence" and to "sexual desire" found in the BG-III parallels. These seem to be allusions to the fallen visitation of Sophia and to the similar fate which awaited her daughter Eve. Both of these episodes are elaborated upon in other Nag Hammadi documents, particularly in the *Hypostasis of the Archons* and *On the Origin of the World*. As in *On the Origin of the World* so in the *Apocryphon of John*: Eve is declared to be innocent and inviolable (II 22,31 et par.), but, nonetheless, conceives her first two sons by the archons.[12]

> And Ialdabaoth was full of ignorance. [He wanted to raise up seed from her, BG 62,6-7; III 31,8-9.] But when the Pronoia (Barbelo) of the universe learned of it, she sent down some ones and they snatched life (ζωή) out of Eve. But the chief archon defiled her, and begot in her two sons, the first and second. They are Eloim and Jawe (II 24,12-18).[13]

Passages like the one above and II 19,15-21 indicate a certain amount of tension in the presentation of the feminine redeemers of *AJ*. They suffer with us: "she who was called 'Life' by him assists the whole creation, suffering with him and restoring him (Adam) to his perfection" (II 20,19-21). But, despite their good intentions, they always seem to be in need of help from on high. We have seen that even Barbelo has to send down "some ones" to help Eve in her crisis (II 24,14).

In typical Christian gnosticism, it is the savior, Christ, who redeems the feminine figures as types of fallen humanity. This theme, so basic for *The Exegesis on the Soul* (II 6) and *The Sophia of Jesus Christ* (BG and NH III 4) is also represented in *AJ* II 13,36-14,9:

> "She (Sophia) repented with much weeping, and the whole pleroma heard the prayer of her repentance, for her syzygy came down to her . . . that he might correct her fault."

This theme, however, needs to be contrasted with another one which makes Sophia a redeemer in her own right. Apart from praying, weeping, and repenting, she herself can be said to "set aright the fault":[14]

> "And our sister Sophia is she who came down in innocence to set aright her fault" (II 23,21-22).

It should be noted, however, that the parallels in BG and Codex III to this passage have a completely different reading:

> " . . . for the Mother's syzygy was sent forth in order to set aright her faults" (III 30,11-12).[15]

In the light of these and similar passages, we can see that the concept of the "redeemed redeemer" is very much present in the Codex II-IV version of the *Apocryphon of John.* Sophia, Zoe, and Barbelo are able to marshall their forces against the archons of darkness, who are for the most part characterized by masculine aggressiveness, and they, the feminine figures, eventually are able to "set aright the fault in everything that she has done in the world" (BG 75,3-5 and III 39,20-21).

The introduction of the term μητροπάτωρ in II 19,17 is probably to be seen as another piece of the reaction against subordination of the feminine principle, in this case against the longer version of this episode in BG-III which alludes to "innocence" and "sexual desire" (προυνικός). The description of the fault of Sophia as a sexual transgression might be an inauthentic note in the text, but it should be remembered that Irenaeus was aware of this interpretation of the fallen Sophia.[16]

Occurrence 5:

> II 20,7-17:... ⲁⲩⲫⲓ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟϥ ⲁⲩⲛⲟⲭϥ ⲁⲡⲙⲉⲣⲟⲥ ⲉⲧⲙ̄ⲡⲥⲁ ⲙ̄ⲡⲓⲧⲛ̄ ⲛ̄ⲧϩⲩⲗⲏ ⲧⲏⲣⲥ̄ ⲡⲙⲁⲕⲁⲣⲓⲟⲥ ⲇⲉ ⲡⲙⲏⲧⲣⲟⲡⲁⲧⲱⲣ ⲡⲣⲉϥⲣ̄ ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩϥ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲱⲁⲛ ϩⲏⲧϥ ⲁϥⲱⲛ̄ ϩⲏⲧϥ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲁⲭⲛ̄ ⲧⲁⲩⲛⲁⲙⲓⲥ ⲛ̄ⲧⲙⲁⲁⲩ ⲧⲁⲓ ⲉⲧⲁⲩⲛ̄ⲧⲥ̄ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲓⲧⲙ̄ ⲡⲣⲱⲧⲁⲣⲭⲱⲛ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲟⲛ ⲭⲉ ⲥⲉⲛⲁⲃⲙ̄ⲃⲟⲙ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲉⲭⲙ̄ ⲡⲥⲱⲙⲁ ⲙ̄ⲯⲩⲭⲓⲕⲟⲛ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲉⲥⲑⲏⲧⲟⲛ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁϥⲧⲛ̄ⲛⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲓⲧⲛ̄ ⲡⲉϥⲡⲛⲁ ⲛ̄ⲣⲉϥⲣ̄ ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩϥ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁⲱⲉ ⲡⲉϥⲛⲁ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲃⲟⲏⲑⲟⲥ ⲛ̄ⲁⲁⲁⲙ.
>
> . . . . "They took him (Adam) and threw him down to the lowest region of all matter. But the Blessed One, the μητροπάτωρ, (=Father in BG-III), the beneficent and merciful One, had mercy on the power of the Mother (Sophia) which had been brought out of the chief archon lest again they might gain power over the psychic and perceptible (αἰσθητόν) body. And he sent through his beneficent spirit and of his great mercy a helper to Adam . . . ."

Here again the (m.) μητροπάτωρ is a substitute for "the Father" found in BG 52,18 and III 24,25. Again, we may say that the motivation was to avoid contrasting the fate of "the Mother" and the mercy of "the Father". Strictly speaking, "the Mother" and "the Father" in this portion of the narrative are not coordinate figures. "The Mother" is Sophia, "the mother of Ialdabaoth" while "the Father" is the transcendent deity. A slightly more accurate mythical picture is displayed when we have, as we have here, a fallen goddess (Sophia) dependent on the mercy of the ultimate syzygy, that is, the μητροπάτωρ. The "helper" (βοηθός) in this scene is none other than the "Epinoia of light" (Eve), who is sent that she "might correct the fault of the Mother" (cf. II 20,27-28).

Occurrence 6:

Occurrence 6:

(III 36,15-37,2) ⲁⲛⲟⲕ ⲇⲉ ⲡⲉⲭⲁⲓ ⲭⲉ ⲡⲭⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁ[ⲫⲉⲓ ⲉⲧⲱⲛ ⲛ̄ⲟ́ⲓ] ⲡⲁⲛⲧⲓⲙⲓⲙⲟⲛ ⲙ̄ⲡ[ⲛⲁ ⲧⲟⲧⲉ ⲡⲉ]ⲭⲁⲫ ⲭⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲣⲭⲏ ⲛ̄ⲧ[ⲉⲣⲉⲧⲙⲁⲁⲩ] ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲣⲓⲛⲁⲩ ϩ̄ⲙ̄ ⲡⲉⲡⲛⲁ ⲛ[ϩⲁⲣⲓⲟⲛ] ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ ⲉϩ<ⲣ>ⲛ̄ ⲧⲉⲧⲛⲁⲯⲉ ⲡⲉⲥⲛⲁⲉ ⲙⲛ ⲡⲉⲡⲛⲁ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ ⲡⲉⲛⲧⲁⲫϩⲓⲥⲉ [ⲛⲉⲙⲁⲛ] ⲉⲧⲉ ⲧⲉⲡⲓⲛⲟⲓⲁ ⲉⲥⲱⲟⲟⲡ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲡⲉⲥⲡⲉⲣⲙⲁ ⲁⲥⲧⲟⲩⲛⲟⲥϥ ⲙⲡⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ ⲛ̄ⲛ̄ⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲣⲉⲛⲉⲁ ⲉⲧⲉ ⲙⲉⲥⲕⲓⲙ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉⲗⲓⲟⲥ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲛ ⲛⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲁϥⲉⲓⲙⲉ ⲭⲉ ⲛ̄ⲟ́ⲓ ⲡⲉϩⲟⲩⲉⲓⲧ ⲛ̄ⲁⲣⲭⲱⲛ . . .

But I said, "Lord, where did the counterfeit spirit come from?" Then he said: In the beginning (ἀρχή) when [the Mother] . . . when I saw in the [Holy] Spirit into the One who is rich in her mercy, and the Holy Spirit, the one who suffered with us, that is, the Epinoia of light, who exists with her seed - she raised up the thinking of the people of the immovable race of the perfect light-man. Then the chief archon learned . . . .

(II 27,31-28,6) ⲁⲛⲟⲕ ⲇⲉ ⲡⲉⲭⲁⲉⲓ ⲭⲉ ⲡⲭⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁϥ̀ⲉⲓ ⲧⲱⲛ ⲛ̄ⲧⲟϥ ⲛ̄ⲟ́ⲓ ⲡⲉⲡⲛⲁ ⲉⲧⲱⲏⲥ ⲧⲟⲧⲉ ⲡⲉⲭⲁϥ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲭⲉ ⲡⲙⲏⲧⲣⲟⲡⲁⲧⲱⲣ ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁⲯⲉ ⲡⲉϥⲛⲁⲉ ⲡⲉⲡⲛⲁ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ̀ ϩ̄ⲛ̄ ⲥⲙⲁⲧ̀ ⲛⲓⲙ̀ ⲡⲱⲁⲛ ϩⲧⲏϥ̀ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲧⲱⲡ ϩⲓⲥⲉ ⲛ̄ⲙ̄ⲙⲏⲧⲛ̄ ⲉⲧⲉ ⲡⲁⲓ̈ ⲡⲉ ⲧⲉⲡⲓⲛⲟⲓⲁ ⲛ̄ⲧⲡⲣⲟⲛⲟⲓⲁ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲛ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁϥⲧⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲥⲡⲉⲣⲙⲁ ⲛ̄ⲧⲣⲉⲛⲉⲁ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲗⲉⲓⲟⲛ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲡⲉϥ̀ⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲛ ⲛ̄ⲱⲁ ⲉⲛⲉϩ ⲙ̄ⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲣⲉϥ̀ⲙⲉ ⲛ̄ⲟ́ⲓ ⲡⲱⲟⲣⲡ ⲛ̄ⲁⲣⲭⲱⲛ . .

But I said, "Lord, where did the despicable spirit come from?" Then he said to me: The μητροπάτωρ(="the Mother, rich in mercy", BG 71,6), who is rich in her mercy, the Holy Spirit in every form, the one who suffers with you, that is, the Epinoia of the shining Pronoia - he raised up the seed of the perfect race, and its mind, and the eternal light of mankind. When the chief archon learned . . .

This last occurrence of μητροπάτωρ is found in a Christian redactional section, indicated by the dialogue between revealer and disciple. Its secondary nature also shows up in the aporia created by the return to the main narrative in 28,6, "when the chief archon learned . . . ."[17]

The pronominal indicators in III 36,20-23, viz. ⲧⲉⲧ-, ⲡⲉⲥ-, ⲉⲥ-, ⲁⲥ-, point to a feminine subject for this sentence. Also noteworthy is the beginning of this passage in Codex III: "In the beginning (ἀρχή) . . . when I saw in the [Holy] Spirit". This sounds like an account of an ecstatic vision of a revealer figure who might have been designated by the term ἀρχή. This figure, which in gnostic circles is connected to the first words of Genesis, "In the beginning . . ." and can stand for a feminine archon, is sometimes associated with Barbelo, e.g., Allogenes XI 58,20-21:

> "I saw the good divine Protophanes, and the Savior . . . and the blessedness of the first ἀρχή, the aeon of Barbelo . . . ."[18]

It is, therefore, quite probable that the word μητροπάτωρ in II 27,33 is a replacement for the original feminine revealer figure of *AJ* as still shows up in the parallel reading of BG 71,6: "When the Mother (ⲧⲙⲁⲁⲩ), rich in her mercy . . ." Since the passage is corrupt in all three versions and breaks off abruptly to return to the main narrative, we

cannot be sure of what exactly was the topic of this section.[19] But we might conjecture that where there is now a Christian dialogue of Savior and disciple, there might have stood some account of a mystical vision of the Mother or of the ἀρχή. Noteworthy, also, is the element of suffering attendant on the visitation, ⲉⲧⲱⲡ ϩⲓⲥⲉ ⲛ̄ⲙ̄ⲙⲏⲧⲛ̄ (ⲛ̄ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲛ, "us", III 71,8), "who suffers with you" (II 28,1).[20]

After the resumption of the narrative in II 28,6 (BG 71,14; III 37,1), the Mother of the BG-III version (the μητροπάτωρ of II 27,33 and IV 43,9) vanishes only to return at the very end of the story (BG 75,11;76,1 and III 39,11,19). But this return of the Mother is strangely lacking in the Codex II-IV version which in its place has the famous *Ode of the Pronoia*, beginning with these words, "But I am the perfect Pronoia of the universe; I changed myself within my seed . . ." (II 30,11f).

The two endings of *AJ*, given below, admirably exhibit the confusion of nomenclature that has been produced in the process of Christianizing a Barbelo document.

Occurrence 7:

BG 75,7-76,5 ⲁⲩⲛⲟⲩⲱⲧ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲙ̄ ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲱⲧ ⲙⲡⲁⲛⲧⲓⲙⲓⲙⲟⲛ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛ̄ⲁ ⲱⲁ ⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩ

ⲧⲉⲧⲉ ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲧⲥ ⲭⲉ ⲉⲧⲉ ⲧⲙⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲉⲓⲱⲧ ⲧⲉ ⲉⲧⲉ ⲛⲁⲱⲉ ⲡⲉⲥⲛⲁ ⲉⲥⲭⲓ ⲙⲟⲣⲫⲏ ϩⲙ ⲡⲉⲥⲥⲡⲉⲣⲙⲁ ⲛⲱⲟⲣⲡ ⲁⲓⲉ̄ⲓ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲉⲡⲓⲁⲓⲱⲛ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲗⲓⲟⲥ ⲁⲛⲟⲕ ⲁⲉ ⲉⲉⲓⲭⲱ ⲛ̄ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉⲣⲟⲕ ⲭⲉ ⲉⲕⲁⲥⲁϩⲟⲩ ⲛ̄ⲧ̄ⲁⲁⲩ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲕϩⲟⲙⲟⲡⲛ̄ⲁ ϩⲙ ⲡⲡⲉⲑⲏⲡ ⲡⲉⲓⲙⲩⲥⲧⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲡⲁ ⲧⲧⲉⲛⲉⲁ ⲉⲧⲉ ⲙⲁⲥⲕⲓⲙ ⲡⲉ ⲧⲙⲁⲁⲩ ⲁⲉ ⲁⲥⲉⲓ ⲛ̄ⲕⲉⲥⲟⲡ ϩⲁⲧⲁϩⲏ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲟⲛ ⲛⲉⲛⲧⲁⲥⲁⲁⲩ ϩⲙ ⲡⲕⲟⲥⲙⲟⲥ ⲁⲥⲧⲁϩⲉ ⲡⲉⲥⲡⲉⲣⲙⲁ ⲉⲣⲁⲧⲟ̄

They became hard through the hardness of the counterfeit spirit until now. She who is blessed, then, that is, the *mother-father*, rich in her mercy - with her seed she takes form.

I have already ascended to the perfect aeon, but now I am speaking these things to thee that you may write them down and give them secretly to thy fellow-spirits; for this is the mystery of the immovable race.

This Mother came to me again. {In} everything which she had done in the world, she was setting aright the "fault".

II 30,10-31,32 ⲁⲩ† ⲛ̄ⲱⲟⲧ ⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲙ̄ ⲡⲉⲛⲱⲟⲧ` ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲡⲛ̄ⲁ ⲉⲧⲱⲏⲥ ⲱⲁϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲉⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩ.

ⲁⲛⲟⲕ ⲃⲉ ⲧⲉⲡⲣⲟⲛⲟⲓⲁ ⲉⲧ`ϧⲏⲕ` ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲏⲣϥ` ⲁⲓⲱⲃⲧ` ϩⲣⲁⲓ ϩⲙ̄ ⲡⲁⲥⲡⲉⲣⲙⲁ . . . . ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲓⲥϩⲏⲧⲉ ⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲓⲛⲁⲃⲱⲕ` ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲁⲡⲧⲉⲗⲉⲓⲟⲛ ⲛ̄ⲁⲓⲱⲛ ⲁⲉⲓⲭⲱⲕ` ⲛⲁⲕ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛ̄ϩⲱⲃ ⲛⲓⲙ` ϩⲣⲁⲓ ϩⲛ̄ ⲛⲉⲕ`ⲙⲁⲁⲭⲉ ⲁⲛⲟⲕ ⲇⲉ ⲁⲓⲭⲉ ϩⲱⲃ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲣⲟⲕ` ⲭⲉⲕⲁⲁⲥ ⲉⲕⲛⲁⲥϩⲁⲓⲥⲟⲩ ⲛ̄ⲕⲧⲁⲁⲩ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲕⲱⲃⲣ̄ ⲡⲛ̄ⲁ ϩⲛ ⲟⲩϩⲱⲡ` ⲡⲁⲓ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲙⲩⲥⲧⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ ⲛ̄ⲧⲅⲉⲛⲉⲁ ⲛ̄ⲁⲧⲕⲓⲙ`

They hardened themselves through the hardness of the abominable spirit until now. I, therefore, am the perfect Pronoia of the universe. I changed myself within my seed . . . .

And, lo, I am about to ascend to the perfect aeon. I have completed everything for thee in your hearing, and have told thee everything that you may write them down and give them secretly to thy fellow-spirits; for this is the mystery of the immovable race.

The first thing to observe in these endings is that there are two feminine figures in the BG-III version (ⲧⲙⲁⲁⲩⲛ̄ⲉⲓⲱⲧ and ⲧⲙⲁⲁⲩ or ⲧⲙⲉⲉⲩ) but only one (ⲡⲣⲟⲛⲟⲓⲁ) in the Codex II-IV version. In the BG-III version, the "Mother-Father" makes one last appearance - this time not as the μητροπάτωρ but in the vernacular Coptic as ⲧⲙⲁⲁⲩⲛ̄ⲉⲓⲱⲧ.

> She who is blessed, then, that is, the mother-father, rich in her mercy - with her seed she takes form (BG 75,10-13; III 39,11-13).

This is a summary statement, announced by the narrative revealer, with a meaning something like this:

> "The merciful Mother of the universe reveals herself to the chosen race".[21]

Barbelo is meant, and she is a tutelary divinity, guarding her race through fire and flood. In fact, at one time she takes upon herself the title of the race:

> "They (the archons) led them into temptation so that they would not remember their *immovable* Pronoia" (BG 75,1-3; III 39,2-5).

From the first pages of *AJ*, it is clear that Barbelo is a coordinate person with the "invisible spirit", that is, the Father. The gnostic trinity of Father-Mother-Son (II 2,14;9,10) is also basic for *The Three Steles of Seth,* the *Eugnosto-SJC* documents, and the *Trimorphic Protennoia*. Perhaps the *Gospel of Philip* has the triad in mind:

> "(If) one must utter a mystery: the universal Father united with the Virgin who came down, and a fire shone for him on that day. He was revealed in the great bridal chamber. Therefore, his body came into being on that day" (II 71,3-9).

But the closest parallel to the Barbelo figure of *AJ* is to be found in the description of the "idea" (ϩⲓⲇⲉⲁ) in Eugnostos III 72,6-14:

> "He (the Father) has his own idea (ϩⲓⲇⲉⲁ) - not like any other idea which we perceive or see - but a strange idea that goes beyond all things. It is better than everything, and she (or "it") looks to every side and sees herself by herself alone."

This description approximates the long paean of praise to the Father and his image, which is described as a second god, in the first pages of *AJ*.

What about the narrative revealer? She is usually denoted by "I", but in the ending she receives a title. She is also "the Mother", a title given her by the recipient of the vision(s).

> "This Mother came to me again. Everything which she did in the world - she was setting aright the fault ('seed' in BG 76,5)."

She also announces her own disappearance: "I have already ascended to the perfect aeon" (BG 75,14-15).

Since the revealer "I" is also the one who gives praise to "the merciful Mother-Father (ⲧⲙⲁⲁⲩⲛ̄ⲉⲓⲱⲧ), these two are not identical, and in the mind of the author they must have been distinguished. This is probably the reason that two feminine titles occur in the BG-III ending: ⲧⲙⲁⲁⲩⲛ̄ⲉⲓⲱⲧ and ⲙⲁⲁⲩ (ⲙⲉⲉⲩ, III 39,19). The Achmimic variant of Codex III, ⲙⲉⲉⲩ, is certainly not a mistake of the scribe, but rather a deliberate archaism. Perhaps "lady" would be a proper translation for this title.[22]

The final words of the apocryphon, before the Christian ending, affirm that the "fault" (ὑστέρημα) has been set aright by the Mother.[23] It would seem that in the original plan of *AJ*, the cosmic fault of Sophia will be "set aright" by a string of feminine redeemers sent to reveal, suffer, and redeem the chosen race.[24] This figure could have a title - *Epinoia* or *Mother* - but ought not to be confused with Barbelo, the image of the invisible spirit.

It is interesting to note that the sole occurrence in the BG-III version of the Mother-Father, ⲧⲙⲁⲁⲩⲛ̄ⲉⲓⲱⲧ, is found in a passage where the simple term "Mother" might not to do to cover both Barbelo and the revealer figure. Probably the Mother reference was originally in the Greek text of BG 76,1, as indicated by the sentence beginning with ⲧⲙⲁⲁⲩ ⲇⲉ.

We cannot say for sure whether the scribes of BG 8502 and NH Codex III when they too would make use of the Mother-Father title are copying an innovation that occurred on the Coptic level with Codex II and IV, but on the other hand where else would they find this title written out? Μητροπάτωρ does not seem to be in use in other gnostic documents apart from *AJ*, and this alone should lead us to conclude that the BG-III version has been influenced in this matter by the redactions of Codex II and IV.

As for the Christian ending, it is obviously an imitation of the original ending which mentioned as recipients "the immovable race". In place of the "immovable race", *AJ* now ends with a reunion of the disciples of Jesus. In place of the writer's "fellow-spirits", there are now the "fellow-disciples". The "mystery" that was revealed by the Gnostic *Lady* so long ago and which she enjoined be "written down" and "kept secure" was indeed "written down" and "kept secure" by others of strange lineage and dialect.

NOTES

[1] So far as I can determine, μητροπάτωρ does not occur in any other Nag Hammadi document.

[2] Reasoning that the single occurrence in the BG-III version reflects the multiple Coptic-level interpolations of μητροπάτωρ in the Codex II-IV version. See under (7) in the discussion. ⲙⲁⲁⲩⲛ̄ⲉⲓⲱⲧ is probably an addition here, based on amalgamation to the Codex II-IV version. In the context of the passage, a feminine figure (Barbelo) is indicated. Cf. the parallel columns presented in the supererogative work of M. Waldstein and F. Wisse, *The Apocryphon of John* (*NHMS* 23; Leiden: Brill, *1995) pp. 168-69.*

[3] The term "holy spirit", in the BG-Codex III version, and the words "Epinoia of light" indicate the feminine gender and justify the bracketed ⲧⲙⲙⲁⲩ in III 36,18.

[4] Cf. BG 76,1 (=III 39,19).

[5] Cf. this with the description of the second god in Eug. III 72,11f (BG 95,6f).

[6] The first God is described as "the invisible virginal spirit", particularly in Codex II where this phrase never describes Barbelo.

[7] Sophia is regularly referred to as "Mother" in *AJ*, and her daughter Eve is "the Mother of the living" (II 23,24 and par.).

[8] Cf. also *Orig.World* 104,2-3: " . . . because she (Pistis) had instructed them (the archons) about the immortal Man and his light."

[9] Waldstein and Wisse, p.84, write: "no room for ⲡⲓⲱⲧ in the lacuna", but at least sixteen letters will fit in the lacuna of III 21,22, e.g., ⲛ̄ⲟ́ⲓ ⲡⲓⲱⲧ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ ⲛ̄ⲧ-. Cf. M. Krause, *Drei Versionen (1962), p.76.*

[10] The *Origin of the World* (II 5) also specifies that the image on the primeval waters is that of Pistis (Sophia): "But the archigenetor, when he saw the image of Pistis on the waters, was sorely grieved, especially when he heard her voice which was like unto the first voice which had called him out of the waters" (107,18-22).

[11] This word, occurring in BG 51,4 and III 23,21, is translated "sexual desire" by Waldstein and Wisse, p. 112. It is unclear whether the desire belongs to the chief archon or to Sophia. The word is also applied to Sophia in the *Second Treatise of the Great Seth*, VII 50,28: "our sister Sophia, who is a whore (ⲡⲣⲟⲩⲛⲓⲕⲟⲥ)".

[12] In the *Hypostasis of the Archons*, the feminine figure, Norea, remains inviolate to the end. Cf. 89,22-31 and 92,19-26.

[13] In the narrative of *On the Origin of the World* 116,26-117,18, Eve laughs at the archons' desire, entering into the tree of knowledge, but, nonetheless, became pregnant with Abel by the chief archon, and with Cain by the seven lesser archons.

[14] Note the continuation, (also missing from the BG-Codex III version), in which an allusion is made to the freeing effect of eating from the tree of knowledge: "and through her they have tasted perfect knowledge" (II 23,25-26).

[15] The parallel in BG 60,13-14 has the future tense, "The Mother's syzygy wll be sent and she will be justified (set aright)."

[16] The pertinent selections from Irenaeus' *A. H. I.29* are given in Appendix 4 of Waldstein and Wisse (1995), e.g., p. 190-91, "whom they call Sophia and Προύνικον."

[17] The continuation in II 28,3, ⲁϥⲧⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲥⲡⲉⲣⲙⲁ ⲛ̄ⲧⲣⲉⲛⲉⲁ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲗⲉⲓⲟⲛ, "he raised up the seed of the perfect race" seems odd. Perhaps ⲁϥⲧⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥ stands for an earlier relative construction in ⲛⲧⲁϩ-, with no change of subject.

[18] Cf. Rose Arthur, *The Wisdom Goddess* (1984) for some other instances of the hypostasized ἀρχή, pp. 54, 58, 60, 165, and 172.

[19] None of these versions gives anything close to an answer to the question posed in II 27,32: "Whence the abominable spirit?"

[20] Waldstein & Wisse translate ϩⲓⲥⲉ, "sympathize(d)", but this sounds artificial. Cf. Jn 4,6, Subachmimic and Sahidic, which have ϩⲓⲥⲉ for κεκοπιακώς (Crum, 710b). In Eug. III 72,11 there is a very interesting dialectal correction of ϩⲓⲥⲉ into ϩⲓ ⲥⲁ, "on (all) sides".

[21] "Takes form" (ϫⲓ ⲙⲟⲣⲫⲏ) is probably not similar to being "incarnate" throughout the history of the chosen race. The gnostic revealer takes immediate revelatory form. The account in III 36,18, "In the ἀρχή, in the spirit, I saw . . ." is possibly the manner in which Barbelo takes form.

[22] The BG-III ending is something like the ending of the Gospel of John in that, like John, it embodies a postscript which gives a title ("*Lady*", "*beloved disciple*") to the source of the revelation.

[23] The BG 76,5 reading σπέρμα is certainly a hearing error for correct ὑστέρημα in III 39,21. Cf. II 20,23 for the same error.

[24] The *Hypostasis of the Archons* knows about a series of feminine redeemers beginning with Eve, and including Norea. "She will be a help for many generations of mankind; this is the virgin whom no power has defiled". Eve is speaking of Norea. In the *Gospel of Philip* 55,27, Mary, the mother of Jesus, is described as "the virgin whom no power has defiled."

Peter and Philip Upside Down: Perspectives on the Relation of the *Acts of Philip* to the *Acts of Peter*

Christopher R. Matthews
Weston Jesuit School of Theology

In comparison with standard historical-critical methods, an intertextual approach to Christian apocryphal literature functions as a postmodern twist on traditional source criticism, both theoretically and practically. Before examining the merits of an intertextual approach to the *Acts of Philip,* some attention to terminology and kindred methodological developments will be helpful. Intertextual theorists maintain that "all writers are first readers, and that all writers are subject to influence...all texts are necessarily criss-crossed by other texts."[1] Construing the nature of intertextuality strictly in terms of readers and texts, however, immediately suggests its inadequacy as a tool for investigating products of "western manuscript culture"[2] such as the Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles. Clearly we must acknowledge the complex range of antecedents (many of which are irrecoverable) that came together in the Apocryphal Acts by incorporating into our understanding of intertextuality the broader notion of "text" employed by most intertextual practitioners. "While in the narrow sense a *text* means a piece of writing..., *text* is also used in a much more general sense to mean anything perceived as a signifying system."[3] In the early Christian milieu we may think initially of the oral transmission of creeds, hymns, prayers, stories, legends, histories, and so forth. Recognition of these oral performances, however, in no way marginalizes the early and widespread use of written texts by Christians.[4] Both oral and written means of communication

---

[1]Michael Worton and Judith Still, eds., *Intertextuality: Theories and practices* (Manchester/New York: Manchester University Press, 1990) 30. I repeat here in succinct fashion the approach to intertextuality sketched in my, "**Apocryphal** Intertextual **Act**ivities: A Response to Harold W. Attridge's 'Intertextuality in the *Acts of Thomas.*'" The paper was circulated to members of the Intertextuality in Christian Apocrypha Seminar as part of our program for the 1995 Annual Meeting of the SBL in Philadelphia.

[2]As Walter J. Ong (*Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word* [1982; New Accents; London/New York: Routledge, 1988] 119) observes, "Manuscript culture in the west remained always marginally oral....Writing served largely to recycle knowledge back into the oral world....Manuscript cultures remained largely oral-aural even in retrieval of material preserved in texts. Manuscripts were not easy to read...and what readers found in manuscripts they tended to commit at least somewhat to memory." William A. Graham (*Beyond the Written Word: Oral Aspects of Scripture in the History of Religion* [Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987] 18) emphasizes the same essential point: "In the West as elsewhere, orality remained always a significant part of chirographic, or script culture, even for a considerable time after the coming of printing technology, so that most of human history has known texts primarily as oral/aural rather than written or printed realities."

[3]Worton and Still, *Intertextuality,* 33 n. 2, emphasis original. "Although texts are autonomous by contrast with oral expression, ultimately *no text can stand by itself independent of the extratextual world.* Every text builds on pretext" (Ong, *Orality and Literacy,* 162, emphasis added).

[4]Harry Y. Gamble's investigation, *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts* (New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 1995), leaves no doubt that written texts were pervasive in the early Christian communities: "No Greco-Roman religious group produced, used, or valued texts on a scale comparable to Judaism and Christianity...." (p. 18); "Christianity was constitutionally oriented to texts" (p. 141). Nevertheless, "we have no reason to think that oral tradition stood in opposition to the production of texts, nor that it inhibited the literary culture of the

coexisted and were continually transformed by the variety of circumstances in which they were employed (e.g., liturgy, preaching, teaching, etc.). Consequently speech and writing must be recognized as components of a much larger sphere of influence, that complex set of circumstances in which any given writer or hearer found her or himself.[5] Concern for this comprehensive sphere of influence is a marked characteristic of the "new historicism." For investigators of the ancient world who approach their task from this perspective, as John Donahue observes,

> Texts from the past are not simply "windows" into a culture, they are themselves "representations" of the culture....Representation is the key for the new historicist understanding of literature from the past. It is both a "fiction" (something made, hence poetics) and the product of *unconscious cultural influences*. To interpret a past textual representation demands all those elements associated with the "new literary criticism," such as concern for genre, a "close reading" of the text, attention to the narrative grammar and structure, but without the accompanying formalism. It also demands, however, attention to *extratextual elements*.[6]

Donahue points to the rhetorical-critical reading strategies of Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza and Vernon Robbins as bearing a close resemblance to new historicism by virtue of their integration of "postmodern literary criticism and historical research."[7] For her approach to the Apocalypse, Schüssler Fiorenza advocates a "rhetorical-evocative paradigm that can do justice to the sociohistorical matrix as well as to the literary-dramatic character of the book."[8] Robbins argues compellingly for an interdisciplinary approach that links literary and social-scientific modes of investigation together in order to deal with the complex phenomena of the ancient world.[9]

---

early church. Just as in its larger Jewish and Gentile environments, so too in early Christian circles, the two media coexisted and interacted" (p. 32).

[5]As Werner H. Kelber ("Jesus and Tradition: Words In Time, Words In Space," *Semeia* 65 [1994] 158-59) puts it, "Once we think of tradition as interactive processes, we concede the presence of a dynamic that is other than either orality or literacy....Tradition in this encompassing sense is a circumambient contextuality or biosphere in which speaker and hearers live....an invisible nexus of references and identities from which people draw sustenance, in which they live, and in relation to which they make sense of their lives. This invisible biosphere is at once the most elusive and the foundational feature of tradition."

[6]John R. Donahue, "The Literary Turn and New Testament Theology: Detour or New Direction?" *JR* 76 (1996) 269-70 (emphasis added). Donahue (p. 271 n. 108) cites Herbert Lindenburger (*The History in Literature: On Value, Genre, Institutions* [New York: Columbia University Press, 1990) on the contrasts between the new and old historicism, including the "fact that new historians are more concerned with the social and anthropological contexts of texts from the past as well as with *intertextual relationships*, 'not simply as in the older history–the study of a particular writer's reading habits, but the discovery of a *larger network of texts that rethink and rewrite one another over considerable stretches of time'*" (emphasis added; the quotation, embedded in my quotation of Donahue, is taken by the latter from Lindenburger, *History in Literature,* 200; an example of scholarly, i.e., documented intertextuality).

[7]Donahue, "Literary Turn," 262, 273 n. 115.

[8]Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, *Revelation: Vision of a Just World* (Proclamation Commentaries; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1991) 20.

[9]See Vernon K. Robbins, "Social-Scientific Criticism and Literary Studies: Prospects for cooperation in biblical interpretation," in Philip F. Esler, ed., *Modelling Early Christianity: Social-*

The creative environment that intertextuality presumes for every text presents the traditional historical critic seeking to reconstruct the circumstances that gave rise to the "original"[10] text[11] with a Sisyphean task. At this point we find ourselves in the postmodern world. "Postmodernism foregrounds, heightens, and problematizes modernity's enabling assumptions about reference, representation, method, and subjectivity."[12] We may profit, however, by allowing the recent postmodernist and new historicist methodological currents to interrogate traditional historical-critical assessments of Christian apocryphal literature that apply modern criteria to texts from another world. Copious refections on the relation of postmodernism and its associated methodologies to biblical literature have appeared in print.[13] Much of this is not directly relevant to our engagement with Christian apocryphal literature. Nevertheless, the postmodern attitude can be usefully exploited in relation to these noncanonical products. Freed from the need to quell phobias about transgressing metaphysical or canonical protocols, a postmodern approach, here incarnated by intertextuality, to the complex compositional phenomena that meet us in the Apocryphal Acts reorients our expectations and goals. Postmodernism is not a method and its invocation, in my opinion, does not imply a wholesale rejection of historical-critical techniques but rather their sensitive

---

scientific studies of the New Testament in its context (London/New York: Routledge, 1995) 274-89. As Robbins notes, "Literary and social-scientific criticism of the Bible emerged in a context where post-modern methods were moving into the humanities and the social sciences. The theoretical consciousness of both approaches is an important part of the new environment. The real antagonists of literary and social-scientific criticism are interpreters who claim to apply tested and proven methods that are free from theory....The contextually limited and subjectively driven nature of its work does not introduce any special concern since that is the nature of all scientific work" (p. 288).

[10]In a discussion of the "epistemological limits of material culture and how it proceeds in its work, as compared to the writing of history proper," Ilya Berelov ("Metamythics: The Epistemological Problems of Archaeology," *Helios* 23 [1996] 90-104) concludes: "We are only now in the process of becoming comfortable with the bottomless pit of origin, a process that will no doubt remain unpalatable to certain people for some time to come" (p. 103).

[11]"The modern Western cultural complex is discontinuous with earlier periods. This is particularly evident, although by no means intuitively or immediately obvious, in our relationship to texts, which is a key element of modern intellectual traditions and one that sets them apart from all earlier eras....In historical perspective, our current conception of the book (and therefore of the reading process and literacy as well) proves to be quite limited and limiting. This limitation exercises particularly pernicious influence upon our attempts to understand the functional historical role of texts in other times and places, for it involves a series of assumptions about the nature of a written 'composition' that are both relatively recent in date and quite culture-specific. These assumptions have skewed our understanding of the ways in which books - and by 'books' I mean written texts in general - have actually functioned through most of history since the inception of writing" (Graham, *Beyond the Written Word,* 20, 10).

[12]George Aichele et al., *The Postmodern Bible* (New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 1995) 13.

[13]On "postmodernism" in connection with biblical studies, see A. K. M. Adam, *What Is Postmodern Biblical Criticism?* (Guides to Biblical Scholarship: New Testament Series; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1995), which contains fulsome annotated bibliographies. See also the "accessible guides" to things postmodern suggested by Burke O. Long, "Ambitions of Dissent: Biblical Theology in a Postmodern Future," *JR* 76 (1996) 277 n. 3.

execution.[14] Reconsideration of the standard evaluation of portions of the *Acts of Philip* will serve to illustrate the beneficial perspective of intertextuality in the following pages.

In his discussion of the attestation for the *Acts of Peter* (*APt*), Wilhelm Schneemelcher places the *Acts of Philip* (*APh*)[15] among the fourth and fifth century witnesses to the *APt* and assumes "knowledge and use" of the *APt* by the *APh* at three points: (1) *APh* 80-85 = *APt* 28, (2) *APh* 140 = *APt* 38, and (3) *APh* 142 = Coptic fragment (Peter's daughter). He resolves: "It cannot indeed be conclusively proved that the author of the Act. Phil. actually transcribed the APt. But the agreements are so strong that literary dependence has to be suspected."[16] This assessment obviously exerts a decided prejudicial effect upon the reconstruction of the milieu and concerns of the *APh*. Is it accurate?

Perusal of the foregoing three passages in the *APh* in connection with a novice's familiarity with intertextuality leads me to suspect that Schneemelcher's judgment, if not completely unjustified, is too simplistic to serve as a meaningful explanation of the data presented by the texts. It is not my intention to set up Schneemelcher as a straw man on this issue, he merely reiterates conclusions reached long before by Carl Schmidt and subsequently ratified by other notable scholars.[17] But since Schneemelcher's edition of the *New Testament Apocrypha* represents the considered opinion of research, it is reasonable to inspect the currently received opinion on this issue in light of a different methodological framework. In our sample case, Schneemelcher's concern is with the *APt,* and he rightly notes that some relation exists between that "text" and the *APh*. I hope to convince you, the reader, through a review of the three examples advanced by Schneemelcher, that considerably more restraint must be exercised before categorizing as "literarily dependent" passages such as those highlighted here from the *APh*.[18] Such circumspection is warranted initially for at least two reasons: (1) the claim of literary dependence is often beyond demonstration, and (2) such an evaluation has allowed scholars to exclude texts labeled as literarily dependent (unless they are found in the canon) from serious consideration as "original" contributions among the surviving

---

[14]With particular attention to the kind of "historical sensitivity" accented by postmodern modes of interpretation, see Gary A. Phillips, "Exegesis as Critical Praxis: Reclaiming History and Text from a Postmodern Perspective," *Semeia* 51 (1990) 7-49, with excellent bibliography.

[15]The *APh* consists of fifteen separately labeled acts concluded by a martyrdom account. Here the various acts within the *APh* are indicated by Roman numerals, e.g., *APh* VI for the sixth act, in order to avoid confusion with the continuously numbered paragraphs in Bonnet's text (Richard Adelbert Lipsius and Maximilian Bonnet, eds., *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha* [2 vols. in 3 parts; 1891-1903; reprint, Hildesheim: Olms, 1959]) 2/1:1-90; the latter are indicated by Arabic numerals; thus, for example, act VI is comprised of §§ 64-86. On the *APh,* see François Bovon, "Les Actes de Philippe," *ANRW* II 25/6 (1988) 4431-4527; Aurelio de Santos Otero, "Later Acts of Apostles," in Wilhelm Schneemelcher, ed., *New Testament Apocrypha* (rev. ed.; 2 vols.; Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox, 1991-92) 2:468-76 (cited hereafter as *NTApoc*[5]); and Frédéric Amsler, François Bovon, and Bertrand Bouvier, *Actes de l'apôtre Philippe* (Apocryphes 8; Turnhout: Brepols, 1996). The translation in the latter volume is based upon MS Xenophontos 32, an edition of which is forthcoming; my discussion still works with Bonnet's edition.

[16]Schneemelcher, "Acts of Peter," in *NTApoc*[5] 2:276-77.

[17]Schneemelcher (ibid., 284 n. 18) supports his judgment with reference to Carl Schmidt, "Studien zu den alten Petrusakten," *ZKG* 43 (1924) 329ff., and Bovon, "Actes de Philippe."

[18]Already de Santos Otero's treatment of the *APh* in *NTApoc*[5] ("Later Acts of Apostles," 470) is more cautious with regard to the episode of Peter's daughter and the crucifixion of Philip and his speech with the "famous logion" at *APh* 140. Although the latter scene offers "certain analogies to the corresponding episode in the APt...there are serious differences between the two passages."

corpus of ancient Christian literature.[19] A judgment of "literary dependence" obscures our recognition of an ancient writer's valuation of practiced imitation as a legitimate compositional technique.[20] When an ancient writer rewrites the familiar, we should hesitate to dismiss the result as unimaginative plagiarism[21] and instead consider the intertextuality operative among the various "texts" that we can identify, while recognizing that our perception will always be partial.

Rewriting the familiar in the *APh* is rarely a matter of simple repetition. While the *APh* may not be in line for literary accolades, what it does with material familiar to us from the *APt* is not usefully categorized by the terminology of dependence. Thus in the three instances before us, if we suppose, with good reason, that Philip's upside-down crucifixion (*APh* 140) is consciously intertextual, this hardly demonstrates direct use of a manuscript of the *APt* for the process of composition. A judgment of literary dependence may lead the interpreter to miss the importance of the scene in the *APh;* it is the latter passage, in fact, that apparently preserves the hermeneutical key to the upside-down imagery which is absent from the known versions of the *APt* (see below). If the narrative sequence developed in *APh* 80-85 owes some debt to *APt* 28, the drama in its current setting is hardly still the *APt.* Finally, the reference to the episode of Peter's daughter in *APh* 142 hardly necessitates a conclusion that literary dependence upon the *APt* is operative.

We must ask what relation our notions of originality have to the literary endeavors of ancient Christian writers. Appropriation of one's library of apocryphal texts in the fourth century (already prejudging how interiorized texts were accessed) may very probably have been different than the processes of formation that led to the earliest examples of written Christian Apocryphal Acts in the second century. But undoubtedly the literary procedures of the fourth century were closer in kind to those of the second century than to those of the twentieth. Curiously it is a postmodern approach, which requires in principle an appreciation of the difference between ancient and modern writing, that offers interpreters of Christian apocryphal writings needed counsel on what is possible in historical/literary reconstruction and what is not. To illustrate how the concept of intertextuality aids in the endeavor to understand

---

[19]Subjective "modern" judgments about either the literary value or the religious worth of a text such as the *APh* should not be accepted as probative. Most Christian "religious" texts of the early centuries did not end up in the canon. To judge those that survived by a twentieth-century estimation of the intrinsic worth of the canonical documents dooms any attempt to understand these texts from the start. Graham's comments on the ambiguity of the conceptual category of scripture (*Beyond the Written Word,* 2-5) and "scripture as a relational concept" (pp. 5-6) might be adapted in the current context to suggest that the *APh* functioned in its early sociohistorical contexts as a "secondarily sacred" text for those who transmitted it.

[20]"Manuscript culture had taken intertextuality for granted. Still tied to the commonplace tradition of the old oral world, it deliberately created texts out of other texts, borrowing, adapting, sharing the common, originally oral, formulas and themes, even though it worked them up into fresh literary forms impossible without writing....Print culture gave birth to the romantic notions of 'originality' and 'creativity,' which set apart an individual work from other works even more, seeing its origins and meaning as independent of outside influence, at least ideally....Manuscript cultures had few if any anxieties about influence to plague them, and oral cultures had virtually none" (Ong, *Orality and Literacy,* 133-34).

[21]As Richard Bauckham ("The *Acts of Paul* as a Sequel to Acts," in Bruce W. Winter and Andrew D. Clarke, eds., *The Book of Acts in Its Ancient Literary Setting* [The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting 1; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1993] 134) observes, "Repetition of narrative motifs and patterns seems artificial to modern readers;...stories tend to lose their credibility when we recognize their resemblance to others. But this is a modern reaction. The use of familiar motifs and patterns is constant in all forms of ancient narrative literature."

the composition of Christian apocryphal texts, let us review in greater detail each of the three alleged dependencies of the *APh* upon the *APt* sketched above.

First consider the alleged dependence of *APh* 142 upon the story of Peter's daughter. After noting Peter's practice of avoiding women everywhere, the text at *APh* 142 simply tells us that he took offense at his own daughter and prayed to the Lord, which resulted in the paralysis of her side "in order that she might not be beguiled." It seems quite clear that we have to do with a straightforward reference on the part of *APh* 142 to a story about Peter. But it makes no sense to identify this as literary dependence upon the *APt,* unless the only alternative to literary dependence is no relation whatsoever. The label of dependence conjures up an image of an author/redactor leafing through a codex of the *APt* and copying out this bit. But the *APh* merely refers to the story, it does not copy anything. Not only is the incident not mentioned in every recension of the *APh,* but the story appears inconsistently in the manuscript tradition of the *APt* itself.[22] Moreover, it is not difficult to imagine its transmission apart from the *APt.*[23] The *APh* could easily have become acquainted with such a tale through oral/aural means, with or without an associated written text. After all, the reference to the story in *APh* 142 ostensibly is to something that everybody knows already; it was not a bit of data that needed to be looked up and verified. The intertextual approach here releases one from an unnecessary conclusion by acknowledging a broader domain for "text."

Next let us review the argument that *APh* VI is dependent on the *APt.*[24] Some time ago Carl Schmidt suggested that the story of the resurrection of an only son recounted in *APh* VI (80-85) was dependent upon a similar account narrated in *APt* 28.[25] François Bovon has now proposed that a much more extensive relation obtains between *APh* VI and the *APt,* suggesting that *APh* VI has adapted *APt* 23-28.[26] He notes the following correspondences: (1) a public confrontation between an apostle and a Jew (*APh* 72-76/*APt* 23); (2) a dispute beginning with a series of scriptural arguments (*APh* 77-79/*APt* 23-24); (3) an ordeal where the apostle raises a dead person after his opponent has failed to do so (*APh* 82-84/*APt* 25-28); (4) a situation where the fate of slaves is connected with their master's resurrection (*APh* 81-85/*APt* 28); and (5) the apostle's refusal of the right to vengeance upon the unbelieving to the beneficiaries of the miracle (*APh* 83/*APt* 28). Bovon suggests that the numerous corresponding elements are best explained by a relationship of literary dependence.[27] While these similarities argue

---

[22]As Christine M. Thomas ("The Acts of Peter, the Ancient Novel, and Early Christian History" [Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1995] 37) notes, "The Coptic episode...belongs to a longer version of the Acts of Peter predating the *Actus Vercellenses,* which provide only a truncation of them."

[23]"The excerpt, however, does show how the individual units of the Acts of Peter stood on their own, and could be employed by Christians of a number of different theological directions" (ibid., 38).

[24]I first approached the issues discussed in this section in my paper, "An Intriguing Case of Composition in *The Acts of Philip,"* delivered to the Consultation on Christian Apocrypha at the 1989 Annual Meeting of the SBL in Anaheim. François Bovon was the respondent. A condensed and revised version of that study was incorporated into my dissertation, "Trajectories Through the Philip Tradition" (Th.D. diss., Harvard University, 1993) 248-55. The latter presentation has been further revised here in light of explicit intertextual concerns.

[25]Schmidt, "Petrusakten," 321-48.

[26]Bovon, "Actes de Philippe," 4488.

[27]Ibid. See also, idem, "The Synoptic Gospels and the Noncanonical Acts of the Apostles," *HTR* 81 (1988) 26. An intertextual conception may be more congenial to Bovon's discussion of the

strongly for some relation between *APh* VI and the *APt,* to characterize it as literary dependence obscures what has been done in the *APh.* The variations within the preceding catalogue of parallels must be given their full weight.[28] Thus although Simon is identified as a Jew by the *APt,* this aspect is clearly secondary there while it is primary in the *APh.* There is a scripture debate between Philip and Aristarchus in the *APh,* while Peter alone resorts to scripture (using different texts from those occurring in the *APh*) in the *APt.* Simon's ultimately unsuccessful attempts to raise the (third) dead man in *APt* 28 are portrayed in such a way as to criticize his use of magic; the scene in *APh* 82 is an exercise in burlesque. The fate of the slaves in the two texts is portrayed quite differently–in the *APh* the slaves do not face the resumption of their service, but death. Finally, although the refusal of vengeance appears to be quite similar, in the *APt* Simon will soon receive his just deserts, while in the *APh* the call not to return evil for evil, in addition to being a theme sounded elsewhere in the *APh,* was possibly motivated by the interactions between Christians and Jews in the author/redactor's time (see below). Alongside these "correspondences" numerous other differences distinguish the similar accounts in the *APh* and the *APt.* I will only mention in passing the strange omission of any mention of Simon in connection with Philip anywhere in the *APh,* even though in the biblical exemplar in Acts 8 it is Philip who initially contends with Simon.[29]

If we can trace a relation between these two sets of "texts," we would do well to conceive of it in an intertextual manner; explanations based upon a judgment of literary dependence do not explain the phenomena nor are they necessary. Much of the *APh* appears to reflect a stream of consciousness style of composition that would drive any scribe actually attempting to cite bookishly all of the "sources" reflected in the text quickly out of the profession.[30] It is intertextual even if it calls texts out of memory for service in a composition or pastiche that makes something new out of the familiar.[31] Such a conception of intertextuality makes sense of our rubric "rewriting." To evaluate properly examples of early Christian rewriting, we must free ourselves from the modern judgment that textual instability signals serious defect.

---

imitation and adaptation of sources in the latter article than notions of literary dependence. For "sources" I would substitute "texts" more broadly conceived, as discussed above.

[28]I can only refer schematically to the texts here. A translation of the *APt* is readily available in *NTApoc*[5]. Unfortunately an English translation of *APh* V-VII is unavailable; an epitome may be found in M. R. James, *The Apocryphal New Testament* (1924; reprint, Oxford: Clarendon, 1960). A French translation (based upon MS Xenophontos 32) is now available in Amsler et al., *Actes de l'apôtre Philippe.* An English translation of *APh* II may be found in Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, eds., *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the Writings of the Fathers down to A.D. 325* (reprint, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1951) 8:503-7.

[29]See Christopher R. Matthews, "Philip and Simon, Luke and Peter: A Lukan Sequel and Its Intertextual Success," in Eugene H. Lovering, ed., *Society of Biblical Literature 1992 Seminar Papers* (SBLSP 31; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992) 133-46; idem, "Philip Tradition," 37-100. Acts 8 already portends further intertextual involvement between Philip and Peter.

[30]Alistair Stewart-Sykes ("Ancient Editors and Copyists and Modern Partition Theories: The Case of the Corinthian Correspondence," *JSNT* 61 [1996] 53-64) suggests the "criterion of physical possibility" to assist in evaluating partition theories of the NT epistles. His discussion assumes the use of rolls. While the redactor of the *APh* probably had access to codices insofar as written texts were involved, the ostensible sources are far more numerous than those considered in partition theories of the Pauline letters. We should incorporate some version of the "criterion of physical possibility" into our notions of how a text like the *APh* was composed.

[31]On the "intertwining between memory and writing in classical antiquity," see Jocelyn Penny Small, "Artificial Memory and the Writing Habits of the Literate," *Helios* 22 (1995) 159-66.

A helpful example of rewriting that extends the case just reviewed is available in a comparison of *APh* VI with *APh* II. There are numerous striking connections between *APh* VI and *APh* II.[32] One notes first the appearance and prominence of Jewish characters in controversy with Philip in these sections (Jews do not play a narrative role in the *APh* outside these two acts). Second, in both of these sections the miraculous abilities of Philip are accentuated in comparison with the other acts in *APh* I-VII. A more extensive comparison suggests the hypothesis that *APh* II represents a revised version of the scenario set forth in *APh* VI, with some contacts with acts V and VII.[33] Both *APh* II and VI are set in Greece; Philip's principal antagonists in each case are prominent Jews (Ananias–*APh* II; Aristarchus–*APh* VI); the issue provoking controversy in both cases is the destruction of the law or Jewish traditions; both narratives employ similar crowd involvement, charges of sorcery against Philip, debate with and miraculous punishments of Philip's respective foes, and a subplot centering on a story of the resurrection of an only son.

Rather than describe the numerous correspondences between these two acts as proof of literary dependence or explain their origin as owing to a common exemplar, *APh* II may be better understood as a rewriting that updates *APh* VI, whether or not it refers to a manuscript of the latter. Several observations suggest that *APh* VI functions as the principal intertextual ingredient for *APh* II. First, *APh* II not only shares an extensive list of features with *APh* VI but also incorporates numerous elements known to us from the martyrdom account;[34] the most striking of these is Philip's rending of the ground to send his tormentors alive into Hades and the christophany of the luminous Christ. It seems unlikely that *APh* VI would have removed just these sensational items had it been influenced by *APh* II. The fact that the miracle story that appears so abrupt in *APh* VI (§§ 80-85) has been well integrated into the course of the narrative in *APh* II (§§ 27-28) also suggests that the adaptation has moved from *APh* VI to *APh* II. In the latter act the christophany causes the destruction of the idol temples setting the scene for a demon's murderous revenge and the intervention of Philip; it also provides the occasion for the final offer of repentance to Ananias and his final refusal.[35]

If it is granted that *APh* II is a rewriting of *APh* VI, whether or not written texts are involved, it is instructive to note the change in attitude of the respective acts toward the Jews. In the narrative surrounding and including *APh* VI there are clearly Jewish complaints about Philip. But when the Jews speak harshly against Philip (*APh* 47), Ireus, one of their leaders, counsels moderation. Further, Ireus is responsive to Philip's message, is converted, and serves as Philip's host. In *APh* II there is no counterpart to Ireus; Philip's host is anonymous. The depiction of Philip's principal antagonists in *APh* II also reveals an intensified hostility toward Jews. In *APh* VI, although Aristarchus is somewhat hostile at the beginning, he is eventually found proclaiming Christ from the scriptures. In *APh* II, however, Ananias is made to confess, "We crucified him" (*APh* 15). That he is irredeemably malevolent is made clear from the beginning where we are told that Mansemat, that is Satan, entered into him (*APh* 13). Whereas Aristarchus pleads for mercy at the first experience of Philip's power, Ananias, though he is

---

[32]Again I can only refer schematically to the texts here.

[33]Bovon ("Actes de Philippe," 4487) notes the similar structure shared by *APh* II, *APh* VI, and the martyrdom, and the theme of conflict between Christianity and Judaism (acts II and VI) or paganism (the martyrdom).

[34]Although the situation is no doubt more complicated, since *APh* VI does share some more general features with the martyrdom.

[35]If one assumed the dependence of *APh* VI on the *APt,* then the clear relation between *APh* II and *APh* VI, and the fact that *APh* II does not preserve any specific connections with the *APt,* would indicate that *APh* II developed from *APh* VI. Had *APh* VI derived its narrative outline of events from *APh* II, subsequent recourse to the *APt* would have been superfluous. For other considerations relating to this issue, see Matthews, "Philip Tradition," 251-53.

continually the object of Philip's miraculous energy and is offered numerous chances to repent, remains obdurate to the end.

Why would *APh* II revise *APh* VI in this manner? This could simply be a general reflection of the tensions between Jews and Christians during the first centuries of the early church.[36] However, it may also be possible to hazard a guess concerning the rhetorical situation. That is, *APh* II may have been written to portray, in story form, a social situation that existed between Jews and Christians during the redactor's time (i.e., social environment as intertext).[37] These texts, namely, *APh* II and *APh* V-VII, suggest that there were contacts between the Christian community behind the *APh* and Jews.[38] Such a relationship perhaps illuminates the fondness in *APh* VIII-XV and the martyrdom for heterodox Jewish material. These texts further suggest, however, that this relationship disintegrated over time. Already in *APh* VI Ireus can say, "O you Jews, who oppose God in everything" (*APh* 82), but this is rather isolated. The version of the events in *APh* II has intensified in a thoroughgoing manner the nascent anti-Jewish attitude that appears in *APh* VI.[39] Memories of the *APt* at this point are dim indeed.

We move now to the third proposed instance of the literary dependence of the *APh* upon the *APt.* At the beginning of the martyrdom account in the *APh,* the conversion of Nicanora, the proconsul's wife, to a chaste form of Christianity leads to the arrest of Philip and his companions, a motif familiar from other Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles. Philip is hung head downwards on a tree while Bartholomew is crucified on a wall opposite him (*APh* 125). When John arrives and sees them, he says, "The mystery of the one who was suspended between heaven and earth will be with you" (*APh* 129). After some dramatic intervening events, Philip dissuades the faithful from extricating him from his torture and launches into a long discourse (*APh* 140). As was indicated above, the first lines of this discourse have often been thought to draw upon Peter's words from the cross in *APt* 38. But that we are far from any notion of simple dependence emerges immediately upon examination of the texts. Peter's lengthy speech is spoken upon his crucifixion, head downwards. After calling for attention, Peter says:

APt 38

> You must know the mystery of all nature, and the beginning of all things, how it came about. For the first *anthropos,* whose likeness I have in (my) appearance, in falling

---

[36]See Marcel Simon, *Verus Israel: A study of the relations between Christians and Jews in the Roman Empire (135-425)* (Littman Library of Jewish Civilization; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986).

[37]There may be a parallel here with the "homeostatic" character of oral societies in which "traditions reflect a society's present cultural values rather than idle curiosity about the past" (Ong, *Orality and Literacy,* 48). Christine Thomas's study of the transmissional fluidity of the texts of the *APt* demonstrates how "the fluidity of such traditions allow them to remain useful to changing audiences over time by easily accommodating new political and social realities into the tradition....This constant process of reformulation allowed the audience to use its history to re-negotiate and revisualize its relationship to present political and social realities" ("Acts of Peter," 173-74).

[38]Bovon ("Actes de Philippe," 4487) wonders whether the author's attention to an active Jewish participation in the city assembly in *APh* VI furnishes "un indice sociologique qui explique, dans les Actes de Philippe, le dialogue ou plutôt la dispute intense avec le judaïsme."

[39]A recent study by Guy G. Stroumsa ("Dall'antigiudaismo all'antisemitismo nel cristianesimo primitivo?" *Cristianesimo nella Storia* 17 [1996] 13-46) concludes that the religious revolution of the fourth century CE, a date that coincides with the likely redaction of the *APh,* was a crucial turning point in the attitude of Christians toward Jews that resulted in the demonization of the latter by the former.

> head-downwards showed a manner of birth that was not so before; for it was dead, having no movement. He therefore, being drawn down - he who also cast his first beginning down to the earth - established the whole of this cosmic system, being hung up as an image of the calling, in which he showed what is on the right hand as on the left, and those on the left as on the right, and changed all the signs of their nature, so as to consider fair those things that were not fair, and take those that were really evil to be good. Concerning this the Lord says in a mystery, "Unless you make what is on the right hand as what is on the left and what is on the left hand as what is on the right and what is above as what is below and what is behind as what is before, you will not recognize the Kingdom." This conception, then, I have declared to you, and the form in which you see me hanging is a representation of that *anthropos* who first came to birth. You then, my beloved, both those who hear (me) now and those that shall hear in time, must leave your former error and turn back again; for you should come up to the cross of Christ, who is the Word stretched out...the Word is this upright tree on which I am crucified; but the sound is the cross-piece, the nature of *anthropos;* and the nail that holds the cross-piece to the upright in the middle is the conversion (or turning point) and repentance of *anthropos.*[40]

Philip likewise issues a summons for attention and then continues as follows:

APh 140, recension Γ:

> I came into this city...to exit from my body...in the form in which you see me. Therefore, do not grieve because I am hung up in this manner. For I bear the type of the first *anthropos,* who was brought head downwards upon the earth, and was made alive again from the death of transgression by the wood of the cross. And now I will satisfy the command given to me. For the Lord said to me: "Unless you make your below into the above, and the left into the right, you will not enter into my kingdom." Therefore, do not become like the opposite type, because all the world has been turned upside down, and every soul that dwells in the body falls into forgetfulness of heavenly things.[41]

The situation of the two apostles is obviously similar: Philip is hung by his heels, Peter requests to be crucified head downwards (*APt* 37) and is described as being hung up (*APt* 38). Yet *APh* 140 presents in only three lines of Greek (according to Bonnet's edition) the content of the twenty-three lines of discourse in *APt* 38. According to *APh* 140 Philip bears in his present appearance the type of the first *anthropos,* who, suspended head downwards toward the earth, is made alive again from the death of transgression through the wood of the cross. In the *APt* the two topics taken up by the *APh,* the first *anthropos* and the cross, fall, respectively, on either side of the saying about making the right left. In the *APh* the saying follows the one sentence presentation that incorporates both of these topics. How are we to explain the sophisticated abbreviation of the extended discourse in *APt* 38 found in the *APh?* Attention to the form of the saying embedded in the discourse only exacerbates the problem.

The text of the saying in the several recensions of the *APh* and in the *APt* shows numerous variations.[42] One may also compare the appearance of the saying in *Gospel of*

---

[40]The English translation is taken from *NTApoc*^{5} 2:315-16, slightly adapted.

[41]Or, *APh* 140, recension Θ: "You, therefore, brothers and sisters, become like me in this type, for this entire world is turned upside down and every soul in it." The translations of *APh* are my own.

[42]See Matthews, "Philip Tradition," 272-73.

Thomas 22 and the related *2 Clem.* 12.2, 6.[43] How is the relation among these witnesses to the saying to be understood? Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* 3.13.92) attributed the saying to the *Gospel of the Egyptians.* Dennis MacDonald's investigation of the traditional features underlying Gal 3:27-28 demonstrated that Paul in these verses drew upon the dominical saying attested by the *Gospel of the Egyptians, 2 Clement,* and the *Gospel of Thomas.*[44] MacDonald was able to show that the performative setting of this saying was baptism.[45] In *APt* 38 and *APh* 140, however, the narrative setting is crucifixion, which suggests that the saying has been secondarily adapted in both of these contexts. Apparently the change of setting also accounts for the dropping of the two pairs two/one and male/female, which occur in the *Gospel of the Egyptians, 2 Clement,* and the *Gospel of Thomas* but are lacking in *APt* 38 and *APh* 140. Instead, *APt* 38 and *APh* 140 introduce below/above and left/right oppositions, which are missing in the other texts with the exception of above/below in *Gos. Thom.* 22.[46]

What is extraordinary in the comparison of the saying as it occurs in *APt* 38 and *APh* 140 is that the version in the *APh* appears to be less developed in form-critical terms. Recension Γ of *APh* 140 presents two simple contrasts: below/above, left/right. *APt* 38 repeats its first opposition in reverse order: right/left, left/right, and then adds two more contrasts that are not repeated: above/below, behind/before. Also, in distinction from the passage in the *APh,* other dualistic oppositions precede the citation of the saying in *APt* 38: right/left, left/right, fair/not fair, evil/good. Not only do the contrasts presented in *APh* 140 appear less developed than those in *APt* 38, but the verb in the apodosis of the saying appears to be more primitive. All three recensions of the *APh* refer to "entering" the kingdom, which seems to cohere with the performative setting of this saying in baptism better than "recognizing" the kingdom in *APt* 38 or the "coming" of the kingdom in *2 Clem.* 12.2, 6.[47]

Scholars have long presumed the literary dependence of *APh* 140 on *APt* 38, but this view does little to explain the phenomena reviewed above. If *APh* 140 is literarily dependent on *APt* 38, we are left with the problem of explaining how a more "primitive" form of the saying found its way into the text of *APh* 140. Further, we must credit the author of the *APh* with a degree of rhetorical sophistication unparalleled in the martyrdom narrative to account for the deft abridgment of the extended discourse in *APt* 38. With respect to the former issue, the appearance of a simpler form of the saying in the *APh* is not a problem for an intertextual approach, which does not require the saying to be more primitive in time. With respect to the second issue, it is sounder methodologically to presume that *APh* 140 has developed without direct reference to a written text of *APt* 38, even while recognizing that the *APt* remains an intertext. If the account in the *APt* has influenced the *APh* in some other manner (e.g., oral tradition, memory), that situation is more complex than a straightforward literary adaptation. The possibility must also be considered that the *APh* was heir to intertexts for this saying beyond the *APt.* Phrases reminiscent of its content appear under Philip's name in *Gos. Phil.* 67:30-35 and 53.14-19.[48] Clearly the saying is of paramount importance to the author of the

---

[43]Also note *Acts of Thomas* 147: "The inside I have made outside, and the outside <inside>" (*NTApoc*^{5} 2:398); and, of course, Gal 3:28. See Dennis R. MacDonald, *There Is No Male and Female: The Fate of a Dominical Saying in Paul and Gnosticism* (HDR 20; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987).

[44]See MacDonald, *No Male and Female,* 14

[45]Ibid., 50-63, 127-29; see also Wayne A. Meeks, "The Image of the Androgyne: Some Uses of a Symbol in Earliest Christianity," *HR* 13 (1974) 193-94.

[46]*Gos. Phil.* 67:30-35 apparently has below/above.

[47]See Ron Cameron, *Sayings Traditions in the* Apocryphon of James (HTS 34; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984) 69.

[48]See also *Gos. Phil.* 60:28 and 67:25.

APh. Furthermore, a hermeneutical key to the saying's meaning has been appended in the *APh.* After the citation of the saying in *APt* 38, the auditors are urged to approach the cross in repentance. But in the *APh* the words that follow the saying have to do with a renunciation of this "topsy-turvy" world and those who live in it. What is significant here, as Jonathan Z. Smith's investigation of the upside-down motif has indicated, is that

> Philip gives a dogmatic formulation which is a major key to this upside-down tradition: "Imitate me in this, for all the world is turned the wrong way and every soul that is in it."...In such a world, *to be upside down is in fact to be rightside up;*...The call of Philip....is thus a gospel of rebellion and liberation....[49]

The upside-down motif has nothing to do with "an exercise in humility" but is rather "an *act of cosmic audacity* consistent with and expressive of a Christian-gnostic understanding and evaluation of the structures of the cosmos and of the human condition."[50] This interpretation is consistent with the introduction of the below/above and left/right contrasts in place of the two/one and male/female pairs of the baptismal saying, since the focus is now on cosmic reversal rather than anthropological unity.

The comparison of *APt* 38 with *APh* 140 cautions us once again against easy assumptions concerning the direct utilization by the *APh* of sayings and motifs known from other Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles. It also suggests that even in those cases where literary adaptation may appear to be a feasible explanation for the composition in the *APh,* much more is involved than simple imitation.

Attention to postmodern warnings concerning over-confidence in the historical reconstruction of the past pays immediate dividends in the study of the Apocryphal Acts. The application of a postmodern reading strategy to the *APh* offers a view of this text impossible under scholarship accustomed to interpreting it through the canon of the so-called five major Apocryphal Acts. The current standard accounts of the *APh*'s literary dependence upon the *APt* are revealed as too simplistic; an intertextual approach, even if less analytically satisfying for some, offers a more accurate account of the phenomena encountered in the text. Models of literary dependence based on source criticism of the Synoptic Gospels are out of their depth when applied to the Apocryphal Acts. An intertextual approach properly highlights rereading and rewriting as integral elements of theological and other kinds of reflection. Consequently when Philip seems to imitate Peter in action or speech, instead of slavish, and therefore meaningless imitation, we encounter a purposeful intertextual juxtaposition accomplished through the employment of valued motifs. That the "competition" some ancient readers detected between Philip and Peter in Acts 8 (see, e.g., *Letter of Peter to Philip*) may still be invoked in the *APh* is a testimony to the viability of the intertextual evolution of favored themes in the milieu of early Christian rewriting.

---

[49]Jonathan Z. Smith, "Birth Upside Down or Right Side Up?" in idem, *Map Is Not Territory: Studies in the History of Religions* (SJLA 23; Leiden: Brill, 1978) 156, 164, 169, emphasis original.

[50]Ibid., 152-53, emphasis original. Smith observes (p. 159) that "it is within this context...of a destruction of one's humanity which is at the same time one's birth, that the upside-down crucifixion of Peter must be interpreted." Smith assumes that the *APh* are dependent upon the *APt*, but he does not review the anomalies pointed out above that are left unexplained by the presumption of dependence.

La composition de l'*Évangile selon Philippe* (NH II,3): une analyse rhétorique.

Louis Painchaud
Collège de Sainte-Foy et Université Laval

Le texte qui nous est parvenu sous le titre d'*Évangile selon Philippe* (EvPhil), malgré et peut-être aussi un peu à cause de son caractère énigmatique et déconcertant, est l'un de ceux qui ont été le plus étudiés parmi les écrits coptes découverts à Nag Hammadi en 1945.[1] Il existe aujourd'hui un certain consensus parmi les chercheurs quant à l'appartenance valentinienne de cet écrit[2] et quant à l'importance de la place qu'y tient la doctrine sacramentaire, et en particulier le motif de la chambre nuptiale. Un problème majeur subsiste cependant, qui entrave le progrès de nos connaissances sur ce texte et rend incertaine son interprétation globale. En effet, malgré de nombreuses tentatives en ce sens, il a été impossible jusqu'à ce jour d'en proposer une analyse littéraire satisfaisante et, en particulier, de trancher la question de son homogénéité. Or, comme le souligne à juste titre Martha Turner dans une thèse récente, cette question est préalable à l'interprétation doctrinale du texte.[3]

---

[1] L'EvPhil est le troisième écrit du codex II de Nag Hammadi, où il occupe les p. 51,29 à 86,18. Il y fait suite à l'*Apocryphon de Jean* et à l'*Évangile selon Thomas*. Les autres écrits réunis dans ce codex sont l'*Hypostase des Archontes*, l'*Écrit sans titre*, l'*Exégèse au sujet de l'âme* et le *Livre de Thomas*. La bibliographie concernant l'EvPhil est relativement abondante; dans la collection de Nag Hammadi, ce texte est en effet l'un de ceux qui ont le plus attiré l'attention avec l'*Évangile selon Thomas*, et on compte une centaine d'articles portant principalement ou exclusivement sur ce texte, auquel on a consacré neuf thèses de doctorat sans compter celles qui sont actuellement en préparation. On connaît une vingtaine de traductions de cet écrit dans différentes langues modernes (allemand, anglais, catalan, espagnol, français, italien, néerlandais, polonais); la première fut celle de H.-M. Schenke, «Das Evangelium nach Philippus. Ein Evangelium aus dem Funde von Nag-Hamadi», *TLZ* 84 (1959) 1-26, et la première traduction française, accompagnée d'une édition critique du texte copte et d'un commentaire, celle de J. É. Ménard, *L'Évangile selon Philippe: introduction, texte, traduction et commentaire* (Strasbourg, 1967). L'édition critique la plus récente est celle de B. Layton, qui est accompagnée d'une traduction de W. W. Isenberg, «Tractate 3: The Gospel According to Philip», *Nag Hammadi Codex II,2-7 together with XIII,2*. Vol. 1 (NHS, 21; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1989) 129-217. Une nouvelle édition critique accompagnée d'une traduction allemande, d'une introduction et d'un commentaire par H.-M. Schenke est présentement sous presse et j'en prépare également une en français pour la *Bibliothèque copte de Nag Hammadi*.

[2] Voir à ce propos E. Thomassen, «Notes pour la délimitation d'un corpus valentinien à Nag Hammadi,» *Les textes de Nag Hammadi et le problème de leur classification. Actes du colloque tenu à Québec du 15 au 19 septembre 1993*, éd. L. Painchaud et A. Pasquier (BCNH, «Études», 3; Québec et Louvain-Paris: Les Presses de l'Université Laval et Peeters, 1995) 243-262 et «How Valentinian is the *Gospel of Philip?*», communication présentée dans le cadre du séminaire sur Nag Hammadi tenu au Collège Haverford le vendredi 17 novembre 1995 (Actes à paraître sous la direction de J. D. Turner et A. McGuire).

[3] Martha L. Turner, *The Sources and Organization of the Gospel According to Philip* (Ph. D. Dissertation; Notre Dame University, 1994) 10-12.

Dans cette communication, je me propose de montrer que cet écrit, tout en donnant l'impression d'un florilège est bien plus qu'une compilation ou un recueil de notes légèrement éditées en vue d'une diffusion limitée, comme on l'a suggéré récemment,[4] et qu'il est une œuvre composée avec soin, et formant un tout d'une grande cohérence littéraire même s'il est difficile de lui attribuer un genre précis. Pour ce faire, je montrerai d'abord que le recours à des figures de répétition est l'une des caractéristiques du style de l'EvPhil, pour montrer ensuite que certaines récurrences qu'on peut observer dans cet écrit ont une valeur structurante et qu'elles en délimitent les grandes parties, et que l'analyse de cet aménagement à la lumière de la rhétorique gréco-romaine révèle à la fois le modèle à partir duquel celui-ci a été élaboré et la fonction de chacune des parties à l'intérieur d'un plan d'ensemble parfaitement cohérent. Je montrerai ensuite que l'obscurité du texte, son apparente incohérence et la difficulté d'y délimiter clairement des unités résultent à la fois d'une pratique de l'écriture comme voile et de la mise en œuvre d'un procédé de composition par glissement où les transitions entre les parties se dérobent au lecteur dans un but pédagogique.

1. Les figures de style par répétition

Une des caractéristiques littéraires de l'EvPhil est son style redondant, qui ne manque pas de frapper le lecteur dès les premières lignes. Lorsqu'on fait un relevé systématique des récurrences lexicales intervenant à l'intérieur d'une phrase ou entre des phrases voisines, on s'aperçoit bien vite qu'il ne s'agit pas d'un phénomène accidentel ou du résultat du manque de soin apporté à la composition de l'œuvre. Bien au contraire, ces récurrences, dont l'accumulation peut paraître lourde au lecteur moderne et que les traducteurs font parfois disparaître en cherchant à varier l'expression, dessinent diverses figures de style fondées sur la répétition de termes identiques. Ces répétitions peuvent être immédiates ou contiguës, de type (/ ... x / x ... /), ou encore, distancées, de type (/ x ... x /), et elles ont alors une valeur encadrante. C'est par l'étude de ces procédés que je propose d'entreprendre l'analyse littéraire de l'EvPhil.

Avant de poursuivre plus avant, il importe de soulever une question méthodologique fondamentale. Toute étude littéraire devrait en principe être menée sur le texte original et non sur une traduction, car le processus de traduction entraîne nécessairement un certain nombre de distorsions ou interférences qui ne peuvent qu'affecter sérieusement un texte, à plus forte raison lorsque cette traduction intervient entre deux langues aussi différentes aux plans linguistique et extra-linguistique que le grec et le copte. Cela est particulièrement vrai dans le

---

[4] Turner, 278.

cas des figures basées sur la récurrence de termes identiques, qu'une traduction peut facilement faire disparaître. Cependant, comme nous ne disposons pour ce texte, comme pour la plupart des textes de Nag Hammadi, que de la version copte et que l'original grec en est perdu, nous n'avons guère le choix.[5] Je vais donc supposer, à titre d'hypothèse de travail, que la traduction copte est de type *de uerbo,* et qu'elle a davantage visé la fidélité à son modèle que la conformité à la langue de traduction.[6] Et je vais relever dans le texte copte des exemples de récurrences correspondant à des figures de style, en supposant que ces figures n'ont pas été produites par la traduction copte, mais qu'elles proviennent du modèle grec.

On distingue deux types de figures de répétition, les figures de répétition immédiates (Wiederholung im Kontakt) et les figures de répétition encadrantes (Wiederholung als Klammer).[7] Les figures de répétition immédiates les plus fréquentes sont la *reduplicatio* et la *gradatio*. La *reduplicatio* ou *ἀναδίπλωσις* (/ ... x / x ... /) est un procédé qui consiste à commencer une nouvelle phrase (*περίοδος*) ou un nouveau membre de phrase (*κῶλα*) par le mot sur lequel se termine la précédente; on en trouve un bel exemple dès les premières lignes de l'EvPhil en 51,31-32: ... ⲁⲉⲡⲣⲟⲥⲏⲩⲧⲟⲥ / ⲟⲩⲡ[ⲣⲟⲥⲏ]ⲩⲧⲟⲥ ⲇⲉ... Ce procédé est largement utilisé dans l'écrit. La *gradatio* ou *κλῖμαξ* est une figure plus complexe formée par une séquence de répétitions immédiates de plusieurs couples de termes identiques (... x / x ... y / y ... z / z ... /). On en rencontre aussi plusieurs exemples dans l'EvPhil, ainsi en 69,25-28: ⲡⲃⲁⲡⲧⲓⲥⲙⲁ ⲟⲩⲛ̄ⲧⲁϥ ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲩ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲛⲁⲥⲧⲁⲥⲓⲥ ⲙⲛ̄ⲛⲥⲱⲧⲉ / ⲉⲡⲥⲱⲧⲉ ⲉϫⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲩⲙⲫⲱⲛ / ⲉⲡⲛⲩⲙⲫⲱⲛ ⲇⲉ ⲉϫⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲧⲁⲟⲩⲉ (cf. aussi 74,16-18; 77,15-20; 78,32-79,5). Les figures de répétition encadrantes peuvent revêtir plusieurs formes. Les principales sont la *redditio*, l'anaphore, l'épiphore et la *complexio*, qui conjugue

---

[5] Il n'existe pas d'étude des différents types de traduction qui nous sont parvenus à Nag Hammadi. Pourtant, des textes comme les *Sentences de Sextus*, le *Fragment de la République de Platon*, ou encore *Zostrien* qui utilise des sources grecques qu'on retrouve également chez Marius Victorinus, comme l'a montré Michel Tardieu dans ses cours au Collège de France pour l'année 1995-96, fourniraient un matériau intéressant pour une telle étude.

[6] Par opposition à la traduction *de sensu*, la traduction *de uerbo* semble avoir été favorisée par la nécessité, apparue avec la diffusion du christianisme, de traduire des textes sacrés, voir à ce sujet J. Bouffartigue, «Du grec au latin: la traduction latine des *Sentences de Sextus*,» *Homère. Horace. Le mythe d'Œdipe. Les Sentences de Sextus* (Études de littérature ancienne, 1; Paris: Presses de l'École Normale Supérieure, 1979) 81-95.

[7] La terminologie technique servant à désigner telle ou telle figure varie beaucoup chez les auteurs anciens, grecs ou latins. J'adopte ici celle de Heinrich Lausberg, *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik* (Munich: Max Hueber Verlag, 1973 [1960]). On pourra également se reporter aux toujours indispensables manuels de J. Chr. G. Ernesti, *Lexicon Technologiae Graecorum Rhetoricae* (Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1983 [Leipzig 1795]) et *Lexicon Technologiae Latinorum Rhetoricae* (Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1983 [Leipzig 1797]).

l'anaphore et l'épiphore. La *redditio* ou *προσαπόδοσις* commence et achève une phrase ou un membre de phrase par le même mot (/ x ... x /): 72,5b-8a ⲛⲛⲥⲃⲏⲩⲉ ⲙⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ... ⲛⲉⲩⲥⲃⲏⲩⲉ ⲛⲉ ou encore 73,9b-13a ⲓⲱⲥⲉⲫ ⲡⲥⲁⲙⲱⲉ ⲁⲩⲧⲱⲃⲉ ... ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲩⲧⲟⲃⲟⲩ. L'anaphore (*anaphora*, *ἀναφορά*) est la répétition au début d'une phrase ou d'un membre de phrase, du mot initial de la précédente (/ x ... / x ...): 52,6-9 ⲛⲉⲧⲣ̄ⲕⲗⲏⲣⲟⲛⲟⲙⲉⲓ ⲛ̄ ⲛⲉⲧⲙⲟⲟⲩⲧ ⲛ̄ⲧⲟⲟⲩ ⲥⲱⲟⲩ ⲥⲉⲙⲟⲟⲩⲧ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲩⲣ̄ⲕⲗⲏⲣⲟⲛⲟⲙⲉⲓ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲧⲙⲟⲟⲩⲧ / ⲛⲉⲧⲣ̄ⲕⲗⲏⲣⲟⲛⲟⲙⲉⲓ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲧⲟⲛⲥ... ou encore 83,30b-32a ⲧⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲁ ⲧⲥ [ⲟⲟⲩⲛ] ⲉⲥⲱⲟⲟⲡ ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲛⲡⲉ[ⲑⲟⲟⲩ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ] /ⲧⲙⲛ̄ⲧ ⲁⲧⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ [ⲉⲥ]ⲛ̣ⲱⲉ... L'épiphore (*conversio*, *ἀντιστροφή*) est la reprise à la fin d'une phrase ou d'un membre de phrase, du mot terminant la phrase précédente (/ ... x / ... x /), par exemple 76,26b-29a ⲛ̄ ⲕⲉⲣⲏⲧⲉ ⲙⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲁⲱⲁⲡⲟ ⲛⲁⲩ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲉⲓⲭⲁⲣⲓⲥ ⲉⲓⲙⲏ ⲛ̄ⲩ† ⲥⲓⲱⲱⲩ ⲙ̄ⲡⲧⲉⲗⲉⲓⲟⲛ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲛ / ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛ̄ⲩⲱⲱⲡⲉ ⲥⲱⲱⲩ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲗⲉⲓⲟⲛ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲛ. Enfin, la *complexio* ou *συμπλοκή* résulte de la combinaison dans une même phrase de l'anaphore et de l'épiphore (/ x ... y / x ... y /): 77,36b-78,3 ⲥⲉⲣ̄ⲁⲡⲟⲗⲁⲩⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲥ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ⲛ̄ⲑⲓ ⲛⲉⲧⲛⲁ ⲧⲟⲥⲥⲟⲩ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲥ / ⲥⲉⲣ̄ⲁⲡⲟⲗⲁⲩⲉ ⲥⲱⲟⲩ ⲛ̄ⲑⲓ ⲛⲉⲧⲁⲥⲉⲣⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲙ̄ⲡⲟⲩⲃⲟⲗ ⲥⲱⲥ ⲉⲩⲁⲥⲉⲣⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛ̄ⲑⲓ ⲛⲉⲧⲧⲟⲥⲥ. La fréquence de l'emploi de ces figures obtenues par la répétition de termes identiques constitue l'une des caractéristiques principales du style de l'EvPhil.

Les cas de récurrence que nous avons observés jusqu'ici sont contenus à l'intérieur des limites d'un membre de phrase ou d'une phrase. Le recours à des procédés de composition par récurrence ne se limite cependant pas aux phrases ou membres de phrases. En effet, on observe également dans l'EvPhil un grand nombre de constructions symétriques fondées sur la répétition de termes identiques, de synonymes ou d'antonymes, ou encore de constructions syntaxiques semblables, et formant des structures parallèles de type A B A B ou concentriques de type A B C B A, ou encore des chiasmes (A B B A). Pour illustrer ces types de construction, j'adopterai une présentation visuelle qui facilite la perception de leur symétrie, et dispense de longues explications.[8] Voici un premier exemple simple d'une

[8] Le lecteur antique était sans doute plus apte que le lecteur moderne à repérer ces structures. Au cours de l'instruction primaire en effet, les enfants mémorisaient les lettres dans l'ordre normal, inversé, ou par paires, la première et la dernière étant couplées, et ainsi de suite (voir H. I. Marrou, *Histoire de l'éducation dans l'Antiquité* [Paris: Édition du Seuil, 1948], 211-212); ce dernier usage est illustré par un ostracon provenant d'Égypte sur lequel les lettres de l'alphabet regroupées en paires (*Α Ω / Β Ψ*) forment une colonne arrangée en boustrophédon; voir J. G. Milne, «Relics of Graeco-Egyptian Schools,» *JHS* 28 (1908) 121-122l. Ce type d'apprentissage et les exercices qui l'accompagnaient contribuaient sans doute à développer chez le lecteur antique une «conscience chiastique» que le lecteur moderne n'a plus; voir A. Stock, «Chiastic Awareness and Education in Antiquity,» *BTB* 14 (1984) 23-27. Dans le domaine biblique, l'importance de ce procédé a été pour la première fois pleinement mise en lumière par N. W. Lund, *Chiasmus in New Testament* (Chapel Hill: North Carolina University Press, 1942 [réimpr. Boston: Hendrickson, 1992]); voir également la série d'articles d'A. Di Marco «Der Chiasmus in der Bibel,» *LB* 36 (1975) 21-97; 37 (1976) 49-69; 39 (1976) 37-

construction de type A B A B où les termes parallèles A A et B B sont antithétiques, la première antithèse portant sur le nombre (beaucoup / peu), la seconde, sur le verbe (semer / récolter) (55,22-23):

A ⲟⲩⲛϩⲁϩ ⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲣⲟⲥ
B ⲉⲩⲥⲓⲧⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲥ
A ϩⲛ̄ⲕⲟⲩⲉⲓ ⲇⲉ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲣⲟⲥ
B ⲉⲩⲱⲥϩ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲥ

Dans le second exemple tiré de 56,3-4, la symétrie est produite par la répétition de la structure logique alors que la progression de la pensée repose sur l'alternance Jésus / Christ et l'opposition sens caché / sens manifeste:

A ⲓ̄ⲥ̄
B ⲟⲩⲣⲁⲛ ⲡⲉ ⲉϥϩⲏⲡ
A ⲡⲉⲭⲣ̄ⲥ̄
B ⲟⲩⲣⲁⲛ ⲡⲉ ⲉϥⲟⲩⲟⲛϩ

Les constructions concentriques sont également nombreuses, ainsi en 56,15-18 (structure de type A B C B A). Ici l'effet de symétrie est assuré par la répétition de la structure logique et des termes principaux, alors que la progression repose sur l'arrangement chiastique et l'inversion du rapport temporel qu'entretiennent entre eux les termes principaux:

ⲛⲉⲧⲁⲱ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲥ ⲁⲉ
A ⲁⲡⲁⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲙⲟⲩ ⲛ̄ⲱⲟⲣⲡ
B ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁϥⲧⲱⲟⲩⲛ
C ⲥⲉⲣⲡⲗⲁⲛⲁ
B ⲁϥⲧⲱⲟⲩⲛ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲛ̄ⲱⲟⲣⲡ
A ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁϥⲙⲟⲩ

85; 44 (1979) 3-70 et J. W. Welch, ed., *Chiasmus in Antiquity. Structures, Analyses, Exegesis* (Hildesheim: Gerstenberg Verlag, 1981). Certains biblistes sont réticents à admettre la fécondité des études fondées sur l'analyse de ces procédés littéraires. Ainsi, X. Léon-Dufour: «Aujourd'hui sévit une fièvre chiasmatique qui trahit son artifice, du fait que les personnes atteintes de cette maladie ne débouchent aucunement sur des résultats identiques (*RSR* 73 [1985] 267). Sur la valeur heuristique et herméneutique de ces analyses, voir cependant la note d'A. Di Marco, «Retorica ed ermeneutica, uno schema retorico: chiasmo e circolarità,» *RivB* 41 (1993) 293-303. Mais ce type de procédé de composition n'est pas exclusif à l'Antiquité ou aux cultures orales, et on pourrait en tirer quantité d'exemples de la littérature moderne et contemporaine, qu'il s'agisse de théâtre, de poésie ou de roman. Ainsi, *Of Mice and Men*, le chef d'œuvre universellement connu de John Steinbeck, offre un exemple remarquable de ce type de structure. En effet, si l'on attribue une lettre à chaque décor où se déroule l'action, on peut représenter ainsi la structure du roman: A B B C C A. M.-C. Lemardeley-Cunci écrit à ce propos: «Une telle symétrie et une telle simplicité contribuent à donner à ce récit une légèreté d'ossature qui fait ressortir le caractère nécessaire de chaque personnage, de chaque épisode, de chaque détail. Tous participent à une architecture épurée marquée par un principe d'économie.» (*Des souris et des hommes de John Steinbeck* [Folio thèque, 10; Paris: Gallimard, 1992], 37). Mais ce n'est pas qu'au niveau de cette structure que Steinbeck joue de symétrie. En effet, parallélismes et répétitions y sont nombreux et créent dans l'ensemble du roman des échos et tissent des liens «qui invitent à rapprocher des passages apparemment distincts.» (M.-C. Lemardeley-Cunci, 27)

Ou encore en 65,21-22 (structure de type A B C C B A). Ici encore l'effet de symétrie est assuré par la répétition de la structure logique et des principaux termes, alors que la progression repose sur l'inversion du rapport sujet / objet et sur la structure concentrique:

A ⲙⲁⲣⲉⲛ̄ⲥⲓⲟⲙⲉ
B ⲱⲃⲱⲕ ⲉⲥⲟⲩⲛ
C ⲱⲁⲡⲥⲟⲟⲩⲧ
C ⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲙⲁⲣⲉⲛ̄ⲥⲟⲟⲩⲧ
B ⲱⲃⲱⲕ ⲉⲥⲟⲩⲛ̄
A ⲱⲁⲧⲥⲓⲙⲉ

Notons que ces constructions basées sur la récurrence de termes identiques allient admirablement la forme au contenu, puisqu'au plan formel, le deuxième versant offre du premier une image inversée, une image miroir, alors que l'idée exprimée dans la deuxième partie constitue aussi une inversion de la première partie.

Ces structures prennent parfois des dimensions plus importantes, ainsi en 67,12-18, où on observe un triple parallélisme produit par la répétition des termes B et C alors que la progression repose sur l'alternance de A:

A ⲟⲩⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲁⲡⲟ ⲛ̄ⲕⲉⲥⲟⲛ ⲱⲟⲟⲛ
B ⲙⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲥⲓⲕⲱⲛ ⲛ̄ⲁⲡⲟ ⲛ̄ⲕⲉⲥⲟⲛ
C ⲱⲱⲉ ⲁⲗⲏⲑⲱⲥ ⲁⲧⲣⲟⲩⲁⲡⲟⲟⲩ ⲛ̄ⲕⲉⲥⲟⲛ ⲥⲓⲧⲛ̄ⲧⲥⲓⲕⲱⲛ
A ⲁⲱ ⲧⲉ ⲧⲁⲛⲁⲥⲧⲁⲥⲓⲥ
B ⲁⲩⲱ ⲑⲓⲕⲱⲛ
C ⲥⲓⲧⲛ̄ⲑⲓⲕⲱⲛ ⲱⲱⲉ ⲉⲧⲣⲉⲥⲧⲱⲟⲩⲛ
A ⲡⲛⲩⲙⲫⲱⲛ
B ⲙⲛ̄ⲑⲓⲕⲱⲛ
C ⲥⲓⲧⲛ̄ ⲑⲓⲕⲱⲛ ⲱⲱⲉ ⲉⲧⲣⲟⲩⲉⲓ ⲉⲥⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲧⲁⲗⲏⲑⲉⲓⲁ

Elles peuvent prendre un tour plus complexe, ainsi cette structure symétrique, elle même formée de deux chiasmes (A B C C B A C D D C) en 68,17-22. Dans ce cas, la progression est assurée au niveau de la structure globale par l'alternance de A, et par le changement de relation entre les éléments logiques. Au niveau de chaque chiasme, la progression repose sur l'alternance dans la direction du mouvement marquée par les adverbes:

A ⲥⲁⲧⲉⲥⲏ ⲙ̄ⲡⲭ̄ⲥ̄
B ⲁⲥⲟⲉⲓⲛⲉ ⲉⲓ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲧⲱⲛ
C ⲟⲩⲕⲉⲧⲓ ⲙ̄ⲡⲟⲩⲱⲃⲱⲕ ⲉⲥⲟⲩⲛ
C ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲩⲃⲱⲕ ⲉⲧⲱⲛ
B' ⲟⲩⲕⲉⲧⲓ ⲙ̄ⲡⲟⲩⲱⲓ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ

A' ⲁϥⲉⲓ ⲁⲉ ⲛ̄ⲑⲓ ⲡⲉⲭ̄ⲥ̄
C ⲛⲉⲛⲧⲁϩⲃⲱⲕ ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ
D ⲁϥⲛ̄ⲧⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ
D ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛⲉⲛⲧⲁϩⲃⲱⲕ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ
C ⲁϥⲛ̄ⲧⲟⲩ ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ

À la première lecture, le texte de 84,14-20 peut paraître particulièrement redondant, mais il présente une très belle structure symétrique, qui peut être vue comme chiastique (A B B A) ou alternante (A B A B) selon que l'on considère le sujet de l'énoncé ou son prédicat comme structurant. L'opposition entre les «apparences de la création» et les «apparences de la vérité» y est campée avec une grande économie de moyens. Ici encore, la forme rejoint parfaitement l'idée. Tout comme les apparences de la vérité sont l'inverse de celles de la création, le texte qui les oppose se présente en deux parties dont la seconde offre une image inversée de la première:

A ⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩ ⲟⲩⲛⲧⲁⲛ ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲩ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲧⲟⲩⲟⲛⲉϩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲡⲥⲱⲛⲧ ⲯⲁⲛⲁⲟⲟⲥ
ⲁⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲟⲟⲩ ⲛⲉ ⲛⲁⲱⲣⲉ ⲉⲧⲧⲁⲉⲓⲏⲩ
B ⲛⲉⲑⲏⲡ ⲁⲉ ⲛⲉ ⲛ̄ⲑⲱⲃ ⲉⲧⲯⲏⲥ
B ⲧⲁⲉⲓ ⲧⲉ ⲑⲉ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲧⲟⲩⲟⲛϩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲗⲏⲑⲉⲓⲁ ϩⲛ̄ⲑⲱⲃ ⲛⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ
ⲥⲉⲯⲏⲥ
A ⲛⲉⲑⲏⲡ ⲁⲉ ⲛ̄ⲁⲱⲣⲉ ⲛⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲥⲉⲧⲁⲉⲓⲏⲩ

On pourrait tout aussi bien présenter cet ensemble sous la forme A B A B en envisageant la structure du point de vue de l'alternance du sujet:

A ⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩ ⲟⲩⲛⲧⲁⲛ ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲩ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲧⲟⲩⲟⲛϩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲡⲥⲱⲛⲧ ⲯⲁⲛⲁⲟⲟⲥ
ⲁⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲟⲟⲩ ⲛⲉ ⲛⲁⲱⲣⲉ ⲉⲧⲧⲁⲉⲓⲏⲩ
B ⲛⲉⲑⲏⲡ ⲁⲉ ⲛⲉ ⲛ̄ⲑⲱⲃ ⲉⲧⲯⲏⲥ
A ⲧⲁⲉⲓ ⲧⲉ ⲑⲉ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲧⲟⲩⲟⲛϩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲗⲏⲑⲉⲓⲁ ϩⲛ̄ⲑⲱⲃ ⲛⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ
ⲥⲉⲯⲏⲥ
B ⲛⲉⲑⲏⲡ ⲁⲉ ⲛ̄ⲁⲱⲣⲉ ⲛⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲥⲉⲧⲁⲉⲓⲏⲩ

On pourrait multiplier les exemples de telles constructions dans l'EvPhil; ceux-ci suffiront à illustrer leur importance dans ce texte. Il faudrait s'attarder à analyser la fonction de ces figures, leur effet sur le lecteur par l'accentuation de certains contrastes, ou encore par la mise en évidence de certains termes placés au centre de ces constructions. Il s'agit là de questions qui ont leur importance, mais qui ne sont pas essentielles à mon propos. Je n'ai introduit ces exemples que pour montrer que ce texte fait une utilisation abondante de procédés littéraires créant un effet de symétrie par la répétition de termes et de structures logiques. Ce

constat n'a rien d'original en soi, mais il est préalable à l'examen de structures symétriques plus vastes, les inclusions, qui reposent sur des procédés analogues.

2. Les inclusions

Qu'il s'agisse de figures de répétition au sens strict ou de constructions parallèles, concentriques ou de chiasmes, ces procédés littéraires sont mis en œuvre tout au long du texte. Leur repérage est relativement aisé, pour peu qu'on les cherche, du moins lorsqu'ils ne jouent que sur une phrase ou sur un petit nombre de phrases.

Là ne s'arrête pas le recours aux procédés répétitifs dans l'EvPhil. On y observe en effet des récurrences lexicales et thématiques séparées par des portions de texte beaucoup plus étendues. Comme celles qu'on vient d'observer au niveau d'unités textuelles plus petites, il faut admettre que ces répétitions ont une fonction littéraire, procèdent de la composition même de l'œuvre et ne sont pas le simple résultat d'un travail de compilation mal édité ou le fruit du hasard. Certaines d'entre elles forment des inclusions, un procédé littéraire bien connu dans la littérature classique comme dans la littérature biblique, qui consiste à délimiter les parties d'une œuvre ou une œuvre entière en répétant à la fin des éléments du début.[9] On peut représenter une inclusion par la formule / A B A'/ où A et A' représentent les éléments récurrents et B une portion de texte d'une étendue indéterminée située entre les

---

[9] Le terme «inclusion» désigne dans la stylistique sémitique un procédé de composition circulaire connu sous le nom de «ring composition» dans le domaine classique; ce terme semble avoir été utilisé pour la première fois par D. H. Müller, *Die Propheten in ihrer ursprünglichen Form* (Vienne, 1896), voir à ce propos H. van Dyke Parunak, «Oral Typesetting: Some Uses of Biblical Structure,» *Bib* 62 (1981) 158 n. 8. En ramenant l'attention de la fin au début d'un développement, elle procure à celui-ci un cadre qui en fait apparaître l'unité à l'auditeur ou au lecteur, voir C. H. Lohr, «Oral Techniques in the Gospel of Matthew,» *CBQ* 73 (1961) 409. Abondamment étudié dans la littérature biblique, ce procédé, n'est pas inconnu dans le domaine classique. Il est utilisé par exemple, par Platon, voir É. des Places, *Une formule platonicienne de récurrence* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1929) 32, et il est partout présent dans le domaine patristique. En fait, même s'il s'agit d'un procédé dont les racines plongent dans l'oralité, il est largement répandu dans toutes les littératures et dans tous les genres littéraires. La littérature moderne et contemporaine en fournit d'innombrables illustrations, ainsi, le poème *Réversibilité* de Charles Baudelaire (*Les fleurs du mal*):

> Ange plein de gaité, connaissez-vous l'angoisse,
> La honte, les remords, les sanglots, les ennuis,
> Et les vagues terreurs de ces affreuses nuits
> Qui compriment le cœur comme un papier qu'on froisse?
> Ange plein de gaité, connaissez-vous l'angoisse?
>
> Ange plein de bonté ...

Dans un tout autre domaine littéraire, les scènes initiale et finale de *Of Mice and Men*, qui se déroulent sur les bords de la rivière Salinas, offrent également un bel exemple d'inclusion, le cadre naturel de ces deux scènes contrastant fortement avec les lieux clos (baraquements et écurie) où se déroule le reste de l'action.

deux éléments récurrents.[10] Avant de poursuivre, il convient d'établir les critères à partir desquels on pourra déterminer qu'une récurrence donnée n'est pas le fruit du hasard, mais qu'elle constitue bien une inclusion. En fait, une telle identification repose nécessairement sur un processus complexe qui doit prendre en considération plusieurs aspects du texte étudié. En cela, le processus d'identification d'une inclusion est analogue à celui qui mène à l'identification d'un chiasme.[11] Dans un premier temps, une inclusion doit reposer sur la récurrence de mots isolés ou groupes de mots identiques, synonymes ou antonymes, ou encore de structures syntaxiques. Un premier critère permettant de distinguer une inclusion s'applique aux mots récurrents eux-mêmes, c'est leur rareté dans le texte étudié. S'il s'agissait de récurrences fréquentes, leur fréquence même leur enlèverait toute efficacité structurante. Un second critère s'appliquera plutôt à la portion de texte encadrée par cette récurrence, qui devrait présenter une certaine homogénéité de forme ou de contenu lui conférant une relative unité et la distinguant de son contexte immédiat.

Voici les paires d'éléments récurrents qui me paraissent former inclusion dans l'Ev-Phil:

> Un *hébreu* produit des *hébreux* ... (51,29) ... / ... Aux jours où nous étions des *hébreux* ... (52,21-22)
>
> Ceux qui *sèment* en hiver *récoltent* en été. (52,25) ... / ... La vérité est *semée* en tout lieu ... il y en a beaucoup qui la voient *semée*, mais peu nombreux sont ceux qui la voient *récoltée* (55,20-23)
>
> Si quelqu'un *descend dans l'eau* (64,22) ... / ... Voilà pourquoi nous *descendons dans l'eau* (77,9)
>
> Qui détient la *connaissance* de la *vérité* est *libre* (77,15) ... / ... Si vous *connaissez* la *vérité*, la *vérité* vous rendra *libres* (84,13)
>
> Pour le moment, nous disposons des apparences de la création ... Les mystères de la *vérité* sont manifestés en figures et en *images*. (84,14-21) ... / ... Et lorsque [cette personne] quitte le monde, elle a reçu la *vérité* en *images*. (86,11-13)
>
> Ceux qui sèment en hiver récoltent en été. L'hiver, c'est le *monde*, l'été, c'est l'autre *éon* (52,25-26) ... / ... Le *monde* est devenu l'*éon*, car l'*éon* est pour elle plénitude (86,13-14)

---

[10] D'autres forment de vastes ensembles concentriques de type A B C C B A, ou parallèles de type A B C A B C qui structurent des unités couvrant plusieurs pages.

[11] Voir D. J. Clark, «Criteria for Identifying Chiasm,» *LB* 35 (1975) 63-72, R. Meynet, «Comment établir un chiasme,» *NRT* 100 (1978) 233-249 et, plus récemment, I. H. Thomson, *Chiasmus in the Pauline Letters*, JSNTSup 111 (1995) 22-33.

Ces récurrences découpent l'ensemble du texte en cinq blocs (51,29-52,24; 52,25-55,23; 64,22-77,15; 77,15-84,13; 84,20-86,19) se faisant suite sans solution de continuité, sauf entre 55,20 et 64,22, et une dernière inclusion (52,25-86,14) enclôt tout le texte à l'exception de la première partie. Il y a dans cette séquence même un indice que ces récurrences ne sont pas l'effet du hasard et remplissent une fonction de délimitation des parties du texte. Voyons maintenant chacune de ces récurrences.

2.1 La première inclusion (51,29-52,21)

> Un hébreu produit des hébreux ... (51,29) ... / ... Aux jours où nous étions des hébreux ... (52,21-22)

Le terme «hébreu» revient cinq fois dans l'EvPhil, les deux autres occurences de ce terme se trouvant en 55,29 et 62,6. Sans y être très fréquent, le terme n'est donc pas absent du reste de l'écrit.

Sa récurrence ici encadre une portion du texte qui présente une unité littéraire certaine. En effet, elle se présente comme une séquence de brefs développements, tous antithétiques, ajointés les uns aux autres par des associations d'idées exprimées par la technique des mots crochets. On y glisse d'une catégorie sociale à l'autre (hébreu et prosélyte à esclave et fils) à propos d'héritage, puis du thème de l'héritage à celui de la mort et de la vie, puis de là à l'opposition croyant / gentil et, finalement à l'opposition hébreu / chrétien. Cette séquence de sentences, même si le sens de chacune d'entre elles prise individuellement demeure voilé et échappe au lecteur, produit une forte impression de cohérence à la fois littéraire et thématique.

Bien que par le style, on puisse rattacher la phrase de 52,25-28 à cet ensemble, celle-ci semble plutôt introduire un nouveau développement dont le style et le contenu tranchent nettement sur l'ensemble contenu entre 51,29 et 52,24.

2.2 La deuxième inclusion (52,25-55,23)

> Ceux qui sèment en hiver récoltent en été. L'hiver, c'est le monde, l'été, c'est l'autre éon. Semons dans le monde afin de récolter en été (52,25-29) ... / ... La véritée est semée en tout lieu ... il y en a beaucoup qui la voient semée, mais peu nombreux sont ceux qui la voient récoltée ... (55,20-23)

Ici, la récurrence porte sur le couple semer/récolter (ⲥⲓⲧⲉ/ⲱⲥϩ). Notons d'abord que ce sont là les trois seules occurrences des verbes «semer» et «récolter» dans l'EvPhil. Ces mots ne reviennent nulle part ailleurs dans l'écrit, ni séparément, ni ensemble.

Si on examine maintenant la portion de texte ainsi encadrée, on constate qu'elle contient la section de l'EvPhil portant sur le rapport des noms à la vérité (53,21-55,6), que précède un développement sur le rôle salvifique du Christ (52,35-53,23) et que suit un développement sur le pain de vie apporté dans le monde par le Christ (55,6-24). La portion de texte ainsi délimitée présente donc une unité thématique certaine en même temps qu'elle se distingue clairement de son contexte immédiat.

Un fois cette unité délimitée, on peut aisément observer que d'autres récurrences interviennent à l'intérieur de cet ensemble et dessinent une structure concentrique:

z *Semons* «dans le monde» pour *récolter* dans l'éon (52,25-35)
A *Le Christ est venu* pour sauver bons et méchants «dans le monde» (52,35-53,23)
B L'*erreur* contenue dans *les noms* transmis à «ceux de ce monde» (53,23-54,5)
C *Un seul nom* n'est pas proclamé «dans le monde» (54,5-10)
C' *Ce nom*, ceux qui le possèdent le comprennent mais ne le prononcent pas (54,10-13)
B' La vérité engendre *des noms* «dans le monde» à cause de nous, mais les archontes veulent tromper l'humanité au moyen des noms (54,13-55,5)
A' *Avant que le Christ ne vînt* apporter le pain du ciel (i.e. la vérité) «dans le monde». (// Jn 6) (55,5-14)
z' Beaucoup voient la vérité *semée*, peu la voient *récoltée* (55,14-23)

En première analyse, on peut donc suggérer que le développement encadré par la récurrence des termes semer / récolter épouse une structure concentrique A B C C' B' A' dont les membres **z z'** constituent les bornes reliées l'une à l'autre par la récurrence du couple semer / récolter. Les membres A A' font tous deux référence à la venue du Christ, les membres B B', au rapport qu'entretiennent les noms avec la vérité, et les membres C C' portent sur le seul Nom qui n'est pas proclamé dans le monde et que certains possèdent. Dans cette structure concentrique, dont le second volet offre du premier une image inversée, le centre constitue véritablement un point tournant. En effet, la séquence A B C pose successivement A) le mélange qui prévaut dans le monde parmi ceux que le Christ a sauvés; B) l'erreur contenue dans les noms transmis à ceux qui sont dans le monde; C) l'existence d'un Nom supérieur à tous les autres noms, qui n'est pas proclamé dans le monde. Ce premier versant de la structure porte donc sur l'erreur et l'ignorance qui existent dans le monde et culmine avec l'affirmation de l'existence d'un nom supérieur à tous les autres, mais qui n'est pas proclamé dans ce monde de l'erreur et du mélange. À partir de là, tout bascule, et la seconde séquence C' B' A' affirme C') que certains possèdent ce nom et le comprennent, mais ne le prononcent pas (il est donc secret); B') que ces noms trompeurs sont engendrés par la Vérité car c'est le seul

moyen de l'atteindre; A) que le Christ est venu apporter cette vérité dans le monde. Alors que le premier versant de cette structure insiste sur la présence de l'erreur dans le monde, le second insiste sur la présence d'une vérité cachée, séminale, mais que peu perçoivent dans sa plénitude, accessible au petit nombre seulement. La structure superficielle dessinée par les récurrences lexicales correspond donc à une réelle unité thématique que renforce encore la répétition de la formule «dans le monde» ou l'équivalent dans chacun des développements constituant cet ensemble, et supporte le mouvement même de la pensée.

La structure de l'ensemble ayant été élucidée, on voit mieux la fonction des deux références à la venue du Christ et le lien qui les réunit au reste du développement. La première référence à la venue du Christ fait de celle-ci le point de départ du mélange et de l'erreur qui existent parmi les chrétiens, puisque le Christ est venu sauver les bons et les méchants dans le monde, alors que la seconde insiste sur la fonction discriminante de la venue du Christ qui, procurant à l'humanité le pain du ciel, c'est-à-dire la vérité (cf. Jn 8), la fait passer de la nourriture animale à la nourriture humaine. Ce passage sous-entend qu'il appartient maintenant à chaque être humain de renoncer à la nourriture des animaux pour adopter la nourriture qui lui est propre, la vérité.

2.3 La troisième inclusion (64,22-77,9)

Si quelqu'un descend dans l'eau (64,22) ... / ... Voilà pourquoi nous descendons dans l'eau (77,9)

Cette troisième inclusion repose sur la répétition de la formule «descendre dans l'eau» (ⲃⲱⲕ ⲉⲡⲓⲧⲛ̄ ⲉⲙⲙⲟⲩ / ⲃⲱⲕ ⲉⲡⲉⲥⲏⲧ ⲉⲙⲙⲟⲩ), qui fait évidemment référence au baptême. Outre les trois occurrences de l'expression considérées ici (64,23; 77,9), on la rencontre encore en 72,30; 74,29 et 75,23. Il s'agit donc d'une formule relativement fréquente dans le texte. On observe cependant qu'elle n'intervient qu'à l'intérieur de la section comprise entre 64,22 et 77,9, ce qui est déjà un indice d'une certaine unité thématique de la portion de texte encadrée par cette récurrence, et que l'inclusion ainsi formée a peut-être précisément pour fonction non seulement de délimiter cette portion du texte, mais d'en annoncer le thème.

En effet, hormis quelques digressions, la portion de texte délimitée par les deux récurrences extrêmes de l'expression est entièrement consacrée à des considérations sacramentelles, baptême, onction, eucharistie, et surtout au thème de la chambre nuptiale. En fait, toute cette portion du texte est consacrée au sens caché de ces sacrements, qui est exprimé à l'aide de la métaphore de la chambre nuptiale. Ici encore, la portion de texte délimitée par cette récurrence présente donc une forte unité thématique.

Au centre géométrique de cette section, à distance quasi égale des deux phrases formant inclusion, on peut lire la phrase «Vraiment, il faut dire ce qui est de l'ordre du mystère!» (71,4) Cette phrase, qui semble sans lien avec son contexte immédiat, me paraît être la clé de voûte de cette section, toute entière consacrée au sens caché des sacrements (*τὸ μυστήριον*), comme l'annonce déjà le texte de 64,30-33. On verra plus tard quel sens précis il faut donner à cette phrase dans le contexte global de l'EvPhil. Une fois repérés ses limites extérieures et son centre, il est aisé d'observer que cette section, comme celle qui est délimitée par la première inclusion, épouse une structure symétrique, non pas concentrique de type A B C / C' B' A', mais parallèle, de type A B C / D / A B C. En effet, la récurrence de thèmes ou d'expressions caractéristiques à l'intérieur de cette section ne se produit pas au hasard, mais selon une séquence identique de part et d'autre de ce centre qui est ainsi mis en évidence. On y passe successivement, mais sans qu'on puisse délimiter très clairement chaque développement, de la chambre nuptiale à la nécessité d'acquérir la résurrection en ce monde, puis au chrême, à l'opposition entrer / sortir, aux sacrements, et, enfin, à la nécessité de revêtir la lumière parfaite pour n'être ni saisi ni vu par les puissances. Certes, les thèmes que je viens d'énumérer ne sont pas les seuls à intervenir dans cette section, mais ils forment deux séquences rigoureusement parallèles, donnant à toute cette section la forme d'un diptyque dont les deux volets encadrent la phrase «Vraiment, il faut dire ce qui est de l'ordre du mystère!»:

(z) Si quelqu'un descend dans l'eau et ne reçoit rien (64,22-30)
A Le mariage est un grand mystère... la chambre nuptiale «icônique» (64,30-66,4)
B Acquérir la résurrection en ce monde... (66,4-67,18)
C Acquérir le Nom par le chrême (67,19-68,18)
D Sortir / entrer; entrer / sortir; rôle du Christ (68,18-37)
E Enseignement sur le baptême et l'onction: le baptême est double, eau et chrême (69,1-70,4)
F Revêtir la lumière parfaite dans le mystère de l'union pour n'être ni vu ni pris (70,5-71,3)

G «Vraiment, il faut dire ce qui est de l'ordre du mystère!»

A' (z) La «grande» chambre nuptiale... descendre dans l'eau (71,4-73,1)
B' Acquérir la résurrection en ce monde (73,1-74,12)
C' Supériorité du chrême sur le baptême; acquisition du Nom (74,13-25)
D' Entrer et sortir (74,25-75,14)
E' Enseignement sur l'eucharistie et le baptême: La coupe de prière ... lorsque nous en buvons, nous recevons l'Homme parfait; l'eau vive, lorsque nous y descendons, nous revêtons l'Homme vivant. Une race désignée par un Nom dans le monde (75,14-76,22)
F' Pour n'être ni saisi ni vu, revêtir la lumière parfaite (76,22-77,9)

(z) Voilà pourquoi nous descendons dans l'eau (77,10-14)

Ainsi donc, tout comme la première inclusion, celle-ci délimite une section parfaitement cohérente au plan littéraire, qui présente une réelle unité de forme et de contenu.

2.4 La quatrième inclusion

> Qui détient la connaissance de la vérité est libre (77,15) ... / ... Si vous connaissez la vérité, la vérité vous rendra libres (84,13)

Le thème de la connaissance de la vérité est évidemment fréquent dans les textes chrétiens de cette époque, qu'ils soient orthodoxes ou hétérodoxes. Dans l'EvPhil toutefois, les expressions «connaissance de la vérité» (ⲧⲅⲛⲱⲥⲓⲥ ⲛ̄ⲧⲙⲉ ou ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲗⲏⲑⲉⲓⲁ) ou «connaître la vérité» n'interviennent qu'en 77,16 (ⲧⲅⲛⲱⲥⲓⲥ ⲛ̄ⲧⲙⲉ) et 23 (ⲧⲅⲛⲱⲥⲓⲥ ⲛ̄ ⲧⲁⲗⲏⲑⲉⲓⲁ) et en 84,9 et 13 (ⲥⲟⲩⲱⲛⲧⲁⲗⲏⲑⲉⲓⲁ), à chaque fois associées au thème de la liberté. En 84,13, où le motif est explicitement introduit comme une citation scripturaire par la formule «Le Verbe a dit» (ⲡⲉϫⲁⲩ ⲛ̄ⲑⲓ ⲡⲗⲟⲅⲟⲥ), la référence à Jn 8,32 est évidente.

Au plan du contenu, la portion de texte comprise entre ces deux récurrences passe d'une exhortation à connaître la vérité (77,15-78,11) à une admonition à ne pas aimer le monde (78,12-79,8), puis à l'énumération des vertus qui font le bienheureux (79,18-80,4), où la connaissance s'ajoute à la foi, à l'amour et à l'espérance (79,18-80,4), puis à la difficulté de réussir (80,4-23), à une comparaison du disciple à un maître de maison avisé (80,23-81,14), aux thèmes du Fils de l'homme et de la chambre nuptiale (81,14-82,30) et à l'éradication du mal, identifié à l'ignorance (82,30-84,7). L'ensemble se clôt par un retour au thème initial: la connaissance de la vérité apporte la liberté et la plénitude (84,7-13).

Malgré que cette portion du texte puisse faire appel à des matériaux divers, son orientation parénétique, qui tranche nettement sur le reste de l'écrit, lui confère une grande cohérence qui a été maintes fois observée.[12]

2.5 La cinquième inclusion

> Pour le moment, nous disposons des apparences de la création ... Les mystères de la vérité sont manifestés en figures et en images (84,14-21) / [Cette personne] a déjà reçu la vérité dans les images (86,12-13)

---

12 Voir par exemple E. H. Pagels, «The "Mystery of Marriage" in the *Gospel of Philip* Revisited,» *The Future of Early Christianity. Essays in Honor of Helmut Koester*, éd. B. A. Pearson (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991) 449. Pagels a bien perçu cette inclusion: «Having finished discussing how to overcome the "root of evil" within oneself, the author returns to the opening theme, quoting John 8:32,» 453.

Cette nouvelle inclusion est formée par la récurrence du thème de la connaissance de la vérité par le truchement des images. La notion d'image revient fréquemment dans le traité. On pourrait même dire que la connaissance de la vérité par les images constitue une de ses idées maîtresses. Hormis ces deux passages, cette idée n'apparaît toutefois explicitement qu'en 67,11. Que ce thème vienne précisément encadrer la dernière partie du traité n'est sans doute pas l'effet du hasard. L'écrit tout entier ne s'efforce-t-il pas de dévoiler à travers de multiples images une vérité cachée dont l'existence a été posée dans la deuxième partie (52,25-55,23)?

2.6 La sixième inclusion

> Ceux qui sèment en hiver récoltent en été. L'hiver, c'est le monde, l'été, c'est l'autre éon (52,25-26) ... / ... Le monde est devenu l'éon, car l'éon est pour cette personne plénitude (86,13-14)

La dernière inclusion est formée de la reprise dans l'avant-dernière phrase de l'écrit de l'opposition entre ce monde-ci et l'autre éon. Le terme «monde» est très fréquent dans le traité où il apparaît 46 fois. On n'y rencontre que six fois le terme «éon». Ils ne sont toutefois associés dans le même contexte que dans ces deux cas, la première fois pour poser leur différence, la seconde pour l'abolir. En effet, à la fin de l'écrit, le monde est devenu l'éon pour qui a reçu les images de la vérité. Tout le mouvement du texte se trouve contenu dans cette inclusion.[13] Cette abolition à la fin du texte de la différence entre le monde et l'éon qui avait été posée au début est d'autant plus significative que la fréquence de l'expression «dans le monde» ou d'expressions analogues dans le reste du traité indique toute l'importance de cette distinction. Cette inclusion, en renvoyant le lecteur à l'opposition initiale «ce monde» / «l'autre éon» qu'elle abolit , met un terme à une lecture qui fait dès lors figure de parcours initiatique, et dont le motif de la déchirure du voile du Temple offre dans la dernière partie, nous le verrons, un condensé métaphorique.

2.7 L'ensemble des inclusions

L'ensemble de ces inclusions contribue à donner à l'EvPhil son ossature. Comme chez Philon d'Alexandrie dont les développements paraissent parfois chaotiques et qui emploie abondamment ce procédé, elles ont ceci de particulier de procurer au lecteur, au début et

---

13 J. É. Ménard avait déjà observé, dans son commentaire de 52,25-26 (sent. 7), le lien qui unit ce passage à la fin du texte, voir *L'Évangile selon Philippe* (Strasbourg, 1967) 126. Les remarques de Ménard et de Pagels (voir la note précédente) démontrent bien l'efficacité de ces inclusions, même auprès d'un lecteur qui ne les cherche pas.

à la fin d'un développement, deux points fixes entre lesquels différents matériaux prennent le relais. Et ce n'est qu'à la fin qu'on prend conscience du rapport qui réunissait l'ensemble.[14]

Excepté pour la portion comprise entre 55,24 et 64,22, très diversifiée par le contenu et par le style, et qui représente le quart du texte, l'ensemble de l'écrit est donc découpé en six sections, toutes délimitées par des inclusions sauf la troisième (55,24-64,22):

Partie 1: 51,29-52,25: brève série d'antithèses;
Partie 2: 52,25-55,23: la vérité cachée dans le monde;
Partie 3: 55,24-64,22: réfutations, aphorismes, étymologies et paraboles;
Partie 4: 64,22-77,15: les sacrements et le mystère de la chambre nuptiale;
Partie 5: 77,15-84,13: parénèse;
Partie 6: 84,13-86,17: résumé, métaphore du voile et conclusion eschatologique.

La présence de ces inclusions dans l'EvPhil n'est pas hypothétique. Elle est un fait littéraire indiscutable. Elle invalide à mon avis définitivement l'opinion maintes fois exprimée selon laquelle il n'y a pas de divisions claires à l'intérieur de ce texte.[15]

Il reste à voir dans quelle mesure ces inclusions et les divisions qu'elles introduisent dans le texte sont indicatrices d'une structure cohérente qui permette de comprendre le lien existant entre chacune de ces parties, si elles sont porteuses d'une signification pour l'ensemble du texte. C'est ce que je vais maintenant chercher à vérifier à partir de la rhétorique littéraire gréco-romaine.

3. La *dispositio* de l'écrit

En passant de l'inventaire des figures de répétition aux inclusions qui délimitent les parties du texte, nous sommes passés du domaine de l'*elocutio* à celui de la *dispositio*, qui constituent avec l'*inventio* et l'*actio*, les quatre parties de la rhétorique gréco-romaine. La *dispositio* est cette partie de la rhétorique qui consiste à aménager les matériaux d'un discours ou d'un texte en un certain nombre de parties ayant leur fonction propre à l'intérieur d'un plan d'ensemble normalement dicté par la situation de communication. Le modèle de *disposi-*

---

14 Voir à ce propos, J. Cazeaux, «Philon d'Alexandrie, exégète,» (ANRW 21.1; Berlin et New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1984) 172-177, et *La trame et la chaîne, ou, Les structures littéraires et l'exégèse dans cinq traités de Philon d'Alexandrie* (ALGHJ, 15 et 20; Leiden: Brill, 1983 et 1989).

15 Cette opinion a été clairement exprimée entre autres par Gerald Leo Borchert (*An Analysis of the Literary Arrangement and Theological Views in the Coptic Gnostic Gospel of Philip* [Dissertation, Princeton Theological Seminary, 1967] 4), dont la thèse portait précisément sur l'arrangement littéraire de l'écrit.

tio le plus simple est donné par Aristote, pour qui un discours ou un texte ne comporte que deux parties nécessaires, la thèse et la preuve, auxquelles peuvent s'ajouter un exorde, une narration et une péroraison.[16] Quoi qu'il en soit du nombre de ces parties, leur ordonnancement, l'importance donnée à chacune, les liens qui les unissent entre elles ont toujours une fonction argumentative. L'économie du discours ou de l'écrit est le chemin par lequel l'auteur ou l'orateur entend faire progresser son destinataire, lecteur ou auditeur pour l'amener à adopter telle ligne de conduite ou telle opinion.[17]

On peut se demander si les six parties que nous avons délimitées dans l'EvPhil correspondent de quelque façon à un modèle rhétorique standard. Posons d'emblée que la première et la sixième parties, relativement brèves, forment l'exorde et la péroraison de l'écrit. L'exorde ayant pour fonction de bien disposer l'auditoire ou le destinataire d'un écrit à l'égard de son contenu ou de son auteur et d'établir la communication, on verra en quoi la matière de cet exorde est adaptée au contenu ou à la fonction de l'écrit. Quant à la sixième partie, si elle remplit la fonction de la péroraison, elle doit de quelque façon résumer les faits et les preuves, émouvoir le destinataire, l'exhorter à adopter une conduite ou à former une opinion spécifique. Elle doit se présenter comme ce après quoi il n'y a plus rien à dire.

3.1 La *narratio* (52,35-55,19)

La deuxième partie du texte correspond bien à la *narratio*. Elle plante d'abord le décor, qui comporte deux niveaux; l'action, en effet, se déroule dans ce monde, mais débouche dans l'éon. Elle introduit les acteurs: «nous» (54,13-15), ceux qui on été rachetés, qui sont divisés aussitôt en deux catégories antagonistes, les bons et les méchants, ceux de la droite et ceux de la gauche, néanmoins frères les uns des autres (52,35-53,20), ceux qui sont dans le monde (53,23-24) et ceux qui sont supérieurs au monde (53,21-23), l'humanité, qui est apparentée à ce qui est véritablement bon (54,19-21), le Christ qui a racheté bons et méchants (52,35-53,14) et qui a apporté le pain du ciel (i.e. la vérité) dans le monde (56,6-14), et qui est aussi le Fils (54,8-10), les archontes qui, contrairement au Christ, veulent tromper l'humanité (54,18-24), l'Esprit Saint qui, secrètement, agit à travers les archontes à leur insu (55,15-20) et finalement, le Père (54,5-10).

---

16 *Rhétorique*, 1414b.

17 À propos de l'utilité de la disposition, voir Olivier Reboul, *Introduction à la rhétorique* (collection Premier cycle; Paris: PUF, 1991) 71.

La scène étant dressée et les acteurs en place, la vérité est posée comme objet de quête auquel tous les acteurs sont reliés: le Christ, qui apporte cette vérité à l'humanité sous la forme du «pain du ciel», un «nous» qui cherche à la connaître (54,13-18), des archontes qui veulent en éloigner l'humanité, mais qui sont manipulés à leur insu par l'Esprit Saint.

C'est donc bien un exposé des faits que propose au lecteur cette partie de l'écrit, un exposé des faits qui est tout entier centré sur la présence d'une vérité cachée dans le monde et sur la difficulté de la connaître.

3.2 La *propositio* (55,20-23)

Nous venons de le voir, la première partie nécessaire d'un discours, c'est, d'après Aristote, la thèse (*πρόθεσις*, *propositio*). Pour Quintilien, la proposition est «le commencement de toute preuve» et elle a pour fonction d'éclairer la question principale.[18] Or il me semble que la question principale qui découle de la narration et qui éclaire toutes les partie de l'EvPhil est bien celle-là (55,20-23):

> La vérité est semée en tous lieux depuis le commencement, et il y en a beaucoup qui la voient semée, mais peu nombreux sont ceux qui la voient récoltée.

Au plan formel, cette *propositio* est brève, tient en peu de mots et elle forme un tout complet. Ce sont là les caractéristiques de la *propositio* selon Cicéron.[19]

Cette *propositio* établit les deux types de rapport qu'un individu peut entretenir avec cette vérité: beaucoup la perçoivent à l'état de germe, mais un petit nombre la connaît en plénitude (55,20-23). On verra que toute la suite du texte, en particulier la fonction des matériaux accumulés dans chacune des parties, se comprend mieux à la lumière de cette proposition. En effet, l'*exhortatio* sera une exhortation à connaître la vérité, la *peroratio* sera centrée sur le thème de la déchirure du voile et sur le fait que seuls certains, qui appartiennent à la classe sacerdotale, seront capables de pénétrer à l'intérieur du voile, et la *probatio* accumule une grande quantité de matériaux qui ont tous pour fonction de démontrer cette thèse, c'est-à-dire à la fois l'existence d'une vérité cachée dans le monde, et le fait que seul le petit nombre peut y accéder.

---

[18] *Institution oratoire*, 4.1.

[19] «*breuitatem, absolutionem, paucitatem*», *De l'invention*,1.22.32

Faire de cette phrase la *propositio* implique que les deux membres de l'inclusion qui encadrent la *narratio* n'appartiennent pas à la *narratio* elle-même, qu'ils lui sont extérieurs. Le premier membre de cette inclusion (52,25-35) devra être considéré comme appartenant à l'exorde dont il forme la conclusion, et son second membre forme lui-même la *propositio*.

3.2 L'*exhortatio* (77,15-84,13)

Quant à la cinquième partie, elle s'ouvre et se referme sur le thème de la connaissance de la vérité et propose un certain nombre de modulations de ce thème (ne pas aimer le monde, éradiquer le mal qu'est l'ignorance, etc.), ce qui est parfaitement cohérent avec le contenu de la *narratio*. Elle apparaît comme une invitation à se joindre au plus petit nombre, à ceux qui connaissent la plénitude de la vérité et de ne pas se contenter, comme le plus grand nombre, d'un germe de vérité.

Cette fonction exhortative appartient normalement à la péroraison. Cependant, le développement considérable de cette exhortation, de même que l'emploi de deux inclusions différentes, pour délimiter cette partie parénétique d'une part et la dernière partie du texte d'autre part, incitent à les considérer comme deux parties distinctes, même si les manuels de rhétorique gréco-romaine ne connaissent pas une telle partie dans la *dispositio* d'une œuvre. Peut-être faut-il voir dans cette originalité de la *dispositio* de l'EvPhil une influence paulinienne.[20]

3.3 La *probatio* (55,24-77,15)

Quant aux parties 3 et 4, elle apparaissent toutes deux comme des preuves à l'appui de la thèse proposée dans la narration, à savoir l'existence d'une vérité cachée dans le monde, et le fait que la pleine connaissance de cette vérité est réservée au petit nombre.

La troisième partie présente en effet une série de courts développements, variés par la forme et par le sujet, mais qui ont tous en commun d'inviter le lecteur à atteindre ou à chercher une vérité cachée, qui n'est cependant jamais donnée. Chaque développement propose une nouvelle voie pour approcher cette vérité cachée, mais à chaque fois, s'arrête au seuil du mystère. Ainsi, la première réfutation (55,24-56,3) s'attaque à l'opinion selon laquelle Marie aurait conçu de l'Esprit Saint, mais ne dit pas de qui elle a conçu. De même, la première étymologie oppose à Christ, nom au sens apparent, Jésus, nom au sens caché, mais sans donner le sens caché de ce nom. On pourrait multiplier les exemples. En fait, chaque réfutation, éty-

---

20 C'est le problème des longues sections exhortatives de Rm 12-15 et de Ga 5-6; voir à ce propos les remarques de J.-N. Aletti, «La *dispositio* rhétorique dans les épîtres pauliniennes,» *NTS* 38 (1992) 400-401.

mologie, parabole ou aphorisme apparaît à la fois comme un reflet de cette vérité cachée, qu'ils voilent autant qu'ils ne la révèlent, et une invitation à la chercher. Les liens qui unissent chacun de ces développements l'un à l'autre ne sont pas de l'ordre du contenu, mais de l'ordre de leur fonction dans l'économie générale du traité et de leur rapport à la *propositio* d'une part et à l'*exhortatio* d'autre part. La cohérence de l'ensemble provient de ce que tous ces développements ont une fonction de confirmation par rapport à l'un des deux aspects de la *probatio*, à savoir qu'il existe une vérité semée dans le monde depuis le commencement, et que seul un petit nombre en atteint une connaissance pleine et entière, alors que le plus grand nombre n'en connaît que le germe.

Quant à la quatrième partie, qui est toute entière consacrée aux sacrements et au mystère de la chambre nuptiale, et qui est délimitée par une inclusion, elle se présente comme une unité formant un tout beaucoup plus homogène. Dans le cadre de l'économie générale du traité telle qu'elle commence à se dessiner, on peut penser qu'elle a pour fonction d'apporter la confirmation par excellence de l'existence d'une vérité cachée dans le monde. Les sacrements que sont le baptême, l'onction et l'eucharistie y apparaissent comme des images ayant un sens caché, lequel est exprimé à travers la métaphore de la chambre nuptiale. Cette métaphore ne sera cependant pas expliquée; le texte s'arrête au seuil du mystère qu'il suggère mais ne dévoile pas, car seule la parole convient au mystère.

Si cette lecture est juste, les parties 3 et 4 que nous avons identifiées plus haut constitueraient donc dans l'économie de l'EvPhil la *probatio*, la preuve, cette partie qui propose des arguments à l'appui de la *narratio*, arguments choisis en fonction de leur valeur persuasive pour le ou les destinataires de l'écrit.

Il me semble donc que l'EvPhil est aménagé selon le plan suivant:[21]

Exorde (51,29-52,35): brève série d'antithèses énigmatiques;
Narration (52,35-55,23): présence d'une vérité cachée dans le monde et difficulté de la connaître;
Proposition (55,20-23): seul un petit nombre peut accéder à cette vérité;

---

[21] Ce plan n'a évidemment rien à voir avec la succession des thèmes ou les matériaux utilisés dans l'écrit, il met l'accent non pas sur le contenu doctrinal, mais sur la structure de l'écrit, telle qu'elle est aménagée à l'aide de procédés littéraires essentiellement formels; voir à propos de ces distinctions, A. G. Wright, «The Riddle of the Sphinx: The Structure of the Book of Qohelet,» *CBQ* 30 (1968) 317-320. Pour une synthèse concernant la *dispositio* du discours classique, voir A. Pitta, *Disposizione e messaggio della lettera ai Galati. Analisi retorico-letteraria* (Rome: Editrice Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1992) 55-61.

Preuve (55,24-77,15): réfutations, aphorismes. étymologies et paraboles (55,24-64,22) et le sens caché des sacrements (64,22-77,15);

Exhortation (77,15-84,13): adhérer à la vérité, ne pas aimer le monde, éradiquer le mal qu'est l'ignorance;

Péroraison (84,13-86,17): résumé, métaphore du voile et conclusion eschatologique.

3.4 L'exorde et la péroraison

Revenons maintenant à l'exorde et à la péroraison pour examiner leur rapport au reste de l'écrit. Pour ce qui est de l'exorde, on sait que sa matière doit être soit le sujet de l'écrit ou encore la personne de l'auteur ou de l'orateur, et il a toujours pour fonction d'introduire le sujet du discours ou de bien disposer l'auditoire ou le lecteur.[22] On peut se demander en quoi la première partie de l'écrit remplit cette fonction puisqu'elle ne semble traiter ni du sujet ni de l'auteur. En fait, elle est peut-être plus proche de la fonction de l'exorde qu'il n'y paraît à première vue. En effet, au plan du contenu, cette partie propose une série de courts développements qui ne paraissent pas avoir de lien entre eux et dont l'interprétation demeure ambiguë. Par exemple, qui sont les hébreux et les prosélytes du début? Quel rapport le développement sur le fils et l'esclave entretient-il avec le précédent? Et avec le développement sur le gentil et le croyant? Quoi qu'il en soit, chacun de ces développements introduit une distinction entre deux catégories d'êtres dont l'une est négative et l'autre positive. Le caractère allusif de cet exorde n'invite-t-il pas à chercher un sens caché demeuré implicite, à identifier ces deux catégories d'êtres? En ce sens, on peut penser que ce prologue a pour fonction de fixer l'*éthos* de l'auteur du texte, le caractère qu'il doit paraître avoir. Or ce que cet exorde donne à penser, c'est que cet auteur sait plus qu'il n'écrit et que derrière ces antithèses se cache un message que seul comprendra le lecteur à qui est destiné ce texte. L'auteur de la *Rhétorique à Herennius* enseigne que le simple début (par opposition à l'exorde indirect), consiste à préparer, dès le commencement, l'esprit de l'auditeur à écouter.[23] Cet exorde qui commence abruptement et fait glisser le lecteur d'une antithèse à l'autre sans que le lien qui les réunit soit explicité n'est-il pas déjà une invitation à rechercher le sens caché du texte?

---

[22] Aristote, *Rhétorique*, 1415b.

[23] *Rhétorique à Herennius*, I.6.

L'apparition du «nous» à la fin de cet exorde réalise bien, du moins en théorie, la fonction phatique de cette partie.[24] En effet, tout exorde a pour fonction première d'établir la communication entre un orateur et son auditoire, ou encore entre un auteur et son lecteur. Le passage abrupt du registre indirect au registre direct au terme de l'exorde, par l'introduction de ce «nous» réunissant en un même sujet l'auteur et son lecteur, arrive à point nommé au terme de cette série d'antithèses. Il laisse entendre que l'auteur et le lecteur appartiennent l'un et l'autre à cette classe d'êtres qui est figurée par le fils opposé à l'esclave, par l'héritier du vivant opposé à l'héritier du mort, par le croyant opposé au gentil. À cet égard, le prologue soulève un certain *pathos*, le sentiment d'appartenir à une catégorie d'êtres se définissant par opposition à une autre catégorie d'êtres, et de former avec l'auteur du texte un seul sujet collectif. Enfin la dernière partie de l'exorde (52,25-35) introduit sans le dire le thème qui sera celui de la *propositio*, car ce n'est qu'après avoir lu celle-ci en 55,20-23 que le lecteur comprendra que c'était de la vérité qu'il était question ici. La fin de l'exorde introduit donc à mots couverts le motif central de l'écrit.

On verra plus loin que la mise en œuvre dans cet exorde de la technique de composition par glissement et que le caractère voilé de sa conclusion ont une fonction pédagogique parfaitement adaptée à la nature de l'écrit.

Pour ce qui concerne la dernière partie de l'écrit, qui est la péroraison, notons simplement que les termes de l'inclusion qui la délimite constituent eux-mêmes une sorte de résumé de tout le texte, puisque la connaissance de la vérité par le truchement des images paraît en être l'argument principal. Quant au développement sur la déchirure du voile du Temple, qui laisse voir ce qui était caché, il invite le lecteur à déchirer le voile, à dépasser les images, pour pénétrer le secret de la vérité. Ce dépassement n'est cependant possible qu'à une certaine classe d'êtres:

> Si certains appartiennent à la classe sacerdotale, ils seront capables d'entrer à l'intérieur du voile avec le grand-prêtre. (85,1-5)

ce qui renvoie le lecteur à la fin de l'exorde, et surtout à la *propositio*.

Ce développement sur le voile du Temple est en réalité une métaphore de la lecture même de ce texte, métaphore qui invite le lecteur à entrer à l'intérieur du Saint des saints, à découvrir le mystère de l'union dans la chambre nuptiale, en échange de quoi il recevra la lumière, et échappera aux archontes non seulement lorsqu'il quittera ce monde, mais dès à

---

[24] Selon Jakobson, la fonction du discours où l'on parle pour établir la communication ou la faire durer.

présent, car le monde sera devenu pour lui l'éon. Cette annonce et cette anticipation d'une récompense eschatologique ont bien leur place au terme de la péroraison pour émouvoir le lecteur et emporter sa conviction.

4. L'écriture comme voile

La structure du texte étant ainsi mise à jour, on peut se demander pourquoi les transitions entre les parties que nous avons identifiées sont si peu explicites, et pourquoi, même à l'intérieur de ces parties, le passage d'un thème à l'autre se fait le plus souvent de façon imperceptible, sans qu'on s'en rende compte. C'est là en effet un des problèmes littéraires les plus importants que pose l'étude de l'EvPhil, et H.-M. Schenke a maintes fois signalé la difficulté de délimiter à l'intérieur de ce texte des unités de sens. Les différents découpages en paragraphes qui ont été proposés par lui et par B. Layton,[25] autant que le refus qu'opposèrent d'autres chercheurs à ces découpages, attestent bien l'acuité de ce problème. Or il me semble que cette difficulté résulte non pas de l'incurie d'un auteur ou d'un compilateur négligent, mais bien plutôt de la mise en œuvre d'un procédé de composition par glissement.

4.1 Les transitions d'un thème à l'autre

Les passages d'un thème à l'autre se font en effet par glissement. Prenons le cas de l'exorde. Il s'ouvre sur une antithèse opposant hébreu et prosélyte. De là on passe à une seconde antithèse qui oppose cette fois l'esclave au fils. Les deux développements sont reliés entre eux par leur forme antithétique. Ils sont également reliés par un mot crochet, MONON, qui se trouve à la fin du premier développement et au début du second.[26] Ce MONON sert tout à la fois de conclusion au premier thème et d'annonce du second, mais cette annonce n'est pas explicite, ce n'est qu'une fois qu'on est entré dans le second développement qu'on se rend compte qu'on est passé d'un thème à l'autre et que ce MONON était précisément l'instrument de ce passage. De même, la notion d'héritage sur laquelle se conclut le second développement annonce le troisième, qui oppose morts et vivants à propos d'héritage. Puis, c'est le thème de la mort qui permet de passer à l'opposition entre le gentil «qui ne peut mourir car il n'a pas vécu» et «celui qui a cru en la vérité». Finalement, on passe de «celui qui a

---

25 H.-M. Schenke, «Das Evangelium nach Philippus. Ein Evangelium aus dem Funde von Nag-Hamadi,» *TLZ* 84 (1959) 1-26, B. Layton, *The Gnostic Scriptutes* (Garden City et New York: Doubleday & Co.) 325-353.

26 C'est à J. É. Ménard que revient le mérite d'avoir le premier attiré l'attention sur l'importance des mots-crochets dans l'EvPhil, cf. *L'Évangile selon Philippe*, 2-6.

cru en la vérité» à celui qui «est devenu chrétien» (52,23-24) , c'est-à-dire ce «nous» qui englobe tout à la fois l'auteur du texte et son ou ses destinataires.

Ce genre de transition par glissement se rencontre tout au long du texte; le passage d'un thème à l'autre s'y fait souvent de façon insensible, de sorte qu'il est extrêmement difficile de délimiter des parties du texte sur une base thématique.

Et il en va de même pour les transitions entre les grandes parties de l'écrit. Elles ne sont jamais annoncées de façon explicite, mais le lecteur glisse insensiblement d'une section à l'autre. Ainsi, ce n'est qu'à la lecture de la *propositio*, qu'on se rend compte que la fin de de l'exorde annonçait, mais de façon voilée, le motif central de tout l'écrit. Et c'est alors seulement qu'on comprend que ceux qui veulent récolter en hiver sont ceux qui ne voient que les germes de la vérité et qui sont le plus grand nombre. Ce sont ceux-là qui, prétendant récolter en hiver, arrachent et ne portent pas de fruit. Ayant lu l'ensemble de la *narratio*, qui porte précisément sur la connaissance de la vérité, le lecteur comprendra alors que l'antithèse semer / récolter avait précisément pour fonction d'introduire au thème de la connaissance partielle ou totale de la vérité.

De même, le début de l'*exhortatio* annonce le thème de celle-ci, qui est la connaissance de la vérité et la lutte contre l'erreur, mais ce n'est qu'après la lecture qu'on se rend compte que la phrase de 77,15-16 avait pour fonction d'introduire le thème de la section toute entière. Et le rapprochement de ce passage avec le texte de 52,25-35; 55,20-23 et 86,11-14 permettra au diligent lecteur de comprendre quel lien subtil unit le thème de la connaissance de la vérité à celui des saisons qui était évoqué à la fin de la section précédente par l'image du printemps qu'amène le souffle de l'Esprit Saint.

C'est ce caractère dérobé des transitions qui fait qu'on ne sait pas très bien où se termine un développement et où commence l'autre, et qui est à l'origine de la difficulté de délimiter les développements des thèmes dans ce texte. Ce problème n'est pas exclusif à l'EvPhil; des dialogues de Platon jusqu'à Justin ou Clément d'Alexandrie,[27] en passant par Horace et Sénèque, on le rencontre partout dans la littérature antique. Voici, par exemple, ce qu'écrit Ulrich Knoche à propos de l'œuvre d'Horace, et qu'on pourrait appliquer aussi bien à EvPhil:

---

[27] À propos des transitions cachées et de l'interpénétration des parties dans les *Stromates*, voir A. Méhat, *Études sur les 'Stromates' de Clément d'Alexandrie* (Patristica Sorbonnensia, 7; Paris, Éditions du Seuil, 1966) 262-271; comme l'EvPhil, les Stromates de Clément dissimulent, sous une apparence désordonnée, une remarquable symétrie; voir Méhat, 272-279.

> Die Wissenschaft hat sich nun die Frage vorgelegt, wie es kommt, daß wir so häufig bei Horaz eine klare Abgrenzung der einzelnen behandelten Themata gegeneinander nicht vorzunehmen vermögen.[28]

Et Knoche renvoie à l'étude de P. Cauer, qui montre que cette difficulté est due au fait qu'Horace, bien souvent, dissimule le mouvement de sa pensée et glisse imperceptiblement d'une considération à l'autre, et qui montre que ce type de transition par glissement (gleitender Übergang) est précisément une caractéristique du style de cet auteur.[29] Cependant, Knoche pousse plus loin l'analyse de Cauer en montrant que l'emploi de ce type de transition est lié à la fonction pédagogique (psychagogische Wirkung) de l'œuvre littéraire. Selon lui, en effet, l'emploi de ces transitions dérobées (verstohlene Übergänge) s'explique par une conception littéraire selon laquelle la fonction «psychagogique» d'une œuvre serait atteinte à travers un mode de composition «organique» (die organische Art der Ökonomie).

D'après Knoche en effet, ces transitions dérobées, ménagées à l'aide de petits éléments de liaison (kleine Verbindungsstücke), remplissent une double fonction, une fonction de rattachement (anknüpfende) et une fonction de continuation (weiterführende). Et elles ont ceci de particulier que le lecteur n'en perçoit immédiatement que la première fonction et que la seconde lui reste d'abord cachée. L'auditeur (ou le lecteur) se trouvera par conséquent dans une sorte d'illusion par rapport à la fonction de transition de ces éléments de liaison, illusion qu'Horace a certainement ménagée, à son avis, dans une intention pédagogique (psychagogische Absicht), car c'est précisément de cette illusion, qui dissimule l'organisation de ses matériaux, que naît l'impression d'unité organique d'une œuvre.

Ce caractère de l'œuvre poétique d'Horace, on le retrouve, *mutatis mutandis*, dans une œuvre qui n'a rien de poétique, l'*Apologie* de Justin. Ch. Munier, qui s'est attaché à en analyser la structure littéraire, cite à ce propos une étude ancienne de Th. Wehofer, qui

> a observé aussi que le problème de la composition de l'*Apologie* ne peut être résolu en distinguant des thèmes nettement délimités se faisant suite dans l'argumentation; il faut prendre aussi en considé-

---

28 U. Knoche, «Betrachtung über Horazens Kunst der satirischen Gesprächsführung,» *Philologus* 90 (1935) 374.

29 P. Cauer, «Zur Abgrenzung und Verbindung der Teile in Hor. Ars poet.,» *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 61 (1906) 232 s.

> ration les transitions d'un thème à l'autre et les digressions, qui font partie intégrante du discours philosophique.[30]

H. Holfelder, pour sa part, s'est attaché à démonter la méthode de composition de Justin. Voici comment Ch. Munier résume l'analyse de Holfelder:

> (Cette méthode) consiste à conduire insensiblement le lecteur d'un thème à l'autre, en lui proposant des aspects toujours nouveaux dans le développement de l'argumentation. Le progrès se fait surtout par association d'idées, ou par des variations à partir de mots-clés ou de synonymes, de membres de phrases ou parfois de phrases entières qui annoncent d'une manière voilée le thème nouveau; mais Justin offre des indications suffisantes pour que l'on puisse reconnaître les étapes de sa démarche (en 13,1; 14,4; 23,1-3; 30, etc.). Holfelder souligne que cette méthode, qui répond à des intentions précises d'ordre essentiellement pédagogique, a été fort pratiquée dans l'antiquité, notamment par les philosophes. Il s'agit moins pour eux d'exposer un système tout fait que d'éveiller l'attention de l'auditeur ou du lecteur à une doctrine de vie. Pour mieux s'insinuer dans l'âme du disciple, la pensée du maître doit faire appel à toutes les techniques de la psychologie; il importe d'émouvoir les fibres les plus secrètes de l'être, par touches insensibles, de solliciter la volonté en même temps que l'intelligence.[31]

Cette description pourrait s'appliquer à l'EvPhil. Comme il glisse insensiblement d'un thème à l'autre, le lecteur se trouve entraîné par le mouvement du texte sans qu'il s'en rende compte. Ainsi, le texte ne fait pas que montrer le chemin qui conduit à la vérité, il est lui-même ce chemin.[32]

4.2 Quand l'écriture se fait voile

À peu près à l'époque où l'EvPhil a sans doute été rédigé, Clément d'Alexandrie fait état de cette fonction «psychagogique» de l'écrit dans le chapitre 1 du premier Stromate.

---

30 Th. Wehofer, «Die Apologie Justins des Philosophen und Märtyrers in literar-historischen Beziehung zum ersten Mahl untersucht,» *RQ*sup 6 (1897) 65-82, cité dans Ch. Munier, «La structure littéraire de l'*Apologie* de Justin», *RSR* 62 (1988) 228.

31 H. H. Holfelder, «*Εὐσέβεια καὶ φιλοσοφία*. Literarische Einheit und politischer Kontext von Justins Apologie,» *ZNTW* 68 (1977) 57, cité dans Ch. Munier, 230.

32 Je reprends ici la formule d'Ilsetraut Hadot à propos des dialogues de Platon: «Der platonische Dialog hat also seelenleitende Funktion. Er zeigt nicht nur den Weg, sondern er ist selbst ein Weg, auf dem die Seele zum Guten voranschreitet,» *Seneca und die Griechisch-römische Tradition der Seelenleitung* (Quellen und Studien zur Geschichte der Philosophie, 13; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1969) 37. Borchert a bien perçu les propriétés pédagogiques de cette particularité littéraire de l'EvPhil, «which twists and turns the mind of the reader» (*An Analysis*, 46).

Selon lui en effet, «cette méthode psychologique (τοιαύτη ψυχαγωγία) grâce à laquelle les esprits studieux reçoivent la vérité, même enveloppée (κεκαλυμμένη), mérite toute confiance.» (Strom. I.2.20) Et plus loin il précise:[33]

> Il va sans dire que ces Stromates, pétris d'érudition, s'ingénient à cacher les semences de la connaissance. De même que le chasseur passionné aime à quêter, fouiller, pister, lancer ses chiens avant de prendre la bête, le vrai se révèle plein de douceur quand on l'a quêté et obtenu à grand travail. (Strom. I.2.20-21)

Et ces chasseurs de vérité sont le petit nombre. Du moins est-ce ainsi que Clément interprète le texte de Mt 13,12:

> Dieu a annoncé par cette parole que les secrets seront révélés à quiconque les écoute en secret, et que les choses cachées seront dévoilées, comme la vérité, à quiconque est capable de recevoir les traditions sous un voile; et que ce qui est secret pour la foule sera manifesté au petit nombre. (Strom., I.1.13.3)

Cacher les semences de la connaissance, de sorte que beaucoup n'en perçoivent que le germe et quelques-uns seulement la voient dans toute sa plénitude, c'est bien à cela que s'emploie l'EvPhil qui l'annonce dans sa *propositio*.

> La vérité est semée en tout lieu qui existe depuis le commencement. Et il y en a beaucoup qui la voient semée, mais peu nombreux sont ceux qui la voient récoltée. (55,20-23).

Ce petit nombre, ce sont «ceux qui appartiennent à la classe sacerdotale et qui seront seuls capables d'entrer à l'intérieur du voile avec le grand-prêtre.» (85,1-4) Et c'est l'ouverture de ce voile qui permet de pénétrer les secrets de la vérité (85,11-13). Que ce développement sur la déchirure du voile du Temple se termine par des considérations sur la pénétration dans la vérité montre bien que sa fonction dans la péroraison est bel et bien métaphorique. La déchirure du voile du Temple n'est rien d'autre qu'une métaphore de la lecture même de ce texte.[34]

---

[33] Les citations de Clément sont tirées de C. Mondésert, *Clément d'Alexandrie. Les Stromates: Stromate 1* (SC, 30; Paris, Éditions du Cerf, 1951).

[34] Voir à propos du fonctionnement de cette métaphore du texte littéraire à la rencontre de plusieurs discours d'origine diverse, A. Le Boulluec, «Voile et ornement: le texte et l'addition des sens, selon Clément d'Alexandrie,» *Questions de sens. Homère, Eschyle, Sophocle, Aristote, Virgile, Apulée, Clément* , éd. P. Salat *et al.* (Études de littérature ancienne, 2; Paris: Presses de l'École Normale Supérieure, 1982) 53-64. Sur le thème de la vérité cachée, voir R. Mortley, *Connaissance religieuse et herméneutique chez Clément d'Alexandrie* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1973), spécialement p. 50-58.

Le fait qu'une telle métaphore se trouve dans la péroraison dit assez que son auteur n'a pas fait autrement que Clément. Tout comme le maître alexandrin, il trouvait sans doute «très dangereux de révéler l'enseignement réellement mystérieux de la philosophie» (Strom I.2.21). La connaissance, en effet, n'est pas à la portée de tous (Strom I.1.2.2). L'occultation (*ἐπίκρυψις*) de la vérité sous des images évite que celle-ci ne tombe entre des mains impies; en ce sens, elle relève de la prudence. Mais elle convient aussi au caractère transcendant de la vérité:

> Tout ce qui se montre à travers un voile fait apparaître la vérité plus grande et plus auguste, comme ces fruits qui transparaissent sous l'eau, ou ces formes sous des voiles qui leur associent la beauté d'autres reflets. Car un éclairage vif est fait pour la critique et, en outre, les choses évidentes ne peuvent être comprises que d'une façon. Mais il est possible de tirer plusieurs relations de sens, comme nous le faisons, de ce qui est dit à mots couverts. Dans ces conditions, l'homme inexpérimenté et ignorant se trompe, mais le gnostique comprend. (Strom. V.56.5-57.1)[35]

Ce que Clément écrit ici à propos de l'Écriture, il le pratique lui-même dans sa propre écriture:

> Il y a aussi des choses que mon livre n'indiquera que par allusion; il insistera sur les unes, il mentionnera seulement les autres, il tâchera de parler sans en avoir l'air, de montrer sous le voile, de signifier sans mot dire. (Strom. I. 1.15.1)

C'est bien aussi l'écriture que pratique l'auteur de l'EvPhil. Les mystères de la vérité, il les manifeste en figures et en images seulement (84,20-21) car l'écrit ne convient pas au mystère, qu'on doit confier à la parole seule. Clément d'Alexandrie insiste en effet sur la différence de degré qui existe entre l'enseignement oral et l'enseignement écrit (Strom. I. 1.9.1). «Les mystères, écrit-il, se confient à la parole et non à l'écriture» (Strom. I.1.13.2 *τὰ δὲ ἀπόρρητα, καθάπερ ὁ θεός, λογῳ πιστεύεται, οὐ γράμματι*). N'est-ce pas précisément, dans l'EvPhil, le sens de la phrase lapidaire: «Vraiment, il faut dire ce qui est de l'ordre du mystère!» (71,3-4 ⲉⲱⲁⲉ ⲱⲱⲉ ⲉⲁⲱ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲙⲩⲥⲧⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ)? Placé au centre géométrique de l'exposé sur le sens caché des sacrements, dont il est en quelque sorte la clé de voûte, cet énoncé prend une valeur axiomatique. Il devrait être placé en exergue de l'EvPhil.

Peut-être est-ce là l'explication du problème soulevé récemment par E. Pagels, qui signale les interprétations contradictoires qui ont été proposées de la doctrine du mariage dans

---

35 Traduction de P. Voulet (SC, 278; Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1981) 117.

l'EvPhil.[36] Alors que certains considèrent que le mystère du mariage et le rituel de la chambre nuptiale n'ont rien à voir avec le mariage réel ou avec quelque pratique sexuelle que ce soit, d'autres pensent au contraire que la théologie valentinienne du mariage spirituel présuppose et requiert même le mariage réel. Or il semble bien que le texte de l'EvPhil tel qu'il nous est parvenu ne permette de trancher ni dans un sens ni dans l'autre, et que sa doctrine sur cette question, pourtant si sensible dans le christianisme du IIe siècle, reste complètement ambiguë. Au terme de son article, E. Pagels conclut que l'EvPhil s'abstient probablement de trancher sur cette question, quoiqu'il semble afficher sa préférence pour l'ascétisme, pour ménager ses destinataires valentiniens en raison de la diversité d'opinions et de pratiques existant parmi eux sur cette question, diversité attestée par Irénée (Adv. haer., 1.6.3).

E. Pagels a certainement raison d'envisager le problème de l'ambiguïté de la position de l'EvPhil à propos du mariage à la lumière du contexte socio-religieux dans lequel ce texte a été produit, mais on peut également considérer ce problème sous l'angle du mode de communication choisi par l'auteur de ce texte, qui reste sans doute délibérément obscur sur ce point. Cette opacité est voulue car le voile ne s'ouvrira que pour ceux qui appartiennent à la classe sacerdotale et qui pourront pénétrer dans le Saint des saints avec le grand-prêtre![37]

Conclusion

En résumé et pour conclure, j'ai cherché à montrer que les figures de répétition jouent un rôle important dans la composition de l'EvPhil et que certaines récurrences y ont une fonction de délimitation des parties de l'écrit. J'ai ensuite montré que l'analyse de ces divisions à la lumière de la rhétorique littéraire gréco-romaine permet de dégager le plan de cet écrit qui est aménagé en six parties, exorde, narration, proposition, preuve, exhortation et péroraison, chacune concourant à sa façon à persuader le lecteur qu'il existe dans le monde une vérité cachée, que cette vérité peut être atteinte au moyen des figures et des images par ceux «qui sont supérieurs au monde» (53,21-22) ou «qui appartiennent à la classe sacerdotale» (85,1-3). D'autre part, l'étude des transitions d'une partie à l'autre, ou d'un thème à l'autre à l'intérieur de ces parties, permet de croire que l'EvPhil a été composé dans l'esprit d'une tradition pédagogique où le texte se fait voile que le lecteur doit lui-même pénétrer s'il veut atteindre la vérité.

---

[36] E. H. Pagels, «The Mystery of Mariage,» 442-446.

[37] En ce sens, l'EvPhil est un écrit ésotérique.

En terminant, il reste à se demander à quel genre littéraire rattacher un tel texte. La rhétorique gréco-romaine connaît trois genres, le judiciaire, qui appartient au domaine forensique, et dont la fin est de déterminer le juste et l'injuste en référence à des faits passés, le délibératif, qui appartient au domaine politique, et dont la fin est de déterminer l'utile pour l'avenir, et enfin, l'épidictique, dont la fin est d'inciter à adopter une conduite vertueuse. Il s'agit là de catégories qui s'appliquent d'abord au discours; cependant, l'influence de ces modèles rhétoriques se fait sentir dans toute la littérature antique, bien au-delà de l'art oratoire. D'autre part, si mon analyse des fonctions des différentes parties du texte est juste, il est clair que son auteur a été influencé par de tels modèles. La question de savoir de quel genre rhétorique ce texte a subi l'influence devient donc parfaitement légitime. À cet égard, ce texte relève certainement du genre épidictique ou démonstratif, comme toute la prédication chrétienne, mais en disant cela, on n'indique qu'un mode très général, et non un genre littéraire au sens strict.

À mon avis, et sous réserve d'un plus ample examen, on peut difficilement classer ce texte dans un genre littéraire bien précis. Vu sous un certain angle, on pourrait peut-être le considérer comme un florilège, cela est particulièrement vrai pour la première partie de la *probatio*, qui semble compiler des matériaux d'origine diverses. Mais rien n'indique que les autres parties du texte, malgré leur apparence décousue, soient principalement constituées d'extraits, et je serais plutôt enclin à considérer l'ensemble comme l'œuvre d'un véritable auteur et non celle d'un compilateur, un auteur qui, comme Clément d'Alexandrie dans ses *Stromates*, a voulu tisser un voile énigmatique dont les mille reflets sont autant d'images d'une vérité indicible.[38] Edward Thomas Rewolinski, qui a le plus clairement posé la question du genre littéraire de l'EvPhil, a bien vu la similarité entre les *Stromates* et l'EvPhil, mais il refuse de voir une parenté générique entre les deux écrits, principalement en raison de leur différence de ton.[39] Cependant, les *Stromates* de Clément ne constituent pas en eux-mêmes un genre littéraire, mais une illustration particulière d'un genre. En effet, Aulu-Gelle, dans la préface de ses *Nuits Attiques*, cite les «Stromates» parmi les titres que l'on attribuait à une littérature variée, que l'on pourrait qualifier de «Mélanges»,[40] et qui pouvait varier grandement aussi bien par le contenu que par le ton ou par l'ampleur. Peut-être est-ce

---

[38] Voir à ce sujet R. Mortley, *Connaissance religieuse*, spéc. p. 186-187.

[39] E. T. Rewolinski, *The Use of Sacramental Language in the Gospel of Philip* (CG II,3), (Dissertation, Harvard, 1978), 44-45.

[40] Voir à ce propos A. Méhat, *Études sur les 'Stromates'*, (Patristica Sorbonensia, 7; Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1966), 99-106.

précisément de ce «genre littéraire» que l'EvPhil se rapproche le plus.[41] Dans le domaine chrétien ce titre a été repris par Origène, dont les *Stromates* sont connus notamment par Eusèbe (Hist. Eccl., 6.24.3) et par Jérôme.[42]

Par conséquent, je propose de voir dans l'EvPhil une réalisation particulière de ce genre littéraire des «mélanges», dont le but est pédagogique ou, pour employer un terme plus spécifique, «psychagogique», qui adopte une *dispositio* calquée sur un modèle rhétorique du genre épidictique et le ton énigmatique (ἐπίκρυψις) jugé convenable à la communication des plus hauts mystères.

Quoi qu'il en soit du genre littéraire, cette analyse démontre à mon avis hors de tout doute le haut degré de cohérence de cette œuvre qui cache, sous une apparence chaotique et un style énigmatique, une structure remarquablement élaborée.[43] Et que cela résulte d'un choix délibéré fait par l'auteur, c'est ce que suggère à mots couverts le texte lui-même (84,14-20):

> Pour le moment, nous disposons des apparences de la création; nous avons coutume de dire qu'elles sont puissantes et estimables, alors que ce qui est caché est faible et méprisable. Voici ce qu'il en est des apparences de la vérité: elles sont faibles et méprisables, mais c'est ce qui est caché qui est fort et estimable.

N'y a-t-il pas là, au début de la péroraison, une discrète allusion à l'EvPhil lui-même, qui dissimule sous des apparences chaotiques un texte agencé avec soin, où l'auteur a caché la vérité sous des apparences faibles et méprisables? Un autre passage, au début de la *probatio* pourrait receler une indication du choix délibéré qu'a fait l'auteur en ce sens (56,20-24):

> Personne ne cacherait un objet de grand prix dans un grand vase. Mais souvent, on va placer des valeurs incalculables dans un vase valant un as.

---

41 A. Méhat, 15-41 et 115-147.

42 Voir P. Nautin, *Origène, sa vie et son œuvre* (Christianisme antique, 1; Paris: Beauchesne, 1977) 293-302.

43 Cela n'exclut pas que cet écrit puisse intégrer des matériaux de sources diverses, ni qu'il ait pu subir des interpolations plus ou moins importantes au cours de sa transmission.

En cela, et par son caractère déconcertant et énigmatique, l'EvPhil réalise pleinement l'idéal de convenance (*τὸ πρέπον*) de l'antiquité, le parfait ajustement de la forme et de l'objet.[44]

---

44 *Τὸ δὲ πρέπον ἕξει ἡ λέξις, ἐὰν ᾖ παθητικὴ τε καὶ ἠθικὴ καὶ τοῖς ὑποκειμένοις πράγμασιν ἀνάλογον.* Aristote, *Rhétorique*, III, 7 1408a10.

FINDING ITS NICHE: THE HISTORICAL AND RHETORICAL SPECIES OF ACTS

Dr. Ben Witherington, III

Asbury Theological Seminary

I. LUKE-ACTS AND HISTORY

To conclude, as most scholars still do, that Luke in his two volume work intended to write history as it was written in antiquity tells modern readers very little about the document itself for two reasons: 1) ancient historiography was both different from modern historiography in some respects, and similar to it in other respects; 2) Luke may have intended to write in a particular manner and failed to do so. The bottom line is whether Luke achieved the sort of standards he professed to set for himself in Lk. 1.1-4. We must take some pains at this point to sketch the character of ancient historigraphy.

First, let it be said that we may dismiss the old argument that the ancients were unable to distinguish fact from fiction. No one who has read Thucydides or Polybius or Tacitus carefully could think that critical scrutiny of historical processes was impossible in antiquity or that no one was interested in such critical distinctions.[1] Thucydides, for one, was quite clear about distinguishing myths from historical facts. Even Lucian, while never attempting to write history, nevertheless knew very well the sort of high standards a true historian should set for his narrative. He says plainly in his treatise on 'How History Ought to be Written':

History cannot admit a lie, even a tiny one..."(9) He stresses that a good historian must go out and investigate and not simply rely on documents or what others tell him. (38) "The historian's sole task is to tell the tale as it happened..." (42) "As to the facts themselves, he should not assemble them at random, but only after much laborious and painstaking investigation. He should...be an eyewitness, but, if not, listen to those who tell the more impartial story, those whom one would suppose least likely to subtract from the facts or add to them out of favor or malice..." (50).

---

[1] Cf. A. W. Mosley, "Historical Reporting in the Ancient World," NTS 12 (1965-66), pp. 8-25. For a sensitive and balanced evaluation of Luke among the ancient historians cf. C. Hemer, The Book of Acts in the Setting of Hellenistic History (Winona Lake; Eisenbrauns, 1990), pp. 63-100.

Lucian also adds that history should be useful, not merely entertaining or pandering to the audience's desires. In saying this, Lucian is not arguing against the applying of any rhetorical conventions to ancient history writing but against a particular kind of rhetorical approach to history writing that treats it like an exercise in declamation or epideictic rhetoric where the facts are neglected or distorted for the sake of praising or blaming one or another historical figure (8-9).[2]

Cicero too, though no historian himself but rather a great orator, knew well what the conventions and standards of history writing were. History was not intended to be encomiastic (Att. I, 19,10). Rather,

who does not know history's first law to be that an author must not dare to tell anything but the truth? And its second that he must make bold to tell the whole truth? That there must be no suggestion of partiality anywhere in his writings? Nor of malice? This groundwork of course is familiar to everyone; the completed structure however rests upon the story and the diction. The nature of the subject needs chronological arrangement and geographical representation..." (De Or. 2.62-63).[3]

We will say more about various of these matters shortly, but here it is sufficient to point out that Luke goes out of his way to provide both chronological arrangement and geographical

---

[2] Lucian's treatise is entitled 'How History Should be Written'. See the discussion in C. K. Barrett, "How History Should be Written," in the volume I edited History, Literature, and Society in the Book of Acts (Cambridge: Cambridge U. Press, 1996) pp. 33-57. In fact, Lucian in this essay is discussing history writing in light of the various rhetorical conventions and concerns of his day, and is far from simply dismissing these concerns.

[3] The arguments of A. J. Woodman, Rhetoric in Classical Historiography, (London: Croom Helm, 1988) pp. 82ff, in regard to the famous letter by Cicero to Lucceius are not persuasive. Cicero is not arguing that history written in his era inherently allowed for the bending of the truth in view of rhetorical conventions. Rather as Fornara, History pp. 101ff. had already shown "Cicero clearly had not asserted that the laws of the monograph abet distortion or magnification; on the contrary, he would like the laws of history bent in a monograph about himself." (emphasis mine). In short he was urging Lucceius to go against the well known conventions of such history writing. On the need for a reliable account in a historical work cf. Tacitus Annals 1.1; Arrian, Anabasis of Alexander Preface; Dio cassius, Roman History 1.2; Herodian, History of the Empire 1.3. These texts reflect the fact that it was widely known that reliability was one of the major goals in historical works.

representation in both Luke and Acts, pointing to the intended historical character of his work.

It must be acknowledged that the standards for historiography mentioned above were not observed a good deal of the time in antiquity. Thucydides and Polybius were in various regards exceptional,[4] but it is also true that it was not impossible for a well educated and apparently well-traveled person like Luke, who claims to have taken time and pains to investigate matters closely, to follow in the footsteps of other exceptional historians. Nor would his use of rhetoric have necessarily led to distortion of the facts. As P.A. Brunt says, rhetoric "could be the handmaiden of truth or falsehood. In principle Cicero thought it should be the handmaiden of truth."[5] While the use of rhetoric could lead to distortion, it could also be used to induce the hearer to pay attention to the facts being narrated and make that narration convincing.[6]

Perhaps one of the most important distinctions that has a bearing on our evaluation of Luke-Acts is that between historiography in the Greek tradition of Thucydides, Polybius, and others and the tradition of history writing largely by Roman authors or those heavily influenced by them that developed during the rise and growth of the Roman Empire.[7] As C.

---

[4] See the discussion by E. Gabbia, "True History and False History in Classical Antiquity," Journal of Roman Studies 71 (1981), pp. 50-62.

[5] P. A. Brunt, "Cicero and Historigraphy," in Miscellanea di studi classici in onore di Eugenio Manni (Rome: 1979), pp.311-340 here p. 340.

[6] IBID.

[7] In the latter category I would include such diverse writers as Dionysisus of Halicarnassus who mirrors what happened when history became subsumed under the heading of epideictic rhetoric with the rise of the second Sophistic in the late first and early second century A.D. (on which see my Conflict and Community in Corinth [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995] pp. 39-48), and also Josephus in his Antiquities who writes at the end of the first century A.D. an ethnographic work in the tradition of the universal histories. The arguments that Luke is indebted to him or vice versa either in method or matter are weak and have been set in the right framework by Sterling, Historiography pp. 100ff. though I would differ with a variety of his conclusions.

W. Fornara has shown, there was a difference between the approach to history writing of the Greek historians writing prior to the first century A.D., and the Roman historians who began to come to the fore starting with Fabius Pictor, and then the series of annalists leading up to and including Tacitus.

Roman historians, almost without exception, focused on the history of one city Rome and its people. They coupled the chronicling of the deeds of great human beings with what has been called horography-- the chronicling of a city's life on a year by year basis, including records of priests, crop harvests, and notable meteorological events. On this front, Luke's work stands much closer to Greek historiography than to the Roman sort,[8] whereas Josephus, by limiting himself to the chronicling of the developments among one people (the Jews rather than the Romans) and attempting a 'universal history' of this one people much more closely approximates some of his Roman predecessors and contemporaries.

For the Greek historian the hallmark of true ιστορια was personal observation (autopsy) and participation in events, travel, inquiry, the consultation of eyewitnesses. The Roman historians, especially those who like Livy wrote universal histories, were often satisfied to stay at home and consult documents and records. In this matter as well, Luke seems much near to Greek history writing.[9] Partly, this practice by the Roman historians was caused by the fact that while Greek historians took the writing of history as a task meant for one's best years, when one was able-bodied, could travel, and had sharpness of mind, the Romans saw history as the provenance of retired statesmen and military figures. In either case, "these conditions excluded all but members of the highest levels of society. Wealth and social contacts were essential to the craft."[10]

While Luke may not have been wealthy by some standards, it is very likely he was either a retainer of a wealthy patron or a person of independent means who had the

---

[8] Cf. Fornara History pp.25ff.

[9] Cf. Fornara, p. 49.

[10] Fornara, p. 49. It is not incidental or accidental that Josephus wrote his Antiquities at the close of his life, following the Roman model.

wherewithal to travel, and the education to write the sort of account he did. His social status must have been relatively high, at least compared to many early Christians. "If style is the man, then the man with whom we have to do is for his time and station a gentleman of ability and breadth of interest, whatever his past reading and training may have been."[11]

It is noteworthy that the Greek historians as a whole did not tend to be politicians or statesmen, though many of them were involved in the affairs they recorded, and some like Thucydides and Xenephon had military involvement in the events they recorded. If we take the 'we' passages on face value, Luke only claims involvement, like Thucydides, at certain limited junctures. The authority of the Greek historian lay not in his social status which, as in the case of Thucydides, he never mentioned or made an issue of, but in his interest and involvement in his subject matter. This stands in contrast to most Roman historians whose narrative had auctoritas mainly because of who wrote it.[12]

An account without a formal mention of an author but with a statement of the author's apparent participation in some of the events, which is what we have in Luke-Acts, certainly stands in the Greek rather than in the Roman tradition of historiography. Notably, "The concept of research finds no place in the Latin prefaces."[13]

The ethnographical and geographical scope of Greek historiography was usually more universal than its Roman counterpart. "The Romans wrote the history of their city and only incidentally of the world" whereas "the Greeks wished to record the memorable deeds of both Greeks and barbarians, and thus purposefully tried to avoid ethnography and its more

---

[11] H. J. Cadbury, The Making of Luke-Acts, (London: SPCK, 1958) p. 220.

[12] Again note how much weight Josephus places on being an important and leading participant in the contemporary events which he chronciles, both as a military figure (cf. The Jewish Wars), and as a statesman and advocate of sorts on the behalf of the Jews. The author of Luke-Acts makes considerably less grandiose claims.

[13] Fornara, p. 56. cf. T. Janson, Latin Prose Prefaces (Stockholm: Almquist and Wiksell, 1964).

narrow scope."[14] Luke makes clear at the outset of his narrative that his will be a narrative about and of import for both Jew and Gentile alike, for he seeks to convey the story of a universal salvation (cf. Lk.2.32).

Though the Greek historians were patriotic enough in their own way they strove for a certain objectivity and even neutrality in their narrative, and did not hesitate to criticize their own kind in a manner and to a degree not usually characteristic of Roman historiography. In Greek historiography "individuals were not necessarily good or bad because of the side they represented or because they were Greeks or barbarians. Even in a work intended for the winning side, there was no room for caricature of an opponent simply because he was an opponent..."[15] In this regard it is notable how Luke records the story of an Ananias and Sapphira (Acts 6), or of an Apollos who needed more instruction (Acts 18), or of the falling out between Paul and Barnabas over Mark (Acts 15).

It is also striking to me the lack of broadscale polemics against either Jews or Romans as ethnic groups though both are portrayed as persecuting or pestering Christians at various points in the narrative.[16] Rather, Luke provides both positive (cf. various Roman officials) as well as negative portrayals of those who were not Christians. He refuses to stereotype people simply because they are not yet followers of 'the Way'. Were Luke-Acts a Roman apologetic work we might expect a quiet omission or even in some cases a glossing over of

---

[14] Fornara, p. 53. It is worth stressing that unlike Luke, Josephus in his Antiquities is indeed doing ethnography, the history of its people, including its origins. I stress this because "the conventions of ethnography vitally differed from those of history. The laws of evidence and obedience to truth were at least in theory mandatory in history. Ethnography permitted the publication of the unconfirmed report of even the improbable." (Fornara, p. 15).

[15] Fornara, p. 62. On the issue of rhetoric and bias cf. pp. below.

[16] Cf. rightly W. C. Van Unnik, "Luke's Second Book and the Rules of Hellenistic Historiography," in Les Actes des Apotres. Traditions, redaction, theologie, ed. J. Kremer (Leuven: Leuven U. Press, 1979), p. 51 "Luke cannot be called partial, not even toward the Jews. Texts like 7.54 (the Jews were enraged) and those of persecutions by the Jews are more a sign of vivid description than of partiality..."

stories that portray Christians in a negative light and others in a positive one. It appears to me that Luke wrote in the Greek tradition, not like a Livy or for that matter like Dionysius of Halicarnassus both of whom would have history subsumed under a large rhetorical umbrella, leading to considerable distortion.[17]

In terms of subject matter, ancient historigraphical works could include a great deal of things not common in modern histories-- lengthy genealogical accounts, discussions of myths, geographical and travel chronicles, biographical sketches, wonders, legendary stories about the foundations of races or cities.[18] Most of these elements usually occured not in historical works about recent events, like that written by Thucydides or Luke, but in the so-called 'universal histories' where the historian was at the mercy of all sorts of traditions and sources since the events were too remote to investigate and no eyewitnesses were still living. When Livy discusses the founding of the city of Rome it is clear enough that objective historiography suffers, because the dead could not rise up to help him write his narrative, and he was not all that careful an investigator or critical scrutinizer of his sources in any case.[19] Careful historians often eschewed the writing of universal histories precisely because of the lack of control and corroboration of data from eyewitnesses. Sextus Empiricus said that true history could be distinguished from false history in that the latter was constructed out of myths and genealogies, dwelling on things that were largely immune to historical scrutiny because they dealt with hoary antiquity (Adv. Math. I.253-61).

---

[17] The great fault in an otherwise helpful study by E. Plümacher, is that he chooses to compare Luke to two historians with whom he had little in common and certainly was not likely influenced by-- Livy and Dionysius of Halicarnassus. But cf. his Lukas als hellenistischer Schriftsteller: Studien zur Apostelgeschichte (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1972).

[18] Even Tacitus, who shows no great interest or belief in pagan religion, never mind other sorts, nevertheless quite readily includes discussions of religious beliefs and practices in his historical works because historians of all stripes had done so for centuries. Cf. the discussion in R. Mellor, Tacitus (London: Routledge, 1993), pp. 14ff. and see Histories 4.83-84 on Isis and Serapis.

[19] Cf. P. G. Walsh, "Livy's Preface and the Distortion of History," Am. Journal of Philology 76 (1955), pp. 369-83.

Another sort of history writing has been called local history. It deals with the sacred traditions, kept by priests in local temples, and with the history of a particular town or shrine or ethnic group in a particular geographical region. The breadth of the material in Luke-Acts shows Luke is not trying to write this sort of history. Nor is his narrative simply an expanded exercise in ethnography, the chronciling of the history of one particular ethnic group, as can be said about Josephus' Antiquities.

While the outsider who heard or read Luke's work, might recognize a certain similarity in the account to Greek or even Roman religious history writing, on the whole the account would appear different from such accounts. This latter sort of history writing

> was always tied to cults and places of the cult. Transmission of knowledge in such cases was ensured by priests and temple attendants... Temple traditions in Egypt are related to statues, monuments, inscriptions, cult places in general, ritual. Historical information as such tends to be anecdotal and often scandalous, particularly if it refers to the private life of kings. Priests, who give the appearance of being learned, in fact retail fables, oddities and portents. Saceredotal tradition in fact is really popularizing, and its market is popular.[20]

Even a cursory reading of Acts will show that this is not what Luke is about. Once the story gets beyond Jerusalem where Christians have some contact with the Temple, it becomes apparent that he is telling about a social movement that did not have priests, temples, or sacrifices, and so he was not recounting local traditions about such places and forms of religion. Luke's account is much more cosmopolitan than that and its focus is elsewhere. Furthermore, the purveyors of the Christian traditions were a wide variety of people from the unlettered to the more well educated like Luke himself, also involving people with a wide range of professions.

It must also be candidly admitted that the author of Luke-Acts is in at least two important respects unlike Thucydides and Polybius. He is not in the main concerned about the political or military history of the larger culture, but about the social and religious history of a particular group or subculture within the empire, but one which Luke believes can and should continue to have a growing and ever broader impact for they proclaim a universal savior and salvation. Also, had Thucydides lived in Luke's era and read Luke's account he would have not been pleased with the amount of attention Luke gives to prophecies, portents,

---

[20] Gabba, p. 60.

signs, miracles, wonders and the like.

This latter trait however would not distinguish Luke from other historians, for instance Herodotus himself, the so-called father of Greek historiography, who wrote what can rightly be called a form of theological historiography where the divine is a major player in the drama recorded.[21] As E. Gabba points out various of the ancients would "assign to true history not only human actions located in time and space, but also the biographies of gods and heroes alongside those of famous men. In other words, divine history was accepted as a narrative of events."[22] This of course distinguishes ancient history from the way most modern historians would view and write history.[23]

---

[21] Ephorus objects to the use of the marvelous simply to give the audience a thrill, but not if it is used properly to furnish examples of morality and justice. cf. the discussion in B.L. Ullman, "History and Tragedy," TAPA 73 (1942), pp. 25-53, here pp. 30-31. Ullman is right to note how history writing was influenced by other genre such as the epic and tragedy. Luke clearly shows he has a sense of drama in various of his episodes (cf. e.g. the Miletus story in Acts 20.17ff.). He is not above playing to the emotions of empathy or even fear (cf. Acts 5.1-11), as did the ancient tragedians. It would be wrong however to rank Luke among the tragic historians, if by that one means he was primarily interested in the dramatic potential of a given story rather than its historical substance, as if the desire to move his audience explains why Luke includes what he does in Luke-Acts. Luke's primary intent is to inform Theophilus and assure him both about the facts and the meaning of 'the things fulfilled among us'. Ullman is also right to stress that from the time of at least Isocrates on, the writing of history was influenced by rhetoric and its conventions (pp. 33ff.).

[22] Gabba, p. 54.

[23] Cf. e.g. M. Grant, Ancient Historians, (N.Y.: Scribers, 1970) p. 357 who criticizes Eusebius' church history by saying that his "whole subject encourages departure from cold secular truth, and invites a deliberate neglect of plausible worldly causes and connexions." It is not just that Grant is claiming that in some cases a belief in the miraculous or supernatural can lead to gullibility in the evaluation of dramatic claims and accounts, but like many post-Enlightenment historians he takes it as beyond cavil that anyone who believes in and makes claims about the supernatural is not using critical historical scrutiny in the evaluation of the historian's data, and therefore is unable to deal with what he sees as the cold hard secular truth. This may in part explain why in an

It would also be clear enough to the careful hearer or reader that Luke was not attempting, as various ancients did, to write about the amazing or supernatural in such a manner that his subject was immune to historical scrutiny, unlike some of the literature about the 'fabulous' in antiquity. For example, it was a popular venture even as early as the third century B.C. to write about utopian societies in remote places such as far away countries or isolated islands. When Euhemerus, Iamblicus, and others wrote about such places often making claims about prodigies and miracles, they did so with certainty that the claims made about these societies could not be investigated by their audiences, and probably would not be taken as unadulterated historical fact in any case. The major function of such narratives was either to set forward certain ideals or to entertain or both. Luke's tale by contrast is set all over the Mediterranean crescent, especially in its major cities, and though some of his summaries do depict early Christianity as a somewhat ideal society (cf. e.g. Acts 2.43-47), he is also careful to reveal some of the problems and trouble-makers that were part of early Christian life as well (cf. Acts 5, Acts 15). He insists throughout that even public officials like King Agrippa will have heard about the events 'which have been fulfilled among us' and such officials had contact with various of the people involved because 'none of these things has escaped notice, for this was not done in a corner' (Acts 26.26).

Luke is not writing either about remote utopian societies, secret religious sects and rites or words and deeds that he feels are immune to historical scrutiny. His claim is that the Jesus movement and the rise of Christianity are real historical phenomena that at least from time to time touch on the larger historical events and processes of the Empire (hence the synchronisms), and so are subject to careful historical scrutiny in an ancient mode, which is to say with some openness to claims about the supernatural.

Of all the historians writing in Greek, Luke's work seems to me to be most like the Greek historiography of someone like Polybius, and to lesser degree, Thucydides. Indeed a reasonable case can be made that in terms of method, style, and type of historigraphy Luke

---

otherwise helpful and comprehensive survey of ancient historians including Eusebius and Josephus he does not deal with Luke's work at all.

is following this particular Greek tradition of history writing, with also some signs of influence by Ephorus (cf. below).

For example, consider the words of Polybius in his famous preface (I.1-4). Polybius speaks of "a phenomenon unprecedented in the annals of humankind" (I.1), as does Luke though the former refers to the rise to prominence and dominance of the Roman Empire, while Luke refers to the appearance of the eschatological Dominion of God spreading across the Mediterranean crescent. Polybius says: "The unity of events imposes upon the historian a similar unity of composition in depicting for his readers the operations of the laws of Fortuna (fortune) upon the grand scale, and this has been my principal inducement and stimulus in the work which I have undertaken." He speaks of not "passing over without remark one of the most admirable and instructive performances of Fortune. That mighty revolutionary, whose pawns are human lives, has never before achieved such an astonishing tour de force as she has staged for the benefit of our generation; yet the monographs of the historical specialists give no inkling of the whole picture..." (I.3-4). In 9.1-2 he goes on to speak of the fact that he writes more for the sake of instruction of the serious student than entertainment of the general reader.

Luke also writes for a serious student who needs instruction about the remarkable things that have happened 'among us' recently, though he does not entirely neglect the matter of entertainment (see Acts 20.7-12). He shares Polybius' view that something unique in the annals of history had transpired which could not simply be explained either piecemeal or on the basis of certain historical precedents or analogies. Luke, like Polybius, clearly has a sense of the magnitude of the historical moment and believes that it is somehow divinely guided, that the unity of events leading to particular ends reflects and reveals the singular hand and plan of a larger guiding force or Being. By comparison to these two writers, Josephus seems much more defensive and resigned, like the tone of the work of Tacitus, placing blame on human social forces, especially for what transpired leading up to A.D. 70.

Polybius is quite clear about the conventions of handling speeches, and the function they should have in a historical narrative. The "whole genus of orations,... may be regarded as summaries of events and as the unifying element in historical writing" (12.25a-b cf. 36.1) He then goes on to castigate another writer who had the pretensions to write history,

Timaeus, for inventing speeches when "it is the function of history in the first place to ascertain the exact words spoken, whatever they may be, and in the second place to inquire into the cause which crowned the action taken or the words spoken with success or failure... A historian... who suppresses both the words spoken and their cause and replaces them by fictious expositions and verbosities, destroys in so doing, the characteristic quality of history..." (12.25a-b). As the historian and classics scholar C. W. Fornara has rightly stressed, there was no convention of inventing speeches for Greek historical works though some bad historians did so. "[C]onventions set the parameters of conduct; we are not entitled to proceed on the assumption that the historians considered themselves at liberty to write up speeches out of their own heads. That some or many or most did so is hypothetically conceivable. We must recognize, however, that such a procedure would have been contrary to convention, and not, as all too many moderns seem to suppose, a convention in its own right."[24]

The portion of Polybius underscored above is especially striking because of the recent work of M. Soards which makes very plain that perhaps the major function of the speeches in Acts is to unify the narrative through a repetition of the major themes of the Good News proclamation.[25] It appears that Luke is carefully following the methodology enunciated by Polybius in his handling of speeches.

It is also Polybius who tells the listener well into his narrative (Book 36, Chapter 12) "The fact that I am deeply involved in a personal sense in the πραζεις which I have to narrate from this point onwards makes it essential for me to vary my references to myself." Part of the point of this is to explain why the first person suddenly appears so late in his histories, not unlike the case in Acts, and partly to explain why he varies the references to himself. Here again the practice has an echo in Acts and suggest Luke's participation in

---

[24] C. W. Fornara, The Nature of History in Ancient Greece and Rome, (Berkeley: U. Cal. Press, 1983), pp. 154-55, emphasis mine. See my discussion of this matter in the volume of essays I edited entitled History, Literature and Society in the Book of Acts (Cambridge: Cambridge U. Press, 1996), pp. 23-32.

[25] M. Soards, The Speeches in Acts. Their Content, Context and Concerns (Louisville: Westminster/J. Knox, 1994),pp. 199ff.

some of the events.[26] J. Jervell has recently stressed the

rule of ancient historiography, the autopsia, is followed as Luke indicates that he personally had taken part in some of the reported events. He announces himself as an eyewitness, co-worker, and companion of Paul in using 'we' (16.10-17; 20.5-15; 21.1-8; 27.1-28.16). There is a wealth of details in these sections compared to other parts of Paul, even details with no significance for his account... We can safely assume that Luke took notes when events happened and used his notes years later. On this point he met the standards of historiography, at least formally."[27]

It is also important to note that both Luke and Acts bear some striking resemblance to the Greek κατα γενος style of arranging one's history, whereby the work proceeds along geographical as well as chronological lines. This sort of approach is seen in the work of Ephorus whose basic principle of arrangment of material seems to be that in a given book or section he will only deal with matters in a particular geographical or major cultural region, usually proceeding with it in chronological order.[28] "Polybius and Diodorus also kept separate the histories of the various regions, although they integrated their material more closely than did Ephorus."[29] For good or ill, Ephorus' approach became standard for Greek historians after him, and I would submit that Luke follows this method.[30]

For example, it has been widely remarked on how Luke's Gospel basically follows not only a chronological arrangement of material but also a geographical arrangement whereby after the preliminary material in Lk. 1-2, we find Jesus first in Galilee, then in

---

[26] See rightly D. E. Aune, The New Testament in its Literary Environment, (Phila: Westminster, 1987), p.124.

[27] J. Jervell, "The Future of the Past. Luke's Vision of Salvation History and its Bearing on his Writing of History," in History, Literature, and Society in the Book of Acts ed. B. Witherington, III, (Cambridge: C. U. Press, 1996), pp. 104-26, here pp. 110ff.

[28] See the discussion in R. Drews, "Ephorus and History Written kata genos," American Journal of Philology 84 (1963), pp. 44-55, and the further evidence he gives in "Ephorus' kata genos History Revisited," Hermes 104 (1976), pp.497-98.

[29] IBID. p.253.

[30] See on this Fornara, History pp. 43-45.

Samaria and finally in Jerusalem and its surrounding villages. In other words Luke's Gospel has a 'going up to Jerusalem' trajectory, whereas Acts basically moves from one region to another starting in Jerusalem and branching out in various directions, eventually ending in the Empire's capital, Rome. It was Ephorus who was apparently first to divide up his historical subjects into separate rolls on the basis of geographical considerations.[31] This might in part explain why the two volumes of Luke-Acts are divided as they are. The first volume will deal with the geographical theater in which Jesus' ministry took place, while the book of Acts will deal with the geographical regions where the early Christian movement and its ministry spread the Good News, largely using the missionary travels of Peter, Philip, and especially Paul from Acts 13 on, to structure the development of the narrative.

Various scholars, including recently B. Rosner and Jervell have argued that if there is a ancient historical niche into which Luke's work seems more nearly to fit it is as a continuation of the sort of history writing one finds in the Hebrew Scriptures, perhaps especially in its Greek translation in the LXX. A closely allied view is that Luke is pursuing the sort of writing one finds in the late hellenized Jewish apologetic historians.[32] For the latter sort of writing G. E. Sterling helpfully offers the following definition: "Apologetic historiography is the story of a subgroup of people in an extended prosed narrative written by a member of the group who follows the groups own traditions but Hellenizes them in an effort to establish the identity of the group within the setting of the larger world."[33]

Yet Acts has some major differences from Hellenized Jewish writers such as Artapanos, Demetrios, Pseudo-Eupolemos, and Josephus.[34] These historians fall into the category of ethnographers of a sort, recounting the history of a particular people, while Luke

---

[31] See especially Drew, p. 253.

[32] See e.g. B. Rosner, "Acts and Biblical History, " in The Book of Acts in its First Century Settings Vol 1. eds. B. W. Winter and A. D. Clarke (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), pp. 65-82, Jervell "The Future of the Past," passim.

[33] G. E. Sterling, Historiography and Self Definition. Josephos, Luke-Acts and Apologetic Historiography (Leiden: Brill, 1992), p.17.

[34] Cf. Sterling, pp. 220ff.

very candidly makes clear that the Christian movement, while growing out of Judaism, involved people from a wide variety of ethnic groups both various sorts of Semites and various sorts of Gentiles. Indeed, one of the major functions of Luke's work seems to be explaining why Christianity, at least by his day, is not predominantly Jewish. Despite the approaching of Jews in synagogues all over the Empire with the message about Jesus, only a minority of Jews have responded positively to the appeal. On the other hand, he recounts repeatedly in detail how Gentiles like Cornelius and others have responded enthusiastically to the Good News. In other words, Luke is trying to explain why his form of religion is one that crosses ethnic boundaries, indeed is a universal religion, inclusive of all ethnic groups.

M. Soards has helpfully noted that there is very little to compare between the speeches in Acts and what we find in 1 and 2 Maccabees or Josephus.[35] While in the case of at least 2 Maccabees and Josephus we have works that are dedicated to presenting and defending Judaism in a favorable light in the wider context of the Hellenized Greco-Roman world, and this may be something like what Luke seeks to do for Christianity, it must be said that the results are very different.[36] The longer one listens to the account in the Acts, the clearer it becomes that while the offer of salvation continues to be made to the Jew first even in Rome at the close of Acts, for they are the original people of God, it is also for everyone.

Luke's account is in part an apologia for, or at least a sympathetic explanation of, a cross-cultural social movement, not just for an ethnic group and its history. Unlike the aforementioned Hellenistic Jewish histories Luke-Acts is not written ad maioram Iudaeorum gloriam, though equally clearly it should not be seen as a super-secessionist polemic against early Judaism either.[37]

---

[35] Soards, The Speeches pp. 159ff.

[36] B. Gärtner, The Areopagus Speech and Natural Revelation (Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1955), pp. 20ff. rightly in my view shows that Josephus and Luke differ considerably in methods, aims, and understandings of history.

[37] Cf. the discussion in R. C. Tannehill, The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts. Volume Two: The Acts of the Apostles (Minn.: Fortress, 1990), pp. 2ff and works cited there.

In regard to the case made by Jervell and others that Luke is writing a continuation of Biblical history, perhaps especially as it is found in the LXX the following should be said. M. Soards has rightly noted the similarities between Nehemiah 9.6-38 and portions of Acts 4.24-30, 7.2-53, 13.16-41,46-47. There is no arguing with the fact that the author is deeply indebted to the Scriptures, especially in its prophetic portions. It is evident in the way he views the content of his narrative and its significance. Furthermore, Luke shares some important things in common with both Biblical and other Jewish historians, that he does not share with Greek ones, for instance his vision of the God of the Bible, or the concept of a chosen people, or the idea of a people guided by a Holy Book. Greek historians say nothing about the latter. What is not noted by those who wish to see Acts as a continuation of OT or at least LXX history writing is that the sort of history Luke chooses to write about is different in crucial respects from the sort found in the OT, or in the Maccabean literature or in the Hellenistic Jewish historians. OT and early Jewish historiography is, like ancient Greek historigraphy, about battles, political intrigue and the like, though of course God is a or even the major player in such dramas. By contrast, Luke is writing about salvation history, God's saving eschatological acts, and fulfillment of Scriptural promises and prophecies that does not come to pass by means of political or military means. Political figures and historical synchronisms play a much less central role.

One is also struck by the fact that Luke's sense of the time or age in which he lives differs markedly from both the earlier Jewish writers in the Bible and his contemporary Josephus. Luke invisions a radical social change initiated by God, not a critical historical development with normal historical antecedents. Acts does not read like the Jewish Wars in this regard.

It is not adequate to see Luke-Acts as simply a continuation of earlier Jewish historigraphic works, if by that one means an organic further development of them. Luke is not writing a mere sequel to the OT, he does not focus on political and military events but rather on the story of the beginning of the fulfillment of all OT hopes, dreams, promises and prophecies by means of the dramatic and surprising intervention of God in Jesus. This is about theological intrusion not mere historical development. Or put another way, it is about the fulfillment of the ends of sacred history caused by divine intrusion in human lives and

situations.[38]

More to the point, Luke's view of the people of God is much more inclusive and universal than one finds in the LXX or in early Hellenistic Jewish historiography. Out of an ethnographic womb has come forth a rather different historical child. It is not accidental that each volume of Luke-Acts begins with a strong Semitic flavor and then becomes more cosmopolitan, even to the extent of an Areopagus address such as we find in Acts 17. It is also not accidental that Jesus' genealogy goes back to Adam, not merely to Abraham (Lk. 3.23-38). The Gentiles will be included within the people of God, and not on narrowly Jewish terms that would require the adopting of a particular cultural and ethnic identity.[39] Indeed, God's plan (βουλη) involves the incorporation of Gentiles into the people of God by planned missionary work, law free and on the basis of grace and faith. Even Peter himself is made to realize this through a vision, and he announces it at the critical council in Acts 15, sounding much like Paul (Acts 15.6-11)! Instead of Gentiles streaming to Zion, Luke envisions Paul going to Rome and explaining even to Jews this new twist in the tale of salvation history.

There were then some partial Jewish antecedents for the general sort of historiographic writing Luke was undertaking, since both sorts of works were indebted in some content and theological and ethical concepts to Biblical historiography and latter Jewish works such as the accounts of the Maccabean revolt, but Luke-Acts does not fit this mold entirely and should be evaluated on its own terms as a two volume historical monograph about a particular religious and social movement.

---

[38] C. E. B. Cranfield, one of my mentors at Durham once remarked, "The new order is not part of the historical process, it does not evolve from the present order; on the contrary, it is the breaking in of that which is outside and beyond history, the replacing, not the self-fulfillment of this order." This can however be discussed as the fulfillment of the divine plan and purpose.

[39] See my forthcoming socio-rhetorical commentary on Acts (to be published by Eerdmans in 1997), and also my article "Not so Idle Thoughts about EIDOLOTHUTON," Tyn.Bul. 44 (1993), pp. 237-54.

Historical Conclusions

Our conclusion is that Luke-Acts bears some strong resemblances to earlier Greek historiographic works in form and method and general arrangement of material, as well as some similarities to Hellenized Jewish historiography in content and general apologetic aims. Furthermore, the echoes and quotes of the OT in Luke-Acts as well as the stress on fulfillment reveal a vital link to the Biblical promises and prophecies of the past. Luke's work follows no one model, but clearly enough it would not have been seen as a work like Roman historiography, Greek biography, or Greek scientific treatises. It would surely however have been seen as some sort of Hellenistic historiography, especially by a Gentile audience.[40] This does not mean that there are not some similarities to other traditions, for instance Tacitus' attempt to write moral history which looks for moral causes of human behaviour and events finds some analogy in Luke's work. Or again Tacitus' shunning of sordid gossip and his seriousness of purpose is like what we find in Luke-Acts. Then too Tacitus' belief that personal participation, and failing that personal research, was essential to writing about recent events seems also to have been Luke's belief.[41]

---

[40] It should be noted however that even some good Roman historians, like Tacitus, while sometimes composing speeches, also often relied on records of speeches they found in the records of the Roman Senate. cf. Mellor, Tacitus p. 19.

[41] See the discussion in Mellor, Tacitus pp. 30ff. I suspect however if Tacitus had read Acts it would have had entirely too much of a Greek and eastern flavor to it to suit him. In particular, its ready use of prophecies, portents, miracles, visions and the like, which was much more characteristic of non-Roman than Roman historiography would have probably have disgusted the sober and often cyncial Tacitus, even though he was not adverse to reporting a prophecy, suspending his usual disbelief, if it added to the power of his story. cf. Histories 2.78-79, 4.81, 5.13. cf. also Mellor, Tacitus p. 49. I also suspect he would have been very skeptical of all the stories in Luke-Acts about people going through character transformation by conversion for "Tacitus, like most Roman writers, usually regarded moral character as fixed at birth and the human personality as essentially static." (Mellor, Tacitus p. 54.). Nor does Luke show the snobbish disdain for slaves, freedmen and freedwomen, and the lower classes so typical of Romans of higher status such as Tacitus.

II. LUKE-ACTS AND RHETORIC

At this juncture we must deal with a subject that sets much of ancient historiography apart from modern history writing-- the influence of rhetoric and rhetorical conventions.[42] Various historians and classics scholars have canvassed this latter subject, and the verdict seems clear enough.[43] Early Greek history writing as embodied in Herodotus and Thucydides was affected by the earlier genres of Greek drama and epic poetry. From the time of Aristotle on there was an increasing influence of other literary traditions as well, especially rhetorical conventions, on the writing of history. By the time we arrive at the first century A.D. some works that claimed to be ιστορια often owed more to declamation and Greco-Roman rhetoric than they did to careful historical study of sources and consulting of witnesses.

For example, Livy who saw the transition from the Roman Republic to the Empire was steeped "in Ciceronian rhetorical theory, and profoundly influenced by that orator's style...." He "probably spent more time upon the literary composition of his history, which included many full-length speeches, than upon the study and comparison of his source material."[44] Even a more sober, cynical and cautious historian like Tacitus can be shown to have taken considerable rhetorical liberties in the presentation of a famous speech by

---

[42] For a general introduction to rhetoric in Luke-Acts cf. W. Kurz, "Hellenistic Rhetoric in the Chirstological Proof of Luke-Acts," CBQ 42 (1980), pp.171-95. Kurz shows that Luke's manner of arguing follows the form of the enthymeme, arguing from premise to conclusion as Aristotle advised (Rhetoric 1,1,11), rather than a Jewish form of argumentation such as proof from prophecy. Further, even in speeches by people like Peter who is 'unlettered' we find stock rhetorical items such as the Hellenistic address form ανδρες αδελφοι, the stress on speaking with παρρησια (free speech), and the use of the oath as evidence (Acts 2.30).

[43] This is stressed by both the historians and the classics scholars cf. S. Usher, The Historians of Greece and Rome, (london: Duckworth, 1985), pp. 100ff. H. F. North, "Rhetoric and Historiography," Quarterly Journal of Speech 42 (1956), pp. 234-42; and especially A. J. Woodman, Rhetoric in Classical Historiography (London: Croom Helm, 1988).

[44] Usher, p. 180-81.

Claudius for which we have an independent record.[45] Some ancients even considered history and history writing a subset or part of the science of rhetoric.[46]

Yet interestingly, even a Livy, whose use of sources can be checked when he draws on a speech from Polybius, does not seem to have engaged in the free invention of speeches, rather "he substantially reproduced the source-content of the speeches he inherited from others."[47] If one can not assume with a highly rhetorical writer like Livy that the free composition of speeches was engaged in, it would be even less warrranted to do so with someone like Luke, especially since there was no convention that ancient historians were free to create speeches.

Even well before the Empire there was an internal debate among historians about how much concession should be given to rhetorical concerns in the writing of history, with continuators of Thucydides like Cratippus disapproving of the inclusions of speeches in history at all since it gave too much freedom for rhetorical invention while on the other end of the scale Theopompus was so obssessed with the literary qualities of his history writing that it may be said that he never saw a rhetorical device that he did not like and use.[48]

It was not however, a matter of the non-rhetorical historians versus the rhetorical ones. The debate was over whether distortion or free invention was allowable in a historical work in the service of higher rhetorical aims. No one was seriously arguing that composers of written history should eschew all literary considerations. As H. F. North says "...there were two essential elements in the ancient concept of history: fidelity to truth and perfection

---

[45] See the discussion in E. G. Hardy, The Speech of Claudius on the Adlection of Gallic Senators," AJP 32 (1913), pp. 79-95 and K. Wellesley, "Can you Trust Tacitus?" Greece and Rome 1 (1951), pp. 13-37.

[46] See K. S. Sacks, "Rhetorical Approaches to Greek History Writing," SBL 1984 Seminar Papers ed. K. H. Richards (Chico: Scholars Press, 1984), pp. 123-33.

[47] Fornara, History p. 161.

[48] See Usher, pp. 100-101.

of style--narratio and exornatio."[49]

We must speak of a sliding scale of those historians like Livy who are more dominated by rhetorical considerations, and those like Cratippus who are less so.[50] Even so serious a historian as Tacitus gave full attention to rhetorical considerations, especially in his speech material and vivid descriptions of battles and other events told in ways meant to evoke pathos. As Mellor says, Tacitus "regarded rhetorical training not merely as a bag of oratorical tricks but as the acquistion of a profound literary culture...".[51] I would suggest the same seems to have been true of Luke as well.

Ancient historical works were meant to be heard primarily and read only secondarily, and this meant that considerable attention had to be given to the aural impression a work would leave on the audience. Furthermore, the audience for such works was well-educated people of some social standing in the overwhelming majority of cases. In other words, first century people who, with rare exceptions, will have had some rhetorical education at both the secondary and tertiary levels of schooling. Furthermore, in "the normal Graeco-Roman curriculum, which varied but little from from the Hellenistic Age to that of the Second

---

[49] Cf. North, "Rhetoric and Historiography," p. 242. On the subject of whether the influence of rhetoric on history writing was a bane or a blessing, she rightly concludes that much depends on the period and on the person. How much freedom did the writer have to tell the truth during the period in which he wrote and about the subject he addressed? Secondly, how much personal and moral commitment did the person have to telling the truth, even if the work suffered somewhat from an aesthetic point of view? In view of the rough spots, even in some of the speeches in Acts, it seems clear that Luke's concern for style was subordinated to his concern for conveying truthful and accurate substance. Relating the good news required a considerable standard of fidelity to the truth about one's sources. Luke also does not seem to be laboring with any imposed external constraints in the telling of his tale. Sometimes he records things that were embarassing to early Christianity (e.g. the Ananias and Saphira episode, the squabbling over the dole for the widows etc.).

[50] Those like Cratippus insisted that veritas replace verisimilitudio cf. North, "Rhetoric and History," p. 239.

[51] Mellor Tacitus p. 7. People often forget that Tacitus was a very gifted rhetor and lawyer long before he became a historian.

Sophistic [in the second century A.D.], history had a firm place in the schools, but it was never studied for its own sake-- always for what it could bring to oratory."[52]

This brings us back to Theophilus, probably Luke's patron, and more certainly of some social standing and thus likely having considerable education. If Luke wished for Theophilus to give ear to the case he was making, he would almost certainly have had to give attention to the rhetorical properties and potentialities of his composition. It may come as some surprise to us, but it was often thought in antiquity that the person most suited to write a work of history was a great orator, like a Cicero.[53] A work of history could be seen as an exercise in producing an extended narratio-- the statement of the facts that provide the points of reference for a rhetorical speech.

Dionysius of Halicarnassus strongly criticized Thucydides for failing to adequately to pay attention to the rhetorical conventions in regard to invention, arrangement, and style. Others during the Roman Empire criticized Thucydides choice of subject as inappropriate for ιστορια which many thought should be a sort of encomimum or epideictic exercise in praising great men, great deeds, great cities, great nations. As we shall see, 2 Maccabees is precisely the sort of document that would have won the praise of such critics during the Empire for it is indeed an epideictic exercise praising great men, great deeds, a great city and temple, and a great nation or people.

Roughly speaking we may divide the influences of rhetoric up into two schools of approach. There were those who thought that the more scientific approach to history writing was in order, and felt Aristotle's advice about rhetoric and history writing should be followed. Polybius, for example, felt that while it was the task of the poet to move or to charm, it was the task of the historian to teach and persuade, but to do so by a selection of events and speeches that record what really happened or really was said however commonplace (cf. 2.56.1-13).

In other words, the art of persuasion, otherwise known as rhetoric, was essential in history writing but serious historians would follow the conventions of deliberative rhetoric

---

[52] North, "Rhetoric," p.235.

[53] See North, "Rhetoric," p. 234.

which had to do with giving advice and counsel about the future, and perhaps also forensic rhetoric which had to do with defending the past, but would stay largely away from epideictic rhetoric, the rhetoric of free invention, and away from mere display and declamation. C. Gempf is right to stress that one should not oversimplify the picture as if there was one clear developing trend in the use of rhetoric or in historiographic methodology in the first century A.D.[54] My point is that there were a variety of views in regard to the use of rhetoric in writing history in Luke's day and that Luke's use of the art of persuasion is more like the more serious earlier Greek historians such as Polybius than he is like a Livy or a Dionysius of Halicarnassus.[55]

As Fornara, has pointed out, style is a function of genre, or to put it differently, different sorts of documents were supposed to be written in different kinds of Greek style.[56] Form and content were expected to coinhere, cooperate, and offer confirmation to one another. This being the case, something can be said about Luke's purposes and intent by evaluating the style and rhetoric of Luke-Acts.

Not incidentally, it has now been demonstrated, after extensive use of the TLG and computer aided comparisons that Luke's Greek style is in various important ways like that of the serious Hellenistic historians, in particular like Polybius' style.[57] Luke is basically no Atticist in his style, nor does he indulge in the florid rhetorical exuberance of a Theopompus.[58] This is important because style was an important indicator of how a work

---

[54] C. Gempf, "Public Speaking and Published Accounts," in The Book of Acts in its Ancient Literary Setting Vol. 1 pp. 259-303.

[55] On the development of rhetoric before and during the Empire cf. D. F. Litfin, St. Paul's Theology of Proclamation (Cambridge: Cambridge U. Press, 1994), pp. 1-134.

[56] Fornara, History, p. 19.

[57] See D. L. Mealand, "Hellenistic Historians and the Style of Acts," ZNW 82 (1991), pp. 42-65.

[58] The only really concessions of Luke to Atticizing tendencies in the writings of historians in the late first century A.D. may be said to be his use of the optative mood which was very rare in Hellenistic vernacular (cf. Acts 8.31, 17.18, 26, 29), as well as the Areopagus address in Acts 17.22-31, where Paul is

should be evaluated in antiquity, and Luke's style suggests that he wishes to be heard as a serious Hellenistic historian would be heard, like a Polybius.

Furthermore, in his ability to vary his style from more to less Semitic, depending on the subject matter (more when in Jerusalem, less the closer he gets to Greece and Rome) he is following the advice of the rhetoricians about the necessity of varying one's style if one wants to appeal to a literate audience. Luke is also attentive to the rhetorical canons of style in regard to the differences that should exist between narrative and reported speeches. Aristides in his Ars rhetorica (1,13,4) sums up the matter neatly: "While the flowing and loose structure is appropriate for narrative and emotional passages, the periodic structure is appropriate for declamations and prooemia and arguments." It is no accident, that Luke's rhetorical skills are more in evidence in the preface and speeches than elsewhere in Luke-Acts.

In his freedom to use Semitisms and the like especially in Lk. 1-2 and Acts 1-12 where it was appropriate, Luke would have been courting a listener who knew and appreciated the cadences and substance of the LXX.[59] This latter Semitizing or

---

addressing an audience which might have appreciated such efforts. This is not to say that he does not sometimes archaize, perhaps especially in the first few chapters of Acts to give it a Semitic flavor, as is also the case in Lk. 1-2. The contrast between the Hellenistic Greek of the preface and the rest of Lk. 1-2 has often been noted (cf. Cadbury, Making p. 223). More importantly for our concerns, Acts becomes progressively more Hellenistic or secular and less Semitic in its style, climaxing in the speech in Acts 17, and in the travel narrative that closes the book (cf. Cadbury, Making, p. 224). The ability to vary style, including at points to write in the style of the LXX and other early Jewish documents shows Luke's considerable skills. If we may take the eyewitness portions towards the close of Acts as a reflection of Luke's normal style (notice how the OT is quoted infrequently in the last eight or so chapters of Acts) when not relying on written sources but simply engaging in free composition, then it must be said that he is Semitizing the early portions of his Gospel and Acts, or else relying on Semitic sources which he does not fully transform.

[59] See J. H. Ropes," An Observation on the Style of S. Luke, " Harvard Studies in Classical Philology 12 (1901), pp.299-305. Luke pays especial attention to the rhetorical canons about variation when one is repeating an idea, motif, or portion of one's narrative as a means to ornament a narrative and avoid monontony.

Setuagintalizing move was in fact not without precedent in a general way in Greek historiography during the Empire for it was a form of deliberate archaizing not unlike those who attempted to Atticize their historical narrative in the latter part of the first century A.D.[60] This simply shows that our author has been influenced by a variety of traditions and is trying to write in a fashion that will allow him to show that the Gospel is for a broad audience including both Gentile and Jew. Archaizing also served the function of stressing a certain kind of link with the past, which is indeed one of Luke's purposes in Luke-Acts. Christianity is not to be seen as a purely new religion, but rather the fulfillment in a more universal mode of a very old one, bringing to fruition ancient prophecies to God's people.

Others historical writers in Luke's era, who seem to have been in the majority during the Empire, preferred to heed the example and successors of Isocrates with the emphasis place on: 1) the moral purpose of history writing (to provide exempli to follow or shun); 2) following an encomiastic and epideictic method characterizing and praising great persons, a method that had more in common with ancient biographical writing than with serious history written by a Polybius or Thucydides; 3) making excessive use of declamation, moralizing digressions, the display of rhetorical virtuosity for stylistic effect, and the introduction of wonders into the narrative for the sake of entertainment.[61]

It must be said that one find precious few moralizing asides or other sorts of intrusions or digressions in Acts (though cf. Acts 17.21). Furthermore, most of the narrative, apart perhaps from a few aspects of the final travel narrative, probably should not be said to be intended for entertainment.[62] The tone and purpose of the account seems far too serious for that. Nor do we find much rhetorical virtuosity displayed for its own sake.

This is not to say that there is not considerable evidence that suggests Luke has certain rhetorical skills and aims. For example, the prologue or exordium in Lk. 1.1-4

---

[60] cf. Aune, The New Testament p.117.

[61] See North, p. 236.

[62] The travel narrative that concludes Acts hardly fits the romance mold, not least because it involves no romance, nor any happy romantic conclusion.

reflects Luke's rhetorical interests. This sentence has been rightly called the best Greek period in the NT. Not only does Luke use a variety of words not found elsewhere in Lk-Acts or the NT (e.g. Επειδηπερ, διηγησις, αναταξασθαι, πληροφορημενος, αυτοπτας), showing his concern to immediately impress upon Theophilus by the style of his composition that this was an important subject worthy of careful listening,[63] but he writes in a clear and direct manner in this sentence as Quintilian required in an exordium (Inst. Or. 4.1.34).[64]

We may also point to a variety of the speeches in Acts that reflect the clear use of forensic and deliberative rhetoric.[65] One may consider for example the forensic rhetoric of the defense speeches in Acts 22-26.[66] Or again one may note the careful rhetorical argument in Paul's synagogue speech in Acts 13.16b-41.[67] P. E. Satterthwaite has shown

---

[63] An elevated subject deserves an evelated or stately style. That what follows does not measure up to this same high standard is in part because Luke goes immediately into a Semitic mode, and in part because the opening of any book on a papyrus roll had to be impressive to get the reader or listener to pay attention to the rest. First impressions were crucial if one did not one's composition to be quickly discarded as not fit for a literate audience's attentions.

[64] R. Morgenthaler, Lukas und Quintilian. Rhetorik als Erzählkunst (Zürich: Gotthelf Verlag, 1993), pp. 393-95. As in his other works Morgenthaler over presses what one can learn from statistical analysis but this does not invalidate many of his observations about Luke's use of rhetoric. The style of writing in Lk. 1.1-4 is clear but not without rhetorical embellishment. Besides the use of unique words one may point to the elegant use of hyperbaton in the phrase αυτοπται και υπηρεται, as well as the reference to have investigated 'everything carefully'.

[65] See now Soards, The Speeches pp. 18ff.

[66] cf. J. Neyrey, "The Forensic Defense Speech and Paul's Trial Speeches in Acts 22-26" in Luke-Acts New Perspectives from the Society of Biblical Literature Seminar, ed. C. H. Talbert (N.Y.: Crossroad, 1984), pp. 210-24; and B. Winter, " The Importance of the Captatio Benevolentiae in the Speeches of Tertullus and Paul in Acts 24.1-21," JTS NS 42 (2, 1991), pp. 505-31.

[67] Cf C. Clifton Black II, "The Rhetorical Form of the Hellenistic Jewish and Early Christian Sermon: a Response to Lawrence Wills," HTR 81 (1988), pp. 1-18, here pp.8ff.

that Luke's choice and arrangement of material in Acts Luke shows familiarity with rhetorical conventions in regard to invention, arrangement, and style of a piece if it was to be persuasive.[68] "At point after point Acts can be shown to operate according to conventions similar to those outlined in classical rhetorical treatises. There are some aspects which it is hard to explain other than by concluding that Luke was aware of rhetorical conventions: the preface; the layout of the speeches; the presentation of the legal proceedings in Acts 24-26."[69] In general, the places where Luke's use of rhetoric becomes most apparent are in the prologues, in the speech material, in his summaries, and in his own travelogue at the end of Acts.

III. ACTS AND 2 MACCABEES-- A CLOSER LOOK

In view of all that we have said about both ancient history writing and rhetoric, a few concluding remarks, in addition to the passing remarks already made, are in order in regard to a comparison of 2 Maccabees and Acts. Firstly, in regard to the scope of the work there is a considerable difference between Acts and 2 Macabees. Acts covers some 30 years in the life of the rising Christian movement (A.D. 30-60), while 2 Maccabees limits itself to covering a fifteen year period of Jewish history (176-161 B.C.), focusing on the exploits of Judas Maccabeus in about two thirds of the length of Acts. Secondly, 2 Maccabees is clearly an epitome as the author admits in the Preface. He is presenting a condensed version in one volume of Jason of Cyrene's five volume work (2 Macc. 2.24). It would be hard to imagine Acts being an epitome. Rather most scholars would suggest that Luke expanded and expounded on the sources that he had.

Thirdly, as a careful reading of 2 Maccabees will show it is like the sort of ancient history writing that focuses on battles and political intrigue. Luke has no interest in the former, and precious little in the latter, except insofar as it has bearing on the progress of the Word and the movement he calls 'the Way'. If one is looking for a similar Jewish writing it

---

[68] P. E. Satterthwaite, "Acts against the Background of Classic Rhetoric," in The Book of Acts Vol. 1, pp. 337-79.

[69] IBID p. 378. On rhetoric, the legal proceedings, and Acts 24-26 cf. B. W. Winter, "Official proceedings and the Forensic Speeches in Acts 24-26," in The Book of Acts Vol. 1 pp. 305-36.

is closer to Josephus' account of the Jewish Wars, than to Acts. Fourthly, in 2 Maccabbees speeches and prayers do not bind the work together thematically or give the narrative direction or summation as is the case in Acts. They are also notably much less plentiful. In fact there is more quoting of letters than there is quoting of speeches in 2 Maccabees (the letters are in two major blocks of material-- 1.1-2.18 and 11.16-38 but we also find one in 9.19-29).[70]

Fifthly, it is clear enough that 2 Maccabees is some form of ethnography. It does not have the more universal character of Luke's Acts. Rather than crossing ethnic lines and social barriers this work intends to reinforce them, as it abhors the over-Hellenizing of Jews (especially at the level of theology and religious praxis, cf. 4.10, 13), and calls Jews back to a faithful keeping of the Law, including observing the festivals, and being willing to die rather than submit to idolatrous practices. This author reflects some of the effects of Hellenization in his writing style (see below) but he is unbending when it comes to matters of content and way of life. He has nothing but praise for Judas' Maccabeus' zeal for restoring Israel to its former glory by means of both military victory and renewal of its Biblical faith and reliance on the Sovereign God of heaven.

To a Graeco-Roman audience this work might well remind one of Roman rather than Greek history writing in its lack of autopsia, its epitomizing method (the method of an armchair historian), its focus on one people. It would also likely have appeared to be some kind of local history, because of the ongoing focus on and concern in 2 Maccabees about the Temple in Jerusalem and its proper priesthood and rites.

A further difference between 2 Maccabees and Acts is that in 2 Maccabees the author resorts to direct address to his audience in the middle of his narrative. At 2 Macc. 6.12-17 the author steps forward and directly urges his audience not to be depressed at the war and gore, the calamities and perversities he has just recounted. There is nothing like this in Acts.

Perhaps however the most striking difference between Acts and 2 Maccabees is in

---

[70] For prayers see 2.24-29 within a letter, 14.35-36, and 15.22-24. For speeches see especially 6.24-30; 7.27-38; 14.6-10; and for dialogue see especially Chapter 7.

their indications about the purpose of their respective works. Luke on the one hand claims he has observed things carefully from the beginning and intends to write an orderly account so his audience may know the truth (or have certainty) about the things which they have been instructed (Lk. 1.1-4).

Contrast this not only to the peculiar placing of letters before the preface in 2 Maccabees but also to the actual content of that preface. He begins his preface at 2 Macc. 2.19 by stating in precis form the content of what was in his source, which he will be presenting a condensed version of, and then beginning in vss. 25ff. he reveals his real interests.

He is writing to please those who wish to read, in fact to profit all his readers. He wishes to secure the gratitude of many (vs. 27). While Jason of Cyrene is viewed as a master builder who had contructed the basic history and taken the time to pay attention to the mass of details and the historical truth in a way our author has not (see vs. 28), our author likens himself to an exterior decorator-- 'the one who undetakes its painting and decoration has to consider only what is suitable for its adornment.' To use rhetorical terms, he is mainly interested in ornatio not in careful or precise narratio.

The author's concern about and playing to the audience is equally clear in the epilogue at 15.38. He has attempted to take the basic history and enhance ones enjoyment of it (15.39), he desires to make sure that 'the style of the story delights the ears of those who read the work' (also 15.39). The aural dimensions of rhetoric and style are of much greater concern to him than substantive arguments or acts of persuasion, or detailed recounting of historical happenings.

In other words our author is very concerned about the rhetorical effect of the account, the impression the sound and style of the account will make on his audience. He is writing much more for the sake of entertainment and enjoyment and exhortation than for historical purposes and so he feels free to play up the elements that produce pathos in the account and will move his audience. This is so much so that, as we have noted, he pauses to encourage the audience not to get depressed about all the war and gore, even though he delights in recording for instance how Razis fell on his sword but couldn't quite do himself in so he ripped out his own entrails and hurled them at the crowd (14.37-46), or how Antiochus

Epiphanes was eaten alive by worms and had an unbearable stench (2 Macc. 9), or how various loyal Jews made dramatic pious remarks just before dying for their faith (2 Macc. 6-7). Luke's account of the death of Herod's death in Acts 12 and the martyrdom of Stephen in Acts 6 pale in comparsion and seems much more restrained and tame in both content and tone.[71]

In short, 2 Maccabees is a work that much better suits Pervo's description of the ancient romance than Acts does.[72] Here indeed the main goal is profit with delight, or in this case delight with some profit. Here the author's rhetoric is a matter of style and sensationalistic story telling by piling up adjectives and descriptive phrases, and interjecting regular value judgments. It can be said to be an exercise in epideictic rhetoric, the rhetoric of praise and blame, which in this case involves the praising of Judas Maccabbee and other loyal Jews like him and the blaming of villains like Antiochus Epiphanes, all with a hortatory aim in sight (namely character formation).[73] This is not even the Classics Illustrated version of the Maccabean story, it is closer to the National Enquirer version, if one evaluates 2 Maccabees as serious historiography. I would submit however that this was not the intent

---

[71] Also notable is the number of times in 2 Maccabees that the author uses dramatic adjectives and adverbs to characterize a person in the narrative and is perfectly prepared to make remarks on their state of mind, bordering on psycholanalysis (cf. e.g. 5.11,25; 7.24; 12.4). This also does not characterize the account in Acts where the author focuses on deeds, not on personalities. The author of 2 Maccabbees is seeking to thrill, inspire, encourage, and build character, Luke is much more interested in instructing and setting the record straight.

[72] See his Profit with Delight (Minn.: Fortress, 1987).

[73] Notice how the author places the mention of his hero Judas Maccabee at the very beginning of his preface in Chapter 2. When the conventions and interests of epideictic rhetoric re applied to historical material, in the end this produces material much more like the moralistic biographical works of Plutarch in his parallel lives than like serious ancient historiography.

of the author as his preface and epilogue and the way he handles his data show.[74] As an exercise in moralizing rhetoric using some historical events as a source of illustration the author is succesful.

The upshot of all this is that in both in content and intent, both in method and style 2 Maccabees has more differences from than similarities to Acts.

---

[74] Since there is overlap between 1 Maccabees and 2 Maccabees it is useful to compare and contrast the handling of the common material. For one thing 2 Maccabees resorts to rhetorical hyperbole, depicting the armies and deaths as considerably larger in number than the accounts in 1 Maccabees. For another thing 2 Maccabees differs in the accounts of Judas' conflicts with other nations, in particular in the chronological correlation of these events with the death of Antiochus Epiphanes (cf. 1 Macc. 6.1-16; 2 Macc. 1.12-16 and Chapter 9). On this see H. C. Kee's introduction in The Cambridge Annotated Study Apocrypha, (Cambridge: Cambridge U. Press, 1994), pp. xxvi-xxvii.

The Beginning of a Narrative Commentary on the Gospel of Mark

Elizabeth Struthers Malbon
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

Narrative critics have for a number of years provided detailed literary analyses of individual pericopae or somewhat broader analyses of one literary element of a narrative (settings, characterization, plot, rhetoric--for example, irony). *Mark as Story* by David Rhoads and Donald Michie looks at each of these four elements in turn for Mark's Gospel. More recently we are beginning to see commentaries from a literary critical or narrative critical point of view. This is an exciting and challenging move since the commentary form is perhaps the greatest monument to scholarly dissection of the biblical text, and narrative critics, in contrast, have sought to draw attention to the *whole* story.

One challenge of a narrative commentary is to deal with settings, characters, plot, and rhetoric simultaneously. A second challenge in fitting narrative critical insights into the sequential commentary form is the issue of reading and rereading. Temporality and directionality are important dimensions of narratives, but does this suggest that the commentator should write for a first-time reader, one who only knows what has already been narrated at a given point? Or is such a "first-time hearer/reader" an empty category, devoid of real hearers/readers in the first century as well as in the twentieth?

In facing these issues in writing a Markan narrative commentary (for the Narrative New Testament Series to be published by Polebridge Press) I have judged that I can best reflect the insights of narrative criticism for commentary users by pointing out initially how the Markan story unfolds sequentially--with its settings, characters, plot, and rhetoric--but by periodically looking back or looking forward in narrative time to related episodes, thus mirroring Mark's own frequent use of echoes and foreshadowings. This paper presents as a sample a draft of the beginning of my Markan narrative commentary: Mark 1-3.

The relatively brief commentary is addressed to a broad audience of undergraduate, graduate, and seminary students and laity. The basic text is the *New Revised Standard Version*, with transliterated Greek words or phrases, explanations, or alternative translations provided only as needed. Scholarly citations are largely avoided--the goal being to engage the commentary reader with the primary narrative rather than with the secondary literature. The portion of the narrative commentary that follows is a working draft. Comments are most welcome!!

Chapters 1-3
The Time is Fulfilled

1:1 THE BEGINNING OF THE GOSPEL . . .

Mark's Gospel is sometimes called the mysterious gospel. The mystery begins at the beginning. **The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God** (1:1, *RSV*). Every word of this opening statement opens up possible meanings for the reader--including the words that are "missing." The "sentence," of course, has no verb. Readers may be tempted to supply [This is] as a "proper" lead-in to 1:1, but the phrase should be allowed to stand as an announcement, a proclamation. As a doorkeeper announces royal guests, "The King and the Queen," or a layreader in some churches proclaims a biblical reading, "The Word of the Lord," so the Markan implied author proclaims, **The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God.** Our proper response in each case is to give attention.

Four words or phrases demand attention: beginning, gospel, Jesus Christ, Son of God. We will begin at the end and work back to the beginning. The phrase **Son of God** or **the Son of God**, while present in a number of ancient manuscripts and witnesses, is absent in a number of others. In terms of the overall narrative, the inclusion of **Son of God** in 1:1 is certainly appropriate because it becomes a highly significant way of describing Jesus in Mark's story, as the re-reader knows. God calls Jesus "my son" at two critical moments: the baptism (1:11) and the transfiguration (9:7). The demons or unclean spirits recognize Jesus as the Son of God on the basis of his healing power (3:11; cf. 1:24; 5:7). But not until the most dramatic moment of the plot, the crucifixion, does a human character recognize Jesus as **Son of God**, and then--surprisingly enough--it is the Roman centurion who has just helped crucify him (15:39). The first-time reader is alerted to keep an ear out for the designation **Son of God**, to solve the mystery of why it has earned this important place in the opening proclamation.

Jesus Christ is also a proclamation, a statement of faith. Christ is not Jesus' last name, of course--as if it would appear as Christ, Jesus in an alphabetical listing. The English *Christ* transliterates the Greek *Christos*, which, in turn, translates the Hebrew *Messiah*, meaning "anointed one." In early Jewish tradition God's "anointed one" referred to one called by God for a special task, usually a king or a prophet. Many forms of Jewish faith and practice at the turn of the eras (from BC to AD or from BCE to CE) manifested hope--of several sorts--that God would soon send Israel a new messiah. The earliest Christians were Jews who affirmed that this hope had been met in Jesus. **Jesus** [is the] **Christ**. [We proclaim] **Jesus** [as the] **Christ**. Mark's gospel unfolds a story of what sort of Christ Jesus is, what it means to proclaim Jesus as the Christ (see especially 8:29 and 14:61).

Mark's opening statement proclaims **the gospel of Jesus Christ**. The *NRSV* gives "good news" as its first translation of *euangelion* and "gospel" in the note--probably to counteract the tendency of contemporary readers to hear "gospel" as the literary genre and official designation of the books of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. That, naturally, would be an anachronistic misunderstanding. For the implied author and audience of Mark 1:1, **gospel** means what it means in Paul's letters (e.g., 1 Thes 1:5; Rom 1:1, 3, 9, 15): the good news proclaimed by and about Jesus, the good news of how God is now acting in the world. Greek scholars discuss whether the relationship indicated in English by **of** (and in Greek by the genitive ending of *Iēsou Christou*) is subjective--the gospel Jesus proclaimed--or objective--the gospel about Jesus. Mark's narrative seems not to require this specification but rather to invite the richness of the ambiguity.

Since the opening statement has no verb--as distinctive a feature in Greek as in English--it serves easily as a title. A title is a proclamation or announcement of the work that follows. The ancient manuscripts of Mark begin not with "The Gospel according to Mark" but with 1:1. It is easy for the re-reader, and not difficult for the first-time reader, to hear **the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God** as a title for Mark's work. Even as an incomplete sentence that phrase makes complete sense. But we must return now to the beginning, for the complete opening is **The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God.** This is such a challenging possibility as a title for the whole work (why just the beginning? why not the whole story?) that some commentators have chosen to interpret 1:1 as a heading for the initial scene (John the baptizer) or scenes (Jesus' baptism and possibly Jesus' testing in the wilderness). Since 1:1 is the only such heading in the entire narrative this explanation is a weak one, and it misses the profoundly simple proclamation with which Mark's gospel challenges its audience: [I will tell you] **The beginning of the gospel . . . .** [You hear my story to its end--its open-ended ending--and you tell me if that is the end of the gospel.] The first-time reader's response of "strange opening, strange book" may lead to the re-reader's response of "mysteriously living good news."

1:2-13 JESUS AND GOD

We are now ready for Mark's story of Jesus Christ, but we hear first Isaiah's story of a messenger. We expect Jesus, but we meet Isaiah, who points to John, who points to Jesus. To understand the story of Jesus we must hear it in its overall context. That context is suggested by **As it is written in the prophet Isaiah.** The implied audience would immediately recognize **it is written** as an invocation of biblical authority (Paul used the same formula). Mark's story of God's activity in Jesus Christ will rest on the older story of God's activity with Israel; Mark's narrative will be filled with intertextual echoes of the Jewish Bible. The modern reader--with the help of good reference notes--may be troubled by the fact that 1:2-3 is a composite quotation drawn from Exodus 23:20 and Malachi 3:1 as well as Isaiah 40:3. Perhaps this troubled the authors of Matthew and Luke as well, since they present only the Isaiah passage at this point. But the discrepancy hardly detracts from the impact of Mark's beginning his narration with a citation of the Hebrew Bible--in the form of its Greek translation, the Septuagint.

Mark's quotation from the Septuagint would likely have been made from memory (as the embedded Exodus and Malachi passages suggest), and Mark's memory--or creativity--has played an interesting trick or two. Verses 2-4 are one long sentence. Our understanding is helped by simplifying this sentence to its basic elements: **As it is written . . . [so] John the baptizer appeared . . . .** The Septuagint of Isaiah 40:3 (lying behind Mk 1:3) might be translated: "A voice cries out in the wilderness prepare the way of the Lord, make straight the roads of our God." Does "in the wilderness" explain where the crying voice was heard? Or where the voice said the way of the Lord should be prepared? (The Hebrew text, reflected, for example, in the *NRSV*, suggests the latter. However, the Septuagint lacks the phrase "in the desert" in the second parallel line, making the Markan reading more understandable.) It suits Mark's purposes to have the crying voice in the wilderness, as **John the baptizer appeared in the wilderness.** The implied reader completes the link: John is **the voice** preparing **the way of the Lord.**

But who is the Lord? The Hebrew text and the Septuagint clearly indicate God: "the way of the Lord" is paralleled by "the roads of God." But in the Markan text this reference is made mysteriously ambiguous--or ambiguously mysterious?--by substituting "his" for God in the second phrase. **"Prepare the way of the Lord, make his** [i.e., the Lord's] **paths straight"** (1:3). Since in early Christian tradition the title Lord (Greek

kurios) was applied to Jesus, the Isaian reference has been opened up as applicable to Jesus. The implied reader is inclined to complete the link: Jesus is Lord.

The reader has been led to conclude that John is the one who makes preparation in the wilderness. In the biblical tradition the wilderness is the place *par excellence* of preparation. There God prepares Israel for entry into the promised land. The preparation now needed by Israel--**people from the whole Judean countryside and all the people of Jerusalem**--is **a baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins**. This baptism John proclaims in the wilderness (1:4) and enacts in the river Jordan (1:5). The force of the imagery of the uninhabitable wilderness is challenged with competing images: a way or road, denoting transition and movement; large groups of people, suggesting a vital communal response; the river, a source of water and life; the river Jordan, a boundary of the promised land. As Israel passed through the Red Sea and into the wilderness of the exodus, through the river Jordan and into the promised land, so now all Judea and Jerusalem by baptism in the river Jordan in the wilderness passes through repentance to forgiveness of sins.

With these overarching themes in mind, verse 6 might strike the reader as a footnote. With issues like repentance and forgiveness to develop, why does the narrator bother to describe John's clothing and diet? The implied author, of course, is assuming the implied audience will pick up the biblical allusion to the prophets in general (Zech 13:4, "hairy mantle") and to Elijah in particular (1 Kg 19:19, "mantle"; 2 Kg 1:8, "A hairy man, with a leather belt around his waist."). Elijah was expected to come as the forerunner of the Messiah, on the basis of Malachi 4:5-6: "Lo, I will send you the prophet Elijah before the great and terrible day of the Lord comes. He will turn the hearts of parents to their children and the hearts of the children to their parents, so that I will not come and strike the land with a curse." John not only dresses like the prophet Elijah--**clothed with camel's hair, with a leather belt around his waist**, he functions like the returning Elijah--as a bringer of reconciliation and a harbinger of "the Lord." Within the Markan narrative John becomes Elijah (9:9-13). **Locusts and wild honey** are foods provided directly by God in the wilderness, not the products of human argiculture. John depends on God alone, and John proclaims not himself but solely the more powerful one to come.

First, John proclaims straightforwardly: **The one who is more powerful than I is coming after me.** Then John suggests a metaphoric analogy: I am less than the servant who unties the **sandals** of the coming one; he is that great. Finally John contrasts the baptism he administers--**with water**--and the baptism the coming one will give--**with the Holy Spirit**. Thus, John, as a character, describes both literally and metaphorically the more powerful one who is coming, but he does not name this character. Just as in vv. 2-6 the narrator leads the reader to view John as Elijah, so in vv. 7-8 the narrator prepares the reader to conclude for herself or himself what was stated in 1:1--Jesus is the Christ. John proclaimed that the more powerful one was coming, and **In those days Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee . . . .**

In those days is perhaps the biblical equivalent of the "Once upon a time" of fairy tales or the *In illo tempore* (Latin for "In that time") of myths. The temporal marker embeds the coming of Jesus in the broader sweep of history, the unfolding story of God's activity. A calendar is no help in locating an event that occurred **in those days**. A livlier imagination is called forth. Yet Mark's story of Jesus does not float off into mythic time and space; it is anchored geographically: **Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee and was baptized by John in the Jordan.** It seems unlikely that the information about Jesus' home town and region is included at this point simply to differentiate Jesus of Nazareth from any other Jesus. The opening statement about **Jesus Christ** (1:1) clearly implies that the audience already has the correct Jesus in mind! Rather the Markan implied author has chosen to give the implied reader the first glimpse of Jesus as someone who has come

from Nazareth of Galilee *to* the Jordan, presumably at some place in Judea (see 1:5). This initial movement *from* Galilee *to* Judea will be paralleled by the broader movement of the plot.

Still, neither Galilee nor Judea form a stage vast enough for the drama Mark wants to enact. The primal elements of water and the heavens must be the backdrop for such a story. **And just as he was coming up out of the water, he saw the heavens torn apart [split, *schizō*] and the Spirit descending like a dove on him.** In Jesus' baptism heaven and earth, divinity and humanity, make contact. Israel's hope that God "would tear open the heavens and come down" (Isaiah 64:1) is met in this occurrence. When, later in the Markan story, the curtain of the temple is split (*schizō*, 15:38) this cosmic event is echoed. The baptismal water of the Jordan, like the water receding after the flood, signals a new creation, a new era of peace and wholeness. As the dove sent forth by Noah came to rest on the renewed earth, so **the Spirit descending like a dove** comes to rest on Jesus.

Water, the heavens, dove--these are the visual images. The verbal script is filled in by **a voice . . . from heaven**. As the implied reader came to label **the voice of one crying out in the wilderness** John the baptizer, so the reader comes even more quickly to label the **voice** that **came from heaven** God. With a strong allusion to Psalm 2:7, a royal psalm, the voice (of God) addresses not the king but Jesus: **"You are my Son, the Beloved; with you I am well pleased"** (1:11). John was clearly right: a more powerful one has come after him. The one John said would baptize **with the Holy Spirit** (1:8) has now been baptized *by* the (Holy) Spirit. John has prepared the way of the Lord, and Jesus has come. God is **well pleased**. And the implied reader has come to see within the story what the narrator asserted at its beginning: Jesus is Son of God. There is a sense of resolution here. But it is momentary.

And the Spirit immediately drove him out into the wilderness (1:12). Jesus is clearly under the power of the Spirit. As Jesus will soon cast out (*exballō*, 1:34, 39, *et al.*) unclean spirits, manifesting power over them, so here Jesus is cast out (*exballō*, 1:12) by the most clean Spirit, who thus has power over him. In the power of that Spirit, the Markan Jesus **was in the wilderness forty days, tested** (*peirazomenos*; *NRSV* **tempted) by Satan . . .** (1:13). Apparently being Son of God does not make for an easy life. Jesus relived symbolically Israel's forty-year period of testing in the wilderness, the uninhabitable wilderness where one must learn to rely on God's providence. But Jesus **was with the wild beasts** of the wilderness and was not harmed. Indeed **the angels ministered to** (*diakoneō*; *NRSV* **waited on**) **him**. Jesus passed the test of his exodus, as did Moses in his forty-day fast on Mt. Sinai (Ex 34:28; Deut 9:9, 18) and Elijah in his forty-day survival on the food given by the angel in the wilderness (1 Kg 19:4-8). Jesus also met quite exactly the test for a righteous person given in the *Testament of Naphtali* 8:4: "If you do good, my children, both men and angels shall bless you, and the Devil shall flee from you and the wild beasts shall fear you and the Lord shall love you" (Nineham: 64).

God has indeed called Jesus **the Beloved** (1:11) in one of only two brief speeches God makes in Mark's gospel. The other divine speech is parallel to this one at the baptism; at the transfiguration a **voice** from **the cloud** says, **"This is my Son, the Beloved; listen to him!"** (9:7). What the omniscient narrator asserts at 1:1--that Jesus is **the Son of God**--is confirmed by the omniscient character God at 1:11, speaking to Jesus, and, later, at 9:7, speaking to three disciples. The narrator can gain no higher credibility for his point of view than having it shared by God. The character most opposed to God, in Jewish and Christian tradition as well as in Mark's gospel, is Satan. The Jewish name **Satan**, the adversary, is used rather than the Hellenistic term the Devil. Satan is given but one action as a character in all of Mark's narrative--and no speech. **Tested** is a better translation for this action (*peirazomenos*, 1:13) than **tempted** (*NRSV*); it means putting to the proof or subjecting to trial. As God's beloved son, Jesus passes the test inflicted

by God's hated enemy. This silent testing of Jesus by Satan confirms from the negative pole of Markan characters what the words from the heavens affirm from the positive pole. In the gospel's opening scenes the superhuman character God and the subhuman character Satan serve to inform the implied reader that Jesus is an extraordinary human character.

As 1:1 *tells* who Jesus is in relation to God--Chrsit and Son of God, so 1:2-13 *shows* who Jesus is in relation to God. According to the Markan narrator, Isaiah points to John, who becomes Elijah and points to Jesus. The gospel of Jesus is in continuity with the Scriptures of Israel; images recur: voice, way, wilderness, water, river Jordan, the heavens, forty, angels. God claims Jesus as his own son, suggesting in Jewish tradition Jesus' obedience to God as father. Such power and obedience does not release Jesus from testing, even testing by Satan, but sustains him through it. The main character of Mark's gospel, Jesus, is now linked with the main character of Mark's Bible, God. Jesus is empowered by God to be obedient. His time has come.

1:14-45 JESUS AND THE REIGN OF GOD

Verses 14-15 are often recognized as transitional; they both cap the movement of the narrative from 1:1 through 1:13 and also set the agenda for the rest of chapter 1: Jesus **proclaiming the gospel** (*NRSV* **good news**) **of God**. Continuity between Jesus' proclamation and John's is signaled by the terms **repentance** (1:4) and **repent** (1:15). Both continuity and development between Jesus' proclamation and the narrator's opening proclamation is indicated by the echoing of the term **gospel** (good news): the narrator proclaims **the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God** (v. 1), and Jesus proclaims **the gospel of God** and implores the implied audience to **believe in the gospel** (vv. 14-15). For the Markan narrator, **the gospel of Jesus Christ** *is* **the gospel of God** because Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God. The summary statement given to the character Jesus in v. 15 also manifests the distinction between Jesus' proclamation and anything presented as yet by John or the narrator. John fulfilled Isaiah's prophecy to **"Prepare the way of the Lord,"** but Jesus announces: **"The time is fulfilled, and the reign** (*RSV* and *NRSV* **kingdom**) **of God is at hand . . ."** (v. 15, *RSV*). Jesus, having been commissioned by God, now sets about his task.

From this bold announcement the story moves immediately into a series of Jesus' actions--calling disciples, teaching, casting out demons, healing the sick, praying--that serve to illustrate what life can be like now that **the reign of God has come near**. But let us pause for a moment to consider the posssible meanings of this explosive affirmation. First, Greek has two words for **time**; the one used here is not *chronos*--chronological time, one thing after another--but *kairos*--the right, proper, or favorable time. The right time is *peplērōtai*, **fulfilled**, fully arrived, filled up; the passive construction implies that it is filled up by God. Second, the traditional translation of *hē basileia tou theou*, **the kingdom of God**, is easily misinterpreted to suggest a place, a physical locale, where God is king--perhaps on the analogy of political entities such as the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. But the force of the Greek *basileia* is more active than spatial; it indicates the ruling activity of God, thus God's reign. Such ruling activity of God, the Markan Jesus states, **has come near** (*NRSV* preferred) or **is at hand** (*NRSV* note). The perfect tense of the Greek verb indicates an action completed in past time but with an effect continuing in the present. This good news is what vv. 14-15 *tell* and vv. 16-45 *show*: the hoped-for time is here; the activity of God's reign has begun and continues in the actions of Jesus.

The temporal and spatial indicators in v. 14 also mark the transition from the era of preparation to that of fulfillment: **Now after John was arrested, Jesus came to Galilee . . . .** When we were prepared to hear the story of Jesus at 1:2, we were surprised to hear Isaiah's prophecy and John's story. Now John's story comes to an abrupt end as Jesus' story moves into full swing. When was John arrested, by whom, and why? the implied naive or first-time reader might well ask. The re-reader knows (6:14-29)--and likely knows as well why the narrator postpones this explanation. The brief notice here serves to dramatize the shift from the time of preparation to the time of fulfillment.

When **Jesus came to Galilee** it was, in the Markan plot, as a return to Galilee. For his baptism by John **Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee** to the Jordan in Judea. As Jesus' initial movement from Galilee to Judea in 1:9 is echoed on the grand scale in chapters 1-9 and 10-16, so Jesus' dramatic return from Judea to Galilee at 1:14 foreshadows his even more dramatic promised return from Judea to Galilee after the resurrection (14:28; 16:7).

Once the Markan Jesus is back in Galilee, **the Sea of Galilee** begins to assert its significant role in the spatial framework of the narrative. The first and final Markan usages of *thalassa*, sea, for spatial location, 1:16 and 7:31, specify *thalassa tēs Galilaias*, **the Sea of Galilee**. Since "the name as applied to the lake does not appear until the gospels use it" (*IDB* 2:348), and since Mark may have been the first gospel written, the author of Mark may have given the lake this name (Malbon, 1984). As Jesus is **of Galilee** (1:9), so the lake he **passed along** (1:16) and crossed over (chaps. 4-8) is **of Galilee**. In addition, this large, freshwater lake is called in Mark's narrative **the sea**, a term that serves with richer scriptural connotations and as a more significant contrast to the land or earth, as we will see later (see 4:1-2).

At this point in Mark's story the sea serves as the appropriate background for literal and metaphorical fishing. **As Jesus passed along the Sea of Galilee, he saw Simon and his brother Andrew casting a net into the sea--for they were fishermen. And Jesus said to them, "Follow me and I will make you fish for people'"** (1:16-17). The new characters are introduced to the implied reader as abruptly as Jesus is introduced to them. Nevertheless, **immediately they left their nets and followed him** (1:18). **Followed** (*akoloutheō*) is a discipleship word in Mark's gospel; by their action in response to Jesus' call, Simon and Andrew take the first steps on the way of discipleship. Within the narrative they literally **left their nets** and symbolically left their vocation, their profession. In a second phase of this double--or quadruple--call story, a second pair of brothers, **James son of Zebedee and his brother John, who were in their boat mending the nets**, literally **left their father Zebedee in the boat with the hired men** and symbolically left their family as well as their profession. The story expands dramatically: a one-sentence call leads to two followers, then two more, who leave not only profession but family. These striking departures of fishermen all turn on a figurative phrase: **fish for people**.

The unusual metaphor of fishing for people appears in the book of the prophet Jeremiah--"I am now sending for many fishermen, says the Lord" (Jer 16:16)--where it involves judgment of the people caught, but also teaching them: "Therefore I am surely going to teach them, this time I am going to teach them my power and my might, and they shall know that my name is the Lord" (Jer 16:21). The implied reader of this call narrative in Mark has little to go on to interpret the fishing metaphor at this point. Perhaps teaching about the power of "the Lord" will be a part of it. What is most striking is the immediacy with which the four follow Jesus and the primacy that calling others has for Jesus in **proclaiming the gospel of God** (1:14). If **the reign of God is at hand** (1:15), then the Markan Jesus immediately assumes a core community will be needed. The kingdom requires a community; the ruling activity of God calls forth the gathering activity of people.

To fish for people one must go not to the sea but to the town; **they went to Capernaum** (1:21). Again the setting shifts to form the appropriate background for the words and actions of Jesus. The narrator indicates a holy time and a holy place--on **the sabbath**, in **the synagogue**--for Jesus' action--teaching and healing with **authority** (1:21, 27). Jesus entering **the synagogue** on **the sabbath** and teaching is narrated as an ordinary occurrence for Jesus as an adult male Jew (1:21; cf. 6:2). What was extraordinary was the nature of that teaching: **They were astounded at his teaching, for he taught them as one having authority, and not as the scribes** (1:22). Jesus' teaching is depicted by contrasting it with that of **the scribes**, the traditional religious lawyers or trained biblical interpreters, who could reasonably expect respect in the synagogue, a house of prayer and of study of the Scripture. The implied reader may not be entirely clear whether, in contrast to Jesus, the scribes have *no* authority; or, whether, in contrast to Jesus, the scribes have only *derivative* authority. But Jesus' authority is presented as direct and certain.

And immediately (*kai evthus*) **there was in their synagogue a man with an unclean spirit . . .** (1:23, *RSV*). Just as Jesus was confronted by the (Holy) Spirit immediately after being called "my Son" by the voice (of God), so Jesus is immediately confronted by an unclean spirit after having taught with authority. Already Mark's plot has little time for peaceful scenes of glory. The unclean spirit seems to know what God and the narrator know, for it cries out through the possessed man: **"What have you to do with us, Jesus of Nazareth? Have you come to destroy us? I know who you are, the Holy One of God"** (1:24). The unclean spirit knows both Jesus' human roots (**of Nazareth**) and his divine commission (**Holy One of God**); it knows that in Jesus' presence *all* unclean spirits (**us**) risk destruction. Jesus demands that the unclean spirit **"Be silent, and come out of him!"** (1:25), and the unclean spirit obeys with violence, **convulsing** the possessed man and **crying with a loud voice** (1:26). Amazingly enough not only the **voice** of God (1:11) but also the **voice** of an unclean spirit (1:24, 26) serves to establish for the implied reader Jesus' relationship to God.

Not so amazingly, the people in the synagogue **were all amazed**. What amazes the implied reader is their way of expressing their amazement: not "What is this? A new power of exorcism!" but **"What is this? A new teaching--with authority!"** (1:27). The people do go on to say, speaking with one voice as is typical in Mark's gospel and in most ancient literature, **"He commands even the unclean spirits, and they obey him"** (1:27). But the question **they kept on asking one another** was the one about his teaching with authority. For the implied author of Mark, Jesus' teaching and exorcizing are not two separable activities; they are both manifestations of Jesus' **proclaiming the gospel of God** (1:14); they are two aspects of the at-hand-ness of God's reign (1:15). Thus the implied author intercalates (or interweaves) these two activities: Jesus' teaching/Jesus' exorcizing/response to both. Both manifest Jesus' **authority** (1:22, 27) and the in-breaking of the reign of God. That experience is the basis of the **fame** that **began to spread throughout the surrounding region of Galilee** (1:28).

And immediately (*kai evthus*) **he left the synagogue, and entered the house . . .** (1:29, *RSV*). The *NRSV* uses so many different translations for Mark's frequent *kai evthus* that the English reader misses the urgency and directness with which the Markan plot unfolds--or rather, spills out--in chapter 1. The *RSV* gives a better indication. At 1:29 we have a change of scene--from **synagogue** to **house**, from sacred space to secular, from public to private--and a change of focal characters--from Jesus and a male demoniac, with all the congregation observing, to Jesus and a female with a fever, with four men observing. Some names are given: it is **the house of Simon and Andrew**, the first two fishermen called to fish for people, and with them are **James and John**, the second two fishermen called. (Are fishing for people and healing connected?) Although she is the recipient of Jesus' healing power, **Simon's mother-in-law** does not receive a name from

the narrator. The healing is narrated simply: **He came and took her by the hand and lifted her up. Then the fever left her, . . .** (1:31). Her response is presented both simply and profoundly: **and she began to minsister to** (*diakoneō*; *NRSV* **serve**) **them** (1:31).

The profundity is in the choice of the verb *diakoneō*, which means not only "to serve," "to wait on" in the literal sense often involving food, but also "to minister to," "to serve" in a larger sense that leads to the term for the early Christian office of *diakonos* and eventually to the English words "diaconate" and "deacon." The first-time reader of Mark likely remembers, only eighteen verses back, that **the angels ministered to** (*diakoneō*) Jesus (1:13). But the re-reader may recall Jesus' later words to his disciples: **"For the Son of Humanity** (*NRSV* **Son of Man**) **came not to be served** (*diakoneō*) **but to serve** (*diakoneō*), **and to give his life a ransom for [the] many"** (10:45). Only on one other occasion is anyone said to minister to others in Mark's gospel--and that reference is equally simple and profound (15:41).

By two dramatic cases, the Markan narrator has suggested the range of Jesus' healing activity: from a male demoniac in the synagogue to a female with a fever at home. Now the narrator adds a summary of other such healings to fill out the picture (1:32-34). Just as **the whole Judean countryside and all the people of Jerusalem** went out to John at the Jordan (1:5), so **the whole city was gathered around the door** (1:33) to Jesus. **And he cured many who were sick with various diseases, and cast out many demons** (1:34), healing all who had been **brought to him** (1:32) by the people.

As part of his exercizing power over the exorcized demons, Jesus silenced them; **he would not permit the demons to speak** (1:34). But the narrator's explanation of Jesus' reason for doing this may strike the implied reader as odd: **he would not permit the demons to speak, because they knew him.** Did Jesus not want to be known? Or did he not want demons for his press agents? If the demons told everything they knew, what would they tell? Would that be the whole story about Jesus as the implied author of Mark knows it? The narrator's comment raises questions, not answers, at this point. This summary of healings and exorcisms is narrated as happening **that evening, at sundown** (1:32)--the seeming redundancy is typical of Mark's narrative. With this temporal marker the implied reader begins to sigh, what a long day--there was no rest for Jesus on that sabbath!

And yet, **In the morning, while it was still very dark, he got up and went out to a wilderness place** (*erēmos topos*; *NRSV* **deserted place**), **and there he prayed** (1:35). The Markan Jesus seems restless--both to talk with God and to carry out the task of **proclaiming the gospel of God** (1:14). It's a new day, a new day, and Jesus seeks out a wilderness place (*erēmos topos*) in order to make a fresh start. His story had begun with a conversation with God in the wilderness (*erēmos*, 1:4, 12, 13)--the wilderness that was, paradoxically, a place of challenging testing and also of God's providing care. The Markan Jesus returns to a wilderness place as if to receive God's care to meet a new challenge.

Apparently when **Simon and his companions** awoke and noticed that Jesus was already up and out, they **hunted for him** (1:36). The Greek verb *katediōxen* literally means "tracked down"; it is used only here in the New Testament, and it usually bears a hostile connotation, e.g., Genesis 31:36, *LXX*. This connotation carries over into the shared speech of Simon and his companions (Andrew, and James and John?) to Jesus: **"Everyone is searching for you"** (1:37). Perhaps the implied audience is to imagine the people knocking on the door of the house where Jesus and his followers were staying to find only Simon and the others, who then desperately track down Jesus in order to bring him back to deal with the crowd. If this is so, Jesus' answer to Simon and the others would not be quite what they were expecting. **He answered, "Let us go on to the**

neighboring towns, so that I may proclaim the message there also; for that is what I came out to do" (1:38). But what about all those folks searching for Jesus back in Capernaum? The pull of the **time** that **is fulfilled** (1:15) keeps up the forward momentum and the hurried pace.

The **message** that Jesus **came out** to **proclaim** (1:38) is **the gospel of God** (1:14), the at-hand-ness of **the reign of God** (1:15). **And he went throughout [all (*holen*)] Galilee, proclaiming the message in their synagogues and casting out demons** (1:39). This summary statement echoes not only the topic statement of 1:14-15 but also the intercalated accounts of Jesus' initial authoritative teaching and exorcizing in the Capernaum synagogue (1:21-28), with its concluding notice of the spread of Jesus' fame **throughout the surrounding region of Galilee** (1:28). The Markan implied author cannot narrate every episode, but what took place in Capernaum recurred **throughout all Galilee** (1:39).

The implied author of Mark is developing a rhythm of "scenes"--specific episodes of teaching and exorcism--and "summaries"--generalized statements that many other such scenes also occurred. The particularized scenes give the narrative its vividness; the generalized summaries contribute to its expansiveness; and the alternating rhythm between the two adds to the urgency of the unfolding story. The summary statement of 1:39 is followed by the scene of healing a leper, 1:40-44, which, in turn, is followed by another summary statement, 1:45.

In the story of the exorcism in the Capernaum synagogue it was the unclean spirit possessing the man that cried out to Jesus, who was present in the same synagogue as the demoniac. The leper, on the other hand, **came** to Jesus, sought him out where he was, **begging him, and kneeling** (although **kneeling** is lacking in some ancient manuscripts). The leper's speech is as deferential as the unclean spirit's was bold: **"If you choose, you can make me clean"** (1:40). The uncleanness of leprosy--or of skin diseases in general--was not only physical but also social and religious, resulting in isolation from community life and corporate worship. The leper did not doubt the power of the Markan Jesus to overcome physical infirmity, but neither did he underestimate the challenge to social and religious norms implied in his request. Thus it is narratively appropriate that Jesus' positive words of response, **"I do choose. Be made clean!,"** are paralleled by his actions of social bonding with the leper: **Moved with pity, Jesus stretched out his hand and touched him** (1:41). There is healing in touching the untouchable one. **Immediately** (*evthus*) **the leprosy left him, and he was made clean** (1:42).

Both Jesus' command, **"Be made clean!,"** and the narrator's confirmation, **and he was made clean**, are passive constructions. Most likely they are intended as "theological passives," that is, circumlocutions for saying, "God make you clean" and "God made him clean." Note that the cleansed leper is told to make an offering (to God). The implied author of Mark and his Jewish characters are faithful to the Jewish tradition of avoiding unnecessary speaking of the divine name.

The implied audience is bound to be somewhat surprised that the gentle Jesus who was **moved with pity** and tenderly **touched** the leper seems so harsh after the cleansing: **After sternly warning him he sent him away at once, saying to him, "See that you say nothing to anyone; but go, show yourself to the priest, and offer [to God] for your cleansing what Moses commanded, as a testimony to them"** (1:43-44). Although the Markan Jesus **came out** to **proclaim the message . . . throughout Galilee** (1:38-39), he seems eager that his fame as an exorcist and healer not get ahead of him. Of course, the Markan Jesus cannot mean literally the first part of his warning--**"See that you say nothing to anyone."** (The Greek uses a double negative for intensification--"say nothing to no one." Compare 16:8 for a similar double negative construction.) Since the second part of

Jesus' command specifies interactions with the priest that would require the leper to tell him of his cleansing, the warning must mean something like "say nothing to anyone on the way; go directly to the temple."

In his concern that the appropriate religious official be properly notified and the mosaic law be observed, Jesus seems respectful of traditional religious responsibilities and sanctions and supportive of his traditional Jewish community and its leaders. Yet, possibly an attentive first-time reader, and surely a reflective re-reader, might ask: What is meant by **a testimony** (or **witness**) **to them**? Who is this **them**? The priests in the temple? The people in general (so *RSV*)? Is a **them** vs. us opposition developing?

Despite the stern warning of the once gentle Jesus, the once deferential cleansed leper **went out and began to proclaim it** [his cleansing] **freely, and to spread the word, so that Jesus could no longer go into a town openly, but stayed out in the wilderness places** (*erēmoi topoi*; *NRSV* **country**); **and people came to him from every quarter** (1:45). Again Jesus returns to the wilderness--the wilderness with its double biblical connotation of testing the people and/or their leaders and the providence (providing grace) of God and its double Markan association of Jesus' baptism as God's "Son" and his testing by Satan. But not even the presumably uninhabited wilderness is able to isolate Jesus from the growing crowds who seek him out. And not even his stern commands can stop **the word** from spreading.

By the end of chapter 1 several dramatic tensions are already subtly woven into the Markan narrative fabric: the tension between withdrawing to the wilderness and traveling throughout the towns of Galilee, the tension between what Jesus is setting out to do and what **Simon and his companions** expect of Jesus, the tension between Jesus' widespread teaching and healing and his attempts to forestall the spread of his fame. Despite these strands of tension, the main impact of 1:16-45 is the *showing* of what was *told* in 1:14-15: Jesus is **proclaiming the gospel of God**; Jesus is enacting the good news of the **fulfilled time** and the at-hand-ness of **the reign of God**. God is opposed to demonic forces and all the powers of evil, including sickness; unclean spirits are being cast out, and the sick are being healed. Some persons have given up vocation and family to follow Jesus and **fish for people. God's reign has come near.**

2:1-3:6 JESUS AND THE TRADITIONAL COMMUNITY

The first two verses of chapter 2 set a new scene. **When he returned to Capernaum after some days, it was reported that he was at home** (2:1). The reference to **Capernaum** reminds the implied audience of Jesus' first experience of authoritative teaching and healing in the synagogue in **Capernaum** (1:21). In Capernaum will Jesus continue to teach and heal **as one having authority, and not as the scribes** (1:22)? The reference to Jesus' being **at home** reminds the audience of **the whole city** that **was gathered around the door** (1:33) of his home earlier, before he withdrew to a **wilderness place** (1:35). Jesus was unable to remain in **wilderness places** (1:45) continually, but a return home to Capernuam entailed a return to the crowds **gathered** at Jesus' **door. So many gathered around that there was no longer room for them, not even in front of the door; and he was speaking the word to them** (2:2). Since the healed leper **spread the word** so **freely** (1:45), Jesus now finds himself **speaking the word** (2:2) to a large crowd.

This rather generalized scene becomes quite specific when four people attempt to bring **a paralyzed man** to Jesus (2:3). Unable to do so **because of the crowd, they removed the roof above him; and after having dug through it, they let down the mat on which the paralytic lay** (2:4). (A Palestinian milieu is assumed, with sleeping mats and mud-roofed

houses.) It is an impressive--and surprising--action of seeking help for a friend, and Jesus was impressed **when** he **saw their faith** (2:5). Jesus' response is equally surprising: **he said to the paralytic, "Child** (*teknon*; *NRSV* **Son), your sins are forgiven."** (A Jewish milieu is assumed, with a traditional belief in the connection between sin and sickness.)

Only **now** does the implied author mention that **some of the scribes were sitting there** (2:6). These are the first scribes to appear as characters in the narrative, although earlier **scribes** served as a negative comparison to the **authority** of Jesus (1:22). Not only has the implied author known all along that the scribes were there, but he also knows their interior state: they were **questioning in their hearts** (2:6). The implied author shares this inside view--in considerable detail--with the implied audience, presenting their exact internal questions: **"Why does this fellow speak in this way? It is blasphemy! Who can forgive sins but God alone?"** (2:7). An initial reaction of the implied audience might be, "Wait a minute. Maybe Jesus was using the theological passive. Maybe he was saying, '[I know] your sins are forgiven [by God].' The scribes are jumping to conclusions."

The implied author, however, goes on to give a parallel inside view of Jesus, who shares with the implied author the ability to see inside views: **Immediately** (*evthus*; *NRSV* **At once) Jesus perceived in his spirit that they were discussing these questions among themselves; and he said to them, "Why do you raise such questions in your hearts?"** (2:8). Both the implied author and the character Jesus use the language of **questioning in their hearts** (2:6; cf. 2:8); the points of view of the implied author and the Markan Jesus are perfectly aligned.

Jesus' second question addressed to the scribes--and, of course, to the implied audience as well--is somewhat odd. **"Which is easier, to say to the paralytic, 'Your sins are forgiven,' or to say, 'Stand up and take your mat and walk'?"** (2:9). Although the second statement is slightly longer in Greek, as in English, that contrast does not seem to be the point. It's six of one, half dozen of the other, basically a nonsense question--unless the sense is to forge a new link between forgiveness of sins and healing of infirmity in challenge to the traditionally affirmed link between sin and sickness. Is this what happens when **the reign of God is at hand** (1:15)?

The Markan Jesus continues his response to the scribes: **"But so that you may know that the Son of Humanity** (*anthropos*; *NRSV* **Son of Man) has authority on earth to forgive sins"--he said to the paralytic--"I say to you, stand up, take your mat and go to your home"** (2:10-11). We must consider in a moment the intertextual and intratextual echoes of **Son of Humanity**, but it is clear from the narrative logic that the Markan Jesus uses the phrase reflexively, to point to himself. The fact that **the Son of Humanity has authority on earth to forgive sins** validates the action of Jesus in saying to the paralytic, **"your sins are forgiven."** The implied reader, of course, needs to make the link, but he or she is becoming accustomed to that, having already linked John with the voice crying in the wilderness and God with the voice from the heavens. The dissymetry of Jesus' broken sentence (*analocouthon*) addressed to the scribes contrasts with the symmetry of his two statements to the paralytic: first, **"your sins are forgiven"** (2:5), and last, **"stand up, take your mat and go to your home"** (2:11). Which is easier to say? It does not matter. Both are said. As the richness of this both/and response of Jesus to the paralytic bespeaks wholeness, so the broken sentence structure in Jesus' reply to the scribes is a token of the broken relationship between them in Mark's narrative.

The phrase, or title, *ho huios tou anthrōpou*, reverberates with both intertextual echoes with the Hebrew Bible and intratextual echoes within the Markan narrative. The phrase has traditionally been translated **the Son of Man**, but the Greek *anthropos* (from which we derive the English word anthropology, the study of human culture) is unambiguously generic--it means a human being, not a male (Greek *anēr*). To avoid the ambiguity of *man* in English, *ho huios tou anthrōpou* is sometimes translated **the Human One**.

Unfortunately, this translation looses the significance of *huios*, "son," and the implicit Markan contrast between **the Son of God** and **the Son of Humanity**. The Markan contrast is not the later Christian one influenced by Greek philosophy and established by the creedal councils--Jesus has two natures, one divine, one human--but rather the more primitive "Christian" one influenced by the Septuagint and Aramaic-speaking Jews--Jesus has two tasks, obedience to God (as to a father) and representation of the people of God through suffering and judgment.

The label "Son of Humanity" in Hebrew and Aramaic (the spoken language of Jews in the time of Jesus) simply means an individual person (see Ps 8:4; note *RSV*), and in Aramaic it could be used as a circumlocution for "I." The phrase occurs throughout the book of Ezekiel as God's address to the prophet Ezekiel (cf. Dan 8:17). It occurs in Daniel 7:13 in a "night vision" of "one like a son of humanity (*LXX: hos huios anthrōpou*)" who is "given dominion and glory and kingship" as a part of the judgment of the "Ancient of Days." From these scriptural usages, **Son of Humanity** inherits associations with prophetic calling, righteous suffering, obedience as God's people, and promised vindication.

In Mark's gospel, the phrase is only used by the character Jesus; not even the narrator picks it up. The "Son of Humanity" sayings of the Markan Jesus are usually grouped by interpreters into three classes: present power (2:10, 28), suffering (8:31; 9:9, 12, 31; 10:33, 45; 14:21 *bis*, 41), future vindication (8:38; 13:26; 14:62). Like most classification systems this one represents an oversimplification, which will be challenged as we read through the gospel. What strikes the implied reader at 2:10 is the novelty of this phrase on the lips of Jesus with no prior presentation of it by the implied author. It is not in the category of **Christ** and **Son of God** (1:1). It is introduced by the Markan Jesus in a context of forgiveness and healing that becomes a context of controversy. The implied audience will have to listen out for its recurrence.

Since Jesus broke off his speech to the scribes to address again the paralytic, the scene ends with a look at the healed paralytic--a proof of the healing and a communal response, traditional closing elements of a healing story. **And he stood up, and immediately** (*evthus*) **took the mat and went out before all of them; so that they were all amazed and glorified God, saying, "We have never seen anything like this!"** (2:12). Neither had the people in the Capernaum synagogue seen such teaching and exorcizing **with authority** (1:27). The scribes, who were apparently there at the beginning of the scene with the paralytic, are apparently still there at its end. The implied author narrates no speech and no inside view, but the implied audience might well imagine that the questions in their hearts remain unanswered.

A spatial shift marks the change of scene at 2:13: from inside to outside, from **at home** to **beside the sea**. The iterative (repetitive) nature of Jesus' being **beside the sea** is indicated by the adverb **again** (*palin*): **Jesus went out again beside the sea.** Also iterative is the presence of the crowd and Jesus teaching: **the whole crowd gathered around him, and he taught them** (2:13). This generalized scene is followed by a specific and extremely compact call narrative that takes some unpacking to appreciate.

And as he was passing along (*paragōn*; *NRSV* **walking along**), **he saw Levi son of Alphaeus sitting at the tax booth, and he said to him, "Follow me." And he got up and followed him** (2:14). The sea side seems an unlikely place for a **tax booth** but an appropriate setting for calling someone new to **fish for people** (1:17). As Jesus was **passing along** (*paragōn*) **the Sea of Galilee** when he saw Simon and Andrew at work and called them to follow after him (1:16-17), so he was **beside the sea, passing along** (*paragōn*), when he saw Levi at work and called to him, **"Follow** (*akolouthei*) **me"** (2:13-14). *Akoloutheō*, "to follow," a Markan signal of discipleship, receives even more prominent use here than in the first

call narrative. Jesus' command to Levi is *akolouthei moi*, and Levi's response is simply **And he got up and followed** (*ēkolouthēsen*) **him** (2:14). In the initial call narrative the Markan Jesus commands Simon and Andrew to **"follow after me"** (*deute opisō mou*, 1:17), and they **followed** (*ēkolouthēsan*, 1:18) **him**, as, soon thereafter, James and John **came after** (*apēlthon opisō*, 1:20) **him**.

As with the second two fishermen, Levi's father is identified by name; and as with all four fishermen, Levi's profession is identified by his setting. Levi's profession, collecting taxes (or tolls) from his fellow Jews for payment to Herod, who served at the mercy of the Roman overlords, was obviously a hated one among his people. Tax and toll collectors were continually "defiled" by contact with Gentiles, as well as frequently dishonest due to the pressures and opportunities of the system. Certainly Levi would have been judged a "sinner" by the traditional religious leaders, and it is not insignificant that the story of his call by Jesus is preceded by a story of Jesus' authority to forgive sins. Levi's call is also succeeded by a story having to do with sinners. And both stories present conflict between Jesus and the leaders of the traditional religious community.

And as he reclined [at table, i.e., ate dinner] **in his house, many tax collectors and sinners were also reclining with Jesus and his disciples--for there were many and they followed him** (2:15, my own translation). It is not immediately--or even upon reflection--clear in whose house the Markan implied author intends this meal to be taking place. It is certain that the *NRSV*'s use of **Levi's house** is an overtranslation, as the *NRSV* note indicates. In terms of the Markan narrative itself (with 2:13-14 followed immediately by 2:15-17) rather than the narrative's possible antecedants (with 2:13-14 and 2:15-17 as possibly separate traditions) it would probably make more sense to assume that Jesus was the host in Jesus' house (see Malbon, 1985). Since the verb *akoloutheō* seems to retain its physical sense while adding the sense of discipleship, it would seem natural to assume that Levi followed Jesus to Jesus' house rather than that Levi followed Jesus to Levi's house, for surely Levi would have led the way in that case. In addition, the scandal of a Jew **eating with sinners and tax collectors**, which so incensed the Markan **scribes of the Pharisees** against Jesus (2:16), appears greater if the Jew is the host in his own home. In terms of narrative logic, a character willing to invite a tax collector to be a close follower would likely be willing to invite **sinners and tax collectors** to a meal in his house. Yet the scandal is in no way smoothed over if one of the sinners and tax collectors is the host.

The Markan designation **the scribes of the Pharisees** is odd, and some ancient manuscripts even read **the scribes and the Pharisees**, which is more usual. In either case, the implied author links these two groups of traditional Jewish leaders, those known as trained interpeters of the Scripture (scribes) and those known for their piety in religious practice (Pharisees). In Mark's narrative these traditional leaders **saw** with whom Jesus was eating as if from the outside looking in; certainly *they* were not reclining at table with such guests. And **the scribes of the Pharisees** did not even confront Jesus directly about this affront to their sense of piety; **they said to his disciples, "Why does he eat with tax collectors and sinners?"** (2:16). (This is the third repetition of the phrase--twice as **sinners and tax collectors**, the third time reversed--in two verses. The implied audience is given no opportunity to miss the theme.)

But Jesus **heard this** and responded directly to his indirect accusers with a proverb in his defense: **"Those who are well have no need of a physician, but those who are sick; I have come to call not the righteous but sinners"** (2:17). From the narrator's implicit metaphor of the host's offered meal we move to the character's explicit metaphor of the physician's offered healing. The Markan Jesus does not challenge the view that **the scribes of the Pharisees** are among the righteous. Rather he states that, given his task of **proclaiming the good news of God** (1:14) and **the reign of God** [that] **has come near** (1:15), he has **come**

to call not the righteous but sinners (2:17). The traditional religious leaders do not respond. The Markan Jesus has the last word.

The words of Jesus basically constitute the next scene. The action consists of speech. There is no spatial shift at 2:18, and the hint of a temporal shift suggested by the **Now** of the *NRSV* is not so clear in the Greek *kai* (basically meaning "and"). However, new characters are introduced: **John's disciples**. The implied author has not mentioned John since the passing reference to his arrest in 1:14, and the earlier account of his baptizing--even though that ministry was narrated as being quite successful--has not really prepared the implied reader for the assumption that John had his own **disciples**. One might argue that the implied author's off-handed way of mentioning John's arrest and John's disciples suggests that he assumed these "narrative facts" could be easily assimiliated by the implied audience, perhaps on the basis of shared traditions outside the text. The argument from silence, however, is always problematic. One is more secure in observing that the implied author's brief references to John's arrest and John's disciples serve to focus the narrative constantly on Jesus; all possible attention to John for his own sake is deflected--by the Markan narrator as well as by the character John (see 1:7-8). This conversation about John's disciples is no exception.

John's disciples and the Pharisees are linked by the narrator's comment that they **were fasting** (2:18). This is an odd juxtaposition since **the scribes of the Pharisees** who were severely questioning Jesus in the immediately preceding scene are developing thereby a negative connotation, and John has a positive connotation as the one preparing **the way of the Lord**. But both groups are contrasted with the disciples of Jesus, who **do not fast** (2:18). The truly significant change, the truly fulfilled time, comes not with John and his disciples but with Jesus and his disciples.

The implied author does not make it clear to the implied audience which characters are questioning Jesus about this contrast: **and they came and said to him** [Jesus] **. . . .** The *NRSV*'s substitution of **people** for **they** is understandable, but misleading. The Markan text is simply ambiguous. Perhaps **they** are the ones who were questioning Jesus in the previous scene--**the scribes of the Pharisees**. But if that were the case their question should have been, "Why do John's disciples and we disciples of the Pharisees fast, but your disciples do not fast?" The narrative effect of the ambiguous questioners or accusers is to suggest a more broadly based opposition to Jesus' activity. **They** are beginning to oppose him.

This growing sense of opposition is confirmed by the fact that in this scene the narrated activity leading to controversy is so compressed that it is overrun by the controversy. This change has occurred in stages. In the scene of the healing of the paralytic, many elements of a traditional healing story are presented, interspersed with narrative elements of controversy with **some of the scribes** (2:1-12). In the two-part scene of (1) the calling of Levi and (2) Jesus eating with sinners and tax collectors, elements of controversy with **the scribes of the Pharisees** close the meal scene that follows the call scene. Here, in the third scene in this series, the narrator's brief comment about who is fasting is followed immediately by the controversy, as **they** come to Jesus with their question--not about Jesus' activity but about the behavior (*not* fasting) of Jesus' disciples. The scribes in scene 1 did not verbalize their questions, but Jesus answered them directly anyway. The scribes of the Pharisees in scene 2 asked Jesus' disciples about Jesus' actions, but Jesus answered them directly anyway. In scene 3 **they** asked Jesus about his disciples' actions, and Jesus' answer was equally direct--although entirely metaphorical.

Jesus said to them, "The wedding guests cannot fast while the bridegroom is with them, can they? As long as they have the bridegroom with them, they cannot fast" (2:19). There is a surplus of speech here. Jesus' rhetorical question assumes a positive answer, and yet

Jesus also states that answer. A wedding party is about as extreme an opposition to fasting as is imaginable: instead of self-enforced lack there is other-presented surplus. The implied audience will do well to avoid squeezing the Markan Jesus' metaphor into an allegorical grid of one-to-one correspondences, but it is quite impossible to avoid the link between Jesus' non-fasting disciples and the wedding guests and thus between Jesus and the bridegroom. John is the voice crying in the wilderness, God is the voice from heaven, and Jesus is the bridegroom--these conclusions are the natural work of the implied audience. What a delightful image--a wedding party! The implied audience can hope that all this controversy will be displaced by celebration. But it is not to be--not any more than peace was to be after Jesus' baptism as God's "Son." The Markan Jesus continues, **"The days will come when the bridegroom is taken away from them, and then they will fast on that day"** (2:20). The party will be over; the celebration cannot avoid the harsh realities of **that day** that is coming; yet something new is happening here.

In two additional images that have the ring of proverbs the Markan Jesus develops the contrast between the old and the new. A **patch** of new **unshrunk cloth** is not sewn **on an old cloak** because, upon first washing, it would shrink and pull away from the garment, making **a worse tear** (2:21). **New wine** that is still forming the gases of fermentation is not put into **old wineskins** that have already been stretched out because the fermenting process would **burst the skins** as it continued to expand them, thus destroying the wineskins and spilling the wine. **". . . one puts new wine into fresh wineskins"** (2:22). What the disciples of the Pharisees and the disciples of John do is of the old order. What Jesus' disciples do is of the new order. The old and the new cannot be mixed. Again the implied audience is called on to make connections. The rhetoric of Mark's narrative is a rhetoric of juxtaposition. Here the implied author juxtaposes three images of contrast presented by the character Jesus and a brief scene of confrontation presented by the narrator. The implied audience must put three and one together to get four. The implied author has, at this point, also juxtaposed three scenes of controversy between Jesus and representatives of the traditional religious community. But there will be four--and more.

One sabbath he was going through the grainfields . . . (1:23). The fourth scene in this series is marked by spatial and temporal indicators. Although the implied audience does not know where or when the previous scene of controversy about not fasting took place, presumably it was neither on the sabbath nor in the grainfields; this scene provides a change in setting. The grainfields seems a strange place to be on the sabbath--in contrast with the more expected **in the synagogue** on **the sabbath** setting of an earlier scene (1:21-28). And, indeed the tension of being in the grainfields, a place of work, on the sabbath, a day of rest, is what generates the controversy between Jesus and the representatives of the traditional religious community; scene 4 presents a shift in setting without a twist in plot.

. . . and as they made their way his disciples began to pluck heads of grain. The Pharisees said to him, "Look, why are they doing what is not lawful on the sabbath?" (2:23-24). Briefly narrated action, followed by an accusing question about the actions of Jesus' disciples put to Jesus by opposing characters representing the traditional religious community, to be followed by Jesus' speech and the opponents' silence--scene 4 parallels scene 3. But this time Jesus' response depends neither on proverbs nor on metaphors (although it does develop an anlalogy) but on Scripture. The Pharisees were the liberal interpreters of Scripture in their day, seeking to apply the scriptural commandments to all aspects of life and thus make all life holy. The Markan Jesus' interpretation of a story from the book of Samuel, however, challenged even their liberal readings and their understanding of holiness by setting up an analogy between the exceptional actions of **David**, Israel's greatest king, **and his companions** and the ostensibly ordinary actions of himself, a Galilean peasant, and his disciples. It is hard for the implied audience to hear

Jesus' question as anything other than insulting when asked of trained religious leaders known for their devotion: **"Have you never read . . ."** the Scripture? (2:25).

Apparently the Markan Jesus had not himself read--or remembered--all the details of Scripture with care! Although Abiathar was high priest during David's reign (2 Sam 15:35), it was his father Ahimelech who was high priest at the time David and his men ate the consecrated bread from the altar (1 Sam 21:1-6). (Compare the Markan narrator's conflation of passages from Exodus, Malachi, and Isaiah at 1:2-3. The standards of accuracy of a print culture are not the same as those of an oral culture.) But it is the big picture the Markan Jesus (like the Markan narrator) is trying to paint.

David **entered the house of God,** the temple, a holy place, **and ate the bread of the Presence,** the holy food set before the presence of God, **which it is not lawful for any but the priests,** the holy religious leaders, **to eat, and he gave some to his companions** (2:26). In the narrative of 1 Samuel 21 the priest first questions David concerning the holiness of his companions (have they abstained from sexual relations?). David's reply provides a rich background for the Markan story: yes, my companions are always kept "holy" when they go on an expedition with me; if my companions are holy even when on "a common journey," how much more will they be holy "today." On an extraordinary day the ordinary rules of holiness may be superceded. The Markan Jesus' implicit analogy is that this day is an extraordinary day; his own disciples are holy; his authority is like David's.

The implied author does not say explicitly that Jesus' disciples were eating the grain they plucked, but that is the clear implication. As David's hungry companions ate the holy bread, so Jesus' (hungry) disciples plucked (and ate) the heads of grain. David and his companions violated the holiness of space--the temple and its holy objects; Jesus' disciples violated the holiness of time--the commandment to avoid work on the sabbath, even the work of "threshing" grain in the palm of one's hand. In the story in 1 Samuel 21, David requests the bread from the priest on behalf of himself and his companions and receives the bread from the priest for himself and them. In the Markan narrative Jesus defends the actions of his disciples, although it is not stated that he shared in these actions. Here he defends their actions of preparing to eat, as in the immediately preceding scene he had defended their actions of eating rather than fasting. It would appear that Jesus' disciples simply cannot please the representatives of the traditional religious community; they eat at the wrong times. Neither can Jesus please them; he eats with the wrong people, **tax collectors and sinners** (2:15-17).

Jesus' concluding word is a statement about the authority of **the Son of Humanity**. The implied audience easily recalls **the Son of Humanity** saying from the first scene of this series, the healing of the paralytic: **"the Son of Humanity** (*NRSV* **Son of Man) has authority on earth to forgive sins"** (2:10). After the plucking grain on the sabbath controversy the Markan Jesus concludes, **"The sabbath was made for humankind, and not humankind for the sabbath; so the Son of Humanity** (*NRSV* **Son of Man) is lord even of the sabbath"** (2:27-28). The second part of this saying could be interpreted as a redundant restatement of the first; **the Son of Humanity** could be taken to mean an individual person (see the discussion of 2:10 above)--the sabbath is for people, people are lord of the sabbath. But that is likely *not* the way the implied audience of Mark that has heard the first saying understands this saying. **The Son of Humanity** on the lips of the Markan Jesus (and it is never on another character's lips or on the narrator's) seems to partake of the connotation of the phrase, or title, in Ezekiel and Daniel. Jesus' authority is something new--comparable to King David's of old, or to the prophet Ezekiel's, or to that of the coming "one like a Son of Humanity," but not at all like the authority of the scribes (1:22). Jesus is **lord even of the sabbath**--and the story of his lordship is far from finished.

[And (*kai*, missing in *NRSV*)**] again** (*palin*) **he entered the synagogue . . .** (3:1). *Now* Jesus enters the synagogue. Is it still the sabbath as it was in the preceding grainfield scene? The narrator does not say at this moment. *Kai*, "and," the grammatically simplest connector, continues to be a marker of the rhetoric of juxtaposition; and *palin*, "again," continues to indicate iterative action. Despite a series of controversies with leaders of the traditional religious community, Jesus continues his habit of **entering the synagogue.**

. . . and (*kai*) **a man was there who had a withered hand** (3:1). *Deja vu.* The first time the Markan Jesus **entered the synagogue** (1:21), **there was in their synagogue a man with an unclean spirit** (1:23). Neither wilderness places nor public places afford Jesus isolation or anonymity from those seeking his help. Earlier Jesus cast the unclean spirit out of the possessed man in the synagogue. Was that on a sabbath? No one said; no one seemed to care; **they were all amazed** (1:27). But this time the narrator says, **They watched him to see whether he would cure him on the sabbath . . .** (3:2). So it is **the sabbath** still, just as it was in the preceding grainfield scene; it is the day of rest. But who are **they**--the ones who **watched him**? The implied audience is reminded of the ambiguous **they** who asked Jesus why his disciples did not fast (2:18). Yes, **they** are opponents here as well, for **they watched him . . . so that they might acuse him** (3:2).

The implied author gives the implied audience no inside view of the hearts or minds of these watching opponents, but the character Jesus seems to have that knowledge. **And he said to the man who had the withered hand, "Come forward." Then he said to them, "Is it lawful to do good or to do harm on the sabbath, to save life or to kill?" But they were silent** (3:3-4). Just who are **they**? And why are they **silent**? The re-reader perhaps remembers who they are, and the first-time reader (or forgetful re-reader) can make a pretty good guess. Jesus had trouble with **some of the scribes** (2:6) when he healed the paralytic; he had trouble with **the scribes of the Pharisees** (2:16) when he ate with sinners and tax collectors. And, just before this, Jesus had trouble with **the Pharisees** (2:24) when his disciples plucked grain on the sabbath.

But why are they **silent**? It is not as if the implied audience is unprepared for their silence. Jesus has reduced his opponents to silence by the end of each of the four preceding controversy scenes. The Markan Jesus has always had the last word, but here **they** do not say even the first word. And something surely could be said in response to Jesus' exaggerated and melodramatic question. The choice is not whether to heal the withered hand or to kill the man but whether to heal the man today on the sabbath or to wait till tomorrow to heal him. The shared message of the Markan Jesus and the Markan implied author is that **the time is fulfilled, and the reign of God is at hand** (1:15); **proclaiming** and enacting **the good news of God** (1:14) is urgent; there can be no waiting.

Yet there can be sadness and anger in response to those who do not sense this urgency. Jesus **looked around at them with anger; he was grieved at their hardness of heart . . .** (3:5). This depiction suggests a serious break in the bonds of community that should link all those who enter the synagogue on the sabbath. For those in the synagogue who do share the Markan sense of urgency, the time of health and wholeness is fulfilled. Jesus **said to the man, "Stretch out your hand." He stretched it out and it was restored** (3:5).

Surely some must have been amazed or astonished as other characters were after earlier healings of Jesus. The narrator, however, is silent about such people now, telling the implied audience only--and solemnly--that **The Pharisees went out and immediately conspired with the Herodians against him, how to destroy him** (3:6). **The Pharisees. They** were the Pharisees all along. And, although they may be reduced to silence, they are not reduced to inaction. The conspiracy of the Markan Pharisees will provide motive force to an important strand of the Markan plot. The narrator gave the implied audience the first hint of difficulties to beset Jesus in recounting that the (Holy) Spirit

cast the newly baptized "Son" of God out into the wilderness (1:12). The character Jesus made it plain in telling **them** that his disciples will fast when **the bridegroom is taken away** (2:20). Now the narrator discloses patterns of opposition between characters (**the Pharisees** and **the Herodians** vs. Jesus) that will move the plot in the forecast direction.

Historical scholars are uncertain what to make of the label **the Herodians**, since it is used only three or four times in the New Testament (Mk 3:6 and 12:13 [// Mt 22:16]; and Mk 8:15 in some mss.). Herod (Antipas) was the son of Herod the Great and tetrarch of Galilee and Perea under the Romans from 4 BCE to 39 CE. Presumably **the Herodians** refers to supporters of the rule and policies of Herod. In Mark's narrative they are always linked with the Pharisees as opponents of Jesus. We will return to them again as the Markan plot thickens and the conspiracy begun so early works itself out in the narrative.

The conspiracy of the Pharisees and the Herodians to destroy Jesus forms the conclusion not just to the fifth controversy story (3:1-6), but to the series of five controversy stories (2:1-3:6). The seriousness of this conclusion encourages the implied reader to look back at the entire series that led up to it. These five carefully narrated and thoughtfully juxtaposed scenes elicit the implied audience's admiration for the Markan storyteller's art. In the first scene Jesus heals a man with non-functioning legs and in the final scene a man with a non-functioning hand. In between, the leaders of the traditional religious community are shown to be as paralyzed and withered as these limbs. The three center scenes all concern eating, itself a symbol of community: with whom to eat, when *not* to eat, when not to harvest and prepare food for eating. The latter two eating scenes involve actions of Jesus' disciples. The last two scenes in the series are set on the sabbath. The first and fourth scenes each contain a **Son of Humanity** saying. The five scenes are interrelated in many ways (see Dewey, 1980). Some interpreters have stressed the overall concentric structure of the set, but the series also manifests a crescendo as the controversy grows.

The first scene, the healing of the paralytic (2:1-12), follows naturally the teaching and healing stories of 1:16-45 that enact the at-hand-ness of the reign of God proclaimed at 1:14-15. Likewise the call of Levi in the second scene (2:13-14) parallels the call of the four fishermen in 1:16-20. Certainly there are in scene 1 **some** silently disgruntled **scribes** and in scene 2 some **scribes of the Pharisees** upset enough to complain to Jesus' disciples about Jesus' actions. But in scenes 3 and 4, opponents (unnamed in 3, **the Pharisees** in 4) directly confront Jesus about his disciples' actions. Finally, in scene 5, the Pharisees, as it turns out, are just waiting to accuse Jesus because of his own actions; yet they do not say a word. Mixed signals are given by the implied author concerning who "wins" this series of disputes. The opponents of Jesus plot to destroy him; yet Jesus has silenced them. This situation leaves room for complex development. The implied audience must be prepared for more than a simple story.

3:7-35 JESUS AND THE NEW COMMUNITY

Even if 3:6 were not so clearly the conclusion to the series of five controversy scenes, the implied reader would notice the new beginning at 3:7 from the change in setting and characters. **Jesus departed** (*RSV* **withdrew**) **with his disciples to the sea . . .** (3:7). The shift from inside (**the synagogue**, 3:1) to outside (**the sea**, 3:7) echoes the similar shift from inside (**at home**, 2:1) to outside (**beside the sea**, 2:13) for the story of the calling of Levi (2:13-14). As we noted earlier, the sea seemed a strange background setting for the calling of Levi from his **tax booth** (2:14), but one very reminiscent of the calling of the four fishermen as followers (1:16-20). Here again, at 3:7, **the disciples** are associated with

the sea. If Jesus **withdrew with his disciples** to be alone, to rest from the series of controversies with the leaders of the traditional religious community (2:1-3:6), he was immediately disappointed, for **a great multitude from Galilee followed him** (3:7). Again intratextual echoes reverberate. **Followed** (*akolouthe*$\bar{o}$) carries connotations of discipleship as well as a literal denotation in Mark's narrative. **A great multitude** at the sea with Jesus and the disciples reminds the implied reader of **the whole crowd** at the sea with Jesus before the call of Levi. Is the Markan Jesus going to call another disciple?

Not yet. The narrator has more to say about the great multitude. The **great multitude** (*polu pl*$\bar{e}$*thos*) **from Galilee** followed Jesus from Galilee, but the **great multitude** (*pl*$\bar{e}$*thos polu*) from elsewhere came to him. The *RSV* reflects the Greek vocabulary and word order more truly than the *NRSV*: **and a great multitude from Galilee followed; also from Judea and Jerusalem and Idumea and from beyond the Jordan and from about Tyre and Sidon a great multitude, hearing all that he did, came to him** (3:7-8, *RSV*). People approached Jesus from all directions: west (Galilee), south (Judea, Jerusalem, Idumea), east (beyond the Jordan), and north (Tyre and Sidon). The geographical areas mentioned also suggest--in an intertextual echo of the Hebrew Scriptures--the extent of the reign of King David, with whom the Markan Jesus has already compared himself implicitly (2:25). David reigned as Israel's greatest king, but Jesus is proclaiming that **the reign of God has come near** (1:15). The Markan Jesus' first action after initiating this proclamation (1:14-15) was to call four fishermen to follow him (1:16-20). *Now* is Jesus going to call some more disciples?

Not yet. The narrator has more to say about the tension between withdrawal and multitudes, between fame and hiddenness. **He** (Jesus) **told his disciples to have a boat ready for him because of the crowd, so that they would not crush him; for he had cured many, so that all who had diseases pressed upon him to touch him** (3:9). The implied reader is reminded of the earlier crowds at Jesus' home in Capernaum (2:1-2), where some who could not reach Jesus with their paralyzed friend dug through the roof (2:4), and of the **spread** of the **word** of Jesus' healing power by the cleansed leper, which made it necessary for Jesus to stay in **wilderness places** (1:45). If not even the roof of his home or withdrawal from the towns--to wilderness places or the sea--can protect Jesus from the crush of the crowds, he might well need to escape on the sea by boat.

It is not just among the people that Jesus' fame as a healer has spread. The unclean spirits have passed the word as well. **Whenever the unclean spirits saw him, they fell down before him and shouted, "You are the Son of God!"** (3:11). The very first unclean spirit Jesus encountered cried out to Jesus, **"I know who you are, the Holy One of God"** (1:24). At 3:11 the unclean spirits, speaking as a chorus in a summary statement, employ the same words as the narrator: **Son of God** (1:1, *huiou theou*, in some mss.; 3:11, *ho huios tou theou*). As Jesus is obedient to God as a son to a father, so unclean spirits are obedient to Jesus as their exorcizer. Although the narrator earlier reported that Jesus **would not permit the demons to speak, because they knew him** (1:34), the implied audience is beginning to see that Jesus' success as a healer is not paralleled by his success at keeping this word silenced by non-human (or human, 1:43-45) witnesses. Thus when the narrator echoes the previous attempts to silence these demonic powers with a new statement--**But he sternly ordered them** [the unclean spirits] **not to make him known** (3:12)--the implied reader is sceptical. There is an ironic tension between Jesus' success in subduing demonic forces that disable persons and his failure in keeping word of that success contained. The word will out.

Although this narrated event by the sea, 3:7-12, begins as a specific, once-occurring scene, it comes to an end as a summary statement of something that happens again and again--**whenever the unclean spirits saw him . . . .** These actions recur in the Markan narrative: Jesus goes to the sea, crowds come to him, he heals them, unclean spirits recognize him, he commands them not to make him known. And all these actions depict

the at-hand-ness of the reign of God (1:15), the good news of God that the Markan Jesus is proclaiming (1:14).

He went up the mountain . . . (3:13). The scene changes--without ever getting to the calling of disciples that the implied reader had anticipated by **the sea.** And on the mountain he **called to him those whom he wanted, and they came to him** (3:13). There it is. The expected call story is not missing but simply deferred to another setting. Those who wish to read Mark's gospel as an historical transcript have difficulties with this reference to **the mountain**. What mountain? There is no "mountain" on the western shore of the Sea of Galilee. But both **the sea** and **the mountain** are rich with associations from the Hebrew Scriptures, and sea and mountain are linked in the exodus narrative. God leads the people through the sea, into the wilderness, to the mountain. Moses goes up the mountain and receives from God the Ten Commandments that serve as the "foundation document" for the formation of Israel as the people of God. As the event of the exodus establishes the covenant by God's action, so the reception of the Ten Commandments ratifies the covenant by the response of the twelve tribes of Israel. A community is formed. On **the mountain** in the Markan narrative a new community is formed. **And he appointed twelve, whom he also named apostles** (missing in some mss.), **to be with him, and to be sent out to proclaim the message, and to have authority to cast out demons** (3:14-15). Sea, mountain, twelve--the intertextual echoes of the exodus narrative in the Markan gospel are loud and clear.

The responsibilities of the new **twelve**, the core of the new community, are narrated with ringing intratextual echoes of the foregoing Markan narrative. The twelve are appointed to two basic--and seemingly opposed, that is, paradoxical--roles: **to be with him, and to be sent out** (3:14). Some followers have already taken up the first role--being with Jesus--by leaving family and profession and following him. The second role, **to be sent out**, is reflected in the term **apostles**, those "sent out," that appears in this verse in some ancient manuscripts. This second role itself has two parts; the twelve are to be sent out for two purposes, both of which echo the Markan Jesus' actions: **to proclaim the message [to preach], and to have authority to cast out demons** (3:14-15). Jesus **came out** to **proclaim the message** (1:38; cf. 1:14). Jesus taught and exorcized as **one having authority** (1:22). Proclamation, authority, exorcism--Jesus asks of others what he has mainfested. No wonder it is a prior requirement that they should **be with him**. They are to echo what they hear and shadow what they see.

And who are these twelve? Their names are given, as well as nicknames for the first three. As might be expected, the four fishermen appear first, but--as a challenge to that expectation--they are listed not quite in the order of their call, which was Simon and Andrew, and James and John. Andrew, called second, is named fourth, giving a greater importance to James and John, called third and fourth but named second and third. This prominence for **James son of Zebedee** and **John the brother of James** (together given **the name Boanerges, that is, Sons of Thunder** by Jesus [3:17])--a prominence shared with Simon--recurs later in the narrative (5:37; 9:2; 10:35-41, without Simon; 14:33; but Andrew is also included at 1:29 and 13:3). Simon is number one in prominence throughout: first called (1:16), his mother-in-law healed (1:29-31), first named in the list of the twelve (3:16), given a special name, Peter (from the Greek *petras*, "rock"), by the Markan Jesus (3:16), one of the special four (1:29; 13:3), one of the special three (5:37; 9:2; 14:33), and dominant spokesperson for the twelve on many occasions. Simon is the one to watch. Most of the other names are just that--names--never mentioned again in the Markan narrative: **Philip, and Bartholomew, and Matthew, and Thomas, and James son of Alphaeus, and Thaddaeus, and Simon the Cananaean** (3:18). The exception is **Judas Iscariot, who betrayed him** (3:19).

Judas's action is truly exceptional, as is the implied author's decision to foreshadow that action at the moment of his being appointed one of the twelve. (Perhaps the re-reader remembers that at each subsequent mention by the narrator the character Judas is called **one of the twelve** [14:10, 43].) As the newly baptized "Son" of God is cast out into the wilderness by the (Holy) Spirit to be tested by Satan (1:11-13), as the bridegroom will be taken away from the wedding guests (2:19-20), so Judas, called by Jesus and appointed one of the twelve, will betray him (3:19). The implied audience can have no illusions about the Markan plot.

One name the implied reader might well expect to see in the list of the twleve is Levi, whose call narrative (2:13-14) parallels that of the four fishermen (1:16-20). (Luke parallels Mark in naming the tax collector as "Levi" [Lk 5:27] and listing "Matthew" among the twelve [Lk 6:15], but Matthew gives "Matthew" as the name in the call story of the tax collector [Mt 9:9-13] and includes "Matthew the tax collector" in the list of the twelve [Mt 10:3].) The narrative effect of this Markan surprise is to let the implied audience know that Jesus had followers who were not among the twelve. The twelve comprised a symbolic group of leaders--not all of Jesus' followers. The latter group is apparently large and certainly open-ended.

Since the Markan Jesus' first action subsequent to proclaiming the at-hand-ness of the reign of God was to call others to follow him, the implied audience has known from the beginning that the good news of God requires a community. In the five controversy stories of 2:1-3:6, the implied audience learned that the leaders of Jesus' traditional religious community would not serve as the leaders of the community of the fulfilled time. New leaders are needed for a new community. The Markan Jesus appoints a symbolic twelve, but one of these will betray him. The new community is no more perfect than the traditional community. The struggle to be the people of God, to proclaim the good news of God, continues. And there is room for others beyond the twelve to be a part of this new community that proclaims good news.

Then he went home . . . (3:19b)--from outside to inside, from the sea and the mountain to the house again. **And**--certainly not to the surprise of the implied audience--**the crowd came together again, so that they could not even eat** (3:20). When crowds gathered at Jesus' house earlier, healings followed (1:33; 2:1-2), although once the healing of a paralytic led to a controversy with **some of the scribes** (2:6). It may be that the reference to eating/not eating also reminds the implied audience of the three earlier controversies about eating/not eating (2:15-28). Thus the implied audience likely assumes the stage is set for healings, with a possibility of controversy with traditional religious leaders. Such an event would not be a surprise in the plot at this point.

But what really happens is a surprise. **When his family heard it, they went out to restrain him, for people** (Greek **they**) **were saying, "He has gone out of his mind"** (3:21). This is the first appearance on the narrative scene of Jesus' family, so the implied audience is intrigued to learn what their attitude toward Jesus is. Yet it is difficult to be certain about their attitude from the narrator's brief comment. Does Jesus' family believe what they hear about him--that he is, literally, "outside himself" (*exeste*)--and thus want to restrain him to lessen their shame? Or does the family believe it and want to protect their own Jesus from the harshness of the crowd? Or does the family disbelieve the assertion that Jesus is "crazy" but want to rescue him from cruel taunts anyway? The implied audience does not know, and instead of giving a clue the implied author leaves the family standing there and the implied audience hanging while other characters are introduced into the scene: **the scribes who came down from Jerusalem** (3:22).

The suspicion of impending controversy grows. Early in the narrative the audience learned that Jesus acted as **one having authority, and not as the scribes** (1:22). Later Jesus

was engaged in controversy with **some of the scribes** (2:6) over healing and the forgiveness of sins, and with **the scribes of the Pharisees** (2:16) over eating with tax collectors and sinners. Now scribes have come down from Jerusalem. Does that mean they are an offical examining committee sent from higher authorities in Jerusalem to check out this Jesus? Has the reputation of this Galilean teacher and healer reached that far? **And the scribes who came down from Jerusalem said, "He has Beelzebul, and by the ruler of the demons he casts out demons"** (3:22). Apparently whatever examining was to be, has been; this is the indictment.

Jesus' response, his defense, is introduced by the narrator in a gentle way--as if the scribes were members of the ever-present crowd, potential followers: **And he called them to him, and spoke to them in parables . . .** (3:23). The re-reader knows that Jesus will soon be speaking to the crowd and to his disciples in parables (see 4:1-2, 33; 7:14-17), but even the first-time reader is likely to associate Jesus' calling with followers rather than opponents.

A parable is an indirect but pointed way of defending oneself. A parable is a story in which relationships at one level of reality are compared with relationships at another level of reality. Jesus opens his parable to the scribes with a rhetorical question and its answer: **"How can Satan cast out Satan? If a kingdom [reign] is divided against itself, that kingdom [reign] cannot stand"** (3:23b-24). It seems clear to all that in Jesus' exorcisms there is a power struggle involving demonic forces. The issue is, whose side is Jesus on? The scribes imagine the strength of Jesus' power to be derived from the source of all demonic power, for which they employ the name of a pagan god, Beelzebul. The Markan Jesus argues that nothing could be further from the truth. Demonic power is not used against demons and unclean spirits, that is, against itself. Satan is evil, not stupid.

The implied audience senses an ironic counterpoint to Jesus' conclusion that **if Satan has risen up against himself and is divided, he cannot stand, but his end has come** (3:26), for Satan's end has in fact come in the Markan narrative. **Satan** tested Jesus in **the wilderness,** but **the angels ministered to him** there (1:12-13). Demons are being cast out by Jesus, whom they recognize as God's **"Holy One"** (1:24) or **"Son"** (3:11). However, Satan's end has come not because Satan's reign is divided against itself but because the more powerful reign of God has come. This is the point of Jesus' parable of the strong man: **"But no one can enter a strong man's house and plunder his property without first tying up the strong man; then indeed the house can be plundered"** (3:27). And who can tie up a strong man (alias Satan) but a stronger one--God's Son, **the one who is more powerful than** John who prepares the way (1:7)?

From the point of view of the Markan Jesus, the scribes from Jerusalem are 180 degrees off course. This is the narrative background for the solemn but difficult saying of Jesus, which the narrator explains was uttered because **they** [the scribes] **had said, "He has an unclean spirit"** (3:30). Confusing the Holy Spirit, the source of Jesus' power, with an unclean spirit, over which Jesus has power, is a fatal category mistake from the Markan point of view. Jesus says, **"Truly I tell you, people will be forgiven for their sins and whatever blasphemies they utter; but whoever blasphemes against the Holy Spirit can never have forgiveness, but is guilty of an eternal sin"** (3:28-29). To fail to see that the Holy Spirit is the source of Jesus' power and authority is to miss the time that is fulfilled, to be outside the reign of God.

Only now does the narrator get back to the family of Jesus. Like Jesus' family, the implied audience has been waiting. **Then his mother and his brothers came; and standing outside, they sent to him and called him** (3:31). Jesus' family could not reach him directly because of the crowd surrounding him; the family is dependent on the crowd to relay their message. **A crowd was sitting around him; and they said to him, "Your mother and**

your brothers and sisters are outside, asking for you" (3:32). Still the implied author gives no hint of the family's attitude toward Jesus--except, of course, concern. The Markan Jesus, perhaps still in a prarbolic mood from talking with the scribes (!), responds not literally but metaphorically to the situation posed by his family. **"Who are my mother and my brothers?,"** Jesus asks rhetorically (3:33; cf. 3:23). **And looking at those who sat around him**, and being ever the teacher, he answers his own rhetorical question (cf. 3:24-26), **"Here are my mother and my brothers! Whoever does the will of God is my brother and sister and mother"** (3:34-35). (Father is not available for this metaphor because it has been so completely taken over as a metaphor for Jesus' relationship with God.)

Some modern interpreters have argued that the Markan narrative presents a negative view of the family of Jesus, that the Markan Jesus rejects his biological family, that the Markan implied author links Jesus' family with the accusing scribes from Jerusalem. (Historically oriented interpreters have then tried to associate Jesus' family with some "opponents" of the author of Mark's gospel.) Indeed the scene of the controversy with the Jerusalem scribes is intercalated (or inserted) into the scene involving Jesus' family. But the broader narrative context gives the implied audience important clues for interpreting this intercalation.

2:1-3:6 presents five scenes of controversy between Jesus and the leaders of the traditional religious community that culminate in a conspiracy to destroy Jesus. 3:7-12 summarizes themes more elaborately developed in chapters 1 and 2: Jesus manifests the at-hand-ness of the reign of God in healing the sick and casting out unclean spirits, who recognize him as God's Son. 3:13-19 narrates Jesus' appointment of twelve followers to carry out with him the task of proclaiming the good news of God and exorcizing demons. Thus the leaders of the traditional community, having rejected the Markan Jesus, are rejected by the Markan narrative as leaders for the new community. Twelve designated followers symbolize a new twelve tribes of God's people; and, apparently, all the tribes will increase, since other followers, such as Levi, are revealed. Then follow the intercalated scenes of Jesus' family and the Jerusalem scribes. The importance of the metaphorical family of Jesus overwhelms the significance of the literal family in the Markan narrative. The echo effect of the overall narrative context suggests a *contrast* between the scribes and this metaphorical family, between the leaders of the traditional community and the participants in the new community.

The implied author has communicated in story form who Jesus is in relation to God (1:1-13), how Jesus manifests the fulfilled time and the at-hand-ness of the reign of God (1:14-45), how Jesus' actions challenge the leaders of his traditional religious community (2:1-3:6), and how Jesus calls into being a new community to proclaim and manifest with him the reign of God that has come near (3:7-35). It never seems to occur to the Markan Jesus or the Markan implied author that the reign of God could be proclaimed without a community. Jesus' first action upon his return to Galilee after his baptism as God's "Son" is to call followers to **fish for people** (1:17) with him. Jesus' final action in this section of the narrative is to call family **whoever does the will of God** (3:35). Whoever does what Jesus does is kin to him--and to each other.

Copyright 1992

WORKS CITED

Dewey, Joanna. *Markan Public Debate: Literary Technique, Concentric Structure, and Theology in Mark 2:1-3:6*. SBLDS 48. Chico, CA: Scholars, 1980.

The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. 5 vols. Nashville/New York: Abingdon, 1962, 1976.

Malbon, Elizabeth Struthers. "The Jesus of Mark and the Sea of Galilee," *JBL* 103 (1984) 363-77.

Malbon, Elizabeth Struthers. "*Tē Oikia Autou*: Mark 2:15 in Context," *NTS* 31 (1985) 282-92.

New Revised Standard Version Bible. Division of Christian Education of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America, 1989.

Nineham, D. E. *The Gospel of St Mark*. The Pelican New Testament Commentaries. Baltimore: Penguin, 1963, 1969.

Rhoads, David and Michie, Donald. *Mark as Story: An Introduction to the Narrative of a Gospel*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982.

Two Early Jewish Approaches to Wisdom

Sirach and Qumran Sapiential Work A

Daniel J. Harrington

The book of Sirach is the most extensive witness that we have for early Jewish wisdom. The Hebrew original was composed at Jerusalem in the early second century B.C. (ca. 180) by "Jesus son of Eleazar son of Sirach" (50:27). It was translated into Greek by the author's grandson in Egypt about 117 B.C. In its traditional form it consists of fifty-one chapters--a very large book and so a treasure of information about wisdom teachings in second-century Judaism.

The Qumran text known as Sapiential Work A is also a large wisdom text. It appears in fragmentary form in six Hebrew manuscripts (1Q26, 4Q415, 416, 417, 418, 423). The manuscripts are Herodian in their script, and the fact that six copies of the work were found in the Qumran library indicates that it was regarded as important there. Although it shares some vocabulary and concepts with such "sectarian" works as the Rule of the Community and Hodayot, it contains none of their distinctively sectarian elements and organizational figures. The original setting and date of the work are hard to determine. But its emphasis on financial dealings and family life preclude an origin in the "monastic" setting envisioned at Qumran by many. An origin in the second century B.C.--roughly contemporary with Sirach--seems likely. Whether it was directly associated with the Jewish movement of which the Qumran group was a part, or was simply regarded as "good reading" at Qumran, is not clear. It is a large book--not a large as Sirach but still very large in comparison with other early Jewish wisdom texts found at Qumran or known from other sources.

In the context of the SBL Consultation on "Wisdom, Apocalyptic, and Early Christianity," I want to compare and contrast these two early Jewish wisdom books. The text of Sirach will generally be cited according to the New Revised Standard Version. The text of Sapiential Work A is quoted from the version that John Strugnell and I have developed in connection with our forthcoming edition in the Discoveries in the Judean Desert series (though I have modernized some expressions). For further information about the text see the Bibliographical Note at the end of this article.

The comparison of the two works is meant to be systematic. It first deals with matters of literary genre--both the large genre of the work as a whole, and the smaller literary forms that make up the whole. Next it considers the traditions used in the texts--the commonplace wisdom traditions and topics as well as biblical (especially the Torah) and other materials. Then it takes up the world views of the two books--their approaches to creation, dualism, the divine mysteries, and eschatology. Finally it discusses the life-setting and community that are implied by each text in an effort to be precise about their social location.

Throughout the comparison, particular attention will be given to the relation between wisdom and apocalyptic--its relative absence in Sirach, and its impressive presence in Sapiential Work A from Qumran. Here I use the term "apocalyptic" simply to describe ideas and images associated with the eschaton, not to refer to the literary genre of apocalypse or to characterize apocalyptic thought as an extreme form of eschatology.

Genre

Both Sirach and Sapiential Work A are best described as wisdom instructions. Both presuppose a setting in which a senior sage addresses someone in search or in need of instruction ("my son" in Sirach, "you who understand" in Sapiential Work A). The senior sage imparts instructions in the form of short packets or paragraphs on various topics. Whatever "proverbs" (far more in Sirach than in Sapiential Work A) and other wisdom forms are used, are generally integrated into the larger instructional format. In both texts the instructions are usually formulated with the aid of parallelism--either synonymous or antithetical (though the fragmentary state of Sapiential Work A sometimes destroys the parallels and makes any restoration a guess).

Wisdom books generally do not follow tight outlines. Rather, most of them give the impression of being collections or anthologies. This is the case with both Sirach and Sapiential Work A.

The most obvious structural features in Ben Sira's wisdom instruction are the hymn about the glory of God made manifest in creation (42:15--43:33) and the poetic retelling of the exploits of Israel's heroes (44--50). For the earlier parts of the book, many commentators point to the series of wisdom poems (1:1-10; 4:11-19; 6:18-37; 14:20--15:10; 24:1-33; 38:24--39:11) as being structurally significant and giving the instructions on various topics an orderly framework. There are blocks of teachings about sin in chapters 16--23 and about speech in chapters 18--20. But beyond these obvious structural features it is hard to see how the small pieces fit together on anything more than an anthological basis.

Sirach contains treatments of some topics discussed in the best preserved parts of Sapiential Work A: money matters (3:30--4:10; 29:1-20; 29:21-28), social relations (7:18-36; 8:1-19; 11:29--12:18; 33:20-33), women (9:1-9; 23:22-26; 25:13--26:27; 36:26-31; 42:9-14), and family relations (3:1-16; 7:23-25; 16:1-4; 30:1-13; 41:5-10; 42:9-14). Other topics that are prominent in Sirach--fear of the Lord, friendship, table manners, sickness, sin, speech, death, and wisdom as an explicit topic--are absent from the extant fragments of Sapiential Work A. Of course, there is no way to know whether those topics appeared in parts of the text that have been lost.

All of the manuscripts of Sapiential Work A are fragmentary. And there are few cases of running text that allow us to see what the sequence of thought was. Indeed, in 4Q418 alone there are about three-hundred fragments, many of them the size of a postage stamp. But there are overlaps among the manuscripts that can help in reconstructing fairly full sections of wisdom instruction at some points (especially 4Q416 2 and 417 1-2 and their parallels).

Since it has a large right-hand margin, 4Q416 1 may mark the beginning of Sapiential Work A. If that is so, the part of the text in this fragment would serve to place the sapiential instructions that follow in a cosmic and eschatological framework. Several other large fragments in 4Q418 (55, 69, 81, 126, 127) also refer to creation and judgment as the framework for righteous action in the present.

The best preserved sections of Sapiential Work A (4Q416 2 and 417 1-2, and the overlapping material) are wisdom instructions with second-person masculine singular imperatives ("do this") and admonitions in the negative ("you shall not")--as in most of Sirach. There are calls to the hearer ("you who understand") and frequent reminders about the listener's poverty ("you are poor"). Whether the reference is to economic or spiritual poverty (or both) is not clear. The main topics of these instructions are money and other

possessions, social relations, and family matters. There are frequent exhortations to meditate on the "mystery that is to be/come," which is apparently the key to understanding creation, ethics, and eschatology. There are also references to heavenly tablets and books associated with the eschatological judgment (see 4Q417 2 i 15-17).

Torleif Elgvin has recently proposed a reconstruction of Sapiential Work A that offers a coherent and comprehensive outline for most of the work as a whole. Using the methods developed by Harmut Stegemann for reconstructing texts from scattered fragments, Elgvin developed the outline for a book that in 4Q416 consisted of twenty-three columns. The early columns (iii-vi) corrresponded to the topics treated in 4Q416 2/417 1 and parallel fragments: financial matters and business dealings, social relations, and family matters. Then there was an eschatological discourse (cols. vii-viii = largely 4Q416 1 and 3) followed by reflections on God's "mystery" and by instructions to walk in righteousness and to praise God (cols. x-xi = largely 4Q417 2). Other parts dealt with the lot of the elect (col. xv = 4Q418 81), rewards and punishments (xx, xxiii = 4Q418 55), the conditions of the farmer (xxii = 4Q423 1 and 2), and a final warning about the coming judgment (xxiii = 4Q418 127).

The most common small literary form is the wisdom instruction. In other words, the large wisdom instruction is made up of smaller wisdom instructions. There are frequent direct addresses, imperatives and prohibitions, and reasons for following the advice. The material is usually gathered in short units or paragraphs on the various topics--as in Sirach.

There is nothing in Sapiential Work A like the historical survey in Sirach 44--50. Neither are there numerical sayings (see Sir 23:16-17; 25:1-2, 7-11; etc.), acrostics (Sir 51:13-30), or beatitudes (Sir 25:8-9). The absence of beatitudes in Sapiential Work A is striking in light of their presence in other Qumran wisdom texts (see 4Q185, 4Q510). Even more striking is the absence of true proverbs. Whereas some sections of Sirach are collections of proverbs, Sapiential Work A is relentless in its commitment to give instructions along with the reasons for following the advice.

Sapiential Work A shares with Sirach the common sapiential vocabulary, i.e. the many different terms for wisdom and knowledge, and for the act of knowing or understanding. Its best preserved parts are noteworthy for their many words for "poverty" and "poor." Whether poverty was a major theme in the work or is prominent due to the accident of preservation, is hard to determine as is the precise sense of the terms (economic, spiritual, etc.).

The most important term in Sapiential Work A is *raz nihyeh* ("the mystery that is to be/come"). It occurs about thirty times. The parallel expressions suggest that it refers to knowledge of righteousness and iniquity in the future and in the present. The most peculiar term is the noun *'wt*, which occurs about fifteen times and whose etymology and meaning remain obscure. There are also many verbal links to the Rule of Community, Hodayot, and Damascus Document. These suggest some relation to the Qumran "sect" if one can still speak of that.

Traditions

By their very nature wisdom books are traditional. They try to distill the practical experience and insights of human beings through the ages on various issues. And so the search for parallels is practically endless. Paying loans back, avoiding business dealings with strangers, honoring one's parents, and relating to one's wife in proper fashion are not new

or original topics, however much we may need to be reminded of them. And so it is not surprising that Sirach and Sapiential Work A share familiar sapiential traditions on various topics. Four examples--concerning loans, surety, parents, and wives--will illustrate the common wisdom traditions and in some cases their distinctive approaches to them.

With regard to financial matters Ben Sira stresses the need to pay back loans: "Pay back your neighbor when a loan falls due" (29:2). Likewise, Sapiential Work A counsels vigilance in paying back loans: "If men's money you borrow for your poverty, do not let there be repose for you day or night, nor rest for your soul until you have restored to your creditor your debt in full" (4Q417 1 i 21-23).

Ben Sira regards standing surety for one's neighbor as the duty of a "good person" (29:14). But he warns about the danger involved in doing so: "Do not go surety beyond your means; think any pledge a debt you must pay" (29:14). He recognizes that sinful people can manipulate the system (see 29:16-20), and observes that a person's life may be at stake: "Forget not the kindness of your backer, for he offers his very life for you" (29:15). In Sapiential Work A there is a similar insistence on the seriousness of standing surety: "On account of your friends you have given away all your life for its price. Hasten and give what is his (the creditor's) and take back your purse" (4Q416 2 ii 5-6). Another text underlines the life-and-death character of such transactions: "Do not sell your self for money...do not sell your glory for any price nor give your inheritance in exchange for surety for a sum of money" (4Q416 2 ii 17-18). In the context of how one should handle a deposit entrusted by a stranger, the addressee is warned: "Do not let your 'spirit' be taken as a pledge for it" (4Q416 2 iii 6-7).

Family relations is a common wisdom topic. There are some good parallels between what Ben Sira says about honoring one's parents (3:1-16) and the advice given in Sapiential Work A. Just as Ben Sira says that "whoever honors his father will live a long life" (3:6), so the Qumran text urges the addressee to honor his parents "for the sake of your life and the length of your days" (4Q416 2 iii 19). Ben Sira says that "his father's glory is a person's own glory" (3:11), and the Qumran text advises: "Honor them for the sake of your own honor" (4Q416 2 iii 18).

There are, however, some unusual emphases in the generally conventional materials relating to parents in Sapiential Work A. First there is the connection made with the addressee's poverty: "Honor your father in your poverty and your mother in your low estate" (4Q416 2 iii 15-16). Then there is a daring comparison: "For as God (reading *'l* with 4Q418 rather than *'b*) is to a man, so is his mother" (16). Finally there is the suggestion that parents deserve respect and honor because of their role in instructing their son in what is truly important: "they have uncovered your ear to the mystery that is to be/come" (18). This text presupposes a "family" rather than "monastic" setting and links standard biblical/sapiential teaching to what is the central (and distinctive) concept of the whole work: "the mystery that is to be/come."

A fourth topic shared by Sirach and Sapiential Work A concerns women in general and wives in particular. Ben Sira's views on this issue are well known: "With a dragon or a lion I would rather dwell than live with an evil woman" (25:16); "In a woman was sin's beginning; on her account we all die" (25:24); and "Better a man's wickedness than a woman's goodness" (42:14).

Sapiential Work A assumes that the one being instructed will marry a wife (see 4Q416 2 iii 19--iv 11). But he is warned against being distracted "from the mystery that is

to be/come" (iii 20-21). The sage is here especially concerned to reinforce the husband's authority over his wife. He gives particular attention to the husband's power to annul his wife's vows and votive offerings: "Every oath binding on her, to vow a vow, annul it according to the mere utterance of your mouth and at your good pleasure restrain her from performing her vow" (iv 8-9). On these matters the Qumran text lacks the obsessive (even misogynist) tone of Ben Sira. But it does insist on the patriarchal/hierarchical relationship between husband and wife.

Another text in Sapiential Work A (4Q415 2 ii 1-9) appears to give advice directly to the wife of the one being instructed in most of the work. The advice is quite conventional, in keeping with the patriarchal assumptions of the work. She is told to honor her father-in-law as her own father, to cling to her husband's bosom, not to neglect her "holy covenant" (the marriage bond), and to be a subject of "praise on the mouth of all men." Though the advice is conventional, the fact that a woman is directly addressed is unusual in Jewish wisdom literature.

Besides treating common wisdom topics, Sirach and Sapiential Work A both use traditions from the Torah as part of their wisdom instructions. For example, Ben Sira's advice about parents and children takes as its starting point the Decalogue's precept to "honor your father and your mother" (Exod 20:12; Deut 5:16). And his teachings there expand upon the biblical promise "that your days may be long and that it may go well for you" (Deut 5:16). The same passages seem to be in the background of Sapiential Work A's treatment of the topic, as the discussion above indicates.

In Sapiential Work A there are other appeals to Torah traditions. For example, the section on relations with one's wife (4Q416 2 iii 19--iv 6) takes as its main texts Gen 2:24 ("therefore a man leaves his father and mother and clings to his wife, and they become one flesh") and 3:16 ("your desire shall be for your husband, and he shall rule over you"). The instruction about annuling the wife's vows and votive offerings (4Q416 2 iv 6-13) is based on Num 30:6-15. And one of the "agricultural" texts (4Q418 103) invokes the biblical law of "mixed things" (see Lev 19:19; Deut 22:9-11) in the course of its advice.

Thus both Sirach and Sapiential Work A weave Torah instructions into their sapiential instructions. Though these traditions presumably carry a certain authority, in neither work is this made explicit by the use of introductory formulas (as in Matthew's Gospel) or even an acknowledgement that a Torah text is being quoted. The Torah traditions are simply part of the advice.

Given the fragmentary character of Sapiential Work A, it is difficult to say what traditions were not in it. But on the basis of what we do have, we can say that Sapiential Work A lacks any personifiaction of Wisdom and any extended meditation on wisdom (unless "the mystery that is to be/come" plays an analogous role). There is no interest in Israel's history (cf. Sirach 44--49) or the Jerusalem temple and its priesthood (cf. Sirach 50).

Ben Sira's lack of interest in apocalyptic traditions is well known. Although there is no explicit denial of life after death, neither is there much affirmation of it (see 38:21-23). The most Important form of immortality is the good "name"--the reputation and memory that one leaves behind (41:1-4). The closest thing to an apocalyptic scenario comes in the prayer for God's people in 36:1-22: "Hasten the day, and remember the appointed time" (36:10). But even here Ben Sira's focus seems to be on some event in the near future (the overthrow of Antiochus III or Seleucus IV?).

What most sets Sapiential Work A apart from Sirach is its lively interest in apocalyptic. There are no periodizations of history, calendar reckonings, or cosmological maps as in some other apocalyptic texts. But the future judgment overseen by God and his angels provides the horizon against which the instructor gives advice. Throughout the work there are appeals to study or meditate on "the mystery that is to be/come," and to live one's life in accord with it. Whereas Ben Sira shows no interest in angels, Sapiential Work A imagines a correspondence (as in other Qumran texts) between the angels' existence in the heavenly court and the life of the wise/righteous on earth. These topics will be treated in more detail in the following section.

World View

Ben Sira treats creation in three long poems (16:24--18:14; 39:12-35; 42:15--43:33). They serve as theological underpinning or a theological framework for his many short wisdom instructions. Much in these creation poems simply echoes earlier biblical material. There is great emphasis on the order of creation and the divine wisdom made manifest in it, the central place of humankind within creation, the gift of the Law as the divinely revealed guide for human action, and the call to those who have strayed to repent and return to God.

Though biblical and traditional in his statements about creation, Ben Sira makes his own distinctive theological contribution (perhaps in response to Qohelet) with his treatment of theodicy in the context of creation. There he articulates what has come to be known as the doctrine of the "the pairs." The teaching is summarized in Sir 33:15: "See now all the works of the Most High: they come in pairs, the one the opposite of the other." It is also expressed in 42:24: "All of them come in twos, one corresponding to the other; yet none of them has He made in vain." Both texts attribute absolute sovereignty to God the creator. But they account for the duality in human history and experience by appealing to the order of creation. This is a modified dualism (as at Qumran), but without any appeal to a subordinate evil power like the Angel of Darkness (as in IQS III-IV).

For Ben Sira, God's creations are objectively good but can result in punishment for the wicked: "For the good all these are good, but for the wicked they turn out evil" (39:27). This is, of course, a neat but simplistic solution to the question of theodicy. It leaves out the reality of innocent suffering and suggests that those who suffer natural calamities and the ravages of war must be among the wicked: "Fire and hail, famine, disease: these too were created for punishment. Ravenous beasts, scorpions, vipers, and the avenging sword to exterminate the wicked: All these were created to meet a need and are kept in his storehouse for the proper time" (39:29-30).

Ben Sira's approach to creation is biblical and traditional. His innovative approach to theodicy is neat but somewhat timid. He acknowledges the existence of a certain duality in creation without developing it in much detail and declares that natural catastrophes are primarily intended to punish the wicked.

The appeal to creation as a theological basis for wisdom instruction is also prominent in Sapiential Work A. But whereas Ben Sira seems intent on describing and glorifying God's creation, the Qumran wisdom text is less speculative and more interested in the moral consequences of creation and divine election. God has separated the wise from the "spirit of flesh." Therefore, "you, separate yourself from everything that He (God) hates and guard yourself from everything that His soul detests" (4Q418 81 2). The addressee is urged

repeatedly to recall his "inheritance" and his "portion" and his "glory" that God has granted him. As in Sirach there are two kinds of people corresponding to a certain modified dualism within creation. Sapiential Work A, however, puts more emphasis on God's activity in choosing the righteous and on the responsibility that the righteous have in acting in a manner appropriate to their "lot" or "inheritance."

God's sovereignty in creating and preserving the universe is affirmed in 4Q418 126 1-10: "Nothing will cease from all their host.... He numbers all, and they did not come to be without His good pleasure." It also stresses the discriminating judgment (election) of God that has already separated the good and the wicked, and looks forward to the future judgment that will bring vengeance on the "masters of iniquity" and vindication for the "poor ones."

The coming divine judgment on human actions is frequently proposed in Sapiential Work A as a motive for good action in the present: "Study (or, inherit) your reward, remembering the requital, for it comes" (4Q417 2 i 14). Then using the motif of the heavenly tablets or books and the language of Exod 32:16, the instructor warns: "Engraved is the ordinance, and ordained is all the punishment." The heavenly tablet or book (see Jubilees 30:20-22; 1 Enoch 47:3; 108:3) apparently contains a list of evil deeds and their punishments.

In 4Q418 69 the "foolish ones" are warned that "to the everlasting pit shall your return be...its dark places shall cry out...those who investigate the truth shall be roused up for your judgment" (6-7). The destiny of the foolish is annihilation: "Then will all the foolish in mind be destroyed" (8).

In 4Q418 126 ii the righteous are promised that "upon the power of God and the greatness of His glory together with His goodness and His great mercy shall they meditate, and upon His faithfulness shall they reflect always. Continually shall they praise His name" (9-11). The righteous will enjoy an angelic existence. To exhort the righteous not to grow weary in seeking wisdom, the sage uses the example of the "sons of heaven, whose lot is eternal life" (4Q418 69 12-13). Indeed, the righteous already participate in the glorious existence of the angels: "among all the godly ones He has cast your lot, and has magnified your glory greatly" (4Q418 81 4-5).

God's plan is called the *raz nihyeh* ("the mystery that is to be/come"). The many references to this term assume that the speaker and the one being instructed know to what it refers, though we as outsiders are never given a definition. There is no reason to identify it with the Torah. It could be a book (like the "Book of Meditation") or an epitome of basic teachings (as in 1QS III-IV). Or it could be an oral or (lost) written esoteric teaching. From its various uses and their contexts, it clearly concerns creation, behavior in the present, and the coming judgment. The translation "mystery of being" seems too metaphysical and static. The expression functions in an elusive and encompassing way--something like the "kingdom of God" in the Synoptic Gospels.

What "the mystery that is to be/come" is can best be approached by referring to some words and phrases that accompany it. Most of the verbs are second-person singular imperatives and occur in the context of the instructor's advice to "test," "study," "meditate," "understand," and "look at, gaze." The nominal phrases parallel to it include "all the ways of truth and all the roots of iniquity" (4Q416 2 iii 14); "the birth-time of salvation, and...who is to inherit glory and iniquity" (4Q417 1 i 10-11); "the inheritance of everything that lives" (4Q418 2 i 18); "the generations of man" (4Q418 77 2); and "the weight of the times and the

measure" (4Q418 77 4). These parallels suggest that the "mystery" concerns creation, ethics, and eschatology.

Those who apply themselves to the mystery can expect rewards in the present: "Then you shall know to discern between good and evil" (4Q417 2 i 7); and "You shall know what is alloted to it, and in righteousness shall you walk" (4Q417 2 iii 9). Such promises underscore the ethical dimension of the mystery.

Whatever the "mystery" was, the ways in which the speaker refers to it suggest that it provides a revelation to those who study it. And the content with its cosmological, ethical, and eschatological aspects indicates that the mystery has been revealed (directly by God or through angels?) and that the instructor is intent on emphasizing the duty of those who would be wise and righteous to apply themselves to it.

There is surely an esoteric dimension to the *raz nihyeh* in Sapiential Work A. This stands in contrast to Ben Sira's method of deriving wisdom instruction principally from practical human experience (the ususual source of sapiential teachings), creation, and the Torah and Israel's history.

The world view of Sapiential Work A seems midway between Ben Sira's timid doctrine of the pairs and the fully fleshed out dualistic schema of 1QS III-IV with its Angels of Darkness and Light. The Qumran text assumes a God more active and involved in creation and human affairs than Sirach does. Its emphasis is on the election that God has imposed on creation and on the moral consequences of being the object of God's grace or good pleasure.

Community

The setting for both Sirach and Sapiential Work A is instructional. In each book a senior sage imparts advice to younger men and uses direct address, generally in the masculine singular.

If the autobiographical wisdom poem in Sir 51:13-30 came from Ben Sira (and there is some dispute about this), then we know that he ran a wisdom school ("the house of instruction," 51:23) and promised great results to those who came to study with him ("you will acquire silver and gold," 51:28). A fuller prospectus for Ben Sira's school appears in the section on the activity of the scribe (38:34b--39:11). His students will learn not only traditional wisdom but also "the law of the Lord's covenant" (39:8). This education will prepare them not simply for the "scribal" life of copying documents or teaching young people but for political leadership and for advising kings and princes (see 38:32b-33). Moreover, Ben Sira was well disposed toward the priesthood and worship at the Jerusalem temple. His survey of Israel's history climaxes with a beautiful description of a temple service at which Simeon the high priest presides (see 50:1-21). Some have even suggested that Ben Sira's school was officially linked with the Jerusalem temple.

Sapiential Work A does not contain any autobiographical notices as Sirach does throughout (see Sir 24:30-34; 33:16-19; 34:9-13; 39:12-13; 50:27; 51:13-30). Whatever can be said about its life setting must be deduced from the text itself. The form and content of the instructions suggest a "school" setting (as in Sirach), though precisely how the school is to be imagined (a tutorial?) is not clear. The instructor uses the address "son" and appears to be superior in wisdom and in age.

The one being addressed may simply be anyone in search of wisdom. But more likely he is in the process of being integrated into the life and teachings of a specific Jewish

movement (which at some point was related to the Qumran people). In one passage (4Q417 2 i 1-17) there may possibly be hints that he is being groomed to exercise leadership. There he is told that applying himself to "the mystery that is to be/come" will equip him with the requisite knowledge about the cosmos, behavior, and rendering judgments in the present. Perhaps Sapiential Work A was intended as a handbook for training leaders within a particular Jewish movement.

The person being instructed in Sapiential Work A was not a monk. Much of the advice concerns financial matters. He is presumed to be involved in loans and standing surety for others. He has business and social dealings with various kinds of people in society. He continues his relationship with his parents. He is expected to marry and to exercise proper authority over his wife.

The fact that six copies of the work were found at Qumran indicates its importance there. It may have simply been popular there (as 1 Enoch was) but not directly related to the Qumran group. However, the linguistic and conceptual links to the Rule of the Community, Hodayot, and Damascus Document suggest that it was more than merely part of a Jewish library in the first century.

Sapiential Work A could have been composed for the non-"monastic" branch of the Qumran or Essene movement. Or (what I consider more likely) the work may have been associated with the foundational, pre-Qumranic phase of the Jewish (Essene, Sadducean?) movement in the second century B.C.

Such a setting would explain both the "secular" dimension of many teachings and the clear links to the "sectarian" works found at Qumran. Then it would be contemporary with Sirach, providing evidence for a major crossroads in Jewish intellectual and religious history. Both works join the wisdom and Torah traditions. Whereas Sirach represents the fusion of the wisdom/Torah and priestly/temple traditions, Sapiential Work A uses wisdom/Torah traditions alongside or in the framework of a dualistic and eschatologically oriented theology.

For the consultation concerned with "Wisdom, Apocalyptic, and Early Christianity" this comparison of Sirach and Sapiential Work A with reference to genre, traditions, world view, and community reveals two of the options current in early (second century) Jewish wisdom literature. While Ben Sira was not interested in (or perhaps opposed to) apocalyptic, the author of Sapeintial Work A and the community for which he wrote were keenly interested in fitting together wisdom and apocalyptic.

Bibliographical Note

Access to the book of Sirach presents few problems. The critical edition of the Greek text is that of Joseph Ziegler (ed.), *Sapientia Iesu Filii Sirach* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965). The Masada fragments were edited by Yigael Yadin in *The Ben Sira Scroll from Masada* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1965). The synoptic presentation of the Hebrew, Greek, Latin, and Syriac versions in Francesco Vattioni's *Ecclesiastico* (Naples: Istituto Orientale di Napoili, 1968) is helpful. The quotations in this paper generally follow the New Revised Standard Version. The best commentary is by Patrick W. Skehan and Alexander A. Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira* (New York: Doubleday, 1987).

The manuscript of Sapiential Work A in Qumran Cave 1 (1Q26) was edited by J. T. Milik in *Qumrân Cave I* (DJD 1; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955), pp. 100-102. The texts from Cave 4 (4Q415-418, 423) appear in preliminary form in Ben Zion Wacholder and

Martin G. Abegg's *A Preliminary Edition of the Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew and Aramaic Texts from Cave Four. Fascicle Two* (Washington, DC: Biblical Archaeology Society, 1994), pp. 54-154, 166-171. Some parts also appear in R. H. Eisenman and M. O. Wise's *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered* (Shaftesbury, UK: Element, 1992), pp. 241-254. Translations of large parts appear in F. García Martínez's *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated* (Leiden: Brill, 1994), pp. 383-93. For general treatments, see L. H,. Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Philadelphia--Jeruisalem: Jewish Publication Society, 1994), pp. 203-206; and Torleif Elgvin's "Admonition Texts from Qumran Cave 4," in M. O. Wise et al. (eds.), *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site* (New York: Academy of Sciences, 1994), pp. 137-152; his article "The Reconstruction of Sapiential Work A," *Revue de Qumran* 16/64 (1995) 559-580; and his paper prepared for this SBL consultation, "Wisdom, Revelation, and Eschatology in an Early Essene Writing," in E. H. Lovering (ed.), *Society of Biblical Literature 1995 Seminar Papers* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), pp. 440-465. See also my paper, "Wisdom at Qumran," in E. Ulrich and J. C. VanderKam (eds.), *The Community of the Renewed Covenant* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994), pp. 137-152. I have incorporated some material from that article in this presentation. For a fuller treatment of this and related Qumran texts, see my book *Wisdom Texts from Qumran* (London: Routledge, 1996). For a study of 4Q417 2 i 1-ii 16) and other important Qumran wisdom texts and themes, see Armin Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination. Weisheitliche Urordnung und Prädestination in den Textfunden von Qumran* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, XVIII; Leiden: Brill 1995); for an English summary, see Lange, "Wisdom and Predestination in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *Dead Sea Discoveries* 2 (1995) 340-354.

Putting the Puzzle Together: Some Suggestions Concerning the Social Location of the Wisdom of Ben Sira

Benjamin G. Wright III
Lehigh University

1. Introduction

In the course of the Steering Committee discussions that resulted in the program for this year's sessions of the Wisdom and Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity Consultation, Dick Horsley made the remark that after our discussions of Sirach last year someone needed to "send up some trial balloons" concerning the social location of this work. This paper takes up that challenge. Off and on for the last several years, I have been thinking about how to read the clues that ben Sira provides in his book in order to see how he fits into the social fabric of the Judaism of pre-Maccabean Palestine.[1] The sources for this period are few, and those that do exist frustrate the exegete since the evidence they provide is, for the most part, indirect and often expressed in ambiguous and/or mythic language. What I want to suggest in this paper is that, among other things, Jesus ben Sira was aware of and intended some elements of his book to address polemically criticisms of the Jerusalem priesthood and Temple by other groups of Jews (priests/scribes?) critical of those institutions. These other Jewish groups were cognizant of people like ben Sira, who were connected with the Jerusalem priests and supported them. Three works that are roughly contemporary with ben Sira express these kinds of criticisms: (1) two of the oldest portions of *1 Enoch*, the *Book of the Watchers* (*1 Enoch* 6-36) and the *Astronomical Book* (*1 Enoch* 72-82), and (2) the *Aramaic Levi Document*.[2] An additional element of such a scenario is that these factions may very well have been in dialogue with each other.

---

[1] I presented some preliminary thoughts on these issues in a paper entitled "Seeking the Sublime: Aspects of Inner Jewish Polemic in the Wisdom of Ben Sira" presented to the Hellenistic Judaism Section of the 1993 Annual Meetings of the SBL in Washington, D. C.

[2] The *Book of the Watchers* and the *Astronomical Book* probably date to at least the third century BCE. J. T. Milik, *The Book of Enoch* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976) dates the Qumran manuscripts of these sections to the second century BCE. Since they are surely not the autographs, the composition of the books must be earlier. On the dating of the Enochic corpus, see George W. E. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981) 46-55, 150-151. On a third century BCE date for *Aramaic Levi*, see Michael Stone, "Enoch, Aramaic Levi and Sectarian Origins," *JSJ* 19 (1988) 159 n. 2 and Robert A. Kugler, *From Patriarch to Priest: The Levi-Priestly Tradition from Aramaic Levi to Testament of Levi*, Early Judaism and Its Literature 9 (Atlanta: Scholars, 1996) 222-224. Sirach is usually dated to somewhere around 180 BCE. See Patrick Skehan and Alexander A. Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*, AB 38 (New York: Doubleday, 1987) 8-10. On the relationship between the *Aramaic Levi Document* and the Greek *Testament of Levi*, see H. W. Hollander and M. de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary* (Leiden: Brill, 1985), Kugler's discussion and the literature cited in Kugler.

The most difficult hurdle to get over in such an enterprise is to reconstruct a social situation, in which various groups may be in conflict, from texts that may only allude to those conflicts and never explicitly indicate who the intended targets of the polemic are or with whom they may be in disagreement. It is precisely these kinds of confrontations that constitute the "trial balloon" aspect of this paper. While ben Sira and the communities represented by *Aramaic Levi* and the Enochic works may be contemporary and even deal with the same themes, can we then move from those "observations" to creating a social world in which these people know of each other and attack or respond to each other? Randal Argall, reading Sirach and *1 Enoch* against one another, has shown that they treat identical themes—revelation, creation, judgment—and articulate them similarly.[3] How does one, or even can one, move from literary theme to social reality?

What I propose to do is a bit different from what Richard Horsley and Patrick Tiller did in their 1992 SBL paper, "Ben Sira and the Sociology of the Second Temple."[4] Horsley and Tiller utilize the insights of Gerhard Lenski[5] to attempt to sketch the contours of Judean society in the time of ben Sira and to understand where he fits in the network of the social structure and system of social relations revealed in his book. In addition, they compare briefly the picture of a "stable and quiet" Judean society, as ben Sira paints it, with that of *1 Enoch* whose social world reveals "intense social conflict."[6] Their study provides important background for the analysis that I want to make, and their conclusions hint that they think Sirach and *1 Enoch* betray the kinds of social interactions that I want to consider here.

Indeed, several recent studies have suggested some relation between ben Sira and *1 Enoch*. George W. E. Nickelsburg, commenting on Sirach's and the *Epistle of Enoch*'s relative treatments of the rich and poor, has speculated as to whether "the *poor* of Ben Sira's time" could have produced the Epistle.[7] In two brief, but suggestive remarks, Saul Olyan links the polemics of the *Testament of Levi* and *1 Enoch* with Sirach. Olyan thinks that both the *Testament of Levi* and *1 Enoch* witness to the claims of the Levites to the priesthood against the pretensions of the Aaronids/ Zadokites.[8] He contrasts these claims to ben Sira's "refusal to recognize the existence of the Levites as a group," and he further comments that "we may have evidence here [in *1 Enoch* 89:73] of a contemporary Levitic theology opposed to Ben Sira's pan-Aaronid exclusivism."[9]

---

[3] Randal A. Argall, *1 Enoch and Sirach: A Comparative Literary and Conceptual Analysis of the Themes of Revelation, Creation and Judgment*, Early Judaism and Its Literature 8 (Atlanta: Scholars, 1995) 249. In this paper, Sirach refers to the book, ben Sira to the person.

[4] Presented to the Sociology of the Second Temple Group, San Francisco, 1992. My thanks to the authors for making available to me a copy of their paper.

[5] *Power and Privilege* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966).

[6] Horsley and Tiller, 33.

[7] "Social Aspects of Palestinian Jewish Apocalypticism," in D. Hellholm, ed. *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East*, 2nd ed. (Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1989) 651. See also, Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, 149.

[8] "Ben Sira's Relationship to the Priesthood," *HTR* 80 (1987) 279-280.

[9] Olyan, 280.

The two most detailed treatments of Sirach and *1 Enoch* are by Randal Argall (noted above) and by Gabriele Boccaccini in his book *Middle Judaism.*[10] Argall's study is primarily concerned with the literary themes and forms that Sirach and *1 Enoch* have in common. At the conclusion of the book he ventures several tentative conclusions about a social connection between the works.[11] After summarizing the differences between *1 Enoch* and Sirach he comments, "Such differences are the stuff of conflict ... it is enough to make the case that each tradition views the other among its rivals."[12] Argall goes on to suggest two other avenues along which one might expect to find this conflict: the distinction between esoteric and exoteric wisdom and portrayals of the rich and poor (drawing on Nickelsburg and Victor Tcherikover).

Boccaccini also looks at the literary similarities and differences among several themes contained in Sirach and *1 Enoch*, but he takes the next step of claiming that these literary aspects reveal that ben Sira is aware of apocalyptic theologies and that he is writing against them. Boccaccini's literary analysis provides hints that he thinks might indicate direct social confrontations between ben Sira and these apocalyptic groups. Commenting on the theme of covenant in Sirach, he writes,

> Ben Sira is intent on reaffirming the centrality of the covenant and the retributive principle, overcoming the aporias and doubts of Job and Qohelet. At the same time he *directly* [emphasis mine] confronts the suggestions of the apocalyptic movement. The calm and systematic style of this wisdom book should not lead us to lose sight of the terms of a bitter debate, addressing such precise referents and urgent questioning.[13]

I will sketch out several literary and conceptual themes that I believe show that ben Sira and the communities represented by *1 Enoch* and *Aramaic Levi* knew and responded to each other's criticisms. Combined with the scholarly insights into the possible social locations of these works, I think enough clues are at hand to argue that the communities behind these works are, in significant ways, engaged in ongoing confrontation with each other over what are considered foundational issues for Jews in the period before the Maccabean Revolt. For these roughly contemporary works, the literature points to social confrontation between Jewish groups at odds with one another rather than Jewish reaction to outsiders and their culture.

---

[10] *Middle Judaism: Jewish Thought 300 B.C.E to 200 C.E.* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991).

[11] Argall's assessment of the dates of the different portions of *1 Enoch* relies on that of Nickelsburg. He wants to use those portions of *1 Enoch* that are contemporary with Sirach, as I do here. Primarily for reasons of space, I have limited this paper to the *Book of the Watchers* and the *Astronomical Book* while Argall has included in his study the *Epistle of Enoch* (*1 Enoch* 92-105). On the *Epistle of Enoch* see also, George W. E. Nickelsburg, "Revealed Wisdom as a Criterion for Inclusion and Exclusion: From Jewish Sectarianism to Early Christianity," in Jacob Neusner and Ernest S. Frerichs, eds., *"To See Ourselves as Others See Us:" Christians, Jews, "Others" in Late Antiquity* (Chico: Scholars, 1985) 74-77. A connection between Sirach and the *Epistle of Enoch* was originally suggested by Victor Tcherikover, *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews* (New York: Atheneum, 1982) 151. See also, Nickelsburg, "Social Aspects," 651.

[12] Argall, 250.

[13] Boccaccini, 80.

2. Problems of the Calendar

"It is difficult to overstress the importance of the calendar." So Michael Stone concludes about the character of third century BCE Judaism.[14] And calendrical concerns are certainly in evidence in the documents at issue here. What is more important to stress is that in some places in these texts the calendar is clearly presented in a context that could be interpreted as polemical. The issue at stake is the difference between the use of a calendar dependant on the sun and one that relied on the moon (or, moon and sun together) and what that means for who controls setting the Jewish festivals and observances. The Qumran community, as is well known, used a solar calendar, but that calendar's origins come earlier than the founding of the group.[15]

Aramaic Levi, the *Book of the Watchers* and the *Astronomical Book* all evidence the use of this solar calendar. Because *Aramaic Levi* is so fragmentary, it is difficult to ascertain exactly how the solar calendar functioned in the document, but it is probable that a calendar like the one used at Qumran is present in the work. Such a conclusion depends on the reports of Levi's children given in *Aramaic Levi* 65-72.[16] Michael Stone and Jonas Greenfield argue that the several characteristics of the dates for the births of Levi's children are consistent with a Qumran-like solar calendar. These include: (1) the numbering of months rather than naming them, (2) the births of three of the children exactly three months apart putting them on the same date and day of the week, (3) two cases, for which dates are provided, where the birth falls on a Wednesday, an important day of the week in the Qumran calendar, (4) Kohath's birth on the morning of the first day of the first month, morning being the time that the day began at Qumran.[17]

The *Book of the Watchers* also preserves clues that an important part of the Enochic visionary traditions was the revelation of the workings of the astronomical bodies. Even though the solar calendar is not mentioned *per se* in the *Book of the Watchers*, it is dependent on such a calendar. Chapters 33-36 appear to be a summary account intended to end the work, and 33:2-4 in particular constitute a condensed version of the *Astronomical Book*. As in the *Astronomical Book*, the angel Uriel shows Enoch the "gates of the heavens" and how the stars that come out of them determine the calendar.[18] Chapters 34-36 also speak of the gates of heaven, although the astronomical scheme in these chapters differs somewhat from that of the *Astronomical Book*.[19]

The *Astronomical Book of Enoch* contains the most extensive and detailed treatment of the 364 day solar calendar.[20] In these chapters, Uriel shows Enoch the intricacies of the movements of

---

[14] Stone, "Enoch, Aramaic Levi," 166.

[15] On the Qumran calendar, see Shamaryahu Talmon, "The Calendar Reckoning of the Sect from the Judean Desert," *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 4 (1958) 162-199.

[16] On the various Greek and Aramaic portions of *Aramaic Levi* see, Michael Stone and Jonas Greenfield, "Remarks on the Aramaic Testament of Levi from the Geniza," *RB* 86 (1979) 214-215 and Kugler, chap. 2.

[17] Stone and Greenfield, "Remarks," 224.

[18] Argall, 52. See the notes to these chapters in Matthew Black, *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch: A New English Edition*, SVTP (Leiden: Brill, 1985) 180-181.

[19] Argall, 52.

[20] The Aramaic fragments of the *Astronomical Book* found at Qumran show that the version used by the Qumranites was more extensive than that preserved in the Ethiopic *1 Enoch*. See, Milik and Black. The solar year constitutes an important part of both forms of the book.

the sun, moon and stars in and out of the gates of heaven. This revelation establishes the solar year as the fundamental basis for the reckoning of seasons and festivals. In two places in the *Astronomical Book* as we now have it, 75:2 and 82:4-7 (which is an apparent intrusion into the astronomical material) and in one apparent addition to the book, 80:2-8, there are polemical passages directed at those who do not use the Enochic calendar.[21] 75:2 and 82:4-7 attack those who do not reckon the four epagomenal days in the calendar that bring it to 364 days. Otto Neugebauer notes that 75:2 "could refer to the lunar calendar of the Jews (which has no intercalary days)."[22] 80:2-8 inveighs against "sinners" whose "years shall become shorter, And their seeds shall be late in their lands and fields." These people are presumably those who do not use the Enochic solar calendar, but a lunar or luni-solar one that rapidly gets out of sync with the solar year. This 364 day calendar is utilized later by the book of *Jubilees* and the people at Qumran in decidedly polemical contexts. George Nickelsburg's comment on these materials is apt at this junction, "Behind all this [the problems concerning calendar evidenced in these works] appears to have been a bitter calendrical dispute with the Jewish religious establishment."[23]

Ben Sira's comments about the heavenly bodies reveals a position on the calendar directly in contrast to that of *Aramaic Levi* and the Enochic works. 43:2-8, the major section in which ben Sira speaks of the sun and moon, is part of a larger section on the works of creation, and his comments on these two heavenly bodies can, and I think should, be read as a polemic against the Enochic solar year. The sun is of interest to ben Sira primarily because it is hot. Six of the eight cola devoted to this celestial body are concerned with its fiery nature. It "parches the earth and no one can endure its blazing heat" (43:3). The sun is much hotter than a furnace, and it "breathes out fiery vapors" (43:4). Nowhere does ben Sira attribute to it any calendrical function. By contrast, his section on the moon focuses almost exclusively on the role that body plays in setting the calendar. The moon, ben Sira says, governs the changing seasons (עתות), the festivals (מועד) and the pilgrimages (חג). As its name implies, the moon gives the month its name, and it serves as an "army beacon" (כלי צבא).

What is so remarkable about this passage is that ben Sira not only denies the sun the role it plays in the Enochic works, he does so in contrast to the function attributed to it in the Priestly creation account in Genesis.[24] Gen 1:14-15 ascribes a cooperative role to the sun and moon when it comes to calendars. "God said, 'Let there be lights in the vault of the heavens to separate the day from the night, and let *them* serve as signs both for festivals and for seasons and for years.'"[25] Such a contravention of the biblical narrative, which ben Sira clearly knows, can best be understood as an attempt by him not to make even an apparent concession to the calendrical stance

---

[21] On this "intrusion of non-astronomical material," see Black, 252, 411 and Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, 48.

[22] Black, 402. James VanderKam notes, however, that the polemic about the four epagomenal days does not necessarily oppose use of a lunar calendar. He argues that the *Astronomical Book presents* a 364 day calendar apparently without any active opposition to the calendar that regulated the cult in Jerusalem. See "The 364-Day Calendar in the Enochic Literature," *SBLSP 1983* (Chico: Scholars, 1983) 164.

[23] Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, 48.

[24] See Olyan for the affinities that ben Sira has with the Priestly source of the Pentateuch regarding the role and place of the priests.

[25] Alexander Rofé, "The Onset of Sects in Postexilic Judaism: Neglected Evidence from the Septuagint, Trito-Isaiah, Ben Sira and Malachi," in Jacob Neusner, et al. *The Social World of Formative Christianity and Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988) 43-44 also notes this problem.

taken by Jews, like those who produced and used *Aramaic Levi*, the *Book of the Watchers* and the *Astronomical Book*, who claim the priority and foundational character of a solar calendar.

3. The Secrets of God and Creation

Ben Sira's opposition to any reliance on the sun for calendrical reckonings seems to represent one particular instance of more general suspicions that he has about the entire enterprise of moving beyond the Law and inquiring into those subjects that are inscrutable, the secrets of the created order and the future. Several passages in his book could be brought to bear here, but the *locus classicus* is Sir 3:21-24.

3:21 Things too marvelous for you, do not investigate
And things too evil for you, do not research.
3:22 On what is authorized, give attention,
But you have no business with secret things
3:23 And into what is beyond you, do not meddle,
For that which is too great has been shown to you.
3:24 For many are the thoughts of the sons of men,
Evil and erring imaginations.[26]

This passage has frequently been read as a polemic against Jewish participation in Greek philosophical inquiry and discussion. Patrick Skehan and Alexander Di Lella summarize it this way, "... Ben Sira cautions his readers about the futility of Greek learning, its goals and techniques, and also reminds them of what the Lord has bestowed on them ... Hence it is better for the enlightened Jew to follow the certainties and true wisdom of the Law revealed to Moses than to strive after the often contradictory musings and uncertain opinions of the Greek thinkers."[27] While it is true that ben Sira wants his readers to adhere closely to the precepts of Moses, I think this passage makes better sense when understood against the backdrop of the mysteries revealed to Enoch and Levi, especially cosmological speculation and eschatological realities.

The passage makes it clear that ben Sira does not want his students engaged in certain kinds of inquiry. Only God can reveal those things that are "too marvelous," "too difficult/evil," or that are "hidden." Investigation of these esoteric matters is not only unwise, but forbidden.[28] But the passage is conspicuously characterized by its vagueness as to the subject of the inquiry. What kinds of things are "too marvelous" or "hidden?"

---

[26] I have used the translation of Argall here who argues for adopting the reading of Ms C from the Geniza for 3:21b against Skehan and Di Lella who use Ms A. To judge from the Greek translation, the situation is more complicated than simply following one manuscript or the other. I would follow Ms A for the verbs since elsewhere in Sirach ἐκετάζω (Gk colon b) only translates Hebrew חקר (11:7, 13:11), but I prefer the adjectives used in Ms C where Greek χαλεπώτερα seems to reflect a *Vorlage* more like Ms C's רעים. Thus, 3:21 might be translated "What is too marvelous for you, do not seek, and what is too harsh/difficult/evil for you do not investigate." The Hebrew of Sirach (except for Ms F) can be most conveniently found in The Historical Dictionary of the Hebrew Language, *The Book of Ben Sira: Text, Concordance and an Analysis of the Vocabulary* (Jerusalem: Academy of the Hebrew Language and Shrine of the Book, 1973 [Hebrew]). For Ms F from the Geniza, see Alexander A. Di Lella, "The Newly Discovered Sixth Manuscript of Ben Sira from the Cairo Geniza," *Biblica* 69 (1988) 226-238.

[27] Skehan and Di Lella, 160-161. See also, Martin Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974) 139-140.

[28] On this passage, see Argall, 74-76, 250.

The dangerous content of the questioning might be indicated by two particular Hebrew terms. The first, the adjective פלאות (3:21, Gk is probably ἰσχυρότερα), may refer to delving into the "works of God," particularly the secrets of God's creation. In the two other places where פלאות is used in Sirach, the first, 11:4 modifies "the works of God (מעשׂי יהוה)" and refers to the way that human fortunes can unexpectedly change. The second occurrence is in 43:24, part of an extended poem on the wonders of creation (42:15-43:33), where פלאות describes "the works of God," but here God's works are the incredible creatures/monsters that live in the sea. Elsewhere in this poem ben Sira uses the related Hebrew word נפלאות to indicate the unfathomable wonders of God's creation. At the beginning of the poem (42:15), he exclaims, "I shall recall the works of God (מעשׂי אל) ... through the word of the Lord are his works (מעשׂיו)." These works are filled with God's glory (v. 16), and even the "holy ones of God" cannot recount "the marvels/wonders of God (נפלאות יהוה)." At the end of the poem, ben Sira extols God for his power and inscrutable nature. Returning to God's works in 43:32-33, he says, "Many more things than these are marvelous (נפלא?) and powerful. Only a few of his works I have seen. It is the Lord who has made all things and to those who fear him he gives wisdom."[29]

In one passage for which no Hebrew is extant, ben Sira uses God's position as creator to reinforce the role of God as judge. In 18:4-7, he again claims that God's creation, and hence God, cannot be fathomed. No one can describe "God's works" or measure his power. One cannot penetrate the "wonders of the Lord (καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐξιχνιάσαι τὰ θαυμάσια τοῦ κυρίου)." This is the same sentiment found in the poem on creation in chapters 42 and 43.

The second important term is the noun נסתרות (3:22, Gk. κρύπτα), which probably refers to what the future holds. The term occurs elsewhere in Sirach in the initial section of the poem on creation in chapter 42. Ben Sira claims that God knows the depths of the human heart and that he "discloses both the past and the future and he reveals the deep secret things (נסתרות)" (42:19). The verbs in this verse, מחוה and מגלה, are certainly verbs of revelation, and נסתרות occurs in parallel with "the past and future." The word, then, in the context of this poem on God's works, connects conceptually both with revelation and creation. The universe comprises not only the created order (visible and invisible), but also the things that God ordains. The past and future, the created order, these are all things that God has "made." Thus, while the "secret things" in this poem could refer to hidden aspects of creation, they almost certainly refer to matters of past and future. The poem culminates in the claim that the creator gives wisdom (revelation of the future and the secrets of creation?) to those who fear him (43:33). Further on in 48:25, the same term is used of Isaiah, who "foretold what should be till the end of time, hidden things (נסתרות) that were yet to be fulfilled." In this passage, ben Sira intends the term to mean matters pertaining to the eschatological future. The most likely content of the נסתרות into which 3:22 prohibits investigation is events of the future, perhaps the eschaton. One can only speculate at this juncture as to whether ben Sira's ambivalent attitude toward revelation of the future reflects his awareness of eschatological speculation of the kind found in *1 Enoch* and *Aramaic Levi*.

It is no accident, in my estimation, that the secrets of creation and revelation of the future are precisely two of the more conspicuous subjects treated in the *Astronomical Book*, the *Book of the Watchers* and *Aramaic Levi*. During Enoch's visions of the *Astronomical Book* and the *Book of the Watchers*, he learns the inner workings of the created order. In his ascent to heaven in *1 Enoch* 14 Enoch encounters God in the heavenly Temple who reveals the impending judgment of

---

[29] Skehan and Di Lella follow the Greek here because of the fragmentary nature of Ms B, which only has the first word and part of the last word fully legible. On the basis of the traces on the manuscript, the Hebrew Language Academy edition of the Hebrew reconstructs the verse, רוב אלה [מ]ק וחז[א]ל[פ]נ. I have translated on the basis of this reconstruction.

the Watchers. This revelation has been understood as *1 Enoch*'s condemnation of the Jerusalem priesthood, a group for whom ben Sira has great sympathy.[30]

As Robert Kugler has the Qumran fragments ordered, 4Q312 2 constitutes the content of Levi's heavenly vision reported initially in 4Q213 1 ii.[31] In 4Q213 1 ii Levi sees the gates of heaven and the text breaks off with mention of an angel. Although fragmentary, 4Q213 2 apparently concerns problems of priestly exogamy. If the placement of the fragment is correct, Levi is shown in a vision that priests will enter into illegitimate marriages.[32] Later, in *Aramaic Levi* 82-106 Levi's speech to his children predicts that his descendants in later generations will not follow his instruction. In the beginning of the section Levi admonishes his children both to learn and to teach wisdom (as well as "reading, writing and instruction"). In 102-106, Levi makes clear that his descendents will abandon that wisdom and will "walk in the darkness of satan ... will become fools." They will turn to wickedness and evil (106). This prediction is not, however, given in the form of a vision but it is more like a testament.

By contrast, although he understands himself to be a sage with prophet-like inspiration (see chap 24), ben Sira admits that he has seen only a small portion of God's works (43:32), and he does not claim to know what the future holds. It is not that God does not reveal these things; he plainly has (to Isaiah, for instance) and does, but the things that God has already given are plenty to contemplate, and these are the only things that are "authorized" (3:22). I read this admonition as ben Sira's warning to his students to stay grounded, so to speak, to confine their study to the Law of God where true wisdom is to be found and where God's authorized revelation is located (Sir 24). In sum, rather than Greek philosophical inquiry, this passage addresses unauthorized interest in things that God has withheld from human understanding. Ben Sira is worried about what he considers to be an unhealthy concern for matters too great to be understood and too difficult, perhaps even too dangerous, to investigate, the secrets of God's creation and the revelation of the future, subjects treated at length in *1 Enoch* and *Aramaic Levi*.[33]

4. Dream Visions and Ascents

In addition to the investigation of certain unauthorized subjects, the possible methods of receiving such "revelation" are also a target of ben Sira's polemic. In 34:1-8, ben Sira takes on dreams and visions.

> 34:1 Empty and false are the hopes of the senseless,
> and fools are sent winging by dreams.
> 34:2 Like one grasping at shadows or chasing the wind
> is whoever puts his trust in dreams.

---

[30] See below on the priesthood. On this interpretation of the *Book of the Watchers* see George W. E. Nickelsburg, "Enoch, Levi and Peter: Recipients of Revelation in Upper Galilee," *JBL* 100 (1981) 575-600; David Suter, "The Priesthood and Apocalyptic," Paper presented at Society of Biblical Literature (my thanks to the author for making his paper available to me); and *idem*, "Fallen Angel, Fallen Priest: The Problem of Family Purity in 1 Enoch 6-16," *HUCA* 50 (1979) 115-135.

[31] Kugler, 77.

[32] A major aspect of Kugler's analysis of the fragment has to do with its similarity to *Jub* 30:5-17. For the complete argument, see Kugler, 83-84.

[33] If Argall's translation of 3:23 is accepted, ben Sira is even aware that these matters have "been shown" to some of his students or are being promulgated in rival wisdom schools. See, Argall, 76.

34:3 What is seen in dreams is a reflection
that mirrors the vision of the onlooker.
34:4 Can the clean produce the unclean?
Can the liar ever speak the truth?
34:5 Divination, omens and dreams are unreal;
what you already expect, the mind depicts.
34:6 Unless it be a vision specially sent from the Most High,
fix not your heart on it.
34:7 For dreams have led many astray,
and those who base their hopes on them have perished.
34:8 Without deceit the Law is fulfilled,
and well-rounded wisdom is the discourse of the faithful.[34]

This section cautions against relying on dreams and visions generally but tells little about what the content of those dreams is. Martin Hengel thinks that the passage is directed against mantic traditions or magical practices, and Skehan and Di Lella refer to the prohibition of divination and paying heed to omens as "pagan and untrustworthy."[35] Indeed, the passage might be read as a general admonition about the problems connected with dreams and dream interpretation since dreams and their interpretations were a concern throughout antiquity.[36] Given the apprehensions that ben Sira has about different calendars and unauthorized investigations into God's secrets, however, I think that a text like 34:1-8, which treats avenues of revelation that correspond to the ways in which *particular* communities legitimate their knowledge of these topics, probably constitutes ben Sira's attempt to undercut those claims to divinely inspired knowledge.[37]

The mention of "divination" and "omens" almost certainly is ben Sira's use of the Mosaic proscriptions against these practices, but they are not the real focus of the passage. Clearly dreams are the real targets, since they are mentioned in vv. 1, 2, 3 and 7.[38] Three times in *1 Enoch* 13 and 14, Enoch says that his visions come in his sleep, and ben Sira's remark in 34:1 that fools "are sent winging by dreams" may even be directed specifically at heavenly ascents in dreams, like Enoch's ascent to heaven and heavenly tour.[39] Although 4QTLevi^{a} is fragmentary, the text says that Levi lies down, and, after a lacuna, he has a vision. It seems likely that some mention of sleep

---

[34] The only Hebrew extant for this section is Ms E, which only preserves portions of v.1. I rely on the Greek for the remainder of the section.

[35] Hengel, 240; Skehan and Di Lella, 409.

[36] On dreams and dream interpretation generally, see Naphtali Lewis, *The Interpretation of Dreams and Portents* (Toronto: Hakkert: 1976) and Patricia Cox Miller, *Dreams in Late Antiquity: Studies in the Imagination of a Culture* (Princeton: Princeton University, 1994).

[37] Argall, 81, wants to read the passage this way as well.

[38] Argall, 82, notes that by linking dreams with divination and omen reading, ben Sira connects these practices with those of the nations found in Deut 18:10-11. He also wonders whether the rhetorical question of 34:4 about purity indicates that the dreamers have separated themselves from the Temple.

[39] Argall, 81.

and/or a dream belongs here and thus, Levi's vision, like Enoch's, comes via a dream.[40] Ben Sira ridicules those who depend on dreams and visions, calling them "senseless" and "fools." He also recognizes the self-fulfilling nature of dreams; they are simply reflections of the one who is dreaming (vv. 3, 5).

Ben Sira also paints himself into something of a corner here as well. Dreams and dream interpretations occur frequently in the Hebrew scriptures. The exception he makes for dreams sent by the Most High (34:6) may refer to the biblical visions, but he nowhere says how one can decide between a divinely inspired dream and one which simply "mirrors the vision of the onlooker" (v. 3). The passage ends in verse 8 with the antithesis to "grasping at shadows," the fulfillment of the Law. The Law is placed in parallel with "well-rounded wisdom," which should be the discourse of the faithful. It is the Law and its wisdom that should concern his students, not flights of fancy found in the dreams and visions of folks like Enoch and Levi.

5. Priests and Priesthood

The literary themes outlined above are suggestive by themselves, and provide evidence that ben Sira was concerned with some problems and claims made in the *Astronomical Book*, the *Book of the Watchers* and *Aramaic Levi*. Recent work on all these books has tried to find for each of them a location in the social world of ancient Judaism. In each case, the conclusions point to groups of priests and/or scribes, who are either supportive of or opposed to those priests who control the cult in Jerusalem. One finds criticism of the Jerusalem priesthood in a number of post-exilic texts, such as Malachi, but the important and ultimately interesting thing about Sirach, the *Book of the Watchers*, *Aramaic Levi*, and perhaps the *Astronomical Book*, is that they are roughly contemporary works, they all treat various priestly concerns, and each may have originated in priestly or scribal groups.

Both George Nickelsburg and David Suter have argued that the myth of the Watchers utilized in the *Book of the Watchers* reflects a criticism of the Jerusalem priesthood, and by extension the Temple, over the issue of improper marriage relationships.[41] Nickelsburg concentrates on the cultic language of *1 Enoch* 15:2-4, in which Enoch is to say to the Watchers that their plea has been rejected. The Watchers should be petitioning on behalf of human beings, not Enoch on their behalf (v. 2). Then comes their indictment, "Why have you [the Watchers] left the high heaven and the eternal holy one and lain with women and defiled yourselves with the daughters of men and taken to yourselves wives and acted like the children of earth ... yet you defiled yourselves with the blood of women ..." (v. 34). The fact that God lives in a heavenly Temple attended by the angels, who are described as priests, has prompted the identification of the Watchers as priests who have fallen and defiled themselves with women and who have sinned in the eyes of the Enochic community by marrying illegitimately. Because of these actions, God has excluded them from the heavenly Temple. Such anti-priestly polemic clothed in myth is consistent with a number of other Second Temple texts that report similar problems and demonstrates that the priesthood is a longstanding issue in Second Temple Judaism. For instance, upon his arrival into Judea, Ezra finds that priests and Levites have married foreign women, a practice he wants halted, and later the *Damascus Document* evidences a similar polemic against the priesthood.[42]

---

[40] On 4QTLevi[a] see, Michael E. Stone and Jonas C. Greenfield, "The Prayer of Levi," *JBL* 112 (1993) 247-266.

[41] Nickelsburg, "Enoch, Levi and Peter" and Suter "Fallen Angel, Fallen Priest." See also, Martha Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish & Christian Apocalypses* (New York: Oxford, 1993) 9-29.

[42] Nickelsburg, "Enoch, Levi and Peter," 584-585; Suter "Fallen Angel, Fallen Priest," 124-128; Himmelfarb, 20-23.

Nickelsburg subsequently concludes that "the easiest explanation [of the myth in *1 Enoch* 12-16] appears to be that the mythmaker has a grievance against the priesthood in his own time ... we have here in *1 Enoch* 12-16 an apocalyptic tradition emanating from circles in upper Galilee who view the Jerusalem priesthood as defiled and therefore under the irrevocable judgment of God."[43]

Suter argues that such criticism of the Jerusalem priesthood pervades all of *1 Enoch* 6-16. Chapters 6-11 have as a central part of the myth a concern that the fallen angels have become defiled by contact with women and blood, and that their offspring are *mamzerim*. *1 Enoch* 12-16 evinces a continued interest in the same problem, but the sexual contact reflected in these chapters, according to Suter, "is defiling *per se* since it represents an illegitimate degree of relationship."[44] This concern suggests that the compiler of *1 Enoch* is worried about family purity, which in Second Temple Judaism is primarily a concern with priestly purity. Suter concludes that "There is a parallel between the separation that the myth seeks to draw between the angelic and human realms and the tendency toward endogamy in priestly marriages."[45] He further notes that other indications in these chapters point to the priesthood as the problem for *1 Enoch* 6-16. The intercessory function ascribed to Enoch in *1 Enoch* 15 is a priestly function. The role of priest as teacher is subverted by the Watchers of *1 Enoch* who teach forbidden knowledge. The illegitimate marriages of the Watchers result in their expulsion from heaven just as priests who contract illegitimate marriages are prevented from serving in the Temple.[46]

A concern with priestly purity could indicate that the *Book of the Watchers* emanated from circles of priests who were convinced that the Jerusalem priests had transgressed purity rules and were defiled as a result. Other clues as well point to priests as the source of the criticisms expressed in *1 Enoch*. Stone argues that the "scientific" speculations found in the early parts of *1 Enoch* must have come from groups of "educated men and may possibly have been associated with the traditional intellectual groups, the wise and the priests." He further notes that the interest in calendar exhibited in the *Book of the Watchers* and the *Astronomical Book* is a traditional priestly matter.[47] In his SBL paper "The Priesthood and Apocalyptic" Suter takes an additional step. On the basis of the sociological analysis of Edward Shils, who studied the roles of intellectuals in society, and the connection made by Stone between apocalyptic and Jewish intellectual traditions, he argues that, since priests are major players in both the central institutional and the central cultural systems of ancient Judaism, and since the interests of these two systems are not identical, the concerns displayed in *1 Enoch* are not only *about* the priesthood, they originate *within* priestly groups.[48]

---

[43] Nickelsburg, "Enoch, Levi and Peter," 586.

[44] Suter, "Fallen Angel, Fallen Priest," 118.

[45] Suter, "Fallen Angel, Fallen Priest," 122.

[46] Suter, "Fallen Angel, Fallen Priest," 123-124. Suter also examines other Second Temple Jewish works, like the *Damascus Document*, that polemicize against the priesthood.

[47] Michael Stone, "The Book of Enoch and Judaism in the Third Century B.C.E.," *CBQ* 40 (1978) 489. Olyan, 280, suggests that the group behind *1 Enoch* was composed of "disenfranchised Levites" and "thus we have evidence here of a contemporary Levitic ideology opposed to Ben Sira's pan-Aaronid exclusivism."

[48] See Suter "Apocalyptic and the Priesthood," 10-12, for the complete argument. He relies on two works by Shils, *The Intellectuals and the Powers and Other Essays*, Selected Papers of Edward Shils 1 (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1972) and *Center and Periphery: Essays in Macrosociology*, Selected Papers of Edward Shils 2 (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1975).

The roles that Enoch, the protagonist of this mythic drama and likely representative of the community, plays, especially in the *Book of the Watchers*, also give some indication of the group that produced the work. Enoch is called "scribe of righteousness" (15:1), and he performs scribal tasks in drawing up the petition of the Watchers. But, Enoch also plays the role of priest. He intercedes between God and the angels, intercession being a priestly function. He has extraordinary access to the heavenly Temple, a place that is the domain of priests.[49] As Suter notes regarding these two roles, "a scribal role need not preclude a priestly one, and may even point in that direction."[50] In addition, Enoch takes on prophetic characteristics, particularly as *1 Enoch* utilizes prophetic literary forms.[51]

A similar social situation is to be found in *Aramaic Levi*. Several elements point to a priestly milieu for this work. Levi's position as the ancestor of the priests results in the glorification of the priesthood as an institution while condemning priests, and such approbation may constitute evidence of a priestly origin for the work. The centrality of the figure of Levi points in the direction of priests as well. The polemic about illegitimate marriages and the wickedness of some priests recalls that of *1 Enoch*. The central emphases of the work reflect priestly interests. Besides its calendrical interest, *Aramaic Levi* included detailed sacrificial instructions (*Aramaic Levi* 13-60) and had a very pronounced emphasis on the importance of the levitical line. Indeed the levitical line is so central that in *Aramaic Levi* the "biblical verses referring to Judah, which came to be interpreted messianically, were transferred to Levi."[52] The *Testament of Levi*, for which *Aramaic Levi* most likely served as a source, attributes scribal characteristics to Levi the priest (8:17, chap 13, 14:4).[53] Stone makes this assessment of *Aramaic Levi*, "[T]he circles responsible for *Aramaic Levi* laid a very strong emphasis on the instructional function of the priesthood and this aspect of the priesthood attracted sapiential motifs."[54] These two roles subsumed under one figure, again remind one of the roles attributed to Enoch.

From the first person descriptions of what he does, together with the high praise accorded the sage/scribe, it is evident that ben Sira himself belonged to that profession. H. Stadelmann argues that ben Sira was, in fact, a priest, but without engaging those arguments in detail here, it is clear that he has a close relationship with and is very supportive of the priests who serve in the

---

[49] Himmelfarb, 23-25.

[50] Suter, "Apocalyptic and the Priesthood," 9.

[51] George W. E. Nickelsburg, "'Enoch' as Scientist, Sage and Prophet: Content, Function and Authorship in 1 Enoch," (Paper presented to the Conference on Theology, Scientific Knowledge and Society in Antiquity, Center for Theological Inquiry, Princeton, 1993) 29. See also, Himmelfarb, 25. In addition, several authors note the relationship between Enoch's ascent in *1 Enoch* 14 and Ezekiel's vision of the chariot, which is a priestly text. On this relationship see Suter, "Apocalyptic and the Priesthood;" Himmelfarb, 26-28.

[52] M. E. Stone, "Ideal Figures and Social Context: Priest and Sage in the Early Second Temple Age," in Patrick D. Miller, Jr., Paul D. Hanson and S. Dean McBride, *Ancient Israelite Religions: F. M. Cross Festschrift* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988) 580.

[53] Himmelfarb, 30.

[54] Stone, "Ideal Figures," 580.

Temple.[55] Olyan accepts Stadelmann's conclusions, and on the basis of passages like 7:29-31 claims that "[i]t is not overstating the case to argue that Ben Sira all but equates the individual's relationship with God to the same individual's relationship to the priesthood."[56] In 7:29-31, ben Sira adopts the language of the Shema and applies it to one's relationship with God's priests. "*With all your heart*, fear God, and treat as holy his priests. *With all your might*, love your maker and do not forsake his servants. Honor God and honor the priest, and give their portion as you are commanded" (7:29-30). By intentionally using this language, ben Sira gives symbolic weight to the whole idea of the importance of the priesthood.[57]

Olyan goes even farther and argues that the makeup of the priestly group so supported by ben Sira is consonant with the view of the Priestly narrative of the Pentateuch in which Aaron and his descendants are the true priests.[58] Ben Sira is, like P, a proponent of a "pan-Aaronid" view of the priesthood through Phinehas with whom God made an eternal covenant. In many details, ben Sira's description of Aaron is taken from the Pentateuch, but the "everlasting covenant" given to Aaron is given particular attention (45:7, 15, 25).[59] Later in chapter 50, ben Sira's praise of Simon II reflects his praise of Aaron in chapter 45. The glorious description of Simon exiting the Temple and blessing the people almost certainly stems from ben Sira's personal experience, even though this poem was probably written after Simon's death.[60] Simon is the epitome of the high priest who fulfills the covenant given to Aaron and Phinehas. Indeed the priests who accompany Simon in ben Sira's description are called "sons of Aaron" (50:13, 16). By choosing this priestly theology over other possible approaches and by his general neglect of the Levites entirely, Olyan understands ben Sira as rejecting the exclusivistic claims of the Zadokites to the high priesthood.[61]

The Temple and its cult also find an important place in Sirach. Of course, one would expect such since that is where the priests whom ben Sira supports serve.[62] God sends Wisdom to dwell in Jerusalem and in the Temple in particular (24:10-12). Ben Sira notes specifically that Zerubbabel and Joshua "raised a Temple, holy to the Lord, destined for everlasting glory" (49:12). Finally, 34:21-35:13 emphasize the importance of observing the cult properly. Ben Sira here stresses the relation between ethics and proper sacrifice, but not to the diminution of offering the proper sacrifice on the proper occasion.

The analysis of Horsley and Tiller suggests that ben Sira's strong support of the Jerusalem priesthood (especially as represented in 7:29-31 and his praise of Simon II) and his first person descriptions of the sage reflect his position in Jerusalemite society. They do not identify ben Sira as

---

[55] H. Stadelmann, *Ben Sira als Schriftgelehrter: Eine Untersuchung zum Berufsbild des vor-Makkabaïschen Sofer unter Berücksichtigung seines Verhältnisses zu Priester- Propheten- und Weisheitslehretum*, WUNT 2/6 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1981).

[56] Olyan, 263.

[57] Olyan, 266.

[58] Olyan, 267.

[59] On the use of the Pentateuch by ben Sira, see B. G. Wright, *No Small Difference: Sirach's Relationship to Its Hebrew Parent Text*, SBLSCS 26 (Missoula: Scholars, 1989).

[60] Skehan and Di Lella, 9.

[61] Olyan, 272, 275-276.

[62] For a critical review of those who argue that ben Sira is not really enamored of the Temple cult *per se* see Olyan, 261-262.

a member of the priestly class, but as a "scribe-sage" who "clearly belonged to what Lenski called the retainer class."[63] They argue that such priestly retainers would have acted as intermediaries between the ruling class, primarily priests in ancient Judea, and the common folk. Clearly, according to Horsley and Tiller, some of the functions of the scribe-sage overlap with those of the priests. These functions, especially teaching the law (a responsibility of Aaron in 45:17, and hence of priests), would have been delegated to the scribe-sage by the priests. "In Ben Sira's Judea, the sages performed the functions that Lenski ascribes to 'the clergy' in societies of limited literacy: officials and diplomats as well as educators."[64]

The scribe-sage class to which ben Sira belonged would naturally be dependent on the priestly ruling class for its own survival and social status. It would be both economically and politically vulnerable. Such a social position accounts well for ben Sira's admonitions to his charges about their dealings with the ruling class. But scribes would also have a modicum of independence and retain a certain authority as the guardians of God's divine revelation and wisdom. Their role as teachers and interpreters of God's Law might also bring them into conflict with their patrons. Horsley and Tiller argue that "The sages had a clear sense of their own, independent of their patrons, of how the temple-state should operate in accordance with (their interpretation of) the covenantal laws. Their high-priestly superiors, however, had regular dealings with the Hellenistic imperial officials and were susceptible to greater influence from the wider Hellenistic culture."[65] That independent interpretation of the Law and divine wisdom seems to have resulted in the sages appropriating for themselves prophetic characteristics. This is true not only of ben Sira (24:33; 39:1-11), but of Enoch as well.[66]

6. Competing Wisdoms and Confrontation

To take these pieces of evidence and to attempt to sketch out where and how ben Sira, *1 Enoch* and *Aramaic Levi* fit together is like trying to do a large jigsaw puzzle with only a few of the pieces. Despite the difficulty, I think that these pieces give some directions in which to work. In short, these works all demonstrate a common interest in calendar, dreams and visions, esoteric knowledge, and all apparently originate in scribal/priestly groups. The collocation of these themes, issues and apparently similar social groups suggests to me that these texts represent competing groups/communities (and with ben Sira and *1 Enoch* competing notions of wisdom) who know about each other, who don't really like each other and who actively polemicize against each other although not necessarily directly. In what follows, I will set out in a little bit more detail what I think this picture looks like.

The fragmentary nature of *Aramaic Levi* necessitates more circumspection than does *1 Enoch*, but it seems probable that the people who stand behind these works represent groups of priests and scribes who are marginalized and even disenfranchised viv-à-vis the ruling priests in Jerusalem. They maintain that the Temple service is defiled because of transgressions of family purity resulting from illegitimate marriages contracted by the Jerusalem priests. Part of their attack on those in power is expressed in *1 Enoch* 6-16 via the myth of the fallen Watchers and God's

---

[63] Horsley and Tiller, 29.

[64] Horsley and Tiller, 30.

[65] Horsley and Tiller, 32.

[66] Ben Sira sees himself as having divine inspiration. See Horsley and Tiller, 31 and Stone, "Ideal Figures," 578. On Enoch as prophet, see Himmelfarb, 25 and Nickelsburg, "Enoch, Levi and Peter."

condemnation of them.[67] Although they, like ben Sira, place great importance on understanding and wisdom, their wisdom and understanding are dependant on a different sort of authority, the ascent vision in which God reveals to the seer the true content of wisdom. The ascent visions of Enoch and Levi provide the basis for their criticism of the Jerusalem priesthood, and heavenly secrets, especially the workings of the calendar, are given to Enoch directly by God during his time in heaven. I do not intend to argue that these people do not depend on Torah at all; it is clear that they do.[68] But where their opposition to the Jerusalem priesthood and the concurrent service in the Temple or their claim to certain kinds of "scientific" knowledge are concerned, they appeal to a higher authority, direct communication from God. And even though the *Astronomical Book*, for instance, does not appear to have originated as a polemical document, it is employed polemically (75:2; 82:4-7). This wisdom is handed down as a sort of counter wisdom to that offered by other wisdom teachers, like ben Sira, and, for a work like *1 Enoch*, this counter wisdom has chronological precedence over the wisdom taught by someone like ben Sira. Enoch received his revelation long before Moses did his. In the case of *1 Enoch*, this wisdom is apparently transmitted in written form that is legitimated by a prophetic inspiration. The "account" of Enoch's transmission of this knowledge to Methuselah makes this clear.

> And now, my son Methuselah, all these things I am recounting to you and writing down for you; and I have revealed to you everything, and given you writings of all these things. Keep, my son, Methuselah, the writings of your father's hand, that you may deliver them to the generations of eternity. Wisdom I have given to you and to your children, and to those who will be your children, that they may transmit it to their children, and to generations of generations forever, to whoever is endowed with wisdom; and they shall celebrate all the wise. Wisdom shall slumber, (but) in their mind those who have understanding shall not slumber, but they shall hearken with their ears that they may learn this wisdom, and it shall be better for those that partake of it than rich food. (82:1-3)[69]

Ben Sira, aware of the attacks mounted by these other priestly groups, polemicizes against them as well. His rejection of the solar calendar, his warnings against seeking esoteric knowledge and his strong defense of the priests who serve in the Temple are intended to counteract the criticisms of these other groups. Ben Sira is a scribe with strong priestly connections who imparts wisdom in *his* school (51:23). But the content of his wisdom is certainly different from that of his opponents. He included in his book a number of extended poems on wisdom, the most well-known being chapter 24. From the very beginning of the book he sets up an equation that recurs several times: fear of the Lord is wisdom, and the one who desires wisdom fears the Lord and fulfills or obeys the Law (1:26-27). For ben Sira, true wisdom is to be found in Torah (24:23), and the one who fulfills the Law finds wisdom (15:1).[70] But an additional, important idea accompanies the fulfilling of the Law and hence the acquisition of wisdom, discipline (Hebrew usually מוסר, Greek, παιδεία). Wisdom is gained through disciplined study. This connection occurs often in Sirach, as for example, in 1:27 "the fear of the Lord is wisdom and discipline."

---

[67] I will not talk about the possible geographical location of such groups here. Nickelsburg ("Enoch, Levi and Peter") has suggested a Galilean provenance for them.

[68] See Nickelsburg, "'Enoch' as Scientist."

[69] Translation taken from Black.

[70] The connection of Law and Wisdom is thoroughgoing in Sirach and the amount of scholarly literature on this subject is immense. For bibliography on these subjects see Skehan and Di Lella. For a view different from the usual identification of Law and Wisdom in Sirach, see Boccaccini, 88-98.

According to 4:17, wisdom teaches "her children," but in the process she "will torment them with her discipline." The fool cannot continue with wisdom because he cannot bear her discipline (6:20-21). As a result, wisdom is not acquired by many, but only by those who can persevere in her training (6:22). That training is the understanding of the Law, the statutes and commandments given by God, which ben Sira, as one who "will pour out teaching like prophecy" (24:33), understands and dispenses with divine inspiration. Ben Sira expects his students to be thoroughly anchored in the study of the Law, the place where true wisdom is to be found. Ben Sira's wisdom is to be understood in contrast with other wisdom schools. Indeed, if Argall's rendering of 3:23b ("for that which is too great for you was shown you") is accepted, then there is evidence that some of ben Sira's students may have reported to him some of the competing wisdom of other teachers.[71]

In all of these works, however, the polemic is mostly indirect. That is, each of them seems to be directed to its own group rather than toward its opponents, and thus, the polemic functions as a way of providing inner group stability and cohesion. The wisdom that Enoch hands on to Methuselah is for those who have not "slumbered," presumably members of the Enochic community. *Aramaic Levi* is not so clear, but the emphasis on Levi as the primary actor may indicate its intended audience as levites or other priests disillusioned with the Jerusalem priests. Ben Sira apparently did not intend his book for those with whom he had difficulties and differences, but for his students. This naturally raises the question that if these books were primarily intended for the in-group and not for the outside opponents, then how would their antagonists know about their criticisms? At this point I can only speculate. It certainly is possible that, since these traditions were transmitted in writing, these people read each other's books. Priests, perhaps more than other Jews, would have need to go to Jerusalem, and these people may well have come into contact or conflict there. Criticism of the Jerusalem priests and/or the Temple do not preclude going to the city. There almost certainly was mobility of disciples from one group to another, and the teachings of one group might be reported to another by students.[72] In the face of a lack of substantial clues, the mechanisms of contact between these groups do remain obscure, however. Ben Sira, like his opponents, was trying to inculcate a certain set of cultural and religious values in his pupils/community. To do that he did not have to resort to direct literary confrontation. He may very well have not wanted to draw unnecessary and, in his mind, unwarranted attention to such teachings. He had divinely inspired wisdom to pass on to subsequent generations. Those who grew up with warnings to pay no attention to fleeting and false dreams, or with admonitions against prying into the secrets of the universe, were less likely to do such things as adults. After all, ben Sira was a diligent student of Israel's scriptures and what does Solomon's wisdom say but, "Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old he will not depart from it" (Prov 22:6).

Ben Sira, *1 Enoch*, *Aramaic Levi*–all three share much in common. In them we find competing notions of scribal wisdom and priestly legitimacy. Their concerns and claims show that in the late third to early second century BCE, besides having to confront and to deal with outsiders and foreign cultural influences, different Jewish groups who had varying assessments of the Jerusalem priesthood and Temple were actively engaged in an inner-Jewish struggle for power.[73]

---

[71] Argall, 75. His study is an extended argument for competing notions of wisdom in Sirach and *1 Enoch*.

[72] There is evidence that young men may have moved from one group to another. One case in point is Josephus's descriptions of his peripatetic youth in *Life* 2. See also, Argall's translation and interpretation of Sir 3:23 (above, this section).

[73] Of course, some of the conflict probably had its origins in different assessments of and participation in Hellenistic culture by different groups. This is, indeed, the most usual way of interpreting some of the issues I have treated above. See Horsley and Tiller.

The clues to the nature of that conflict are extant in works like *1 Enoch*, *Aramaic Levi* and Sirach. The people who stood behind these works had a great deal at stake in the outcome–power and social position and control. In this "trial balloon" of a paper, I have tried to fill in some of the missing pieces of the puzzle and to suggest that the struggle was not one conducted in ignorance of the opposition, but that it was a confrontation engaged in by participants who knew about and were responding specifically to each other.

The Significance of Matthew's Eschatology for Biblical Theology

by James D. G. Dunn
University of Durham

As I understand it, the task I have been given is to reflect on how Matthew's eschatology relates to the larger picture of biblical eschatology. How do the motifs and emphases of Matthew's eschatology function within the larger picture? Are they part of strands which run consistently through many biblical documents? Or do they jar with the motifs and emphases of other documents? And are the issues implicit in Matthew's eschatology local to Matthew, related primarily to Matthew's own situation? Or are there larger theological issues to which Matthew contributes but which transcend the particularities of Matthew's contribution? Within the broader sweep of 'biblical eschatology' (still to be defined) the narrower focus of the NT, on the impact of the Christ event, brings a particular set of problems to the fore (not least, the issue of the delayed parousia), and the Gospels focus attention still more tightly on the way in which the Jesus tradition relevant to this theme has been handled.[1]

As requested, I assume that Don Hagner's paper on 'Matthew's Eschatology'[2] provides a basic statement of the status quaestionis, and that his exposition of the familiar present/future tension in the Jesus tradition on the kingdom is an accurate representation of Matthew's eschatology. That in itself underlines the value of starting this discussion with Matthew and not with the Jesus tradition itself. For while the battle can rage (unceasing it would seem)[3] on the question whether Jesus himself preached a future or a present kingdom or both, the issue seems to be beyond dispute for Matthew itself: in Matthew the predominant emphasis on future eschatology is clear,[4] even if the importance of realized eschatology cannot be denied,[5] and despite whatever qualifications may be added in terms of an interim period and delay.[6] More to the immediate

---

[1] For the reservations I have regarding the use of the term 'biblical theology' in this connection see my 'Das Problem "Biblische Theologie"', in *Eine Bibel - zwei Testamente*, ed. C. Dolmen & T. Söding (Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1995) 179-93.

[2] D. A. Hagner, 'Matthew's Eschatology', in *To Tell the Mystery: Essays on New Testament Eschatology in Honor of Robert H. Gundry*, ed. T. E. Schmidt & M. Silva (JSNTS 100; Sheffield: JSOT, 1994) 49-71.

[3] On the one hand e.g. M. J. Borg, *Jesus in Contemporary Scholarship* (Valley Forge: TPI, 1994) chs. 3-4; on the other D. C. Allison, 'A Plea for Thoroughgoing Eschatology', *JBL* 113 (1994) 651-68.

[4] Hagner 54-9, 61-3.

[5] Hagner 50-4.

point, this clear setting out of the present/future tension in Matthew's eschatology provides an important starting point for our wider reflection.

I

It should have occasioned more surprise than it has that Matthew, like the other Synoptics, seems to be remarkably untroubled by the fact of the present/future tension in his tradition. He can pass on what on the face of it seem to be contradictory elements of Jesus' teaching without any sign that the contradiction caused him any disquiet. For example, Jesus' disciples should presumably go on praying, 'May your kingdom come' (Matt. 6.10), even though Matthew recalls Jesus as also saying, 'Since it is by the Spirit of God that I cast out demons, then the kingdom of God has come upon you' (12.28). Or again, Matthew can record Jesus' assurance, that 'there are some standing here who will not taste death before they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom' (16.28), without any sign of strain (why hasn't it happened yet?), and without attempting explicitly or implicitly to relate it to some more plausible fulfilment than the transfiguration (Mark's version would have provided a plausible correlation with a Pentecost-type tradition).

Why is this? Why such equanimity in the face of so troubling a challenge to faith or contradiction to hope as expressed in Matthew's own tradition? The same question arises in reference to the famous crisis of 'the delay of the parousia', so beloved in reconstructions of Christian beginnings and of the Sitze im Leben of particular NT writings earlier in the present century. Where is this crisis of eschatological confidence? Apart from 2 Pet. 3.3-10, where is this acute sense of failed Naherwartung which putatively produced so much NT theological reflection and writing? In particular, where is the sense of crisis and catastrophe regarding the destruction of Jerusalem in what most regard as post-CE 70 writings?[7] The relative calmness of NT writers in the face of such tensions and failures of hope is a factor which we have to take into account in any assessment of the wider significance within biblical theology of Matthew's present/future eschatological tradition.

At this point Hagner's own attempt to defuse something of the tension cannot escape criticism. His resolution hangs upon his assumption or conclusion that Matthew itself was written at a date before CE 70. This enables him to diminish the problem of unfulfilled imminent expectation by relating it to the still future (but imminent) fall of Jerusalem: Matt. 10.23 and 16.28 have in view a coming of the Son of Man in judgment on Jerusalem.[8] Matthew, writing before the fall of

---

[6] Hagner 59-61, 63-4.

[7] The attempt by J. A. T. Robinson, *Redating the New Testament* (London: SCM, 1976) to use the absence of reference to the events of AD 70 to date the NT writings earlier than 70 has not been found convincing.

[8] Hagner 61-2.

Jerusalem, assumes that the destruction of Jerusalem is imminent and that the parousia will take place then.[9] In contrast, Jesus himself may have spoken in imminent terms only of the destruction of Jerusalem, while 'references to the coming of the Son of Man are less delimited'.[10] In this way he provides a means of getting Jesus off the hook (of failed Naherwartung) by impaling Matthew himself even more firmly on it.

In my judgment, this strategy must be counted a failure. For one thing, the conclusion that Matthew was written before CE 70 is almost impossible to sustain. It is not simply a matter of Matt 22.7, but that verse would be sufficient in itself to make the case for a post-70 date: the awkwardness of its insertion into the parable is so blatant,[11] and its reference to the destruction of Jerusalem so obvious (probably the clearest reference in the whole of the NT), that the unwillingness to recognize the allusion looks too much like tendentious exegesis for comfort.

More to the point, however, the question has to be asked: why such an urge to get Jesus or Matthew off the hook? Is such a concern not too much driven by later anxiety over the theological problem of Jesus or scripture being shown to be mistaken? Would we not be better to start with the fact of the tension and with the apparent equanimity of a writer like Matthew (writing after CE 70!) in recording such a failure of imminent expectation? The primary question for the exegete is surely not, How do we handle this theological problem thrown up by our preliminary reading? but, Was this tension a problem for Matthew (and the early churches in general), and if not, why not? It is precisely by setting Matthew's eschatology within the wider context of the Judaeo-Christian scriptural tradition that we can hope to answer such questions and thus to draw out the significance of Matthew's eschatology for biblical theology.

II

There are two striking characteristics of biblical hope which call for immediate attention. One is the frequency with which a hope is only partially fulfilled, or, alternatively, hope's fulfilment is delayed or deferred, without causing the hope itself to be called into question. The other side of the same phenomenon is the frequency with which a hope partially fulfilled or delayed becomes the basis for a redefinition and reaffirmation of that hope.

The point can be readily illustrated, first, from two of the great fulcrum points in biblical history. One is the hope of the promised land

---

[9] Hagner 67, 69.

[10] Hagner 66-68.

[11] A complete military expedition interrupts the summons to the already prepared banquet, which then proceeds as though only a few hours had intervened.

and entry into it. It is not simply a matter of the hope being delayed and redefined as a result of Israel's disobedience in the wilderness.[12] It is also the way in which the letter to the Hebrews can extend the idea of the promised rest in the promised land - a hope fulfilled, but not completely fulfilled. The Christian pilgrimage can be likened to the people's wandering in the wilderness; for, according to Heb. 4, 'there remains a rest for the people of God' into which they have still to enter. In a not dissimilar way the *kleronomia* promised to Abraham can be redefined and extended to include or to refer to the world as a whole or to the age to come (as in Rom. 4.13),[13] without any sense of tension between the earlier and later understanding of the promise, or any sense that the fuller reading of the promise indicated a denial of or dissatisfaction with the original promise. In other words, the great goal of the promised land could be read as incomplete, delayed, in part at least only a shadow of what is still to come.[14]

Similarly the exile became for many Jews an image of their being under the curse of God upon their disobedience - the familiar SER pattern (sin-exile-return). And the longed-for return from exile became a continuing metaphor for Israel's hoped for restoration as God's favoured nation.[15] So the great prophets of the school of Isaiah could depict the restoration of Israel and the longed-for return to Judea in classic images of eschatological renewal and of paradise restored - the child playing over the hole of the asp, and the wolf and lamb feeding together (Isa. 11.6-9; 65.25). The Qumran community in turn evidently believed that return had not been achieved until, in fulfilment of Ezek. 4.5-6's 430 years, their own establishment marked the end of exile (CD 1.5-11).[16] And the seer of Revelation is not the only one to use Babylon as the metaphor of final opposition to God (Rev. 14.8; 17-18).

In other words, in both cases, both promised land and return from exile, the hope fulfilled fell short of the hope expressed, and the realisation of hope was understood as only a partial fulfilment of that hope. Yet, the partial fulfilment did not undermine or falsify the hope but became the springboard for a fresh articulation of hope. The 'already' did not completely express the fulness of hope, so that the unrealized 'not yet' became the basis of hope re-expressed.

---

[12] Within the NT cf. 1 Cor. 10.1-13.

[13] See on my *Romans* (WBC 38; Dallas: Word, 1988) 213.

[14] Note also the use of the *exodos* motif in Luke 9.31.

[15] The feature has attracted renewed interest in recent years - e.g. J. M.Scott, '"For as Many as are of Works of the Law are under a curse" (Galatians 3.10)', in *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel*, ed. C. A. Evans & J. A. Sanders (JSNTS 83; Sheffield Academic, 1993) 187-221.

[16] By implication, return was still outstanding for the rest of Israel.

A second, related aspect is highlighted by Charles Holman, in a thesis completed with me in 1982 and about to be published.[17] It starts from the related observation that eschatological delay was not a new problem for the first Christians. On the contrary, it was a common feature in the Jewish writings of the two centuries preceding Jesus.[18] Thus, for example, Dan. 2.44 and 12.12-13 indicate a sense of Naherwartung, but 8.13 and 12.6 also express a concern about delay. In the Enoch literature the Apocalypse of Weeks (*1 Enoch* 93.1-10; 91.12-17) carries the implication that the eighth week is about to dawn but also a sense of delay (93.10), which in the present structure of the book sets up a tension running through 94-105 and most evident in 104. *Jubilees* 1.4-29 and 23.11-31 also express awareness of the problem of hope deferred.

A good example is the Qumran commentary on Hab. 2.3, the *locus classicus* for reflection on the problem of delay:[19]

> 'For the vision has an appointed time, it will have an end and not fail' (2.3a). Its interpretation: the final age will be extended and go beyond all that the prophets say, because the mysteries of God are wonderful. 'Though it might delay, wait for it; it definitely has to come and will not delay' (2.3b). Its interpretation concerns the men of truth, those who observe the Law, whose hands will not desert the service of truth when the final age is extended beyond them, because all the ages of God will come at the right time, as he established for them in the mysteries of his prudence (1QpHab 7.5-14 Martinez).

We need simply note, that in claiming direct correlation between Habakkuk's words and the situation of his own community, the writer both recognizes the problem of failure of Habakkuk's hope for Habakkuk's time, but also reaffirms the hope and its fulfilment in Qumran. It need hardly be said that a community whose second century BCE establishment was seen as a fulfilment of eschatological hope would have been well familiar with the problem of delay by the time of Jesus - and will, no doubt, have helped keep the problem before others.

To mention but three more examples. *Sibylline Oracles* 3.46-62 looks very much like a later addition to explain why the eschaton expected in the second century BCE had not happened. *Psalms of Solomon* 17.44-45 and 18.6 can be characterised as a kind of modified Naherwartung, with a still fervent hope expressed in 17.45. And the same sort of tension between Naherwartung and delay is a feature of *Test. Moses* 7-10.

---

[17] *The Origins of Christian Eschatology* (Peabody, Mass: Hendrickson, 1996).

[18] The point had already been made by R. J. Bauckham, 'The Delay of the Parousia', *Tyndale Bulletin* 31 (1980) 3-36: 'the problem of delay was an inescapable problem at the heart of apocalyptic eschatology, but the tension it undoubtedly produced was not a destructive tension' (5).

[19] An exception in addressing the fact of delay within Jewish apocalyptic has been A. Strobel, *Untersuchungen zum eschatologischen Verzögerungsproblem auf Grund der spätjüdisch-urchristlichen Geschichte von Habakuk 2.2ff* (NovTSupp 2; Leiden: Brill, 1961); Bauckham 5.

The survey could be readily extended into the Jewish literature of the post CE 70 period, particularly *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*, where the tension between unfulfilled Naherwartung and hope still sustained is even clearer, and the problem of delay is sharper than anything we find in the NT.[20] But enough has been said to make the point: a tension between partial or delayed fulfilment and hope redefined and re-expressed was a regular feature of biblical and post-biblical hope. In other words, the tension within Matthew's eschatology is very much of a piece with the tradition of eschatological hope in the Jewish writings of the period.

III

It is hardly surprising that similar features are characteristic of the NT. The trajectory of biblical hope as a hope well accustomed to living with delay and readjustment of that hope runs right through the NT.

Here we can hardly avoid referring to the primary fulcrum point within the Christian tradition itself, namely, the coming of Jesus Messiah. The Christian tradition has no doubt that this parousia was itself the fulfilment of eschatological hope. Yet the figure expected by John the Baptist was to be one who would bring final judgment - the unfruitful trees to be cut down and cast in the fire, the chaff likewise to be burnt with unquenchable fire (Matt 3.10, 12). The hope of the royal Messiah was for one who would restore the glory of his father David's reign (Ps 2.7-9; Ezek 34.20-31; etc). In the light of such hope, the Jesus who actually came was a great surprise - indeed, a considerable disappointment to so many, including the Baptist (according to Matt. 11.3), not to mention the great bulk of the Jewish people.[21] The predictions of kingly glory and of judgment on the nations were not fulfilled. For Christian theology it is an uncomfortable but undeniable fact that Jesus did *not* fulfil all the messianic hopes for the age to come. In the light of Jesus' ministry, the sect of the Nazarenes had to redefine the biblical hopes they inherited - above all to hope of a Messiah who must suffer and die. Here again we note the phenomenon that the first Christians seem remarkably unphased by the fact that their Messiah did not fulfil what they also regarded as the full range of messianic prophecies.

At the same time, the images used by Jesus, the blind to see, the deaf to hear, the lame to walk, the poor to have good news proclaimed to them (Matt 11.5), were the Isaianic images used for the age to come, for paradise restored (Isa 29.18-19; 35.5-6; 61.1-2). There was fulfilment of traditional hopes in significant measure. In some sense the new age had come. So quite apart from the dispute over Jesus' own expectation, we can hardly fail to recognize an element of 'not' or 'not yet' alongside the 'already' which the first Christians affirmed in regard to Jesus as fulfiller of

---

[20] See further Bauckham 10-19.

[21] As NT use of Isa. 6.9-10 clearly shows - Matt. 13.14-15; Mark 4.12; John 12.40; Acts 28.26-27. See also Rom. 11.

messianic hope. The hope was reaffirmed even as it was redefined. Thus again is illustrated the nature of biblical hope - both realised and reexpressed, without the one causing the other to be denied.

The same points can be made with regard to the descriptions of and significance attached to the other fulcrum points at the beginning of Christianity - the resurrection of Jesus and Pentecost. The claim that Jesus' resurrection was the beginning of the resurrection of the dead (Rom. 1.4), the 'firstfruits' of the harvest of dead bodies (1 Cor. 15.20), is understandable in the first flush of enthusiasm. What is more striking is the fact that these descriptions and metaphors could be maintained long past the time when it became evident that the general resurrection was not yet and the metaphor had lost most of its rationale. The degree of fulfilment constituted by the one-off of Jesus' resurrection was evidently sufficient to sustain the metaphor well past its 'sell-by' date. Matthew himself presumably reasoned somewhat along these lines in retaining the tradition of Matt 27.51-53.

Similarly with regard to the way in which the event of Pentecost is presented as the fulfilment of eschatological hope, hope of the age to come. Not only is the outpouring of the Spirit 'on all flesh' a typical way of envisaging the new age (Joel 2.28-32). But the prophecy of Joel, fulfilled at Pentecost, according to Acts, includes talk of the sun turned to darkness and the moon to blood in anticipation of the coming of the day of the Lord (Acts 2.20). This, according to Luke's version of Joel's prophecy, would happen 'in the last days' (2.17). But, despite the absence of such cataclysmic end-time happenings, Luke evidently regarded this hope as fulfilled at Pentecost. The hope had been fulfilled, but not in the way that the prophet seems to have envisaged. The hope is reaffirmed even as it is redefined.

In short, the characteristic tension of biblical hope (tension between hope partially fulfilled and re-defined, and between hope delayed but re-expressed) seems to be carried forward into the earliest and most definitive focal points of Christian faith.

IV

When we turn to the whole question of the delay of the parousia itself the same picture emerges. It is true that 1 Thess 4.13-18 confronts an anxiety caused by delayed parousia, or rather by the unthought through phenomenon of death prior to the parousia. But Paul himself seems unphased by such developments. Similarly 2 Thess 2 is more concerned to maintain the tension between Naherwartung and its not yet fulfilment than to resolve it one way or another. Alternatively, can we rule out the possibility, popular earlier in this century, that the Maranatha prayer, 'Come Lord Jesus', was used as a eucharistic prayer - 'Come to us Lord as we gather two and three in your name to partake of your body and blood'; or, as others might put it, 'Make yourself known to us in the breaking of the bread, as you did to the two at Emmaus' (Luke 24)? Was there thus already a real understanding of Christ's 'coming again' in the Lord's

Supper which did not completely fulfil the hope of parousia but could be held alongside it? Similarly John in his Gospel seems to suggest that Jesus' promises to his disciples in the farewell discourses, that he would not leave them desolate, but would come to them, were to be fulfilled in the coming of the Spirit of Truth, the place of the first Paraclete filled by the coming of the other Paraclete (John 14). And Revelation likewise seems to envisage multiple 'comings' (local as well as universal) of Christ (1.4, 7; 2.5, 16; 3.3, 11, 20).[22] Here again we find a tension built into the parousia hope, a tension between already and not yet, between reaffirmation and redefinition.

Of particular relevance is the eschatological tension between Spirit and kingdom evident both in Paul and the Jesus tradition. In the Pauline letters the Spirit is the 'firstfruits and first instalment' (*aparche* and *arrabon*) of the inheritance which is the kingdom (cf. Rom. 8.10-11, 23; 1 Cor. 6.9-11; 2 Cor. 5.5; Eph. 1.14). Similarly in the Jesus tradition, it is the presence and empowering of the Spirit which marks out the presentness and promise of the kingdom (Matt. 12.28; Luke 4.18-19; John 3.3-8). This tension between the already and the not yet does not seem to have been a problem for Jesus and the first believers so much as an explanation for and expression of the dynamic of their spirituality.[23]

On a narrower front, the idea that Mark's Gospel was written in the flush of unqualified imminent expectation soon had to be replaced by a recognition of the note of caution present, not least, in the 'little apocalypse' itself (Mark 13.7-8, 10, 24, 32).[24] The tension integral to biblical hope is integral to Mark's hope too. The contrasting view that Luke was long resigned to a lengthy delay before the parousia has the equally awkward task of reckoning with the sense of imminence retained in such passages as Luke 10.9 and 18.7-8. Luke 21 retains the Markan apocalypse (Mark 13) in qualified manner precisely in order to reaffirm the parousia hope afresh.[25] And even in his second volume, where hope deferred does seem to be much more the order of the day, Luke still puts in close proximity talk of believers being already 'in the last days' and of Jesus' ascension as a pattern of his coming again (Acts 1.11; 2.17). In other words, it is evident that for both Evangelists the tension of hope fulfilled, deferred and reaffirmed, at one and the same time, was simply the nature of biblical hope. Similarly we may assume that a Matthew who could retain the tradition that Jesus restricted mission to Israel (Matt. 10.5-6), within which the imminence motif is prominent (10.23), and yet also end

---

22 Holman, *Origins* 150-1.

23 See further my 'Spirit and Kingdom', *Expository Times* 82 (1970-71) 36-40.

24 Cf. W. Marxsen's wrestlings on the subject - *Mark the Evangelist* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1969) 166-89.

25 Cf. e.g. E. Franklin, *Christ the Lord: a Study in the Purpose and Theology of Luke-Acts* (London: SPCK, 1975) 12-21.

his Gospel with a call for universal mission (28.16-20), would have been much less concerned with the tension in his eschatology than most of his 20th century commentators.

Nor, we may add, was Jesus himself likely to have been deeply troubled by such tension between hope delayed and hope reaffirmed. We have alrdy mentioned the way in which the tension between the already come and yet to come of the kingdom may be said to have been held together in Jesus' own experience of the Spirit. In addition, there is the tradition that Jesus himself warned of the dangers of speculating about the future and of building anything on these speculations. Questions about who would be whose wife for the much married woman were inappropriate: the one sure thing was that the life of the world to come would not be determined by the rules governing present-day society or by such-like human concerns (Mark 12.18-27 / Matt 22.23-33 / Luke 29.27-40). Again, no one can know the day or the hour of the end events, not even the angels, (not even the Son!), but only the Father (Mark 13.32 / Matt 24.36).[26] That is, according to the teaching of Jesus as recorded by both Mark and Matthew, there is an unknown quality, an unknowableness about God's future, which means that confidence in God could remain strong without being specific; the hope was in God, not in the particulars of what God will do. And again, God can repent and change his mind: the unfruitful tree can be given another year to show whether it is after all fruitful (Luke 13.6-9); Ninevah can repent and be spared, even if prophet Jonah is outraged at the seeming falsification of his prophecy of doom. In the tradition of biblical hope, confidence in God could remain strong. But in the matter of final summing up of all things God is unpredictable in terms of human schematization, since his mercy runs far beyond what any human being would think proper or could predict, however inspired.[27]

The conclusion thus emerges with clarity and consistency, that biblical hope was never as rigid and fixed as most commentators seem to assume. Biblical hope was never dependent on such a specificity and detail of fulfilment that lack of fulfilment could be counted as falsifying that hope. Hope could be affirmed in image and language which might seem to leave it hostage to failure, disappointment and falsification. And yet in the event it was not so counted; the degree of fulfilment was regarded as sufficient to encourage a reaffirmation and restatement of that hope. What we might call the incremental fulfilment of hope over a lengthy period, dependent finally on eschatological verification, seems to have been a well established feature of theological reflection on promise and fulfilment right through the biblical period. Any first century

---

[26] A conclusion that 'not even the Son' is part of later redaction - so, e.g., C. K. Barrett, *Jesus and the Gospel Tradition* (London: SPCK, 1967) 25-6 - does not carry with it the corollary that the whole saying is late. Given the tradition we are here documenting, Jesus was as likely to have been conscious of the problems of delay as any of his followers.

[27] 'The problem of delay is the apocalyptic version of the problem of evil' (Bauckham 7-9).

Nazarene who was aware of the biblical and post-biblical tradition of eschatological hope would be familiar with this feature and in consequence not be overly troubled by the delay of the parousia. The problems caused for Christian theology in this area are more the result of a tendency to limit discussion of this question to the confines of Christian parousia hope than anything else. Those familiar with the well established tradition of biblical/Jewish hope would not be surprised by the relative calmness of the NT writers, including Matthew in face of hope deferred.

V

There is a further dimension to this whole discussion which we have time only to touch on. That is the character of the language of such expressions of eschatological hope, a character to which the current interest in hermeneutical issues has made us more sensitive, but which is also evident when we take a step backwards and view the particular issues posed by Matthew's eschatology within the context of biblical theology/language as a whole.

The point is probably clearest when we recall how much eschatological language in the Bible is the language of *vision*. The most characteristic imagery is no doubt that of the Christ coming in clouds. 'Behold, he is coming with the clouds', cries the seer of Revelation at the beginning of his series of heavenly visions (Rev 1.7). In apocalyptic vision, of course, clouds functioned as a means of heavenly transport (in the NT Mark 13.26; 14.62; Acts 1.9; 1 Thess 4.17; Rev 11.12), and as a symbol of divine majesty and authority. One thinks particularly of Ezekiel's archetypal vision of the chariot throne of God, the vision of 'a great cloud' which came out of the north, in the midst of which was the fire and the living creatures and the chariot itself (Ezek 1). And in the other archetypal vision of Daniel, the one like a son of man came with the clouds of heaven (Dan 7.13). It is important here to grasp that the symbolical force of this language would have been fully appreciated by the prophets and seers. They would not have expected their readers simply to take it at face value. Any more than Daniel would have expected his readers to think the extraordinary beasts, which came up out of the sea earlier in his vision (7.3-8), were intended to denote actual beasts. The apocalyptic visionary worked with symbolical language all the time, as Revelation's sequence of bowls and trumpets, strange portents and bizarre beasts, makes very clear. As the history of interpretation of Revelation has underlined over and over again: in Revelation a literal interpretation is usually a false interpretation. It is in the nature of apocalyptic vision that what is seen and described is more symbol than anything else. Such a recognition transposes the problem of partial fulfilment and of delay into a language game which is different from the one in which the issues are usually debated.

Another aspect of this is the recognition that in talking of the parousia the focus is on events which go beyond history and which can

only be spoken of in the language of *myth*. The point is familiar from the traditional parallel between talk of the beginning and talk of the end, between Endzeit and Urzeit. The term 'myth' is used, I need hardly remind you, not in the sense of unhistorical, but in the sense of denoting that which is beyond history, that for which scenes drawn on the template of human history can function only metaphorically or allusively. How else can one speak of what precedes history as humans know and experience it? Likewise with expectations of a final crisis or climax of history. Again, it is not a question of myth denoting falsehood, but of myth denoting a truth which can only be expressed by picture language and imagery. The myths of primordial beginnings and eschatological ends of the world and of humankind is not true in terms of quantifiable units of time and locatable areas of space, but may be true in the way that a great poem or a great painting is true. To be sure, we may hesitate to ascribe what we regard as such sophistication to the writers of our biblical texts, but the very feature we have already outlined above (the lack of deep concern about disappointments in hope) should warn us that they were more sophisticated in their own restatement and reaffirmation of hope than many 20th century commentators!

This brings us to the more modern recognition that so much of the language central to the discussion of Matthew's eschatology is the language of *metaphor*. We need only recall that the primary term, evidently so characteristic of Jesus' teaching and of the Jesus tradition, is the metaphor of God's kingdom or reign. In so describing Jesus' talk of the *baslieia tou Theou*, I do not mean that we should abstract Jesus' usage from a temporal sequence or collapse the language into that of a timeless symbol.[28] But I do wish to insist on the symbolic character of the language nonetheless and to point up the consequences for the now traditional problem of the already/not yet tension in Jesus' teaching on the kingdom.

The fact that Jesus could use the language of the kingdom without definition or description should have alerted commentators at this point sooner than it did. It was evidently a metaphor which functioned as metaphors do, by triggering a set of images, by setting off a chain of associations, a sequence of reverberations, rather than than by providing a formal statement or easily measurable account. It spoke of a transcendent aspiration, rather as the term 'heaven' still does in religious circles today. In a context of successful exorcism it evoked a sense of God's power active in the world. Not least, it was most naturally attached to the language of parable, the symbol that stimulated hope and prompted response, married to stories that surprised and provoked out of conventional ways of looking at possibilities and responsibility. As we have learned not to ask of parables, What does it mean?, as though there was a single correct meaning for the parable, so we should have learned more quickly not to

---

28 N. Perrin, *Jesus and the Language of the Kingdom* (London: SCM, 1976) is only one example of the recognition of the need to tackle the interpretation of the Jesus tradition on the kingdom on a broader basis than simply the fulfilment/failure of particular expectations.

ask, Why has it not come yet?, as though the metaphor was reducible to a single or uniform expression of hope.

The fact is that the hope and attendant eschatology expressed in the Jesus tradition is not at all clear, and probably was not clear to either Jesus or the Evangelists. What did he hope for? Scholars continue to be confused on this, because the data is confusing. He proclaimed the coming of the kingdom: 'The kingdom of God is at hand; repent!' (Mark 1.15). But did he mean by that, the restoration of Israel, or the coming of the end of the world? The former might seem a disappointingly narrow hope to attribute to Jesus. Though we might wonder then why Luke represents the disciples as responding to the risen Jesus' exposition of the kingdom with the question, 'Will you at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?' (Acts 1.6)? And the latter, the end of the world, an exposition of the coming kingdom from which Albert Schweitzer will not let us escape,[29] poses still more difficult questions. Was Jesus' hope for his own generation not after all fulfilled? Jerusalem was destroyed indeed,[30] but the stars have not yet fallen from heaven nor the angels come to gather the elect (Mark 13.25, 27)? So Jesus' own hope belongs to the same tradition of biblical hope realised but not completely, an already which still leaves a not yet outstanding as the substance of hope freshly reminted. So little was the motif of the kingdom fundamental to John's understanding of Jesus that he could recast his whole portrayal of Jesus with only the barest rerefence to the Synoptic-like tradition on the theme (John 3.3-5; contrast 19.36-37).

The same is presumably true of Jesus' talk of the coming Son of Man. The basic problem, too little acknowledged, is that the language is that of apocalyptic vision, with all the ambiguity entailed. In consequence questions of referentiality neither can be avoided nor can they be finally answered. Did he mean a coming of the Son of Man to God - a hope of vindication and exaltation? So the clear echo of Daniel's vision in all the relevant NT passages might suggest (Dan. 7.13-14). Or did he envisage the Son of Man, or himself as the Son of Man coming again from heaven to earth? So some expressions of the hope seem to indicate (Mark 14.62). But how fair is it to press such language for meaning? How much more sense is it than to ask what a parable means or what constitutes the truth of a great poem.

The subject is obviously huge, but hopefully its relevance to our subject is sufficiently obvious to require no further elaboration here.

V

---

[29] As will be evident, I side with Allison in the dispute with Borg (above n. 3).

[30] Cf.Hagner (above n. 10).

To conclude. (1) The tension within Matthew's eschatology is hardly unique within the larger biblical tradition. The focus on Jesus, and the theological corollaries which follow do, of course, give Christian eschatology its own unique stamp. But if the issue lies with the tension between already and not yet, between kingdom already come but kingdom also still to come, then it is not unique. If the problem is that of delay (of kingdom or parousia), then it is not unique. On the contrary, Matthew's eschatology then can be seen to stand wholly within the stream of biblical hope.

(2) It follows that this feature of Matthew's eschatology, as of biblical theology as a whole, should not be treated simply as a problem. It is rather an unavoidable feature of human thinking about divine purpose, and human language about the unknown future. To attempt to collapse the tension in the hope and in the language would destroy the nature of eschatological hope. The living tradition is rather of hope redefined and reaffirmed, of hope sustained by incremental fulfilment, with dependence on eschatological validation undimmed, whatever the fulfilment or lack of it. The tension marks the dynamic of biblical hope rather than its denial.

(3) A final thought relates once again back to Jesus' own expectation. Given this recurring feature of biblical eschatology, both prior to and subsequent to Jesus himself, it would be very surprising if Jesus himself had a monochrome eschatology, lacking that very tension and dynamic so characteristic of the biblical tradition. On the contrary, it is much more likely that Jesus himself stood in that tradition and was influenced by it. In which case, Matthew's eschatology, precisely at this traditionally sensitive point of incomplete expectation, failed Naherwartung, delayed fulfilment, is much closer to Jesus' own eschatology than has frequently been argued.

MATTHEW'S ESCHATOLOGY

Donald A. Hagner
Fuller Theological Seminary

The importance of eschatology in the Gospel of Matthew has been recognized especially since G. Bornkamm's seminal essay of 1956, "Enderwartung und Kirche im Matthäusevangelium."[1]

Bornkamm's essay was concerned with the theological relationship between eschatology and such matters as ecclesiology, law and christology. He showed clearly that Matthew is an interpreter of the traditions he received. Bornkamm did not, however, address the difficult problem of the entire body of eschatological teaching of the Gospel and what in fact the expectation of the evangelist concerning the end might have been. It is to this subject that we turn our attention in this paper.

Any attempt to describe Matthew's eschatology in a comprehensive manner will find its greatest challenge in coping with the variety of materials that must be dealt with. Matthew's eschatological perspective, like that of the other evangelists, includes statements concerning not only the future (near and more distant), but also the present, and even the past (i.e. already from the evangelist's point in time). There are furthermore statements in Matthew concerning the imminence of eschatological events, as well as others that imply a delay of the end, and even an interim period of considerable length, and last but not least, indications of agnosticism concerning the time of the end.

Much, if not most, of the material in question is drawn by the evangelist from his sources. Some of it is the result of his redactional activity and some perhaps is created by him. Given the exceptional complexity—not to say contradictory nature—of the various eschatological statements of Matthew, the question is: So far as the evangelist himself is concerned, do these statements cohere in any meaningful way? If we may not properly speak of a "systematic" view of eschatology in the Gospel, may we at least speak of a "coherent" view?[2] Or was the evangelist simply content to put traditional materials into his narrative without any concern about their mutual incompatibility?

This paper will explore the problem of Matthew's eschatology with these questions in mind. Our concern is with the eschatology of the Gospel itself and not with the teaching of Jesus.

I. THE DATA

We begin with a brief review of the data before looking at attempts to understand the data as a comprehensive whole. In what follows, we have no hope of being exhaustive—which would be nearly impossible not only because of the sheer amount of material, but also because of the allusive character of much of it, as well as the problem of the exegesis of some of it. We hope only to have touched upon the most significant material.

1. Realized Eschatology in the Gospel of Matthew

Matthew's stress on the theme of fulfillment is an obvious characteristic of the Gospel. The evangelist's use of the verb *plēroun* in the so-called formula quotations is of course particularly well known.[3] What happens in connection with the birth, ministry, and death of Jesus, is described with great emphasis by Matthew as the fulfillment of the scriptures. There is a sense indeed in which the whole of Matthew is eschatological in character.

1.1. Regardless of the date one assigns to Matthew, as a primarily historical narrative the Gospel describes a chain of eschatological events—i.e., events having eschatological significance—as already *matters of past history*. These past events have somehow a vital connection with the future not only by anticipating or foreshadowing what is yet to occur—i.e., what is properly eschatological—but by constituting the very basis of the eschatological events of the future.

1.1.1. The opening two chapters of Matthew, which serve as prolegomena to the story of Jesus, are nevertheless of great theological significance in establishing the perspective of the evangelist. These chapters of course abound with obviously eschatological motifs. The genealogy (1:1-17), centering on Abraham and David, points to the one who is the fulfillment of the covenantal promises associated with both names, to the one "who is called Christ (*ho legomenos christos*)." The child is conceived by the Holy Spirit and is named Jesus "for he will save his people from their sins" (1:21). The evangelist adds that "all this took place to fulfill what the Lord had spoken by the prophet," whereupon follows the first of his fulfillment quotations, drawn in this instance from Isa. 7:14. Chapter two continues along the same line, with the motif of fulfillment further strengthened by no less than three formula quotations as well as the quotation in 2:5.

The past events of the birth and the infancy narratives are for the evangelist laden with eschatological significance. They are in themselves eschatological events that inaugurate a new era.

1.1.2 The ministry of Jesus is of course marked by the same sense of eschatological fulfillment. Jesus' words and deeds point repeatedly to the coming of the Kingdom of God, a phrase used for the longed-awaited eschatological reality of God's rule upon the earth.

At the beginning, the words of John the Baptist, "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand (*ēggiken*)" (3:2) are picked up verbatim by Jesus (4:17; it is also the message of the disciples in 10:7). Although the meaning of the verb *eggizein* has been extensively debated,[4] it seems to me that its most natural meaning in both instances is that the kingdom has come near, not that it is actually present. What precisely is meant by this nearness is difficult to say. Perhaps it is a way of indicating that the kingdom has come in some sense, but short of the expected apocalyptic consummation. (This is obviously a conclusion that the reader must draw by the end of the gospel.) On the other hand, it is possible that the evangelist intends the reader to understand that the coming of the kingdom, even in its "realized" sense, depends upon the completion of the work of Jesus in his death and resurrection. But even understood as involving nearness, the significance of this statement is

not to be underestimated. A new era, marked by eschatological fulfillment, has begun to dawn.

The ministry of Jesus itself is summarized by the evangelist as involving the preaching of "the gospel of the kingdom" (4:23; cf. 9:35), now with no mention of nearness, but rather with the presumption of its presence.[5] In agreement with this conclusion is the remarkable statement of 12:28: "But if it is by the Spirit of God that I cast out demons, then the kingdom of God has come (*ephthasen*) upon you." There is far less ambiguity concerning the meaning of the verb *phthanein* than concerning the verb *eggizein*. *Phthanein* clearly asserts the presence of the kingdom.[6]

In relation to the casting out of demons, one further small but significant indicator of realized eschatology should be noted. In 8:29 the demons who are about to be exorcized ask plaintively "Have you come here to torment us before the time (*pro kairou*)?" This motif, unique to Matthew, points at once to the eschatological character of the exorcism as well as to the fact that the eschaton proper lies yet in the future.

In his answer to the question of John the Baptist Jesus implies that he is the one "who is to come (*ho erchomenos*)." In the words about John that follow is a statement that again suggests present fulfillment: "For all the prophets and the law prophesied until John; and if you are willing to accept it, he is Elijah who is to come" (11:13f.). Closely related to this is the statement in 17:12, made in reference to John, that "Elijah has already come, and they did not know him, but did to him whatever they pleased." Without going into detailed examination of these passages, we may note that John himself may be classified as an eschatological figure. In 11:10, where Malachi 3:1 is quoted, John is identified as the one who precedes the coming of the Lord and prepares his way.[7] This further confirms the conclusion that the coming of Jesus is to be understood as an eschatological event.

Referring to his preaching and healing ministry, Jesus makes this quite remarkable assertion in 13:16f.: "But blessed are your eyes, for they see, and your ears, for they hear. Truly, I say to you, many prophets and righteous people longed to see what you see, and did not see it, and to hear what you hear, and did not hear it." What was longed for was of course eschatological fulfillment, and it is this that Jesus says has now come in and through his work.[8]

1.1.3. The passion narrative is also written from the standpoint of fulfilled prophecy. In 26:24 Jesus says: "The Son of man goes as it is written of him." According to 26:54, Jesus will not resist arrest (and the death that will surely follow) because "How then should the scriptures be fulfilled , that it must be so (*dei genesthai*)?" 26:56 stresses yet again that "all this has taken place, that the scriptures of the prophets might be fulfilled." The evangelist provides a fulfillment formula quotation in 27:9.

It may be questioned whether this stress on the fulfillment of the scriptures is sufficient to consider the events of the death and resurrection of Jesus as eschatological events. But there are other elements of the narrative that encourage the reader to think of eschatology in these events. A number of unusual occurrences, such as the supernatural darkness that covered the land (27:45), the two earthquakes (27:51 [cf. 27:54] and 28:2), and the descent of the angel from heaven in 28:4 are unmistakably apocalyptic in character. Furthermore, whatever else we make of the narrative, it is clear that the story of the resurrection of "many

bodies of the saints" in 27:51-53, is meant to point to the eschatological significance of the death and resurrection of Jesus.

1.2. It is an unusual irony to speak of *eschatological* events of the *past*. How events of the past can have eschatological meaning is no doubt to be explained as due to the fact that they are perceived as having an ongoing present and future significance. Realized eschatology for Matthew is therefore not simply a matter of past events. The present significance of these events for the church is probably well known to Matthew's community and it is not the evangelist's immediate purpose to draw this out in his narrative (in the way, for example, that the writer of the Fourth Gospel does).[9] There are, however, a few instances in the Gospel where eschatological reality available to the present experience of the readers can easily be seen.

1.2.1. The promise that Jesus "will baptize you with the Holy Spirit" (3:11) could well have been taken by the readers to refer to a dimension of realized eschatology in their Christian experience. The Beatitudes (5:3-12) speak not only of a blessedness of the indeterminate future, but also of a present blessedness. The present tenses in vv 3 and 10 ("theirs is *[estin]* the kingdom of heaven") are deliberate and point to the present blessedness of those who are receptive of Jesus' message.

Among other items that may be mentioned are freedom from anxiety concerning everyday needs (6:25-34; cf. 7:7-11), and the promise of rest for the heavy laden (11:28-30), both of which have eschatological overtones.

2. Future Eschatology in the Gospel of Matthew

It must be admitted that despite the importance of realized eschatology in Matthew, the volume of material devoted to future eschatology is much greater. The bulk of this has to do with the apocalyptic consummation of the age, the day of the Lord when the righteous will receive their reward and the wicked their judgment.[10] The subject is complicated by the fact that Jesus also speaks of other future events that have an eschatological character—in particular, of course, the destruction of Jerusalem. A major challenge of the eschatological discourse of chs 24-25 is to disentangle what refers to the end of the world and what refers to the destruction of Jerusalem.

2.1. What will happen at the consummation of the age, according to Matthew, is a complex of events involving the parousia of Jesus and the final judgment wherein the righteous are rewarded and the wicked are sent to their punishment.

2.1.1. Matthew is filled with references to the judgment of the wicked. The importance of this to Matthew and his Jewish readers seems self-evident. It is already important from the preaching of John the Baptist, who speaks of "the wrath to come" (3:7), of the trees not bearing good fruit as being "cut down and thrown into the fire" (3:10), and of the one following him, who will baptize with fire, burning the chaff "with unquenchable fire" (3:12).

Jesus too speaks early and often of the final judgment. In the Sermon on the Mount he

speaks of "the Gehenna of fire" (5:22), again of Gehenna (5:29f.), of "destruction" in 7:13, and like John, of the tree not bearing good fruit being "cut down and thrown into the fire" (7:19). The day of judgment ("that day") is in view in 7:22f. where the evil doers are told to depart from the presence of Jesus. The sermon closes with the metaphor of a storm symbolizing the eschatological judgment (7:24-27). So too does Matthew stress future judgment in the remaining four discourses.[11] In the missionary discourse Jesus refers to the coming day of judgment which will be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrah than for the towns that reject the messengers (10:15). The threat of future judgment appears again in 10:28 and 33. The discourse of the parables of the kingdom alludes repeatedly to the future judgment, sometimes less directly (cf. 13:12-15), but most often in direct and vivid imagery (13:30, 40-42, and 49f.), employing the metaphor of the furnace of fire and Matthew's favorite idiom of weeping and the gnashing of teeth (as also in 8:12; 22:13; 24:51 and 25:30). What is most remarkable in ch 13 is of course the stress on the delay of judgment--something we shall investigate below. In the discourse of ch 18 future judgment is implicit in v 6 then explicit in vv 8-9, with mention of "eternal fire" and again "the Gehenna of fire," and then parabolically in v 34f.

Before we look at the eschatological discourse itself, the mention of future judgment elsewhere in the Gospel should be noted. In 8:12 the future judgment (being thrown "into the outer darkness") of unbelieving Israel is mentioned. 11:22-24 contains reference to "the day of judgment" for the unrepentant towns of Chorazin and Bethsaida, which are compared unfavorably with Tyre and Sidon, and for Capernaum, which is also compared unfavorable with Sodom (cf. 10:15). 12:32 is particularly interesting for our purposes since it refers to the non-availability of forgiveness "either in this age or in the age to come," the latter referring apparently to the final judgment, which is thus clearly distinguished from the present era. 12:36f. again speaks of "the day of judgment." So too 12:41-42 speak of the coming "judgment" for that generation (cf. 12:45). 16:27 refers to the future judgment to be rendered by the Son of man, who "is to come with his angels in the glory of his Father." Judgment imagery again appears as part of a parable in 22:13, where the one not properly attired for the wedding banquet is to be bound hand and foot and cast "into the outer darkness," where there will be weeping and the gnashing of teeth. A future sentencing of the scribes and Pharisees to Gehenna is found in 23:33 (cf. v 35).

We turn finally to the eschatological discourse itself. As is to be expected, much emphasis is given to the judgment to come. The outlook becomes rather complex, however, because of the prophecy of the destruction of Jerusalem. The two items are incorrectly—from our point of view at least—if understandably, linked in the question of the disciples (24:3). 24:15-26 probably refers to the destruction of Jerusalem. The apocalyptic imagery of 24:29 suggests the coming of the final judgment, as do the parabolic metaphors of 24:39 (flood), 24:43 (unexpected thief), 24:50 (unexpected master), 25:12 (rejected maidens), and 25:30 (worthless servant). In two of these instances Matthew's formulaic judgment language occurs: the "wicked servant" of 24:48ff. is "put with the hypocrites" where people will "weep and gnash their teeth," and the "worthless servant" of 25:24ff. is case: "into the outer darkness; there people will weep and gnash their teeth." Most striking, however, is the final judgment scene with which the discourse closes (25:31-46). Those at the left hand of the King are addressed with the words "Depart from me, you cursed, into the eternal fire

prepared for the devil and his angels" (25:41; cf. 25:46: "And they will go away into eternal punishment").[12]

It is obviously important to the Jewish perspective of Matthew's community that there will be a final reckoning in an eschatological judgment to come. If eschatology has somehow already begun, it is clear that one aspect of the eschatological expectation, although delayed for the time being, must yet occur in the future. Like other NT writers, the evangelist uses the coming judgment as a motivation for righteous conduct.

2.1.2. Correlative to the future judgment of the wicked is the future or eschatological blessing of the righteous. Although the latter is very important in Matthew, it is referred to rather less often than is the future judgment. It is true that according to the evangelist the followers of Jesus are already blessed; yet that blessing is in the present, even for the righteous, mixed with tribulation, persecution, and suffering. Only in the future will the rewards of the righteous be fully experienced.

Future blessings as well as present blessings are in view in the Beatitudes (5:3-12): comfort, the inheriting of the earth, satisfaction, eschatological mercy, the vision of God. In the face of persecution the disciples are to rejoice, "for your reward is great in heaven." The petition in the Lord's prayer, "Thy kingdom come" (6:10) also looks forward to the full experience of eschatological blessing. Future rewards for those who do their righteous deeds in secret are probably in view in 6:4, 6, and 18. Future entry into the kingdom of heaven in connection with the final judgment is found in 7:21. In the second discourse we encounter future salvation in 10:22 and, more allusively, in 10:32. Future rewards for those who receive the message of the disciples are in view in 10:41f. In the parable discourse future salvation is in view in the image of wheat being gathered into a barn (13:30) as well as the statement that "then the righteous will shine like the sun in the kingdom of their Father" (13:43). In the fourth discourse future salvation is alluded to only in the final parable (18:27 and 32; but cf. 18:13).

We again delay looking at the eschatological discourse in order to review the pertinent material from other parts of the Gospel. In 8:11 we have the remarkable reference to eschatological blessing in the statement that "many will come from east and west and sit at table with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven." Apart from a few passing allusions (e.g., 12:31f.; 12:37; 16:25; 19:17, 21, 23-25), the next striking passage is in 19:28 where, in response to Peter's specific question concerning future rewards, Jesus states: "Truly, I say to you, in the new world (*en tē paliggenesia*), when the Son of man shall sit on his glorious throne, you who have followed me will also sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel. And every one who has left houses or brothers or sisters or father or mother or children or lands, for my name's sake, will receive a hundredfold, and inherit eternal life." Also notable is the request of the mother of the sons of Zebedee, who in effect asks for special eschatological blessing for her sons in the request: "Command that these two sons of mine may sit, one at your right hand and one at your left, in your kingdom (*en tē basileia sou*)" (20:21). The reference in 22:28 and 30 to "the resurrection (*tē anastasei*)" again indicates the eschatological blessing of the future.

The eschatological discourse naturally contains a number of allusions to future eschatological blessing. Salvation is mentioned in 24:13 and the elect are gathered in 24:31.

It is the faithful and wise servant who will be blessed (24:46). The wise maidens gain entrance into the marriage feast (25:10); those who have made good use of the talents given them receive the plaudit: "Well done, good and faithful servant; you have been faithful over a little, 1 will set you over much; enter into the joy of your master" (25:21=25:23). Finally, in the concluding judgment scene, those at the right hand of the King are invited: "Come, O blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world" (25:34), and in 25:46 the righteous enter "into eternal life."[13]

It is clear from the above that the evangelist distinguishes between the present blessing of the righteous from a yet-to-come eschatological experience of blessing.

2.1.3. We turn finally in this section to the predictions of a future coming or return of Jesus—predictions that to some extent relativize the eschatological import of the events recorded in the narrative of the Gospel. If the ministry of Jesus is somehow to be conceived of as eschatological in character, it is also not absolute or exhaustive so far as the purpose of God is concerned.

Whereas 9:15 speaks (somewhat obscurely) of the bridegroom being taken away from the disciples, there is not yet any indication of a return of the bridegroom. 10:23 contains the first reference to the future return of the Son of man (= Jesus), although it has been taken, wrongly on both counts in my view, to mean that Jesus expected the Son of man (not himself) to come in just a matter of days—i.e., before the missionary journey of the disciples was over. Also unlikely, in my view, is the conclusion that this statement simply refers to the fact that Jesus would meet his disciples in a few days or weeks, i.e., before they had completed that specific mission.

Since the resurrection is itself a kind of parousia of Christ to the church, we here mention the predictions of the resurrection (16:21; 17:9, 23; 20:19; 26:32), although this resurrection can hardly be thought to satisfy the eschatological expectation of the church.

Important for our purposes is 16:27f., where it is said that "the Son of man is to come (*mellei ... erchesthai*) with his angels in the glory of his Father," for the purpose of rendering judgment (cf. 13:40ff.). This is followed immediately by the famous logion: "Truly, 1 say to you, there are some standing here who will not taste death before they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom." Allusions to the future coming of Christ are found in 23:39 and 26:29. Then again in 26:64 we encounter an important logion: "But I tell you, hereafter (*ap' arti*) you will see the Son of man seated at the right hand of Power, and coming on the clouds of heaven."

The eschatological discourse takes its point of departure from the disciples' question in 24:3, who ask about the time of the destruction of the temple and "what will be the sign of your coming (*parousias*) and of the close of the age (*synteleias tou aiōnos*)?" Jesus responds by describing what must happen before his coming and by noting that his coming will be as unmistakable as lightning in the sky (24:27). The event itself is referred to in 24:30: "then will appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven ... and they will see the Son of man coming on the clouds of heaven with power and great glory." That the time of the parousia of the Son of man may be unexpected (implying delay), and thus the importance of being ready, is the point of the material that follows (24:37-44; 24:50; 25:1-12). The final judgment scene begins with the last logion concerning the coming of the Son of man: "When the Son of man

comes in his glory, and all the angels with him, then he will sit on his glorious throne. Before him will be gathered all the nations, and he will separate them from one another as a shepherd separates the sheep from the goats" (25:31f.).

3. Passages that Presuppose an Interim Period Before the End

There can be no doubt that the presence of the eschatological kingdom proclaimed by Jesus through his words and deeds is clearly distinguished by the evangelist from the eschatological denouement at the end of the present age. Further evidence of this can be seen in those passages that imply an interim period, whether of shorter or longer duration.

3.1. Jesus' calling, training, and commissioning of disciples obviously implies an interim period of some length. When Jesus first calls disciples in 4:19 he says "Follow me, and I will make you fishers of men." This could of course be regarded as being fulfilled in the sending out of the twelve in 10:5ff., yet the content of 10:16-25 obviously points to a time much later than the journey for which the disciples are being instructed in 10:5-15. Indeed, that material points beyond the disciples (as does much, if not most, of the material addressed to the disciples) to the later church. Similarly, 23:34 refers to an indeterminate future, when Christian prophets, wise men, and scribes will be rejected and persecuted.

Of the greatest importance, of course, is 16:18f., where Jesus talks of building his church. That church during its existence will withstand the "gates of Hades." The disciples will have an ongoing responsibility in the community (16:19; 18:18) and Jesus promises in the future to be in their midst (18:20).

In the giving of the great commission with which the Gospel ends, the disciples (and the church) are told to evangelize, to baptize and to teach, and again the promise is given "lo, I am with you always, to the close of the age (*heos tēs synteleias tou aiōnos*)."

3.2. Another element, related to the preceding, but deserving of special mention, is the necessity of the preaching of the gospel. Over against the temporary limitation of his and his disciples' mission to Israel (10:5f.; 15:24), a future time is also in view when the gospel of the kingdom will be preached to the whole world, including the gentiles. With the mission to Israel, or perhaps eventually to the gentiles, Jesus tells the disciples to pray for more laborers to be sent into the harvest (9:37f.). The gentile mission adumbrated in 10:18 (and more allusively in 2:1-12; 4:15; 8:11) and 12:18, 21 comes to explicit expression in 24:14, where it is linked with the end of the age: "And this gospel of the kingdom will be preached throughout the whole world (*en holē tē oikoumenē*), as a testimony to all nations (*pasin tois ethnesin*), and then the end (*to telos*) will come." A universal mission is also in view in 26:13: "wherever this gospel is preached in the whole world." It is preeminently in view in 28:19, where the disciples are told to "go and make disciples of all nations (*panta ta ethnē*)."

3.3. The amount of space given to ethical teaching in the Gospel itself (e.g., chs 5-7; 9:15b; 12:33-37; 16:21-27; 18:21f.; 22:15-21; 23:8-11) also suggests an interim period in which the righteousness of the kingdom is to be manifested. If this is an "interim ethics," it need not be for only a short interim, despite its radical idealism. Note should be taken too of

the disciplinary procedure of 18:15-17, and also the statement "For you always have the poor with you, but you will not always have me" (26:11).

3.4. Promises made by Jesus seem also to presuppose an interim period. Among others, and in addition to the promises of Jesus' presence already mentioned (e.g. 18:20; 28:20), we may point to the assurance of 6:33 and 7:11, the comfort of 10:19, 28-30, the invitation of 11:28-30, and the promise of 17:20 and 21:21f.

3.5. A final and important aspect pointing to the interim period, especially in the eschatological discourse, is the necessity for certain things to happen before the end. This includes such things as various tribulations (24:6-8), persecution (24:9f.; see too 10:17-31), the deceitful claims of false prophets and christs (24:5, 23-26), and the destruction of Jerusalem (24:15-22).

4. Logia Concerning Imminence

We begin to approach the difficulty of our problem when we now review those logia that indicate, or at least seem to indicate, imminent judgment or an imminent parousia (and hence, end of the age)--i.e., not necessarily at any moment, but to be experienced by that very generation. The evangelist has apparently found no problem in including these logia together with the material just reviewed that implies an interim period.

4.1. Two of these statements have to do with the imminence of the parousia, or at least with some kind of "coming" of the Son of man.

4.1.1. Toward the end of the missionary instructions given to the twelve, Jesus asserts: "When they persecute you in one town, flee to the next; for truly, I say to you, you will not have gone through all the towns of Israel, before the Son of man comes" (10:23). Some interpretive options are: (1) the parousia is expected before the immediate mission at hand is completed, i.e., within a matter of days or weeks; (2) the mission in view is that carried on in Israel until the fall of Jerusalem, with the coming of the Son of man understood as a coming in judgment upon the city; (3) the mission to Israel to be carried on by the church will continue until the parousia at the end of the age and thus the time of the parousia is not delimited by the statement. I favor the second explanation of this difficult passage,[14] but without taking it to mean the end of the evangelizing of the Jews in 70 CE.

4.1.2. The logion found in 16:28 is of key importance to our problem: "Truly, I say to you, there are some standing here who will not taste death before they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom." Although it is theoretically an option to attempt to understand "some standing here who will not taste death" in some way other than in the natural or plain sense of the words, this seems to me an arbitrary and unsatisfactory solution to an awkward problem. Some may think the same of any similar attempt to understand the coming of the Son of man as meaning anything other than the parousia. To my mind, however, this is at least a possibility worth considering. The most obvious options, other than the parousia

itself[15], are: (1) the resurrection; (2) pentecost (yet Matthew shows no awareness of this); and (3) the destruction of Jerusalem. Again I favor the conclusion that this, like 10:23, may be a reference to the coming of the Son of Man in judgment (cf. v 27) in the destruction of Jerusalem.[16] Because of the typological connection between the destruction of Jerusalem and the final judgment, the latter is also in view through the foreshadowing provided by the former.

4.2. Two of the imminence logia have to do with judgment, and do not mention the parousia directly.

4.2.1. According to 23:35, the guilt of the Jews in having murdered the prophets and having persecuted the Christians—the latest of God's emissaries—will come upon them in the form of some kind of judgment. Upon them will come "all the righteous blood shed on earth," to which is added in 23:36: "Truly, I say to you, all this will come upon this generation." This very probably refers to the destruction of Jerusalem, understood as a vindictive judgment upon unbelieving Israel.

4.2.2. The second and last logion is the most general of all. At the end of the short parable of the budding fig tree (24:32-35) comes the statement "So also, when you see all these things, you know that he (it) is near (*eggus estin*), at the very gates." This is followed by the words: "Truly, I say to you, this generation will not pass away till all these things (*panta tauta*) take place" (24:35). Since this parable follows, as in Mark, not the material of 24:15-28, but that of 24:29-31, which refers to the parousia of the Son of man, it may well be that the evangelist means to include the parousia. On the other hand, the words themselves do not refer to the coming of the Son of man; the *eggus estin* is vague and could easily be understood as referring to something else, such as the fall of Jerusalem.[17]

5. Statements Referring to a Delay of the Parousia

In our survey of the data we look next at a few passages that contain a specific reference to delay. The material in view here is found mainly in passing references in parables, all in the eschatological discourse, but may be for that reason even more significant. These references stand in some tension with the imminence logia just reviewed. They are related to and indirectly support the material that implies an interim period, but are distinctive in the employment of the notion of delay.

5.1. In the parable of the faithful or unfaithful servant (24:45-51), the wicked servant says to himself: "My master is delayed (*chronizei*)" (24:48). He uses this delay as an excuse to act unrighteously.

5.2. The very next parable, that of the ten maidens (25:1-14), contains the words: "As the bridegroom was delayed." The parable of course depends on the idea of a long wait, and stresses the idea of preparedness.

5.3. In the third parable, that of the talents (25:14-30), which follows immediately upon those just mentioned, the master is introduced as a man "going on a journey (*apodemon*)" (25:14). After he distributed the talents, it is said that "he went away" (25:15). His return to settle accounts is described as being "after a long time" (*meta polyn chronon*)" (25:19).[18]

6. Agnosticism Concerning the Time of the End

The final data to be reviewed here are the statements that the time of the end cannot be known. Like the references to delay in the previous section, these are found only in the apocalyptic discourse. There is, indeed, a close connection between the delay and the motif of agnosticism.

6.1. Most remarkable of all is the logion of 24:36: "But of that day and hour no one knows, not even the angels of heaven, nor the Son, but the Father only." It is little surprise that copyists, with christological concerns in mind, were inclined to omit the reference to the Son's ignorance of the time of the end. This is clearly a saying that the early church could not have created. It stands in considerable tension with the imminence sayings, unless one concludes that what is in view is not the general time, but only the particular hour and day—a highly unlikely interpretation, in my opinion.

6.2. Further references to the fact that the time of the end is unknown are found in the exhortatory material that follows the passage just mentioned. As those in the days of Noah did not know of the approaching disaster, those of the last day will not know the time of the coming of the Son of man. Thus Jesus exhorts: "Watch therefore, for you do not know on what day your Lord is coming" (24:42). And again, "Therefore you also must be ready; for the Son of man is coming at an hour you do not expect" (24:44).

The same emphasis is found in the two parables that follow this passage. Thus, with reference to the wicked servant: "the master of that servant will come on a day when he does not expect him and at an hour he does not know" (24:50). The parable of the ten maidens concludes with the exhortation: "Watch therefore, for you know neither the day nor the hour" (25:13).

These exhortatory references to the time being unknown point to an undetermined future, to an unexpected time, when people apparently have no reason whatever to expect the end.

II. THESES CONCERNING MATTHEW'S ESCHATOLOGY

The material we have surveyed is filled with tensions, some of which appear to involve quite contradictory assertions. It is of course arguable that the evangelist has simply collected disparate traditions that were available to him and blithely ignored the fact that they were incompatible. On the other hand, it is equally possible that in the evangelist's mind the various eschatological elements we have noted did fit together in some larger, comprehensive whole. It is at least worth investigating this possibility before throwing up our hands in dismay at the challenge of an integrated understanding Matthew's eschatology.

7. The Present/Future Tension

The fundamental tension in the eschatology of the NT and of Matthew is that between presently realized eschatology and the eschatology of the future. If we sometimes call the latter "eschatology proper," we thereby indicate the central oddity of the NT affirmation that what lies properly in the future has somehow already entered the present in and through the work of Jesus Christ.

This particular tension has of course been thoroughly explored in our century.[19] The significance of the breakthrough of Weiss and Schweitzer in establishing the fundamental importance of the apocalyptic perspective for Jesus can hardly be exaggerated. This viewpoint of "consistent eschatology" stressed only one side of the tension. Dodd stressed the other side of the tension in his emphasis on realized eschatology. It was clear that a strong case could be made for each side of the tension. Kümmel, Jeremias, Cullmann, Schnackenburg and others effectively showed that it was not a matter of either/or, but of both/and. Something like a consensus seems to have emerged, although there have continued to be dissenters.[20] Little more needs to be said here about this tension, except to indicate its importance to the other problems to be discussed.

7.1. The tension between present and future eschatology constitutes the foundational complexity giving rise to the specific problems discussed below. If eschatology is a single fabric of reality, a divided eschatology, with some present and some future, becomes problematic. The reality of present eschatology that is short of consummation itself implies not only a necessary future eschatology, but even its imminence. Where the end is announced as having begun, its final aspect cannot easily be thought of as distantly future.

8. The Imminence/Delay Tension

A further complicating factor is found in the expectation of two distinct events in the future: the fall of Jerusalem and the coming of the Son of man. The fall of Jerusalem is described in quasi-eschatological language and in the same discourse that describes the coming of the Son of man. The two events are obviously linked in the minds of the disciples (as their question implies, 24:3) and very probably also in the mind of the evangelist.

8.1. The fall of Jerusalem is obviously the most natural referent of the imminence sayings. So far as length of time is concerned, it fits best language such as "there are some standing here who will not taste death before they see..." (16:28), which of course refers to "the Son of man coming in his kingdom," and the references to "this generation" (23:36; 24:35).

8.1.1. It seems possible that all the imminence sayings spoken by Jesus originally referred to the fall of Jerusalem. Then, if we may speculate further, since those who heard Jesus speak of the fall of Jerusalem could not in their minds dissociate such a catastrophic event from the end of the age, it may be that the idea of imminence became attached to sayings about the coming of the Son of man. If the destruction of Jerusalem was imminent,

so too must the coming of the Son of man be imminent.

8.1.2. There is a theological relationship between the fall of Jerusalem and the end of the age, since both involve judgment. If the two are thought of as happening independently, the former may be regarded as a prefiguration of the latter. As the length of time between the two increases, the theological connection replaces the apparent earlier, though wrongly conceived, chronological association.

8.2. The logia concerning the coming of the Son of man can be quite vague so far as the time is concerned (cf. 16:27 [where the *mellei* need not imply imminence];[21] 24:27; 25:31; 26:64 [where the *ap' arti*, lit. "from now on," is difficult to understand[22]]; as well as the allusions in 23:39 and 26:29). Even 10:23 with its reference to the evangelizing of Israel is indeterminate, since it could mean up until the destruction of Jerusalem or until the parousia itself. So too, the *locus classicus,* 24:30, remains vague despite the *eutheōs* of 24:29, since it is not altogether clear which tribulation is in view in the phrase "after the tribulation of those days."[23]

16:28 is the least ambiguous of the imminence logia so far as time reference is concerned. It is arguable that the expression "the Son of man coming in his kingdom" could refer to the destruction of Jerusalem.[24] Many argue, however, that the most natural interpretation of this verse is that it refers to the parousia. If this conclusion is correct, then the author of Matthew probably regarded the parousia as imminent in the same way as, and perhaps because, the destruction of Jerusalem was imminent.

8.2.1. Further to be noted is the fact that the delay motif is applied not to the destruction of Jerusalem, but is restricted to allusions to the parousia (see section 5, above).

8.2.2. Similarly the agnosticism motif, with its accompanying exhortation to "watch," occurs only in reference to the time of the parousia (see section 6, above).

8.3. Thus we may conclude that the references to the destruction of Jerusalem are, as one might expect, much more delimited by the emphasis on imminence. By contrast, references to the coming of the Son of man are less delimited, being also conditioned by indications of delay and lack of knowledge. The idea of imminence, however, by cross-over influence, may well have become attached to a few logia concerning the coming of the Son of man.

9. The Length of the Implied Interim Period

The material reviewed in section 3 above shows that the evangelist must have considered an interim period as necessary between the ministry of Jesus and the end of the age. Can anything be said about the length requirements for that interim period?

9.1. Of greatest interest is whether the forty years between the death of Jesus and the destruction of Jerusalem in AD 70 may be thought to be a sufficiently long interim period for

the accomplishment of all that is expected. If so, this material need not be regarded as incompatible with the imminence motif, taken as referring to events of 70.

9.1.1. Forty years is enough time for extensive evangelization, for the building of a church, for the practice of kingdom ethics, for the experience of the presence of the risen Jesus, and so forth.

9.1.2. The gentile mission, especially through the work of Paul, had been quite successful by the year 70. Already more than a decade earlier Paul could speak of the gospel as having been preached throughout the world (Rom. 10:18), meaning of course the Roman world, and had to plan to work in Spain in order not to build on the work of another.

9.1.3. The experience of various trials and tribulations, famine, persecution, false prophets and christs, during the forty year period prior to 70, also seems sufficient to correspond to what was prophesied as coming before the end.

9.2. At the same time, it may be admitted that an interim period of this kind is by nature not delimited, but open-ended. From our late perspective the centuries that followed continue to fulfill the promises and expectations of the interim period.

10. Conclusion: The Eschatological Expectation of the Evangelist

We may now attempt on the basis of the preceding discussion to draw together some concluding theses concerning Matthew's expectation concerning the future. At a few points more than one option may be given. The bearing of these concluding remarks on the dating of the Gospel will also be given some attention.

10.1. Matthew views the ministry of Jesus as the inauguration of eschatology. A new era has dawned in fulfillment of certain, though not all, promises of the scriptures.

10.2. By its very nature, present or realized eschatology brings with it the promise of a future wrap-up of an apocalyptic character, i.e., involving the judgment of the wicked, the reward of the righteous, and the establishment of a new world.

10.3. The future consummation, brought about by the coming of the Son of man, will occur not immediately, but only after an interim period. (The consummation can nevertheless be described as imminent, i.e., as occurring within that generation.)

10.4. As promised by Jesus, that generation was to see the destruction of the temple and the fall of Jerusalem.

10.5. It was virtually unthinkable that the events just mentioned could happen without bringing with them the coming of the Son of man and the end of the age. Therefore the coming of the Son of man is, like the fall of Jerusalem, also regarded as imminent, i.e., as

to occur within that generation. They are part of the same complex of events; as the evangelist's added *eutheos* in 24:29 may indicate, the destruction of Jerusalem was to be followed "immediately" by the parousia of the Son of man.

10.5.1. If the statements of the preceding paragraph are true, it would be most natural to date Matthew before 70 (despite 22:7, which has often been made to bear more weight than it can).[25] The evangelist would then not have known of the failure of the parousia to occur in connection with or immediately after the fall of Jerusalem.

10.5.2. At least two other possibilities, each concerning a post-70 date, should be mentioned. The first is the least attractive: The evangelist, writing say a decade later, may have felt the necessity to be faithful to traditions he received, and hence preserved them even though the events themselves did not bear out the predictions. A second possibility is that the evangelist had witnessed the fall of Jerusalem and now consequently awaited a parousia that might occur at any moment (but how long can such an extended expectation reasonably be thought to last?).

10.6. The interim period of some forty years, already experienced by the evangelist, was regarded by him as sufficient time in which to fulfill the prerequisites to be accomplished before the end.

10.7. It is, in my opinion, less plausible to believe that the evangelist really did separate the fall of Jerusalem, which was obviously imminent, from the parousia of the Son of man, which he then put forward into the indeterminate future. In order to sustain such a view one has to put an unusual twist on the imminent parousia logia, especially 16:28 (preceded by 16:27, which clearly refers to the coming of the Son of man), unless it be taken as referring to the fall of Jerusalem.[26]

III. POSTSCRIPT

The conclusions drawn above, if correct, mean that the evangelist, apparently in good company with others in the early church, may have been wrong about the time of the parousia. Although it has not been our concern in this paper to deal with the teaching of Jesus, insofar as it can be known, it may well be the case that he too associated the fall of Jerusalem with the end of the age and the coming of the Son of man. This possibility would be consonant with his own admission of ignorance concerning the time of the consummation (24:36). On the other hand, it may well be that Jesus spoke of imminence (i.e., "this generation," "those standing here") only in connection with the fall of Jerusalem, speaking of the parousia only in indeterminate language.[27] In that case, the disciples would be responsible for confusing the imminence of the fall of Jerusalem with the coming of the end of the age.

It is intriguing that the data examined above are capable of such different possible interpretations. Whether or not the evangelist (or his contemporaries) was able in his mind to

separate the fall of Jerusalem from the apocalyptic coming of the Son of man, his later interpreters have been able to do so, even if under necessity. The data are actually, for the most part, remarkably amenable to such an interpretation. As we have seen, the time of the coming of the Son of man and the concomitant end of the age is usually left vague and indeterminate; it is furthermore the case that the time of the end is conditioned by the delay motif, which can be understood as open-ended, as well as the ignorance motif, which is regularly accompanied by the exhortation to faithful watching. The one really difficult statement in Matthew for this view is 16:28 which, however, as we have seen, *can* be understood as referring to something other than the parousia.

Luke, one of the earliest interpreters of the difficult Markan logion, has already "de-eschatologized" it: "there are some standing here who will not taste death before they see the kingdom of God" (Lk. 9:27). Many in the church have since done likewise.

It is a pleasure for me to dedicate this essay to Robert H. Gundry, whose friendship I have valued over the years and whose scholarship I have always admired, not only for its obvious, uncompromising respect for the text of scripture, but also for its inimitable freshness and fairness.

1. "End-Expectation and Church in Matthew," in *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew*, with G. Barth and H. J. Held, trans by P. Scott (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1963) 15-51. The essay first appeared in the 1956 Festschrift for C. H. Dodd, *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

2. The problem in its complexity is quite similar to that of Paul and the Law. E. P. Sanders argues against H. Räisänen that Paul's view of the Law although not "systematic," may with some effort at least be seen as being "coherent." *Paul, the Law and the Jewish People* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983) 147f.

3. The formulae are found in: 1:22; 2:15, 17, 23; 4:14; 8:17; 12:17; 13:14 (*anaplēroun*); 13:35; 21:4: and 27:9. Cf. more generally 26:54, 56. See R. H. Gundry, *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel*, NovTSup 18 (Leiden: Brill, 1967).

4. See W. G. Kümmel, *Promise and Fulfillment,* trans. by D. M. Barton (London: SCM, 1957) 19–25. Thus Gundry, rightly: "The verb *ēggiken* indicates nearness right up to, but not including, the point of arrival." *Matthew. A Commentary on His Literary and Theological Art* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982) 43.

5. The same phrase constitutes the message to be proclaimed after Jesus' death according to 24:14 (cf. 26:13).

6. "It can therefore be said with certainty that Matt. 12.28 = Luke 11.20 must be translated 'the Kingdom of God has come upon you'." W. G. Kümmel, *Promise and Fulfillment,* 107. See G. E. Ladd, *The Presence of the Future* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974), 139-48.

7. Cf. too Malachi 4:5 [3:23 Heb.] where Elijah is said to come "before the great and terrible day of the Lord comes."

8. On the other hand, the opponents of Jesus, the Pharisees and Sadducees, who come asking for a "sign," are apparently unable "to interpret the signs of the times" (16:3).

9. That the evangelist does to some extent draw out the significance of eschatology for the church is shown by Bornkamm in "End-Expectation and Church in Matthew."

10. For a discussion of apocalyptic in Matthew, see D. A. Hagner, "Apocalyptic Motifs in the Gospel of Matthew: Continuity and Discontinuity," *Horizons in Biblical Theology* 7 (1985) 53–82; O. L. Cope, "'To the Close of the Age': The Role of Apocalyptic Thought in the Gospel of Matthew," in *Apocalyptic in the New Testament.* Essays in honor of J. Louis Martyn, eds. J. Marcus and M. L. Soards, JSNTSS 24 (Sheffield: JSOT, 1989) 113–124.

11. This is effectively shown by Bornkamm, "End-Expectation," 16–24.

12. It may be noted that there is no reference to future judgment in the passion and resurrection narratives (chs. 26–28), except for the indirect allusion in 26:24.

13. Parallel to the observation in the preceding note, there are no direct references to future eschatological blessing in chs. 26–28.

14. Gundry understands the passage as referring to the parousia. *Matthew*, 194f. D. A. Carson also interprets 10:23 as referring to the fall of Jerusalem. "Matthew" in *The Expositor's Bible Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984) 8:250-53.

15. Gundry, with many commentators, favors the parousia here. *Matthew*, 341f.

16. For me the decisive point in the exegesis of this passage is the reference to "some standing here who will not taste death" (i.e. die), for which only the fall of Jerusalem makes sense.

17. Cf. Luke 21:31, which supplies *hē basileia tou theou* as the subject. Gundry argues for a double fulfillment, one in AD 70 and the other at the parousia. *Matthew*, 491.

18. A delay of the parousia may also be possibly hinted at in 24:6: "the end is not yet"; and in 24:8: "all this is but the beginning of birthpangs."

19. For a review of the discussion, see G. Lundström, *The Kingdom of God In the Teaching of Jesus,* trans. by J. Bulman (Richmond: John Knox, 1963); G. E. Ladd, *The Presence of the Future* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974) 3–42. See too the symposium, *The Kingdom of God in 20th-Century Interpretation,* ed. W. Willis (Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson, 1987) and the collection of essays, *The Kingdom of God,* ed. B. Chilton (Philadelphia/London: Fortress/SPCK, 1984).

20. E.g., R. H. Hiers, *Jesus and the Future* (Atlanta: John Knox, 1981) and C. Sullivan, *Rethinking Realized Eschatology* (Macon, Georgia: Mercer University Press, 1988), who continue to espouse the consistent eschatology viewpoint; T. F. Glasson, *The Second Advent* (3rd ed., London: Epworth, 1963) and J. A. T. Robinson, *Jesus and His Coming* (London: SCM, 1957) deny that Jesus ever spoke of his parousia. See most recently the stimulating article of C. C. Caragounis, "Kingdom of God, Son of Man and Jesus' Self-Understanding," *Tyndale Bulletin* 40 (1989) 3–23; 223–238.

21. See Bauer, Arndt, Gingrich and Danker, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press, 1979) 501a.

22. Gundry regards it as a referring to "a mental seeing of the Son of man sitting at God's right hand," a seeing that begins immediately with the events of 27:51b-53. *Matthew*, 545.

23. In Gundry's view, from 24:15 Matthew is writing about the tribulation of the end time, i.e. something yet future, and thus the problem of the "immediately" disappears. *Matthew*, 481-89. Blomberg regards 24:15-20 as referring to the fall of Jerusalem, but 24:21-28 to the yet future tribulation, thereby avoiding the problem. *Matthew*, 357-361 (cf. Leon Morris, *The Gospel According to Matthew* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992] 605-10;). R. T. France, on the other hand, takes the entirety of 24:5-35 as referring to the destruction of Jerusalem, again thereby avoiding the problematic "immediately." *Matthew*, 335-47. F. D. Bruner regards the material throughout as having "a double reference," i.e. both to the destruction of Jerusalem and the parousia of the Son of man. *Matthew*, 2:860-69. Without denying the typological connection between the events, I regard Bruner's approach as too easily bypassing the exegetical difficulties of the passage.

24. There are, as we have noted above, many possible interpretations of this clause. I mention a coming in judgment upon Jerusalem here because it fits best the time span referred to in the words "some standing here who will not taste death before they see." Among other popular interpretations are the transfiguration (which seems too soon to suit the time reference), the resurrection (e.g., 28:16–20, as a "coming to the church in an anticipated 'parousia'" [J. P. Meier, *Matthew,* NTM (Wilmington: Glazier, 1980) 188] or pentecost, but these too do not fit the time reference. For a history of the widely varying interpretations of the logion, see M. Künzi *Das Naherwartungslogion Markus 9,1 par,* BGBE 21 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1977).

25. On the language of 22:7, see B. Reicke, "Synoptic Prophecies on the Destruction of Jerusalem," in Studies in *New Testament and Early Christian Literature,* ed. D. Aune (Leiden: Brill, 1972) 121–34, here p. 123. For a recent impressive argument for a pre-70 date (65–67), see R. H. Gundry, *Matthew* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982) 599–609. See too, J. A. T. Robinson's comments on the date of Matthew in *Redating the New Testament* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1976) 102–107.

26. It is possible that the logia of vv 27 and 28 refer to different events. Cf. the note in the New Jerusalem Bible: "In vv. 27–28 two sayings of Jesus, each dealing with a different event, have been joined together because they have a common reference to the coming of the kingdom of

God: v. 27, the kingdom of the Father; v. 28, the kingdom of Christ."

27. B. S. Crawford, in a stimulating article, argues that the imminence sayings concerning the parousia "are community formulations reflecting the eschatological outlook of the early church as expressed in the utterances of its prophets." "Near Expectation in the Sayings of Jesus," *JBL* 101 (1982) 225–244, here 244.

The Significance of Matthew's Eschatology for Systematic Theology

Hans Schwarz

The Gospel according to Matthew is the longest canonical gospel. It has an extensive childhood narrative, includes the important Sermon on the Mount and concludes with the passion narrative and the commissioning of the disciples to evangelize in the name of the resurrected one. One would expect that this gospel also informs us about eschatology. Yet as soon as we look closely we notice that the term "eschatos" is only used a few times in that gospel (Mt 5:26; 12:45; 20:8ff.; 27:64).1 In none of these instances has the word any correlation to the term eschatology. This should not be surprising. Eschatology is not a term used in the Bible. The Latin term "Eschatologia" is used for the first time in 1644 by Philipp Heinrich Friedlieb and the German term "Eschatologie" for the first time by Christian Wilhelm Flügge in a treatise published between 1794-1800.2 How can we then determine how Matthew understood a term that was not used until the 17th or 18th century? Moreover, if we ask today, what is meant by eschatology we get very diverse answers. Clearly, even today there is no unanimity in what this concept ought to imply. When we read Matthew and other New Testament sources, we will notice that there is expressed a reality and an expectation which is not clearly defined and which also shifts in content and emphasis. One could describe this with the term "hope," which includes both an expectant attitude and expected events.3 In close correlation with the Matthean witness we could then describe eschatology in a comprehensive sense as a doctrine of the fulfilment, of Jesus' expected return (through his death!), and, going beyond Matthew, of his presence in the faithful through the Spirit. In a narrower sense eschatology would then only include a part of this hope, the return of Christ in the future, the final judgment, and the inauguration of a new creation, again with the latter one going beyond Matthew and gleaning this expectation from Paul. If we just take three points from this proposed preliminary definition, fulfilment, parousia, and final judgment, we will at once notice how difficult it is to ground systematic assertions in biblical scholarship.

1. The Problem of Grounding Systematic Assertions in Biblical Scholarship

While it was clear for the Reformers in the 16th century that the basis for any assertion in matters of faith was the Scripture, for us as heirs of the Enlightenment such immediate access to Scripture is no longer tenable. But even in the pre-Enlightenment era one did not use Scripture ndiscriminately. Martin Luther, for instance, who emphasized the priority of Scripture above everything else, established a canon within the canon, namely the Gospel according to St. John and Paul's letters to the Romans and to the Galatians to accentuate the biblical message and to highlight that which was significant for faith over against that which was more at the fringe and therefore peripheral. He had his own hermeneutic key to unlock the Bible. Similar to Paul Tillich's insistence that situation and message need to be correlated, Martin Luther brought his situational anxiety of how to obtain a gracious God to the Bible and received an answer from Scripture by accentuating some of its writings.

It seems beyond question that the respective situation of the reader and the biblical message must be correlated to each other so that the Bible can speak to the reader's situation. Yet how should this kind of correlating take place? Is our own situation to be interpreted in a different way through the biblical message or must our own situation also be open to change? Since it takes its cue from a certain hope, biblical eschatology seems to side with Karl Marx when he stated: "The philosophers have only interpreted the world in various ways; the point, however, is to change it."4 A correlation is more than a depiction of a status quo, it must be open for newness. The situation cannot just illumine the message and vice versa. We must be open to the same possibility when we relate our experience to the biblical witness. Friedrich Schleiermacher already noticed that "strictly speaking..., we can have no doctrine of the consumation of the Church, for our Christian consciousness has absolutely nothing to say regarding a condition so entirely outside our ken."5 Yet in the same breath he admitted: "None the less, these prophetic pictures fill a great place in the Church, and it is incumbent on us, before pronouncing for their exclusion from this exposition, to inquire as to their source." Eschatology is not something we experience in the present, therefore it is nearly impossible to extrapolate it from our present experience. Nevertheless,

as Schleiermacher admitted, eschatological assertions have had an amazing attractiveness within Christendom.

What should systematic theology then do? Should it confine itself to a historical approach, critically sifting through those eschatological developments in the Bible and bring them into a coherent whole? If God's self-disclosure did occur, it would be strange if such a self-disclosure were confined to Scripture. We have to be open to the possibility that God's self-disclosure is being refined and clarified throughout history. At the same time we should caution that not every thought which appears in the history of Christendom is true just because of its appearance. Given that we cannot uncritically accept every new idea, how do we decide what is normative? If we ask, "what can we hold true today?" our reason or our experience would become normative. As Schleiermacher saw (though he did not heed his own insight) the Christian consciousness has absolutely nothing to say concerning that which is basically outside itself. Unless we opt for arbitrariness in our judgments, that is, if we declare our reason or experience to be normative, we are forced back to Scripture as our starting point for reflection. As Schleiermacher noticed and as virtually all contemporary theologians have reiterated "we cannot ascribe the same value" to eschatology as we do to other doctrines.6 There has emerged an increasing distrust with regard to the content of eschatology. Rudolf Bultmann captured this sentiment most tellingly when he stated: "The mythical eschatology is untenable for the simple reason that the parousia of Christ never took place as the New Testament expected. History did not come to an end, and, as every schoolboy knows, it will continue to run its course."7 The expectation of an end of the world that Jesus and early Christianity shared has not come to fulfilment. History is still going on after nearly two thousand years. Rudolf Bultmann concludes that we cannot simply reiterate the New Testament eschatology because it is expressed in a mythical framework that is part of a worldview no longer held in the 20th century.8 This does not mean that we can discard it either. Instead of taking the apocalyptic imagery literally, we have to ask for its existential meaning. From the Pauline writings and the Gospel of John, Bultmann concludes that the decisive event has already occurred, that the turn of the aeons has happened in the coming of Jesus of Nazareth. Whoever believes in God's grace as exhibited in Christ is already a new creation. Also in the coming of Jesus judgment has occurred. A persons's commitment for - or against - Jesus determines whether one has entered life or has become prey to death. Whoever believes in Christ has a new self-understanding that, however, needs to be reassured ever again. With Bultmann eschatology renounced any future end and restricted itself to the present: "Ssalvation occurs then as a spiritual working-through of the misery which unfortunately is still present and remaining. Death will reign in all eternity, but we will learn to bear it."9 Jürgen Moltmann in the early 1960s revolted against such a Stoic epiphany of the eternal present and introduced the concept of promise as the leading eschatological category. Decisive for him is "the realization of the eschatological hope of justice, the humanizing of man, the socializing of humanity, peace for all creation.10 He no longer wants to confine eschatology to a discourse about the so-called last things which will happen at the end, but to consider the whole course of history which drives towards this end. Therefore the traditional contents of eschatology, such as the death of the individual and eternal life, or the final judgment and the new creation at the end, are no longer thematized. Moltmann rightly reminds us that eschatology leads to action instead of otherworldly passivity or resignation. Yet he shies away from saying what will await us once all the human struggle is over.

Here Wolfhart Pannenberg leads a decisive step further. He claims in his 1961 "Dogmatic Theses on the Doctrine of Revelation" that "the universal revelation of the deity of God is not yet realized in the history of Israel, but first in the destiny of Jesus of Nazareth, insofar as the end of all events is anticipated in his destiny."11 In Jesus the end of the world has occurred in proleptic anticipation.12 This means that that which had been anticipated as the end and fulfilment of history, the resurrection of the dead, in fact happened in a proleptic way in and with and through Jesus. Since history comes to its conclusion in the destiny of Jesus, this destiny is the key to our understanding of God's self-disclosure. The Christ-event has truly eschatological character, since there is no self-disclosure of God necessary beyond this event. At the end of the world there will occur on a cosmic scale what had happened in and with Jesus on an individual scale.

Jesus is the paradigm and the anticipation of our own future and at the same time the inspiration and possibility of living toward that future. Pannenberg, in contrast to Bultmann, maintains the necessity of a future completion of the world and of the resurrection of the dead. Since it is important for him to work within the context of world history, and not in a narrowly conceived faith version called salvation history, he emphasizes that the ramification of Jesus' life and destiny is not privy to secret knowledge but open to everyone who has eyes to see. If we follow Pannenberg then, the three eschatological items we singled out, fulfilment, parousia, and final judgment, are not antiquated items, which are irreconcilable with a modern worldview. On the contrary, fulfillment, parousia, and final judgment are still tenable today.

Before we can finally focus on the biblical account, we must note that New Testament scholarship, even in its most respectable form, poses a seemingly insurmountable barrier. Donald A. Hagner in his comprehensive-essay "Matthew's Eschatology" writes:
The evangelist, apparently in good company with others in the early church, may have been wrong about the time of the parousia. Although it has not been the concern of this paper to deal with the teaching of Jesus, insofar as it can be known, it may well be the case that he too associated the fall of Jerusalem with the end of the age and the coming of the Son of Man. This possibility would be consonant with his own admission of ignorance concerning the time of the consumation (24:36). On the other hand, it may well be that Jesus spoke of imminence (cf. the expressions 'this generation', 'those standing here') only in connection with the fall of Jerusalem, speaking of the parousia only in indeterminate language. In that case, the disciples would be responsible for confusing the imminence of the fall of Jerusalem with the coming of the end of the age.13 Hagner leaves us here with an option: either Jesus spoke of the parousia only in indeterminate language and the disciples then confused this with the imminence of the fall of Jerusalem, or Jesus himself associated the fall of Jerusalem with the end of the age and the coming of the Son of man. If the latter option were true, he was wrong about the time of the parousia. Of course, one could immediately concede that Jesus was human and such a mistake could happen to anyone.

But some mistakes are crucial whereas others hardly matter. If I wear the wrong necktie, this mistake may be forgiven, whereas if I use somebody else's credit card, this comes under the different verdict of fraud. If Jesus was wrong about the time of the parousia, he was not simply mistaken, but his whole message was a fraud. At that point we should take Albert Schweitzer more seriously. To determine which option is right, truth or fraud, let us look again at the sources.

2. Fulfilment, Parousia, and Final Judgment according to Matthew

It becomes quickly clear that without the Old Testament and the contemporary Jewish apocalyptic concepts of the endtime, Matthew's eschatology remains unintelligible. The genealogy in Mt 1:1-17 centering upon Abraham and David points to the one who is the fulfilment of the convenantal promises associated with both names. Without exaggeration one can say that "Matthew's stress on the theme of fulfilment is an obvious characteristic of the Gospel."14 The history of God with his people was supposed to come to fulfilment in the post-exilic period. It is the special merit of apocalyptic thought that it did not give up the hope of Israel which is concretized in God's promises in history. The birth and infancy narratives in Matthew are intended to show within this apparently promissory context that through God's doing a new era has been inaugurated. While in the Old Testament the question remains open as to how God has brought his history with Israel to a conclusion, the New Testament (especially Matthew) explicitly state that the Messiah has been born. Thus, on the one hand, God's history with Israel has been concluded, but, on the other hand, a history of the coming kingdom is inaugurated. This is confirmed again in the ministry of Jesus, whose words and deeds point to the coming of the kingdom of God. Jesus' proclamation of the kingdom of God can be seen as the foundation of New Testament eschatology and beyond that of Christian eschatology in general. Jesus carries on the ministry of John the Baptist proclaiming, "repent, for the kingdom of heaven has come near" (Mt 4:17; 3:2), a message that is supposed to be continued by Jesus' disciples (Mt 10:7).

Jesus enunciates the coming kingdom especially through parables. The main content of his expectation is the coming of God to judge the world and to complete it and bring it to perfection (Mt 13). Since the

kingdom is near, the call for repentance is of utmost urgency. Therefore the ethical teachings as they are especially brought to the fore in the Sermon on the Mount cannot be compromised. Albert Schweitzer rightly reminded us that this interim ethic is an integral part of Jesus' proclamation and expectation. The coming of the kingdom is also illustrated by Jesus' actions since they are prophetic signs pointing to the kingdom's coming, anticipating it, and propelling it forward.

But the question must be addressed when the kingdom is supposed to come. Two options are introduced here: a realized eschatology and a future eschatology. But one can differentiate even further: 1. The kingdom is coming soon (Mt 4:17). 2. The kingdom is present (Mt 12:28). 3. There are signs which pertain to the coming end (Mt 24). 4. The kingdom will still come in this generation (Mt 12:28). 5. Only the Father knows when the kingdom will come (cf. Mt 24:36). - If the coming of the kingdom is an event, then the time factor concerning its occurence cannot be excluded. If the kingdom were simply present with Jesus' coming the story could quickly conclude and it would be hard to understand why the Gospel would devote that much space to the passion, death and resurrection of Jesus. This means that the presence of the kingdom is for Matthew not simply a fact that would signal that Jesus' mission could be marked off as fulfilled. Rather the presence of the kingdom is something that pushes on toward the future. But how far will it go? The clue comes from the passion narrative, since it was written from the standpoint of fulfilled prophecy.

Not in the birth of Jesus, not in his words and actions, but in his death do we find the fulfilment of the messianic promises, the final judgment and the creation of a new world.15 In the account of Jesus' death we hear hints (Mt 27:40-54) of the signs of the end. We hear about the darkness that came over the whole old earth, we hear about Elijah who was supposed to come at the endtime, and we hear that at the moment of Jesus' death the temple is symbolically destroyed with the tearing apart of the curtain. Moreover the earth shook and the rocks were split. The old earth tumbles and a new creation occurs: "The tombs also were opened, and many bodies of the saints who had fallen asleep were raised. After his resurrection they came out of the tombs and entered the holy city and appeared to many" (Mt 27:52f.). Small wonder that the centurion testifies: "Truly this man was God's Son!" (Mt 27:54). The events of which Matthew writes show that in Jesus' death on the cross the expected events had occurred.

The very fact that in Matthew's Gospel such an ending was accepted shows that the Christian community agreed that Jesus was no fraud. The expectations carried over from the Old Testament found their fulfilment in him. Yet they were fulfilled in a paradoxical way in the catastrophe of the cross. The sign of defeat was understood by the Christians as a sign of fulfilment. The resurrection was no cover up of the cross, but its continuation, signifying that this death was the starting point of new life. The resurrection of Jesus as the Christ is not a proof but part of the salvational significance of Jesus. While the followers of Jesus expected the final judgment in which God will judge everyone, there occurred the death of Jesus. Instead of confronting us with our sins, Jesus suffered innocently for the sins of human depravity. Since Jesus' followers expected the inauguration of a new world, the resurrection of Jesus as the Christ was understood as the break-through to new life. Expected was God's coming to his people and there Jesus as God's embodiment was in their midst.

While Jesus' scattered followers were gathered again under the impression that God had decisively acted, the debate ensued as to whether this fulfilment was all that was supposed to come. Once the issue of fulfilment had been settled, the question emerged of the so-called parousia of Christ. In this context it is interesting that Matthew emphasizes how important it is to fulfill God's will. We hear for instance in the Lord's Prayer, "Your will be done, on earth at it is in heaven," (Mt 6:10), a phrase which is missing in Luke. Matthew has added a third petition to the first two emphasizing even more that the final fulfilment may come, the hour in which God's desecrated and misused name will be glorified.16 The Christian community which prays this knows that the turning point has commenced. God's gracious salvific work has begun and now the praying community is asking for the full disclosure of that which has already been given. Similarly, according to Matthew, it asks in the final petition for the definite rescue from the power of the evil one.17 Apparently salvation is not yet fully present. Though God's name is sanctified in heaven, this is not yet the case on earth. Yet God's kingdom is not a half-baked item. It has to spread

beyond heaven to earth and to the whole universe. Small wonder that the faithful are urged to be watchful. The recognition that Jesus is the Messiah necessitates the complete fulfilment of the salvific process. It must be complemented with the parousia. Christology necessarily leads to eschatology so that God will be all in all. It should make us wonder why, neither in Matthew nor in the other gospels, we can discern a disappointment by the Christians over the supposed delay of the parousia. There was nothing to be disappointed about. There was rather a fierce debate, which is most pronounced in 1 Cor, of whether there is more to come other than the decisive Christ-event. This debate is still going on today. Yet why should we, after nearly two thousand years, still expect something beyond the Christ event? Why still bother with the parousia?

3. The parousia of Christ as the sum total of all

John A.T. Robinson, in his book Jesus and His Coming: The Emergence of a Doctrine, sees no evidence in the teaching of Jesus or in the earliest preaching and creeds of the church, that there should be a parousia, a second advent of Christ after a certain time has elapsed. Yet he detects an unresolved crisis in the christology of the early church: Has the messianic event taken place? Has the Christ come? The crisis was overcome with a compromise: "Part of it had taken place and part of it had not, the Christ had come and yet would come."18 Thus the messianic drama has two main parts separated by an interval. While Robinson rightly reminds us that Christ's first coming at "Christmas" and his last coming in the final parousia form a unity and must be equally emphasized, we have a hard time finding the crisis in the christology of the early church of which Robinson speaks. Jesus would have never been accorded the multitude of messianic titles had he not been conceived of as the Messiah. Matthew would not have bothered trying to establish the continuity between the promises of old and the subsequent fulfilment in Jesus' life and ministry. There was no doubt that Jesus was the Messiah. Where debate came in was whether more was to be expected than that which Jesus had ushered in with his life and destiny. Here the New Testament followed the Old Testament promissory history which envisioned that some day God would be Lord over his people and they would enjoy a life of total harmony with him unrestrained by any anti-godly powers and destructions. The promise at the conclusion of Matthew, "I am with you always, to the end of the age," urges us on to the vision in the Book of Revelation, "See, the home of God is among mortals. He will dwell with them as their God; they will be his peoples, and God himself will be with them; he will wipe every tear from their eyes. Death will be no more; mourning and crying and pain will be no more, for the first things have passed away" (Rev 21:3f.). This is still our situation today.

While both church and individual believers witness to the spiritual presence of a new creation, the boundless misery in today's world and the resistance of evil against God call for a final resolution. Neither spiritualization of the eschatological goal nor amelioration of present conditions nor a whole-hearted opposition to all evil forces can usher in salvation and the visible rule of God. The only possible solution is the final victory of God over these powers and their decisive banishment. As Jesus tells the disciples of John the Baptist, death and human suffering are not part of the new world to come (Mt 11:4ff.). Matthew's preference for the term "kingdom of heaven" over "kingdom of God" may be out of respect for Jewish piety, but it could also signify that this kingdom transcends earthly reality. It is not part of the present world as we experience it today.

But the new created order, which is being ushered in by the returning Christ, will make an end to all misery and suffering. For this reason the great creeds of Christendom emphasize the return of Christ to judge the living and the dead, the resurrection of the body, and life everlasting. Strangely enough they do not mention a twofold outcome of history and eternal fire and brimstone. Christians take their cue from the Christ event. Without condoning universalism, they believe in salvation and not in damnation. Corresponding with this conviction and perhaps influencing it, the Gospel of Matthew also concludes with the command for mission and not for drawing lines between believers and unbelievers. It is convinced that Jesus is the Messiah, the gateway to the kingdom and also its inaugurator. Without this fervently proclaimed hope the gospel would lose itsdistinctiveness and power.

1 Cf. Gerhard Kittel, "eschatos," in ThWBNT 2:694.2 According to Sigurd Hjelde, Das Eschaton und die Eschata (München: Christian Kaiser, 1987), 37 and 97.3 We follow here and at many other places the illuminating deliberations by Friedrich Beißer, Hoffnung und Vollendung: Handbuch Systematischer Theologie (Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1993), 15:223.4 Karl Marx, "Theses on Feuerbach," in Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, On Religion, intr. R. Niebuhr (New York: Schocken, 1964), 72.
5 Friedrich Schleiermacher, The Christian Faith, ed. H.R. Mackintosh and J.S. Stewart (New York: Harper Torchbook, 1963), 2:697, for this and the following quote.6 Ibid., 703.7 Rudolf Bultmann in his programmatic essay, "The New Testament and Mythology," in Kerygma and Myth: A Theological Debate, ed. Hans Werner Bartsch, trans. R.H. Fuller (London: SPCK, 1953), 1:5.8 Cf. for the following Hans Schwarz, On the Way to the Future: A Christian Eschatology in the Light of Current Trends in Religion, Philosophy, and Science, rev. ed. (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1979), 83ff.
9 So Friedrich Beißer, op. cit., 215.10 Jürgen Moltmann, Theology of Hope: On the Ground and the Implication of a Christian Eschatology, trans. J.W. Leitch (New York: Harper, 1967), 329.11 Wolfhart Pannenberg, "Dogmatic Theses on the Doctrine of Revelation", in Revelation as History, ed. W. Pannenberg, trans. D. Granskou (New York: Macmillan, 1968), 139 (thesis 4, own. trans.)
12 For the following cf. Hans Schwarz, op. cit., 96ff.13 Donald A. Hagner, "Matthews's Eschatology," in To Tell the Mystery: Essays on New Testament Eschatology in Honor of Robert H. Gundry, ed. Thomas E. Schmidt and Moises Silva, JSNTSup 100 (Sheffield: ISOT Press, 1994), 70.14 Ibid., 50.15 For the following cf. Friedrich Beißer, op. cit., 233ff.16 Cf. Joachim Jeremias, Das Vater-unser im Lichte der neueren Forschung (Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1962), 21.17 Ibid., 28.18 John A.T. Robinson, Jesus and His Coming: The Emergence of a Doctrine (London: SCM, 1957), 142.

Reading The Book Of Isaiah As Christian Scripture

Roy F. Melugin
Austin College

In July, 1967, shortly after the Six Day War in which the Israelis took possession of the ancient holy sites in Jerusalem, Rabbi Abraham Joshua Heschel wrote excitedly about the new state of affairs (Heschel, 1971: 5-38). "It is as if the prophets had risen from their graves," he wrote (p. 5). He portrayed Jewish martyrs sitting at heaven's gates as "having refused to enter the world to come lest they forget Israel's pledge," the pledge in Psalm 137 never to forget Jerusalem (p.6). But they need wait no longer. The ancient promises have been fulfilled: God has comforted Jerusalem (Isa 40:1-2; 52:9). For centuries Jews would tear their garments in their vision of Jerusalem in ruins, but after Auschwitz and Dachau, Bergen-Belsen and Treblinka there was nothing left to tear. Now, however, the widow Jerusalem was once again a bride (pp. 14-17).

Rabbi Heschel used scripture with astonishing power. The biblical tradition gave meaning to the Six Day War. Indeed, it was the biblical tradition and its significance for Judaism which enabled this military victory to evoke such spiritual transformation in the life of a scholarly rabbi. How could those ancient texts work so powerfully? Heschel knew quite well that the biblical texts which spoke to him so forcefully were not written with 1967 in mind. He knew that Isaiah 40-55 was written about the Babylonian exile in the sixth century BCE and not about CE 1967. But that not insignificant fact diminished not in the slightest the spiritual power of those words on Rabbi Heschel during the events of 1967.

The Bible spoke to Heschel with tremendous force because he lived in a symbolic world populated by the scriptures. Its stories, its images, its laments, its expressions of hope, its torah, and much, much more constituted the spiritual world in which Heschel dwelt and through which he interpreted the world of space and time in which he lived. He was aware that he was not approaching these texts as entities to be studied with dispassionate neutrality but rather as dynamic traditions to be used as part of his community's repertoire for spiritual transformation.

It might seem strange that I introduced an essay about reading Isaiah as Christian scripture with the testimony of a Jewish rabbi. I

chose to begin with Heschel because of his passionate use of scripture to interpret the events of his own time. Both Judaism and Christianity have again and again reinterpreted their scriptures over the centuries to shape the identity and behavior of those communities. Thus interpreters of Isaiah as Christian scripture should recognize that there never would have been any interpretation of Isaiah which we could call Christian without experiences which called forth new readings of Isaiah for a community gathered around Jesus Christ.

I

I understand the enterprise of reading Isaiah as Christian scripture with as many practical concerns as theoretical considerations. I am interested in practical matters because I believe we are now in a cultural context in which a large number of Christians, both liberal and conservative, live more by secular myths than by Christian tradition. Many of my liberal Christian friends hardly know the scriptures, while many of my conservative biblically-literate Christian friends are governed to a large extent by a myth of social contract which leads them to be more committed to following the gospel of the pursuit of individual self-interest than to understanding themselves as a part of the family of the children of God, who have familial responsibilities to all their sisters and brothers in God's family. All the while the community of biblical scholars tends to be preoccupied more with pursuing the questions generated in the university than with addressing the life and death issues which the contemporary church faces.

My intent here is certainly not to pronounce as irrelevant the serious work which biblical scholars perform. Even less do I want to leave the impression that I would settle for a lowering of the quality of biblical scholarship. What I do advocate is increased attention to hermeneutical paradigms which are concerned directly with the use of scripture to shape the life of present-day communities of faith. In order to promote a hermeneutical dialogue of that kind I shall present below some hermeneutical principles which I think might be useful in the use of books such as Isaiah in the Christian community.

A. If the church's scriptures are to guide the church, what the scriptures are to do to shape the life of the church is of utmost importance. To explain what the scriptures meant is insufficient. The scriptures must be used to do something, namely, to shape the

church's relationship with God and to aid the church in creating just and loving relationships among human beings.

A performative-language hermeneutic is important for the purposes I have in mind (Austin, 1962; Searle, 1970). All of us know from the results of redaction-historical studies that redactors readily constructed fresh meanings for older texts in order to shape the life of communities of faith in new situations. As the book of Isaiah grew, older passages were reinterpreted in order to enable the community to deal with new circumstances. And New Testament writers also constructed new meanings for Isaiah in order to shape the life of the community gathered in the name of Jesus Christ. They were not confined by past meanings in their use of the text.

Today's community of biblical scholars has been influenced by the widespread tradition originating in the ancient Western philosophical conviction that language reflects reality. In particular, traditions rooted in the Enlightenment have led to the development of a guild of biblical scholars who have been taught to represent as accurately as possible the meanings and intentions of the authors of biblical texts. Biblical writers, however, were not acquainted with the Hellenic philosophers' understanding of the correspondence between language and reality. They were more concerned to do something with language (a performative use of language) than they were to explain or describe reality. Performative language theory with its emphasis on use allows us to connect meaning with use and not simply with "original meaning."

It is by no means my intent to eschew all attempts to construct descriptions of past textual meanings. But description of past meanings is not an end in itself. Although such descriptions may often be useful, they must be subordinate; they must be subordinate to the use of scripture in the formation of obedience and faithfulness in the church.

B. One of the performative functions of scripture is the construction of a symbolic world which can shape the life of the Christian community. Everyone lives in a symbolic world--a world of stories, images, and other traditions which shape that person's identity. Stories about George Washington and Abraham Lincoln, stories and proverbs with "Horatio Alger" themes, cowboy movies, political speeches extolling the "self-made" person, and much more constitute the symbolic world which has shaped the identity of many

persons as citizens of the United States. The Bible and other church traditions have shaped the life of the Christian community. As George Lindbeck has shown, the symbolic world of a given religion heritage is a "cultural-linguistic tradition," i.e., the result of particular cultural traditions mediated through language (Lindbeck, 1984: ch. 2). And Paul Ricoeur has taught us the figurative character of symbolic worlds (Ricoeur, 1980: 98-104).

The book of Isaiah can be a significant part of the symbolic world of a community of faith. I know of no religious community, however, whose symbolic world is constituted by Isaiah alone. The use of Isaiah in a community of faith generally takes place in the context of that community's canon of scripture and of other traditions as well. Use of Isaiah in Judaism will be generally conditioned by Talmudic and other rabbinic traditions which are important parts of the cultural-linguistic heritage of Judaism, whereas New Testament texts dramatically influence the construction of symbolic worlds in the Christian community and will therefore color the interpretation and use of Isaiah in the church.

C. A symbolic world is not something which exists <u>in</u> the text but is instead a construct created by interpreters of the text. As we saw, Jews and Christians construct somewhat different symbolic worlds; thus the worlds they will create in reading Isaiah will undoubtedly differ in some respects.

Why is one's symbolic world necessarily a construct? This is so first of all because no reader has direct access to the mind of an author <u>or</u> unmediated access to a text. Whenever we interpret a text, it is <u>we</u> who determine which questions to ask of the text; <u>we</u> use whatever skills we have been taught to determine which questions are important to pose. There is no interpretation which is not to some significant extent the creation of the interpreter (Fish, 1980: 1-17, 303-21).

Interpretations of past meanings are also interpreters' constructs. As Hayden White has shown, the historical interpreter must decide what elements from the historian's sources to include or exclude in describing the past (White, 1978: 51). Moreover, the historian must also use inferences or speculation to narrate the past; he or she must "emplot" the past, i.e., construct a plot by means of which the entire narrative of the past can hang together (White, 61ff.).

Synchronic interpretations of texts are also interpreters' constructs. For example, Marvin Sweeney divides the book of Isaiah into two major parts (chs. 1-33, 34-66), whereas he might have constructed it somewhat differently, e.g., with backward and forward movements as opposed to Sweeney's linear and hierarchical conceptualization of structure (Sweeney, 1996a: 39-48; see the critique of Sweeney by Sheppard, 1992: 555-57). Sweeney's structural proposals are indeed impressive, yet they are his creation rather than something inherent in the text. To be sure, not all proposals of structure would necessarily be of equal standing. A proposal must be shown to "fit" the text. Yet it seems likely that two quite sophisticated but different portrayals of structure might fit the text equally well.

Katheryn Pfisterer Darr has presented an interpretation of Isaiah based on a reading of figurative speech on the part of the interpreter (Darr, 1994). She is quite explicit in her contention that she has constructed her interpretation of Isaiah (pp. 23-45). Indeed, one might argue, we know so little about how ancient Israelites interpreted figurative speech that any interpretations of tropes in Isaiah which we propose will inevitably be our creations based on how we have been trained in our time to interpret figurative language.

Even though the meanings which we "find" in Isaiah will be in no small measure our own constructs, we must continue to show that they "fit." We must be aware, however, that, in interpreting Isaiah for use in the Christian community, "fit" is related not only to the text of Isaiah itself but also to the context and purposes for which the text is used.

D. If we are to concern ourselves with "fitting" use of Isaiah as Christian scripture, we must recognize that a "fitting" interpretation of Isaiah in that context could not simply be one that would fit, let us say, in a fifth or fourth century BCE context.

Much of the Isaianic language which the Christian community must quite appropriately reinterpret is language of promise. Walther Zimmerli has shown us that the language of promise in ancient Israel functioned in such a way that there was no univocal relationship between the meaning of a particular promise as originally uttered and what was understood as fulfillment of that

promise (Zimmerli, 1963: 89-122). Promises were performative utterances (my terminology, not Zimmerli's) which helped create history in that they were vehicles of language which led Israel on a journey which actually shaped their history as they anticipated fulfillments of the promises (pp. 98-99). In ever-new historical situations promises already fulfilled could once again function as promises (p. 112). For example, the promise of the land, fulfilled in Joshua's time, could once again function as promise and be given new interpretation--in the time of the Babylonian exile, later on in the diaspora, in modern Zionism, and even by Heschel in the events of 1967. What are construed as fulfillments of promises do not necessarily correspond to the language of the promises literally understood (Zimmerli, 112).

Why is this so? It is because promises are not predictions. Predictions are true or false, whereas promises are fulfilled or unfulfilled. A weather forecaster predicts the weather rather than promising it; and the predictions are true or false. I promised to be faithful to my wife instead of predicting faithfulness. My promise to her is neither true nor false but fulfilled or unfulfilled. Many years ago I promised my father that I would care for him in his old age and show him my love. Little did I know then that in fulfilling my promise I would have to force him to leave his home and make him see me as cruel and uncaring. I was faithful to my promise but in ways which differed from the letter of my earlier language of promise.

And so it is with biblical promises. Communities of faith later than the time of the completion of the book of Isaiah cannot use many Isaianic promises as originally construed; they must be reinterpreted. Indeed, the Christian community must use the admonitions and exhortations, the announcements of judgments and the promises in the book of Isaiah as testimonies to the righteousness of God which are to be used to shape the church's life (Hays, 1989: 183). The church as a community gathered around Jesus Christ must reinterpret Isaiah for its own life.

The church must also feel free to read Isaiah typologically. Christians who use Isaiah to speak to the church belong to none of the Israelite tribes, do not wish for the glorification of the Temple mountain (Isa 2:1-4), do not yearn to live in the promised land (see Isa 40:3-5, 9-11; 49:14-26), do not belong to the historical people Israel. Yet the Hebrew Bible never loses its ties to these historical

realities. Christians cannot identify with the centrality of Jerusalem to their identity as people of God, as does the book of Isaiah; Christians cannot share existentially in a promise to return to Jerusalem and regard its rebuilding as central to their existence as does Isaiah 40-66. Such imagery can become a part of a Christian's symbolic world through typology (see von Rad, 1963: 35).

Typology exists within the ancient Israelite scriptures, such as in the use of the Exodus imagery in Isaiah 40-55. Within ancient Israel the use of typology tends to be closely tied to concrete historical and geographical realities, such as a physical deliverance from bondage (as in Isa 40-55) or a return home to particular geographical locales, e.g., Palestine, the city Jerusalem. Concrete historical realities such as those described above are often used in the Christian community to prefigure what the church has experienced in its life in Jesus Christ (von Rad, 1963: 36). The historical fate of Jerusalem as bride and mother cannot be of central significance for Christian life; but such imagery, tied to a particular city in the concreteness of Israel's history, can prefigure aspects of the Christian community's life. Because the church sees itself as an historical community in continuity with Israel and its history, the events and symbolic traditions which shaped and reshaped Israel's story-world can shape the symbolic story-world of the church.

E. Another of the performative functions of scripture in both Judaism and Christianity is its role as <u>precedent</u> in shaping the life of the community. The rabbinic tradition uses torah as precedent. Narratives can also function as precedents. The behavior of Abraham in the narrative of the near-sacrifice of Isaac, for example, can be used as a precedent for how to behave especially in boundary situations, e.g., in times when faithfulness could lead to martyrdom. Isaianic texts which concern themselves with questions of justice and injustice can be used by communities of faith in many different historical contexts as precedents for the community's behavior. Or Isaianic traditions about the place of Gentiles in relationship with Israelites can be employed as precedents in the life of communities of faith in many circumstances in various periods of history.

Using a text as precedent involves applying it in situations different from that for which the precedent was originally intended. For example, Isaiah's messianic expectation clearly involves the messianic king's authoritative rule to establish justice in society (Ps. 72:1-4; Isa 9:6). How should the church use these texts as

precedents? Should the church use these particular passages to color the church's understanding of Jesus as messiah? How should traditions of messiah as strong ruler who creates a just social order be compared with messiah as suffering servant whose power seems not to be one of political strength? How should the church weigh these different precedents in deciding which emphases take priority? More about this later.

To sum up: Reading Isaiah as Christian scripture requires a somewhat different hermeneutic from one in which Isaiah is interpreted as an ancient Israelite book. To be sure, because the church sees itself as in historical continuity with Israel and its story, the church has a theological stake in reading Isaiah in its ancient context, namely, in its original place in the story which the church confesses. But that cannot be the last word, for Isaiah must be used to help the Christian community shape its own life. The church must use Isaiah to construct its own symbolic world: It employs Isaiah typologically; it construes Isaianic promises as fulfilled in its own life; it employs tropes in Isaiah to shape its own relationships with God and the world. And it uses Isaianic precedents for the church to evaluate critically its own life and behavior.

II

My purposes in this essay are not limited to a reconstrual of the book of Isaiah for use in the Christian community in generic terms. Use of scripture in communities of faith must be concrete and particular. There are admittedly some typicalities in the ways one might expect Isaiah to be used in Judaism as opposed to Christianity. There are undoubtedly ways in which Heschel's use of scripture in 1967 is typically Jewish, but what he does is also particular, i.e., related to the new historical realities after the Six Day War. We may also expect Christian uses of scripture to be similarly particular and concrete.

Because this essay is as concerned with practical matters of use of scripture for transformation of the church in concrete contexts as it is to engage in general theoretical reflection, I have decided to illustrate the performative usage of Isaiah in the Christian community by creating an imaginary Christian congregation which uses Isaiah to shape its life. In so doing, I shall expand upon a fictive portrayal which I have already developed for publication elsewhere (Melugin, "The Book of Isaiah and the Construction of Meaning,"

forthcoming). I have in mind an imaginary community of white Christians in Atlanta or Chicago or Dallas who make extensive use of the book of Isaiah to confront the racism in the larger community in which they live and also in their own congregation. Their church building is located in what was once an all-white neighborhood which has now become almost entirely African-American. Many in the congregation want to use congregational energy and financial resources for ministry to the surrounding neighborhood, which is now largely poverty-stricken. But some influential people do not want to minister to African-Americans, and they resist using their financial resources and church building for purposes other than activities for middle-class persons. Moreover, several persons in the congregation benefit financially as "slum landlords" over homes in the neighborhood which have been allowed to deteriorate.

This congregation in its use of Isaiah could see themselves as foolish children of God who unlike ox and ass who know their owner and the master's crib, do not have understanding (Isa 1:2-3). They can indeed see themselves as stubborn and rebellious children (Isa 1:4-9) whose land has been eaten by aliens so that they are like a booth in a vineyard, like a lodge in a cucumber patch, like a besieged city (Isa 1:8, RSV). Their neighborhood has actually been devoured by aliens--by African-Americans who have occupied the neighborhood and left the white congregation like a besieged fortress in a surrounding land occupied by invaders. Moreover, they see themselves as not having learned from their experiences. As a congregation they have suffered because of the intransigence and insensitivity of some of their members. They are bruised from head to foot, as it were (Isa 1: 5-6), from the wounds in the congregation which resulted from the perceived "eating" of their neighborhood by the "aliens" who took over. Many fled the congregation, so that those who were left could say (prompted by Isaiah) that if God had not left them a "few survivors" they would have been completely destroyed (Isa 1:9).

The striking parallels between Isaiah 1:4-9 and the experiences of this congregation are in some sense coincidental, though the parallels allow the potential of using this passage with special force. Nevertheless, the destruction of a congregation is scarcely the same as the devastation of Judah and the threat of the extinction of Jerusalem. Even though the particularity of the wounds to that congregation were important to them, what happens to a particular Christian congregation cannot have the same symbolic significance as

would the destruction of Judah and Jerusalem in ancient Israel. The relationship between the two are typological; yet the typology aids this congregation in using Isaiah to construct a symbolic world in which it can live.

The prophetic torah speech in Isaiah 1:10-17 can contribute more to the church's construction of a symbolic world. God rejects the sacrifices which Israel offers; the divine Father rejects their cultic meals and wants instead for them to plead for the legal rights of widow and orphan (see Melugin, 1996). Could not this text be used to shed light on our imaginary congregation's eucharistic meal? By living in a symbolic world constructed through their serious reading of Isaiah, might they not see themselves as judged in their eucharistic "eating" fellowship because they do not seek justice for the poor in their church's neighborhood? Might they not see themselves on trial (Isa 1:18-20) and asked to choose between obedience and the concomitant "eat(ing) the good of the land" and rebellion and being "eaten" by the sword (see Whedbee, 1971: 29, 42-43 and Sweeney, 1996a: 63-67, concerning the imagery of trial)?

This fictive Christian community might also understand itself as faithful-city-turned harlot because of its failure to deal with racism and injustice (Isa 1:21-26). It might see itself as standing under God's judgment but with the hope of being purified (see vv. 24-26), as being redeemed by acts of justice (see v. 27). And those who "repent" will be redeemed. Indeed, the Isaianic theology of a remnant can well become part of the symbolic world in which this imaginary Christian congregation lives.

Isaiah 2-4 might well sharpen and deepened this community's life in relation to God's desire for justice. Elders and princes are judged for oppressing the poor (see Isa 3:13-15). Indeed God's paramount interest in the health of the body politic (see Isa 1:21-26) becomes more clearly seen when God's judgment takes the form of the collapse of community because God removes mighty man, warrior, judge, prophet and other leaders of society and they are replaced by babes and women (Isa 3:1-12). Yet their symbolic world, which includes redemption of the community through those who repent (Isa 1:27), can be made still richer through the promise of the deliverance of a remnant and its being made holy through the washing away of the filth of the daughters of Zion (Isa 4:1-5). Our imaginary community could indeed understand its hope for the future as based on a remnant of those who repent (Isa 1:27). Their

impurities will be removed as with smelting or with lye (see Isa 1:24-26) and their filth washed away (Isa 4:1-5). The purging of this community of faith and the remnant which is left can be seen as the future of this fictive church and the establishment of a ministry of justice. All this will not be easy; the remnant will not emerge unscathed but will experience agony and pain in the church's redemption, like the stump of a tree which is burned and burned again (see Isa 6:13).

The opening of Isaiah 2 (vv. 2-4) and its vision of the teaching of torah to all nations at Mt. Zion can become a part of the Christian community's vision of justice and peace. Its apparent analogy to Mosaic Torah as understood in the reform of Ezra (see Sweeney, 1996b) cannot be the ultimate horizon for this text's use in the Christian community; understandings of torah such as those expressed in Matthew 5 and in the priority of the commands to love God and neighbor (see Matt 22:34-40) manifest a hermeneutic regarding torah to which Christians might give serious consideration. Moreover, the focus on Zion as a particular geographical locale in Isaiah 2:2-4 and in ancient Israel (and also in Judaism) would have to be reconstrued in the Christian community--perhaps in typological terms with the temple in Jerusalem as expressing symbolically the locale of the throne of God (see, for example, Isa 6:1). The vision of "all nations"--not simply the community of the elect--learning justice and peace through God's torah is surely of importance to the Christian community. Our fictive Christian congregation could indeed understand Isaiah 2:2-4 as illumining its own calling as a community with a word which leads to justice and peace for the "nations," i.e., all persons in their neighborhood regardless of religious orientation.

The Isaianic messianic vision (9:5-6 [English, vv. 6-7]; 11:1-9; 32:1-8) emphasizes the promised king's role in establishing justice in the social and political order. To be sure, there appears to be an implied contrast between Ahaz and the promised new king; moreover, Hezekiah seems to be portrayed as the righteous king who fulfills these promises (see the discussion of Isa 36-38 by Sweeney, 1996a: 458). Yet Isaiah 11:1-9 seems to be too utopian in outlook to be seen as completely fulfilled by Hezekiah (see Seitz, 1993: 1-5). Furthermore, the Hezekiah narrative in Isaiah 36-38 does not reflect the emphasis on justice which we find in Isaiah 9:5-6, 11:1-9, and 32:1-8.

The Christian church has traditionally understood Israel's messianic promises to be fulfilled in Jesus. Yet New Testament texts focus mostly on servant passages in so-called "Second Isaiah;" Isaiah 9:1-6, 11:1-9, and 32:1-8 are almost completely absent in New Testament messianic references (see the usage of Isa 9:1-2 in Matt 4:15-16). Thus Isaiah 9:5-6, 11:1-9, and 32:1-8 can contribute an understanding of the role of justice in a Christian symbolic world's picture of the messianic rule which New Testament texts do not provide. If, after all, the love commandments are the weightiest of all the commandments (Matt 22:34-40), a ministry of love would require justice. This is why the messianic age must be understood as necessitating justice in the church and in the larger human community, even if this theme is not prominent in the New Testament. In the context of racism and poverty in our imaginary church's context, connecting the community of the messianic age with justice is of great importance, and messianic texts in Isaiah are a significant resource.

The church has traditionally connected texts in Isaiah 40-55 and 61 with the messianic age, especially these texts which concern themselves with the servant of the Lord--even though the servant is not explicitly said to be a messianic figure (Melugin, 1976: 64-74). In particular, the interpretation of Isaiah 53 in our imaginary church has been colored by the interpretation of Isaiah 53 in Christian tradition. And, in our particular fictive community and its concern about racism, Martin Luther King's specifically Christian understanding of suffering love has affected the way this church community has read Isaiah 53 and has applied Isaiah 53 to an understanding of how oppressed persons can suffer for the sins of oppressors. Moreover, King's Christian vision has helped them read the language about the servant's being afflicted without opening his mouth and his undergoing suffering without doing violence (Isa 53:7-9) as visionary language which can lead to redemption and reconciliation in the political sphere of race relations and concern about poverty. All of this is done in the context of a Christian rereading of Isaiah which differs in significant ways from what we would construe a fifth or fourth century Israelite interpretation to mean.

Our fictive Christian community might understand itself to be metaphorically in exile (see Brueggemann, 1988: 73-74). The Christian church might encourage such a figurative reading, whereas an ancient Israelite interpretation would remain closely tied to the

particular historical situation of the Babylonian exile. The relationship between the ancient Israelite reading and that of our imaginary Christian community is typological. The Isaianic emphasis on the return to Jerusalem and the rebuilding of the city refers to a particular city in a particular geographical location, while a Christian typological usage of this language can be of a trope less tied to historical and geographical reality. Our fictive church community can use this language typologically to create rich figures of speech about exile and return to Zion which can powerfully shape the community's identity and behavior.

To conclude: Our imaginary church is able to use Isaiah to construct its identity as a Christian community and to shape its way of relating to God in its calling to promote justice in its particular locale. Isaiah has helped them to see that their own community of faith has been and still is divided by injustice (Isa 1:21-31; 59:2ff). It still waits for the justice which is still not fully present (see Isa 59:11; Conrad, 1991: 103-106). On the one hand, it is to be a suffering community modeled on Isaiah 53--a community which is willing to suffer for the redemption of the neighborhood in which it is located. But it is not as apolitical as the suffering Jesus who is its Lord. It considers the Isaianic precedents of the messiah and servant who brings justice (Isa 9:5-6; 11:1-9; 32:1-8; 42:1-4) to be especially weighty precedents for shaping its own mission in the social and political context in which it exists. Indeed, it sees the Isaianic emphasis upon a just social and political order to be of particular significance for its own calling.

Lamentably this essay has had to deal all too briefly with the problem of reading Isaiah as Christian scripture. This has been so partly because of limitation of space. But it is also the case that, after a long period in which what scripture meant has been nearly the only game in town, we are having to walk in partial darkness to rediscover how to understand what scripture means as it speaks to communities of faith in various contexts generation in and generation out.

Bibliography

Austin, J. L.
1970 How to Do Things With Words. New York: Oxford.

Brueggemann, Walter
1988 Second Isaiah: An Evangelical Rereading of Communal Experience. Pp. 71-90 in Reading and Preaching the Book of Isaiah. Edited by Christopher R. Seitz; Philadelphia: Fortress.

Conrad, Edgar W.
1991 Reading Isaiah. Minneapolis: Fortress.

Darr, Katheryn Pfisterer
1994 Isaiah's Vision and the Family of God. Louisville: Westminster John Knox.

Fish, Stanley
1980 Is There a Text in This Class: The Authority of Interpretive Communities. Cambridge, MA: Harvard.

Hays, Richard B.
1989 Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul. New Haven and London: Yale.

Heschel, Abraham Joshua
1971 Israel: An Echo of Eternity. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Lindbeck, George A.
1984 The Nature of Doctrine: Religion and Theology in a Postliberal Age. Philadelphia: Westminster.

Melugin, Roy F.
1976 The Formation of Isaiah 40-55. BZAW 141; Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Melugin, Roy F.
1996 Figurative Speech and the Reading of Isaiah 1 as Scripture. In New Visions of Isaiah. Edited by Roy F. Melugin and Marvin A. Sweeney; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press (forthcoming).

Melugin, Roy F.
fc. The Book of Isaiah and the Construction of Meaning. In Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretive Tradition. Edited by Craig C. Broyles and Craig Evans; Leiden: E.J. Brill (forthcoming).

Rad, Gerhard von
1963 Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament. Pp. 17-39 in Essays on Old Testament Hermeneutics. Translated by John Bright; edited by J. L. Mays; Richmond: John Knox.

Ricoeur, Paul
1980 Essays on Biblical Interpretation. Philadelphia: Fortress.

Searle, John R.
1970 Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Seitz, Christopher
1993 Isaiah 1-39. Louisville: John Knox.

Sweeney, Marvin A.
1996a Isaiah 1-39 with an Introduction to Prophetic Literature. Forms of the Old Testament Literature 16; Grand Rapids, MI/Cambridge, U.K.: Eerdmans.

Sweeney, Marvin A.
1996b The Book of Isaiah as Prophetic Torah. In New Visions of Isaiah. Edited by Roy F. Melugin and Marvin A. Sweeney; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press (forthcoming).

Whedbee, J. William
1971 Isaiah and Wisdom. Nashville and New York: Abingdon.

White, Hayden
1978 Tropics of Discourse: Essays in Cultural Criticism. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins.

Zimmerli, Walther
1963 Promise and Fulfillment. Pp. 89-122 in Essays on Old Testament Hermeneutics. Translated by James Wharton; edited by J. L. Mays; Richmond: John Knox.

Isaiah as a Scroll or Codex Within Jewish and Christian Scripture

Gerald T. Sheppard
Emmanuel College, Victoria University in the University of Toronto

Here we are at the end of the five year cycle of the Isaiah seminar which began with the adventurous notion that we look at the book of Isaiah as a whole, and, in this session, explicitly as a book of Jewish and Christian Scripture. If there are coffee breaks in heaven, I wonder what Rashi and Calvin, or Hillel and Jesus, are saying about how adventurous this question seems to them? Since two other papers precede my own, one on Jewish and one on Christian interpretation of Isaiah as Scripture, I will presuppose their treatments provide us with particular instances peculiar to each religious usage. They will surely offer, as well, insight into the nature of Scriptural interpretation and its relevance and/or irrelevance to the religious life of Jews and Christians. If their conclusions might offend a few, I have been given the opportunity to offend many. I will try to offer some steps toward a postmodern comparative hermeneutic of the book of Isaiah as Scripture within the two religions. For this paper to be brief I will offer almost no direct criticisms of work done by others or readily available in standard overviews within our discipline of biblical studies.

I will divide my essay into two parts. The first part will consider the hermeneutical question: How can scholars describe as a matter of public, collaborative discourse, a Scriptural book? The importance of the first section of my paper is to argue that a consideration of this matter does not require a religious commitment to begin this work, but neither ought it to preclude a religious or theological investment in that same scholarly conversation. In the second part I will address the question: What is Jewish and Christian Scripture, and, more specifically, how can we properly describe the book of Isaiah within these Scriptures? In this second part, I will initially sketch some historical characteristics of the Scriptures of Judaism and Christianity, including the book of Isaiah within it, during the period of the second century C.E. until the early third century. Then, I will finally turn to a few specific topics on the book of Isaiah in an effort to cast some all too familiar modern ideas into perhaps a new and unfamiliar light.

PART I: HOW CAN SCHOLARS DESCRIBE A SCRIPTURAL BOOK?

Someone may object to this question by appealing to the commonplace axiom of the Modern Age, that we, as scholars (regardless of our religious perspectives), ought to read the Bible "like any other book." That assumption is precisely one I want to challenge. For those who consider hermeneutical theory only a game, then my aim in what immediately follows is simply to put all my own cards on the table.

A Scenario of Recent Circumstances

The past ways that we, as scholars, have phrased questions about the book of Isaiah illustrates well our present problem. What had seemed self-evident for several decades during the modern period was the assumption that the meaning of the words of the Bible primarily "referred" an ancient "author's intent" and, whether accurate or not, to what happened in the past. So, we rarely needed to speak of "the Bible as history," since that would sound tautological. Most scholars just knew intuitively that they had to read it that way. Among Christian scholars, even old liberals and fundamentalists agreed on that point in principle, though reaching the opposite results. Christian old liberalism (using "higher" or historical criticism) and fundamentalism (using historico-grammatical exegesis) were, in this sense, the left and right wing responses operating within the same modernist assumptions. Christians of faith who accepted the results of a liberal modern historical criticism often sought to describe some additional theological dynamic within their modern reconstructions of a changing "history" or "history of traditions." We heard, consequently, of the Bible as a "saving drama," or as a collection of testimonies to "God's acts" and "self-revelation in history," or as the records of a series of constructive "actualizations" (Vergegenwartigungen) of past traditions when they became irrelevant or only supportive of an uninspired orthodoxy.[1]

---

[1]For an unusually impressive treatment of this last topic, especially in Von Rad, see Joseph W. Groves, Actualization and Interpretation in the Old Testament (SBLDS 86; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987).

In contrast to this older modern approach, scholars since the 1960s began to speak of the Bible or specific books of the Bible, including Isaiah, as literature. That phrase did not sound tautological, although none of us really doubted that it was "literature" as distinguished from, for instance, paper mache or pottery or a perfunctory scientific treatise. Others refined the literary nature of the Bible, so that we might regard the book of Isaiah as a literary "classic." Yet, the endurance of a literature and its pervasive use is not enough to make it a "classic," anymore than the literature of telephone books and menus will ever earn that attribution. In the case of Bibles, Jewish or Christian, we might as well admit, as scholars, that it is not consistently great literature under its own or any later literary-aesthetic standards. With training in the French rhetorical tradition of Paris in the early Renaissance, John Calvin could speak confidently of the "unpolished simplicity" of the Bible, "bordering on rudeness, though, thank God, there were some exceptions: "the style of some of the prophets is not surpassed by the elegance and beauty of heathen writers." His explanation for the aesthetically low quality of most of the Bible is a theological one: "For it was not without an admirable arrangement of Providence, that the sublime mysteries of the kingdom of heaven have for the greater part been delivered with a contemptible meanness of words" (my underlining).[2] Conversely, Augustine, who read primarily the elevated Latin translation of the Vulgate, tried to argue for the eloquence of Scripture. David Norton, in a recent study of this subject, observes, "Where Appollonarius rewrote the Scriptures to make them a substitute for the classics, Augustine presents the unadulterated Scriptures as an alternative to the classics, superior in truth, not significantly inferior in their writing, and so superior overall."[3]

Since the 1970s some of us began to describe the Bible, as Scripture. But why did that expression not sound ridiculously tautological to all of us at the time? By what shift in

---

[2]John Calvin, Institutes of the Christian Religion (trans. by Henry Beveridge; Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1966) 75.

[3]See, on this topic, David Norton, A History of the Bible as Literature: From Antiquity to 1700 (Vol. 1; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993) 47.

perspective did we ever come to doubt that the Bible or the book of Isaiah itself ever existed as anything but a book of Jewish and Christian Scripture? How did we ever reach a time and place so that it sounded dangerously "theological" for Brevard S. Childs to entitle his introduction in 1979, The Old Testament as Scripture, and for professors of the rank of Rolf Rendtorff and John Levenson, in books and essays, to risk sharp criticism from peers when they asked how Jewish and Christian scholars might properly describe together a shared scriptural text, and perhaps even speak together about some religious, rather than merely historical, content?[4]

My point in presenting these examples is not to belittle anyone for not finding each of these expressions tautological, but to demonstrate that we have passed through an epochal shift in how we perceive things as scholars since the 1960s. What seems self-evidently tautological, anachronistic, or contradictory in one epoch may not be the same in the next. As the Modern Age draws to a close, we have begun to know things differently and have every right to enjoy, but not to indulge, the delusions of progress appropriate to this altered state of affairs.

On that note, let me state more explicitly what older modern positions I am opposing. In agreement with recent postmodern criticism, we ought to be disenchanted with Schleiermacher's programmatic and highly influential proposal in modern hermeneutics of a universally valid "general hermeneutic" drawn from the arts and humans sciences. Once that task was accomplished, he felt assured that we could then find room to accommodate an understanding of the Bible and "revelation," as one of many "special hermeneutics," as a subclass of "the general hermeneutic." Despite Schleiermacher's profound statements about "revelation" in the opening chapter of The Christian Faith, he himself offered for a "special hermeneutic" of the Bible little

---

[4]Brevard S. Childs, The Old Testament as Scripture (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979); For example, Rolf Rendtorff, "Toward a Common Jewish-Christian Reading of the Hebrew Bible," 89-108, and Jon D. Levenson, "Theological Consensus or Historicist Evasion? Jews and Christians in Biblical Studies," 109-145, in Hebrew Bible or Old Testament: Studying the Bible in Judaism and Christianity (ed. Roger Brooks and John J. Collins; Notre Dame: Notre Dame Press, 1990).

more than a few observations on linguistic peculiarities of the New Testament.[5] I do not want to try to sustain his proposal simply by improving his treatment of "special hermeneutics" in respect to Scripture, by adding, for instance, other peculiarities of Scripture based on a canonical approach, canon-conscious redactions, or James Sanders' "canonical criticism," as tempting as that might be.[6]

Furthermore, on the basis of practical reason alone, I do not think that there is anything "divine" about Kant's "imperatives" or that there is any universal logic so that we should all agree about any trans-historical Neo-Kantian "general hermeneutic" that can be drawn from the arts and human sciences, any metanarratives of "history" and other narratives, any globalization of personal experience, or any self-evident aesthetic vision of a transcendent "desire" in the development of human language and literature, such as Northrop Frye seems to propose. For the same reason, I have strong reservations about Gadamer's "hermeneutical universalism," without doubting for a moment the value of his insights into "the element of effective-history...operative in all understanding of tradition."[7]

These reservations about our capacity to make universal statements are compounded by the work of Michel Foucault, who demonstrates how different epochs of human consciousness entail significantly different "forms of knowing." In everyday jargon, what people in one Age found unthinkable may be precisely what people in another epoch cannot stop thinking about. Conversely, we, in a later generation, may find it very difficult to imagine

---

[5]Gerald T. Sheppard, "Biblical Interpretation Since Gadamer," PNEUMA 16/1 (1994) 121-141.

[6]Gerald T. Sheppard, "Canonical Criticism," 861-66, in The Anchor Bible Dictionary (ed. by David Noel Freedman, Vol. 1; New York City: Doubleday, 1992). I made a mistake in this dictionary essay by describing "canon criticism" when James Sanders, who first coined this phrase, has been careful to speak only of "canonical criticism."

[7]Hans-Georg Gadamer, Truth and Method (New York: Seabury Press, 1975).

why our predecessors were so stupid as to not see what is so obvious to us. In a course I taught with Stanley Walters on the history of interpretation, I recall a day when the doctoral students tore Origen apart for one failing after another. Walters suddenly shocked them by observing, "Yes, but we must not forget that Origen was a lot smarter than any of us in this room." We all know the modern fallacy of measuring the excellence of past interpreters by their ability to anticipate historical criticism. Yet, scholars still arrogantly call premodern interpreters "precritical," usually without any effort to describe premodern "criticism" with as much care as they invest in their own defense of modern methodologies. While we may feel the pride of "progress" based on the accumulation, refinement, and implementation of past knowledge, that very possibility of achievement also conceals elemental, epistemological shifts in the human capacity to see, to know, and to interpret. We often make the mistake of assuming that we describe the same things as did past interpreters, whenever we recapitulate the same words they used: such as "(human) nature," "history," "I," "religion," "land," "Temple," "God," "man," "woman," "sin," "salvation," "Torah," "Gospel," "book," "author," "Scripture," or "Isaiah."

If we insist on finding something like a "general hermeneutic" on the order of Schleiermacher's search for a universally valid description of human understanding, then we will necessarily and perhaps ironically be forced to rely upon a variety of truth claims to which we cannot expect others to consent. In this respect, though not in every other, I am in full agreement with Karl Barth's blunt statement in Church Dogmatics I/2,

> It is in view of the only possible explanation of the Holy scripture that we have laid the principles of exposition indicated--not, of course, believing they apply only to biblical exposition, but believing always that because they are valid for the exposition of every human word, and can therefore lay claim to universal recognition. It is not at all that the word of man in the Bible has an abnormal significance and function. We see from the Bible what its normal significance and function is. It is from the word of man in the Bible that we must learn what has to be learned concerning the word of man in general. This is not generally recognized. It is more usual blindly to apply to the Bible false ideas taken from some other source concerning

> the significance and function of the human word. But this must not confuse us into thinking that the opposite is the right one. There is no such thing as a special biblical hermeneutics. But we have to learn that hermeneutics which is alone and generally valid by means of the Bible as the witness to revelation.[8]

If we grant the essence of Barth's argument, then any description of the book of Isaiah that we -- Jewish and Christian and other scholars -- can discuss as scholars critically together will not be at the level of a general, universally valid hermeneutic. Instead, we must find more modest, regional or special hermeneutics that will allow us room to describe, with personal integrity, the book of Isaiah while bracketing out those terms peculiar to the universal claims of the respective and unharmonized general hermeneutics affirmed by any of the diverse scholarly participants.

In Christian faith, we are sometimes advised that, since God's grace is undeserved and abundant, "If you are going to sin, then sin boldly." So, now, I will tell you how I differ with Barth. My main problem with Barth, or at least with how the historical Barth can now be heard, is that his blunt "No!" to Emil Brunner and "natural theology," coupled with how he uses Christological language to permeate every area of discourse, seems to leave almost no room for a robust discussion on matters of Scripture with non-Christians, except as a testimony to Christian faith. This reservation will seem too gentle for some. If you want to see a gloves off criticism of Barth, see James

---

[8]Karl Barth, Church Dogmatics, trans. G. T. Thompson and H. Knight (London: T & T Clark, 1956) I/2, 466. See similarly the argument for the special nature of Scripture in the essay by Charles M. Wood, in contrast with a more general socio-linguistic theory in Kathryn E. Tanner's appeal to the usus loquendi in Scriptural Authority and Narrative Interpretation ed. Garrett Green (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1987), 3-20, 59-78. On Barth's effort to avoid either a univocal or equivocal literal sense, see George Hunsinger, "Beyond Literalism and Expressivism: Karl Barth's Hermeneutical Realism," Modern Theology 3 (April 1987): 209-223.

Barr's Guilford lectures on "Natural Theology."[9] In my view, any insistence on using Christological language in describing what is shared in the book of Scripture by Jews and Christians would be no more reasonable than for Jewish scholars to insist we cannot talk about the book of Isaiah without rejecting Christian faith entirely or only by employing the logic of the Mishnah.

However, I think Barth offers an important corrective in his insistence that if you want a truly general hermeneutics of universal significance you will inevitably stand within some particular claims of faith to which other people have no reasonable obligation to assent. At the level of such a general hermeneutic, every Jewish scholar has full justification for appealing to the Torah in precisely the same radical way Barth appeals to Gospel. Therefore, I do not think a diverse group of scholars can describe together the book of Isaiah as Scripture or, for that matter, anything else, according to a universally valid general hermeneutic, to which we all ought logically to consent. Likewise, the modern effort to distinguish a neutral "secular" territory of discourse apart from the religious only plays into a false dichotomy and misses entirely the larger issue raised cogently by Schleiermacher. Similarly, our agreement on the validity of historical criticisms is only a modest achievement, for it has been won at the cost of reducing the subject of the book of Isaiah to less than what this seminar in particular has tried to imagine. The fact that Jewish, Christian, and other scholars can all use form criticism together is significant but disappointing if we <u>also</u> want to understand why and how the book of Isaiah exerts pressure upon readers within two major living religions who still regard it as Scripture. In stating matters this way, I have sidestepped entirely the embarrassing rumor that some scholars have the audacity to participate actively as members in these same religious communities.

In sum, how do we move beyond the unsatisfying idea that agreement on older modern historical criticisms will offer a sufficient common ground for a scholarly description of the book of Isaiah as Scripture? On the one hand, I want to focus on "text-oriented" descriptions. This priority betrays my own desperate effort not to solve too many problems in the

---

[9]James Barr, <u>Biblical Faith and Natural Theology</u>, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993) 1-20.

interpretation of interpretation simply by documenting, under the aegis of a "reader response approach," the tyrannical imagination of all real, possible, or ideal readers. If all things are possible, not all are equally interesting. Which brings us to that other messier hand -- I fully realize that the text of the book of Isaiah as a book of Scripture has never existed in social and political isolation, as will be painfully evident in a later section of this essay on Jewish and Christian Scripture during the second century.

Wisdom as a "Middle Discourse": A Necessary Arena of Special Hermeneutics in the Wake of the Late Great Modern Age

This question about the boundaries of non-universal special hermeneutics for diverse scholarly descriptions of a biblical book could be discussed in other ways that ignore the Bible itself. I greatly respect those recent efforts but will make only passing reference to them here. Instead, in the spirit of the particular topic of our seminar, I want to try to find my point of departure within the formation of Jewish Scripture itself. In brief, I will argue for the biblical revelation of "Wisdom" as a "middle discourse," offering access to a wide range of regional or special hermeneutics of a non-universal sort. I am calling it a "middle discourse" because it allows for rigorous discussion of theological, religious, revelatory, as well as pedestrian elements without expecting the possibility of a "natural theology," on the one hand, or a secular, universal or general hermeneutic, on the other. Though we may want to reject the idea of a natural theology, that rejection does not deny the theological nature of some Wisdom discourse nor does it deny that anyone in the world might see and respond positively to God's own action in the world.[10] It does create a space for a robust conflict, one that self-consciously brackets out the requirement of commitments to the universal claims of the Torah or Gospel, in order to expand the critical conversation among the most diverse possible partners. Yet, it does not assign to Wisdom discourse a systematic universality, as if it could, in and of itself, have a valid mechanism for circumscribing the essence of the politics of the entire human drama. At the same time, it can and must describe lines of power, avenues of escape, and seek to demystify the language of faith in terms of discrete practices. Also,

---

[10]Here I would lean more in the direction of Barth rather than Barr.

within the limits of this Wisdom discourse lies the possibility that we might by empathetic imagination redescribe congenially the rules that govern the discourse of a general hermeneutic advocated by others with whom we differ. Because all of these exercises are loaded with the likelihood of self-deception, we must, as did Solomon, invite the Queen of Sheba for a visit to test us, I would add, on a regular basis.

Again, we could appeal to Habermas and his emphasis on a diverse community of discourse to make similar points, but I prefer to find a vehicle from within Jewish Scripture itself. On that score, I now want to consider some features in the legend of Solomon's visit with the Queen of Sheba and her testing of his wisdom. I cannot begin in this essay to present adequately the detailed arguments of other scholars and myself on this topic. But, in sum, I am suggesting that within the late formation of Jewish Scripture we have a profound intertextual presentation of Solomon and Solomonic books in relation to "Wisdom" as an idiom of revelation comparable, though inferior to that of Moses and the first five biblical books in relation to the revealed "Torah." The exact relationship between Torah and Wisdom, consequently, becomes a major debate throughout the history of Jewish interpretation. Moreover, it is something Christianity owes en masse to Judaism. Therefore, the very Christian explication of the Gospel required an appeal to these very precedents of revelation: Torah (both as law and teaching; Matt. 5:17-18; Romans 2-10; Hebrews 3; etc.), Prophecy (as promise and fulfillment and as an illumination of the present tense within each new generation's effort to hear the Word of God; Matt. 26:54-56; etc.), and Wisdom (e.g., the teachings of Jesus, 1 Corinthians 1, James; etc.). In the history of Jewish and Christian interpretation of Scripture up to the modern period, we can trace this fascinating debate regarding how revealed Wisdom relates to other terms of revelation, for the sake of understanding the politics of exegesis, our own self-understanding, and practical activities of each religious community.

At the risk of sounding glib, I want to make my point by briefly noting some aspects of this revealed "Wisdom" in the narrative about Solomon and the test he faced when the Queen of Sheba visited him. My aim is simply to illustrate in a memorable way some contours of Wisdom as a discourse shared between Judaism and the world and, therefore, shared as well between Jews and later Gentile Christians in the world. First, in the narrative of 1 Kings 10, the Queen of Sheba, a brilliant woman, tests

Solomon, and not the other way around. Second, he invites the test since, apparently, what the world thinks is important (Deut. 4:6), even if not everything the world thinks is equally important. Third, this Wisdom is not "secular" as is evident elsewhere in Scripture (Prov. 2:6-7; 3:19-20; 1 Kings 3:10-12). Therefore, the Queen of Sheba is invited by Solomon to a debate to some degree on matters of revelation! Fourth, Wisdom knows it limits. Here I cannot help but think of the incisive treatment of this topic by Von Rad in a chapter of his Wisdom in Israel. While Solomon makes himself vulnerable to her in vast territories of discourse, he does not invite her to evaluate the Torah which God has delivered by Moses as an idiosyncratic covenant with Israel (which Solomon himself must be careful to obey: 1 Kgs. 3:13-14, 6:11-13; 8:54-61; 9:3-9), and she does not bring her prophets to test his prophets. Nonetheless, the range of the discourse of wisdom is remarkably extensive and in various places in Scripture it is spelled out, such as in 1 Kgs. 5:9-14 and by the nature of the Solomonic books themselves. Similarly after the Queen of Sheba tests him with "questions," she considers his wisdom on the basis of other politically concrete things she sees: "When the Queen of Sheba observed all of Solomon's wisdom, and [or "including"?] the palace that he built, the fare of his table, the seating of his courtiers, the service and attire of his attendants, and his wine services, and the burnt offerings that he offered at the House of the Lord, she was left breathless" (1 Kgs. 10:3-5, NJPS). Fifth, and finally, the Queen of Sheba finds, as noted above, in the sacrifices at the Temple an indication of wisdom, even as prayer and sacrifice occur as topics in the book of Proverbs. People of every nation and religion ought to be able to evaluate, to some degree, the wisdom and folly of prayer. If we cannot agree on the Torah or the Gospel, at least we might be able to appreciate differences between wise rather than foolish prayers, regardless of the religion.[11]

---

[11]On this sapiential nature of prayer, I recall a passage from John Updike's memoirs: "Picasso once chastised Matisse for designing and decorating a chapel. Both men were professed atheists. Matisse retorted, 'Yes, I do pray; and you pray too, and you know it all too well: when everything goes badly, we throw ourselves into prayer.... And you do it; you too. It's no good saying no.' John Updike, Self-Consciousness, (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1989) 221.

My appeal to Wisdom as an idiom of revelation and as a middle discourse relies, I admit, on an outdated compass that I have found in the Bible. I am using it, nonetheless, to guide me through a territory literally littered with evidence of unsuccessful, half-completed expeditions that got funded on the basis of a generally accepted archaeology of knowledge. The valuable half-truths of these unsuccessful digs often remain unpublished still! Beyond accepting the challenge of working at the continuous reformulation of this prevailing archaeology of knowledge and its methods, I have sought to explain the necessity and value of a myriad of descriptive modes of understanding, each with its own unrepentant circularity and rules for a relative rather than universal objectivity. Within this concept of Wisdom I would include most exercises of historical criticism, comparative philology, archaeology, and all the disciplines of analysis common to a university setting. I am assuming that such Wisdom affirms the value and necessity of serious public discourse and assumes the potential efficacy of that discourse is to move us in the direction of truth. Though Habermas opposes most postmodern proposals, I think he might find in this formulation of Wisdom support for his own emphasis on critical discourse within a diverse community in pursuit of the promise of modernity as "an unfinished project." Yet, this Wisdom would be congenial to deconstructionist and semiotic studies precisely because they call the bluff on the expectation of public consent on the validity of a general hermeneutic. Furthermore, they often offer us brilliant heuristic, rather than merely eristic, exercises in both the demystification of hermeneutical elements and the diagnosis of the lines of power hidden within them.

PART II: WHAT IS SCRIPTURE AND WHAT IS THE BOOK OF ISAIAH WITHIN IT?

Wilfred Cantwell Smith published a book three years ago entitled, What is Scripture? A Comparative Approach. In a key chapter, "A Particular Example, to Illustrate," he compares the massive commentary of Marvin Pope on Song of Songs in the "Anchor Bible Series" with the late medieval commentaries of Rashi and Bernard of Clairvaux. Smith concludes,

> Modern Biblical scholarship in principle as well as in practice has tended to assume that to read The Song or any other book in the Bible -- let alone the Qur'an or the Lotus Sutra -- with the view that God is speaking to us, personally, now, in and through that text is ('was') to adopt an orientation remote and irrelevant, if not

> benighted. The mainline Church, and liberal Jews, to a large extent accepted, heroically after a profound struggle, the positive side of Biblical scholarship's outlook, without thinking through the negative implications; and with but little to propose as to how to supplement the position.[12]

For Smith, the alternative is certainly not a call for less historical criticism, or for more piety or for an appeal to mystical experience on the part of scholars. Rather, he challenges us to describe how these texts could and did function in a scriptural manner for centuries, whether or not we as scholars personally conjoin those earlier readers. Of Pope's "brilliant modern scholarship," Smith says, "I would reject nothing in, subtract nothing from, his thesis. Add to it, however, we decisively should. Much remains to be done."[13] The same could be said for most commentaries on Isaiah, even for the so-called conservative historicist ones. When the erudite E. J. Young, a Christian fundamentalist, can write such a dull, multi-volume commentary on the book of Isaiah, we have fair warning that sensitivity to this issue of Scripture is not simply a matter of piety or of a conservative view of the historical nature of the prebiblical traditions.

I have cited Smith because he reminds us that we perhaps ought to take Christian Scripture as seriously as we would more likely take the Qur'an as Muslim Scripture in a university course. We do not need to solve the problem of comparative religions in order to do this, but if we never ask the question about its function as Scripture, except to debunk it as precritical, then we have been intellectually irresponsible according to the terms of Wisdom I have tried to describe. Moreover, we may be helped in our discussion of the book of Isaiah as Scripture by looking at Scriptures in other religions. For instance, Smith suggests that Mani, in the third century C.E.was "perhaps [the] first person ever to compose a scripture

---

[12]Wilfred Cantwell Smith, What Is Scripture?, (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993) 41.

[13]Ibid., 42.

consciously."[14] Smith's comment that Mani is the only person we know historically to ever self-consciously compose a Scripture, confirms that most of historical criticism, even redaction criticism or the reconstruction of parties in conflict in post-exilic Israel, still belong to the prebiblical traditions that become biblical or scriptural at some other stage. Here I think we as biblical scholars need to think more carefully about the relationship between what we call redaction history and other features, such as "inner-biblical" interpretations (as in the work of Nahum Sarna and Michael Fishbane, as well as in the French school of anthological midrash) or perhaps what I have described as "canon-conscious redactions," recalling the work of I. L. Seeligmann who spoke of a complex history of traditions prior to das Aufkommen eines Kanonbewusstseins.[15]

In my view, we need to distinguish within the book of Isaiah prebiblical traditions from their semantic transformation when in the post-exilic period they become parts of a biblical book with a radically different context, intertext, and extratextual assumptions regarding the book's form, function, and subject matter in terms of a revelation from God. The specificity of that revelation is delimited in certain ways by the form of the Scripture itself, which even assigns it a name not entirely self-evident from the pre-history: "Torah" in Jewish Scripture, "Gospel" in Christian Scripture. Hence, for several generations of biblical scholars to have asked so rarely in their commentaries on Isaiah how the book relates to the Torah of Moses is to miss a question obvious, at the very least, to centuries of both Jewish and Christian interpreters prior to the modern era. It is our myopia, not theirs, if we do not ask it.

Two Scriptures and Two Religions in the Second Century C.E.

If we try to take seriously the form and function of the book of Isaiah as a book of Jewish and Christian Scriptures, then we might examine that crucial period in the second to early third century C.E. I am going make here only a few observations related to a project with David Trobisch and Rolf Rendtorff, that

---

[14] Ibid., 22.

[15] I. L. Seeligmann, "Voraussetzungen der Midraschexegese," JTS 1 (1953) 152.

begins with this period, then looks back and forward across time. So, I owe much to these conversations for the ideas that follow, though I must take responsibility for any frailty in their presentation.

Both Jews and Christians, who had often been identified with Jews in the eyes of the Romans, faced terrible persecutions until the second quarter of the second century. Around the time these persecutions abated, we see the emergence of rabbinic Judaism and post-Apostolic Christianity. Certainly, the brutal retaliation of the Romans against Jews in the aftermath of Bar Kochba had come to end in some significant ways under the reign of Antoninus Pius (ca. 139 C.E.) and the Severides. Jews could now govern their own affairs to some degree and the synagogues became officially tolerated as centers of Jewish religious life. While Christians still suffered the threat of death especially in Rome, as did Jews, the actual killing of Jews and Christians became more sporadic under Antoninus Pius and subsequently under Marcus Aurelius (161-180). Only with the famous intervention of Marcia to Commodus, the son of Marcus, did the forced enslavement of Christians temporarily abate. When Septimus Severus began his reign in 193, he tolerated both Jews and Christians, though in 202 he issued an edict condemning to death anyone actively recruiting others to join either the Jewish or Christian religions.

It is in this climate that Jews and Christians forged their identities separate from one another, establishing a number of key features that we now take for granted. For instance, the protosynagogue of the preceding century is arguably the model of congregational life for both the Jewish synagogue of this period and the house church of Catholic Christianity. A number of other close parallels between the two religions may be noted, including Jewish hope that the ensuing Age of the Messiah would replace the synagogue with a reconstituted Temple and the Christian hope that the return of Christ would replace the house church with the Kingdom of God. Just as some new benedictions in the synagogue began to reject Christians from Jewish worship, so the latest "Gospel" of John focuses on criticism of "the Pharisees" who had become in the second century the architects of rabbinic Judaism, despite their minority status during the time of Jesus.

Another feature, closer to our topic, is the selection by Jewish authorities of what we call today a "proto-Massoretic" text from perhaps six or more textual possibilities to become an

official text, in scroll form, of the Hebrew Bible. Perhaps in this period, as well, the designation of the third part of the Hebrew Bible as "Writings" helped to distinguish this Jewish Scripture as "Written Torah" from traditions of the "Oral Torah," some of which would be codified and published at the beginning of the third century as the Mishnah. In about the same period, around 150 A.D., Christians published the first edition of the Bible that gained acceptance among most Catholic Christianity. Trobisch has made a good case for its appearance in the form of codex fascicles, all in Greek, and including what was later called the "Apocryphal" books. Christians substituted the Theodotian version of Greek for Daniel but not for other books, which shows that they were making self-conscious decisions about the text of Scripture. They made sure anyone who wanted to purchase a fascicle of the Christian Greek Bible would know it was the official one, and not a Jewish Greek text, by substituting the nomina sacra for many words for God and other terms of special typological significance. The problem of defining the Christian Bible, of course, only starts there. Brevard Childs, in my view, correctly sees this problem of the subsequent debates of the precise nature of the Christian Bible when he states, "Perhaps the basic theological issue at stake can be best formulated in terms of the church's ongoing search for the Christian Bible."[16] Even more radically, Childs states, "In sum, the exact nature of the Christian Bible both in respect to its scope and text remain undecided up to this day."[17] For example, the famous exchange of letters in the fourth century between Jerome and Augustine in a debate over whether the rabbinic Hebrew text ought to have priority over the Greek in a Christian "Old Testament" illustrates one decisive moment in that search.

But what does all this have to do with how we might define the book of Isaiah as Scripture? Within the limits of this essay let me suggest only two things. First, the book of Isaiah in both traditions, in slightly different ways, relates to a similar conception of revelation, but with a different subject matter. While rabbinic Judaism emphasized the book as commentary on the

---

[16]Brevard Childs, Biblical Theology of the Old and New Testaments, (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1992) 67.

[17]Ibid., 63.

Torah as well as prophecy of the future, Christians sought to see in the book a promise fulfilled in the Gospel. Hence, the book of Isaiah in Christian Scripture testifies for Christians to the subject matter of the Gospel in a manner entirely unexpected and unnecessary for rabbinic interpretation. In this respect, a change in the context of this book, between two different Scriptures has clearly effected differences in its semantic function as Scripture.

Second, I want to expand on one aspect of an observation by Jacob Neusner regarding circumstances in the bloody aftermath of the early second century:

> The entire history of Christianity and Judaism alike flowed across the abyss of that catastrophe. Each religious tradition had to make sense of what it meant to worship God in ways lacking all precedent in the history of Israel, of which each religious tradition claimed to be the natural outcome and fulfillment.[18]

Perhaps an even more radical example of "lacking all precedent" is the unpredictable way each religion decided how to interpret a Scriptural book scripturally. On the Jewish side, from the time of Hillel's seven middot to later, more elaborate rules of interpretation, midrash has predominated over peshat, the "literal, plain, grammatical" sense. Particularly since the Torah is not heard only by means of the Bible but also fully within the tradition of the rabbis, midrash better expresses the type of argumentation by which the scriptural import of the book of Isaiah belongs to a Jewish understanding of revelation. When Michael Fishbane tries to find the origins of midrash in the Hebrew Bible itself, he can speak at most of a trajectory from inner-biblical interpretation toward the possibility of midrash.

Christians face a similar situation, based on a different perception of the options. The hermeneutical understanding of "the literal sense," accompanied by "the rule of faith," and the necessary discernment of the community of faith goes back at least to Irenaeus in the middle of the second century. It is accompanied by the post-apostolic Catholic Church's rejection of Marcion's Gnostic "Gospel" with its complete rejection of

---

[18]Jacob Neusner, Judaism in the Beginning of Christianity (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984) 89.

Judaism, but carries with it a disavowal of Jewish-Christian midrashic methods of interpretation. Yet, when E. Earle Ellis examines Paul's use of "the Old Testament," he finds so little evidence that Paul appealed to the literal sense that he must rationalize: "The grammar and the historical meaning are assumed; and Pauline exegesis, in its essential character, begins where grammatical-historical exegesis ends."[19] (147)

The point I want to make is that the role of the book of Isaiah in either the Jewish rabbinic or the post-Apostolic Christian tradition suggests that the impact of Scripture, and the book of Isaiah within it, exceeded what we might have predicted from the origins of the traditions in individual books or even from later signs of inner-biblical interpretation within Scipture itself. Neither midrash on the Jewish side, nor "literal sense" on the Christian side is required by the text of Isaiah per se, except in so far as it belongs to two respective Scriptures, with two different accompanying strategies of response to it in the hope of revelation. If we are going to describe the book of Isaiah as a scriptural book, we cannot ignore this specific religious setting in which Isaiah functions differently in two different religions. Concommitantly, only by acknowledging these differences can what remains the same attain its full significance for both religions.

Concluding Observations

Since I have counted on the other two papers to raise particular issues, I do not here want to develop in any elaborate detail the implications for issues we have considered in this seminar. Since I have already contributed in two earlier papers in this seminar, I will simply raise a few points about the our current scholarly debate regarding the "former" and "latter things." I think we need to reexamine the older modern logic against the unity of the book of Isaiah. G. A. Smith provides an excellent example of the argument that persuaded most scholars in the English speaking world. At the outset, we must grant that "Cyrus, in short, is not presented as a prediction, but as a

---

[19]E. Earle Ellis, Paul's Use of the Old Testament, (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1957) 147.

proof that a prediction is being fulfilled."[20] Otherwise the argument in "a great part of Isa. 41-48 would be utterly unintelligible."[21] It would be "unintelligible," since this section of Isaiah includes "a debate...and speaks of ancient prophecies which have come from Jehovah, and points to Cyrus as their fulfillment." My point is that we need to ask some more precise questions about what makes something logically "unintelligible" to the modern period when, Smith admits, the idea "that Isaiah himself prophetically wrote these chapters" had been "almost universally accepted," "Til the end of last century."[22] I want to raise three questions about Smith's own historical reconstruction.

First, if what makes the argument "intelligible" and persuasive in Isaiah 41-48 is the proof of fulfillment accompanied by the earlier prophecies being waved in the faces of false prophets, then we may reasonably ask where those prophecies are. But Smith's response is simply: "It does not matter to us in the meantime what those prophecies were. They may have been certain of Jeremiah's predictions; we may be sure that they cannot have contained anything so definite as Cyrus' name..." (11) I would think, in fact, that if this prophet speaking in Isaiah 41-48 is <u>not</u> Isaiah himself, then the "former things" must be his own and definitely not from Jeremiah, or for that matter anything we would expect to find in Isaiah 1-39. Unless, of course, the last editors of this book no longer even care enough about the dispute in Isaiah 41-48 to retain all the intelligible elements of it!

Second, Smith recognizes a threat to his own logical appeals in his redescription of the argument of an exilic or post-exilic prophet in parts of Isaiah 41-48, that his reconstruction of events and the logic of these traditions would be undermined if he were to find here an anonymous prophetic voice. In other words, the proof of the prophet referring to "latter things"

---

[20]George Adam Smith, <u>Isaiah XL-LXVI</u> ("The Expositor's Bible"; London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1890) 9.

[21]<u>Ibid</u>., 10.

[22]<u>Ibid</u>., 3.

requires that an audience of contemporaries and antagonists knows him. Smith tries to avoid this problem by assuring us:

> Nevertheless, the prophecy is not anonymous. By these impersonal voices a personal revelation is made. The prophets may be nameless, but the Deity who speaks through them speaks as already known and acknowledged: My people, saith your God.[23]

In fact, we may argue that the absence of Isaiah's name in these chapters contributes to the resulting ambiguity which the editors have created here and elsewhere (for example, just as it does for the promised "child" in Isaiah 7-11 and the individual suffering servant of Isaiah 53). This functional ambiguity of the former and latter things now, within the book of Isaiah as Scripture does, however, contain just enough features from its tradition prehistory to preclude us from seeing in Isaiah 40-66 either synonymous voices or the Word of God detached from mediation through human prophetic words. In other words, the editors appear less concerned about retaining in full older prebiblical traditions and seek, instead, other terms by which to assert the unity of the book as a whole. The use of former and latter things in the original dispute underlying Isaiah 41-48 is not simply identical with the use of former and latter things by the later editors to structure the book as a whole. In essence, Isaiah needs not to have spoken every word in this book by his name in order to sustain his attribution as its writer. The editors have made a tradeoff at the partial disturbance of precisely what Smith wants to reconstruct.

Third, neither Jewish Scripture nor the Christian Scripture has a specific word that indicates what we associate with "author." Hence, we would be more accurate in understanding this dimension of biblical books by speaking instead of "designated writers" for biblical books. The multiplicity of voiced traditions does not undermine the integrity of the book of Isaiah and Isaiah's identity within it as the writer, since the logic of the book itself aims at a quite different set of assumptions about coherence, continuity, and intelligibility.

Here I also want to call attention to the modern fallacy of confusing the premodern formulation of "the scope, purpose, or

---

[23] Ibid., 73.

intention of the whole book" (Flacius) with a modern, conservative or liberal, reconstruction of a historical author's original intent. What has been lost is that the Bible describes designated "writers" of parts or whole biblical books, but these figures are never called "authors." God alone is "the author" (cf. 1 Cor. 14:33; Heb. 5:9; 12:2) of biblical revelation to which the designated writers of scriptural books are, at most, prophetic human "witnesses."

The Scroll of Isaiah as Jewish Scripture, Or, Why Jews Don't Read Books

Benjamin D. Sommer
Northwestern University

> It is [a]...grievous error for Christian scholars to assume that the reconstruction of the literature's historical development can now replace the study of the canonical shape of the Pentateuch...Rather, the present shape of the Pentateuch offers a particular interpretation--indeed a confession--as to how the tradition was to be understood by the community of faith. Therefore, it seems to me important first of all to describe the actual characteristics of the canonical shape and secondly to determine the theological significance of this shape.
>
> Brevard Childs, "The Old Testament as Scripture."
>
> If the Torah is sacred only in its redacted form, it is that form in which it must be read as Scripture. Isolating narrative strands will not do. What do the strands mean in their intertwined form? What is the meaning of the braid that is the text?
>
> Edward Greenstein, "The Torah as She is Read."
>
> I have concentrated...on the "wholeness" of biblical texts, rather than on their growth out of fragments...At the same time,...I have found it increasingly fascinating to encounter the text's complex layering...Every time a biblical story or law was put into a new setting or redaction, its meaning, and the meaning of the whole, must have been somewhat altered. A chorus of different periods and concerns is often discernible, however faintly.
>
> Everett Fox, *The Five Books of Moses.*[1]

The desire among Jews and Christians alike to confront ancient Israelite literature as scripture has generated attempts to interpret biblical texts as wholes, not merely as collections of fragments. These attempts take two forms. Some scholars concentrate on the rhetoric, artistry, and message of biblical texts; others attend to the canonical shape of the Bible and of its individual books. While the former, literary, approach has attracted both Jews and Christians, the latter has tended to be confined to Christians. This essay will ask why that should be the case--why, that is, canonical or unity-oriented approaches to biblical books make no contribution to a modern Jewish understanding of scripture. I shall explore this question by focusing on scholarly discussions of the Book of Isaiah.

Before turning to Isaiah, I need to pause to suggest what a modern understanding of a biblical book as Jewish scripture entails. A modern Jewish view of scripture must be just that: modern, which is to say, post-traditional. By this I mean that the views of traditional Jewish exegetes are no longer determinative for it, though they remain significant. This is the case both for larger questions, such as the identity of a book's author, and for minute issues, such as the interpretation of a particular passage. For example, almost all pre-modern Jewish exegetes identified Moses as the author of the Torah and Isaiah as the author of the Book of

---

[1]Childs, "The Old Testament as Scripture of the Church," *Concordia Theological Monthly* 43 (1972) 711, 715; Greenstein, "The Torah as She is Read," in *Essays on Biblical Method and Translation* (BJS 92; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989) 35; and Fox, *The Five Books of Moses: A New Translation with Commentary and Notes* (New York: Schocken, 1995) xxi.

Isaiah.[2] But a modern Jewish view of scripture can no longer make such a claim, at least if it is to have any integrity.[3] (All this is not to deny that there are to this day Orthodox Jewish biblical exegetes who vigorously uphold the doctrine of Mosaic or Isaianic authorship; such commentators, however, remain pre-modern, and their concerns differ from those of someone forming a modern view of biblical books as scripture.) Similarly, while a modern Jewish exegete[4] will be interested in readings of midrashic and medieval rabbinic commentators, she cannot allow herself simply to accept a traditional explanation as authoritative, even on a halachic passage.[5] A modern Jew viewing a biblical book as scripture needs to find an approach that is responsible to critical and historical issues, one that does not evade sound findings of academic scholarship. Such an approach must acknowledge that biblical texts come

---

[2]Few real exceptions exist. Various medieval rabbinic commentators suggested that parts of the Torah were composed after the time of Moses (see Nahum Sarna, "Hebrew and Bible Studies in Medieval Spain," in *The Sephardi Heritage: Essays on the History and Cultural Contribution of the Jews of Spain and Portugal* [ed. by R. D. Barnett; London: Vallentine, Mitchell, 1971] 349-351, and Uriel Simon, "Spanish Exegetes," in *Jewish Biblical Exegesis* [ed. Moshe Greenberg; Jerusalem: Bialik, 1983] 52-55 [Heb.]). But these commentators deal only with specific Pentateuchal verses, and their opinions are thus not really adumbrations of the modern rejection of Mosaic authorship. More significant is the view of ibn Ezra, the great twelfth century commentator, that Isaiah 40-66 were written by a prophet who lived one and a half centuries later than Isaiah, a view that he presents in veiled language intended only for the perceptive reader (see especially Uriel Simon, "Ibn Ezra between Medievalism and Modernism; the Case of Isaiah 40-66," *SVT* 36 [1985] 257-271). His opinion was never taken up--or even acknowledged--by other pre-modern Jewish exegetes.

[3]Willful naiveté is hardly the proper response of a modern scholar who wishes to view the ancient documents as sacred. Cf. Job 13.7-11 and 42.7; see also R. Elazar's statement in *b. Yoma* 69b.

[4]By this I mean a modern exegete interested in viewing a biblical book as Jewish scripture. Of course the term could also mean a modern biblical critic who happens to be Jewish, but such exegetes are not the my concern in this essay.

[5]In this respect, the modern commentator is not very different from some of her predecessors. While some medieval rabbinic commentators do accept Talmudic interpretations of halachic passages as authoritative and reject any other possible readings, others are willing to examine a level of meaning that differs from the level explicated by the *tannā'îm* and *'āmôrā'îm*. This is the case in the work of the twelfth century French exegetes Rashbam and, to some extent, Yosef Bekhor Shor (see especially Eliezer Touitou, "On Rashbam's Method in His Commentary on the Torah," *Tarbiz* 45 [1979] 252-253 [Heb.], and, on Bekhor Shor, R.A. Poznanski, *Introduction to the French Sages as Biblical Commentators* [Warsaw: Ḥevrat Mĕqiṣê Nirdāmîm, 1913] lxxii [Heb.]); further, this may also be the case in the work of a slighter later Provencal figure, Radak (see the comments of Frank Talmage, *David Kimhi: The Man and His Commentaries* [Cambridge: Harvard University, 1975] 77.)

Independence from older traditions is even more strongly evident in regard to non-legal material. When commenting on aggadic passages, many medieval commentators strive for originality against their predecessors (see Poznanski, lxiii, cxxxvii) and are willing to reject midrashic interpretations (see, e.g., ibn Ezra's introduction to his Torah commentary, section concerning the fourth way). Others accept the validity of midrashic readings while arguing that other readings are also possible (see especially the work of Touitou on Rashbam [esp. 248-252] and Poznanski on other French rabbinic exegetes [on Yosef Kara, xliii; on Bekhor Shor, lxxi; on Eliezer of Beaugency, cxxxviii], and cf. the somewhat more complex case of Radak discussed in Talmage [esp. 126-133]).

from a culture quite removed from our own and that we need to study them in the same way that we study other ancient and foreign cultural material.

For a modern view of Jewish scripture these methodological caveats are necessary, but they are not sufficient. While this view must admit that a gulf separates us from the text's original functions, it also insists on seeing the text as more than an artifact. However historically grounded, a modern approach to Bible as Jewish scripture must see these writings as relevant to contemporary religious concerns. Thus we may recall Uriel Simon's distinction between modern and premodern approaches to the Bible: premoderns aver that the Bible speaks to us now, while modern critical approaches remind us that the Bible speaks the language of a specific time.[6] A modern view of Bible as Jewish scripture attempts have it both ways: it wants somehow to appropriate the text's meaning in its ancient setting to a contemporary Jewish one. Similar statements might be made of any modern approach to ancient Israelite literature as scripture; an additional element is vital for a specifically Jewish attempt of this sort. Although the approach I am sketching out does not regard older Jewish opinions as correct *a priori*, it must nonetheless participate in the stream of Jewish biblical exegesis. This does not merely mean that modern Jewish scholars ought to sprinkle their work with quotations from midrash and medieval rabbinic exegesis alongside the works of modern scholars.[7] Rather, a modern Jewish approach to Bible as scripture must be sensitive to the emphases of older Jewish biblical exegesis; it must reflect that stream's ideas of why and in what ways the Bible is important. It is, after all that tradition of interpretation which has made

---

[6]See Simon, "Ibn Ezra between Medievalism and Modernism," 258: "While medieval philological exegesis was guided by the principle that 'The Tora speaks the language of men,' [and other traditional forms of biblical exegesis were guided by the even broader principle that the Bible is addressed to all generations; see Simon, 256], modern philological-historical interpretation is guided by the fundamental assumption that Sacred Scripture speaks in the language and ideas of men of a specific time. Even the eternal must be garbed in the temporal, for as purposeful speech every biblical text must have been intelligible to its audience and tuned to its need, problems, longings." Cf. Jon Levenson, "Theological Consensus or Historicist Evasion? Jews and Christians in Biblical Studies," in his collection, *The Hebrew Bible, the Old Testament, and Historical Criticism* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1993) 88.

[7]Of course, attention to classical Jewish commentators does enrich the work of modern critical scholars, Jewish and non-Jewish. However, the use of the classical commentators in modern scholarship is not necessarily related to an attempt to view the Bible as scripture; it is relevant to many specifically critical concerns. On the place of the rabbis in modern critical scholarship, see Rolf Rendtorff, "Rabbinic Exegesis and the Modern Christian Bible Scholar," in his collection, *Canon and Theology* (tr. and ed. by Margaret Kohl; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993) 22-24; for examples of commentators who use ancient and medieval insights productively for elucidating modern questions, see Brevard Childs, *The Book of Exodus* (OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1974) and Moshe Greenberg, *Understanding Exodus* (New York: Behrman House, 1969) and *Ezekiel 1-20* (AB; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983). The use of rabbinic commentary is not only relevant for synchronic or holistic readings; indeed, the rabbis' keen sense of gaps, contradictions, and discontinuities greatly aids source critics, as the example of Israel Knohl's work shows (*The Sanctuary of Silence: The Priestly Torah and the Holiness School* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995], e.g., 10 n. 12, 18 n.27, 28 nn. 55 and 59, 31 n. 66, etc.).

the text sacred to Jews, and through which Jews have approached the Bible.[8] For this reason, any Jewish view of scripture must treat strive to be influenced by older forms of Jewish exegesis.[9] Further, this approach needs to take into account how real Jewish communities come into contact with biblical texts.

How, then, might a modern Jew in search of scripture appropriate various perspectives on the Book of Isaiah? One can identify three main ways of viewing the book: traditional, critical, and unity-oriented. The traditional view posits Isaiah the son of Amotz as the author of the whole Book of Isaiah. According to modern critical scholarship, chapters 40-66 are the product of an author or authors living during and after the Babylonian exile; thus these chapters are not related to Isaiah at all, or in any event this section of the book is no more related to Isaiah than are other exilic and post-exilic prophetic works such as Ezekiel or Haggai. Further, there are passages that do not stem from Isaiah even within Isaiah 1-39, though they were added to a collection that clearly was attributed to Isaiah. A third point of view has arisen in recent decades, largely under the influence of canon criticism: while recognizing that the Book of Isaiah is the product of diverse authors living before, during, and after the exile, this view asserts that the book has a thematic unity and grew over time as a single body of material.[10]

---

[8]See the classic statement of Solomon Schechter, one of the first Jewish scholars who attempted to synthesize a critical method with a modern religious outlook, in his summary of the theological position of the "historical school" (*Studies in Judaism* [First Series; Philadelphia: JPS, 1896] xvii-xix). In asserting that interpretation is at least as authoritative as the biblical text, Schechter is not innovating; see, e.g., *b. San.* 99a (s.v. תניא אידך).

[9]By older forms of Jewish exegesis, I mean in particular rabbinite streams; I do not refer to types of Judaism or Jewish literature (e.g., Karaism, the Pseudepigrapha, Qumran) which have not contributed significantly to the Judaisms of the modern era.

[10]The volume of work is by now enormous. For summaries of the work of this school and bibliographies, see, among other, Rolf Rendtorff, "The Book of Isaiah: A Complex Unity. Synchronic and Diachronic Reading," in *Society of Biblical Literature: 1991 Seminar Papers*, (ed. Eugene Lovering, Jr.; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991) 8-20; and Christopher Seitz, *Zion's Final Destiny: The Development of the Book of Isaiah; A Reassessment of Isaiah 36-39* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991) 26-35. For more recent bibliography, see the various essays in *New Visions of the Book of Isaiah* (ed. Roy Melugin and Marvin Sweeney; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, forthcoming).

One may disagree with my sharp distinction between the second and third views described above. Many scholars from the unity school are indeed interested in the sort of diachronic issues that comprise the main concerns of the critical approach (see, e.g., H.G.M. Williamson, *The Book Called Isaiah: Deutero-Isaiah's Role in Composition and Redaction* [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994], and, for a carefully differentiation between the diachronic and synchronic issues, R.E. Clements, "Beyond Tradition History: Deutero-Isaianic Development of First Isaiah's Themes," *JSOT* 31 [1985], esp. 97-98). Such scholars argue that the Book of Isaiah cannot really be divided into the two or three parts described by earlier critical scholars, since (they claim) Deutero-Isaiah played a crucial role in shaping Isaiah 1-39, while Isaiah 40-66 were written as continuations of Proto-Isaiah. Thus these unity-oriented scholars concern themselves primarily with the composition history of the book, and not exclusively with an attempt to read the book canonically. However, I think that many of these scholars are more influenced than they admit by an assumption that Isaiah is a unity; they find compositional unity because they set out to find it (cf. the comments of David Carr, "Reaching for Unity in Isaiah," *JSOT* 57 [1993] 77-80). The elements of continuity they uncover may be impressive on a synchronic level, but these elements do not support the

This third viewpoint appears initially to meet the needs of a modern Jewish approach to scripture as described above. The unity orientation at once acknowledges the findings of modern critical scholarship and goes beyond them to find a message stemming from the canonical book viewed as a totality; it manages to have it both ways. But I would like to suggest that for a modern Jew attempting to view the Book of Isaiah as scripture, this third viewpoint has little to contribute, whereas the critical approach can be the most enriching. This suggestion may generate some surprise. After all, the critical theory does not regard the book's sections as organically related.[11] In choosing the critical approach, then, I seem not to succeed in returning us to the book as *scripture* (that is, the work as accepted and revered in the reli-

---

historical conclusions that the scholars reach. For example, many linkages among various parts of the book involve vocabulary common throughout the Hebrew Bible; thus one could use these items to show a connection between parts of Isaiah and many texts outside of Isaiah. Why, then, are these linkages deemed significant? Apparently because Proto-Isaiah, Deutero-Isaiah, and Trito-Isaiah are already physically linked--i.e., they are found on a single scroll. But the reasoning becomes circular here: the similarities appear significant to a unity-oriented scholars only because that scholar follows canon criticism in seeing the scroll as a literary unity rather than a collection. If one is open to the possibility that the presence of these corpora on a single scroll is a coincidence or a secondary development, then these linkages are not impressive as evidence for compositional affiliation of material on that scroll.

A similar problem affects attempts to find themes that unify the book. As Gerald Sheppard has noted, "our problem is no longer that there are so few obvious connections between parts of the book, but that there are so many and they seem so independent and disparately related" ("The Book of Isaiah: Competing Structures according to a Late Modern Description of Its Shape and Scope," in *Society of Biblical Literature 1992 Seminar Papers* [ed. Eugene Lovering; Atlanta: Scholars, 1992] 575). This plethora of common themes, I think, points to the conclusion that there really are no significant (which is to say, unique or distinctive) motifs that hold the book together. The many themes proposed by unity-oriented scholars could just as easily link either section of the scroll to most any prophetic book, or indeed (in the case of the theme Sheppard highlights [575-578], the "fear not" theme) to many works of ancient Near Eastern literature outside of Israel. To be sure, Deutero-Isaiah and the Isaianic "apocalypse" are not unrelated to the traditions of Isaiah son of Amotz, but they are connected to other prophets in the same ways, and perhaps even more intimately (for lengthier discussion, see my article, "Allusions and Illusions: The Unity of the Book of Isaiah in Light of Deutero-Isaiah's Use of Prophetic Tradition," in Melugin and Sweeney, *New Visions*).

All this is not to deny that attempts to bridge the two main parts of the book took place in antiquity; chapter 39 surely does so (as many unity-oriented scholars have astutely observed), and material in chapters 1 and 65-66 may have been transferred to their current places to give a sense of inclusio to the scroll (though this argument seems somewhat strained). But the fact remains that there are at least two sections on the Isaiah scroll which can be read coherently on their own. The evidence gathered by unity-oriented scholars supports a synchronic/canonical reading of the book as a unity, and at times it shows us how redactors brought several blocks of originally independent material together. But it does not demonstrate that the parts were always linked. Therefore, I think it is justifiable to speak of three perspectives: traditional, critical, and unity/canonical, since the more ambitious diachronic conclusions of unity scholars follow only from canon-critical presumptions.

[11]This theory, of course, does not deny Deutero-Isaianic reliance on First Isaiah; but it does not see that reliance as unique (since Deutero-Isaiah relies heavily on other earlier Israelite texts as well) or pivotal (since Isaiah 40-66 or 40-55 can be read coherently by itself).

gious communities that formed it[12]), since any attempt to view a biblical book as scripture must consider just that: the whole book, not a series of sections.

Or must it? I would like to suggest that viewing the Book of Isaiah as containing at least two distinct corpora works quite well for a modern Jewish view of scripture for two reasons: first, the unity or coherence of biblical books has traditionally *not* been important for Jewish views of scripture; and second, because separating the book into non-exilic and exilic portions engages modern Jewish concerns particularly well.

In Jewish scripturality, the literary unit of "book" is insignificant. For the midrashic exegete, the next unit after the verse that matters is the Bible as a whole, or perhaps the section (Torah or Nach [תנ"ך]--i.e., Prophets and Writings), but certainly not the book. This point has been stated cogently by James Kugel:

> Midrash is an exegesis of biblical verses, not of books...There simply is no boundary encountered beyond that of the verse until one comes to the borders of the canon itself--a situation analogous to certain political organizations in which there are no separate state, provinces, or the like but only the village and the Empire. One of the things this means is that each verse of the Bible is in principle as connected to its most distant fellow as to the one next door....Indeed [the midrashist] sometimes delights in the remoter source.[13]

This disregard for the notion of book distinguishes classical Jewish exegesis from other hermeneutic stances to scripture. One might be tempted too regard midrash as a holistic reading method and therefore to liken midrash to canon and literary criticism, with which it shares an apparently integrative approach.[14] Such an analogy, at least in one respect, would be misleading. Midrash is first of all a fragmentary mode of reading: it examines words, verses, or small collections of verses quite independently of their context in a given biblical book. True, midrash is concerned in its own way with context; but the context into which a midrashist puts a given verse is that of the entire Bible, not the more local context that literary critics privilege, and certainly not the context of the biblical book so loved by canon critics.

One sees this clearly in midrashic exegeses of the Book of Isaiah. While there is no *Midrash on the Book of Isaiah* (an absence that is itself telling), some midrashic collections contain sections on particular pericopes in Isaiah. This is the case especially in the *Pĕsîqtā'*

---

[12]Cf. Brevard Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979) 73, and cf. 83.

[13]James Kugel, "Two Introductions to Midrash," in *Midrash and Literature*, eds. G. Hartman and S. Budick (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986) 92 (originally in *Prooftexts* 3 [1983]).

[14]On similarities between holistic or literary approaches and classical Jewish exegesis, see, e.g., Meir Weiss, *The Bible from Within* (Jerusalem: Bialik, 1962) 24-25 [Heb.]. For a discussion of the differences as well as similarities between midrash and literary reading of the Bible, see Sarah Rozik (Kamin), "Midrashic and Literary Modes in Biblical Interpretation," *Beth Miqra* 21 (1976) 71-78 [Heb.].

dĕRab Kahănā', a collection of *pĕtîḥtôt* on the synagogue lectionary for special Sabbaths.[15] Several chapters (*pisqā'ôt*) of *Pesiq. Rab Kah.* deal with readings from Isaiah (generally from what we would call Deutero-Isaiah). The rabbis there (as in all midrashim) devote much of their energy to relating verses in the section under consideration to other biblical verses. What is relevant to my argument is that *pĕtîḥtôt* in *Pesiq. Rab Kah.* rarely relate verses from Isaiah to other verses from Isaiah. The rabbis are concerned, rather, to show how a verse from Isaiah relates to verses from the Torah, the Writings, or at times the Prophets. Demonstrating the unity of the whole canon is the rabbi's goal; demonstrating the unity of Isaiah is not. Thus the very first *pĕtîḥâ* on Isa 40.1 links that verse to Job 4.17 and several verses from Ruth 2 (which are in turn linked to Jer 2.27, Isa 24.15, Ps 139.9, Mal 3.20, Ezek 10.5 and 3.13, Isa 6.2, and Ps 36.8).[16] The presence of a few other verses from Isaiah (which connect not directly to Isa 40.1 but to Ruth 2.12) among a slew of verses from other books shows that for the midrashist, relating Isaiah to Isaiah is not important; the exegete, rather, connects the base-verse from Isaiah to other verses from the Bible as a whole. This same tendency appears throughout midrashic comments on Isaianic verses.[17] For the rabbinic exegete (and hence, I would argue, for the modern Jew attempting to create a specifically *Jewish* mode of relating to the Bible as scripture), Isaiah does not function as a book but as a collection of verses and pericopes. These verses and pericopes must be shown to relate not foremost to other parts of Isaiah but to other parts of the canon, perhaps most of all to the Torah.[18]

In other words, classical Judaism regards Isaiah (like any prophetic book) as a collection of pericopes that relate to other parts of the Bible at least as much as they relate to each

---

[15]For a brief discussion of the *pĕtîḥâ* form, see G. Stemberger and H. Strack, *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*, 7th ed., trans. M. Bockmuehl (Philadelphia: T. & T. Clark, 1991) 265-268, with extensive bibliography.

[16]The section appears in Bernard Mandelbaum, ed., *Pesikta de Rav Kahana according to an Oxford Manuscript with Variants*, 2d ed. (New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary, 1987) 263-265.

[17]One observes this outside *Pesiq. Rab Kah* as well. See the comments on Isaianic verses collected in the *Yalqûṭ Šimʿônî* (an anthology of midrashim on the entire Bible edited sometime between 1000 and 1400). Thus the first comment on Isa 1.1 does connect Isa 1.2 with Isa 44.22 and attributes authorship of the comforting parts of the book to the same prophet who wrote the warnings earlier therein. But it also connects Isa 1.1 to a series of verses from Hosea, Amos, 1 Kings, Exodus, and Daniel. The connection within the book is not an issue of particular concern.

One might argue that *Yal. Šimʿônî* contains a midrashic on Isaiah (and on all other biblical books) and that the existence of such a midrash shows that at least a medieval compiler wanted to create a midrashic commentary on all biblical books as wholes. But *Yal. Šimʿônî* contains not commentaries on books but series of comments on individual verses, organized by book.

[18]The tendency to relate prophetic verses especially to the Torah (as opposed to other verses from the Prophets or the Writings) is less evident in *Pesiq. Rab Kah.* On this tendency generally in Judaism, see John Barton, *Oracles of God: Perceptions of Ancient Prophecy in Israel after the Exile* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1986) 20-21. Incidentally, a fine example of a reading of the Book of Isaiah that reflects and renews this classical Jewish view of scripture appears in Sheppard's essay in the *1992 Seminar Papers*, 578-582.

other. This tendency further manifests itself (and may in part result from) the manner in which most Jews have any contact with Isaiah. Jewish reading of the prophets takes place through the synagogue lectionary cycle. Prophetic readings, or *haftārôt*, are chanted directly after the Pentateuchal readings in the synagogue each Sabbath and holiday. Thus the lectionary relates prophetic pericopes to Pentateuchal readings. For example, each year on a mid-winter Sabbath Isaiah 6 is read in following Exodus 18-20. The next Sabbath, one reads not Isaiah 7 but Jer 34.8-22, 33.25-26 in conjunction with Exodus 21-24. As a result, religious Jews (by which I mean simply those who attend Sabbath services) tend to connect prophetic texts not with other texts from the same book but with texts from the Torah. Canon critics are interested in how Isaiah 6 relates to Isaiah 40.[19] Jewish readers are more likely to ask how the revelation scene in Isaiah 6 sheds light on the theophany at Sinai described in Exodus 19; for these readers, Isaiah 6 does not particularly relate to the oracle in Isaiah 40, or even the visions in Jeremiah 1 or Ezekiel 1-3. Similarly, Isaiah 40 is read not as a part of the book from which it comes but as relating to Deut 3.23-7.11, which is the Pentateuchal reading it accompanies each year in mid-summer. Because the Sabbath on which Deut 3.23-7.11 and Isaiah 40 are read always follows the fast of the Ninth of Ab, Jews also relate Isaiah 40 to the Book of Lamentations and Jeremiah 8.13-9.23, which are read during that fast.

The notion of "book," then, is simply immaterial for a Jewish approach to scripture.[20] Ancient Jews produced interpretations of biblical verses, not of biblical books.[21] In the case of

---

[19]See, for example, Rolf Rendtorff, "Jesaja 6 im Rahmen der Komposition des Jesajabuches," in *The Book of Isaiah* (ed. J. Vermeylen; BETL 81; Leuven: University Press, 1981) 79-81; Rainer Albertz, "Das Deuterojesaja-Buch als Fortschreibung der Jesaja-Prophetie," in *Die Hebräische Bibel und ihre zweifache Nachgeschichte: Festschrift für Rolf Rendtorff* (ed. E. Blum, C. Macholz, and E. Stegemann; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1990) 244-248; Christopher Seitz, "The Divine Council: Temporal Transition and New Prophecy in the Book of Isaiah," *JBL* 109 (1990) 229-247. The historical conclusions in these essays are deeply affected by their canonical orientation. See also Roy Melugin, *The Formation of Isaiah 40-55* (BZAW; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1976) 176-178, who is more careful to ground canonical conclusions on a careful historical reading from pp. 83-84.

[20]A possible exception to this statement can be seen in *m. Meg.* 4:4, which rules that *haftārôt* readings can skip from section to section within a biblical book but not from one book to another. This shows that Jewish law sees the unit of book as having at least some significance.

However, the fact remains that rabbinic hermeneutics, like all ancient Jewish hermeneutics, never confronted the unit of book. Rather, the rabbis approached prophetic books as a collections of individual units, and for them these units did not relate to other units within the same book in any meaningful or unique way. Cf. Barton, *Oracles*, 150: "In ancient times everyone assumed that the whole book of Isaiah was by that prophet, but no one read the book as a unity. On the contrary Isaiah (like the rest of Scripture) was read as if it were a collection of innumerable fragments, a book not unlike Proverbs, in which every pericope, indeed every sentence or even every word, had a meaning independent of its context. The perception of Isaiah as part of 'the holy books' inhibited any attempt to find unity within the book itself, since it was not seen as a work with its own internal integrity but as a more or less arbitrary length cut from a longer roll, the seamless fabric of the oracles of God."

[21]Granted, in the case of comments on the Torah and on the Five Scrolls, these verse-by-verse comments were redacted into midrashic collections dealing with books. But works such as *Exod. Rab.* or *Sifre* are first of all clusters of comments (often ordered with a thematic thrust in mind), not commentaries on books. Cf. James Kugel, *In Potiphar's House: The Interpretive Life of Biblical Texts* (New York: HarperCollins, 1990) 255: "Our

the prophetic books, Jews do not read them from start to finish in the synagogue; instead they read discrete passages from the prophets.[22] Modern canon critics are interested in the notion of canon precisely because they are modern: their literary predilections (including their concern for coherence within, and extended readings of, biblical books) are rooted in Protestantism and, more importantly, New Criticism.[23] It is not surprising, then, that their perfectly logical and legitimate constructs have no relevance for Jewish ideas of scripturality.[24]

---

present midrashic collections are somewhat deceiving, since they seem to constitute running commentaries on entire biblical books, whereas in fact most are anthologies of individual, verse-centered comments strung together by the editor."

[22]Even in the case of the Torah, the context of the book as a whole is largely broken down liturgically. Although the Torah is read sequentially in its entirety, the reading is accomplished piece by piece over the course of a year; and in some ancient communities (where a Palestinian rather than Babylonian lectionary cycle was in use) the reading was accomplished over three to three and a half years (for a brief description of these cycles, see Strack-Stemberger, *Introduction*, 262-264, and Ismar Elbogen, *Jewish Liturgy: A Comprehensive History* [translated by Raymond Scheindlin, based on the 1913 German edition and the expanded 1972 Hebrew edition edited by Joseph Heinemann; New York and Philadelphia: Jewish Theological Seminary and JPS, 1993] 129-138). Some modern synagogues have introduced a triennial cycle that is even more disjunctive in nature than its ancient counterpart.

Thus religious Jews both ancient and modern have been encouraged by their liturgical practices to view scripture as a series of short pericopes rather than as whole scrolls. This was even more strongly the case among ancient Jews for two reasons. First, most ancient Jews did not own scrolls and would only have access to scripture by hearing short passages as they were recited. Second, even ancient Jews with access to the physical texts would not generally read them as wholes in the way that modern readers do--viz., by flipping back and forth to compare various passages. As late as the amoraic period Jews used scrolls rather than codices (see Nahum Sarna, "The Order of the Books," in *Studies in Jewish Bibliography, History and Literature in Honor of I. Edward Kiev* [ed. Charles Berlin; New York, Ktav, 1971] 408-409), and scrolls do not lend themselves to the sort of holistic readings favored by canon critics. Cf. Katheryn P. Darr ("Isaiah's Vision and the Rhetoric of Rebellion," in *Society of Biblical Literature 1994 Seminar Papers* [ed. Eugene Lovering, Jr.; Atlanta: Scholars, 1994] 852), who correctly notes the importance of the physical form of the text; oddly, however, she imagines an ancient reader attending to an "unfolding scroll" in a fashion that probably never existed, given the nature of scrolls.

[23]As is argued quite persuasively by John Barton, *Reading the Old Testament: Method in Biblical Study* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1984) 101-103, 141-154.

[24]It is important to note that the midrashic tendencies I noted above (breaking down or atomizing pericopes; recontextualizing verses by linking them to verses in other books) appear in pre-rabbinic Jewish exegesis as well--that is, in exegesis more or less contemporary with the long process of canonization. (See the examples of the tendency to link verses discussed by Michael Fishbane, "Use, Authority and Interpretation of Mikra at Qumran," in *Mikra: Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, [ed. Martin Jan Mulder; CRINT 2,1; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988] 351-354, and the discussion of atomization and re-contextualization in Kugel, *Potiphar's*, 220f.) In light of this, it becomes clear that Childs is quite incorrect when he asserts, "It is a misunderstanding of the canonical method to characterize it as an attempt to bring extrinsic, dogmatic categories to bear on the biblical text....Rather, the approach seeks to work within that interpretative structure which the biblical text has received from those who formed and used it as sacred scripture" (*Introduction*, 73). By stressing the literary unit called "book," canon critics in fact ignore the interpretative

A critical approach to the composition of Isaiah, on the other hand, may work particularly well for a modern Jewish notion of scripture. By emphasizing the discrete blocks of material within the book, a critical approach may actually enrich the modern Jew's understanding of the book's relevance. Further, focusing on Isaiah 40-66 as a block of material on its own is not without precedence in Jewish tradition. I shall briefly explain the latter point before sketching out how looking at the book's sections on their own is religiously interesting for a modern Jew.

Traditional Jewish exegetes other than ibn Ezra attribute the Book of Isaiah to a single author,[25] even though, as we have seen, this attribution does not significantly affect their interpretations of his writings.[26] However, Jewish tradition at times does seem to treat the material in chapters 40-66 as a section of its own. This is most evident in the prophetic lectionary. On the seven Sabbaths following the fast of the Ninth of Ab, "*haftārôt* of consolation" are read; these present a lengthy response to the Book of Lamentations, which is read on the Ninth of Ab itself, and they also prepare the way for the ten days of repentance (including Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur) that begin seven weeks after the Ninth of AB. All these *haftārôt* of consolation are taken from Isaiah 40-66.[27] Other prophetic passages would work just as well to console, to encourage, and to underscore the promise of forgiveness and redemption:

---

structure of ancient readers. Doing so is perfectly defensible, but the anachronism of such a method ought to be acknowledged. Cf. Barton, *Oracles*, 149-150.

[25]One can imagine that traditionalists might admit that certain short sections are not by Isaiah; indeed, Rabbi Simon, in *Lev. Rab.* 6:6 maintains that Isa 8.19-20 are not the work of Isaiah but comprise the prophetic *oeuvre* of one בארה, identified elsewhere as Beeri (בארי), the father of Hosea (see Rashi to Isaiah 8.19, and the sources cited in M. Margulies, *Midrash Wayyikra Rabbah: A Critical Edition* [New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1993; first published in 1953] 142). But an exception of this sort hardly overturns the general attribution of the book to Isaiah.

[26]To be sure, on occasion the rabbis refer to Isaianic authorship of 40ff. in their exegeses; see for example the fourth comment on Isa 40.1 in *Pesiq. Rab Kah.* (pp. 268-270 of Mandelbaum). Similarly, the first interpretation of Isaiah 40.1 in *Yal. Šimʿônî* refers back to Isa 39.8 to stress the connection between chapters 39 and 40 (cf., the similar point made by many unity-oriented critics); even there, however, the full context of the midrash in *Yal. Šimʿônî*'s source, *Midr. Zûṭāʾ Cant.* 8:4, shows the midrash to be equally interested in connecting Isa 40.1 with 1 Kgs 19.10; the nexus within Isaiah is neither unique nor particularly significant for the midrashist.

[27]For a list of the readings, see *Tanakh: A New Translation of the Holy Scriptures* (Philadelphia: JPS, 1985) x. The first of these is Isa 40.1-26. On the origin of the *haftārôt* of consolation, see Elbogen et. al., *Liturgy*, 145 and 425-426 n. 13. Elbogen et. al. point out that these lections must have been standardized as early as the fifth century C.E. (i.e., considerably earlier than most other prophetic lections), because they are used by Karaites as well as Rabbinites and because they are already known to *Pesiq. Rab Kah* (which is dated sometime between the fifth and seventh centuries C.E.; see Elbogen, ibid., and Strack-Stemberger, 321-322). On the origin of these *haftārôt* see also Louis Barth, "The 'Three of Rebuke and Seven of Consolation' Sermons in the Pesikta deRav Kahana," *JJS* 33 (1985) (=*Essays in Honor of Yigal Yadin*) 505-509.

one thinks of Isaiah 9, Isaiah 11-12, Isaiah 27, Isaiah 30.18f., Jeremiah 30-33, Jeremiah 50-51, Ezekiel 37-39, Ezekiel 47, to name only a few. Yet the rabbis chose exclusively from the last part of Isaiah. To be sure, they did not intend to hint that these chapters were written by someone other than the eighth century prophet, but they do seem to treat them as a distinct unit.[28] A similar tendency may be evident in pre-rabbinic Judaism: a Qumran document, 4QTanḥumim (4Q176)[29] strings together quotations of consolation taken exclusively from Deutero-Isaiah.[30] Again, in creating a catena of encouraging verses, one could quite easily take from other parts of Isaiah; the decision to draw exclusively from the last part of the book is noteworthy. Finally, we should recall ibn Ezra, one of the most important medieval rabbinic commentators, who was (so far as we know) the first scholar to surmise that chapters 40 and following were composed by an anonymous prophet in the Babylonian exile,[31] even though other Jewish scholars did not follow him in this view until the advent of modernity.[32]

---

[28]Does Maimonides display a similar tendency in his review of laws pertaining to these *haftārôt*? He notes (*Mišnê Tôrâ, Hilkôt Tĕfillâ*, 13:19) that all the prophetic readings between the Ninth of Ab and Rosh Hashanah are taken from what he calls נחמות ישעיהו, as if the last part of the Book of Isaiah (which is not the only part containing comforting material) can be referred to with a descriptive title of its own. He does not insinuate that the chapters that provide these *haftārôt* comprise a separate book, but he does refer to them as a particular block with their own name.

[29]For the text, see J.M. Allegro, *DJD* 5, 60-67 (and cf. John Strugnell, "Notes en marge du volume V des 'Discoveries in the Judean Desert of Jordan'," *RQ* 7 [1970] 229-236). As Lawrence Schiffman notes, the text is not sectarian but reflects typical views of late Second Temple Judaism (*Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls* [Philadelphia: JPS, 1994] 386).

[30]Ps 79.2-3 may be quoted at the beginning of the passage, though the fragmentary nature of the text makes it difficult to be sure. Zech 13.9 is quoted on another fragment that appears to belong to this document. The bulk of the document, however, clearly relies on Deutero-Isaiah and not on Isaiah 1-39.

[31]See above, note 2.

[32]The views of Samuel David Luzzatto (often known by the acronym, Shadal) deserve particular attention. Luzzatto, who lived from 1800 to 1865 is important for our purposes because he straddles the line between traditional and modern Jewish Bible scholarship as I have described them. (As Simon shows ["Between Medievalism," 271], the same can not be said of ibn Ezra; in spite of the many cases in which he anticipates modern biblical criticism, his perspective remains medieval.) Luzzatto was in contact with some of the first modern biblical scholars, both Jewish and non-Jewish, and heartily acknowledges their learning and critical acumen. He is willing to put aside traditional Jewish beliefs regarding authorship and to amend the vocalization provided by Jewish tradition (i.e., the Masorah) and often the consonants as well. Most indicative of his modernism, he insists that one must examine claims about the Bible critically rather than accepting or rejecting them on the basis of piety (on all these tendencies, see his essay on the unity of Isaiah, "The Book of Isaiah," in his collected essays, *Meḥqĕrê Hayyahădût*, 2 vols. [Warsaw: Hatsefirah, 1913; originally published in *Kerem Ḥemed* 7 {1842}] 2:30-31, 43-44 [Heb.], and additional examples cited in Lawrence Kaplan, "Scholarly, Non-traditional Fundamentalism: On Samuel David Luzzatto's Approach to the Bible," *Conservative Judaism* 35:2 [Winter, 1982] 16-17 and 23 nn. 4-5). But the form and content of his commentaries link them more closely in many ways with the classic rabbinic exegetes, and the results of his investigations leave central Jewish beliefs about the Bible (and especially about the Torah) untouched. Lawrence Kaplan, in a detailed study of Luzzatto's writings on the

All this suggests that approaching the two main halves of the Book of Isaiah separately is legitimate for a modern Jewish approach to the Bible as scripture; why, however, is doing so advantageous? I would like to suggest two reasons.

First, the critical theory divides the book into two main parts: a section stemming from

---

Bible, has argued persuasively that we should term Luzzatto a scholarly, non-traditional fundamentalist: he is scholarly and non-traditional in his willingness to depart from earlier Jewish views of the Bible, but fundamentalist in his belief in the doctrinal and historical inerrancy of scripture ("Scholarly," 15-25). Thus Luzzatto is a crucial figure in the move towards a modern Jewish biblical exegesis and especially in the attempt to create a post-traditional Jewish view of scripture (cf. Kaplan, 23).

In 1841 Luzzatto wrote an essay rejecting the notion, then gaining acceptance, that an exilic Jew living in Babylon wrote chapters 40 and following in Isaiah. He argues as follows. The prophecies in chapters 40-66 claim to have been written long before the events they describe--viz., the conquest of Babylon by the Persian monarch, Cyrus. This claim is clear from verses such as Isa 45.21 and 48.3,5. If they were not written by an eighth century prophet, then these verses are simply lies--they assert they were written before the 530's even though they were not. Luzzatto readily acknowledges that parts of the Bible were not written by the author to whom tradition assigns them; but he refuses to allow that the parts of scripture were written to deceive. Since the chapters claim to have foretold the coming of Cyrus long ago, they must have done so; and thus an exilic Jew cannot have written Isaiah 40-66. (See Luzzatto, esp. 44; Kaplan, 18-20; and Kaplan's later article, "Samuel David Luzzatto and the Unity of the Book of Isaiah: A Postscript," *Conservative Judaism* 38:2 [Winter, 1985] 77-81).

Does this figure, who supplies a model for a modern, post-traditional view of scripture, abjure a critical approach to Isaiah? I think not, for two reasons. (1) Luzzatto's approach does not really differ significantly from the modern scholar's. Though he cannot admit that these chapters were written *by* an exilic Jew, he agrees that they were written *for* exilic Jews. Luzzatto recognizes that the audience of the prophecies in chapters 40 and following is not an eighth century audience (see his essay, 38-39). Indeed, he maintains that Isaiah did not speak these prophecies aloud (since they would have been meaningless to his contemporaries) but wrote them down for a later readers (p. 39). Luzzatto is quite ready to assert that the Book of Isaiah contains two distinct corpora, if not in authorship then certainly in setting. (2) Luzzatto's interpretation of verses such as 45.21 and 48.3,5 is not the most likely one, and hence his objection to the critical theory can fall away. These verses may refer back to older prophecies uttered by an exilic prophet's predecessors, in which case they present themselves as contemporaneous with Babylon's fall. Elsewhere Deutero-Isaiah alludes to specific prophecies of earlier prophets that have come true: thus Isa 42.18-25 borrows vocabulary and imagery from Isa 30.9-14 in order to confirm the fulfillment of the earlier text; Isa 48.10-11 implicitly notes that Jeremiah's dire warning in Jer 9.6 has come to fruition, to cite only a few examples. Deutero-Isaiah frequently refers to older prophecies by other prophets that have come to pass; the point of these passages (e.g., 41.22, 43.12, 44.6-7, 48.3) is that the audience should recognize YHWH's uniqueness and trustworthiness because He announced long ago what would take place later. In light of this it is clear that passages such as 45.21 and 48.3-5 do not purport to be pre-exilic. Rather, they note that YHWH had issued predictions through earlier prophets which turned out to be accurate--viz., that Judah would be punished through exile, and that Judah's conqueror would eventually be punished in turn. Thus Luzzatto's theological objection to dating these verses to the exile turns out to be unnecessary. It follows that Luzzatto's approach can lead to a view of Isaiah most closely resembling neither the traditional viewpoint nor the canonical approach but a critical reading. On the other hand, I cannot see how Luzzatto would find a canonical approach promising; the notion of a *Fortschreibung* would appear too similar to the reading he rejected.

the Land of Israel and a section from the exile.[33] This suits modern Jewish concerns particularly well. The emphasis on Deutero-Isaiah as literature of exile and return allows us to focus on Deutero-Isaiah's Zionism, on his situation as a diaspora Jew looking forward to revival. Perhaps more than any other biblical writer, Deutero-Isaiah is the Zionist voice in Jewish scripture (and I use the term Zionism in a limited, highly specific, way: to refer to an outlook closely resembling the nineteenth and twentieth century ideology of that name). This is not to gainsay the stress on the nation's link with its land in many other biblical books, including especially Proto-Isaiah. Nonetheless, only Deutero-Isaiah speaks as an exile whose chief concern is going home, home to a land he in all probability had never seen.[34] In this respect Deutero-Isaiah displays a distinctive affinity in both situation and aspiration with modern Zionism. Parts of chapters 40-66 also treat the conditions of the returned exiles. Those returnees in Persian-era Judah experienced a restoration that had not lived up to earlier hopes. Therefore the prophet(s?) in the last chapters of Isaiah wrestled with concretized ideals that turned out to be fraught with the ambiguities and difficulties of actual events. Here again the connection to modern Zionism is obvious. In a canonical reading of the Book of Isaiah, the presence of this Zionist book in scripture is obscured, but the critical reading highlights this corpus. For the modern Jew, this is crucial, since Zionism is the most dynamic, the most widely held, and the most effective Jewish response to modernity.

Similarly, the critical approach invites one to notice ideas peculiar to First Isaiah.[35] These might be somewhat blurred if one regarded the Book of Isaiah as a unit. Isaiah's themes of Zion threatened yet surprisingly delivered and of the returning remnant[36] have particular resonance to post-1948 Jewish history. Moreover, the dangers of the theme of Zion's inviolability--dangers that Jeremiah was later to critique so incisively (Jer 7:3-4, 26:4-6)--are

---

[33]Even if one admits that later (at times post-586) passages were added to the first part of the book, its character as a mainly pre-exilic document stemming from the Land of Israel remains intact. Similarly, even if one regards chapters 56-66 or (more likely) 49-66 as having been written in the Land of Israel rather than Babylon, those chapters remain exilic in orientation, because the full restoration from exile anticipated in 40-48 had not yet occurred. For the notion of exile as more than a geographic concept, see J.Z. Smith "A Pearl of Great Price and a Cargo of Yams: A Study in Situational Incongruity," in his collection, *Imagining Religion from Babylon to Jonestown* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1982) 90-101.

[34]Thus Deutero-Isaiah differs from the other candidate for the distinction of most Zionist writer, Ezekiel. Much of Ezekiel was composed while the first commonwealth still survived; his message of restoration is only part of his work, and not the most prominent part. Further, Ezekiel's first home was indeed his homeland, and thus he differed from Deutero-Isaiah and the founders of modern Zionism.

[35]For particularly fine summaries, see Yehezkel Kaufmann, *Toledot ha-Emunah ha-Yisraelit*, 4 vols. (Tel Aviv: Mosad Bialik and Devir, 1937-56) 3:202-204 (and see also his *The Religion of Israel* [translated and abridged by Moshe Greenberg; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960] 394-395), and Gerhard von Rad, *The Message of the Prophets* (translated by D. Stalker; San Francisco: Harper, 1967) 137, 144.

[36]See especially von Rad, 136.

especially relevant to modern Jewry, especially in the Land of Israel.[37] The critical theory that invites us to hear various ancient voices separately provides the most useful model for the modern Jewish reader straining to find contemporary messages in scripture.

This brings me to the second reason that the critical approach to the composition of the Book of Isaiah fits the concerns of modern Jews particularly well. The emphasis on division highlights our perception of the Bible--and even of an individual biblical book--as an anthology. In this particularly case, it allows one to note the differences between Isaiah and Deutero-Isaiah, and among the other hands who contributed to the final book as we know it. The Book of Isaiah (like the Tanakh as a whole) thus becomes not a source of dogma but a record of debate, of conversation, of revision within tradition. This model works well for modern forms of Judaism, because they endeavor to continue those ancient conversations and debates and hence to find warrant for their own innovations within the context of tradition. Moreover, by emphasizing the distinct layers of the ancient texts, one can achieve the dual goals central to a modern Jewish view of scripture: as one utilizes the findings of modern scholarship, one renews an essential characteristic of traditional Jewish learning. Biblical exegesis in rabbinic and medieval Judaism has always focused on debate and variety. Midrashic collections string together alternate interpretations of a verse and often record (or create) exegetical debates among rabbis.[38] The presentation of the debate in a *miqrā'ôt gĕdôlôt* (an edition of the Bible with medieval commentators) differs: there one finds the biblical text in the center of the page and several commentaries around it. The sages whose words surround and guard the biblical text comment not only on that text but on each other as well.[39] Argument and exchange, then, are the focus of traditional Jewish Bible study; their marginal position on the physical page belies their central role. Critical scholarship can show that the debates appearing in the

---

[37]The notion of Zion's inviolability (which produced the theme of surprising deliverance in Isaiah's eighth century prophecies) created an idolatry of Zion, against which Jeremiah spoke in the sixth century, and against which it is necessary to speak in the late twentieth. Isaiah's admirable love of an idea that later went awry serves as a useful warning: the disciples of the wise are not always themselves wise; those who follow the pursuers of justice may not themselves be just. One thinks, for example, of Rav Kook and his legacy in the more extreme, and violent, components of the nationalist-religious camp.

[38]Debate and exegetical variety plays a much smaller role in non-rabbinic Judaisms of the ancient world. In Qumran, for example, the act of interpretation, at least by the Teacher of Righteousness, was regarded as inspired (see, e.g., 1QpHab 7.2-4), and therefore recording several possible interpretations was unnecessary. The rabbis, on the other hand, did not generally suggest that their interpretations were inspired. Because they saw their readings as human in origin and fallible, they engaged in debate regarding correct understandings of biblical verses. See Steven Fraade, *From Tradition to Commentary: Torah and Its Interpretation in the Midrash Sifre to Deuteronomy* (SUNY Series in Judaica; Albany: SUNY Press, 1991) 3-5, 9, 13.

[39]The setup of the page in the *miqrā'ôt gĕdôlôt* is important when we consider Jewish ideas of scripturality, since from the 1500's or earlier until relatively recently a rabbinic Bible was probably the only Bible most Jewish scholars used. I suspect that single volume editions containing only the Bible itself were rare among Jews the Middle Ages, and they remain somewhat rare even among contemporary ultra-orthodox Jews. Even the earliest printed Hebrew Bibles usually included the commentaries; see Martin Jan Mulder, "The Transmission of the Biblical Text," in *Mikra* (cited above, n. 24) 116-121.

midrashic collections or in the margin of the *miqrā'ôt gĕdôlôt* exist in the biblical text itself. A harmonizing reading moves our attention away from the discrete texts within a biblical book and the cacophony they create. For a modern Jewish view of scripture, on the other hand, the dynamic nature of biblical texts must not be overlooked.[40]

While the various parts of the Book of Isaiah do share a great deal with each other (though no more than they share with many other prophetic books),[41] they also part ways on crucial issues, especially regarding kingship and the city of Jerusalem. Isaiah is deeply committed to the Davidic monarchy; following the covenant of grant (known to us from texts such as Psalm 89 and 2 Samuel 7), he trusts in an eternal royal line descended from David.[42] To be sure, he is at times frustrated with a given monarch (note his unhappiness with Ahaz in chapters 7-8 and his disapproval of some of Hezekiah's policies in 31.1-3 and 22.9-12). This does not, however, lead him to a rejection of the monarchy; it inspires him to look forward to a day when a better, indeed perfect, Davidic monarch will rule (chapters 9 and 11; 32.1). Deutero-Isaiah's attitude towards kingship differs considerably. Even though the royal family still existed in his day (as the end of 2 Kings reminds us), he does not hope for the renewal of its rule. This stance has often been noted and is perhaps most evident in Isa 55.1-5.[43] Indeed, whenever Deutero-Isaiah borrows from an older royal text, whether in Isaiah or Psalms, he pointedly omits any reference to the king and nationalizes whatever motif was associated with the monarch.[44] The omission is startling given the hope for the dynasty's re-enthronement

---

[40]Cf. the similar reasoning of Jon Levenson, "Why Jews are not Interested in Biblical Theology," in his collection, *Hebrew Bible* (cited above, n. 6) 53-54, and especially his eloquent statement on p. 56. Cf. also Knohl, 230, whose statement can serve as a model for a modern Jewish understanding of scripture.

[41]See my article, "Allusions and Illusions."

[42]On the connection between Isaiah's views and older royal texts, see, e.g., Hans Wildberger, *Königsherrschaft Gottes: Jesaja 1-39*, 2 vols. (Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1984) 1:128-138; J.J.M. Roberts, "The Divine King and the Human Community in Isaiah's Vision of the Future," in Albert Green, Herbert Huffmon, and Frank Spina, *The Quest for the Kingdom of God: Essays in Honor of George E. Mendenhall* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1983) 132-133; Ernst Würthwein, "Jesaja 7,1-9. Ein Beitrag zu dem Thema: Prophetie und Politik," *Wort und Existenz. Studien zum Alten Testament* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970) 138-143. Jesper Høgenhaven argues against Würthwein that Isaiah 7 is not based on 2 Samuel 7 (*Gott und Volk bei Jesaja: Eine Untersuchung zur biblischen Theologie* [Leiden: Brill, 1988] 86-87, 226), but he does not succeed in showing that Isaiah's ideas are unrelated to a Davidic covenant of grant.

[43]See Otto Eissfeldt, "The Promises of Grace to David in Isaiah 55:1-5," in *Israel's Prophetic Heritage* (ed. B. Anderson and W. Harrelson; New York: Harper, 1962) 202-207; Joachim Begrich, *Studien zur Deuterojesaja*, 2d edition (TBü 20; Munich: Kaiser, 1969) 105; B.W. Anderson, "Exodus and Covenant in Second Isaiah and Prophetic Tradition," in *Magnalia Dei: The Mighty Acts of God, Essays...in Memory of G. Ernest Wright* (ed. F.M. Cross, W. Lemke, and P. Miller; Garden City: Doubleday, 1976) 343.

[44]See, e.g., Isa 42.1-8 and 60.17-61.1, which borrow from Isa 11.1-10; Isa 44.24-45.8, 49.7-23, and 60.1-21, all of which rework Ps 72.1-17; Isa 61.1-11, which seems to be based on Ps 132.9-18; Isa 44.24-45.8, which may be compared with Psalm 2. For discussions of these texts and their relationships, see the third and fourth chapters in my University of Chicago dissertation, *Leshon Limmudim: The Poetics of Allusion in Isaiah 40-66* (1994).

expressed in other exilic and early post-exilic texts, such as Jer 33.14-16, Ezekiel 37, Zech 3.8, 4.6-10, 6.12, and Hag 1.12-15, 2.21-23.[45] If we read the Book of Isaiah as a unity, we are likely to miss the extent to which the writer(s?) in the last part of the book differ both from predecessor(s?) in the beginning of the book and from contemporaries. This evidence for diversity of opinion in an era of national renewal is important for a Jewish view of scripture, especially in the late twentieth century.

Much the same point can be made regarding the prophets' attitudes toward Zion. They both stress Zion (as does the "apocalypse" in Isa 24.34 and 25.6, which recall First Isaiah), but in different ways: Deutero-Isaiah can no longer speak of its inviolability, which was so central to First Isaiah.[46] On this issue, Deutero-Isaiah is closer to Jeremiah (how could he not be, of course, living after the destruction?).[47] Deutero-Isaiah is not unaware of the Zion traditions of his predecessors, but he develops them in new ways and passes over the frankly inaccurate aspects of Isaiah's sanguine predictions in silence.[48] Again, a strongly diachronic approach heightens our sensitivity to the difference between the two parts of the book, enriching our ability to hear many voices from the text.[49]

"The way midrash collections introduce a new comment is revealing--*dābār ʾāḥēr* (another interpretation)," Jon Levenson writes.[50] What is Deutero-Isaiah (or Trito-Isaiah, if he existed) but a lengthy *dābār ʾāḥēr*? What are the interpolations (whether Josianic or post-exilic) that some critics find in Isaiah 1-39? Insofar as critical methods of study reveal the diachronic

---

[45]On these, see Joseph Blenkinsopp, *A History of Prophecy in Israel from the Settlement in the Land to the Hellenistic Period* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1983) 183; P. Ackroyd, *Exile and Restoration* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1968) 124-125; and Anderson, "Exodus Typology in Second Isaiah," in *Israel's Prophetic Heritage* (cited in note 43) 124 n. 27.

[46]See, e.g., von Rad, 126-138.

[47]Interestingly, Deutero-Isaiah does not really even respond in any clear fashion to the fact that this central aspect of Isaiah's prophecies turned out to be incorrect. If the book really were a redactional unity, and if Deutero-Isaiah were primarily writing a *Fortschreibung* of Isaiah's work (as many scholars from the unity school contend), the absence of a response to this theme would be surprising.

[48]For one reading that stresses Deutero-Isaiah's reworking of the Zion theme in Isaiah, see Martin Buber, "Redemption (Isaiah and Deutero-Isaiah)," in *On the Bible: Eighteen Studies* (ed. Nahum Glatzer; New York: Schocken, 1968) 164.

[49]For a brief summary of some other significant theological differences between Isaiah and Deutero-Isaiah, see S.R. Driver, *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* (New York: Meridian, 1956; first published in 1897) 242-243.

[50]Levenson, "Why," 56.

layering of biblical texts, they demonstrate the continuity between the Bible and Jewish exegesis, between Miqra and Midrash, between Torah and Talmud. It is for this reason that critical study, not canonical study, presents the finest model for a modern Jewish view of scripture.[51] Of course, within the plethora of critical methods, some are more helpful than others; holistic readings of biblical pericopes are of particular relevance here, which explains why Jewish scholars, from Buber, Rosenzweig, and Cassuto on, have taken such a strong interest in literary study of the Bible.[52] But holistic readings of entire books strike no chord with the history of Jewish biblical exegesis or with contemporary Jewish concerns.[53]

Jews, in short, do not read books.[54] The traditionalist reads the classic commentaries on individual verses; the modern Jew discovers manifold historical levels whose presence links Bible with later Jewish texts and encourages ongoing development of tradition; the post-modern Jew revels in the diverse voices and counter-voices so reminiscent of Talmudic and contemporary dialectic. Biblical theologians do read books: they find overarching themes that run through a biblical book, in spite of the components from which the book is built,[55] and thus a canonical approach to the Book of Isaiah is relevant to Old Testament theology. It is not important to Tanakh theology.[56] For that reason I prefer not to speak of the Book of Isaiah as

---

[51]In distinguishing between critical and canonical study (rather than viewing canon criticism as another method of critical study, alongside source, form, redaction, and rhetorical or literary criticism), I follow Childs, *Introduction*, 82.

[52]One thinks of scholars such as Meir Weiss, Jacob Licht, Shemaryahu Talmon, Zvi Adar, Meir Sternberg, Michael Fishbane, Robert Alter and Edward Greenstein, all of whom display the influence of these figures.

[53]This explains why, in spite of the similarity among the quotations from the beginning of this essay, the methods associated with Childs on the one hand and people like Greenstein and Fox on the other are in practice so very different.

[54]I have stressed throughout this essay the import of certain aspects of classical Jewish exegesis; still, this sentence ought not be read atomistically through the decontextualizing hermeneutic of midrash.

[55]See, for example, J.J.M. Roberts, "Isaiah in Old Testament Theology," *Int* 36 (1982) 130-143, as well as Childs, *Introduction*.

[56]For the distinction, see Moshe Goshen-Gottstein, "Tanakh Theology: The Religion of the Old Testament and the Place of Jewish Biblical Theology," in *Ancient Israelite Religion: Essays in Honor of Frank Moore Cross* (ed. P. Miller, P. Hanson, and S.D. McBride; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987), esp., 625, 633-634. As Goshen and Levenson have both noted, Jews have tended to be interested in the history of Israelite religion (a field that attends to diversity) rather than in biblical theology (a field that looks for unity), in large part for reasons noted above (and see Goshen-Gottstein, 621-622; Levenson, "Why," 35-36). This preference reminds us of another crucial dissimilarity between modern Jewish and Christian approaches to scripture. A non-theological reading is especially relevant for contemporary Jews because Judaism, unlike Christianity, is not only a religion but an ethnicity. Many Jews today are not religious; they maintain a strong identity as Jews independent of beliefs about God or ritual. Thus a theologically oriented mode of reading cannot seem interesting to them. But a historical one can, since a historical mode of reading teaches about the origins of the ethnos and the beliefs of one's ancestors, which remain meaningful even to the secular Jew.

Jewish scripture. Instead, it is the Scroll of Isaiah or the Anthology of Isaiah, with its many distinct elements, that can be meaningful, and even sacred, to modern Jews.

Melchizedek the Liberator
An Early Interpretation of Genesis 14?*

Anders Aschim
The Norwegian Lutheran School of Theology, Oslo

Melchizedek, the mysterious priest-king, appears only twice on the stage of the Hebrew Bible (Gen 14:18-20, Ps 110:4), both times to disappear at the next moment. With one notable exception, the New Testament does not mention Melchizedek at all. In Heb 5 and 7, on the other hand, the Melchizedek figure plays a very significant role. The priesthood of this mysterious person -- "without father, without mother, without genealogy, having neither beginning of days nor end of life, but resembling the Son of God, he remains a priest forever" (Heb 7:3)[1] -- serves as a *typos* for the priesthood of Christ.

Later Jewish, Christian, and Gnostic literature, however, discloses a lively interest in the Melchizedek figure. The information concerning Melchizedek in these texts far outweighs what the Hebrew Bible has to say about him. No wonder, then, that this challenging figure has also generated a rich scholarly literature.[2]

In some of the extra-biblical texts, Melchizedek is understood as a heavenly being. Although this is not a type of interpretation common in mainstream Jewish or Christian circles, it is attested in texts of widespread origin. The purpose of this paper is to examine a limited group within these texts, which share a specific feature: The image of Melchizedek as a heavenly "holy

* I am indebted to the Research Council of Norway for supporting my research, including a period of study in Jerusalem in the Spring of 1996. I wish to express my gratitude to the Hebrew University of Jerusalem for hosting me, and to the Ecole Biblique et Archéologique Française for the advantage of library privileges. My participation in the SBL Annual Meeting is supported by the Norwegian Non-fiction Writers and Translators Association.

[1] Biblical quotations from the NRSV, unless otherwise indicated.

[2] The most comprehensive studies are F.L. Horton, *The Melchizedek Tradition: A Critical Examination of the Sources to the Fifth Century A. D. and in the Epistle to the Hebrews* (SNTSMS 30; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), and C. Gianotto, *Melchisedek e la sua tipologia: Tradizioni giudaiche, cristiane e gnostiche (sec. II a.C.-sec. III d.C.)* (Supplementi alla Rivista Biblica 12; Brescia: Paideia, 1984), to which the reader is referred for reference to the earlier literature. Cf. also M. Delcor, "Melchizedek from Genesis to the Qumran Texts and the Epistle to the Hebrews," *JSJ* 2 (1971) 115-35, and the excurses in H.W. Attridge, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1989) 192-95, and H.-F. Weiß, *Der Brief an die Hebräer* (MeyerK 13; 15. Aufl.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991) 381-87.

warrior" who battles with evil powers.[3] In most cases, this activity is explicitly connected with the liberation of human souls from the dominion of these powers. At first sight, it is difficult to see any relation between this portrait of Melchizedek and the texts of the Hebrew Bible. I shall argue, however, that this feature may to a large extent be a result of creative exegesis of Gen 14 and Ps 110. In particular, I shall propose that a peculiar interpretation of Gen 14 lays behind this trait. But first, a survey of the texts in question is appropriate.

The Texts

The Qumran Document 11QMelch

One column of 25 lines (with considerable lacunae) and a few words from the columns immediately preceding and following are all that remain of this poorly-preserved document.[4] A 1st century BCE *date* seems reasonable for the manuscript. While most earlier interpreters think that the composition also dates from the 1st century, several recent studies have argued for a date in the late 2nd century BCE.[5]

11QMelch is an *exegetical* document. Several passages from the Hebrew Bible are either explicitly cited and interpreted (in the same manner as the *pesharim*) or alluded to. The most predominant feature of the preserved text is the interplay between citations from Lev 25, the law of the jubilee year, and allusions to Isa 61:1-3. This constitutes the web of the text, into which other scriptural verses are incorporated.[6]

Melchizedek appears in a very prominent role in this text. According to 11QMelch 2:4-6, he will "bring back" (שוב hiph.) a group called "the captives" (שבויים), to whom he is to "proclaim liberty" (דרור). This is an event of the eschatological year of jubilee. The language is heavily dependent on Isa 61. Melchizedek is clearly understood as a *heavenly redeemer* figure. He is identified with the אלוהים of Ps 82:1 (2:10).[7] His antagonist is Belial (2:12), well known from the Qumran library as "the prince of this world, the leader of the children of darkness in the war

---

[3] Following B.A. Pearson, "The Figure of Melchizedek in Gnostic Literature," *Gnosticism, Judaism, and Egyptian Christianity* (Studies in Antiquity and Christianity 5; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990) 108-23, esp. pp. 111, 112.

[4] The extensive research on this text can be divided into three phases, each initiated by a seminal study: a) The preliminary edition: A. S. van der Woude, "Melchisedek als himmlische Erlösergestalt in den neugefundenen eschatologischen Midraschim aus Qumran Höhle XI," *OTS* 14 (1965) 354-73. The most important additional discussions are: M. de Jonge - A. S. van der Woude, "11Q Melchizedek and the New Testament," *NTS* 12 (1966) 301-26; J. A. Fitzmyer, "Further Light on Melchizedek from Qumran Cave 11," *JBL* 86 (1967) 25-41 (reprint in idem, *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament* [SBLSBS 5; rev. ed.; Missoula: Scholars, 1974] 245-67); J. Carmignac, "Le document de Qumran sur Melkisédeq," *RevQ* 7 (1970) 343-78; b) J. T. Milik, "Milkî-ṣedeq et Milkî-rešaʿ dans les anciens écrits juifs et chrétiens," *JJS* 23 (1972) 95-144, a very influential study to which we shall return at several points. Further, P. J. Kobelski, *Melchizedek and Melchireša*ʿ (CBQMS 10; Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1981); c) E. Puech, "Notes sur le manuscrit de XIQMelkîsédeq," *RevQ* 12 (1987) 483-513, important for its accurate re-reading of the epigraphic evidence and its attempt to determine the locations of all the fragments within the original scroll. Some slight revisions in E. Puech, *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future: Immortalité, résurrection, vie éternelle? Histoire d'une croyance dans le Judaïsme ancien* (Ebib 21-22; Paris: Gabalda, 1993) 2.515-26, 546-61. A number of other studies have improved our understanding of 11QMelch. For bibliography, see Puech, "XIQMelkîsédeq," 483-84, nn. 1-4; A. S. van der Woude, "Fünfzehn Jahre Qumranforschung (1974-1988). III.C.2: Der Melchisedek-Text (11QMelch)," *TRu* 57 (1992) 41-45.

[5] Puech, "XIQMelkîsédeq," 507-10; A. Steudel, *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QMidrEschar*^{a,b}*): Materielle Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Gattung und traditionsgeschichtliche Einordnung des durch 4Q174 ("Florilegium") und 4Q177 ("Catena A") repräsentierten Werkes aus den Qumranfunden* (STDJ 13; Leiden: Brill, 1994) 183, 196; H. Stegemann, *Die Essener, Qumran, Johannes der Täufer und Jesus* (Herder Spektrum 4128; 4. Aufl.; Freiburg-Basel-Wien: Herder, 1994) 167-69.

[6] J. A. Sanders, "The Old Testament in 11Q Melchizedek," *JANESCU* 5 (1973) 373-82; G. J. Brooke, "Melchizedek (11QMelch)," *ABD* 4.687-88. I agree with Fitzmyer that "The thread which apparently runs through the whole text and ties together its various elements is Lev 25" ("Further Light," 29).

[7] Despite Carmignac's objections ("Melkisédeq," 353-54), this is the most likely interpretation.

against the children of light, and the tempter".[8] Melchizedek appears as *judge* on God's behalf; he is entrusted to "exact the vengeance of God's judgements" upon Belial and the "spirits of his lot" (2:12-13), who seem to be responsible for the unhappy state of "the captives". It is disputed whether Melchizedek has *priestly* functions in this text.[9] In my opinion, this is a reasonable assumption: Melchizedek is probably to be understood as the subject of "to atone" (לכפר) in 2:8, which is connected with the eschatological "D[ay of Aton]ement" (יו֯ם הכפ֯ורים) of the preceding line.

The role attributed to Melchizedek in 11QMelch is very similar to that of *Michael* in 1QM 17:5-8. Most commentators identify the two figures, on good grounds.[10] In some later Jewish sources, Michael appears as the heavenly high-priest (cf. *b. Ḥag.* 12a). Another traditional role of Michael is that of the guardian angel of Israel -- a "holy warrior" role, to which we shall return below.

Except in the paraphrase of Gen 14 in 1QapGen 22:14, the name "Melchizedek" is not preserved elsewhere in the Qumran library. It is possible, however, that it should be restored in one or two places in the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice,[11] and highly probable that it should be read in 4Qʿ Amram ᵇ.[12] In a setting resembling Jude 9, two angelic figures contest for the speaker's soul. The negative power is identified as מלכי רשע. The "three names" of the positive power are not preserved, but the restoration מלכי צדק is very likely. These two names, then, seem to be another way of identifying the "heavenly opponents" well-known from dualistic passages in Qumran literature as "the Prince of Light" and "the Angel of Darkness" (1QS 3:20-21).[13]

The Tractate "Melchizedek" from Nag Hammadi (NHC IX,1)

The title *Meljis[edek]* appears at the beginning of this tractate, comprising pp. 1:1-27:10 of Codex IX from Nag Hammadi.[14] The state of preservation is very poor, and the extremely fragmentary condition of the manuscript makes its interpretation uncertain. Pearson *dates* the manuscript to the fourth century CE, and assigns the final redaction of the work to the third century.[15]

Formally, *Melch.* is an *apocalypse*. Melchizedek appears as the receiver of heavenly revelations, which he communicates to an audience. The tractate can be divided into three parts. The first (1:1-14:15) and the last (18:?-27:10) consist of revelations to Melchizedek, narrating i. a. the story of Jesus Christ, cast in the form of prophecy of future events. The middle section (14:15-18:?) tells about cultic actions (baptism) and prayers performed by Melchizedek in response to the first revelation. Some scholars have suggested a cultic setting for the document,

---

[8] B. Otzen, "בְּלִיַּעַל b^{e}liyya^{ʿ}al," *TDOT* 2.136.

[9] Cf. Kobelski, *Melchizedek* 64-71; Puech, *Croyance*, 2.551-53.

[10] This identification was already proposed by van der Woude, "Melchisedek," 368-72; cf. J. M. Baumgarten, "The Heavenly Tribunal and the Personification of Ṣedeq in Jewish Apocalyptic," *ANRW* II.19.1 (1979) 219-39, esp. pp. 222-25; Puech: *Croyance*, 2.548-50.

[11] 4Q*401* 11:3; 22:3 (doubtful). C. Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition* (HSS 27; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985) 134, 143-44.

[12] 4Q*544* 2-3. For the text, see J. T. Milik, "4QVisions de ʿAmram et une citation d'Origène," *RB* 79 (1972) 77-97; recent discussion: Puech, *Croyance*, 2.535-36, 550-51.

[13] Cf. Kobelski, *Melchizedek*, 75-83.

[14] Published in *The Facsimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices: Codices IX and X* (Leiden: Brill, 1977) pl. 5-31. Critical edition: B. A. Pearson - S. Giversen, "NHC IX,*1*: Melchizedek," *Nag Hammadi Codices IX and X* (ed. B. A. Pearson; NHS 15; Leiden: Brill, 1981) 19-85; the translation is also found in *The Nag Hammadi Library in English* (ed. J. M. Robinson; 3rd ed.; Leiden: Brill, 1988) 438-44. A German translation is included in H.-M. Schenke, "Die jüdische Melchisedek-Gestalt als Thema der Gnosis," *Altes Testament - Frühjudentum - Gnosis: Neue Studien zu "Gnosis und Bibel"* (ed. K.-W. Tröger; Gütersloh: Mohn, 1980) 111-36, and an Italian version in Gianotto, *Melchisedek*, 193-207.

[15] *NHC IX and X*, 8, 14, 40; "Melchizedek (NHC IX,*1*)," *ABD* 4.688.

within a rite of initiation or baptism.[16] Several layers of tradition (Christian, Jewish and Gnostic) are discernible in the document. Although it is difficult to evaluate the exact relationship between them, it seems probable that a Jewish-apocalyptic substratum can be discerned.[17]

In this tractate, Melchizedek appears as a priestly figure who, having gone through a ritual of investiture (corresponding to the Gnostic initiation) assumes a salvific function, which he is destined to complete in the future.[18] The passage of particular interest to us occurs towards the end of the tractate, on p. 26, where the victorious Melchizedek is greeted, probably by other heavenly beings: "Be [strong, O Melchize]dek, great[High-priest] of God[Most High, for the ar]chon[s], who [are] your [enemi]es, [made w]ar; you have pr[evailed over them, and] th[ey] did not prevail over [you, and you] endured, an[d you des]troyed your enemies[...]."[19] If this passage represents the immediate continuation of what is preserved on p. 25, where the story of Jesus' death and resurrection is narrated, Melchizedek and Jesus Christ are in fact identified in this part of the tractate.[20] The crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus are understood in terms of Melchizedek's victory over the *archontes*.

Pistis Sophia

Pistis Sophia is a collection of Gnostic *revelation dialogues*, found in *Codex Askewianus*. The text is traditionally divided into four books. Book IV is commonly regarded as the oldest part of the collection. Most scholars *date* the work to the late 3rd or early 4th century CE.[21]

In *Pistis Sophia* IV, chs. 139-140 (pp. 359-366),[22] Jesus teaches his disciples about the way in which human souls are saved. They learn about the five *archontes* which rule over "the way of the Midst". In strictly parallel passages, Jesus discloses the names of the archontic rulers, the number of subordinate demons, and the different types of sins which they cause by entering human beings, whose souls are "carried off by theft". Further, the punishments and torments suffered by these human souls are depicted. At a certain point, described in astrological terms, "the sphere turns" and a heavenly intervention takes place, at the initiative of "the little Sabaoth" = Zeus. Some heavenly being "looks down" upon the places of the archontic ruler in question and causes these places to be "dissolved and destroyed". The conclusion of each paragraph is: "And all the souls which are in her (i.e., the archon's) punishments are carried off and returned to the sphere because they were perishing in the punishments of x." The strong syncretistic tendency is obvious, and a rich flora of mythological images is utilized. Nevertheless, a basic structure is visible.

---

16 W. Beltz, "Melchisedek - eine gnostische Initiationsliturgie," *ZRGG* 33 (1981) 155-58; Gianotto, *Melchisedek* 211; J.-M. Sevrin, *Le dossier baptismal séthien: Etudes sur la sacramentaire gnostique* (Bibliothèque copte de Nag Hammadi, "Etudes" 2; Québec: Presses de l'Université Laval, 1986) 222-46.

17 Pearson, *NHC IX and X*, 29-34; C. Colpe, "Heidnische, jüdische und christliche Überlierefung in den Schriften aus Nag Hammadi IX," *JAC* 23 (1980) 109-27, on *Melch.* pp. 109-21; J. Helderman, "Melchisedeks Wirkung: Eine traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung eines Motivkomplexes in NHC IX, 1,1-27,10 (*Melchisedek*)," *The New Testament in Early Christianity* (ed. J.-M. Sevrin; BETL 86; Leuven: Leuven University Press/Peeters, 1989) 335-62, esp. pp. 340-41.

18 Gianotto's summary, *Melchisedek*, 214.

19 Restoration and translation after Pearson, *NHC IX and X*, 82-83. My indications of the lacunae differ slightly.

20 Pearson, *NHC IX and X*, 28-31; Gianotto, *Melchisedek*, 213. This is disputed by Helderman, "Wirkung," 345-47. There is a lacuna of about 15 lines at the bottom of p. 25.

21 Coptic text, English translation, and bibliography in C. Schmidt - V. MacDermot, *Pistis Sophia* (NHS 9; Leiden: Brill, 1978). References in the following are to chapter, page, and line numbers of the Coptic text in this edition. German translation in C. Schmidt - W. Till, *Koptisch-Gnostische Schriften 1* (GCS; 3. Aufl.; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1959) 1-254. Recent introductions: P. Perkins, "Pistis Sophia (Codex Askewianus)," *ABD* 5.375-76; D. Good, "Pistis Sophia," *Searching the Scriptures 2: A Feminist Commentary* (ed. E. Schüssler-Fiorenza; New York: Crossroad, 1993) 678-707.

22 Cf. Horton, *Melchizedek*, 142-45; Gianotto, *Melchisedek*, 223-26; Pearson, "Figure," 116-18.

Zorokothora Melchizedek[23] appears in this section as one of the heavenly beings whose "looking down" causes the destruction of the "places" of the third archontic ruler, Hekate (p. 363:28-364:4).[24]

More important, perhaps, is another passage, which represents the only deviation from the pattern outlined above. The story about the first archontic ruler, Paraplex, is interrupted by a question of Mary: "My Lord, reveal to us in what manner the souls are carried off by theft" (p. 360:2-4). This gives Jesus the opportunity to describe how the two "great lights", Jeu and Zorokothora Melchizedek, descend at appointed times -- "when the cipher (*psēphos*) and the time of their rank (*taxis*) comes" -- to trouble the *archontes*, take light particles away from them, and bring the latter back to "the Treasury of the Light"; or, in more de-gnosticized language, to liberate human souls from evil powers. A cyclic pattern is involved, since this saving action is repeated from time to time. In the intermediary periods, however, the *archontes* again "snatch" souls "by theft" and consume them (pp. 360:5-361:11).

There are several references to Melchizedek in *books I-III* of *Pistis Sophia*. We shall concentrate on the most elaborate passage, in book I, chs. 24-27.[25] Although this may be regarded in certain respects as a parallel to the section from book IV, it is a far more complex text. Again, a question of Mary is the vehicle for the teaching (p. 33:25-27). Unlike in book IV, Melchizedek is here clearly subordinated to Jeu and possesses a distinct function. After the story of the binding of the archons by Jeu (with elements not unlike 1 En 6-11), Melchizedek enters: "And when the time came of the number (*arithmos*) of Melchizedek, the great Paralemptor of Light, he came to the midst of the aeons, and to all the archons which were bound in the sphere and in the Heimarmene, and he took away what is purified of the light ..." (p. 34:16-20). The archons thereby lose vital functions. The light is collected (Melchizedek is assisted in this task by other *paralemptores*) and brought to the "Treasury of Light" by Melchizedek. The matter, however, is made into human and animal souls. The cyclic pattern is again present here, as in book IV: the activity of the archons continues and Melchizedek intervenes again (ch. 26, pp. 36-37). In a third round, however (ch. 27, pp. 37-39), the speaker, Jesus himself, is introduced in a role similar to that of Melchizedek. This passage has close ties to chs. 6-16, and repeats parts of the story there about Jesus' entry into the different dominions of the evil powers, clothed in the "garment of light", his victorious war against them, and their punishment.

The Problem

A priori, there is reason to expect a relationship between the biblical Melchizedek figure and the holy warrior of these later texts. To take the case of *11QMelch*: "The document never plainly alludes to either the psalm [110] or Gen 14.18-20. ... Still, could any Jew acquainted with those scriptural passage fail to think of them when mentioning Melchizedek?"[26] 11QMelch is, indeed, a

---

[23] For the magical name *Zorokothora* (also in *2 Jeu*), see Horton, *Melchizedek*, 145; Gianotto, *Melchisedek*, 222; Pearson, "Figure," 114, n. 36.

[24] The other heavenly figures with a similar function are 1. The "Great Sabaoth, the Good"; 2. Jeu; 4. Zarazaz; 5. The "Great Jao, the Good".

[25] For this passage and the remaining references, cf. Horton, *Melchizedek*, 135-42; Gianotto, *Melchisedek*, 226-33; Pearson, "Figure," 118-21.

[26] D. M. Hay, *Glory at the Right Hand: Psalm 110 in Early Christianity* (SBLMS 18; Nashville/New York: Abingdon, 1973) 27. Cf. Kobelski, *Melchizedek*, 51, n. 8.

The question of the *dating of Gen 14 and Ps 110*, although highly controversial and clearly relevant for the present argument, has to be postponed to another occasion. Suffice it to state that I presuppose a *pre-Hasmonean* date for both texts. The hypothesis that the Hasmonean rulers exploited the Melchizedek figure for legitimation of their position has much in its favor. Relevant texts are 1 Macc 14:41; Josephus *Ant.* 16 §163; *Ass. Mos.* 6:1. Cf. the discussions of Gianotto, *Melchisedek*, 46-51; Puech, "XIQMelkisédeq," 509-10; A. Vivian, "I movimenti che si oppongono al tempio: Il problema del sacerdozio di Melchisedeq," *Henoch* 14 (1992) 97-112. Opposition towards Hasmonean claims may well be a factor motivating the quite different strategies for handling the figure of Melchizedek in 11QMelch, where he becomes a heavenly being, and in *Jub.*, where he does not appear at the appropriate place of the narrative (13:25-27); the context is retained, however, including the motif of tithing; the title

work saturated with scriptural references. It would be highly unlikely that the mention of Melchizedek would fail to evoke particular biblical texts in the ears of the readers, surely part of the writer's original intent.

In the cases of Gnostic texts, things may be different. A work representative of scholarship on the Gnostic Melchizedek traditions states: "With *Pistis Sophia* there is no trace left of any scriptural influence, whether from Hebrews or from the two Old Testament texts."[27] It is quite possible, however, that a reader of *Pistis Sophia* would also be likely to recall the biblical associations on hearing the name "Melchizedek", and that the author intended him/her to do so. This is also a work saturated with Scripture. Already in ch. 18 (pp. 27:21-28:1), a proof from scripture (Isa 19:3, 12) is introduced. In particular, citations and interpretations of various psalms (including Psalms and Odes of Solomon) play a major role in the section of the work which presents the story of the fall and redemption of Pistis Sophia (chs. 29-82).[28] Several New Testament writings are also explicitly cited. And in ch. 43 (p. 72:17-19), Deut 19:15 is cited in such a way as to make it probable that the Torah was also an authority for the author of *Pistis Sophia*.[29] While chs. 29-82 may have a prehistory on its own,[30] the work as it now stands is remarkable for the importance given to scriptural interpretation.

The case of *Melch.* is difficult to assess because of its fragmentary character. Heb 7 certainly plays a role.[31] But similar *a priori* assumptions concerning the influence of OT texts cannot be made so easily here.

The problem can be formulated the following way: We *expect* the Melchizedek of these texts to have something to do with the biblical Melchizedek. At first glance, however, it is very difficult to find any connection other than the name itself.

The Hypothesis: A Reading of Genesis 14

This paper will argue that *the wider literary context of the Melchizedek passages from the Hebrew Bible, and of Gen 14 in particular*, is of decisive importance for the development of the figure "Melchizedek the Liberator" in the texts under discussion.

Several authors have examined the wider context of *Psalm 110* and endeavored to detect connections between this psalm and 11QMelch which may account for Melchizedek's special status in this text. The understanding of Ps 110:4 is crucial in these attempts, in particular the cryptic expression על דברתי. Several possible readings of the psalm have been suggested. A) The psalm as a whole is read as an address to Melchizedek, his name in v. 4 being understood as a vocative. B) The psalm is ascribed to Melchizedek himself, his name in v. 4 then being taken as

---

"Priest for the Most High God" is applied to Levi in 32:1; and blessing formulas similar to Gen 14:19 are found in *Jub.* 22:11 and 25:11. In my opinion, the evidence is most easily explained if the presence of the biblical texts is assumed as a common heritage.

[27] Pearson, "Figure," 122.

[28] Cf. H. L. Jansen, "Bibelske tekster i Pistis Sophia," *DTT* 21 (1958) 210-18; idem, "Gnostic Interpretation in Pistis Sophia," *Proceedings of the IXth International Congress for the History of Religions, Tokyo 1958* (Tokyo, 1960) 106-11 (reprint in *The Many and the One: Essays on Religion in the Graeco-Roman World Presented to H. Ludin Jansen* [ed. P. Borgen; Trondheim: Tapir, 1985] 145-50); and in particular, A. Kragerud, *Die Hymnen der Pistis Sophia* (Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1967). Kragerud compares the character of the Psalm paraphrases to the targumim, 140-42, 211. J. Carmignac, "Le genre littéraire du 'Péshèr' dans la Pistis-Sophia," *RevQ* 4 (1964) 497-522, investigates some instances where a psalm is made the object of lemmatic exegesis, a technique similar to the Qumran *pesher*.

[29] Kragerud, *Hymnen*, 96.

[30] H. L. Jansen, "Er Sofia-teksten en mysterieliturgi?," *NorTT* 68 (1967) 91-93; cf. idem, "Alv Kragerud, Die Hymnen der Pistis Sophia, 1967 [rec.]," *Temenos* 3 (1968) 180-83.

[31] Schenke, "Melchisedek-Gestalt," 127; Pearson, *NHC IX and X*, 34-35; Gianotto, *Melchisedek*, 215-16; and especially Colpe, "Überlierefung," 115-20, who raises the question "... ob etwa der ganze Hebräerbrief in Melchis. verwendet worden sei" (115).

an apposition to the suffix of על דברתי ("according to my, Melchizedek's, order").[32] The image of Melchizedek may have been shaped by the themes of warfare and judgement in Ps 110. Colpe has read both 11QMelch and NHC IX,26 as transformations of Ps 110:4-7, the latter part of the psalm referring to the judgement of the "Priest(-king) according to the order of Melchizedek". This he sees as forming the background of the "Archontenkampf".[33]

Genesis 14 has also been examined for possible links. Kobelski, who has made the most careful study of the relationship between 11QMelch and the passages from the Hebrew Bible, suggests that the wider context of this passage may also be of some relevance: "It is difficult to say if the author ... associated the sudden and mysterious appearance of Melchizedek with the rescue of Lot from captivity and his deliverance from the enemy, but the association of Melchizedek in 11QMelch with a rescue from captivity and the deliverance from the enemy Belial raises this possibility."[34]

Since the possible links between our texts and Ps 110 have so far has been more extensively examined than the possible influence from Gen 14, the present paper will concentrate upon the latter relationship. It is my purpose to sketch a reading of Gen 14 along the lines of Kobelski's suggestion. I shall apply the reading both to 11QMelch and the later Gnostic texts, and I shall argue that certain features in the texts about "Melchizedek the Liberator" are best explained by understanding them as instances of this type of reading.

Like Gen 18,[35] *Gen 14:18-20* was probably understood in some circles of early Judaism and Christianity as an angelic appearance to Abraham. Given such an understanding, what is the function of this sudden appearance? Why does Melchizedek appear just here? And why does Abra(ha)m give Melchizedek a tithe? The answer presumably has something to do with the preceding narrative. How was Abraham able to defeat the united armies of four great kings with the aid of only 318 men (Gen 14:14-16)? Very probably: by divine intervention. For a reader in antiquity, this was likely to take the form of an *angelic* intervention. Abraham's miraculous victory and the rescue of Lot from captivity consequently represent the visible and earthly manifestation of a "holy war". On the parallel invisible, heavenly plane an angel comes to the help of Abraham. He leads the angelic forces to victory over the hostile forces of the evil powers, the supporters of Abraham's enemies. This, I propose, is the role of Melchizedek, whom Abraham honors following the battle and who blesses him.[36]

The biblical episode most closely related to this reading of Gen 14 is Joshua's encounter with the "commander of the Army of the Lord" (Josh 5:13-15), which, however, takes place *before* the defeat of Jericho in Josh 6. Particularly illuminating examples of the scenario of simultaneous war on two levels are found very early and very late in the Hebrew Bible. According the song of Deborah, "the *stars* fought from heaven" against Sisera (Judg 5:20); and in Dan 10-12 we meet *Michael* in the role of the angelic general who protects Israel. Michael is portrayed as a "heavenly warrior", who contends in the heavenly sphere against the guardian angels of Israel's enemies (Dan 10:13, 21; 12:1).

Some Methodological Issues

It should be admitted that there are several serious obstacles to this project. Two of the texts in question, 11QMelch and *Melch.*, are in an extremely fragmentary condition. This fact alone makes it virtually impossible to reach safe conclusions. Also, we are dealing with texts which were written and transmitted in different languages: Hebrew, and (Greek translated into) Coptic.

---

[32] Cf. D. Flusser, "Melchizedek and the Son of Man," *Christian News from Israel* (April 1966) 23-29 (reprint in idem, *Judaism and the Origins of Christianity* [Jerusalem: Magnes, 1988] 186-92); Milik, "Milkî-ṣedeq," 124-25, 138; Baumgarten, "Heavenly Tribunal," 222, n. 11; Kobelski, *Melchizedek*, 52-55.

[33] Colpe, "Überlierefung," 114-15. Cf. Hay, *Glory*, 27, 122.

[34] Kobelski, *Melchizedek*, 52. Cf. Milik, "Milkî-ṣedeq," 137.

[35] Cf. the explicit identification of the "three men" as "angels" in 4Q*180* 2-4 ii 3-4.

[36] For Melchizedek as "chef d'armées celéstes", cf. Milik, "Milkî-ṣedeq," 137.

A considerable distance exists between 11QMelch and the Gnostic writings, not only in terms of language, but also regarding period and cultural environment.

A couple of fundamental methodological issues deserve special attention. Like all other attempts to find "missing links" -- of which numerous examples exist in traditional biblical exegesis, ranging from textual criticism to redaction criticism -- this one involves a certain element of *circularity*.[37] This does not invalidate such attempts *per se*; not every *circulus* is *vitiosus*. It may be argued that *all* writing of history consists of reconstructing -- or even: constructing -- probable contexts for the fragments of the past that have come down to us, and that this is the only possible way of explaining them. The "hermeneutic circle" is a necessary principle for understanding. Ideally, the hypothesis should be controlled by external factors. This is not always possible, and in such cases the hypothesis must be stated with a high degree of uncertainty. The main test, however, is the explanatory force of the hypothesis in relation to the individual elements that are to be explained.

The Norwegian saying, "As you shout in the forest, you will be answered," may formulate another methodological issue. We shall be looking for "echoes" of earlier texts in later ones, and we will certainly be inclined to find some. The element of *subjectivity* involved in such an enterprise is not to be overlooked. Cases of explicit citation of earlier texts are usually easy to detect. But there is a descending scale of certainty from explicit citations, via more or less obvious allusions, to "echoes" of a more subtle kind, and the interpreter should at least make this clear. I take the name Melchizedek in the texts under study to be an "allusive (intertextual) echo" of one or more of the biblical texts. While we shall attempt to control this assumption by asking whether the texts share certain semantic fields, we must remain open to the possibility of subtler echoes; according to R. B. Hays, "Allusive echo functions to suggest to the reader that text B should be understood in light of a broad interplay with text A, encompassing aspects of A beyond those explicitly echoed".[38]

Genesis 14 and Melchizedek the Liberator

In this paragraph, I will re-read the texts relating to "Melchizedek the Liberator" with two questions in mind: a) To what extent is it possible to demonstrate "echoes" from Gen 14 (or from the other biblical texts)? b) In what way does the proposed reading of Gen 14 contribute to the understanding of these texts?

11QMelch

Except for the name "Melchizedek" itself (11QMelch 2:5, 5, 8, 9, 13), the search for *terminological* connections to the biblical texts yields rather uncertain results. Although some links do exist, most of them occur within citations of other biblical texts. This fact does not necessarily render the correspondences accidental; the interplay between biblical texts in 11QMelch is very consciously constructed. But the evidence is at best ambiguous. [מלך], "king",

---

[37] Cf. the precise description of this problem, applied to tradition-history, in M. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Rev. ed.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1988) 9.

[38] R. B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 1989) 20. I find Hays' seven criteria for testing "intertextual echoes" useful. Our use of the history of interpretation below comes close to his fifth test: "Historical Plausibility". The importance of this approach lies in its emphasis on the generative power of scriptural texts. In this respect it is not unlike the program of "comparative midrash" developed by J. A. Sanders, e. g. "From Isaiah 61 to Luke 4," *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults* (Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty, ed. J. Neusner; SJLA 12; Leiden: Brill, 1975) 1.75-106, or the "inner-biblical exegesis" of Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*. Cf. also the earlier works of L. Hartman, *Prophecy Interpreted: The Formation of some Jewish Apocalyptic Texts and of the Eschatological Discourse Mark 13 par.* (ConBNT 1; Lund: Gleerup, 1966) -- where he utilises the term "echo" in a similar way to Hays, 118, 122, 125 etc.; idem, *Asking for a Meaning. A Study of 1 Enoch 1-5* (ConBNT 12; Lund: Gleerup, 1979). For the study of semantic fields as an exegetical tool, cf. K. Berger, *Exegese des Neuen Testaments: Neue Wege vom Text zur Auslegung* (Uni-Taschenbücher 658; Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer, 1977); Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, 283-91.

for example, occurs in 2:16, as does שלום, "peace" (cf. מלך שלם, "king of Salem" in Gen 14:18),[39] but within a quotation from Isa 52:7. The same is the case with *Zion* (2:16, 23, 23), cf. Ps 110:2. The language of *judgement* is another link. The verb דין qal, "judge" (2:11, cf. Ps 110:6) stands within another quotation, from Ps 7:9.[40]

Another set of correspondences may be more significant. The use of the verb שוב hiph., "make return", in the description of Melchizedek's activity (2:6) may be comparable to the use of the same verb in Gen 14:16, where Abraham "returns" Lot. In Gen 14:14, the verb שבה niph., "be taken captive", is used in reference to Lot; שבויים, "captives" (11QMelch 2:4; Isa 61:1) is derived from the same root.[41]

As noted earlier, several scholars have found connections between the content of 11QMelch and *Ps 110*. In particular, the motif of judgement connected with Melchizedek is most probably developed from the psalm. I believe, in addition, that the proposed interpretation of *Gen 14* is capable of explaining certain features of the Melchizedek figure in 11QMelch, such as the role of the "heavenly warrior" and the activity of "returning" the captives. Melchizedek here takes on a role which is similar to that of *Abraham* in Gen 14:12-16. This is not surprising. According to the proposed hypothesis, the earthly battle of Abraham and the heavenly battle of Melchizedek are conceived as parallel events.

I think that this reading offers the most probable explanation for the identification of Melchizedek with Michael.[42] The "heavenly warrior" is probably a more important connection between Michael and Melchizedek than the motif of the "high-priest".[43] The message of 11QMelch to the "sons of light", who are represented as "captives" in exile, would be: They will be "returned" to where they belong by the help of their heavenly guardian Melchizedek, as was Lot in the days of Abraham.

Melch (NHC IX,1)

Although the influence of Heb 7 is clear in this work, some features are perhaps better explained as through association with the OT texts. There are certain terminological correspondences between *Melch.* p. 26 and Gen 14/Ps 110.[44]

---

[39] Early instances of the interpretation "Salem" = "peace" are found in Philo, *Leg All* 3.79, 81, and in Heb 7:2. Milik, "Milkî-ṣedeq," 137 has suggested that מלך שלם (Gen 14:18) may be reminiscent of the angelic title מלאך שלום "angel of peace" (cf. 4Q*228* 1 i 8; 1QH 19:10; 3Q*8* 1:2).

[40] As noted by Fitzmyer, "Further Light," 32.

[41] It is interesting to note that the root occurs a number of times in the expanded rewriting of Gen 14 in 1QapGen 22, compare e. g. ll. 11-12 with Gen 14:16: "Lot too, his nephew, he (i. e. Abraham) saved with all his flocks; and all the *captives* (lit. "the captivity") which they had *taken* he brought back" (וכול שביתא די שבאו אתיב). J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave I: A Commentary* (BibOr 18A; 2nd ed.; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1971) 72-73, cf. 171. Emphasis mine.

[42] For another view, see M. Mach, *Entwicklungsstadien des jüdischen Engelglaubens in vorrabbinischer Zeit* (Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum 34; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1992), 237 n. 341.

[43] Cf., however, the "new priest" of *T. Levi* 18, a figure in many respects reminiscent of Melchizedek in 11QMelch. See Milik, "Milkî-ṣedeq," 123; Kobelski, *Melchizedek*, 66-68; and especially Helderman, "Wirkung," 347-58, who finds a cluster of motifs shared by this text, 11QMelch and *Melch.*: The battling high-priest is regularly connected with the eschatological rest. I do not accept Helderman's reading לנח "um Ruhe zu geben" in 11QMelch 2:20 (349). Both the form and its translation are dubious. The word is reconstructed by most scholars as [לנחמ] "to comfort", cf. Isa 61:2. The presence of the motif of the eschatological Sabbath rest at the end of the jubilee periods in which history is divided may still be argued for in 11QMelch.

[44] Comparison with the Coptic version is complicated by the fact that there is still no critical edition of the Sahidic OT. For Heb, cf. G. Horner (ed.), *The Coptic Version of the New Testament in the Southern Dialect otherwise called Sahidic and Thebaic* vol. 5 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1920).

Parts of *Gen 14* are extant in three of the Sahidic MSS in the list of J. W. Wevers (ed.), *Genesis* (Septuaginta 1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974) 48-51: 14:17-20 in Sa^{6} = J. Schleifer (ed.), *Sahidische Bibel-Fragmente aus dem British Museum zu London* (Sitzungsberichte der Kais. Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse 164/6; Wien: Hölder, 1911) 2-4; 14:1-7 in Sa^{8} = J. E. Gilmore - P. le Page Renouf,

a) The passage in 26:2-4, which probably may be conjectured "[Melchi-ze]dek, great [high-priest] of God [Most High]" (similar expressions in 15:9-13) most obviously recalls Gen 14:18. It also recalls Heb 7:1, of course.
b) The expression "made war", 26:5-6 (cf. 13:15-16), is also found in Gen 14:2.
c) There are even some *archontes* (26:4-5) present in Gen 14:7 LXX (and in Bo; Sa is not extant in this passage): The "*archontes* of Amalek and the Amoreans". This reading presupposes a Hebrew *Vorlage* שרי. TM reads שדי, "fields".
d) Concerning the exhortation *čᵉm[čom]*, "be [strong]" in 26:2, one may note the occurrence of the corresponding noun *čom*, "power, strength" in Ps 110:2 ("the scepter of your power") and 3 ("the day of your strength").
e) The expression "your enemies", 26:9 (a similar form is conjectured in 26:5; cf. 13:5), is found both in Gen 14:20 and in Ps 110:1.2.

These correspondences are difficult to evaluate. A degree of conjecture is involved in the reading of the passage in *Melch.* In the cases b) and c), it is not immediately evident how the entities in question in Gen 14 may be related to Melchizedek. The correspondences d) and e) are more convincing. They may mean that the whole of *Ps 110* was read as a text concerning Melchizedek. The cluster of warfare language, although not very specific, is an interesting feature shared by Gen 14, Ps 110, and *Melch.*, but not by Heb.

Melchizedek's battle with the *archontes* may well be read as a transformation of *Gen 14*, in a similar way as suggested for 11QMelch. One point is not easy to explain, however: In *Melch.*, the victorious Melchizedek, returning from the battle with the *archontes*, is greeted by other heavenly beings. At the corresponding point in Gen 14, it is Melchizedek who greets the victorious Abraham returning from battle.

There is no evidence extant in *Melch.* to the view that Melchizedek is "liberating" or "returning" someone. This may, of course, be accidental, due to the fragmentary state of the document. If the identification Melchizedek = Christ is correct, however, and the victory of Melchizedek is connected with the crucifixion and resurrection of Christ, it is not difficult to see this in terms of the priestly intercession of Christ/Melchizedek on behalf of others.

Pistis Sophia

The search for linguistic correspondences between the *Pistis Sophia* material and the biblical texts yields even less results. Although some correspondences do exist, it is uncertain whether they possess any significance. Most of them may be explained as accidental. The *archontes*, for example, are well represented in Pistis Sophia, as in many other Gnostic works; precisely because of that fact it is far from obvious that they have any connection with the "*archontes* of Amalek" etc. in Gen 14:7 LXX. Similarly, although *taxis*, "order", which is a keyword in Ps 110:4, frequently occurs in Pistis Sophia, it possesses its own distinctive use. The closest instance to Ps 110 is that of the description of Melchizedek and Jeu in IV, ch. 139 (p. 360:17-18), where "the cipher and the time of their rank" is mentioned. Hay has suggested that Melchizedek's location at

---

"Coptic Fragments," *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology* 17 (1895) 251-53; 14:1-2, 17-20 in Sa^{20} = A. Ciasca (ed.), *Sacrorum bibliorum fragmenta copto-sahidica musei Borgiani* (Rome: Congregatio de propaganda fide, 1885) 1.14-15. The verses 14:12-16, central to the argument of this paper, are not extant in any MS of Sa to my knowledge. For the Bohairic version, cf. M. K. H. Peters (ed.), *A Critical Edition of the Coptic (Bohairic) Pentateuch 1: Genesis* (SBLSCS 19; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985).

The complete *Psalm 110* (LXX: 109) is preserved in the MS called Sa^{L} by A. Rahlfs (ed.), *Psalmi cum Odis* (Septuaginta 10; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1931) 18 = E. W. Budge (ed.), *The Earliest Known Coptic Psalter: The Text, in the Dialect of Upper Egypt, edited from the unique Papyrus Codex Oriental 5000 in the British Museum* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner, 1898) 121. Parts of the psalm are preserved in at least four other MSS, see C. Wessely (ed.), *Sahidisch-griechische Psalmenfragmente* (Sitzungsberichte der Kais. Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse 155/1; Wien: Hölder, 1907) 46 (vv. 1-3) and 150 (vv. 1-7); A. Ciasca (ed.), *Sacrorum bibliorum fragmenta copto-sahidica musei Borgiani* (Rome: Congregatio de propaganda fide, 1889) 2.143 (vv. 2, 4 and 6, 7; two different sources).

"the place of those of the right" (ch. 112, p. 291:14-16) might represent an allusion to Ps 110:1.[45] But again, "right" and "left" serve as cosmological terms in their own right in Pistis Sophia (cf. chs. 136, 141, pp. 354, 369).

We have unique sources of information for the first part of the work about the techniques of biblical interpretation used. Although there is extensive use of citations, another mode of interpretation is also at work: the paraphrasing or re-working of biblical texts, in distinctively Gnostic language, by the substitution of words and concepts, etc. The structure of the biblical text is nevertheless retained. Neither Gen 14 nor Ps 110 is cited. The two passages we have been studying (chs. 14-27; 139-40) may resemble the structure of Gen 14 (captivity - liberation) in certain respects, but only in a very general way. The situation is not unlike that of 11QMelch. Ample examples of explicit scriptural interpretation are evident throughout the work, while direct links to the Melchizedek texts of the Bible are not easy to detect.

Not much remains in *Pistis Sophia* of the motif of the interceding, self-sacrificing high-priest; the influence of *Heb* seems to be totally lacking. Although some echoes of *Ps 110* may be perceived in the judgement of Hekate (ch. 140, pp. 363-64), if there are any biblical associations *Gen 14* remains the most likely text. Melchizedek's interventions to purify the light which is bound to the *archontes* can be understood as a Gnostic re-interpretation of Gen 14 according to the reading proposed here. It is difficult to decide, however, whether and to what extent the biblical text itself has generated this interpretation or whether the whole complex has been taken over from an earlier tradition. Several scholars have suggested that *Pistis Sophia* may represent an *interpretatio gnostica* of a tradition similar to that of 11QMelch.[46]

Genesis 14 in the History of Interpretation

It is not our intention here to give a full treatment of the history of the interpretation of this chapter, nor are the samples given below by any means exhaustive.[47] Many of them are later than the texts studied here. While later texts may in many cases contain older traditions, this must eventually be proved by a careful analysis of each individual text, a task which far exceeds the format of this paper. I do think that some of the instances cited may be relevant to a traditio-historical argument, and I shall occasionally suggest in footnotes some points that, in my opinion, deserve further investigation. For the present purpose, however, I shall not claim that any tradition contained in these examples predates the final redaction of the document in question; indeed, I shall make no claim at all about direct dependence between texts. What I shall claim is that the reading of Gen 14 advocated above falls well within the range of exegetical possibilities available for a reader of the text in antiquity, and that this reading represents a possible way of filling certain "gaps" -- elements in need of interpretation -- which other early interpreters also experienced.[48]

Melchizedek as a Heavenly Figure

Melchizedek's sudden appearance is a good example of such a "gap". It is clearly a phenomenon which requires some kind of explanation. This point is thoroughly analyzed in the scholarly

---

[45] Hay, *Glory*, 141.

[46] Schenke, "Melchisedek-Gestalt," 135; Pearson, "Figure," 122-23.

[47] A valuable collection of materials is still that of L. Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1909-38) 1.227-34; 5.223-27. Cf. also the works mentioned in nn. 2 and 64.

[48] The concept of "gaps" is another loan from literary oriented reading strategies. Cf. M. Sternberg, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative: Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading* (Indiana Studies in Biblical Literature; Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1985) 186-229; D. Boyarin, *Intertextuality and the Reading of Midrash* (Indiana Studies in Biblical Literature; Bloomington/Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1990) 39-56. While tradition history was primarily developed to uncover genetic relationships between texts, the concept of "gaps" is useful in this context because it highlights another aspect of the history of interpretation: Similar interpretations may originate as independent answers to the same problems, inherent in the text to be interpreted.

literature, and we can treat it briefly. As is well known, Melchizedek's identity as a heavenly being is one of the strategies used to explain his appearance, a solution also applied in texts which we have not analyzed in this paper.

The most interesting passage on Melchizedek in *Philo* is found in *Leg All* 3.79-82. Philo's identification of Melchizedek with the *Logos* (§ 82) has attracted particular attention.[49] This belongs, however, to the level of allegorical application. As we shall see, Philo clearly perceives Melchizedek as a human figure. Later readers of Philo, however, certainly could find in his work a potential to understand Melchizedek as a heavenly being.

It is disputed whether the author of the Letter to the *Hebrews* understood Melchizedek as a heavenly being. Although the well-known verse in 7:3 may suggest that he did, the issue remains obscure, simply because this was not one of the author's major concerns; everything he said was directed towards demonstrating the importance of *Christ's* priesthood.[50] On the other hand, the Melchizedek of Hebrews could clearly be -- and indeed manifestly was -- read by later interpreters (Melchizedekians, Gnostics) as a heavenly figure.

According to Jerome's letter to Evangelum (Epistle 73), *Origen* held the view that Melchizedek was an angel. Unfortunately, it is impossible to verify this from Origen's own extant works.[51] Heresiological literature, however, attests that conceptions of Melchizedek as a heavenly being were present in various Christian groups, the earliest and most important example being the so-called "Melchizedekians", followers of a certain Theodotus the banker (c. 200 CE), mentioned, inter alia, by Hippolytus.[52]

Few *Gnostic* works mention Melchizedek. In addition to *Melch.* and *Pistis Sophia*, he is mentioned in a fragment of a revelation dialogue from Bala'izah and in *2 Jeu*. With the possible exception of *Bala'izah 52* (because of its fragmentary state), Melchizedek is always presented as a heavenly being.

Although not very broadly attested, then, the type of interpretation explaining Melchizedek as a heavenly being was a strategy available to interpreters of quite different backgrounds.[53]

---

[49] Horton, *Melchizedek*, 56-60; Gianotto, *Melchisedek*, 91-99.

[50] Cf. Attridge, *Hebrews*, 187, 189-92.

[51] Gianotto, *Melchisedek*, 167-69.

[52] The most complete survey is still H. Stork, *Die sogenannten Melchisedekianer mit Untersuchung ihrer Quellen auf Gedankengehalt und dogmengeshichtliche Entwicklung* (Forschungen zur Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons und der altkirchlichen Literatur 7/2; Leipzig: Deichert, 1928); cf. Horton, *Melchizedek*, 87-114; Gianotto, *Melchisedek*, 237-62. J. Helderman's study, "Melchisedek, Melchisedekianer und die koptische Frömmigkeit," *Actes du IVe Congres Copte: Louvain-la-Neuve, 5-10 septembre 1988, II: De la linguistique au gnosticisme* (eds. M. Rassart-Debergh - J. Ries; Publications de l'Institut Orientaliste de Louvain 41; Louvain-la-Neuve: Institut Orientaliste, 1992) 402-15 (# 7942 of D. M. Scholer: "Bibliographia Gnostica XXII", *NovT* 36 [1994] 92), was not accessible to me.

[53] An attractive approach is found in the recent study of M. Bodinger, "L'énigme de Melkisédeq," *RHR* 211 (1994) 297-333. To over-simplify his argument, which deserves a much fuller discussion than the present context allows, the reason why Melchizedek appears in some instances as a heavenly figure is that he always was a heavenly figure. In Gen 14 and in Ps 110, Melchizedek is none other than the well-known Semitic solar god *Ṣedeq* (cf. R. A. Rosenberg, "The God Ṣedeq," *HUCA* 36 [1965] 161-177), subordinated in these texts to the Most High God and given the role of commander of the angels or the stars (309, 313). This is not only true for later interpretations but is also the original meaning of Gen 14 itself. The correspondence Melchizedek - *Ṣedeq* has been pointed out earlier, especially by Baumgarten, "Heavenly Tribunal," 222-23, although hardly to the extent achieved by Bodinger.

Attractive as Bodinger's proposal is, there are some problems with his approach. Most importantly, it does not satisfactorily explain why mainstream Jewish and Christian traditions sees in Melchizedek a thoroughly human figure. This may, of course, be due to a massive repression of mythological elements. I still think, however, that it is easier to explain the development from a human Melchizedek figure into an angelic one than vice versa. Furthermore, Bodinger seriously downplays Melchizedek's role as a *priest*. While the observation that כהן may have other meanings as well is certainly valid (313; cf. Horton, *Melchizedek*, 45-48), the interpretative tradition unequivocally regards him as a priest.

The Victory of Abraham

The victory of Abra(ha)m and his 318 men over the united armies of four kings is another point of interest. It is comparable to Gideon's victory with a similarly small force in Judg 7 (cf. Origen, *Homiliae in Genesim* 2:5). A widespread interpretation in rabbinical literature minimizes the force still more. Through the well-known example of *gematria* on the number 318 -- the numerical equivalent of the name of Eliezer, Abraham's faithful servant -- the sages concluded that Abraham and Eliezer alone defeated the enemy (e. g. *b. Ned.* 32a; *Gen. Rab.* 43:2, 44:9; cf. *Tg. Pseudo-Jonathan*)! In *Lev. Rab.* 28:4 this argument is used as proof that Abraham's victory was "neither with weapon nor with shield but with prayer and supplication",[54] since Abraham was naturally unable to defeat these powers on his own. For Philo, the story serves as the paradigm of a man trusting in God (*Abr* 232).

Especially interesting for our purpose are two interpretations of Gen 14:15 which explicitly connect the victory of Abraham with the activity of heavenly powers, be it of an angelic or an astral nature. In *b. Sanh.* 96a, the verse is interpreted as follows:

> *And he fought against them, he and his servants, by night* (לילה) *and smote them.* R. Joḥanan said: The angel who was appointed to [aid] Abraham was named *lailah* (מלאך שנזדמן לו לאברהם לילה שמו), as it is written, *[Let the day perish wherein I was born], and the* Lailah *which said, There is a man child conceived.* R. Isaac, the smith, said: He [the angel] set into motion the activities of the night [viz. the stars] on his behalf (לילה עשה מעשה), as it is written, *They fought from heaven; the stars in their courses fought against Sisera.*[55]

The other passage is from *Gen. Rab.* 43:3. This interpretation connects Gen 14:15 with Isa 41:2, "*Who has raised up one from the east, Ẓedeḳ* (Righteousness) *calling him to his feet*", understood as a saying about Abraham. Different opinions concerning the referent of the word צדק are given, of which the following, ascribed to R. Berekiah, is the most significant for our purposes: "The planet *Ẓedeḳ* [Jupiter] (מזל צדק) illumined his path" -- thereby assisting Abraham in his nightly victory.[56]

The thought that Abraham's victory was the result of the intervention of heavenly powers, then, is attested in other forms in the early history of the interpretation of the chapter.

The Evil Powers

Our reading of Gen 14 presupposes that Abraham has not only helpers but also adversaries who belong to the heavenly sphere.

Several possible candidates for such a position may be found in the text. The most obvious ones are the *four kings* against whom Abraham wages war. While several attempts to identify these kings have been made in later exegesis, they do not generally seem to have been demonized. An interpretation recorded in *Gen. Rab.* 42:2 and 4 raises an interesting perspective, however. In this text the countries of the "four kings" are identified as Babylon, Media, Greece, and Edom/Rome.[57] The importance of these passages lies in their association of Gen 14 with the pattern dividing world history into epochs related to four successive empires, a device widely applied in antiquity and well known from Dan 2 and 7. While the kingdoms are usually identified

---

[54] H. Freedman - M. Simon (eds.), *The Midrash Rabbah, 2/2: Leviticus* (London/Jerusalem/New York: Soncino, 1977) 361-62.

[55] I. Epstein - J. Schachter - H. Freedman (eds.), *Sanhedrin* (Hebrew-English Edition of the Babylonian Talmud 24; London: Soncino, 1969). The supplementary citations are from Job 3:3 and Judg 5:20.

[56] Tanslation, including the scriptural verse (construed differently in modern translations), from H. Freedman - M. Simon (eds.), *The Midrash Rabbah, 1: Genesis* (London/Jerusalem/New York: Soncino, 1977) 354. This passage attracts particular interest if one accepts Bodinger's hypothesis, above, n. 53.

[57] In 42:4, the following saying of R. Eleazar b. R. Abina is transmitted in this connection: "When you see the Powers fighting each other, look for the coming [lit. 'feet'] of the King Messiah (לרגלו של משיח)" (Freedman, *Genesis* 346). One may be inclined to find an echo of Isa 52:7 here, cf. the "feet" of the "messenger/anointed one" in 11QMelch 2:16, 18.

with historical entities, they often attract mythological dimensions. Dan is a good example, both in ch. 7 (beasts vs. Son of Man), and in chs. 10-12, where the heavenly princes of some of these kingdoms appear (10:13, 20-21).[58]

The interpretation of Gen 14 in *Philo* is most interesting. A suitable starting point is the elaborate passage in *Abr* 225-244. In the first part, Philo paraphrases the narrative, with some interesting embellishments. The historical character of the incident and the persons involved (including Melchizedek) is evident. In § 236, however, the "literal" reading ends and is replaced by an allegorical interpretation. As elsewhere in Philo, Abraham is here represented as the prototype of the wise person. The *nine kings* -- Philo consequently refers to the four kings from the east and the five local kings as one group -- represent the four passions ("pleasure, desire, fear and grief") and the five senses, which are in conflict over the dominion of the human soul. The wise Abraham, however, sets out to fight against all nine, and is able to restore the right balance of the soul. This interpretation is consistent throughout the preserved works of Philo (*Congr* 92; *Ebr* 105-106; cf. *Quod det* 14). While Philo's interpretation is of a psychological rather than a cosmological kind, an externalization of this type of interpretation which refers the passions and senses to supernatural powers might easily be imagined.[59]

Other possibilities in the text for the recognition of otherworldly adversaries also exist. Milik has proposed that the contrast between Melchizedek and the *king of Sodom* -- "roi d'une ville impie par excellence" -- in Gen 14:17-24 may have been interpreted as an image of the combat conducted between the two angelic chiefs, similar to that described in 4Qᶜ Amram.[60] *Philo's* contrast between Melchizedek as a paradigm of the wise and peaceful king and the despot (*tyrannos*)[61] in *Leg All* 3.80-81, while still on a human level, might well be read against such a background. The negative examples which Philo himself immediately introduces, however, are the Ammonites and Moabites. M. Philonenko has recently suggested that the names *Melkireša*ᶜ (4Qᶜ Amramᵇ; 4Q*280* 2) and *Malkira* (*Mart. Isa.* 1:8) both have a scriptural origin in Gen 14:2. Here, the names of the kings of Sodom and Gomorrah are given as ברע and ברשע. These names have been a consistent subject of interpretation in Jewish exegesis.[62]

The presence of the *Amalekites* in Gen 14:7 was felt by the sages to demand an explanation, since according to the chronology of Gen Amalek had not yet been born (he will be in 36:12; cf. *Gen. Rab.* 42:7). The Amalekites play a rather anonymous role in this text, and there is not much to hint at the arch-enemy of Israel well known from later passages of the Hebrew Bible. However, the reader acquainted with this picture might be disposed to read it into Gen 14 as well. An eminent illustration is found in Origen, *Homiliae in Numeros* 19:1. The text to be explained is

---

[58] For surveys of the "four kingdom"-pattern, cf. e. g. D. Flusser, "The Four Empires in the Fourth Sibyl and in the Book of Daniel," *IOS* 2 (1972) 148-75 (reprint in *Judaism*, 317-44); K. Koch - T. Niewisch - J. Tübach, *Das Buch Daniel* (ErtFor 144; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1980) 182-213, in particular 208-209, where the idea is related to angelology; J. J. Collins, *Daniel* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993) 166-70.

Two passages from the Book of *Revelation* may be of some interest. In 9:13-15 (the sixth trumpet), "four angels" are mentioned "who are bound at the great river Euphrates". These angels are released "to kill a third of humankind". In 16:12, the sixth bowl is poured on the river Euphrates, "and its water was dried up in order to prepare the way for the kings from the east". The background of these passages is not completely clear. I would suggest that an echo of the "four kings" of Gen 14 may be present here. This is not to deny that Ezekielan imagery (in particular Ezek 38-39) dominates this part of Rev.

[59] A further investigation of the relation between the works of Philo and *Pistis Sophia* may prove a fruitful task. One may be inclined to see a connection between the five *archontes* of *Pistis Sophia* 139-40 and the five senses of *Philo*, but the correspondences are far from obvious.

[60] Milik, "Milkî-ṣedeq," 137.

[61] The despot in this connection is called *archōn polemou*. The possibility that this may be of some importance for the understanding of the Gnostic texts, and of *Melch.* in particular, may be considered.

[62] M. Philonenko, "Melkireša^{ᶜ} et Melkira^{ᶜ}. Note sur les 'Visions de ^{ᶜ}Amram'," *Sem* 41-42 (1993) 159-162. Philonenko cites *Tg. Pseudo-Jonathan*. Cf. also *Gen. Rab.* 42:5, where the name ברע is interpreted as בן רע, "son of evil", ברשע as בן רשע, "son of wickedness". Cf. M. C. Astour, "Political and Cosmic Symbolism in Genesis 14 and its Babylonian Sources," *Biblical Motifs. Origins and Transformations* (ed. A. Altmann; Studies and Texts 3; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1966) 74.

Num 24:20, the last of Balaam's visions. Origen finds reason to begin his sermon with a survey of the places where "Amalek" appears in the Bible. In connection with the first occurrence, Gen 14, he interprets the word Amalek as he "who snatches (*ablingens*) the people or who makes the people deviate (*declinans*)". "The princes (*principes*) of Amalek" in this text are none other than the evil spirits, who "snatch" people, who "consume" them and who "make them deviate". Further aspects of the description of the evil spirits are taken from Eph 6.[63]

Lot

The final aspect of the history of interpretation to be treated here concerns Lot. In the proposed reading, Lot plays the role of the soul captured by evil forces, the object of liberation.

The picture of Lot in the history of interpretation is ambiguous, as it is within the Genesis narrative itself. While some authors represent him as an example of wisdom, hospitality and goodness (Wis 10:6; Josephus *Ant.* 1.200-202), he is heavily condemned by others (*Jub.* 16:8-9) as "the arch-example of incest".[64] The ambiguity of the Lot figure may explain his absence from the texts which portray Melchizedek as Liberator (Abraham's absence is more difficult to explain).

Again, the evidence of Philo is interesting. For him, Lot is "an unreliable and hesitating person, ever inclining this way and that" (*Abr* 212).[65] In *Migr* 150, the separation of Abraham and Lot (cf. Gen 12:32; 13:7) is interpreted, with a clear allusion to Gen 14:12, as follows: "We shall find Lot having a relapse, suffering from the old complaint, *carried off a prisoner of war by the enemies in the soul*; and Abraham, resorting to every device to guard against his abuscades and attacks, setting up separate quarters."[66] Lot appears here, it seems to me, in a very similar role to that of the "captives" in 11QMelch or "the souls taken by theft" in *Pistis Sophia*:

Concluding Remarks

In this paper I have established a reading of Gen 14 which assigns Melchizedek, understood as a heavenly figure, an active role in the rescue of Lot (Gen 14:12-16). As a commander of the angelic forces and a patron angel of Abraham, the ancestor of Israel, Melchizedek contends in the heavenly sphere against the forces of the evil powers, simultaneously with the earthly battle between Abraham and his enemies. I have suggested that this type of interpretation is a probable background for certain post-biblical texts, in which Melchizedek is portrayed as a heavenly "holy warrior".

While the name "Melchizedek" itself was understood as a strong echo of Gen 14/Ps 110, most of the linguistic correspondences shared by the biblical and the post-biblical texts may be understood either as rather general or as accidental. Because the "echoes" detected in the texts under scrutiny are of such an uncertain nature, the reconstruction remains a hypothesis.

I have argued, however, that the proposed reading of Gen 14 provides a plausible explanation of certain features of the texts in question, in particular the attribution of a role to Melchizedek which is otherwise ascribed to Michael. While the function of the heavenly high-

---

[63] Text in W. A. Baehrens (ed.), *Origenes Werke, 7: Homilien zum Hexateuch in Rufins Übersetzung, 2. Teil: Die Homilien zu Numeri, Josua und Judices* (GCS; Leipzig: Hinrich, 1921); French translation in A. Méhat (ed.), *Origène, Homélies sur les Nombres* (SC 29; Paris: Cerf, 1951). This picture resembles closely that in *Pistis Sophia*, where souls are "taken by theft" by the demons. While not sufficient to prove that Gen 14 is deliberately "echoed" in *Pistis Sophia*, a shared *topos* between Origen and *Pistis Sophia* is not improbable, considering Origen's location in time (early third century CE) and space (Alexandria).

[64] J. A. Loader, *A Tale of Two Cities: Sodom and Gomorrah in the Old Testament, early Jewish and early Christian Traditions* (Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 1; Kampen: Kok, 1990) 78.

[65] F. H. Colson (ed.), *Philo* (LCL 289; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1935) 6.104-105.

[66] F. H. Colson - G. H. Whitaker (eds.), *Philo* (LCL 261; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1932) 4.218-19, my italics.

priest may possess some significance, the function of the heavenly patron of Israel or of its patriarch is more important.

Some examples from the history of interpretation of Gen 14 were analyzed, to demonstrate that the elements of this reading lie well within the exegetical possibilities available for a reader of the text in antiquity.

At this point, it is appropriate to briefly comment on the internal relationship between the different texts studied. After all, we may be dealing here not with dependence on a common tradition but with the independent realization of certain potential interpretations at different times and in different environments. One must take into account "... that there are only a limited number of ways in which Melchizedek could be thought of as an angelic figure and that any two such presentations would of necessity have some features in common."[67] The peculiar interpretation of Gen 14 shared by these texts, however, and the possibility that they also share features *not* dependent on the biblical text,[68] support the assumption that we are dealing with a shared tradition, although there is not enough evidence to postulate that the Gnostic writers actually knew the specific text of 11QMelch.

A final remark may be allowed on a text *not* treated in detail in this paper: The letter to the *Hebrews*. While the discovery of 11QMelch (and that of *Melch.*) raised great expectations about a breakthrough in the understanding of Heb, later studies have tended to be far more modest in this respect. Heb and 11QMelch seem to emphasize different aspects of this figure.[69] And while Heb is certainly a formative impulse behind *Melch.*, Pearson is to be supported in his conclusion that "...the Christian interpretive tradition concerning Melchizedek, begun by the author of Hebrews, is simply a caesura in the case of the Gnostic evidence. The constant trajectory of interpretation runs from pre-Christian Judaism (11QMelch) to the 'decadent' Gnosticism of third- or fourth-century Egypt represented by the books of *Pistis Sophia*..."[70]

---

[67] Horton, *Melchizedek*, 165.

[68] On this point, cf. especially Horton, *Melchizedek*, 165-66, who points to the "the difficult notion of the 'time of the number of Melchizedek'" in *Pistis Sophia* (ch. 25, cf. also ch. 139), and adds: "We cannot but be reminded that in the 11QMelchizedek, Melchizedek is to come at the time of the last jubilee, and one can imagine how that notion might have been adjusted to fit a Gnostic idea of a periodic descent of Melchizedek into the realm of the archons." Other scholars read the expressions in *Pistis Sophia* on an astrological background (Gianotto, *Melchizedek*, 225). Cf. also Helderman, "Wirkung," 347-58; Pearson, "Figure," 122-23.

[69] Cf. Attridge, *Hebrews*, 28-29. As pointed out by Horton, *Melchizedek*, 167-68, however, there are some interesting similarities between Melchizedek in 11QMelch and *Christ* in Heb. See in particular Heb 2:14-15.

[70] Pearson, "Figure," 123.

MELCHIZEDEK, MICHAEL, AND WAR IN HEAVEN*

James R. Davila
St. Mary's College
University of St. Andrews
St. Andrews, Fife, KY16 9JU
SCOTLAND
jrd4@st-andrews.ac.uk

The theme of the eschatological "war in heaven" between the angelic forces of good and the demonic forces of evil was a topic of great interest in early Jewish and Christian literature. The focus of this paper is the reflexes of this story which name the angel Michael or Melchizedek as the leader of the heavenly army. I will survey the sources of the myth in roughly chronological order through late antiquity, explore its origins in ancient Near Eastern and Israelite mythic themes, and present a provisional reconstruction of the development of the eschatological celestial battle in its various trajectories.

When a leader of the battling angels is mentioned in the texts, he is almost always either Michael or Melchizedek. It seems clear that the two were identified at least in some circles. In Qumran sectarian literature each appears as the head of the angelic hosts at the eschatological battle in different texts (see below). Based on this fact, as well as contextual considerations, J. T. Milik has suggested that a fragmentary passage in the Visions of Amram (4Q544) originally listed them together as names of the angel of light.[1] In addition, at least one medieval Hebrew text also identified Melchizedek with Michael.[2]

The relationship of these two angels, and how they came to be associated with one another, is one of the issues to be considered in this study. I will look at three texts from Qumran, one from the book of Revelation in the New Testament, one document from Nag Hammadi, and a liturgical poem by the Jewish poet Qalliri. Other texts will be alluded to in passing, but many that mention Melchizedek or Michael outside the context of the eschatological battle will be ignored.

11QMELCHIZEDEK (11Q13)

11QMelchizedek is preserved in a single, extremely fragmentary MS whose script places it in the first century B.C.E., so the date of composition must have been sometime earlier. The overall contents imply that it is a sectarian work.[3]

---

*The abbreviations used in this paper are those standard for the *Journal of Biblical Literature*. Translations are my own unless otherwise indicated.

[1]"4QVisions de ʿAmram et une citation d'Origène," *RB* 79 (1972) 77–97, esp. 85–86. See also Paul J. Kobelski, *Melchizedek and Melchireša*ʿ (CBQMS 10; Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1981) 24–36.

[2]A. S. Van der Woude, "Melchisedek als himmlische Erlösergestalt in den neugefundenen eschatologischen Midraschim aus Qumran Höhle XI," *OTS* 14 (1965) 354–73, esp. 372.

[3]The *editio princeps* was published by Van der Woude in "Melchisedek als himmlische Erlösergestalt" (N. 2). For subsequent bibliography see Kobelski, *Melchizedek and Melchireša*ʿ (N.

Originally it consisted of at least three columns; the first is lost except for a line written perpendicularly in a margin, but much of the text of the second column is extant, as well as the beginnings of some lines in the third column. The narrative of col. 2 describes the eschatological conflict fought by the divine being Melchizedek and his angelic allies against Belial and the evil spirits of his lot. The battle is set in "the tenth Jubilee" and is associated with the Day of Atonement:

> 6. . . this matter 7in the first week of the Jubilee after [the] ni[ne] Jubilees. And the d[ay of aton]ement is the e[nd of] the [t]enth [Jub]ilee, 8to atone in it for all the sons of [El and] the people of the lot of M[elchi]zedek . . . upon them . . . their . . . for 9it is the designated time for the year of favor for Melchize[de]k . . . holy ones of El for a reign of justice, as it is written 10concerning him in the songs of David, that which He said, "God stands in the as[sembly of El.] In the midst of the Gods he judges" (Ps 82:1). And concerning him He said, "Above it 11on high, return! El judges the peoples" (Ps 7:8–9), and which s[ays, "How long will you] judge unjustly and will you lift [up] the face of the wicked? Selah" (Ps 82:2). 12Its interpretation concerns Belial and concerns the spirits of his lot who . . . in their turning away from the statutes of El to [act wickedly.] 13And Melchizedek will avenge the vengeance of the judgments of E[l . . . from the hand of Be]lial and from the hand of all . . . 14And for his help will be all the gods of . . . all the sons of El and He shall appoi[nt] 15this [found]ation. It is the day of . . . which He said . . .

The general nature of the conflict is clear enough, although few details survive. Line 7 of col. 3 gives the added information that "[they] will consume [B]elial with fire," confirming (hardly a surprise!) that Belial was defeated.

THE WAR RULE (1QM)[4]

The War Rule is a loose collection of traditions about eschatological matters which appears in the Qumran library in a number of recensions. The most complete copy, and the one containing the material discussed in this section, is the MS from Cave One, dated palaeographically to the early Herodian period, late in the first

---

1); and Emile Puech, "Notes sur le manuscrit de XIQMelchî sédeq," *RQ* 12/48 (1987) 483–513, esp. 483–84 nn. 2–4. The document refers to "Belial" (2.12, 22, 25; 3.7) and "the spirits of his lot" (2.12), both common terms in the Qumran sectarian texts. It also uses the technical term "its *pešer*/ interpretation" (2.12, 17), known only from the sectarian literature.

[4]My translations from the War Scroll are based on transcriptions of photographs published by E. L. Sukenik in *The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University* (Jerusalem: Hebrew University and Magnes Press, 1955) and by Maurice Baillet in DJD 7, informed by the following commentaries: Martin Abegg, "The War Scroll from Qumran Caves 1 and 4: A Critical Edition" (Unpublished Ph.D. diss., Hebrew Union College–Jewish Institute of Religion, 1992); Jean Duhaime, "War Scroll (1QM, 1Q33)," "Cave IV Fragments," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*, vol. 2, *Damascus Document, War Scroll, and Related Documents*, ed. James H. Charlesworth (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1995) 80–197; Yigael Yadin, *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light Against the Sons of Darkness* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962).

century B.C.E. Two passages in the War Rule seem to refer to the same conflict with the forces of evil, but with Michael or the prince of light as the protagonist rather than Melchizedek. In col. 17 the following text appears, set off by partial blank lines preceding and following it. It seems to be presented as part of the chief priest's address to the troops before they go out to fight Belial and the sons of darkness (16.9–13), but it may well have had an independent existence before the editing of 1QM.

> [4]And you, strengthen yourselves and do not fear them, [for] their craving is for formlessness and for void and their staff is as though it were not. Not . . . [5]Israel all that is and shall be . . . in all the eternal times to be. Today is His appointed time to subdue and to abase the prince of the rule of [6]wickedness. And He shall send eternal help to the lot of His [red]emption by the might of an angel. He made magnificent the dominion of Michael in eternal light, [7]so as to enlighten with happiness the covenant of Israel; peace and blessing for the lot of God, to exalt among the gods the dominion of Michael and the rule of [8]Israel among all flesh. And righteousness shall be happy on high and all the sons of His truth shall rejoice in eternal knowledge. And you, sons of His covenant, [9]strengthen yourselves in the crucible of God until He wields His hand and fills His crucibles, His mysteries for your station.

This passage anticipates a conflict between the forces of good and evil in which God is to establish the dominion of Michael over the prince of the rule of wickedness, apparently the same figure as Belial (whose name, perhaps, should be reconstructed in line 5). The conflict between the prince of light and Belial is also mentioned in 13.9–16 as part of an address of the priests, Levites, and elders blessing God and cursing Belial (cf. 13.1–3).

> [9b]You are the God of our covenant;[5] (we are) Yours, an eternal people, and you cast us into the lot of light [10]for your truth. And of old You appointed a prince of light as our helper and in . . . and all the spirits of truth are in his rule. And it was You who [11]made Belial for the pit, an angel of enmity. And in dark[ness] is his [rul]e and it is in his counsel to make wicked and to make guilty. And all the spirits of [12]his lot are angels of violence. They walk in the boundaries of darkness and together their [crav]ing is for it. But we are the lot of Your truth. We shall be happy in the hand of [13]Your might and we shall be glad in Your salvation and we shall rejoice in [Your] hel[p and in] Your peace. Who is like You in power, God of Israel? Yet with [14]the poor is Your mighty hand. And which angel or prince is like the help of . . . [Fo]r of old You appointed for Yourself a day of battle . . . [15]. . . to help with truth and to destroy guilt, to abase darkness, and to give might to

[5]Reading with 4Q495, frag. 2.1, even though Jean Duhaime doubts on the grounds of the size of the lacuna that the reading was the same in 1QM ("War Scroll [1QM, 1Q33]" [N. 4]: 122 n. 158). This consideration does not seem decisive to me.

light, and to . . . [16]. . . to an eternal station to annihilate all the sons of darkness, and happiness for . . . (*a blank line follows*)

The battle here is God's, but the implication is that it will be played out between the prince of light and Belial.[6] Comparison of this text with the passage in col. 17 quoted above indicates that the author or editor of 1QM identified Michael with the prince of light.

THE SONGS OF THE SABBATH SACRIFICE (4Q400–407, 11Q 17, MasShirShabb)

The Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice, also known as the Angelic Liturgy, describes the worship of the angels in the various chambers and levels of the celestial temple, all the way up to God's throne-chariot in the heavenly throne room. The palaeographical evidence indicates that it existed by the end of the first half of the first century B.C.E. It does not seem to have been written by the same group or groups that produced the sectarian scrolls in the Qumran library.[7] Carol Newsom, the editor of the *editio princeps*, has suggested that two fragments of 4Q401 originally mentioned Melchizedek.[8] The name is damaged in both cases, but the reconstruction appears likely. The two fragments read as follows.

Frag. 11

כו]הֵן כוהנ[ים	. . . pries]t of priest[s . . .
א]לוהי דעת וכ[	. . . God of knowledge and . . .
מלכי] צדק כוהן בעד[ת אל	. . . Melchi]zedek, priest in the asse[mbly of God . . .

Frag. 22

]◦◦[ ]קדושי[	. . . holy one[s . . .
]ש מלו ידיהם[	. . . they filled their hands . . .
]מל[כי צדק	. . . Mel]chizedek . . .

Based on the identifiable material preserved in 4Q401, Newsom has concluded that most of the fragments of this MS come from the first five or six of the thirteen songs in the composition.[9] In a later publication she suggests that frags.

---

[6]Another passage in the War Rule (15.12–18) describes the apocalyptic battle as the "war of God" (מלחמת אל, line 12). It pictures a conflict of God and the angels against Belial (if the restoration in line 17 is correct) and the spirits of wickedness, but Michael is not mentioned in the surviving fragments of the text. The passages in cols. 13 and 17 are discussed by J. T. Milik in "Milkî-ṣedeq et Milkî-reša' dans les anciens écrits juifs et chrétiens," *JJS* 23 (1972) 95–144, esp. 139–43.

[7]Carol Newsom, "'Sectually Explicit' Literature from Qumran," in *The Hebrew Bible and Its Interpreters*, ed. William Henry Propp et al. (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1990) 167–87, esp. 179–85. In this article Newsom rejects her earlier conclusion in the *editio princeps* (see N. 8 below) that the work is a sectarian text.

[8]Carol Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985) 133–34, 143–44.

[9]Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* (N. 8): 8–9.

11 and 22 should be placed somewhere in songs three through five.[10] Given the probable location of these fragments in the work, I would like to draw attention to a fragment from another MS which came from the same general area. Frag. 4 of 4Q402 can be located with certainty near the end of song five, thanks to an overlap with MasShirShabb.[11] The first part of the fragment reads:[12]

> 1. . . 2. . . and he divided knowledge . . . 3. . . according to] his understanding he inscribed st[atutes . . . 4. . . his being impure . . . not . . . 5. . . and [they] shall not be . . . together . . . . . . sus]tainers of [his] thought and knowledge of the holy . . . 7. . . their . . . the war of God in/with ho[liness . . . 8. . . for to the God of gods belong [weap]ons of wa[r]s . . . 9. . . gods run to [His] muster and the sound of tumu[lt . . . 10. . . gods/God in the war of the heavenly clouds and was . . .

This fragment describes a celestial conflict involving God and the gods, which is called the "war of God" (מלחמת אלהים, nearly the same phrase as in 1QM 15.12) and the "war of the heavenly clouds" (מלחמת שחקים, reminiscent of the phrase "war in heaven" in Rev 12:7, to be discussed below). Frags. 1 and 3 of 4Q402 also seem to have to do with eschatological judgment. The former refers to "powerful mighty ones" (גבורי עוז, line 4) and "all the foundations of transgression" (כול יסודי פשע, line 5), while the latter has the word "he will judge" (ישפט; line 5). Newsom suggests that frags. 2 and 3 belong to the fifth song and frag. 1 to the end of the fourth or the beginning of the fifth song, so the theme of the eschatological battle seems to have been a theme in this part of the work.[13] Frag. 2 refers to "broc[ade] work" and has the phrase "in the inner room of the King" (lines 7 and 8, respectively), so the celestial temple seems also to have been mentioned in song five. Other fragments from 4Q401 and 4Q402 which come from the same general area of the work also allude to the heavenly temple (4Q401 frags. 4, 12, 13, 16//4Q402 frag. 9; 4Q402 frag. 6; frag. 7?).

Given this evidence, I propose that song five in its complete form described the eschatological war in heaven and presented Melchizedek as the high-priestly eschatological redeemer, much the same as in 11QMelchizedek. The likely placement of the fragments themselves renders this scenario possible, although the connection between priestly ordination in the celestial temple and the final battle is not intuitively obvious. However, another account of this battle does combine the two themes and thus makes my conclusion probable. In chapter 10 of the Testament of Moses the first two verses read:[14]

---

[10]Carol Newsom, "'He Has Established for Himself Priests': Human and Angelic Priesthood in the Qumran Sabbath *Shirot*," in *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin*, ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman (JSOT/ASOR, 1990) 101–20, esp. 106.

[11]Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* (N. 8): 8–9, 148–49.

[12]The remainder of the song (lines 11–15 in 4Q402 frag. 4 and lines 1–7 of MasShirShabb col. 1) extols the incomprehensible wonders devised by God for their appointed times.

[13]Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* (N. 8): 8–9, 149.

[14]Translation by J. Priest in "Testament of Moses," in *OTP* I 931–32. See also R. H. Charles, *APOT*, vol. 2, *Pseudepigrapha* 421, under the title "The Assumption of Moses."

[1]Then his kingdom will appear throughout the whole creation.
Then the devil will have an end.
Yes, sorrow will be led away with him.
[2]Then will be filled the hands of the messenger,
who is in the highest place appointed.
Yea, he will at once avenge them of their enemies.

The following eight verses describe the apocalyptic battle waged by God himself. It is generally agreed that the messenger whose hands are filled (i.e., who receives priestly ordination) is Michael. So here we have a reflex of the myth of the war in heaven leading to the defeat of personalized cosmic evil that begins with a priestly ordination of the angelic protagonist. Such, I propose, was the structure of song five of the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice. It described the ordination of the angelic beings in the heavenly temple, presumably including Melchizedek, then narrated the war in heaven that results in eschatological judgment. The exact nature of the opposition is not clear in the preserved fragments. There is a reference to "his being impure" (היותו טמא) in 4Q402 frag. 4.4, which Newsom takes to refer to the purification of the angelic warriors.[15] But other passages in the Qumran literature associate Belial and the evil spirits with uncleanness (Community Rule [1QS] 4.10, 21–22; Damascus Rule [CD-A] 4.15–17; 1QM 13.5), and this text may be singling out an evil adversary for mention. If so, it can no longer be determined whether it was Belial, Satan, some form of the chaos dragon (none of whom are mentioned elsewhere in the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice), or another force of evil. In addition, the phrase "to all the foundations of transgression" in 4Q402 frag. 1.5 may refer to the forces of evil at the final battle.

REVELATION 12:7–9

The book of Revelation, probably written near the end of the first century C.E. in Asia Minor, contains another reflex of the war in heaven myth in chapter 12. The development of the traditions in this chapter into their present form seems to have complex, and for the most part I am following here the redactional analysis of Adela Yarbro Collins.[16] She argues that the Christian redactor–probably John himself–combined the myth of the woman and the dragon (vv. 1–5 and 14–16) with the myth of the war in heaven (vv. 7–9). He added seams to connect the myths to each other and to the rest of the book (vv. 6, 13, 17), introduced a Christian hymn (vv. 10–12), and made other small changes. The two myths were Jewish rather than Christian

---

[15]I can think of no other reference in the Qumran sectarian literature that explicitly asserts that good angels could incur uncleanness. The Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice says in 4Q400 frag. 1, col. 1, line 14 that "there is nothing unclean in their [the angels'] sanctuaries" (although the defilement of the angels themselves is not directly precluded); and 1QM 7.3b–6 and the Rule of the Congregation (1QSa) 2.3b–9a seem to imply that the holy angels cannot endure the presence of cultic impurity. But the later Jewish mystical tradition does claim that angels can become ceremonially defiled from contact with human beings, which defilement is purified by immersion in rivers of fire. See, for example Peter Schäfer et al., *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur* (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck] 1981) §§181–82.

[16]Adela Yarbro Collins, *The Combat Myth in the Book of Revelation* (HDR 9; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1976) 101–55.

in their original form, although Greek myth also has significantly influenced the first. In its present setting the story of the woman leaves us perplexed as to whether she represents the Church or Mary the mother of Jesus. But the pericope makes good sense if she is interpreted as Israel, the figurative mother of a Jewish messiah. Likewise, the war in heaven features Michael as the divine hero (as in the War Scroll and the *piyyut* by Qalliri, discussed below), although we would expect Jesus to take on this role (as in Revelation 19) if the narrative were composed by a Christian.

It is the second source, the story of Michael's battle with the dragon in Rev 12:7–9, that concerns us here.

> 7And there was war in heaven. Michael and his angels had to fight[17] with the dragon, and the dragon and his angels fought, 8and he did not prevail, nor was a place found for them anymore in heaven. 9And the great dragon was thrown–the ancient serpent called the devil and Satan who leads the whole inhabited world astray–he was thrown to the earth and his angels were thrown with him.

The origins of this reflex of the myth are extremely ancient. An Ugaritic text (*CTA* 5.1.1–5) alludes to a battle in which the god Baal defeated *ltn*, clearly the same creature as the monster Leviathan in the Hebrew Bible and later literature.[18] In the restoration period or later, the apocalyptic section of the book of Isaiah (chs. 24–27) refers to the same myth–in almost the same words, but the battle is projected into the eschatological *Endzeit* and has Yahweh as the protagonist (Isa 27:1). This eschatological form of the tradition is developed further in Revelation, first by the replacement of Yahweh by Michael, and second by the use of the more generic term "dragon" (δράκων) instead of the name Leviathan. As Richard Bauckham has noted, the picture of the dragon is significantly developed by its identification (perhaps by way of Isa 27:1) with the serpent of Genesis 3 and then, by extension, with the devil or Satan.[19]

---

[17]This translation of the mysterious infinitive πολεμῆσαι follows the proposal of R. H. Charles that it is a Hebraism indicating a kind of infinitive of necessity (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on The Revelation of St. John* [2 vols.; ICC; Edinburgh: Clark, 1920] I 322. It is entirely possible that, as Charles suggests, John was translating a written Hebrew source. But it is equally possible that he composed the story freely in Greek heavily tinged with his native Hebrew (ibid. 1, cxlii–cliii).

[18]For a discussion of this passage in the overall context of the cosmogonic battle between the sea monster Yamm and Baal in the Ugaritic texts, as well as the version of the myth in Exod 15:1–18 with Yahweh as its hero, see Frank Moore Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1973) 112–44, esp. 118–20. I do not necessarily accept Cross's assumption that Yamm and the dragon were identified in the Ugaritic or biblical texts. For a survey of all Ugaritic and biblical texts relevant to the dragon myth see John Day, "Dragon and Sea, God's Conflict with," and "Leviathan," in *ABD* II 228–31; IV 295–96, respectively.

[19]Richard Bauckham, "The Lion, the Lamb, and the Dragon," in *The Climax of Prophecy: Studies on the Book of Revelation* (Edinburgh: Clark, 1993) 174–98, esp. 192–95. Given the antecedents in the Leviathan myth, as well as the parallel version of this myth preserved by Qalliri (see below), I see no reason to accept Yarbro Collins's argument that the opponent in Rev 12:7–9 was originally Satan rather than the dragon (*Combat Myth* [N. 16]: 109–10, 116). I suggest that the redactional seam

Another ancient myth, not noted explicitly by Bauckham, has also influenced this narrative. The theme of a revolt of an astral deity against the high god seems to go back to Ugaritic myth (*CTA* 6.1.48–65) and is found in the Hebrew Bible in Isa 14:12–20. In this passage the king of Babylon is pictured as the deity "Day Star, son of Dawn" (the translation of the *RSV*) who attempted to ascend to heaven and overthrow the Most High, but who instead was cast down from heaven into the underworld. The story of the fall of Satan from heaven in later literature seems to be derived from this myth, which, like the theme of the dragon, is projected into the apocalyptic *Endzeit* in the book of Revelation.[20]

The myth of Satan (the "adversary") in the Hebrew Bible (e.g., in Job 1–2; Zechariah 3; 1 Chr 21:1) is echoed as well, insofar as the celestial prosecuting attorney is identified with both the serpent and the dragon.

THE MELCHIZEDEK TRACTATE FROM NAG HAMMADI (NHC IX, 1)

This document from the Gnostic library discovered in Nag Hammadi, Egypt, is found in a single, exceedingly fragmentary Coptic MS of the fourth century C.E. Birger Pearson hazards a guess that the work was composed in the late second or early third century C.E., probably in Egypt, and it seems to have been written originally in Greek.[21] In any case it must be later than the rise of Christianity. The contents of the work can be roughly summarized as follows: an angelic messenger brought a revelation to the high priest Melchizedek (known from Genesis 14), which described, *inter alia*, the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ. This address concluded with instructions on to whom to reveal the message. Melchizedek arose with joy and carried out a number of rituals and invocations to Gnostic divinities. Then more heavenly messengers granted him another revelation that appears to indicate that Melchizedek himself will be incarnated as Jesus Christ (p. 25 of the codex). He will also defeat his enemies, the archons, in battle. After admonishing him not to reveal this knowledge without permission, the messengers ascended into the heavens.

The passage of interest for our purposes is 26.1–14, which describes the conflict with the archons. I give it with the translation of Giverson and Pearson.[22]

> greeted [me . . .]
> They said to me, "Be [strong, O Melchizedek],

Yarbro Collins notes, marked by the repetition of the word ἐβλήθη, "was thrown," comes from the addition of the phrase "the ancient serpent called the devil and Satan who leads the whole inhabited world astray," but that the subject "the great dragon" was original.

[20]Yarbro Collins, *Combat Myth* (N. 16): 81–83. Note also Daniel 8:9–11, 23–25, which applies the astral revolt myth to Antiochus Epiphanes and which influenced Rev 12:4. Other late references to the fall of Satan include 2 Enoch 29:4–5; Life of Adam and Eve 12–17; and Luke 10:18. Michael is also involved in the passage from the Life of Adam and Eve, although he does not explicitly cast Satan out of heaven.

[21]Birger A. Pearson et al., *Nag Hammadi Codices IX and X* (NHS 15; Leiden: Brill, 1981) 19–85, esp. 39–40; Pearson and Søren Giverson, "Melchizedek (IX, 1)," in *The Nag Hammadi Library in English*, ed. James M. Robinson (3rd. ed.; New York: Harper & Row, 1988) 438–44, esp. 439.

[22]The use of brackets to indicate missing text in this translation is extremely conservative. Enough of the words "Melchizedek" and "archons" is preserved in the MS that the readings are not in doubt.

great [High-priest]
of God [Most High, for the archons],
who [are] your [enemies],
made war; you have [prevailed over them, and]
they did not prevail over you, [and you]
endured and [you]
destroyed your enemies [. . .]
of their [. . .]
will rest, in any [. . .]
which is living (and) holy [. . .
those that] exalted themselves against him in [. . .]
flesh

There is much in this passage which is reminiscent of the traditions we have examined thus far about Melchizedek and Michael. In the Melchizedek Tractate this figure is repeatedly referred to as a High-priest (5.14–15; 6.17; 15.12; and here) or a priest (15.8; 19.14 [reconstructed]), echoing Gen 14:18 and (if correctly reconstructed above) the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice. He engages here in a cosmic war (πόλεμος) against the archons (the evil pleromic divinities of Gnostic cosmology) sometime after the crucifixion and resurrection of Christ, presumably at the eschaton. There is another reference to someone making war at the eschaton in 13.15–16 (the plural subject is unclear), which is immediately preceded by mention of three categories of spiritual beings (?) along with "those [that dwell] in the heavens and those that are [upon] the earth and those that are under the earth" (13.12–15). Presumably a cosmic battle in all three realms is envisioned.

Elsewhere (18.5–6), Jesus Christ, and thus apparently Melchizedek, is given the title "Commander-in-chief (ἀρχιστρατηγός) [of the] All." The Greek term ἀρχιστρατηγός is a common title of the archangel Michael.[23] Christ is also called "glorious one" (but the reading is unclear) and the high angels assisting him are "chief commanders (ἀρχιστρατηγός) of the luminaries (φωστήρ)" (6.2–3). There is a reference to an "angel of light" in a broken context in 15.1 and the high angels are called "commander" (στρατηγός), "luminary" (φωστήρ), and "man-of-light" in 17.11–14 or commander in chief (ἀρχιστρατηγός) in 17.18–19. These terms recall Michael, the angel of light or prince of light at Qumran, who leads the heavenly armies against the forces of Belial.

Thus in this Gnostic Christian work the myth of the war in heaven has been adapted to the theology of the writer. Jesus and Melchizedek are one and the same, and the eschatological battle is between him and the archons, the spiritual forces of evil for the Gnostics, rather than the dragon or Belial.

QALLIRI ON LEVIATHAN AND THE GREAT PRINCE

The last major text to be examined in this article is a *piyyuṭ* (a liturgical poem) written in the land of Israel by the Jewish poet Eleazar be-Rabbi Qallir

[23]For references see Pearson et al., *Nag Hammadi Codices IX and X* (N. 21): 33–34.

(Qalliri) in the fifth or sixth century C.E., one of many he prepared in two large compositions for the commemoration of the Ninth of Av. This particular poem (*silluq*), ויכון עולם על מליאתו, celebrates the vision of the eschatological victory of the messianic era. One section of it, published by Jefim Schirmann, narrates the battle between the two cosmogonic monsters, Behemoth and Leviathan, in the Garden of Eden.[24] This section of the poem begins with a description of the righteous in the Garden of Eden, for whose viewing pleasure the contest will be held (lines 1–17). God will show them three monsters: Ziz (a giant bird who plays no further part in the story after he is briefly described in lines 18–20), Behemoth, and Leviathan. Many details about the size, nature, and power of the latter two creatures are given (lines 21–77). Then the poem, borrowing heavily from the language of Job 41 and other scriptural texts, tells how God will bring Leviathan into the Garden.

[78]And when the great day comes,
the Great King will say:
[80]"Let him provide us with food for a great people."
And He will send the great prince against him,[25]
and with him troops, a great crowd
to spread over him a great net
and to drag him by the jaw with his great power.

[85]Lances shall lance him,
but he will reckon the iron of the lances to be straw.
Again, boilings shall boil against him,
but the clubs shall be reckoned by him as chaff.

They will shoot arrows from a bow,
[90]but the "son of a bow" shall not make him flee.
Bronze (shall be reckoned) as rotten wood.

They will hurl against him stones like crags,
but for him slingstones are turned to chaff.
Then in his wrath he will set out to swallow them.

[95]He will make (his own) head lofty in front of the gods.
The ʾErʾellim angels shall be terrified by his lifting it up.
By his presence they shall be confounded in valor.

It shall be known to the Powerful One,[26]

---

[24]Jefim Schirmann, "The Battle Between Behemoth and Leviathan According to an Ancient Hebrew *Piyyut*," *Proceedings of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities* 4 (1971) 327–69.

[25]Another reading is "Michael, the great prince." Contra Schirmann ("The Battle Between Behemoth and Leviathan" [N. 24]: 335), this is the correct identification of the great prince (cf. Dan 12:1), as has been pointed out by Kenneth William Whitney, Jr., in "Two Strange Beasts: A Study of Traditions Concerning Leviathan and Behemoth in Second Temple and Early Rabbinic Judaism" (University Microfilms: Unpublished Th.D. diss., Harvard University, 1992) 198.

[26]Or "the Refuge." Both senses of this word are echoed in lines 99–102.

and He will give forth a voice of power with His voice
100 to send against him a gift of power,
in order that he be taken without refuge.
In his neck power lodges.

Leviathan will be compelled into the Garden to meet and do battle with Behemoth, who will already be there. They will fight and set the Garden on fire, producing aromatic smoke. Eventually God will separate them and slay them both so that they may be served up in the eschatological banquet for the righteous.

This version of the myth is the most closely related to the one in Rev 12:7–9 of those studied above. Michael is the chief angel in both and his foe is the primordial dragon (although the dragon is identified with the devil only in Revelation). In both, the encounter between Michael and the dragon figure is a brief episode in a much longer narrative. Again, the encounter is inconclusive in each version: the dragon is cast down from heaven but continues to oppress the earth in Revelation, while in the *piyyuṭ* the attack on Leviathan by Michael fails and the monster must be herded into the Garden by God.[27]

SYNTHESIS

We have now surveyed the six major surviving reflexes of the myth of the eschatological battle conducted by Michael or Melchizedek against the forces of darkness.[28] Three concern Michael: in the War Rule he fights the war of God against Belial; in the book of Revelation he fights a war in heaven against the dragon who is the serpent and Satan; and in Qalliri's *piyyuṭ* he (as the "great prince") does battle with Leviathan. The other three concern Melchizedek: in 11QMelchizedek he opposes Belial; in the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice (assuming my reconstruction is correct) he fights the war of God and the war of heaven against a foe whose identity is lost; and in the Melchizedek Tractate from Nag Hammadi he fights a war with the archons and prevails over them. Some rabbinic sources also

---

[27]Other reflexes of the myth are found in the rabbinic literature. According to *b. B. Bat.* 74b–75a, the angel Gabriel will arrange a hunt for Leviathan, but the monster will not be defeated without God's help. The account in *Pesiq. Rab Kah.* is closely related to that of Qalliri, but has God ordering the attending angels to make war with (עשו עמו מלחמה) Leviathan. Twice they attacked him, but they failed to harm him. For discussions of both texts see Schirmann, "The Battle Between Behemoth and Leviathan" (N. 24): 355; Whitney, "Two Strange Beasts" (N. 25): 196–97. The late Midr. *ʾAlpā ʾ Bêṯôṯ, w"h d"g* tells essentially the same story, with Gabriel as the chief angel. The Hebrew text is found in *Batei Midrashot*, ed. Shlomo Aharon Wertheimer and Abraham Joseph Wertheimer (2nd ed.; Jerusalem: Ktab Yad waSepher, 1968) 437–38. For an English translation and comments see Whitney, "Two Strange Beasts" (N. 25): 202–208. Finally, another late passage in Pirqe R. El. (ch. 27) relates that God ejected Sammael (before his fall, the highest angel in heaven) and his troop of angels from heaven and that Sammael seized Michael's wings in order to drag him down too. Michael was saved only by the intervention of God. The fall of Sammael is also mentioned in chs. 7, 13, 14. Chapter 14 recounts the punishment of the serpent in the same sentence. See Gerald Friedlander (ed.), *Pirkê de Rabbi Eliezer* (4th ed.; New York: Sepher-Hermon, 1981) 46, 92, 99, 193–94.

[28]There appear to be a few more allusions to the myth which do not name the protagonist or give a clear indication of who he is. These include T. Levi 5:6; T. Dan 6:1–7; and Sib. Or. 3.805–807.

name Gabriel or the attending angels as protagonists in the war against Leviathan and tell a story of a conflict between Michael and Sammael when the latter was cast out of heaven.

What, then, are the origins of this myth, and how did it develop into the versions we have before us? It was noted above, in the section on Rev 12:7–9, that it can ultimately be traced to two very ancient Canaanite myths: the primordial battle between Baal and Leviathan and the revolt of an astral deity against the kingship of Baal. In Israelite tradition, Yahweh became the hero of the two myths (e.g., in Ps 74:12–17 and Isa 14:12–20. After the exile they were projected into the eschatological *Endzeit* (e.g., in Isa 27:1 and 2 Enoch 29:4–5).

The next major mutation is one for which we have relatively little documentary evidence. The angel Michael took the place of Yahweh in some reflexes of both myths. We have no way of knowing when this change took place, but it seems to fit the general trend in the Second Temple period of angels taking on functions originally ascribed to God. Thus I see no reason to assume that Michael was involved in any early cosmogonic versions. Rather, he was probably only introduced into the eschatological scenarios. In the book of Daniel, Michael is portrayed as an angelic warrior who battled the prince of Persia (10:13, 21) and who will be active at the eschaton (12:1). It may be that he had already been absorbed into the dragon myth or the astral revolt myth by this time, or it may be that the influence of the book of Daniel precipitated the mutation. We have no way of knowing whether Michael took on the role of divine warrior in both myths independently, or whether he was taken into one and then by extension into the other. Our earliest evidence places him in battle against Belial in the War Scroll (the astral revolt motif),[29] and against the dragon or Satan in Revelation (a mixture of the Leviathan and astral revolt motifs, with the serpent of Genesis 3 and Satan added for good measure).

Of the two early traditions involving Melchizedek, only one (11QMelchizedek) preserves the name of his adversary, Belial. We have no way of knowing who the hostile power was in the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice. It is quite clear that Melchizedek was introduced into the war in heaven myth secondarily, since he appears in the Hebrew Bible as the priest-king of Jerusalem (Gen 14:18–20) and as the patron of a priesthood of the Davidic kings (Ps 110:4). I have argued elsewhere on the basis of evidence from West Semitic royal funerary cults and postexilic references to Melchizedek that he was a divinized royal patron of the house of David in the preexilic cult of the Jerusalem temple and that Melchizedek the god evolved from this divinity and became an important angelic figure from the Second Temple

---

[29]An additional complicating factor that is outside the scope of this paper is the influence of Iranian dualism on the sectarian literature from Qumran. It seems clear that some elements of Iranian religion (such as the opposition between light and darkness or a sevenfold eschatological battle) were absorbed by these texts. The idea that Michael/Melchizedek is the prince of light in opposition to Belial/Melchiresha as the angel of darkness (1QS 3.20–21; CD-A 5.18; 1QM 13.10–11; 4QVisions of Amram [4Q544] frags. 2–3?), and that God created the angels of darkness with evil natures (1QS 3.25), may have Iranian roots, but the fundamental myth is Jewish. Michael, Melchizedek, Belial, and Melchiresha are Hebrew names with recognizable biblical antecedents and, as has been shown above, the basic elements of the war in heaven myth have their origins in earlier Canaanite and Israelite traditions. For a discussion of the Iranian evidence see Kobelski, *Melchizedek and Melchireša'* (N. 1): 84–98.

period on.[30] Whether or not I am right about his origins, it is certain that he was considered a divine being not only at Qumran, but also in early Christian and Gnostic traditions. Since Michael also functioned as a heavenly priest, it is easy to see how the priestly angel Melchizedek was identified with him and took on his role in the war in heaven myth.[31] Presumably the name Belial (which comes from a personalized understanding of phrases in the Hebrew Bible like איש הבליעל, "worthless man" [e.g., 2 Sam 16:7]) is an earlier appellation than Melchiresha for the demonic opponent. The latter name is found only at Qumran, and appears to have been coined on analogy with the name Melchizedek: the opponent of the "king of righteousness" is the "king of wickedness."

The next stage in the tradition is found in the Melchizedek Tractate from Nag Hammadi. Two developments are notable in this document. First, Melchizedek is identified with Jesus Christ. Strange though this may seem, it is comprehensible within the early Christian thought world. It was natural, and probably inevitable, that Christians should have made Jesus the hero of the war in heaven myth (as in Revelation 19–20 and the Odes of Solomon 22:5). Since reflexes of the myth which involved Michael or Melchizedek were still being circulated, one possible reconciliation would be to identify Jesus with one or both of the angels, and this solution was adopted in the Melchizedek Tractate. The other development is that the archons become the evil opponents. Again, the transformation makes sense. Since the archons were the celestial forces of evil in the Gnostic mythos, it was natural that Gnostic Christians should have replaced the dragon or (more likely) a satanic figure with the more relevant archons.

Oddly, one of the latest accounts of the myth, the *piyyuṭ* by Qalliri, contains one of the stratigraphically earliest versions. The hero is Michael, the great prince, and the opponent is the dragon Leviathan, who is not connected in any way to the serpent of Genesis 3, Satan, or the astral revolt. This poem is essentially an extended commentary and development of scriptural passages that mention Leviathan, and it may well transmit very conservatively something of the process of exegesis which created one stream of the war in heaven myth.

The other rabbinic texts, with one exception, tell essentially the same story as Qalliri, but replace the great prince with either Gabriel or the attending angels. Gabriel, like Michael one of the four archangels in Second Temple literature, is also mentioned alongside Michael in the War Scroll and implicitly in the book of Daniel. His name ("God is my might") has a martial ring to it, and he acts both as a messenger (e.g., Dan 8:15–17; 9:21; Luke 1:19, 26) and a warrior (1 Enoch 10:9). It is easy to see how he would eventually begin to take on the role of Michael in the tradition, as well as how Michael's role in the war in heaven might occasionally be applied generally to the attending angels.[32]

The exception is the story of the conflict between Michael and Sammael in Pirqe R. El. This account is independent of the Leviathan tradition and seems to descend from the myth of the astral revolt. It is most closely related to the reflex

---

[30]James R. Davila, "Melchizedek: King, Priest, and God," forthcoming in *The Seductiveness of Jewish Myth: Challenge or Response*, ed. S. Daniel Breslauer (Albany: State University of New York).

[31]See the references collected by Van der Woude in "Melchisedek als himmlische Erlösergestalt" (N. 2): 370–71.

[32]For detailed references for Gabriel, see Carol A. Newsom, "Gabriel" in *ABD* II 863.

involving Michael and Belial in 1QM (as well as the similar tradition in 11QMelchizedek), but the appearance of Sammael rather than Belial as the antagonist tends to indicate that the narrative arose independent of the Qumran literature.

CONCLUSIONS

After surveying the surviving accounts of the eschatological battle between the forces of good and evil involving the warrior angel Michael or Melchizedek, I have proposed a reconstruction of the branching trajectories of the myth. I trace the origins of the story back to Canaanite and Israelite traditions about the conquest of Leviathan and the revolt of an astral deity and suggest that Michael was the first angelic protagonist to replace Yahweh in both myths, with Melchizedek–the divinized priestly figure–in turn replacing him in some versions. Eventually Jesus Christ, Gabriel, and the attending angels were absorbed into some reflexes of the story. The antagonists included Leviathan, the dragon (combined with the serpent and Satan), Belial, and the archons of Gnostic mythology.

From Fiction to History: contextualizing *Joseph and Aseneth*

Gideon Bohak
The University of Michigan

Having devoted an entire monograph to examining the original social context of *Joseph and Aseneth*, I shall not reiterate all my arguments here.[1] Instead, I shall briefly consider the different types of arguments which may be adduced in contextualizing ancient works of fiction and assess their advantages and difficulties, both in general terms—what some might call "methodology"—and in their specific application to this novel. In doing so, I hope (a) to demonstrate that the problems that beset the study of *Joseph and Aseneth* are in no way unique, and (b) to assess the relative merits of the various methods for determining the original context of a given work of fiction.

1. The first evidence to be utilized in analyzing any literary piece is the text's own claim of who its author was, or, to a lesser extent, the manuscripts' claims in that regard. When dealing with ancient fiction, however, this often is not very helpful. In some cases, the text and the manuscripts do not identify their author at all (as in *Joseph and Aseneth*, the *Testament of Abraham*, or the *History of Apollonius King of Tyre*, to give but a few examples).[2] In other cases, the authorial identification is fictitious (witness the *Letter of Aristeas*, which Aristeas never wrote, or the supposed letters of *Chion of Heraclea*), or simply wrong (as with the *Ass*, falsely attributed to Lucian, or the *Alexander Romance*, often laid at Callisthenes' door). Finally, even when an author's name is known, it is often the case that little is known about him beyond the meager details supplied by the text or the manuscripts (e.g., Chariton, Achilles Tatius, Heliodorus, and others). Thus, the most natural method of determining when and where an ancient text was written often proves ineffective, since only a few ancient works of prose fiction are securely attributed to

---

[1] G. Bohak, *Joseph and Aseneth and the Jewish Temple in Heliopolis*, [SBL Early Judaism and Its Literature], Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996

[2] A similar situation prevails for the novels known only from papyrus fragments, since their authors' names often are missing.

well-known authors (as are, e.g., Lucian's *True Stories* or Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*).

2. A second type of data that could be adduced in contextualizing an ancient text consists of evidence for its existence at a given time and place, evidence that provides a *terminus ante quem* for its composition, and might shed some light on its previous history. When available, such evidence is extremely useful—as, for example, in the case of Chariton's *Chaereas and Callirrhoe*, dated by Erwin Rohde to the late-fifth or sixth century CE and soon discovered on a second century CE papyrus from Egypt.[3] Yet after a century of papyrological discoveries, many Greek works of prose fiction are still absent from the papyrological record, and the Judeo-Greek literature—including texts whose Alexandrian or Egyptian provenance is certain—is almost unattested.[4] In other cases, the evidence consists not of the texts' physical remains, but of citations from or allusions to them in subsequent literature, such as Alexander Polyhistor's excerpts from many Judeo-Greek writers, or Josephus' extensive use of the *Letter of Aristeas*. This too, however, provides few clues for dating most of the Greek novels, for only rarely were they quoted, or even alluded to, by later writers.[5] Thus, while such evidence facilitates the dating of some texts, the absence thereof cannot serve to justify a late dating of others. *Daphnis and Chloe*, for example, is first attested in the twelfth century, a full millennium after its likely date of composition.[6] Similarly, the earliest evidence for the dissemination of traditions connected with *Joseph and Aseneth* is found in Egeria's description of her visit to Helio-

---

[3] Cf. E. Rohde, *Der griechische Roman und seine Vorläufiger*, Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel, 1876, p. 489 with B.P. Grenfell and A.S. Hunt, *Fayum Towns and their Papyri*, London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1900, pp. 74-82. For other papyrus fragments of this work, see R.A. Pack, *The Greek and Latin Literary Texts from Greco-Roman Egypt*^{2}, Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press, 1965, p. 33.

[4] For the extant fragments, see J. van Haelst, *Catalogue des papyrus littéraires juifs et chrétiens*, Paris: Sorbonne, 1976, esp. pp. 199-206.

[5] See B. Wesseling, "The Audience of the Ancient Novels," in-H. Hofman (ed.), *Groningen Colloquia on the Novel*, vol. 1, Groningen: Egbert Forsten, 1988, pp. 67-79, esp. 67-68.

[6] D.M. Reeve, *Longus: Daphnis et Chloe*, Leipzig: Teubner, 1986, p. V.

polis, in the late-fourth century CE, but this provides no clue as to how old these traditions were at the time.[7]

3. Moving from "external" to "internal" evidence—that is, to arguments adduced from the text itself—pride of place must be given to linguistic analysis, as it is the least subjective of all forms of textual investigation. The systematic examination of a text's lexical and grammatical practices can reveal features which are unattested prior to a given date, thus supplying a *terminus post quem*, or after a given date, providing a *terminus ad quem* for that text. It can also point to features which were characteristic only of a certain geographic region or a specific social milieu. Unfortunately, such analysis often yields only a very vague notion of a text's date and provenance, and sometimes none at all. Chariton's *Chaereas and Callirrhoe*, for example, has repeatedly been subjected to syntactic and lexical analyses, but the results remain inconclusive, with the scholarly opinion constantly oscillating between ca. 100 BCE and 100 CE, and no end in sight to this swing of the pendulum.[8] This ambiguity results not so much from flaws in the analytical method as from the lack of sufficient evidence for the linguistic habits of the ancient world, as well as the enormous variation within these habits. In a similar fashion, the linguistic analysis of *Joseph and Aseneth* demonstrates its extensive use of the Greek Bible (see below), proving that it could not have been written prior to the second century BCE, during which many of the biblical texts were rendered in Greek. Beyond that, however, this novel provides few *post quem* linguistic signposts,[9] all of a rather dubious nature, since

---

[7] For Egeria's visit to Aseneth's house, see Ch. Burchard, *Untersuchungen zu Joseph und Aseneth*, (WUNT 8), Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1965, pp. 137-138; *id.*, "Der jüdische Asenethroman und seine Nachwirkung. Von Egeria zu Anna katharina Emmerick oder von Moses aus Aggel zu Karl Kerényi," *ANRW* II.20.1 (1987), pp. 554-556; G. Bohak, *op. cit.*, pp. 98-100.

[8] Cf. A.D. Papanikolaou, *Chariton-Studien: Untersucuhngen zur Sprache und Chronologie der griechischen Romane*, [Hypomnemata 37], Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1973, pp. 160-163 (first century BCE) with C. Ruiz-Montero, "Aspects of the Vocabulary of Chariton of Aphrodisias," *CQ* 41 (1991), 484-489 (end of first or beginning of second century CE) and C. Hernández Lara, *Estudios sobre el aticismo de Cariton de Afrodisias*, [Classical and Byzantine Monographs 29], Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1994, pp. 221-224 (agreeing with Ruiz-Montero).

[9] Cf. the list in Ch. Burchard, *Untersuchungen*, pp. 148-151 with the shorter list in *id.*, "Joseph and Aseneth," in-J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, vol. 2, Garden City: Doubleday, 1985, p. 108

(a) our diachronic knowledge of the Greek language often is sketchy, and new discoveries could shake any assertion that a word or construction X does not appear prior to a date Y, and (b) there is always the danger that late words within the text are nothing but secondary scribal accretions. To give one specific example, the appearance of a Latin loan-word, σωλάριον, in the shorter recension, *d*, of *Joseph and Aseneth* 7:2,[10] does not necessarily demonstrate the lateness of this recension, as it may have entered the manuscript tradition hundreds of years after the actual composition of that text.[11] Thus, while a linguistic analysis of the novel's recensions has helped identify the *a* and *c* texts, which differ from *b* and *d* on hundreds of occasions, as late reworkings of the novel, it shed little light on the relative dates of the latter two recensions.[12]

While assigning *post quem* dates is difficult, *ante quem* limits, based on words and linguistic usages which supposedly died out at a certain period, are even more treacherous, given the tendency in much of ancient literature to mine earlier texts for their linguistic idiosyncrasies and to incorporate these in new literary pieces—what might be called "archaizing," "atticizing," or "biblicizing" according to the specific kind of text. Thus, for example, the appearance of the Persian term σατράπης—that in *Joseph and Aseneth* apparently refers to Egypt's local governors—is not an historical anachronism but an attempt to make use of archaic-sounding terminology.[13] Evidently, such linguistic practices are of little value for our quest for *Joseph and Aseneth*'s original context.

---

10 M. Philonenko, *Joseph et Aséneth: Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes*, Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1968, p. 150 (σωλαριω BD: υπερωω EFH). Cf. Ch. Burchard, "Ein vorläufiger griechischer Text von Joseph und Aseneth," *Dielheimer Blätter zum Alten Testament* 14 (1979), p. 10 (υπερωω).

11 Cf. A. Standhartinger, *Das Frauenbild im Judentum der hellenistischen Zeit: Ein Beitrag anhand von 'Joseph und Aseneth'*, [AGAJU 26], Leiden: Brill, 1995, p. 40, n. 200. Note, however, that the word σωλάριον does not appear in S. Daris, *Il lessico latino nel greco d'Egitto*^{2}, Barcelona: Institut de Teologia Fonamental, 1991.

12 For the *a* and *c* texts, see M. Philonenko, *Joseph et Aséneth*, pp. 4-11; Ch. Burchard, "The Present State of Research on Joseph and Aseneth," in-J. Neusner, P. Borgen, E.S. Frerichs, and R. Horsley (eds.), *New Perspectives on Ancient Judaism*, Lanham, New York and London: University Press of America, 1987, vol. 2, pp. 32-34.

13 Cf. LXX 1 Sam 5:8 etc., where the Philistine rulers are called σατράπαι. This term appears in other Greek novels, including those that are not set in the Persian period—see, e.g., Achilles Tatius, *LC* IV.11 with J.J. Winkler's comments in B.P. Reardon (ed.), *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989, p. 227 n. 58.

If the linguistic analysis of *Joseph and Aseneth* provides few clues for determining its exact date of composition, such analysis could shed some light on the milieu in which it was written. First, it is inconceivable that anyone not deeply familiar with the Greek Bible, and equally unencumbered by the rules of Greek idiom, would have written such monstrosities as φύγω ἀπὸ προσώπου τινός, ἐκχέω τὴν δέησίν μου ἐνώπιόν τινος, or κατακόπτω τινὰ ἐν στόματι ῥομφαίας. Moreover, the entire narrative constantly presupposes the readers' familiarity with the biblical Patriarchs and their previous exploits.[14] It is therefore safe to say that the author and intended readers were either Jews or Christians, deeply interested in the biblical text and less mindful of the demands of Greek prose style. Moreover, the linguistic analysis reveals that *Joseph and Aseneth* is not likely to have been translated from Hebrew or Aramaic, as it contains numerous expressions that cannot have been of Semitic origin, and that never appear in the many Greek texts that actually were translated from Hebrew or Aramaic Jewish texts.[15] These two conclusions set *Joseph and Aseneth* apart from the "pagan" Greek novels on the one hand and from the Hebrew and Aramaic Jewish texts on the other, but they do not amount to a definite statement concerning its historical context.

4. Once the linguistic analysis has failed to bring the desired result, we must begin analyzing the text itself. When we do so, the first thing to pay attention to is the historical events it mentions, alludes to, or presupposes, for these will provide a *terminus post quem* for the text, and some notion of what events its author found particularly interesting. The best-known application of this process is, of course, Porphyry's brilliant analysis of the *Book of Daniel*, refuting the text's own claims to have been written in the Persian period. Unfortunately, most ancient works of fiction do not supply as many historical clues as does *Daniel*, but in some cases such allusions do provide useful clues as to a text's likely date. In Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*, for example, the siege of Syene (Assuan) seems to have been modeled after the celebrated siege of Nisibis in 350 CE, and so

---

[14] For both points see, e.g., G. Delling, "Einwirkungen der Sprache der Septuaginta in 'Joseph und Aseneth'," *JSJ* 9 (1978), pp. 29-56, and R.D. Chesnutt, *From Death to Life: Conversion in Joseph and Aseneth*, [JSP Suppl. 16], Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995, pp. 256-258.
[15] See esp. Ch. Burchard, *Untersuchungen*, pp. 95-96.

the dating of the entire novel—to the third or fourth century CE—hinges on the exact relationship between the extant descriptions of that event and *Aethiopica* IX.3-5.[16]

In the past, scholars have always assumed that *Joseph and Aseneth* does not allude to any historical event beyond those mentioned already in the Book of Genesis.[17] The issue is more complex, however, for this novel contains an "enigmatic" revelation scene (chapters 14-17), in which a fiery angel shows Aseneth a symbolic vision not unlike the visions shown to Enoch, Abraham, Daniel, and others in numerous Jewish and Early Christian texts. The vision includes a group of bees, "white as snow, and their wings like purple and like violet and like scarlet and like gold-woven linen garments" (16:18), that leave their honeycomb and build a new one, similar to the first, on Aseneth's lips and mouth. The bees' appearance is clearly based on the description of the priestly regalia in Exod 25-40, and the conclusion suggests itself that they are a symbolic representation of Jewish priests and that their honeycomb stands for the Jewish temple. Since the bee-priests' new comb is explicitly connected with Aseneth, their action must be a symbolic description of the flight from Jerusalem of Onias IV and his followers and the establishment of a second temple, modeled after the first, in Aseneth's hometown, Heliopolis.[18] This necessitates a *terminus post quem* of ca. 160 BCE for the novel, and provides a clear clue as to the author's identity, for only a staunch supporter of Onias' temple would have included the establishment of this temple as the major event of such a revelation. It also serves to accentuate the difference between *Joseph and Aseneth* and the other Greek novels, namely, that it contains an apocalyptic scene, an historical revelation that contributes little to the narrative's progress—unlike, e.g., the prophetic dreams in *Chaereas and Callirrhoe*, or the necromantic revelation in *Aethiopica* VI.14-15—and appeals to the readers over the heads, as it were, of the story's own protagonists. In this respect, *Joseph*

---

16 See G.W. Bowersock, *Fiction As History: Nero to Julian*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994, pp. 149-160.

17 And claims that it *reflects* the events surrounding the conversion of Queen Helena (V. Aptowitzer, *HUCA* 1 (1924), pp. 239-306) or the Alexandrian riots of the late-30s CE (D. Sänger, *ZNW* 76 (1985), pp. 86-106) have met with little approval.

18 See further G. Bohak, *op. cit.*, pp. 6-15

and Aseneth is much closer to the *Book of Daniel*, to Enoch's many visions, or to Virgil's *Aeneid* (e.g., VI.756-893), than to such a straightforward love story as Chariton's *Chaereas and Callirrhoe*.

This new interpretation of the honeycomb scene raises the possibility of one other historical allusion in *Joseph and Aseneth*. When the angel burns the original honeycomb, in 17:3-4, his action probably should be interpreted as a reference to the burning of the original Jewish temple. This might reflect the actual destruction of Jerusalem in 70 CE, some four years before Onias' temple itself was entirely obliterated, in which case we would have to date the novel, or at least these two verses, between 70 and 74 CE. We must stress, however, that it is not uncommon for ancient revelation scenes to "foretell" not only events which had come to pass by the author's time, but also those which he was hoping to see within his own lifetime -- some of which, as *we* know, never came to pass. Daniel foretold the Resurrection (Dan 12:2), Enoch could see the coming Judgment (*1 Enoch* 90:20-39), and Anchises promised that Augustus "super... Indos / proferet imperium" (*Aen.*, VI.794-5). Similarly, the symbolic reference to the destruction of Jerusalem by a divine fire probably represents the author's own wishful thinking, long before 70 CE, rather than a *post eventum* reference to that fateful year.[19]

5. With all the references and allusions to known events collected and analyzed, we must next examine what literary works the text mentions, alludes to, or presupposes. Since explicit references to contemporary or near-contemporary literature are rare in ancient fiction, this examination inevitably leads to a survey of the supposed allusions to, or reworking of, one text by another. This, of course, is a highly subjective enterprise—witness Rohde's confidence that Chariton was familiar with the novels of Iamblichus and Heliodorus, a familiarity that soon turned out to be chronologically impossible. A similar case, though far more problematic, is offered by the relationship between Xenophon's *Ephesiaca* and Chariton's *Chaereas and Callirrhoe*. Their interdependence is evident, but who borrowed from whom? "Much has been written," says Tomas Hägg, "in an attempt to prove who is the model and who the imitator, and since

---

[19] G. Bohak, *op. cit.*, pp. 15-18, 81-82.

neither of the novels is dated with absolute certainty, this discussion is bound to continue."[20] Unfortunately, *Joseph and Aseneth* does not seem to echo any literary work other than those found in the Greek Bible, though one issue—the author's possible familiarity with Egyptian literature, in Demotic or in Greek translation—has never been explored.[21] Yet this exploration too is not likely to yield any conclusive evidence for *Joseph and Aseneth*'s exact date and specific place of origin.

6. With the historical and literary allusions collected and analyzed, we may turn to the other analytic tools at our disposal. First among these is the examination of specific narrative details which could point to the text's geographic or chronological context. Naturally, there is much uncertainty in that approach too, for it often is hard to judge an author's factual accuracy from a distance of almost two millennia. To give just one example, we may note the long debate over *Daphnis and Chloe*'s descriptions of the island of Lesbos, descriptions that may reflect the author's familiarity with that island—and may not.[22] Even worse, however, is the fact that even an author's demonstrable knowledge of the *realia* of a certain place need not imply a personal familiarity with that location. Heliodorus, for example, spends many pages displaying his remarkable erudition, describing at great length Egyptian and Ethiopian sites, peoples, customs and curiosities. Yet this "Phoenician from Emesa," as he describes himself (*Aeth.* X.41), clearly owed much of his knowledge to the benefits of a good library, and one may only speculate as to how much he actually traveled himself. Fortunately, *Joseph and Aseneth*'s case is somewhat different, since its author was not striving for an ostentatious display of his bookish erudition, and probably possessed little such learning to begin with. Thus, his familiarity with Egyptian *realia* (such as the detailed description of Aseneth's tower-complex), and with some aspects of Egyptian religion (such as the correct identification of Atum-

---

20 T. Hägg, *The Novel in Antiquity*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983, p. 20.

21 G. Bohak, *op. cit.*, p. 102.

22 See the succinct summary in B.D. MacQueen, *Myth, Rhetoric, and Fiction: A Reading of Longus's Daphnis and Chloe*, Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1990, pp. 191-195.

Re, "the father of all the Egyptian gods," as "a wild old lion"), could lend support to the suggestion of an Egyptian provenance for this novel.[23]

7. In addition to narrative elements that disclose the physical *realia* of the author's world, details that might reflect the author's social position must also be examined. This is especially valid for works such as *Joseph and Aseneth*, given the tendency of Jewish and Christian writers to recast the biblical Patriarchs in their own image. Thus, *Joseph and Aseneth*'s recurrent emphasis on Joseph's, and Levi's, good relations with Pharaoh, in spite of their dislike of Egyptians in general, could direct us to Ptolemaic Egypt, and to Jewish circles with close ties in the royal court. Likewise, the military prowess which characterizes Levi, Simon, and all the sons of Leah and Rachel could point to Jewish soldiers as the intended readers of such a narrative. Finally, the strong emphasis on Levi, the paragon of the pious man, could point to a Jewish priest, a descendant of the biblical Levi, as *Joseph and Aseneth*'s likely author.[24] Granted, this is only circumstantial evidence, but when many lines of evidence converge on the Jews of the Land of Onias—settled in their military κατοικίαι and worshipping in their Heliopolitan temple—such evidence lends further support to the conclusion arrived at from the analysis of the honeycomb scene. *Joseph and Aseneth* is an Oniad, Heliopolitan text.

8. Once the analysis of the text's depiction of everyday *realia* and social situations is complete, we may begin to employ arguments based on "cui bono" reasoning. We may ask, that is, who could have benefited from the text under discussion, and in what ways. Before asking this question, however, we must emphasize one major difference between *Joseph and Aseneth* and most, if not all, of the "pagan" Greek novels. Daphnis, Chloe, Theagenes, Charicleia, and their ilk all share one essential trait, namely, their anonymity. From nowhere did they come, and into nowhere did they go once the narratives that hosted them were over. These protagonists' actions could have had entertainment, emotive, or educational value—but

---

[23] For a fuller discussion of both issues, see G. Bohak, *op. cit.*, pp. 67-70 and 58-61, respectively.

[24] For these and other narrative elements that could point to an Oniad origin, see G. Bohak, *op. cit.*, pp. 41-62.

they had no *a priori* socio-political significance for the novels' readers. Even Chariton's actors, supposedly known historical figures, would have been of no personal significance to *Chaereas and Callirrhoe*'s readers, beyond, perhaps, the fact that they were both Greek.[25] *Joseph and Aseneth* was very different, however, since it was devoted to the lives and deeds of the Jews' revered Patriarchs. Such narratives tended to straddle the thin line separating fiction from history, and often were taken by their readers as reliable historical accounts.[26] Thus, they could have had an entertainment, emotive, and educational value similar to that of Longus' or Chariton's novels, but they also tended to have a much deeper meaning, for stories about one's ancestors often have direct implications for one's own society.[27] *Joseph and Aseneth*, then, like the *Alexander Romance*, or Virgil's *Aeneid*, is quite likely to have had a message for its early readers that went beyond the cathartic joy of the narrative's happy end.

Finding out what this message may have been is a very tricky issue, for it inevitably depends on how *we* think that the text's readers *could* have used it. However, once we begin to have a sense of who these readers may have been, it is not idle to ask what the text's implications may have been for these postulated readers. As an example, we may take the Famine Stele, an inscription that purports to report a decree of King Djoser, but actually was cut in the Ptolemaic period. Since the decree itself is entirely devoted to Djoser's grant of land, and of additional revenues, to the temple of Khnoum in Elephantine, it stands to reason that it was the priests of that temple who set it up, for it was they who could benefit

---

25 Note the constant emphasis on the Greek-Barbarian dichotomy—1.14.9; 2.5.11; 5.2.6; 6.4.10; 6.5.10; 6.6.5; 6.7.12; 7.1.8; 7.3.6f.

26 As can be seen, for example, from Josephus' use of *Daniel* and *Esther*, or Alexander Polyhistor's use of Artapanus, Eupolemus, and other Jewish "historians."

27 To be sure, some of the fragmentarily preserved Greek novels, such as the ones about Ninus or Sesonchosis, may have shared this trait too, and it has even been suggested that such "hero romances" were the fountainhead of the Greek novelistic tradition itself (M. Braun, *History and Romance in Graeco-Oriental Literature*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1938; M. Hadas, "Cultural Survival and the Origin of Fiction," *South Atlantic Quarterly* 51 (1952), pp. 253-260), but this notion has often been challenged—see, e.g., B.E. Perry, *The Ancient Romances: A Literary-Historical Account of their Origins*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967, p. 172 ("The puerile romance of Ninus has no patriotic or nationalistic orientation or significance" etc.), and cf. J.J. Winkler and S.A. Stephens, *Ancient Greek Novels: The Fragments*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995, pp. 7-8.

from its public display.[28] Similarly, though less evidently, perhaps, *Joseph and Aseneth*'s recurrent mention of Pentephres' "field of inheritance"—the fertile field that Joseph and Aseneth apparently inherited—could have been most useful for Heliopolis' Oniad settlers. Having received large tracts of land from Philometor, they could now justify that action, *ex post facto*, by noting that these territories had been in Jewish hands once before. Moreover, it is also possible that the novel's emphasis on Aseneth's house, and on the transformation it undergoes—parallel to Aseneth's conversion—likewise served the needs of the novel's Oniad readers, who may have identified that structure beneath the foundations of their own temple.[29]

These, then, are the main analytic tools at our disposal. Unfortunately, these relatively secure methods often yield only meager results, and so desperate scholars tend to resort to arguments based on the place which a certain text is deemed to occupy on various alleged historical lines of development. Most commonly, this takes the form of stating that the text expresses ideas which were unknown prior to a date X or after a date Y, or were unique to a social group Z. All such methods, however, share two very dubious assumptions that often go unstated. First, they assume that we actually understand the ideas expounded by the text. Such understanding, however, often depends first and foremost on the correct identification of its *Sitz im Leben*, and so the argument inevitably leads either to dreadful circularity or to learned expositions of what the text must have meant regardless of its original context. Second, and even more disturbing, is the underlying assumption of a linear progression of ideas, so that a text which expresses ideas that "fall between" two other texts must also fall between them chronologically, and ideas that "belong" to one group could never be expressed by another. Such arguments cannot withstand even the mildest of criticisms, but the temptation to proffer them often proves irresistible. Thus, the scholarly inclination to prefer a

---

28 For the Famine Stele, see M. Lichtheim, *Ancient Egyptian Literature*, vol. 3, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980, pp. 94-103; K. Zibelius, "Hungersnotstele," in-W. Helck and E. Otto (eds.), *Lexikon der Ägyptologie*, vol. 3, Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1980, p. 84.

29 For both points, see G. Bohak, *op. cit.*, pp. 63-74.

weak explanation to none at all has lead to the proliferation of such hypothetical reconstructions of where and when various texts, including *Joseph and Aseneth*, must have been written.

A quarter-century ago, Arnaldo Momigliano wrote of our novel that "in the last twenty years it has become fashionable again, at least in esoteric circles. Classical scholars have suddenly suspected that *Joseph and Aseneth* may be the oldest Greek novel in existence. New Testament scholars have found it relevant to the question of the nature of the Last Supper. And more generally the seekers of symbols have found a new text to interpret on their own level."[30] For the last six years, I have been haunted by this last sentence, for by suggesting an Oniad provenance for *Joseph and Aseneth* I, too, am only interpreting it on my own level. Whether Momigliano would have approved of the result I cannot say, but I have learned from his own work that creativity is the spice of historiography—and a wide perspective its greatest asset. Turning ancient fiction into ancient history is never easy, and *Joseph and Aseneth*'s case is no exception. If there is one thing which sets this text apart it is the equanimity with which its modern readers could admit that its very heart, the honeycomb scene, is "enigmatic," and then proceed to contextualize and explain the entire novel anyway. By offering a consistent interpretation of that scene, and showing how it can transform our understanding of the narrative as a whole, I hope to have challenged all of *Joseph and Aseneth*'s readers to reinterpret this fascinating text on a new, and higher, level.[31]

---

30 A. Momigliano, *Alien Wisdom: The Limits of Hellenization*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975, p. 117.

31 I am grateful to Dvorah Janssens for her comments on an earlier draft of this paper.

From Text to Context: The Social Matrix of *Joseph and Aseneth*

Randall D. Chesnutt
Pepperdine University

The task of drawing inferences from a literary text about its social and historical context is considered passé by many. Deconstructionism has raised serious doubts about the possibility and even the desirability of the task. In a time of dramatic epistemological shifts and postmodern skepticism toward historical inquiry, is our Pseudepigrapha Group's choice of topic appropriate? Is a session entitled "*Joseph and Aseneth*: Moving from Text to Social and Historical Context" a viable and worthwhile enterprise?

I, for one, believe that it is. I remain convinced that literary texts contain encoded within them the raw materials for historical and social reconstruction. Indeed, I believe that such reconstruction is not only a justified, but an essential, part of a responsible effort to understand and appreciate a work of fiction such as *Joseph and Aseneth*.[1] This is not to say that a text can be read in only one way, or that authorial intent and historical setting are always and easily retrievable. To be sure, the data are complex, and the interpreter is always a part of the interpretation. The concrete realities behind an ancient text are, at best, *constructed* and not merely *discovered*. Conclusions about the circumstances of composition are therefore likely to be a chimera, and are certain to be provisional.

Nevertheless, neither the tentativeness of our proposals nor the unbounded multiplicity of possible interpretations so highly prized in ahistorical versions of literary theory should force us into methodological docetism. The text of *Joseph and Aseneth* provides at least some clues regarding the historical, ideological, and social location of its author and community. These clues—however sketchy and painstakingly difficult to extract and synthesize—are sufficient, in my judgment, to warrant scholarly discourse in which hypotheses are formed and tested, certain reconstructions are judged better than others because they account more fully than others for the various aspects of the text, and explanatory conclusions are drawn based on the better reconstructions. On this modest premise a responsible and profitable discussion of our topic can proceed.

---

[1]I am persuaded by the sociology-of-knowledge emphasis that ideas should be understood in terms of the social context in which they come to expression and which they embody. See especially the landmark work by P. Berger and T. Luckmann, *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1966). Whether the object of study is an idea, a culture, or a text, the interpreter's task is "to rescue the 'said' ... from its perishing occasions and fix it in perusable terms" (C. Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays* [New York: Basic Books, 1973] 20-21).

One other preliminary must be addressed in order to clarify the limitations and scope of this essay. For purposes of this study I assume the strong—though not unanimous—consensus on the following literary and historical matters: (1) the long text of *Joseph and Aseneth* published by C. Burchard lies closer to the original than the short version edited and defended by M. Phlonenko;[2] (2) Greek is the original language;[3] (3) the work is Jewish and evidences no Christian redaction in its earliest attainable form;[4] (4) the provenance is most likely Egypt;[5] (5) the date of composition lies between *circa* 100 BCE and 115 CE;[6] and (6) the literary genre is the Hellenistic novel or romance.[7] In assuming these working hypotheses I do not mean to take the

---

[2]See C. Burchard, *Untersuchungen zu Joseph und Aseneth: Überlieferung-Ortsbestimmung* (WUNT 8; Tübingen: Mohr, 1965) 1-90; and esp. idem, "Zum Text von 'Joseph und Aseneth,'" *JSJ* 1 (1970) 3-34. Burchard's preliminary edition of the long version, published first as "Ein vorläufiger griechischer Text von Joseph und Aseneth," *Dielheimer Blätter zum Alten Testament* 14 (1979) 2-53, and supplemented in "Verbesserungen zum vorläufigen Text von Joseph und Aseneth," *Dielheimer Blätter zum Alten Testament* 16 (1982) 37-39, is available most conveniently in an appendix in A.-M. Denis, *Concordance greques pseudépigraphes d'Ancien Testament* (Louvain: Université Catholique de Louvain, 1987) 851-59. M. Philonenko's edition and defense of the short recension appears in the first half of his monograph, *Joseph et Aséneth: Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes* (SPB 13; Leiden: Brill, 1968). Although some recent translations and studies have relied on Philonenko's short version, no recent study of which I am aware has offered a defense of his textual theory vis-à-vis Burchard's. R. Kraemer is among those who favor the short version. See, e.g., *Her Share of the Blessings: Women's Religions among Pagans, Jews, and Christians in the Greco-Roman World* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992) 110-12.

[3]Among others, Burchard, *Untersuchungen*, 91-99, argues this convincingly.

[4]Ibid., 99-107. Dissenting voices on this issue are T. Holtz, "Christliche Interpolationen in 'Joseph und Aseneth,'" *NTS* 14 (1968) 482-97; and H. F. D. Sparks, *The Apocryphal Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984) 469.

[5]Burchard, *Untersuchungen*, 142-43; and Philonenko, *Joseph et Aséneth*, 99-109.

[6]Burchard, *Untersuchungen*, 143-51; and Philonenko, *Joseph et Aséneth*, 108-09. The *terminus post quem* of *circa* 100 BCE is set by the extensive dependence of *Joseph and Aseneth* on the LXX. See on this G. Delling, "Einwirkungen der Sprache der Septuaginta in 'Joseph und Aseneth,'" *JSJ* 9 (1978) 29-56. As will be noted below, G. Bohak, *'Joseph and Aseneth' and the Jewish Temple in Heliopolis* (Unpublished Dissertation, Princeton University, 1994) 208-15, argues for an earlier date, but I do not believe that it can be much earlier than 100 BCE. The *terminus ante quem* is largely a corollary of Egyptian provenance, although there are some corroborative data. Because Egyptian Jewry was reduced to virtual oblivion by the revolt of 115-17 CE, a Jewish text concerned with conversion and reflecting a viable Jewish community must predate that devastating revolt. Attempts to pinpoint a more precise date within the rough termini of 100 BCE and 115 CE are tenuous.

[7]In spite of universal agreement on this broad generic classification, the numerous attempts to pigeonhole *Joseph and Aseneth* within known or supposed species of the romantic genre have generated no consensus and are thus far inconclusive. See, among other studies, Philonenko, *Joseph et Aséneth*, 53-98; S. West, "'Joseph and Asenath': A Neglected Greek Romance," *Classical Quarterly* 24 (1974) 70-81; H. C. Kee, "The Socio-Cultural Setting of Joseph and Aseneth," *NTS* 29 (1983) 394-98; R. I. Pervo,

"introductory" questions lightly or to forestall discussion of them by our panelists. Rather, because I have defended these positions at some length elsewhere, and because they represent the consensus of most scholars who have published recently on *Joseph and Aseneth*,[8] I assume them here and proceed to deal with some aspects of the text's social matrix on which no such consensus has emerged.

Clearing the Air

Before I propose my own understanding of the social setting and purpose of *Joseph and Aseneth*, let me clear the air by pointing out certain problems which I see in previous proposals. Explanations of the socio-historical setting and purpose of *Joseph and Aseneth* can be grouped conveniently—if somewhat arbitrarily—into two types.[9] The first may loosely be called a history-of-religions approach in that it relies heavily on supposed parallels between the religious ideas and practices reflected in this text and those which characterize one or more known groups in the larger religious world of late antiquity. Close parallels between *Joseph and Aseneth* and the Essenes,[10] the Therapeutae,[11] the mystery religions (especially the Isis Cult),[12] Merkabah Mysticism,[13]

"Joseph and Aseneth and the Greek Novel," *SBLSP 1976* (ed. G. MacRae; Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1976) 171-81; and idem, *Profit with Delight: The Literary Genre of the Acts of the Apostles* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987), *passim*.

[8]See my history of research and assessment of the present state of opinion on these six points in *From Death to Life: Conversion in Joseph and Aseneth* (JSPSup 16; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995) 19-93.

[9]At the time of this writing I have not yet seen Angela Standhartinger's recent study, so I do not know where or whether her approach fits into this scheme. I know only that she explores the connection with the Jewish wisdom tradition, which I regard as a very promising line of inquiry (as I indicated in *From Death to Life*, 268). On the wisdom connections see D. Sänger, *Antikes Judentum und die Mysterien: Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu Joseph und Aseneth* (WUNT 2/5; Tübingen: Mohr, 1980) 191-208; and idem, "Judisch-hellenistische Missionsliteratur und die Weisheit," *Kairos* 23 (1981) 231-42.

[10]K. G. Kuhn, "The Lord's Supper and the Communal Meal at Qumran," *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (ed. K. Stendahl; New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957) 65-93; W. Nauck, *Die Tradition und der Charakter des ersten Johannesbriefs* (WUNT 3; Tübingen: Mohr, 1957) 169-71; and R. T. Beckwith, "The Solar Calendar of Joseph and Asenath: A Suggestion," *JSJ* 15 (1984) 90-111.

[11]Kuhn, "The Lord's Supper and the Communal Meal at Qumran," 65-93; and esp. M. Delcor, "Un roman d'amour d'origine thérapeute: Le Livre de Joseph et Asénath," *BLE* 63 (1962) 3-27.

[12]G. D. Kilpatrick, "The Last Supper," *Exp Tim* 64 (1952) 4-8; M. Philonenko, *Joseph et Aséneth, passim*; idem, "Initiation et mystère dans Joseph et Aséneth," *Initiation* (ed. C. J. Bleeker; Supplements to Numen, Studies in the History of Religions 10; Leiden: Brill, 1965) 147-53; idem, "Un mystère juif?" *Mystères et syncrétismes* (Etudes d'histoire des religions 2; Paris: Geuthner, 1975) 65-70; and Kee, "Socio-Cultural Setting," 394-413.

[13]H. C. Kee, "The Socio-Religious Setting and Aims of 'Joseph and Asenath,'" *SBLSP 1976*, 183-92; and idem, "Socio-Cultural Setting," 394-413.

and Gnosticism[14] have all been alleged, and it is largely on the basis of such connections that the socio-historical context and purpose of the work have been understood. For example, those who have drawn close connections between *Joseph and Aseneth* and the mystery religions have posited an environment in which mystery initiation held great appeal. The work is thus seen as a piece of missionary propaganda designed to attract converts by representing conversion to Judaism in the guise of initiation into a mystery.[15] Similarly, those who have found analogies to Aseneth's experiences in the beliefs and practices of Jewish groups such as the Essenes or Therapeutae have naturally understood the community behind the text in terms of the social and theological complexion of those groups as they are known to us from other sources.

However, as I have argued at length in my recent monograph, most such approaches rest on a premature effort to elucidate phenomena in *Joseph and Aseneth* by reference to external sources without sufficient prior attention to those phenomena in their own right within their own literary context. These comparative studies have also tended to exaggerate the similarities while ignoring major differences.[16] For example, the language of "ignorance" in *Joseph and Aseneth* has nothing of substance in common with the gnostic systems with which it has often been compared. In *Joseph and Aseneth*, "ignorance" simply denotes the non-acknowledgment of God and the worship of idols instead. In no instance does it have the gnostic sense of unawareness of the soul's divine origin, subsequent imprisonment in the world of matter, and inability to return to its native abode without supramundane revelation. Such a metaphysical framework is completely lacking in *Joseph and Aseneth*, where the human predicament, conversion, and salvation are all conceived quite differently.[17] Likewise, while many have been quick to associate the "meal" language in *Joseph and Aseneth* with the sacred meals of the Qumran sect, any similarities are far overshadowed by more fundamental differences. Even if an actual ritual meal lies behind the language of eating and drinking in *Joseph and Aseneth*—and this is debatable—absent from this text are the strict regimen, the messianic and eschatological yearnings, the sectarian exclusiveness, and the priestly obsession with purity which characterized the Qumran meals. Neither in the "meal" passages in particular nor the larger ideology and praxis reflected in *Joseph and Aseneth* in general do we find any similarities with the Essenes beyond what is reasonable to expect from two movements sharing any sort of Jewish heritage, and the differences are so marked as to rule out any use of the Qumran scrolls to locate *Joseph and Aseneth* socially and historically.[18] The same can be said of the parallels which have been noted between mystery initiation and Aseneth's conversion. Similarities, and perhaps even influences, may be discernible on individual points—although I think even this has been exaggerated—but there is nothing to suggest that

---

[14]H. Priebatsch, Die *Josephsgeschichte in der Weltliteratur* (Breslau: n.p., 1937) 11, 135; Philonenko, *Joseph et Aséneth*, 83-89; and M de Goeij, *Jozef en Aseneth; Apokalyps van Baruch* (De Pseudepigraphen 2; Kampen: Kok, 1981) 13-22.

[15]Kilpatrick, "Last Supper," 4-8; and E. W. Smith, Jr., *'Joseph and Asenath' and Early Christian Literature: A Contribution to the Corpus Hellenisticum Novi Testamenti* (Unpublished Dissertation, Claremont Graduate School, 1974) 23, 32-45.

[16]*From Death to Life*, 96, 149-50, 185-253 *et passim.*

[17]Ibid., 202-07.

[18]Ibid., 186-95; and similarly on the Therapeutae, pp. 195-98.

Aseneth's story was shaped appreciably by mystery initiation or that the Judaism reflected in the work was influenced on any large scale by the mystery religions.[19]

Notwithstanding the perils of superficial comparisons, parallelomania[20] is alive and well in the study of *Joseph and Aseneth*. Understandings of the social setting and purpose of the work have been influenced too much by premature and methodologically flawed comparisons and too little by the social profile which appears in the text itself. What is needed is more careful attention to the social tensions in the narrative as possible indicators of the social reality behind the text. Surely such data provide a more reliable index to the milieu of *Joseph and Aseneth* than do supposed analogies with external phenomena.

The second approach is a literary-historical (at times, even allegorical) attempt to relate the characters, plot, and language of *Joseph and Aseneth* to known and datable events in the history of Judaism, especially Egyptian Judaism. The central methodological issue which arises from this approach is the degree of detail which we can reasonably expect to recover from this narrative about its historical and social setting. Although I believe—and will argue below—that the evidence allows us to reconstruct in a general way the social and religious issues which form the generative problematic of the work, connecting the work to specific times, places, and events requires more supporting evidence than the text is likely to yield, and certainly more than has thus far been adduced.[21] Reference to two attempts to define the specific historical circumstances that led to the composition of *Joseph and Aseneth* will suffice to illustrate the point.

D. Sänger has proposed that the story mirrors in very specific ways the experiences of Alexandrian Jews living under Roman rule. The characters, according to Sänger, represent actual groups in the author's world. Joseph and the members of his family who are portrayed favorably represent the majority of Egyptian Jews, who tried to live at peace with their pagan neighbors. Aseneth stands for proselytes. Pharaoh and Pentephres represent sympathizers or God-fearers from the governing class. Pharaoh's son personifies the militant anti-Judaism of those gentiles who were jealous of the Roman administration's friendly treatment of the Jews. Those sons of Jacob who side with Pharaoh's son against Joseph and Aseneth represent an opportunistic faction of Alexandrian Jews who collaborated with the anti-Jewish forces for personal advantage. The most likely time frame for such a work is *circa* 38 CE, when, in a well-known episode reported by Philo,[22] precisely such smoldering tensions led to a pogrom against the Alexandrian Jews while Flaccus was prefect of Egypt and Gaius Caligula was emperor.[23]

---

[19]Ibid., 217-53. Sänger, *Antikes Judentum und die Mysterien*, 190, concludes similarly.

[20]The term is from S. Sandmel's classic methodological essay, "Parallelomania," *JBL* 81 (1962) 1-13.

[21]J. J. Collins, *Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora* (New York: Crossroad, 1983) 90-91, writes similarly: "The story of chapters 22-29 is evidently paradigmatic of Jewish-gentile relations in the Egyptian Diaspora, although it is by no means a simple historical allegory. ... The details of the story do not have precise historical equivalents."

[22]*Flaccus* 4-12; *Embassy to Gaius* 16-20, 25-27; see also Josephus *Ant.* 18.8.1.

[23]"Erwägungen zur historischen Einordnung und zur Datierung von 'Joseph und Aseneth,'" *ZNW* 76 (1985) 86-106.

Although Sänger is correct that clues about the social groupings and problems in the real world of the author are to be found in the persons and events in the narrative, the association of the details of the story with the particular events of 38-41 CE is unwarranted. Nothing in the text invites us to compare the hostility of Pharaoh's son toward Joseph with the anti-Judaism that led to the pogrom in 38 CE. Such anti-Judaic sentiments do not even appear in the text except in Aseneth's own comments before she meets Joseph (4:9-11). The author attributes the hostile actions by Pharaoh's son not to his anti-Judaism but to his passionate desire to have Aseneth for himself. Certainly the episode narrated in chaps. 22-29 illustrates the ever-present potential for conflict when Jews live in a gentile environment, but specific links with the events of 38 CE are lacking. Other occasions of intense conflict punctuated the history of Judaism in Greco-Roman Egypt, even if the disturbances of 38-41 CE happen to be better known to us because of Philo's involvement in them. Indeed, it could even be argued that *Joseph and Aseneth*'s positive portrayal of the gentile monarch and conciliatory stance toward gentiles would have been more likely before rather than during or soon after the bloody conflicts of 38-41 CE.[24]

The most comprehensive and creative attempt to relate the book to specific events in Jewish history is that by G. Bohak.[25] Bohak contends that *Joseph and Aseneth* was written in and for the Oniad Jewish settlement which was founded in Heliopolis in the wake of the turbulent events in Jerusalem in the 170s and 160s BCE.[26] The key to the novel, according to Bohak, is the hitherto unexplained episode about the bees in 16:8-17:3, and the key to this scene is the detail that the bees had "wings like purple and violet and scarlet and gold-woven linen cloaks" (16:18).[27] Because the four

---

[24]Because there is nothing in the story which reflects the presence of the Romans, and Egypt is depicted as an independent country with rulers favorably disposed toward the Jews, several have in fact argued for a date of composition in the Ptolemaic period before the Roman conquest in 30 BCE. So, e.g., G. D. Kilpatrick, "Last Supper," 5; idem, *The Eucharist in Bible and Liturgy: The Moorehouse Lectures 1975* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983) 59-60; and, with caution, Collins, *Between Athens and Jerusalem*, 89-91. However, the traditional picture of overwhelmingly hostile Roman attitudes toward Judaism is exaggerated, as J. Gager, *The Origins of Anti-Semitism: Attitudes Toward Judaism in Pagan and Christian Antiquity* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1983) 35-38, correctly insists. Other than including most Jews among the non-citizen residents of Egypt subject to the *laographia*, Augustan policy afforded the Jews a very favorable position during the early imperial period prior to the violence of 38-41 CE. Moreover, we must not suppose that the specific political structures reflected in the story are those of the author's own time rather than those dictated by the story's fictional setting. In any case, pinpointing a date of composition on the basis of a one-to-one correspondence between the political details in the story and precise historical equivalents is extremely tenuous.

[25]The following summary is based on Bohak's 1994 Princeton dissertation, *'Joseph and Aseneth' and the Jewish Temple in Heliopolis* (see note 6 above). I have not yet seen his article, "Aseneth's Honeycomb and Onias' Temple: The Key to *Joseph and Aseneth*?" which the dissertation lists as forthcoming in *Proceedings of the Eleventh World Congress of Jewish Studies*.

[26]Josephus *Ant.* 12.9.7; 13.3.1-3; *B. J.* 1.12; 7.10.2-3.

[27]This and all subsequent quotations from *Joseph and Aseneth* are my own translation of Burchard's Greek text. See note 2 above.

textiles named here appear in Biblical and other passages dealing with the Jewish temple and priesthood, the bees must symbolize Jewish priests. Thus we have "firm grounding on which to base an interpretation of the whole scene."[28] The honeycomb must represent the Jerusalem temple, and the bees' departure from one honeycomb to build another symbolizes Onias IV's withdrawal from Jerusalem to build a new temple in Heliopolis. The bees who wanted to sting Aseneth represent Jewish opposition to the Oniad project, their deaths point to the inevitable failure of any opposition to this divinely-foretold project, and their resuscitation signals a second chance for Onias' Jewish opponents. The burning of the first honeycomb portends the destruction of the Jerusalem temple (which the Oniads probably would have welcomed), and the honeycomb which is left over stands for the one and only remaining Jewish temple—the one in Heliopolis.

Having established the Oniad provenance of *Joseph and Aseneth* from the work's "central scene," Bohak re-examines the remainder of the novel in light of this connection and finds that certain other elements of the story become much more easily explainable. For example, the author's elaborate description of military maneuvers in chaps. 22-29 becomes understandable in light of the military character of the Oniad settlement in Heliopolis and its strategic importance to the Ptolemies. The Oniad colony's dependence on the patronage of the Ptolemaic court would explain why our author portrays the Pharaoh so positively even while holding such disdain for Egyptians in general. The designation of the property which belonged to Pentephres and his wife (and later to Joseph and Aseneth) as "the field of their (our) inheritance" (3:5; 4:2; 16:4; 24:15; 26:1) would make sense as part of a case that Onias and his followers were not robbing anyone by settling in Egypt but were merely reclaiming territories which their ancestors rightfully owned. The author's Oniad priestly ties would account for both the prominence of Levi in the narrative and the fact that Aseneth's house is described so as to resemble a temple, and her room an inner sanctum.

Bohak concludes that *Joseph and Aseneth* is a piece of Oniad propaganda written in the Ptolemaic period (most likely in the mid-second century BCE) to defend and legitimate the Jewish settlement and temple in Heliopolis. Contrary to scholarly consensus, the central feature of the work is not conversion but the apocalyptic "foretelling" (*vaticinium ex eventu*) of the construction of Onias' Heliopolitan temple.

Bohak's novel thesis has the merit of attempting to decipher a passage which, by all estimates, is the most difficult in *Joseph and Aseneth*. The episode of the bees is highly symbolic, and Bohak's allegorical reading is as plausible as any other. But the sole argument which he cites to make his interpretation of the scene more than merely plausible—namely, the exclusively priestly connotations of the four types of material—fails to do so. These materials appear frequently in various combinations to connote extravagance and/or royalty, as well as temple and priesthood.[29] Moreover, even if the combination of textiles were exclusively priestly, it would hardly provide the definitive key to the whole scene, much less the entire work, as Bohak claims. To make *any* interpretation of such a problematic passage the interpretive key to the entire work is extremely precarious.

Apart from the episode about the bees, the parallels which Bohak claims between *Joseph and Aseneth* and the history and interests of the Oniad settlement in Heliopolis

---

[28] *'Joseph and Aseneth' and the Jewish Temple in Heliopolis*, 32.

[29] E.g., Isa 3:21-24; Jer 4:30; Esth 1:6; 8:15; Prov 31:21-22; Ezek 27:16; Luke 16:19; Rev 8:12, 16.

are forced and unconvincing. Although Levi does figure prominently in *Joseph and Aseneth*, he is esteemed for his *prophetic* rather than his *priestly* qualities. Moreover, since Levi and Simeon appear together in Genesis 34 as protectors of Dinah, their appearance here as protectors of Aseneth is not surprising. One need not evoke a priestly obsession to account for Levi's prominence. The ambivalence represented in the concern for separation from gentiles, on the one hand, and the positive image of gentile rulers, on the other hand, was not peculiar to the Oniad settlement but was more broadly characteristic of Jewish life in the Ptolemaic and early Roman periods.[30] The semitized expression "the field of their (our) inheritance" hardly evidences the developed scheme of Oniad propaganda which Bohak deduces from it. The suggestion that Aseneth's quarters are described so as to resemble a temple is strained; the motif of a lovely maiden secluded in an ornate penthouse is a commonplace in Hellenistic romances, and the trappings of idolatry in Aseneth's tower are crucial for the way her conversion story functions within the novel (as we shall see below) and do not necessarily indicate a house-as-temple concept.

Is *Joseph and Aseneth*, then, related in any way to the Oniad community of Heliopolis? Such a connection is entirely possible. A sizable colony of Jews lived there for well over two centuries and occupied a very important strategic role for more than a century. But at least in its present state of development, Bohak's Oniad hypothesis is as speculative as it is ingenious. Confirmation would require from *Joseph and Aseneth* greater anachronistic specificity about the author's own time and place than this work of literary fiction set in the patriarchal era is likely to yield.

Narrative Conflict and Historical Context

In the foregoing I have suggested that explanations of the social setting and purpose of *Joseph and Aseneth* have been influenced too much by supposed parallels with external phenomena and too little by the social and religious tensions in the story itself. I have also expressed my view that these literary conflicts are very revealing about the general social setting of the work, though not necessarily about the specific occasion or context of its composition. It is time now to examine these neglected elements in the story as they bear on our topic. Three principal frontiers of social distinction and conflict in *Joseph and Aseneth* invite consideration: that between Jews and gentiles, that within the Jewish community, and that between the convert to Judaism and the convert's gentile family. These deep-seated tensions so permeate the narrative that we must reckon with the possibility that they are not merely literary but echo social reality in the author's community.[31]

Jews and Gentiles

The most obvious and categorical of these distinctions is that between Jew and gentile.[32] That the author is concerned with this distinction and its ramifications is

---

[30]See note 24 above.

[31]The following argument is a condensed version of the case which I have developed in "The Social Setting and Purpose of Joseph and Aseneth," *JSP* 2 (1988) 21-48; and *From Death to Life*, 96-117, 256-65.

[32]Of course, these terms would be anachronistic in the patriarchal context in which the story is supposedly set, and are not used in *Joseph and Aseneth*. Yet they accurately represent a fundamental distinction which the author draws and which is integral to the story.

evident in many ways in the opening chapters (e.g., 1:5) but becomes most explicit in the account of Joseph's first visit in Pentephres' house. Here the hosts set a separate table for Joseph "because Joseph would not eat with the Egyptians since this was an abomination to him" (7:1). Then when Aseneth comes forth to kiss Joseph, he will not allow it, saying:

> It is not proper for a man who worships God, who blesses with his mouth the living God and eats blessed bread of life and drinks a blessed cup of immortality and is anointed with blessed ointment of incorruption, to kiss a strange woman, who blesses with her mouth dead and dumb idols and eats from their table bread of strangling and drinks from their libation a cup of deceit and is anointed with ointment of destruction. Rather, the man who worships God will kiss his mother and the sister born of his mother and the sister from his tribe and kinsfolk and the wife who shares his bed, who bless with their mouths the living God. Likewise, it is not proper for a woman who worships God to kiss a strange man, because this is an abomination before the Lord God (8:5-7).

These words of Joseph follow a form attested with only slight variations several other times in the work: "it is not proper for a man (woman) who worships God to ..." (21:1; 23:9, 12; 29:3). Other passages also specify how "the man (men) who worship(s) God" must behave (23:10; 28:5-7). The repeated use of these stereotyped expressions to define conduct befitting the people of God suggests that situations akin to those addressed by the formulas existed in the real social world of the text. This inference is confirmed by the last sentence in the passage cited above: "Likewise, it is not proper for a woman who worships God to kiss a strange man, because this is an abomination before the Lord God" (8:7). This final interdiction is different from what has preceded it in that nothing in the story line calls for it; there is no Jewish woman in the story for whom exogamy is a possibility. The generalization from the specific case at hand to a related situation not actually represented in the narrative betrays a didactic interest in clarifying Jewish identity and appropriate Jewish conduct in a gentile environment. The story is addressing vital social issues. The milieu of *Joseph and Aseneth* evidently was one in which Jews lived in dynamic tension with gentiles and struggled to maintain a distinctive Jewish identity. The polluting effect of intermarriage and of table fellowship with gentiles was of grave concern. According to this author there can be no intimacy, and certainly no intermarriage, between the worshiper of God and the idol worshiper.

The following chapters express in a variety of ways the fundamental distinction between pagan existence and existence as God's elect people. In Joseph's prayer in 8:9, the one is designated darkness, the other light; the one error, the other truth; the one death, the other life. The barrier separating the two is defined most specifically in terms of idolatry and the pollution associated with it—a fact graphically illustrated in the account of Aseneth's conversion. Before her conversion she is utterly bound up in idolatry (2:3; 3:6; 8:5-7), and her conversion consists precisely of the renunciation of idols. The author not only details Aseneth's smashing of her idols and disposal of all the sacrificial food and vessels (9:2; 10:12-13), but has Aseneth reiterate this accomplishment and express her contempt for the gods repeatedly in the remainder of the story (11:4-5; 12:12; 13:11). In her soliloquies (11:7-9, 16) and prayer (12:5), and later in her psalm (21:13-15; not in Philonenko's text), Aseneth links her alienation from God and from the people of God directly to her idolatry. Even Aseneth's announcement to Joseph that she has converted epitomizes the whole of her conversion in the one definitive act of repudiating idols: "I am your maidservant Aseneth; and all the idols I have cast away from me and they have been destroyed" (19:5; not in Philonenko's text). Clearly, for

this author idolatry is what comprises the gulf separating Aseneth from Joseph, gentile from Jew. Jewish self-identity, the essence of gentile existence as viewed from the Jewish standpoint, the predicament of Aseneth which her conversion resolves, and the nature of conversion itself are all conceived in terms of idolatry and its opposite, the worship of the true God and dissociation from the defilement of idols. Only with great peril to the understanding of *Joseph and Aseneth* can this basic fact be ignored and superficial comparisons drawn with other texts or phenomena where the social boundaries are drawn quite differently.

The advantages of Aseneth's newfound (Jewish) existence over her former (idolatrous) state are articulated at length in chaps. 14-17 by the "man from heaven," who commands Aseneth to dress in a manner consonant with her new status (14:12), assures her that her name has been written in the book of the living in heaven (15:4), and tells her that she will be "renewed and refashioned and given new life" and that she will "eat blessed bread of life and drink a blessed cup of immortality and be anointed with blessed ointment of incorruption" (15:5). This whole complex of expressions implies an unmistakable contrast with Aseneth's former existence. The wretchedness and defilement and destruction which are the lot of the idol worshiper stand in contrast to the blessedness and renewal and immortality which accrue to the worshiper of God. In 15:6 Aseneth is told that she is to be Joseph's bride—another striking indication of her elevation in status since earlier as a "strange woman" she could not even sit at table with Joseph or kiss him or have any association with him (7:1-6; 8:5-7). The enigmatic incident involving the honeycomb in chap. 16 expresses yet again the blessings which accrue to the people of God. All those who penitently attach themselves to the true God eat from this comb and thereby eat the same immortal food as that eaten by the angels of God in paradise (16:12-13). This honeycomb is the spirit of life; everyone who eats from it will live forever; to perceive its true origin and nature is to know "the ineffable mysteries of the Most High"; to eat it is to eat bread of life, drink a cup of immortality, and be anointed with ointment of incorruption (16:14-16; not in Philonenko's text).

The potential for direct confrontation when Jews live in a gentile environment is illustrated in chaps. 22-29, where Pharaoh's son plots to murder Joseph and abduct Aseneth. In the course of this narrative the formula "it is not proper for the man who worships God to ...," which was used earlier to prescribe proper Jewish behavior toward gentiles (8:5, 7; 21:1), appears several more times for the same purpose (23:9, 12; 29:3). Other passages within this section lack the expanded formula but nevertheless specify how "men who worship God" must behave in situations of conflict (23:10; 28:5, 7). The use of these stereotyped expressions to define the proper ethic for the people of God in their dealings with gentiles suggests that this is an important concern in the shaping of the narrative and that uneasy relations with gentiles characterized the real social world of the text.

The author's high estimation of Jews and Judaism is evidenced in this final part of the story by the glowing portraits of individual Jewish characters such as Joseph (18:1-2, 11; 21:1, 4, 21), Jacob (22:3, 7, 10), Levi (22:13; 23:8, 10; 26:6; 28:15-17; 29:5-6), and Benjamin (27:1-5), and the favorable portrayals of the Jewish people in general vis-à-vis gentile characters (23:2; 24:3, 7; 23:15-24:1; 27:6). While clearly expressing a sense of Jewish supremacy, the author is careful to avoid leaving the impression that the Jews are vengeful people who take undue advantage of their superiority. They rather hold the ideal that "it is not proper for us to repay evil for evil" (23.9; see also 28.5, 10, 14; 29.3), that "it is not proper for a man who worships God to harm anyone in any way" (23.12), that "men who worship God" respect every person (28.7). Although some of the sons

of Jacob do become embroiled in the plot instigated by Pharaoh's son, the Jewish characters who are positively portrayed consistently reject any such subversive activity and denounce retaliation of any sort beyond what is necessary for defense. Indeed, Jewish characters on both sides of the conflict periodically articulate the principle of clemency toward offenders which clearly represents the author's ideal.

The tension between Jews and gentiles which permeates *Joseph and Aseneth* and which has been summarized briefly here is more than a literary backdrop for Aseneth's story; it is a crucial part of the document's *raison d'être*. The very predicament of Aseneth which her conversion story resolves is that she is a gentile and a worshiper of idols, and the emphasis in the narrative of her conversion is therefore not upon ritual formalities but upon her renunciation of idols. The Jewish self-identity that emerges from the story is defined vis-à-vis the characteristic elements of paganism, namely, idolatry and the defilement associated with it. The hostile action instigated by Pharaoh's son and narrated in chaps. 22-29 pits gentile against Jew. The ethical instruction which is sprinkled throughout the narrative has to do largely with Jewish relations with gentiles, disallowing social interaction with gentiles but urging respect and magnanimity toward them in situations of conflict. The pervasiveness of this tension, the expression of Jewish self-identity in terms of it, the narrative of Aseneth's conversion in the context of it, and the obvious concern to regulate Jewish conduct within it suggest that the tension is not merely literary but echoes social reality in the author's community.

Internal Jewish Dissension

In addition to the tension between Jews and gentiles, there is obvious conflict among the Jewish characters in *Joseph and Aseneth* following the couple's marriage. The hostility which these two encounter in chaps. 22-29 comes not only from Pharaoh's son but from some of Jacob's sons as well. Even before Pharaoh's son proposes his plot against Joseph and Aseneth, we learn of a rift among the sons of Jacob over the way the couple is to be perceived. Simeon and Levi treat them cordially, "but the sons of Zilpah and Bilhah, the maidservants of Leah and Rachel, did not accompany them because they were envious and hostile toward them" (22:11; see also 24:2). The wide range of responses to the plot proposed by Pharaoh's son illustrates the scope of the discord among the sons of Jacob. Simeon and Levi refuse to have any part in such a plot and pledge their support for Joseph, but with divergent ideas about appropriate retaliation against the gentile instigator. Simeon is inclined to take up the sword immediately, while Levi counsels non-retaliation unless Pharaoh's son persists in his evil plan (23:6-17). Dan, Gad, Naphtali, and Asher align themselves against Joseph and Aseneth, but there is at least some vacillation on the part of Naphtali and Asher (25:5-6). The remaining sons, Reuben, Judah, Issachar, Zebulun, and Benjamin, all join Simeon and Levi in coming to the aid of Aseneth and Joseph, but again with varying notions of appropriate vengeance against the plotters (29:1-5).

By itself the antagonism of some of Jacob's sons toward Joseph and Aseneth in the last part of the story would not prove the existence of real dissension within the author's Jewish community, much less the nature of that dissension. But alongside the bitter strife in the Israelite community in chaps. 22-29 is indirect but significant evidence earlier in the narrative to suggest that such problems did in fact exist in the author's community and that they centered upon attitudes toward the gentile convert to Judaism and the marriage of a convert and a born Jew.

The strongest such evidence is the author's obvious and belabored effort to exalt Aseneth and establish the propriety of her marriage to Joseph, as if writing for those with

contrary opinions. In spite of Aseneth's distance from the people of God as the story opens, she is also carefully portrayed in such a way as to demonstrate her potential worthiness to be Joseph's wife. Thus the reader is informed already in 1:5 that Aseneth bore no likeness to Egyptian women but was "in every way similar to the daughters of the Hebrews; and she was as tall as Sarah and as graceful as Rebecca and as beautiful as Rachel." The author is even careful to portray Aseneth in terms which closely parallel the portrayal of Joseph. Just as Joseph was extremely handsome and was the constant object of the desires and seductions of all the women of Egypt (7:3), so Aseneth was "very tall and graceful and beautiful to behold more than all the virgins on the earth" (1:4); indeed, the fame of her beauty spread and there was great competition for her hand (1:6). Yet, just as Joseph consistently rejected these annoying advances and remained a "virgin" (4:7; 8:1; see also 7:4-5), so Aseneth was "a virgin hating every man" (7:8; see also 1:4-6; 2:1). Similarly, the exalted attributes ascribed to Joseph, such as "mighty man of God" (3:4; 4:7; 18:1-2; 21:21) and "son of God" (6:3, 5; 18:11; 21:4), find counterparts in the description of Aseneth as one "adorned as the bride of God" (4:1) and as "daughter of the Most High" (21:4). The description of Joseph in 6:2-6 borders on an ascription of angelic status, but the same can be said of the descriptions of Aseneth in 18:9-11 and 20:6-7: she is likened to the sun just as Joseph is; heavenly beauty is ascribed to both; and both are said to radiate great light. When Joseph first arrives at the house of Pentephres, he is clad in an exquisite white tunic and a golden crown with precious stones and has a royal staff in his hand (5:5); later Aseneth too dresses in a radiant white garment and wears a golden crown with costly stones and has a scepter in her hand (14:12-15; 18:5-6). In the heat of the conflict described in the last part of the story, Joseph's brothers acknowledge that "the Lord is guarding him [Joseph] like the apple of his eye" (25:5); soon thereafter Aseneth too is assured, "the Lord is with you and he will guard you like the apple of his eye" (26:2). In the same context, the sons of Bilhah and Zilpah realize "the Lord is fighting against us for Aseneth" (28:1), just as earlier they had warned each other, "the angels of God will fight for him [Joseph] against you" (25:7). Aseneth's depiction as a near mirror image of Joseph shows that she is in no way inferior to him.

There are also significant parallels between Aseneth and Levi, who is highly esteemed in this work. Aseneth has access to "the ineffable mysteries of the Most High" (16:14) just as Levi does (22:13); she ranks among "those who devote themselves to the Most High God" (15:7; see also 16:14: "all those who devote themselves to the Lord God") just as Levi is "one who devoted himself to the Lord" (22:13); and she urges clemency toward enemies with the same magnanimous language used earlier by Levi for the same purpose (28:7, 10, 14; cf. 23:9-12; 29:3). Again Aseneth demonstrates qualities that put her on a par with the most revered sons of Israel.

The author's concern to establish the convert's parity within the Israelite community is suggested also by the affable reception which both Jacob and Joseph accord to the newly-converted Aseneth. Early in the story Jacob warned his children: "be on strong guard against a strange woman so as to have no association with her, for association with her is destruction and corruption" (7:5). However, later this same Jacob warmly receives the converted Aseneth as his daughter-in-law, blessing her, kissing her, and eating and drinking with her (22:8-9). Similarly, Joseph's own perception of Aseneth undergoes a radical *volte-face*. When she was a "strange woman" he would have nothing to do with her and in fact articulated in no uncertain terms the most intransigent interdiction against intimacy between Jews and gentiles (8:5-7), but he eagerly receives her as his wife upon learning of her conversion to Judaism (19:8-21:9). Far from violating the prohibition regarding "strange women," Joseph's

marriage to Aseneth and Jacob's full acceptance of her serve to show that Aseneth is no longer a "strange woman"; by crossing over to the Jewish religion she has become Jewish; she is now one of the people of God.

The author seems intent upon portraying Aseneth as deserving of full acceptance into the Israelite community and as worthy to be the wife of the patriarch. The frequency and variety of means employed to verify this suggests the existence in the Jewish world of the text some less favorable opinions about the convert and especially about marriage to the convert. Again it seems that we are dealing with something which is not merely literary but indicative of real social tensions in the author's community which have profoundly shaped the narrative.[33]

Still other elements in *Joseph and Aseneth* corroborate this inference. For example, the detailed account of Aseneth's self-abasement, asceticism, and repudiation of idolatry serve to confirm the sincerity and genuineness of her conversion, as if there were those inclined to doubt this. The claim that as a convert Aseneth was no longer a "strange woman" but a legitimate member of the Israelite community and a legitimate mate for Joseph would have been undermined had the author left any room for doubt that her conversion was genuine and complete; hence the extended narrative of Aseneth's destruction of her idols, bitter mourning in sackcloth and ashes, fasting, confession, and prayer. No one tells Aseneth to do these things; they are rather voluntary acts of penitence (11:10-11). Moreover, as Aseneth repents, she is fully aware of the ostracism from her family and friends that will result (11:4-6; 12:12-14; 13:1-2); she is under no illusion that worldly advantage will accrue to her; she has no ulterior motives. The stress on Aseneth's self-abasement, voluntary ascetic rigor, humiliation, and decisive abandonment of idolatry in full cognizance of the social consequences, together with the very biblical and Jewish flavor of the piety expressed in her soliloquy and prayer, leave little room for the reader to doubt that her repentance is sincere and her conversion genuine and complete. Indeed, within the narrative itself, Aseneth's affliction and acts of penitence are cited as signs of the genuineness of her conversion (13:1-11; 15:2-3).

The angelic being's visit in chaps. 14-17 serves further to authenticate Aseneth's conversion by showing that her professed change corresponds to transcendent objective reality. I have argued elsewhere that Aseneth's conversion is already a *fait accompli* when the angelic visitor arrives. The angelophany is neither the cause nor the occasion of her conversion.[34] Rather, as D. Sänger has perceived, the literary function of chaps. 14-17 is to provide heavenly confirmation of a conversion that has already taken place and to articulate the benefits of conversion to the true God and membership in the elect people of God.[35] Thus the man from heaven assures Aseneth that her name

---

[33]G. Anderson, *Ancient Fiction: The Novel in the Graeco-Roman World* (Totowa, NJ: Barnes and Noble, 1989) 81, correctly states that "the point of the Hellenistic Jewish romance of Joseph and Asenath is to glorify the conversion of the pagan Egyptian noblewoman Asenath to the worship of Yahweh," but he does not discuss the social context or rhetorical function of this emphasis.

[34]*From Death to Life*, 121-25.

[35]"Bekehrung und Exodus: Zum jüdischen Traditionshintergrund von 'Joseph und Aseneth,'" *JSJ* 10 (1979) 29-30; and idem, *Antikes Judentum und die Mysterien*, 156-57, 182.

has been written irrevocably in the heavenly book of the living (15:4),[36] that she has eaten the same food as that eaten by Joseph and by the angels in paradise (16:14-16; cf. 8:5-7), and that she has become a partaker of life, immortality, and incorruption (16:14-16)—to reiterate but a few of the benefits enumerated. This heavenly ratification of Aseneth's conversion, expressed in such exalted language by God's chief angel—the veracity of whose words is itself confirmed by the miraculous appearance of the honeycomb as he had promised (17:1-2)—leaves no room for any perception of this convert as inferior or unworthy. That Aseneth qualified to receive the heavenly visitor and the many blessings announced by him is proof positive of the heavenly recognition of her conversion and her full status as one of the people of God.

God's protection of Aseneth from her persecutors in the final chapters provides further proof of divine regard for this convert and divine disfavor toward any who would challenge her rightful place in the community of Israel. When Aseneth is the target of a murderous conspiracy at the hands of Jews, God intervenes more than once to deliver her (26:6; 27:11; 28:10). Joseph's words of assurance to Aseneth before the ambush thus proved true: "the Lord is with you and he will guard you like the apple of his eye" (26:2). Even the sons of Jacob who had tried to kill Aseneth come to realize: "the Lord is fighting against us for Aseneth" (28:1).

Not only does the narrative clarify God's stance in this situation; it also incorporates more direct appeals for those "men who worship God" to be indulgent and respectful in their treatment of their "brothers ... who worship God" (23:9-17; 25:5-7; 28:5-14). This ethical material is couched in the same stereotyped language used to define proper Jewish conduct in situations of conflict between Jews and gentiles, and it is directed toward both the aggressors and those in a position to retaliate. Here again we have a strong indication that the tension within the Israelite community at the literary level reflects actual internal conflict in the author's Jewish community.

The mysterious scene with the honeycomb and the bees in 16:17-23 also should be mentioned in this connection, though its interpretation is quite uncertain. At the very least we can say that the episode parallels the foiled plot against Aseneth by some of the sons of Jacob in chaps. 22-29. The malicious bees who die because they want to sting Aseneth represent her Israelite antagonists (Israelite because some continuity is implied between these bees and the ones mentioned in 16:14), and the restoration of the dead bees to life represents the eventual restoration of those antagonists to good standing in the community of Israel in spite of their evil deeds (28:10-16).[37] Again there is evidence—however problematic—of intramural Jewish conflict.

---

[36]Because of the long-standing Jewish tradition regarding the inscribing of the names of the righteous in the book of life (e.g., see Exod 32:32-33; Ps 69:28; Dan 12:1; Mal 3:16-17; *Jub.* 30.22; *1 Enoch* 47.3; 1QM 12.2; Luke 10:20; Rev 3:5; 13:8; 20:12, 15), Aseneth's enrollment in this book is especially expressive of her elevation to full standing as one of the people of God.

[37]See the discussion of this episode by Burchard, "Joseph and Aseneth," *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J. H. Charlesworth; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983-85), 2.230 n. h2; Bohak, who of course sees this as the central episode in the book and exploits its allegorical potential to the fullest, nevertheless agrees in broad outline with the interpretation proposed here: the honeycomb scene is a preview of the evil brothers' scheme against Aseneth, the failure of that plot, and the forgiveness of these brothers in spite of their treachery (*'Joseph and Aseneth' and the Jewish Temple in Heliopolis*, 154, 198-99).

The cumulative effect of the intertwined motifs discussed above is to suggest that some disharmony existed in the author's Jewish community and that at least part of it centered on attitudes toward the convert to Judaism and the Jew by birth who marries the convert. As in the case of the tension between Jews and gentiles discussed earlier, so also in the case of the internal Jewish discord treated here, we are dealing with social issues which seem to have had a decisive role in shaping the story.

Familial Ostracism of the Convert

A third area of social tension is that between the new convert to Judaism and the convert's former friends and family. Upon destroying her idols and turning to the God of Israel, Aseneth finds herself "an orphan and desolate and abandoned and hated" (11:3). Even her parents have disowned her: "and therefore my father and my mother and my whole family have come to hate me, and they have said, 'Aseneth is not our daughter because she has destroyed our gods'" (11:5; see further 11:12-14; 12:5-12). Ostracized by family and friends, cut off from all familial and social support, Aseneth expects severe persecutions and can seek refuge only in God, who is "the father of the orphans, and a protector of the persecuted, and a helper of the oppressed" (12:13).

Even though this motif of familial and social ostracism runs throughout Aseneth's soliloquy and prayer, in the story line itself Aseneth has only the most cordial relations with her parents. The motif of the convert's loss of familial and social support is traditional, as is attested most clearly in Philo,[38] and it no doubt reflects the true plight of many Jewish proselytes in the Hellenistic world. But because it does not impact the plot when Aseneth and her parents actually interact, we probably should not see in it a strong social current underlying and influencing the composition of *Joseph and Aseneth* in a major way.

Why, then, does this traditional motif figure so prominently in Aseneth's soliloquies and prayer? We may suggest that it functions to buttress the aforementioned case for the convert's sincerity and worthiness. That she was fully aware of the ostracism and persecution which often accompany conversion to Judaism provides another link in the chain of arguments that she was sincere in embracing the God of Israel; she had no ulterior motives, no illusion that she stood to gain worldly advantage. Rather, she crossed over to Judaism in full awareness of the serious problems that would ensue. Thus it appears that the theme of the convert's severance from relatives and friends does not reflect a programmatic social undercurrent in *Joseph and Aseneth* on the order of the other two areas of tension treated above. It seems rather to be related to the tension within the Jewish community in that it serves to enhance the perception of the convert among Jews who held divergent opinions about the convert's relative status.

---

[38]*Special Laws* 1.9, 57; 4:34; *On the Virtues* 20. Proselytes, according to Philo, "have left ... their country, their kinsfolk and their friends" in crossing over to the Jewish religion. They are to be classified along with orphans and widows as those who have been cut off from their natural means of protection and support and who stand "most helplessly in need" of God's pity and compassion. Having "turned his kinsfolk ... into mortal enemies," the convert has entered the most humble and desolate circumstances, an "orphan-like desolate state." Only in God can he hope to find a helper and a place of refuge. The striking verbal similarities confirm the traditional character of the motif. See also *Num. Rab.* 8.2 and Josephus *Ant.* 20.2.4; 20.4.1-2.

Conclusions: The Setting and Purpose of *Joseph and Aseneth*

We have seen that the narrative of *Joseph and Aseneth* is permeated by social and religious conflict which is not merely literary but which mirrors to a significant degree the real matrix in which the work was composed. That matrix was one in which Jews lived in dynamic tension with gentiles and struggled to maintain a distinctive Jewish identity, one in which there was some contention about the status of gentile converts, and one in which intermarriage with gentiles, including marriage between a convert to Judaism and a born Jew, were live issues. If it seems unnecessary to stress these tensions, which, after all, were the common experience of Jews throughout the Hellenistic world and scarcely unique to this document, it should be reiterated that precisely these social dimensions of the narrative have been obscured by the preoccupation with the ritual features of Aseneth's conversion as the basis for comparative study and the key to the socio-religious setting and purpose of *Joseph and Aseneth*. Recognition of the general social and religious atmosphere of the text may not be as satisfying as detailed reconstructions based on supposed analogies with events and communities known from other sources, but I believe that such "analogies" stretch the evidence too far. The social and religious conflicts reflected in the text itself provide a more reliable—if incomplete—guide to the setting and purpose of the work than do the concerns imported from other texts and phenomena with which *Joseph and Aseneth* has been compared. It is appropriate, therefore, to close with some account of the likely audience and purpose of *Joseph and Aseneth* which is informed by the foregoing investigation.

Although many have understood *Joseph and Aseneth* as missionary propaganda designed to win gentiles to the Jewish faith, the work is not well-suited for missionary purposes. The author's assumption that the readers are familiar with the biblical narratives, especially the patriarchal stories, suggests instead a Jewish audience or at least readers who stood very close to Judaism. Moreover, the repeated formula "it is not proper for a man (woman) who worships God to ..." and the other attempts to define the conduct befitting "those who worship God" are clearly directed inward, to Jews, and not outward. The very problem in scripture for which the story furnishes a midrashic solution—namely, the marriage of the patriarch Joseph to the daughter of a pagan priest (Gen 41.45, 50; 46:20)—is a problem to the *Jewish* conscience.

Neither the polemic against idolatry nor the exalted opinion of Jews and Jewish tradition which permeates *Joseph and Aseneth* suggests that the work was written for gentiles. V. Tcherikover correctly insisted that Jews themselves needed to have their esteem bolstered by hearing their people and heritage extolled, and to be reminded of their distinctiveness vis-à-vis gentiles and of the danger of assimilation to gentile culture.[39] Moreover, Jews who were not accommodating toward converts and who had reservations about the propriety of marriage to them—and we have argued above that such concerns did in fact exist in the Jewish community behind the work—needed reassurance that true conversion entails the utter repudiation of idols and everything associated with idols, and therefore that marriage to a convert is no concession to paganism. Such intramural concerns seem best to account for the detailed narrative of Aseneth's renunciation of her idols; there is no reason to think that the polemic against idolatry is propaganda calculated to win converts.

---

[39]"Jewish Apologetic Literature Reconsidered," *Eos* 48 (1956) 169-93.

The Jewish community represented in the narrative itself certainly lacks any missionary impulse. Joseph does not attempt to proselytize Aseneth; indeed, when he first sees her he urges that she be sent away (7:2, 6). Later he prays for her conversion only after her parents have taken the initiative to bring the couple together (7:7-8), and following the prayer he leaves and does nothing more for her. Neither does Joseph show any interest in converting Aseneth's family, and even the narrator seems unconcerned to have Pharaoh or Pentephres convert in spite of the fact that both are favorably disposed toward Judaism and its God (3:3-4; 4:7-8; 7:7-8; 20:6-7; 21:4-6). This disinterest seems incompatible with the view that the document was written to proselytize gentiles. *Joseph and Aseneth* certainly reflects openness to converts and a high opinion of them, but not an active desire to seek them.[40]

If *Joseph and Aseneth* is not missionary literature, what do the social and religious tensions which we have seen in the narrative reveal about the purpose of the work? It may be unwise to think of a single overarching purpose, but the exalted portrayal of the convert suggests that one of the primary purposes was to enhance the status of converts within a Jewish community divided over the estimation of converts. Through the story the author demonstrates that converts are beneficiaries of all the blessings and privileges of the people of God and that as such they are to be received fully into the community of Israel and are suitable mates for Jews. Even God's own chief angel appears in the story to provide heavenly endorsement of the conversion and marriage of the prototypical convert.

At the same time, the author is obviously concerned to extol Jewish life and religion and to warn against exogamy and idolatry, perhaps in order to show that the openness to gentile converts is no concession to paganism and no threat to a distinctive Jewish identity. Since Aseneth was not acceptable as a wife for Joseph until she fully repudiated her idols, her story entails no concession to idolatry and its polluting effect. Similarly, opposition to exogamy is not compromised but confirmed in this story; Aseneth could marry a "son of God" only because she had become a "daughter of the Most High." Neither does full acceptance of the convert entail any diminution of the blessed status enjoyed by Jews as the people of God. These blessings are in fact affirmed and articulated at great length in the story, but with the emphasis that the Jew by conversion participates in them every bit as fully as the Jew by birth. Membership in the people of God according to *Joseph and Aseneth* is not even determined by ethnic descent but by acknowledgment of the true God, and is characterized by "proper" conduct. Thus, the true convert is on equal footing with the Jew by birth, and the latter must avoid the contamination of idols and engage in "proper" conduct in order to retain God's favor. "Proper" conduct is defined to include not only the avoidance of gentile impurity but also the treatment of both Jews and gentiles with magnanimity and respect in situations of conflict.

Pace G. Bohak, conversion is indeed the central theme of *Joseph and Aseneth*, but it is central because of the social conflicts surrounding it and not because of its ritual formalities or missionary appeal. The exalted estimation of converts in *Joseph and Aseneth* seems designed not so much for potential converts as for Jewish readers who had reservations about the full integration of converts. Even the reminders to Jews of their privileged status and responsibilities seem designed for a community in which the

---

[40]C. Burchard, "Der jüdische Asenethroman und siene Nachwirkung. Von Egeria zu Anna Katharina Emmerick oder von Moses aus Aggel zu Karl Kerényi," *ANRW* 2.20.1 (1987) 655-56, draws the same distinction.

perception of converts was the basic issue which brought these other concerns to the fore.

From Fictional Text to Socio-Historical Context: Some Considerations from a Textcritical Perspectiv on Joseph and Aseneth[1]

Angela Standhartinger
J. W. Goethe-Universität, Frankfurt a. M.

John of Patmos writes at the end of his apocalypse (Rev 22:18-9):

> I warn every one who hears the words of the prophecy of this book: if any one adds to them, God will add to him the plagues described in this book, and if any one takes away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God will take away his share in the tree of life and in the holy city, which are described in this book.[2]

John of Patmos was eager to spread his book, and the quoted text is an attempt to achieve that. He beatifies all those who read and hear the words of this book (1:3), and he asks his readers to memorize it if possible (τηρεῖν). In distinction to the models of the genre chosen he declines the sealing (22:10). The warning at the end of the book also indicates the dangers that John takes into account in the case of mass-distribution of his book.

Ancient texts that could be multiplied only by way of copying were not protected against conscious or involuntary corruption. Everyone who got hold of a copy needed to examine the value of the manuscript in a textual-critical manner. Textual criticism in antiquity was always connected with literary critical considerations. The scholars of the Musaion in Alexandria established critical editions of Homerís works. The criteria they took into account were not only stilistic observations but also theological and ethical ones.[3] Galen in his critical revision of the works of Hippocrates used methods of higher criticism, too, and analyzed the authenticity of the edited works not merely by way of stilistic criteria but also through the demonstration of inner stringency and according with his understanding of Hippocratic thinking in general.[4] Finally, the history of reception of Aristoteles' (esoteric) works made generally known during the rule of Sulla prove that books could be fought against because of their corrupt text.[5]

---

[1] I'm grateful to Dieter Georgi and Kerstin Ruoff for their comments on this paper and their help with the translation.

[2] All Bibletranslations are taken from *Revised Standard Version* (Toronto, New York, Edinburgh: Thomas Nelson, 1953).

[3] Cf. L.D.Reynolds, N.G.Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars*, Oxford : Clarendon Press ^{2}1974, 5-15.

[4] Cf. L. O. Bröcker, "Die Methoden Galens in der literarischen Kritik", *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 40 (1885), 415-38.

[5] Cf. Dieter Georgi, "Die Aristoteles- und Theophrastausgabe des Andronikus von Rhodus. Ein Beitrag zur Kanonsproblematik" *Konsequente Traditionsgeschichte: Festschrift für Klaus Baltzer zum 65. Geburtstag* (OBO 126; ed. Rüdiger Bartelmus a.o; Freiburg: Freiburger Universitätsverlag and Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993), 45-69.

Ancient librarians already developed a complex methodology of textual and literary criticism. However, they could not prevent a transmission of tradition full of variants. Textual variants not only originated accidentally but also reflected more or less the textual- and literary critical ideas and activation of the copyists and their communities. Whether individual copyists introduced marginal notes of their predecessors into the text itself or produced marginal critical glosses themselves, whether they directly repaired and improved manuscripts they considered faulty, substituting something that appeared lost or eliminating what seemed a secondary gloss to them, whatever it was, their work is formed by their own understanding and the interpretation of the writing before them in their community and the resp. edition is part and expression of that.[6]

The textual tradition of Joseph and Aseneth (*JosAs*) is very manifold. The romance, counted among Jewish pseudepigrahic writings, is preserved in more than 80 manuscripts in seven languages. Christoph Burchard in his influential studies on Joseph and Aseneth has organized the textual tradition of *JosAs* in four Ms-families and has undertaken a reconstruction of what he considers the oldest graspable text on the basis of the longest available text, that of MS-family b.[7] In the 1960ies Marc Philonenko has reconstructed the text of *JosAs* as well on the basis of what he considered the oldest and shortest textual family d.[8] Since that time the question of the oldest available text is not only debated between these two scholars.

The two texts that Burchard and Philonenko reconstructed naturally remain hypothetical. They are not the ancient texts themselves. But they are, nevertheless, very helpful tools. Burchard in his preliminary edition has compiled all necessary material that "nicht ganz offenkundig aus textkritischen Gründen sekundär ist."[9] including that from non-Greek witnesses (syr; arm; lat, äth, ngr.) whereas Philonenko is undertaking "mais seulement d'établier... le texte de la recension la plus anciene, le texte court".[10] Even though Philonenko himself does not always follow his stated principles his edition is useful as a critical reconstruction of the shorter text.[11]

In my dissertation I have tried to show, that the two textual versions of *JosAs*, reconstructed by Burchard and Philonenko, are not accidental products of textual growth or textual slippage, but rather two different versions of the same story, each with an image of women, consistent in itself and with its own theological profile.[12] With the method of literary criticism I analyzed the

---

[6] Some texts were transmitted in several variants from the beginning, for instance, if a text was merely given to friends for the purpose of friendly critique, correction or improvement, and then one of these copies was further distributed before the final form of the text was established and went into circulation. Cf. Raymond J. Starr, "The Circulation of Literary Texts in the Roman World", *Classical Quarterly* 37 (1987) 213-23.

[7] Christoph Burchard, *Untersuchungen zu Joseph and Aseneth.Überlieferung-Ortsbestimmung* (WUNT 8; Tübingen: Mohr ,1965). A Reconstrution of the longest Verson of Joseph and Aseneth lays behind his translation in *OTP* and JSHRZ. The greek text is now available in Albert-Marie Denis, Boncordance Grecque des Pseudèpigraphes dé Ancient Testament (Louvain-la-Neuve: Universitè Catholique de Louvain, 1987), 851-59.

[8] Marc Philonenko, *Joseph et Aséneth. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes* (SPB 13; Leiden: Brill, 1968).

[9] Christoph Burchard, "Der jüdische Asenethroman und seine Nachwirkung: Von Egeria zu Anna Katharina Emmerick oder von Moses aus Aggel zu Karl Kerényi" *ANRW* II 20 (1987), 543-648.

[10] Philonenko, *Joseph et Aséneth,* 23.

[11] Philonenko in some parts of his reconstruction of the text of family d has added passages from a text that cannot be certified for textual witnesses B,D,slav. This is of importance for the content particulary in 1:7(Ph); 8:5.10(Ph); 15:7(Ph); 21:3(Ph) and 28:2(Ph). With respect to these passages I have drawn merely on the text certified by mss B,D and the slav tradition.

[12] Angela Standhartinger, Das Frauenbild im Judentum der hellenistischen Zeit: Ein Beitrag anhand von 'Joseph und Aseneth' (AGJU 26; Leiden: Brill, 1995).

characterizations of the female and male figures as well as the description of the heavenly world and have placed all of that into the contemporary discussion on the role of women during the period in question. It struck me that both textual versions participated in the contemporary exegetical and theological discussion about biblical texts, each in its own way. The texts, so my thesis that I am trying to prove in this essay, both participate in the Hellenistic Jewish discussion of wisdom theology. The differences of the two presentations in *JosAs* 14-18 represent two different points of view as they can be found in wisdom theology at large, points of view that can be distinguished from one another, in particular in the way their depictions of human and divine women figures culminate. As a conclusion I'd like to offer some fundamental methodological considerations that might lead further.

I. Wisdom-motives in the shorter version of Joseph and Aseneth 14-18

In the meantime, it has often been observed that the entire narrative of *JosAs*, although written in simple Greek, contains a highly complex interpretation and renarration of different biblical traditions. Reflections of Gen 1-3; 34 and 39-50; of Psalms; of Song of Songs and other biblical material were discovered, as well as traditions common with other intertestamental writings like *Adam and Eve*; *T. Job* or *2 Enoch*.[13] This masterly playing with biblical tradition and its history of interpretation associates *JosAs* with the writings of the theological wisdom movement. In particular with respect to *Wisdom of Solomon*, Dieter Georgi has crystallized the reception and differentiated working out of a great number of biblical traditions.[14] Recent research in theological wisdom and its connections with apocalypticism has demonstrated the popularity of acquisition, assiociation with, and further development of prophetic traditions.[15]

Following I shall particularly present the prophetic traditions that are worked into *JosAs* 14-18. Afterwards I shall analyze the specific redaction of the material in both textual versions along their depiction of the women figures of Aseneth and Metanoia. In order to demonstrate the specific portrayals of the longest and the shortest recension of the text of *JosAs* I shall start with the shorter version. Afterwards I shall point out the characteristic differences in the presentation

---

[13] For reference to Gen 1-3 and Cant *see* Ross Kraemer, "The Book of Aseneth", *Searching the Scriptures II. A Feminist Commentary* (Ed. Elisabeth Schüssler Firoenza; New York: Crossroad, 1994) 787-816. For reference to Pss Dieter Sänger, "Bekehrung und Exodus. Zum jüdischen Traditionshintergrund von 'Joseph und Aseneth'" *JSJ 10 (1979)* 21-27; Delling, *Einwirkungen* der Sprache der Septuaginta in 'Joseph and Aseneth' *JSJ* 9 (1978) 29-56 and Standhartinger, *Frauenbild*, 180-189. The reception of the Joseph story and its interpretative tradition has been seen already by Edgar W. Smith, "Joseph Material in Joseph and Aseneth and Jospehus Relating to the Testament of Joseph" *Studies on the Testament of Joseph* (SBLSCS 5; ed. Georg W. E. Nickelsburg; Missoula, Mont: 1975) 133-137 see also Standhartinger, *Frauenbild,*. 138-151. On Gen 34 cf. Standhartinger, "'Um zu sehen die Töchter des Landes': Die Perspektive Dinas in der jüdisch-hellenistischen Diskussion um Gen 34" *Religious Propaganda and Missionary Competition in the New Testament World. Essays Honoring Dieter Georgi* (NovTSup 74; Lukas Bormann. a. o. (ed.); Leiden: Brill, 1994) 89-116. Burchard und Philonenko have collected a series of allusions in their annotated translations.

[14] Cf. Dieter Georgi, "Das Wesen der Weisheit nach der 'Weisheit Salomos'" *Gnosis und Politik* (Religionstheorie und Politische Theologie 2; Jacob Taubes (ed.); Munich a.o.: Schöningh, 1984) 66-81. See also his annotated translation *Weisheit Salomos* (JSHRZ III/4; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1974), 348-478.

[15] See for example George W. E. Nickelsburg, "Wisdom and Apocalypticism in Early Judaism: Some Points for Discussion" *SBLSP* 33 (1994) 715-32.

of the longer recension. In a third step I shall compare both versions and situate them within the discussion of wisdom theology.[16]

The encounter of Aseneth with the heavenly Anthropos[17] picks up a series of motifs of biblical stories of the prophet's calling. As in Exod 3:4-6 (vgl. 4 Ezra 14:1-3; *Bib. Ant.* 53:2) there is an addressing (ἐκάλεσεν αὐτήν) with a twofold naming of the figur being called, the question about the identity of the caller and the self-presentation of God (ἐγώ εἰμι...) in *JosAs* 14,4-8(B)/4-7(Ph). Here, however, the topic appears in the form of the epiphany story, especially developed further in apocalypticism. For the purpose of illustration I present the shorter text of *JosAs* 14:8-11(Ph) and Dan 10:5-12 side by side:

(Dan 10:5) I lifted up my eyes and looked, and behold, a man clothed in linen, whose loins were girded with gold of Uphaz. 10:6 His body was like beryl, his face like the appearance of lightning, his eyes like flaming torches, his arms and legs like the gleam of burnished bronze...	(*JosAs* 14:8(Ph)) And she looked up and saw a man like Joseph in every respect, with a robe and a crown and a royal staff. 14:9(Ph) But his face was like lightning, and his eyes were like the light of the sun and the hair of his head like flames of fire and his hands and his feet like iron from the fire.
10:9 ... I fell on my face in a deep sleep with my face to the ground. 10:11 And he said to me, 'O Daniel, ..., Aseneth, give heed to the words that I speak to you, and stand upright, for now I have been sent to you.' 10:12 Then he said to me, 'Fear not, Daniel...'	14:10(Ph) And Aseneth looked at him and she fell on her face at his feet in great fear and trembling And the man said to her: 'Take heart, and do not be afraid; but stand up and I will speak to you'[18]

The comparison makes obvious the similarities: the heavenly figure in *Daniel* is clothed in byssus, girded and shining. His face has the appearance of lightning (ἀστραπή), his eyes appear like torches and his arms and legs shine like glaring metal. The Anthropos encountering Aseneth is presented as "in everything like Joseph", whose light figure was emphasized already in *JosAs* 6. The similarity to the heavenly figure from *Daniel* however is stressed furthermore by way of increasing the light factor in case of the heavenly Anthropos over the figur of Joseph, "but (πλήν) his face was like lightning (ἀστραπή)..." (14:9(Ph)). The eyes of the heavenly

[16] Unfortunately Philonenko has changed the enumeration of verses of Rießler/Burchard. The references to his reconstruction are marked with 'Ph' and the references to the text of the longer textual version of Burchard with 'B'.

[17] The heavenly visitor has no name in the oldest textforms of *JosAs.* He is just called *ὁ ἄνθρωπος.* On the basis of his self-presentation as "Commander of the Lord, as house and chief captain of all the hosts of the Most High" (14:8(B)/14:7(Ph)) he could be Michael (cf. *T. Abr.* A 1:4; 2:2; 3:9; 3 *Baruch* 11:4-8; 13:3; 5 *Ezra* 4:24; 2 *Enoch* 33:10). Yet *5 Ezra* 1:4 (Raphael) states something different. MS A identifies Michael (but cf. 63.19 (Battiffol)). Because there is no differentiation between 'man' as the male human being and man as a generic term, I decided to use the Greek term 'Anthropos'.

[18] Translations of the shorter version of *JosAs* are taken (and sometimes modified) from D. Cook in: *The Apocryphal Old Testament* (Hedley F. D. Sparks (ed.); Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984) 465-503. Translations of the longer version are taken from the translation of Burchard in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (hereafter *OTP)* (ed. James H. Charlesworth, New York, London, Toronto, Sydney, Auckland: Doubelday, 1985), 177-247.

Anthropos are as in *Daniel* a source of special light and hands and feet are like glowing iron. Aseneth and Daniel both are not able to stand before this light figure and fall to the ground. Both are told: "Don't fear!" and both are ordered to stand up and to receive the message.

The relationship of Dan 10:5-11 and *JosAs* 14:9-11(Ph) is not a singular phenomenon in the context of biblical and and Jewish-Hellenistic literature. The same pattern of an epiphany-story is also found in Ezek 1:26-28; *2 Enoch* 1:4-9; Rev 1:12-19: and others. Aseneth in *JosAs* 14 is diredcted by the Anthropos to put on a bright stole with a bright belt.[19] Enoch again, after he has arrived in the heavenly throne room, is first clothed anew:

> *(2 Enoch 22:8-10)* The LORD said to Michael: 'Take Enoch, and extract (him) from the earthly clothing. And anoint him with the delightful oil, and put (him) into the clothes of glory.' And Michael extracted me from my clothes. He anointed me with the delightful oil; and the appearance of that oil is greater than the greatest light, its ointment is like sweet dew, and its fragrance like myrrh; and its shining is like the sun. And I gazed at all of myself, and I had become like one of the glorious ones, and there was no observable difference.[20]

Like Enoch Aseneth, too, is prepared for the reception of the heavenly message itself by dressing with new bright clothing. The motif of the elected just ones being clothed is encountered already in Wis 5:15-18 and taken up in 2 Cor 5:1-4.[21] Being dressed with new clothes causes a transformation of being (cf. *Bibl. Ant.*20:2). The Aseneth of the shorter text is changed by the enconter with the heavenly Anthropos into a heavenly being herself. Like the elect ones from 4 Ezra 7:97, who are shown, "how their face is to shine like the sun, and how they are to be made like the light of the stars, being incorruptible from than on,"[22] Aseneth receives a face "like the sun and eyes like the rising morning star" (18:7(Ph)). Thus she has as well received the figure of the Anthropos (cf. 14:1, 9(Ph)).

The epiphany story in *JosAs* 14 with its following transformation by way of new clothing does not render the main motifs connecting *JosAs* with the stories of the prophet's call and their further development in wisdom theology and apocalypticism. Some elements of the most fascinating and equally most mysterious chapters of the narrative in *JosAs* 16 as symbolic actions allude to prophetic traditions. The eating of a honey comb (16:9(Ph)) reminds of the scroll that Ezechiel is supposed to eat during his vision of call and that tastes "sweet as honey" in his mouth (3:3). After the Anthropos stroked through the honey comb with his finger the narrative of the shorter text continues (16:12-15(Ph)):

> (*JosAs* 16:12(Ph)) And Aseneth was standing on the left and watching (θεωρεῖν) everything the man was doing. 16:13 And bees came up from the cells of the comb, and they were as white as snow and their wings were iridescent – purple and blue and gold; and they had golden diadems on their heads and sharp-pointed stings. 16:14 And all the bees flew in circles round Aseneth, from her feet right up to her head; and yet more bees, as big as queens setteld on Aseneth's lips. 16:15 And the man said to the bees, 'Go,

---

[19] The shorter text in 14:13-16(Ph) as well as in 18:4(Ph) speaks of a στολὴ λαμπρά resp. of a ζώνη λαμπρά whereas the longer text reads στολὴ λινῆ (14:12-14(B)) and ζώνη χρυσῆ (18:6(B). A bright stole is mentioned also in *T. Abr.* A 16:6; *1 Enoch* 14:20; Acts 10:30; Rev 15:6, 19:8. It is attribute of a heavenly being.

[20] Transl. F. I. Andersen, *OTP*.

[21] The majority of textual witnesses reads ἐνδυσάμενοι in 2 Cor 5:3.

[22] Transl. B. M. Metzger, *OTP*.

please, to your places.' And they all left Aseneth and fell to the ground, every one of them.

16:17(Ph) as much as the connection of bee-symbolism and resurrection show that in this symbolic action resurrection is made the theme. Ross Kraemer already indicated the parallel to Virgil. In addition, behind the extensive description of the bees in 16:13(Ph) a certain color-symbolism can be suspected. The bees unite the colors of Aseneth (3:9(Ph)) and of Joseph (5:6(Ph)). Yet the touching of the lips by the queen bee reminds of the touching of the lips of Isaiah (6:6-7) and of Jeremiah (1:9) during the calling of the prophet.

Finally, the conclusion of the essential vision of the heavenly Anthropos *JosAs* 17:7-8(B)/17:6(Ph) recalls prophetic calls as well. In the shorter text the Anthropos is taken up into heaven before the eyes of Aseneth like Elija before the eyes of Elisha (2 Kgs 2:11)

(2 Kgs 2:11) And as they still went on, and talked, behold,	(*JosAs* 17:6(Ph) .... and Aseneth turned to move the table, and the man vanished out of her sight, and Aseneth saw what looked
a chariot of fire (ἅρμα πυρός), and horses of fire, separated the two of them.	like a chariot of fire (ἅρμα πυρός)
And Eli'jah went up (ἀνελήμφθη) by a whirlwind into heaven (εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν).	being taken up (ἀναλαμβανόμενον) into heaven (εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν) towards the east.

The catch-words ἀναλαμβάνειν and ἅρμα πυρός (fire chariot) are the characteristics of all heavenly assumptions and renarrations of the rapture of Elijah.[23] Elisha becomes a prophet himself observing the assumption of Elijah. In the shorter text, the figure of Aseneth is indeed portrayed as a prophetess. She is the one who extends the prohibition of revenge ("do not ot repay evil for evil" (23:9(Ph); 28:4.14(Ph); 29:3(Ph)) from the neighbor unto every human (28:4(Ph)). She stands in intimate relationship with the prophet (sic!) Levi (22:8-9(Ph)), and saves the sons of Bilhar and Silpa from the power of their brothers (28:16(Ph)).[24]

In *JosAs* 14-18, a whole series of motifs appears from prophetic literature and its further development in wisdom and apocalypticism. The sapiential patterning is basic to the document. This is less due to the lack of "disclosing a transcendent reality which is both temporal, insofar as it envisages eschatological salvation, and spatial insofar as it involves another, supernatural world."[25] but caused by the importance of the wisdom figure herself. She is the subject in *JosAs* 15:7-8(Ph):

(*JosAs* 15:7(Ph)) For Metanoia is the daughter of the Most High and she entreats the Most High on your behalf every hour, because she is the mother of virgins, and every hour she petitions him for those who repent (μετανοοῦντες); for she has prepared a heavenly bridal chamber (νυφὼν οὐράνιος) for those who love her, and she will be a servant for

---

[23] Cf. *Life of the Prophets* 21:12; Sir 48:9; 2 Macc 2:58; *1 Enoch* 93:8.

[24] The summary of the narrator in 28:16(Ph): "Thus Aseneth saved the men (the sons of Bilhar and Silpa) from their brothers wrath, so that they (the sons of Lea) did not kill them" is the only complete sentence that the shorter text reads alone against the longer text.

[25] For this definition of an apocalypse see John J. Collins, "Towards the Morphology of a Genre", *Semeia* 14 (1979) 9.

> them for ever. 15:8 And Metanoia is a virgin, very beautiful and pure and chaste and gentle; and God Most High loves her, and all his angels do her reverence (αἰδεῖσθαι).[26]

The attributes of Metanoia point to her (older) sister Wisdom/Sophia. She is the "daughter of the Most High" (cf. Philo, *Fug.* 52; *Quaest. in Gen.* 4.97 cf. also Prov 8:22). Her close relationship to God is already emphasized in Prov 8:30 and Wis 8:3-4. Therefore, she can intercede for the wise before God. She is called the mother of the righteous or the wise (Sir 15:2; Philo, *Fug.* 109 a.o.). The honorary attributes named in *JosAs* 15:8(Ph) in Wis 7:22f and Jak 3:17 are referred to Sophia, too.

The relationship between wise and Wisdom already in Wis 8:2-18 is described as erotic love:

> (Wis 8:9) I decided, therefore, to bring her into matrimony, because I knew that she would be a counselor for me in (all) goods and a comfort in worry and misery. (8:16-18) (Always when) I am coming home I shall sleep with her, for intercourse with her has no bitterness and the marital communion with her no hurt, but joy and merriment. As I considered this by myself and reflected it in my heart that immortality lies in the familiar connection with wisdom perfect delectation in tender affection to her inexhaustible wealth in the toils of her hands, prudence in marital intercourse with her and good reputation in participation with her speaking, (then) I went about and seeked to take her to me.[27]

Despite or even better: because of this erotic love to Wisdom virginity (also of men) is an ideal in large parts of the wisdom movement (cf. Wis 3:13). Therefore, the talk about the heavenly bridal chamber in *JosAs* 15:7(Ph) is not surprising. It is a reception of this sapiential language describing the love between Wisdom and the wise, frequently using erotic language already in the book of Proverbs (cf. Prov 4:6-9; Sir 4:11-19; 14:20-15:10; Wis 8). Philo portrays the wise as 'lovers of Sophia' (οἱ σοφίας ἐρασταί: cf. *Sacr.* 18; *Migr.* 57; *Mut.* 37), or as her life partners (σύμβιοι: *Post.* 78) resp. 'Sophia wooing' (σοφίαν μνώμενοι: *Ebr.* 49). And the love between Wisdom and wise can also happen in reverse sexual roles.[28]

Why is Sophia called in *JosAs* μετάνοια? Neither the personification of Metanoia nor the multinymity of Sophia are truly surprising. The multinymity of Sophia is stressed by Philo (*Leg. All.* 1.43) , and the personified Metanoia is known not only to Philo but also to *T.Gad* 5:7-8.[29] Philo *Som.* 2.292 states:

> Yet, if they pass from this intoxication to sobriety, and become themselves again; if realizing sottishness of their past they feel shame and selfreproach for the sins to which their ill-judging judgement has led them; if they take repentance for their counsellor, a counsellor impervious to flattery and bribery; if they propitiate the merciful power of Him that is by recantations in which holiness replaces profanity, they will obtain full pardon.[30]

---

[26] This is the text of the ms. D. in a somewhat changed translation of Cook. Philonenko here added the texts of both Greek manuscripts D and B.

[27] Transl. Georgi.

[28] In the description of the relationship between Sophia and the female Therapeutrides Philo of Alexandria changes the sex-roles: "The feast is shared by women also, most of them aged virgins, who have kept their chastity not under compulsion,... but of their own free will in their ardent yearning for wisdom. Eager to have her for their life mate they have spurned the pleasures of the body and desire no mortal offspring but those immortal children which only the soul that is dear to God can bring to the birth unaided because the Father has sown in her spiritual rays enabling her to behold the verities of wisdom." *Vita contemplativa* 68. Transl. F. H. Colson.

[29] For more personified Metanoias in pagan literature cf. J. Behm, μετανοέω κτλ. *TWNT* 4 (1942), 975.

[30] Transl. F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker.

The passage already shows that μετάνοια implies more than the conversion from paganism. Metanoia here appears more as God's agent, who γνῶσιν παρέχει τῇ ψυχῇ (*T. Gad* 5:7). Philo can say: τὸ μὲν μηδὲν ἁμαρτεῖν ἴδιον θεοῦ, τὸ δὲ μετανοεῖν σοφοῦ (*Fug.* 157).[31] For Philo μετανοεῖν is inevitable for the soul's path to God, especially as the destruction of the earlier sinful life (*Abr.* 17-19) and the receiving of another, completely purified spirit (*Mut.* 123-4). The soul, thus purified, becomes a dwelling place for God (*Sobr.* 62-3). Metanoia implies the concept of the transformation of mind as a comprehensive renewal of the wise.

The Aseneth of the shorter text in her encounter with the Anthropos experiences a metamorphosis into a heavenly figure. She receives the same glow as the heavenly visitor. "The inexpressible (mysteries) of God" (16:7(Ph)) are revealed to her. Her true home is the heavenly bridal chamber together with the just ones – the sons of God – and she is associated with Metanoia/Sophia. God leads her to Joseph (cf. 15:2-5.9(Ph)) - one of his sons. But not the wedding itself is most important. It happens more or less incidentally (cp 21:7-8(Ph)). More important is the "reinflaming" and the "melting together" (19:3(Ph)) of son and daughter of God (21:3(Ph)). The allusions to biblical stories of call during the heavenly vision makes us suspect that Aseneth herself is called to become a prophetess during her encounter with the Anthropos.

II. Wisdom motifs in the longer version of *JosAs* 14-18

The longer text of *JosAs* reads the entire text of the shorter text, with the exception of variations in the choice of words. In many places, however, it contains a longer text. These extensions in fact present a different image of both women figures. This I shall demonstrate in the following paragraphs.

The reading of the longer text in 14:9(B) "and Aseneth raised her head" instead of "and Aseneth raised her eyes" (14:8(Ph) cf. Dan 10:5) may be caused by moral considerations. The moral conceptions related to gender roles, made evident for instance in Sir 26:9, claim that prostitution of a woman already begins with her raising of her eyelids. But the emphasis on fear in 14:10(B) (cf. 14:10Ph) appears to me more important. Fear and trembling in front of heavenly light figures is a common topic in Ezechiel and in apocalypticism. Yet, in the longer text fear belongs to the basic attitudes of Aseneth during the entire visions. The narrator of the longer text characterizes his figure, esp. in ch.16, by reporting her present feeling. In 16:2(B) he tells us that Aseneth is sad because she has no honey comb in her pantry. He describes her fear of the fire-spraying hand in 16:11(B) und in 16:13(B). In 18:7(B), finally, he reports an inner dialogue of the sad Aseneth, where she expresses her fear that Joseph will despise her because of her ugliness. This female figure who is unable to withstand the situation is confronted by the superior smile (μειδιᾶν) of the Anthropos (16:12(B),14(B)).[32]

The Aseneth of the longer text, too, sees the Anthropos on his chariot going to heaven (17:8(B)). But this chariot with its four horses and the Anthropos' standing on it insinuate the entrance of Joseph narrated in 5:4(B) and the comparisons "like a flame of fire" (ὡς φλὸξ πυρός) and "like lightning" (ὡς ἀστραπή) allude to the Anthropos himself (vgl. 14:9(B)). The allusion to 2 Kgs 2:11 is more or less pushed back.[33]

In the longer text as well we find a symbolic action of the bees on Aseneth' mouth:

---

[31] "To do no sin is peculiar to God, to repent to the wise man." Cf. Wis 12:10; also 11:23; 12:19.

[32] μειδιᾶν (smile) often describes the friendly and generous smiling of the ruler. See Standhartinger, *Frauenbild*, 127-8.

[33] In the longer version the Anthropos "walks (πορεύεσθαι) into the heaven" (17:8(B)) – which indicates another difference from the Elijatradition.

> (*JosAs* 16:17x(B)) And Aseneth stood at his left (hand) and watched (βλέπειν) everything that the man was doing.... 16:19 And all those bees encircled Aseneth from feet to head. And other bees were great and chosen like their queens, and they rose from the damaged part of the comb and encircled Aseneth's mouth, and made upon her mouth and her lips a comb similar to the comb which was lying before the man. And all those bees ate of the comb which was on Aseneth's mouth, and made upon her mouth and her lips a comb similar to the comb which was lying before the man. 16:20 And all those bees ate of the comb which was on Aseneth's mouth. And the man said to the bees, 'Go off to your place'.

The queenbees do not grasp the lips of Aseneth, but they form a comb on her mouth similar to the comb of the Anthropos. With a comb on one's mouth one cannot speak. The description of the Aseneth of the longer text, therefore, contains fewer allusions to biblical calls of prophets. Instead of that, Aseneth is associated with another motif complex: that of the encounter of a human beeing with an angels, in particular the recognition of a heavenly visitor *after* having received the message.

Another difference between the longer and the shorter text is the understanding of the revealed "inexpressible mysteries of the Most High" (16:14(B)/16:7(Ph)). For example in 15:12x(B) Aseneth asks for the name of her visitor that she must not know because it is "unspeakable (ἄρρητος) and man or woman is not allowed to pronounce nor hear it in this world. This is surprising, for the Anthropos had already introduced himself in 14:8(B). 17:9(B) in particular gives evidence that Aseneth does not grasp what is revealed to her during the encounter with the Anthropos. After the Anthropos has left, Aseneth says in the longer text:

> (*JosAs* 17:9(B)) (What a) foolish (ἄφρων) and bold (τολμηρά) (woman) I (am), because I have spoken with frankness (παρρησία) and said that a man came into my chamber from heaven; and I did not know that (a) god came to me.

In her internal monologue Aseneth blames her own behavior during the vision. She had acted in a fresh manner, beyond the norm of behavior appropriate for women. She had spoken "in frankness".[34] Frankness is an essential value in the understanding of ancient democracy. In this sense it is also used in 23:10(B) with respect to Levi in a positive manner. Here, it becomes obvious that the longer text does present its figures alongside of sexually specified moral ideas.

The recognition of an angel of God 'post festum' is demonstrated by Gideon (Judg 6:11-24):

> Then the angel of the LORD reached out (ἐξέτεινεν) the tip of the staff that was in his hand, and touched (ἥψατο) the meat and the unleavened cakes; and there sprang up fire (ἀνήφθη πῦρ) from the rock and consumed the flesh and the unleavened cakes; and the angel of the LORD vanished from his sight (ἀπῆλθεν ἐξ ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτοῦ). 6:22 Then Gideon perceived that he was the angel of the LORD; and Gideon said, 'Alas, O Lord GOD! For now I have seen the angel of the LORD face to face.'

The scene underlines the visitor's heavenly origin who receives mainly the sacrifice but does not eat anything earthly together with humans. This is the sign that makes Gideon recognize with whom he had been talking. In comparison with *JosAs* various similarities occure. The heavenly Anthropos stretches out his hand touching the comb that subsequently dissolves in fire (17:3(B)/3(Ph)). Afterwards he disappears from Aseneth's eyes (17:8(B)/6(Ph)). Judg 6 ist sometimes connected with a similar story of the Samson tradition (Judg 13) in the renarration in

[34] Cf. Prov 9:13; 7:13(Σ); Sir 22:5; Esth 1:18; *Arist.* 250; Plutarch, *mor.* 142A a.o.; Josephus, *Ant.* 4.219 a.o.

Lib. Ant. 42 and Josephus, *Ant.* 5.276-84.[35] In Judg 13:19-22 the angel refuses the food offered to him right from the start. Judg. 13:17-18 contains one further motif that is picked up in *JosAs* 15:12x(B), too:

(*JosAs* 15:12x(B)) (And Aseneth said to him,)	(Judg 13:17) And Mano'ah said to the angel of the LORD,
'What is your name, Lord,	'What is your name
(τί ἐστι τὸ ὄνομά σου),	(τί ὄνομά σοι), so that (ἵνα),
tell me in order that (ἵνα) I may praise	when your words come true,
and glorify you (δοξάσω) for ever...'	we may honor you (δοξάσωμέν σε)?'
And the Man said to her:	13:18 And the angel of the LORD said to him:
'Why do you seek this, my name,	'Why do you ask my name?
(ἵνα τί τοῦτο ζητεῖς τὸ ὄνομά μου)	(ἵνα τί τοῦτο ἐρωτᾷς τὸ ὄνομά μου;),
Aseneth? My name is in the heavens,	
in the book....	
those names are exceedingly great	
and wonderful (θαυμαστός).'	seeing it is wonderful (θαυμαστός)?'

The story of the longer version of *JosAs* alludes to these motives of the encounter of a human and an angel. Gideon and Manoah receive a message by the visiting angel. However they are not transformed into heavenly beings. In the longer version of *JosAs* Aseneth is portrayed in the same manner. She is not yet transformed, but has (only) received a message. This observasion explains, why Aseneth prays during the vision a different prayer in each of the texts (15:12(B)/13(Ph)):

(*JosAs* 15:12(B)) Blessed be the Lord *your* God the Most High who sent you out to rescue me from the darkness and to bring me up *from the foundations* of the abyss,	(*JosAs* 15:13(Ph)) Blessed be the Lord God who sent you out to rescue me from the darkness and *bring me into light;*
and blessed be *your* name forever.	and blessed be *his* name for ever

The Aseneth of the shorter text now stands in the light (φῶς) and ranks herself among those who sing God's praise. The Aseneth of the longer text instead thanks the Anthropos that he has lead her out of the "foundations of the abyss" and asks for blessing.

Finally, it has to be stated that the Aseneth of the longer text during and after her encounter with the Anthropos is no light figure, contrary to what the shorter text tells us. *JosAs* 18(B) narrates, that her face has not fallen despite the seven days of lament (cf. *JosAs* 10). Therefore, she fears that Joseph would despise her (18:7(B)). She receives her transformed figure only after she has remembered the "commandment of the Anthropos"(18:5(B)) and has clothed herself with her "wedding garment like lightning." Then she obtains a transformed appearance. Again, the description of her new appearance is much longer than in the shorter text.

---

[35] LibAnt 42:9: "And Manoah built an altar *upon the rock* and offerd *sacrifices and holocausts*. And when he had cut up the meats and placed them on the altar, *the angel reached out and touched them with the tip of his staff* (Judg. 6:21). And fire came forth from the rock, and it devoured the holocausts and sacrifices. And the angel of the Lord *went up* from there *with the flame of fire. But Manoah and his wife saw these events and fell on their* faces and said, '*Surely we will die because we have seen the Lord face to face.*' And Manoah said, 'It is not enough that I have seen him but I even asked his *name, not kowing that he was the minister of God.* '" (Judg. 13:16-18; Transl. D. J. Harrington).

> (*JosAs* 18:9(B)) And Aseneth leaned (over) to wash her face and saw her face in the water. And it was like the sun and her eyes (were) like a rising morning star, and her cheeks like fields of the Most High, and on her cheeks (there was) red (color) like a son of man's blood, and her lips (were) like a rose of life comming out of its foliage, and her teeth like fighting men lined up for a fight, and the hair of her head (was) like a vine in the Paradise of God prospering in its fruits, and her neck like an all-variegated cypress, and her breasts (were) like the mountains of the Most High God.

The shorter text reads merely the two first comparisons that describe Aseneth in the appearance of the Anthropos (14:1,9(B)/1.9(Ph) cf. also 6:2(B)/5(Ph)). The remaining comparisons are found in the longer text alone. They belong to the traditional ancient optics of beauty as a poem of Rufinus (ca. 130 C.E.) demonstrates:

> Golden are her eyes and her cheeks like crystal, and her mouth more delightful than a red rose. Her neck is of marbel and her bosom polished...[36]

The pictorial level describes the paradise of God (cf. e.g. *2 Enoch* 8:1-8). Yet, it remains an open question here — as well as in 16:16(B) — how Aseneth relates to paradise. On the comparative level only parts of the body and features are mentioned: face, eyes, cheeks, lips, teeth, hair, neck, breasts, resembling a person, unable to move or operate. Aseneth remains – in modern terms – less than a half-sculpture, a bust. She lacks arms, hands, even more the torso, legs and feet, that is everything necessary for taking an active stand in the world. This is all the more obvious since the elaborate description of the image Jacob (22:7(B)) is speaking of his head, hair, beard, eyes, sinews, shoulders, arms, thighs, calves and feet, and comparing the figure with persons: young man, Ethiopian, angel, giant. Although Jacob is presented as an old man and the scene alludes to Gen 48 the comparison stresses his superhuman strength and his readiness for action.[37] The descriptions of Aseneth and of Jacob are specifically differentiated due to gender specifications. Aseneth is particularly signified as an especially beautiful bride. Because of this beauty she is a bride worthy to Joseph and, therefore, a daughter of God (21:4(B) cf. also 18:7(B)).

The gender specification of the presentation also shows in the description of the heavenly figure of Metanoia/Sophia in comparison with the other figures of the narrative. Metanoia according to 15:8(B) is sister of the Anthropos. She pleads incessantly to God and prepares as patroness of the virgins a place of rest for them.[38] In the longer text, the Anthropos functions most of all as guide of Aseneth as bride and as best man bringing Aseneth and Joseph together (15:2-5,9(B)). The allusion to a heavenly wedding between Wisdom and wise in the heavenly bridal chamber is suppressed here. Joseph replaces Sophia as firstborn of creation (cf. Prov 8:22; Wis 7:2; 8:4. Philo, *Ebr.* 31 a.o.) in the longer text. He is here called – different from the shorter

---

[36] Anthologia Graeca 5. 48. Transl. W. R. Paton.

[37] On the retelling of Gen 48 in *JosAs* 22(B) see Standhartinger, *Frauenbild*, 140-5

[38] The longer text reads: ἐκλιπαρεῖν instead of παρακαλεῖν. Both verbs carry the meaning "entreat" but ἐκλιπαρεῖν in contrast to παρακαλεῖν, which also means "call, exhort, encourage, demand" emphasizes the pleading and humiliating aspect of asking. In the references in Liddell/Scott, the subservient or defeated party tries to make the winning or superior party change its mind by way of "earnestly entreating " Cf. e.g. *JosAs* 1:7(B)/11(Ph); Josephus *Ant* 5.260; Philo, *Leg. ad. Gaium* 31; Dion. Hal. 7.20,1; Plut, *Them.* 5; Strab. 14.5,10; 17.1,29.

text – "firstborn" (18:11(B); 21:4(B); 23:10(B)).[39] After the heavenly vision Joseph appears in the longer text in a particular way as mediator of wisdom for Aseneth (19:11(B)).

In the encounter with the Anthropos the Aseneth of the longer text is promised a place among the heavenly virgins. The Anthropos announces to her that she was selected as bride of Joseph. Yet, she recognizes only afterwards the relevance of this message and the identity of the Anthropos. Mediated by the visit of the Anthropos she receives extraordinary beauty which enables her to become the bride of the "fistborn" son of God. In the following narrative she nevertheless remains passive (cf. cap. 28(B) to 28(Ph)). As daughter in law of Jacob she stands under the protection of Levi and the sons of Lea. Opposing the shorter text, however, in the longer text it is Levi who saves the sons of Silpa and of Bilhar from the wrath of their brothers (28:15-17(B)).

III. The Discussion between shorter and longer version of *JosAs*

The passages of the longer text of *JosAs* exceeding the shorter text as much as the occasionally differing choice of words characterize the women figures specifically. The longer version contradicts itself in some places. I have already pointed out the contradictions between 16:14/7 and 15:12x(B)/17:9(B). 19:11(B) surprises, as well, in the face of the parallelizing of Aseneth and Wisdom in 17:6(B) (cf. Prov 9:1) and of the reception of the spirit of life already successful (cf.16:14,16(B)). In addition to that, the promise of the Anthropos to Aseneth in 15:4(B): "your name was written in the book of the living in heaven; in the beginning of the book, as the very first of all..." does not really harmonize with 15:12x(B). I therefore presume, that the longer textual version reconstructed by Burchard did not have one unified and consistent level of redaction or of tradition but possibly several ones.

Still, in my opinion certain tendencies are observable in the longer text. The characterizations of the women figure of Wisdom and of Aseneth in each text is distinguishable. In the shorter text Wisdom is God's daughter who endows the wise with herself as gift in the heavenly bridal chamber. The possession of Wisdom causes change of mind and form and calls the wise to new action in the world. The longer text instead works hard to assign Sophia's traditional place beside God as God's first work of creation to male figures (Joseph/Anthropos). At least her part of activity on this earth passed on to Joseph and his brothers. The idea of the encounter of the selected righteous ones with heavenly Wisdom and their transformation and change of mind caused by that and leading to new activity in the world in the longer text is suppressed in favor of the story of a rebellious woman (cf. cap. 4), who finally through self-humiliation (cf. cap. 11(B)) receives the heavenly message of being selected as bride of Joseph and who obtains quite in style an extraordinary beauty.

This controversy about the gender role and the true sexuality of God's Sophia between the shorter and the longer version of *JosAs* is found also in Philo of Alexandria. There, Sophia increasingly is replaced by the Logos, although Philo does not thoroughly distinguish between the figures of Logos and Sophia. It is rather an identification of Logos and Sophia (*Leg. All.* 1.65; *Heres.* 191; *Somn.* 2.242-43). Attributes of Sophia are transferred to the Logos (*Leg. All,* 1.43/*Conf.* 146). A reason for this replacement is mentioned in *Abr.* 100-2:

> Now in a marriage where the union is brought about by pleasure, the partnership is between body and body, but in the marriage made by wisdom it is beween thoughts which

[39] πρωτότοκος (in Philonenko 21:3(Ph)) does not belong to the text of the mss-faily of the shortest text (BDslav). It is evident only in the witnesses of the longer text FW, syr. arm. L1; L2 und A.

> seek purification and perfect virtues. Now the two kinds of marriage are directly opposed to each other. For in the bodily marriage the male sows the seed and the female receives it; on the other hand in the matings within the soul, though virtue seemingly ranks as wife, her natural function is to sow good counsels and excellent words and to inculcate tenets truly profitable to life, while thought, though held to take the place of the husband, receives the holy and divine sowings. Perhaps however the statement above is a mistake due to the deceptivenesss of the nouns, since in the actual worlds employed νοῦς has the masculine, and ἀρετή the feminine form. And if anyone is willing to divest facts of the terms which obscure them and observe them in their nakedness in a clear light he will understand that virtue is male, since it causes movement and affects conditions and suggests noble conceptions of noble deeds and words, while thought is female, being moved and trained and helped, and in general belonging to the passive category which passivity is its sole means of preservation.[40]

In becoming gifted with Wisdom the wise – here as much as already in Wis 8 (cf. also *Vita Cont.* 68 a.o.) described as erotic process – Wisdom takes the active part. The wise are represented by the patriarchs – that means by male figures. The idea of an active function of a female figure causes difficulties for Philo. Therefore, he often makes effort to turn sexual attributions of his figures upside down. In his intepretation of the name "Bathuel" (*Fug.* 50-52) he presupposes the meaning "daughter of God" = Sophia. But in the end he argues: "wisdom's name is feminine, her nature is manly" (*Fug.* 51).[41] Thus in Philo we can observe a process of masculinization of the originally female figure of Wisdom.

IV. Further Considerations

1. I have shown that the comparison of various textual versions of an ancient writing as a whole has enlightened the discussion about this writing. The texts were discussed in ancient times already, the narrative and certain characterizations were altered. Each text, so to say, takes position in a specific way within the discussion alive in ancient Judaism. This could happen because some people consciously refused content and meaning, but also because of textcritical consideration. If someone or a group of scholars jugded a manuscript or its ancestor as corrupt, it has to be reconstructed, and this reconstruction of the 'original' form must include theological and ethical considerations.

2. The placing of *JosAs* in the Jewish-Hellenistic discussion about wisdom also explains the choice of the genre by the authors. *JosAs* belongs to the genre of Greek erotic novel.[42] As in the oldest, only fragmentarily preserved, representatives of that genre, esp. the Ninos-romance, the narrative technique is not very elaborate. Monological and dialogical scenes are bridged by few connecting sentences from the perspective of the narrator. The main differences between *JosAs* and the more or less completely preserved representatives of the genre, Xenophon's *Ephesian*

---

[40] Transl. F. H. Colson. A different position is represented by Philo in *Cher* 40-52: God sheds his seed/sperm into wisdom/virtue who brings to birth the wise. Cf. also *Post* 78.

[41] C.f. also Georgi, "Frau Weisheit oder das Recht auf Freiheit als schöpferische Kraft" *Verdrängte Vergangenheit, die uns bedrängt. Feministische Theologie in der Verantwortung für die Geschichte* (ed. Leonore Siegele-Wenschkewitz; Munich: Chr. Kaiser, 1988) 241-76.

[42] C.f. Philonenko, *Joseph et Aséneth*, 43-48; Burchard, *Der dreizehnte Zeuge* (FRLANT 103; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht,1970) , 66-81 a.o.; S. West, "Joseph and Asenath: A Neglected Romance" *Classical Quarterly* 24 (1974) 70-81; Richard I. Pervo, "Joseph and Asenath and the Greek Novel," *SBLSP* 10 (1976), 171-181., Standhartinger, *Frauenbild, 20-6,* 231-7.

Tale und Chariton's *Callirhoe,* consist in the concentration on the amorous suffering of the heroine and in the heavenly vision (*JosAs* 14-18). What happens in Xenophon 1.1-9 and in Chariton 1.1, in *JosAs* fills 21 chapters. On the other hand, the endangering of the protagonist's modesty that dominates the completely preserved Greek novels is limited to ch. 22-29 in *JosAs*. And different from Xenophon and Chariton the end of the narration in *JosAs* does not focus on the reunion of the lovers. This, as well as the characteristic of the women figures, distinguishes *JosAs* from the non-Jewish representatives – as already Richard Pervo pointed out.[43] But contrary to him in my opinion this is especially true in the shorter text, whereas the image of women in the longer text has greater similarities with the completely preserved representatives of the genre.

3.The reception resp. imitation of an ancient novel in a Jewish writing does not surprise if we think of Ezechiel's tragedy on the story of Moses or Theodotus' epic of Sichem. Yet, to me the adoption of the genre of the novel appears particularly useful for a sapiential theological writing. Here the erotic love of the wise to Wisdom is, as we have seen above, an essential motor in her mediation. Philo's works give evidence for speculations about the true sex of God's Sophia and the gender roles in the erotic mediation of Wisdom. In the shorter text of *JosAs* the figure of the wise is portrayed by the role of a woman and this happens – different from Philo – in part of the textual tradition without a masculinization of the principle endowing with Wisdom. Aseneth gifted with Wisdom here turns into the incorporation of the wise in the world.

4. Identifying *JosAs* as novel emphasizes the literary character of the narrative. Like other ancient novels *JosAs* selects less prominent figures, here of the biblical story, as protagonists of the novel and tells (seemingly) a story of their lifetime. Although the border between fiction and historiography in antiquity is less markedly drawn than in modern times – demonstrated, for instance, by the technique of προσωποποιΐα — ancient novels are most of all conscious literary products, the reality content of which remains debatable, for the time of the narrated action as much as for the time of their literary origin.[44] *JosAs* lacks even more than the completely preserved ancient novels any local coloring. Heliopolis here merely consists of a house and a tower. It remains unclear where the Pharao lives, and the fight between the son of the Pharao and Aseneth at best vaguely hints at some locality (place of a river beginning to swell and a grove of reed next to it in 24:19-20(B)/24:16,21(Ph); 26:5(B)/26:5(Ph); 27:2(B)/27:3(Ph); 28:7(B)/28:5(Ph)). This is, in my opinion, the main reason why there is up to now so much discussion on the date and origin of *JosAs*.

5. Literary criticism has drawn a sharp line between literary text and historical reality. In my point of view, this border is to be observed with respect of the fictional narrative of *JosAs*. I have consistently spoken of figure and way of presentation. As fiction *JosAs* does not describe directly the reality of the community(ies) in form of a historical allegory or a 'roman à clef'. Yet, by the

---

[43] *See.* Pervo, "Aseneth and Her Sisters: Women in Jewish Narrative and in the Greek Novels", *'Women like this.' New Perspectives on Jewish Women in the Greco-Roman World* (SBLEJL 1; ed. Amy Jill Levine; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991) 145-160.

[44] On προσωποποιΐα see Theon, *Progymnasmata,* 8.The dating of the individual Greek novels is much debated. See Consuelo Ruiz-Montero, "Chariton von Aphrodisias: Ein Überblick" and "Xenophon von Ephesos: Ein Überblick" *ANRW* II 34 (1994) 1006-54, 1087-1138. Kurt Treu in "Der Realitätsgehalt des antiken Romans" *Untersuchungen zur literatischen Kommunikation und Gattungsgeschichte* (ed. Heinrich Kuch; Berlin: Akademieverlag, 1989) 107-125, casts doubts on the reflection of true reality presented by these novels. On the discrepancy between the images of women in ancient romances and contemporary possibilities of women s. Brigitte M. Egger, *Women in the Greek Novel: Construction the Feminine* (PhDiss University of California, Irvine, 1990).

specific way of presentation this novel (in at least two versions) takes part in the exegetical and theological discussion in hellenistic Judaism.

6. Differing with many representatives of literary criticism in my opinion that the reception of ancient textes has to be done within the frame of reference of the contemporary discussion. It is not only important *what* was read in general, but also *how* ancient readers could and would read a certain writing. The way of presentation and the techniques of characterization have to be analyzed on the background of ancient discussion of such and related matters. What I have tried to show in my book is, that this controversy between the shorter and the longer text of *JosAs* on the presentation of women charakters takes part in the discussion in jewish and pagan literature written from the second century BCE to the second century CE.

7. The movement from text to socio-historical context puts this novel into the theological and anthropological discussion of which it is a part. If one of the topics in the ancient jewish wisdom discussion was the true sex and the gender role of the wise and wisdom, there is some reason to place this novel in the time before or beside the writings of *Philo of Alexandria* and the NT. Here, one can observe major tendencies to change the sex of the female wisdom into a male agent. On the other hand, there are some hints to a controverse position in Philos description of the female Therapeutrides, where the sapiential gifted women definitely plays a role (*Vita Cont.* 68). The Therapeutrides also composed (*Vita Cont.* 28-29) and took over the role of Mirjam and the women of Exod 15 in the liturgical songs of the worship service of the entire group (*Vita Cont.* 83-90). This is not to say, that the Therapeutrides are actually the group of origin of *JosAs*. Besides some theological differences which have been collected elsewhere, one must recognize that the authors of the story choose to write in a popular manner of a novel.[45] In contrast to the Therapeutrides *JosAs* share the oicumenic world view and the missionary efforts of this genre.

8. But it appears significant that in focussing on the danger of being raped (*JosAs* 22-29(Ph)) *JosAs* puts the finger on a women-specific problem, and it does so in retelling the story of Dinah (Gen 34) on the one side and on the other in the use of the story of Joseph and the wife of Potiphar interpreted frequently in Hellenistic Judaism (Gen 39:7-20 cf. *T. Jos* 3-9; Josephus, *Ant.* 2.39-59). In the shorter text of *JosAs* the sexual roles are distributed in a reversed manner. The Phaidra-motif – die erotomaniac craze – here is transferred to the son of the Pharao (vgl. 23:2(Ph): ἐμμανὴς ἐγένετο).[46] The stupidity of the person "crazy with love" is uncovered (cf. *JosAs* 25(Ph)) and Aseneth is saved with the help of God from her attackers. The drawn swords "fell from their hands to the ground and were reduced to dust." (27:8(Ph)). This ironical presentation of male figures causes the suspicion that the perception of the reality by women has at least contributed to this story.

9. I hope that my study has demonstrated that textual criticism in its redaction-critical dimensions – drawing on the textual versions as a whole and not used merely as quarry for the reconstruction of the oldest text – can be used for clarifying the background of fictitious narratives. We can show which elements of the entire presentation were considered particularly worthy of discussion, problematic and in need of correction. We may even be able to observe trajectories. The method of analysis needs no limitation to *JosAs*. It can be applied to other pseudepigrapha as well. The necessary questions should not be limited to the problem of the possibly oldest of the available versions but should also ask for the relationship of the versions to

---

[45] On the diferences between Philo's description of the Therapeutics and *JosAs* see: Burchard, *Untersuchungen*, 107-12; Philonenko, *Joseph et Aséneth*, 103-6; Chesnutt, *Conversion*, and others. But see also Kraemer, "Monastic Jewish Women in Greco-Roman Egypt: Philo Judaeus on the Therapeutrides" *Signs* 14 (1989) 342-70.

[46] Evidence and argument on this in Standhartinger, *Frauenbild*, 145-51.

one another. In such an approach, the widely ranging discussion about the many biblical figures is to be uncovererd. A glance at the portrayal of Eve in 2 Cor 11:1-14; 1 Tim 2:9-15 and *Apoc. Adam* (NHC V 64:1-67:14) already causes the suspicion that great differences in the presentation of this biblical figure existed. The textual versions of *Adam and Eve* confirm this picture. The Greek and Slavic versions of the text have preserved a testament of Eve that contradicts in a diametrical fashion the tendencies of the depiction of Eve as they are found particularly in the Latin version.[47] The analysis and the critical comparison of textual versions of the so-called Jewish pseudepigrapha are able to contribute to the uncovering of the discussion within ancient Jewry and, thus, to a more differentiated picture of our image of theological and anthropological controversies present in that context.

[47] *C.f.* John R. Levison, "The Exoneration of Eve in the Apokalypse of Moses 15-30" *JSJ* (1989), 135-150 and Christiana de Groot van Houten, "Will the Real Eve Please Stand?", *SBLSP* 33 (1994), 301-311.

Paul's Hearing at Caesarea: A Preliminary Comparison with Legal Literature of the Roman Period

H. Stephen Brown
Temple University

Introduction

Today in modern criticism of the New Testament there is still the notion that Paul's hearings before the procurators Felix and Festus in Acts of the Apostles are in some way historical documents, or were drawn in large part from court records of the events, now, alas, lost.[1] The purpose of this paper is to demonstrate that these accounts are in fact neither historical accounts nor are drawn from records of Roman judicial proceedings. Rather, they are dramatic presentations of Luke's version of Paul's proclamation that mimic many of the characteristics of actual historical texts. This can be demonstrated if the texts from Acts are investigated in the context of real legal texts from antiquity. It is by means of such comparison that the scenes of Paul in court at Caesarea may be excluded from the typology of "history" because they do not match the structure, purpose or even language of contemporary records of real court cases. Specifically, in a comparison with the minutes of real courts of the Roman Empire, we find that Paul's purported hearing before Felix not only does not reflect real records of Romans, but, in fact, has much more to do with the goals of literary constructs evident in Greco-Roman novels.

This paper shall examine the nature of Roman court documents as we find them in the Egyptian papyri. It shall compare and contrast this kind of document with Acts 24:1 - 23, looking at the criteria for judicial and forensic rhetoric as they relate to both the papyri and Acts. Then I shall look at trials in the Greco-Roman novels and ultimately situate Acts 24 in the writing of the period. However, in order to do this it is necessary to give a brief history of criticism of Acts, to demonstrate the scholarly insistence on Acts' historicity and legalistic accuracy.

[1] It is remarkable to me that this state of affairs continues for these particular episodes in Acts, especially in light of the fact that many of the same scholars whose work I use in this paper actually subscribe to the Tuebingen school and reject the notion that Luke was presenting some kind of historiography for all the rest of Acts. And yet, the notion of historicity remains in these scenes of Paul's hearings for these scholars.

The "Conventional Wisdom":

To reiterate, New Testament scholars have rather blithely assumed that the legal scenes of Acts *a priori* are a more or less accurate account of real events in the first century. Or, failing that, there is the assumption that Acts contains scenes that are based on real accounts by eyewitnesses and public records. Often, either the investigator spends great effort explaining the essential historicity of the scenes, or the scenes end up-- conveniently-- ignored. With few exceptions, there is a tendency to gloss over the matter, or to prove pre-conceived notions.

In "Roman Law and the Trial of Paul"[2] the great Acts scholar, Henry Cadbury, tried to prove that Acts was a historical document by assessing its legalistic scenes. He was successful, only in that he was able to make a number of questionable connections between Paul and Roman law. Moreover, he remained puzzled by certain aspects of Paul's trials, such as the lack of specificity of the charge against Paul. On this, for example, Cadbury says that this particular issue is hard to pin down, though he does admit, "...we shall hardly expect Luke to formulate it in precise terms of Roman criminal law."[3] Further Cadbury himself made many assumptions about the text's relationship to Roman law, formulating his interpretation of the account in deceptively precise terms, without evidence, and thereby setting the tone of many later writers.

For example, there is the matter of Paul's purported appeal to Caesar. On this Cadbury writes at length on how the appeals procedure was used, both *provocatio* and *appellatio*, and applies it to Paul's case, though he admits that our knowledge of the use of these appeals is obscure.[4] Indeed, as Jones later pointed out, Paul's appeal is apparently our only example of *provocatio* and is "...unfortunately very confused."[5] This, of course, generates its own set of problems. To his own credit, Cadbury does mention that *provocatio* may not have been applicable to citizens living in the provinces during the early principate, but limited to the city of Rome.[6] As Garnsey later noted, Festus "...was under no obligation to grant Paul his request."[7] In other words, Paul's appeal is already presented by Cadbury as a fact, but without real evidence. At this point in his work Cadbury has wandered far from the text of Acts to verify Luke's history. And because of Cadbury's otherwise deserved stature in New Testament scholarship, he set the mold for the following decades of study of Acts.

Even in the last ten years both Richard Cassidy,[8] and Brian Rapske[9] have, much as did Cadbury, considered Acts to be a historical document. For example, on Lysias' letter to Felix

---

[2] Henry J. Cadbury, "Roman Law and the Trial of Paul" in *The Beginnings of Christianity; Part One: The Acts of the Apostles*, Foakes & Lake ed., (London: Macmillan, 1933).

[3] Ibid., 305 - 306.

[4] Ibid., 312 - 319.

[5] A.H.M. Jones, *The Criminal Courts of the Roman Republic and Principate* (Totowa: Rowman & Littlefield, 1972), 101 - 102.

[6] Cadbury, 314. *Provocatio* was an instrument of the Republic and may, or may not have still been in use during the Julio-Claudian dynasty.

[7] Peter Garnsey, "The *Lex Julia* and Appeal under the Empire," JRS 56 (1966), 184.

[8] Richard Cassidy, *Society and Politics in the Acts of the Apostles* (Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1987), 97 - 98.

[9] Brian Rapske, *Paul in Roman Custody*, vol 4 of The Book of Acts in its First Century Setting (Grand Rapids, MI: Eardmann's, 1994)

concerning Paul's arrest and interrogation, Cassidy says that "...against the light of what has preceded in Luke's account, Lysias' letter can only be regarded as a creative interweaving of fiction and fact."[10] What we can glean from this is that Lysias has taken the truth and distorted it-- as if we knew that the preceding was itself an accurate account of a real event. However, we know no such thing, but from such deductions in Acts scholarship many still believe that this scene in Acts is historical.

The only difference in Rapske's work is that he devotes more space to Roman police procedure than either Cassidy or Cadbury. Again, the circumstances of Paul's arrest and hearings as related by Acts are treated simply as fact. Problems are explained away, or, as in the case of the prophecy of Agabus, ignored.[11] The inconsistencies of the text-- such as the conspiracy that required Paul to have 470 guards to protect the "change of venue" to Caesarea-- are explained away as the usual practice in dealing with political prisoners in Roman Judea.[12]

Other commentators on Acts either have let these passages pass or let the assumption of historicity remain-- or both-- with little or no comment. For example, T.L. Johnson's otherwise monumental commentary on Acts ignores these questions of law, though with great perception he does hint that the aim of Luke's account is to tell how Paul got from Caesarea to Rome as part of theological rhetoric, but gives little more in the way of detail.[13] G. Luedemann seems willing only to follow Cadbury, and tie these passages to historiography. On Acts 23 he says: "Hypothetically, the following historical facts can be assumed to be the basis for the tradition in this chapter."[14] On Acts 24: "All the elements of tradition that have been reconstructed might have a high claim to historical probability."[15] These comments neither explain anything, nor strike me as particularly illuminating for the text of Acts itself. And there are many other examples of this kind of work in the literature. Indeed, some still insist that Luke had accurate knowledge of the geography of Asia Minor, Judea and Jerusalem[16] in spite of the compelling evidence of others that this was not the case.[17] But these few suffice to illustrate my point. This is not to say, of course, that all commentators on Acts have treated Acts in just this way. Certainly some have abandoned the historical perspective and examined the text in its ancient theological context. For example, Haenchen posits Luke's use of Paul's hearings as part of the theological witness to the Romans.[18] Trites writes on the same idea of witness for the

---

[10] Ibid., 98.

[11] Ibid., 140.

[12] Ibid., 153 - 155.

[13] Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1992), 368 - 444.

[14] Gerd Luedemann, *Early Christianity According to the Traditions in Acts: A Commentary* (London: SCM Press, 1989), 246.

[15] Ibid., 250.

[16] C.J. Hemer, "Luke the Historian," *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester*, Vol. 60 No. 1 (1977), 28 - 51.

[17] Richard I. Pervo, *Profit with Delight* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987), 54 -57.

[18] Ernst Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1971), 357 - 358.

proclamation through Luke's specific use of legal language in the hearing scenes.[19] But these are few and far between. Hence, most scholarship of these scenes in Acts has rarely ventured far from the "conventional wisdom."

The Typology of Roman Court Records

In order to compare this hearing in Acts with contemporary Roman legal literature, we shall now examine the form, or typology of the Roman court record. Fortunately, literally dozens of examples of court cases from the Egyptian papyri have survived. The Egyptian papyri provide us with a fairly clear picture of life in Egypt from rise of the Ptolemies to the end of Antiquity. Among the fragments of letters, books, poems and horoscopes are dozens of examples of legal texts. These consist of edicts, arrest orders, bail receipts, minutes of proceedings, and court decisions. From these papyri we have a fairly clear idea of how courts worked in the ancient world. Let us now give a brief outline of the procedure.

Accusations filed with the magistrate's office generated an investigation, which generated summonses for the litigants. The accused and witness were interrogated, often by torture. A finding of guilt at this stage could result in sentencing; a not-guilty verdict resulted in immediate acquittal. If the case did not merit immediate sentencing (capital crimes such as sedition, *perdullio*, and *maiestas* generated immediate judgments) then a court date was set, bail was paid, depositions taken of all involved and documents submitted to the court. When the trial convened, the magistrate directed the proceedings, allowed the litigants to speak and enter their evidence, supervise the admission of recorded testimony and the testifying of witness. In the end the magistrate rendered a decision.[20]

These texts show that court records, contained in the minutes of legal proceedings before magistrates, have several characteristics that define them as a genre. They are identifiable in the texts' purpose, structure, and language. Structure means that the text has a certain form typical of court records, telling us what happened when and what was said by whom in court. Language means that such a text uses specific legal terms indicative of Roman court procedure. Purpose means that the text's *raison d'être* records a specific incidence of administration of Roman Law in a court proceeding. Together these compose the rhetorical typography of the court record. As it turns out, it is a particularly dry form of judicial rhetoric.

In P. Oxyrhynchus 237 we find the minutes from a prefect's court (city unspecified) in 133 c.e. The text tells us that a certain Antonius appeared and, through his lawyer, explained a dispute he had had with his father-in-law, Sempronius, that resulted in Sempronius taking Antonius' wife away. Antonius then charged Sempronius with incest. Sempronius, represented

---

[19] Allison A. Trites, "The Importance of Legal Scenes and Language in the Book of Acts," *Novum Testamentum*, 16 (1974), 278 - 284.

[20] Raphael Taubenschlag, *The Law of Greco-Roman Egypt in the Light of the Papyri: 332 BC - 640 AD* (New York: Herald Square, 1944), 325; 361 - 362; 411 - 421. Strachan-Davidson tells us that Roman criminal trials elsewhere in the empire proceeded in much the same way. Evidence was admitted to the court, witnesses were examined and cross-examined, sealed affidavits of absent witnesses could be admitted into evidence. Even juries were used. James L. Strachan- Davidson, *Problems of the Roman Criminal Law* (Amsterdam: RODOPI, 1969 (1912)), 112 - 116; 120 - 124; 158 - 159; 164 - 166.

by his own lawyer, testified that his action resulted from a violent action by Antonius. The magistrate ultimately decided that the wife of Antonius (sadly, she is never named) should decide with whom she would prefer to live.[21]

With regard to the category of language we find that this one page of text uses six unambiguous legal terms in seven places. The terms used are the most common legal terms; for example we find the words court (βῆμα), advocate (ῥήτωρ), accusation (ἔγκλημα), and violence (βίας). Of course these words have other meanings outside the law, but in the context of these legal documents they are technical terms bearing clear and unambiguous meaning. The structure of this text is typical and could almost be used as a prototype for the genre. It begins with the place and date of the court and names the presiding magistrate. Then the complaint is read, followed by the plaintiff's testimony. The testimony of the defendant and/or the defendant's advocate(s) comes next. Finally the decision of the magistrate rests at the end of the document. The purpose could not be more clear. The text shows the administration of the law in a particular case-- here on the limits of a father's *potestas* over his married daughter.

P. Oxy 37, dated to 49 c.e., records the minutes of the case Pesouris v. Saraeus. It seems the plaintiff had hired a wetnurse to care for a foundling adopted by the plaintiff; The plaintiff accuses her of negligence, causing him to seize the child from the nurse's home. Subsequently, he claims, the nurse kidnapped the child from him. The nurse makes the counter charge that in fact the foundling had died and that Pesouris had seized her own son. Apparently the child was present in court, for the magistrate remarks that the child looks like Saraeus and says that she and her husband must sign a sworn declaration that the foundling died and that the child was theirs.[22]

The language of P. Oxy. 37 contains six legal terms that are used at eight places in one and one quarter pages of text. Again, as with P. Oxy. 237, the terms are common ones such as βῆμα, ῥήτωρ and ὑπόμνηματισμων (minutes). Plus there are more specific terms such as ἀντίδικος (defendant), γράμμα (statement), and χειρόγραφον (sworn declaration), again legally specific technical terms in this context are not unusual. The structure is clear and concise, telling us exactly what happened in the court-- providing the date, the case, who said what, and when, and the decision. Even more, the text records that evidence (receipts and signed contracts) was entered into the record. As for purpose, again as with P. Oxy 237, this case clearly has only one purpose, to relate the working of the law in a case of contract dispute, kidnapping, and negligence.

P. Gurob 2, dated to about 220 b.c.e., is the record of the case Dositheus v. Heracleia in which Dositheus claims that, during an argument, Heracleia spat upon him. Dositheus then brought a suit against Heracleia for 200 drachmae for the assault and an unspecified amount for damage to Dositheus' mantle (the amount is in a lacuna). Unfortunately for Dositheus, even though his suit was filed in the court and read at the proceedings, he never showed up to plead his case. Heracleia, however, did appear with the result that Dositheus was found guilty of injustice and the judges threw the case out. [23]

---

[21] A.S. Hunt and C.C. Edgar, ed. *Select Papyri, Vol II: Non-Literary Papyri, Public Documents* (LCL, 1977), 198 - 201.

[22] Ibid., 194 -197.

[23] Ibid., 190 - 195.

In language, we find that in two and a half pages eleven legal terms are used twenty-one times. As with the other examples, we find common legal terms: ἔγκλημα, δίκη, and ὕβρις. We also find more specialized terms such as δικαστής (judge).[24] In structure the text appears little different from P. Oxy 237 and P. Oxy 37; we get the same information: the names of the court officers, of the litigants, who said what and the court's decision. Purpose in the text is also straight forward; the only concern of the text is that the law is administered and justice served.

P. Hamb 1.4 is a summons to appear in court from 87 c.e. As such it is not strictly a court proceeding, yet it does tell us about one that was scheduled. Here Lucius Vettius Epaphroditus swears that he will appear on a certain date to answer charges against him-- in other words, it is a subpoena resulting from a hearing. The text tells us exactly the same kind of information as the minutes of a court proceeding. In a half page of text, this document uses four legal terms four times. Again the words are familiar: βῆμα, γράμματα, χειρόγραφον. Again the court is named, the magistrate, the litigants and the time and place of the proceedings-- straight-forward and to the point. As to purpose, again the proper administration of law is the goal-- no more, no less.[25]

Of course these are not the only examples of this genre of text; many others are extant. Indeed, a random sample of volumes of papyri recovered over the last century regularly turns up at least a couple of court cases. For example in the collection of the *Papyri Oslonensis* a quick examination revealed four different cases all dating from the early to late second century.[26] A random volume from the Egypt Exploration Society's *Papyri Oxyrhynchus* collection turned up an extract from a fourth century trial of extortion.[27] Each of these cases, though in more fragmentary condition than the previous examples, exhibit the same characteristics as the samples cited above. The language is familiar, using the same technical legal terms for participants and proceedings. The structure is also the same: the magistrate is named as are all the other participants. The location of the court is named. All the events of the proceedings are recorded, including the entering of evidence and testimony (if any) and the magistrate's decision. The only purpose of these, as with the others, is that the administration of the law be recorded.

Thus there exists ample evidence from antiquity to locate and codify the typology of the court account. Again, this account is defined by its use of legal-specific language, a structure that explicates the process of legal administration and a purpose that has no other goal than the functioning of the Roman law and service of justice. Now the use of the foregoing is to test the inclusion or exclusion of other texts against the category of court-account. And now may we turn our attention to the text at hand, Paul's first hearing before Felix.

Luke's Account and the Papyri

In Acts 24:1 - 23 we find a delegation having arrived from Jerusalem to present its case against Paul, and we see a proceeding that superficially resembles a real court. Tertullus, the

---

[24] This was a specialized term for a judge sitting on a panel of ten judges. This form of court was common in Ptolemaic Alexandria. Taubenschlag, 369 - 371.

[25] *Select Papyri*, 174 - 177.

[26] S. Eitrem and Leiv Amundsen, *Papyri Oslonensis*, 3 vol. (Oslo: Jacob Dybwad, 1931), v.2, 39 - 44; v.3, 64 - 67.

[27] J. W. B. Barns, et al., *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, vol 31 (London: The Egypt Exploration Society, 1966), 96 - 97.

advocate hired by the Jerusalem council and the high-priest Ananias,[28] presents his very brief accusatory oration, an oration that some have said superficially resembles the form of forensic oration of which we have many examples from Cicero, among others.[29] The speech begins with a *captatio benevolentiae* of praise for the procurator, then proceeds to the accusation, which is echoed by his clients. But when Felix allows Paul to speak on his own behalf, the resemblance to a real court ends. For what Paul tells us smacks more of the dramatic than the historical, even more so than Tacitus at his melodramatic best! For example, Cordus' defense speech on liberty before the senate in the reign of Tiberius comes to mind immediately.[30] After his own brief *captatio benevolentiae*, Paul tells the court that 1) he did nothing, 2) he had not time to do all that he is charged with, 3) his real accusers are not in the court and 4) the only thing the elders of Jerusalem accuse him of is professing a belief in the resurrection, a belief that he already shares with many of his accusers. Felix then adjourns the hearing with the strange comment that he will make a decision when Lysias arrives-- though there is no reason why this should be necessary. Felix, as procurator, was an imperial legate[31] and thus the highest official in the area and one who had full powers to try capital cases, including those of Roman citizens and was answerable only to the provincial governor and the emperor.[32]

Superficially, in some ways, this scene does resemble a court account, but detailed examination reveals that it is not at all in the same category as actual court accounts found in the ancient papyri. In language these two and a half pages of text use only three different legal terms at six locations. The verb καταγορεύω is used four times, ῥήτωρ once, and δίκαιος once. This is not very encouraging; βῆμα (court) is absent, as is δίκη (justice, law) and ἀντίδικη (defendant). These are words that would be present were this a court account, as they are in the papyri. Further the use of δίκαιος (also a word for justice) is nullified by the fact that Paul uses the word only in reference to the resurrection, not the law. Because of this, attempts to tie the language of this scene to the law are unconvincing in the face of the evidence of the papyri. As mentioned, the most common words found in the papyrological accounts of court-cases are simply not found in Acts. Indeed, the very word for the court (βῆμα) is missing as is the word for justice (δίκη), which is, lest we forget, the function of the law.

In structure, too, the resemblance to a court is superficial. Important items such as the names of the plaintiffs (aside from Tertullus and Ananias) and the date of the proceedings are absent. The court proceedings are mildly chaotic. First, there is no real accusation on the part of the plaintiffs; they only give a vague complaint that he was stirring people up. There is no nuance

---

[28] As an aside, the very first problem with the historicity of this passage presents itself right away. It has long been noted that the high-priest during Felix' tenure was not Ananias, but either Johnathan, or Ishmael. Alfred Loisy, *Les Actes des Apotres* (Paris: Emile Nourry, 1920), 848 - 849.

[29] Jerome Neyrey, "The Forensic Defense Speech and Paul's Trial Speeches in Acts 22 - 26: Form and Function," in C.H. Talbert, ed., *Luke--Acts: New Perspectives: from the society of Biblical Literature Seminar* (New York: Crossroad, 1984), 210 - 224.

[30] Tacitus *Annals* 4.34 - 35.

[31] Suetonius *Div. Claudius* 28; Josephus *Antiquities* 20.7.1 - 2.

[32] Peter Garnsey, "The Criminal Jurisdiction of Governors," *JRS* 58 (1968), 53 - 55, especially 55.

of sedition or revolt. In the end, they can only accuse Paul of being the leader of a sect,[33] a problem with a local religion that should not have rated a hearing. Indeed, Judaism had long been attested as having special status among the "foreign" religions of the Roman empire and its own rule of law concerning religious matters.[34]

Still, granting that there was a case here, Paul's defense speech would demand a different response. At the very least the procurator would have needed to begin an investigation. This is especially relevant in the face of Paul's assertion that the real accusers ("some Jews from Asia") were absent from the court. Beyond the speeches there are no depositions entered into evidence, no other witnesses to the "crime." Indeed, the very people who originally made the accusation, those same "Jews from Asia," are nowhere to be found. Even more, the accusers who did appear, Tertullus and the others, vanish, never to be heard from again. In short, what we have are two speeches. There is no evidence. There are no witnesses. There is no testimony. There are not even any formal charges filed. Finally, as noted above, there is no decision rendered by the governor, though this case should have been thrown out-- especially if we consider the testimony of P. Gurob 2, where, even in the presence of a formal accusation and proper procedure generated by a proper hearing, the charge of assault was thrown out because the actual plaintiff was not present in the court.[35]

Furthermore, the composition of the speeches of Tertullus and Paul removes them from consideration of actual legal court testimony. Some scholars have tried to show that these "speeches" follow the oratory methods set forth by Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian. They try to show that, as with the classical forms of forensic rhetoric, they consist of an exordium (the *captatio benevolentiae*), a statement of facts and a proof just as did the speeches of the great orators of the Greco-Roman world.[36] However they remain unconvincing. Indeed the length of these "speeches" is little longer than a summary from the trial minutes contained in the papyri, which is barely sufficient to learn what the conflict in the case was about, let alone allow someone to hold forth on it. Further, there is the problem of what is left out of Tertullus' and Paul's "speeches"; if we knew nothing else about these men, these speeches would tell us precious little, indeed. The only reason we know what is going on in this scene is because we have at our disposal everything that happened before in the story, that is we have the continuity of the story-line. Further, with the disappearance of Tertullus comes the disappearance of the charge-- as

---

[33] Johnson., 409 - 417. Also see a similar dramatic structure in Jesus trial in Luke 23.

[34] Rajak, Tessa, "Was There a Roman Charter for the Jews?" *JRS* 74 (1984), 107 - 123: Rajak makes the case for there not being a special legal instrument of Roman Law that encompassed the entire Jewish population of the empire, but still says that the privileges alleged by Josephus and Philo were real enough.; Alan Watson, *The State, Law and Religion: Pagan Rome* (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1992), 58 - 62.: Watson also makes the point that Roman Law would not interfere in the practice or disputes of one of the licit "foreign" religions, except where it impinged upon the prerogatives of the state.

[35] *Select Papyri*., 190 - 195.

[36] Neyrey. For the opposite view, that this is not Roman or Greek rhetoric, see George Kennedy, *Classical Rhetoric and its Christian and Secular Traditions from Ancient to Modern Times* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1980), 129 - 132; also Kennedy reiterates the Roman disinclination to enforce Jewish religious law in his *New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1984), 135 - 137.

weak as it was-- of sedition. After this no real charges are mentioned in the course of Paul's further encounter with Felix and his encounters with Festus. Luke himself states that none of the accusations proffered before Felix was even valid.

In the end we have a scene that, if viewed as an independent, historical, or legal text, comes across as a flat, one-dimensional enactment of what an author thought a trial would be like. Luke wants to evoke a trial and he succeeds, in a literary evocation. Viewed against the evidence of the papyri, the scene reveals itself as something other than what has been claimed for it. Its language is not the language of the courts. Its structure is not that of the court proceedings. Without the language or structure of legal texts, the scholarly claim that the scene's purpose has anything to do with an actual court proceeding weakens. Further, the scene's history is suspect and lacks detail. Moreover the "hearing's" purported judicial rhetoric, its oratory, is abbreviated to the point of incomprehensibility. Even the papyri, brief as they are, provide us with far fuller accounts of themselves. As we saw, the record of the papyri can give something as apparently trivial as the judge's remark about the resemblance between two people! In other words, unlike Acts these cases are extremely specific.

Thus, Acts is not an account of a real court case. The language, the structure and purpose of the scene do not match with bona fide proceedings as we have them in the papyri. Therefore, because this scene is not an account of a real court case, Acts cannot be an example of judicial rhetoric. Neither can Acts be a piece of deliberative rhetoric because 1) the speeches of the characters are too short to present the audience with any specific information and 2) the audience is not being asked to decide on something, as if in assembly. Therefore, if it is not judicial, or deliberative rhetoric, this scene must be an example of epideictic rhetoric. By this is meant that this scene is being presented not in order to elicit a specific reaction, but to paint a picture for the purpose of changing the morals and beliefs of the audience through edification.[37]

What does the scene in Acts do? First, it is a scene that mimics orations. Second, it is a scene that mimics a court-document. Third, it is a scene that is a dependent portion of a longer work. From these we may derive their opposites: Acts is not oratory, it is not the proceedings of a court and it is not an independent text. Nor is it by definition judicial, or deliberative rhetoric. As with novelistic literary creations, the scene evokes the belief that it is judicial rhetoric. It is not history, but it evokes history to set the tone. It is not a court record, but it wants us to believe that Paul's case proceeded in such a dramatic manner. Because of this strange dichotomy, we must begin to look at surviving pieces of contemporary literature that say the same things about themselves in order to find Luke's purpose for creating this evocation and "wanting us to believe."

Acts and the Greek Novel

As it turns out, there is a body of literature that carries these same attributes, a body of literature that has been examined in recent years as to its relation to Acts as a text and a genre:

---

[37] Kennedy, *A New History of Classical Rhetoric* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), pp. 3 - 10. This is in stark contrast to martyr literature of the second, third and fourth centuries which does contain excellent examples of bona fide judicial rhetorical oration on the part of the martyrs, see G.W. Bowersock, *Martyrdom and Rome* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 23 - 39.

the ancient Greek novel.[38] To be specific, there is considerable congruence between this scene in Acts and similar "hearings" in the Greek novels. In particular, this shall be demonstrated by comparing what we have discovered about this scene in Acts with a similar scene (that takes place a similar point in the action) taken from the novel *Callirhoe*.[39]

In book five of *Callirhoe* there occurs the trial of Dionysius v. Mithridates. This case, which takes place before the great king of Babylon, is one where the accusation of adultery and theft abound. Dionysius, who has taken Callirhoe, already the victim of many incredible circumstances, as a wife, has accused Mithridates of attempting to steal the woman from him. There is a speech of accusation by Dionysius, and one of defense by Mithridates. The king directs the proceedings by having first the charge, then the defense, presented before him. The case is further confused when Mithridates states that he did not write the mysterious letter to Callirhoe that Dionysius uses as his evidence. Instead, Mithridates, when asked to prove his defense, performs a "deus ex machina-like" melodrama by presenting the real author of the letter, Chaereas, Callirhoe's original husband. At that point the court is adjourned and the resolution put off (indefinitely as it turns out, much as in Acts).[40]

In many ways it is like Paul's hearing before Felix. First, it has a procedure reminiscent of Acts wherein the magistrate directs the procedure only to the extent of indicating that first the plaintiff, then the defendant should speak, without much input of his own-- yet another divergence from the structure of the papyri. Second, as with Acts, the defense alleges that the charge is false, and (once more as in Acts) we know that this is so because we know that this is the context of these scenes. Third, as with Acts, the action is dramatic, the language is that of action rather than of the court. Fourth, the purpose of the scene, again as with Acts, is not the function, or administration of law, but the launching of the action of the story to the next situation and, ultimately, the final resolution of the action. In the case of *Callirhoe* the final resolution is that the young lovers get together and live happily ever after. In Acts the final resolution is that Paul, guiltless, is sent to Rome to witness for God "...two whole years at his own expense and welcomed all who came to him, proclaiming the kingdom of God and teaching about the Lord Jesus Christ with all boldness and without hindrance." And in the process, in the case of both works, we have been entertained and edified.

To reiterate this in the three-part model I used for the papyri and Acts, we find that this scene has much in common with the scene from Acts and little-- indeed nothing-- in common with the papyri. The plaintiff and defendant are not represented by advocates, as one would expect considering the date of the story's composition.[41] There are no words to distinguish this court of law, which is deciding a potentially capital case, from the everyday language of the royal chamber. In terms of structure as well there is little of the structure found in the papyri, but there is the structure we see in the scene in Acts. The king's only input (as with Felix) is to order first the

---

[38] Pervo, 1 - 11. As with Pervo, I am not trying to say that Acts is a novel, but I do think that it has many affinities with the novel. In other words, it is novelistic.

[39] Chariton *Callirhoe* 5.4 - 8, in Bryan P. Reardon, *Collected Ancient Greek Novels* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1989), 21 - 124.

[40] Ibid., 79 - 86.

[41] Recent consensus indicates a first century c.e. composition for Callirhoe's-- Ibid., 17 - 18; Niklas Holzberg, *The Ancient Novel: An Introduction* (New York: Routledge, 1995 (1986)), 43.

plaintiff to speak, then to ask the defendant to speak. The only persons named are those who are important to the story in general, characters who reappear through the rest of the action. The only evidence entered is the letter sent by Chaereas to Callirhoe. Even the servants of Mithridates who were part of the plot (and therefore are accessories) are absent. The scene ends much the same way as Acts does, for there is no resolution of this conflict because of the subsequent action and calamity. The decision of the judge is never rendered.

As for purpose, here again we have a match with the scene in Acts. The purpose of the court scene in *Callirhoe* has nothing whatsoever to do with the law and its administration. Rather the purpose of the "hearing" is only to move the action and change its direction. As a result of this scene the hero and heroine discover that the other is alive and the scene sets up the sub-plots necessary for the action to come to a happy resolution. The comparison of *Callirhoe* with Acts and against the model generated by the papyri demonstrates compellingly the affinity between this scene in Acts and the similar scene in *Callirhoe* and the differences both have with the papyri.

One can see the advantages of this comparative approach, both for actual legal texts and for structurally ambiguous texts. However, the primary advantage is that it enables us to take care of niggling questions about the text of Acts. For example, while people have tried to present the speeches of Tertullus and Paul as bona fide speeches from a court of law and have had to go to great lengths to preserve that idea, removing them to the world of the novel eliminates the need to present them as the actual speeches of actual people. Of course this does not eliminate the possibility that Paul really had a hearing before Felix in the fifties of the first century c.e. But it does eliminate the problem of tying that lost event with the theological rhetoric of Luke whose overarching purpose is the justification and proof of the success of Paul's gentile mission. Rather, these speeches can be placed more properly, and with far fewer problems, into the mold of the ancient novelist who was interested first in his own literary ability to utterly captivate the audience by his heroes' turns of phrases. Thus. just as the novelists were more interested in style and story than in veracity of their facts, so in the case of Acts were literary style and drama put to the task of explicating Luke's understanding of Paul's mission.

Conclusion

So, in the end there is only one compelling conclusion: this text, Acts 24:1 - 23 as we receive it is not a legal text, and therefore not an historical text. We know it is not a legal text because it does not have the language, the structure, or the purpose of legal texts such as those surviving accounts of the proceedings from the courts of the Roman era, the papyri. Indeed, the only times that formal law is even alluded to in this scene and its antecedents and descendants is to state that Paul has broken no law. We further know that it is not a legal text because it does not use the rhetoric of the court in more than a superficial manner-- Tertullus, who vanishes after he is done speaking, speaks too briefly and too vacantly to represent a good example of forensic style, Loesch's praise notwithstanding.[42] This scene, instead, functions, as do similar scenes in the novels, to move the action in new directions. The purpose of this scene, much as in *Callirhoe*, has nothing to do with the law, but everything to do with the movement of Paul from Judea to the center of the known world, Rome. Thus the purpose of the scene is literary and theological, not

---

[42] Stephan Loesch, quoted in Ernst Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1971), 657.

historical. As a literary work it is gripping. One sits at the edge of the chair anticipating what will happen. Besides, it is ultimately ironic, the audience is devastated by the knowledge that if he had not appealed, he would be free!

To return this analysis to the center of this discussion, that is of rhetoric and rhetorical analysis of Acts, I think that the evidence is compelling for a recategorization of Acts. This comparison and contrast between Acts, a text that has been thought to exhibit the characteristics of an historical account of a genuine trial, and real records of trials from the papyri, demonstrates that this scene from Acts in no way fits the category of legal record. The genre of the papyri is too different to warrant such a notion. From this can be deduced the conclusion that the rhetorical style of the passage, though superficially partaking of ancient forensic discourse, is simply imitating that style for dramatic purposes within the context of epideictic rhetorical discourse. That is to say that this scene is an edifying, novelistic piece of literature that dramatically proclaims Luke's understanding of Paul's mission to the gentile world.

Bibliography

Barns, J.W.B., et al. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, vol. 31. London: The Egypt Exploration Society, 1966.

Bowersock, G.W. *Martyrdom and Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Cadbury, Henry J. "Roman Law and the Trial of Paul" in *The Beginnings of Christianity; Part One: The Acts of the Apostles*. F.J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake, ed. Vol. V. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1933.

Cassidy, Richard J. *Society and Politics in the Acts of the Apostles*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1987.

Eitrem, S., and Leiv Amundsen. *Papyri Oslonensis*. 3 Vols. Oslo: Jacob Dybwad, 1931.

Garnsey, Peter. "The Criminal Jurisdiction of Governors," *JRS* 58 (1968), 51 - 59.

_____. "The *Lex Julia* and Appeals Under the Empire," *JRS* 56 (1966), 167 - 189.

_____. *Social Status and Legal Privilege in the Roman Empire*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1970.

Haenchen, E. *The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971.

Holzberg, Niklas. *The Ancient Novel: An Introduction*. Translated by Christine Jackson-Holzberg. New York: Routledge, 1995 (1986).

Hunt, A.S. and C.C. Edgar, ed. *Select Papyri, Vol. II Non-Literary Papyri, Public Documents*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1977.

Johnson, Luke Timothy. *The Acts of the Apostles*. Sacra Pagina Series Vol. 5. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1992.

Jones, A.H.M. *The Criminal Courts of the Roman Republic and Principate*. Totowa, NJ: Rowman and Littlefield, Publishers, 1972.

Kennedy, George. *Classical Rhetoric and its Christian and Secular Traditions from Ancient to Modern Times*. Chapel Hill: University of North Caroline, 1980.

_____. *A New History of Classical Rhetoric*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994.

_____. *New Testament Interpretation Through Rhetorical Criticism*. Chapel

Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1984.

Kohlenberger, John R. III, Edward W. Goodrick, James A. Swanson. *The Exhaustive Concordance to the Greek New Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1995.

Luedemann, Gerd. *Early Christianity According to the Traditions in Acts: A Commentary*. Trans. John Bowden. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1989 (1987).

Mommsen, Theodore. "Die Rechtsverhaeltnisse des Apostels Paulus," *Zeitschrift fuer die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 2 (1901), 81 - 96.

Pervo, Richard I. *Profit With Delight: The Literary Genre of the Acts of the Apostles*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987.

Rajak, Tessa. "Was There a Roman Charter for the Jews?," *JRS* 74 (1984), 107 - 123.

Rapske, Brian J. *The Book of Acts and Paul in Roman Custody*. Vol. III of The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eeardmans Publishing Co., 1994.

Reardon. Bryan P., ed. *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*. Berkley, CA: University of California Press, 1989.

Strachan-Davidson, James L. *Problems of the Roman Criminal Law*. Amsterdam: Editions RODOPI, 1969 (1912).

Talbert, Charles H., ed. *Luke - Acts: New Perspectives from the Society of Biblical Literature Seminar*. New York: Crossroad, 1984.

Taubenschlag, Raphael. *The Law of Greco-Roman Egypt in the Light of the Papyri: 332 BC - 640 AD*. New York: Herald Square Press, Inc., 1944.

Trites, A.A. "The Importance of Legal Scenes and Language in the Book of Acts," *Novum Testamentum* 16 (1974), 278 - 284.

Watson, Alan. *The State, Law, and Religion: Pagan Rome*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1992.

The Persuasive Moment: Rhetorical Resolutions in Paul's Defense Before Agrippa

Frank Crouch, Duke University

Reading Paul's final defense before Agrippa (Acts 25:23–26:32) in light of ancient rhetoric allows one to see ways in which Acts' presentation of a Christian message could have been convincing to ancient readers. While this paper will consider the form of Paul's speech, the primary emphasis will lie on the dynamics of its rhetoric and the speech's potential persuasiveness.

The paper will draw on ancient rhetorical handbooks in a manner consistent with their actual purpose—not as a source for determining proper forms or classifications of arguments, but as a source for determining the most persuasive ways a topic could be presented or a point could be argued. For Greco-Roman rhetoricians, rhetorical function took priority over rhetorical form. The forms found in rhetorical handbooks were presented as means to an end, being derived from an analysis of speeches and writings that had already actually persuaded people. As Quintilian asserts, "the precepts of oratory are not established by laws or public decrees, but whatever is contained in them was discovered by expediency" (*Institutes* II.xiii.6).[1] The rules and the forms were highly goal-directed, providing a structure through which persuasion might take place. The handbooks could supply "patterns of persuasion," but persuasion itself only occurred during the interplay of speaker, listener, and speech. Any form could be forsaken in order to achieve one's desired effect. "I shall not deny that it is in general of service to attend to rules, or I should not write any; but if expediency shall suggest anything at variance with them, we shall have to follow it, deserting the authority of teachers" (*Institutes* II.xii.7).

A rhetorical analysis that over-emphasizes formal characteristics and technical distinctions can focus so closely on the "logos" of an oration that it misses the "pathos" that was crucial to the persuasive moment. Cicero urged speakers to find a way to induce their audience "to be swayed by something resembling a mental impulse or emotion, rather than by judgment or deliberation. For men decide far more problems by hate, or love, or lust, or rage, or sorrow, or joy, or hope, or fear, or illusion, or some other inward emotion, than by reality or authority, or any legal standard, or judicial precedent or statute" (*De Oratore* II.xli.178). To understand the power and allure of rhetoric one must explore the ways in which technical aspects served persuasive functions, influencing people to make "this" decision rather than another, and providing speakers and writers with the means of moving their audiences in the ways they wanted them to go.

---

[1] *The Institutio Oratoria of Quintilian* (trans. H. E. Butler; LCL, 4 vols.; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1920); see also *Institutes* II.xiii.1-2. Cf. Cicero, *De Oratore* II.xxiii.98; Cicero, *De Oratore* (trans. E. W. Sutton and H. Rackham; LCL, 2 vols.; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1942).

Paul's Defense Before Agrippa

As is well-documented, since Greco-Roman historians often created or modified speeches to serve their historical interests,[2] one cannot be certain that this speech actually represents the words of Paul. However, it certainly represents Paul as Luke wished him to be perceived. The uncertain historicity of the speech does not affect this analysis, since the analysis focuses on the speech's rhetorical processes. Whether the words are Paul's or Luke's, they conform to Greco-Roman conventions, and a rhetorical analysis can reveal ways they would have appealed to ancient readers. In this analysis, the speech's rhetoric will be explored as if it were actually delivered by Paul, though, ultimately its rhetorical functions will be described on the basis of its place within the overall structure of Acts.

The speech is set within the context of a lengthy legal process. Paul appears before Agrippa and the people in the course of his appeal to Caesar (25:23-7). He speaks as a solitary prisoner addressing a crowd of strangers. However, Paul does not technically stand under trial as he delivers this speech. An unofficial hearing has been convened in order to clarify matters for Agrippa and especially for Festus, the governor, who must write a report on Paul for the emperor. At the same time, even though Festus opens the proceedings with a declaration of Paul's innocence (25:25), and even though no sentence will be passed after this speech, Paul's opponents are calling for his execution. Thus, the stakes are high for Paul as Agrippa gives him permission to begin his defense.

The speech's brevity hinders the attempt to discern a traditional format, though one could divide the speech into an Introduction (26:2-3), a Narration (26:4-8), a Proof (26:9-18), and an Epilogue (26:19-23). The interruption by Festus (26:24) further complicates the attempt to find the speech's structure, since within the narrative world of the account it is not clear that Paul has finished his speech.[3] However, as noted before, structure was secondary to persuasion.

Paul begins with a traditional captatio benevolentiae, for he stands before a king and addresses a group of strangers. Not having any prior history with his audience upon which to draw, he must quickly establish a favorable connection with his listeners. Quintilian advised that if some part of a case would appeal to or conciliate a judge, it should be mentioned at the very beginning of one's defense (*Institutes* IV.i.23). Paul expresses his good fortune at being able to present his case before Agrippa, who is familiar

---

[2] Martin Dibelius wrote the classic exposition of this in "The Speeches in Acts and Ancient Historiography," *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles* (New York: Charles Scribners Sons, 1956).

[3] David Aune divides the speech into captatio benevolentiae (26:2-3), Narration (26:4-13), Proof (26:19-23), then the interruption prevents the Epilogue, *The New Testament in Its Literary Environment* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1987) 126.

with the customs and controversies of the Jews. He then asks for Agrippa's patience as he speaks.

He begins his Narration with an immediate appeal to the goodness of his character. Paul's good character must be immediately established, for, as Aristotle stated, character is the primary standard by which every speaker's persuasiveness is judged. "We believe good men more fully and readily than others; this is generally true whatever the question is, and absolutely true where exact certainty is impossible and opinions are divided" (*Rhetoric* I.2.1356a 6-8 [Roberts]).[4] In fact, a speaker's "character may almost be called the most effective means of persuasion he possesses" (*Rhetoric* I.2.1356a 13 [Roberts]).[5] A proof based on ethos worked well because the Romans believed generally that character dictates actions.[6] Further, since character was considered to be, on the whole, unchanging, it was "difficult, if not impossible, for a man to perform actions inconsistent with or outside his previously manifested ethos."[7] Aristotle stated that when a person is suspected of a crime, fairness and equity demand that the judges "ask not what a man is now but what he has always or usually been" (*Rhetoric* I.13.1374b 15 [Roberts]).

Thus, it is imperative for Paul to establish his good character, but he faces the rhetorical dilemma of addressing a crowd composed completely of strangers and accusers. He cannot appeal to his audience's past knowledge of his actions, and he has no one present to speak on his behalf. Thus, he faces the difficult task of serving as his own character witness. He attacks this problem with the bold rhetorical move of calling upon his accusers to serve as his character witnesses. His way of life, he says, from his youth is known to all the Jews (26:4). They have long known, if they are willing to bear witness, that as a Pharisee he has lived by the strictest standards of his religion (26:5). This appeal to his accusers overcomes the ignorance of his listeners with a daring argument from probability. If Paul did not have a sterling character, he would not be likely to cite his accusers as his witnesses. Anyone can get friends to testify, but only if Paul were sure of his innocence would he call as witnesses the very people who brought him to trial. Faced with the unhappy prospect of serving as his only witness— a decidedly weak position—he strengthens his case by evoking in the minds of his hearers the image of other witnesses. In some ways, these witness are better than "real" ones. Since these "witnesses" exist only as a product of Paul's rhetorical creation, they, of course, agree

---

[4] Aristotle, *The Rhetoric and the Poetics of Aristotle* (trans. W. Rhys. Roberts and Ingram Bywater; The Modern Library; New York: Random House, 1984).

[5] See also, Cicero, *De Oratore* II.xliii.184, and Quintilian, *Institutes* V.xii.9-13.

[6] James May, *Trials of Character: The Eloquence of Ciceronian Ethos* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988) 20-21.

[7] Ibid. 26.

completely with his assessment. Since they do not actually stand up and speak in their own words, in the minds of the audience they speak with the words of Paul and "confirm" his claims.

Paul then bolsters his position by affirming the antiquity of the beliefs that motivate his actions. He does not act upon his own authority, but with the authority of his ancestors and of God (26:7). His defense here appeals to commonplaces that any Greco-Roman audience would recognize as true. As noted in Theon's *Progymnasmata*, actions are justified if they occur "in accordance with nature and the common habits and customs of all people" or if they are "acceptable either to gods or to ancestors" (XI.44, 54-5).[8] Paul's commonplaces are somewhat problematic since he appeals to Jewish beliefs that were not necessarily the beliefs of the Greco-Roman world at large or the beliefs of the majority of this specific audience. But, Paul has already invoked Agrippa as an "authority" on Jewish customs (26:3), so, once again, as long as Agrippa does not object, his silent listening can be assumed by the rest of the audience to be agreement with Paul's argument. Thus, even if the customs to which Paul refers are not well-known to a Greco-Roman audience, the silent, but "official" acceptance by Agrippa would lend validity to Paul's appeal to the ancient religion of his people.

After establishing the propriety of his motives, Paul asks a rhetorical question that raises the central issue for which he is being tried—"Why is it judged unbelievable by you that God raises the dead?" (26:8). Paul faces another difficult rhetorical hurdle if he wishes to base his defense on the probability of a unique event that defies common experience. Cicero advises, "It is of the greatest importance to inquire what is possible and what is impossible of achievement ... for all debate is at once cut short by the realization that a thing is impossible" (*De Oratore* II.lxxxii.336). Paul completely forfeits his credibility unless he can establish some degree of probability for his claim.

The phrasing of his rhetorical question helps his defense. He does not ask why it would be unbelievable that people could come back from the dead. He asks why it would be unbelievable that *God* could enable people to come back from the dead. If one considers the power of God, the hypothetical possibility of resurrection becomes much stronger. Why would anyone doubt that God could do that? Theon, in his discussion of "thesis," lists reasons that support the idea that the gods provide for the world (*Progymnasmata* XI, 177-239). One commonplace support for the idea, which can be stated "without any explanatory material," asserts that it would be easy for the gods to provide for the world (XI, 179-80). Assertions about possible activities of the gods need no explanation, for what would not be easy for the gods (or, in Paul's case, for God) to accomplish? The phrasing of the rhetorical question does not prove the fact of the resur-

---

[8] *The Progymnasmata of Theon: A New Text with Translation and Commentary* (ed. and trans. James R. Butts; Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International, 1987).

rection, but it does not have to. By invoking the potential power of God, he can side-step his audience's potential incredulity regarding resurrection and offer it as a defensible hypothetical possibility.

Paul does not leave his argument there, however. He momentarily sides with his audience by acknowledging that his belief strains credulity. Of course it might seem preposterous to proclaim the resurrection of Jesus. In fact, it once seemed so offensive to him that he, too, sought to put people to death who proclaimed it (26:9-11). This recital of his previous hatred for those who believed in the resurrection strengthens his current position of belief. If a ruthless persecutor can be persuaded, there might be reason for judges or casual listeners to consider the idea as well.

In his Proof (26:9-18), Paul tells a story explaining why he changed from persecutor to preacher. The story contains the essential elements of narrative common to ancient rhetoric: character, action, place, time, manner, and cause (*Progymnasmata* V.5-38, 477-81). For example, the character—Paul (Saul, in the story); the action—a journey to Damascus; the cause—he was sent by the chief priests; the time—midday; the place—along the road; another event—he saw a light; the manner—a light from heaven shining brighter than the sun; characters involved—Paul and those on the journey with him; and so forth. Thus, the elements of the story would have been satisfactorily complete to Paul's listeners (and to the readers of Acts).

The description of the voice that speaks to him and the words that it says provides an intriguing blend of Jewish, Christian, and Greco-Roman elements. The voice speaks in Hebrew but it quotes a Greco-Roman proverb, "it hurts you to kick against the goads."[9] The use of Hebrew by the divine voice maintains the connection between Paul and his foreign, but ancient, religious tradition. Strikingly, however, even the Hebrew-speaking divine voice uses Greco-Roman conventions of speech. In the midst of the narration of such an unusual incident, words familiar to a Roman audience appear and establish a link with everyday experience.

Paul's proof of the resurrection comes with the identification of the voice as the voice of Jesus (26:15). The one who had died now spoke to Paul and commissioned him to bear witness to what he had seen. This divine source for his activities provides additional ground upon which to base his defense. In the midst of a society that treasured ancient ideas and mistrusted new ones, Paul (and the author of Acts and the early church) faced the difficult task of maintaining that these teachings were both ancient, and therefore trustworthy, *and* new, and therefore distinctive. He implicitly argues that he acts according to an ancient hope that had only recently come to fulfillment. If his ideas seem strange, nonetheless, he argues, they originated from divine authority.

---

[9] Commentators often cite the Greco-Roman background of this proverb. Dibelius gives thorough documentation in "Literary Allusions in the Speeches in Acts," *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles*, 188-91.

The divine authority for Paul's proclamation, however, does not resolve all difficulties, since his message still has the taint of "newness." Theon, when offering a list of commonplace ideas that could support a thesis, advises that one can argue that "5) we do not act alone, but many others also do it; next that 6) we are not the first, but there have even been many before us" (*Progymnasmata* XI, 49-51). Paul cannot make that claim. Even though the general belief in resurrection is ancient, the belief in Jesus' resurrection is new. If Paul is on trial for his proclamation, the newness of his message increases the difficulty of his position. Aristotle asserts as a general principle, "Again, a man's crime is worse if he has been the first man, or the only man, or almost the only man to commit it" (*Rhetoric* I.14.1375a 2-4 [Roberts]).

Paul must depend on other commonplace arguments for his defense: "But if we do act alone or first, [we say] that 7) it is at least much better to have initiated noble deeds ... Then that 8) it is appropriate; then that 9) it is just; then that 10) it is holy. And this last argument is double, for it is acceptable either to gods or ancestors" (*Progymnasmata* XI, 51-5). Paul uses such arguments throughout the rest of his oration. The voice of Jesus commissioned him to preach to the Gentiles, to turn them from darkness to light and from the power of Satan to God, so that they might receive forgiveness of sins and a place with those who are sanctified (26:18). Such a task would be appropriate, noble, just, and holy all at once. His activity is both innocent and justified, hardly the grounds for execution.

Paul begins his Epilogue with a direct address to Agrippa, "Thus, O King Agrippa, I was not disobedient to the heavenly vision" (26:19). He had acted appropriately in response to a divine command. What else could he have done once he had seen such a vision? Paul employs a highly recommended defense. Hermogenes advised that if one has intentionally done wrong—and Paul had clearly intended to preach the resurrection—he or she should plea for leniency by either accepting the responsibility for the action or transferring responsibility to another thing or person who is "capable of being blameworthy."[10] Placing responsibility for his actions upon the divine voice transforms his "guilt" into justification. Cicero advised a similar defense—"Now all acts may be defended as justifiable which are such that the doing thereof was a duty, or permissible, or necessary" (*De Oratore* II.xxv.106). The divine vision imposed necessity upon the one who beheld it. Aristotle advised judges to consider whether the accused could have taken a better course than the one he or she has taken (*Rhetoric* II.23.1400a 25 [Roberts]). Paul stands on firm ground when he declares his obedience to the vision. Who would advise taking a different course from obedience to God?

---

10 Raymond Nadeau, "Hermogenes *On Stasis*, A Translation with an Introduction and Notes," *Speech Monographs* 31 (1964) 394.

Paul reiterates his response to the vision (26:20). He preached in Damascus, Jerusalem, the countryside of Judea, and also to Gentiles, calling upon them to repent and turn to God and do deeds worthy of repentance. Again, the audience should easily see that his motives and deeds were appropriate, noble, and holy. Yet, because of his preaching, his opponents (unreasonably) seized him and tried to kill him (26:21). At this point in the speech, Paul's focus on the reasonableness of his actions, in contrast to the actions of his opponents, could bring the audience over to his side. He could offer the defense that Festus had already mentioned—that Paul had not been brought to trial because he had committed crimes, but because he had religious differences with his opponents. Proclaiming a message of resurrection in response to a divine imperative does not break any laws. Paul stands in line with a defense rather sardonically stated by Hermogenes—one can argue whether it is fitting to be brought to trial for actions that no law has forbidden.[11]

Paul concludes his defense by proclaiming that he has continually received help from God until this very day (26:22). In addition, he does not only have God on his side, but he invokes the approval of the prophets and Moses as well. Aristotle allowed one, in a forensic speech, to claim as witnesses "poets and all other notable person whose judgments are known to all" (*Rhetoric* I.15.1376a 17-20 [Roberts]). Paul's citation of the prophets and Moses would suffer from the fact that knowledge or recognition of their authority would be primarily restricted to those who were familiar with Jewish or Christian beliefs. Greco-Roman lists of authoritative writers and great men and women, not surprisingly, do not mention any biblical characters.[12] However, Paul can once again rely on Agrippa's silent, but eloquent, assent to validate the authority of his otherwise unfamiliar witnesses.

Unfortunately, whatever ground Paul has gained by focusing on the reasonableness of his actions is quickly lost when he repeats his belief in the resurrection of Jesus from the dead (26:23). At least, he loses any ground he has gained with Festus. Upon hearing again the idea of Jesus' resurrection, Festus interrupts, exclaiming, "Paul, you are mad; your great learning is turning you mad!" (26:24). Paul replies, "I am not mad, but I am declaring opinions truly and with self control" (26:25). Paul's only "madness" occurred when he formerly persecuted the church. Now he acts with full possession of his faculties. In fact, once again boldly putting words into Agrippa's mouth, Paul asserts that even

---

[11] Ibid. 407.

[12] Dio Chrysostom, *Dio Chrysostom* (trans. J. W. Cohoon and L. L. Crosby; LCL, 5 vols.; New York: G. O. Putnam's Sons, 1932-51) Or. 18.6-7; see also Quintilian, *Institutes* X.I.20-1.

the king will support his claims, for none of the things he has mentioned have escaped Agrippa's notice, for this was not done in a corner (26:26).[13]

At this point, the narrative dispenses with forensic rhetoric and defense. The focus turns away from Paul and centers directly upon Agrippa. Paul's persuasive moment abruptly transforms into an evangelical moment. "King Agrippa, do you believe the prophets? I know that you believe" (26:28). When Agrippa demurs and exclaims that Paul seeks to make him a Christian, Paul answers, "I only wish by God, either in a little while or a long while, that not only you but also all who are hearing me today would become such as I am—except for these chains" (26:28-9). Paul's last words, though not technically part of his speech, establish a link between his motives and actions and the good of the people. Paul only wants to act according to the best interests of his listeners.

Following the interruption by Festus, rhetorical function gives way almost completely to narrative function. Though Paul's speech is rhetorically impressive and speaks powerfully for his innocence in terms that any Greco-Roman audience could understand, his innocence is never really in doubt. He had been proclaimed innocent by Festus before his defense even began (25:25) and he will be declared innocent again by Agrippa and those who were with him (26:30-2). Since Paul's hearers clearly accept his innocence, the more urgent question becomes their willingness to accept his message. Paul remains obedient to the divine imperative to proclaim the message of resurrection, even while being tried for that very act of proclamation. The real narrative interest in Paul's defense lies in the final interchanges between Paul and his two most eminent listeners. The unofficial hearing to gauge the innocence of his conduct has been seized by Paul (and the narrator) as an opportunity for a sermon. Thus, the hearing serves as a narrative vehicle that not only displays Paul's innocence, but, more importantly, distributes Paul's message. Rather than being trapped in an uncertain legal process, Paul takes advantage of his evangelical opportunities before this audience and, his obedience to the vision will eventually provide another opportunity before an audience in Rome.

Conclusion

Acts' depiction of Paul's defense before Agrippa draws on conventional Greco-Roman rhetorical conventions that serve a larger narrative purpose. It relates an "ethical narrative" of his actions that portrays the exemplary nature of his character. It overcomes the embarrassing and difficult hurdle of establishing his goodness before an audience of strangers by invoking a silent, but rhetorically effective, "assent" to his character on the part of his accusers. It also overcomes the audience's ignorance of his tradition and per-

---

13 Abraham Malherbe's article, "'Not in a Corner': Early Christian Apologetic in Acts 26:26," *SecCent* 5 (1985/6) 193-210, documents the apologetic significance of this phrase. It could serve as a rhetorically effective bridge between the nature of Paul's actions and the sympathies of a Greco-Roman audience.

spective by invoking the silent, but significant, "validation" of his tradition with an appeal to Agrippa's expertise in Jewish customs. It acknowledges that the audience might disagree with Paul's beliefs, an acknowledgment that could alleviate potential hostility or rejection. At the same time, an argument from probability gains a foothold for the defensibility of his beliefs, at least in theory. The recitation of Paul's obedience to a divine vision imputes an unimpeachable motive to his activities, which are portrayed as reasonable, appropriate, and holy. This gives the defense an implicit tone that says, "I don't know why they attacked him. They hated him without cause." Finally, the speech functions within the narrative not only as a proof of Paul's innocence on Greco-Roman terms, but as an evangelistic appeal to a Greco-Roman audience. The speech, on its own, could convince readers of Paul's innocence. However, the speech also serves a larger rhetorical purpose for the narrative. At the end of the hearing, the focus turns to the response of the audience, not to the question of innocence, but to the question of the truth of Paul's message. Using pre-existing modes of argumentation and persuasion, the narrative's rhetoric could potentially convince readers not only that Paul's activities were innocent, but, more important, that his message was true and worthy of belief.

Selected Bibliography

Aristotle. *The Rhetoric and the Poetics of Aristotle*. Trans. W. Rhys Roberts and Ingram Bywater. The Modern Library. New York: Random House, 1984.

Aune, David. *Greco-Roman Literature and the New Testament*. SBL Sources for Biblical Study, ed. Bernard B. Scott, no. 21. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988.

----------. *The New Testament in Its Literary Environment*. Library of Early Christianity, ed. Wayne A. Meeks, vol. 8. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1987.

Butts, James R., ed. and trans. *The "Progymnasmata" of Theon: A New Text with Translation and Commentary*. Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International, 1987.

Chrysostom, Dio. *Dio Chrysostom*. 5 vols. Trans. J. W. Cohoon and L. L. Crosby. LCL. New York: G. O. Putnam's Sons, 1932-51.

Cicero, *De Oratore*. 2 vols. Trans. E. W. Sutton and H. Rackham. LCL. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1942.

Dibelius, Martin. *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles*. Ed. Heinrich Greeven. New York: Charles Scribners Sons, 1956.

Downing, Gerald F. "Common Ground With Paganism in Luke and in Josephus." *NTS* 28 (1982) 546-59.

----------. "Ethical Pagan Theism and the Speeches in Acts." *NTS* (1981) 544-63.

Kennedy, George. *New Testament Interpretation Through Rhetorical Criticism*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1984.

Kilgalen, J. J. "Paul Before Agrippa (Acts 26, 2-23): Some Considerations." *Biblica* 69 (1988) 170-95.

Mack, Burton and Vernon K. Robbins. *Patterns of Persuasion in the Gospels*. Sonoma, CA: Polebridge, 1989.

Malherbe, Abraham. "'Not in a Corner': Early Christian Apologetic in Acts 26:26." *SecCent* 5 (1986/6) 193-210.

Markus, R. A. "The Problem of Self-Definition: From Sect to Church." *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition*, vol. 1. Ed. E. P. Sanders. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980.

Raymond Nadeau, "Hermogenes *On Stasis*, A Translation with an Introduction and Notes," *Speech Monographs* 31 (1964) 361-424.

Quintilian. *The Institutio Oratoria of Quintilian*. 4 vols. Trans. H. E. Butler. LCL. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1920.

Sattler, William. "Conceptions of Ethos in Ancient Times." *Speech Monographs* 14 (1947) 55-65.

Schubert, Paul. "The Final Cycle of Speeches in the Book of Acts." *JBL* 77 (1968) 1-16.

Trites, Allison A. "The Importance of Legal Scenes and Language in the Book of Acts." *NovT* 16 (1974) 278-84.

The Unknown Paul: Philosophers and Sophists in Acts 17

Mark D. Given
The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

I wish to set the stage for my pursuit of the unknown Paul of Acts 17 with some short excerpts from Ernst Haenchen's commentary, *The Acts of the Apostles*, specifically from chapter forty-one which covers the scene of "Paul in Athens."

> συμβάλλω can mean "to converse with" but also to "engage in an argument" (Bauer, *Wb* 1539). This double meaning or lack of sharpness in the description continues all through and is part of the individual character of this scene . . .[1]

> . . . above all we should not overlook the allusive references to Socrates: Paul speaks in the marketplace to every man--like Socrates. They think he is introducing new gods--like Socrates. And Socrates came before the court on that account and was sentenced to death.[2]

> . . . Luke conjures up the shadow of Socrates . . .[3]

I want to highlight two points made in these excerpts. First, this entire scene is characterized by a pervasive ambiguity, even *double entendre*, as the use of συμβάλλω demonstrates. Second, the entire scene conjures up the shadow of Socrates, i.e. Paul is cast in the role of Socrates. My thesis is that these points are intimately related, and that recognition of this fact is crucial for recognizing the *sophistication* of Luke's Athenian literary menagerie and the unknown Paul who inhabits it.[4]

---

[1] Ernst Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971) 517.

[2] Haenchen, 527.

[3] Haenchen, 528.

[4] The fruitfulness of linking the Socratic allusions with the speech itself has also recently been demonstrated in an article by Karl Olav Sandnes ("Paul and Socrates: The Aim of Paul's Areopagus Speech," *JSNT* 50 [1993] 13-26). As the abstract succinctly states, "This article presents three arguments: (1) the rhetorical strategy to be used by a speaker faced with a critical audience was *insinuatio*, subtle approach, to speak with conceaiment; (2) Paul's way of introducing Jesus in this speech is surprisingly cryptic, and leaves the audience with questions; (3) the use of Socrates

We can begin by asking why it did not occur to Haenchen to connect these two important aspects of the scene--the linguistic presence of ambiguity and the ghostly presence of Socrates. Careful attention to where he does and does not find evidence of intentional ambiguity supplies the answer. Where Haenchen *does* find examples of "double meaning or lack of sharpness in description"is in the narrative framework of the scene. Where he *does not* find examples is in the discourse of the characters. The best illustration of this fact is his treatment of Paul's *captatio benevolentiae*, i.e. "currying of favor," in v. 22. Haenchen translates it as: "You Athenians, I see that you are highly religious in every way."[5] "Highly religious" is his rendition of δεισιδαιμονεστέρους, a highly ambiguous adjective that can be taken as a compliment, "very religious," or as an insult, "excessively religious," "superstitious." Haenchen concludes that "What is involved here, however, is not [the latter] meaning (which always has a flavour of reproach), but the cautiously appreciative 'religious'."[6] What Haenchen does, then, is to indulge in the classic either/or thinking that pervades interpretation of the Areopagus speech. The equivocal is rendered univocal. Danger is thus averted. What danger you may ask? The danger of presenting the image of a Paul who does not play fair with his audience. A Paul who intentionally deceives his audience with ambiguous language. In short, a Paul who cheats.

In an article which recently appeared in Brill's new journal *Biblical Interpretation*, I demonstrate that this use of δεισιδαιμονεστέρους is only the beginning of a series of double meanings in Paul's speech. As the speech continues and ". . . the orator says, 'What therefore you ignorantly worship, this I proclaim to you,' does he mean, 'What you worship unknowingly,' or 'What you worship improperly/shamefully'?"[7] ἀγνοῦντες can bear either connotation. Similarly, when the orator reaches his *peroration* in v. 20, "Does the phrase, 'the times of ignorance,' refer epistemologically to 'the times of misconception' or morally to 'the times of culpable error'?" ἄγνοια can bear either connotation. Does the orator say that God "overlooks" or "despises" the times of ignorance? ὑπεροράω can bear either connotation.[8] Once these ambiguities are recognized, the entire speech is transformed into a highly sophisticated doublespeak, understood one way by "the oratees, who are inquisitive and philosophically inclined pagans," and in quite another way by "the narratee, Theophilus, who, like the implied reader, is now, on the basis of

---

traditions found quite clearly in the prelude to the speech is seen as shedding light on Paul's indirect speaking in the speech itself. Paul's aim was to promote curiosity and elicit questions."

[5] Haenchen, 515.

[6] Haenchen, 520.

[7] Mark Given, "Not Either/Or but Both/And in Paul's Areopagus Speech," *Biblical Interpretation* 3,3 (Leiden: Brill, 1995) 366.

[8] The D manuscript replaces υπεριδων with παριδων, from παροράω. This verb could also be understood two ways. Either "God, having noticed the times of ignorance," or "God, having overlooked the times of ignorance." Either way the negative connotation of ὑπεροράω is avoided.

his reading of Acts up to this point, an insider."[9]

Once we recognize that what Luke gives us is a Paul who deceives his audience with intentional ambiguities, we are better prepared to see why the pervasive presence of ambiguity and the pervasive presence of Socrates in this scene are not unrelated. But first we must turn our attention to Socrates and ask to what sort of character Luke is likening his dialectical Paul. When Luke places the mantle of Socrates on Paul's shoulders, is it an unambiguously positive maneuver?

To judge from the remarks of New Testament scholars who have commented on Luke's Paul-Socrates equation, one would have to answer a resounding yes. And this positive appraisal of such an association also holds true for scholars who have found evidence of the Socratic philosophical tradition in the authentic letters of Paul. The prime example is Hans Dieter Betz who explicitly argues in his *Der Apostel Paulus und die socratische Tradition* that Paul conciously sides with philosophy in its great struggle with rhetoric/sophistry.[10] From the time of Plato, Greek, and later Roman, philosophers in the Socratic tradition sought to distinguish between their own philosophic rhetoric, one of truth and reality, and sophistic rhetoric, one of falsehood and mere appearance.[11] Indeed, Plato himself barely allowed the possibility that dialectic, which he considered the true philosophical discourse, could be called rhetoric at all, leaving Aristotle to describe a philosophic rhetoric that could then be distinguished from a sophistic one. But the influence of Plato's more extreme division was by no means limited to the classical period. The polemical dispute between philosophy and rhetoric had a continuous history for over two millenia, well into the eighteenth century when rhetoric ceased to be the crowning glory of a liberal education.[12]

The deceptive nature of this debate has received a fair amount of attention from classicists in recent years. As George Kennedy says,

---

[9] Given, 363. See p. 369 for discussion of how other terms in the peroration are rendered "undecidable" by the pervasive presence of ambiguity.

[10] Hans Dieter Betz, *Der Apostel Paulus und die socratische Tradition: Eine exegetische Untersuchung zu seiner "Apologie" 2 Korinther 10-13* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1972). E.g., "Windisch erkennt richtig die antisophistische Tendenz der paulinischen Argumentation. Im folgenden werden wir zu zeigen versuchen, daß Paulus hiermit in einer bis auf Socrates zurückgehenden Tradition steht" (14). And later, "Als 'μιμητής τοῦ Χριστοῦ' stellt [Paulus] sich also hinein in die Tradition des griechischen Humanismus und versteht sich mit dieser Tradition im Kampfe befindlich gegen das Programm der 'Sophisten'" (146).

[11] Betz, 14-42, provides a fine survey of much of this polemic from the time of Plato to Paul.

[12] "While Plato's hostility towards rhetoric, expressed over a thirty-year period, was idiosyncratic and extreme, the rivalry between the two disciplines persisted just as long as rhetoric was a living force. It flared up in the second century BC; again in the first century AD, in the movement known as the 'second Sophistic'; in the Middle Ages it formed part of the recurring 'Battles of the Liberal Arts'; in the Renaissance it was largely found in the humanists' attack on scholastic philosophy; while in later periods it has been the work of individuals rather than coherent groups" (Brian Vickers, *In Defence of Rhetoric* [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988] 148).

> Some modern readers sympathize with philosophy in its dispute with rhetoric. In the former discipline they see devotion to truth, intellectual honesty, depth of perception, consistency, and sincerity; in the later [*sic*], verbal dexterity, empty pomposity, triviality, moral ambivalence, and a desire to achieve self-interest by any means. *The picture is not quite so clear cut.*[13]

Indeed the greatest stumbling block to maintaining a clear cut binary opposition between philosophy and rhetoric is that opposition's very foundation--Plato's Socrates. Consider these remarks by prominent classicists found in Gregory Vlastos's recent authoritative treatment of the historical Socrates entitled *Socrates: Ironist and Moral Philosopher*.

> E. R. Dodds: "It looks rather as if Plato was content at this stage to let Socrates repay the Sophists in their own coin, as no doubt Socrates often did." Paul Friedländer: Socrates believes that to educate deluded persons "he must resort to dialectical tricks"; and he "knows how to deceive better than all the sophists." W. K. C. Guthrie: "Plato lets Socrates make a wickedly sophistical use of ambiguity when he likes." Charles Kahn: Socrates uses "dialectical trickery" to win his argument against Polus in *G*[*orgias*]. 474c-475c.[14]

These quotes stand at the beginning of a chapter titled "Does Socrates Cheat?" By no means does Vlastos himself want to endorse such opinions, and at times it sounds as if he is writing yet another apology for Socrates. Nevertheless, his own strategy for refuting the charge that Socrates was cunning and deceptive strongly confirms that in some ways the charge is undeniably true. According to Vlastos,

> What creates the problem is the Socrates of Plato's earlier dialogues--complicated, devious, cunning, and not averse to playing pranks on his interlocutors upon occasion. Does *he* remain always free of resort to deceit? I want to argue that he always does *when arguing seriously*: this is the all important qualification.[15]

And how can we know when Socrates is serious? ". . . *when Socrates is searching for the right way to live, in circumstances in which it is reasonable for him to think of the search as obedience*

---

[13] George A. Kennedy, *A New History of Classical Rhetoric* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994) 9. Italics mine.

[14] Gregory Vlastos, *Socrates: Ironist and Moral Philosopher* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991) 132.

[15] Vlastos, 133-134.

to divine command, his argument cannot involve wilful untruth."[16] How comforting it would have been for the often thoroughly duped interlocutors of Socrates to have known this! For instance those involved in the *Protagoras*, a veritable war of words between Socrates and the great sophist named in the title. Vlastos admits that Socrates enters into this contest with complete prognostication of Vince Lombardi's famous sporting logion, "Winning isn't everything; it is the only thing." The contest begins with an opening speech by Protagoras, a masterful exhibition, featuring, among other things, some brilliant interpretations of Simonidean poetry. The speech is greeted with loud applause and Socrates feels like he has received a knock out blow. Then, as Vlastos explains,

> To recover from the set-back [Socrates] tries a brazen maneuver and succeeds in pulling it off: he has the effrontery to claim that when the poet says "it is hard to be good" he is using "hard" (χαλεπόν) to mean "bad"--a willful travesty of the poet's meaning, for which he nonetheless manages to win support by wheedling endorsement for it from a distinguished member of the company, Prodicus, master of the "correct use of words."[17]

Vlastos goes on to note Socrates' thoroughly tongue-in-cheek representation of the anti-intellectual Sparta as "doing more than any other Greek state to foster philosophy."[18] Vlastos concludes that "It can hardly be disputed that throughout this performance Socrates is pulling the wool over his hearers' eyes. What is his game? Irony, certainly, but irony put to a very special use: mockery elaborately played out in sly concealment of its mocking intent."[19] But Vlastos sees a great divide between the impression Socrates' performance made on outsiders as opposed to insiders. Thus,

> . . . when Alcibiades [one of Socrates' companions] hears Socrates say poker-faced that it is bad to be good he knows that someone's leg is being pulled. But others in the company who are not in the know would be easily fooled. No signal of irony would come across to them from the wild constructions Socrates puts on Simonides' verse. Nor would they have any way of knowing that the tale about the Spartans was a spoof. Only at the end of his long speech does Socrates give away the information from which his hearers, if they had the wit, could figure out that

[16] Vlastos, 134.

[17] Vlastos, 135.

[18] Vlastos, 136.

[19] Vlastos, 136.

he had been putting on an act.[20]

Let us remember that Vlastos set out to defend Socrates against the charge of arguing like a sophist. And so, in light of all of these frank admissions of Socrates' devious dialectical stratagems, I must conclude that Vlastos is not a sophist. Would you wish to be defended in an Athenian court by someone who admits that the charges that you are cunning and deceptive are true except when you are being serious?

Now we are ready to return to our question. Is the pervasive presence of ambiguity and the allusive presence of Socrates in the scene of Paul in Athens intimately related? Surely.

Luke decides to have Paul encounter some Epicureans and Stoics. The very recent introduction (17:2) and repetition (17:17) of the image of Paul as dialectician is surely a prelude to this encounter. Ten of the thirteen occurrences of διαλέγομαι in the New Testament are found in Acts, where they always refer to Paul (17:2,17; 18:4,19; 19:8,9; 20:7,9; 24:12,25). The first occurrence in 17:2 refers to his dialoguing in the synagogue of Thessalonica on three Sabbaths. In 17:17 he dialogues both in the synagogue and the agora. It is hardly accidental that Luke has introduced this word at just this time and restricted it to Paul. For Luke, Paul is the first and foremost Christian dialectician. Only Apollos is given a similar, though by no means equal, honor. Apollos' "powerful refutations" (διακατελέγχομαι) are mentioned but not narrated (18:28). Paul, on the other hand, dialogues with Jews (17:2,17; 18:4,19; 19:8), philosophers and other frequenters of the Athenian agora (17:17-18), attendees of his formal lecture series in the Hall of Tyrannus (19:9), fellow workers (20:7,9), and a Roman governor (24:25).

While commentators invariably concentrate upon the contrasting cosmological and theological ideas of the Epicureans and Stoics, as well as the relative incompatibility or compatibility of their ideas with those expressed in the ensuing speech, what is missed is the *rhetorical* significance of a dialectical Paul confronting representatives of the two philosophical schools which had the least in common where general linguistic theory, particularly dialectic, was concerned. While Epicurus, and the school he founded, was lampooned by rival schools for a naive and totally inadequate theory of language, the Stoics were, and still are, recognized as having the most highly developed linguistic theory in the history of Greco-Roman philosophy. They were indeed the philosophers of the Word (λόγος), and they were especially renowned for their dialectic. The Stoic stress on mastery of linguistic theory and lexical precision is certainly related to the fact that they provide the first surviving definition of the linguistic phenomenon known as ambiguity (ἀμφιβολία), one that is remarkable for its "complexity, subtlety, and precision."[21] Why were the Stoics the ones to take such a keen interest in this subject? As the

---

[20] Vlastos, 137.

[21] Catherine Atherton, *The Stoics on Ambiguity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993) 1.

Atherton explains,

> Stoic interest in ambiguity was the inevitable consequence of the basic doctrines about human nature, language, and rationality on which the whole Stoic system was based. . . . The point was that seeing or missing an ambiguity could make a difference to one's general success as a human being.[22]
>
> . . . Like other Hellenistic philosophies, Stoicism was above all a theory for expounding and recommending a way of life; . . . Since happiness consists in moral goodness, and human good is perfected rationality, any failure to recognise ambiguities in philosophical argument, disquisition, or exposition, can result, not in some minor intellectual error--a botched definition or a shaky conclusion--but, by way of deep conceptual confusions, in blocking access to the truths and supporting proofs which systematically define and explain the governing principles of the universe, and the comprehension of which guarantees correct, successful conduct of an individual life.[23]

Since they were the first philosophical school to study the subject systematically, it is perhaps not surprising that the Stoics took considerable pride in their ability to detect ambiguities, whether intentional or accidental. As Atherton has stated,

> Stoic dialectic is able to distinguish what is said ambiguously (D.L. 7.47 (31B7)), as if nothing else could, and no person but the man with dialectical knowledge--an extraordinary claim, whose remarkableness lies rather in its ambition than its uniqueness. Behind it lie Stoicism's pretentions to authoritativeness in philosophy, in the principles of science, and in all linguistic matters.[24]

Epicurus' attitude toward dialectic and the importance of detecting ambiguity was quite different. Both Diogenes Laertius and Cicero provide evidence that,

> Epicurus' famous hostility to dialectic (*e.g.* D.L. 10.31(191); Cicero *acad.* 2.97 (201)) was blamed for his failure to teach "how ambiguities are distinguished", "qua via . . . ambigua distinguantur", or to fix the meaning of such a key term as

---

[22] Atherton, 2-3.

[23] Atherton, 129.

[24] Atherton, 127.

> *pleasure* despite his frequent assertion "that the force of words should be carefully expressed", "diligentia oportere exprimi quae vis subiecta sit vocibus" (Cicero *fin.* 1.6, 22 (19H)).[25]

In light of the well known Stoic pretensions to dialectical mastery and expertise in detecting ambiguities and sophisms, as well as the equally well known shortcomings of the Epicureans in such matters, Luke's casting of Paul in the role of Socrates, the returned father of dialectic, can hardly be coincidental or innocent. In the opening encounter in the agora, his point is not simply to link Paul with Socrates as one who dialogues, but also to portray the Athenian philosophers as grossly misunderstanding Paul's message as the proclamation of a new god and goddess precisely through their failure to disambiguate *anastasis*. In the speech, Luke's point is not simply to link Paul with Socrates as one who appeared before the Athenian court, but also to portray the Athenian intellectuals as victims of sophistic verbal cunning through their failure to recognize Paul's "wickedly sophistical use of ambiguity," to borrow Guthrie's expression.

Fowler's *Modern English Usage* defines "Socratic Irony" as "a form of utterance that postulates a double audience, consisting of one party that hearing shall hear and not understand, and another party that, when more is meant than meets the ear, is aware both of that more and the outsiders' incomprehension."[26] Or, in other words, Socratic irony is "the use of words intended to convey one meaning to the uninitiated part of the audience and another to the initiated, the delight of it lying in the secret intimacy set up between the latter and the speaker."[27] And what of those Platonic dialogues where there is no initiated audience, only Socrates and his interlocutor? According to Vlastos, "The ironies with which Socrates plies his interlocutor in each of those dialogues, lost on his interlocutor, are certainly not meant by Plato to be lost on the readers: they are the 'initiated' who are meant to grasp the meaning that eludes the interlocutor's comprehension."[28]

While Vlastos would like to deny such high-handed sophistic concealment to the historical Socrates, at least when he was being serious (!), he finds that it is "indeed acceptable as a description of *Platonic*, rather than Socratic, irony . . ."[29] Based on the reading of Paul in Athens presented here I would contend that it is also acceptable as a description of Lukan irony. Vlastos speaks of the "amusement" Socrates' initiates would have "derived from watching him stick pins

---

[25] Atherton, 110.

[26] Vlastos, 244.

[27] Vlastos, 245.

[28] Vlastos, 245.

[29] Vlastos, 245.

in Athenian windbags . . ."[30] Apparently Luke invites his initiates/insiders, Theophilus and all other readers, to a similar carnival. Who, then, is the unknown Paul of Acts 17? The Lukan Socratic Paul: *both* philosopher *and* sophist.

[30] Vlastos, 245.

Narrative as Persuasion: Epideictic Rhetoric and Scribal Amplification in the Stephen Episode in Acts

Todd C. Penner
Emory University

I. At the Crossroads of Rhetorical and Scribal Cultures: Ancient Historiography

Recent studies of the communicative environment of antiquity have moved toward a more precise classification and delineation of the various discourse settings of ancient writers and speakers. Of particular importance for the understanding of narrative composition and elaboration in ancient texts are the distinctions made between a rhetorical culture and a scribal culture. V. K. Robbins has advanced this discussion in recent times. He typifies a scribal culture as one in which speech or writing is reproduced within the framework of copying and/or editing various written and oral records and speeches.[1] There is no real interest in elaboration or amplification of the records and speeches towards the goal of persuasion; rather, scribal culture is mostly interested in the annalistic preservation of specific details that effect daily life. Within the context of ancient Greco-Roman education, the basic writing exercises set out for the youth can be understood as more rudimentary scribal tasks, although already moving toward a rhetorical type of cultural configuration. In Quintilian, repetition of written narratives is understood as aiding the child in acquiring the ability for proper speech (II.4.15). Theon, in his *Progymnasmata*, describes the exercise of "recitation" (*apangelia*) in which a chreia, fable or narrative is recited using identical or similar wording (III.143-145; IV.43-54; V.228) with the goal being training for eventual composition.

By contrast, a rhetorical culture is one in which the acts of speaking and writing are inextricably linked. As Robbins notes, in a rhetorical culture writers and speakers compose "both orally and scribally in a rhetorical manner."[2] The various aspects involved in either oral

[1] See his brief taxonomy of the various forms of communicative culture in "Oral, Rhetorical, and Literary Cultures: A Response," *Semeia* 65 (1994) 77-82.

[2] "Progymnastic Rhetorical Composition and Pre-Gospel Traditions: A New Approach," *Synoptic Gospels: Source Criticism and the New Literary Criticism* (ed. C. Focant; BETL 110; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1993) 110. Also see Robbins' discussion in "Writing as a Rhetorical Act in Plutarch and the Gospels," *Persuasive Artistry: Studies in New Testament Rhetoric in Honor of George A. Kennedy* (ed. D. F. Watson; JSNTSup 50; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991) 145-49. Also see the brief treatment in B. B. Scott and M. E. Dean, "A Sound Mapping of the Sermon on the Mount," *Treasures New and Old: Contributions to*

or literary presentation and reception belong to the same realm of cognitive experience and are set within a framework of persuasion and argumentation. Thus, the two media of orality and literacy are in fact part of the same process of argumentative elaboration and arrangement with the goal being the effectiveness of the communication. In late antiquity, more often than not, scribal culture was increasingly brought into contact with the larger rhetorical sphere so that already in the formative stages of education one learned to recite, reconfigure and amplify the literary and oral word with specific argumentative strategies in view. Robbins has pointed out that recitation in the progymnastic compositions already reflects the budding of a "rhetorical scribal culture."[3] The more advanced exercises such as elaboration, amplification and ultimately composition itself do in fact move more rudimentary scribal activity into the realm of a fully-developed rhetorical culture.

While the progymnastic exercises offer one way of construing the intersection of scribal and rhetorical cultures in antiquity, perhaps it is in the realm of historiography, and to a lesser extent epic composition, that the relationship between the two is most fully perceived. In the act of composing history and epic the union of rhetorical mentality and scribal transcription is achieved. In Cicero's discussion of historiography in his dialogue *On the Orator*, there is an intriguing exchange in which Antonius outlines some specifics of historical composition. Antonius acknowledges that "history began as a mere compilation of annals, on which account, and in order to preserve the general traditions, each High Priest used to commit to writing all the events of his year of office...(II.52)."[4] Antonius goes on to bemoan the fact that many Greek and Roman writers have simply adopted this scribal activity of recording mere dates, places, people and events without attempting to adorn the composition with rhetorical decoration (II.53). Antonius continues by describing the process of historical writing as being a combination of the "groundwork" or "fundamentals" (*fundamenta*) and the "superstructure" (*exaedificatio*), the latter being erected out of "matter"/"story" (*rebus*) and "diction" (*verbis*) (II.63). It is clear that Cicero views historiography as a melding of bare annalistic scribal activity with the rhetorical skill of elaboration and arrangement.[5] Historical composition consists in amplification of the rudimentary facts, and herein lies the fullest union of scribal and

---

Matthean Studies (eds. D. R. Bauer & M. A. Powell; SBLSS 1; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996) 311-15.

[3] "Oral, Rhetorical, and Literary Cultures," 80-81; "Writing as a Rhetorical Act," 147-48.

[4] Unless otherwise noted, all translations from ancient texts are from the Loeb Classical Library.

[5] Menander Rhetor, in his treatise *On Epideictic*, has an interesting parallel to this discussion by Cicero in his treatment of the *lalia* (talk) (see text and translation in D. A. Russell & N. G. Wilson, *Menander Rhetor* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981]). Menander states that should one be in the position to deliver an encomium for a provincial governor in "talk" form, one should treat, among other things, his character. In the detailing of character one should seek examples for illustration using "an old story or one of our own invention, so as not to appear to be dealing in bare facts, in which there is no charm (389.9-11)."

rhetorical cultures. Antonius notes that not only is chronological and geographical arrangement of utmost importance in historical writing, but the writer must also express personal approbation or disapproval of specific events; attribute not only speech in certain situations, but fitting actions as well; outline various causes for particular events; clarify connections between cause and effect; and elaborate the character and actions of the main individuals. In the end, it is evident that for Cicero historiography is recitation of known events (scribal activity) placed in service of making persuasive claims on the reader/hearer (rhetorical activity).[6]

The Stephen episode in Acts is particularly interesting for this discussion since this is a primary place where both rhetorical and scribal cultural aspects surface. Especially noteworthy is the way, on the one hand, that narrative functions as an explicit argumentative technique through recitation and reconfiguration of a previous written account (the Israel-story from the Old Testament), reflecting a more developed rhetorical scribal approach.[7] On the other hand, the Stephen episode also illustrates the manner in which arrangement and composition of narrative material has a more general and implicit rhetorical function, reflecting the persuasive environment of rhetorical culture. This latter point is important since here narration of particular details is not merely an unreflected event. Rather, the rhetorical act of arranging material becomes just as important as substantive amplification and elaboration of that material. Let us turn, then, to an analysis of recitation, arrangement, elaboration and amplification in the Stephen episode in Acts.

II. The Stephen Episode as Epideictic Discourse

The narrative of Stephen in Acts 6:8-7:60 is a complex unit as is attested by the wide variety of scholarly opinions concerning its nature and purpose. The basic context is laid out plainly: because of the persuasive power of Stephen (6:8; 10), certain Jews belonging to Diaspora synagogues and presumably living in Jerusalem (6:9) bring false charges of blasphemy against Stephen (6:11). The council gathers and false witnesses repeat the charges (6:12-14). The bulk of Acts 7 contains Stephen's lengthy speech arising from the judicial setting as some form of response to the accusations (7:2-53). The speech itself rehearses the key salvation historical events of Israel's past up until the time of Solomon. The discourse concludes with a sudden transition to invective as Stephen condemns the council sitting in judgment (7:51-53). The reaction of the council to the discourse results in a rather vivid scene involving the martyrdom of Stephen, bringing the episode to a conclusion (7:54-60).

The sequence of elements in Acts 6:8-7:60 raises the question whether this narrative is judicial, deliberative or epideictic in nature. The issue is whether the primary goal of this unit

---

[6] For a fuller treatment of the theory of historiography in Cicero see A. J. Woodman, *Rhetoric in Classical Historiography* (Portland: Areopagitica Press, 1988) 70-116.

[7] For a more detailed delineation of the terminology related to the various methods utilized in a rhetorical scribal culture such as "recitation" and "reconfiguration" (and various other terms used throughout this essay) see the discussion by Robbins, "Oral, Rhetorical, and Literary Cultures," 83-88.

is to indict or acquit, to move the reader to particular action, or to praise and censure. Lucian, in his *How to Write History*, criticizes historical narration that engages in panegyric and eulogy (7; 10; 38). Consequently, he argues for a separation between history and oratory. In his view, the sole end of historiography should be the detailing of that which is useful (9) and, by definition, true (9; 40). With his accent on the dual qualities of political understanding and power of expression (34) put in the service of arrangement and exposition of narrative material (50-51), Lucian presents historical writing as a task belonging to the deliberative branch of rhetoric. So far as he is concerned, a narrative account should provide data that equips the reader to evaluate political events critically and to decide to act toward certain ends rather than others. Like Plutarch in his treatise *On the Malice of Herodotus* and Dionysius of Halicarnassus in his essay *On Thucydides*, Lucian denounces the utilization of historical writing as a means of flattery or unprovoked malice - namely, epideictic discourse - and proffers in its stead a vision of history as an impartial and probable reckoning of events which will provide future readers with advice in matters of politics - namely, deliberative discourse. The writer of Luke-Acts is evidently close to Lucian's understanding when the purpose of the work is outlined as the attempt to provide an "orderly account" (*kathexēs*) with the aim of producing "certainty" (*asphaleia*). The certainty which the narrative provides should produce the motives, ability and information whereby a person will decide to act in one way rather than another. Yet, significant portions of Luke and Acts are epideictic and some are judicial.

Insofar as the setting of Stephen's speech in Acts 7 is concerned, the context for Stephen's response to the charges before the council is judicial in nature. As a result, Stephen's speech has usually been viewed as a piece of judicial rhetoric, especially since the "hearers" of the speech are in a position to offer judgment on the basis of the discourse.[8] Thus, viewing the speech as a combined accusation and apology, or, apology by means of a "counter-accusation," appears on the surface to be the best way of reading the oration in the context of the larger narrative. In this way, the key features of both *apologia* and *katēgoria* are obviously present, even though Stephen does not directly address the false charges. Despite these basic aspects of the speech which could persuade us we are dealing with judicial rhetoric, however, the actual content of the discourse evolves epideictically so that the focus is not on what is "just" or "unjust" but on "praise" and "blame." Even though a court setting is present in the narrative, the writer of Acts evinces no real intention of having Stephen provide a formal response to the charges but uses the accusations as a foil to energize a speech of praise and blame. The writer does not anticipate a true verdict from the "hearers" either at the narrative level or at the level of the intended reader of the larger work. Rather, the argument is concerned with the demonstration of particular qualities of specified topics with a view to persuasion involving present affirmations.[9]

---

[8] This is a key feature of judicial oratory: the ability and authority of the audience to render judgment. Cf. G. A. Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1984) 74.

[9] See Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism*, 73-77, for a general treatment of the nature and goals of epideictic rhetoric.

Some of the apparent discrepancy between judicial and epideictic rhetoric in the Stephen episode can be resolved through a closer analysis of the purpose of historiography in general. While it was noted above that Lucian and Plutarch favor a deliberative aim for historiography, Cicero views historical writing as belonging to the species of epideictic (*Or.* 37). It should be observed, however, that this is partially because he considers one of the functions of epideictic rhetoric to be the furnishing of advice (*Par. Or.* 69-71; cf. Quintilian, III.4.14) and history is viewed as the supreme medium for achieving this aim (*De Or.* II.36). At the same time, the thin line between judicial and epideictic branches of oratory is evident when in the discussion on historiography in the treatise *On the Orator*, Antonius appears to associate historical writing with judicial rhetoric.[10] The overlap between epideictic and judicial rhetoric is most evident in the concern of both branches to detail the motivation and intention of an actor.[11] Moreover, the three general species of rhetoric clearly intersect and at times are nearly interchangeable, as the ancient rhetoricians acknowledge.[12] In light of these observations one can overemphasize the differences between judicial and epideictic rhetoric in the case of the Stephen episode, and perhaps one could say that in this instance one finds a forensic speech on the cusp of epideictic. In its immediate context the precise classification of the discourse is open to debate, but in the larger setting of Luke-Acts the epideictic function of the speech looms large. The speech combined with the narrative setting moves beyond the purely judicial in nature towards ends that concern honor and blame rather than simply acquittal or guilt .

Once the epideictic nature of the Stephen episode begins to appear, it becomes clear that the speech is only one part of a larger rhetorical unit. That is, to analyze only the speech in terms of ancient rhetoric is to miss the fact that the narrative units before (6:8-7:1) and after (7:54-60) the speech provide key elements of the rhetorical structure missing from the discourse itself. The narrative elements, in effect, provide crucial links in the argumentative texture of the Stephen episode. It should be remembered that part of the historian's craft according to Cicero is not only providing the "fundamentals" but also erecting a "superstructure." This latter move is a combination of two aspects: story and diction. For Cicero, this entails "invention," "arrangement" and "expression" (on these categories see *De Inv.* I.9ff). Thus, alongside the speech, the narrative segments involving the depiction of the trial and the description of the reaction of the council form part of the larger rhetorical aims of the writer expressed through invention and arrangement. Now it is clear that the rhetorician's craft involves not only the production of specific proofs and arguments, but also the arrangement of the material. Here we see that these aspects are an inherent part of the historian's task as well (cf. *De Or.* 36).

---

[10] On this see the comments by Woodman, *Rhetoric in Classical Historiography*, 95.

[11] See M. Heath, *Hermogenes on Issues: Strategies of Argument in Later Greek Rhetoric* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995) 16.

[12] For example, in Quintilian III.7.28, epideictic is said to be similar to deliberative rhetoric. In III.4.14, Quintilian states that all three branches of oratory are concerned with issues pertaining to panegyrics, thus emphasizing the overarching epideictic quality of all three species.

The role of narrative in the overall construction of a historical argument emerges clearly in the opening unit of the Stephen episode (6:8-7:1). One of the most common observations regarding Stephen's speech is that it does not provide a proper defense of the charges raised in the preceding narrative unit. In rhetorical terms this means that the charges are accepted as "factual." The truth of the charges is not disputed but the "quality" of the facts is addressed.[13] Viewed from this perspective, the introductory section of 6:8-7:1 can be understood to form the *exordium* for the larger rhetorical unit. That is, it both introduces the orator, Stephen, a great Christian "speaker" who discourses with wisdom and spirit/in the Spirit (6:10), and it provides the common topics which will be amplified and elaborated in the ensuing speech with a view to addressing the issue of the quality of those specified topics. Thus, the charges brought against Stephen provide a foil for introducing the subject of the rhetorical unit, the common topics.

Cicero compares the "commonplaces" or "topics" to letters of the alphabet which immediately are brought to mind in order to present a case (*De Or.* II.130). Theon, in his *Progymnasmata*, defines common topics as the "familiar place" from which one "readily argue(s) against those who are widely regarded as acting unjustly (VI.11-12)."[14] Thus, according to Theon, the "commonplace" can be defined "as a resource for arguments (VI.12-13)." He goes on to state that in this "amplifying speech about a commonly accepted subject" there is no need for either an *exordium* or a statement of proof (VI.20-22). He notes, however, that contrary to theory "many authors immediately fuss with introductions and set forth the subject itself as if they were telling a narrative; and in addition to all this, add amplifications (VI.36-38)." Theon thus conceives of a fairly straightforward introduction of the topics.[15] The writer of Acts enacts this approach by introducing the topics of discussion rather briefly, elaborating narratively certain details of the setting and amplifying the topics through minor repetition.

After his discussion on the setting forth of the topics, Theon details the use of the *exordium* and the narrative which follows the former's introduction of the common topics: "if we should want to use both an introduction and a narrative, as in a lawsuit, we will take up our arguments after the introduction and the recitation of the injustice (VI.44-46)." This is then followed by a discussion of the various methods for the amplification of the topics. Thus, according to Theon, the *exordium* introduces the stated common topics which will be amplified by means of a section of proofs. The topics fuel the discussion of what is honorable and

---

[13] On the matter of *stasis* theory and the specific issues of fact and quality see Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism*, 18-19.

[14] The translation for Theon's *Progymnasmata* is taken from J. R. Butts, "The 'Progymnasmata' of Theon: A New Text with Translation and Commentary" (Ph.D. diss., Claremont Graduate School, 1987).

[15] Another good discussion of "commonplaces" is contained in the *Progymnasmata* of Aphthonius (see the text in *Readings from Classical Rhetoric* [eds. P.P. Matsen, P. Rollinson, & M. Sousa; Carbondale & Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press, 1990] 267-88). For Aphthonius, the common topic is a "composition amplifactory of inherent evils (VII)" and is to be contrasted with the *encomium*. This stands in contrast to Theon who understands that the exercise of amplifying common topics can be used with respect to both vice and virtue.

shameful, praiseworthy and blameworthy, in essence detailing virtue and vice (Aristotle, *Art of Rhetoric* I.9.1). What is at stake is the presentation of what is good and what is not. It should also be noted that, according to Quintilian, the "proper function...of panegyric is to amplify and embellish its themes (III.7.6)." Aristotle also states that amplification of the topics is most suitable to epideictic (*Art of Rhetoric* I.9.40). Thus, the *exordium* is a critical element in the larger rhetorical unit for epideictic speeches as it sets forth the commonplaces for elaboration and amplification. Consequently, the beginning section of the Stephen episode does not simply detail a description of "actual events" but contributes to the larger epideictic goal of the Stephen episode as a whole as it sets forth, narratively, topics for elaboration. The opening narration represents a carefully-crafted piece which initiates the formation of argument in narrative form. This aptly illustrates the general function narrative can have in the construction of rhetorical discourse.

III. Narrative and Speech in the Stephen Episode

IIIA. The Narrative ***Exordium*** *(6:8-7:1)*

Turning to an analysis of the larger rhetorical unit, the theme for amplification is set forth and then repeated twice in the narrative *exordium* (6:8-7:1). In 6:11 it is stated that Stephen speaks blasphemy against Moses and God. In 6:13, in progymnastic fashion, this same charge is repeated using different words: Stephen speaks against "this holy place" and "the law." The chiastic structuring of the two sets of charges - Moses (A)/God (B)/holy place (B´)/law (A´) - clearly pairs the correlating terms of each indictment so that the second accusation in 6:13 is both a simple restatement of the initial charge in 6:11 and also an elaboration as the precise content of the "blasphemy" against Moses and God is detailed. In 6:14 the charge is elaborated further through the addition of the allegation that Stephen has stated that Jesus will destroy the holy place and change the customs of Moses. Through repetition and elaboration, the main topics are stated: Moses and the law; God and the temple. In the speech itself it is apparent that the topic of "this holy place" energizes the discussion of the interpretation of the law and the prophets, and, in fact, the issues of law and temple are inextricably linked throughout the larger rhetorical unit. That "place" (*topos*) is the key topic in the speech is evident from the fact that in 7:7 "place" becomes a core aspect in the promises given to Abraham and in 7:49 (cited from Isa 66:1) "place" is paired as a synonym for "house" (*oikos*) as the house/temple of God, forming the climax of Stephen's closing invective. It is apparent that the logic of the narrative from beginning to end centers on the meaning of "place." Moreover, the entirety of Stephen's discourse provides a recitation of Scripture placed in the service of making a particular argument about "this holy place." Thus, the discussion of "place" is carried out with regard to "law" (*nomos*) and consists of reinterpretation through reconfiguration of antecedent written biblical tradition. Consequently, the opening topics of "law" and "holy place" are not incidental elements. The subsequent discourse amplifies and embellishes these topics epideictically. In the ancient Jewish environment there is little doubt that the topics of law and temple would have been "familiar places" (common topics) from which to develop an argument. Furthermore, as with the topics in epideictic, the commonplaces set forth in the *exordium* are charged with the

issues of shame and honor, vice and virtue. While in many instances epideictic proceeds from the honorable to the dishonorable, in this particular case the discourse begins with an accusation that certain acts of Stephen are shameful and, as it unfolds, the argumentative texture of the discourse reverses the location of honor and shame. Epideictic elaboration and amplification of the topics demonstrate that the shameful behavior lies not with Stephen but with those accusing him. Consequently, the discourse is an attempt to demonstrate where true dishonor rests. Thus, the quality of the action, rather than the truth or falsity of the charges, becomes the critical argumentative strategy employed.

The *stasis* of quality in ancient rhetoric is complex, but it is important to note some aspects as the issue of quality becomes crucial for understanding the argument made in the ensuing sections of the Stephen episode. As noted earlier, Stephen's speech amplifies the common topics that the introduction recounts in narrative form. The speech is concerned not with whether the actions occurred or the precise definition of the actions; it assumes the fact and definition of the event. What is at stake is the quality of the action: whether it is just or unjust, or, through an epideictic lens, whether it is honorable or dishonorable. The *stasis* of quality is an important element of judicial rhetoric, but, as Quintilian notes, it also forms the fundamental basis of the development of all topics in epideictic or demonstrative rhetoric (VI.4.3). While Quintilian states that the best defense on the basis of quality is to establish that an act with which one is charged is actually honorable, it is evident from the development of Stephen's discourse that the main stress is on proffering a "counter-accusation" in which the rhetor demonstrates that the accusers are themselves guilty of the charges they bring. The judicial elements are here quite crisp as the proper interpretation of law illustrates that those sitting in judgement are themselves blasphemers of God and violators of the law. Yet, the common topics evolve epideictically as the noble Stephen stands in contrast to the rather ignoble depiction of the Jewish council, the latter being denounced and condemned by the end of the oration. The narration not only presents the intended reader with an explicit scenario of praise and blame, but its effect is also to draw the reader into an affirmation of the appropriateness of the particular amplification of the common topics.

It should be noted that the *stasis* of quality in the Stephen episode is ultimately more complex than can be outlined here. The issue throughout is the quality of the action, and this fits both the epideictic and judicial movements of the discourse. In the terms of Hermogenes' treatise *On Stases*,[16] several aspects of the issue of quality arise throughout Stephen's speech. On the one hand, Stephen offers a "counterplea" which argues that an action of which one is accused is legitimate in its own right. On the other hand, the element of "counter-accusation" surfaces as well. That is to say, while Stephen does not transfer the responsibility to a victim or third party (as would be the proper move in judicial rhetoric), he does charge the accusers with being dishonorable and shameful in the situation (a function of the epideictic goals of the discourse). At another level, however, the oration involves not only logical aspects of quality but legal aspects as well. After all, Stephen is accused of having spoken against "law" as well as "place." As a result, the legal issues of quality enter into the discussion. There is an implied sense of "conflict of law," or, in this case, conflict in the interpretation of law, although the

[16] For the most recent translation of this text see Heath, *Hermogenes on Issues*, 28-60.

argument of the speech allows no room for the existence of "ambiguity" in the law itself. Moreover, the matter of "assimilation" is also present in that certain prophetic texts are used as prisms through which to refract specific meanings from other texts (in this particular case the citation from Isa 66:1 influences the recitation and reconfiguration of biblical narrative). Thus, much like in the Qumran writings, a less specific "counter-definition" arises in the context of specific texts or text-groups utilized to form a larger defining structure. All of this is to show that the issue of quality in Stephen's speech is complex insofar as it pertains to the amplification of the topics set forth in the *exordium*. Nevertheless, pinpointing what is at stake in the discourse itself aids in the understanding of the episode as a whole and helps illuminate how the topics set forth in the *exordium* evolve epideictically.

Before moving from the *exordium* to the speech proper, it is once again worth stressing that the opening narrative provides a crucial linchpin in the larger rhetorical unit. Alongside its function in setting forth the topics for amplification and elaboration, the introductory account (and one could include the closing narrative here as well) also establishes the *ēthos* and the *pathos* of the various characters in the plot (cf. Aristotle, *Art of Rhetoric*, II.1-17), attributing honorable actions and emotional states to Stephen and dishonorable ones to those bringing the false charges and sitting in judgment. The establishment of the people's character achieved through the speech - their obstinate and "illegal" opposition towards the Holy Spirit, prophets and the Righteous One; 7:51-53 - thus finds confirmation and proof in the opening and closing displays of their dishonorable and shameful behavior. As it is stated in the *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum* (35), narratives "carry more conviction with the hearers than scoffs," and thus narrative forms a critical element in epideictic rhetoric as it "mirror(s) character and manners." Narrative therefore provides the basis for praise and blame (ridiculing "your opponent for the things on which he prides himself"), but also accommodates itself readily as an argumentative strategy. Here one perceives how nicely historical writing lends itself to the characterization of individuals and acts, and, furthermore, how the epideictic function of historiography, such as one finds in Herodotus, could come to the forefront so readily.

IIIB. The ***Narratio/Partitio*** *(7:2-8)*

Moving from the *exordium* (6:8-7:1) to the speech proper (7:2-53), it becomes apparent that the oration is comprised of the two core elements of rhetorical discourse: a combined *narratio/partitio* (7:2-7) and the central *probatio* (7:8-53). This basic division is supported by the structure of the speech. The critical unit of the oration is clearly the opening section which focuses on the promises given to Abraham (7:2-7). Here the rhetor recites in sequence the fundamental narrative which will be crucial for the remaining discourse. Unlike the *narratio* in judicial rhetoric, this unit does not detail the "case" of Stephen. Rather, it sets out the basis for the amplification which is to follow through the retelling of past events that will prove integral for the overall argument. That is, as the *narratio*, the opening unit outlines the promises to Abraham, establishing the basic "facts" of the proceeding argument. At the same time, as the *partitio,* it provides the central scheme of the promises of slavery, deliverance, and worship "in this place" which become the propositions to be developed, and these, in turn, structure the arguments in the *probatio*. Here the exposition of the propositions for embellishment in the *partitio* carries with it a certain structuring function which can be compared to the phenomenon

of "ring composition," a feature particularly prominent in historiography as a means for arranging material in speeches.[17] In Stephen's speech, the promise of slavery (7:6) is narratively fulfilled in 7:9-29; the promise of deliverance (7:7) in 7:30-43; and the promise of worshipping "in this place" (7:7) in 7:44-46 when the "tent of testimony" is brought into the land.[18]

The crux of the opening *narratio/partitio* lies in the promise that after deliverance from Egypt the people will worship God "in this place." There is little doubt that this reference is a play on the charges against Stephen set forth in the *exordium*,[19] developing the common topics through narrative recitation and reconfiguration. At the same time, as the "facts" of the case are set forth in the form of abbreviated recitation of biblical narrative, the central promise of worship "in this place" evinces a reconfiguration of the initial promise to Abraham in which the citation of Gen 15:14 is combined with Exod 3:12, establishing the "place" of Moses as that "place" promised to Abraham. In the present discourse, Acts 7:6 is a reformulation of Gen 15:13, the basic words of which are used to narrate God's promise to Abraham. The context of this text is established in Acts 7:5. There the promise consists of land which is to be given to Abraham's seed. This paraphrases the promises spoken by God in Gen 15:1-11 and can be viewed as abbreviated recitation. Moreover, one should note that the specific references in Stephen's speech to Gen 15:13-14 (the promises of slavery and deliverance) have their immediate Old Testament context between explicit promises of land to Abraham (Gen 15:7; 15:18-21). Thus, the promises of Gen 15:13-14 are understood as forming part of God's larger covenant promise to Abraham regarding the connection of the people (descendants) to the land. The writer of Acts 7 makes this same link by having the mention of the promise of land in 7:5 precede the spoken promises of slavery and deliverance in 7:6-7, which in turn conclude with further reference to the land (7:7b). Consequently, the promises of slavery and deliverance are subordinate to the overarching promise of the land. Following upon the promise in 7:5, Acts 7:6 presents a simple reference to the suffering of Israel in Egypt. Acts 7:7 continues with a direct recitation following the LXX: God will judge the nation enslaving Israel and they will leave that country. It is at this point that a significant change in the text occurs. Rather than following the biblical account and reading "and they will come out with great possessions" (the reading of the MT and LXX), the discourse of Acts 7 reads: "they shall come out and worship me **in this place**." Words from Exod 3:12 have deftly been included in the recitation of Gen 15:14. In effect, this provides a play between the "mountain"/"temple" as the deuteronomic "place" of Moses and the land as the "place" of Abraham, ultimately involving a reinterpretation

---

[17] Cf. I. Worthington, "History and Oratorical Exploitation," *Persuasion: Greek Rhetoric in Action* (ed. I. Worthington; London: Routledge, 1994) 115-16.

[18] This same observation has been made by R. G. Hall, *Revealed Histories: Techniques for Ancient Jewish and Christian Historiography* (JSPSup, 6; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991) 197. The actual structuring of the speech is more complex than can be detailed here. It should be noted, however, that the concluding portion (7:44-53) is patterned on the unfolding of themes in 7:35-43, resulting in various levels of ring composition within the discourse.

[19] In 6:13 the temple is referred to as "this holy place" (*topos*). Cf. the charges against Paul in Acts 21:28 where *topos* is twice used to refer to the temple.

of the "place" of Acts 6:13 through the "place" of 7:7.[20] Theon mentions the possibility of combining separate narratives in the process of their elaboration (V.427-28), and this is precisely what the writer of Acts has done in the recitation of the Abraham story. The clever play on "place" connects to the opening common topic, forming a bridge to the elaboration of the argument in the remaining portion of the speech.

A last point to be made regarding the opening *narratio/partitio* is that there is a deliberate reversal of elements from this section (esp. 7:4-8) in the latter part of the speech.[21] Whereas in 7:4 God resettles Abraham in the land of Israel, he "resettles" the people away from the land in 7:43. Moreover, whereas God promises Abraham that his people will worship him in the land (7:7), in 7:42 the people worship the "hosts of heaven" prior to entering the land. Furthermore, the reference to Abraham circumcising his offspring in 7:8 has its negative counterpart in the image of the people having "uncircumcised hearts and ears" in 7:51. From this it appears that not only does the Abraham section structure the remaining portion of the speech, but it also furnishes the basic elements of the negative characterization of the Jewish people as blame arises precisely from the reversal of that which is praised (cf. Aristotle, *Art of Rhetoric*, I.9.41). This helps explain the focus on idolatry which concludes the speech. In the way it is reconfigured in Acts 7, the reversal of the main element of the Abrahamic promise is idolatry, and thus its primacy in the conclusion of the speech is a further indication of the real issue involved all along: the "hearers" of the speech are depicted as failing to understand the promises given to Abraham. In the past this lack of perception was evinced through their worshipping of foreign deities, rejection of Moses and, ultimately, the building of the temple itself. In the present this lack of perception is demonstrated through continued opposition to the prophets and the Holy Spirit. Therefore, in the final analysis, it is evident that the opening *narratio/partitio* has an important function as it states the "facts" of the case for discussion, sets forth the propositions to be developed, and structures the following *probatio*, energizing its logic

---

[20] This play on "place" (*topos*) is similarly noted by R. C. Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation; Vol. II: The Acts of the Apostles* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990) 92-93, although he misses the argumentative shift which is gained through the play when he asserts that the promise in 7:7 anticipates the temple as the place of worship in the land (p. 93). The biblical intertexture behind 7:7 runs deep. In short, in Exod 3:12 the promise to Moses is that the people will worship God at "this mountain." In Deuteronomy, however, *topos* becomes a reference to the temple as the place of the worship of God (cf. Deut 12:5; 11-14, 18, 21, 26). In the Song of Moses (Exod 15:17) there is already an explicit identification of the mountain as the *topos* of God's sanctuary. Similarly, the targums explicitly establish the link between *topos* as temple and *topos* as mountain (cf. *Tg. Neof.* Exod 15:17 where the mountain is made equivalent to the "house of God's sanctuary" and the "house of God's Shekhinah"). Josephus, in *Antiquities* II.269, may already reflect this coupling. Thus, the themes in Stephen's speech depend on a variety of connections which undergird the selection and manipulation of antecedent written traditions.

[21] On this see the brief discussion in Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: Vol. II*, 90.

of progression and development.

IIIC. The ***Probatio*** *(7:9-53)*

The remaining section of the speech forms the *probatio*, a unit in which the specific topics introduced in the *exordium* and developed further in the *narratio/partitio* are now amplified. The heart of epideictic discourse is the amplification of common topics, and for the writer of Acts this entails the utilization of rhetorical scribal techniques. Already introduced in the *narratio*, the strategy of argumentation is fully elaborated through abbreviated recitation which reconfigures prior written biblical narrative. A detailed analysis of the rhetorical elaboration and amplification of the topics of law and temple is not possible in this essay, however a few observations can be made by way of summarizing the main elements of the *probatio*.

Following the promises to Abraham laid out in the *narratio*, the *probatio* develops these by focusing first on slavery, then on deliverance, and finally concluding with a discussion of the tabernacle and the fulfillment of the promise of worshipping "in this place" upon entering the land - an event antecedent to the building of the temple. This forms the heart of the argument of the discourse: the fulfillment of worship "in this place" precedes the establishment of the temple. Central to the retelling of the biblical narrative is the subtle reconfiguration of the tradition through its abbreviated recitation. For instance, in the detailing of Moses' first and second attempts at the deliverance of Israel from Egypt, the writer heightens the stature of Moses as deliverer and simultaneously begins the characterization of the people as those rejecting God's prophets (7:23-43).[22] The abbreviated recitation allows the writer to pass over aspects of the biblical text which would detract from the rhetorical force of the narrative argument. The reconfiguration of the narrative allows for a restructuring of the antecedent tradition in a manner which stresses two parallel attempts at deliverance by Moses which are both followed by

---

[22] This is accomplished in several ways. Similar to some Hellenistic Jewish writers, Acts 7:22 relates that Moses learned all the wisdom of the Egyptians (cf. Philo, *Life of Moses*, 1.20-24). Moreover, in an interesting contrast to Moses' own claim in Exod 4:10, Moses is described as being "powerful in his words and deeds (7:22)." As well, unlike the biblical narrative, in Acts 7 Moses understands his act of slaying the Egyptian in terms of God's action through him for the deliverance of the people (7:25), thus highlighting the significance of the event. Furthermore, in the Old Testament it is narrated that Moses fled Egypt because Pharaoh was seeking to kill him (Exod 2:15), but in Acts 7:29 the motivation for flight is left unexplained, thus playing down the negative characterization of Moses as being fearful. The reversal of the biblical narrative here is significant in the following ways: it portrays Moses in quite a positive light throughout, unlike the biblical narrative which presents a more complex multi-dimensional characterization of Moses; and it depicts the Jews as being hard-hearted already before they leave Egypt (their rejection of Moses' first attempt at deliverance is a major theme of this section; cf. 7:25-29; 35). This last point is important because it illustrates an on-going endemic quality of the people that not only surfaces in the wilderness (7:39), but is present long before, making the words of the invective in 7:51-53 all the more apropos.

subsequent rejections by the people. Particularly noteworthy is the addition of motivation and intention to the characters in the recited biblical tradition, an important element in amplification.[23]

The story of the deliverance is also retold in the form of abbreviated recitation. After noting the unwillingness of the people and their turning toward idolatry, the text from Amos 5:25-27 is included as a "commentary" on the narrative, demonstrating the result of the people's actions (7:42-43) and establishing a cause and effect relationship.[24] In a similar manner, following upon the notice of Solomon's having built the temple, the writer provides an "objection" from Isaiah 66:1-2 to the abbreviated recitation, harshly acknowledging that the building of the temple "made by hands" (7:48-50) bears a structural relationship to the idolatry evidenced in the golden calf incident - an idol also "made by hands" (7:41).[25] This can be viewed as the supplying of an "authoritative opinion" and/or a "previous judgment" (cf. Theon, VI.85; Cicero, *De Inv.* I.101; Aristotle, *Art of Rhetoric*, II.28.12), or possibly even testimony from an oracle (cf. Cicero, *De Inv.* I.101; Aristotle, *Art of Rhetoric* I.15.14). It is noteworthy that once again the abbreviated recitation, here peppered with authoritative citations from the prophetic corpus,

---

[23] Cf. Theon, VI.41, for the use of motivation of "culprits" in the discussion of the common topics. Motivation also becomes a central theme in the treatment of individuals and their actions in historiography. For the attribution of motivation in Herodotus see M. L. Lang, *Herodotean Narrative and Discourse* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1984) 73-79.

[24] Cf. Theon, V.388-99, where he refers to "adding a comment" through the supplying and interweaving of maxims in the narrative. The connection between cause and effect, it should be recalled, is an important element in Cicero's understanding of historiography (*De Or.* II.63).

[25] Space does not permit a detailed treatment of the specifics behind the apparent anti-temple sentiments which arise toward the end of the discourse. The basic argument, as noted above, is that when the tent of testimony enters the land (7:44-45) the initial promise to Abraham (7:7) is fulfilled. Underneath the surface, however, lies a whole series of texts which provide a larger framework for what is being argued in the speech. Ultimately, 2 Sam 7:1-17 (cf. also Ps 131) provides key insights into this section of Acts 7 as the theme of the Davidic "house" (understood Messianically) is played off against the literal meaning of "house" as the temple built by Solomon. Furthermore, the presence of Messianic motifs in the speech is reinforced by the fact that Messianic themes are assimilated to the promises to Abraham elsewhere in Luke-Acts. In Acts 3:25-26, the promise to Abraham involves the blessing provided by the "raised servant of God." In the Benedictus (Luke 1:73), the Messiah (1:69) fulfills the promise to Abraham that upon deliverance from their enemies his people would worship God freely and righteously. This formulation very nearly parallels the promise to Abraham in Acts 7:7. Hence, it seems likely that the argument of Acts 7 is more than simply a reflection of ancient tabernacle nostalgia. Rather, the argument regarding the building of the temple is really a statement about the "wicked ways" of the people (Acts 3:26) and represents one way of addressing this larger issue. The actual aim is to make an assertion about Lukan soteriology through a specific argument about the nature of the promises to Abraham and the failure of the hard-hearted people to accept their God-sent prophet.

pushes the narrative retelling in the direction of the writer's larger epideictic focus. That is, the people reject God's prophets, turning a deaf ear to the "living oracles" (7:38, 53). The Jewish accusations regarding Stephen's alleged blasphemy against the temple of God and the law of Moses are thus clearly demonstrated as wrongheaded. It is not Stephen but those who bring the charges who are shown to be unjust and ignoble. The abbreviation of the biblical narrative, mixed with prophetic citation and rhetorical elaboration, has allowed the rhetor to amplify the common topics of law and temple, illustrating that the real issue is not Stephen's blasphemy but the wrongdoing and shameful acts of his accusers.

It is important to note that through abbreviated recitation of the biblical narrative the writer has been able to include all the key elements of amplification set forth for epideictic speech. In light of the *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum* (III.3.20ff),[26] the following corresponding elements of amplification are striking: the demonstration that the actions of the characters have produced either good or bad results has been developed by the writer through the connection between idolatry and exile; the introduction of a previous judgment (or commentary) has been utilized by the writer on two occasions through the citation of prophetic texts; the establishing of a comparison has, in the case of Acts 7, evolved in the deliberate counter-reflection of the negative qualities of the people over against the positive characterization of Stephen and Moses; and, finally, the presence of a unit detailing the "intentionality" of the evil actors, demonstrating the premeditated and repeated nature of their actions, has been developed throughout the speech and achieves its climax in the concluding vituperative invective against the Jewish council. Hence, all the major aspects of an amplified speech are present in the *probatio*. Consequently, the move from the introduction of the common topics and their amplification towards denunciation and invective against the "hearers" in the council intimates that the argumentative texture is epideictic in nature. Moreover, in line with Quintilian's suggestion (VIII.4.9), the amplification rises to a climax, increasingly heightening the negative characterization of the people and finally culminating in the prophetic denunciation at the end. It is important to stress, however, that it is precisely in the retelling and reconfiguring of pre-existing narrative that the amplification of the common topics takes place and the particular vituperative nature of the rhetoric is developed.

IIID. The Narrative ***Peroratio*** *(7:54-60)*

The concluding narrative portion of the Stephen episode forms the *peroratio* for the larger epideictic piece. As is the case with the introduction, it is the narrative itself which provides the key rhetorical elements of the conclusion. Here the writer offers both a positive characterization of Stephen and at the same time paints a vile portrait of the Jews in the council, disposing the reader favorably toward the former and unfavorably toward the latter. Moreover, the *peroratio* continues the amplification of the previous themes, especially the rejection of the prophets, combined with further deprecation of the people. Furthermore, utilizing the rhetorical

---

[26] Cf. Theon, VI.44-87, who outlines almost the exact same pattern for the amplification of the common topics. Aphthonius, in his *Progymnasmata*, delineates a similar, albeit briefer, model for the elaboration of the topics.

move of *indignatio* (cf. Cicero, *De Inv.* I.100), the narration of events is clearly intended to arouse contempt for, and extreme offense at, the actions of the council, but admiration for the martyr Stephen, who finds further narrative confirmation in the fact that his death is patterned on the death of Jesus in Luke.[27] It is interesting to note that Theon concludes his discussion of the common topics with an outline of how to provide "vivid description" of the serious unjust and dishonorable actions of individuals (VI.88-97).[28] This is precisely what the writer of the Stephen episode in Acts has done. The concluding narrative thus plays a formative role in making an argument through description and deliberate characterization. The depiction of the mob scene which leads to Stephen's death confirms, with a touch of irony, what Stephen has stated in the concluding invective: these people continue to persecute the prophets, put to death the righteous ones, and contravene the laws of Moses. The *peroratio* is therefore not simply some incidental note on the fate of a certain early Christian leader named Stephen, but in fact provides the culminating proof, further amplification of the topics, excitement of the emotions of the reader, and a summary of the main thrust of the epideictic rhetoric up to this point.

IV. Conclusion

In this brief analysis of the Stephen episode in Acts I have argued two points. First, I have suggested that the entire episode, not simply the speech, forms a unified whole as an epideictic rhetorical unit. The narrative segments at the beginning and end of the speech are critical elements of the argumentative strategy and arrangement, and illustrate the presence of a rhetorical culture: the writing of narrative is through and through a rhetorical act. Narrative becomes argument primarily through arrangement of the material, and acquires its content/subject matter through elaboration, amplification, and embellishment. Second, in the discussion of the *probatio*, I have argued that the key element is the presence of abbreviated recitation which aims to reconfigure antecedent written biblical tradition in light of larger epideictic patterns and goals. Here scribal culture is placed in service of the rhetorical culture of persuasion. Therefore, the rewriting of biblical narrative is at all points a highly-charged rhetorical activity, brimming with argumentative texture. Furthermore, amplification of common topics is carried out through this use of previously written narrative, illustrating the way in which narrative further serves the ends of the elaboration of argument.

In light of these observations, I would suggest that any attempt to trace pre-Lukan sources in Acts 7 or to speculate on the Hellenist connection to the temple and early Christianity based on the Stephen episode alone represents a misguided approach to this text. Rhetorical aims and patterns are at the heart of the arrangement and elaboration of the narrative, and thus a more fruitful approach to this unit would be to refocus the discussion by establishing the

---

[27] Here the stress is on the noble death of the martyr/sage rather than on the raising of pity (through *conquestio*; cf. Cicero, *De Inv.* I.106ff) for a Stephen characterized by human weakness or ill fortune.

[28] Description through attribution of characteristics and actions is also a key element in Cicero's understanding of elaboration in historiography (cf. *De Or.* II.63).

function of the Stephen episode within the larger narrative of Luke-Acts through its employment of particular rhetorical conventions and its amplification of select common topics.

Narrative in Ancient Rhetoric and Rhetoric in Ancient Narrative

Vernon K. Robbins
Emory University

A new era in analysis and interpretation began about fifteen years ago with insights into the rhetorical nature of the chreia and chreia elaboration in New Testament literature (Hock and O'Neil; Mack and Robbins; Mack 1990; Watson and Hauser: 115–20). Now the time has come to broaden the discussion to the narrative and the fable in addition to the chreia. This essay includes only a few observations about the fable. For the most part, it adds insights from rhetorical discussion of the narrative in antiquity to insights about chreia and chreia elaboration. Discussion of chreia elaboration has brought insight into the nature of the "complete argument" in New Testament literature (Mack in Mack and Robbins: 51–63). Discussion of the rhetorical characteristics of narrative introduces insight into the nature of a "complete situation." The most important information for this essay has been gleaned from the first five chapters of Theon of Alexandria's *Progymnasmata* — a first century treatise written in Greek during the last half of the first century CE (see Theon). These chapters contain systematic rhetorical discussion of the chreia, the fable, and the narrative. Building on insights from Theon's discussion in these chapters, this essay explores the presence of chreia, fable, and narrative in Luke and Acts. Then it explores the creation of complete situations as contexts for elaborated speech both in Luke and Acts. The goal is to gain insight into the rhetorical nature of historiography as it exists in Luke and Acts.

The Rhetorical Characteristics of Narrative

Among the writings in the New Testament, the four Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles are narrative compositions. The effect of each is to narrate a story. Embedded in the narrational texture of each story, however, is an argumentative texture. As the beginning, middle, and ending of the story unfolds, the story presents an argument. From the perspective of ancient rhetoricians, argumentation regularly unfolded in one of three modes. It would indict or acquit certain people, thus be judicial; it would move people to act in one way rather than another, thus be deliberative; or it would confirm presupposed values through praise and censure, thus be epideictic (Kennedy 1984: 19–20). Charles H. Talbert's investigation of biographical historiography in antiquity revealed five argumentative types. If an interpreter uses guidelines from the ancient rhetoricians to understand the argumentative texture of these five types, the result is as follows:

Epideictic Biographical Historiography

Type A, which "simply provide[s] the readers a pattern to copy," is epideictic in nature. The primary strategy is praise, like in Lucian's *Life of*

Demonax (2) where the author states: "It is now fitting to tell of Demonax ... that young men of good instincts ... may be able to set themselves a pattern from our modern world and to copy that man, the best of all philosophers whom I know about" (Talbert 1977: 94). An example in the life of a ruler exists in Plutarch's *Life of Cleomenes*, where the text states: "In all these matters Cleomenes was himself a teacher. His own manner of life was simple, plain, and no more pretentious than that of the common man, and it was a pattern of self-restraint for all" (13; Talbert 1977: 96).

Judicial Biographical Historiography

Type B, which "aim[s] to dispel a false image of the teacher and to provide a true model to follow" (Talbert 1977: 94), is judicial in nature. The primary strategy is to acquit a person from a reputation of wrongdoing, like Xenophon's *Memorabilia* where the author states: "To me then he seemed to be all that a truly good and happy man must be. But if there is any doubter, let him set the character of other men beside these things; then let him judge" (4.8.10; cf. Robbins 1994: 239). An example in the life of a ruler exists in Pseudo-Callisthenes' *Life of Alexander*, where "he is idealized as a god-like king over against the supposed misrepresentations of him elsewhere" (Talbert 1977: 96).

Type C, which "intends to discredit a given teacher by exposé" (Talbert 1977: 95), is also judicial in nature. The goal is to indict the person as a wrongdoer, a charlatan, like Lucian's *Alexander the False Prophet* where the author states: "I blush ... because I am devoting my energy ... to the exploits of a man who does not deserve to have polite people read about him, but rather to have the motley crowd in a vast amphitheatre see him being torn to pieces by foxes or apes" (2). An example in the life of a ruler would be the account of "Clitarchus who accompanied Alexander's expedition and wrote of it as a brilliant adventure conducted by a tyrant spoiled by fortune" (Talbert 1977: 97).

Deliberative Biographical Historiography

Type D, which "had as their purpose to indicate where the 'living voice' was to be found in the period after the founder" (Talbert 1977: 95), is deliberative in nature. In answer to the question "where the true tradition of the school is to be found," a biography of the life of a founder of a philosophical school followed by a list or narrative about his successors — like Diogenes Laertius' *Lives of Eminent Philosophers* — directs the reader toward the truth which is beneficial from this tradition. According to Talbert, "[n]o biographies of rulers fall into this category" (1977: 97).

Type E, which "aim[s] to validate and/or provide the hermeneutical key for the teacher's doctrine" (Talbert 1977: 96), also is deliberative in nature. Porphyry's *Life of Plotinus*, for example, provided a basic introduction to Plotinus' way of life and thought that made it an integral part of the collection of his works. An example in the life of a ruler exists in Philo's *Life of Moses*,

which "functioned as an elementary introduction to the ideals of Judaism" (Talbert 1977: 97).

As Talbert assessed the NT Gospels and Acts, he considered Mark to be very much like a Type B biography, Luke-Acts like a Type D life of Jesus, and Matthew like a Type E biography (Talbert 1978: 1649–50). This would mean that Mark is primarily judicial and that Matthew and Luke-Acts are primarily deliberative in nature.

This is not the proper place to evaluate Talbert's assessment of the overall rhetorical nature of the Gospels and Acts in the New Testament. Rather, the goal is to use his insights into biographical historiography of teachers and rulers in Mediterranean antiquity as a springboard for discussing narrative in ancient rhetoric and rhetoric in ancient narrative. Rhetorical analysis of the Acts of the Apostles began with interpretation of Paul's defense speeches (e.g., Veltman 1978). This analysis points to a substantive amount of judicial rhetoric in Acts. In *Patterns of Persuasion in the Gospels*, analysis of Plucking Grain on the Sabbath and the Beelzebul Controversy points to an interplay between judicial and epideictic rhetoric (Robbins in Mack and Robbins: 107–41, 161–93; cf. Robbins 1991a); analysis of the sayings about Foxes and Birds and Leaving the Dead in Matthew 8 and Luke 9 and the elaboration of the Parable of the Sower in Mark 4 reveals deliberative rhetoric (Mack and Robbins: 69–84, 143–60); and Mack's analysis of the Markan and Lukan versions of The Anointing of Jesus reveals judicial argumentation that moves to a deliberative thesis in order finally to conclude with an epideictic emphasis (Mack and Robbins: 85–106). Willi Braun, in turn, found a movement from judicial and epideictic to deliberative rhetoric in the Lukan account of the Great Banquet (Braun 1995: 158–75). Rhetorical analysis of the Gospels and Acts, then, points to a lively interplay of judicial, deliberative, and epideictic rhetoric in their discourse.

Making a Long Story Short and a Short Story Long

The question now is how interpreters can move yet further ahead in rhetorical analysis of the Gospels and Acts. This paper attempts to draw some things together programmatically by reaching beyond the chreia into the full range of the anecdotal tradition (Robbins 1989). Key to the discussion are insights from the *Progymnasmata* of Theon, which was written during the first century CE in Greek (Hock and O'Neil: 63–5), and the *Progymnasmata* of Hermogenes, which was written during the second century in Greek (Hock and O'Neil: 155–8). Theon considered the chreia, the fable, and the narrative to be primary constituents of writing in antiquity. A chreia is a brief statement or action with aptness attributed to a specific person (III.2–3 [Butts]); a fable is a fictional story depicting a truth (IV.2 [Butts]); and a narrative is an explanatory account of matters which have occurred or as if they have occurred (V.2–3 [Butts]). In the second chapter of his *Progymnasmata*, Theon gleans examples of fable, narrative, elaboration, and rebuttal from Herodotus and Thucydides, as well as other writers. This is instructive for analysis and interpretation of the Gospels and Acts. The inner cultural constituents of writings in the Mediterranean world, including the New Testament, are brief statements or actions attributed to specific people (which New Testament interpreters recently have learned to call chreiai), fictional stories depicting truths (which New Testament literature regularly calls parables), and explanatory accounts of events (which rhetoricians during late antiquity called narratives). Internally, each anecdote exhibits the art of making a long story

short. But when all are put together, they hold the key for making a short story long. More than this, anecdotes are a key resource for making a story persuasive. They contain the insights into life that move people to indict or acquit, to act in one way rather than another, and to censure one person and praise another.

Burton Mack launched rhetorical analysis of the Gospels by focusing on Hermogenean elaboration of the chreia (Mack 1984, 1987, 1988, 1990; Mack and Robbins 1989). This was a natural place to begin, since Hermogenean elaboration shows how the rhetorical goal of anecdotes in late antiquity was closely related to the rhetorical goal of judicial, deliberative, and epideictic speeches. We need to move beyond this mode of analysis by merging Hermogenean focus on the "complete argument" with Theonian focus on the "complete situation." Hermogenes' interest in elaborating the chreia into a complete argument is the result of thinking back from the standard constituents of a speech to anecdotes that bring the life of a culture into a speech. On the basis of information from the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* at the beginning of the first century BCE, we can see that rhetoricians considered the major constituents of a complete argument in a speech to be: thesis, rationale, contrary, analogy, example, supportive citation, and exhortative conclusion (Hock and O'Neil: 177; Mack and Robbins: 51–63). It has been remarkable to find many "complete arguments" both in epistolary and narrative literature in the New Testament (Mack 1990).

In contrast to Hermogenes, who wrote toward the chreia chapter and chreia elaboration as the highpoint of his rhetorical analysis of the anecdotal tradition, Theon placed the chreia chapter first and wrote toward the narrative as the bearer of the "complete situation." The reason for Theon's strategy is twofold. First, he had a deep interest in historiographical writing and found substantive rhetorical resources in it. Second, he had reflected on the relation of the anecdotes he found in all kinds of literature in antiquity to the creation of speeches that move people to indict or acquit, to act in one way rather than another, or to engage in praise or censure on the basis of presupposed values in the culture. Interpreters of the Gospels and Acts must merge insights from the Theonian approach with insights from the Hermogenean approach to make new advances in rhetorical analysis and interpretation of the Gospels and Acts. Distinctions between the chreia, the fable, and the narrative were not as important to the ancient rhetoricians as the insight that exercises with the entire anecdotal tradition were, as Theon says, "the foundation stones for every form of writing" (II.139–40 [Butts]), including historiography.

Major advances in analysis and interpretation of the Gospels and Acts can emerge if interpreters use insights from Theon's chapter on narrative. Theon uses the Greek terms διήγησις and διήγημα interchangeably for narrative as he describes how grammarians should use short narratives in the training of young people during the grammatical phase prior to the rhetorical phase of education. Theon begins with a definition of narrative (διήγημα) as "an explanatory account of matters which have occurred or as if they have occurred" (V.2–3 [Butts]). Then he lists six elements (στοιχεῖα) of narrative: character (πρόσωπον); act (πρᾶγμα); place (τόπος); time (χρόνος); manner (τρόπος); and cause or reason (αἰτία) (V.5–38, 477–81 [Butts]; cf. Quintilian IV.2.2–3). Here the reader sees the constituents of the "complete situation." Theon recognizes that some accounts of situations are not complete. As he says:

> Since these are the main elements of which the complete narrative (ἡ τελεία διήγησις) is comprised, it is composed from all of them plus what is related to

them. The narrative which lacks one of these elements is incomplete (ἐλλιπής) (Theon V.8–11 [Butts]).

This means that the most satisfactory historiographical account will create a series of complete situations as contexts for complete arguments. If we detect movement toward this goal in Luke and Acts, we will be in a position to assess their rhetorical qualities as historiograpical writing.

Of special importance for interpretation of New Testament narrative is Theon's placement of character (πρόσωπον) before act, place, time, manner, and cause in his discussion of narrative. Theon, like other rhetoricians in Late Antiquity, placed persons at the center of analysis and interpretation of narrative. The centrality of people in narrative signals the "biographical" orientation of narrative during this period of Mediterranean antiquity. In addition to race, gender, training, disposition, age, and fortune, Theon includes motive, action, speech, death, and what is after death as central to narrative (V.12–14 [Butts]). The reader will recognize that this description gives narrative a close affinity with chreia. Central to both chreia and narrative are individual people. The reader also will recognize that these attributes are central to the study of christology, discipleship, soteriology, and eschatology in New Testament narratives. The depictions of Jesus' motives, actions, speech, death, and resurrection are the inner fabric of the Gospels, and depictions of the motives, actions, speech, and death of followers of Jesus are the inner fabric of the Acts of the Apostles.

The second most important attribute of narrative for Theon is "act" (πρᾶγμα). Theon's definition of a chreia, in contrast to a narrative, includes either a statement (ἀπόφασις) or an action (πρᾶξις) by a specific person, or a combination of both (Theon III.22–84 [Butts]). A narrative, in contrast, focuses on actions. Within the inner nature of act, Theon includes not only the degree to which an act is important, dangerous, possible, easy, and necessary but whether it is advantageous or disadvantageous, just or unjust, or honorable or dishonorable (V.15–18 [Butts]). The reader will recognize these categories as the goals of the three basic types of rhetoric. The purpose of deliberative rhetoric is to move people toward action that is advantageous or beneficial (σύμφερον) and to dissuade them from action that is disadvantageous or detrimental (ἀσύμφερον). The purpose of judicial rhetoric is to acquit those who are just (δίκαιον) and to indict and punish those who are unjust (ἄδικον). The purpose of epideictic rhetoric is to praise that which is honorable (ἔνδοξον) and to censure that which is dishonorable (ἄδοξον). Thus, actions in narrative, according to Theon, produce deliberative, judicial, or epideictic rhetorical discourse.

Beyond character and act are place, time, manner, and cause or reason (αἰτία). Certainly one would expect place, time, and manner to be internal ingredients in narrative. But we also consider an account of the cause of the event to be central to historiography. In the context of a rhetorical discussion, it is important to notice that the presentation of a cause or reason evokes a rhetorical syllogism, commonly called an enthymeme. In Hermogenes' elaboration of the chreia, presentation of the cause or reason (αἰτία) creates the context for the unfolding of a complete argument (Mack in Mack and Robbins: 51–8). Likewise, the presentation of the cause or reason for the actions (αἰτία τῶν πράξεων) in narrative evokes a logical environment for argumentation in historiography. Theon lists the following kinds of reasons within a complete narrative:

> whether it has occurred for the sake of acquiring benefits, or for removing evil; or because of friendship, or because of a wife, or for the sake of children, or because of emotions (love, hate, envy, pity, drunkenness, and passions similar to these) (Theon V.35–8 [Butts]).

The reference to acquiring benefits reminds one of the rationale in the elaboration of a theme into a complete argument with seven parts in *Rhetorica ad Herennium* IV.xliii.57:

> since it is from our country that we receive all our advantages, no disadvantage incurred on her behalf is to be regarded as severe.

Likewise, the reference to removing evil reminds one of the rationale in the example of the complete argument in *Rhetorica ad Herennium* II.xix.28:

> Indeed he wished to rid himself of his bitterest enemy, from whom, with good cause, he feared extreme danger to himself.

The cause or reason internal to a complete account of a situation evokes a syllogistic environment that can call forth a complete argument. Rhetorical analysis of the Gospels and Acts, then, should be attentive to the interaction between situation and argument. Where complete situations are a context for complete arguments, New Testament narrative has reached a level of rhetorical completeness that would function well in Mediterranean society and culture.

Anecdotal Tradition in Luke and Acts

With this information about chreia and narrative, let us now turn to Luke and Acts. To write well in antiquity, one had to manipulate anecdotal tradition skillfully — which meant chreiai, fables, and narratives. This was a skill the writer of the Gospels and Acts possessed. Luke manipulates the anecdotal tradition exceptionally well. Certain anecdotes in Luke contain an exceptionally economical use of words to make them brief. The cleansing of the temple is a prime example. With twenty-five Greek words, Luke 19.45–6 presents Jesus' action in the temple in the form of a chreia:

> And he entered the temple and began to drive out those who sold, saying to them, "It is written, 'My house shall be a house of prayer'; but you have made it a den of robbers."

Matthew 21.12–13 uses twenty more Greek words than Luke to present the scene, and Mark 11.15–17 uses thirty-six more words. In contrast to the *καί* paratactic construction in Matthew and Mark, the Lukan construction skillfully uses participles to create the kind of abbreviated chreia Theon displays in his *Progymnasmata* (see Hock and O'Neil: 1–7, 24, *et passim*).[1] Skillful chreia composition also exists in the Acts of the Apostles, though there are only a few chreiai in it. One chreia occurs in Acts 1.4–5:

> And while staying with them he charged them not to depart from Jerusalem, but to wait for the promise of the Father, which, he said, "you heard from me, for John baptized with water, but before many days you shall be baptized with the Holy Spirit."

The text of the Gospel of Luke exhibits the same efficiency with fable-parable tradition. Luke 8.5–8 recounts the parable of the sower with seventy-six Greek words, in contrast to

---

[1]Also see Luke 3.10–11; 3.12–13; 3.14; 6.5D; 8.19–20; 9.49–50; 13.22–25. See discussion in Robbins 1988.

Matthew 13.3b–9, which uses ninety-one words, and Mark 4.3–9, which uses one hundred four. In addition, Luke 11.24–26 uses only fifty-five Greek words to present the fable of the unclean spirit who exits and returns with seven additional spirits, and Luke 15.8–9 uses only thirty-nine Greek words to recount the story of the woman who lost and then found one of ten drachmas. Truly, Lukan text exhibits excellent skill at crafting brief chreiai and fables.

Lukan text also contains well-crafted short narratives. An excellent narrative exists in Acts 11.27–30:

> Now in these days prophets came down from Jerusalem to Antioch. And one of them named Agabus stood up and foretold by the Spirit that there would be a great famine over all the world; and this took place in the days of Claudius. And the disciples determined, every one according to his ability, to send relief to the brethren who lived in Judea; and they did so, sending it to the elders by the hand of Barnabas and Saul.

Another excellent narrative exists in Acts 12.20–23:

> Now Herod was angry with the people of Tyre and Sidon; and they came to him in a body, and having persuaded Blastus, the king's chamberlain, they asked for peace, because their country depended on the king's country for food. On an appointed day Herod put on his royal robes, took his seat upon the throne, and made an oration to them. And the people shouted, "The voice of a god, and not of man!" Immediately an angel of the Lord smote him, because he did not give God the glory; and he was eaten by worms and died.

Theon would distinguish between these two types of narrative. The first narrative fits the category of "event narrative" (πρατικὸν πρᾶγμα), which is an account of an occurrence that has political or historical significance (V.26–33, 46–59 [Butts]). The second narrative is a "mythical narrative" (μυθικὸν πρᾶγμα), which is a story that includes gods, heroes, or other mythical figures (V.20–5, 39–45 [Butts]). In both instances, Lukan text exhibits skill with composition of brief narratives.

A writer also needed to acquire the skills to expand an anecdote efficiently. An excellent display of Lukan skill in expansion is Luke 8.42b–34: the Woman with a Hemorrhage. With one hundred fourteen words, the Lukan text presents action of Jesus, action of the crowd, description and action of the woman, the woman's healing, Jesus' response, Peter's response, Jesus' counter-response, the woman's action and response, and Jesus' final response. The Markan text uses forty-eight more Greek words to recount the same episode with similar action in it (Robbins 1987). At the same time, the Lukan text contains quite long, well-crafted fable-parables, like the Rich Man and Lazarus (Luke 16.19–31), which contains two hundred forty-four Greek words, and the Prodigal Son (Luke 15.4–32), which contains three hundred ninety Greek words.

The writer of Luke and Acts, then, contains a high level of skill at manipulating anecdotal tradition. The text shows an excellent facility with participles and infinitives that makes it possible to write short anecdotes efficiently and it shows an ability to write long anecdotes with an economical use of words. Such an ability to manipulate chreiai, fables, and narratives is fundamental to writing good historiography, and the writer of Luke and Acts shows this ability very well.

Narrative Introductions to Elaborated Speech in the Gospel of Luke

The search to understand the rhetorical relation of the Gospel of Luke and the Acts of the Apostles reveals a related pattern of creating narrative introductions for rhetorical elaborations. The point is that Lukan composition moves "chreia elaboration" towards "narrative elaboration" by creating narrative introductions that articulate topics for which the subsequent elaboration creates amplified argumentation. Since the elaborations in the Gospel of Luke use a series of anecdotal traditions — contraries, analogies, examples, and supportive citations — they are properly called "progymnastic elaborations" (Robbins 1993a). In Acts, many narratives exhibit the nature of progymnastic composition. Yet, many of the speeches in the Acts of the Apostles exhibit characteristics of more advanced stages of rhetorical elaboration. This is analogous to the presence of progymnastic elaborations in certain portions of Plutarch's writings (Robbins 1991b) and rhetorical elaborations that exhibit more advanced stages in other portions (cf. Aune 1978).

To set the stage for analysis of Luke and Acts, it may be helpful to be clearer about the nature of a narrative. As we saw above, Theon emphasizes act rather than speech in a narrative. Nevertheless, speech may be present in a narrative. An example exists in Herodotus 1.31, to which Theon refers in II.28–9 (Butts). The narrative is as follows:

> There was a feast of Hera at hand for the Argives, and their mother needs must ride to the temple; but the oxen did not come from the fields at the right moment. The young men [Cleobis and Biton], being pressed by lack of time, harnessed themselves beneath the yoke and pulled the wagon with their mother riding on it; forty-five stades they completed on their journey and arrived at the temple. When they had done that and had been seen by all the assembly, there came upon them the best end of a life, and in them the god showed thoroughly how much better it is for a man to be dead than to be alive. For the Argive men came and stood around the young men, congratulating them on their strength, and the women congratulated the mother on the fine sons she had; and the mother, in her great joy at what was said and done, stood right in front of the statue and there prayed for Cleobis and Biton, her own sons, who had honored her so signally, that the goddess should give them whatsoever is best for a man to win. After that prayer the young men sacrificed and banqueted and laid them down to sleep in the temple where they were; they never rose more, but that was the end in which they were held. The Argives made statues of them and dedicated them at Delphi, as of two men who were the best of all.

Internal to the narrative is response of various people to the action performed in it. In this story in Herodotus, the responses emerge in the form of indirect quotation. It is only a small step, however, to a formulation of these statements in direct speech, since the narration indicates the content of the responses. The Argive men congratulate the two sons "on their strength," the women congratulate the mother "on the fine sons she had," and the mother prays for Cleobis and Biton "that the goddess should give them whatsoever is best for a man to win." We will see below that the narration in Luke and Acts uses direct quotation more often than it uses indirect quotation.

Equipped with this insight into narratives, let us turn to the Gospel of Luke, which contains a number of sections that various interpreters have identified during the last thirty-five years as rhetorical elaborations (cf. Braun: 148–51):

(a) Luke 5.27–39 (Braun: 149)
(b) Luke 7.18–35 (Cameron 1990)
(c) Luke 7.36–50 (Mack in Mack and Robbins: 100–4)
(d) Luke 11.14–36 (Robbins in Mack and Robbins: 185–91)
(e) Luke 11.37–54 (Gowler 1993)
(f) Luke 12.13–21 (Braun: 148; Farmer: 307–10)
(g) Luke 13.1–9 (Braun: 148; Farmer: 305–6)
(h) Luke 14.1–24 (Braun: 158–75)
(i) Luke 15.1–32 (Braun: 148; Farmer: 305–6)
(j) Luke 16.14–15, 19–31 (Braun: 148; Farmer 305–6)
(k) Luke 19.1–27 (Braun: 148–50).

These elaborations are properly termed "progymnastic elaborations," since they unfold as brief units of material in a sequence, like the chreia elaboration in Hermogenes' *Progymnasmata* (Robbins 1993a). As we attempt to understand the relation between the Gospel of Luke and the Acts of the Apostles, it is informative to look carefully at the introductions to these elaborations. Analysis of the introductions to these elaborations reveals that in some instances the narration is so fully developed that it fulfills Theon's criteria for a "complete narrative." Where this is the case, the elaborations approach the characteristics of a "narrative" elaboration rather than a "chreia" elaboration. These introductions, then, are an initial place to see the nature of the Gospel of Luke as a narrative (διήγησις: Luke 1.1). Narrative introductions to sections of material are an important characteristic, in turn, of historiography.

There is not space here to analyze character, act, place, time, manner, and cause in each of these introductions. Therefore, the discussion will focus on selected instances and will display a special characteristic of introductory narratives that exists both in Luke and in Acts. As Lukan narratives establish a context for elaborated speech, they introduce topics through thought or speech of people in the setting that become major topics in the elaborated speech. In most instances, though not all, the Lukan text presents this thought or speech in the form of direct quotation. The thought or speech in the narrative introduction then calls forth the elaborated speech of the main character in the unit.

Luke 7.36–9, the Anointing of Jesus, is an excellent example:

> One of the Pharisees asked him to eat with him, and he went into the Pharisee's house, and took his place at table. And behold, a woman of the city, who was a sinner, when she learned that he was at table in the Pharisees's house, brought an alabaster flask of ointment, and standing behind him at his feet, weeping, she began to wet his feet with her tears, and wiped them with the hair of her head, and kissed his feet, and anointed them with the ointment. Now when the Pharisee who had invited him saw it, he said to himself, "If this man were a prophet, he would have known who and what sort of woman this is who is touching him, for she is a sinner."

Luke 7.40–50 elaborates the issues raised by this narrative, as Burton Mack has shown (Mack and Robbins: 100–4). Mack displays the elaboration under the following argumentative topics: introduction, analogy, example, rationale and contrary, conclusion, and judgment. For our discussion here, it is important to look carefully at the opening narrative, which Mack properly designates a *narratio* (διήγημα/διήγησις). In accord with

Theon's criteria for a narrative, it focuses on a person (Jesus), an action (anointing by a woman), a place (Pharisee's house), a time (when a Pharisee invited Jesus to dine with him), the manner (the woman came up from behind Jesus, wet his feet with her tears and wiped them with the hair of her head, and kissed his feet and anointed them; at which the Pharisee murmured), and the reason (the woman was a sinner). The amount of detail in the narrative introduction exhibits well the nature of Lukan composition. The elaboration of Jesus' speech in response to the situation displays Lukan skill with anecdotal tradition. Jesus tells the Pharisee a fable-parable about two debtors in 7.41–2. The dialogue that emerges creates the setting for paraphrasing the action of the woman in the initial narrative (7.44–5), introducing a contrary (7.46), and creating a maxim ("One who is forgiven little, loves little"). The unit displays classic Lukan composition. In truth, the unit is a "narrative" elaboration rather than a "chreia" elaboration.

Another excellent example is Luke 11.14–36, the Beelzebul controversy. The narrative introduction to this elaboration is as follows:

> Now he was casting out a demon that was dumb; when the demon had gone out, the dumb man spoke, and the people marveled. But some of them said, "He casts out demons by Beelzebul, the prince of demons"; while others, to test him, sought from him a sign from heaven.

Luke 11.17–36 elaborates the issues raised by the narrative (Robbins in Mack and Robbins: 185–91; cf. Robbins 1991a). In this instance, the material topics in the narrative (Aristotle, *Rhetoric* I.4–8; Kennedy 1984: 20) establish the overarching framework for the elaboration, into which argumentative topics are embedded. The material topics in the narrative introduction are as follows:

Situation
> Now he was casting out a demon that was dumb;

Topic: Exit
> when the demon had gone out, the dumb man spoke,

Topic: Praise
> and the crowds marveled.

Topic: Censure
> But some of them said, "He casts out demons by Beelzebul, the prince of demons";

Topic: Test
> while others, to test him, sought from him a sign from heaven (Mack and Robbins: 185).

In this instance, the details in the narrative introduction are less developed concerning place, time, and manner. It is noticeable, however, that the narrative introduces the person Jesus with a decisive act (exorcising a demon from a man who is dumb). Like the introduction to the story of the anointing, the focus is on the response of the people in the setting once the nature of Jesus' action has been presented. The people marveled at Jesus' exorcism, but some of them said he performed it by Beelzebul and others sought from him a sign from heaven. As the elaboration unfolds, it becomes clear that the topics in the introduction provide the context for elaborating "from the parts" of the narrative (Theon III.276–82; Hock and O'Neil: 107; Robbins 1993b: ix–xvi). The outline of the elaboration of Jesus' speech then emerges as follows:

Topic: Censure
Analogy
Counterdefinition (Contrary)
Analogy
Inference
Topic: Exit
Fable
Topic: Praise
Chreia with praise
Topic: Test
Thesis
Rationale
Example
Analogy
Contrary with application
Concluding Exhortation (Mack and Robbins: 186–9)

The point of displaying this is twofold. First, material topics rather than argumentative topics may establish the primary framework for a rhetorical elaboration. Because Theon talks about elaborating the chreia "from the parts" of the chreia, it seems appropriate to call this Theonian elaboration. Hermogenean elaboration, in contrast, follows the procedures of the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* in unfolding the elaboration on the basis of the argumentative topics of the complete argument. The elaboration of Jesus' speech in the Lukan version of the Beelzebul Controversy unfolds on the basis of topics in the parts of the introductory narrative. In turn, the elaboration embeds the argumentative topics of a complete argument in the structure that emerges from elaborating the parts (censure, exit, praise, test). Second, the complexity of this elaboration exhibits well the nature of more developed rhetorical elaboration in Mediterranean literature. The "progymnastic" exercises available to us in Theon and Hermogenes were meant to function simply as "beginnings" for the purpose of learning how to manipulate anecdotal tradition toward the goals of rhetorical speaking and writing. Luke 11.14–36 displays both the rudiments of elaboration, using progymnastic techniques of arguing from the parts and from the argumentative topics of the complete argument, and some of the more complex moves elaboration may contain when its writer has skillfully performed a historiographical composition.

One more unit will occupy our attention briefly before we turn to a summary of narrative introductions in Luke and to narrative introductions in Acts. Willi Braun has performed an outstanding analysis of Luke's account of the Great Banquet in Luke 14.1-24 (Braun 1995). In his analysis, he outlines the elaboration on the basis of the argumentative topics of the complete argument. This produces the following outline:

Setting
Challenge and Question
Response
(1) Introduction
(2) Chreia
(3) Rationale

Setting
(5) Analogy
(7,4) Judgment and Contrary
(5) Analogy
Challenge/Question
(6) Example
(8) Conclusion (Braun: 162–4)

The numbers in the outline represent the sequence of argumentative topics in Hermogenes' elaboration of the chreia. The headings of setting, challenge, and question signal the possibility of a narrative-like beginning, and the additional headings of setting and challenge/question signal the kind of complexity an interpreter encounters in historiographical writing. Braun mentions in footnote 42 on page 158 that:

> V. Robbins ... has challenged the claim that the pattern of argumentation in Luke 14 is best exposed with reference to the Hermogenean *ἐργασία*, an elaboration pattern that is based on the thesis/proofs logic of the 'complete argument' .... He suggests that Luke 14 is better understood as a Theonian *chreia* 'argument' (*ἐπιχείρημα* or *ἐπιχείρησις* rather than *ἐργασία*, 'elaboration', ('working out'), a manner of dialectically expanding upon (*αὔξησις*) the parts of a *chreia* that is guided by epideictic interests as its 'major impulse'."

This challenge occurred when my own analysis suggested that the overarching structure of the elaboration was addressing material topics in the introduction. For me, the parts of the introduction unfold as follows:

Topic: Sabbath
One sabbath
Topic: Guest
when he went
Topic: Eat Bread
to eat bread
Topic: Host
at the house of a ruler who belonged to the Pharisees, they were watching him.

This brief narrative introduction sets the stage for the chreia in Luke 14.2–4, which features both speech and action on behalf of Jesus in Luke 14.2–4. The end result of Luke 14.1-4 is a merger of narrative composition with chreia composition. The initial narrative sentence introduces four major material topics, and the remaining sentences create a dramatic situation for the elaboration that follows. Through Braun's skillful research and interpretation, we know the cultural "thickness" of these opening verses. Jesus' healing of the man with dropsy in the Pharisee's house on the sabbath enacts a healing of insatiable thirst and hunger which resonates symbolically with the Lukan depiction of Pharisees as filled with "*ἁρπαγή* (11.39 [Q], 'exortion'), *πλεονεξία* (12.15, 'greed') and *φιλαργυρία* (16.14, 'love of money'; cf. 16.13, *δουλεύειν μομωνᾷ*)" (Braun 1995: 39). In the end, this chreia plus the opening verse introduces a "complete situation" which the elaboration addresses in detail.

For a display of the elaboration, I prefer the following outline:

Topic: Sabbath
- 14.5 Rationale
- 14.6 Commentary

Topic: Guest
- 14.7–10 Contrary
- 14.11 Judgment

Topic: Host
- 14.12–13 Contrary
- 14.14 Rationale

Topic: Eating Bread
- 14.15 Situation
- 14.16–23 Example
- 14.24 Concluding Rationale

It appears to me that the topics that provide the overall structure for the elaboration are the four material topics displayed in this outline. This means that each unit does not simply recycle the meaning of the initial unit, as in Hermogenean elaboration (see Mack and Robbins: 57–63), but each unit provides new insight on an additional part of the opening scene. This procedure is more natural to epideictic rhetoric than judicial or deliberative rhetoric (Kennedy 1984: 78–79). Step by step, the elaboration unfolds on the basis of a sequence of material topics. The interesting thing about this unit, as Braun has shown so well, is that it also contains the internal ingredients of a complete argument. The same thing, however, applies to the Lukan version of the Beelzebul controversy. By the time the elaboration is complete, the text has encountered the hearer or reader with all the argumentative topics necessary to make a complete argument in the context of the material topics the situation raises for discussion.

There is not space here to analyze the remaining elaborations listed above. Each in its own way exhibits the dynamics of a narrative introduction which establishes a context for dynamic interaction between material and argumentative topics as the elaboration unfolds. It is important for us, rather, to move on to a discussion of narrative introduction and elaboration of speech in the Acts of the Apostles.

Narrative Introductions to Speeches in Acts

It is remarkable how the narrative introductions to major speeches in Acts exhibit compositional characteristics similar to the narrative introductions to elaborations in the Gospel of Luke. For purposes of displaying the similarity, the narrative introductions to five of the speeches are especially interesting:

(a) Acts 6.18–7.60: Stephen
(b) Acts 17.16–34: Paul at Athens
(c) Acts 21.27–22.29: Paul arrested in the Temple
(d) Acts 24.1–23: Paul before Felix
(e) Acts 25.13–26.32: Paul before Agrippa and Berenice

Overall, the narrative introductions in Acts contain greater amplification than in the Gospel of Luke. Thus, in some instances the direct speech is much longer than in Luke.

Acts 6.18–7.70, which features Stephen's speech and death, exhibits Lukan elaboration of narrative and speech exceptionally well. Todd C. Penner, in an essay in this

volume, shows how the initial narrative (6.8–15) introduces the topics the subsequent speech and narration elaborate. For our purposes here, it will helpful to observe the nature of Acts 6.8–15 as a "complete narrative." Acts 6.8 begins by referring specifically to the character (*πρόσωπον*) Stephen, who, "full of grace and power, did great wonders and signs among the people." The reader knows that the place (*τόπος*) is Jerusalem (6.7) and the time (*χρόνος*) is after the experience of Pentecost and a sequence of encounters with the Jerusalem authorities. Acts 6.9–13 presents the act (*πρᾶγμα*) of people who belonged to diaspora synagogues and the manner (*τρόπος*) in which they did what they did: they stood up and argued with Stephen; they secretly convinced people to speak against Stephen; they stirred up the people, the elders, and the scribes who confronted him, seized him, and brought him before the council; and they set up false witnesses against him. Acts 6.10 describes the reason: "they could not withstand the wisdom and the Spirit with which Stephen spoke." In Theon's terms, this is a "complete" narrative (IV.8–11 [Butts]).

A special characteristic of Lukan style, as we observed above, is to introduce direct speech into a narrative introduction. Thus, two sayings attributed to people engaged in the action occur in the context of the opening narrational prose:

> (a) Then they [those who belonged to the diaspora synagogues] secretly instigated men, who said, "We have heard him speak blasphemous words against Moses and God."
>
> (b) And they set up false witnesses who said, "This man never ceases to speak words against this holy place and the law; for we have heard him say that this Jesus of Nazareth will destroy this place, and will change the customs which Moses delivered to us."

The presence of these two sayings makes this unit analogous to narrative introductions in the Gospel of Luke where speech of one or more people other than Jesus moves the narration toward a "complete narrative." Often the statements of the people introduce key topics that are elaborated by the speech of the main character. Sometimes the statements provide the reason for the event to unfold as it does. Stephen's speech (7.1–53) is a response to this situation, and the concluding narration explains the people's response to his speech. See Penner's essay in this volume for further comments on this unit.

The narrative introductions to four other major speeches in Acts also reveal this basic Lukan approach to rhetorical elaboration. Again, direct speech in these narrative introductions are especially interesting in relation to the material topics the speech of the main character addresses. The following list exhibits these sayings:

> (b) Acts 17.17–20: And some [Epicurean and Stoic philosophers] said, "What would this babbler say?" Others said, "He seems to be a preacher of foreign divinities" — because he preached Jesus and the resurrection. And they took hold of him and brought him to the Areopagus, saying, "May we know what this new teaching is which you present? For you bring some strange things to our ears; we wish to know therefore what these things mean."
>
> (c) Acts 21.27–28, 36: the Jews from Asia ... cried out, "Men of Israel, help! This is the man who is teaching men everywhere against the people and the law and this place; moreover he also brought Greeks into the temple, and he has defiled this holy place." ... the mob of the people followed, crying, "Away with him!"

(d) Acts 24.2–9: " ... we have found this man a pestilent fellow, an agitator among all the Jews throughout the world, and a ringleader of the sect of the Nazarenes. He even tried to profane the temple, but we seized him. By examining him yourself you will be able to learn from him about everything of which we accuse him." The Jews also joined in the charge, affirming that all this was so.

(e) Acts 25.14–21: Festus laid Paul's case before the king, saying, " ... When the accusers stood up, they brought no charge in his case of such evils as I supposed; but they had certain points of dispute with him about their own superstition and about one Jesus, who was dead, but whom Paul asserted to be alive...."

In each instance, the subsequent speech by Peter, Stephen, or Paul, plus the conclusion, elaborate topics introduced by the narrative introduction. We also know, from previous and ongoing analyses of the speeches in these contexts that a significantly elaborated speech then occurs in the context, followed by a significant conclusion. For further analysis of the speeches that emerge in the context of these narrative introductions, see the essays in this volume by Mark D. Given, H. Stephen Brown, and Frank L. Crouch.

Conclusion

A major goal of this essay has been to display rhetorical dimensions of narrative as they appear in the writings of rhetoricians contemporary with the Gospels and Acts. At the outset, one of the discoveries was that rhetoricians saw extensive anecdotal traditions in historiographical writings. For Theon, chreiai, fables, and narratives are major constituents of the all forms of writing in antiquity, so he wrote a chapter on each after the two introductory chapters to his *Progymnasmata*. Building on this insight, our goal has been to take some initial steps in rhetorical analysis and interpretation of anecdotes in Luke and Acts to exhibit inner rhetorical dimensions of historiographical composition as these two writings display it. One result of the analysis and interpretation has been the discovery of a similar procedure of narrative elaboration in Luke and Acts. Both in Luke and Acts, a narrative introduction creates a complete situation which contains material topics that the main character addresses in elaborated speech. There has not been space or time to perform any kind of comprehensive analysis in this essay. Rather, the mode has been to present some beginning insights with the hope that others will join in the task of detailed rhetorical analysis throughout Luke and Acts.

Works Consulted

Aristotle, *The "Art" of Rhetoric*, trans. John Henry Freese, LCL, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926.

Aune, David E. (1978) "Septem Sapientium Convivium (*Moralia* 146B–164D)," in H. D. Betz (ed.) *Plutarch's Ethical Writings and Early Christian Literature*, Studia ad corpus hellenisticum novi testamenti 4, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 51–105.

Braun, Willi (1995) *Feasting and Social Rhetoric in Luke 14*, SNTSMS 85, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cameron, Ron (1990) "'What Have You Come Out to See?' Characterizations of John and Jesus in the Gospels," *Semeia* 49: 35–69.

Farmer, William R. (1962) "Notes on a Literary and Form-Critical Analysis of Some of the Synoptic Material Peculiar to Luke," *NTS* 8: 301–16.

Herodotus. *The History of Herodotus*, trans. David Grene, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.

Hock, Ronald F. and O'Neil, Edward (1986) *The Chreia in Ancient Rhetoric: Volume I. The Progymnasmata*, Texts and Translations 27, Graeco-Roman Religion Series 9, Atlanta: Scholars Press.

Kennedy, George A. (1984) *New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism*, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

— (1991) *Aristotle, On Rhetoric: A Theory of Civic Discourse*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Lucian, "Alexander the False Prophet," in *Lucian*, trans. A. M. Harmon, vol. 4, LCL, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1925, 173–253.

Mack, Burton L. (1984) "Decoding the Scriptures: Philo and the Rules of Rhetoric," in F. E. Greenspahn, E. Hilgert, and B. L. Mack (eds.) *Nourished with Peace: Studies in Hellenistic Judaism in Memory of Samuel Sandmel*, Chico, CA: Polebridge Press.

— (1987) *Anecdotes and Arguments: The Chreia in Antiquity and Early Christianity*, Occasional Papers 10, Claremont, CA: Institute for Antiquity and Christianity.

— (1988) *A Myth of Innocence: Mark and Christian Origins*, Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

— (1990) *Rhetoric in the New Testament*, Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

Mack, Burton L. and Robbins, Vernon K. (1989) *Patterns of Persuasion in the Gospels*, Sonoma, CA: Polebridge Press.

Quintilian. *The Institutio Oratoria of Quintilian*, trans. H. E. Butler, 4 vols., LCL, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1920–2.

Rhetorica ad Herennium. [Cicero], *Ad C. Herennium*, trans. H. Caplan, vol. 1, LCL, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954.

Robbins, Vernon K. (1983) "Pronouncement Stories and Jesus' Blessing of the Children: A Rhetorical Aproach," *Semeia* 29: 43–74 = *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers* 21, ed. K. H. Richards (Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1982): 407–30.

— (1985) "Picking Up the Fragments: From Crossan's Analysis to Rhetorical Analysis," *Forum* 1.2: 31–64.

— (1987a) "The Woman who Touched Jesus' Garment: Socio-Rhetorical Analysis of the Synoptic Accounts," *New Testament Studies* 33: 502–15 = *New Boundaries in Old Territory* (1994): 185–200.

— (1987b) "Rhetorical Argument about Lamps and Light in Early Christian Gospels," in Peter Wilhelm Böckman and Roald E. Kristiansen (eds.) *Context, Festskrift til Peder Johan Borgen, Relieff* 24, Universitetet i Trondheim: Tapir, 177–95 = *New Boundaries in Old Territory* (1994): 201–17.
— (1988a) "The Chreia," in David E. Aune (ed.) *Greco-Roman Literature and the New Testament*, Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1–23.
— (1988b) "The Crucifixion and the Speech of Jesus," *Forum* 4.1: 33–46.
— (1988c) "Pronouncement Stories from a Rhetorical Perspective," *Forum* 4.2: 3–32.
— (1989) *Ancient Quotes and Anecdotes: From Crib to Crypt*, Sonoma, CA: Polebridge Press.
— (1991a) "Beelzebul Controversy in Mark and Luke: Rhetorical and Social Analysis," *Forum* 7.3–4: 261–77.
— (1991b) "Writing as a Rhetorical Act in Plutarch and the Gospels," in Duane F. Watson (ed.) *Persuasive Artistry: Studies in New Testament Rhetoric in Honor of George A. Kennedy*, Sheffield: JSOT Press, 157–86.
— (1993a) "Progymnastic Rhetorical Composition and Pre-Gospel Traditions: A New Approach," in Camille Focant (ed.) *The Synoptic Gospels: Source Criticism and the New Literary Criticism*, BETL 110, Leuven: Leuven University Press, 111–47.
— (1993b) "Introduction: Using Rhetorical Discussions of the Chreia to Interpret Pronouncement Stories," *Semeia* 64: vii-xvii.
— (1994) *New Boundaries in Old Territory: Form and Social Rhetoric in Mark*, ed. David B. Gowler, Emory Studies in Early Christianity 3, New York: Peter Lang.
Salyer, Gregory (1993) "Rhetoric, Purity, and Play: Aspects of Mark 7:1–23," *Semeia* 64: 139–69.
Talbert, Charles H. (1977) *What Is a Gospel? The Genre of the Canonical Gospels*, Philadelphia: Fortress Press = ROSE #9, Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1985.
— (1978) "Biographies of Philosophers and Rulers as Instruments of Religious Propaganda in Mediterranean Antiquity," in Hildegard Temporini and Wolfgang Haase (ed.) *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II.2, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1619–51.
Theon. *The Progymnasmata of Theon: A New Text with Translation and Commentary*, trans. James R. Butts, Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International, 1987.
Veltman, Fred (1978) "The Defense Speeches of Paul in Acts," in Charles H. Talbert (ed.) *Perspective on Luke-Acts*, Danville, VA: Association of Baptist Professors of Religion.
Xenophon. *Memorabilia*, trans. E. C. Marchant, vol 4, LCL, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968.

Some Observations about Mysticism and the Spread of Notions of Life After Death in Hebrew Thought

Alan F. Segal
Department of Religion
Barnard College, Columbia University

The Bible remains an enigma to the study of mysticism. Critical notions of mysticism in the West often begin with the Christian definition that mysticism is the knowledge of God from experience spliced together with some attention to a discipline to transform consciousness. While the Hebrews certainly found God in their lives, nothing approaching the kinds of disciplines we normally associate with both the Jewish and Christian versions of mysticism has come down to us in biblical texts. Even when we begin from the notion that each mysticism is unique and needs to be understood in its own terms before any comparative observations can be offered, we are still left with the dirth of evidence concerning the biblical period.[1] One problem in Hebrew thought is to trace the beginnings of the notion of ecstatic experience before specific techniques have been recorded. Another problem is that our evidence seems at first anomalous.[2] What is particularly interesting in Hebrew thought is the close connection between the rise of orthodox notions of a heavenly afterlife and the heavenly ascent to attain it after traditional prophecy was widely believed to have ceased. In this paper, I survey the evidence of life after death broadly in biblical thought in order to show that notions of resurrection in Hellenistic times form the basis of Jewish mysticism and the definitive innovations of Christianity.

The earliest parts of the Bible do not concern any life after death worth having; the Bible at times even seems deliberately to avoid talking about it. Rather than discuss the notion, as was quite common in the literature of Israel's neighbors, the advice of the Bible is curt and practical "Teach us to number our days that we may gain a wise heart" (Psalm 90:12). This life with its inevitable death is what the Bible wants to emphasize.

Any reader who systematically surveys the oldest sections of the biblical text becomes impressed with how the Bible studiously avoids the concept of life after death. The reasons for this silence must be supposed and cannot be demonstrated but one sensible guess would be an editorial enmity for foreign cults. We know well that the Bible normally turns the objects of veneration in other neighboring countries into the material objects of God's creation. Thus the heavens of Hebrew life are not gods but the handiwork of God. At the same time, we have clear evidence that the Israelite populace did venerate these objects and were opposed by prophet and priest.

1 See the frequently cited preface to the collection of essays edited by Steven Katz, *Mysticism and Religious Traditions* (New York: Oxford, 1981).

2 For more on this interesting subject, see David E. Aune *Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983).

In the same way, we may assume that reticence to talk of life after death or ghostly existence reflects ancient Hebrew reticence to grant a realm or a power in competition with God. Most likely, we find no extended discussion of the notion of life after death or the realm of the dead in biblical thought, not because it did not exist in popular Israelite thought probably, but because the editors of the Bible are suspicious of it. There is real little evidence of biblical syncretism, though it is discussed often by prophets, priestly, and royal writers. Any quick survey of the world's notions of life after death shows that the belief in ghosts and spirits at least is almost universal in human experience, where it serves a myriad of different social purposes, perhaps the most important being retribution or the protection and respectful burial of the dead. Indeed, the notion of spirits probably is older than the human race itself, since we find grave goods in Neanderthal burial sites.

Divination and ancestor worship must also be mentioned as often supported by the notion that something of the dead personality has survived death. In Hebrew thought, the issue which brings out the biblical editors' sense of wrath against idolatry is divination. In the famous story of Saul and the witch of Endor (1 Samuel 28:6-17), we see revealed something of what the Bible studiously avoids. Samuel is just as reticent as the medium to provide Saul with an answer to his question. From this passage and many others, we learn some things about the ancient and partly suppressed traditions of the afterlife. Like other cultures there was in Israel an abode of the dead, usually called *Sheol* but sometimes called by other names suggesting a pit or waste. It was not a place of reward or punishment. Very like the Greek Hades, all the dead go there. There is no reward or punishment in this depiction. But unlike the Greek Hades, the dead (or at least Samuel) do not have to wait for word from above to know about human events and this makes all the difference. Samuel already knows the future; indeed, a plausible derivation for the word Sheol may be found in the word "ask" or "inquire." And perhaps it is this quality of Ancient Near Eastern mythology which disturbs the writers most. Because of his supernatural powers, the ghost Samuel is called an *Elohim*, a *god* emerging from the ground. On the other hand, the plural verb may imply several "gods" or "supernatural judges" appearing, of which Samuel is one. In any event, the term suggests the reasons for the biblical silence on life after death.

So far as this passage of biblical narrative is concerned then, the dead can be recalled but it is sinful to do so, probably because to do so suggests that they are divine beings, breaching the canons of monotheism (a slightly anachronistic way to express it). But, as Brian Schmidt shows in his recent study of the material, the Bible's reticence and condemnation of the behavior is closely associated with the Deuteronomic Reform and may perhaps originate there.[3] The word witch (מכשפה) used to describe the enchantress in 1 Samuel is the same word used to describe the last of the enchanters in Deuteronomy (מכשף) except that the gender is common (masculine) in Deuteronomy. The reason given for the prohibition seems to be that these practices violate monotheism by allowing the children of Israel to practice religiously like those who preceded them and were dispossessed by the Lord for their sinfulness--passing their sons and daughters through fire. What we might call the Hebrew impulse to monotheism then was consistent with the Deuteronomic suspicion of foreign cults and what seems to be a deliberate failure to spell out notions of life after death, lest it define powers in opposition to God or areas whence his rule does not extend.

3 Brian Schmidt, *Israel's Beneficent Dead: Ancestor Cult And Necromancy In Ancient Israelite Religion And Tradition*, Forschungen zum alten Testament, 11 (Tubingen, J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1994), p. 294. It is possible to assent to Schmidt's observations about the linkage between Deuteronomy and this polemic without assuming that the polemic begins there. It seems to me that it is equally likely that the polemic is due to long-term social conflicts in the society which are recorded here in Deuteronomic form.

And, of course, though the Psalms were written through a vast period of time, some possibly even periods when the notion of life after death had been encouraged by Hellenistic culture, most of the Psalms do not color the abode of Sheol morally. Although there is some moralizing tendencies in statements like "the good will praise you" while the evil will be lost. Most of the Psalms use Sheol as a way to convince God not to kill the Psalmist in his distress (Ps. 16:10). This is roughly equivalent to the remarks of Isaiah 38:18-19, which states that only the living praise God; while Psalm 49 goes into great detail in saying that the wealth of the sinners is evanescent. Though throughout the Bible there are some notions that the good remain with God, since God would not suffer his righteous to perish,[4] The general skepticism of the biblical writers continues even once Greek influence is felt in the land.

The book of Ecclesiastes, whose date is controversial but which is now usually thought to evince Greek and especially Stoic influence, does not see any necessity to invoke the Platonic notion of immortality of the soul (Eccles. 9:3-10). This is especially interesting because Ecclesiastes appears to reflect not just ancient consciousness but self-conscious reflections by the narrator. There is a brief notion of judgment earlier but it appears ironic: "For the fate of humans and the fate of animals is the same; as one dies, so dies the other. They all have the same breath, and humans have no advantage over the animals; for all is vanity (Eccles. 3:19).

All reward is this worldly and evanescent. Kohelet's reaction to this knowledge is Stoic in form--not despair but $\alpha\pi\alpha\theta\epsilon\iota\alpha$, courageous indifference. It is not much different from the famous stoic epitaph, which is so common in the Hellenistic period: I was not, I was, I am not, I care not (NON ERAM, ERAM, NON SUM, NON CURAM). And this is part of the heroic facing of death in the ancient world which Freud admired so much. Like Sidduri in the Old Babylonian version of the Gilgamesh epic, Kohelet suggests a *carpe diem* theme. Enjoy life. Eat and drink with enjoyment; let your family give you pleasure; dress well. This life is all that we can know. Don't count on anything more. (And this is Job's answer as well, except that he has the unique privilege of appealing his case directly to the divine throne room.)

Even in the later, much more pious apocryphon, *The Wisdom of Jesus Ben Sira*, we find similar notions which ignore life after death. All rewards and punishments are considered to be part of this life. Adversity is a test of one's faith; "Opt not for the success of pride; remember it will not reach death unpunished" (9:12). Even more important is Ben Sira's famous discussion of death:

Give, Take, and treat yourself well,
for in the nether world there are no joys to seek.
All flesh grows old, like a garment;

4 Note places where Psalms uses the term "forever" or "length of days" with exaggeration. Psalms 21:4, 22:26, 25:1, 31:5, 36:9, 37:18. For instance, "may your hearts live forever" in Psalm 22:26 probably does not imply anything more than a wish. Nor does the following imply anything more than Sheol, together with the hope that God will continue to guard him there: "Into your hand I commit my spirit; you have redeemed me, O Lord, faithful God (Ps: 31:5). The "forever" at the end of Ps 23:6 "I shall dwell in the house of the Lord forever," is a tendentious translation of "length of days" in Hebrew: לאורך ימים. Nor does the motto of Columbia University in Psalm 36:9: "In your light we see light" (Psalm 36:9). Psalm 37:18, often quoted in support of life after death, seems to me to imply the opposite: "The Lord knows the days of the blameless, and their heritage will abide forever." Psalm 86:11 and Psalm 145:1 suggests that the faithful will glorify God's name forever, which may perhaps imply a moral reward after the grave. But it scarcely articulates anything resembling a "beatific" view of life after death. The best one can say is that in spite of the biblical reticence to spell out a detailed notion of life after death, several more popular notions creep into Jewish religious literature where the hand of the polemical editor was unlikely to be strongly felt, as in the independently redacted psalms.

the age-old law is: all must die (14:16-17)

There are two ways, principally, in which a person outlasts death in Ben Sira's estimation. The first is through children (30:4-5). They will represent their parents after death. The other way is by means of a lasting good reputation (41:11-13).

This approach to life, which Freud characterized as heroically facing death without illusion, continues in Hebrew thought principally amongst the Sadducees. They are aristocracy by birth not talent and they continue the most ancient traditions.

But there is certain evidence of the gradual imposition of the idea of life after death in the later prophets and psalms. One of the most famous passages occurs in Ezekiel 37, although the context suggests that it is meant to be the vehicle of a vision, not an actual happening (Ezekiel 37:1-14).

The other passage which is often brought in demonstration of ancient views of life after death in Israelite thought is in Isaiah 26:17-19.

> Your dead shall live, their corpses[5] shall rise.
> O dwellers in the dust, awake and sing for joy!
> For your dew is a radiant dew,
> and the earth will give birth to those long dead.[6]

It is the people who are the subject of the passage. The prophet points out the previous failures of the people. They have tried already to return to the LORD. But, as in Ezekiel 37, their endeavors were in vain. And it seems to me that this passage, like the Ezekiel one, is meant to be a prophetic vision, not an actual prediction.

The first clear reference to life after death can be defined exactly, both with regard to its and date and with regard to the specific circumstances that produced it:

> "At that time Michael, the great prince, the protector of your people, shall arise. There shall be a time of anguish, such as has never occurred since nations first came into existence. But at that time your people shall be delivered, everyone who is found written in the book. Many of those who sleep in the dust of the earth[7] shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. Those who are wise shall shine like the brightness of the sky,[8] and those who lead many to righteousness, like the stars forever and ever. (Daniel 12:1-3)

Here is the first explicit reference to resurrection in the Hebrew Bible. And we can fix its arrival. The date is 168 bce or thereabouts. The sign of the resurrection is the arrival of Michael. It is a time of unprecedented, terrible tribulation. But the people whose names are written in the book shall be rescued. The book has never been explicitly mentioned before in Hebrew thought, though it may be derived from Exodus 32:32-33 and quickly becomes part of

[5]Cn Compare Syr Tg: Heb *my corpse*

[6]Heb *to the shades*

[7]Or *the land of dust*

[8]Or *dome*

standard Jewish lore (e. g. Ascension of Isaiah 9:21-22), as well as providing the central image for the liturgy of Rosh Hashanah (See m. Rosh Hashanah 1:1)[9].

Now this writer is aware of the previous writing on the subject. The language of Daniel 12:1-3 is taken directly from Isaiah 26:19. The writer of Daniel has certainly taken the ambiguous prophecy of Isaiah in a literal sense, saying that the sleepers in the dust will literally rise. But he has not taken the writing literally in every respect because he has some definite notions about the identity of the resurrected. He goes on to say that the righteous will not be resurrected alone. Also some of those whose behavior has been reprehensible will be resurrected for eternal contempt and shame. Later discussions of resurrection will confine themselves to providing a reward for the righteous. This particular passage, the earliest *undoubted* reference to resurrection in the Hebrew Bible, suggests that both the righteous and the very evil need to be resurrected for the purposes of giving them their well-deserved rewards.

Besides the general resurrection and punishment, a very interesting special reward is promised to those who make others wise (המשכילים). They shall shine like the brightness of the heavens (כזוהר הרקיע), those who lead the many to righteousness, like the stars forever (ככוכבים לעולם ועד). They shall be luminous beings, shining as stars, which is the same as the angels, for stars and angels had been identified since earliest times (e.g. Judges 5:20 and also Job 38:7).

This vision serves as the basis for the doctrine of resurrection even in rabbinic Judaism. The term brightness or splendor is Zohar (זוהר) and is likely the basis for the title of the most famous book of Jewish mysticism, The Zohar, written in the High Middle Ages. So there is no question that this passage is important to later mystical tradition.

Now there is no scriptural basis for this heavenly reward. Though scripture can be adduced in retrospect in support of the imagery of sleep and waking, we do not get a rational explication of the preceding scripture. Instead the passage is framed as a prophetic dream. This innovation in Hebrew thought is not decided by exegesis but by a specific revelation received by consciously or unconsciously manipulatable means. For me this clarifies the social position by which the previous scriptures were reunderstood into a specific prophecy for resurrection. It was authored by revelatory dreams from prophets who beforehand must have been contemplating the meaning of the precedents in Isaiah and Ezekiel, but who did not exegete the past text but rather re-experienced it as revelation in dream visions. We have often seen that early Jewish mysticism has been found in apocalyptic and pseudepigraphical documents, as well as in Christian documents, by tracing various themes which later show up in Jewish mysticism. But little has been said about the methods by which revelations are achieved. The reasons for this are clear enough. It is very difficult to discuss consciousness from a text alone. But I would suggest that exegesis of the earlier texts in Ezekiel and Isaiah is not enough to explain the innovation of resurrection and life after death in this Daniel passage. One has also to understand that the vision was given on the basis of prophetic dreams but that it is also based on the texts that came earlier. A word or two is necessary about how both can be possible at once.

Dreams are a special case of human consciousness. We all have them, several times a night, but usually we only remember a very few. And we can stimulate that remembrance either directly by waking up during the dream and reciting or writing it down or by consciously or unconsciously making conditions which disturb sleep indirectly--such as by eating or drinking too much or too little or by ingesting psychetropic substances or by vigils or prayer

9 My thanks to Steven Davis for having pointed out the connection with Exodus 32.

or otherwise predisposing the dream to be seen in a particular light. Finally, dreams are very much related to daily experience, both in content and emotional tone. That would mean that anyone who spent his or her time in careful exegesis of the texts which describe the heavens, the divine throne room, and the journey there would likely dream about the same details. Besides reflecting the "unconscious" issues of life, with training, people are actually consciously able to manipulate the content and even progress of their dreams. Lastly, oral reporting and literary processes are always available to subject the dream experience to correction when it goes far from the expected details.

Certainly dream visions are one major means which explains the imagistic relationship between earlier texts like Daniel and Ezekiel and the Hellenistic apocalypses. We should note that a person who seeks out a dream and treats it as a revelation is relying, from our point of view, on ordinary reflex of human experience but is choosing to treat the experience as a non-normal state of consciousness and a divine message, in short, a religiously altered state of consciousness or RASC. Usually in cultures that posit a non-normal state of consciousness for prophecy, dreams are also specially marked as having a divine origin. We certainly know that this is true in Hebrew society because of the famous dreams of Joseph and Daniel. So, from the perspective of the agent (where there is one) and the hearers of the stories, these are religious experiences, clearly understood to have religious consequences. And there is no reason to believe that people did not have these experiences. They are relatively common throughout the world and not especially uncommon in Judaism and Christianity today. And, of course, dreams are omnipresent (except for B. F. Skinner, who, it is often told, claimed not to have them).

Dreams were expected and prepared for by the prophets and seers of that. Night vigils of lamentation are characteristic in some way of many of the same apocalypses and they are also present in the later apocalypse, 2 Enoch. This seems to me to be far more than just chance. Whether they are isolated as specific techniques by the text is beside the point; dreams are peculiarly both within control and out of rational control, so they can easily be seen as authored as messages from the deity. This is almost universally accepted in the Hellenistic world. And they are the medium for revelation in these texts with remarkable frequency, no doubt because of Daniel.

Furthermore, in 4 Ezra there are three famous other techniques--fasting, eating flowers of the field, and drinking a fiery liquid. The last technique, however, should probably be excluded as an actual technique because the drinking itself occurs in the vision, as a way of remembering scripture more than anything else, and it does not appear to be suggested as a waking technique for achieving revelation. None of the seers themselves are directed to do this before the vision starts. So this should probably be seen as a specific characteristic of that single vision.

Fasting, however, is a well understood technique in other cultures. In some sense it doesn't matter whether the culture chooses to mark the activity as directly related to the vision or merely one of the preparations, like obtaining ritual purity. As a physical stimulus, fasting, like over-eating, will bring on vivid dreams and even, if it progresses far enough, waking visions. And while we do not know whether the plants eaten had any psychetropic properties, the description of the special diet may imply a specific agent and is, at the very least, a significant part of the fasting theme. It may be even more, since poppies, Marajuana, and Jimson weed, as well as other psychoactive plants, grow wild everywhere around the Mediterranean. But the important notion, in any case, is that the enormous changes in interpretation which we can see between Ezekiel 37 and Isaiah 24-27 need to be justified not merely by exegesis but by *revelation*. God needs to communicate this novelty directly to the Israelites through dreams, interpreted as prophetic vision. The direct importation of literal resurrection into the culture of Judea would demand special circumstances and special justification.

And of course, in our period, dreams even more afford protection to the divinity's sovereignty. Dreams seem to be from without, they are not usually understood as being under human control (though we know that there are a number of aspects of dreaming which are under conscious control, at least with some training). Furthermore, it is quite easy to train oneself to remember and record dreams and to analyze them for whatever meaning is desired. There is a more subtle relationship between conscious and unconscious processes which interact in the setting in which religious experience takes place. And no one can gainsay that however the experience is gained that it must depend largely on images generated by intimate and long-standing study of the biblical texts which preceded them. And this is just as we would expect since dreams are unusually susceptible such to influences from texts or from daily events, as we all know.[10] Who is to say that meditative states, contemplative states, and self-hypnosis is not equally suspicious?

Revelation in Judaism is also specific to historical circumstances. We think we know the specific events that produced the revelation of resurrection in Daniel. It was not written during the Persian period, as it purports to be but during the persecution surrounding the Maccabean War. During this period, Jews were martyred for their faith. We note in 2 Maccabees 6-7 that the first martyr, Eleazar, refuses to eat pork, or even to eat acceptable food when the crowd has been told it was pork. So the old man Eleazar dies a martyr's death, even though he is offered a merciful and respectful way out, because in his last remaining years, he does not want to make a mockery of his entire life in his last few moments (2 Macc. 6:18-31). Soon the seven brothers and the mother are put to the same torture. This gruesome story differs in several important ways from the story of Eleazar. Although the children are as valiant as the old man, their reasons for allowing themselves to be martyred are quite different. Several of the children make brave statements about a reward for martyrs in the world to come, all of which mention bodily resurrection fairly explicitly (2 Macc. 7:9b, 11, 14) and seem to be an explicit way of working out the problem in theodicy which the first brother outlines: "The Lord God is watching over us and in truth has compassion on us, as Moses declared in his song that bore witness against the people to their faces, when he said, 'And he will have compassion on his servants' " (2 Macc. 7:6). The issue that occasions resurrection and ascension is again, as it was in Daniel, theodicy.

And, of course, it is the compassion of God, which makes the whole notion of resurrection necessary in the case of martyrdom, is a way of spelling out the prophecy that we have already seen in Daniel 12. Resurrection shows God's continuing mercy in vindicating those who suffer martyrdom. The resurrection will be bodily, in fact very bodily, as the third son's remarks make clear. The effect of this extreme attention to the body in the restoration of this world shows that the tradition of resurrection is not at all obligated to platonic thought or even Greek thought, although 2 Maccabees is certainly a book that was written first in Greek and uses Greek cultural norms in a variety of ways. The palpability of the bodily resurrection, wherever it comes from, has become a quintessentially nationalist, Hebrew idea, organizing national liberation from the Syrian Greeks. It is the remedy given by God to the Jews because of the cruelty and oppression of foreign domination, a notion which will carry on directly into the Roman period. And it is easy to see why it is stressed at this particular moment. The persecutors have destroyed the bodies of the young martyrs. But God's mercy guarantees that they will have them back and have the pleasures of their bodily existence again when God raises them. In the epitomist's comments in 2 Maccabees 12:43f, we also see a similar interest

[10] One can appreciate Himmelfarb's attempt to unravel various confusions which have existed in the portrayal of these problems. Yet she inadvertently continues the confusion because she does not try to define the phenomenology of religiously altered consciousness or ask how it might leave traces in thext so she mistakenly decides it is absent in this Jewish material.

in resurrection: "In doing this he acted very well and honorably, taking account of the resurrection (ἀνάστασις). For if he were not expecting that those who had fallen would rise again (ἀναστῆναι), it would have been superfluous to pray for the dead" (2 Macc. 12:43).[11] We have come a great distance from the issues that occupied Deuteronomy.

In such protestations of earthly compensation for the pleasures foregone by martyrdom, one other important aspect of the tradition is often overlooked. The mother encourages her martyr sons in several ways, but nowhere more importantly than when she exalts God's creative powers (7:22) and even more clearly in 2 Maccabees 7:28: "I beseech you, my child, to look at the heaven and the earth and see everything that is in them, and recognize that God did not make them out of things that existed. Thus also mankind comes into being." This is, in most estimations, the first clear statement of *creatio ex nihilo*, the first time God is clearly praised as creator from nothing.[12] In Genesis, of course, God does not actually create everything--darkness (חושך) and the deep (תהום) precede creation. The writers of the great prologue in heaven of Genesis 1 were not sensitive to the theological principles which we have inherited from Aristotelianism. Even Isaiah 45:7 only praises God as the creator of light and darkness. One normally thinks that Aristotelian principles suggest the necessity that God create out of nothing, else anything that is co-terminous with God be also thought of as co-equal with Him. But this passage in 2 Maccabees shows that the motivation for stressing creation from nothing was actually the growing notion of bodily resurrection. God needs the powers to create the martyrs' bodies again from nothing. In the previous examples where resurrection is discussed a bodily residuum remains. The dry bones knit together in Ezekiel, the corpses of those who rest in the dust become the basis of the awakened and resurrected saints in Daniel. Here, the text seems impelled to stress that God can create as He will because in this power rests His promise to the martyrs. The martyrs will be resurrected from nothing just as all humans come from nothing. It is not the creation of the world which is stressed here but the mysterious creation of each individual. The result of this assertion is the reassurance that God can certainly resurrect the righteous from dust and even from nothing, if nothing remains. There is no gainsaying the absolute innovations which the sudden importation of ideas of life after death found in Hebrew thought. Evidently the Roman occupation radicalized many different parts of the population. And it makes necessary a reclarification of what will later be two distinct mystical topics--the deeds of creation (מעשה בראשית) and the deeds of the Merkabah (מעשה מרכבה).

The texts at Qumran now show that this sectarian group also believed in resurrection and life after death, perhaps even as angels, as Josephus implies. Furthermore, the Qumran community apparently nursed many ascension traditions, as we are seeing in the more recently published Qumran material. Certainly this is in line with Daniel's prophecy that those who make others wise will become stars in heaven. And ascension is just what Josephus reports about them. Yet, although it is clear that these promises of resurrection, ascension, and heavenly immortality as angels come from a sectarian background, the ideas were so attractive to the culture as a whole that they spread out far broader than the sectarian conventicles of first century Judaism. They appear in the Pharisees who are hardly a millennarian sect, though they apparently do have a distinct group identity.

In back of this seeming anomaly lies the ambiguity of the existence of a second doctrine of life after death to enter Judaism. The idea of the immortality of the soul was entering Jewish life from the other end of the social spectrum. Immortality of the soul enters with Greek philosophical contexts--in particular Platonic notions of the immortal soul. Judaism

11 See also 2 Macc. 7:9, 14 and also 12:38-46.

12 Sir. 24:8 also suggests the same but it is normally dated a bit later.

does adopt these notions but during this period the first social classes to adopt them are not the same as those who adopt notions of resurrection. Indeed, they are in some ways, polar opposites. Resurrection is the product of the disenfranchised classes of people who cannot abide foreign domination. By contrast, immortality of the soul is mainly adopted by classes of people who learn Greek culture and benefit from it. They are deeply involved in Greek intellectual ideas or who are attempting to combine Judaism with the intellectual currents of their day. Among those who adopt Platonic notions in Hebrew thought are Philo, Josephus, several other Jewish philosophical writers.

But let us concentrate first on the clear-cut contrasts before we discuss the mixture of the two concepts. The contrast in social class is clearly congruent with the contrast in conceptions of the afterlife. The writers promise to the young martyred men a return of the physical body which was denied them by their martyrdom, a fitting reward which returns their youth and strength to them. By contrast the Greco-Roman philosophical apologists create a synthesis in Greek and Hebrew thought but at first they leave out resurrection completely. Indeed, in many cases, they tried to show that Jewish thought anticipated Greek thought by means of God's direct revelation. Immortality of the soul both in Greece and its Jewish versions stresses the ideals of a more aged intellectual class--continuity of consciousness. Sacrificing youth may want complete restoration of their bodies and their lives; the wise aged have eschewed the pleasures of the flesh for philosophical reflection. In so doing, they may actually have valorized for the first time in Jewish life the notion of self-conscious reflection, of which the immortality of the soul is a natural extension. If so, it is interesting to note that personal, self-conscious reflection has been part of Jewish literature at least since the time of Ecclesiastes where, in the older heroic fashion, it denied any notions of life after death. And of course this is the strain of thought that is most favored by the Sadducees.

While Philo and Josephus operate explicitly out of educated Greek notions of life after death, other aspects of Jewish life absorb the notions without the philosophical proofs and demonstrations. The Wisdom of Solomon 3:1-4 uses a Greek notion of immortality in describing the more traditionally Jewish notion of resurrection for the martyrs. The occasion of the discussion is the death of the righteous and, like the apocalyptic sensibility, the writer of Wisdom claims that they are immortal, with God. Yet, unlike the apocalyptic works, there is no obvious end of time with a judgment. There is no remedy for death in that no one returns from it. Rather their souls are in the hand of God, an idea which, in the end, is quite similar to some of the Psalms where the righteous are preserved by God from Sheol. This passage, while it extols the martyrs, offers quite a different kind of notion than the apocalyptic formula for compensation of the righteous.

Even more important is the social context of these ideas, which place it squarely in the higher classes of Jewish life, who have seen fit to articulate the inchoate notion of afterlife in the Bible with the help of Greek philosophy. The millennarian notion of afterlife is, in these places, quite different from this Hellenized wisdom tradition. After the tradition ramifies in various ways, many more complicated combinations will be possible, but the beginning seems to preserve different origins for the different notions of life after death in Jewish thought.

Similarly, the trend which is foremost in the Maccabean literature contains interest in immortality, as we have seen. But by the time of the writing of 4 Maccabees 9:21, 22 and 14:5, 16:13 and 17:12, the fashion in which immortality will be sought will be in a synthesis of Greek and first temple Israelite thought. As opposed to the corresponding passage in 2 Maccabees, there is no elaborate discussion of resurrection in 4 Maccabees, no corresponding cosmological argument that God made everything, hence can recreate those who are dead from nothing. Instead, there is a clear relationship between martyrdom and immortality, but astral immortality, even with fire serving as the element cleansing mortality from the martyrs, just as fire and light are the characteristics of heavenly life.

Thus, the second notion of immortality to enter Jewish thought in the first century is that of the immortal soul. It can be used to describe martyrdom but it is not organically related to the notion of martyrdom in the same way that bodily resurrection is. Of course, this notion of life after death brings with it a different kind of interest in mystical and religiously altered states of consciousness. Ecstatic ascent to the heavens in mystical contemplation or soul flight is in fact used in the ancient world as an experiential demonstration that the ultimate home of the soul will be in the immortal heavens. The earlier notions of resurrection are affected by "name" or "spirit" or in some kind of bodily transformation, as continues to be the case in 1 Enoch. The notion of a soul will later clarify the issue of continuity of identity in resurrection but it does not seem to be present in earlier notions of resurrection. Clearly then, it is not enough to say that resurrection is a native Jewish notion while immortality of the soul is a Greek notion. These ideas enter Jewish society in different ways and begin to underscore the social fragmentation that is exacerbated by the Greek conquest in the fourth century bce. By the first century we have clearly differentiated social circumstances, which also show up in the various understandings of life after death. But it is not true that the Hellenistic writers eliminated any discussions of religiously altered states of consciousness when they revalued notions of resurrection to immortality of the soul. The Hellenistic world valued these phenomena and so Jews like Philo interpreted them in a philosophical context.

Every first century sectarian group had a position on these issues. The social structure of first century Judea is described primarily by Josephus, who mentions that there are Sadducees, Pharisees, and Essenes (War 2.119; Ant. 18.11-12). The Sadducees appear to be the traditional aristocracy, priestly in nature. On the other hand, their philosophy, which denies life after death, does not appeal to many, according to Josephus (War 2.164-5). So they are not merely a social and political grouping; they have clear religious views as well. Or their social position implies a certain position with regard to life after death. "The Sadducees hold that the soul perishes along with body" (Ant. 18.16). The Sadducees do not believe in fate, feeling that God is distant from human beings and that we must take responsibility for what we will: "All things lie within our own power so that we ourselves are responsible for our well being, while we suffer misfortune through our own thoughtlessness" (Ant. 13.173). Finally, Josephus says that the Sadducees do not look forward to any other rewards and punishments after death. People are to be compensated for their own deeds in this world. In Josephus' organization of the issues, belief in life after death and the issue of justice in this world are intimately connected. Furthermore, Josephus' portrayal of Sadducees is paralleled in the gospels, where Jesus and Sadducees argue over the existence of resurrection (Matt. 22:23-33; Mark 12:18-27; Luke 20:27-40). Jesus even argues for the concept of resurrection with an argument reminiscent of the Pharisees. This hardly means that Jesus was himself a Pharisee; rather it points out the importance of the conceptualization of resurrection in popular varieties of Judaism (Matthew 22:23-33). Jesus demonstrates the concept of resurrection by quoting two different scriptures and assuming that there can be no seeming contradiction between them. Since scripture says that YHWH is God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob and he is also called "the living God," (actually God of the living), then the patriarchs must still be alive. This is not only an effective argument in the first century; the Gospels are much impressed with it. It is so effective that it makes the Pharisees, who also believe in resurrection, jealous.

Indeed, rabbinic literature also criticizes the Sadducees for not believing in resurrection. They are, in rabbinic eyes, obtusely literal in understanding the scripture. But that only underlines what we can see from the historical development of the concepts of resurrection and afterlife in Judaism. There is no easy way to derive resurrection from any biblical text before Daniel. Obviously, the Sadducean Bible would not have contained the visions in Daniel. Although we have no identifiably Sadducean text--that is, no writing that we can identify as specifically Sadducean in a sectarian sense--it is quite likely that many biblical and inter-

testamental books could actually reflect their perspective. The Wisdom of Jesus ben Sira, Ecclesiasticus as it is called in Greek, written by a wisdom teacher in the earlier Greek period and which, as we have already seen, does not contain any concept of life after death, could easily have been highly prized among them.

There is an easy and clear parallel between the social position of the aristocrats and their explicit theology. As lords of the land, they have a relatively privileged life. They appear to need no other rewards than those they take in this world. But, of course, this is not an inevitable correlation. One might have easily imagined exactly the opposite--where the aristocrats take for themselves the rewards of the next world just as they take the rewards of this life. Such was the case in Egypt of the Pharaohs, for instance. Logical correlation alone does not make this social history inevitable. What explains the particular correlation found in Hebrew thought is the traditional interests of Israelite culture--its abhorrence of notions of an afterlife, probably because of its relationship to idolatry, and the virtual lack of the notion in the Hebrew Bible. This puts the Sadducees in rather close association with the Epicureans and Stoics of the early Hellenistic period. Because of this traditional value, the aristocrats were more easily impressed by one of the high philosophies of Greek life--stoicism. Like the aristocratic Stoics of Greek culture, the highest class rulers of Hellenistic Israel felt that life could be faced in bravest and most steadfast and brave terms without reference to any afterlife.

The Pharisees have a social position which is harder to understand from their religious life. The Sadducees had to share power with the Pharisees, who were apparently a skilled class of scribal and craftsmen who studied the laws in detail. Not only did Josephus describe them as the most accurate interpreters of the law, he did so in language that suggests that they already possess the "oral law" which is characteristic of the rabbis. Josephus describes their product as *nomima* "legal enactments" (Life 191) and says several places that they handed down (paredosan) regulations not recorded in the Torah of Moses (Ant. 13.297; 17.41). The Greek terminology suggests oral transmission, as does the sentence structure which contrasts the Pharisaic enterprise with the written law. Josephus describes the Pharisees as more abstemious in their personal habits than the patrician Sadducees. "They simplify their standard of living" (18.12). He says that they are not impressed by luxury nor seek it in this world. Rather they are respectful and deferential to elders and keep their word (18.12). The Pharisees are affectionate to each other and cultivate harmonious relationships within the community (War 2.166).

The Pharisees, who are expert at understanding the law, believe that there are rewards and punishments, as well as life after death. They are educated men, helpful in running the state. Though Josephus is from a priestly family himself and so heir to the Sadducee position, should he desire it, in his autobiography, he states that he learned to govern his life according to the styles of the Pharisee, since he wants a career in public life (Life 10-12). However, this is not be interpreted as Josephus' conversion to the Pharisees.[13] Josephus often appears not to like Pharisees much, especially in his public career as a general during the war, when they are constantly trying to have him removed from office. Evidently, his background made him suspicious and his attempt to live as one was less than entirely convincing. In his later writings, Josephus suggests that they are the class of people in whom Rome can best trust to govern the land after the destruction of the temple. But that is many years after the war. On the other hand, more religious persons found the Pharisees' piety impressive. Jesus says that unless one's "righteousness surpasses even that of the Pharisees, a person will certainly not enter the kingdom of heaven" (Matt. 5:20). Jesus' admiration had limits because, according to Mark, they could be criticized as setting aside the commands of God in order to observe their own traditions (Mark 7:9).

13 See Steve Mason, *Flavius Josephus on the Pharisees* (Leiden: Brill, 1991).

Again, Josephus loads notions of reward, punishment, and providence with their notions of life after death. He says that the Pharisees attribute everything to fate and to God at the same time (War 2.162). Logically, this is hard to imagine, so Josephus continues by saying that we all have individual choice but that fate cooperates in each action (2.163). Indeed, the rabbinic movement, which rests on the traditions transmitted by the Pharisees, maintains that "everything is foreseen, yet free will is also given." Or, the rabbis say, "everything is in the hands of heaven except the fear of heaven," meaning that God has control over everything except that a person has the power and ability to deny God. As Josephus says: "Though they postulate that everything is brought about by fate, still they do not deprive the human will of the pursuit of what is in human power, since it was God's good pleasure that there should be a fusion and that the will of humanity with its virtue and vice should be admitted to the council-chamber of fate." (Ant. 18.13-14)

Of course, Josephus does not neglect the Pharisees' view of resurrection. He says "Every soul, they maintain, is imperishable, but the soul of the good alone passes into another body, while the souls of the wicked suffer eternal punishment" (War 2.163). This does not mean that they necessarily believed in metempsychosis or reincarnation. Rather it apparently means that Josephus envisioned another, different kind of body for imperishable souls. The body which we use in this life is corruptible; therefore, like Paul, he sees a new incorruptible flesh to be the reward of the good. It may well be that this is identical or close to the notions which we have seen in Enoch.

What is interesting about this party system in first century Judea is that it was a combination of political and religious differences which apparently separated the two groups into sects or parties. And resurrection was one of the subjects that distinguished between them. That means in the century and one half to two centuries between the Maccabean war, the appearance of the dream visions of Daniel, and the writings of Josephus and the New Testament the notion of life after death had become very popular in Israel. This is most dramatically confirmed by a story told by Luke about Paul. It is not mentioned in Paul's letters, so it may be an apocryphal story that has grown up in the generation between Paul and his biographer. But it illustrates that the issue of life after death was still being fiercely fought in first century Judea (Acts 23:6-10).

Shortly after the events narrated in Luke's early history of the church and likely written at the same time and place, Josephus' War also discusses the issues of life after death amongst the inhabitants of Judea. We have already seen how he figures the issues of resurrection for his Roman audience. When he discusses the act of martyrdom which ends the First War against Rome, Josephus is at his most articulate. The speech of Eleazar ben Yair, one of the leaders of the defenders of Masada against the Roman siege, is clearly the work of Josephus himself. He describes the hopeless situation and then writes the appropriately heroic speech for the leader of the defense.

The first appeal is to heroism. Clearly, God has determined that they should all die since the Romans are close to vanquishing them, although they have had the best position possible and an enormous cache of supplies and weapons. On the other hand, God has graced them with information which many of their compatriots have not have--the knowledge of their imminent capture. He therefore urges a noble death in liberty (*ελευθέρα δ' ἡ τοῦ γενναίου θανάτου...*, War 7.326) rather than slavery and dishonor.

Though many are convinced by this appeal, others are more compassionate for their wives and children. For this reason, Eleazar continues on to a discussion of the immortality of the soul (*περὶ ψυχῆς ἀθανασίας*, War 7.341). Josephus reports that "Death truly gives liberty

to the soul and permits it to depart to its own pure abode, there to be free of all calamity" (*οὗτος μὲν γὰρ ἐλευθερίαν διδοὺς ψυχαῖς εἰς τὸν οἰκεῖον καὶ καθαρὸν ἀφίησι τόπον ἀπαλλάσσεσθαι, πάσης αυμφορᾶς ἀπαθεῖς ἐσομένας*, War 7.344).

Josephus continues by positing that the soul is the principle of life in the world--whatever it inhabits is alive and whatever it abandons immediately dies. He then tries to demonstrate that the soul is independent of the body in sleep and will be all the more so after death. This is pure platonic thinking which may have impressed Josephus's readers deeply. But it is unlikely to be anything at all like the ideas of immortality that the desperate defenders of Masada embraced. They, like all other Jewish sectarian groups of the day, were probably more attracted by the notion that they would be resurrected in their bodies completely to enjoy the rest of the life which had been denied them by faith. We have noticed that all the nativist groups of the first century, Christianity included, embraced notions of a bodily resurrection, not the immortality of the soul. It is in fact Josephus' use of Greek notions of immortality to describe the Hebrew notion of resurrection that has totally confused scholarship on the two different clear social backgrounds of the two ideas. Once we see where the two different notions come from it is easy to disentangle the opposing notions and see Josephus rather as the first of many attempts to bring the two concepts together. It was not easy.

Paul himself is apparently trying the same kind of hermeneutical enterprise when he answers the question of the nature of resurrection in 1 Corinthians 15:35-45. There is an interesting double vision in Paul's attempt to talk about spiritual bodies. This seems to be a way of mediating between Greek notions of soul or spirit and the Jewish apocalyptic notion that the body of the martyr is to be resurrected. In any event, it is Paul's own insight that is clearest here.

The context for these visions is clearly apocalyptic prophecy. In 2 Corinthians 12:1-4, Paul says that he is talking about visions and revelations of a man in Christ, who is likely to be himself. He also says that this man went to paradise, so ascent and visionary revelation (we must add a notion of non-normal state of consciousness here to come up with a naturalistic explanation for the content of the revelation).

Ppaul says twice that he does not know whether the man was in in the body or out of the body. Although it is not entirely clear whether Paul is describing his own or someone else's experience, but the vast majority of scholarship thinks that Paul is describing himself. If I had to wager, I would suggest that Paul is saying that he has experienced the ascent and he does not know whether he journeyed in the body or not. This certainly fits the apocalyptic and mystical evidence in early Christianity and Judaism where some ascents seem to be soul flights whereas others seem to be bodily journeys. Suffice it to say that these seemingly parenthetical remarks are quite impressive and unusual pieces of evidence for a particular theoretical moment in Late Antiquity ascent texts. Paul is flatly stumped by the mechanism. He will not risk a guess.

At any rate, 2 Corinthians suggests that Paul has not entirely adopted the Platonic notion of the immortal soul. Had he done so, he would not have contemplated the eventuality that a body could ascend to heaven and he would have had a ready-made explanation--soul flight--for the mechanism of the journey. This Pauline dilemma is probably impossible within a strictly Jewish apocalyptic framework, prior to the importation of Greek philosophy, and it is certainly impossible for anyone who has a well defined Platonic notion of soul. Paul's predicament is that he knows both; he speaks out of one to a community that knows the other.

The gospels, which are not so concerned with the issues of being understood as a preacher in the same way, come out much more strongly in favor of the more traditional and

apocalyptic Jewish notion of resurrection of the body (Luke 24:33-44). Here uniquely in the gospels, Jesus's resurrection is separated from his ascension. During the interim the risen Jesus clarifies many of the issues that appear to have troubled the early text. Jesus appears physically to the disciples and clarifies that he has not appeared as a spirit. Rather it is his physical body that appears. He celebrates the Lord's Supper, eating bread and drinking wine and, lastly, even showing that he can eat a piece of fish. Only after he clarifies this point above and beyond the point of the Eucharist does he ascend to heaven.

In the Gospel of John, the physicality of the resurrection is even more clearly outlined (John 20:24b-29). Doubting Thomas must touch the wounds of Jesus before he believes in the bodily resurrection.[14] The church is clearly involving itself in important ways in a dialogue between more apocalyptic Jewish Christians and more hellenized Christians of all kinds on the nature of Jesus' post-resurrection existence. If he is purely a spirit, the argument seems to run, then there is nothing specifically unique about Jesus' post-mortem life. Like all spirits or immortal souls, Jesus merely appears on earth in his "shade" or "ghostly" form. But, these stories clearly say that the resurrection was corporeal and very real. It was unique; it was bodily; it was apocalyptic; and it was God's merciful response to Jesus' willing martyrdom. The result is that Jesus is the first of those to rise bodily from the dead at the end of time. The intellectualist notion of the immortal soul is entirely ignored. Even the story of the resurrection of Lazarus (John 11:17-44) is portrayed in this way, though it basically has the form of a miracle in the Johannine narrative.

But the church cannot ignore the concept of immortality of the soul for long. Indeed, Christianity found it to be the hardest of all the ideas of natural theology and resisted the combination for two centuries.[15] Simply this is why: The claims of Christianity make most sense within a context in which the resurrection of the body can be claimed. In this context, Jesus' own martyr's sacrifice makes sense. His own resurrection is the first of the dawning age, in which all the righteous who follow him will be resurrected as well. But what can Jesus' sacrifice mean in a world that has, in principal, accepted the notion of the immortality of the soul as a purely natural process. Since every soul is immortal, what is the special salvation which Jesus' sacrifice brings? Christianity's claim for Jesus' death makes perfect sense in a Jewish sectarian environment but it can seem almost meaningless in a Platonic environment. Christianity, unlike the upper classes of Judea, must be very careful how it appropriates Greek philosophical thinking. This is a nagging subterranean question which follows Christianity across the boundary between Hebrew eschatology and Greek psychology. The steps necessary to demonstrate the final Christian absorption of the concept of the immortal soul cannot be outlined here. But suffice it to say that the Christian community begins to separate between the immediate reward of the dead--immortality of the soul, and the ultimate telos of history, the resurrection of the body. In doing so, it is in effect using the notion of the immortality of the soul to defuse its apocalypticism. For once the immortality of the soul is put into the equation, appropriately baptized for Christian use, then God's mercy can be preserved without any necessity of keeping the imminent end of the world. It is partly though this process that Christianity almost uniquely in world history turns itself from being a marginal Jewish apocalyptic cult into a world religion and yet manages to preserve the uniqueness of Jesus' message in a Greek environment.

14 Gregory J. Riley, *Resurrection Reconsidered: Rhomas and John in Controversy* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995). For an opposing perspective see, April D. DeConick, *Faith Mysticism in the Gospel of John: The Johannine Community as a Community of Discourse*, forthcoming. Also see April D. De Conick, *Seek to See Him: Ascent and Vision Mysticism in the Gospel of Thomas* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1996).

15 See Jaroslav Pelikan, *Christianity and Classical Culture: The Metamorphosis of Natural Theology in the Christian Encounter with Hellenism* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993), see especially chapter 20, "Life in the Aeon to Come," pp. 311-326.

The most difficult case is, in some respects, the Pharisees, who seem not to be sectarian or apocalyptic yet adopt notions of resurrection as well as notions of the immortal soul. Evidently they both interact with the high aristocratic traditions and the more popular culture. Even if the precise social strategy of the Pharisees is more mysterious than the other sectarian positions, one thing is clear in the development of Pharisaic thought: as the Pharisees become the rabbis, making a bid to control the religious life of the Jewish community, they synthesize the notion of an immortal soul with the notion of bodily resurrection.

The rabbis have an entirely different problem from the Christians. They do not have to protect the uniqueness of any one particular resurrection. They do not have to protect the physical notion of resurrection against the competing notion of the immortality of the soul. They have no problem making these two notions go together or adopting any number of florid and imaginative additions to the doctrine. But Christianity made the whole notion of apocalyptic ends suspicious. When one looks at the rabbinic discussions of resurrection in the Talmud one sees what looks like an enormous skepticism setting in. The rabbis fight to show that none of the specific descriptions in scripture are to be generalized and some are not to be believed as proofs of resurrection at all. Their skepticism is a way of defusing the tremendous revolutionary potential which is inherent in the original doctrine of resurrection. Of course, this irony of deconstruction is peculiarly our own modern perspective, not theirs, for the rabbis refused to take the method that far. In fact, a quick look at liturgy reveals that life after death is repeatedly valorized in daily prayers. For instance:

You are mighty, eternally, O Lord.
You bring the dead to life, mighty to save.
You sustain the living with loving kindness
With great mercy you bring the dead to life again.
You support the fallen, heal the sick, free the captives;
You keep faith with those who sleep in the dust.
Who can compare with Your might, O Lord and King?
You are Master of life, and death, and deliverance.

This is the second paragraph of the Amidah, the prayer recited at every Jewish service. And it is but one of innumerable references to the resurrection which dot the prayerbook. Evidently then, the lessons learned in careful scrutiny of doctrine were meant to have natural limits.

The prayer for the dead is not the Kaddish prayer, which is a doxology to God; rather it is the *El Malay Rahamim* (אל מלא רחמים), a regular part of Jewish interment and memorial services. In this prayer Daniel 12 is directly quoted when the dead are said to be in heaven, "shining with the brightness of the heavens," under the wings of the Shekhinah: "Lord, full of mercy, who dwells on high, Let the holy and pure find perfect rest under the wings of your Shechinah in the heights, let them shine as the brightness of the heavens, the souls of all those dear ones who are remembered today for a blessing."

As opposed to the Christian community which sought for centuries to shore up a consistent and quite detailed notion of the life after death which its adherents could expect, Judaism went in the other direction, obscuring its previous notions of bodily resurrection and the importation of the Greek notion of the immortality of the soul. The purpose of this was not just to emphasize this world's ethical behavior but to denigrate the kind of salvation which is characteristic of Christian life. In so doing, they left to *Merkabah* Jewish mysticism, the mystical successor to the heavenly journeys found in the pseudepigraphical literature, the experience of climbing through the heavens to the throne of God. But originally this mystical experience was what made the transformation of thought and consciousness possible.

PLOT AND MATTHEW

Kathleen Weber
The Catholic University of America

In commenting on the perplexed position of plot in modern literary theory, C. H. Holman and W. Harman stated: "Although an indispensable part of all fiction and drama, *plot* is a concept about which there has been much disagreement."(1) Virtually all discussions of plot still take their starting point from portions of Aristotle's discussion of tragic plot in the *Poetics*, but often go on to point out significant variants unaccounted for by Aristotle's theory.(2) The accumulation of these variants has added up to a chaotic picture in which no widely agreed-upon pattern has been discerned.(3)

This paper will suggest that resolution may be possible by expanding the parameters of the discussion; I will turn to modern psychological research and theory, beginning with the synthesis offered by the social cognitive psychologist Albert Bandura, to obtain information about the narrative interests of the Western mind.(4) Significantly, there is a substantial overlap between the interests identified by psychologists and Aristotle's description of tragic plot. It seems clear that Aristotle's description of plot has functioned well as a starting point for discussion because of its substantial concurrence with these basic narrative interests. This paper will argue that plot variants discernable in both modern and ancient narrative are best understood as transpositions, inversions, and frustrations of these basic narrative interests, a fact that hardly makes such variants inappropriate or undesirable. As will be argued below, these variants may be understood as absorbing an excess human capacity for problem solving, since a problem-solving capacity adequate to our greatest crises may well lead to boredom and restlessness in the tedium of daily existence. The unraveling of twisted narrative can put this excess capacity to benign or even constructive use.

Selected Psychological Research and Theory on Narrative

Two key disciplines that have respectively provided a positive and negative impetus to Bandura's thinking are paleoanthropology and classic psychological learning theory. Evolutionary theory focuses on the struggle of species to perpetuate themselves and understands characteristics contributing to this goal as conferring a competitive advantage. Thus, the discipline of paleoanthropology includes among its aims the identification of the competitive advantage of various human characteristics, both cultural and biological. Although controversy may attend attempts to explain the competitive advantage of some human traits (e.g., growing long hair only on the tops of our heads), the competitive advantage of other characteristics can be easily imagined (e.g., the ability to walk upright, through which robust human beings can cover great distances over varied terrain, in a posture facilitating vigilance, while leaving the hands free for activities, including the use of weapons). Thus, Bandura's investigation of observational learning maintains a steady focus on discerning its competitive advantage for human survival. This attention to teleology is particularly appropriate given the relentlessly teleological character of the human universe in which every element of our environment is shaped to support human needs, goals, and desires. Furthermore, an attention to teleology confers the additional benefit of helping to discern the most essential features of plot. Although the phenomena of the human universe may be described through operational definitions, such as the one Aristotle gives for plot, an understanding of an entity's usefulness for its human consumers can make a critical contribution to identifying its more important and even essential aspects. For example, knowing that the automobile's purpose is to transport people and incidental cargo will help one recognize that the motor and seats are essential components while the cigarette lighter is not.

Thus, Bandura has drawn positive inspiration from the discipline of paleoanthropology but has also formulated his theory in reaction to classic psychological learning theory, which focused almost exclusively on trial-and-error learning.(5) Bandura argues that trial-and-error learning is hardly the dominant mode of learning for human beings. He writes: "In actuality, virtually all learning phenomena, resulting from direct experience [trial and error], can occur vicariously by observing other people's behavior and its consequences for them. The capacity to learn by observation enables people to acquire rules for generating and regulating behavioral patterns without having to form them gradually by tedious trial and error. The abbreviation of the acquisition process through observational learning is vital for both development and survival. Because mistakes can produce costly, or even fatal consequences, the prospects for survival would be slim indeed if one could learn only from the consequences of trial and error."(6) Indeed, numerous studies have demonstrated that many animal species

benefit from observational learning as well.(7) However, a critical difference between humans and animals is the human capacity for the symbolic representation of behavior in a broad range of media (description, narration, verbal and nonverbal dramatization, visual media, etc.). We learn not only from direct observation of behavior, but by encountering its *mimēsis* as well. Thus, Bandura stresses observational learning and its symbolic representation, whose potential has been vastly expanded through the development of mass media.(8) Indeed, it has recently been noted that we live amid the first human generation socialized as much by television as by parents.

Bandura reports psychological studies demonstrating that the observation of consequences contributes significantly to the effectiveness of observational learning.(9) While people may acquire new repertoire by simply observing the behavior of others, Bandura notes, "The effects of modeling on behavioral restraint rely heavily on the information conveyed about the performability and probable consequences of modeled courses of action."(10) He also writes, "Among the countless behaviors acquired through observation, those that seem to be effective for others are favored over those behaviors that have been observed to produce negative consequences."(11)

To summarize, Bandura views human beings as continually engaged in observational learning, an activity critical to the evolutionary success of the species. Cultural goods are primarily transmitted through observational learning, with symbolic modeling vastly increasing human opportunities for such learning. It should be noted that Bandura's understanding of observational learning has gained wide acceptance among psychological theorists: developmental psychologist J. Grusec observed that it has become "an accepted part of our knowledge base" and has served as a useful platform for fruitful research.(12) However, despite Bandura's enormous interest in observational learning, he never specifically addresses the distinction between the observation of actual behavior or the observation of its *mimēsis* and does not use the term "narrative" in his discussion.

Other psychologists have focused specifically on the human use of narrative,(13) with its capacity to represent effectively the relationships between key elements of the human universe: setting, characters, events, actions, causality, and consequences.(14) For human beings, narrative becomes a problem-solving laboratory in which causality and consequences can be replayed as many times as desired in the safety of a mimetic rehearsal of experience rather than a consequential real-life enactment. As Bandura remarks: "Rather than solving problems solely by enacting options and suffering the costs of missteps, people usually test possible solutions symbolically and discard or retain them on the basis of estimated outcomes before plunging into action."(15) Indeed, in the case of children, the experiences demanding mimetic exploration and rehearsal may be the routine events of daily life that are not yet routine to children,

demonstrated by their interest in playing school, store, or house. Psychologists J. Bruner and J. Lucariello described the presleep monologues of a two-year old girl that detailed and elaborated the routine events of her daily life. Bruner and Lucariello interpreted this behavior as an attempt to understand the relationship between agents and actions in the regular activities in which she participated.(16) I would also understand it as an attempt to increase competence and decrease anxiety through additional drill in daily challenges.

However, as children become comfortable in their everyday environments, they lose interest in narrative rehearsals of routine events. Lucariello demonstrated that kindergarten children show far more interest in building narratives about nonroutine situations than routine situations.(17) To test this, kindergartners were told a pair of stories that were either conventional or modified to include nonconventional elements. The conventional stories are given below:

> Mary woke up on her birthday. There was going to be a party. Lots of friends came to the party and they all brought presents. Mary's mother put the birthday cake on the table. Everybody sang "Happy Birthday" and Mary blew out the candles. Mary's father took pictures with a camera. Everybody played games and went home.
>
> Johnny came home from school one day. There was going to be a visit from his cousins. His cousins came over and brought lots of toys. Johnny's mother cut carrots on the table. Everyone did their homework and Johnny painted some pictures. Johnny's father fixed a lamp with a screwdriver. Everybody ate dinner and Johnny's cousins left.

One should note that these stories offer no information about the causality or motivation of events, leaving such inferences to the children. Some children heard these conventional stories, while others heard stories modified in three ways, either by the substitution of unusual actions ("Mary threw water on the candles" instead of "Mary blew out the candles;" and "Johnny hung some pictures" instead of "Johnny painted some pictures"), or the introduction of puzzling moods ("Mary/Johnny was very unhappy"), or by the introduction of both kinds of modification at the same time.

As might be expected, children were much more likely to make narrative additions in response to the unconventional stories than the conventional ones, adding information that in many cases clarified the cognitive or affective perspective of the characters. As might be expected, the more clearly unconventional

stories about the birthday party elicited more narrative additions than the less eccentric stories about the visit from the cousins. Additionally, there was a clear difference in the children's response to various kinds of unconventionality in stories: significantly more narrative additions were made to stories that reported atypical behavior (narrative additions offered in response to 64.7% of the investigator's questions about the child throwing water on birthday candles and 41.7% of questions regarding the child hanging pictures) than to stories that reported inappropriate sadness in the protagonist (22%/11%) or a combination of atypical behavior with atypical affect (40.6%/29.2%). It seems that for most kindergartners, atypical behavior demands explanation more urgently than atypical affect; 18 of 23 children who heard that Mary threw water on her birthday candles offered some comment on her cognitive or affective processes in a seeming attempt to account for this extraordinary behavior.(18) It could be that stories combining both atypical behavior and atypical affect received somewhat fewer narrative additions because the atypical affect already offered some explanation for the eccentric behavior.(19)

To summarize, Bandura has described the immense competitive advantage for human beings in observational learning, by which the enormous complexity of human culture is acquired, whether through observation of direct human behavior or its symbolic *mimēsis*. Bandura reports research demonstrating that adults absorb information through observational learning more effectively when they expect to perform similar tasks than when they consider the modeled activities to be personally irrelevant.(20) However, perceived personal relevance is far from determinative, because a population interested only in the immediately relevant would miss many opportunities to learn things that might possibly prove useful in the future, thereby decreasing their competitive advantage. Rather, one finds a range in levels of curiosity within human populations, with many individuals deeply interested in observing situations with an uncertain relevance to their lives. Indeed, many of Lucariello's kindergartners demonstrated an interest in stories about a birthday party or a visit with cousins whose relevance to their own situation was far from obvious.

Of great significance are Bandura's comments about the human interest in consequences and outcomes, with people showing a strong propensity to enact or avoid behavior on the basis of its observed outcome. Indeed, one may understand narrative as a laboratory in which the interactions of key elements in the human universe can be represented with a primary emphasis on gaining information about causality and outcomes. Plot underscores how the various elements of the human universe conspire to effect transformation for characters (Aristotle's *metaballein, metabasis, Poetics* 51a.14; 55b.26-29), whether a transformation that is desired and pursued, or feared and resisted. In fact, looking to the survival value of narrative, I would identify impact or outcome as

plot's most essential feature. We want most of all to know what transformations have been attained or missed, suffered or evaded. We inquire first about outcomes: Who won? Who died? Who survived? The details of why and how can be filled in later.

To summarize, I would propose that the survival value of narrative stems from the following characteristics:

1. The capacity of plot to communicate the impact of events upon characters;
2. The capacity of plot to organize and communicate information regarding causal relationships among multiple elements in the human universe;
3. The demonstrated high interest of human beings in narratives exploring atypical or problematic situations; and
4. The relatively high interest of human beings in narratives focused on situations not directly relevant to themselves.

My attempt to locate the most characteristic function of narrative in its power to educate, with the hope of thereby identifying its most essential features, may seem problematic, since it is abundantly clear that hardly anyone reads a novel or attends a movie with the primary goal of learning. However, given the critical survival value of observational learning, this is actually not surprising. Activities essential to a species' success often lose their effortful character and become pleasurable, because individuals who find the critical activities pleasurable are more likely to persist in them, thrive, and be more successful at passing on their genes. For example, hardly anyone thinks of eating or sex as making critical contributions to our survival as a species while engaged in these activities. Because observational learning has been absolutely critical to the success of the human species, it is not surprising to find that natural selection has left most of us with a strong attraction to this activity (whether direct observation of the fortunes of those around us or their *mimēsis*). Furthermore, it has been important to our success as an opportunistic species to be interested in situations not immediately relevant to our present circumstances. Thus, we tend to consume narrative indiscriminantly and seldom experience the activity as laborious or educational. This does not mean that the narratives we consume always benefit us, any more than our capacities for eating and sexuality always have good results.

However, alongside narrative's primary survival value in educating human beings in outcomes and causal relationships, numerous secondary uses of narrative must be recognized as well. As noted above, many human beings possess problem-solving capacities far in excess of the demands of their daily

routines. Narrative with its emphasis on exploring the problematic (whether in form or content) can make enjoyable and potentially constructive use of such excess capabilities. Indeed, as Aristotle recognized, the exploration of the problematic is often far more enjoyable in the vicarious medium of *mimēsis* than in direct experience (*Poetics* 48b.10-12). Another secondary use of narrative points in precisely the opposite direction: human beings who feel threatened by their present environments may find refuge in the narrative *mimēsis* of a reality that is safe, predictable, and reassuring, as do young children demanding the nightly rereading of the same story, or consumers of romance and action adventure genres, with their guaranteed triumphs for the protagonists (although here too narrative displays its typical interest in the problematic in the protagonist's ritualistic surmounting of difficulties en route to the preordained triumph). Other secondary uses of narrative will be recognized below.

Aristotle's Discussion of Plot

Aristotle's discussion of plot has unusual importance if only because it still serves as the basis of discussion of plot by literary theorists. Although Aristotle does not attempt to identify the teleology or impact of plot upon readers, many elements of his purely operational definition recall the basic narrative interests suggested by the psychological theory and research discussed above.

In *Poetics* 50a.3-5, Aristotle offers a formal definition of plot that may be summarized as follows: Plot (*mythos*) is a construction of incidents (*synthesis tōn pragmatōn*) that is a representation of an action (*mimēsis tēs praxeōs*).(21) Although one learns from this statement that an action (*praxis*) somehow encompasses lesser, component incidents (*pragmata*), the meaning of the key terms *praxis* and *pragmata* are hardly thereby adequately clarified. As with many definitions, Aristotle's is replete with vague and ambiguous terms that are themselves in need of definition. Given the loose organization of the *Poetics*, it is not surprising that an explanation of action (*praxis*) was actually offered earlier in the course of Aristotle's formal definition of tragedy (49b.24-28). Here, Aristotle specifies that an action (*praxis*) represented in a tragedy must be serious (*spoudaios*, complete (*teleios*), and have magnitude (*megethos*).(22) Of course, these terms only demand further specification in turn.

Earlier the *Poetics* had made it clear that the term *spoudaios* is specific to the genres of epic and tragedy, which are concerned with serious events in the lives of superior people. In several loci, *spoudaios* functions as a synonym of *kalos* and *semnos*, in contrast to the inferior, laughable, grotesque characters and events of comedy (48a.1-18; 48b.25-26).

The term *teleios* is not explained until later in the *Poetics* where an ample description is offered: a complete action is a series of causally connected incidents, consisting of a beginning that does not necessarily follow anything followed by a middle that is both caused and causing, and finally an end after which nothing necessarily follows (50b.26-34).(23) As a result, Aristotle can assert elsewhere that the incidents of one person's life do not constitute a complete action simply because they are suffered or accomplished by the same individual (*Poetics*, 51a.16-19).(24)

Aristotle's use of the term *megethos*, "magnitude, greatness," is complicated by its use in three different senses in the *Poetics*. In 49a.19, the term *megethos* inhabits the same semantic universe as *semnos*, *spoudaios*, and *kalos*. The *genre of tragedy* attained magnitude (*megethos*) when it evolved from its scurrilous Dionysic origins to occupy itself with serious events in the lives of superior people. In a second sense, *plots* are said to have magnitude in proportion to their length and complexity. The philosopher regards longer and more complex plots as superior so long as they remain clear and not too complex for remembrance (*Poetics*, 50b.34-51a.11).(25) However, the magnitude of an *action* is clearly distinct from these two meanings, as suggested by 50b.25-26, where Aristotle remarks that it is possible for an action to be complete but lack magnitude.(26) The philosopher does not clarify this statement immediately, but appears to return to the issue in 51a.12-15 where he describes magnitude as existing in proportion to the impact of events on characters' lives, in proportion to the change of fortune effected: "[I]n whatever magnitude a change from misfortune to good fortune, or from good fortune to misfortune, can come about by a sequence of events [*ginomenōn*] in accordance with probability or necessity--this is an adequate definition of its magnitude" (51a.12-15; see also 52b.28-53a.17).(27)

On this basis, I believe that it would be useful and legitimate to substitute the more specific term "impact" for the vague and polyvalent "magnitude" in expressing Aristotle's concept of the magnitude of an *action*. Thus, Aristotle's notion of plot may be summarized as follows: plot is a representation of a causally related chain of incidents that has significant impact on the lives of characters and that eventually reaches completion through the achievement of a new state of fortune. Thus, I find three important elements in Aristotle's definition of plot: impact, causality, and completeness.

Some have criticized Aristotle's definition on the basis that there is no event that does not have antecedents or consequences. However, the antecedents or consequences of causally connected incidents that result in a change of fortune may quickly become too subtle or remote to be discerned (the dissipating ripples on a pond) or too routine to sustain further interest (an impoverished lifestyle following a reversal of fortune). Thus, Aristotle's observations reflect a popular epistemology under which most readers operate most of the time. Modern narra-

tives that stress the endless antecedents and consequences of actions represent an inversion of the ordinary reader expectations, an inversion that may, of course, prove interesting to readers.

Possibly because Aristotle's explanation of an action's magnitude is isolated from the rest of his remarks on plot, it tends to be the most neglected element in literary theoretical discussions. For example, Forster's influential definition of plot, "A plot is also a narrative of events, the emphasis falling on causality," focuses exclusively on the element of causal connection. However, it is interesting to note that his parade example of plot, "The King died and the Queen died of grief," gives implicit recognition to Aristotle's two other characteristics (i.e., death is notorious in its impact on lives and is a widely-recognized point of completion from a folk epistemological perspective).(28) Indeed, one should note that Forster's prime example of a story lacking in plot, Sir Walter Scott's *The Antiquary*, abounds in transformations attained or evaded: for example, the hero saves the heroine from drowning and is recognized at the end of the book as the heir to an earldom. Forster defends his analysis by arguing that the author has no real interest in the improbable events that cause these outcomes: "[H]e dumps them down without bothering to elucidate them."(29) However, one must recognize that by Aristotelian standards Scott's novel swarms with plot.

Aristotle and Psychological Perspectives

It is clear that there are striking correspondences between Aristotle's understanding of plot and the narrative interests promoting human survival, as suggested by recent psychological theory and research. Aristotle's stress on impacts and causality is clearly paralleled in this thinking. Aristotle's third major characteristic, completeness, may be reflected indirectly in research subjects' reported interest in outcomes. Through observational learning people hope to achieve a new stasis, a lasting improvement in some area of their lives; if people have no hope for a stable gain, there is little incentive for learning or change.

Bandura's insistence on the importance of symbolic observational learning recalls Aristotle's comment that human beings learn their first lessons through *mimēsis* (*tas mathēseis poietai dia mimēseōs tas prōtas*) and that learning through mimetic observation is pleasant and attractive, even for the non-philosopher (*Poetics* 48b.7-8,12-17). Although the point is not stressed in the *Poetics*, one can assume that Aristotle would expect audiences to learn much from the characters of epic and tragedy, who are better, nobler, and more courageous than ourselves (48a.1-17; 54a.16-19; but see *Politics* VIII 5.1339a25, 1340a36). As is well known, Aristotle explicitly locates the purpose of tragedy in its ability to effect emotional catharsis by arousing emotions of pity and terror (*Poetics* 49b.27-28). This

identifies a further secondary use for narrative as a vehicle for manipulating emotions alongside its primary competitive advantage as a vehicle for learning about causal relationships and outcomes.(30) It is interesting to recognize that this secondary use is also facilitated by the safety of the mimetic environment, in which emotions can temporarily become the central focus, sheltered from the demands, complications, and consequences of the real world. Interestingly, Aristotle does not comment on the phenomenon of high audience interest in situations and characters that are not immediately relevant to the audience, a mechanism necessary for the arousal of sympathetic emotion, but clearly assumes this interest.

If one were to adapt Aristotle's definition of tragic plot to correspond to the basic narrative interests based on the psychological data, one might describe plot as a causally related chain of incidents which represents the complete process, from the viewpoint of popular epistemology, by which a significant change of fortune is achieved or resisted in the lives of characters. As noted above, I would argue that other varieties of plot can be regarded as inversions, transpositions, or frustrations of these basic interests. For example, the *Tractatus Coislinianus*, an ancient work on comedy regarded by some as a summary of the lost second half of Aristotle's *Poetics*, states: "Comedy is a representation of an action that is laughable and lacking in magnitude" (*Tract. Cois.* 4).(31) In comedy, instead of imagining sympathetically the impact of changes in fortune upon characters, we laugh when characters fall down and laugh even harder when we see them in the hospital swathed in bandages and casts. Instead of granting magnitude to these impacts, we consent to their trivialization, in an inversion of the ordinary process of observational learning, which strives to gauge accurately the impact of events on characters. Of course, sophisticated consumers of comedy will be aware of the tension between a realistic evaluation of the impact of events and the sharp comedic discount, but naive consumers may conclude from too steady a diet of comedy that eye gouging does not hurt.

Plot and Matthew

The Gospel of Matthew has sometimes been disparaged as a work lacking in literary sophistication and subtlety, especially in comparison to Mark. Clearly, scholars working out of literary perspectives have been less attracted to the text of Matthew: M. A. Powell's comprehensive bibliography lists 145 studies for Mark in contrast to only 96 for Matthew, a work nearly twice as long. As an example of such disappointment, R. M. Fowler has lamented Matthew's reworking of Mark's abundant rhetoric of indirection: Marcan ambiguities that entice the reader

into active involvement with the text have been reduced to pedestrian didactic clarity in Matthew.(32)

However, such disparagement fails to cast light on Matthew's astonishing success for early Christian audiences; Matthew was the gospel most frequently copied and quoted in the patristic era and was given the signal honor of standing first in the NT canon.(33) Doubtless this triumph is partly due to the weaknesses of rivals: e.g., the heretical associations of John, the brevity and ambiguity of Mark. However, Matthew also triumphed in preference to Luke, a work with a decided advantage in Hellenistic literary polish and sophistication.(34) The reasons for this success are undoubtedly complex: one can point to the sonoric and rhythmic appeal of Gospel's language,(35) the organizational clarity of the Matthean discourses, the Gospel's focus on issues of ethics and ecclesiology relevant to its audiences, and the Gospel's thematic consistency and clarity. In comparison with Matthew, Luke often appears rambling, episodic, and less forceful in enunciating its themes.(36) To add to Matthew's other strengths, I would also stress the Gospel's much stronger emphasis on plot than the other Synoptics.

This study has argued that a fascination with outcomes and causality is ingrained in the human species by our evolutionary development. No matter what other interests we bring to narrative, we are gripped by a basic interest in learning what will happen to the characters and why. Forster granted a contemptuous recognition to this powerful drive, characterizing "curiosity" as the lowest of reader motivations.(37) It will be argued below that much of Matthew's power comes from its attention to this interest.

Of course, the other Synoptics also let readers know what happens to characters, but none with the persistent attention of Matthew. Matthew gives a great deal of attention not only to the fate of its protagonist, Jesus, but subordinate characters and character groups as well: John the Baptist, the disciples, the crowds, the Jewish leaders, and readers (see discussion below). All of these characters are involved in a single unified Aristotelian *action* but are affected in different ways by this chain of events. Although I do not view the Gospel as having any real subplots, it will be helpful and appropriate to speak below of differing plot strains that correspond to the differing fortunes of these characters.

The Antecedents and Consequences of Matthew's Plotted Incidents

To describe the unified action represented in Matthew, it is helpful to make use of the distinction made by N. L. Petersen between story time and plotted time.(38) In Petersen's usage, story time denotes the extreme temporal boundaries

of a narrative, including events alluded to or narrated retrospectively and prospectively, while plotted time is the subset of story time encompassing the series of incidents narrated in sequence in the work. Although the action represented in Matthew is unified (*holos*) in the Aristotelian sense that every event is causally precipitated by preceding events, the action is not complete (*teleios*) in the sense that the first plotted incident, the birth of Jesus, is without significant antecedents or the last incident, Jesus' resurrection appearance to his disciples, is without clear consequences. Instead, in J. L. Magness' term, Matthew has a suspended ending in which events consequent to the plotted events of the narrative are abundantly foreshadowed.(39) Such events include the evangelization of the nations (24:14; 28:19), persecution and tribulation for faithful believers (5:10-11; 10:16-39; 24:4-25), the coming of the Son of Man (10:23; 16:27-28; 24:29-31; 25:31-46), the eschatological trial (7:21-23; 11:20-24; 12:41-42; 25:14-30,31-46), and the administration of reward and punishment (5:3-12; 6:1-18; 16:27-28; 19:28-29). Likewise, the first plotted event of the Gospel, the birth of Jesus, is precipitated by the rejection of God's earlier messengers to Israel, which necessitates the sending of a final messenger, God's Son (cf. 21:33-44).

Magness found a similar suspended ending in Mark, which foreshadows the reunion of Jesus with his disciples in Galilee (Mark 14:28; 16:7) and his coming as the Son of Man in power and glory (8:38; 13:26; 14:62).(40) Suspended endings are also found in OT books: in Numbers 33:50-56, detailed instructions are given to Israel for entering and conquering the Promised Land, instructions that will be carried out only in Joshua; similarly, 2 Chronicles ends with a call for volunteers to return to Judah to rebuild the temple (36:22-23), a deed that will be accomplished only in Ezra.

Action does not die down at the end of Matthew: instead, more intense action is projected, on the part of believers in their vigorous service to their Lord, and on the part of God in the promised eschatological intervention that will assert full divine control over the universe. Events foreshadowed after the last plotted incident become suspended indefinitely over the reader, arousing an interest that is never defused by narrative resolution within the literary work. Indeed, Magness claims that the greater an ending's deviation from the expectation of closure, the greater its impact.(41) However, it is important to note that Matthew (like the other biblical books noted above) does not abandon an Aristotelian sense of closure but simply postpones the action's *telos* until a moment after the work's last plotted incident.

Matthew's references to events lying outside its plotted chain of events are critical to the work's impact. First of all, they contextualize the Gospel's plotted incidents as part of a single grand divine action stretching from the foundation of the world (25:34) until its eschatological transformation (28:20).(42) By means of frequent references to the past and future, Matthew situates its plotted events

on a cosmic plane far more expansive than the intimate, familial, and human scale inhabited by Greek tragedy, a limited scale within which some degree of resolution can be imagined. In contrast, Matthew is focused on events determining the fortunes of the cosmos and its inhabitants, events that clearly have not attained their resolution.

Secondly, frequent references to future eschatological events help readers avoid a sense of closure, with the attendant danger of complacency. This is furthered by Matthew's preservation of the Marcan placement of the eschatological discourse. If Matthew had transferred the eschatological discourse to the end of chap. 28, so that the glorified Jesus delivered a lengthy dissertation on the eschatological future, the Gospel would leave its readers inhabiting that future through the mechanism of identification. Readers could be tempted to experience that future as accomplished and resolved rather than pending and consequential. Such is the route taken by the Book of Revelation, where readers are allowed to bask at the book's end in a comforting description of eschatological reward. The last two chapters of Revelation permit readers to experience themselves as passing through tribulation, battle, and judgment and attaining to the bliss of the just.(43) In contrast, Matthew's readers are barely allowed to stray in their proleptic experience of the eschatological future past the jeopardy of the eschatological trial, apart from fleeting imagery of future reward and punishment.(44) The passion narrative that follows the eschatological discourse forces readers to relocate themselves in the temporal framework of the lifetime of Jesus. By the time readers reach the Gospel's final words, *heōs tēs synteleias tou aiōnos* (28:20), they have been thoroughly recalled to a time when the eschaton is still future and hence pending, unresolved, and consequential.

The Cosmic Action of Matthew

Although the cosmic scale of the action is critical to the impact of Matthew, the Gospel reveals this scale only gradually in references dispersed throughout the Gospel that contextualize the Gospel's plotted incidents amid past and future events. In this, one may see evidence of a literary subtlety not often conceded to Matthew. Here, the Gospel demands of its readers qualities characterized by Forster as "intelligence" and "memory."(45) To borrow W. Iser's language, readers are called to build the aesthetic object through successive phases of reading, "each of which contains aspects of the object to be constituted, but none of which can claim to be representative of it . . . . The incompleteness of each manifestation [of the aesthetic object] necessitates syntheses, which in turn bring about the transfer of the text to the reader's consciousness."(46)

This study can sketch only cursorily how the cosmic action of Matthew is revealed in these many references, but one should recognize that the cosmic scope of this action is not stressed in the early chapters of the Gospel. Instead, the infancy narrative contextualizes the present phenomenon of Jesus in terms of Israel's national past: Jesus is presented as the culmination of God's interactions with Israel beginning with Abraham (1:1-17), he is confirmed as the rightful king of Israel by numerous signs (2:2-6,9), but his unique status is hinted at in his fulfillment of prophecy ("God with us," 1:23; "Out of Egypt I called my son," 2:15). The eschatological future begins to be foreshadowed in the preaching of John the Baptist: Jesus is the Coming One who will baptize with fire and bring eschatological ruin to *Israel's* unfaithful leaders (3:7-12). The uniqueness of Jesus receives further emphasis in the baptism scene: as the Coming One and God's beloved Son, Jesus is revealed as the definitive divine intervention, at least for Israel (3:11,13-17). Larger possibilities are first suggested in the temptation scene: Satan offers Jesus all the kingdoms of the cosmos, but Jesus stands aloof from the tempter and this broader sphere for moment (4:8-10).

Succeeding chapters point out the connections between the plotted incidents of Matthew and events past and future. Unbelieving Israel will be excluded from the kingdom in the *future* (8:11-12; 11:20-24) because of its consistent hostility toward God's purposes in the *past* and *present* (21:33-46; 22:1-7; 23:13-39). The harshness of Matthew's denunciation of Israel has become a great difficulty for interpreters. To understand this harshness, one must keep in mind the Gospel's origin in an atmosphere of intense competition between Matthew's Jewish Christian community and the more successful early rabbinic movement for the opportunity to control the reconstruction of post-A.D. 70 Judaism.(47) In this context, the death of John the Baptist for fearless prophetic witness at the hands of a Jewish tetrarch is best understood, not as a subplot (14:3-12), but simply as a further instance of Israel's consistent action in rejecting every messenger sent by God, summarized in the parables of the vineyard tenants and wedding feast (21:33-46; 22:1-14), and exemplified by the rejection of Jesus at Nazareth (14:54-58), plots against Jesus' life (2:1-18; 12:14; 26:4,57-68; 27:1,25); and the foreshadowed Jewish rejection of Christian missionaries (10:5-23; 23:34-39). However, God's plan for dealing with this longstanding opposition has even deeper roots: near the end of the Gospel it is revealed that the kingdom has been prepared for the righteous from the foundation of the world (25:34).

As for the future, Jesus' role in eschatological events is first alluded to by John the Baptist in 3:7-12: Jesus is the Coming One will execute judgment upon faithless Jewish leaders. The following chapters gradually flesh out the scope of this role: Jesus announces in 7:15-23 that he will pronounce judgment on lawless Christian false prophets as well. As the Gospel proceeds, Jesus is frequently identified with the Son of Man whose coming as eschatological judge will

reconfigure the human universe, bringing completion (*telos*) to the cosmic drama with the triumph of the kingdom (10:22-23; 16:27-28; 24:29-31; 25:31-46).

One should also note that the scope of the action represented in Matthew is gradually revealed to have spatial universality, as well. At the beginning of the Gospel, Jesus turns away from Satan's offer of the kingdoms of the world and to focus his attention on Israel (10:5; 15:24), but fleeting references suggest that his ministry will eventually have a broader impact (4:15-16; 8:5-13; 12:18-21; 13:38; 15:21-28). This broader impact is greatly stressed in the eschatological discourse: not only will the church carry out a universal mission of evangelism (24:14), but the parousia of the Son of Man will destroy the powers of heaven (24:29), freeze *all* the guilty tribes of the earth in their tracks (24:30), and bring eschatological justice to *all* the nations (25:31-46). At the gospel's end the risen Jesus commands his disciples to undertake the mission of universal evangelization.(48)

Thus, although the plotted incidents of the Gospel of Matthew focus on a single person's activity in Palestine and its immediate environs during a few short decades, these events are revealed to be a segment of a grand action that encompasses the cosmos and all its history, an action that will be complete only with the eschatological intervention. Indeed, one may view the Gospel as playing off the two scales against each other: incidents on a relatively intimate scale in Jewish Palestine are slowly revealed to be integral to an unfinished cosmic drama. In this respect, one may contrast Matthew with Philostratus' biography of Apollonius of Tyana, which contains many similar biographical elements (i.e., peripatetic ministry, disciples, teachings, healings, execution by unjust authorities, and even a return from the dead) but does not place these incidents in a cosmic framework, claim cosmic consequences for them, or present them as part of an action yet to be completed.(49)

The Plot Strains of Matthew

To apply the understanding of plot developed in the first half of this study to Matthew, one must take note of the impact of the action as well as the chain of causality that produces it. Even though Matthew represents a unified action, i.e., a single series of causally related incidents, these incidents have differing impacts for each character or character group involved. Ordinarily, those who write plot summaries need not be troubled by such considerations: they can legitimately focus simply on the impact of plotted incidents on the protagonist. However, Matthew is unusual in being more than ordinarily interested in having the reader take note of the fortunes of lesser characters, e.g., Jesus' disciples or Jewish enemies. Thus, the impact of Matthew's unified action should be described from the perspectives of these varied characters as separate plot strains.

Even more unusually, Matthew is a work that makes its own readers characters in the narrative. One might say this is true of any intensely rhetorical work that seeks to persuade its readers to belief or action; rhetorical works attempt the transformation of their readers and plot is devoted to tracing transformations.(50) In the Gospel, the disciples are transformed through their encounter with Jesus in the narrative, and readers can be transformed, too, because they also enter and inhabit the narrative world in their own way: Fowler has described how readers frequently take the position of silent observers in Mark.(51) However, the readers role in Matthew goes well beyond that of silent witness: readers are informed that they will become characters in the portion of the action projected beyond the Gospel's last plotted incident. Until the end of the age, readers lie under the divine call to preach the gospel and bear up under prophesied persecution and tribulation. A number of parables also inform readers that they will stand as defendants at the final judgment: one day they will be judged as either weeds or wheat, good or useless fish, properly or improperly clothed, wise or foolish virgins, faithful or lazy servants, sheep or goats. Readers first become entangled in the grand cosmic action of Matthew by hearing the Gospel, with its call to reshape their lives in response to its message: their response will determine their fortunes at the *telos*. Incidentally, one may view Karl Marx's *Das Kapital* as another eschatological work with a suspended ending in which readers' lives will be determined by their response to prophesied events moving toward a *telos*.

Thus, I will attempt to summarize the plot of Matthew first from the perspective of readers, who are given ample information to appreciate the saga in which they find themselves entangled. Jesus is sent to Israel as its trueborn king (Matthew 1-2) and God's definitive intervention in the nation's history (3:13-17). Eventually, it is revealed that Jesus is God's final intervention (21:33-44). The arrival of Jesus is met by hostility that is gradually revealed to be characteristic of Israel's response to God, past, present, and future (10:17; 21:33-44; 22:1-7; 23:29-37). Jesus' authority is demonstrated for all (Jewish crowds and leaders, disciples and readers) in many ways: the fulfillment of scripture, prophetic endorsement, mighty deeds, astonishing teaching (Matthew 1-9), but Israel fails to receive its Messiah (Matthew 11-12), and so becomes a cautionary example to readers. Jesus eventually turns away from an Israel that has rejected him to focus on the instruction of disciples and readers (Matthew 13-25). Once Peter has demonstrated a certain appreciation of Jesus' significance, Jesus announces his plan to go to Jerusalem in obedience to God's will (*dei*), knowing that confrontation, final rejection, and death await him, although he continues to instruct his disciples (16:13-25:46). Jesus' enemies hope to obliterate him by death, but Jesus' obedient death turns out to have surprising eschatological consequences: believers are ransomed and saved from sin (1:21; 20:28; 26:28), the mission to the Gentiles is

opened (28:19-20; cf. 10:5-6; 15:24), and Jesus is invested with the authority of the Danielic Son of Man over heaven and earth, an authority even greater than the authority once offered him by Satan (4:8-10; 28:18). However, the eschatological transformation achieved by Jesus' death is far from complete: readers will still have to endure great hardships in pursuing their assigned task of preaching the gospel and serving God (10:11-38; 24:4-25). However, the endowment of Jesus with all authority in heaven and earth makes the final eschatological transformation inevitable: if Jesus is Lord, then heaven and earth must be reconfigured to reflect this lordship. Despite the information readers are given about the eschatological future, a troubling indeterminacy remains about their personal standing: they know they will be defendants at the eschatological trial but are warned that they may find divine judgment more rigorous than expected (7:21-23; 22:11-14; 25:1-13,14-30,31-46). Hence, they are cautioned against the slightest complacency in the period of delay preceding the eschaton.(52)

To summarize the impact of Matthew's cosmic action on readers, whom I assume to possess a Christian commitment before their exposure to Gospel,(53) the reader's appreciation of the authority and dignity of Jesus and the demands of the Christian life is gradually deepened by repeated exposure to Jesus' authoritative words and deeds, an authority seconded by prophetic and divine pronouncements and scripture. Readers' horror of disloyalty to Jesus is deepened by exposure to the negative example of Jewish *lesé majesté*. The Gospel was written for a hierarchical society that recognized some individuals as inherently better, nobler, and more deserving of respect: we retain some remnant of these feelings in our horror of presidential assassination. Indeed, the plot of Matthew has important parallels to the story of Benito Aquino: a legitimate claimant to leadership comes to his own land and is destroyed by the long obdurate rulers of his own people. However, the resurrection demonstrates that opposition to Jesus can have no permanent effect: Jesus, not his opponents, will determine the fortunes of the cosmos on judgment day. Thus, the Gospel seeks to effect a partial transformation in its readers through two significant encounters, the first with Jesus and his authoritative teaching and the second with the Jewish leaders and their obduracy, encounters that should strengthen and clarify readers' Christian commitment. However, readers will not experience complete transformation and new stasis until the eschaton, the story's projected *telos*.

To examine the cosmic action of Matthew from a different perspective, following a different plot strain, one might consider the character of Jesus. Summarizing briefly the impact of the action on Jesus, he is born king of the Jews but becomes lord over heaven and earth, capable of effecting the eschatological transformation, through his obedience to the Father's will. Jesus, whose credentials as Israel's king are stressed in Matthew 1-2, refuses Satan's offer of the kingdoms of the world, giving preference to serving God alone (4:8-10). God's

will demands that Jesus present himself to Israel as a Messiah of word and deed (Matthew 5-9), only to face inevitable rejection (Matthew 11-12). Once rejected, Jesus turns to his disciple band to school them in righteousness, again according to God's plan (13:10-17). When Peter displays a certain level of understanding of Jesus' identity, Jesus announces the divine necessity of going to Jerusalem to face death at the hands of Israel's leaders, although he continues to instruct his disciples (16:13-25:46). Jesus' obedient death in Jerusalem seems to threaten a negative transformation for Jesus, i.e., his disgrace and annihilation, but ironically results in a positive transformation, beginning the eschatological transformation of the world in which sins are forgiven, the mission to the Gentiles is opened, and Jesus is invested with all authority in heaven and on earth. Jesus is transformed into a being of cosmic authority, able to remain with his church "all days" and reconfigure the universe at his parousia (28:18-20).

Similarly, one might trace the impact of the cosmic action of Matthew on Jesus' Jewish opponents. The power of these opponents is established at the beginning of the gospel and continues to be stressed throughout. As an infant, Jesus is threatened by a king supported by chief priests and scribes (2:1-17); as an adult, Jesus withdraws in the face of the Pharisees' plot against his life (12:14-15). The hostility of the Jewish leadership toward Jesus is gradually revealed as characteristic of Israel's hostility toward all of God's messengers (10:17; 21:33-44; 22:1-7; 23:29-37). The motivation for this hostility is never directly addressed by the Gospel, however, some passages suggest a lust for prestige, power, and control (21:33-46; 23:5-12). The Gospel makes it clear that Jesus could call on the Father for resources to overwhelm his enemies, but scripture and the Father's will would not then be fulfilled (26:53-54). The last plotted incidents of Matthew show the power of Jesus' enemies undiminished: they are still able to manipulate political power and spread lies about Jesus (27:62-66; 28:11-15). In the projected events following the last plotted incident, they will go on persecuting believers (5:10-11; 10:17; 23:34; 24:9-10), corrupting and misleading them (7:15; 23:3-15; 24:5,11,23-24), spreading lies about them (5:11), and shutting up the kingdom of heaven in people's faces (23:13). Thus, the power and influence of Jesus' opponents appear to be completely undiminished by the plotted incidents of Matthew. However, readers know this stalemate to be an illusion: the endowment of Jesus with cosmic authority has made the destruction and punishment of his enemies inevitable. The house in which these villains dwell has already been completely undermined by the eschatological storm: *kakous kakōs apolesei autous* (21:41).

One could go on to examine plot strains related to Jesus' disciples and the crowds, i.e., the impacts that the action of Matthew has upon these character groups. However, I must confess that I have given less thought to these strains and am less confident of how to describe them; accordingly, I will defer their discussion to other investigators or another occasion.

Characterizing the Plot of Matthew

Below I will attempt to summarize the distinctive perspectives that this study has adopted toward the plot of Matthew. First, I have seen the plotted incidents of Matthew as only one segment of the complete cosmic action represented in the Gospel, a chain of events that begins with God's repeated sending of messengers to Israel and continuing with God's sending his Son as the final messenger. Jesus, the final messenger, by his obedience to the Father in seeking the lost sheep of the house of Israel and then enduring death, gains all authority in heaven and on earth. It is announced that he will use that authority one day to transform the human universe and bring completion to the grand cosmic action. It is significant to note that many of elements of this plot summary are paralleled in the parable of the vineyard tenants: the repeated sending of messengers, the sending of the son as a final messenger, and the accomplishment of the *telos* by divine intervention (21:33-44). In this parable, the sending of the son is only one phase of the complete action. Because of the close parallels between the Gospel of Matthew and this Marcan parable, it is tempting to see the Marcan parable as the inspiration for the Gospel's emphasis on contextualizing the plotted incidents of Jesus' life in a larger framework. Indeed, Matthew points out the parable's correspondence to the grand action of Matthew through a redactional interpretation placed in the mouth of Jesus: "Therefore I tell you that the kingdom of God will be taken away from you and given to a people who will produce its fruit" (21:43).

A second perspective brought forward in this study is the idea that Jesus undergoes real transformation, at least in status, as a result of the Gospel's action. Jesus is born king of the Jews and is offered an illegitimate mastery of the kingdoms of the earth by Satan (4:8-10), but finally becomes lord of heaven and earth through obedience to the Father (28:16-20). This picture of a Son whose status undergoes real evolution may stand in tension with Chalcedonian christology but appears nonetheless to be characteristic of this early Christian document.

A third perspective advocated in this study is the idea that Matthew stresses readers' roles as characters in the action. In fact, I would contend that of all the plot strains evident in the Gospel (Jesus, John the Baptist, disciples, enemies, readers), the Gospel is most interested in the impact of the action on its readers. The transformation of Jesus into a figure of cosmic majesty is stressed so that readers may gain a proper appreciation for the authority of his words;(54) the perfidy of Jesus' enemies is stressed so that readers may be suitably horrified by their example. One should note that Jesus does not function as a simple protagonist in Matthew, a figure in whose fortunes readers are invited to interest themselves and with whom they are invited to identify. Instead, Jesus is a curious hybrid figure, both a protagonist whose interests the reader can share and

a potential antagonist who may well play a hostile role in readers' lives on judgment day. In fact, it could be argued that readers themselves, whose status as righteous or unrighteous has not yet been clarified, are themselves the ambiguous protagonists upon whose fortunes the Gospel is most intensely, albeit largely indirectly, focused.

Kernels and Satellites in Matthew?

Two significant attempts have been made recently by W. Carter and F. Matera to analyze the plot of Matthew using concepts of kernel and satellite developed by the literary theorist S. Chatman.(55) According to Chatman, kernels are the major events that form the chain of causality in a narrative, moments of choice that determine the direction that events will take, which cannot be deleted without destroying the narrative logic. In contrast, satellites do not send the narrative in a new direction, but are only the workings-out of the choices made at the kernels.(56)

In evaluating Chatman's schema, it should be noted that the concept of kernel implies a restricted way of understanding causality, viz., that new trains of consequences are always excited by relatively discrete and focused incidents. Indeed, in Chatman's schema satellites are seen as dependent on kernels and always following them, not possibly leading up to them. One must admit that the kernel and satellite schema corresponds well to some experiences and many narratives. For example, in A. Dumas' 19th century novel, *The Three Musketeers*, the balance of the story is set in motion by two kernels, the Queen's unthinking gift of jewelry to her lover and the consequent theft of that jewelry by her enemies, that threaten to reveal her affair to her husband.

However, I would argue that the kernel/satellite schema of causality is not a good fit for much of Matthew. Instead, events in Matthew often seem to be precipitated by an accumulation of incidents. To point to a parallel in our modern world, violence resulting from ethnic feuds is typically motivated by a long history of tension and resentment. In these feuds, an outbreak of violence cannot be reasonably attributed to the effect of a single, isolated kernel incident, but is better understood as the result of a long accumulation of bitter events. Indeed, a specific event can serve as a trigger for violence, but the impact of such an event is more due to the accumulated events that preceded it than the trigger itself, which itself can be quite trivial. Along these lines, one finds in two Matthean parables examples of multiple incidents motivating new action: it is the rejection of *multiple* embassies of servants that prompts a new strategy on the part of the Father in the juxtaposed parables of the wedding feast and the vineyard tenants (21:33-46; 22:1-14). In both parables, it seems clear that the new initiative

is a response to the *repeated* character of the rejection, not to the motivating power of any incident by itself.

Therefore, I would argue that changes in the direction taken by events in Matthew are often the result of repeated incidents of a similar character, among which a single precipitating incident may stand out only slightly. Because Matthew stresses the accumulation of similar incidents that eventually precipitate new turns in the action, it is obvious that different types of incidents can be in the process of accumulating simultaneously. Therefore, the accumulating buildups may often overlap, frustrating efforts to dissect the Gospel into narrative blocks in each of which only one phase of the action occurs. For this reason, the plot summary below will attempt to locate the portion of the Gospel where a specific development in plot is generally focused, with the understanding that these sometimes soft-edged blocks may overlap one another and also that materials relevant to certain plot developments may be located outside the blocks where the development is focused. Many of these outlying materials will be noted. It should also be noted that this summary of Matthew's plot emphasizes causal connections (A produces B, B produces C, C produces D, etc.) in contrast to the other plot summaries of this study which have focused on the impact of the action on different characters.

1. Israel's *repeated* rejection of God's earlier messengers, including John the Baptist, necessitates the sending to Israel of a new, final, and faithful messenger, Jesus (focus of the action is 1:1-3:11).

   Carter and Matera both stress that causality in plot is often recognized only retrospectively, after the reader has finished constructing the aesthetic object in Iser's phrase.(57) The fact that Jesus was sent in response to Israel's rejection of God's earlier messengers will not be clearly recognized by readers until 21:33-46; 23:29-37, although this pattern of past rejection was hinted at in earlier references to the greater responsiveness of Gentiles (2:1-12; 8:5-13; 15:21-28), Jewish hostility toward John and Jesus (2:1-23; 4:12; 11-12; 14:1-12), and foreshadowed Jewish hostility toward Christian missionaries (10:11-39). Nevertheless, although the rationale for Jesus' appearance is not established until much later, the first chapters of the Gospel are focused on establishing Jesus's credentials as God's authentic, ultimate, and faithful envoy. For authenticity, see, e.g., the multiple signs proving that Jesus is the Jewish king and the theophany endorsing his special status at his baptism (1:1-17; 2:1-6; 3:13-17); for ultimacy, see the references to Jesus as God's Son (2:15; 3:17); for fidelity, see Jesus' rejection of the tempters' proposals (4:1-11).

2. In response to the arrest of John (the latest Jewish rejection of God's messenger), Jesus returns to Galilee to carry out a ministry of faithful proclamation of the Gospel to Israel through word and deed (focus of the action is 4:12-10:42).

   The arrest of John, which is one of many Jewish rejections of God's messengers, triggers Jesus return to Galilee where he will show forth God's light by proclaiming the Gospel through word and deed.(58) Thus, a prominent Matthean element like the Sermon on the Mount need not be viewed as a dispensable satellite, but as making an essential contribution to advancing the plot in demonstrating thoroughness and faithfulness of Jesus pursuit of his mission to Israel, helping to ground the reader's horror at Israel's subsequent rejection (see Item 3 below).(59) Furthermore, one should note that Jesus' ministry to Israel has the concurrent effect of beginning to build a disciple band who will one day form the core of a church that will replace Israel (4:18-22; 5:1; 8:14-15,23-27; 9:9; 10; 21:43).

3. *Repeated* rebuffs of Jesus and his message by Israel, at first primarily by the Jewish leaders (but see 11:20-24), culminate in the accusation that Jesus drives out demons by Beelzebub (12:22-32). The cumulative weight of these rejections necessitates Jesus' turning to his disciples who have been given knowledge of the secrets of the kingdom, thus beginning the process of building a new *ethnos* that will possess the kingdom (21:43: focus of the action is 10:11-13:58).(60)

   It should be noted that Jesus was first rejected and threatened by Jewish leaders as an infant (2:1-23). Jewish hostility is also strongly foreshadowed in the missionary discourse (Matthew 10), which I see as a Janus element, both reflecting Jesus' willingness to minister faithfully to Israel (see item 2 above) and the sad fact that such ministry is certain to be met with rejection. In chapters 11-12, the towns of Galilee are excoriated for their unresponsiveness, and the Pharisees are found guilty of the unforgivable accusation that Jesus acts through the power of Beelzebub (12:22-32). In chapter 13, the parable of the sower summarizes the inability of many to respond to the Gospel (13:1-23). In contrast, it is announced that the secrets of the kingdom of heaven have been given to the disciples. Henceforward, Jesus' teaching will be cloaked in incomprehensible parables (Matthew 13) or addressed primarily to the disciples (18; 24-25). Matthew will remove several Marcan notices of Jesus teaching the crowds (Matt 14:4 || Mark 6:34; Matt 16:24 || Mark 8:34). The turn of events stressed here is echoed repeatedly elsewhere: Jesus began to form his disciple band earlier in the

narrative (see Item 2 above), and manifestations of Jewish hostility will continue even after Jesus has turned away from Israel (15:12; 16:1-4; 21:23-22:39).

4. Jesus' *persistent* faithful preaching of the Gospel brings increased understanding of the Gospel message by the disciples (the focus of the action is 13:1-16:20).

   As noted in Item 2, the bond between Jesus and his disciples begins to form long before Jesus turns away from Israel. However, 13:1-16:20 has the highest concentration of references to the disciples understanding of Jesus and his teaching (13:10-17,51; 14:33; 16:12,13-20).

5. One specific instance of the disciples' of increasing understanding, the confession of Peter, opens the way for new teaching from Jesus about suffering and servanthood and the announcement of the divine necessity of Jesus going to Jerusalem to suffer and die (focus of the action is 16:13-28:20).

   The necessity of being ready to accept servanthood and suffering for the sake of the Gospel was suggested even earlier by the persecution of Jesus in the infancy narrative (2:1-23), the Beatitudes (5:10-22), the arrest and execution of John (4:12; 14:1-12), and the missionary discourse (Matthew 10). Such issues are brought into sharper focus in the second half of the Gospel (see esp. 16:21-27; 18-19; 20:20-28). However, it is left unclear at the end of the Gospel whether the disciples (and readers) will successfully embrace this new teaching. The disciples show repeated incomprehension and reluctance to accept the demands of suffering and servanthood: see especially their desertion of Jesus at his arrest (16:22; 18:21; 19:10,13; 26:36-56,69-75). The conduct of readers and disciples in the time of delay before the eschaton will reveal whether they have embraced these teachings.

6. One instance of the repeated hostility toward Jesus by Jewish leaders, the confrontation over Jesus' cleansing of the temple by the chief priests and elders (21:23-46), prompts their decision to arrest Jesus and secure his death (focus of the action is 21:1-27:50).

   Obviously, the specific incident that triggers the decision to arrest Jesus must be seen in the context of numerous previous clashes between Jesus and his enemies, which have resulted in murderous designs on him in the past (2:1-12; 12:14).

7. The death of Jesus, by which his enemies hope to achieve his disgrace and annihilation, instead achieves important eschatological effects, heralded by the apocalyptic signs that follow Jesus' death (27:51-53). God's special commitment to Israel is ended and the mission to the nations is opened (21:43; 24:14; 28:19), sins are forgiven (1:21; 20:28; 26:28), and Jesus is endowed with the full authority of the Danielic Son of Man (28:18: focus of the action is 27:50-28:20).(61)

8. The risen Jesus commands his disciples to make disciples of all nations, stressing the importance of obeying all his commands, with the effect that disciples and readers are again put under obligation to reorder their lives in accord with the Gospel until the eschatological intervention (focus of the action is 28:16-20).

9. As disciples and readers faithfully preach the gospel in obedience to Jesus' command, Jewish leaders and false prophets will continue to trouble them, necessitating their fidelity and patient endurance (action is foreshadowed primarily in 10:5-42; 24:4-25).

10. The eschatological intervention will bring transformation and a new, enduring stasis of reward or punishment to every human being (action foreshadowed primarily in Matthew 13, 24-25).

In the plot summary above, I have identified a number of specific events that herald new turns in the plot of Matthew (even though I had emphasized that such developments are often precipitated by accumulations of incidents), i.e., the arrest of John the Baptist, the accusation that Jesus drives out demons by Beelzebub, the confession of Peter, the controversy attending the cleansing of the temple, the death of Jesus, the resurrection appearance to the disciples, and the eschatological intervention. The first four of these events bear an obvious family resemblance to many other incidents featured in the Gospel. Three are examples of persistent Jewish hostility toward God's messengers, while the confession of Peter is one of many instances where the disciples show an increasing understanding of Jesus and his message (cf. specifically the earlier instance in which Jesus is hailed as Son of God by his disciple band, 14:33). In analyzing Matthew's plot, I would prefer to identify these events as *triggers* rather than kernels, because they precipitate events in new directions in response to trends that have been building for some time. One should note that Matthew also features true kernels in Chatman's sense in the death of Jesus, the resurrection encounter with the disciples, and the eschatological intervention, because these unique events

singlehandedly drive the narrative in new directions. It should be noted that no greater significance for the plot is implied whether the plot development is precipitated by a kernel (Items 7,8,10), a trigger (Items 2,3,5,6) or an accumulation of similar incidents (Items 1,4,9).

Because the plot summary above recognizes that turns in the plot are often the culmination of long-running trends, it is not surprising that my account of these plot turns exhibits at best only a partial correspondence to the sections of the Gospel that have distinguished on the basis of literary formulas. On the basis of my plot summary, the formula that appears to be most consistently associated with plot developments is *apo tote ērxato ho Iēsous* (4:17; 16:21).(62) This formula appears when the arrest of John prompts Jesus to move to Galilee to bring light to that region through his ministry of word and deed (Item 2) and also appears when Jesus begins to teach his disciples the hard news of suffering and death (Item 5). However, there are eight other turns in the plot of Matthew where this formula does not occur. Clearly, attention to this formula alone will not lead to full appreciation of the plot of Matthew.

Likewise, there is some correspondence between the Gospel's obvious surface pattern of alternating discourse and narrative, punctuated by Bacon's formula, *kai egeneto hote etelesen ho Iēsous* and the plot turns identified above (7:28; 11:1; 13:53; 19:1; 26:1).(63) The paired discourse and narrative of Matthew 5-9 represent the heart of the task of Item 2, Jesus' faithful preaching of the gospel to Israel. Similarly, the paired discourse and narrative of Matthew 10-12 represent the heart of the dilemma of Item 3, the rejection of Jesus by Israel (with the corresponding anticipated rejection of Jesus' envoys). Likewise, the discourse of Matthew 18 advances the task of Item 5, the instruction of the disciples as servant leaders.

In approaching the structure of Matthew, interpreters have been too ready to assume that there is only one principle of organization operative in the work, when there are likely to be several at once. I am reminded of Dave Brubeck's renowned jazz classic, *Take Five*, in which different instruments play in different time signatures simultaneously to great effect. Once again, Matthew may have greater literary complexity than is commonly assumed.

Conclusion and Reflections

In conclusion, I would maintain that the approach to the plot of Matthew adopted in this paper has two significant advantages. First, it is able to show the relationship of more of the Gospel's materials to its plot. Specifically, it can integrate the events lying outside the Gospel's plotted incidents, whether retrospective allusions to God's dealings with Israel or prospective prophesies of

missionary work, tribulation, and eschatological consummation, into a complete cosmic action within which the plotted incidents of Matthew function as a segment. Additionally, it can demonstrate the important contributions made by many Matthean materials as elements building toward new plot developments, rather than dispensable satellites.

Secondly, this approach can help explain the strong appeal of Matthew to audiences for whom an interest in outcomes has been ingrained by our evolutionary heritage. The Gospel's heightened emphasis on outcomes is particularly furthered by a strong emphasis on the future eschatological consummation: elsewhere I have identified references to eschatological events in 59 of the Gospel's 148 pericopes (nearly 40%).(64) However, readers may be unsettled by the strong emphasis late in the Gospel (chap. 25) on the unsettled character of their own eschatological destinies.(65)

Initially prompted by the lack of consensus among literary theorists regarding the nature of plot, this study has turned to observational learning, an activity critical to our success as a species over hundreds of thousands of years, as a guide to determining the most essential features of plot. The essential features of observational learning were identified as an interest in outcomes and causality. The resemblance of this finding to the Aristotelian triad of impact, causality, and completeness was noted, with a retrieval of the element of impact (*megethos*) often neglected by literary critics. Other kinds of plots were conceived as inversions, transpositions, and frustrations of this typical pattern. In applying these concepts to Matthew, one finds in the Gospel an intense interest in outcomes, including an unusual level of interest in the impact of the action on minor characters (with an educational effect on readers), a coherent sense of causality, and a delay in the plot's *telos* to an indeterminate future that permits readers to become characters in the unfinished action. Likewise, this study's encounter with the text of Matthew disclosed that the kernel/satellite concept does not adequately characterize the various kinds of causality at work in the Gospel.

I hope that this study's attention to the adequacy of literary theory for interpreting Matthew will encourage other biblical interpreters to become more than simple consumers of literary theory. We have taken up tools shaped primarily for the analysis of modern novels and applied them to ancient texts: it would be surprising if these tools did not need modification to make them equal to the task. My hope is that biblical interpreters will increasingly become travelers in both directions on the hermeneutical spiral between text and literary theory, a reciprocal movement that should produce expanding illumination in both directions.

Notes

1. C. H. Holman and W. Harman, *A Handbook to Literature* (6th ed.; New York, Macmillan; London, Collier, 1992) 360.

2. M. H. Abrams, *A Glossary of Literary Terms* (6th ed.; Fort Worth, TX, Harcourt Brace, 1993) 162; J. A. Cuddon, *A Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory* (3rd ed.; London: Basil Blackwell, 1991) 720; and E. M. Forster, *Aspects of the Novel* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1927) 126-154.

3. For a brief summary of various recent definitions of plot, see F. Matera, "The Plot of Matthew's Gospel," *CBQ* 49 (1987) 233-53, esp. 235-36.

4. There is reason to believe that these narrative interests are shared not just by Westerners but by human beings generally, because of the great contribution made by narrative to human observational learning (see discussion below). However, I am not conversant enough with non-Western narrative to be able to demonstrate this.

5. A. Bandura, *Social Foundations of Thought and Action: A Social Cognitive Theory* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1986) xii, 19, 107.

6. Ibid., 19-20.

7. Ibid., 98-99; H. E. Adler and L. L. Adler, "What Can Dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) Learn by Observation?" *Oteology* 30 (1978) 1-9; L. L. Adler and H. E. Adler, "Ontogeny of Observational Learning in the Dog (*Canis familiaris*)," *Developmental Psychobiology* 10 (1977) 267-71; J. J. Herbert and C. M. Harsh, "Observational Learning in Cats," *Journal of Comparative Psychology* 37 (1944) 81-95; and E. R. John, P. Chesler, F. Bartlett, and I. Victor, "Observational Learning in Cats," *Science* 159 (1968) 1489-91.

8. Bandura, *Thought and Action*, xii, 70-71.

9. Ibid., 53; A. Bandura, "Influence of Models' Reinforcement Contingencies on the Acquisition of Imitative Responses," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 1 (1965), 589-95; A. Bandura and P. G. Barab, "Conditions Governing Nonreinforced Imitation," *Developmental Psychology* 5 (1971) 244-55; R. A. Dubanoski, *Imitation as a Function of Role Appropriateness of Behavior and Response Consequences to the Model* (unpublished MS; Iowa City: University of Iowa, 1967); R. A. Dubanoski and D. A. Parton, "Imitative Aggression in Children as a Function of Observing a Human Model," *Developmental Psychology* 4 (1971) 489; and S. R. Yussen, "Determinants of Visual Attention and Recall in Observational Learning by Preschoolers and Second Graders," *Developmental Psychology* 10 (1974) 93-100.

10. Bandura, *Thought and Action*, 49.

11. Ibid., 68.

12. J. Grusec, "Social Learning Theory and Developmental Psychology: The Legacies of Robert Sears and Albert Bandura," *Developmental Psychology* 28 (1992)

776-786, esp. 776.

13. Henceforth, the term "narrative" will be used in this study in a broad sense inclusive of drama and other mimetic representations of human behavior.

14. For an attempt to relate the various elements represented in narrative to plot development see the pentad proposed by K. Burke: actor, action, goal or intention, scene, and instrument. Burke argues that imbalances or misfits between these elements give rise to the problematic situations that interesting narrative address. See K. Burke, *A Grammar of Motives* (Berkeley: University of California, 1969).

15. Bandura, *Thought and Action*, 18.

16. J. Lucariello, "Canonicality and Consciousness in Child Narrative," *Narrative Thought and Narrative Language* (ed. B. K. Britton and A. D. Pellegrini; Hillsdale, NJ: L. Erlbaum, 1960), 131-49, esp. 132-33; J. Bruner and Lucariello, "Monologue as Narrative Recreation of the Word," *Narratives from the Crib* (K. Nelson, ed.; Cambridge: Harvard University, 1989) 73-97.

17. Lucariello, "Canonicality and Consciousness in Child Narrative," 131-149.

18. Ibid., 147.

19. Ibid.

20. F. H. Kanfer, P. H. Duerfeldt, B. Martin, and T. E. Dorsey, "Effects of Model Reinforcement, Expectation to Perform, and Task Performance on Model Observation," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 20 (1971) 214-17.

21. *Poetics* 50a.3-5: *estin de tēs men praxeōs ho mythos hē mimēsis, legō gar mython touton tēn synthesin tōn pragmatōn.*

22. *Poetics* 49b.24-25: *estin oun tragǭdia mimēsis praxeōs spoudaias kai teleias megethos echousēs.*

23. *Poetics* 50b.26-34: *holon de estin to echon archēn kai meson kai teleutēn. archē de estin ho auto men mē ex anankēs met' allo estin, met' ekeino d' heteron pephyken einai ē ginesthai; teleutē de tounantion ho auto men met' allo pephyken einai ē ex anankēs ē hōs epi to poly, meta de touto allo ouden; meson de ho kai auto met' allo kai met' ekeino heteron. dei ara tous synestōtas eu mythous mēth' hopothen etychen archesthai mēth' hopou etyche teleutan, alla kechrēsthai tais eirēmenais ideais.*

24. *Poetics* 51a.16-19: *Mythos d' estin heis ouch hōsper tines oiontai ean peri hena ę̄; polla gar kai apeira tǭ heni symbainei, ex hōn eniōn ouden estin hen; houtōs de kai praxeis henos pollai eisin, ex hōn mia oudemia ginetai praxis.*

25. By this measure, it would seem that Aristotle would probably have been a fan of the blockbuster novel. R. Janko (Aristotle, *Poetics I* [trans. and ed. R. Janko; Indianapolis: Hackett, 1987] 89) notes Aristotle's preference for the large and complex, evidenced by his preference for large cities (*Politics* VII 4.1326a25ff). The Greek aesthetic preference for the monumental is evidenced by their

admiration for colossal statues and tall women (noted by D. W. Lucas in Aristotle, *Poetics* [trans. and ed. D. W. Lucas; Oxford: Clarendon, 1968] 114).

26. *Poetics* 50b.23-25: *keitai dē hēmin tēn tragōdian teleias kai holēs praxeōs einai mimēsin echousēs ti megethos; estin gar holon kai mēden echon megethos.*

27. *Poetics* 51a.12-15: *en hosō megethei kata to eikos ē to anankaion epexēs gignomenōn symbainei eis eutychian ek dystychias ē ex eutychias eis dystychian metaballein, hikanos horos estin tou megethous.*

28. Forster, *Aspects of the Novel*, 130.

29. Ibid., 51-62.

30. Based on Aristotle's notion of good character involving attaining the mean in our emotions and actions (*Ethics* II 6.1107a5), a number of scholars have come to understand that Aristotle's concept of catharsis does not connote the violent discharge of emotions but their moderation (see Janko, *Poetics*, vii, xvi-xx).

31. See Janko, *Poetics*, xxiii; and idem., *Aristotle on Comedy* (Berkeley: University of California, 1985).

32. Fowler, *Aspects of the Novel*, 237-60.

33. W. D. Köhler, *Die Rezeption des Matthäusevangelium in der Zeit vor Irenäus* (WUNT 2.24; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1987).

34. For an ancient witness to Luke's stylistic competence, see Jerome's comment that Luke "was the most skilled writer of Greek among all the evangelists" (*Ep. ad Damasum* 20.4,4). Luke commands the most extensive Greek vocabulary of all the Gospels. Although he is capable of writing in high historical style (1:1-4; 3:1-2), Luke often adopts a style suitable to the characters and scenes he is representing, a practice called *prosōpopoieia* by ancient literary theorists. See J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke* (AB 28 and 28A; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1981, 1985) 1.107-27 and L. T. Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke* (Sacra Pagina 3; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1991) 6-7.

35. B. B. Scott and M. E. Dean, "A Soundmap of the Sermon on the Mount," SBL Seminar Papers (Atlanta: Scholars, 1993) 672-725.

36. R. C. Tannenhill (*The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation* [2 vols.; Philadelphia, Fortress, 1986] xiii-xiv) notes the work's episodic quality and claims that its unity springs out of the consistency of purpose of its chief characters, Jesus and John the Baptist. Tannenhill's decision to structure much of his commentary around character relationships (see chapter titles, "Jesus and the Crowd or People," "Jesus and the Authorities," "Jesus and the Disciples") seems prompted by the absence of a clear plot structure in the middle chapters of the Gospel. As for Luke's less pronounced thematic emphases, I would argue that only Luke's theme of the right use of wealth receives the same forceful enunciation that Matthew lends to such themes as righteousness, the kingdom, and the eschatological consummation.

37. Forster, *Aspects of the Novel*, 44-48, 130-31.

38. N. R. Petersen, *Literary Criticism for New Testament Critics* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978) 49-80, esp. 51-53, 78.

39. J. L. Magness, *Sense and Absence: Structure and Suspension in the Ending of Mark's Gospel* (SBL Semeia Studies; Atlanta: Scholars, 1986) 19-22.

40. Ibid., 20-21.

41. Ibid., 22.

42. Matera ("The Plot of Matthew's Gospel, 241) recognizes that the story of Matthew has larger dimensions than the life of Jesus but does not develop this insight. He states: "How does Matthew organize time? . . . A first response, then, is that Matthew organizes time in terms of Jesus' life. But a closer examination reveals that Matthew prefaces Jesus' birth with a genealogy (1:1-17) which extends back to Abraham and that the resurrection appearance points to the close of the ages (28:20). Therefore, although Matthew's story deals with the life of Jesus, it encompasses a broader perspective, the time between Abraham and the parousia. The plot of Matthew's Gospel has something to do with salvation history."

43. One must recognize, however, that the closing verses of Revelation do act with some effectiveness to pull the reader back to a moment when the eschaton is future (22:6-7,10,12,17,20). However, Revelation does not work to abolish entirely the glow of the vicarious eschatological experience. In fact, the final verses of the book are full of prayers of longing for its renewal (Rev 22:17,20).

44. For a discussion of the relatively detailed depiction of the eschatological trial in Matthew contrasting with relatively brief references to rewards and punishments, see K. Weber, *The Events of the End of the Age in Matthew* (unpublished dissertation; Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America, 1994) Chapter 6.

45. Forster, *Aspects of the Novel*, 131-34.

46. W. Iser, *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1978) 107-9, esp. 109.

47. D. J. Harrington (*The Gospel of Matthew* [Sacra Pagina 1; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1991] 16, 20-22) offers a context for understanding the Gospel's bitterness by describing the Gospel's origin during a period of severe tension and competition among various Jewish movements, among them the largely Jewish-Christian community for which Matthew was written. These movements proposed rival programs for the reconstitution of Judaism after the disaster of A.D. 70. The Gospel's harsh criticisms of Jewish leaders have as much or more to do with the evangelist's outsider perspective on the early rabbinic movement as with the relationship of the historical Jesus with his contemporaries. Much of the vehemence of the Gospel's perspective stems from a recent history of persecution (10:17,23; 23:34) and Jewish Christianity's need to maintain itself against a more successful early rabbinic movement (pp. 322-23, 327).

48. For arguments that Matt 28:19 proposes a universal mission, see J. P. Meier, "Nations or Gentiles in Matthew 28:19?" *The Mission of Christ and His Church* (GNS 30; Wilmington, DE: Glazier, 1990) 141-52 [originally published in *CBQ* 39 (1977) 94-102]. For arguments that 25:31-47 proposes a universal judgment, see ibid. and K. Weber, "The Sheep and Goats Image in Matthew 25:31-46" *CBQ* (forthcoming); and idem, *The Events of the End of the Age in Matthew*, Chapter 5, Section IV.B.

49. For correspondences between the *Vita Apoll.* and Matthew, see E. P. Sanders and M. Davies, *Studying the Synoptic Gospels* (London: SCM; Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1989) 254-55.

50. K. Egan ("What Is a Plot?" *New Literary History* 9 (1978) 455-73, esp. 463) contends that the most important impact achieved by a plot is its affective impact on readers.

51. Fowler, *Aspects of the Novel*, 67.

52. Weber, "The Sheep and Goats Image."

53. For a discussion of Matthew's authorial audience as Christian, see G. N. Stanton, "The Origin and Purpose of Matthew's Gospel: Matthean Scholarship from 1945 to 1980," *ANRW* II/25.3, 1890-1951; and Harrington, *Matthew*, 1-2, 6.

54. Along these lines, D. Marguerat (*Le jugement dans l'évangile de Matthieu* [Le Monde de la Bible; Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1981] 33-34, 103) argues that the presentation of Jesus as eschatological judge has the goal of giving authority to the teaching of the earthly Jesus. He states: "The eschatological finale confers on the words of Christ an authority that comes to him from judgment. . . . [T]he announcements of judgment have not been unthinkingly copied by Matthew: they ground the authority of the speaker of the discourses" (pp. 33-34). Again, Marguerat observes: "The earthly Jesus, whose life, deeds, and teaching are portrayed in the Matthean narrative, already appears in the dignity of the eschatological judge. The teacher who transmits his instructions to his disciples will determine access to the kingdom at the judgment. The one who has come is none other than the one who is to come" (p. 74).

55. W. Carter, "Kernels and Narrative Blocks: The Structure of Matthew's Gospel," *CBQ* 54 (1992) 463-481; and F. Matera, "The Plot of Matthew's Gospel," 233-253.

56. S. Chatman, *Story and Discourse* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell, 1978) 53-54.

57. Carter, "Kernels and Narrative Blocks," 467; see also Matera, 243-44, who cites J. Culler ("Defining Narrative Units," *Style and Structure in Literature: Essays in the New Stylistics* [ed. R. Fowler; Ithaca, NY: Cornell, 1975) 123-42, esp. 135) as stating that kernels are recognized retroactively by identifying their effects.

58. Pace Carter ("Kernels and Narrative Blocks," 468-471) who argues that 4:12-16 should be separated from 4:17-25 because 1:1-4:16 is focused on who Jesus is, while 4:17-11:1 is focused on what Jesus does, the coming of Jesus to Galilee

as God's light in reaction to the imprisonment of John is a symbolic equivalent of the closely following reports of Jesus preaching the gospel to Israel through word and deed.

59. Matera's ("The Plot of Matthew's Gospel," 238) use of the kernel/satellite schema places him in the somewhat paradoxical position of recognizing that Sermon on the Mount "has immense importance for Jesus' ministry," but functions only as a satellite event with respect to plot. It seems improbable that an discourse so important in exemplifying Jesus' chief activity (viz., his ministry) would make no contribution to advancing the plot.

60. Note the resemblance of this development with the plot summary offered by Matera ("The Plot of Matthew's Gospel," 243): "In the appearance of Jesus the Messiah, God fulfills his promises to Israel. But Israel refuses to accept Jesus as the Messiah. Consequently, the Gospel passes to the nations."

61. J. P. Meier, *The Vision of Matthew: Christ, Church and Morality in the First Gospel* (Theological Inquiries; New York: Paulist, 1979), 204-10; and Weber, *The Events of the End of the Age in Matthew*, Chapter 3, Section IV.

62. J. D. Kingsbury, "The Structure of Matthew's Gospel and His Concept of Salvation History," *CBQ* 35 (1973) 451-74; idem, *Matthew: Structure, Christology, Kingdom* (London: SPCK, 1976) 7-37; and idem, "The Figure of Jesus in Matthew's Story: A Literary-Critical Probe," *JSNT* 21 (1984) 3-36.

63. B. W. Bacon, "The 'Five Books' of Matthew against the Jews," *The Expositor* 15 (1918) 56-66; and idem, *Studies in Matthew* (New York: Holt, 1930).

64. Weber, *The Events of the End of the Age in Matthew*, Appendix A.

65. Weber, "The Sheep and Goats Image."

THE APOSTLE PHILIP, THE VIPER, THE LEOPARD AND THE KID. THE MASKED ACTORS OF A RELIGIOUS CONFLICT IN HIERAPOLIS OF PHRYGIA

(*ACTS OF PHILIP* VIII - XV AND *MARTYRDOM*)[1]

Frédéric AMSLER
Geneva

1. Summary of the text

The last part of the Acts of Philip (*APh* VIII to XV and the *Martyrdom*)[2] can be divided into four sections: 1. On the order of the Savior, the apostles, Philip, his sister Marianne, and Bartholomew leave as missionaries to Ophioryme, the city of the viper-worshippers (*APh* VIII, 1--15 [94--96]).[3] 2. The apostles travel to Ophioryme (*APh* VIII, 16--XII). During their journey they encounter a leopard and a kid endowed with powers of human speech (*APh* VIII, 16--21 [96--101]). Then, on two occasions, they meet a dragon which they overcome (*APh* IX and XI). In *APh* XII, the leopard and the kid claim and obtain the eucharist. 3. After arrival in Ophioryme (*APh* XIII), Philip, Marianne, and Bartholomew heal and convert Stachys, the leader of the viper-worshippers (*APh* XIV), and also Nicanora, the wife of Tyrannognophos, the governor of the city (*APh* XV). 4. Finally Philip is martyred (*APhM* 19--42 [125--148]).[4]

2. The problem of interpretation

Like other apocryphal Acts of apostles, such as those of Andrew or John, the *APh* must be read on several levels to be fully appreciated.[5]

2.1. Taken literally, the *APh* VIII ff appear to be a romanesque adventure story, which would entertain good Christian people with its mix of the marvellous and the horrible. The reader or listener will marvel at the appearances of the Savior, the talking animals, the dragons overcome and the premonitory dreams, and will be horrified at the cruelty of the torture inflicted on the apostles. If we stayed at the level of this naive reading, it would be hard to go beyond the judgment of Theodor Zahn, who maintained in 1900 that this text dated from the late 4th century at the earliest and was the work of a man "very ignorant and very weak in thought."[6]

---

[1] I express my gratitude to Irena Backus, professor at Geneva University and to Ann Blair, assistant at Harvard University, for the English translation and careful revision.

[2] Maximilien BONNET, "*Acta Philippi et Acta Thomae, accedunt Acta Barnabae*," in Richard Adelbert LIPSIUS and Maximilien BONNET, *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha*, (Leipzig: Hermann Mendelssohn, 1903; reprint Darmstadt, 1959), 2.2.VII--XV, XXXVI--XXXVII., 1-90 (APh VIII ff, 36--90). French translation: Frédéric AMSLER, François BOVON et Bertrand BOUVIER, *Les Actes de l'apôtre Philippe: Introduction, traduction et notes*, (Apocryphes 8; Turnhout: Brepols, 1996). A fuller presentation of this contribution can be found on pages 52 -- 86.

[3] Numbers in brackets [...] refer to the section numbers in the text edited by M. Bonnet.

[4] It is possible to demonstrate that *APhM* 1--18 [107--124] is a conglomerate of short introductions, composed on the basis of information contained in *APh* XIV and XV. This section became necessary for the story to be understood once the *Martyrdom* was separated from the rest of *Acts of Philip*.

[5] Eric JUNOD, "Le mystère apocryphe ou les richesses cachées d'une littérature méconnue," in J.-D. KAESTLI et D. MARGUERAT, eds., *Le mystère apocryphe. Introduction à une littérature méconnue*, (Essai biblique 26; Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1995), 9--25.

[6] Theodor ZAHN, *Forschungen zur Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons und der altkirchlichen Literatur*, VI,I : *Apostel und Apostelschüler in der Provinz Asien*, (Leipzig: A. Deichert, 1900), 18.

2.2. With a more critical reading of the text, one that is more sensitive to its sociological and theological aspects, we can recognize, as was noted correctly by Erik Peterson,[7] the interdicts typical of an ascetic community known to heresiologists by the name of Encratite: vegetarianism, abstinence from wine, abstinence from marriage and procreation, and refusal of wealth.

2.3 However, we can uncover the full meaning and historical value of the *Acts of Philip* only through an allegorical, symbolic and typological interpretation, in the light of the comparative history of religions. The principal key to understanding this part of the apocrypha was discovered already in 1864 by Alfred von Gutschmid who wrote: "Coins confirm therefore the story of the Acts of Philip, at least insofar as one may deduce, that in Hierapolis the snake was worshipped not for itself, but as the holy animal of Cybele, and it was kept in its temple, guarded by the *galloi* (the priests of Cybele) and honored by the libations of the faithful." The *Acts of Philip* would therefore give us "one of the most valuable pieces of information ever transmitted by the apocryphal acts of apostles."[8] The discovery by François Bovon and Bertrand Bouvier[9] of the long text of the *Acts of Philip* in a manuscript from Athos, the *Xenophontos 32*, and of *APh* VIII,1-15 in an Athenian manuscript (Athens, National Library *346*), confirms very clearly, in my view, the interpretation of Gutschmid, which was favorably quoted by Richard Adelbert Lipsius[10] and only taken up by the numismatist Leo Weber[11] in 1910 before curiously falling into oblivion.

3. The double meaning of the viper, the leopard and the kid

Dispersed throughout the text are arguments which enable us to discern in *APh* VIII ff a polemic against the cult of Cybele. Taken singly, none of them can be considered as decisive, but taken together they constitute a coherent polemic against the metroac cult.

I will now examine some of the passages or expressions which are revealing both of this polemic, and of a Christian context. As I said before, polysemy is one of the salient features of the text.

3.1. The viper

When sending her on this mission, the Savior addresses Marianne:

> As for you, Marianne, change your costume and appearance; take off everything feminine in your outward appearance, the summer dress that you wear. Do not let the hem of your clothing drag on the ground, do not wrap it, but cut it; then take the road with your brother Philip to the city of Opheoryme, which means the 'snakes' walk'; indeed the inhabitants of this city worship the viper, the mother of snakes. When you enter the city, the snakes of this city must see you stripped of your appearance of Eve, so that nothing in your appearance betrays a woman (*APh* VIII, 4).

---

[7] Erik PETERSON, "Die Häretiker der Philippus-Akten," *ZNW* 31 (1932) 97--111. In the same perspective see François BOVON, "Les Actes de Philippe," *ANRW* 2.25.6 (1988) 4431--527.

[8] Alfred von GUTSCHMID, "Die Königsnamen in den apocryphen Apostelgeschichten. Ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis des geschichtlichen Romans," *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*, N. F. 19 (1864) 400--01. Reprinted in A. von GUTSCHMID, *Kleine Schriften*, (ed., F. RÜHL; Leipzig: 1890), 2.393--94.

[9] François BOVON, "Les Actes de Philippe," *ANRW* 2.25.6 (1988) 4431--527; Bertrand BOUVIER, François BOVON, "Actes de Philippe, I, d'après un manuscrit inédit," in D. PAPANDREOU, W. A. BIENERT, K. SCHÄFERDIEK, eds., *Oecumenica et patristica. Festschrift für Wilhelm Schneemelcher zum 75. Geburtstag*, (Chambésy - Geneva: Metropolie der Schweiz, 1989), 367--94.

[10] Richard Adelbert LIPSIUS, *Die apocryphen Apostelgeschichten und Apostellegenden* , (Braunschweig: C. A. Schwetschke, 1884; reprint Amsterdam: Philo Press, 1976), 2.2.11--12.

[11] Leo WEBER, "Apollon Pythoktonos im phrygischen Hierapolis," *Philologus. Zeitschrift für das classische Alterthum* 69 (1910) 178--251.

This excerpt from the *Xenophontos 32* calls for three comments.

3.1.1. The preeminent role of Marianne. While at the beginning of the text the lot falls to Philip to leave for the country of the Hellenes, much to his displeasure, in this passage on the other hand, it is to Marianne that the Savior announces exactly where the apostles must go: to *Opheoryme*, which means the *snakes' walk*.

3.1.2 The hostility between woman and snake. The information about the viper that interests us here is inserted in a rereading of Genesis 3 with added insistence on the hostility between woman and snake. The Savior explains to Marianne that in order to overcome the hostility of the snake, she must take on a masculine mentality, to the extent of masculinizing her dress and appearance; probably this notion reaches back to a very ancient mythological explanation of menstruation.

3.1.3 The viper as mother of snakes. The exegetical development on the hostility between woman and snake is motivated by the fact that Marianne is going to a city dedicated to the viper. But this viper is not merely a diabolical figure, as in Genesis 3.

Firstly, the viper is clearly presented as a divine animal. Secondly, this viper carries the title of mother of snakes (μήτηρ τῶν ὄφεων). The viper, (ἔχιδνα), is feminine, while snake (ὄφις) is masculine. Both the title of mother and the use of the Greek term ἔχιδνα suggest that the viper represents a feminine deity. Finally, the title of mother of snakes sounds like a transposition of the Greco-Roman title of Cybele, the mother of the gods (Μήτηρ θεῶν).

3.2 The leopard and the kid

After saying goodbye to the Savior on their departure for Ophioryme, the apostles are attacked in a deserted place by a great leopard:

> *APh* 16 [96] As they had penetrated the desert of the female dragons, while they were walking, there came a great leopard out of the woods which covered the mountain. Seeing the apostles of the Savior, he ran to throw himself at their feet and spoke in a human voice: "I prostrate myself before you, o servants of the divine greatness, envoys of the only son of God, order me to speak to perfection."
>
> *APh* 17 [97] And Philip said: "In the name of Jesus-Christ, speak !"
>
> And the leopard, taking a perfect human voice, started to say: "Listen to me, Philip, you who are trying to marry us to the word of God. I happened at the first hour of the night to fall on a herd of goats grazing on the other side of the mountain of the female dragon, the mother of snakes, and I stole a kid. While I was entering the wood in order to eat it after having hit it, it took a human voice and started to cry like a small child, saying: 'O leopard, cast off this savage heart of yours and this bestial design, and fill yourself with sweetness, for the envoys of the divine greatness are about to pass through this desert, to accomplish to perfection the promise of the glory of the only Son of God.' With these scolding words, the kid made me hesitate in myself, and slowly my heart changed, and my savagery changed to sweetness; sparing him, I decided not to eat him."

This passage calls for a few brief comments.

3.2.1 First, the problem of reconstituting *APh* VIII. While the first extract I cited came from the manuscript of Athens, National Library *346*, also discovered by François Bovon, the episode of the conversion of the leopard is only attested in the manuscript edited by Maximilien Bonnet, the *Vaticanus graecus 824*, which manifests a clear concern for orthodoxy. Furthermore, in the martyrdom, only a viper is mentioned, even in *Vaticanus graecus 824*. Therefore one can reasonably identify the female dragon of *Vaticanus* with the viper of the *Atheniensis*, all the more so as both bear the significant title of "mother of snakes."

3.2.2 Second, one learns that the mountain is not so much the place of residence of the female dragon or viper, but that it is consecrated to her (ὄροσ τησ δρακαίνησ). This is interesting because Cybele is closely connected to the mountain. As the historian of religion Philippe Borgeaud from Geneva explains in his forthcoming book: "A set of toponymic evidence transmitted by the Greek tradition enables us nonetheless to assert that Cybele is originally only an epithet (one among many) of a goddess called, simply, Mother (Matar in Phrygian). The epithet refers to the name of a mountain. The Matar kubileia (Cybelene mother) of the Paleo-Phrygian sanctuary is an appellation applied to a long series of Anatolian Greek goddesses: Meter dindumene, Meter sipylene, Meter berekuntia, Meter idiae and Meter angdistis (or Agdistis): Mother of Dindyme, of Sipyle, of Berecynthe, of Ida, of Agdus, all of them mountains. The best generic translation, that which the Greeks sometimes used, would be Meter oreia, the "mountainous Mother".[12]

3.2.3 Third, *APh* VIII links the viper, the mountain, the leopard and the kid. The kid is known as an attribute of Attis,[13] the unhappy lover of Cybele, and the leopard the most ferocious of wild animals, is, like the lion, the principal attribute of Cybele. We should note that in our apocryphal text, the appeasement of the leopard, the transformation of his savagery into sweetness, his conversion, are not the work of Cybele, but of the Son of God. In the Christian perspective, the motif of the reconciliation of animals inevitably evokes Isaiah 11.6-9:

> Then the wolf shall live with the sheep,
> and the leopard lie down with the kid;
> the calf and the young lion shall grow up together,
> and a little child shall lead them;
> the cow and the bear shall be friends,
> and their young shall lie down together.
> The lion shall eat straw like cattle;
> the infant shall play over the hole of the cobra,
> and the young child dance over the viper's nest.
> They shall not hurt or destroy in all my holy mountain,
> for as the waters fill the sea,
> so shall the land be filled with the knowledge of the LORD.[14]

As we know, this text was held in high esteem by millenarians. Here again, it is possible to see how the plurality of interpretations crystallizes around the figures of the leopard and the kid. Associated with the viper, mother of snakes, and the mountain, these quadrupeds evoke Cybele and Attis. Reconciled and endowed with human speech, they appear as the narrative pillars of millenarian convictions, which were particularly, and almost exclusively, developed by the Christians of Asia Minor. However, in my view, the millenarian interpretation of the text does not do full justice to it, and it is only the underlying preoccupation with undermining the cult of Cybele which accounts for the author's choice of the leopard and the kid, rather than, for instance, a wolf and sheep or a lion and cattle. The same underlying preoccupation explains why the hostility between the viper and Philip remains unabated until the *Martyrdom*..

3.3. The identity of Ophioryme

A few manuscripts of the *Martyrdom of Philip*, but not the most reliable, identify Ophioryme with Hierapolis of Asia, that is Hierapolis of Phrygia, actually Pamukkale. While I

---

[12] Philippe BORGEAUD, *La Mère des dieux* (La librairie du XXe siècle; Paris: Seuil, 1996), chapter one.

[13] Pausanias, *Description of Greece* VII.17.10; Arnobius, *Against the Nations* V.6.

[14] *New English Bible with Apocrypha*, (Oxford University Press-Cambridge University Press, 1970).

agree with François Bovon in considering this identification as a secondary explanation in the text, I do not think it wrong.[15] Even though the concern with re-placing Philip in the city which the ecclesiastical tradition has assigned to him could be considered suspect, some of the passages of the text can be explained only if read in the context of the unusual geography of Hierapolis, where Cybele was worshipped.

3.4. The cult of Cybele in Hierapolis

Officially the tutelary god of Hierapolis is Apollo Archegetes.[16] However, in the case of coins which show Apollo transpiercing a large snake, Leo Weber has demonstrated that it was not a banal reproduction of the Delphic myth (Apollo killing Pytho), but an image of the opposition between Apollo, the god imported by the Greeks, and the local divinity, the goddess Cybele. These coins are only one of numerous illustrations of Cybele's snake-like shape and confirm my interpretation of *APh* VIII. In addition to numismatic evidence, there are epigraphic and literary indices which attest the presence of Cybele in Hierapolis. We might mention here:

1) An inscription dating from ca. 200 AD dedicated to the *archigallos* Marcos Aurelios Eutychianos by the council and the people of the city.[17]

2) In his *Geography* (XIII, 4, 14), Strabo has a detailed description of Hierapolis and its famous Plutonion.

3) In his *Bibliotheca*, Photius quotes the *Vita Isidori* from Damascius, a VIth century platonic philosopher:

> At Hierapolis in Phrygia there was a temple of Apollo, and beneath this temple descended an underground passageway which gave forth deadly vapors. . . . The author says that he himself and the philosopher Dorus, being driven by curiosity, went down there and returned from it unharmed. The author says, "While I was sleeping at Hieropolis, in a dream it seemed to me that I was Attis and that, by the command of the Mother of the gods, I was celebrating what they call the Festival of Rejoicing. This dream signified our liberation from the lower regions."[18]

The cult of Cybele in Hierapolis was centered on the Plutonion, which Italian archaeologists did indeed discover under the Apollo temple in accordance with the testimony of Damascius.[19] The water of the hot spring, full of carbonic acid, releases carbonic gas when it spurts out. Heavier than air, the gas remains in the wells, causing limestone to precipitate and thus producing the beautiful cascades of white stone. The text of Damascius implies that the *galloi* in Hierapolis practised incubatory medicine, similar to that practised in Epidaurus. This VIth century testimony is enough to justify the hypothesis of there having been a conflict between rigorist Christians and Cybele in Hierapolis in Phrygia during the second half of the IVth century.

---

[15] Cf. François BOVON, "Les Actes de Philippe," *ANRW* 2.25.6 (1988) 4493.

[16] Carl HUMANN, Conrad CICHORIUS, Walther JUDEICH, Franz WINTER, *Altertümer von Hierapolis* (Jahrbuch des Kaiserlich Deutschen Archeologischen Instituts, Ergänzungsheft 4; Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1898), 42--43. The most recent overview of the archeological evidence in Hierapolis is Daria DE BERNARDI FERRERO, "Hierapolis," in *Arslandtepe, Hierapolis, Iasos, Kyme. Scavi archeologici italiani in Turchia.* Introduzione di Giovanni PUGLIESE CARRATELLI, saggi di Fede BERTI, Daria DE BERNARDI FERRERO, Marcella FRANGIPANE, Sebastiana LAGONA, (Venice: Marsilio, 1993), 104--87.

[17] Marteen Jozef VERMASEREN, *Corpus Cultus Cybelae Attidisque (CCCA)*, Vol. I *Asia Minor* (Études préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l'empire romain 50; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1987), 30 n° 76.

[18] Photius, *Bibliotheca* 242, 131.

[19] Gianfilippo CARETTONI, "Scavo del tempio di Apollo a Hierapolis. Rapporto preliminare," *Annuario della Scuola Archeologica di Atene e delle Missioni Italiane in Oriente* 41--42 (n.s. 25--26) (1963--64) 411--33.

3.5. The *Acts of Philip* and Hierapolis

Some passages of the *Acts of Philip* XIII ff also lead us to suppose that Ophioryme is a pseudonym of Hierapolis and that the viper is really an image of Cybele.

First, the text says that Ophioryme is inland (*APh* XV,1), on the side of a mountain and this corresponds to the geographical position of Hierapolis.

Second, to punish them Philip throws the viper, Tyrannognophos, and the impious crowd into the abyss (*APhM* 27-28 [133-134]). But the Savior raises the inhabitants back up (*APhM* 32 [138]), using his luminous cross to act as a ladder. Only the viper and the governor remain in the abyss. Though the author adopts the vocabulary and motifs of the Biblical story of Core, Datan and Abiram (Num 16), the allusion to the Plutonion of Hierapolis is obvious. Strabo said that only the *galloi* could go in and out of the abyss unharmed. In the Christian apocryphon, it is not Cybele, but the Savior Jesus Christ himself, who saves the people from the abyss.

Third, the story of the healing of Stachys in *APh* XIV can be interpreted as a Christian adaptation of metroac incubation. The leader of the viper-worshippers became blind by coating his eyes with some liquid of snake's eggs. While Philip is present in Ophioryme, Stachys has the same dream on three occasions. In it he sees an old man, a woman, and a young man baptizing, so he decides to consult Philip, the true doctor. This story confirms the archeological hypotheses according to which incubation was practised in the famous martyrium of Philip in Hierapolis.[20] In the square portico which surrounds the octagonal sanctuary, the floor was left unpaved to allow pilgrims to come into direct contact with the earth supposed to contain the relics of Philip.

Thus, it is no longer Cybele but Philip, or more exactly Christ through Philip, who occupies the hot and healing spring, the holy place of Hierapolis, the holy city.

4. Conclusion

Following Alfred von Gutschmid, it it can be argued that the viper, the leopard and the kid are the masked actors of a polemic which opposes the author of the *Acts of Philip* VIII ff to the cult of Cybele in Hierapolis. Like Leo Weber, I consider as sound the idea that Philip takes up where Apollo left off in his struggle against Cybele. Furthermore, although the text says the contrary, the victory of the Christian Hierapolitans must have been as insignificant as that of the Greek colonizers. And it must be borne in mind that several aspects of the text betray a strong metroac influence. Neither Hellenism nor Christianity, nor even Islam were capable of eradicating that particular form of indigenous worship. As the historian of religion Robert Turcan says: "To this day, it is necessary to *see* the peasants of Hierapolis (Pamukkale) whirling round frantically to the rhythms of their drums, to get an inkling of the impact that corybantism would have exercised on the human nervous system."[21]

Whatever the part we assign to the religious conflict depicted in the text, the *Acts of Philip* emerge, in my view, as a document of capital importance for the study of the cult of Cybele and Attis in late Antiquity.

---

[20] Paolo VERZONE, "Hierapolis di Frigia nei Lavori della Missione Archeologica Italiana," *Quaderni de "La Ricerca scientifica"* 100, *Un Decennio di Rcerche Archeologiche* I, (1978) 455.

[21] Robert TURCAN, *Les cultes orientaux dans le monde romain* (Histoire; Paris: Les Belles-Lettres, 1989), 37.

The Influence of 1 Corinthians on the *Acts of Paul*[1]

Peter W. Dunn
Georgetown, Ontario

According to Tertullian (*bapt.* 17), an Asian Presbyter (henceforth, "the Presbyter") wrote the *Acts of Paul* (*APl*) and later resigned his office because of the scandal which his writing had caused. The general reaction in the early church, however, seems to have been much more favorable, for the *APl* enjoyed widespread dissemination and acceptance. Its story of Paul is fascinating, portraying him as a wandering missionary and wonder-worker who creates disturbances everywhere he goes, though he always manages to convert not a few and escape, until his martyrdom at the hands of Nero. In the most celebrated section of the *APl*, known as the *Acts of Paul and Thecla* (*AThl*), Paul turns a certain Thecla away from her fiancé, Thamyris, to embrace Christianity and chastity. Thamyris takes his revenge by stirring the mobs and the authorities against both his fiancée and the Apostle.

Scholars often consider this very vivid image of the Apostle to be a gross deviation from the historical Paul. In the first critical monograph on the *AThl*, C. Schlau[2] set the tone for how scholars would treat the Paulinism of the *APl*. He could detect only a single phrase which was reminiscent of the authentic Paul:

> Bezeichnen schon die Reden des Apostels Paulus in der Apostelgeschichte des Lucas, verglichen mit seinen Briefen, eine gewisse Neutralisirung der specifischen Gedanken des Apostels, so ist in unsern Acten diese Neutralisirung in einem Grade fortgeschritten, dass die dem Paulus in dem [*sic*] Mund gelegten Reden, abgesehen von dem einmal (c. 4) vorkommenden Ausdruck καρπὸς δικαιοσύνης,[3] auch nicht an einen einzigen ihm eigenthümlichen Gedanken mehr erinnern.[4]

More recent studies generally concur with Schlau's judgment of the Paulinism of the *APl*. A. F. Findlay, whose treatment of the *APl* is the most harsh, exclaims concerning the teaching of ἐγκράτεια and the resurrection: "There is in all this a very grave falling away from the Pauline conception of salvation."[5] A. Lindemann assesses the *APl* as follows: "Der

---

[1]This paper is largely gleaned from my dissertation, "The *Acts of Paul* and the Pauline Legacy in the Second Century," accepted for the degree of PhD at the University of Cambridge (1996) and done under the supervision of Willy Rordorf (Prof. Emeritus of the Unversity of Neuchâtel). I use Rordorf's Greek text of the *APl* which is in preparation for the *Acta Pauli*, CChr Series Apocryphorum (Turnhout: Brepols, forthcoming). I have used a numeration for certain episodes which will be first introduced in W. Rordorf, "Les *Actes de Paul*," in *Écrits apocryphes chrétiens*, eds. F. Bovon and P. Geoltrain, La Pléiade (Paris: Gallimard, forthcoming). Note also the following symbols: cop^{1} = Heidelburg Papyrus; cop^{B} = Bodmer Papyrus; P^{1} = Hamburg Papyrus. Biblical citations in English are from the RSV.

[2]*Die Acten des Paulus und die ältere Thekla-Legende. Ein Beitrag zur christlichen Literaturgeschichte* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1877).

[3]According to Schlau, even this expression deviates from its original Pauline sense (*Akten des Paulus*, 55).

[4]Schlau, *Akten des Paulus*, 59.

[5]*Byways in Early Christian Literature: Studies in the Uncanonical Gospels and Acts* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1923) 263.

Paulus der Akten ist der Verkünder des λόγος θεοῦ περὶ ἐγκρατείας καὶ ἀναστάσεως.[6] Dahinter steht keine besondere Tradition und auch kein besonderes gerade Paulus betreffendes Anliegen; ... " E. Dassmann judges the *APl* as "ein ausdrückliches Eintreten für den Apostel bei Unkenntnis seiner Theologie (Acta Pauli)."[7] Thus, the Paul of the *APl* is seen as a distortion conforming more to the tastes of second-century readers than to the Pauline epistles.[8] D. R. MacDonald even tries to explain why the *APl*, among other Pauline acts,[9] neglects the Pauline epistles.[10] But there is a consistent failure in all of these studies of the *APl*: They lack a text by text analysis of the use of the Pauline epistles in the *APl* on which a fair judgement of its Paulinism might be based.

This paper will limit itself to analyzing the influence of 1 Cor on the Presbyter's depiction of Paul's life, his teaching, Christian's action and the worship of the church. The influence is nowhere more profound than in the *AThl* 5-6, the very passage which scholars so frequently cite as a litmus test to show how far the Presbyter has digressed from the true Paul.

But before we begin, it is necessary to set out an important assumption concerning the relationship of the *APl* and *3 Corinthians* (*3 Cor*).[11] Both the external and the internal evidence suggests that *3 Cor* was probably a document which arose independently of the *APl*. It is my opinion that it was a source which the Presbyter used in his original edition of the *APl*. In appropriating *3 Cor*, the Presbyter must have agreed with both its theology and its portrayal of Paul.[12] So I will also treat the influence of 1 Cor on *3 Cor*, bearing in mind that it may not be by the Presbyter who wrote the *APl*.

---

[6]*Paulus im ältesten Christentum. Das Bild des Apostels und die Rezeption der paulinischen Theologie in der frühchristlichen Literatur bis Marcion*, BHT 58 (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck] 1979) 69.

[7]*Der Stachel im Fleisch: Paulus in der frühchristlichen Literatur bis Irenäus* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1979) 317; cf. H. W. Tajra, *The Martyrdom of St. Paul: Historical and Judicial Context, Traditions and Legends*, WUNT 2,67 (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck] 1994) 126; W. Rebell, *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen und Apostolische Väter* (München: Chr. Kaiser, 1992) 162.

[8]See E. Rolffs, in *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen*, ed. E. Hennecke, 2d ed. (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck] 1924) 197.

[9]MacDonald takes the following Pauline Acts into consideration: Acts, the *APl*, the *Acts of Peter*, the *Acts of Andrew and Paul*, the *Acts of Peter and Paul*, the *Acts of Xanthippe and Polyxena*.

[10]"Apocryphal and Canonical Narratives About Paul," in *Paul and the Legacies of Paul*, ed. William S. Babcock (Dallas: Southern Methodist University, 1990) 55-70.

[11]See W. Schneemelcher, *New Testament Apocrypha*, trans. ed. R. McL. Wilson, 2d ed. (Philadelphia: Westminster/John Knox, 1991-92) 2:227-29; W. Rordorf, "Hérésie et orthodoxie selon la correspondance apocryphe entre les Corinthiens et l'apôtre Paul," in *Orthodoxie et hérésie dans l'Eglise ancienne*, Cahiers de la Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie 17 (1993) 22-35; Dunn, "*Acts of Paul*," 101-6.

[12]Cf. A. F. J. Klijn, "The Apocryphal Correspondence Between Paul and the Corinthians," *VC* 17 (1963) 10.

1. The Influence of 1 Cor on the *APl*'s Portrayal of Paul's Life

1 Cor appears to have influenced the Presbyter's depiction of Paul's life in the Ephesian (*APl* 9) and the Corinthian (*APl* 12) episodes. In the light of a recent paper in this seminar by R. I. Pervo,[13] it will also be necessary to examine the possible influence of the Book of Acts on these two episodes.

*1.1 Paul at Ephesus (*APl *9)*

Because of a very successful mission in Ephesus, Paul is condemned to the beasts. The ferocious lion which meets him in the arena, however, greets him with a human voice, being the very animal which Paul baptized in an earlier account. A sudden hailstorm saves both Paul and the lion.

Pervo lists some parallels between this account of Paul's stay in Ephesus and that in Acts 19:

> Common to both are Priscilla and Aquila, Ephesus, a mission of vast success, opposition to Paul related to a critique of idolatry, an angry crowd in a theater, including metallurgists, intimations of a riot, and an official who suggests that discussion is not in order. These themes and motifs are, to be sure, common enough, but the accumulation in this setting demands attention.[14]

Such coincidences, however, may not signify literary dependence, for most of these elements appear in other episodes of the *APl* where dependence on Acts is by no means evident. The theater is a typical place for persecution (*APl* 6 [cop^1 38:24]; *AThl* 20). Hermogenes is depicted as a smith (*AThl* 1), and so opposition to Paul from metallurgists is a motif which is already present. As for the official stating that the discussion is out of order, in Acts 19:40, it is the riot which is unlawful, but in the *APl*, Paul's teaching is not to be heard, as Jerome[15] states, Ἄνδρες Ἐφ[έσιοι,] ὅτι μὲν ὁ ἀνὴρ οὗτος καλῶς εἶπεν οἶδα, ἔτι δὲ ὅ[τι νῦν] καιρὸς ταῦτα ὑμᾶς μαθεῖν οὐκ ἔστιν. Jerome calls instead for an immediate judgement in Paul's case. Pervo sees parallels which may either be explained as common motifs in the *APl* or are not really parallels at all.

There are significant differences as well. The riot in Acts is much more acute as the Ephesians cry out in defense of Artemis and risk sanction from higher authorities (19:40). The town clerk (γραμματεύς) persuades them to quiet down and bring lawful charges later, whereas in the *APl*, Paul receives a sentence of death from the governor (ἡγεμών). In Acts, the Asiarchs dissuade Paul from entering the theater, so that he is not condemned, and there is, above all, no lion. Dependence on Acts does not seem to adequately explain the *APl* 9, as Rordorf states: "Andererseits sind die Unterschiede zwischen den Berichten auch so charak-

---

[13]"A Hard Act to Follow: The Acts of Paul and the Canonical Acts," Read at the Society of Biblical Literature, Seminar on Intertextuality in Christian Apocrypha, November, 1994. 1-27. Chicago, 1994.

[14]Pervo, "Hard Act," 10-11.

[15]"Hieronymus" in English editions. Following Rordorf (*Acta Pauli*), I have preferred "Jerome" which is a more familiar name in English.

teristisch, daß unmöglich die *Paulusakten* direkt von der Apostelgeschichte abhängig sein können."[16]

Certain passages from the Pauline epistles provide a broader base of comparison. In 1 Cor 15:32, Paul questions: "What do I gain if, humanly speaking, I fought with beasts at Ephesus? If the dead are not raised, 'Let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we die.'"[17] Paul also mentions a lion from which he narrowly escapes (2 Tim 4:17): "But the Lord stood by me and gave me strength to proclaim the message fully, that all the Gentiles might hear it. So I was rescued from the lion's mouth." R. Bauckham[18] contends that the Presbyter believed these two hints to refer to the same event and so imaginatively filled in the gaps. Finally, Bauckham also suggests that the Lion episode corresponds with 2 Cor 1:8-10:

> For we do not want you to be ignorant, brethren, of the affliction we experienced in Asia; for we were so utterly, unbearably crushed that we despaired of life itself. Why, we felt that we had received the sentence of death; but that was to make us rely not on ourselves but on God who raises the dead; he delivered us from so deadly a peril, and he will deliver us; on him we have set our hope that he will deliver us again.[19]

Likewise, in the *APl* 9, Paul receives the death sentence, despairs for his life and is miraculously delivered.[20] Thus, far from creating the lion story from pure imagination, the Presbyter would appear to have cleverly woven into his story details from 1 and 2 Cor and 2 Tim, as well as to have drawn ideas from the story of Androclus and the lion.[21]

Bauckham also observes that Aquila and Priscilla have a church in their house at Ephesus in both 1 Cor 16:19 and 2 Tim 4:19. Likewise, in the *APl*, when Paul arrives at

---

[16]Rordorf, "In welchem Verhältnis stehen die apokryphen Paulusakten zur kanonischen Apostelgeschichte und zu den Pastoralbriefen?" in *Text and Testimony: Essays on New Testament and Apocryphal Literature in Honour of A. F. J. Klijn*, ed. T. Baarda, *et al.* (Kampen: Uitgeversmaatschappij J. H. Kok, 1988) 233.

[17]D. R. MacDonald believes that a lion story must have circulated during Paul's own day. He argues further that the Apostle himself rejects this story in 1 Cor 15, but to do so, he must make a conjectural emendation of the text which is not very convincing ("A Conjectural Emendation of 1 Cor 15:31-32; or the Case of the Misplaced Lion Fight," *HTR* 73 [1980] 265-76).

[18]"The *Acts of Paul* as a Sequel to Acts," in *The Book of Acts in Its Ancient Literary Setting*, eds. B. W. Winter and A. D. Clarke, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993) 119.

[19]Bauckham, "Sequel," 119.

[20]Rordorf suggests that 2 Cor 1:8-10 testifies to the same event which is the historical basis for both the *APl* 9 and Acts 19 (*Verhältnis* 233).

[21]Apion recorded his own eyewitness account of the event in the fifth book of *Aegyptiaca*, as preserved in a summary by Aulus Gellius (*Attic Nights* 5:14). See B. M. Metzger "St. Paul and the Baptized Lion," *Princeton Seminary Bulletin* 39 (1945) 16, n. 15); and D. R. MacDonald *The Legend and the Apostle: The Battle for Paul in Story and Canon* [Philadelphia: Westminster, 1983] 22.

Ephesus, he stays at the house of Aquila and Priscilla,[22] where the church meets. Acts 18-19, on the other hand, never mentions that they own a house in Ephesus. According to Bauckham, the Presbyter would have also read that Paul planned to stay in Ephesus until Pentecost (1 Cor 16:4-9):

> I will visit you after passing through Macedonia, for I intend to pass through Macedonia, and perhaps I will stay with you or even spend the winter, so that you may speed me on my journey, wherever I go. For I do not want to see you now just in passing; I hope to spend some time with you, if the Lord permits. But I will stay in Ephesus until Pentecost, for a wide door for effective work has opened to me, and there are many adversaries.

Likewise, in the *APl*, the persecution against Paul at Ephesus breaks out at Pentecost (*APl* 9:11), "And there was a fame of the grace and much blessing between ... [*sic*] and Pentecost."[23] Paul's intention to leave Ephesus and to go through Macedonia before visiting the Corinthians corresponds to the itinerary of the extant *APl*. Though Paul does not expressly stay the winter in Corinth, the *APl* 12:1 states that Paul preached the word of perseverance for forty days, and this could correspond to the "some time" which Paul hoped to spend there. 1 Tim 1:3 also indicates Paul traveled from Ephesus to Macedonia, and 2 Tim 4:20 would suggest that Paul traveled through Corinth, where he left Erastus, on his way to Rome.[24] Thus, it is clear that the Pauline itinerary in the *APl* from Ephesus to Corinth corresponds with certain passages in 1 and 2 Cor and 1 and 2 Tim, but not at all with Acts.

1.2 Paul at Corinth (APl *12)*

Paul stops in Corinth and spends forty days with the Corinthian Christians on his way to Rome. He stays in the house of Stephen for forty days. How we arrive at the reading "Stephen" instead of C. Schmidt's "Epiphanius" will require an explanation below. When Paul is about to depart, the Corinthians are distressed about when they shall see him again; three prophetic messages predict the Apostle's martyrdom in Rome, increasing their grief. There are certain similarities between this episode and Acts 20:17-21, where the Ephesian elders are saddened because Paul predicts they will not see his face again. Pervo suggests that the Presbyter has rewritten Acts 20:17-21:14 to better suit his liking:

> In both texts the mood changes as Paul prepares to embark on his fateful journey. Prayer, prophecy, and pathos color the scenes, ... Oral tradition is

---

[22]The Lukan form of her name (Priscilla) instead of the Pauline form (Prisca) is not very telling (contra Bauckham, "Sequel," 220; and Pervo, "Hard Act," 10, n. 42). It is not certain that the form in cop^{B} is original or a scribal variant. Nor is it certain that the Presbyter did not already possess copies of the Pauline epistles which contained the Lukan form of the name (cf. variants in NA^{27} at 1 Cor 16:19 and Rom 16:3).

[23]Schneemelcher, *NT Apocrypha*, 2:265.

[24]Ignatius calls the Ephesians the παροδός of the martyrs, naming Paul explicitly (*Eph.* 12:1). He probably does not depend on Acts 20, as W. R. Schoedel contends (*Ignatius of Antioch: A Commentary on the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch*, Hermeneia [Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985] 73), for he was not strictly on his way to martyrdom. Like the Presbyter, he more likely relies on 1 and 2 Tim (J. B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers*, 2d ed. [London: MacMillan and Co., 1889] 2.2.63).

> not a likely source for a blend of such disparate material. The presence of a similar complex at the comparable narrative juncture in the *APl* is best explained as a revision or imitation of the written text of Acts.[25]

On the other hand, no verbal dependence is detectable. Neither is the scene's "similar complex" convincing evidence of the Presbyter's rewriting of Acts 20:17-21:14. Paul's own instructions in 1 Cor 12-14 provide a more convincing literary model for the prophetic messages which Paul, Cleobius, and Myrta utter in the Corinthian assembly (see § 4.2 below). In addition, the Corinthians have displayed distress over Paul's situation in Philippi (*3 Cor* 1), so that the narrative has already depicted their great concern over his well-being and their desire for his presence (*3 Cor* 2:6, 16). Even Paul himself speaks of the Corinthians' feelings for him (2 Cor 7:6-7): "But God, who comforts the downcast, comforted us by the coming of Titus, and not only by his coming but also by the comfort with which he was comforted in you, as he told us of your longing, your mourning, your zeal for me, so that I rejoiced still more." Moreover, "prayer, prophecy, and pathos" are not at all disparate elements: Polycarp prayed for a number of days, received a vision, and predicted his own passion to the brethren.[26] Pervo overstates his case. The Presbyter seems to be drawing upon the Pauline epistles (including *3 Cor*), upon his own characterization of the Corinthians, upon the expectation that visions and prophetic messages precede martyrdom, not to mention the common literary scene of great sadness at the departure of a loved one.[27]

Now concerning the reading of Stephen in the place of Epiphanius, we must look first at the greeting in Corinthians' letter to Paul (*3 Cor* 2:1): Στέφανας[28] καὶ σὺν αὐτῷ πρεσβύτεροι Δάφνος καὶ Εὔβουλος καὶ Θεόφιλος καὶ Ξένων Παύλῳ τῷ ἀδελφῷ ἐν κυρίῳ χαιρεῖν. This address is remarkably like Polycarp, *Phil.* (greeting): Πολύκαρπος καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ πρεσβύτεροι τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ τῇ παροικούσῃ Φιλίππους (Lake, 1912:1.282). Ignatius calls Polycarp a bishop (ἐπίσκοπος; Ign., *Pol.*, greeting), as does the *Mart. Pol.* 16:2, though Polycarp himself never employs the word. But he does set out requirements for presbyters (*Phil.* 6:1). Polycarp may have only considered himself first among peers in the presbyterial ranks. Whatever the case may be, the author of *3 Cor* has formulated this salutation in such a way as to make Stephanas appear to be the bishop of Corinth or at least the leading

---

[25]Pervo, "Hard Act," 12

[26]*Mart. Pol.* 5; In *Mart. Perp.* 4 and 7 (ca. AD 200; H. Musurillo, ed. and trans., *The Acts of Christian Martyrs* [Oxford: University Press, 1972] xxvii) prayer and visions play a role in the prelude to Perpetua's martyrdom (cf. *Mart. Pion.* 2).

[27]In addition to Acts 20:17f. and the *APl* 12, one may easily add to this list: *APt* 1-3; *AJn* 58-59; E. Junod and J.-D. Kaestli study the common elements in some detail (*Acta Iohannis*. CChr Series Apocryphorum [Brepolis: Turnhout, 1983] 2:431, n. 1). Xenophon of Ephesus' *Ephesian Tale* 1:10 shows that the "scene of departure" is by no means limited to Christian literature.

[28]Rordorf (*Acta Pauli*) will prefer Στέφανος in agreement with the versions. But as he will suggest in his introduction, his task is to make a critical edition of the *APl* not of *3 Cor*. Given the unanimous agreement of the versions against the Greek, it is probable that the Presbyter made this change when incorporating *3 Cor* into his *APl*. Στέφανας, however, should be retained as the original reading of *3 Cor*.

presbyter. This is particularly interesting in light of what Paul writes to the Corinthians concerning Stephanas (1 Cor 16:15-18):

> Now, brethren, you know that the household of Stephanas were the first converts in Achaia, and they have devoted themselves to the service of the saints; I urge you to be subject to such men and to every fellow worker and laborer. I rejoice at the coming of Stephanas and Fortunatus and Achaicus, because they have made up for your absence; for they refreshed my spirit as well as yours. Give recognition to such men.

Paul enjoins the Corinthians to be subject to and to honor Stephanas as an important convert and the leader of a household. The author would appear to have seen these exhortations concerning Stephanas and to have recognized the ministerial offices of *ἐπίσκοπος* and *πρεσβύτερος* which existed in his own time.

3 Cor 2:1 is not alone in this interpretation of Stephanas. Clement of Rome states concerning the apostles : *κατὰ χώρας οὖν καὶ πόλεις κηρύσσοντες καθίστανον τὰς ἀπαρχὰς αὐτῶν, δοκιμάσαντες τῷ πνεύματι, εἰς ἐπισκόπους καὶ διακόνους τῶν μελλόντων πιστεύειν.*[29] Clement, who knows 1 Cor (see *1 Clem.* 47:1-4), borrows the word *ἀπαρχή* from 1 Cor 16:15[30]: *Παρακαλῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί· οἴδατε τὴν οἰκίαν Στεφανᾶ, ὅτι ἐστὶν ἀπαρχὴ τῆς Ἀχαΐας καὶ εἰς διακονίαν τοῖς ἁγίοις ἔταξαν ἑαυτούς.* The use of the word *διακονία* tends to confirm that 1 Cor 16:5 was the inspiration for *1 Clem.* 42:4. Clement would probably consider Stephanas to belong to the first category, *ἐπίσκοπος*, as in *3 Cor.*

Paul similarly commends Onesiphorus who serves as the example of a faithful man to whom Timothy may entrust the Pauline teaching (2 Tim 1:16-2:2), and in the *APl* he appears as the local leader of the church at Iconium. Like Stephanas, Onesiphorus is the head of a household (cf. 2 Tim 4:19). The Presbyter repeats this kind of exegesis in his treatment of Priscilla and Aquila:

> 1 Cor 16:19
> The churches of Asia send greetings. Aquila and Prisca, together with the church in their house, send you hearty greetings in the Lord.
> Rom 16:35
> Greet Prisca and Aquila, my fellow workers in Christ Jesus, who risked their necks for my life, to whom not only I but also all the churches of the Gentiles give thanks; greet also the church in their house.

In the *APl* 9:1f., they are the leaders in the house church at Ephesus in keeping with 1 Cor 16:19, and Aquila should probably be understood as the bishop. Moreover, in the extant episodes of the *APl*, the leadership situation appears to confirm this trend. Each locale has one

---

[29]*1 Clem.* 42:4; Lake, Kirsopp, trans. *Apostolic Fathers*, LCL (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1912-13) 1:80.

[30]Cf. Rom. 16:5. See Dassmann (*Stachel*, 97) and Lindemann (*Paulus*, 192), who states: "Falls der Vf tatsächlich an beide Stellen gedacht hat, müßte er sie freilich betont uminterpretiert haben: Während bei Paulus *ἀπαρχή* einfach die ersten Christen meint, ist in 1 Clem offenbar an eine hierarchische Spitzenstellung gedacht, die auf die Apostel zurückgehe (*καθίστανον τὰς ἀπαρχὰς αὐτῶν*)." But Paul clearly endows these "first converts" with hierarchical authority when he tells the Corinthians to submit to them!

leader; in addition to Stephanas at Corinth and Onesiphorus at Iconium, there are Hermias at Myra (*AThl* 41) and Claudius in Italy (*APl* 13:3-4). Judas, the brother of Jesus, appears as the dominant Christian in Damascus, but is not a resident leader. The Damascene church apparently meets in the house of the widow Lemma (*APl* 9). Judas is probably an itinerant in keeping with 1 Cor 9:5,[31] and his designation as a "blessed prophet" may indicate a wandering ministry as in the *Didache* 11f.

Epiphanius as the correct reading of the *APl* 12:1 would contradict this trend in the *APl* of one city-one leader (*APl* 12:1; P^{1} 6:2). Why is it not Stephanas? Does the Presbyter have two leaders at Corinth in view? The photographs of P^{1} may provide the answer to this question.[32] Schmidt transcribes the letters as Ἐπ[ι]φαν[ίου].[33] However, there are some problems with this reading. The letters are not particularly legible, for the MS has suffered some wear and tear in addition to soiling. The second vertical stroke of what Schmidt saw as a "Π" is not connected to the rest of the letter, so it could instead be part of a letter which follows. The letter "I" would have had to have been completely smudged out. Finally, what Schmidt read as the top line of the "E" is also not joined to the rest of the letter. Thus, the best he could have read was ΈΠ[Ι]ΦΑΝ[ΙΟΥ], for the letters "E" and "Π" are reconstructed. It is equally possible to read ϹΤΕΦΑΝ[ΟΥ]. The scribe tended to write "C" very small and sometimes to join or overlay it with a following "T". The internal evidence must fall towards the reading "Stephen",[34] who was a known figure connected with Paul and the church at Corinth, not only from 1 Cor but also from *3 Cor* which the Presbyter has used as one of his sources. In my opinion, this passage would not contradict the rule of one city-one leader but confirm it.

Thus, we see that the Presbyter's portrayal of Paul's itinerary from Ephesus to Rome appears to follow that set out in 1 Cor 16:4-9 and 2 Tim 4:20. His struggles in Ephesus are inspired by 1 Cor 15:32, 2 Cor 1:8-10 and 2 Tim 4:17. The leaders with whom he comes in contact in Ephesus and Corinth, Aquila, Priscilla and Stephen, appear to be derived from 1 Cor 16:15-18. In all of this, it is often impossible to reconcile details with the Book of Acts. It would appear, therefore, that 1 Cor and other Pauline epistles have strongly influenced the Presbyter's portrayal of Paul's life.

---

[31]See R. Bauckham, *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus in the Early Church* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1990) 1.

[32]I wish to thank Prof. Rordorf for allowing me to see photographs which he acquired recently from the Hamburg University Library. Unfortunately, P^{1} has suffered further corruption at 6:2 so that we are now wholly dependent upon the photographs in C. Schmidt and W. Schubart, ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΠΑΥΛΟΥ*: Acta Pauli nach dem Papyrus der Hamburger Staats- und Universitäts-Bibliothek* (Glückstadt and Hamburg: J. J. Augustin, 1936).

[33]P^{1} 6:2; Schmidt-Schubart, ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΠΑΥΛΟΥ, 44.

[34]If the Presbyter is responsible for the change in *3 Cor* 2:1 from Stephanas to Stephen, it is reasonable to conclude that the reading here would also include the more common name. But no doubt in the Presbter's mind, this Stephen is the same person as the Stephanas of 1 Cor.

2. The Influence of 1 Cor on the *APl*'s Portrayal of Paul's Teaching

2.1 A Treatise on the Resurrection (*3 Cor* 5:24-28)

3 Cor 5:24-32 vehemently defends the doctrine of the resurrection of the flesh. *3 Cor* 5:26-28 apparently draws from Paul's teaching in 1 Cor 15:35-37:

3 Cor 5:26-28	1 Cor 15:35-37
Οὔ *τε γὰρ, ἄνδρες Κορίνθιοι, οἴδασι τὸν ἐπὶ τοῦ πυροῦ σπόρον ἢ* ***τῶν*** *ἄλλων* ***σπερμάτων****, ὅτι* ***γυμνὰ*** *βάλεται εἰς τὴν γῆν καὶ συμφθαρέντα κάτω* ***ἠγέρθη*** *ἐν θελήματι θεοῦ ἓν* ***σῶμα*** *καὶ ἡμφιεσμένα, ὥστε οὐ μόνον* ***τὸ σῶμα ἐγείρεται*** *τὸ βληθὲν ἀλλὰ πολλοστὸν ὀρθὸν εὐλογημένον. Εἰ δὲ δεῖ ἡμᾶς καὶ ἀπὸ* ***τῶν σπερμάτων*** *μὴ ποιεῖσθαι τὴν παραβολήν.*	*Ἀλλὰ ἐρεῖ τις· Πῶς* ***ἐγείρονται*** *οἱ νεκροί; ποίῳ δὲ* ***σώματι*** *ἔρχονται; ἄφρων, σὺ ὃ σπείρεις, οὐ ζῳοποιεῖται ἐὰν μὴ ἀποθάνῃ· καὶ ὃ σπείρεις, οὐ* ***τὸ σῶμα*** *τὸ γενησόμενον σπείρεις ἀλλὰ* ***γυμνὸν*** *κόκκον εἰ τύχοι σίτου ἤ τινος τῶν λοιπῶν· ὁ δὲ θεὸς δίδωσιν αὐτῷ σῶμα καθὼς* ***ἠθέλησεν****, καὶ ἑκάστῳ* ***τῶν σπερμάτων*** *ἴδιον* ***σῶμα****.*[35]

The author of *3 Cor* does not cite 1 Cor 15:35-37—he paraphrases it. But Rordorf[36], taking the cue of Vetter,[37] argues that *3 Cor* 5:24-32 depends instead upon a Jewish source which is also reflected in *b. Sanh.* 90a-b.[38] *B. Sanh.* 90a is interesting, for like *3 Cor* 5:24-25, it excludes from the resurrection those who deny it:

> BUT THE FOLLOWING HAVE NO PORTION THEREIN [i.e., the life to come]: HE THAT SAYS THAT THERE IS NO RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD PRESCRIBED IN THE LAW, ... A Tanna taught: Since he denied the resurrection of the dead, therefore he shall not share in that resurrection, ...[39]

Then, *b. Sanh.* 90b cites the parable of the seed, in order to answer the question if those who are resurrected will be clothed or nude—i.e., with or without a body[40]:

> 'But when they arise, shall they arise nude or in their garments?'—He [Rabbi Meir] replied, 'Thou mayest deduce by an *a fortiori* argument [the answer] from a wheat grain: if a grain of wheat, which is buried naked, sprouteth forth in many robes, how much more so the righteous, who are buried in their raiment!'[41]

The "grain of wheat" corresponds directly with *τὸν ἐπὶ τοῦ πυροῦ σπόρον*, though *3 Cor* adds *ἢ τῶν ἄλλων σπερμάτων*, which shows that it corresponds better with 1 Cor 15:37, *εἰ τύχοι σίτου ἤ τινος τῶν λοιπῶν*. Both the Rabbinic text and *3 Cor* say that the nude seed is raised

---

[35]In this paper, I have used boldface text to indicate verbal agreements with the *APl* or *3 Cor*. Underlining indicates agreement which is not as exact.

[36]"Hérésie," 53-56.

[37]"Eine rabbinische Quelle des apokryphen dritten Korintherbriefes," *TQ* 4 (1895) 622-33.

[38]Cf. *Pirqe R. El.* 33(17c)=*b. Ketub.*111b.

[39]I. Epstein, ed., *The Babylonian Talmud: Seder Neziḳin* (London: Soncino, 1935) 3.601, 603.

[40]Rordorf, "Hérésie," 54-55.

[41]Epstein, *Neziḳin*, 3:607.

"clothed", an element missing in 1 Cor 15:35-37. To be clothed, however, is indeed a Pauline metaphor for the resurrection of the body (2 Cor. 5:4), though Paul employs the word ἐπενδύομαι not ἀμφιέννυμι (*3 Cor* 5:26). On the other hand, only *3 Cor* and 1 Cor mention the will of God and the dying or perishing of the seed (cf. John 12:24). Furthermore both *3 Cor* and 1 Cor literally refer to the body, not simply through a metaphor, "clothing". I think it imprudent to rule out 1 Cor 15:35-37 as part of the inspiration of *3 Cor* 5:26-32.[42] One or more Jewish sources[43] have probably also influenced the composition of *3 Cor* 5:24-32, which incorporates two further illustrations from the OT, Jonah and Elisha,[44] and twice uses the Jewish exegetical method *a minori ad maius*.[45] But it is extremely unlikely that the author does not also know 1 Cor.[46] I suggest that he created a new treatise on the resurrection by combining his Jewish sources and 1 Cor 15:35-37. In *3 Cor* 6:34-36, the author draws from two recognizable sources, Phil 3:7-11 and Gal 6:14-18, to create a new composition. Thus, he may have similarly combined 1 Cor 15:35-37 with one or more Jewish sources.

2.2 Paul and Ἐγκράτεια

In the *AThl* 5-6, Paul teaches the word of God concerning continence and the resurrection.[47] In the epistles, the use of ἐγκράτεια and its derivatives is infrequent but significant. In Gal 5:23, it appears in a list of Christian virtues, the fruit of the Spirit. In 1 Cor 9:25, the Christian practises ἐγκράτεια for an imperishable crown: πᾶς δὲ ὁ ἀγωνιζόμενος πάντα ἐγκρατεύεται, ἐκεῖνοι μὲν οὖν ἵνα φθαρτὸν στέφανον λάβωσιν, ἡμεῖς δὲ ἄφθαρτον. Thus, the practice of ἐγκράτεια wins an eschatological reward, as in the *APl*. Finally, to practise sexual ἐγκράτεια is better than to marry according to 1 Cor 7:9: εἰ δὲ οὐκ ἐγκρατεύονται, γαμησάτωσαν, κρεῖττον γάρ ἐστιν γαμῆσαι ἢ πυροῦσθαι. Moreover, a beatitude expresses

---

[42]Contra Rordorf, "Hérésie," 55.

[43]I disagree with Vetter who said that there must be a single, written source ("Quelle," 632-33). He considered the author of *3 Cor* a stupid, unimaginative forger who simply pieced two sources together—parts of the *APl* and the alleged Jewish source on the resurrection. The use of the *APl*, however, is no longer possible to maintain; the MS evidence now evinces the conclusion that the Presbyter used *3 Cor*. In addition, there is no way of knowing what Jewish sources were available to the author in oral form, who may have even been a Jewish Christian.

[44]Jonah appears as an example of bodily resurrection in the ps.-Philonic *Homily on Jonah* (Rordorf, "Hérésie," 55; Y. M. Duval, *Le Livre de Jonas dans la littérature chrétienne greque et latine. Sources et influence du Commentaire sur Jonas de saint Jérome (Etudes august)*[Paris, 1973] 80, while the examples of Jonah and Elisha are joined in *Midr. Teh.* 26:7 (Duval, *Jonas*, 175, n. 274).

[45]See *3 Cor* 5:31, 32b [and 33b]; Rordorf, "Hérésie," 55. However, both Jesus (Matt 6:26-30; 7:9-10; 10:29-30) and Paul (Rom 11:24) use this method, and early Christians may have simply learnt it through imitating them.

[46]H. E. Lona reasons that the author would more likely know 1 Cor 15:35-37 than a Jewish source whose antiquity is uncertain (*Über die Auferstehung des Fleisches*, BZNW 66 [Berlin: De Gruyter, 1993] 163, n. 440).

[47]The Presbyter is not alone in this characterization of Paul's essential teaching. According to Luke, Paul taught Felix and Drusiana περὶ δικαιοσύνης καὶ ἐγκρατείας καὶ τοῦ κρίματος τοῦ μέλλοντος (Acts 24:25), themes which recur in the *APl*.

the better choice (1 Cor 7:40): *μακαριωτέρα δέ ἐστιν ἐὰν οὕτως μείνῃ, κατὰ τὴν ἐμὴν γνώμην· δοκῶ δὲ κἀγὼ πνεῦμα θεοῦ ἔχειν*. In Clement of Alexandria (*strom.* 3.80.1) and P^{46}, the absolute *μακάρια* stands in the place of the relative *μακαριωτέρα*, illustrating a tendency to intensify Paul's position on *ἐγκράτεια* in a way not unlike the *APl.*

2.3 The Teaching of Ἐγκρατεια *and the Resurrection*

The following five out of thirteen beatitudes (I-XIII) in the *AThl* 5-6 have direct contact with the Pauline epistles, especially 1 Cor:

(II) *Μακάριοι οἱ ἁγνήν τὴν σάρκα τηρήσαντες, ὅτι αὐτοὶ ναὸς θεοῦ γενήσονται.* First of all, the word "flesh" presents a problem. For the Presbyter, *σάρξ* is interchangeable with *σῶμα*, for it is impossible to discern a difference in usage between the two terms.[48] With this minor difference in terminology, the beatitude derives from 1 Cor 6:19-20 (cf. 1 Cor 3:16-17; 2 Cor 6:16; Eph 2:21):

> *ἢ οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι τὸ σῶμα ὑμῶν ναὸς τοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν ἁγίου πνεύματός ἐστιν οὗ ἔχετε ἀπὸ θεοῦ, καὶ οὐκ ἐστὲ ἑαυτῶν; ἠγοράσθητε γὰρ τιμῆς· δοξάσατε δὴ τὸν θεὸν ἐν τῷ σώματι ὑμῶν.*

In the Pauline epistles, the image of the believers as the temple of God is always a present reality. Correct behavior follows as the direct, logical conclusion of this reality. Thus, the indicative precedes the imperative. But in Beatitude II, the indicative follows the imperative. The formal constraint of beatitudes may have necessitated this shift, since, for example, Jesus promises future rewards in seven out of nine beatitudes in Matt 5:3-11. The form of the beatitudes has imposed certain changes in verb tense, causing the Pauline ethic to resemble Jesus' own teaching to a greater degree.

(IV) *Μακάριοι οἱ ἀποταξάμενοι τῷ κόσμῳ τούτῳ, ὅτι αὐτοὶ εὐαρεστήσουσιν τῷ θεῷ.* (V) *Μακάριοι οἱ ἔχοντες γυναῖκας ὡς μὴ ἔχοντες, ὅτι αὐτοὶ κληρονόμοι τοῦ θεοῦ γενήσονται.* (XI) *Μακάριοι οἱ δι' ἀγάπην θεοῦ ἐξελθόντες του σχήματος τοῦ κοσμικοῦ, ὅτι αὐτοὶ ἀγγέλους κρινοῦσιν καὶ ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ πατρὸς σταθήσονται.* Beatitudes IV, V, and XI form a group since their direct inspiration derives from 1 Cor 7:29-33:

> *τοῦτο δέ φημι, ἀδελφοί, ὁ καιρὸς συνεσταλμένος ἐστίν· τὸ λοιπόν, ἵνα καὶ* **οἱ ἔχοντες γυναῖκας ὡς μὴ ἔχοντες** [V] *ὦσιν, καὶ οἱ κλαίοντες ὡς μὴ κλαίοντες καὶ οἱ χαίροντες ὡς μὴ χαίροντες καὶ οἱ ἀγοράζοντες ὡς μὴ κατέχοντες, καὶ οἱ χρώμενοι τὸν κόσμον ὡς μὴ καταχρώμενοι· παράγει γὰρ <u>τὸ σχῆμα τοῦ κόσμου τούτου</u>* [IV, XI]. *θέλω δὲ ὑμᾶς ἀμερίμνους εἶναι. ὁ ἄγαμος μεριμνᾷ τὰ τοῦ κυρίου, πῶς <u>ἀρέσῃ τῷ κυρίῳ</u>* [IV]*· ὁ δὲ γαμήσας μεριμνᾷ τὰ τοῦ κόσμου, πῶς ἀρέσῃ τῇ γυναικί, ...*

The Presbyter shows a marvelous grasp of the Pauline motivation for sexual continence. The form of this world is passing away; it will be burned in the final eschatological fire—a recurrent theme in the *APl.* The continent person, therefore, will deny this passing age to be pleasing to God (IV), just as the unmarried person in 1 Cor is free to please the Lord, not an earthly spouse. Those who leave the form of this world will judge the angels (XI), as in 1 Cor 6:3: *οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι* **ἀγγέλους κρινοῦμεν**, *μήτι γε βιωτικά*; It may seem incongruous that one reward for renouncing this world is to be blessed at the right hand of the Father (XI), which in Paul is the place that the exalted Jesus occupies (Rom 8:34; Col 3:1; Eph 1:20). But Paul also

---

[48]See Dunn, "*Acts of Paul*," 175-78.

considers the saints as fellow heirs with Jesus (Rom 8:17); thus, the Presbyter may simply be coming to the logical conclusion concerning the place of the saints in the future Kingdom. Thus, the phrase, *αὐτοὶ κληρονόμοι τοῦ θεοῦ γενήσονται*, may also be echoing this Pauline theme (cf. 1 Cor 6:9-10; Gal 5:21).

(XIII) *Μακάρια τὰ σώματα τῶν παρθένων, ὅτι αὐτὰ εὐαρεστήσουσιν τῷ θεῷ καὶ οὐκ ἀπολέσουσιν τὸν μισθὸν τῆς ἁγνείας αὐτῶν· ὅτι ὁ λόγος τοῦ πατρὸς ἔργον αὐτοῖς γενήσεται σωτηρίας εἰς ἡμέραν τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀνάπαυσιν ἕξουσιν εἰς αἰῶνα αἰῶνος.* Beatitude XIII is the finale of Paul's teaching in the house of Onesiphorus. Of course, of all the beatitudes, this one seems the most instrumental in leading Thecla to break off her engagement with Thamyris, for it is the only one which advocates the continence of virgins explicitly. Again, the inspiration, at least for the protasis, relates directly to 1 Cor 7:34:

> *καὶ ἡ γυνὴ ἡ ἄγαμος καὶ ἡ παρθένος μεριμνᾷ τὰ τοῦ κυρίου, ἵνα ᾖ ἁγία καὶ τῷ σώματι καὶ τῷ πνεύματι· ἡ δὲ γαμήσασα μεριμνᾷ τὰ τοῦ κόσμου, πῶς ἀρέσῃ τῷ ἀνδρί.*

The virgin, who does not have worldly concerns, will be pleasing to God, not a husband, by being holy both in body and in spirit. This person can expect to receive a special reward on the day of Christ according to the Presbyter. The narrative will henceforth recount how Thecla takes Paul's teaching to heart, breaks off her engagement with Thamyris—who is in any case a pagan, and Paul only permits the Christian to marry "in the Lord" (1 Cor 7:39). In reward for her piety, she receives baptism, salvation in the arena, and eternal rest (beautiful sleep—*μετὰ καλοῦ ὕπνου ἐκοιμήθη*; *AThl* 43).

Thus, Beatitudes II, IV, V, XI, and XIII are expositions of 1 Cor 6-7. Four other beatitudes take direct inspiration from Jesus' beatitudes, displaying dependence on Matt.[49] The remaining four relate to the theme of continence and the resurrection, and would appear to be inventions of the Presbyter himself, though not without Pauline inspiration.[50] The frequency of allusions to 1 Cor 6-7 is hardly by accident. *The Presbyter's purpose for recounting Thecla's story emerges—he wishes to give narrative embodiment to Paul's teaching in 1 Cor 6-7.*

3. The Influence of 1 Cor on the *APl*'s Portrayal of Christians in Action

3.1 The Actions of Married Christians

Scholars very often allege that the *APl* is encratite, forbidding sexual intercourse even in the bounds of marriage. Yet if we focus on Onesiphorus and Lectra, and not on Thecla, we see a married couple held in high esteem, whose sons complain of hunger during a fast, suggesting that they are young and no longer able to bear the rigor (*AThl* 2, 23). Thus, the *APl* by no means forbids procreation within marriage, though it states, "Blessed are they who have wives as if they had them not, for they shall be heirs of God."[51] This beatitude may simply be

---

[49]Beatitudes I and XII are word for word the same as Matt 5:8 and 5:7 respectively, though XII adds a second apodosis; the apodosis in VII equals that in Matt 5:4; the apodosis in VIII resembles that in Matt 5:9.

[50]Cf. Beatitude IV and 2 Cor 5:11 (the fear of God); Beatitude VIII and 1 Cor 1:30 (the wisdom of Jesus Christ); Beatitude X and Eph 3:4 (the understanding of Jesus Christ).

[51]*AThl* 5; Schneemelcher, *NT Apocrypha*, 2:239; cf. 1 Cor 7:29.

advocating a temporary abstinence for prayer, in agreement with 1 Cor 7:1-5. Origen understands it as teaching the necessity to abstain from marital intercourse before the Eucharist.[52] Indeed, by holding up Onesiphorus' family as a model, the *APl* affirms the orthodox position that the purpose of sex and marriage is procreation.[53]

In 1 Cor 7:12-13, Paul writes that the believer must not separate from a non-Christian spouse who is willing to continue in the marriage. This may help clarify Paul's dismissal of Artemilla to her husband: *APl* 9:21 (P[1] 4:5): *ἀπέλυσεν πρὸς τὸν ἄνδρα αὐτῆς*. Artemilla, the believing woman, returns to her husband in order to live out this Pauline policy. This is another strong indication that the *APl* is not encratite.

3.2 The Actions of a Virgin

Modern research has reached an impasse concerning the meaning of 1 Cor 7:36-38:

> *Εἰ δέ τις ἀσχημονεῖν ἐπὶ τὴν παρθένον αὐτοῦ νομίζει, ἐὰν ᾖ ὑπέρακμος, καὶ οὕτως ὀφείλει γίνεσθαι, ὃ θέλει ποιείτω, οὐχ ἁμαρτάνει, γαμείτωσαν. ὃς δὲ ἕστηκεν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ ἑδραῖος μὴ ἔχων ἀνάγκην, ἐξουσίαν δὲ ἔχει περὶ τοῦ ἰδίου θελήματος καὶ τοῦτο κέκρικεν ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ καρδίᾳ, τηρεῖν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ παρθένον, καλῶς ποιήσει. ὥστε καὶ ὁ γαμίζων τὴν ἑαυτοῦ παρθένον καλῶς ποιεῖ καὶ ὁ μὴ γαμίζων κρεῖσσον ποιήσει.*

According to the ancient exegetes, this passage refers to the father who does not know if he should marry off his virgin daughter—*γαμίζω* is taken in its natural, causative sense.[54] In recent times interpreters have seen engaged couples as the recipients of Paul's advice, arguing from evidence that *γαμίζω* may signify simply "to marry".[55] Many others have followed the

---

[52]*Peri pascha* 36:33f (*Origène.* Sur la Pâque*: Traité inédit publié d'après un papyrus de Toura*, eds. & trans. O. Guéraud and P. Nautin, Christianisme antique 2 [Paris: Beauchesne, 1979] 221f.) on the meaning of Exod 12:11: *Καὶ ὁ ἐν γάμῳ δὲ τὸ πάσχα τρώγων τὴν ὀσφὺν αὐτοῦ περιζώσεται· μακάριοι γὰρ οἱ ἔχοντες γυναῖκες ὡς {οἱ} μὴ ἔχοντες, ὁ ἀπόστολος εἴρηκεν.* Bovon states, "Sans être vraiment encratite, cette lecture du texte biblique jette une lumière négative sur la sexualité et interdit, semble-t-il, tout rapport conjugal avant la participation à l'eucharistie" ("Une nouvelle citation des *Actes de Paul* chez Origène," *Apocrypha* 5 [1994] 115). Drawing on Exod 19:15, Origen, *comm. in I Cor.* 7.5 (C. Jenkins, "Documents: Origen on I Corinthians. III," *JTS* 9 [1907-8] 501-2 [§ XXXIV]), implies that abstinence from conjugal relations should last three days before the Eucharist: *καὶ Μωϋσῆς μὲν ἁγνίζει τὸν λαὸν καὶ λέγει τρεῖς ἡμέρας μὴ προσέλθητε γυναικί, ἵνα δυνηθῶσιν ἐκ τοῦ προκεκαθαρευκέναι ἀκροαταὶ γενέσθαι τοῦ θεοῦ.* On Origen's understanding of 1 Cor 7:5, see H. Crouzel, *Virginité et Mariage selon Origène*, Museum Lessianum, section théologique 58 (Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1963) 53f.

[53]See, e.g., Justin, *apol.* 1.29.1; cf. 1 Tim 2:15.

[54]For the interpretation of 1 Cor 7:36-38, I depend upon the summary discussions of R. H. A. Seboldt ("Spiritual Marriage in the Early Church: A Suggested Interpretation of 1 Cor 7:36-38," *CTM* 30 [1959] 103-19, 176-89) and of Fee (*The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, NICNT [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987] 349-355).

[55]See Seboldt, "Spiritual Marriage," 110-13; Fee, *1 Cor*, 349f.; C. K. Barrett, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Black's New Testament Commentary (London: A. & C. Black, 1968) 185.

cue of H. Achelis,[56] who argued that the passage concerns a couple living together, but who have not consummated their marriage. Such spiritual marriages are known to have existed at the time of Irenaeus, albeit among the Valentinians.[57]

The conclusion made above is that the *AThl* is a narrative interpretation of 1 Cor 6-7. If so, the Presbyter understands 1 Cor 7:36-38 as referring to the engaged couple. Thecla hears the teaching of Paul and chooses to break off her engagement to Thamyris in order to remain pure. God confirms her decision by saving her from execution and baptizing her. Therefore, one cannot rely on the *AThl* as an example of *virgines subintroductae* in the second century.[58]

4. The Influence of 1 Cor on the *APl*'s Portrayal of the Church at Worship

4.1 An Angel Speaking in Tongues

While the Ephesian Christians meet in the house of Aquila for a night of prayer, an angel of the Lord appears and startles them. The angel speaks to Paul in tongues (*APl* 9:3). This scene is immediately reminiscent of 1 Cor 13:1, where Paul says that if he speaks in the tongues of men and of angels but has not love it profits him nothing, though we know that Paul can speak in tongues because he thanks God that he speaks in tongues more than all the Corinthians (1 Cor 14:18). Evidently the Presbyter considers speaking in tongues to refer to a heavenly language used among the angels. When the angel ceases to speak in tongues, Paul "interprets" for the Ephesians (*APl* 9:3) in keeping with 1 Cor 12:10 and 14:26f. The message is prophetic, predicting a severe trial which would fall upon Paul and the Ephesian church at Pentecost.

4.2 Three Prophetic Messages at Corinth

This final scene at Corinth (*APl* 12:2-5) depicts the anguish that the Corinthians experience because of Paul's departure for Rome. For this reason, they hold a fast during which the Holy Spirit speaks to the congregation three times, through Paul, Cleobius, and Myrta. The fast follows a liturgical pattern, for at one point Paul offers a sacrifice (*APl* 12:4, *προσφορά*), which could be understood as the preparation for the Eucharist, and after Myrta's prophetic message, the group shares bread and rejoices through the singing of psalms of David and odes "according to the custom of the fast" (*APl* 12:5): *μεταλαβεῖν [ἕκαστον το]ῦ [ἄ]ρτου καὶ ἐυωχεῖσθαι αὐτοὺς κατὰ τὴν συνήθεια[ν τῆς] νηστείας ὑπο αὐτῶν ψαλμῶν τε Δ(αουὶ)δ καὶ ᾠδῶν.*"

A liturgy of fasting may have developed quite early in the church. Paul is leaving the Corinthians, who fast so as to commission him for his trip to Rome. A similar fast occurs in Acts 13:2-3 (cf. Acts 14:23), where the prophetic word also plays an extremely important role:

---

[56] *Virgines subintroductae* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1902).

[57] Irenaeus, *haer.* 1.6.3; Achelis, *Virgines subintroductae* 19.

[58] Fee (*1 Corinthians*, 327) points to the *AThl* 5-6 as evidence of the practice of *virgines subintroductae*, relying on Seboldt ("Spiritual Marriage" 177) who states that the ascetic ideal of virginity "becomes apparent in the apocryphal Acts of Apostles, which probably dates [*sic*] from the second and early third centuries ... " Seboldt proceeds to quote from the *AThl* and the *ATh* as if they were a single document with a common *Sitz im Leben*!

λειτουργούντων δὲ αὐτῶν τῷ κυρίῳ καὶ νηστευόντων εἶπεν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, ἀφορίσατε δή μοι τὸν Βαρναβᾶν καὶ Σαῦλον εἰς τὸ ἔργον ὃ προσκέκλημαι αὐτούς. τότε νηστεύσαντες καὶ προσευξάμενοι καὶ ἐπιθέντες τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῖς ἀπέλυσαν.

Now it is important to note that the *APl* 12:2-5 represents a liturgy of fasting in order to understand fully the influence of Pauline texts. In 1 Cor 14:26-33 Paul corrects the Corinthians' abuse of speaking in tongues by limiting a meeting to at most three messages in tongues which must be interpreted. He also stipulates that no more than three prophets may utter prophetic messages. We have seen that Paul interprets for the Ephesians the angel's prophetic message in tongues (*APl* 9:3), in keeping with 1 Cor 14:26f. The *APl* 12:2-5 presents a gathering in Corinth with three prophets, not more, who utter their prophecies in succession and in an orderly manner. Their message is followed by the singing of psalms (cf. 1 Cor 14:26). In agreement with 1 Cor 13, Paul teaches concerning love, Ὦ ἄνδρες ἀδελφοὶ σπουδά[ζ]ετε ἐπὶ τὴν νηστ[είαν] καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην ... (*APl* 12:2). Thus, 1 Cor 13-14 plays an important role in the Presbyter's conception of Christian liturgy. He shows the Corinthians obeying to the letter Paul's admonishments to them.

4.3 A Woman Prophesying in the Assembly

A woman, Myrta, prophesying during the liturgy[59] raises an important question concerning the text of 1 Cor 14:34-35, which is often considered an interpolation by textual critics.[60] In the Majority Text, this passage follows immediately after Paul's instructions on how prophecy must be conducted in the church, thereby giving the impression that women are excluded from such prophetic activity. The Presbyter, in my opinion, could not have had 1 Cor 14:34-35 in his copy, for he depicts a woman prophesying in the assembly, when otherwise he seems quite determined to show that the practice of the Corinthians follows Paul's teaching to the letter.

The interpretations of Origen and Tertullian confirm that the natural understanding of 1 Cor 14:34-35 in its context is to consider it not simply a prohibition against women speaking but especially against women prophesying in church.[61] In a catena, Origen uses this passage

---

[59]Other passages concerning Thecla praying and testifying in the houses of Hermias (*AThl* 41) and Onesiphorus (*AThl* 42) are more ambivalent, since they do not say whether Thecla's speaking occurs during a church gathering. *3 Cor* 2:7 mentions a revelation given to Theonoe concerning Paul. But it likewise gives no indication that she recounted this revelation in church.

[60]See the thorough discussion of Fee, *1 Corinthians*, 699-708. MacDonald also argues that a scribe modelled the interpolation of 1 Cor 14:33b-36 on 1 Tim 2:11-13 (*Legend*, 86-89); he thus extends the limits of the interpolation with substantial justification. See NA[27], UBS[3], and *TCGNT* 565. While the internal contradiction between this passage and 1 Cor 11:3-16 places the text in doubt, the Western witnesses (D F G *et al.*) which transpose vs. 34-35 to the end of the chapter, set the limits of the interpolation.

[61]For an overview of the Patristic interpretation of 1 Cor. 14:34-35, I depend on the summary discussions of R. Gryson, *The Ministry of Women in the Early Church*, trans. J. Laprote and M. L. Hall (Liturgical Press, 1976) 17-20 (Tertullian), 28-29 (Origen); and C. P. Bammel, "Die Prophetie in der patristischen Exegese zum ersten Korintherbrief," *Augustinianum* 29 [1989] 157-162.

against the Montanists, stating that women do not have the right to prophesy in the assembly as did Priscilla and Maximilla.[62] Furthermore, Tertullian, a Montanist himself, agrees with this interpretation, considering it improper for women to speak in the assembly,[63] so that when a woman does prophesy, it is in private after the meeting when most of the people have been dismissed (*anim.* 9:4). Irenaeus apparently interprets 1 Cor 11:4-5 to mean that a woman may prophesy in church (*haer.* 3.11.9). This combined with his silence about 1 Cor 14:34-35 in his extant corpus[64] suggests that his copy of the epistle also lacked these verses.

This leads to the following speculation: Could it be that 1 Cor 14:34-35 is an anti-Montanist interpolation?[65] Neither the Presbyter nor Irenaeus seem to have had it in their copies of 1 Cor. The earliest definite attestation to this variant is from the end of the second century (Tertullian and P^{46}). Therefore, it could date from the second half of the second century, leaving it enough time to infiltrate the Alexandrian text and that of Tertullian, but insufficient time to reach the Presbyter or Irenaeus of Lyon.

Conclusion: 1 Corinthian as Paul's Most Important Epistle

Both the author of *3 Cor* and the Presbyter draw from 1 Cor more frequently than from the other Pauline epistles, especially in their portrayals of Paul's teaching. W. Bauer in his oft cited *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*[66] observes that 1 Cor is the favorite epistle of the Christian writers of the second century. His judgment is harsh: Having left behind the heart of Paul, these authors opted for 1 Cor "which is so meager in didactic content."[67] It is my contention that scholars have similarly belittled the Paulinism of the *APl* because it strays from what they, as Protestants, consider the center of Paul—his teaching of justification by faith, especially as it is found in Romans and Galatians. It is precisely here where the Presbyter and the author of *3 Cor* diverge from modern scholarship—they do not consider it necessary to elaborate on the theme of justification by faith. This does not mean that it is completely lacking in their understanding of Paul. By the second-century, the debate with would-be Judaizers has subsided, and so Paul's teaching against such opponents also falls from the frontline of attack. In its place we find themes from the Pauline epistles which are meaningful in a second-century context, interpreted from a second-century point of view.

The *APl* is concerned with exhibiting the behavior of Christians both in the assembly and in everyday situations. This is precisely why the Presbyter finds so much of his inspiration from 1 Cor. In 1 Cor Paul does not expound upon God's grace in the face of those who would replace it with observance of ritual law. He is concerned rather to guide believers in

---

[62]In C. Jenkins, "Documents: Origen on I Corinthians. IV," *JTS* 10 (1909) 41-42 (§ LXXIV); ET in Gryson, *Ministry* 28-29.

[63]See, *bapt.* 17; *virg. vel.* 9:1; *adv. Marc.* 5.8.11. The first document originates from his pre-Montanist days, the last two are usually considered Montanist. Thus, his Montanism had no effect on his interpretation of 1 Cor 14:34-35.

[64]I depend on *Biblia Patristica* (Paris: Éditions du Centre National de la recherche scientifique, 1975) 1:467.

[65]Cf. MacDonald, *Legend*, 88

[66]ET: (London/Philadelphia: SCM/Fortress Press, 1971), 217f.

[67]Bauer, *Orthodoxy*, 219.

the Christian life, in worship and in everyday relationships, and this in opposition to some who appear to be motivated by ideas which prefigure second-century gnosticism. The Presbyter's concerns seem to be similar.

But does the *APl* constitute a grave falling away from the Pauline conception of grace, as Findlay contends? Only if one presses the teaching of sexual continence and the resurrection to mean that only the sexually continent will attain the resurrection.[68] Such would agree, perhaps, with Demas' and Hermogenes' misrepresentation[69] of Paul's teaching to Thamyris (*AThl* 12). Two observations are important here: (1) No Christian besides Thecla makes a vow of continence explicitly in the *APl*; this includes those who receive baptism (Artemilla, Longus and Cestus). Apparently, then, the vow of continence is not requisite for baptism. (2) Thecla has apparently made a vow of continence, but Paul refuses her request for baptism (*AThl* 25). Evidently, the Presbyter did not consider the vow of chastity sufficient proof of a person's readiness for Christian initiation.

Let me make two observations about the teaching of continence and the resurrection. Firstly, it is eschatological. It describes life in the future age. Sexual chastity, in keeping with the teaching of Jesus (Luke 20:27f.), is the condition of the angels. Onesiphorus and Lectra, however, are not thereby excluded because their marriage and child-rearing ties them down to this age. Rather, they can experience the future through momentary retreats in prayer and fasting, as in the six-day fast at the open tomb of Daphne (*AThl* 23). Secondly, the teaching is not intended for unbelievers, as are the many speeches before the authorities. The Presbyter presents it as a Christian teaching for those already in the fold. What goes on inside those houses where the Christians meet? Far from practising incest and ritual cannibalism, as pagans often accused Christians, they were learning about the beatific continent life. Thecla, while yet an unbeliever, overhears the teaching through the neighboring window and is enthralled by it. She shows the special grace which God has given to her by embracing the deeper Christian message before learning the basics. In my opinion, the theme of sexual continence and the resurrection was a "meat" of early Christian teaching, while the theme of justification by faith constituted the "milk".

But was it legitimate for the Presbyter to interpret Paul from a second-century perspective? I think so. Each Christian generation has the right to look again to the Scriptures to find answers to the questions which confront it. To deny the Presbyter this right would be to force his Paulinism to be irrelevant to his generation. This in itself would be un-Pauline, for Paul insisted (1 Cor 9:22), "I have become all things to all men, that I might by all means save some." So the Presbyter has reacted in a Pauline fashion. He remains faithful to the spirit of Paul, by adapting the message to changing circumstances yet adhering to themes in the epistles, especially 1 Cor.

---

[68]I argue in ch. 4 of my dissertation ("*Acts of Paul*," 69-88) that the *APl* is not encratite but wholly orthodox in its understanding of sexual chastity, marriage and procreation.

[69]See J. Gwynn, "Thecla," in *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, eds. W. Smith and H. Wace (London, 1887) 4:891; L. Vouaux, *Les Actes de Paul et ses lettres Apocryphes: Introduction, textes, traduction et commentaire* (Paris: Librairie Letouzey et Ané, 1913) 171; and now Rordorf, "*Actes de Paul*"; Dunn, "*Acts of Paul*" 78-79. These interpreters have argued that Demas' and Hermogenes' comments are not to be understood as an accurate representation of Paul's teaching but as an attempt to discredit him in the eyes of Thamyris.

The "Acts of Titus": A Preliminary Translation

With an Introduction, Notes, and Appendices[1]

Richard I Pervo
Seabury-Western Theological Seminary

Introduction

The "Acts of Titus"

When M.R. James was finally able to satisfy an old ambition and transcribe part of a life of Titus, he found that it had "the most destructive effect upon the conjectures which I advanced in a late number of the Journal."[2] In said "late number"[3] James had argued that the *Acts of Paul* (*APl*) were a *sequel* to the canonical Acts. The "Acts of Titus," as he called the text, drew upon the *APl* in ways indicating that *APl* runs parallel to the canonical Acts. Subsequently, additional portions of *APl* have come to light, research has proceeded, and Francois Halkin has published the full text of the "Acts of Titus" in two editions, cited here as "menology and "menology 2."[4] W. Rordorf has developed and modified James's

---

[1]The following exercise is envisioned as a *parergon* to the ongoing task of reconstructing the ancient *Acts of Paul*. For the current state of the CSEL project see the note of J.-D. Kaestli in *Bulletin de L'aelac* 5 (1995) 11-12.

[2]"The Acts of Titus and the Acts of Paul," *JTS* 6 (1905) 549-546, 549. Other studies of the "Acts of Titus" include, C. Schmidt ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΠΑΥΛΟΥ (Hamburg: J.J. Augustin, 1936 hereafter ΠΠ), 113-117, and W. Schneemelcher's introduction to the *APl* in idem ed. *New Testament Apocrypha*, trans. ed. R. McL. Wilson (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1992), vol. 2:218-233 (hereafter "Schneemelcher" with reference to this section and "Schneemelcher-Wilson" in reference to the translated collection). ΠΠ is Schmidt's edition of a Hamburg Papyrus 40, abbreviated PH. Three decades before he edited an oft-fragmentary Coptic text known as PHeid (*Acta Pauli*, Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1905). Translations of these and other components of *APl* may be found in Schneemelcher-Wilson (W. Schneemelcher) 237-270 and in J.K. Elliot, ed., *The Apocryphal New Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), 364-388. (In *Acta Pauli* Schmidt offers more text and translation than either Schneemelcher or Elliot chose to reproduce in their versions.)

[3]"A Note on the *Acta Pauli*," *JTS* 6 (1905) 244-246.

[4]F. Halkin, "La légende crétoise de saint Tite," *Analecta Bollandia* 79, 1961, 241-256. He describes the mss. of the earlier edition on pp. 241-242: **P**, Parisinus grec 548, fol. 192v-196, a tenth century minuscule, the ms. known to M.R. James, and **O**, Ottobonianus 411, copied in 1445, fol. 476v-480. The later edition is printed on pp. 252-56 of Halkin's article. For convenience the edition based upon

argument in a number of articles. Recently R. Bauckham has revived the argument that *APl* is a sequel to the canonical Acts.[5] It therefore seems appropriate to provide a preliminary translation of the earlier edition of this text, together with some notes and comments about its use of canonical and apocryphal traditions and other relevant matters. Motivating this enterprise is the belief that texts cited as sources deserve examination within their general contexts. Moreover, the very task of attempting a translation generates fresh reflection upon the questions.

Summary of the Menology

The reputed author of the menology (and probably its source) was "Zenas the lawyer," a name drawn from the pauline tradition.[6] Titus was a Cretan native of very high standing. His youthful fondness for the Greek classics was challenged by visions that eventually led him to read Isaiah. Meanwhile the governor, who was his uncle,[7] had learned of the ministry of Jesus in Judea and dispatched an investigating committee led by Titus. This delegation[8] arrived in time to be an eyewitness of Jesus's miracles,

---

O and **P** is herein denominated "the menology," while the other text edited by Halkin is called "menology 2."

[5]R. Bauckham, "The Acts of Paul as a Sequel to Acts," in B.W. Winter and A.D. Clarke, eds. *The Book of Acts in its First Century Setting, Vol 1.. The Book of Acts in its Ancient Literary Setting* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1993), 105-152. (A response to Bauckham is R. Pervo, "A Hard Act to Follow: *The Acts of Paul* and the Canonical Acts, *Journal of Higher Criticism* 2.2 [1995] 3-32.) Rordorf's views are contained in "In welchem Verhältnis stehen die apokryphen Paulusakten zur kanonischen Apostelgeschichte und zu den Pastoralbriefen?" in T. Baarda et al. eds., *Text and Testimony. Essays on New Testament and Apocryphal Literature in Honour of A.F.J. Klijn* (Kampen: Uitgeversmaatschappij J.H. Kok, 1988), 225-241, "Nochmals: Paulusakten und Pastoralbriefe," in G.F. Hawthorne and O. Betz, eds., *Tradition and Interpretation in the New Testament*, E.E. Ellis FS., Ed. G.F. Hawthorne with O. Betz (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 319-327, and "Was wissen wir über Plan und Absicht der Paulusakten?" in *Oecumenica et Patristica*, FS W Schneemelcher, ed. D. Papandreou et al. (Champesy-Genf: Metropolie der Schweiz 1989), 71-82.

[6]Titus 3:13. Commentators, especially those who regard the Pastoral Epistles as authentic in whole or part, have worried about whether his professional competence was in Roman or in Jewish law. For a full discussion see C. Spicq, *Les Epitres Pastorales* (Fourth Edition. *Etudes Bibliques*. Paris: Gabalda et Cie, 1969), vol. 2:691.

[7]The menology seems to presume, incorrectly, that Roman proconsuls were drawn from the local aristocracy of Crete in the first century. Under the reorganization of Augustus, Crete and Cyrene formed a single senatorial province, the governor of which resided at Gortyna.

[8]The others dispatched with him immediately disappear from the

passion, and resurrection. Titus belonged to the earliest circle of believers. Ordained by the apostles, he served as Paul's precursor and as a companion in miracle-working and persecution. Following the mission in Corinth, they went to Crete, where Titus's brother-in-law Rustillus was governor. The pair then proceeded to Ephesus. Together with Timothy and Luke, Titus remained with Paul until the latter's death under Nero. (Chapters 1-6).[9]

Titus returned to Crete and a hero's welcome. He played a key role in both the destruction and the protection of pagan temples, while training and ordaining eight suffragans[10] and corresponding with Dionysius the Areopagite *et al.* The good archbishop died happily at age 94. His resting place in a former pagan temple subsequently became a healing shrine. (Chapters 7-12).

Genre

M.R. James has popularized the title "Acts of Titus." In fact the work is not much less concerned with local ecclesiological prestige than with hagiography,[11] but its author appears to have had before him a fuller text that might well be labeled "The Acts of Titus." This hypothetical text would qualify as one of the "minor" or "later" Apocryphal Acts.[12]

Provenance and Date of the ATit.

The focus upon Crete and an interest in promoting Titus not only as first Metropolitan of the island but also as a prominent native son appear to leave no doubt that *ATit* is a Cretan product.[13] Description of the metropolitan organization of Crete establishes a *terminus a quo* of the early fifth century.[14] Halkin argues that reference to Dionysius the Areopagite moves the date forward another

---

narrator's sight.

[9]These chapters alone are of interest in reconstructing the *APl.*

[10]Titus's position as bishop of Crete was noted by Eusebius, *H.E.* 3.4.6.

[11]The theme of the menology is not so much the deeds of the earthly saint as the the powers of the heavenly patron working through his shrine. The only miracles described are those associated with the destruction or transformation of pagan temples and post-mortem healings.

[12]For a brief comparison with *The Acts of Barnabas* see Appendix III.

[13]By the late fifth century communities interested in promoting their autonomy were well advised to have not only apostolic origins but the very remains of an apostle. Rome, with both Peter and Paul, led the way. Conflict about the ranking of various metropolitan sees played an important role in the Ecumenical Councils.

[14]M. Falla Castelfranchi, "Crete," *Encyclopedia of the Early Church,* ed. A Di Beradino, Trans. A. Walford. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), 1:208-209, 208.

century.[15] The Arab conquest of 823 provides a secure *terminus ad quem*, and the text most probably antedates the transfer of Crete from Roman to Constantinopolitan ecclesiastical jurisdiction (730), the iconoclastic controversy, and the ministry of Andrew of Crete (d.740), who was well informed about the activity of Titus. On the bases of language, style, and content one would be tempted to date the text in the late fifth century.[16] It is safest to conclude that, although there may have been an earlier edition of *ATit*, the source behind the menology--not the earliest edition of an *ATit*--stems from the early seventh century.[17]

Sources and Traditions of "The Acts of Titus"

Even a casual reader will soon conclude, as did James, that the menology is at many points an epitome of a once more substantial work. The continuation of this process of abbreviation can be marked by comparing the two editions presented by Halkin. Since, however, Ps.-Zenas himself summarized his sources, it is often difficult to determine where abbreviations belong to *ATit* and where they have been introduced by editors of the menologies.

The preparation of a Cretan-oriented work celebrating Titus as a companion of Paul presented Ps.-Zenas with substantial challenges. The canonical Acts mention Crete only as a station on Paul's voyage to Rome (27:7-12). The letter to Titus does, to be sure, establish his jurisdiction there (1:5), but it is not especially flattering to the inhabitants:

> There are also many rebellious people, idle talkers and deceivers, especially those of the circumcision; they must be silenced, since they are upsetting whole families by teaching for sordid gain what it is not right to teach. It was one of them, their very own prophet, who said, "Cretans are always liars, vicious brutes, lazy gluttons." *That testimony is true*. (Tit. 1:10-13a, NRSV, emphasis supplied).

---

[15]Halkin, 242. This is not absolutely certain, for Eusebius states that Dionysius of Corinth already identified the Areopagite as first bishop of Athens (*H.E.* 3.4.10; 4.23.3), but Halkin shows that it is made probable by the direction of ten letters in the Areopagitic corpus to "Titus the Hierarch" penned in response to the latter's epistles (251 n.1). The menology thus provides the motive for these Dionysian contributions.

[16]The language is essentially *koine*. Attribution of authorship to Zenas reflects the same technique used in the assignment of the later *Acts of John* to Prochorus. M.R. James, who had a practiced eye, relates *ATit* (555) to the period of the *Acts of Barnabas*, which was attributed to Mark. Both of these later Acts stem from the late fifth century.

[17]Ps.-Dionysius's use of the name implies the existence of legends and/or traditions about Titus.

Ps.-Zenas discovered a means for dealing with this unpleasant bit of history.[18] An even more daunting obstacle was the canonical Acts, which somehow neglects to mention Titus. The *APl*, on the other hand, did refer to Titus, probably more than twice.[19] It is interesting to observe not only the artful ways in which this author links and inter-weaves epistles and the two Acts but also the implicit contradictions of them entailed by his methods.

The opening portion, which sets forth Titus's great learning and high status, may rely upon local legend; it could equally be the creation of Ps.-Zenas. The embassy to Judea (chapters 1-2) is possibly dependent upon the *Pseudo-Clementines* or kindred tradition,[20] with justification from John 12:20-21 (Greeks who wish to see Jesus). Chapter 3 begins with a brief summary of Acts 1-7, which places Titus among the "Cretans and Arabs" of Acts 2:11, as well as the one hundred twenty of Acts 1:15. Omitting Acts 8, Ps.-Zenas turns to the events of Acts 9, but for the conversion of Paul he prefers *APl*. Specifically, the writer replaces, so to speak, Acts 9:20-25 with material from *APl*. While apparently taking up Acts 9:26-30, he leaves the apostle in Caesarea, rather than at Tarsus awaiting a summons from Barnabas to Antioch. In chapter 4 the newly ordained Titus joins Paul, with whom he is sent forth by the Jerusalem apostles. Their first reported station is Antioch, where they come upon Barnabas (who did not, therefore, send for Paul). All of this is quite different from Acts 9 and 11:19-30. It is justified by, if not fully dependent upon, *APl*.

Reference to the execution of James (chapter 4) derives from Acts 12, and the itinerary following is that of Acts 13-14 (without, of course, a commission of Paul in Antioch). Titus, rather than Barnabas, is Paul's companion. He is also the precursor of Paul, playing for him the role of John the Baptist. This datum is gleaned from *APl* (3.2; *Mart.* 1). The final portion of chapter 4 reflects the outline of Acts 16-18.[21]

---

[18]See below. It is noteworthy that the text begins by stating that Paul made mention of Zenas the lawyer without identifying the source: his letter to Titus (3:13).

[19]As James ("Acts of Titus," 555) posits, *APl* most likely made more frequent reference to Titus than the remains indicate.

[20]Dissemination of reports about Jesus and voyages to Judea are also elements of the beginning of the *Ps.-Clementines*, *Rec.* 1.6//*Hom.* 1.6; *Rec.* 1.12//*Hom.* 1.15. Titus's devotion to Greek philosophy strengthens the possibility of dependence. F.S. Jones has published part of his translation of these texts, together with a full introduction and summary of research in *An Ancient Jewish Christian Source on the History of Christianity: Pseudo-Clementine Recognitions 1.27-71*. SBLTT 37 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995). On the subject see further n.52, below.

[21]There is no reference to the Jerusalem meeting of Acts 15/Gal 2, at which Titus played a controversial role (see the textual variants in Gal 2:5). Jerusalem is not Paul's base in *ATit*, a view arguably derived from *APl*.

Near the close of chapter four, in a section characterized by epitomizing or, possibly, a lacuna in the source, the menology reflects harmonization of the different itineraries of Acts and *APl*. The Coptic and Greek papyri (PHeid and PH) report a visit to Philippi *following* Paul's adventures in Ephesus, as does Nicetas of Paphlagonia.[22] While at Corinth Paul narrates what he had suffered "in Philippi in the workhouse (?)..." Translation of this sentence is uncertain. Schmidt's text reads ἐξηγουμένου Παύλου ἅ πέπονθεν ἐν Φιλ[ι]πποις ἐν] τοῖς ἐργάστροις καὶ ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ, τί αὐτῷ συνέβη, (PH 6, 4-5). Elliot renders "...Paul related what he had suffered in Philippi in the workhouse and everywhere and what had befallen him..." Schneemelcher's version reads "...Paulus erzählte, was er in Philippi in den Werkstätten[23] und an jedem Ort erlitten hatte, was ihm zugestossen war..." In 1936 Schmidt proposed "...Paulus erzählte, was er erlitten in Philippi [im] Arbeitshause und an jedem Orte, was ihm begegnet war..."[24] Perhaps the relative and indirect interrogative clauses should be seen as equivalents, linked by καί: "...Paul related what he had suffered in Philippi in the workhouse (?) and what had happened to him in every place."

The translation of ἐργάστροις, the primary meaning of which is "the cost of labor," is a greater difficulty. The reading of the menology is difficult at this point,[25] but it is quite likely that the accounts of Acts 16 (earthquake leading to freedom) and *APl* (Paul among prisoners engaged in labor)[26] have been harmonized.[27] This is another indication that the author of *ATit* understood *APl* as a parallel narrative to Acts rather than as a sequel.

At the narrative moment found in Acts 18:18 (or 19:1), Ps.-Zenas reports a mission of Paul and Titus to Crete (Chapter 5). Chapter 6 brings them to Asia. Some of the narrative summary derives from *APl*. The association of Titus and Timothy (the latter mentioned for the first time) with the delivery of 2 Corinthians shows an attempt to integrate the writing and delivery of letters with data derived from the two Acts. The author prefers the story of Paul and the lion to the account of Acts 19. *APl* is also the basis for Titus's presence with Paul at his martyrdom, but with a difference. In *APl* (*Mart.* 1) Titus precedes Paul to Rome, whither

---

[22]See Appendix I.

[23]In n.2 he offers a conjectural alternative: "Arbeitshaus?"

[24]Elliot, 382; Schneemelcher, *Neutestamentlichen Apokryphen* 2:234; Schmidt IIII 45.

[25]See Halkin's n.7, 246-47 and n.80, below.

[26]PHeid 41 appears to confirm that Paul was not only imprisoned for some time while in Philippi but that his punishment involved labor, perhaps in the mines (Schmidt, *Acta Pauli* 36*-37*, 70-71; IIII 98-100).

[27]Both the menology and PH have two prepositional phrases in ἐν: ἐν Φιλίπποις, ἐν τοῖς ἐργάστροις, immediately adjacent in PH, separated by seven words in a series of genitive absolutes in the menology.

he has come from Dalmatia.[28] *APl* (in the present form of the much-edited *Martyrdom*) thus gives opportunity for an epistle to the absent Titus; the menology leaves no such room, since it asserts that Titus was the nearly constant companion of Paul. The epistle to Titus, with its gratuitous references to Cretan morals, is effectively suppressed.[29]

Information about the APl

With regard to the six or more borrowings from *APl* now evident, the major contribution of the menology is to provide strong weight for James's view that *APl* "were *not* a sequel to the canonical Acts, but a supplementary narrative running parallel thereto. From this conclusion I do not see any way of escape."[30] Neither do I. One may further observe that for Ps.-Zenas *APl* formed a reliable source that he implicitly contradicts less often than he does the canonical text.[31] When Chapter 4 speaks of material contained "in the Acts of the Apostles" it evidently refers to more than one work.[32] Given that his basic criterion was reference to Titus, the author exercises considerable skill in the use and manipulation of his sources. His method is quite acceptable by modern standards; only the principle seems arbitrary.

Those interested in the order of the original *APl* would like this text to shed light upon its itinerary.[33] On this question the menology is often obtuse. It is possible that the writer has devised a new itinerary, in part or whole. He may have added the mission to Crete. The major difference appears to be that Paul's adventures at Sidon and Tyre *precede* rather than follow those at Iconium and Myra. From the summary one might conclude that Paul had

---

[28]Cf. 2 Tim 4:10.

[29]Conjectures about the use of other traditions and comments about the above may be found in the notes to the translation.

[30]M.R. James, "Acts of Titus," 555.

[31]One apparent defect Ps.-Zenas noted in Acts was its lack of chronological data, a gap he remedies in ch.3. Ch. 12 exhibits a similar chronographic interest, suggesting that they represent an authorial contribution. (In speaking of "contradictions" and the like I do not mean to suggest that the author of *ATit* would claim that Acts gave false information.)

[32]Support for this understanding derives from the use of both Acts and *APl* by Nicetas of Paphlagonia and Nicephorus Callistus (Appendices II-III).

[33]James wrestled with this problem in "Acts of Titus," as have others subsequently. For a summary of their efforts see Schneemelcher. The task is formidable. Those who examine the Coptic fragments (PHeid) published by C. Schmidt must admire his labor and ingenuity, but his findings, when not supported by other texts, are no more than tentative. Even should they be fully correct, there is no assurance that this Coptic edition maintained the original order and contents of *APl*. *3 Corinthians*, for example, which it includes, was probably a subsequent addition to *APl*.

exorcised Aphphia and wrecked a statue of Apollo at Damascus, although, as James noted, this could be the result of epitomization, and as Schmidt observes, there is no adverb specifying the locale of these events.[34] An apparent editorial motivation for singling out these two events for summarization is that exorcism of demons and the overthrow of pagan statues and temples are major themes of chapters 7-12.

As the menology reads, the itinerary of Paul is: Damascus, *X*?, *Y*?, Jerusalem, Caesarea, Antioch, Seleucia, Cyprus, Salamis, Paphos, Perga, Pisidian Antioch *again*,[35] Iconium, Lystra, Derbe, Philippi... Corinth (evidently), Crete, Ephesus...Rome. Although he was originally commissioned by the Jerusalem apostles, who assigned him Titus as a colleague,[36] Paul makes but one continuous "journey," more in keeping with the spirit of *APl* than the plan of Acts. If he has a "home base," it is Caesarea (Maritima) rather than Jerusalem or Antioch. The text does not state that Paul went to Rome as a prisoner. The final trace of canonical Acts comes at the conclusion to chapter 4.

The closing words of chapter 3 presumably refer to the account in Acts 9:26-30. However, the text reads "Then (εἶτα) he went to Jerusalem and in turn (αὖθις) to Caesarea." αὖθις may be rendered "again," which would imply that this was a second visit to Caesarea and took place some time after his conversion. This construction could more easily be fitted into the generally prevailing reconstruction of *APl*.[37] The reference to a subsequent visit to Antioch in Chapter 4 supports this possibility. If, on the other hand, *APl* presented the mission in Ephesus as a return journey, the author of *ATit* has either overlooked or modified this fact. The menology makes it more probable that *APl* described a single visit to Ephesus.[38]

One of the more vexing problems in the attempt to reconstruct an edition of *APl* is the identification of names and places. This text may shed equal amounts of illumination and confusion upon some of these questions. To return to chapter 3, after noting the "conversion" of Paul, the menology offers three consecutive sentences beginning with καί.[39] The first affirms that Paul first proclaimed Christ in Damascus (*v.l.* Arabia). The next relates the exorcism of one Aphphia (*v.l.* A*m*phia) the wife of Chrysippus. Third

---

[34]James, "Acts of Titus," 554; Schmidt III 114.

[35]On the significance of πάλιν see below and Appendix I.

[36]Cf. Gal 2!

[37]Note, however, that πάλιν is clearly used for "again" in the case of a visit to Pisidian Antioch (ch.4), and in Nicetas of Paphlagonia 84v.

[38]One may see similar harmonization in the case of Philippi (above). In neither case does *ATit* blend two different visits. For R. Bauckham's views on Ephesus in the *APl* see "Sequel" (n.5), 109 and 119.

[39]Halkin, 245, marks each of these with a raised stop.

is a statement that he wrecked a temple of Apollo after a fast of seven days. In the rather fragmentary Coptic Heidelberg papyrus (PHeid 35-39) there is reference to "Amphi*on* and Chrysippus" in an exorcistic context. There the events are associated with Tyre. The destruction of a statue/temple of Apollo at Sidon evidently *precedes* this material.

Critics since James have proposed that "Amphion" is to be equated with "Apphia" and that the author of the *ATit* quickly summarized events that took place in different cities, reversing the order of two of them. The situation is not made less complex by the apparent occurrence of the name "Ammia" in two Coptic papyri of the *APl* that speak of events in Damascus.[40] Schneemelcher does not wish to connect this person, identified not as the wife of Chrysippus but as the daughter of Lemma, a widow, with the beneficiary of exorcism.[41] J.B. Lightfoot's 1879 study of the name "Apphia" (Philemon 2) remains valuable.[42] There he states that the name is of Phrygian origin, evidently once a term of endearment or relationship. Aphphia and Apphia are variant spellings. The diminutive is Apphion, Aphphion, or Aphion. According to Lightfoot Theodore of Mopsuestia called the co-addressee of Philemon Amphion, "by a common corruption."[43] Ammia, moreover, is a similar Phrygian name that likewise exhibits variant spellings. The difference between Ap(h)phia and Amphion is like that between Prisca and Priscilla.[44] Given its particularity, confusion with or corruption into Ammia is not impossible, but the difference in relationship makes identification of the two unlikely.[45]

At least some of the available traditions of *APl* seem to confound Syrian and Pisidian Antioch. The menology witnesses to this confusion but cannot resolve the question of whether it already occurred in the earliest editions of *APl*. This confusion may have been in the edition of *APl* used by the author of the *ATit* or it may be a contribution made by that author or a later epitome. The history of the reception of *APl* suggests that visits to particular

---

[40]Both of these remain unpublished. One is discussed and partially translated by W. Crum ("New Coptic Manuscripts in the John Rylands Library," *BJRL* 5 [1920], 497-503). The other is a Geneva papyrus in the hands of R. Kasser, who has supplied a preliminary translation and discussed the text. For this translation and references see Schneemelcher-Wilson 2:263-265.

[41]Schneemelcher, n.23, p.236, rejecting a suggestion of Kasser.

[42]J.B. Lightfoot, *Saint Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1957 [reprint of 1879]), 306-307.

[43]The corruption to which he refers is the fluctuation among labial sounds (M being a nasal labial).

[44]If Lightfoot is correct about the Phrygian character of both names, this could be a clue to the provenance of *APl*.

[45]Note also Eus. *H.E.* 5.27.2-3, where in a discussion of Montanism, he refers to a work of Alcibiades (Militiades in all probability), that speaks of prophets "according to the new covenant," among whom are "a certain Ammia," identified in par. 3 as from Philadelphia.

sites could be added, deleted, or combined. Any tendency to make such visits returns to earlier sites in a period following Acts 28, as it were, may be due to later editorial efforts to harmonize Acts, *APl*, and the Pastoral Epistles. Even as late as c.600, however, *ATit* reveal no desire to assign priority to Acts for the determination of the pauline itinerary.

The quite fragmentary opening six pages of PHeid refer to the raising of a son of one Anchares in Antioch, followed by flight and a stated desire to go to Iconium.[46] Pisidian Antioch would fit this itinerary, since it is not far from Iconium. The menology reads, in chapter 4, "Arriving at Antioch, they found Barnabas, the son of Panchares whom Paul had raised." This is easily related to the *APl*, based upon the coincidence of city, action, and parent.[47] There are two differences:

1.) Barnabas. This name may have been found in a part of the Coptic text that is no longer available, or that text could have spoken about an anonymous son, leaving a gap to be filled in by Ps.-Zenas. The latter seems more probable. Whoever was responsible, this identification reduced Barnabas from Paul's partner[48] to the status of a presumably youthful dependent. Titus, rather than Barnabas, became the companion of Paul on his "first journey." This tendency to down-play Barnabas was a seed planted by Paul that began to take root in the canonical Acts, was cultivated by the *APl*, and came into full bloom in the *ATit*.[49] For good measure *ATit* also suppressed the name and activity of Silas.

2.) The menology is not so much a summary of an episode from *APl* as it is the description of a subsequent visit with emphasis upon the discovery of Barnabas, who was the beneficiary of Paul's earlier ministry, rather than to the familial and civil conflict surrounding the raising of Panchares's son.[50] From the oration of Nicetas (Appendix I), however, it appears that the *APl* described an itinerary that moved from Antioch to Iconium.

---

[46]For a summary of the incident see Schmidt, III 114.

[47]Greek Panchares could easily become Anchares in Coptic because initial P- may be confused with the Coptic definite article.

[48]In historical fact, Barnabas was at one time the senior partner of Paul.

[49]Barnabas's honor is vindicated in the *ABarn*. See Appendix III.

[50]W. Schneemelcher, 219, says "...the author of the Acts of Titus assumed that the raising of Barnabas took place in Pisidian Antioch, and that Paul after his activity in Cyprus returned thither by way of Perga, and thence came to Iconium." This is correct if the πάλιν of ch. 4 is seen as marking a *third* visit.

Additional Features

As one might expect of an orthodox text edited under the Christian empire, there is little reference in the menology to conflicts with government officials and no suggestion of the disruption of lawful marriages. Indeed, Titus (and Paul) benefit from the Cretan's highly-placed relations. Rustillus (brother-in-law and governor) shields Christians from Jewish attacks. Conversely, he also protects the Jews of Crete from oppression in connection with the First Revolt.[51] The text is noteworthy for its general lack of animosity or hostility toward Jews. The report about Titus's vegetarian diet and preference for rough fabrics at the conclusion of chapter 7 may be a residue of a rather stringently ascetic source.

Some observations about the figure of Titus can be advanced. The account of his conversion appears to be a rather anti-intellectual adaptation of the motifs found in the opening chapters of the *Pseudo-Clementines*.[52] His only recorded "sin" was admiration of Greek literature and such "philosophers" as Homer. Admonished by an audition to leave Crete and his *paideia*, he resists for nine years.[53] A vision directing the reading of Hebrew scripture serves as *praeparatio evangelica* and diplomatic equipment for the embassy to Judea that he apparently heads.[54] He is not, however, stated to have become a believer until he had witnessed the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus.

The *ATit* drew upon both epistles and *APl* for its characterization of Titus. The epistles present Titus as both faithful companion and performer of sensitive assignments (especially in the circumstances underlying 1 Corinthians). *APl* develops the latter role.[55] The author of *ATit* probably expanded this into the role of precursor, whereby Titus goes before Paul as a messenger to prepare his way.[56]

---

[51]The writer may not distinguish among the various revolts under Nero, Trajan, and Hadrian, 66-135 CE.

[52]The *Ps.-Clems.* portray Clement as a seeker after truth who finds no comfort in the philosophical schools and travels to Judea after hearing reports about Jesus: *Rec.* 1.6//*Hom.* 1.6; *Rec.* 1.12//*Hom.* 1.15. There philosophy is a kind of apologetic *praeparatio evangelica*. In the menology it is a mere waste of time; the Hebrew bible provides sufficient preparation.

[53]This resistance may have embarrassed the editor, who overlooks it in the chronological account of ch. 12.

[54]Titus, although a Greek, learned enough Hebrew to worship in that language, ch. 7. Ps.-Zenas apparently understood the vision as a command to learn Hebrew and thus enable Titus to understand and be understood by Judeans.

[55]See the sage remarks of L. Vouaux *Les Actes de Paul et ses lettres apocryphes*, (Paris: Librairie Letouzey et Ané, 1913),151 n. 1*.

[56]In the surviving material Titus is said to precede Paul to both

Translation[57]

Sigla:
underlined words = Borrowings from *APl.*
italicized words = Possible Borrowings from or imitations of *APl.*

Of the Holy Apostle Titus, a Disciple of the Holy Apostle Paul, Who Became Bishop of Gortyna in Crete.

1. Zenas the Lawyer, whom the Holy Apostle Paul mentions,[58] is the one who wrote his [Titus's] life as set forth below:

The most holy Titus stemmed from the lineage of Minos, king of Crete.[59] At age twenty, when he was quite devoted to the poems and dramas of Homer and the other philosophers, he heard a voice saying, "Titus, you must depart from here and save your soul, for this learning will be of no benefit to you."[60] He wanted to hear the same voice once more, for he was familiar with the deceptions issued vocally from statues. After remaining resistant for nine years, he was instructed in a vision to read the book of the Hebrews. Taking up the book of Isaiah, he came upon the following passage: "Dedicate yourselves to me, you many islands. Israel is saved by the Lord with everlasting salvation," etc.[61]

2. Now when the Proconsul of Crete, who was the uncle of St Titus, heard of the salutary birth and baptism of Christ the Master and of the marvelous deeds he performed in Jerusalem and elsewhere, he took counsel with the leading people of Crete and then dispatched Titus with some others to Jerusalem so that he would be able to hear the message and speak and teach those things that he was going to see. Titus arrived, saw, and worshiped Christ the Master. He observed all of his marvelous deeds and also witnessed the Master's salutary sufferings, his burial, resurrection, and divine ascension, as well as the arrival of the all-holy Spirit upon the divine

---

Iconium and Rome.

[57]The following translation is to be considered as a draft prepared for the SBL Seminar on Intertextuality in Christian Apocrypha. Suggestions and corrections will be appreciated. These may be sent to Richard I. Pervo, 2122 Sheridan Road, Evanston, Illinois 60201, U.S.A.

[58]Tit 3:13. (On this oblique reference see above.)

[59]The motif of noble lineage, common in ancient fiction, is an indication of Cretan local patriotism.

[60]Cf. 2 Tim 3:16.

[61]This appears to be a frame enclosing Isa 41:1-45:17, a fact the editor may have overlooked. The standard LXX of Isa 41:1 is Ἐγκαινίζεσθε πρός με, νῆσοι, οἱ γὰρ ἄρχοντες ἀλλάξουσιν ἰσχύν· ἐγγισάτωσαν καὶ λαλησάτωσαν ἅμα, τότε κρίσιν ἀναγγειλάτωσαν (different from MT). Not only the popular Deutero-Isaiah but doubtless also the reference to "islands" makes this text appropriate. For the reading of Isaiah in religious quests see Acts 8:26-39.

apostles. He became a believer.

3. He was numbered with the one-hundred twenty[62] and among the 3,000 who came to believe in Christ through Peter, the chief, as indeed it is written, "Cretans and Arabs."[63] Titus was ardent and always zealous in the Spirit.[64] Three years later 5,000 men had been added to the faith.[65] Two years later, after the cripple had been healed by Peter and John, the apostles were persecuted and charged not to speak in the name of the Lord Jesus. When the priests were intent upon putting them to death, Gamaliel, the teacher of the law, deterred their plan.[66] After seven years had passed, Stephen was stoned.[67] Thereafter occurred Paul's experiences in Damascus: i.e., his blinding and recovery of sight.[68]

Paul preached the message about Christ first in Damascus.

He healed Aphphia,[69] *the wife of Chrysippus, who had been possessed by a demon.*[70]

After a fast of seven days he cast down the idol of Apollo.[71] Then he went to Jerusalem and in turn [*or* again][72] to Caesarea.

4. St Titus was ordained by the apostles and sent with Paul to teach and to ordain whomever Paul might designate.[73] *Arriving at Antioch, they found Barnabas, the son of Panchares whom Paul had raised.*[74] Herod the Tetrarch[75] killed James the brother of John with a sword. After this they travelled to Seleucia, Cyprus, Salamis, and Paphos. From there they went to Perga in Pamphylia and again[76] to Pisidian Antioch, then to Iconium, *to the household of Onesiphorus,*

---

[62]One hundred twenty: cf. Acts 1:15.

[63]Acts 2:11 was for Ps.-Zenas a godsend, in several senses of that word.

[64]ζέων τῷ πνεύματι is an expression applied at Acts 18:25 to Apollos and thus suitable for an associate of Paul.

[65]Cf. Acts 4:4.

[66]Acts 3-5.

[67]Acts 7.

[68]Cf. Acts 9.

[69]Ms. O reads "Amphia." See the discussion of this name above.

[70]*APl* 6 (?).

[71]Cf. *APl* 5.

[72]On the translation of αὖθις and its significance see above.

[73]The menology envisions Paul as having ordained Titus as a kind of suffragan bishop, with the authority to confer holy orders subject to Paul's approval.

[74]*APl* 2. Both Titus and Barnabas are thus presented as persons of upper-class pagan background.

[75]Acts 12:1 assigns responsibility for this deed to a "King Herod." The writer may have confounded this with Acts 13:1, which does refer to Herod the Tetrarch.

[76]On this πάλιν note Nicetas of Paphlagonia 84v, discussed in Appendix I.

to whom Titus had previously reported the facts about Paul, since he was Paul's precursor in every city.[77] From there he [Titus?[78]] went to Lystra and Derbe. The divinely inspired Titus both preached the word of God with Paul in every city and endured persecutions and whippings. Both nonetheless enlightened the hearts of unbelievers by working signs and wonders just as [these] all are reported in the Acts of the Apostles.[79]

When Paul was in custody while at Philippi and an earthquake occurred in the *prison work-house*,[80] he was freed.[81] {Now some write "Titus Justus, but others "Titus Pistos."}[82]

---

[77]*APl* 3.

[78]The *v.l.* "they" resolves this problem and is therefore likely to be secondary.

[79]The plural Πράξεσι is most easily understood as applying to Acts and APl. The canonical book cannot by any stretch of imagination serve as a basis for the ministry of Titus, as it does not mentionhis name. Note the similar expressions in Nicetas and Nicephorus, Appendices II-III.

[80]The text is difficult here. In n.7, p.246-47, Halkin states that O reads ἐργαστηρίοις, while in P there appears ἐγ//α///οις, and notes the appearance of ἐργάστροις in ch.9. For reasons based upon PHeid and PH I take ἐργάστροις as here equivalent to to ἐργαστήριον (cf. Latin *ergastulum*). The very difficulty of this word is strong evidence for dependence upon a text of *APl*.

[81]In the canonical text Paul's only named companion in Philippi (and cell-mate) was Silas (16:11-40, but note the "we" in vv. 11-16).

[82]The last sentence appears to be a gloss and a good indicator that the author has omitted material from the source but seized upon an interesting remark. The gloss may reflect an attempt to associate Titus in some way with the Titius Justus of Acts 18:7. "Titus Justus" is a well-attested variant there, for which the menology provides additional evidence.

5 At that time Rustillus,[83] who was married to Titus's sister,[84]
had completed a second period in the governorship of Crete. Paul and Titus arrived there.[85] When the ruler saw the divinely inspired Titus weighed down with tears, he attempted to compel him to live with him, but St Titus did not obey him. Rustillus advised him not to speak against the pagan gods.[86] St Titus expounded the gospel of Christ to him, claiming "If you believe my message, you will be exalted on earth and in the city of Rome." Shortly thereafter his son died. He brought him to Paul at night. Following prayer, Paul raised him.[87] After they had spent three months[88] there, Rustillus sent them on with ample rewards. He went to Rome and was designated consul. Thereafter, because Rustillus was a relative of Titus, those of the circumcision[89] only engaged in verbal combat, not daring to do anything else to the proclaimers of God's word.[90]

---

[83]Menology 2 corrects (apparently) this otherwise unattested name to the more familiar Rutillus.

[84]Another sister, Euphemia, is mentioned in ch. 10. She died a virgin.

[85]Schmidt, IIII 119, states that *APl* may have included missionary journeys to Crete ("or also Cyprus").

[86]This recommendation of prudent conduct might possibly be inspired by *APl*, where the governor of Ephesus does not reject Paul's critique of idols but finds it irrelevant (PH. 1,24-25, C. Schmidt IIII, 24, as well as Nicetas and Nicephorus [Appendices I-II).

[87]This summary episode is appears to imitate incidents common in *APl* and other Apocryphal Acts. The nocturnal setting is motivated by a desire for secrecy rather than by circumstances like those of Acts 20:7-12.

[88]Three months: cf. Acts 19:8 (Ephesus) and 20:3 (Greece).

[89]One of four NT occurrences of οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς is at Tit 1:10, although with the article τῆς in that instance.

[90]This is the nearest approximation to an anti-Jewish remark in the menology. Although it gratuitously assumes that anti-Christian Jewish violence and cabal was customary, its function is to show the advantages obtained by Titus's membership in a powerful family.

6. Leaving Crete, they went to Asia. In the course of Paul's teaching at Ephesus 12,000 persons came to believe.[91] *There the apostle also fought with beasts, being cast to a lion.*[92] Titus, Timothy, and Erastus delivered the second epistle to the Corinthians.[93]

Titus, Timothy, *and Luke remained with the apostle until his consummation under Nero.*[94] They thereupon returned to Greece and got Luke established there.[95] Titus and Timothy then moved on to Colossae.[96] Timothy subsequently returned to Ephesus while Titus proceeded to Crete.[97]

7. The Cretans greeted his arrival joyfully, like that of a relative, and decreed a holiday. They adorned the temples of their idols, took in hand the sacred swords, and, clad in [*or* carrying] their purple-trimmed ephebic tunics [? *possibly*: tunics with diagonal purple stripes] they went before him.[98] St Titus addressed them graciously and urged them to be responsive to what he said. He began by singing, in Hebrew,[99] "May God be merciful to us and bless

---

[91]Schmidt, IIII, 117, suspects that these statistics derive from *APl*. Such statistics do not permeate the surviving tradition of the *APl* but are common in the menology.

[92]*APl* 7. ἐθηριομάχησεν could be derived from 1 Cor 15:32, but the lion is a notable member of the cast of *APl*.

[93]Cf. The author derived the mission of Timothy and Erastus from Acts 19:22, where they are sent to Macedonia. 2 Tim 4:20 deposits Erastus at Corinth. 2 Cor 2:13; 7:6, and ch. 8 relate Titus to Macedonia. Association of journeys mentioned in Acts with the delivery of pauline correspondence cannot readily be dismissed as crude harmonization, since it is a conjectural procedure that continues to enjoy scholarly favor.

[94]*APl* 11.

[95]The ministry of Luke in Achaea is based upon traditions independent of *APl*. One example of this tradition is the "old Gospel Prologue" that states Luke died in Boeotia at age 84. This may be read in K. Aland, ed. *Synopsis Quattour Evangeliorum* (Stuttgart: Würtembergische Bibelanstalt, 1964), 533 and in many introductions to Luke and Acts.

[96]New Testament scholars might be tempted to see here a suggestion of the post-mortem delivery of Colossians (Col 1:1). In any case Titus, Timothy, and Luke continue the work of the martyred apostle.

[97]These data could be derived from the Pastoral Epistles: Ephesus for Timothy in 1 Tim 1:3, Crete as Titus's base in Tit 1:5.

[98]The event is evidently a religious procession, such as those on feast days, in which Titus occupies the honorific final position. The text is very difficult: καὶ κοσμήσαντες τοὺς ναοὺς τῶν εἰδώλων αὐτῶν ἔλαβον εἰς χεῖρας τὰ ἱερὰ ξίφη αὐτῶν καὶ τοὺς περιπορφύρους χιτῶνας, καὶ προῆγον αὐτοῦ. My translation gains some support from menology 2, which reads "They took in their hands their sacred swords and purple-bordered tunics."

[99]Paul is depicted as conversing with the Patriarchs in Hebrew in *APl*

us," etc.[100] They responded that they did not know what he was saying. Only the Hebrews present understood. Presently, as they drew near to the idol of Artemis, it cast itself down, breaking forth with a cry: "You [pl.] are acting insolently in ignorance!"[101] St Titus said to them, "Since you are publicly presenting the images, condemnation therefore falls upon you." They thereupon threw down the swords and remained without food until early morning, reciting the psalm in expectation that they would hear something from the idol. Then, after numerous marvels, they began to exclaim: "There is one god, the one manifested to us this day!"[102] Five hundred came to believe in Christ.

The diet of the apostle consisted of garden vegetables. He took his rest upon [dined in?] goat's hair and sheepskin.[103]

8. Titus ordained bishops in Cnossus, Hierapytna, Cydonia, Chersonesus, Eleutherina, Lampa, Cisamus, and Cantanus, so that there would be nine bishops with Gortyna as Metropolitan See. He taught them for four years.

Now at that time the Roman Emperor Vespasian fell upon Jerusalem and took the Jews there and in every place captive.[104] Yet because of blessed Titus's relative there was no persecution of the Jews in Crete.

9.[105] Now a certain Secundus, who had received funds from the Emperor Trajan to rebuild a temple of idols, did indeed begin the project. St Titus happened by, glimpsed the enormous undertaking, uttered a deep groan, and moved on. The next morning it transpired that the entire foundation had collapsed and that the building-blocks were scattered about.[106] Just as Secundus was on the verge of

---

(*Mart*. 5).

[100]Psa 67 [LXX 66], appropriate because of its references to gentiles as offering praise to God.

[101]This chapter has some affinities with *AJn* 42.

[102]This text has evidently abbreviated a lengthy account of the humiliation of Artemis. Menology 2 represents a considerable improvement, with substantial dialogue at the climax of which the idol is pulverized at Titus's invocation of Christ's name. It is possible that this edition is closer to the original. In any case experienced readers of hagiography can easily fill in the blanks, as the author of the menology expected them to do.

[103]This abrupt reference to Titus's life-style constitutes another indicator of abbreviation. (One might expect Titus to wear these fabrics, but ἀνεπαύετο does not seem to bear that meaning.)

[104]See n.51. Titus was the general whose army captured Jerusalem.

[105]Chs. 9-11 are a legend explaining how the site of a former pagan temple became a healing shrine of St Titus. The relative fullness of this account indicates that this incident expresses the menologist's leading concern, if not that of *ATit*.

[106]This may be a transformation of the legends surrounding Julian's efforts to rebuild the Temple at Jerusalem.

doing away with himself,[107] someone advised him to hasten to Titus. Once there, he knelt down and besought Titus to protect him from liability. The saint replied, "If you should come to believe in my Christ, the building will be erected." In response Secundus asked indulgence for himself and promised to give him a child he loved.[108] The saint said, "Get to work on your task and, as you work, repeat together with the laborers, "There is but one god, the god in heaven!" Thereafter this cry was repeated in the course of the work.[109] When the temple was completed, St Titus said to the people, "Know well, brothers and sisters, that that place will become a proving-ground for holy relics."

10. When Euphemia, the virgin sister of blessed Titus died, he laid her remains in a place that he had built.[110] There he would often offer hymns and praise to God.

Subsequently, he wrote letters to Dionysius the Areopagite and to others.[111]

Then, after he had wrought many marvelous deeds, he saw the holy angels sent to take him. Fragrant smoke and a cloud glowing more brightly than the sun filled the house. Titus, with transfigured face, let forth a great glad laugh. Raising his hands toward heaven, he cried out, "Lord, I have kept your faith true and have preserved the people intact. Into your hands I commend my spirit.[112] Of your own self strengthen your people." After adding the "amen" he gave up his spirit joyfully and lives for ever.

---

[107]Cf. Acts 16:27.

[108]Menology 2 improves this by stating that he asked indulgence until the building was complete and adding in the next sentence that he had his child baptized.

[109]"In the course of the work" renders the troublesome ἐν τοῖς ἐργάστροις. Did the source state this this labor was performed by prisoners taken in the revolt?

[110]The "place" in question may be the temple, as menology 2 states. (One could render the relative clause: "that she had built," but this seems less likely.)

[111]Halkin, as noted above, aptly associates the mention of Dionysius with the works of the Pseudo-Areopagite, which include a lengthy letter to Titus. He sees no connection with the "Pseudo-Titus Epistle," which was probably written in Latin. (For a discussion of that text see A. de Santos Otero in Schneemelcher-Wilson, 2:53-74.) It is tempting to see in this intrusive sentence an interpolation into an earlier work, made either by the menologist or a subsequent editor of *ATit*. Menology 2 more successfully integrates this into the account by making these letters testaments of an apostle whose death is drawing near.

[112]The departing Titus echoes the words of his master, Paul (2 Tim 4:7), the latter's charge (Acts 20:28, etc.), and the words of his savior (Luke 23:46).

11. They then anointed his remains with oils and aromatic spices, clothed them in a white garment, and carried them off for burial. At that moment the temples of the idols collapsed, but the people within them came out unharmed and saw the remains of the saint.

His precious tomb is in fact an altar, at which are the chains used to bind those afflicted by unclean spirits.[113] In this place all who are deemed worthy to embrace the resting place of the saint experience healing.[114]

12. Now the holy apostle and hierarch of Christ was twenty years of age when he came to Jerusalem.[115] One year passed until the ascension of the Lord. He spent ten years before being ordained apostle and archbishop by the chief disciples of the Lord. Titus contended for eighteen years in the proclamation of the gospel[116] and spent six years in Crete and the other islands.[117] For thirty nine years he dwelt in his native city, so that the total years of his earthly life were ninety four.

May we all receive mercy from his intercessions, we who give thanks to and believe in our Lord Jesus Christ, to whom belong all glory, honor, and reverence, with the Father and the Holy Spirit, now and always, to the end of the ages. Amen.

---

[113]The text presumably means that healed demoniacs have left their former chains as *ex-voto* offerings and attestations.

[114]The relics of Titus were removed to St. Mark's, Venice following the Arab capture of Crete in 823 and not returned to the island until 1968, according to G. Dragas ("Titus," *The Encyclopedia of Early Christianity*, ed. E. Ferguson et al. [New York: Garland, 1990], 903-905, 904). That same page contains a photograph of the remains of a possibly sixth-century Church of St. Titus at Gortyna. For a more detailed description of this building see M. Falla Castelfranchi, (n.14), 209.

[115]In this pious chronological summing up it seems to have been appropriate to omit his delay of nine years between initial call and actual departure. It is difficult to reconcile the data in this chapter with the chronology given in ch. 2, which, if cumulative, yields twelve years before the death of Stephen, or seven, if counted from a single starting point. Seven may be correct if one presumes that Paul labored for three years before Titus was ordained to be his assistant. The fourteen (plus three?) years of Gal 2:1 could scarcely be the basis of these calculations.

[116]This clause apparently refers to Titus's labor as a companion of Paul.

[117]The menologist presumably wishes readers to understand that Titus devoted these six years to erecting the hierarchy of Crete and adjacent islands.

Appendix I

Nicetas of Paphlagonia:

In 1931 A. Vogt published panegyrics on Saints Peter and Paul by the tenth-century Rhetor, Nicetas of Paphlagonia, a pupil of Photius.[118] Although he was a learned man at home with scripture and established patristic authorities, Nicetas did not hesitate to use apocryphal sources in his panegyric,[119] in this case the *APl*.[120] In so doing he was not in the least atypical. Since there are frequent references to this panegyric in the literature about *APl*, but little detailed discussion, I have prepared the following summary, which seeks to identify elements of the oration that appear to bear upon the contents of the *APl*.[121]

Nicetas follows Acts and the epistles closely until he comes to Paul's departure from Damascus.[122] Immediately following the description of his escape in the basket (which does not appear to be a component of the extant fragments of *APl*), he reports that Paul went to Syrian Antioch (82r).[123] There Paul preached, was imprisoned, and subsequently rescued. The chief of the city[124] saw in a vision his son, who had died. His wife was also restored. This is presumably a summary of the episode of Anchares and Phila.[125]

---

[118]"Deux discours inédits de Nicétas de Paphlagonie," *Orientalia Christiana* 23 (1931) 5-97. The basis is an eleventh century ms. (755 of the Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris).

[119]Vogt, introduction, 13.

[120]The Panegyric on Peter does not make liberal use of apocrypha, (outside of the martyrdom section, the source of which is related to but not derived from *APtr)*. The *APtr* may not have been available to Nicetas. It is, of course, quite illuminating that a follower of a strident critic of the ApocActs did not hesitate to employ one of them as a valid historical source. On the views of Photius see E. Junod "Actes Apocryphes et Hérésie: le jugement de Photius," in F. Bovon et al. eds. *Les actes apocryphes des apōtres* (Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1981), 11-24.

[121]The text, with a facing French translation that is not always fully reliable, may be found on pp. 60-96 in Vogt's edition, ms. folio 76r-93r. References are to the folio numbers.

[122]It is interesting that, in his discussion of Paul's conflict with Aretas (82r), for which N. relies more upon 2 Cor 11:32-33 than upon Acts 9: 24-25, he supplies the grounds of charges laid against Paul: ὡς ἀρνητὴν πατρῴου θεοῦ και μόνου, ὑβριστὴν δὲ τῶν βασιλέων τῶν ἐπὶ γῆς καί τινα Ἰησοῦν... Cf. 1 Tim 1:13 τὸ πρότερον ὄντα βλάσφημον καὶ διώκτην καὶ ὑβριστήν· ἀλλὰ ἠλεήθην, ὅτι ἀγνοῶν ἐποίησα ἐν ἀπιστίᾳ.

[123]ἐντεῦθεν δὲ τῇ κατὰ Συρίαν Ἀντιοχείᾳ προσεληλυθώς.

[124]ἄρχων/-οντες τῆς πόλεως is Nicetas's fixed expression for the chief magistrate(s) of every city, including Rome.

[125]*APl* 2, PHeid 1-6.

Thence the apostle went to Iconium. Nicetas summarizes the deeds of Thecla, whose authority he underlines.[126] The oration then records a(n initial) Jerusalem visit inspired by a desire to interview Peter, whom Paul had not previously seen (83r).[127] In his description of the "Jerusalem Conference" Nicetas follows Galatians. Unlike most patristic exegetes, he does not seek to explain away the quarrel between Peter and Paul.[128] He states that the result of the quarrel was the total abolition of the Torah.

At this juncture (84r, *ad fin.*) Nicetas reverts, apparently, to Acts 13, for 84v reports that, with Barnabas,[129] He returned to Antioch *again*.[130] Thereafter the orator takes up the mission to the Anatolian cities, Myra and Lystra, with a suitable apostrophe on the apostle's experiences.[131] Ephesus is the next destination. The orator thus appears to describe an itinerary that moved from Antioch through southern Asia Minor to Ephesus.[132] There Paul delivers a public address,[133] summarizing, after an appeal to natural revelation, the stories of the fall and the redemption (85v-86v). It is worthy of note that this is the only speech of Paul quoted *verbatim* in the entire panegyric.[134]

---

[126]83r: οὕτως αὐτὴ μὲν διὰ Παύλου διδάσκαλος ἔνθεος ἀπεστέλλετο καὶ σώτειρα πάντα μικροῦ δεῖν καὶ ποιεῖν καὶ διδάσκειν ἐπιτρεπομένη, ὅσα τοῖς θειοτάτοις ἀποστόλοις ποιεῖν θεμιτόν. This statement throws down the gauntlet before 1 Tim 2:12 διδάσκειν δὲ γυναικὶ οὐκ ἐπιτρέπω, οὐδὲ αὐθεντεῖν ἀνδρός, ἀλλ' εἶναι ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ and Tertullian *De Bapt*. 17. Nicetas also identifies her exposure in the theater in apostolic and Pauline terms: θέατρον ἑαυτὴν καὶ ἀγγέλοις καὶ ἀνθρώποις (*APl* 3.22. Cf. 1 Cor 4:9 δοκῶ γάρ, ὁ θεὸς ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀποστόλους ἐσχάτους ἀπέδειξεν ὡς ἐπιθανατίους, ὅτι θέατρον ἐγενήθημεν τῷ κόσμῳ καὶ ἀγγέλοις καὶ ἀνθρώποις).

[127]τὸν μέγαν ἱστορῆσαι Πέτρον ζητῶν, οὔπω πρῶτον ἰδών (cf. Gal 1:18).

[128]On patristic interpretation of Gal 2:11-14 see M.F. Wiles, *The Divine Apostle*: *The Interpretation of St. Paul's Epistles in the Early Church* (Cambridge: The University Press, 1967), *passim*.

[129]This prepositional phrase appears to be the only reference to Barnabas in the oration.

[130]ἐκεῖθεν ἀφοριζόμενος καὶ ἀφορμώμενος πρὸς τε τὴν Ἀντιόχειαν αὐτὴν πάλιν. This provides an important clue to the interpretation of *ATit* 4.

[131]δεσμά, τὰς εἱρκτάς, τὰς φρουράς, τὰς φραγελώσεις, τοὺς λιθασμούς, τοὺς ῥαβδισσμούς, τὰς ἐκ τῶν ἔξω, τὰς ἐκ τῶν ἔσω τῶν Ἰουδαίων τε καὶ ἐθνῶν ἐπιβουλὰς καὶ ἐπηρείας

[132]For a possible basis see Acts 18:23; 19:1.

[133]ἐν μέσῳ τῷ δήμῳ καὶ (85r) τῇ βουλῇ τῶν πρώτων τῆς πόλεως ἐδημηγόρει

[134]Two observations: 1.) It may be possible to utilize this speech to help in the reconstruction of the damaged text of *APl* (PH 1-5) at this point. 2.) When his sources are canonical scripture, Nicetas is more likely to summarize.

The chief official of the city appreciated this discourse, but found the occasion inopportune, because of public displeasure. Paul is incarcerated in preparation for condemnation to the beasts. He devoted that time to the conversion of Eubula and Artemilla, followed by his delivery from the lions and the subsequent hail-storm. The Ephesian material clearly derives from *APl* 7.[135] It is clearly possible to provide more than an outline of this episode. For his part Nicetas places the prison-escape under the honor of "the apostolic act," thereby "canonizing" (legitimizing), as it were the story found in *APl*.[136] Would not the one who had delivered Thecla by the prayers of Paul also save the apostle from the beasts? Of course. Moreover, there is further proof to be found in 1 Cor 15:32.[137]

Nicetas does not make these observations until reporting that Paul sailed from Ephesus to Macedonia.[138] He then turns to a summary of Paul's miracles, which are pluralized for greater effect: raising of the dead,[139] healing those afflicted with dropsy,[140] curing the lame,[141] lepers,[142] and every kind of infirmity with his healing touch.[143] Tribulations are summarized in their turn, with particular attention to Ephesus, followed by those in the cities of Macedonia and Achaea: Philippi, Thessalonica, Athens, Beroea, and Corinth (87_r).[144]

Nicetas can summarize Paul's experiences in Macedonia and Achaea by referring his hearers to the narrative of Paul's companion, Luke, who tells of Paul's final voyage to Jerusalem, his arrest, and his voyage to Rome. 88_v says that Paul was acquitted of

---

[135]Nicephorus Callistus does not record the speech. Both Nicetas and Nicephorus are politically sensitive in that they do not report that the magistrate sought the crowd's decision.

[136]οὔκουν ἀτιμαστέον τὴν ἀποστολικὴν πρᾶξιν ἥ ἀμφιβαλεῖν ἄξιον διαγορεῦουσαν... (86_v). Vogt's translation "les Actes des Apôtres" (81) is misleading.

[137]The coincidence of appeal to the truth of *APl* with regard to the Ephesian mission in both Nicetas and Nicephorus is one ground for suspecting that the latter depends upon the former.

[138]Acts 20:1, cf. *APl* 8.

[139]Anchares: *APl* 2.

[140]*APl* 4.

[141]Acts 14:8-13.

[142]The only reference to lepers in the known segments of *APl* is in 10 (PH 8.36//P. Berol. 13803), which is a summary of the miracles of Jesus.

[143]Acts 19:11-12?

[144]Nicetas appears to blend several texts. Demetrius the silversmith is named in Acts 19:24; Alexander the coppersmith is an apparent merger of the Alexander of Acts 19:33 with the figure of 1 Tim 1:20; 2 Tim 4:14. He associates both in a metallurgical conspiracy against Paul in Ephesus. (Note that *APl* 7 speaks of "goldsmiths," on which see R. Pervo, "Hard Act," [n.5] 12-14.)

this charge,[145] and thereafter spent a number of years evangelizing all Italy, as well as the east and the west.[146] He then presents a lengthy resumé of Paul's theology and accomplishments, not neglecting mystical experiences and the creation of rules for ecclesiastical and domestic organization (88v-91v).

91v states that, after he had preached the gospel to the ends of the earth,[147] the magistrates of the city (of Rome)[148] issued a decree against Paul and Peter, himself, on the grounds of agitating nearly everyone, women and men,[149] to acknowledge the crucified one as God. So many are slain that Rome is in danger of depopulation. Simon the Magus then throws his weight against the apostles in an address before the emperor. That wicked person asserts his ability to fly and is shot down by the prayers of the disciples of Christ. In response Nero condemns Peter and Paul to die by cross and sword, respectively. Both died on the same day in the last year of Nero's reign.[150]

This account of Paul's later years and martyrdom does not derive from an edition of the *APl*, but from sources akin to the "Pseudo-Marcellus" tradition (*Acta Petri et Pauli*) that stressed the concurrence of the apostolic martyrdoms in Rome and the unity of the two chief apostles.[151]

Comment: Nicetas continues the tradition of exploiting a wide range of sources for describing the life of Paul, including the various letters, Acts, the *Acts of Paul*, and other apocryphal traditions. His presentation of the course of Paul's travels is not based upon Acts, which he silently corrects at some points and supplements at others. Possibly because of the shadow of Photius, he uses a singular expression when appealing to *APl*, a text he does not name. Utilize it he apparently does.

---

[145]The grounds for this statement presumably derive from the Pastoral Epistles, especially 2 Tim 4:16.

[146]Cf. *1 Clem.* 5.6: κῆρυξ γενόμενος ἔν τε τῇ ἀνατολῇ καὶ ἐν τῇ δύσει.

[147]τὰ πέρατα τῆς οἰκουμένης. See Acts 1:8; 13:47; *1 Clem.* 5:5-7.

[148]The oration does not explain how or why Paul had returned to Rome.

[149]Like many Byzantine churchmen, Nicetas avoids any suggestion that the apostles alienated women from the marital bed.

[150]The climax of the companion panegyric on Peter (73r-75r), turns, after the appointment of Clement as ποιμήν, to the (unspecified) accusation, laid by Simon, that brought Peter to Nero's judgment seat. In this account Peter alone utters the prayer and makes the sign of the cross that bring Simon crashing to earth.

[151]A useful study of traditions about the death of Paul in the first five centuries is Harry W. Tajra, *The Martyrdom of St. Paul*, WUNT 67 (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1994). Nicetas's interest in such harmonization was stimulated by the ecclesiastical politics of his day. On this see Vogt, 17-20.

Nicetas uses *APl* not only to fill gaps in the canonical account but also to supersede it at points, particularly in the narrative reported in Acts 9-15; 19. Both the epistles and *APl* support the alternate picture Nicetas draws. The pauline itinerary revealed in this oration is as follows: Damascus, Syrian Antioch, Iconium, Jerusalem, Antioch, Myra, Lystra, Ephesus, Philippi, Thessalonica, Athens, Beroea, Corinth, Macedonia, Troad, Ephesus and the other cities of Asia, Jerusalem, Caesarea, Rome, Italy, East and West, Rome.

Appendix II

Nicephorus Callistus, *Ecclesiastical History* 2.25[152]

Now they who drew up the travels of Paul have related that he did many other things, and among them this, which befell when he was at Ephesus. Hieronymus being governor, Paul used liberty of speech, and he (Hieronymus) said that he (Paul) was able to speak well, but that this was not the time for such words. But the people of the city, fiercely enraged, put Paul's feet into irons, and shut him up in the prison, till he should be exposed as prey to the lions.[153] But Eubula and Artemilla, wives of eminent men among the Ephesians, being his attached disciples, and visiting him by night, desired the grace of the divine washing. And by God's power, with angels to escort them and enlighten the gloom of night with the excess of the brightness that was in them, Paul, loosed from his iron fetters, went to the sea-shore and initiated them into holy baptism, and returning to his bonds without any of those in care of the prison perceiving it, was reserved as a prey for the lions.

A lion then, of huge size and unmatched strength, was let loose upon him, and it ran to him in the stadium and lay down at his feet.[154] And when many other savage beasts, too, were let loose, it was permitted to none of them to touch the holy body, standing like a statue in prayer.[155] At this juncture a violent and vast hailstorm poured down all at once with a great rush, and shattered the heads of many men and beasts as well, and shore off the ear of Hieronymus

---

[152]*P.G.* 145, col. 821. The translation is that of M.R. James, *The Apocryphal New Testament*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1953, 292, who emulated the AV of 1611. The notes come from my own hand.

[153]Note that Nicephorus, like Nicetas, does not represent the governor as submitting the case to public judgment.

[154]There is no reference to the baptism of this creature.

[155]With regard to the literary plan of *APl*, it is apparent that there is a clear parallel between the experiences of Thecla (hail-storm, 3.22, lion, 3.33) and Paul. The technique is common in Luke and Acts, where Jesus, Peter, and Paul work similar miracles, and in the romantic novels, where the experiences of the lovers are often symmetrical. The parallelisms in these works, like the symmetry found in such romantic novels as *An Ephesian Tale* are not lacking in artistry, as they are neither wooden nor mechanical. Nicetas gives homage to this symmetry (87_r, paraphrased above).

himself. And thereafter, with his followers, he came to the God of Paul and received the baptism of salvation. But the lion escaped to the mountains.

And thence Paul sailed to Macedonia and Greece, and thereafter through Macedonia came to Troas and to Miletus, and from there set out for Jerusalem.[156]

Now it is not surprising that Luke has not narrated this fight with the beasts along with the other acts: for it is not permitted to entertain doubt because (or seeing that) John alone of the evangelists has told of the raising of Lazarus: for we know that[157] not every one writes, believes, or knows everything, but according as the Lord has imparted to each, so does he perceive and believe and write spiritually the things of the spirit.

Comment: It is noteworthy that Nicephorus defends the authenticity of the story of Paul and the lion by analogy with the different accounts found in the intracanonical gospels. Both traditions are valid. Nicephorus regards the "travels"[158] as supplemental to Acts. The extent to which Nicephorus made actual use of *APl* is disputable,[159] but once again there is evidence that a later authority viewed *APl* as parallel ("when he was at Ephesus") to Acts rather than as a sequel.

---

[156]The material in this paragraph comes from Acts 20-21. On the possible dependence of Nicephorus upon Nicetas, see below.

[157]Εἰ δὲ Λουκᾶς μὴ ταῖς λοιπαῖς πράξεσι καὶ τὴν θηριομαχίαν ταύτην ἱστόρησε, θαυμαστὸν οὐδέν. οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀμφισβητεῖν δεῖ, ὅτι μόνος τῶν εὐαγγελιστῶν Ἰωάννης τὴν τοῦ Λαζάρου ἔγερσιν διηγήσατο· καὶ γὰρ ἴσμεν, ὡς οὐ...

[158]περίοδοι is the term used also by Photius.

[159]Nicephorus may have had access to the panegyric of Nicetas. 86r, for example, reads...πολλῶν δὲ καὶ ἄλλων θηρίων ἀπολυομένων, μηδενὸς δὲ τὸ σύνολον τοῦ ἱεροῦ θιγεῖν τολμήσαντος σώματος ἀνεστηλωμένου τῇ προσευχῇ, and Nicephorus πολλῶν δὲ καὶ ἄλλων θηρίων ἀφιεμένων, οὐδενὶ ψαύειν τοῦ ἱερου ἐξῆν σώματος, ἀνεστηλωμένου τῇ προσευχῇ. PH 5, 4-5 reads τοῦ Ἱερονύμου βάλλοντ[ο]ς πολλὰ θηρία εἰς τὸ τὸν Παῦλον ἀναιρεθῆναι καὶ ἐπι τὸν λέοντα (Schmidt, IIII 40). It would be difficult to demonstrate that Nicetas was not Nicephorus's source. In the matter of order, for example, both report, against PH, the lion's departure before stating that Paul sailed for Macedonia. If this were so, it would disqualify Nicephorus as an independent witness to the text of *APl* here. The charge of "faked documentation" would, however, magnify the nature of his appeal to the authority of the "Journeys/Acts of Paul," which despite the reserve of Nicetas, he clearly identified as the source of the episodes. It is also possible that Nicephorus had access to *APl* or an excerpt therefrom, but preferred the superior Greek of Nicetas.

Appendix III

The Acts of Barnabas

"The Journeys and Witness of St Barnabas the Apostle"[160] barely qualified for a place in Bonnet, who printed it as an Appendix.[161] The object of this short text is essentially ecclesiological, since it seeks to support the right of the Cypriote church to ordain its own bishops on the grounds of apostolic foundations and relics.[162] The purpose of the following summary is to provide comparison and contrast with the "Acts of Titus."

The *ABarn* has been divided by modern editors into twenty-six short chapters. Somewhat longer than the menology, it may approximate the length of the hypothetical *ATit*.[163] Apart from a florid preface its style is relatively simple.

The author is none other than John, a former servant (ὑπηρέτης) of Cyril, the priest of Zeus.[164] He was baptized in Iconium, where the pagan John received the new Christian name Mark![165] Narration is in the first person, both singular and plural.

The leading theme of chapters 1-7 is the schism between Paul and Barnabas over the role of Mark. The apostle to the gentiles is characterized as illness-prone,[166] stubborn, and temperamental, resolutely opposed to the presence of Mark, who had aroused his wrath not only by tarrying but in particular by retaining a number of parchments in Pamphylia.[167] Three weeks of abject markan

---

[160]Περίδοι καὶ μαρτύριον τοῦ ἁγίου Βαρνάβα τοῦ ἀποστόλου. The identification of both Titus and Barnabas as apostles is related to the respective claims of the churches they patronize.

[161]R.A. Lipsius and M. Bonnet, eds. *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha*, two volumes in three parts (Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1972 [reprint of Leipzig, 1903]), II.2.292-302. There is a translation, based upon Tischendorf's text, in *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, A. Roberts et al., eds, vol. 8 (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1978 [reprint of 1896 edition]), 493-496. For a recent discussion see A. de Santos Otero in Schneemelcher-Wilson, 2:465-66.

[162]So de Santos Oro, with good grounds.

[163]*ABarn* is c. 25% longer than the menology.

[164]Mark thus continues his service (Acts 13:5) but to a different god.

[165]The datum of Acts 12:12 is thus implicitly rejected. The menology supplies a similar background for Barnabas.

[166]When Mark catches up with Paul in Antioch he is sick in bed. Galatians 4:13-14 and 2 Cor 12:7 are apparent sources for this view of Paul's health.

[167]For the parchments 2 Tim 4:13. *ABarn* 6 does not state that Mark deserted Paul and Barnabas but that he stayed behind. His object was to sail to the west (Rome?) but this was vetoed by the Spirit.

repentance did not sway the rather rigid apostle Paul. When new plans are discussed Barnabas promotes Cyprus, while Lucius suggests Cyrene, but Paul is bound by a vision for Jerusalem. Barnabas suggests that they winter in Cyprus and visit Jerusalem at Easter.

The result is a "great contention,"[168] considerably exacerbated by Barnabas's wish to take Mark, a plan Paul finds utterly unacceptable. In the end matters are patched up with the assistance of prayers and visions. Barnabas bids Paul, whom he will not see again, farewell and departs for Cyprus.[169]

The balance of the book concerns their mission in Cyprus. Barnabas is equipped with texts given by his friend Matthew, "a book of the voice of God and a narrative of miracles and teachings" (15). Barnabas is described as healing the sick and ordaining a bishop. Major obstacles are pagan festivals[170] and Jews, the latter led by an old acquaintance: Bar-Jesus, who no longer has the visual difficulties imposed by Paul.[171] At Salamis Barnabas unrolls the scroll provided by Matthew and teaches in the synagogue (22). The upshot of this is a brutal execution and the burning of even his bones (23). Mark and other believers rescue the dust from its planned destruction and deposit this, together with the documents provided by Matthew (24-25). Our narrator then departs for Alexandria.

Although both works have local ecclesiological aims and both close with reference to apostolic relics, *ABarn* says almost nothing of Barnabas's travels and labors prior to the point at which he sails off the map of canonical Acts (15:39). The major canonical resource is Acts, with some borrowings from epistles. The principle issue in the first part of the work is the separation of Paul and Barnabas. Somewhat surprisingly, the quarrel is not glossed over. In this case there is an account of "the contendings of the apostles" with one another. Paul bears the onus in a characterization that is quite probably meant to be humorous.[172] He did not wish to return to Cyprus and must bear the brunt of this

---

[168]Cf. Acts 15:39.

[169]The depiction of Barnabas in this section is borrowed from the characterization of Paul in Acts 20-21.

[170]One of these is particularly offensive in that it includes a race performed by a number of naked men and women (19). Barnabas rebukes this abomination, causing the collapse of the western part of something that leaves many dead and injured and the rest seeking refuge in the Temple of Apollo. At the time of composition many of the old festivals probably survived in secularized form--although a contest like that described is rather unlikely.

[171]Cf. Acts 13:6-13.

[172]de Santos Oro notes that a number Greek mss. and versions lack the description of Mark's penance and Paul's rejection of it (chs. 6-7). This evidently embarrassed at least some copyists with its apparent rejection of penance and harsh characterization of Paul.

decision. Some of his qualities are transferred to Barnabas. The latter can, to all intents, found the church in Cyprus, a view that may be supported from Acts 13, which does not speak of communities. Salamis has the remains of its true apostolic founder.

Conclusion

Ecclesiastical competition, which included questions of jurisdiction, encouraged a creative use of the canonical Acts, which could be quarried, supplemented, or silently altered to suit the claims of rival apostles. *ATit* reduces Barnabas to a cipher while *ABarn* lends its hero some of Paul's virtues and denigrates even "the apostle" in order to highlight its hero. These "minor acts" provide both glimpses into the use of sources and data about the reception and transformation of the various Acts in the centuries after their composition. Reverence for canonical texts, "simple piety," and source-limitations alone do not account for the varied fate of apocrypha.

"Who is wise and understanding among you?" (James 3:13).
An analysis of wisdom, eschatology and apocalypticism in the Epistle of James.

Patrick J Hartin
Gonzaga University, Spokane

Much recent research has focused on the traditions of wisdom, eschatology and apocalyptic, especially as they relate to genre (Nickelsburg 1994:715-732). These examinations have argued that such terms do not refer to neatly defined genres as was once thought. Instead, their interrelationship has been the subject of much investigation (Collins 1993:165-185).

This present examination focuses on the Epistle of James and examines its relationship to the three traditions of Wisdom, eschatology and apocalyptic. Can this epistle shed any light upon the relationships between these different traditions? Reference will also be made to the Epistle of Enoch (1 Enoch 92-105) as a help to identify these relationships.

I. Traditions reflected in the Epistle of James

A. Wisdom traditions reflected in the text

Israelite wisdom traditions give evidence of a twofold area of concern: namely the presentation of ethical admonitions and advice, as well as an attempt to reflect upon the nature of wisdom. This wisdom tradition shows that Israel is a daughter of the Middle East for it binds her to her neighbors in its form, structure, and even content. This tradition perseveres in the period between the two testaments and is responsible for the production of more writings which bridge the gap between the two testaments.

A twofold development can be observed within Israelite wisdom thinking (Crenshaw 1976:24-26). The first stage revolved around the notion that the fear of the Lord was the beginning of wisdom. The path to acquiring wisdom is through the acceptance of God, through adherence to the covenant faith. The second stage battles with the question of how knowledge, derived from the realm of human wisdom, can be given the quality of truth. To bridge the gap, as it were, between the divine and the human, the wise postulated the personified figure of wisdom. This heavenly figure dwells in their midst and is responsible for enlightening the minds of the wise.[1] These two aspects of wisdom form the focus of attention throughout the wisdom thinking of the Hebrew writings, namely the ethical way of life demanded by wisdom and the personification of wisdom itself.

The Epistle of James is to be viewed against this two-sided concern of wisdom to see how it situates itself in this perspective. Attention will be given to both dimensions, namely (a) the relationship of wisdom and ethics, and (b) the nature of wisdom.

1. The relationship of wisdom and ethics

Some wisdom literature, in particular the books of Proverbs, Qoheleth, and Ben Sirach, aims at providing instruction for the art of living, or the mastery of life itself. The ethical teaching of the wisdom writings has as their goal the leading of a happy existence under the sovereignty of God. This provides the context for all ethical teaching and James, as a wisdom

[1] Ben Sirach takes the personification a step forward when Wisdom is seen to dwell above all in Israel. This is achieved through the identification of Wisdom and Torah (Crenshaw 1976:25).

writing, can only be fully appreciated and understood against this background. In James[2] the ethical is expressed by means of specific forms that owe their origin to the Hebrew tradition. Among these forms in which the wisdom advice is presented are the following:

a. Wisdom sayings

A wisdom saying arises from experience and draws a conclusion from this experience. Very often it entails giving advice on how to lead one's life. James contains numerous examples of such wisdom sayings.[3] For example: "For judgment will be without mercy to anyone who has shown no mercy; mercy triumphs over judgment" (James 2:13).[4]

Most often these wisdom statements conclude a pericope by reinforcing the argument. For example: "And a harvest of righteousness is sown in peace for those who make peace" (3:18).[5] This saying brings together the thought development in this pericope: the gift of wisdom produces the gift of righteousness which is illustrated by peace. At the same time this saying bridges the gap to the next pericope: chapter 3 concludes with a reference to peace, while chapter 4 opens with the question on the origins of conflicts: "These conflicts and disputes among you, where do they come from?" (4:1).

b. Wisdom admonitions

Admonitions lay emphasis on the didactic element and call for obedience to and implementation of the advice. Usually a reason is added to support this admonition. They are eminently suited to the wisdom style that offers practical advice to its readers. James finds this form to be the most appropriate way to express his paraenetical advice. For example:

* "My brothers and sisters, whenever you face trials of any kind, consider it nothing but joy" (1:2). This passage continues with numerous other admonitions: "and let endurance have its full effect, so that you may be mature and complete, lacking in nothing" (1:4); "If any of you is lacking in wisdom, ask God, who gives to all generously and ungrudgingly, and it will be given you" (1:5); "But, ask in faith, never doubting, for the one who doubts is like a wave of the sea, driven and tossed by the wind" (1:6).

* James 1:19-27 contains a series of admonitions that revolve around the threefold saying: "Let everyone be quick to listen, slow to speak, slow to anger" (1:19).[6] This pericope considers each one of these phrases which give rise to admonitions.

* James 4:7-10 contains ten imperatives that include related admonitions: "Submit yourselves therefore to God. .....Humble yourselves before the Lord, and he will exalt you." All the admonitions are contained between these parallel admonitions to submit to God.

* The Epistle of James ends with various admonitions on such themes as not taking oaths; the exhortation to prayer; and finally concluding with the admonition: "You should know that whoever brings back a sinner from wandering will save the sinner's soul from death and will cover a multitude of sins" (5:20). By following these admonitions and the way of life that this epistle outlines, the reader can hope for salvation.

---

[2]For the sake of brevity I shall simply refer to the Epistle of James, as James. By using the designation "James" I do not mean to imply anything about the identity of the author.

[3]Dibelius, in his commentary on James (1975), argued that these were isolated sayings that did not fit into their context. Originally these sayings might have been independent, but James has carefully brought them together as an intimate part of the context.

[4]Dibelius (1975:147) argues that this is "an isolated saying" that has no connection with the themes of the section preceding it. A close examination of this passage, however, shows that this verse does form an essential part of the context where it summarizes the main argument of the pericope, namely not to show partiality in one's actions.

[5]Other similar sayings are : "For just as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is also dead" (2:26). "For where there is envy and selfish ambition, there will also be disorder and wickedness of every kind" (3:16); "And a harvest of righteousness is sown in peace for those who make peace" (3:18).

[6]Dibelius (1975:109-110) has argued that this three-part saying is constituted from traditional wisdom sayings.

A twofold perspective emerges from this examination. A focus on the present shows the readers the type of life they are to lead now. Secondly, a vision onto the future looks toward the attainment of salvation. Noteworthy is the appropriation of a new dimension into traditional wisdom reflection: the world view of wisdom has been broadened to include the eschatological dimension.[7]

c. Beatitudes

The beatitude is a form common to wisdom literature. In comparing the form of the beatitude in the Old Testament[8] with that in the New Testament, one striking difference emerges. In the New Testament the perspective has changed from the blessing conferred in the present, to one that awaits a fulfillment in the future eschatological age (Hauck 1967:367).[9]

There are two occasions where the word *μακάριος* occurs in the Epistle of James.

* James 1:12: *Μακάριος ἀνὴρ ὃς ὑπομένει πειρασμόν, ὅτι δόκιμος γενόμενος λήμψεται τὸν στέφανον τῆς ζωῆς ὃν ἐπηγγείλατο τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν.* In this beatitude[10] the eschatological dimension dominates and transforms this wisdom form. The wisdom statement is referred to the future, producing a definite contrast between present and future. An eschatological correlative is evident here: the blessedness projected onto the future stands in opposite correlation to what is experienced in the present. The promise is made to those who endure trial now that they will inherit "the crown of life." In this there is a closeness to the expression of the beatitudes in the Sayings Gospel Q as well as in the Book of Revelation, where they occur within an eschatological framework (Hauck 1967:367-370).

* James 1:25: *ὁ δὲ παρακύψας εἰς νόμον τέλειον τὸν τῆς ἐλευθερίας καὶ παραμείνας, οὐκ ἀκροατὴς ἐπιλησμονῆς γενόμενος ἀλλὰ ποιητὴς ἔργου, οὗτος μακάριος ἐν τῇ ποιήσει αὐτοῦ ἔσται.* The word *μακάριος* occurs again, but this time it is used not in the form of a beatitude, but rather as an adjectival description. The blessing refers to the future: one's present actions bring the promise of future blessings. Again the perspective is that of the eschatological correlative.[11]

These two occurrences of *μακάριος* in James show clearly the eschatological correlation between the present and the future. The promise of blessedness is reserved for the future, to be attained as a consequence of what one does now,. This future lies in that realm of God's kingdom where those who are blessed will inherit "the crown of life." The eschatological provides the motivation for the present way of life. The wisdom advice and ethical exhortations are all governed by the eschatological perspective. The traditional wisdom world view taken over

---

[7]In James (as with the Sayings Gospel Q) the death and resurrection of Jesus does not influence the wisdom world view. Instead, the future, eschatological age exercises a specific impulse upon James.

[8]Although the literary form of a beatitude has been shown to be at home in both the Old Testament and the Greek worlds (Hauck 1967:362-364), it is really in the world of the Hebrew writings of the Old Testament and intertestamental period that the closest analogies are found.

[9]For example, in Ben Sirach 26:1 the blessing is clearly upon the present: "Happy is the husband of a good wife; the number of his days will be doubled." (See also Pr.14:21). Whereas the New Testament envisages the blessing largely for the future: "Blessed are you who are poor, for yours is the kingdom of God" (Lk 6:20).

[10]The structure conforms to the normal New Testament way of expressing the beatitude. (See for example the Beatitudes in Matthew 5:2-12 and Luke 6:20-23). *μακάριος* appears first, followed by the person who is considered blessed (in this instance the general expression *ἀνὴρ*), and then the reason for the blessedness is expressed (Hauck 1967:367).

[11]Hauck (1967:369) comments on these two verses in James 1:12 and 1:25: "Similarly, those who stand fast are called blessed in James 1:12, for their earthly endurance brings them eternal salvation. The thought of a sure reward is also present when the righteous doer is called blessed in James 1:25. In all these verses the light of future glory shines over the sorry present position of the righteous. Thus the New Testament beatitudes are not just intimations of the future or consolations in relation to it. They see the present in the light of the future."

from the Old Testament has now been injected with an eschatological world view that provides the overlay and the motivation for their actions in the present.

d. Woes

This literary form is evident in both the prophetic and wisdom traditions. The Epistle of James has brought this literary form into harmony with the wisdom tradition. Two examples are evident in the epistle:

* James 4:13-17 addresses a condemnation against false confidence. He opens this address with a call "Come now!" (Ἄγε νῦν).[12] He operates in the same way in which the prophets of the Old Testament presented their message.[13] They often directed their attacks outside of the community of Israel, with no real expectation that the nations whom they addressed would in fact turn from their ways. Instead, these attacks operate as a call for the people of Israel to heed the warnings and correct their way of life. James provides his readers with a teaching that calls for faith to be carried out in action. By putting their trust entirely in themselves, they reject God. A similar way of address is found in 1 Enoch in the context of a series of woes. In 94:1 Enoch speaks to his "sons", then in 94:8 he changes his address to embrace the rich: "Woe to you rich," and he continues with this second person address. The same change of address is observable between 95:3 and 96:1-3. In these passages the audience envisaged is the righteous and the suffering. But, within the same context an address is made to the rich and sinners: 95:1,2,4-7; 96,4-8 and 97:2-10. As in the Epistle of James, so here in 1 Enoch, a distinction is drawn between the community and those rich outside the community. The address to the rich outside the community acts more as a teaching for the members of the community of Enoch than as an appeal for the rich outside the community to change their way of life. While James is not attacking a specific incident within the community of his audience, he is warning them in prophetic style against an attitude evident within the world which they are to avoid. Faith and action are not to be separated.

A second woe (Ἄγε νῦν... James 5:1-6) follows immediately on the previous condemnation of those who fail to put their trust in God. The previous pericope emphasized the need to place trust solely in God. This pericope illustrates how the rich place their trust, not in God,

---

[12]A phrase not found elsewhere in the New Testament, apart from the beginning of the next chapter (James 5:1-6). While it is found elsewhere in Greek literature. (For example, in the diatribe, Epictetus 1.2.20; 1.6.37; 3.24.40; as well in as the Sybline Oracles 3:562) (Davids 1982:171), the form of this pericope is rather to be associated with the prophetic modes of address. As Dibelius (1975:231) says: "4:13-16 is delivered in the style of a prophetic address. The prophet cries out his words among the masses, unconcerned about whether his accusations reach the ears of those whom he accuses." I would see this expression (Ἄγε νῦν) corresponding to the prohetic form of address "Woe, to you..." (such as Isaiah 5:8ff).

[13]In the prophetic literature the criticisms are sharp. For example, Micah 6:11: "Can I tolerate wicked scales and a bag of dishonest weights?"; Amos 8:4-6: "Hear this, you that trample on the needy, and bring to ruin the poor of the land, saying, 'When will the new moon be over so that we may sell grain; and the sabbath, so that we may offer wheat for sale? We will make the ephah small and the shekel great, and practice deceit with false balances, buying the poor for silver, and the needy for a pair of sandals, and selling the sweepings of the wheat.'" Ezekiel singles out the great trading city of Tyre for condemnation: "Now you, mortal, raise a lamentation over Tyre, and say to Tyre, which sits at the entrance to the sea, merchant of the peoples on many coastlands" (27:1-36).

In the wisdom literature the accusations are equally forceful: Proverbs 20:23: "Differing weights are an abomination to the Lord; and false scales are not good." Ben Sirach devotes a series of chapters to the temptations that come from commerce (Sirach 26:29-29:28). He criticizes very sharply the way of life of the trader: "A merchant can hardly keep from wrongdoing, nor is a tradesman innocent of sin" (26:29).

The Book of Revelation continues this tradition of condemning merchants in the criticisms against Babylon: "And the merchants of the earth weep and mourn for her, since no one buys their cargo anymore, cargo of gold, silver, jewels, and pearls, fine linen, purple, silk and scarlet, all kinds of scented wood, all articles of ivory, all articles of costly wood, bronze, iron, and marble, cinnamon, spice, incense, myrrh, frankincense..." (18:11-13).

but in their riches. The eschatological references are much more specific and intense. In language that bears close similarities to the prophets, this pericope opens with a reference to "the miseries that are coming to you" (5:1) and continues with reference to "the last days" (5:3) that are graphically depicted as "a day of slaughter" (5:5). In contrast to the attitude of the rich stands the attitude of the righteous one who offers no resistance. The implication given is that the righteous will be justified in the eschatological age.[14] The eschatological perspective is pursued in the following pericope: "Be patient, therefore, beloved, until the coming of the Lord" (5:7-11).

In James wisdom emerges as a strategy wherein advice is offered to the hearer on how best to lead one's life. Faithful to this strategy James uses not just the wisdom tradition, but other traditions as well, namely the eschatological and the prophetic. By incorporating the eschatological and the prophetic world views within the wisdom perspective, the call to a specific way of life becomes all the more urgent. The eschatological provides the motivation: judgment in the future depends upon the way one leads one's life here and now. The use of prophetic imagery and terminology reinforces this urgency: "You have lived on the earth in luxury and in pleasure; you have fattened your hearts in a day of slaughter" (5:5).

e. Wisdom forms of comparison

The use of different forms of comparison is characteristic of all wisdom writing. The reader is actively involved in the processes of discovering the relationship intended by the speaker. The Epistle of James makes use of different types of comparison among which three are to be noted:

First, there is the simple contrast that calls the reader to adopt a specific action. "But ask in faith, never doubting, for the one who doubts is like a wave of the sea, driven and tossed by the wind" (1:6). "But, be doers of the word, and not merely hearers who deceive themselves" (1:22). "Adulterers! Do you not know that friendship with the world is enmity with God?" (4:4).

Secondly, there are explicit comparisons such as similes or metaphors that are characteristic of James's style of writing. "...for the one who doubts is like a wave of the sea, driven and tossed by the wind" (1:6); "...the rich will disappear like a flower in the field" (1:10); "It is the same with the rich; in the midst of a busy life, they will wither away" (1:11).

Finally, like the Gospels the Epistle of James also uses the parabolic method of comparison and instruction. Again the reader becomes actively involved in discovering the intended meaning.

* "For if any are hearers of the word and not doers, they are like those who look at themselves in a mirror; for they look at themselves and, on going away, immediately forget what they were like" (James 1:23-24). The comparison illustrates the need to put into action what has been heard: to be a doer of the word.

* "For if a person with gold rings and in fine clothes comes into your assembly, and if a poor person in dirty clothes also comes in..." (James 2:2-4). Discrimination on the basis of wealth is clearly condemned in this comparison.

* "If a brother or sister is naked and lacks daily food, and one of you says to them, 'Go in peace; keep warm and eat your fill,' and yet you do not supply their bodily needs, what is the good of that? So faith by itself, if it has no works, is dead" (James 2:15-17). By means of this parabolic illustration (Ropes 1916:206), James argues his wisdom perspective: faith must be put into action to be considered true faith.

These wisdom forms (sayings, admonitions, beatitudes, woes, and forms of comparison) all demonstrate the Epistle's firm roots in the wisdom tradition. At the same time wisdom functions as a strategy that integrates aspects taken from the prophetic and eschatological traditions in order to show how faith must give direction to action. I shall return below to draw out further the significance that the integration of the eschatological perspective within the wisdom

[14]The same promise is made to the righteous in 1 Enoch 92-105.

tradition had for James.

2. The nature of wisdom

The wisdom tradition going back to the Book of Proverbs (chapter 8) also demonstrates another development, namely a reflection upon the nature of wisdom itself, a speculation that would ultimately lead to a personification of wisdom. An aspect of this tradition is evident in James, though not as prominent as the practical aspect of wisdom. Two pericopes in James (1:5-8; and 3:13-18) offer a definite reflection on the nature of wisdom.

a. Wisdom as a gift from God (1:5-8)

In the spirit of absolute certainty in being heard, one approaches God to request God's wisdom. In contrast to this confidence appears the person who doubts, the one who is double-minded (δίψυχος) and unstable (ἀκατάστατος) (1:7-8). It is not acquired through self-realization, but comes from God in prayer. Wisdom is above all God's gift. "All wisdom is from the Lord, and with him it remains forever" (Sir 1:1).[15] James reflects this Jewish wisdom tradition that sees God as the giver of all wisdom, giving "generously and ungrudgingly" (1:5). The response to this belief requires one to pray in faith for what one needs. Again James is reliant upon the Jewish wisdom tradition that encourages constant prayer: "Do not grow weary when you pray" (Sir 7:10). This same thought reappears in James 5:16 "The prayer of the righteous is powerful and effective."

This request for the gift of wisdom must be viewed in the context of the previous pericope which called on the hearer to strive for perfection, a perfection that is the consequence of steadfastness: "and let endurance have its full effect, so that you may be mature and complete, lacking in nothing" (1:4). In this way James brings his thought to his intended climax. Effectively, James is saying: "Let steadfast endurance make you perfect" (Dibelius 1975: 74). The notion of perfection required the idea of wisdom in the underlying wisdom tradition: "For even one who is perfect among human beings will be regarded as nothing without the wisdom that comes from you" (Wis 9:6). For this reason James 1:2-4 is incomplete in that perfection demands a reference to the possession of wisdom. This is supplied by 1:5-8. Because wisdom is God's gift enabling one to stand the test, it is to be sought in prayer from God with firm confidence.[16]

b. The wisdom from above (3:13-18)

Elsewhere, I argued that this is the central pericope in the epistle, the other pericopes forming an embrace around it (Hartin 1991:29-32). This passage contains the most direct reflection on wisdom. A striking connection with the previous pericope (3:1-12)[17] appears through the parallelism in the opening of each pericope: 3:1 deals with the teacher διδάσκαλος, while 3:13 considers the σοφός. διδάσκαλος and σοφός stand in parallel fashion to each other. Both pericopes show concern with divisions within their ranks. In a sense teachers can be held responsible for starting or fuelling these disputes (3:1). At the same time in discussing the nature of wisdom James acknowledges that selfish ambition is the chief obstacle to obtaining wisdom. The teacher is the wise person: the διδάσκαλος becomes the σοφός. Mussner (1981:168-169) shows that this shift from διδάσκαλος to σοφός reflects the

---

[15]Cf also Sirach 1:26; 17:11; 24:2; 39:6. The Book of Wisdom also develops this perspective: "Therefore I prayed, and understanding was given me; I called on God, and the spirit of wisdom came to me" (Wis 7:7; cf also 8:21; 9:4).

[16]This is a clear illustration of the gospel tradition of "ask and it will be given you" (Luke 11:9).

[17]This is contrary to the position of Dibelius (1975:207) who states: "There is no indication of a connection with the preceding section, and the interpretation will reveal that there is no connection in thought either."

world of the first century CE where the two concepts were being used interchangeably.[18] The focus centers upon the wisdom from above. This section[19] unfolds in a threefold way:

First, James 3:13 presents the criterion for true wisdom and asks the question: "Who is wise and understanding?" While the phrase *"wise and understanding"* (*σοφὸς καὶ ἐπιστήμων*) does not occur in the rest of the New Testament, it is found frequently in the Septuagint (Davids 1982:150).[20] James argues that whoever makes a claim to be a leader in the church (*διδάσκαλος - σοφός*) must lead a life that demonstrates faith in action. In addition to the specific actions that are performed, the leader (*σοφὸς καὶ ἐπιστήμων*) will demonstrate a life led "with gentleness born of wisdom" (*ἐν πραΰτητι σοφίας*). The believer is challenged to see the cardinal virtue for life as consisting in "meekness" (especially in situations of strife) (Davids 1982:150).[21] For James the truly wise person (the true leader) is one whose life and actions are directed by the virtue of meekness. This sentence operates as a topic sentence for the rest of the vices and virtues that follow and it acts as a guiding force for each list.[22]

Secondly, James 3:14-16 gives a negative definition of a lifestyle led without wisdom. In this and the next section James contrasts two lifestyles: one led without wisdom (3:14-16) and one led with wisdom (3:17-18). The proper lifestyle of one who is wise excludes all bitter jealousy and selfish ambition (*ζῆλον πικρὸν ἔχετε καὶ ἐριθείαν*). James calls upon those who are filled with contentiousness to refrain from claiming inspiration from God's wisdom. They cannot possess God's wisdom if at the same time they are full of jealousy and cause dissensions.[23] On a number of occasions James teaches that true wisdom comes down from heaven (James 1:5; 1:17 and 3:17). In the Jewish wisdom tradition it was tantamount to an axiom that all true wisdom is divine in origin and comes down from heaven (Pr 2:6; 8:22-31; Sir 1:1-4;24:1-12; Wis 7:24-27; 9:4, 6, 9-18).

Finally, James 3:17-18 presents a positive definition of wisdom in describing the true wisdom from above (*ἄνωθεν σοφία*). James 1:17-19 helps to shed light upon the understanding of this text. "Every generous act of giving, with every perfect gift, is from above, coming down from the Father of lights, with whom there is no variation or shadow due to change" (James 1:17). In this context wisdom is the great gift that comes down from above (Davids 1982:88). This gift from above, this wisdom, results in the person receiving the word of truth (*λόγος ἀληθείας*) and becoming "a kind of first fruits of his creatures" (1:18). From the context it appears as a reference to Jewish-Christians as the first to be reborn in God's process of redemption.[24] The gift of God from above, of which the greatest is wisdom, results in a rebirth. "The word of truth" (*λόγος ἀληθείας*) (1:18) is referred to in 1:21 as the *ἔμφυτος λόγος*. Although the meaning of *ἔμφυτος* has been variously interpreted as inborn, innate, natural, the more commonly accepted translation is that of "implanted."[25] This implanting

---

[18]As Mussner (1981:168-169) says: "Weil im Spätjudentum der Lehrer (Rabbi) und der Weise fast identisch sind."

[19]I have examined this passage in detail in Hartin (1991:97-113). Here I wish to highlight some of the aspects of this investigation that have significance for this study.

[20]For example, Deut 1:13; 4:6; Sir 21:15; and Dan 1:4.

[21]This is a characteristic Christian virtue as can be seen from its appearance in almost every tradition of the New Testament (Gal 6:1; Eph 4:2; 2 Tim 2:25; Tit 3:2; 1 Pet 3:16; James 1:21).

[22]There is a striking parallel to this verse in Sirach 3:17: "My child, perform your tasks with humility; then you will be loved by those whom God accepts." Again James demonstrates that he lies close to the wisdom world view of Sirach which sees one's life directed by virtues such as meekness.

[23]As Dibelius (1975:210) states: "The boast which defies the truth is their claim of wisdom, for true wisdom cannot be contentious to be honest and to cease claiming inspiration from God's wisdom."

[24]See Davids 1982:89; Dibelius 1975:104-105; Mussner 1981:94-94; Adamson 1976:76-77.

[25]See Dibelius 1975:113; Davids 1982:95; Adamson 1976:98-100; Johnson 1995:202.

takes place through the proclamation of the Gospel.[26] With this as the wider context to 3:17 the wisdom from above appears not simply as a gift directed to a specific moral type of life, but as bringing with it regeneration and rebirth. The eschatological is already seen to have begun in that believers are promised the gift of wisdom that works in them a regeneration and makes of them "first fruits". The audience to whom James writes already now participate in the eschatological age announced by the prophets of old.

The promise of the fruit of righteousness for those who work for peace (3:18) is part of the promise of the wisdom that is from above. This promise occurs in an eschatological perspective (Hoppe 1977:67). All the ethical admonitions in this section are directed towards this eschatological gift of righteousness. The one who has lived by the qualities of wisdom will possess the fullness of the gift of righteousness in the life to come.

c. Significance of this investigation

James lies clearly within the wisdom tradition emanating from the Old Testament and the intertestamental writings whereby all true wisdom comes from above. In his reflection on the nature of wisdom James has emphasized the following aspects:

* it comes down from above from God;
* it is communicated to people as a result of their requests
* it brings with it the necessary virtues for leading a specific way of life
* above all it works rebirth and regeneration in the heart of the believer who becomes "a kind of first fruits of God's creatures" (1:18).

Characteristic of James' application of the wisdom tradition is the fact that he has broadened the perspective to incorporate consistently an eschatological perspective. Attention will now be given to the significance of this focus upon the eschatological to identify the purpose and effect that his broadening of the wisdom tradition had in the context of the Epistle of James.

B. The function of the eschatological in the Epistle of James

Eschatology provides the context for the teaching of this writing. Because James shares a common world view with his readers, he does not need to give a detailed explanation or description of this thought world (Davids 1982:39).[27] Instead, he presupposes it.

1. The present acts as the beginning of the end time

a. "To the twelve tribes in the Dispersion" (1:1)

The epistle opens with the address: "To the twelve tribes of the Dispersion" (1:1). The exact meaning is greatly disputed.[28] I think the best approach is to understand it in the context

---

[26]As Davids (1982:95) says: "Thus the God who regenerates (begets) the Christian by the word of truth, will save him by the same word implanted in him if he receives it."

[27]Davids (1982:39) goes on to argue that one can presume from this that James's readers must have had a certain apocalyptic understanding (similar to that found in 2 Thessalonians 2): "This community, like Paul's (cf. 2 Thessalonians 2), has seen to it that the apocalyptic teaching is among the basics of the faith. Without an appreciation of the foundational role this teaching played in the Christian world view of James's church, one could harldy understand the joy referred to in 1:2, 12. This is, as J. Thomas has aptly put it, *'eschatologische Vorfreude,'* anticipated joy in the face of trials because of the reward which one knows is fast approaching."

[28]See the different perspectives in, for example, Dibelius (1975:66-68); Laws (1980:47-49); Müssner (1981:11-12); Davids (1982:63-64); and Johnson (1995:169).

of the hope in the restoration of the twelve tribe kingdom of Israel.[29] This belief in the coming of the kingdom provided the motive for John the Baptist's call to repentance: "In those days, John the Baptist appeared in the wilderness of Judea proclaiming, 'Repent, for the kingdom of heaven has come near'" (Mt 3:1-2). In the context of the ever intensifying kingdom eschatology, the first generation Judean Church must have held similar views to those expressed by John. They, as well as John, were preparing the people for the dawn of a restored twelve tribe kingdom. It is for this purpose that the Gospel writers present Jesus appointing a group of twelve.

In the tradition of the Gospel of Matthew the importance of the twelve tribes emerges even more forcefully. Jesus has the exclusive task of reconstituting the twelve tribes of Israel. In Matthew 15:24 Jesus counters the shouting of the woman from Tyre and Sidon with the statement: "I was sent only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel." This passage conveys the belief that the Matthean community saw the gathering-in of the lost sheep of the house of Israel as a task of Jesus. When Jesus in turn commissioned the Twelve, he was in effect delegating this same task to them, namely, of gathering together the lost tribes.

The full eschatological understanding of the twelve tribes emerges in the final saying of the Sayings Gospel Q: "And I confer on you, just as my Father has conferred on me, a kingdom, so that you may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and you will sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel " (Lk 22:24-30//Mt 19:27-29). In this instance a future role is attributed to the twelve disciples, a role that shares in the role of the Son of Man and involves judging the twelve tribes: a task that includes the gathering-in of those who truly belong to the twelve tribes at the end of time.

In addressing his readers in this way, James is exercising the role of gathering-in the twelve tribes of Israel. James sees these Jewish Christians now as the true Israel for whose restoration the Jewish nation had been hoping for centuries. Now this hope is being realized. So the eschatological hope of Israel's past reaches fulfillment. The beginning of the end time occurs with this Jewish-Christian community which is the twelve-tribe people.[30]

b. "the first fruits of his creatures" (1:18)

Those who belong to this new Israel, the twelve tribes, are "the first fruits". The language and thought of creation permeate both this verse and the preceding one. Without doubt James has in mind the eschatological creation in which Jewish Christians are consciously conceived of as the first fruits (ἀπαρχή) of God's creatures. Here, we are in the context of creation, but creation conceived of as redemption, as a new creation. God's redemptive activity results in Jewish Christians becoming the first-fruits of God's creatures (κτισμάτων).[31] James 1:17

---

[29]Nathan, the prophet, promised King David that his kingdom would not end: "Your house and your kingdom shall be made sure forever before me; your throne shall be established forever" (2 Sam 7:16). The belief arose that the twelve tribe kingdom would continue for ever. This belief survived despite the destruction of both the northern and southern parts of the land of Israel. During the exile the prophets began to proclaim the return of the people and the restoration of the destroyed twelve tribe kingdom (for example, Ezekiel 37:19-24; Jeremiah 3:18; Sir 36:13 [MT]). This became a central conviction of Jewish eschatology and apocalyptic literature. The literature specific to the Qumran community also presupposes the restoration of the twelve tribe kingdom. It even plans the organization of the Qumran community, its battle order and the Temple, as if it were already a fact.

[30]In this sense I see the letter emerging from Palestine, from the Judean chruch, with the notion of the *diaspora* understood in its normal and natural way, namely referring to those areas outside the land of Palestine. This view differs from that of Dibelius (1975:66) who understood this term in a metaphorical sense by which Christians are identified as the true Israel whose real home is not here on earth, but in heaven, and that Christians on earth are living as it were in the diaspora. (This is the spirit in which 1 Peter addresses his readers in 1:1). However, because of the understanding of the Jewish Christian origin of this epistle and the notion of the "twelve tribes" as outlined above, I think it best to see the term diaspora being used in its original sense as a reference to "the true Israel (i.e. Jewish Christians) outside of Palestine (i.e. probably in Syria and Asia Minor)" (Davids 1982:64).

[31]The word κτίσμα is often used in the wisdom literature to refer to God's creatures (e.g. Wis 9:2; 13:5; 14:11; Sir 36:20).

referred to the "Father of Lights," which also has the creation in mind: God is the creator of the sun and moon.[32] As creator of the lights of heaven, God is different from creatures in that in God there is no variation: "In him there is no variation or shadow due to change" (1:17).

While using terminology related to creation, James has in mind the new creation which brings about a rebirth. The starting point for God's new creative activity lies with Jewish-Christians, but it is not intended to end there. It is meant to embrace ultimately all humanity (Mussner 1981:96). The "first-fruits" implies that others will follow. Once again the eschatological world view is basic to the understanding of the entire epistle. Addressed to those who are the first-fruits of this eschatological age, the epistle also looks forward to a future where this will be brought to fulfillment. Creation imagery is used to give further understanding to this eschatology.

2 The present acts as the preparation for the end time

The present is on the threshold of the end of history. The new age has begun to break in and that brings with it a tension between this world and the world that is ultimately to come (Davids 1982:38). James 5:7-11 captures this eschatological tension between the present and the future. This passage is rich in traditional eschatological images: the parousia of the Lord is near (*ἕως τῆς παρουσίας τοῦ κυρίου*) (5:8); the reader is exhorted to have patience in this intervening period before the coming of the Lord, which will usher in a period of judgment, for the "Judge is standing at the doors!" (5:9). The images of "the coming of the Lord" and the "Judge" are ones that belong to the eschatological world view.

The context of this passage focuses especially upon the judgment of the rich who have not recognized the imminent judgment. James 5:1-6 condemns the rich in true prophetic fashion for the way in which they have behaved: they "have laid up treasure for the last days" (5:3); they have amassed fortunes and have behaved as if they will last for ever; they have not realized that the "last days" have already broken upon the world; they have "fattened (their) hearts in a day of slaughter" (5:5).[33] Their actions have made them ready for the day of God's judgment.

This is the closest that James comes to the use of apocalyptic language. He uses it without emphasis and does not develop the descriptions that are so characteristic of apocalyptic. In the same context (5:17) James refers to another symbol that appears in the eschatological world view: namely, Elijah. According to the tradition Elijah is due to return before the end of the world.[34] However, James focuses not on the eschatological, but on Elijah as a "human being like us" (5:17). The biblical picture had showed Elijah as a man of prayer, a man whose prayer had powerful effects (1 Kings 18:36-40): it is to this James draws attention. James turns away from apocalyptic speculations to focus upon a human quality that speaks more vividly to his readers.

The awaited "coming of the Lord" brings both judgment and salvation: judgment against those who have failed to follow the right path (chief among these are the rich); and salvation

---

[32]Genesis 1:14-15 speaks of the lights of the heavens: "Let there be lights in the dome of the sky to separate the day from the night; and let them be for signs and for seasons and for days and years, and let them be lights in the dome of the sky to give light upon earth." A similar expression to *πατὴρ τῶν φώτων* appears in the Armenian translation of the Apocalypse of Moses 36:38; in Job 38:28 there is reference to *ὑετοῦ πατήρ* ("the father of the rain"); in Philo, De spec.leg I,96 reference is made to the "father of the kosmos" (*τῷ τοῦ κόσμου πατρί*): and in the Testament of Abraham 7:6 reference is to the "father of the light" (*πατὴρ τοῦ φοτός*).

[33]This phrase "a day of slaughter " (*ἐν ἡμέρα σφαγῆς*) belongs to that prophetic tradition where God's judgment is viewed as a day of slaughter for God's enemies (for example: Is 34:5-8; Jer 46:10). What is also significant is that Enoch explicitly connects the judgment of the rich to such a day: "You ... have become ready for the day of slaughter, and the day of darkness and the day of the great judgment" (1 Enoch 94:9; 97:8-10; 99:15).

[34]Thus Elijah prepares the people of God for the last time" (Jeremias 1964:934).

for those who are patient (chief among these are the poor). The themes of judgment and salvation run like threads throughout the letter. Negatively, the theme of judgment sees the rich fading away like the flowers in the field (1:10); in the middle of life they wither away (1:11). Positively, this letter promises a "crown of life" (1:12) for those who love God. It promises as well to those who are poor that they will be "heirs of the kingdom" (2:5). Finally, those who are sick acquire the eschatological gift of the forgiveness of sins (5:15). In effect the Epistle of James shows that the whole life of the believer is orientated towards a future with an eschatological end resulting in either salvation (life) or judgment (condemnation).

3 Eschatology and ethics

a. The eschatological motivation

James has used the eschatological perspective as the motivation for his wisdom advice: perfection is the ultimate aim towards which all ethical action is directed, a perfection that is attained only at the "coming of the Lord."[35] On the negative side judgment acts as a caution. The teacher is warned: "for you know that we who teach will be judged with greater strictness" (3:1). Believers are cautioned against acting as a judge of one's neighbor in the present, because this will fuel their own judgment in the future: "There is one lawgiver and judge who is able to save and to destroy. So who, then, are you to judge your neighbor?" (4:12). The correct use of the tongue is also stressed (3:5-10), as is the correct usage of the taking of oaths "that you may not you fall under condemnation" (5:12).

On the positive side the eschatological motivation provides certain promises:

* Those who withstand temptation are promised "the crown of life" (1:12).

* Those who persevere "will be blessed in their doing" (1:25).

* Those who put faith into action, who produce a faith that is alive, will be justified: "You see a person is justified by works and not by faith alone" (2:24).

* Those who bring back "a sinner from wandering will save the sinner's soul from death and will cover a multitude of sins" (5:20).

* Those who are "the poor in the world..." will be "heirs of the kingdom that he has promised to those who love him" (2:5).

* Part of the eschatological context of the ethical admonitions is that it provides an encouragement to patient endurance: "Be patient, therefore, beloved, until the coming of the Lord" (5:7). James links encouragement to endure with eschatological hope.

4 An apocalyptic eschatology?

James' world view sees God both as the creator of the world, "the Father of lights" (1:17) as well as the judge at the end of the world, "the Lord of hosts" (5:4). A dualism also appears whereby the world of demons opposes the world of God: "You believe that God is one; you do well. Even the demons believe - and shudder" (2:19).[36]

How apocalyptic is the eschatological language of James? The clearest indication of the apocalyptic imagination is found in the two passages examined earlier (James 5:1-6 and 5:7-

---

[35]Throughout the letter James issues a call to perfection. He opens the letter with the call: "let endurance have its full effect (τέλειον), so that you may be mature (τέλειοι) and complete, lacking in nothing" (1:4). The perfection to which James calls his readers is not a perfection that is acquired in the Stoic way of "natural" perfection, worked by one's own actions (Mussner 1981:210). Instead, it is to be viewed in the eschatological sense in that it is something that only comes to fullness in the future. One's life in the present is meant to be led in such a way that one aims toward that perfection. For this reason all the ethical instructions within the letter are embraced by the eschatological. It has been described as an "*Interimsethik*" (Mussner 1981:210) - a way of life for the present which is on its way to fulfillment in the fullness of the eschatological age.

[36]This is an interesting reference by James. He does not go out of his way to explain himself - he simply introduces a reference to the demons, which shows that it forms part of the world view that he shares with his readers, a world view that is not always made explicit.

11). James 5:1-6 has the picture of the destruction of those who have persecuted God's faithful ones. The language comes closest to that of the apocalyptic world view - there are references to miseries that are about to occur (5:1); the destruction of wealth (5:2-3); the cries of the innocent reaching the Lord of hosts (5:4); the day of destruction being referred to as a "day of slaughter" (5:5). James 5:7-11 refers to "the coming of the Lord" (mentioned twice in 5:7 and 8) that is viewed as a time of judgment: "the Judge is standing at the doors" (5:9). Apocalyptic language and imagery is evident behind these passages of James. But, they are presented in a much more restrained way than one sees expressed in the apocalyptic writings such as Daniel and Revelation.

In encouraging people to persevere amidst trials and temptations (1:12) James does not give any detailed description of what the trials actually are, as tends to occur in the graphic descriptions that traditional apocalyptic imagination gives to the sufferings and persecutions of the righteous (Laws 1980:28). James is far more restrained. The trials and sufferings he has in mind are the more ordinary or daily ones.[37] For example, James 1:27 refers to the affliction of widows and orphans by using the term θλῖψις (affliction). This is a technical term occurring in apocalyptic literature for the sufferings of the eschatological age.[38] James, however, does not focus upon its possible apocalyptic setting. Instead he places it within the context of the sufferings of the widow and the orphan. Why is there this change? It appears to be a deliberate reinterpretation of the tradition in order to show that the present events are indeed signs of the coming end. James reinterprets the everyday sufferings of those most abandoned in society as the signs that the end is rapidly approaching.[39]

Eschatology is essential to the Epistle of James for it makes of the letter more than just a collection of paraenetical wisdom sayings, as Dibelius was want to categorize it (Dibelius 1975:3-4). It is my contention that James is aware of the apocalyptic imagination - it is part of the thought patterns that he shares with his contemporaries and in particular with his readers.

---

[37]As Laws (1980:28) says: "James gives no indication in i.2 of the nature of the 'various kinds of trials' to be encountered, but his examples of endurance of v.7, the farmer, and v.11, Job, suggest that he thinks of the everyday difficulties facing the individual rather than of a particular crisis..."

[38]Schlier (1972:139-148) argues that this term in the Septuagint has acquired a "theological significance from the fact that it predominantly denotes the oppression and affliction of the people of Israel or of the righteous who represent Israel" (1972:142). In the New Testament the same term is adopted with theological significance to refer to sufferings now endured by the Christian church in the eschatological age: "If we thus see that it belongs to the nature of θλῖψις in the NT, first, that it is inseparable from Christian life in this world, and secondly, that it is the suffering of Christ, who is afflicted in His members, a third characteristic is that this is eschatological tribulation" (1972:144). Attention is drawn in the New Testament usage of this term especially to the sufferings that occur prior to the parousia (Mt 24:21 speaks of the sufferings of the disciples prior to the end).

The Book of Revelation sees the sufferings and tribulations of the present as already being experienced and marking the beginning of the end: Ἐγω Ἰωάννης, ὁ ἀδελφὸς ὑμῶν καὶ συγκοινωνὸς ἐν τῇ θλίψει... (1:9).

It is against this background that the usage of θλῖψις in James is to be understood. Most commentators ignore this background to this usage in James (for example, Johnson [1995:212] who says: "There is no need to look beyond the chronic condition of the orphans and widows for a suitable definition of *thlipsis*." Laws (1980:28), however, draws attention to this usage of θλῖψις. She later (1980:89) adds: "...elsewhere in the NT the noun thlipsis has almost the status of a technical term for the sufferings that precede the End, the 'Messianic Woes', e.g. Mk xiii.19; 2 Thess i.4; Rev. ii.22; cf Dan xii.1; Hermas, Vis.ii.2.7. In Col.i.24 Paul seems to see his own sufferings as contributing to the thlipseis tou Christou, the 'Messiah's affliction' which his people must bear."

[39]Laws (1980:90) examines the reason for this shift in the usage of the term thlipsis and she concludes to two possible reasons for this change: "It could be that he is trying to dispense with the old eschatological ideas, finding them no longer appropriate.... Alternatively James may be trying to keep the expectation alive and real in a situation where the traditional 'signs' are conspicuously lacking, and in that attempt he carries out a deliberate reinterpretation of the nature of the signs."

However, James tends to distance himself from this imagination for two reasons: First of all, the usual apocalyptic signs of the end are missing. James is convinced that the eschatological age is upon them with the "Judge standing at the doors!" (5:9); however, those elements that belong to a truly apocalyptic era are absent. This leads James to a reinterpretation of the apocalyptic signs. The ordinary sufferings of the present are reinterpreted as signs of the end - such as the tribulations afforded the widow and orphan, as well as the trials faced by every brother and sister: "My brothers and sisters, whenever you face trials of any kind, consider it nothing but joy" (1:2).

Secondly, despite the view that the coming age does bring with it judgment, the ethos of the whole epistle is that this coming age is to be approached not with fear and trepidation, but with joy and happiness as the letter itself opens: "Count is all joy" (Πᾶσαν χαρὰν ἡγήσασθε, ἀδελφοί μου...1:2). For those who adopt the wisdom exhortations of James there is hope, joy, peace and perfection - with nothing to fear. The traditional apocalyptic description of the destruction of the wicked is absent from James - in its place stands the positive challenge that the writer lays before his readers to endure amidst the sufferings and persecutions of this age. The focus rests on the future hope: "the Lord of glory" (2:1) who provides the "crown of life" (1:12), rather than on dread and fear of judgment.

II. The Epistle of Enoch and the Epistle of James

The Epistle of Enoch (1 Enoch 92-105)[40] bears a number of similarities to the Epistle of James. An examination of these similarities may help to further specify the character of the Epistle of James in so far as it relates to the traditions of wisdom, prophecy, eschatology and apocalyptic. The following characteristics may be observed:

First, the Epistle of Enoch is presented as a letter that is addressed from the ancient "patriarch" Enoch to "all the offspring that dwell upon the earth, and for the latter generations which uphold uprightness and peace" (1 Enoch 92:1).[41] This bears a counterpoint to the Epistle of James, which as a letter is addressed from James, a "patriarch" in early Christianity, to "the twelve tribes in the dispersion". In a sense the addressees are analogous: while Enoch is addressed to all his spiritual descendants throughout time and the world (Nickelsburg 1992:511), James is addressed to Jewish Christians, the spiritual descendants of Israel throughout the world. In effect the intention is the same: to offer advice on how to lead their lives.

Secondly, throughout both epistles lies the contrast between the righteous and sinners and the respective judgments that await them in the future. "Now, my children, I say to you: Love righteousness and walk therein! For the ways of righteousness are worthy of being embraced; (but) the ways of wickedness shall soon perish and diminish" (1 Enoch 94:1). Likewise James states: "You do well if you really fulfill the royal law according to the scripture, 'You shall love your neighbor as yourself.' But if you show partiality, commit sin and are convicted by the law as transgressors..." (James 2:8-9). However, while in James there is reference to judgment, there is no detailed description of the judgment as occurs in 1 Enoch (92-105).

---

[40]1 Enoch is an interesting literary collection developing over a long period of time. Nickelsburg (1991:51) estimates that it spanned more than three centuries. Not only is it a collection of different texts, but it is also a collection of different traditions that have been forged into a unity: "Nonetheless, *1 Enoch* is a consciously shaped compilation of traditions and texts, and it is appropirate to search for internal points of commonality (apart from Enochic attribution in most cases) in which the compilers and editors saw the potential for a unity comprised of diversity" (Nickelsburg 1991:52). In particular it provides a good example of the development of traditions, forms and genres during the intertestamental period as no extant piece of literature does. In this sense it occupies a unique position.

[41]The translation of 1 Enoch that I quote here is that of Charlesworth 1993:5-89.

Thirdly, the major similarity between 1 Enoch (92-105) and the Epistle of James is that they both employ many of the same literary forms in their composition. Nickelsburg (1981:146) has shown that 1 Enoch (92-105) uses three major literary forms throughout:[42]

A. Woes

The form of woes presents the charge of evil against sinners as well as the impending judgment they can expect. For example,

"Woe unto those who build oppression and injustice!
Who lay foundations for deceit.
They shall soon be demolished" (1 Enoch 94:6).

While some of the woes are directed against those who abandon the teachings of the Torah, the majority concerns those who fail in social demands (Nickelsburg 1981:147). A particular concern is expressed for the way in which the rich abuse the poor.

The occurrence of the woe is not as marked in the Epistle of James as it is in 1 Enoch (92-105). As has already been indicated, the Epistle of James contains two only "woes" (James 4:13-17; 5:1-6). James's concern is largely of a social nature and in particular with the way the rich have mistreated the poor. Judgment and destruction also await them in the future.[43] In the condemnation of the rich James and 1 Enoch (92-105) share some close similarities. For both the rich are guilty of oppressing the poor, who are identified as the "righteous" (James 5:6; 1 Enoch 96:7-8). A divine punishment will ultimately be carried out against the rich.

B. Exhortations

These express a call to the righteous to persevere in the life of courage and peace that they are leading:

"Be hopeful, you righteous ones, for the sinners shall soon perish
from before your presence.
You shall be given authority upon them,
such (authority) as you may wish to have" (1 Enoch 96:1).

The Epistle of James is essentially a series of admonitions and advice on how to lead one's life. While the material in James in largely composed of exhortations, 1 Enoch (92-105) contains far more woes than exhortations.

C. Descriptions of judgment

In 1 Enoch (92-105) passages of judgment are generally introduced by expressions such as "In those days" and they show their similarity to the prophets (Nickelsburg 1981:148). For example:

"In those days, the prayers of the righteous ones shall reach unto the Lord;
but for all of you, your days shall arrive.
He shall read aloud regarding every aspect of your mischief,
in the presence of the Great Holy One.

---

[42]"This central part of the epistle is comprised almost entirely of three liteary forms well known from the biblical tradition, especially from the prophets" (Nickelsburg 1981:146). I refer to those literary forms identified by Nickelsburg in order to compare the Epistle of James in this regard.

[43]James 5:5 condemns the rich for having "fattened your hearts in a day of slaughter." 1 Enoch uses a similar image: "Woe unto you, O rich people... In the days of your affluence, you committed oppression, you have become ready for death, and for the day of darkness and the day of great judgment" (1 Enoch 94:8-9).

Then your faces shall be covered with shame,
and he will cast out every deed which is built upon oppression" (1 Enoch 97:5-6).

James on the other hand does not enter into descriptions of judgment. Instead the epistle is content with focusing on the present and issuing warnings to sinners, rather than giving detailed descriptions of what punishments lie ahead. Here James seems to lie closer to the wisdom tradition where forms of comparison dominate.

The above examination shows that both Enoch[44] and James use traditional material that is at home both in the prophetic and in the wisdom traditions, yet they use them in different ways and in different degrees. Woes and admonitions/exhortations occur in both traditions, as is evidenced in Ben Sirach (2:12-14; 41:8) as well as the prophets. 1 Enoch 92-105 gave more emphasis to the woes, while James made more use of the form of the exhortation and admonitions. Both demonstrate that a clear distinction between prophetic and wisdom traditions at the time of composition of these texts was non existent (Nickelsburg 1977:327). In effect for Enoch (92-105) the wise and the righteous are identical.[45] James too is interested in calling his readers to become wise: "Who is wise and understanding among you?" (James 3:13). For James the wise and the teacher are identical.

However, the major difference between the Epistle of Enoch and the Epistle of James lies in the focus that Enoch places upon the revelation of the future that acts as a comfort for those suffering now. The imminent future day of judgment is the revealed message that Enoch (92-105) communicates to his readers, a day that will overcome injustice and bring the righteous to happiness (1 Enoch 102:1; 103:1-3). This revealed message shines through both the prophetic and wisdom traditions used by Enoch and in turn brings Enoch into the orbit of the apocalyptic genre. It is especially the claim to the revelation of the heavenly realm and the future that produces its apocalyptic connections (1 Enoch 97:6). The apocalyptic genre becomes more obvious from the context in which 1 Enoch 92-105 occurs: the Apocalypse of Weeks (93:1-10; 91:11-17) appears within this section (92-105), while the visions of the other world in chapters 1-36 provide further justification for the revelatory message that Enoch proclaims.[46]

Nickelsburg (1977:326) describes the genre of 1 Enoch 92-105 in this way:

> "Wherein does Enoch 92-105 cohere? How does the author perceive reality, and indeed his writing, within that context? I should express the message pervading the whole of these chapters as follows:
>
> > The revelation of God's unseen world and future paradoxically calls the oppressed community to faith, courage, and joy in the present.
>
> The centrality of revelation to these chapters makes the adjective 'apocalyptic' altogether appropriate as a description of the author's message."

Not having the wider context that 1 Enoch 92-105 is able to embrace, the Epistle of James does not contain the strong descriptive revelation of the future judgment (as Enoch has) that gives meaning to the present. Belief in a future judgment operates in James as an explanation for the way in which one should conduct one's life now in the immediate expectation of the "coming of the Lord." James 5:1-11 provides the future climax which gives meaning to the present. However, in comparing the reference to judgment in James and 1 Enoch 92-105,

---

[44]When using the designation "Enoch" in this context, I have the Epistle of Enoch (92-105) in mind.

[45]1 Enoch 104:12 "Again know another mystery!: that to the righteous and the wise shall be given the Scriptures of joy, for truth and great wisdom."

[46]As Nickelsburg (1981:149) says: "The epistle of Enoch is similar to other apocalyptic writings in the kind of situation it presumes, the message it conveys, and the purpose for which it was written. The author exhorts his readers to steadfastness on the basis of a revealed message about an imminent judgment that will remove oppression and adjudicate injustice. This work shares with the apocalypses we have treated the claim that it is an ancient writing intended for latter-day readers. It differs from them in form. Although it contains a brief, sketchy apocalypse, as a whole it is not an ordered account of events to come."

what is notable is that in James no description is given to this future judgment that will befall the righteous and the sinner (as occurs in Enoch).

This examination of 1 Enoch (92-105) is most helpful in throwing light upon the nature of the Epistle of James. The most noteworthy difference is that revelation, so central to 1 Enoch, is absent from the Epistle of James. It is precisely this aspect of "revelatory literature" that separates the Epistle of James from the apocalyptic genre. The definition of the genre of an apocalypse, as given by Collins (1992:4), is worth noting as further support for showing that James does not conform to the genre of an apocalypse: "An apocalypse is defined as: a genre of revelatory literature with a narrative framework, in which a revelation is mediated by an otherworldly being to a human recipient, disclosing a transcendent reality which is both temporal, insofar as it envisages eschatological salvation, and spatial insofar as it involves another, supernatural world."[47]

Essential to this definition is the notion that "revelation" is the distinguishing mark of this type of writing. According to this perspective, then, the Epistle of James does not belong to this category. It has no concern with a revelation of the future or the heavenly world; its attention is directed specifically to the present. There is no narrative framework given to the epistle, neither is their any supernatural being present that mediates the transcendent world.

This is not to deny that the future does operate in James as a call to the present. To paraphrase Nickelsburg (1977:326) one can say: "In the Epistle of James the future calls the oppressed community to faith, courage and joy in the present." However, there is no "revelation of God's unseen world" as there is in Enoch. The coming of the Lord is imminent, but there is no description of that coming, nor of what the world will be like after that coming. It is presented as an event in the immediate future, but James does not speculate on it, nor does he give information about it. While the context of the audience of James does include situations of oppression and affliction, the exhortations and wisdom comparisons give a picture of a community that needs to be reminded of the importance of putting faith into action, of fulfilling the law of love, of bridling the tongue, and so forth.

On the other hand one cannot claim that James is generically pure. While the imagery of Daniel or Revelation is lacking in James, nevertheless the world of James is a world that is dominated by evil to the extent that James defines religion as keeping oneself "unstained by the world" (1:27). The future does operate as the motivation for the way one leads one's life in the present. The future proclaims the imminent coming of the Lord, as the "Judge standing at the doors!" (5:9).

Because revelation does not function in the Epistle of James in the same was as it does in the Epistle of Enoch, and because any imagery or language of apocalyptic in James is relatively low key, James cannot be classified as an apocalypse. While James bears some characteristics in common with the Epistle of Enoch, this aspect of revelation provides the dividing line separating James from "apocalyptic". In this way the Epistle of Enoch has helped to give further clarity about the nature of the Epistle of James and its relations to the wisdom, prophetic, eschatological and apocalyptic traditions.

---

[47]While universal agreement is far from having being achieved in providing a definition of "apocalyptic genre", there are some aspects that are seen as vital in establishing such a definition. It is judged to belong to that wider category of writing, known as revelatory writing (Hellholm 1991:146; Collins 1991:11-12). Collins further clarifies his definition when he says: "I would now accept the amendment to the definition of the genre offered in *Semeia* 36, in the light of the suggestions of Hellholm and Aune: an apocalypse is 'intended to interpret present earthly cirucumstances in the light of the supernatural world and of the future, and to influence both the understanding and the behavior of the audience by means of divine authority' (A Yarbro Collins, 'Introduction: Early Christian Apocalypticism,' *Semeia* 36 (1986), 7)" (Collins 1991:19).

III. Conclusion

By way of conclusion I should like to return to some of the questions posed to the consultation.

A. Genre and Traditions

The Epistle of James belongs to that wisdom tradition that offers practical advice and instruction on the art of leading one's life. Two aspects of wisdom material are evident, namely wisdom instruction or exhortations and reflection upon wisdom, upon its origin with God.[48] The issue of genre shows that the nature of the Epistle of James is wider than just one category. Both the prophetic and eschatological play a decided influence in determining the nature of the Epistle of James. Prophetic forms are used in order to give expression to the wisdom advice. At the same time eschatology plays a vital role in providing motivation for the wisdom teaching that is offered. This is different from the traditional wisdom of the Old Testament and intertestamental periods. For James the future holds sway over the present. The coming of the Lord acts as the motivation for the way one leads one's life in the present: it gives meaning to all the ethical advice.

In line with the Epistle of Enoch (92-105) James demonstrated a usage of similar traditional material: such as prophetic woes and admonitions. Eschatology also played a dominant role in each text by providing the motivation for the present. James and Enoch are heirs to traditions which they used in different ways. In 1 Enoch (92-105) the apocalyptic revelatory genre unites the wisdom, prophetical and eschatological material together. In James, on the other hand, wisdom provides the unifying force in bringing together the prophetical, and the eschatological material, while distancing itself from the apocalyptic.

B. World View

The revelation of the future is not a focus for the writer of the Epistle of James, as it is with apocalyptic texts.[49] Neither is James couched in dreams, visions or revelations by means of angels. However, James does seem to share aspects of some thought patterns present in an apocalyptic world view: he knows of the world of devils (2:19); that the world of future judgment brings about a separation between the righteous and the sinner (5:1-11); and that there is a "crown of life" (1:12) in store for those who show their love of God. While James shares these thought patterns with his contemporaries, they do not displace his focus of providing exhortations and advice to the readers about how they are to lead their lives in the present. James does not work out a comprehensive world view whereby this world is understood only in relation to the heavenly world. In this sense, then, James is not apocalyptic.

Reflection on the Torah, so characteristic of the wisdom writings of the Old Testament as well as the intertestamental periods, has continued in the Epistle of James. Certainly the Torah provided the foundation against which one can judge the practical advice that is given for the way to lead one's life. The Epistle of James has given this reflection on the Torah a particular focus with a centrality assigned to the law of love: "You shall love your neighbor as yourself"

---

[48]This corresponds to the first two categories of wisdom material that Collins (1993:168) identifies within Israelite traditions, namely wisdom sayings and theological wisdom. The other three categories, namely nature wisdom, mantic wisdom and higher wisdom through revelation, are absent from the Epistle of James.

[49]As Nickelsburg (1994:722) says: "The authors of apocalyptic texts, while they actually draw heavily on the Torah and the prophets, present new revelations, although they attribute them variously to pre-Mosaic authors (Enoch and Abraham), Moses himself, and post-Mosaic figures (Daniel, Ezra and Baruch). The sources of these new revelations are said to be cosmic journeys and dream visions, interpreted by angels."

(identified as well as the "royal law" (2:8), and "the law of liberty" [2:12]). This law of love provides impetus for the ethical advice that becomes a specific illustration of this law in action, whether it be "caring for widows and orphans"; or showing no partiality with regard to rich and poor (2:1-7); or even the bridling of one's tongue (3:5-10).

C. Community

The community presupposed by the Epistle of James is the wider Jewish-Christian community outside Palestine ("the twelve tribes in the Dispersion" 1:1). In the very designation, "the twelve tribes in the Dispersion," the author reminds the readers of their eschatological position in the plan of God. They are the reconstituted people of Israel expected in the eschatological age.

Despite its distinctiveness, the community nevertheless remains an open community: outsiders are welcome, as seen by the entry of a rich person into the community. (2:1-13). James challenges the members of the community to make everyone welcome, not just the rich. The community shows an obligation of caring for its own members: the suffering, the ill (5:13), and in particular the sinner who "wander from the truth" (5:19).

While the community which the epistle envisages does experience sufferings and persecutions, these emanate chiefly from the hands of the rich against the poor. The sufferings are not the apocalyptic cataclysmic destructions of Revelation and Daniel. Yet, the same technical language is used to refer to the sufferings and afflictions of the present moment, such as those endured by widows and orphans (θλῖψις, 1:27). Tensions emerge within the community when it discriminates against the poor in favor of the rich (2:1-12). The community gathers together as an assembly ("the synagogue" [2:2]). Certain structures are also evident within the epistle which show a remarkably early period: the sick are invited to call upon "the elders of the church" (5:14). The writer is a teacher ("for you know that we who teach..." [3:1]), who strives after wisdom: "Who is wise among you" (3:13). The categories of διδάσκαλος and σόφος are identical. As a wisdom teacher James aims at transmitting, not knowledge, but ethical exhortations in line with the way Ben Sirach presented his teaching (Nickelsburg 1994:725). The author does not present his teaching as directly revealed or inspired. Yet, his reflection on the nature of wisdom shows that he views it as a gift that comes down from above (3:13-18). As a teacher, James must share this wisdom with his readers.

No specific situations can be identified which are seen to give rise to the letter's ethical advice. This does not mean that the ethical advice is presented in a vacuum:[50] much of the admonitions must emerge from the background of events that have taken place (such as discrimination against the poor [2:1-12]; or the rich's oppression of the poor [5:1-6]).

D. The importance of this investigation

This examination of the Epistle of James shows a writing emerging from the world of early Christianity that is home to wisdom, prophetic, apocalyptic and eschatological traditions. James challenges scholarship to discard the focus upon "pure" traditions as a confusion that does not do justice to the evidence. Classifications such as apocalyptic, eschatological, wisdom, prophetic are heuristic tools that remain such: tools to enter into the reality of the past: they do not become the reality itself. To try to classify a writing into solely one category produces a distortion of the evidence. James is in fact a hybrid, which brings many different traditions together, as did 1 Enoch (92-105), and as such provides a possible example for the way other traditions operated in the New Testament world. James brought the traditions together in one way, 1 Enoch in another.

---

[50] As Dibelius (1975:46) was accustomed to argue from his understanding of James as a paraenetical work.

The world of the New Testament knows of another writing, the earliest source behind the Gospels, "Q", which bears many similarities to the Epistle of James. It, too, is a hybrid, composed of wisdom, eschatological, prophetical and apocalyptic material. As with James, the wisdom tradition functions as the dominant tradition bringing the others together (Hartin 1991:78-80). The challenge that both James and 1 Enoch (92-105) would pose to the study of "Q" is to view these traditions as existing and developing together. The traditions of wisdom, eschatology and apocalyptic are not to be seen in opposition, but as James and Enoch show, they exist in a relationship as part of the world heritage to which they belong.

Bibliography

Adamson, JW
1976 *The Epistle of James.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
1989 *James: The man and his message.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Attrdige, HW, Collins, JJ & Tobin, TH (eds)
1990 *Of Scribes and Scrolls; Studies on the Hebrew Bible, Intertestamental Judaism and Christian Origins: presented to John Strugnell.* College Theology Society Resources in Religion, 5. Lanham: University Press of America.

Charlesworth, JH (ed)
1983 *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, vol 1 Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments.* New York: Doubleday.

Collins, JJ
1977 "Cosmos and Salvation: Jewish Wisdom and Apocalyptic in the Hellenistic Age," *History of Religions* 17, 121-42.
1979 "Jewish Apocalypses," *Semeia* 14, 21-59.
1986 "Apocalyptic Literature," in Kraft, RA, & Nickelsburg, GWE (eds) *Early Judaism and its Modern Interpreters.* Philadelphia: Fortress.
1990 "The Sage in The Apocalyptic and Pseudepigraphic Literature," in Gammie, JG & Perdue, LG (eds), *The Sage in Israel and the Ancient Near East*, Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 343-54.
1991 "Genre, Ideology and Social Movements in Jewish Apocalypticism," in Collins, JJ & Charlesworth JH (eds), *Mysteries and Revelations: Apocalyptic Studies since the Uppsala Colloquium.* JSPSupp 9. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 11-32.
1992 [1984] *The Apocalyptic Imagination.* New York: Crossroad.
1993 "Wisdom, Apocalypticism, and Generic Compatibility," in Perdue, LG, Scott, BB, & Wiseman, WJ (eds) *In search of Wisdom,* Westminster: John Knox, 165-85.

Crenshaw, JL
1969 "Method in determining Wisdom Influence upon 'Historical' Literature," *JBL* 88, 129-42.
1976 *Studies in Ancient Israelite wisdom, selected with a Prolegomenon by JL Crenshaw.* New York: KTAV Publishing House.

Davids, PH
1982 *The Epistle of James: A commentary on the Greek Text.* Exeter: Paternoster.

Dibelius, M
1975 *James: A commentary on the Epistle of James.* (trans. MA Williams), Philadelphia: Fortress.

Gammie, JG & Perdue, LG (eds)
1990 *The Sage in Israel and the Ancient Near East.* Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Hartin, PJ
1991 *James and the 'Q' Sayings of Jesus.* Sheffield: Sheffield University Press.

Hauck, F
1967 "μακάριος, μακαρίζω, μακαρισμός" *TDNT* IV, 362-64, 367-70.

Hellholm, D
1991 "Methodological reflections on the problem of definition of Generic Texts," in Collins, JJ & Charlesworth JH (eds), *Mysteries and Revelations: Apocalyptic Studies since the Uppsala Colloquium.* JSPSupp 9. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 134-63.

Hoppe, R
1977 *Der theologische Hintergrund des Jakobusbriefes.* Würzburg: Echter.

Jeremias, J
1964 "Ἠλ(ε)λίας," *TDNT* II, 928-41.

Johnson, LT
1995 *The Letter of James.* The Anchor Bible. New York: Doubleday.

Knight, DA & Tucker, GM (eds)
1985 *The Hebrew Bible and its Modern Interpreters.* Philadelphia: Fortress.

Kraft, RA, & Nickelsburg, GWE (eds)
1986 *Early Judaism and its Modern Interpreters.* Philadelphia: Fortress.

Laws, S
1980 *A Commentary on the Epistle of James.* London: Black.

Mussner, F
1981 *Der Jakobusbrief: Auslegung.* (4th edition). Freiburg: Herder.
1989 "Die ethische Motivation im Jakobusbrief," in Merklein, H (ed), *Neues Testament und Ethik,* Freiburg: Herder, 416-23.

Nickelsburg, GWE
1977 "The Apocalyptic message of 1 Enoch 92-105," *CBQ* 39, 309-28.
1981 *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah.* Philadelphia: Fortress.
1982 "The Epistle of Enoch and the Qumran Literature," JSS 33 *Essays in Honour of Yigael Yadin,* 333-48.
1991 "The Apocalyptic construction of reality in 1 Enoch," in Collins, JJ & Charlesworth JH (eds), *Mysteries and Revelations: Apocalyptic Studies since the Uppsala Colloquium.* JSPSupp 9. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 51-64.
1992 "Enoch, First Book of," in Freedman, DN (ed), *Anchor Bible Dictionary,* volume 2, New York: Doubleday, 508-16.

1994 "Wisdom and Apocalypticism in early Judaism: some points for discussion," in Lovering, EH (ed), *SBL Seminar Papers,* Atlanta: Scholars.

Perdue, LG
1994 *Wisdom & Creation: The Theology of Wisdom Literature.* Nashville: Abingdon.

Perdue, LG, Scott, BB, & Wiseman, WJ (eds)
1993 *In Search of Wisdom: Essays in memory of John G Gammie.* Westminster: John Knox.

Ropes, J
1916 *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle of St James.* Edinburgh: T& T Clark.

Schlier, H
1972 "θλίβω, θλῖψις," TDNT III, 139-48.

Smith, JZ
1975 "Wisdom and Apocalyptic,' in Pearson, BA (ed), *Religious Syncretism in Antiquity: Essays in conversation with Geo Widengren,* Missoula: Scholars.

Yarbro Collins, A
1986 "Introduction: early Christian Apocalypticism," *Semeia* 36, 1-11.

A Letter to the Twelve Tribes in the Diaspora: Wisdom and 'Apocalyptic' Eschatology in the Letter of James

Matt A. Jackson-McCabe
University of Chicago

John S. Kloppenborg, in his important and impressive work *The Formation of Q*, enumerates the differences between the "formative layer" of Q (Q^1) and its secondary redaction (Q^2) under three headings: projected audience, forms, and motifs.[1] In contrast to the polemical and threatening speeches of Q^2, which assume a deuteronomic conception of history and "project, so to speak, 'over the heads' of the proximate audience" to impenitent opponents of the community, those of Q^1, directed at members of the community, are "hortatory and instructional" in tone and contain at most "mild warnings" regarding the insufficiency, rather than the utter lack, of their faith.[2] Formally, Q^1 is dominated by "sapiential admonitions of the form second-person . . . imperative with or without motive clauses" such as rhetorical questions, apodoses, and appeals to nature, while also containing beatitudes, proverbs and wisdom sayings, and parables.[3] "The sayings most typical" of Q^2, on the other hand, are "*prophetic judgment sayings and apocalyptic words.*"[4] While the dominant theme of Q^2 is the imminent judgment, Q^1 is more typically concerned with a radical ethic, motivated by the dawning of "the kingdom," which rejects "the norms of macro-society." In particular, it contains a special emphasis on the theme of poverty, possibly even using "the poor" as a designation for the community.[5]

In a later essay Kloppenborg points out that "The detection of the presence of redaction in a sayings collection such as Q cannot proceed simply by cataloguing and sorting the individual Q sayings into two or three 'piles' either on the basis of common form, or shared motifs, or the extent of external attestation."[6] "Literary explanations are required," rather, given the fact that "certain blocks of Q trade heavily in the prophetic motifs . . . while in other blocks of material, such motifs are either completely absent or appear in highly contrived and artificial ways."[7] It is thus of the highest significance for Kloppenborg that Q as a whole is framed by references to the judgment: the fact that this same motif appears not only in "prophetic-polemic blocks" of material in Q, but also in relatively isolated sayings in otherwise "sapiential" contexts suggests to

---

[1]John S. Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q: Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections* (Studies in Antiquity & Christianity; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987), 166-70, 238-42.
[2]Ibid., 167f and 238f.
[3]Ibid., 239f.
[4]Ibid., 169, emphasis his.
[5]Ibid., 240-42; cf. 169-70.
[6]John S. Kloppenborg, "The *Formation of Q* Revisited: A Response to Richard Horsley," *SBLSP* 28 (1989), 205. With the mention of the criterion of "external attestation," Kloppenborg refers to a paper given by John Dominic Crossan at the 1987 SBL Q Seminar entitled "Tradition in the Formation of Q"; see Kloppenborg, "Revisited," 205 n. 7.
[7]Kloppenborg, "Revisited," 209.

Kloppenborg that, from a compositional point of view, those materials which concern the judgment represent a later redactional stage in the composition of Q.[8]

In this paper I wish to show that an analogous combination of elements is also to be found in the Letter of James. While James' moral exhortation has significant points of contact with the Jewish Wisdom tradition, its instruction functions in the context of a worldview which can be characterized as "apocalyptic" to the extent that it is dominated by an expectation of an imminent *parousia* of some supernatural figure and a divine judgment which will reverse the corruption that characterizes the present world. The letter's address to "the twelve tribes who are in the diaspora" is to be understood in connection with this eschatological expectation. It is a highly charged address which, from a deuteronomistic perspective, both symbolizes the dire nature of James' present circumstances and, especially in conjunction with the reference to Jesus χριστός, sounds a note of hope for the promised kingdom. Moreover, the eschatological elements of James, as those in Q, surface particularly at the beginning and end of the letter, as well as in relatively isolated sayings in the hortatory sections in the body of James. They are, nonetheless, integral to James' aim and are thus not to be characterized as late additions.

James and Jewish Wisdom Literature

It has long and often been observed that the Letter of James contains significant points of contact with the traditions of Jewish wisdom. The most obvious of these connections comes in the form of direct literary dependence. The clearest instance of such dependence is the citation of Prov 3:34 at Jas 4:6, introduced by the formula διὸ λέγει,[9] though a number of other allusions to Proverbs have also been suggested, most notably one to Prov 10:12 at Jas 5:20.[10] It is of some interest, too, that James' reference to Job at 5:11 is unique in the NT, though of course the canonical book of Job was not the only ancient work which dealt with this figure.[11] Less certain is the possible dependence of James upon Sirach and/or the Synoptic sayings source Q, though at the very least it shares a number of important thematic interests with both of these writings.[12]

Comparisons of James' language and style to those of Jewish wisdom have also been made. Regarding James' terminology, Halson reports that "In his distinctive vocabulary . . . we

---

[8]Ibid., 206-10; on the use of the term "sapiential" to describe Q^1, see ibid., 210f.

[9]James follows the LXX, though reading ὁ θεός where the latter has κύριος; cf. in this respect 1 Pet 5:5; *1 Clem* 30:2 and Ign. *Eph.* 5:3. Luke Timothy Johnson (*The Letter of James: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* [AB; New York: Doubleday, 1995], 33, cf. 283) argues that "the influence of the original context of Prov 3:34 can be found throughout Jas 3:13-4:6 (compare Prov 3:19-35)."

[10]On Jas 5:20 as an allusion to Prov 10:12, see Baasland, "Der Jakobusbrief als Neutestamentliche Weisheitsschrift," *ST* 36 (1982), 123; and more tentatively Johnson, *The Letter of James*, 339. More skeptical still are Sophie S. Laws (*A Commentary on the Epistle of James* [Black's New Testament Commentaries. London: Black, 1980], 120); and Dean B. Deppe (*The Sayings of Jesus in the Epistle of James* [Chelsea, MI: Bookcrafters, 1989], 48f). See further the parallels to Proverbs suggested by J. A. Kirk ("The Meaning of Wisdom in James: Examination of a Hypothesis," 38) and James Hardy Ropes (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle of St. James* [ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1916], 19).

[11]In light of James' many other points of contact with the Jewish wisdom tradition, Baasland ("Neutestamentliche Weisheitsschrift," 124) describes this reference to Job as "hardly a coincidence"; Johnson (*The Letter of James*, 319f), however, points out that James' presentation of this figure is more on line with that of the *Testament of Job* than the canonical work.

[12]On James' dependence on Sirach, see esp. Hubert Frankemölle, "Zum Thema des Jakobusbriefes im Kontext der Rezeption von Sir 2,1-18 und 15,11-20." James' dependence on both Q and Q^{Matt} is argued extensively by Patrick J. Hartin (*James and the Q Sayings of Jesus* [JSNTSup 47; Sheffield: JSOT, 1991]).

can say that the author of the Epistle of James has a marked predeliction for words from the Septuagintal Wisdom literature."[13] This would seem to be a further indication of James' familiarity with the writings produced in the Jewish wisdom tradition. With respect to style, reference has been made to the regular use of direct address, the frequency of imperatives, and especially the use of metaphorical imagery, for example, at 1:6b, 10-11; 4:14b; 5:7.[14] Contact with the wisdom tradition can also be seen in the presence of a number of aphoristic expressions in James (e.g. 1:19b, 2:13; 3:18).[15] It has been pointed out further that James' self-presentation as "teacher" (3:1) is typical of writers in the Jewish Wisdom tradition.[16]

It is however the similarity of James' themes to those characteristic of Wisdom literature, and particularly of Sirach, that is the most commonly noted affinity.[17] Foremost among these is the thematization of wisdom itself, regarded by some as a or even *the* central theme of James as a whole, but which surfaces particularly at 1:5 and 3:13-18.[18] The themes of testing (1:2-4) and perfection (1:2-4; 3:2) are also frequently cited as points of contact; in fact, the manner in which these two themes are related to that of wisdom at 1:2-12 has been been described as typical of Jewish wisdom thought.[19] Other themes often mentioned in this connection include the control of the tongue (Jas 3:2-12),[20] concern for the socially disadvantaged, particularly "widows and orphans" (1:27; 2:2-4, 15-16)[21] and anger (1:19-20).[22]

The many points of contact between James and the Jewish wisdom literature are indeed impressive, and there can be no doubt that James' ethical instruction has been significantly

---

[13]B. R. Halson ("The Epistle of James: 'Christian Wisdom'?," in F. L. Cross, ed., *Studia Evangelica* 4.1 [TU 102; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1968], 309) reports that of the 67 *hapax legomena* in James, "thirty-four appear in the Wisdom books of the Old Testament and Apocrypha . . . as compared with twenty-five in non-Wisdom Apocryphal books . . . eighteen in the Prophets and Daniel . . . fifteen in the Pentateuch . . . twelve in the historical books . . . and nine in Psalms"; cf. Baasland ("Neutestamentliche Weisheitsschrift," 124) and Frankemölle (*Der Brief des Jakobus*, vol. 1 [Ökumenischer Taschenbuchkommentar zum Neuen Testament 17; Gütersloh: Gütersloher, 1994], 86).

[14]Halson, "Christian Wisdom," 310; Baasland, "Neutestamentliche Weisheitsschrift," 124. Mußner (*Der Jakobusbrief* [HTKNT 13/1; Freiburg: Herder, 1975^3], 33) reports that James contains 54 imperatives; Davids (*The Epistle of James: A Commentary on the Greek Text* [NIGTC; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdman's, 1983], 58), however, counts 49.

[15]Halson ("Christian Wisdom," 311; cf. 309), finds twenty-three "isolated sayings" or "aphorisms" in James, but does not list them exhaustively.

[16]Hartin, *James and the Q Sayings of Jesus*, 22.

[17]See esp. John William MacGorman, "A Comparison of the Book of James with the Jewish Wisdom Literature,"(Ph.D. diss., Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1956); also Joseph B. Mayor, *The Epistle of St. James: The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes, and Comments and Further Studies in the Epistle of St. James* (London: MacMillan, 1913^3; repr., Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1954), cxiii, cxvi-cxviii; Johnson, *The Letter of James*, 33f; Baasland, "Neutestamentliche Weisheitsschrift," 124; Dean B. Deppe, *The Sayings of Jesus*, 49; Ropes, *The Epistle of James*, 18f.

[18]On the centrality of the theme of wisdom to James, see esp. Hartin, *James and the Q Sayings of Jesus*, 23-34; cf. Deppe, *The Sayings of Jesus*, 183; and Rudolf Hoppe, (*Der theologische Hintergrund des Jakobusbriefes* [FB 28; Würzburg: Echter, 1985^2], 17, 146).

[19]See esp. Hoppe, *Der theologische Hintergrund*, 18-43; also Ulrich Luck, "Weisheit und Leiden: Zum Problem Paulus und Jakobus," *TLZ* 92 (1967), 253-58.

[20]See esp. MacGorman, "Comparison," 136-42, with the many parallels he cites; cf. Baasland, "Neutestamentliche Weisheitsschrift," 124; Ropes, *The Epistle of James*, 19.

[21]See MacGorman, "Comparison," 142-47, again with parallels; cf. Baasland, "Neutestamentliche Weisheitsschrift," 124; Ropes, *The Epistle of James*, 19.

[22]Frankemölle (*Der Brief des Jakobus*, 325f) speaks of "many analogies in the wisdom litertaure," citing esp. Sir 4:27b-29 and 5:10-14; cf. Johnson, *The Letter of James*, 33.

influenced by Jewish wisdom tradition. It is thus not altogether surprising that James as a whole has not infrequently been characterized as a "wisdom writing," though others have been more skeptical regarding the appropriateness of this designation.[23] The resolution of this disagreement would of course require a clear notion of what defines a "wisdom writing" in the first place, and I do not wish to enter into this difficult problem here. A few comments regarding James, however, are in order.

If one characterizes James as a "wisdom writing" simply to denote its overall aim as the giving of ethical instruction for life in accord with divine wisdom, it would be difficult to disagree.[24] No one would deny that James is some type of ethical and/or religious exhortation.[25] However, given the strong associations that the term "wisdom literature" has with the Jewish wisdom literature in particular, as applied to James this characterization is potentially misleading. As Johnson has recently pointed out, James as a whole – Dibelius' literary assessment notwithstanding – is less aphoristic and more characterized by extended and tightly constructed argumentation than is typical of the Jewish wisdom literature.[26] So too, the poetic parallelism generally characteristic of this body of literature is scarcely comparable to the straightforward prose of James.[27] Moreover, Jas 5:1-6 is more reminiscent of the utterances of the Jewish prophets than the sages,[28] while other parts of James are closer to the Greek diatribe.[29]

There are also significant differences with respect to James' themes. As H. von Lipps has pointed out, several of the themes typically found in Jewish wisdom literature are noticeably absent from James, e.g., domestic issues, friendship, sexuality, and diligence and laziness.[30] On the other hand, some of the more prominent concerns of James, particularly its expectation of an imminent judgment and *parousia* of the Lord, are scarcely characteristic of Jewish wisdom literature. All things considered, it is perhaps best to describe James more generally as moral exhortation rather than as a "wisdom writing." Indeed, while James' ethical instruction

---

[23]Those who describe James a "wisdom writing" include Halson, "Christian Wisdom," 313 and passim; Baasland, "Neutestamentliche Weisheitsschrift," esp. 123-25; Hartin, *James and the Q Sayings of Jesus*, 12, 42; Frankemölle, *Der Brief des Jakobus*, 68, 87. Among those who find this description to be inadequate are Ropes, *The Epistle of Saint James* (ICC. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1916), 17; Davids, *Epistle of James*, 23-24; Hermann von Lips, *Weisheitliche Traditionen im Neuen Testament* (WMANT 64; Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1990), 434; Johnson, *The Letter of James*, 33.

[24]For such a general use of the category "wisdom literature," see John G. Gammie, "Paraenetic Literature: Toward the Morphology of a Secondary Genre," *Semeia 50* (1990), 41-71. On the use of the term "divine" to describe James' notion of wisdom, see below.

[25]Though beyond this point there is wide disagreement as to precisely what type of exhortation James is. See most recently the discussions by Frankemölle, *Der Brief des Jakobus*, 64-70, and Johnson, *The Letter of James*, 16-26.

[26]Johnson, *The Letter of James*, 33-34. See further the recent studies of James in light of ancient rhetoric, esp. Wilhelm Wuellner, "Der Jakobusbrief im Licht der Rhetorik und Textpragmatik," *LB* 43 (1978), 5-66; Ernst Baasland, "Literarische Form, Thematik, und geschichtliche Einordnung des Jakobusbriefes,"in *ANRW* II.25.5 (1988), 3646-84; Hubert Frankemölle, "Das semantische Netz des Jakobusbriefes: zur Einheit eines umstrittenen Briefes," *BZ* 34 (1990), 161-97; Wesley HiramWachob, "'The Rich in Faith' and 'The Poor in Spirit': The Socio-Rhetorical Function of a Saying of Jesus in the Epistle of James," (Ph. D. diss., Emory University, 1993); Duane F. Watson, "Rhetoric and James 2," *NTS* 39 (1993), 94-121; and idem, "Rhetoric and James 3:1-12," *NovT* 35 (1993), 48-64.

[27]Ropes, *Epistle of St. James*, 16-17.

[28]Cf. Pedrito U. Maynard-Reid, *Poverty and Wealth in James* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1987), 81; also Hartin, *James and the Q Sayings of Jesus*, 22.

[29]See esp. Ropes, *The Epistle of St. James*, 10-16; cf. Dibelius, *James: A Commentary on the Epistle of James*, rev. Heinrich Greeven, trans. Michael A. Williams (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975) 1, 3; and Stanley K. Stowers, "Diatribe," in *ABD* 2, 193.

[30]H. von Lips, *Weisheitliche Traditionen im Neuen Testament*, 433.

undoubtedly contains significant points of contact with the Jewish wisdom tradition, its general worldview is better described as apocalyptic than in terms of wisdom.

"Apocalyptic Eschatology" in James

If the influence of the Jewish Wisdom tradition on James' instruction is clear, the conceptual framework within which its exhortations function is more akin to the Jewish apocalypses and related literature. Though James has no obvious interest in the otherwordly journeys, the periodization of history,[31] or the dreams and heavenly revelations that characterize the Jewish and Christian apocalypses, his worldview can be described as "apocalyptic" if we, with John Collins, understand by this description a worldview "distinguished primarily by the increased importance attached to supernatural agents and a world beyond this one, and by the hope for judgment and vindication beyond death."[32] Both of these features figure prominently in James, whose instruction is given in light of an imminent "*parousia* of the Lord" which will be characterized above all by divine judgment and a reversal of the corruption that defines the present world.

The world of James is defined by two diametrically opposed poles between which humans find themselves, and which can be generally characterized as "good" and "evil." Unlike the ethical dualism common in wisdom literature, most characteristically expressed by the contrast of "the sage" and "the fool," James' dichotomy is expressed most clearly in terms of an opposition between God and "the world," as in the succint statement made at 4:4: "Do you not know that friendship with the world is enmity with God? Therefore whoever wishes to be a friend of the world becomes an enemy of God."[33] As is suggested already by the use of "God" in this dichotomy, there is clearly a metaphysical dimension to James' dualism.[34] Thus at 4:7-8a the individual's choice between God and "the world" is depicted in terms of one's choice between two supernatural agents, God and ὁ διάβολος, both of whom, apparently, actively seek to influence individual humans. Thus James warns his audience to "submit" to God and "resist" the devil, to "draw near" to God and the "flee" from the devil (4:7-8a).[35]

The inseparable connection between the supernatural realm and human ethics for James is evident above all in his understanding of wisdom. That wisdom which is "from above," which is to say, from God,[36] manifests itself primarily in proper ethical action. In contrast, those whose behavior is characterized by the self-serving ambition (ἐριθεία) and jealousy (ζῆλος) that promotes discord and "every foul deed" manifest a wisdom that is "demonic" (δαιμονιώδης) rather than from

---

[31]Though note his belief that he is living in "the last days" (5:3).

[32]John J. Collins, "Wisdom, Apocalypticism, and Generic Compatibility," in Leo G. Perdue et al., *In Search of Wisdom: Essays in Memory of John G. Gammie* (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox, 1993), 170; cf. idem, *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to the Jewish Matrix of Christianity* (New York: Crossroad, 1989), 9; and Paul D. Hanson, "Apocalypticism," in *IDBSup*, 29f.

[33]See also 2:5, where τοὺς πτωχοὺς τῷ κόσμῳ are said to be πλουσίους ἐν πίστει καὶ κληρονόμους τῆς βασιλείας.

[34]Contra Dibelius, *James*, 220; see further Hoppe, *Der theologische Hintergrund*, 59-66.

[35]Cf. the notoriously difficult Jas 4:5, which most likely refers to God's jealousy regarding the "spirit which he has made to dwell in us"; see esp. Dibelius, *James*, 223-24.

There is apparently a certain synergy assumed between "the devil" and the individual's own illicit desires, the latter of which are explicitly named as the source of strife (4:1-3), and sin and death (1:14-15), and are contrasted with the λόγος that comes from God (cf. 1:18). Cf. in this respect the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, esp. *T. Reu.* 1:11; 6:3; *T. Dan* 5:6; *T. Ben.* 6:1; 7:2.

[36]Cf. Jas 1:17, where ἄνωθεν is synonymous with καταβαῖνον ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς τῶν φώτων.

God and "earthly" (ἐπίγειος; cf. the opposition of God and κόσμος) rather than "from above."[37] While the attributes of the "wisdom from above" are precisely the sorts of behavior that are advocated throughout James,[38] it is apparently the demonic wisdom that governs the conduct characteristic of the present world. Thus the present situation of James is one characterized above all by the tyranny of "the rich," who are portrayed as withholding wages from laborers in order to sate their own greed (5:4f),[39] as blasheming "the good name that was invoked over you" (2:7), as oppressing and dragging into the law courts the "poor" whom Jas addresses (2:6b), and of killing "the righteous" (5:6).[40] "The world" is in general a source of impurity, the avoidance of which, along with an active concern for the socially disadvantaged who suffer under the present circumstances, is at the very heart of James' conception of "true religion."[41]

The resolution of the dire circumstances that characterize the present situation of James and his audience is to be accomplished by means of a supernatural intervention in history that will ensure the ultimate triumph of good over evil. James twice speaks of this event as the παρουσία τοῦ κυρίου. Whether κύριος here refers to God or to a heavenly Jesus Christ is not immediately clear, as both figures are referred to as κύριος in the epistle.[42] If, as seems likely, this figure is the same as that referred to as "the judge" who is "standing at the doors" at 5:9, one might argue that κύριος is here to be understood with reference to God, since according to 4:12 there is only one judge and lawgiver, and that, apparently, is God.[43] On the other hand, 4:11-12 is intended mainly to contrast human and divine acts of judgment, and for this reason it seems unneccesary to interpret it strictly so as preclude the possibility that some other figure might accompany God at the divine judgment. In fact, where reference is made to an eschatological figure "standing at the doors" in the synoptic tradition, it refers to the "Son of Man" who, at least for the evangelists, is to be identified with Jesus Christ.[44] For this reason it seems rather likely that the Lord of 5:7-9 is to be taken as a reference to Jesus Christ, who is thus to be understood as a heavenly figure.[45]

This supernatural event is understood to be imminent (5:8, 9; cf. 2:12). Indeed, James understands himself and his audience to be living "in the last days" (ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις). The "parousia of the Lord" will bring with it the divine judgment concerning which James warns

---

[37]3:14-15. The lifestyle characterized by Hartin as "without wisdom" (*James and the Q Sayings of Jesus*, 99, 101) would be more accurately described as a life guided by the *wrong* wisdom. That James is in fact contrasting two types of wisdom here seems clear from the use of the fem. adj. ψυχική at 3:15.

[38]Cf. the adjectives used to describe the "wisdom from above" at 3:17 with other passages in James: e.g. ἁγνή with 1:27 (ἄσπιλον); εἰρηνική with 4:1, 11 and 5:9; μεστὴ ἐλέους with 2:13; μεστή . . . καρπῶν ἀγαθῶν with 1:22-25; 2:14-26; ἀδιάκριτος with 1:6-8; and ἀνυπόκριτος with 2:1-7.

[39]This charge is grounded in the Torah; see Lev 19:13 and esp. Deut 24:14-15. The concern is quite common in the ancient Jewish literature; cf. Mal 3:5; and esp. Sir 34:26-27 (=LXX 34:22), plus the further parallels listed by Dibelius (*James*, 238 with nn. 46-47) and Maynard-Reid (*Poverty and Wealth*, 85).

[40]The precise nature of this last charge is not immediately clear, though it is probably to be understood as a general accusation rather than as an exclusive reference to Jesus or James the Just; see Dibelius, *James*, 239-40. Cf. in this respect esp. Sir 34:26-27 (=LXX 34:22): "to take away a neighbor's living is to commit murder; to deprive an employee of wages is to shed blood."

[41]Jas 1:27; cf. 3:17, where the "wisdom from above" is described as "in the first place" ἁγνή.

[42]Jesus Christ is referred to as such in both passages where he appears (1:1; 2:1), while God is called "Lord" at least at 1:7 (cf. 1:5).

[43]So most commentators; see e.g. Dibelius, *James*, 229; Mußner, *Der Jakobusbrief*, 188; and Davids, *The Epistle of James*, 170. Note esp. the use of the phrase εἷς ἐστιν at Jas 2:19.

[44]Mark 13:26-29; Matt 24:30-33.

[45]So most commentators; see Davids, *The Epistle of James*, 182f. That Jesus Christ is a heavenly figure in James is also suggested by the attribute of "glory" given him at 2:1; see Franz Mußner, "»Direkte« und »indirekte« Christologie im Jakobusbrief," *Catholica* 24 (1970), 112-13.

his audience throughout his letter (5:9; cf. 2:12-13; 3:1; also 4:11-12). The result will be above all a reversal of the circumstances of the present world: "the rich" will be humiliated and the "meek" will be exalted (1:9-10; 5:1). In fact, for the rich this will be a "day of slaughter" (5:5); they, with all their dealings, shall perish (1:11).[46] The poor (οἱ πτώχοι; cf. ὁ ταπεινός), on the other hand, have been chosen by God to be the inheritors of the kingdom "promised to those who love him" (2:5).[47] The context in which we are to understand the poor's "inheritance" of this "promised kingdom" will become clearer through an examination of a final, and generally overlooked, aspect of James' eschatology.

James as a Letter to the Twelve Tribes in the Diaspora

In a brief but interesting article on the use of the "twelve tribes" in early Judaism and Christianity, S. Pines has noted that several New Testament texts, like the War Scroll and other literature from Qumran, refer to the twelve tribes in an eschatological context.[48] Pines concludes that "In this point as in many others, early Christianity borrowed from the Qumran sect."[49] For Pines, however, the reference to the twelve tribes at Jas 1:1 is not be understood in light of the eschatological significance given the tribes in the sectarian literature from Qumran, at Matt 19:28 || Luke 22:30, and at Rev 7:2-8; for "these addressees are clearly supposed to be contemporaries of the author of the Epistle."[50]

While Pines draws attention to an important point by making a connection between the eschatological interest in the twelve tribes in the sectarian Dead Sea Scrolls and in some early Christian literature, both his conclusion regarding the direct relationship between the Qumran sect and the early Christians and his exclusion of James' reference to the tribes from this context are questionable. Regarding the former point, an interest in the twelve tribes in an eschatological context is scarcely limited to the Qumran sect and the early Christians. Rather, both the Qumran literature and that of the early Christians are to be viewed within the context of the marked surge of interest in the eschatological restoration of the twelve tribes that characterizes the Jewish and Chrsitian literature of the early Roman period.[51] Given the widespread nature of this interest, it is simply unneccesary to posit a direct dependence of the Christians upon the Qumran sect in the absence of any corroborating evidence. On the other hand, the attempt to read Jas 1:1 apart from the interest in the tribes of Israel in the literature contemporary with James seems on the face of it rather arbitrary. In fact, when Jas 1:1 is viewed in this context, it emerges as a highly evocative address that, from a deuteronomistic perspective, both connotes a present state in which the promises of God remain unfulfilled and, especially in connection with a χριστός, sounds a note of eschatological hope. This is a point that has not been sufficiently appreciated in the secondary literature and which therefore requires some attention. Given the number and complexity of the

---

[46]James' hostility toward "the rich" finds its closest parallels in the Epistle of Enoch and in Luke's gospel; see on this literature George W. E. Nickelsburg ("Riches, the Rich and God's Judgment in 1 Enoch 92-105 and the Gospel according to Luke," *NTS* 25 [1979], 324-44).

[47]Cf. 1:12, where those who endure trials are said to receive "the crown of life promised to those who love him." On the use of the phrase τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν, see below.

[48]S. Pines, "Notes on the Twelve Tribes in Qumran, Early Christianity and Jewish Tradition," in I. Gruenwald et al., *Messiah and Christos: Studies in the Jewish Origins of Christianity Presented to David Flusser on the Occasion of His Seventy-Fifth Birthday* (Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1992), 151-54.

[49]Ibid, 154.

[50]Ibid., 154; cf. F. J. A. Hort, *The Epistle of James: The Greek Text with Introduction, Commentary as far as Chapter IV, Verse 7, and Additional Notes* (London: MacMillan, 1909), 2.

[51]The remarkable increase in interest is likely to be accounted for in connection with the collapse of Jewish national autonomy in the middle of the first century BCE.

works that must be treated, my discussion must remain rather attenuated; it will nonetheless be, I hope, sufficient for the present purpose.

In the biblical narrative from Genesis to Joshua, the twelve tribes are associated above all with God's covenantal promise of the land to Abraham and his seed, i.e. the twelve patriarchs and their descendants.[52] In the book of Numbers, the twelve tribes provide the basic military organization of Israel at every stage in the conquest of Canaan.[53] Once taken, of course, the land itself is divided into twelve tribal territories according to the direct command of God (Num 26:52-56); this division is narrated in some detail at Josh 13-19.

Given their prominent association with God's (inalienable) promise of the land to Israel particularly in the narrative of Numbers and Joshua, it is not surprising that the tribes are often associated with a hope for the future restoration of Israel, as at Isa 49:6.[54] It is especially interesting given our present concern that this hope is often found in connection with a messianic hope for a Davidic king. This combination is quite prominent in Ezekiel, where the emphasis lies not only upon the gathering of the exiles from among the nations, but upon the final re-unification of the Northern and Southern kingdoms under a single Davidic king.[55] According to Ezekiel, the land will once again be divided among the twelve tribes as their "inheritance," according to God's promise.[56]

In the Hellenistic period, reference to the twelve tribes in connection with a hope for the future restoration of Israel surfaces in only one work. Interestingly enough, that work is the Wisdom of Jesus ben Sira, which stands apart from the earlier works of the Jewish "wisdom canon" for its combination of sapiential and deuteronomic interests.[57] There are two references to the tribes of Israel in Sirach, and both concern the hope for their future restoration. The hope that God will "gather all the tribes of Jacob and give them their inheritance as at the beginning" appears first at Sir 36:13f, in the context of a prayer whose original presence in Sirach, however, some have called into question.[58] That Sirach himself entertained such a hope is evident in any case from a passage from the Praise of the Fathers, where it said that Elijah (not a Davidic king) will "restore (καταστῆσαι) the tribes of Jacob."[59] The blending of wisdom instruction and deuteronomic thought – and even a hope for the restoration of Israel's tribes – in Sirach's wisdom book is noteworthy.

The scarcity of examples of eschatological interest in the tribes of Israel in the Hellenistic period only highlights the marked surge of interest in the period following the Roman domination of Judea. Josephus reports the belief that the ten lost tribes were not really lost at all, but were still in existence "beyond the Euphrates," and the expectation that they would someday return to the land of Israel is in fact widely attested in the literature of his time.[60] The second book of the

---

[52]See esp. Gen 50:24. The twelve tribes also have a prominent connection to Israel's cult (e.g. Exod 24:4; Exod 28:21, 29; Num 7:2). It is the emphasis upon the tribes' participation in the covenant which underlies both of these associations.

[53]See esp. the censuses taken at Num 1:2-3 and 26:1-4; the instructions for the organization of the camp and for marching (Num 2; 10); the spying out of the land at Num 13:1-16; and the battle recorded at Num 31 (cf. Judg 4:6; 18:29ff).

[54]Matt 4:13ff would seem to suggest that the tribal names were still associated with the land in the first century CE. If this is the case, the common association of the twelve tribes with restoration is even more understandable.

[55]See esp. Ezek 37:15-28.

[56]Ezek 47:13-14, 21-23; 45:8; and esp. ch. 48.

[57]See Leo G. Perdue, *Wisdom & Creation: The Theology of Wisdom Literature* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1994), 284f.

[58]See M. Gilbert, "Wisdom Literature," in Michael E. Stone, ed., *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: The Literature of the Jewish People in the Period of the Second Temple and the Talmud* (CRINT, section 2; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 298.

[59]Sir 48:10.

[60]Josephus, *AJ* 11.133.

Sibylline Oracles, dated around the turn of the era, speaks of a time of "the gathering" (ἡ συναίρησις) when "a people of ten tribes will come from the east to seek the people, which the shoot of Assyria destroyed, of their fellow Hebrews."[61] The result will be the perishing of nations and the rule of "the faithful chosen Hebrews" over "exceedingly mighty men."[62]

In most cases, however, the hope for the restoration of the tribes is accompanied, as in Ezekiel, by a messianic expectation. Thus at *Pss. Sol.* 17:21-34 the psalmist requests that God raise up a Davidic χριστός to remove the unrighteous rulers and the nations from Jerusalem.[63] This figure "will judge the tribes of the people that have been made holy by the Lord their God" and, like the Davidic king of Ezekiel, will "distribute them upon their land according to their tribes."[64] As with the Sybilline prophecy, these events appear to mark the beginning of Israel's political domination over the world (*Pss. Sol.* 17:31, 34).

4 Ezra evidences a similar belief in the continued existence of the ten tribes beyond the Euphrates and an expectation of their eschatological restoration by the hand of the messiah. The "man from the sea" whom Ezra sees in the vision at 13:1-13 is elsewhere called the "messiah" and is clearly, at least in his earthly form, of Davidic descent.[65] After destroying the "innumerable multitude" that unites against him, he will "gather to himself . . . the ten tribes which were led away from their own land into captivity in the days of King Hoshea," and who had decided to "go to a more distant region" in order to keep the law (13:39-42).

2 Baruch, which is probably dependent upon *4 Ezra*,[66] also contains both a clear messianic expectation and a hope for the restoration of the tribes of Israel, though the two are not explicitly linked.[67] This work opens as God informs Baruch that the exile which the "ten tribes" suffered is about to happen to the "two tribes" as well as a result of their sinfulness.[68] In fact, the tribes appear repeatedly in this work in connection with the exile from the land resulting from Israel's unfaithfulness to the covenant.[69] However, exile can be avoided – and indeed restoration effected – by means of the repentance of even a portion of Israel: "If, therefore, you will make straight your ways, you will not go away as your brothers went away, but they will come to you" (77:6).[70] Thus this work closes with a letter from Baruch to "the nine and a half tribes which were across the river" (78:1) which is meant to serve as "a witness between me and you that you may remember the commandments of the Mighty One" (84:7). This letter emphasizes that the tribes in exile must understand that their current suffering is actually for their own good; they must further

---

[61]2 *Sib. Or.* 171ff. The translation is that of John J. Collins, "The Sibylline Oracles," in *OTP*, vol. 1, 349; on the dating of this oracle see p. 331.

[62]2 *Sib. Or.* 174f; 2 *Sib. Or.* 187f mentions the coming of Elijah as taking place *after* the return of the ten tribes.

[63] See further Gene L. Davenport, "The 'Anointed of the Lord' in Psalms of Solomon 17," in George W. E. Nickelsburg and John J. Collins, eds., *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism* (SBLSCS 12; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1980), 67-92.

[64]*Pss. Sol.* 17:26-28; cf. 17:43-44. The translations are from R. B. Wright, "Psalms of Solomon," in *OTP*, vol. 2, 667.

[65]*4 Ezra* 7:28-29; 12:32. See further Michael Edward Stone, *Fourth Ezra: A Commentary on the Book of Fourth Ezra* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990), 207-13. Translations of *4 Ezra* are those of B. M. Metzger, "The Fourth Book of Ezra," in *OTP*, vol. 1, 517-59.

[66]See John J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, 179f.

[67]See *2 Bar* 29-30, 40, 70:9 and 72. All translations of *2 Baruch* are taken from A. F. J. Klijn, "2 (Syriac Apocalypse of) Baruch," in *OTP*, vol. 1, 615-52.

[68]2 *Bar* 1:1-5. While this passage speaks of the "ten" and "two" tribes, the rest of the work speaks of "nine and a half" and "two and a half." A rationale for this discrepancy is not apparent.

[69]E.g., *2 Bar* 62:5; 64:5; 72:2-10.

[70]Cf. further *2 Bar* 63, where the two and a half tribes are said to have been protected from Sennacherib on account of the righteousness of Hezekiah.

> remove from your hearts the idle error for which you went away from here. For if you do these things in this way, he shall continually remember you. He is the one who always promised on our behalf . . . that he will never forget or forsake our offspring, but with much mercy assemble all those again who were dispersed (78:6-7).

One finds a similar set of circumstances in the *Tesatments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. The well-known problems regarding the history of this work obviously impinge upon the question of its date, though in its present form, at least, it clearly belongs to the Roman period. Whatever the case, this work contains a clear, if rather confusing, messianic interest as well as a profound concern for the eschatological restoration of Israel, though the two are not explicitly linked.[71] The tribes are mentioned several times in connection with the *Testaments*' "Sin – Exile – Return" pattern described by Marins de Jonge,[72] most notably at *T. Ben.* 9:2 where it is said that "the twelve tribes shall be gathered" with all the nations at the rebuilt temple of God "until such time as the Most High shall send forth his salvation through the ministration of the unique prophet."[73]

As Pines has pointed out, the sectarian literature from the Dead Sea Scrolls evidences an analogous combination of messianic expectation and an eschatological interest in the tribes of Israel. Eschatological interest in the tribes is found at 4Q164, dated to the first century BCE, where Isa 54:12 is interpreted as concerning "the chiefs of the tribes of Israel in the las[t d]ays [...].[74] Still more striking is the organization of the military by tribes in preparation for the battle on the "Day of Revenge" given in the War Scroll, which at least in its present form is dated around the turn of the era, and which is obviously reminiscent of the preparations for the conquest of Canaan given in Numbers.[75] This tribal organization is also found throughout the "rule of the congregation of Israel in the final days" given in 1QSa, a work which additionally refers to this organization in connection with meals with the "Messiah of Israel," and which has been similarly dated to the mid-first century BCE.[76] While there is no explicit interest in the "return" or "restoration" of the tribes, the heavy reliance on the book of Numbers in association with the great eschatological battle in the War Scroll probably suggests that the sect expected an eschatological re-enactment of the conquest.[77]

As Pines has shown, references to the tribes of Israel in eschatological contexts also occur in early Christian literature. In Revelation, the seer reports that twelve thousand from each of the twelve tribes of Israel will be "sealed" with the mark of God prior to the coming of the day of wrath (7:1-8). How exactly one is to interpret these "twelve tribes" has been a matter of some

---

[71]See further Anders Hultgård, "The Ideal 'Levite', the Davidic Messiah, and the Saviour Priest in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," in Nickelsburg and Collins, *Ideal Figures*, 93-110.

[72]Marinus de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Study of Their Text, Composition, and Origin* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1975^2), 83-86.

[73]The translation is that of H. C. Kee, "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," in *OTP*, vol. 1, 827. See also *T. Ben.* 10:7 and *T. Dan* 1:9.

[74]For the date see Geza Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (New York: Penguin, 1987^3), 267. All translations of the Dead Sea Scrolls are from Florentino García Martínez, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated: The Qumran Texts in English* (trans. by W. G. E. Watson; Leiden: Brill, 1994).

[75]See Yigael Yadin, *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light Against the Sons of Darkness* (trans. by Batya and Chaim Rabin; Oxford University Press: 1962), 16, 38-86; also Philip R. Davies, *1QM, the War Scroll from Qumran: Its Structure and History* (BibOr 32; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1977), 24-58. On the date of the War Scroll see Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 104.

[76]Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 100.

[77]So Yadin (*The Scroll of the War*, 38) writes that "the sect saw in its sojourn in the wilderness a time of transition corresponding to the forty years' sojourn of the Israelites in the desert, and, like the latter, preparatory to its own return which would follow the pattern of the first Conquest"; cf. Davies, *1QM*, 28.

debate, though in light of the contrasting of this group with the "great multitude" made up of people "from every nation" at 7:9, it is most plainly understood as a reference to those of the Jewish people who are to be saved.[78] In any case, the context is clearly eschatological; and in the wider context of Revelation there is obviously some connection with a Davidic messiah (5:5). The twelve tribes appear again in an eschatological context at Rev 21:12, where their names are inscribed upon the gates of the heavenly Jerusalem.

Jesus' promise to the Twelve that they shall sit on "thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel," found at Matt 19:28 and Luke 22:30, almost certainly goes back to Q.[79] In both gospels this promise is one of an eschatological reward for the Twelve, though the rewards are promised on different grounds, and the saying itself occurs in quite different contexts in Matthew and Luke. A determination of the original Q saying is in any event unneccesary for our present purpose.[80] It is sufficient to note that in Q, Matthew and Luke, as in the literature previously surveyed, the twelve tribes of Israel appear in an eschatological context, and particularly in connection with Jesus' "kingdom" (Luke) or the "throne of glory" of the Son of Man (Matthew).

This association of Jesus with the eschatological restoration of Israel is especially developed by Luke, who presents Jesus' life and work squarely within the context of the Jewish hope for a Davidic messiah and national restoration.[81] Luke mentions the twelve tribes again at Acts 26:6-7, where Paul explains to Agrippa that he is on trial "on account of my hope in the promise (ἐπαγγελία) made by God to our ancestors, a promise that our twelve tribes hope to attain, as they earnestly worship day and night" (τὸ δωδεκάφυλον ἡμῶν ἐν ἐκτενείᾳ νύκτα καὶ ἡμέραν λατρεῦον ἐλπίζει καταντῆσαι). The nature of this promise is not elucidated in this passage; the language, however, is clearly reminiscent of the ideas we have found to be commonly associated with the twelve tribes: the promise was made to the fathers, and the hope of the twelve tribes to attain this promise is bound up in a proper piety. That this passage is to be taken with reference to restoration of Israel (however this might have been understood by Luke) is in fact clear from the rather remarkable resemblance it bears to Luke 2:36-38, where Anna the Prophetess appears as a specific example of the generalization made at Acts 26:6-7: a member of the "tribe of Asher" (ἐκ φυλῆς Ἀσήρ), Anna "never left the temple, and with fasting and prayer worshipped day and night (λατρεύουσα νύκτα καὶ ἡμέραν)." Upon seeing the child Jesus, Anna began speaking about him "*to all who were looking for the redemption of Jerusalem*" (λύτρωσιν Ἰερουσαλήμ).[82]

Given the widespread interest in the restoration of the twelve tribes, particularly in the early Roman period, one need not conclude, with Pines, that the Christians "borrowed" this motif from the Qumran sect. More importantly for the present context, given the remarkable consistency with which the tribes of Israel are associated with the eschatological restoration of Israel in conjunction with a messianic figure, Pines' contention that Jas 1:1 has no eschatological import is rather implausible. E. P. Sanders has noted, regarding "the motif of the twelve disciples," that "If not

---

[78]This passage has received significant attention, not least due to the peculiar exclusion of Dan from the list of the tribes. See, e.g., the recent exchange between Christopher R. Smith ("The Portrayal of the Church as the New Israel in the Names and Order of the Tribes in Revelation 7.5-8," *JSNT* 39 [1990], 111-18) and Richard Bauckham ("The List of the Tribes in Revelation 7 Again," *JSNT* 42 [1991], 99-115).

[79]On the presence of this logion in Q, see the literature cited by John S. Kloppenborg, *QParallels: Synopsis, Critical Notes & Concordance* (Foundations & Facets; Sonoma: Polebridge, 1988), 202.

[80]See however the attempt at a reconstruction by Arland Jacobson, *The First Gospel: An Introduction to Q* (Sonoma: Polebridge, 1992), 244ff.

[81]See esp. Luke 1:32-33, 68-75; 2:3, 25-38; and 24:21.

[82]The mention of Anna's tribal affiliation is particularly noteworthy in this regard, as it is, as far as I have noted, wholly unique in the literature of this period in that it refers to an individual as a member of one of the ten "lost" tribes. Pines ("Notes on the Twelve Tribes," 154 n. 17), notes this peculiarity as well.

every text which looks forward to the vindication of Israel explicitly mentions the number twelve, it is nevertheless true that the expectation of the reassembly of Israel was so widespread, and the memory of the twelve tribes remained so acute, that *'twelve' would necessarily mean 'restoration'*."[83] How much more so a reference to the *twelve tribes*! The fact that James' address implies that the tribes are understood to be contemporaries of the author is not in itself significant given the widespread belief that even the "ten tribes" were in still in existence east of the Euphrates.

In fact, when James' address is understood in the context of this widespread hope, it emerges as an effective and highly significant introduction to the epistle. Given the close association of the twelve tribes particularly with the land of Israel, James' address to the "twelve tribes *in the diaspora*," whether or not it is to be taken to imply the geographical location of James' intended audience, connotes the view that God's promise to Israel is at present unfulfilled.[84] On the other hand, if a reference to the twelve tribes virtually *de facto* conjures up images of eschatological restoration, this address at the same time sounds a note of hope for the future – particularly in light of the preceding reference to Jesus χριστός.[85] Such an interpretation in fact squares well with the eschatology that emerges from the rest of the letter. Those who are to inherit the promised kingdom live presently under the oppression of "the rich" (2:5-7); "the world" is thoroughly corrupt and antithetical to the purposes of God, but this situation will soon be reversed by a supernatural event that will entail judgment and both the destruction of "the rich" and the inheritance of the promised kingdom by "the poor."

Hartin is surely correct that James' address to the "twelve tribes" suggests the deuteronomic perspective of the author.[86] It is difficult to resist the conclusion that James' notion of a promised "kingdom" to be "inherited" by the poor is also to be understood in this context. Both the kingdom and the "crown of life" are promised by God particularly "to those who love him" (τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν, 1:13, 2:5), and this latter is a stereotyped phrase often used in deuteronomistic contexts with reference to the keeping of God's commandments.[87] The centrality of the "law," however understood, to the thought of James is of course also well known.[88] One might further note in this connection the call to repentance at 4:1-10.

Wisdom and Eschatology in the Composition of James

The Letter of James contains similiarities in form, projected audience and theme to both Q^1 and Q^2 as distinguished by Kloppenborg. James is dominated by imperative forms, and contains beatitudes and wisdom sayings, but also displays words of prophetic judgment. A prime example of the latter is Jas 5:1-6, which stands out from the rest of the letter's mix of hortatory instruction

---

[83]E. P. Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985), 98; emphasis his.

[84]The precise nature of this "restoration" for James, as in several of the works discussed above, is not immediately clear. This important problem is beyond the scope of the present essay.

[85]This passage has important implications for the role of Jesus Christ in James, though a full discussion of this problem is not possible here. It is odd that Mußner, who recognizes that the restoration of the twelve tribes is among the "eschatological deeds of the messiah" (*Der Jakobusbrief*, 62), does not discuss this issue at all in "»Direkte« und »indirekte« Christologie."

[86]Hartin, *James and the Q Sayings of Jesus*, 77. Like Mußner (*Der Jakobusbrief*, 62), however, Hartin understands it to imply that the Christians are *already* restored: "The epistle issues a call to those who are a part of this community to lead a life worthy of their having experienced God's call to salvation, *as those whom God has restored*" (*James and the Q Sayings of Jesus*, 78; emphasis added).

[87]See esp. LXX Exod 20:6; Deut 5:10; 7:9; 2 Esdr 11:5 (=Neh 1:5); Dan 9:4; *Pss. Sol.* 14:1-2; see further Martina Ludwig, *Wort als Gesetz: Eine Untersuchung zum Verständnis von "Wort" und "Gesetz" in israelitisch-frühjüdischen und neutestamentlichen Schriften. Gleichzeitig ein Beitrag zur Theologie des Jakobusbriefes* (Franfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1994), 144-50.

[88]Jas 1:22-25; 2:8-12; 4:11-12.

and milder warnings aimed at members of the group as a hostile and polemical address directed at outsiders.[89] James also contains an emphasis on some of the more important themes characteristic of both the formative and redactional strata of Q as delineated by Kloppenborg: most striking are James' concern for poverty and his use of "the poor" as a description of the group,[90] his emphasis on the providence of God (1:5-8; cf. 4:3), and his expectation of the imminent advent of some supernatural figure to bring an eschatological judgment that will reverse the corruption of the present world. James further, like Kloppenborg's Q^2, evidences a deuteronomic understanding of history, and even a similar eschatological interest in the twelve tribes.[91]

It is noteworthy, moreover, that a certain analogy between James and Q exists at the compositional level. The epistle is framed with eschatological references. Jas 1:1, with its address to "the twelve tribes who are in the diaspora," places James' instruction from the start within both an eschatological and a deuteronomistic framework. The concluding section of James in particular stresses the imminence of the eschaton, containing two references to the approaching *parousia* of the Lord, as well as the warning that "the judge is standing at the doors." In addition to these introductory and concluding references, James contains only one section that is entirely concerned with the theme of the judgment (5:1-6); other references come in the form of relatively isolated sayings at the beginning or end of literary units, which place James' instruction on the horizon of the coming judgment (2:12-13; 3:1), or which more generally give the exhortation an eschatological focus (1:12; perhaps also 3:18).[92]

It is interesting that the juxtaposition of sapiential and "apocalyptic" elements in James has not, at least to my knowledge, given rise to theories of earlier and later strata in the history of its composition.[93] In fact, these elements are quite well integrated in James. The instruction of James, which clearly evidences the influence of the instructional traditions contained in the Jewish wisdom literature, is given in light of an imminent *parousia* of the Lord and divine judgment. The wisdom that James advocates manifests itself in proper ethical action and is opposed to the demonic wisdom that inspires the self-serving behavior which characterizes "the world." The motivation for James' ethic, as in Q, is the coming of the "kingdom"; James' kingdom, however, in contrast to the "kingdom" Kloppenborg finds in Q^1, functions rather clearly in a deuteronomistic context and will be ushered in by a supernatural agent. The main duty of the "brothers" and "sisters" in the meantime is to wait patiently and be strong (5:7-8): this means resisting "the devil," avoiding the impurity of the "world," and manifesting the works of the wisdom that is "from

---

[89]On "the rich" as outsiders, see Maynard-Reid, *Poverty and Wealth*, 81f, and the literature he cites at p. 127 n. 3; note however the dissenting, though in my opinion not persuasive, view of Cain Hope Felder, "Wisdom, Law and Social Concern in the Epistle of James" (Ph.D. diss., Columbia University, 1982), 150-61. Milder rebukes directed at members of the group are found, for example, at 2:20 and 4:13-17; note, though, the rather harsh address "adulteresses" at 4:4.

[90]E.g., at 2:5; see esp. the discussion of Dibelius (*James*, 39-45), who states that for James "being poor and being Christian were coincidental concepts" (p. 44).

[91]Similarities between the Letter of James and the synoptic sayings source have often been noted; see esp. Patrick Hartin (*James and the Q Sayings of Jesus*, esp. 140-217),who argues extensively for James' knowledge of both Q and Q^{Matt}. The question of James' dependence upon Q is beyond the scope of this paper.

[92]On the eschatological character of 3:13, see Hoppe, *Der theologische Hintergrund*, 67-70.

[93]Though such theories have been proposed, they have been related either to theses regarding an originally Jewish document (e.g. Friedrich Spitta, "Der Brief des Jakobus," in idem, *Zur Geschichte und Litteratur des Urchristentums*, Bd. 2 [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1896], 1-239; and Arnold Meyer, *Das Rätsel des Jacobusbriefes* [BZNW 10; Giessen: Töpelmann, 1930]), to the detection in James of both a "hellenistic" commentary and an earlier "hebraic" text (W. L. Knox, "The Epistle of St. James," *JTS* 46 [1945], 10-17), or to explain how a letter by James of Jerusalem could be written in such good Greek (Davids, *The Letter of James*, 10-13, 22) rather than with a concern for a perceived incompatablity of its sapiential and apocalyptic elements. Such theses have in any case won little acceptance.

above" rather than that which is "demonic" and "earthly," especially vis à vis those who are socially disadvantaged. The combination of sapiential and apocalyptic elements in a unified manner in the Letter of James, and the framing of the former by the latter, perhaps warrants another look at Kloppenborg's separation of these elements to uncover a "formative component" of Q.