SEMINAR PAPERS



SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE

ANNUAL MEETING 2000

SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE

2000 Seminar Papers

Society of Biblical Literature
Seminar Papers Series

Number 39
Society of Biblical Literature
2000 Seminar Papers

Society of Biblical Literature
2000 Seminar Papers

One Hundred Thirty-Sixth Annual Meeting
November 17–21, 2000
Opryland Hotel
Nashville, Tennessee

Society of Biblical Literature
Atlanta

Society of Biblical Literature
2000 Seminar Papers

Copyright © 2000 by the Society of Biblical Literature

All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying and recording, or by means of any information storage or retrieval system, except as may be expressly permitted by the 1976 Copyright Act or in writing from the publisher. Requests for permission should be addressed in writing to the Rights and Permissions Office, Society of Biblical Literature, 825 Houston Mill Road, Atlanta, GA 30329.

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: 0-88414-030-X
ISSN: 0145-2711

Printed in the United States of America

Contents

Christian Apocrypha Section

S19 Petrine Traditions in the *Acts of Philip: Letter of Peter to Philip*, a Variant of a Q Saying Found in Matthew 18:21–22, *Acts of Peter*, and the *Acts of Peter and the Twelve Apostles*
Andrea Lorenzo Molinari 1

Constructions of Ancient Space Seminar

S64 Sanctuary and Womb: Henri Lefebvre and the Production of Space
Roland Boer 24

S64 Word Reconstructing Flesh: Portable Christianity and Its Fragile Earth Connection
Mary Huie-Jolly 49

S64 Images of Cities in Ancient Religions: Some Methodological Considerations
Daria Pezzoli-Olgiati 80

Early Jewish and Christian Mysticism Group

S184 The Mystical Understanding in the *Ascension of Isaiah*
Jonathan Knight 103

S184 Ex 33 on God's Face:
A Lesson from the Enochic Tradition
Andrei A. Orlov 130

Formation of the Book of Isaiah Group

S158 Lowth's Isaiah Commentary and Romanticism
Gary Stansell 148

S158 What's New in Lowth? Synchronic Reading in the Eighteenth and Twenty-First Centuries
Patricia K. Tull 183

Formation of the Book of the Twelve Seminar

S65 God Sows the Land: Hosea's Place in the Book of the Twelve
Laurie J. Braaten 218

S65 The Repentance of Nineveh in the Story of Jonah and Nahum's Prophecy of the City's Destruction: Aggadic Solutions for an Exegetical Problem in the Book of the Twelve
Beate Ego 243

S65 Psalms in the Book of the Twelve: How Misplaced are They?
Erhard S. Gerstenberger 254

S65 Haggai-Zechariah: Prophecy after the Manner of Ezekiel
Steven S. Tuell 263

Historical Jesus Section

S138 Jesus in Oral Memory: The Initial Stages of the Jesus Tradition
James D. G. Dunn 287

Josephus Seminar

S114 The Politics of Contempt: Judeans and Egyptians in Josephus' *Against Apion*
John M. G. Barclay 327

S203 "A Myth for the World": Early Christian Reception of Cannibalism in Josephus, *Bellum Judaicum* 6.199–219
Honora H. Chapman 359

Matthew Section

S28 "To Save His People from Their Sins" (Matt 1:21): Rome's Empire and Matthew's Salvation as Sovereignty
Warren Carter 379

S68 Salvation in Matthew
Robert H. Gundry 402

Paul and Politics Group

S144 The Politics of Commendation
Efrain Agosto 415

S144 The Politics of Virtue and Vice in the Pauline Epistles
Jennifer Wright Knust 436

Rhetoric and the New Testament Section

S147 The Argumentative Coherency of Romans 7:1–6
Keith Augustus Burton 452

Romans through History and Culture Seminar

S99 Bishop John William Colenso's Interpretation to the Zulu People of the *Sola Fide* in Paul's Letter to the Romans
Jonathan A. Draper 465

S208 "A Remedy for Having Been Born of Woman": Jesus, Gender, and Genealogy in Romans
Pamela Eisenbaum 494

S208 The Gendered Sinner in Romans 1–7
Teresa J. Hornsby 520

S208 Judging and Community in Romans: An Action within the Boundaries
Yak-Hwee Tan 559

Synoptic Gospels Section

S122 A Monopoly on Marcan Priority? Fallacies at the Heart of Q
Mark Goodacre 583

S122 Luke's Rewriting of the Sermon on the Mount
Mark A. Matson 623

S122 A Pioneer Narrative Critic and His Synoptic Hypothesis: Austin Farrer and Gospel Interpretation
Jeffrey Peterson 651

Theological Perspectives on the Book of Ezekiel Seminar

S123 Priesthood in Exile According to the Book of Ezekiel
Friedrich Fechter 673

S123 Priest, Prophet, and Exile: Ezekiel as a Literary Construct
Corrine Patton 700

S194 Ezekiel: Zadokite Priest and Visionary Prophet of the Exile
Marvin A. Sweeney 728

Theology of the Disputed Paulines Group

S74 God, Cosmos, and Church Universal: The Theology of Ephesians
Pheme Perkins 752

Wisdom and Apocalypticism in Early Judaism and Early Christianity Group

S31 The *Psalms of Solomon* and the Ideology of Rule
Rodney A. Werline 774

S213 Paul's Anti-Imperial "Discourse of the Cross": The Cross and Power in 1 Corinthians 1–4
Demetrius K. Williams 796

Petrine Traditions in the *Acts of Philip*: *Letter of Peter to Philip*, a Variant of a Q Saying Found in Matthew 18:21–22, *Act of Peter* and the *Acts of Peter and the Twelve Apostles*

Andrea Lorenzo Molinari

The *Act of Peter*, Papyrus Berolinensis 8502.4, was discovered several years before the end of the nineteenth century, presumably somewhere near Akhmim in Upper Egypt. The actual date and location of the discovery is unknown since the codex which contains the *Act of Peter* was found in an antiquities shop in Cairo in 1896. After this, Carl Schmidt brought it to Berlin and subsequently published its contents in 1903.[1] Since 1896, it has been preserved in the Department of Egyptology of the National Museum in Berlin. The codex itself contains three other texts, the *Gospel of Mary*, the *Apocryphon of John* and the *Sophia of Jesus Christ* — all of which are gnostic in character.

At the time of Schmidt's publication the text received its first critical analysis.[2] Following this first study, a good portion of the overall debate has centered on this text's relationship with the apócryphal *Acts of Peter* (preserved in its most complete form in the Latin manuscript, *Actus Vercellenses*). Schmidt viewed the *Act of Peter* as part of the long-lost first third of the *Acts of Peter*. Although his 1903 introduction received a fairly warm reception, he received some criticism from A. Hilgenfeld.[3] He was also challenged, this time with more resolve, by Gerhard Ficker in 1904, a position Ficker reaffirmed in

---

[1]The basic details of the circumstances surrounding the discovery are described by Schmidt in his Prelude, (*Die alten Petrusakten im Zusammenhang der apokryphen Apostellitteratur nebst einem neuentdeckten Fragment* [TU 24.1; Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1903] 1–2).

[2]Schmidt was the first to publish the Coptic text (*Die alten Petrusakten*, 1–7). As far as I have been able to determine there have been three subsequent publications of the Coptic text: Walter C. Till and Hans-Martin Schenke, eds., *Die gnostischen Schriften des koptischen Papyrus Berolinensis 8502* (TU 60; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1972) 296–319; James Brashler and Douglas M. Parrott, eds., *Nag Hammadi Codices V,2–5 and VI with Papyrus Berolinensis 8502,1 and 4* (NHS 11; Leiden: Brill, 1979) 478–93; and, most recently, Lousie Roy, *L'Acte de Pierre [BG 4]* (BCNH Section Textes 18; Québec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval, 1987). For a review of all the times this text has been published and into which languages, see Roy (*L'Acte de Pierre [BG 4]* 172–74).

[3]Hilgenfeld, "Die alten Actus Petri," *ZWT* 46 (1903) 321–41.

1924.[4] Unfortunately, Ficker's comments were not as thorough as they should have been. Thus he left himself vulnerable to a determined refutation. Not surprisingly, Schmidt responded almost immediately in that same year,[5] pushing aside Ficker's light resistance, and since then his arguments have attained general acceptance.[6]

---

[4]There are three works by Ficker that come into play here. The first two were published in 1904, the third in 1924. In the first analysis (a brief introduction in the first edition of *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen*), Ficker hesitatingly accepted Schmidt's proposal of an original unity between the Coptic *Act of Peter* and the *Acts of Peter*, albeit with some reservations. In this collection the text of the *Act of Peter* was published in German as part of the *Acts of Peter* ("Petrusakten," in Edgar Hennecke, ed., *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen in Verbindung mit Fachgelehrten in deutscher Übersetzung und mit Einleitungen* [Tübingen: Mohr, 1904] 383–423; hereafter "Petrusakten I"). However, in the same year (1904), Ficker also published a rather extensive analysis of the *Acts of Peter* as part of a handbook intended to accompany the texts provided in the previous volume. In this study Ficker included a brief critical analysis of Schmidt's 1903 article in which he concluded, contrary to Schmidt, that the *Act of Peter* was probably not the long-lost first part of the *Acts of Peter* ("Petrusakten," in E. Hennecke, ed., *Handbuch zu den Neutestamentlichen Apokryphen in Verbindung mit Fachgelehrten* [Tübingen: Mohr, 1904] 395–491; see especially 400–404; hereafter "Petrusakten II"). Finally, in 1924, Ficker pushed Schmidt too far. In the second edition of *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen*, Ficker, acting upon his previously stated conviction, refused to publish the *Act of Peter* as part of the *Acts of Peter* ("Actus Vercellenses," in E. Hennecke, ed., *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen in Verbindung mit Fachgelehrten in deutscher Uebersetzung und mit Einleitungen* [2d ed.; Tübingen: Mohr, 1924] 226–49).

[5]From Schmidt's own words it is clear that, although irritated by Ficker's comments in 1904 ("Petrusakten II," 400–404), it was Ficker's refusal in 1924 even to publish the *Act of Peter* that was the final straw that provoked Schmidt's extended argument ("Studien zu den alten Petrusakten," *ZKG* 43 [1924] 321; hereafter "Studien I"). Schmidt also wrote a second article on the *Acts of Peter* ("Studien zu den alten Petrusakten: Die Komposition," *ZKG* 45 [1927] 481–513).

[6]E.g., Roy states, "That this Coptic fragment was part of the ancient Πράξεις Πέτρου, there cannot be any doubt, as was established by C. Schmidt" (*L'Acte de Pierre [BG 4]* 177). See also Léon Vouaux, *Les Actes de Pierre* (Documents pour servir a l'étude des origines chrétiennes; Paris: Librairie Letouzey et Ané, 1922) 35–38; Brashler and Parrott, *Nag Hammadi Codices V,2–5 and VI*, 474–75; Kurt Rudolf, *Gnosis: The Nature and History of Gnosticism* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1987) 28; James E. Goehring, "Act of Peter," *ABD* 5.266; S. Kent Brown, "Act of Peter," in Aziz S. Atiya, ed., *The Coptic Encyclopedia* (8 vols; New York: Macmillan, 1991) 1.57; and J. K. Elliott, *The Apocryphal New Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1993) 391. Also, Michel Tardieu, while not describing the relationship between the *Act of Peter* and the *Acts of Peter* in detail, still assumes (presumably following Schmidt) that they were at one time a single text. He attributes the "suppression" of the Coptic fragment to its "fundamentalism" (*Écrits Gnostiques: Codex de Berlin* [Sources gnostiques et manichéennes 1; Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1984] 69).

Due to space considerations Schmidt's discussion cannot be evaluated adequately here. However, for the purposes of contextualization, it is profitable to sketch the basic lines of his thinking in regard to the relationship between the *Act of Peter* and the *Acts of Peter*. Schmidt's arguments can be divided into three categories: 1) his general observations on the title *Act of Peter* itself;[7] 2) nine points of consensus in thought and language between the *Acts of Peter* and the *Act of Peter*;[8] and 3) the witnesses of various early Christian documents. The four witnesses which Schmidt claims support his position of an original unity of the *Act of Peter* and the *Acts of Peter* are found in Jerome, *Against Jovinianus* 1.26, the *Acts of Nereus and Achilleus*,

---

[7]Schmidt begins his observations on the title by stating that the *Act of Peter* is "only a little episode out of a bigger work that had Peter as its object" ("Studien I," 323). He notes that the Coptic incipit, ⲦⲈⲠⲢⲀⲔⲒⲤ ⲘⲠⲈⲦⲢⲞⲤ, preserves the original Greek title, Πρᾶξις Πέτρου. Schmidt argues that because the Coptic *Act of Peter* calls itself an "act" (i.e., associating itself with the genre "apocryphal acts") it must associated with a larger collection of acts (and to Schmidt's mind there can only be one collection of Petrine acts!). In fact, Schmidt's entire argument is based on the fallacious assumption of a single source in antiquity for Petrine acts-like traditions. Schmidt admits that, "Now all these points noted here are not convincing in the same degree; because these points of contact could be shown also with other acts of the apostles. However in their totality they encourage the conviction, that the little πρᾶξις must be placed in some connection to a fictitious depiction of the life of Peter, and that can only be the ancient πράξεις Πέτρου, such as that available to us in the Actus Vercellenses (ibid., 328). We see this same presupposition at work again in Schmidt's later comments concerning evidence drawn from the *Acts of Philip*: "If now it is certain that the author of the *Acts of Philip* has known and used the *Acts of Peter*, then everyone who is unbiased will naturally come to the conclusion, that he has also read the story of Peter's daughter in the same *Acts of Peter*. Or is he expected to have used still other Petrine stories as well?" (ibid., 332).

[8]The following is a brief paraphrase of Schmidt's points:
1. Narrated events occur on a Sunday.
2. Healing of the blind, deaf and lame occurs in both texts.
3. Visions play a big role.
4. The description of the paralyzed state is similar.
5. Sexual asceticism is the moral ideal.
6. Similar phrases are used for the Eucharistic sharing.
7. The phrase "eyes of the flesh, eyes of the soul" appears in both texts.
8. God is portrayed as a merciful God in both texts.
9. The names and/or descriptive terms used for God and/or Christ are similar.

Augustine, *Contra Adimantum* 17.5[9] and *Acts of Philip* 142. In this study, I shall focus my attention on the fourth of these four witnesses.

This final piece of Schmidt's argument for the original unity of the *Act of Peter* with the Vercelli *Acts of Peter* is based on a very short passage found in the *Acts of Philip* M.36 [142],[10] which in its present context is found in the Martyrdom portion of the *Acts of Philip* as part of Philip's exhortation to the crowd witnessing his death:

> 'Therefore our brother Peter fled from every place where a woman was: and further, he had offense given by reason of his own daughter. And he prayed to the Lord, and she had a palsy of the side that she might not be led astray' (Καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ὁ ἀδελφὸς ἡμῶν Πέτρος ἔφυγεν ἀπὸ παντὸς τόπου ἐν ᾧ ὑπῆρχεν γυνή. ἔτι δὲ καὶ σκάνδαλον εἶχεν διὰ τὴν ἰδίαν θυγατέρα, καὶ ηὔξατο πρὸς κύριον, καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν παραλύσει τῆς πλευρᾶς αὐτῆς διὰ τὸ μὴ ἀπατηθῆναι).[11]

---

[9]See my article, "Augustine, *Contra Adimantum*, *Pseudo-Titus*, BG 8502.4 and the *Acts of Peter*: Attacking Carl Schmidt's Theory of an Original Unity between the *Act of Peter* and the *Acts of Peter*," *SBLSP* 38 (1999) 426-47.

[10]Regarding the date of *Acts of Philip*, Frédéric Amsler states: "The date and the geographical area out of which the *Acts of Philip* has issued remains unknown. The first mention of the apocrypha figures in a list of books not received by the ecclesiastical tradition, constructed, it seems, in Gaul around 500 and inserted in the *Decree of Gelasius*. On the contrary, since they know and even cite them, the *Acts of Philip* does not seem to be before the *Acts of Peter*, the *Acts of John* and the *Acts of Andrew*, indeed even those of Paul or Thomas, which the critic dates back to the second or third centuries. But... an appreciable number of indications contained in the text itself invite us to place the composition of this apocryphal book around the turn of the fourth and fifth centuries in Phrygia, in Asia Minor, and to attach it to an ascetical movement, one that is a little marginal by the account of the official Church, but which has established itself in the mold of one of the most fruitful oriental monastic spiritualities" (Amsler, François Bovon and Bertrand Bouvier, trans., *Actes de l'apôtre Philippe* [Apocryphes: Collection de Poche de l'AELAC 8; Turnhout: Brepols, 1996] 14).

[11]The Greek is that of recension B of the Martyrdom, taken from the manuscript known as Xenophontes 32. Here, as elsewhere, when the Greek text of the *Acts of Philip* appears I am indebted to François Bovon, who graciously provided galleys of the key passages from the edition of the *Acts of Philip* he and his colleagues were preparing at the time when I was researching this section. At the time of the final typesetting of this manuscript, the volume has been published and is available in François Bovon, Bertrand Bouvier and Frédéric Amsler, eds., *Acta Philippi* (CC Series Apocryphorum 11; Turnhout: Brepols, 1999).

Schmidt supports his position by pointing out the fact that there are strong similarities (similarities that, in his mind, are indicative of literary dependence) between *Acts of Philip* 6.16–21 [80–85] and *Acts of Peter* 28 (a "contest" involving the resurrection of a young man between an apostle and his adversary) and *Acts of Philip* M.34 [140] and *Acts of Peter* 38 (the upside down crucifixions of the apostles and their subsequent speeches).[12] After pointing out these resemblances, Schmidt, with almost a giddy tone, states:

> If it is now certain that the author of the *Acts of Philip* knew and used the *Acts of Peter*, then any unbiased observer will naturally come to the conclusion, that the author has also read the story of Peter's daughter in the same *Acts of Peter*. Or should it be assumed that he used still other Petrine stories as well?[13]

Once again, Schmidt's assumption of a single source in antiquity for traditions concerning Peter (i.e., the *Acts of Peter*) is operative. Certainly, it is undeniable that the *Acts of Philip* has some knowledge of the *Acts of Peter* — yet what kinds of connections are there between these two texts? And is there any evidence in the *Acts of Philip* that its author(s) may have "used still other Petrine stories as well"?

Before we can specifically answer the first of these questions, it is helpful to recognize that *Acts of Philip* M.36 [142] is not a direct quotation of

---

[12]The whole question of literary dependence, especially in regard to its application to the *Acts of Peter* and the *Acts of Philip*, has been recently addressed by Christopher R. Matthews. After examining these three points of so-called dependence, Matthews concludes: "The current standard accounts of the *APh*'s literary dependence upon the *APt* are revealed as too simplistic.... Models of literary dependence based on source criticism of the Synoptic Gospels are out of their depth when applied to the Apocryphal Acts.... 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" ("Peter and Philip Upside Down: Perspectives on the Relation of the *Acts of Philip* to the *Acts of Peter*," *SBLSP* 35 [1996] 34). Unfortunately, while Matthews does question the commonly held understanding of the nature of the relationship of *Acts of Peter* to *Acts of Philip* (inspired and dependent on Schmidt), he does accept Schmidt's assumption of an original connection of the *Act of Peter* and the *Acts of Peter*.

[13]Schmidt, "Studien I," 332.

the story of Peter's daughter. Rather, it is probably best described as a summary of or reference to that story. It is clearly a polemical use of this narrative in support of the encratite theology which characterizes the *Acts of Philip*. Its slanted perception of the story of Peter's daughter is best captured in the phrase, "our brother Peter fled from every place where a woman was." This statement displays a gross distortion of the material known to us from the *Act of Peter*, e.g., the uncensored references to Peter's continued cohabitation with his wife and the vision at the time of his daughter's birth which implies that he was already a Christian — his time with Jesus had not changed his views on marriage and sexual activity. (Apparently, Peter was not very good at fleeing "from every place where a woman was" and must have used his bedroom as one of his hiding places — hence, his daughter!)[14]

The work of François Bovon is particularly helpful in expanding this discussion. It serves to help us clarify our understanding of the differences between the various ways an author might use a source:

> In the case of the apocrypha and canonical gospels, it is necessary to distinguish between citation, imitation, and adaption. *Acts Ph. Martyrdom* cites the story of the daughter of Peter from the *Acts of Peter* which *Acts Ph.* 2 manifestly imitates: the description of Philip in Athens bears the features of Paul's appearance in that city as described in Acts 17. *Acts Ph.* 5–7, on the other hand, adapts a long section from the *Acts of Peter* (a scriptural quotation). All three techniques, citation, imitation, and adaption, are methods which reveal the use of written documents.[15]

While I appreciate Bovon's attempt to clarify the issue, I would prefer a more specified use of the term "citation" for *Acts of Philip* M.36 [142] which can mean either direct quotation or a less specific reference to or mention of facts — in this case the latter definition is appropriate. I accept his final statement

---

[14]Schmidt also recognizes this inconsistency although he fails to recognize its impact on his thesis. He describes the author's use of this story as "completely garbled," pointing out that Peter is married and does have a daughter ("Studien I," 330–31).

[15]Bovon, "The Synoptic Gospels and the Noncanonical Acts of the Apostles," *HTR* 81 (1988) 25–26. Note Bovon's assumption that the *Act of Peter* was originally part of the *Acts of Peter* (cf. idem, "Les Actes de Philippe," *ANRW* 2.25.6 [1988] 4523).

with the proviso that while citation, imitation, and adaption can reveal the use of written documents, they can also reflect the knowledge of oral traditions that are either reliant on or independent of written sources. Clearly, in the case of *Acts of Philip* M.36 [142], we are not dealing with the direct use of a written source as with Matthew's use of Mark.

Recently, Christopher R. Matthews analyzed the relationship between the *Acts of Philip* and its sources. Matthews questions the traditionally held understanding of the relationship between the *Acts of Peter* and the *Acts of Philip*. He discusses the *Acts of Philip* and its use of biblical material, story elements and narrative plot lines from other apocryphal acts and various gnostic and Jewish sources but stresses that it can be shown that borrowing was not always "clear cut."[16] For example, after comparing *Acts of Philip* M.34 [140] and *Acts of Peter* 38 with special focus on a shared saying ("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"),[17] Matthews concludes:

> Scholars have long presumed the literary dependence of *APh* 140 on *APet* 38. But... this view raises a number of questions. If *APh* 140 is dependent on *APet* 38, we are left with the problem of explaining how the 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 *APet* 38. It is sounder methodologically to presume that *APh* 140 has developed without reference to the text of *APet* 38. If the account in the *APet* has influenced the *APh* in some other manner (e.g.,

---

[16]Matthews, "Trajectories Through the Philip Tradition" (Ph.D. dissertation; Cambridge: Harvard University, 1993) 238–40. For more specific treatment of the various sources underlying the *Acts of Philip* see, Bovon, "Les Actes de Philippe," 4475–4521 and Amsler, *Actes de l'apôtre Philippe*, 27–80.

[17]This is the version of this saying found in the *Acts of Peter* 38. Other versions are found in the *Acts of Philip* 140, *Gos. Thom* 22 and *2 Clem* 12.2.

> through oral tradition), that situation is more complex than a straightforward literary adaptation.[18]

He concludes:

> The comparison of *APet* 38 with *APh* 140 cautions us 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 a simple imitation.[19]

Matthews raises an important point. We must guard against assuming too quickly the direct dependence of one text on another just because two texts share motifs. As I have already demonstrated, with my examination and refutation of Schmidt's nine points of consensus, many of the motifs shared between texts are extremely common in both non-Christian and Christian literature and need not signal literary dependence (direct or otherwise).

The work of Frédéric Amsler on the *Acts of Philip* is a more modern example of over-reliance on the appearance of similar motifs to demonstrate literary dependence. The extensive indexes that are provided at the conclusion of Amsler's new French translation include a list of occasions in the *Acts of Philip* where he believes references are made to the *Acts of Peter*.[20] In his introduction he particularly singles out the *Acts of Peter* as a key source for *Acts of Philip*, acts 5–7:

> The probable literary dependence of the *Act of Philip* VI in comparison to the *Acts of Peter* (*Ac Peter* 28) was noticed already at the beginning of the century as the presence of a similar diptych composed of the resurrection of a dead man bears out. But this comparison must be enlarged not only to *Acts*

---

[18]Matthews, "Trajectories", 276.

[19]Ibid., 279.

[20]Amsler, *Les Actes de l'apôtre Philippe*, 308. These indexes include references to biblical and apocryphal writings as well as those of various Church writers.

> *of Peter* 23–28, but equally to *Acts of Peter* 21–22, if one is to go back with it as far as the *Act of Philip* V, and to *Acts of Peter* 29, if one is to go forward with it as far as Act VII. Although the Petrine *Acts* sometimes present a very complicated writing, the only danger will be not to explain the same series of themes in the *Acts of Peter* 21–29 and the *Acts of Philip* V to VII without giving a good number of verbal contacts: repetition of the transfiguration (*Ac Ph* V.22–23; *Ac Peter* 21); fasting of the apostle before combat (*Ac Ph* V.26; *Ac Peter* 22); a theological dispute opposing the apostle with a Jewish adversary (*Ac Ph* VI.9–15; *Ac Peter* 23–24); victory of the apostle, alone capable of raising the dead (*Ac Ph* VI.16–20; *Ac Peter* 25–27 or rather 28); pious rivalry between the host of the apostle and the father or the mother of the resuscitated son concerning the place of worship (*Ac Ph* VII.2; *Ac Peter* 29). To this can be joined again, for example, the appearance in the two texts of the personage of the doorkeeper or female doorkeeper (*Ac Ph* V.17; *Ac Peter* 9) and the motif of the purification of the house (*Ac Ph* V.49 in the Vaticanus gr. 824; *Ac Peter* 19). A more careful comparison of the two writings shows that its borrowing does not extend to the doctrinal plan, each of the two texts pursues its proper theological objectives.[21]

I include this description of Amsler because it demonstrates perfectly my point in regard to latching on to general motifs to demonstrate literary dependence. For example, I agree with Amsler's assessment of the connection between *Acts of Philip* 6.16–21 [80–85]/*Acts of Peter* 28. It is solid because it is supported by the general proximity of motifs as well as similarity of plot structure. While I agree with his assessment of some kind of dependence (although not one of direct literary/textual dependence) of this story of the contest involving the resurrection of a young man (i.e., *Acts of Philip* 6.16–21 [80–85] on *Acts of Peter* 28), I cannot accept the way that such an assessment opens the floodgates to seemingly innumerable and decidedly weaker assertions of dependence! Perhaps an example will prove my point here. Amsler suggests a connection between the two doorkeepers. However, the figure of the doorkeeper in *Acts of Peter* 9 functions only to pass on to Peter the instructions of Simon (i.e., to say that Simon was not at home), while the female doorkeeper in *Acts of Philip* 5.14 and 17 (again in 7.1) becomes a convert and

[21]Ibid., 47–48.

is specifically named, Marclena. Should it be so fantastic to us that both instances, set in and around the homes of the rich (Marcellus and Irenos), mention a doorkeeper — a cultural commonplace?![22] It is the exact same situation with Amsler's second example, the motif of the purification of the house (*Ac Ph* 4.42 in the Vaticanus gr. 824; *Ac Peter* 19). The idea of sprinkling water or other substances so as to purify or "exorcise" a house is present in Judaism as well a number of Greco-Roman cultic situations. In no way should it surprise us that purification rituals for the home are common, as Eli E. Burriss explains so aptly:

> Among all peoples, water and fire are common instruments for removing the harmful effects of contact with persons or things which, as they believe, possess a mysterious power to harm. Inasmuch as they find in everyday life that water can cleanse their household utensils and their bodies, they believe, by a curious twist in thinking, that it can cleanse them of the uncanny contagion of those persons and things which are, as we say, taboo.[23]

Tertullian himself says as much in *De baptismo* 5.1 (*inter* AD 200–206):

> Well, but the nations, who are strangers to all understanding of spiritual powers, ascribe to their idols the imbuing of waters with the self-same efficacy." (So they do) but they cheat themselves with waters that are widowed. For washing is the channel through which they are initiated into some sacred rites — of some notorious Isis or Mithras. The gods themselves likewise they honor by washings. Moreover, by carrying water around, and sprinkling it, they everywhere expiate country-seats, houses, temples and whole cities: at all events, at the Apollinarian and Eleusinian games they are

---

[22]Cf. the account found in Petronius Arbiter, *Satyricon* 28–29 (the prelude to the feast of Trimalchio). Note its mention of the doorkeeper. Furthermore it describes a painting of a huge chained dog on the wall near the porter's lodge — shall we assume then the dependence of the *Acts of Peter* 9 on the *Satyricon*? Obviously it is clear that a mere "connect the dots" approach to literary motifs in related texts is not enough to demonstrate dependence.

[23]Burriss, *Taboo, Magic, Spirits* (1931; reprint, Westport, Conn.: Greenwood, 1972) 150–51.

> baptized; and they presume that the effect of their doing that is their regeneration and the remission of the penalties due to their perjuries.

Thus it is not so great a leap from the concept of cleaning one's house with water to ritualizing this common occurrence in regard to spiritual cleaning i.e., exorcism, protection, baptism. Furthermore, as I compare the texts Amsler lists as reflecting the influence of the *Acts of Peter* on the *Acts of Philip*, I find that the overwhelming majority of these so-called "references" are equally tenuous (e.g., the reference to the apostles' smiles in *Acts of Peter* 6 and *Acts of Philip* 6.2). I have said all this simply to underline the fact that the *Acts of Philip*, while certainly influenced by the *Acts of Peter*, is not reliant upon its source in the same way as Matthew is reliant on Mark. We should not make the mistake of imagining that the author(s) of the *Acts of Philip* were engaged strictly in copying and revising directly from the *Acts of Peter* as from a written source. In answering the question as to what kinds of connections there are between these two texts, it may be safer to limit our assertions of *Acts of Philip*'s dependence on the *Acts of Peter* to those instances which are more secure (i.e., *Acts of Philip* 6.16–21 [80–85]/*Acts of Peter* 28 and *Acts of Philip* M.34 [140]/*Acts of Peter* 38 and even the specific kind of dependence of these instances is open to debate as has been demonstrated by Matthews!). All other claims of dependency must be subjected to rigorous examination, not assuming that knowledge of *Acts of Peter* 28 and 38 indicates wholesale interpolations. Each case must be individually tested. Matthews's preliminary results indicate that the borrowing is probably not direct, and my critique of the over-reliance on motifs demonstrates that it is also not nearly as extensive as has been previously asserted. In short, we should not proceed with the image of the authors of the *Acts of Philip* writing with an open copy of the *Acts of Peter* before them!

With these remarks made, we can proceed to answer the second question: is there any evidence in the *Acts of Philip* that its author(s) may have "used still other Petrine stories as well"? The answer to this question is a resounding "yes." In the pages that follow, I shall examine three other parts of the *Acts of Philip* that have Petrine connections. I shall show that none of

these three segments have any connection whatsoever with the *Acts of Peter*, thus demonstrating conclusively that the author(s) of the *Acts of Philip* did know other Petrine stories.

If Schmidt's principle (i.e., if the knowledge and use of *Acts of Peter* can be demonstrated in the *Acts of Philip*, then any mention of a story involving Peter must also derive from this same source) is to be followed for *Acts of Philip* 142, then we should assume logically that the story of Philip's apostolic affirmation/commission in *Acts of Philip* 3.1–3 must also derive from the *Acts of Peter*:

> When Philip, the apostle of Christ, arrived in the empire of the Parthians, behold he found in a city the apostle of Christ, Peter, in the company of the other disciples and of some women, who were imitating the male faith. Philip said to Peter and to those who were with him: "I beseech you, O my companions in the Spirit, I beseech you, you who have received the crown of Christ in the apostolic order, confer on me your authority, so that I might preach the Gospel and that I might bring in the number of those who share with you the glory in heaven, the zeal, the delight, the abasement of the flesh, and in the heart without fear of those who are humble in continence. You, you have manifested your zeal according to the authority that you have received; pray therefore also for me now, so that I might preach the Gospel and that I might bring in the number of those who will realize the authority which is in them." At these words of Philip, they fell to their knees to pray to the Lord on his behalf, and all were in joy at that which Philip had asked thus to fulfill his apostolate and his deaconate.
>
> There was there also the blessed John, who said to Philip: "My brother and my companion in the apostolate, if it is true that you must travel far and wide, know that brother Andrew has left for Achaia and for all of Thrace, Thomas for India and the murderous flesh-eaters, Matthew to the pitiless inhabitants of caves, whose nature is savage. The Lord will be with you. You therefore, Philip, are not left abandoned, because Jesus is with you.
>
> And Philip having narrated in full all that concerned Athens, they glorified God. Philip added: "I adjure you, blessed John, and you, blessed Peter, pray for me, so that I also might accomplish that mission which the Lord has confided in me."

Unfortunately, Schmidt fails to discuss this Petrine story. No major commentator of whom I am aware claims that this commissioning scene was originally part of the *Acts of Peter* — except for Amsler's minor comparison of the phrase "companion in the apostolate (co-apostle)" in *Acts of Philip* 3.2 with a similar construction in *Acts of Peter* 9 (again a similarity that is virtually meaningless).[24] Rather, Amsler, Bovon and Matthews all choose to discuss this text as it might relate to the canonical Acts and, in the case of the latter two commentators, the *Letter of Peter to Philip* (NHC 8.2).[25] This last suggestion is particularly intriguing and it is concisely expressed by Matthews:

> While the connection of 30–32 with Acts is not explicit, the similarity between 30 and the opening of the *Letter of Peter to Philip* is striking: Philip on one side and Peter and those with him on the other. While it is possible that both of these texts take their starting point directly from Acts, this is by no means certain.[26]

To Matthews's observations I would add that both *Letter of Peter to Philip* and *Acts of Philip* 3.1–3 describe a commissioning scene and the eventual world-wide dispersion of the apostles to preach the Gospel (albeit in a much abbreviated form in the former):

> Peter gathered together the others also, saying, "O, Lord Jesus Christ, author of our rest, give us a spirit of understanding in order that we also may perform wonders."

---

[24]Amsler, *Actes de l'apôtre Philippe*, 123 n. 126.

[25]Amsler, *Actes de l'apôtre Philippe*, 39–41; Bovon, "Les Actes de Philippe," 4479–4481; and Matthews, "Trajectories," 243–44.

[26]Matthews, "Trajectories," 243–44. I include here the letter portion (*Ep. Pet. Phil.* 132.12–133.8): "Peter, the apostle of Jesus Christ, to Philip our beloved brother and our fellow apostle and to the brethren who are with you: greetings! Now I want you to know, our brother that we received orders from our Lord and the Savior of the whole world that we should come together and give instruction and preach in the salvation which was promised us by our Lord Jesus Christ. But as for you, you were separate from us, and you did not desire us to come together and to know how to organize ourselves in order that we might tell the good news. Therefore would it be agreeable to you, our brother, to come according to the orders of our God Jesus?"

> Then Peter and the other apostles saw him, and they were filled with a holy spirit, And each one performed healings. And they parted in order to preach the Lord Jesus. And they came together and greeted each other saying, "Amen." Then Jesus appeared saying to them, "Peace to you all and everyone who believes in my name. And when you depart, joy be to you and grace and power. And be not afraid; behold, I am with you forever!" Then the apostles parted from each other into four words in order to preach. And they went by the power of Jesus, in peace (ⲦⲞⲦⲈ ⲁⲛ<ⲁ>ⲡ[ⲟ]ⲥⲧⲟⲗⲟⲥ ⲁⲩⲡⲱⲣⲝ ⲙⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲉⲡⲓϥⲧⲟⲟⲩ ⲛⲱⲁⲍⲉ ⲍⲉ ⲉⲩⲉⲧⲁⲱⲉ ⲟⲉⲓⲱ; 140.2–27).

The similarities between these two texts are not simply based on similar motifs but on a similar plot structure. In both texts, Philip and Peter are portrayed as representing separate early Christian groups that eventually reconcile, Philip's group submitting itself to Peter's. This union of communities leads to an evangelistic commission (i.e., a recognition of the valid authority of the leaders of Philip's community) and a geographically organized mission. Another interesting point, related to the question of official recognition of valid authority, is that both texts employ almost identical dual ministerial titles that are used in reference to Philip in *Acts of Philip* 3.2 ("brother" and "companion in the apostolate/co-apostle") and *Ep. Pet. Phil.* 132.13–14 ("our beloved brother and our fellow apostle"; ⲡⲉⲛⲥⲟⲛ ⲙⲙⲉⲣⲓⲧ ⲙⲛ ⲡⲉⲛⲱⲃϩⲣⲁⲡⲟⲥⲧ[ⲟ]ⲗⲟⲥ) — a point of similarity which must be taken with due caution owing to the commonality of these titles. Regardless, it is interesting to consider the comments of Marvin Meyer on this matter:

> The depiction of Philip is somewhat more problematic. He is termed ⲡⲉⲛⲥⲟⲛ ⲙⲙⲉⲣⲓⲧ, a common and appropriate enough phrase for Philip, but he is also described as ⲡⲉⲛⲱⲃϩⲣⲁⲡⲟⲥⲧⲟⲗⲟⲥ. When we note that the particular Philip here addressed seems to be none other than the Philip of Acts 6:5, 8:4–40, and 21:8, we may be surprised by the title ⲱⲃϩⲣⲁⲡⲟⲥⲧⲟⲗⲟⲥ. After all, in the NT Acts this Philip is described as one of the seven "deacons," and is called ὁ εὐαγγελιστής (21:8). Philip the apostle is one of the Twelve, and is also listed as one of this group in Acts (1:13). For the author of Acts, who goes to such lengths to provide apostolic

> sanction for the Hellenistic mission of Philip in Samaria, there is a clear distinction between these two Philips. Furthermore, Luke is somewhat jealous in his use of the term ἀπόστολος in Acts; in general it is reserved for the exclusive group of the Twelve.... Other sources, however, some as early as the second century C.E., tend to identify these two Philips; such seems to be the case with the Bishop Polycrates of Ephesus as well as Clement of Alexandria, and may be also the case in our tractate.[27]

Thus we see that the canonical Acts was also aware of a tradition of a joining of communities represented by Philip and Peter. However, in the case of Acts the author hesitates to grant Philip's community equal status with Peter's.

Whatever the specific connections between the similar traditions that are present in the canonical Acts, *Acts of Philip* and *Letter of Peter to Philip*, it is clear that in *Acts of Philip* 3.1–3 we are dealing with a tradition that is much more than a creation *ex nihilo* of the author. *Acts of Philip* 3.1–3 represents merely one version of a Petrine/Philipine tradition that existed outside of both the *Acts of Philip* and the *Letter of Peter to Philip*. At any rate, it is representative of a Petrine source that is present in the *Acts of Philip* that clearly does not derive from the *Acts of Peter*.

As far as I can determine there is only one other instance in the *Acts of Philip* in which Peter appears specifically, *Acts of Philip* (8.11–12). In regard to our discussion of Schmidt's assumption that the author(s) of the *Acts of Philip* could not have used another Petrine source, it is interesting to note that *Acts of Philip* (8.11–12) also has no connection with the *Acts of Peter*. The following section is only a small part of a moral exhortation delivered by the Savior to Philip which spans from 8.9–14:

---

[27]Meyer, *The Letter of Peter to Philip* (SBLDS 53; Chico: Scholars Press, 1981) 93–94. Jacques É. Ménard, commenting on this same text, states the connection between the tradition in the *Letter of Peter to Philip* and the apocryphal acts. He suggests that the title, "Apocryphal Fragment of the Acts of the Apostles," could be given to the entire work. He elaborates: "The letter takes its essential motifs from the discourse of mission: the apostles are sent to preach. In the Gospels they are sent two by two (Mark 6:7). From the Acts of the Apostles (8:4–5, 26–40) it has formed itself apocryphal or gnostic traditions which are crystalized for example, in the *Acts of Thomas* or in the *Gospel of Truth* or, again, in the *Acts of Philip* or the *Gospel of Philip*" (*La lettre de Pierre à Philippe* [BCNH Section Textes 1; Québec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval, 1977] 6, 40).

> This is why (διὰ τοῦτο), when the anger provoked by the crime of the Watchers was going to run wild in the world, the Lawmaker ordered Noah to construct the ark and to make to enter therein all the species of animals before which he would not release the deluge and make to perish the evildoers. He gave the order to Noah to make to enter into the ark the birds and the beasts according to their species, of the clean each one seven pairs, male and female, and of the unclean, two pairs, male and female; manifesting by these numbers the work of each. With some, he did not pardon entirely, but he rendered to them according to their malice. To others, he granted his pardon, in sparing the seven pairs.
> This is why your brother Peter remembered that which Noah had done in the day of the chastisement of the sinners, when he said to me: "Do you want that I forgive my brother up to seven times, in the manner of which Noah forgave?" And I myself responded to him: "I do not wish that you satisfy yourself with following the example of Noah; but forgive seventy times seven times." (διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ὁ ἀδελφός σου Πέτρος ἐμνήσθη τοῦ πραχθέντος ὑπὸ τοῦ Νῶε ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς ἐκδικήσεως τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν καὶ εἶπέν μοι· 'θέλεις ἀφιέναι τῷ ἀδελφῷ μου ἕως ἑπτάκις, ἀντὶ τοῦ καθὼς ἀφῆκεν Νῶε; ἐγὼ δὲ ἀπεκρίθην αὐτῷ· 'οὐχ οὕτως θέλω ἀντὶ τοῦ κατὰ τὸν τύπον τοῦ Νῶε καὶ μόνον, ἀλλὰ ἄφες ἑβδομηκοντάκις ἑπτά.') Now therefore, Philip, do not grow weary in doing good to those who do evil to you.

The latter part of this excerpt appears to represent a different version of the tradition which is found in Matthew 18:21–22:

> Then Peter came to him and asked, 'Lord, how often am I to forgive my brother if he goes on wronging me? As many as seven times? Jesus replied, 'I do not say seven times but seventy times seven.

This tradition was also known to Q as is evidenced by the version found in Luke 17:4 — "Even if he wrongs you seven times a day and comes back to you seven times saying, 'I am sorry,' you are to forgive him." In regard to the version(s) of Q which is (are) believed to have been used by Matthew and Luke, it is widely accepted that the attribution of the question to Peter is a Matthean redaction. For example, in discussing the phrase, Τότε προσελθὼν

ὁ Πέτρος εἶπεν αὐτῷ ("Then Peter came to him and asked"), Robert H. Gundry states:

> We meet Mattheanisms in τότε, προσελθὼν, and Πέτρος. The second of these points to Jesus' dignity. The combination of Peter's name and the verb of speaking occurs fourteen times in Matthew, not at all in Mark, and only once in Luke.[28]

If the scholarly consensus is right in attributing this phrase to Matthean redaction, then it would appear that the variant that is found in *Acts of Philip* 8.12 has been influenced by the Gospel of Matthew. However, while I generally accept its connection to the tradition found in Matthew, this is not without its complications either.[29]

---

[28]Gundry, *Matthew: A Commentary on his Handbook for a Mixed Church under Persecution* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1994) 370. This position is also held by W. D. Davies and Dale C. Allison, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew* (ICC; 3 vols.; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1988) 2.792. Likewise, among Q scholars a similar view is commonly held. For example, John S. Kloppenborg places the entire phrase in brackets which indicates that the material is not from Q (*Q Parallels: Synopsis, Critical Notes & Concordance* [Foundations & Facets; Sonoma, Calif.: Polebridge, 1988] 184–85). Cf. also David R. Catchpole, *The Quest for Q* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1993) 143.

[29]It is interesting that the connection of Peter with this saying is also present in another variant, although the Jewish name Simon is present instead of the Greek Peter. In *Dialogus adversus Pelagianos* 3.2, Jerome includes yet another version of this saying which he attributes to the *Gospel of the Nazaraeans*: "He said: If your brother has sinned with a word and has made amends with you, receive him seven times a day. Simon his disciple said to him: Seven times a day? The Lord answered and said to him: Indeed, I say to you, as many as seventy times seven times. For in the prophets also, after they were anointed with Holy Spirit, a word of sin was found." In this case, direct dependence on Matthew or Luke can be debated. For example, see T. W. Manson, *The Sayings of Jesus* (London: SCM, 1949) 211–12; Joachim Jeremias, *Unknown Sayings of Jesus* (London: S. P. C. K., 1957) 83–85; and Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2.793–94. Despite the Mattheanisms in Matthew 18:21a (e.g., τότε, προσελθὼν) which strongly suggest some Matthean reworking, it is not impossible that Matthew found this saying attributed to Peter in his or her source. It is a question of the chicken versus the egg. Did Matthew's interest in Peter drive him or her to add Peter's name wholesale throughout the gospel or did Matthew's interest in Peter make sayings and actions associated with him that much more desirable for inclusion in his or her gospel? This and other comparison texts can be found in William D. Stroker, *Extracanonical Sayings of Jesus* (SBLRBS 18; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989) 9–10.

It would be naive to imagine that the author was directly influenced by Matthew — as if he or she had heard Matthew 18:21–22 read in a liturgical setting or even read the text itself and then elaborated on that passage in *Acts of Philip* 8.11–12. Rather, the author of the *Acts of Philip* 8 appears to have come by this material through a later, interpreting source. Even a surface reading of the text of *Acts of Philip* 8.11–12 indicates that the author (through the hortatory words of Jesus) was reminding his or her audience of a specific interpretation of Peter's question to Jesus that was in vogue at the time of his or her writing.

The actual interpretive connections between Noah and Peter require some thought. First, it is interesting to note that the text itself actually attributes the conceptual connection between the two figures to Peter himself ("Peter remembered that which Noah had done in the day of the chastisement of the sinners...."). Thus, an interpretive process that can be placed chronologically between the writing of Matthew and the writing of *Acts of Philip* 8 has been projected backwards in time onto Peter himself — presumably to give extra weight to the teaching and to serve to encourage the audience to accept the interpretation being offered. Second, the early Christian preacher/exegete does offer a slight hint regarding the rationale behind the connection of Noah and Peter in his or her comments following the section which focuses on Noah: "manifesting by these numbers the work of each: with some, he did not pardon entirely, but he renders to them according to their malice; to others, he granted his pardon, in sparing the seven pairs...." (καθ' ἕκαστον ἀριθμὸν δεικνύων αὐτοῦ τὸ ἔργον, ὅτι οὐ συνεχώρησεν αὐτῷ πάντῃ, ἀλλὰ ἀνταπέδωκεν αὐτῷ τὸ ἑαυτοῦ κακοποιὸν εἶδος· πάλιν δὲ ἡ συγχώρησις αὐτοῦ ἔφθασεν εἰς τὰ ἑπτὰ ἑπτά). It is these phrases that serve as an interpretive matrix, albeit in an abbreviated form. The key in both stories for the original preacher/exegete (not the author of *Acts of Philip* 8) is the representative significance of the number seven. As was common in early Christian teaching, the OT passage is reduced to a type or foreshadowing of the

perfection of the New Covenant.[30] The preacher/exegete views the rescue of the various animals as suggestive of God's mercy made available by Jesus. According to the preacher/exegete, in the days of Noah even the unclean animals received a share (however minimal) of God's pardon. However, the lion's share of this mercy was extended to the clean animals — which in the preacher/exegete's mind can be equated with the "brother" to whom Peter makes reference. Thus, while a graduated amount of forgiveness is allotted to the unclean (i.e., the non-Christians or non-community members — presumably in the form of conversions to Christianity), the focus of mercy is the clean (i.e., the brother Christian, community member – a rather communo-centric focus). Thus the preacher/exegete understands Jesus to be ordering a level of communal mercy/forgiveness that supersedes the OT mind set represented by Peter and initiated in a type by Noah. Of course this is pure speculation but perhaps the preacher/exegete might have explained Jesus' motivation for such an expanded and generous code of mercy/forgiveness by reflecting on the fact that, despite the seven clean pairs of animals were saved, many more clean animals perished along with their unclean counterparts – thus suggesting the need for unlimited forgiveness (i.e., unlimited space in the ark for all the clean animals/Christians)!

To support this understanding of *Acts of Philip* 8.11–12 as previous tradition, I point to the fact that both 8.11 and 8.12 begin with the phrase "This is why" (διὰ τοῦτο). This introductory phrase serves as a mnemonic device which is intended to jog the reader's memory. In short, a saying plus associated OT text is mentioned and the larger interpretive matrix is presumed by the author. This is born out by the fact that the exact and specific typological connections between Noah's rescue of animals and Peter's question are not readily apparent. Furthermore, the author of *Acts of Philip* 8 does not deem it necessary to explain the theological implications to his or her readers with anything more than the general interpretive reference to the number seven — it is assumed that they are already aware of the connections.

---

[30]See Origen's explanation of the allegorical method of scriptural exegesis in *De principis* 4.11–16; also *Commentary on John* 1.8.

Further evidence of the previous existence of the Noah/Peter tradition is provided in that the theological explanation I have proposed above is not the reason the author includes this tradition in the exhortation of the Savior. The fact is that this saying plus associated OT text does not really conform well with the general context of the larger moral exhortation of *Acts of Philip* 8.9–14. The larger context speaks philosophically of the overall superiority of good over evil; the saying refers to unlimited forgiveness. In *Acts of Philip* 8.9–10, the Savior encourages Philip not to return evil for evil, but rather to believe that good far outstrips evil. In attempting to prove this the author draws on examples which he or she argues can be found in nature such as the fact that light chases away darkness, that water (associated with good) is much greater in quantity than fire (associated with evil) and the fact that the number of aquatic predators (the predator being associated with violence and, therefore, evil) is much smaller than all the other aquatic species (the good "victims"). In the eyes of the author, the reason for bringing up the Noah/Peter tradition is because it can be used as an illustration which will demonstrate the superiority and superabundance of good (forgiveness) over evil (hatred). It must be reaffirmed that the explanation I have offered as to the connection between the Noah material and Peter's question regarding forgiveness (i.e., that of the hypothetical preacher/exegete) is complicated and, despite the interpretive phrase included by the author in *Acts of Philip* 8.11, could not have been expected to be quickly grasped by a reader simply by virtue of a cursory reading. The author is definitely assuming prior knowledge of this piece of pastoral exegesis on the part of his or her audience. Thus, this interpretation predates its inclusion in the *Acts of Philip*. Therefore, I suggest that there was a trajectory of ecclesiastical use of this passage that began with 1) the tradition as it was found (probably in varied forms) before Q; 2) the version(s) found by Matthew and Luke in their respective copies of Q; 3) Matthew's tradition (the most relevant strain of tradition when discussing *Acts of Philip* 8.12); 4) a catechetical tradition (possibly also in writing as in an early Christian sermon or commentary) which linked Noah with Peter; and 5) the knowledge of and reference to this same catechetical tradition as authoritative by the author of

Acts of Philip 8.[31]

There is much that is uncertain in regard to *Acts of Philip* 8.11–12. There are more questions that perhaps we cannot answer. Does the connection between Noah and Peter reflect verbal preaching tradition or was it known to the author of *Acts of Philip* 8 by way of a commentary or written sermon? What was the exact nature of its dependence on Matthew — or is it dependent at all? While important and interesting, these questions lead us away from the discussion at hand. For our purposes the key point to be made here is that regardless of whether *Acts of Philip* 8.11–12 is directly dependent on Matthew or if it had a previous existence as part of an early Christian sermon or commentary, it represents another example of a Petrine tradition that has found its way into the *Acts of Philip* from a source other than the *Acts of Peter*.

The final example of the *Acts of Philip*'s awareness of traditions known to be associated with Peter and yet not part of the *Acts of Peter* can be found in *Acts of Philip* 13.4. Philip, after entering the town of Hierapolis, is described as setting up his base of operations in an abandoned medical dispensary:

> Entering into the village, the apostles found a dispensary in the vicinity, which was vacant and none of whose physicians were there. Philip said to Miriam: "Here our Savior has preceded us and has prepared for us this spiritual dispensary. Let us occupy it and find rest, because we are exhausted from the exertion of the road." To Bartholomew, he said: "Where is the unguent box that the Savior gave to us on that occasion when we were in Galilee? (τῷ δὲ Βαρθολομαίῳ εἶπεν "ποῦ ἐστιν ὁ νάρθηξ ὃν ἔδωκεν ἡμῖν ὁ σωτὴρ ἐν τῷ καιρῷ, ἐν ᾧ ἐτυγχάνομεν ἐν τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ;) Let us set up practice in this dispensary and attend to the sick until we see what purpose the Savior sets for us."

This reference to the unguent box that the Savior gave to the apostles Philip

[31]Amsler is less definitive is his assessment as to at which level of tradition the Noah connection was introduced. He seems to vacillate between its creation by the author and the author's use of it as previous tradition: "By means of a play on the number seven, the author, heir perhaps of a tradition, introduces Noah into the canonical dialogue of Jesus and Peter" (*Actes de l'apôtre Philippe*, 183 n. 373).

and Bartholomew has no precedent in the *Acts of Philip*. However, it may well refer to a tradition that is now known to us from the *Acts of Peter and the Twelve Apostles* 9.1–11.26 (taken from the NHLE):

> He said to Peter, "Peter!" And Peter was frightened, for how did he know that his name was Peter? Peter responded to the Savior, "How do you know me, for you called my name?" Lithargoel answered, "I want to ask you who gave the name Peter to you?" He said to him, "It was Jesus Christ, the son of the living God. He gave this name to me." He answered and said, "It is I! Recognize me, Peter." He loosened the garment, which clothed him - the one into which he had changed himself because of us - revealing to us in truth that it was he. We prostrated ourselves on the ground and worshiped him. We comprised eleven disciples. He stretched forth his hand and caused us to stand. We spoke with him humbly. Our heads were bowed down in unworthiness as we said, "What you wish we will do. But give us power to do what you wish at all times." He gave them the unguent box and the pouch that was in the hand of the young disciple. He commanded them like this, saying, "Go into [the] city from which you came, which is called Habitation. Continue in endurance as you teach all those who have believed in my name, because I have endured in hardships of the faith. I will give you your reward. To the poor of that city give what they need in order to live until I give them what is better, which I told you that I will give you for nothing." Peter answered and said to him, "Lord, you have taught us to forsake the world and everything in it. We have renounced them for your sake. What we are concerned about (now) is the food for a single day. Where will we be able to find the needs that you ask us to provide for the poor?" The Lord answered and said, "O Peter, it was necessary that you understand the parable that I told you! Do you not understand that my name, which you teach, surpasses all riches, and the wisdom of God surpasses gold, and silver and precious stone(s)?" He gave them the pouch of medicine and said, "Heal all the sick of the city who believe [in] my name." Peter was afraid [to] reply to him for the second time. He signaled to the one who was beside him, who was John: "You talk this time." John answered and said, "Lord, before you we are afraid to say many words. But it is you who asks us to practice this skill. We have not been taught to be physicians. How then will we know how to heal bodies as you have told us?" He answered them, "Rightly have you spoken, John, for I know that the physicians of this world heal what belongs to the world. The physicians of souls, however, heal the heart. Heal

> the bodies first, therefore, so that through the real powers of healing for their bodies, without medicine of the world, they may believe in you, that you have power to heal the illnesses of the heart also."

The Greek word for "unguent box" is νάρθηξ.[32] This is the same word that lies behind *ActsPet12Apost.* 9.30.[33] This statement by Philip in *Acts of Philip* 13.4 reflects two immediate parallels with *ActsPet12Apost.*: 1) Philip refers back to a time (presumably before the apostles part company to go to their designated, geographically separate, missions; cf. *Acts of Philip* 3) when the Savior (note the solitary use of "Savior" in *ActsPet12Apost.* 9.5) presents some apostles (at *least* two: Bartholomew and Philip or Peter and John) with an unguent box; and 2) this unguent box is directly connected with a mission to heal both bodies and souls (as is evidenced by Philip's comments in 13.4).[34] The question inevitably arises: Did the author of *Acts of Philip* know a tradition of an apostolic commission to heal bodies and souls? If so, did this tradition look anything like *ActsPet12Apost.*? If Amsler is right and *Acts of Philip* is to be dated at the end of the fourth or beginning of the fifth century, then it is possible that the author may have been familiar with *ActsPet12Apost.* — at the very least we have evidence that the *Acts of Philip* and *ActsPet12Apost.* shared a tradition concerning an apostolic commission to heal bodies and souls. Once again, we have the possibility that *Acts of Philip* had knowledge of traditions associated with Peter other than those found in the *Acts of Peter*. If I am right and *Acts of Philip* did indeed have knowledge of other Petrine stories, then it is reasonable to conclude that its summary reference to the story of Peter's daughter need not have belonged to the *Acts of Peter*. Hence, the irony of Schmidt's own words come back to haunt him — "is he expected to have used still other Petrine stories as well?" — and, ironically, the answer is yes.

---

[32]The similar reference to the unguent box in these two texts is noted by Bovon, "Les Actes de Philippe," 4506. See also Matthews, "Trajectories," 242 n. 34 and 258 n. 55 (although Matthews fails to note the connection with *ActsPet12Apost.*).

[33]Brashler and Parrott, *Nag Hammadi Codices V,2–5 and VI*, 225.

[34]In *Acts of Philip* the image of the physician is applied to both Jesus (3.4; 4.4.5; 5.27; 6.11–12; 8.6; 12.7) and Philip (2.7; 5.27; 6.11–12; 13.4–5; 14.4.8; 15.7).

Sanctuary and Womb: Henri Lefebvre and the Production of Space

Roland Boer

Henri Lefebvre, Marxist philosopher and social scientist, one-time member of the French Communist Party, parent of numerous offspring, director of the Institut de Sociologie Urbaine in Paris (Nanterre), intellectual inspiration for May `68 in France (at the tender age of 67), author of no less than 66 books, remains one of the under-translated giants of the great tradition of French intellectual life from the 1930s to the 1980s.

I undertake here a rather specific task, which is to engage in a critical discussion with Lefebvre's *The Production of Space* in order to consider the construction, or, as Lefebvre insisted, the production of space in the ancient world, specifically in this case the Bible. The book was the final product of an intense investigation, as David Harvey points out in the Afterword, into urbanization and the question of space between 1968 and 1974, the year the book first appeared in French, after a number of others from the same project.

Various Spaces

Before I plunge into the stream of his work, I need to make some comments about method. Lefebvre operates with a few crucial moves, strategies that are distinctive marks of his dialectical Marxism. To begin with, he constantly seeks to link the abstract realm of theory with the concrete reality of praxis, speaking of the connections needed between mental and social space, describing in detail features such as urban traffic and human dwellings and then moving into theoretical discussions of habitus, flows and so on. But there is also the retrospective-prospective dialectical habit he assumes, running back, sometimes to his favored Greece and Rome, to pick up a certain topic and trace it through to the contemporary situation, only to cast a view into the future.

Dialectical thinking, Hegelian or dialectical Marxism, has been a characteristic feature of western Marxism, and one finds it in operation, and explored, in the work of the Frankfurt School, especially that of Theodor Adorno, and those closely connected with the school, such as Walter

Benjamin and Ernst Bloch. It is also central to the methods of others, like Georg Lukacs, Fredric Jameson and, of course, Henri Lefebvre. The dialectic has not necessarily been restricted to Western Marxism (although that term, a product of the Cold War, is now falling by the wayside); for dialectical thinking, termed dialectical materialism, was also central to the intellectual endeavor of the old Eastern European communist countries. The taint of Stalin always meant that many Western Marxists trod warily, seeking out less mechanical and deterministic forms of the dialectic. A few have indeed sought out a non-dialectical Marxism, among them Louis Althusser and Gilles Deleuze, whose thinking may indeed provide one of the ways forward for a post-Cold War Marxism.

Another may indeed be from Lefebvre, whose Marxism runs to the left of the French Communist Party, from which he was expelled in 1957 after a thirty year membership. Calling his dialectic a "dialectical materialism" as well, but finding the Stalinist line of the French Communist party too restrictive and stifling, Lefebvre developed a Marxism profoundly touched by situationism and surrealism, but also with a deep sensitivity for human living. He wanted to take up what he felt was Marx's unfinished project in so many ways: he saw that work less as a fixed body of texts to be exegeted with the reverence accorded sacred texts and more as the beginning of much larger program of intellectual and practical work. The introduction of the question of space is but one of the ways in which Lefebvre undertook to expand Marx. (For instance, he argued that the tendency to reduce society to questions of economics and politics in both Marxism and liberalism was incredibly restrictive: the issue of space was one of the ways of shifting away from such a fixation.)

Less a process that, like Hegel, called for *Aufhebung*, a supersession that kicks the whole problem, the impossible contradiction or antinomy, onto another level in which the problem in question suddenly becomes a much smaller issue in a wider context, Lefebvre's dialectic is one that plays with the opposition or contradiction in question. Toying with it, looking at it from myriad perspectives, and inevitably favoring the lesser term of the opposition in order to move through the whole problem, Lefebvre kept his dialectic open and running. At times he picks up the threefold dimension of a more conventional dialectic, speaking of, for instance, energy, space and time, or of truth beauty and rhythm, or, as I have already suggested, economics, politics and space. They might be analyzed separately, in conflictual pairs, or on an entirely different tack (see 1986: 42), bringing in

an item from elsewhere with which to raise questions about one of the terms under discussion. He does this effectively in *Critique of Everyday Life* (1991b: 141, 145-7, 226), where he connects the notion of the quotidian with religion, especially the popular, half-conscious practices of religion (for Lefebvre, traditional French Catholicism). One distinctive feature of Lefebvre's dialectic is that it produces a profound destabilization of the received notions concerning particular terms and their relationships, which is distinctly reminiscent of the practices of a certain poststructuralism that arose at the time Lefebvre was himself doing his most influential work.

A dialectical reading of the construction of space in the ancient Near East might run in a number of directions, seeking out the play and flow between rural and urban, contrasting the production of space in seats of religious and political power and that of the peasants, or tracing the interaction between the crucial commerce of the sacred and that of space, or contrasting texts from the MT and the LXX in order to read for their different productions of space. In fact, I have found, due to a spasmodic practice of what might be called spatial reading over the last decade or so, that many of the texts of the Hebrew Bible, my specific focus of expertise, give over to spatial analysis.

A distinct form of Lefebvre's dialectic appears in his discussion of space. It is perhaps best to refer to Lefebvre here on the conceptual triad that recurs time and again in the book:

1. *Spatial practice*, embracing production and reproduction, and the particular locations and spatial sets characteristic of each social formation. Spatial practice ensures continuity and some degree of cohesion. In terms of social space, and of each member of a given society's relationship to that space, this cohesion implies a guaranteed level of *competence* and a specific level of *performance*. This is space perceived (*perçu*) in the common sense mode.

2. *Representations of space* (*représentations de l'espace*): the discourses on space, the realms of analysis, design and planning, which are tied to the relations of production and to the "order" which those relations impose, and hence to knowledge, to signs, to codes, and to "frontal" relations. In other words, the conception of space (*l'espace conçu*).

3. *Spaces of representation* (*espaces de la représentation*): the deeper presuppositions behind plans and definitions. Coded, recoded and decoded, these spaces embody complex symbolisms, linked to the clandestine or underground side of social life, as also to art. It provides partially concealed criticism of social orders and the categories of social thought, and may happen through bodies, aesthetics, gender, and so on. As the third part of a dialectic it offers, as lived space (*l'espace vécu*), as historical sediments or glimpses of the new, utopian possibilities of a new spatialization of social life (see Lefebvre 1974; 1991a: 33, 245; Shields 1999: 160-170).

As ever, Lefebvre's descriptions leave one simultaneously puzzled and illuminated. There are in fact a number of other terms used in relation to space that I want to touch upon in a moment – social space, absolute space, abstract space, contradictory space, mental space, natural space and so on – but the above distinctions are in fact crucial, not only for Lefebvre but also for my reading of some Hebrew texts that will appear in the next parts.

In order to make sense of these three central categories of his spatial dialectic, there is some philosophical legwork to be done. Although it seems like a commonplace now, the idea that certain givens of human experience are social and economic constructions rather than immovable and eternal, natural, objects, was an argument that still needed some work in the early 1970s. The constructionism that now reigns across the humanities and social sciences owes a large debt to the work of Marx and Marxists like Lefebvre, so that it has become possible to see how bodies, genders, sexualities, apart from the more common targets of religion and the family, are constructed in certain ways in certain social formations. But in Lefebvre there is a crucial difference that I want to emphasize. He speaks not of the "construction" but of the "production" (*la production*) of space. In the first point of his spatial dialectic, production is closely tied in with reproduction, the perpetuation of the means of production in question.

More than a linguistic quibble is at issue here, for "production" evokes the crucial Marxist category of mode of production, into which I need to diverge for a moment or two. For Marx and Engels (and I draw here from *The German Ideology*), human beings both produce and are produced: they are produced by the conditions in which they live but they also produce those very same conditions. The production of the means of subsistence through the organization of physical resources affects their social and cultural life, but it also acts to remake the material life of the people in question. That is, their very being and nature as human beings is produced by their production of subsistence in relation to nature.

In other words, for Marx mode of production is the way human beings produce their means of subsistence in relation with nature and the existing mode of production. It is the means required for the production of the necessary and luxury items of human existence. Marx identified two dimensions: the forces or means of production, which designates human interaction with nature in terms of raw materials, technical knowledge and the uses of labor; and the relations of production, which refers to the patterns of human interaction and allocation of labor.

At this point we find some of the terms in the first two categories of Lefebvre's spatial dialectic – (means of) production in spatial practice and relations of production in the representation of spaces. Indeed, the ultimate category for any Marxist criticism worthy of the name is mode of production, a notion simultaneously abstract and concrete, since it deals directly with the understanding of history.

Let me provide a few examples that will return in some form in my discussion of the biblical texts. In capitalism, the great focus of Lefebvre's work, the means of production involve industrial (a euphemism for capitalism is sometimes the "industrial revolution") and now electronic or cybernetic technologies, the extraction of minerals, the massive farming process of agribusiness, unequal wages and the mobilization of masses of low paid workers, especially women, children and workers in the "Third World." The social relations of production involve the fundamental distinction between bourgeoisie and working class, which is now thoroughly globalized. The ideologies of such a mode would include liberalism and the oppositional Marxism. Its culture is marked by the growth of popular and media culture over against high culture, as well as the all pervasive presence of commodification. Its politics involves the rise of the nation-state and democracy, and a legal system whose prime focus is

the protection of private property, whether that be the individual person or non-human objects. Along with commodities, money and capital itself, Lefebvre argues that a particular form of space has also been produced: the city, as successor to the medieval town, has become the center for finance, government, human and social living. In relation to this the rural has been transformed into an area for the capital production of food and other raw materials, supplying the cities from whom it expects its money; and human dwellings have been produced in terms of the bourgeois family, "boxes for living in" on private lots.

Or, at the other end of the scale, the so-called Asiatic Mode of Production has as its means of production the various techniques for widespread hand-tooled agriculture with domesticated animals. Any new developments in technology are directed towards agriculture (improved quality of implement metal, or irrigation, and so on). The relations of production involve a multitude of small landholders that pay tribute to various layers of a significant bureaucracy, at a local, "national" and imperial level. At the top of the bureaucracy is the imperial center – Babylon, Egypt, Asshur, Beijing etc. – where the tribute is lavished upon a standing army (used to ensure the regular payment of tribute and increase the empire), buildings of imperial government and religion and the relatively large number of officials required to keep the system running. Culturally and ideologically religion or the sacred was the central language for expressing political, philosophical, juridical, political and other matters (except that it is a little anachronistic to put it this way). The production of space in the Asiatic mode of production depended upon the layering of tribute payments enforced upon the peasants: very few centers of bureaucracy (the ancient "city") towards which all tribute was directed, and then the subservience of even these spaces to a larger center, of which the smaller centers seem like various points on the spokes of a wheel. The spatial practice was then focused upon the flows towards and away from the centers, and this was inextricably tied up with the religious centralization in the places of power and the destination of tribute. If the language and ways of thinking could operate only in the sacred, then the spatial direction always looked towards the point of tribute payment. Domestic space was then ordered in terms of the need to maintain such a system, and the family unit was a much larger affair focused on ensuring that there was produce to survive and pay tribute: many generations, as many children as possible,

single room dwellings in which humans and animals all spent the night, if not a good part of the day as well.

With these kinds of descriptions, bare though they are, one gets a sense of the difference between modes of production – something Marxist criticism is able to highlight. Of course, the problem with any approach that seeks to periodize history according to one pattern or another is how to account for longer patterns, the carry through of one item into other modes of production, whether they are sacred texts or the status of the peasant. So, in Marxism a growing awareness has arisen of many overlaps, foldbacks and glimpses of new forms found at any one moment, but the assumption is that one mode of production will end up being dominant.

This is basic Marxist theory, but it provides the background necessary to understand Lefebvre's insistence on the "production" of space. One of the results of a shift to "construction" over against "production" in the more recent development of the idea is that "construction" conjures up the notion of social construction, the social context that constructs the individual, bodies, genders and so on. What are lost in the transition are both the specific historical dimensions of a Marxist theory of modes of production, and its connection with economics, politics, ideology and so on.

I have also been speaking, albeit somewhat briefly, of the whole issue of the spatial practice that is produced in different modes of production. But Lefebvre points out that a mode of production needs to perpetuate itself, to reproduce itself, a process carried out at all levels from the macro-economic (the investment of capital and the deployment of finance capital), to class (the reproduction of the labor power of the working class) to the personal (a point close to home for Lefebvre and his many offspring from a series of partners). Indeed, the reproduction of modes of production is a distinct way of introducing the sexual into the most fundamental of Marxist categories, for Marxism has not been noted for its ability to deal with Eros in a positive fashion: the ability to do so has usually been imported. Lefebvre shifts gear and argues that production and reproduction cannot be separated, taking a tip from the traditional Marxist notion that the basic means of production (technology and resources) also includes the numbers, patterns and distribution of human population. But in order to think about this adequately one needs to think about sex, and not just the processes of breeding, but the libido itself.

Yet, the spatial practice of which Lefebvre speaks, and the space that is produced, refers primarily to social space, the space created by humans in

their interaction with nature, each other and former modes of production. Social space appears in relation to, and over against, physical or natural space, the space of a nature in which human beings increasingly have the upper hand. Since capitalism is now rampant, Lefebvre, while admitting that natural space remains the point of departure for considerations of space and the social process, argues that social space under capitalism now has nature at its mercy: everyone wants to preserve nature, yet everything now seeks to undermine such a desire. Natural space for Lefebvre disappears rapidly over the horizon, for the very "nature" upon which we now look has been produced by human beings (see 1991a: 30-1).

But there is one final distinction of the categories of space listed above that I have not explored: that between frontal and hidden, the overt and the covert relations of production. For this is the key to his distinction – an odd one on first reading – between the representations of space and spaces of representation. Not only does each mode of production produce specific types of social space (as well as all sorts of other forms from other modes that are subsumed as subvariants), but it also has a specific type of relations of production (the organization of human resources in terms of class, division of labor, and so on). But the issue here is how those relations of production operate spatially. In order to trace this, Lefebvre invokes all the complexity of his dialectical materialism. Under capitalism, he identifies three types of interaction between reproduction and the social relations of production: biological reproduction, the reproduction of labor power, and the reproduction of the social relations of production. Each of these three interacting layers is displayed symbolically, simultaneously exhibited and displaced, that is, concealed. Such a symbolic system works with relations of production that are both out there and not, in the forefront and clandestine, explicit and repressed. The former, overt type appears in the forms of monuments, public art, and buildings, especially those of state and business: this is the realm of the representation of space, the frontal, obvious node of the relations of production. The more covert and clandestine version, the shadowy realm of spaces of representation, is interested in what is hidden, closed over, spaces that represent in wayward and diverse fashions.

Lefebvre's oft-repeated example is one he in fact loathed – the bourgeois family home. The overt dimension of the house, facing the street (and do not all detached houses have to face the street?), is its sitting room or formal lounge room, where considerable expense is outlaid: lounges and

tables and exquisite chairs, with expensive curtains and pieces of art either on the walls or standing. The public realm of the bourgeois house is one of decor, money and repression. Perhaps the only other room allowed such visual presence is the formal dining room, usually leading off from the lounge room. But there is another realm of such boxes for living in that marks a whole series of repressions: the preparation of food takes place out of sight, as do toilet functions, both evacuating and washing. If these are relegated to the back of the house, the most hidden is sex itself, restricted to night time in the parents' bedroom, with a locked door and when the children are asleep, or, if older, out of the house.

To return once more to the distinctions between spatial practice, representation of space and space of representation, it seems to me that any application of such categories must recognize that the distinction Lefebvre makes between biological reproduction, the reproduction of labor power, and the reproduction of the social relations of production is one that applies to capitalism. As he notes, "it should be pointed out that in precapitalist societies the two interlocking levels of biological reproduction and socio-economic production together constituted social reproduction - that is to say, the reproduction of society as it perpetuated itself generation after generation, conflict, feud, strife, crisis and war notwithstanding." (1991a: 32). All the same, the powerful distinction between the representation of space and space of representation remains in place, since the lack of distinction between reproduction and production applies directly to the realm of social practice. The notion of covert and overt, of hidden and clear, comes of course from the Marxist perception of class conflict as crucial to historical processes. And it is not for nothing that Lefebvre locates the opposition in the realm of relations of production, where class and class conflict operate in Marxist thought. The frontal class, the one of monuments and impressive buildings and the clear marks of power, stands over against that class which is repressed, beaten down and exploited. Lefebvre's innovation is to widen this to the symbolic field of relation of production, of class relations.

And since it is a symbolic field that is his primary concern, it seems to me that such an approach may be taken up in the reading and interpretation of texts as well. While spatial practice in the ancient world may be more difficult to trace in the texts that derive from it, the representation of space and space of representation are far more amenable to the consideration of texts, including texts from the Hebrew Bible.

There is one final issue before I turn to the Hebrew Bible. A substantial portion of *The Production of Space* seeks to refashion Marxist periodization in terms of space. This is a grand plan that involves a prior commitment to periodization as a viable way of considering history itself. Of course, if one is, like Lefebvre, persuaded by the power of Marxism and Marxist analysis, then historical periodization is an issue and a problematic that needs some thinking. And if space and its production are inescapably tied to mode of production, as I have argued above, then there will necessarily be different types of space for different modes of production. What is interesting about all of this is that the substantial part of *The Production of Space* is given over precisely to such a periodization; Shields, in his advocatory study of Lefebvre (1999) remains unimpressed by the larger system-building dimensions of Lefebvre's Marxism – to which he remained committed throughout his life – preferring the freer, playful, erotic and lived radicalism of this indefatigable writer. For me, however (and this may be symptomatic of a much larger dimension of my physical and intellectual life), the sheer imagination and ability to sustain thought in this way is one of the most impressive dimensions of Lefebvre's work. So, in the following table I have outlined in the first two columns the received Marxist periodization of history in terms of modes of production and what might be called the cultural dominant – a particular way in which culture, and in fact the superstructure as a whole, might be characterized. In the third column I have lined up the various productions of space as Lefebvre follows them through in the bulk of his book.

Mode of Production	*Cultural Dominant*	*Space*
Hunting and gathering, agriculture and husbandry (tribal society, primitive communism or the horde	magic and mythic narrative	absolute space (nature)
Neolithic agriculture (the *gens* or hierarchical kinship societies)	kinship	absolute space

Asiatic mode of Production ("oriental despotism" and divine kings)	religion or the sacred	sacred space
ancient or classical mode of production (the *polis* or oligarchical slave-holding society)	"politics" in terms of citizenship of the city-state	historical space (political states, Greek city-states, Roman empire)
feudalism	relations of personal domination	sacred space
capitalism: classical, monopoly, and late	commodity reification	abstract space (politico-economic space of property) contradictory space (global capital vs localized meaning)
communism	original forms of collective and communal association	differential space (future space revaluing difference and lived experience)

What I have done here is take the periodization of space in Lefebvre's work, linked it with Shields' discussion and tabulation (1999: 170-2), and then fine tuned a number of points where I think that Shields misses the point somewhat. I find it odd, for instance, for him to argue that such a periodization is linear rather than undialectical, for Lefebvre himself argues that each of the types of space is contained, albeit in subordinate or hidden forms, in each of the modes of production. Further, each mode of production and of space cannot exist without dialectical connections to those forms around it, especially the ones that precede and follow. Finally, in periodizing space, Lefebvre carries out the grandest dialectical move with space and time themselves, the inescapable categories (thanks to Kant) of thinking in the modern, capitalist world.

I need to close my theoretical section with a closer look at the realms of absolute space and sacred space, for they are relevant to the biblical material I want to visit next.

The original moment is the space of nature itself, absolute space, pure space. In this context the first social space of the tribe inscribes itself, specifically the semi-nomadic tribe of a hunter-gatherer society, with its seasonal paths, temporary camps and border zones. Whether hunting for game, engaged in limited agriculture or even in the first farming settlements, absolute space dominates. The production of space is here analogical, conceiving of the camp, settlement or village – ie. human society – in terms of a mythic body, with the layout of such settlements narrativized in mythic and magical narrative. There is a distinct anthropomorphism in the representation of space, the settlement and its environment, with settlement and its outside understood in terms of the body and its beyond.

Sacred space, that which follows absolute space temporally and logically in Lefebvre's schema, is produced with the emergence of the city-state, which he finds in the ancient Near East, traditional Asian societies such as that of China, and also the early stages of the Greek world. Rome and its empire comprises a new stage, that of historical space. In other words, over against the more conventional division that begins with Greece and the reliance of such a mode of production on slave labor – a system whereby the very economic and social, let alone the cultural, possibilities of the Greek and Roman worlds are enabled by the labor of slaves – over against this characterization, he posits the emergence of the city-state and then of the Roman imperial system as the points of transition. This is a larger argument that I don't need to pursue here, but it is symptomatic of Lefebvre, for whom the city was a vital dimension of his lived experience, as well as much of his writing and research, that the emergence of the first cities should be central.

But this is not capitalism (for which he reserves his most sustained analysis and critique): in the new city-state the sacred and the political are inseparable. The location of palace and temple in the one location, side by side and often connected as one building, marks the possibility of the city-state. The sacred city – Babylon, Beijing, Egyptian cities of the Pharaohs, Jerusalem itself – supersedes the village and the semi-nomadic tribe to constitute the new, central sacred space. Despot, city and the gods are inseparable: the despot is, in many cases, god, a descendent of a god, or in a

relationship much closer than any other citizen; the city is where the god-despot dwells. In exacting tribute, such cities dominate the rural regions surrounding them, pushing back nature, the realm of absolute space, through the technologies of political, economic and sacred power. This form of the city mutates into the Greek *polis* and even dimensions of the Roman *urbs*, in which the sacred space of the city, as *imago mundi*, is set over against the barbarian outside, that realm beyond the power of the city-state.

Ironically, in light of my own particular use of Lefebvre, he is at his weakest with these early productions of space. His energy was of course directed to capitalism and its emergence and dissolution, but the realm of absolute space, although suggestive, is too much shot through with European, especially French, conceptions of the primitive and pre-historic. He is on better ground with sacred space and the emergence of the city-state, although, as some have argued, it is very much gendered in terms of heterosexual binary, with the realm of the city-state characterized as active and masculine and the outside as passive and feminine. Apart from the fascinating with the vast program of Deleuze and Guattari in *A Thousand Plateaus*, especially the *urstaat*, what is sorely needed for this kind of work is a detailed consideration of earlier modes of production and their construction of space.

My use of Lefebvre, then, while bouncing off this spatial schema, is more interested in reading for the production of space, specifically in terms of the threefold dialectic of spatial practice, the representations of space and the space of representation.

Biblical Spaces

> How much can we really learn, for instance, confined as we are to Western conceptual tools, about the Asiatic mode of production, its space, its towns, or the relationship it embodies between town and country? (Lefebvre 1991a: 31-2).

The texts I might discuss are legion, so I restrict myself to noting a few in passing that obviously lend themselves to a spatial analysis, before looking more closely at one text and its implications, namely 1 Samuel 1-2.

Let me begin in reverse and note a rather obvious item for spatial analysis from the New Testament: the journeys of Paul in the book of Acts, which are followed, in the space of the New Testament codex itself, with letters first bearing spatial names: Rome, Corinth, Galatia, Ephesus, Philippi, Colossae and Thessalonika. There follow the personal names, except for the letter to the Hebrews. Indeed, the pivot seems to be Rome, for Acts ends with Paul living in Rome, preaching and teaching "quite openly and unhindered" (Acts 28:31). Romans immediately follows, with a range of cities after Rome that spans the distance between Rome and Jerusalem until Hebrews, tardy and hidden and without a place designator, brings up the rear. Lefebvre sustained interest in Rome would be an unavoidable interlocutor in such a reading, as it would in reading the Jerusalem of the gospels, to which Jesus turns, or the new Jerusalem of the Apocalypse descending from the sky without a temple. Is this city not a Roman *urbs*?

Another item that begs a spatial analysis is the function of Egypt in the Hebrew and Greek texts of the Bible. Given that it is a longstanding imperial center, whose sway waxed and waned over a millennium or two, the perpetual presence of Egypt as a literary feature of the Bible deserves a closer, spatial look. On the one hand, it is a place of escape, rest, restoration of fortunes and the legendary birth of founding leaders (Joseph and the family of Jacob, Moses, Jeroboam, the remnant who were not transported to Babylon in 2 Kings 25:26, Jesus, Mary and Joseph and so on), as well as one of oppression and imperial expansion into Judah and Israel (Exodus 1-2, Ezekiel 29-32, etc.).

However, in 1 Samuel 1-2 we have a rather inconspicuous text that touches more with Lefebvre's lifelong concern with the quotidian, everyday lived life. I should make it clear that whereas Lefebvre assumes the representational function of texts, from architecture through human bodies to written texts themselves, the kind of representation he works with is not of the sort that is second nature to most biblical scholars, namely, the specific history of a people or a period, the acts of states, groups of people or individuals from day to day and year to year. Historical research remains focused on locating texts in such a history and reading them for reference to it. In this respect the energy now directed at the Second Temple period, arguing for very late dates, works with the same set of assumptions; it is only the period that has changed.

So, the referential function of a text like 1 Samuel 1-2, while it can tell us little about any figures such as Samuel or Eli, or the events surrounding them, or even the moves of story-tellers and scribes who may have told or penned such a story at an indeterminate later period, it can tell us something about the production of space, of broader economic and cultural patterns in a much larger time frame that beggars any effort at more specific dating.

Since 1 Samuel 1-2 is a written text, it speaks, according to Lefebvre's schema, of the representations of space and spaces of representation: that is, as a text it functions in some representational way. It can then speak only in a secondary manner about spatial practice; or rather, there is a spatial practice of the text that refers to the spatial practice of whatever social formation it comes from. As far as the representation of space is concerned – the "frontal" discourse of space, the logic, ideology and conceptual depictions of space in relation to modes of production – we need to begin with the last verses of Judges, which may be read as an introduction to this text: "And the people of Israel departed from there at that time, every one to his tribe and family, and they went out from there every one to his inheritance. In those days there was no king in Israel; every one did what was right in his own eyes" (Judges 21:24-25). Following the suggestion of David Jobling, I read these verses as not so much a condemnation of the chaos just depicted, a conclusion to the story of the Benjaminites, but rather as the possibility of desirable state of affairs, without a king to rule over them and exact tribute and so on. In this case, the verses set up the spatial possibilities of 1 Samuel 1-2.

So there is a man from his own inheritance – Ramathaim-zophim of the hills of Ephraim – and from his own tribe and family – Elkanah the son of Jeroham, son of Elihu, son of Tohu, son of Zuph, and Ephraimite (1 Sam 1:1). The representation of space here is a dispersed pattern of living, each person living in a particular geographical and tribal place, what Lefebvre would designate as a *habitus*. The issue is one of the relations of production, specifically the distribution of human beings and their relations to each other in the production of what is required for human existence. The naming of the two women of Elkanah, Hannah and Peninah, is part of the same logic, as is the crucial statement, "And Peninah had children, but Hannah had no children" (1 Sam 1:2). The problem as it unfolds in this story is the barrenness of Hannah, which, as the story makes clear, is distinctly *her* problem since Peninah had sex with the same man as she.

This touches on the question of the reproduction of the means of production, as well the spaces of representation, to which I will turn in a moment. But what we have here is an economic unit here, given that families of whatever shape are at basis economic units in particular modes of production.

But let me stay with the representations of space: the immediate narratological event is the annual journey to worship and sacrifice at the sanctuary at Shiloh. This journey, the path taken from a small space in the hills of Ephraim to Shiloh, is one of those flows of which Lefebvre speaks time and again, open to what he also calls "rhythm analysis" (See Lefebvre 1996: 219-240). The annual journey frames the story itself, determining its rhythm: at the end of this particular trip, "they rose early in the morning and worshipped before the Lord; then they went back to their house at Ramah" (1 Sam 1:19). But then, after conception and birth, the family, minus Hannah and Samuel, travel to Shiloh again (1 Sam 1:21). Eventually Hannah goes up after weaning the child in order to dedicate him to the shrine (1 Sam 1:24), they return home (1 Sam 2:11), and then return year by year with a robe for Samuel which Hannah makes for him and gives to him at the time of yearly sacrifice (1 Sam 2:19) The annual journey to the major shrine of course indicates the importance of the shrine itself, with its priestly family, Eli, Hophni and Phinehas. The shrine, the place of worship, no matter how modest or grand, is a key representation of space, a frontal dimension which orders the lives of the smaller economic units of the extended families and tribes. The spatial pattern is like a wheel with unequal spokes leading in all direction from the center, or perhaps like an asterisk with lines leading out and coming into the point at the middle, the sanctuary. What we have here, then, is the production of sacred space and its organization of the social and economic patterns of human life.

The spatial patterns of the sanctuary itself, while not laid out explicitly as in so many places (the tabernacle of Moses, Solomon's temple, Ezekiel's temple plans and so on), appear as well. Eli, semi-retired (Hophni and Phinehas are the priests - 1 Sam 1:3), sits "on the seat beside the door post of the temple of the Lord" (1 Sam 1:9), able to observe Hannah praying. The line of sight is important here as well, for, apart from suggestions of voyeurism, Eli commands the sanctuary with his sight, although his insight itself is lacking with regard to Hannah.

What of the spaces of representation – the clandestine or underground side of social life, the sediments of lived space, of gender relations and

family patterns, and the possibilities of something new? The annual journey to Shiloh is occasion for rivalry between Hannah and Peninah, for the latter taunts Hannah over her barrenness. Peninah provokes and irritates, so Hannah responds with weeping and refusal to eat. An ineffectual Elkanah, who "loves" Hannah, can only ask questions restricted to the space of representation – weeping, eating, her heart and her barren womb (1 Sam 1:8).

Apart from the family dynamics, the bodies of the women function as the major spaces of representation, specifically their wombs, the matrix of the story. It is as though the wombs are set over against the sanctuary, the other pole around which this story oscillates. Both hidden, and foregrounded, Peninah's fertile womb contrasts with Hannah's barren womb. It is the cause of their conflict, a marker of her economic superfluity (Elkanah gives her but one portion), and the focus of her prayer in the sanctuary. Her vow – to dedicate the son born as a Nazirite to the Lord at the shrine – focuses again on her womb, for she seeks the Lord to open her womb in reverse to the divine closure (1 Sam 1:6). Then it is time, after the blessing pronounced by Eli, for Elkanah's seed to find its way into her womb, where a son is conceived and born (1 Sam 1:19-20). Hannah's body is now the location of sex and impregnation, and it remains fecund, particularly after the dedication of Samuel and the annual blessing from Eli (2 Sam 2: 20-21). I will return in a moment to the pattern whereby various males – Eli, Elkanah and the Lord – all ensure Hannah's fertility.

Hannah's body works in one other way in this text, apart from empty womb, source of anguish, and then blessing, divine visitation and sex. I refer here to Eli's singular lack of perception: he observes her mouth and her lips moving. This is the realm of representations of space, for Eli, the priest in the sanctuary of the Lord, is in that realm. It is also, for Lefebvre, the zone of perception, space that is perceived. Spatial practice breaks in here, percieved space, for Eli perceives her lips and her mouth, but that is all, given his spatial role in the story, all that he can perceive. She, however, speaks in her heart, but her voice is not heard. The very use of heart in this sense, very different from the observed heart of medicine, or (to avoid too much anachronism), an open dead body, is in the realm of the symbolic and the mythic. The heart as lived is very different from the heart as thought and perceived. Desire, Hannah's desire, her anxiety and vexation (1 Sam 1:16), and mythification appear here. The contrast between Eli and Hannah could

not be sharper in terms of space: the one comes from the representation of space, the other from the space of representation.

Eli sees her mouth and lips, but does not hear her voice. Hannah's heart acts as a metaphor for her womb, but her womb cannot be mentioned directly. In a perceptive *tour de force*, Eli concludes she is drunk. In response to Eli's rebuke, she admits not to pouring drink into her body, but pouring out her nephesh to God (1 Sam 1:15). Yet, even though her womb draws the prayer from her, she reveals to Eli none of the content of her prayer. Other parts of her bodily self, internal and external, have been revealed, but not her womb and its vexations. The spaces of representation in this case are not as myopic as Eli, for in the realm of the shrine, the external and frontal representation of space, it is not possible for her womb to be mentioned, seen or referred to. It is a realm both crucial to yet suppressed by the overt structure of space in this text. Hannah's womb remains unspoken and unperceived within the sanctuary, since sanctuary and womb are at odds with each other in spatial terms. If we pick up Lefebvre again, we find that in the production of sacred space, the realm of nature and of women's bodies is suppressed and removed from the domain of shrine, temple, and also city. But this space, what he calls absolute space, does not disappear; rather, it retreats into the interior, into the enclosed spaces of caves, nooks and crannies, alleyways, and of course bodies. The womb becomes a prime site for such an investment of alternative space, outside the bodies of males, of sanctuaries and cities, it yet remains crucial to the pattern of sacred commerce: hence the roles of Eli, Elkanah and God in relation to her womb. So here, it seems, we find the intersection of absolute space and sacred space, an overlap that Lefebvre himself was keen on locating.

Is there a utopian possibility in these spaces of representation, specifically with Hannah's womb and the way that it is the focus of the story? If we follow the work of Butler (1993), Grosz (1995) or Blum and Nast (1996), as well as Lefebvre, then bodies, especially female bodies, spatially exceed our representations and images, twisting away from patriarchal signs and controls. It would appear, on one reading at least, that the militant anthem of 1 Sam 2:1-10 fits the bill. It celebrates the strengthening, by God, of the weak and lowly, the bringing down of mighty kings, powerful, proud and arrogant men. The hungry, feeble and barren find food, strength and pregnancy. And yet, the central figure in this is God, which leads me to the final dimension of spatial practice.

Spatial practice appears at certain points that reflect an economy of the sacred, a sacred commerce in which issues of production and reproduction can only be perceived in terms of the sacred. So it is that Peninah taunts Hannah on the annual journey to Shiloh, specifically after the allocation of portions to each member of the extended family, for Hannah would be given only one portion (1 Sam 1:4, see also 7). Why not at other times, in this story? At this moment the role of the divine in reproduction is highlighted: on the journey, or rather at Shiloh, after the sacrifice, sacred commerce comes to the fore.

In order to maintain a mode of production it is necessary to reproduce labor power, ie. human beings. In different modes of production this may happen in different ways. For instance, in slave holding societies the slaves who do the work for the system to keep functioning are acquired through conquest, systems of debt, as well as children of slaves. However, in most cases human reproduction plays some role, especially in those where tribe or gens plays a fundamental role in the relations of production. The reproduction of large families, often polygamous, is crucial for the mode of production to sustain itself. So it is with this story, although with a few twists.

Firstly, there is the curious pattern of reproduction that seems to follow another rhythm from that of sex itself. In order for Hannah to conceive, she first goes to Shiloh, prays at the shrine, receives a blessing from Eli, is remembered (1 Sam 1:19) or visited (2 Sam 2:21) by God and then has sex with Elkanah. It seems as though she needs three men for the whole process to work (1 Sam 1:20; 2 Sam 2:21). As far as the rhythm of the story is concerned, it is only after the annual sacrifice and vow that the correct combination comes together for conception. This odd pattern is reinforced by the obverse, when she does not go (1 Sam 1:22), promising to do so when she has weaned the child. Then, when Hannah brings Samuel to dedicate him at the shrine, there is no pregnancy either, for there is no blessing, visitation, or sex in the story at that moment either.

It seems that the story has the making of a sacred commerce, a divine economy in which the system requires the activity of God to keep it running. But there is another feature that at first seems to undermine all this: is the dedication of Samuel as a Nazirite, to live and work at the temple, not an undermining of the need for labor power in the unit of the extended family? Would it not fit the logic of the system better if he were to grow up in the family and take his share of the workload? In the end, I

would suggest, Hannah has the system at heart, for in dedicating the child to the Lord at the shrine she ensures that the sacred commerce will continue. Not only does she fulfil her vow (1 Sam 1:11) – necessary to avoid a divine curse – but she ensures that the role of the shrine and its priesthood in the production of sacred space is maintained. This is the reason, in a spatial analysis, why the sons of Eli, as well as Eli himself, must appear worthless and corrupt in the story (2 Sam 2:12-17, 22-36). Their sin is so great for it is a sin against God rather than other people (2 Sam 2:25). Samuel, therefore, is their designated replacement, and Hannah thereby performs a crucial function for the maintenance of this particular production of space and its mode of production (the Asiatic mode of production). Her boy, the product of her womb, must go to the shrine in order to underwrite its continuance at the hub of the spokes.

Do even the spaces of representation fall victim to the spatial practice of a particular mode of production? Does Hannah's womb also, despite the utopian glimpse it provides, reinforce the system as a whole? It would seem so, except for one detail: it all takes place at Shiloh, not Jerusalem. Here I make a dialectical move, characteristic of Lefebvre and other Marxists indebted to him such as Fredric Jameson, taking the whole discussion to another level and widening out the problem in a whole new way. What difference does Shiloh make? A whole lot, it seems to me.

The story is curious in the context of the larger scale into which it falls, especially if we keep Noth's construction of a "Deuteronomistic History" in mind.[1] I want to pick up but one piece of this proposal, namely the centrality of the construction of the first temple by Solomon in the structure of the work. One of Noth's arguments was that the work exhibited an over-riding structure into which the ethereal author, creatively named the "deuteronomistic historian," fitted the bits and pieces cobbled together for the history itself. At the center of this planned work, and at the middle point of the chronology, Solomon begins building the temple (see 1 Kings 6: 1). But not only is the temple central in a chronological sense; it also functions as the only place for legitimate worship of Yahweh. The other

[1]I write "construction" advisedly, for, as I argue in *Novel Histories*, the "deuteronomistic history" is produced in the space between the biblical text and Noth's critical work. He read Deuteronomy-Kings as though it were the "deuteronomistic history," and in order to construct it as such he saw it as an historical novel. See Boer 1997, especially 13-14, 77-103.

places, especially the high places, but also the other shrines and minor places for worship are therefore illegal, not to be tolerated. And this applies even to those with some apparent pedigree, such as Bethel, Dan, and of course, Shiloh. So, a continual pattern becomes apparent in the "Deuteronomistic History," in which worship must be carried out in Jerusalem, at the temple, and nowhere else, and yet alternative worship continues. The various shrines and high places become contested zones, the subject of polemic and theological condemnation.

Spatially, such a conflict is crucial on a number of levels. The split between Rehoboam and Jeroboam is read in terms of the legitimacy or otherwise of the sanctuaries *to which people travel for sacrifice and worship*. Jeroboam, in order to stop the people going to Jerusalem, sets up worship in Bethel and Dan so that the people may go there, so that the hubs are now located within the territory of Israel and not Judah (1 Kings 12:25-33). This becomes a leitmotif for the rest of Kings, any condemnation now connected with the proverbial sins of Jeroboam. The contest closes with Josiah's destruction of the sanctuary at Bethel (2 Kings 23: 15-20). Indeed, Josiah's reform, with its long list of items destroyed, abolished, annihilated and ground into dust, embodies such a spatial contest in intricate detail, for the danger exhibited there is that if such a pattern of religious observance were allowed to go unchecked, it would infect the temple in Jerusalem as well.

Finally, there is not unexpectedly a theological glue to all of this that runs through from beginning to end. The basic theological bifurcation of this "history" is between obedience and disobedience: following the laws and wishes of Yahweh will lead to blessings, understood in terms of land, long life, wealth and offspring; falling away, worshipping other gods, and thereby disobeying Yahweh's commandments, which appear strategically at the beginning in Deuteronomy, will mean early death, misfortune, and ultimately, the spatial punishment of dispossession from the land, which is of course the punishment, according to this story, for continued apostasy.

So, in the broader context there is a spatial dynamic at work that lifts the whole consideration of Shiloh to a new dialectical level. If Shiloh falls into the category of one of these shrines, a hub of sacred space outside Jerusalem, then it is, as a whole, part of the spaces of representation. If sacred space seeks to control worship and economics in the central city and temple – and for Lefebvre sacred space relies not so much on the shrine alone as on the sacred city – then Shiloh is in another place, namely, that of

suppressed spaces, of the elements of an older spatial organization that has now succumbed to the new order. Along with the various high places, grottoes, trees and so on, it is now a space of representation, on par with domestic patterns and bodies themselves. What this means is that whereas in the story of I Samuel 1-2 Hannah's womb, the major space of representation in the text of 1 Samuel 1-2, acts as one pole over against the sanctuary of Shiloh, in the larger context, her womb and the sanctuary fold into one space. The spatial logic of this is that the very possibility of a story about her womb can only take place in a narratively marginal, suppressed space such as that of Shiloh. Were it set in the Jerusalem of Solomon's temple, then it would have faced a narrative fate comparable to the suggestion of Solomon that the baby fought over by the two sex workers in 1 Kings 3:16-28 be cut in two.

Also, the sheer absence of descriptions, plans and designs of the shrine at Shiloh marks it off as less a representation of space than as a space of representation. All I was able to glean from the text was the centrality of Shiloh for the annual journey of the family to worship. By contrast, the issue of plans, building programs, sources of finance, interior design, and so on is inseparable from the consideration of the temple in Jerusalem. Thus, 1 Kings 5:15(ET 5:1)-7:38, is concerned with various facets of the building of the temple, roughly a third of the total textual space given over to Solomon's reign (1 Kings 3-11), let alone the dedication in the long chapter 8. Chronicles pumps this up even further, with 2 Chronicles 1:18(ET 2:1)-4:22 devoted to temple construction, and then a further slab of text, three chapters (2 Chronicles 5-7), given over to the dedication of the temple. This is not all, for further temple plans appear in Ezekiel 40-48, and a good section of Ezra and Nehemiah is given over to the story of the rebuilding of the temple and then the city of Jerusalem itself. Various prophets (Haggai, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel) agonize over the temple, Psalms sing its praises and hopes for the future rest there (the Maccabees). Finally, the only other stretch of text with as much detail about the construction of a sanctuary is of course that of the tabernacle. The detailed instructions of Yahweh, down to the fineries of interior design, curtain material and clothes for the priests, are passed on to Moses over forty days and nights on Mt Sinai itself (Exodus 25-30), and then replicated in the description of its construction (Exodus 35-40). This is no less a representation of space than the temple in Jerusalem, and the two are linked through the wayward track of the ark of the covenant, which makes its way finally into the temple in Jerusalem.

The fleeting description of Shiloh pales by comparison to the inordinate attention given to temple and tabernacle. Boring stretches of text to be sure, but interesting precisely because of their boredom and tedium, particularly in terms of space. Let me return, however, to the tension I noted earlier between the central sacred space of Jerusalem and its temple which is so characteristic of the Asiatic mode of production. In the same way that worshipers and their acts of worship flow to the temple, so also their tribute flows into the city and the ruling class that feeds on the surplus product extracted from the peasants. Should we read the narrative presence of alternative, submerged and repressed spaces as sites of resistance, as places where older types of space remain and also from where new possibilities might arise, especially if they are connected with patterns of bodies that we find there as well? On one level it seems as though this is indeed possible, but I want to make another point here: it is not so much that we should side with one or the other as a better space, but that the contradiction between the two is part of the very production of space for such a socio-economic system. That is, the centripetal site for sacred observance, with its temple and palace, the site for political and economic power that is simultaneously religious, cannot exist without the centrifugal spaces of alternative sites for worship, and so also political and economic activity. Jerusalem cannot exist without Shiloh, and vice versa, for this is the dialectical logic of such a production of space. It is therefore a mistake to argue for either the correctness of the henotheistic/monotheistic ideology of certain dimensions of the text or for the viability of widespread polytheism. Both exist within this particular mode of production as necessary counterparts to each other.

Thus far I have read 1 Samuel 1-2 at two levels – the immediate one of the story centered on Shiloh and then a larger one of the relation between Shiloh and comparable places with Jerusalem. But there is another, wider, level that reinforces my argument (but which cannot be argued at length here), for if we look at the larger context we find that for most of its existence Jerusalem found itself in tension with stronger imperial centers, whether of the Egyptians, Babylonians, Assyrians, Persians, Greeks or Romans. On this level, Jerusalem becomes an outside rim on a much vaster wheel, perpetually oscillating between subservience to larger imperial centers and limited independence. On this level too, then, the fundamental contradiction of the Asiatic mode of production cannot be avoided, namely the centrifugal force of the periphery and the centripetal force of the centre. Such a pattern perpetually replicates itself on a range of scales.

I have relentlessly sought to read these texts with the methods of Lefebvre in mind, partly in order to seek out the extraordinarily fecund possibilities his work provides, but also as part of a larger project on Marxist Literary Criticism and the Bible. Of course, it is but one distinct way of reading such texts, and the danger is that the claims for a spatial analysis may be too grand. I would prefer to see it as part of a larger program that includes other Marxist categories, such as the class, ideology, the theory of value, and so on. However, the sustained discipline of a specific reading like this one is not without its pleasures.

WORKS CITED

Blum, V., and H. Nast

1996 "Where's the Difference? The Heterosexualization of Alterity in Henri Lefebvre and Jacques Lacan." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 14/4: 559-80.

Boer, Roland

1997 *Novel Histories: The Fiction of Biblical Criticism*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Butler, Judith

1993 *Bodies that Matter: On the Discursive Limits of Sex*. London: Routledge.

Grosz, Elizabeth.

1995 *Space, Time and Perversion: Essays on the Politics of Bodies*. London: Routledge.

Lefebvre, Henri.

1970 *Du rural á l'urbain*. Paris: Anthropos.

1974 "La production de l'espace." *L'Homme et la société* 31-2 (January-June): 15-32.

1986 *Le retour de la dialectique. 12 mots clés*. Paris: Messidor Éditions Sociales.

1991a*The Production of Space*. Trans. Donald Nicolson-Smith. Oxford; Blackwell (French 1974, 1984).

1991b*Critique of Everyday Life*. Trans. John Moore. London: Verso.

1996 *Writings on Cities*. Trans. and introd. by Eleonore Kofman and Elizabeth Lebas. Oxford; Blackwell.

Shields, Rob

1999 *Lefebvre, Love and Struggle: Spatial Dialectics*. London: Routledge

Word Reconstructing Flesh: Portable Christianity and its Fragile Earth Connection

Mary Huie-Jolly
School of Ministry, Knox College, Aotearoa/New Zealand

People's experience of the space they inhabit is affected by their typical social practices. When humans act as if their identity is grounded in earth as their next of kin, they speak on her behalf. Conversely, actions of dominance legitimate rituals of divine power over the earth which do not prohibit treatment of the earth as a thing, to be bought and sold and used as a mere commodity.

I live in Aotearoa under the hole in the ozone layer where pollutants fed into air in the northern hemisphere mean increased risk of melanoma for those "down under". The climate of global warming raises sea levels driving inhabitants of tiny atolls from their homes in Oceania. The air and sea and earth rudely attest human violation of earth's cloak of cloud. The space I inhabit is intersected by two distinct perceptions of spatiality. In one, typical of Oceanic cosmologies, humans find a place in between earth mother and sky father; in the other, the map of the cosmos associated with Western Christianity the earth and all its inhabitants are under God's dominion.

The Maori, who came to Aotearoa long before European settlement, explained their habitat in the space between earth and sky through stories of the first parents, Papatuanuku, the earth mother and Ranginui, the sky father.[1] Their children personifying trees, sea life, wind, ferns, yams and humankind, governed the various aspects of nature. For example, when a tree must be felled to build a house, the one wielding the hatchet must acknowledge Tane who personifies trees. For the time being humans become

[1] I am grateful to Hine Waititi, Wayne TeKaawa and Wiremu Quedley who at different times gave advice on different parts of my discussion of *taha* Maori.

subject to sacred restrictions acknowledging the domain of the tree (Tane) in order that they may take what they need without upsetting the relationship with the forest. Complicated *tapu* (taboo) restricted actions to particular times and places. Observing *tapu* restrictions recognises the value of the tree to humans. *Tapu* restrictions do not guarantee protection against human exploitation of earth. They do place prohibitions against exploitation of earth at the core of Maori understanding of the sacred.

Foregrounding ritual in environmental space

The production of social space is a process, it does not happen quickly; social space incorporates social actions, says Henri Lefebvre (1991:33-34). Actions sanctioned by the society generate social space. Special places and rituals represent the spatiality of society to itself (Lefebvre 1991:34).

Maori migrations to Aotearoa were followed as much as a millennium later during an era of colonial expansion by Christian European traders, missionaries and settlers, in that order. "Pakeha" is the Maori name for New Zealanders of European descent. Some say that the Maori people of Aotearoa "profited" from the coming of the Pakeha because the Christian religion of the colonists demystified the awesome power of the earth. Maori observed restrictions out of respect for the elemental energy intrinsic to every part of creation; *tapu* (taboo in English) put in place restrictions for observation of its sacredness (Shirres 1997:41-42). Christianity brought a different understanding. The earth was not regarded as intrinsically powerful. The missionaries and settlers did not observe sacred restrictions in order to chop timber. The earth was theirs to be used at will.

In New Zealand inhabited by Pakeha, the earth stripped of her cloak of mystery, has been put firmly in her place. She is there for our use. We can ply our trade unhindered. This change in behaviour regarding the sacredness of earth may seem to be for human profit, free from the burden of obligation to the powers of sea and forest and fertile earth. But in the long term, from under the ozone hole, we see our loss. Connection with earth is broken. No

sacred place is given to earth and no sacred obligation binds us to her. Where no restriction surrounds digging or planting or chopping trees, people exploit the power and vulnerability of the earth's own intrinsic energy. Like all social practice, Lefebvre observes, spatial practice is lived directly before it is conceptualized; but the "speculative primacy of the conceived over the lived causes practice to disappear along with life" and so does very little justice to the unconscious level of lived experience (1991:34). Positing an idea of mental space neglects the social space wherein language becomes practice (Lefebvre 1991:5).

To avoid priority of concept over practice I will compare Maori and Christian ritual. Ritual practice is in fact spatial practice. Ritual is coded behaviour that gives pattern to values to be enforced and allows members of the group to internalise its norms in the very process of interaction (Douglas 1973: 54). Because ritual mediates, supports and communicates the relation of everyday life to the sacred, it relates individual needs to public social needs, both expressed in symbolic acts (Douglas 1975: 61). Ritual and spatial practice are interrelated.

The interactive process that generates spatiality is outlined in Lefebvre's trialectic of :

spatial practice,
concepts of space, and
spaces of representation.

Lefebvre noted that concepts of spatiality have a dominating effect on spatial practice in Neocapitalist societies where only in the spaces of representation is there room for imaginative play with what might or ought to have been (Lefebvre 1991:38,42).

Following Lefebvre's trialectic, ritual functions as a space of representation. It mediates between language and lived experience. For society to present and represent its space, it must have special places consecrated to symbolic representation. Ritual represents and mediates social practice. My paper explores ritual in relation to my social location under the ozone hole.

Environmental ethics are important, but this response alone is inadequate. A spatial perception of interdependence, solidarity and belonging, qualities communicated by participation in ritual can structure relationship between society and the sacred as the more fundamental ground of environmentally sustainable behavior. Responses to the task of tribal adaptation in small less organized societies may be imaginatively juxtaposed to the, much more complex, global environmental crisis. In tribal societies ethical behaviour does not need to be stipulated but is understood in a way that goes deep than external rules. To belong within a kin group is to construct ethical behavior within social relations themselves, these weave a network of mutual obligation and interdependence, which ground ethical behavior more profoundly than external rules (Rappaport 1999:325).

I treat ritual as practice that encompasses language. Ritual avoids reduction of "coded behavior" to an epistemological "mental realm"; unlike a semiotic "reading" of society, which applies codes from texts to space, thereby reducing social space to a message and its inhabitants to a reading, attention to ritual mediates practice and concept (Lefebvre 1991:5). Ritual allows us to focus on the relationship between language and space as a social product. (See Lefebvre 1991:7,17).

Both actions and words, including myths and texts stated and unstated, accompany and underpin ritual. Ritual has adaptive significance in relation to social circumstances of humanity (Rappaport 1999: 407). Energy for foregrounding some information and backgrounding others is not random. People make decisions and shape meaning by manipulating language to do what they want to do in response to their environment. Social interaction is a process linking adaptive meaning implicit in actions to meaning that is ritualised and thereby made explicitly symbolic (Douglas 1975:8).

The resources for Christian practice are diverse, even within the biblical canon set apart as sacred text. Adaptive foregrounding and backgrounding fits with my own experience of Christian faith. Though an immigrant to New Zealand as an adult, I grew up white in Georgia in the fifties. Church was part of the furniture of my childhood. We rattled through the creed Sunday by Sunday: I believe in God the Father almighty, Jesus his son our Lord, conceived, dead, buried, risen, seated at the right hand of God, and so on, Amen. The creed was background material, taken for granted, like the furniture of our house and the warm air full of lightning bugs. The operational response to living counter-culturally in a context of structural racism was foregrounded by my mother: 'Jesus said, "do unto others as you would have them do unto you" ', and their derivative, 'we are all equal in God's eyes, so you treat everybody the same.' The foregrounded material helped me walk. Later this formative material was backgrounded. In the late sixties, destablized by hippy values, the promise of God's certain abiding truth provided an ark of belonging and safe boundaries. The monarchic stream of Jesus as Lord, consistent with the creed that had been backgrounded, now came to the fore. To the social confusion, Jesus was the answer and Scripture the guide. In the mission oriented practice that accompanied the confession, the operational focus was obedience to carrying this saving message everywhere, till every knee bow and tongue confess Christ is Lord. Where it is deemed socially and politically advantageous to legitimate expansionist practice, it is not uncommon to find the Lordship of Jesus foregrounded.

The process of foregrounding and backgrounding allows society and Christian faith within society to adapt its spatial representation to changing environmental awareness and circumstances. I will suggest that persistent foregrounding of God's power and victory over all things has had damaging environmental consequences. Lefebvre notes that taboo, prohibition or protection surrounding places regarded as sacred leads to a tendency to avoid criticism of the sacred. Special places, protected from criticism as

good or evil, facilitate social continuity without revealing, unmasked, their dangerous side (Lefebvre 1991:34). One way of unmasking the damaging impact of one's own sacred practice is comparison. Cross cultural comparison allows people, even within one faith tradition, to see themselves from outside their own "space" and to become self critical, to make judgements concerning difference. (See Smith 1987:14). I juxtapose Maori practices acting out a sacred perception of earth with comparable Christian rituals.

The paper critiques the monarchic stream of Christian faith for failing to ritually protect of the power and fragility of the life support system from human damage. (See Costanza 1996: 1,4,5 and Berry 1990). I do not imply that Christian faith is always or intrinsically damaging to earth. Christian tradition is always foregrounding and backgrounding in the process of adapting to new circumstances. In this process old and new resources that value and give voice to earth are coming to the fore. In using the English term "dominant Christianity" I draw on E.S.Fiorenza's definition of "kyriarchy as the rule of emperor\master\lord\father\husband over his subordinates, and the kyriocentric ideological articulations that validate relations and systems of domination (Fiorenza 1994: 14). I extend her definition to include rule over the earth, as if earth were without voice or intrinsic power.

Mary Douglas holds that taboo is the key to deciphering the meaning of a society (1989;1975). Taboo marks at the same time that which is forbidden and regarded as sacred. Douglas identifies taboo as a code connecting religious assumptions with the organization of everyday life. Spatial perceptions are acted out in relation to social tests in ritual practice. Taboo surrounds those areas that are considered most fragile and vulnerable, needing protection in a society. The role of taboo in the spatial organization of daily life is (at least in part) acted out in the rituals of the politically

dominant religion. Religion is intimately related to social solidarity (Berger 1967: 51). Conversely dominant political and economic and scientific practices will not thrive unless they are allowed (or not forbidden) within the spatiality constructed by the dominant religion. I assume that even complex Western pluralistic societies legitimate everyday practice through foregrounding and backgrounding of the specific aspects of religious traditions which fit social practice, allowing for selection and manipulation of ritual; conversely ritual practice of the dominant religion shapes spatial perception.

For the purpose of this paper, imagine that the category of space is akin to the construct of religious identity. Immanuel Kant's views space as an intuitive, and interpretive construct. I presume it is cut of the same cloth as the ordering, naming, place assigning, value determining, role of (in Kant's terms) "the unconditioned" in religion (albeit religion culturally derived and intuitively internalised. In other words, I am assuming that the Kantian construct) of space is not unlike the spatiality constructed in ritual, and associated with religion.

Kant observed that space is an intuitive and interpretive category of thought. He does not attempt to explore the question of how the category of space might be understood by non-Western peoples whose perception is formed in other frameworks of meaning. In exploring distinctive cultural perceptions of spatiality, I borrow from Kant the description of space as a necessary and constructive category inherent in thought. Space is constructed as an intuitive interpretive category of the mind that apprehends the relationship of the human person to others through sense data.

Kant gives priority to the autonomy of the singular mind in experience, an "individual deity of self". Smith reckons Kant receives this from the rhetoric of society (Smith 1987: 35). The spatial assumption that the human has "power over" "objects" external to oneself is reinforced in spatial practices which impose an external order on host cultures which are perceived as passive recipients. Expansionist practices in overseas

missionary expansion, colonialism and global capitalism treat others who do not belong to the dominant order as a passive and malleable to reconstruction within the dominant order. Ritual must be interpreted in relation to the social system. Society, constructed by exchanges, verbal, material and behavioural, is represented in ritual, and ritual contributes to construction of social and spatial reality (Douglas 1975:121).

In worship Christians acknowledge the value of earth, because it is created by and belongs to God (as do all things), and Christians do sometimes add on ethical guidelines responsive to the environmental crisis. Yet, the religion that allowed expansionist practices neither regards earth as sacred nor ritually protects earth's vulnerability to human exploitation. At the same time "our species activities on the planet have now become of so large a scale that they are beginning to affect the life support system itself"; our challenge is to live sustainably and well within the material limits of a finite planet (Constanza, et al 1996:1,4,5).[2]

The plausibility structure of religion is the coherence between the lived experience of everyday practice and that which is held sacred; individuals in a religious world require a social context within which the religion can maintain plausibility (Berger 1967: 50). Moral imperatives derive from social intercourse and draw on a view of the environment to support social order. Credibility between ritual's symbols and environment is secured by commitment to normative institutions and beliefs. As normative practice, ritual carries means for adapting society to environment and to ourselves, by limiting and extending ecological interaction (Douglas 1975: 241-242).

---

[2] The Earth Bible faces the biblical heritage of the Western world as a contributing factor to the current ecological crisis. It responds by a biblical hermeneutic of the intrinsic worth of the earth as a community of interconnected life, mutually interdependent on each other for survival, capable of voicing cries against injustice. See Benchmark Draft II of the Earth, http://eca.anu.edu.

The earth is understood to be threatened by expansionist human spatial practice. Yet the dominant religion under which these expansionist social and economic structures thrived transmits no taboo surrounding the vulnerability of the earth in relation to humans. Experientially Western Christians understand that the earth is vulnerable, yet kyriarchal Christian ritual does not value and protect the vulnerability and power of the earth by acknowledging its sanctity. The plausibility structure of Christianity is undermined when there is scarce practical link between experience and the sacred.

Dominant religious concepts and social practice are related even in complex, neocapitalist, global societies, though the relationships are complex. By linking Peter Berger's theory of the social construction of reality to spatial perceptions, I assume that spatial practice projects patterns of behaviour on to a cosmic order. The order of the patterns then in turn imposes roles and values on the society. The roles are legitimated by the dominant religion of the society. I will presume that the spatiality implicit in Christian liturgy, representing the dominant religion of New Zealand society, has some connection with the organization and interpretation of space in the dominant culture. When the spatial practice of exploitation of the earth is allowed by expansionist economics this indicates that in some way an expansionist order of social construction which condones dominance over the earth must have been legitimated by the religion under which these social practices emerged.

Pakeha Christianity operates on the homiletic paradigm of faith formed in a liturgical event that proclaims, through ritual, the Word of God. To accept one universal truth is to interpret the space of one's environment. The truth of the Word because it is regarded as sacred is exalted. Conversely local understanding submits to the normative order of the Word of Christ. The Word became flesh. But the flesh is not regarded as sacred in its own right, only by virtue of its connection to the Word. This religious tendency renders local adaptations fragile. The liturgical paradigm, Word imposes order upon flesh, ignores the fact that people live, not in the centre of the circle of

worship, in a posture of receptivity to the words of divine direction and authority but in the context of everyday relationships with their respective environments (Farley 1988). A link between ritual and expansionist economic practice is consistent with Henri Lefebvre's critique of neocapitalism. He notes that concept and word are given priority over experience of nature and lived reality; the mental realm "comes to envelope the social and physical ones" (Lefebvre 1991:5). Similarly, the liturgical paradigm of a superior word imposes a set form of ritual response on passive experience.

Belonging to Earth and to God

In Maori practice, after the birth of a child the *pito* 'umbilical cord' and the *whenua* the placenta or afterbirth are gathered up (Shirres 1997:54). The family wraps and with ceremony places them in the earth or in a tree used for that purpose near the local marae or homestead. The placenta returned to a particular ancestral place grounds the identity of the newborn child in the land. The connection between reproductive blood and the very earth itself is profound. In Maori language the same word *whenua* means both land and placenta. Land is the macrocosm, the placenta the microcosm grounding every mother and child bodily and linguistically within the ancestral place of habitation.

Both Christian liturgy and Maori practice place those who participate in their rituals into a particular role in relation to the environment. However Christian and Maori ritual place different priorities on the value of locality and kin and response to the spatial environment..

In Maori myth creation begins with the embrace of the primal parents. The children are crowded between them. In order to make room to breathe they throw their embracing parents apart. Their mother Papanuatuku is thrown down to earth their father Ranginui is thrown up to the sky. Of their children (representing the sea, trees, fernroot, wind) only humankind stays with the

mother. The myth by itself carries no self-referential information, nor does its telling presuppose a relationship between myth and narrator. The practice of placing the cord and placenta in the earth at birth does stipulate this relationship (Rappaport 1999:134).

Spatially the story is lived out in the meetinghouse where the poles and rafters represent ancestors holding up the communal space between earth and sky. Separation and difference are grounded in relation to the earth as ancestor. The meeting house itself, the centre of communal life, is understood to represent the body of the ancestors. The meeting house is also referred to as Taane-whakapiripiri 'the trees of the forest' personifying the one who props up the sky to hold the parents apart (Shirres 1997:58). The carved pillars represent the presence within the house of notable male and female ancestors from the tribe's genealogy who are addressed in the speeches opening every communal gathering. The roof signifies Ranginui the sky father, the floor Papatuanuku the earth mother, and the ridgepoles that hold up the roof represent poles used by their children to prop up the sky, to separate sky and earth to make it possible for them to move in the light. They must continually be held apart for they long to be reunited. In a South Island account, rain is the tears of sky father's longing to be reunited with earth mother (Schremp 1992:103). The whole of life occurs within the tension filled space of their descendants who continue to hold up the space between earth and sky.

For Maori, One is their ancestor, sky standing here earth lying there (Schremp 1992:96); the children who separated them personify the mauri (elemental energy) of each section of creation. Tawhirimatea, wind personified is the son who sides with Ranginui the father and remains bellicose against the children who stay with Papa-tuanuku, mother earth; due to disruption by wind, all went to their ecological niche except Tuumatuenga (associated with humans) who stayed with earth (Schremp 1992:75-77). Papatuanuku, the earth protects her children in the folds of her body, and the sea, Hine-moana, the sea, protects sea life from the sun who is trying to kill them. Various beings, rock, gravel, and sand protect earth from gnawing

ocean (Schremp 1992:77-78). In this delicately balanced contention between different forces, natural beauty is not celebrated for its own sake but in connection with primal ancestors (Schremp 1992:78).

Ritual reinforces conformity to a commonly accepted set of norms (Douglas 1975:66). Placing the placenta in the earth ritually acknowledges solidarity with the people, the land, the ancestors. Within this place of belonging one is obligated to live in relationship, not to treat the land, the ancestors, the meetinghouse or the people as mere things.

Christian ritual constructs a different spatiality. Compare the ritual of baptism, an initiation into the family of God, not of kin and place. Whereas the Maori practice of burying the placenta identifies the person with the land, Christian baptism identifies the person with God. Contrast the rubrics for baptism: " I baptise you Andrea Marie in the name of the Father and Son and Holy Spirit". The Christian names are spoken but the family name is omitted as a reminder that baptism is not of earthly birth to the parents but of spiritual birth in the name of Father, Son and Spirit. The ritual is set apart as sacred by distinguishing spiritual birth in God's family from birth in the human family.

Fertility imagery does occur in the Christian rite of baptism. Birth from the mother's womb is juxtaposed to spiritual birth into the kingdom of God in John 3. The dialogue, framed within the context of baptisms by John the Baptist and Jesus and rich in metaphor of water and spirit, appears to communicate a Johannine perspective on the sacred meaning behind the ritual of baptism: Jesus tells Nicodemus he must be born from above (or again, ανωθεν is ambiguous). To Nicodemus' incredulous question, "How can anyone enter a second time into his mother's womb and be born?," Jesus responds, "That which is born of flesh is flesh, that which is born of spirit is spirit. Unless you are born from above you cannot enter the kingdom of God..." (John 3.3-6). Similarly, "as many as received him he gave them power to become children of God...who were born not from blood, nor the will of the flesh , nor human will, but from God" (John 1.12-13). Birth is

prominent; but it is birth into the kingdom of God that supersedes and devalues the fleshly birth from the mother's womb. Unlike Maori practice that values the placenta by placing it in the earth, baptism devalues the female dimension of reproduction as 'flesh', in contra-distinction from 'Spirit'.

Jacques Lacan argues that the ultimate foundation of space is prohibition surrounding the separation of the child from its mother's body. His semiotics derives from Freudian psychoanalysis: unconscious prohibition surrounding incest represses desire for reunification with the mother. The autonomous male rechannels and controls his energies. Repression of unconscious desire to be reunited with the mother is the masked force that builds civilised structures of control over primitive instinct. Thus humans are formed socially in an 'environment' of zones defined by interdiction and bans against incest (Lefebvre 1991:36). Dual prohibition accompanies objectification of the phallus as "not nature" and relegation of the realm of the mother, sex and reproductive blood to the realm of the cursed (Lacan summarised by Lefebvre 1991:35).

Lacan's thesis is interesting in light of fertility imagery in baptism, foreshadowed by male rather than female imagery, in the First Temple. The temple represents enthronement of the deity consolidating his reign of peace. The Ugaritic mythology, from which Israelite temple ideology was derived, places the temple on the divine mountain as the throne over the heavens as well as the earth. It is "the paradise" from which all fertility and blessing flow, issuing in blessings of fertility beyond the temple to benefit the entire cosmos (Eliade 1957). The reign of the king is integrally related to the fruitfulness of the cosmic order (Crow 1998). Loren Crow identifies many aspects of the First Temple with fertility, all of them related to the King: the temple as house of the king, the garden, forest, and river. Even the king himself, Crow says, has ramifications for connecting God's presence with the fruitfulness of the land. Yet connection between the king and fertility is spatially elusive. Though the king is identified with fertility in the myth, women bear children and rear them. As in John 3 and the ritual of baptism,

women are present socially, but absent from sacred spaces of representation. The new birth by baptism creates children, not of the flesh, but of God the Father in Christ the Son.[3] Baptism constructs identity, not with the earth as mother, but with God as Father and Christ the Word who became flesh in order to save our sinful flesh.

Similarly, for Lacan, identity of the self is accomplished by separation from the mother. Is this construction symptomatic of a society that identifies with God in contradistinction from earth and bodily flesh? Kyriarchal Christianity gives no sacred space of representation to the nurture of the child by the mother. Birth is prominent; but it is birth into the kingdom of God that supersedes and devalues the fleshly birth from the mother's womb.

Lefebvre agrees with Lacan that society is structured by the unconscious forces surrounding prohibition, but he sees prohibition against productive activity, not incest, at the origin of society (Lefebvre 1991:35). Prohibition surrounds productive activity in Maori practice, limiting it to particular times and places; taboo on building or planting protects the earth, trees or sea from productive activity that oversteps the boundaries appropriate to the realm of trees or sea. Before building workers subject themselves to sacred restrictions acknowledging the domain of trees in order not to violate bounds in relationship with the forest (Shirres.1997:45-47).

Similarly, placing of the umbilical cord and placenta in the earth constructs identity and boundaries. The sacred relationship between mother, child and home place, ritually and concretely becomes the standing place to which the growing person can always return. The ritual publically, socially acknowledges the sacredness of this formative, nurturing, sustaining relationship.

Western society is fascinated with sexuality in all its unconscious and therefore underground dimensions. The fascination is, I suggest,

[3] See Romans 8.1-17.

symptomatic of societies that have no sacred space representing fertility. Extinction of female imagery from public ritual space leads to repression and denial. When no ritual observes the sacred place of the body in fertilty, incest is feared because no taboo publically protects the vulnerable and powerful relationship between mother, child, and earth. Fear of incest, the violation of child by the parent, becomes a subconscious motivator of actions. When no ritual surrounds this sphere of social life, fear, masked by denial, increases because no taboo ritually protects the relationship between mother and child as sacred.

Though they are very different, both baptism and traditional Maori practice locate persons within a place of belonging. The placenta *whenua* is placed in the land *whenua*, linguistically and ritually identifying the life of mother and child together with a particular ancestral place of belonging. In comparison, Christian baptism regards connection of the person to God, not the land, as the focus of the sacred.

No Particular Place in Monarchic Space

I teach in a Protestant seminary in New Zealand. The land was first populated by Maori around a millennium ago. And yet from the coming of missionaries, followed by British colonisation, Christian liturgical patterns have been little affected by interaction with the contours of life in these islands or the social practices of her first peoples. Our students, as neophyte practitioners of Christian liturgy, are taught to follow this constant and unchanging liturgical pattern.

approach to the Word
proclaiming the Word
receiving the Word
sent out by the Word.

The Word of course is God, Christ, Scripture and sacraments, all of which belong together in the task of proclamation. Conformity of life to this Word is the aim of liturgical piety.

This basic liturgical pattern has been associated with social developments that allowed, or did not forbid, the society to be dominated by an expansionist spatiality. This kyriarchal version of Christianity offered a place of belonging to God, even to non-Western people who already held a quite different sense of belonging to the earth. To accept the proclamation of Christ as King over all the earth meant that other peoples' local understandings of earth were at best challenged and enriched, at worst supplanted or undermined by conformity to the Word of Christ the King.

How did Christian worship become a place establishing ritual which is unconnected with any particular place? The kingship of Christ is framed within the ancient Israelite notion of God as King over all creation. It derives from an ancient near eastern myth which represents the temple as the place of divine victory and superiority over the raging threats of chaos and enemies. The myth centres around kingly enthronement of the deity in the temple, consolidating his reign of judgment and peace flowing out to the entire earth. To act in response to the myth is to value structures of order victorious over chaos. Both the First and Second Temple were structured on this monarchic ideology. After the destruction of the First Temple, perception of the Temple as dwelling place of God changed.

Religions that had been originally tied to a geographic centre with archaic traditions, become dispersed due to the political situation in Late Antiquity. In this period Smith maintains that almost every religion occurred both in its homeland and diasporic centres (Smith 1978: xiii-xv). The Second Temple in the Persian period coincided with the emergence and spread of diasporic communities (Smith 1978:104-128).The need to adapt to alienation and dispersion from the archaic shrine of one's ancestors was not limited to Jewish worship. Religions of Late Antiquity persisted by conscious drawing on archaic models and texts; Smith documents the weakening of the inextricable relation of deity to one particular place, and the shift from celebration of deity at a central shrine to appearance of deity as saviour; the saviour rescues initiates from their vulnerability concerning place (Smith 1978: xiii-xv).

Yet even Jews uprooted from their homeland maintained the focus on Jerusalem, the city of the great King from whence blessings flowed to all the earth; portrayal of Jerusalem as sacred space persisted in both in tannaitic Judaism and Christianity. After the destruction of the Second Temple, a development symptomatic of the social fact of dispersion, the myth became both portable and exportable. A shift to valuing of no place occurs at the expense of grounding in a particular place. Meaninglessness is the danger of utopia. The loss of belonging any place, is real for people uprooted from their home. (See Smith 1978: 104-128).

Interpretations of the significance of Jesus were diverse in the first century. But the Christian expression that became dominant in Western Christianity used the monarchic image of God enthroned in the temple to present Jesus as Lord.[4] In the first century this confession issued a challenge: 'Jesus is Lord, not Caesar'. It is paradoxical that Jesus' actions and teachings were not compatible with the monarchic myth of divine power over others. His actions challenged the power of place and status. The stories of the poor and blind and lame compelled from highways and hedges to the wedding feast, of the last who will be first, reverse customary values and yet are set within the institutional metaphors of feast and hierarchy.[5]

Jonathan Z.Smith attaches to the term "utopia" its literal Greek meaning "no place" to describe a worldview which finds traditional boundaries of place and status oppressive, is rebellious against them, and consequently gives value to no place by constructing values unconnected to traditional associations of status with land and kin (Smith 1978: xii,131,135). While Jesus' language spoke of God's kingdom, his practices reversed the traditional associations of kingdom with place and hierarchy. On the road the kingdom proclamation calls followers to hate father and mother, unlike

[4] My unpublished Phd dissertation develops this thesis in more detail. (See Huie-Jolly 1994).

[5] Lk 14.15-24;13.30; Mk 9.35;10.31.

foxes and birds to have no resting place, to let the dead bury their own.[6] These itinerant practices devalue attachment to land, kin, and home in relation to the kingdom of God The reconfiguration undermines social bonds of place and kin.[7]

To associate these social practices with the Kingdom of God was to reconfigure concepts of the monarchy of God, in the society for whom this perception of God was indigenous. As Douglas observes, people are not controlled by their cosmological ideas; rather they live in the middle of their cosmology, energetically manipulating it by their own lives, foregrounding and backgrounding, and using ritual to force conformity to what they have in mind (Douglas 1975: 60-61).

The Jesus movement's status reversing practices represent one stream of an indigenous movement against, not for, expansionist imperialist domination. In commitment to reversal of hierarchy, Jesus stood in a Hebraic tradition of egalitarian preference and of mercy for the outsider and the stranger. The anti-place lifestyle may have destablized local values; but lacking political power, it was counter cultural, not an expansionist force for domination. In order to consolidate the movement into a force capable of standing on its own authority, the ritual meanings attached to God's kingdom were manipulated to legitimate the imperial reign of Jesus. The monarchic structure of Christ's kingdom was foregrounded to legitimate the place of Jesus, who suffered, died and rose, to ascend to his seat at the right hand of God. The Jesus movement became the cult of Christ the King. The operational foreground became the heavenly empire centred around Jesus as King of Kings and Lord of Lords. The actions and teachings of Jesus concerning the reign of God fell into the background. Jesus was proclaimed Lord by testimony of the hierarchical monarchic stream, not the egalitarian stream within Hebraic religion.

[6] Lk 14.26;9.57-62.

Catherine Tanner approaches the task of Christian identity from a constructivist perspective of adaptive response to situations. Her approach is similar to Edward Soja's attention to the spatial dimension of lived experience, which he calls "thirdspace", as an openness responsive to adaptation to one's environment. Tanner thinks that the task of Christian identity proceeds in each situation through the process of what she calls "working entirely with borrowed materials" (Tanner 1996:115). In this way, faith works within situations in culture. It takes the materials encountered in situations, cultural materials, and gives them a distinctively Christian twist. Presuppositions within Jewish practice were the stuff of the culture. They already carried great meaning. So followers of Jesus "borrowed" them as vehicles of the meaning of Jesus. For example the enthronement of the divine king was "borrowed" as testimony to the meaning of Jesus. In order to consolidate their somewhat culturally destablizing movement Christians "borrowed" from their culture material from Psalms which picture kingly enthronement. Within this Scriptural framework Jesus is proclaimed as the anointed king, related to God as Son to Father. After the pattern of Yahweh as King of the universe, all things are compelled to submit to his dominion. By drawing monarchic imagery like Psalms 2, 110 and 89. Early Christians used Scripture to argue that Jesus by his crucifixion and resurrection is now seated alongside God the master of the universe; thus to submit to God is to submit to honour of Jesus in his status as anointed King, as Son of God. (See Huie-Jolly 1998).

By foregrounding a monarchic interpretation of Jesus, the Christian practice and testimony that became dominant consolidated around a controlling centre. Milton Moreland shows that perception of one unified and authoritative movement consistent with Pauline thought is constructed by the Acts narrative. The place and status granting device in Acts is its division of the world into believers and unbelievers in Jesus. In Acts, Jerusalem has an important function as the place of origin of the earliest church and the base from which its outward expansion was authorised and legitimated. At the same time, and with no trace of irony, Acts portrays the early church as a portable, mobile, and relatively egalitarian movement, attractive to new

groups, and centred around salvific initiation into Jesus as Messiah. Building on the claim that God does not live in the Jerusalem Temple, Acts shifts to a portable concept of the temple: faith in Jesus, who ascended over all the earth, is enthroned in heaven (Acts 6.13; 7.47-57). Acts renegotiates the ANE temple myth of enthronement as the centre and source of blessings flowing to all the earth; but Jesus is placed within the mythic centre. The language of centre, Smith maintains, is primarily political, and only secondarily cosmological, it is a vocabulary that stems from kingship and royal ideology, and may or may not be tied to cosmic myths. (Smith 1987: 14-17).

Spatial focus on the centrality of Christ as Lord relegates to the realm of the ungodly those who disagree, who do not worship him enthroned in heaven (Acts 2.32-40; 5.23-31). Lefebvre observes that when people are situated in relation to passing tests characterised by the presence or absence of gods; this sets up reserved spaces within social space (Lefebvre 1991:35). Overtly concerned with making Jesus sacred, the shift to centring around Jesus functions as a taboo. It protects his humanity and his cross from vulnerability and shame. It legitimates the status and power of those who align themselves to the righteous Jesus. Yet the cult surrounding Jesus is not attached to a particular place. It is more vocative than locative; it is predominantly verbal. Jesus' divine superiority is proclaimed within a portable monarchic expansionist concept. In the diverse encounters with new cultural worlds one might expect Acts to echo with a carnival-like cacophony of voices. But no. Acts presents an either/or choice. Its claims pressure compliance with warnings that to reject these claims is to face judgment. This line of argument became historically dominant. (See Robbins 1996).

Baptism ritually connects the daily experience of the baptised to the cross of Christ. Participation in Christ through baptism reenacts burial and resurrection. The baptised are called thereafter to walk in the Spirit of God by putting to death, or crucifying, the things of the flesh. The cross was public execution of a kind reserved for slaves and traitors against Rome,

socially associated with shame. Christians set taboos around Jesus' cross, protecting the vulnerability of Jesus to shame by holding the crucifixion sacred in light of his resurrection (Huie-Jolly 1994). John speaks of Christ being lifted up on the cross, the same word υψωθω is used for lifting up (on the cross in crucifixion) and for exaltation and enthronement of the king.[8]

When the baptised liturgically renounce the world, the flesh and the devil, this ritually constructs everyday experience in Christ as victory of Spirit over the flesh.[9] Taboos surround that which is vulnerable and powerful thus in need of protection. The relationship of the baptised to God is held sacred. The relationship with the flesh of one's own body, kin and locality in connection with earth is valued only to the extent that these are brought under the dominion of the Spirit.

The spatial perception of God as King reigning over heavens and earth shaped the landscape of Jewish perception This cultural presupposition was taken as given by the followers of Jesus, and provided the background for the dominant Christian liturgical paradigm. Related to this is citation of Israel's scripture to give the stories of Jesus cultural legitimacy and authority. The authority already attached to Hebrew scripture, extended to approved testimony concerning Christ. This allowed it to be passed on from generation to generation as authoritative text in the same way that, in that culture, Hebrew scripture already was authoritative.

Maori and Christian ritual practices both locate persons within a place of belonging. Yet in Maori practice the specific contours of particular places are held sacred in connection with particular ancestors. For example the topographical bend in lake Wakitipu, which joins one range of mountains with another, is said to represent the figure of an ancestor chief weeping for his love who has left him following the way through the mountains. The land itself tells a story. As I have visited marae (the meeting house and

[8] Jn 8.28; 12.32-34.

[9] See Rom 6.1-11;8.9-17.

surrounding village) and been shown around, every hill and valley in the telling of my hosts carried a story of ancestors and events of two or three generations before. When the family places the umbilical cord and placenta in the earth, they connect the body of child and mother, not just with the earth or nature in general, but with the particular marae. In Fiji it is said that anyone who misses out on the ceremony at birth is thought to gad about like a chicken not knowing where they belong. Oceanic practice connects to the particularities of place. In contrast Christian ritual spatially centres people around worship at the throne of God, regardless of place. The bread and wine of Eucharist offered by the people to God does make a local connection. However, it is also surrounded by taboo. The bread is not sacred because it is the fruit of the earth and the work of human hands (though this is valued), but by virtue of its transformation from earthly food to the sacred body of Christ.

In Maori custom the earth speaks. Topological features give voice to stories of ancestors. Respect for local identity and difference is enshrined in the *powhiri* (ceremony welcoming people of other tribes to the marae). The visitors do not just walk into the meeting house. They must be called on by a wailing cry from the women naming and connecting the living who would visit with the dead embodied in that place. When the visitors have entered and are to speak their speech contains formal acknowledgments, first they address the land, next the meeting house which represents the ancestors. These are not just general references but specific to each party and their particular points of interrelation. Even in informal situations Maori do not introduce themselves to each, other by "my name is....." but by asking "where are you from?". You would reply, "My mountain is Takutimu, my river is Oreti, my people are ....., and finally in that context, "my name is.....". The Maori means of questioning is to refer to its largest possible context, assuming that all are related and trying to work out how, historically and genealogically (Schremp 1992:62). The focus is not control but relationship. Accordingly in Maori knowledge it is assumed that any two beings are related; the challenge is to adduce what specifically the relationship is (Schremp 92).

Contrast the travelogue in Acts. Though the location of the missionaries Paul and Silas is constantly changing, the diverse contexts have little permanent impact on the message received. The portable proclamation of Jesus as Lord according to scripture carries within itself a portable cosmology of divine rule that is transmitted intact to other people elsewhere. The Christian place of belonging is belief in Jesus' Lordship and submission before the King of Kings. This place is not connected with any particular place on earth. Christian ritual contains no taboo protecting as sacred the integrity of the host place where people receive the gospel. Taboos concerning scripture and the sacraments do protect the sacred and vulnerable person of Christ as Lord.

Imported order and local understanding

Christianity was accepted in Samoa when missionaries made public tests of the power of the Christian God over sacred powers associated with nature. The missionaries made demonstrations of eating fish that the Samoans associated with divine powers in order to break the ancient taboo. The test demonstrated the impotence of the fish in the more powerful presence of the Christian God.[10] When the missionaries survived unharmed the awe surrounding ancient taboos was broken. The God of Jesus Christ, claimed the missionaries, was victorious over the gods of the sea and forest. Awe of the sacred connection with the earth was undermined. Practices regarded as superstition by the missionaries no longer had the power to compel ritual behaviour acknowledging the intrinsic power of the earth. Respect for the intrinsic energy *mauri* of the earth was regarded as idolatry. The word of power, the gospel of Jesus' victory over all the powers in earth and on heaven, was far superior to things made of wood or stone.

[10] My information is based on an historical drama celebrating the 200th anniversary of the London Missionary Society in Samoa at University of the South Pacific in Suva Fiji, 1996.

Christian ritual imposes an order of place and hierarchy, and at the same time undermines local understandings of earth and ancestors as sacred. To decipher the meaning of social practice pay attention to what is taboo, both sacred and protected (Douglas 1971). What is protected in the space constructed by ritual? What is not protected? How do these protections, or lack thereof, relate to what is allowed and what is forbidden more widely in spatial practice?

The same human activity produces both society and religion. This is always a dialectical relation; when humans interact adaptively with their environment the order of perception which is projected as sacred requires a social base or "plausibility structure" (Berger 1967: 45-48). Religion is healthy to the extent that concepts of sacredness converse with and adapt to the environment within which they are received.

Expansionist movements thrive by imposing one model regardless of place. Similarly, holiness extends from one direction in Christian ritual. Sacred place is given to the Word of God in Christ from which flows relationship with one another. Kyriarchal liturgy has no sacred place for conversation with the presence or voice of the earth; place is established before the throne of God, regardless of diversity of geographical location.

In many cases missionaries presented the tribal stories of the Hebrews as God's word, in a completely different category from the myths of indigenous peoples. The Christian Bible was held sacred at the expense of many tribal peoples' traditions of how they came to be in their own place in the earth.

The Scripture principle is based on the cultural assumption that God is king and that his word is law; it extends the identity of God's unfailing word, without error to the God breathed human work of written testimony to God (Farley 1982). It worked well to transmit ethical guidance of dispersed Jews. Sacred stories of Israel maintained a tribal link to their understanding of their particular connection with the earth. However when it was transmitted as a rule of Christian authority, its nature was altered. Identification with

Jesus was central to ecclesial identity in early Christianity, says Farley; thus scripture in this context was no longer primarily Torah guidance, a way to walk, rather it became a source of hermeneutical authority to bolster and lend legitimacy to claims concerning the identity of Jesus (Farley 1982).

This rendered earth connection fragile for non-Jewish followers of Jesus. As a feature of kyriarchal Christianity the scripture principle means that the tribal lore of other people is held sacred over the sacred stories of one's own people and place. All other sacred perceptions are suspected as idolatry. People who bow before this throne risk disconnection from their own traditions grown from the earth up.

For Christians, the functional genre, says Farley, was no longer Torah toward Halakah a way of walking toward application, but Gospel toward belief. "Jesus and the Gospels were seen as the true fulfilment of the written Torah" and the key to the unity of the whole narrative (Farley 1982:88). When foregrounded for expansion to the furthest corners of the globe, the monarchy of King Jesus can be imposed like McDonalds, or a Disney theme park, razing to the ground and paving over the structures that previously grew there.

The identity of Jesus with God, as son of the father, spatially links humanity to identification with Christ, Messiah after the manner of God the King. The things regarded as sacred, unquestionable and therefore taboo or prohibited mark the areas regarded as vulnerable and in need of protection. Jesus enthroned at the right hand of God sits alongside God in Christian worship. The prohibitions that make him sacred protect against seeing him as an ordinary human. The vulnerability of the God-man Christ is ritually protected. His crucifixion conventionally regarded as the shameful death reserved for criminals and slaves is made sacred as divine atonement and salvation. Baptism is ritual participation in Jesus' death and resurrection (Rom 6.1-11). Taboo protects the vulnerable man Jesus by assigning him sacred identity with God. Human flesh, vulnerable to sin, is sanctified by

identity with Christ's resurrection in baptism. Taboo protects the divinity of Christ, but no taboo protects the vulnerability of the earth.

The liturgy of Christ's rule and dominion over all creation has been associated with social developments that allowed, or did not forbid, the society to be dominated by an expansionist spatiality. The Kingdom has served expansionist practices as fulfilment of the bold human task of carrying out God's mission. A modern hymn expresses expansive human identification with God as creator.

> God who stretched the spangled heavens, infinite in time and place
> We thy children in thy likeness share inventive powers with thee
> ...teach us what we yet may be....
> We have conquered worlds undreamed of since the childhood of our race
> ...facing us with life's destruction or our most triumphant hour..
> As thy new horizons beckon, Father give us grace to be
> children of creative purpose, thinking thy thoughts after Thee
> ...Great Creator lead us onward till our work is one with thine
> (Catherine Bonnell Arnott 1927-).

As we sing we ritually acknowledge technological exploitation of earth as the likeness of God. The risk to all of life is acknowledged but without any balancing taboo or protection for earth. On the anthropological axiom that religion and social practice are interconnected, attention to liturgy as a spatial construct may feed thinking about construction of social space.

Kant sees space as a category of the human mind that places an interpretive order on sense experience. Human perception actively imposes order upon the passive sense data of nature. Kant describes this widespread spatial assumption as expressed in the teaching of Galileo.

> Galileo knowing the weights of balls in advance, caused them to roll down a plane....[Accordingly he] taught students of nature that "reason

has insight only into that which it produces after a plan of its own and it must not allow itself to be kept in natures leading straits but...show the way with principles of judgement based on fixed laws, constraining nature to give answer to questions of reason's own determining" (*Critique Pure Reason*, Preface 2nd Edition B xiii 1934:14).

Kant thought in reference to a society that was profoundly moulded by Christian assumptions. His cosmological apologetic theologically challenges sceptical empiricism on the grounds that it allows for no morality, freedom, or Author of creation. In his cosmological argument, the 'unconditioned', that corresponds to the intuition of space by which humans perceive the appearance of objects, bears the attributes of the Christian God. (See *Antimony of Pure Reason* 3-6 1934: 226-242). Within this socio-religious framework, Kant perceived the external world as largely passive in reference to the meaning and order imposed by the unconditioned intuition of space at work in the human mind. A priori intuitions construct experience of sense data by imposing an order of place on all that is touched and seen and perceived. (See *Critique*, Pref 2nd ed Bxvii-xixx 1934:16-17). The category or organizing principle of space interprets sense data.

A century and a half later Lefebvre critiqued the dominance of concept over spatial practice; the daily routine of people living in industrial societies is controlled by the concepts of space imposed by architects, planners, and economists. This is indicative, he says, of a "powerful ideological tendency" unconsciously expressing "the dominant ideas" of "the dominant class"; i.e. theoretical space produces mental space, mental space then in circular fashion "becomes the locus of theoretical practice" which separate from social practice, sets itself up as the central reference point of knowledge (Lefebvre 1991:6). Rather than spatial experience of one's habitat giving rise to language in a way that is grounded in connection with the earth, neocapitalist spatiality is, according to Lefebvre, controlled by concepts of space imposed upon spatial practice (Lefebvre 1991:43-44). The adaptive connection with earth has become dysfunctional due to the imbalance of control by concept; priority is given to written word at the expense of

experience of space. Space is rendered passive. Lefebvre sees nature as receding, dying. Soja, interpreting Lefebvre, observed that in Western consciousness time has been privileged over space. Space is backgrounded while written words of historical merit are foregrounded over actions. Both Kant and Lefebvre assume that concepts dominate spatial practice. Is this symptomatic of society long shaped by kyriarchal Christianity? The liturgy of the Word of Christ did not prohibit, and often accompanied, social practices of neocapitalist economic globalisation, colonisation, missionary expansion, industrialisation and imperial voyages of so called "discovery". Yet Christian ritual contains no taboo to protect the vulnerability of local traditions from its divine Word. The voice of God is protected, but the voice of the earth is not.

Rituals follow a convention in order to have a conventional effect (Rappaport 1999: 108,124). They are not positive independent sanctions on behaviour; rather ritual enforces conformity to a common code, a product of assent to norms expressed publicly and visibly (Douglas 1975:63). In "enunciating, accepting and making conventions moral" ritual contains within itself a tacit social contract, says Rappaport, "as such it establishes, guards and bridges boundaries between public systems and private processes... [It is the] basic social act" (Rappaport 1999: 138).

My comparison between Christian liturgy and Maori ritual presumes that the spatial construct of a people is akin to the construct of their religious identity; spatial perception reflects organizing principles which function as taboos protecting that which is specially vulnerable and perceived as sacred. Baptism focuses on belonging to God, not the earth. The connection with kin and place is subordinate and incidental. In worship Christ reigns over all creation and humans born by baptism in his life belong with him. Earth is not protected as sacred by this ritual. The sacred dimension is the spirit, not the flesh. Spirit reigns over the flesh. Connection with land and kin, though vulnerable, is not protected.

WORKS CITED

Berger, Peter. 1967 *The Sacred Canopy: Elements of a Sociological Theory of Religion.* New York: Doubleday.

Berry, Thomas. 1990 "The Spirituality of the Earth". In eds. Charles Birch et al. *Liberating Life: Contemporary Approaches to Ecological Theology.* Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.

Boyarin, Daniel 1994 *A Radical Jew: Paul and the Politics of Identity.* Berkeley: University of California Press..

Branham, Joan R. 1998 "Negotiating Women's Space in Early Christian Architecture: The Jerusalem Temple as Burden of Authority," Unpublished paper presented at AAR/SBL Annual Meeting, Orlando, Florida.

Costanza, Robert et al. 1996 *An Introduction to Ecological Economics* (Boca Raton, FLA: St Lucie Press).

Crow, Loren D. 1998 "Holy Precincts, Holy City, Holy Land: the Orientation of Diaspora Jews toward Jerusalem in the Persian Period," Unpublished paper presented at AAR/SBL Annual Meeting, Orlando, Florida.

Douglas, Mary. 1973 *Natural.Symbols:Explorations in Cosmology*, 2nd ed.. New York: Vintage Books.

_____ 1974 "Deciphering a Meal". In Clifford Geertz, ed., *Myth, Symbol and Culture.* New York: Norton.

_____ 1975 *Implicit Meanings: Essays in Anthropology.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

_____ 1989 "Taboo". In A.C.Lehmann and J.Myers, eds. *Magic, Witchcraft and Religion: An Anthropological Study of the Supernatural.* 2nd ed.. Mountain View, CA: Mayfield.

Eliade, Mircea *1957* *The Sacred and the Profane: the Nature of Religion.* New York: Harper and Row.

_____ 1958 *Patterns in Comparative Religion* (New York: Sheed and Ward).

Farley, Edward. 1982 *Ecclesial Reflection: an Anatomy of Theological Method.* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press)

_____ 1988 *The Fragility of Knowledge: Theological Education in the Church and the University.* Philadelphia : Fortress,

Fiorenza, Elisabeth Schussler. 1994 *Jesus: Miriam's Child, Sophia's Prophet: Critical Issues in Feminist Christology.* New York, NY: Continum.

Flanagan, James W. 1998 "Constructs of Space, Place, and Territoriality in Ancient Southwest Asia," Unpublished paper presented at AAR/SBL Annual Meeting, Orlando, Florida.

Geertz, Clifford. 1975 *The Interpretation of Cultures.* London: Hutchinson & Co.

Gilbert, Gary. 1998 "Transformation of Jerusalem from Sacred Space to Sacred Time," Unpublished paper presented at AAR/SBL Annual Meeting, Orlando, Florida.,

Huie-Jolly, Mary 1994 "The Son Enthroned in Conflict: A Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation of John 5.17-23". Unpublished Phd Dissertation, University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand.

_____ 1997 'Threats Answered by Enthronement: Death/Resurrection and the Divine Warrior Myth in John 5.17-29, Psalm 2 and Daniel 7. In. *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals.* Evans, Craig A & Sanders, James A. eds. Sheffield:Sheffield Academic Press Ltd.

Kant, Immanuel 1934 *The Critique of Pure Reason.* Abridged. Trans. Norman Kemp Smith. London:Macmillian and Co.

Lefebvre, Henri, 1991 *The Production of Space,* English Trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith. (Oxford: Blackwell).

Moreland, Milton. 1998 "Jerusalem as the Place of Origins in Early Christian Imagination," Unpublished paper presented at AAR/SBL Annual Meeting, Orlando, Florida.

Primivesi, Anne. 1994 "A tide in the Affairs of Women?". PP.186-198 in *EcoTheology: Voices from South and North*, ed. David G.Hallman,.Maryknoll,NY: Orbis Books/WCC.

Rappaport, Roy. 1999 *Ritual and Religion in the Making of Humanity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Robbins, Vernon K. 1996 *The Tapestry of Early Christian Discourse: Rhetoric, Society and Ideology.* London: Routledge.

Schrempp, Gregory. 1992 *Magical Arrows: the Maori, the Greeks, and the Folklore of the Universe.* Madison,WI: University of Wisconsin Press.

Shirres, Michael P. 1997 *Te Tangata The Human Person.* Auckland, New Zealand: Accent Publications.

Smith, Jonathan Z. 1978 *Map is not Territory: Studies in the History of Religion.* Leiden: E.J.Brill.

_____ 1987 *To Take Place: Toward Theory in Ritual.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Soja, Edward W. 1996 *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and Other Real and Imagined Places.* Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Tanner, Catherine. 1996 *Theories of Culture: A New Agenda for Theology.* Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Images of Cities in Ancient Religions: Some Methodological Considerations

Daria Pezzoli-Olgiati
University of Zurich/Switzerland

The ancient sources present a wide spectrum of texts related to the city and its religious interpretation. However, in most cases, they do not contain explicit reflections about the religious meaning of urban space, but rather implicit images that need to be reconstructed with great methodological care. Another important problem related to such an attempt is the comparison between documents, which of course could be iconographic as well as literary, belonging to different religious, linguistic, historical, and geographical contexts. Is it possible to compare images of cities beyond the cultural borders? Do all the texts on the "city" really relate to the same entity? How far do external definitions of the ancient city correlate with the internal view of a single historical case?

Looking for possible answers to such questions it appears particularly instructive to consider distinct streams within the science of religion that deal with the same problems in different ways.

Approaches to urban space

The religious meaning of space is one important topic in the phenomenological approach to religion.[1] Mircea Eliade's work in particular contains a deep reflection on the general interpretation of space

[1] For an overview on different phenomenological approaches to space, see Tworuschka 1994.

with many allusions to urban space. Eliade starts from the premise that space is not homogeneous:

> For religious man, space is not homogeneous; he experiences interruptions, breaks in it; some parts of space are qualitatively different from others. . . . There is, then, a sacred space, and hence a strong, significant space; there are other spaces that are not sacred and so are without structure or consistency, amorphous. Nor is this all. For religious man, this spatial nonhomogeneity finds expression in the experience of an opposition between space that is sacred – the only real and real-ly existing space – and all other space, the formless expanse surrounding it.2

Space is transformed into sacred space through a hierophany; it is the place where the sacred is shown. Therefore it becomes the pivotal point of orientation:

> When the sacred manifests itself in any hierophany, there is not only a break in the homogeneity of space; there is also revelation of an absolute reality, opposed to the nonreality of the vast surronding expanse. The manifestation of the sacred ontologically founds the world. In the homogeneous and infinite expanse, in which no point of reference is possible and hence no orientation can be established, the hierophany reveals an absolute fixed point, a center.[3]

Sacred space is understood as a split in the homogeneity of profane space; this break builds an opening that allows a joint between separated cosmic spheres, between heaven, earth and underworld: sacred space is defined by this vertical dimension (*axis mundi*). The world is conceived as an extension around this axis, respectively the *axis mundi* is situated at the center of the world. The sacred mountain, the temple and palace, the sacred city are always the *axis mundi*, the connection of the cosmic dimensions. As center of the world, the sacred space contains a replica of the whole cosmos, it represents heaven, earth and underworld in a concrete form (*imago mundi*). Sacred space is the only conceivable dimension of life. In Eliade's thought sacred space is constantly connoted

[2] Eliade 1987:20. See also 1957, 1960.

[3] Eliade 1987:21.

in an absolute positive way: it is cosmos, it is withdrawn from the chaos by divine intervention:

> One of the outstanding characteristics of traditional societies is the opposition that they assume between their inhabited territory and the unknown and indeterminate space that surrounds it. The former is the world (more precisely, our world), the cosmos; everything outside it is no longer a cosmos but a sort of "other world," a foreign, chaotic space, peopled by ghosts, demons, "foreigners" (who are assimilated to demnons and the souls of the dead). At first sight this cleavage in space appears to be due to the opposition between an inhabited and organized – hence cosmicized – territory and the unknown space that extends beyond its frontiers; on one side there is a cosmos, on the other a chaos. But we shall see that if every inhabited territory is a cosmos, this is precisely because it was first consecrated, because, in one way or another, it is the work of the gods. The world (that is, our world) is a universe within which the sacred has already manifested itself, in which, consequently, the break-through from plane to plane has become possible and repeatable.[4]

Urban space is seen as a particular form of sacred space. The pre-modern city is described as "cosmicized", founded by the gods, *axis* and *imago mundi*:

> Being an *axis mundi*, the sacred city or temple is regarded as the meeting point of heaven, earth, and hell. . . . Every Oriental city was situated at the center of the world.[5]

Following this phenomenological approach to the ancient city, urban space appears as a dimension withdrawn from chaos, a replica of the cosmos, the center of the world. Its meaning and value are therefore fixed, its connotation constantly positive. According to this concept, every historical urban entity must be considered as a concretization of this archetype, as a manifestation of a numinous phenomenon.[6]

[4] Eliade 1987:29f.

[5] Eliade 1991:12, 14.

[6] Within urban studies this research stream has influenced important work such as Wheatley 1969; Dougherty 1980; Hawkins 1986; Eck 1987.

This view can be contrasted with a second approach, that of the geography of religion. Here the link between space and religious symbol system is defined as a complex interaction:

> Die Beziehungen zwischen geographischer Umwelt und Religion sind wechselseitig, denn Klima, Relief, Siedlung und andere Geofaktoren eines Raumes spiegeln sich in den Religionen, ihren Vorstellungswelten, Institutionen und Erfahrungsmustern, und zugleich sind die Religionen durch ihre Anhänger an der Gestaltung der Umwelt beteiligt.[7]

For our purpose this broad question must be focused particularly on one aspect of the interaction between geographical environment and religious symbol system, namely the perception of (urban) space in a selection of ancient religious texts.[8]

This approach is correlated to a definition of the ancient city as a pre-industrial complex form of social organization with a division of labor, a socioeconomic stratification, a central organization, a spatial concentration of specialized and decisional activities and the resultant opposition between city and its periphery, where food supply is produced.[9] The religious symbol system is an essential element of ancient urban society, that assures its preservation and functioning. The images of cities are expressions of the religious system; they transmit a vision of the urban dimension as a structured, transparent, and functioning world.[10]

For our attempt to analyze and compare images of cities in ancient religions the second approach seems more practicable. On the one hand it is undeniable that the phenomenological approach contributes a great deal to clarify and define the general problem of interpreting sacred space: it stresses the importance of spatial dimension within religious thinking; places a basic vocabulary at our disposal to describe the religious meaning of space; and develops the entire question in comparative form.

[7] Hoheisel 1985:123. See also Sprockhoff 1964; Schwind 1975; Gualtieri 1983; Büttner 1985; Hoheisel 1988; Rinschede 1999.

[8] Gualtieri, 1983:163; Stolz 1997a, 69f.

[9] For this approach to the problem of defining the ancient city see Weber 1976; Sjoberg 1960; Kolb 1984; Liverani 1986; Levi 1989.

[10] Liverani 1976; Brüschweiler 1983; Xella 1994.

Nevertheless, this last point shows also the limits of this approach: sacred space is conceived as a manifestation of a numinous phenomenon; therefore, every document, is seen as an illustration of this numinous phenomenon, regardless of its cultural and historic setting. Moreover the general interpretation of the pre-modern city as sacred space does not fit documents with an ambiguous or even critical vision of urban space. On the other hand the second approach indicates possible strategies to afford different texts; based on a functional definition of religion, it allows a comparison without minimizing the particularity of a single document.[11]

City between cosmos and chaos

This point is crucial for the present project, which seeks a methodological basis on which to compare heterogeneous texts. I am looking for a methodological support for a comparison between heterogeneous texts. My interest focuses not primarily on homogeneous "ideologies" of cities but on a selection of images that point as well to the ambivalent character of ancient cities.[12] My concern is more about single expressions of different religious symbol systems than about a general theory on religious interpretation of cities in antiquity.

Nevertheless, the analysis of concrete examples in very different texts, most of all from Mesopotamia and the biblical traditions, has revealed some common features that are particularly relevant for methodological considerations. The considered religious documents, chosen from different literary genres, do not present explicit, but almost always implicit concepts of the city. This implies that the religious interpretation of urban space is the result of a reconstruction.[13]

Most of the images are produced within cities; therefore they support an "urbanocentric" point of view. The city and all the aspects of urban space are seen as the ideal dimension where human life can be developed according to divine plans; they are valued in an absolutely positive way.

[11] Stolz 1993, particularly 21.

[12] Cardini 1994; Van de Mieroop 1997:42-61.

[13] Stolz 1997b.

This is the reason why Mircea Eliade could find a large number of examples to clarify his interpretation of the city as sacred space, as cosmos. However, beside the many positive descriptions of urban space, there is a variety of critical and even negative interpretations.[14] Such polemics against the urban dimension are written both from a peripheral, non-urban point of view as well from the very center of the city. The reconstruction of the interpretations of urban space in a specific context must consider that many different concepts can coexist.

To this heterogeneity given by coexisting varying interpretations, several other variables can be added, such as differences of cultural, geographical and historical environments, difference in languages, literary genres, and settings of the texts.

In this wide range of images of ancient cities there are few possible common denominators to support a comparison beyond cultural and religious borders. In my opinion the definition of the ancient city as a complex system mentioned above shows a practicable way to compare different concepts of urban space. It is especially true that the relationships between the center – the city – and its periphery, – the countryside, the place where most of the food is produced; the far regions, from where different goods are imported – became a dominant aspect. If, on a socioeconomic level, this relationship has to be read in terms of a mutual exchange – the city provides organization and structures while the periphery supply the resources[15] – on a religious level it assumes the meaning of a radical contrast: the city appears as the center, as ordered and structured, as a place of life and culture, while its periphery is connoted as space of disorder, of uncontrolled powers, total absence of (cultural) life. [16] This polarity can be expressed in terms of opposition between cosmos and chaos.

Of course, the choice of such categories marks different allusions to the two approaches to urban space presented above. On the one hand the link

[14] Brüschweiler 1983:182; Liverani 1986:141.

[15] Finley 1973; Liverani 1987.

[16] This contrast between city and its periphery is also pointed out in numerous ancient designations of urban space. As examples Van de Mieroop 1997:10; Redford 1997; Frick 1977.

to Eliade's work is evident, although here the concepts of cosmos and chaos are used as heuristic categories and no longer situated in a phenomenological context. They are not understood as markers for the qualitative difference between sacred and profane space, between space where the sacred manifests itself and amorphous, chaotic space. On the other hand, as shown by several documents, the chosen categories of cosmos and chaos can be considered as a basic opposition in the implicit conceptions of ancient cities produced by the particular religious symbol system.

Beginning with this fundamental opposition it seems possible to develop several categories to compare different images of the ancient city. They are based on transformations of the basic opposition between city interpreted as a cosmos and the dimension of chaos.

The first category encompasses texts representing the city as a cosmos: urban space is seen as realization of a divine plan or assumes divine connotations. In this group the city is valued positively. The images transmitted by the texts represent the features of the real city.

The second category includes images that build a model for the real city: urban space is still valued positively, but judged as susceptible of improvement. The city of the image provides a strategy for the city to reach the quality of cosmos.

The next category also contains a sort of model, but expressed with images of crisis. In the documents classified in this group the city is interpreted as a vulnerable dimension in a permanent tension between cosmos and chaos. The city tends to lose its quality as a cosmos, and decays; it tends to assume chaotic features. This kind of reflection stresses the necessity to come back to its original quality of structured life dimension.

The last two groups of images represent a qualitatively different kind of reflection on the city: both of them deny the possibility of interpreting the real city as a cosmos, but in different ways.

Thus, in the fourth category the idea itself of the city as a cosmos or as a entity tending to the cosmos is categorically denied. Following this kind of interpretation the city does not deserve to subsist in any form.

Finally the last category resolves the condemnation of the city describing "cosmic" cities located in other spatial and/or temporal dimensions.

The following diagram summarizes the categories as follows:

	representations	
1.	image as representation	the city as a cosmos
	models	
2.	image as model (positive)	the city tending to the cosmos
3.	image as an expression of a crisis (negative)	the city between cosmos and chaos
	visions	
4.	image as condemnation (negative)	the city as chaos
5.	image as transcendent dimension (positive)	the transcendent city as a cosmos

Most of the cases analyzed up to now within the current research project belong to the first group; the other categories include cases where the relationship between city and religious symbol systems becomes more complex, ambivalent and perhaps ambiguous. The five groups are developed according to a gradient, starting from interpretation of the urban reality as an ordered, functioning, transparent world up to transcendent visions of city situated in other spatial and temporal dimensions. On the one hand the idea of a gradient points out the link between the categories and on the other hand announces in advance the difficulty to classify borderline cases. However, this categorization should be understood as a possible instrument to show some directions and to make documents comparable, although, as we stressed above, every text is a unique manifestation of a determined religious symbol system.

The development from the representation of the city as a cosmos through the positive and negative models and finally to the visions of urban space both as condemnation and as transcendent dimension,

corresponds to an increase of critical distance: the reflection on the city becomes more explicit, the opposition between cosmos and chaos can be so radically transformed that it reaches, in the most extreme cases, an identification.

Examples

To test out the presented approach I would like to briefly discuss some examples of images chosen from completely distinct contexts: on the one hand the Sumerian composition *Curse of Agade*, on the other hand the last book of the New Testament, the *Revelation of John*. Both contain contrasting images of cities: from the opposition between different descriptions of the city both texts develop a interesting reflection on urban space.

The first example is a singular case within Sumerian literature. Written at the end of the third millennium B.C., perhaps in Nippur, the *Curse of Agade* tells first of the rise, then the crisis, and eventually the complete destruction of the city of Agade during the reign of Naram-Sin. Although it shares some traits both with lamentation traditions and historiographic literature, the *Curse of Agade* does not belong to either of these literary genres.[17]

The composition, which contains 281 lines, begins with the description of the rise of the city through the intervention of the goddess Inanna, who decides to move to Agade and transform it into her most beautiful residence:[18]

> After Enlil's frown
> Had slain Kish like the Bull of Heaven,
> Had slaughtered the house of the land of Uruk in the dust like a mighty bull,
> And then, to Sargon, king of Agade,
> Enlil, from south to north,

[17] Cooper 1983:20-26.

[18] Translation from Cooper 1983:51f. See also Attinger 1984.

Had given sovereignty and kingship –
At that time, holy Inanna built
The sanctuary Agade as her grand woman's domain,
Set up her throne in Ulmash.
Like a youngster building a house for the first time,
Like a girl establishing a woman's domain.
So that the warehouses would be provisioned,
That dwellings would be founded in that city,
That its people would eat splendid food,
That its people would drink splendid beverages,
That those bathed (for holidays) would rejoice in the courtyards,
That the people would throng the places of celebration,
That acquaintances would dine together,
That foreigners would cruise about like unusual birds in the sky,
That (even) Marhashi would be reentered on the (tribute) rolls,
That monkey, mighty elephants, *water buffalo*, exotic animals,
would jostle each other in the public squares –
Thoroughbred dogs, lions, mountain ibexes alu-sheep with long wool –
(So that all this might happen), Holy Inanna did not sleep.
At that time, she filled Agade's . . . with gold.
She filled its shining . . . with silver,
Delivered copper, tin, and blocks of lapis to its granaries,
Sealed them away in its silos.
She endowed its old women with advice,
She endowed its old men with counsel,
She endowed its young women with dances,
She endowed its young men with martial might,
She endowed its little ones with joy.
The *viceroy's* children, (still) crackled by nursemaids,
Played *algarsur*-instruments,
Inside the city was the *tigi*-drum, outside it, the flute and *zamzam*.
Its harbor, where ships docked, was full of excitement,
All foreign lands rested contentedly,
Their people experienced happiness.
Its (Agade's) king, the shepherd Naramsin,
Rose like the sun on the holy throne of Agade.
Its city-wall touched heaven, like a mountain,
Holy Inanna opened wide
The portals of its city-gates, as if for the Tigris, going to the sea,
Ships brought the goods of Sumer itself upstream (to Agade),

The highland Amorites, people ignorant of agriculture,
Came before her (Inanna) there with spirited bulls and spirited bucks,
Meluhhans, people of the black mountains,
Brought exotic wares down to her,
Elam and Subir carried goods to her like packasses,
All the governors, temple administrators, and land registrars of the Gu'edena,
Regularly supplied monthly and New Year offerings there.[19]

In this first part of the composition Agade is described as a fulfilled and magnificent city. These charactertics are the result of the intervention of a goddess, Inanna, who works without resting to establish her new residence. The narration presents first Inanna's plans: she aims to build a city of abundance, stability, welfare, social peace, and perfection. To reach this goal she does not allow herself even to sleep. In the second part, the description concentrates on the realization of this plan: every kind of precious goods are carried into the city; the inhabitants are gifted with wisdom and the perfection of skills required for their position; inside the city there is joy and music, outside peace with all the foreign lands; a magnificent rule guarantees the functioning of this city of perfect happiness; the monumental wall of the city touches heaven; all the surrounding people, even the farther and less civilized, bring tribute to Agade, which becomes the very center of all nations. Agade is described as a perfect city, and its outstanding quality is due solely to the intervention of Inanna. Agade rises in such way because Inanna has chosen it as her dwelling.

Agade is presented as a cosmos; it assumes a central position both on the vertical and on the horizontal level. Since the goddess has her residence in that city, it becomes a convergence point of the divine and human dimension; since it has all the quality of a perfect city, it becomes the center of all the lands. This presentation of Agade as a cosmos contrasts sharply with its image in the last part of the composition, where the city is cursed.

[19] Lines 1-53.

For reasons that are not clear – the present reconstruction of the text is not complete at this very point[20] – the fate of the city changes abruptly. Inanna, followed by the other gods, abandons Agade. Consequently the city falls consequently into decay and its king into depression. After seven years he decides to avenge his city and destroys Ekur, the principal temple of Enlil in Nippur. This attack to his beloved residence cannot be ignored by the head of the pantheon, who strikes the whole land with destruction. To stop this chain of destruction and bring peace back, the gods of the pantheon curse Agade and determine its annihilation:[21]

> Once again, Sin, Enki, Inanna, Ninurta, Ishku, Utu, Nusku, and Nisaba – all the gods whosoever –
> Turned their attention to the city, and
> Cursed Agade severely:
> "City that attacked Ekur – it was Enlil!
> "Agade that attacked Ekur – it was Enlil!
> "May your holy walls, to their highest point, resound with mourning!
> "May your *giguna* be piled up like dirt!
> "May your *lahama*-figures that stand in the gateway,
> "Lie on the ground, like giants drunk on wine!
> "May your clay be returned to its Abzu,
> "May it be clay cursed by Enki!
> "May your grain be returned to its furrow,
> "May it be grain cursed by Ezinu!
> "May your timber be returned to its forest,
> "May it be timber cursed by Ninildum!
> "May the cattle slaughterer slaughter his wife,
> "May your sheep butcher butcher his child,
> "May your pauper drown the child who seeks money for him!
> "May your prostitute hang herself at the entrance to her brothel,
> "May your cult prostitutes and hierodules, who are mothers, kill their children!
> "May your gold be bought for the price of silver,
> "May your silver be bought for the price of *pyrite*,
> "May your copper be bought for the price of lead!
> "Agade, may your athlete be deprived of his strength,

[20] Edzard 1989.

[21] Lines 222-272.

"May he be unable to lift his gear bag *onto its stand*!
"May your *niskum*-ass not enjoy its strength, but lie about all day,
"May that city thereby die of hunger!
"May your aristocrats, who eat fine food, lie (hungry) in the grass,
"May your upstanding nobleman
"Eat the *thatching* on his roof,
"The leather hinges on the main door of his father's house –
"May he *gnaw* at those hinges!
"May depression descend upon your palace, constructed in joy!
"May the 'evil one' of the silent plains scream out!
"In your fattening pens, established for purification ceremonies,
"May foxes that frequent ruined mounds sweep with their tails!
"In your city-gate, established for the land,
"May the 'sleep bird', the bird of depression, establish its nest!
"In your city that couldn't sleep because of the *tigi*-drum music,
"That couldn't rest because of its rejoicing,
"The cattle of Nanna, that fill the pens –
"May they shriek like the 'wandering one› of the silent plains!
"May long grass grow on your canal bank tow-paths,
"May 'mourning grass' grow on your highways laid for coaches!
"Moreover, on your tow-paths, places (built up) with canal sediment,
"May *recurved* mountain sheep and mountain *ul*-snakes allow no one to pass!
"On your plains, where fine grass grows, may 'lamentation reeds' grow!
"Agade, may your flowing sweet water flow as brackish water!
"Whoever says, 'I would dwell in this city!' – may no dwelling place be acceptable to him there!
" Whoever says, 'I would rest in Agade!' – may no resting place be attractive to him there!
And with the raising of the sun, so it was!

The last lines of the composition reveal the complete realization of the curse: Agade has disappeared. The composition ends with praise to Inanna for having destroyed Agade.

The curse lists all the demolition phases. The lamentations of the inhabitants will overstep the highest point of the city monumental wall; the temple and its buildings will collapse. The city must return to the condition before his creation: its clay, grain and timber have to return to their original place and will be cursed from the gods who used to protect

them. Agade must run back along the stages of its creation: the materials used to build it have to be retransformed into raw material; agriculture and water supply have to be destroyed. The whole urban life must be annihilated. Several times the list speaks about parents killing their children; the flourishing trade collapses; all the pleasures of city life will disappear; the richest inhabitants will starve; the music will stop for ever; the once well-preserved roads will became inaccessible. The vital separation between city and steppe will no longer exist: brushwood, wild beasts and demons will take possession of the area that was once the most perfect city. The image of Agade's destruction presents the features of an absolute negation of the city: more than destroyed, Agade is being dismantled, undone for ever.

The comparison between the initial image of Agade as a cosmos and the conclusive curse stresses this definitive aspect of destruction. There are several symmetric oppositions: positive elements of the first image are explicitly denied in the curse. One point seems common to the opposite images: both the rise of the city and its demolition are due to divine intervention, the urban space is completely dependent on divine will.

To date the text there are two references: the reign of Naram-Sin (ca. 2260-2223) and the Thirth Dynasty of Ur (2119-2004?)[22] period, from which there are some fragments of the composition preserved. Although this question has been long discussed, it is likely that the destruction of Agade in this literary composition does not refer to an historic event. Some researchers propose to read the text as a piece of polemic literature against Naram-Sin, the ruler of the predominant city flourishing at that time.[23]

The first image can be understood as a representation of Agade in its best time: the city of the image reproduces an interpretation of the real city as a realization of a divine plan and consequently as a perfect dimension. The last one, by contrast, presents a paradoxical image; it denies any possibility of survival for the capital of the flourishing kingdom. The

[22] For the problems conected with dating the text cf. Kuhrt 1995:44f.

[23] Cooper 1983:97f.; Falkenstein 1965:48f.; Römer 1974:220; Krecher 1978:138; Jacobsen 1987:359.

transformation of Agade within the literary composition from a perfect, "cosmic" city to its absolute negation is realized and interpreted on a theological plane. Although Naram-Sin brought the reign of Akkad to its major extension, in the litarary tradition he became an ambiguous personage, characterized by extravagant, blasphemous pretensions.[24] His attempt to compete with the supremacy of the gods is punished by the abandonment and the consequent annihilation of his beautiful city. Agade, once cosmos, is reduced to a space of chaos.

The second example comes from the Christian tradition. Like the *Curse of Agade* it contains different contrasting images of cities. While in the first example the transformation concerns the same city and is developed on the chronological dimension, in the second the opposition is built with two different cities: Babylon, a city reduced to chaos, and Jerusalem, the realization of a transcendent cosmos.

In Chapter 17 an angel affords John, the human protagonist of *Revelation*, a vision of the judgment of Babylon:

> So he carried me away in the spirit into a wilderness and I saw a woman sitting on a scarlet beast that was full of blasphemous names, and it had seven heads and ten horns. The woman was clothed in purple and scarlet, and adorned with gold and jewels and pearls, holding in her hand a golden cup full of abominations and the impurities of her fornication; and on her forehead was written a name, a mystery: "Babylon the great, mother of whores and of earth's abominations." And I saw that the woman was drunk with the blood of the witnesses to Jesus.[25]

In this first section the text lists some predominant characteristics of Babylon, presented as a woman: carrying symbols of powers (e.g. the scarlet color of her clothing, the precious jewels), she is sitting on a beast characterised negatively. From the outset, the text insists on the reasons for Babylon's radical condemnation. The image of the cup filled with sins is reiterated in the title on her forehead: Babylon the great is the mother of

[24] Liverani 1988:242f.; Edzard 1989:104; Cooper 1983:3f.

[25] Rev 17:3-6. Translation: NRSV (for all the quoted biblical texts); for exegetical details and further bibliography see Pezzoli-Olgiati 1997.

whores and of all abominations on earth; and eventually she is drunk from human blood. In the following interpretation of this first scene given to John by the angel (Rev 17:7-18), all these negative elements are further emphasized. To sum up: Babylon is a personified city, where the center of a perverse power, the power of the Beast, is concentrated. This power is presented as a symmetrical contrast to the power of God and of its Lamb, a Christological personage: the power of God and its Lamb seek life, while Babylon's power is founded on perversion, destruction, and murder. This is the fundamental reason why Babylon must be demolished.

The detailed description of the condemnation and its realization follows in Rev 18. A mighty angel calls out in heaven:

> "Fallen, fallen is Babylon the great! It has become a dwelling-place of demons, a haunt of every foul spirit, a haunt of every foul bird, a haunt of every foul and hateful beast. For all the nations have drunk of the wine of the wrath of her fornication, and the king of the earth have committed fornication with her, and the merchants of the earth have grown rich from the power of her luxury."
> Then I heard another voice from heaven saying, "Come out of her, my people, so that you do not take part in her sins, and so that you do not share in her plagues; for her sins are heaped high as heaven, and God has remembered her iniquities. Render to her as she herself has rendered, and repay her double for her deeds; mix a double draught for her in the cup she mixed. As she glorifies herself and lived luxuriously, so give her a like measure of torment and grief. Since in her heart she says, 'I rule as a queen; I am no widow, and I will never see grief', therefore her plagues will come in a single day – pestilence and mourning and famine – and she will be burned with fire; for mighty is the Lord God who judges her."[26]

The text works with strong oppositions: the once luxurious city becomes a space of demons and evil spirits; the people, who used to deal with Babylon, must share its condemnation; the people of God, however, are urged to come out before the city collapses. The condemnation is presented as a mighty act of divine vindication.

Rev 18 continues with the lamentations of three particular groups of inhabitants: kings (18:9-10), merchants (18:11-17a), and seamen (17b-19),

[26] Rev 18:2b-8.

who used to share Babylon's great wealth. The final scene describes the dynamic of destruction :

> Then a mighty angel took up a stone like a great millstone and threw it into the sea, saying, "with such violence Babylon the great city will be thrown down, and will be found no more; and the sound of harpists and minstrels and of flautists and trumpeters will be heard in you no more; and an artisan of any trade will be found in you no more; and the sound of millstone will be heard in you no more; and the light of a lamp will shine in you no more; and the voice of bridegroom and bride will be heard in you no more; for your merchants were the magnates of the earth, and all nations were deceived by your sorcery. And in you was found the blood of prophets and of saints, and of all who have been slaughtered on earth."[27]

Two elements emerge in this text: the violence in demolishing Babylon and the negation of the very aspects of city life. The vision presents a *Gegenbild* of a functioning city: therefore the destruction assumes the features of a radical negation of city life. At the very end the topic of Babylon's fault recurs once again: the enormously powerful city founded its wealth on the murder of God's people.

Among the many unclear points in Rev 17f. there is also a question about the meaning of some verbal forms: following the narrative construction it is not clear when the city has to be destroyed. At some times it seems that Babylon is already fallen (e.g. 18:2), at other times that its destruction will happen in the future (e.g.17:16 or 18:21f.).

The numerous allusions within the text and the reconstruction of the historic context in which Revelation was composed make it evident that the vision of Babylon's condemnation and destruction contains a strong polemic against Rome. Written for the Christian congregations living in seven flourishing cities in Asia Minor at the end of the 1st Century C.E., the *Revelation of John* can be interpreted as a reflection on the role of concurring powers in history: the power of the Beasts and of Satan on the one hand, the power of God and its Lamb on the other.[28]

[27] Rev 18:21-24.

[28] Ulrichsen 1985; Bovon 1986; Collins 1984 and 1988; Thompson 1990.

John presents to his adressees a vision of Rome and its power as an entity that, although very strong and dominant in the present, will not survive God's judgment. The image of the city in Rev 17f. shows an urban space that has became incompatible with life for the followers of Christ. The condemnation of Babylon depends on a theological interpretation of history and its fulfillment following a divine plan.

To the wealthy, magnificent, luxurious city – a trait that fits Rome but also cities like Ephesus, Smyrna, Pergamum etc. – *Revelation* opposes the image of a transcendent city. It is only in this eschatological dimension that the realization of life according to Christ's revelation will be complete.

> Then I saw a new heaven and a new earth; for the first heaven and the first earth had passed away, and the sea was no more.
> And I saw the holy city, the new Jerusalem, coming down out of heaven from God, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband. And I heard a loud voice from the throne saying, "See, the home of God is among mortals. He will dwell with them; they will be his people, 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 thing have passed away." And the one who was seated on the throne said, "See, I am making all things new." Also he said, "Write this, for these words are trustworthy and true." Then he said to me, "It is done! I am the Alpha and the Omega, the beginning and the end. To the thirsty I will give water as a gift from the spring of the water of life. Those who conquer will inherit these things, and I will be their God and they will be my children. But as for the cowardly, the faithless, the polluted, the murderers, the fornicators, the sorcerers, the idolaters, and all liars, their place will be in the lake that burns with fire and sulphur, which is the second death."[29]

The new Jerusalem is situated in a new spatial and temporal sphere: in a future dimension, in a new cosmos encompassing only a heaven and an earth. The absence of the sea marks the new quality of the new creation, where every ambiguity is transcended. The city is presented as a dimension descending on earth, sent by God: this origin connotes

[29] Rev 21:1-8.

Jerusalem as the ideal space where humans can live together with God and his Lamb. The divine quality of Jerusalem is already visible in its first presentation: it is compared with a splendid bride, it is a holy city. For the persecuted people of God, Jerusalem will be a place of healing and consolation. In that city, there will not be any kind of suffering, mourning, and crying: even death will be overcome. In the first part of the vision quoted above the text insists on its veracity: the words of this vision are divine words, words of a God who encompasses history and possesses the source of the water of life. New Jerusalem is a space of truth, transparency, divine love, eternal life: whoever deals with negative powers is categorically excluded from this cosmic space.

The second, longer part of the vision (Rev 21:9-22:5) re-proposes and deepens many of these aspects: Jerusalem's divine origin, splendor and preciousness, architectonic elements, perfect shape and size, and precious materials. The city does not have a temple: the relationship between God and his Lamb and the inhabitants is perfectly harmonious and immediate; there is no need of a intermediary institution. Jerusalem is bright, all light, absolutely unequivocal, transparent. No negative entity can enter it. Rev 21-22:5 describes a transcendent, eschatological image of urban space as a perfect cosmos.

Interestingly, Babylon's condemnation does not lead to the abandonment of the very idea of city. Although Jerusalem comes from a divine dimension and is situated in a transcendent cosmos, it is still clearly conceived as an urban space. One cannot overlook the symmetrical oppositions between the images of Babylon and Jerusalem. Both are presented partly as women – one is a whore, the other a bride – partly as city. Both wear precious jewels. Both have particular names: Babylon, blasphemous names; Jerusalem, the names of the twelve tribes of Israel and of the twelve apostles. Drinking assumes an important role in both: Babylon drinks the blood of the followers of the Lamb, while in Jerusalem there is the water of life. The wordly Babylon is an ambiguous space: it contains wealth for some and death for others, while Jerusalem is a space of salvation and life in its purest form. Considered from a theological point of view, this opposition has a radically asymmetrical value and marks a qualitative, insuperable difference.

Conclusion

Two texts have been presented here very briefly in order to show the main direction of the present project on the imagery of ancient cities. Of course there is no pretension of an exhaustive analysis. Notwithstanding, the examples chosen are inscribed in different categories and contain interesting contrasts. In the first case, the *Curse of Agade*, the image of the city as a cosmos is opposed to an image of absolute negation: the once splendid Agade, dwelling place of Inanna and other gods, is annihilated and transformed into chaos. The second example presents opposed images of future cities: Babylon, the condemned city and the new Jerusalem, a vision of an eschatological cosmos.

Both negative images can be understood as a failure of the city. Agade and Babylon are spaces where an appropriate relationship between the human and the divine spheres is no longer possible, though for different reasons. In the first case the gods have deserted, cursed and eventually demolished Agade. The condemnation concerns only Agade, its ruler and all its inhabitants, and does not involve a general negative interpretation of urban space. On the contrary, in the second case the judgment over Babylon is opposed to a vision of a qualitatively new cosmic city; therefore the destruction of Babylon seems to imply a general polemic against urban life on earth: it is not the condemnation of a particular city, but of a negative power concentrated in Babylon but, of course, present everywhere on earth.

The transformations within the two compositions consequently follow different dynamics: in the *Curse of Agade* there is a negative development from the city as a cosmos to its condemnation, while in *Revelation* the images of cities constitute the strong opposition between the radical condemnation of the perverse city and the eschatological city as a place of salvation, fulfillment, and the complete realization of life.

Although the chosen examples refer only to three categories, I hope to have shown clearly enough the central aims of my present work: the analysis of more historical documents will test the applicability of this methodological approach but also the limits of this comparison attempt.

6. Bibliography

Attinger, Pascal, 1984: Remarques à propos de la "Malédiction d'Accad", Revue d'assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale 78, 99-121.

Bovon, François, 1986: Possession ou enchantement, Les institutions romaines selon l'Apocalypse de Jean, Cristianesimo nella Storia 7, 221—238.

Brüschweiler, Françoise (ed.), 1983: La ville dans le Proche-Orient Ancien, Actes du colloque de Cartigny 1979, Leuven: Peeters 1983.

Büttner, Manfred, 1985: Zur Geschichte und Systematik der Religionsgeschichte, in: Büttner, Manfred / Hoheisel, Karl / Köpf, Ulrich, Grundfragen der Religionsgeographie, Berlin: Reimer, 13-121.

Cardini, Franco (ed.), 1994: La città e il sacro, Verona: Garzanti - Scheiwiller.

Collins, Adela Yarbro 1984: Crisis and Catharsis, The Power of the Apocalypse, Philadelphia: Westminster Press.

-, 1988: Gegner von aussen: Rom als Prototyp des Bösen im frühen Christentum, Concilium 14, 473-479.

Cooper, Jerrold S., 1983: The Curse of Agade, Baltimore - London: John Hopkins.

Dougherty James, 1980: The Fivesquare City, The City in the Religious Imagination, Notre Dame: University Press.

Eck, Diana L., 1987: The City as a Sacred Center, in: Smith, Bardwell / Reynolds, Holly Baker (eds.), The City as a Sacred Center, Essays on Six Asian Contexts, Leiden - New York - Kopenhagen - Köln: Brill.

Edzard, Dietz O., 1989: Das "Wort im Ekur" oder die Peripetie in "Fluch über Akkade", in: Behrens, Hermann / Loding, Darlene / Roht, Martha T. (eds.), DUMU-E$_2$-DUB-BA-A, Studies in Honor of Åke W. Sjöberg, Philadelphia: University Museum, 99-105.

Eliade, Mircea, 1957: Centre du monde, temple, maison, in: Bloch, Raymond (ed.), Le symbolisme cosmique des monuments religieux, Actes de la conférence internationale qui a eu lieu sous les auspices de l'Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente à Rome, avril-mai 1955, Roma - New York: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, 57-82.

-, 1960: Structures and Changes in the History of Religions, in: Kraeling, Carl H. / Adams, Robert M. (eds.), City Invincible, A Symposium on Urbanisation and Cultural Development in the Ancient Near East held at the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, December 4-7, 1958, Chicago: University Press, 351-366.

-, 1987: The Sacred and the Profane, The Nature of Religion, San Diego - New York - London: Harcourt Brace (orig. Das Heilige und das Profane, 1957).

-, 1991: The Myth of the Eternal Return, or, Cosmos and History, Princeton: University Press (orig. Le mythe de l'éternel retour, 1949).

Finley, Moses I., 1973: The Ancient Economy, Berkeley - Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Frick, Frank S., 1977: The City in Ancient Israel, Missoula: Scholars Press (Society of Biblical Literature diss. series 36).

Gualtieri, Antonio R., 1983: Landscape, Consciousness, and Culture, Religious Studies 19, 161-174.

Hawkins, Peter S. (ed.), 1986: Civitas, Religious Interpretations of the City, Altanta: Scholars Press.

Hoheisel, Karl, 1985: Geographische Umwelt und Religion in der Religionswissenschaft, in: Büttner, Manfred / Hoheisel, Karl / Köpf, Ulrich, Grundfragen der Religionsgeographie, Berlin: Reimer, 123-164.

-, 1988: Religionsgeographie, in: Cancik, Hubert / Gladigow, Burkhard / Laubscher, Matthias (eds.), Handbuch religionswissenschaftlicher Grundbegriffe, Bd. I, Stuttgart - Berlin - Köln: Kohlhammer, 108-120.

Jacobsen, Thorkild, 1987: The Harps that once... Sumerian Poetry in Translation, New Haven - London: Yale University Press.

Kolb, Frank, 1984: Die Stadt im Altertum, München: Beck.

Krecher, Joachim, 1978: Sumerische Literatur, in: Röllig, Wolfgang, Altorientalische Literaturen, Wiesbaden: Athenaion (Neues Handbuch der Literaturwissenschaft 1), 101-150.

Kuhrt, Amélie, 1995: The Ancient Near East, c. 3000-300 B.C., Vol. I + II, London - New York: Routledge.

Levi, Mario Attilio, 1989: La città antica, Morfologia e biografia della aggregazione urbana nell'antichità, Roma: L'Erma di Bretschneider (Problemi e ricerche di storia antica 12).

Liverani, Mario, 1976: La concezione dell'universo, in: Moscati, Sabatino (ed.), L'alba della civiltà, Società, economia e pensiero nel Vicino Oriente Antico, vol 3: Il pensiero, Torino: UTET, 439-516.

-, 1986: L'origine delle città, Le prime comunità urbane del Vicino Oriente, Roma: Editori Riuniti (Libri di base 99).

-, 1987: La città vicino-orientale antica, in: Rossi, Pietro (ed.), Modelli di città, Strutture e funzioni politiche, Torino: Einaudi (Biblioteca di cultura storica 165), 57-85.

-, 1988: Antico Oriente, Storia, società, economia, Bari - Roma: Laterza.

Pezzoli-Olgiati, Daria, 1997: Täuschung und Klarheit, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1997 (FRLANT 175).

Redford, Donald B., 1997: The Ancient Egyptian "City": Figment or Reality?, in: Aufrecht, Walter E. / Mirau, Neil A. / Gauley, Steven W. (eds.), Urbanism in Antiquity, From Mesopotamia to Crete, Sheffield: Academic Press 1997 (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Suppl. Series 244), 210-220.

Rinschede, Gisbert, 1999: Religionsgeographie, Braunschweig: Westermann.

Römer, Willem H. Ph., 1974: Fünf und zwanzig Jahre der Erforschung sumerischer literarischer Texte, Bibliotheca Orientalis 31, 207-221.

Schwind, Martin (ed.), 1975: Religionsgeographie, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Sjoberg, Gideon, 1960: The Preindustrial City. Past and Present, New York: Free Press.

Sprockhoff, Joachim-Friedrich, 1964: Religiöse Lebensformen und Gestalt der Lebensräume, Über das Verhältnis von Religionsgeographie und Religionswissenschaft, Numen 11, 85-146.

Stolz, Fritz, 1993: Paradiese und Gegenwelten, Zeitschrift für Religionswissenschaft 1, 5-24.

-, 1997a: Grundzüge der Religionswissenschaft, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht (2. ed.).

-, 1997b: Vergleich von Produkten und Produktionsregeln religiöser Kommunikation, in Klimkeit, Hans-Joachim (ed.), Vergleichen und Verstehen in der Religionswissenschaft, Berlin - New York: Harrassowitz, 37-51.

Tworuschka, Udo, 1994: Heiliger Raum und heilige Städte aus der Sicht der Religionsphänomenologie, in: Tworuschka, Udo (ed.), Heilige Städte, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1-8.

Ulrichsen, Jarl H., 1985: Die sieben Häupter und die zehn Hörner. Zur Datierung der Offenbarung des Johannes, Studia Theologica 39, 1-20.

Van De Mieroop, Marc, The Ancient Mesopotamian City, Oxford: Clarendon 1997.

Weber, Max, 1976: Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft, Grundriss der verstehenden Soziologie, Fünfte, revidierte Auflage mit Textkritischen Erläuterungen hrsg. von Johannes Wickelmann, 2. Halbbd., Tübingen: Mohr.

Wheatley, Paul, 1969: City as Symbol, Essays on the Arrangement and Perception of Urban Space in the Traditional World, London: H.K. Lewis.

Xella, Paolo, La città divina, 1994: Cultura urbana e politeismo nel Vicino Oriente antico, in: Cardini, Franco (ed.), La città e il sacro, Verona: Garzanti - Scheiwiller, 1-42.

The mystical understanding in the *Ascension of Isaiah*

Jonathan Knight

Diocese of Ely and University of Kent

The subject of mysticism is now increasingly recognized as a contributing factor in the development of early Christianity alongside the better-known, and probably even more abused, term "apocalypticism".[1] One thinks here of the mystical experiences attributed to Jesus and recorded by Paul, not to mention the mystical journey described in some detail by the Book of Revelation.[2] Such mysticism continued beyond the New Testament period and inspired a whole variety of later figures, much as it claims supporters and adherents today. Given the nature of early Christology - especially the belief that the resurrection revealed the earthly Jesus as a heavenly being - it is inevitable that an interest in discerning heavenly beings should stand at the heart of the Christian religious interest. So it has always been, and doubtless always will be so.

Two issues spring immediately to mind when writing of "early Christian mysticism" in this way. The first is the need to define "mysticism" precisely, especially in view of the variety of popular understandings to which I have just alluded. The second is the need to consider *all* the available evidence, not merely that selection of evidence with which we are familiar or which happens to appeal to us. One of the advantages of a Conference such as this is that it brings together scholars

[1]See e.g. Jey J. Kanagarag, *'Mysticism' in the Gospel of John: An Inquiry into its Background* (SuppJSNT, 158; Sheffield, 1998). Earlier studies include A. Schweitzer, *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle* (ET London, 1931).

[2]See Mk 1.9-11; Lk. 10.18; 2 Cor 12; and Rev. 4-5.

from a variety of disciplines to pool their understandings in a way that allows this wider picture to emerge. That is a healthy sign of life in what has sometimes been regarded as a difficult and even an obscure field.

The purpose of this paper is clear from its title. It is to examine the early Christian apocalypse called the *Ascension of Isaiah* and to see where its evidence fits into that wider picture. My paper has a more precise aim as well as this general one. I set out to examine in particular the possibility, first implied by Origen and then raised by Martin Werner, that the *Asc. Isa.* uses scriptural traditions to frame the content of its mystical perspective. This is turn leads to consideration of the role of scripture in early Christian mysticism more generally, and the attempt to locate the *Asc. Isa.* on the map of early Christian literature in terms of its contribution to this issue.

I

The first step is of necessity a question of definition. I have said that the *Asc. Isa.* is "an apocalypse" but that this paper falls within the attempt to discern the contours of early Christian "mysticism". What, then, are "mysticism" and "apocalypticism" and how do they differ from each other?

The question of what constitutes "apocalypticism" has been the subject of scholarly interest since John J. Collins and his collaborators produced their ground-breaking morphology and definition in *Semeia* 14 (1979).[3] This morphology provides a bench-mark for study of the wider

[3]'Apocalypse: Morphology of a Genre'. The contributors to this volume were J.J. Collins (Jewish and Persian material), A.Yarbro Collins (Christian), F.T. Fallon (Gnostic), H.W. Attridge (Greco-Roman) and A.J. Saldarini (Rabbinic). The most recent study of the topic is John J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination* (2nd edtn;

apocalyptic question. Collins and his colleagues defined the apocalypse on that occasion 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.[4]

They supported this definition from a study of all the extant apocalypses, whether or not they form individual texts, dividing their analysis into a sequence of grids which focused on the manner of the revelation and the temporal and spatial axes on which the revealed material comments.

Several features of the Collins morphology call for notice here. In the first place it shows that the apocalypse constitutes "revelatory literature". This is the essence of the genre. The apocalypse purports to reveal information that cannot be discerned except through revelation. In the logic of ancient cosmology this means that the secrets of heaven are made accessible for the benefit of people on earth.[5] That is why some apocalypses, including the *Asc. Isa.*, describe a heavenly journey by the seer in which he sees a variety of secrets.

Secondly, the apocalypse has a narrative framework. This framework is essential, not incidental to the genre. The apocalypses almost universally describe the situation under which the revelation was received; almost universally again under the fiction of pseudonymity.[6]

Grand Rapids, 1998). An earlier but still important study is David Hellholm (ed.), *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East* (Tübingen, 1983).

[4]*Semeia* 14 (1979), p. 22.

[5]Cosmology is, in consequence, an indispensable feature of the apocalypses. On ancient Jewish cosmology see H. Bietenhard, *Die himmlische welt im Unchristentum und Spätjudentum* (WUNT, 2; Tübingen, 1951). On the cosmology of the apocalypses see A.Yarbro Collins, *Cosmology and Eschatology in Jewish Apocalypticism* (JSJSS, 50; Leiden, 1996).

[6]Revelation and the *Shepherd of Hermas* are exceptional in not being pseudonymous. Ancient pseudonymity is examined by J. Sint, *Pseudonymität im Altertum* (Innsbruck,

This means that the literature "tells a story": often a story that is of considerable relevance to the situation the individual apocalypse addresses. The apocalypses do not consist of unbroken dialogues by the heavenly mediator, although there is a move in this direction in some of the Gnostic apocalypses. We must always consider the relation of the narrative framework to the probable *Sitz im Leben* and *vice versa.*

Thirdly, the revelation is mediated by an otherworldly being. This mediator is generally an angel, but in the book of Revelation (1.12-16) he is the heavenly Christ. The appearance of the mediator is an integral part of the work's narrative setting. It substantiates the claim that *heavenly* secrets are disclosed in the work. The mediator comes from the presence of God (or is himself divine). In the *Asc. Isa.* Isaiah dialogues with an angel and even hears the voice of God himself. This is a claim to revelation, and thus to authority, of the very highest order possible.

The special feature of the Collins 1979 morphology was the identification of two different types of apocalypse. Type I has no other-worldly journey. It is divided into three sub-types. Type Ia is an "historical" apocalypse. Type Ib includes cosmic and/or political eschatology; type Ic has only personal eschatology. Type II includes an otherworldly journey. It is also divided into three sub-types. Type IIa is an apocalypse with an otherworldly journey and a review of history; type IIb links the otherworldly journey with cosmic and/or political eschatology; and type IIc with (only) personal eschatology. Although Himmelfarb thinks that here we actually have two different literary genres,[7] the similarities between them in many ways outweigh the differences (as Collins effectively shows). It is probably better to speak

1960); see also D. Meade, *Pseudonymity and Canon: An Investigation into the Relationship of Authorship and Authority in Jewish and Earliest Christian Tradition* (Grand Rapids, 1987).

[7]Martha Himmelfarb, *Tours of Hell* (Philadelphia, 1983) p. 61.

of two different types of apocalypse than to distinguish different genres. In a review of his original position published in 1991 Collins retains the twofold distinction but questions the practical value of distinguishing "sub-types" in the classification produced in this way.[8]

Amongst the further work on the question of definition I mention only the research of David Aune. The first volume of his commentary on Revelation contains a short but significant discussion of the apocalypse genre.[9] Aune insists, in a prolegomenon to his study of the text, that all descriptions of literary genres must deal with the three inter-related matters of form, content and function. He goes on to explain what he means by this in respect of "the apocalypse". In *form*,

> An apocalypse is a first-person prose narrative, with an episodic structure consisting of revelatory visions often mediated to the author by a supernatural revealer, so structured that the central revelatory messages constitutes a literary climax, and framed by a narrative of the circumstances surrounding the purported revelatory experience.

So far as the *content* is concerned, this is the communication of a transcendent, usually eschatological, perspective on human experience and values. Thirdly, Aune gives the apocalypse a threefold *function*. He claims it legitimates the transcendental authorization of the message; mediates a reactualization of the original revelatory experience through a variety of devices which conceal the message that the text purports to reveal; and thereby enables the readers to modify their thinking and behaviour to conform with transcendent perspectives.

---

[8]John J. Collins, 'Genre, Ideology and Social Movements in Jewish Apocalypticism', in John J. Collins and James H. Charlesworth (eds.), *Mysteries and Revelations: Apocalyptic Studies since the Uppsala Colloquium* (SuppJSP, 9; Sheffield, 1991), pp. 11-32.

[9]*Revelation 1-5* (WBC, 52a; Dallas, 1997), Introduction, pp. lxxvii-lxxxii.

This work helps to frame an appropriate definition of "apocalypticism". The best recent scholarship distinguishes between "apocalypticism" as a broadly-based phenomenon and "apocalyptic eschatology" as a specific feature within the panorama of apocalypticism so that we now have a triadic distinction between "the apocalypse", "apocalyptic eschatology" and "apocalypticism". Two scholars who have advocated this approach are Paul D. Hanson and John J. Collins.[10] Hanson writes of "apocalypticism" that it:

> *refers to the symbolic universe in which an apocalyptic movement codifies its identity and interpretation of reality.*[11]

Collins purposefully describes "apocalypticism" with reference to the apocalypses. He observes that the apocalypses take a heightened interest in otherworldly regions and supernatural beings and introduce belief in the resurrection of the dead when compared with the Hebrew Bible. This leads him to write about "apocalypticism":

> Taken together, these core elements of content constitute a *world view*, which was new and distinctive in Judaism when it first emerged in the Hellenistic period, although it subsequently came to be widely accepted. The belief in a judgment beyond death and in the influence of angels and demons on human life created a framework for human decisions and actions. *This world view or "symbolic universe" which*

[10]P.D. Hanson, 'Jewish Apocalyptic against its Near Eastern Environment', *RB* 78 (1971), pp. 31-58; 'Prolegomena to the Study of Jewish Apocalyptic', in *Magnalia Dei*, pp. 389-401; *The Dawn of Apocalyptic* (Philadelphia, 1975; second edition, with appendix, 1979); 'Apocalypse, Genre' and 'Apocalypticism', *IDB Suppl.* (1976), pp. 28-33; *Old Testament Apocalyptic* (IBT; Nashville, 1987); 'Apocalyptic Literature', in D.A. Knight and G.M. Tucker (eds.), *The Hebrew Bible and its Modern Interpreters* (Chico, 1985), pp. 465-88; and 'Apocalypses and Apocalypticism', *ABD*, vol. i, pp. 279-82. J.J. Collins, especially in *Apocalyptic Imagination*, pp. 1-42; and 'Apocalypses and Apocalypticism', *ABD*, vol. i, pp. 282-88.

[11]*IDB Suppl.*, p. 30; italics added.

is extrapolated from the apocalypses is what we call "apocalypticism".[12]

This work shows encouraging signs of moving towards a consensus. "Apocalypticism", we might say, is the construction of a symbolic universe in which a particular author or circle give voice to their hopes for salvation by elevating their situation to the level of a grand cosmic contest in which the heavenly perspective becomes important. This symbolic universe permits the disclosure - i.e. the revelation from heaven - of a new world-view that stands in marked contrast to the dominant world-view by which the apocalyptic circle feel themselves oppressed. This sense of distance - reinforced by the apocalyptic literature - from the majority opinion provides an explanation of the dualism which is a feature of most if not all apocalypses (and thus of apocalypticism as a broader construct). Such dualism is an expression of polarized distinctions by which the alienation of a group is set in perspective and explained to its members, over against the world-view that prevails in wider society. One might almost say (for all the dangers of reductionism) that to this extent apocalypticism is a *projection of fantasy* in which hopes for salvation are elevated to the heavenly world because of the perceived hopelessness of the situation from which they spring.

The question now arises of how we define "mysticism" and how "mysticism" relates to the definition of "apocalypticism" constructed in this way. Like "apocalypticism", "mysticism" has a precise and technical meaning. Thomas Aquinas defined mysticism as *cognitio deo experimentalis*: the kind of knowledge that comes from a direct or first-hand encounter. A more recent commentator, Rufus Jones, calls mysticism 'the type of religion which puts the emphasis on immediate awareness of relation with God, on direct and intimate consciousness of

[12]*ABD*, vol. i p. 283.

the Divine Presence. It is religion in its most acute, intense and living stage.'[13] The Oxford English Dictionary describes it as 'belief in the possibility of union with the Divine nature by means of ecstatic contemplation.'

One of the sure-footed results of scholarly study of mysticism is that there is no general and distinctive human "mystical awareness" that bypasses the differentiations of individual religion and culture.[14] Those who have mystical experiences generally do so in the context of the religious tradition that nourishes them. This is true of Jewish mysticism and, we shall see, most importantly true of the *Asc. Isa.*.[15] The particular mystical context with which we are concerned here is that of the apocalyptic mysticism that stemmed from biblical roots and flowered in what has come to be known as the "inter-testamental" period. In saying this, I am by implication distinguishing between "mysticism" and "apocalypticism".[16] It will be evident that "mysticism" is something more limited than "apocalypticism". If "mysticism" is the intimate knowledge of the divine, and "apocalypticism" the construction of a symbolic and theoretical universe, "mysticism" appears as one of the elements within "apocalypticism" but not its only constituent element. Within the Jewish apocalyptic tradition, mysticism often provides authentication for the revealed material by providing assurance about the

---

[13]*Studies in Mystical Religion* (1909) Introduction, p. xv.

[14]See Richard H. Jones, *Mysticism examined: philosophical enquiries into Mysticism* (Alabany, 1993). Also important is R. Otto, *Mysticism East and West: Comparative Analysis of the Nature of Mysticism* (ET London, 1932); and R.C. Zaehner, *Mysticism sacred and Profane: An Inquiry into some varieties of praeternatural experience* (Oxford, 1957).

[15]On Jewish mysticism see Gerschom G. Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (New York, 1957); id., *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism, and Talmudic Tradition* (New York, 1960). On Christian mysticism see Andrew Louth, *The Origins of the Christian Mystical tradition from Plato to Denys* (Oxford, 1981).

[16]As is done also by I. Gruenwald, *Apocalyptic and Merkabah Mysticism* (Leiden, 1980), pp. 29-72.

divine origin of the vision in question. Mysticism also has a theoretical function in that it grounds the apocalyptic revelation in the Jewish theological understanding of God as the supreme heavenly monarch whose will determines all.

It is not possible to understand any Jewish mysticism without noticing its biblical roots. Its roots are the theophanies experienced by the Hebrew prophets and recorded in the final version of the Pentateuch.[17] The Sinai theophany (Exod. 24) and the visions of Micaiah-ben-Imlah (1 Kgs. 22.19), Isaiah (ch. 6) and Ezekiel (ch. 1) are all important in framing this later understanding. They describe God as an enthroned monarch briefly glimpsed by the seer on earth.[18] In post-biblical Judaism *1 En.* 12-14 (third century BCE) marks a development in Jewish mysticism by elevating the seer to the presence of God in the second of two heavenly palaces. This is the cradle from which all subsequent Jewish mysticism sprang; including the mystical perspective of a work such as the *Asc. Isa.*.

II

Our next step is to introduce the *Asc. Isa.* and explain why it is relevant for the study of early Christian mysticism.[19]

---

[17]See Jeffrey J. Niehaus, *God at Sinai: Covenant and Theophany in the Bible and ancinet near east* (Carlisle, 1995).

[18]Thus Scholem, *Major Trends*, pp. 43-44: 'No doubts are possible on this point: the earliest Jewish mysticism is throne-mysticism'.

[19]Critical edition by P. Bettiolo, A. Giambelluca Kossova, E. Norelli and L. Perrone, *Ascensio Isaiae: Textus* (CCSA, 7; Turnhout, 1995); commentary by E. Norelli (ed.), *Ascensio Isaiae: Commentarius* (CCSA, 8; Turnhout, 1995). See also M. Pesce (ed.), *Isaia, il Diletto e la Chiesa: visione e esegesi profetica cristiano-primitive nell'Ascensione di Isaia* (TRSR, 20; Brescia, 1983); A. Acerbi, *Serra Lignea: Studi sulla Fortuna della Ascensione di Isaia* (Rome, 1984); id., *L'Ascensione di Isaia: Cristologia e profetismo in Siria bei primi decenni del II secolo* (SPM, 17; Milan, 1989); E. Norelli, *L'Ascensione di Isaia: Studi su un apocrifo al croeciva dei*

The *Asc. Isa.* as an apocalypse falls into two distinct halves. Chapters 1-5 are a pseudonymous prophecy of events between the two descents from heaven of the pre-existent Christ, who is often called "the Beloved One" in the *Asc. Isa.*. This material has the form of an apocalyptic historical review familiar from Daniel and other apocalypses.[20] Chapters 6-11 described Isaiah's ascension to heaven where he witnesses the descent and ascension of the Beloved One, including his appearance on earth as Jesus. The work as a whole has a seven-storied cosmology in which God is a remote being and the gulf between his presence and the human world in ordinary circumstances unbridgeable.

It follows from this brief introduction that our attention here will be confined to chs. 6-11 of the *Asc. Isa.*. While chs. 1-5 have their rightful place in the apocalyptic tradition, they cannot be said to have mystical content in the sense I have defined this here. Even though it might be said that chs. 1-5 and 6-11 demonstrate significant coherence in terms of their content, the fact remains that chs. 1-5 lack a description of revelatory method and they nowhere grant Isaiah a vision of the throne of

---

cristianesimi (Origini NS, 1; Bologna, 1994); id., *Ascension du prophète Isaïe* (Turnhout, 1993); id., 'Il martirio di Isaia come *testimonium* antigiudaico?', *Henoch* 2 (1980), pp. 37-56; id., 'La resurezzione di Gesù nell'*Ascensione di Isaia*', *Cristianesimo nella Storia* 1 (1980), pp. 315-66; P.C. Bori, 'L'Estasi del profeta: "Ascensio Isaia" 6 e l'antico profetismo cristiano', *Cristianesimo nella Storia* 1 (1980), pp. 367-89; Robert G. Hall see 'The Ascension of Isaiah: Community Situation, Date, and Place in Early Christianity', *JBL* 109 (1990), pp. 289-306; 'Isaiah's Ascent to see the Beloved: An Ancient Jewish Source for the Ascension of Isaiah', *JBL* 113 (1994), pp. 463-84; id., *Revealed Histories: Techniques for Ancient Jewish Historiography* (SuppJSP, 6; Sheffield, 1991), pp. 137-47; Jonathan Knight, *Disciples of the Beloved One: The Christology, Social Setting and Theological Context of the Ascension of Isaiah* (SuppJSP, 18; Sheffield, 1996); id., *The Ascension of Isaiah* (GAP, 2; Sheffield, 1995); and Richard J. Bauckham, 'The Ascension of Isaiah: Genre, Unity and Date', in his *The Fate of the Dead: Studies on the Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (Leiden, 1998), pp. 363-90.

[20]See Hall, *Revealed Histories*, pp. 137-47.

God. This means that they constitute a form of Christian apocalypticism from which substantial mystical content is lacking.

Chapters 6-11, by contrast, redound with mysticism. In order to introduce this material we must consider two critical questions in respect of it. The first is the problem of the traditions about Jesus found in the Ethiopic text (E) of ch. 11 (11.2-22 E) but missing in the Slavonic (S) and a Latin (L2) version of that chapter. The second is the relation of chs. 6-11 to chs. 1-5 of the apocalypse. This is bound up with the question of dating.

The problem of the Jesus traditions is in fact of only marginal relevance for this paper. Both S and L2 allow that the mediator appeared as Jesus. The E text uses material that shows certain similarities with Matthew's Gospel. There are similar traditions about Jesus in 3.13-18 which also show contact with Matthew and where E is significantly supported by other versions. The emerging consensus view of this material is that it derived from a "kerygmatic summary" independent of the present form of the Gospels and similar to some of the material in Acts and other early Christian literature.[21] This means that it illustrates the wider stock of material from which texts such as Matthew emerged. The likelihood is that this material stood in the original *Asc. Isa.* and that S and L2 represent a subsequent abbreviation of the text. This is suggested by the fact that E is supported by other versions in 3.13-18 and the occasional verbal similarity between the traditions in the *Asc. Isa.* and other kerygmatic summaries. The likelihood is that 11.2-22 was omitted

[21]On these see Richard J. Bauckham, 'Kerygmatic summaries in the speeches of Acts', in B. Witherington (ed.), *History, Literature and Society in the Book of Acts* (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 185-217, esp. pp. 191-204.

by the parent of S and L2 either because it was considered too docetic or perhaps because it was considered insufficiently docetic.[22]

How the two halves of the apocalypse relate to each other has been variously answered in research. In terms of the composition of chs. 1-5 A. Acerbi argues that this material is composite because of proposed discord between 3.13b-31 and its present context.[23] This view has not generally been accepted by other scholars. Richard Bauckham thinks that the whole work is that of a single author.[24] E. Norelli argues that the two halves of the apocalypse represent different phases in the life of a prophetic circle in which the material in chs. 6-11 is the earlier composition.[25] To this disagreement about the precise circumstances of composition is linked disagreement about the date of the apocalypse. Bauckham thinks the whole work was composed in the decade 70-80 CE.[26] Norelli thinks the two halves of the *Asc. Isa.* were divided by the turn of the second century CE.[27] In my own published work I have argued that the apocalypse makes good sense when seen against the background of the correspondence between Pliny and Trajan in the second decade of the second century.[28] I continue to think that the reign of either Trajan or Hadrian is the likely time of composition.

III

[22]See my *Disciples*, pp. 26-27. The priority of the E text is established also by Bori in the article cited.
[23]*L'Ascensione*, Chapter 8.
[24]'The Ascension of Isaiah'.
[25]*Ascensio Isaiae: Commentarius*, pp. 36-52; id., *L'Ascensione*, pp. 59-67.
[26]'The Ascension of Isaiah'.
[27]*Ascensio Isaiae: Commentarius*, pp. 65-66.
[28]*Disciples*, pp. 33-39.

So we come to the real heart of this paper. Chs. 6-11 of the *Asc. Isa.* describe Isaiah's mystical experience in which he is transported to the seventh heaven to witness the mediator's descent and ascension. In order to grapple with this material we must first read it through and gain some understanding of what it contains.

Chapter 6 is a narrative introduction to the description of the mystical ascension.[29] This is similar to some of the material in the earlier part of the apocalypse. The narrator explains that Isaiah came into the royal court from Gilgal and experienced a mystical ascension during his residence there. Robert G. Hall has attempted to suggest that this passage describes the actual mystical practices of the prophetic circle that produced the apocalypse but this view must be held suspect for more than one reason.[30] In the first place, the narrative of apocalypses cannot always be construed as allegory of the community situation that produced them. Secondly, the parallels with the narrative in chs. 1-5 call for caution in framing this interpretation. Although I have suggested that the story of Isaiah's death in ch. 5 possible discloses an early Christian interest in the phenomenon of martyrdom, we must note there is material in 1.1-3.12 which does not necessarily reflect the circumstances of the circle in question. Even Hall himself acknowledges the possibility of a *periodic* meeting of prophets, not a fixed and gathered assembly. 2.7-11 has been interpreted as a veiled reference to the formation of the Qumran community![31] Thirdly, although the description of the mystical trance possibly (or even probably) reflects contemporary praxis, the story of the gathering of the prophets does not of itself imply that the work stems from a prophetic conventicle. We must be more open-minded than Hall

---

[29]See Bori, 'L'Estasi del Profeta'.

[30]'The Ascension of Isaiah'.

[31]By David Flusser, 'The Apocryphal Book of *Ascensio Isaiae* and the Dead Sea Sect', *IEJ* 3 (1953), pp. 30-47.

on this issue whilst noting the striking nature of the description of mystical ascent.

In any event, the story in ch. 6 is of only marginal relevance to the unfolding mystical ascension that occurs in chs. 7-11 of the *Asc. Isa.*. Before considering this we must briefly examine the story of what happens psychologically in Isaiah's ascension in the second half of ch. 6.[32] It is evident that Isaiah enters a mystical trance in which his body experiences a cataleptic state. We cannot be sure that the account has not been overworked but the underlying strand seems convincing. 'And while he was speaking with the Holy Spirit in the hearing of them all, he became silent, and his mind was taken up from him, and he did not see the men who were standing before him. His eyes indeed were open, but his mouth was silent, and the mind in his body was taken up from him. But his breath was (still) in him, for he was seeing a vision' (6.10-13).[33] This is one of the very rare descriptions of mystical praxis from the ancient Christian world, parallel in its importance to Paul's enigmatic account in 2 Cor. 12.[34] The notion of the mystic making his ascension surrounded by his disciples has parallels in Jewish mysticism, notably in the tractate *Hekhaloth Rabbati*.[35] The crucial point to note is that this is a mental or inner ascension in which normal psychological functions are apparently suspended while the event occurs. We have no way of

[32]In terms of the psychology of mystical encounter I find helpful the article by Kenneth Wapnick, 'Mysticism and Schizophrenia', in R. Woods (ed.), *Understanding Mysticism* (London, 1980), pp. 321-37.

[33]I cite in this paper the translation of Michael E. Knibb in James H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, vol. 2 (London, 1985), pp. 143-76 (with introduction).

[34]On which see J.W. Bowker, "Merkabah Visions and the Visions of Paul', *JJS* 16 (1971), pp. 157-73; and A.T. Lincoln, "Paul the Visionary: the Setting and Significance of the Rapture to Paradise in 2 Corinthians 12.1-10', *NTS* 25 (1979), pp. 204-20.

[35]On which see now James R. Davila, 'Prolegomena to a Critical edition of the Hekhaloth Rabbati', *JJS* 45 (1994), pp. 208-26.

verifying the origin and authenticity of this material but there is no convincing reason for suspecting the latter. *Asc. Isa.* ch. 6 is to be prized by students of early Christian mysticism despite all the problems that it raises.

The point I made about mysticism being culturally determined is relevant here. Despite the initial continuity with the ambience of Jewish mysticism, it is immediately obvious that the *Asc. Isa.* is written from a distinctively Christian standpoint. The doctrine of the seven heavens is not found in orthodox Christian literature before Gnosticism but it is a familiar feature of Jewish apocalypticism.[36] Paul's reference to three heavens in 12.2, combined with the mystical outlook of the Book of Revelation, shows there was no standard cosmology in first century Christian thought.[37] The single-storied universe acknowledged by Jesus was perhaps the most common view. Paul's reference is clearly to exceptional circumstances, hence the increase in the number of the heavens. That the *Asc. Isa.* details seven heavens in one sense reveals the influence of Jewish apocalypticism but it more obviously shows the author's interest in advocating a transcendent theological understanding. The God of the *Asc. Isa.* is a remote deity who inhabits the seventh heaven. Only an exceptional person like Isaiah can see him. The pseudonymous setting of the *Asc. Isa.* is striking when compared with Revelation and *Hermas*. We must always bear in mind the possibility that chs. 6-11 are a carefully constructed account in which literary skill as well as traces of mystical insight is present.[38] No claim is made here for contemporary vision of God. The doctrine of the seven heavens has the

[36]See Collins, *Cosmology*, pp. 21 -54. The idea reappears in the Gnostic text called the *Poimandres*, which dates to the second century BCE.

[37]NB that the deutero-Paulines Colossians (1.5) and Ephesians (4.10; 6.9) also speak of a plurality of heavens.

[38]I hope myself to investigate this suggestion in future research.

effect of drawing attention to the descent and ascension of the Beloved One as the decisive salvific moment.

The most significant feature of chs. 7-11, however, is not the number of the heavens but their own unique internal arrangement.[39] The *Asc. Isa.* is indubitably a Christian composition. The heavens are seven in number. Heaven Seven contains the three divine beings. Immediately above the earth is the firmament or sky. This is the location of 'Sammael and his hosts' (7.9). The prophet states that 'there was a great struggle in it, and the words of Satan, and they were envying one another'. Heaven One contains a throne in the middle surrounded to either side by angels. Heavens Two to Six locates an enthroned angel on the central throne. This arrangement is continued until Heaven Six. Of this heaven the prophet states that 'there were none of the left, nor a throne in the middle, but all (were) of one appearance, and their praise (was) equal' (8.16). The contents of the seventh heaven are progressively described but there is no doubt that their crucial feature is given by the conclusion of the work 11.32-33. At the high point of the mediator's ascension the prophet observes, 'And then I saw that he sat down at the right hand of that Great Glory, whose glory I told you I could not behold. And also I saw that the angel of the Holy Spirit sat on the left.'

The contention of this paper is that 11.32-33, cited here, supplies the rationale of the work's cosmology. The *Asc. Isa.* works with a rudimentary Trinitarian theology in which God is an enthroned divine being, as in earlier Jewish mysticism, and where he is surrounded on either side by the heavenly Christ and the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit's status is ambiguous in the *Asc. Isa.*.[40] He is often called an angel (as

---

[39]See Gruenwald, *Apocalyptic*, pp. 57-62. The idea is repeated in the early Merkavah-midrash *Re'uyot Yehzekel.*

[40]See E. Norelli, 'Sulla pneumatalogia dell'*Ascensione di Isaia*', in Pesce (ed.), *Isaia*, pp. 211-76.

here) but in 9.33-36 is worshipped in company with the other two beings. This must mean he is a divine being despite the angelic language used to describe him. The Beloved One is never said to be an angel although in the E text of 9.30 he is transformed to resemble an angel; apparently to help the prophet's vision of him. Despite this, the description of his descent and earthly appearance is modelled on angelophanic lines, as I have argued in my published doctoral dissertation.

It is not perhaps difficult to see how the arrangement of the three divine beings in 11.32-33 has come about. That God is an enthroned deity derives from the Hebrew Bible. The notion that the Son attends the right hand of God is familiar in New Testament writings, at least from Rom. 8.34 onwards.[41] It derives from the position accorded the king in the Royal Psalms, transferred in this sense from the earthly to the heavenly perspective. That the Spirit should be seated on the left is an inference from these two propositions.

Comparison with Rev. 4-5, however inviting, must be made on the level of mystical imagination and not of the form of the ideas alone.[42] Even though the two passages were composed around the same time, there is considerable variation between them. Thus the *Asc. Isa.* calls the Spirit an angel; Revelation refers to *seven* spirits of God (4.5). In Rev. 5.6 the Lamb (on the best exegesis of that verse) stands in the middle of the divine throne; the *Asc. Isa.* gives the Spirit and the Beloved One their own throne. This is a demonstration of the power of mystical

[41]This strand of Christology is examined by D.M. Hay, *Glory at the Right Hand* (Nashville, 1973); M. Gourgues, *Á la Droite de Dieu: Résurrection de Jésus et actualisation du Psaume 100.1 dans le Nouveau Testament* (Paris, 1978); and Christoph Markschies, '*Sessio ad dexteram*: Bemerkungen zu einem altchristlichen Bekenntnismotiv in der christologischen Diskussion der altchristlichen Theologen', in Marc Philonenko (ed.), *Le Trône de Dieu* (WUNT, 69; Tübingen, 1993), pp. 252-317.
[42]On which see C.C. Rowland, 'The Visions of God in Apocalyptic Literature', *JSS* 10 (1980), pp. 137-54.

imagination, not a significant problem for the study of early Christian theology. Comparison between the two passages does, however, identify the extremely ordered nature of the *Asc. Isa.* account when compared with the New Testament Apocalypse. The clear and steady progress of thought in the *Asc. Isa.* suggests that a doctrinal point is being made and that this is the real purpose of our apocalypse. The effect of the vision is to foreground the Beloved One's descent and ascension which occurs when Isaiah enters the seventh heaven and which later brings the apocalypse to its conclusion (11.32-33). This *may* be a mystical vision in the true sense; but the visionary report has been carefully constructed to draw attention to doctrinal issues in this way.

Asc. Isa. 10-11 is the earliest *explicit* account of Christ's descent from heaven to appear as Jesus of Nazareth and his return to whence he came. This parabola pattern has often been discerned in Phil. 2.6-11 but that passage poses considerable problems of exegesis.[43] The pattern is alluded to, but never explicitly described, in the Fourth Gospel (Jn 3.13; 6.62; 20.17).[44] Once again, the importance of the *Asc. Isa.* can hardly be under-estimated as a source for early Christian theology with a strong mystical dimension. The vision of the descending and ascending Beloved One is the real purpose of the second half of the *Asc. Isa.*.

There is an obvious question to be asked in respect of this material. This is why the author should bother to write a visionary report telling his readers apparently what they already knew. There is more than one potential answer to this question but I want to sketch out two related issues, in rising order of importance. The first is the point I made a moment ago, that the *Asc. Isa.* is the first Christian text to include this

[43]See Marcus Bockmuehl, '"The Form of God" (Phil. 2:6): Variations on a Theme of Jewish Mysticism', *JTS* 48 (1997), pp. 1-23.

[44]See J. A. Bühner, *Der Gesandte und sein Weg im vierten Evangelium* (WUNT, 2; Tübingen, 1977).

form of Christology explicitly. The status of the apocalypse as Christian *doctrine* must not be neglected. Part of the author's purpose is to attempt a formal statement of what Christians believed about Jesus and to do so in the authoritative form of apocalyptic revelation. Readers are thereby told that Jesus is the divine Beloved One whose appearance, death and resurrection were foretold even by Isaiah. This statement must be set alongside the emergence of the canonical Gospel tradition as a means of setting forth, in the context of a different literary genre, the abiding importance of Jesus together with an interpretation of his death and resurrection set against the backcloth of heavenly events. The inclusion of kerygmatic summaries in both halves of the *Asc. Isa.* indicates that preserving and elaborating the Jesus tradition formed part of the author's interest.

The more substantial answer to this question consists in examining the use to which this christological pattern is put in the *Asc. Isa.*. A significant clue is offered in 7.9 (cited above) and then again in chapter 10. 7.9 states that Sammael-Satan and his hosts were engaged in civil warfare in the firmament, implying that this behaviour pattern somehow determined events on earth as well. Chapter 10 makes the mediator disguise himself as an angel of successively lower rank as he descends through the lower heavens. By this ruse he passes undetected through the firmament, subsequently appearing on earth as Jesus. At the ascension the aerial powers apparently recognize the mediator for what he is and worship him (11.22ff.). There is a textual problem in 11.23-25 through which the mediator's appearance in the first heaven is apparently omitted from the text but it is a reasonable assumption that the response which our present text attributes to the firmament angels was attributed to them

in the original apocalypse.[45] In this case, we should have to assume that the firmament angels are judged but not yet destroyed through the Beloved's saving appearance. Here, I think, lies the actual purpose of chs. 6-11. The material reminds the readers that everything necessary for their salvation has already been secured but that their present life, under the tyranny of the powers who controlled the world, is lived out in tension between the past announcement of judgment and its final realization at the parousia when, according to 4.14-18, Beliar and his hosts would be removed to Gehenna and the messianic kingdom and resurrectional state be introduced.

The *Asc. Isa.*, then, is practical soteriology and not a dry textbook of Christian doctrine. It offers its readers grounds for hope by explaining something of their present existence against the mythological background of heavenly conflict in which the disciples of the Beloved One prove victorious. More than one reason for this writing can be produced on the social besides the doctrinal level. We must beware of the blanket conclusion that apocalyptic literature is always addressed to situations of conflict. The rise of apocalypticism in the relative prosperity of the third century BCE belies this conclusion. Having said this, chs. 1-5 offer evidence of at least a general sense of unease among the authors.[46] He is conscious of a distance from the time of the apostles, presenting the apostolic age (3.19-20) in the same glowing terms he uses for the appearance of Jesus himself (3.13-18). This suggests a sense of eschatological weariness which we know from other writings (notably 2 Pet. 3.9; *1 Clem.* 23) was a feature of second and third generation Christianity as the original eschatological urgency proved to be ill-

[45]See Bauckham, 'The Ascension of Isaiah', pp. 374-80; Knight, *Disciples*, pp. 264-67.

[46]See my *Disciples*, Chapter 3.

founded. In particular, he regrets the demise of prophecy in his own generation (3.21-31) and, whatever is meant by this form of mythology, is prepared to countenance significant wrongdoing from the Roman administration in which the demon Beliar upgrades his assault by descending from the firmament to enter the arena in the person of Nero. All of this suggests a growing sense of unease in early second century Christianity as the hopes of the movement were re-examined and reinterpreted in the light of the new situation.

Both the careful delineation of the author's position in respect of other groups (chs. 3-4) and the carefully-articulated Christology of chs. 6-11, I suggest, are clues to the meaning of the *Asc. Isa.*. Chs. 1-5 outlines the problem of increasing Christian alienation in the world which the original hopes of the Christians had held would be transformed when the original disciples of Jesus were still alive. 4.14-18 prescribes the ultimate remedy by insisting that the parousia hope was not in vain and that the mediator would return from heaven to deal with the evil powers as promised. Chs. 6-11, in company with the deutero-Pauline literature, offer a retrospective view of the life of Jesus as the event whereby the evil powers had already been condemned, even if their final destruction is a yet-to-be-realized event. This provides hope in the face of the alienation described by chs. 1-5 so that the assurance of hope in the *Asc. Isa.* is a double-edged one. The Beloved One has acted already and he will act again. In the past he condemned the evil powers by catching them unawares and by bringing knowledge of the true God to humankind. In the future he will return from the seventh heaven to remove the evil powers and provide the longed-for resurrectional existence that was the climax of the Christians' hopes.

The *Asc. Isa.* is thus powerful doctrine indeed. Its significance is that it stands of the meeting-point of first and second-century Christianity and

interprets the former in such a way that caters for the needs of the latter. The original hopes of the Christians are preserved but people are shown that a decisive salvific intervention has occurred already. Apocalypticism is the chosen vehicle of this announcement. The apocalypse form was selected because of its powerful claim to authority. The mysticism of the second half reinforces this sense of authority by making Isaiah an eyewitness (albeit a visionary eyewitness) of the original events concerning Jesus. In particular, the arrangement of the lower heavens demonstrates in visual form that the structure and order of the universe cannot be understood apart from the Christian revelation, in which it is said that the resurrection destiny of the faithful is none other than to share the life of the seventh heaven themselves (4.17).[47]

IV

Now to the question of to what extent meditation on scripture has helped to shape the form of mysticism that we find in the *Asc. Isa.*.

The first thing to say here is that this question cannot be considered apart from the question of what the Jesus traditions have contributed to the development of this apocalypse. If I can put it like this, the author was aware of more than one existing strand on which he drew. If anything, it is the Jesus traditions and not the Hebrew Bible as such that exercised the greater influence. This is because the author insists that the past history of Jesus is just as important salvifically as his promised but future return to earth. We saw that the use of these "kerygmatic summaries" in the *Asc. Isa.* must be considered, in purpose but not in

[47]Further important work remains to be done on this aspect of the *Asc. Isa.* eschatology

genre, with the appearance of the canonical Gospels. Both are ways of preserving and interpreting the traditions about Jesus for a new generation of Christians when new conditions apply than when Jesus himself had lived and preached.

Comparison between the Jesus traditions in the *Asc. Isa.*, and between material internal and external to the apocalypse, shows that these summaries were more flexible in form than for instance Martin Dibelius allowed.[48] I have argued this case in greater length in my paper on Mary also published in this volume of SBL papers. The author himself evidently felt free to make his own insertions and adaptations. This is particularly obvious in the description of Mary's *virginitas in partu* for which the *Asc. Isa.* is apparently our earliest witness. It is also obvious, I think, in the strange description of the resurrection in *Asc. Isa.* 3.16-17.[49]

This approach to the kerygmatic summaries, together with what we have seen about our author's distinctively Christian cosmology, provides a model to approach the use of scripture in the *Asc. Isa.*. There is an initial presumption in favour of the conclusion that the author's use of scripture is likely to be subtle rather than slavish. In what follows I want to examine the possible use of scripture in chs. 6-11 and then return to examine chs. 1-5 from the same perspective.

The critical question to ask in respect of chs. 6-11 is whether Isa. 6 has to any extent influenced the author at this point. As another Cambridge scholar has observed,[50] it is remarkably difficult to find anything approaching a doctrine of the Trinity in the Hebrew Bible. Isa. 6.1-4 - the vision of the Lord attended by the seraphim - is the only likely

---

[48]*From Tradition to Gospel* (London, 1934).

[49]On which see E. Norelli, 'La resurrezione di Gesù nell'*Ascensione di Isaia*', *CrSt* 1 (1980), pp. 315-66.

[50]G.C. Stead, 'The Origins of the Doctrine of the Trinity, I', *Theology* 77 (1974), pp. 508-17.

analogy. This of itself casts doubt on whether the Hebrew Bible as such has extensively resourced the vision of *Asc. Isa.* 6-11. Yet the question of possible Isaianic influence must be posed in formal terms, if only because of our text's pseudonymous attribution to Isaiah.

Origen has often been felt to supply convincing evidence here. According to *De Princ.* 1.3.4 he learned from a Jewish (?) source that the two seraphim of Isa. 6.1-4 were Christ and the Spirit.[51] It is possible that Origen, like other second and third century writers, may have known the *Asc. Isa.* but it is a different question whether the author of the apocalypse himself made this interpretation of scripture. The chronology of *Asc. Isa.* 6.1 ('in the twentieth year of the reign of Hezekiah') is different from that of Isa. 6.1 ('in the year that King Uzziah died'). This is not necessarily problematic given our author's inventive mind, but it is at least a note of caution. Nor does Isa. 6 attribute to the prophet a mystical ascension as such.

Having said this, it is probably easier to attribute some influence by Isa. 6 on the *Asc. Isa.* than to deny that this possibly occurred. The basic picture of God attended by subordinate beings is at least approximately similar to the structure of the seventh heaven in the *Asc. Isa.*, which we have seen is reflected in the lower heavens as well. If this was the original source for the vision we must acknowledge, both that the author of the *Asc. Isa.* was conceivably the first to understand Isa. 6 in this way, and that the influence of the biblical passage has been by no means unmediated by the intervening apocalyptic tradition.

---

[51]'My Hebrew Master used to say that the two six-winged seraphim in Isaiah who cry to one another and say, holy, holy, holy is the Lord of hosts, were the only-begotten Son of God and the Holy Spirit' (Butterworth's translation).

The notion of mystical ascension to the presence of God is familiar in the apocalyptic tradition from *1 En.* 12-14 onwards.[52] What distinguishes the *Asc. Isa.* in this respect is not the fact that a mystical ascension is included but that the Jewish mystical tradition has been reworked in a distinctively Christian direction by the implied Trinitarianism of the cosmology. The signs are that this a self-conscious reworking of the apocalyptic tradition. The retention of the seven-storied cosmology and pseudonymity against the trend of what was happening in other Christian apocalypses suggests a desire to retain Jewish modes of thought but deliberately and significantly to rework them. The possibility is that Isa. 6 suggested this view but we should remember that Trinitarianism and implied Trinitarianism was a feature of first century Christianity before the writing of the *Asc. Isa.*.[53] It is not necessary to suppose that Isa. 6 was the only or even a necessary source for the creation of this cosmology given the prior Christian evidence.

So to chs. 1-5. In 3.8-10 there is an interesting comment by Belchira that Isaiah has claimed to see more than Moses the prophet by announcing his visions of God.[54] Isa. 6 is alluded to in this context and the prohibition of Exod. 33.20b as well ('There is no man who can see the LORD and live', 3.9). This is unfair to Moses because Exod. 24 of course grants Moses and others a vision of God in the context of the Sinai theophany. The intention is obviously to devalue Moses. In the context of the *Asc. Isa.*, where Isaiah is introduced as a prophet of Jesus, this looks like a dispute between Judaism and Christianity which has the possibility of mystical vision as its overt façade. It is implied that

[52]It was studied classically by Wilhelm Bousset, *Der Himmelsreise der Seele* (repr. Darmstadt, 1971). A more recent study is Alan F. Segal, 'Heavenly Ascent in Hellenistic Judaism, Early Christianity and Their Environments', *ANRW* II.23.2, pp. 1333-94.

[53]See Arthur W. Wainwright, *The Trinity in the New Testament* (London, 1962).

[54]See my *Disciples*, pp. 190-93.

Judaism disallows mysticism whereas Christianity encourages it. On another level this comes close to the statement (to be developed in Justin Martyr's *Dialogue with Trypho*) that Judaism has no authentic knowledge of God whereas Christianity does.

The issue is thus one of *what kind* of mystical knowledge is possible, set within the context of whether mystical knowledge of God is possible at all. Here, Isa. 6 is preferred to Exod. 33.20b in an intriguing contrast between the law and the prophets. Although the vision that follows does not offer the same explicit cosmology which we saw brings the *Asc. Isa.* potentially closest to Isa. 6, the dispute turns precisely on scriptural interpretation: specifically, on the question of which scriptures are to be preferred in an obvious "canon-within-a-canon" whose effect is the devaluation of the Torah so far as its religious significance is concerned. The person who appeals to Moses on this occasion is Belchira whom the *Asc. Isa.* describes as a false prophet (2.12; 3.1). His citation of Moses offers a definite evaluation of Moses. It is only one step from this to the Gnostic assertion that "it was *not* as Moses said". This position is not reached in the *Asc. Isa.* but the apocalypse nevertheless illustrates the kind of religious polemic out of which such a view was constructed.[55]

V

The final stage is to ask what the *Asc. Isa.* reveals about the development of early Christian mysticism in the broader sense. It is difficult to comment generically on this issue because of the apocalyptic form of the *Asc. Isa.*. Other mystical texts, especially the classical Christian texts, are not apocalypses. This makes a side-by-side comparison difficult.

[55]As I observe in *Disciples*, pp. 176-82.

Nevertheless, one should not ignore the importance of this apocalypse so far as the later mystical tradition is concerned. The *Asc. Isa.* very possibly was known to Origen and perhaps to other writers as well. Its importance lies in the fact that, quite literally, it offers a distinctively Christian world-view. Not just the theology but also the cosmology is constructed with Christian principles in mind. This makes it far more distinctively Christian than, say, the theophany of Rev. 4-5 for which a Jewish original has often been discerned.

We must ask what this development of a distinctively Christian mysticism means. It is interesting that this predates the development of a systematic Christian theology (first done in Origen's *De Principiis*) by at least a century. This is a strong indication that, whatever the actual mystical experience that lies behind the text, mysticism is by no means unimportant so far as the development of theology is concerned. Whilst it is difficult to trace out a precise relationship between the two, the *Asc. Isa.* shows an intriguing interplay between mysticism and theology in terms of the development of this Christian perspective.

The most striking feature of the *Asc. Isa.* perspective is its comprehensiveness. This is found not just in its Christology but in its attempt to relate the readers' present position to a detailed account of reality conceived in strongly mythological terms. The *Asc. Isa.* demonstrates that early stage of Christian mysticism which had got beyond the desire for an isolated vision and had just begun to yield the demand for a broad panorama. This would be continued in later work, though there mysticism often if not generally bows before the dominance of theology. The *Asc. Isa.* continues to repay careful study in this and a variety of topics of relevance to the study of the early Christian world.

Ex 33 on God's Face: A Lesson from the Enochic Tradition

Andrei A. Orlov
Marquette University

Ex 33:18-33 depicts Moses who asks the Lord to show him His glory. Instead the Lord agrees to proclaim his name before Moses, telling him that it is impossible for a human being to see God's face.

In recent scholarship this prominent motif of Moses' story has become a stumbling block for students of the Hebrew Bible. Currently most biblical scholars agree upon apparent difficulties in the literary-critical analysis of this section of Exodus. M. Noth comments that "a literary-critical analysis of Ex 33 is probably impossible."[1] B. Childs confirms that there are several fundamental exegetical problems with Ex 33:18-33. "The most difficult one is to determine the role of this passage in its larger context."[2]

The internal logic of the passage about the Divine face is also problematic. The whole narrative about God's פנים in Ex 33 is quite perplexing. Ex 33:11 informs a reader that God would speak to Moses face to face (פנים אל־פנים) as a man speaks with his friend. A few verses later, in 33:14-15, God promises Moses that His face will go (פני ילכו) with him. In the context of these promises and early testimonies about "face-to-face" relationships, it comes as a surprise that in 33:20 the Lord suddenly rejects Moses' request to see His face (לא תוכל לראת את־פני).

It is clear that the anthropomorphic tradition about the divine face in Ex 33 has a fragmentary character. [3] It may well contain polemics between

---

[1] M. Noth, *History of Pentateuchal Traditions* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1972) 31, n. 114.

[2] B.S. Childs, *The Book of Exodus. A Critical, Theological Commentary* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1974) 595.

[3] A.F. Campbell and M.A. O'Brien placed Ex 33 within the nonsource texts. Cf. A.F. Campbell and M.A. O'Brien, *Sources of the Pentateuch: Texts, Introductions, Annotations* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993) 263.

the anthropomorphic position of J source and the Deuteronomic theology of the divine name: instead of seeing God's face the Lord offers Moses to hear His name.[4] M. Noth observes that Ex 33 can be seen as "a conglomeration of secondary accretions."[5]

The apparent difficulties one encounters in clarifying the concept of the divine face within the context of the known sources of the Pentateuch call for an investigation of the broader biblical and extrabiblical traditions where this motif could be possibly preserved in its extended form. Implicitly linked to the "original" Exodus motif, these later "interpretations" might provide some additional insights which may help us better understand the fragmentary tradition preserved in chapter 33. This article will focus on one of the possible echoes of Ex 33--the theophanic tradition of the divine countenance preserved in the corpus of the Enochic writings.

---

[4] The Old Testament materials reveal complicated polemics for and against anthropomorphic understanding of God. Scholars agree that the anthropomorphic imagery of the Hebrew Bible was "crystallized" in the tradition, known to us as the Priestly source. Moshe Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972) 191. Theological developments of the Priestly tradition demonstrate that the anthropomorphism of the Priestly source is intimately connected with the place of Divine habitation. In this tradition, "in which the Divinity is personalized and depicted in the most tangible corporeal similitudes," God, who possesses a human form, has a need for a house or tabernacle. (Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School,* 191). Weinfeld rightly observes that this anthropomorphic position was not entirely an invention of the Priestly source, but derives from early sacral conceptions found in the early sourses. In these traditions the Deity was sitting in his house ensconced between the two cherubim, and at his feet rests the ark, his footstool. In spite of the active promulgation of anthropomorphic concepts in some Old Testament materials, like J, P and Ezekelian sources, the Hebrew Bible also contains polemics against God's corporeality. Scholars note the sharp opposition of the book of Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic school to early anthropomorphic traditions. In their opinion, Deuteronomic school "first initiated the polemic against the anthropomorphic and corporeal conceptions of the Deity and that it was afterwards taken up by the prophets Jeremiah and Deutero-Isaiah." (Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School,* 198). In contrast to the anthropomorphic imagery of J and P, the Deuteronomic school promulgates anticorporeal theology of "divine name" with its conception of sanctuary (tabernacle) as the place where only God's name dwells. On Deuteronomic antianthropomorphism cf.: T.N.D. Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth. Studies in the Shem and Kavod Theologies* (Coniectanea Biblica. Old Testament Series, 18; Lund: Wallin & Dalholm, 1982); Moshe Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, 191-209.

[5] M. Noth, *History of Pentateuchal Traditions* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1972) 31, n. 114.

The Face of the Lord

The *Slavonic Apocalypse of Enoch*, a Jewish text, apparently written in the first century CE,[6] contains two striking theophanic descriptions

[6] On *2 Enoch* see: I. D. Amusin, *Kumranskaja Obshchina* (Moscow: Nauka, 1983); F. Andersen, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]) 1. 91-221; G. N. Bonwetsch, *Das slavische Henochbuch* (AGWG, 1; Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1896); G. N. Bonwetsch, *Die Bücher der Geheimnisse Henochs: Das sogenannte slavische Henochbuch* (TU, 44; Leipzig, 1922); C. Böttrich, *Weltweisheit, Menschheitsethik, Urkult: Studien zum slavischen Henochbuch* (WUNT, R.2, 50; Tübingen: Mohr, 1992); C. Böttrich, *Das slavische Henochbuch* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlaghaus, 1995); C. Böttrich, *Adam als Mikrokosmos: eine Untersuchung zum slavischen Henochbuch* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1995); R. H. Charles, and W. R. Morfill, *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1896); J. H. Charlesworth, "The SNTS Pseudepigrapha Seminars at Tübingen and Paris on the Books of Enoch (Seminar Report)," *NTS* 25 (1979) 315-23; J. H. Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the New Testament. Prolegomena for the Study of Christian Origins* (SNTSMS, 54; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985); J. Collins, "The Genre of Apocalypse in Hellenistic Judaism," *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East* (ed. D. Hellholm; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1983); L. Cry, "Quelques noms d'anges ou d'êtres mystérieux en II Hénoch," *RB* 49 (1940) 195-203; U. Fischer, *Eschatologie und Jenseitserwartung im hellenistischen Diasporajudentum* (BZNW, 44; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1978); A. S. D. Maunder, "The Date and Place of Writing of the *Slavonic Book of Enoch*," *The Observatory* 41 (1918) 309-316; N. Meshcherskij, "Sledy pamjatnikov Kumrana v staroslavjanskoj i drevnerusskoj literature (K izucheniju slavjanskih versij knigi Enoha)," *Trudy otdela drevnerusskoj literatury* 19 (1963) 130-47; N. Meshcherskij, "K voprosu ob istochnikah slavjanskoj knigi Enoha," *Kratkie soobshchenija Instituta narodov Azii* 86 (1965) 72-8; J. T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976); H. Odeberg, *3 Enoch or the Hebrew Book of Enoch* (New York: KTAV, 1973); A. Orlov, "Titles of Enoch-Metatron in *2 Enoch*," *JSP* 18 (1998) 71-86; A. Orlov, "Melchizedek Legend of 2 (Slavonic) Enoch," *JSP* 31 (2000) 23-38; S. Pines, "Eschatology and the Concept of Time in the *Slavonic Book of Enoch*," *Types of Redemption* (ed. R. J. Zwi Werblowsky; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1970) 72-87; A. Rubinstein, "Observations on the *Slavonic Book of Enoch*," *JJS* 15 (1962) 1-21; P. Sacchi, *Jewish Apocalyptic and its History* (JSPSS, 20; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996); A. De Santos Otero, "Libro de los secretos de Henoc (Henoc eslavo)," *Apócrifos del AT IV* (ed. A. Díez Macho; Madrid, 1984) 147-202; G. Scholem, *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism and Talmudic tradition* (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1965); M. I. Sokolov, "Materialy i zametki po starinnoj slavjanskoj literature. Vypusk tretij, VII. Slavjanskaja Kniga Enoha Pravednogo. Teksty, latinskij perevod i izsledovanie. Posmertnyj trud avtora prigotovil k izdaniju M. Speranskij," *Chtenija v Obshchestve Istorii i Drevnostej Rossijskih (COIDR)* 4 (1910); M. Stone, *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (2 vols; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984) 2.406-8; A.

involving the motif of the divine face. The first one occurs in *2 Enoch* 22[7] which portrays Enoch's encounter with the Lord in the celestial realm. Enoch recounts:

> I saw the view of the face of the Lord, like iron made burning hot in a fire and brought out, and it emits sparks and is incandescent. Thus even I saw the face of the Lord. But the face of the Lord is not to be talked about, it is so very marvelous and supremely awesome and supremely frightening. And who am I to give an account of the incomprehensible being of the Lord, and of his face, so extremely strange and indescribable? And how many are his commands, and his multiple voice, and the Lord's throne, supremely great and not made by hands, and the choir stalls all around him, the cherubim and the seraphim armies, and their never-silent singing. Who can give an account of his beautiful appearance, never changing and indescribable, and his great glory? And I fell down flat and did obeisance to the Lord (*2 Enoch* 22:1-4, the longer recension).[8]

In chapter 39 Enoch reports this theophanic experience to his sons during his short visit to the earth, adding some new details. Although both portrayals demonstrate a number of terminological affinities, the second

---

Vaillant, *Le livre des secrets d'Hénoch: Texte slave et traduction française* (Paris: Institut d'Etudes Slaves, 1952; repr. Paris, 1976); J. VanderKam, *Enoch: A Man for All Generations* (Columbia: University of South Carolina, 1995).

[7] In this paper I have used Andersen's English translation of *2 Enoch* and follow his division in chapters. Cf. F. Andersen, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]) 1.102-221.

[8] Andersen, 136. The shorter recension of the Slavonic text gives a less elaborated description of the Lord's appearance: "I saw the Lord. His face was strong and very glorious and terrible. Who (is) to give an account of the dimensions of the being of the face of the Lord, strong and very terrible? Or his many-eyed ones and many-voiced ones, and the supremely great throne of the Lord, not made by hands, or those who are in attendance all around him, the cherubim and the seraphim armies, or how unvarying and indescribable and never-silent and glorious is his service. and I fell down flat and did obeisance to the Lord." Cf. Andersen, 137. Andersen observes that the absence of the comparison with hot iron in the MSS of shorter recension shows the embarrassment of scribes over this attempt to describe the Lord's appearance. Andersen, 137.

account explicitly connects the divine face with the Lord's anthropomorphic "extend." The following account is drawn from the shorter recension of *2 Enoch*:

> And now, my children it is not from my lips that I am reporting to you today, but from the lips of the Lord who has sent me to you. As for you, you hear my words, out of my lips, a human being created equal to yourselves; but I have heard the words from the fiery lips of the Lord. For the lips of the Lord are a furnace of fire, and his words are the fiery flames which come out. You, my children, you see my face, a human being created just like yourselves; I am one who has seen the face of the Lord,[9] like iron made burning hot by a fire, emitting sparks. For you gaze into my eyes, a human being created just like yourselves; but I have gazed into the eyes of the Lord, like the rays of the shining sun[10] and terrifying the eyes of a human being. You, my children, you see my right hand beckoning you, a human being created identical to yourselves; but I have seen the right hand of the Lord, beckoning me, who fills heaven. You see the extend of my body, the same as your own; but I have seen the extend of the Lord,[11] without measure and without analogy, who has no end... To stand before the King, who will be able to endure the infinite terror or of the great burning (*2 Enoch* 39:3-8).[12]

---

[9] lice Gospodne. Cf. A. Vaillant, *Le livre des secrets d'Henoch: Texte slave et traduction française* (Paris: Institut D'Etudes Slaves, 1952) 38. Unless noted otherwise, this and the subsequent Slavonic citations are drawn from Vaillant's edition.

[10] The important detail of this description is solar symbolism, which plays an important role in *2 Enoch*. The text often uses solar metaphors in various descriptions of angelic beings; e.g., in chapter 1 where Enoch meets two angels with "faces like the shining sun." Later, during his heavenly journey, Enoch sees "a group of seven angels, brilliant and very glorious with faces more radiant than the radiance of the sun." The images of fire and light are often involved in these solar descriptions of angelic hosts. The text pictures "... glorious and shining and many-eyed stations of the Lord's servants... and of the ranks of powerful fireborn heavenly armies." Andersen rightly observes that "fire and light are fundamental elements in the physics of *2 Enoch*." Andersen, 104.

[11] obʾjatie Gospodne. Vaillant, 38.

[12] MSS of the longer recension do not demonstrate substantial differences with this description.

In both theophanic descriptions the notion of the Lord's "face" plays a crucial role. It is not a coincidence that in both of them the "face" is associated with light and fire. In biblical theophanies smoke and fire often serve as a divine envelope that protects mortals from the sight of the divine form. Radiant luminosity emitted by the Deity fulfills the same function, signaling the danger of the direct vision of the divine form. Luminosity also represents the screen which protects the Deity from the necessity of revealing its true form. Scholars note that in some theophanic traditions God's form remains hidden behind His light.[13] The hidden כבוד is revealed through this light, which serves as the luminous screen, "the face" of this anthropomorphic extend. *2 Enoch's* theophanies which use the metaphors of light and fire may well be connected with such traditions where the divine "extend" is hidden behind the incandescent "face," which covers and protects the sovereignty of the Lord.

In *2 Enoch* 39:3-6 the "face" is closely associated with the divine "extend" and seems to be understood not simply as a part of the Lord's body (His face) but as a radiant *façade* of His anthropomorphic "form."[14] This identification between the Lord's face and the Lord's "form" is reinforced by an additional parallel pair in which Enoch's face is identified with Enoch's "form":

> You, my children, you see my face, a human being created just like yourselves; but I am one who has seen the face of the Lord, like iron made burning hot by a fire, emitting sparks... And you see the form of my body, the same as your own: but I have seen the form (extend) of the Lord, without measure and without analogy, who has no end (*2 Enoch* 39:3-6).

---

[13] April De Conick's pioneering research shows that in Enochic traditions God's form remains hidden behind his light. A. De Conick, *Seek to See Him: Ascent and Vision Mysticism in the Gospel of Thomas* (SVC, 33; Leiden: Brill, 1996) 104-5.

[14] G. Scholem's research on the presence of שיעור קומה tradition in *2 Enoch* 39 helps to clarify the "anthropomorphic" character of the Lord's "extend" in *2 Enoch*. Cf. his lecture "The Age of *Shiur Qomah* Speculation and a Passage in Origen" in G. Scholem, *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism, and Talmudic Tradition* (New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary, 1965).

The association between the divine face and divine form in *2 Enoch* 39:3-6 alludes to the biblical tradition from Ex 33:18-23 where the divine *panim* is mentioned in connection with his glorious divine form - God's *Kavod*:[15]

> Then Moses said, "Now show me your glory (כבדך)." And the Lord said, "I will cause all my goodness to pass in front of you, and I will proclaim my name, the Lord, in your presence... but," he said, "you cannot see my face (פני), for no one may see me and live."

It is clear that in the biblical passage the impossibility of seeing the Lord's face is understood not simply as the impossibility of seeing the particular part of the Lord but rather as the impossibility of seeing the complete range of His glorious "body." The logic of the whole passage, which employs such terms as God's "face" and God's "back," suggests that the term *panim* refers to the "forefront" of the divine extend. The imagery of the divine face found in Psalms[16] also favors this motif of the identity between the Lord's face and His anthropomorphic "form." For example, in Ps 17:15 the Lord's face is closely associated with His form or likeness (תמונה):

---

[15] The term כבוד can be translated as "substance," "body," "mass," "power," "might," "honor," "glory," "splendor." In its meaning as "glory" כבוד usually refers to God, his sanctuary, his city, or sacred paraphernalia. The Priestly tradition uses the term in connection with God's appearances in the tabernacle. P and Ezekiel describe כבוד as a blazing fire surrounded by radiance and a great cloud. M. Weinfeld, "כבוד" *TDOT*, 7. 22-38.

[16] On the Face of God in Psalms see: S. Balentine, *The Hidden God: The Hiding Face of God in the Old Testament* (Oxford; Oxford University Press, 1983) 49-65; W. Eichrodt, *Theology of the Old Testament* (2 vols; Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1967) 2.35-9; M. Fishbane, "Form and Reformulation of the Biblical Priestly Blessing," *JAOS* 103 (1983) 115-21; J. Reindl, *Das Angesicht Gottes im Sprachgebrauch des Alten Testaments* (ETS, 25; Leipzig: St. Benno, 1970) 236-7; M. Smith, "Seeing God in the Psalms: The Background to the Beatific Vision in the Hebrew Bible," *CBQ* 50 (1988) 171-83.

As for me, I shall behold your face (פניך)[17] in righteousness;
when I awake, I shall be satisfied with beholding your form
(תמונתך).[18]

It is evident that all three accounts, Ex 33:18-23, Ps 17:15 and *2 Enoch* 39:3-6, represent a single tradition in which the divine face serves as the *terminus technicus* for the designation of the Lord's anthropomorphic extend.

Apparently, all these accounts deal with the specific anthropomorphic manifestation known as God's *Kavod*.[19] The possibility of such identification is already hinted in Ex 33 where Moses who asks the Lord to show him His *Kavod* receives the answer that it is impossible for him to see the Lord's "face." The correlation of the divine face with "likeness" (תמונה) in Ps 17:15 can be also an allusion to the *Kavod*, which in Ez 1:28 is described as "the likeness of the glory of the Lord (דמות כבוד־ יהוה)."

There is another early Mosaic account which correlates the Sinai encounter with *Kavod*. This important tradition, found in the fragments of the drama "Exodus" written by Ezekiel the Dramatist, depicts Moses' experience at Sinai as the vision of God's anthropomorphic *Kavod*:[20]

I dreamt there was on the summit of mount Sinai
A certain great throne (θρόνον μέγαν) extending up to heaven's cleft,
On which there sat a certain noble man
Wearing a crown and holding a great scepter in his left hand.[21]

---

[17] Note also that poetic rhyme תמונתך/פניך further reinforces the correspondence between the face and the form of God in this passage.

[18] Although the passage uses a different terminology, namely, the term תמונה, the identification still has a strong anthropomorphic flavor. The term תמונה can be translated as form, likeness, semblance, or representation,

[19] Contra W. Eichrodt who insists that the *panim* had no connection with the *Kavod*. He argues that the two concepts derive from different roots, and were never combined with one another. Cf. W. Eichrodt, *Theology of the Old Testament*, 2.38.

[20] P.W. van der Horst observes that Ezekiel the Dramatist's vision of God in human shape seated on the throne is based on the first chapter of the biblical Ezekiel. Cf. P.W. van der Horst, "Moses' Throne Vision in Ezekiel the Dramatist," *JJS* 34 (1983) 24.

[21] C.R. Holladay, *Fragments From Hellenistic Jewish Authors* (4 vols.; Texts and Translations, 30; Pseudepigrapha Series, 12; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989) 2.363.

W. Meeks observes that this passage may be safely taken as a witness to traditions of the second century BCE, since it was quoted by Alexander Polyhistor who lived around 80-40 BCE. [22] It means that by the second century BCE Moses' association with *Kavod*, hinted in Ex 33, was already surrounded by an elaborate imagery, in which the Throne of Glory played a crucial role.

2 Enoch 22 further strengthens this theophanic pattern in which the encounter with the Divine Face is understood as the vision of God's throne. The text gives several points of evidence which prove that the anthropomorphic "extend," identified with the divine face, indeed represents His *Kavod*. The theophany of the divine countenance in the Slavonic apocalypse is surrounded by a peculiar *Kavod* imagery, which plays a prominent role in the Ezekelian account. The following parallels are noteworthy:

1. The theophany of the divine face took place in the highest of the heaven.[23] The highest of the heaven is a traditional place of God's Throne, the abode of His Glory. A later account found in *3 Enoch* tells that "In ʿArabot there are 660 thousands of myriads of glorious angels, hewn out of flaming fire, standing opposite the throne of glory. The glorious King covers his face, otherwise the heaven of ʿArabot would burst open in the middle, because of the glorious brilliance..."[24]

2. The theophanic description in *2 Enoch* 22 refers to "His many-eyed ones,"[25] alluding to האופנים, the Wheels, the special class of the Angels of the Throne who in Ezekiel 1:18 are described as the angelic beings "full of eyes (מלאת עינים)."

3. A reference to the "many-voiced ones" probably alludes to choirs of angelic hosts surrounding the Throne.

---

[22] W. Meeks, *The Prophet-King. Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology* (SNT, 14; Leiden: Brill, 1967) 149. Cf. also C.R. Holladay, *Fragments From Hellenistic Jewish Authors*, 2.308-12.

[23] Andersen, 136-37.

[24] Alexander, 305.

[25] Andersen, 137.

4. Finally, in *2 Enoch* 22 there is a direct reference to the throne of the Lord, which occupies a central place in the theophanic description, and is pictured as "supremely great and not made by hands."[26] The Throne of Glory is surrounded by the armies of the angelic hosts, cherubim and the seraphim, with "their never-silent singing."[27]

Moses' Face

Previous research shows that the correlation between God's face and his luminous form (his glorious *Kavod*) was already implicitly articulated in Ex 33. The Enochic theophany found in *2 Enoch* further strengthens this connection, giving a theophanic description of the Lord's face as his terrifying "extend" which emits light and fire.

The important detail of these two accounts is the "danger motif"--the warnings about the peril of seeing the Deity. Both of them contain specific references to the harmful effect this theophanic experience has on the mortals who dare to behold the Divine face. In Ex 33:20 the Lord warns Moses about the danger of seeing His face: "You cannot see my face, for no one may see me and live." The motif of peril is further reinforced by the Lord's instructions in 33:22 where he commands Moses to hide himself into a cleft in the rock and promises to protect the prophet with His hands.

The "danger motif" also looms large in *2 Enoch*. In *2 Enoch* 39, immediately after his description of the theophany of the face, Enoch gives warning to his children about the danger of this theophanic experience:

> Frightening and dangerous it is to stand before the face of an earthly king, terrifying and very dangerous it is, because the will of the king is death and the will of the king is life. How much more terrifying [and dangerous] it is to stand before the face of the King of earthly kings and of the heavenly armies, [the regulator of the living and of the dead]. Who can endure that endless misery? (*2 Enoch* 39:8).[28]

---

[26] Andersen, 137.
[27] Andersen, 137.
[28] Andersen, 164.

The "danger motif" in Ex 33 and in *2 Enoch* implicitly suggests that both of these accounts support the idea that the human being actually can see the face of God. M. Weinfeld argues that the warning about the danger of seeing the Deity usually affirms the possibility of such an experience. In his observations about antianthropomorphic tendencies of Deuteronomy, Deutero-Isaiah and Jeremiah, he points to the fact that these texts demonstrate a lack of usual warnings about the danger of seeing the Deity found in pre-Deuteronomic books. He concludes that it happened because the Deuteronomic school cannot conceive of the possibility of seeing the Deity.[29]

The possibility of theophany hinted in *2 Enoch* and Ex 33 might suggest that Exodus' account implicitly asserts that Moses could see the divine form.[30] The distinctive details in the depiction of Moses' face in Ex 34 may further support this conclusion. But before we explore this motif, let us again return to the narrative of *2 Enoch*.

From this Enochic account we learn that the vision of the Divine face had dramatic consequences for Enoch's appearance. His body endures radical changes as it becomes covered with the divine light. The important detail here is that the luminous transformation of Enoch takes place in front of the radiant "face" of the Lord. In 22:6 Enoch reports that he was lifted up and brought before the Lord's face by the archangel Michael. The Lord decides to appoint Enoch as שר הפנים, the Prince of the Divine Presence: "Let Enoch come up and stand in front of my face forever."[31] Further, the Lord commanded the archangel Michael to remove Enoch from earthly clothing, anoint him with delightful oil, and put him into the clothes of the Lord's glory (22:8-9).[32] The text describes the actions of Michael, who anoints Enoch with delightful oil and clothes him. The symbolism of light permeates the whole scene; the oil emanates the rays of the glittering sun

---

[29] M. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, 207.

[30] Another "Mosaic" account attributed to J, openly articulates this possibility: "With him (Moses) I speak mouth to mouth (פה אל־ פה), clearly and not in riddles; he sees the form (ותמנת) of the Lord (Num 12:8). "

[31] Andersen, 139.

[32] Andersen, 139.

"greater than the greatest light."[33] At the end of this procedure, Enoch "had become like one of the glorious ones, [34] and there was no observable difference."[35]

In Enoch's radiant metamorphosis before the Divine face an important detail can be found which links Enoch's transformation with Moses' account in Exodus. In *2 Enoch* 37 we learn about the unusual procedure performed on Enoch's face on the final stage of his encounter with the Lord. The text informs that the Lord called one of his senior angels to chill the face of Enoch. The text says that the angel appeared frigid; he was as white as snow, and his hands were as cold as ice. The text further depicts the angel chilling Enoch's face, who could not endure the terror of the Lord, "just as it is not possible to endure the fire of a stove and the heat of the sun..."[36] Right after this "chilling procedure," the Lord informs Enoch that if his face had not been chilled here, no human being would be able to look at his face.[37] This reference to the radiance of Enoch's face after his encounter with the Lord is an apparent parallel to the incandescent face of Moses[38] after the Sinai experience in Ex 34.

References to the shining countenance of a visionary found in *2 Enoch* return us again to the Exodus story. Ex 34:29-35 portrays Moses[39]

---

[33] Andersen, 138. Jarl Fossum provides a number of allusions to the theme of "shining oil" in *2 Enoch*. Cf. J. Fossum, *The Image of the Invisible God: Essays on the Influence of Jewish Mysticism on early Christology* (NTOA, 30; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1995) 84.

[34] Andersen observes that "this motif (Enoch's transformation into the glorious angel) seems to have been influenced by the legend of Moses, whose shining face was a reflection of God's magnificent glory." Andersen, 139.

[35] Andersen, 139.

[36] Andersen, 160.

[37] Andersen, 160.

[38] About possible Mesopotamian provenance of this motif cf.: M. Haran, "The Shining of Moses's Face: A Case Study in Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Iconography [Ex 34:29-35; Ps 69:32; Hab 3:4]," *In the Shelter of Elyon* (JSOP, 31; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1984) 159-73; W. Propp, "The Skin of Moses' Face - Transfigured or Disfigured?" *CBQ* 49 (1987) 375-386.

[39] On Moses' traditions see: R. Bloch, "Die Gestalt des Moses in der rabbinischen Tradition," in *Moses in Schrift und Überlieferung* (Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1963) 95-171; G.W. Coats, *Moses: Heroic Man, Man of God* (JSOTSup, 57; Sheffield: Sheffield Press, 1988); S. Hafemann, "Moses in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha: A Survey," *JSP* 7 (1990) 79-104; W.A. Meeks, *The Prophet-King: Moses Traditions and the*

after his encounter with the Lord. The passage says that "when Moses came down from Mount Sinai ... he was not aware that his face was radiant, because he had spoken with the Lord." The strange logic of the last sentence, which points to an ambiguous connection between the speech of the Lord as a cause of Moses' glowing face can be explained by the Enochic theophanic account where "the lips of the Lord are a furnace of fire, and his words are the fiery flames which come out."[40]

These parallels between the later Enochic text and the biblical Mosaic account are not inappropriate. As will be demonstrated later, the connection between the Enochic and Mosaic accounts has quite ancient roots. Evidence of the early link between Enoch and Moses includes the already mentioned drama of Ezekiel the Dramatist, which was apparently written during the second century BCE.[41]

W. Meeks[42] and P. W. van der Horst[43] observe that the depiction of Moses in the drama of Ezekiel the Dramatist bears some similarities to Enoch's figure in the Enochic traditions. They note a number of remarkable allusions in the drama to Enochic motifs and themes. These allusions include the following points:

1. Moses's account is depicted as his dream vision in a fashion similar to Enoch's dreams in *1 Enoch* and *2 Enoch*.

2. In the text Moses is "elevated" by God, who gives him the throne, the royal diadem,[44] and the scepter.

3. God appointed Moses as an eschatological judge of humankind able to see "things present, past and future"[45]--the traditional role of Enoch found already in early Enochic booklets.

Johannine Christology (NovTSup, 14; Leiden: Brill, 1967); R. Polzin, *Moses and the Deuteronomist: A Literary Study of the Deuteronomic History* (New York: Seabury, 1980).

[40] Andersen, 163.

[41] C.R. Holladay, *Fragments From Hellenistic Jewish Authors*, 2.312.

[42] Meeks, 147.

[43] P.W. van der Horst, 21-29.

[44] The crowning of Enoch-Metatron became a prominent leitmotif in later Enochic tradition, especially, in *3 Enoch*. W. Meeks observes that the enthronement of Enoch-Metatron in *3 Enoch* "betrays interesting similarities to Moses' traditions." Meeks, 207. See also van der Horst who observes that "like Moses, Enoch is assigned a cosmic and divine function that involves the wearing of regalia." P.W. van der Horst, 25.

4. Moses is an "expert" in "a variety of things," including cosmological and astronomical information:

> I beheld the entire circled earth
> Both beneath the earth and above the heaven,
> And a host of stars fell on its knees before me;
> I numbered them all,
> They passed before me like a squadron of soldiers.[46]

This preoccupation with various meteorological, astronomical and eschatological "secrets" are typical duties of the elevated Enoch which are here transferred to Moses apparently for the first time.[47]

5. Finally, the motif of assigning the seat/throne is a peculiar feature of Enochic literature where Enoch/Metatron is depicted as a scribe[48] who has a seat (later a throne) in the heavenly realm. [49] *2 Enoch* 23:4 pictures the angel Vereveil who commands Enoch to sit down.[50] "You sit down; write everything...." And Enoch said, "And I sat down for a second period of 30

---

[45] C.R. Holladay, *Fragments From Hellenistic Jewish Authors*, 2.367.

[46] C.R. Holladay, *Fragments From Hellenistic Jewish Authors*, 2.365.

[47] R.H. Charles argued that this transition of Enoch's function to Moses first was made in *2 Apoc. Bar.*, where God shows Moses "the measures of the fire, also the depths of the abyss, and the weight of the winds, and the number of the drops of rain." *APOT*, 2.514.

[48] In *1 Enoch* 74:2 Enoch writes the instructions of the angel Uriel regarding the secrets of heavenly bodies and their movements. M. Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments* (2 vols; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978) 2.173. Qumran Enochic fragments (4QEnGiants 14; 4QEn 92:1) picture Enoch as "the scribe of distinction" ספר פרשא. Cf. J.T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976) 261-62 and 305. In the Book of Jubilees Enoch is attested as "the first of mankind... who learned (the art of) writing, instruction, and wisdom and who wrote down in a book the signs of the sky..." J.C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees* (2 vols.; CSCO 510-11, Scriptores Aethiopici 87-88; Leuven: Peeters, 1989) 2.25-6.

[49] P.W. van der Horst also stresses unique features of Moses' enthronement in Ezekiel the Dramatist, which depart from Enochic and Merkabah imagery. He observes that "In Moses' vision, there is only one throne, God's. And Moses is requested to be seated on it, not at God's side but all alone. God leaves his throne. This scene is unique in early Jewish literature and certainly implies a deification of Moses." van der Horst, 25.

[50] Sjadi. Vaillant, 26.

days and 30 nights, and I wrote accurately" (23:6).[51] The theme of Enoch/Metatron's seat became a prominent motif in Rabbinic tradition, where according to *b. Hag.* 15a, the privilege of "sitting" beside God was accorded solely to Metatron by virtue of his character as a "scribe": for he was granted permission as a scribe to sit and write down the merits of Israel.

The tacit links between Enoch and Moses found in the early Enochic theophanic tradition later become openly articulated in Rabbinic literature. In this later enunciation, as in the initial encounters, the familiar theophanic motif from the Exodus story again plays a crucial role. From *3 Enoch* we learn that it is Enoch-Metatron, whose face once was transformed into fire,[52] who is now the one[53] who tells Moses about his shining visage: "At once Metatron, Prince of the Divine Presence, said to Moses, Son of Amram, fear not! for already God favors you. Ask what you will with confidence and boldness, for light shines from the skin of your face from one end of the world to the other."[54]

Conclusion

The foregoing research has examined some extrabiblical materials related to the motif of the divine face found in Ex 33. The investigation has shown that the evolution of this motif in later traditions is dependent on an Enoch-Moses *gestalt*, which plays a prominent role in Enochic theophanies of the divine face. This research, however, would not be complete without mentioning another important source which is also related to the traditions

---

[51] Andersen, 141.

[52] *3 Enoch* 15:1 depicts this radiant metamorphosis of Enoch-Metatron: "When the Holy One, blessed be he, took me to serve the throne of glory, the wheels of the chariot and all the needs of the Schekinah, at once my flesh turned to flame, my sinews to blazing fire, my bones to juniper coals, my eyelashes to lightning flashes, my eyeballs to fiery torches, the hairs of my head to hot flames, all my limbs to wings of burning fire, and the substance of my body to blazing fire." Alexander, 267.

[53] Scholars observes that in Merkabah tradition Metatron is explicitly identified with the Face of God. Cf.: A. De Conick, "Heavenly Temple Traditions and Valentinian Worship: A Case for First-Century Christology in the Second Century," *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism* (eds. C.C. Newman, J.R. Davila, G.S. Lewis; JSJ, 63; Brill: Leiden, 1999) 329; D.J. Halperin, *The Faces of the Chariot* (TSAJ, 16; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1988) 424-425.

[54] *3 Enoch* 15B:5. Cf. Alexander, 304.

about the patriarch Enoch and the prophet Moses. This source is the priestly editor of the Pentateuch.

Much attention has been devoted to the peculiar interest of the priestly editor in anthropomorphic descriptions of the Deity.[55] M. Weinfeld and T. Mettinger show that the Priestly source played a crucial role in promoting biblical theophanic traditions. In these traditions Moses' figure has occupied an important place.[56]

The Priestly source also was the locus where the enigmatic figure of Enoch for the first time appeared in its esoteric complexity,[57] indicating that the priestly author was cognizant of the broader Enochic developments. Some scholars believe that perhaps it is "to some such developed Enoch tradition the author of Genesis is making reference when he emits his cryptic statements about Enoch in Genesis 5:22-24."[58]

Students of the Enochic tradition are now aware that the priestly editor was familiar with the peculiar Mesopotamian traditions[59] which constituted a conceptual framework for Enoch's figure.[60]

---

[55] On the issue of Old Testament's anthropomorphism see: J. Barr, "Theophany and Anthropomorphism in the Old Testament," *VT Suppl.* 7 (1960) 31-8; J. Hempel, "Die Grenzen des Anthropomorphismus Jahwes im Alten Testament," *ZAW* 57 (1939) 75-85; F. Michaeli, *Dieu à l'image de l'homme: Étude de la notion anthropomorphique de Dieu dans l'Ancient Testament* (Neuchâtel: Delachaux, 1950); E. Jacob, *Théologie de l'Ancient Testament* (Neuchâtel: Delachaux, 1955) 30ff.; M.C.A. Korpel, *A Rift in the Clouds. Ugaritic and Hebrew Descriptions of the Divine* (Münster: UGARIT-Verlag, 1990) 87-590; T.N.D. Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth. Studies in the Shem and Kavod Theologies* (Coniectanea Biblica. Old Testament Series, 18; Lund: Wallin & Dalholm, 1982).

[56] T.N.D. Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth. Studies in the Shem and Kavod Theologies*; Moshe Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, 191-209.

[57] The traditions about Enoch are different in J and P. For the discussion of the differences cf. J. VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition* (The Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series, 16; Washington: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984) 23-51; H.S. Kvanvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic: the Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and of the Son of Man* (WMANT, 61; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988) 40-53.

[58] M. Stone, "Enoch, Aramaic Levi and Sectarian Origin" *JSJ* 19 (1988) 162.

[59] On the Mesopotamian traditions behind the Enoch's figure cf.: H. Zimmern, "Urkönige und Uroffenbarung" in Eberhard Schrader, *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament* (2 vols., Berlin: Reuther & Reichard, 1902-03) 2.530-43; H. L. Jansen, *Die Henochgestalt: Eine vergleichende religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung* (Norske

In these Mesopotamian traditions a prototype of Enoch, Enmeduranki, is portrayed as a "translated" figure, the one "who sat in the presence (ma-har)[61] of Shamash and Adad, the divine adjudicators."[62] This reference to Enmeduranki's access to the glorious presence/face of the solar deity[63] indicates that the later role of Enoch as *Sar ha-Panim*, the Prince of

---

Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo II. Hist.-Filos. Klasse, 1; Oslo: Dybwad, 1939); P. Grelot, "La légende d'Hénoch dans les apocryphes et dans la Bible: origine et signification", *RSR* 46 (1958) 5-26, 181-210; J. VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition*; H.S. Kvanvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic: the Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and of the Son of Man*.

[60] Important witnesses to these traditions include the various versions of the so-called Sumerian antediluvian King List, the materials which dated from 1500 B.C.E. to 165 B.C.E. The List demonstrates a number of similarities with the genealogy of Genesis 5. One of its interesting details is that Mesopotamian kings, as well as patriarchs from Genesis' account, had extraordinarily long reigns, ranging from 3,600 to 72,000 years. A second important parallel is that two versions of the List give ten kings, the last of whom is designated as the hero of the flood. It demonstrates a close resemblance to the role of Noah who occupies the tenth place in the list of Genesis 5. J. Vanderkam notes that "in the literature on Genesis 5 there is a well established tradition which holds that P modeled his pre-flood genealogy on a Mesopotamian list of antediluvian kings, the so-called Sumerian King List." Vanderkam, 26. An important character in the Sumerian King list is Enmeduranki (Enmeduranna), the king of Sippar, the city of the sun-god Shamash. In three copies of the List he occupies the seventh place, which in Genesis' genealogy belongs to Enoch. Moreover, in other Mesopotamian sources Enmeduranki appears in many roles and situations which demonstrate remarkable similarities with Enoch's story. J. Vanderkam's research shows that the priestly author was aware of these broader Mesopotamian traditions which served as a prototype for Enoch's figure, whose symbolic age of 365 years reflects the link between the patriarch and the solar cult of Shamash. Vanderkam concludes that "the biblical image of Enoch is based on the Mesopotamian picture of Enmeduranki." Vanderkam, 50.

[61] In another text about Enmeduranki the same motif of the divine presence can be found: "...he may approach the presence (ma-har) of Shamash and Adad..." W.G. Lambert, "Enmeduranki and Related Matters", *JCS* 21 (1967) 132.

[62] W.G. Lambert, 128 and 130.

[63] On Mesopotamian solar symbolism and its influence on biblical concepts, including the concept of the divine *panim* cf. A. Caquot, "La Divinite Solaire Ougaritique," *Syria* 36 (1959) 90-101; B. Janowski, *Rettungsgewissheit und Epiphanie des Heils* (WMANT, 59; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1989) 1.105ff.; B. Langer, *Gott als "Licht" in Israel und Mesopotamien: Eine Studie zu Jes. 60, 1-3.19f* (Österreichische biblische Studien, 7; Klosterneuburg: Verlag Österreichisches Katholische Bibelwerk, 1989); W. Smelik, "On Mystical Transformation of the Righteous into Light in Judaism," *JSJ* 26 (1995) 122-44; M. Smith, *The Early History of God: Yahweh and the other Deities in Ancient Israel* (San Francisco, 1990); M. Smith, "The Near Eastern Background of Solar Language for Yahweh," *JBL* 109/1 (1990) 29-39; H. P.

the Divine Presence or the Prince of the Face,[64] was already present in its rudimentary form in the Mesopotamian traditions known to the priestly editor.

In the light of these observations the idea that Ex 33 could actually contain the original Enochic motif is not inappropriate. The implicit link between the Enochic account of the divine Presence and the Mosaic account of the divine *panim* may well reflect the conceptual world of the priestly editor, who often "has expressed his acquaintance with a fairly broad range of Mesopotamian traditions in remarkably few words."[65]

Stähli, *Solare Elemente im Jahweglauben des Alten Testaments* (OBO 66; Freiburg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1985).

[64] Some scholars argue that the biblical concept of the divine face also has Mesopotamian roots. M. Fishbane and M. Smith show that the language of the Lord's shining face was part of Israel's inheritance from ancient Near Eastern culture. Cf. M. Fishbane, "Form and Reformulation of the Biblical Priestly Blessing," *JAOS* 103 (1983) 115-21; M. Smith, "'Seeing God' in the Psalms: The Background to the Beatific Vision in the Hebrew Bible," *CBQ* 50 (1988) 171-83. Fishbane stresses that "the various and abundant use of such imagery in ancient Near Eastern literature, particularly from Mesopotamia where it recurs in a wide range of genres, suggests that ancient Israel absorbed such imagery as part and parcel of its rich patrimony." M. Fishbane, 116.

[65] Vanderkam, 50.

Lowth's Isaiah Commentary and Romanticism

Gary Stansell

St. Olaf College

Introduction

Robert Lowth, born in the cathedral close, Winchester (1710), is best known to modern biblical scholars as the eighteenth-century critic who (re)"discovered" and also greatly refined the theory of "parallelismus membrorum"[1] represented in Hebrew poetry. At least some discussion of Lowth's understanding of the structure of Hebrew poetry is found in standard "Introductions to the Old Testament"; lengthier presentations are typical in scholarly works on biblical poetry (e.g. Kugel 1981; Schökel 1988; Petersen and Richards 1992). A poet himself,[2] Lowth was appointed to the Professorship of Poetry at Oxford (1741; resigned 1750), later becoming Bishop of St. David's and of Oxford (1766) and then of London (1777). It was during his tenure as Professor at Oxford that he presented his well-known and highly acclaimed[3] "De Sacra poesi Hebraeorum praelectiones academia Oxonii habitae a Robert Lowth; Subjicitor metricae Harianae brevis confutatio et oratio Crewiana," a series of thirty-four lectures (1741-50) in Latin. The lectures were first published in Latin as a book by Clarendon Press in 1753. The *Praelectiones* were then published in Germany in Latin (vol. 1 1758; vol. 261), with notes by J. D. Michaelis

---

[1]Smend (1991:12) notes that according to F. Rehkopf (ZNW 71 1980:46ff.), the phrase "parallelismus membrorum" does not have its origin in Lowth.

[2]See B. Hepworth, "Lowth's Poetry," in his Robert Lowth, 1978:63-76.

[3]See Kugel's (1981: 274-86) critical remarks.

(only selections of the book were ever translated into German[4]). Selections in English, published in the *Christian Magazine* (1766-77), preceded the entire book's translation into English in 1787, translated by G. Gregory, with notes by J. D. Michaelis and Gregory, as *Lectures in the Sacred Poetry of the Hebrews* (2 vols.; henceforth cited as *Praelectiones*, in accordance with scholarly custom).

Considerably less well-known and inaccessible to twentieth-century biblical scholars is Bishop Lowth's translation of and commentary on the book of Isaiah (*Isaiah: A New Translation, with a Preliminary Dissertation, and Notes, Critical, Philological, and Explanatory [2 vols., 1778]*).[5] Unlike

---

[4]There is some confusion among historians about the history of the translation of Lowth's *Praelectiones* into German. R. Smend (1991:60-61) suggests that this stems from the fact that the first two editions of *RGG* understand Rosenmüller's edition to have been a translation into German; in fact, it merely reproduced the original Latin. Hence R. Marrs's (89) statement, "a German translation appeared in 1773," is slightly misleading and needs modification (as does Hayes and Prussner 1985:51, "The work had greater influence in Germany where it had been translated in 1770 [sic!], than in its earlier Latin dress in England"; but this must refer to the "Selections" made from *Praelectiones* translated and published by a C. B. Schmidt in Danzig. According to Smend, "In Wahrheit hat es die 'Praelectiones' deutsch nie gegeben, sieht man von einem etwas obskuren Auszug ab, den 1793 ein Herr Schmidt in Danzig herausgegeben hat [Robert Lowth, *Vorlesungen über die Heilige Dichtkunst der Hebräer im Auszug von Carl Benjamin Schmidt* (Danzig) 1793], den aber nicht einmal die Göttinger Universitätsbibliothek besitzt and den sie auch in keiner anderen westdeutschen Bibliothek nachweisen kann." The greater influence in Germany, therefore, is not because there was an accessible German translation before there was an English translation for British readers.

[5]For this essay, the microfiche copy available to me is a 1794 reprint, *Isaiah: A New Translation by the late Robert Lowth, D.D., Bishop of London, to which has been added A*

Lowth's *Praelectiones,* the references to and citations of his *Isaiah* are hardly to be found in modern biblical criticism, although his translation and commentary "were widely distributed and reprinted in various editions for almost a century" (Marrs: 89). A quick perusal of a few standard scholarly works on Isaiah would seem to indicate that Lowth's *Isaiah* long ago outlived its interest and usefulness for contemporary questions. For example, no references in the bibliography or introduction are found in the more recent Isaiah commentaries by Duhm, Wildberger, Clements, Hayes and Irwin; however, Gray (ICC), although he lists both the *Praelectiones* and the *Isaiah*, discusses only the former under the section "Poetical Forms" (lix-lxviii). It might appear that what Lowth originally had to say about the book of Isaiah for more recent scholarship is now either passé, or long since assumed into our "modern" understanding of prophetic poetry. Nevertheless, contemporary Isaian scholarship, I hope to suggest, may profit by re-visiting Lowth and his *Isaiah.* The succeeding paragraphs seek to provide a selective, indeed rather provisional, analysis and evaluation of Lowth's translation and his commentary. It was enormously important in its time--also outside of England--and rapidly became a standard work (Prickett: 105). The translation itself is said to have been "at once acclaimed as a landmark in biblical translation" (Roston: 135). Let us ask, then, What were the marks of distinction of the volume, and what remains of enduring value? More specifically, and for the sake of delimiting the investigation, we propose to discuss Lowth's *Isaiah* under four categories: I. Isaiah as Prophet and Poet; II. Lowth's Translation,

---

plain, concise and particular Explanation of each Chapter. Extracted chiefly from "A Treatise on the Prophet," By John Smith, D.D. (Albany: Charles R. and George Webster, 1794).

Dissertation and Notes; III. The "Sublime" in Isaiah's Prophecy; IV. The Influence of Lowth's *Isaiah.*

I. Isaiah as Prophet and Poet

1. Lowth indicates his interest in the book of Isaiah already in his *Praelectiones*, Lecture XXI: "Isaiah, the first of the prophets, both in order and dignity, abound in such transcendent excellences, that he may be said to properly afford the most perfect model of prophetic poetry" (233). In Lecture II Lowth had already introduced the subject of prophetic poetry, observing that prophecy had always possessed meter; that style needs to reflect the images that "surpass all human conception" by taking the form of predictions of the future. In Lecture XIX he emphasizes that prophecy as poetry also "consists chiefly in a certain equality, resemblance, or parallelism, between the members of each period, so that in two lines (or members of the same period) things for the most part shall answer to things, and words to words, as if fitted to each other by a kind of rule or measure" (221). As Lowth makes clear, his intention is literary and critical, not theological.

As the student of poetry in the Hebrew Bible knows, the association of prophecy and poetry has become enormously problematic since the time of Lowth. Are the prophets to be understood as poets? As Kugel has indicated in a recent volume he edited (*Poetry and Prophecy* 1990:1), the link between the two has a long and complex history: some scholars have argued for the disjuncture between prophet and poet; others identify them as the same, or consider the poet to be "prophetlike." The issue is not merely an old or an insignificant debate, for, as Alan Cooper (43) has pointed out, "Lowth's equation of prophecy with poetry . . . is no mere

intellectual relic." Cooper refers to Heschel's concern that this is an "attempt to substitute aesthetics for theology"; and to Freedman's argument that the issue is intimately bound up with the problem of inspiration and therefore also of authority and revelation. These issues suggest that, in approaching Lowth's *Isaiah,* a brief discussion about "prophecy and poetry" will provide a starting point and some historical context and necessary orientation.

2. The question of the relationship of prophet to poet and vice-versa, to be sure, long preceded Bishop Lowth (on what follows, cf. especially Kugel 1990:1-25; also Roston passim). Dante, Milton, and Blake, among others, considered themselves to be gifted with prophetic, inspired speech. But the path of course traces itself on back to ancient Greece and biblical Israel. Kugel calls attention to the distinction made in Ezekiel (33:30-33) between a "singer of beautiful songs" and a prophet. And in early Judaism, it was offensive to identify prophets with "mere poets" (Kugel 1990:13). However, Christianity, beginning with Jerome and extending to the Renaissance, the church's thinkers "did not tire of exalting the literary values of Scripture over classical (pagan) models," allowing for the poetic within prophecy. Lowth's view was that biblical prophecy was a form of poetry; indeed ". . . it is sufficiently evident, that the prophetic office had a most strict connexion with the poetic art. They [prophet and poet] had one common origin, one common author, the Holy Spirit" (*Praelectiones* vol. II:18, cited by Prickett: 107). The issue remained complex up to (and of course after) Bishop Lowth's time. The questions that perhaps best focus the issue relative to Lowth are, (1) "Did the prophets write in verse?" And (2) "How does one distinguish poetry from prose?" The identifying marks are parallel members and meter (as a system unrecoverable). But the feature of Hebrew poetry that possessed regularity was a parallelism of the

clauses. This means that "Isaiah and the Psalms obey the same prosodic rules" (Kugel 1990:24) and therefore prophecy as poetry is to be distinguished from prose.

But the poetry of the prophets ranks higher than other poetic writings in the Hebrew Bible. "The first rank I assign to the *prophetic*, or that species of poetry which is found to pervade the predictions of the prophets, as well those contained in the books properly called *prophetical*, as those which occasionally occur in other parts of the scriptures (*Praelectio*nes, 195). Indeed, prophetic poetry has a peculiar character, because it is "more ornamented, more splendid, and more florid than any other. It abounds more in imagery . . . abounds most in metaphors, allegories, comparisons, and even in copious and diffuse descriptions" (225-26).

Among the prophets, Isaiah stands above all the rest. According to Lowth, whose effusive language has a quaint ring to the modern ear

> [Isaiah] is at once elegant and sublime, forcible and ornamented; he unites energy and copiousness, and dignity with variety. In his sentiments there is uncommon elevation and majesty; in his imagery, the utmost propriety, elegance, diversity; in his language, uncommon beauty and energy; and, notwithstanding the obscurity of his subjects, a surprising degree of clearness and simplicity (*Praelectiones,* 233).

Lowth's breathless admiration--he seems to run out of hyperbolic vocabulary, having used "elegant" and "energy" twice in one sentence--for Isaiah prevents his readers from being surprised when he almost immediately puts Jeremiah and Ezekiel in their respective second and third place rankings. "Jeremiah, though deficient in neither elegance nor sublimity, must give place in both to Isaiah" (234-35; on the "sublime," see

below, part III). What of Ezekiel? The pre-Romantic and Romantic poets of the eighteenth-century considered Ezekiel to be the greatest of the "Oriental poets." Indeed, Robert Lowth's father, William (said to be a greater scholar than Robert), had written a commentary on Ezekiel and discussed the "sublimity" of Ezekiel (Hepworth: 16-17). Robert Lowth stood partly in agreement with his father when he commented, "Ezekiel is much inferior to Jeremiah in elegance; in sublimity he is not even excelled by Isaiah: but his sublimity is of a totally different kind" (235).[6]

3. Given Lowth's profound love for and appreciation of Isaiah's poetry, as is evident throughout the thirty-four *Praelectiones*, it is not entirely unexpected that, twenty-eight years (1778) after his final lecture on Hebrew Poetry, he would publish his translation of and commentary on the book of Isaiah, his second "Hauptwerk" (Smend 1991:58). Lowth's biographer, Brian Hepworth, suggests that the central place of *Isaiah* in his work was "not an afterthought but a return to central issues regarding the nature of Oriental poetry" (142). The scholarly world was prepared and expectant, and the book "rapidly became a standard work" (Prickett: 103). German scholars could welcome a German translation, beginning the next year (4 vols. 1779-81),[7] by the Göttinger Universitätsprediger Richerz and, just as Michaelis had added critical notes to the *Praelectiones*, so a

---

[6]To this a footnote has been added by the the translator, G. Gregory, who boldly yet apologetically disagrees with Lowth on the matter of Ezekiel's sublime quality: "So far from esteeming Ezekiel equal to Isaiah in sublimity, I am inclined rather to think, that he displays more art and luxuriance in amplifying and decorating his subject than is consistent with the poetical fervour, or, indeed, with true sublimity . . . [nor does Ezeliel's poetry] strike with admiration" (235-36).

[7]Jeaias, *neu Übersetzt nebst einer Einleitung und critischen philologician und erläuternden Anmerkungen aus dem Englischen: Mit Zusätzen und Anmerkungen, von J. B. Koppe.*

theologian at Göttingen, Johann Benjamin Koppe, did the same for *Isaiah.* Koppe's notes took on an importance of their own (see below, Part IV)

II. Lowth's Translation, Dissertation, and Notes

1. The Translation

A. If Isaiah is a poet, then his prophecies must be presented visually to the reader in verse form, as Lowth's "New Translation" of course did: each line or stichos of a given verse was printed in visually parallel form, but without indentation of the second line, as is found in most modern translations. A comparison of Lowth's *Isaiah* with the Authorized Version, which prints each verse as prose, with the verse number in the margin, suggests the visual impact to Lowth's original readership. To printed versification modern readers have long been accustomed; but it was a break-through in the eighteenth century. Isa 3:16 may serve as an example.

AV, Isa 3:16

16 Moreover the Lord saith, Because the daughters of Zion are haughty, and walk with stretched forth necks and wanton eyes, walking and mincing as they go, and make a tingling with their feet:

Lowth, 3:16

16 Moreover JEHOVAH hath said:
Because the daughters of Sion are haughty;
And walk displaying the neck,

And falsely setting off their eyes with paint;
Mincing their steps as they go,
And with their feet lightly tripping along:

RSV, 3:16 (note the slight refinement in attempting to display the parallel members)

16 The Lord said:
Because the daughters of Zion are
haughty
and walk with outstretched necks,
glancing wantonly with their eyes,
mincing along as they go,
tinkling with their feet;

Lowth went even further than printing parallel clauses; in order to distinguish for his readers the prose, introductory (and "historical") character of superscriptions or titles (e.g. Isa. 1:1; 2:1; 13:1), Lowth had them printed in capital letters,[8] and not versified.

Lowth, 2:1-2

THE WORD, WHICH WAS REVEALED TO ISAIAH, THE SON OF AMOTS, CONCERNING JUDAH AND JERUSALEM.

2 IT shall come to pass . . . .

[8]In the copy of *Isaiah* available to me (Albany, 1794), the superscriptions are italicized rather than capitalized.

The critical significance, indeed, the revolutionary character, of this move was not missed on some of Lowth's contemporaries, and provoked their criticism. For example, Thomas Howes ("Doubts Concerning the Translation and Notes of the Bishop of London to Isaiah . . . ," 1783), who wanted to extend Lowth's work, castigated him for "falling back on received assumptions . . . " (Tannenbaum: 28). For Howes, Lowth had not sufficiently explained how and that there is coherence and art in the arrangement of the various genres and prophecies in the book of Isaiah. According to Lowth, the book, while it excels "in all graces of method, order, connexion, and arrangement . . . , particular predictions . . . as they are now connected, without any marks of discrimination [and] judicious arrangement, on some occasions creates insuperable difficulties (*Praelectiones,* 85-86, quoted in Tannenbaum: 27). To Howes, a work that is said to lack something in its arrangement and internal coherence, whether the source was inspired agitation or the hand of the redactor, could not have authenticity and aesthetic integrity (Prickett 113-14). Hence, when Lowth set off Isa 1:1; 2:1 etc. by capital letters from the prophecies they introduced, this was for Howes an instance of asserting the presence of editorial, and therefore, inartistic, unaesthetic dispositions of the poetic units.

But there are prose verses in Isaiah which are not titles provided by the redactor, according to Lowth's translation. For Lowth, narrative material which provides the frame for dialogue is to be set as prose, while the dialogue itself has the marks of parallelism. For example, Lowth presents Isa. 6:1-3aα as prose, and the words of the seraphim in v. 3aβb as poetry. Thus,

. . . . And they cried alternately, and said: [6:3aα -- prose]
Holy, holy, holy, JEHOVAH God of Hosts! [6:3aβ -- poetry]
The whole earth is filled with his glory. [6:3b -- poetry]

Modern readers expect as much, so this is hardly startling. The critical problem is, as recent discussions point out, how does the translator determine what is prose and what is poetry? It is broadly assumed that Lowth provided the answer to this: parallelism is the chief characteristic of poetry. Would that things were so simple![9] A glance at the translation of Isaiah in the *TANAKH* (JPS) illustrates that they are not. In its translation, 6:3aα is not a part of the narrative in 6:1-2 but is set as poetry and thus belongs to the whole of v. 3:

And one would call to the other,
"Holy, holy, holy!
The Lord of Hosts!
His presence fills all the earth!"

The TANAKH leaves about two extra lines between 6:2 and 6:3, making the difference between the prose and poetry even more visually distinct, unlike Lowth (cf. RSV), who has extra space only between titles and what follows (1:1. etc.). A break in the text by means of extra line-spaces was not a part of Lowth's program (but see below on Koppe's German edition of *Isaiah).*

---

[9]Kugel rightly reminds us that parallelism was neither the subject of his *Praelectiones* nor "even a central point" (1981: 282). It is not the purpose of this essay to deal critically with *parallelismus membrorum*.. See the discussion offered by Prof. Tull's essay on Lowth in *SBL 2000 Seminar Papers.*

B. Lowth's theory of translation, notes Prickett (111), "could have been the Preface of the *Good News Bible*," although there are immediately apparent differences.

> The first and principal business of the Translator is to give us the plain literal and grammatical sense of his author; the obvious meaning of his words, phrases, and sentences, and to express them in the language into which he translates, as far as may be, in equivalent words, phrases, and sentences. . . . For whatever senses are to be included in the Prophet's words, Spiritual, Mystical, Allegorical, Analogical, or the like, they must all entirely depend on the Literal Sense (*Isaiah* I [1807[5]], lxvii, cited by Prickett: 111-12).

According to Roston, Lowth's theory of translation is "to a certain extent, implicit in his exposition of parallelism; for if the poetic character of Hebrew poetry depended not upon metre but upon the balance of ideas and phrases, the translator was better advised to retain this specific poetic character in a literal version than to compensate for the supposed loss of metre by translating into heroic couplets" (133). For Lowth, therefore, his translation of Isaiah intended to re-present the Hebraic parallelism, without any attention to reproducing any sort of regular meter. This permitted a word order, usually, quite in keeping with the Hebrew.

C. A first comparison of Lowth's translation with the AV reveals nothing particularly striking or extensive, but verbal changes are occasionally radical (this paragraph is largely dependent on Hepworth: 148). For example in Isaiah 1:7, the AV reads, "Your country is desolate, your cities are burned with fire . . . and it is desolate, *as overthrown by strangers*." But Lowth translates the italicized words "as if destroyed by an

inundation," claiming that the AV is a misreading. In 1:8 where the AV has "*cottage* in a vineyard", Lowth translates "shed." Broadly speaking, his entire translation conveys a "sense of exclusive, exotic appeal to the senses," and where his father, William, who used the AV, is theological in his commentary, Robert is anthropological; where "William is spiritual, Robert is materialistic" (Hepworth: 148). His interest in ancient customs, especially cosmetics, is reflected in Lowth's translation of 3:16. The AV reads:

> Because the daughter of Zion are haughty, and walk with stretched forth necks and *wanton eyes* . . . .

Lowth provides a striking expansion for the italicized words with the translation:

> Because the daughters of Sion are haughty;
> And walk displaying the neck,
> and falsely setting off their eyes with paint . . . .

Lowth's "Notes" to this verse indicate he had read widely about oriental customs and beauty practices, for he cites in detail books at his disposal which describe methods of applying eye-cosmetics in Baghdad and Turkey. Indeed, Lowth may have not been the philologian that Michaelis had wished for (in his first review of *Praelectiones*, Michaelis had sniffed that Lowth had no knowledge of other Semitic languages, in particular Arabic; Smend 1991:46), but he had a passionate interest in the culture and customs of the ancient Near East. According to Hepworth's biography, "'Daily Life in the East' is the scarcely submerged theme of these four hundred pages or so of

notes; and the topics include not only medicine, horticulture, dyes, cosmetics, and poetic theory, but agriculture, architecture, anthropology, military strategy, town planning, and viniculture" (153).

2. The Dissertation

The volume commences with a "Dissertation" which presents Lowth's project for the appreciation and translation of Isaiah's poetry.[10] The "Dissertation" hardly presents any new insights on Isaiah beyond the *Praelectiones*. But it does offer a unified presentation of comments that were scattered throughout the lectures, with added detail and analysis of parallelism in various, key passages in Isaiah. Hepworth (142) claims that one now needs to read the *Praelectiones* in the light of Lowth's "Dissertation" in his *Isaiah.* But the reverse is equally true. In any case, here it must suffice to summarize a few significant points concerning Lowth's understanding of Isaiah from the "Dissertation."

A. In comparison with his *Praelectiones*, Lowth gives almost double the examples, and with greater detail, of "synonymous parallelism." To his elaboration on the kinds of parallelism, he adds a discussion of "the distinction of Hebrew Verses into Longer and Shorter."

---

[10]In some but not all later editions, for example in the 1794 reprint from Albany (Charles and George Webster), the "Dissertation" has been dropped in favor of only an introductory "Short Account of Isaiah." Brief and disappointing, it is only five pages in length (pp. 3-7). These few paragraphs, plus the "Summary Explanations" added by John Smith (D.D., "Minister of the Gospel at Campbleton, Scotland"), which precede each chapter, provide only a minimum amount of guiding commentary for the reader.

B. He illustrates how parallelism, and the interdependence of form and meaning, aids the translator (and the interpreter) in better understanding obscurities in the text. For example, the VA translates IA 28:14 with

> Wherefore hear the word of the Lord, yea scornful men, *that rule* this people which is in Jerusalem.

Lowth, taking marshal in this instance to mean "to speak in parables" because of its parallel with "scornful men," translates as a correction:

> Wherefore hear ye the word of the Jehovah, ye scoffers;
> Ye of this people in Jerusalem, who utter sententious speeches.[11]

C. In that a quarter of a century had elapsed since his lectures, Lowth can now cite extensively the scholarship that had developed. For example, he takes into account the work done on manuscripts done by Charles Godfrey Woide (1725-90) and especially Benjamin Kennicott (1718-83), whom Lowth had encouraged and inspired.

3. The Notes

The original edition and many, but not all, subsequent editions of Lowth's *Isaiah* included a second volume of Notes, longer than the first

---

[11]The RSV and the NRSV follow the AV. TANAKH (JPS) gives an alternative reading in the notes similar to Lowth, "composers of taunt-songs for that people." But some follow Lowth: Fohrer (56) translates "ihr Sprüchemacher," while Wildberger (1063-64) has "ihr Sprücheklopfer," and supports his translation by reference to the verse's parallelism and its larger literary context.

volume of translated text and the introductory "Dissertation" combined. In Hepworth's judgment, the Notes are "an indispensable guide to the nature of the English sense of 'the Oriental' in the last half of the eighteenth century" (151) and suggest something of the importance of lore from the East for the pre-Romantics and Romantics. The Notes reflect the wide reading and learning of their author, who cites numerous natural histories and travelers' diaries, besides many contemporary biblical scholars. His vision of and approach to the book of Isaiah was profoundly shaped by the knowledge of the East being made available during his time.

III. The Sublime in Isaiah's Prophecy

1. Lowth on the Sublime

In Lecture I of his *Praelectiones,* Lowth had clearly announced "the Sublime" as a "dominant concern" (Abrams: 77) in his study of the language and style of Hebrew poetry. He praised the Hebrew Poetry,

> . . . than which the human mind can conceive nothing more elevated, more beautiful, or more elegant; in which the almost ineffable sublimity of the subject is fully equaled by the energy of the language, and the dignity of the style. And it is worthy observation, that as some of these writings exceed in antiquity the fabulous ages of Greece, in sublimity they are superior to the most finished productions of that polished people.

Later, in Lectures XIV-XVII, he takes up this theme in detail and with considerable energy, announcing at the beginning of this section, "I proceed to treat the Sublimity of the sacred poets." The sublime, he argues, is implied in the word mashal, for in its sense of "to take or lift up a

parable," a lofty meaning is implied; indeed, a mashal expresses "power, or supreme authority, and when applied to style, seems particularly to intimate something eminent or energetic, excellent or important." Balaam's "parable" (Num 23:7-10) serves as Lowth's first example for presenting his understanding of the sublime in prophetic poetry. Taking "the sublime" in the "most extensive sense," Lowth notes the following characteristics: (1) "magnificent display of imagery and diction"; (2) "force of composition . . . which strikes and overpowers the mind, (3) which excites the passions, and (4) which expresses ideas at once with perspicuity and elevation," (5) while the language itself may be "plain or ornamented, refined or familiar." In a word, the sublime is "that force of composition, whatever it be, which strikes and overpowers the mind." Prickett emphasizes that for Lowth, the sublime is about "naturalness as against artificiality, the irregular as against the regular, the mysterious as against the comprehensible." (108).

Hardly would such notions have struck Lowth's audience as foreign. Indeed, "all students of the eighteenth-century are familiar with the fact that during that period there was throughout Europe an immense amount of speculation on aesthetic questions" (Monk: 1). Here Lowth clearly situates himself within the tradition of Longinus[12]: with his use of the words "sublime" or "sublimity, " he says, he "cop[ies] Longinus, the most

[12]Longinus's treatise Peri Hupsous is traditionally rendered in English as "On the Sublime" (for a recent translation, *On the Sublime*, Ed. D. A. Russell). Longinus's date is debated (3rd cent. C.E.? more recently an uneasy agreement dates it 1st cent. C.E.; Macksey: 471). On Longinus and the sublime, see Monk (10-28), who notes that Longinus "did not invent the conception of the sublime. . . . The notion that rhetoric is an instrument of emotional transport was dominant among the ancients, and the grand style the purpose of which was to move, was an integral part of their rhetoric (11).

accomplished author on his subject, whether we consider his precepts or his example" (Lecture XIV: 155). But in the eighteenth- century, other significant ideas about the sublime were being expressed, especially by Burnet, Addison, and Burke. The sublime for them, Hepworth summarizes, was "an experience of as it were, self-induced, non-rational and subjective spatial elevation" and it was closely connected to the "twin concepts central to Romanticism of 'creative imagination' and the poet as prophet" (Hepworth: 6). Lowth's understanding of prophetic poetry frequently gets expressed in the spatial images dear to Romanticism: just as Balaam "*lifted up*" his mashal, so biblical prophecy is sublime, its sentiments possessing "uncommon *elevation* and majesty" (Lecture XXI: 233). That which is elevated is metaphorically "seen" or perceived by the eye (Lecture V); but for Lowth, this "seeing" refers not to the classical perspectives of reason but rather to an Oriental sense of perception by means of the emotions. The eighteenth-century's distinction of "the language of reason" and "the language of the passions," a Longinian theme later to be extensively developed by Burke, is clear in Lowth (Abrams: 150), who puts the matter most pointedly in Lecture XIV, "Reason speaks literally, the Passions speak poetically."

Although Lowth is indebted to Longinus, he also picks up a theme from Augustine's (*On Christian Doctrine*, Book IV) defense of the Bible's beauty and eloquence against the enemies of the church who attacked divine inspiration of the Bible because of its barbarous language and lack of eloquence (Monk: 77). Now, mid-eighteenth century England had, in the midst of religious controversy over inspiration, returned to considerations of the sublime. Thus in proposing to speak about the sublimity of Hebrew poetry, Lowth was not taking his audience by surprise; whatever else may

be innovative in his *Praelectiones,* his thoughts on the sublime were admittedly derivative and, according to Monk (83), "disappointing."

Lowth's four lectures on the sublime (*Praelectiones:* XIV-XVII) are considered to have been somewhat vague in their total conception (Monk: 81). He divided his subject into three aspects, sublime *expression, sentiment*, and *passion*, with the third perspective, being the most interesting (Monk: 82). Concerning "passion" Lowth proposes that poetry arises from mental emotion; that is, its origin comes from

> the effects which are produced upon the mind and body, upon the imagination, the senses, the voice, and respiration, by the *agitation of the passions* (emphasis mine; Lecture XVII:183).

Poetry, the imitation of the agitations of the passions, if it contains "true poetic enthusiasm . . . [to be full of the god]," must conceive emotion so perfectly that it can be transferred to the "instinctive passion of another" (183-84), namely, the reader. In that Lowth emphasized that biblical poetry is superior to other poetry because of its passionate intensity and fervour, he seems to propose a more "ambitious programme for the romantics than was to appear fifty years later. . ." (Roston: 106). Although he stopped short of developing a cogent and clear aesthetic theory--his purpose was to be critical--he expressed clearly enough the idea that sublimity is "not so much a quality of the object as an effect on the subject" (Monk: 83).

2. The sublime in Isaiah

In his Lecture XXI, on "The Peculiar Character of Each of the Prophets," Lowth singles out Isaiah as the best example of Hebrew poetry's

"native grace and harmony." Isaiah is the model of what is "elegant and sublime," his sentiments possessing "uncommon elevation and majesty." Ezekiel, however, who had been the darling of the Romantics (especially Burnet, Addison, and Burke[13]) and the supreme example of "orientalism" and sublimity, possessed an even greater sublimity than Isaiah, Lowth admitted; however, he maintained that Ezekiel's "sublimity is of a different kind" (XX1:235). It is perhaps ironic that Lowth used a quote from Ezekiel to illustrate the sublime in Isaiah, to whom Ezek 27:12 "most justly applies" (XXI:233):

> Thou art the confirmed exemplar of measures,
> Full of wisdom, and perfect in beauty.

To illustrate Lowth's appreciation of the sublime in Isaiah, let us briefly examine three examples of his exposition, Isa. 1:24; 14:1-27; 34:1-24.

A. Lowth had discussed in Lecture XVI how the biblical poets use human and nature images to express aspects of the divine nature. True, such images are not to be taken literally; they are "remote from their object, and most unworthy of the Divine Majesty." But, argued Lowth, in that they are metaphorical, and thus force a comparison, they are "by far the most sublime" of all imagery. And when metaphors are borrowed from the world of nature, they are even more sublime. In his *Isaiah*, Lowth devotes particular attention to Isaiah 1:24:

> Wherefore saith the Lord Jehovah God of
> Hosts, the mighty One of Israel:
> Aha! I will be eased of mine adversaries;

---

[13]See Hepworth (183) on Burke.

I will be avenged of mine enemies.

The commentary in his Notes is an extensive literary-analytical, psychologically astute estimate of what might disturb the reader of inspired poetry. Among humans, he says, anger arises from a sense of injury and affront; but revenge removes the uneasiness of the painful sensation and one senses release and relief, which is "pleasing and quieting at least for the present." But can this be said of God (Isa 1:24)? Does God calm himself down by venting his wrath and vengeance as humans do? Lowth answers, "This is a strong instance of the metaphor called Anthropopathia; by which throughout the Scriptures, as well the historical as the poetical parts, the sentiments, sensations, and affections; the bodily faculties, qualities and members of men, and even brute animals, are attributed to God." How can God be like men or animals? Are not "low objects" inappropriate as images of God? Can Jehovah be likened unto a "growling lion" (Isa 31:4)? Yes, of course; for Lowth, the more brutish and crude the image, the more sublime.

B. Lowth considered Isa 14:1-29 to be a parade-example of the sublime in Isaiah's prophecy.[14] His exposition categorizes the passage as an "ode"[15] of six parts: introduction (vv. 1-3); chorus of Jews (vv. 4-8); new scene and new speakers (vv. 9-11); Jews resume speaking (v. 12); different scene and speakers (vv. 13-20); God speaks in the concluding verses (vv. 21-27).

---

[14]Here I am following the 1794 reprint of *Isaiah* (54-56) in which the commentary on chap. 14 is essentially drawn from Lowth's earlier remarks in his *Praelectiones.*

[15]Lowth took up the ode as a major theme in *Praelectionses* XXV. The ode, which Adam originally sung in praise of creation, is of three kinds: the sweet, the sublime, the middle kind. Psalm 23 is an example of the first kind. Of the sublime category, there are two types, those which are sublime according to form or according to content.

Lowth was fascinated by the various scenes, speakers, and transitions in this poem. But of particular poetic significance, he thought, was the scene portrayed in vv. 9-11. He comments,

> The regions of the dead are laid open, and hades is represented as rousing up the shades of the departed monarchs. They rise from their thrones to meet the king of Babylon on his arrival, and insult him on his being reduced to the same abject condition with themselves.

Lowth continues, obviously moved by the poetic power of the imagination, praising the piece's "astonishing brevity, perspicuity, and force." Indeed, he states, "This is one of the boldest figures ever attempted in poetry . . ." (*Isaiah*, 54). Lowth's own energy and imagination have obviously been provoked, so that he can only conclude his exposition with multiple superlatives on the ultimate sublimity of the entire poem:

> The images of this ode are so various, so numerous, and so sublime; expressed with such force, in such elevated words, figures, and sentences, that it is impossible to conceive any thing of the kind more perfect . . . a noble, sublime, and truly divine spirit glows in every sentence; nothing can be found deficient, nothing redundant.

But Lowth's readers, if they should suppose that this concatenation of adjectives, breathlessly ejaculated by the Bishop's over-wrought passion for poetry and its aesthetic power, has come to an end, they would be mistaken! He concludes,

> The persons are so numerous and not confused, bold, but not extravagant: a noble, sublime, and truly divine spirit glows in every sentence; nothing can be found deficient, nothing redundant.--In a word, for beauty of disposition, strength of colouring, greatness of sentiment, brevity, perspicuity, and force of expression, this ode of Isaiah stands among all the monuments of antiquity unrivaled.

It should be noted that in the reprint edition of 1794 (Albany: Charles R. and George Webster), whose "explanatory" comments have been written by John Smith of Scotland, the commentator's words which immediately follow the above quotation have a sobering effect. Lest his readers should be carried away by such aesthetic flights, Smith states rather matter-of-factly of Isa 14, "It remains to be observed, that, at the precise period predicted, the prophecy was punctually fulfilled (Dan. chap. v)" (56). Although it cannot be pursued here, a historian of Lowth's work might profitably study how this particular edition, without Lowth "Dissertation" or "Notes," but with the addition of Rev. Smith's commentary, toned down the aesthetic emphasis as well as the new hermeneutic contained in the complete editions of Lowth's *Isaiah.*

C. Lowth believed that the aim of prophecy was either to evoke "fears and apprehensions" or to give comfort. While he considered Ezekiel to excel in the vehement and "tragical," and to excite only the terrible (*Praelectiones,* XXI), Lowth found in Isa 34 a particular expression of Isaiah's ability, by means of terrible images, to convey the sublime. A "regular and perfect poem, consisting of two parts" (XX:227), it is replete with the "splendid imagery" of an eschatological drama. The passage speaks of the wrath of Jehovah, slaughter, stinking carcasses, blighted figs, blood of lambs and goats, sulfur and burning pitch, which is the divine

punishment. But the consequence of the destruction is "a full and complete restoration." Lowth calls attention to the amplification of God's vengeful and destructive acts, a magnification of the "atrocity," but also to the beauty of the restoration. While modern readers may be put-off by the gore of Edom's punishment, Lowth's translation, transforming the prose of the AV into striking parallelism, exhibits the literary artistry of a poem carefully arranged and containing brilliant images. As such, it serves well to demonstrate Lowth's connecting of the sublime in Isaiah with disturbing pictures and terrible events.

The twentieth-(or twenty-first) century exegete, raised principally on historical criticism and its many sub-categories, might easily be put off by Lowth's verbose and aesthetic appraisal of Hebrew poetry. Indeed, as we shall see below in Part IV, while the eighteenth and nineteenth-century German reception of Lowth's work was positive and far-reaching in its consequences, the aesthetic appreciation of Isaiah and the prophets by Lowth interested them less than his break-through in the critical examination of the text itself and its context.

IV. The Influence of Lowth's *Isaiah*

1. The significance and influence of Lowth's *Praelectiones*, in particular his understanding of Hebrew parallelism, is well-known, and often critically analyzed and/or refined. On the other side, Literary scholarship has made clear enough how Lowth not only participated in and but greatly influenced the notions of "Orientalism"[16] and its concern for "primitivism"

---

[16]The term was introduced by Spence and came to connote timelessness, primitivism, the poet as prophet, an interest in the cultural exotica that is characteristic of the eighteenth-

and "originality" which "lay at the heart of the Romantic movement" (Hepworth, Preface [no page number]). Indeed, he was a major expert on these matters in the mid-eighteenth-century and very much a part of "a profound cultural shift from the certainty that the perspectives of Greece and Rome stretch back to a moment in historical time, to an awareness of the mythologizing processes of original man that are ever-present in all men" (Hepworth: 181). Prickett undoubtedly speaks for a broad and recognized consensus when he states that Lowth's *Praelectiones* "inaugurated a critical revolution" in England (110).

2. But what can be said about the significance and influence of his second major work, *Isaiah*? While Lowth the poet influenced many other poets, it was especially Christopher Smart ("his most important convert") who attempted to follow in his poetry the parallelism exemplified in Lowth's *Isaiah.*[17] And in England, men of letters were of course well acquainted with Lowth and his work. He attracted the attention of Boswell who, after meeting him, wrote that Lowth was "neat," "judicious," a "little" man. To William Temple, Boswell wrote, "I do not think that Lowth is an engaging man"; nor did he think that Samuel Johnson had yet read Lowth's *Isaiah,* although, he reported, Johnson had heard that "it was a great work" (Hepworth: 163). According to Lowth's biographer, Brian Hepworth, the Bishop's achievements were well-acknowledged by an impressive list of eighteenth-century intellectuals, in addition to Smart, Boswell, and Johnson: William Cowper, Edward Gibbon, Hannah More, Joseph Wharton, Thomas Wharton the Younger, John Wesley, and John Wilkes (Hepworth: 161). But to speak of Lowth's "influence" is not enough. In the

---

century; the sublime, the parallel between the creation of the universe and the creativity of the poetic imagination, etc.; cf. Hepworth: 56-62.

[17]On Smart's debt to Lowth, see Hepworth : 173-178.

world of biblical scholarship itself, another kind of influence was immediately apparent, especially in Germany.

3. Johann David Michaelis, an orientalist and philologian in Göttingen, had attended the second of Lowth's thirty-four lectures in October 1741, and after his return to Germany, helped to publish them, in Latin, together with his own critical, learned notes (1758-61).[18] Unlike the *Praelectiones*, which was (and is) yet to be translated into German in its entirety, Lowth's *Isaiah* was published in German translation[19] with critical notes by Göttinger Professor of Theology, Johann Benjamin Koppe,[20] beginning in 1779, a year after its original publication in England. By this time, Lowth's reputation was well established in Germany and the book became an important commentary on Isaiah. But it was the notes by Koppe which became especially significant for the "higher criticism" of the book of Isaiah (Smend 1991:59), while Lowth's aesthetic treatment of Isaiah's poetry earned, finally, less attention. Koppe's notes analyzed larger passages into smaller units, something Lowth of course had not done in his own "Dissertation" and "Notes"; nor had his translation been printed in such as way as to suggest divisions within chapters. For example, Lowth treated Isa 1:1-21 as a unit; Koppe broke the text down into three parts (vv. 1-9, 10-20, 21-31), a critical move which made conservative scholars nervous. Wilhelm Gesenius made fun of this, for now the book of Isaiah appeared, he said, "als ein loser Kartenspiel gemischter Haufe abgerissener

---

[18]On the relationship and exchange of letters between Michaelis and Lowth, and the former's criticism of the latter, see Smend 1991:45-53. Most of the material in this paragraph is indebted to Smend's significant discussion of "Lowth in Germany" (1991:43-62, especially 58-61).

[19]See above, section I.3. and also footnote 7.

[20]On Koppe, see John Hayes (1999:39).

Fragmente verschiedener Dichter aus verschiedenen Zeitalter."[21] Koppe's notes hinted that Isa 40-66 ought to be dated during the Babylonian exile, an insight later picked up by Johann Christoph Döderlein and expressed more directly by him. The critical notes by Koppe were highly regarded; Smend asserts that in Germany Lowth's *Isaiah*, however, did not gain its status because of Koppe's notes (implying that this idea might be held by some), and cites the praise given by Gesenius and E. F. C. Rosenmüller because of Lowth's text-critical abilities and insights--Lowth himself being uninterested in "higher criticism." Nevertheless, it is remarkable, and perhaps representative of other scholars and intellectuals as well, that Johann Gottfried Herder wrote in a letter (Briefe IV, 85) that he was desirous of a copy of Lowth's translation, but admitted that he was almost more interested in the notes which had been added by Koppe than he was in the original (Smend 1991:58). The importance of Koppe's notes cannot be gainsaid. Moreover, according to Smend, these notes were a much more appropriate supplement to Lowth's *Isaiah* than Michaelis's notes had been to the *Praelectiones* (1991:58-58).

4. For German intellectual history--indeed, for the history of biblical interpretation--the connection of Lowth and Herder cannot, in my judgment, be overestimated. How much and precisely in what way Herder was influenced by Lowth has yet to be investigated at length. But Herder's debt to Lowth is certainly considerable and of the greatest significance. Even a superficial glance in the index of *Schriften zum Alten Testaments* [22] makes clear Herder's numerous references and allusions to Lowth. Smend comments that "Anklänge an Lowth finden sich bei Herder von seinen ältesten literarischen Versuchen an . . . " (1991:54). And it is obvious that

---

[21]W. Gesenius, *Jesaia* (1821:136), quoted in Smend (1991:59).

[22]*Johann Gottfried Herder Werke* (Band 10; Ed. R. Smend).

Herder's famous *Vom Geist der Ebräischen Poesie* (1782-83) means to evoke Lowth's title *De sacra poesi Hebraeorum,* which is mentioned with praise in the first sentence of Herder's introduction to the former, however much his purposes differ from Lowth's. Herder intentionally dropped Lowth's "*sacra*," substituting the word "*Geist.*" The signal is clear: Herder was much indebted to Lowth; Herder rejected or at least distanced himself in many significant ways from Lowth,[23] his attitude toward the *Praelectiones* being an ambivalent one (Frei: 184).[24] But what is significant for our purposes is to emphasize that some of the heart of Lowth's programme entered Germany through Herder and was absorbed in various ways into German Old Testament Studies.[25] To be sure, it was not so much Lowth's aesthetic and literary genius but his humanism and materialist "stress on the creative capacity of the human mind" that interested Herder, Michaelis, and others. Furthermore, it was Lowth's

---

[23]See Smend 1991:53-58 for details. Herder denied, to mention only one item, that the origin of poetry is in the temple, i.e. in religion. It is rather in folk music, dancing, popular songs, etc. Moreover, Herder thought Lowth "too formal" in his analysis of poetry.

[24]The nature of this ambivalence needs to be more thoroughly explored. Nor is Herder's critique always fair, as Isaiah Berlin maintains. Berlin says that for Herder, "it was not enough to understand the Hebrew Scriptures as a sublime work of art, and compare its beauties with those of Homer, as the Oxford scholar, Robert Lowth, had done; we must transport ourselves into a distant land and an earlier age, and read it as the national poem of the Jews, a pastoral and agricultural people, 'be an oriental among the primitive oriental dwellers of the East'" (Berlin: 186). Had Herder forgotten that Lowth had said, ". . . we must see all things with their eyes . . . read Hebrew as Hebrews would have read it . . . "? (*Praelectiones:*, V, quoted by Berlin: 186, footnote 6).

[25]The significance of Lowth for Duhm's Isaiah Commentary, often recognized, cannot be dealt with here for reasons of space. See Clements's comment (1976:54).

"historical" approach which was to "prove seminal for the German historians and biblical scholars of the second half of the eighteenth century" (Prickett: 110).

5. Has the literary-aesthetic side of Lowth had significant, recognizable influence on modern, German Old Testament scholarship? The answer to this, one would have to begin, of course, with Hermann Gunkel. The influence of Herder's Romanticism upon Gunkel, who often refers to Herder, has long been noted (Anderson: xviii-xx). But any analysis of Gunkel's debt to Herder must consider the degree to which Gunkel is ultimately rooted in Lowth. The connection between Lowth and Gunkel begs for detailed investigation, which to my knowledge has not yet been done. It remains to be shown whether Gunkel ever cited or directly referred to Lowth (Smend 1991:62). Here, we may briefly refer to only three obvious elements in Gunkel's work which recall Lowth. The first is Gunkel's distinction between prose and poetry and the "Parallelismus der Glieder" (Gunkel 1963:3). The second is the notion of prophet as poet. It has been shown above how significant this theme is for Lowth.[26] The following quotation from Gunkel could have come out of Lowth's mouth:

> Of its nature enthusiastic inspiration speaks in poetic form, and rational reflection in the form of prose. Consequently, in form, the prophetic 'speech' was originally a poem. People like the prophets, who received their ideas in times of exalted inspiration and uttered them under the impulse of an over-flowing emotion, could only speak in poetic rhythms . . . . From the aesthetic point of view, these

[26]Kugel is surely correct in stating that it is not parallelism, but rather Lowth' arguments that prophecy is a form of poetry, that is the new and important thing in Lowth's *Praelectiones* (1981:282).

> poetic compositions of the prophets reach extraordinarily high standards and represent the most sublime element in the Old Testament, which is full of the sublime (Gunkel 1969:66).

This is not Herder talking through Gunkel! For Herder downplayed "the sublime" as a significant poetic and aesthetic characteristic (see footnote 24). The third is Gunkel's interest in the *Sitz im Leben* of biblical texts. The need to understand the real life situation of the Hebrews and their poets and to enter into their aesthetic experience has, certainly, one root in the anthropological-ethnographic interests one finds, for example, in Lowth's copious "Notes" in his *Isaiah*, where he energetically gathered material that clarifies the material of every-day life and customs of the Hebrew culture. This is to suggest--the argument will have to be made elsewhere and in great detail--that Lowth provides much of the significant intellectual background to Gunkel's whole project and his passionate interest in the life-settings of biblical genres.

Concluding Remarks

Modern biblical scholarship knows itself to be indebted to Bishop Robert Lowth. But by and large, that debt has been perceived to be most closely connected with his insights into the nature of Hebrew poetry. Scholars of literature understand, correctly, that Lowth's project was really not so much about Hebrew poetry but rather "Oriental poetry," that is, the earliest poetry of the East from earliest times; nay more, it was about the nature of poetry itself. His Isaiah translation and commentary were one part of that project; in this later work, as he himself noted, he could bring to bear in detail in his *Isaiah* what he had conceived in his lectures many years before.

When today's reader of biblical commentaries takes up Lowth's *Isaiah*, the book is surprising in part. One finds, in general, what one is used to: translation, commentary, philological notes, and so on. The verbose style is, to be sure, off-putting. But even an unsympathetic reader would not, I think, help but be impressed by his ability to re-enter the poetic world of the ancients, to take his reader with him and humbly but profoundly help him/her to see, or rather to "feel," all that is there--the ancient world of homely, even crude at times, but utterly powerful imagery. His aesthetic-literary method, mostly ignored in the nineteenth-century, but taken up again in part by Gunkel and others, perhaps has very little to teach us that is new. But Lowth approached the text with a certain *habitus*, a way of entering into the text and its language--he called it "reading Hebrew the way the Hebrews read"--which cannot help but give liveliness to ancient words; we would do well to try practising his art and assuming his *habitus*.

His translation of Isaiah still conveys an uncommon sharpness and sense of the book's original emotion and passion; the poetic imagery runs from earthy to noble, but finally brilliant in its effect--sublime, would be his word for these things and more. But Lowth's greatest abiding significance, I believe, is that he utterly persuades us that Isaiah is a great poet. That, however, is not insignificant, given where prophetic scholarship is these days. I propose that we need from Lowth a reminder that Hebrew prophecy will not be grasped in a way that is most appropriate to its nature if we over-emphasize the prophetic BOOK at the expense of the individual poem. A final lesson for us, perhaps, is that an aesthetic, emotional, passionate reading of the text is in no way inimical--Lowth himself shows us this in his *Isaiah* --to the more intensely rational aspects of the historical method. In his time, Lowth managed to keep these two rivals in proper tension. We might try to do as well.

Bibliography

Abrams, M. H.

1953 *The Mirror and the Lamp: Romantic Theory and the Critical Tradition.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Anderson, Bernard W.

1972 "Introduction: Martin Noth's Tradio-Historical Approach in the Context of Twentieth-Century Biblical Research." Pp. xiii-xxxii in Martin Noth,*A History of Pentateuchal Traditions.* Trans. B. W. Anderson. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Berlin, Isaiah

1976 *Vico and Herder: Two Studies in the History of Ideas.* New York: The Viking Press.

Clements, R. E.

1976 *One Hundred Years of Old Testament Interpretation.* Philadelphia: Westminster.

Clements, R. E.

1987 *Isaiah 1-39.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Duhm, Bernard

1892 *Das Buch Jesaija.* Göttinger Handkommentar zum AT. 1968[5]. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Rupprecht.

Fohrer, Georg

1967 *Das Buch Jesaja.* Band 2 Kapitel 24-39. 2. Auflage. Zürcher Bibelkommentare. Zürich: Zwingli Verlag.

Gray, George Buchanan

1912 *The Book of Isaiah I-XXVII.* ICC. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.

Frei, Hans W.

1974 *The Eclipse of Biblica Narrative: A Study in Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century Hermeneutics*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Gunkel, Hermann

1969 "The Israelite Prophecy from the Time of Amos." Pp. 48-75 in *Twentieth Century Theology in the Makin*.g. Ed. Jaroslav Pelikan. New York: Harper & Row. Trans. from RRG[2].

Hayes, John H. and Frederick C. Prussner

1985 *Old Testament Theology: Its History and Development.* Atlanta: John Knox Press.

Hayes, John H. and Stuart A. Irvine

1987 *Isaiah The Eighth Century Prophet: His Times and His Preaching.*. Nashville: Abingdon.

Hayes, John H.

1999 "Koppe, Johann Benjamin." P. 37 in *Dictionary of Biblical Theology.* Vol. K-Z. Ed. John H. Hayes. Nashville: Abingdon.

Hepworth, Brian

1978 *Robert Lowth.* Boston: Twayne Publishers.

Herder, Johann Gottfried

1993 *Vom Geist der Ebräischen Poesi*. Pp. 661-1301 in *Johann Gottfried HerderWerke. Schriften zum Alten Testaments*. Band 5. Ed. Rudolf Smend. Frankfurt am Main: Deutscher Klassiker Verlag.

Koppe, J. B.

1779 *D. R. Lowths . . .Jesajas, neu übersetzt nebst eine Einleitung und critischen philologischen und erläuternden Anmerkungen aus*

dem Englishen: Mit Zusätzen und Anmerkungen von J. B. Koppe. 4 Vols.1779-1781.Trans. Prof. Richerz. Göttingen.

Kugel, James L.

1981 *The Idea of Biblical Poetry: Parallelism and Its History.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

1990 "Poetry and Prophecy: An Overview." Pp. 1-25 in *Poetry and Prophecy.* Ed. James L Kugel. Ithica: Cornell University Press.

Lowth, Robert

1787 *Lectures on the Sacred Poetry of the Hebrews.* Trans. G. Gregory. 2 vols. London: J. Johnson.

1794 *Isaiah: A New Translation.* Albany: Charles R. and George Webster.

Macksey, Richard

1994 "Longinus." Pp. 470-74 in *The Johns Hopkins Guide to Literary Theory and Criticism.* Ed. Michael Groden and Martin Kreiswirth. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Marrs, R. R.

1999 "Lowth, Robert." Pp. 89-90 in *Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation.*. Vol K-Z. Ed. John H. Hayes. Nashville: Abingdon Press.

Monk, Samuel H.

1960 *The Sublime: A Study of Critical Theories in XVIII-Century England.* Michigan: The University of Michigan Press.

Petersen, David L. and Kent Harold Richards

1992 *Interpreting Hebrew Poetry.* Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Prickett, Stephen

1986 *Words and the Word: Language, poetics and biblical interpretation.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Roston, Murray

1965 *Poet and Prophet: The Bible and the Growth of Romanticism.* London: Faber and Faber.

Schökel, Luis Alonso

1988 *A Manual of Hebrew Poetics.* Rome: Editrice Pontifico Istituto Biblico.

Smend, Rudolf , ed.

1985 *Johann Gottfried Herder. Schriften zum Alten Testament.* Johann Gottfried Herder Werke Band 5. Frankfurt am Main: Deutscher Klassiker Verlag.

1991 "Lowth in Deutschland." Pp. 43-62 in *Epochen der Bibel*kritk. Gesammelte Studien Band 3. München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag.

Tannenbaum, Leslie

1982 *Biblical Tradition in Blake's Early Prophecies: The Great Code of Art.* Princeton: Princeton Univerisity Press.

Wildberger, Hans

1982 *Jesaja.* BK 10/3. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag.

What's New in Lowth?
Synchronic Reading in the Eighteenth and Twenty-First Centuries

Patricia K. Tull
Louisville, KY

General Introduction

For the past several years, members of the Formation of the Book of Isaiah Group have discussed the need to extend our study beyond contemporary understandings of Isaiah's formation, and to learn how the book has been conceived by earlier readers. This move coincides with a growing interest in biblical studies in the history of interpretation.

Till recently, serious discussion of the Bible's history of interpretation has been limited to reiterating the findings of the past two hundred years. Even terminology has favored such localization. When recent work is called "critical biblical scholarship" and earlier work is called "pre-critical," such parochial value judgment prevents us from seeing what is critical about premodern scholarship and what is sometimes peculiarly uncritical in modern scholarship.

We have much to learn from knowing where we have been. First, contemporary insights have often been anticipated by various Jewish and Christian biblical readers at various times in history. Literary scholars, for instance, are gaining insight from medieval rabbinical discussions which, free of the scientific positivism that was to come, often anticipate postmodern discussions of rhetoric and reading practices.

Second, we have inherited both wheat and chaff from our predecessors. Assumptions that modern scholars have absorbed unaware merit reexamination. Often early, more extensive discussions spell out explicitly to us the hidden significance of ideas we have accepted implicitly. Changes in understanding second temple Judaism, for instance, have benefited greatly from surveying the ingressions of Christian antisemitism into biblical understanding.

Third, the very different ways previous scholars have formulated questions and sorted evidence can often jar us to reexamine our own assumptions and categories, and to ask questions in new ways. Every critical axiom is rooted in some discussion in the misty past, before the winners of the debate were canonized and the losers forgotten. What plagued a previous generation ought sometimes to plague us anew. As I hope to show, ferment often leads to revolutionary insights that are hardly accessible during less tumultuous times.

Fourth, studying the history of biblical scholarship, with all its uncharted territory, is an adventure. When I proposed to write on Robert Lowth's contributions, I did not know what questions to ask, nor did I see clearly how revolutionary his work was. Because much that was new in his day is universally assumed today, its significance is easy to miss. This study led me down paths I have never been before, and I submit it with apologies to members of the audience who know far more than I do about some of what I will try to compile and present.

Introduction to Robert Lowth

Lowth's two best known contributions to biblical studies were his 1741 *Lectures on the Sacred Poetry of the Hebrews* and his 1778 *Isaiah: A New Translation with a Preliminary Dissertation and Notes.* His early lectures, given at his election as professor of poetry at Oxford University, laid out the terms in which he would later translate Isaiah. He asserted that Hebrew poetry is characterized, like other poetry, by terse and elevated language. But unlike western poetry, with its recognizable rules of rhyme and meter, Hebrew poetry is most clearly distinguished by its "parallelism of

members," that is, "a certain equality, resemblance, or parallelism, between the members of each period; so that in two lines (or members of the same period), things for the most part shall answer to things, and words to words, as if fitted to each other by a kind of rule or measure."[1]

Illustrating this parallelism throughout his lectures with examples not only from the Psalms, but also from narrative and prophetic books, Lowth laid the groundwork for the claim expressed in the title of Lecture XVIII: "The Writings of the Prophets Are in General Poetical." Indeed, by this point he had shown so many examples of similarity between the styles of psalmic and prophetic passages, and had so emphatically pronounced Isaiah "the sublimest of poets,"[2] and had so deeply intertwined designations of "prophet" with "poet," that by the eighteenth lecture his claim more recapitulated the argument than introduced it.

Lowth's work gained a following very quickly both in England and on the continent, not only among biblical scholars, but also among poets and philosophers. When, nearly forty years later, he incorporated both his suggestions about parallelism and his insight about prophecy in a new translation of Isaiah, he began a revolution in the industry of Bible publication, a revolution so comprehensive that most of our generation has grown up with little awareness that Bibles were ever printed in any other way than what we know in the RSV: that is, with two contrasting formats: block prose paragraphs and ragged poetic lines, visually cuing to us what is poetry and what is prose. Were it not for the staying power of the Authorized (King James) Version, with its single format throughout, most readers would not know the Bible had ever come any other way. Certainly nothing in the AV nor any modern translation betrays to us that the poetic talent of the prophets had ever been questioned, much less lain unnoted for centuries.

Now before I explain the direction this paper will take, I will betray a point of ignorance of my own. I betray it hoping that I am not the only professor of biblical studies who did not know this, but also, having now ex-

[1] Robert Lowth, *Lectures on the Sacred Poetry of the Hebrews*, trans. G. Gregory (London: 1787), 210.

[2] Lowth, *Lectures,* 149.

amined the evidence, feeling some confidence that there are good reasons why I didn't. When I first read Lowth as a graduate student, I was perplexed by his claim that the prophets were poets. I owned two copies of the BHS, which everyone knows is a painstaking reproduction of the Leningrad codex that predates Lowth by several centuries. In the BHS, the book of Isaiah is clearly laid out in alternating poetry and prose. At the time I wondered whether Masoretic codices were simply unavailable in Lowth's time. Otherwise I could not fathom why the poetry of Isaiah had to be discovered.

What I realized subsequently was that, though in their foreword Karl Elliger and Wilhelm Rudolph declared the BHS a faithful rendering of the Leningrad codex, only departing from it with a very few accents here and there, and though not the faintest hint is whispered that the Masoretic Bible's page layout is any different from the BHS's representation, the page formatting of the BHS has actually nothing to do with that of L. Though we are not told, the BHS, and the third edition of BHK that preceded it in using L, and the first two editions of the BHK that presented Jacob ben Chayim's 16th-century Hebrew text, all make one highly interpretive move: they format every page according to western conventions of poetry and prose, ignoring the system of MT manuscript presentation.[3]

Realizing what a deep effect typesetting conventions had had on my own assumptions about poetry and prose in the Bible led me to wonder several things about Lowth:

First, what did Bibles look like at the time that he was writing? By what conventions and assumptions had they been laid out, and what messages did they convey to readers? What possibilities did they promote and what did they obscure?

[3] In the BHK's prolegomena, Paul Kahle stated, "We have attempted to reproduce this text just as it stands in the manuscript." He went on to discuss the care with which they distinguished methegs that occurred in L from those that the editors added (xxxi). Similarly Elliger and Rudolph: "We have thought it best to reproduce the text of the latest hand of L with close fidelity. We have accordingly refrained from 'removing obvious scribal errors.'" Discussion ensued of the care with which the BHS was collated and repeatedly checked against the manuscript (xii).

Second, how did Lowth influence the appearance of subsequent Bibles, especially in the prophets? To what extent has there been general agreement with Lowth? What new hegemonies of viewpoint have grown up with this change? What do they give us as readers, and what do they take away?

Third, what impact has all this had on the study of Isaiah, "the sublimest of poets"? To what extent do prose/poetry distinctions make sense for interpreting Isaiah, and what has been gained—and lost—by attention to parallelism in its poetry? And what further gains might be ahead of us as a result of the new interest in parallelism by scholars such as Adele Berlin, Robert Alter, and James Kugel?

Representation of Poetry Prior to Lowth

The question of how biblical poetry was visually represented before Lowth's time is complex and tangled, influenced by the conventions not only of ancient Jews, but also of Greek and Latin literature, European conventions of the middle ages, and the changes wrought by the printing press. In addition, talmudic assertions, Hellenistic aesthetics, Reformation piety, scholastic needs, and economics all contributed to creating a great variety in the appearance of Bibles by the 18th century. However, one of the very few givens shared across centuries, across religious lines, and across languages was that the prophetic books were not poetry.

Researching this question was complicated by several factors: not only the difficulty of obtaining rare books and manuscripts, but, more importantly, the fact that the look of text on the page is seldom discussed in secondary literature. A near silence prevails on these matters almost as deafening as the silence of the BHK and BHS concerning their own layout. This aspect of what Emmanuel Tov called "para-textual elements" is with us every day in every Bible, but it has not been in the conscious sights of many. In addition, when I did find discussions, either ancient or modern, there was a frustrating diversity in the use of the same words. Words such as "poetic line," "prose," "stichoi," "colon," "meter," and "verse," mean different things to different writers. Consequently, when I did not actually see key

pages of primary manuscripts and printed editions, it was harder to assess the clues in the secondary literature. So what I present here is introductory and provisional, and if it proves interesting I hope to pursue it further.

Hebrew Bibles

As we know, most of the earliest manuscripts did not represent poetry the way modern westerners are used to seeing it—with the end of the line on the page corresponding to the end of the poetic line. In fact, the ANE culture out of which biblical writing grew shows little familiarity with such a system. The Ba'al cycles on Ugaritic tablets found at Ras Shamra, constructed with parallelism similar to the Bible's, are written in block text filling the tablet end to end.

Manuscripts found at Qumran, however, show experimentation with stichometric arrangements. Tov noted that several Psalms scrolls and fragments show one stich or two hemistichs, sometimes separated by spaces, written per line on the page.[4] James Kugel observed that while 4QPs^{a} is written without any line breaks, as are the community's own Hodayot, 4QPs^{b} "is written in short narrow columns consisting of a single verse-half per line."[5] But this has apparently more to do with the look of the scroll than the sense of the text. As Kugel exclaimed, sometimes "this arrangement fails to represent the line's semantic parallelism and simply apposes random chunks of words!"[6]

Masoretic texts, including the Leningrad codex, show much development of these early experiments. There, Psalms, Proverbs, and the dialogues of Job are laid out in a format differing distinctly from that of the rest of the Bible. Narrative and prophetic books appear in blocks three columns to a page, but the Psalms, Proverbs, and the dialogues of Job appear in two

[4] Emmanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 212.

[5] James Kugel, *The Idea of Biblical Poetry* (Yale University Press, 1981), 119-120.

[6] Kugel, 120.

blocked columns, with a gap toward the middle of almost every line.[7] Sometimes an *atnah* or *sof pasuq* precedes the gap, but other times there is none.

Four individual passages are laid out even more dramatically, with one column extending across the page and the lines either justified both right and left with a large space in the middle (called in rabbinic tradition "log over log, brick over brick") or laid out to resemble overlapping bricks, with a gap in the middle of one line, and two gaps in the next with a line centered under the space above (called "brick over log, log over brick"). Only certain set texts show such dramatic formatting: Exodus 15:1-18, Deuteronomy 32, Judges 5, and 2 Samuel 22. These songs obviously differ substantially from the narrative surrounding them, but they are not nearly the only chunks of psalm-like text in the Bible. Two lists are also written stichographically: Joshua 12:9-24 and Esther 9:7-9. The MT practice reflects talmudic prescriptions for the layout of the two lists and the Exodus and Judges texts.[8]

The Masoretic tradition reflects another innovation that will become important later: its division into verses and, by means of the accentual system, smaller segments of text that help determine syntactic units. According to Henry Barclay Swete, this system of verse division is also mentioned twice in the Talmud.[9] Although the numbering of verses and chapters was still several centuries in the future, the Masoretic verse divisions, when imported much later into English Bibles, would actually enable interpreters such as Lowth to see parallelism much more clearly than their predecessors could.

As James Kugel and Adele Berlin have shown, medieval rabbinic interpreters had clear ideas about the poetic features of the Bible, ideas that in some ways anticipated Lowth. Several note the binary structure of Hebrew

[7] The accentual system of these three books is also distinct from that of the remainder of the Bible.

[8] Adele Berlin, *Biblical Poetry through Medieval Jewish Eyes* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1991), 8.

[9] Henry Barclay Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1900), 342. He pointed out Meg 4.4 and Kidd 30.1.

verse. Joseph ibn Kaspi (1279-1340), for instance, analyzed the relationships between the two halves of verses, identifying four types of verses with descriptions very reminiscent of Lowth's three categories of parallelism.[10]

However, for theological reasons, Jewish interpreters sharply distinguished poetry from prophecy. Don Isaac Abravanel (1437-1508) explained, "Prophecy is the effluence that flows into the intellect and imagination of the prophets; at the time of his prophecy the prophet's faculties are asleep and his senses lost, and his soul is occupied with providence, and he tells people what he saw or heard without its being within his control."[11] But poetry comes from the Holy Spirit, and the prophet speaking under its influence "wills and chooses to speak as he wishes: words of wisdom, praise, warning and so forth."[12] Rabbinic scholars generally thought that "prophecy was the conduit for divine revelation; indeed, prophecy was the word of God. Poetry was a product of human creativity."[13]

Commentators trusted the Masoretic formatting of the Bible to help them identify poetry. In fact, Moshe ibn Ezra considered nothing in the Bible poetry except Psalms, Job, Proverbs, and the four stichometrically arranged songs. Even these, he pointed out, "do not employ [fixed] meter or rhyme, as Arabic poetry does."[14] But when the printing press took over the publication of Hebrew Bibles in the late 15th century, simplification in the page layouts resulted. Printers began to arrange Psalms, Proverbs, and Job in the same way as prose books, and to print in poetic format only the few passages that the Talmud required. Thus, though it was universally understood that the Psalms were poetry and the prophets were prose, they were no longer differentiated visually.

Early Christian editions of the printed Hebrew Bible followed the formatting practices of the Jewish Bibles. Critical editions began to flourish from the 16th century on, first in the form of polyglot editions which pre-

[10] Berlin, *Biblical Poetry*, 43-44.

[11] Berlin, *Biblical Poetry*, 126.

[12] Berlin, *Biblical Poetry*, 126.

[13] Berlin, *Biblical Poetry*, 48.

[14] Berlin, *Biblical Poetry*, p. 69.

sented Hebrew, Greek, Latin, and sometimes Targums, Arabic, and Syriac translations side by side. By the time Lowth translated Isaiah he had at his disposal several new tools, including Johann Heinrich Michaëlis's 1720 critical edition, the comprehensive and beautiful 1655 London Polyglot, and the compendium of textual variants and new edition of the Hebrew Bible assembled by his friend and colleague Benjamin Kennicott.[15] The majority of Lowth's individual comments in *Isaiah* concern not parallelism or poetry, but rather textual criticism. His was one of the early efforts to evaluate the versions for emendations of the Hebrew.

Greek Bibles

From very early times, Hebrew and Greek manuscripts diverged in their portrayal of poetry. The three great early codices of the LXX, Sinaiticus, Vaticanus, and Alexandrinus (4th and 5th centuries), arrange several books poetically. These include not only the Psalms, Job, and Proverbs, but also the Song of Solomon, Lamentations, Wisdom, Ben Sirach, the Psalms of Solomon, and (unlike contemporary Bibles) Ecclesiastes.[16] The arrangement of these books, *per cola et commata* following the tradition of Greek verse, is quite different from that in the Masoretic tradition. Each clause and each phrase begins on a new line, so that what appears in the Hebrew as a single verse might be divided into two or even three lines. If the sense line overruns the space on the physical line, it is continued underneath with an indent. Thus it resembles much more closely what we have come to recognize as western poetic format. Although the Septuagint scribes took a much more liberal view than the Masoretes concerning what was poetry, they clearly agreed that the prophets were not.

By the early days of the printing press and the Protestant Reformation, the Septuagint had fallen onto hard times. Since it was neither the original

[15] Lowth, *Isaiah,* xlvi-xlix.

[16] Thomas S. Pattie, "The Creation of the Great Codices," in *The Bible as Book: The Manuscript Tradition*, ed. J.L. Sharpe and Kimberly van Kampen (London: The British Library, 1998), 63.

Hebrew, nor the familiar Vulgate, it was little read and consulted.[17] Only later would scholars begin to recover its usefulness as a witness to the pre-Masoretic Hebrew text. Because of this, the LXX was not printed as early as other Bibles, and made its first appearances in the Complutensian Polyglot of 1514-17 and the Aldine edition of 1518.

Latin Bibles

Like the LXX poetry and many classical prose texts, Jerome's translation of the prophets was laid out *per cola et commata*. However, he cautioned his readers in his preface to Isaiah, "not to mistake it for metre, as if it were any thing like the Psalms, or the writings of Solomon; for it was nothing more than what was usual in the copies of the prose works of Demosthenes and Cicero."[18]

Vulgate manuscripts varied widely. Three different styles of page layout appeared: either *per cola et commata*, which tended to waste space, or block text, with punctuation or space marking the logical breaks, or, especially in the case of poetic texts, with each verse given a new line.[19] The advent of printing seemed only to increase the possibilities for differing combinations of text layout. While the Gutenberg Bible of the mid-15th century used block paragraphs with highly ornamented initial letters throughout, other Bibles continued to be printed *per cola et commata*, either in full or in the poetic sections. Still others laid out poetic texts verse by verse. Their selection expanded beyond the canon of poetry in Masoretic Bibles, to include such texts as Lamentations, Hannah's prayer in 2 Samuel 2, and Hezekiah's prayer in Isaiah 38. In short, not all Vulgate editions distin-

---

[17] Basil Hall, "Biblical Scholarship: Editions and Commentaries," in *The Cambridge History of the Bible*, ed. S.L. Greenslade (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963), 56.

[18] Jerome, PL 28:825. Although this quote was taken from Lowth, *Isaiah*, p. ii, nearly every modern discussion of biblical poetry or biblical page layout cites it.

[19] Patrick McGurk, "The Oldest Manuscripts of the Latin Bible," in *The Early Medieval Bible: Its Production, Decoration, and Use*, ed. Richard Gameson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 13.

guished visually between poetry and prose, but those that did so invariably treated prophecy as prose and not as poetry.

Pagnini's translation from the Hebrew of 1528 was the first Latin Bible in which verses were numbered. In this early attempt at numbering, "the text is printed continuously; the verse-numbers are placed in the margin, and the division is indicated in the text by a heavy paragraph-mark. This gives the page an unfortunate plague-stricken appearance...."[20] While prose books were laid out in block, the Psalms were paragraphed one verse at a time. Another Latin Bible in the same period, Estienne's Vulgate of 1532, employed paragraphs for the prose, but set the Psalms and other poetic passages *per cola et commata*.[21]

A facsimile of the first page of the Psalms in Plantin's Royal Polyglot of 1569-72 shows the wide variety possible in textual layout, even by the same printer on the same passage. There, the Hebrew verses in the left column are numbered and kept on distinct lines. To the right of them, Jerome's translation from Hebrew shows some verses divided line by line and others in block paragraph. To its right, the LXX appears in blocked paragraphs, though employing more divisions than Jerome's translation from the Greek, to its right, which is laid out in large blocks.[22]

English Bibles

In Lowth's time, the Authorized Version of 1611 had maintained its premier status for a century, having won the hearts of the British after many years of competition with the Geneva Bible of 1560. Built from the insights of several English translations in the century before its creation, the AV reflected the best that critical scholarship and literary artistry had to offer in the English language. It is quite possibly a series of circumstances completely unrelated to prophetic literature that created a version of the Bible in

[20] M.H. Black, "The Printed Bible," in *The Cambridge History of the Bible*, ed. S.L. Greenslade (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963), 437.

[21] Black, 437-438.

[22] S.L. Greenslade, ed. *The Cambridge History of the Bible*, vol. 3 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960), plates 30-31.

which Lowth was able so easily to perceive continuities between poetry and prophecy.

Until the Geneva Bible, the few English translations that existed were printed very differently from what we know in the AV. The first complete English Bible, Miles Coverdale's 1535 rendering, which was translated from Latin and German versions, adopted a paragraph format known from Vulgate Bibles, using the chapter numbering system developed by Stephen Langdon in the 13th century and a subdivision of chapters into smaller units designated "A," "B," "C," etc. that was first seen in Latin Bibles of the 15th century. He left the Psalms in block text like the prose. Nevertheless, he had a good instinct for the Psalms' poetic cadences, and his translation attained virtual immortality by entering the Anglican Book of Common Prayer. Coverdale's Bible was soon followed by Matthew's Bible of 1537, Taverner's Bible of 1539, and the Great Bible of 1539.

Substantial change occurred with the appearance of the Geneva Bible of 1560. The first English Bible translated directly from Hebrew, it was also the first to number the verses according to the Masoretic divisions. Unlike Plantin's experiment, the Geneva Bible broke the passages into one-verse, numbered paragraphs—just as the AV continues to do—dramatically changing the look and feel of the text.

As might be expected, and as scholars who began in the 19th century to reverse this trend complained, this arrangement made prose narrative much more difficult to read. At the same time, as Gerald Hammond has noted, prose's loss was poetry's gain. The free-standing sense units of the Hebrew text, translated into a vernacular language that was often able, unlike Greek or Latin, to recreate the original line word by word, dramatically helped make the parallelistic features of biblical poetry stand out to the naked eye. Though lacking a theory of parallelism, the translators of both the Geneva Bible and the AV that borrowed from it gained a feel for Hebrew poetry that was clearly conveyed in their literal translations.[23]

[23] Gerald Hammond's in-depth comparison of early English biblical translations demonstrates the clarity of the parallelistic lines in the Geneva and AV texts in comparison both with earlier English translations and with the NEB of this century: "Throughout the Pro-

A significant debate of the day was how biblical poetry ought best to be represented in translation. Major translators of the Bible from Coverdale to the AV offered literal word-by-word renderings as much as possible, and these "prose psalms" were standard in English Bibles. But around this same time, another version of biblical poetry was gaining popularity, especially among the new Protestant church, the translation of the Psalms into English meter and rhyme. These singable, aesthetically recognizable renderings of the Psalms became a staple of Reformation worship, and were bound by printers into many editions of the Geneva and AV Bibles.[24] For many, rendering Hebrew psalms into verse that was recognizable in the western ear was the only way to experience the text as poetry.[25]

Metrical psalms were highly popular, so popular that the first translation of any part of the Bible, and the first book published, in English-speaking America was *The Bay Psalm Book*, published by the Massachusetts Bay Colony in 1640.[26] Like other metrical psalters, *The Bay Psalm Book* appeared both on its own and bound with many editions of the Bible.[27] Calling other metric renditions "paraphrases" because they added to and subtracted from the sense of the original for the sake of English verse, the colony's

---

phetic and Poetic books the Geneva Bible corrects, tidies up, and gives poetic form to what had previously stood as the English text" Gerald Hammond, *The Making of the English Bible* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1983), 131.

[24] Basil Hall, "The Genevan Version of the English Bible: Its Aims and Achievements," in *The Bible, the Reformation and the Church: Essays in Honour of James Atkinson*, ed. W.P. Stephens (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 127.

[25] Hall, *Genevan Version,* 136, describes "a stranger attending a Huguenot service [who] spoke of being ravished by the sound of men's and women's voices blending in the melody of the Psalms, and noted that many protestant worshippers still sing the Old Hundredth in Kethe's words ("All People that on Earth Do Dwell") to the Genevan melody. For a book-length discussion of metrical psalms, see also Rivkah Zim, *English Metrical Psalms: Poetry as Praise and Prayer, 1535-1601* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987).

[26] Harold Scanlin, "Bible Translation by American Individuals," in *The Bible and Bibles in America*, ed. Ernest Frerichs (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1988), 44.

[27] John Alden, "The Bible as Printed Word," in *The Bible and Bibles in America*, ed. Ernest Frerichs, Bible in American Culture (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1988), 13.

clergy translated the psalms carefully from the Hebrew.[28] The book's preface explains with intrepid logic:

> The psalms are penned in such verses as are suitable to the poetry of the Hebrew language, and not in the common style of such other books of the Old Testament as are not poetical; now no protestant doubteth but that all the books of the scripture should by God's ordinance be extant in the mother tongue of each nation, that they may be understood of all, hence the psalms are to be translated into our English tongue; and if in our English tongue we are to sing them, then as all our English songs (according to the course of our English poetry) do run in metre, so ought David's psalms to be translated into meter, that so we may sing the Lord's songs, as in our English tongue so in such verses as are familiar to an English ear which are commonly metrical: and as it can be no just offence to any good conscience to sing David's Hebrew songs in English words, so neither to sing his poetical verses in English poetical meter.[29]

So deeply did metrical psalms take root in English-speaking Christendom that discussion of their merits continued in Lowth's own day. John Dennis, writing in 1704, extolled poetry as "the natural Language of Religion."[30] Since the Bible belonged to a more sublime order of discourse than prose, "all those parts of the Old Testament which were writ in Verse, ought to be translated in Verse, by Reasons which may have force enough to convince us, that Verse translated in Prose is but half translated."[31]

Lowth disagreed. He maintained that the structures and cadences of the Hebrew language itself differed radically from those of the Greek and

---

[28] Scanlin, 44.

[29] *The Bay Psalm Book: A Facsimile Reprint of the First Edition of 1640* (University of Chicago Press, 1956). This is in the preface; the pages are not numbered.

[30] John Dennis, *The Critical Works of John Dennis*, ed. E.N. Hooker, vol. 1 (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1939), 364.

[31] Dennis, 331.

Latin from which western conventions derive. "Its metres are neither complex nor capable of much variety; but rather simple, grave, temperate: less adapted to fluency than to dignity and force."[32] Therefore, "a poem translated literally from the Hebrew into the prose of any other language, whilst the same forms of the sentences remain, will still retain, even as far as relates to versification, much of its native dignity, and a faint appearance of versification. This is evident in our common version of the Scriptures."[33]

Despite his arguments, Lowth often concluded his lectures with his own Latin metered renditions of psalms, forcing his English translator to "inspect every modern author" in search of worthy English rhyme, and occasionally to offer his own versification, protesting faintly that "I was a poet through necessity, not choice."[34] As Lowth explained when presenting Psalm 19, "By exhibiting it in an entire state, though in modern verse, you will more readily perceive the order, method, and arrangement of this beautiful composition."[35] In light of his arguments against such verse and his advocacy of close translation, as well as his praise of the brevity, vividness, and parallelism of biblical poetry, this is a surprising statement, reflective of the regard in which metrical poetry was held. Indeed, while the tradition ordinarily limited such verses to psalms, Lowth offered metric renditions of both 2 Samuel 1 and Isaiah 14.[36]

Summary

By Lowth's time, the question of how poetry was best rendered in the vernacular was wide open. Bibles in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin varied greatly, and none of them portrayed poetically all that readers sensed was verse. Printed English Bibles had obliterated the distinction between prose and psalmody, yet had opened the way to noticing poetic features more clearly by separating chapter and verse line by line. For the first time since

[32] Lowth, *Poetry*, 46.

[33] Lowth, *Poetry*, 47.

[34] Lowth, *Poetry*, vi.

[35] Lowth, *Poetry*, 301.

[36] Lowth, *Poetry*, 268 and 316.

Jerome, the poetic lines of not only the Psalms, but the prophets too, were visible on the page, in the native tongues of Christians, and translated in such a way as to highlight their parallelistic rhythm. In addition, understanding of the Psalms as poetry, and the desire to experience them poetically, continued to spur inquiry into the meaning and form of Hebrew verse.

Lowth's Contributions

Though Lowth is best known today for his theory of parallelism, this comprises only a minor part of a much more comprehensive discussion of Hebrew poetry in his early lectures. There he discussed poetic imagery, metaphor, personification, and what he called the "sublime," which until his time was a description reserved for poetry in the Greek tradition. By pointing out the beauty and logic of Hebrew verse, he aimed to redefine poetic sublimity itself. As the rise of 19th-century romanticism with its wide interest in the Bible as classic literature shows, he succeeded in introducing biblical poetry into the canons of human artistic achievement.

What Characterizes Poetry

Lowth took for granted, as did others both before and since, that Hebrew poetry is metrical. Beginning with acrostic poems with their unmistakable alphabetical line-length indicators, he observed that they are "so regularly accommodated that word answers to word, and almost syllable to syllable."[37] Nevertheless, Lowth asserted, the details of Hebrew metricality are unrecoverable, because pronunciation is entirely lost, and even the Masoretes did not know it. This was an old argument borrowed from Jewish commentators, though his criticism of Masoretic preservation is predictably much more severe.

Lowth introduced parallelism not as a substitute for meter, as he is often described as doing, but as a visible remain of a metered system that certainly existed but was beyond recovery. Fortunately, the semantic nature of parallelism meant that even in translation, Hebrew poetry retained "much

[37] Lowth, *Poetry*, 40.

of its native dignity, and a faint appearance of versification."[38] He went on to describe in detail the "sententious" style of Hebrew poetry, which he considered its primary characteristic:

> The Hebrew poets frequently express a sentiment with the utmost brevity and simplicity, illustrated by no circumstances, adorned with no epithets...they afterwards call in the aid of ornament; they repeat, they vary, they amplify the same sentiment; and adding one or more sentences which run parallel to each other, they express the same or a similar, and often a contrary sentiment, in nearly the same form of words.... Frequent and laconic sentences render the composition remarkably concise, harmonious, and animated; the brevity itself imparts to it additional strength, and being contracted within a narrower space, it has a more energetic and pointed effect.[39]

Lowth introduced his system of parallelism much later in his lectures, after discussing many other aspects of Hebrew poetry. Finally in Lecture 18 he claimed that the prophecies are poetic, and in Lecture 19, in order to compare their poetic features with those of the Psalms, he introduced his three well-known categories of parallelism. Even there his discussion is not nearly as simplistic as later characterizations of parallelism became: "This parallelism has much variety and many gradations; it is sometimes more accurate and manifest, sometimes more vague and obscure: it may, however, on the whole, be said to consist of three species."[40]

These species were 1) synonymous parallelism, "when the same sentiment is repeated in different, but equivalent terms,"[41] the most prevalent and multifarious form; 2) antithetic parallelism, "when a thing is illustrated by its contrary being opposed to it,"[42] found in the Proverbs of Solomon and

[38] Lowth, *Poetry*, 47.

[39] Lowth, *Poetry*, 59-60.

[40] Lowth, *Poetry*, 210.

[41] Lowth, *Poetry*, 211.

[42] Lowth, *Poetry*, 215.

the Song of Hannah; 3) synthetic or constructive parallelism, a category for "all such as do not come within the two former classes,"[43] "in which the sentences answer to each other, not by the iteration of the same image or sentiment, or the opposition of their contraries, but merely by the form of construction."[44]

The Prophets as Poets

Having presented many illustrative passages from prophetic books side by side with psalmic texts, and having argued by other means that the prophets are poets, Lowth finally used his observations on parallelism to clinch his argument concerning poetry and prophecy, by piling psalmic and analogously formed prophetic texts side by side, one after another, as illustrations of each category and sub-category of parallelism, beginning with Psalm 116, Isa 60:1-3 (in which "the Prophetic Muse is no less elegant and correct"[45]), Isa 53:1-5, and Hos 11:8-9.

In further chapters Lowth went on to describe the general character of prophetic poetry and the particularities of each prophet. His assertions are so bold and, by this point, so self-evident, that it is difficult to remember that what he was saying, which would continue to be repeated in literature for the next two hundred years, was very new.

Isaiah Translation

Lowth began his translation of Isaiah with a "preliminary dissertation" reiterating his discussion of poetry, with particular emphasis on parallelism, in order to show the value of translating Isaiah as a prophet, since "a just representation of his manner, and of the form of his composition, has never been attempted, or even thought of, by any translator, in any language, whether ancient or modern."[46] By this time he was confident enough in his theory to assert that the parallelistic construction of Hebrew poetry is "so

[43] Lowth, *Poetry*, 216-217.

[44] Lowth, *Poetry*, 216.

[45] Lowth, *Poetry*, 210.

[46] Lowth, *Isaiah*, i.

observable, as plainly to discriminate in general the arts of the Hebrew Scriptures which are written in verse, from those which are written in prose."[47] He qualified this assertion by acknowledging that there are many longer verses whose lines are difficult to determine, and "no complete system of rules concerning this matter can, perhaps be formed."[48] Still, he hoped to demonstrate that "this way of considering the subject may have its use, in furnishing a principle of interpretation of some consequence, in giving a general idea of the style and character of the Hebrew poetry, and in showing the close conformity of style and character between great part of the prophetical writings, and the other books of the Old Testament universally acknowledged to be poetical."[49]

He went on to explain that attending to parallelism would help in interpreting passages containing textual corruptions or obscure words. In fact, his extensive notes actually concentrated on text-critical matters more than poetic analysis. Though, largely in reaction to the excesses of intervening generations, contemporary text critics caution against emending the Bible on the basis of poetic analysis, many of Lowth's suggestions have in fact stood the test of time and now appear in the BHS critical apparatus or in various contemporary English translations. Some have even been corroborated by Qumran readings.[50]

Lowth's translation of Isaiah itself was self-consciously modeled on the AV, the main innovations being his line scansion and some alternative translations. The prose in his Isaiah was mostly limited to superscriptions and the narrative sections of chapters 6-7 and 36-39. Thus, although modern translations follow Lowth in laying out large sections of Isaiah as poetry, the number of verses Lowth considered poetic is unrivaled by subsequent translations.

---

[47] Lowth, *Isaiah*, vii.

[48] Lowth, *Isaiah*, xxiv.

[49] Lowth, *Isaiah*, xxiv.

[50] For a more detailed discussion of these, see R.S. Cripps, "Two British Interpreters of the Old Testament: R.Lowth and S. Lee," *BJRL*, no. 35 (1952/53) 385-404.

Effects of Lowth's Work

Nineteenth-Century German Commentaries

Lowth's *Lectures*, originally delivered in Latin to "standing room only" crowds,[51] were published in England in 1753, and republished in Germany, with annotations by Johann Michaëlis, in 1758-1761. Translation into continental languages soon followed,[52] but English translation waited until 1787, in an edition that included some of Michaëlis's notes. Lowth's *Isaiah,* written in English, was translated into German almost immediately, with extensive notes by J. Koppe.[53]

His ideas met with enthusiasm especially in Germany. Johann Herder's *Spirit of Hebrew Poetry*, published in 1782, borrowed the term "parallelism" for his extensive discussion biblical poetry without mentioning Lowth directly.[54] Wilhelm Genesius, writing his own Isaiah commentary in 1821, also took over Lowth's idea of parallelism, and used him much more than he gave him credit for, referring to Lowth by name most often when he disagreed. R.S. Cripps has traced these arguments and demonstrated that "when he disagrees with Lowth it can be said generally that the merits of the cases and the subsequent verdict of time both favor Lowth."[55] Gesenius nevertheless praised Lowth in his introduction, saying, "His work on Isaiah has, in aesthetic and poetic insight, outstanding merit. Himself a poet, and the possessor of elegant classical culture, he studied our prophet and, above all, O.T. poetry, from this point of view."[56] Moreover, in listing recent German translations of Isaiah, Gesenius mentioned "metrische, aber zu frei und mod-

---

[51] Michael H Floyd, "Falling Flat on Our Ars Poetica or Some Problems in Recent Studies of Biblical Poetry [Parallelism]," in *The Psalms and Other Studies*, ed. J Knight and L Sinclair, 120.

[52] Stephen Prickett, "Poetry and Prophecy : Bishop Lowth and the Hebrew Scriptures in England in the Eighteenth Century," in *Images of Belief in Literature*, ed. David Jasper (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1984), 89.

[53] J.B. Koppe, *D. Robert Lowth's Jesaias Übersetzt Mit Einer Einleitung und Kritischen Philologischen und Erläuternden Anmerkungen* (Leipzig: 1780).

[54] Cripps, 398.

[55] Cripps, 393.

[56] Quoted in Cripps, 397.

ernisirende" translations by J.D. Cube (1785) and G. Krägelius (1790) that he viewed as borrowing from Lowth.[57] If so, Lowth's own poetic rendition of Isaiah was anticipated three years before him by one of his own admirers.

Translations of Isaiah into poetic form followed in several 19th-century German commentaries, including the works of Umbreit and Duhm. Not all admired his work equally, however. In his 1867 commentary Franz Delitzsch dismissed Lowth, saying he "never gets below the surface, alters the Masoretic text at his pleasure, and goes no further than an aesthetic admiration of the form."[58]

Editions of the Bible before the Revised Version

The impact of Lowth's assessment of Isaiah and other prophets as poets became apparent more slowly in editions of the Bible, in part because the continuing popularity of the AV discouraged new translation projects for nearly three centuries. However, new printings of the AV provided opportunities for innovative typesetting. In editions that began to distinguish poetry from prose, the term "parallelism" occurred regularly, but Lowth himself remained unmentioned.

One of the first of these, if not the first, was James Nourse's 1827 "Paragraph Bible." Its title page explains, "The text of the common translation is arranged in paragraphs, such as the sense requires: the divisions of chapters and verses being noted in the margin, for reference." Explaining the history of the Bible's division into chapters and verses "without any regard

---

[57] Wilhelm Gesenius, *Philologisch-Kritischer und Historischer Kommentar über den Jesaia* , 3 vols. (Leipzig: F.C.W. Vogel, 1821), 139.

[58] Franz Delitzsch, *Biblical Commentary on the Prophecies of Isaiah*, trans. James Martin, vol. 1 (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1867), 64. Delitzsch was an equal opportunity critic, however, saying of Umbreit that his commentary "manifests itself in lofty poetic language…never coming down from the cothurnus" (65), and of Ewald, "there is something irritating in the self-sufficiency with which he ignores nearly all his predecessors, the dictational assumption of his criticism, his false and often nebulous pathos, and his unqualified identification of his own opinions with truth itself" (65).

to the sense,"[59] Nourse asserted that the continuous paragraphs found in both Hebrew and Greek texts give critics working in those languages a great advantage in comprehending textual continuity. This edition distinguished typographically among three genres: prose, poetry, and the "poetic prose" of such books as Ecclesiastes.

Nourse did not discuss the means by which genre determinations were made, leaving readers to surmise that they are, for the scholar working in original languages, self-evident. Detection of poetry is surprisingly quite liberal, perhaps even surpassing the most poetically laden contemporary translations such as the NJB. Even snippets like Noah's curse in Genesis 9, and the tantalizing half-verse one-liner, "even as Nimrod the mighty hunter before the LORD" (Gen 10:9), are set off from the paragraphs around them and centered on the page as poetry. More extensive poetic sections such as "Spring up O well" (Num 21:17-18) are set in double columns. This is the very first edition of the Bible that I discovered in which prophetic books are found in poetic scansion. Though his decisions do not appear to be quite as liberal as Lowth's, they are very close. Several other editions of the AV, especially in the early 20th century, followed Nourse's lead in abandoning the single-verse paragraphs of the 1611 Bible.

Commentaries and the Nourse Bible notwithstanding, distinguishing between prose and poetry in biblical editions gained ground more quickly than understanding the poets as prophets did. The Revised Version of 1895 (along with its American edition, the American Standard Version of 1901) was the first authorized and thorough reworking of the AV. This monument on the road to modern biblical translation reflects only partial acceptance of Lowth's understanding when it states:

> The old division of the books into chapters and verses has been abandoned in favour of the arrangement in paragraphs.... In the poetical

[59] James Nourse, *The Holy Bible, Containing the Old and New Testaments : Translated out of the Original Tongues and with the Former Translations Diligently Compared and Revised. The Text of the Common Translation Is Arranged in Paragraphs* ... (New York: American and Foreign Bible Society, 1848, Orig. pub. 1927), iv.

> portions, besides the division into paragraphs, the Revisers have adopted an arrangement in lines, so as to exhibit the parallelism which is characteristic of Hebrew Poetry. But they have not extended this arrangement to the prophetical books, the language of which although frequently marked by parallelism is, except in purely lyrical passages, rather of the nature of lofty and impassioned prose.[60]

Editions of the Bible Since the RV

Within a decade, a new version of the RV was prepared by Richard Moulton. His "Modern Reader's Bible: The Books of the Bible with three Books of the Apocrypha, Presented in Modern Literary Form," printed first in individual volumes just before the turn of the century, and subsequently in a single volume, completely reformats the RV. Moulton's aim was "to investigate, from internal evidence of the writings themselves, and by principles of comparative literature, the exact literary form and detailed structure of the books of Scripture; and then to use all the devices of modern printing for the purpose of indicating such structure to the eye of the reader."[61]

Moulton's work contains some of the most thorough discussion of Hebrew poetry to be found in any edition of the Bible. His analysis of genre attended to the blurring of distinctions between poetry and prose:

> Biblical verse rests upon the parallelism of clauses. But, in all languages, parallelism of clauses belongs also to prose literature, being a marked feature of oratory. In such a system then prose and verse will overlap; the extremes of each will be as far apart as in other languages, but there will be passages which have relations with both.[62]

In regard to Isaiah, Moulton criticized both the AV, for disconnecting verse from verse so that it had "lulled too many of us into being content with

---

[60] *The Holy Bible: The Revised Version with the Revised Marginal References* (London: Oxford University Press, 1898, Orig. pub. 1895), viii.

[61] Moulton, vii.

[62] Moulton, 1530.

prophecy as a storehouse of sacred sayings,"[63] and contemporary commentators, for being concerned only with how many Isaiahs there were. Bracketing out issues of authorship and redaction in a way that set him either three generations behind or three generations ahead of his time, Moulton presented Isaiah as an integrated drama of redemption. Since "at present the effusion of a poetaster in the corner of a provincial journal is printed with more discrimination of poetic form than the masterpieces of the Bible,"[64] he intended "to ascertain, from internal evidence and the analog of other prophecy, what are the separate compositions of which the whole book is made up, and what is the true literary form of each, and to present these to the eye with the conventional external arrangement to which a modern reader is accustomed."[65]

The practice of interpreting Isaiah and other prophets as poets took hold in the 20th century, and was reflected in a new 1912 translation by the American Baptist Publication Society ("The Holy Bible Containing the Old And New Testaments: An Improved Edition, Based in Part on the Bible Union Version").[66] In 1917, the Jewish Publication Society followed suit with "The Holy Scriptures according to the Masoretic Text: A New Translation."

By the time of the next major English translation, the RSV in 1952, the notion of prophets as poets was practically universal. According to James Muilenburg, who worked on the revision committee and whose essay on "The Poetry of the Old Testament" appears in a brief *Introduction to the Revised Standard Version of the Old Testament,* less than 15% of the OT appears as poetry in the American Standard Version, while 40% of the RSV

[63] Moulton, 1391.

[64] Moulton, 1391.

[65] Moulton, 1391-1392.

[66] Harry M. Orlinsky and Robert G. Bratcher, *A History of Bible Translation and the North American Contribution* (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1991), 73. I was unable to obtain a copy of this translation.

is presented as poetry.[67] Like others before him, Muilenburg offered an extended discussion of parallelism without mentioning Robert Lowth.

The past thirty years have seen a plethera of new biblical translations reflecting varying degrees of originality, accuracy, and grace. With very few exceptions these translations follow the RSV in presenting the biblical text in two formats: prose block and poetic verse. For the most part these decisions are presented to readers just as those in the BHK and BHS were: omitting all mention of the interpretive work on the face of every page. The NIV translators' preface is practically the only contemporary Bible since the RSV to discuss poetry. In a manner reminiscent of Nourse and the RV, however, the NIV explains how prose/poetry decisions are made: "poetical passages are printed as poetry."

But even the briefest comparison of modern biblical translations shows that the sharp distinctions that each translation committee makes between poetry and prose have not been well corroborated by other committees. For instance, in Isaiah 8, where narrative, dialogue, and oration are interspersed, the number of verses represented as poetry ranges from 2 (RSV and NRSV) to 11 (NIV and Tanakh) to 15 (NJB). As I will show later, many translations display only a superficial awareness of the parallelism that presumably guides their decisions.

Contemporary Discussions of Parallelism

Although the concept of parallelism has been so completely absorbed into the study of the Bible that its presence as an indicator of poetry has come to be assumed, very little was offered by way of refinement of Lowth's work until this generation. The general view seems to have been that parallelism was synonymous with poetry and vice versa, and that its presence was perfectly easy to distinguish. To retain this synonymity, lines in an otherwise parallelistic passage that did not fit Lowth's definition were

---

[67] James Muilenburg, "The Poetry of the Old Testament," in *An Introduction to the Revised Standard Version of the Old Testament*, ed. Members of the Revision Committee (New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1952), 62-63.

assigned to his catch-all category, "synthethic parallelism," and parallelisms in texts that did not share poetry's terse rhythms and syntax were ignored.

For many years, improvements in Lowth's theories were limited to multiplications of his basic categories of parallelism. But recent discussions of poetry and of parallelism have begun to experiment with new ways of describing its effects and dimensions. Like many rival scholars, the new definers of parallelism tend to highlight their disagreement, while those of us looking in from the outside are more aware of their similarities. Though there is not room in this paper to discuss their work in detail, mention should be made especially of the pioneering work of James Kugel, Robert Alter, Adele Berlin, and David Clines.

All four seek to describe the relationships between parallelistic lines. Whereas Lowth emphasized the similarity, or correspondence, between the lines, emphasis has been placed more recently on their difference, a difference lending the poetry its dynamic movement. Kugel's famous iteration is, "A is so, and what's more, B."[68] Alter improved on this saying by discussing the intensification that occurs in the second line, a sense of "how much more so."[69] Thus the second line introduces terms that are more literary, "highfalutin," explanatory, metaphorical, so that "the characteristic movement of meaning is one of heightening or intensification, of focusing, specification, concretization, even what could be called dramatization."[70] Clines, similarly, described what he called "the parallelism of greater precision," in which elements of the second line disambiguate or explicate elements of the first line, and drive us back to reread the first line with greater understanding.[71]

Adele Berlin's approach is more comprehensive and linguistic, offering a survey of the levels of language on which biblical parallelism occurs: not only on the grammatical level of parallel clauses and the lexical level of

---

[68] Kugel, 1.

[69] Robert Alter, *The Art of Biblical Poetry* (New York: Basic Books, 1985), 11.

[70] Alter, 19.

[71] David Clines, "The Parallelism of Greater Precision: Notes from Isaiah 40 for a Theory of Hebrew Poetry," in *Directions in Biblical Hebrew Poetry*, ed. Elaine R. Follis (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1987), 77-100.

parallel words, but also in combinations of these, as well as phonologically in a variety of ways. Since these different levels of parallelism can coincide in an endless number of ways, the effect of any particular parallelistic passage "must be viewed in light of its context.... Parallelism itself does not have a meaning; but it structures the meaning of the signs of which it is composed."[72]

I have reserved discussion of Kugel for last, though his book appeared first. He called into question the entire category of biblical poetry. Accepting as normative the prevailing idea of the synonymity of parallelism and poetry (despite observations to the contrary not only by other interpreters but by Lowth himself), Kugel showed that not all poetry contains what might fairly be called parallelism, and, more importantly, that parallelism occurs regularly in biblical prose. Attempts to bifurcate biblical literature into two genres that may be distinguishable in classic English literature, but in Hebrew are not, result in bending these categories to accommodate vast amounts of material that lie somewhere in the middle ground, partaking of rhythm, parallelism, and terseness, but not falling neatly into the metrical lines that some psalms do. To Kugel, such interpretive labels as "rhythmical prose," "now-lost poetic sagas," "unmetrical poetry," "parallelistic prose," "poetic resonance" are all symptomatic of the misfit of such a polarity.[73] And when such a binary structure is applied to the presentation of biblical texts, the result is the BHK's "confusing mishmash," especially in the prophetic books, in which "the text lurches from prose into poetry and back to prose, sometimes within a single sentence."[74] In short, "the whole problem of what is and is not 'poetry' in the Bible has been put to modern-day commentators most dramatically and irresolvably, by their own post-Lowthian zeal for representing *parallelismus membrorum* typographically."[75]

"In sum, what is called biblical 'poetry' is a complex of heightening effects used in combinations and intensities that vary widely from composi-

[72] Berlin, *Biblical Parallelism*, 138.

[73] Kugel, 83.

[74] Kugel, 77.

[75] Kugel, 121.

tion to composition even within a single 'genre.'"[76] "The biblical skyline has buildings of all shapes and sizes; a stylistic analysis of a passage must properly take into account the relative intensity and formality of each line.... The categories of prose and poetry imply too sharp, and total, a polarity: to use only these terms is to describe sections of the skyline as consisting either of 'building' or 'no building.'"[77]

In a very real sense, the subject of biblical poetry comes full circle with Kugel's criticisms of the bifurcation of biblical text into prose and poetry. Whereas the most ancient biblical manuscripts seem to have done little to distinguish them, and for the first two millennia the category of poetry was both sharply limited philosophically and ambiguously displayed visually, Lowth's observation of parallelism as a special feature of poetry, and his addition of the prophets to the canon of biblical poets, opened the door to a 19th- and 20th-century positivism about what was prose and what was poetry that has finally, like poor Eliakim in Isaiah 22, been hung on a peg and loaded with too much weight, the offspring and the offshoots, all the lesser vessels, the bowls and the jars: "In that day the peg driven into the firm place will give way; it will be sheared off and will fall, and the load hanging on it will perish" (Isa 22:25).

Test Cases from Isaiah

Isaiah 1

The 16th-century recasting of biblical text from block paragraphs to verse-length units did wonders for illuminating parallelism, though it rendered the reading of continuity in narrative much more difficult. Many parts of Isaiah and other prophets certainly benefit from Lowth's insights, and from the attention to parallelism that has resulted. One need look no further than the very first chapter to see the improvements that poetic scansion makes in interpretive appreciation. Here compare the last major translation that rendered Isaiah in prose with that of Robert Alter, who aimed to highlight the text's poetry:

---

[76] Kugel, 94.

[77] Kugel 86.

ASV: Isaiah 1:2 Hear, O heavens, and give ear, O earth; for Jehovah hath spoken: I have nourished and brought up children, and they have rebelled against me. 3 The ox knoweth his owner, and the ass his master's crib; *but* Israel doth not know, my people doth not consider. 4 Ah sinful nation, a people laden with iniquity, a seed of evil-doers, children that deal corruptly! they have forsaken Jehovah, they have despised the Holy One of Israel, they are estranged *and gone* backward.... 9 Except Jehovah of hosts had left unto us a very small remnant, we should have been as Sodom, we should have been like unto Gomorrah.

2 Listen, heavens, give ear, earth—
for the Lord has spoken.
Sons have I raised and reared up, and they rebelled against Me.
3 The ox knows his owner, the ass his master's crib.
Israel does not know, My people does not grasp.
4 Ah, sinful folk, people laden with crime,
Seed of evildoers, sons depraved!
They've forsaken the Lord despised the Holy One of Israel,
they have dropped away....
9 Had not the Lord of Hosts left us a bare remnant,
We should be like Sodom, resemble Gomorrah.[78]

Just as the AV did long before Lowth coined the term, the ASV's more or less literal translation retains much of the parallelism for the discerning eye. But in some places it completely misses. Verse 2b, for instance, retained word for word by Alter, is rendered in the ASV, "I have nourished and brought up children," a pedestrian clause turning the Hebrew backward, losing the syntactic chiasm of object-verb-verb/pronoun-verb-object, and obscuring the Hebrew's prominent introduction of the discourse's subject,

[78] Alter, 142-143.

God's children.[79] Extra words blur sharp contrasts in verses 3 and 4. Verse 9, with its discursive 25 words translating the Hebrew's 11, obliterates whatever heightened mood the passage had created. In attempting to retain the AV's archaic style, the ASV destroys Isaiah's terseness.[80]

Here many of the more recent translations that render Isaiah 1 as poetry do the text a great service, the more so the more carefully they follow the Hebrew and attend to the parallelism. The NEB is entirely paraphrastic, exchanging the original parallelisms for creations of its own (verse 3b, for example, is rearranged: "but Israel, my own people,/has no knowledge, no discernment"), but the RSV, NRSV, and NAB retain the Hebrew's word order, and the Tanakh offers a clipped rendition that retains its forcefulness: "Had not the LORD of Hosts/Left us some survivors,/We should be like Sodom,/Another Gomorrah."

Isaiah 8

In passages in which poetic features are obvious and consistent, poetic scansion works well, especially if attention is paid to other elements of the text's style. Yet what happens in a passage that, in Kugel's words, "lurches from prose into poetry and back to prose," because its contents are neither consistently parallelistic nor consistently discursive? As I have noted, Isaiah 8, which mixes a variety of kinds of speech, is treated very diversely by modern translations. Except for verses 2-3 and the introductions of speeches, the chapter consists of divine and prophetic speech. Lowth renders nearly all of it poetically. The following chart surveys recent interpretations:

Version	Verses rendered as poetry
*Lowth	*8:4, 6-23
RSV/NRSV	8:9-10
JPS (1917)	8:6-10

[79] It should be noted that most modern translations continue this reversal, though Alter's (and the RSV's) order is perfectly acceptable, and effective, English.

[80] In fact, the ASV follows the AV very closely in these verses. Lowth's translation improves verse 4 and 9 considerably, but he too reverses the clause in verse 2.

NAB	8:6-10, 12-15
Moulton	8:9-10, 21-22
NIV	8:6-10, 12-17
Tanakh	8:6-10, 11-15, 22
NEB	8:6-10, 16-22
NJB	8:9-22
BHS	8:6-10, 12-18, 19?, 20?, 21-23

Several observations can be made. First, no two of these editions agree, except of course the RSV and its revision. Second, the differences cannot be chalked up to more or less willingness to break into song: even those more inclined to see poetry do not agree on which verses to see it in. For instance, one would think on the basis of the majority that verses 6-8 might be a safe investment for the NJB, but it resists them, going with everything else instead.

Third, while the NRSV offers one of the most faithful translations line by line, it oddly renders most of the chapter, even the most obviously poetic sections, as prose. The NEB and NJB, on the other hand, present more of the passage as poetry, yet their translations obscure the Hebrew parallelism the most. The NEB translates verse 6 as poetry but inexplicably deletes its parallelistic line:

> Because this nation has rejected
> the waters of Shiloah, which run so softly and gently,
> [here a phrase is deleted]
> therefore the Lord will bring up against it
> the strong, flooding waters of the Euphrates,
> the king of Assyria and all his glory....

This translation coincides with half of a BHS suggestion, which is to delete not only the one phrase but also "the king of Assyria and all his glory." Thus it creates neither the parallelism in the Masoretic text nor that which the BHS perceives.

The NRSV, though retaining the parallelism, presents the verse as prose, just before switching to poetry in the same speech:

> Because this people has refused the waters of Shiloah that flow gently, and melt in fear before Rezin and the son of Remaliah; therefore, the Lord is bringing up against it the mighty flood waters of the River, the king of Assyria and all his glory....

Without any translation revision at all, this wording, set as verse, would read:

> Because this people has refused
> the waters of Shiloah that flow gently,
> and melt in fear
> before Rezin and the son of Remaliah;
> therefore, the Lord is bringing up against it
> the mighty flood waters of the River,
> the king of Assyria and all his glory....

Similarly, in the only two verses that everyone agrees are poetic, the NJB obscures the poetry by sheer verboseness. Below is the NJB's rendering of verses 9-10, with the completely additional phrases italicized, and additional verbose renderings of simple words underlined:

> Realise *this*,[81] peoples, and be afraid,
> listen, all *members of* far-off nations!
> Arm yourselves yet be afraid!
> Arm yourselves yet be afraid!
> Devise plans *as you may:* they will come to nothing!

[81] The NJB adopts the LXX reading rather than the very obscure Hebrew word that nearly resembles it typographically. This is one of the textual emendations recommended by Lowth, and it has been included in the BHS apparatus and adopted in NAB and NEB as well.

Make *what* pronouncements *you like*; it will not come about!
For God is with us!

Once again, as in the ASV's Isaiah 1, the poetry is obscured by additional words and paraphrastic phrases. In addition, this translation misrepresents the number of "plans" and "pronouncements," changing "it" to "they" in one line and leaving an ungrammatical and unparallel "it" in the next. It also misses, as others do, the repetition of roots in verb-noun combinations, and paraphrastically deconcretizes the passage's solid language. Although English is inevitably wordier than Hebrew, a cleaner rendering is:

Know, peoples, and be shattered,
Listen, all distant places of the earth,
Gird yourselves and be shattered,
gird yourselves and be shattered!
Plan a plan and it will be frustrated,
Speak a speech and it will not stand,
for with us is God.

The last observation, and most dismaying, is that the BHS is the most dizzying of all. In addition to "lurching" back and forth more than any other edition, the BHS also varies both the indentation and the line lengths as if it knows something both we and the Masoretes don't, and leaves verses 19 and 20 in some kind of not-quite-justified but not-quite-poefied no-man's-land, the intent of which is difficult to puzzle out.

By trying to discern acute distinctions between poetry and prose, modern translations have not improved on either Lowth or the AV, both of which read consistently, each in its own way, as did the Masoretic text. For different reasons, neither the MT, nor the AV, nor Lowth subdivided the speeches of Isaiah and God into arbitrarily determined poetic and unpoetic units. But every one of these newer editions has done so, creating discontinuities that dismember an already difficult passage.

Unless his catch-all, third category is stretched to the breaking point, Lowth's decision to render as poetry nearly all divine and prophetic speech, not only in this chapter but throughout Isaiah, cannot have been made only on the basis of parallelism. As he observed, and as Nourse, Moulton, and Kugel have also seen, a middle ground exists in rhetorical speech, which may not quite be lyric poetry, but is certainly more rhythmic, more terse, more inclined to double back and parallel, more elevated than prose, even than most biblical narrative. As the new century begins, the time has come to reconsider the dichotomy into which many prophetic speeches are thrown. There may be other solutions, but I wonder if we can do much better than to follow Jerome's lead. Rather than making fine distinctions between prophetic speech which is poetry and that which is not, we might represent the prophets best by casting their speeches in the *per cola et commata* system that worked so well for Greek prose and poetry alike.

Conclusion

What was new in Lowth? A survey of manuscripts and printed texts in Hebrew, Greek, Latin, and English has shown a great deal of experimentation with the graphic portrayal of biblical texts. However, largely because of the limitations of printing, by Lowth's time the text of the prophets and that of the poetic books were rendered identically (though understood differently) in both Hebrew and English. The AV's verse numbering system aided biblical study and helped the poetry emerge, but atomized prose narrative. A humanist inclination to read the Bible as literature helped Lowth not only to discern the prophets' poetry but also to experiment graphically, employing western literature's visual renderings of prose and poetry.

It took over a century to become standard, but Lowth's prose/poetry rendition of Isaiah is now so widespread that it is difficult to imagine anything else. Simplistic readings of Lowth, and adoption of his basic ideas without reading him at all, have resulted in contemporary attempts at acute distinctions between poetry and prose in the prophets. This has resulted in an application of "parallelism" that has broken texts in strange and inconsistent ways, as Isaiah 8 exemplifies.

Contemporary discussions of parallelism hold much promise for translations of the future. These will be much aided by discontinuing a flat identification between parallelism and poetry and by more nuanced study of the significance of both parallelism and other rhetorical devices. In addition, since the Bible's physical appearance has undergone so many changes and endured so many experiments over the years, and since a technological explosion has now made easier what the printing press made more difficult, perhaps the time has come, after a century of dividing the Bible, neatly but inconsistently, between poetry and prose, to try something else.

What's new in Lowth? A fresh eye, a bold spirit of innovation that is not best emulated by slavish imitation (and certainly not by flat readings of his work), but rather by borrowing the best that he offers, as he did with his predecessors, and building newly upon it with the same spirit of creativity, and love for the Bible's beauty.

God Sows the Land:
Hosea's Place in the Book of the Twelve

Mr. Laurie J. Braaten
Eastern Nazarene College

The Minor Prophets have been passed down as a single collection titled "The Book of the Twelve." Recent studies have explored ways of reading the Twelve as a unity.[1] One approach looks for unifying elements in framing devices such as *inclusios*, key words, motifs, and themes.[2] In the Formation of the Book of the Twelve Seminar, recent suggestions for such devices include love (Watts, 1997), marriage imagery (Baumann, 1999), and the Day of Yahweh (Rendtorff, 1997, Nogalski, 1999). Others note such themes as Yahweh's relation with Israel and Judah, return and/or repentance, the changing roles of the nations, and vegetational motifs.

The current study is a thematic approach based primarily on a synchronic reading of the MT.[3] It begins by looking for literary clues concerning the text's meaning. What is the reader expected to find *in* the

[1] A full literature survey will not be attempted, see the recent surveys in the SBL Seminar Papers by Marvin A. Sweeney (1999), Aaron Schart (1998), and Paul L. Redditt (1997).

[2] For this method see James D. Nogalski, "Intertextuality and the Twelve," *Forming Prophetic Literature: Essays on Isaiah and the Twelve in Honor of John D. W. Watts* JSOTSup 235 (ed. James W. Watts and Paul R. House; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996) 102-24.

[3] Examples of fruitful thematic approaches include Paul R. House, *The Unity of the Twelve* BLS 27 (Sheffield: Almond Press, 1990); Terence Collins, *The Mantle of Elijah: The Redaction Criticism of the Prophetical Books* BibSem 20 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993) 59-87; and Raymond C. Van Leeuwen "Scribal Wisdom and Theodicy in the Book of the Twelve" *In Search of Wisdom: Essays in Memory of John G. Gammie* (ed. L. Perdue, B.B. Scott, W. J. Wiseman; Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1993) 31-49. The current study will not pursue questions of the variant textual order attested in the LXX. For such an approach see Barry Alan Jones, *The Formation of the Book of the Twelve: A Study in Text and Canon* SBLDS 149 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995).

text and what is the reader expected to bring *to* the text? It will also seek answers concerning the *utility* or functionality of the text. What is the text supposed to do *to* or *for* the reader?, and who *is* the reader? In other words, what is the text's *setting* and *purpose*?

I

The opening and closing oracles in the Book of the Twelve provide hints concerning key thematic elements of the whole.[4] The first is an *inclusio* formed by the word "land" (אֶרֶץ). Hosea 1:2 reads "Go, take a woman of whoredom and children of whoredom, for the *land* commits whoredom away from Yahweh." The final oracle in Malachi (MT) warns that God is going to send Elijah to restore father-son unity, "lest I come and strike the *land* with a ban of destruction"[5] (Mal 3:24 [Engl. 4:6]). These two occurrences of land are typically treated as references to the inhabitants, or people of the land, and not to the land *per se*.[6] Given the frequent use of vegetational imagery[7] in the Twelve, however, it is possible that the collector(s) wished to designate *land* as an important theme throughout the work. How did Hosea, as the introduction to the Twelve, employ this theme?

Hos 1:2-9 contains four commands to the prophet involving symbolic acts or namings. The first (quoted above) commands a marriage and the

---

[4] These texts may also serve as *inclusios* for the individual prophetic work or earlier collections. Some texts serve multiple duty, the presence of specific terms being responsible for the placement of a book in its current location, see James Nogalski, *Literary Precursors to the Book of the Twelve* BZAW 217 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1993) 14-15.

[5] Translations are the author's unless otherwise stated.

[6] This is especially the case for Hos 1:2, e.g., Hans Walter Wolff, *Hosea* Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974) 15. Beth Glazier-McDonald understands the reference in Malachi to connote the territory circumscribed by the families mentioned in the oracle, and comments on the intimate connection between land and people in the Hebrew Bible, see *Malachi: Divine Messenger* SBLDS 98 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987) 258-59.

[7] See Collins, *The Mantle of Elijah*, 67-68, 77, 80, *passim.*

simply as a location of past sin and God's responses, and so the reader is left to ponder, "What does (will) God sow?"

The reader has two alternatives for answering these questions. One is to wait for further information in Hosea and the Twelve, the other is to draw upon the traditions Hosea presupposes in the Elijah cycle. Both options bear much fruit.

The reader would probably first reflect on the Elijah traditions concerning the Omrides, Jehu, and Jezreel. A quick glance at that narrative[10] reveals that the house of Ahab (including Joram) is charged with "bloodshed" (דמים) and "whoredom" (זנונים) for crimes of murder, land seizure and Baalism. Likewise, Hosea charges Ephraim with false worship, bloodshed, etc., often characterized as "whoredom."[11] The land receives attention here since the crimes that are singled out, "bloodshed" and "whoredom," are sins that violate the sanctity of the land and bring upon it pollution or defilement.[12]

The reader returns to Hosea to interpret the first symbolic act. The "woman of whoredom" whom Hosea marries produces "children of whoredom." These children receive names indicating they are symbolic of God's people, Israel. If that is the case with the children, then what does the woman symbolize? Does she also symbolize Israel as is usually suggested? A survey of the family imagery in Hosea outside of Hos 1-3 discloses that Israel/Ephraim is always depicted in masculine imagery as the offspring or

---

[10] 1 Kgs 18; 22; 2 Kgs 9. Full documentation for the material in this paragraph will appear in a forthcoming paper. Note that the (MT) Book of the Twelve concludes with an explicit reference to Elijah in Mal 3:23[4:5] forming another frame around the corpus.

[11] For "whoredom" (זנונים and תזנסות) see Hos 2:4[2], 6[4]; 4:11, 12; 5:4; 6:10. For "bloodshed" see Hos 4:2; 6:8; 12:15[14]. Both appear throughout the Twelve, the two are attested in the accusations against Nineveh in Nah 3:1-4.

[12] For "bloodshed" see Num 35:37; for "prostitution" or "whoredom" see Lev 19:29; Jer 3:1. Ps 106:34-39 lists the sins of the settlement as mingling with the Canaanites, worshiping their idols, sacrificing children, polluting the land with blood, and prostituting themselves. Although these texts postdate Hosea, the ideas were apparently known earlier. Walter Brueggemann argues for Jeremiah's familiarity with these priestly ideas, see *The Land* OBT (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977) 118-19.

son of Yahweh, and never as God's bride.[13] Some interpreters have suggested the woman, as portrayed in Hos 2, symbolizes a city in a manner similar to the way Isaiah depicts Jerusalem as a whore in Isaiah 1.[14] The agricultural imagery of chapter 2, however, together with the indication in Hos 1:2 that the "woman of whoredom" represents the whoredom of the *land* support the interpretation that Yahweh's bride in Hos 1-2 is the land *per se*. Although redactors have changed the referent of the imagery in the last half of Hos 2 and in Hos 3, the initial land imagery remains intact in the final form of Hosea and the Twelve.[15]

Hosea accuses both land and people of whoredom. The people commit whoredom by worshipping Baal as their provider god instead of Yahweh, thereby "wedding" the land to Baal (Hos 2:10b[8b]). The land commits whoredom because through the people's action she is now allied to "lovers" to whom she attributes her gifts rather than to her real husband, Yahweh (2:7-10a[5-8a]). The people are intimately tied to the land as its offspring, and they also share the land's corporate guilt, in much the same way that Joram was accused of the whoredom of his mother Jezebel (2 Kgs

---

[13] It is generally supposed that the prophet's accusations of "whoredom" are grounded in the image of Israel as an unfaithful wife. As Schmitt shows, however, the older material in Hosea (Hos 4-14) always uses the root זנה in the masculine when accusing Israel of whoredom, unless specific women are in view (4:14). The same usage is attested throughout the Pentateuch. Generally speaking, the references to God's people in the Hebrew Bible are masculine, with Israel (a patronymic!) depicted as the "son/sons of God," see John J. Schmitt, "The Gender of Ancient Israel" *JSOT* 26 (1983) 115-25.

[14] Schmitt, "The Gender of Ancient Israel" 120. Gale A. Yee, pointing to the references to Jacob's (unnamed) wife in Hos 12:13 and Rachel in Jer 31:15, suggests the woman is Rachel, (*Composition and Tradition in the Book of Hosea: A Redaction Critical Investigation.* SBLDS 102 [Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987] 124-25). The major weakness of these interpretations is that no such female figures are mentioned in Hos 1-3.

[15] The land as bride imagery is consistent through Hos 2:15[13]. In 2:16[14] oracles of salvation have been appended to the judgment speech, and there is a transformation of the imagery. At this point the bride becomes Israel, whom Yahweh will take *into* the wilderness unlike 2:5[3] where the bride (land) will be made *like* a wilderness. The major Greek codices, however, read "I will designate her as (τάξω . . . εἰς) a wilderness" in 2:15, cf. LXX 2:5, see *BHK*. In chapter 3, a late reinterpretation and application of Hos 1-2, the bride clearly represents Israel. See Braaten, "Parent-Child Imagery in Hosea" 12-18, 46-72, 220-80.

9:22). In response to her unfaithfulness Yahweh divorces his wife and strips her as an act of shame and punishment (2:4-5[2-3], 12[10]) by denuding her of the agricultural products which clothe her (2:11[9]).[16]

The idea of the land being culpable is probably connected to the notion that the land can be violated and rendered polluted by whoredom or bloodshed. As we have seen above, these crimes are the subject of the two opening oracles and elsewhere in Hosea, as well as the Elijah narrative to which the two oracles allude.

The meaning of "God sows" is now becoming apparent. The agricultural bounty of the land is a gift of God. As such, God can take it back as an act of judgment. Likewise, the people, who are the offspring of their father Yahweh and the land,[17] had been sown on the land, and are expected to take root there. As an act of judgment, however, God can disown and remove (or "harvest") his offspring from his land. But God can also give back the gifts as an act of grace, and so "God sows" can regain its original positive significance (Hos 2:23-25[21-23]). The imagery of sowing, planting and harvesting, as acts of God or the people, can be traced through the remainder of the Twelve.[18]

The threats of judgment against the land are alleviated by promises of a future restoration of her agricultural products in Hos 2:16-25[14-23]. Yet the reader is troubled by the seeming unjust treatment of the land, which apparently became implicated in whoredom and defilement through the actions of the people, and by no fault of her own. The subject is taken up again in Hos 4, but this time from the perspective of the land.[19]

---

[16] For the marriage and divorce laws and customs reflected in the imagery of Hos 2 see Braaten, "Parent-Child Imagery in Hosea" 261-78.

[17] Sexual imagery is not in view here, rather the notion that God is the father/creator of individuals, expressed both in terms of creation in the womb of the mother and creation in the womb of the earth, see Braaten, "Parent-Child Imagery in Hosea," 280-92.

[18] The current study will trace this imagery through Hosea and Joel with some concluding observations on Malachi.

[19] As indicated earlier, Hos 3 is a late redactional reformulation and new interpretation of Hos 1-2 (see Braaten, "Parent-Child Imagery in Hosea," pp. 279-80). It leaves aside the issue of the agricultural demise of the nation and presents Israel's (Judah's?) punishment

II

If the land is presented as under God's judgment due to "her" sin in Hos 2, she is even more clearly presented as suffering due to the sins of the people in Hos 4:1-3. The contrast between the two passages can be epitomized by the observation that Yahweh appeals to his children to join him in a lawsuit against their mother[20] *the land* in Hos 2:4[2], whereas in Hos 4:1 the lawsuit is against the *inhabitants of* the land because their sins have had disastrous effects on the land. It is significant that this passage, like Hos 1:2, serves as an introduction to a major section of Hosea, and that land is an important element in both.

The lawsuit in Hos 4:1-3 introduces chapter 4 and the second major section of the book. Verse 2 summarizes the sins as bloodshed as in the opening judgment oracle in chapter 1. In both cases the land and its people are adversely affected. In Hosea 4, however, the land is clearly presented as a victim, suffering unjustly for the sins of her human inhabitants. The land responds to this suffering as sufferers often react in the Hebrew Bible—she "mourns" (4:3).[21] In her recent dissertation Katherine Hayes has isolated nine examples of the "earth mourning" in the prophetic literature, three of which occur in the Book of the Twelve. Hayes observes that in these texts the mourning earth is usually depicted as responding to human distress or

---

and restoration as the loss of monarchy and cult, and eventual return to David. As such it may function as a second introduction to the Twelve by adding a messianic element, as Ps 2 does for the Book of Psalms.

[20] The invitation to join in the lawsuit is soon turned against the children (2:6[8]), because they share in the whoredom of their mother. The call to join in the suit thus serves a parabolic function similar to Isaiah's appeal to the people to render a judgment against "the vineyard" in the parable of Isa 5:1-7, see 5:3.

[21] אבל can connote both "mourning" and "drying up." Some conjecture two roots for the word (KB s.v.), but it is more likely that the two meanings are interrelated. See the discussion in Katherine M. Hayes, "'The Earth Mourns': Earth as Actor in a Prophetic Metaphor" (Ph.D. dissertation, Catholic University of America, 1997) 14-23.

transgression.[22]

The land is presented as a victim whose fate is corporately linked to the actions of her sinful human inhabitants. If the people persist in their sin and refuse to change, then the land will continue to suffer. It might be possible, therefore, to see the mourning of the land as encompassing a repentance ritual, a response occasioned both by the land's miserable "dying" condition and the corporate sin affecting her. The beginnings of this ritual may be hinted at in Hos 2. Here God warns his bride that if she does not voluntarily give up her unfaithfulness she would be stripped as an act of judgment. Perhaps this is also the initiation of an imposed mourning.[23] After this judgment Yahweh promises he will restore her to the marital relationship and return the previously stripped agricultural products. The mourning of the land in Hos 4, then, would signal that she has submitted to this judgment, and so she now anticipates the promised renewal. Yet for the transformation to be complete the sinful inhabitants of the land—who continue to pollute her with their unfaithfulness, violence and whoredom—must also acknowledge their sin and follow the example of the mourning and repenting land. The land's fate is corporately bound up with her inhabitants', so she will remain under judgment until the people repent (שׁוּב) or are removed from her.[24]

---

[22] Hayes isolates the metaphor (chronologically) in Amos 1:2; Hos 4:1-3; Jer 4:23-28; 12:1-4; 12:7-13; 23:9-12; Isa 24:1-20; 33:7-9; and Joel 1:5-20. The earth's condition and appearance during a drought can be likened to human mourning rituals, "The Earth Mourns" 2-3, 19-20.

[23] Stripping as a mourning ritual is one of six motifs Hayes identifies in the metaphor. She suggests the threatened stripping in Hos 2:4-15[2-13] (cf. 13:15 and 10:1-2) is an "imposed mourning" (see 2:13[11]) on the bride whom she identifies as Israel as *both* community and land. She sees a similar sequence of whoredom, pollution, and stripping (of Jerusalem) in Ezek 16:30-52 and 23:26-30 ("The Earth Mourns" 71-73). She does not seem to identify this mourning with repentance rituals. Perhaps there are allusions to the stripping of ornaments as a sign of mourning and contrition in Hos 2:4[2], 15[13], cf. the stripping of ornaments in Exod 33:4-6 as imposed mourning and contrition.

[24] For the fate of land and people linked under the judgment of God see Hayes, "The Earth Mourns" 62 (especially n. 35). The priestly writer warns that the land will "vomit out" the Israelites, like it did the previous inhabitants, if they defile (טמא) themselves and the land by prohibited sexual practices, Lev 18:24-30 (cf. Ezra 9:10-15). As mentioned

The languishing of the land and removal of her creatures points ultimately to the downfall of her inhabitants. Here we may have an allusion to the Jezreel, or "God sows" motif. In Hos 4:3 the verb נאסף, "being destroyed," could also be rendered "being gathered," or "harvested." God's judgment is here manifested in a reversal of creation, or a taking back or harvesting of what God has sown on the earth: ". . . what God has originally sown, or planted on the earth, he is now gathering up."[25] This would not only apply to the languishing plant life, but extends to all creatures or "seed," beasts of the field, birds of the air, and fish of the sea—and ultimately, to God's unrepentant people.

III

The motif of the people's failure to properly repent and their resulting tenuous relationship with the land continues throughout Hosea, as well as the remainder of the Book of the Twelve. We will now trace this motif to the end of Hosea before we briefly summarize its function in Joel and Malachi.

Hosea 4:4-5:7 exhibits a high degree of thematic unity.[26] The prophet

---

above, two items singled out as defiling and profaning the land are bloodshed (Num 35:33) and making one's daughter a prostitute (Lev 19:29; cf. Jer 3:1). The later act results in the *land* committing prostitution. "It is the land that is finally abused. Such action fouls the nest of Israel. And there is no alternative but to be rejected, because the land must be cared for," Brueggemann, *The Land* 119.

[25] Hayes, "The Earth Mourns" 80, n. 83. For the allusions of Hos 4:3 to the tradition attested in the P creation narrative see Michael De Roche, "The Reversal of Creation in Hosea" *VT* 31 (1981) 400-409.

[26] Most commentators divide the passage in multiple units based on consideration of form, style, or content; e.g., Wolff finds separate "transmission units" in 4:4-19 and 5:1-7 (*Hosea*, 73-74 and 95). If one reads the material straight through, however, the thematic unity is found in the addressees as "priests" (4:4, 6, 9; 5:6), the attack on the cult (throughout), the accusation of "whoredom" (4:10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15; 5:3, 4, note "spirit of whoredom" in 4:12 and 5:4), which is connected with the desire for children (4:10; 5:7). The accusation that the people do not know Yahweh practically frames the unit including the introduction (4:1, 6; 5:4), as does the mention of the demise of the land (4:3) and the fields being devoured by Yahweh (5:7).

continues to announce threats of God's judgment against a straying people whose efforts to approach God are misguided. They lack knowledge and reject God's torah (Hos 4:6); they dedicate themselves to literal and spiritual whoredom (4:10, 12, 13-15, 18). Not only do they not know God, but also their deeds of whoredom have become a spiritual power rendering them incapable of returning to God (5:3-4, cf. 4:19). Their inadequate attempts to seek Yahweh reveal their unfaithfulness: new offspring are not the children of Yahweh, they are "sons of strangers" (5:6-7). Therefore the fertility festivals will be turned against the people, and they and their land allotments (נחלות) will be devoured (5:7; cf. 4:10).

The next section, Hosea 5:8-7:16,[27] takes up the theme of Israel's misguided efforts at repentance more directly; note the frequent use of the keyword שוב. Many interpreters see a shift here from a cultic to a historical focus, but they also recognize some continuity with the previous section.[28] The opening command to blow the *shophar* and to "cry out" (5:8) are generally regarded as military terms: the prophet is issuing the war alarm.[29] While the military background is certainly connoted, the most one could say here is that such an alarm warns the people to seek refuge from the enemy in a city.[30] However, the alarm serves a more important function: it announces the "day of punishment" (5:9) and the need for a corporate acknowledgement of guilt.[31] With such an aim, the prophet announces the

---

[27] Wolff finds syntactic, stylistic, and thematic unity in the material, *Hosea* 108.

[28] Wilhelm Rudolph, claiming to follow a consensus, asserts 5:8 is a new beginning marked by a shift from the cultic to the political; *Hosea* KAT XIII/1 (Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1966) 125. A. A. Macintosh (following Jerome) sees the immediate connection between the sections in "what God had threatened through his prophet is now fulfilled in the events of history;" *Hosea* ICC (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1997) 194.

[29] The blowing of the *shophar* connotes a war alarm or signal, cf. Judg 6:34; 1 Sam 13:3; 2 Sam 2:28; 18:6; KB s.v. 3. For רוע (hiph) as a war alarm, as cry or trumpet blast, see Num 10:9; Josh 6:10, KB s.v. 3.

[30] So Macintosh, *Hosea*, 194. Hosea, in view of the rest of the book, would hardly be calling the people to war.

[31] The *shophar* was often used to announce theophanies and/or cultic gatherings, including days of fasting and repentance (see Pss 47:6[5]; 81:4[3]; Joel 2:1, 15), KB s.v. A.1, 2. The verb רוע was also employed in cultic rejoicing (Pss 47:2; 65:13) or laments

people's sins and the impending judgment of God. Previously the prophet had warned that because of their unfaithfulness Israel's festivals would consume their land allotments (5:7). Now the prophet announces that Yahweh will strike the people with maladies that affect land, crops, and people ("maggots", "rottenness," "sickness," and "wounds" 5:10-12, NRSV). But instead of repenting, the people seek healing from Assyria (5:11-13). So God threatens to become like a lion who will "tear" and "carry off (from the land[?])" his people (5:14). Then God will "return" (אשובה) and await their acknowledgment of guilt (5:15). Instead, the people's "return" (נשובה) results in a superficial confession of God's willingness to heal and restore fertility (6:1-3). They expect clouds bearing life-restoring showers; they will not come because their "loving commitment" lacks its restorative effect. Rather, it is like a fleeting morning cloud or a quickly dissipating dew (6:4-6), disappointing the farmer and leaving the land parched and the vegetation wilting. Israel continues in their bloodshed (6:8-9), and their whoredom continues to defile (טמא) them (6:10-11). As land grabbers (5:10), God will also remove Judah as a "harvest" (קציר, 6:11).

God's efforts to restore (שוב שבות) and heal only bring the people's sin into sharper relief (6:11b-7:16). They do not ponder ("say to their hearts") that Yahweh remembers all their wickedness (7:2). Although fallen, they refuse to call upon God (7:7). Israel's guilt is self-evident, yet they refuse to return to (שוב) or seek Yahweh their God (7:10). Instead they vacillate between Egypt and Assyria for help (7:11). The prophet takes up a lamentation (woe oracle) against them because they continue to stray, rebel, and actually plot evil against God (7:13-16). God no doubt expects rites of contrition and confession, but their mourning rituals are not from the heart. Instead of repenting they attempt to move their God to reward them by gashing themselves in the manner of the Canaanites (7:14).[32] Again the

(Mic 4:9); see Stuart A. Irvine, "Enmity in the House of God," *JBL* 117 (1998) 647-48; KB s.v. 5, 6.

[32] See Wolff, *Hosea* 128. Self-mutilation was practiced by the Canaanite prophets whom

prophet mentions that when the people turn (שׁוב), it is not to God (Hos 7:16a).[33] The people whom God had once trained for warfare have become like a deceitful bow, they will fall by the sword and be brought into mockery in the land of Egypt (7:15-16).

IV

Hosea 8-13 continues to accuse the people of straying and failing to return to God, only now the punishment of land degradation and loss is heightened and seems more certain. The next unit comprises Hos 8:1-9:9.[34] Hosea 8 begins like Hos 5 with a command to blow the *shophar* (8:1). Here, however, Yahweh addresses the prophet[35] to sound the alarm. War is again the immediate problem, the enemy is depicted as a vulture about to swoop down upon "the house of Yahweh," the land as *Yahweh's* dwelling place.[36] But the *shophar* reference could again connote a call to cultic

---

Elijah confronted on Mt. Carmel (1 Kgs 18:28). Prohibitions against this custom are found in Deut 14:1, and in Lev 19:28 immediately before the command not to profane the land by making one's daughter a prostitute. On the other hand, it is possible to understand from Jer 16:6 that such gashing was standard practice in mourning rituals when observed outside the Canaanite cults.

[33] ישובו לא על is difficult to translate, although it is clear that the people are not returning to God. The textual traditions suggest correcting the text to read "They turned, {but} not to a yoke," or "they turned to {what does} not profit. It is also possible to emend the text to read "they turned, but not to me," see Wolff, *Hosea* 108.

[34] This division is also adopted by C. F. Keil, *Biblical Commentary on the Twelve Minor Prophets* (2 vols; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1869) 1:111.

[35] With Macintosh, *Hosea* 292, contra Wolff, who objects that this would be the only place in Hosea 4-14 where Yahweh addresses the prophet directly, *Hosea* 133. Rudolph observes "wenn Jahwe seinen Propheten in Kap. 1 u. 3 anredet, warum soll er es nicht auch in Kap. 8 tun können?" *Hosea* 161.

[36] Rudolph, interprets it as "'der Raum, das Gebiet Jahwes', d.h. das heilige Land wie in 9,15;" *Hosea* 162. Given the family imagery of Hosea, it is also possible to view this as Yahweh's family allotment. Francis I. Andersen and David Noel Freedman interpret the phrase as "the promised land as Yahweh's realm or estate," *Hosea* AB 24 (Garden City: Doubleday, 1980) 486. Although most recent commentators reject a reference to the Temple here, given the cultic allusions in the chapter, it is conceivable that both land and temple are in view. Note the dual use of "dwell" and "place" to connote both temple and

assembly, as the appropriate place for prophetic speech and Israel's response. Israel is called once more to follow the land's lead in mourning and repenting for sins.[37]

Calling as the voice of Yahweh, Hosea announces that Israel has broken the covenant, transgressed torah, and is guilty of idolatry and other cultic irregularities (8:1, 4, 6, 12, 13). Israel shows that they still do not accept the charges, and desperately attempt to reassert their status as the covenant people. "They cry in lament (יזעקו) to me, 'My God, we know you—(it's) Israel!'" (8:2). But their political and cultic sins affect their relationship with Yahweh and the land. Hosea expresses this in proverbial speech with a twofold application. "Because they sow wind (יזרעו רוח) the whirlwind they will harvest" (8:7a). First, their sins literally affect their harvest, the grain will not yield as expected (8:7b).[38] If there should be some growth, then "strangers will swallow it" (זרים יבלעהו, 8:7c). Second, the prophet speaks of the people's displacement from the land, using the catchword "swallow;" Israel will be "swallowed up" by the nations (8:8).

The meaning of this use of the proverbial "to reap what one sows" is augmented by the broader context of Hosea. The רוח Israel has sown and reaped is the רוח זנונים, the "spirit/wind of whoredom" (Hos 4:12; 5:4; cf. 4:19), which robs Ephraim of the ability to return to God. They hoped through their whoredom to multiply and have abundant fertility, instead they bore "children of strangers." The prophet now adds the charge that their political alliances are misguided because they bargain for lovers in Assyria (Hos 8:9-10). They have sinned against Yahweh, the land, and one another. It is time to reap the consequences; "strangers" (with whom they

---

land in Jer 7:1-15.

[37] Collins suggests cultic settings for the production of the Twelve. The first edition reflects the "preaching and liturgical prayers" of the exilic assemblies, where the mood "varied from resigned acceptance and regret in the early years to hope and determination, even optimism as time went by." The second edition was set in the "prayers and reflections associated with religious gatherings" at the post-exilic Jerusalem temple, *The Mantle of Elijah,* 62-63.

[38] Macintosh notes the connection here between the natural world and moral sphere, as seen in Hos 4:1-3, *Hosea* 313-14.

bargained!) will "swallow" what is left of their crops, and then Israel itself. They have strayed so far from Yahweh that now no matter how much God should write his instructions the people would consider it "as (something) strange" (זר, 8:12). Israel would rather offer sacrifices than return, so "they to Egypt shall return" (ישובו, 8:13). God's sowing has apparently failed; he will "harvest" the inhabitants from his land. Both God and Israel will reap what they have sown.

The prophet reiterates the charge of "whoredom" (9:1). Although the cult is directed to Yahweh, it is really "like the "peoples" (9:1-5). The rituals have the same consequence as elsewhere in Hosea—the desired fertility will not result (9:2). Yahweh will not be pleased with the sacrifices, which, like mourner's bread, will defile Israel, and will not be permitted in the house of Yahweh (9:4).[39] Israel will no longer be allowed to "dwell in the land of Yahweh" (9:3), an allusion to the charge against "those who dwell in the land" (Hos 4:1-3). Israel will be gathered and buried by Egypt, their goods and pilgrim tents[40] will be dispossessed[41] by nettles and thorns (9:6b) as the land returns to its unpeopled condition.

Furthermore, the prophet indicates that the "day of the festival of Yahweh" has initiated Israel's destruction, the "days of punishment" and "retribution" have come (9:5-7). Israel refuses to believe God has treated them fairly and "cries out" in lamentation (9:7). Irvine argues that the setting of this passage is "a communal lament service at a national sanctuary," the "house of God" (9:8).[42] In this service a cultic prophet

[39] Here "house of Yahweh" is a place of worship, and so lends support to the thesis that the "House of Yahweh" in 8:1 indicates a cultic setting, possibly Bethel or Samaria. If this phrase is a redactional gloss, as Wolff maintains (*Hosea* 155), then it may indicate a post-exilic Jerusalem setting for the reading of the Book of the Twelve. Both meanings may apply, however, as Hosea receives a new setting in the Twelve.

[40] See Wolff, *Hosea* 156.

[41] For the rendering of ירש in contexts of inheriting or disinheriting see KB, s.v. 1-3. It is significant that the land is designated as belonging to Yahweh, who will protect his estate by removing its destroyers.

[42] For the emendation of ידעו to ירעו see *BHS*. For its translation see the discussion of Hos 5:8 above. Irvine identifies in this passage several allusions to lamentation rituals

complains that Yahweh has failed to protect the nation during an enemy invasion. Hosea rebukes this prophet as foolish and mad and as perpetrating enmity in the house of God (9:7-8).[43] The lamenting of the people is still misdirected. Hosea closes by reiterating God's determination to "remember their iniquity" and "punish their sin" (9:9, cf. 8:13).

Hos 9:10-10:15 is bound together by its increased use of plant imagery to connote Ephraim's relation with the land, Yahweh, and one another. There is also an increase in the oracles against Ephraim's children, rather than crops, as judgment for participation in the fertility cult. The text alternates with remarkable consistency between plant imagery, the fertility cult, and judgment on offspring. Threats of punishment are even more certain and serious than in the previous section, and now include more references to the king and his officials, and Israel's political and military intrigues. The passage seems to be an explanation of the oracle pronounced against king and kingdom by the symbolic name of the first child, Jezreel, or "God sows." But the increasing references to children bring to bear the disownment implied in the names of the second and third children, "Not-Found-Compassion" and "Not-My-People."[44]

The passage is a speech of Yahweh with brief interjections by the prophet, sometimes appearing as a dialogue.[45] Yahweh once regarded (ראיתי) Israel as grapes in the wilderness, the first fruits of the fig (Hos

---

and a number of terms characteristic of lament psalms, "Enmity in the House of God," 652.

[43] Recent studies have argued convincingly that Hos 9:7b-8 are the words of Hosea against a prophet, and not Hosea citing words spoken against him; see Irvine, "Enmity in the House of God," 645-48; and Margaret S. Odell, "Who were the Prophets in Hosea?" *HBT* 18 (1996) 83-87. The widespread view that 9:7b are the people's words goes back at least to Julius Wellhausen, who interprets 9:7b as a dispute ("Rede und Gegenrede"), *Die kleinen Propheten* (dritte ausgabe; Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1898) 123.

[44] Likewise Macintosh, *Hosea* 369, 377.

[45] Wolff considers 9:10-17 "a sketch of an audition account" of Hosea to the inner circle which transmitted his sayings, *Hosea* 162-63. Congruent themes continue, however, through Hos 10. Wolff recognizes a similar setting for Hos 10, seeing the material as delivered to the same inner circle (172).

9:10a), a palm-shoot[46] planted in a meadow (9:13a), a fruitful vine (10:1). But from the beginning they committed themselves in love to Baal (9:10b). Yahweh will take away childbirth, but if they should bear children he will bereave them[47] and pronounce his woe over them when he departs from them (9:11-12). Indeed, Ephraim is about to produce children for the executioner (9:13b).[48] The prophet responds by praying they will neither give birth to nor nurse children (9:14). Yahweh replies that he has hated them since Gilgal. God no longer loves them so he will disown[49] them, casting them out of his "house," i.e., his land and family, and to the exilic and postexilic reader, his temple (9:15). At this point the plant metaphors take on negative connotations. Ephraim will no longer take root, God will kill their children in the womb as the prophet requested (9:16). The prophet summarizes the outcome of Ephraim's lack of response since the initial call to hear, "My God will reject them since they have not heard him, they will be wanderers in the nations."[50] Since Israel has failed to hear and respond to the accusations concerning their crimes against the land, God will reject them, disowning them from his land, and turning them into landless wanderers.

The remainder of the section the prophet continues to use plant imagery in indictments against Israel and its leaders. As the bounty of Yahweh's land (ארצו) increased, so did their altars and pillars. Since these

---

[46] See Macintosh, *Hosea,* 370-71, Rudolph, *Hosea,* 180, 182, and NRSV.

[47] Cf. the sequence in Hos 8:7b, where there will be no production of grain, but if some should grow it will be consumed by others.

[48] ואפרים להוציא אל־הרג בניו, for the translation "about to (lead)" see GKC §114h, k. הוציא can mean "lead, bring out (to, אל)," or "generate," usually of plants, BDB s.v. hiph, 1g, j; it is also used of God's agency in birth in Job 10:18. In Hos 9 the plant imagery suggests both meanings. Perhaps a third meaning would be apparent to the post-exilic reader, "put away, disown" as in Ezra 10:3, 19.

[49] "Hate, love, and cast out (גרש)" are often interpreted as divorce language here. But the same terms connote disownment. Since the dominant family image of Israel in Hosea is the father-son relationship and disownment (Hos 1), disownment is probably in view here as well, see Braaten, "Parent-Child Imagery in Hosea" 308-15, cf. 40-41 and 88-134.

[50] This is the first time the verb "hear"(שמע) has been used since the introduction and opening section (Hos 4:1 and 5:1).

come from a "divided heart"[51] Israel will be held guilty, and Yahweh will destroy these (10:1-2). Yet Hosea still hopes that Israel is about to admit that their political demise is due to their not fearing Yahweh (10:4a).[52] Perhaps a small starting point will be their mourning over the calf of Beth-aven which will soon be deported to Assyria (10:5-6). But until they repent sincerely, the prophet continues to accuse them of bearing bad fruit; judgment sprouts like poisonous plants because of their empty covenants (10:4). When the king and cult are removed, briers and thistles (cf. Gen 3:18 and Isa 7:23-25) will grow up over their altars, reclaiming their domain (10:7-8).

Hosea now tells Israel how to receive the restoration they earlier claimed Yahweh had unfairly withheld (8:2). They need to sow according to righteousness, and they will reap according to the loving commitment (חסד) they have lacked (see Hos 4:1; 6:6). This will be nothing less than breaking fallow ground. It is now time for Israel to act, to seek Yahweh, and await his rain of righteousness upon them (10:12). Formerly they have sown (plowed) wickedness and reaped injustice. Thus they are bearing the consequences of eating the fruit of lies (10:13a), concerning which they have been warned (Hos 4:2).

Chapters 11-13 are thematically connected by references to the Exodus tradition. It contains increased direct appeals to repent through the use of שוב, sometimes offering a renewed sense of hope to the reader. Yet the prophetic accusations and threats of punishment continue to convey the gravity of the situation necessary to foster an urgency for repentance.

Hos 11:1-7 depicts the Exodus as an act of adoption of Israel as God's son. Israel later violated this covenant by offering service to the Baals instead of Yahweh, his loving and nurturing parent.[53] Having refused to return (שוב) to Yahweh, Israel will return (ישוב) to the land of Egypt (and

---

[51] 10:2, see *BHS*.

[52] For the interpretation of these verses see Wolff, *Hosea* 174; Macintosh, *Hosea* 392-94.

[53] The adoption imagery differs from the land as mother image elsewhere in Hosea, see Braaten, "Parent-Child Imagery in Hosea" 292-308.

Assyria, 11:5). Israel will be destroyed and consumed, and when they turn away (משובה) from Yahweh they will find no nurture from Baal[54] (11:6-7). But judgment and destruction will not mean the complete end of God's son. Yahweh's compassion moves him to promise that he will not again (שוב) destroy Ephraim (11:8-9). This resolve is a major turning point in the book; Yahweh is now ready to "return them (והושבתים) to their houses" (11:11).

To move toward that goal, Yahweh announces his lawsuit against (Judah and) Jacob to "repay (ישיב) him according to his deeds." Since the suit is patterned after God's relationship with the patriarch Jacob there is hope, for despite his undesirable past, when Jacob wept and sought God's favor the divinity met with him at Bethel (12:3-7[2-6]).[55] The prophet promises God's aid, "And you, with the help of[56] your God shall return (תשוב); maintain loving commitment and justice, and hope for your God continually" (12:7[6]). Although Ephraim is still unwilling to confess his guilt in cheating others for his wealth (12:8-9[7-8]), Yahweh stands ready to restore him to the lost festival tents (12:10[9]).[57] Again Ephraim is compared to Jacob, and warned that the prophets have been sent as bearers of God's revelation, either for their destruction or protection.[58] But since Ephraim has given offence, God will return (ישיב) his reproach to them (12:11-15[10-14]).

Ephraim once spoke with authority, but he quickly fell into the fertility cult. When they experienced satiation in their pasture and "lifted their heart" they forgot Yahweh (13:1-7). Again God threatens to devour

---

[54] Reading בעל for על, see *BHS*; cf. 11:2.

[55] For this interpretation see Wolff *Hosea* 211-14. He says "Israel . . . should take the course of its ancestor: weeping and supplication, submission and repentance. In Bethel Yahweh's word will once again come to those willing to return" (213).

[56] *Beth instrumenti*, for the translation see Macintosh, *Hosea* 491.

[57] Relating this verse to 9:5, see the commentaries. Rudolph suggests the tents are symptomatic of the poverty of exile in contrast to the comfortable life of the monarchy. He thus interprets the oracle as a threat of exile and understands the reference to a festival as ironic, *Hosea* 223, 234.

[58] For the translation of נשמר ב in Hos 12:14[13] as "be guarded by" or "be attentive to" see KB s.v. niph, 1, 2, against Odell, "Who were the Prophets in Hosea?" 88.

his people as a lion, leopard, bear, or beast of the field (13:7-8), perhaps representing some of the "inhabitants of the land" that are suffering due to Israel's sins (Hos 4:3). Yahweh would be Israel's helper,[59] but Israel would rather rely on ineffective political leaders (13:9). Before a final word of judgment (13:15-14:1[13:16]), and the final appeal to repent (14:2-9[1-8]), there is an interesting notice regarding Ephraim's condition as son. A record of his sin has been placed in storage[60] declaring that he is an "unwise" son because he fails to come to the birth canal when "the pangs of the woman giving birth (יולדה) are upon him" (13:12-13).

Hosea only presents one figure as the birth mother of Israel—the land (Hos 1:2; 2:4[2], 6[4]; possibly 4:5). The land is once more a victim, for Ephraim's refusal to come to term not only portends certain death for himself, but also for his mother. The wise son would surrender to the birth process, i.e., return to Yahweh from the heart, obeying in matters of worship, loving commitments, and politics. As the redactor summarizes at the end of Hosea, the "wise . . . walk in the ways" of Yahweh (Hos 14:10[9]). Although Israel's destruction is deserved, Yahweh decides to ransom them from sheol, and redeem them from death—and he will not change his mind (נחם, 13:13-14).[61]

The connection with the preceding passage is through the allusion to Ephraim dying in the womb of the (mother) land, for ארץ can also connote the "underworld"[62] or sheol. Instead of letting the womb become sheol for his son, however, Yahweh will redeem him. Before the way of repentance is presented, the section ends with a warning concerning agricultural

---

[59] Hos 13:9a is obscure, either Yahweh or Israel could be understood as the cause of Israel's destruction, see the commentaries, esp. Macintosh, *Hosea* 533-34 and T. K. Cheyne, *Hosea, with Notes and Introduction* CB (Cambridge: University Press, 1884) 122.

[60] Macintosh, *Hosea* 542.

[61] The translation of these lines as a question (see NRSV) is gratuitous (see Cheyne, *Hosea 124,* Keil, *Minor Prophets* 159, and Artur Weiser, *Das Buch der zwölf kleinen Propheten* ATD 24/I [2. Auflage; Göttingen: Bandenhoed & Rupert, 1956] 98).

[62] KB, s.v. 5.

disasters due to the wind of Yahweh[63] and war (13:15-14:1[13:16]).

Up to this point Hosea has repeatedly called for corporate repentance and acknowledgment of guilt. Every effort has failed. The confessions have been superficial, the people have refused to admit their sin, instead they blame Yahweh for not responding according to their desires. Unless one party changes, there is an impasse.

Such a change is forthcoming. Hosea 14 begins with two more appeals to return (שׁוּב, 14:2[1] and 3[2]), but with some new elements. First, the prophet provides Ephraim with a prayer of confession. They are to request that God take away their iniquity, then promise to offer sacrifices of thanksgiving.[64] They must admit they cannot find help in political alliances or handcrafted gods. They conclude by confessing "in you the orphan will find compassion (יְרֻחָם)" (4[3]). The second new element is this significant change in Ephraim's status from son to orphan. A "son of harlotry" or a rebellious son might be disowned or publicly executed,[65] but an orphan is always granted protective status by the gods.[66]

The third new element is Yahweh's promise to enable his people to return. "I will heal their unfaithfulness ("turning away" מְשׁוּבָה), . . . for my anger has turned (שָׁב) from me" (14:5[4]). God's restorative power will be like the dew to Ephraim, who will thrive and flourish like a healthy plant in the land. Through God Ephraim will blossom and strike root; his shoots will spread out, he will flourish, reversing the judgment of earlier chapters and recalling the positive connotations of Jezreel, or "God sows." If he

---

[63] The terms used of the drying wind (רוח, קדים, יבשׁ, חרב) are also employed in Exod 14:21-22 to connote Yahweh's drying of the sea. Thus allusions to the Exodus begin and end the section comprising Hos 11:1-14:1[13:16].

[64] Lit. "bulls of our lips," 14:3[2], see Odell, "The Prophets and the End of Hosea" *Forming Prophetic Literature* 166.

[65] The compassion is a reversal of the name לא־רחמה, the disownment oracle of Hos 1:6. For the execution of a rebellious son see Deut 21:18-21, cf. Elizabeth Bellefontaine "Reviewing the Case of the Rebellious Son" *JSOT* 13 (1979) 13-31.

[66] Ps 82:3-4; Exod 22:22-24; Deut 10:18; 24:17; 27:19; see F. Charles Fensham, "Widow, Orphan, and the Poor in Ancient Near Eastern Legal and Wisdom Literature" *JNES* 21 (1962) 129-39.

relies no more on idols then Ephraim will have his fruit from Yahweh (6-9[5-8]).

V

Joel develops earlier themes by employing language reminiscent of Hosea. First, there is a call for the elders to hear, and for those who dwell in the land to listen (1:2, cf. Hos 4:1-3 and 5:1). The prophet then questions, "Has *this* occurred in your days, or in the days of your fathers?" Nogalski has convincingly argued that *this* (זאת) refers to the repentance and promises of Hos 14 which have not yet occurred. Hosea ends with a *promise*: if the people respond, God will enable them to repent and he will heal them. But there is no indication that the people have responded to the offer.[67] Next, Yahweh speaks about mourning due to the devastation of "my land" and its produce (1:4-13). Some are *commanded* to participate in a mourning rite: the drunkards (1:6), a female subject (1:8), priests[68] (1:9, 13), and farmers and vinedressers (1:11). But there is one who *responds* to the command: "The ground (אדמה) mourns" (1:10)—apparently the female subject called upon to wail in 1:8.[69] This is a variation on the "land mourns" imagery of Hos 4:1-3,[70] supporting our proposal: the land responds

---

[67] Nogalski observes that Hosea 14 presumes Israel will suffer future punishment, then offers promises of restoration after repentance. Joel anticipates the punishment and calls for *this* repentance. He also suggests that the "missing" accusation of sin in Joel is supplied by its position after Hosea in the Twelve, see *Redactional Processes in the Book of the Twelve* BZAW 218 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1993) 15-17, 22; and "Joel as 'Literary Anchor' for the Book of the Twelve" a paper presented to the SBL International Meeting (1997) 6-9. I thank the author for providing me with a copy of this paper.

[68] With *BHK* Reading אבלו in 1:9 as an imperative, cf. 1:13, see LXX.

[69] Nogalski notes the connections of the agricultural imagery in the Joel passage with Hosea 2 (and elsewhere), and argues that the bride of Hosea and Joel are the same, which he regards as Zion (but he also uses "Israel"). He comments on the merit of Bergler's suggestion (whose work was unavailable to the author at the time of writing) that the reference could be to land, see *Redactional Processes* 7-8 (cf. n. 25), 18-22, "Joel as Literary Anchor" 11-12; and. *Literary Precursors* 21-24, 58-73.

[70] For a discussion of this passage see Hayes, "The Earth Mourns" 260-302.

to the call to mourn over God's judgment and her demise, while her inhabitants' response is pending. In Joel 1:14 there is another call for a fast and assembly at the house of God for "all those who dwell in the land" to "cry in lamentation" (אזעק) to Yahweh, reminding us again of Hos 4:1-3. The response of the land's nonhuman inhabitants is depicted in language suggestive of laments: animals sigh (אנק), cattle are confused (בוך), sheep bear guilt (נא שם), beasts of the fields long for (ערג) Yahweh.

The command to blow the *shophar* and issue an alarm (Joel 2:1) is reminiscent of Hos 5:8 and 8:1; in Joel, however, it announces the day of Yahweh (2:2-11). The voice concludes with a double call to repentance (שוב), with fasting, weeping and mourning from the heart (2:12-13a), something Israel's rites lack in Hosea.[71] The call is grounded in the gracious and merciful character of Yahweh (2:13b-14).[72]

The last command for a fast—again announced by the *shophar* in Zion—concerns the gathering of all people and the intercession of the priests (Joel 2:15-17). A turning point is announced by an oracle of salvation conditional on a future repentance of the *people*:[73] "Yahweh will be zealous for his *land*, and will have compassion (חמל) for his people" (2:18). For the people, the agricultural bounty lost and promised again in Hosea[74] will be restored and the enemy expelled (2:19-27). But the oracle of assurance ("do not fear") comes first to those who have repented and mourned—the ground (אדמה) and the beasts of the field (2:21-22)!

In a final act of restoration for the people Yahweh promises to pour out "my spirit" (רוחי) upon all flesh, thus enabling all people to prophesy

---

[71] Hosea 7:13-14; cf. Nogalski, "Joel as Literary Anchor" 11-12.

[72] Van Leeuwen, who traces the theme of God's mercy (per Exod 34:6-7) in the Twelve, notes that this is the first explicit formulation of the theme in the Twelve, see "Scribal Wisdom and Theodicy" 40.

[73] Likewise Nogalski, who states 2:18 "constitutes the assurance of YHWH's positive response to the people presuming the people do indeed *repent*" (emphasis his), *Redactional Process* 4. My only qualification is the observation that, like Hosea 4:3, a partial repentance has begun with the mourning of the ground (Joel 1:10) and its nonhuman inhabitants (2:17-20).

[74] Hos 2:10-14[8-12], 24[22]), likewise Nogalski, "Joel as Literary Anchor" 8.

by Yahweh, and thereby reversing the negative imagery connected with wind/spirit in Hosea (Joel 3:1-2[2:28-29]).[75]

Although much more could be said about the land imagery in Joel, we will close this section with a final brief note. Joel ends with a reference to the bloodshed and wilderness imagery first initiated in Hosea 1-2. Only now it is (the lands of) Egypt and Edom which will become a desolate wilderness for shedding innocent blood in the land of Judah (Joel 4[3]:19-20).

VI

Malachi has much in common with Hosea; a short list follows. The book uses father-son imagery for the relationship between God and his people.[76] God will not bless the priests and will punish their offspring because they have not been committed from the heart (2:2), and show partiality in teaching (תורה, 2:4-9). God does not honor their weeping and sighing (בכי ואנקה) at the altar due to men's broken covenant with their wives and failure to produce "seed of God" (2:13-16). The people complain that God seems inconsistent and unjust (2:17).

The repentance sought in Hosea and Joel (and the Twelve) is still needed. Although God has not changed his mind concerning his standard, the people have not changed "since the days of their fathers" but have turned aside from God's statutes. Therefore he calls them to "return (שובו) to me and I will return to you" (3:6-7). If the people show their commitment by paying their tithes, God will grant the agricultural abundance they lack, then even the nations will notice as they(!) become a

[75] Cf. the "spirit of whoredom" (Hos 4:12, cf. 19; 5:4), the people "sow" and "herd" wind (8:7; 12:2[1]), the cultic prophets are "persons of the spirit" (9:7), and Yahweh's רוח as winds of judgment (13:15).

[76] Mal 1:6; 2:10; 3:17; perhaps 4:5 LXX.

land of delight (3:12).[77] The last word the people speak in Malachi (the Twelve) shows that many still resist change. They complain that repentance rituals are pointless, since the evil and arrogant continue to prosper (3:13-15). "They say, 'It is vain to serve God, and what is the use of us observing his obligations, or that[78] we should go about in mourning clothes[79] before Yahweh of hosts" (3:14). The mourning, or repentance rituals called for by earlier voices are hereby resisted.

In response a "scroll of remembrance" (ספר זכרון) is written before Yahweh for those who fear and serve him (3:16-18). Is it possible to identify this document as the Book of the Twelve as Nogalski has proposed?[80] Perhaps the solution lies in the catchword connection of the "scroll of *remembrance*" with the last command in (the MT of) Malachi: "*Remember* (זכרו) the torah of Moses, my servant, which I commanded him on Horeb, concerning all Israel—the statutes and the ordinances" (3:22 [4:4]). Malachi and Hosea both charge that the priests fail in their obligations to teach torah. Hosea depicts God as saying it would do no good for him to write more "torahs" since the people consider them "strange."[81] But more importantly, there is an increased perception in the postexilic community that *the prophets* taught the "fathers" the law and statutes of Moses. Many of these prophetic words were proclaimed during fasting or repentance rituals.[82] This association of torah with the words of

---

[77] Here ארץ is a comprehensive term for the land as gift and place of blessing, which includes the people who inhabit it and benefit by it, cf. Rudolph, *Haggai — Sacharja 1-8 — Sacharja 9-14 — Maleachi* KAT XIII/4 (Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1976) 285.

[78] For this use of כי in a consecutive clause depending on an interrogative clause see GKC §107u.

[79] This H.L., קדרניות, is no doubt connected with mourning customs, see the listings in KB under קדר.

[80] *Redactional Processes* 206-12.

[81] Hos 8:12, which is the first reference to "writing" in the Book of the Twelve. The second is God's command for Habakkuk to write his vision, the third is this Malachi passage.

[82] 2 Kgs 17:13-18; Zech, 1:4-6. Collins calls Zech 1:6b a "model response" of repentance which functions to "influence our reading of *The Twelve.*" Further, the command to

the former prophets read during days of fasting, mourning and repentance would be consistent with Nogalski's suggestion and the proposals of this study. This scroll preserves for the postexilic community the remembrance of the torah of Moses taught to the "fathers" by the earlier prophets, and now employed for the comfort and warning of subsequent generations.

But the Scroll of the Twelve also had a familial setting. The book of Deuteronomy, which influences Malachi, emphasizes the connection between the public reading of torah and the parental responsibility for teaching the Mosaic torah.[83] For such teaching to be effective there must be mutual respect between the generations. Children must honor their parents (Deut 5:16a, cf. Mal 1:6) and fathers are told, "set to your heart" the words recited in the cult and command your sons "to observe all the words of this torah" (Deut 32:44-47; cf. Mal 1:1b LXX). Without this intergenerational respect they will risk disobedience to Yahweh's commands and the "long life" of blessing on the *land* will be forfeited (Deut 5:16b; 32:47). And so Malachi's closing words announce the new work of an old prophet in restoring the conditions necessary for hearing anew the words of the

---

remember the law in Mal 3:22 "brings us back to Zech 1:2-6 and ultimately to . . . Moses," 79, 84. See the discussion of the connection of the Law of Moses with the prophets in Glazier-McDonald, *Malachi*, 265-67 and Paul L. Redditt, "The Redaction of the Book of the Twelve," *Forming Prophetic Literature* 254-55. The proclamation of prophecy at fast days is first attributed to Jeremiah. In an effort to move the Judean pilgrims to pray for mercy he had Baruch *write* his words on a scroll to be *read* at the temple on a fast day (Jer 36:4-8). Zech 7:1-14 (cf. 8:19) speaks of fasting and mourning rituals where the former prophets spoke. These also proclaimed God's torah and word through the spirit. Because the people refused to listen the people were scattered and the *land* became desolate. An assembly gathered as Ezra fasted in mourning attire and prayed about the potential for the Judeans to defile the *land*, like the Canaanites before them, because they failed to keep the commandments of "your servants the prophets" concerning intermarriages (Ezra 9:5-10:1; cf. Neh 9:1-37). Daniel, fasting in sackcloth and ashes, confesses that God's people did not listen to the law of Moses spoken through the prophets, which brought wrath to Jerusalem and God's people, Dan 9:3-19. According to Solomon's vision in Chronicles, when Yahweh causes fertility to cease due to sin, if the people humble themselves and repent God will forgive them and heal the *land*, 2 Chron 7:12-14.

[83] For the presence of children at the reading of the Deuteronomic law see Deut 29:10-11; 31:12-13; cf. Christopher J. H. Wright, *God's People in God's Land: Family, Land, and Property in the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990) 81-84.

prophets in the Scroll of the Twelve, that their relationship with the *land* might remain unharmed.

"Behold, I am sending to you Elijah the prophet,
before the great and dreadful day of Yahweh.
He will restore the heart of the fathers to the sons
and the heart of the sons to the fathers,
lest I come and strike the land with a ban of destruction (3:23-24[4:5-6].

The Repentance of Nineveh in the Story of Jonah and Nahum's Prophecy of the City's Destruction: Aggadic Solutions for an Exegetical Problem in the Book of the Twelve

Beate Ego
University of Osnabrück/Germany

A coherent reading of the story of Jonah within the literary unit of the Book of the Twelve poses the problem of its relationship to the prophecy of Nahum. Under the assumption that the individual works of this literary unit appear in a chronological order,[1] the question is, why did Nahum have to prophesy to the destruction of Nineveh after its people had already repented in the time of Jonah?[2] According to traditional Jewish exegesis the prophet Jonah is placed in the time of Jeroboam II (787-747 B.C.),[3] whereas Nahum is dated as having lived in the time of King Jotham (756-741 B.C.)[4] or in the time of King Manasseh (696-642 B.C.).[5]

---

[1] Cf. Aaron Schart, *Die Entstehung des Zwölfprophetenbuches. Neubearbeitungen von Amos im Rahmen schriftübergreifender Redaktionsprozesse* (BZAW 260; Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 1998) 26f.

[2] For this problem in general cf. Schart, 27f.291; Brevard Springs Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1997) 425; James Dominic Nogalski, *Redactional Processes in the Book of the Twelve* (BZAW 218; Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 1993) 270-271.

[3] For the date of Jonah see 2 Kgs 14:25; on this issue see Hartmut Gese, "Jona ben Amittai und das Jonabuch," in *Alttestamentliche Studien*, (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1991) 122-138, esp. 126-127; Schart, 290; Hans Walter Wolff, *Dodekapropheton 3*: Obadja und Jona (2d ed.; BKAT 14/3; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1991) 53.

[4] Cf. *Ant. 9.239*.

[5] Cf. *Seder 'Olam Rabba 20*; see also Louis Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews*, (7 vols.; Philadelphia: The Jewish Society of America, 1946-1955) 6.314 n. 56; 373 n. 200; Anna Maria Schwemer, *Studien zu den frühjüdischen Prophetenlegenden Vitae prophetarum* , vol. II: *Die Viten der kleinen Propheten und der Propheten aus den*

Therefore, the contradiction between the plot of the story of Jonah on the one hand and the prediction of Nahum against Nineveh on the other hand evokes a "semantic gap." This gap was "closed" or "filled" in early Jewish and rabbinic exegesis in different ways. In this contribution, the respective passages solving this exegetical problem will be analyzed in relation to the varying aspects of each particular intention of exegesis. During this process it will become evident, that the creation of a coherent relationship between Jonah and Nahum is only one concern of interpretation and that, when dealing with this issue, further motives must be considered.

The earliest reference concerning the question formulated above, is to be found in the Book of Tobit which was probably written in the eastern Jewish diaspora around 200 BC.[6] In his imposing farewell address, the aged Tobit advises his children to flee Assyria, since its capital, the city of Nineveh, will be destroyed in the near future. Whereas the long version of the Book of Tobit G^{II}, which, in all probability, is to be seen as the more original and earlier text,[7] refers in this context to "those things which Nahum spoke to Nineveh" (Tob 14:4), in the shorter and younger version G^{I} we read:

> Go into Media, my son, for I surely believe those things which Jonah the Prophet spoke to Nineveh, that it shall be overthrown.[8]

It seems to be very unlikely, that the name "Nahum" here was erroneously changed to "Jonah," the more so as in Tob 14:8 G^{I} there exists - without a parallel in the text of the version G^{II} - a further reference to the prophecy of Jonah concerning the destruction of Nineveh:

Geschichtsbüchern. Übersetzung und Kommentar (TSAJ 50; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1996) 88.

[6] Beate Ego, *Buch Tobit* (Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit, vol. II: Unterweisung in erzählender Form; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1999) 899f. with references to further literature.

[7] Concerning the question of the relationship of the two versions of Tobit cf. Ego, *Buch Tobit*, 875f. with references to further literature.

[8] Quoted according to *The Apocrypha of the Old Testament. Translated out of the original tongues and with the former translations diligently compared and revised. King James Version 1611* (New York: American Bible Society, 1972) A51.

> And now, my son, depart out of Nineveh, because that those things which the prophet Jonah spake shall surely come to pass."[9]

The references to Jonah seem to imply that the reception of the book of Jonah was focused, in this context, on his prediction against Nineveh (cf. Jonah 1:2; 3:4), while the fact, that the Ninevites carried out repentance from their evil deeds, as told in Jonah 3:5-10, is simply ignored. Under this aspect, the prophecy of Jonah could be identified with the prophecy of Nahum as both prophets are considered as ominous men foretelling of the destruction of Nineveh. Jonah's prophecy seems to be the same as Nahum's message concerning the destruction of the Assyrian capital, and in this way the contradiction between Jonah and Nahum appears to be solved.

An analogous tendency of interpretation is apparent in Josephus' retelling of the story of Jonah in *Ant. 9,214*:

> Then, having prayed to God to grant him pardon for his sins, he went to the city of Ninos and, standing where all could hear him, proclaimed that in a very short time they would lose their dominion over Asia; after giving them this message, he departed. And I have recounted his story as I found it written down.[10]

By ignoring the thematic motif of the repentance of the Ninevites and by replacing the precise biblical statement, that Nineveh "will be overthrown in 40 days" (Jonah 3:4) with the vague "in a very short time," and also because in this passage, the message of judgement within the narration of Jonah is beeing emphazised, one gets the impression once again, that Jonah's prediction is quite similiar to the prophecy of Nahum.[11]

---

[9] Quoted according to *The Apocrypha of the Old Testament.*, A51.

[10] Quoted according to the translation of Ralph Marcus, *Josephus*, vol VII (The Loeb Classical Library; London, Cambridge/ Massachusetts: William Heinemann Ltd, Harvard University Press, 1958) 113.

[11] See also *Ant. 9.242* concerning Nahum's prophecy. Cf. Schart, 28: "Jona wird dargestellt, als habe er für eine unbestimmte Zukunft den Untergang Ninives angekündigt. Nahum hätte diese Botschaft des Jona dann später aufgegriffen und ausgebaut. Beide Propheten hätten mit ihrer Untergangsankündigung schließlich Recht behalten und sich als wahre Propheten erwiesen. Die Leserschaft soll darüber staunen, daß die biblischen Propheten ein Ereignis bereits so lange vorher angekündigt haben. Josephus hat einen Zusammenhang geschaffen, der das Problem des Verhältnisses von Jona und Nahum löst, mußte aber dazu wesentliche Teile der Jonasschrift

These passages can also be regarded in the context of another aspect that played an important role in early exegesis about Jonah. As Elias Bickerman has demonstrated in his articles that were published in the sixties and that concerned the interpretation of the Book of Jonah in Judaism and Christianity, these literary units are also to be considered in the light of the question as to whether Jonah is to be accused of being a false prophet: "Jonah went to Nineveh, announcing in the name of God that in forty days the city would be overthrown. Yet, the *fata denunciativa* did not materialize. Was he a false prophet, who only pretended to speak in the name of God?"[12] This aspect is clearly expressed in the Book of Tobit and in the writings of Josephus. "It will all come true; everything will happen to Assyria and Nineveh that was spoken by the prophets of Israel whom God sent," says the author of Tobit in Tob 14:4 (G^{II}). "Not a word of it will fall short; everything will be fulfilled when the time comes."[13] Also Josephus, in the context of his

---

verschweigen."

[12] Elias Bickerman, *Four Strange Books of the Bible. Jonah / Daniel / Kohelet /Esther* (Schocken Books: New York, 1967) 33-38. This aspect was recently stressed and embellished by Schwemer, 69-72. Cf. the "Vita of Jonah" in *Vitae Prophetarum* : "Jonah was from the district of Kariathmos near the Greek city of Azotus by the sea. And when he had been cast forth by the sea monster and had gone away to Nineveh and had returned, he did not remain in his district, but taking his mother along he sojourned in Sour, a territory (inhabited by) foreign nations; for he said: 'So shall I remove my reproach, for I spoke falsely in prophesying against the great city of Nineveh'"; cited according to the translation of D.R.A. Hare, "The Lives of the Prophets," in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* , vol. II (ed. J.H. Charlesworth; Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1985) 383-399, here: 392. Concerning Nahum it is stated: "Nahum was from Elkesei on the other side of Isbegabrin of the tribe of Simeon. After Jonah this man gave to Nineveh a portent, that it would be destroyed by fresh water and an underground fire, which also happened." Cf. the solution of this problem in *Pseudo-Philo, De Jona c. 46 §186* based on the exegesis of Jonah 3:4: "Forty more days and Nineveh shall be overturned (נהפכת)" by using the double meaning of the Hebrew "הפך - to turn, to change, to destroy, to overturn": Not the city was destroyed, but the hearts of the Ninevites were changed. To this issue cf. Folker Siegert, *Drei hellenistisch-jüdische Predigten. Ps.-Philon, "Über Jona," Über Simson" und "Über die Gottesbezeichnung 'wohltätig verzehrendes Feuer'*," vol. I *Übersetzung aus dem Armenischen und sprachliche Erläuterungen* (WUNT 20; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1980) 43f.; vol. II: *Kommentar nebst Beobachtungen zur hellenistischen Vorgeschichte der Bibelhermeneutik* (WUNT 61; Tübingen: J.C.B. Siebeck [Paul Mohr], 1992) 211-212 with references to further literature.

[13] Quoted according to the translation of *The New English Bible with the Apocrypha* (Oxford: Oxford University Press / Cambrigde University Press, 1970) 67.

utterances about Nahum, stresses in the same way the fact, that all the predictions of the prophets were fulfilled:

> And many more things besides did this prophet prophesy about Nineveh, which I have not thought it necessary to mention, but have omitted in order not to seem tiresome to my readers. But all the things that had been foretold concerning Nineveh came to pass after a hundred and fifteen years (*Ant. 9.242*).[14]

Before turning to the question of how the Sages dealt with the contradiction between the narration of Jonah and the prophecy of Nahum, it should be underlined that the thematic motif of the repentance of the Ninevites plays a very important and significant role in rabbinic tradition. The earliest rabbinic reference concerning the reception of Jonah 3:8-10 is to be found in the *Mishnah*. Here, the repentance of the Ninevites appears as "the type" for repentance in general and the gentile Ninevites are portrayed as being shining examples for the doing of penance.

M.Taan. 2.1, a tradition which very likely originates in the liturgy of the sanctuary and which was later used in the context of service for fast days outside the temple,[15] describes this service in the following manner:

> What is the order [of service] for fast days? The ark is taken out to the open space of the city, wood ashes are placed on the ark, on the head of the Nasi and and on the head of Ab-beth. Everyone else puts ashes on his head; the elder among them addresses them with words of admonition [to repentance] thus, "Our brethren, scripture does not say of the people of Nineveh, 'and god saw their sackcloth and their fasting', but, 'and God saw their works, that they turned from their evil way' (Jonah 3:10); and in the prophets it is said, 'and rend your heart and not your garments' (Joel 2:13).[16]

---

[14] Quoted according to the translation of Ralph Marcus. Concerning this aspect as appearing in the work of Josephus cf. Schwemer, 70.

[15] On this issue see Joseph Heinemann, *Prayer in the Talmud. Forms and Patterns* (SJ 9; Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1977) 108f.

[16] Quoted according to the translation of *The Babylonian Talmud. Translated into English with notes, glossary and indices*, 35 vol. (ed. Isidore Epstein; London: Soncino Press, 1935-1952) ad loc.

The final quotations from Jonah 3:10 und Joel 2:13 show in a very clear manner, that in relation to the repentance of the Ninevites, it was not the rites of penance that were important, but a conversion of doing, which was accompanied by an inner conversion of the heart.[17]

In the Gemara of the *Babylonian Talmud*, i.e. in *b. Taan. 16a* referring to the above quoted passage, the utterance of the *Mishna* about the sincere and deep repentance of the people of Nineveh is confirmed and embellished. Starting off with a concrete example, the Gemara makes clear the radical manner in which the Ninevites understood Jonah's prophecy to repent. The penance of the Ninevites did not stop at fasting and praying. Their deeds showed that they were determined to lead a better life: If a man had usurped another's property, he sought to make amends for his iniquity; some went so far as to destroy their palaces in order to be able to give back a single brick to the rightful owner. The determination of the Ninevites to lead a better life is made evident in the above mentioned passage by a tradition attributed to R. Samuel, who interpreted the biblical phrase in Jonah 3:8 "from the violence that is in their hands (החמס אשר בכפיהם)" in the following manner: "Even if one had stolen a beam and built it into his castle he should raze the entire castle to the ground and return the beam to its owner."[18]

Thus, it can be seen, that on the one side, in rabbinic literature, great importance has been attached to the repentance of the people of

---

[17] For a more detailed analysis of this text see Beate Ego, "Denn die Heiden sind der Umkehr nahe. Rabbinische Interpretationen zur Buße der Leute von Ninive," in *Die Heiden. Juden, Christen und das Problem des Fremden* (ed. R. Feldmeier / U. Heckel; WUNT 70; Tübingen: J.C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1994) 158-176, esp. 159f.

[18] Quoted according to the translation *The Babylonian Talmud*. ad loc. An embellished version of this midrash is to be found in the mediaval *Midrash Jonah (Bet haMidr. I, pp. 96-105)*. Cf. also *Tg. Esth. II Est 4:1*, where Mordechai says: "People of the house of Israel, beloved and respected ones, let us proceed to look at the people of Nineveh, when the prophet Jonah son of Ammitai was sent to it, to overturn the city of Nineveh. So when the word reached the king of Nineveh, he rose from his precious throne and removed the crown from himself, covered himself in sackcloth, rolled himself in ashes, and issued a proclamation in Nineveh which said: It is the decree of the king and his princes as follows: No man or beast, herd or flock should go out to pasture or drink any water. They should repent from their evil ways and from the violence that in their hands; then He retracted through his memra the evil thing He planned to do unto them and did not do (it). Let us also do like they (did), and let us decree fast days and proclaim fasts because we were exiled from Jerusalem"; quoted according to B. Grossfeld, *The Two Targums of Esther, translated with Apparatus and Notes*, (The Aramaic Bible 18; Edinburgh: T&T Clark Ltd, 1991) 152f.

Nineveh. In this field of Jewish tradition however, new light has also been shed on the interpretation of Jonah 3:8-10, which implies a further solution for the contradiction between Jonah and Nahum. For example, there exists a direct reference to Jonah in *Tg. Ps.-J. Nah 1:1*:

> Previously Jonah the son of Amittai, the prophet from Gath-hepher, prophesied against her and she repented of her sins; and when they sinned again, there prophesied once more against her Nahum of Beth Koshi, as is recorded in this book.[19]

This means, that the Ninevites' new attitude toward life did not last very long and that they returned very soon to their evil deeds, thereby deeming the necessity for the appearance of another prophet foretelling the destruction of the city. In support of this, one has also to understand a passage contained within the *Midrash Pirqe de Rabbi Eliezer*, a passage written in early mediaeval times that represents the genre of "rewritten bible."[20] After an impressive description of the deeds of repentance based on the tradition described in *b. Taan. 16a*, which serves to show the power of repentance in general, *Pirqe R. El. 43* continues with the very brief, but nevertheless harsh statement:

> After forty years they returned to their many evil deeds, more so than their former ones, and they were swallowed up like the dead, in the lowest Sheol, as it is said, "Out of the city of the dead they groan" (Job 26:12).[21]

It is worth noting that in modern research, reference is usually made in particular to this midrash in order to underline the midrashic tendency towards harmonizing between Jonah and Nahum in rabbinic exegesis.[22] This effect however, is only then achieved, when it is assumed that Nahum prophesied quite soon after Jonah against Nineveh - perhaps as

---

[19] Quoted according to K.J. Cathcart / R.P. Gordon, *The Targum of the Minor prophets* (The Aramaic Bible 14; Edinburgh: T&T Clark Ltd, 1989, 131. Cf. also *Rashi ad Nah 1:1*: "It was already written about them, and this is the prophecy of Jonah ben Ammitai; and hence, now Nahum is predicting against them ..." Then follows the quotation out of *Tg. Ps.J. Nah 1:1*.

[20] For this literary genre cf. Günther Stemberger, *Einleitung in Talmud und Midrasch* (8th ed. München: C.H. Beck, 1992) 321-323. - Josef Heinemann, *Aggadot we-toeledotehen* (Sifriyat Keter, Jerusalem: Keter Publishing House, 1974) 181.

[21] See also the parallel *Yal. Sh. Jonah § 550 (430c)*.

[22] For example Schart, 28.

stated in *Seder Olam 20*, during the reign of King Manasseh,[23] and that the narrator of *Pirqe de Rabbi Eliezer* was not aware of the exact historical background and chronological framework of the real destruction of Nineveh by Nebuchadnezzar, King of Babylon in 612 A.D. David Luria (1798-1855), the Lithuanian rabbi, scholar, and commentator of *Pirqe de Rabbi Eliezer*, was apparently aware of this problem and stated that after its destruction, Nineveh was built again and that Nahum appeared predicting against the city, subsequent to this rebuilding.[24] Perhaps also here, one has to take into account the aspect of defending Jonah from the accusation of being a false prophet. As explicitly stated in this context, the "40 years" which this midrash between Jonah's prophecy and the city's destruction poses, correspond to the biblical "40 days" in the prophecy of Jonah (Jonah 3:4).

Finally, another aggadic tradition exists which harmonizes the narration of Jonah and Nahum's prophecy. It is to be found in the Gemara of the Jerusalem Talmud based on *m. Taan. 2.1.* Here, the thematic motif of Nineveh is considered in a quite different way and the biblical story finds itself in a process of being changed. In *y. Taan. 2.1, 65b* we have a tradition that is attributed to R. Simeon ben Laqish and R. Yohanan:

> Said R. Simeon ben Laqish, "The repentance that the men of Nineveh carried out was deceitful ... Said R. Yohanan, What they had in their hands they gave back, but what they had hidden in chests, boxes, and cupboards, they did no give back.[25]

Although the Gemara of the *Babylonian Talmud* stresses the severeness of the repentance of the Ninevites, the *Jerusalem Talmud* maintains, that this repentance was hypocritical und superficial. The biblical phrase "החמס אשר בכפיהם" - literally: "the violence which was in their hands" (Jonah 3:8), which was interpreted in *b. Taan. 16a* as a reference for the giving back of all property acquired in iniquity, is understood by R. Johanan in a strongly literal manner: Only the stolen property that was actually in the hands of the Ninevites at the time of Jonah's homily was

---

[23] See above the notes concerning the dating of Nahum.

[24] Cf. Y. Horowitz, "Luria, David Ben Judah," *EncJud 11*, 571.

[25] Quoted according to the translation of *Jacob Neusner, The Talmud of the Land of Israel. A Preliminary Translation and Explanation*, vol 18: *Besah and Taanit* (Chicago Studies in the History of Judaism; Chicago: The University of Chicago, 1987) 180-181. The same tradition is quoted in *Midrash Jonah* in the context of a very possitive description of Nineveh's repentance.

given back; everything else which was stolen before this time, the Ninevites kept for themselves. Thus, the penance of the Ninevites was no more than a deception, a "trick" to outwit God.

It should be stressed however, that in this context there has not been found any explicit hint to Nahum's prophecy. As I have shown in a previous study,[26] the motif of the hypocritical and superficial repentance of the Ninevites functions in particular in order to comfort Israel. This becomes clear in the midrashic context of *Pesiq. Rab Kah. 24.11.* In this passage, the thematic motif of hypocritical repentance is integrated with a homily, which seeks to comfort and console Israel in its distress and humiliation. The tradition here is part of a homily for Hos 14:2, - the beginning of the Haftarah for the Parashah האזינה. Its "Sitz im Leben" is Shabbat Shuva between Rosh-ha-shanah and Yom Kippur. After several calls for repentance it is stated: "Master of the Universe, if we will carry out repentance will you be prepared to accept us?." The homily answers by explaining, that the ten days between Rosh-ha-shanah and Yom Kippur are destined in a special manner for the repentance of man. In other words, within this time, God is willing to accept also imperfect forms of penance. The Ninevites' repentance appears - as also in the case of Ahab, David or Manasseh - as a paradigm for an imperfect repentance which nevertheless is accepted by God.

Great importance is attached here to the following consoling, paracletical aspect: God did not refuse the imperfect repentance of the gentiles, so why should he refuse his own people? The acceptance of the superficial, indeed hypocritical penance of the Ninevites serves as a kind of guarantee for God's everlasting mercy with his own people.[27]

Moreover, as Ephraim Urbach has already shown in an article published in 1949/50,[28] some of the above mentioned texts dare to be regarded in the context of antichristian polemics. The rabbinic teachers may have changed their interpretation of the narration of Jonah as a reaction to the anti-Jewish form of interpretation of the Church Fathers, who used this story of Nineveh to demonstrate the stubborn attitude of the people of Israel.

---

[26] Ego, Heiden, 165-166.

[27] Cf. also Apostolic Constitutions 8,9,9 (SC 336, Metzger 163).

[28] Ephraim Urbach, "*Tᵉshuvat anshe ninive wehaviquah hayehudy nosry*,"*Tarbiz 20* (1949/50) 118-122. Cf. also Elias Bickerman, "Les deux erreurs du prophète Jonas," *RHPhR 45 (1965)* 232-264, esp. 240; Bickerman, Four Strange Books, 17, without explicitely referring to Urbach's article.

The paradigmatic character of this repentance as appearing in rabbinic literature and used in order to critize Israel,[29] was also utilized in the exegesis of the Church Fathers. On the one hand the Christians are admonished to imitate the behavior of the Ninevites;[30] on the other hand the Ninivetes' willingness in doing penance is seen as an admonition against Israel. This thematic motif, although originating in the inner-jewish self admonition, is now being turned against Israel from outside. E.Bickerman described this process as follows: "Les Pères de l'Eglise acceptèrent l'interpretation juive mais la retournèrent contre ses auteurs."[31] Situated within this background, the negative attitude towards Nineveh's repentance as found in the rabbinic literature seems to be very plausible.

In the summing the different results of the analysis of these passages, it becomes obvious that aggadic exegesis solves the tension between Jonah and Nahum in different ways:
- by ignoring the thematic motif of repentance of the people of Nineveh (Tob 14:4.8 and *Ant. 9.214);*
- by starting off from the assumption that, after their repentance, the people of Nineveh started once again to commit sins (*Tg. Ps.-J. Nah 1:1; Pirqe R. El. 43),*
- by interpreting the repentance as being hypocritical and superficial (*y. Taan 2.1, 65d; Pesiq. Rab Kah. 24.11*).

---

[29] Cf. for example *Mek. pisha 1 (Horowitz/Rabin 3f.)*: "Jonah said: I will go outside of the land, where the divine presence does not reveal itself, for since the Gentiles are more inclined to repent, I might be causing Israel to be condemned." Cp. also *Lam Rab. Petihta 31 (17b)*: "Why couldn't it (scil. Jerusalem) learn from Jonah's city, Nineveh? One Prophet I sent to it and they repented, but how many prophets I have sent to Jerusalem and they didn't repent?!"

[30] See also *1 Clem 3:4-6:4; 7:7*; for further references cf. Eugen Biser, "Zum frühchristlichen Verständnis des Buches Jonas," *Bibel und Kirche 17 (1962)* 19-21, esp. 20; Yves-Marie Duval, *Le livre de Jonas dans la littérature chrétienne grecque et latine. Sources et influence du Commentaire sur Jonas de saint Jérôme*, 2 vol. (Sources Augustiennes; Paris: Études Augustiennes, 1973) vol. II, Index *Metanoia; *Pénitence nécessaire des païens.

[31] Elias Bickerman, Les deux erreurs, 240; Bickerman, Four Strange Books, 16. The earliest reference to this fact is to be found in Justin's work "Dialogue with the Jew Trypho" 108:1-3, which dates to the second half of the Second Century A.D. Here Israel is exhorted to act like the Ninevites and to carry out repentance. It seems, that in the fourth and in the beginning of the fifth century, utterances of this kind were increasing. For a collection of this material see Ego, Heiden, 169-173.

It has to be underlined however, that apart from *Tg. Ps.-J. Nah 1:1* and - in a special manner - in the variants of Tob 14:4, no special reference to the prophecy of Nahum is made. For this reason, because of the complexity of the traditions, it seems to be appropriate to differentiate between an explicit and an implicit aggadic solution in order to explain the contradiction between the narration of Jonah and Nahum's prophecy. In addition to this, one should take into account, that there are further motifs of interpretation to be reflected on when dealing with these passages. One has to consider, for instance, the tendency towards the defending of Jonah against the accusation of being a false prophet. Special attention should also be given to the motif of the superficial and hypocritical repentance of the Ninevites. This includes, on the one hand, a paracletical tendency towards Israel through which the people should be comforted and encouraged; God is also prepared to accept imperfect forms of repentance. On the other hand, this motif should be regarded within the context of anti-Christian polemics. In relation to the above, it can be seen, that the traditional forms of Jewish exegesis for the story of Jonah make up a complex process which includes several different factors and interpretative intentions.

Psalms in the Book of the Twelve: How Misplaced Are They?

Erhard S. Gerstenberger

1. Like many other areas of OT-research the prophetic canon of the Hebrew Scriptures is undergoing new investigation, because the parameters of modern exegetes' living, thinking and questioning have dramatically changed.[1] Alterations in the reader's perspective, according to self-critical hermeneutical theories, necessarily result in fresh reconstructions of our own concepts of the past. The Hebrew Canon of three "large" and twelve "minor" prophets, consequently, being an important part of the *TeNaK* (Torah; Nebiim; Ketubim) is being scrutinized almost from scratch in regard to composition, form- and tradition history, profile of authors and transmitters, schools of thought, relation to contemporary extra-biblical phenomena of prophecy, possible life-situations and many other points of view. The results of these endeavors are amazing: They are confronting us with quite unaccustomed sketches or visions of the growth and use of prophetic literature and the molding of prophetic images by later tradition.

2. As a case in point we concentrate on the abundant existence of liturgical genres within the prophetic writings. It seems strange indeed, that most of the 15 prophetic books contain portions of what we may call psalmic genres, whether they be more in the style of purely "liturgical" or of "homiletical"[2] categories of texts. (Mind this protestant distinction between fixed agendaric and extemporaneous parts of worship). Leaving alone the latter ones for the time being we notice a great wealth of passages which seem to belong to worship-agendas, both in the form of unilateral, man/woman - God oriented, prayer and hymn-singing to Yahweh and in a polyphonic or strictly "liturgical" shape, that means, as proclamation to and response of the community. Thus we find almost full scale communal complaints in Jer 14:2-14; Isa 63:7 - 64:10; Joel 1 - 2. Scholarly literature sometimes declares them to be outright worship "liturgies." The so-called individual complaint is at least mirrored in the so called "Confessions of Jeremiah" (Jer 11:18-22; 12:1-6; 15:10-21; 17:12-18; 18:18-23; 20:7-18). A full individual thanksgiving song is placed into narrative contexts (Isa 38; Jonah 2) while a the communal variety comes up at the end of the "Isaiah Apocalypse" (Isa 12). More examples could be named; we will shortly focus on the psalmic texts extant in the Book of the Twelve.

---

[1]To cite but one effort of fundamental re-evaluation: Ferdinand E. Deist, "The Prophets: Are We Heading for a Paradigm Switch?" BZAW 185 (1989) 1 - 18.

[2]Some scholars have long ago aptly investigated prophetic texts under homiletical perspectives, cf. Eberhard von Waldow, Anlaß und Hintergrund der Verkündigung des Deuterojesaja, Diss. Bonn 1953; Ernest W. Nicholson, Preaching to the Exiles, Oxford: Blackwell 1970. Cf. also the liturgical approach to Jeremiah of Henning Graf Reventlow, Liturgie und prophetisches Ich bei Jeremia, Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn 1963.

3. One of the very firmly entrenched and most influential concepts of prophets and prophetic activity through the 19th and 20th centuries has been that of personal identity and authorship of each individual messenger of God. Bernhard Duhm, for example, based his interpretation of the prophetic writings exclusively on the authenticity of prophetic personality.[3] The historical figures named in superscriptions of prophetic books (sometimes nowhere else!) are considered the authors of at least a nucleus of their respective prophetic writings; disciples may have functioned as secretaries of these "men of God." All later additions to their original minutes of divinely inspired kerygma according to this view have to be regarded inferior or worthless, because they cannot possibly match the genius of the authentically prophetic mind surpassing by far the normal frame of contemporary conscience and experience. - This traditional view by and large has been undone by more recent research. In general, modern exegetes today agree that parts of prophetic books have been molded by subsequent transmitters (redactors) and that the image of prophets and prophecy is at least partially dependent on, better: completely formed by, later interpretation.[4] Setting aside, therefore, the idea of personal authorship of prophetic sayings, discourses, narratives (which certainly has its merits at some point) more and more interpreters are discovering other parameters for describing the origin and growth of prophetic books based on group processes within the community of believers and worshipers, with individual poets and preachers receding into the background.[5] Taking into account anthropological and sociological research on prophetic phenomena, considering more intensely the evidence of biblical tradition itself, we may conclude, that the agents of later communal organization were paramount in forming the prophetic messages as well as the concepts of prophecy in general. This means: It has been the needs, aspirations, and sufferings of the early Jewish community which has brought forth the prophetic books using rather faint memories of "classical" prophecy in Israel and very few, if any, "authentic" words coming from the 8th and 7th centuries B.C.E.

---

[3]Bernhard Duhm, Israels Propheten, Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 2nd ed. 1922.

[4]To give but a a few examples: Joseph Blenkinsopp freely admits the creative role of transmitters in forming the biblical concepts of prophecy, e.g.: "It will now be apparent that those who edited and transmitted the Book of Jeremiah, over a period of several centuries, have been at pains to present him as fulfilling the paradigm of the prophetic role in Israel" (A History of Prophecy in Israel, Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2nd ed. 1996, 135; cf. my own epilogue ["Ausblick"] to the German translation of J. Blenkinsopp, Geschichte der Prophetie in Israel, Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1998, 266 - 289).

[5]The literature to be cited here is extensive. For the time being I content myself to giving a few names: Wilhelm Caspari, Lieder und Gottessprüche der Rückwanderer, BZAW 65, 1934; Karl Friedrich Pohlmann; Ernest W. Nicholson; Ehud ben Zvi; Robert P. Carroll.

4. Applying these new visions of prophecy to the Book of the Twelve and asking for psalm-like materials within the relevant writings, we first should venture a purview of the 82 printed pages given in the Hebrew Bible according to Rudolf Kittel (respectively 96 pages of the edition of Karl Elliger, in Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia). There is no claim, however, of being exhaustive at this point.

4.1 From the outset it becomes clear that psalmic passages in the Book of the Twelve belong to different genres, and they have been placed (if that is what happened to them) into their context in various ways. Some of them are highlighted by some kind of introductory formulae: Jonah 2:2 (RSV 1) - determined by its narrational context - is a narrative introduction: "Then Jonah prayed to Yahweh, his God, from the belly of the fish," followed by the formulaic expression "he said" (cf. Isa 38:9 + "I said"; 1 Sam 2:1; Exod 15:1, 21; Judg 5:1 etc). Clearly, this is a case of a literary set-in or inset psalm,[6] a thanksgiving song, as it were which serves the plot of the story. Whether or not there are any liturgical implications in such a use of psalms is dependent on the use of the surrounding narrative. There are, in any case, no hints as to participation of worshipers in intoning a psalm like this.
Jonah is the only narrative text in the Book of the Twelve. It may be worthwhile to investigate the rationale of its being there, in the midst of so much "prophetic discourse." A second example of formal citation of a psalm, however, is offered by Hab 3:1: "A prayer of the prophet Habakkuk according to Shigionoth." This phrase is strongly reminiscent of redactional Psalm-superscriptions, attributing a poem to some traditional singer, like Asaph, David etc. In our case, the term "shigionoth"[7] coincides with the headline of Psalm 7, while the designation "prayer" in the Psalter is used with Psalms 17; 86; 90; 102; 142. In addition, part of the psalmic superscription appears at the end of the hymn in Hab 3:19. All we may surmise from the introduction of the Habakkuk-psalm, a kind of theophanic victory song, is the following: Parts of "prophetic" texts have been used in worship settings. But how should we interpret this fact? The function of superscriptions in the psalms needs to be investigated further (see below). Interpretations vary greatly: Later readers of the prophetic writings may have extracted opportune texts and remodeled them for use in service.[8] The Qumran Psalm-tradition may be cited as a case in point. But relocation of the emended version, a communal hymn, into the prophetic book remains enigmatic. Another hypothesis recognizing the liturgical provenance of Hab 3 makes the author of this text a cultic prophet firmly anchored

[6]Cf. James W. Watts, Psalm and Story (JSOTSup 139) Sheffield: Academic Press 1992.

[7]NRSV, the HarperCollins Study Bible 1993, 1400 has a note synthesizing what little knowledge we have about technical terms in the Psalm-superscriptions: "*Shigionoth* ..., a musical and liturgical term ..., which may indicate that the prayer was spoken in the temple."

[8]Thus, e.g. Wilhelm Rudolph, Micha, Nahum, Habakuk, Zephanja, KAT XIII,3, 239 - 243.

in the temple institution.[9] For some scholars the whole book reveals a liturgical structure of prophetic complaint and divine answer thus being proof of the much conjured institution of cult-prophecy.[10] The theory of ancient Israelite cult-prophetic liturgies within prophetic books and psalms has to abandon all concepts of free-lance divine messengers. They are being substituted by cult-officials. More serious, to my mind, is the fact that such interpretations do fully recognize the liturgical character of some texts, but they still cling to quite traditional patterns of interpreting them exclusively under (rather authoritarian) author-audience aspects. The creative stimulus of communal worship procedures does not enter into consideration.

The smallest of all prophetic writings within the Twelve is Obadiah comprising 21 verses some of which partly coincide with Jer 49:9, 14-16. Biblical tradition does qualify these divine "threats against Edom" as typical prophetic utterances, in the case of Obadiah as a "vision" of a Yahweh-spokesman.[11] Therefore, the genre "oracles against the nations" seemingly does not belong into the liturgical fold. On the other hand, we may surmise that these oracles have been used in worship-situations as a means of Israel's self-defense against the nations.[12] Furthermore, communal complaints in the Psalter imply threats and curses against enemy nations and the oppressive rule of foreign powers (cf. Psalms 60; 83; 137). Interestingly enough, all three psalms do mention, besides other nationalities, the neighboring rival Edom. There is some reason, therefore, to include oracles against foreign enemies among liturgical texts. In that case the book of Obadiah constitutes a prime example of agendaric material being ostensibly shown in the Book of the Twelve, and being marked, as it were, by a special headline, as a substantial corpus in this prophetic context.

---

[9]Cf. Friedrich Horst and Theodor H. Robinson, Die Zwölf kleinen Propheten, HAT I,14, Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr 1954, 183 - 186; Jörg Jeremias, Kultprophetie und Gerichtsverkündigung, WMANT 35, Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag 1970, 85 - 100.

[10]Besides J. Jeremias, op. cit. cf. Aubrey R. Johnson, The Cultic Prophet and Israel's Psalmody, Cardiff: University of Wales Press 1979 and many other works (overview: Klaus Koch, Propheten/Prophetie II, TRE 278, Berlin: de Gruyter 1997, 477 - 499.

[11]"Vision" as a typical communication to Yahweh-messengers, is used widely, especially in exilic-postexilic prophetic texts, cf. Isa 1:1; Jer 14:14; 23:16; Ezek 7:26; 12:22-27; Hos 12:11; Mic 3:6; Nah 1:1; Hab 2:2-3; and heavily concentrated in Dan 8.

[12]Genre and "Sitz im Leben" of these particular "oracles" have not been sufficiently studied so far, cf. Peter Höffken, Untersuchungen zu den Begründungselementen der Völkerorakel des Alten Testaments, diss. Bonn 1977; Bernhard Gosse, Isaie 13,1 - 14,23 dans la tradition littéraire du livre d'Isaie et dans la tradition des oracles contre les nations, OBO 78, Fribourg and Göttingen: University Press and Vandenhoeck, 1988; Joseph Blenkinsopp, op. cit. 131 - 132; 175 - 176 etc. Scholars in general agree on the exilic/postexilic dates of these sayings' inclusion into the prophetic tradition.

4.2 There are, on the other hand, passages of the type we are looking for which stand out from their environment without being separated from their contexts by formulaic introductions or subscriptions. Joel 1:2 - 2:27[13] may be an example, if those scholars are correct who consider all the following passages as later accretions. The two first chapters contain elements of communal complaint[14] and responses by Yahweh, so much so that many exegetes consider it the basic text of Joel, and a full-fledged worship-liturgy at that.[15] In fact, most exegetes think of some liturgical provenance of the text. The enigmatic question remains, how such a different genre could enter the prophetic canon to begin with. Due to traditional presuppositions, the prophet must enter the temple sphere by becoming a cultic official in order to make plausible the existence of a cluster of agendaric genres in the prophetic canon. The opposite vision may be closer to ancient Israel's reality: The prophet does not need to enter the cultic realm, but the ideal figure of the communicator of Yahweh's word and will, on the contrary, emerges from cultic practice, because he has been synthesized right there. In Joel 1 - 2 we have an agendaric block of material to which, in the course of worship-use other liturgical parts have been added. - A similar relationship prevails between Micah 7 and the preceding chapters of the book of Micah. Apparently a liturgical block has been put at the end of a "prophetic" collection of sayings.[16] For what purpose? Why did the composers of the book choose a liturgical form to close the book? (And, why, for that matter, did they occasionally use prayer-language when shaping up the body of text, cf. Mic 1:8-16; 4:5; 5:4-5; 5:8; 6:6-8?). So, while there is a certain independence of the closing part to the book, there also seems to be a bit of interaction between the final part and the body of the book.

---

[13]Other divisions of the book are being discussed, e.g. Joel 1:2 - 2:17; 2:18 - 4:21 (RSV 3:21), cf. Erich Zenger et. al. (eds.), Einleitung in das Alte Testament, Stuttgart: Kohlhammer 1995, 381 - 385. More important is E. Zenger's and others' evaluation of the booklet as mere "literary prophecy and prophetic interpretation of prophetic writings" (383)

[14]As to the genre terminology used here (especially "complaint," "lament," "divine response" etc) cf. Erhard S. Gerstenberger, Psalms (FOTL XIV,1) Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 1988; the second volume (FOTL XIV,2 including the commentary on the Book of Lamentations) is being processed by the publisher.

[15]Cf. Gösta W. Ahlström, Joel and the Temple Cult of Jerusalem, (VTSup 21), Leiden: Brill 1971; Oskar Loretz, Regenritual und Jahwetag im Joelbuch, Altenberge: Ugarit Verlag 1986.

[16]Ever since Hermann Gunkel exposed the liturgical character of this final chapter of Micah ("Der Micha - Schluß," Zeitschrift für Semitistik 2, 1924, 145 - 178) scholars have speculated about the type and function of these verses (Mic 7:8-20). There is a certain agreement on the basic forms being "agendaric," but many colleagues shun away from calling them "real liturgical texts." They rather think of literary imitations (cf. lately Rainer Kessler, Micha, HthKAT, Freiburg: Herder 1999, 296 - 312).

Another example, again slightly different from the preceding two, is Nah 1:1-11. Clearly, there once has been an alphabetical acrostic somewhere within or without the book of Nahum, parts of which have been preserved in Nah 1:2-8 (lines which successively, with some errors and omissions) begin with the letters Aleph to Kaph of the Hebrew alphabet. Equally lucid is the fact that the text of an acrostic poem has been severely remodeled, perhaps to fit into the congregational philosophy and liturgical praxis of the ancient assembly.

4.3 A larger number of psalmic passages have been interwoven with the "prophetic" context. Apparently, they react to messenger speech or prophetic denunciations of Judah or Israel. Hos 6:1-6 is a good example. The preceding passage (Hos 5:8-14) is a terrible invective against cities and tribes of northern Israel, conjuring (military and accusatory terminology) an enemy invasion and culminating in a divine pronouncement of destruction and deportation[17]: ."... I myself will tear and go away; I will carry off, and no one shall rescue. I will return again to my place until they acknowledge their guilt and seek my face. In their distress they will beg my favor." (Hos 5:14b-15). Thus the catchword is given for the following communal confession and declaration of confidence (H.W. Wolff: "Busslied," op. cit. 148 - 149), a genre well known from collective complaints (Hos 6:1-6; cf. Pss 95:6-7; 100; 106:6; Neh 9:16-31; Ezra 9:9-15; Dan 9:5-16 etc.). The passage in question, therefore, is an integral part of the prophetic text, but at the same time it is a true example of communal worship. - The same holds true or else may be claimed e.g. for Zeph 3:14-15;[18] Hab 1,2-4, 12-14; Mic 4:1-5 (parallel to Isa 2:1-5); 6:6-8 and other passages. Even dirge-like poems e.g. in Mic 1:8-16;[19] Amos 5:1-3 may have to re-evaluated under the hypothetic perspective of being authentic witnesses of some sort of communal (or individual, that means small-group[20]) worship. This kind of intimate relationship between psalm-like passages and "prophetic" pronouncements can hardly be explained by any theories about cultic prophecy. Hans Walter Wolff may be pretty close to the truth when summing up his observations as to the liturgical qualities of Mic 7:8-20:

> Relevant worship-services comprised in the first place readings of old prophetic sayings announcing the evil ..., secondly contemporary prophetic

---

[17]Analytical details can be found in Hans Walter Wolff, Hosea, BKAT XIV/1, Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2nd ed. 1965, 131 - 167 and other commentaries.

[18]Cf. Erhard S. Gerstenberger, "Der Hymnus der Befreiung im Zefanjabuch," in: Walter Dietrich, et al (eds.), Der Tag wird kommen, SBS 170, Stuttgart: Kathol. Bibelwerk 1996, 102 - 112.

[19]Cf. Rainer Kessler, op. cit. 90 - 111.

[20]Cf. Erhard S. Gerstenberger, Der bittende Mensch, WMANT 51, Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag 1980; idem, Yahweh, the Patriarch, Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress 1996, 55 - 66.

utterances highlighting the actual situation by biting critique or comforting words ..., and finally the psalm-like response of the congregation, referring to the preceding kerygma.[21]

4.4 Only very few relevant psalm-like passages seem to be incorporated into prophetic books like erratic pieces of non-prophetic literature, or meteor-like witnesses of another world. Closer investigation may still yield contextual ligatures, though. The items most hotly discussed over a longer period of time certainly are those fragmented parts of a Yahweh hymn found in the book of Amos (Amos 4:13; 5:8-9; 9:5-6 [Amos 8:8]), the so-called doxological intrusions. They indeed have puzzled exegetes for a long time already exactly for being so disconnected with the context.[22] Be that as it may, the inclusion of hymnic elements in this fashion is some evidence for cultic use of the "prophetic" book.

5. Conclusions

5.1 Psalmic texts are integrated into the Book of the Twelve in a variety of ways. We have to describe the modalities and functions these passages are performing. A frame of introductory and/or concluding formulas suggests the availability of the text for liturgical use, in a way visible in the Psalter. Unframed, semi-autonomous psalmic texts may be equally convenient pieces for worship services of the community. Finding a text marked in the way of Hab 3 and most poems of the Psalter it is hard to imagine a purpose other than a liturgical purpose behind this feature. Superscriptions consisting of personal adscription and technical terms do not serve the interests of possible readers.[23] - Interactive use of psalmic texts in "prophetic" writings may hint at the possibility, that it was not the prophetic texts

[21]Hans Walter Wolff, Micha, BKAT XIV/4, Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag 1982, 194.

[22]Perhaps Karl Budde, "Zur Geschichte des Buches Amos," BZAW 27, 1914, 63 - 77, was the first to focus on this phenomenon. Friedrich Horst gave a first comprehensive interpretation: Doxologies are customary responses of those accused of crimes, admitting their guilt, so that they may be sentences ("Die Doxologien im Amosbuch," ZAW 47, 1929, 45 - 54). Cf. also Werner H. Schmidt, "Die deuteronomistische Redaktion des Amosbuches," ZAW 77, 1965, 168 - 173; Wener Berg, Die sogenannten Hymnenfragmente im Amosbuch, Frankfurt: Bernhard Lang 1974; Klaus Koch, "Die Rolle der hymnischen Abschnitte in der Komposition des Amos-Buches," ZAW 86, 1974, 504 - 537. He rejects F. Horst's interpretation opting for each hymnic fragment being a marker of book-division, but actually pointing back to some liturgical use of the texts (op. cit. 536).

[23]Regarding the Psalter (and the Prophets?) as private reading material has come into vogue. This concept almost certainly is a modern one presupposing a literary society (which does not even exist today in a completely consistent way. An investigation in Brazil, e.g. showed that 8 % of the population nourish persistent reading habits).

which attracted liturgical passages, but on the contrary: Cultic situations may have produced prophetic pronouncements. - Only the erratic variety of interspersed psalms in apparently alien contexts could cause problems for our way of interpretation. But why should later redactors place fragments of psalms into a non-cultic context? The best explanation, it seems to me, still is the real worship-situation. Perhaps congregations would respond to citations of doomsday-prophecy by intoning hymns. This genre in fact is a "weapon" against destruction and misery. Elogizing the power of God, the mighty benevolence of the Creator, in itself may defeat the enemies or other evil potencies. Thus, the Chronicler tells of military victory on account of hymn-singing (2 Chron 20:21-22). And the legendary witnesses of Yahweh of Daniel 3, according to the Greek, apocryphal tradition sing hymns in the midst of the "fire-oven." Furthermore, hymnic passages may constitute part and parcel of complaint songs.[24] Therefore, the fragmented hymn in Amos should not seem too strange to us. On the contrary, it could be another piece of evidence for the origin and transmission of "prophetic" discourse in worship.

5.2 Most scholars will agree that the bulk of "psalmic" passages in the prophetic canon does have some affinity to liturgical texts and outlooks. Few will accept the idea that these cultic elements in the prophets may be the "Leitfossil" of the whole prophetic literature, betraying, as it were, the formative matrix at least of the composition and partly new creation of divinely inspired discourse. We do not have much authentic information about this possible state of affairs. But the passages adduced above from the Book of the Twelve certainly would become more perspicuous, if they are considered not as alien intruders but as solidly grounded in worship. An additional investigation of "prophetic" speech-forms (especially the genres of admonition; call for repentance; exhortation; ethical reflection etc), so frequently used in the prophetic canon, would greatly enhance the quest for a cultic origin of "prophetic" composition and discourse. There are many other signs of this being the case: E.g. the famous relationship of Jeremiah to his personal scribe Baruch and the role of the written prophetic record in Jer 36. This beautiful and theologically most meaningful story, certainly made up in deuteronomistic circles, strongly presupposes a use of the prophetic word as lecture reading in exilic or post-exilic congregations. The "words of Jeremiah" are written exclusively to be read to a community, so that it can 'amend its ways and its doings' (cf. Jer 7:3). The prophet himself is expressly barred from the temple in order that his words may be read to the people. The destruction of the written word of God is the great danger for the congregation, not so much the possible demise of the prophet himself. - In the Books of the Chronicler the prophet is merging into the office of the Levite singer. He is responsible for preserving the psalmic tradition, and singing hymns and prophesying is about the same demonstration of

[24]Cf. Erhard S. Gerstenberger, FOTL XIV/1, 11 - 14.

Yahweh's will (1 Chron 25:1-3). That means: Congregations at the time of the Chronicler (4th century B.C.E.?) did identify liturgical with prophetic activity.

5.3 With strong evidence at hand about a) about the growth and shaping of biblical traditions including those of the emerging prophetic canon in exilic and post-exilic times, and b) about the forming of a unified prophetic image during the same time of exilic-post-exilic restoration of Juda in a religious community we might tentatively take the stance of reverting to the traditional approach in order to test the hypotheses stated above. The interpretation of prophetic texts in the past tried to start out from the historical person communicating the will and verdict of Yahweh for his people in a concrete moment of Israelite life. Mentally starting from this point zero, the point of origin of a given textual unit, exegetes tried to verify if later additions of modifications of the text could be pointed out. Eventually, exegesis had to proceed from the fountainhead of the real prophet and his authentic saying down to the Masoretic and other ancient versions of the text, observing the significant alterations in ductus and meaning of the text. If later additions, interpretations, corrections etc. had overgrown the original prophetic word the modern exegete would have to muster his or her sharp tools of critical research and cut back through the jungle of later interpretations in order still to get to the fountainhead or the gold-mine of that significant first saying and its author. Now, we should try to take the other possible avenue, legitimated by all kinds of historical and social critical methods: What we have in our Bibles are textual witnesses going back to second century B.C.E. at the earliest (LXX; Qumran etc.). We would have to scrutinize the text starting with its latest layers and conditionings, theological expectations, and typical concepts. The analysis of this latest layer should not consider the text an end-product (which, to be sure, it definitely is in some respects), but it should try to discover the creative interests in and moldings of the distant past. No human being and no group of people can avoid, while designing for him- and itself a picture of bygone persons and messages, imposing its own, contemporary experiences on the ancient witnesses. The prophets and their messages, as we find them today in our Bibles, to a large extent are a condensation of a good number of prophetic types and roles, including perhaps a few real incidents and memories of old. The most important part of prophetic literature apparently is constituted by late passages which are projected back into olden times. Likewise, the figures of those men of God, serving as Yahweh's envoys, are certainly condensed from some historical experience and much communal expectations. For the most part, the figures and names of prophets in the Book of the Twelve really are projections into the past, of exilic and post-exilic concepts of what prophecy should have been achieving before the exile.

"Haggai-Zechariah: Prophecy after the Manner of Ezekiel"

Steven S. Tuell, Randolph-Macon College, Ashland, VA

The role of the book of Ezekiel in the formation of the canon at first seems, to say the least, ambiguous. The important role of books such Isaiah or Jeremiah, which were quoted from and alluded to with considerable frequency in the texts of developing Judaism and Christianity, is obvious. But Ezekiel was more usually seen as a problem in need of a solution. Rabbinical Judaism considered the study of this book dangerous for any but the mature scholar.[1] Three times (b. Shabbat 13b; b. Hagigah 13a; and b. Menahot 45a) Talmud records the story of Hananiah ben Hezekiah, leader of the school of Shammai, who burned three hundred jars of oil laboring over the texts until all the contradictions between Ezekiel and the Torah of Moses were resolved. Even so, b. Menahot 46a observes that only when Elijah comes will all the discrepancies be explained.

Difficult as the book may be, the rightful place of Ezekiel in the canon was unquestioned.[2] Indeed, Ezekiel is today sometimes identified as the key figure in the transition between the pre-exilic prophets and the post-exilic scribes, and hence between ancient Israelite religion and second-temple Judaism. [3] But the influence of Ezekiel is still most apparent in the literature of fringe communities: in apocalypses such as Daniel (especially chapters 7 and 10), the Book of the Watchers (1 Enoch 4:8-25), and Revelation (Rev 11:1; 21:10-21; 22:1-6), and in the life and liturgy of the

---

[1] In a letter to Paulinus, bishop of Nola, Jerome reports a Jewish regulation of his day barring anyone under the age of thirty from reading either the beginning (chapters 1--3, the vision of the chariot throne), or the ending (chapters 40--48), of Ezekiel's book (cf. *St. Jerome,* W. H. Freemantle, A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, 2/6 [New York: Christian Literature, 1893] 502).

[2] Cf. b. Baba Bathra 14b, 15a, which claims the authority of the Great Synagogue for Ezekiel, as well as Daniel, Esther, and the Book of the Twelve.

[3] For Ezekiel as a liminal figure between prophet and scribe, see Ellen Davis, *Swallowing the Scroll: Textuality and the Dynamics of Discourse in Ezekiel's Prophecy* (JSOT 78; Sheffield: Almond Press, 1989), 65-66.

Essenes.[4] Ezekielian influence on more mainstream texts within the canon is less apparent, and more subtle.[5]

This study will explore the influence the book of Ezekiel may have had upon Haggai-Zechariah[6] by investigating four possible points of

[4] For a general treatment of the apparent influence of Ezekiel on the Essene community, cf. Ben Zion Wacholder, "Ezekiel and Ezekielianism as Progenitors of Essenianism," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research*, ed. Devorah Dimant and Uriel Rappaport (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 186-196. Allusions to Ezekiel appear in particular in the Shabbat Shirot from Qumran. The description of the throne chariot of Yhwh in 4Q404, 1,2:1-16 (Carol Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition* [HSS 7; Atlanta: Scholars, 1985], 226) and 4Q405, 20-21-22 (Newsom, *Songs*, 303) obviously derives from Ezekiel 1, as Newsom has noted (*Songs*, 52 and 55-56). The interest of Ezekiel 40--42 in the temple gates also appears to find a parallel in the Songs. Note that the words used to describe the entrances and exits of the heavenly temple in 4Q405 (*bw'*, *ys'*, שׁער, *pth*) appear together only in Ezekiel: the first two in 40:11, 38, 40 and 46:3; all together in 46:2-3 (as noted by Newsom in *Songs*, 42).

[5] For example, compare Ezek 44:1-14 and Isa 56:1-8; on this parallel, cf. Michael Fishbane (*Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1985] esp. 138 and 142) and Walther Zimmerli (*Ezekiel*, Vol. 2 [tr. Ronald E. Clements; Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979] 453-454).

[6] This study will deal with Haggai and Zechariah 1--8. Scholarly consensus holds that Zech 9--14 represents a later, apocalyptic addition to Zechariah. Evidence indicates that Haggai and Zechariah 1--8 have been edited together; so Peter Ackroyd, "The Book of Haggai and Zechariah I-VIII," *JJS* 3 (1952) 155-156; W. A. M. Beuken, Haggai-*Sacharia 1-8: Studien zur Überlieferungsgeschichte der Frühnachexilischen Prophetie* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1967), 331; Carol L. and Eric M. Meyers, *Haggai, Zechariah 1-8*, AB 25B (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, 1987), xliv-xlviii and especially xlix, which demonstrates the redactional links particularly between Haggai and Zech 7-8; Seth Sykes, *Time and Space in Haggai-Zechariah 1-8: A Bakhtinian Analysis of a Prophetic Chronicle* (Ph. D. diss., Union Theological Seminary in Virginia, 1997), 38-68. David Petersen, while insisting on the distinct composition and redaction of Haggai and Zechariah, nonetheless views Zechariah as a response to Haggai (*Haggai and Zechariah 1-8*, OTL (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1984), 124. The early proposal of A. Klostermann, that Haggai-Zechariah was a single original narrative secondarily divided into two books (*Geschichte des Volkes Israel bis zur Restauration unter Esra und Nehemia* [Munich: C. H. Beck, 1896], 212-213; cited by Beuken, 11), while rendered impossible by the distinctiveness of Haggai and Zechariah, nonetheless affirms the unity achieved by their

connection: the centrality of temple and cult in Haggai-Zechariah; the dating formulae, precise to the day, which structure this composite work; Zechariah's vision reports; and the use of the first person in Zechariah. Once the likelihood of Ezekielian influence has been established, this study will raise questions concerning the nature of that influence, and its significance for the redaction of Haggai-Zechariah and the Book of the Twelve.

I. Possible Points of Influence

A. The Centrality of Temple and Cult. The editorial superscription to Ezekiel identifies this prophet as a priest (Ezek 1:3). However, the content of the book would lead the reader to this conclusion, even without that explicit statement. The prophet's concern for right worship and ritual purity (i.e., Ezek 18:5-6; Ezek 8) and the parallels in style and content between Ezekiel and the Holiness Code (for example, in Lev 18:6-19//Ezek 22:8-12) make the relationship between the book of Ezekiel and Jerusalemite priestly circles evident.

As we might expect from a prophet-priest, concerns for the temple affect both the content and the structure of Ezekiel. The book is punctuated by three great visions (1--3, 8--11, 40--48). These complex vision reports are linked by the experience of the divine glory, the *kābôd*, which in Priestly texts signifies the presence of Yhwh in sacred space.[7] In

---

redaction. As James Nogalski has demonstrated, Haggai and Zechariah 1--8 were combined prior to their incorporation into the Book of the Twelve, and Zech 9--14 were added subsequent to this incorporation (*Literary Precursors of the Book of the Twelve*, BZAW 217 [Berlin: de Gruyter, 1993], 278, and *Redactional Processes in the Book of the Twelve*, BZAW 218 [Berlin: de Gruyter, 1993], 274-279). As this study is concerned with the composition and redaction of Haggai-Zechariah and, secondarily, of the Book of the Twelve, consideration of Zech 9--14 was not deemed relevant.

[7] First at the mountain of God (Exod 24:16, 17; 29:43; 40:34, 35; Lev 9:6, 23), later at the tabernacle (Num 14:10, 21, 22; 16:19; 17:7 [16:42]; 20:6). The sole apparent exception to this rule, the appearance of the glory at the giving of the manna in Exodus 16:7, 10, proves on closer examination rather to confirm the rule. Not only is this incident set in the immediate vicinity of the mountain of God (cf. Exod 17:6), but the mention of a jar of manna being placed *lipnê hā'ēdūt* ("before the testimony") in v. 34

Ezekiel, however, the *kābôd* is encountered in an unclean land, among the exiles. In the first vision (Ezek 1--3), the *kābôd* comes to be with Ezekiel and his fellow exiles in Babylon, beside the river Chebar. This gracious presence of Yhwh with the exiles, however, implies the divine absence from the Jerusalem temple, where the *kābôd* would normally be manifested.[8] In the second vision (Ezek 8--11), this implication is confirmed: the *kābôd* has abandoned the temple and the city, leaving both ripe for destruction.

In the third and final vision, Ezekiel 40--48, the *kābôd* appears for the last time, inhabiting a glorious visionary temple. Many scholars would agree, with Blenkinsopp[9], that this vision involves the rebuilding of the temple, in fulfillment of the promise in Ezekiel 37:26b-27: "I will bless and multiply them, and will set my sanctuary among them forevermore. My dwelling place shall be with them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people."[10] However, this researcher has argued elsewhere that the

---

demonstrates that, in an earlier form of the tradition, this account belonged to the period after Sinai, in connection with the tabernacle and the Ark. Although in Num 14:21 the earth is said to be filled with the *kābôd Yhwh* (cf. Isa 6:3), the particular manifestation of the *kābôd* remains tied to sacred space. Indeed, care must be taken to ensure that unauthorized contact with the *kābôd* does not occur (cf. the Korah rebellion, Num 16:1-11, 16-22, 35--17:15 [16:50]), suggesting that the manner in which the *kābôd* fills the earth is very different from the manner in which it is present on Sinai and in the tabernacle. The language used of the *kābôd* in the Jerusalem temple (1 Kgs 8:11; Pss 24:7, 10; 26:8; 29:3; Isa 6:3) is, thus, in direct continuity with P: not surprising, as the writers and redactors responsible for P are of the same lineage as the Zadokite priests of the pre- and post-exilic temple establishments.

[8] Little wonder, as Samuel Terrien observes, that Ezekiel's call begins with the heavens being torn open: "As the member of a priestly family, the young deportee had doubtless believed that Yahweh dwelt in Zion. He could not expect that Yahweh would manifest his presence in a remote and totally alien land except through some shattering of the cosmic order" (*The Elusive Presence: The Heart of Biblical Theology*, [Religious Perspectives 26; San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1978], 258).

[9] Blenkinsopp further argues that the Temple vision originally followed Ezekiel 37 (*Ezekiel*, Interpretation [Louisville, Kentucky: John Knox, 1990], 177-178; 179-180; 194).

[10] Unless otherwise stated, English Bible quotations will be from the New Revised Standard Version (NRSV).

temple description in Ezekiel 40--42 does not fit the pattern of temple-building texts in the ancient Near East. Rather, the original text of Ezekiel 40--48 depicted a heavenly ascent; the temple the prophet describes is the original, archetypal dwelling of God.[11] Ezekiel's description of this structure would have served in his community as a substitute for the Jerusalem temple and its iconography, which provided for worshipers a connection to divine reality (cf. Ps 48:13-14). In its final form, however, the function of the final nine chapters of Ezekiel has been redirected. By a thoroughgoing Zadokite redaction, probably dating to early in Darius' reign, Ezekiel's visionary experience of Yhwh's presence has become a law, the Law of the Temple, describing the means by which the divine presence may legitimately be approached: through right cult (43:18-27; 44:13--46:15) and right priesthood (44:4-31).[12]

---

[11] Steven Tuell, "Ezekiel 40--42 as Verbal Icon," *CBQ* 58 (1996) 649-664.

[12] For a detailed analysis of the redaction of Ezekiel 40--48, see Tuell, *The Law of the Temple in Ezekiel 40--48* (HSMS 49; Atlanta: Scholars, 1992), Chapter Two. By means of this redactional expansion, the center of the text has been subtly shifted from the divine promise of presence (Ezek 43:7a) to the means by which the presence can be encountered. A liturgy is set forth, together with a cult calendar and a hierarchy of Temple personnel. The funding of the cult is arranged, and hence its continuance is guaranteed. Within this scheme are evidences of gritty reality. Political problems are revealed in the three prophetic critiques of the leader in the land, the *nāśî'* (45:8; 45:9; and 46:18). Tensions in the Temple leadership are evidenced by the polemic against the Levites, especially in 44:6-14. The society depicted in the Temple Vision is no ideal projection, but an actual society, centered on a state-supported Temple in which the secular leadership played an important role. The evidence suggests that this society was Restoration Judea. Persian interventions in the religious institutions of other subject peoples tended to follow the pattern described here. The sixty-shekel mina from the table of weights and measures in 45:10-12 corresponds to the system of weights and measures instituted by Darius I. The title *nāśî'*, given to the leader of the society portrayed in the Temple Vision, was also given to Sheshbazzar, first governor of the Persian province of Yehud. The restriction of priesthood to the Jerusalemite altar clergy can best be explained as a transitional stage between First and Second Temple periods, operative until the time of Ezra's Mosaic torah. Even the borders depicted in 47:15-20 roughly coincide with the borders of the Persian province Abar-Nahara, of which Judah was a part (so Tuell, "The Southern and Eastern Borders of Abar Nahara," *BASOR 284* [1991] 51-58). Particularly

These same concerns for temple, cult, and priesthood animate Haggai-Zechariah. Even outside the books that bear their names, the prophets Haggai and Zechariah are remembered in connection with the rebuilding of the temple (Ezr 5:1 and 6:15). Within the text of these prophets as well, these issues are primary, suggesting that Ezekielian influence may be found at this point.

Clearly, the rebuilding of the temple and the reestablishment of Judah as a nation are the principal themes of Haggai's prophecy.[13] Haggai 1:2-11 echoes the theme of material prosperity, linked to the divine presence enshrined and celebrated in the right temple with the right cult, which is communicated in Ezekiel 47:1-12[14] --though in a negative, rather than a positive sense. The failure to rebuild the temple, Haggai declares, has meant disaster not only for the human community, but also for the land itself. Without the temple, the land has suffered the curse of infertility and drought (Hag 1:2-9). Only when Yhwh's house is rebuilt will the land be blessed once more.

In Zechariah as well, the rebuilding of the temple is a prominent concern. Zechariah 2:14-17 (10-13) describes Jerusalem as the place of Yhwh's dwelling, in language reminiscent of Ezekiel 37:24-28.[15] In particular, the rebuilding of the temple is the subject of the intertwined vision report and oracle found in Zechariah 4:1-14. In his vision, Zechariah sees a golden lampstand. Ordinarily, lampstands in the ancient world were made of clay; that Zechariah's lampstand is made of gold suggests that we are to see it in connection with the golden lampstands of the tabernacle and the temple of Solomon. The single golden menorah of the ancient

---

suggestive (see n. 59, below) is the Demotic Chronicle, which details the demand of Darius that the Egyptian clergy produce a law of the temples. As 43:12 explicitly states, in its final form, the Temple Vision is just such a code: it is *tôrat habbāyit*, the Law of the Temple.

[13] For example, Peter R. Ackroyd, "Haggai," in *Harper's Bible Dictionary*, ed. Paul Achtemeier (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1985), 367.

[14] Tuell, *Law*, 68-71; cf. also "The Rivers of Paradise: Ezek 47:1-12 and Gen 2:10-14," in *God Who Creates*, ed. S. Dean McBride, Jr. and William Brown (Eerdmans, 2000?), forthcoming.

[15] Meyers and Meyers, 168.

tabernacle had three branches on each side like the modern menorah, providing space for seven lamps (Exod 25:31-40). Solomon's temple, on the other hand, had held ten golden lampstands (1 Kgs 7:49), but nothing is said of any of them having branches like the one in the tabernacle. The single, branchless lampstand of Zechariah's vision, with its seven lamps but multiple lights, represents a harmonization of these two old memories of service in God's presence. Tending the lamps was an important task of the priesthood (Num 8:1-4; 2 Chronicles 13:11), which indicates the great symbolic significance of the lampstands in both temple and tabernacle. The treelike arrangement of seven branches on the tabernacle lampstand suggests that the lampstand was a sign of God's presence in the fruitfulness of the earth. Although the lampstands from Solomon's temple and Zechariah's vision do not have branches, carvings of trees and flowers covered the temple's walls (1 Kgs 6:29), while in Zechariah's vision, the lampstand is flanked by two olive trees (Zech 4:3). Hence, here as well, the notion of life-giving fertility is joined to God's presence.

An oracle concerning Zerubbabel (Zech 4:6-10a) has been inserted between the vision (Zech 4:1-5) and its interpretation (4:10b-14). Many scholars have argued that this insertion was made by later editors,[16] but Carol and Eric Meyers propose that the oracle and the vision belong together, and were likely arranged together by Zechariah himself.[17] The specific provisions of the Zerubbabel oracle relate to the rituals of temple rebuilding usually performed by the king. Before Zerubbabel, the Lord declares, the top of the temple mount shall become a smooth, level place, prepared for rebuilding.[18] Into this building site Zerubbabel will carry the "top stone" (Hebrew *hā'eḇen hārō'š*), while all the people cheer (Zech 4:7). The "top stone," or, perhaps better the "first" or "premier stone," would have been the equivalent of the first brick in Babylonian temples, ceremonially placed by the king. When a temple was rebuilt, a brick from the earlier temple would be ceremonially preserved from the ruins for inclusion in the new temple. This custom, too, may provide the

---

[16] For example, Paul D. Hanson, "Zechariah, Book of," in *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, Supp., ed. Keith Crim (Nashville: Abingdon, 1976), 982.

[17] Meyers and Meyers, 242.

[18] Meyers and Meyers, 244-245.

background for Zerubbabel's "top stone."[19]

Also said to be in Zerubbabel's hand is "the tin stone" (Hebrew *hā'eḇen habbĕḏîl*; Zech 4:10). If the Hebrew phrase refers to a plummet,[20] then the intention once more is to depict Zerubbabel in the act of rebuilding--here, checking that the temple walls are laid true. However, deposits of precious materials and of symbolic metal objects such as nails were often placed in temple foundations. Perhaps the "tin stone" refers to such a foundation deposit.[21] In any case, seeing this object in the hands of Zerubbabel is convincing proof, even to the skeptics who "despised the day of small things," that the spirit of the Lord is at work in Zerubbabel. Having restored the foundations of the temple, he will also complete the rebuilding (Zech 4:9).

The priesthood as well figures prominently in Haggai-Zechariah. Two of Haggai's four oracles are addressed to Joshua the high priest, as well as to Zerubbabel the governor (Hag 1:1; 2:2, 4; note that Joshua also figures prominently in the narrative depicting the temple rebuilding in Hag 1:12-15). Another oracle involves the request for, and response to, a priestly torah (Hag 2:10-19).[22]

The importance of the priesthood in Zechariah is indicated in many ways. In Zechariah 3, the prophet sees the high priest Joshua on trial in the heavenly court, accused by *haśśāṭān*. He is, however, vindicated. Yhwh rebukes *haśśāṭān* and declares, "Thus says the LORD of hosts: If you will walk in my ways and keep my requirements, then you shall rule my house and have charge of my courts, and I will give you the right of access among those who are standing here" (Zech 3:7). As Paul Hanson observes, "This passage both reflects the exalted position of the Zadokite high priest at this period and hints at the existence of intercommunity controversy over

[19] Meyers and Meyers, 246-248.

[20] As it has traditionally been rendered; so NRSV. JPSV reads "stone of distinction."

[21] Meyers and Meyers, 253-254.

[22] For a brief summary of the various approaches to this enigmatic text, see Brevard Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979), 464-465.

his appointment."[23] Another, implicit affirmation of Joshua comes in the interpretation of Zechariah's vision in chapter 4. The two olive trees are identified as "the two anointed ones who stand by the Lord of the whole earth" (Zech 4:14)--referring, evidently to Zerubbabel the governor and Joshua the high priest. The Hebrew phrase translated "anointed ones" in the NRSV is *bĕnê-hayyiṣhār*, literally "sons of oil." The term *yiṣhār* usually refers to fresh olive oil, and is never used elsewhere for anointing oil. The point does not appear to be that Joshua the high priest and Zerubbabel the governor are messiahs.[24] Rather, just as the two olive trees in Zechariah's vision provide oil for the lamps, the high priest and the governor together are expected to provide for the temple, where God's presence will be experienced and celebrated. Note, too, that in Zechariah as in Haggai, the priests are approached for an authoritative ruling (Zech 7:1-3), which again provides the occasion for a prophetic oracle.

To be sure, Ezekiel and Haggai-Zechariah manifest a common interest in temple, cult, and priesthood. However, the general ideas concerning the temple expressed in Haggai-Zechariah can be found elsewhere throughout the ancient Near East and in the Hebrew Bible, and do not indicate dependency upon Ezekiel. Further, Ezekiel's characteristic terminology is not used. The term *hêkal*, used in Ezekiel 41:1 and elsewhere for the long central chamber of the temple, is in Haggai (Hag 2:15, 18) and Zechariah (8:9) used interchangeably with *bêt Yhwh*, for the entire temple. Ezekiel's term for divine presence, *kābôd*, does appear in Haggai 2:3, 7, and 9. However, it is used differently than in Ezekiel: as an adjective meaning "splendor," not as a noun indicating divine presence.[25] In Zechariah, on

---

[23] Paul D. Hanson, "Zechariah," in *Harper's Bible Dictionary*, 1159. Note, for example, that while the Law of the Temple in Ezek 40--48 affirms an exclusively Zadokite priesthood, it makes no mention of a high priest (cf. Tuell, *Law*, 146-151).

[24] Note, though, the mention of the crowns in Zech 6:9-15. Although only the crown for Joshua is mentioned in the final form of the text, the use of the plural in vv 11 and (possibly) 14, and the reference to "a priest by his throne" in v 13, show that the original form of the text envisioned crowns for both Joshua and Zerubbabel (so Hanson, "Zechariah," 983). The Essenes did expect two messiahs, one a priest and one a king (cf. Geza Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English*, 4th ed. (London: Penguin, 1995), 60.

[25] *Contra* Meyers and Meyers, 54.

the other hand, *kābôd* is used with reference to the divine presence (Zech 2:9), and even as a circumlocution for the divine name (Zech 9:12). However, in both Haggai and Zechariah, the term *kābôd* appears together with the expression *Yhwh ṣĕbā'ôt*, which in texts expressive of the old Zion theology depicts Yhwh enthroned above the cherubim in the most holy place. Indeed, as Meyers and Meyers observe, *Yhwh ṣĕbā'ôt* is a characteristic expression of Haggai-Zechariah.[26] This term never appears in Ezekiel; indeed, Tryggve Mettinger proposes that it has been polemically excluded.[27] Also conspicuous by its absence from Haggai-Zechariah is any reference to the detailed legislation in the final form of Ezekiel 40--48, or to the temple plan in Ezekiel 40--42. Note, too, that while the role of Joshua as high priest is an important theme in Haggai-Zechariah, the cultic legislation in Ezekiel 40--48 makes no mention of a high priest. In short, while temple, cult, and priesthood are shared interests of Ezekiel and Haggai-Zechariah, the concrete expression of these ideas in Haggai-Zechariah does not derive from Ezekiel.[28]

B. The Dating Formulae. Sixteen different occurrences of the date formula can be found in Ezekiel, each time as the heading of a unit. Of these, eleven are precise to the year, month and day (1:1; 8:1; 20:1; 24:1; 29:1; 29:17; 30:20; 31:1; 32:1; 33:21; and 40:1). Three others (1:2; 26:1; and 32:17) are precise to the year and day, while two date in reference to some fixed event (3:16 refers back to the date of the call vision, and sets its vision seven days later, while a second date in 40:1 specifies the year as the fourteenth after the fall of Jerusalem). Interestingly, both the first use of the date formula (Ezek 1:1, 2) and the last (Ezek 40:1) are doubled dates.

---

[26] Meyers and Meyers, 18. While Haggai constitutes only .2% of the Hebrew Bible, it contains 14 occurrences of *Yhwh ṣĕbā'ôt* : 5% of the total references. Similarly Zechariah 1--8, at .6% of the Hebrew Bible, accounts for 14% of the total references (44 occurrences).

[27] Tryggve N. D. Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth: Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies*, tr. Frederick H. Cryer, (CBOTS 18; Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1982), 11, 109-113.

[28] *Contra* Paul D. Hanson, who argues that Haggai and Zechariah were attempting to enact the program in Ezekiel 40--48 (*The Dawn of Apocalyptic* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975], 174).

The dates in Ezekiel are mainly sequential,[29] and are calculated by the years of Jehoiachin's exile, which also happen to be the years of exile for Ezekiel and his fellows. The sole exception, the enigmatic "thirtieth year" of Ezekiel 1:1, would appear to be a reference to Ezekiel's age at the time that his career as a prophet began.[30]

There are eight occurrences of the dating formula in Haggai-Zechariah (Hag 1:1, 15; 2:1, 10, 20, Zech 1:1, 7; 7:1). All but two are precise to the year, month and day: 2:20, which gives only the day, but refers explicitly back to the date in 2:10; and Zechariah 1:1, which gives only the year and month. Usually, as in Ezekiel, these date formulae introduce a unit. But the date formula in Haggai 1:15 appears to be free-floating, suggesting that the text has been disarranged.[31]; moreover, the "second year of King Darius" in Haggai 1:15b seems to do double-duty, defining both the date in 1:15 and the following date in 2:1. However, Meyers and Meyers note that 1:15 forms a neat envelope with 1:1 (while 1:1 gives year, month, and day, 1:15 presents the date as day, month, year), and so propose that it is intended to conclude the first unit.[32] Two of the

---

[29] Only three dates are out of sequence: 26:1, which postdates 29:1 by about a year; 29:17, the latest date in Ezekiel, which introduces a later appendix to Ezekiel's original prophecy; and 32:1, which postdates 33:21 by about two months. Note that *G* of 32:17 specifies the first month, which likewise predates 32:1.

[30] Rudolf Smend held that the thirtieth year was rather the year of the book's completion (*Der Prophet Ezechiel* [KEH; Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1880], xxii). C. C. Torrey concluded from this date that the book had originally been written in the thirtieth year of Manasseh (*Pseudo-Ezekiel and the Original Prophecy* [New Haven: Yale University, 1930; reprint, Library of Biblical Studies {New York: Ktav, 1970}], 17-18; 64).

[31] Hans Walter Wolff believes that the "Haggai-chronicler," as he calls the final redactor of this text, moved the oracle now found in 2:15-19 from its original position following 1:15, so that the promised blessing was associated, not with rebuilding, but with the rejection of the unclean from participation. This left 1:15, which had introduced that oracle, as a free-floating fragment. Cf. Hans Walter Wolff, *Haggai: Eine Auslegung*, BSt 1 (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1951), 20-21.

[32] Meyers and Meyers, 36. They further propose that the year may have dropped out of 2:1, due to haplography (37). Petersen, on the other hand, proposes that Haggai 1:1-15 be divided into two units, one beginning with a date formula (1:1-11), the

date formulae (Hag 2:10 and 20) refer to the same day: "On the twenty-fourth day of the ninth month, in the second year of Darius." This date is also emphasized in Haggai 2:18: "Consider from this day on, from the twenty-fourth day of the ninth month." Meyers and Meyers propose that this was the date of the refoundation ceremony for the temple, and note that it stands at the center of Haggai-Zechariah, with three dates before it and three after.[33] The dates are sequential, with the exception of Zechariah 1:1, which predates Haggai 2:10 and 20. Seth Sykes proposes that these overlapping dates "create the impression that the two prophets are equally responsible for enabling the founding of the temple;" in this way, the overlap contributes to the unity of Haggai-Zechariah as a "single utterance."[34] Note finally that the dates in Haggai-Zechariah are calculated by the regnal years of a foreign king, the Persian monarch Darius--a move without precedent in the prophetic corpus.[35]

We have no reason to doubt the accuracy of these dates, either in Ezekiel or in Haggai-Zechariah. However, the date formulae in Ezekiel are less significant for the structure of that book, and appear to be original to the prophet. In Haggai-Zechariah, on the other hand, the dates are a major redactional link between Haggai and Zechariah, and a key structural feature, dividing the text into seven sections.[36] Obviously, in both books, the system of dating precise to the day shows a keen awareness, perhaps even an obsession, with the passage of time. In Ezekiel's case, it is the slow passage of the exile that is in view. In Haggai-Zechariah, Meyers and Meyers propose, the dates are a "countdown" to the end of the disruption brought by exile, thanks to the rebuilding of Yhwh's temple.[37]

That Haggai-Zechariah marks time by the regnal years of the Persian Darius would appear to indicate at least an acknowledgement and acceptance of Persian domination, and perhaps even a pro-Persian bias, on

---

other ending with one (1:12-15). However, these verses appear to make best sense as a single unit (so Beuken, 31-33, and Meyers and Meyers, 36).

[33] Meyers and Meyers, xlvii.

[34] Sykes, 42-44.

[35] As Meyers and Meyers observe (5).

[36] See especially Sykes, 39-47.

[37] Meyers and Meyers, 6.

behalf of the text's redactor.[38] However, Seth Sykes proposes rather that the "chronistic" structure of Haggai-Zechariah involves a transformation of the old Babylonian chronicle genre. The Babylonian chronicles[39] functioned to preserve the social order; in particular to maintain royal support of the temple and cult at Esagil. By selectively chronicling the reigns and vicissitudes of "good" and "bad" kings, the Babylonian chronicles generate a portrait of the ideal king, who preserves Babylon and its temples, and so is blessed by the gods. By dating in accordance with the reign of Darius, Haggai-Zechariah may appear to be following in that same vein. However, the focus of the text is not on the rule of the Persian monarch, but rather (as the preponderance of references to the old title *Yhwh ṣĕbā'ôt* indicates) on the kingship of Yhwh. Haggai-Zechariah, Sykes states, "subverts the historical reality of Persian imperial rule by depicting the universal rule of Yahweh."[40]

The consistent use of dating formulae precise to the day is a feature unique to Ezekiel and Haggai-Zechariah, and so a likely sign of Ezekielian influence on the later composition. However, note that this influence belongs to the level of the redactional combination of Haggai-Zechariah, not to the level of their composition. Further, while the form of Ezekiel's date citations has been followed in Haggai-Zechariah, it has been put to quite a different use.

C. Vision Reports. We have already considered the importance of the three great *kābôd* visions in the structure of Ezekiel. All three are dated precise to the day (1:1; 8:1; 40:1), and all are designated *mar'ôt 'ĕlōhîm* ("visions of God;" Ezek 1:1; 8:3; 40:2).[41] In all three, the prophet is lifted

---

[38] Meyers and Meyers, 5-6; Hanson, *Dawn*, 244-245.

[39] Sykes accepts the classification of A. Kirk Grayson, who identifies twenty-four texts as chronicles; cf. *Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles*, Texts from Cuneiform Sources (Locust Valley, N.Y.: Augustin, 1975). Fourteen of these texts, those composed prior to Haggai-Zechariah, are analyzed by Sykes using the tools of Bakhtinian literary criticism, in order to uncover their sociopolitical setting and function (Sykes, 71-130).

[40] Sykes, 208.

[41] *Mar'â* is relatively rare, occurring only eleven times in the Hebrew Bible: Gen 46:2; Num 12:6 (both E); 1 Sam 3:15; and Dan 10:7 (2x), 8, 16; as well as Ezek 1:1; 8:3; 40:2; and 43:3.

out of himself into heavenly reality as the vision begins. The formula for expressing prophetic ecstasy, "the hand of Yhwh was upon me," occurs six times in Ezekiel: not only in the three great vision complexes (Ezek 1:3; 3:14, 3:22; 40:1), but also in 33:22 (where the *yad Yhwh* removes Ezekiel's dumbness; cf. 3:22-27) and 37:1 (at the beginning of the vision of the dry bones). Zimmerli rightly regards the phenomenon of prophetic ecstasy as characteristic of Ezekiel, a point of continuity between this prophet and the pre-classical prophets.[42] With Ezekiel as well comes the first instance of a feature that will become more and more common in later texts: the presence of an angelic figure, to illustrate and interpret the prophet's visions (Ezek 40:3-4).

While vision reports play no role at all in Haggai, Zechariah's prophecy is characterized by weird symbolic visions. The message of this prophet is communicated in eight vision reports (1:7-17; 1:18-21; 2:1-5; 3:1-10; 4:1-5, 10b-14; 5:1-4; 5:5-11; and 6:1-8), interspersed with prophetic oracles (1:1-6; 2:6-13; 4:6-10a; 6:9-15; 7:1-14; 8:1-17, 18-23). An angel whom the prophet calls "the angel who talked with me" serves as Zechariah's guide and interpreter in these visions (Zech 1:9, 19; 2:3-5; 4:10-14; 5:3, 6-8, 10-11; 6:5-6). Like Ezekiel's visions, Zechariah's abound in fantastic imagery and odd, supernatural beings. These visions may be understood as dreams or night visions (Zech 1:8; 4:1; compare Dan 7:1-2). However, it is also possible that Zechariah, like Ezekiel, speaks out of a prophetic ecstasy, in which he is transported to the heavenly world. So, in Zechariah 3:1, the prophet is standing in the heavenly throne room. In Zechariah 4:1, moreover, the prophet says that the angel "wakened me, as one is wakened from sleep" (Zech 4:1). This could mean that the vision of the lampstand that follows came in a dream. However, the language of the verse suggests that the prophet may have intended a comparison: being summoned by the angel at the beginning of the vision was *like* being awakened from sleep. For Zechariah, the world of God's revelation is not less real, but rather more real, than the waking world. Entry into the visionary state was not like falling asleep, but rather like waking up![43]

On the one hand, then, Zechariah's visions seem in character very

---

[42] Zimmerli, 1:42.

[43] Meyers and Meyers, p. 229.

like Ezekiel's. On the other hand, Ezekiel's characteristic vocabulary is once again absent. Zechariah's visions are not titled *mar'ôt 'ĕlōhîm*; nor are they dated. Ezekiel's formulaic expression for prophetic ecstasy does not appear in Haggai-Zechariah. Further, the content of Zechariah's visions is, generally speaking, entirely distinctive and unlike Ezekiel. We should note, by the way, that the presence of one or two words or images in both Zechariah and Ezekiel is not sufficient to indicate dependency. So, for example, Zechariah 5:1-4 involves a scroll (like Ezek 2:8--3:3), and elements of measurement (like Ezek 40--42, or 48:1-35). However, these are very common ideas, and are used in quite distinctive ways: Ezekiel eats his scroll, while Zechariah's flies through the air. No influence of Ezekiel upon Zechariah can be deduced from such specious parallels.

The exception that proves the rule is Zechariah 2:5-9 (1-5). Here, Zechariah sees "a man with a measuring line in his hand." This is certainly an allusion to Ezekiel 40:3, where the prophet describes a man with a linen cord and a measuring reed in his hand. Although different terms are used (*ḥeḇel* in Zechariah, *pĕtîl-pištîm* in Ezekiel), the correspondence is striking. The linen cord is never mentioned again in Ezekiel, suggesting that Zechariah's vision deliberately responds to Ezekiel's, providing the reason for the unexplained cord. Even more striking is the declared purpose of these two figures. Each appears to be engaged in measurement: of the visionary temple complex and the fabulous river that flows out of it in Ezekiel, and of Jerusalem in Zechariah. Little wonder that Meyers and Meyers see a virtual correspondence between these two visions.[44]

Note, however, that in fact Zechariah's vision is not a parallel to Ezekiel's, but rather a response, indeed a parody. First, it is no accident that the man in Ezekiel's vision measures the temple and not the city. The "very high mountain" (Ezek 40:2) to which Ezekiel is taken as this final vision report opens is, of course, Zion, the Jerusalem acropolis. In Ezekiel, however, the mountain is not *called* Zion, a term that never appears in this book. Indeed, in Ezekiel's vision the city, described in Ezekiel 48:30-35, is not located on the mountain, and the temple is not located within the city.[45]

---

[44] Meyers and Meyers, 151.

[45] Zimmerli (2:547), observes that the "last sentence of the book of Ezekiel shows how the old tradition of the city of God has forcefully obtained justice for itself

In the original vision, it was not the earthly, political Zion, but the heavenly, mythical Zion that was the ground of hope. True, the final form of Ezekiel 40--48, with its detailed legislation regarding both priest and prince, does emphasize concrete, political reality. But the Jerusalem focus in Zechariah remains at odds with Ezekiel's vision. Second, note that detailed, careful measurement is the point of Ezekiel 40--42. The perfect dimensions of the sanctuary serve to demonstrate its holiness. But in Zechariah's vision, the man with the measuring line never actually gets to measure anything. As Petersen observes, "An angelic interpreter interrupts these proceedings and proclaims that the new Jerusalem will exist without boundaries."[46] Zechariah clearly alludes to Ezekiel here. But, his own vision moves in an entirely different direction.

In the prominence given to vision reports, and in the role played by the interpreting angel, Zechariah has certainly been influenced by Ezekiel. However, in content the visions of Zechariah are quite distinct. Once more, it is in matters of form, rather than matters of content, that Ezekiel's influence is felt.

D. The Use of the First Person. Margaret Odell proposes that the use of the first person in Ezekiel reflects the transformation of the building inscription, an ancient Mesopotamian genre that also used the first person.[47] This genre functioned to exalt the king who had established the building's foundations. However, in Ezekiel's adaptation of the genre it is Yhwh, not

---

against the priestly reform project, which, through the separation of city and temple, has robbed the city of much of its dignity." He therefore classes Ezek 48:30-35 with the similar exaltations of the city in Deutero- or even Trito-Isaiah (2:545), and views it as a later addition to the text. Based on the parallel between the city in 48:30-35 and the "construction like a city" in 40:1-4, this researcher has proposed that 48:30-35 was a part of the prophet's original vision (Tuell, *Law*, 73-74). Only by explicitly describing the city as distinct from the mountain could Ezekiel adequately express his point: that the true dwelling of God has been cut loose from its associations with Jerusalem.

[46] David L. Petersen, "Zechariah," in *Harper's Bible Commentary*, ed. James L. Mays (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1988), 748. Petersen, too, understands Zechariah here as a repudiation of Ezekiel 40--48.

[47] Margaret S. Odell, "Genre and Persona in Ezekiel 24:15-24," in *Theology and Anthropology in Ezekiel*, ed. Margaret Odell and John Strong (Scholars, 2001?), forthcoming.

the prophet, who is king; Ezekiel is *ben adam*, the loyal subject. While certainly intriguing, Odell's proposal is not finally convincing. Apart from the use of the first person, the text of Ezekiel does not match the features of the building inscription; further, it is unclear how public such inscriptions would have been, and so what access Ezekiel could have had to exemplars of this genre.

Another ancient "autobiographical" genre is the votive inscription. A fine example is the inscription upon the statue of Udjahoresne, an intriguing figure who seems to have been for Egypt what Ezra was for Judah: a legal/religious authority, acting under Persian auspices.[48] In the inscription, Udjahoresne is called "the chief physician,"[49] probably owing to his high position, not only in the temple of Neith, but in the House of Life, an institution dedicated to medicine and the healing arts as well as to religious ritual.[50] However, he had also served as the commander of the Egyptian fleet before his defection to the Persians under Cambyses.[51] It was Udjahoresne who composed the titulary of Cambyses in Egypt: Mesutire, meaning Son of Re, the sun god.[52] Under this name, Cambyses ruled as king of Upper and Lower Egypt. In return, the Persian monarch gave Udjahoresne the authority to expel the "foreigners" from the temple of Neith, even to destroy their houses and property, and to restore the temple to its former glory.[53]

Clearly, Ezekiel could not have been influenced by the Udjahoresne inscription, although the political and religious situation it describes sounds much like that of the Law of the Temple[54]--or, for that matter, like that of Haggai-Zechariah. Still, Ezekiel could well have been familiar with Egyptian votive inscriptions. Blenkinsopp observes a formal parallel between the

---

[48] Joseph Blenkinsopp, "The Mission of Udjahoresnet and Those of Ezra and Nehemiah," *JBL* 106 (1987) 417.

[49] Miriam Lichtheim, *Ancient Egyptian Literature*, Vol. 3: *The Late Period* (Berkeley: University of California, 1980) 39.

[50] Lichtheim, 36.

[51] Lichtheim, 37.

[52] Lichtheim, 38. The name is translated on 40.

[53] Lichtheim, 38.

[54] Tuell, *Law*, 84-85; 90-91.

Udjahoresne inscription and the memoirs of Nehemiah, suggesting in particular that Nehemiah 13 "was modeled on the Egyptian autobiographical votive inscription."[55] Such borrowing could perhaps also be indicated by the first-person style of Ezekiel and Zechariah. However, neither Ezekiel nor Zechariah really read like autobiographies. Despite the fact that they are written in first person, we learn surprisingly little about the prophets themselves. In the foreground is not the personality of Ezekiel or Zechariah, but rather the word of Yhwh.[56]

The most likely explanation for the use of the first person in Ezekiel, and perhaps for the preponderance of dates as well, comes from the predominant role played by visions in his prophecy. Vision reports are typically in the first person, and are usually dated.[57] It is little wonder, then, that in the work of a visionary such as Ezekiel the first person style became generalized across the narrative. It is perhaps possible that Zechariah could have adopted the first person independently, for the same reasons. However, as we know that Zechariah made use of Ezekiel, and as Ezekiel is the only other predominately first-person text in the prophetic corpus, it is more likely that the first-person style in Zechariah is due to Ezekielian influence.

II. The Nature and Significance of Ezekielian Influence on Haggai-Zechariah

It is apparent that Ezekiel has influenced Haggai-Zechariah. However, this composite work never refers to Ezekiel the prophet or quotes from his book. Allusions to Ezekiel are few, and distant. The closest parallels between Ezekiel and Haggai-Zechariah are found in the text of Zechariah; the most probable sign of Ezekielian influence in Haggai, the use of the date formulae, comes from the redactional layer linking Haggai to Zechariah. This connection supports the proposal of Meyers and Meyers, that either Zechariah himself or a close disciple is responsible for the redaction of

---

[55] Blenkinsopp, "Udjahoresne," 417.

[56] Cf. J. Rosenberg, "Jeremiah and Ezekiel," in *The Literary Guide to the Bible*, ed. R. Alter and F. Kermode (Cambridge: Belknap, 1987), 196.

[57] Adela Yarbro Collins, "vision," in *Harper's Bible Dictionary*, 1115.

Haggai-Zechariah.[58]

Ezekielian influence upon Haggai-Zechariah relates most reliably to matters of form rather than content. Rather like a painter producing a still life in the style of Picasso, or a composer creating a fugue in the style of Bach, the author/redactor of Haggai-Zechariah has produced a book of prophecy after the manner of Ezekiel. We have in the New Testament gospel of Luke an intriguing parallel to this usage of an earlier text. As I. Howard Marshall observes, Luke's "use of a LXX style must raise the question whether he thought of himself as writing a work of the same kind and thus continuing the 'salvation history' which he found in it."[59] Analogously, it appears that Zechariah, in his prophetic activity and particularly in his composition and editing work, understood himself to be working in the tradition of Ezekiel.

III. Ezekiel and the Emergence of Scripture

The early Persian period, indeed the reign of Darius, marks the compilation of Haggai-Zechariah, the final redaction of Ezekiel, and quite possibly the beginnings of both the Chronicler's History[60] and the Mosaic torah. The probable impetus for this tremendous burst of literary creativity was a decree of Darius, described in the so-called Demotic Chronicle:

> As for Darius, it heeded him . . . the land (of Egypt) in its entirety because of the excellence of his character. He issued a decree concerning Egypt to his satrap in (his) third regnal year, as follows: "Let be brought unto me the learned men . . . from among the (military) officers, the priests, (and) the scribes of Egypt so that, being assembled together, they may in concert

---

[58] Meyers and Meyers, xliv-xlviii.

[59] I. Howard Marshall, "An Assessment of Recent Developments," in *It Is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture*, ed. D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1988), 9.

[60] Cf. D. N. Freedman, "The Chronicler's Purpose," *CBQ* 23 (1961) 439-440; William M. Schniedewind, *The Word of God in Transition: From Prophet to Exegete in the Second Temple Period* (JSOT 197; Sheffield, 1995), 249.

write the law of Egypt which had been (observed) formerly through the forty-fourth regnal year of Pharaoh Amasis, (that is) the fifth pharaonic law, (concerning) the temples (and) the people."[61]

Eric Meyers suggests that "Persian encouragement to codify laws in the provinces could well have been the impetus to combine Zechariah 1-8 with Haggai into a single composite piece that was probably intended for presentation at the rededication ceremony of the Second Temple."[62] The material in Haggai and Zechariah, however, scarcely fills the bill as a "law. . . (concerning) the temples (and) the people." Ezekiel 43:12, though, is a striking literary parallel to the Demotic Chronicle. While the Chronicle records Darius's demand for the "law (concerning) the temples" in Egypt, 43:12 (the superscription to the juridical corpus that follows) declares "This is the law of the temple." In its final form, Ezekiel 40--48 is one Judean answer to Darius' command: this is the law of *our* temple, in Jerusalem.

Even if such an order as described in the Demotic Chronicle was not given directly to the Judean priestly establishment, Persian concern for an official codification of Egyptian temple laws would surely have galvanized the Yhwhistic priestly communities, both in Babylon and in Palestine, to formulate their own authoritative canons. In Jerusalem, the first fruit of this labor was Ezekiel 40--48 in its final form: the Law of the Temple, founded upon Ezekiel's last vision report. In Babylon, the process of compilation would eventually result in the Mosaic torah, our Pentateuch.[63]

If this proposal is correct, and the Priestly redactors of Torah and the Temple vision were virtual contemporaries, both the numerous parallels and

---

[61] Wilhelm Spiegelberg, *Die sogenannte demotische Chronik des Pap. 215 der Bibliotheque Nationale zu Paris, nebst den auf der Ruckseite des Papyrus stehenden Texten* (Demotische Studien 7; Leipzig, 1914) 30-31. Translated here from the Demotic by S. Dean McBride, Jr.

[62] "The Persian Period and the Judean Restoration: From Zerubbabel to Nehemiah," in Patrick Miller, Paul Hanson and S. Dean McBride, Jr. (eds.) *Ancient Israelite Religion* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987) 513. Cf. also Meyers and Meyers, 380.

[63] Blenkinsopp ("Mission," 414) has also proposed a link between the codification of the legal material in the Pentateuch and the Demotic Chronicle.

the puzzling differences between them are readily accounted for. The traditions used by the two would have been very similar, if not identical. However, working in two different locales, under different editorial philosophies, the decisions made as to structure and significance would have understandably differed. Darius had ordered the Egyptian priesthood to write the law of their people and temple as of their last great figure of authority. For the Jerusalem priests responsible for the Law of the Temple, this seems to have been Ezekiel, the great prophet-priest of the exile; their torah was woven into his grand vision of the temple. The priesthood in exile, however, looked further back: beyond Zedekiah, Jehoiachin, and even David, to Moses. Their law was placed into the context of the old epic of JE, and concluded with Deuteronomy, severed from its place as the prologue to the Deuteronomistic History. In this way, they made sense of their history, made peace with the still-lively Levitical traditions, and addressed the need of their people for a statement of purpose and identity. It would have been this work that Ezra brought back with him to Jerusalem (Ezr 7:14). The Law of the Temple in Ezekiel 40--48 was in a sense a first draft of the Torah, assembled by priestly editors from a variety of sources, yet skillfully woven into a unified whole.

That the book of Ezekiel should have been made the basis for an authoritative text is not surprising. The explicitly literary character of the book of Ezekiel has been stressed by scholars as early as Smend.[64] The unique function of Ezekiel as a written text has been a particular concern of Ellen Davis.[65] She finds great significance in the report of Ezekiel's call

---

[64] Rudolf Smend, *Der Prophet Ezechiel* (KEH; Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1880) xxi: Smend was so impressed by the tight structure and unity of vision in Ezekiel as to write "man könnte kein Stück herausnehmen, ohne die ganze Ensemble zu zerstören" (one could not remove any part without destroying the whole structure). Robert Wilson ("Ezekiel," in *Harper's Bible Commentary*, 657) has argued forcefully that "Ezekiel was a written composition from the beginning." He gives three reasons for this claim. First, Ezekiel is rarely depicted delivering oracles, but is rather encountered sitting his home. Second, the complexity of the oracles suggests that they were not delivered orally, but were written compositions from the beginning. Third, written prophecy would have been most conducive to wide distribution among the broadly dispersed exilic community.

[65] Ellen Davis, *Swallowing the Scroll: Textuality and the Dynamics of Discourse in Ezekiel's Prophecy* (JSOT 78; Sheffield: Almond Press, 1989), 65-66.

vision, where the prophet describes a scroll, covered front and back with writing, which he is told to eat (Ezek 2:8--3:3). Thus revelation "comes to Ezekiel already *as a text*."[66] The point may, of course, be overstated; certainly written prophecy did not originate with Ezekiel. However, while earlier prophetic "books" are clearly written collections of oral performances, Ezekiel's work has the consistency of style and theme characteristic of written composition. Ezekiel, unlike his prophetic forebears, has written a book.[67]

I propose that, in Haggai-Zechariah, Zechariah too has written a book, modeled after Ezekiel. Meyers and Meyers observe in the later prophets "an increasingly greater awareness of and dependence on sacred literature;" indeed, they suggest that "the availability of written, sacred tradition as revelation from God must have been one critical factor" in the eventual disappearance of prophecy.[68] The emerging notion of written text, rather than oral pronouncement, as word of God extends in a broad continuum from Ezekiel onward. The Chronicler, who like Ezekiel has often been cited in connection with Haggai-Zechariah,[69] stands in this same tradition. Here, the plan for the temple and its liturgy is revealed to David as a written text: "All this, in writing at the LORD's direction, he made clear to me--the plan of all the works" (1 Chr 28:19). The Chronicler is a student of Scripture, and understands the will of God to be expressed through the written word.[70] The portions of the Chronicler's History which deal with

---

[66] Davis, *Scroll*, 51. Contrast the emphasis on a written text here with the emphasis on orality in the call of Jeremiah (Jer 1:9).

[67] So Hermann Gunkel, "Die israelitische Literatur," in *Die orientalischen Literaturen*, ed. P. Hinnenberg (Die Kultur der Gegenwart 1/7; Berlin, 1906), 82.

[68] Meyers and Meyers, 201. Cf. also Benjamin D. Sommer, "Did Prophecy Cease? Evaluating a Reevaluation," *JBL* 115 (1996) 46-47, although he attributes the decline of prophecy to the end of kingship and the destruction of the temple.

[69] So Beuken, 331-336; Ackroyd, "Haggai," *Harper's Bible Commentary*, 745.

[70] In the text of Chronicles, "the word of the Lord" refers always either to prophetic revelation (1 Chr 11:3, 10; 22:8; 2 Chr 11:2; 12:7; 18:4, 18; 36:21) or to the word of Scripture, specifically the torah of Moses (1 Chr 15:15; 2 Chr 30:12; 34:21; 35:6). Indeed, this may be an artificial distinction, since in the Chronicler's view prophets write books (so Samuel, Nathan and Gad in 1 Chr 29:29; Nathan, Ahijah, and Iddo in 2 Chr 9:29; Shemaiah and Iddo in 2 Chr 12:15; Iddo in 2 Chr 13:22; Jehu ben Hanani in 2

the post-exilic restoration of Judah (that is, Ezra-Nehemiah) continue this same theme.[71] With the exception of Haggai and Zechariah, prophets and prophecy no longer function as the means of God's revelation. So, Ezra is not a prophet, but rather "an inspired text interpreter."[72] The text of Scripture has become the means of divine revelation. The great Temple Scroll from Qumran marks a far point on this continuing trajectory. This text, a plan for a massive temple complex, presents itself as the *tabnît* originally revealed to Moses, then handed on to Solomon by David.[73] For the Qumran community, not only were the revelations to Moses and David seen as one and the same, but this unified revelation was contained not in a vision, but in a book.

Along this trajectory, of course, falls the Book of the Twelve. That the Book of the Twelve *is*, in fact, a book has been ably demonstrated by James Nogalski's careful documentation of redactional connections among its members.[74] With Odil Steck, Nogalski identifies the tradents responsible for the redaction of Isaiah as also being responsible for the redaction of the

---

Chr 20:34; Isaiah in 2 Chr 26:22 and 32:32), and so may be seen as composers of Scripture. With Geza Vermes (E. Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ [175 B.C.--A.D. 135]*, III.1, rev. and ed. by B. Vermes, F. Millar, and M. Goodman [Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1986], 326) and Philip S. Alexander ("Retelling the Old Testament," in *It Is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture*, 100), this researcher views Chronicles as an exemplar of the "rewritten Bible" genre.

[71] With Frank Moore Cross, Jr., "A Reconstruction of the Judean Restoration," *Int* 29 (1975) 194-198; and Joseph Blenkinsopp, *Ezra-Nehemiah*, OTL (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1988) 43-54; *contra* H. G. M. Williamson, Israel *in the Books of Chronicles*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1977), 69; Sara Japhet, *I & II Chronicles*, OTL (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1993), 4-5; Ralph Klein, "Chronicles, Book of 1-2." *Anchor Bible Dictionary*, Vol. 1, ed. David Noel Freedman (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 993. Cf. Steven Tuell, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, Interpretation (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 2001?), forthcoming.

[72] Schniedewind, *Word,* 250.

[73] Yigael Yadin, *The Temple Scroll, Volume 1: Introduction* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1983), 177 and 182.

[74] See n. 6, above.

Twelve.[75] However, the impetus for collecting these twelve disparate prophetic collections and combining them as a book may well have originated with Ezekiel: arguably, the first *author* in Israel. Further, the final form of Ezekiel, culminating in the Law of the Temple, may mark the first step toward the canon as we know it. Ezekiel may well be the inventor of Scripture.

[75] Nogalski, *Processes*, 280; Odil Steck, *Der Abschluß der Prophetie im Alten Testament: Ein Versuch zur Frage der Vorgeschichte des Kanons*, Biblische - Theologische Studien 17 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1991).

Jesus in Oral Memory:
The Initial Stages of the Jesus Tradition

By James D. G. Dunn
University of Durham

1. Oral Tradition

Anyone who wishes to take part in what has become familiarly known as 'the quest of the historical Jesus' can only hope to do so with any effect though the Jesus tradition. 'Jesus tradition' is shorthand for the material used by the Gospel writers, particularly (for reasons we don't need to go into here) the Synoptic Gospels – that is, stories about Jesus, teachings attributed to Jesus. Does that tradition give us access to the 'historical Jesus'?[1] Immediate access, or only at some remove? Does it tell us what Jesus actually did and said, or only what pious reverence attributed to him? In the attempt to answer such questions, all agree, the evidence of the Jesus tradition itself has to be decisive. The history of the quest has been the history of the investigation of the character and value of the Jesus tradition, its sources, its forms, its redaction - in a word, its tradition-history.

However, it soon becomes apparent that there has been a huge and persisting gap in the analysis of that evidence. I refer to the repeated failure to take seriously the fact that in the initial stages of the traditioning process the tradition must have been *oral* tradition. In consequence there has also been the failure to investigate the character of the tradition in its oral phase, and to ask what its orality must have meant for the transmission of that material. I do not say that the subject has not been raised during the period covered by the various quests of the 'historical Jesus'. But unfortunately, when it has been raised, the issue has usually been sidetracked into other questions and its significance for our understanding of the tradition history of the Jesus tradition lost to sight.

1.1 J. G. Herder. Within the history of the quest J. G. Herder (1744-1803) is usually given the credit for first raising the issue. Herder was unhappy with Lessing's idea that behind the Synoptic Gospels lay an original Aramaic gospel of the Nazarenes: 'Neither apostolic nor church history knows of any such Primal Gospel'. What did lie behind them was indeed a 'common Gospel', but it was an *oral* gospel.[2] Herder's description of this material foreshadows later treatments, not least his description of the orally transmitted material as 'an oral saga'.

> In the case of a free, oral narrative, not everything is equally untrammeled. Sentences, long sayings, parables are more likely to retain the same form of expression than minor details of the narrative; transitional material and connecting formulae the narrator himself supplies. . . . The common Gospel consisted of individual units, narratives, parables, sayings, pericopes. This is evident from the very appearance of the Gospels and from the different order of this or that parable or saga. . . . The fact that it consists of such parts vouches for the truth of the Gospel, for people such as most of the

[1] I use the term 'historical Jesus', mindful of the fact that it can be misleading, since it properly denotes the historians' Jesus, Jesus as 'reconstructed'(!) by the methods of historical research, but is regularly used to denote the man himself who walked and talked in the hills and villages of Galilee in the late 20s and/or early 30s of the common era.

[2] I draw on W. G. Kümmel's abstract, despite his somewhat misleading decription (*The New Testament: The History of the Investigation of its Problems* [1970; Nashville: Abingdon, 1972/London: SCM, 1973] 79-82).

apostles were, more easily recall a saying, a parable, an apothegm that they had found striking than connected discourses.[3]

Unfortunately these potentially fruitful insights were absorbed into and lost to sight in the quest for sources of the Synoptic Gospels which became the dominant concern of 19th century Gospels research.[4]

1.2 Rudolf Bultmann. It was not until the rise of form-criticism early in the 20th century that the question of the earliest Jesus tradition's oral character re-emerged. In his Preface to the 1962 publication of one of his essays on form criticism, Bultmann began with a summary definition: 'The purpose of Form Criticism is to study the history of the oral tradition behind the gospels'.[5] And in his summary description of how oral tradition was transmitted he made an observation similar to that of Herder: 'Whenever narratives pass from mouth to mouth the central point of the narrative and general structure are well preserved; but in the incidental details change takes place . . .'.[6] Unfortunately, once again, the possibilities of working fruitfully with a realistic conceptualisation of oral tradition and how it functioned were more or less strangled at birth by several assumptions which distorted Bultmann's reconstruction of the oral traditioning processes.

Two in particular are worth noting. (1) Bultmann focused on the forms and assumed that certain 'laws of style' determined the transmission of the forms. These laws, apparently drawn from some acquaintance with studies in folklore elsewhere,[7] included the further assumptions of a 'pure' form,[8] of a natural progression in the course of transmission from purity and simplicity towards greater complexity,[9] and of a development in the tradition determined by form rather than content.[10] (2) More significant was Bultmann's assumption of a *literary* model to explain the process of transmission. This becomes most evident in his conceptualisation of the whole

---

[3] Extracts from J. G. Herder, *Collected Works* (ed. B. Suphan) Vol. XIX, in Kümmel, *New Testament* 81-2. B. Reicke, *The Roots of the Synoptic Gospels* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986) 11-12, makes special mention of J. C. L. Gieseler, *Historisch-kritischer Versuch über die Entstehung und die frühesten Schicksale der schriftlichen Evangelien* (Leipzig: Englemann, 1818).

[4] Kümmel's own treatment represents the same priorities.

[5] 'The Study of the Synoptic Gospels', *Form Criticism* (with K. Kundsin, 1934; New York: Harper Torchbook, 1962) 1.

[6] 'The New Approach to the Synoptic Problem' (1926), *Existence and Faith* (London: Collins, Fontana, 1964) 39-62 (here 47).

[7] R. Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition* (1921, [2]1931; ET Oxford: Blackwell, 1963) 6-7; though note the criticism of E. P. Sanders, *The Tendencies of the Synoptic Tradition* (SNTSMS 9; Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1969) 18 n.4.

[8] 'The "pure form" (reinen Gattung) represents a mixture of linguistic and history of language categories, which is to be assigned to an out of date conception of language development' (eine Vermischung linguistischer und sprachhistorischer Kategorien . . . die einer heute überholten Auffassung der Sprachentwicklung zuzuweisen ist) (J. Schröter, *Erinnerung an Jesu Worte: Studien zur Rezeption der Logienüberlieferung in Markus, Q und Thomas* [WMANT 76; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1997] 59; also 141-2).

[9] But see Sanders' critique in *Tendencies*, in summary: 'There are no hard and fast laws of the development of the Synoptic tradition. On all counts the tradition developed in opposite directions. It became both longer and shorter, both more and less detailed, and both more and less Semitic. . . .' (272).

[10] See e.g. his assertions in 'New Approach' 45-7 and 'Study' 29, and the fuller analysis of *History* and critique of the assumption by W. H. Kelber, *The Oral and the Written Gospel* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983) 2-8.

tradition about Jesus as 'composed of a series of layers'.[11] The imagined process is one where each layer is laid or builds upon another. Bultmann made such play with it because, apart from anything else, he was confident that he could strip off later (Hellenistic) layers to expose the earlier (Palestinian) layers.[12] The image itself, however, is drawn from the literary process of editing, where each successive edition (layer) is an edited version (for Bultmann, an elaborated and expanded version) of the previous edition (layer). But is such a conceptualisation really appropriate to a process of oral retellings of traditional material? Bultmann never really addressed the question, despite its obvious relevance.

Here then, we have to speak of form criticism's missed opportunity. The main body of discussion following Bultmann stayed with the literary model and the focus shifted more to the communities which shaped the tradition or to the easier question of its later shaping in redaction criticism.[13] There were two main exceptions. One is the too little regarded attempt by C. F. D. Moule to highlight the vitality of the form history process in the life of the churches, 'to place in their setting in life and thought the processes which led up to the writing of early Christian books'.[14] His concern, however, was primarily to explain the genesis of Christian literature, and not with the character and processes of oral tradition, though some of his observations are entirely relevant to our inquiry.[15]

1.3 Birger Gerhardsson. The other was the protest by Harald Riesenfeld and his pupil Birger Gerhardsson that Bultmann had indeed ignored the most obvious precedents for the transmission of tradition in Palestine. Riesenfeld noted that the technical terms used for transmission of rabbinic tradition underlie the Greek terms used in the NT for the same process (*paralambanein* and *paradidonai*) and deduced that the early Christian traditioning process, like the rabbinic, was a 'rigidly controlled transmission' of words and deeds of Jesus, 'memorized and recited as holy word'. The idea of a community shaped tradition was too inaccurate. Rather we must think of tradition derived directly from Jesus and transmitted by authorised teachers 'in a far more rigid and fixed form'.[16]

Gerhardsson developed Riesenfeld's central claim by a careful study of rabbinic tradition transmission, as the nearest parallel for the Palestinian Jesus tradition, and reinforced his teacher's main claim.[17] Unlike the form critics, Gerhardsson

---

[11] R. Bultmann, *Jesus and the Word* (New York: Scribners, 1935) 12-13.

[12] Ibid.

[13] The most successful and influential was H. Conzelmann, *Die Mitte der Zeit* (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1953, [2]1957, [5]1964; ET *The Theology of St. Luke* (London: Faber & Faber, 1961).

[14] C. F. D. Moule *The Birth of the New Testament* (London: A. & C. Black, 1962, [3]1981) 3.

[15] See particularly his recognition that Papias (Eusebius, *HE* 3.39.15) conceived of Peter retelling the teaching of Jesus '"*pros tas chreias*, with reference to the needs" (i.e. as occasion demanded, as need arose)' (*Birth* 108, 120-1); his observation on 'the more fluid interchange of forms (in worship), such that snatches of prayer and hymnody flow in an out of the texture of pastoral exhortation' (270) also parallels the recognition among folklorists on the fluidity of oral performances (below #1.4).

[16] H. Riesenfeld, 'The Gospel Tradition and Its Beginning' (1957), *The Gospel Tradition* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1970) 1-29 (here 16, 26, 24).

[17] B. Gerhardsson, *Memory and Manuscript: Oral Tradition and Written Transmission in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity* (Lund: Gleerup, 1961); refined in a succession of further publications: *Tradition and Transmission in Early Christianity* (Lund: Gleerup, 1964); *The Origins of the Gospel Traditions* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979); *The Gospel Tradition* (Lund: Gleerup, 1986); 'Illuminating the Kingdom: Narrative Meshalim in the Synoptic Gospels', in H. Wansbrough,ed., *Jesus and the Oral Gospel Tradition* (JSNTS 64; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1991) 266-309.

recognized the need to investigate the actual techniques of oral transmission. The key word, he confirmed, is 'memorization',[18] memorization by means of constant repetition, the basic technique of all education then and since (in fact, until only recently in the West).[19] In Rabbinic Judaism the pupil had the duty 'to maintain his teacher's exact words', as the basis for any subsequent comment(ary) of his own.[20] Principally on the basis of the importance of 'the word of the Lord' in earliest Christianity, as attested by Luke and Paul, Gerhardsson went on to deduce that Jesus 'must have made his disciples learn certain sayings off by heart; if he taught, he must have required his disciples to memorize'; 'his sayings must have been accorded even greater authority and sanctity than that accorded by the Rabbis' disciples to the words of their teachers'. Consequently, when the Evangelists edited their Gospels they were able to work 'on a basis of a fixed, distinct tradition from, and about, Jesus'.[21]

Unfortunately these contributions were largely dismissed, in large part because the appeal to rabbinic precedent was deemed (unfairly) to be anachronistic.[22] More to the point, unlike the rabbinic tradition, the Gospel tradition does not depict Jesus teaching by repetition.[23] And more important for present purposes, the claims of both Riesenfeld and Gerhardsson seem to envisage a far more rigid and fixed tradition than could explain the obvious disparities between the same tradition as used by the Evangelists.[24] Even allowing for the importance of teachers and tradition in the earliest churches,[25] the process envisaged is evidently too controlled and formal to explain the divergencies in the tradition as it has come down to us.[26] The possibility of finding the key to the tradition-history from Jesus to the Synoptics in the processes of oral transmission had once again eluded scholarship.

1.4 Werner Kelber. To Werner Kelber is due the credit for being the first NT scholar to take seriously the distinctive character of oral tradition as illuminated by a sequence of studies from classicists, folklorists and social anthropologists.[27]

---

[18] E.g., 'The general attitude was that words and items of knowledge must be memorized: *tantum scimus, quantum memoria tenemus*' [we only know as much as we retain in our memory] (*Memory* 124).

[19] 'Cicero's saying was applied to its fullest extent in Rabbinic Judaism: *repetitio est mater studiorum*. Knowledge is gained by repetition, passed on by repetition, kept alive by repetition. A Rabbi's life is one continual repetition' (*Memory* 168).

[20] Gerhardsson, *Memory* 130-6 (here 133); also chs. 9-10.

[21] Gerhardsson, *Memory* 328, 332, 335; similarly *Origins* 19-20, 72-3; *Gospel* 39-42. R. Riesner, *Jesus als Lehrer* (WUNT 2.7; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1981) also emphasizes the role of learning by heart (*Auswendiglernen*) in Jesus' teaching (*Jesus* 365-7, 440-53; also 'Jesus as Preacher and Teacher' in Wansbrough ed., *Jesus* 185-210 (here 203-4).

[22] Cf. J. Neusner's apology for his earlier review in his Foreword to the recent reprint of *Memory* and *Tradition* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998).

[23] Kelber, *Oral* 14.

[24] Schröter, *Erinnerung* 29-30. Gerhardsson did not examine the Synoptic tradition itself in *Memory*, though he went a considerable way towards filling the gap twenty-five years later in his *Gospel*.

[25] See e.g. my 'Can the Third Quest Hope to Succeed?', in B. Chilton & C. A. Evans, eds., *Authenticating the Activities of Jesus* (Leiden: Brill, 1999) 31-48 (here 37-8).

[26] Gerhardsson can speak of 'a logos fixed by the college of Apostles', with reference to the tradition of 1 Cor. 15.3ff. (*Memory* 297).

[27] The earlier contribution by the Seminar on 'Oral Traditional Literature and the Gospels' passed largely unnoticed, mainly, I suppose, because it functioned in service of the theme for the overall Colloquy on *The Relationships Among the Gospels* (ed. W. O. Walker; San Antonio: Trinity University, 1978) 31-122. L. E. Keck reviews earlier work and summarizes the Seminar's discussion ('Oral Traditional Literature and the Gospels: The Seminar', *Relationships* 103-22).

Characteristics include 'mnemonic patterns, shaped for ready oral recurrence', 'heavily rhythmic, balanced patterns, in repetitions or antitheses, in alliterations and assonances, in epithetic and other formulary expressions, in thematic settings, . . . in proverbs'. Typical of oral performances were variations on what nevertheless were recognizable versions of the same story, with some more or less word for word repetition in places, both fixed and flexible formulaic elements, and so on.[28] Kelber drew attention to similar features which had already been observed in the Jesus tradition: 'the extraordinary degree to which sayings of Jesus have kept faith with heavily patterned speech forms, abounding in alliteration, paronomasia, appositional equivalence, proverbial and aphoristic diction, contrasts and antitheses, synonymous, antithetical, synthetic, and tautologic parallelism and the like', miracle stories 'typecast in a fashion that lends itself to habitual, not verbatim, memorization'.[29] And in his description of oral transmission he fully acknowledges his indebtedness to earlier studies. 'Oral thinking consists in formal patterns from the start'; 'formulaic stability' and 'compositional variability' go hand in hand - '"this mid-state between fixed and free"'.[30] Oral transmission 'exhibits "an insistent, conservative urge for preservation" of essential information, while it borders on carelessness in its predisposition to abandon features that are not met with social approval'.[31] 'Variability and stability, conservatism and creativity, evanescence and unpredictability all mark the pattern of oral transmission' - the 'oral principle of "variation within the same"'.[32]

The chief thrust of Kelber's book, however, is to build on the distinction between oral and written, between oral performance and literary transmission, which he draws from Walter Ong in particular. The distinction is important, not least since it requires modern literary scholars to make a conscious effort to extricate their historical envisaging of the oral transmission of tradition from the mind-set and assumptions of long-term literacy.[33] Equally important is the immediacy of an oral communication in contrast to written, the direct and personal engagement of speaker and auditor not possible in writing, what Kelber call(s) the 'oral synthesis'.[34] This is

---

[28] W. J. Ong, *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word* (1982; London: Routledge, 1988) 33-6, 57-68. The work of A. B. Lord, *The Singer of Tales* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, 1978) has been seminal (here especially chap. 5). Note also R. Finnegan, *Oral Poetry: Its Nature, Significance and Social Context* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1977) chap. 3, especially 73-87; also 90-109. See also A. B. Lord, 'The Gospels as Oral Traditional Literature', in Walker, *Relationships* 33-91 (here 37-8, 63-4, 87-9); and the overview by D. E. Aune, 'Prolegomena to the Study of Oral Tradition in the Hellenistic World', in Wansbrough, ed., *Jesus* 59-106 (with bibliography).

[29] Kelber, *Oral* 27; see also 50-1.

[30] Kelber, *Oral* 27-8; quoting B. Peabody, *The Winged Word: A Study in the Technique of Ancient Greek Oral Composition as Seen Principally through Hesiod's Works and Days* (Albany: State University of New York, 1975) 96.

[31] Kelber, *Oral* 29-30; quoting Lord, *Singer* 120. Lord also characterises the change from oral to literary composition as the change 'from stability of essential story, which is the goal of oral tradition, to stability of text, of the exact words of the story' (*Singer* 138).

[32] Kelber, *Oral* 33, 54; quoting E. A. Havelock, *Preface to Plato* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, 1963) 92, 147, 184, passim.

[33] Ong begins by noting: 'We – readers of books such as this – are so literate that it is very difficult for us to conceive of an oral universe of communication or thought *except as a variation of a literate universe*' (*Orality* 2, my emphasis). As noted above, Bultmann did not avoid this mistake.

[34] Kelber, *Oral* 19, referring to W. J. Ong, *The Presence of the Word: Some Prolegomena for Cultural and Religious History* (New Haven: Yale University, 1967; paperback Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1981) 111-38.

partly what I have in mind when I talk of the 'impact' made by Jesus on his disciples. The contrast can be overplayed: for example, the recognition that in the ancient world documents were written to be *heard*, that is, read out and listened to rather than read, is commonplace in all these disciplines;[35] the fact that letters can be a fairly effective substitute for personal absence has become important in recent study of Paul's letters;[36] and the encounter with its written version can be as creative as a hearing of the original speech, indeed, in reader-response criticism each reading of a text is like a fresh performance of it.[37] Even so, for anyone who has experienced a (for them) first performance a great musical work, like Beethoven's Ninth or Verdi's Requiem, the difference between hearing in the electric atmosphere of the live performance and hearing the recorded version played later at home (let alone simply reading the score) is unmistakeable.[38]

There are other important observations made by Kelber. He takes up the key observation of Albert Lord[39] in warning against the ideal of 'original form'; 'each oral performance is an irreducibly unique creation'; if Jesus said something more than once there is no 'original'.[40] This is true, although the impact made by each retelling by Jesus on those who heard and retained the teaching should be distinguished from the effect of their own reteaching on others. Kelber also rightly notes that oral retelling of Jesus' words will already have begun during Jesus' lifetime; the Bultmannian thesis of a tradition which only began to be transmitted after Easter is highly questionable.[41] Moreover, in Kelber's work, very noticeably, *narratives*, the retold stories about Jesus, re-emerge into prominence from the marginalisation imposed upon them by the almost exclusive focus of scholarly interest on the sayings of Jesus.[42] Not least of importance, given Kelber's developed

---

[35] See further P. J. Achtemeier, '*Omne verbum sonat*: The New Testament and the Oral Environment of Late Western Antiquity', *JBL* 109 (1990) 3-27; R. A. Horsley & J. A. Draper, *Whoever Hears Youi Hears Me: Prophets, Performance, and Tradition in Q* (Harrisburg, PA: TPI, 1999) 132-4, 144-5, in dependence on R. Thomas, *Literacy and Orality in Ancient Greece* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1992).

[36] Influential here has been R. W. Funk, 'The Apostolic Parousia: Form and Significance', in W. R. Farmer, et al, eds., *Christian History and Interpretation*, FS J. Knox (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1967) 249-68.

[37] The idea is developed by Frances Young, *The Art of Performance: Towards a Theology of Holy Scripture* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1990).

[38] 'The reader is absent from the writing of the book, the writer is absent from its reading' (Kelber, *Oral* 92, quoting P. Ricoeur, *Interpretation Theory: Discourse and the Surplus of Meaning* [Fort Worth: Texas Christian University, 1976] 35).

[39] Lord, *Singer*: 'In a sense each performance is "an" original, if not "the" original. The truth of the matter is that our concept of "the original", of "the song", simply makes no sense in oral tradition' (100-1).

[40] Kelber, *Oral* 29; also 59, 62. Finnegan also glosses Lord: 'There is no correct text, no idea that one version is more "authentic" than another: each performance is a unique and original creation with its own validity' (*Oral Poetry* 65). She credits Lord with bringing this point home most convincingly (79), though by way of critique she points out that memorization also plays a part (79, 86).

[41] Kelber, *Oral* 20-1, citing appositely the demonstration by H. Schürmann of sayings on kingdom, repentance, judgment, love of enemy, eschatological preparedness, etc., which show no trace of post-Easter influence ('Die vorösterlichen Anfänge der Logientradition: Versuch eines formgeschichtlichen Zugangs zum Leben Jesu', in H. Ristow & K. Matthiae, eds., *Der historische Jesus und der kerygmatische Christus* [Berlin: Evangelische, 1962] 342-70).

[42] Kelber, *Oral* ch. 2. Unfortunately the over-evaluation of the sayings source Q and the Gospel of Thomas in the neo-Liberal quest of the Jesus Seminar and J.D.Crossan, *The Historical Jesus: The Life of a Mediterranean Jewish Peasant* (San Francisco: Harper, 1991) has continued to direct attention away from the importance of stories told about Jesus.

thesis, is his recognition that Mark (his main focus in the Gospels) retains many of the indices of orality - for example, its 'activist syntax' and colloquial Greek, its use of the storyteller's 'three', and its many redundancies and repetitions; 'Mark may be treating an oral story in order for it to remain functional for the ear more than for the eye'.[43] Mark's Gospel may be *frozen* orality,[44] but it is frozen *orality*.[45]

Unfortunately, Kelber pushes his thesis about Mark marking a major transition from oral to written far too hard and seriously diminishes its overall value. The first step in his thesis development is that the written Gospel disrupts the 'oral synthesis'; it 'arises not from orality *per se*, but out of the debris of deconstructed orality'; it indicates 'alienation from the oral apparatus'; it 'accomplishes the death of living words for the purpose of inaugurating the life of textuality'.[46] The transition is overdramatized: it is widely recognized that in a predominantly oral culture, oral versions of a tradition would continue after it had been transcribed and that knowledge of the written version would usually be in an oral medium.[47] At the same time, it is true that only with a written text can we begin to speak of an editing process, such as Bultmann envisaged; prior to that, in repeated oral performances the dynamics are different, more of the order of 'theme and variations' than Gerhardsson's 'memorization'.[48] This is why talk of 'sources', appropriate in considering the origin of a written text, can be inappropriate with oral tradition. It is also why, I may add, even talk of 'oral transmission' can mislead such discussions, since it envisages oral performance as intended primarily to transmit (transfer) rather than, say, to celebrate tradition.[49]

However, Kelber pushes on to argue that Mark's textualizing of the tradition amounts to an 'indictment of oral process and authorities', an 'emancipation from oral norms', an objection to 'the oral metaphysics of presence'. Thus Mark repudiates the first disciples, Jesus' family and ongoing prophetic activity, as oral authorities to be discredited; the first disciples are 'effectively eliminated as apostolic representatives of the risen Lord'.[50] Paul is called in as apostle of orality and set over against Mark's Gospel as written text, with the classic gospel/law antithesis reworked as an antithesis between oral gospel and written law, spirit and (written) letter, 'under the law' as under textuality.[51] In all this a different christology is at stake: the

---

[43] Kelber, *Oral* 65-8.

[44] Kelber, *Oral* 91, 94.

[45] The oral character of Mark's narrative has since been strongly emphasized by T. P. Haverly, *Oral Traditional Literature and the Composition of Mark's Gospel* (Edinburgh PhD, 1983), and especially by J. Dewey, 'Oral Methods of Structuring Narrative in Mark', *Interpretation* 43 (1989) 32-44; 'The Gospel of Mark as an Oral-Aural Event: Implications for Interpretation', in E. S. Malbon & E. V. McKnight, eds., *The New Literary Criticism and the New Testament* (JNSTS 109; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1994) 145-63. Note also Lord's earlier evaluation of 'The Gospels as Oral Traditional Literature' (Walker, *Relationships* 58-84 [particularly 79-80, 82], 90-91). The conclusion of the Symposium on *Jesus and the Oral Gospel Tradition* (ed. H. Wansbrough) can cut both ways: 'We have been unable to deduce or derive any marks which distinguish clearly between an oral and a written transmission process. Each can show a similar degree of fixity and variability' (12). Cf. Schröter, *Erinnerung* 55, 60.

[46] Kelber, *Oral* 91-6, 130-1, 184-5 (quotations from 95, 98, 131).

[47] See e.g. Ø. Andersen, 'Oral Tradition', in Wansbrough, ed., *Jesus* 17-58 (here 43-53).

[48] The more serious danger in writing down a tradition, as Lord observed, is 'when the singer believes that they (the written versions) are *the* way in which the song *should* be presented' (*Singer* 79).

[49] For this reason I often use the inelegant verbal noun formation 'traditioning' to indicate a process of which 'transmission' *per se* may be only a part.

[50] Kelber, *Oral* 96-105, 129 (quotations from 98, 99-100, 129).

[51] Kelber, *Oral* 141-51, 151-68.

passion narrative as a literary phenomenon implies a distanciation from an oral christology; Q, with its 'fundamentally oral disposition' and inclusion of prophetic utterances, maintains the living voice of Jesus, whereas Mark elevates 'the earthly Jesus at the price of silencing the living Lord' by 'relegating all sayings to the former while silencing the voice of the latter'.[52]

Here is a thesis too quickly gone to seed. To find Paul as apostle of orality lumped with Q is a refreshing change. But Paul himself would almost certainly have been baffled by the thrust of such an argument. As one who in his preaching vividly and openly portrayed Christ as crucified (Gal. 3.1), and who both preached the kerygma of the first witnesses (1 Cor. 15.1-11) and depended on the Spirit's inspiration for the effect of his preaching of the crucified Christ (1 Cor. 2.4-5), Paul would certainly not have recognized such distinctions. Kelber forgets not only the continuity between oral and first writing (as initially written orality), which he had earlier acknowledged, but he ignores the points made above, that in an age of high illiteracy documents were written to be *heard* and that a reading can also be likened to a performance. In claiming that, in contrast to Mark's Gospel, 'Q effects a direct address to present hearers'[53] he ignores the fact that Q is generally regarded as a *written* source. He also forgets the living character of tradition, that written as well as oral tradition can effect a re-presentation (making present again) of ancient teaching and events,[54] particularly in liturgy, as in Paul's recollection of Jesus' words in regard to the Lord's Supper (1 Cor. 11.23-26). Regrettably then, once again, the potential significance of recognizing the distinct character of the oral traditioning process in the case of the Jesus tradition has been subverted by another agenda and lost to sight.

1.5 Kenneth Bailey. What has been missing in all this has been a sufficiently close parallel to the oral traditioning which presumably was the initial mode of and vehicle for the Jesus tradition. As Kelber himself noted,[55] however helpful the lessons learned from the study of Homeric epics and Yugoslavian sagas, we cannot simply assume that they provide the pattern for oral transmission of Jesus tradition within the thirty or so years between Jesus and the first written Gospel. The nearest we have to fill the gap is the essay by Kenneth Bailey in which he has reflected on more than thirty years experience of Middle East village life.[56] These villages have retained their identity over many generations, so that, arguably, their oral culture is as close as we will ever be able to find to the village culture of first century Galilee. Bailey puts forward the idea of '*informal controlled tradition*', to distinguish it both from the models used by Bultmann ('informal, uncontrolled tradition') and Gerhardsson ('formal controlled tradition'). In informal controlled tradition the story can be retold in the setting of a gathering of the village by any member of the village present, but usually the elders, and the community itself exercises the 'control'.[57]

Bailey characterizes the types of material thus preserved under various headings. (1) Pithy proverbs; he describes 'a community that can create (over the centuries) and sustain in current usage up to 6,000 wisdom sayings'. (2) Story riddles; 'in the

---

[52] Kelber, *Oral* 185-99, 199-207 (quotations from 201, 207).

[53] Kelber, *Oral* 201.

[54] Deut. 6.20-25: '*we* were Pharoah's slaves . . . and the Lord brought *us* out of Egypt . . .'.

[55] Kelber, *Oral* 78-9.

[56] K. E. Bailey, 'Informal Controlled Oral Tradition and the Synoptic Gospels', *Asia Journal of Theology* 5 (1991) 34-54; reprinted in *Themelios* 20.2 (1995) 4-11 (double column pages).

[57] Bailey, 'Informal' 4-5.

story the hero is presented with an unsolvable problem and comes up with a *wise* answer'. (3) Poetry, both classical and popular. (4) Parable or story; 'Once there was a rich man who . . ., or a priest who . . .' and so on. (5) Well-told accounts of the important figures in the history of the village or community; 'if there is a central figure critical to the history of the village, stories of this central figure will abound'.[58]

Particularly valuable are Bailey's notes on how the community controlled its tradition. He distinguishes different levels of control. (i) No flexibility - poems and proverbs. (ii) Some flexibility - parables and recollections of people and events important to the identity of the community. 'Here there is flexibility *and* control. The central threads of the story cannot be changed, but flexibility in detail is allowed'. (iii) Total flexibility – jokes and casual news. 'The material is irrelevant to the identity of the community and is not judged wise or valuable'.[59]

He illustrates more recent tradition by retelling stories about John Hogg, the primary founder of the new Egyptian Evangelical community in the 19th century. These were orally transmitted and sustained stories which had been drawn on for Dr Hogg's biography (published in 1914) and which were still being retold in almost the same way when Bailey dipped into the tradition in 1955-65.[60]

He also tells two stories from his own experience.[61] One concerns a fatal accident that took place at a village wedding, at which it was customary to fire hundreds of rifle rounds into the air in celebration. On his way (back) to the village Bailey heard the story from several people, including the boatman taking him across the Nile, a boy on the far bank, and other villagers including the village mayor. Each retelling included different details, but the climax of the story was almost word for word:

> Hanna (the bridegroom's friend) fired the gun. The gun did not go off. He lowered the gun. The gun fired (passive form). The bullet passed through the stomach of Butrus (the bridegroom). He died. He did not cry out, 'O my father', nor 'O my mother' (meaning he died instantly without crying out). When the police came we told them, 'A camel stepped on him'.

The point was that the community had quickly determined that the death was an accident and the story had been crystallized to make this clear ('The gun fired', not 'He fired the gun').[62] By the time Bailey heard it (a week after the event) the story had been given its definitive shape.[63] His other story is of his own experience of preaching. Often he would tell a story new to the community. As soon as the story was finished the congregation would enact 'a form of oral shorthand'.

---

[58] Bailey, 'Informal' 6-7.

[59] Bailey, 'Informal' 7-8.

[60] Bailey, 'Informal' 8-9. To be noted is the fact that 'community' here does not equate to 'individual village', since the Evangelical community would be scattered over many villages.

[61] Bailey, 'Informal' 9-10.

[62] The police accepted the community's version ('A camel stepped on him'), not because they did not know what had happened but because they accepted the community's judgment that the shooting was an accident.

[63] Bailey notes that he had first heard the story 28 years earlier, but the central core was 'still indelibly fixed' in his mind because it was so firmly implanted in his memory that first week ('Informal' 9-10). If I may add my own pennyworth. I met Kenneth Bailey in 1976 or 1977, when he told me the same two stories. They made such an impression on me that I retold them several times during the intervening years. When I eventually came across the article cited (in 1998) I was fascinated to note that my own retelling had maintained the outline and the key features of the core elements, although in my retelling the supporting details had been reshaped. This oral transmission covered more than twenty years, after a single hearing of the stories, by one who normally forgets a good joke almost as soon as he has heard it!

The elder on the front row would shout across the church to a friend in a loud voice, 'Did you hear what the preacher said? He said . . .' and then would come a line or two of the story including the punch-line. People all across the church instinctively turned to their neighbours and repeated the central thrust of the story twice or thrice to each other. They wanted to retell the story that week across the village and they had to learn it on the spot.

The hypothesis which Bailey offers on the basis of his reflections on these experiences is that informal, controlled oral tradition is the best explanation for the oral transmission of the Jesus tradition. Up until the upheaval of the first Jewish revolt (66-73) informal controlled oral tradition would have been able to function in the villages of Palestine. But even then, anyone twenty years and older in the 60s could have been 'an authentic reciter of that tradition'.[64]

All this confirms that the previous paradigms offered by Bultmann and Gerhardsson are inadequate for our own understanding of the oral transmission of the Jesus tradition. In particular, the paradigm of literary editing is confirmed as wholly inappropriate: one telling of a story is in no sense an editing of a previous telling; rather, each telling starts with the same subject and theme, but the retellings are different; each telling is a performance of the tradition itself, not of the first, or third, or twentythird 'edition' of the tradition. Our expectation, accordingly, should be of the oral transmission of Jesus tradition as a sequence of retellings, each starting from the same storehouse of communally remembered events and teaching, and each weaving the common stock together in different patterns for different contexts.

Of special interest is the degree to which Bailey's thesis both informs and refines the general recognition among students of the subject that oral tradition is typically flexible, with constant themes, recognizable versions of the same story, some word for word repetition, and both fixed and variable formulaic elements depending on the context of the performance. What he adds is significant; in particular the recognition of the likelihood that (1) a community would be concerned enough to exercise some control over its traditions; (2) the degree of control exercised would vary both in regard to form and in regard to the relative importance of the tradition for its own identity; and (3) the element in the story regarded as its core or key to its meaning would be its most firmly fixed element.[65]

The key question, of course, is whether we can find the marks of such 'informal, controlled oral tradition' in the Synoptic tradition itself.

2. The Synoptic tradition as oral tradition - narratives

We certainly do not know enough about oral traditioning in the ancient world to draw from that knowledge clear guidelines for our understanding of how the Jesus tradition was passed down in its oral stage. Any inquiry on this subject is bound to turn to the Jesus tradition itself to ask whether there is sufficient evidence of oral transmission and what the tradition itself tells us about the traditioning process. We need to bear in mind, of course, that the only evidence we have is already literary (the Synoptic Gospels), and therefore also the possibility that the mode of transmission has been altered. On the other hand, Kelber readily acknowledges the oral character of much of Mark's material, and the boundaries between oral Q and written Q seem

[64] Bailey, 'Informal' 10.

[65] Cf. Lord's examples of songs with a 'more or less stable core' (*The Singer Resumes the Tale* [Ithaca: Cornell University, 1995] 44, 47, 61-2).

to be rather fluid, as we shall see. We shall therefore focus on Mark and Q material in the next two sections (##2, 3).

For convenience we will look first at the narrative traditions. Here at least we do not have the problem of deciding whether such traditions came from Jesus (as we inevitably ask in respect of sayings attributed to Jesus). At best such traditions derive from those who were with Jesus and who witnessed things he did and said.

2.1 The conversion of Saul. The first example comes not from the Synoptics themselves, but from Luke's second volume, Acts. All that is necessary for the example to be relevant for an inquiry into Jesus tradition is the assumption that Luke handled such a tradition in Acts in the same way that he handled traditions in his Gospel.[66] The value of the example is threefold. (i) The three accounts (Acts 9.1-22; 22.1-21; 26.9-23) all come from a single author (Luke); so we avoid some of the unknowns operative when two or three different authors deal with the same episode; there is no need to hypothesize different sources. (ii) They are manifestly all accounts of the same event (Saul's conversion); so the harmoniser's hypothesis of different episodes to explain differences between parallel accounts is not open to us. (iii) And yet they are strikingly different in their detail; so if the *same* author can tell the *same* story in such *different* ways, it must tell us much about his own attitude to re-telling traditional material, and possibly about the early Christian traditioning process more generally.[67]

When we examine the three accounts more closely there quickly becomes evident a striking parallel to the patterns of oral tradition observed above (##1.4-5). There are several constants: the chief character – Saul; the setting – a journey to Damascus to persecute followers of Jesus; the circumstances – a (bright) light from heaven, Saul fallen to the ground, Saul's companions; the heavenly voice. But beyond that the details vary considerably. Did Saul's companions all fall to the ground (26.14), or only Saul himself (9.4, 7)? Did they hear the voice of Jesus (9.7), or not (22.9)? Saul's blindness, so prominent in chs. 9 and 22, is not mentioned in ch. 26. Likewise, Ananias has considerable prominence in chs. 9 and 22, but is nowhere mentioned in ch. 26. The other constant, the commission to go to the Gentiles, comes once to Saul directly on the road (26.16-18), once through Ananias (9.15-17), and once later in Jerusalem (22.16-18). Most striking of all is the fact that what was evidently accounted the core of the story, the exchange between Saul and the exalted Jesus, is *word for word*, after which each telling of the story goes its own distinctive way:

---

[66] The three accounts of Paul's conversion in Acts are occasionally treated synoptically (e.g. C. W. Hedrick, 'Paul's Conversion/Call: A Comparative Analysis of the Three Reports in Acts', *JBL* 100 [1981] 415-32; C. K. Barrett, *Acts 1-14* [ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1994] 439-45), but their value as examples of the way oral tradition functioned has thus far not really been appreciated.

[67] The passages are thus a good example of Lord's observation that even from the same singer, stability from one performance to another is likely to lie not at the word for word level of the text, but at the levels of theme and story pattern (*Singer* chap. 5). Similarly Finnegan: 'that variability is not just a feature of lengthy oral transmission through time and space but is inherent both in different renderings of one literary piece within the same group and period and even in texts by the same person delivered at no great interval in time. In such cases, memorisation of basic themes or plots is involved, but a generalised explanation of the oral poetry in terms of particular texts exactly memorised does not easily fit the abundant variability demonstrated in tape-recorded (as well as dictated) texts' (*Oral Poetry* 57).

9.3 As he was travelling and approaching Damascus,	22.6 'While I was travelling and approaching Damascus, about noon	26.12 'I was travelling to Damascus with the authority and commission of the chief priests, 13 when at midday along the road, your Excellency, I saw a light from heaven, brighter than the sun, shining around me and my companions. 14 When we had all fallen to the earth, I
suddenly a light from heaven flashed around him.	a great light from heaven suddenly shone about me.	heard a voice saying to me in the Hebrew language, "Saul, Saul, why are you persecuting me? It hurts you to kick against the goads." 15 I asked, "Who are you, Lord?" The Lord said,
4 He fell to the earth	7 I fell to the ground	
and heard a voice saying to him, "Saul, Saul, why are you persecuting me?"	and heard a voice saying to me, "Saul, Saul, why are you persecuting me?"	"I am Jesus whom you are persecuting.
5 He asked, "Who are you, Lord?" The reply came, "I am Jesus, whom you are persecuting.	8 I answered, "Who are you, Lord?" Then he said to me, "I am Jesus of Nazareth whom you are persecuting". 9 Now those who were with me saw the light but did not hear the voice of the one who was speaking to me. 10 I asked, "What am I to do, Lord?" The	
6 But get up and enter the city, and you will be told what you are to do".	Lord said to me, "Get up and go to Damascus; there you will be told everything that has been assigned to you to do".	16 But get up and stand on your feet; . . .".

Here, then, we have an excellent example of the oral principle of 'variation within the same', and specifically of Bailey's finding that the key point in the story will be held constant, while the supporting details can vary according to the circumstances. In this case in particular, the second account is clearly angled to bring out Saul's Jewish identity (22.3, 17; also Ananias – 22.12), and the account of the heavenly commission delayed for dramatic effect (22.17-21); whereas the third account functions as part of Paul's defence by implying that Paul's commission was part of Israel's commission (26.18, 23 with echoes of Isa. 42.6, 17 and 49.6). In short, what becomes evident here is the fact that Luke was himself a good story-teller, and that his retelling the story of Paul's conversion is a good example not simply of use of oral tradition in a written work, but of the oral traditioning process itself.

2.2 The centurion's servant. Within the Gospel tradition itself, one of the most intriguing episodes is the one recorded in Matt. 8.5-13 and Luke 7.1-10 (with a likely parallel in John 4.46b-54). The first point of interest is that the pericope is usually credited to Q, despite it being a narrative, and despite there being no parallel to such an episode being included within other sayings Gospels.[68] But why should a pericope be attributed to the document Q[69] simply because it belongs to the non-

[68] The point is simply assumed, e.g., by Bultmann, *History* 39, and R. J. Miller, ed., *The Complete Gospels* (HarperSanFrancisco: Polebridge, 1994) 262-3.

[69] To avoid the confusion which has been endemic in discussion of Q, I use 'q' for the actual material common to Matthew and Luke, and 'Q' for the hypothesized document from which q was drawn. The working assumption that Q = q is one of the major weaknesses in all Q research.

Markan material common to Matthew and Luke ('q')?[70] Did Matthew and Luke have no common (oral) tradition other than Q? That hardly seems likely as an *a priori*. In fact, the logic behind the Q hypothesis is that the degree of *closeness* between Matthew and Luke ('q') can only be explained by postulating a common written source (Q). Whereas the divergence between Matthew and Luke in the first half of the story is substantial, to put it no more strongly. Of course, it is possible to argue, as most do, that Matthew or Luke, or both, have heavily edited the Q version; but when 'q' properly speaking covers only part of the pericope, the argument for the existence of Q at this point becomes very slippery.

Is common oral tradition a more plausible hypothesis? Let us not assume that Matthew's and Luke's only source for such non-Markan Jesus tradition was a written document (Q). When we then examine the matter more closely the oral tradition hypothesis does indeed seem to make better sense.

Matt. 8	Luke 7
5 When he entered Capernaum, a centurion came to him, appealing to him 6 and saying, "Lord, my servant is lying at home paralyzed, in terrible distress." 7 And he said to him, "I will come and cure him."	1 After Jesus had finished all his sayings in the hearing of the people, he entered Capernaum. 2 A centurion there had a slave whom he valued highly, and who was ill and close to death. 3 When he heard about Jesus, he sent some Jewish elders to him, asking him to come and heal his slave. 4 When they came to Jesus, they appealed to him earnestly, saying, "He is worthy of having you do this for him, 5 for he loves our people, and it is he who built our synagogue for us." 6 And Jesus went with them, but when he was not far from the house, the centurion sent friends to say to him, "Lord, do not trouble yourself, for I am not fit to have you come under my roof; 7 therefore I did not consider myself worthy to come to you. But speak the word, and let my servant be healed. 8 For I also am a man set under authority, with soldiers under me; and I say to one, 'Go', and he goes, and to another, 'Come', and he comes, and to my slave, 'Do this', and the slave does it." 9 When Jesus heard this he was amazed at him, and turning to the crowd that followed him, he said, "I tell you, not even in Israel have I found such faith."
8 The centurion answered, "Lord, I am not fit to have you come under my roof; but only speak the word, and my servant will be healed. 9 For I also am a man under authority, with soldiers under me; and I say to one, 'Go'. and he goes, and to another, 'Come', and he comes, and to my slave, 'Do this'. and the slave does it." 10 When Jesus heard him, he was amazed and said to those who followed him, "Truly I tell you, in no one in Israel have I found such faith. 11 I tell you, many will come from east and west and will eat with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven, 12 while the heirs of the kingdom will be thrown into the outer darkness, where there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth." 13 And to the centurion Jesus said, "Go; let it be done for you according to your faith." And the servant was healed in that hour.	Luke 13.28-29 10 When those who had been sent returned to the house, they found the slave in good health

The episode is clearly the same: it is the story of the healing at a distance of the seriously ill servant of a centurion who lived in Capernaum. Within that framework we find the same striking features: (i) a core of the story where the agreement is

[70] The most weighty consideration is that Matthew and Luke both agree in positioning the episode after the Sermon on the Mount/Plain (A. Harnack, *The Sayings of Jesus* [London: Williams & Norgate, 1908] 74; D. Lührmann, *Die Redaktion der Logienquelle* [WMANT 33; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1969] 57). Is that sufficient?

almost word for word (Matt. 8.8-10/Luke 7.6-9); (ii) details which vary on either side of the core, to such an extent that the two versions seem to contradict each other (in Matthew the centurion comes to plead with Jesus personally; in Luke he makes a point of not coming).

Evidently the exchange between Jesus and the centurion made a considerable impression on the disciples of Jesus: the combination of humility and confidence in Jesus on the part of such a figure, and Jesus' surprise at its strength would have been striking enough.[71] Equally noticeable is the way in which Matthew and Luke have both taken the story in their own way: Matthew emphasizes the theme of the centurion's *faith*, by inserting the saying (Matt. 8.11-12) which Luke records in Luke 13.28-29 (the centurion as precedent for Gentile faith),[72] and by rounding off his telling with a further commendation by Jesus of the centurion's faith (Matt. 8.13); Luke emphasizes the theme of the centurion's *worthiness*, by having the elders testify of his worthiness (*axios*) (7.4-5) in counterpoise to the centurion's expression of unworthiness (*exiwsa*) (7.7a). Nor should we ignore the fact that both Matthew and Luke draw their different emphases from the same core – faith (Matt. 8.10), worthiness/fitness (*hikanos*) (Luke 7.6).

Here I would suggest is a fine example of oral traditioning, or if it is preferred, of Evangelists writing the story in oral mode.[73] The story was no doubt one which belonged to several communities' store of Jesus tradition. The story's point hangs entirely on the central exchange between Jesus and the centurion; that is maintained with care and accuracy. We may deduce that the story was important for these communities' identity, not least for their own sense of respect for and openness to Gentiles.

What, however, about John 4.46-54?

46 Then he came again to Cana in Galilee where he had changed the water into wine. Now there was
a royal official whose son lay ill in Capernaum. 47 When he heard that Jesus had come from Judea to
Galilee, he went and begged him to come down and heal his son, for he was at the point of death. 48
Then Jesus said to him, "Unless you see signs and wonders you will not believe". 49 The official said
to him, "Sir, come down before my little boy dies". 50 Jesus said to him, "Go; your son will live".
The man believed the word that Jesus spoke to him and started on his way. 51 As he was going down,
his slaves met him and told him that his child was alive. 52 So he asked them the hour when he began
to recover, and they said to him, "Yesterday at one in the afternoon the fever left him". 53 The father
realized that this was the hour when Jesus had said to him, "Your son will live". So he himself
believed, along with his whole household.

Agreement in no less than eleven points of detail is probably enough to substantiate the conclusion that this story of the healing at a distance of the seriously ill servant of a person of rank in Capernaum is another version (more distant echo?) of the same

---

[71] Contrast R. W. Funk, et al., *The Five Gospels: The Search for the Authentic Words of Jesus* (New York: Macmillan: Polebridge, 1993): 'Since the words ascribed to Jesus vary, and since there is nothing distinctive about them, we must assume they were created by story-tellers' (300). But the argument is self-defeating: would story-tellers create such unmemorable words?

[72] Funk's discussion is quite confused as to whether Matt. 8.11-12 could have existed separately from Matthew's narrative context (*Five Gospels* 160) despite the recognition that its 'Q' parallel (Luke 13.28-29) need not presuppose a Gentile mission (348); whereas J. S. Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987) argues that the 'tendentious development of the healing story into an apology for Gentile inclusion occurred already in the oral stage' prior to Q (120).

[73] Contrast the meticulous analysis of D. Catchpole, *The Quest for Q* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1993) ch. 10, which assumes the literary paradigm throughout and evokes the picture of Matthew and Luke carefully editing an original Q more or less word by word.

episode that we find in Matt. 8/Luke 7.[74] Particularly noticeable, however, are the facts that the official is not (no longer) identified as a Gentile and that the Matthean/Lukan core is not (no longer) there. On the other hand, the key emphasis on the person's faith is present, and Jesus' response to that faith (despite some initial hesitation); John strengthens the theme and uses it to develop his own warning against a faith based merely on miracle (John 4.48).[75]

What to make of this in terms of early Christian oral transmission? The simplest answer is that two versions of the same episode diverged in the course of various retellings. It could be that the idea of the official as a *Gentile* centurion was introduced in the course of the retelling.[76] Alternatively, and if anything more probable, it could be that in the second (Johannine) stream of tradition the identity of the official as a Gentile was seen as a subsidiary detail to the main emphasis on his faith, and so was neglected in the retellings. Either way, the differences are so great that the hypothesis of literary dependence becomes highly improbable;[77] on the contrary, the two versions (Matt/Luke and John) provide good evidence of stories of Jesus being kept alive in oral tradition.[78] And either way we can see something of both the retentiveness of the oral traditioning process and its flexibility in allowing traditions to be adapted to bring out differing emphases.

2.3 Markan narratives. There is no need to re-run the standard arguments for Markan priority (Mark as the earliest of the Synoptic Gospels)[79] or to give examples of where Synoptic analysis points to the firm conclusion of Matthean and Lukan dependency on Mark. In other cases, however, the variation in detail is such that the straightforward hypothesis of literary dependence on Mark becomes very strained. Consider the following narratives: the stilling of the storm (Mark 4.35-41/Matt. 8.23-27/Luke 8.22-25); the Syrophoenician woman (Mark 7.24-30/Matt. 15.21-28); the dispute about greatness (Mark 9.33-37/Matt. 18.1-5/Luke 9.46-48); and the widow's mite (Mark 12.41-44/Luke 21.1-4).

---

[74] See further C. H. Dodd, *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1963) 188-95; J. D. G. Dunn, 'John and the Oral Gospel Tradition', in Wansbrough, ed., *Jesus* 351-79 (here 359-63).

[75] For John's theology of different levels of faith, see e.g. R. E. Brown, *John* (AB 29; New York: Doubleday, 2 vols. 1966) 530-1. Dodd saw the contrast as between the Synoptics' interest in the remarkable faith of a Gentile, whereas 'in John the central interest lies in the life-giving power of the word of Christ' (*Historical Tradition* 194). Crossan, however, overstates the contrast between the two versions (Matt/Luke and John) when he talks of the story being pulled in 'two contradictory directions' (*Historical Jesus* 327).

[76] Since Herod's army was modelled on the Roman pattern, the 'centurion' of the Synoptic account could conceivably have been a Jew.

[77] *Pace* F. Neirynck, 'John 4.46-54: Signs Source and/or Synoptic Gospels', *Evangelica II* (Leuven: Leuven University, 1991) 679-88, who assumes that only redaction of literary sources can be invoked to explain the differences.

[78] Cf. E. Haenchen, *Johannesevangelium* (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1980) 260-1, summarizing his treatment in 'Johanneische Probleme', *Gott und Mensch* (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1965) 82-90.

[79] This remains the large consensus view among NT specialists, despite the continuing protests of a vocal minority.

a) The stilling of the storm:

Matt. 8	Mark 4	Luke 8
	35 On that day, when evening had come, he said to them, "Let us go across to the other side".	
23 And when he got into the boat, his disciples followed him.	36 And leaving the crowd behind, they took him with them in the boat, just as he was. Other	22 One day he got into a boat with his disciples, and he said to them, "Let us go across to the other side of the
24 A great storm arose on the sea, so great that the boat was being swamped by the waves; but he was asleep.	boats were with him. 37 A great stormwind arose, and the waves beat into the boat, so that the boat was already being filled. 38 But he was in the	lake". So they put out, 23 and while they were sailing he fell asleep. A stormwind swept down on the lake, and the boat
25 And they went and woke him up, saying, "Lord, save us! We are perishing!" 26 And he said to them, "Why are you afraid, you of little faith?" Then he got up and rebuked the winds and the sea;	stern, asleep on the cushion; and they woke him up and said to him, "Teacher, do you not care that we are perishing?" 39 He got up and rebuked the wind, and said to the sea, "Be quiet! Silence!" Then the wind ceased,	was filling up, and they were in danger. 24 They went to him and woke him up, shouting, "Master, Master, we are perishing!" And he got up and rebuked the wind and the raging waves; they ceased,
and there was a dead calm.	and there was a dead calm.	and there was a calm.
	40 He said to them, "Why are you afraid? Have you still no	25 He said to them, "Where is your
27 The men were amazed, saying, "What sort of man is this, that even the winds and the sea obey him?"	faith?" 41 And they were filled with great awe and said to one another, "Who then is this, that even the wind and the sea obey him?"	faith?" They were afraid and amazed, and said to one another, "Who then is this, that he commands even the winds and the water, and they obey him?"

Here again we have the characteristic features of different retellings of a single story about Jesus. The key points remain constant: Jesus with his disciples in a boat (on the lake); a great storm and Jesus asleep (differently described); the disciples rouse Jesus, he rebukes the wind and sea and a calm results; Jesus questions the disciples' lack of faith and they express wonder. The key lines are clearly: 'he got up and rebuked the wind(s), and there was a calm'; 'who is this that even the wind(s) obey him?'[80] Round this core the story could be told and retold, the details varied in accordance with the context of retelling and with any particular angle the story teller wished to bring out.[81]

Once again it is quite possible to argue for a purely literary connection – Matthew and Luke drawing upon and editing Mark's (for them) original. The problem with the purely literary hypothesis is that most of the differences are so inconsequential. Why, for example, as literary editors would it be necessary for them to vary the description of the storm and the danger of the boat being swamped (each uses different verbs)? It is surely more plausible to deduce that Matthew and Luke knew their own (oral) versions of the story and drew on them primarily or as

[80] It is widely recognized that the story is structured on the pattern of the story of Jonah, with the key lines distinctive to bring out the point, How much greater than Jonah is here; see e.g. W. D. Davies & D. C. Allison, *Matthew 8-18* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1991) 70.

[81] In particular Matthew's retelling emphasizes the themes of discipleship/following (*akolouthein* – 8.19, 22, 23) and of 'little faith' (*oligopistos/ia*), distinctive to Matthew (8.26; cf. 6.30; 14.31; 16.8; 17.20).

well. Alternatively, it could be that they followed Mark in oral mode, as we might say; that is, they did not slavishly copy Mark (as they did elsewhere), but having taken the point of Mark's story they retold it as a storyteller would, retaining the constant points which gave the story its identity, and building round the core to bring out their own distinctive emphases.

b) The Syrophoenician woman:

Matt. 15	Mark 7
21 Jesus left that place and went off to the district of Tyre and Sidon. 22 Just then a Canaanite woman from that region came out and started shouting, "Have mercy on me, lord, son of David; my daughter is tormented by a demon". 23 But he did not answer her at all. And his disciples came and urged him, saying, "Send her away, for she keeps shouting after us". 24 He answered, "I was sent only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel". 25 But she came and knelt before him, saying, "Lord, help me". 26 He answered, "It is not fair to take the children's food and throw it to the dogs". 27 She said, "Certainly, lord, for also the dogs eat from the crumbs that fall from their masters' table". 28 Then Jesus answered her, "Woman, great is your faith! Let it be done for you as you wish". And her daughter was healed from that hour.	24 From there he set out and went away to the region of Tyre. He entered a house and did not want anyone to know he was there. Yet he could not escape notice, 25 but a woman whose little daughter had an unclean spirit immediately heard about him, and she came and bowed down at his feet. 26 Now the woman was a Gentile, of Syrophoenician origin. She begged him to cast the demon out of her daughter. 27 He said to her, "Let the children be fed first, for it is not fair to take the children's food and throw it to the dogs". 28 But she answered him, "Certainly, lord, and the dogs under the table eat from the crumbs of the children". 29 So he said to her, "For saying that, you may go, the demon has left your daughter". 30 So she went to her home, and found the child lying on the bed, and the demon gone.

The picture here is very similar. The story is again clearly same: an event which took place in the district of Tyre; a non-Israelite woman with a demon possessed daughter; healing at a distance. Most striking is the fact that the two versions share almost no word in common apart from the core section (underlined). The core of the story is manifestly the exchange between Jesus and the woman, held constant, more or less verbatim (Mark 7.27-28/Matt. 15.26-27). Apart from that the retelling is completely variable: in particular, Mark emphasizes the woman's Gentile identity, while Matthew both plays up the resulting tension and the woman's faith. As with the story of the centurion's servant above, the fact that the healing was successful is almost an afterthought in every telling.

Here too the same feature is evident as in the stilling of the storm: the variation between the two versions is such that the hypothesis of literary dependence becomes very implausible. A connection at the level of oral retelling is much the more probable. Either Matthew knew the story through oral tradition and drew directly from that tradition, or he himself retold Mark's story as a storyteller would. We should note that it would be misleading to say that Matthew knew a different *version* of the story.[82] For that would be to slip back into the idiom of literary editions, as though each retelling of the story was a fresh 'edition' of the story; whereas the reality with which we are confronted is more like spontaneously different variations (retellings) on a theme (the identifiable theme and core).

[82] Characteristic of discussion dominated by the literary paradigm is the assumption that variations between the two versions can be explained only in terms of conflation of sources; see e.g. V. Taylor, *Mark* (London: Macmillan, 1952) 347.

c) The dispute about greatness:

Matt. 18	Mark 9	Luke 9
	33 Then they came to Capernaum; and when he was in the house he asked them, "What were you arguing about on the way?" 34 But they were silent,	
1 At that time the disciples came to Jesus and asked, "Who is greater in the kingdom of heaven?"	for on the way they had argued with one another about who was greater. 35 He sat down, called the twelve, and said to them, "Whoever wants to be first must be last of all and servant of all".	46 An argument arose among them as to who of them was greater.
2 He called a little child, and put it among them,	36 Then he took a little child and put it among them; and taking it in his arms, he said to them,	47 But Jesus, aware of their inner thoughts, took a little child and put it by his side,
3 and said, "Truly I tell you, unless you turn and become like little children, you will never enter the kingdom of heaven. 4 Whoever humbles himself like this little child is greater in the kingdom of heaven. 5 And whoever welcomes one such little child in my name welcomes me".	37 "Whoever welcomes one of such little children in my name welcomes me, and whoever welcomes me welcomes not me but the one who sent me".	48 and said to them, "Whoever welcomes this little child in my name welcomes me, and whoever welcomes me welcomes the one who sent me; for he who is lesser among all of you, that one is great".

The basic picture is the same as before. The constants are clear: the disciples' dispute about who was greater; Jesus' rebuke by drawing a little child into the company; and the core saying which climaxes the story. Each retelling elaborates the basic outline in the Evanglist's own way (Mark 9.35; Matt. 18.3-4; Luke 9.48c). Matthew and Luke were able also to use the fuller tradition of Jesus' speaking about 'the one who sent me' (Matt. 18.37b/Luke 9.48b). And here again the degree of verbal interdependence tells against literary interdependence, whereas the mix of constancy and flexibility indicates an oral mode of performance.[83]

[83] Here again Taylor's discussion in terms of 'fragments loosely connected at 35 and 36' and 'fragmentary stories' (*Mark* 403-4) betrays the assumption that there must have been an original story or original stories of which only fragments remain, and thus also his failure to appreciate the character of oral tradition.

d) The widow's pence:

Mark 12	Luke 21
41 He sat down opposite the treasury, and watched how the crowd put money into the treasury. Many rich people put in large sums. 42 A poor widow came and put in two small copper coins, which are worth a penny. 43 Then he called his disciples and said to them, "Truly I tell you, this poor widow has put in more than all those who are contributing to the treasury. 44 For all have contributed out of their abundance; but she out of her poverty has put in all she had, her entire life".	21:1 He looked up and saw rich people putting into the treasury their gifts; 2 he also saw a needy widow putting in two small copper coins. 3 He said, "Of a truth I tell you, this poor widow has put in more than all of them; 4 for all those have contributed out of their abundance for the gifts, but she out of her poverty has put in all the life she had".

The episode is brief, being almost entirely taken up with the identifying details (the contrast between the rich people's giving and the two small copper coins of the poor widow) and Jesus' observation which evidently made the episode so memorable (and therefore retained close to word for word). With such a brief pericope the scope for explanation in terms of Luke's editing of Mark is stronger. But even so, the flexibility of detail in the build-up to the climactic saying bespeaks more of oral than literary tradition.

2.4 Results. Other examples could be offered.[84] None of this is intended to deny that Matthew and Luke knew Mark as such and were able to draw on his version of the tradition at a literary level and often did so; in terms of written sources, the case for Markan priority remains overwhelmingly the most probable. Nor have I any wish to deny that Matthew and Luke regularly edited their Markan *Vorlage*. Sometimes by substantial abbreviation.[85] Sometimes by adding material to make a better[86] or a further point.[87] Sometimes to clarify or avoid misunderstandings.[88] At

[84] The healing of Peter's mother-in-law (Mark 1.29-31/Matt. 8.14-15/Luke 4.38-39); the cleansing of the leper (Mark 1.40-45/Matt. 8.1-4/Luke 5.12-16); Jesus' true family (Mark 3.31-35/Matt. 12.46-50/Luke 8.19-21); precedence among the disciples (Mark 10.35-45 = Matt. 20.20-28; but Luke 20.24-27); the healing of the blind man/men (Mark 10.46-52/Matt. 20.29-34/Luke 18.35-43). Why do the lists of the twelve close disciples of Jesus vary as they do (Mark 3.16-19/Matt. 10.2-4/Luke 6.13-16)? Presumably because in the process of oral transmission confusion had arisen over the names of one or two of the least significant members of the group. The sequence of Mark 12.1-37/Matt. 21.33-46, 22.15-46/Luke 20.9-44 could be orally related, but the extent and consistency of verbal link suggests a primarily literary dependence of Matthew and Luke on Matthew. The constancy of verbal link between the three accounts of the feeding of the five thousand likewise probably indicates an editing rather than a retelling process (Mark 6.32-44/Matt. 14.13-21/Luke 9.10-17); but John's version (John 6.1-15), where almost the sole verbal links are the numbers (cost, loaves and fishes, participants, baskets of fragments), surely indicates oral retelling. The character of the sequel (Mark 6.45-52/Matt. 14.22-33/John 6.16-21) points clearly in the same direction. And though Matthew's dependence on Mark for the passion narrative is clear, the alternative version used by Luke may well indicate a tradition passed down orally independent of the Mark/Matthean (literary) version.

[85] The linked stories of the Gerasene demoniac (Mark 5.1-20/Matt. 8.28-34/Luke 8.26-39) and Jairus' daughter and the woman with the hemorrhage (Mark 5.21-43/Matt. 9.18-26/Luke 8.40-56) look like examples of heavy abbreviation of Markan redundancy, especially by Matthew. Similarly with Matthew's treatment of the death of John the Baptist (Mark 6.17-29/Matt. 14.3-12), and with Matthew's and Luke's treatment of the healing of the epileptic boy (Mark 9.14-29/Matt. 17.14-21/Luke 9.37-43). Lord notes that performances of often very different lengths is a mark of oral tradition (*Singer of Tales* 109-17).

[86] E.g. Matt. 12.5-7, 11-12a adds precedents more apposite to the two cases of Sabbath controversy than were provided in Mark 2.23-28 and 3.1-5 (Matt. 12.1-8 and 9-14); cf. Luke 13.10-17.

the same time, however, it would be improper to ignore the fact that in a good number of cases, illustrated above, the more natural explanation for the evidence is *not* Matthew's or Luke's literary dependence on Mark, but rather their own knowledge of oral retellings of the same stories (or, alternatively, their own oral retelling of the Markan stories). We really must free ourselves from the assumption that variations between parallel accounts can only be explained in terms of literary redaction. After all, it can hardly be assumed that the first time Matthew and Luke heard many of these stories was when they first came across Mark's Gospel. The claim that there were churches in the mainstream(s) represented by Matthew and Luke who did not know any Jesus tradition until they received Mark (or Q) as documents simply beggars belief and merely exemplifies the blinkered perspective imposed by the literary paradigm. To repeat: the assumption, almost innate to those trained within western culture, that the Synoptic traditions have to be analysed in terms of a linear sequence of literary editions, where each successive version is an editing of its predecessor, simply distorts critical perception and skews the resultant analysis. The transmission of the narrative tradition has too many oral features to be ignored.

The more appropriate conclusions are twofold. (1) The variations between the different versions of same story in the tradition do not indicate a cavalier attitude to or lack of historical interest in the events narrated. In almost every case examined or cited above it is clearly the same story which is being retold. Rather, the variations exemplify the character of oral retelling.[89] In such oral transmission the concern to remember Jesus is clear from the key elements which give the tradition its stable identity. And the vitality of the tradition is indicated by the performance variants. These were not traditions carried around in a casket like some sacred relic of the increasingly distant past, their elements long rigid by textual rigor mortis; but neither were they the free creation of teachers or prophets with some theological axe to grind; rather they were the lifeblood of the communities in which they were told and retold. What Jesus did was important to these communities for their own continuing identity.[90]

(2) In the material documented above the differences introduced by the Evangelists, whether as oral diversity or as literary editing, are consistently in the character of abbreviation and omission, clarification and explanation, elaboration and extension of motif. The developments often reflect the deeper faith and insight of Easter; that is true. But they do not appear to constitute any radical change in

---

[87] E.g. the Matthean additions to explain why Jesus accepted baptism from the Baptist (Matt. 3.14-15), and in his presentation of Peter as the representative disciple (Matt. 14.28-31; 16.17-19); the Lukan addition of a second mission (of the seventy[-two]) in Luke 10.1-12, presumably to foreshadow the Gentile mission (cf. 14.23 below).

[88] Cf. e.g. Mark 6.3a, 5a with Matt. 13.55a, 58; Mark 10.17-18 with Matt. 19.16-17. In both cases Matthew's respect for the Markan wording is clear, even when he changed it presumably to prevent any unwelcome implication (see my *The Evidence of Jesus* [London: SCM, 1985] 18-22). See further J. C. Hawkins, *Horae Synopticae: Contributions to the Study of the Synoptic Problem* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1898, [2]1909) 117-25.

[89] It should be noted that this deduction from the tradition itself coheres with Papias' account both of Peter's preaching and of Mark's composition: that Peter gave/adapted (*epoieito* - could we say performed) his teaching with a view to the needs (*pros tas chreias* - that is, presumably, of the audiences), but not as making an orderly account (*suntaxin*) of the Lord's sayings, so that Mark did no wrong in thus writing down some things (*enia*) as he recalled them' (Eusebius, *HE* 3.39.15).

[90] It is probably significant that the two traditions of the same event which diverge most markedly are those relating to the death of Judas (Matt. 27.3-10; Acts 1.15-20); in comparison with the death of Jesus, the fate of Judas was of little historical concern.

substance or character or thrust of the story told.[91] Of course, we have only sampled the Jesus tradition to a limited extent, and further checks are necessary. But at least we can say that thus far developments in the Jesus tradition were consistent with the earliest traditions of the remembered Jesus.

3. The Synoptic tradition as oral tradition - teachings

I choose the term 'teachings' rather than 'sayings', since the latter is too casual. It allows, possibly even fosters the impression of serendipity – sayings of Jesus casually overheard and casually recalled, as one today might recall impressions of one's school or college days in a class reunion thirty years later. But we should not forget that Jesus was known as a teacher,[92] and was so regarded by his disciples,[93] and that the disciples understood themselves as just that, 'disciples' = 'learners' (*mathetai*). Even that reminder should be sufficient to indicate that the recollection of Jesus' teaching would have been altogether a more serious enterprise from the start. Moreover, if I am right, the earliest communities of Jesus' disciples would have wanted to retain such teaching, as part of their own foundation tradition and self-identification, a fact which Paul and other early letter writers were able to exploit when they incorporated allusions to Jesus' teaching in their own paraenesis.[94] We need not assume a formal process of memorization, such as Gerhardsson envisaged. But a concern to learn what the master had taught, and to exercise some control over the degree of variations acceptable in the passing on of that teaching, can both be assumed on a priori grounds and find at least some confirmation in the oral traditioning processes envisaged by Bailey.

3.1 Aramaic tradition. We may start by recalling that the tradition as it has come down to us has already been translated once, from Aramaic to Greek. Here is another curious blind spot in most work on Jesus' teaching, in all phases of the 'quest for the historical Jesus'. I refer to the repeated failure to ask about the Aramaic form which Jesus' teaching presumably took.[95] Without such inquiry any assertions about

---

[91] It is more likely that Matt. 10.5 (restriction of the disciples mission to Israel) recalls Jesus' own instruction than that Jesus was known to commend a Gentile mission and Matt. 10.5 emerged as a prophetic protest within the Judean churches; in fact, Jesus' commendation of Gentile mission is at best an inference to be drawn from certain episodes in the tradition.

[92] Mark 5.35/Luke 8.49; Mark 9.17/Luke 9.38; Mark 10.17/Matt. 19.16/Luke 18.18; Mark 10.20; Mark 12.14, 19, 32/Matt. 22.16, 24, 36/Luke 20.21, 28, 39; Matt. 8.19; 9.11; 12.38; 17.24; Luke 7.40; 10.25; 11.45; 12.13; 19.39: It should be recalled that Jesus seems also to have been remembered as 'a teacher of people' by Josephus (*Ant.* 18.63).

[93] Mark 4.38; 9.38; 10.35; 13.1/Luke 21.7; Mark 14.14/Matt. 26.18/Luke 22.11; though it is noticeable that Matthew and Luke seem to have avoided the term (for the most part) on the lips of the disciples, presumably as not being sufficiently exalted.

[94] See further my *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998) 185-95.

[95] This is by no means to deny that Jesus knew at least some Greek (in what language did any exchange between a Gentile[?] centurion and Jesus, or between Jesus and Pilate take place?), or even that he may have spoken in Greek on occasions. Meier's discussion of the subject is quite sufficient for our purposes (*Marginal Jew* 1.255-68, 287-300). On the question of penetration of the Greek language into first century Israel see especially M. Hengel, *The 'Hellenization' of Judaea in the First Century after Christ* (London: SCM, 1989); S. E. Porter, 'Jesus and the Use of Greek in Galilee', in Chilton & Evans, eds., *Studying the Historical Jesus* 123-54. I see no reason to depart from the huge consensus which continues to maintain that Jesus gave at least the great bulk of his teaching in Aramaic; see particularly J. A. Fitzmyer, 'The Languages of Palestine in the First Century A.D.', *A Wandering Aramean: Collected Aramaic Essays* (Missoula, Montana: Scholars, 1979) 29-56; also

earliest forms of the teaching tradition are bound to be suspect in some measure. Not that such a criterion (Can this saying be retrojected back into Aramaic?) should be applied woodenly; translation aimed to achieve dynamic equivalence could easily produce a Greek idiom quite different from the nearest Aramaic equivalent.[96] What is of more immediate importance for us here are the important observations by Aramaic experts with regard to the character of the teaching tradition. All have noted that the tradition, even in its Greek state, bears several marks of oral transmission in Aramaic. Already in 1925 C. F. Burney had drawn attention to the various kinds of parallelism (synonymous, antithetic, synthetic)[97] and rhythm (four-beat, three-beat, *kina* metre) characteristic of Hebrew poetry.[98] And Matthew Black noted many examples of alliteration, assonance and paranomasia.[99] This is all the stuff of oral tradition, as we noted above (#1.4). Joachim Jeremias climaxed a lifetime's scholarship by summarising the indications that many of the words appearing in Jesus' teaching had an Aramaic origin, and that the speech involved had many characteristic features, including 'divine passive', as well as the features already noted by Burney and Black.[100]

Such evidence should be given more weight than has usually been the case. Of course, an Aramaic phase may only be evidence of an early (post-Easter) stage of transmission when the tradition was still circulating in Aramaic. But if the tradition is consistently marked by particular stylistic features, as the Aramaic specialists conclude, then it has to be judged more likely that these are the characteristics of one person rather than that the multitude of Aramaic oral tradents had the same characteristics. The possibility that we can still hear what Jeremias called 'the *ipsissima vox*' (as distinct from the *ipsissima verba*) of Jesus coming through the tradition should be brought back into play more seriously than it has in the thirty years since Jeremias last wrote on the subject.[101]

As with the narrative tradition, so with the teaching tradition, various examples are readily forthcoming. We begin with two examples from within earliest Christianity's liturgical tradition. In this case the studies in orality have confirmed what might anyway have been guessed: that tradition functioning as 'sacred words' within a cult or liturgy is generally more conservative in character; the transmission (if that is the best term) is in the nature of sacred repetition in celebration and

---

'The Study of the Aramaic Background of the New Testament' in the same volume 1-27 (here 6-10); to whom Meier acknowledges his debt. Porter argues that possibly seven of Jesus' conversations took place in Greek - Matt. 8.5-13; John 4.4-26; Mark 2.13-14; 7.25-30; 12.13-17; 8.27-30; 15.2-5, each, apart from John 4, with parallels (*The Criteria for Authenticity in Historical-Jesus Research* [JSNTS 191; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2000] 157-63).

[96] Note the warning of M. Casey, 'The Original Aramaic Form of Jesus' Interpretation of the Cup', *JTS* 41 (1990) 1-12, particularly 11-12.

[97] Riesner estimates 'about 80 per cent of the separate saying units are formulated in some kind of *parallelismus membrorum*' ('Jesus as Preacher and Teacher' 202).

[98] C. F. Burney, *The Poetry of our Lord* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1925).

[99] M. Black, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts* (Oxford: Clarendon, ^{3}1967) 160-85; though note Fitzmyer's strictures (*Wandering Aramean* 16-17). See also Riesner, *Jesus als Lehrer* 392-404.

[100] J. Jeremias, *New Testament Theology. Vol. One: The Proclamation of Jesus* (1971; ET London: SCM, 1971) 3-29.

[101] R. W. Funk, *Honest To Jesus* (HarperSanFrancisco: Polebridge, 1996) talks of Jesus' 'voice print', including antithesis, synonymous parallelism, reversal, paradox and others more distinctive to Funk's own approach (144-5, 149-58).

affirmation of a community's identity-forming tradition. Within the Jesus tradition two passages immediately call for attention.

3.2 The Lord's Prayer (Matt. 6.7-15/Luke 11.1-4).

Matt. 6	Luke 11
7 "When you are praying, do not heap up empty phrases as the Gentiles do; for they think that they will be heard because of their many words. 8 Do not be like them, for your Father knows what you need before you ask him.	11:1 He was praying in a certain place, and after he had finished, one of his disciples said to him, "Lord, teach us to pray, as John taught his disciples". 2 He said to them, "When you pray, say:
9 Pray then in this way: Our Father who are in heaven, hallowed be your name. 10 Your kingdom come. Your will be done, on earth as it is in heaven. 11 Give us today our daily bread. 12 And forgive us our debts, as we also have forgiven our debtors. 13 And do not bring us to the time of trial, but rescue us from the evil one. 14 For if you forgive others their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you; 15 but if you do not forgive others, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses."	Father, hallowed be your name. Your kingdom come. 3 Give us each day our daily bread. 4 And forgive us our sins, for we ourselves forgive everyone indebted to us. And do not bring us to the time of trial."

What is the explanation for such variation? It would be odd indeed if Matthew and Luke derived this tradition from a common written source (Q).[102] Why then the variation, particularly within the prayer itself? Here again the curse of the literary paradigm lies heavy on discussion at this point. To think that this tradition was known only because it appeared in writing in a Q document! Whereas, much the more obvious explanation is that this was a tradition maintained in the living liturgy of community worship (as the first person plural suggests). Almost certainly, the early Christian disciples did not know this tradition only because they had heard it in some reading from a written document. They knew it because they prayed it, possibly on a daily basis.[103] In this case, in addition to the curse of the literary paradigm, the fact that so many academic discussions on material like this take place in isolation from a living tradition of regular worship, probably highlights another blind spot for many questers.

The point is that liturgical usage both conserves and adapts (slowly).[104] As Jeremias argued, the most likely explanation for the two versions of the Lord's Prayer is two slightly diverging patterns of liturgical prayer, both versions showing signs of liturgical adaptation: in Matthew the more reverential address and an opening phrase more readily said in congregational unison, and the additions at the end of each half

[102] As B. H. Streeter observed in his *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins* (London: Macmillan, 1924) 277-8.

[103] This possibility is widely acknowledged; cf. e.g. U. Luz, *Matthäus 1-7* (EKK; Zürich: Benziger/Neukirchen: Neukirchener, 1985) 334; Crossan, *Historical Jesus* 293; J. P. Meier, *A Marginal Jew* Vol. 2 (New York: Doubleday, 1994) 357-8; H. D. Betz, *The Sermon on the Mount* (Hermeneia: Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995) 370. In Didache 8.3 it is commended that the prayer be said three times a day (a good Jewish practice).

[104] Orthodoxy still celebrates the liturgies of St John Chrysostom and St Basil of Caesarea.

of the prayer to elaborate the brevity and possibly clarify the petition to which the addition has been made; in Luke particularly the modification for daily prayer ('each day').[105] That the liturgical development/modification continued is indicated by the later addition of the final doxology ('for yours is the kingdom and the power and the glory for ever, amen') to Matthew's version.[106] It is not without relevance to note that such liturgical variation within what is manifestly the same prayer continues to this day. In Scotland pray-ers tend to say 'debts', in England 'trespasses'. And contemporary versions jostle with traditional versions in most modern service books. Since liturgy is in effect the most like to oral tradition in modern western communities (regular worshippers rarely need to 'follow the order' in the book) the parallel has some force.

One other point worth noting is that both introductions (Matt. 6.9a; Luke 11.1-2a) confirm what was again likely anyway: that this prayer functioned as an identity marker for the first disciples.[107] Christians were recognizable among themselves, as well as to others, as those who said 'Father' or 'Our Father' to God,[108] whereas the typical prayer of Jewish worship had more liturgical gravitas.[109] Moreover, both versions of the tradition attribute the prayer explicitly to Jesus, and report the prayer as explicitly given to his disciples by Jesus.[110] That no doubt was why the prayer was so cherished and repeated. It would be unjustifiably sceptical to conclude despite all this that the prayer was compiled from individual petitions used by Jesus[111] and/or emerged only later from some unknown disciple.[112] Its place in the early tradition indicates rather the influence of some widely and highly regarded person; among whom Jesus himself is the most obvious candidate for the speculator.

3.3 The last supper. The obvious second example is the record of Jesus' last supper with his disciples, which evidently became a matter of regular liturgical celebration (1 Cor. 11.23-26). The tradition here is fourfold.

Matt. 26	Mark 14
26 While they were eating, Jesus took a loaf of bread, and after blessing it he broke it, giving it to the disciples, and said, "Take, eat; this is my body". 27 Then he took a cup, and after giving thanks he gave it to them, saying, "Drink from it, all of you; 28 for this is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many for the forgiveness of sins. 29 I tell you, from now on I will not drink of this fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new with you in the kingdom of my Father."	22 While they were eating, he took a loaf of bread, and after blessing it he broke it, gave it to them, and said, "Take; this is my body". 23 Then he took a cup, and after giving thanks he gave it to them, and all of them drank from it. 24 He said to them, "This is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out on behalf of many. 25 Truly I tell you, no more will I drink of the fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God."

105 See further Jeremias, *Proclamation* 195-6.

106 Text-critical data in B. M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (London: United Bible Societies, 1971, corrected 1975) 16-17. Didache 8.2-3 indicates an intermediate phase when the doxology was only 'Yours is the power and the glory for ever'.

107 Jeremias, *Proclamation* 196-7.

108 The references in Rom. 8.15-16 and Gal. 4.6 confirm that Paul understood the 'Abba' prayer as distinctive of Christians.

109 For example, the benediction over the meal begins, 'Blessed art thou, Lord our God, king of the universe'.

110 It goes back into good Aramaic; see e.g. Jeremias, *Proclamation* 196; W. D. Davies & D. C. Allison, *Matthew 1-7* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1988) 593.

111 Funk, *Five Gospels* 148-50; the discussion is vitiated by the assumption of literary dependence.

112 Crossan, *Historical Jesus* 294.

Luke 22	1 Cor. 11
17 Then he took a cup, and after giving thanks he said, "Take this and divide it among yourselves; 18 for I tell you that from now on I will not drink of the fruit of the vine until the kingdom of God comes." 19 Then he took a loaf of bread, and when he had given thanks, he broke it and gave it to them, saying, "This is my body, which is given for you. Do this in remembrance of me." 20 Also the cup likewise after supper, saying, "This cup is the new covenant in my blood which is poured out for you.	23 For I received from the Lord what I also handed on to you, that the Lord Jesus on the night when he was betrayed took a loaf of bread, 24 and when he had given thanks, he broke it and said, "This is my body which is for you. Do this in remembrance of me." 25 Likewise also the cup after supper, saying, "This cup is the new covenant in my blood. Do this, as often as you drink it, in remembrance of me." 26 For as often as you eat this bread and drink the cup, you proclaim the Lord's death until he comes.

The tradition has been preserved in two clearly distinct forms, one in Mark and Matthew (A), the other in Luke and Paul (B). In A Jesus 'blesses' the bread; in B he 'gives thanks'. B adds to the word over the bread, 'which is (given) for you. Do this in remembrance of me'. Over the cup A has 'This is my blood of the covenant which is poured out (for) many'; whereas B has 'This cup is the new covenant in my blood'. This variation is most obviously to be explained in terms neither of literary dependence, nor of one or other more easily retrojected into Aramaic,[113] but in terms of two slightly variant liturgical practices. For example, the fact that in the A version the words over the bread and the wine are set in parallel ('This is my body; this is my blood') probably indicates a liturgical shaping to bring out the parallelism. Whereas the B version maintains the framework of a meal, with the bread word presumably said at the beginning (in accordance with the normal pattern of the Jewish meal) and the cup bringing the meal to a close ('after supper'). In A the modification puts the focus more directly on the wine/blood, whereas in B the focus is more on the cup.[114]

Here again it would be somewhat farcical to assume that this tradition was known to the various writers only as written tradition and only by hearing it read occasionally from some written source. The more obvious explanation, once again, is that these words were familiar within many/most early Christian communities because they used them in their regular celebrations of the Lord's Supper: this was living oral tradition before and after it was ever written down in semi-formal or formal documentation. Here too it was a matter of fundamental tradition, the sort of tradition which Paul took care to pass on to his newly formed churches (1 Cor. 11.23),[115] the sort of tradition which gave these churches their identity and by the

[113] J. A. Fitzmyer notes that both forms can be retrojected into contemporary Aramaic 'with almost equal ease and problems' (*Luke* [AB 28A, two vols; New York: Doubleday, 1981, 1985] 1394-5); see again Casey, 'Original Aramaic Form'.

[114] See further my *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament* (London: SCM, 1977, [2]1990) 165-7, and those cited there in n. 23.

[115] The fact that Paul ascribes the tradition to 'the Lord' (1 Cor. 11.23) should not be taken to indicate a revelation given to Paul after his conversion (as particularly most recently H. Maccoby, 'Paul and the Eucharist', *NTS* 37 [1991] 247-67). The language is the language of tradition ('I received' – *parelabon*; 'I handed on to you' – *paredwka*), and 'the Lord' from whom Paul received it is 'the Lord Jesus (who) on the night in which he was betrayed took bread . . .' (11.23). See further the still

performance of which they affirmed their identity (cf. again 1 Cor. 10.21). It was tradition remembered as begun by Jesus himself, and remembered thus from as early as we can tell.[116]

It is, of course, a fair question as to whether in the earliest form Jesus was remembered as celebrating a Passover meal or instituting a ritual to be repeated. On the latter issue, the A version does not in fact say so; and the call for or assumption of repetition is a distinctive feature both of B, and of the elaboration in 1 Cor. 11.25b-26. Moreover the evidence of redaction is apparent elsewhere.[117] Nevertheless the characteristics of oral tradition remain clear: a concern to maintain the key elements of the words used by Jesus as carefully as necessary, with a flexibility (including elaboration) which in this case no doubt reflects the developing liturgical practices of different churches.

3.4 Sermon on the Mount/Plain. A curious feature of the Sermon on the Mount tradition is the variableness in the closeness between the Matthew and Lukan versions. In what we might call (for the sake of convenience) the third quarter of Matthew's Sermon, the degree of closeness is such that the passages qualify as good evidence for the existence of a Q document.[118] But in the other three-quarters the verbal parallel is much less close, so much so as to leave a considerable question as to whether there is evidence of any literary dependence.[119] In most cases much the more plausible explanation is of two orally varied versions of the same tradition. As before, the evidence does not determine whether one or other (or both) has simply drawn directly from the living oral tradition known to them, or whether one or other has borrowed in oral mode from the Q document. Either way the evidence is more of oral dependence than of literary dependence. Consider the following examples.

---

valuable discussion of O. Cullmann, 'The Tradition', *The Early Church: Historical and Theological Studies* (London: SCM, 1956) 59-75, who notes inter alia that 1 Cor. 7.10 also refers the tradition of Jesus' teaching on divorce to 'the Lord' ('To the married I give charge, not I but the Lord . . .') (68).

[116] The silence of Didache 9 ('concerning the Eucharist') as to any 'words of institution' need not imply that Didache reflects an earlier stage (than Mark or 1 Cor. 11) in the liturgical development (as Crossan, *Historical Jesus* 360-7 argues). It could well be that Didache assumes the traditional core and attests simply the addition of thanksgiving (*eucharistein*) prayers deemed appropriate in a more liturgically solemnized act (as also Didache 10). John's Gospel says nothing of a last supper, but reflects knowledge of bread and wine words in John 6.52-58. For a recent brief discussion and review (with bibliography) see W. D. Davies & D. C. Allison, *Matthew 19-28* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1997) 465-9.

[117] Particularly Matthew's addition of the phrase 'for the forgiveness of sins' (Matt. 26.28), the very phrase he seems deliberately to have omitted in 3.2 (cf. Mark 1.4/Luke 3.3).

[118] Matt. 6.22-23/Luke 11.34-36; Matt. 6.24/Luke 16.13; Matt. 6.25-34/Luke 12.22-32; Matt. 7.1-2/Luke 6.37a, 38b; Matt. 7.3-5/Luke 6.41-42; Matt. 7.7-11/Luke 11.9-13; Matt. 7.12/Luke 6.31.

[119] Despite which, most discussions simply assume redactional use of Q; see e.g. Fitzmyer, *Luke*, and Davies & Allison, *Matthew*, *ad loc.* Streeter recognized the likelihood of 'oral tradition in more than one form', but argues that differences have to be explained by Matthew's 'conflation' of Q and M – that is, by literary editing (*Four Gospels* 251-3).

Matt. 5.13	Luke 14.34-35
13 You are the salt of the earth; but if salt has lost its taste, how can it be restored? It is no longer good for anything, but is thrown out to be trampled under foot	34 Salt is good; but if even salt has lost its taste, how can it be seasoned? 35 It is fit neither for the earth nor for the manure heap; they throw it out.

Matt. 5.25-26	Luke 12.57-59
25 Come to terms quickly with your accuser while you are on the way (to court) with him, lest your accuser hand you over to the judge, and the judge to the guard, and you will be thrown in prison. 26 Truly I tell you, you will never get out from there until you have paid back the last penny.	57 And why do you not judge for yourselves what is right? 58 Thus, when you go with your accuser before a magistrate, on the way (to court) make an effort to settle with him, lest you be dragged before the judge, and the judge hand you over to the officer, and the officer throw you in prison. 59 I tell you, you will never get out from there until you have paid back the very last halfpenny.

Matt. 5.39b-42	Luke 6.29-30
But whoever hits you on your right cheek, turn to him the other also; 40 and to the one who wants to sue you and take your tunic, let him have your cloak also; 41 and whoever forces you to go one mile, go with him a second. 42 Give to the one who asks you, and do not turn away the one who wants to borrow from you.	29 To the one who strikes you on the cheek, offer the other also; and from the one who takes away your cloak do not withhold your tunic also. 30 Give to everyone who asks you; and from the one who takes what is yours, do not ask for them back.

Matt. 7.13-14	Luke 13.24
13 Enter through the narrow gate; for the gate is wide and the road is easy that leads to destruction, and there are many who enter through it. 14 For the gate is narrow and the road is hard that leads to life, and there are few who find it.	24 Strive to enter through the narrow door; for many, I tell you, will try to enter and will not be able.

In each case two features are evident: the teaching is the same in substance; the main emphases are carried by key words or phrases (salt, lost its taste, thrown out; accuser, [danger of being] thrown in prison, 'I tell you, you will never get out until you have paid back the last [half]penny';[120] cheek, other, cloak/tunic also, 'Give to him who asks you';[121] 'Enter through the narrow gate'); otherwise the detail is quite diverse. It is hard to imagine such sayings being simply copied from the same document. The alternative suggestion that there were several editions of Q (Matthew copying from one, Luke from another) smacks of desperation, since the suggestion undermines the arguments for the existence of a Q document in the first place. Similarly with the suggestion that Matthew was free in his editing of Q (= Luke) or vice-versa.[122] Here

[120] Didache 1.5 makes use of this last saying: 'he will not get out from there, until he has paid back the last penny'.

[121] Didache 1.4-5 may well reflect knowledge of Matthew's version. In the Gospel of Thomas the saying has been formulated with a slightly different thrust: 'If you have money, do not lend it at interest, but give it to someone from whom you will not get it back' (GTh 95).

[122] E.g. the reconstructions of Q by A. Polag, *Fragmenta Q: Textheft zur Logienquelle* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1979), seem to assume that sometimes Luke, sometimes Matthew has preserved Q; as a result he both masks the disparity between the two versions and still leaves it a puzzle why

once again the literary paradigm will simply not serve. These are all teachings remembered as teachings of Jesus in the way that oral tradition preserves such teaching, with the character and emphasis of the saying retained through stable words and phrases, but the point elaborated in ways the re-teller judged appropriate to the occasion.

3.5 Other Q/q tradition. The picture is little different for traditions shared by Matthew and Luke elsewhere in the record of Jesus' teaching. Once again there are passages where the wording is so close that a literary dependence is the most obvious explanation.[123] But once again, too, there are parallel passages which simply cry out to be explained in terms of the flexibility of oral tradition.

Matt. 10.34-38	Luke 12.51-53; 14.26-27
34 Do not think that I came to bring peace to the earth; I came not to bring peace, but a sword. 35 For I came to set a man against his father, and a daughter against her mother, and a daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law; 36 and a man's foes will be members of his own household. 37 Whoever loves father or mother more than me is not worthy of me; and whoever loves son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me; 38 and he who does not take up his cross and follow after me is not worthy of me.	12.51 Do you consider that I am here to give peace on the earth? No, I tell you, but rather division! 52 From now on five in one household will be divided; three against two and two against three 53 they will be divided, father against son and son against father, mother against daughter and daughter against mother, mother-in-law against her daughter-in-law and daughter-in-law against mother-in-law. 14.26 Whoever comes to me and does not hate his father and mother, and wife and children, and brothers and sisters, yes, and even his own life, cannot be my disciple. 27 Whoever does not carry his own cross and come after me cannot be my disciple.

Matt. 18.15, 21-22	Luke 17.3-4
15 "If your brother sins against you, go and point out the fault when you and he are alone. If he listens to you, you have regained your brother". 21 Then Peter came and said to him, "Lord, if my brother sins against me, how often should I forgive him? As many as seven times?" 22 Jesus said to him, "I tell you, not seven times, but seventy-seven times".	3 Be on your guard! If your brother sins, rebuke him, and if he repents, forgive him. 4 And if the someone sins against you seven times a day, and turns back to you seven times and says, "I repent", you must forgive him.

either or both diverged from the written text of Q. E.g., in the first case, on the usual literary redactional principles, it is more likely that Luke 14.34a echoes Mark 9.50a than that Luke = Q.

[123] Matt. 8.19b-22/Luke 9.57b-60a; Matt. 11.7-11, 16-19/Luke 7.24-28, 31-35; Matt. 11.25-27/Luke 10.21-22; Matt. 12.43-45/Luke 11.24-26; Matt. 23.37-39/Luke 13.34-35; Matt. 24.45-51/Luke 12.42-46.

Matt. 22.1-14	Luke 14.16-24
1 Once more Jesus spoke to them in parables, saying: 2 "The kingdom of heaven may be compared to a king who gave a wedding banquet for his son. 3 He sent his slaves to call those who had been invited to the wedding banquet, but they would not come. 4 Again he sent other slaves, saying, 'Tell those who have been invited: Look, I have prepared my dinner, my oxen and my fat calves have been slaughtered, and everything is ready; come to the wedding banquet'. 5 But they made light of it and went away, one to his farm, another to his business, 6 while the rest seized his slaves, mistreated them, and killed them. 7 The king was angered. He sent his troops, destroyed those murderers, and burned their city. 8 Then he said to his slaves, 'The wedding is ready, but those invited were not worthy. 9 Go therefore into the streets, and invite everyone you find to the wedding banquet.' 10 Those slaves went out into the streets and gathered all whom they found, both good and bad; so the wedding hall was filled with guests. 11 But when the king came in to see the guests, he noticed a man there who was not wearing a wedding robe, 12 and he said to him, 'Friend, how did you get in here without a wedding robe?' And he was speechless. 13 Then the king said to the attendants, 'Bind him hand and foot, and throw him into the outer darkness, where there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth'. 14 For many are called, but few are chosen."	15 One of the dinner guests, on hearing this, said to him, "Blessed is anyone who will eat bread in the kingdom of God!" 16 Then Jesus said to him, "A certain person gave a great dinner and invited many. 17 At the time for the dinner he sent his slave to say to those who had been invited, 'Come; for it is now ready'. 18 But they all alike began to make excuses. The first said to him, 'I have bought a farm, and I must go out and see it; please accept my regrets'. 19 Another said, 'I have bought five yoke of oxen, and I am going to try them out; please accept my regrets'. 20 Another said, 'I have married a wife, and therefore I cannot come'. 21 So the slave returned and reported this to his master. Then the owner of the house became angry and said to his slave, 'Go out at once into the roads and lanes of the town and bring in the poor, the crippled, the blind, and the lame'. 22 And the slave said, 'Sir, what you ordered has been done, and there is still room'. 23 Then the master said to the slave, 'Go out into the roads and lanes, and compel them to come in, so that my house may be full. 24 For I tell you, none of those who were invited will taste my dinner'."

In each of the above cases we clearly have the same theme. But the agreement and overlap in wording between the Matthean/Lukan parallels is so modest, even minimal, that it becomes implausible to argue that the one was derived from the other or from a single common source at the literary level. The hypothesis that Matthew and Luke drew directly from Q (= Luke?)[124] simply does not make enough sense of the data. Whereas the similarity of theme and point being made fits well with the

[124] See again e.g. Fitzmyer, *Luke*, and Davies & Allison, *Matthew*, *ad loc.*; Catchpole, *Quest* 323-4.

flexibility and adaptability of oral retelling.[125] In each case the Evangelist seems to have expressed and/or elaborated the common theme in his own way:

Matt. 10.37-38 (worthiness), Luke 14.26-27 (discipleship);
Matt. 18.15, 21-22 (church discipline);
Matt. 22.7, 11-14 (destruction of Jerusalem; lack of wedding robe),
Luke 14.21-22, 23 (church's twofold mission).

But such retellings are well within the parameters of orally passed on teaching.[126] We can conclude without strain that Jesus was remembered as warning about the challenge of discipleship and the family divisions which would likely ensue, as encouraging generous and uncalculating forgiveness, and as telling a story (or several stories) about a feast whose guests refused to come (the variation in reasons given is typical of story telling) and who were replaced by people from the streets.[127]

3.6 Results. To sum up, our findings in regard to the traditions of Jesus' teaching accord well with those regarding the narrative traditions. I have no wish to deny the existence of a Q document, any more than to deny the priority of Mark: But again and again in the case of Q/q material we are confronted with traditions within different Synoptics which are clearly related (the same basic teaching), and which were evidently remembered and valued as teaching of Jesus. At the same time, in the cases examined above the relation is not obviously literary, each version derived by editing some literary predecessor. The relation is more obviously to be conceived as happening at the oral level. That could mean that these traditions were known to the Evangelists not in a literary form, but in the living tradition of liturgy or communal celebration of the remembered Jesus. Or it could mean that they knew the tradition from Q, but regarded Q as a form of oral retelling, so that their own retelling retained the oral characteristics of the traditioning process. The two alternatives are not mutually exclusive, of course, but it can hardly be denied that the consequences for the definition of the scope and content of the Q document are considerable. It is important that future Q research should take such considerations on board.

As with the narrative tradition, the sample of teaching tradition examined above seems to confirm the implications drawn from the oral character of its formulation.

---

[125] The Gospel of Thomas has variant traditions of the first and last of the three examples above (Matt. 10.34-36/Luke 12.51-53/GTh 16; Matt. 37-38/Luke 14.26-27/GTh 55, 101 [but with typical Thomas embellishment]; Matt. 22.1-14/Luke 14.16-24/GTh 64); Mark 8.34 also knows a variant version of Matt. 10.38/Luke 14.27/GTh 55.2b, which Matt. 16.24 and Luke 9.23 follow. Whereas in the second example Didache again seems to know Matthew (Did. 15.3; Matt. 18.15-35), as probably does the Gospel of the Nazarenes 15 (Matt. 18.21-22).

[126] Cf. Gerhardsson, 'Illuminating the Kingdom', who concludes that the differences between the parables (narrative meshalim) demonstrate 'deliberate alterations of rather firm texts' (291-8), though the assumption of the literary paradigm should also be noted.

[127] The judgments rendered by the Jesus Seminar on these passages well illustrate the highly dubious criteria and tendentious reasoning by which they reached their conclusions, including: a rather naive idea of consistency (Matt. 10.34-36 seems to 'contradict' Jesus' teaching on unqualified love); Jesus was less likely to echo scripture than the Christian community (reason unexplained); use made of material indicates its originating purpose (Luke 17.3-4 as the reflection of 'a more mature community than is likely to have been the case with Jesus' followers during his lifetime'); the fallacy of 'the original form' (the rationale of the procrustean bed of the literary paradigm) (Funk, *Five Gospels* 174, 216-7, 362, 234-5). But to discuss 'authenticity' by reference simply to such considerations as precise wording, tensions with other sayings and appropriateness to later contexts, totally fails to consider the implications of oral transmission: a saying, like a story, could retain its identity by constancy of theme and particular words or phrases, while at the same time being adapted and reapplied to developing situations in the ongoing life of the earliest churches.

(1) There was teaching of Jesus which had made such an impact on his first hearers that it was recalled, its key emphases crystallized in the overall theme and/or in particular words and phrases, which remained constant in the process of rehearsing and passing on that teaching in disciple gatherings and churches. All of the teaching reviewed would have been important to their identity as disciples and communities of disciples and for the character of their shared life. Such teaching would no doubt have been treasured and meditated upon in the communal gatherings, much as Bailey suggested.

(2) The variations in the reteaching indicate a readiness to group material differently, to adapt or develop it, and to draw further lessons from it, consistent with the tradition of initial impact made by Jesus himself and in the light of the developing circumstances of the churches which treasured the teaching. Once again the point is that the tradition was living tradition, celebrated in the communal gatherings of the earliest churches. There was no concern to recall all the precise words of Jesus; in many cases the precise circumstances in which the teaching was given were irrelevant to its continuing value. But neither is there any indication in the material reviewed that these were sayings interjected into the tradition by prophets or free (literary) creation, or that the development of particular teachings subverted their original impact.[128] These were remembered as teaching given by Jesus while he was still with them, and treasured both as such and because of its continuing importance for their own community life and witness.

4. Oral transmission.

In the light of the above we can begin to sketch in the likely process of traditioning in the case of the Jesus tradition.[129]

4.1 In the beginning, already during Jesus' own ministry, as soon as disciples began to gather round him, we can envisage initial impressions and memories being shared among the group. 'Do you remember how/what he said when he . . .?' must have been a question often asked as the embryonic community began to feel and express its distinctiveness. No doubt in similar ways their village communities had celebrated their identity and history in regular, even nightly gatherings. And as soon as the disciples of Jesus began to perceive themselves as (a) distinctive group(s) we may assume that the same impulse characteristic of oral and village culture would have asserted itself. As Jesus' immediate group moved around Galilee, encountering potential and then resident groups of disciple or sympathisers in various villages, the

---

[128] Draper also argues that the thesis of some of Jesus' sayings 'created entirely de novo . . . conflicts with the processes of oral transmission. Such entirely innovative "words of the Risen Jesus" are inherently unlikely' (Horsley & Draper, *Whoever* 183). Horsley however assumes that prophets would have been responsible for the celebration of the tradition (*Whoever* 300-10) without enquiring what the role of teachers might have been.

[129] B. W. Henaut, *Oral Tradition and the Gospels: The Problem of Mark 4* (JSNTS 82; Sheffield: JSOT, 1993) is tendentiously concerned to argue the virtual impossibility of recovering any oral tradition behind the Gospels: all differences, no matter how great, can be explained in terms of literary redaction; and oral tradition was wholly fluid and contingent on the particularities of each performance. But his conception of the oral tradition process is questionable – as though it was a matter of recovering a history of tradition through a set of sequential performances (e.g. 118; here we see the problem in talking of 'oral transmission' – above $$$); and he gives too little thought to what the stabilities of oral remembrances of Jesus might be as distinct from those in the epics and sagas studied by Parry and Lord.

natural impulse would be the same. We should assume, of course, that Jesus was giving fresh teaching (as well as repeat teaching) all the while. But in more reflective gatherings, or when Jesus was absent, the impulse to tell again what had made the greatest impact on them would presumably reassert itself.

Three features of this initial stage of the process are worth noting. First, if Bailey's anecdotal accounts bring us closer than any other to the oral culture of Galilee in the second quarter of the first century CE, then we may assume that the traditioning process *began* with the initiating word and/or act of Jesus. That is to say, the impact made by Jesus would not be something which was only put into traditional form (days, months or years) later. The impact would include the formation of the tradition to recall what had made that impact; in making its impact the impacting word or event *became* the tradition of that word or event. The stimulus of some word/story, the excitement (wonder, surprise) of some event would be expressed in the initial shared reaction; the structure, the identifying elements and the key words (core or climax) would be put into oral form in the immediate recognition of the significance of what had been said or happened. Thus established more or less immediately, these features would then be the constants, the stable themes which successive retellings could elaborate, round which different performances could build their variations, as judged appropriate in the different circumstances. Subsequently we may imagine a group of disciples meeting and requesting, for example, to hear again about the centurion of Capernaum, or about the widow and the treasury, or what it was that Jesus said about the tunic and the cloak, or about who is greater, or about the brother who sins. In response to which a senior disciple would tell again the appropriate story or teaching in whatever variant words and detail he judged appropriate for the occasion, with sufficient corporate memory ready to protest if one of the key elements was missed out or varied too much. All this is wholly consistent with the character of the data reviewed above.

It also follows, second, that those accustomed to the prevalent individualism of contemporary culture (and faith) need to make a conscious effort to appreciate that the impact made by Jesus in the beginning was not a series of disparate reactions of independent individuals.[130] Were that so we might well wonder how any commonality of tradition could emerge as individuals began to share their memories, perhaps only after a lengthy period; post-modern pluralism would have been rampant from the first! But tradition-forming is a communal process, not least because such tradition is often constitutive of the community as community. As it was a shared experience of the impact made by Jesus which first drew individuals into discipleship, so it was the formulation of these impacts in shared words which no doubt helped bond them together as a community of disciples.

At the same time, we should not ignore an important corollary. The character of the tradition as shared memory means that in many instances we do not know precisely what it was that Jesus did or said. What we have in the Jesus tradition is the consistent and coherent features of the shared impact made by his deeds and words, not the objective deeds and words of Jesus as such. What we have are examples of oral retelling of that shared tradition, retellings which evince the flexibility and elaboration of oral performances. There is surely a Jesus who made such impact, the remembered Jesus, but not an original pure form, not a single

---

[130] Cf. Horsley's scathing critique of Liberalism's focus on the individual and of B. L. Mack's *The Lost Gospel: The Book of Q and Christian Origins* (HarperSanFrancisco, 1993) (Horsley & Draper, *Whoever* 15-22). Crossan also seems to think of oral tradition solely in terms of individuals recollecting - J. D. Crossan, *The Birth of Christianity* (HarperSanFrancisco, 1998) 49-93.

original impact to which the historian has to reach back in each case. The remembered Jesus may be a synthesis of the several impacts made on and disciple responses made by Jesus' earliest witnesses, but the synthesis was already firm in the first flowering of the tradition.

Thirdly, it follows also and is perhaps worth repeating that the traditioning process should not be conceived of as initially casual and only taken seriously by the first disciples in the post-Easter situation. As just implied, community formation was already at an embryonic stage from the first call of Jesus' immediate circle of disciples; 'formative tradition' would have had an indispensable part in that process.[131] In addition, if indeed Jesus did send out his disciples as an extension of his own mission (Mark 6.7-13 pars.),[132] what would they have said when they preached? The implication of the text is clear, and the inference from the fact of a shared mission hard to avoid, that their preaching would have at least included teaching which Jesus had given them. Also that Jesus would have taught them what to say – not in a verbatim mode, but in a mode which would convey the disciple-effecting impact which they themselves had experienced. One way or another, we may be confident that a good deal at least of the retellings of Jesus tradition now in the Synoptic Gospels were already beginning to take shape in any early pre-Easter preaching of the first disciples. [133]

Did Easter and the transition from Galilean village to Hellenistic city, from Aramaic to Greek not make any difference, then? Yes, of course. Easter shaped the perspective within which this first tradition was remembered. The transition from village to city shaped the tradition for changing circumstances. The transition from Aramaic to Greek (already implied by the description of 'Hellenists' = 'Greek-speakers' in Acts 6.1) would introduce the shifts in nuance which any translation involves.[134] But the oral Jesus tradition itself provided the continuity, the living link back to the ministry of Jesus, and it was no doubt treasured for that very reason; the very character of the tradition, retaining as it does so many of its Galilean village[135]

---

[131] Cf. the picture which P. S. Alexander, 'Orality in Pharisaic-Rabbinic Judaism at the Turn of the Eras', in Wansbrough, ed., *Jesus* 159-84, adduces for the disciple-circle round a rabbi in the early tannaitic period forming a small, quasi-religious community, eating communally and with a common purse, being taught by him (166-7), a picture which may not be as anachronistic as might at first appear (182-4).

[132] A strong body of opinion regarding Q sees the earliest stage of its collection/composition (Q^1?) as intended to provide guidance for itinerant missionaries on the pattern of Jesus' own mission; similarly Schürmann, 'vorösterlichen Anfänge'.

[133] The point has been argued by E. E. Ellis on several occasions, most recently in 'The Historical Jesus and the Gospels', in J. Ädna et al., eds., *Evangelium - Schriftauslegung - Kirche*, P. Stuhlmacher FS (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1997) 94-106, reprinted in his *Christ and the Future in New Testament History* (SuppNovT 97; Leiden: Brill, 2000) 3-19; also *The Making of the New Testament Documents* (Leiden: Brill, 1999) 20-27; but he weakens his case by unnecessarily questioning whether there was an initial oral stage of transmission (*Christ* 13-14) and arguing for 'at least some written transmission from the beginning' (*Making* 24), that is, already during Jesus' ministry (*Christ* 15-16; *Making* 32, 352). However his belief that 'literacy was widespread in Palestinian Judaism' (22) is highly questionable (possibly as low as 3 percent – Horsley, in Horsley & Draper, *Whoever* 125-7); and his conception of oral transmission is very restricted to a choice between 'folkloric origin' and the 'controlled and cultivated process' of the rabbinic schools (*Christ* 14-15; he does not know of Bailey).

[134] It is not necessary to assume that the 'Hellenists' only emerged after Easter; there may have been Greek-speaking disciples during Jesus' Galilean and Jerusalem missions (cf. Mark 7.26; John 12.20-22), and traditions already being transposed into Greek.

[135] A repeated emphasis of Horsley & Draper, *Whoever*.

and pre-Easter themes,[136] not to mention its Aramaic resonances (#3.1), makes that point clear enough. Here we may learn from post-modernism's emphasis on both the reader and the tradition. If it is indeed the case that the hearer fills in the 'gaps in signification' from the tradition, that an audience interprets a particular performance from their shared knowledge,[137] then we can be fairly confident that the Jesus tradition was an essential part of that shared knowledge, enabling the hearers in church gatherings to 'plug in' to particular performances of the oral tradition and to exercise some control over its development.

4.2 Tradition sequences. Another questionable assumption which has dominated the discussion since the early form-critics is that in the initial stage of the traditioning process the tradition consisted of individual units.[138] That may indeed have been the case for the very beginning of the process, and the Gospel of Thomas gives it some credibility for the continuing tradition. But there is also good evidence of sayings being grouped and stories linked from what may have been a very early stage of the transmission process – even, in some cases, that Jesus may have taught in connected sequences which have been preserved. To group similar teachings and episodes would be an obvious mnemonic and didactic device for both teachers and taught, storytellers and regular hearers, more or less from the beginning. We may think, for example, of the sequence of beatitudes brought together in oral tradition or Q (Matt. 5.3, 4, 6, 11, 12/Luke 6.20b, 21b, 21a, 22, 23), and elaborated differently by Matthew and Luke (Matt. 5.3-12, Luke 6.20b-26). Or the sequence of mini-parables (the wedding guests, new and old cloth, new and old wineskins) in Mark 2.18-22 (followed by Matt. 9.14-17 and Luke5.33-39). Or Jesus' responses to would-be disciples (Matt. 8.18-22/Luke 9.57-62). Or the sequence of teaching on the cost of discipleship and danger of loss (Mark 8.34-38; again followed by Matt. 16.24-27 and Luke 9.23-26), where Q/oral tradition has also preserved the sayings separately.[139] Similarly with the sequence of sayings about light and judgment in Mark 4.21-25 (followed by Luke 8.16-18), with equivalents scattered in Q and the Gospel of Thomas.[140]

A particularly interesting example of traditional material being grouped because of the inner connectedness of the traditions are the sequences of Jesus' teaching related to his exorcisms.

---

136 See again Schürmann, 'vorösterlichen Anfänge' (above n. 40).

137 Horsley and Draper both draw on the work of J. M. Foley, *Immanent Art: From Structure to Meaning in Traditional Oral Epic* (Bloomington: Indiana University, 1991), also *The Singer of Tales in Performance* (Bloomington: Indiana Univesity, 1995) on this point (*Whoever* 161-4, 182; Foley draws in turn on the literary theory of W. Iser and H. R. Jauss), and make much of the importance of 'metonymic referencing' (elements which evoke a whole theme within the tradition), again in dependence on Foley (*Whoever*, index 'metonymic referencing').

138 Kloppenborg, following in the train of successive form-critical analyses, perceives the composition process as 'the juxtaposition of originally independent units' (*Formation* 98). Funk assumes that 'the imprint of orality' is evident only in 'short, provocative, memorable, oft-repeated phrases, sentences, and stories' – 'a sixth pillar of modern gospel scholarship' (*Five Gospels* 4); 'only sayings that were short, pithy, and memorable were likely to survive' (*Honest* 40). This assumption predetermines that 'the Jesus whom historians seek' will only be found in such brief sayings and stories. He lists 101 words (and deeds) judged to be 'authentic' in his *Honest* 326-35.

139 Matt. 10.38/Luke 14.27; Matt. 10.39/Luke 17.33; Matt. 10.33/Luke 12.9.

140 Matt. 5.15/Luke 11.33/GTh 33.2; Matt. 10.26/Luke 12.2/GTh 5.2, 6.4; Matt. 7.2/Luke 6.38b; Matt. 25.29/Luke 19.26/GTh 41.

Mark	Theme	Q	
3.22-26	Beelzebul	Matt. 12.24-26	Luke 11.15-18
	Finger/Spirit of God	Matt. 12.27-28	Luke 11.19-20
3.27	Strong man	Matt. 12.29	Luke 11.21-22
	He who has ears	Matt. 12.30	Luke 11.23
3.28-29	Unforgivable sin	Matt. 12.31-32	Luke 12.10
	Return of unclean spirit	Matt. 12.43-45	Luke 11.24-26

Here are two sets of sayings, one with three sayings (Mark), the other with five sayings (Q/Luke), of which only two overlap in that sequence. Both the groupings and their diversity typify the process of oral transmission.[141]

Even more fascinating, but almost impossible to set out in tabular form, is the tradition of the sending out of the disciples on mission, where it is evident from Mark 6.7-13 and the parallels in Matt. 9.37-10.1, 7-16, Luke 9.1-6 and Luke 10.1-12 that there were at least two variations, one used by Mark and another oral (Q?) version. The variations make it probable that the material was used and re-used, probably beginning with Jesus' own instructions for mission, but developed and elaborated in terms of subsequent experience of early Christian mission.[142]

As for Q itself, the current growth in Q studies shows amazing confidence in handling a text whose scope and content will always be a matter of argument and hypothesis. How in particular is one to distinguish redaction from (initial) composition?[143] If a redactor was not troubled by the presence of aporiae and tensions in his final text, would an initial compositor of Q have felt any different?[144] How can one both argue for the coherence and unity of Q (as proof of its existence), and at the same time argue that internal tensions indicate disunity, without the one argument throwing the other into question? Textual tensions are no proof of redactional layers (what author ever succeeded in removing all tensions from his/her final product, or attempted to do so?). The point can be pushed further by arguing that Q was itself composed as a sequence of discourses.[145] And the composition of Mark itself can be understood as setting in appropriate sequence a number of groupings already familiar in the oral traditioning process:[146]

---

[141] The fact that the Gospel of Thomas has a parallel only to Mark 3.27/Matt. 12.29 (not Luke 11.21-22 = Q?) (GTh 35) would be consistent with GTh's de-eschatologizing tendencies.

[142] Does the fact that Thomas has only two disjoint parallels (GTh 14.2/Luke 10.8-9; GTh 73/Matt.9.37-38/Luke 10.2) imply a fading of a compulsion to mission?

[143] Note particularly the severe criticisms at this point of C. M. Tuckett, *Q and the History of Early Christianity* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1996) 52-82.

[144] In H. Koester's view the apocalyptic material 'conflicts' with the emphasis of the wisdom and prophetic material (*Ancient Christian Gospels: Their History and Development* [London: SCM/Philadelphia: TPI, 1990] 135). Kloppenborg speaks of 'aporiae created by redactional activity', or of a group of sayings 'modified by the insertion of a secondary expansion or commentary . . .' (*Formation* 97, 99); but that simply begs the question, as Kloppenborg seems to realise (*Formation* 99).

[145] Horsley in Horsley & Draper, *Whoever* 23-4, 61-2, 83-93, 148. This is in effect an extension of a strong trend to recognize 'complexes of logia' or 'collections of aphoristic sayings' behind Q (D. Zeller, *Die weisheitlichen Mahnsprüche bei den Synoptikern* [Forschung zur Bibel 17; Würzburg: Echter, 1977]; R. A. Piper, *Wisdom in the Q-tradition: The Aphoristic Teaching of Jesus* [SNTSMS 61; Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1989]; similarly Kloppenborg, *Formation*).

[146] Cf. particularly, H. W. Kuhn, *Ältere Sammlungen im Markusevangelium* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck, 1971). Worthy of note is Lord's observation that 'Oral traditional composers think in terms of blocks and series of blocks of tradition' ('Gospels' in Walker, ed., *Relationship* 59).

24 hours in the ministry of Jesus	Mark 1.21-38
Jesus in controversy (in Galilee)	Mark 2.1-3.6
Parables of Jesus	Mark 4.2-33
Miracles of Jesus round the lake	Mark 4.35-5.43; 6.32-52
Marriage, children, and discipleship	Mark 10.2-31
Jesus in controversy (in Jerusalem)	Mark 12.13-37
The little apocalypse	Mark 13.1-32
The passion narrative	Mark 14.1-15.47

Of course most of this is unavoidably speculative; even more so if we were to guess at whether and how passages like Mark 4.2-33 (parables of Jesus) and Mark 13.1-32 (the little apocalypse) grew by a process of aggregation from earlier, smaller groupings. The point is that we should not assume that such compositional procedures came into the process only at a later stage of the process or only when the tradition was written down.

4.3 Not layers but performances. One of the most important conclusions to emerge from this review of the oral character of so much of the Jesus tradition, and of the likely processes of oral transmission, is that the perspective which has dominated the study of the history of Synoptic tradition is simply wrong-headed. Bultmann set out the playing field by conceiving of the Jesus tradition as 'composed of a series of layers'.[147] The consequence of this literary paradigm was that each retelling of episodes or parts of the Jesus tradition was bound to be conceived on the analogy of an editor editing a literary text. Each retelling was like a new (edited) edition. And so the impression of each retelling as another layer superimposed upon earlier layers became almost inescapable, especially when the literary imagery was integrated with the archaeological image of the ancient tell, where research proceeds by digging down through the historical layers.[148] The consequence has been widespread disillusion at the prospect of ever being able successfully to strip off the successive layers of editing to leave some primary layer exposed clearly to view. Equally inevitable from such a perspective was the suspicion and scepticism met by any bold enough to claim that they had been successful in their literary archaeology and had actually uncovered a large area of Jesus' bedrock teaching.

But the imagery is simply inappropriate. An oral retelling of a tradition is not at all like a new literary edition. It has not worked on or from a previous retelling. How could it? The previous retelling was not 'there' as a text to be consulted. And in the retelling in turn the retold tradition did not come into existence as a kind of artefact, to be examined as by an editor and re-edited for the next retelling. In oral transmission a tradition is performed, not edited. And as we have seen, performance includes both elements of stability and elements of variability – stability of subject and theme, of key details or core exchanges, variability in the supporting details and the particular emphases to be drawn out. That is a very different perspective. And it allows, indeed requires rather different conclusions. These include the likelihood that the stabilities of the tradition were sufficiently maintained and the variabilities of the retellings subject to sufficient control for the substance of the tradition, and often actual words of Jesus which made the first tradition-forming impact, to continue as integral parts of the living tradition, for at least as long as it took for the Synoptic tradition to be written down. In other words, whereas the concept of literary layers

147 Bultmann, *Jesus* 12-13.

148 As again by Crossan in his talk of 'scientific stratigraphy' (*Historical Jesus* xxviii, xxxi-xxxii). Funk also envisages 'the historical Jesus' being 'uncovered by historical excavation' (*Five Gospels* 3).

implies increasing remoteness from an 'original', 'pure' or 'authentic' layer, the concept of performance allows a directness, even an immediacy of interaction with a living theme and core even when variously embroidered in various retellings.[149]

The concept of oral transmission, as illustrated from the Synoptic tradition itself, therefore, does not encourage either the scepticism which has come to afflict the 'quest of the historical Jesus' or the lop-sided findings of the neo-Liberal questers. Rather it points a clear middle way between a model of parrot-like memorization on the one hand, and any impression of oral transmission as a series of evanescent reminiscences of some or several retellings on the other. It encourages neither those who are content with nothing short of the historicity of every detail and word of the text, nor those who can see and hear nothing other than the faith of the early churches. It encourages us rather to see and hear the Synoptic tradition as the repertoire of the early churches when they recalled the Jesus who had called their first leaders and predecessors to discipleship and celebrated again the powerful impact of his life and teaching.

4.4 Oral tradition to written Gospel. We need not follow the course of oral transmission beyond the transition from oral tradition to written Gospel. The significance of that transition can be exaggerated, as we noted above in reviewing the work of Kelber (#1.4): Jesus tradition did not cease to circulate in oral form simply because it had been written down; and hearings of a Gospel being read would be part of the oral/aural transmission, to be retold in further circles of orality.[150] But there are two other aspects, misleading impressions or unexamined assumptions, which have encouraged false perspectives on the subject and which should be highlighted here.

One is the impression that the oral Jesus tradition was like two (or several) narrow streams which were wholly absorbed into the written Gospels through their sources. So much of the focus in Gospel research has been on the question of sources for the Gospels that it has been natural, I suppose, for oral tradition to be conceived simply as source material for the Gospels, without any real attempt being made to conceptualize what oral communities were like and how the oral tradition functioned prior to and independently of written collections and Gospels. As already noted, some narrative criticism and some discussions of Synoptic pericopes at times almost seem to assume that when a copy of Mark or Matthew or Luke was initially received by any church, that was the first time the church had heard the Jesus tradition contained therein. But this is to ignore, or forget one of the key insights of form-criticism in the beginning - that is, the recognition that the tradition took various forms because the forms reflected the way the tradition was used in the first churches. In fact, it is almost self-evident that the Synoptists proceeded by gathering and ordering Jesus tradition which had already been in circulation, that is, had already been well enough known to various churches, for at least some years if not decades.

---

[149] I have struggled to find a suitable image to replace that of layers (edited editions), and played with the model of forms somewhat like space satellites circling round the remembered Jesus, with the forms of the 60s and 70s not necessarily further from Jesus than those of the 40s and 50s. The image is not very good, but it can be elaborated to depict John's Gospel as on a higher orbit, or to include the possibility of forms drifting out of the gravity of the remembered Jesus, or being caught by a countervailing gravity. The earlier image of a trajectory could be fitted to this also - e.g., Q material on a trajectory leading to the Gospel of Thomas no longer held within the original gravity field.

[150] This point was already being made by H. Koester in his first monograph – *Synoptische Überlieferung bei den apostolischen Vätern* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1957).

Where else did the Evangelists find the tradition? Stored up, unused, in an old box at the back of some teacher's house? Stored up, unrehearsed, in the failing memory of an old apostle? Hardly! On the contrary, it is much more likely that when the Synoptics were first received by various churches, these churches *already* possessed (in communal oral memory or in written form) their own versions of much of the material. They would be able to compare the Evangelist's version of much of the tradition with their own versions. As we have seen above, the divergences between different versions of the Synoptic tradition imply a lively and flexible oral tradition known to the Evangelists and presumably also to the churches with which they were associated.

This line of thought links in to the other assumption which has become debilitatingly pervasive: that each document belongs to and represents the views of only one community, and that the tensions within and between documents indicate rival camps and already different Christianities. The assumption derives again from the first insights of form-criticism: that the forms of the tradition reflect the interests of the churches which used them. This was reinforced by the sociological perspective of the final quarter of the 20th century: literature as the expression not so much of a single mind as of a social context. But these insights have been narrowed (and distorted) in a quite extraordinary way, to claim in effect that each text was written by and for a particular community – a Q community, a Mark community, a Matthean community, and so on.[151] The assumption is that Q, for example, somehow *defines* its community: it is a 'Q community' in the sense that the Q material is its *only* Jesus tradition; it holds to this material in distinction from (defiance of?) other communities who are similarly defined by their document (the logic would be to suppose a 'passion narrative' community, a miracles-source community, and then a Mark community, etc.).[152] But the assumption must cover also the streams of tradition which entered into the Gospels. The implication, in other words, is of differing and conflicting streams of tradition more or less from the first, celebrating in effect different Jesuses – a prophetic and/or apocalyptic Jesus, Jesus the wisdom teacher, the Jesus of aretologies (divine man), and so on.[153]

---

[151] R. Bauckham, 'For Whom Were the Gospels Written?', in R. Bauckham, ed., *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), provides a number of examples (13-22). He suspects that 'those who no longer think it possible to use the Gospels to reconstruct the historical Jesus compensate for this loss by using them to reconstruct the communities that produced the Gospels' (20). See also S. C. Barton's strictures in the same volume ('Can We Identify the Gospel Audiences?', *Gospels for All* 173-94) on the use of 'community' and on our ability to identify beyond generalizations the social context in which the Gospels were written.

[152] Kloppenborg, *Formation* 25; 'Q represents a theologically autonomous sphere of Christian theology' (27), 'a discrete group in which Q functioned as the central theological expression' (39). Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*: 'Both documents (Gospel of Thomas and Q) presuppose that Jesus' significance lay in his words, *and in his words alone*' (86 my emphasis).

[153] Cf. particularly Koester, 'One Jesus and Four Primitive Gospels'; also 'The Structure and Criteria of Early Christian Beliefs', in Robinson & Koester, *Trajectories* 205-31; Lührmann, *Redaktion* 95-6; Mack, *Myth* 83-97. Koester's reflections on 'The Historical Jesus and the Historical Situation of the Quest: An Epilogue', in Chilton & Evans, eds., *Studying the Historical Jesus* 535-45, indicates how dubious the reasoning has become. (1) 'The history of Christian beginnings *demonstrates* that it was most effective to establish and to nurture the community of the new age without any recourse to the life and work of Jesus of Nazareth' ('Historical Jesus' 535 my emphasis). *Assumption*: 'the community of the new age' did not know or value any Jesus tradition. (2) 'There were followers of Jesus, who were not included in the circle of those churches for which the central ritual and the story of Jesus' suffering and death was the unifying principle. Instead, they believed that their salvation was mediated through the words of wisdom that Jesus had spoken. In the Synoptic Sayings Source a community appears that had combined this belief in Jesus with the expectation of his return as the Son

Richard Bauckham has recently challenged this assumption with regard to the written Gospels. His counter-thesis is that 'the Gospels were written for general circulation around the churches and so envisaged a very general Christian audience. Their implied readership is not specific but indefinite: any and every Christian community in the late-first-century Roman Empire'.[154] The claim may be too exaggerated (for *all* Christians?), though we should not discount the likelihood that Evangelists wrote out of their more local experience primarily with a view to a much larger circles of churches, in Syria-Cilicia, for example. And Bauckham needs to give more weight to the likelihood that particular communities were the Evangelist's *source* for Jesus tradition, as distinct from communities as the Evangelist's *target* in writing his Gospel. But he is justified in dismissing the idea that the Evangelist would have written his Gospel for the community in which he lived.[155]

The point here, however, is that Bauckham is certainly correct to highlight the evidence that the first churches were by no means as isolated from one another and at odds with one another as has been so often assumed. If Paul's letters (and Acts) are any guide, the first churches consisted rather of 'a network of communities in constant communication', linked by messengers, letters and visits by leading figures in the new movement.[156] This ties in with what we would anyway have expected: that church founding included the initial communication of foundation tradition; and that Paul could assume common tradition, including knowledge of Jesus tradition, even in a church which he had never previously visited (Rome). And though there were indeed severe tensions between Paul and the Jerusalem leadership, Paul still regarded the lines of continuity between the churches in Judea and those of the Gentile mission as a matter of first importance (Gal. 1.22; 1 Thess. 2.14; 2 Cor. 1.16). In short, the suggestion that there were churches who knew only one stream of tradition – Jesus only as a miracle worker, or only as a wisdom teacher, etc. – has been given far too much uncritical credence in scholarly discussions on the Gospels and ought to have been dismissed a lot sooner.

5. In summary

We began by noting the widespread recognition among specialists in orality of the character of oral transmission, as a mix of constant themes and flexibility, of fixed and variable elements in oral retelling. But we also noted that such insights had hardly begun to be exploited adequately in the treatment of Jesus tradition as oral tradition. However, Bailey's observations, drawn from his experience of oral

---

of Man' ('Historical Jesus' 537). *Assumptions*: one document per church; silence regarding means ignorance of means opposition to; differing emphases are irreconcilable in a single document. (3) Some of those addressed in 1 Corinthians seem to have understood Jesus' sayings 'as the saving message of a great wisdom teacher'; the earliest compositional strata of Q seems to have understood 'Jesus' words of wisdom as a revelation providing life and freedom' ('Historical Jesus' 540). *Assumptions*: Corinthian 'wisdom' was based on Jesus' teaching, and implies a christology; 1 Cor. 1-4 requires more than a rhetorical and socio-political understanding of that wisdom; Q wisdom was soteriological rather than paraenetic.

[154] Bauckham, 'For Whom?' 1.

[155] Bauckham, 'For Whom?' 28-30; 'Why should he go to the considerable trouble of writing a Gospel for a community to which he was regularly preaching?' (29).

[156] Bauckham, 'For Whom' 30-44; also M. B. Thompson, 'The Holy Internet: Communication Between Churches in the First Christian Generation', in Bauckham, ed., *Gospels* 49-70. Bauckham justifiably asks, 'Why do scholars so readily assume that the author of a Gospel would be someone who had spent all his Christian life attached to the same Christian community' (36).

traditioning processes in Middle Eastern village life, have highlighted points of potential importance, particularly on the rationale which, in the cases in point, determined the distinction between the more fixed elements and constant themes on the one hand, and the flexible and variable elements on the other. Where stories or teaching was important for the community's identity and life there would be a concern to maintain the core or key features, however varied other details (less important to the story's or teaching's point) in successive retellings.

Our own examination, (##2-3), of the Jesus tradition itself confirmed the relevance of the oral paradigm and the danger of assuming (consciously or otherwise) the literary paradigm. The findings did not call into serious question the priority of Mark or the existence of a document Q. But in each of the examples marshalled the degree of variation between clearly parallel traditions, and the inconsequential character of so much of the variations, should hardly have encouraged an explanation in terms of literary dependence (on Mark or Q) or of literary editing. Whereas, the combination of stability and flexibility positively cried out to be recognized as typically oral in character. That probably implies in at least some cases that the variation was due to knowledge and use of the same tradition in oral mode, as part of the community tradition familiar to Matthew and Luke. And even if a pericope was derived from Mark or Q, the retelling by Matthew or Luke is itself better described as in oral mode, maintaining the character of an oral retelling more than of a literary editing.

In both cases (narratives and teachings) we also noted (1) a concern to remember the things Jesus had done and said. The discipleship and embryonic communities which had been formed and shaped by the impact of Jesus' life and message would naturally have celebrated that tradition as central to their own identity as disciples and churches. We noted also (2) that the memories consisted in stories and teachings whose own identity was focused in particular themes and/or particular words and phrases – usually those said by Jesus himself. And (3) that the variations and developments were not linear or cumulative in character, but the variations of oral performance. The material examined indicated neither concern to preserve some kind of literalistic historicity of detail, nor any readiness to flood the tradition with Jewish wisdom or prophetic utterance.

Finally (#4), we have observed that the pattern of the oral traditioning process was probably established more or less from the beginning (before the first Easter) and was probably maintained in character through to (and beyond) the writing of the tradition down. The first impact (sequence of impacts) made by Jesus resulted in the formation of tradition, which was itself formative and constitutive of community/church through Easter and beyond Galilee, and which was preserved and celebrated through regular performance (whether in communal or specifically liturgical gatherings), or reviewed for apologetic or catechetical purposes. In other words, what we today are confronted with in the Gospels is not the top layer (last edition) of a series of increasingly impenetrable layers, but the living tradition of Christian celebration which takes us with surprising immediacy to the heart of the first memories of Jesus.

On the basis of all this we can begin to build a portrayal of the remembered Jesus, of the impact made by his words and deeds on the first disciples as that impact was 'translated' into oral tradition and as it was passed down in oral performance within the earliest circles of disciples and the churches, to be enshrined in due course in the written Synoptic tradition.

The Politics of Contempt: Judaeans and Egyptians in Josephus' *Against Apion*

John M.G. Barclay, University of Glasgow

I. Introduction

Among the literary monuments of Roman imperialism, there are none more skilfully crafted than Vergil's depiction of Aeneas' shield in Aeneid book 8 (626-731). At the climax of this celebration of Roman history stands the battle of Actium (671-728) in which Caesar (Octavian), supported by the Italians, the Senate and the people, is opposed by Anthony, whose 'barbarian' resources are symbolised by his shockingly 'Egyptian' wife: *sequiturque (nefas) Aegyptia coniunx* (688). The fact that Cleopatra was in truth of pure Macedonian descent does not deter the propagandist: as queen of Egypt she is 'Egyptian' and summons the troops with her native *sistrum* (696). Octavian's victory thus represents the triumph of Roman civilisation against the barbarian East, a contrast whose profundity is clear in its religious dimension: here religious monstrosity - the Egyptian animal cults - confronts the sanity and familiarity of the Roman deities: *omnigenumque deum monstra et latrator Anubis / contra Neptunum et Venerem contraque Minervam / tela tenent* (698-700).[1] The poetry is exquisitely carved in the language of contempt: Egypt's religion, as well as her terrain, her populace and her dignity, are crushed by Roman superiority.

[1] 'Barking Anubis, a whole progeny of grotesque deities are embattled against Neptune and Minerva and Venus' (trans. C. Day Lewis). The translations of Against Apion given below are my own.

Vergil's scorn for the troublesome but defeated foreigner represents a deep vein of Roman xenophobia which borders on racism. If the only good Egyptian is one subject to the sobering and civilising influence of Roman power, the same may be said of Gauls, Judaeans, Syrians and many others. Cicero could count on such prejudices in a Roman jury when he needed to discredit foreign witnesses: 'is any of the most honourable natives of Gaul to be set on the same level with even the meanest citizen of Rome?' (Pro Fonteio 27). Here too, political or military resistance to Rome is twinned with outrageous religion. These Gauls who once threatened the city of Rome, who have 'repeatedly attacked this city and its empire' (35), are notorious, Cicero claims, for their 'monstrous and barbarous custom of sacrificing humans' (31). Who can trust their oaths by the immortal Gods when their barbarity renders them so contrary to all humanity? 'Other nations wage war in defence of their religion; they do so against the religion of every people' (30).

Military superiority and religious disdain forge a powerful circularity which is all but mentally unassailable: just as Roman success is proof of her greater piety, so the crushing of nations which have the effrontery to challenge her might demonstrates their gross or pathetic contrariety to all religious decency. The same nexus is easily employed to discredit Judaeans. Cicero overturns Judaean complaints against Flaccus simply enough by reference to Pompey's victory in Jerusalem. Even when there was peace, Judaean religion was at variance with 'the glory of our empire, the dignity of our name.' But 'now it has shown by its armed resistance what it thinks of our rule' and the result indicates how little the Gods care for them (Pro Flacco 69). The same logic undergirds Tacitus' disdain more than 150 years later: the Judaean Revolt is consistent with the fact that 'they regard as profane all that we hold sacred; on the other hand they permit all that we abhor' (Histories 5.4.1).

From this political perspective the 'otherness' of Judaean religious tradition is nothing but outright hostility, their indigenous customs simply 'depraved'.

The arrogance of this imperial ideology did not usually necessitate cultural suppression. Native rites could be tolerated, even imitated and admired, on their own territory or by individual Romans. The famous cultural and religious 'tolerance' of the Roman empire, and the complex cultural negotiations which took place in the processes of 'Romanisation', witness to a political pragmatism which continually assessed what was, and what was not, a threat to Roman power. But the ideology which maintained that power was never seriously threatened by fads for Egyptian or Judaean customs or even by their subtle incorporation into the 'Roman' way of life: when politically expedient or militarily necessary the Roman élite could draw on a deep cultural and religious contempt for the nations they had benevolently 'pacified'.[2]

We possess understandably few remnants of the ways in which subject nations responded to such Roman disdain. In most cases only the ambiguous witness of material culture gives us access to the voices of the colonised. All the more precious, therefore, is Josephus' Against Apion, where a knowledgeable spokesman for the Judaean tradition is bold enough to answer back to his cultural critics and skilful enough to do so in terms calculated to win Roman attention. In this essay I wish to explore one facet of Josephus' apologetic, a strategy which simultaneously exploits and counters Roman contempt for her subjects. In observing how Josephus deploys Roman stereotypes of Egyptians I hope to unearth some facets of his rhetorical

[2] Earlier studies of Roman imperialism (e.g. A.N. Sherwin-White, Racial Prejudice in Imperial Rome, Cambridge: CUP, 1967) are now increasingly supplemented by the perspectives of post-colonial theory (e.g. D.J. Mattingly [ed.], Dialogues in Roman Imperialism, Portsmouth, R.I.: Journal of Roman Archaeology, 1997).

strategy and to illuminate thereby the cultural and political stance he adopts in re-presenting the Judaeans to his Roman or Romanised readers.[3]

II. Egyptians and Judaeans in *Against Apion* [4]

An overview of Against Apion reveals Josephus' varied deployment of the category 'Egyptian' in accordance with the differing aims of his rhetoric. For his opening gambit (1.6-56), in which he subverts the appeal to 'famous Greek historians' and their damaging lack of reference to Judaeans, it suits Josephus to divide ancient historiography into two camps. On the one side lie Greeks, whose lack of ancient records and endemic disagreements disqualify their historiographical pretensions; on the other are 'Egyptians, Chaldaeans and Phoenicians', with whom Josephus aligns Judaeans, whose antiquity and care for the preservation of ancient records is legendary (1.8-14, 28-29). This division into 'Greek' and 'barbarian' historiography (1.58) is a massive over-simplification, but it enables Josephus to gain from the prestige of others' acknowledged antiquity and, in particular, from the famous preservation of records in Egypt.[5] Whatever they thought about contemporary Egyptians, the Roman reading public were inclined to respect the marvellous antiquity of

[3] I have outlined some reasons to interpret Josephus' strategy and readership along such lines in 'Judaism in Roman Dress', in J.U. Kalms, F. Siegert (eds.), Internationales Josephus-Kolloquium Aarhus 1999, Münster: LIT, 2000. Of course, both Roman opinions on Judaeans and many of Josephus' counter-strategies had their roots in the Hellenistic era, but I am convinced that Josephus' apology is also closely related to his own historical and political context.

[4] I share several observations here with K. Bertholet's paper, 'Josephus' use of Graeco-Roman stereotypes on the Egyptians', to be published in the Josephus-Kolloquium volume cited in the previous note.

[5] The extreme antiquity of Egyptian records had been a topos since Herodotus (2.100); Cicero, De Re Publica 3.14 shows its continuing influence in Roman discourse.

records housed in Egyptian temples, and Josephus is eager to let that prestige across to the less recognised terrain of the Judaean scriptures.

The nations singled out for this respect are the ones whose records Josephus will use in 1.69-160 for their witness to Judaean antiquity. For this purpose it is important that the ancient Egyptians be credited, since Josephus needs Manetho to be unimpeachable: the Hyksos story, which Josephus presses into his service (1.73-104), is validated as a translation from the 'sacred records' (1.73). Josephus' position is awkward, however, since Manetho also supplies the first example of the 'Egyptian slanders' which he will set himself to combat in 1.219-2.144. Hence the effort which Josephus expends on keeping the two Manetho stories apart, separated not only by a large section of text but also by a heavily reinforced distinction between sources: when Manetho demonstrated Judaean antiquity he was drawing on ancient Egyptian writings, but when he talked about the departure of the lepers he was following 'anonymous fables' (1.105, repeated in 1.228-29 and 1.287). The distinction is almost certainly artificial: whatever the mixture of sources from which Manetho drew, there are as many legendary elements in the Hyksos story as in that about the lepers, and the two obviously belonged together in Manetho's narrative (despite Josephus' claim in 1.230-32). But since the one story is to be affirmed and the other repudiated, the first is validated by its origin in the Egyptian ancient records, the other traced to untrustworthy legend, whose falsity is attributable to Egyptian hate (1.287).

It is significant that when he turns to this new section of his work (1.219-2.144) Josephus dubs all his opponents as 'Egyptian' either by origin or by orientation: 'It was Egyptians who began the libels directed against us, and certain people who wanted to gratify them attempted to twist the truth' (2.223). The identity and motivation of these others who 'wanted to gratify'

the Egyptians is left deliberately vague: Josephus clearly hopes by this means to sweep into the 'Egyptian' category not only Manetho and Chaeremon, whose ethnicity probably was Egyptian, and not only Apion, whom he will falsely represent as such, but also Lysimachus and even perhaps Apollonius Molon (see below, section IV). In any case, 1.223 marks the transition from a positive to a negative stereotype of Egyptians, signalled immediately by abuse of their 'stupid' religion (1.224-25). From this point on, the label 'Egyptian' is uniformly dirty and, in a rhetorical climax, gleefully stuck all over the testimony of Apion. By the time he has finished with him (with his gruesome and somewhat 'Egyptian' death, 2.142-44), Josephus has finished with the Egyptian strategy altogether: it plays no part in his encomium for the Judaean constitution in 2.145ff. Like any skilled orator, Josephus has selected and manipulated ethnic stereotypes to suit his argumentation, allowing as little interference as possible between positive and negative images. 'Egyptian' is malleable enough to serve his rhetoric in various ways.[6]

It is noticeable, however, that wherever he positions Judaeans in relation to Egyptians, as historiographical allies or religious foes, Josephus insists on one point: whatever else Judaeans are, they are not Egyptian by origin. The prominence of this theme is not so clearly signalled in the preface to the work (1.1-5) as one might expect: although Josephus there asserts that he has previously established both the antiquity of the Judaean nation and its own original nature (1.1), it is the antiquity topic alone which he signals as presently contested (1.2-3), and which is the theme of the historiographical

[6] The one cross-over of positive and negative stereotypes occurs in 2.140-41 where Josephus needs wise and pious Egyptian priests to establish Apion's wicked abandonment of his 'native' traditions. Josephus would not wish us to consider what cultic functions these priests might serve. The label 'Greek' is also used with varying valence in Against Apion, and the only unambiguously positive labels are, significantly, 'Judaean', 'Chaldaean' and 'Roman'.

debate (1.6-56) and of the various witnesses in 1.69-218 (e.g., 1.59, 69, 93, 215, 217). Nonetheless, when he summarises his achievements at the end of the work (2.287-92), Josephus places as much emphasis on his refutation of false claims that the Judaeans' ancestors were Egyptian as on the proof that they were ancient (2.288-89), and this accurately reflects the fact that the issue of Jewish non-Egyptian ancestry had emerged repeatedly throughout the treatise.

It is striking, for instance, that when Josephus summarises what can be learned from Manetho, who had been introduced to prove Judaean antiquity (1.69, 93), the first conclusion drawn is that 'we came to Egypt from elsewhere' (1.104; cf. 1.228). As this reference shows, Josephus is willing to endorse (or create) a preposterous identification between the Hyksos and the Israelites: he quotes Manetho's derogatory account of the Hyksos' reign of terror (1.75-90) without apology or correction, since this 'proves' not only the Judaeans' antiquity but also, and equally importantly, their foreign origin. Manetho's reference to 'some people of an obscure race from eastern parts' (1.75) will serve Josephus' purposes well enough - even his speculation that they were Arabs (1.82) - just so long as this story, certified by the Egyptian records, makes clear that 'we are not Egyptian'. In fact, Josephus insists on this point when discussing Manetho's leper-story no less that five times (1.228-29, 252-53, 270, 278, and 279-86 re Moses); it appears that what he fears most is not just the association of Jews with lepers but also, and in particular, the association with Egyptian lepers. He cannot allow any such 'mixing' (1.229, 253, 278).

The same concern recurs throughout Josephus' response to Chaeremon, Lysimachus and Apion. Josephus' reply to Chaeremon puts greatest emphasis on questions of identity: 'The absolute gem is this: he has not said who these

large numbers of soldiers were [the 380,000 at Pelusium], and where they were from - whether they were of Egyptian descent or had come from elsewhere' (1.298). Similarly 'the most remarkable thing is one cannot discover from him whom he calls "Judaeans" ' (1.302). The same issue arises with regard to Lysimachus, who had apparently labelled those who suffered leprosy and scabies 'Judaeans' (1.305). Who are these people?, Josephus asks: 'were they foreign or native by descent? So why, if they were Egyptians, do you call them Judaeans? And if they were foreigners, why do you not say where they came from?' (1.314; cf. 316 re Moses).

By the time he gets to Apion, the exodus-theme is just about done to death, but Josephus still reminds his readers that 'our fathers were neither Egyptian by descent nor expelled from there due to physical disfigurement or any other such misfortune' (2.8, cf. 2.28, 122). It seems as if Josephus has read these accounts of the leper-exodus with as much concern about the confusion of 'Judaean' and 'Egyptian' as about the attribution of sacrilege, God-forsakenness and impurity. His rhetoric displays an almost frantic concern to place as clear a distinction as possible between 'Egyptian' and 'Judaean'. The expression 'Egyptian Judaeans' which he had allowed himself to use in War 1.190 would have been disastrous here!

We are entitled to ask why Josephus adopts this stance with such rigour. It does not seem sufficient to reply that this is because the biblical records (for him 'the truth') stood against this. There are many things in the biblical record which he does not bother to defend here, and, as we have noted, many features in Manetho's story about the Hyksos which contradict the biblical account concerning the identity of the Hebrews and their sojourn in Egypt. Yet Josephus happily endorses Manetho's Hyksos story, just as he somewhat absurdly accepts Choerilus' account of the tonsured Solymi as a

reference to inhabitants of Jerusalem (1.172-75). Thus rhetorical strategy, and not just biblical authorisation, determines what Josephus will or will not accept, and his repeated insistence that Judaeans are not Egyptians must have more at stake than simply its discord with the biblical account. In fact, he makes no effort here to establish a counter-claim that the Judaeans had Chaldaean ancestry; the point is mentioned once (1.71) but never argued (cf. Antiquities 1.158-60). All the emphasis falls on the negative point: whatever they were, they were not Egyptian. It seems he had a formidable presumption to negate and a large strategic investment in destroying it.

III. The Popular Association of Judaeans and Egyptians

A broad range of evidence suggests that it was very commonly believed in the Hellenistic-Roman era that the Judaeans were originally of Egyptian stock. While Tacitus lists a number of different theories about Judaean origins (Histories 5.2-3), two out of the six listed concern an element of the Egyptian population migrating to Judaea, either voluntarily or by expulsion (5.2.2; 5.3); indeed, he indicates that in his day 'most authors' followed some version of the leper-expulsion narrative (5.3.1). In fact, if we survey other authors, it is clear that there were at least three ethnographical models which traced the Judaean nation to its roots in Egypt. In one model, the Judaeans are depicted as an Egyptian colony;[7] in a second, an exodus from Egypt is led by Hierosolymus and Juda (in some versions with Typhonian associations);[8] in a

[7] This model takes its inspiration from Herodotus' link between Egyptian circumcision and the 'Syrians in Palestine' (2.104), and is found in Diodorus 1.28, 55 (possibly derived from Hecataeus), in Strabo 18.2.5 (cf. Strabo apud Josephus, Ant 14.118) and in Celsus apud Origen, Contra Celsum 1.22; 3.5-6; 4.31; 5.41. Strabo also has a different version (16.2.34-39), in which circumcision is a later degradation; but that account is otherwise similar to this tradition, with no reference to a plague.

[8] Tacitus, Histories 5.2.2; Plutarch, Isis and Osiris 31 (363 c-d).

third, there is an expulsion or voluntary exodus led by Moses, typically associated with a plague and the divinely ordained removal of diseased or accursed inhabitants of Egypt. This last version is the one best known to us, both from Tacitus' full account and from the variant versions which Josephus cites from Manetho, Chaeremon and Lysimachus; it is also evident in varied forms in Diodorus (following Hecataeus) and Pompeius Trogus, and appears to have been utilised by Apion.[9] But the notion of the Judaeans as Egyptian colonists, who left Egypt as a surplus population or in revolt against Egyptian religious practices, was also of widespread currency, so one did not have to adopt the 'leper' story to think the Judaeans originally Egyptian. Even those who associated Judaeans with other points of origin ('the east', for example, or Damascus) seem to have linked up such accounts to one or another version of the Egyptian exodus, thus reinforcing the popular conception that the Judaeans were really (that is, by origin) a variant, rebellious or polluted offshoot of the Egyptian race.[10]

The popularity of this linkage to Egypt, and of its multiple narrative versions, can be easily explained: it made excellent aetiological sense. Just as the Judaeans attributed the Passover, Unleavened Bread, the leadership of Moses and the giving of the law to the circumstances and aftermath of their escape from Egypt, so Greek and Roman authors gave historical explanations for the distinctive customs of the Judaeans. Why, for instance, did Judaeans

[9] Tacitus, Histories 5.3; Manetho apud Josephus, Against Apion 1.227-250; Chaeremon apud Josephus, Against Apion 1.288-92; Lysimachus apud Josephus, Against Apion 1.304-11. In Diodorus 40.3 (derived from Hecataeus) the Judaeans are already 'foreigners' who are expelled because of a plague, but not themselves diseased; in another account (34/35.1.1-2) they are lepers and accursed. Pompeius Trogus (apud Justinus 36.2) has the Judaeans originate in Damascus, but also expelled from Egypt because of a plague. Apion probably followed some such account as we find in Chaeremon and Lysimachus (see Against Apion 1.122) though he supplemented the 'disease' element with the groin-tumours suffered in the desert (2.20-27).

[10] Thus Manetho and Pompeius Trogus, cited above.

observe the seventh-day rest? A narrative explanation could easily be found: they crossed the desert from Egypt in six days and rested from their exertions on the seventh.[11] Why were they somewhat unsociable in their habits? Because they had suffered the hostility of others in their expulsion from Egypt and learnt to trust no-one else.[12] Why was their religion aniconic and monotheistic? Obviously in reaction to the Egyptian animal cults and the multiplicity of deities they had grown up with in Egypt.[13] Why did they observe fasts? Because of their hunger in the desert.[14] Why were they so devoted to Moses? Because they had sworn an oath of undying loyalty as he led them out of Egypt.[15] Why did they worship an ass? Because an ass showed them the way to a spring as they struggled across the desert.[16] The list could go on, but is long enough already to indicate how readily the popular imagination could link known or imagined, but puzzling, Judaean characteristics with some element or other of the exodus drama. If the aetiologies look to us extraordinarily simplistic, that simplicity is what made them so attractive. Tacitus' heavy use of this mode of explanation indicates that he could rely on such aetiologies being taken seriously in élite circles.

The evidence suggests, in fact, that two of the most widely known Judaean peculiarities - circumcision and food-abstentions - served to link them in the popular imagination with Egypt. Circumcision, that self-disfigurement

---

[11] Apion in Against Apion 2.20-27; Tacitus, Histories 5.4.3; Pompeius Trogus (Justinus 36.2.14) refers to a seven-day fast in the desert; Plutarch, Isis and Osiris 31 (363 c-d) mentions a seven-day flight.

[12] Hecataeus in Diodorus 40.3; Manetho in Against Apion 1.239; Lysimachus in Against Apion 1.309; Pompeius Trogus in Justinus, Epitome 2.15; Diodorus 34/35 1.1-2.

[13] Diodorus (following Hecataeus) 40.3.4; Strabo 16.2.35; Celsus apud Origen, Contra Celsum 1.23-24; 3.5.

[14] Tacitus, Histories 5.4.3; Lysimachus apud Against Apion 1.308.

[15] Moses' leadership is emphasised in nearly all the accounts; the loyalty motif is stressed by, for instance, Manetho (apud Against Apion 1.238) and Tacitus (Histories 5.4.1).

[16] Tacitus, Histories 5.3.2; 5.4.2; Plutarch, Quaest Conviv 4.5.2 (670d-e).

which amused or shocked both Greeks and Romans, was widely known to be a Judaean habit, but also one observed by Egyptians, or at least by Egyptian priests. Herodotus' claim that the Colchians, Phoenicians and 'Syrians in Palestine' (2.104) had learned this practice from the Egyptians (2.104) all but invited the application to Judaeans. In accordance with the current diffusionist theories of culture, it was widely believed that the Judaeans had inherited or borrowed this custom from the Egyptians: Hecataeus (?), Diodorus, Strabo, Celsus and even Philo follow this line of thought.[17] Indeed, Josephus, who is anxious to find notable Greek witnesses to Judaeans, thinks Herodotus was actually referring to Judaeans, and thus is forced to agree with him that the 'Syrians in Palestine' (for Josephus, the Judaeans) learnt this custom from Egypt (Against Apion 1.168-71).[18] He also uses the commonality of circumcision between Judaeans and Egyptian priests as evidence with which to indict Apion (2.141-44). By so doing, he bears testimony to, and unwittingly reinforces, the common perception of 'Judaeans as Egyptians'.

Judaean food-abstentions strengthened the association. Those who read Herodotus (2.47-48) knew that Egyptians would not sacrifice a pig (except at the full moon), so it was easy to link Jewish abstention from pork with Egyptian scruples.[19] In fact, since these were the only two nations known to

---

[17] See above note 6; Philo, Spec Leg 1.2 admits circumcision is shared with Egyptians, but not that it is borrowed from them. For the Egyptian habit (variously ascribed to all Egyptians, or just to priests) see, e.g., Diodorus 1.28.3 (all Egyptians) and Athenaeus, Deipnosophistae 299f (priests); cf. A. Burton, Diodorus Siculus, Book 1. A Commentary, Leiden: Brill, 1972, 121. Josephus relies on it being recognised as a practice of Egyptian priests (Against Apion 2.141).

[18] There is good reason to think Herodotus is not thinking of, and in fact did not know of, a people called 'Judaeans', but Josephus needs to read him that way. Since normally Josephus wants to show how others have learned from (i.e. imitated) the Judaeans, this admission is striking, but necessary if he is to use Herodotus at all. Not surprisingly, therefore, circumcision does not feature in the account of the Judaean way of life in 2.145ff.

[19] Egyptian abstention from pork is still being discussed by Aelian, De Natura Animalium 10.16. The link with Judaeans is noticed by Sextus Empiricus, Pyr 3.223: a Judaean or an

abstain from pork - and how peculiar! What else was a pig for, except to be eaten?[20] - it was obvious that one should bracket them together. More generally, it was widely thought that Judaean abstention from certain animals and fish was a sign that they honoured, revered, even divinised such creatures, and here the obvious parallels (besides that with the Syrians and fish) were the animal cults, and associated food-taboos, of the Egyptians. We find such misconceptions being vigorously denied by Ps.-Aristeas (144-71 re mice etc.), but it is striking how frequently we find Judaean food-taboos being discussed in parallel with those of the Egyptians: the two nations were in a common category.[21] Where it was noticed that Judaeans actually ate some of the animals which Egyptians regarded as sacred (e.g. cows), this could be explained on the premise that they deliberately instituted this reversal in their revolt from their Egyptian roots.[22]

Thus whether as borrowing from Egypt, paralleling her strange taboos, or flouting her customs, the explanation of Judaean practices frequently linked them with Egypt. As geographical neighbours with so much in common, and such remarkable shared differences from Hellenistic-Roman culture, Egyptian-Judaean culture could easily be conflated. Endless recycling of old and erroneous stereotypes, and the skin-deep curiosity of the élite, ensured that such 'barbarian' nations had little chance of correcting such misperceptions. It is not, then, entirely surprising that Tiberius should lump Judaeans and

---

Egyptian priest would die rather than eat pork. Josephus relies on this perception in Against Apion 2.141.

[20] The question is raised as a genuine puzzle in Cicero, De Natura Deorum 2.160; Porphyry, De Abstinentia 1.16. Most other animals had an obvious utility to humanity.

[21] See, e.g., Plutarch, Quaest Conviv 4.5 (669c-670e), where it is discussed whether the Judaean abstention from pork arises from respect for the pig, parallel to Egyptian respect for field mice, crocodiles, cats or hares; cf. the parallel between Egyptians and Judaeans in food-taboos in Philo, Legatio 361-2; Epictetus 1.11.12-13; 1.22.4; Porphyry, De Abstinentia 2.26, 61; Erotianus apud Vocum Hippocraticarum Collectio frag. 33.

[22] E.g. Tacitus, Histories 5.4.2.

Egyptians together in his expulsion of foreign elements from Rome in 19 CE: the Egyptian and Judaean rites, and associated elements in the Roman population, were apparently viewed as parallel, if not identical, phenomena.[23] It is probable, indeed, that Judaeans were sometimes mistaken for Egyptians: even such a high-profile (though admittedly non-practising) Judaean as Tiberius Julius Alexander could be described, by a well-informed Roman, as an Egyptian (Tacitus, Histories 1.11).

This widespread view of Judaean Egyptian origins, its cementation by aetiological reasoning, and the common observation of parallel cultural phenomena, provides an historical context for Josephus' insistence that Judaeans are not in origin Egyptians. The immediate literary context for many of these pleas is his attempt to discredit versions of the leper-exodus, but I doubt whether that can provide the whole explanation. It was open to him, for instance, to counter the leper-stories with a milder version of the exodus - for instance, Strabo's positive account of Moses' disgust with Egyptian religion, his advance on Greek anthropomorphism and his leadership of the 'most thoughtful' Egyptians to Judaea (16.2.34-36). Perhaps Josephus felt that any account which made Judaeans an offshoot, and therefore culturally derivative, from the Egyptians, would have conceded too much. Although it might have been possible to argue that whatever they derived from Egypt they improved, he perhaps invested too much in the notion of Moses as the first inventor of piety and constitutional virtue to be able to allow cultural second-handedness at this crucial point.[24]

---

[23] Josephus, Antiquities 18.65-84; Suetonius, Tiberius 36; Tacitus, Annals 2.85.4. Tacitus' use of the singular *ea superstitione* may cover both Egyptian and Judaean rites (though it may refer to the latter alone).

[24] Celsus (apud Origen, Contra Celsum 1.2) overcame the perception of Greek inferiority by insisting that Greeks were better able to judge the value, and practise the virtues, of what 'barbarians' had discovered! Josephus presumes Mosaic priority in Against Apion 2.168, 281, 293-95. For the topic see P. Pilhofer, PRESBYTERON KREITTON. Der

But it seems that the overriding concern for Josephus, in distinguishing Judaeans from Egyptians, was to set them in contrast, in fact in the sharpest possible antithesis, in their placement on the prevailing honour scale. In the last resort, the Judaeans are not, and cannot be, Egyptians because Josephus has staked so much on a rhetoric of antithesis, which both facilitates his apologetic task and permits him to exploit the popular denigration of Egyptians while boosting the reputation of Judaeans. It is to these aspects of his strategy that we now turn.

IV. Dishonourable Egyptians: Slandering the Slanderers

At the opening of the first book of Against Apion, Josephus mounts a sustained attack on Greek historiography, aligning Judaeans, as we have observed, with Egyptians, Phoenicians and Chaldaeans (1.6-56). In this fine specimen of cultural retaliation, he punctures the arrogance of those who care only about 'renowned Greek historians' (1.2) and even offers the Greeks a taste of their own medicine (1.69). From this vantage-point it might have been possible for Josephus to mount a defence of Judaeans in consort with other 'barbarian' nations, including the Egyptians, countering the insufferable snobbery with which they were routinely treated. In fact, as we have noted, he does no such thing. Having utilised the Egyptian reputation for antiquity, he turns against them with a vehemence explicable only by the requirements of his rhetoric. In short, he chooses to represent the 'slanders' he counters as

---

Alterbeweis der jüdischen und christlichen Apologeten und seine Vorgeschichte, Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1990.

coming from an Egyptian source, and chooses the perfect weapon of an orator in countering this opposition: ethos denigration.[25]

As we have observed, when Josephus turns to that part of his agenda dealing with 'those slanders and slurs which certain people have aimed at our nation' (1.219), he identifies their authors as 'Egyptians' and those who sympathise with them (1.223). However one may judge the historical plausibility of this claim, its role in his rhetoric is clear.[26] Under this label he can include Manetho, Chaeremon and Lysimachus, but also Apion, whose 'Egyptian' identity is one of Josephus' most emphatic themes. What is more, while refuting Apion, Josephus includes a number of other scurrilous stories about the Judaeans, such as the discovery of the ass head in the temple, the annual sacrificial feast on a Greek, and the Idumaean theft of the head of a pack-ass (2.79-124). Whether or not Apion used these stories, as Josephus claims, it is essential to Josephus' rhetoric to reply to them in responding to Apion, rather than dealing directly with 'those who supplied Apion with this fodder' (2.79), Posidonius, Apollonius Molon and Mnaseas. To respond directly to these authors would be to clarify that such legends were not specifically Egyptian (even if the ass-stories had Typhonian echoes). Such legends are far easier to answer if they are thought of as 'Egyptian' and associated with Apion, since Josephus can reply in kind, using the Egyptian animal cults as an easy target (e.g. 2.81, 85-86). To recognise these slanders as authentically Greek or Idumaean would unravel the loose claim of 1.223 and would require Josephus to recognise a source of opposition to Judaeans with quite different cultural roots. When he does move on to the criticisms of

[25] See J.M. May, Trials of Character. The Eloquence of Ciceronian Ethos, Chapel Hill: North Carolina Press, 1988 for an analysis of Cicero's techniques in this sphere.
[26] On the origins of anti-Judaean stories see most recently P. Schäfer, Judeophobia. Attitudes towards the Jews in the Ancient World, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997.

Apollonius Molon (2.145, 148, 258), he associates him vaguely with Lysimachus (2.145, 236) and Apion (2.295). Indeed, Molon had been listed with 'Egyptian' authors giving the date of the exodus (2.18), and later Josephus claims he was an admirer of the Persians (2.270). Thus it seems that, even if he cannot be entirely 'Egyptianised', Apollonius Molon can be allowed no clear ethnicity of his own; and it must by no means be revealed that he had been a teacher of notable Romans (Plutarch, Cicero 4.4-5; Caesar 3.1).

Thus Josephus sustains, or at least takes care not to disrupt, the impression that Judaeans have only the Egyptians ranged against them, and if he can establish that presumption his task is infinitely easier. For the Egyptians can be presented not only as inveterate enemies of the Judaeans, and thus clearly prejudiced and unreliable in their 'slander', but also as consumed by envy (1.224). As Bertholet has noted (see above note 4), this latter motif is crucial, since it constructs a hierarchy in the relationship between Egyptians and Judaeans: one only envies those in a position superior to oneself. Judaean superiority is in fact cleverly maintained in a comment which Josephus inserts into his response to Apion:

> In relation to us, Egyptians are swayed in one of two directions:
> they either boost themselves by claiming common ancestry with us,
> or they drag us down by association with their poor repute. (2.31)

The argument depends on the premise of Egyptian κακοδοξία, never demonstrated, but always assumed. It implies, by contrast, that Judaeans are honourable: they would never want to associate with mean Egyptians, but the latter, either from envy or from spite, will claim the association. Here there comes to the surface the tactic which undergirds Josephus' whole strategy in

relation to the Egyptians: to affirm and then utilise their poor reputation as a foil against which to place Judaean honour.

Before exploring this strategy in further detail, we should note its prevalence throughout Josephus' response to Apion (2.1-144). Despite his frequent claims about Apion's imbecility, Josephus has clearly found his multi-faceted case against the Judaeans formidable, and perhaps judges his influence in Rome to be of continuing significance.[27] But he has found a simple way of dealing with him: just characterise him as 'Egyptian'. The label here is almost as absurd as Vergil's dubbing of Cleopatra an *Aegyptia coniunx*. Although he was not apparently an Alexandrian citizen by birth, Apion had been granted this citizenship (2.32) and benefited from an enormously advanced Greek education to become famous as an orator and γραμματικός; indeed, he proved to be of such significance to the Alexandrian citizenry that he was accorded the leadership of the delegation to Gaius after the riots of 38 CE (Josephus, Antiquities 18.257-60). It is thus almost inconceivable that he was a native Egyptian by ancestry; in any case, his Alexandrian citizenship automatically negated that label. The fact that he was born at the Oasis does not make him, as Josephus claims, 'an Egyptian par excellence' (2.29): plenty of 'Hellenes' were born in towns other than Alexandria. We may be practically certain, therefore, that Josephus has falsified Apion's ethnicity and it is not hard to see why. This deception gives Josephus his most valuable weapon in responding to Apion, one which he will utilise in practically every counter-argument and which will in some cases constitute the only argument he cares to deploy.

[27] See my 'Josephus v. Apion: Analysis of an Argument' in S. Mason (ed.), Understanding Josephus: Seven Perspectives, (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998) 194-221.

Two examples of Josephus' strategy must suffice as illustration here. Apion's polemic against Judaeans arose out of the Alexandrian crisis, and one of its themes was the 'illegitimacy' of the claim of some Judaeans to Alexandrian citizenship. As he begins his reply (2.38-42), Josephus claims that it is natural that early settlers in a colony should be named after the city, and makes vague claims that Judaeans elsewhere are called 'Antiochenes' etc. (2.38-39). He then confuses the issue by reference to Roman citizenship: 'Has not the generosity of the Romans ensured that their name has been shared with practically everyone, not only with individuals but with sizeable nations as a whole?' (2.40). As Josephus must have known, Roman citizenship was hardly parallel, in legal or political terms, to citizenship of a polis, but the argument enables both this gratuitous praise of the Romans and a sly counter-polemic against Apion:

> And if Apion discounts this type of citizenship, let him cease to call himself an 'Alexandrian'. For he was born, as I said above, in the depths of Egypt; so how could he be an 'Alexandrian' if he discounts this type of citizenship, as he sees fit to do in our case? In fact it is only to Egyptians that the Romans, who are now rulers of the world, have refused to grant any form of citizenship. Such was Apion's nobility of character that he considered himself worthy of acquiring privileges from which he was debarred, and tried to bring false charges against those who justly obtained them. (2.41-42)

The argument, which will hardly bear close scrutiny, depends on the depiction of Apion as an 'Egyptian' whose Alexandrian status is suspect and whose proper (in)dignity is revealed by Roman opinion: it is the judgment of those who 'rule the world' (and therefore determine honour) which indicates how one ought to consider an 'Egyptian' like this.

The same tactic of contempt is deployed in relation to religion. Where Apion had asked, 'Why, if they are citizens, do they not worship the same Gods as the Alexandrians?' (2.65), Josephus evades a full reply by issuing a counter-charge:

> Why, in your case, although you are Egyptians, do you wage among yourselves huge, implacable, battles over religion? Is it not indeed for this reason that we do not call you all 'Egyptians' - nor even collectively 'human beings', since you worship beasts hostile to our nature, nurturing them with great care - while our nation at least is clearly single and thus uniform? (2.65-66)

Again the argument would not work if Apion had not been identified as a representative of the Egyptians. In this case Josephus can exploit the bafflement with which non-Egyptians viewed the diverse animal cults in Egypt (see below) and takes care to represent these not simply as strange but as gross, and their Egyptian practitioners as sub-human. Once again an honour-scale is erected: the Egyptians are at the bottom, along with their wild animals, while the Judaeans by contrast display the virtues the Egyptians lack. As this section of the argument develops (2.67-72), it swings back into politics (with which the religious question was always connected) and places the blame for the Alexandrian troubles on the infiltration of 'Egyptians' (2.69); it closes, significantly, with another appeal to Roman opinion:

> For none of the kings seems to have bestowed citizen rights on Egyptians, nor now do any of the emperors, while in our case Alexander brought us into the city, the kings augmented our rights and the Romans have seen fit to preserve our privileges for all time. (2.72)

Such abuse of the 'Egyptian' Apion is ubiquitous, giving Josephus ready ammunition with which to turn defence into attack, while spicing his rhetoric with the humour of ethnic ridicule. Josephus would deny, of course, that he resorts to counter-slander: he is not slandering the Egyptians, simply telling the truth. But the 'truth' he is telling is one established by the cultural dynamics of the Roman empire, and it is his alignment with this discourse in the twinned spheres of religion and politics that we will now investigate in a little more depth.

V. Egyptian Religion and Roman Values

It is significant that as soon as he turns against 'Egyptians' for their various slanders of Judaeans, Josephus highlights the religious contrast between the two nations:

> The contrast between the two peoples has inspired in them a great animosity, since our form of piety differs from what they practise to the same degree that the nature of God stands removed from irrational animals. It is their common ancestral tradition to consider these animals as Gods, although they differ from one another on a local basis in the honours they accord them. Empty-headed and utterly stupid people, they were inured from the beginning to erroneous opinions about Gods, and so did not succeed in imitating the lofty character of our theology but envied us when they saw us emulated by others. (1.224-25)

Encapsulated here are most of the themes to which Josephus will return in his denigration of Egyptian religion (cf. 1.254; 2.86, 128, 139, besides the polemic of 2.65-66 cited above). He insists on taking the Egyptian

theriomorphic cults at face value: the Egyptians really are stupid enough to worship animals. Although he once alludes to a mythological explanation of these cults (2.128), he never refers to long-established rational explanations, based on the utility of these animals for human well-being, nor to the allegorical or 'mystical' interpretations of Egyptian religion.[28] What is more, it is not just ordinary, or friendly, animals that Egyptians treat as Gods: they nurture savage animals (2.139), wild beasts 'contrary to our nature' (2.66), such as crocodiles and asps (2.86). This not only rules out any rationale for these cults based on their value for humanity, it demonstrates how low the Egyptians sink in finding objects of worship and how stupid they are to revere things which damage themselves: to Josephus' amusement, they even consider those bitten by asps or seized by crocodiles blessed and worthy of God (2.86).[29] Equally important are their internal localised differences (1.225), their 'huge, implacable battles' (2.65; cf. Ant 1.166; 13.66). Such internal splintering of the Egyptian nation demeans them all, but it also suggests an instability, a volatility, which damages their political reputation. A religion which is so harmful to humanity and so socially divisive is an easy target.

The contrast with Judaeans in the passage cited above (1.224-25) is crucial to Josephus' strategy. It presupposes a hierarchy of being, which we find universally represented in the Hellenistic-Roman world. At the bottom is inanimate nature (stones, plants etc.) and just above that level are the animals,

[28] Rational explanations, stressing the value of such animals for humanity, are found as early as Herodotus (e.g. 2.75 re the ibis) and became popular in the Hellenistic and Roman eras (e.g. Cicero De Natura Deorum 1.101). The notion of a mysterious but secret theology was also encouraged by Herodotus (2.65) and was advanced by apologists of many sorts (e.g. Plutarch, Isis and Osiris 74-76 [380f-382c]; Celsus apud Origen, Contra Celsum 1.20; 3.19). Josephus' refusal to countenance allegorical explanations of 'Greek' myths (Against Apion 2.255) suggests he would have had little sympathy with this approach. Contrast Philo, Vit Mos 1.23.

[29] This topos also derives from Herodotus (2.90), but Herodotus had expressed no disdain; even Aelian (De Natura Animalium 10.21) expresses more amazement than scorn.

which are sentient but 'irrational'. Above the animals is humanity, endowed with reason; and above humans, the stars and/or 'daemons', which are themselves inferior to the supreme level of being, God(s). To worship animals is thus to sink from the highest to almost the lowest end of the chain of being: to conceive of the Gods in anthropomorphic terms was at least better than this! Of course, it was possible to represent iconic worship as a still inferior religion, since the statues and portraits were themselves made of inanimate material, and thus the polar opposite of God. Josephus exploits this antithesis once in Against Apion, in explaining why Judaeans do not use images in worship (2.75; cf. 2.190-92). But it is noticeable that he makes less of this than he does of Egyptian animal cults, and it is particularly significant that his critique of those who use statues in worship is directed against 'Greeks and some others' (2.74), as if he is going out of his way to avoid any criticism of the Romans.

Thus Josephus' critique of Egyptian religion is employed both to denigrate those whose stories could damage the reputation of Judaeans and to set off Judaean religion by contrast. This is so evidently superior and 'lofty' that it is naturally emulated and admired by many (1.225; cf. 1.166; 2.280-86). That Josephus needs to do so little to establish the 'stupidity' of Egyptian religion is an indication of how widespread and how culturally embedded this verdict had become.[30] Where Herodotus had expressed his amazement at Egyptian animal cults, without showing disdain, Diodorus and Plutarch were obviously embarrassed by the cults they tried to explain; in Josephus' day, and in Roman circles, Egyptian theriolatry was a topic of widespread

[30] Of course, Josephus was also drawing on a long Jewish tradition, represented in the Diaspora by, e.g., Ps.-Aristeas 138; Wisdom of Solomon 11.15; 15.18-19; Sib Or 3.29-30; 5.276-80; Philo, Decal 76-80; Vit Cont 8-10. Artapanus is the striking exception.

amusement.[31] This is clear not only from the work of satirists like Lucian and Juvenal, whom one can expect to pounce on anything capable of ridicule, but also from a number of general comments which note that Egyptian cults are 'laughed at' by 'the majority' of people.[32] Plutarch knows he has an uphill struggle in his attempt to find uplifting symbolism in the animal cults, and it seems that few Romans were willing to make the effort, however much they may have admired and even adopted the worship of Isis.

Two comments by élite Romans indicate the sort of disdain which Josephus could count on. According to Dio, Augustus on his annexation of Egypt refused to visit the Apis bull, despite its significance in Egyptian national consciousness and the respect with which the Apis tradition had been upheld by the Ptolemies. His dismissive comment, that he was accustomed to worship Gods not cattle (Dio 51.16.5), indicates the stance of the new rulers of Egypt; we noted at the outset Vergil's supercilious attitude to the 'monstrous' Gods of Egypt. A century and a half later Juvenal could count on the willingness of his readers to share his laughter at the 'monsters' worshipped by 'mad Egypt', and, like Josephus, could build on that presumption to ridicule their mutual intolerance. In his powerful Satire 15 he displays the impatience of the Roman ruling class at those subjects obstinate enough to consider their Gods the only ones worth worshipping (*solos credat habendos / esse deos quos ipse colit*, 15.37-38) and dramatises Egyptian fractiousness in a gruesome account of a local feud. In his appeal to a Roman or Romanised reading public Josephus could count on such a set of stereotypes, and a tradition of cultural contempt, which renders his victory

[31] See the full survey of material in K.A.D. Smelik and E.A. Hemelrijk, ' "Who knows not what monsters demented Egypt worships?" , ANRW II.17.14, 1852-2000.
[32] Cicero, De Natura Deorum 1.101; Aelian, De Natura Animalium 12.5. Cf. Lucian, De Sacrificiis 15; Deorum Concilium 10-11; Jupiter Tragoedus 42.

over his 'Egyptian' opponents remarkably straightforward. Cicero would have been proud of him.

What would have shocked Cicero was Josephus' use of this ridicule of Egyptians precisely in order to defend another 'barbaric' race, the Judaeans. The contrasts which Josephus sets up - between animal-worshipping stupidity and the σεμνότης (one can almost hear the Latin *gravitas*) of Judaean 'theology' (1.225), between the volatility of Egyptian religious disputes and the harmoniousness of Judaean unanimity (2.65-68) - are designed to establish Judaean religion as an honourable, safe religion, entirely compatible with the Roman ethos. In fact, throughout this apology Josephus is concerned to present Judaean religion as consonant with the noblest and highest philosophy (1.175; 2.168, 239, 255-57, 281). The Judaean conception of God is parallel to, in fact the source of, the best in the whole philosophical tradition (2.168, 281) and its freedom from 'Greek' mythology indicates how far it rises above such demeaning conceptions of God (2.239-54). Even its controversial imagelessness indicates how lofty its theology really is (2.73-75).

The main problem for Josephus was in explaining why this noble Judaean religion was so intolerant as to appear 'antisocial' towards those with other religious practices and beliefs. Juvenal's impatience with those who thought only their Gods worth worshipping (Satire 15.37-38, cited above) indicates how serious was the sort of criticism which Josephus cites here from Apollonius Molon: that the Judaeans were misanthropic (2.148), in fact the most worthless specimens of humanity (2.236) because they did not admit those who had other conceptions of God and did not share fellowship with those who preferred a different lifestyle (2.258). Of course this criticism of Judaeans had a long pedigree. The originally Hellenistic sense of shock, that in the 'civilised' world there should be those so 'unfriendly' as to refuse

ordinary decency to other 'Greeks', was inherited and maintained by the Roman ruling class for whom such religious exclusivism was unwelcome, since it could cause serious social tensions in an empire which required smooth inter-cultural co-operation. Josephus' defence of Judaeans on this count appeals, in the end, to the right of Judaeans to preserve their ancestral customs (2.259-75), even against the critical demands of philosophy (2.262-68). This appeal was well-made: in the sphere of religion, élite Romans typically fell back on the inherited *mos maiorum* when questioned by philosophy, and cultural conservatism was a trait Romans had to respect.[33] And here Josephus' double-standard is particularly glaring. Where Judaean religion was noble, lofty and philosophical - or, where it was open to philosophical criticism, at least traditional and thus respectable - Egyptian religion was nothing but stupid, its philosophical interpretation not worth the barest mention and its practices, however immensely ancient, simply ridiculous.

VI. Egyptians and Judaeans under Roman Hegemony

As we noted in the introduction, Roman ridicule of Egyptian religion went hand in hand with disdain of the (contemporary) Egyptian people: it was a central tenet of imperial propaganda that subject peoples were lesser beings who could only be improved by Roman governance. It was simple enough to draw direct conclusions from the 'absurdity' of the animal cults: people with a religion like that must be very gullible, excessively 'superstitious', if not entirely mad. The fact that they actually fought over such animal-worship, the people of one nome deliberately provoking another by eating their sacred

[33] See, e.g., Cicero, De Natura Deorum 3.5-6.

animals, only shows what a hot-headed and uncivilised people they are. Juvenal contrasts such barbarity with the spread of Graeco-Roman culture throughout the empire: even Britain is civilised now (Satire 15.110-12), and only in Egypt could such horrors still prevail. Plutarch records the feud between the dog-worshipping Cynopolites and the fish-worshipping Oxyrhynchites, which led the people of the two nomes to war; he concludes, significantly, by noting that they were finally brought to order only through the 'punishment' applied by the Romans (Isis and Osiris 72 [380a-c]). Such are the benefits of Roman control. The Egyptian people as a whole might be characterised as 'useless and unwarlike' (e.g., Juvenal, Satire 15.126), or alternatively as reckless, impudent and insubordinate (e.g., Tacitus, Histories 1.11).[34] Dio presents an illuminating example of Roman condescension towards the province: a populous place with rich resources of importance to Rome, its people had a facile, fickle character, while the Alexandrians had an alarming capacity for revolution (50.24; 51.17.1-3). The humiliations which Augustus inflicted on this justly proud city caused, as we know, deep and long-lasting indignation, but Dio saw nothing but the proper exercise of imperial power: 'thus was Egypt enslaved' (51.17.4).

Josephus uses a number of such stereotypes in Against Apion, and he needed them. One can make out from Josephus' reply that Apion had denied the right of Judaeans to be citizens of Alexandria. According to Apion, they were insignificant residents in the city who had been disloyal to the Ptolemies and even challenged Roman power at a critical moment in history (2.50). He had accused them of stirring up trouble in Alexandria; they were a troublesome and unassimilated element in the population (2.65, 68), who were brazen enough not to accord Roman emperors the usual honours (2.73). In

[34] See further Smelik and Hemelrijk, 'Who knows not?', 1920-54.

fact, the wickedness of their culture and the impiety of their religion were proved by their perpetual 'slavery' to other nations and by the repeated capture of their city; we may suspect he made special mention of Pompey's capture of Jerusalem in 63 BCE (2.125). These were powerful accusations, whose special barb lay in their presentation of Judaeans as hostile to their Roman overlords. Josephus' sensitivity to such charges suggests that they continued to resonate in his day, when they could acquire additional force from the Jewish Revolt.

As we have noted, Josephus' typical response is to turn such accusations back against his 'Egyptian' prosecutor. It is Egyptians like Apion who are debarred from citizenship (2.38-42), and it was not Judaeans who stirred up trouble in Alexandria, but Egyptian-Alexandrians of Apion's sort (2.68-70).[35] What else can one expect from 'fickle and empty headed' Egyptians (1.225) with their 'evil habits' (2.70)? The tactic serves to distract the reader from the significance of the charge against the Judaeans, but it also involves a concerted campaign to present Judaeans as politically honourable from the perspective of Roman power. In terms of their history in Egypt, Josephus insists that Judaeans supported the rightful Ptolemaic line, and makes great capital out of Apion's point that Cleopatra refused to grant them grain: agglomerating several aspects of Augustan anti-Cleopatran propaganda he takes it as an honour that the Judaeans were slighted by her (2.56-60). The emperors, he insists, have always had a good opinion of Judaeans in Egypt (2.61-64), and if the Judaeans do not set up their images, that is cause to admire the *magnanimitas* and *mediocritas* of the Romans (2.73). Thus at no

[35] Josephus here reflects the polemical use of ethnic labels in the Alexandrian crisis, in which both Judaeans and Alexandrians called the other 'Egyptian'; see K. Goudriaan, 'Ethnical Strategies in Graeco-Roman Egypt', in P. Bilde et al. (eds.), Ethnicity in Hellenistic Egypt (Aarhus: Aarhus University, 1992) 74-99.

point does Josephus allow Judaean and Roman interests to come into conflict, while the Egyptians are always at fault or in disgrace.

The crowning example of this tactic comes in 2.125-34 when Josephus responds to Apion's claim about Judaean political weakness. His first and main response is simply to return the compliment: 'they, obviously, belong to the most dominant city, and have become accustomed from the beginning to ruling, rather than serving, the Romans!' (2.125). The sarcasm continues: 'So it is only the Egyptians ... who have the special privilege of not having been subservient to any of those who conquered Asia or Europe - these who throughout time have not had a single day of freedom, not even at the hands of their indigenous masters!' (2.129; cf. again 2.130, 133). Such rhetoric suitably demeans the Egyptians under the heel of their Roman 'masters', but the *tu quoque* is clearly not a sufficient reply. Interestingly, Josephus adds that most nations experience changes of fortune (2.127), and insists that one cannot blame pious victims if their temples were impiously destroyed:

> I pass over the kings who were famed for their piety (for example, Croesus) and the disasters they experienced in their lives; I pass over the burning of the Athenians' acropolis, of the temple in Ephesus, and that in Delphi, and thousands of others. No-one has used these events to reproach the victims, but the perpetrators. (2.131)

One can hardly read this argument without a certain frisson: among those 'thousands of others' is, of course, the Judaeans' famous temple in Jerusalem, an example which cannot have been absent from Josephus' mind, even if it could not have been present in Apion's. Josephus here comes within an ace of a devastating criticism of Rome: who else, after all, 'perpetrated' this destruction? To develop this argument would be to destroy that circularity which tied Roman piety to Roman military might and thus subvert the self-

congratulation of Roman imperialism. Josephus, however, prefers to 'pass [this] over' - a silence as strategic as his contorted efforts in the War to exonerate Titus for the burning of the temple. Elsewhere in Against Apion he mentions Titus' 'occupation' of the temple (2.82), but not the destruction; in fact, he insists on speaking of the temple as a continuing reality (e.g. 2.193-98). The Judaeans who, in Josephus' lifetime, were butchered in theatres all over the Roman empire did so for their defiance of Rome during that war, and no doubt with curses of Rome on their lips. Josephus alludes to such deaths in theatres and he will honour them, but only for their bravery in dying 'for the law' (e.g. 1.43; 2.232-34); he never lets us enquire who tortured them, and why.

By shying away from any hint of criticism, Josephus indicates that his apologetic strategy depends on an alignment of the interests of Judaeans and Romans. He finishes this section (2.125-34) by insisting that 'when all monarchs on all sides made war on the Romans, ours alone were maintained as allies and friends due to their loyalty' (2.134). The example is well out of date: thanks to the Romans, Judaeans no longer had 'monarchs', and 'loyalty' was the not first thing to spring to the mind of anyone contemplating the events of 66-73 CE! Josephus' silences and diplomatic manoeuvres indicate that his apology is written under the constraints of Roman power. The denigration of 'enslaved' Egyptians is again the foil for the portrayal of Judaean 'friends', but it is clear that such an honour is in the gift of Rome. If the emperors have the right to determine the recounting of history (1.50-52), so Josephus will not challenge their right to apportion honour on their terms. At every turn Josephus is confronted by this political constraint, and it appears that he has accommodated himself to it well enough.

VII. Conclusions

In exploring Josephus' use of the category 'Egyptian' I hope to have illuminated some parts of his rhetorical strategy, but also, and at the same time, some aspects of his cultural and political stance. It can now be seen that his insistence that Judaeans are not in any way 'Egyptian' serves to counter a common contemporary association between the two nations, but is also part of a strategy to set the two in polar opposition, constructing Judaean honour against the backdrop of Egyptian disgrace. Labelling his opponents as 'Egyptian' not only enables Josephus to dispose of them swiftly; it also helps him insert Judaeans into the honour-codes of Roman discourse, as exemplars of reasonable and traditional piety and as loyal friends to Rome. Josephus thus utilises Roman disdain of one subservient people in order to redeem the honour of another; he laughs with them at the 'barking Anubis' in order to silence their criticism of an 'antisocial' religion.

Such an analysis suggests we view Josephus as an ambivalent figure, caught in the dilemma of an apologist: he needs to speak in the terms of the dominant culture if he is to win respect, but he speaks on behalf a culture not entirely aligned to that mainstream. If we examine the power-relations which underlie this apologetic stance, we find a figure who has been given permission to speak for Judaeans against their contemporary detractors but who can afford to do so only in terms unequivocally complimentary to his Roman masters. This stance is complex and can be variously assessed. From one angle, Josephus' achievement is to use the tools of the Hellenistic-Roman tradition, and the value-system most relevant to his Roman(ised) readers, in order to represent and advocate his own Judaean tradition: if the effort shows how far he has been acculturated in his Roman environment, it also displays

what might be termed reverse acculturation, the use of Hellenistic-Roman culture to render honourable a stubbornly particularist tradition. From another angle, Josephus' evasions and delicate tip-toeing around Roman sensitivities look like the capitulation of the colonised to the terms imposed by the colonisers, unable any longer to hear, or at least to represent, the voices of those who had suffered at the hands of the 'magnanimous' Romans. I do not wish to adjudicate between these two perspectives or to find some mediating position between them: neither can be easily dismissed. But I suppose we might have hoped that he had shared less heartily in the Romans' jokes at others' expense or, better, dropped some hint that their sense of humour was fundamentally sick.[36]

[36] My evaluative language deliberately makes explicit the political perspective from which I write; other perspectives (pro-Roman, anti-Jewish, anti-Egyptian, uncritically pro-Josephan) would read the evidence differently. All historiography is contingent in varying ways and I do not regard the lack of a supposed 'neutrality' as a capitulation to historical irresponsibility or subjectivism.

"A Myth for the World": Early Christian Reception of Cannibalism in Josephus, *Bellum Judaicum* 6.199-219

Honora H. Chapman, Santa Clara University

The Christian Fathers adapt, comment upon, and quote Josephus's detailed and dramatic description of the destruction of Jerusalem for a variety of literary and theological purposes.[1] They cite the scene of Mary's cannibalism at *B.J.* 6.199-219 more often than any other from the *War* because it provides them with vivid evidence to corroborate passages in the scriptures concerning the two destructions of Jerusalem and to illuminate God's punishment of his people for sin.[2] Josephus's Christian readers also appreciate his use of tragic themes and diction in the scene of cannibalism.[3] They choose, however, to ignore that his rhetorical purpose in this tragic passage is to encourage his readers to have compassion for the majority of Jews who suffered during the war with the Romans because of the actions of the Jewish rebels. In this paper I shall offer an analysis of the scene of Mary's cannibalism within the context of the *B.J.* Then I shall examine how Melito, Origen, Eusebius, Basil, and John Chrysostom read and employ the Josephan passage.

---

[1] H. Schreckenberg has extensively probed the reception of Josephus by later Christians; see, for instance, his *Flavius-Josephus Tradition in Antike und Mittelalter*, Leiden, 1972; *Rezeptionsgeschichtliche und textkritische Untersuchungen zu Flavius Josephus*, Leiden, 1977; and "Josephus und die christliche Wirkungsgeschichte seines 'Bellum Judaicum,'" *ANRW* 2, pt. 21, sec. 2, ed. W. Haase, Berlin, New York, 1984, pp. 1106-1217.

[2] On the use of the story of the cannibalism of Mary, see most recently S. Mason, *Josephus and the New Testament*, Hendrickson, 1992, pp. 11, 15, 32. Mason, in his chapter "The Use and Abuse of Josephus," p. 11, remarks, "Of all the Christian references to Josephus that have survived from the ancient world and the Middle Ages, the passage most commonly cited from his works, next to his reference to Jesus [*Ant.* 18.63-64], is one that describes a horrible act of cannibalism during the Roman siege."

[3] Schreckenberg has detected the historian's use of tragedy and comments generally on its effect upon Christian readers of the *Bellum*: "On the whole, Josephus awakened, especially with his *Jewish War*, the emotions of his Christian readers; indeed, his depiction of the destruction of Jerusalem was in individual scenes composed almost like a tragedy and, especially at certain climaxes of the story, was perceived in just this way by Christian readers. They felt horror and fright in the face of the Jewish catastrophe; they felt, at the same time, on account of the frequently moralizing historical view of Josephus, a certain edification and satisfaction in stationing themselves on the side favored by God," in "The Works of Josephus and the Early Christian Church," trans. by H. Regensteiner, in *Josephus, Judaism, and Christianity*, ed. by Louis H. Feldman and Gohei Hata, Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1987, p. 320.

Josephus, *B.J.* 6.199-219

The story of Mary's cannibalism occurs in Book 6, right at the climax of his account of the Roman siege of Jerusalem in 70 C.E., and it serves dramatically as the catalyst for the destruction of the Jewish Temple. By setting this abomination of cannibalism directly before the destruction of the Temple, Josephus plainly is creating a disaster of biblical proportions, especially for his Jewish audience, who would know of the first destruction and other dire cases of cannibalism from the scriptures. At the same time, he tempers his description with *topoi* and *pathos* gleaned from Greek tragedy and historiography. Josephus sets the scene for Mary in *Bellum* 6 by painting a picture of the social breakdown within Jerusalem as the siege persists and of the "indescribable sufferings"[4] of those perishing from famine. Throughout the *B.J.* the victims are the majority of the Jewish people, and the villains are the Jewish rebels, whom Josephus calls "*lestai*" or brigands and whom he excoriates for turning the Temple into a polluted brigand-stronghold.

Josephus introduces the story of Mary's cannibalism with a rather lengthy prologue:

> But why should I tell about their shamelessness in eating inanimate food because of the famine? For I am about to reveal a deed of such a kind that has never been recorded by Greeks or barbarians, awful to tell and unbelievable to hear. For my part, so that I did not seem to my future audience to be telling tales, I would gladly have left out this misfortune, if I had not had countless witnesses among my own contemporaries. Above all, I would be paying cold respect to my country if I lied in my account of the things it has suffered.[5]

There are several issues to address in this introduction to the Mary episode: its supposed uniqueness in both the Greek and Jewish worlds, its emotional impact, its credibility with respect to his future audience, his insistence upon the use of eye-witnesses, and, finally, his desire not to be considered a traitor to his country but to present accurately through an account ("*logos*") the sufferings of his own people. I shall analyze each of these elements in this prologue in relation to Josephus's overall historiographical agenda before turning to his narrative of the scene itself.

In this prologue to Mary's cannibalism, Josephus first tantalizes his audience by claiming that he will reveal a deed unparalleled in Greek or Jewish history. The few modern scholars who have examined this passage assume that Josephus has made a slip, is ignorant, or is lying, but none provides satisfactory explanation for his motives in doing any of the above.

---

[4] *B.J.* 6.193.

[5] *B.J.* 6.199-200.

Thackeray notes, "Josephus strangely ignores the parallel incident at the siege of Samaria, recorded in 2 Kings vi.28f."[6] Thackeray seems to assume that Josephus knew the Hebrew story and chose not to include it.[7] Thackeray in his note also relates this incident in the *Bellum* to the warnings of God's retribution for Israel's violation of the commandments in Deuteronomy 28.57 and Baruch 2.2f. Price augments these Biblical citations with others, including rabbinic parallels.[8]

I, however, do not think that Josephus's omission is "strange" but actually essential to his historiographic goals. We should draw a comparison between Josephus's claim here of the incomparable nature of Mary's cannibalism and the historian's larger claim at the beginning of *Bellum* Book 1 that this war between the Romans and the Jews was the greatest of all ever waged.[9] In this, he is hearkening back to Thucydides' claim of the Peloponnesian War surpassing all previous wars.[10] Great wars require great climaxes. In his story of Mary Josephus is laying out an extraordinary explanation for why the cataclysmic destruction occurs in Jerusalem. It, therefore, would only have deflated the grandeur and supposed uniqueness of his material at this point to refer to the Samaritan cannibalism in 2Kings.

An understanding of the scriptural background is essential for reading the passage of Mary's cannibalism. Besides the account in 2Kings of the Samaritan mothers' cannibalism, the Hebrew literature set dramatically during the Babylonian exile repeatedly foretells/reports cannibalism during the siege of Jerusalem which led to the destruction of its first Temple and the captivity of its people. What is key to these previous exilic texts, especially Jeremiah, Lamentations, and Ezekiel, is that Israel interpret its sufferings, including engaging in cannibalism,[11] as punishments from Yahweh for not

---

[6] Thackeray (1928), vol. 3, p. 434, n. a. At 2 Kings 6:26-31, a Samaritan woman in direct speech informs the besieging king of Aram that she and another woman had made a pact to eat each of their sons; she has given up her own child, which they cooked and ate, but now the other is hiding her son. Upon hearing this "the king tore his garments."

[7] S. Schwartz, *Josephus and Judaean Politics*, Leiden: Brill, 1990, p. 43, n. 79, proposes that Josephus did not even know this story in 2Kings when he was composing the *B.J.*

[8] J. Price *Jerusalem Under Siege: The Collapse of the Jewish State, 66-70 C.E.*, Leiden: Brill, 1992, p. 156, nn. 122 and 123.

[9] *B.J.* 1.1 and 1.4.

[10] Thucydides 1.1.

[11] Jeremiah 19:9: "I shall make them [Septuagint: "They will"] eat the flesh of their own sons and daughters"; Lamentations 2:20: "Should women eat their offspring, the children they have cared for? [LXX: "Shall women eat the fruit of their womb? The butcher has made a gleaning; will the infants suckling at the breasts be slain?] Should the priest and prophet be killed in the sanctuary of the Lord?", 4:10: "The hands of compassionate women have boiled their own children, who became their food in the destruction of the daughter of my people"; Ezekiel 5:9-10: "And I shall do to you what I have never done before and will never do again because of your abominations. Therefore fathers will eat

keeping the Jewish Law, and specifically for profaning the Temple. Parents, both fathers and mothers, will eat their own children. Ezekiel emphasizes that this act is unprecedented.[12] Perhaps Josephus is also building upon this idea when he claims that the Mary story is unparalleled.

These exile reports of cannibalism, both the Biblical and Josephus's, would have been conceived by a Jewish author, especially a priest,[13] and read by a Jewish audience as fulfillments of the original warnings of God's punishments for sacrilege recorded in Leviticus 26[14] and Deuteronomy 28. Both passages contain cannibalism committed against children. The Levitical warnings proceed to the destruction of Israel's cities and sanctuaries and the dispersion of its people into "the land of their enemies."[15] The warnings in Deuteronomy more explicitly contextualize the accursed cannibalism with the onslaught of the enemy. Deuteronomy also creates a character, "the tenderest and most fastidious of women." Once a grand woman, "who has never ventured to set the sole of her foot upon the ground," she now is a hateful wife and, worse still, a desperate mother reduced by starvation to eating both the afterbirth and her own baby.[16]

---

their children in your midst, and children will eat their fathers; and I shall make judgements against you and I shall scatter all your survivors to every wind"; also see Baruch 2:3, which was not part of the Hebrew Bible.

12 Baruch 2:2 also makes this claim.

13 As a priest performing the daily whole-offering (or *Tamid*) at the Temple in Jerusalem before the war, Josephus would have recited a shorter version of Yahweh's blessings and curses upon Israel from Deuteronomy 11. This idea of rewards and punishments was intrinsic to the relationship between Yahweh and Israel and was reiterated in daily Temple ritual.

14 On Josephus's later interpretive use of Leviticus 19 in *Contra Apionem* 2.190-216, see Alan Kirk, "Some Compositional Conventions of Hellenistic Wisdom Texts and the Juxtaposition of 4:1-13; 6:20b-49; and 7:1-10 in Q," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 116.2 (1997), pp. 235-257, especially p. 251 and n. 56, and Chart 2 on pp. 252-253. Kirk shows that Leviticus 19 provides the structure for elements of Jewish religion and customs which Josephus chooses to include here in *C.A.* 2. I would emphasize that Josephus never quotes the Scriptures directly because this would not be easily recognizable nor necessarily appeal to his gentile audience, and yet his Jewish readers would understand the context/source for his comments.

15 Lev. 26: 30-41; 36, 38, 39, 41, 44.

16 Deuteronomy 28: 53, 56-57. Notice also, however, that Deuteronomy 28:54-55 describes first the "most tender and fastidious man," who eats his own children, before mentioning the woman. BT *Gittin* 56a adapts this passage to tell the story of Martha b. Boethus, who dies from the famine during the siege of Jerusalem; two scholars have situated Josephus's account of Mary within the context of the rabbinic exegeses: N. Cohen, "The Theological Stratum of the Martha b. Boethus Tradition: An Explanation of the Text in *Gittin* 56A," *HTR* 69 (1976), pp. 187-195, and B. Visotzky, "Most Tender and Faitest of Women: A Study in the Transmission of Aggada," *HTR* 76 (1983), pp. 403-418.

That Josephus was working from this biblical material seems evident; we should now consider how he could adapt it for his historiographic purpose. Philo provides keen insight into how a hellenized Jew would consider and shape a narrative of cannibalism based on these scriptural passages for a hellenized audience in the first century C.E. Philo's treatise entitled *On Rewards and Punishments* traces how God rewards those who follow the Law handed down to Moses, and how transgressors are punished. After describing the earthly blessings for the just and pious, Philo graphically elaborates on the punishments found in Leviticus 26 and Deuteronomy 28. On the famine and drought that will ensue, causing people to turn to cannibalism, Philo comments: "The tales of Thyestes will be child's play compared with the extreme misfortunes, which the times will produce in great abundance."[17] Thyestes is a natural choice when referring to cannibalism, since in the myth he (albeit unwittingly) ate his own children. Philo then dwells on the horrible consequences of not obeying God: "But ills that last and waste away both body and soul produce new sufferings more profound than the ones described in tragedies, which seem to be told because of their excesses."[18] Philo, therefore, makes it very plain that tragedy is the natural point of association for his hellenized audience when discussing extreme human suffering, whether real or hypothetical and regardless of religion.

In this introduction to the Mary episode Josephus is also insisting upon his own personal integrity as a historian who tells the truth, based on eye-witness account, and who records it for posterity. Here he is aspiring to Thucydidean reliability, trustworthiness, and permanence.[19] All of these qualities are part of Josephus's mission statement in the main introduction to his history.[20] As Josephus explains, there were witnesses to Mary's deed, and consequently his insistence upon accuracy in his main introduction would be a sham were he not to include the event. Moreover, his personal attachment to the suffering of his people is a posture which he has already assumed in his main introduction to his history of the war.[21]

Finally, by using the word "*logos*" to describe his account about Mary, Josephus is asserting its truthfulness. He insists that he is telling a *logos* (and, therefore, not a *mythos*) about his homeland. Yet we shall discover by analyzing this passage closely that he consciously uses the narrative tactics of *mythos* in order to make his *logos* a more compelling and convincing

---

17 Philo, *de Praemiis et Poenis*, 134.

18 Ibid., 136.

19 Thucydides 1.20-22.

20 See especially 1.2: accuracy valued over the invective or praise in others' accounts; 1.6: his efforts to educate all near and far accurately; 1.16: at great expense and effort he presents his memorial of great accomplishments; 1.18: a war he experienced personally; 1.30: his history is for lovers of truth.

21 *B.J.* 1.11-12.

apologia to his audience. Josephus, therefore, chooses to have Mary's cannibalism play out on the tragic stage, endowing it with mythical status in order to become a more palatable reality for the audience. Though it may seem ironic to us, Josephus lays claim to Thucydidean "accuracy" when presenting a story imbued with myth. This myth, the story of Mary, in turn, introduces his greatest *mythos* of all in the *Bellum*: his explanation for the burning of the Temple.

Josephus commences his main account of Mary in the following way:

> There was a woman among the people who live beyond the Jordan named Mary, daughter of Eleazar, of the village of Bethezuba (this means the "house of hyssop"), distinguished by birth and wealth, who escaped with the rest of the people to Jerusalem and became involved in the siege.[22]

The very first words in this passage, "*gyne tis*," immediately alert his audience that he is going to be telling an engaging story involving an otherwise minor character. Throughout the *Bellum* Josephus uses "*tis*" in combination with a noun in order to introduce provocative or exemplary material.[23] This use of "*tis*" to introduce paradigmatic material is also a trait shared by a type of narrative that at first glance appears quite different from that of Josephus's history: the fable. As the grammarian Theon formulates it, a fable is a "*logos pseudes eikonizon aletheian.*"[24] While the fabulist represents "truth" through "a false story," the historian purports to be presenting a "true story" while using the tools of fiction.

Josephus commences his story by giving details of Mary's father's name and home in Peraea. He provides the details about her great wealth and high social position perhaps in order to increase his audience's respect for her and to prepare for the tragedy of her great fall. She takes refuge in Jerusalem, only to lose all her belongins to rebel raids.

The focus of this passage rests upon Mary's emotional state. Josephus highlights the terrible vexation that drives her to reproach and curse the looters, who, in turn, are provoked to act against her.[25] The historian then suspends the narrative, in order to build up to the supposedly unparalleled

---

22 *B.J.* 6.201.

23 For instance, in his account early in book 2 of the period shortly after the death of Herod, Josephus introduces three colorful pretenders to the throne with this "*tis*" formula. *B.J.* 2.57 (Simon of Peraea), parallel passage in *Ant.* 17.273 [Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.9 has "*Simo quidam*"]; *B.J.* 2.60 (a shepherd called Athrongaeus), parallel passage in *Ant.* 17.278; *B.J.* 2.101 (a young Jew from Sidon), parallel passage in *Ant.* 17.324. Also, at *B.J.* 2.118, Josephus introduces the founder of the rebellious Zealots in the same way, parallel passages in *Ant.* 18.4 and *Ant.* 18.23. None of the parallel passages in *Ant.* uses "*tis*."

24 Theon, *Progymnasmata* 3.

25 *B.J.* 6.203.

deed, by crafting a comparatively long sentence and by delaying introduction of the baby until Mary's dramatic direct address:

> But when no one out of either anger or pity killed her, and she was tired of finding any food for others, and it was difficult now to find it from any source, and the famine was advancing through her innards and marrow while her anger was burning stronger than the famine, she, under the influence of her anger, along with necessity, went against nature and seizing her child, her child who was an infant at the breast, said, "Poor baby, in the midst of war and famine and civil strife, why should I preserve you? There will be slavery with the Romans, if we are alive under them, but the famine is beating out even slavery, and the rebels are harsher than both. Be food for me and for the rebels a fury and for the world a myth, the only one lacking for the calamities of the Jews."[26]

This passage is rich with tragic imagery and themes crucial to Josephus's history as a whole.

The picture of a passionate female from Greek tragedy strongly emerges. Josephus explains Mary's emotional state in terms very familiar from Greek tragedy: she is overwhelmed by the goads of "*orge*" and "*anagke*,"[27] "anger" and "necessity," to commit a deed "against nature." The combination of anger, necessity, and an unnatural act committed by a mother are characteristics which Josephus and his audience would have readily identified with the mythological Medea. In Euripides' rendition, Medea is driven by *orge* against her former husband, Jason.[28] After killing Jason's new bride (and his new father-in-law), Medea believes she *must* kill her own children, an unnatural act, so that they will not be killed by another: "Surely it is necessity for them to die; and since it is necessary, I, the very one who bore them, will kill them."[29]

The audience of the *Bellum* finally learns the crucial piece of information just before her speech: Mary has a child. Josephus heightens the suspense

---

[26] *B.J.* 6.204-207.

[27] See Colin Macleod, *Collected Essays*, Oxford, 1983, "Thucydides and Tragedy," pp. 140-158, for a stimulating analysis of themes, such as necessity (p. 154, in Euripides' *Hecuba*), in the tragedians and Thucydides, especially his speeches. As Macleod points out at the end, the two main sources for the material of these fifth century composers were life and Homer.

[28] Euripides, *Medea*, on Medea's anger: lines 121 (Nurse), 176 (Chorus), 447 (Jason), 520 (Chorus), 870 (Medea), 909 (Jason).

[29] Ibid., 1062-3. (These lines are reiterated at 1240-1241, and could be deleted, as editors have, at either location.) Another tragedy which stresses the role of "necessity" in forcing a parent to kill children is Euripides' *Heracles*, which Thackeray claims was a favorite of Josephus.

and tragic *pathos* by delaying this revelation until the beginning of Mary's tragic monologue. When Mary seizes her baby, she mirrors the violence of the rebels' guards who have snatched her property earlier. That the baby is a nursling makes it that much more vulnerable, thereby increasing the *pathos* and inviting the audience's pity.

This component of a mother *and* child suffering during siege is one shared in the Hebrew and Greek traditions, surely because the literary *topos* is a reflection of the realities of war through which both cultures suffered. Homer's Andromache serves as the archetype in Greek literature of the pathetic woman left alone with a babe in arms after the father has died in war. The tragedians turned to Homer's poetry on the Trojan War as a source of inspiration for describing the pain of war, as did Thucydides. Likewise, Josephus turns to Greek tragedy as inspiration for shaping this moment in his narrative. Josephus, however, is also recalling the Hebrew prophetic literature of lamentation, which decries the plight of women in war.[30] The Christian gospels, which were composed in response to the Hebrew tradition as well as current realities at the end of the first century C.E., also attest, through the prophecies of Jesus, to the theme that women and their babes will suffer because of war and the destruction of Jerusalem.[31] Josephus is shaping his narrative within both the Greek and Hebrew lines of thought, including the Hebrew prophetic literature of lamentation.

After seizing her infant at the breast, Mary delivers a short tragic monologue. As with other speeches in the *Bellum*, it reflects Josephus's own apologetic *Tendenz*. What makes this speech remarkable, however, is that it is uttered by a woman, Mary. The fact that Josephus allows a woman to speak at all is more in keeping with Greek drama.[32] Mary's speech is unusual for the *Bellum* because it comes directly from the mouth of a woman; it is even more unusual still in that it is addressed to a baby. (Let us remember that Josephus could have had Mary simply direct her words to the rebels, who were the source of her agony.) Babies are hardly the typical addressees of set speeches in Graeco-Roman historiography, especially at the climax of an historical account. Instead, this rings of the role of children

---

[30] For instance, Lamentations 2:10-12: children, still nursing, begging for food and taking consolation at their mothers' breasts; also 2:20 "Will the infants at the breast be slain?" In response to this type of imagery is the apocalyptic poem of consolation in Isaiah 66.

[31] For the specific predictions on women and their children, see Mk. 13.17: "Alas for women who are pregnant and for the ones nursing in those days." This prediction is found verbatim at Mt. 24.19 and Lk. 21.23.

[32] Elsewhere in the *Bellum*, only in Book 1 does the historian give direct speeches to women. These speeches occur during the highly dramatized saga of the destruction of the *oikos* of Herod and his tragic downfall, when women are being tortured in order to gather information about the poisoning of the king's brother, Pheroras.

in Greek tragedy, which had as its archetype the role of Astyanax as a focus of *pathos* in Homer's *Iliad*.[33]

Women, children, and the gods are considered among the main conventional objects of concern before battle. Josephus, however, raises this typical element to a much more dramatic level by allowing a woman to speak to her child in order to explain just what is at stake in the war he is describing. We cannot possibly determine whether this is a new interpretation of the conventional mention of women and children at the climax of a history of a war, since so many histories that we know of from antiquity are now lost. We can assume, however, that Josephus presents the scene with Mary very deliberately in order to further his apologetic aims and to appeal to his audience's taste.

There is more here, however. The fact that Mary is addressing her own son and commanding him to serve a higher purpose through his death belongs to the tradition of the Jewish stories in 2 and 4 Maccabees describing the courageous mother who urges her seven sons to resist the attempts of Antiochus Epiphanes to hellenize the Jews and to endure his punishments. Josephus, too, is telling a story of resistance to political power, but not so much against the foreign Romans, who potentially would enslave the mother and child, but against the rebels, whom the historian has been so careful to blame for the famine and the forthcoming destruction of Jerusalem.

Mary offers an interpretation of what her baby's death signifies: food, fury, and myth all rolled into one. On the practical level within the story, the baby will serve as "food" to alleviate the mother's hunger. On the thematic level, the baby will play the tragic role of a "fury" after its death (like those in Aeschylus's *Oresteia*), hounding the rebels for the crimes they have committed. The echo of the *Oresteia* resounds, especially since Josephus is condemning the rebels yet again for their murderous *oikeia stasis* and *homophylos phonos*.[34] Finally, the label of "myth"[35] elevates the baby to a heroic role in a tragedy, which is a further clue to the nature of this particular narrative. It also clearly foreshadows Josephus's own interpretation of

---

[33] This is not, however, to say that children do not figure as dramatic foci of attention in Classical and Hellenistic historiography; see Mark Golden, "Change or Continuity? Children and Childhood in Hellenistic Historiography," in edd. M. Golden and P. Toohey, *Inventing Ancient Culture, Historicism, Periodization, and the Ancient World*, London: Routledge, 1997.

[34] D. Ladouceur, "Josephus and Masada," in L. Feldman and G. Hata, edd., *Josephus, Judaism, and Christianity*, Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1987, p. 110, comments on these in relation to the episode of Masada in book 7.

[35] Josephus uses the word *mythos* only once elsewhere in the *B.J.* at 3.420, where he describes the traces of Andromeda's chains at Joppa.

Apion's canard about Jews sacrificing and eating a Greek every year: this is "full of everything to do with tragedy."[36]

The baby embodies all the suffering of the Jews in this war by suffering murder, dismemberment, and consumption at the hands of his own mother. Josephus states:

> And with these words she slew her son, and then having roasted the body, she devoured half of it, while the rest she covered and was safeguarding.[37]

The baby is roasted, and only half is consumed while the rest is held in reserve as leftovers. Scheiber[38] has suggested that Josephus has derived his idea of a mother with a half-eaten baby from the very end of Petronius's *Satyricon* as we have it. Here Eumolpus justifies his requirement that his inheritors eat him up after he dies by pointing to the historical precedents of cannibalism during the sieges at Saguntum, Petelia, and Numantia, where in the final case "mothers were found who were holding half-eaten bodies of their children at the breast."[39] One also, however, might wonder whether Josephus could have known of the story from Polybius's monograph of Scipio's siege of Numantia.[40] Polybius in his *Histories* glorifies his friend Scipio,[41] and it would be no surprise if a laudatory account of his capture of Numantia inspired Josephus to draw a literary and historical parallel between Scipio and Titus both facing cannibal mothers.[42]

The rebels now appear, and Mary invites them to eat part of her "sacrifice":

> This is my own child, and this is my deed. Eat, for I, too, have eaten. Don't be weaker than a woman or more compassionate than a mother.

---

36 *C.A.* 2.97.

37 *B.J.* 6.208.

38 A. Scheiber, "Zu den Antiken Zusammenhangen der Aggada," *Acta Antiqua Academia Scientiarum Hungaricae* 13 (1965), pp. 267-272.

39 Petr., *Sat.* 141.

40 This piece is mentioned by Cicero in *Ad Fam.* 5.12.2. Also, in *de Rep.* 6.11 (*Somnium Scipionis*), Cicero has Scipio Africanus the Elder predict to Scipio the Younger: "*bellum maximum conficies, Numantiam excindes.*"

41 See, for instance, Polybius *Hist.* 31.25, on the close relationship between Polybius and Scipio, and Scipio's fine character. Scipio appears once in the *B.J.* at 2.380 in Agrippa's list of historical exempla of nations that defied Rome and fell.

42 S. Cohen, "Josephus, Jeremiah, and Polybius," *History and Theory* 21 (1982), p. 367, compares the careers of these two historians. A. Eckstein, "Josephus and Polybius: A Reconsideration, *CA* 9 (1990), pp. 175-208, draws many apt parallels, both thematic and linguistic, between the two authors, but he does not mention this scene.

> If you are pious and turn away from my sacrifice, then I have eaten for you, and let the left-overs remain for me [43]

Josephus clearly has made Mary a woman from Greek tragedy, both in proclaiming this murder-cannibalism her "deed" and by referring explicitly to her status as a woman and a mother as a challenge to the rebels. She is, in fact, a latter-day Medea/Agave hybrid. Medea, before she murders her children, calls their deaths her "sacrificial offerings,"[44] and agonizes over their fate at the hands of enemies should she not dispatch them. Agave does not see her son Pentheus's brutal death as a "sacrifice," but she does invite the chorus to "share the banquet."[45] Mary does not try to put her baby's body back together again as Agave may have at the end of the *Bacchae*, but both women and their people suffer the same fate of dispersion.[46]

Josephus then reports, in the tradition of political invective, that the rebels depart having *almost* eaten the human flesh.[47] The historian has used this image of the rebels as virtual cannibals twice before, and returns to it again when he claims that they would have eaten corpses had the Romans not captured them first.[48] The rebels are the true villains here, not Mary, as Titus will soon make clear in his reply to this deed.

We now receive the mixed audience response of Jews in the city and of the Roman soldiers just outside of it. Josephus engages in wordplay when the "*mythos*" of the mother's deed gets out and is interpreted by the residents of Jerusalem as a "*mysos*," an abomination.[49] Josephus reports the Roman

---

[43] *B.J.* 6.211.

[44] Euripides, *Medea* 1054.

[45] Euripides, *Bacchae* 1184.

[46] Consider possible lines from Dionysus's speech at his epiphany at the end of the play where the god may have pronounced his sentence upon the Thebans for their blasphemy against him: "I shall not hide the evils which the people must now suffer. They must leave the city, making way for barbarians, and unwillingly go to many cities, the unlucky ones dragging the yoke of slavery," (reconstructed from *Christus Patiens*, lines 1668-9 and 1678-9, in Dodds' edition).

[47] *B.J.* 6.212.

[48] *B.J.* 4.541 (on Simon), 5.4 (on Jewish factionalism), 6.373 (on rebels in the underground tunnels).

[49] *B.J.* 6.212. In his novel a century later, Achilles Tatius also engages in wordplay in Kleitophon's tragic monologue over the supposedly dead and cannibalized Leukippe. He bemoans many aspects of her death, listing them off: its foreign location, its violence, the fact that she is a "purifying sacrifice for [the] impure bodies" of the brigands, that she had to see her own evisceration, and worst of all, that her "insides are inside the outlaws, victuals in the vitals of bandits," 3.16. Here Winkler's clever translation is a reflection of the Greek wordplay of *taphe*, burial, and *trophe*, food. In essence, Kleitophon does not dwell upon his own loss, but instead encapsulates the *meaning* of Leukippe's death in his short speech, just as Mary has in her short speech to her baby.

army's response to hearing the news of the "*pathos*": a mixture of incredulity, pity, but mostly deeper "hatred" ("*misos*") towards the Jews.[50] The triple wordplay creates a causal link and explanation for the events to follow: the *mythos* of the baby's *mysos* inflames Roman *misos*. This helps to explain the Romans' ferocity later in the assault upon Jerusalem.

Mary's tragic act of cannibalism also provides the ultimate justification for the destruction of the Temple. Josephus gives Titus a defense speech in which he claims that God knows that he has shown clemency by offering peace, autonomy, and amnesty, and yet the Jews have chosen the opposite. He then blames the Jews for "first setting fire with their own hands to the Temple which is being preserved by us for you."[51] The use of the first person plural stands out in the middle of indirect discourse, which only emphasizes Josephus's argument that the Romans and their leader have great concern for the Temple. Titus then declares that such people, who would set their own Temple on fire, "are worthy of such food" as Mary's cannibal feast.[52] The Roman general pronounces his verdict: he will "bury this abomination of infant-cannibalism ("*to tes teknophagias mysos*") in the very destruction of the country" and vows "not to leave in his *oikoumene* a city standing for the sun to look upon where mothers are fed thus."[53] Titus finally condemns the men specifically for creating the situation by not submitting to the Romans. Thus, ends the tale of Mary in the *B.J.*; she has served her narrative purpose and is never mentioned again.

Melito of Sardis, *Peri Pascha* 52

The first attestation to the story of Mary's cannibalism occurs in *Peri Pascha*, a homily attributed to Melito, a prolific second-century Christian writer and "eunuch" at Sardis according to Eusebius.[54] This homily's inflammatory rhetoric against Jews as unrepentant sinners and killers of Christ provokes scholars to explain what kind of Christian[55] would

---

[50] *B.J.* 6.214.

[51] *B.J.* 6.216

[52] *B.J.* 6.216.

[53] *B.J.* 6.217.

[54] This text is reconstructed from a melange of Greek and Coptic papyri and codices, as well as texts in Georgian and an epitome in Latin. I shall be referring to the text found in S. G. Hall, *Melito of Sardis, On Pascha and Fragments, Texts and Translations*, Oxford, 1979.

[55] No one seems to dispute that the author of this homily was a Christian at the time of its composition, but there is controversy regarding the author's identity and sectarian sympathies. For instance, in a very recent book A. Stewart-Sykes, *The Lamb's High Feast: Melito, Peri Pascha and the Quartodeciman Paschal Liturgy at Sardis*, Leiden: Brill, 1998, argues as his title suggests that "Melito was a member of one of those groups

compose such a text and to evaluate the status of and relations between the Christian and Jewish communities at late antique Sardis. The *Peri Pascha* does not stand alone as potential evidence for these social and religious aspects of Jewish life in Sardis. Scholars generally rely upon two other major pieces of evidence: the notices quoted in Josephus's *Antiquities* concerning the privileges granted to Jews at Sardis in the first century B.C.E.[56] and the fourth-century archaeological remains of a grand synagogue, which was built in basilica form into the corner of a bath-gymnasium complex and which was flanked by a colonnade of shops that were owned by and served both Jews and Christians.[57] The decrees in Josephus, however, date about two hundred years before and the remains of the synagogue over one hundred years after the homily's assumed date of composition in the mid-second century.[58]

In a recent article Lynn Cohick sensibly warns the reader of this homily against leaping to conclusions about religious conflicts at Sardis (especially by using the fourth-century synagogue as a sign of second-century Jewish power) and instead asks us to "consider seriously broader social concerns and developing Christian thought, which may affect greatly the interpretation of the homily."[59] Cohick comments approvingly on the observations of Miriam Taylor:

> She argues convincingly that the homily's descriptions and details about Jews/Judaism are biblical images, with little or no reference to second-century Sardis. In examining the characteristics of "Israel" in the

---

of Christians who became known as Quartodecimans, those who kept Pascha in the fourteenth of Nisan, in accordance with the custom that had been handed down from Judaism," p. 2. On the other hand, Lynn Cohick, "Melito's *Peri Pascha*, in edd. H. C. Kee and L. H. Cohick, *Evolution of the Synagogue: Problems and Progress*, Harrisburg: Trinity, 1999, p. 124, remarks that (based on *E.H.* 4.26.3-11, 13-14 and 5.24.2-6) Eusebius's "description of the author as a Quartodeciman is not obviously reflected in our homily, and his quotation allegedly from the *Peri Pascha* is not found in our homily. Moreover, nothing in the homily hints of its provenance. With that in mind, and to prevent confusion, I will not refer to the homily's author as Melito."

56 Josephus, *Ant.* 14.231-2, 14.235, 14.259-261 (on these last two, see P. Bilde, "Was hat Josephus über die Synagoge zu sagen?" in edd. J. U. Kalms and F. Siegert, *Internationales Josephus-Kolloquium Brüssel 1998*, Münster, 1999, pp. 15-35), and 16.171.

57 See ed. G. M. A. Hanfmann, *Sardis from Prehistoric to Roman Times*, Harvard, 1983. Five essays on the Sardis synagogue by A. T. Kraabel appear conveniently together in *Diaspora Jews and Judaism: Essays in Honor of, and in Dialogue with, A. Thomas Kraabel*, Univ. of South Florida, 1992. On the shops: J. S. Crawford, *The Byzantine Shops at Sardis*, Harvard, 1990.

58 For a reevaluation of the inscriptional evidence see M. Bonz, "The Jewish Community of Ancient Sardis: Deconstruction and Reconstruction," in Kee and Cohick, 1999.

59 Cohick, p. 123.

homily's anti-Jewish section, one is struck with the overwhelming number of biblical comparisons and the absence of examples of second- or third-century C.E. Jewish practices. "Israel's" crime seems to be that it did not recognize the miracles of Jesus or the person of Jesus as the Messiah (*PP* 84-90). Whereas Chrysostom's sermons against the Judaizers include ample examples of specific interactions between Christians and Jewish [sic] in fourth-century Antioch, our homily offers only characteristics or incidents from biblical accounts."[60]

Taylor and Cohick, therefore, emphasize the essentially scriptural basis of Melito's description of Jews and Judaism. Cohick does not mention Melito's use of the *Bellum Judaicum*, but this only encourages one to examine closely how Melito might have adapted Josephus's text for his literary purposes.

I would simply stress here that we need to view Melito's incorporation of the story of Mary's cannibalism into his scripturally based interpretation of the Pascha primarily as a rhetorical strategy. The fact that Melito would turn to the *B.J.*, the product of a Jewish author, is in itself an interesting comment upon the availability of the text (or excerpts from it) in second-century Asia Minor and upon the desire of a Christian to use it. Of course, it is always possible that Melito drew upon Josephus as an extra-biblical source elsewhere in his lost works listed by Eusebius at *E. H.* 4.26.

But can we be so sure that Melito is actually using Josephus's account from *B.J.* 6 at *Peri Pascha* 52? After all, Melito never refers to Josephus, whereas other Christian authors we shall examine do mention the historian by name as their source. Schreckenberg presents a scholarly consensus that this paragraph of the homily exhibits an allusion to Josephus's story.[61] Hardwick weighs the evidence: "Although one cannot say with certainty that Josephus' account of the Roman siege of Jerusalem was in Melito's mind, elements in Melito's text reflect the situation in the *B.J.* rather than what we find in Scripture." Hardwick observes that the sufferings in *P.P.* are "not of foreign origin," just as Josephus depicts the source of Jewish trouble as internal party politics, and the "cannibalism described by Josephus is the ultimate tragedy as it is for Melito."[62] I believe that Hardwick and the others are correct in seeing a textual relationship between *P.P.* 52 and the *B.J.*[63]

---

[60] Cohick, pp. 136-7, on M. Taylor, *Anti-Judaism and Early Christian Identity*, Leiden: Brill, 1995.

[61] H. Schreckenberg, *Rezeptionsgeschichtliche und textkritische Untersuchungen zu Flavius Josephus,* Leiden, 1977, pp. 13-14, where he cites Perler, who originally suggested this in 1966, and von Campenhausen in assent.

[62] M. E. Hardwick, *Josephus an an Historical Source in Patristic Literature Through Eusebius*, Scholars Press, 1989, pp. 17-18.

[63] I am perplexed by Stewart-Sykes choosing to compare the *P.P.* to Josephus's *Antiquities* in section 3.1.5 on "*Peri Pascha* as Rhetorical History," pp. 77-83 and then

The immediate context for the Josephan borrowing is the homily's description of the "destruction" ("*apoleia*") of mankind by sin (*P.P.* 48-56), a destruction which the author labels "*kaine de kai phobera*," "strange and terrible" at *P.P.* 50. In no respect is this destruction limited to "Israel," the Jewish people, whom he excoriates later, nor is it linked directly to the destruction of Jerusalem. This general destruction includes self-destruction, as mankind becomes "parricides, infanticides, and fratricides" (*P.P.* 51). Hall aptly notes here: "This passage is inspired both by biblical ideas (Gen. 4:8; Judg. 9:5; John 13:8; Lev. 18:21; Wisd. 12:5) and by Greek mythological figures such as Orestes, Agamemnon, and Medea."[64]

Mankind's self-destruction culminates in *P.P.* 52, a mother's cannibalism. Melito introduces it as "*to de kainoteron kai phoberoteron*,"[65] emphasizing its extraordinary nature in comparison to all the other heinous sins. Melito has used this exact phrase as the beginning of *P.P.* 23, and he, therefore, is here linking this tale of cannibalism back to the death of the Egyptians' firstborn at the Passover. Josephus in similar fashion claims that Mary's deed was unparalleled. And just as Josephus starts his story with "*gyne tis*," Melito introduces his account with "*meter tis*," thus cutting away all the background on Mary which Josephus provides; he instead concentrates on the key necessary detail: she is "a mother." The baby, whom Josephus finally introduces as "*to teknon*" and "*pais hypomastios*" and whom Mary addresses as "*brephos*" in her speech, is transformed in Melito immediately into his fated end: flesh (to be eaten), "*sarkon*." In the next line the mother is tasting the child who once nursed at her breasts ("*prosepteto hon exethrepsen masthois*"), echoing Josephus's "*pais hypomastios*" and swiftly making the consumer the consumed. How Melito has poetically condensed and focussed this material is truly startling; not a word is wasted. In the following line Melito indulges in heavy alliteration with "*kai ton karpon tes koilias eis koilian katorussen*," "and the bounty of her belly she buried in her belly." Basil, whom I shall discuss below, also engages in this anaphora with "belly" when describing the cannibalism but uses a different word. What follows? "And the wretched mother became a dreadful ("*phoberos*"— again) tomb, gulping down ("*katapinousa*") the child whom she conceived, no longer talking." "*ouketi proslaloun*" at the end is obelized in Hall's text with good reason, and perhaps just an epsilon has slipped out of the verb ("proselaloun"?), but since Papyrus Bodmer XIII (B) has the verb, it should stay in some form.[66] After all, Mary does speak directly to

---

deciding not to discuss the one passage, *P.P.* 52, which seems to indicate that Melito had at least seen or heard of Josephus's *B.J.*

64 Hall, p. 29, n. 16, on *PP.* 51.

65 Melito has used this exact phrase as the beginning of 23, thereby linking this tale of cannibalism back to the death of the Egyptians' firstborn at the Passover.

66 Hall's suggestion of "*kataphilousa*", "kissing," (to replace "*proslaloun*") is charming and does play off "*katapinousa*" cleverly, but since there is no kissing in the biblical or

the baby in the Josephan passage. Of course, what is missing from Melito are the details of how Josephus's Mary cooks, eats half of, and then conceals the rest of her baby's body, and most importantly, how she offers it to the rebels who can barely resist eating it. Melito, however, in *P.P.* 55-6, picks up the word "*sarxs*" again, which he has used in the plural to describe the flesh of the devoured child, and dwells upon the separation and division of "the beautiful body" of mankind. He might even be alluding further to the *B.J.* when he speaks of the "*kaine...symphora kai halosis*" which encloses mankind and makes him captive, the very fate which Mary was trying to prevent her baby from suffering. In the texts of Josephus and Melito, the victim's body becomes a symbol for the sins committed and the consequences suffered.

After the paragraph on cannibalism, Melito turns next in *P.P.* 53 to incest and adultery as further general scriptural examples of "strange, dreadful, and outrageous" behavior. Hall notes on *P.P.* 52 that "Melito is perhaps conscious of repeated allegations that Christians were child-eaters, cf. Theophilus, *Ad Autolycum* iii.3-5;" furthermore, he observes on *P.P.* 53 that "the theme of sexual malpractice is a favorite in Christian apologetic (Tatian, *Oratio ad Graecos* 33-4; Athenagoras, *Supplicatio* 34; Tertullian, *Ad nationes* 1.16)."[67] In fact, Athenagoras even uses the same verb as Melito, "*katapino,*" to describe his accusers' unseemly and predatory sexual and eating practices. While Athenagoras is specifically turning the accusations of cannibalism and sexual depravity back upon his accusers, Melito juxtaposes the two sins in his general condemnation of all mankind. Josephus, however, does not use the incest motif alongside his account of Mary's cannibalism.

What, then, are we to make of Melito's adaptation of Josephus, and how does it fit into the homily as a whole? In the larger picture, Melito's cannibal mother and her child serve as a counterpart to the Egyptians who lost their firstborn sons during Passover, a scene he has so dramatically recounted in the first section of this homily. Melito has employed many of Josephus's details from the *B.J.* for his depiction of mankind's sinful self-destruction through cannibalism, but the homilist has masterfully condensed these details and has transformed them for a new exegetical context. He does so without ever commenting directly upon the historicity, truth-value, or literary qualities of the Josephan text he has employed. The only true "*logos*" that Melito really cares about is Christ (*P.P.* 3, 4, 7, etc.), and

---

Josephan scenes of cannibalism, it's probably best not to introduce it here. Another thought: since an Egyptian child speaks in the first part, only to be silenced by death (*P.P.* 26), perhaps Melito intended the mother's child in 52 to be the one no longer speaking, and in this way B's reading would stand. The baby never speaks in Josephus.

67 Hall, p. 29, nn. 17 and 18. Also see A. McGowan, "Eating People: Accusations of Cannibalism Against Christians in the Second Century," *JECS* 2 (1994), pp. 413-442.

Jerusalem as a real place[68] only matters in the homily when it serves as the place "in the middle of which" "God" was "murdered" (*P.P.* 94, 96). The Romans (and rebels) from the *B.J.* are never specifically mentioned as instruments of God's punishment and destroyers of Jerusalem;[69] in fact, the only "general" and *triumphator* is Christ.[70] We shall not encounter such an extraordinary and imaginative reworking of Josephus's account of cannibalism in Origen, Eusebius, Basil or John Chrysostom.

Origen, *Fragmenta in Lamentationes* 105

Origen employs Josephus's account of cannibalism to explain the text of Lamentations 4:10 in his commentary which is now fragmentary and known as *Fragmenta in Lamentationes*.[71] The specific Fragment 105 on Lam. 4:10, as well as Fragments 109 and 115 which also mention and quote from Josephus on the destruction of Jerusalem, has received careful discussion by Mizugaki.[72] He remarks that "in proportion to the remaining fragments, this chapter [4] contains the highest frequency of references to Josephus among all of the extant works of Origen."[73] After examining the fragments in some detail, he concludes, "The fact that there are substantial allusions to Josephus in *Fragmenta in Lamentationes* proves that such historic incidents as the destruction of the Temple and the fall of Jerusalem were significant to Origen's theology."[74]

---

[68] Melito had been a pilgrim to Jerusalem. K. Armstrong, *Jerusalem: One City, Three Faiths*, Knopf, 1996, pp. 170-171, reports: "Eusebius says that 'crowds' came 'from all over the world' to visit Jerusalem [Eus., *The Proof of the Gospel* 6:18-23], but even he could only name four pilgrims, one of whom was Melito, who had absolutely no interest in the city of Aelia. It was 'worthless now because of the Jerusalem above.' Melito had come to Palestine for scholarly, not devotional, reasons: he hoped to further his biblical studies by researching the country's topology....There is no evidence that Jerusalem was a major pilgrim center for Christians during the second and third centuries." My thanks to Tom Hawkins for pointing this passage out to me and for reading this paper.

[69] At *P.P.* 99, the Latin text adds "*impugnatus ab hostibus contremuisti*," whereas the Greek, Coptic, and Georgian do not have this. In any case, the line is not historically specific.

[70] Christ as "*strategos*," *P.P.* 105; Christ in triumph over the enemy, *P.P.* 102.

[71] The text appears in *Origenes Werke, Dritter Band, GCS*, ed. E. Klosterman, Berlin, 1983; Fragment 105 at p. 273.

[72] W. Mizugaki, "Origen and Josephus," in edd. L. Feldman and G. Hata, *Josephus, Judaism, and Christianity*, Detroit: Wayne State, 1987, pp. 325-337; on the Fragments, pp. 331-333. Also see L. Feldman, "Pagan and Early Christian Anti-Semitism," in his *Studies in Hellenistic Judaism*, Leiden: Brill, 1996, p. 302.

[73] Ibid., p. 331.

[74] Ibid., p. 333.

In Fragment 105, Origen attempts to explain the curious lines at Lamentations 4:10: "The hands of compassionate women boiled their own children; they became food for them [the women] in the ruin of the daughter of my people." Compassion is hardly the first thought that comes to mind when describing cannibalism, so Origen starts off his commentary: "So that the women may not seem on account of savagery to have eaten their children, it says they are compassionate; it attributes the suffering to the necessity of their lack [of food]." "Necessity" (along with "fury") also drives Mary at *B.J.* 6.205, but Origen does not refer to the context of this passage until he has to explain the boiling/roasting of the children, which he says "happened during the siege of the Romans."

Mizugaki has analyzed Origen's use of Josephus's cooking/roasting vocabulary, but he does not notice that Origen is not troubled by the plural cannibal mothers in Lamentations only being one mother in Josephus (and in Melito). He does comment upon Origen's approval of and reliance upon Josephus's "accuracy" in the final line of this fragment[75] and elsewhere in his writings. For Origen, Josephus is an essential piece of extra-biblical evidence for the truth of the scriptures, but Origen does not acknowledge that Josephus himself built his description of Mary and the destruction of Jerusalem on the foundation of these same scriptures. Furthermore, though Origin himself justifies the women's cannibalism by using the word "necessity," which figures prominently in Greek tragedy and in the *B.J.*, in Fragment 105 he does not attend to the literary and "tragic" nature of Josephus's account of Mary's cannibalism as Basil and John Chrysostom will; he instead values Josephus's text for certain details from the destruction of Jerusalem which help him illuminate the diction and content of Lamentations.

Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* 3.6.20-8

Origen quotes a bit of Josephus *B.J.* 6 almost verbatim in Fragment 109, but Eusebius takes this reliance upon Josephus's exact testimony to a new level. He chooses to quote verbatim long portions of Josephus's account of the famine in Jerusalem in *B.J.* 5 and 6, especially the cannibalism of Mary, "in order that those who happen upon this work may have some partial knowledge of how the punishment of God pursued them soon after for their crime against the Christ of God" (*E.H.* 3.5.7). Eusebius then introduces these famine passages by inviting his reader to pick up book 5 of the *B.J.* and "to go through the tragedy of what was then done" (3.6.1). Eusebius does at least recognize the tragic nature of Josephus's account, as will Basil and John Chrysostom. Eusebius then quotes from book 5, followed up by 6.193-

---

75 Frag. 105: "And this and the other sufferings Josephus has presented with accuracy in his [writings] on the capture."

213. Cutting off just before Josephus describes the Roman reaction to Mary's cannibalism, Eusebius interjects his own interpretation that this is, again, their punishment for their impiety and "their crime against the Christ of God" (3.7.1). For Eusebius, however, the cannibalism of Mary is not only a sign of God's punishment, but it also fulfills the prophecy of Christ at Matthew 24:19-21 (3.7.1).[76] John Chrysostom will also see the connection between the cannibalism of Mary and Matthew 24. Eusebius returns to this thought at 3.7.6, marveling that if one compares the rest of Josephus's account of the war to Christ's sayings, one can apprehend "the truly divine and supernaturally wonderful character both of the foreknowledge and of the foretelling of our Savior." Whether Eusebius's readers had access to a full text of the *B.J.* or interest in investigating such comparisons is hard to determine.[77] In any case, Eusebius's use of extended quotation from the *B.J.* is not unique within the context of the *E.H.* as a whole; consider, for instance, his long quotation from the written account of the martyrs in Gaul at the beginning of *E.H.* 5, which is some of the most gripping reading in his entire history. Clearly Eusebius has an eye for graphic stories, and Josephus provided several, including the cannibalism of Mary, which Eusebius could incorporate selectively into his overall theological argument for the triumph of the church over its enemies.

Basil, *Homilia Dicta Tempore Famis et Siccitatis*, and John Chrysostom, *Homilia 76, In Matthaeum*

Both Basil and John Chrysostom understood the scene of Mary's cannibalism in *B.J.* 6 as a piece of drama/tragedy.[78] Basil, in a homily on hunger and thirst, speaks of how:

---

[76] Hardwick, p. 124, see further application of Mary's cannibalism in Eusebius: "The *Preparation for the Gospel* 7.2 and the *Prophetic Excerpts* 3.46 connect the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple by the Romans with the destruction of the city and the Temple in Daniel 9:26. For Eusebius, the gruesome details of destruction, suffering, cannibalism and the statistics of the dead and the enslaved in the aftermath in *H.E.* 3 (all drawn from the *Jewish War*) fit the apocalyptic vision of Daniel. Eusebius juxtaposes Daniel's promise of deliverance with the prophecy of a world ruler (whom Josephus identified with Vespasian [*B.J.* 6.312-313]) and identifies the figure as Christ."

[77] Origen also invites his readers to pick up Josephus at *Contra Celsum* 1.16: "For anyone interested can read what has been written by Flavius Josephus in two books on the antiquity of the Jews, where he produces a considerable collection of writers who testify to the antiquity of the Jews."

[78] Schreckenberg (1987), p. 324, n. 25, notes that both Basil and John Chrysostom perceived that the episode of a mother's act of cannibalism was written as "drama" or "tragedy." He also includes that "Isidore of Pelusium says (*PG* 78, 968) that the sorrowful fate of the Jews should serve the world as a tragic spectacle."

> ...a mother, who had given birth to a child from her belly received it back into her belly in evil fashion. And the Jewish history, which the diligent Josephus composed for us, enacts this tragedy, when terrible sufferings took hold of the people of Jerusalem who were paying the just penalty for their impiety against the Lord.[79]

Basil is not speaking here of the destruction of Jerusalem or Christ's prophesies. Instead, he is simply using the example from Josephus to provide corroboration for his section on famine as the worst of human calamities. He labels Josephus as "diligent," which aligns with our other Christian authors who comment on his accuracy. Basil also appraises the literary nature of Josephus's *B.J.* as tragedy.[80]

John Chrysostom uses this scene of Mary when commenting in a homily on Matthew 24 concerning Christ's prophesy of coming destruction. Like Eusebius, he tells his reader to turn to Josephus's text to get "the truth" of Christ's prophesies.[81] He mentions Josephus as his extra-biblical source, says that the horrors of the war "surpass all tragedy," and specifically mentions the "*paidophagian.*"[82] He links this account of Jewish suffering to the crucifixion of Christ, as Eusebius does.

Basil and John both read the scene of Mary's cannibalism as "tragedy," since as astute ancient readers they understand the literary nature of the presentation. At the same time, however, they insist upon its "truth" as support for their arguments, just as Josephus does.

Conclusion

Each of the Christian writers examined here draws upon Josephus's depiction of Mary's cannibalism in the *B.J.* to justify his own interpretation of the scriptures, especially those which touch upon the destruction of Jerusalem. Most of them identify it as "tragedy" while insisting upon its truth; they, therefore, are responding positively to Josephus's own rhetorical prompting. The tragic irony, however, of these Christian readings of Mary's cannibalism in the *B.J.* is that Josephus presents his account with its "myth for the world" in order to exonerate the majority of his people, yet the Christians generally use it to support their condemnation of the Jews.

---

79 Basil, *Homilia Dicta Tempore Famis et Siccitatis*, *PG* 31,324.

80 At the end of this homily, Basil juxtaposes the terms "*mythos*" and *logos*" when discussing the options of heaven or hell at the Last Judgement: "These are not a myth, but a logos which is proclaimed with an true voice" (*P.G.* 31.327). I wonder whether he was inspired by his reading of Josephus's story of Mary to do so.

81 John Chrysostom *Homilia 76, In Matthaeum*, *PG* 58, 695.

82 Ibid.

'To Save His People From Their Sins' (Matt 1:21): Rome's Empire and Matthew's Salvation as Sovereignty

Warren Carter Saint Paul School of Theology Kansas City MO 64127

Discussions of Matthean soteriology have typically examined three, inter-related dimensions. One approach, shaped by protestant dogmatics, has explored salvation as an individual's standing before God, and investigated the relationship of the indicative and the imperative, law and grace, mercy and judgment, faith and works.[1] A second approach, shaped by covenant/ covenantal nomism,[2] or wisdom traditions,[3] has emphasized salvation's communal shape and wrestled, in part, with the relationship between the church and Israel in salvation history.[4] A third approach has highlighted the eschatological culmination of God's cosmic purposes.[5]

My goal in this paper is to address an issue fundamental to all these approaches, namely, the scope or nature of Matthean soteriology. Davies and Allison summarize the typical scholarly view:

> The Messiah's first task is to save his people from their sins (1:21), not deliver them from political bondage...Jesus saves his people 'from their sins'. This underlies the religious and moral--as opposed to political--character of the messianic deliverance. Liberation removes the wall of sin between God and the human race; nothing is said about freedom from the oppression of governing powers (contrast Ps. Sol. 17).[6]

---

[1] These relationships are variously depicted. P. Luomanen, Entering the Kingdom of Heaven: A Study of the Structure of Matthew's View of Salvation (WUNT 101; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999) 7-23.

[2] Luomanen, Entering, 23-32, 42-48, 278-84.

[3] Luomanen (Entering) omits wisdom perspectives. F.T. Gench, Wisdom in the Christology of Matthew (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1997) 1-33.

[4] G. Strecker, Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit (FRLANT 82; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1962), Israel, Jesus, Church; J.D. Kingsbury, Matthew: Structure, Christology, Kingdom (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975) 25-39, Israel, Jesus and the church. Some analyses mistakenly advocate supercessionist readings, with the church replacing Israel (e.g. W. Trilling, Das Wahre Israel. Studien zur Theologie die Matthäusevangelium [SANT 10; Munich: Kösel, 1964]; A. Hultgren, Christ and His Benefits: Christology and Redemption in the New Testament [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987] 69-76, esp. 75-76) and with the inauguration of a "new" covenant (B. Charette, The Theme of Recompense in Matthew's Gospel [JSNTSup 79; Sheffield: JSOT, 1992] 77-78, 162-68; R. Mohrlang, Matthew and Paul. A Comparison of Ethical Perspectives [SNTSMS 48; Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1984] 78-80).

[5] D. Sim, Apocalyptic Eschatology in the Gospel of Matthew (SNTSMS 88; Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1996).

[6] W.D. Davies and D. Allison, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on The Gospel

Though this view is rarely disputed, I will argue that to understand the nature or scope of Matthew's salvation as individual, spiritualized, and moral, is too restrictive. To contrast "forgiveness of sins" with "deliverance from political oppression" anachronistically assumes a divide between the religious and the political, falsely ascribes this contrast to both the Psalms of Solomon and to Matthew, and incorrectly posits a monolithic view of messianic expectations.[7] Further, this view overlooks a very immediate form of "political oppression" in the gospel's world, namely Roman imperialism. I will argue that Matthew's salvation does include "freedom from the oppression of governing powers" and deliverance from political bondage, notably from the sinful socio-political and economic structures of Roman imperialism that manifest Satan's rule. Matthean soteriology asserts God's sovereignty in ending all evil including Rome's empire, and in forming a new and just creation.

I will employ two methods previously neglected in the conversation. A narrative-critical or audience-oriented approach[8] seems especially

---

According to Matthew 3 Vols. (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988-97) 1.174, 210. The second task? R. Gundry, Matthew: A Commentary on His Handbook for a Mixed Church Under Persecution (2nd Edit; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982, 1994) 23-24. Charette (Theme of Recompense, 87) claims Jesus saves from a "spiritual rather than physical" exile. D. Hagner, (Matthew 1-13 [WBC 33A; Dallas: Word, 1993] 19) concedes that saving from Roman occupation is possible but not post-70. "The deliverance from sins is in a much more profound, moral sense and depends finally upon the pouring out of Jesus' blood (26:28)." W. Wiefel (Das Evangelium nach Matthäus [THKNT 1; Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1998] 33) cites W. Grundmann (Das Evangelium nach Matthäus [THKNT 1; Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1968] 69) in contrasting "die traditionelle jüdische Endzeithoffnung" of a Messiah who redeems from foreign domination, with Jesus' different task: "...sind es hier nicht die politischen Feinde von denen er errettet, sondern die Sünden."

[7] For a contrast with Ps. Sol 17, D. Hill, The Gospel of Matthew (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972) 79; Gundry, Matthew, 24; J. Gnilka, Das Matthäusevangelium (HTKNT 1; Freiburg: Herder, 1986, 1988) 1.19. The twenty-three uses of ἁμαρτία in the Psalms of Solomon (including four in Ps. Sol. 17) show that these Psalms are concerned with "deliverance from the oppression of governing powers" and with sin between people and God, as well as among people. The Psalms, like Matthew, include forgiveness of sins and deliverance from political oppression in God's saving work. P. Bonnard (L'Évangile selon Saint Matthieu [CNT 1; 2nd Ed.; Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1982] 21) calls the (mis)use of Ps Sol 17, "une mauvaise habitude." On diverse messianic expectations, J. Charlesworth (ed.), The Messiah (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992).

[8] I understand "audience" as the "authorial audience," the audience presupposed by the text but attested by textual features that assume certain levels and types of competency (linguistic, socio-political, religious etc.) and by the gospel's circumstances of origin. This audience is my (re)construction, influenced by these factors and by scholarly debate. See P.J. Rabinowitz, "Whirl without End: Audience-Oriented Criticism," in G.D. Atkins

warranted. Previous discussions tend to select pericopes according to predetermined theological schemes, focus on redaction, and neglect narrative location, sequence, form, and the audience's interpretive work.[9] An imperial-critical view counters the neglect of Roman imperialism in Matthean studies in asking what role the audience's experience of Roman imperial power might play in understanding Matthean soteriology.[10]

Verse 1:21c ("he will save his people from their sins") will be the focus verse. Located in the opening chapter, this birth and naming announcement, spoken to Joseph by an authoritative "angel of the Lord," commissions the yet-unborn Jesus to his life work. It defines the main character's name in salvific terms, and employs the verb "save" (σώζω) for the first time. The oft-noted "primacy effect" whereby initial content shapes an audience's expectations, understandings and questions throughout the work, highlights the verse's contribution.[11] I will attend to the audience's political-historical experience of Roman imperialism (Section I), to 1:21's narrative context (II-III), to its lexical items (IV-V), and to its intertextual connections (VI), to argue that Matthean soteriology asserts God's sovereignty over the cosmos by ending all evil, including Rome's empire (VII-VIII).

I

Matthean scholarship, focused on the relationship between Matthew's community and a synagogue, has rarely considered any connection with Rome's empire. Six brief observations signal the validity of attention to

---

and L. Morrow (eds.), Contemporary Literary Theory (Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts, 1989) 81-100; idem, Before Reading: Narrative Conventions and the Politics of Interpretation (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University, 1987) 15-46; W. Carter, Matthew: Storyteller, Interpreter, Evangelist (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1996) 15-115; W. Carter and J.P. Heil, Matthew's Parables: Audience-Oriented Perspectives (CBQMS 30; Washington: CBA, 1998) 8-17; W. Carter, "Narrative/Literary Approaches to Matthean Theology: The 'Reign of the Heavens' as an Example," JSNT 67 (1997) 3-27.

[9] Examples abound. Luomanen (Entering, 51-58) superficially dismisses "the modern literary approach" (52; note the misleading singular!) and begins with 5:17-20 as the first reference to "entering the reign." But surely chapters 1-5:16 including particular sections, (1:21 "save" and 4:18-22 "follow"), contribute something.

[10] On an audience's assumed knowledge, M.A. Powell, "Expected and Unexpected Readings in Matthew: What the Reader Knows," Asbury Theological Journal 48 (1993) 31-51; Carter, Matthew: Storyteller, 1-115, though regrettably I omit the experience of Roman imperialism.

[11] M. Perry, "Literary Dynamics: How the Order of a Text Creates its Meaning," Poetics Today 1 (1979-80) 35-64, 311-64. Studies of the gospel's plot attribute a prime role to 1:21 and 1:18-25. M.A. Powell, "The Plot and Subplots of Matthew's Gospel," NTS 38 (1992) 187-204, esp. 195-99; W. Carter, "Kernels and Narrative Blocks: The Structure of Matthew's Gospel," CBQ 54 (1992) 463-81, esp. 472-74; idem, Matthew: Storyteller, 149-75.

Roman imperialism:

> The gospel's plot concerns the death of its main character by a distinctly Roman form of execution, crucifixion.
>
> Jesus proclaims and enacts the empire (βασιλεία) of God, over against Rome's empire (see section IV).
>
> Jesus conflicts with the religious leaders, members of the ruling class allied with Rome (see section IV).
>
> The gospel interprets Rome's destruction of Jerusalem in 70 CE as God's punishment of Israel's leaders for the rejection of Jesus (22:1-10; section V).
>
> In chapters 2 and 14, the gospel portrays two of Rome's murderous allies and puppet kings.
>
> Twice Jesus instructs about paying taxes (17:24-27; 22:15-22), a means by which Rome expresses and enforces its power.

I will elaborate a seventh: Roman imperial power pervades the gospel audience's world.[12] While Roman presence was very visible in any of the provenances suggested for the gospel, I will focus on the traditional locale, Antioch, though recognizing other locations are possible.

Rome sustained its economic and political power not only by alliances with local elites, by military might, by a transportation infra-structure that moved goods to the center, and by a proprietary mentality which claimed resources through taxes and tributes, but also with a carefully articulated ideology[13] at whose heart is a theological claim: Rome's sovereignty derives

---

[12] W. Carter, "Toward an Imperial Critical Reading of Matthew's Gospel," SBL 1998 Seminar Papers: Part 1 (SBLSP 37; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998) 296-324; idem, "Contested Claims: Roman Imperial Theology and Matthew's Gospel," BTB 29 (1999) 56-67; idem, "Paying the Tax to Rome as Subversive Praxis: Matthew 17:24-27," JSNT 76 (1999) 3-31; idem, "Invoking Isaiah: Matthean Soteriology and An Intertextual, Anti-Imperial Reading of Isaiah 7-9 and Matt 1:23 and 4:15-16," JBL 2000 (forthcoming); idem, Matthew and the Margins: A Religious and Socio-Political Reading (Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 2000).

[13] For imperial structures, control, and ideology, see G. Lenski, Power and Privilege: A Theory of Social Stratification (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966) 189-296; E. Said, Orientalism (New York: Pantheon Books, 1978); idem, Culture and Imperialism (New York: Vintage Books, 1994); J. Kautsky, The Politics of Aristocratic Empires (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1982); T. Eagleton, Ideology: An Introduction (London/New York: Verso, 1991); A. Kee, "The Imperial Cult: The Unmasking of an

from the gods.[14] The emperor is the gods' agent who manifests their presence and blessings to ensure societal wellbeing and fulfill Rome's destiny. According to Virgil, Jupiter, "father of men and gods," appoints Romulus to found the Roman empire for which "I set no bounds nor periods of empire; dominion without end have I bestowed." Romans will be "lords of the world" (Aeneid, 1.254, 278-79, 281). Over a century later, Seneca has Nero extol the emperor's divine election, his divinely-given power over individuals and nations, and role as agent of the gods' will:

> Have I of all mortals found favor with heaven and been chosen to serve on earth as vicar of the gods? I am the arbiter of life and death for the nations; it rests in my power what each man's (sic) lot and state shall be: by my lips fortune proclaims what gift she should bestow on each human being: from my utterance peoples and cities gather reasons for rejoicing; without my favor and grace no part of the whole world can prosper; all those many thousands of swords which my peace restrains will be drawn at my nod, what nation shall be utterly destroyed, which banished, which shall receive the gift of liberty, which have it taken from them, what kings shall become slave and whose head shall be crowned with royal honor, what cities shall rise and which shall fall – this is mine to decree. (De Clem 1.1.2).[15]

"Without God's aid so vast an empire could never have been built up," declares Josephus (JW 2.390-91). Jerusalem should surrender since "God

---

Ideology," Scottish Journal of Religious Studies 6 (1985) 112-28. Susan Mattern (Rome and the Enemy: Imperial Strategy in the Principate [Berkeley: University of California, 1999] 108-9, 115-22, 162-222) emphasizes Rome's ruthless power, honor, status, security, revenge, deterrence by terror. Said (Culture and Imperialism, 9) defines imperialism as "the practice, the theory, and the attitudes of a dominating metropolitan center ruling a distant territory; 'colonialism'…is the implanting of settlements on distant territory."

[14] See Carter, "Toward an Imperial Critical Reading," 296-324; J. Gagé, "La théologie de la victoire impériale," Revue historique 172 (1933) 1-43; K. Scott, The Imperial Cult under the Flavians (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1936); A-M. Taisne, "Le thème du triomphe dans le poésie et l'art sous les Flaviens," Latomus 32 (1973) 485-504; L.R. Taylor, The Divinity of the Roman Emperor (Philadelphia: Porcupine, 1974); D. Cuss, Imperial Cult and Honorary Terms in the New Testament (Paradosis 23; Fribourg: Fribourg University, 1974); J.R. Fears, Princeps a Diis Electus: The Divine Election of the Emperor as a Political Concept at Rome (Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome Vol. 26; American Academy in Rome, 1977); idem, "The Theology of Victory at Rome: Approaches and Problems," in H. Temporini and W. Haase (eds.), ANRW II.17.2 (New York/Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1981c) 736-825; for some modifications of Fears' work, D. Schowalter, The Emperor and the Gods: Images From the Time of Trajan (HDR 28; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993).

[15] J. R. Fears, "Nero as Vicegerent of the Gods in Seneca's De Clementia," Hermes 103 (1975) 486-96.

was on the Roman side" (JW 5.368); "you are warring not against the Romans only but also against God"(JW 5. 378; cf 396, 412).[16] There is no separation of the political and the religious. The latter serves the former; the former enacts the latter.

Vespasian becomes emperor in 69CE, followed by his sons Titus in 79 and Domitian in 81. Writers such as Tacitus, Suetonius and Dio, and poets such as Martial, Silius Italicus, and Statius employ traditional themes of divine election and of the ruler as the agent of the gods' will and blessings, especially Jupiter's,[17] to provide divine legitimation for the Flavian reign.[18] Vespasian's accession means the end of the gods' disfavor and punishment (Tacitus, Hist. 1.3; 4.3). For Josephus, *God* has Nero send Vespasian to command the armies of Syria thereby "shaping the destinies of empire" (JW 3.6-7). Josephus attributes to Vespasian thoughts that "divine providence had assisted him to grasp the empire and some just destiny had placed all sovereignty of the world within his hands" (JW 4.622).

Jupiter's election and favor are also reflected in his protection of Domitian. Tacitus (Hist 3.74) and Suetonius (Domit. 1. 2) note that Domitian found safety during the civil war in the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus (also Martial, Epig. V.1.7-8; VII.60.1-2). Silius Italicus (c.26-101CE) has Jupiter predict:

> The burning of the Tarpeian temple cannot alarm thee;
> But in the midst of the impious flames thou shalt be
> Saved, for the sake of (hu)mankind; (Punica 3.609-610)

As a result of Jupiter's favorable intervention and election, Domitian rules "the blessed earth with paternal sway" (3.625-6). Statius salutes Domitian:

> A god is he, at Jupiter's command he rules for him the blessed world …Hail ruler of men (sic) and parent of gods, foreseen by

---

[16] Josephus' demands for submission echo Cicero's century-old claim that "Jews and Syrians were born for servitude" (De Prov 10), a view Titus repeats in urging his troops to conquer "inferior" Jews who have "learned to be slaves" (JW 6.37-42).

[17] J.R. Fears, "The Cult of Jupiter and Roman Imperial Ideology," in W. Temporini and W. Haase (eds.), ANRW II.17.1 (Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1981) 3-141. Taisne ("Le Thème du triomphe," 486) notes that the triumphant emperor as "un représentant de Jupiter en personne" is standard in imperial flattery "de Virgile à Stace, d'Auguste à Domitien."

[18] Suetonius, Galba, 1; Tacitus, Hist. 1.86; Suetonius, Vespasian. 5.6; cf. Dio 65.1.3; Tacitus, Hist. 1.10; 2.1; 2.76. For legitimating signs, Tacitus, Hist. 4.81; Suetonius, Vesp. 7.2-3; Dio 65.8.1. Scott, Imperial Cult, 2-19. On Martial and the Flavians, J.P. Sullivan, Martial: the Unexpected Classic. A Literary and Historical Study (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1991) 115-45; on Statius, K. Scott, "Statius' Adulation of Domitian," AJP 54 (1922) 247-59; A. Hardie, Statius and the Silvae: Poets, Patrons, and Epideixis in the Graeco-Roman World (ARCA Classical and Medieval Texts, Papers, and Monographs 9; Liverpool: Francis Cairns, 1983) 189-94; on Silius Italicus, W.C. McDermott and A. Orentzel, "Silius Italicus and Domitian," AJP 98 (1977) 24-34.

me and foreordained was thy godhead. (Silv. IV.3.128-29, 139-40).

As the gods' elected agents, the emperors manifest the gods' rule on the earth. Silius Italicus has Jupiter assure a worried Venus that long into the future Rome will rule powerfully and successfully (Punica 3.570-629). Jupiter previews the "future events" (3.630) that he has ordained, notably the military successes of the Flavians, Vespasian (3.593-602), Titus (3.603-6), and Domitian (3.604-29). Martial and Statius also identify Domitian as the agent of Minerva, goddess of war and the arts. She appears on Domitian's Greek and Syrian coins often in military pose and bearing Jupiter's thunderbolt.[19] Vespasian's coins celebrate the gods' numerous gifts through him to humanity: peace, victory, agricultural prosperity, security, well being, harmonious relations, and liberty, among others. Titus and Domitian proclaim similar blessings.[20] Domitian is, in Martial's words, "the world's sure salvation" (Epig. II.91.1), its "blest protector and savior" (Epig. V.1.7), its "chief and only welfare" (Epig. VIII.66.6). Statius declares Domitian "Lord of the earth" (Silv. III.4.20), "ruler of the nations and mighty sire of the conquered world, hope of men and beloved of the gods" (IV.2.14-14).

Residents of a city like Antioch encountered the propaganda of Rome's divine election and beneficial sovereignty in various forms. Antioch was the capital of the province of Syria, a militarily and economically strategic location.[21] Rome's rule was exercised by an emperor-appointed legate and his retainers[22] in cooperation with local elite.[23] It embraced taxes, legal jurisdiction, supervision of local government, and internal order and defense.[24] The latter task was accomplished by the three or four legions of

---

[19] L. Morawiecki, "The Symbolism of Minerva on the Coins of Domitianus," Klio 59 (1977) 185-93; Scott, Imperial Cult, 166-88.

[20] Scott, Imperial Cult, 25-32 (Vespasian), 51-53 (Titus), 93-96 (Domitian); J. Fears, "The Cult of Virtues and Roman Imperial Ideology," in H. Temporini and W. Haase (eds.), ANRW II.17.2 (Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1981) 827-948, esp. 899-902. Abstract notions are deified and understood to be the working of a particular deity ("Cult," 828).

[21] M.P. Charlesworth, Trade Routes and Commerce of the Roman Empire (2nd Edn; New York: Cooper Square, 1970) 36-56.

[22] Lenski, Power and Privilege, 243-48. Retainers included "officials, professional soldiers, household servants and personal retainers" who served "the political elite."

[23] S. Alcock, "Archaeology and Imperialism: Roman Expansion and the Greek City," JMA 2 (1989) 87-135, esp. 90-95; M. Goodman, The Ruling Classes of Judea: The Origins of the Jewish Revolt Against Rome A.D. 66-70 (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1987) 29-35; P.A. Brunt, "The Romanization of the Ruling Classes in the Roman Empire," in D.M. Pippidi (ed.), Assimilation et résistance à la culture greco-romaine dans le monde ancien (Bucarest: Editura Academiei, 1976) 161-73.

[24] P. A. Brunt, "Laus imperii," in P.D.A. Garnsey and C.R. Whittaker (eds.), Imperialism in the Ancient World (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1978) 159-91, esp. 173-74.

about five thousand per legion stationed in Antioch.[25] Agents of war and intimidation,[26] the legions upheld Pax Romana --"peace with bloodshed" to (mis)quote Tacitus (Ann 1.10)--against the Parthian threat to the east and against internal disorder. Vespasian assembled his army to invade Galilee and Judea in 67 CE in Antioch (Josephus, JW 3.8,29), and Syrian corn and other crops supplied Titus' army against Jerusalem (JW 5.520).

These administrative and military personnel, and their buildings, were but some of the visual images of Roman sovereignty and election observed daily by residents of Antioch.[27] Present and future emperors visited the city and no doubt celebrations of significant imperial occasions (e.g. the founding of Rome; birthdays) promoted imperial visibility.[28] Numerous emperors and legates engaged in extensive building activity.[29] Statues of Rome's founding figures, Romulus and Remus being nursed by a she-wolf, of emperors Tiberius and Vespasian, and a cenotaph in honor of Germanicus, Tiberius' nephew and Caligula's father who died in Antioch, celebrated Roman sovereignty.[30] Coins, handheld billboards of imperial propaganda, employed images of emperors and legates and imperial symbolism to proclaim the numerous blessings of various divinities bestowed through imperial rule.[31] Intimidating post-70 Judea Capta coins depicting subjugated Judeans upheld Roman power, celebrated its 'peace', and warned of similar subjugation for any who opposed the power that the gods had ordained.[32] Titus set up bronze figures at Antioch's southern gate

---

[25] Josephus places three legions in Antioch in 40 CE (JW 2.186). D. van Berchem ("Une inscription flavienne du Musée d'Antioche," Museum Helveticum 40 [1983] 185-96) discusses an inscription that indicates four legions in the mid 70s. Tacitus (Annals 4.5) locates four legions in Syria and indicates (Hist 2.80) their significant involvement in Antiochene life.

[26] For this view "from below;" K. Wengst, Pax Romana and the Peace of Jesus Christ (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987) 1-54, esp, 25-26.

[27] P. Zanker, The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1988). On government buildings as symbols of imperial power, Kautsky, Aristocratic Empires, 156.

[28] Augustus and Tiberius visited in 20 BCE, Caligula in 19 CE, Vespasian in 66-67 CE, Titus in c.71, and Trajan in the 70s-80s. S.R.F. Price, Rituals and Power: The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1984), though there is little data specific to Antioch.

[29] G. Downey, A History of Antioch in Syria from Seleucus to the Arab Conquest (Princeton, NJ; Princeton University, 1961) 140-41, 163-219.

[30] Downey, History of Antioch, 181-188, 206.

[31] For Flavian coin propaganda, Scott, Imperial Cult, 25-33, 51-53, 92-94; Carter, "Toward an Imperial-Critical Reading," 302-15. C.H.V. Sutherland, "The Intelligibility of Roman Imperial Coin Types," JRS 49 (1959) 46-55.

[32] L.J. Kreitzer, Striking New Images: Roman Imperial Coinage and the New Testament World (JSNTSup 134; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1996) 17-98, esp. 19-24, 136-39; D.R. Edwards, "Religion, Power and Politics: Jewish Defeats by the Romans in

leading to Daphne that were understood to be cherubim from the Jerusalem temple. These figures reminded humiliated Jews of Rome's destiny to rule and its superior power. Titus placed symbols of Aeternitas on the gates, a proclamation of the eternal duration of Roman and Flavian sovereignty given by the gods.[33] Taxes, tributes, and levies of goods and labor, up to two-thirds of peasant production, paid for this Roman presence and control.[34] When Nero wonders about abolishing indirect taxation, "his older advisers...pointed out that the dissolution of the empire was certain if the revenues on which the state subsisted were to be curtailed" (Tacitus, Annals 13.50). Not paying taxes was regarded as rebellion against Rome's sovereignty.[35] Post-70, Vespasian redirected a Jewish tax for the Jerusalem temple to rebuild and maintain the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus in Rome (Josephus, JW 7.218; Dio Cassius 65.7.2). Its payment declared the supremacy of Jupiter and Rome in defeating Jerusalem and its God, and identified Jews as "a defeated race punished for (their) nationality."[36]

While provincial elite writers like Aristides and Plutarch celebrate the empire's benefits of peace, freedom, common laws, a common fatherland, and material gifts to cities and officials,[37] the rarely expressed view "from below" is very different. Tacitus has the British chief Calgacus speak passionately against the burdens of provincials: slavery, conscription, tax,

---

Iconography and Josephus," in J.A. Overman and R.S. MacLennan (eds.), Diaspora Jews and Judaism: Essays in Honor of, and in Dialogue with, A. Thomas Kraabel (SFSHJ 41; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992) 293-310, esp. 301-306; Mattern, Rome and the Enemy, 114-22, 162-222.

[33] Downey, History of Antioch, 206; Fears ("Cult of Virtues," 900-902) notes that Vespasian, Titus, and Domitian celebrate the divine power Aeternitas on coins; Scott, Imperial Cult, 42, 95.

[34] So Cerialis in Tacitus, Hist. 4.74. Lenski (Power and Privilege, 267-68) identifies about 70 per cent as an upper figure. Kautsky (Aristocratic Empires, 150) argues that "to rule in aristocratic empires is, above all, to tax." Note the proprietary "the things of Caesar" in Matt 22:21. M. Corbier, "City, Territory, and Taxation," in J. Rich and A. Wallace-Hadrill (eds.), City and Country in the Ancient World (London: Routledge, 1991) 211-39); Wengst, Pax Romana, 26-37; Carter, "Paying the Tax," 15-18.

[35] Agrippa argues that Jewish non-payment in 66 CE was an "act of war" (JW 2.403); payment will remove the "charge of insurrection" (JW 2.404). Also Josephus, Ant. 12.158-59; Tacitus, Annals 3.40-41; 4.72-73; 6.41. R. MacMullen, Enemies of the Roman Order: Treason, Unrest and Alienation in the Empire (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, 1966) 212-14; S. Dyson, "Native Revolts in the Roman Empire," Historia 20 (1971) 239-74.

[36] E. Smallwood, The Jews under Roman Rule from Pompey to Diocletian: A Study in Political Relations (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1981) 372-76; M. Goodman, "Nerva, the Fiscus Judaicus and Jewish Identity," JRS 79 (1989) 40-44; Carter, "Paying the Tax to Rome," argues that Matt 17:24-27 advocates payment of this tax, ironically, to recognize God's sovereignty not Rome's.

[37] V. Nutton, "The Beneficial Ideology," Garnsey and Whittaker, Imperialism, 209-21.

tribute, forced labor, requisitioned goods, Roman arrogance: "To plunder, butcher, steal, these things they misname empire: they make a desolation and they call it peace" (Agricola 29-31). Wengst summarizes the military, political and economic situation of most people in a city like Antioch: "Internal conditions ordered by Rome, security from external enemies guaranteed by Rome, paid for by tribute, maintained by obedience..."[38] And legitimated by the gods as the divine will.

II

Hearing the gospel's opening genealogy (1:1-17),[39] the narrative context for 1:21, in this imperial context suggests a polemical function. The genealogy does not attest Rome's election by the gods, outline Rome's history, assert Rome's sovereignty, or proclaim the emperor's agency in manifesting the gods' blessings. Instead, it asserts *God's* sovereignty. God has elected Israel and Jesus to accomplish *God's* purposes. In so doing, it asserts that, despite all appearances to the contrary post-70, sovereignty belongs to God, not to Rome.[40] This affirmation answers the central question of apocalyptic worldviews, "To whom does the sovereignty of the world belong?"[41]

Second, the story of God and Israel told in 1:1-17 attests that God's purposes triumph no matter the adversity. Like Abraham and David, most characters exhibit faithfulness and unfaithfulness. In fact, the latter dominates. Of the thirteen kings after David in verses 6b-11, only four are evaluated in 1-2 Kings and 1-2 Chronicles as good kings. The repeated reference in 1:11-12 to exile (emphasized by 1:17) highlights an event that the Deuteronomist, Chronicler, and Ezekiel, using the same noun, view as God's punishment of a sinful people.[42] The continuation of the genealogy after the exile (verses 12-17) indicates that both Babylonian imperial power and Israel's faithlessness are subordinate to God's purposes. Rome will not

---

[38] Wengst, Pax Romana, 21.

[39] D. R. Bauer, "The Literary and Theological Function of the Genealogy in Matthew's Gospel," in D. R. Bauer and M.A. Powell (eds.), Treasures Old and New: Recent Contributions to Matthean Studies (SBL Symposium Series No 1; Atlanta: Scholars, 1996) 129-59.

[40] I see the gospel in part as inspiring religiously-based, non-violent opposition to the empire through an alternative commitment to God's empire manifested by Jesus, and to a corresponding set of practices. Carter, Matthew and the Margins, "Introduction." MacMullen, Enemies, 95-162; A. Momigliano, "Some Preliminary Remarks on the 'Religious Opposition' to the Roman Empire," in A. Giovannini (ed.), Opposition et Résistances à L'Empire d'Auguste à Trajan (Entretiens sur L'Antiquité Classique 33; Geneva: Fondation Hardt, 1987); Bowersock, "Mechanics of Subversion," in Giovannini, Opposition et Résistances, 291-320; Said, Culture and Imperialism, 191-281.

[41] E. Käsemann, "On the Subject of Primitive Christian Apocalyptic," in New Testament Questions of Today (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969) 135.

[42] W. Carter, "'Solomon in all his glory': Intertextuality and Matthew 6:29," JSNT 65 (1997) 3-25, esp. 11, and nn 27-28.

be able to resist God's purposes continued in Jesus (1:1,16).

Third, the repeated references to Abraham (1:1, 2, 17) recall God's promise that through Abraham *God* will bless all the peoples of the earth (Gen 12:1-3). As "son of Abraham," Jesus is God's agent through whom God's blessing is encountered. The beneficiaries of God's blessing are "all people," not just Jupiter's emperors and their privileged elite who exploit others for their own benefit.[43] The earth, including Israel's land (Lev 25:2, 23, 38), belongs to God (Ps 24:1), not to the occupying Romans. Jesus promises its restoration to a more equitable use (Matt 5:5; 19:28).[44]

Fourth, the references to David as "king" in 1:6 and his successors in 1:6-11 recall God's promise of descendants and an eternal kingdom (2 Sam 7:14; Ps 89:3-4). The phrase "by the wife of Uriah" in 1:6 recalls David's aberrations as king as he departs from the just kingship envisioned, for instance, by Psalm 72. There, kingly reign embodies God's sovereignty over the earth, ensures justice for the poor, and does not exploit and oppress. This vision differs from usual kingly practices as Moses in Deut 17:14-17 and Samuel in 1 Sam 8:1-17 emphasize, and as Roman imperial practice exhibits.[45] The Davidic reference prepares for king Jesus, son of David who will mercifully enact God's empire and salvation (9:27-31; 20:29-34).

III

The immediate narrative context of 1:21 concerns Jesus' origin (1:18 γένεσις). His conception occurs "before (Joseph and Mary) came together" and results "from the holy spirit." It is God's act. Conception by a god was typical of outstanding imperial figures like Alexander (Plutarch, Alexander 2.1-3.4), Rome's founder Romulus (Plutarch, Romulus 2.3-6) and the emperor Augustus (Suetonius, Deified Augustus 94.4). It identifies them as agents chosen by the gods to do their will. Jesus is set in such elect and commissioned company, but with the key difference: God elects him.

IV

The explanation of the name "Jesus" ("for he will save his people from their sins," 1:21) prophesies future greatness. Such prophecies typically mark the births of figures like Vespasian and Titus, destined by the gods for political and imperial rule.[46] Jesus is to save "his people" (λαός). Is this the church

---

[43] God's purposes involve significant figures like Abraham and David, and nobodies that leave no trace in the traditions (1:3b-4, 13-15). On the elite's exploitation of the rest, Wengst, Pax Romana, 19-45; Carter, Matthew and the Margins, "Introduction."

[44] See note 84.

[45] Carter, "'Solomon'," 16-24; idem, "Paying the Tax," 15-26.

[46] Suetonius, Vespasian 5; Titus 2; note also Romulus, Plutarch, Romulus 2.4; Cyrus,, Herodotus, Hist 1.107-8; Alexander, Cicero De Div 1.23.47; Augustus, Suetonius, Augustus, 94; Tiberius, Suetonius, Tiberius 14; Moses, Josephus, Ant 2.215-16. Note the portents of disaster in Suetonius, Vitellius 3.2.

or Israel? If the pronoun is emphasized, "his people" suggests the church (ἐκκλησία) that experiences salvation (4:18-22; 16:18; 18:18), and consists of Jews and Gentiles (28:16-20). But in the immediate context of God's covenant faithfulness to Israel outlined in 1:1-17, and the scripture citation in 2:6 identifying Jesus "as a shepherd for my people Israel" (λαός), an immediate referent to Israel seems more likely.[47]

What sins?[48] The common view asserts that only "religious and moral" sins, but not oppressive political, social or economic sins, are in view. The audience knows from the genealogy's vast catalogue of human sinfulness that such a division is false. Elaborating the Abraham and David stories alone reveals deception, xenophobia, abuse of power, adultery and murder.[49] The litany of failed kings and references to Babylonian exile attest further violation of social relationships and political structures (1:6-11). The kings are condemned in 1-2 Kings and 1-2 Chronicles, as well as by the prophets, for much wrongdoing, from failure to implement and maintain authentic worship to unjust and oppressive rule that greedily exploits the poor. The sinfulness is simultaneously political, economic, social, religious and moral.

Herod, Rome's vassal king, protects his political power with terror and viciousness (2:16). Chapter 2 exemplifies the sinfulness of imperial rule, the oppressive ways of "the kings of the earth" who resist God's just purposes (cf Ps 2:2; Matt 17:24-27), and do murderous harm to the vulnerable Rachels of this world. Herod Antipas (14:1-12) and Pilate (27:11-26) will exhibit similar resistance to God's purposes in unjust acts against people.

The temptation scene reveals an important perspective on this sinful world of imperial power. In 4:8 Satan offers Jesus "all the kingdoms/empires (βασιλείας) of the world." The offer reveals Satan's claim over the world and its political realms. If Satan controls the world's empires, it follows that the leading empire, Rome, is under the devil's control as the devil's agent. Rome's rule manifests Satan's empire. The noun βασιλεία ("kingdom/ empire") in 4:8 recalls the use of βασιλεύς for Rome's ally, king Herod, in 2:1, linking him to Satan, and reinforcing a contrast with king Jesus (2:2,

---

[47] Gnilka, Das Matthäusevangelium, 1.19; A. Sand, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (RNT 1; Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1986) 47-48. Combining the two readings highlights the faithfulness but incompleteness of God's purposes.

[48] An investigation of ἁμαρτία clarifies little. In its six appearances (Matt 3:6; 9:2, 5, 6; 12:31; 26:28), the contexts lack specificity.

[49] On Hagar, P. Trible, Texts of Terror (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984) 9-35. On Abraham's shabby treatment of Sarah, Gen 12:12-13; 20:13; his xenophobia, Gen 12:10-20; 20:8-18.

βασιλεύς) and his God-given empire (4:17, βασιλεία).[50]

In this devilish, imperial world, Jesus demonstrates the empire of God (4:17) and exposes and challenges imperial control as contrary to God's empire (20:25-28). The catalogue of diseases in 4:23-25 reflects in part the social, economic and political hardships and inequities of the imperial world. One cause of disease, malnutrition, results from an inadequate food supply and land resources, from the poor's non-existent economic resources for land, seed and animal improvement, from taxes and tributes, high food prices, overwork, and control of the market by elite merchants.[51] Healing resists such a world and anticipates God's transforming empire. Paralysis and demon possession (4:24) are frequently observed phenomena in contexts of political oppression, colonial dominance, and social conflict.[52] Jesus' exorcisms point to God's empire that overcomes the devil's sovereignty (12:28). Constantly Jesus challenges unjust social relations and the unequal distribution of and limited access to resources (5:3-12; 6:9-13).[53] The rich young man of 19:16-22 is guilty of much more than a little greed. He depicts the social elite whose excessive wealth is understood to result from an over-accumulation of a limited resource at the expense of the poor.[54]

---

[50] For βασιλεία as "empire," Dan 2:37-45 (Babylonian, Median, Persian, Greek empires), 1 Macc 1:6 (Alexander), 1 Macc 1:16, 41, 51, and Josephus, JW 1.40; 7:40 (Antiochus Epiphanes/ Seleucids), Josephus, JW 5.409 (Rome and Vespasian). Josephus designates Roman emperors as βασιλεῖς (kings) in JW 3.351; 4.596; 5.563; Titus the βασιλεύς, JW 5.58.

[51] In Philostratus, Apollonius 1.15, civil conflict and famine result from manipulation and hoarding. One of Trimalchio's guests comments that with high prices and shortages, the "jaws of the upper classes" do well while "the little people come off badly" (Petronius, Satyricon, 44). P. Garnsey, Famine and Food Supply in the Graeco-Roman World: Responses to Risk and Crisis (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1988). Jesus' feeding stories (12:1-8; 14:13-21; 15:32-39) anticipate a time when all people enjoy abundant provision (cf 2 Bar 73:2-3; 74:1).

[52] P. Hollenbach, "Jesus, Demoniacs and Public Authorities," JAAR 49 (1981) 567-88; J. P. Brown, "Techniques of Imperial Control: The Background of the Gospel Event," in N. Gottwald (ed.), The Bible and Liberation: Political and Social Hermeneutics (Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1983) 357-77; G. Theissen, The Miracle Stories in Early Christian Tradition (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983) 231-64; W. Wink, Unmasking the Powers: The Invisible Forces That Determine Human Existence (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986) 43-52.

[53] Jesus resists amassing wealth (6:19-34; 11:8; 13:19; 23:5-7) and urges redistribution of resources in non-repayable loans (5:42) and almsgiving without patron-client reciprocity (6:2-4). Carter, Matthew and the Margins; S.H. Ringe (Jesus, Liberation, and the Biblical Jubilee: Images for Ethics and Christology [OBT 19; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985] 33-90) links these practices to Jesus' Jubilee vision. M. Crosby , House of Disciples: Church, Economics and Justice in Matthew (Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1988) 147-70.

[54] B.J. Malina, "Wealth and Property in the New Testament and its World," Int 41 (1987) 354-67.

Jesus' instruction to divest his wealth, to redistribute it to the poor, and to follow him, anticipates the dismantling of the imperial economic system of inequitable distribution. This imperial world is not structured according to God's will. In teaching about taxes, Jesus refuses to recognize the empire's ultimacy (17:24-27; 22:15-22).[55]

As many have observed, Jesus' conflict with an alliance of religious leaders (Pharisees, Sadducees, chief priests, scribes) is central to Matthew's plot.[56] What has not often been observed, or accorded a central place in interpretive strategies, is the audience's understanding of religious leaders (not lower level religious personnel) as members of the elite governing and retainer classes.[57] The societal pre-eminence of religious leaders--chief priests,[58] Pharisees,[59] Sadducees,[60] scribes,[61]--derives from birth, wealth, political and social alliances, control of the cult, divine sanction, and

---

[55] Carter, "Paying the Tax to Rome."

[56] S. van Tilborg, The Jewish Leaders in Matthew (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1972) 1-6; J.D. Kingsbury, "The Developing Conflict between Jesus and the Jewish Leaders in Matthew's Gospel: A Literary-Critical Study," CBQ 49 (1987) 57-73; Carter, Matthew: Storyteller, 229-31.

[57] One exception is A. Saldarini, Pharisees, Scribes and Sadducees in Palestinian Society (Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1988). Utilizing the work of Lenski, Kautsky and Eisenstadt, Saldarini correctly locates the religious leaders among the governing and retainer classes (Pharisees, 35-49, esp. 40-41, and 157-73 for Matthew).

[58] Josephus is horrified when in the late 60s, the "brigands" elect high priests not from the hereditary, traditional families (JW 4.147-57). The pro-Roman stance of the "chief priests and notables" is evident in 66CE when the chief priests urge the people's submission to Florus after he had sacked part of Jerusalem and killed over three thousand (Josephus, JW 2.320), and when they oppose the lower priests for abandoning "the customary offering for their rulers" and urge them to offer them "for Caesar and the Roman people" (JW 2.197). Josephus sees here "the foundation" for the war with Rome (JW 2.410), a view he ascribes to the "powerful ones/notables" and chief priests (JW 2.414). Saldarini (Pharisees, 41) locates the chief priests in the governing class.

[59] Josephus notes that in 66, "the powerful ones" (δυνατοί, "the principal citizens") assemble with the chief priests and "the most notable Pharisees" to discuss the (lower) priests' refusal to offer sacrifices (JW 2.411). This alliance sends delegations to the Roman governor Florus and to Agrippa to express loyalty and to distance themselves from the priests' actions. Josephus links himself with the "chief priests" and "leading Pharisees" in Life, 20-23. Saldarini, Pharisees, 79-198, 277-97. For pre-66-70 Pharisaic political involvement, Josephus, JW 1.110-12, 571.

[60] Josephus links the Sadducees with political power and the wealthy in Ant 13.297, and with high status people in Ant 18.17. At least one high priest was a Sadducee (Ant 20.199). G. Porton ("Sadducees," ABD 5. 892-895, esp 894) notes Josephus' pro-Pharisee stance. Saldarini, Pharisees, 298-308.

[61] In interpreting sacred texts and representing authoritative traditions, scribes typically exercise a role that conserves the status quo. Kautsky, Aristocratic Empires, 326-327; G. Sjoberg, The Preindustrial City (New York: Macmillan, 1960) 230; Saldarini, Pharisees, 41-42, 241-76.

education, and was typical of aristocratically dominated empires.[62] Their elite status and commitment to the current social structure are evident in their first appearance as allies of Rome's puppet king Herod (2:4-6). In their final appearance, they are allies of Rome's governor and soldiers (27:62-66; 28:11-15).

Throughout, the religious leaders conflict with Jesus over specific issues. But as members of the imperial society's elite, they exercise not a restricted "religious" role, but social, economic, and political power, and with detrimental effect. They do not seek "justice, mercy and faith" (23:23). They resist Jesus' claims to be God's agent who offers God's benefits to all of society, especially to those on the margins (9:1-8; 9-13; 12:1-8, 9-14, 22-37; 21:14-16) etc.). In defending the status quo and alliance with Rome, they hinder people from knowing God's reign (23:13), expose people to hardship and violence (21:12-13; 26:47-27:31), protect patriarchal structures (19:3-12), and practice injustice and deceit (27:62-66; 28:11-15). In rejecting Jesus' teaching and authority, they reject his prophetic attempts to form a different social order (a "domination-free" society), and defend their own privileged location in an inequitable society sanctioned by Rome ("the domination system)".[63] Their conflict with Jesus reflects a collision of two different visions of society, and a struggle over who has the authority to shape society. [64] The narrative reveals them to be Satan's agents committed to resisting God's will.[65] Jesus announces that they are not God's agents (15:13-14), declares that the privileged societal structure with its inequities of power that they support does not belong to God's empire (20:24-28; 23:5-7, 8-12), and removes their role in God's purposes (21:43).[66] In response, they ally with Rome to kill him. Pilate's power could prevent the execution, but instead he makes it happen.[67]

---

[62] Lenski, Power and Privilege, 256-66; Kautsky, Aristocratic Empires, 81-83, 161-66 ("an aristocratic occupation"); Saldarini, Pharisees, 35-49.

[63] W. Wink, "Jesus and the Domination System," in E.H. Lovering Jr. (ed.), SBL 1991 Seminar Papers (SBLSP 30; Atlanta: Scholars, 1991) 265-86; idem, Engaging the Powers: Discernment and Resistance in a World of Domination (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992) 13-137. While Wink's terminology helpfully highlights the conflict of social visions, I have some reservations as the final section will indicate.

[64] The leaders are false shepherds in 9:36. The image invokes Ezek 34 where the leaders are condemned for harsh rule (34:4) and benefiting themselves at the expense and neglect of the rest. The citing of Jer 7 in Matt 21:13 functions similarly.

[65] They are "evil" like Satan (6:13 and 12:23; 16:4), and "tempt" Jesus like Satan (4:1, 3 and 16:16:1; 19:3; 22:18).

[66] Carter, "Matthew 21:33-46," in Carter and Heil, Matthew's Parables, 159-68.

[67] D.J. Weaver, "Power and Powerlessness: Matthew's Use of Irony in the Portrayal of

The world of sins from which the people are to be saved consists not only of private, moral and religious imperfections (15:19; 19:18-19). It also consists of sinful imperial, social, economic and religious structures and practices that benefit the elite, burden the rest, violate God's will and sovereignty, and resist God's empire and agent, Jesus. The Roman imperial world manifests Satan's reign.

V

What, then does God do? The allegorical parable of 22:1-14, especially 22:7, interprets Rome's destruction of Jerusalem and of the temple (the center of the religious leaders' power [68]) in 70 CE as God's punishment.[69] The king, angered by the elite's violent rejection of his repeated invitations to his son's wedding, "sent his troops, destroyed those murderers, and burned their city." The disruption of the sequence between 22:6 and 8 caused by adding verse 7 (not in Q), the symbolic vocabulary of king, wedding feast, son, and slaves,[70] the deployment of a common, destructive imperial tactic,[71] and Josephus' graphic account of the burning of Jerusalem (JW 2.395-97; 6.249-408; cf 2 Bar 6-7) suggest a reference beyond the narrative world.[72]

This interpretation of Jerusalem's destruction by Rome as God's punishment for sin utilizes the Deuteronomic view that God's blessings and curses take effect through historical events (Deut 27-28). The Deuteronomist accounts for the sixth-century Babylonian destruction of Jerusalem and exile in these terms (Deut 28-30; 1 Kgs 9:1-9; 2 Kgs 17, 24-25; cf. Jer 25; 2 Bar 6-8). Just as imperial powers like Assyria (Isa 10:1-7),

---

Political Leaders," in Bauer and Powell, Treasures New and Old, 179-96, esp. 191-95. Pilate is not, though, unmasked as "a powerless puppet." Rather he uses his power for death not for life. The resurrection unmasks the limits of his power.

[68] Typically, the people pay for the elite's self-interested choices.

[69] So most commentators. For dissenting views, K.H. Rengstorff, "Die Stadt der Mörder (Mt 22:7)," in W. Eltester (ed.), Judentum, Urchristentum, Kirche (FS J. Jeremias; BZNW 26; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1960) 106-29; Gundry, Matthew, 436-37.

[70] Davies and Allison, Matthew 3.197-208.

[71] Antiochus Epiphanes, 1 Macc 1:19, 29-32; Pompey, Pss. Sol. 2:1-6; 8:1-5, 19-21; Cestius the Roman governor of Syria in 66 CE, Josephus, JW 2.504-5, 508, 530.

[72] Also 21:12-13, 18-19, 41-43; 23:37-39; 27:25. See the relevant sections in Carter, Matthew and the Margins. For Jerusalem's fall in 70CE as God's punishment (though not for rejecting Jesus) enacted through Rome, see 4 Ezra 3:24-36; 4:22-25; 5:21-30; 2 Bar 1:1-5; 4:1; 6:9; 32:2-3; Josephus, JW 4.386-88; 5.559; 6.40-41, 96-110; 7.323-36, 358-60; N.R M. de Lange, "Jewish Attitudes to the Roman Empire," in Garnsey and Whittaker, Imperialism in the Ancient World, 255-81; P. Esler, "God's Honour and Rome's Triumph: Response to the Fall of Jerusalem in 70 CE in Three Jewish Apocalypses," in P. Esler (ed.), Modeling Early Christianity (London and New York: Routledge, 1995) 239-58; J. Neusner, "Judaism in a Time of Crisis: Four Responses to the Destruction of the Second Temple," Judaism 21 (1972) 313-27.

Babylon (Jer 25:1-11), Antiochus Epiphanes (2 Macc 6:12-17) and Rome in the first century BCE (Ps Sol 2:1-15; 8:9-22) function as God's punitive agents, so Rome does in 70 CE.[73] Ironically, the religious elite's ally carries out God's punitive will.

But the gospel does not see this punishment as the end. Rome's act is not the final rejection of Israel (also Josephus, 4 Ezra, 2 Baruch). God's salvific purposes and faithfulness will continue through Jesus. Matthew 1:21c declares, post 70, that Jesus will save his people from the sins for which they have been punished. The traditions that recognize imperial powers as God's punitive agents also affirm that these agents are themselves punished for not honoring God. So God uses, then judges and destroys Assyria (Isa 10:12-34), Babylon (Jer 25:12-14; 27:7; Isa 44:28; 45:1), and Antiochus Epiphanes (2 Macc 7:32-36). Various traditions anticipate a similar fate for Rome (Pss. Sol. 2:16-25, 30-33; 17:21-34; Sib. Ora. 3.46-53; 1QM 1; 2 Bar 1:4-5; 5:1-4; 8:1-5; 13:11-12). The end of Rome's punitive rule is certain. There is salvation from the oppression of governing powers and deliverance from political bondage.

VI

Three intertextual links in 1:21-23 reinforce the view that Jesus' saving from sin concerns not only moral and religious sins, but also the oppressively sinful political, social, economic and religious structures and practices of Rome's imperial world. Limits of space permit only a minimal discussion.

First, while commentators often suggest that 1:21c echoes Ps 130 (LXX129):8,[74] few pursue the link. If the echo is understood metonymically whereby citing a part invokes the whole,[75] all of Psalm 130 is in view. The Psalm seeks God's deliverance from trouble or "iniquity" (130:1-4, 8). While the initial expression seems personal, the final two verses show the petition to be national. Twice Israel is named, exhorted to "hope" in God, assured of God's covenant faithfulness ("mercy/steadfast love"), and reminded of God's redeeming power. The repeated "redeem" in verses 7-8 recalls two prominent situations of divine redemption, from Egypt and from Babylon.[76] God also "redeems" from Assyria (Sir 48:20) and from Antiochus Epiphanes (1 Macc 4:11).

---

[73] Compare Josephus, "God indeed long since had sentenced (the temple) to the flames" (JW 6.250; cf 2.539; 6.110).

[74] For example, Davies and Allison, Matthew 1.209; Hagner, Matthew 1.19; Gundry, Matthew, 23; Sand, Das Evangelium, 48.

[75] Carter, "Invoking Isaiah;" J.M. Foley (Immanent Art: From Structure to Meaning in Traditional Oral Epic [Bloomington: Indiana University, 1991] 1-60) identifies the metonymic function of citations as part of the "traditional referentiality" of oral/aural texts.

[76] About one-third of the one hundred uses of the verb λυτρόω in the Septuagint

The Psalm's circumstances of trouble remain unspecified. But the generic language offers access for worshippers in any situation of national trouble. Invoked by Matt 1:21, the Psalm embraces the present "trouble" of occupation by imperial Rome, solicits the audience's agreement that their iniquity brought it about, reassures them of God's covenant faithfulness, and exhorts them to hope in the Lord for redemption or liberation from Rome. God through Jesus will save the people from their sins punished by Rome in Jerusalem's fall in 70 CE.

A second intertext points to a similar experience. The name "Jesus," the Greek form of Joshua,[77] recalls Moses' successor who, as God's agent, completes God's redemption of the people from Egypt by taking the land. "God saves" the people not in a moral or religious sense. Their salvation was very political, socio-economic, and military in execution. Jesus, the new Joshua, also saves from an enemy and (re)claims the land.[78] I will return to the *how* question in sections 7 and 8.

A third intertext is invoked immediately after 1:21c in 1:22-23. Jesus is named Immanuel, God with us. The use of this designation for emperors and kings (deus praesens/epiphanes) suggests some polemic.[79] Jesus, not the emperor, manifests God's presence and will. But the citation from Isa 7:14 has further explanatory and encouraging functions. A metonymic understanding of the citation draws attention to Isa 7-9[80] where Judah is threatened by the imperial aspirations of Israel and Syria, who are in turn threatened by Assyria. God offers the worried king Ahaz a child as a sign of God's presence.

Isaiah 7-9 provide three perspectives on imperial power. God opposes it in resisting Israel and Syria. God uses it (Assyria) to punish sin. And third, imperial Assyria falls under God's judgment. For Matthew's post-70 audience living under a similar situation of Roman imperial control, the intertext provides perspectives on its present and future. Its present is punishment for sin as evidenced by the fall of Jerusalem in 70 CE. Rome was God's agent. But there is hope in that God will save the people from Roman imperial control. The punishment and Rome's power will end as God's sovereignty is exhibited.

---

designate redemption from Egypt and Babylon.

[77] Note Philo, De mutatione nominum, 12.121; Sirach 46:1.

[78] Jesus rejects violent resistance in the present (Matt 5:38-42). W. Wink, "Neither Passivity nor Violence: Jesus' Third Way (Matt 5:38-42 par.)", in W.M. Swartley (ed.), The Love of Enemy and Nonretaliation in the New Testament (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1992) 102-25; idem, Engaging the Powers, 175-257. But his return is another story (sections VII and VIII).

[79] Cuss, Imperial Cult and Honorary Terms, 134-40, and 139 for Domitian.

[80] Carter, "Invoking Isaiah," for a developed discussion.

The three intertexts--Ps 130, Joshua, and Isa 7-9—identify situations in which God's sovereignty is asserted over political powers. Matthew's audience knows similar circumstances under Rome's rule, and is promised God's salvation through Jesus. There is no mandate to spiritualize the intertexts. But how will Jesus save from sins?

VII

Davies and Allison correctly recognize that 1:21 "is not very illuminating with regard to exactly *how* Jesus saves."[81] Some have observed ἁμαρτία in 1:21c and 26:28 ("for the forgiveness of sins"), noted the link of the supper with the cross, and, by way of 20:28, concluded that Jesus saves through his death. But this is only a partial answer. From a narrative perspective, if Jesus saves only or primarily through the cross, there would be little point to the preceding twenty-five chapters. Chapter 9 is problematic since nearly twenty chapters prior to the cross and without reference to it, Jesus forgives a man's sins (9:2, 5, 6). Further, the language of saving (σώζω), used in 1:21c, does not direct exclusive attention to the cross. The verb appears in the fourfold taunts about Jesus saving himself (27:40, 42 [2x], 49), but refers five times to eschatological rescue from distress (8:25; 10:22; 19:25; 24:13, 22), and three times to healing (9:21, 22 [2x]). Jesus' saving work includes healing and eschatological deliverance.

Nor can it be claimed that this verb signals the gospel's only salvific moments.[82] Based on the "primacy effect," I would suggest that the commissioning of the newly-conceived Jesus in 1:21c to "save his people from their sins" functions at the outset as a point-of-view statement.[83] It defines Jesus' whole ministry as the means of his saving work. His words call people to encounter God's empire (4:17) and to participate in an alternative community with structures and practices that non-violently resist conventional cultural values and manifest God's reign (4:18-22; chs 5-7; 5:38-42). His healings manifest God's reign in anticipation of the transformed new creation which displays God's will and purposes (Isa 35:5-6; 61:1-2; 2 Bar 73:2; 74:2). For this reason he supplies food to those who are deprived (12:1-8; 14:13-21; 15:32-39; cf 2 Bar 74:1). His exorcisms manifest God's empire that disrupts Satan's reign in anticipation of God's final victory (12:28). His meals display God's mercy or covenant faithfulness (9:13; 12:7). His death, a ransom for many (20:28), shows that

---

[81] Davies and Allison, Matthew 1.210.

[82] Neither σωτήρ nor σωτηρία appears in Matthew. σωτήρ commonly designates emperors: Josephus, JW 3.459; 7.71; A. Deissmann, Light From the Ancient East (New York: Hodder and Stoughton, 1910) 368-69. The verb σώζω designates Rome's favor experienced in not being destroyed and by submitting to Roman rule (Josephus, JW 1.27; 1.391; 2.421; 5.360-61,373).

[83] Carter, Matthew: Storyteller, 119-48.

the worst the religious and political elite can do can not limit God's sovereignty since God raises Jesus from death. And Jesus speaks of his return in power to complete what is under way in his ministry, the establishment of God's empire, sovereignty, and salvation.

This return, preceded by distress on the earth (24:3-26) and worldwide mission (24:14), is part of a multi-faceted event for which no timetable is given. Its main elements, though, are clear: Jesus' arrival, judgment (25:31-45), a new creation (19:28),[84] the end of all unjust practices as God's sovereignty or empire is established in a heaven and earth marked by health, wholeness, and plenty (28:18).[85]

And Rome? The description of Jesus' return in 24:27-31 "with power and great glory" employs terms that echo imperial rule.[86] His return as Son of Man is a παρουσία (24:27). While denoting God's presence (Josephus, JW 3.80, 202), the term signifies the approach of a king (Polybius, Hist. 18.48.4; Josephus, Ant 19.339), (future) emperor (Titus, Josephus, JW 5.410), military commander (Josephus, JW 2.617; Life 90-91, 273) or other officials or envoys (Ant 12.86) to a (subject) city (3 Macc 3:16-17; Josephus, JW 4.345).[87] Jesus' παρουσία represents not an imperial power like Rome, but God's empire. His coming is public, visible, glorious, like flashes of lightning (ἀστραπή, 24:27). Lightning is a polyvalent image that cleverly invokes competing sovereignties. It often designates manifestations of God's sovereignty and presence (Exod 19:16; Ezek 1:13; Dan 10:5; Wis Sol 5:15-6:11, esp. 5:21). But lightning also commonly appears on coins to depict Jupiter/Zeus' sovereignty wielded by emperors like Domitian.[88] It

---

[84] Sim, "The Meaning of παλιγγενεσία in Matthew 19:28," JSNT 59 (1993) 3-12, and Gnilka, Matthäusevangelium, 2.172. For heaven and earth passing away, 5:18; 24:35. 5:5 (inheriting land) promises a new earth not dominated by Rome (Carter, Matthew and the Margins, 5:3-12). For the renewal of heaven and earth in Jewish apocalyptic texts, Sim, Apocalyptic Eschatology, 50, 111-14 (4 Ezra, 2 Baruch, 1 En 72, 91:16; 45:4-5). There is no textual reason to spiritualize 5:5 (contra Charette, Theme of Recompense, 84-91). "The main battle in imperialism is over land, of course" (Said, Culture and Imperialism, xii-xiii, 78).

[85] See Sim, Apocalyptic Eschatology.

[86] Davies and Allison list eight interpretations of 24:27-31(Matthew 3.355-56); none, includes judgment on Rome. Kreitzer (Striking New Images, 30-68) proposes influence of the "Roman legionary *aquilae*" (68) but seems to think Rome's destruction of Jerusalem is in view (61).

[87] See the further references in BAGD, 629-30; for inscriptions and coins, especially the adventus coins of Nero and Hadrian, see Deissmann, Light, 372-78; A. Oepke, "παρουσία," TDNT 5.858-61; Kreitzer, Striking New Images, 146-86, 212-19; for later Christian uses, S. MacCormack, "Change and Continuity in Late Antiquity: The Ceremony of Adventus," Historia 21 (1972) 721-52.

[88] Kreitzer, Striking New Images, 66-67, provides examples including an aureus with an eagle clasping a lightning bolt in its claw.

symbolizes Jupiter's rule and world order, the "divine power exerted against the forces of barbarous hubris and on behalf of civilized existence".[89] Here it images Jesus' coming and the assertion of God's sovereignty over all things, including Rome.

And his impact? "Wherever the corpse is, there the ἀετοί gather" (24:28). The noun is commonly translated as "vultures," though "eagles" is preferable.[90] The eagle can be a bird of prey that feeds on corpses (Job 9:26; 39:27-30; Martial, Epig 6.62.4), but here the image is of "gathering" not feeding. Eagles also denote imperial powers like Babylon as agents of God's punishment on the people,[91] a role Rome performs in 70 CE (22:7; 4 Ezra 11-12). Significantly, the eagle symbolizes Roman imperial power (Suetonius, Gaius 14.3; Tacitus, Ann 15.29), "the symbol held in highest regard by the Romans" (Appian, Civil Wars 2.61). The eagle-standards lead Titus' army on its march to Jerusalem (Josephus, JW 5.48). Josephus calls these eagle-standards (aquilae) "sacred emblems" which "precede every legion, because it is the king and the bravest of all the birds; it is regarded by (Roman soldiers) as the symbol of empire, and whoever may be their adversaries, an omen of victory" (JW 3.123; Ant 18:120-21).[92]

In 24:28, at the coming of the Son of Man, the eagles are gathered with the corpses. This is not Rome as God's agent punishing Jerusalem. This scene concerns the return of the Son of Man. Nor do the eagles hover over or feed on the corpses. Rather corpses and eagles are gathered together (συναχθήσονται). The scene depicts destroyed Roman troops ("the corpse") with fallen eagle-standards scattered among them. The scene reflects apocalyptic battle scenes (1 QH 6:22-29; 1QM 2:15-4:17; Rev 9:1-11) and is appropriate to other elements in the gospel such as 16:18 that refer to the attacks of the forces of evil, as well as to 4:8 which allies Satan and Rome.[93] The parousia of the Son of Man destroys Rome's power. The agent of God's punishment in 70 and agent of Satan (4:8) that resists God's ways is judged.[94] The final salvation of "his people from their sins" means

---

[89] Fears, "Theology of Victory," 817. Also Fears, "Jupiter and Roman Imperial Ideology," 79.

[90] The first meaning in BAGD, 19; Kreitzer, Striking New Images, 62-63.

[91] Deut 28:47-53, esp. 49; Jer 4:13; Lam 4:19; Ezek 17:1-21; Hab 1:8; Dan 7:4.

[92] Ovid laments the shameful capture of eagle-standards by the Parthians. Augustus procured their return in 20 BCE (Fasti, 585-90). In 66CE Jewish fighters "routed" the Roman governor of Syria and "took one of his eagles" (Suetonius, Vespasian, 4.5). Herod, Rome's puppet, displays an eagle on the temple gate (Josephus, JW 1.650-653; Ant. 17.151-63). Kreitzer, Striking New Images, 31-57.

[93] Sim, Apocalyptic Eschatology, 103-4; J. Marcus, "The Gates of Hades and the Keys of the Kingdom (Matt 16:18-19)," CBQ 50 (1988) 443-55.

[94] Is there any hope for Rome? Apparently only a few individuals (the centurions, 8:5-13; 27:54).

the establishment of God's sovereignty or authority over heaven and earth (28:18).[95]

VIII

I have argued for a very material and political, not spiritualized, understanding of Matthew's salvation. Matthew's vision of salvation reveals the world to be sinful, under imperial power and controlled by Satan. Jesus' words and actions create an alternative community and demonstrate God's empire that is yet to be fully established. The gospel envisions salvation as the end of this sinful world, the defeat of Rome, and the establishment of a new heaven and earth under God's sovereignty.

But the irony must be noted. This vision of the completion of God's salvation and overthrow of Roman imperial power co-opts and imitates the very imperial worldview that it resists! For Rome and God, the goal is the supreme sovereignty of the most powerful. For both, the scope or extent of their sovereignty is the cosmos. Both appeal to the divine will for legitimation. Both understand the establishment of sovereignty to be through a chosen agent and by means of the violent overthrow of all resistance.[96] Both offer totalizing perspectives. Both demand compliance. Both destroy enemies and leave no space for the different or the non-compliant. Both recognize that those who welcome its sovereignty benefit. The gospel depicts God's salvation, the triumph of God's empire over all things including Rome, with the language and symbols of imperial rule.

One could look for ways in which the presentation of God's imperial system or empire is modified or ameliorated. Perhaps the establishment of God's sovereignty means justice wrought on those who deserve nothing less. But the formulation reveals a revengeful character rather than, for instance, a reconciling stance.[97] Or one could welcome this imperializing portrayal as a sign of an intense commitment to be free of domination. It is indeed, but at what price, and freedom for whom? Or one could differentiate the two systems by arguing that one sovereignty is imposed (Rome's) but God's is chosen in a covenantal context. That is true for the present, but not the future. Why does a gospel that chooses the option not to dominate in the present (20:20-28) absolutize domination--its own--for the future? Or one

[95] The loss of light from the sun and moon (24:29) draws on scenes like Isa 13:10 and 34:4 that concern the destruction of imperial powers, and on the use of the sun and moon on coins of Vespasian and Domitian in association with the goddess Aeternitas (Rome and the Flavian dynasty for ever). Jesus' return is "lights out" time for Rome. The "sign" of verse 30 probably continues the military image with a reference to God's emblem in opposition to the eagle. The angels (24:30) are imaged in 26:53 as legions of heavenly warriors.

[96] Sim (Apocalyptic Eschatology, 227-241) notes violence and "scare tactics" in the eschatological scenes.

[97] For revenge in Roman imperial strategy, Mattern, Rome and the Enemy, 171-94.

could, as I think the gospel finally does, attempt to bypass the ambiguity by appealing to God's otherness. God is benign, loving, faithful, and merciful to all (5:7, 45) which means the establishment of God's perfect sovereignty as God the creator intended from the beginning (19:4). Jesus' yoke is easy (11:30). The argument rests on the faithful and merciful nature of the covenant God who is fundamentally *not* like human beings. But such an argument is classically imperialist at heart. Imperial rule typically presents itself as benign, especially for its immediate beneficiaries.[98] In the end, the gospel can not imagine a world without imperial power.

Such a conclusion is understandable. The imperial worldview is so prevalent that even this story of protest against imperial rule can not escape its cultural world. It has no other language to use. As much as it resists and exposes the injustice of Rome's rule, as much as it points to God's alternative community and order, as much as it glimpses something of the merciful inclusion of the non-elite in God's love and life-giving reign for all, as much as it offers alternative economic practices, renounces violence, and promotes more egalitarian household structures,[99] it can not, finally, escape the imperial mindset. The alternative to Rome's rule is framed in imperial terms. Salvation comprises God's loving sovereignty, God's empire, established over all, including the destruction of oppressive governing powers like imperial Rome.

[98] See, variously, Seneca, De Clementia 1.4.1-2; Tacitus, Agricola, 21; Aristides, passim; the nineteenth century Englishman, Ruskin (Said, Culture and Imperialism, 101-2).

[99] The gospel is suspicious of human patriarchy, both domestic (19:13-15; Carter, Households and Discipleship, 90-114) and political (the empire is an imperial patriarchy; the emperor is the "pater patriae," "father of the fatherland"), yet it images God, albeit benignly (5:45-48), as the father whose will must be obeyed (12:46-50). The same irony is evident in kingship language.

SALVATION IN MATTHEW

Robert H. Gundry

Westmont College, Santa Barbara, California

Because of other obligations, I accepted the assignment to write on salvation in Matthew only on condition that it would be acceptable for me to deal with the biblical text alone, not with secondary literature as well. In reference to Matthew's text, then, I hope to answer several questions: What does salvation consist of? Who does the saving? Who are saved? How are they saved? When are they saved? What circumstances, real or imagined, seem to have prompted Matthew to present his version of salvation? I shall conclude with some comparisons and inferences concerning Matthew's *Sitz im Leben.*

What Does Salvation Consist of?

Matthew wastes little space before introducing the topic of salvation, and his first mention of it indicates that salvation consists of deliverance from sins (1:21). The plural of "sins" seems to imply that Matthew does not conceive of sin as an external power that has enslaved its victims so as to make them sin against their will (contrast esp. Rom 7:7–25). By modifying "sins," in fact, "their" (a subjective genitive in Greek) seems to fix the blame for sinning on the sinners themselves, so that deliverance from sins means deliverance from punishment for sinful acts, such as those listed in 15:19: "evil designs, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false testimonies,

blasphemies" (N.B. the consistent use of the plural in this list, over against the singular in the NRSV except for the first item). With this view of salvation agree Matthew's references to forgiveness of moral debts (i.e., release from having to pay them—6:12; cf. 18:27, 32, 35), forgiveness of trespasses (6:14–15), and forgiveness of sins (9:2, 5, 6; 26:28), even every sin and blasphemy except for blasphemy against the Spirit (12:31–32). The plural of "debts," "trespasses," and "sins" is again notable, as is also the modifier "every" when "sin" and "blasphemy" occur in the singular.

On the other hand, salvation consists in rescue from τοῦ πονηροῦ (6:13). Some take the Greek expression as neuter and therefore as referring to evil in the abstract, to evil in general, or to any evil thing. Others take the expression as masculine and therefore as referring to Satan as the Evil One. The use of the masculine ὁ πονηρός in 13:19 for the one who snatches the word of the kingdom out of hearers' hearts favors a reference to Satan in both passages (cf. also 5:37, where τοῦ πονηροῦ may stand opposite God in the preceding verses, and 13:38–39, where τοῦ πονηροῦ equates with "the Devil"). With the neuter understanding, rescue from evil would presumably mean the same as salvation from sins, i.e., deliverance from punishment for the evil that one has done. With the masculine understanding, rescue from the Evil One would probably mean rescue from the Devil, Satan, as the one who tempts people to commit sins (4:1–11; 16:23).

To the woman who had the issue of blood Jesus pronounces salvation (9:22); and at his crucifixion chief priests, scribes, and elders say, "He saved others, he cannot save himself" (27:42). Since the supposed inability of Jesus to save himself has to do with physical deliverance from crucifixion, his antithetically parallel saving of others had to do with deliverance from the physical effects of their sins, just as the woman's salvation had to do with stopping her issue of blood (cf. 4:23–24; 8:16–17; 11:4–5; and other

text of the OT passage has the third person plural. Most likely, then, Matthew himself produced this reading by altering a different one so as to define the people whom Jesus saves as those who call his name Immanuel. They are a sinful people; at least they were prior to his saving them from their sins. But he came to call sinners, not righteous people (9:9–13).

For the saved, Matt 21:43 uses another collective term besides "people," viz., "nation." Jesus' having saved them as a people from their sins, they are now a nation that produces the fruits of God's kingdom, i.e., good deeds, righteous conduct (see, e.g., 5:16; 21:32). Comprising this nation are people of faith in Jesus, and of discipleship to him, from all nations (8:10–11; 28:19), plus holy ones, saints, from the past (27:51b–53)—an international nation of little people, social nobodies and mental infants as to human wisdom and prudence (10:42; 11:25; 18:6, 10, 14; 25:40, 45). But the saved are few, the Monaco of nations as far as population is concerned (7:13–14), so few as to be a family (5:22–24, 47; 7:3–5; 10:21; 12:46–50; 18:15, 21, 35; 25:40; 28:10). These are the saved.

How Are They Saved?

Because of their mental infantilism, Jesus' people have to be saved by divine revelation (11:25–26), by God's giving them to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven (13:11). Because of their sins, Jesus' people have to be saved by divine mercy (5:7) and generosity (19:30–20:16), and by the service of Jesus in giving his life as a ransom in substitution for them (20:28), i.e., by the shedding of his covenantal blood for the forgiveness of their sins (26:28; contrast the taunt, "Save yourself . . . and come down from the cross" [27:40–42], and cf. Elijah's not coming to save Jesus from death

by crucifixion [27:49]). So much for what is done on behalf of Jesus' people for their salvation.

What do they need to do for themselves? They need to repent of their sins by getting baptized, confessing their sins during baptism, and producing fruit worthy of repentance, i.e., speaking and acting in a way that shows their baptism in water to have been prompted by genuine repentance (3:6–10; 7:16–20; 12:33–35; 21:43; 28:19). One produces such fruit by learning and keeping the law as explained, commanded, and exemplified by Jesus (5:20–48; 11:29; 13:1–23, 51–52; 19:16–19; 28:19); and such learning and obedience mean leaving the way of wickedness and going the way of righteousness (21:28–32), speaking good words (12:33–35), doing good deeds (5:16; 16:27; 25:14–30), converting oneself into the lowly position of a little child (18:3–4), not causing others to stumble into sin (18:6–7), and not stumbling into sin oneself (18:8–9). The list of specifics goes on and on: meekness, mercy, purity of heart, peace-making, conciliation, avoidance of lust, maintenance of marriage, truthfulness, love of enemies, prayer for persecutors, secret charity, secret fasting, secret praying, forgiveness of debtors, forgiveness of those who have sinned against you, renunciation of earthly wealth, self-criticism, adherence to the Golden Rule (see the whole of the Sermon on the Mount, and passages such as 18:21–35; 19:21–30, among others). Matthew will not have salvation apart from these and other evidences—the absence of vices opposite to the foregoing virtues, for example—that repentance was genuine.

Repentance from sins and the practice of virtue do not suffice for salvation, however. One must also believe in Jesus (18:6; cf. 8:25–26; 9:2, 22; 14:31; 16:8; 28:17). Believing in him entails confessing him in public (10:32–33); calling him "Immanuel" (1:23); loving him more than you love your father, mother, son, or daughter (10:37); taking your cross and

stories of healings, exorcisms, and the raising of a dead person). Perhaps it is relief from these physical effects of sinning to which Jesus refers in promising rest to the weary and heavy laden who come to him (11:28–30; cf. his miracles mentioned in the earlier part of ch. 11).

For Matthew, however, salvation goes beyond deliverance from the physical effects of sin. It extends to deliverance from condemnation (11:22–24), from being lost, perishing (18:14), from wrath (3:7), that is to say, from being thrown into a furnace of unquenchable, eternal fire and thus from weeping and gnashing of teeth (3:10–12; 7:19; 13:30, 42, 50; 18:8–9). Positively, salvation extends to justification, being pronounced righteous (12:36–37), to entrance into life (18:8–9; 19:17) with the result of having life that is eternal (19:16). This entrance into life comes by way of entrance into the kingdom of heaven (18:3)—through bodily resurrection, if necessitated by prior death (12:41–42; 22:23–33; 27:51b–53)—and thus with the result of participation in God's heavenly rule on earth, a participation that brings with itself comfort in place of mourning, property in place of poverty, vindication in place of shame, mercy in place of judgment, a vision of God, acknowledgment as God's sons, and great reward in place of persecution (5:3–12).

Who Does the Saving?

Jesus saves, as his very name indicates (1:21; cf. Peter's outcry in 14:30, "Lord, save me," though he was asking Jesus to save him from drowning). Since salvation includes forgiveness of sins, salvation by Jesus naturally includes *his* forgiveness of sins (9:1–7). And since he acts always in consort with God, salvation naturally includes forgiveness by the Father in heaven as well (6:12 with 6:9). Furthermore, since Jesus' baptizing of

people in the Holy Spirit and fire appears in its Matthean context to consist of his Spirit-endowed ministry, whatever the meaning of "fire" the Holy Spirit joins Jesus and God the Father in the act of salvation (3:11–17). This trinitarian cast accords with Matthew's trinitarian formula for baptism (28:19).

That Jesus, God the Father, and the Holy Spirit do the saving looks like a vertical axis of salvation in Matthew. But a horizontal axis appears, too. For disciples' restoration of a straying, sinning fellow disciple counts as gaining that fellow disciple so that he or she does not perish (18:12–18). Thus we can say that in Matthew disciples save each other. Not only "the Son of Man" but also "human beings" (N.B. the plural) have "authority" to forgive sins (9:8 with 9:1–7; cf. 18:21–35). Since salvation includes forgiveness, as already noted, and since the authority of human beings to forgive sins parallels the Son of Man's authority to do so, we can say once again that in Matthew disciples save each other.

Matthew does not stop with trinitarian and ecclesial salvation, however. His soteriology proceeds to self-salvation. Those who lose their lives for Jesus' sake will find—i.e., save—their lives (16:24–26). Such a losing of life counts as one's own doing (τὴν πρᾶξιν αὐτοῦ—16:27), so that you save yourself.

Who Are the Saved?

It is Jesus' people who are saved (1:21). And who are they? They are those who "call his name 'Immanuel,'" those who confess that in him "God [is] with us" (1:23), and who make this confession in public despite the threat of persecution (10:32–33). The third person plural of "they will call" in Matthew's quotation of Isa 7:14 is text critically unique. No other known

following him, which means risking persecution by open discipleship (10:38–39; 16:24–27); persevering under persecution (10:16–23; 24:9–13; cf. 13:18–23 and contrast the denials of Jesus by Peter [26:69–75] and Judas Iscariot's betrayal of Jesus [26:47–57]).

Because of double mention by Matthew, it bears emphasis that under persecution one must persevere to be saved: "But the one persevering to the end—this one will be saved" (10:22; 24:13; contrast the one who in 13:20–21 hears the word and receives it immediately and joyfully but because of tribulation and persecution turns out to be "temporary" and stumbles into sin rather than bearing the fruit of good deeds). Just as Judas Iscariot exemplifies disciples who show the falsity of their profession by betraying their fellows to persecutors (cf. 24:10, unique to Matthew: "and then many will stumble into sin and betray each other and hate each other"), Peter exemplifies disciples who betray the falsity of their profession by denying Christ under the pressure of persecution, as shown by Matthew's inserting the phrase "before all" concerning Peter's denial of Jesus in 26:70, so that Peter falls into the category of those whom Jesus will deny before his Father in heaven because they have denied him before others (10:33). Naturally, then, the bitterness of Peter's weeping, paralleled in Luke 22:62 but not in Mark 14:72 (see Matt 26:75), is followed up by Judas Iscariot's hanging himself (Matt 27:1–10); and Peter's name disappears from the story of Jesus' resurrection (contrast 28:7 with Mark 16:7), so that the reference in Matt 28:16 to "the eleven disciples" shows that Peter remains as a tare among wheat, not to be separated from the wheat until the end. (Corollaries to Peter's representation of disciples who do not persevere to the end so as to be saved are, first, that in Matt 16:17–19 "this bedrock," on which Jesus will build his church, is not Peter, "a stone," but "the bedrock" of Jesus' "words," to which—not as in Luke 6:47, 49—Matt 7:24, 26 attached "these,"

corresponding to "this" with "bedrock' in Matt 16:18 and, second, that in view of the falsity of Peter's discipleship the authority to bind and loose, an authority represented by "the keys of the kingdom of heaven," has to be given in 18:18 to the disciples in general whereas it was given only to Peter in 16:19.)

Belief in Jesus shows itself not only in perseverance under persecution, but also in the endangering of oneself by extending hospitality and charity to fellow disciples who are fleeing persecution (cf. 10:40–42; 25:31–46 with 10:11–13, 23, most of this material being unique to Matthew). More generally, genuineness of repentance and belief shows itself in faithful, prudent, and kind treatment of fellow disciples; otherwise, there awaits dichotomization, a fate shared with the hypocrites, and weeping and gnashing of teeth (24:45–51). Not exactly salvation!

Negatively, Matthew takes pains to note that salvation does not come by baptism as such (3:7). To drive this point home he shifts the phrase "for the forgiveness of sins" from John's baptism (so Mark 1:4 par. Luke 3:3) to the Words of Institution (Matt 26:28). Again negatively, Matthew notes twice that salvation does not come by virtue of Abrahamic ancestry (3:9; 8:11–12).

When Are They Saved?

Forgiveness of sins takes place in the present. "Your sins are being forgiven," Jesus says to a paralytic (9:2). Then he heals the paralytic to prove that as the Son of man "on the earth" he has authority to be forgiving sins (9:6). Inversely, blasphemy against the Holy Spirit will not be forgiven "in this age" (12:31–32). But neither will it be forgiven "in the coming [age]." Since forgiveness of sins equates with salvation, then, salvation

occurs both now and hereafter. As to the hereafter, "every careless word that human beings will speak—they will give an account concerning it in the day of judgment. For by your words you will be pronounced righteous and by your words you will be condemned" (12:36–37). By virtue of repentance and coming to hear the wisdom of Solomon, respectively, the men of Nineveh and the queen of the South will rise up "in the judgment" and condemn Jesus' generation. Correspondingly to the condemnation of Jesus' generation, then, the salvation of the men of Nineveh and the queen of the South must take place in the day of judgment, which is also the day of resurrection. Since those who do not turn and become like little children "will by no means enter the kingdom of heaven" (18:3), the entrance of those who do convert will likewise occur in the future. And the going away of the righteous into eternal life (25:46) will occur "when the Son of Man comes in his glory, and all the angels with him," at which time "he will sit on his throne of glory" and judge "all the nations."

What Circumstances, Real or Imagined, Seem to Have Prompted Matthew to Present His Version of Salvation?

Notably, Matthew presents a catch-all doctrine of salvation (cf. his catch-all Christology: Jesus as the Christ, Immanuel, the Son of God, the Son of Man, Lord, and Wisdom). His is a soteriology of both-and rather than this-but-not-that. In 19:16–30, for example, having eternal life, inheriting eternal life, entering life, entering the kingdom, having treasure in heaven, and being saved all carry the same soteriological meaning. Fine distinctions mean little to Matthew. Though he distinguishes between repentance and belief on the one hand and evidence ("fruit," as he calls it) on the other hand,

he does not distinguish cleanly between salvation as a gift and salvation as a reward, or clearly deny the latter in favor of the former, as Paul does. And it remains unclear what relationship, if any, exists between the covenant in which Jesus' blood is shed for the forgiveness of sins (26:28) and the various covenants that the OT talks about (again contrast Paul).

Within Matthew's soteriological potpourri, however, we can discern certain emphases. For him salvation consists primarily of forgiveness of sins (though this element is expressed in a variety of terms). But stress falls not so much on God's forgiving mercy, accepted through faith, as on human beings' saving themselves in the sense of demonstrating that they have truly repented of their sins. Thus it is the righteous who are saved, and they are saved by persevering in the superiorly righteous conduct they have learned from Jesus' teaching and example. Because they must persevere to the end, their salvation occurs mainly in the future.

We are now positioned to speculate on the circumstances that may have evoked the foregoing emphases. As implied in the first paragraph of this paper, those circumstances may have existed in fact or only in the mind of Matthew, or may have consisted of a mixture of fact and fantasy. I favor the factual but will not attempt here an argument for my opinion, except to say that the references of Paul to his former persecution of the church (Gal 1:13; Phil 3:6; 1 Tim 1:12; cf. Acts 8:1–3; 9:1–2, 13–14, 21; 22:4–5; 26:9–11), coupled with his references to continued persecution by non-Christian Jews (2 Cor 11:24, 26; 1 Thess 2:14–16), favor the factual.

There, I have tipped my hand. Matthew's soteriological emphases seem to have grown out of circumstances in which he perceived Jewish Christians to be suffering persecution from fellow Jews who had not become Christians. As a result, and as always happens in times of persecution—including those times when Christians have persecuted Jews—some were

falling away to save their necks. Matthew saw Christians, Judas-like, betraying other Christians to their persecutors. He saw Christians, Peter-like, falsifying their profession with public denials of Christ. He saw their distinctively Christian conduct lapsing in such a way as to make them indistinguishable from their fellow Jews who made no Christian profession. He saw them failing to evangelize those fellow Jews and failing to make disciples of Gentiles as well, for such evangelistic efforts would mark them for persecution.

Warning! Your salvation depends on perseverance in the Christian life and witness. Otherwise you will be lost along with those who make no profession, many of them your very persecutors. Prove yourselves true. Do not let persecution lead you to hide your connection with Jesus. Flee if you must, but preach the gospel of the kingdom wherever you go. And do your good works as Christians in the full gaze of the public, even to the extent of endangering yourselves by openly ministering to persecuted fellow Christians. The day of judgment is coming. Show yourselves salty, not saltless; wise builders, not foolish ones; wheat, not tares; good fish, not bad; wearing a wedding garment, not lacking one; useful in service, not slothful and useless; wise virgins, not foolish ones. Do not slip into the category of goats rather than sheep. Your salvation is at stake. Make sure you are one of the few that will be saved.

Concluding Comparisons and Inferences Concerning Matthew's *Sitz im Leben*

If Matthew's emphasis on salvation by works of righteousness arises out of a need for persecuted Christians to prove the genuineness of their profession, we might ask whether a similar emphasis in the Epistle of James

arises out of the same need, or out of a different one. If out of a different one, has the difference in need made a difference in the emphasis? My own impression is that in James the emphasis arises out of a need to quell contentiousness within local assemblies, so that the works of righteousness have to do with the gaining, or regaining, of harmony in those assemblies, whereas in Matthew the emphasis arises out of a need to prove genuineness of Christian profession under persecution, so that the works of righteousness have to do with the risks of open discipleship and Christian evangelism in the larger society.

If Matthew's emphasis arises out of a need for persecuted Christians to prove the genuineness of their profession, we might also ask whether the emphasis has the purpose of combating Paul's doctrine of salvation—or, as he prefers to say, justification—by faith apart from works, or of combating an antinomian aberration of Paul's doctrine. To ask the question in these terms is to cast doubt on an affirmative answer. The same is true if we ask whether Matthew's emphasis has the purpose of combating, or competing with, the rabbinic Judaism that was evolving in the last quarter of the first century. For it is one thing to claim superiority over that Judaism for the purpose of keeping persecuted Christians true to the faith, but it would be quite another thing to claim superiority over that Judaism for the purpose of taking command of Jewish religious life. And to suppose a synergy of both purposes founders on the unlikelihood that a persecuted minority thought of taking over the large, persecuting body. On the contrary and as already noted, Matthew underlines the fewness of those who will be saved: "For the gate is small, and the way is narrow that leads to life, and few are those who find it" (7:14).

So we are back to the old question whether Matthew's Gospel represents an intramural competition for power within Judaism (Christian

Judaism versus rabbinic Judaism) or an intramural crisis of discipleship within Jewish Christianity (defections from discipleship back into Judaism versus perseverance in Christian life and witness). There is no need to repeat here all the well-worn arguments for and against these views. But if Matthew's soteriological emphasis on perseverance does arise out of persecution, score a point for an intramural crisis of discipleship within Jewish Christianity over against an intramural competition for power within Judaism. And given an intramural crisis of discipleship within a Jewish Christianity persecuted by non-Christian Judaism, then from that standpoint the possibility of an earlier date for Matthew looks good. For we know of such persecution prior to the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple, and one has to ask whether after that destruction non-Christian Jews had enough political clout to persecute Jewish Christians.

The Politics of Commendation

Efrain Agosto
Hartford Seminary

Introduction

This essay seeks to contribute to the ongoing dialogue about the relation between "Paul and empire."[1] In what follows, I analyze an important aspect of patron-client relations in the Greco-Roman world of the Apostle Paul – commendation. Commendation was an instrument of power in the Roman Empire. Powerful patrons endorsed the political advancement of their clients, proteges and peers by means of letters of commendation. In his discussion about patronage in the early Roman Empire, Richard Saller writes, "Scholars have not always taken sufficient notice of the Republican tradition of recommendations."[2] Saller goes on to show how such luminaries as Cicero and Pliny employed commendation letters to advance the fortunes of their friends and clients by means of letters to men as powerful as the emperor himself. They wrote so many such letters that we have extensive collections of them, and, moreover, their letters, especially those of Cicero, became the models of commendation letter-writing for generations to come.

The Apostle Paul also wrote commendation within the body of his extant letters. In fact, except for Galatians, all of Paul's uncontested letters contain commendation of one form or another. Indeed, among the contested letters, only Colossians contains the commendation motif, an indication of how useful this topos was to the living Paul.

The question this paper pursues is: If commendation was such an important aspect of patron-client relations, was it also an instrument of patronage and power for the Apostle Paul? How did commendation function for Paul within the context of his Greco-Roman churches? As such, I will be

---

[1] As reflected in the series of essays in Richard Horsley, Paul and Empire: Religion and Power in Roman Imperial Society (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1997).
[2] Richard Saller, Personal Patronage under the Early Empire (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 108.

in conversation with those recent studies on Paul and patronage, as well as Paul and empire.

Patronage and Commendation in the Roman World

Several studies have noted the importance of patronage as the bedrock of social relations in the Roman world of the Apostle Paul. "[T]he Roman imperial patronage system formed one of the most powerful and determinative conditions of the Pauline mission."[3] In contrast to our modern age, antiquity was "a society based on patronage, not class stratification."[4] Emperors and provincial leaders depended on patron-client relations for information on candidates for imperial positions. Richard Saller describes how modern bureaucratic societies use "formal, impersonal mechanisms," such as applications and hiring systems by which individuals "could initiate contacts with the central government." By contrast, Saller explains, Roman imperialism depended on the personal contacts of patron-client networks throughout the empire.[5] One could argue that the equivalent of "applications" in this system was the commendation letter written by "men of status" on behalf of peers and proteges whom they brought to the attention of the emperor and provincial leaders.

The nature of these commendation letters is best described as a catalogue of virtues, such as modestia (moderation, restraint, obedience to authority), huminatas (humanity, kindness, refinement, education, culture), and probitas (honesty, uprightness). Such qualities, rather than being objective criteria of a candidate's merit, as in modern assessments of a job-seekers' qualities, reflect a common set of patronal values, expected of anyone "irrespective of the office, honor or privilege requested."[6]

> In Roman commendationes, . . . the personal relationship between patron and client is stressed and there is no attempt to appear impartial. This is because the aristocratic qualities sought were

[3] Richard Horsley, "General Introduction," in idem, Paul and Empire, 5.
[4]Thomas Carney, The Shape of the Past: Models and Antiguity (Lawrence, KS: Coronado Press, 1975), 63, as quoted by John Dominic Crossan, The Historical Jesus: The Life of a Mediterranean Jewish Peasant (San Francisco: Harper, 1992), 59.
[5]Saller, Personal Patronage, 205.
[6] Ibid., 108.

> manifested largely in the context of friendship and patron-client relationships. In other words, the recommender illustrates his client's loyalty, integrity and industry by reference to this display of those qualities in their mutual friendship.[7]

One example from Cicero should suffice to illustrate this point. He endorses a candidate for a consulship as a "most admirable and gallant of citizens [optimus et fortissium civis]; a man of great influence [summa auctoritate] and soundest sentiments [optime sentiens]." Cicero concludes that people like this are "leaders of public policy [auctores consili publici]. He decries the paucity of such character traits in most other Roman consular candidates (Ad Familiares 12.2.3).[8]

However, the personal relations involved in this commendation are what Cicero considers even more important:

> For myself, I never fail, and I never shall fail, to protect those dear to you: and whether they appeal to me for advice or whether they do not, I can in either case guarantee my love and loyalty [benevolentur fidesque] to yourself (Ad Fam. 12.2.3).

It is Cicero's personal relationship to the letter recipient, as well as to the subject of the letter, that stands behind the dynamics of this commendation letter. In other words, patron-client relations are motivated by persons of similar status and aristocratic tastes supporting each other and their clients and proteges. As Saller argues, "the message" of each commendation letter tends to be the same: "'this man is a friend or client of mine and hence of worthy character.'"[9]

Commendation in Paul's Letters

Given these dynamics of commendation in the patronal society of the Roman world, what can we learn about Paul's commendations? First, they have similar structure as Greco-Roman commendations. Besides identifying the subject of the letter and requesting some assistance from the letter recipient, the commendation passages in Paul's letters also provide some

---

[7] Ibid., 108-109.

[8] All citations from classical texts are taken from the Loeb Classical Library editions, unless otherwise noted.

[9] Saller, Personal Patronage, 108.

criteria that Paul expects from those whom he endorses.[10] I will review these in the following commendations from several of Paul's letters.

1 Thessalonians 5.12-13

In his earliest extant letter, Paul's concern about the survival of the young congregation in Thessalonica includes an endorsement of local leaders who have carried on the work of Paul and his associates during his absence. There can be no doubt that a large part of the persecution that this church is suffering according to Paul in this letter (cf. 1 Thess 1.6, 2.14, 3.1-5), is due to the religio-political climate of this important Roman colony. Upon offering an alternative ekklēsia (assembly or church) and kurios (Lord or Caesar) to that offered by Rome and its imperial cult in Thessalonica, Paul, his associates, and those who joined the fellowship in Thessalonica, no doubt incurred the wrath and persecution of the "city authorities" (Acts 17.6) who wanted to placate Rome by maintaining singular focus on the imperial cult ("the decrees of Caesar" – Acts 17.7) as the official religious expression of the city.[11] Paul and his colleagues escape with their life according to the author of the Book of Acts (Acts 17.10), but they leave behind a persecuted church, according to what Paul writes in his subsequent letter to them (1Thess). Only Timothy can return, console them and bring back good news to Paul (1 Thess 3.1-10).

Among Paul's admonitions in his response to the Thessalonians, then, is this word of commendation for the community's emerging local leadership:

> But we appeal to you, brothers and sisters, to respect those who labor among you, and have charge of you in the Lord and admonish you;

[10] For a discussion of the form and structure of Pauline commendations, see Chan Hie-Kim, Form and Structure of the Familiar Greek Letter of Recommendation, Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 4 (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1972).

[11] Such an assessment of the situation in Thessalonica has been offered by Robert Jewett, The Thessalonian Correspondence: Pauline Rhetoric and Millenarian Piety (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986), 91-132. See also Karl P. Donfried, "The Imperial Cults of Thessalonica and Political Conflict in 1 Thessalonians," in Horsley, Paul and Empire, 215-223.

esteem them very highly in love because of their work (1 Thess 5.12-13a).[12]

The identity of these commended individuals is tied to their credentials. Paul does not otherwise name them. The community knows who these people are because they have labored among them, exercised charge over them or assisted (proistamenous) the community in some way, and admonished or instructed (nouthetountas) them. These functions both identify the unnamed individuals and commend them to the community.

The key term for our purposes is the participle for proistēmi, which can mean either "lead" (the sense in NRSV) or "help." One scholar suggests that the immediate context requires "helping" because Paul praises the persons "account of their work," which includes hard labor (kopiōntas), help and admonishment.[13] In Romans 12.8, the participle appears again, this time in one of Paul's gift lists. It stands between "the one who contributes" and "the one who does acts of mercy." Yet the NRSV again translates proistamenoi as "the leader" rather than "the one who gives aid," as the RSV did. Again, the immediate context (contributing and showing mercy) seems to dictate the latter, more general meaning--helping. At the same time, however, this does not preclude the sense that, given what Paul requests for those whom he commends in 1 Thess 5.12-13a ("esteem them very highly"), those who help in the community, also receive leadership recognition.[14]

Moreover, there is another text in which Paul employs a cognate of proistēmi and it does have a more direct sense of leadership. In Romans 16.1-2, to which we will turn below, Paul refers to Phoebe as a prostatis, the noun form of prostēmi. The noun prostatis frequently appears in the

---

[12] All Scripture references are taken from the New Revised Standard Version unless otherwise noted.

[13] See Bo Reicke, "proistēmi, Theological Dictionary of the New Testament VI, 700-703.

[14] See Ernest Best, The First and Second Epistle to the Thessalonians, Harper's New Testament Commentaries, Reprinted Edition (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1988), 225, who argues strongly for the meaning, "caring for," with regard to proistamenous, because it contrasts well with the next participle, "admonishing." In Best's view, the leadership element is one of several aspects of the "care" Paul requests, but not the predominant one.

literature of the times with reference to a "patron" or (less frequently) a "patroness."[15] Thus, the NRSV translates the term as "benefactor," while the RSV had "helper." As we shall see below, the context in Romans dictates "patron" or "benefactor" as a better translation, just as the context here in 1 Thessalonians 5 dictates "help" or "assist" as a better translation for the verb form, proistamenous.

Nonetheless, while the more general term "those who help" is preferred, this does not preclude the patronage involved. James Walters puts it this way: "The proistamenos is not the one who `governs' but who "protects" the interests of those who are socially vulnerable, a patron."[16] Thus Paul does invoke the language of patronage in his commendation, just as the Roman commendations do. However, one must note the emphasis on a particular kind of patronage involved here, as reflected in Walters' assertion. It is a caring concern for those in trouble, the "socially vulnerable," that Paul wishes to highlight as the duty of those whom he commends as leaders of the community.

The next part of the exhortation, after the commendation, demonstrates this emphasis: "Be at peace among yourselves. And we urge you, beloved, to admonish the idlers, encourage the faint hearted, help the weak, be patient with all of them" (1 Thess 5.13b-14). It is such attention to those in the community who suffer the most that ultimately commends the leadership of these persons in 1 Thess 5.12-13a. They are patrons in the sense that they care for the weak, not that they lord over them. This most certainly is a direct attack on the type of patronage system practiced throughout the empire, including the city of Thessalonica, which vigorously and viciously persecuted any and all disloyalty to patronage of the imperial cult.[17]

---

[15] For examples of this literature, see James Walters, "`Phoebe' and `Junia(s)'—Rom.16:1-2,7" in Carroll D. Osburn, Essays on Women in Earliest Christianity, Vol.I (Joplin, MO: College Press, 1993), 167-190.

[16] Ibid., 178.

[17] See Donfried, "Imperial Cults," for the evidence supporting this claim in Thessalonica.

1 Corinthians 16.15-18

The commendation of leaders who serve the community, rather than lord over it, continues in Paul's commendation of Stephanas toward the end of 1 Corinthians. Structurally, it is two commendations in one passage.[18] The first commends "the household of Stephanas" (16.15-16); the second "Stephanas and Fortunatas and Achaicus" (16.17-18), the latter two most likely members of the household in some capacity (e.g., business associates, slaves). In either case, Stephanas is the focus in both sets of commendations.[19]

This is intriguing because Paul also mentions Stephanas at a key juncture in the opening of the letter (1.16). At that point, Paul is trying to minimize the importance of who baptized whom in Corinth because that was apparently causing some controversy over leadership in the Corinthian community (1.12-17). Paul wants to emphasize community unity in Christ (1.13-15), rather than ties to particular leaders (for example, Paul, Apollos or Cephas, 1.12-13). Yet, Paul baptized some individuals like Stephanas, Gaius and Crispus (1.14-16), precisely those whom Paul mentions elsewhere as persons who support his ministry by providing hospitality and leadership to the Corinthian church. Later, writing to the Roman Christians, Paul brings greetings from Gaius, "who is host [xenos] to [Paul] and to the whole church" in Corinth (Rom 16.23). In the Book of Acts, the author describes Crispus as a synagogue leader who becomes "a believer in the Lord together with all his household" through the ministry of Paul in Corinth (Acts 18.8). Similarly, the early mention of Stephanas in 1 Cor 1, strategically sets up his double commendation in 16.15-18.[20]

[18] See Kim, Familiar Greek Letter, 130 for this structural analysis, where he notes: "1 Cor 16.15-18 has two passages of commendation appearing together."

[19] See Gordon Fee, The First Epistle to the Corinthians, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1987), 828-829, who discusses the passage as having a "singular emphasis on Stephanas."

[20] See Richard Horsley, "1 Corinthians: A Case Study of Paul's Assembly as an Alternative Society," in Horsley, Paul and Empire, 250, who discusses the roles of Stephanas and others as Paul's "network of friends" who help him "mediate" conflict with other leaders in Corinth.

What is it about Stephanas and his household comrades that commend them? The key criterion for Paul is their diakonia: "service to the saints" (16.15):

> Now, brothers and sisters, you know that the members of 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 put yourselves at the service of such people, and of everyone who works and toils with them (16.15-16).

The elements of reciprocality and exemplification stand out in this commendation. Paul urges the Corinthian community to respond to the diakonia (service, ministry) of Stephanas and company, something to which they have "devoted themselves" (etaxan eautous), with similar devotion and service (hypotassēsthe – "be subject to such people" [RSV], or "put yourselves at the service of such people," [NRSV]). With this play on words with the verb tassō, Paul urges the community to reciprocate to the service of Stephanas with similar service to him and his household.[21]

However, it is not just to Stephanas and company to which devotion and service is requested, but the text says (twice, in fact, see 16.18), that "everyone who works and toils with them" should be commended and given recognition just like Stephanas (16.17). Thus Stephanas becomes an example for others to follow with regard to the appropriate criteria for commendation: If you serve the church with hard work and labor, you merit recognition as someone worthy of emulation.[22]

---

[21] The verb tassō carries the idea of placing or appointing someone to a fixed spot or an assigned position. The reflexive form, as here, has a sense of self-appointment, usually by means of active demonstration, i.e., work or service. "To assign oneself," is to "devote oneself to service." See BAGD, "tassō," 805. Similarly, hypotassō, usually meaning "submit" or "subject oneself to," including in several Pauline texts (1 Cor 14.32, 15.27-28; Rom 8.7, 10.3, 13.1), here coupled with its root word tassō and the diakonia of Stephanas, et.al., probably also requests diakonia toward them from the rest of the community, as suggested by the NRSV translation, "put yourselves at their service."

[22] See J. Paul Sampley, Walking Between the Times: Paul's Moral Reasoning (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991), 89-91, and Margaret Mitchell, Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation: An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1991),42-60, 178-179, for discussions of exemplification in this and other passages in Paul.

These same themes were present in the Thessalonian text: those who worked hard and labored for the church were praised by Paul (1 Thess 5.12-13a). Not naming them specifically probably helped to make such praise and recognition available to anyone who served the community in a similar way. The leaders in Thessalonica became models for others to follow.

The second commendation in 1 Cor 16.17-18 names additional individuals besides Stephanas (Fortunatus and Achaicus) and focuses, not specifically on their service to the Corinthian community, but this time on their service to Paul:

> I rejoice at the coming [parousia] of Stephanas and Fortunatus and Achaicus, because they have made up for your absence; for they have refreshed [anepausan] my spirit as well as yours. So give recognition to such persons.

Essentially, with this second commendation, Paul wants to show support for those who have supported him in his ministry. Stephanas and the others who have travelled with him have brought joy to Paul by their visit; they have supplied news about Corinth in a way that "makes up" (aneplerosan – "filled the void") for the "absence" of others from Corinth (hymeteron hysterēma – "your absence"); and they "refreshed" (anepausan) Paul's spirit.

To be sure, all of this serves Paul's purpose of lending support to those who can help him best, in his own estimation, to resolve discord in Corinth. There are ulterior motives in Paul's commendation of Stephanas and his household. These are people who support Paul's ministry, his leadership and his gospel. Thus he wants to make sure that their leadership is heeded in Corinth, over against any leaders who oppose Paul's apostleship.

Nonetheless, I agree with those, such as Richard Horsley, who argue that these opposing leaders in Corinth want Paul as their "house apostle," a position of patronage to which Paul will not submit himself. Thus he will work with his hands, as demeaning as such an action would be for "proud,

potential patrons" of a movement founder like Paul.[23] By refusing their financial support and working in manual labor to support his ministry, Paul creates a situation of "enmity" with a core of elite leaders in the Corinthian community.[24] Instead, Paul commends those leaders whom he feels genuinely serve the community, and not their own status enhancement. In doing so, of course, they also serve Paul and his version of the gospel. This gospel, however, is diametrically opposed to "replicating the controlling and exploitative power relations of the dominant society."[25]

Thus we have a kind mixed message as we read these commendations of Paul. A model for appropriate community leadership is established: those who work hard and serve diligently on behalf of the gospel community receive commendation from Paul. Those who insist on ongoing interpretations of power by means of the Roman way – a patron-client system, are not commendable in Paul's mind. Such a system simply does not correspond to the empowering and liberating message of the gospel, which has as its motivating force a Messiah/Lord crucified on a Roman cross. At the same time, we have Paul serving as a patron over this process. It is his interpretation of the gospel and his cooperative leaders that carry the day and receive commendation.

This two-edged sword continues when we turn to another set of commendations in a letter written to another Pauline community in another major Roman colony – Philippi.

---

[23] See Horsley, "1 Corinthians," 250. See also John Kingman Chow, Patronage and Power: A Study in Social Networks (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992), for an extensive argument of how the search for patronage lies behind the conflicts Paul encounters in Corinth. Cf. Peter Marshall, Enmity in Corinth: Social Conventions in Paul's Relations with the Corinthians (Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1987, for the argument that Paul's rejection of the offer of "friendship"/patronage creates enmity with some in Corinth. Thus Paul commends others, such as Stephanas.

[24] Marshall, Enmity, 165-257, for the heart of the argument.

[25] Horsley, "1 Corinthians," 250.

Philippians 2.25-30 and 4.2-3

Philippians actually contains three passages of commendation, but one of them is more formally considered an "envoy passage" (the sending of Timothy – Phil 2.19-24).[26] Yet it is intriguing to inquire why Paul commends not only his envoy, Timothy, but also, more formally, Epaphroditus (Phil 2.25-30), and then toward the end of the letter, the ministry of Euodia and Syntyche (Phil 4.2-3). Most of Paul's commendations do come at the end of his letters. Philippians has two in the middle (including the envoy passage) and another toward the end.[27]

Perhaps the solution lies in several unique criteria Paul introduces in these commendations. For example, Timothy is lauded for his "genuine concern" for the "well-being" of the Philippians (2.20). Just like Jesus "looked not to [his] own interests" (2.4), Timothy seeks after the interests of the Philippian community (2.21). In this way, he has shown his "worth," dokimos (2.22), a term Paul often uses with reference to a believer's proven track record in service to the gospel.[28] Finally, like other associates and local leaders Paul commends, Timothy "has served [edoulesen] with [Paul] in the work of the gospel" (2.22).

Paul adds one unique item to his praise of Timothy, however. Timothy has exercised this service with Paul, "like a son with a father" (2.22), thereby describing the singular relationship Paul has with Timothy, apparently his closest co-worker. One Roman commendation echoes the paternal language in Paul's commendation of Timothy. In a letter to the emperor Trajan, Pliny praises the son of a long-time associate as "an honest, hard-working, young man [iuvenem probum industrium]," much like

[26] For this distinction see my study of Pauline commendations, "Paul's Use of Greco-Roman Conventions of Commendation," Ph.D. Dissertation, Boston University (1996), 139, 196-204. See also Margaret Mitchell, "New Testament Envoys in the Context of Greco-Roman Diplomatic and Epistolary Conventions: The Example of Timothy and Titus,""JBL 111 (1992), 641-662.

[27] I assume with Duane Watson, "A Rhetorical Analysis of Philippians and Its Implications for the Unity Question," Novum Testamentum 30 (1987), 57-88, and others, the integrity of Philippians.

[28] See Paul Sampley's discussion of dokimos terms in Walking, 65.

Timothy. The "industry" of Pliny's young elite demonstrates that he is "well-worthy of his excellent father [egregio patre dignissimum]."

However, although the father-son relationship is invoked in both commendations, the two differ with regard to the nature and purpose of that relationship. In Phil 2.22, Paul commends Timothy for serving the cause of the gospel together with Paul. Pliny's commendation implies that the youth's hard work in imperial positions has served to enhance his father's reputation. Timothy does enhance Paul's character by this service. Having a faithful associate helps Paul's reputation in the eyes of his churches. However, Paul highlights his and Timothy's work together on behalf of the gospel, not on behalf of his reputation. It is the gospel's advancement, not personal achievement or status, that concerns Paul and Timothy both.

The commendation of Epaphroditus (Phil 2.25-30) further demonstrates this focus as Paul introduces another aspect of acceptable commendation criteria: risk. Epaphroditus, unlike Timothy, is an envoy from the Philippian community to Paul during one his imprisonments (Phil 1.7, 12-14, 2.25). Paul wants to send Epaphroditus back especially because he has been very ill, so much so "that he nearly died" (2.26-27). Yet, what concerns Epaphroditus in particular more than anything else is worrying the Philippians about his illness: He "has been distressed because you heard that he was ill" (2.26).

Thus, in the formal commendation request of the passage, Paul praises Epaphroditus for being willing to confront even death for the cause of the gospel:

> Welcome him then in the Lord with all joy, and honor such people because he came close to death for the work of Christ, risking his life to make up for those services [leitourgias] that you could not give me (2.29-30).

We have seen these similar themes in the previous commendations: recognition for hard work and service on behalf of the gospel and invitation to others to follow the commended one's example ("honor such people"). The element of risk is new, although not to Paul's discussion of his own ministry. For example, in several passages known as "hardship lists," Paul

describes his ministry as one which entails suffering, hardship and risk (1 Cor 4.9-13, 2 Cor 4.7-12, 6.3-10, 11.23-30). Indeed, in one of these passages, Paul even commends himself by means of hardship!:

> . . . but as servants of God we have commended ourselves in every way: through great endurance, in afflictions, hardships, calamities, beatings, imprisonments, riots, labors, sleepless nights, hunger . . . (2 Cor 6.4-5).[29]

Thus to have an associate who also confronts such risk and hardship on behalf of the gospel is, for Paul, highly commendable. Epaphroditus fits this criterion well.

There's another interesting aspect of this commendation that we have not seen before and that is the use of the term leitourgia, translated as "service" in this passage. First, Paul refers to Epaphroditus as a leitourgos ("servant") of the Philippians on behalf of Paul (2.25). Then he calls Epaphroditus' service to Paul a leitourgia (2.30). In Greco-Roman contexts, leitourgia often referred to "all kinds of public service."[30] "Liturgies" entailed public works projects that Roman and provincial elites often took on at their own expense, as a means of enhancing their status in the eyes of the people, and the imperial heirarchy. Indeed, recent studies have shown the singular focus on the imperial cult in the Greek settings of the Roman empire, including temple building projects, as a means of exercising power and control over those newly conquered territories in the East.[31]

Paul has a different notion of leitourgia in mind:

---

[29] For an extensive discussion of the hardship lists in Paul, see John T. Fitzgerald, Cracks in An Earthen Vessel: An Examination of the Catalogues of Hardships in the Corinthian Correspondence, SBL Dissertation Series 99 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988).

[30] Peter O'Brien, Commentary on Philippians, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1991), 332. See also Max Zerwick and Mary Grosvenor, A Grammatical Analysis of the Greek New Testament (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1981), 553, who remind us that leitourgia comes from the root words laos ("people") and ergon ("work"), and thus the original meaning of "service for the people," whether in religious or secular contexts.

[31] See the studies by S.R.F. Price, including "the transformation of civic space" and architecture during the Roman period in Greece and Asia Minor, in his Rituals and Power: The Imperial Cult in Asia Minor (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), especially 133-169. See also Price, "Rituals and Power" in Horsley, Paul and Empire, 47-71.

> But even if I am being poured out as a libation over the sacrifice and the offering [leitourgia] of your faith, I am glad and rejoice with all of you (Phil 2.17).

Epaphroditus' service has been offered in a similar vein. His leitourgia included delivering a monetary offering from the Philippians to Paul, which Paul describes as "a fagrant offering, a sacrifice acceptable and pleasing to God" (4.18). Thus, in Paul leitourgia takes on this sense of "sacrificial service" to God and on behalf of the gospel community.

Timothy and Epaphroditus are good models of the type of leadership Paul expects from his co-workers, associates and local leaders. Indeed, this has been his purpose in the first two chapters of the Philippian letter. Paul exhorts the Philippians toward unity of purpose and stedfastness on behalf of the gospel in light of suffering and opposition (1.27-30). To bolster this narratio (statement of purpose), he cites the examples of Jesus (2.1-11), himself (2.12-18), Timothy and Epaphroditus (2.19-30).[32] He also cites the "negative example" of opponents of the Philippian Christians in 3.1-21. The Philippians should follow the good examples rather than the bad: "Brothers and sisters, join in imitating me, and observe those who live according to the example you have in us" (3.17). Perhaps this is why Paul writes an unusual number of commendations in this short letter. He wants to commend good examples.

The final commendation comes just before the final exhortations toward joy and unity (4.4-9). In Phil 4.2-3, Paul exhorts the unity of two female local church leaders, Euodia and Syntyche. In doing this, he commends them. According to the structural analysis of Pauline commendations offered by Chan-Hie Kim, Paul identifies the commended individuals ("I urge Euodia and I urge Syntyche . . ."); cites their credentials ("for they have struggled beside me in the work of the gospel, together with

[32]This rhetorical structure is outlined in a variety of recent studies, including Watson, "Rhetorical Analysis of Philippians;" Ben Witherington III, Friendship and Finances in Philippi: The Letter of Paul to the Philippians (Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International); and Cynthia Briggs Kitteredge, Community and Authority: The Rhetoric of Obedience in the Pauline Tradition (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1998), 53-100.

Clement and the rest of my co-workers); and makes a commendation request ("I ask you also, my loyal companion, to help these women"). It is an unusual construction but, nonetheless, formally, a commendation.[33]

Beyond the question of form and structure, however, what do we make of the unusual request by Paul? Certainly, the theme of unity has been consistent throughout the letter. Here, an example exists of two local leaders ("coworkers" of Paul, in fact) whose disagreement, whatever it might have been (including the possibility that it might have been with Paul[34]) is a cause for concern. In fact, Paul may have geared his whole argument in the latter toward addressing this concern:

> Rhetorical analysis and attention to the use of obedience language in Philippians supports the argument that these verses are very significant in the letter and suggests that Euodia and Syntyche should be considered central to the rhetorical problem.[35]

Thus, that Paul should employ commendation (for the third time!) at this critical juncture in his rhetorical argument, bolsters my argument that this instrument of patronage plays a much more important role in Pauline rhetoric than has been previously noted.

At the same time, however, what Paul chooses to emphasize in his commendations continues to be diametrically opposed to what typical Greco-Roman commendations emphasized. What is the critical characteristic praised with regard to Euodia and Syntyche? "They have struggled beside me in the work of the gospel," writes Paul. This athletic imagery of "joint struggle" – synathleō – is cited one other time by Paul in his writings, right here in Phil 1.27, where Paul describes "the manner of life" expected of those committed to the gospel: "striving side by side [synathlountes] with one mind for the faith of the gospel." From his communities and fellow workers, Paul expects a unified struggle even in the face of opposition (1.28) and conflict (agona, 1.30). Thus he offers this

---

[33] See Kim, Familiar Greek Letter, 128-129, who identifies 4.3 as the content of the commendation (with "these women" as the identifier) and 4.2 as the introduction to it.
[34] See the intriguing argument along these lines by Kittredge, Community and Authority, 105-110.
[35] Ibid., 93.

assessment of the believer's life: "For [God] has graciously granted you the privilege not only of believing in Christ, but of suffering for him as well" (1.29).

Euodia and Syntyche have struggled together with Paul in this way on behalf of the gospel. That's why he calls them his "co-workers." Thus, like Jesus, Paul and Epaphroditus, they have taken on the risks of life and ministry in and for the gospel. This is why they are commendable.[36]

Moreover, Paul accomplishes another task by commending Euodia and Syntyche in this way. He reminds his readers of the reality of conflict, opposition and suffering as part and parcel of the Christian way over against the Roman way of triumphalism. With his gospel and gospel communities (ekklessiae - "assemblies"), Paul "stands over against Roman imperial ideology."[37] He does not stand over against "Judaism," for example.

> Not in Philippians, where both Paul and the Philippians struggle against persecution by official and/or local opponents, but will attain martyrlike vindication, and whose real citizenship is in heaven, from which they expect the true "Savior" (Phil 1.15-30; 2.14-18; 3.20-21).[38]

Paul and his colleagues, Timothy, Epaphroditus, Euodia and Syntyche have demonstrated their willingness to suffer persecution on behalf of the euangelion about Jesus Christ, the crucified Sōtēr.[39] This commends them in ways that no typical Roman patron would find acceptable, and no Roman letter of commendation would seek to highlight.

---

[36] But see Kittredge, Ibid., 105-110, who would argue the case differently. The language of "struggling together with Paul" indicates that Euodia and Syntyche are missionary partners, who remain of "one mind" with each other, but not with Paul. Thus Paul, in the Letter to the Phillippians, has to construct "a rhetoric of obedience" with imitation of himself and others like him (Timothy, Epaphroditus), as the "authoritative model" of behavior for co-workers. A fascinating argument, but how does one explain Paul's praise of their prior "struggle" with him for the gospel and the friendly tone of the letter as a whole?

[37] Horsley, "General Introduction," 6.

[38] Ibid.

[39] For how Paul uses and transforms the language of Roman imperial ideology, such as euangelion and sōtēr, for his own "missionary theology," see Dieter Georgi, "God Turned Upside Down - Romans: Missionary Theology and Roman Political Ideology," in Horsley, Paul and Empire, 148-157.

Romans 16.1-2

Finally, we come to the Pauline commendation which has the clearest reference to patronage and the closest relationship to the center of the Empire, Paul's Letter to the Christians at Rome, and his commendation of Phoebe at the end of that letter (Rom 16.1-2). I noted earlier in the discussion about 1 Thess 5.12-13 that here in the Roman text we find the noun form of the verb prostēmi. Paul commends Phoebe, among other things because she is a prostatis. Earlier translations, such as the Revised Standard Version, translated this term, "helper." However, the context and the lexical evidence points to the more specific term, "patron" or as in the New Revised Standard Version, "benefactor."

Thus, note the following translation of the commendation of Phoebe, showing its formal structure:

(a) identification: "I commend to you Phoebe,
(b) credentials: our sister, who has been a deacon [diakonos] of the church at Cenchreae,
(c) request: so that [hina] you may receive her in the Lord, in a manner worthy of the saints, and assist her in whatever matter [pragmati] she has need from you.
(b') credentials: for she has been a patroness [prostatis] of many and of me also."[40]

By placing her status as prostatis last, Paul clearly wants to emphasize to his Roman readers that Phoebe is worthy of their hospitality (the most likely implication of the generalized request, "whatever matter she has need from you"), because she has been a hospitable patron to other believers, including Paul himself.

Thus Paul does not shy away from using the language of patronage, nor its principle vehicle, the commendation, when it serves his greater purposes on behalf of the gospel and the communities which he serves and to which he writes.

What are his purposes in sending Phoebe to Rome, and in commending her as a "sister," a diakonos, and a prostatis? Certainly, she is

[40] Format adapted and translated from Kim, Familiar Greek Letter, 132.

the bearer of this important Roman letter in which Paul wishes to introduce himself and his gospel to an audience of believers that does not know him personally (except for the litany of persons Paul greets in the astounding catalog of names in Rom 16.3-16).

Paul's "letter of introduction" further proposes to seek missionary support from the Roman churches for a preaching trip to Spain (Rom 15.22-24).[41] As with the Jerusalem collection, which he describes in the very next passage (Rom 15.25-27), Paul expects a network of support for his gospel mission:

> So, when I have completed this [the collection for Jerusalem], and have delivered to them what has been collected, I will set out by way of you to Spain; and I know that when I come to you I will come in the fullness of the blessing of Christ (Rom 15.28-29).

Shortly after this passage and a prayer request for a safe trip to Jerusalem (15.30-32), Paul commends Phoebe to his Roman readers.

Richard Horsley has suggested that Paul's Jerusalem collection reflects a kind of underground economy in the internationalized, cross-empire movement that was Pauline Christianity:

> [T]he network of assemblies had an "international" political economic dimension diametrically opposed to the tributary political economy of the empire. . . [T]he movement had developed its distinctive way of practicing international economic solidarity and (horizonal) reciprocity, the (relative) "haves" sharing with the "have-nots.". . By contrast with the vertical and centripetal movement of resources in the . . . economy of the empire, Paul organized a horizontal movement of resources from one subject people to another . . .[42]

The Roman letter invites the house assemblies there to join this "horizontal movement of resources," in this case from Rome to "subject peoples" in Spain. Phoebe, an experienced patron and leader of the movement back east, is asked to not only deliver the letter which makes this

[41] See the series of articles on the "purpose of Romans" in Karl Donfried, ed., The Romans Debate, 2nd Edition (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991) .
[42] Horsley, "1 Corinthians,"251.

request, but probably, to explain it further and begin to organize it in anticipation of Paul's arrival.[43] Thus, once again, Paul uses the instruments of the patronage system, including commendation, for the purposes of spreading the gospel. To be sure, it is the gospel as he proclaims it and defends it, but nonetheless, it is a gospel that in language, content and practice challenges the status quo of the Roman Empire.

Conclusions

In this essay, I have tried to remind the reader, or introduce the reader, as the case may be, to the role of commendation as an integral vehicle for promoting patron-client relations in the world of the Roman Empire at the turn of the ages. Commendation was also a vehicle employed by the Apostle Paul in the first century C.E. to promote the stability of his churches by means of enhancing the status of key leaders within those communities. Thus, in a sense, Paul practiced commendation in a way similar to the patronage of the Roman world—he commended his people for his assemblies based on criteria he thought worthy of recognition.

However, in another, very real sense, Paul, just like he did, for example, with the terms of Roman political ideology,[44] infused the elements of commendation with his gospel theology. In particular, the criteria Paul uses to commend his fellow workers and local leaders to his churches, reflect a singular concern for the well-being of the gospel message and especially the gospel communities. Thus, commended individuals must be willing to work hard and serve the community in sacrificial ways, even to the point of hardship, risk, injury, persecution and death. Personal, social status enhancement in the larger world do not figure in Paul's commendation equation as they do in typical Roman commendations of the times. In this way, Paul continues to undermine the traditions of Roman patronage and power, and, in this case, its use of the commendation letter.

[43] This has been suggested previously by Robert Jewett, "Paul, Phoebe and the Spanish Mission," in Jacob Neusner, et.al., The Social World of Formative Christianity and Judaism: Essays in Tribute to Howard Clark Kee (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988), 142-161.

[44] On this point, see Georgi, "God Turned Upside Down."

I have also attempted in this essay to engage in conversation with the very important work being done to link Paul's development of Christian assemblies throughout the Eastern Mediterranean portions of the Roman Empire to the overwhelming challenges of Roman imperial hegemony.[45] I have appreciated engaging with this material because it represents a "politicizing" of Paul that has largely been overlooked previously in Pauline studies. Now we can see a side of the Apostle that did in fact challenge the power of the Empire and not just accommodate to it, as certain readings, for example, of Romans 13.1-7 might suggest.[46] It is my hope that, here and beyond, the study of "the politics of commendation" might contribute to these efforts in understanding Paul and politics.

Finally, this is my hope because of some personal, theological, as well as historical, concerns. If we can demonstrate that the Apostle Paul and his communities engaged in some (subversive) de-imperialization, how might that contribute to the ongoing movement of post-colonial hermeneutics in our own academic discipline? I became involved in the study of Pauline commendation and leadership because of my interest in understanding the role of social status in the early church. After working for years with inner-city clergy in so-called minority churches who exercised significant leadership in those communities without corresponding significant status in the larger world because of limited educational and income credentials, I began to wonder how that operated in the early church. Was status more important than service? Studying Paul's commendations of leaders helped me explore that question in significant ways; more study is needed. Paul's interaction with the imperial powers certainly contributes to these questions in a major way.

Yet, it is interesting to me how I came to these questions in the first place. A member of a "non-Western" diaspora community of the colonized (Puerto Ricans in New York) joins the largely "Western" guild of historical biblical criticism to ask questions about the status of another colonized

[45] Thus the various references above to several of the articles in the volume edited by Horsley, Paul and Empire.

[46] On this, see the highly nuanced reading of Rom 13.1-7 by Neil Elliott, "Romans 13.1-7 in the Context of Imperial Propaganda," in Horsley, Paul and Empire, 184-204.

community – the early Christians. The decolonization of so-called objective biblical criticism, to echoe the words of Fernando Segovia,[47] has contibuted to the presence of persons like me, an urban Puerto Rican scholar, in the discipline, such that "other voices can now speak in their own tongues and no center controls the discourse."[48] In short, there is a synergy between the decolonization project of the Apostle Paul and the decolonization of our discipline that is worth exploring further.

[47] In such valuable, theoretical contributions as "Cultural Studies and Contemporary Biblical Criticism: Ideological Criticism as Mode of Discourse," in Fernando Segovia and Mary Ann Tolbert, Reading from this Place, Vol. 2 (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995), 1-17.

[48] Ibid., 7.

THE POLITICS OF VIRTUE AND VICE IN THE PAULINE EPISTLES

Jennifer Wright Knust

Rome, prior to the advent of the Emperor Augustus, was described by Horace as overrun with immorality:

> *Fecunda culpae saecula nuptias promum inquinavere et genus et domos: hoc fonte derivata clades in patriam populumque fluxit.*
>
> O most immoral age! First you tainted marriage, the house, and the family. Now from the same source flows pollution over fatherland and people! *Carm.* 3.6

In contrast, Horace proclaimed, the Augustan moral revival has restored the city to its proper virtue. Thanks to Augustus, "the pure house is no longer sullied by adultery. Law and custom have tamed unclean lust. Mothers are proud of legitimate children. Punishment follows on the heels of guilt."[1]

The Emperor Augustus portrayed himself and was portrayed as reviving the virtue and piety of Rome and the empire. Following his victory at the Battle of Actium, Octavian Augustus[2] fashioned himself as the restorer of Roman tradition, instituting moral reform through legislation, building projects, and a revival of Roman religion at the expense of "foreign" cults.[3] He reinstated the *mores maiorum*, returning

[1] Hor. *Carm.* 4.5, *nullis polluitur casta domus stupris, mos et lex masculosum edomuit nefas, laudantur simili prole puerperae, culpam poena premit comes.*
[2] On the significance of the title "Augustus," see Mary Beard, John North and Simon Price, *Religions of Rome*, vol. 1 *History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 182-184.
[3] Ronald Syme, *The Roman Revolution* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1939), 150-152, 228-235.

Rome to its original piety, granting peace and prosperity to the city and the empire, and instituting a new era of concordia within households and across the empire.[4] As Philo put it, his "every virtue outshone human nature," and he alone was able to quiet the storms of civil war, set every city at liberty, bring order to disorder and civilization to barbarians.[5]

Augustus came to set the standard for the "good emperor," a man in control of his passions who rules both himself and his empire well.[6] Stories of his life and conduct were offered as moral *exempla* in all sorts of discourse.[7] Seneca, for example, recommended that his readers emulate Augustus's moderate response to excessive anger.[8] Elsewhere Seneca extolled the virtue of Nero by remarking that no one talks about the deified Augustus any more, for Nero's goodness is so apparent that no other model is needed.[9] Similarly, in Pliny the Younger's panegyric to the Emperor Trajan, Trajan's exceptional virtue and piety emerge as prominent themes. Trajan's deeds and person exemplify *pudor, moderatio, temperantia, concordia,* and *pietas.*[10] Thanks to Trajan, all the subjects of the empire, even the poorest, are exceptionally fertile. Proud parents raise legitimate

---

[4] Paul Zanker, *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus,* trans. Alan Shapiro (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1988).

[5] Philo *Legat.* 143-151, ὁ τὴν ἀθρωπίνην φύσιν ὑπερβαλὼν ἐν ἁπάσαις ταῖς ἀρεταὶς (English translation Smallwood, 91). In 27 BCE, the Senate recognized Augustus's exceptional political achievements by praising his *virtus, clementia, iustitia* and *pietas,* commemorating his restoration of the *res publica* on a golden shield. *Res Gestae* 6.16-21. Cf. J. Rufus Fears, "The Cult of the Virtues and Roman Imperial Ideology," *ANRW* 2.17.2:885-885.

[6] See Helen North, "Canons and Hierarchies of the Cardinal Virtues in Greek and Latin Literature," in *The Classical Tradition: Literary and Historical Studies in Honor of Harry Caplan,* ed. L. Wallach (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1966), 177-178.

[7] The *exempla* were anecdotes telling the exceptional deeds of great men. These *exempla* were memorized by students during their rhetorical training and regularly appear in forensic oratory, historiography, biography, and even philosophical works. See Richard Saller, "Anecdotes as Historical Evidence for the Principate," *Greece and Rome* 27 (1980): 69-83.

[8] Sen. *Ira* 3.40.2-5. Augustus, Seneca tells us, when confronted with the intemperate anger of Vedius Pollio toward a slave, interceded on the slave's behalf. Thus, the slave escaped a most horrid punishment — being eaten by huge lampreys kept in a fish pond.

[9] Sen. *Clem.* 1.1.6.

[10] Plin. *Pan.* 22-25.

children who will grow into adulthood.[11] Slaves obey their masters and masters care for their slaves.[12] Augustus, Nero, Trajan — each emperor was, at one time or another, said to personify virtue and piety, at least in theory. Indeed, by the second-century CE, the association of the emperor with the virtues had become a cliché.[13]

As Horsley, Georgi, Wengst, Elliot and others have noted, Christianity in general and Pauline Christianity specifically emerged in the context of this reconfiguration of piety and power under the figure of the emperor.[14] Augustus and other emperors were represented as universal benefactors, saviors, the sons of a god, fulfilling divinely ordained providence and guaranteeing both peace and piety.[15] Reading early Christian texts in light of these imperial rhetorics of power, Horsley and others have persuasively argued that Paul and other early Christian authors cannot easily be read as recommending accommodation to empire. Indeed, the gospel of the crucified Messiah stands in direct contrast to the "gospel according to Augustus."[16] Paul's injunctions to "distinguish what really matters" (Phil 1:10) and to "resist conformity to this world" (12:2) have

[11] Plin. *Pan.* 26-28. See the extensive discussion of Trajan's virtues according to Pliny and also as represented on coins, inscriptions, and reliefs in Fears, 913-924.
[12] Plin. *Pan.* 42.
[13] Andrew Wallace-Hadrill, *Suetonius: The Scholar and his Caesars* (Great Britain: Duckworth, 1983), 147.
[14] See the collection of essays in Richard A. Horsley, ed. *Paul and Empire: Religion and Power in Roman Imperial Society* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1997); Horsley, *1 Corinthians* Abingdon New Testament Commentaries (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1998), esp. 22-38; Dieter Giorgi, "Who is the True Prophet," *Harvard Theological Review* 79 (1986): 100-126; Klaus Wengst, *Pax Romana,* trans. John Bowden (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987); Neil Elliot, *Liberating Paul: The Justice of God and the Politics of the Apostle* (Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1994). See also Walter E. Pilgrim, *Uneasy Neighbors: Church and State in the New Testament* Overtures to Biblical Theology (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1999). Cf. Simon Price, *Rituals and Power: The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), esp. 2-5, 49-51, 53-62, 243-246.
[15] Price, 51, 54; Cf. John K. Chow, "Patronage in Roman Corinth," in *Paul and Empire,* 104-125.
[16] Georgi, 100.

been reinterpreted to imply a direct critique of Roman rule.[17] Further, imperial claims that the emperor has instituted "peace and security" are directly denied by Paul: "just as people are saying 'peace and security' sudden destruction will come upon them" (1 Thess 5:3).[18] Christian and Pauline "faith" (*fides*, πιστίς) is read against the Augustan claim that the whole Roman realm is distinguished by *fides* and *iustitia* (δικαιοσύνη).[19] Paul, therefore, has been reinterpreted as an anti-imperialist in contrast to all readings that would find in him support for conformity to imperial (and other governmental) authority.

In this paper, I too will suggest that Paul offered a pointed critique of empire in his letters. The Paul I have found is also an anti-imperialist Paul, a Paul who was deeply critical of Roman imperial pretensions and propaganda. One of the ways he registered his rejection of empire was by arguing that transformation "in Christ" results in a decisive break with the depravity of the world. Non-Christians are "enslaved to lust"; Christians are "slaves of God."[20] Gentiles fornicate.[21] Christians glorify God in their bodies.[22] Non-Christians join their bodies to prostitutes.[23] Christians exercise self-control, or they marry and thereby channel their passions appropriately.[24] In this way, Paul juxtaposed the brothers and sisters in Christ with the depraved gentile idolaters, condemning the "crooked and perverse generation"[25] for sexual deviancy while setting the Christians apart on the basis of their exceedingly strict self-control. In the process, Paul participated in a long-standing argument, familiar to Greeks, Jews and

[17] Elliot, 189.
[18] Wengst, 11-19.
[19] Georgi.
[20] Rom 6:13-23.
[21] 1 Thess 4:5; Gal 5:16-26; Rom 1:18-32.
[22] 1 Cor. 6:15-20.
[23] 1 Cor 6:15.
[24] 1 Cor 7:1-40.
[25] Phil 2:15.

Romans alike. This argument, repeated in a variety of sources across the empire, vilified outsiders while defining insiders on the basis of sexual virtue and vice. By participating in this polemic, however, Paul reinscribed many of the very same cultural assumptions about sex and gender that were held by his neighbors.

Recent studies of sex and gender in the ancient Mediterranean world have proposed that they were configured according to a strict hierarchy, with "male" understood to be more perfect and "female" deficient. Sex and gender conform to a matrix of active/passive, superordinate/subordinate and dominant/submissive with the elite male expected to assume the active, superordinate, dominant role and women or persons of lesser status, especially slaves, expected to be passive, subordinate and submissive.[26] As Aristotle put it, slaves are different from their masters "by nature." They have no faculty of deliberation but require masters, those who are capable of moral goodness and reason, to rule over them.[27] Freeborn women were likewise thought to be incapacitated "by nature," weaker and colder than men, less capable of virtue and therefore in need of special protection and surveillance.[28] Though Aristotle should not be viewed as representative of the entire ancient world, he is far from alone in his insistence that slaves, women, and, to a lesser extent, freedmen and laborers, are deficient in virtue.[29] The freeborn, elite, citizen male, on the other hand, is the opposite

---

[26] Brooten, 241, 275-280.

[27] Arist. *Pol.* 1260a4-1260b8.

[28] Arist. *Pol.* 1260a4. Plato *Tim.* 50d; Arist. *Meta.* 1.6.998a. On this view in the classical Greek sources, see Kenneth Dover, *Greek Popular Morality in the Time of Plato and Aristotle* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1974), 96-102; in Hellenistic Greek sources, see Eva Cantarella, *Pandora's Daughters,* trans. Maureen B. Fant (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univeristy Press, 1987), 92-97; in Roman sources, see Susan Treggiari, *Roman Marriage* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), 205-228; in late antiquity, see Joëlle Beaucamp, *Le Statut de la Femme à Byzance (4e-7e siècle),* vol. 1 (Paris: De Boccard, 1990), 26-27.

[29] For example, see Ach. Tat. 7.10; Pliny *NH* 35. On this view as expressed by Aristotle's contemporaries, see Dover, *Greek Popular Morality,* 114-115. Some Stoic philosophers argued that slaves could achieve wisdom and cultivate virtue. See, for example, Sen . *Ep.* 47. Cf. Keith Bradley, *Slave and Society at Rome* (Cambridge: Cambridge University

of the deficient female or slave. He is dominant. He controls himself. He embodies *virtu*/ἀρετή. In sexual acts, he penetrates. He pursues. As Halperin puts it, sex in Greek society "is conceived to center on, and to define itself around, an asymmetrical gesture, that of the penetration of one person by the body — and, specifically, by the phallus — of another."[30] Gender was delineated on the basis of status: "What counted, then, was not the anatomical 'sex' of the sexual partners but their social genders — the degree, that is, to which their sexual roles did or did not correspond to their respective positions in a rigid social hierarchy."[31]

To what extent did Paul accept this hierarchical configuration of sex, gender and status? Some recent considerations of Paul have persuasively argued that he adopted much of this sex-gender system as his own, despite his claim that "there is neither Jew nor Greek, neither slave nor free, not male or female, for you all are one in Christ Jesus."[32] For example, Paul affirmed the view that woman is derivative and secondary to man. "The head of every man is Christ, the head of a woman is her husband, and the head of Christ is God" and "Man was not made from woman, but woman from man. Neither was man created for woman, but woman for man."[33] Further, Paul assumes that woman is meant, "by nature," to be the passive

---

Press, 1994), 135-145. Yet, the fact that the questions "are slaves fully human?" or "can slaves cultivate virtue and wisdom?" were raised at all emphasizes that slaves were commonly assumed to be deficient in virtue, wisdom, and humanity. On the supposed moral deficiencies of freedmen, see Petronius's satirical portrait of the vulgar freedman Trimalchio who "would wish as a matter of course to ape the lifestyles of the rich and famous . . a former slave like Trimalchio would show no hesitation at all in submitting a host of underlings to the sorts of indignities of which he had first-hand experience himself." Bradley, 64 on Pet. *Satyr.* 26.

[30] Halperin, 30.

[31] Ann Pellegrini, in "Lesbian Historiography Before the Name?" ed. Elizabeth Castelli, *GLQ* 4.4 (1998), 580.

[32] Gal 3:28. For the opposing view, see, for example, Elliot, *Liberating Paul,* 52-54, 209-214

[33] 1 Cor 11:3, 8-9. See Mary Rose D'Angelo, "Veils, Virgins and the Tongues of Men and Angels: Women's Heads in Early Christianity," in *Off with her Head! The Denial of Women's Identity in Myth, Religion, and Culture,* eds. Howard Eilberg-Schwartz and

partner in sexual acts and man to be the active partner. Women who "exchange natural relations for unnatural" and men who "commit shameless acts with men" demonstrate their depraved, dishonorable lusts and deserve to die.[34] Paul also relies upon a metaphorical use of slavery that presupposes the association between slaves and sexual immorality, juxtaposing "slaves of lust" and "slaves of sin" to "slaves of Christ."[35] Thus, though Paul may have rejected Rome, at the same time, he adopted hierarchical sex-gender-status cultural presuppositions that had previously served to undergird imperial, not Christian, claims to legitimacy. His critique of Roman imperial pretensions, framed, in part, in terms of sexual virtue and vice depended upon and reinscribed theories of sex and gender that, historically, had been used by Romans and Greeks to claim their own privileged status.

As we have already observed, part of the making of imperial legitimacy rested on claims about the piety and virtue of the emperor. The exceptional piety, temperance, and valor of the emperor justify his position and ensure the well-being of the empire. This view has much in common with the earlier Greek proposition that only good men can truly be kings. Though a bad man may seem to be a king — he may be called a king by his

---

Wendy Doniger (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995), 131-164; Dale B. Martin, *The Corinthian Body* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), esp. 229-249

[34] Rom 1:26-32. See Brooten, 241-266, 298-299.

[35] Rom 6:15-23; 7:5; 8:15. Christians, Paul states, are no longer "slaves to sin," but rather become "slaves to God" and therefore "slaves of righteousness" (δοῦλοι τῆς ἁμαρτίας; 6.17: δουλωθέντες δὲ τῷ θεῷ ἔχετε, "you have been enslaved to God"; 6.18: ἐδουλώθητε τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ, "you were made slaves to righteousness."). Though Paul's term for "sin" (ἁμαρτία) is a general one, the sexual imagery is preserved: "You once made your members slaves to impurity and to greater and greater iniquity, so now make your members slaves to righteousness and sanctification." (6:19) "While we were living in the flesh, our sinful passions (τὰ παθήματα τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν), aroused by the law, were at work in our members to bear the fruit of death." (7:5). For discussion of Paul's metaphorical use of slavery, see Dale B. Martin, *Slavery as Salvation: The Metaphor of Slavery in Pauline Christianity* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990). On Rom 6:20-23, see esp. 60-68. Martin stresses the "status-improvement" aspect of these two "spheres of slavery."

subjects, he may call himself king — in actual fact, this is impossible. Enslaved to his passions, he is equally enslaved to his subjects, though he and his subjects may not realize it. This theory can be found as early as Plato, though Dio Chysostom attributed it to Homer:

> Ὅμηρος ὁμοίως τοῖς ἄλλοις σοφοῖς τε καὶ ἀληθέσιν ἀνδράσιν, ὡς οὐδείς ποτε πονηρὸς καὶ ἀκόλαστος καὶ φιλοχρήματος οὔτε αὐτὸς ἑαυτοῦ γενέσθαι δυνατὸς ἄρχων οὐδ' ἐγκρατὴς ὅυτε τῶν ἄλλων οὐδενός, οὐδ' ἔσται ποτὲ ἐκεῖνος βασιλεύς, οὐδ' ἂν πάντες φῶσιν Ἕλληνες καὶ βάρβαροι καὶ ἄνδρες καὶ γυναῖκες, καὶ μὴ μόνον ἄνθροποι θαυμάζωσιν αὐτὸν καὶ ὑπακούωσιν
>
> Homer, in the same manner as other wise and truthful men, says that no wicked or licentious or avaricious person can ever be a ruler or master either of himself or of anybody else, nor will such a man ever be a king even though all the world, both Greeks and barbarians, men and women, affirm the contrary.[36]

A late third-century treatise on epideictic oratory recommended that emperors be praised for their bravery (ἀνδρεία), justice (δικαιοσύνη), moderation (σωφροσύνη), and wisdom (φρονήσις).[37] The moderate emperor is demonstrated by the propriety of his subjects:

> διὰ βασιλέα σώφρονες μὲν οἱ γάμοι, γνήσιοι δὲ τοῖς πατράσιν οἱ παῖδες, θείαι δὲ καὶ πανηγύρεις καὶ ἀγῶνες μετὰ του προσήκοντος κόσμου καὶ τῆς προπούσης σωφροσύης γίνονται·
>
> Because of the emperor, marriages are chaste, fathers have legitimate offspring, spectacles, festivals and competitions are conducted with proper splendor and due moderation.[38]

---

[36] Dio Chrys. *Or.* 1.14.
[37] 373. See C. E. V. Nixon and Barbara Saylor Rodgers, *In Praise of Later Roman Emperors: The Panegyrici Latini* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), 22-23. On the four cardinal virtues, see North, "Canons and Hierarchies," 177-180.
[38] 367.5-8. English translation Russell.

Thus, the good *princeps* is firmly in control of himself and responsible for a moral climate in which the virtues flourish and vices are punished.[39]

Given this argument, Paul's claim that "the gentiles" and "the world" are characterized by fornication, "unnatural" intercourse, and out-of-control passions can be read, in part, as a serious critique of the ruling elite. In a world where legitimacy rested on claims to virtue, Paul's argument that non-Christians are, by definition, sexually licentious, "slaves to sin" and "slaves to lust," while Christians are fully in-control of their passions and themselves, undermines the proposition that the emperor and his representatives deserve the honor and authority that they seek. They, in fact, are the true "slaves." They are the degenerates. If virtue is a litmus test of fitness for leadership, then Pauline assertions about the moral superiority of the brothers and sisters in Christ, read together with his arguments about the moral corruption of all non-Christians, suggests a decided anti-imperialist critique. Non-Christians, incapable of virtue, can only be wicked, licentious and avaricious tyrants, incapable of ruling themselves let alone others.

Paul, early in his letter to the Romans, describes the punishment that God has reserved for those who suppress the truth. They have been "given up" in the lusts (ἐπιθυμίαι) of their hearts to impurity, "to the dishonoring of their bodies among themselves, because they exchanged the truth about God for a lie and worshipped and served the creature rather than the Creator, who is blessed forever!"[40] Three times Paul states that they have been "given up" (παραδίδωμι) by God to lust. God "gave them up in the lusts of their hearts to impurity," "gave them up to dishonorable passions"

[39] Cf. G. Maslakov, "Valerius Maximus and Roman Historiography. A Study of the *exempla* Tradition," *ANRW* 2.23.1: 451-453.
[40] Rom 1:24.

(εἰς πάθη ἀτιμίας)[41] and "gave them up to a base mind" (εἰς ἀδόκιμον νοῦν) and "to do the things which are improper" (ποιεῖν τὰ μὴ καθήκοντα). In his earlier letter to the Thessalonian Christians, Paul compared the holiness and honor of Christians with the "passion of lust" that characterizes the gentiles, warning the Thessalonians that the Lord will avenge improper behavior.[42] Similarly, in Philippians Paul prophesied that the "enemies of Christ," that is, Christians who oppose Paul, will be destroyed: "Their end is destruction, their god is the belly, and they glory in their shame, with minds set on earthly things."[43] Thus, to Paul, non-Christians and false Christians alike share a common disease, out-of-control lust.

When Paul argued at the beginning of Romans and elsewhere that the proof of the corruption of the world was in abhorrent sexual practices, he participated in a traditional polemic. Canaanite idolaters, the book of Exodus states, "prostitute themselves to their gods."[44] The prophet Ezekiel turned the accusation against Jerusalem. Jerusalem, by failing to live up to the covenant, acted just as one would expect idolaters to behave: as a whore. She "lavished her (Heb. "your") whorings on any passer-by," betraying her faithful husband, god.[45] Such Hebrew Bible commonplaces were extended to include the Greeks and other "gentiles" by Hellenistic Jews. As the Wisdom of Solomon puts it, gentile idolaters are by definition

---

[41] Rom 1:26.
[42] 1 Thess 4-7.
[43] Phil 3:19. Cf. Philo *Virt.* 34.182. The impiety of the apostate Jews leads them to serve "the delights of the belly and the organs below it." Further examples in Paul include 1 Cor 5:1-2, 6:9-11; Phil 2:14-16; 2 Cor 10:7-22; Gal 5:16-26. On Phil 3:19, see Elizabeth Castelli, *Imitating Paul: A Discourse of Power* Literary Currents in Biblical Interpretation (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1991), 95-97.
[44] Ex. 34.15-16: ותנו אחרי אלהיהם MT, ἐκπορνεύσωσιν ὀπίσω τῶν θεῶν αὐτῶν LXX; Cf. Lev. 17.7, 20.1-9.
[45] Ezek. 16.15: ותשפשי את־תזנותיך על־כל־עובר לו־יהי MT, ἐξέχεας τὴν πορνείαν σου ἐπὶ πάντα πάροδον LXX; cf. Deut. 31.16: In a dream, the coming idolatry of the people is predicted. The Hebrew people, following Moses' death with "play the harlot after the strange gods of the land."

sexually depraved. The making of idols is the "beginning of fornication"; idolaters "kill children in their initiations," "hold frenzied revels," and "no longer keep either their lives or their marriages pure."[46] Writing a few years after Paul, the Jewish historian Josephus condemned the Greeks for following the example of their depraved, incestuous gods. These gods, Josephus contends, were used as an excuse "for the monstrous and unnatural pleasures in which they themselves indulged."[47]

Paul may have repeated a familiar Jewish discursive strategy when he accused non-Christians and false Christians of sexual licentiousness, but portions of his argument were equally at home in the larger rhetorical environment of the early empire. Accusations of sexual licentiousness, intended to arouse the disgust of an audience, were standard in ancient polemics.[48] Political opponents, problematic emperors, controversial philosophies, new religions, and barbarian cultures were all characterized as debauched, depraved, and perverse.[49] Paul's condemnation of all, for lack of a better word, homoerotic[50] activity may have marked him as a Jew

---

[46] Wis. Sol. 14:12-26: Ἀρχὴ γὰρ πορνιέας ἐπίνοια εἰδώλων . . . ἢ γὰρ τεκνοφόνους τελετὰς ἢ κρύφια μυστήρια ἢ ἐμμανεῖς ἐξάλλων θεσμῶν κώμους ἄγοντες οὔτε βίους οὔτε γάμους καθαροὺς ἔτι φυλάσσουσιν . . . γάμων ἀταξία, μοιχεία καὶ ἀσέλγεια.

[47] *Ap.* 2.275: ταύτην ἀπολογίαν αὐτοῖς τῶν ἀτόπων καὶ παρὰ φύσιν ἡδονῶν συντιθέντες.

[48] Cf. Apth. *Prog.* 8, Theon, in L. Spengel, *Rhetores Graeci*, vol. 2 (1854), 109.

[49] See Jacqueline Flint Long, *Claudian's In Eutropius: Or, How, When, and Why to Slander a Eunuch* (Chapel Hill, North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press, 1996), 65-146; Severin Koster, *Die Invektive in der griechischen und römischen Literatur* (Meisenheim am Glan: Verlag Anton Hain, 1980); Catherine Edwards, *The Politics of Immorality in Ancient Rome* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993; James Rives, "Human Sacrifice among Pagans and Christians," *JRS* 85 (1995):65-85; on such charges in classical Greece, see Kenneth Dover, *Greek Popular Morality in the Time of Plato and Aristotle* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1974), esp. 32.

[50] The applicability of the term "homosexuality" to sexualities in the Greco-Roman world has recently been called into question. See, for example, David M. Halperin, *One Hundred Years of Homosexuality* (New York: Routledge, 1990), the articles in Elizabeth Castelli, ed., "Lesbian Historiography before the Name?" *GLQ* 4 (1998): 559-578, Thomas Lacqueur, *Making Sex* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1990), Craig A. Williams, *Roman Homosexuality* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), Paul Veyne, "Homosexuality in Ancient Rome," in *Western Sexuality*, eds. Philippe Ariès and André

(Jews were virtually always critical of same-sex intercourse, in contrast with Greeks and Romans who, under their own cultural rules, found some homoerotic activity wholly acceptable),[51] yet his decision to associate corruption with sexual vice places him firmly within Greek and Roman rhetorical traditions as well.

A survey of invective in classical and Hellenistic Greek sources yielded the following standard categories: (1) former life as a slave or slave ancestry; (2) non-Greek origin; (3) having to work for a living; (4) acting as a thief; (5) engagement in reprehensible sexual acts; (6) hating one's family, friends, or city; (7) having a gloomy nature; (8) improper appearance, dress, or behavior; (9) military desertion; (10) bankruptcy.[52] A summary of Latin invective terminology yielded similar results, with lowly origin, degrading occupation, improper appearance, criminality, sexual vice and gluttony emerging as central topics.[53] Though charges of sexual misbehavior were not the only available vituperative category, such charges do frequently appear, often to spectacular results.[54]

Béjin, trans. Anthony Forster (Oxford: Blackwell, 1985). For the opposing view, see John Boswell, *Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980) and Amy Richlin, "Not before Homosexuality: The Materiality of the *Cinaedus* and the Roman Law against Love between Men," *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 3 (1992-93): 523-573.

[51] There have been numerous publications that attempt to uncover the precise sexual misdeeds to which Paul refers here. Does Paul deem any and all same-sex contact "unnatural" (παρὰ φύσιν)? Or is he only concerned about pederasty? (Robin Scroggs, *The New Testament and Homosexuality* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1983). But see Mark D. Smith, "Ancient Bisexuality and the Interpretation of Romans 1:26-27," *JAAR* 64.2 (1996): 223-256.) Does he actually refer to women having sexual relations with women? Or, given the difficulty of these verses, perhaps he doesn't even conceive of the fact that women could engage in sexual activity with one another. (This argument has, to my mind, been overturned by Brooten.)

[52] Wilhelm Süß, *Ethos. Studien zur älteren griechischen Rhetorik* (Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1910) 247-254. Cf. Koster, 2.

[53] Ilona Opelt, *Die lateinischen Schimpfwörter und verwandte sprachliche Erscheinungen. Eine Typologie* (Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 1965), 125-189. Cf. Long, 66-67.

[54] Note, for example, the disenfranchisement of Timarchus for (supposedly) prostituting himself in his youth, Aesch. *In Tim.* discussed at length by Kenneth Dover, *Greek Homosexuality* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1978). Virginia Hunter places Aeschines' speech against Timarchus fully in the context of Athenian invective and politics,

Men could lose their reputations or even their citizenship if their enemies succeeded in demonstrating that they had violated "the sex-gender system" of ancient Greece or Rome. In both the Greek and the Roman case, an adult, citizen male who sought penetration by another could be accused of violating both his status and his gender. He was "like a woman," "like a slave," or, even worse, "like a prostitute."[55] There is a whole complex of charges — effeminate, weak, soft, womanish (μαλακός, ἁβός, τρυφερός, θηλύτης and related terms)[56]— available to accuse a man of being "feminine," preference for the passive role in sexual acts being the most disturbing. Describing the situation in fifth-century Athens, Winkler concludes, "The *kinaidos* [defined here as a man who seeks anal or oral penetration] is a scare-image standing behind the more concrete charges of shaming one's integrity as a male citizen by hiring out one's body to another man's use."[57] In the case of Rome, accusations of *mollitia* (softness, effeminacy) were made in law courts, emperors were evaluated in terms of their relative effeminacy, and satirists described the outrageous "feminine" exploits of their (male) targets. Other potent charges included: corrupting free-born youths or women, squandering one's inheritance on pleasures, especially of the sexual or gastronomical type, engaging in incestual relations with one's mother or sisters, and participating in

---

Policing Athens: Social Control in the Attic Lawsuits, 420-320 BC (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994). Note also the adultery trials of Appuleia Varilla, Claudia Pulchra, Aemilia Lepida (Tac. *Ann.* 2.50, 4.52, 3.22), discussed by Edwards, 61-62.

[55]Dover, *Homosexuality*, Craig A. Williams, *Roman Homosexuality* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), Eva Cantarella, *Bisexuality in the Ancient World,* trans. Cormac O. Cuilleanain (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992), Maude Gleason, *Making Men* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995).

[56] The second-century lexicographer Pollux mentions the following terms related to loathsome, licentious, or reprehensible: βδελυρός, ἀσελγής, ἐπίψογος; μαλθακός, ἐκτεθηλυσμένος, γύννις refer to softness and effeminacy; passive homosexuality is referred to by the terms catamite, "vendor of his youthful beauty," and "prostitute's colleague," καταπύγων, τὴν ἡλικίαν πεπρακώς, ταῖς πόργαις ὁμότεχνος. See Gleason, 65. For a discussion of the Latin vocabulary, see Williams, 142-159 and J. N. Adams, *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1982).

[57] John Winkler, *The Constraints of Desire* (New York: Routledge, 1990), 46.

religious rituals where orgies, cannibalism, or other horrific rites were presumed to occur.[58] Free-born women could also be accused of sexual crimes, with adultery, acting like a prostitute, joining in orgiastic foreign cults, and excessive indulgence in luxuries among the most common charges.[59] These women brought shame not only upon themselves but their families. Actually, the state of an entire city could be measured on the basis of the behavior of its women. A good Rome, a harmonious city is exemplified by the chastity of its women. [60]

Greeks turned the accusations of sexual licentiousness against Rome, Romans turned them against Greeks and both associated "barbarians" with insatiable lust. For example, the Syrian Greek satirist Lucian described Rome as a cesspool of sexual vice. In Rome "every place and every agora is full of the things they love most, and they admit pleasure at every gate — this one by the eyes, that one by the ears or the nostrils, yet another by the throat and by sexual intercourse (lit. "by means of Aphrodite").[61] Roman authors often represented the Greeks as slaves to pleasure and extravagance, with "Greek leisure" serving as a stereotypical accusation,[62] and Persia or "the East" could stand for sexual and sumptuary excess to both Greeks and Romans.[63] Barbarians were said to be soft (μαλακος,

[58]Plut. *Luc.* - *Cim. comp.* 1.5-6, *Vit. Lys.* 2, *Mor.* 145B, *Vit. Cat. Mai.* 20.8; Nep. *Dion* 4.3-4; Poly. 21.25.5; Sall. *Cat.* 11.5; Suet. *Gaius* 36-37, 40, 41; Cic. *De orat.* 2.283, *Ad Fam.* 97; Pliny *NH* 18.32. Luc. *Nigr.* 15-16; Mus. 5.10, among other examples.

[59] See esp. Dem. 21.158; Is. 21.19-20; Dio 55.12-16; Plut. *Luc* .6.2-4, *Vit. Sol.* 23; Cic. *Cael.* 49; Hor. *Carm.* 3.6.17-32; Livy 39.15.9; Sen. *Ben.* 6.32.1; Suet. *Aug.* 65.1-2; Juv. *Sat.* 6 and *Anth. Pal.* 31. Cf. Margaret MacDonald, *Early Christian Women and Pagan Opinion: The Power of the Hysterical Woman* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

[60] Cf. Juvenal's satiric portrait of Rome in which *pudicitia* has fled and all the elite women of the city (empresses, the wives of senators and equestrians) commit adultery with impunity, especially with men of lesser status than they. 6.285-290. For discussion, see Edward Courtney, *A Commentary on the Satires of Juvenal* (London: Althone Press, 1980).

[61] *Nigr.* 15-16. Translation my own.

[62] For example, Sall. *Cat.* 11.5. See Edwards, *The Politics of Immorality*, 93.

[63] For example, Aeschylus 1.242; Dio 48.301; Plut. *Luc.* - *Cim. comp.* 1.5-6.

ἀβός) and slavish (δουλεία). Even Jews were said to be "prone to lust" by Tacitus.[64]

Jews from the Hebrew Bible onwards also defined themselves over against outsiders in sexual terms. For example, Leviticus prefaces prohibitions about incest, intercourse with a menstruating woman, child sacrifice, "lying with a man as with a woman," and bestiality with the warning that Israel is not to "do as they do in the land of Egypt" or "as they do in the land of Canaan."[65] Throughout much of the Hebrew Bible, idolatry (i.e., false religiosity) is described in sexual terms as "fornication" or "prostitution."[66] The third Sibylline Oracle juxtaposed Jews who are "mindful of pure wedlock" with Phoenicians, Egyptians, Romans, and Greeks who commit adultery and pederasty.[67] Similarly, according to Josephus "the (Jewish) law recognizes no sexual intercourse except the natural union of man and wife, and that only for the procreation of children. And it abhors that of men towards men"[68] yet, he charges, the Greeks engage in "unnatural" pleasures such as incest, adultery, and male homoerotic sex.[69] Such an argument continued in rabbinic literature, with homoerotic sex, adultery, promiscuity, pimping and bestiality described as a gentile, not a Jewish problem.[70]

---

[64] Tac. *Hist.* 5.5.

[65] Lev 18:2-3. Cf. Brooten, 288-294 on the influence of Leviticus on Paul.

[66] Ex 34:15-16, Deut 31:16; Judg 2:17, 8:27; 1 Chr 5:25; Ezek 6:9, 20:30; 2 Kings 9:22. Cf. Phyllis A. Bird, "'To Play the Harlot': An Inquiry into an Old Testament Metaphor," in *Gender Difference in Ancient Israel,* ed. P. Day (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989), 75-94.

[67] *Sib. Or.* 3.590-600. Cf. 3.762-765. See discussion in Erich S. Gruen, "Jews, Greeks, and Romans in the Third Sibylline Oracle," in *Jews in a Graeco-Roman World,* ed. Martin Goodman (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), 15-36.

[68] μῖξιν μόνην οἶδεν ὁ νόμος τὴν κατὰ φύσιν τὴν πρὸς γυναῖκα, καὶ ταύτην εἰ μέλλοι τέκνων ἕνεκα γίνεσθαι. τὴν δὲ πρὸς ἄρρενας ἀρρένων ἐστύγκε Joseph. *Ap.* 2.198.

[69] *Ap.* 2.275.

[70] Sacha Stern, *Jewish Identity in Early Rabbinic Writings* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1994), 23-26. Cf. Michael Satlow, "Rhetoric and Assumptions: Romans and Rabbis on Sex," in *Jews in a Graeco-Roman World,* 137-144 and *Tasting the Dish: Rabbinic Rhetorics of Sexuality* Brown Judaic Studies 33 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995).

Jews, Greeks and Romans, therefore, all defined "the other" in sexual terms, with the good Jew, the true Greek and the proper Roman represented as one who controls the passions and avoids sexual licentiousness.[71] By utilizing sexual virtue and vice to delineate the brothers and sisters in Christ from everyone else, Paul participated in this well-worn strategy. In the process, he adopted sex-gender-status presuppositions that underpinned his hierarchical society, even if he called into question the validity of imperial claims about the virtue of the emperor and the purity of the empire he ruled. Thus, Paul's argument in Romans 1 that those who have rejected God have been rejected by God and therefore left to their "unnatural," degrading passions can be read as an indictment of "the world," but also as a restatement of the assumptions of that world. Similarly, Paul's warnings that Christians are to avoid being "like the gentiles," "like the idolaters," eschewing the "works of the flesh" in favor of the "fruits of the spirit,"[72] while highly critical of his society, rearticulates the argument that the proof of the righteousness and piety of a person, a household, a city, or even an empire lies in sexual morality. Indeed, Horace's encomium to Augustus could be paraphrased as Pauline parenesis. Thanks to Christ (instead of Augustus), adulteries have ceased, unclean lust has been overcome, and the wrath of God, not Augustus, follows on the heels of guilt.

[71] Cf. James B. Rives, "Roman Religion Revisited," *Phoenix* 52 (1998): 345-365.
[72] 1 Thess 1:9, 4:5; 1 Cor. 5:10-12, 6:9-11, 10:7-22; 2 Cor 6:14-18; Gal 5:16-26.

The Argumentative Coherency of Romans 7:1-6

by

Keith Augustus Burton

Oakwood College

Historically, commentators have had a problem with the argumentative coherency of Romans 7:1-6. For instance, C. H. Dodd contends that Paul's argument has gone "hopelessly astray" and advises: "We shall do best to ignore the illustration as far as may be, and ask what it is that Paul is really talking about in the realm of fact and experience."[1] Dodd adds that "the illustration ... is confused from the outset,"[2] and observes that while in 7:1 the principle states that the *dead* person is free from the law's domain, in 7:2-3 it is the *living* wife who is freed from the law. John Ziesler goes a step further when he instructs interpreters to refrain from even trying to make sense of the argument: "Probably we should accept the fact that the analogy is inexact without trying to find a more obscure level on which it does operate well."[3] Also bemused by Paul's logic, F. F. Bruce observes:

> When Paul applies the analogy, we are conscious of a reversal of the situation. The believer in Christ is compared to the wife, and the law to her husband, but whereas in the illustration it was the husband that died, in the application it is not the law that has died

---

[1]C. H. Dodd, *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans* (New York/London: Harper & Brothers, 1932), 101. For similar comments see William Barclay: "Seldom did Paul write so difficult and so complicated a passage as this." *The Letter to the Romans* (Rev. ed. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1975), 92; or Howard Rhys, *The Epistle to the Romans* (New York: Macmillan, 1961), 77: "Like many other Pauline illustrations, neither of these is truly satisfactory [i.e. the slavery illustration from chapter six or this one], and that in Chapter 7 is obviously confused in its reference."

[2]Dodd, *Romans*, 100.

[3]John A, Ziesler, *Paul's Letter to the Romans* (London: SCM, 1989), 172. See also Rhys, *Romans*, 77, who comments, "Nor has this brief parable been helped by the tendency of so many exegetes to convert it into an allegory." And Charles Gore, *St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans* (London: Murray, 1899), 1:240, who in reasoning that the mistakes were caused by Paul's faulty dictation remarks: "The attempts to show that there is no confusion are not successful."

> but the believer; the believer has died with Christ - and yet it is still the believer who, no longer bound to the law, is free to be united with Christ.[4]

In similar sentiment C. K. Barrett exclaims: "The analogy is imperfect. In marriage, the husband dies and the wife is free. In Christian life, the law does not die (as analogy would require); Christ dies, and by faith Christians die with him."[5] Following this trend, Ernest Best remarks:"... the illustration does not quite fit what Paul wishes to say: in it the husband dies and the wife is free to marry again; in verse 4 the wife, i.e. the believer (you...have died), dies and then marries again."[6] In addition, E. Brunner asserts: "The simile is faulty in that there first of all one person is set free by the death of the other, here, however, by his own death; and then, also, in so far as there the dying person and the survivor are always different persons, here they are the same."[7] If the analogical correspondents are indeed mismatches, then Dodd is right in his claim that Paul "... lacks the gift for sustained illustration of ideas through concrete images.... It is probably a defect of imagination."[8]

Contrary to these assertions, I propose that Romans 7:1-6 contains a coherent argument that is within the scope of human comprehension. I believe that the verdict should not be given until each analogical argument is evaluated. In this paper, I will assess each analogical argument with the purpose of establishing criteria for evaluating the unique characteristics of Paul's argumentative style. My primary purpose is to determine if Paul's analogies convey distinct elements that can assist in an analysis of Romans 7:1-6. Before

---

[4]F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans* (London: Tyndale, 1963), 137.

[5]C. K. Barrett, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (London: Black, 1989), 128.

[6]E. Best, *The Letter of Paul to the Romans* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967), 77.

[7]Emil Brunner, *The Letter to the Romans: A Commentary* (London: Lutterworth, 1938), 57. See also Rhys, *Romans*, 77; and Ziesler, *Romans*, 172.

[8]Dodd, *Romans*, 103.

evaluating the analogies, I will provide a brief overview on the principles of rhetorical argumentation.

Principles of Rhetorical Argumentation

The rhetorical handbooks generally agree that all arguments are developed either enthymematically or paradeigmatically (analogically). For instance, Aristotle states that "all orators produce belief by employing as proofs either *examples* or *enthymemes* and nothing else."[9] Cicero also recognizes that "All argumentation ... is to be carried on either by induction (*inductio*) or deduction (*ratiocinatio*)."[10] Quintillian shed further light with this observation that "Every artificial proof consists either of indications (*signa*), arguments (*argumenta*) or examples (*exempla*)."[11]

While both types of argument are equally important for the establishment of proofs, they each have a distinct function. The enthymematic argument aims to persuade the audience by deductive reasoning and has the tendency to excite the audience as it evokes audience participation.[12] On the other hand, the argument from analogy effects persuasion *via* inductive reasoning but can easily bore an audience since it is more easily comprehended than the enthymeme. Consequently, it is recommended that enthymemes should be used more frequently than analogies in rhetorical argumentation.

Aristotle defines the analogy (παράδειγμα) as the rhetorical version of the inductive argument (ἐπαγωγή) in dialectic.[13] A simple modern definition of the argument from analogy is given by C. Perelman and L. Olbrechts-Tyteca who state, "... when particular phenomena are invoked one after the other we are inclined to regard them as examples. This is particularly the case when the

---

[9]Aristotle, *Ars rhetorica* 1.2.8.

[10]Cicero, *De inventione* 1.51.

[11]Quintillian, *Institutio oratoria* 5.9.1.

[12]Aristotle, *Ars rhetorica* 1.2.10, suggests that "... those [arguments] which depend on enthymemes meet with greater approval."

[13]Aristotle, *Ars rhetorica* 1.2.9.

phenomena exhibit some similarity."[14] The operational words in this definition are "similar" and "particular." Each *particular* example must be *similar* in principle to the *particular* case that the rhetor wishes to exemplify–it must be analogous in some way.[15] It stands to reason that in order for an analogical argument to be effective, it must contain information to which the audience will readily grant assent.[16]

The fact that the argument from analogy is more easily comprehended than the enthymematic argument makes it a more effective form of argument in the conveyance of difficult concepts. It is precisely because of its simplicity that Paul chose to utilize the argument from analogy to elucidate his difficult teaching about the status of νόμος in the life of the believer in Romans 7:1-6. However, as we have seen in chapter one, many commentators feel that in using this device, Paul does not clarify but confuses his teaching. I am proposing that the prevalence of this attitude is due to the fact that these commentators have not taken into account the *modus operandi* of the rhetorical analogy. The rest of this paper is dedicated to a systematic analysis of Paul's use of analogical argumentation in Romans.

Analogical Arguments in Romans

1. Abraham and Justification by Faith (3:21-4:22)

The argument is developed with a *narratio* (3:21-26), an enthymeme (3:27-31), and a historical analogy (4:1-22).[17] The illustration of the analogy is

---

[14]Ch. Perelman & L. Olbrechts-Tyteca, *The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame, 1969), 351.

[15]Cf. Carlo Natali, "Paradeigma: The Problems of Human Acting and the Use of Examples in Some Greek Authors of the Fourth Century B.C." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 19 (1989): 142.

[16]Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, *New Rhetoric*, 351. See also Scott Consigny, "The Rhetorical Example," *Southern Speech Communication Journal* 41 (1976), 123, who comments that as an artistic proof, the analogical argument "... leads [the auditor] to accept a new mode of perceiving and behaving toward a situation."

[17]On the strategic placement of the analogical argument see Aristotle, *Ars rhetorica* 2.20.9: "... if we have [enthymemes], examples must be used as evidence and as a kind of

developed enthymematically, and features the historical figure Abraham who is heralded as an example of a person who was justified by his faith before he received the mark of Jewish legalism–circumcision (4:1-10).[18] Romans 4:11-18 contains the application for the illustration. Here it is claimed that whether or not a person is cognizant of the law's demands, every individual who exercises a faith similar to Abraham's can be justified. The illustration is revived in 4:19-22 where the details of Abraham's act of faith are given. The *peroratio* of this proof (4:23-25), also serves as a final application for the historical analogy.

2. Baptism and the New Life (6:1-14)

The second analogy shows how one who has died to sin should no longer live a sinful life, and refutes the inference: "Let us continue in sin so that grace may increase" (6:1). Paul utilizes the familiar image of baptism to illustrate his argument (6:3-5).[19] The baptismal image is significant because it also symbolizes the believer's spiritual participation in the death and resurrection of Christ. The application is contained in 6:5-14 where the believers are encouraged to live a life of righteousness, as is fitting for people who "have been brought from death to life" (6:13).

3. Slavery and the Two Masters (6:15-23)

The third analogy draws on the image of slavery to demonstrate the believer's obligation to righteousness, and opposes the notion: "Let us sin since we are not under law but under grace" (6:15). Paul invites the audience to put themselves in the position of "obedient slaves" who have the choice of serving two masters (6:16). The image of slavery is used metaphorically throughout the

---

epilogue to the enthymemes. ...[I]f they stand last they resemble evidence, and a witness is in every case likely to induce belief."

[18]Gale, *Analogy*, 173-75, only sees 4:4 as illustrative. This is probably due to the fact that he is not working under the guidelines of classical rhetorical theory under which he could have classified these verses as an enthymematic illustration.

[19]Gale, *Analogy*, 179, rightly states: "Although the New Testament provides no clear description of the procedure that was followed in early Christian baptism, Paul presupposes here the act of immersion."

application as the believers are informed of their transfer from the dominion of sin to the dominion of obedience (6:17-23).[20]

4. Widowhood and a Change in Legal Status (7:1-6)

The purpose of the fourth analogy is to demonstrate how the change from the flesh to the Spirit is accomplished. This analogy continues the refutation of the false inference posed in 6:15. Paul adopts an example from the experience of marriage to illustrate his response. The illustration focuses on the legal status of a widow who upon the death of her husband is released from the law that demanded her fidelity to him, and can join herself to another husband (7:2-3). In applying the principle to his argument, Paul suggests that the auditors have also "been made dead to νόμος, so that they may be with another" (7:4).

Also of importance to this analogy is the status of νόμος in relation to the married couple. Paul states that in being widowed, the woman is "released" from the νόμος governing her marriage and is consequently "free" from it (7:2,3). According to 7:3b, her newly acquired freedom allows her to become another man's wife without being designated an "adulteress." Similarly, the believers have been released from νόμος and are also free to be with another (7:6,3).

When one views this analogy from the viewpoint of a real life situation, the transferal of the images does not conform to our understanding of reality. In the previous analogies on baptism and slavery, it is clear that the auditors must identify with the one being baptized and the slave figure. And even in the slave analogy where they are to identify with the two slaves, they do so sequentially after ownership has changed. However, in this analogy, the auditors are required to identify with the images of husband and wife simultaneously. While this application may seem confusing on the surface, it appears that Paul purposely chose this picture to forcefully illustrate his mystical teaching about salvation.

5. Covetousness and Deliverance from the Flesh (7:7-12)

The fifth analogy appears before an enthymeme which depicts the struggle of the individual who experiences a transformation from the flesh to the Spirit.

[20]Notice the three terms that are used synonymously: ὑπακοή (6:16), δικαιοσύνη (6:18), and θεός (6:22). The appearance of obedience as a synonym to righteousness is "surprising" to Gale (*Analogy*, 184).

The analogy provides the source for the enthymeme's premise, and at the same time responds to those who may infer from the previous argument that "the law is sin" (7:7a).[21] Paul demonstrates that the problem is not with νόμος but the individual, and depicts sin as an adversary. By inciting the innocent victim to covet, sin is accused of taking advantage of the individual's ignorance of a commandment that prohibits coveting. Consequently, when the commandment is revealed the individual is automatically guilty and consequently condemned (7:7b-8). Arguing *minor maioris*, Paul shows that if this entrapment is true for one commandment, it is even more true for the entire law which exposes sin to people and at the same time condemns them to death (7:9-12).

The importance of this analogy to the remaining argument cannot be underestimated. In establishing the "holiness" of the law, Paul also exposes the "sinfulness" of the sinner which puts the sinner at odds with the law. Consequently, 7:13-25 is an enthymematic depiction of the same discussion that has taken place in 6:1-14, 6:15-23 and 7:1-6. As in the other pericopes (6:6, 22; 7:4-6), this argument shows that transformation from the old life to the new is achieved only through Jesus Christ (7:25).

6. The Potter and God's Elective Freedom (9:19-29)

The sixth analogical argument features the image of a potter who is free to shape and use an inanimate lump of clay in whatever way he chooses (9:20-24). As he does in his other arguments, Paul states the principle of the analogy before the illustration in the form of a question (9:19): "Why does [God] find fault? For who can resist his will?" In making the application, Paul appeals to the prophets Hosea and Isaiah to support his thesis that not all Israelites are elected by God, and not all Gentiles are excluded by him (9:25-29).[22]

7. Paul, Elijah and the Remnant of Israel (11:1-6)

The analogy of 11:1-6 supports Paul's assertion that God has not rejected all the descendants of Israel. Paul begins the illustrative section of the analogy by presenting himself as an example of an Israelite who has been elected by God

[21]On the use of analogy as a source for an enthymeme see Aristotle, *Ars rhetorica* 2.25.8.

[22]See discussion in Gale, *Analogy*, 199-200.

(11:1b). In an attempt to give his argument additional force, he reminds his audience of the incident when Elijah and 7,000 Israelites maintained God's favor, although the rest of their compatriots had been rejected due to apostasy (11:2-4). Paul applies the analogy to his "present time" as he informs the audience that a remnant "elected by grace" still exists among the Jews (11:5-6). In closing the argument, he is quick to add that the remnant's election has nothing to do with works (i.e. the fact that they are Jews).

8. Bread, Olive Trees and the New Elect (11:11-32)

The eighth analogy demonstrates the primacy of Israel among the elect. Having established the premise that salvation has only come to the Gentiles because of Jewish failure (11:11-15), Paul crafts a rather detailed parabolic analogy (11:16-24).[23] The image of the dough from the first-fruits offering (11:16a) serves as a primer for the parable of the olive tree (11:16b-24). The application of the parable takes place in 11:25-32,[24] and restates the observation that although it may seem as if Gentiles are now outnumbering Jews among the saved, the Jewish primacy in the election scheme means that they can still qualify for God's mercy (11:30-32). This argument helps to clarify the thesis that the gospel is able to save "Jew *first* and also Greek."

9. Food, Days, and Honoring God (14:1-6)

The final analogy occurs within the judicial case of 14:1-15:13. The case addresses the attitudes of "weak" Christians who judge others for eating meat, and "strong" Christians who despise others for eating only vegetables (14:1-4). As a solution to the problem, Paul elevates a parallel case in which Christians have differences regarding the observance of certain holy days, but accept their differences since both the observers and abstainers claim to be honoring the Lord (14:5-6).[25] This mutual understanding of the individual's right to his or her

[23]See principle of strategic placement in Aristotle, *Ars rhetorica* 2.20.9.

[24]Gale, *Analogy*, 206, wrongly states: "...the application of the [analogy] is only implied; it is not stated explicitly." This false statement is due to the facts that he limits the analogy to 11:16-24, and does not define the illustration enthymematically.

[25]For support of this theory see John Ziesler, *Romans*, 324-25; K. Barth, *The Epistle to the Romans* (London: Oxford University, 1919), 510; T. Zahn (*Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer ausgelegt*, 3d ed. (Leipzig: Deichert, 1925), 573; and Käsemann, *Romans*, 370.

personal religious conviction is given as the basis on which the meat-eaters and vegetarians can accept each other.[26]

Characteristics of Paul's Analogical Argumentation

1. Consistency in Form

Perhaps the primary characteristic of the analogies in Romans is the formal consistency. Each one starts with an argumentative premise that states the principle to be demonstrated.[27] The premise is followed by the illustration which clarifies the argument.[28] Finally, the illustration is applied to the argument.[29] The exception to this rule is the analogy in Romans 4 where there are two sets of illustrations and applications.

2. Relevant Subject Matter in Illustration

Paul follows the first rule of analogical argumentation by picking illustrations with which the audience could readily identify.[30] The majority of the illustrations are derived from the religious literature and experience of the auditors. They were all familiar with the historical figures of Abraham and Elijah, and could easily associate with the images of baptism, day observance, marriage, covetousness, and ritual offerings. The remaining illustrations were drawn from the social world of the audience. All would have been acquainted with slavery (either by experience or observation), and Paul takes for granted that they would have also been acquainted with matters concerning agriculture (as is required for the olive tree analogy).

Because Paul assumes that the members of the audience are familiar with the images used for illustrations, he does not always provide all the details. For

---

[26]See Sanday-Headlam, *Romans*, 387.

[27]Cf. 4:1-2; 6:1-2; 6:15; 7:1; 7:7; 9:19; 11:1; 11:11-15; 14:1-4.

[28]Cf. 4:3-10,19-22; 6:3-10; 6:16-18; 7:2-3; 7:7b-8; 9:20-24; 11:1b-4; 11:16-24; 14:5.

[29]Cf. 4:11-18, 23-25; 6:11-14; 6:19-23; 7:4-6; 7:9-12; 9:25-29; 11:5-6; 11:25-32; 14:6.

[30]With this in mind, Gale, *Analogy*, 231, is probably wrong in his conclusion "... that in Paul's use of analogy *his pictures provide no reliable clue as to his thought or understanding with respect to the phenomena or life situations that those pictures represent or from which they are drawn.*"

instance, In the analogy on baptism he assumes that the audience is aware of both the mode and significance of the rite. Also, in the illustration featuring Abraham, he speaks of Abraham's faith before he even makes reference to the details of the story.

3. Multiple Illustrations in a Single Analogy

On occasion, Paul uses multiple analogies to illustrate the same argument.[31] When analogies are formulated in this way, they give the appearance of an inductive argument. A double illustration is used in the analogy of 11:1-6 when after elevating himself as an example of an Israelite who was not rejected by God, Paul refers to the more influential historical figure of Elijah. This strategy is used again in 11:16ff, where Paul uses the image of the first fruits to transfer the principle of priority in holiness to the olive tree.

4. Nonconformity to Real Life Situations

Another characteristic of Paul's analogies is that the images do not always conform to real life.[32] In the analogy on baptism, for instance, the individual does not really die and experience resurrection, and to suggest that a manumitted slave *has to be* enslaved to another master was definitely not the case in a society in which slaves often enjoyed unconditional freedom. Gale refers to the fictitious nature of Pauline analogy in his comments on the analogy about the potter:

> While the absurdity of the clay's questioning of the potter may serve to suggest man's impropriety when he presumes to "answer back" to God, real correspondence between picture and idea is of course absent, since clay is a *thing*, while man is a thinking being.... Furthermore, between the potter and the clay there is neither a bond of love nor a relationship allowing for "wrath" as is true between God and man.[33]

---

[31]For a similar observation see Gale, *Analogy*, 226.

[32]See Gale, *Analogy*, 225, who comments: "In the case of numerous analogical usages the pictures, as they are presented, included elements that do not represent accurately the phenomena or life situations from which they are drawn."

[33]Gale, *Analogy*, 200.

The reason why many of the analogies do not conform to reality is simply because they are parabolic. A parable is intended to provide an image that can be transferred from the realm of fiction or speculation to the realm of reality or hypothesis.

5. Multiple Points of Correspondence

While Paul uses analogies to support a single argument, there are usually a number of points of correspondence between the illustration and the application.[34] For instance, in the illustration of the vine there are several points of correspondence: (1) the branches with Jews and Gentiles; (2) the breaking off of some of the branches with the exclusion of some Jews; (3) the grafting in of new branches with the inclusion of Gentiles; and (4) the grafting in of former branches with the future inclusion of repentant Jews. These several points of correspondence in no way obstruct the fact that the sole purpose of the analogy is to demonstrate that God elects both Jews and Gentiles.

6. Enthymematic Development of Illustration

Another important feature of Paul's analogies is the enthymematic development of some of the illustrations. The purpose of an enthymeme is to show "... that if some premises are true, something else beyond them results from this because they are true [(i.e. the conclusion)], either universally or for the most part...."[35] Samples of enthymematically developed illustrations in Romans are found in the analogy featuring Abraham's faith,[36] and the one on baptism.[37] Paul follows Aristotle's precedent when he develops his illustrations enthymematically.[38] Given the structure, one may be tempted to classify such arguments as enthymemes. However, its function as an analogy is demonstrated

---

[34]See Gale, *Analogy*, 223.

[35]Aristotle, *Ars Rhetorica* 1.2.9.

[36]If Abraham's faith--as opposed to works--was credited to him for righteousness (4:3), and a worker receives wages not credit (4:4), then all who do not work but have faith will be credited with righteousness (4:5-10).

[37]If baptism symbolizes participation in the death of Jesus (6:3), and Jesus has been raised from the dead (6:4a), then the baptized person has also experienced resurrection (6:4b).

[38]Aristotle, *Ars rhetorica* 1.2.19.

by the fact that the argument is not complete at the conclusion of the enthymeme but is accompanied by an application to the matter under discussion.

7. Dispersion of Metaphorical Elements in Application

Finally, some of the analogies in Romans include metaphors in the application that have been derived from the illustration. For example, in the analogy on slavery the metaphor of slavery is consistently applied to the auditor throughout the application (6:17-22). Likewise, in the analogy on baptism, the metaphor of the believer's death and resurrection is continuously featured (6:5-13). Since the images are being used metaphorically, they should not be seen as a continuation of the illustration.

Concluding Implications

As I mentioned in the introduction, most commentators identify Romans 7:1-6 as an embarrassing excuse for an analogy. An assessment of the major elements in Paul's analogical arguments have demonstrated the opposite. My analysis of the analogical arguments in Romans has highlighted seven systematic features, six of which are present in Romans 7:1-6:

1. The form is consistent with the other analogies. The principle appears in 7:1, the illustration in 7:2-3, and application 7:4-6.
2. The subject matter is relevant to the audience. Having been taught from νόμος, the auditors would have been aware of the commandment against adultery. They would also have known the terms by which a woman could enter into a new marriage.
3. The illustration is developed enthymematically. Paul reasons that if a law prohibits a woman from having a relationship with another man while she is married and the husband dies, then she is no longer married and consequently free to have a relationship with another man.
4. The analogy does not conform to reality. As we mentioned above, in order for the analogy to work, it demands for the auditor to identify with both the husband and the wife simultaneously.
5. There are multiple points of correspondence between the illustration and the application. Although only a single point is intended, the images of marriage law, first husband, wife, and second husband in the illustration,

correspond with νόμος, body of Christ, believer, and the resurrected one in the application.

6. Elements from the illustration are carried metaphorically into the application. In the application, Paul uses the metaphor of "fruitbearing" to designate the offspring of the relationships.

Our survey has demonstrated that Paul's analogical arguments display a high degree of consistency, and adequately explain their related theses. Only in one instance does an analogy deviate from a structured form. Given this proven consistency in form and application, one is compelled to be skeptical over any suggestion that Paul's use of analogical argumentation is "confused."

BISHOP JOHN WILLIAM COLENSO'S INTERPRETATION TO THE ZULU PEOPLE OF THE *SOLA FIDE* IN PAUL'S LETTER TO THE ROMANS

Jonathan A. Draper
University of Natal, Pietermaritzburg

1. Theoretical Presuppositions[1]

The nineteenth century Christian missionaries, who took their gospel to the world newly opened up by colonial conquest, left home with a social universe which appeared self-evident, secure and superior to the indigenous cultures and beliefs of the colonized peoples. Inevitably, however, their role as agents of the dominant culture, situated at its boundaries, also placed this taken for granted social universe side by side with rival social universes of meaning, which destabilized and challenged their own. Berger and Luckmann rightly observe that, "The historical outcome of each clash of gods was determined by those who wielded the better weapons rather than those who had the better arguments" (1966:109). The missionaries used the opportunities provided by colonial administration–often aided and abetted and legitimated the process of colonization–and the desire of African people for trade in European goods, to their own advantage. Yet the African people were not mere passive victims of European aggression, but purposive participants in events. Their relationship with both the missionaries and the colonialists consisted from the first of both resistance and negotiation. Because the outcome of such a confrontation of competing social universes is not known at the outset, they saw not only threats but also opportunities. The missionaries were only ever partially in control of the process of evangelization, whatever they themselves imagined.

[1] This section of the paper is taken in part and modified from my article, "The Bishop and the Bricoleur: Bishop John William Colenso's *Commentary on Romans* and Magema Kamagwa Fuze's *The Black People and Whence They Came*", forthcoming in G. O. West (ed.), *The Bible in Africa*. Leiden: Brill.

In other words, the history of the missions and of the reception of the Bible must be seen as a dialectical process, an unequal one in many respects to be sure, but nevertheless a more intricate, contested and mutual process than has usually been recognized. This has been aptly characterized by Jean and John Comaroff in their study of the mission among the Tswana people as a "long conversation" in which "many of the signifiers of the colonizing culture became unfixed," so that:

> They were seized by the Africans and, sometimes refashioned, put to symbolic and practical ends previously unforeseen, certainly unintended. Conversely, some of the ways of the Africans interpolated themselves, again detached and transformed, into the habitus of the missionaries. Here, then, was a process in which signifiers were set afloat, fought over, and recaptured on both sides of the colonial encounter (Comaroff & Comaroff 1991:17-18).

European military power and technology certainly ensured that the missionaries could insert their agenda into the conversation and be heard. However, from the first, their converts talked back and did not always agree. They experimented with the numinous sources of power they imagined (rightly or wrongly) to lie behind European might, in the attempt to control and use them for their own purposes. They did not always understand what they were doing, nor, for that matter, did the missionaries, but the path of the missions was not the smooth and triumphal one so often portrayed in the missionary reports home. Since, however, the records were written by the conquerors, with apologetic intent, they often have to be "read backwards" to hear the other side of the "conversation."

Of course, the ability to hold a conversation depends in part on the ability to speak a common language. Berger and Luckmann have pointed to language as the vehicle of the "objectification" of social universe: language is the medium through which my experiences become "both objectively and subjectively real" (1966:39). In the confrontation of the European and African social universes, language played an

especially intricate and central role. Many missionaries spoke and listened only through interpreters, so that they were not really engaged in a conversation in any deeply meaningful sense. Nevertheless, they still wrestled with the language of symbols, names, words and gestures and, inasmuch as they were fully dependent on the interpreters, they were also more easily manipulated by these cultural intermediaries for their own purposes. Knowledge of the language of the conquerors not only subverted the culture of the indigenous Africans but enabled them to begin subverting the work of the missionaries in the interests of cultural survival (whether they were conscious of doing so or not). On the other hand, those missionaries who did undertake the arduous task of learning another language faced a more massive challenge to their own reality, since one cannot learn a language without learning a culture. Fluency in another language and culture relativizes and destabilizes one's own, but also enables one's thinking to be intimately understood by one's interlocutors. This was especially true for those like Bishop Colenso, in situations where there were no dictionaries, grammars, or translations of the Bible, and even the name God should be called was a matter of grave dispute.

Jean and John Comaroff develop a particularly helpful model of the relationship between hegemony as the power of the taken-for-granted world view which is shared by particular communities and controls human behavior unseen, and ideology as the conscious and contested "effort to control the cultural terms in which the world is ordered and, within it, power legitimized" (1991:24). The relationship between hegemony and ideology is fluid, unstable and constantly shifting: Hegemony, we suggest, exists in reciprocal interdependence with ideology: it is that part of a dominant world view which has been naturalized and, having hidden itself in orthodoxy, no more appears as ideology at all. Inversely, the ideologies of the subordinate may give expression to discordant but hitherto voiceless experience of contradictions that a prevailing hegemony can no longer conceal (1991:25).

Most significantly, for our purposes, the Comaroffs argue that there is always a gap between hegemony and ideology, a liminal space, out of which forms of resistance

and new consciousness may emerge: Between the conscious and the unconscious lies the most critical domain of all for historical anthropology and especially for the analysis of colonialism and resistance. It is the realm of partial recognition, of inchoate awareness, of ambiguous perception, and, sometimes, of creative tension: that liminal space of human experience in which people discern acts and facts but cannot or do not order them into narrative descriptions or even into articulate conceptions of the world: in which signs and events are observed, but in a hazy, translucent light; in which individuals or groups know that something is happening to them but find it difficult to put their fingers on quite what it is. It is from this realm, we suggest, that silent signifiers and unmarked practices may rise to the level of explicit consciousness, of ideological assertion, and become the subject of overt political and social contestation or from which they may recede into the hegemonic, to languish there unremarked for the time being. As we shall see, it is also the realm from which emanate the poetics of history, the innovative impulses of the *bricoleur* and the organic intellectual, the novel imagery called upon to bear the content of symbolic struggles (1991:29). Colonial conquest plunged the African social universe into crisis, since neither "therapy" nor "nihilation" (Berger & Luckmann 1966:105-116) could hold it together in the face of European power and the growing number of "deviants" from the African social system (the converts to Christianity). But the crisis was not one-sided, since the missionaries themselves also came from an England in acute intellectual and social crisis, arising out of the related phenomena of the Enlightenment and industrial capitalism, so that the (contested) area of ideology was proportionately large in comparison with the (silent and uncontested) area of hegemony. The Comaroffs argue, indeed, that the missionary enterprise was in some respects an attempt to resolve cognitive dissonance in Nonconformist Britain by the creation of a new world in their image in the "blank spaces" of Africa (1991:77-78). The collision of their European culture with African culture thus provided a rich liminal space for potential exploration (1991:49-85). It was both social universes which were destabilized by the colonial encounter, and not just the African one, and this study of Colenso's work bears out their contention that "the missionary encounter must be regarded as a two-sided historical process; as a

dialectic that takes into account the social and cultural endowments of, and the consequences for, all the actors–missionaries no less than Africans" (1991:54).

In this contestation, both parties became *bricoleurs*, in their own ways, sorting through the debris of the two collapsing social universes for usable odds and ends of culture. Of course it is more obvious in the case of the African converts, since their predicament was the more severe, but it was true also for the missionaries as well, since they constantly found that things did not work as they should and their received ideas were challenged. Both parties engaged in the work of cultural *bricolage*, as this has been aptly defined (and positively evaluated) by Marilyn Legge in her attempt to address the crisis of the Christian faith in the post-modern era as "the art of using what is at hand, odd materials for purposes other than intended, to create something useful and distinct to meet a yearning or need. This is an accessible practice often found where people aim to survive against the odds" (1997:6).

For Colenso, crucial areas of British hegemony (what is "self-evidently true") were breaking down under the impact of the African experience, and this in the situation where important gaps in the ideology of post-Enlightenment, industrial Britain were emerging among the educated elite he represented. His *Commentary on Romans* is a valuable source of insight into the hermeneutical and cultural issues which came into play in this meeting of Africa and Europe, particularly since the nature and authority of the Bible was one of the focal points of conflict. The Comaroffs suggest that both missionaries and the colonized Africans should be understood as actors in a two-sided drama, and that the context of both parties should be explored before any attempt is made to delineate their interaction. This is the procedure we shall follow here, albeit briefly.

The Nonconformist missionaries of the Comaroffs' study were largely drawn from upwardly mobile men from the newly industrialized areas, poorly educated and socially marginalized: "persons caught between the rich and the poor, either

indeterminate in their class affiliation or struggling hard to make their way over the invisible boundary into the bourgeoisie" (1991:85). They enacted their marginalization in the mission field by moving beyond the boundaries of colonial administration. They were subsequently caught between and manipulated by both the colonial authorities and by the African authorities. Their response to the Tswana people was pragmatic, reactive and unreflective, assuming that simply proclaiming the Word found in the Bible and teaching cleanliness and industry would evangelize the natives. Their assumption was that African languages were simple "folk languages" not difficult for advanced (European) people to grasp and utilize, so that their translations were "a hybrid creation born of the colonial encounter itself" (1991:218). Colenso presents a profile with marked differences.

2. Bishop John William Colenso (1814-1883)

In 1853, John William Colenso was consecrated the first missionary Bishop of Natal, the raw, insecure and unsettled British colony in Africa carved out by traders and adventurers from the newly emerged Zulu Kingdom and the Dutch trekkers who had moved up from the Cape seeking land. Born a lower middle class Nonconformist, he had converted to the established Church of England and worked his way through St. John's College, Cambridge as Clerical Sizar. A brilliant mathematician, he became a fellow of the college before he met and married Francis Sarah Bunyon, a step which changed the direction of his life. Francis and her family were part of a circle of free thinking Broad Church people, centred around F. D. Maurice (1805-1872). She herself had initiated the contact with Maurice because of her admiration for the philosophy of Samuel Taylor Coleridge (1772-1834), writing to him to thank him for his defence of Coleridge since, "young ladies talking about philosophy.... would not be listened to" (Rees 1958:27). The Romantic poet, political radical and philosopher, Coleridge, late in his life, adopted Christianity and sought a renewal of the life of the Church of England centred on religious experience and ethics. He argued for the existence of a universal harmony underlying all particulars, rooted in a God apprehended by all humankind

experientially through natural phenomena, "who from all eternity doth teach Himself in all, and all things in Himself" ("Frost at Midnight" in *Lyrical Ballads*). Francis' letters (collected in Rees 1958) show that she was a powerful presence in Colenso's life, thinking and work. She introduced him to a group of Anglicans deeply concerned over the future of a church which had not even begun to face the challenge of the revolutionary Enlightenment sweeping Continental Europe.

Colenso was deeply influenced by Maurice's Christian universalism and rejection of eternal damnation, and also by his brand of Christian socialism, although, when the storm burst over Colenso's *Commentary on Romans*, Maurice disowned him and called on him to retract the book. Colenso was also convinced of the truth and importance of the evolutionism of Charles Darwin and Sir Charles Lyell, and, indeed, translated and taught their theories to his converts in the mission school at Ekukhanyeni ("Place of Enlightenment") in his *First Lessons in Science* (1861), at the same time as he translated and taught the Bible. The *Commentary on Romans* was also published in 1861 at Ekukhanyeni, seven years after his arrival in Natal. It resulted in his excommunication for heresy by the Metropolitan of the Anglican Church in Southern Africa, Bishop Gray of Cape Town in 1863, setting off a storm of legal and theological controversy which rocked the entire Church of England establishment (for a good account, see Guy 1983). Few of the accounts of these events have taken the *Commentary on Romans* itself seriously as a work of exegesis.

Bishop Colenso's *Commentary on Romans* begins with an extraordinary, but concealed contradiction between his role as missionary (who identified himself with his Zulu community) and his role as bishop (a peer and an official of empire), which was not clear to him or others at the time, though it was to become painfully so later.

2.1 The Missionary

Thus, on the one hand, he subtitles the work, "Newly translated and explained from

a Missionary Point of View" and states in his Preface that here, "The teaching of the great Apostle to the Gentiles is here applied to some questions, which daily arise, in Missionary labours among the heathen more directly than usual with those commentators, who have not been engaged personally in such work, but have written from a very different point of view, in the midst of a state of advanced civilization and settled Christianity. Hence they have usually passed by altogether, or only touched very lightly upon, many points, which are of great importance to missionaries, but which seemed to be of no immediate practical interest for themselves or their readers." Colenso spent the first seven years of his bishopric learning Zulu by endless conversations with the young men at his school, who were his first converts, and busied himself with producing and publishing on his mission press a Zulu *Grammar*, *Dictionary* and *Translation* of the Bible. On 4 July, 1859, two years before the publication of the *Commentary on Romans*, Colenso wrote to Rev. Hose, Rector of Dunstable:

> My rule is to visit the white population, once a year. But my time is principally occupied with work for the heathen. This is at present, I fancy, the only diocese where the work of preparing grammars, dictionaries, and translations must necessarily fall upon the Bishop. Our work began here with the foundation of the See; and though other Christian bodies–as usual–preceded us into the field, they had done very little indeed towards laying down the language for other teachers, or preparing books for the use of the natives (Cox 1888a:119).

He positions himself alongside Zulu people in his daily life at the Mission Station, which began when he arrived and continued for the seven years prior to the publication of the work (and subsequently, of course). Remarkably, following the model of "conversation" we are using, Colenso also "gives voice" to his converts in print. When he went on a pioneering visit beyond the borders of the colony to meet the Zulu King Mpande and his heir Cetshwayo, Colenso required his three Zulu companions to keep diaries of their experience and he published these, in the first

indigenous literature in Zulu: *Three Native Accounts of the Visit of the Bishop of Natal in September and October, 1859, to Umpande, King of the Zulus; with Explanatory Notes and a Literal Translation, and a Glossary of All the Zulu Words Employed in the Same: Designed for the Use of Students of the Zulu Language*, in 1860. One of the three, Magema KwaMagwaza Fuze subsequently wrote the first book by a Zulu person in the Zulu tongue, *Abantu Abamnyama, Lapa Bavela Ngakona* (*The Black People and Whence They Came*), which he only succeeded in getting published in 1922 as a very old man.

Colenso spent extensive periods talking, in Zulu, to these young men. "You probably know by this time the sort of questions which natives, such as these, if they are only allowed to think about religion, and to inquire about the matters which the missionary sets before them, are likely to ask their teacher" (Colenso [1865] 1982:227). When Colenso defends the principle of missionary work against the evolutionism of the anthropologists in a speech to the Marylebone Literary Institution in 1865, he speaks poignantly of his conversations with William Ngidi, who calls for more sympathetic and open talk between missionaries and Zulu people, commenting, "I am afraid William meant to include in this talk 'hearing and answering their questions' also'" (*Ibid.*:228). In the same talk, he cites a sermon preached by Jonathan Ngidi, who emphases, as Colenso does, the importance of conscience and natural religion. Colenso refuses to conceal the problems with the Bible which he brought with him from his Broad Church circle in England, arguing, "How is it possible to teach the Zulus to cast off their superstitious belief in witchcraft, if they are required to believe that all the stories of sorcery and demonology which they find in the Bible.... are infallibly and divinely true.... I, for one, cannot do this" (*Ibid.*:232). In other words, the Zulu people at Ekukhanyeni were Colenso's primary dialogue partners and reference points.

2.2 The Official of Empire

On the other hand, he dedicates the work to Theophilus Shepstone, the Secretary for Native Affairs in the Colony of Natal, and talks of the great work to which he felt

God was calling Shepstone (that of extending British rule into the independent Zulu kingdom). Shepstone was at the centre of an aggressive expansionist colonial policy in Natal, and something of a wheeler dealer in the drama being played out between the Dutch trekkers, the Zulu kingdom and the Colony of Natal. Colenso was indebted to Shepstone for his first information and advice on his mission, and trusted him. For Colenso, as colonial missionary bishop to the Zulu people, it was a natural alliance between social equals. Shepstone became godfather to his daughter. Yet Shepstone's devious dealings with the Zulu people led to a bitter feud between him and Colenso, when the bishop discovered what was going on from his converts. Shepstone's comment on the affair was that "he did not think the Bishop would have thrown over his old friends for the sake of a *dirty* Kafir" (Rees 1958:371). Most of Colenso's life in Natal, after the publication of Romans, was spent in active resistance to colonialist aggression against the Zulu people, both in the Natal law courts and in the British parliament. In the end, this defence of the Zulu people completely overtook "conventional missionary work," but opened up a more profound missionary "conversation" which bore fruit in political struggle continued by his wife and family even after his death.

It seems that in 1861, when Colenso published this work, there was an inherent social ambiguity in his position and thinking. He is both the agent of empire and the Christian missionary and philanthropist. He does not yet see the contradictions inherent in the two positions. Ironically, it is precisely his exegesis and interpretation of Paul in the *Commentary on Romans*, which plunged him into a crisis which resolved the ambiguity at one level, but opened it up at another level. It led to isolation from his own class and an ever increasing identification with Zulu resistance to colonial domination, but forced him to adopt an Erastian position, asserting the supremacy of the state over the church in law, in order to retain his bishopric over against a church which declared him a heretic.

The fact that Colenso was working on the translation of the Bible into Zulu at the same time as he was working on his *Commentary on Romans* is significant. He provides a translation into English from the Greek, but we will examine his

translation into Zulu from the Greek alongside it, since it is, in many ways, more interesting and rich in significance. The need to find dynamic equivalents to Greek words, where none are fixed by tradition (as in English), destabilizes the text, and opens up new semantic possibilities and questions.

3. The Colonial Context

Colenso is best known as an Old Testament scholar, in which field he dialogued with Dutch scholars, translated their works and was influential in the evolution of Pentateuchal studies. Why then was his first Biblical work a *Commentary on Romans*? It seems clear it was partly a result of questions raised by the thinking of Maurice, long before he set sail for Natal, since he describes it as "the results of seven years of Missionary experience, as well as of previous close study of this Epistle" (1861:i). He also considered his *Commentary on Romans* and his *Commentary on the Pentateuch* to be a contribution to the rethinking the church in England would have to do, when the impact of the Enlightenment was brought home: "I fully believe that a terrible crisis is at hand for the Church of England and have tried to do my part to help some to stand firmly, when many props upon which they have been hitherto relying shall be felt to give way under them" (Letter to Mr. Allnutt, August 2, 1861, enclosing a copy of the *Commentary on Romans*; Cox 1888:126).

On the other hand, a commentary on Romans became urgent for Colenso because of the conditions he found in Natal, where the existing missions were emphasizing fear of hell as a motive for conversion and were pushing the penal theory of the atonement as the basis for their Christology. He wrote to Rev. Ferguson on August 9, 1859:

> The great drawback here is that the country is already saturated with a corruption of Christianity, and the natives have acquired such a view of the character of God and of the Gospel as keeps them back from

> desiring to have a much closer acquaintance with it. This they have obtained partly from the example they have constantly before them in the lives of the unfaithful Christians–partly from the mistaken teaching of the missionaries. 'God said, Let them be destroyed: the Son rose up and said, Let them be saved, let me die in their place' (Cox 1888:119-120).

Such a viewpoint was "little short of blasphemy," "utterly contrary to the whole spirit of the Gospel" and "operating with most injurious and deadening effect, both on those who teach, and on those who are taught" for Colenso:

> Such questions as these have been brought again and again before my mind in the intimate converse which I have had, as a Missionary, with Christian converts and Heathens. To teach the truths of our holy religion to intelligent adult natives, who have the simplicity of children, but withal the earnestness and thoughtfulness of men,–to whom these things are new and startling, whose minds are not prepared by long familiarity to acquiesce in, if not to receive, them,–is a sifting process for the opinions of any teacher, who feels the deep moral obligation of answering truly, and faithfully, and unreservedly, his fellow-man, looking up to him for light and guidance, and asking, 'Are you sure of this?' 'Do you believe this?' 'Do you really believe that?' The state of everlasting torment after death, of all impenitent sinners and unbelievers, including the whole heathen world, as many teach, is naturally so amazing and overwhelming an object of contemplation to them, and one so prominently put forward in the case of those, who have been under certain Missionary training, that it quite shuts out the cardinal doctrines of the Gospel, the Fatherly relation to us of the Faithful Creator (1861:198).

Central to the problem, in Colenso's mind, was the particular, exclusivist interpretation and emphasis given to *sola fide* by Protestant missionaries in Natal. Central to their understanding was a view of all human beings as fallen sinners and God's wrath waiting to punish all sin with death. Christ comes, then, to die in our stead and take the punishment which rightly belongs to us. The only way for a human being to avoid damnation and eternal hellfire is to make an act of faith and be baptised into Christ's death. The rest of humanity is a *massa damnata*. The Christian mission is understood by them in terms of individual faith, conversion and baptism, which must separate the Zulu converts from their community, their culture and their ancestors. The arbitrariness and injustice of such a conception outrages Colenso:

> This dogma makes no distinction between the profligate sensualist and the ill-trained child. And it is often so stated as to involve the multitudes of ignorant, untaught, heathen, the great mass of humankind, in the same horrible doom of never-ending despair, making this beautiful and blessed world the very shambles, as it were, of Almighty Vengeance (1861:190).

For Colenso, who spent his time talking with his Zulu people, this posed a massive problem. Zulu culture emphasizes the continuity of the living and the dead in unbroken community. The ancestors are honoured and constantly made present to the living, and provide the cultural coherence and ethical underpinning of the Zulu social universe. If the broad mass of unbaptized Zulu people, living and dead, are consigned to hellfire by the Christian religion for failing to make a public act of faith, how could a Zulu person conscientiously accept Christianity? Against this Colenso asserts his own understanding of the *sola fide* as simple, joyful acceptance of what God has already done in Christ, which does not require any act on our part to be efficacious, and he argues that this is the correct understanding of Paul's teaching in Romans.

In addition, Colenso notes that the colonists find in their Christian faith and baptism a ground, namely their "election" as Christians, for feelings of superiority over the Zulu people. Their interpretation of the Bible provides them with legitimation for their seizure of the land from the Zulu, whom they believed to be depraved, primitive and childlike. Doctrines of evolution and election go hand in hand in the popular mythology of colonialism. It is for these reasons that Colenso undertakes to write a commentary on Romans, which had provided the traditional Scriptural underpinning for the *sola fide* in Protestant thinking since Luther. He is convinced that a proper study of the text will show that Paul teaches no such thing, but rather supports his own universalist theological position.

4. Colenso's Reading of Romans

Colenso's interpretation hinges, to some extent, on his view of the letter as written to Jews and not to Christians. He argues at length that there was no Christian church in Rome at the time Paul was writing, but only Jews and proselytes still attached to the synagogue, who had come to some elementary form of belief in Jesus as messiah, perhaps from having heard the disciples preach in Jerusalem at the first Pentecost. This is why Paul feels free to go to Rome, since he is not "building on anyone else's foundation." These Jewish incipient believers ("a 'sect' of the Jews") were characterized by what Colenso terms "the three great prepossessing errors of the Jewish mind," namely that they have a special status before God, that they have a special claim on the messiah over against the Gentiles, and that those Gentiles who believed must keep the law if they were to be regarded as equal to Jews (1861:9). Paul knew the situation from his discussions with Priscilla and Aquila in Ephesus, who had now returned to Rome with Paul's teaching concerning salvation for all humankind without works of law. Paul is concerned to share the gospel with them clearly before he comes himself to Rome on his way to Spain. In reply to the Jewish reliance on election and pride of race, Paul is determined to show in his letter that salvation is pure gift of God, that it is meant for both Jews and Gentiles "without any special favour or distinction" (*Ibid.*), and that it is received by faith

alone without law and ceremony.

At this point, with our post-holocaust sensitivity, we would rightly detect here an essentialism with regard to the Jewish people on Colenso's part. Yet his purpose is the opposite of anti-Semitism in his own context. He wishes to show that the English Christian settlers have no grounds of racial pride over against the Zulu, and makes the same point *vis à vis* modern Jews, namely that Christians have no basis for racial pride over against the Jews. On the contrary, their cruelty and bigotry towards the Jews has made it impossible for Jews to believe in the Christian religion:

> But, as for the Jews of the present day, we cannot presume to say that they too have been 'given over to a reprobate mind,' or that their eyes are darkened as a penal consequence of their continuing in unbelief. It may be so in certain individual cases, where light has reached the inner man, and been rejected. But, probably, in our days, amidst the great body of the Jewish people, such cases are very rare. It is far more likely that the acts of abominable cruelty, injustice, and contemptuous bigotry, with which, in Christian lands and by Christian people–too often, alas! by Christian ministers–they have been so frequently, and are even now, treated, have gone far to fix them in holy and righteous horror of a religion, which taught that such outrages were right. All, surely, that an humble-minded Christian can allow himself to say of the present state of the Jews generally is that they are not actually incurring great moral *guilt*–(he cannot judge of that,)–but suffering great moral and spiritual loss from the acts of their forefathers (33).

Colenso's point is that no human being can base feelings of racial superiority against another on the basis of their Christian faith. On the contrary, the Gospel means that all human beings now stand equal before God in "Christ their Head." He is about to argue that the English colonialists are "the Jews" of his day, while the Zulu and the

modern Jews are in the position of "the Gentiles" in Paul's argument. Everything Paul says about "the Jewish" reliance on their race and culture as giving them a privileged position before God, applies in the context of colonial Natal to the colonialists. This is a radical and powerful exegetical move in the colonial context. In our context, we would, of course, question the inherently negative symbolic content given to the notion of "the Jew," even with Colenso's liberatory intention, as tending to confirm negative essentialist categories. Nevertheless, the rhetorical force of Colenso's interpretation remains an effective corrective to ethnocentrisms of every kind.

Like many interpreters of Romans, Colenso believes that the essence of Paul's argument is introduced in 1:16-17, but that he holds back from drawing the full implications of his teaching at this point, delaying until 3:21-22. Colenso argues that 1:18-3:20 is rhetorical in nature, intended to lull the Jewish reader into agreement and prepare her/him to accept the proposition that God's righteousness is sheer gift to all without distinction of race. Hence, Colenso reads the two passages together. We will come back to this later.

He translates 1:16-17 as follows, "For I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ; for the power of God it is unto salvation to everyone that believeth, both to the Jew first and Greek. For the righteousness of God is being revealed in it, (a righteousness) from faith unto faith, as it is written, 'The righteous shall live out of faith'."

The first point to note is that Colenso interprets "the righteousness of God" to refer not to the nature of God, nor to any act by which human beings make themselves righteous before God, not even the act of faith, but to the gift of righteousness which God gives to humans in his Son:

> Let this be distinctly noted that, throughout this Epistle, the righteousness of God, or God's righteousness, means God's gift of righteousness–not God's own personal inherent righteousness or

> justice, not *God's way of justifying sinners*, of making them righteous, of giving them righteousness, (which is by giving it to them in His Son), but the very righteousness itself–which God gives to men, so that by his free gift they stand before Him accepted and beloved,–God's righteousness, in short, opposed to *Man's* righteousness, to that which a man may fancy he can claim or work out for himself (10).

In his Zulu translation of Romans, Colenso is able to capture this understanding with the passive verbal form, *ukulungiswa okungoNkulunkulu*, "the being made right which is from God." God has simply provided a righteousness to the whole human race in Christ, whether they know it and accept it by an act of faith on their part or not (14). All of us, Christians, Jews, heathen, are dealt with by Creator God as righteous creatures, not only now, but "from all eternity." This is the reason for the universality of human religious experience, which impels people to live moral lives:

> The tokens of God's favour have been shed abroad on the human race from the first. He 'gave them rain from heaven, and fruitful seasons, filling their hearts with food and gladness.' He wrought by His Spirit on theirs, teaching men everywhere to 'feel after Him, if haply they may find Him, in whom they lived and moved and had their being, who was not far from any one of them.' But now in the Gospel is being revealed the secret of all this (14).

This understanding underlies Colenso's translation of the Greek present passive as a continuous tense: "is being revealed," which in his Zulu translation becomes *kuhlalukiswa*, "is being made to come to light." This is an ongoing process of enlightenment at work in every human heart through the conscience, since "the tokens of God's favour have been shed abroad on the human race from the first" in nature (14). This is an important component of his understanding of Romans. Just as salvation *is being revealed* from day to day in the life of every human being, so judgment or "wrath" *is being revealed* every day in the life of every human being:

"It is being daily, hourly, constantly, revealed, by the dealings of God with men; and especially by the secret witnessings of our own hearts. All men everywhere know in themselves that there is a Divine displeasure threatening those, who *do what they know to be wrong*, who 'keep back,' hold down, restrain, suppress, 'the truth through or in iniquity.'" (21). However, it is God's salvation which has the last word:

> Thanks be unto God! One Love embraces all. Already side by side with this revelation of God's wrath for wilful sin in the heart of man, there is a revelation of His Mercy–a secret sense that there is forgiveness with our Father in Heaven, in some way or other, possible or actual (21).

In their religious experience and practice, all humankind has always experienced the presence of God dimly through nature. All human beings are conscious of sin and guilt but also have a sense that forgiveness is possible and feel innately that they are children of a merciful God. For the Christian, writes Colenso, we find the "secret" of this universal human experience of God in the gospel: "For therein is revealed, the righteousness which God gives us,–which He gives to all, the evil and the good, the just and the unjust alike, that we may be regarded as children before Him–undutiful and disobedient children, it may be, self_willed and prodigal,–but children still, and to be dealt with as children, even when He visits us with His displeasure–children who have been called to inherit a blessing, and are not lying under a curse" (21-22).

Colenso does not allow the interpretation of "from faith to faith" to mean the sanctification of the elect in 1:17, but draws a convoluted parallel with 3:21-22: "But now, apart from law, [of which he had been speaking in the digression] the righteousness of God has been manifested, (though being witnessed of by the law and the prophets,) but *the righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ,* (=from faith), *unto all* and upon all *them that believe* (=unto faith)." His Zulu

translation makes Colenso's underlying understanding clear, particularly his choice of the word to express *pistis*, namely *temba,* which expresses confidence, hope, trust, while he explicitly rejects the alternative favored by the American Board Mission, *kolwa*, whose root meaning is "to be satisfied, have enough of a thing, to be satisfied with the evidence of a thing," commenting in his *Dictionary* (234), "N.B. The word *kolwa* only expresses *belief* in the sense of *assent*, not of *trust* or *affiance*, for which *temba* must be employed. Hence it is a very improper word to be used generally, for the faith of a Christian." In confirmation of his observation, that *kolwa* retains its root meaning of being satisfied, I can point to a Zulu saying still current, despite the "holy" use of *amakholwa*, namely *sibhema sekholwa*, said in appreciation at the end of a good party means literally, "we have smoked and we are satisfied!" The word *kolwa*, however, won out and is the commonly used word for a believer in Zulu today, as in the Bible Society version of the Bible. Colenso is undoubtedly right in his observations, and the use of *ukukholwa* ironically undermines the *sola fide* understanding of its missionary proponents. Colenso was concerned to maximize the nature of justification as objective, universal gift and human response as a simple trusting reliance on the Creator God.

This understanding of "faith" as simple trusting hope, rather than an act of conversion, is important, since it connects with the universalist position he goes on to adopt. It is inherently possible for a heathen to have this kind of faith, to trust in a God experienced through nature and served by obedience to the promptings of conscience, since there is "a faith in the Living Word, which speaks within them" and "a living obedience to the law of truth and love, which they find written upon their hearts by the finger of God" (63-64).

"The righteous shall live out of faith" is cited from Habakkuk as a prelude to the rhetorical exercise which follows, to reassure the Jewish listeners and to arouse "the sense of *their* needing (as well as the 'sinners of the Gentiles') the 'righteousness of God' which is 'revealed in the Gospel.'" (17). The implications are drawn only in 3:21-26, where the righteousness of God (understood as God's gift of putting us

right freely given) is extended "unto all and upon all that believe" apart from the law and prophets. In other words, there is no special status before God for the Jew over the Gentile–and by extension for the colonial Christians over the heathen Zulu people. This gift of righteousness in Christ is *being made* real in every human being all the time from the beginning "the Greek Present, implying their continuing state of righteousness" (62). As we have already seen, Colenso understands "belief" in a broad sense of the positive response of any human being, Christian, Jew or heathen, to the spiritual promptings of God as they know and experience God's love. Thus 3:21-26 already, in his opinion, extend justification to the whole human race, though he concedes that Paul *may* in this case be referring to believers only (63). After all, he argues, while Paul may be ambiguous about how far the "all" extends in 3:23, in 5:15-19 Paul *must* refer to all humankind, "So then, just as through one fault, *it passed* [death] unto all men, unto condemnation, so also, through one righteous act, *it passed* [the gift of righteousness] unto all men, unto justification of life" (Colenso's translation, 99). "Let the words of this verse be well noted," writes Colenso, "By Christ's one act of loving obedience, the free gift of God has come upon *all* men, unto justification of life, that is, unto a justification which brings with it the gift of life" (103). "For 'the many' who died in Adam,' were, of course, the whole race; and therefore also, blessed be God! 'the many,' to whom 'the grace of God abounded, and the free gift by grace of the one man Jesus Christ,' the gift of righteousness, must be the whole race, the whole family of man" (102).

While 5:19 uses the future tense, "the many shall be made righteous," this is because of the continuous nature of God's redeeming work in "the multiplied declarations of righteousness, which shall be made in this life to the individual members of the great human family. Whenever the 'unrighteousness' of any Jew, Christian, or Heathen, 'is forgiven, and his sin covered,'–whenever he feels any measure of the peace of God's children, in the faithful discharge of any duty, or in forsaking any path of evil,–whenever there is brought home to his heart in any way the message of God's Fatherly Love by means of any one of Earth's ten thousand voices,–then he hears, as it were, a fresh declaration of righteousness, he may know

that he is recognised again as a child of God's House" (103). This is indeed the essence of the good news, that the whole human race is righteous before God in Jesus Christ "their Head" and every human being already experiences the redeeming work of the Spirit of God which Christians expressly experience through their baptism:

> He Himself, the Father of Spirits, is everywhere enlightening and quickening the spirits of men. Every good thought, which has ever stirred within a heathen's mind, is a token of that work which God's good Spirit is working within him, as one of the great Human Family, redeemed by the Love of God in Christ Jesus, and related all to the Second Adam by a second spiritual birth, (of which Baptism is the express sign and seal to the Christian,) as they are by their natural birth to the (107).

Paul goes on to work out the implications of this in chapters 6-8, in terms of the sacraments, human nature and natural religion.

5. Theological Implications of Colenso's Exegesis of the *Sola Fide*

5.1 Anakephalaiosis

In rejecting the penal theory of the atonement ("He did not bear the weight of the curse; He did not suffer the accumulated weight of woe, due, as a punishment, to the sins of the world. St. Paul says not a word of this." 111), Colenso gives maximum weight to Paul's use of the formulation "as in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive," to see Christ as the Head of humanity, encapsulating and restoring humanity in his own person on the cross ("What He, our Head, did, that we, the members of His Body, share in–we, the whole brotherhood of Man,–we, the whole race, whose nature He took upon Him." 113). Although the concept of the headship of Christ does not appear in Romans, but mainly in the deutero-Pauline epistles (Eph 1:22, 4:15, 5:23; Col 1:18, 2:10, 19; but cf. 1 Cor 11:3), Colenso interprets Paul's

first and second Adam typology in this way (Christ as head occurs no less than 49 times) to refer to the work of Christ in the *Commentary on Romans*. Christ's work is effective in gathering up the whole of humankind since creation and up to the final resurrection into one in himself and restoring it to what God all along intended it to be. So we are no longer accursed creatures but children, whether or not we come to conscious Christian faith.

Colenso's thinking at this point is reminiscent of the *recapulatio* Christology of Irenaeus, though there is no evidence that he is conscious of it. The summary of Aloys Grillmeier gives of Irenaeus' theology provides resonates with Colenso's exegesis of Romans:

> Just as in the invisible world the Logos is already the head of all being created in him, so now in the incarnation he becomes head of the visible and corporeal world, and above all the head of the church, so drawing everything to himself. This represents at the same time a recapitulation of creation and above all of fallen Adam, i.e. a renewing and saving permeation of the whole history of the world and of mankind by 'Christ the Head,' from its beginning to its end (1975:102).

For Colenso, this Adam Christology, which stresses the Fatherhood of God and of the solidarity of all human beings as bothers and sisters in Christ, is what ought to provide the motivation for Christian mission and not fear of damnation or selfish hope of individual privilege which leaves the rest of humankind to perish:

> We are to go forth in the confidence that all men everywhere are sharing these blessings, though as yet they may not be privileged to know it–honouring our brother-men, whoever they may be, as members of the Great Human Family, whom God hath redeemed for Himself in His own dear Son,–and longing and labouring to tell them, in life and act, in our own persons, if we may, or by helping others in our name to

> tell them, of One Love, of which all earthly loves are telling, of which all precious thought are whispering in the very centre of their being, which embraces us all (119).

When the missionary meets those who have not heard the Gospel, s/he must recognize that the Spirit of Life is already in them: "All men, then, have this spirit, this spiritual life, though all men may not realise it to themselves nor exhibit it to others" by virtue of their relation to Christ as Head (147).

5.2 Purgatory and the Ultimate Salvation of All Humankind

The second theological implication of Colenso's understanding of Paul is that it problematizes the concept of eternal damnation. After all, if there is this human solidarity in redemption, whether they make an *act* of faith or not, and if the penal theory of the atonement is set aside, then how can one talk of punishment at all, except as a corrective measure for deliberate and obstinate sin. But if punishment is corrective, then it cannot be eternal. Interpreting 8:21, Colenso insists that the words "that the creature also itself shall be set free from the bondage of corruption, into the freedom of the glory of the children of God" refer to the whole of the created order and must mean that there is hope for the whole race, including the unrighteous in the end (175-176). So, in one of the most sustained pieces of argumentation in the whole commentary, he argues for the doctrine of Purgatory as representing the majority Christian viewpoint through the ages and even in his own. There must, in God's good time, be the hope of redemption even here. So, while there will be judgment for all now and at the hour of death, according to the light given each, and all will experience the "worm" of guilt and the "fire" of God's anger against sin, at the last all will be brought into the light of God's glory and presence.

5.3 Sacraments as Signs to the World

Thirdly, if all are already redeemed by the work of Christ as Head of humanity recapitulating the race from creation, then what role could the sacraments play. Certainly, the sacraments do not effect redemption (*ex opera operandi*), but they

show it forth. Baptism, like circumcision for the Jew, is an outward sign of God's blessing already given, but does not guarantee any special privilege for the Christian. Colenso paraphrases Paul in 2:25 as follows:

> The baptism of a Christian has a meaning and use, if he walks faithfully; otherwise his baptism becomes a mere nullity. If, then, an unbaptised heathen does that which is good and right and true, shall not his unbaptised state be reckoned for baptism? and they, which are heathens by nature, and walking according to the light vouchsafed to them, judge those, who, baptised Christians as they are, yet knowingly transgress the law of their Lord? For he is not a Christian, who is so merely in name and profession, nor is that true baptism, which is only outwardly with water. But the Christian in God's sight is he who is one inwardly; and the baptism, which is of value before Him, is that of the heart, in the spirit, not in the outward form. (51) ....It might be asked, 'If you say the heathen may be saved without the knowledge of the Gospel, what advantage then, hath the Christian, or what profit is there in Christian Baptism?' And a similar answer might be given: Much, in every way: in the very first place, because to them are entrusted the Holy Scriptures, the books of the New Testament as well as the Old?' And to this we might go on to add, 'To them are given the means of grace, and the hope of glory.'(53)

The blessing is already given before baptism to all humankind, and serves to ratify that gift long ago given (75) for the individual "receiving each for himself, personally, in baptism a formal outward sign of ratification of that adoption, which they have shared already, independently of the sign, with the whole race" (200). Central to Colenso's thinking is the insistence on humankind as one. He uses the phrase "the whole race" sixteen times, to emphasize human solidarity in the Christ event.

The same can be said about the eucharist. It likewise represents a gift already given objectively to all in their daily experience of life, but signified outwardly in the sacrament:

> The Body and Blood of Christ are represented to us by the Elements, whether we come to feed by faith upon them at that particular time or not. These things, *out of ourselves*, are set forth to us in that Holy Sacrament, as the source of all Life of every kind to us all, of all the blessings which we enjoy in our daily life, personal, family, social, or national–as the great provision of our Father's Love for us, of which we are partaking, day by day, at every moment, as redeemed creatures, though we may not know it or may not heed it,–of which every man everywhere is partaking, though he may not know what the Word made Flesh has done at His Father's bidding for the children of men (115).

This conclusion that the Body and Blood of Christ are given "to all the human race, not only in the Sacrament, but at all times, and of which, in fact, all men are everywhere partaking, through God's mercy, and so receiving all the life they have" (116) was one of the conclusions which most outraged the Anglo-Catholic orthodoxy of Bishop Gray and his supporters in the heresy trial.

5.4 Natural Religion and the Conscience

Finally, the consequence of this Christian universalism Colenso draws from his interpretation of Romans, is a new emphasis on natural religion and conscience. All human beings experience the Fatherhood of God, have access to the gift of salvation given in Christ and are called by the creator Spirit to an ethical life by the conscience given to every human being. The Christian has the advantage of knowing and experiencing this good news and the responsibility of sharing it with the rest of the human family. The Christian, however, has no ground for pride or for a sense of superiority. For Colenso, the Epistle was specifically written by Paul to counter feelings of racial privilege and pride. The implications of this for colonial society

were specifically drawn by him in the *Commentary on Romans*. This would inevitably set him on a collision course with the colonial government and the settler community.

6. The Consequences

Colenso's *Commentary on Romans* was printed only at his mission station and received brief attention, largely as source material for his heresy trial. As an examination of the charges shows, it was on the basis of his exegesis of Romans that he was excommunicated, and not, as is sometimes asserted, his challenge to Scriptural inerrancy in his *Commentary on the Pentateuch*. Yet his exegesis was hardly taken seriously as an interpretation *of Paul's letter*. No attempt was made to refute Colenso's exegesis by his accusers. Colenso's work at Ekukhanyeni did not succeed in making conventional converts. As I have argued elsewhere in examining the relationship between Colenso and Magema Fuze (Draper 1998a, 1998b, 2000), Colenso's theology, propounded in his interpretation of Romans, undermined the logic of conventional mission work. If all are already saved, whether they accept the Christian gospel or not, then what they stand to benefit from by baptism is enlightenment, knowledge of what they already possess. Colenso's emphasis on the value and importance of natural religion, of the universal operation of conscience, and of the equality of all races and cultures, made for a "cool conversion" in the terms of Berger and Luckmann. There was no need for an absolute break with their former way of life for his converts, no severance of family and kinship ties. Instead, his teaching encouraged the emergence of a Zulu national identity and cultural revival. However, if Colenso's *Commentary on Romans* is measured as part of the "long conversation" between European Christianity and Africa, then it was profoundly successful.

The mission station itself was abandoned, after the traumatic events of Colenso's excommunication and legal battles in the Privy Council. Colenso abandoned his early visions of an alliance with imperial authorities to put a Christian king on the

Zulu throne and came to be a fierce defender of Zulu independence and legal rights against the colonialists: first Langalibalele, then Cetshwayo, and then, posthumously through his family, Dinizulu. He excerpted decisions and reports of the Natal colonial government and sent them to a network of activists in England. He lobbied in the imperial Parliament and fought in the courts. His converts and scholars from Ekukhanyeni were among the vanguard of a new Zulu consciousness and resistance to colonialism, known early on as "the Bishopstowe Faction," after his house at Ekukhanyeni. This is certainly not the kind of outcome which missionary societies expected or welcomed at the time, but one of which, with hindsight, the church can be proud. Exegesis can have unexpected consequences.

Bibliography

Berger, P. & Luckmann, T. 1966. *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. New York: Doubleday.

Colenso, J. W. 1860. *First Steps of the Zulu Mission*. Reprinted in Colenso, *Bringing Forth Light*, 43-161.

Colenso, J. W. 1861a. *St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans: Newly Translated, and Explained from a Missionary Point of View*. Pietermaritzburg: Ekukanyeni Mission Press.

Colenso, J. W. 1861b. *A Letter to His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, upon the questio of the proper treatment of cases of polygamy, as found already existing in converts from heathenism*. Ekukhanyeni: Mission Press.

Colenso, J. W. 1861c. *First Lessons in Science*. Ekukhanyeni: Mission Press.

Colenso, J. W. 1862_1863. *The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua Critically Examined*. London: Longman & Green.

Colenso, J. W. 1865. Translation of A. Kuenen, *The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua Critically Examined*. London: Longman & Green.

Colenso, J. W. 1865. Translation of H. Oort, *The Worship of Baalim in Israel*. London: Longman & Green.

Colenso, J. W. 1865. *On Missions to the Zulus in Natal & Zululand* (A Lecture to the Marylebone Literary Society, 23rd May 1865). Reprinted in Colenso, *Bringing Forth Light*, 203_238.

Colenso, J. W. 1878 (2nd Edition). *Zulu-English Dictionary*. Pietermaritzburg: Davis (Printed by Magema, Mubi & Co., Ekukanyeni).

Colenso, J. W. [1880] 1988. Translation of C. Vijn, *Cetshwayo's Dutchman*. Reprinted London: Greenhill, (Pages 83-192 consist of Colenso's notes).

Colenso, J. W.

Colenso, J. W. 1903 (4th Edition). *First Steps in Zulu: Being an Elementary Grammar of the Zulu Language*. Pietermaritzburg & Durban: Vause, Slatter & Co (Printed by Magema, Mubi & Co., Ekukanyeni).

Colenso, J. W. 1982. *Bringing Forth Light: Five Tracts on Bishop Colenso's Zulu*

Mission, edited by R. Edgecombe. Pietermaritzburg: University of Natal Press (Killie Campbell Africana Library Reprint Series 4).

Comaroff, Jean & John 1991. *Of Revelation and Revolution: Christianity, Colonialism, and Consciousness in South Africa* I. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Cox, G. W. 1888a-b. *The Life of John William Colenso, Bishop of Natal*. London: Ridgway.

Draper, J. A. 1998a. "Hermeneutical Drama on the Colonial Stage: Liminal Space and Creativity in Colenso's Commentary on Romans," *JTSA* 103, 13-32.

Draper, J. A. 1998b. "Magema Fuze and the Insertion of the Subjugated Historical Subject into the Discourse of Hegemony," *Bulletin for Contextual Theology* 5/1-2, 16-26.

Draper, J. A. 1998c. "Archbishop Gray and the Interpretation of the Bible," in J. Suggit and M. Goedhals, *Change and Challenge: Essays Commemorating the 150th Anniversary of Robert Gray as First Bishop of Cape Town (20 February 1848)*, 44_54. Johannesburg: CPSA.

Draper, J. A. 2000. "The Bishop and the Bricoleur: Bishop John William Colenso's *Commentary on Romans* and Magema Fuze's *The Black People and Whence they Came*" forthcoming in G. O. West & M. W. Dube, *The Bible in Africa: Transactions, Trajectories, and Trends*. Leiden: Brill.

Guy, J. 1983. *The Heretic: A Study of the Life of John William Colenso 1814-1883*. Pietermaritzburg: University of Natal Press.

Legge, M. J. 1997. "Bricoleurs-in-Community. Reframing Theologies of Culture," *Religious Studies and Theology* 16/1, June 1997, 5-22.

Rees, W. 1958. *Colenso Letters from Natal*. Pietermaritzburg: Shuter & Shooter.

"A Remedy for Having Been Born of Woman:" Jesus, Gender, and Genealogy in Romans

Pamela Eisenbaum
Iliff School of Theology

I

I have heard it said that academics do not solve problems so much as create them. My work in the following paper derives from my longstanding inability to understand certain kinds of logical connections made by the apostle Paul in his letter to the Romans (and elsewhere). But since I find that I sometimes see problems where others do not, and since I believe firmly in making transparent one's agenda, *and* since this seminar deals with the reception of Romans, I first want to share with you a little of who I am as a reader.

I am a Jewish New Testament scholar who teaches in a mainline Christian Seminary and who is passionate about teaching and studying Paul. Indeed, this paper is part of a larger project on Paul. The concerns that led me to the study of Paul were, put simply, his attitude toward women and Jews. I am motivated to pursue this bifocal agenda for two reasons primarily. First, in the post-Holocaust world, I care deeply about the health of Jewish-Christian relations, and Paul has so often been invoked as a witness against Jews and Judaism. Second, the seminary context within which I teach is a liberal one which is committed to the well-being and fair treatment of women in the church, yet Paul is so often cited as a scriptural authority who opposes the equal treatment of women. Although I am an

outsider to the church, my role as a faculty member within a Methodist Seminary gives me authority to speak to the issue, and my commitment to my students and feminist goals compels me to speak about it.

Interpreting Paul in light of these issues, however, is not easy. I have come to see that the questions asked of Paul need to be much more nuanced than simply, Was Paul good or bad for women? Or, was Paul a good Jew or a bad Jew? Thus, while I maintain a dual focus that encompasses studies in Judaism and feminism, both of these arenas have become more complex in my thinking, so that now, instead of asking whether or not Paul was a good Jew, I ask how he conceptualized the boundaries of Judaism in the first place; instead of asking whether or not Paul promoted gender equality, I ask how and where the category of gender functioned in Paul's thought. In other words, I take less and less for granted when reading Paul, and inevitably I am led to problematize that which often seems unproblematic to others.

My particular "problem" in this paper lies with explaining the inter-relationship between Abraham, the Gentiles, and christology in Romans, with emphasis on the third element. I have argued recently that Paul implicitly understands himself as an Abrahamic figure who establishes a new kind of family, one made up of both Jews and Gentiles.[1] That argument (part of which I reproduce here in abbreviated form in my discussion of Romans 4 below) depends partly on demonstrating how Paul's self-understanding resembles the life of Abraham and partly on showing that Paul conceptualized Abraham not primarily as an exemplar of faith for Gentiles, as is commonly thought, but rather as a patrilineal ancestor who encompasses many nations and thereby constitutes Jews and Gentiles as kin. My ultimate goal here is to understand how and why Paul associated the advent of Christ with the erasure of Jew-Gentile distinctions.

For those who, in the wake of Krister Stendahl, E. P. Sanders, and others, follow the "new perspective" on Paul, Paul's main concern in Romans is to break down the barriers between Jews and Gentiles, so as to demonstrate that God is the God of all people (not just Israel alone) and that God's salvation is available to all.[2] Generally speaking, I consider myself a new perspective scholar, and I accept this observation. But the question that has persistently bothered me is why the death and resurrection of Jesus is the means by which the barriers are broken down. There is certainly no inherent relationship between christology and the dissolving of the Jew-Gentile boundary, even though the association seems to have come naturally for Paul and in deutero-Pauline literature as well.[3]

The simple answer is that Jesus' resurrection marks the beginning of the end (since resurrection was not thought to be something that happened to people on an individual basis, but was supposed to happen collectively at the end of time), and the vision of the end as articulated in prophets like Isaiah involves the in-gathering of the nations. So Christ, having inaugurated the end of time, signals to Paul that he needs to find ways to be inclusive of Gentiles, which he does and which is most fully articulated in Romans.

The trouble with this answer is that it only addresses the question in terms of Jesus' resurrection, not in terms of his death. But, as any reader of the apostle's letters knows, Paul has a well developed theology of Jesus' death. I do not think anyone would dispute that the nucleus of Paul's christology is the death and resurrection of Jesus; without Jesus' death on the cross there would be no resurrection. The death and resurrection, in fact, go together in Paul's thought as one salvific event: "It will be reckoned to

[1] "Paul as the New Abraham," Paul and Politics, ed. Richard Horsley (Philadelphia: Trinity Press, forthcoming).
[2] The "new perspective" is nicely summarized by J. D. G. Dunn, The Theology of Paul the Apostle (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998) 335-40.

us who believe in him that raised from the dead Jesus our Lord, who was put to death for our trespasses and raised for our justification" (Rom. 4:24-25, NRSV).

In the old Augustinian-Lutheran interpretation of Romans, my interpretive problem does not arise, because Christ's death does not function to break down barriers between different kinds of human beings. Rather, Christ's death reconciles human beings to God by vicariously atoning for their sins. Attaching such significance to the death of Jesus makes sense because it follows the logic already inherent in ancient Judaism, namely that making the appropriate kinds of sacrifices atones for one's sins. Jesus is simply understood as the ultimate form of sacrifice.[4]

Within the context of the new perspective, however, the logical relationship between Jesus' death and the inclusion of Gentiles remains opaque. I echo the sentiment of W. D. Davies that Paul does not adequately explain how Jesus' crucifixion makes possible for Gentiles their inclusion in God's promises.[5] Why is it necessary that Jesus' death be a sacrificial one in order to accomplish this task? N. T. Wright, against Davies, thinks the connection is plain: "Gentiles simply come in, from nowhere; Jews have their membership [in the covenant] renewed, brought back to life, by sharing the death and resurrection of their Messiah."[6] Wright's statement does not

---

[3] I'm thinking here especially of Ephesians 2:11-16.

[4] See, e.g., the comments of Joseph Fizmyer, Romans (AB; New York: Doubleday, 1993) 249-50; or those generally of Ernest Käsemann, Commentary on Romans (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1980).

[5] Jewish and Pauline Studies (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984) 127. Davies made this comment not while discussing Romans, but Galatians 3, but I take him to mean the point generally.

[6] The Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993) 155. To be fair to Wright, he, like others, does not address the issue directly, probably because he does not perceive a need to do so. Moreover, he has a peculiar understanding of Jesus' death that for him may make the need for demonstrating the logical relationship between Jesus' death and Gentile inclusion less necessary. If I understand him correctly, the cross atones primarily for the sins of Israel (where sin has

offer an explanation of Paul's logic, but rather takes it for granted, as so many new perspective scholars and other Christian readers do. Because followers of Jesus – at least of the Pauline school, which won the day on the question of Gentile inclusion – acted on an assumed connection between the death and resurrection and the extending of promises to Gentiles, and because of the de facto subsequent history of Christianity, it seems as if there is an inherent connection, but, in reality, it is only a historical one, one that can only be observed in retrospect. That Paul made so powerful an association between these two things in the first place remains to be explained.

II

Having articulated the problem, I now turn to proposing a solution, or at least an explanation. I intend to argue that the logical connection between Jesus and the Gentiles lies with understanding the death of Jesus as a sacrificial act through which Paul creates kinship ties with people to whom he is not biologically related. Jesus is not the patrilineal ancestor who inaugurates this new family. Abraham, rather, remains the patriarch, and it

---

been concentrated according to Gal 3:22 or Rom 7:13). Jesus' death is not a general act of atonement on behalf of the human race; Jesus is Israel's redemption, her final restoration from exile. Wright's assumption here is that the Jews themselves have not enjoyed the promises to Abraham (they've been in exile) and thus those promises have been prevented from "flowing out to the Gentiles." The restoration of Israel thereby means the inclusion of Gentiles (151). While I agree that Paul recognizes in the original promises to Abraham the inclusion of Gentiles – Paul reads the story of Abraham to mean that God intends that Gentiles be God's people too, ultimately – I don't agree that Paul understands himself and other Jews as outside the Abrahamic covenant. I do not have room here to document all my reasons, but suffice to say that statements such as that found in Rom 4:1,12; 5:6; 9:1-5, and, especially Gal 3:14, where Paul says, "that in Christ Jesus the blessing of Abraham might come to the Gentiles," indicate to me that he understands that some (namely Jews, or at least some Jews) already have the covenant of Abraham and that Jesus now permits the extension of those promises to Gentiles. Thus, the logic of the connection between the death of Jesus and what Wright calls "the miraculous fact that Gentiles are at last being admitted into the family of Israel's God" (154) remains to be adequately explained.

is the Abrahamic lineage into which Gentiles are incorporated. Jesus, however, is the sacrificial means by which Gentiles become members of the Abrahamic kin group. In order to show why Jesus' sacrificial death is necessary for realizing Jew-Gentile relatedness, I first need to introduce the reader to the work of the feminist sociologist Nancy Jay, whose insights I will use subsequently to address the issue at hand.

In her book, Throughout Your Generations Forever: Sacrifice, Religion, and Paternity,[7] Jay makes a point commonly observed by anthropologists, namely, that social constructs are required for the establishment of paternity in a way they are not for maternity because of the blunt reality of childbirth. From this observation, Jay argues that these social constructs almost always take the form of sacrifice. Jay's central thesis is that sacrifice is "a remedy for having been born of woman."[8]

Jay's most significant contribution is her insight that gender plays a key role in the logic of sacrifice. One way to observe the role of gender is to note the symbolic opposition between sacrifice and childbirth in numerous and diverse religious traditions. Interestingly, and most apropos for the study of early Christianity, this opposition occurs in Greek, Roman, and Israelite traditions, all of which, for example, require some sort of sacrifice to remove the pollution generated by childbirth, or to demarcate the period of pollution from neutral time. Furthermore, sacrifice generally enables the stripping away of the limits of biology and mortality (associated with women) so that one can enjoy membership in an eternal social order.[9] Consider the following excerpt from Ovid in his description of Heracles' transformation from mortal to immortal being:

All that his mother gave him burned away.

---

[7] (Chicago and London: University of Chicago, 1992).
[8] Generations, xxiii.
[9] Generations, 39.

Only the image of his father's likeness
Rose from the ashes of his funeral pyre…
So Heracles stepped free of mortal being…
And with an air of gravity and power
Grew tall, magnificent as any god.[10]

True, Heracles' father was divine and his mother mortal, but the language of the story nevertheless functions paradigmatically. It is not accidental that this particular metamorphosis comes at the moment when Heracles was sacrificing bulls to Zeus.

Biology is never the sole factor in determining kinship structures. Social processes, such as marriage and adoption, always aid in the construction of family and genealogy. But fatherhood in particular requires social construction. Jay points out that in both Greece and Rome, birth did not automatically grant family membership; a child needed to be ritually recognized by the father, who could also withhold such recognition.[11] Similarly, the rabbinic rite of circumcision constitutes the boy as a legitimate descendant of Abraham. The blessing pronounced at circumcision ("Blessed art thou, Lord our God, King of the Universe, who has sanctified us by his commandments, and commanded us to admit him [the child] to the covenant of Abraham our father") seemingly gives the father the ability to *make* his son a descendant of Abraham, rather than having to rely on a pre-existing biological condition.[12]

---

[10] The Metamorphoses, trans. Horace Gregory (New York: Viking, 1958) 248, also quoted in Jay, Generations, 31.
[11] Jay, Generations, 43-45.
[12] See the arguments of Howard Eilberg-Schwartz, who explicitly connects circumcision and patrilineal descent in The Savage in Judaism: An Anthropology of Israelite Religion and Ancient Judaism (Bloomington: Indiana University, 1990) 141-73; and idem., God's Phallus: And Other Problems for Men and Monotheism (Boston: Beacon, 1994) 141, 200-202. See also Lawrence A. Hoffman, Covenant of Blood: Circumcision and Gender in Rabbinic Judaism (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1996) 38-48.

Anthropologists generally recognize two ways to trace descent: agnation and cognation. Agnation is constituted by unilineal descent, through one ancestor, which is most often the patriline. Cognation recognizes the lineage of both parents. Because "cognation branches out so rapidly that it cannot identify clearly defined groups enduring from generation for generation,"[13] many societies, including the Greeks, Romans and ancient Israelites, use agnation to determine one's primary lineage. Agnation, or what I will call patrilineal descent, is an artificial construct usually going back to a single ancestor, designed to provide society with a coherent social identity.[14] Abraham functions as this kind of patriarchal ancestor in Judaism.[15] Concern for patriliny appears most frequently in those societies in which families are part of more extended and complex kin groups (e.g., clans, tribes) and where the transfer of property (i.e., concerns over inheritance) needs conscious attention.[16]

A patriline maintains intergenerational continuity between fathers and sons, and that maintenance means that women and childbearing are necessarily devalued.[17] As Jay says of exogamous patrilineal systems, "Women marry outside their own family and bear children for the continuity of a different family. Children are born not just of women, but of outsiders. For any boy, 'all that his mother gave him' pollutes the purity of the paternal line."[18] Because the women who provide the heirs for one family originate in a different family and have a different genealogy, their lineage cannot be recognized without threatening the boundaries and coherence of the

---

[13] Jay, Generations, 42.

[14] See the classic essay by Meyer Fortes, "The Structure of Unilineal Descent Groups," American Anthropologist 55 (1953) 17-41.

[15] See the comments of Jeffrey Siker in Disinheriting the Jews: Abraham in Early Christian Controversy (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox, 1991) 135.

[16] Jay, Generations, 34

[17] See the comments of Carol Delaney, Abraham on Trial: The Social Legacy of Biblical Myth (Princeton: Princeton University, 1998) 156-58.

patriline. Patrilineal lines of descent cannot use the evidence of birth to establish kinship, but they must provide some sort of reliable evidence for paternity. Sacrifice counts as that evidence. As Jay says, "When membership in patrilineal descent groups is identified by rights of participation in blood sacrifice, evidence of 'paternity' is created which is as certain as evidence of maternity, but far more flexible."[19]

The observation that sacrifice is frequently associated with establishing kinship was made long before Jay. Her contribution lies with her observation of the connection between sacrifice and a particular kind of kinship relation, that between fathers and sons. She would argue that the substantive reasons for the association of sacrifice and patrilineal descent can only be determined within a given society. However, at the level of abstraction, the logic of sacrifice lends itself to the establishment of kin, because sacrifice is fundamentally about joining and separating.

Scholars of ritual studies have long divided sacrifice into two kinds, communion and expiatory. Communion sacrifice functions to bring people together and usually takes alimentary form, i.e. people eating together from the same ritual object. The intention of expiatory sacrifice is to separate people from whatever they need to be separated from: outsiders, sins, pollution, evils, etc. As Jay points out, the two kinds of sacrifice identified by scholars are helpful for understanding sacrifice, but using them to categorize sacrifices as practiced by peoples does not work, because sacrifices often involve elements of both. In other words, in reality the two categories overlap. Therefore, she views both kinds as two sides of the same coin, as elements of the same logic of sacrifice. The purpose of sacrifice is the construction and maintenance of relationships. In order for people to understand themselves as joined together, they must also perceive

[18] Jay, Generations, 31.

themselves as separating from someone or something else. The process of forming one coherent identity (whether for an individual or a group) requires a concomitant process of differentiation. "There is necessarily an 'either/or' about lineage membership (members must be distinguished from non-members), and for patriliny, this either/or requires transcending descent from women."[20]

Because birth can be transcended by sacrifice, it also makes possible the establishment of social relations or lines of succession in groups where typical family relations play no role (she offers the example of the Catholic priesthood, where the celebrants of the mass comprise a lineage of males going back to Jesus). Furthermore, participation in a lineage based on sacrifice enables participants to be part of a "ritually-defined social order, enduring continuously through time, that birth and death (continually changing the membership of the 'eternal' lineage) and all other threats of social chaos may be overcome."[21] Jay is particularly eloquent on summing up the association between sacrifice, patriliny, and immortality, and is worth quoting at length:

> The twofold movement of sacrifice, integration and differentiation, communion and expiation, is beautifully suited for identifying and maintaining patrilineal descent. Sacrifice can expiate, get rid of, the consequences of having been born of woman (along with countless other dangers) and at the same time integrate the pure and eternal patrilineage. Sacrificially constituted descent, incorporating women's mortal children into an "eternal" (enduring through generations) kin group, in which membership is recognized by participation in sacrificial ritual, not merely by birth, enables a patrilineal group to

[19] Jay, Generations, 36.
[20] Jay, Generations, 40.
[21] Jay, Generations, 39.

> transcend mortality in the same process in which it transcends birth. In this sense, sacrifice is doubly a remedy for having been born of woman.[22]

Although Jay means by immortality the continuity of lineage, it is not hard to imagine a particular context in which participation in the patrilineage allows one to transcend, quite literally, one's mortal being, and that is exactly what I think we have in Paul.

III

Christ's death on the cross constitutes the sacrifice that integrates Gentiles into the lineage of Abraham – that is the essential "logic" that connects Paul's christology to his mission to incorporate Gentiles into Israel. The resurrection is important, too, but it represents the other side of the sacrifice, namely, the divine inheritance effected by the sacrificial death, adoption as sons of God, rebirth as a new immortal being who transcends the fleshly birth from a woman. The constraints of time and space do not allow me to be exhaustive, but I believe I can make a preliminary case for this understanding by highlighting selected texts from Romans. I will first discuss excerpts from chaps. 4 & 9, then turn to excerpts from 5 & 8. The combination will no doubt strike many readers as peculiar, since Romans 5-8 usually marks the mid-section and is often seen to stand notoriously apart from chaps. 1-4 and 9-11. But I have chosen deliberately, not only because these chapters contain the material most relevant to the issue at hand, but also to illustrate the logical connections between Paul's christology, found mainly in chaps. 5-8 and his concerns for Jew-Gentile relations found in earlier and later chapters.

---

[22] Jay, Generations, 40.

Romans 4:1: *What shall we say? Have we found Abraham to be our forefather according to the flesh?*[23]

This translation comes from the work of Richard Hayes. The NRSV translates this verse very differently: "What then are we to say was gained by Abraham, our ancestor according to the flesh?" In many ways, Hayes' translation is the simplest and most straightforward rendering of the Greek. To be sure, the Greek is terse and there are several translation possibilities (as there always are), Hayes' translation seems to me best for grasping the upshot of Paul's rhetoric in introducing this section. Dividing the verse into two questions is more consistent with Pauline style generally (see e.g., Rom 6:1; 7:7). Most importantly, Hayes has shifted the emphasis from Abraham's actions to Abraham's status as ancestor, and this seems to best anticipate what follows in the chapter.

This shift in emphasis has an increasing number of followers. Recently scholars have begun to recognize that Abraham-as-ancestor may be more significant than Abraham-as-example in Romans 4.[24] In the old Augustinian-Lutheran reading of this chapter, the emphasis always fell on the first half, up to v. 16, where Paul's interprets Gen 15:6 in light on Ps 32:1, and the language of justification appears frequently. Interpreters traditionally understood Abraham as an illustration of justification by faith. But, as Paul himself says after relating that Abraham's circumcision follows God's proclamation of the patriarch as righteous, the purpose of this

[23] Here I follow the translation of Richard Hayes, "Have We Found Abraham to be Our Forefather According to the Flesh?: A Reconsideration of Rom 4:1," NovT (1985) 79-85.
[24] See Michael Cranford, "Abraham in Romans 4: The Father of All Who Believe," NTS 41 (1995) 73. See also the discussion by Stan Stowers (Rereading Romans: Justice, Jews and Gentiles [New Haven: Yale, 1994] 227-50), whose work has been extrememly influential on my own. He does not follow Hayes' translation of 4:1, but nevertheless reads Romans 4 with an emphasis on Abraham's being the ancestor of Jews and Gentiles rather than the exemplar of justification by faith. See also my forthcoming article, "Paul as the New Abraham.".

sequence of events is to make Abraham the father of all who believe, the uncircumcised and the circumcised (4:11-12).

To put it succinctly, this chapter is Paul's proof that Gentiles and Jews are both descendants of Abraham, and, therefore, they are kin. As Stan Stowers aptly puts it,

> Romans does not wrestle with the problem of how God goes about saving the generic human being. Rather, it asks how families of people establish a kinship with God and with one another. Jews inherit a status as God's children (literally "sons") from generation to generation; other peoples do not. How do gentile peoples get into a family relation so that they can stand righteous before God rather than as enemies and aliens?[25]

While scholars recognize the paternal language, they assume Paul's language of ancestral connection between Abraham and the Gentiles is really analogical, metaphorical, and rhetorical; Paul is not literally claiming an ancestral connection between the two. In contrast, I contend that an ancestral connection is exactly what Paul is claiming. Before proceeding, however, it is worth providing my rendering of Rom 4:16-22.

> **Romans 4:16-22:** *16)That is why it depends on faith, in order that the promise will be guaranteed –according to grace – to all his descendants, not only to those who are descended from law, but also to those descended from the faith of Abraham, who is the father of us all. 17)As it is written, "I have made you the father of many nations" – in the presence of the God in whom he believed, who gives life to the dead and calls into existence the things that do not exist. 18)Hoping against hope, he believed that he would become "the father of many nations," according to what was said, "So numerous shall your*

[25] Stowers, Rereading Romans, 227.

descendants be." 19)He did not weaken in faith when he considered his own body, which was already as good as dead (for he was about a hundred years old), or when he considered the barrenness of Sarah's womb. 20)No distrust made him waver concerning the promise of God, but he grew strong in faith as he gave glory to God, 21)being fully convinced that God was able to do what he had promised. 22)Therefore his faith "was reckoned to him as righteousness."[26]

These verses are important because they give content to Abraham's faith. While traditional interpreters have too often assumed that Abraham's faith consisted in his personal belief or trust in God – in either case, an interior disposition positively directed toward God – here we have Abraham's faith specified: Abraham's act of faith is the conception of Isaac.[27] The quotations from Genesis are directly associated with Isaac's conception, but we do not need to depend on allusions. In vv. 19-20 Paul paraphrases the story. Abraham's act of faith is to start a family, and, as I will demonstrate momentarily, the progeny Abraham will produce through Isaac are the equivalent of God's heirs.[28]

Moreover, God's heirs in this case includes other "nations." Although it was not commonly emphasized, it was not unusual for Jewish interpreters to mention Abraham's being the father of Gentiles.[29] In some cases, Abraham was understood to be the ancestor of certain Gentiles to whom

---

[26] I have based my translation on the NRV, but have had to alter it substantially. All translations of Romans in this paper are taken from the NRSV and modified where indicated.

[27] See Stowers, Rereading Romans, 230.

[28] Cf. Eilberg-Schwartz (God's Phallus, 141), who says of the patriarchal narratives involving barren women and miraculous births, "the father God and son jointly participate in procreation."

[29] Even Ben Sira, who fundamentally thinks of Abraham as the father of the Jewish nation, introduces the patriarch by calling him "the great father of a multitude of nations" (44:19).

Jews could then claim a kinship relation.[30] What is unusual, however, is that Paul explicitly connects the promise that Abraham will be the father of many nations to the conception of Isaac. Although this linkage is unprecedented (at least to my knowledge), it makes exegetical sense, since the biblical story indicates that the promise for multitudinous progeny and heirs is fulfilled, at least initially, with the birth of Isaac. For Paul, Abraham's act of faith gives birth to Jewish and Gentile heirs within a coherent lineage; it marks the beginning of a line of descendants who will fulfill God's promises.

As will be seen fully when we come to 8:14-17, while Jews and Gentiles can be descendants of Abraham, receipt of divine inheritance depends upon being properly "adopted." Contrary to popular belief, I do not think Paul thinks that Jews are biological descendants (*kata sarka*, to use Paul's language), while Gentiles become descendants by "adoption" (*uiothesia*). He uses the term explicitly of Jews in Rom 9:4: "They are Israelites, and to them belong the adoption...." Paul does not use this term, either here or in Galatians (see Gal 4:5), as a way of emphasizing the Gentiles' lack of physiological connection to Abraham. The term means to become a son, with all the rights and privileges thereof.[31] Having the claim of inheritance to one's father's name and estate is of far greater significance in structuring patrilineal genealogy than mere biology. Paul makes this point clearly in 9:6-9.

> **Romans 9:6-9:** *But it is not as though the word of God had failed, for not all those descended of Israel belong to Israel, and not all of Abraham's children are his descendants, but "through Isaac your descendants shall be called." This means it is not the children of the*

[30] In 1 Macc 12:21 and Josephus, Ant. 12.226, Jews and Spartans are said to be kin because both are descended from Abraham.

[31] See the discussion by Carolyn Osiek, "Galatians," *Women's Bible Commentary*, eds. Carol Newsom and Sharon Ringe (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox, 1998).

> *flesh who are children of God, but the children of the promise who are counted as descendants. For the word of the promise is as follows: "At this time, I will come and a son will be born to Sarah."*

Physical descent does not make one a "son." If a Jew's status before God is not dependent on biological lineage, then surely such lineage is not required for Gentiles either. Jews who consider themselves descendants of Abraham do not hold this privilege by virtue of physical descent; otherwise Abraham's children by Hagar would be counted as heirs along with Sarah's, which neither Paul nor any other Jews of his time believed to be the case.

Although Paul does not mention Hagar in Romans, we know from Galatians 4, that Paul thought of Hagar and Sarah and their respective sons almost as antitypes of one another. Sarah's son, Isaac, and his descendants, are the children of promise. Hagar's son (who remains unnamed by Paul) is associated with slavery and the flesh. The conception of Isaac as narrated by Paul in Rom 4:19-20 mentions Abraham's advanced age and the barrenness of Sarah's womb. Mention of these details serves to emphasize the miraculous, to be sure, but also the non-fleshly nature of the conception. The reason for this, I think, is that Paul is describing the birth of God's heirs, not just Abraham's. In Rom 9:8, it is clear that children of Abraham (through Isaac) and children of God can be used interchangeably. When he says, "it is not the children of the flesh who are children of God, but the children of promise who are counted as descendants," he means that biological descent and ordinary human reproduction did not/cannot/will not bestow genealogical status requisite to being a member of God's family. Thus has Paul answered the question he posed in 4:1, "Is Abraham our father according to the flesh?"

Traditional interpreters have thought that Paul devalues genealogy.[32] Specifically, any claims to privilege because one is a "Jew by birth" are rendered meaningless. Even new perspective scholars in this way see Paul critiquing Judaism for its claims to ethnic privilege. But, to the contrary, lineage remains essential to Paul. To be sure, Paul is critiquing what he deems too narrow an interpretation of Abraham's patriline, particularly in the first half of chap. 4: The act of circumcision does not make one a legitimate heir of Abraham. But Paul's point is that lineage bestows the gift of grace upon the heir. Participation in the Abrahamic lineage is not something one can do for oneself (justification by faith notwithstanding[33]), because patrilines work by the father's bestowing his lineage, inheritance, name, etc., upon the son; a son cannot claim that inheritance for himself, it is the privilege of the father to give it.

IV

Rom 5:6,8-10: *6) For, while we were still weak, at the right time, Christ died for the ungodly. 8) But God proves his love for us in that while we were still sinners Christ dies for us. 9)Much more surely then, now that we have been justified by this blood, will we saved through him from the wrath (of God).*[34] *10) For if while we were enemies, we were reconciled to (by?) God through the death of his Son, much more surely, having been reconciled, will we be saved by his life.*

---

[32] Although he could hardly be called "traditional," this position is fully articulated by Eilberg-Schwartz in God's Phallus, 199-236.

[33] I follow the view of Richard Hayes and others that one is justified not by one's own faith, but by Jesus' faith. See Hayes, The Faith of Jesus Christ: An Investigation of the Narrative Substructure of Galatians 3:1-4:11 (SBLDS 56; Chico, CA: Scholars, 1983) and "Pistis and Pauline Christianity: What is at Stake?" Pauline Theology, Volume IV: Looking Back, Pressing On (Atlanta: Scholars, 1997) 35-60.

[34] "of God" is not in the Greek.

Commentators typically assume that Paul speaks here of believers (i.e., Christians). Their working Augustinian assumption is that the condition of all humanity is sinful. Furthermore, all are in the same kind of state of sinfulness, and therefore all require the same means of salvation. But I think it much more likely that the subject indicated is Gentile believers. Indeed, I find the suggestion that Romans 5-8 generally addresses concerns specific to Gentiles to be the most compelling way to understand these chapters in relation to the rest of Romans.[35]

Terms like "ungodly," "sinners," and "enemies" are terms typically used by Jewish authors to characterize Gentiles, and Paul is no different in this regard. The use of "ungodly," for example, appears in Rom 1:18, where it surely refers to the Gentile condition. It also appears in 4:5, where it implicitly refers to Abraham in his pre-circumcision state.[36] Although Jews could fall prey to sin, Paul does not regard them as "sinners" the way Gentiles are (as evidenced by Gal 2:15 where Paul uses the term to distinguish Gentiles from Jews: "We ourselves are Jews by birth and not Gentile sinners.") Because they stood within the promise of the covenant, Jews had a way to atone for sin, while Gentiles were defined as outside the covenant and therefore alienated from God.

That Paul uses the first person plural is no deterrent to this reading, because Paul typically uses rhetorical means to express solidarity with his Gentile followers. (Significantly, he switches to the second person in 6:11-23, precisely where he speaks vividly of those who were once "slaves of sin," and who yielded their members "to impurity and to greater and greater

[35] See Stowers (Rereading Romans, 248-60) whose work I am indebted to here.
[36] One way Abraham is understood to be father of Gentiles as well as Jews is that Abraham is both Jew and Gentile, and in post-biblical Judaism he is widely considered to be the first proselyte. See my discussion in "Paul as the New Abraham" and that of Edward Addams, "Abraham's Faith and Gentile Disobedience: Textual Links between Romans 1 and 4," JSNT 65 (1997).

iniquity." Again, while Jews sin, it is mainly Gentiles who Paul speaks of in such grave terms.) Besides, since the main thrust of Paul's argument in Rom 4 is that Gentiles can be part of the lineage of Abraham through Christ, Paul and his Gentile kin can be understood to share one collective identity. It is Jesus' death in particular that enables unity of Jew and Gentile. The language of joining and separating, clearly evident in v. 10, appears throughout the middle chapters of Romans. True, there is no mention of being joined to Abraham – Paul uses the language of being in Christ – in these chapters. Of course, the bringing in of the Gentiles into Abraham's lineage as described in Romans 4 is, theologically speaking, not merely for the sake of better relations between Jews and Gentiles, but for the sake of their salvation. They become members of God's family in order that they might partake of the inheritance God gratuitously bestows on God's heirs.

> **Rom 5:12-14**: *12) Therefore, just as sin came into the world through one man, and death came through sin, and so death spread to all because all have sinned – 13) sin was indeed in the world before the law, but sin is not reckoned when there is no law. 14) Yet death exercised dominion from Adam to Moses, even over those whose sins were not like the transgression of Adam, who is a type of the one who was to come.*

Ultimately, it is important to understand the role that gratuity plays in Paul's entire scheme in chaps. 5-8. Paul's reflections on the Adam-Christ typology in the second half of chap. 5 – which of course have led many to see these chapters as fundamentally concerned with the condition of universal humanity – is, at least partly, his way of explaining how human beings find themselves in circumstances not of their own making. As Stowers says, Paul's "main concern consists in showing how the actions of

one person can affect many."[37] This kind of thinking appears almost "natural" in a cultural context like Paul's, where the actions of an individual can affect, for better or worse, the status of the whole family. At the same time, as Charles Cousar avers, "But of course Adam and Christ are more than individuals; they incorporate in themselves all people. Each is the progenitor and prototype of all humanity. Through the one person death spreads to all; through the other person life comes to all."[38] In general I would agree (though, as I hope to make clear by the end, I do not think "progenitor" is an apt word for Jesus). Each one counts as the first man, marking the beginning of the age. Adam marks the beginning of the age of sin and death; while Christ marks the age of the "free gift" (*charisma*) and eternal life. But in the first age, as we saw in Romans 4, Abraham's faithful actions initiate a special lineage in spite of the Adamic situation. This lineage becomes the people Israel who eventually receive God's law and therefore develop a means of dealing with sin. This ability sets them apart from the other peoples who, because of Adam, remain enslaved to sin. Death may be a reality for everyone in the first age, Jews and Gentiles alike, but Jews, being children of God and able to abide the law, hold sin in check and are poised to receive their divine inheritance, whenever the time comes. In this sense, death cannot be said to hold dominion over Jews since the time of Moses (5:14), even though, as I imagine Paul recognized, Jews died just like everybody else.

Gentiles, on the other hand, remain slaves to sin. Nevertheless, following the logic of Romans 1-3 that God is impartial, they are technically as accountable to the law as are Jews (see esp. 2:14-15). Following cultural stereotypes, Paul regards Jews as "naturally" obedient, not because they

---

[37] Stowers, Rereading Romans, 254.

[38] "Continuity and Discontinuity: Reflections on Romans 5-8," in Pauline Theology, Volume. III, eds. David Hay & E. Elizabeth Johnson (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995) 203.

possess the law, but because they are the descendants of Abraham and have a kind of genetic edge, while Gentiles are disobedient because they have not heretofore had the benefit of participation in this blessed lineage. The purpose of Romans 6-7 is precisely for Paul to illustrate vividly through speech-in-character that when well meaning Gentiles try to engage the law they are indicted by the law. The law does not work for Gentiles because they are stuck in Adamic existence without the benefit of God-given grace, without the benefit that comes simply from being part of Israel.

With Christ comes the start of the new age. The new age means that it is time for God to make good on God's promises which for Paul means the promise of eternal life. But Christ, in making the transition from the old age to the new, makes possible the incorporation of outsiders (Gentiles) by means of his sacrificial death.

> ***Rom 8:3-4,14-17**: 3) For God has done what the law, weakened by the flesh, could not do: by sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, as a sin offering,[39] he condemned sin in the flesh, 4) so that the just requirement of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not according to the flesh but according to the Spirit.... 14) For all who are led by the Spirit of God are children of God. 15) For you did not receive a spirit of slavery to fall back into fear, but you have received a spirit of sonship.[40] When we cry "Abba!" "Father!" 16) it is that very Spirit bearing witness with our spirit that we are children of God, 17) and if children, then heirs, heirs of God and joint heirs with*

[39] The NRSV reads "and to deal with sin," but "sin-offering" is recognized an option by many commentators.

[40] The NRSV has "adoption," the RSV has "sonship." I have chosen sonship because it best captures the underlying assumptions of Paul's eschatological anthropology. I hope it is obvious that I have had to use sexist translations throughout this paper in order to make my argument.

Christ – if, in fact, we suffer with him so that we may also be glorified with him.

Paul's claim in Rom 8:3-4, which represents a kind of restatement of what he said in 3:21-26, is an articulation of Christ as sacrifice. But in distinction to 3:21-26, here Paul refers to Jesus as the "Son," and the discussion culminates with his declaration that they, the Gentiles, can now also claim God as "Father;" they have become joint heirs with Christ. Here one can see most clearly the paradigmatic connection between sacrifice and filial legitimation articulated by Nancy Jay.

Jesus' sacrifice expiates sin – Paul clearly describes the event explicitly as an expiatory sacrifice. In my view, this sacrifice atones primarily for the sins of Gentiles, those outside the protected covenant of Israel. At the same time, though it remains implicit, Jesus' sacrifice effects the joining of Jews and Gentiles, and as such it is a communion sacrifice. Both in 3:24-25 and here in chap. 8 the mention of Jesus' sacrifice appears within a context in which boundaries between Jews and Gentiles are being dissolved. In chap. 3 Paul reiterates that there is no distinction between Jew and Gentile; in chap. 8 he does not use the language of Jew-Gentile, but that of genealogical legitimacy. Gentiles receive the same "sonship" (8:15) that Jews already possess (9:4). Gentiles are joined to God's family because of Jesus' sacrificial death, which is so sure a guarantee that separation is no longer possible (8:33-39).

The reason law is an issue for Paul, both in chaps. 1-4 and chaps 5-8, is that it distinguishes Jews and Gentiles, and such distinctions are no longer acceptable if both kinds of people are to share the same lineage and its blessings. When Paul says "For God has done what the law, weakened by the flesh, could not do...," he means that the law could not achieve the expiation and communion achieved by Jesus' sacrificial death. Two reasons

inform this assumption. First, Gentiles who try to become Jews by taking on the law are unlikely to succeed – that is his point in Romans 6-7 – because Paul makes certain cultural stereotypes about Gentiles. Simply put, Gentiles cannot become Jews. Thus, the law will condemn them and the "distinction" between Gentiles and Jews will remain. Second, the law is designed to encourage personal responsibility and accountability for sin, but, while it enables knowledge of sin (7:7), it can never alleviate the human susceptibility to sin, because as long as one lives even partly in the flesh, sin's potential remains. Adam's shadow is cast over everyone, Jew and Gentile alike. Jewish privilege and the Jewish ability to cope with the sinful condition of flesh does not originate from the law, but from the Abrahamic lineage. The Mosaic law is given as a token of the divine grace that Israel already enjoys because of Abraham. What Gentiles need is the assurance that comes from being the seed of Abraham.

Since Abraham is nowhere explicitly in view in chaps. 5-8, and since Paul speaks repeatedly of being "in Christ," my claim that Gentiles need to participate in the seed of Abraham as part of their salvation needs some explanation. According to Stowers, the "faith of Christ"— understood as a subjective genitive – is analogous to the "faith of Abraham." Stowers refers to the faithful acts of both figures as "generative faithfulness,"[41] because God's response to their acts of faithfulness is to extend the blessing from the one to the many. What each of them does as individuals has ramifications for others who receive blessings not because of what they do, but because of what was done on their behalf.

In distinction to Stowers, I do not think the parallelism between Abraham and Christ can be extended very far. For Paul Christ is analogous to Adam. Adam and Christ, as discussed above, each inaugurate an age that

[41] Stowers, Rereading Romans, 230.

has general anthropological implications. Adam is associated with mortality, flesh, and sin. Jesus is associated with immortality, the spirit, and the removal of sin. Abraham, on the other hand, inaugurates a special lineage. He remains the essential patrilineal ancestor for those who will inherit the divine promises in either age. As Stowers himself says, "For Paul, Jews and gentiles are now related because Christ has made Abraham the father of gentiles, so that the two sets of peoples share the same progenitor."[42] To put it in terms consistent with the interpretation being offered here, Christ is the means by which Gentiles can claim Abraham as their ancestor and thereby inherit the Abrahamic promises.

Christ himself cannot be a progenitor and his faithful actions cannot be generative in the same way that Abraham's are (as described in Romans 4). Paul does not – perhaps cannot – view Christ as a founding father. Because Christ is quintessentially the Son, it would have been difficult to conceive of him as a father. Christ is the first born of the immortal, and believers are his "fellow heirs." Christ's death on the cross is an act of faith; like Abraham, Christ acted faithfully by following through with what God intended. But, while the language of faith is certainly important to Paul in conceptualizing his christology, Jesus' faith alone cannot explain why Paul sees a link between Jesus' death and the inclusion of Gentiles. Rather, it is the filial-sacrificial mechanism that results in the Gentiles' divine sonship. Jesus' death constitutes an act of sacrifice, and it is sacrifice that holds the power to rearrange the genealogical configuration between Jews and Gentiles and between people and God.

What distinguishes Jesus from Abraham and everybody else is that he is God's *Son* whom *God* puts forward as a sacrifice (3:25; 8:3). Thus it is an act of grace, generated by God the Father who sacrifices his first born on

[42] Stowers, Rereading Romans, 239.

behalf of others who will become his children as a result. Following the pattern of human patriliny, divine genealogical status is something one inherits from one's father at the father's discretion. One cannot achieve patrilineal status, it is gratuitously bestowed. A person does not become a "son of God" by mere achievement, but because God has made that person a member of the family. One does not achieve matrilineal status by one's own effort either, but the difference between matrilineal and patrilineal status is that a father can choose or not choose to incorporate a child into his family. Mother and child are simply linked through biology and the reality of childbirth. Patrilineage can only be granted by the father; it is his prerogative and his alone, which means it is completely independent of maternity and all the other limitations of human biology. Thus, it is no surprise that the means to immortality, which is ultimately what Paul means by being a "son of God," is achieved by the same patrilineal means that unite Jew and Gentile in Abraham. Participation in Christ's sacrificial rite, being "in Christ" not only bestows the Abrahamic patriline upon the participant, it dissolves all fleshly limitations (Gal 3:28) and thereby enables the realization of immortality.

In conclusion, the assumptions of patriliny make up the essential components of Paul's christology in Romans. In order to bring these assumptions to light, one must first understand the significance of Romans 4. Abraham may be exemplary in his actions, but Paul's descriptions in Romans 4 are not there so as to inspire imitation by others. Romans 4 proves that Abraham is the father of Gentiles as well as Jews – God made a promise guaranteeing that Abraham would be the father of many nations. Furthermore, being a member of Abraham's patriline really made one a member of God's own family. The promise to Abraham about being the

father of many nations, however, was not fulfilled until the sacrifice of Christ. Formerly, during the age of Adam, it remained in abeyance. Only one small nation, the Jews, enjoyed the benefit of being a descendant of Abraham. These Jews were given God's law, which increased the distinction between those favored by God, the Jews, and those who remained out of favor, Gentiles. In order to reconfigure the genealogical boundaries so as to include many nations in the divine patriline and thus fulfill the promise to Abraham, God offered the sacrifice of his own Son, who came in the flesh so as to obliterate the fleshly distinctions that separate people from one another, and human beings from God. Jesus' sacrifice could accomplish so transformative a task because it reflects the kind of sacrificial mechanism found in many cultures, a mechanism that alleviates the constraints of biology and human relations, truly a "remedy for having been born of woman." If it had not been for the patrilineal assumptions in the world of Hellenistic Judaism, where the primary theological construct was a single male deity unencumbered by a female consort, and where genealogical identity was constructed around the patriarch,[43] would Paul (and other early Christians) have envisioned the salvation of the world as having been achieved by a Father-God and the gratuitous sacrifice of his first born Son?

[43] In posing this question, I have been influenced by Eilberg-Scwhartz's observations in God's Phallus, that a single male deity created all kinds of problems in conceptualizing the workings of procreation and family relations.

THE GENDERED SINNER IN ROMANS 1-7

Teresa J. Hornsby
Drury University

Introduction

When Paul talks about sin and the sinner (ἁμαρτία and ἁμαρτωλός), which occur 51 times in the Roman epistle (45 of those occur in chapters 1-7), the modern reader may take for granted that he or she knows what Paul "means" simply because she or he is privileged to about two-thousand years of exegeses and conversations which concern the meaning of those words. After a brief survey and analysis of occurrences of ἁμαρτωλός that are contemporary with or prior to Paul's writings, I will look specifically at Paul's understandings of ἁμαρτία and ἁμαρτωλός in his letter to the Romans. My primary question is, is there an assumed, unspoken connotation of gender attached to the word? In an earlier work, I have concluded that a typically Aristotelian-based depiction of "sinner," which would influence first-century understandings of ἁμαρτωλός, posits an ideal, immovable mark against which all else is measured -- and the sinner misses that mark. Aristotle's "sinner" comes to represent all who fall short of the ideal -- an ideal that is imagined as masculine in Christianity. If the norm is indeed constructed with or perceived as a masculine ideal, deviation from that norm would acquire a greater degree of feminization, or, in other words, be understood as a "flawed masculinity." Thus, the binaries that Paul uses

frequently in Romans, "sinner/righteous" and "sinner/God," become not only strict oppositions but gendered, hierarchical ones as well. The added dimension of gender to an understanding of "sinner" in Paul provides insight to Pauline theology, particularly as he presents it in the letter to the Romans.

What follows first is a survey of how "the sinner" has been understood in Greek literature from the early Classical period through the first century. I apologize for the technical details, but from the necessary philology that follows, I intend to show that ἁμαρτωλός is defined as one who is always in opposition to the ideal; the sinner is perceived as being "off the mark." The "ideal" is expressed early on as societal assumptions about gender performance. As the idea "sinner" emerges in early Christian writings, it stands opposite to an "ideal" that is expressed in terms of heterosexual masculinity. Thus, the sinner, by its definitive relation to a masculine ideal, becomes "flawed masculinity," an ambiguous category that requires reconciliation. Paul's identification and "reconciliation" of the sinner in Romans 1-7, I will argue, is expressed primarily through assumptions of gender and gendered relationships.

A. Ἁμαρτωλός and Gender

1. Occurrences of Ἁμαρτωλός in Classical Greek Literature

Occurrences of ἁμαρτωλός and its variations outside Jewish and Christian texts are sparse.[1] There are only four known applications in Classical and Hellenistic Greek literature: Aristophanes' *Thesmophoriazusae* (1111); Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* 2:9:1-3; Philodemus Philosophus, *De Ira* ,[2] and Eupolis, fr. 24.[3] I have found that a closer look at the four Classical and Hellenistic occurrences of ἁμαρτωλός does indeed inform the reader about possible ways that Paul might have understood the word. For brevity's sake, I will address only two here.

Thesmophoriazusae (c. 415 BCE), one of Aristophanes' comedies, has the word ἁμαρτωλός in a farcical scene near the end. To set the stage, so to speak: earlier in the play Aristophanes writes, "a dramatic poet must submit to all the demands of his characters -- so, if he writes about women he must dress like a woman, and be a woman" (line 152). Later

[1] For example, ἁμαρτωλός does not appear at all in Philo, Josephus, Epictetus or other works of Stoicism.

[2] Karl Wilke, *Polistrati Epicurei [Peri alogou kataphroneseos]* (Lipsiae: B. G. Teubneri, 1905), 73

[3] Jan Demianczuk, *Supplementum comicum, Comoediae Graecae fragmenta post editiones Kockianam et Kaibelianam reperta, vel indicata* (Hildesheim: Georg Olms,

(1100 - 1134) he creates a comic encounter among Mnesilochos, who is dressed like a woman; Euripides, who is pretending to be an Echo; and a Scythian law officer. Euripides, noticing that Mnesilochos is in chains, remarks that he is grieved by seeing such a "sweet maid" (πάρθεν) manacled. The officer replies, "He is no sweet maid, he is a ἁμαρτωλός." Since Aristophanes' use of this word is the earliest that we know, to translate would be somewhat arbitrary. But at the very least, Aristophanes places ἁμαρτωλός as the antithesis of one who appears to be a πάρθεν, a young woman or virgin.[4] However, one cannot simply say ἁμαρτωλός is opposite of virgin, maiden, or young girl, since the label is actually given to a man. If the label had been given to a female character rather than to Mnesilochos, then the two terms, ἁμαρτωλός and πάρθεν, could be understood as direct opposites. Rather, according to Aristophanes' use, it would suffice to say that ἁμαρτωλός is descriptive of someone who pretends to be a maiden or a virgin.

1967). The complete fragment 24 is found in *Photius Berolinenis v. Reitzenstein, Anfang d. Lex. d. Photios:* 88,4.

[4] See H. G. Liddell and Robert Scott, *Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1940), 1339; Bauer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979), 627. I have found no commentary of *Thesmophoriazusae* that addresses the occurrence of ἁμαρτωλός. However, A. M. Bowie discusses the transgressiveness of this play, particularly in its playfulness with gender. *Aristophanes: Myth, Ritual, and Comedy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 205-227; on the sexual overtones of the crossdressing in *Thesmophoriazusae,* see J. Henderson, *The Maculate Muse* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1975), 134f.

Aristotle's mention of ἁμαρτωλός is as brief as the former. Aristotle writes, "moral virtue is a mean - a median (μέσον) between two vices: one of excess (ὑπερβολη) and one of deficit, or lack (ἐλλειψις)."[5] One should therefore aim for the mean and avoid the extremes. Quoting a line he attributes to Calypso, he warns sailors to "steer the ship of yonder spray and surge."[6] Odysseus is faced with the choice of going into the whirlpool and being consumed or steering closer to the monster Scylla, which would result in a lesser loss to him and his crew. Thus, with the warning, Odysseus is telling the navigator to avoid the excessive loss and choose instead the lesser.

Returning now to ἁμαρτωλός in *Thesmophoriazusae*, we find that the category of "excess" introduced by Aristotle provides a new interpretive frame. The crossdressing ἁμαρτωλός is certainly one who counters social norms. Mnesilochos personifies a commingling of "virtue," i.e., those things congruent with societal standards, in the socially acceptable gender markings (the woman's costume), and "vice" i.e., those things in opposition to societal standards, in the subversion of those gender markings through a drag performance. Further, Aristophanes makes explicit an idea

---

[5] Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*. H. Rackham, Editor (London: William Heinemann LTD, 1934)*2:9:2.*

[6] Homer, *The Odyssey*, 12.219. This remark is actually spoken by Odysseus as his ship approaches the whirlpool of Charybdis.

only shadowed in Aristotle: the ἁμαρτωλός is off center; if one assumes that the "center," or the standard by which all else is judged is perceived as a masculine ideal, an image on which Paul relies, then the ἁμαρτωλός by definition could in this case be gendered feminine. Mnesilochos is literally a ἁμαρτωλός, a feminized male.

This quick survey indicates that in the Greek Classical periods, ἁμαρτωλός carries an idea of being off the mark and in opposition to what is considered "normal" or acceptable.[7]

Whether or not Paul was familiar with any of these works is impossible to know. According to some scholars, Paul was well educated in Greek rhetoric; his rhetorical skills are, they claim, quite advanced.[8] Thus Paul may have been familiar with the use of ἁμαρτωλός in ancient Greek literature. On the other hand, Paul undoubtedly knew the Septuagint.[9] Because there are far too many occurrences of ἁμαρτωλός

---

[7] The occurrences of ἁμαρτωλός in Eupolis and in Philodemus are extremely brief; for the sake of brevity, I refer the reader to "The Gendered Sinner," Unpublished Dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 2000, for my complete comments on those works.

[8] Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Paul and His Theology* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1987), 29; Jürgen Becker, *Paul: Apostle to the Gentiles* (Louisville: Westminster/ John Knox Press, 1993), 34.

[9] E. P. Sanders best addresses Paul and his familiarity with the LXX in E. P Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985); see also Richard B. Hays, "The Role of Scripture in Paul's Ethics," Eugene H. Lovering, Jr. and Jerry L. Sumney, eds., *Theology and Ethics in Paul and His Interpreters* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1996), 30-47.

and ἁμαρτία to analyze each one in the present project, I confine my study to ἁμαρτωλός in selections from the Psalms and from Ben Sira.

2. Ἁμαρτωλός in the LXX

a. Psalms

Near scholarly consensus on the meaning of ἁμαρτωλός in the Septuagint is that the word means "the wicked." While some have tried to identify who "the wicked" are historically, as I show below, others have recognized that it is a variable that changes according to the subject. The relativist aspect of ἁμαρτωλός -- as with all words -- is a distinction that needs more attention not simply because "the sinner" is defined only in relationship to those things that occupy a central position of power, but because the word also takes on gendered and hierarchical value from that relationship. The production of "the sinner" as a label for one who is socially deviant is clearly observed in the Septuagint.

Ἁμαρτωλός occurs at least 143 times in the Septuagint.[10] Of these 143, seventy are found in the Psalms and thirty-nine in The Wisdom of Ben Sira (Sirach). In the LXX ἁμαρτωλός stands in the place of five different

[10] Ἁμαρτωλός occurs in Tobit two times, Wisdom of Solomon two times, Sirach thirty-nine times, and 1 Maccabees five times, Amos two times, Isaiah six times, Ezekiel three times, Daniel three times, Psalms seventy times, and Proverbs six times.

Hebrew roots: רשע, חטא, חנף, חרש, and רע.[11] The predominant number of translations are from only two roots, חטא and רשע, and without the witness of Psalms, ἁμαρτωλός represents the two almost evenly (thirteen are רשע and twelve are חטא). For example, all of the uses of ἁμαρτωλός in Amos are for חטא while four of the five occurrences of ἁμαρτωλός in Isaiah have translated רשע. Further, the Book of Job has twenty-five occurrences of רשע yet none is translated as ἁμαρτωλός. Since ἁμαρτωλός does not clearly represent a particular word or meaning outside Psalms or Sirach, this section will look specifically at the two books where ἁμαρτωλός most frequently occurs.

E. P. Sanders argues that given the total number of verses in which ἁμαρτωλός replaces רשע in the LXX, ἁμαρτωλός should be understood as "the wicked" and should be considered a technical term. David Neale concurs with Sanders on the first point but disputes Sanders's assertion that the understanding of wicked remains the same throughout Jewish and Christian literature. Neale, like Sanders, bases his argument (that ἁμαρτωλός equals "wicked") entirely on the frequency of times that ἁμαρτωλός replaces רשע in Psalms.[12] However, none mentions either

[11] Proverbs alone uses ἁμαρτωλός to translate four of these words.

that there are at least sixteen examples in Psalms where רשע is translated into other words besides ἁμαρτωλός or that רשע is not consistently translated as ἁμαρτωλός outside Psalms.[13] At best, one could make the argument that only for the Greek translator of Psalms, ἁμαρτωλός equals רשע. However, the examples of Pss 1:5 and 103 (104):35, where both חטא and רשע appear in the same verse and the translator chooses to replace חטא with ἁμαρτωλός rather than רשע, disputes even that. These two examples -- verses that include the two Hebrew words that are most often translated into ἁμαρτωλός, רשע and חטא -- provide test cases.

Neither Sanders nor Neale notes that when both words occur in a single Hebrew verse (e.g., Pss. 1:5; 104:35 [LXX 103:35]), the translator replaces חטא rather than רשע with ἁμαρτωλός. Neale and Sanders allow the sheer frequency of usage in Psalms stand as proof. It is true that by the numbers alone, the conclusion that the Psalmist equates ἁμαρτωλός and רשע seems secure, since out of the eighty-one times רשע occurs, sixty-nine are translated ἁμαρτωλός. But textual arguments and arguments

---

[12] Neale, *None But Sinners* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991), 76; Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism*, 177; See also James D. G. Dunn, "Pharisees, Sinners, and Jesus," in Jacob Neusner, Ernest Frerichs, Peder Borgen, Richard Horsley, Editors, *The Social World of Formative Christianity and Judaism*. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988), 274

about meaning should not be founded entirely on statistics, especially if even one example disputes the majority. The examples of Pss. 1:5 and 104:35 show that for the Psalmist, ἁμαρτωλός may have a general meaning of "the wicked" but the construction of these verses allows the translator to show a more nuanced meaning of ἁμαρτωλός.

Psalm 104 is in praise of YHWH's creation and care of the earth and of all life. Similar to Genesis 1, it describes in poetic language the separation of the waters from the earth (vv. 5-9), and the ordering and caring of the birds and beasts (11-13), as well as those things that bring pleasure to the human being: livestock and plants, wine and bread (14-16). [14] And like Genesis, the psalmist notes that the creation is all good. Everything is in order, and every creation exists for the benefit of every other living thing: the trees exist for the birds; the hills are for the goats; the rocks are refuge for the badgers (16-23). Verses 24-34 proclaim that YHWH has created everything and YHWH controls everything - and all is for the good.

---

[13] רשע is not translated to ἁμαρτωλοί in the following Psalms: 9:5; 10:13; 11:2, 5, 6; 12:8; 17:9, 13; 26:5; 31:17; 36:1; 37:28, 35, 38; 75:4; 104:35.

[14] In addition to shared themes, the two passages, Psalm 104 and Genesis 1, overlap on several key vocabulary words: עוף השמים (Ps. 104:12, Gn. 1:26); למועדים (Ps. 104:19, Gn. 1:14); חיתו (Ps. 104:11, 20, Gn. 1:24); עשב (Ps. 104:14, Gn. 1:11-2, 29-30); and מקום (Ps. 104:8, Gn. 1:9); On the similarities between the two passages, see P. Humbert, "La Relation de Genese 1 et du Psaume 104 avec la Liturgie du Nouvel-An Israëlite," in *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses* 15 (1935): 1-27; and A. Van der Voort, "Genese 1:1 a 2:4a et le Psaume 104," in *Revue Biblique* 58 (1951): 321-47. Van der Voort asserts that the Genesis passage is later and "reflects the use of

Throughout the Psalm, there is only praise and adoration for all life and a sense of rejoicing in it and worshipping YHWH for all creation.

Suddenly, in the final verse (104:35) the psalmist writes,

> יתמו חמאים מן־הארץ ורשעים ענד אינם
> LXX: Εκλείποισαν ἁμαρτωλοί ἀπό τῆς γῆς καί ἄνομοι ὥστε μή ὑπάρχειν αὐτούς.
>
> "Let sinners be consumed from the earth and let the wicked ones no longer exist."

In English יתמו in v. 35 may be translated as "let them be consumed" or "let them perish," or "let them be removed" but always with a sense of erasing "sinners" from the face of the earth. My first concern with these particular translations is that they are inconsistent with the theological and literary flow of the passage. Theologically, the author is praising God for the usefulness, connectedness, and wholeness of all creation. The interjection of a curse on sinners at this point is out of place. When the author curses sinners in other passages, the curse comes expectedly and follows a general theological theme, cf. 9:16-17; 10:12-18; 37:10-40. Stylistically, if one translates v. 35 as a curse, it radically departs from the motif of the rest of the passage. [15]

---

the psalm." Leslie C. Allen, *Psalms 101-150,* in David A. Hubbard, Glenn W. Barker, John D. W. Watts, eds. (Waco: Word Books: 1983), 31.

Considering the conclusions drawn above about ἁμαρτωλός as being off-center, missing the mean by excess or by defect, or being imperfect, perhaps there is a nuance in Psalm 104 that compelled the Greek editor to translate חת rather than רשע as ἁμαρτωλός. And if we recognized such a nuance, the English translation could be adjusted so that it communicates a meaning without corrupting the theological and literary integrity of the psalm.

The first problem is the word יחמו. To interpret its root (תמם) to mean "perish" or to be consumed or wiped out, as it is in the NRSV, KJV, and NIV, disrupts the theme and flow of the verse. Further, such a translation is not consistent with how the Psalms uses תמם elsewhere. Psalms never uses words formed from תמם to mean "to perish." Rather, אבד or דמה are used.[16] In Psalms words from the root תמם are used exclusively (and 104:35 would be the sole exception) to convey a sense of

---

[15] Though no one argues that Ps. 104:35 is not an original part of the rest of the hymn, several have noted that the verse is not exactly in sync with the rest of the passage. Leslie Allen, *Psalms 101-150,* 28, that verse 35 "falls outside the poetic structure of the psalm." Martin Dahood, (*Psalms,* Anchor Bible 16, 17, 17a [Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1966-70], 17:33) comments on the "oddness" of the language of v. 35 (cf. Hans-Joachim Kraus, *Psalms 60-150: A Commentary* [Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1989], 304).

[16] Psalms uses אבד twenty-six times (1:6; 2:12; 5:6; 9:3, 5, 6, 18; 10:16; 21:10; 31:12; 37:20; 41:5; 49:10; 68:2; 73:27; 30:16; 83:17; 92:9; 102:26; 112:10; 119:92, 95, 176; 142:4; 143:12; 146:4) and דמה twice (49:12; 49:20) to mean perish.

wholeness, of integrity, or of righteousness.[17] Though תמם is often translated as "wholly consumed" (usually by fire or famine) or "completely wiped out" (cf. Jer. 44 (51):12, 18, 27), even in this sense there remains a connotation of wholeness, of being completely subsumed. The essence of such a meaning is found most clearly in Jer. 6:29 and in Eze. 24:11. Here, the word תמם means "consume," but it is as a metalworker's fire consumes all the imperfections of a precious metal; "to consume" is to strip away the imperfections in order to purify. If we understand "sinner" to be representative of someone who falls short of perfection or wholeness or who is in opposition to righteousness, then the phrase in v. 35 could be read as "let the sinners be made whole" or "let the sinners be made righteous" or "let the sinners be made perfect." Thus, read with the final phrase "from the land," the theme of the entire psalm is preserved: all things that God has made are sustained by the land; therefore, let sinners (also) be made whole from the land, and let wickedness no longer exist."

The translator of the Psalms understands that there is a distinction between "sinners" and the "wicked," and when the translator must choose between the two, חטא is the better fit because its root also suggests

---

[17] Cf. perfection: 18:30, 32; 19:7; 37:7; 64:4; 101:2, 2, 6; 139:22; integrity: 7:8; 25:21; 26:1, 11; 41:12; 78:72; uprightness: 7:11; 11:2, 7; 18:23, 25, 25; 19:13; 37:18.

meanings such as "to purify, or "to bring into balance."[18] The choice of translation in v. 35 is due in part to the word תמם. If the author calls for wholeness or integrity, the translator recognizes that ἁμαρτωλός is the word that best communicates a sense of being imperfect, or being in opposition to perfection. תמם, then, should be read in Psalm 104:35 as a corrective to the imperfect - the off-center: the imperfect shall be made perfect; the defective shall be made whole; what is excessive shall be consumed (as per Jer. 6:29 and in Ezekiel 24:11).

In Psalm 1:1, 5, both חטא and רשע are present. Again, the translator uses ἁμαρτωλός to replace חטא rather than רשע. And immediately preceding v. 5, Ps. 1:4 describes the wicked and the sinners with an image of the chaff being driven away by the wind. Verse 1:5 concludes that the sinners (ἁμαρτωλοί) will not stand in the gathering of the righteous.[19]

---

[18] For example, according to *The New Brown, Driver, and Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament,* edited by Francis Brown with the cooperation of S. R. Driver and Charles A. Briggs (Lafayette, Ind.: Associated Publishers and Authors, 1981), 308, חטא can mean "to purify (eleven times), cleanse (eight times), purge (once), reconciliation (once). Gesenius' *Lexicon* also lists one of its meanings as "to expiate, to cleanse:" Samuel Prideaux Tregelles, *Gesenius' Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament Scriptures* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971), 271.

[19] Peter C. Craigie (*Psalms 1-50,* David A. Hubbard, Glenn W. Barker, John D. W. Watts, eds. [Waco: Word Books: 1983]), sets up these Psalms in the following relationship: "1) the solid foundation of the righteous (1:1-3); 2) the impermanence of the wicked (1:4-5); 3) a contrast of the righteous and the wicked (1:6)" (59).

The prevalent understanding of ἁμαρτωλός in Psalms is clearly "one who stands over and against the righteous." Whenever this particular connotation is the only one present in a verse, the LXX replaces either חטא and רשע with ἁμαρτωλός. However, when both words are present, the translator chooses to use ἁμαρτωλός for חטא because ἁμαρτωλός preserves the nuance of imperfection. The Psalmist, in the examples above, does not call for the destruction of the sinners, but for their justification. The term ἁμαρτωλός and the images of chafing wheat and purification by fire form the idea that the sinner should be made whole or should be made perfect by doing away with the imperfections, with the primary objective being to bring the sinner into "normal" or "proper" society. We will see the same image made even more explicit in Ben Sira.

b. The Wisdom of Ben Sira (Sirach)

I have argued that ἁμαρτωλός carries a connotation of "missing the mark," of being imperfect or off center due to defect or to excess, and above all, it is descriptive of social deviance. Ἁμαρτωλός is a highly derogatory term used to label those in opposition to "the righteous," though of course the terms exist in a dialectical relationship and are relative rather than absolute. Neale notes: "In Psalms 'sinner' has been applied to the

enemies of Israel, the Psalmist's personal enemies, Israelites who have gone astray, and all who have turned away from God."[20] There is no doubt that "sinner" represents "the unrighteous:" "Just as the righteous represent those who do God's will, the sinners are those who represent a whole complex of behavior that is opposed to God and his ways."[21] But, as I have shown, there is more to the meaning of ἁμαρτωλός. The distinction between the ἁμαρτωλοι and the ἀνομοί (the wicked or the lawless) should not be glossed over. The distinction between the two, i.e., that one, ἁμαρτωλοί, has a connotation of imperfection, is important enough that the translator of Psalms deviated from a standard translation decision, one that he or she had made at least fifty times prior to 103:35 (LXX), to preserve the connotation necessary for the passage's theme. For Ben Sira, the theme of excess is sometimes present, but Ben Sira accents the identification of the sinner as someone who is in sharp contrast to the righteous.

Ἁμαρτωλός occurs in Sirach at least thirty-nine times, and the Hebrew words it translates are numerous. The translator(s) are not particular, it seems, about which Hebrew word is replaced by ἁμαρτωλός. It appears that for the translator(s), the strongest criterion for rendering

---

[20] Neale, *None But Sinners*, 78.

[21] Neale, *None But Sinners*, 95.

ἁμαρτωλός is that it should represent those in opposition to "the righteous" or "the good" (e.g., 12:4; 13:17; 15:7,9; 16:13; 19:22; 21:6; 33:14; 41:6 *et al.*); if a thought, word, or deed is described as good, righteous, or wise, the sinner is one who does the opposite. Whether the Hebrew word for "wicked" or "lawless" or "transgressor" is used seems to make no difference. If the one being described stands in opposition to desired or normative behavior, then Ben Sira's translator uses the word ἁμαρτωλός.

The modern word that best describes the representation of the "sinner" in the Greek Ben Sira is "deviant." The "deviant" is that person who is in opposition to socially accepted standards; he or she deviates from the norm.[22] Though it may seem that the translator chooses ἁμαρτωλός without discretion, he or she preserves the underlying meaning of all the Hebrew words ἁμαρτωλός replaces. While Ben Sira may have chosen to use חטא or רשע, the essence of their meanings is that each is in opposition to "right" behavior; the translator preserves this essence through the use of ἁμαρτωλός.

---

[22] I am using "deviant" to mean that which exists apart from what is socially acceptable behavior. See David P. Aday, *Social Control at the Margins: Toward a General Understanding of Deviance* (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing, 1990); Erdwin H. Pfuhl, *The Deviance Process* (New York: van Nostrand, 1980).

If Ben Sira has central concerns, it is to do everything in moderation and conform to societal standards. As in the poem of chapter 39, all things are good things, but all have the potential to be harmful (to one's health, soul, reputation, for example). For Ben Sira all behavior that is the antithesis of what is proper belongs to the "sinner." For Ben Sira, the righteous and wise are always in opposition to the sinner, and if the two mingle, the righteous becomes sinful. It is clear that Ben Sira understands "the sinner" and "the righteous" to be categories of human beings – an understanding that Paul, as we shall see, does not share.

3. Ἁμαρτωλός in First-Century, Non-Canonical Writings

There are few non-canonical or non-Christian occurrences of ἁμαρτωλός that are more or less contemporary with Paul's letter to the Romans. Ἁμαρτωλός does not occur in any form, for example, in Josephus, Philo, Pliny the Younger or in any of the Stoic philosophers, nor does it occur in the later letters of Polycarp or Ignatius. Ἁμαρτωλός does occur fairly often in the some of the other writings of the mid-second century. For example, some form of ἁμαρτωλός occurs six times in the Shepherd of Hermas (~140ce) and five times in Epistle of Barnabas (~130ce).

The only example in which ἁμαρτωλός occurs in writings certainly within the first century (apart from the canonical gospels) are Plutarch (~75ce), Clement's First Letter to the Corinthians (~96ce), and the "Apocalypse of Moses," which is also called the "Lives of Adam and Eve." For the sake of brevity (too late!) I will focus on only two: "The Lives of Adam and Eve" and "The Shepherd of Hermas."

a. The Lives of Adam and Eve

Ἁμαρτωλός appears twice in "The Lives of Adam and Eve" (hereafter, *Vitae*).[23] Though there is no agreement about its date, M. D. Johnson places its composition at the end of the first century CE, which would make the apocalyptic-style narrative roughly contemporary with the Letter to the Romans.[24]

The story begins when Adam is ill and dying. He makes it clear that sickness and death are the results of Eve's disobedience of God (6:7). Adam sends Seth and Eve back to paradise to find a special oil of anointing that will relieve his pain (9:4). Adam instructs Eve to put dirt (γῆν) on her head and weep so that God will hear her (9:3). But when Seth and Eve get

---

[23] There are both Greek and Latin versions of "The Lives of Adam and Eve."

[24] M. D. Johnson, translator and introduction, "The Life of Adam and Eve," in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, 2 Volumes, James H. Charlesworth, ed. (New York:

to paradise, the angel Michael is there to tell them that they cannot have the oil to anoint Adam; the oil can only be used on the day of the resurrection. On that day, he explains, there will be no more sinners (ἐξαμαρτάνοντες). The sinners are not destroyed but are converted into righteousness; their "evil hearts" are replaced with "good hearts" (13:5). When Eve returns to Adam, he insists that she tell their children and their grandchildren how she was tempted by the serpent in paradise. She tells the story of the snake, of her transgression of God's commandment, and her expulsion from the garden. Eve tells everyone that when she ate from the tree, she realized that she was "naked of the righteousness with which she had been clothed" (20:5). As she transgresses God's commandment not to eat from that tree, she loses her status as "righteous" and is separated from the ones who remain righteous: God and Adam.

When Eve finishes telling her story, she first asks Adam to kill her so that God will return to Adam (29). When Adam refuses, saying that to kill Eve would be like killing a part of himself, she goes off and weeps (κλαίω) and declares all her transgressions (32). This section, 32, is commonly referred to as "Eve's Repentance." Eve prays to God: "Father of everything, I have sinned, I have sinned against you, I have sinned against the holy elect, I have sinned against the cherubim, I have sinned against the

---

Doubleday, 1985), volume II, 249-295. These two works, Romans and *Vitae,* were probably written about forty years apart.

throne, I have sinned, Lord, I have sinned against all." Just as Eve finishes her confession to God, an angel comes to tell her that Adam has died, so we do not know at this point in the narrative if God reacts to Eve.

Eve dies six days after Adam. As she is dying, she prays to God to be buried with Adam: "Do not separate me from the body of Adam; for you made me from his members; but rather consider me worthy, even me, unworthy and sinful (ἁμαρτωλός), to be buried near his body" (42:15). Eve is buried with Adam at the end of the narrative.

For the author of the *Vitae*, ἁμαρτωλός is one who disobeys God and breaks one of the commandments (11:2). The ἁμαρτωλός is in opposition to the righteous. And, obviously, the sinner is a woman. Eve knows that after she sinned, the "clothing of righteousness" was removed. And, as John Levison points out, Eve identifies "glory" with righteousness (20:1-2); everything she does in the narrative, including her transgression, is to participate in the glory (the righteousness) of God.[25] Eve sees herself as a sinner both worthy and unworthy (42:6) to be joined with God's righteousness. There is a subtle implication throughout the narrative that Adam is still righteous -- or at least, is more righteous than Eve -- and Eve despairs that because she is a sinner, she will be forever apart from Adam

---

[25] John R. Levison, "The Exoneration of Eve in the Apocalypse of Moses," in *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Periods*, 29 (1989), 135-150.

(29:15; 42:6). Michael assures her that in the day of the resurrection, the sinner becomes righteous. Thus, ἁμαρτωλός here, as in the previous examples, is not a fixed category but one that exists in opposition to the righteous and can be eventually transformed into a righteous person. Though "sinner" here is described in positions very similar to those of the Psalms and of Ben Sira, the idea emerges that God is righteous (perfect) and that humans, men and women -- men to a lessor degree -- fall short of that mark.

Eve's acknowledgment of her sins and her subsequent burial with Adam suggest that she (as a character) is redeemed. Though she is blamed for all the world's sorrows, Eve also represents all the sinners who are made righteous -- united again with the one from which they had deviated.[26] The representatives of righteousness in this narrative are both male: God is the mac-daddy of righteousness, and the righteousness of Adam, as is the righteousness of the human male, is liminal: it is not as "sinful" as a woman but certainly not the perfect righteousness of God.

---

[26] Levison comments on Eve's redemption in "The Exoneration of Eve," 141.

b. The Shepherd of Hermas

Though there is near consensus for a mid-second-century date for "The Shepherd,"[27] there is one discussion of "sinner" that makes a connection between masculinity and righteousness explicit.

Though Hermas says categorically that one cannot distinguish between "the righteous" and the "sinners," he does make a distinction through their reproductive potential:

> He showed me many trees, without leaves, which appeared to me to be as if barren, for they were all alike. And he said to me, do you see these trees? I said yes, lord, and I see that they are all alike and barren (ξηρα). And he answered me and said, these trees which you see are they who dwell in this world. I said, Why, lord, are they barren and all alike? He said because in this world, neither righteous nor sinners are distinct (φαίνονται) but all are alike. For this world is winter for the righteous and they are nondistinct (οὗ φαίνονται), though they are living with sinners. For just as in the winter the trees which have shed their leaves are alike, and it is not apparent which are barren and which are alive, so in this world neither the righteous nor the sinners are apparent, but all are alike (Sim. 3:1-3)

---

[27] The latest possible date for "The Shepherd" is set by its mention in the Muratorian canon where the canon's editors reject it because it was "written quite recently, in our own time in the city of Rome, by Hermas, while his brother Pius [c. 148 CE] was sitting on the throne of the church of the city of Rome." Kirsopp Lake, "The Shepherd of Hermas," E. Capps, T. E. Page, and W. H. D. Rouse, eds., *The Loeb Classical Library: The Apostolic Fathers*, Two Vol. (London: William Heinemann, 1924), 2:2-3; Graydon F. Snyder, "Hermas' The Shepherd," David N. Freedman, ed. *Anchor Bible Dictionary*, Six Volumes (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 3:148. John Christian Wilson, on the other hand, argues that "The Shepherd" may have been written as early as 80CE. *Toward a Reassessment of the Shepherd of Hermas: Its Date and Its Pneumatology* (Lewiston: Mellen Biblical Press, 1993), 9-61.

Though this passage maintains the opposition of "the righteous" and "the sinner," Hermas' guide tells him that one cannot distinguish between the two *in this world.* The guide maintains that there is a distinction among human beings but one cannot manifest his or her righteousness until they leave "this world." In the section that follows, Sim. 4:1-8, Hermas is told that there will come a time when one will be able to know which is which; the sinners will be "fruitless" (ἄκαρποι) and therefore Hermas should be "fruitful" (καρποφόρησον) so that he will not look like a sinner (Sim. 4:5).[28] Thus, a mark of the sinner is the inability to "produce fruit." If the accepted gender role (for either male or female) is to reproduce, this is an explicit charge of impotency and a connotation of demasculinization for the male; for the female sinner, it is also a charge that she is not fulfilling the expected and "normal" role of her gender. The sinner in "The Shepherd" is understood not specifically as flawed masculinity, but as an ambiguous gendered category: as one who does not conform to expected, socially constructed gender roles.

4. The Sinner as Femme

Through two examples from Classical literature, two examples from the LXX, and two examples from the literature of the first and early second

centuries, I have argued that there are two primary connotations of ἁμαρτωλός. The most obvious one is also the most accepted meaning: the sinner always stands in opposition to the righteous (or to social norms), even though the categories "sinner" and "the righteous" shift according to context. This particular connotation has its strongest evidence in the Psalms and in Ben Sira, and it remains strong in the literature contemporary with Romans.

Further, I have argued that "sinner" also has a sense of "missing the mark," and, as Aristotle first articulated, the "mean" is perfection and the sinner is either excessive or defective. For the psalmist, the act of justification or purification occurs by taking away all that is excessive (everything beyond what is necessary, anything that corrupts what is considered pure, whole or perfect). And within both of these groups – Classical Greek and LXX – "the sinner" and "the righteous" are categories of human beings. As we approach the literature of the first century, the categories begin to become more ambiguous.

A typically Aristotelian depiction of "sinner" posits an ideal, immovable mark against which all else is measured. However, Aristotle's concept of the logical and biological ideal is invested with what he identifies

[28] All six occurrences of ἁμαρτωλός are in the passages mentioned above (Man 2; Sim. 3, Sim. 4).

as masculine traits.[29] Aristotle's "sinner" comes to represent all who fall short of the ideal, yet he makes that ideal masculine. This image of the "ideal" as perfect male is made explicit in "The Lives of Adam and Eve." God becomes the personification of perfect righteousness and the humans represent sinners (though Adam retains, as a man, an essence of righteousness). The connotations of sinner in the Psalms and in Ben Sira assume that there is an ideal standard as well, but the standard is defined by those who are in the center -- all else by comparison is imperfect.

"The sinner," traditionally, is everything the good person, or the normal person, or the pure person is not. The sinner is perceived particularly as someone who does not conform to his or her prescribed social roles. But above all, the norm (or the pure, or the good) is constructed as a masculine ideal --principally in the development of Hellenism. Full-blown in Christian scripture, the masculine ideal is realized as God the husband, God the father, God the son, God the judge, God the king. Thus, deviation from that ideal would acquire a greater degree of

---

[29] On Aristotle's perception of a gendered rational and biological ideal, see Marguerite Deslauriers, "Sex and Essence in Aristotle's Metaphysics and Biology," in Cynthia A. Freeland, Editor, *Feminist Interpretations of Aristotle* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1998), 138-67; Kathleen C. Cook, "Sexual Inequality in Aristotle's Theories of Reproduction and Inheritance," in Julie K. Ward, editor, *Feminism and Ancient Philosophy* (New York: Routledge, 1996), 51-67; Marcia Homiak, "Feminism and Aristotle's Rational Ideal," *Feminism and Ancient Philosophy,* 118-37; Charlotte Witt, "Form, Normativity, and Gender in Aristotle: A Feminist Perspective," *Feminist Interpretations of Aristotle*, 118-37.

feminization. For a man to be called a sinner in Hellenistic Christianity might have suggested not only alienation from God as a theological concept but also could imply distance from the masculine ideal. If, for example, women are understood as imperfect males, as Aristotle implies,[30] then women by definition are always "sinners," and the sinner is more of a woman than the non-sinner.

In the Psalms and Ben Sira, which suggest that "sinfulness" is always in opposition to righteousness, there is a clear chasm between those who are sinners and the righteous ones. I detect anxiety, however, in "The Shepherd of Hermas" as it introduces the idea of less-than-ideal masculinity and femininity: the impotent male, the barren female. As the shepherd tells us explicitly that the sinner is unable to produce fruit, the ambiguous categories connect the sinner to an image of sexual dysfunction. Likewise, the *Vitae* implies that Adam is in a liminal space: he is human and unable to be wholly righteous (as God is righteous) but he is male and certainly more righteous than Eve. And Eve's liminality is that she is a wife who cannot be with her husband. The option then presents itself that human beings can

---

[30] Thomas Laqueur best argues that Aristotle's notion of biological equality rests on a masculine ideal. See Thomas Laqueur, *Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992), 25-35; See also Bernadette Brooten, *Love Between Women*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996), 157n.

become righteous and reconciled with God. Human reconciliation with God is a theme that comes up early in Paul's letter to the Romans.

B. Paul and the Sinner in the Letter to the Romans

Only in Paul's writings do the separate images of "the sinner as not-righteous" and "God as masculine ideal" begin to erupt into a theology that implies that "sinner" = not-masculine. As Paul conjures up, again and again, "male" metaphors for God (the images of God as father, God as son[31]; God as one who adopts us[32]; God as judge;[33] or God as king[34]), metaphors, symbols, and other signifiers of individuals in general become feminized and rendered as ambiguous in relation to the idea of masculine perfection.[35]

---

[31] For example, see Gal. 1:1, 3; Phl. 2:11; 1 Th. 1:1; Rom. 1:7, 6:4, 8:15, 15:6; 2 Cor. 1:19; Gal. 2:20.

[32] Rom. 8:12-17, 23. Only males could adopt by Roman law. See J. M. Scott, *Adoption as the Sons of God* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1992), 9; David John Williams, *Paul's Metaphors* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1999), 83 n135. Closely related to Paul's metaphors of "adoption" is his rhetoric of inheritance. God is envisioned, it seems, as an elite landowning male who bestows his possessions on sinners. See Gal. 4:1, 7.

[33] Rms. 3:21-26; 4:5, 8:30,33. This metaphor is implied through the idea that God "justifies" or "reconciles" the sinner. See Williams, *Paul's Metaphors*, 144-7, on Paul's use of the image of "God as judge."

[34] Rms. 14:7; 1Cor. 4:20; 6:9,10; 15:24, 50; Gal. 5:21; 1 Th. 2:12.

[35] Howard Eilberg-Schwartz discusses various problems that result from imagining God as divine masculinity, among which are the feminization of the male worshipper and the devaluation of the feminine overall. *God's Phallus and Other Problems for Men and Monotheism* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1994), 141-2.

The binary "sinner/righteous," so strong in Psalms and in Ben Sira as it divides human beings into categories, emerges in Paul's letters, particularly in Romans, as a category that separates God from human beings. While one might understand such a move as theologically divisive, or, at least, potentially destructive in its vertical, hierarchical construct, the act of grouping all humans together -- that is, both the Gentile and Jewish Christians of the Roman community – may also function as a way to blur internal differences. The result is that all humans are united under the guise of imperfection. Thus, when Paul says, "all have sinned and have fallen short of the glory of God," (3:23) he is being quite literal: God is perfection -- that is, perfect masculinity (whatever that is) -- and the rest of us are sinners -- that is, we are not perfectly masculine. The category of "flawed masculinity" becomes doubly problematic for men, as Eilberg-Schwartz has already suggested.[36] Human masculinity exists as an ambiguous category that is not within masculinity (as God is masculine) and not femininity (as woman is feminine).[37] In Romans, Paul seeks, I think, to remove the gendered ambiguities.

---

[36] Ibid.

[37] I am not saying that there are only two genders; I am saying that Paul's historical and social context would have recognized only two "natural" genders: male and female.

In Romans 3, where Paul first uses the words ἁμαρτωλός and ἁμαρτία in that letter (3:7, 9, respectively), he speaks in binaries: human injustice versus God's justice (3:5); human falsehood versus God's truthfulness (3:7); human evil as opposed to God's goodness (3:8). Whereas the writers of Psalms and Ben Sira talked about sin/righteousness as categories of humans, Paul uses the dichotomies as separators of humans and God. Paul declares "all, both Jews and Greeks, are under the power of sin: there is no one who is righteous, not even one (3:9-10)." For Paul, the relationship that defines "sinner" is not just one of a "good" or "normal" person against one who deviates from that norm -- or, in other words, Paul's "sinner" does not simply mean "not righteous." Rather, Paul's definition of sinner emerges as "not-God."[38] Though sinner does suggest "not righteous" for Paul in general, he has already declared that only

---

[38] E. P. Sanders points toward this distinction between what he calls the righteousness terminology of Palestinian Judaism and Paul's use of the term "righteousness": "Most succinctly, righteousness in Judaism is a term which implies the *maintenance of status* among the group of the elect." E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism,* 544. Sanders's comments reflect "the new perspective" of Paul's understandings of justification: Paul is concerned with the unification of a community that contains both Jewish and gentile Christians – as opposed to drawing sharp distinctions between those who keep the Law and those who do not. See also J. D. G. Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Grand Rapids: Eerdman's, 1998), 334-340; Stanley K. Stowers, *A Rereading of Romans: Justice, Jews, and Gentiles* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994); Mark D. Nanos, *The Mystery of Romans: The Jewish Context of Paul's Letter* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996); William S. Campbell, *Paul's Gospel in an Intercultural Context: Jew and Gentile in the Letter to the Romans* (New York : P. Lang, 1991).

God is righteous (3:9-10; 3:23). If one is not God, then one is not righteous, i.e., a sinner.

Chapter 3 of Romans not only introduces the words "sin" (3:9,20) and "sinner" (3:7) but is a conclusion to an argument Paul weaves throughout chapters 1 and 2. Paul first claims that all *gentiles* are separate from God – one piece of evidence of their idolatry is found in their homoeroticism (1:18-32);[39] then Paul claims that all *Jews* are separate from God -- one evidence of their idolatry[40] is circumcision without keeping all

---

[39] It is questionable if Paul is indeed talking about homoeroticism in this passage. For the sake of argument, I will begin with the premise that he is. See William Countryman, *Dirt, Greed, and Sex* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988), 97-123. One of Paul's primary concerns in both Romans 1:18-24 and Romans 7 is idolatry. On Romans 1, Daniel Patte and Franz Leenhardt have convincingly argued that Paul understands that God may be known to an extent in God's creations. Leenhardt notes that humanity has the capacity to have knowledge of God but has refused the "real and valid knowledge which God offered them." Franz Leenhardt, *The Epistle to the Romans* (London: Lutterworth Press, 1961), 64-5; For Leenhardt, the result of human blindness to God is the inability to discern what is natural from what is perverse. Patte understands God's knowableness similarly. He writes, "What is knowable about God is manifest (or "plain")...He makes himself known... In sum, God manifests himself in the world in such a way that any human being can clearly perceive and know him." Daniel Patte, *Paul's Faith and the Power of the Gospel* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983), 258-9. Patte and Leenhardt define idolatry as not knowing the real, the natural in God's creatures. Therefore, how can humanity know what is "natural" concerning anything else? "They corrupt the human body and human relations which were supposed to be manifestations of God's power and deity" (Patte, 261-2). In other words, God may be known through the natural, which is a part of God's ordering of the universe, but God cannot be known in disorder and in those things that the human has rendered "unnatural."

[40] In addition to those unnatural and idolatrous images named in Romans 1:23, Patte also suggests that Paul views the Jewish understanding of Torah as idolatrous; it is the same type of misrecognition of God's presence as found in the images of chapter 1. Patte writes, "This enslavement to the Law has the same effect upon the Jews' life that the enslavement to idolatry has on the pagans. The pagans follow the demands of their

the Law (2:17-29); and finally, chapter 3 concludes that the *whole world* is separate from God and in need of justification, or reconciliation.

While the message that "the whole world is in need of justification" can be considered as one of community unification,[41] Paul's use of the example of homoeroticism and circumcision so early in Romans (chapters 1-3) betrays, I think, a subliminal tendency to think of sin in terms of "imperfect masculinity" (as Paul understands it).[42]

As others have already observed, Paul certainly personifies sin (just as he personifies God).[43] For example, according to Paul in Romans, sin is embodied (6:6), sin holds us captive (3:9; 5:21; 6:7; 6:16-23, 7:26), sin was born (5:12), sin deceives and kills (7:11). And, beginning in chapter six, Paul sets up parallels between God and sin: in 6:13, Paul tells the Romans to "no longer present your members as instruments of wickedness," but "present your members to God as instruments of righteousness." In 6:16-

---

bodies - this part of the creation out of which they made an absolute - because they believe that in so doing they do good... Similarly, the Jews follow the demands of the Law - this revelation that they received from God and out of which they made an absolute - because they believe that in so doing they do good." Patte, 263.

[41] Brooten comments on the "boundary-blurring potential" of homoeroticism within Paul's Roman community. See Brooten, *Love Between Women,* 361.

[42] On the relationship between circumcision and reduced masculinity, see Eilberg-Schwartz, *God's Phallus,* 157; 229-30; *The Savage in Judaism* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990), 141-77.

[43] Dunn, for example, comments on Paul's personification of sin in *The Theology of Paul the Apostle,* 111-14.

23, Paul portrays sin and God as slave-masters, so to speak: "But now that you have been freed from sin and enslaved to God, the advantage you get is sanctification" (6:22). Paul continues a parallel of sin and God in chapter seven. Paul writes, for example, "With my mind, I am a slave to the law of God, but with my flesh I am a slave to the law of sin (7:26). Not only does Paul parallel God and sin, he also aligns God with mind and sin with body – an idea that Paul develops throughout chapter 7. Though I hesitate to restate that in the Western discourse of philosophy and gender, mind/soul = male, and body = female,[44] I will. Boyarin makes the association clear when he writes,

> [Genevieve] Lloyd has shown how this dualism [of universal mind and socially marked body] became rewritten historically such that the universal mind came to be identified as male, while the engendered body became female.[45]

Since Paul personifies God with gender, it should come as no surprise that the personification of God's antithesis would be gendered as well. More, if

---

[44] I hesitate because, to paraphrase Judith Butler, when I restate women's perceived connection with the body, I perpetuate that connection.

[45] Daniel Boyarin, *Galatians and Gender Trouble: Primal Androgyny and the First-Century Origins of a Feminist Dilemma* (Berkeley: Center for Hermeneutical Studies, 1995), 2; He cites Genevieve Lloyd, *The Man of Reason: "male" and "female" in Western Philosophy* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984), 7.

God's gender is perfect masculinity, the gender of sin would have to be imperfect masculinity.

That Paul unconsciously connects the sinner with "imperfect masculinity" becomes explicit in 7:2-6 when he uses a woman as a metaphor for "one who knows the Law." (7:1). Paul describes a woman who is "bound by law" to her husband until he dies. Once he is dead, she is free to marry another man. He writes, "in the same way, you have died to the law through the body of Christ, so that you may belong to another, to him who has been raised from the dead in order that we may bear fruit for God" (7:4). Yet, one of the problems with defining sinner as "imperfect masculinity" is that one should have some idea what "masculinity" is. The idea "masculinity" mutates from culture to culture, even from person to person. As a general rule, it is safe to say that conformity to socially produced gender roles was a chief concern in the minds of early Christian writers. For example, David J. A. Clines has suggested that the "literary portraiture" of Jesus conforms to popular Greco-Roman notions of ideal masculinity.[46] Clines offers a partial list of what he identifies as "traditional male traits," which raises a whole other set of issues, but Clines does note that the one standard by which masculinity is invariably measured is against

[46] Clines, David J. A., "*Ecce Vir*, or, Gendering the Son of Man," Cheryl Exum and Stephen D. Moore, Editors, *Biblical Studies/Cultural Studies* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 352-375.

femininity: "The primary rule," he says, "is don't be female."[47] OK. But what does that mean? According to Bernadette Brooten, one dominant characteristic of what was considered to be the natural, gendered order, is that being female is being the passive, physical partner: "the male is naturally active and females naturally passive."[48] Others have argued that central to masculinity is the ability to reproduce; impotency suggests flawed masculinity.[49] Brooten goes on to argue that the protests in early Christian writings against homoeroticism were actually provoked by perceived transgressions of "natural" gender roles. Not only would Paul perceive homoeroticism as unnatural, he would also find it, particularly male homoeroticism, as a trope for imperfect masculinity. Paul provides the remedy for flawed masculinity in chapter 5.

Paul tells the Roman church that because Christ has died for the sinners (5:8), sinners are justified only through Jesus' blood and are then reconciled (5:10-11) with God.[50] In the justification through the blood of

---

[47] Ibid., 371. Clines is following the typology of J. A. Doyle, *The Male Experience* (Dubuque, IA: William C. Brown, 2nd edn, 1989).

[48] Brooten, *Love Between Women*, 352.

[49] See Eilberg-Schwartz, *God's Phallus*, 200-02; Phyllis Bird, '"Male and Female He Created Them,"' *Harvard Theological Review* 74 (2):129-59; Shaye Cohen, "Crossing the Boundary and Becoming a Jew," *Harvard Theological Review* 2 (I): 13-34;

[50] The idea that the sinner can be made righteous again through a reunion with God appears, if you recall, in "The Lives of Adam and Eve." Eve knows that Adam has been

Jesus, Paul provides a resolution to a very real conflict. Paul, in Romans 5, produces the only way that "sinners," those with flawed masculinity, can be perfect – though it may not be the perfection they expect.[51] Given possible anxieties over the inadequacy of human male masculinities in the face of God's perfect masculinity, it is not surprising that reconciliation occurs only through one who embodies the two sources of the anxieties: perfect masculinity (as the *adopted* son of God after resurrection) and flawed masculinity (as a human male). According to Paul in Romans, Jesus lived his life as a human "descended from David, according to the flesh" and then became the son of God "according to the spirit of holiness by resurrection" (1:4). Yet, Paul's remedy for human males has a twist. Perfection (in the guise of divine masculinity) is not possible, according to Romans, until after

---

separated from the righteousness of God through her sin and seeks to remove herself so that God will return to Adam and he can be made righteous once again (section 29). The reconciliation, in my view, does not occur in this body. In light of Paul's comments in chapter 3 and his perpetual oppositioning of human sinfulness and God's righteousness, I would agree with Ernst Käsemann who says that the reconciliation of the sinner occurs eschatologically. See Ernst Käsemann, "'The Righteousness of God' in Paul," in *New Testament Questions of Today* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969), 168-82. For an opposing view, see Rudolf Karl Bultmann, "*Dikaiosyne Theou,*" *Journal of Biblical Literature* 83 (1964) 12-16.

[51] Though Paul does recognize an opportunity for human righteousness through a reconciliation with God, it is not clear if the human being is reconciled to God in this lifetime or after death I doubt very much that Paul would be able to imagine (masculine) perfection in all human bodies. I follow Käsemann in that complete reconciliation occurs only after the flesh is destroyed (see previous note). See discussion of human righteousness in J. Christiaan Beker, *Paul the Apostle* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980), 262-63; also in Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 451-53; Fitzmyer, *Paul and His Theology*, 36, 60, 78-9.

one has shed their fleshly bodies,[52] – even Jesus did not become perfect until after his resurrection. On the other hand, Paul's remedy in Romans allows another type of perfection: perfect femininity.

Predictably, Paul imagines the reconciliation of sinners with God in the metaphor of marriage (7:4-6). As I have quoted above, Paul writes, "you have died to the law through the body of Christ, so that you may belong to another, to him who has been raised from the dead in order that we may bear fruit (καρποφορήσωμεν) for God" (7:4). Bearing fruit. That's the name of the game. Rather than bolstering the masculinity of the sinner, Paul's portrayal of the sinner as "the bride of Christ" reifies his or her femininity. Paul presents the sinner, who was unable to bear fruit, according to the Shepherd, as a mature, child-bearing woman -- not an effeminate male, not a circumcised male, not a physically active woman who has sex with other women -- but a real, honest-to-god, physically passive, baby-birthing, woman. Paul's notions of reconciliation do not bring the sinner (particularly the male sinner) out of the ambiguous area of "flawed masculinity" into "perfect masculinity." Rather, justification in

---

[52] Dunn writes, "In short, Paul walks quite a fine line between regarding flesh as irredeemably flawed and treating it as actively antithetic and hostile to God." Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*, 67. Baptism (Rom. 6:34), I would argue, is a symbol for the future resurrection of the faithful. It is the best they can do while still carrying around the burden of the flesh. See Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*, 450-55.

Christ removes gendered ambiguities by making the sinner conform *entirely* to popular notions of femininity – at least, while he is living in the flesh.

Conclusion

Paul's imaging of God as masculine not only creates gendered ambiguity, particularly for men, as others have already noted,[53] but engenders the concept of "sinner" as already more feminine. Earlier understandings of ἁμαρτωλός implied that the sinner is someone who "fails to do their gender right."[54] But with Paul, the "right" way to do gender is the heterosexual masculine way for which God sets the impossible standard. The "sinner" is imagined, then, in symbols that reflect less-than-ideal heterosexual masculinity. To complicate matters, according to the "theology" that Paul teaches to the Roman church, all are sinners, and sin gets personified as feminine. Since sin, flesh, and the feminine are so intertwined in Paul's philosophical foundations, perfect masculinity cannot exist until after death when men (like Jesus) are rid of their bodies. Thus, to appropriate the ambiguity of "not masculine but not female,"

---

[53] See Daniel Boyarin, *A Radical Jew: Paul and the Politics of Identity* (Berkeley: University of CA Press, 1994); Eilberg-Schwartz, *God's Phallus,* 141-2.

[54] Judith Butler, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (New York: Routledge, 1990), 140.

reconciliation in this life emerges as a reification of heterosexual femininity.[55]

[55] One implication of understanding the entire world as "not perfect masculinity" is that femininity would be the "natural" state of the world. A toxic byproduct of Paul's Roman theology is that men who are perceived as "effeminate" (μαλακοί, for example) and women in general are considered doubly sinful. On the various understandings of μαλακοί, see Brooten's discussion and notes in *Love Between Women,* 260 and 260n.

JUDGING AND COMMUNITY IN ROMANS: AN ACTION WITHIN THE BOUNDARIES

Tan, Yak-Hwee
Vanderbilt University

Introduction

Asia is a continent of paradoxes and plurality, geographically, politically, economically and religiously. In light of these pluralities and complexities, the question as to how does one do Asian biblical hermeneutics has been addressed and continue to be addressed by both Asian theologians and biblical critics. However, with the world of politics "entering a new phase in which the great divisions among humankind and dominating conflict will be cultural,"[1] Asian biblical hermeneutics which were primarily political and socio-economic in nature[2] must go beyond these boundaries to include the cultural and religious dimensions.

This is particularly true in the context of Southeast Asia with Singapore as a representation of the multi-racial, multi-cultural and multi-religious aspect of the region. In other words, Singapore is a pluralistic society. For this paper, I seek to demonstrate that the Christian community, with reference to first-generation Chinese Christians who are confronted with cultural and religious questions. One of the questions raised is whether one can be different within the Christian community without being judged, and conversely whether maintaining community relationships is more important than anything else, like principles and rules. Paul gives counsel in Rom 14:1-15:13 to the Christian community in Rome who was struggling with the issue of "to eat or not to eat" and "to observe or not to observe." This text is subjected to various interpretations of which mine is one.

---

[1] Huntington, Samuel, "The Clash of Civilizations?" in *Foreign Affairs,* Vol. 72 No. 3, 22.

[2] Some examples are "*minjung* theology" advocated by Korean theologians, the "*dalit* theology" by Indian theologians and "the liberation of struggle" by Filipino theologians.

For me, one of the main teachings of Rom. 14:1-15:13 in the wider framework of the letter is that it is appropriate and proper for Christians to be different. Hence, I will argue in this paper that we have no right to judge anyone who is different from us, especially in a pluralistic society such as Singapore where community understanding and living is important for the maintenance of the nation's political and socio-economic structure. The reading of Rom. 14:1-15:13 from the community dimension will unravel that judging in the community amounts to ostracizing or marginalizing. When someone is being judged in a community, (s)he is ostracized or marginalized from his/her community even though (s)he remains within the community. Moreover, the text raises the question as to who we are to marginalize members of our community, because ultimately all of us are accountable before God who creates that community. Therefore, whether one is "weak" or one "has faith," whether one is male or female, whether one is from the First World or from the 'Rest of the World," one is intrinsically related to all the others within the community, upholding and bearing responsibility for the other. In other words, the issue of 'eating' becomes a secondary issue both for the one who is "weak" and the one who "has faith."

To support my argument, first, I will briefly present the specific context that informed such a conclusion.[3] Having established the specific context, I will proceed with the assistance of literary-rhetorical analysis, to discuss some important theological concerns of Rom. 14:1-15:13 that will help to clarify the question of judging for the Roman Christian community. The literary-rhetorical and theological analyses therefore, will provide me the foundation to read the text as an Asian Chinese woman from a community dimension.

---

[3] Grenholm and Patte introduce Scriptural Criticism that uses the contextual frame, as well as the hermeneutical and analytical frames in the elucidation of choices involved in the interpretation of a text, see the section "Overtures" in *Reading Israel in Romans,* ed. Cristina Grenholm and Daniel Patte (Valley Forge: Trinity International Press, 2000), 1-54.

Opening Vignette

Statistics show that 16 per cent of the Singapore population are Christians[4] of which a considerable proportion comes from one ethnic group, the Chinese. Moreover, many of the Chinese Christians are first-generation Christians meaning that they come from families who practice a different religion and/or a combination of religions, such as Buddhism, Taoism and Confucianism. Therefore, one of the struggles Chinese Christians encounter is the issue of eating food that have been offered to "idols"[5] or participation at ancestor worship. Let me illustrate from the real-life situation of Dawn.[6]

Dawn comes from a non-Christian Chinese family deeply in traditional Chinese beliefs and practices. She became a Christian, that is, she accepted Jesus Christ as her Savior and Lord after attending an evangelistic meeting held at her secondary school. Dawn's 'follow-up' leader told her that from the time of her 'conversion,' she could not participate in ancestor worship,[7] meaning that taking of

[4] "Singapore. Facts and Figures, 1997," 4. As at June 1996, the population of Singapore is made up of three main ethnic groups, namely the Chinese who makes up 77.3% of the population, the Malays 14.1%, the Indians 7.3% and the balance 1.3% comprise of people of other ethnic groups, e.g. Eurasians, Japanese, Europeans. Each ethnic group has its own language, culture and religion which often defines their identity. The Chinese embrace what is termed as Chinese religions (that is, Taoism, Confucianism and Buddhism), the Malays Islam and the Indians Hinduism. The majority of Christians are from the Chinese ethnic group.

[5] The eating of food offered to idols is not contrary to Scriptures because "no idols in the world really exists" (1 Cor. 8:4).

[6] Dawn's 'conversion' to Christianity is not an exception. There are other 'converted' Christians whose family background are non-Christian, such as the Indians. The majority of the Indians are Hindus. Dawn is a member of a Presbyterian Church in the Republic of Singapore.

[7] Confucius emphasized paying homage to ancestors. *Qing Ming* (All Souls Day) becomes an occasion for the worship of ancestors. Originally, *Qing Ming* was a celebration of spring, falling in early April, 106 days after the winter solstice. It was more of a picnic than a festival when families go to their ancestors' cemeteries and tidy the graves, place red candles and joss-sticks on the stone altars, and offer food, drinks and flowers. After the worship, the food and

joss-sticks and eating food offered at the worship are prohibited. The passages from 1 Corinthians 8 and Romans 14:1-15:13 were used as proof texts. Hence, Dawn was confronted with the dilemma, "to eat or not to eat," and "to observe or not to observe." When she consulted with other members of the church, she was informed of another interpretation, according to which such a prohibition is justified when the "eating" causes someone to stumble in his/her faith because his/her conscience is weak. When she became a Christian, Dawn did not realize that she would be confronted with a religious-cultural dilemma. She sincerely desired to be a faithful and obedient Christian in the Christian community and at the same time, wanted to affirm the cultural tradition in which she was raised. Therefore, the issue of "eating" is not only a religious matter; it also challenges her Chinese cultural ethos of filial piety and familial ties.

The two interpretations of a text reveal that the text is "fluid" and that these interpretations are influenced by theological presuppositions of the reader(s). Hence, are there other plausible interpretations? For Dawn, the question of "judging" in light of the community is urgent and has to be addressed. How can Dawn come to a decision in a community that is divided on the issue of "to eat or not to eat"? As a Chinese Presbyterian minister from a non-Christian family, I used to pastor a Chinese-speaking church whose membership are mainly Christians from non-Christian families.[8] In this context, the church and I have always struggled with the questions of 'judging" (ostracizing or marginalizing) in light of the one who is "weak" vis-à-vis the one who "has faith." Can we define the one who is "weak" and the one who "has faith"? Rom. 14:1-15:13 allows me to do so. The text raises the question: What is the teaching of this text for me, an Asian Chinese Christian

wine are in turn consumed by the offerers. On other occasions, these offerings are placed before ancestral tablets in the home's family altar. Ancestral tablets are usually small wooden boards inscribed with birth and death dates. This altar will include the ancestors' names and photographs. Ancestor worship are performed on occasions such as the birth and death dates of the ancestors, the Lunar Chinese New Year, the 15th day of the Hungry Ghosts Month.

[8] Currently, I am on "leave of absence" from the church.

woman today? What is the teaching which is faithful to the Scriptures in a pluralistic society, like Singapore?

Using Rom 14:1-15:13 in the wider framework of the letter, I will argue that it is appropriate for Christians to be different and that the myriad facets of Christian community warrant it. Moreover, our accountability to the other insists that judging (ostracizing or marginalizing) is inappropriate in a community. Hence, we have no right to ostracize or marginalize anyone who comes from a different orientation, be it gender, race or religion. This text also teaches what it means for Christian believers to live within the community and to witness as a Christian community in pluralistic Singapore. In fact, in the preceding verses (Rom. 13:8-13)[9] Paul has already appealed to the Roman Christians to have love for one another.

Such is the context that relates the "scriptural text" and "life situation" in my reading of Rom. 14:1-15:13. Literary and theological analyses of the text from analytical and theological commentaries will further elaborate this reading. Furthermore, using the lens of Chinese understanding of the individual and community,[10] I will show that judging entails ostracizing or marginalizing the other. In conclusion, I will argue that difference is appropriate and is to be celebrated within the community.

Kuan-hsi **between the "weak" and the one who "has faith"**

[9] See John 13:34-35 "..... By this everyone will know that you are my disciples, if you have love for one another."

[10] King, Ambrose Y. C., "The Individual and Group in Confucianism: A Relational Perspective" in *Individualism and Holism: Studies in Confucian and Taoist Values.* Edited by Donald J. Munro (Ann Arbor: Center for Chinese Studies, The University of Michigan, 1985), 57-70. See also his work, "*Kuan-hsi* and Network Building: A Sociological Interpretation" in *The Living Tree. The Changing Meaning of Being Chinese Today.* Edited by Tu Wei-Ming (Stanford: Standford University Press, 1994), 109-126.

The focus of a Confucian is upon the "organic relationship" between the individual and the "group," whether the "group" is defined in terms of the family, or the village, or the government.[11] The emphasis on such interdependence between the individual and the group is grounded on the notion that "the individual is never an isolated, separate entity; man [human] is defined as a social or interactive being."[12] Therefore, his/her speech, actions and thoughts must be exercised in light with other humans of the "group." Such a demeanor is grounded in the understanding that it is only within the social context that a human can achieve *jen* (benevolence), a virtue which is "a source of admiration from and inspiration for one's community" expressed metaphorically in a passage from the *Analects* (6/23)[13]

> The Master said: "The wise find joy on the water, the good [that is, those who have *jen*] find joy in the mountains. The wise are active, the good [that is, those who have *jen*] are quiet. The wise are joyful, the good [that is, those who have *jen*] live long."[14]

In other words, the individual can achieve fulfillment only when s(he) is in relationship with the "group." In turn, this raises the question: How does s(he) conducts himself/herself in the "group" of which (s)he is a member? Rom. 14:1-15:13 in the wider framework of Romans poses such a challenge. However, an

---

[11] Ibid., 61. According to Confucians, human community is classified into three categories: the individual; the family; and the group. The notion of "group" is ambiguous and hence, "shifting." The family can be defined as a "group." However, the boundary of the family is quite elusive because it can includes members of the immediate family but also can include members belonging to the same lineage or clan.

[12] Ibid., 111. King cites Charles A. Moore, "Introduction: The Humanistic Chinese Mind," in *The Chinese Mind.* Edited by C. A. Moore. (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1967).

[13] Hall, David L. and Roger T. Ames, *Thinking Through Confucius* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1987),114.

[14] Leys, Simon, *The Analects of Confucius. Translation and Notes.* (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1997), 27. The translations in the parentheses are mine.

examination of the characteristics of the one who is "weak" and the one who "has faith" helps to clarify the conduct of members of the Christian community.

For me, the primary teaching of Rom. 14:1-15:13 is that it is appropriate to be different in the Christian community because all of us belong to Christ who is the Lord and Judge. Therefore, judging is not our prerogative. The dispute between the one who is "weak" and the one who "has faith"[15] gives ground for Paul to use his rhetorical skills and to disseminate his teaching regarding judgment. The foundational instruction which Paul laid down in 14:1, "and to the one who is weak with reference to (his or her) faith,[16] accept among you,"[17] paves the way for his line of argument and ultimately, to his purpose that is, to "accept one another" (15:7). Using the parallelisms of "eating or not eating" (14:2-4) and "observing and not observing" and interspersing them between 14:1 and 15:7, Paul seeks "to present each of the two positions which are competing with one another side by side in such a way that both remain equally related to Christ."[18]

---

[15] Paul Minear speculates that the Roman church was not an unified church but comprised of different communities "brought into existence at diverse times, by diverse leaders, with diverse conceptions of the Gospel" (7). Furthermore, Paul sought to bring reconciliation to these communities by using twelve axioms, for example, "God has welcomed him/her" (Rom. 14:3). (*The Obedience to Faith: The Purposes of Paul in the Epistle to the Romans.* SBT 2/19; [London: SCM, 1971]).

[16] (1) Dunn, James D. G., *Word Biblical Commentary. Vol. 38b. Romans 9-16* (Dallas: Word Books, 1988), 798. "The one who is weak" is a pejorative description. It describes the person's failure "to trust God completely and without qualification." In other words, s(he) is dependent upon outward practices as his/her qualification of faith.

[17] (1) Ibid., 798. I concur with Dunn's that the term παραλἀμβανομαι has the force of "receive or accept into one's society, home, circle of acquaintance". I would further reiterate that the translation " "accept among you" conveys a concrete expression of approval and favor on the part of the community and hence, entails responsibility on each other.

[18] Stuhlmacher, Peter, *Paul's Letter to the Romans. A Commentary*. Translated by Scott J. Hafemann. (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1994), 222.

By defining the two groups as those who are "weak in faith" and others who are "strong in faith," Paul was indirectly addressing a theological issue, namely "faith" as the crucial characteristic of the two opposing groups. Some scholars have concluded that the "weak" refers to Jewish Christians and those who "have faith" refers to the Roman Christians from Gentile background.[19] However, if the dispute is between Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians in the Roman Christian community, should not Paul be more specific in his address? Why use the vague terms, "the weak in faith" and those who "have faith" (cf. 15:1)?[20] While some scholars define the identities of the opposing groups in terms of ethnic difference,[21] I will argue the vague use of terms by Paul is his way of addressing an issue beyond ethnic boundaries; it is "faith" that defines their identities (14:1-2, 22-3; cf. 15:1a).

The dispute that confronted the Roman Christian community apparently, arises from the condition of those who are "weak in faith" (τῇ πίστει) vis-à-vis those who "have faith."[22] For Fitzmyer[23] and Cranfield,[24] "faith" does not refer to

---

[19] See footnote 15. Unlike Minear, Willie Marxsen argues that the dispute confronting the Roman Christian community is no longer a question of Jewish Christian trying to impose Jewish customs on the rest since there is no Jewish prohibition of eating meat or drinking wine. Rather, the conflict is between "Christians of different background, no longer concerned about dietary or calendaric regulations, over which the "weak," those of Jewish background and closely related to Jerusalem Jewish Christians, still had concern." (Cited by Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Romans. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary. The Anchor Bible Vol. 33* [New York: Doubleday, 1992], 77-78).

[20] Fitzmyer, *Romans,* 78.

[21] Ibid., 78. Fitzmyer argues that Paul was directing to a theological issue, that is, "all human beings need the gospel, for all are under sin" and therefore, was directing against those who profess to be Christians and having been Jews, still trusted in their circumcision as guarantee for salvation (cf. Rom. 2-3).

[22] The relative pronoun of ὃς and the participle ἀσθενῶν in the Greek text of Rom. 14:2 are in the singular but I have translated them to plural to express the inclusiveness and communal dimension of the community.

[23] Ibid., 688-689.

"belief" but to a conviction or assurance that leads to action. In other words, "faith" is understood as a concrete expression of belief, a "living and dynamic aspect of faith rather than the mere fact."[25] Hence, the question "to eat or not to eat" and more importantly, "to judge" in Rom. 14:1-15:13 is based upon one's conviction about certain practices. From this perspective, in his lengthy discourse (Rom. 1-8), Paul discusses the question of "faith," among other theological concerns referring to the essence of Christianity, but at this point of his letter, he advances a concrete sense of faith. After expounding the characteristics of believers' faith "in Christ" (Rom. 12), Paul proceeds to illustrate how believers should interact with others. In Rom. 13, he argues for the believers' demeanor towards authorities who are appointed by God (13:2).

However, from my perspective, it is most important to note that Paul asserts here that all authority ultimately belongs to God (13:1) and therefore, both groups are under the authority of God. In other words, both groups are brought into a relationship in which each is accountable to the other. In a nutshell, from the beginning to the end Paul refers to the same faith—a faith which embraces a communal dimension. Therefore, the communal dimension of faith overrides the outward practices of believers, such as "to eat or not to eat."

For Paul, "faith" is when a believer "recognizes and appropriates God's saving work in Christ."[26] S(he) accepts and believes that the crucifixion and the resurrection of Jesus is the way of salvation as ordained by God (1:5; 3:25; 10:17). "Faith" also means that the believer must make known that acceptance and belief by

---

[24] Cranfield, C.E.B., *The International Critical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. Vol. II. Commentary on Romans 9-16 and Essays.* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark Ltd., 1979), 698, 700.

[25] Bultmann, Weiser, "πιστεῦω" in *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament.* Vol. 6.Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Translated and edited by Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1965), 212.

[26] Ibid., 207.

confessing it with his/her mouth (ὁμολογήσῃς) (Rom. 10:9). In confession, s(he) turns away from himself/herself and confesses that Jesus Christ is his/her Savior and Lord. When the believer confesses Jesus as Lord (κῦριος), s(he) affirms that the resurrection is the soteriological event through which Jesus becomes the κῦριος (Rom. 4:24). In addition to his/her confession that Jesus is the resurrected Christ, s(he) must acknowledge the existence of Jesus Christ in history. In a nutshell, his/her faith is founded upon the resurrected Christ and the historical Jesus.[27] Moreover, s(he) expresses that belief (πῖστις) and confession (ὁμολογία) in the act of baptism. Baptism is a demonstration that "we have been buried with him by baptism into death, so that, just as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, so we too might walk in newness of life" (Rom. 6:4). Therefore, a personal relationship is established between the believer and Christ (Rom. 1:8; 6:8; 11:20).[28]

For a Chinese Christian believer, his/her acceptance of Jesus Christ as Lord and Savior also means that new relationships are being established. One is with Jesus Christ, the other with other members of the community of faith. And personal relationship (*kuan-hsi)* is an important Chinese social phenomenon..[29] The notion of *kuan-hsi* for Chinese society is grounded in Confucian understanding that no human, as discussed at the beginning of this section, is an isolated entity. A human is a "relational" being. There are many kinds of relations of which the most fundamental are the five cardinal relations (*wu-lun)* which have been regarded as the basic standard of Chinese social order. The five cardinal relations and their tenor are: affection between parent and child; righteousness between ruler and subject; distinction between husband and wife; order between old and young; and sincerity

[27] Ibid., 211.

[28] Ibid., 217-222. Bultmann gives a synopsis of πῖστις? and πιστεῦω in Paul, that is, Paul and the common Christian concept of faith; and The Pauline concept of faith in contrast to that of Judaism.

[29] King, "*Kuan-hsi* and Network Building: A Sociological Interpretation," 109-126.

between friends.[30] Of the five cardinal relations, three belong to the family and the other two are based upon the family model. The focus in these five cardinal relations is *kuan-hsi* (personal relationships) which in some ways, govern the conduct of oneself in that relationship.[31] It is inevitable that Chinese Christian community are affected by such patterns and structures of the Chinese social order.

In a preordained relation, such as the father-son cardinal relations, the status and responsibilities of the individual(s) are determined. However, under other non-preordained relation(s), the basis of *kuan-hsi* amongst the individuals depends on the existence of religious beliefs which becomes "a commonality of shared identification" of the individuals concerned.[32] Therefore, when a Chinese becomes a Christian (s)he, like many others in the community, enters into a voluntarily constructed relationships with others on the basis of their "shared identification," that is their faith in Jesus Christ. Besides the "shared identification" of the individuals concerned, *kuan-hsi* entails a certain decorum, that is "to know and act on certain prescribed rules of behavior"[33] on the individuals of the relationship. Many have perceived that the individual in the Confucian value system is placed in an absolutely hierarchical context, but to the contrary, the role relationships were originally symmetrical and interdependent.[34] In other words, each individual is

---

[30] King, "The Individual and Group in Confucianism," 58.

[31] King, "*Kuan-hsi* and Network Building: A Sociological Interpretation," 111. King quotes Liang Sou-ming, *Chung-ku weh-hua yao-I* (The essential features of Chinese culture) (Hong Kong: Chi-cheng T'u-shu Kung-ssu, 1974), 94.

[32] Ibid., 115. King cites the work of Chie Nakane who asserts that "Chinese group consciousness is formed on a set of criteria (attributes) – such as kinship, native place, dialect, religious belief." (Nakane, Chie, *Japanese Society* [New York: Penguin, 1970:1).

[33] Silin, Robert H., *Leadership and Values* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970), 43 quoted by Ambrose Y. C. King in "*Kuan-hsi and* Network Building," 120.

[34] King, "The Individual and Group in Confucianism," 58. However, the *hsiao* concept (filial piety) later became the central focus of the Chinese ethical system and the individual is submerged into the familistic ethics. Hence, the symmetrical father-son relation became asymmetrical in nature.

expected to perform his/her role according to propriety as prescribed by the *kuan-hsi* s(he) has with the other.[35]

Therefore, from the perspective of Chinese Christians, Rom. 14:1-15:13 is not primarily about "eating" or "observing" but about working out their *kuan-hsi* (personal relationship) on the basis of their "faith" in Jesus Christ. The "faith" of those who are "weak" and of those who "have faith" extend also when it "works itself out in knowledge of what [they have] to do in a given situation."[36] Because of the knowledge that all will ultimately stand or fall before "their own lord" (14:4; cf. 14:22), and therefore, judging others is not within the perimeter of any believer. Paul, moreover, reiterates that whether people are "weak" or "have faith," they are all God's possession (Rom. 14:8ff) and the notion "possession" conveys the idea of belonging. Together with *kuan-hsi,* belonging becomes a strong and binding factor that holds the community together as well as the link of the community to God.

Jesus Christ's *kuan-hsi* with his community

Having elucidated the theological question of "faith," Paul proceeds to use Jesus Christ as an illustration to argue for Jesus Christ's relationship (*kuan-hsi)* with his believers and its basis for inclusivity within the community of faith. What might be considered as a minor matter, Paul treats with severity because of the threat it poses to divide the church. For Paul, "fellowship among Christians is not to be based on questioning and disputing, toward the result that the one adopts the other's view and accepts it as the norm of action. Such a sameness is not a Christian ideal

[35] King, Ambrose Y. C. and Michael H. Bond., "The Confucian Paradigm of Man: A Sociological View*" in *Chinese Culture and Mental Health.* Edited by Wen-Shing Tseng and David Y. H. Wu (New York: Academic Press, 1985), footnote 2. In a symmetrical relationship, if one party fails to perform his/her required role, it is legitimate for him/her to oppose.

[36] Buschel, *TDNT Vol. 6,* 218.

… [D]ifference is proper."[37] The one who is "weak" as well as the one who "has faith" should be allowed to be who s(he) is and act as s(he) does because the Christian community is big enough to include both groups. Paul has already argued such a stance towards any issue in Rom. 2:1ff. – a point which remains even if for many commentators, ὦ ἄνθρωπε πᾶς ὁ κρίνων ("whoever you are, the judging one") referred to the Jew (cf. 2:17).[38] Paul argued that God's impartial judgment falls on all, regardless whether one is a Jew or a Greek (Rom. 2:1-11; 12-16; 17-24; 25-29; 3:1-9; 10-20).[39] Furthermore, Christ's death and resurrection are evidences that he is the "Lord of both the dead and the living," summed up in the confession that "every knee shall bow" to him (14:11). In referring to Christ's death and resurrection (Rom. 14:9), Paul reiterates the sovereignty of God. Whether the believers live or die, they under the authority of Christ, because Christ who underwent "death for our salvation … has acquired authority over us which cannot be destroyed by death, and by raising again, he has received our whole life as his peculiar property."[40] On the account that God is sovereign, "we are not only forbidden rashly to attempt this or that without God's command, but we are also commanded to be patient under all troubles and losses."[41] In sum, regardless whether believers are "weak" or "have faith," they all "belong to and must acknowledge their relation to God as Kyrios"[42] (14:8) as well as belonging to one another.

In fact, three *kuan-hsi* are established. One is between the believer and God because "one belongs to the Lord through faith" and the other is among the believers, "faith is the thing that is true of all Christians, the fact that unites them all,

---

[37] Nygren, Anders, *Commentary on Romans.* Translated by Carl C. Rasmussen (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1949), 443-444.

[38] Fitzmyer, *Romans,* 297.

[39] Ibid., 296-297.

[40] Ibid., 500.

[41] Calvin, John, *Commentaries on the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans.* Translated by J. Owens (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1948), 499-500.

[42] Fitzmyer, *Romans,* 691.

be they weak or strong in that faith."[43] The third *kuan-hsi* is the one established between the community of faith and God (15:5,6). In the *kuan-hsi* between the believer and God, Christ's passion, death and resurrection, confirmed by Scriptures (14:9; 15:3, 8ff.) bear evidence of Christ's lordship over the believer. On the part of the believer, s(he) honors his/her role in that relationship by accepting the authority of the Lord. The *kuan-hsi* between the believer and the other(s) in the community, on the other hand, is likened to that between the older brother and the younger brother and where the tenor of the relationship is sincerity and respect.

Using the terms of dying and living, Paul directs the one who is "weak" and the one who "has faith" that their dying is relational, no longer "without regard for [his/her] fellow brothers and sisters in faith"[44] (14:7). The reason is because their *kuan-hsi* relationship constrains them to do so. Therefore whether one dies or lives in the community, all is affected by the action. Besides, each no longer live to himself/herself; (s)he lives for his/her Lord, and Christ lives in him/her. If Christ is the Lord of the believer's life, then s(he) is no longer judged by human beings, "And you, why do you ostracize your brother or your sister? And you also, why do you despise your brother or your sister?"[45] In judging the other, the believer not only brings judgment upon himself/herself from God but also places the whole community in the judgment seat of God. When God establishes *kuan-hsi* with the believer(s), God implicitly establishes *kuan-hsi* with the whole community because of their relationship to the other grounded in their faith in Jesus Christ who is the judge of all (14:10).

---

[43] Nygren, *Commentary on Romans*, 444-446. Nygren notes that Paul did not take the position of either 'the weak' or 'the strong' because if he did, he would be giving signals that to be a "Christian would have meant to follow certain outward usages, to eat or not to eat."

[44] Stuhlmacher, *Paul's Letter to the Romans,* 221.

[45] "Sister" is added in the translation to make the language of the text inclusive (NRSV). In light of this paper, the term "sister" is important as it suggests that the issue encountered by the community that comprised of male and female believers. According to Cranfield, Paul addresses first the one who is "weak" and then the one who "has faith" (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. Vol. II., 709.).*

***Kuan-hsi* and Judging in the community**

In a situation where different opinions take place, the tendency to despise or to cast judgment on the others is to be expected, just like in the Roman Christian community. However, the question one poses is: On what basis do people who judge have the authority to do so? According to Paul, the answer is neither party has the right to do so. The rhetorical questions, the parallelisms, and the "conduct of Christ, a way of life .... [d]esignated in the Scripture"[46] (14:4, 10; cf. 2:3-4; 21-23; 3:1-9), undergird Paul's argument that members of the community should endure and accept the other (15:3-6)[47] for all[48] will take their places[49] before the judgment seat of God[50] (14:10,12; cf. 2:3 "when God's righteous judgment will be revealed"). No one should assume that s(he) will be exempted from the judgment of God. On the contrary (s)he will be asked not to give account for his/her "faith in Jesus Christ" but also for the outworkings of his/her faith, *how* s(he) was a Christian. In a word, s(he) will have to give an account of his/her stewardship in light of the "now" (14:4-6) and "then" (14:10-11)[51] to God whose judgment is righteous (2:5; 11, 16). God's righteous judgment is explicit for God will repay all humans according to their attitudes (2:1-11), but because of God's goodness and

[46] Stuhlmacher, *Paul's Letter to the Romans,* 229.

[47] According to Dunn, Paul's emphasis of positive consideration of others (15:5) is a "necessary structural contrast to the ***presumption*** (emphasis mine) of both Jew and Gentile attacked (cf. Rom. 11:18-20; 12:16) (*Word Biblical Commentary,* 836). However, I would argue that the contrast is directed to the issue of judging rather than the case of ethnic identity.

[48] Ibid., 809. The πᾶντες has weight, that is, given the place of emphasis. It is an inclusive term that includes the one is "weak" or the one "has faith."

[49] Ibid., 808-809. The term παρίστημι is attested in other portions of the New Testament (Acts 27:24; 1 Cor. 8:8; 2 Cor. 4:14; 2 Tim. 4:17) with the "judicial technical sense of appearing in court before a judge."

[50] (1) Cranfield, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary,* 709. The idea of standing before the judgment seat of God is a "powerful dissuasive from all sitting in judgment on one's fellows."

[51] Dunn, *Word Biblical Commentary,* 809.

patience (2:4), humans were given time to repent and be justified on Christ alone (5:9, 10, 8:33; 14:9).[52]

The crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus the Messiah reveals the impartial righteousness of the one God who shows no respect for human distinctions (3:26), whether one is a Jew or a Gentile. God's impartial righteousness has to be matched only by the "faith" of the believer, not outward practices. At the very onset of the letter, Paul discussed and emphasized this very important and fundamental theological aspect of God. It is the righteousness from God which is the "new way of salvation which God had opened through Christ."[53] Paul argues that even the Jew who with his/her special gifts and received promises (3:1, 9:4-5; 11 passim) can only established his/her own righteousness on the basis of the "righteousness from God." In other words, it "was that righteousness, which can be enacted only by the God who characteristically makes something out of nothing, which Abraham obtained by his trust (Rom. 4)."[54] There is no distinction or separation, διαστολῆ between Jew and Gentile in the community of faith because God's impartial judgment renders such distinctions invalid: "It is God who justifies. Who is to condemn?" (8:33b-34a). Therefore, if there is any boasting, on the part of the Jew over the Gentile (3:27) and also the Gentile over the Jew (11:18), Paul reiterates that all humans are finite. They are unable to comprehend the "mind of the Lord" and have not been the Lord's counselor (11:34). Therefore, by whose standards and authority can they dispense their judgment? Paul's answer is that no one is in the position to judge. Moreover, the act of "judging one another that divide the people of God run directly contrary to the universal judgment of the one God"[55] (14:1-15:13).

---

[52] Buchsel, Herntrich, "κρῖνω" in *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament.* Vol. 3. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Translated and Edited by Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1977), 938.

[53] Nygren, *Commentary on Romans,* 9-15.

[54] Meeks, *Judgment and the Brother,* 296.

[55] Ibid., 297.

The fact that "when people set themselves to judge others, they stretch forth their hand to something which God has reserved to himself [Godself] and to Christ,"[56] with the knowledge that all judgments rest upon God, they reveal their "human finitude." This "human finitude" is demonstrated in the Roman Christian community that was being bound by the traditions and practices and also taking pride in holding fast to them, for example the "weak" who eats only vegetables (14:2). The one who is "weak" is concerned with "deeds and facts."[57] Lest the one who "has faith" think that s(he) is without fault, Paul warns him/her that she is also finite. S(he) might think that s(he) has attained "freedom of conscience" and therefore, can act as (s)he pleases. According to Barth, this is human illusion, because by making "freedom of conscience" to a concrete thing, that is "to eat or not to eat," or "to observe or not to observe," the one who "has faith" is not "free from legalism." By 'concretizing' his/her "freedom of conscience," the one who "has faith" reveals his/her frailty too, with reference to the "weak."[58] In summary, both their positions are weak because they are *their* positions that are based on *their* faith and according to *their* lives. In short, they are not absolute, eternal and infinite. The critical truth is that before the Lord, there is no distinction as to whether s(he) is "the weak" or the one who "has faith," for both will stand as HUMANS, both "from the same embarrassment and from the same hope."[59] Both the one who is "weak" and the one who "has faith" are both equal before God because of God's sovereignty. Human finitude reinforces human frailty and therefore, reveals that our judgment is weak and defective precisely because we are mere HUMANS.

---

[56] Nygren, *Commentary on Romans*, 445.

[57] Barth, Karl, *The Epistle to the Romans.* Translated from sixth edition by Edwyn C. Hoskyns (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1933), 508. Barth cites examples from the Greek period through the Middle Ages where the church was bound to such traditions and practices. Barth concludes, "But now we can understand also both the grandeur of the Catholic system and the dignity of the rigorous Reformation ethic … the tragedy which is bound up with it all."

[58] Ibid., 507-509.

[59] Ibid., 514.

As already explained, the individual in the Chinese society is never separate from the "group" because s(he) is a "relational being" and his/her *kuan-hsi* with the other is important. In any relational context, "the individual's relations with the others are neither independent nor dependent but *interdependent*. Thus, the individual self is not totally submerged in the relationships. On the contrary, the individual has considerable social and psychological space for action."[60] In other words, s(he) has the capacity to pass judgment and sever the relationship with the others because of their failure to perform his/her part in the established relationship.[61] However, I argue that because s(he) is interdependent with others, (s)he cannot do so. Moreover, to judge the other with the consequences that there would be disharmony and dissension within the community is contradictory to what Chinese esteem, "the adjusted equilibrium and social harmony."[62] For example, the family will not thrive or prosper lest there is social harmony. Given that the Chinese social order is patterned after the family models, "harmony became the touchstone for all interpersonal behavior"[63] and be maintained in spite of differences.

In light of Rom. 14:1-15:13, the people who are "weak in faith" and others who are "strong in faith" have established a *kuan-hsi* on the basis of their faith in Jesus Christ and not upon outward practices of "eating" or "observing." In other words, it is a collective relationship where the two groups are responsible to the other. Therefore, they are constrained to live in harmony and for the mutual upbuilding of each other (14:15-16, 19; 15:2). To expel the others who are different moreover, would go against God's purpose which is "righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit" (14:17) and disrupt the social harmony of the Christian community. Consequently, instead of judging the others in the forensic

[60] King, "The Individual and Group in Confucianism," 63.

[61] Ibid., 62. King argues that the Chinese social order is built upon "the concept of *lun* ... a set of rules governing social relations."

[62] Ibid., 62.

[63] King, "The Confucian Paradigm of Man," 34.

sense, the others are ostracized or marginalized while both groups still remain in the community.[64] In summary, the Chinese Christian cannot separate himself/herself from his/her community and to judge entails ostracizing or marginalizing the other. However, the admonition is "Do not ostracize the other," regardless of his/her orientation.

CLOSING VIGNETTE

Many feminist biblical critics and scholars might be disappointed that I did not engage any strategies from the field of feminist criticism to read Rom. 14:1-15:13 and that my reading is not feminist *per se*. I must admit that this is intentional and for a purpose. As one Asian Chinese Christian woman, I regard the notion of community, whether it is family, church or society with utmost importance. Such high regard for community is derived from Confucian understanding that the human is an interactive being. A human must be in a relational context which is interdependent in order to achieve his/her benevolence (*jen*). In such a relational context, the focus is on personal relationship (*kuan-hsi*). For me, by using the notion of *kuan-hsi* in light of the individual and the community from the Chinese perspective, I sought to show the inclusivity of its implications. In other words, instead of constructing binomial opposites of "Self" and "Other" and their characteristics, the notion of *kuan-hsi* diffuses its opposites and the attention is directed to the community as a whole. Therefore, whether one is a female or male, whether one is from the First World or from the 'Rest of the World," one is intrinsically related to all the others within the community, upholding and bearing

[64] Kingston, Maxine Hong, *The Woman Warrior. Memoirs of a Girlhood Among Ghosts* (New York: Vintage International Edition, 1989). In the chapter, "No Name Woman," Kingston narrates an account that happened in the early 1920s to her aunt who was impregnated by a man who was not her husband, and having been found out later by her family and the village was ostracized. She was made to sit at an "outcast table" for her meals even though she must have lived in the same house as her parents (7).

responsibility for the other. Hence, the broad use of *kuan-hsi* with the communal dimension assists such a celebration of differences.

However, I am aware that some feminist biblical critics and theologians are wary that in my so doing, Chinese women might be submerged in the Chinese social order that is perceived as patriarchal. My argument is that the five cardinal relations, whether the one between the husband and wife or the one between the elder and the younger, they are equal and interdependent. Each party is expected to perform his/her role according to propriety (*li*) but if one party fails to honor his/her responsibilities, opposition is expected from the other party. In light of this brief argument, Chinese women therefore, are active participants in a relationship. A paper that focuses upon *li* (propriety) in relations would further elucidate my argument but this calls for another occasion.

My reading of Rom. 14:1-15:13 in the wider framework of the letter demonstrates that "to eat or not to eat," "to observe or not to observe" is a secondary issue. The issue is how relationships (*kuan-hsi*) affect "judging" the others in the community in which believers come with diverse opinions and/or from different ethnic and religious backgrounds. The text teaches about living together under the lordship of Jesus Christ who is also the judge of us all. Therefore, we should not judge the other who is different but accept each other (14:13, 15:2, 5, 7) because God's impartial righteousness in Christ is available to all, whether Jew or Gentile.

Some eleven years ago, when my small congregation of about forty members in Singapore underwent a division because of leadership and theological matters of which one of them is "to eat or not to eat," an important and fundamental question was raised, What has gone wrong with our *kuan-hsi?* Moreover, the division distressed many because it created social disharmony amongst members of the community, contrary to Chinese concern for social order. Therefore, instead of expelling the others on the basis of judgment which might cause social disorder in

the community, the Chinese Christian ostracizes or marginalizes the other, and keeping him/her still in the community. However, on the basis of their "faith in Jesus Christ" in which a personal relationship (*kuan-hsi)* is established between them, judging is henceforth, not appropriate. By judging others, believers also judge themselves before God who is the ultimate Judge. Moreover, God celebrates difference, exemplified in God's offer of salvation to all who believe and accept Jesus as Savior and Lord.

In a pluralistic society such as Singapore, first generation Singapore Christians, in addition to their other religious, cultural and racial identities, receive a distinctive identity because of their faith in Jesus Christ: we are Chinese (or Indians or Malays) and we are Christians who have faith in Jesus Christ. Having faith in Jesus Christ does not mean that one has to abandon one's cultural, religious and ethnic traditions but rather to act on the basis of theological assumptions that all human beings "belong to God and that God may be served in a variety of ways."[65] At one of the plenary sessions, Chung Hyun Kyung at the World Council of Churches Seventh Assembly at Canberra in 1991 used the ancient religious tradition of her homeland, South Korea to restate her faith in the power of the Holy Spirit.[66] Her challenge was clear: God can be served in one's religious traditions. For Chinese Christians, the Confucian perspective of the individual and community enlarges one's hermeneutical approach to reading the text which in turn becomes Scriptures for its readers.

---

[65] Gaventa, Beverly Roberts, "Romans" in *The Women's Bible Commentary.* Edited by Carol A. Newsome and Sharon H. Ringe (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1992), 319.

[66] Kinnamon, Michael, ed., *World Council of Churches. Signs of the Spirit. Official Report Seventh Assembly.* Canberra, Australia, 7-20 February 1991 (Geneva: WCC Publications, 1991), 37-47.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

Barth, Karl. *The Epistle to the Romans*. Translated from sixth edition by Edwyn C. Hoskyns (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1933).

Calvin, John. *Commentaries on the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans*. Translated by J. Owen. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1948).

Cranfield, C. E. B. *The International Critical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. (Edinburgh: T & T Clark Ltd., 1979).

Dunn, James. D. G. *Word Biblical Commentary, Rom. 9-16*. (Dallas: Word Books, 1988).

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *The Anchor Bible. Romans*. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary. (New York: Doubleday, 1993).

Hall, David L. and Roger T. Ames, *Thinking Through Confucius* (Albany: State University of New Yor Press, 1987).

Kingston, Maxine Hong. *The Woman Warrior. Memoirs of a Girlhood Among Ghosts* (New York: Vintage International Edition, 1989).

Kinnamon, Michael, ed. *World Council of Churches. Signs of the Spirit. Official Report Seventh Assembly.* Canberra, Australia, 7-20 February 1991 (Geneva: WCC Publications, 1991).

Leys, Simon. *The Analects of Confucius.* Translation and Notes (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1997).

Nygren, Anders. *Commentary on Romans.* Translated by Carl C. Rasmussen. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1949).

Stuhlmacher, Peter. *Paul's Letter to the Romans. A Commentary.* Translated by Scott J. Hafemann. (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1994).

Walters, James C. *Ethnic Issues in Paul's Letter to the Romans*. (Valley Forge: Trinity Press International, 1993).

ARTICLES

Buchsel, Herntrich. "Kri/nw" in *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament.* Vol. III. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Translator and Editor: Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1965): 921-954.

Bultmann, Weiser. "Pisteu/w" in *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament.* Vol. VI. Edited by Gerhard Friedrich. Translator and Editor: Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publsing Co., 1968): 174-228.

Gaventa, Beverly Roberts. "Romans" in *The Women's Bible Commentary.* Edited by Carol A. Newsome and Sharon H. Ringe, Sharon H. (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1992): 313-320.

Grenholm, Cristina and Daniel Patte. "Overtures" in *Reading Israel in Romans.* Edited by Cristina Grenholm and Daniel Patte (Valley Forge: Trinity International Press, 2000): 1-54.

Huntington, Samuel. "The Clash of Civilizations?" in *Foreign Affairs* Vol. 72 No. 3: 22-37.

Karris, Robert J. "Rom. 14:1-15:13 and the Occasion of Romans" in *CBQ* 34/2 April (1973): 155-178.

King, Ambrose Y. C. "The Individual and Group in Confucianism: A Relational Perspective" in *Individualism and Holism: Studies in Confucian and Taoist Values.* Edited by Donald J. Munro (Ann Arbor: Center for Chinese Studies, The University of Michigan, 1985): 57-70.

_____ "*Kuan-hsi* and Network Building: A Sociological Interpretation" in *The Living Tree. The Changing Meaning of Being Chinese Today.* Edited by Tu Wei-ming (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1994): 109-126.

King Ambrose Y. C. and Michael H. Bond. "The Confucian Paradigm of Man: A Sociological View" in *Chinese Culture and Mental Health.* Edited by Wen-Shing Tseng and David Y. H. Wu (New York: Academic Press, 1985): 29-45.

Meeks, Wayne. "Judgment and the Brother: Romans 14:1-15:13" in *Tradition and Interpretation in the New Testament. Essays in honor of E. Earle Ellis.*

Edited by Gerald F. Hawthorne with Otto Betz, (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1987): 290-300.

Singapore. Facts and Figures, 1997. (Singapore: Ministry of Arts and Information,1997).

A Monopoly on Marcan Priority? Fallacies at the Heart of Q

Mark Goodacre

Introduction

For over three years now I have maintained a site on the world wide web devoted to the idea of dispensing with Q while defending Marcan Priority.[1] In some circles, this solution to the Synoptic Problem is not novel. At Oxford, where I was educated, Q scepticism was for a while much more common than belief in the existence of Q. Indeed Marcan Priority alongside Luke's use of Matthew originated in Oxford with the publication in 1955 of Austin Farrer's article "On Dispensing with Q".[2] But in other circles, the notion of a world without Q appeared strange and unfamiliar, an option only

---

[1] Mark Goodacre (ed.), *Mark Without Q: A Synoptic Problem Web Site*, http://www.bham.ac.uk/theology/q (1997-2000)

[2] Austin Farrer, "On Dispensing with Q", D. E. Nineham (ed.), *Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1955), pp. 55-88; reproduced at Mark Goodacre (ed.), *Mark Without Q*, http://www.bham.ac.uk/theology/q/farrer.htm. The so-called "Farrer theory" effectively originated a little earlier – see James Hardy Ropes, *The Synoptic Gospels* (First Published 1934; Second Impression with New Preface, London: Oxford University Press, 1960), pp. 37, 66-8 and 93-4. For the Oxford connection, see, among others, Michael Goulder, *Midrash and Lection in Matthew* (London: SPCK, 1974), the Speakers' Lectures in Oxford in 1969-71; John Drury, *Tradition and Design in Luke's Gospel* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1976), written while Drury was chaplain of Exeter College, Oxford; E. P. Sanders and Margaret Davies, *Studying the Synoptic Gospels* (Philadelphia: Trinity Press International; London: SCM, 1989), written while Sanders was Dean Ireland Professor at Oxford; and Eric Franklin, *Luke: Interpreter of Paul, Critic of Matthew* (JSNTSup, 92; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994).

usually considered in the very different clothing provided by the Griesbach theory, which rejects not only Q but also Marcan Priority. From such quarters I receive a good deal of positive feedback on the web site now known as *Mark Without Q*, but the encouragement is tempered with an interesting and persistent question that goes something like this: "OK; let's say for the sake of argument that you are right that the Q hypothesis is a mistake. If so, how do you account for its popularity? Why do so many people apparently find it plausible?" On one level, the answer to this is straightforward. Students often adopt the views of their teachers, just as those teachers also adopted the views of their teachers. And teachers and students are influenced by the textbooks which themselves generate the status quo as well as being informed by the same status quo. Q maintains its dominance largely as a function of its dominance – majorities are not overturned in a day. But this is hardly, of course, the whole picture and we need to look elsewhere to understand the continued popularity of Q.

Some Q sceptics have informally suggested that the popularity of Q has to do with an almost universal appeal in which there is something for everyone. For those at one end of the theological spectrum Q provides an early witness to Jesus' sayings, bridging the troubling, over thirty-year gap between the crucifixion and Mark's Gospel. For those at the other end of the

spectrum, Q aligns itself with the Gospel of Thomas to form a "trajectory" in early Christianity that contrasts radically with emerging orthodoxy, and which only "canonical bias" can now obscure from our view.

But the difficulty with such suspicions is that they involve the unsavoury matter of attempting to second-guess scholarly biases and assumptions, an enterprise that in the end tends to detract from civil and productive scholarly discourse and only serves to reinforce the positions of those who perceive themselves to be under attack. The most profitable way ahead will not be to speculate about motives but rather to re-examine some of the grounds explicitly given for belief in the existence of Q. It is here that we can see the grounds on which many students are persuaded of the plausibility of Q. It is here that we will find some key reasons for its widespread acceptance.

I will argue that a series of fallacies lie at the heart of the Q hypothesis. The fallacies on which we will focus are all arguments that have the appearance of plausibility, which seem to be in some way self evident, but which on closer inspection turn out to involve some false or dubious premises and reasoning. I do not think that they are solely responsible for the success of the Q hypothesis, but they have bolstered and supervised its continued domination of the field. I do not claim that all those who accept the existence

of Q all work with all of these fallacies. Some, for example, are clearly more common to non-experts on the Synoptic Problem than to experts (and vice versa). But all of these have in their own way helped to make Q much more popular than it might otherwise have been and have contributed to the inflated role it plays in some New Testament scholarship.

(1) "Marcan Priority is Identical to the Two-Source Theory"

Many scholars and students of the New Testament continue to labour under the misapprehension that the theory of Marcan Priority necessitates believing in the existence of Q. Frequently, otherwise knowledgeable scholars simply describe the theory of Marcan Priority as the Two-Source Theory; or they attempt to argue in favour of Q by means of arguing in favour of Marcan Priority; or they claim that the only major alternatives to the Two Source Theory are theories involving Matthean priority. The difficulty proceeds from a tendency that has arisen which defines Marcan Priority purely in terms of the role it plays in the Two-Source Theory. To take a recent example, Beverley Roberts Gaventa writes in passing:

> "Here I rely on the theory of Markan priority, which holds that Mark wrote the first of the Gospels known to us and that Matthew

> and Luke, independently of one another, rely upon Mark in addition to other sources and their own editing or redactions. Although recent decades have witnessed a reconsideration of this issue, in my judgement Markan priority still provides the best account we have of the literary relationships among the synoptic Gospels."[3]

The description here is not, however, of Marcan Priority but of Marcan Priority viewed from within the perspective of the Two-Source Theory.[4] Where Marcan Priority is seen as Matthew's and Luke's *independent* use of Mark, Q becomes a necessity, the logical means of explaining the existence of double tradition material in which there is close literary agreement between Matthew and Luke. But it is unhelpful to define Marcan Priority solely in terms of the way it functions in that one theory, for in doing this one major alternative solution to the Synoptic Problem – the Farrer Theory – is

---

[3] Beverley Roberts Gaventa, *Mary: Glimpses of the Mother of Jesus* (Personalities of the New Testament; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1999), p. 24, n. 4. I am aware, of course, that this comment (and many others like it) are simply little statements in passing in footnotes. But that reinforces the point – what scholars give away in passing can be a reliable guide to common assumptions.

[4] Though even within the Two-Source Theory there are exceptions to this, e.g. Robert Gundry, who maintains the Two-Source Theory but thinks that Luke also knew Matthew. See, for example, "Matthean Foreign Bodies in Agreements of Luke with Matthew against Mark. Evidence that Luke used Matthew" in F. Van Segbroeck et al (eds.), *The Four Gospels* Fs. F. Neirynck (BETL 100; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992), Vol. 2, pp. 1467-95.

ruled out before the discussion has even begun. After all, the Farrer theory, let us remind ourselves, strongly affirms Marcan Priority in its attempt to dispense with Q.[5]

It is not difficult to see how this state of affairs has arisen. For most of its history, Marcan Priority has been associated with the Q theory. The two tenets of the theory have become like sisters, and they are sisters who seem to be fond of one another for they are seldom seen apart. Scholars used to thinking of Marcan Priority and Q as a team quickly come to express the one element in terms of the other, to blur the distinction and to lose awareness of the clear difference between them. It is a situation that is intensified by the pervasive presence of the Griesbach hypothesis, which dispenses with both tenets of the Two-Source theory, Marcan Priority and Q, arguing that Luke used Matthew and that Mark used them both.[6] This hypothesis, revived by

---

[5] Defenders of the Farrer theory, most notably Michael Goulder, John Drury and Eric Franklin, tend to take Marcan Priority for granted in their Q scepticism. See, however, my "Fatigue in the Synoptics", *New Testament Studies* 44 (1998), pp. 45-58, reproduced at Mark Goodacre (ed.), *Mark Without Q: A Synoptic Problem Web Site* http://www.bham.ac.uk/theology/q/fatigue.htm, which attempts to combine a fresh argument for the Priority of Mark with a related argument for Luke's use of Matthew. See also my *The Synoptic Problem: A Way Through the Maze* (Sheffield Academic Press, forthcoming).

[6] The authors own preferred name for their hypothesis is "The Two-Gospel Hypothesis", Matthew and Luke "the two Gospels" acting as sources for Luke. However, Michael Goulder has argued that the term is essentially confusing because the Farrer Theory is also, in a way, a "two Gospel hypothesis", with Mark and Matthew the sources for Luke. See further Michael Goulder, "Luke's Knowledge of Matthew" in Georg

William Farmer in the 1960s and currently championed by the Research Team of the "International Institute for the Renewal of Gospel Studies",[7] apparently remains the best known alternative to the dominant paradigm outside of the United Kingdom. It is a testimony to this Research Team's success in organizing and marketing themselves[8] that their views are sometimes regarded as presenting the chief rival[9] or indeed the only alternative[10] to the Two-Source Theory. This incorrect impression tends to obscure the challenge from the Farrer theory by aligning it with or, worse, regarding it as in some way more peculiar than the Griesbachian alternative.[11] Dieter Lührmann speaks of

---

Strecker (ed.), *Minor Agreements: Symposium Göttingen 1991* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993), pp. 143-60 (p. 143, n. 1).

[7] The first major publication of this group was Allan J. McNicol with David L. Dungan and David B. Peabody (eds.), *Beyond the Q Impasse - Luke's Use of Matthew*: A Demonstration by the Research Team of the International Institute for Gospel Studies (Valley Forge PA: Trinity Press International, 1996). For a detailed review and critique, see my "Beyond the Q Impasse or Down a Blind Alley", *JSNT* 76 (1999), pp. 33-52. See also the review by Christopher Tuckett, *JBL* 117 (1998), pp. 363-5; also in *SBL Review of Biblical Literature* (1998), http://www.bookreviews.org/Reviews/1563381842.html.

[8] This is not meant pejoratively. It is arguable that the dominance of the Two-Source Theory necessitates careful thinking about how to organise and advertise the alternatives.

[9] See, for example, J. Tyson, "The Synoptic Problem" in his *The New Testament and Early Christianity* (New York; London: Macmillan; Collier Macmillan, 1984), pp. 148-58.

[10] This is the remarkable claim of Arland Jacobson, "The Griesbach Hypothesis has succeeded in establishing itself as the only real alternative to the Two Document Hypothesis." (*The First Gospel: An Introduction to Q* (Foundations & Facets; Sonoma, CA: Polebridge, 1992), pp. 5-6).

[11] Stephen Patterson, for example, regards Goulder's views as "more obscure" than Griesbach: Review of C. M. Tuckett, *Q and the History of Early Christianity*, *JBL* 117

the alternatives to the Q theory as a choice between either Matthean Priority or Proto-Luke[12] and Helmut Koester asserts with misplaced confidence that "All attempts to disprove the two-source hypothesis favour the priority of Matthew or some earlier form of Matthew which was possibly written in Aramaic".[13] Others who have heard of the Farrer Theory sometimes misunderstand it, as when Craig Blomberg describes Michael Goulder's *Luke: A New Paradigm* as a "defence of the Augustinian model", suggesting that one has "but to read" it to find out how implausible its theories are.[14]

(1998), pp. 744-6 (p. 744); also at *SBL Review of Biblical Literature* (1998), http://www.bookreviews.org/Reviews/156563246X.html.

[12] "I consider the assumption that Matthew and Luke used a second source in addition to Mark to be assured, despite all criticism. Neither the priority of Matthew nor proto-Luke hypotheses can resolve the Synoptic Problem to any comparable extent." ("Q: Sayings of Jesus or Logia?" in R. Piper, ed., *The Gospel Behind the Gospels: Current Studies on Q* (NovTSup, 75; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994), pp. 97-116 (p. 97). I am grateful to Michael Goulder for this observation, "Is Q a Juggernaut?", *JBL* 115 (1996), pp. 667-81, reproduced at Mark Goodacre (ed.), *Mark Without Q*, http://www.bham.ac.uk/theology/q/goulder.htm (p. 668, n. 11).

[13] Helmut Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels: Their History and Development* (London: SCM; Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1990), p. 130. Cf. Burton L. Mack, *The Lost Gospel: The Book of Q and Christian Origins* (New York: HarperSanFrancisco, 1993), "Even today there are scholars who continue to resist the two-source theory and to favour Matthew as the earliest gospel" (p. 20). Cf. also Luke Johnson, *The Real Jesus* (San Francisco: Harper, 1995), p. 52.

[14] Craig. L. Blomberg, *Jesus and the Gospels: An Introduction and Survey* (Leicester: Apollos, 1997), p. 90, n. 27. The same unfortunate mistake is made by one of the key scholars writing from the Griesbachian perspective, David L. Dungan, *A History of the Synoptic Problem: The Canon, the Text, the Composition and the Interpretation of the Gospels* (Anchor Bible Reference Library; New York: Doubleday, 1999), "the modified Augustinian hypothesis proposed by B. C. Butler and Austin Farrer" (p. 369); again on pp. 376, 378 and 384-5.

In other words, many appear to think that the Q hypothesis and Marcan Priority are inextricably linked, and that dispensing with Q necessarily entails the rejection of Marcan Priority.[15] But while it is true that the Q hypothesis can only stand if Marcan Priority is first affirmed, the converse is certainly not the case: Marcan Priority does not require the existence of Q in order to make good sense of the Gospels. The cause for concern is that the Q hypothesis is artificially bolstered in the mind of many scholars and students of the Gospels because they are unaware of the major alternative that would enable them to dispense with Q at the same time as affirming and building on Marcan Priority.

This of course brings us, though, to a key question for the Farrer theory and one which ought quickly to settle the matter. The fallacy we have been discussing assumes that Marcan Priority equates to Matthew's and Luke's independent use of Mark. The question that the Farrer Theory forces us to ask is this: does Luke's knowledge of Mark seem to be independent of Matthew's knowledge of Mark, or might there be signs that Luke knows not

---

[15] The point is that there is some widespread ignorance about the Farrer theory. It should go without saying that there are, of course, some honorable exceptions, e.g. John Kloppenborg (ed.), *The Shape of Q: Signal Essays on the Sayings Gospel* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994), Chapter 1 (pp. 2-3); Dale C. Allison, Jr., *The Jesus Tradition in Q* (Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: TPI, 1997), p. 1; John Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q: The History and Setting of the Sayings Gospel* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000). Unfortunately, the latter was not published before the writing of this paper.

only Mark but also Matthew's reworking of Mark? The common answer to this question is "no", but this too is based on a fallacy, as we shall see.

(2) "Luke does not feature any of the Matthean additions to Mark in triple tradition material"

It is commonly said that Luke appears to be ignorant of Matthew's additions to Mark in material shared by all three Synoptic Evangelists, something that is held to be particularly problematic for the idea that Luke knew Matthew as well as Mark. W. D. Davies and D. C. Allison, for example, make the following claim:

> "If Luke drew upon the First Gospel it is remarkable that he betrays no knowledge of the obvious Matthean additions to the Markan material (e.g. Mt. 3.14-15; 9.13a.; 12.5-7; 16.2b-3, 17-19; 19.9; 21.10-11; 26.52-4; 27.19, 24, 52b-53). In other words, Luke seems to have known Mark, not Mark as revised by Matthew."[16]

---

[16] W. D. Davies and Dale C. Allison, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew: The International Critical Commentary on the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1988), p. 116. Davies and Allison are, however, aware of the Farrer theory – see p. 114, n. 66.

This statement rests on a misunderstanding. To speak of Luke's knowledge of "Mark" or of "Mark as revised by Matthew" is to present a false alternative. The Farrer theory supposes that Luke knows *both* Mark *and* Mark as revised by Matthew. Indeed, those defending it attempt to point to Luke's knowledge of Matthew's revisions of Mark as evidence in their favour. But the misunderstanding is compounded by a fallacy, the assumption that Luke "betrays no knowledge of the obvious Matthean additions to the Markan material". The same argument is made with even more vigour by Joseph Fitzmyer:

> "Luke is never seen to reproduce the typically Matthean additions within the Triple Tradition. By 'additions' I mean the fuller Matthean formulations of parallels in Mark, such as the exceptive phrases in the prohibition of divorce (Matt. 19.9; cf. Mark 10.11 . . .); Jesus' promise to Peter (Matt. 16.16b-19; cf. Mark 8.29); Peter's walking on the waters (Matt. 14.28-31; cf. Mark 6.50); and the peculiarly Matthean episodes in the passion narrative (especially the dream of Pilate's wife [Matt. 27.19] or Pilate washing his hands [Matt 27.24]) . . . the real issue here is to explain Luke's failure to adopt the extra Matthean materials in his

parallels, or at least some of them, if he has written in dependence on Matthew."[17]

There are two difficulties here. First, the examples given are not strong enough to make the case. Matt. 14.28-31, for example, is a Matthean addition in the middle of the story of the Walking on the Water (Mark 6.45-52 // Matthew 14.22-33), a story that is wholly absent from Luke, in either its Marcan or Matthean form. One should not be surprised that Luke lacks the Matthean additions to a story that does not feature at all in his Gospel.[18]

The other examples mentioned have such a blatantly Matthean stamp that it is straightforward to imagine why Luke might have preferred the Marcan version that had been more familiar to him over a longer period. When we use redaction-criticism in analyzing Luke's use of Mark, we work on the assumption that, on the whole, Luke will include those passages he finds congenial. When we work on the assumption of Luke's use of Matthew,

[17] *The Gospel According to Luke I-IX* (Anchor Bible 28, New York: Doubleday, 1981), pp. 73-4. Cf. Christopher Tuckett, *Q and the History of Early Christianity: Studies on Q* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1996), pp. 7-8: "Luke never appears to know any of Matthew's additions to Mark in Markan material. Sometimes, in using Mark, Matthew makes substantial additions to Mark, cf. Matt. 12.5-7; 14.28-31; 16.16-19; 27.19, 24. If Luke knew Matthew, why does he never show any knowledge of Matthew's redaction of Mark? It seems easier to presume that Luke did not know any of these Matthean additions to Mark and hence that he did not know Matthew."

[18] The same error is made by Tuckett – see previous note.

suspending redaction-critical practice should not be a realistic option. We will expect to find, to use Austin Farrer's phrase, only the "Luke-pleasing" elements of Matthew in the third Gospel.[19] In particular, we should not be surprised that Luke's version of Peter's Confession (Luke 9.22-26) does not feature Matthew's additions about the ascendancy of Peter. After all, Luke's Gospel is not as positive about Peter overall as is Matthew's, and the narrative development of Luke-Acts – in which Peter progressively recedes further and further into the background – would seem to exclude the possibility of Luke's inclusion of the Matthean statement. It is exactly the kind of Matthean addition to Mark that we would expect Luke to omit.[20]

But there is a more serious problem with the argument. Its premise, that Luke does not feature any of Matthew's modifications of Mark, is flawed. On the assumption that Luke knows Matthew as well as Mark, Luke prefers Matthew's version to Mark's in several triple tradition incidents: the whole John the Baptist complex (Matt. 3, Mark 1, Luke 3); the Temptation (Matt. 4.1-

[19] Austin Farrer, "On Dispensing", p. 57.

[20] It is worth adding that if indeed the theory of Marcan Priority is correct, Luke may well have known Mark for quite some time longer than he has known Matthew. In such circumstances, his familiarity with Mark might have made the Matthean additions clear to him. Fitzmyer is particularly keen to stress that "the *pattern* in these passages is such in the Matthean Gospel that they are best regarded as additions" (*Gospel*, p. 74, his emphasis). Given that this pattern seems so clear to Fitzmyer and others, we should not rule out the possibility (I would say likelihood) that the pattern was also clear to Luke.

11 // Mark 1.12-13 // Luke 4.1-13), the Beelzebub Controversy (Matt. 12.22-30 // Mark 3.20-27 // Luke 11.14-23) and the Mustard Seed (Matt. 13.18-19 // Mark 4.30-32 // Luke 13.18-19) among them. On all of these occasions, the parallels between Matthew and Luke are more extensive than those between Mark and Luke. Indeed the early parts of each Gospel are particularly rich in examples of Luke apparently following Matthew's modified versions of the shorter Markan pericopae. Take John the Baptist's prophecy about Jesus, for example, which appears in all three Synoptics:

Matthew 3.11-12	Mark 1.7-8	Luke 3.16-17
11. ἐγὼ μὲν	[*cf. Mark 1.8a*]	ἐγὼ μὲν
ὑμᾶς βαπτίζω ἐν ὕδατι		ὕδατι βαπτίζω ὑμᾶς·
εἰς μετάνοιαν· ὁ δὲ		
ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος	ἔρχεται ὁ	ἔρχεται δὲ ὁ
ἰσχυρότερός μού ἐστιν,	ἰσχυρότερός μου	ἰσχυρότερός μου,
οὗ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἱκανὸς	ὀπίσω μου, οὗ οὐκ εἰμὶ	οὗ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἱκανὸς
	ἱκανος κύψας λῦσαι	λῦσαι τὸν ἱμάντα
τὰ ὑποδήματα	τὸν ἱμάντα τῶν	τῶν ὑποδημάτων
βαστάσαι·	ὑποδημάτων αὐτοῦ. 8.	αὐτοῦ·
	ἐγὼ ἐβάπτισα ὑμᾶς	
αὐτὸς ὑμᾶς βαπτίσει	ὕδατι, αὐτὸς δὲ	αὐτὸς ὑμᾶς βαπτίσει
ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ	βαπτίσει ὑμᾶς	ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ
πυρί. 12. οὗ τὸ πτύον	πνεύματι ἁγίῳ.	πυρί. 17. οὗ τὸ πτύον
ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ		ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ
διακαθαριεῖ τὴν ἅλωνα		διακαθᾶραι τὴν ἅλωνα
αὐτοῦ, καὶ συνάξει		αὐτοῦ καὶ συναγαγεῖν
τὸν σῖτον αὐτοῦ εἰς		τὸν σῖτον εἰς τὴν
τὴν ἀποθήκην, τὸ δὲ		ἀποθήκην αὐτοῦ, τὸ δὲ
ἄχυρον κατακαύσει		ἄχυρον κατακαύσει
πυρὶ ἀσπέστῳ.		πυρὶ ἀσβέστῳ.

The underlined words represent substantial addition to Mark by Matthew, material then paralleled in Luke, refuting the claim that such material never occurs. The same is true in the nearby story of the Temptation of Jesus. Mark's version (Mark 1.12-13) is only two verses long whereas Matthew (Matt. 4.1-11) and Luke (Luke 4.1-13) both have an extended story featuring a major dialogue between Jesus and the Satan with the three famous temptations and rebuttals. Once again, it will seem to the scholar assuming Marcan Priority without Q that the simple Marcan story has been elaborated by Matthew and copied by Luke. Or, to put it another way, Luke has here preferred to use Matthew's substantial modification of the Marcan story. The argument from Luke's lack of Matthew's modifications of Mark seems to be refuted by a simple glance at the Synopsis.

This material is of course familiar to scholars using the argument about Luke's lack of Matthew's additions to Mark, but the force of this evidence, and the fact that it contradicts one of the standard arguments is not felt. The primary reason for this[21] is that examples of this kind are placed in the special

[21] Note also that some of the most impressive examples of this feature come, as we have seen, in Luke 3-4, covering material like John the Baptist and the Temptations. This is precisely the material that tends to be allowed an honorary exception to the rule when one is discussing the related phenomenon of Luke's order – Luke never, it is said, places double tradition material in the same triple tradition context as Matthew, except in Chapters 3-4. Although this exception is not specifically invoked in the context of Luke's alleged lack of Matthean additions to Mark, it may be that the same exception is thought to apply here. The Q sceptic's concern is that this is just the kind of rather bulky exception that tests a rule

category of "Mark-Q overlap", those passages occurring in all three Synoptics in which Mark is not clearly the middle term, which blur the usually more straightforward distinction between "triple tradition" and "double tradition". The fallacy at the base of this argument for Q is that where Luke (on the assumption of Marcan Priority without Q) prefers the Matthean version of a pericope shared with Mark, this automatically goes into the category "Mark-Q overlap". And where Luke prefers the Marcan version of a pericope shared with Matthew, this is held to demonstrate his lack of knowledge of the Matthean versions of Marcan pericopae. I am afraid that Q sceptics are placed in a "no win" situation here. This argument for Q is one that sounds persuasive but which, on closer examination, is based on a fallacy.

(3) "The Q material appears in five large thematic discourses in Matthew but in an artistically inferior arrangement in Luke."

It has long been held that Luke's order constitutes the best evidence for the existence of Q. For while Matthew has Q material as part of his fine, artistic arrangement of Jesus' discourses into five major blocks, Luke has the same material scattered throughout his Gospel. This is held to be uncongenial for the thesis that Luke had read Matthew. R. H. Fuller, for example, writes:

---

and finds it wanting. Further, much of Luke's agreement with Matthew's additions to Mark actually occurs outside of Luke 3-4.

> "Matthew has tidily collected the Q material into great blocks. Luke, we must then suppose, has broken up this tidy arrangement and scattered the Q material without rhyme or reason all over his gospel – a case of unscrambling the egg with a vengeance!"[22]

One does not have to look far to find similar statements, praising Matthew's fine arrangement and denigrating Luke's. This is the context in which scholars arguing for Q tend to be particularly disparaging about Luke. "If Matthew is Luke's source," says Styler, "there seems to be no common-sense explanation for his order and procedure."[23] Or, if Luke read Matthew, Stanton says, "he has virtually demolished Matthew's carefully constructed discourses'.[24] And Fitzmyer asks:

> "Why would Luke have wanted to break up Matthew's sermons, especially the Sermon on the Mount, incorporating only a part of it

---

[22] Reginald H. Fuller, *The New Testament in Current Study* (London: SCM, 1963), p. 87.

[23] "Synoptic Problem" in Bruce M. Metzger and Michael D. Coogan (eds.), *The Oxford Companion to the Bible* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), pp. 724-7 (p. 726).

[24] Graham N. Stanton, "Matthew, Gospel of" in *DBI*, ad loc.

> into his Sermon on the Plain and scattering the rest of it in an unconnected form in the loose context of the travel account."[25]

Ultimately, such statements go back to the famous comments of B. H. Streeter, claiming that Luke would have been a "crank" to have acted in the way that a Q sceptical theory would demand,[26] and of Holtzmann who asked why "Luke should so wantonly have broken up the great structures, and scattered the ruins to the four winds?"[27] There are two fundamental problems with this pervasive view.

First, the above quotations all focus on Matthew's five famous "blocks" of teaching material, each of which is marked off with the Matthean formula, "When Jesus had finished . . ." (Matt. 7.28; 11.1; 13.53; 19.1; 26.1). But by emphasising the five Matthean blocks, a misleading impression is generated. The casual reader, who does not check the secondary literature by paying careful attention to an open Synopsis, might assume that all of the Q material appears in those five Matthean blocks. Fuller clearly states this –

---

[25] J. A. Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, p. 74. Cf. also Christopher M. Tuckett, "Synoptic Problem" in *ABD*, VI, pp. 263-70 (p. 268).

[26] B. H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins* (London: Macmillan, 1924), p. 183.

[27] H. J. Holtzmann, *Die synoptischen Evangelien, Ihr Ursprung und geschichtlicher Charakter* (Leipzig: Engelmann, 1863), p. 130.

"Matthew has tidily collected the Q material into great blocks"[28] and so does Stein;[29] the others, by connecting Q material so closely with the five discourses imply a connection that is stronger than is actually the case.

The fact is that the double tradition material is often located in Matthew outside of his five major discourses, in Chapters 3-4 (John the Baptist; Temptation); 8.5-13 (Centurion's Boy); 8.19-22 (Foxes); 9.37-8 (Labourers); 11.2-27 (Messengers from John; Woes; Thanksgiving); 12.22-45 (Beelzebub; fruit; house swept clean); 22.1-10 (Banquet); and Chapter 23 (Woes against Pharisees).[30] We should also remind ourselves that large parts of the five major blocks are made up of Marcan and other non-Q material. The third discourse (Matthew 13), for example, has only three verses of Q material (13.16-17, Blessings; 13.33, Leaven; cf. 13.31-2, Mustard Seed). And similarly the fourth (Matthew 18) has only four verses of Q material

[28] See above and footnote 22.

[29] Robert Stein, *The Synoptic Problem: An Introduction* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1987), p. 95: "Matthew's handling of his source, however, was far more thoroughgoing, for he has arranged this material into five 'books'. The result is a masterful organization whose artistry is well-recognized." Cf. also, "Within Matthew this material is found in five (or six) sections, all of which end with something like 'And when Jesus finished these sayings' . . . These five sections (5-7; 10; 13; 18; 23-25 [or 23; 24-25]) are artistically arranged within Matthew's Gospel . . ." (*ibid.*).

[30] Stein acknowledges that much Q material occurs in Matthew 23 but tends to treat it as part of the fifth discourse (see previous note).

(18.12-13, Lost Sheep; 18.21-22, Seven Times Seventy).[31] To put it mildly, the double tradition material is at least as widely distributed in Matthew as it is in Luke. We will do well to be wary of the assumption that Luke, on the Farrer theory, is primarily unravelling Matthew's five discourses when he is reproducing double tradition material. This is a major oversimplification of the evidence, and one which detracts from a proper appreciation of what might have been involved in a reworking of Matthew by Luke.

There is, furthermore, a second and more troubling element in the common perspective on Luke's ordering of the double tradition material. The idea that Luke's ordering of this double tradition material is "artistically inferior" to Matthew's is an important element in the discussion. It is stated most explicitly by Robert Stein:

> "The thesis that Luke obtained the Q material from Matthew cannot explain why Luke would have rearranged this material in a totally different and 'artistically inferior' format."[32]

---

[31] One is able to see the distribution of the double tradition material in Matthew and Luke quickly and easily by using Allan Barr, *A Diagram of Synoptic Relationships* (Second Edition with a New Introduction by James Barr, Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1995; first published 1938). Also useful is a new internet resource, Alfred Suhl, *Schemata und Übersichten über die synoptischen Evangelien* (created 1999), http://wwuuser.uni-muenster.de/cit/Evv/synoptiker/Hauptrahmen/SynoptikerHauptframe.htm, which provides colour breakdowns of Matthew and Luke according to the Two-Source Theory.

[32] Robert Stein, *The Synoptic Problem*, p. 95. Cf. also p. 96: "The arrangement of the material in Matthew is extremely well done. The Sermon on the Mount (Matt. 5-7) ranks

The same viewpoint is, as we have seen, common. Statements of the kind that Luke, if using Matthew, was a "crank", who acts "without rhyme or reason", who "demolishes" Matthew's fine discourses have been a key part of Streeter's legacy. Ultimately this amounts to nothing more than a somewhat dubious value judgement based on outmoded ideas of what Luke was attempting to do in composing his Gospel. Over seventy-five years have passed since Streeter spoke with all the confidence of an era of scholarship in which Luke, like the other evangelists, was essentially a "scissors and paste" editor. But scholarship has changed since then and we should avoid allowing Streeter's legacy to exercise an undue influence in an era in which contemporary literary criticism of Luke has tended to pronounce in favour of his artistic ability.[33]

As appreciation for Luke's literary ability and so for the narrative coherence of his Gospel intensifies, so too it will seem less necessary to appeal to the Q theory to explain the quirks of his order. Streeter's and others' statements, which take for granted a negative value judgement on Luke's order,

---

as one of the greatest works of literature ever written. Why would Luke, who was by no means an inept writer, choose to break up this masterpiece and scatter its material in a far less artistic fashion throughout his Gospel?"

will become difficult to sustain in the light of contemporary narrative-critical studies of Luke. One of the most important elements to emerge is the observation that Luke's narrative is constructed on the principle of creating a plausible, biographical account in which special attention is paid to movement and sequence. There would be little place in such a narrative for the kind of excessively long monologue that is Matthew's speciality. As Luke Johnson observes, for example, Luke's narrative is "essentially linear, moving the reader from one event to another . . . Instead of inserting great blocks of discourse into the narrative, Luke more subtly interweaves deeds and sayings".[34]

It is straightforward to see this in practice. Where in Matthew the double tradition pericope "Care and Anxiety" (Matt. 6.25-34 // Luke 12.22-34) occurs in the middle of the longest and most famous monologue in his Gospel, the Sermon on the Mount, in Luke it occurs in an excellent and appropriate literary context following on from his unique parable of the Rich Fool (Luke 12.15-21). The parable warns those members of the crowd (who still have possessions, 12.13-14) that life does not consist of the abundance of such possessions –

[33] Cf. Farrer, "On Dispensing", p. 56. Farrer's observation that "our conception of the way in which the Gospels were composed has gradually altered", and the consequences for the Q hypothesis, is all the more true in the year 2000 than it was in 1955.

[34] Luke Johnson, "Luke-Acts, Book of" in *Anchor Bible Dictionary* IV, pp. 405- 6.

death may strike at any time. The teaching builds on this but develops it, utilizing similar imagery but now changing the audience, exhorting "the disciples" (12.22) not to be anxious about their lack of possessions, something that is a prerequisite for discipleship in Luke (e.g. 5.11, 5.28, 14.33; cf. 6.20). This kind of sensitive narrative arrangement, so typical of Luke, gives some indication of how overstated it is to speak of Luke "demolishing" Matthew's Sermon on the Mount and "scattering the ruins to the four winds". We might more appropriately speak of Luke critically, sensitively and creatively re-working Matthean materials in accordance with his own special narrative agenda.[35]

We should not be surprised about such elements in Luke's order, though, if we decide to take his Preface seriously. After all, Luke appears to be critical of predecessors' attempts to write narratives of the Jesus story (Luke 1.1) and in the same breath stresses not only that he has investigated everything carefully (1.2) but also that he is going to write to Theophilus accurately and *in order* (1.3). On the Q theory, there is little reason for this overt stress on order, since Luke's order is usually taken to be similar to that of Mark and Q. But on the

---

[35] I have written at greater length on the potential for fruitful interaction between source- and narrative-criticism of Luke in "Luke, Narrative-Criticism and the Q Hypothesis", as yet unpublished paper given to the SBL Annual Meeting Synoptics Section November 1998.

Farrer theory, the stress is understandable: Luke is making clear that he is critical of his predecessors' work and that his radical re-ordering of Matthew is in the interest of providing Theophilus with the truth of those things in which he has been catechized.

We have allowed ourselves to be guided in this matter by the Q hypothesis for too long. It is no longer acceptable to say that Luke's ordering of double tradition material is "artistically inferior" to Matthew's. In doing so, we only succeed in basing our synoptic theory on a faulty premise compounded by a dubious value judgement informed by assumptions that need no longer (arguably should no longer) be ours.

(4) "The Minor Agreements between Matthew and Luke against Mark are too minor to make the case against Q"

For some time now, Q sceptics have been drawing attention to the Minor Agreements as the Achilles Heel of the Two-Source Theory.[36] If Matthew

---

[36] The key recent publication on the Minor Agreements is G. Strecker (ed.), *Minor Agreements: Symposium Göttingen 1991* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993). For a good introduction to the problem the Minor Agreements pose for the Two-Source Theory, see E. P. Sanders and M. Davies, *Studying the Synoptic Gospels* (Philadelphia: TPI; London: SCM, 1989), pp. 67-83. For the role they play in the Farrer theory and especially in Michael Goulder's work, see further my *Goulder and the Gospels: An Examination of a New Paradigm* (JSNTSup, 133; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), Chapter 3.

and Luke redacted Mark independently of one another, the premise behind the Q theory, then we should not expect to see the number and quality of Minor Agreements that in fact we do see.[37] In an attempt to counter the force of the Minor Agreements, Q theorists have recently gone on the offensive, claiming that the Minor Agreements are problematic not only for themselves but also for Q sceptics. Tuckett makes the point with his characteristic clarity and force:

> "The fact that the Minor Agreements are so minor makes it very hard to believe that Luke has been both influenced positively by Matthew's text in such (substantively) trivial ways, but also totally uninfluenced by any of Matthew's substantive additions to Mark. Undoubtedly the Minor Agreements constitute a problem for the 2ST, but precisely their minor nature constitutes a problem for Goulder's theory as well."[38]

---

[37] It is difficult to judge the precise number, or to assess the significance of the number of Minor Agreements. F. Neirynck, *The Minor Agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark with a Cumulative List* (BETL, 37; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1974) lists over 750, but of course many of these, as Neirynck has maintained in several publications, are straightforwardly attributable to independent redaction by Matthew and Luke. The stronger MAs, like that at Mark 14.65 (τίς ἐστιν ὁ παίσας σε;), are those that are most troubling to the 2ST.

[38] Christopher Tuckett, *Q and the History of Early Christianity*, p. 28. Tuckett makes a similar point in "The Minor Agreements and Textual Criticism" in G. Strecker (ed.), *Minor Agreements*, pp. 119-41 (p. 140). See further note 42 below.

Tuckett's statement illustrates a real difficulty arising from the degree of emphasis that scholars like Michael Goulder have placed on the case from the Minor Agreements.[39] In the attempt repeatedly to point to a concrete difficulty for the Two-Source Theory, Q sceptics have inadvertently given the impression that the best evidence in their favour is only "minor". But this perspective is, I think, just a trick of the light, and on closer examination it turns out to be based a fallacy.[40]

Part of the fallacy we have seen already in relation to the question of Luke's alleged lack of Matthew's additions to Mark in the triple tradition. On the Farrer theory it is simply not the case that Luke is "totally uninfluenced by any of Matthew's substantive additions to Mark". On the contrary, Luke regularly includes Matthew's substantive additions to Mark, but these tend to get placed into a special category of their own labelled "Mark-Q overlap". The Minor Agreements are thus only part of a broader spectrum and we might properly speak of a sliding scale of Matthean

[39] For Michael Goulder's work on the Minor Agreements, see especially "On Putting Q to the Test", *NTS* 24 (1978), pp. 218-34; *Luke: A New Paradigm* (JSNTSup, 20; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989); and "Luke's Knowledge of Matthew" in G. Strecker (ed.), *Minor Agreements*, pp. 143-60. For analysis and comment see my *Goulder and the Gospels*, Chapter 3.

[40] This point develops a comment I made in *Goulder and the Gospels*, p. 126.

influence on Luke, from pure triple tradition passages which feature Minor Agreements, to Mark-Q overlap passages which feature major agreements between Matthew and Luke against Mark, to double tradition passages where Luke is dependent solely on Matthew. It is the attempt to categorize all of the data in accordance with the demands of the 2ST, Minor Agreements into one class, Mark-Q overlaps into another, double tradition into another, that causes us to miss this.

Tuckett, for example, deals with the different elements of Luke's agreement with Matthew against Mark under these different headings. When writing on the Minor Agreements he asks, "Why should Luke have allowed Matthew's text to influence him in such a minor way as to create these small agreements, but rarely in any major way?"[41] When talking about the Mark-Q overlaps, however, he rightly describes them as "major agreements" between Matthew and Luke against Mark:

> "Indeed the agreements between Matthew and Luke are so extensive (and it is only because they are so extensive that one postulates a parallel, non-Markan version) that these texts are often called 'major agreements'. They really constitute a separate category and cause no

[41] *ABD* VI, p. 267.

real difficulty for the Two-Source theory provided one accepts the possibility in principle of overlapping sources."[42]

Thus, where Luke agrees with Matthew against Mark in minor ways, we tend to call this "Minor Agreement". Where Luke agrees with Matthew against Mark in major ways, we call this "Mark-Q overlap". The pervasive use of this nomenclature, which is derived from the Two-Source Theory, is causing us to miss one of the most interesting features among all the Synoptic data, the fact that there is a continuum, from pure triple tradition to pure double tradition, with varying degrees of agreement along the way, from relatively minor to quite major agreement between Matthew and Luke against Mark. The point, then, is this – the Minor Agreements are indeed troubling to the Two Source Theory but they are only troubling in so far as they constitute

---

[42] *ibid.* These observations should be qualified by drawing attention also to Tuckett's treatment of MAs and Mark-Q Overlaps in *The Revival of the Griesbach Hypothesis: An Analysis and Appraisal* (SNTSMS 44; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), Chapters 7-8. He suggests that one of the conditions for seeing Mark-Q overlap is evidence of another source underlying the Matthean and Lukan version, i.e. the Matthean version will not be explicable solely as Matthean redaction of Mark. The difficulty with this perspective is that one of the key pieces of evidence in favour of another underlying source is the substantial agreement between Matthew and Luke against Mark – one can see this clearly in *ABD* quotation above. Further, Matthew's use of Mark need not imply that Matthew had no other sources for this material. The point is that Luke is here showing literary agreement with the Matthean version of the triple tradition, regardless of Matthew's own sources in reworking Mark.

one (albeit key) element in a broader spectrum of evidence, all of which is conducive to the Farrer Theory.

(5) "Luke's occasional greater primitivity over against Matthew necessitates the existence of Q"

The argument from "alternating primitivity" is a key element in the standard case for the existence of Q. For if sometimes Matthew and sometimes Luke has the more primitive wording in the double tradition, this might well seem to be a sign that both were dependent on a prior document. As Davies and Allison, for example, make clear:

> 'Sometimes it is the First Evangelist who seems to preserve the more original form of saying appearing in the double tradition, at other times it is Luke. This is inexplicable if one evangelist is following the other.'[43]

However, there are major difficulties with this apparently straightforward argument. The difficulties can be divided into two categories: (a) problems

---

[43] W. D. Davies and D. C. Allison, *Matthew*, vol. 1, p. 116. The point is repeated again and again in the literature, e.g. Stein, *Synoptic Problem*, pp. 96-101; it is perhaps the most common argument for the existence of Q.

with the means by which scholars arrive at the conclusion that Luke's material is more original than the Matthean parallels and (b) problems with the assumption that greater primitivity in Luke would necessitate the existence of a Q document.

(a) The conclusion that Luke often witnesses to the more primitive Q wording is based in part on fallacies exposed by Michael Goulder. These fallacies are still not fully appreciated in much literature on the Gospels, so I will attempt to summarise them here:

(i) Self-Contradiction in the Reconstruction of Q: One of the principles in the reconstruction of Q is that language characteristic of Matthew is unlikely to have belonged to the original wording of Q. Arguments of the form "this expression is characteristic of Matthew's redaction, so it is unlikely that it stood in Q" occur regularly in the literature. So where Matthew and Luke have different wording in the same double tradition passage, and where Matthew's wording is particularly characteristic of his writing, it is often concluded that Matthew and not Q is responsible for those Matthean elements. The knock-on result is that the Lucan version, on such occasions, will appear to be more primitive than the Matthean version.

Michael Goulder has pointed to a major problem for this principle by drawing attention to double tradition material in which characteristic Matthean expressions are present in both the Matthean and the Lucan versions, including famously Matthean expressions like ὀλιγόπιστοι (Matt. 8.26 R; 16.8 R, 14.31 M; Matt. 6.30 // Luke 12.28 QC[44]); ἐκεῖ ἔσται ὁ κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων' (Matt.13.42, 50; 22.13; 24.51; 25.30; Matt. 8.12 // Luke 13.28 QC) and "And when Jesus had finished [these sayings] . . ." (Matt. 11.1; 13.53; 19.1; 26.1; Matt. 7.28 // Luke 7.1). Since such distinctively Matthean expressions occur in this bedrock "QC" material, a major question mark is placed over one of the standard principles used in the reconstruction of Q. Since Q's style is clearly Matthean on these occasions, reconstructing Q elsewhere by eliminating the Matthean elements – the standard practice – becomes problematic. We cannot assume that the Matthean expressions occurring in his versions of double tradition material, but absent in the Lucan parallels, are due to Matthean redaction rather than to Q. In other words, the notion that Luke often features the more original Q wording is based in part on a fallacy in the way that this "original wording" is calculated. If we accept the existence of Q, we know that its style was (at

---

[44] R = Redactional addition by Matthew on the assumption of Marcan Priority; M = only in Matthew; QC = common to Matthew and Luke.

least) sometimes Matthean in nature. This deprives us of one of the main grounds for concluding that Matthean language in Q passages where Matthew and Luke differ is secondary.[45]

(ii) The Lucan Priority Fallacy: There is a related problem. The calculation that Lucan forms of Q sayings are sometimes more original than their Matthean counterparts is also based on a feature of Luke's style. Luke is a subtle and versatile writer with a large vocabulary and a tendency to vary his synonyms. Matthew, on the other hand, has a more pronounced, easily recognisable style, and he does not have so rich a vocabulary. It is consequently much less straightforward to judge Lucan redactional activity than it is to pick out where Matthew has edited sources, and it is correspondingly easy to jump to the conclusion that an apparently 'un-Lucan' form is a 'pre-Lucan', Q form. Again and again one sees in the literature claims that a given word is "un-Lucan and therefore pre-Lucan", claims that

---

[45] For the original argument on the "Matthean Vocabulary Fallacy", see Michael Goulder, *Luke: A New Paradigm*, particularly pp. 11-15. For a critique, see my *Goulder and the Gospels*, Chapter 2, especially pp. 83-5. Goulder modified the argument, partly in response to my critique, in "Self-Contradiction in the IQP", *JBL* 118 (1999), pp. 506-17. This statement is stronger than the earlier version of the argument, partly because it focuses primarily on telling Matthean expressions and partly because it focuses specifically on the issue of the reconstruction of Q and not more generally (as before) on the supposed prevalence of Matthean vocabulary in Q.

artificially reinforce the notion that Luke's version is more primitive than Matthew's.[46]

These fallacies in the calculation of the original wording of Q are widespread and it is arguable that they account, in part at least, for many of the decisions that Q scholars make in favour of the priority of Lucan versions of Q. They do not, of course, account for all such decisions. Sometimes it is simply the case that good arguments for the secondary nature of the Lucan version have been ignored, one of the best examples of which is Luke's "Blessed are the poor" (6.20) over against Matthew's "Blessed are the poor in spirit" (Matt. 5.3).[47] At other times it may be because the Lucan version indeed exhibits, when all things have been considered, signs of greater primitivity. I do not think that the number of such passages is large, but it is

---

[46] Goulder, *Luke*, pp. 15-17.

[47] A strong case can be made for Luke's secondariness here, in one of the most commonly given examples of alleged Lucan primitivity because of: (a) Luke's well-known preference for "the poor"; (b) Luke's parallel opening of his previous major discourse with good news to "the poor" (4.18); (c) the characteristic Lucan eschatological reversal involving "poor" and "rich" (6.20 and 23; cf. 1.52-3 etc.), later narrativized in the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus (16.19-31); (d) the oft-ignored narrative-critical observation that Luke's Sermon is addressed to "the disciples", those who have "left everything" to follow Jesus (5.11, 5.28; cf. 14.33); (e) the non-Matthean nature of the term "poor in Spirit". See further my (as yet unpublished) paper, "How Blessed are the Poor?: Source-Critical Reflections on the First Beatitude in Matthew, Luke, Thomas and Q", read at the Synoptics Section, British New Testament Society conference, Bristol, September 1999.

worth looking at what the implications of the presence of such passages would be. Do they necessitate the existence of Q?

(b) Let us say that we were to find a Lucan form of a Q saying that appeared on solid grounds to be more original than its Matthean counterpart. Would this witness to the existence of Q? It is universally assumed that the answer to this question is affirmative, but we need to observe that this too is based on a fallacy. Occasional signs of greater primitivity are only a difficulty for Luke's literary knowledge of Matthew if we are prepared to deny the role of oral tradition in Gospel relationships,[48] if we assume oral traditions of the Jesus story died out as soon as each evangelist committed them to papyrus, or if we think that oral traditions each travelled down their own individual, exclusive pipelines, one for Mark, one for Q, one for L and so on.

The situation, in other words, is like this. If we grant Luke's literary dependence on both Matthew and Mark, it is inherently plausible to imagine this literary dependence interacting with Luke's knowledge of oral traditions of some of the same material. This makes it inevitable that, on occasion,

---

[48] This is effectively Goulder's position and is arguably one of the most problematic elements in his thesis. My *Goulder and the Gospels*, Part 2, accepted Goulder's thesis that Luke was a highly creative writer without the less plausible theory that Luke had virtually no knowledge of oral traditions. See especially pp. 284-7. Although John Drury also follows this path, it is not necessary in the acceptance of the Farrer theory – cf. Austin Farrer, "On Dispensing", p. 85 and Eric Franklin, *Luke*, throughout.

Luke will show knowledge of some more primitive traditions. Take, for example, the Lord's Prayer (Matt. 6.9-13 // Luke 11.2-4), one of the key examples of a supposedly more primitive Lucan form, and, as a liturgical text, the kind of passage that we will expect to have been particularly prone to local variation in oral tradition. Even today, where the Lord's Prayer is often known primarily orally and not in dependence on a written text, one finds local variation. The same kind of thing seems highly likely to have been the case when Luke comes to write his version of the prayer in 11.2-4. He looks at the Matthean version but re-writes it in line with the version more familiar to him from frequent recitation in his own tradition. Just as many Catholics today end the prayer where Matthew ends it, at "Deliver us from evil", without adding "Thine be the kingdom, the glory and the power, for ever and ever Amen", so Luke ends his prayer with "Lead us not into temptation" and not with "But deliver us from evil", in spite of the fact that the latter is present in his text of Matthew. Just as Catholics today know of the existence of the "Thine is the kingdom" clause, but choose not to use it because of familiarity and loyalty to tradition, so too it is hardly difficult to think of Luke knowing the clause "But deliver us from evil" but not using it for the same kinds of reason.

We can see the same principle at work in Luke's use of Mark. We do not always automatically accord priority to the Marcan version of traditions they share. In the case of the Eucharistic tradition, for example (Matt. 26.26-29 // Mark 14.22-25 // Luke 22.15-20), Luke appears to have different, arguably "more original" elements over against Mark – indeed we are lucky enough to have an independent witness to this in Paul's epistle to the Corinthians (1 Cor. 11.23-26). Given that most of us happy to grant that there are, on occasions, some more primitive elements in Luke's triple tradition passages, not withstanding Luke's agreed literary dependence on Mark, we should not be surprised to see the same thing from time to time in the double tradition material that Luke shares with Matthew.

The difficulty is that scholars have routinely confused issues of literary priority with issues over the relative age of traditions. The theory of Luke's literary dependence on Mark and Matthew does not necessitate the assumption that his material is always and inevitably secondary to Matthew's and Mark's. Just as most of us do not deny the likelihood that Luke creatively and critically interacted with the living stream of oral tradition when he was working with Mark, so too we should not think it odd that he

might have interacted with Matthew in the light of his knowledge of similar material in oral tradition.[49]

As usual, we will do well to pay attention to what Luke tells us he is doing in 1.1-4. Does he not imply that he has been engaging carefully not only with those who have undertaken to write narratives (1.1), but also with the things that have been "handed down by those who from the first were eyewitnesses and servants of the word" (1.2)? If we take this seriously, we have a picture of an evangelist who is critically and creatively interacting with both traditions and writings of "the events that have been fulfilled among us". The time has come to distinguish properly between direct literary use of a prior text and knowledge of oral traditions, both of which are key in the composition of Luke's Gospel. Since practically all scholars accept that Luke was familiar with oral traditions of Jesus material, it is quite reasonable to assume that some of these traditions will have overlapped and interacted with his direct knowledge of his written sources. It is quite reasonable, in other words, to dispense with Q.

[49] I am grateful to my former supervisor John Muddiman for setting my thoughts off in

Conclusion

In spite of the steady increase in uncertainty on the Synoptic Problem in some circles, Q has remained Marcan Priority's favourite companion. But we should not allow Q a monopoly on the affections of Marcan Priority. For while the Priority of Mark has stood the test of time, Q looks less secure. Its essential premise, Matthew's and Luke's independent use of Mark, is based in large part on arguments which at first hearing sound plausible but which on closer inspection turn out to be flawed. It is not acceptable to speak of Luke lacking Matthew's additions to Mark in triple tradition (fallacy 2), nor will it do simply to repeat the dubious value judgement on Luke's order (fallacy 3). The Minor Agreements are only "too minor" to be significant if they are viewed outside of the larger continuum of agreement between Matthew and Luke against Mark (fallacy 4) and the argument from "alternating primitivity" requires both dubious assumptions about the reconstruction of Q and the failure to recognise a distinction between literary priority and the relative age of traditions (fallacy 5). Least acceptable of all is the simple equation of Marcan Priority with the Two-Source Theory, thereby eliminating the challenge from the Farrer Theory (fallacy 1).

---

this direction. See his review of Michael Goulder, *Luke* in *JTS* 43 (1992), pp. 176-80.

Fitzmyer once said that the great advantage of the Q hypothesis was its usefulness, its *Brauchbarkeit*, and in some ways this is right.[50] It is an hypothesis that as part of the Two-Source Theory has allowed us the means to get familiar with Marcan Priority, to work with it, to test it and to re-imagine Christian origins with it. In an era of scholarship less sensitive than ours to the literary creativity of Luke, Marcan Priority needed a partner like Q to help establish its plausibility. But its usefulness was only for a season. The more we work with Q in the interpretation of Matthew and Luke, the more we will see its limitations for doing what we now want to do in Gospel studies. We are grateful to Q – it has served us well – but now it is time for it to bow out and to give way to a worthy successor, a theory that allows us scope to appreciate the evangelists' literary achievements while strongly affirming, indeed building on the Priority of Mark.

[50] J. Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, p. 65, "the modified Two-Source Theory has at least led to all sorts of advances in gospel interpretation and has pragmatically established its utility"; cf. Arland Jacobson, *The First Gospel*, p. 5; W. D. Davies and D. C. Allison, *Matthew*, p. 98.

LUKE'S REWRITING OF THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT

Mark A. Matson
Milligan College

As a solution to the Synoptic Problem, the reigning two-source hypothesis posits in addition to Mark a second source termed "Q." A major foundation upon which the argument for a source "Q" is built is the perceived independence of Luke and Matthew. If Luke and Matthew did not know each other, then there must be a source common to both of them to explain the remarkable similarities between the two gospels. If, however, the Third Gospel used Matthew as one of its sources, the whole structure of the two-source hypothesis becomes unstable, since one of its major foundations is removed. Without the independence of Luke and Matthew, a hypothetical source is rendered functionally unnecessary.

One reason that has often been put forward for the independence of Luke and Matthew is the perceived literary superiority of the Sermon on the Mount. Since much of the material in the Sermon on the Mount is found in various places in Luke's narrative, it has been argued that Luke must have relied on a source with a dissimilar order to the material. This is because, given the distinctive, structured, and rhetorically powerful thrust of Matthew's presentation, it would be unlikely or impossible that Luke would have dismantled the material in Matthew 5 – 7, scattering it among a variety of narrative settings, and destroying its literary unity.

But is it a necessary or even compelling conclusion that Luke would not have used Matthew in such a way that resulted in a restructuring and recontextualizing of material found in Matthew's Sermon on the Mount? This paper is a preliminary attempt to examine critically the assumption that Luke's compositional strategy could not have used Matthew's material in such a way as to dismantle the First Gospel's construction. Or, put in a more positive way, this paper will explore Luke's use of material from Matthew's Sermon on the Mount from the perspective of the Farrer Theory; that is, that Luke had

available two primary sources: Mark and Matthew.[1] While the test for any theory of gospel relationships is, of necessity, complex and depends on a cumulative demonstration of reasonableness, still a narrow test case is often a worthwhile means of gaining entry to the larger questions. The issue of the Sermon on the Mount, and Luke's alternative presentation of that material, is an ideal test case.

I. The Importance of the Independence of Matthew and Luke

It is not necessary to repeat the primary arguments for the existence of "Q," which have been developed in a number of places.[2] But it is, perhaps, worth reviewing the importance that has been placed on the independence of Luke and Matthew and its relationship to the Q hypothesis, as well as some of the correlate assumptions that go along with this view. Christopher Tuckett lays out the basic situation quite clearly:

> The case for the existence of Q, like the case for Markan priority, is a cumulative one. It is also in some sense a negative one, since the Q hypothesis is essentially the alternative to the possibility that Luke knew Matthew. (The theory that Matthew knew Luke is hardly ever proposed today.) If Luke did not know Matthew, the only real alternative theory is that both evangelists depend on common source material.[3]

One also finds similar attention to the central role of the independence of Matthew and Luke in J. C. Hawkins: "In thus speaking of the lost document Q we are making the second of the two assumptions for which grounds have to be here stated. We are assuming that neither Mt nor Lk drew upon the other's

---

[1] Austin M. Farrer, "On Dispensing with Q." In *Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R.H. Lightfoot* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1955), pp. 55-88.

[2] See, for instance: (1) Robert H. Stein, *The Synoptic Problem: An Introduction* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1987), pp. 89-112; (2) Werner G. Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament,* Revised Edition (Nashville: Abingdon, 1990) pp. 63-77, especially p. 64; (3) E. P. Sanders and Margaret Davies, *Studying the Synoptic Gospels* (Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1989), pp. 62-66, p. 67.

[3] C. M. Tuckett, "the Synoptic Problem" in *Anchor Bible Dictionary* [*ABD*] (NY: Doubleday,1992), vol. 6, p. 268.

Gospel as his written source, but that they used independently an older document."[4] Similarly, B. H. Streeter notes that the simplest solution to the material common to Luke and Matthew, but absent from Mark, is that Luke knew Matthew's gospel. In response to this, he offers fundamental problems to this "easy" solution: (1) the disagreement in the order of such common material in the Markan outline ("... subsequent to the Temptation story, there is not a single case in which Matthew and Luke agree in inserting the same saying at the same point in the Marcan outline"), and (2) the "original form" of the saying varies between Luke and Matthew.[5] These representative references from scholars who have defended the Q hypothesis are sufficient to indicate the importance of the independence of Luke and Matthew. Simply put, without the independence of Luke and Matthew, the need for Q disappears.

A counterpart to the idea that Luke could not have used Matthew as a major source is the nature of Luke's role as an author, or, more correctly, the conception that Luke was not an author, but rather a compiler and editor. For the original Q hypothesis, with the independent reliance of Luke and Matthew on that source, originated in great part on a view of the gospel writers as compilers of traditions with little independent authorial design.[6] But modern Lukan studies have increasingly emphasized Luke's skill as a composer, not just an editor. Of course this understanding has been developed with respect to Matthew as well, and Matthew is seen as having formed from disparate material his great sermons.[7] But there still remains an underlying resistance to

---

[4] John C. Hawkins, "Double Tradition in Matthew and Luke" in *Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, ed. W. Sanday (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911), p. 102.

[5] B. H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins* (NY: The Macmillan Co., 1925), p. 183.

[6] Farrer, p. 56.

[7] The existence of five large discourse blocks has often been noted, which suggests an intentional compositional strategy. See W. D. Davies and Dale Allison, *The Gospel According to St. Matthew* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1988), pp. 58-72. Analysis of the Sermon on the Mount has also shown its intentional design: cf. Dale Allison, "The Structure of the Sermon on the Mount," *JBL* 106 (1987): 423-445; Dale Allison, A New

conceiving Luke's work as having substantial freedom with his source material, a freedom that is educated primarily from a literary artistic sense, not a restricted reliance on source documents.[8]

As a result of this rather wooden view of Luke's compositional strategy, it is argued that Luke would hardly have disrupted the order of Matthew's material if he were relying on the First Gospel, this despite the fact that the Q theorists are willing to grant that Matthew has rearranged the material from Q (which is often presumed to have been presented in the order found in Luke). But this assumes an estimation of literary aesthetics that overshadows the strictly historical question: Matthew's arrangement is good, and Luke's is not as good. So Tuckett succinctly states the argument "If Luke knew Matthew, why has he changed the Matthean order so thoroughly, disrupting Matthew's clear and concise arrangement of the teaching material into five blocks, each concerned with a particular theme?"[9] Note the statement that Matthew's arrangement is clear and concise, thus implying that Luke's alternative arrangement is less than that. To put it more bluntly, Streeter suggests:

> If then Luke derived this material from Matthew, he must have gone through both Matthew and Mark so as to discriminate with meticulous precision between Marcan and non-Marcan material; he must then have proceeded with the utmost care to tear every little piece of non-Marcan material he desired to use from the context of Mark in which it appeared in Matthew – in spite of the fact that contexts in Matthew are always exceedingly appropriate – in order to re-insert it into a different context of Mark having no special appropriateness. A theory which would make an author capable of such a proceeding would only be tenable if, on other

---

Approach to the Sermon on the Mount," *ETL* 66 (1988): 405-414; J. Smit Sibinga, "Exploring the Composition of Matth. 5-7," *Filologia Neotestamentaria* 7(1994): 175-196.

[8] Hence the continual reference to Luke's material as retaining the original order of the Q material.

[9] Tuckett, *ABD*, p. 268.

grounds, we had reason to believe he was a crank.[10]

Streeter's rhetoric is remarkably excessive, and the facts of the case do not support him well. But the point here is the underlying assumption that Luke's arrangement is inferior to Matthew, which is an aesthetic view. Kümmel takes this aesthetic perspective and directly applies it to the Sermon on the Mount when he asks, "What could possibly have motivated Lk, for example, to shatter Mt's sermon on the mount, placing part of it in his sermon on the plain, dividing up other parts among various chapters of his Gospel, and letting the rest drop out of sight?"[11]

Finally, we must also note a prevailing assumption that Luke must have a uniform, and again I use the term wooden, approach to his use of sources. Thus one critique lodged against the possible use of Matthew by Luke is based on Luke's pattern of usage of Mark. Since Luke often follows Mark's order of pericopes rather closely, albeit with large segments or interpolations of non-Markan material, we should expect Luke to follow a similar approach with respect to Matthew.[12] This assumes that Luke held his various sources in equal esteem, which again assumes a rather cut and paste approach to authorship.

The foregoing objections to Lukan use of Matthew are significant. Any attempt to propose an alternative to the two source hypothesis must ultimately deal with them. In this attempt to explore the viability of the Farrer theory in the case of the Sermon on the Mount, the following questions must be faced head on:

1. Is Luke's use of Matthew reasonable, given his authorial design and behavior?

2. Is Luke's arrangement necessarily less aesthetically pleasing than Matthew? Is it less compelling? Is it less convincing for the purpose that the

---

[10] Streeter, p. 183.

[11] Kümmel, p. 64.

[12] This assessment of Luke's use of Mark is not entirely accurate. I will return to this point in the conclusion of my paper.

Evangelist puts forward?

3. Can one imagine Luke using Mark in a different way than he does Matthew?

These concerns will guide the evaluation of Luke's use of the Sermon on the Mount material, and I will return to these explicit concerns at the conclusion of this paper.

It also appropriate at the outset to attempt a clear and concise statement of the major features of the tentative hypothesis (alternative to the two-source hypothesis) that educates this exploration of the Sermon on the Mount material. These can be summarized as follows:

1. Mark is the first gospel written, and was used by churches, and thus was available to the authors of Luke and Matthew some years before subsequent gospels were written.

2. Matthew used Mark as his major source, supplementing it with a variety of traditional material, as well as creatively shaping that material in a new gospel.

3. Luke also relied on Mark as his primary source for structure and wording. As with Matthew, Luke added additional material to Mark's gospel, and was willing to modify and edit Mark when he deemed it appropriate.

4. Luke also used Matthew, but was more critical of Matthew than he was of Mark. This may have been due to the perceived priority of Mark (perhaps having already achieved a firm place in the church's teaching and preaching), or it may be due to a perceived editorial freedom on the part of Matthew that Luke was more willing to modify.

5. Luke also has his own design, which is inherently theological and literary. As stated in the prologue, Luke was critical of other attempts at presenting the life of Jesus, either because they were not properly ordered or, more probably, because the presentation of material did not adequately present the story so that the readers would "know the truth" about Jesus. Luke is, then, a rhetorical document which aims to produce a more compelling story for the reader.

From this alternative perspective of the Farrer theory of synoptic relationships, I will explore the reasonableness of Luke's handling of the

Sermon on Mount material. If Luke's use of Matthew's Sermon on the Mount is found to be plausible within the context of Luke's theology and literary methods, then the necessity of Luke's independence from Matthew will need to be questioned on a more global basis. In the discussion that follows I will deal with three features of the difference between Luke and Matthew relative to the Sermon on the Mount material: (1) omitted material, (2) differences in order and placement of material, and (3) differences in language and emphasis in similar material.[13]

II. The Case of Omitted Material

If Luke had available Matthew's Sermon on the Mount, why would some of Matthew's material simply be left out of the newly constructed gospel? A comparison of Luke and Matthew quickly allows one to identify units of material that have no counterpart in the Third Gospel. These units are:

❑ Mt 5:21-24	On Murder and Anger
❑ Mt. 5:27-30	On Adultery
❑ Mt. 5:33-37	On Oaths
❑ Mt. 6:1-4	On Almsgiving
❑ Mt. 6:5-6	On Prayer
❑ Mt. 6:7-8	Don't Pray as Gentiles
❑ Mt 6:16-18	On Fasting
❑ Mt. 7:6	Pearls and Swine

This list of material in Matthew's sermon that is absent from Luke is intriguing, in part because this material is primarily found grouped together in Matthew. This suggests the possibility that Luke found whole units of material less than satisfactory and tended to delete them in somewhat block fashion. In the first instance, Matthew's antitheses, one can note that Matthew's antithesis construction (you have heard it said ... but I say) is avoided entirely by Luke. Of course, Luke does use some snippets of material from the section found in

[13] I am indebted in the following discussion to observations made by Mark Goodacre in his forthcoming book, *The Case Against Q* (Trinity Press International, forthcoming).

Mt 5:21-48, but in a very different way than Matthew. For instance, the latter part of the first antithesis on murder and anger is found in Luke 12:57-59 as an admonition for reconciliation, but without the framing context (e.g. the antithesis construction) of a reinterpretation of the Law. Now, it is possible that Matthew added the framing context, and that the essential teaching (e.g. Mt 5:22-26 without Mt 5:21, or Mt 5:32 without Mt 5:31) was present in Q. But this avoids dealing with the fact that most of the material on the antithesis section is either missing in Luke or found in very different contexts. This suggests a more intentional pattern of avoidance of this section of material.

Similarly, most of the section from 6:1-18 is missing, with the major exception only being the Lord's Prayer. This section, introduced in Matthew with the words "beware of practicing your piety before others to be seen by them" seems, as a section, to have been avoided by Luke. Again, some small segments of this material are found elsewhere in Luke (e.g. the advice against public demonstration of righteousness seems to have been picked up by Luke at 16:15), but it has lost its Matthean focus as part of a multi-pronged argument against various acts of Jewish piety. Again, perhaps Matthew has simply added this anti-piety material to "Q" material in forming his sermon. But a more likely explanation is that Luke has found clusters of material in Matthew's sermon that were considered unhelpful in his presentation of the teaching of Jesus.

What is noteworthy is that both sections that are avoided by Luke tend to deal with a reinterpretation of Jewish law or criticism of Jewish practice. The antithesis section addresses a rather particular reinterpretation of Jewish law, almost as an intramural legal debate. And the "piety" unit deals with particular pietistic practices of Judaism, practices which might often be ways of distinguishing Jews from other peoples. To the degree that one might conceive of Luke's audience as being heavily Gentile, and Luke's purpose as addressing salvation for all people, these particular deletions make sense.[14] Moreover, attention to divisive issues such as the legality of particular practices might serve to distract from Luke's sense to synthesize Jewish

[14] Joel Green, *The Gospel of Luke* (Grand Rapids: Wm B. Eerdmans, 1997), p. 21.

practices with Gentile inclusion. The combination of the concern for audience and the interest in bridging the divide between Jews and Gentiles might also explain the deletion of Mt. 7:6, which would almost certainly be viewed as a pejorative statement against Gentiles.

Scholars have argued that Luke resists the large blocks of teaching that are found in Matthew in preference to smaller units of teaching.[15] This may well be a supporting reason for Luke to have cast a critical eye on material taken over from Matthew. But this, in itself, seems a less compelling explanation for the omissions. And it certainly does not explain why this material in particular was omitted over against other material that was used.

At any rate, the material in Matthew that is not represented in Luke is distinguished by its presence in clusters in Matthew, and its cohesive subject matter. These two factors would certainly fit with an editorial pattern of selecting material from Matthew for reuse in a rewritten gospel.

III. The Case of Re-ordering and/or Transposed Material

A comparison of Matthew's Sermon on the Mount with Luke finds that similar material is found in a wide variety of contexts in Luke. Much is, indeed, found in Luke's Sermon on the Plain (6:17-49). But within Luke's sermon, some has a slightly different order. Additionally, other material from Matthew's Sermon on the Mount is transposed to completely different settings. We can quickly chart this out as follows:

[15] Drury, *Tradition and Design in Luke's Gospel* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1976), p. 134; M. D. Goulder, *Luke: A New Paradigm* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989) p. 346.

Comparison of Placement of Matthew and Luke Sermon on Mount Material[16]

Mt. 5:1	Setting of Sermon on Mount	Lk. 6:17	Setting of Sermon on Plain
		Lk. 6:20-23	Beatitudes
Mt. 5:3-12	Beatitudes	Lk 14:34-35	Salt is Good
5:13	Salt of the Earth	Lk 8:16; *11:33 Light on a Stand*	
5:14-16	Light on a Stand	***Lk 16:16-17***	***Law and Prophets***
5:17-20	On the Law & Prophets	Lk 12:57-58	On Reconciling
5:25-26	On Reconciling	***Lk 16:18***	***On Divorce***
5:31-32	On Divorce	Lk 6:29-30	Turn the Cheek
5:38-42	On Retaliation	Lk 6:27-28;32-36	Love your Enemies
5:43-48	Love Your Enemies		
		Lk 11:1-4	Lord's Prayer
6:9-15	The Lord's Prayer	**Lk 12:33-34**	**Treasure in Heaven**
6:19-21	Treasure in Heaven	*Lk 11:34-36*	*The Good Eye*
6:22-23	The Good Eye	***Lk 16:13***	***Two Masters***
6:24	Two Masters	**Lk 12:22-32**	**Do Not Worry**
6:25-34	Do Not Worry		
		Lk 6:37-42	Do Not Judge
7:1-5	Do Not Judge	Lk 11:9-13	Ask, Seek, Knock
7:7-11	Ask, Seek, Knock	Lk 6:31	Golden Rule
7:12	Golden Rule	*Lk 13:23-24*	*Two Ways*
7:13-14	Two Ways	Lk 6:43-45	Known by its Fruit
7:15-20	Known by its Fruit	*Lk 13:25-27*	*On That Day*
7:21-23	On that Day	Lk 6:47-49	House Built on a Rock
7:24-27	House Built on a Rock		

At first glance, this comparison of the placement of material in Matthew's sermon and Luke's use of it appears hodge-podge and almost random. But a closer look shows some very strong evidence of Luke's knowledge of Matthew's order and a thoughtful approach to transposing the material.

A. The Sermon on the Plain

Luke does utilize a significant amount of material from Matthew's sermon in his Sermon on the Plain. Of course, as the previous chart has shown, much has also been moved to completely different contexts. But a comparison

[16] Note the following listing of clustering of Luke's material that will be used in the following discussion:Cluster "A" - Highlighted; Cluster "B" - Underlined; Cluster "C" - *Italic & Underline*; Cluster "D" - **Bold Type**; Cluster "E" - *Italic*; Cluster "F" - ***Bold Italic***.

of the material that Luke does incorporate shows a remarkably common ordering:[17]

Order of Material Common to
Sermon on Mount and Sermon on Plain

	Matthew 5:1-7:27		Luke 6:17-49
5:1	Setting of the Sermon	6:17	Setting of the Sermon
5:3-12	The Beatitudes	6:20-23	The Beatitudes + Woes
5:38-42	On Retaliation	6:27-28	Turn the Cheek
5:43-48	Love Your Enemies	6:29-30	Love Your Enemies
		6:31	Golden Rule
		6:32-36	Love Your Enemies
7:1-5	Do Not Judge	6:37-42	Do Not Judge
7:12	Golden Rule		
7:15-20	Known by its Fruit	6:43-45	Known by its Fruit
7:21-23	On That Day (Lord, Lord)	6:46	Lord, Lord

With the exception of a cluster of material dealing with the topic of Love Your Enemies, Luke's order is identical with Matthew's. This order of material is readily explainable if Luke has relied on Matthew.

To begin with, Luke has a setting of his sermon that is heavily dependent on Mark's language at 3:7-13, whom he has in general been following very closely for much of the order of material (the major exceptions dealing with calling and naming of "the twelve"). Luke follows Mark in having Jesus name the twelve apostles on a mountain top (Lk 6:12-16), which is the unit of text immediately preceding the Sermon on the Plain, different than Matthew's placement. He, therefore, has Jesus coming down from the mountain just before beginning his sermon. Luke, then, has Jesus begin the sermon on a level place, a very explicit contrast to the previous mountain setting.[18] The emphasis on the placement of the sermon appears as well to be a deliberate

[17] The chart is a modification of that found in Drury, p. 133, to whom I am indebted for the clarity such a chart presents.

[18] Green notes (*Luke*, p. 262), I think correctly, that this is a theological construction by Luke to emphasize the movement from prayer place to action.

rejoinder to Matthew's sermon on the mountain. Perhaps this was to emphasize that the sermon was for all the people, since the mountain seems to be a place for Jesus' close relationship with his disciples (in Mark and Luke, the disciples are selected on a mountain; in Matthew the disciples alone seem to follow Jesus to the mountain to hear the sermon).[19] This would seem to be additionally suggested by the clear differences in the audience for the sermons: Matthew addresses only his disciples (i.e. the twelve), while Luke emphasizes that there was a great crowd of his disciples and a great crowd of people. Perhaps Luke was also uncomfortable with the Mosaic imagery. But at any rate, Luke's emphasis on the level place appears to be a specific counterpart to Matthew's placement on the mountain. Since the setting in Matthew is hardly likely to be from Q, this opening language in Luke which parallels Matthew's setting, seems to suggest some literary engagement with Matthew.[20]

What follows then in Luke is a number of pericopes selected from Matthew's sermon, presented in the same order. The exception to the common ordering of material is a small cluster which is an interpretation of Matthew's admonitions on love of enemies. Luke has taken the material from Mt 5:43-48 and slightly re-ordered it, inserting into its midst the Golden Rule. Luke resists the antithesis format which Matthew uses to introduce his teaching on loving enemies. Instead, Luke moves to the beginning of the unit a thesis statement, "Love your enemies, do good to those who hate you," then picks up Matthew's examples (turn the other cheek, give your shirt, etc), and finally follows that with more generalizing comments on the thesis established at the outset: do to others as you wish others would do, do good to evil since even

---

[19] Hans Conzelmann (*The Theology of Luke* [NY: Harper and Row, 1960], p. 44) also notes that for Luke mountains are places of revelation and prayer. Luke has Jesus on mountains generally alone or with a small group of disciples, e.g. Lk 9:37.

[20] John Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987), pp. 70, 74 shows the Q material starting at Lk 6:20 and Mt 5:3, thus relegating the setting of the sermons to redaction by the evangelists. Hans Dieter Betz, *Sermon on the Mount* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995) ignores both settings, though he thinks the common orientation suggests a similar prior setting in the pre-gospel tradition (p. 80-81). But if so, how does one account for the specifically different geographical placement? Surely this must a conscious choice of the evangelists.

sinners do good to those who do good. He completes the section returning to a modification of Matthew's close of this pericope: be merciful as your Father is merciful, substituting "merciful" for Matthew's "perfect." Luke appears to be closely following Matthew's material, then, but making some rhetorical improvements and interpreting the command to love one's enemies in terms of the very broad Golden Rule.

If one compares Luke's shorter Sermon on the Plain with Matthew's Sermon on the Mount, it would appear that Luke has achieved a more focused sermon than Matthew. It has often been noted that Matthew's sermon is a collection of disparate materials, with which it is somewhat difficult to find a clear pattern.[21] Allison has argued cogently for a pattern of triads which reflects the evangelist's own pattern of composition.[22] But even with this pattern, there is still the sense of a loose collection of material covering a variety of ethical subjects. In contrast, Luke's sermon is far more focused and consistent: "One single theme is carried through, and the individual sections follow each other in meaningful order, joining member to member by internal connection."[23] Goulder has argued that Luke's sermon is essentially a simple two pronged sermon: the first part deals with poverty and persecution the disciple must expect, and the latter part deals with peril of blind leaders.[24] Luke Timothy Johnson has similarly argued that Luke's Sermon on the Plain is "thematically more integrated" than Matthew's sermon.[25] Is this movement from loose collection to a tighter more coherent sermon not what one might

---

[21] K. Grayston, "Sermon on the Mount" in *IDB* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962), vol. 4, p. 288, notes that "the sayings of 6:19-24 are loosely held together by the thought of possessions," and "the section 7:1-12 is an oddly assorted group of sayings..."

[22] D. C. Allison, "A New Approach to the Sermon on the Mount," pp. 405-414.

[23] Emanuel Hirsch, *Frühgeschichte des Evangeliums*, as quoted in Betz, p. 41. Hirsh's evaluation is far more accurate than Joseph Fitzmyer's: "In contrast to the well-constructed Matthean sermon on the mount, the Lucan sermon is loose and rambling." *(The Gospel According to Luke, I-IX* [NY: Doubleday, 1981], p. 628).

[24] M. D. Goulder, *Luke: A New Paradigm*, p. 348.

[25] Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1991), p. 110.

expect from Luke's culling the Matthean material, collecting it in a more cohesive and systematic order? Is this not implicit in what Luke says of his own work, that he intends to put things down "in order?"[26]

B. Cluster of Material Relative to Prayer

It is striking, of course, that Luke does not include the Lord's Prayer in his Sermon on the Plain. Instead, this is moved to a later chapter. But Luke again shows a keen eye for order and systematic presentation in this transposition. Luke includes the Lord's prayer in a section that deals more extensively with prayer than Matthews's Sermon on the Mount. In many ways, then, Luke has accentuated and expanded the material he found in Matthew.

Chapter 11 in Luke begins with Jesus praying, a particular emphasis in Luke.[27] The Third Evangelist then uses this setting as an opportunity to bring together a number of teachings about prayer as response to the disciples' request to be taught. First is the Lord's Prayer, followed by a unit of *Sondergut* material, the example of the Importunate Friend (Lk 11:5-8). This is then followed by a passage drawn from the Sermon on the Mount, Mt 7:7-11, Encouragement to Pray.

What Luke presents in this small cluster is an effective mini-sermon on the importance of prayer. The material is selected around a central theme and coheres well. In comparison, Matthew's presentation separates two different teachings on prayer, with the result that they become part of a catalog of various virtues. By separating the prayer material and bringing it together, and framing it with both Jesus' own prayer attitude and the disciples' request to learn about this attitude, Luke has given it an independent status that makes it more important as an independent quality.

C. Cluster of Material On Lamp

More problematic is Luke's handling of Mt 5:14-16, the Light on a

---

[26] I particularly like Fitzmyer's translation of the prologue here: "I too have decided, after tracing everything carefully from the beginning, to put them systematically in writing for you.." (*Luke*, p. 287). (my emphasis)

[27] Joel Green, *The Theology of Luke* (Cambridge: University Press, 1995), p. 58-9.

Stand. In the first place, Luke actually retells this parable twice: Lk 8:16 and Lk 11:33. The first actually relies on Mk 4:21-25, and is found in Luke precisely following material drawn from Mk 4:13-20. A close examination shows that Lk 11:33 is drawn fairly closely from the Matthew version found in the Sermon on the Mount.

But Luke does not insert this into his text by itself, but rather Luke inserts it into a section of Luke which has already drawn on Sermon on the Mount material (the Prayer section discussed above, Lk 11:1-13). And, further, Luke connects the Lamp on a Stand pericope with another piece of material drawn from the Sermon on the Mount, The Sound Eye, Mt. 6:22-23. Since the eye is deemed the "lamp of the body," Luke has apparently made the connection that Lamp on the Stand stands for a person of sound spirit, a "whole" person, a righteous individual. The material which stands unconnected in Matthew is thus contextualized in Luke.

Luke has also connected the parable of the Light on a Stand with the preceding passage on the Sign of Jonah (Lk 11:29-32), by means of the linking word "evil."[28] This generation is "evil" because it does not recognize that the need to repent was already spoken through Jonah. So also the person's eye that is "evil" produces a darkness like placing a lamp under a basket. But the prophetic call to repentance and forgiveness, as with Jonah so also with Jesus (something greater than Jonah! v. 32), should be an occasion for light and soundness. The net result of this is that Luke has produced a nuanced interpretation of material available from Matthew (Light on Stand, Good Eye, Jonah) and reconfigured seemingly independent material into a prophetic warning about hearing the announcement of repentance and forgiveness. This construction from disparate Matthew material also leads quite nicely to Luke's warnings against the Pharisees (Lk 11:37-52), who can be taken to be examples of the evil generation that does not hear the prophetic call.

Viewed from Luke's narrative design, in which Jesus in the central section of the gospel is taking on the role of Prophet journeying toward

---

[28] Green, *Luke*, p. 462. Johnson, *Luke*, 184 ff., has also linked these passages together as a single pericope.

Jerusalem with increasing opposition, Luke's use of the Matthew material fits perfectly. He has taken material from various places in Matthew, and recontextualized them to effectively move forward Luke's story of Jesus the prophet on the Way.

D. Cluster of Material on Riches

More easily perceived is Luke's use of Sermon on the Mount material in his chapter 12. Here the connecting theme of riches is apparent. Luke has constructed a unit of material that all emphasizes the relationship of the disciple with wealth. This cluster of material, which Johnson entitles "Treasure and the Heart," consists of:

❑ Lk 12: 13-15	Warning Against Avarice	Lukan *Sondergut*
❑ Lk 12:16-21	Parable of the Rich Fool	Lukan *Sondergut*
❑ Lk 12:22-32	Do Not Worry	From Mt. 6:25-34
❑ Lk 12:33-34	Treasure in Heaven	From Mt. 6:19-24

These four units provide a striking and powerful sermon on the relative value of wealth and the connection between belongings and a relationship with God. By combining material from Matthew's Sermon on the Mount, together with unique material, Luke has made a more effective point. This is, of course, consistent with Luke's literary and theological emphases.[29] This section in Luke is but one of many that address the special concerns of poverty and riches and discipleship.

One should also note in this unit of material that Luke has made a rather specific interpretation of the role of possessions in the context of discipleship. While the original parable on the Rich Fool is addressed to the multitude as a warning, the subsequent teaching about care and anxiety is addressed to the disciples, who one can assume have already made the commitment to follow God rather than personal gain.[30] To these disciples the words or comfort ("do

---

[29] Green, *Theology of Luke*, p. 112.

[30] My gratitude to Mark Goodacre for this observation, who noted this following a first reading of this paper.

not worry") are given. Luke has allowed the accumulation of material from different sources to discriminate between audiences, which is a fairly sophisticated narrative device.

Note also here the hand of Luke in the modification of Mt 6:19-21, an indication of Luke's interaction with the material. Luke has added a strong reinterpretation of the Matthean language. Instead of the negative exhortation "do not lay up treasures on earth" in Mt 6:19, Luke makes a stronger statement with a positive, "Sell your possessions, and give alms (Lk 12:33)." This is clearly the hand of Luke.[31]

So this construction has all the marks of Luke's emphasis and his redaction. Luke has gathered material together, and modified it, to make a strong rhetorical point about the way to deal with possessions. It is easier to argue for Luke's active redaction here than to assert that this was Q's original order which Luke happened to pick up, and that Matthew has adapted it and lost the original power of it. This is especially true if one argues that Lk 12:16-21 were part of Q and originally preceded Q 12:22-34.[32] In this case, one might wonder whether Matthew was a "crank" for breaking up such a carefully constructed unity of material! But such a unity of material and emphasis is comprehensible given Luke's theological agenda.

E. Cluster of Eschatological Material

Directly following the teaching on possessions discussed above, Luke collects two groups of teachings in close proximity that center on eschatological concerns: 12:35 - 13:9 and 13:23-25. In the latter eschatological section Luke has drawn on material that was found in Matthew's Sermon on the Mount, Lk 13:23-24 (Two Ways) // Mt 7:13-14, and Lk 13:25-27 (On That Day) // Mt 7:22-23.

At first glance it would appear that this whole section is a bit of a hodge-

---

[31] Note, for instance, similar themes in Lk 14:33, 18:22 (and cf. 11:41), and especially in Acts 4:32 ff.

[32] As Schürmann does, with some appreciation by Kloppenborg. See Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q*, p. 216, note 182.

podge of teachings drawn from various sources.[33] The initial eschatological warnings have a parallel with Mt. 24 (parallel Mk 13). But Luke also considered it appropriate following the sections on courage in face of tribulation (12:1-12) and concern over possessions (12:13-34) to address eschatological concerns.

The return to the issue of eschatological concerns in 13:22 flows rather naturally from the intervening teaching on the Kingdom of God. Following the parable of the mustard seed and the leaven, Luke interprets the Kingdom of God eschatologically as the narrow door (Lk 13:22-24), and the call to the householder to open the door (Lk 13:25-30). Here Luke also combines the material from Mt 7:22-23 with other material from Mt (8:11-12) and Mk (10:31) to produce a powerful eschatological warning. Note also that by using Mt 8:11-12 material to focus on the rejection of God's prophets, he anticipates Jesus' own rejection and death as the Prophet. Since he follows this up with both the warning against Herod ("L" material) and the Lament over Jerusalem, the dual focus of eschatological concern and passion anticipation seems to be carefully constructed.

Looking at the whole narrative construction, these two sections of eschatological material are appropriate and provide an existential warning to the disciples and crowds about the importance of the teaching, as well as an anticipation of the passion. Luke has combined material from various sources, especially using the material from the Sermon on the Mount linked here by the thematic common feature of the door (narrow door, closed door) to emphasize commitment to the Kingdom and eschatological exclusion for those who reject Jesus.

F. Cluster of Material About the Law

Luke has created a final cluster of Sermon on the Mount material in a unit which deals with the relationship of possessions and the Law. The cluster

---

[33] Note Johnson's observation at this point: "This section challenges the reader's commitment to Luke as a conscious author of his Gospel ... Do we meet here a deft and deliberate crafter of the story, or only a clumsy editor? At stake is the interpretation of the passages themselves." (*Luke*, p. 219) Johnson finally concludes, as I do, that there is a careful compositional effort in this section.

of material is arranged as follows:

❑ 16: 1-9	The Dishonest Steward	Lukan *Sondergut*
❑ 16: 10-12	Faithful with much	Lukan *Sondergut*
❑ 16: 13	Two Masters	From Mt 6:24
❑ 16: 14-15	Pharisees Reproved	Lukan *Sondergut*
❑ 16: 16-17	Law and Prophets	From Mt 11:12-13; 5:17-20
❑ 16:18	On Divorce	From Mt 5:31-32
❑ 16: 19-31	Rich Man and Lazarus	Lukan *Sondergut*

It is fairly clear that the entire section of chapter 16 deals with the proper relationship to money and possessions, although there are a number of very difficult and troubling issues in this section. But the difficulties of understanding why some of the Matthean/Q material is inserted into a fundamentally Lukan section is as difficult for the Q hypothesis as for the Farrer hypothesis. Simply put, why does Luke insert the section on the Law and Prophets, or more particularly the saying on divorce, at this point? Even if he were drawing on Q, it is difficult to fully understand why he would insert these pericopes here.

Notwithstanding some real questions about Luke's authorial strategy, the broad outlines of Luke's purpose are clear. The first part of the unit (16:1-13) deals generally with the need to consider the proper use of possessions. The difficult parable of the dishonest manager at least suggests that one should use possessions to gain advantage. From this perspective, the moralizing summary in v. 9 "make friends for yourselves by means of mammon so that when it is gone they may welcome you into the eternal homes" seems to refer back to Luke's previous modification of the Treasure in Heaven saying from the Sermon on the Mount, Lk 12:33.[34] One wonders, then, whether this recollection does not lead Luke to insert the saying on Two Masters, which in Matthew is found close to the Treasure in Heaven section. Thus, the summary statement that one can't serve both God and mammon is appropriate to

[34] Johnson, *Luke*, p. 248: "As the manager used possessions to secure a place for himself, so should the disciples. In the light of Luke's language elsewhere about laying up treasures in heaven (12:33) there can be no doubt that this saying refers to almsgiving."

interpret the whole section preceding.

The second unit of material in Luke 16, vv.14-31, plays off a controversy with the Pharisees to develop the Jewish understanding of the Law's attitude toward money. This controversy is, of course, epitomized by the parable of Lazarus and the Rich Man which concludes this unit of material. The linkage of the Law with proper use of possessions is made clear in the final phrase, which implies that the problem with the Rich Man (=Pharisees) was simply that he was not really listening to the Law or he would have cared for Lazarus.

Within this last unit, Luke has inserted two units of material that are problematic, vv. 16-17, which draws on material found in Mt 11:12 -13 and Mt 5:17-20, and v. 18 which is similar to Mt 5:31-32. What appears to be happening is that Luke is trying to make application to the importance of the law, and thus the reference to the law and the prophets, as well as divorce, perhaps are meant to resonate with the Pharisees concern to keep the law.[35] From this perspective, the final turn in the Lazarus parable achieves a slightly stronger sense of irony. What I conceive Luke doing, then, is drawing on some previous material he knows from Matthew that deals with the Law to use as a foil for the Lazarus parable. While it is not a perfect fit, it serves Luke's purpose and drives the narrative forward to the final ironic twist in 16:31.

G. Various Minor Transpositions

What remains from Luke's use of Matthew's Sermon on the Mount material are a few minor transpositions:

❑ Lk 8:16	Light on a Stand	From Mt 5:14-16??
❑ Lk 12:57-59	On Settling with an Opponent	From Mt 5:25-26
❑ Lk 14:34-35	Salt Losing its Saltiness	From Mt 5:13

[35] Kloppenborg argues that it is situated in Luke here because of its location in the original order of Q, "(there is scarcely any reason for Luke to move this saying from its Matthean position to its present Lucan location)." (*Formation of Q*, p. 79) But it stands out in Matthew as well, so Fitzmyer: "It is almost as isolated there [Matt 5:32] as it is here in Luke, being unrelated to the topics of the other five antitheses, although agreeing with them in form." (*The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV* [NY: Doubleday, 1983], p. 1119)

I have already briefly discussed Luke's handling of the Lamp on the Stand. Luke in 8:16 seems in fact to be reliant in fact on Mark 4:21-25. The wording is closer to Mark, and finds its place in Luke's narrative matching exactly Mark's narrative order. Rather than being a doublet of Matthew 5:14-16, I think Luke has followed Mark closely in one unit, and drawn on Matthew in another part of his narrative (Lk 11:33).

Luke's use of Mt 5:25-26, The Settling with an Opponent, is found in the midst of some of his eschatological material (see section discussed above). Here it follows the pericope on Interpreting the Times (Lk12:54-56) and precedes the *Sondergut* story of the Barren Fig Tree (Lk 13:1-9). The net effect is to interpret the judge in Luke's version Settling with an Opponent as God; this is an eschatological judgement, which fits well with one of Luke's interests.[36]

The final transposition is Luke's use in 14:34-35 of the Salt parable from Mt 5:13, influenced by Mk 9:49-50. The location in Lk 14 is somewhat fitting if Luke is still aware of Mark's order. From Lk 9:51 to18:15, Luke has little contact with the Synoptic outline. At Lk 9:49-50, the Third Evangelist was drawing on Mk 9:38-41, and he returns to the Lukan outline at 18:15-17, drawing on Mk 10:13-16. The placement of the parable about salt in Lk 14:34 may reflect some of this sense of Markan outline, drawing on Mk 9:49-50 at this point. And in its Lukan narrative context, it serves to summarize a cluster of material which generally deals commitment to the Kingdom.

Luke, though, is drawing on Matthean language in his version of the Salt pericope. The statement in Luke, "it is fit neither for land or dunghill, men throw it away" has no counterpart in Mark, and is a modification of Matthew's form. So Luke, while perhaps locating the Salt pericope here under the influence of Mark's order, has nonetheless taken up Matthew's form of the parable. But Luke's use is at the same time uniquely Lukan, used to drive home the pointed remarks about the need for commitment to the Kingdom.

---

[36] Certainly one of the better evaluations of Luke's complex approach to eschatology is found in Robert Maddox, *The Purpose of Luke-Acts* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1982), pp. 100-157.

H. Summary Observations

As a review of Luke's use of the material which is common to Matthew's Sermon on the Mount, I note the following features:

(1) Luke has tended to use the material, whether drawn from Matthew or Q, in clusters which develop fairly coherent themes. These thematic clusters often accentuate or develop the material which is somewhat "thrown together" in Matthew as a list of ethical admonitions. This thematic clustering, then, furthers Luke's theological agenda and is consonant with a careful compositional strategy.

(2) Luke is quite willing to modify the order of Matthew's sermon, yet shows some reliance on it at certain points. This is especially true in Luke's Sermon on the Plain, where his use of common material is fundamentally Matthew's. The common ordering of material in the two sermons (even given the Lukan transpositions that remove material to other locations in his narrative) would suggest some literary relationship. Is it a common reliance on Q? Luke's use of Matthew would appear to be a more reasonable conclusion.

(3) Is the order of Q material in Luke as simply the order of the document "Q"? But this thesis appears to be derived from a negative response to Matthew's obviously constructed order; if Matthew's is not the original order, then Luke must have the original order. [37] Given Luke's careful attention to thematic coherence, however, it seems unlikely that Luke would have simply developed his themes around certain Q sayings as they happened to occur in this prior document, adding various Markan or *Sondergut* material as necessary. And perhaps Q theorists have been a bit enamored with Matthew's editorial construction, but have given less attention to Luke's own narrative design. Given Luke's authorial control over material, it seems more likely that he has selected material as needed to build thematic units in a

[37] This is the primary thrust of Kloppenborg's section on the order of Q (*Formation of Q*, pp. 72-80). Material in Matthew is deemed out of order because one can see a theological emphasis. But it is frequently stated that Luke has no reason to tamper with the order of Q, so Luke's order must reflect Q's order.

narrative development.

IV. Luke's Interpretation of Matthew Material

In addition to understanding Luke's intentional ordering of material, there are signs that Luke has demonstrated an active editorial approach to contextualizing and modifying sources that he draws on in the service of a distinctive theology. I will consider one important example from material in Luke that is drawn from the Sermon on the Mount, the Beatitudes.

A. The Beatitudes:

Luke's beatitudes certainly show a clear tendency to pick up themes that are central to his theological program. It is well known that Luke's beatitudes demonstrate a different emphasis. The Third Gospel has, instead of Matthew's eight (or nine) beatitudes, simply four. First let us consider the four Matthean beatitudes which are missing in Luke:

1. blessed are the meek
2. blessed are the merciful
3. blessed are the pure in heart
4. blessed are the peacemakers.

It is striking that these four omitted beatitudes all deal with spiritual qualities of the listener. The rationale for omitting these four may be seen even more clearly in the modification of the beatitudes taken up by Luke:

Matthew's version	**Luke's version**
Blessed are the poor in Spirit for theirs is the kingdom of heaven	Blessed are the poor for yours is the kingdom of God
Blessed are those who mourn for they shall be comforted	Blessed are you that weep now for you shall laugh
Blessed are those who hunger and thirst for righteousness for they shall be satisfied	Blessed are you that hunger now for you shall be satisfied
Blessed are those persecuted for righteousness' sake for theirs is the kingdom of heaven	

Blessed are you when men revile you and persecute you and utter all kinds of evil against you falsely on my account	Blessed are you when men hate you and exclude you and revile you, and cast out your name as evil, on account of the Son of man!
Rejoice and be glad, for your reward is great in heaven, for so men persecuted the prophets who were before you.	Rejoice in that day, and leap for joy, for behold, your reward i is great in heaven; for so their fathers did to the prophets.

A quick comparison of the beatitudes above shows the major differences between Matthew's and Luke's versions. What has been often noted is the emphasis in Luke on real physical concerns and the present reality of those. Hence the use of poor, instead of poor in spirit; or weep now, instead of mourn; or hunger now, instead of hunger and thirst for righteousness; all these modifications speak to a concern for real present suffering. In contrast, Matthew's version interprets these difficulties as spiritual difficulties: poor in spirit, hungering and thirsting for righteousness, persecuted for righteousness' sake. That Luke wants to emphasize the physical reality of present suffering is made manifest by his inclusion of a set of woes that exactly parallel the blessings: woe to the rich, woe to those full now, woe to those who laugh now, woe to those when people speak well of them. These woes are certainly Luke's own composition, and speak to his unique emphasis.[38] The concurrance of the woes which are Luke's addition with the focus of the beatitudes strongly suggests that Luke has had a strong hand in shaping the beatitudes. The use of the pronoun "you (pl.)" is also an indication that Luke has exercised a compositional role in this section.[39]

But more important than any linguistic argument is the theological and narrative argument for Luke's strong redactional hand in the section of the beatitudes and woes. Luke has signaled his interest in the issue of physical needs and the reversal of fortunes early in the Third Gospel. Mary's Song in

---

[38] As Fitzmyer notes, *Luke I-IX*, p. 627.

[39] Henry J. Cadbury, *Style and Literary Method of Luke* (Cambridge,MA: Harvard University Press, 1920), pp. 124-26.

Lk 1:46-55 has an anticipatory nature, and it sings of the concern for the poor and the hungry in ways that look forward to the beatitudes: "He has brought down the powerful from their thrones and lifted up the lowly; he has filled the hungry with good things, and sent the rich away empty." (Lk 1:53-53). Similarly, Jesus' inaugural sermon at Nazareth (Lk 4:16-21), which has often been called programmatic for the gospel, evokes the same themes.[40] There the use of Isaiah 61 anticipates again the beatitudes: "he has anointed me to bring good news to the poor." In such a carefully constructed anticipation of the themes of reversal, is it likely the beatitudes are simply taken over from a source? Or is it not more likely that Luke has extensively modified them? If so, why is it unlikely that he modified the form found in Matthew, rather than that found in a common source?

The net result of this cursory examination of the beatitudes section shows Luke's heavy compositional hand on the material. Luke has formed his version of the beatitudes to fit into a carefully constructed narrative pattern. In other words, Luke was quite willing to modify and craft material around distinct theological emphases. This is hardly a cut-and-paste editor, as is suggested by the Q hypothesis -- at least that view that has Luke reflecting the early state and order of Q. And if Luke can be shown to be exerting a strong compositional strategy, then it is also equally likely that he has been willing to modify Matthew toward this end rather than simply adopting Q material.

V. Conclusions

I return, then, to the initial concerns that have been raised about Luke's use of Matthew.

1. Is Luke's use of Matthew reasonable, given his authorial design and behavior? Luke indicates some of his literary emphasis and design in the prologue: he desires to produce a narrative that is ordered as a compelling testimony of who Jesus was. The key words here are narrative and order. Given this concern, Luke's "dismantling" of Matthew's Sermon on the Mount would appear to be very reasonable.

---

[40] Green, *Theology of Luke*, p. 76.

The following aspects of this literary concern would, in my opinion, support this conclusion:

a) Luke resists the long sermons that so dominate Matthew and tend to break up the narrative flow. Instead, Luke develops Jesus' teaching in smaller clusters that depict Jesus as responsive to questions or concerns that arise in the course of the narrative. We can see this responsiveness in the teaching on prayer (Lk 11:1-13), where the disciples ask, upon observing his own prayer life, to be taught about prayer. Or, similarly, Jesus' teaching on the proper estimation of possessions (Lk 12:13-34) follows a question about inheritance.

b) Jesus restricts his subject matter at the Sermon on the Plain to two issues which are pertinent at the beginning of His ministry: the concern for reversal, and a prophetic call for his followers to have a sound foundation. The first theme picks up the programmatic issues sounded in the infancy narrative (especially Mary's song) and the sermon at Nazareth. The second anticipates the rejection by the Jewish leaders, and serves as a call to his disciples to follow in the teachings that will be given in the rest of the gospel. It anticipates, then, the rest of the gospel. But its setting in Luke, just after the appointing of the twelve, and the gathering of a large group of disciples, is particularly important. For Luke, this sparser sermon is particularly fitting for the setting, a setting he has placed after the appointment of the twelve, which itself follows healings and signs which should (and did) elicit a response from his disciples (which includes, for Luke, more than the twelve). Luke's narrative setting, and the limited subject matter, is highly appropriate.

c) Much of Jesus' teaching awaits the journey, chapters 9-18. The journey is, of course, a literary motif that Luke uses to insert material that is not found in Mark. Luke, then, uses the open motif of the journey to situate a number of teaching clusters along the way. These clusters allow Luke to develop themes with more emphasis than Matthew has in his longer Sermon on the Mount.

d) Luke's way of dealing with Matthew is part of a general pattern. Mark Goodacre has noted that Luke treats Mark's section on the parables (chapter 4) in much the same way – that is that some is omitted, some is

retained, and some is moved to different contexts.[41] Luke's control over his source material, then, is a pervasive pattern, not just a feature of his use of Matthew.

2. Is Luke's arrangement necessarily less aesthetic than Matthew? Is it less compelling? Is it less convincing for the purpose that the Evangelist puts forward? The question of aesthetics is difficult. To whom should a work be aesthetically pleasing? The question is frankly impossible to answer.

To begin with, this question presumes that Matthew's Sermon on the Mount is a clear and compelling account of Jesus' teaching. While Sermon on the Mount does present Jesus in a Mosaic fashion as a giver of ethical mandates, it appears also as an accumulation of a large number of discrete, seemingly unconnected issues. What structure there is is a loose structure. There is much in the Matthean sermon which might seem artificial, and the accumulation of ethical mandates is perhaps less effective than treating some issues independently.

But without regard to questions of Matthew's efficacy, one can also affirm Luke's creative success. Luke follows literary conventions in Luke and Acts that reflect aesthetic and rhetorical concerns of antiquity. In reworking Mark's and Matthew's gospels, fitting them into a narrative plot derived from Mark, but with an extensive travel account, Luke has produced a pleasing narrative that tells a particular story of Jesus that is effective. It is not the same story as Matthew or Mark produce. This story is more concerned about the marginalized, about Jesus the prophet of God being rejected by the Jews, and about the larger story God's plan for all of creation -- including the Gentiles. And Luke is less concerned about the particularities of Jewish law. Literarily, Luke is more willing to develop his prophetic story with literary foreshadowing and summaries, rather than explicit proof-texting from Scripture. The question of aesthetics and compelling narrative must, then, be answered within the context of Luke's larger purpose.

3. Can one imagine Luke using Mark in a different way than he does

---

[41] Mark Goodacre, *The Case Against Q*, chapter 4, developing material from Goulder, *Luke a New Paradigm.*

Matthew? A major argument posed against Luke's use of Matthew is that he would be utilizing his two sources in significantly different ways. This starts with the assumption that Luke has rather routinely used Mark with few changes, but this is not true. He has, for instance, in the passages just preceding the Sermon on the Plain, shown remarkable freedom in re-ordering the sequence of the initial accounts of Jesus' first preaching, healing, and calling of the disciples. So Luke is not entirely a slave to the Markan account.

But notwithstanding this recognition that Luke is more sophisticated in his use of Mark than often credited, there are good reasons to imagine Luke dealing with Matthew quite differently. First, if Mark had achieved a place in the early church's "scripture" as a well known account of Jesus' ministry, and Matthew has been only recent addition to that, one can imagine that Mark would be given priority in assembling a new narrative. Secondly, since Matthew's interests often deal with issues particular to Jewish Christians, Luke's interest in showing a new Israel that extends to Gentiles as a more fundamental part of God's plan might well necessitate a more critical eye toward the First Gospel. And finally, Matthew's own construction into lengthy discourses can be seen as running contrary to Luke's narrative design which intersperses action, dialogue and teaching into smoother account of Jesus' movement toward Jerusalem. Given these features in Matthew, it is very reasonable to see Luke casting a more critical eye upon Matthew, even while considering material in it as valuable for a new edition of the story of Jesus.

This paper cannot in short compass address all the concerns that have been raised about Luke's possible use of Matthew. But with an understanding of Luke's purpose, and his literary method, it appears reasonable that the Third Evangelist would have rewritten the Sermon on the Mount in the fashion that he presents us. If so, then it is also reasonable to rethink the independence of Luke from Matthew, and rethink the role that the hypothetical document Q might have played in the construction of the Third Gospel.

A Pioneer Narrative Critic and His Synoptic Hypothesis
Austin Farrer and Gospel Interpretation

Jeffrey Peterson
Institute for Christian Studies
Austin, Texas

"Why dig up solid foundations, why open questions long taken for settled?" So asked Austin Farrer 45 years ago as he undertook to challenge that seemingly most assured result of modern New Testament criticism, the Two-Source Hypothesis.[1] Farrer did not advocate a complete repeal of the nineteenth century, as William R. Farmer and others have done by their revival of the Griesbach hypothesis, the dominant theory of Synoptic relationships from ca. 1800 to 1860.[2] Farrer's work on the Gospels retained "the well-grounded conviction that St Mark's is the earliest written of the Gospels, and that the other three (two of them more particularly) knew and

[1] A. M. Farrer, "On Dispensing With Q," in D. E. Nineham (ed.), *Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1955) 55.

[2] For the recent revival of the Griesbach hypothesis, see William R. Farmer *The Synoptic Problem: A Critical Analysis* (New York: Macmillan, 1964); Allan J. McNicol et al., *Beyond the Q Impasse—Luke's Use of Matthew* (Valley Forge, Penn.: Trinity, 1996); David B. Peabody et al., *Mark's Use of Matthew and Luke* (Valley Forge, Penn.: Trinity, forthcoming). For critique from adherents of 2SH, see Christopher M. Tuckett, *The Revival of the Griesbach Hypothesis: An Analysis and Appraisal* (SNTSMS 44; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983) and Sherman E. Johnson, *The Griesbach Hypothesis and Redaction Criticism* (SBLMS 41; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991). Apropos Farmer's concern for the relation of critical scholarship to historic Christian faith (most evident in *The Gospel of Jesus: The Pastoral Relevance of the Synoptic Problem* [Louisville, Ky.: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1994], 3–11 *et passim*), Ferdinand Christian Baur and David Friedrich Strauss may serve as reminders that adherence to Griesbach is no guarantee against modernist heterodoxy.

used his work."[3] Farrer dispensed only with the second source of the Two-Source Hypothesis (hereinafter 2SH), the document hypothesized to account for the non-Marcan matter common to Matthew and Luke, usually designated Q or (inaccurately) the "Synoptic Sayings Source" or "Sayings Gospel."[4] Rather than a lost source, Farrer accounted for the Double Tradition by appeal to Luke's use of Matthew in addition to Mark; the Q material he held to constitute "those parts of St Matthew's non-Marcan matter which were likely to attract St. Luke, in view of what we know about the general character of his Gospel, or can conjecture about his aims in writing it."[5] The quality of "Luke-pleasingness" that Farrer ascribed to these particular Matthaean expansions of Mark's Gospel obviated the need to postulate an otherwise unknown source.[6]

---

[3] Farrer, *A Study in St Mark* (Westminster: Dacre, 1951) 1.

[4] E.g., Helmut Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels: Their History and Development* (Philadelphia/London: Trinity/SCM, 1990) 128–171 ("Synoptic Sayings Source") and John S. Kloppenborg (ed.), *The Shape of Q: Signal Essays on the Sayings Gospel* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994). Such designations, while descriptive of certain hypothesized antecedents to Q (on which see especially John S. Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q: Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections* [SAC; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987] 89–262, 317–328) are inaccurate as a description of the final form of the document which along with sayings includes narratives of John the Baptist's ministry and of Jesus' baptism, temptation, and healing activity, and indeed exhibits a narrative sequence moving from the vicinity of the Jordan in Q 3:3, to the wilderness in Q 4:1, to Nazara in Q 4:16, to Capernaum in Q 7:1 (Mark Goodacre, "Narrative Sequence in a Sayings Gospel? Reflections on a Contrast Between Thomas and Q," paper presented to the Q Section, SB Annual Meeting, Boston, Mass., 23 November 1999).

[5] Farrer, "Dispensing," 56.

[6] Farrer's interest in dispensing with Q can be dated to 1940, when he outlined his approach to the Gospels in a letter to his father (a Baptist professor of theology) and in an

Most scholars treating the Synoptics in the half-century since have been content to answer Farrer's challenge with a shrug and a repetition of his question: "Why dig up solid foundations? Why indeed?" "On Dispensing with Q" has been entirely neglected in Germany and gone largely unengaged in this country.[7] One factor in the United States has been the notoriety that

---

unpublished essay, one thesis of which was that "St Luke used St Matthew, and Q is a fiction of the critics, derived from the error of supposing the evangelists to be scissors-and-paste hacks like the Pentateuchal editors" (quoted in Philip Curtis, *A Hawk Among Sparrows: A Biography of Austin Farrer* [London: SPCK, 1985] 120) Farrer was not the first to combine Marcan priority with Luke's use of Matthew as well as Mark; see Eduard von Simons, *Hat der dritte Evangelist den kanonischen Matthäus benutzt?* (Bonn: Georgi, 1880); E. W. Lummis, *How Luke Was Written: Considerations Affecting the Two-Document Theory with Speical Reference to the Phenomena of Order in the Non-Marcan Matter Common to Matthew and Luke* (Cambridge: University Press, 1915) esp. 38; James Hardy Ropes, *The Synoptic Gospels* (London: Oxford University Press, 1934) 37, 66–68, 93–94; and Morton Scott Enslin, *Christian Beginnings* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1938) 431–434. Farrer differed from these in that his source hypothesis formed one element of a thoroughgoing revaluation of the Synoptic tradition. Further, it is not clear whether he wrote in dependence on any of these predecessors, whom he never cites. In Michael Goulder's apt phrase, however, "Farrer contemned the footnote" ("Farrer as Biblical Scholar," in Curtis, *Hawk Among Sparrows*, 193), and his own attitude towards citation is captured in the preface to the published version of his 1946 Bampton Lectures: "My debts are to such obvious sources for the most part that there will be no real fraud in leaving them unacknowledged," with acknowledgment of a specific point of indebtedness to Gabriel Marcel's *Être et Avoir* (*The Glass of Vision* [Wesminster: Dacre, 1948] x). This suggests that, if any, Farrer may have depended on Ropes's or Enslin's surveys ("obvious sources," perhaps, for the study of the Gospels at that time).

[7] A notable American exception to the rule is E. P. Sanders, whose *Studying the Synoptic Gospels* (co-authored with Margaret Davies; London/Philadelphia: SCM/Trinity, 1989) not only engages FH (somewhat infelicitously termed "Mark without Q") but embraces it as the most satisfactory account of Synoptic origins; though the case is rather diffusely presented (see pp. 21, 62–63, 93–97, 103–105, 117 [where the paragraph endorsing FH is lacking enumeration as 3]) and qualified (not to say confused) by the favor shown one element of M.-E. Boismard's complicated theory of Synoptic relationships, viz., "criss-cross copying" (see pp. 105–111, 117). Sanders is, however, less an exception than he may at first appear, having studied in Oxford and co-authored the book with Margaret Davies while a member of that faculty. See also Joseph B. Tyson, "Source Criticism of the Gospel of Luke," in *Perspectives on Luke-Acts* (PRSt Special Studies 5; ed. Charles

Griesbachians have succeeded in winning for Matthaean priority, in consequence of which American scholars tend to assume that the only live alternative to the majority hypothesis involves abandoning the priority of Mark.[8] Thus, Helmut Koester, representative of both German and American scholarship at their highest levels, writes in an advanced textbook that "[a]ll attempts to disprove the two-source hypothesis favor the priority of Matthew or of some earlier form of Matthew,"[9] while introductory discussions and commentaries frequently commend 2SH as the most plausible solution to the Synoptic problem available, with only Griesbach (and so Matthaean priority) presented as an alternative.[10] Only in Farrer's own United Kingdom has his hypothesis received significant attention.[11]

H. Talbert; Danville, Va./Edinburgh: Association of Baptist Professors of Religion/T. & T. Clark, 1978) 27–28, which is potentially misleading in describing FH as "a hypothesis that was, in some respects, similar to that put forward by Augustine of Hippo," without mention of the former's Marcan priority (27 and n. 11).

[8] The situation will not be improved by the outright confusion of FH with the Augustinian Hypothesis (which, like Griesbach, entails Matthaean priority) in David Laird Dungan's Griesbachian *History of the Synoptic Problem* (ABRL; New York et al.: Doubleday, 1999) 376, 378, 384–385.

[9] Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, 130. Another *Handbuch* discussion by an accomplished German scholar in evident innocence of FH is Dieter Lührmann's *Itinerary for NT Study* (London/Philadelphia: SCM/Trinity, 1989 [1984]) 42–45.

[10] Among recent commentators, see W. D. Davies and Dale C. Allison, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to Saint Matthew* (vol. 1; ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1988) 97–127; Joel Marcus, *Mark 1–8: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 27; New York et al.: Doubleday, 1999) 40–47. For introductions, see Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Writings of the New Testament: An Interpretation* (rev. ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999) 156; Raymond E. Brown, *An Introduction to the New Testament* (ABRL; New York et al.: Doubleday, 1997) 111–116; Mark Allan Powell, *Fortress Introduction to the Gospels* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1998) 16–19. Noteworthy for its consideration of "the Farrer-Goulder hypothesis" is John S.

A Difference of Perspective

Here is the answer Farrer gave to his own question: Why uproot the foundations laid for the study of the Synoptics by Holtzmann's *Die synoptischen Evangelien* and Streeter's *Four Gospels*? Because, Farrer maintained,

> [s]ince Dr. Streeter wrote, our conception of the way in which the Gospels were composed has gradually altered; so gradually, that we have not observed the extent of the alteration. Nevertheless the change that has taken place removes the ground on which the Q hypothesis stood.

Even on the charitable supposition that Farrer was right about Q, he was evidently mistaken about the readiness of his contemporaries to recognize it as a superfluous entity. But since Dr. Farrer wrote (this essay contends) our accepted modes of studying the Gospels have shifted dramatically; so dramatically, that we have scarcely considered the implications of this shift for an hypothesis inherited from a generation of scholarship in which

---

Kloppenborg Verbin, "The Life and Sayings of Jesus," in *The New Testament Today* (ed. Mark Allan Powell; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1999) 10–30, at 14–15.

[11] See especially Michael D. Goulder, *Midrash and Lection in Matthew* (London: SPCK, 1974); *Luke: A New Paradigm* (2 vols.; JSNTSup 20; Sheffield: JSOT, 1989); "Is Q a Juggernaut?" *JBL* 115 (1996) 667–681; and "Self-Contradiction in the IQP," JBL 118 (1999), pp. 506–517; Mark S. Goodacre, *Goulder and the Gospels: An Examination of a New Paradigm* (JSNTSup 133; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996). See also John Drury, *Luke* (New York: Macmillan, 1973); *Tradition and Design in Luke* (Atlanta: John Knox, 1976); and *The Parables in the Gospels: History and Allegory* (New York: Crossroad, 1985); Eric Franklin, *Luke: Interpreter of Paul, Critic of Matthew* (JSNTSup 92; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994); Jonathan Knight, *Luke's Gospel* (New Testament Readings; London and New York: Routledge, 1998).

diachronic interpretation all but eclipsed synchronic.[12] When such an inventory is taken, it becomes apparent how unstable is the ground on which the Q hypothesis continues to stand, propped up as it is by the most learned and industrious scholars in the discipline.[13]

In what follows I will identify three recent developments in scholarship that materially affect our assessment of Farrer's hypothesis. All three reflect the end of the predominance of diachronic modes of exegesis and the advent of the synchronic, which has so altered the exegetical landscape since Farrer invited us to bid Q adieu. At the risk of mischaracterizing current study of the Gospels as intensely polarized between these modes (for the reality is more pandemonium than polarization), these shifts are stated as a series of alternatives: (1) whether we view the Evangelists as *archivists* preserving units of treasured tradition for posterity or as literary *artists*, shaping such traditions as they had received into narratives marked by, or at least aspiring to, coherence and integrity; (2) whether in reading the Synoptic narratives we give primary

[12] For two excellent brief accounts of the interpretive shift here referred to, see Robert C. Tannehill, "Freedom and Responsibility in Scripture Interpretation, with Application to Luke," in *Literary Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays in Honor of Joseph B. Tyson* (ed. Richard P. Thompson and Thomas E. Phillips; Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 1998) 265–278, and William S. Kurz, S.J., *Reading Luke-Acts: Dynamics of Biblical Narrative* (Louisville, Ky.: Westminster/John Knox, 1993) 1–6.

attention to the comparative *order* of pericopes or to the *sequence* of episodes within each Gospel, whether in other words our reading of the Gospels is primarily source-critical or narrative-critical; and (3) whether we understand the Gospels as addressed to isolated *communities* each possessing a distinctive, usually sectarian construal of Jesus and his significance or as addressing a network of churches extending across the Mediterranean, linked by personal and epistolary contact and exhibiting substantial agreement on Jesus' significance (if not lockstep uniformity), a federation whose members would have recognized one another as sharing fellowship in a universal *church*. If we reexamine aspects of Farrer's heretical proposal in light of such current perceptions of the Gospels, we may find that the shift of perspective he optimistically perceived in 1955 has belatedly arrived, and that it makes sense for us, as it did not so readily for Farrer's contemporaries, to entertain the surrender of Q.

Archivists vs. Artists

The first shift that concerns us is one that Farrer himself identified, or better anticipated. At the heart of his case against Q stood the contention that

> the hypothesis wholly depends on the incredibility of St. Luke's having read St. Matthew's book. That incredibility depends in turn on

[13] Michael Goulder has noted that the Q hypothesis "has the highest vested interest of any New Testament hypothesis in that virtually every scholar has written a book assuming its truth" ("Farrer the Biblical Scholar," in Curtis, *A Hawk Among Sparrows*, 197).

> the supposition that St. Luke was essentially an adapter and compiler. We do not now, or ought not now, so to regard him. And being once rid of such a supposition, we can conceive well enough how St. Luke could have both read St. Matthew's book as it stands, and written the gospel he has left us. Then at one stroke the question is erased to which the Q hypothesis supplied an answer. For the hypothesis answered the question, "From what does the common non-Marcan material of Matthew and Luke derive, since neither had read the other?"[14]

Luke was not essentially an adapter and compiler; he, like the other Evangelists, was an author. That judgment was central to Farrer's interpretation of the Gospels, and to his interest in Synoptic relationships. In the course of his work on the Gospels, Farrer cites only one scholar by way of general inspiration: R. H. Lightfoot, whose *History and Interpretation in the Gospels* and *Locality and Doctrine in the Gospels* Farrer credited with putting the reader "in touch with St Mark, a living Christian mind, and a mind of great power," a "discovery . . . which comes like water in the desert to men who have been trained to see in his gospel a row of impersonal anecdotes strung together by a colourless compiler."[15]

Throughout the period of Farrer's engagement with the interperation of the Gospels (i.e., between 1940 and 1968), the field was typified by the metaphor that was K. L. Schmidt's most famous contribution to the subject: the Gospels were regarded like pearls on a string, originally isolated units of

[14] Farrer, "Dispensing," 56.

tradition strung together on a secondary framework contributed by the Evangelists.[16] The *Formengeschichte* of Schmidt, Dibelius, and Bultmann proceeded on the assumption that the historically informative way to read the Gospels was to remove the pearls (i.e., the traditional units) from their string and examine them individually. Bultmann's students effected an apparent revolution without fundamentally altering this picture by developing the suggestions with which their teacher concluded his *Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition* concerning "The Editing [*Redaktion*] of the Traditional Material," and especially his scarcely realized aim of clarifying "the theological character of Gospels."[17] Redaction criticism as developed in Germany and imported to the United States redirected attention from the individual pearls themselves to the arrangement given them by the Evangelist, and to the narrative "string" connecting them.

For Farrer, however, as for a number of recent redaction and narrative critics, it is the necklace as a whole that adorns one's Beloved and therefore invites the attention of the interpreter.[18] Indeed, on his understanding

---

[15] Farrer, *Study in St Mark*, 7.

[16] See Stephen Neill and Tom Wright, *The Interpretation of the New Testament 1861–1986* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1988) 254.

[17] Bultmann, *History of the Synoptic Tradition* (rev. ed.; Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1963; reprinted, Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, n. d.) 338. See Sanders and Davies, *Studying the Synoptic Gospels*, 201.

[18] Farrer differs from recent reader-centered critics (e.g., Stephen D. Moore, *Literary Criticism of the Gospels: The Theoretical Challenge* [New Haven and London: Yale

Schmidt's metaphor is misleading; the necklace is not of pearls but of cut stones, each one carefully shaped by the Evangelist for its contribution to the finished product.[19] What is true for Mark is true for Matthew and Luke as well, with the qualification that each later Evangelist had before him a written source or sources, from which he quarried such material as met the needs of the story he wished to tell according to his own plan.[20]

When the story of Synoptic scholarship is told, the discovery of the Evangelists as authors is usually connected with the launch of redaction criticism on the Continent, credited to Günter Bornkamm, Hans Conzelmann, and Willi Marxsen.[21] This neglects the work of Lightfoot, whose Bampton Lectures of 1934, as Dennis Nineham remarks,

---

University Press, 1989]) in that on his reading the Beloved whose neck the Gospels adorn is not the *Psyche*, the consciousness of the lone interpreter, a consciousness isolated even though shaped by various reading communities in which she participates (willingly or unwillingly). For Farrer, this role is played rather by the *Ekklesia*, the community of faith united in her confession of (more or less) the Nicene symbol; more or less, because Farrer's own Christology, after the manner of the pre-Constantinian church, appears more subordinationist than the *homoousios* is sometimes interpreted to allow.

[19] Farrer's response to Schmidt: "[T]he more we examine St Mark, the more his sentences are seen to flow away into the continuous process of his thought, and to bear the stamp of having been composed for the place in which they stand. Any line of the supposed summary is found to presuppose the anecdotes which on this hypothesis [i.e., the form-critical] have been fitted in above it" (*Study in St Mark*, 187). Farrer's evaluation of form criticism as dependent on literary interpretation (not *vice versa*) takes the form of a delightful account of "paragraph-criticism" as subordinate to "book-criticism" (*Study in St Mark*, 21–29). See also "The Mind of St Mark," in *Interpretation and Belief* (ed. Charles C. Conti; London: SPCK, 1976) 14–22.

[20] See *Study in St Mark*, 26–27; *St Matthew and St Mark* (Westminster: Dacre, 1953) 38–56, 116–130, 160–199.

"exemplified . . . the insights of what later came to be called redaction-criticism."[22] Lightfoot and Farrer merit a mention alongside William Wrede as scholars who, though little followed in their time, engaged Mark as an author rather than a mere arranger of pre-formed tradition.[23]

To some degree, Farrer's work even anticipates structuralist and post-structuralist exegesis of the Gospels, for on occasion he considers the relationship between the patterns he discerned in the narrative and the Evangelist's intention. Farrer's earliest published study of Mark announces his discovery of "a pattern of which St Mark was *in some measure* conscious, and which in any case shaped his story as he wrote it."[24] His final discussion of Mark includes remarks even more explicitly distinguishing text from author.[25] In any event, the recognition of the Gospels as works of

---

[21] See Neill and Wright, *Interpretation of the New Testament*, 283–284; Janice Capel Anderson and Stephen D. Moore (eds.), *Mark and Method: New Approaches in Biblical Studies* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992) 8.

[22] Dennis Nineham, "R. H. Lightfoot and the Significance of Biblical Criticism," *Theol* 88 (1985) 97–105. There is a certain irony in Nineham's having undertaken to vindicate his teacher's reputation and account for the neglect of his Gospel studies, while subsequently dismissing Farrer as "a philosophical theologian [who] . . . in the post-war period . . . interested himself in biblical questions" but was never a "widely recognized biblical scholar"; Nineham does account Farrer a "remarkable . . . and . . . saintly . . . man" (*Crossing the Boundaries: Essays in Biblical Interpretation in Honour of Michael D. Goulder* [ed. Stanley E. Porter, Paul Joyce, and David E. Orton; Leiden, New York, and Köln: Brill, 1994] xii–xiii).

[23] For Farrer's response to Wrede's construal of the Marcan "messianic secret," see *Study in St Mark*, 221–246.

[24] *Study in St Mark*, v (italics added).

[25] E.g., "This [narrative pattern] is pleasing, whether or not St Mark did it on purpose," and "The false suggestion of pattern is the suggestion that St. Mark ever held in mind the

rhetorical art and the attempt to discern the literary patterns ordering their materials are now the rule rather than the exception.[26]

The plausibility of Farrer's proposal concerning Q is greatly enhanced on the supposition that the Gospels are the product not of botchers but of weavers. In the next section we turn to one means of discerning the pattern that marks the weavers' work.

Order vs. Sequence

Consideration of the relative order of pericopae holds a venerable place in the discussion of Synoptic source criticism, in particular the argument that since either Matthew or Luke always agrees in order with Mark when the other fails to agree, Mark . B. C. Butler (an Augustinian) pointed out that the argument is invalid, the conclusion not following from the premises. Adherents of 2ST such as Christopher Tuckett have agreed with Butler that "the much discussed appeal to the failure of Matthew and Luke ever (or hardly ever) to agree against Mark in order and wording does not prove that Matthew and Luke independently used Mark as a source; it

---

whole system of echoes which we diagrammatize in a single figure. Perhaps he never did. Even so, he may have been aware of writing one wave of antitypes after another. What he held before him would be no diagrams, either in his head or on paper; it would be the series of types in his already written narrative from which he was working" ("Levi the Son of Alphaeus," unpublished MS, provided through the courtesy of Michael Goulder).

only shows that Mark is some kind of 'middle term' between the other two in any pattern of relationships."[27] E. P. Sanders has made the more significant observation that the premises are not true; a significant number of passages are not adequately described by the usual formula, including some ten in which overlap with Q cannot be invoked to account for the agreement against Mark. His conclusion is that the evidence supports Luke's use of Matthew.[28]

Such considerations of comparative order, by no means without value in the understanding of Synoptic relationships, are nonetheless remote from the concerns of many current interpreters. Indeed, it is ironic that most Gospels scholars remember Farrer if at all for his contribution to the Synoptic problem, for this was far from Farrer's principal interest in the Gospels.[29] Farrer's Synoptic hypothesis was ancillary to his principal

---

[26] Donald H. Juel suggests that for Mark at least Norman Perrin was a key figure in the transition from redaction criticism to narrative criticism (*A Master of Surprise: Mark Interpreted* [Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1994] 22–25).

[27] Christopher M. Tuckett, "Jesus and the Gospels," *NIB* 8 (1995) 76. Tuckett's "ever (or hardly ever)" covers a multitude of sins; the traditional argument for 2ST did not equivocate on the question of agreements in order but held that Marcan order is always supported by either Matthew or Luke. It is of course grossly inaccurate to deny that "Matthew and Luke ever (or hardly ever) . . . agree against Mark . . . in wording" as such "Minor Agreements" number in the hundreds, and a significant few (most notably at Mark 14:65) cannot be accounted for by independent redaction.

[28] E. P. Sanders, "The Argument from Order and the Relationship Between Matthew and Luke," *NTS* 15 (1968) 249–261, esp. 261.

[29] In this Farrer finds common ground with those scholars for whom the Synoptic problem is a trial to be endured periodically at the hands of enthusiasts rather than a topic

interest, the literary interpretation of the Gospels, especially Mark.[30] Farrer's Marcan studies attend not to the relative *order* not on source criticism but on the narrative *sequence* of Mark (and to a lesser extent the other Evangelists), in which Farrer thought to find the interpretive key that would unlock the Gospels as theological statement and as historical witness.[31] In this focus on the internal sequence within the Gospels, Farrer anticipated the concerns of contemporary narrative critics.

Such a focus engages the argument for the existence of Q based on Luke's order in the Double Tradition. On the standard hypothesis, while Matthew combines the teaching material in Q to produce his five discourses, Luke follows Q's order; this accounts among other things for the absence of structure many interpeters have found in Luke's Journey to Jerusalem (Luke

---

of genuine interest, and discussion of same more a visit to the dentist than a day at the races.

[30] Farrer's pioneering contributions to literary interpretation of the Gospels, even more neglected than his Synoptic hypothesis, are recognized by Frank Kermode, *The Genesis of Secrecy: On the Interpretation of Narrative* (Cambridge, Mass., and London: Harvard University Press, 1979) 60–64, 70, 72; Johnson, *Writings of the New Testament*, 181. Juel comments only that Farrer's "creative exploration of literary patterns places him outside the usual guild of Markan scholars" (*A Master of Surprise*, 118).

[31] The significance of various Marcan sequences of pericopae was the principal concern of Farrer's work on Mark, first treated in the fanciful dream disclosing the pattern of healing miracles as initially understood (*Study in St Mark*, 34–52; a corrected account of this sequence, confirmed by its adaptation in Matthew, is given in *St Matthew and St Mark*, 19–105, 116–130; yet another discussion of sequence appears in the book MS left incomplete at Farrer's death, which will be published along with other essays relevant to Marcan interpretation as *Further Studies in St Mark*, currently in preparation.. The whole enterprise is usefully evaluated by Goulder, "Farrer the Biblical Scholar," in Curtis, *Hawk Among Sparrows*, 204–212.

9:51–19:27). To account for this section of the Gospel on the basis of Luke's narrative logic would significantly affect the assessment of the probability that Luke derived the order from Q.

The most convincing general characterization is by David L. Tiede, who describes the section as "a literary device for gathering a host of stories, sayings, and episodes into a sequence which has direction and purpose," which he characterizes more precisely as "the schema of an extended journey as the occasion for interpreting 'the way of the Lord,'" presented in three distinct stages (Luke 9:51–13:21; 13:22–17:10; 17:11–19:27). In view of the striking and programmatic opening pericope (Luke 9:51–56), Tiede entitles the section "The Way of the Determined Messiah."[32] None of the several proposals to account for the arrangement of this section commands wide assent, but in recent study the question has been reconceived as one of narrative logic. Thus, Joel Green has identified five "interrelated narrative needs" met by the section.[33] Further, Green and Alan Culpepper have eschewed suggestions of architectonic structure and invited attention to the orderly connection of one pericope with another.[34]

---

[32] David L. Tiede, *Luke* (ACNT; Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1988) 194–195.

[33] Joel B. Green, *The Gospel of Luke* (NICNT; Grand Rapids and Cambridge: Eerdmans, 1997) 394–399.

[34] R. Alan Culpepper, *The Gospel of Luke: Introduction, Commentary, and Reflections* (NIB IX [1995]), 12, and 214–364 *seriatim*; Green, 399 n. 20. This is in part a response to proposals of chiastic structure (e.g., Charles H. Talbert, *Reading Luke: A Literary and*

Farrer's own attempt to clarify this sequence invoked typology, arguing that Matthew composed his Gospel on a Hexateuchal pattern (culminating in a "Book of Joshua [*Iesous*]), that Luke perceived this Matthaean pattern and reproduced it with considerable alteration, and that the Journey constitutes the Lucan Deuteronomy.[35] Even so sympathetic a critic of Farrer as Michael Goulder regards this suggestion as more ingenious than convincing.[36] Yet a less ambitious proposal that Deuteronomy serves as a model for the Journey appeared in the same volume. C. F. Evans proposed no typological schema extending throughout the Gospel; he merely identified a series of parallels in theme (and to some extent language) between Deuteronomy LXX and the Lucan Journey, suggesting that the former served as model for the latter.[37] Those scholars

---

Theological Commentary on the Third Gospel [New York: Crossroad, 1984] 111–113), which Green dismisses as unpersuasive "because of the length of Luke's central section, and thus the improbability that Luke's audience (especially his auditors!) would be able to balance in their short-term memories so complex a structure over such a lengthy a span of narrative time" (399 n. 20). See also McNicol et al., *Beyond the Q Impasse*, 151–244 (esp. 152–153).

[35] This of course develops B. W. Bacon's proposal that the conclusions to Matthew's five discourses divide the Gospel into a Pentateuch . Farrer further suggested that Luke's method in the composition of the individual pericopae of the Journey resembled rabbinic midrash in characteristically juxtaposing two Matthaean texts as the basis for each new paragraph. See the discussion in "Dispensing," 73–82.

[36] See Goulder, "Farrer as Biblical Scholar," (in Curtis, *Hawk Among Sparrows*) 196–197.

[37] C. F. Evans, "The Central Section of St Luke's Gospel," in Nineham (ed.), *Studies in the Gospels*, 37–53. Farrer in fact refers the reader of his essay to Evans's ("Dispensing," 79), which is usefully summarized in Evans, *Saint Luke* (TPINTC; London/Philadelphia: SCM/Trinity, 1990) 34–36, and in Drury, *Tradition and Design*, 139–140.

who have not ignored Evans's suggestive proposal have tended to accord it only summary dismissal, without detailed discussion of the sequential parallels.[38] Thus, Tiede's observation that "the outline of Deuteronomy simply does not dictate the sequence" of 9:51–19:27 and Luke Johnson's demurral that "Luke's imagery is more wide ranging" than Deuteronomy do not directly engage Evans's suggestion that the Journey takes Deuteronomy as a model, which it follows with some freedom.[39] A section so composed would not stand alone within Luke-Acts, in the judgment of recent interpreters; Joel Green has argued that the Lucan Infancy interacts extensively with the story of Abraham related in Genesis 11–21, and Luke Johnson has found the structure of Luke-Acts as a whole disclosed by the exegesis of Deut 18:15 incorporated in Stephen's speech in Acts 7, which reflects close study of the LXX of Genesis, Exodus, and Deuteronomy, among others.[40]

---

[38] The essay and the relevant section of Evans's commentary are without citation in Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*; Talbert, *Reading Luke*; and Green, *Gospel of Luke*. A yet more summary dismissal than those cited in the next note is found in Joseph A. Fitzmyer, S.J., *The Gospel According to Luke (I–IX): Introduction, Translation, and Notes* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1981): Jesus "is not [here] depicted by Luke as a 'new Moses,' *pace* C. F. Evans" (826).

[39] Tiede, *Luke*, 195 (who however lists considerations favoring Evans); Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke* (SP 3; Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1991) 163. Evans himself granted that "[s]ome of the resemblances of subject matter and wording in these parallels may be fortuitous. Deuteronomy is a diffuse and very repetitive book, and Lk. 9^{51}—18^{14} is heterogeneous" ("Central Section," 50).

[40] See Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 52–58; Johnson, *Acts* (SP 5; Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1992) 136–138, at 137.

Such an understanding of the Journey, as integral to the composition of Luke's narrative rather than the deposit of teaching traditions he preferred not to omit, seems more appropriate to a Gospel known for its literary artistry.[41] At issue in this investigation is not only the order that should be followed in the reconstruction of Q but also its very existence. For to the extent that the Lucan sequence in the Double Tradition is found congenial to Luke's narrative (whether on the scheme commended here or on some other), an unattested source whose order Luke (for the most part) passively adopted but Matthew rearranged to produce his great discourses (among other things) is rendered a superfluous entity. As appreciation of Luke's literary design appreciates, the stock of Q must tend to fall.

Insular Communities vs. Church Universal

The most recent development that casts a new light on Farrer's farewell to Q is the proposal that the Gospels were written not for isolated conventicles but for the Christian readership at large in the first century.[42] This historical thesis is not as obviously connected to the "synchronic shift" noted in our first two considerations, but in fact it coheres nicely with them. Exegesis pursued on the basis of source-, form-, and redaction-critical

[41] As acknowledged by Streeter himself: "a consummate literary artist," *Four Gospels*, 548.

models is characteristically focused on the transmission of traditions concerning Jesus and on the application of those traditions in ecclesial situations faced by the Evangelists (or the tradents who preceded them). In redaction criticism especially the attempt has been made to construe each Gospel as a tightly focused response to a crisis (or at least a situation) in the specific community addressed.[43] But if the Gospels are understood as works composed for a general audience, then interpretive attention may shift from the delineation of the community's situation and to the narrative of the Gospel itself. Narrative criticism turns out to be the mode of engagement most appropriate to the situation in which the Gospels originated.

It may be observed that Q as typically understood is rendered problematic on the understanding of the Gospels as generally addressed, and this in two respects. First, Q is held to be the charter document of a community who treasured the memory of Jesus as teacher rather than as crucified and resurrected Messiah.[44] Such a community would stand in clear tension with that network of urban conventicles calling on the risen Jesus as

[42] See Richard J. Bauckham (ed.), *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences* (Grand Rapids, Mich., and Cambridge, UK: Eerdmans, 1998).
[43] See as representative T. Weeden, *Mark: Traditions in Conflict* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971); Anthony J. Saldarini, *Matthew's Christian-Jewish Community* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994); P. F. Esler, *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts: The Social and Political Motivations of Lucan Theology* (SNTSMS 57; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987).
[44] See Kloppenborg, "Easter Faith and the Sayings Gospel Q," *Semeia* 49 (1990) 71–99.

Lord from Jerusalem to Rome, as this network can be discerned in the Pauline letters.[45] If the reconstruction of such communities on the basis of the canonical Gospels is an error of method, then basing the reconstruction of a discrete community on Q is likewise problematic, and the setting in which Q originated and functioned is rendered unclear. Second, the thesis of relatively isolated communities is conducive to the suggestion that Luke was written independently of Matthew; whereas if the Gospels were intended for and enjoyed a broad circulation, it becomes difficult to suppose that a new book about Jesus could remain unknown for any great period of time in view of the extensive communication networks between the earliest churches.[46] To suppose any gap in time between the two Gospels is then to increase the likelihood of a later Evangelist's direct knowledge of his predecessor's book.

A Time for Reconsideration

Even if fully embraced, none of these considerations of itself establishes Farrer's contention that Gospel scholarship should dispense with Q, nor do all of them taken together. They do, however, suggest that this contention may fruitfully be given a second hearing. For in the light cast on

[45] For Jerusalem and Judea generally as party to the Christological concord obtaining between Paul's churches and Rome, see especially 1 Cor 15:1–11; Gal 1:23.

the Gospels by narrative criticism and related approaches, Farrer seems in some respects an interpreter half a century ahead of his time; Q meanwhile seems less a necessary postulate and more a reflection of the tendency that Gilbert Highet lampooned in classical studies as "the habit of *Quellenforschung*, the search for sources, which began as a legitimate inquiry into the material used by a poet, historian, or philosopher, and was pushed to the absurd point at which it was assumed that everything in a [work] . . . was derived from earlier writers."[47] The non-Marcan correspondences in wording between Matthew and Luke of course attest that an inquiry into sources is legitimate to explain the relationship between these two Gospels; what is arguably absurd—more recognizably so now than 50 years ago—is the assumption that the direct dependence of Luke on Matthew is untenable. Yet it is on this assumption that, as Farrer saw with clarity, the postulate of Q depends.

The nineteenth century saw Griesbach yield the throne to Holtzmann, who ruled the twentieth with Streeter as vice-regent. It is early to predict the fortunes of the kingdom in a new century, but it is not entirely implausible to

---

[46] See Michael B. Thompson, "The Holy Internet: Communication Between Churches in the First Christian Generation," in Bauckham, *Gospels for All Christians*, 49–70.

[47] Gilbert Highet, *The Classical Tradition: Greek and Roman Influences on Western Literature* (New York and London: Oxford University Press, 1949) 499. Highet's description of the dismal state of classical studies in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (466–500) is instructive for comparison with the study of the NT.

imagine that thanks to the work of Farrer and such partisans as Goulder, Sanders, Drury, and Goodacre, the challenger rejected in 1955 may yet wear the purple and claim the vast Synoptic kingdom for his own. At the least, his bid to rule stands a chance of being met today by a people more receptive to the prospect of his accession.

Priesthood in Exile According to the Book of Ezekiel

Dr. Friedrich Fechter
Friedrich-Alexander Universität
Erlangen-Nürnberg

1. Textual Basis

The expression "priest" occurs only three times in Ezekiel 1-39, specifically, vv. 1:3, 7:26, and 22:26, but in the Verfassungsentwurf ("Constitution Project") 22 times. Statistical results show that priests play hardly any role in the prophet's announcements of disaster, while they play a central role in the utopian outline of the future shrine and new city called "YHWH is here" (48:35).

If we ask now what we can learn from the book of Ezekiel about the role and status of the priesthood during the exile, we inevitably come to a barrier. For as it already can be seen by the statistical results, none of the texts address this question; the passages from Ezekiel 1-39 concern priests in the time before 587, while the constitution project takes the time of the new construction programmatically into view.

There is, nevertheless, a connection between the two periods of time, even if such a connection is not directly obvious in the texts. This connection consists in the authors of the texts. As it will be shown, these authors are closely related to each other and to the prophet. At the same time, it will also be demonstrated that the small number of texts possibly stemming from Ezekiel actually originated instead from later tradents who developed their program of the new temple and the new city under his name.

2. Examination of the Results

2.1. Ezekiel 1-39

There are two passages dealing with priests within Ezekiel 1-39, and both of them are announcements of disaster. They must be considered to

represent the preaching before 587 B.C.E. Ezek 7:26 describes a forthcoming situation in which one disaster follows another, and one piece of bad news is only followed by more bad news. In situations like these, one would ordinarily consult the responsible institutions: priests, prophets, and elders. The announced disaster, however, insists that now none of these institutions will be able to work like expected. The prophet will not have any vision, the priest will not give תורה, and the elders will not know any counsel (v. 7:26). Obviously priests were expected to provide תורה, i.e. instruction.

> On the other hand, Ezek 22:26 reproaches the priests:
>
> Their priests have done violence to my teaching and have profaned my shrines; they do not distinguish between sacred and secular, neither have they taught the difference between impure[1] and pure. Before my sabbaths they veil their eyes—so that I am profaned in their midst.

This reproach notes that the tasks of priests have consisted in the following: to give instruction, to protect the shrine from being violated, to make decisions concerning the distinction between the sacred and secular, pure and impure, and to observe the Sabbath. It seems astonishing that there is no mentioning of the sacrificial cult at all.

Here priests are referred to in the context of a Ständepredigt, that is at the second position immediate after the prince (נשׂיא[2]).[3] This one is accused of reigning violently, killing people and arbitrarily appropriating property. The reproaches against prince and priests are followed by reproaches against the institutions of government (שׂרים) and the prophets. None of them acts in an appropriate fashion. Finally, the "people of the land" (עם הארץ) are also accused, because they oppressed the powerless. No one in the entire society has proven to be an exception; everyone is guilty. YHWH, in fact, did not have any choice: he had to punish this behavior.

---

[1] The article on ובין־הטמא seems to be an addition.

[2] Text must be corrected in v. 25 according to the Septuagint (G).

[3] Cp. the discussion by Tuell, The Law of the Temple in Ezekiel 40-48, HSS 49 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992), pp. 105-112.

Ezek 22:24-31 must be considered as a retrospective explanation of the catastrophe of 587. There is no future perspective.

To sum up: Both passages, Ezek 7:26 and 22:26 demonstrate what priests should have done if they only had done their job in the correct manner; but they did not act in this way. In regard to this, they are blemished having caused the destruction of Jerusalem together with all the others of YHWH's people. There is no difference between priests and laity in this respect.

2.2. The Constitution Project: Ezekiel 40-48.

2.2.1. Overview

While little is said about priests in Ezekiel 1-39, the situation is completely different in the last nine chapters of the book: beside the prince and the "people of the land," priests and levites play a central role in this portion of the text. Primarily, Ezek 43:18-27 and 44:4-31 carry much weight. Therefore, these two texts shall be analyzed literarily in what follows. No literary analysis will be conducted on the other occurences, however,[4] though some reference will be made to these texts in order to strengthen the argument.

2.2.2. The Consecration of the New Altar: Ezek 43,18-27.[5]

"Ezekiel" is addressed here and summoned. This is striking. He himself is summoned to consecrate the new alter.[6] Especially v. 22b, 24b,

[4]See Ezek 40:45f; 42:13f; 45:1-8,18-25; 46:19-24; 48:6-15.

[5]With one exception there seems to be no reason for text critical emendations in this text. Verse 21 in the MT reads ולקחת את הפר החטאת and, therefore, the article before פר seems to be wrong. It is possible to understand the text as follows: "and you shall take the bull as the sin offering." This rendering of the passage seems to make sense and is able to maintain the present the text.

[6]G tries to alter the text in order to avoid this difficulty; even papyrus 967, which often follows the MT against G, does so. But MT makes sense and has the benefit of

25b-27bα are astonishing in this respect, because in these verses another subject is acting; beyond that v. 21bβ has a third masculine singular subject. V. 25b-27bα explicitly refer to the priests, who are mentioned in vv. 24b and 27bα. In v. 21bβ the subject might be understood as an impersonal "one," with which it is expressed that the addressed "Ezekiel" should not act on his own. Verse 22b makes for real difficulties, however. Suddenly we hear about the action of several persons, whose activity is compared with other actions already performed by these same persons. This first action, already completed, is the decontamination ("de-sinning") of the altar by the offering of a bull, which was narrated in vv. 19-21. According to these verses, however, "Ezekiel" himself was to decontaminate the altar. He should act as follows: he should give a bull to the priest for a sin offering (v. 19). With the blood of this bull, "Ezekiel" alone should decontaminate the altar and make expiation for it (v 20). After that Ezekiel should take that bull and "someone" should burn the bull at a certain place outside the sanctuary, yet still inside the temple area.[7] It remains totally unclear, who that "someone" is—except the fact that "Ezekiel" himself could never be that "someone," otherwise the change of subject in v 21b would be unexplicable.

Be that as it may, it seems clear that the instruction about the Day of Atonement in Leviticus 16 must be seen in the background of the text of Ezekiel 43. It is determined in Lev 16:27-28 that somebody should go outside the camp in order to burn the young bull and the goat from the sin offering. The one who is burning the animals should fulfill some cleaning rites before he is allowed to return into the camp. If we take this text into consideration we have to recognize that the ritual instruction of Ezekiel 43 contains two different rites: the blood rite at the altar and, after that, the burnt offering outside the sanctuary.

In spite of that, v. 22b says: "and <u>they</u> have to decontaminate the altar as <u>they had decontaminated</u> it with the bull." With certainty this means that the priests <u>must</u> have been involved in the ritual of decontamination

---

being the *lectio difficilior*.

[7]This assignment reminds one of the phrase "outside the camp" in Lev 4:12, 21; 8:17; 9:11; 16:27.

previously. This ritual, however, consists of two elements as has been shown above. This means that the priests took part in the second expiation ritual and had to execute the blood rite as well.

Of course we should question whether this contradiction might be the consequence of literary expansion. Indeed, v. 22 could be omitted without any break in the literary structure of the passage. But if this is the case, then we would not be able to answer the question why this verse should have ever been inserted here after the passage had already been formulated. It seems rather impossible that v. 22 could be a later addition.

There is another problem in the text, namely v. 25. The change of subject here is more striking than in v. 22. Moreover v. 23f seems to form a classic closing, especially with use of the verb כלה (v. 23). Obviously, the purification and expiation of the altar were considered to be finished by offering of the bull and the goat. This is also attested by the ritual of the Day of Atonement in Lev 16:18-19, where expiation of the altar on יום הכפרים ("Day of Atonement") had to ensue with the blood of a bull and a goat. If we look at Ezek 43:24 we find that the offering of a bull and a ram with participation of the priests is clearly separated from the ritual of consecration. Rather, the priestly offerings open the series of regular offerings on this altar from that moment onwards. Verses 25-27 must be an addition, because of their return to the theme "consecration of the altar." Change of subject in v. 25 results from the attempt to combine the instructions directly addressed to "Ezekiel" in vv. 18-24 with the plural instructions of vv. 25-27. These verses are formed in the style of ritual legislation which is commonly in third person plural.

This addition lengthens the consecration of the altar up to the duration of one full week.[8] It is characteristic that "Ezekiel" offers a goat and the priests are offering bull and ram. In vv. 25-27, the ritual is changed opposite v. 18-24. The offering of a bull in v. 25 cannot be the same as the bull of the sin offering in v. 19-21. The bull of the burnt offering is rather the same as the concluding offering from vv. 23-24. The one who added v. 25-27 also

[8]It is possible that there is a connection with Lev 8:33, 35.

added this sacrificial bull to the ritual of expiation. The series of regular offerings begins with this consecration ritual lasting one week. Also in regard to this point, vv. 25-27 differ from vv. 18-24, because the beginning of regular offerings, according to vv. 25-27, starts on the eighth day, whereas this offering (according to vv. 23-24) takes place with the second or perhaps the third day after starting the expiation ritual. Last but not least, we have to take in consideration that there are plain terminological differences between the two parts of the text.[9]

The concluding v. 27 has a somewhat parenetic character because of its address in the second person, masculine plural. This is the first time in the whole of the passage that an outside perspective comes into play in regard to its function as an offering. After all, the interests of the community in offerings aim at calming the deity, assuring his shelter, welfare, as well as his assistance and help. Exactly these elements can be found in the concluding promise in the second part of v. 27, inluding the cult-legal term רצא. Ezekiel himself probably never used this verb; only in 20:40-41 is it found elsewhere in the book, in the context of an announcement of salvation, which seems to be an expansion to one of the additional layers in Ezekiel 20.[10]

---

[9]In vv. 18-24, we find the verbs עלה, "sacrifice," זרק, "splash," נתן, here "put on," כפר, pi. "to make atonement for," שׂרף, "burn," קרב hi., "offer" and שׁלך hi., "throw." In vv. 25-27, the verbs עשׂה, "prepare," and טהר pi., "cleanse" appear. Only כפר pi., "expiate" is used without difference, though this use is not significant because of the theme of expiation.

[10]Ohnesorge (Jahwe gestaltet sein Volk neu: zur Sicht der Zukunft Israels nach Ezechiel 11:14-21, 20:1-44, 36:16-38, 37:1-14, 15-28, Forschung zur Bibel, 64 [Wurzburg: Echter, 1991], pp. 96-101) has found quite a few different layers in Ezekiel 20. His arguments are not convincing in every case, but overall he seems to be right. First there are some double readings and tensions, which question the literary unity of Ezek 20:32-44. Especially v. 40bα and 41aα are not a unity at all (Krüger [Geschichtskonzepte im Ezechielbuch, BZAW 180 {New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1989}, pp. 271-2] has overlooked this); the change of person between v. 40bα und v. 40bβ is not motivated from third masculine plural to second masculine plural. Beyond that the theme of v. 40a,bα differs from that in v 40bβ,41aα$_1$. Probably v. 40bα once concluded the passage with v. 40. It is expressed by this that YHWH accepts Israel as offering on his mountain.

Altogether this passage strongly recalls the ordination ritual,[11] which is instructed in Exod 29:1-37 and executed in Lev 8:15-34. In this text, Moses functions as the initiator. After the ordination of the priests Moses expiates and consecrates the altar and then executes the first offerings, especially the one of the עיל־המלעים.[12] This עיל־המלעים seems to be some kind of protecting offering for the newly ordained priests. There is nothing comparable in Ezek 43:18-27.[13] There is a simple reason for this lack of ritual: the priests in Ezekiel 43 already are considered ordained priests.

In sum, Ezekiel 43 is a priestly legislation text, which uses the book of Ezekiel without being stamped by its character as a prophetic book.[14]

2.2.3. Higher and Lower Clergy: Ezek 44:4-31

2.2.3.1. Text-Critical Notes

Verse 5: The opposition למבוא . . . מוצאי suggests reading plural למבואי (see Targum [T] and Peshitta [S]). Also בכל מוצאי should be read וכל מוצאי.

Verse V 6: MT only once reads אל־בית. But G attests another בית before מרי. Obviously MT is the result of haplographic writing.

Verse V 7: "My house" is an explanating expansion; the versions attest

---

On the other hand, it is said in v. 40bβ and so on, that YHWH accepts them gracefully, because they bring him their offerings, which he wants them to bring to him, as soon as they will be gathered from their diaspora. By these words v. 40bβ, 41, 42 express a post-exilic temple offering cultic perspective, whereas v. 40a,bα lacks this perspective.

[11] Cf. Allen, Ezekiel 20-48, WBC 29 (Dallas: Word, 1990), p. 251.

[12] Cf. Gerstenberger (ATD, pp. 6, 89; [Eng. trans., Leviticus: A Commentary, OTL, trans. Douglas W. Stott {Louisville: Westminister John Knox, 1996}]) renders "Einsetzungswidder" ("consecration ram").

[13] N.B.: The anointing of the altar is missing in Ezekiel 43, but this will not be discussed.

[14] The term "regulations of the altar" often is paralleled with "regulations of tora" in Numbers 19, or with the superscription of the passa-instruction in Exod 12:43. These parallels cannot be discussed here.

only one of the two objects. Often ויפרו is changed into ותפרו according to the versions. But this is an emendation which wants to avoid the problematic utterance that foreigners had broken the covenant.

Verse 8: Read ותשימון. Perhaps the final ם has been changed into ן for euphonic reasons.

Verses 8 and 9: G opens v. 9 with δια τουτο. This leads to the assumption that MT לָכֶם at the end of v. 8 might originally have been לָכֵן in the beginning of v. 9.

Verse 10: אשר תעו can be related to the Levites or to Israel. In the latter case, this expression must be regarded as an explanatory phrase, in the former case it must be regarded as an aggravating gloss; it remains unattested by G and S.

Verse 12a: Imperfect and following perfect consecutive should be understood in a frequentative manner and must not be changed for that reason.

Verse 18b is widely misread by the versions. It must be conceived as an elliptic phrase which means: "they are not allowed to gird themselves in a manner that causes sweat."

Verse 19: The second phrase אל־החצר החיצונה is a dittographic error.

Verse 24: Ketib should be read in v 24aα: לִשְׁפֹּט "in order to judge," whereas the Qere יִשְׁפְּטֵהוּ in v 24aβ must be preffered according to the rendering of the versions.

Verse 25: It is likely that יבאו instead of the singular in the MT is the original reading. א and ו seem to have been exchanged. The copula before לאח has wrongly been omitted.

Verse 26: יספרו־לו must be original against the plural reading of MT, due to the singular suffix in v. 26a and the versions.

Verse 28a must have been formulated negatively. It seems possible that the Vulgate (V) is correct. The present text connects v. 27 and 28: "and it (i.e. the sin offering) shall be their heritage." But that seems to make little sense in context.

2.2.3.2. Analysis

2.2.3.2.1 The text can under no circumstances date from Ezekiel. Indeed, it seems with very high probability to be of post-exilic origin.

2.2.3.2.1.1 The introduction of the complex represents the beginning of a new visionary guided tour ("Führungsvision") following 44:1-3. But Ezek 44:6-46:18 show no sign of being that form.[15] Instead, we find within the background of accusations several regulations used to denounce a former behavior. The guided tour does not find its adequate continuation before 46:19-47:12. From these observations it follows that the section 44:6-31 might be a part of an expansion layer.[16]

2.2.3.2.1.2 44:6-9aα_1 is arranged in the structure of a begründete Unheilsankündigung (i.e. a substantiated disaster announcement). The first part of it opens with a summons to speak and a messenger formula, and then turns in reproach directly to the addressees who are accused of serious offenses. Classically, a second messenger formula (v. 9) then follows, which opens the announcement part. This part is found in here, too, but the structure of the announcement differs clearly from those examples that can be traced back to the prophet himself. While in other texts YHWH's intrusion into history is announced, the introduction of a new cult order is carried out here (v. 9ff). Certainly this announcement of a new cultic order likewise contains punishment, but this is not referred to as YHWH's interruption of history. The result of the punishment is a lasting status reduction of part of the cult staff. In addition, there is a change from direct address (v. 6b-8) to a speech in the third person (v. 9ff). Embedded in this passage we can find another

[15] Cf. Ernst Vogt, Untersuchungen zum Buch Ezechiel, AnBib 95 (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1981), pp. 161, 175.

[16] See similarly Krüger, Geschichtskonzepte, p. 311-12, with different layers.

part of a begründete Unheilsankündigung. This one is opened with the expression, typical of Ezekiel, יען אשר (v. 12). But there is no לכן at the beginning of the announcement portion; instead על־כן is used. This shows an imitating style. It is completely unusual to find in the announcement of punishment, which is in the form of a status reduction for a part of the cult staff, a reward announcement suddenly carried out for a different part of the cult staff. Like the announcement of punishment before it, this announcement of reward is grounded in the behavior of this part of the cult staff. Nowhere else in the book of Ezekiel does YHWH act in favor of human beings on account of their behavior. YHWH's saving acts are elsewhere justified in his free will alone.

2.2.3.2.1.3 Elements of Ezekielian language are picked up (e.g., "house of rebellion," formulas, structure of begründete Unheilsankündigung), but there are not just a few ideas and terms, for example circumcision, that are completely unusual to Ezekiel the prophet as well as to the early expansion layers. Not to be circumcised seems to be characteristic of foreign peoples (28:10; 31:18; 32:19-32) in later additions.[17] The rejection of the stranger (vv. 7-9) is very untypical for the prophet himself. Here the moment of the ethnic and religious identity of the people of YHWH comes into consideration, a typically post-exilic topic. In these times circumcision becomes a religiously well-founded distinction of the people of YHWH, contrasting them with the foreign nations. This distinctive mark must have gained so much weight that during the second temple period it gained entrance in legislation, particularly because the stranger now lived amongst Israel. This rejection of all strangers is in clear contradiction to 3:6.

2.2.3.2.1.4 The distinction of the cult staff in two castes also cannot be explained by exilic circumstances. There is a significant parallel in Numbers 18, but without the strong polemics against the Levites as it is found in here.[18]

---

[17] Cf. the discussion in Nurmela, The Levites. Their Emergence as a Second-Class Priesthood, South Florida Studies in the History of Judaism 193 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998), pp. 92-95.

[18] There are no hints that Numbers 18 might be the older conception as Allen suggests (Ezekiel, p. 261, referring to M. Fishbane, Biblical Interpretation in Ancient

A somewhat comparable situation can only be detected in the so-called Korach-Bearbeitung of Numbers 16, also stemming from post-exilic times.[19]

2.2.3.2.1.5 The phrase "when Israel/the Israelites went astray" occurs two times in the text. Presupposed there is a phase of the history which is now thought to be completed and is to be followed by a new phase which is still lasting. Such a view is nearly impossible for exilic times.

2.2.3.2.2 Verses 17-31, which give instructions regarding the behavior of the priests in the new order, can be distinguished from the facilities of the new order of the cult staff in the prior section, which had been formed in prophetic style. The origin of these determinations should be subtly differentiated. Though the form of the regulations corresponds to the priestly torah, the composition reminds one of a decalogue. The regulations herein come from ten (different) taboo areas. An exception is the regulation concerning the dresses for inside and outside in vv. 17-19. This regulation occurs in similar form in 42:14.[20] On the one hand, it emphasizes the distinction between sacred and secular area and, on the other, the peculiar position of the priest as mediator between the holy and the people. Verse 18 interrupts this dress rule for inside and outside the sanctuary by the fact that

---

Israel [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985], pp. 138-43).

[19] L. Schmidt (Studien zur Priesterschrift, BZAW 214 [New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1993], pp. 135-146) has shown that this layer in Numbers 16 is a revised edition of the story of the 250 men, which has been made by the Priesterschrift. Like Ezekiel 44, the Korach-revision has its theme the opposition of Levites and Priests. While Korach and Aaron are the exponents of their opposing groups in Numbers 16, only Zadok is mentioned in Ezekiel 44. He, however, is not an actor but an identifying figure. On the other hand, there is no figure on the side of the Levites in Ezekiel 44 which might be compared with Korach in Numbers 16. There also is a difference in regard of the distinction between both of the cult staff groups in the two texts. But both texts commonly speak of seduction. In Numbers 16, this motif has come into the text because of the secondary revision of the older story about the 250 men. This does not matter in regard of comparison between Ezekiel 44 and Numbers 16.

[20] See Lev 6:4, where the priest has to remove his linen clothes when leaving the sanctuary.

the general rule is picked up that the service at the shrine has to be carried out exclusively in linen clothes.[21] Therefore, v. 18 may originally have been connected with the following instructions. This composition, however, does not seem to be united either. For example, the regulations concerning the cleaning of the priest after having contact with a deceased seems to be a later addition. This can be demonstrated first by comparison with Lev 21:1-4, which text has the same theme, and, second, with the fact that v. 25-26 suddenly talks about the priest in singular form. Beyond that, Ezekiel 44:26-27 may mirror Num 19:11 concerning the instruction about the seven day period of purification.

Further inconsistencies can be found in YHWH's "I," which appears suddenly in vv. 23-24 and 28, as well as in the direct address (that had not come into view in vv. 9-27) in v. 28b and 30. In addition v. 30bα mentions the priest in the singular and v. 30bβ changes to the second person singular. The parenetic character of vv. 28b and 30a leads to the assumption that we find here the continuation of the framework address delivered earlier to the "house rebellion" in v. 6-8. Verse 30 seems to have been placed here, because it addresses the question of the supply of priests, which is regulated in v. 29.

2.2.3.2.3 The following picture arises from the text: The determinations concerning the priestly caste, with its distinctions between upper and lower class of clergy, may have formed the core of the text. It was completed by regulations concerning inner and outer spaces in vv. 17 and 19. This complex may have been expanded on thematical grounds by the priestly torah of vv. 18, 20-22, 25, 29, and 31, so that v. 18 became part of the inner/outer-space regulations. Those passages containing YHWH's "I" also seem to be expansions. Without exception, these dealt with the relation

[21] See also Exod 29:39, 42-43; 39:27-29; Lev 6:3. It seems interesting that woolen clothing is strictly forbidden "while they do service within the gates of the inner court and in the house." Zimmerli (BKAT, 1134) suggests the possibility that sweating might not necessarily be the only reason for this instruction. The fact, however, that wool is an animal product could indeed be the main reason, because the sacred had to be protected from contact with the impure.

between the priests and the people. The priests are instructing the people to distinguish between pure and impure, sacred and secular[22] (v. 23), acting as judges (v. 25a), supervising the feasts (v. 25b) and, finally, in regard to the settlement of the נחלה (v. 28a). Verse 28b is striking because of its use of אחזה instead of נחלה, and its address in second masculine plural. This addition might date to the final redactor of the chapter, the same one who formed the framework addressing the "house of contradiction." He is responsible for imbedding and revising the text in v. 6-8, 28b, 30a. The addition in v. 30bα probably dates to the the time of Nehemiah; v. 30bβ is of even later origin.

It should be taken into account that Numbers 18 seems to be some kind of counterpart to Ezekiel 44. It also contains the combination of priestly order and priestly supply as in Ezekiel 44. Numbers 18, however, cannot be discussed here.

3. Conclusions for the Question of the Investigation

3.1. The Statements of the Texts.

3.1.1. Ezekiel and Moses.

The question whether Ezekiel himself could have been a priest or merely the son of the priest Buzi rises from Ezek 1:3. The precise reference to which הכהן refers cannot be recognized definitively. Now we can answer this question with a greater degree of certainty from the viewpoint of the authors of Ezek 43:18-27. Ezekiel has indeed been a priest. He initiates the post-exilic sacrifice in the temple. By that Ezekiel is equated with Moses who inaugurated service in Israel. This is also theologically interesting, for this means that, in the eyes of the author, Ezekiel repaired the broken relation between God and his people, because this relation is obviously mediated by the sacrifical cult. It is decisive that this reparation does not start out from humankind, but rather depends on a free initiative of YHWH. The prophetic scheme of rhetoric is wrapped around the priestly ritual legislation, and thus

[22]Note the reference back to Ezek 22:26.

shows that no one brings service, not even a priestly person, but YHWH himself causes, ordains, and organizes it as a means of salvation for humankind.

Before the altar can be used for sacrifice, it must be cleansed of sin. Sin is regarded to be something like a substantia, which must totally be removed from the altar. We must draw the conclusion that humans can only progress toward salvation after sin has been removed.

The priests are not characterized as mediators but as executors. But the first time the altar is used, it must be Ezekiel-Moses who acts in this initial act in order to consecrate the new altar. Ordinary priests do not suffice here. Ezekiel-Moses is only responsible for the initiation, though; the priests then are in his succession.

3.1.2. Status Difference.

3.1.2.1 According to Ezek 40:45-46[23] there are two groups of priests in the service of the visionary temple: temple servants and altar servants. The groups are hierarchically ordered, although Zimmerli does not share that view.[24] The two are to reside in opposite places. As the later addition shows, the origin of the two priestly groups is the criterion that distinguishes their service: the Zadokides alone are allowed to come close to YHWH.

On the other hand, 42:13-14 might represent an older stage, because the distinguishing of priests found in 40:45-46 is missing. Also, in this passage two rooms are mentioned, but these are used by all of the priests without reference to rank.

---

[23]As Zimmerli (BKAT, pp. 1035-6) has shown, 40:38-46 interrupts the logic of the visionary guided tour in 40:1-37, 47-49; 41:1-4. In particular, the dramatic address to the guided visionary in 41:4 is destroyed, if there is some interpreting word before it. At the redactional layer, however, there is a specific relation between 40:45-46 and 41:4. The former mentions those who are allowed to come close to YHWH, the later explains the place of the abode of YHWH. In any case 40:44-46 relies on 40:38-43. Verse 46b seems to be a later addition which might be inserted here in order to identify these with the Zadokides.

[24]Zimmerli, BKAT, p. 1028.

In comparing the two texts, one sees the beginning of an important development. At first, only one distinction is made, namely the one between priests and non-priests. The regular whereabouts of the priests is in the immediate proximity of the sacrifice place. Everything which comes into touch with the sacrifice is withdrawn from the normal use. The criterion of this distinction is holiness. Later, a differentiation takes place within the priesthood.

3.1.2.2 This differentiation is central in Ezek 44:10-16. Such a differentiation had not existed in older times according to the author's opinion.[25] The text of v. 13 says: "they are not allowed to come close to me in order to serve as priests for me and to approach to all my holy things, to the Holy of Holies." This can only mean that they had been permitted to do a priestly service in former times. This permit now is abrogated, because the Levites had left YHWH (v. 10: רחק) as Israel went astray (v 10: תעה). One can recognize that the author is in so great a temporal distance to the event, that he virtually works out of an epochal structure of history: time of going astray, time of purification, time of new beginnings. The latter is the author's time. In regard to the Levites, it is characterized as a time when they must bear the negative results of their sinful behavior. There is no temporal limitation on this punishment. Indeed this means status reduction, the Levites are no longer called כהן, a title which they must have possessed in former times. Moreover, 40:45, 46a[26] distinguishes between the two priestly groups, as has been shown above. One of them were servants of the house, the other one servants of the altar. Yet, there seems to be no status difference in 40:45, 46a. On the other hand, Ezekiel 44 knows of status reduction of those who must carry out the service of the house. In principle, such a status reduction can only take place if there has been a higher status before. This higher status was valid apparently up to the time of the preaching of the new order and, therefore, until the author's time. It becomes recognizable, then, that Ezekiel

[25] This seems to correlate with the literary-historical development of the book of Ezekiel, cf. Davis, Swallowing the Scroll. Textuality and the Dynamics of Discourse in Ezekiel's Prophecy, JSOTSup 78 (Sheffield: Almond Press, 1989), p. 163 n. 44.

[26] Note that v. 46b is a later insertion.

44 represents an expansion to the basic layer of the constitution project. However, this expansion has inserted a further element besides the status reduction of a part of the priesthood, and this is the distinction between Levites and Zadokides.

Two moments become clearer with this:

1. Priesthood had existed in former times in two groups. Both of them traced their genealogies back to Levi. They differed only in respect of the areas of their responsibility.

2. Originally both had access to the sacrificial service for YHWH.

Ezekiel 44 undertakes all efforts to strengthen the already existing role differentiation by the additional of status reduction. The major reasons for the reduction are mentioned with regard to the group whose status is devalued. Although the reproach mentioned is massive—the Levites are accused having practiced foreign cults—one cannot easily harmonize that reproach with the actual activities of the Levites. The text does not say anything about this. In regard to this point, we can conclude that the author must be a member of the Zadokides. He uses linguistic and traditio-historical elements of Ezekiel's own texts and is, therefore, probably a member of Ezekiel's circle. This circle seems to be composed strongly, if not exclusively, of levite-zadokite priests. It is highly improbable that Ezekiel himself was not a priest (see above 3.1.1). Quite obviously he never performed his ministry in the Jerusalem temple, like most of his closer, intimate friends had not. But their conception of themselves as priests was without doubt stamped by this.

3.1.2.3 The other texts (Ezek 45:1-8[27]; 46:19-24, 48:8-15) lie on the

---

[27] According to the context it seems clear that 45:1-8 must be regarded as a secondary insertion (Allen, Ezekiel, p. 255; Tuell, Law, p. 174, in contrast, speaks of an early foreshadowing of the connection between נשׂיא and priests), which might have been added because of the expression תרומה (44:30; 45:1, 6, 7). This text tries to explain the tension between the prohibition of possessing land in 44:28 and the distribution of land in 48:10ff. Therefore, Ezek 45:1-8 had to be added exactly in this place. This text was probably made just for its present location in the book. Verse 8 connects this text with the admonition of the princes in v. 9. An even later addition seems to be v. 2, because there is a clear relation between v. 1 and v. 3. In addition the use of

same level of strongly devaluating the Levites in favor of the Zadokite priesthood. Several times in these texts the theme of the distribution of land comes into play. A specific area in the middle of the land plays an important role, which is called תרומה. Its measures are 25,000 to 20,000 "yards." It is remarkable that everywhere where the number 20,000 (עשתים) occurs in the text in respect of the distribution of land it has been changed into 10,000 (עשרה).[28] The one who changed the text wanted to express that the holy תרומה only existed in the acre of 25,000 to 10,000 "yards." This area is the piece of land designated for the servants of the shrine, but not for the Levites. The Levites should not live on holy ground. This was not the intention, of course, in the original text, but it shows the trend moving in the direction of 44:10-16 that solidly obtained validity.

3.2. The Problem of Exilic Priesthood: Role and Status.

It is striking that all of the actions regarding the ordination of priests, which are ordered in Exodus 29 and carried out in Leviticus 8, are missing in Ezekiel 43. We can draw the conclusion that there must have been a regular succession of priests during exilic times. According to the opinion of the members of the Ezekielian circle, the priesthood remained valid in exile without practicing sacrificial cult. Such a conception of one's own social group presupposes a collective process, which is flanked by delimitating measures against others who do not belong to the group. The members of the Ezekielian circle had to dissociate themselves clearly from all other groups in the gola to be able to keep this profile. They must have been able to maintain the basic principles of priestly regulations that had constituted the priesthood before 597/587. Quite likely, a large part of the regulations may have first been designed, if not literarily fixed, in exilic times, based on the these delimiting efforts of the priestly group against all others. For the sake of

---

הקדש in v. 2 is unique in the book of Ezekiel as the idea of an uncultivated green area around the sanctuary.

[28] E.g. 45:1; 48:9.

these efforts, the internal priestly distinctions, which are evident in texts such as Numbers 16, 18, or Ezekiel 44, may also have been carried out. But what could have triggered this internal effort to make a Levitical distinction? Was it conflict that had become virulent first in the gola? Or was it conflict that in principle had already existed in the pre-exilic times, whose social consequences, however, first appeared in exile?[29]

There is simply no textual evidence for the former. We do not know what might have happened in the gola in this respect. It is, however, wrong to conclude from this that there had not been such conflicts between the different groups; we know nothing about this.

Excursus: Remarks on Levitical and Priestly Past History[30]

What we do have, however, is the textual results of the Deuteronomy. This legislation draws very little attention to priests[31]—in contrast to the results in Leviticus. Only in respect to their office in Deut 17:8-13 and 18:1-8 are their tasks described; in 17:18, 19:17, and 21:5 are they mentioned in their judicial functions, in accord with 17:8-13.[32] They are described mostly as "the levitical priests"[33] there. The deuteronomic concept is very interesting because priests almost nowhere are described in their regular "priestly" job, i.e., as executors in sacrificial service at the sanctuary.[34] Deut 18:1-5 rather speaks only of their supply by the sacrifices. Sacrifice is not carried out by priests according to the deuteronomic lawgiving. The person sacrificing is

---

[29] "Exile" has to be understood in two ways: temporarily and locally!

[30] Cf. Tuell, Law, p. 124-132.

[31] Outside the complex of the law giving, priests are mentioned in the liturgical addition in Deut 26:3-4 and in 27:9 and 31:9.

[32] Note the exception of Deut 24:8.

[33] This expression was altered by S everywhere it occurs in order to distinguish between Levites and priests.

[34] Rose (ZBK, p. 85) is wrong asserting: "Der Priester wird *funkional* gesehen: er führt das Schlachten eines Tieres durch"—the Text of Deuteronomy 12 does not say anything about this! Deut 26:1-4 seems to be the only exception describing the priest as mediator of sacrifice.

the free male full citizen, as demonstrated by Deut 12:13, 27; and 16:2. Even knowledge about pure and impure (Deuteronomy 14) is not assigned to the priest, but to the group of the free male, full citizens. The ritualistic tasks of the priests are strangely generally described as לעמד לשרת שם־יהוה ("to stand and minister in the Name of the Lord" NRSV)— but one cannot say what this could have been. Parenetic tasks (Deut 20:2-4), especially the instruction in the law (24:8), the controlling of law compliance (17:18) and, connected with it, jurisdiction (17:8-13; 19:17-18; 21:5). There is little difference when we take the results of the framework texts into account.

On the other hand, one can recognize a great interest in the Levites and their supply in the deuteronomic law. Lying in the background may have been an institution, whose maintenance they had once won, that was taken away from them by the deuteronomic lawgiving, i.e. the shrines throughout the countryside.

It seems clear from the older texts of the Hebrew scriptures that the Levites formerly had not been included in the priestly caste. Nor had they originally formed a tribe, as later conceptions suggest. They rather seem to have been a group separated from the people, who did not possess land but played a role in cultic demand (e.g. Jud 17:7[35]). Therefore, the Levites should not be considered primarily an ethnic but a social entity. This may be the reason for the fact that priestly tasks have fallen to them in later times. It is indeed possible that the known opinion of Wellhausen is correct that "Levite" has become the name of the priest caste in general.[36] The stereotyped expression הכהנים הלוים ("the levitical priests") in the book of Deuteronomy cannot be explained otherwise, even when we recognize that beside this expression, "Levites" are mentioned as well, who obviously are not considered to be priests.

---

[35] Cf. L. Grabbe, Priests, Prophets, Diviners, Sages. A Socio-Historical Study of Religious Specialists in Ancient Israel (Valley Forge, Penn: Trinity Press International, 1995), pp. 43-4.

[36] Wellhausen, Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel (Gloucester, Mass: Peter Smith, 1973), pp. 118ff.

In favor of the one central sanctuary all other shrines shall disappear according to the deuteronomic legislation. Deut 18:7 particularly grants that the Levites could also do their job at the central shrine like their levitical brothers who were already there. Included with this, however, is the problem that only the one sanctuary with its related duty could never serve as a sufficient maintenance institution for all of the cultic staff there. Thus the free male full citizen is to supply the Levites. There are several passages where the Levite occurs together with the personae miserae, widow, orphan and stranger.

As has long been recognized, Deut 18:7 is not in accordance with 2 Kgs 23:9. It is explicitly stated here that the former priests of the country shrines—here called high places—were not allowed to serve at the Jerusalem temple. Independently from this, as one assesses the literary ratio of these texts to each other, one can notice that two groups stand in opposition to each other in the two passages: the Levites who probably were country priests outside Jerusalem and the Jerusalem priests. The relationship of both groups is problematic and quite obviously these difficulties are connected both with the origins of the groups and with their rights: the country priests would gain entrance into offices refused to them up to a particular time, while the Jerusalem priests tried to fight against those usurpers—and they really knew how to fight!

If 2 Kings 23 speaks about high places, then a negative connotation is included, at least in the author's opinion, as can be seen in 2 Kgs 23:5. This verse does not speak of כהנים but of כמרים. A כמר is always a priest of a strange cult in the Hebrew scriptures.[37] 2 Kgs 23:5, when compared with 2 Kgs 23:9, leads to the conclusion that the country priests were obviously regarded as priests of foreign cults. There is a shift from deuteronomic legislation to deuteronomistic narration, which depends upon a different author's perspective. As has been shown especially by Deuteronomy 12-25, deuteronomic legislation has a positive view of the Levites. They must have

[37] Cf. Gleis, Die Bamah, BZAW 251 (New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1997), pp. 228-9.

been in close relationship with the subject of the legislation; in my opinion deuteronomic lawgiving came from levitical circles. They were to give up several privileges for theological reasons. In order to concentrate YHWH's service at one single place in order to fulfill the theologically central confession of Deut 6:4-9, the Levites had to give up their role as priests at local shrines spread throughout the country. After the destruction of Jerusalem and especially her temple, the necessity arose to explain this catastrophy theologically. The deuteronomists accomplished this by using the category of monotheism. With this approach, local shrines became suspicious, having been shrines of other gods and strange cults and their priests having been כמרים. Unfortunately these priests might have been the former Levites. So, the refusal of the original Jerusalem priesthood was combined with the monotheistic argument against the local shrines, which, ironically enough, was developed out of the regulations about centralization of the cult in the deuteronomic legislation. The Levites were dropped—what a strange irony—who probably had put the idea of monolatry on its way to monotheism.

*****

If we take this perspective into consideration, it seems to be the exact same as that of the Korach-revision in Numbers 16 and that of Ezekiel 44. There are two groups of priests, one of them considering themselves to be the legitimate YHWH-priesthood accusing the other of illegal cult practices. It does not matter in this regard whether the YHWH-priests feeling themselves to be legitimate refers to Aaron or Zadok. Decisive is a quite different factor, which only becomes recognizable if one takes the deuteronomic legislation and 2 Kings 23 into view, namely, the opposition of city and country priests. The latter are considered to be illegitimate, first ascertainable at the deuteronomic level of tradition. The traditional priests of the Jerusalem temple could not have tolerated the inclusion of the former country priests for reasons of prestige. Since the defense merely of their prestige did not seem to be very respectable, the Deuteronomists based their arguments on theological grounds as has been shown: the practice of foreign cults.

This argument relies on the assumption that there never had been any foreign cult at the temple of Jerusalem at all, which cannot be true.[38] But suddenly this problem seems to become a question of secondary importance. Ezek 44:14-15 explicitly states that the Zadikodes "have done service at my sanctuary when Israel went astray from me." According to this the cultic horrors shown in Ezekiel 8[39] could have been done on no account by Zadokites. This is impossible. According to Ezek 9:4, Ezekiel had to sign the forehead of those people in Jerusalem with a Taw who suffered under the ritualistic transgressions in the temple of Jerusalem. These marked people under no circumstances can be identified with the Zadokides of Ezek 44. The Zadokides would have carried out the proper service in the temple, when Israel went astray (44:15). They were not among those who cried in the streets (Ezek 9:4).

So we have to recognize that Ezekiel 44 combines two opinions with each other: (1) the cults at the country shrines were illegitimate (strange) cults; (2) the Zadokidic cult was integral all the time. These opinions were developed in exilic times, because they are dependent on the presupposition of a cultic reason for the catastrophe of 597/587. This assumption, however, first occurs in deuteronomistic circles about 550 B.C. The combination of both opinions, however, is a product of priestly circles, and the results of the book of Ezekiel make it very probable that the Ezekielian circle might have been the main one, but not the only one. This can be seen by the slightly different views presented in Numbers 16 and Ezekiel 44, where the genealogical connections with Aaron and with Zadok occur.

---

[38] See e.g. 2 Kgs 23:4 and especially Ezekiel 8.

[39] It does not matter whether we declare Ezekiel 8 to be "pure fantasy" (Kaufman cited by Halperin, Seeking Ezekiel. Text and Psychology (University Park, Pa.: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1993), p. 46) or taken literally—there is a remarkable tension between this text and the other. The historical argument does not fit in here.

3.3. The Lineage of Zadok.[40]

Zadok seems to be the one who was the most suitable figure in Israel's past on whom to base the ideal of legitimate priesthood as developed during exile by the Ezekielian circle.

Zadok has been the one who, according to 2 Sam 8:17, had been priest under David's rule, together with Abiathar. He functioned as a negotiator between the citizens of Jerusalem and David in the rebellion of Absalom (2 Sam 15:24-29). This leads to the opinion, that Zadok and Abiathar might have already been Jebusite priests in pre-Davidic times. Beyond that we have to recognize that Zadok's lineage seems to have been traced back to the Elide priests of Shiloh because of Ahitub. This Ahitub is said to have been Zadok's father (2 Sam 8:17). Another (?) Ahitub appears in 1 Sam 14:3 as grandson of Eli.[41] If we take this into account, Zadok might have been regarded as the first YHWH-priest at Jerusalem, who also served at the tabernacle of YHWH (cf. 2 Sam 15:24-25).

There is yet another point. Zadok belongs to the lineage of Aaron's son Eleazar (1 Chr 5:29-34; 6:35-38; 24:1-4). This lineage does not contain the name of Eli, the former priest of Shiloh. So it can be assumed that Eli might have belonged to Ithamar, Aaron's other son.[42] Because of the guilt of Eli's sons, Eli's line should be extinguished (1 Sam 2:27-36). Ithamar's lineage obviously was regarded as the lower one,[43] because Ithamar had to control the Levites (Exod 38:21; Num 4:28,33). Zadok, who did not belong to Ithamar's and Eli's descendants thus became the appropriate ancestor of the Jerusalem priesthood.

---

[40] Cf. Nurmela, Levites, pp. 19-21.

[41] Of course both persons might be identified as the same one. But we must leave this question open. The genealogical connections are unclear. See 1 Sam 22:20: Ahitub—Ahimelech—Abiathar and 2 Sam 8:17: Abjatar—Ahitub.

[42] Nadab and Abihu had died according to Lev 10:1-3.

[43] This seems to be mirrored by the lower number of the priests from Ithamar's lineage in 1 Chr 24:1ff.

3.4. No Problem in Exilic Priesthood: Succession.

The tendency of differentiating of two castes of priests with different status permits certain conclusions about the development of the priesthood in exile. The question "Who is a priest?" took on increasingly greater significance, apparently in view of the absence of the practice of sacrifice during that time. The genealogical connection with one common ancestor apparently became the decisive criterion. The innovative moment was that Levi no longer took part in the sacrificial cult. But the relation to Levi was irreversible and could not be eliminated. This genealogical connection must have already been a fixed part of the priestly identity in pre-exilic times. But it was possible to distinguish between the Levites of one category and those of another. This distinction had first been executed by Ezek 44:10-16. It was based on genealogical reasons, as well. A very narrowly defined connection with the Jerusalem sanctuary was combined with this distinction. Some members of the levitical lineage were not able to claim this connection. These are mentioned as "Levites" in Ezek 45:5, whereas the others are "the priests"; the expression "levitical priests," as in 44:15, is now avoided. Ezek 45:1-8 obviously shows the next stage of development in status differentiation: priests and Levites are set in opposition to one another.

In addition Ezek 45:1-8 says that the Levites possess אחזה. By this the Levites are taken out of the regulations concerning priests in Ezek 44:28. That means that the Levites no longer can be considered as YHWH's אחזה. The distinction between priests and Levites is thus sharpened.[44]

To sum up: the delimitation of the priesthood seems to be closely tied to the question of succession. The idea of lineage control fixed the boundaries between the groups and formed the rules of identification.

---

[44] Ezek 46:19-24 seems to be of still later origin. Priests and "Levites" are totally different in this passage. The term "Levites" is even completely avoided, the text only speaks of house servants. There are some connections with Lev 17:3-9, which want to withdraw the liberalization of the profane slaughtering (Deuteronomy 12).

4. Further Conclusions

Priesthood in exile according to the book of Ezekiel seems to be determined by three factors:

1. The representation of their own identity by the complete succession or descent of their group from the common ancestor Zadok; one can see how this factor arises (compare 44:10-16 against the older 40:45-46) and disappears (48:9-14; 46:19-24).
2. Combined with the first factor, the sharp delineation from the former non-Jerusalemic priesthood, which is called "the Levites."
3. The conscious separation of both groups as clergy in opposition to all other members of society.

These three factors do not rely on cultic service, which seems to be very important. We have to note that neither circumcision nor observance of the sabbath played any role. None of these elements, which played such an important role for the community of post-exilic Judah, is of any interest in this respect. Ezek 44:17-31 probably contains those elements which were decisive in order to distinguish between those who were clergy and all of the others. A determination that regulates the sharp distinction of the clothing for the use inside and outside the sanctuary—or should we say, in contact with YHWH and in contact with the ordinary people—is placed at the top of these regulations. There is a sharp distinction between sacred and secular, pure and impure, priest and non-priest. This distinction might be the point for which the caste of the priests trained during exile. This took place in the circle around the prophet Ezekiel. This prophet may have been a central integrating figure of the exiled priests. YHWH had called him to be a watchman against the people of Judah. Ezekiel, though part of this people, had to take a place outside. There was a sharp distinction between YHWH and the prophet, on the one hand, but also between YHWH's prophet and the people, on the other. The Ezekielian circle took over this distinction for all members belonging to it.

In later times the men of the Ezekielian circle started projecting the design of the new town and the new sanctuary. They created a utopian

model,[45] concentric in style with its center being the altar of YHWH. The beginning of the cult was connected with the ancestor of their ideas (Ezekiel) and the definition of the cultic personnel was connected with the ancestor of their lineage (Zadok), the first Jerusalem priest, who came from the line of Eleazar. In this fashion, they formed a pyramidic picture of the new order.

The architects were not able to execute their project. Other groups insisted on Aaron as the legitimating ancestor. Jerusalem could not be designed in the way as the city "YHWH is Here" had been projected. YHWH's cult had to struggle against others (Isa 57:3-10). And the limitation against strangers did not work as intended (Isa 56:1-8). But some of the ideas developed in the gola asserted themselves, first of all the differentiation between priests and Levites. The Ezekielian priests were very successful: the lists of people returning home from Mesopotamia in Ezra and Nehemiah shows a great number of priests, but only a few Levites. The priestly propaganda had done its job.

Why did they do so? There is still another aspect that has not been mentioned yet, but it seems in my opinion to be the most important one. Let us take a last glance at the texts. With Ezek 48:8-15 an additional aspect comes into view. There is a concentric picture in regard to the distribution of land. Sacred and secular areas are strictly seperated from each other. But they are not only separated they are at the same time undivorcibly related to one and another. This seems to reflect the self-understanding of the priests more adequately. Priests are those who are separated from all the others and exempted from service, but nevertheless live in the midst of the land among all of the citizens. They are not allowed to bring together sacred and secular areas, but at the same time they have to be mediators between both.

---

[45] Recently Kutsko (Between Heaven and Earth: Divine Presence and Absence in the Book of Ezekiel, Biblical and Judaic Studies from the University of California, San Diego, 7 [Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2000], p. 147) interpreted Ezekiel 36-37 as caused by "appropriating standard Mesopotamian language of re-creation and repatriation of cult statues, inverting the whole system by applying it to his description of the revivification and restoration of Israel." If Kutsko is right, it might be possible to combine this hypothesis with the question of concept of Ezekiel 40-48, as well.

This seems to be the result of a monotheistic picture of God. Only if God is completely seperate from the world and at the same time turns himself to the world can he be described as the only god. If there is no severe distinction between God and world, one cannot deny that God is—at least in part—dependent upon the world. If there is no turning to the world the question of the absentia dei causes a problem for salvation. So the concept of the constitution project in Ezekiel 40-48 tells us about the effects of these dialectics on the picture of priesthood. There must have been an intense discussion among the exiled priests[46] concerning other religions. Under the pressures of the Babylonian pantheon, they had to answer the question how to comprehend the world that had not even been created by one single god, but even worse is governed by only one. If there is one single God alone, he can only be thought of as a god completely identical with the world or totally separate from it. Israel's faith traditions show, from earliest times onward, that there has never been an option for the first. In the time of the exile and in the exile in Babylonia, the priests started a process of clarification of the picture of God as the only one, who must be both totally separate from the world yet also cannot leave it alone. The abode of the priest according to Ezek 48:8-15 reflects this picture of God in a good manner. The priests became, then, the necessary mediators between God, the Holy One, and the people. Priestly sacrificial service, thus, became the only Heilsweg to God.

[46]See Grabbe, Priests, p. 47.

PRIEST, PROPHET AND EXILE: EZEKIEL AS A LITERARY CONSTRUCT

Corrine Patton, University of St. Thomas

At the beginning of the book of Ezekiel, the prophet is identified as a priest. Breaking the frame of the majority of the book, the author tells the reader Ezekiel's parentage and office. Ezekiel himself tells us that he is among the exiles of the early deportations, implying that his social location in Judah had been among the elite priests, those who had some official function recognizable to the Babylonians.[1] All of these notices inform an interpretation of the book. The audience subsequently reads the rest of the book through the lens of this information. The reader knows that Ezekiel comes out of a particular social setting, that of an elite priest, a social setting that leads to certain expectations about his behavior. The reader should also know that, at least in the final form of the text, the author and Ezekiel are not identical. Although the original author may, in fact, have been the historical Ezekiel, the book projects Ezekiel as the narrator, a character within the prophetic narrative, through whom the reader experiences the exile. Recent studies of the book have begun to take the literary features of the narrative elements of the book seriously, including the characterization of Ezekiel.[2] However, more studies have focussed on his function as prophet, than on that as priest.[3] Since the restoration of the priesthood is so important at the

---

[1] Zimmerli defines the first deportation as closer to the taking of official hostages. See his discussion in Ezekiel 1: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel, Chapters 1-24 (Hermenia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979) 365-65 and 507.

[2] See especially the studies by M. Greenberg, Ezekiel 1-20 (AB 22: New York: Doubleday, 1983) and Ezekiel 21-37 (AB 22A; New York: Doubleday, 1997); E. F. Davis, Swallowing the Scroll: Textuality and the Dynamics of Discourse in Ezekiel's Prophecy (JSOTSup 78; Bible and Literature, 21; Sheffield: Almond, 1989); K. R. Stevenson, Vision of Transformation: The Territorial Rhetoric of Ezekiel 40-48 (SBLDS 154; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996; and M. S. Odell, "You Are What You Eat: Ezekiel and the Scroll," JBL 117 (1998) 229-48.

[3] Odell's piece does explore the interconnection of the priestly and prophetic roles of the character, although the focus is on the first five chapters as an extended prophetic initiation.

end of the book, certainly how the character of Ezekiel functions as priest contributes to a fuller understanding of the book's projection of the ideal priest.

This paper will not address the question of the relative status of the Zadokites and Levites in Ezekiel 44, or, to use Gese's terms, the Zadokite layer.[4] Clearly that material presumes priestly distinctions, with Zadokites as holier than the Levites. It explicitly states that this distinction is the result of some sin on the part of the Levites. I assume that the book accurately reflects the possibility of a hierarchical priesthood at the sanctuary in Jerusalem, no matter which groups would vie for top honors. I see the material in the Zadokite layer, as a secondary addition to the core vision in chapters 40-48, one that is in continuity with the focus on priestly concerns in the core material, but one that develops those concerns in a way distinct from the earlier material.[5]

Instead, I wish to examine the functions and definition of what it means to be a priest as both assumed and asserted by the text. I presume that

---

[4] H. Gese, Der Verfassungsentwurf des Ezechiel (Kap. 40-48): Traditionsgeschichtlich untersucht (BHT 25; Tubingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1957).

[5] Some representative studies of the history of Zadokites and Levites, see A. Cody, A History of Old Testament Priesthood (AnBib 35; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1969) esp. 166-68; J. D. Levenson, Theology of the Program of Restoration of Ezekiel 40-48 (HSM 10; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1976) 129-51; R. Abba, "Priests and Levites in Ezekiel," VT 28 (1978) 1-9; P. D. Hanson, The Dawn of Apocalyptic: The Historical and Sociological Roots of Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology, rev. ed. (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979) 218-40, and "Israelite Religion in the Early Postexilic Period," Ancient Israelite Religion: Essays in Honor of Frank Moore Cross, ed. P. D. Miller, P. D. Hanson, and S. D. McBride (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987) 485-508; N. Allan, "The Identity of the Jerusalem Priesthood during the Exile," HeyJ 23 (1982) 259-69; R. K. Duke, "Punishment or Restoration? Another Look at the Levites of Ezekiel 44.6-16," JSOT 40 (1988) 61-81; S. S. Tuell, The Law of the Temple in Ezekiel 40-48 (HSM 49; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992) 121-52; I. M. Duguid, Ezekiel and the Leaders of Israel (VTS 56; Leiden: Brill, 1994) 58-90; S. L. Cook, "Innerbiblical Interpretation in Ezekiel 44 and the History of Israel's Priesthood," JBL 114 (1995) 193-208; and R. Nurmela, The Levites: Their Emergence as a Second-Class Priesthood (USF Studies in the History of Judaism 193; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998) esp. 85-106.

the book projects an idealization of priesthood, both in its portrayal of the character of Ezekiel and in its condemnations of priests in Jerusalem. This idealization may never have been the historical reality of what it meant to be a priest, and I do not think it can be read as some kind of transparent window through which we glimpse the historical priests of the pre-exilic temple. Rather this is an idealization that comes out of the experience of the fall of the city, the destruction of the temple and the functional cessation of all priestly activity.

Ezekiel is a central figure in the book; the reader experiences all speech, all action through this figure. Throughout the majority of the book Ezekiel is a first-person narrator presented, however, as both the author and the narrator.[6] Even if the author and the narrator are identical, the portrayal of the author as narrator does not necessarily reflect the whole reality of the actual author. The portrayal of the narrated self is controlled by various literary parameters of the text itself, such as aesthetics, narrative flow, the function of the narrator in the overall plot, etc. In addition, authors who wish to present themselves as sympathetic narrators will sublimate elements of their real selves that might impede the sympathetic identification with the reader.[7] Ezekiel is portrayed as a sympathetic narrator. The reader's evaluation of him is informed first and foremost by the fact that God in the

---

[6] On narration in the Hebrew Bible, see A. Berlin, Poetics and Interpretation of Biblical Narrative (Bible and Literature, 9; Sheffield: Almond, 1983) esp. 43-59. See also T. Longman, Literary Approaches to Biblical Interpretation (Foundations of Contemporary Interpretation, 3; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1987) 85-87, and D. M. Gunn, "Reading Right: Reliable and Omniscient Narrator, Omniscient God, and Foolproof Composition in the Hebrew Bible," The Bible in Three Dimensions: Essays in Celebration of Forty Years of Biblical Studies in the University of Sheffield, ed. D. J. A. Clines, S. E. Fowl, and S. E. Porter (JSOTSup 87; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1990) 53-64.

[7] At this point I am speaking about the implied or ideal reader, rather than the actual reader. Certainly in the book of Ezekiel our contemporary audience is neither the implied nor the ideal reader of this text, although we are the actual readers. For a discussion of the identity of Ezekiel's ideal readers see Davis, Swallowing the Scroll, 73-77

text seems to view Ezekiel positively.[8] Ezekiel is not an omniscient narrator. Although he has access to a great deal of information not known by other human characters in the text, this knowledge only comes to him because it is directly revealed by God.

Starting from a literary standpoint, Yahweh is also a literary figure in this text whose speech is presented as authoritative, and who embodies certain ideals. As a character within the text, it is God who is omniscient, rather than Ezekiel. Social construction and social critique in the speeches of Yahweh are presented not merely as the opinions of a sympathetic narrator, but as the authoritative commands of an omniscient character in the text. Again, this portrayal of God may in fact reflect the reality of God, but this portrayal is even further removed, since the author does not claim to be God. So although the character of God is omniscient, the author does not claim to have complete knowledge of this omniscient character. Even the author projects that what he knows of God, he knows through Ezekiel's experiences of God's revelations.

The story-telling in the book is done so artfully that the reader is drawn into assuming that what it says about Ezekiel reflects an historical person's real experience, and that what it says about God is true and reliable. This study proceeds, however, assuming that the text is controlled more by ideological struggles than by historical facts. This paper will examine the ideology of priesthood, outside of the Zadokite layer, in relationship to four areas: the social hierarchy projected or assumed in the text, the question of sin or righteousness of various social groups, the priesthood's role and function especially in relationship to prophecy, and, lastly the priest's relationship to God. I assume that the book reflects the experience of the exiled community, and the competing theological and ideological views this experience elicited.

Inscribing Social Hierarchy

The book of Ezekiel exhibits great concern for the various forms of leadership in Judah. References are made to the royal leader (king or

[8] I will return to the question of the sin of the exiles below.

prince), the priests, the prophets, and the elders. Although few historical leaders are actually named in the text, people in every leadership role are judged for their sins, including both the priests and the prophets. Yet, nowhere in the first thirty-nine chapters are such roles themselves condemned. The final form of the vision of restoration in chapters 40-48 seems to imply that the ideal reconstruction of the nation will include adjustment to social categories, such as the demotion of the king to a nasi',[9] and, in the Zadokite layer, the hierarchical differentiation of Zadokites and Levites in the temple.

Social hierarchy can be defined in relationship to several different phenomena. First, the term often connotes uneven access to authority and power, but this power can be defined in many different ways, including political, economic, and ritual. The political hierarchy in the book is complex. The author seems to assume that each leadership role has a different sphere of decision making. Kings are responsible for international politics (17:11-21) and protection of the weak (34:4), prophets for responsible communication of only divinely revealed oracles (3:17-21; 13:3-16; and 33:2-7), and priests for "instruction" on legal and ritual issues, (7:26 and 22:26), as well as for maintaining proper levels of purity and managing impurities (spelled out in various laws for the priests in the final vision). Leaders are criticized for failure in their responsibility for their duties, but not for trying to assume too much power. The moral responsibility of individuals who are not leaders is mitigated by the degree to which the leaders have fulfilled their own responsibilities. The long sentinel discourses (3:17-21 and 33:2-7) on the corporate responsibility of the prophet in cases when he or she fails to warn those God condemns, serves as a model of leadership based, not on privilege, but on responsibility. Similarly, in the oracle against the shepherds, the people are scattered and

[9] See the studies of this figure in Duguid, Ezekiel and the Leaders of Israel. See also Levenson, Theology of the Program of Restoration, 55-107; C. R. Biggs, "The Role of the Nasi in the Programme for Restoration in Ezekiel 40-48," Colloquium: The Australian and New Zealand Theological Review 16 (1983) 46-57; and Tuell, The Law of the Temple, 103-20.

exiled because of the failures of the kings (chapter 34). In the vision of restoration, political differentiation is maintained, although not stressed.

The author does not have as much to say about economic hierarchy. In passages such as 7:11 and 20 the author mentions the wealth of those who will be punished, and its loss in the destruction, but, in distinction to prophets such as Amos and Micah, he does not focus on social justice issues and the distribution of wealth.[10] More attention is paid to land as a source of economic status. In the final vision of restoration, land division is "equitable" in that land is evenly distributed to the tribes, although there is no regard for the relative fertility or productivity of the land.[11] The political leader has more land than any other individual, but the purpose of this excess land is to provide the animals for sacrifice on the high holy days. The temple has the most choice land, and, presumably, this also is determined by the necessities of maintaining the sacrificial services. Clearly then wealth is granted by God so that Israel can maintain temple ritual.[12]

Land distribution in these visions, however, has more to do with reflecting a hierarchy of approach.[13] This concept again clearly derives from the fact that the pinnacle of hierarchy, and that which orders the world hierarchically, is God. In this sense, then, the tribes are certainly not equal, but are arranged hierarchically, the most important being closest to the temple. This arrangement of tribes in such a hierarchy of status is evident in other Israelite texts, such as Numbers, but whether it is an innovation here

---

[10] The reference to the shepherds eating fat in 34:2-3 may be an exception.

[11] Perhaps this is due to the fact that in the vision, God clearly can make any land blossom like the garden of Eden. For other examples of images of Eden, see M. Himmelfarb, "The Temple and the Garden of Eden in Ezekiel, the Book of Watchers and the Wisdom of ben Sira," Sacred Places and Profance Spaces, ed. J. Scott (Contributions to the Study of Religion 30; Westport: Greenwood, 1991) 63-78; and J. F. Kutsko, Between Heaven and Earch: Divine Presence and Absence in the Book of Ezekiel (Biblical and Judaic Studies, 7; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2000) 129-47.

[12] Stevenson (The Vision of Transformation) focuses on this theological function of land in the final vision.

[13] I take this term from M. Haran, "The Priestly Image of the Tabernacle," HUCA 36 (1965) 191-226.

depends entirely on how one dates Ezekiel and P. Earlier poetic texts, such as the Blessings of Jacob and Moses, as well as the Song of Deborah, do reflect some hierarchy of the tribes, but this is based more on political hierarchy, rather than hierarchy of approach. Throughout the book of Ezekiel, however, a hierarchy of approach seems to be assumed. This issue is clearly in play in the final vision, where the author explicitly limits access to sacred space. In fact, this seems to be one of the overriding polemics evident throughout chapters 40-48. However, unlike the distinction between Zadokites and Levites, this element of the text is in continuity with the earlier condemnations. The repeated stress on Judah's sins as abominations that lead to defilement also assumes that there have been violations of approach. The fact that this defilement leads to God's abandonment of the temple suggests that these include violations of access.

Within this hierarchy of status, the book clearly depicts the priests as having the top rung of the ladder. Priests control access to the temple precinct, and they alone have access to the area around the altar. In the final vision, hierarchy is projected, portrayed, and maintained by questions of access and approach. The king may have all sorts of political and economic power. He may be able to conduct war, initiate treaties, and control trade, but all of this is portrayed as ultimately insignificant if he cannot burn the whole burnt offering. Since it is God's presence which determines the hierarchy of approach, the "hierarchy of hierarchies" is that of approach. In comparison to this, questions of economic worth and political power are insignificant.

How does the portrayal of Ezekiel address these various hierarchies? First, Ezekiel's economic status must be inferred. Clearly he is in exile, which may presume he has lost access to all wealth. If he were from the priestly family that had at one time controlled the temple of Jerusalem, then he would not have lost ancestral land in the deportation. However, the land to which he would have lost access would have been temple lands. This makes the book's focus on the restoration of temple property at the end of the book even more understandable. His own access to wealth would have been through that temple and its income. Again the stress on the restoration of the sacrificial system would then be a restoration of his own economic

status. However, the lack of critique of the treatment of the poor may also reflect his inherently privileged status. He represents the concern for the restoration of the privileged group, not the effects of the siege and fall on the poor.

It may at first glance appear that Ezekiel's portrayal may have little to do with political hierarchy. He is never addressed as the high priest, nor is he promised this office in the restoration. He never addresses or condemns a royal figure, like Isaiah had. Although God condemns false prophets through Ezekiel, Ezekiel himself is not seen in a direct contest with other prophets over true and false prophecy, like Jeremiah. In fact, the characterization of Ezekiel throughout the book stresses his political insignificance. Throughout much of the book he suffers from muteness. His behavior marginalizes him from the rest of society. Although he is famous enough to be sought out by elders, even this notice is undermined in 33:30-33 in which it is revealed that the people come to him for entertainment, not for the authority of his utterances. Furthermore, chapter 11 shows that, prior to the fall of Jerusalem, his status as an exile is even further belittled by those people who still remain in the city. These people are quoted as saying, "They are far removed from the Lord; this land is given to us for a possession" (11:15). This demonstrates that for the public audiences within the book, Ezekiel is portrayed as yielding little intrinsic power.

Here, however, a closer reading of the text reveals that the author is playing with elements of irony. Publicly Ezekiel appears to be a nobody, but by the book's end he has usurped the power and status of almost every other leadership position. The most obvious usurpation has to do with royal power. Although in the ancient Near East, the ones responsible for temple building were the kings. The book of Ezekiel has no place specifically for the king in temple building: he neither receives a command to build, nor is given the plan by either God or the prophet, except insofar as he is part of the whole community which is to receive the plan. Ezekiel is portrayed as usurping this royal role. The final vision also has Ezekiel receiving a set of laws. Again, although in Israelite texts law-giving is associated with the pre-monarchic period, in the ancient Near East revelation of law would have been given to a royal figure, not a prophet. In Ezekiel 20 the law is

associated with the wilderness period, although not attached to either Moses or Sinai.[14] At the end of the book Ezekiel is usurping someone's power, either that of an ancient figure, such as Moses, or that of a king who can declare a law code as authentic.

Other social roles are also taken over by the lead character. Ezekiel usurps the role of the prophet. Although not a professional prophet, he becomes one through God's commands to command to prophesy. Although this will be addressed in more detail below, at this point it can be further noted that by the end of the book the prophetic office outside of the person of Ezekiel has entirely disappeared. The restored Israel has no place for the prophetic group. The elders, as well, are subordinated to the role and power of Ezekiel. They consult and obey him, and, in the end, join their tribes around the temple. This usurpation of political roles by the main character serves to elevate his political status over all other leaders.

The primary way Ezekiel's status is asserted, however, is through the hierarchy of approach. The powerful opening vision unquestionably establishes Ezekiel as the one who has fullest access to God's presence. Although Ezekiel is not, in fact, the high priest, the text portrays him as a priest who not only usurps the hierarchy of approach from the high priest, but even surpasses it. Even though the lines between priest and prophet become blurred, focussing strictly on Ezekiel as priest, shows he has access to the Holy of Holies, even when he is, in fact, not physically there. Within the narrative timeframe, he sees God more clearly than the priest who still remains in Jerusalem. He can approach God, see heavenly beings, and even handle a heavenly plan.

Although the opening vision plays off of and expands the similar vision from Isaiah of Jerusalem, Ezekiel is not portrayed as worried about the inherent danger of his own uncleanness. In fact, he asserts his own pure state when God commands him to eat food cooked on human dung (4:14). It must be noted that his concern in chapter 4 is with his own pure status, and not with the inherent danger this contamination would involve in any future

[14] C. Patton, "'I Myself Gave Them Laws that Were Not Good': Ezekiel 20 and the Exodus Traditions." JSOT 69 (1996) 73-90.

contact with God. The book certainly portrays God as the one who actively purifies Israel both at its establishment (chapters 16 and 23), and in the vision of restoration in 36:25 and 33. However, not once does the character of Ezekiel undergo a purification ritual that renders him fit for such direct contact with God. This portrayal then renders Ezekiel as essentially unlike any other character in the book, hierarchically better, more pure, and therefore, more qualified to approach God than any other priest, prophet or political figure. This is especially striking in a book so focussed on purity and defilement.

The irony of the portrayal of Ezekiel, however, is furthered by the language that God uses when addressing this main human character. God repeatedly refers to Ezekiel as ben 'adam. In this book, it does not yet seem to connote a title of elevation, like the use of the term in Daniel. Rather, if we assume the phrase simply stresses Ezekiel's status as human, then this repetition stresses the difference between God and Ezekiel. It certainly cuts against any tendency to view Ezekiel as in some way different from other human characters. It might also connote that God's choice of Ezekiel neither results from Ezekiel's inherent worthiness or effects a change in Ezekiel to a status beyond that of humans. In addition, God's strongly worded admonitions to Ezekiel on his responsibility reinforce the notion noted earlier that positions of leadership do not lead to entitlement; rather they entail grave responsibilities.

Berquist notes that in the Persian period, the temple serves to demarcate social boundaries,[15] but with the destruction of the temple social categories are up for grabs. The characterization of Ezekiel as a priest is part of a larger program in the book to re-configure social hierarchies. In this program, Ezekiel embodies the perfect ideal, the one at the top of the social ladder. This social view maintains an inherently hierarchical structure within society. Placement within the hierarchy certainly includes some economic and political rights, such as land ownership, authority, power, and wealth, but for this author these hierarchies also entail grave responsibilities,

[15] J. L. Berquist, Judaism in Persia's Shadow: A Social and Historical Approach (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995) 147-54.

responsibilities that, when not fulfilled, ultimately lead to the destruction of the whole social order. However, within these leadership roles, the author has made clear that the most essential hierarchy is that of approach or access to God's presence. Violations of other social positions result in defilement, thus assuming that the person who holds that office is too close to God, and needs to be distanced, or demoted, from that position. Ezekiel the priest, by being the one closest to God models the perfect leader. The stress throughout the book on his mortality, the recognition of his apparent lack of public leadership, as well as the dire warnings to Ezekiel if he fails to prophecy highlight the irony of leadership in this system: it may be gift you really would rather not have.

Moral Hierarchy

Social hierarchy is the most straightforward of the hierarchies within the book. Although the author uses irony to illustrate the various aspects of social hierarchy, the social roles themselves can be sorted out. The question of sin and righteousness, however, is more complex. Nowhere in the book does it seem that the author regards anyone as worthy of God's regard. The reviews of Israel's history are noteworthy for positing no kind of "honeymoon period" when Israel was true to the covenant. To highlight the metaphorical imagery, Israel was a foundling wallowing in its own defiling blood. Even the oracles of restoration depict God as the one purifying Israel from its own defilement. In the condemnations of specific social groups, such as we find in chapter 7, all priests, prophets, elders, and royal persons are guilty of sin and abomination.

Yet, Ezekiel as a character is reserved from this judgment of sin. As mentioned above, Ezekiel maintains he has never been in a state of ritual impurity (4:14), which, given the intimate connection between cultic and ethical violations presumed in this book, means he has committed no sin. As a literary character, it is not absurd to presume that the reader is meant to take Ezekiel's self-portrait literally. Within Israelite literature, there are clear parallels with two other perfectly righteous men who experience disaster: Noah and Job. It can be argued whether references in Ezekiel to Noah and Job in 14:14 and 20 are references to the literary texts we have or references

to the traditions in other forms, but in this instance it does not seem to matter. What is important is that these are such fitting references in a book whose own hero is a perfectly righteous man suffering a horrible fate. The parallels to Job are particularly poignant: like Job, Ezekiel's sufferings include loss of wealth, status, and family. Like Job he suffers a disease that limits his interaction with society. Like Job he has to eat his bread in a defiling place. In parallel to Noah, neither man can save his own sinful community. In addition, the plan for the restoration of civilization is mediated through these two men. As for Daniel, we know too little of the contents of this legend in Ezekiel's day to speculate. Is Ezekiel thinking of a figure closer to Ugaritic Dan-el, the righteous king and wise judge who suffers for the impiety of his son? Or is the figure closer to the Hellenistic biblical Daniel, also wise and righteous, and, like Ezekiel, often associated in the book with wisdom forms, and unfairly suffering in exile? We cannot know, beyond recognizing that wisdom, righteousness and unfair suffering are an integral part of both stories.

Again, this portrayal of Ezekiel suggests something about the debate over sin and responsibility during the exile. Whose sin led to this horrible destruction, and whose atonement for sin would be sufficient for participation in a future restoration? If we assume that Ezekiel in some way represents the ideal exile, what does that suggest about the answers to these questions that the author has in mind? Chapter 18 stresses that responsibility for sin is not multi-generational, as is assumed by the deuteronomistic historian. Instead, it asserts that each generation is punished for its own sin. As Joyce has pointed out, this is not quite the same as individual responsibility.[16] The book still assumes corporate responsibility, isolated to its own generation. The explicit dating in the book clearly places Ezekiel among those who themselves were deported. He is not someone born in exile, as could be argued for the author of second Isaiah. Ezekiel 11:14-21 shows that those left in the city felt that the responsibility for the fate of the

[16] Divine Initiative and Human Response in Ezekiel (JSOTSup 51; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989). See also G. H. Matties, Ezekiel 18 and the Rhetoric of Moral Discourse (SBLDS 126; Atlanta: Scholars, 1990).

deportees stemmed from their own behavior. Given book's stress that punishment is meted out to the sinner, it would seem that Ezekiel too must logically assume that those, including himself, who had been deported were sinners. In a few places the deportees are addressed for their sin (14:3-5; 20:2-4; 33:31-32), although certainly more focus is on the sin of those still in the land. There are also some scant indications, especially in the condemnation of the shepherds, that the author recognizes that innocent individuals could have been swept up in the punishment. Ezekiel is consistently depicted as one of these people.

The reader also recognizes that the repeated pattern in the book is not sin-punishment-repentance-restoration, but sin-punishment-restoration-repentance.[17] Those in the land are still on the first step of this pattern; not yet punished, they continue to sin. The deportees have reached the second stage, but Ezekiel in his visions has alone completed the pattern. By the end of the book he has seen the restoration with all of its theological and anthropological implications clearly shown. The reader participates in this narrator's knowledge. While the book promises the real exiled audience that they will soon participate in this vision and understand God. Within the narration, however, this pattern leaves Ezekiel on the outside. He is the one who does not sin, yet suffers punishment. Within the timeframe of the narrative, he is the only one who fully understands the onerous demands of a God such as Yahweh. By the end of the book, he is also the only one who has returned, albeit in a vision. He experiences how seeing the restoration leads to a clearer understanding of God, and the requisite demands on humanity. The other characters are promised a future when they can be like Ezekiel. Therefore, with respect to morality, Ezekiel functions not to personify some group whom the author addresses, but rather as a symbol of hope for the whole exiled audience after the fall of the city.

Ezekiel's righteousness is attributed by his role as priest rather than that as prophet. His righteousness is defined in terms of his purity status and is further re-inscribed by God's revelations to him, revelations that at the end

---

[17] For a discussion of this in chapter 20, see J. Blenkinsopp, Ezekiel (Interpretation; Louisville: John Knox, 1990) 86-91.

of the book leave Ezekiel literally standing in the place of the high priest. As a prophet, on the other hand, he is rendered mute as soon as he is given the message to prophesy. Even towards the end of the book his prophetic role is still not recognized. As a prophet, then, he is a dismal failure.[18] The book cuts against the power of the prophet further in two ways. First, none of the ancient examples of intercessors, with the possible exception of Daniel, are prophets. This suggests that the author does not view intercession as primarily a prophetic power. Second, both the condemnation of prophets in 13:9 reinforced by the visions of restoration have no place for prophets in the restoration. This suggests that for the author prophecy is only a necessary phenomenon in times of crisis, and not a stable element of Israelite society. In the future, the priest will channel all divine mediation.

Ezekiel: A Priest Who Prophecies

The observation that social and moral hierarchy elevate the priest over the prophet seems to cut against the fact that the most prominent portrayal of Ezekiel in the book has him functioning, not as a priest, but as a prophet. Yet, it is striking that he is never explicitly called "the prophet Ezekiel," although there are a few references to "the prophet," clearly indicating Ezekiel. The interplay of Ezekiel as priest and as prophet are almost impossible to sort out and indicate how little we know about the distinctions of these two offices in the pre-exilic period.[19] The book never claims that he

---

[18] Davis also highlights the ways in which Ezekiel's prophetic power is severely limited. She connects this with a transformation in the social role of the prophet, and not as an element in the interplay between priest and prophet. See especially E. F. Davis, Swallowing the Scroll: Textuality and the Dynamics of Discourse in Ezekiel's Prophecy (JSOTSup 78; Bible and Literature 21; Sheffield: Almond, 1989) 133-40. Davis's focus on the literary role of Ezekiel as prophet, however, serves as a model for my study here. Certainly his priesthood is subordinated to his portrayal of prophet, but it remains an important element not often explored. What follows in my discussion are only those elements of his role as prophet that impact on our understanding of his role as priest.

[19] One recent attempt by M. S. Odell, ("You Are What You Eat: Ezekiel and the Scroll," JBL 117 [1998] 229-48) reads chapters 1-5 as Ezekiel's transformation from priest to prophet. Although I agree that much of these chapters do show his initiation as a

was publicly recognized or identified as a prophet. Wilson has identified elements in the text that clearly imply that his prophetic authority was questioned. [20] Certainly the text tells us his prophetic role was not even recognized by those who came to hear him (33:30-33).

Instead the book focuses on God's repeated command to Ezekiel to prophecy. The book has God commanding Ezekiel to prophesy twenty-eight times. In addition, in the sentinel passages (3:17-21 and 33:2-7), God instructs Ezekiel about the seriousness of this prophetic function. Of course, the irony in the book is that immediately after God tells Ezekiel that if he fails to warn the people, their death will be attributed to him, God strikes the prophet dumb and unable to deliver the messages. Nevertheless, these commands clearly indicate that the author sees much of Ezekiel's activity in the book as related not to his priestly office, but to his role as prophet. This would certainly include the symbolic acts he performs, as well as the visions he reports, in addition to the oracles he pronounces.

The text also seems to presume a clear distinction between priests and prophets, a distinction recognizable to the audience. Anthropological studies of priesthood, both generally and within ancient Israel concede that there is a distinction between priesthood and prophecy, yet no one agrees on the exact articulation of that distinction.[21] Although in biblical studies more attention has been paid to the prophet, historians of Israelite religion are attempting a more sympathetic understanding of Israelite ritual, but in the process what seems to have been clarified is the ambiguity of these categories.[22] For

---

prophet, I maintain that priestly elements persist throughout the book, and that, by book's end, the priestly role alone remains.

[20]R. R. Wilson, Prophecy and Society in Ancient Israel (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980) 282-86.

[21]Recent studies have shown that much early writing on this topic was biased by prejudice either against Catholic religiosity, or Jewish faith. Too often the priest was viewed as negative, conservative, preserving traditions at all costs, and keeping religious expression tied to its earlier magical roots. I do not need to rehearse the criticism of this approach here; the point has been clearly made by other scholars.

[22] It is surprising to me, however, how many studies of temple ritual and priestly theology never address the role and function of the priest. For example, J. G. Gammie

instance, was the reading of oracles in the context of sacrifice a function of the priest or the prophet? If it was the function of the priest, then it certainly indicates that priesthood had a role of mediation. How does this mediation differ from other prophetic mediations? If it is the job of the prophet, how does the use of this ritual within stable religious ritual relate to the more charismatic nature of the prophet? The only hope at a better understanding of prophecy and priesthood is by returning again and again to the texts, letting them speak for themselves as much as possible, recognizing there was certainly disagreement in ancient Israel, especially over the category of the prophet.

In the book of Ezekiel, prophecy is first associated with visionary experience. The prophet stands between the human community and God. In order to understand the relationship, both sides of this interrelationship must be considered.[23] These visions come on Ezekiel uninvited, and they are overwhelming experiences that he cannot refuse. These experiences do not include a clear vision of God, but they do entail clear spoken communication. In this respect, the communication happens in both directions: God talks to Ezekiel, but Ezekiel also talks to God. In the prophet's communication with the human community, the spoken message seems to be an essential component of the prophetic function. He or she is to deliver an accurate warning to the people. Ultimately their life or death depends first on him or her, and then secondarily on their own response to that message. But the book also makes clear that the prophet must communicate the visions clearly, as well as accurately perform the symbolic acts. In other words, the prophet does not just get a message that he can

---

(Holiness in Israel [OBT; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989]) and P. P. Jenson (Graded Holiness: A Key to the Priestly Conception of the World [JSOTSup 106; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992]) discuss priestly holiness as evidence of various phenomena associated with ritual, but not as a social force in and of itself. Even C. Bell (Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice [New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992] and Ritual: Perspectives and Dimensions [New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997]) pays only scant attention to the social function of the personnel responsible for ritual.

[23] In what follows, I do not claim to be original, but I am simply trying to explain my assumptions about the prophetic task in the book of Ezekiel.

express in whatever form he sees fit; rather, the form and the content of the prophetic message is relayed to him.

In the condemnation of prophets in chapter 13 and 22, prophets are condemned for delivering false oracles. Yet both 13: 23 and 22:28 note that these are the result of false visions that the prophets see.[24] These prophets clearly speak in the name of the Lord (13:13:7 and 22:28), but the text does not address the source of their false visions. Presumably they are condemned for their inability to discern between a true and false vision. The gravity of their sin is reinforced by the punishment announced in 13:9, namely their permanent removal from Israelite society.

Ezekiel, a prophet with a true vision, is not depicted in the tradition of the reluctant prophet like Moses and Jeremiah, but he is certainly not the professional prophet who automatically knows how to elicit God's presence, nor the kind of "life-long" prophet like Elijah. Although Blenkinsopp highlights use of early ecstatic prophecy in the portrayal of Ezekiel, this is still part of a larger movement in the book to appropriate a wide-range of traditions. Strictly within the prophetic tradition, not only does Ezekiel act like an ecstatic prophet, but he also plays on the call of Isaiah and the image of Israel as God's wife in Hosea.[25] Clearly the author of Ezekiel was a highly literate scribe, familiar with a wide-range of stories and traditions with which he plays in his portrait of Ezekiel. Ezekiel, then becomes the quintessential charismatic prophet: called for specific purposes, but whose prophecies are imbued with the prophetic tradition.

Yet again, the author plays ironically with this tradition. The book most often associates the address to Ezekiel as "son of man" with the command to prophecy. Repeatedly in the text, the phrase occurs in divine speech introduced by the prophetic formula, "The word of the Lord came to me." It was noted above that the "son of man" language serves to stress

---

[24] For a recent study of the condemnation of the female prophets, see N. R. Bowen, "The Daughters of Your People: Female Prophets in Ezekiel 13:17-23," JBL 118 (1999) 417-33. She concludes that the condemnation is part of the book's larger attempt to solidify power under one priestly group.

[25] For a full study of the book's use of earlier prophetic traditions, see K. W. Carley, Ezekiel among the Prophets (SBT 31; Naperville: SCM, 1974).

Ezekiel's humble status, especially in relationship to God. In the Deuteronomistic History, however, the prophet is often referred to as the "man of God." Noting that the construct state can also be used adjectivally, this title might infer the divine status of the prophet. This title appears most often in the earliest strata of Dtr, and, therefore, would reasonably have been a tradition known to the author of Ezekiel. The incessant replacement of this prophetic title in the book with "son of man" again highlights an ironic twist. All prophets other than Ezekiel are condemned to banishment from the Israelite community, while the only prophet left, Ezekiel, is not an 'is 'elohim, but only a ben 'adam. The text clearly asserts that Ezekiel, although he does prophesy, is neither a recognizable prophet or a man of God.

In the final form of the book, the author breaks the frame at the beginning of the book to inform the reader that the profession of this first person narrator is that of a priest. This was his publicly recognizable social role. This notice may, in fact, be secondary; it is intrusive in its present location, and it certainly is not a literary technique utilized in the bulk of the book. Even if this authorial voice in 1:3 is secondary, it does not contradict the portrayal of Ezekiel in the rest of the book; in fact, it merely makes obvious what the rest of the book implies about his social context.[26] One cannot simply remove the few references to priesthood in the text and have some sort of classical prophet. Clearly the designation of Ezekiel as a priest is fully in line with the concerns and ideology of the book. Ezekiel's title of priest seems to play itself out throughout the book in a variety of ways. The obvious affinity with H and P so often noted are one way that the priestly office is reinforced, but I would argue not the most significant way. These parallels seems to attach more to the author and the ideology of the book as a whole, than it does to Ezekiel; in fact, you could say in some ways God sounds more like P, rather than Ezekiel does.

---

[26] Blenkinsopp's proposal of an elite priestly, ultimately Zadokite redactor stems from similar observations. See J. Blenkinsopp, A History of Prophecy in Israel, rev. ed. (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1996) esp.167-70.

The characterization of Ezekiel as a priest is reinforced in other ways in the text. First, his protest about his own purity suggests his priestly status. Only a priest of some rank would have kept such strict purity observation. Second, the reaction of Ezekiel in the death of his wife makes most sense if he were a priest. It is further reinforced in the laws of priestly marriage in 44:22. Third, his own knowledge of ritual forms, temple architecture, and issues of defilement indicate he is pictured as someone specially trained in these areas. He is consulted by elders, but clearly not as a prophet. The wording of these consultations closely parallels the elders' consultation of Moses in Exod 18:15. Although it is unclear in this text whether Moses is portrayed as priestly or prophetic, he is advised in this matter by a priest, Jethro.[27] Lastly, the reference to the "thirtieth year" at the beginning of the book may in fact be a reference to the age of Ezekiel's ordination, with the last date corresponding to the age of priestly retirement.[28]

However, it also has to be noted that no where in the book does Ezekiel do anything one would consider particularly priestly. He does not sacrifice, maintain a ritual calendar, or make decisions of purity or cleanness for his community. He is not depicted as performing the rituals that could have been conducted in exile, such as circumcision, observation of the sabbath or passover. He does not condemn those remaining in Jerusalem for continuing the sacrificial system, nor does he contend that those in charge of the temple are illegitimate for this service. God does mention that some of Ezekiel's relatives remain in Jerusalem (11:14), so perhaps lineage was adequately maintained for this author's satisfaction, but still there is no evidence of rivalry in the book among priestly factions until the Zadokite layer.

---

[27] For a similar conclusion, see A. Cody, A History of Old Testament Priesthood (AnBib 35; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1969)144-48.

[28] This view was argued most thoroughly by J. E. Miller, "The Thirtieth Year of Ezekiel 1:1," RB 99 (1992) 499-503. For other ways in which the book reflects cultic institutions, see L. Monloubou, "Signification du culte selon Ezechiel," Ezekiel and His Book: Textual and Literary Criticism and their Interrelation ed. J. Lust (BETL 74; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1986) 7-20.

Certainly many of these negations occur because the book is written when no temple exists. Yet, in light of this, the book's insistence that the role and function of the priest not only continues to exist, but is a vital component for mediating a vision of restoration is significant. These voids point the reader away from those aspects of the priesthood having to do with public performance, and in its place, invite the reader to think more clearly about the function of priesthood in its relationship to both God and the people.[29] Ironically, then, in the book this change in social setting does not lead to the cessation of a social function, but to a clarification of its theological and anthropological role, a clarification that includes the elevation of this role over all other social groups.

God's Chosen Priest

What is this role and function of the "temple-less" priest as portrayed in Ezekiel? First it must be recognized that Ezekiel's priesthood is primarily associated with his genealogy in the book. He is a priest, not necessarily because he performs certain functions, but because he was the son of a priest. But is that really the extent of the message of Ezekiel's priesthood for the book?

Although there are relatively few cross-cultural studies on the nature and function of Israelite priesthood, at least in comparison with prophecy, many note a variety of functions associated with the priest.[30] Priestly

---

[29] Davis investigates the transformation of the prophetic role (Swallowing the Scroll, 133-40). I see this as a similar program in the book.

[30] More general studies of the nature of priesthood can be found in M. Weber, especially Ancient Judaism (New York: Free Press, reprint 1952); R. H. Pfeiffer, Religion in the Old Testament: The History of a Spiritual Triumph (New York: Harper, 1961) 77-82; A. Cody, "Priesthood in the Old Testament," Priesthood and Prophecy in Christianity and Other Religions (Studia Missionalia 22; Rome: Gregorian University Press, 1973) 309-29; L. Sabourin, Priesthood: A Compartive Study (Studies in the History of Religions 25; Leiden: Brill, 1973); and M. Beard and J. North, eds., Pagan Priests: Religion and Power in the Ancient World (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990). Surprisingly many cross-cultural studies on ritual, such as by Durkheim, Berger, and Bell do little to address the social role and function of the priest. If they contain any

functions are usually associated with maintenance of sacred space. As such the priest protects the sanctity of the place, and cares for that which represents that sanctity, such as the cult object. The priest oversees the rituals in and around that place, rituals that are usually in the form of sacrifice. The priest also mediates the divine resident's presence, often by reading oracles. All studies agree that the priest holds an elevated position, one that is often subordinated, however to political powers. This priestly office is part of a larger program of social maintenance associated with the temple; as a result, priesthood is often characterized as traditional, static, and opposed to innovation. Most scholars further agree that there is no clear line between priest and prophet. This ambiguity is even further complicated by the problem of terminology. Many cultures had no word that completely corresponds to our word "priest."

Some of the categories evident cross-culturally do in fact help us to sort out the biblical witness to ancient Israelite priesthood.[31] Israelite priests

---

discussion it is either of the ritual specialist, stressing public performance, or the shaman, a figure closer to prophetic roles in ancient Israel.

[31] Much of what follows is dependent on studies of Israelite priesthood, most of which are interested in tracing the history of the priesthood. See, for instance, A. Cody, A History of Old Testament Priesthood (AnBib 35; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1969); V. H. Matthews and D. C. Benjamin, Social World of Ancient Israel: 1200-587 BCE (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1993) 187-98; R. D. Nelson, Raising up a Faithful Priest: Community and Priesthood in Biblical Theology (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1993); J. Blenkinsopp, Sage, Priest, Prophet: Religious and Intellectual Leadership in Ancient Israel (Library of Ancient Israel; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1995) 66-114, and A History of Prophecy in Israel, rev. ed. (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1996); Rooke, D. W. "Kingship as Priesthood: The Relationship between the High Priesthood and the Monarchy," King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar, ed. J. Day (JSOTSup 270; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1998) 187-208; and P. M. McNutt, Reconstructing the Society of Ancient Israel (Library of Ancient Israel; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1999) 176-81. More attention has been paid lately to the priesthood in the second temple period. See, for instance, M. E. Stone, "Ideal Figures and Social Context: Priest and Sage in the Early Second Temple Period," Ancient Israelite Religion: Essays in Honor of Frank Moore Cross, ed. P. D. Miller, P. D. Hanson, S. D. McBride (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987) 575-86; S. L. Cook, Prophecy and Apocalypticism: The Postexilic Social Setting

certainly performed the functions outlined above. To this is added a stress on their role as teachers, presumably being held responsible for providing ritual instructions to the people. Israelite priesthood before the divided monarchy may have also conflated priestly duties and prophetic. Blenkinsopp maintains that early priests were less involved in sacrificial service, and more with oracular activity, while Nelson sees the priests' job as teacher of "torah" a late element of their function.

Although there are no legal texts that outline all of the activities of the priests, an examination of legal rituals, as well as prophetic condemnations provide a fuller view. First, priests are servants of God. I understand this language arising from temple ideology which views the temple as housing some aspect of the real presence of the divine being. The domestic metaphors that cluster around the temple suggest that viewing the temple as the "god's home" does in fact shed some light on their ancient theology. Anthropological studies relate these activities to the priest's duty to tend to the cult statue and the sanctuary. Within this system, the priests, then, would act as God's servants, providing for every divine need, from food to divine rest. Language of servanthood then is often applied to the priest.

Several different servant roles are maintained by the priests. For instance, priests control access to divine presence, much as servants control who can access a royal resident. Priests act as "bodyguards," willing to risk their lives in protection of the divine resident. Concurrently often the priest's role in sacrificial rituals is also related to his servant status. When sacrifice is understood as food for the deity, the priest is seen as the expert in food preparation: selection of edible materials of sufficient quality (determined by ritual categories), the preparation and proper handling of both raw and cooked food products, for animal sacrifices the slaughter, butchering and cooking of the meat with similar preparation for grain and wine offerings, and the distribution and disposal of prepared foods. Most

---

(Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995); J. Blenkinsopp, "The Judaean Priesthood during the Neo-Babylonian and Achaemenid Periods: A Hypothetical Reconstruction," CBQ 60 (1998) 25-43; and G. N. Knoppers, "Hierodules, Priests, or Janitors? The Levites in Chronicles and the History of the Israelite Priesthood," JBL 118 (1999) 49-72.

importantly, the priest alone handles the blood, the very life of the sacrificial victim rendered back to its creator. In Ezekiel, these roles are maintained in the laws to the priests in 40-48.

Priests also often participated in activities that modern scholars designate as prophetic. First, priests read oracles, most often associated in the Hebrew Bible with the Urim and the Thumim. Second, they probably were responsible for delivering the war oracle. Saul is condemned by Samuel for making the preliminary sacrifice himself, rather than waiting for Samuel (13:8-14). Jehoshaphat goes to the temple to seek God's answer when Jerusalem is attacked, and receives his answer from a Levite (2 Chronicles 20). Third, many people whom modern scholars designate as prophets are often seen doing priestly activities or performing in priestly places. To name just a few: Samuel resides at the temple and makes sacrifices, Elijah makes sacrifices, Isaiah has his inaugural vision in the temple, and Jeremiah is a priest. Fourth, from a few texts it seems visionary experience was often attributed to the priest. While it is true that visions are more often associated with prophets, Exodus 24:9-10 describes a vision of God to the elders mediated by Aaron and his sons, much like those of Isaiah and Ezekiel. The priests are first to "see" God's glory in the temple, and in Isaiah 28:7 both priests and prophets err in vision. The characterization of Ezekiel plays on parallels to prophets who act like priests, especially Elijah and Isaiah, while the visionary component of his prophetic experiences is stressed. Ezekiel embodies the ambiguity of priest and prophet.

While the activities outlined above stress the priests' jobs in relation to God, the priest also has certain duties in relationship to the community at large. Some less prominent functions of the priest include control over communal health and administrating the community's excess wealth through the temple's economic functions. The most common job of the priest mentioned in Israelite texts is that of instructor or educator. Although we have no narratives of priests teaching, nor any catalogue of the substance of what they are to preach, the condemnations of priests who do not instruct insinuates that this instructions related to ritual obligations which the community needed to maintain correct ritual service. This is not the same as the instruction of the sage, which seems to focus on moral and social

behavior. Ezekiel, again, combines two traditions: he is associated with wisdom forms in the book (12:21-25; 17:1-10; 18:1-24; 20:49; 24:3), and he is commanded to teach the laws promulgated in the final vision (43:11-12).

Too often, however, modern scholars focus either on the social maintenance function of the priest, or on functions dealing with negative aspects of God. Certainly the priests were also responsible for maintaining regular worship of the divinity. As such, the priest did help control dangerous contact with God, but I would maintain that this was not the only function. Even more prominently, he also helped the community in appropriate celebrations of God's gifts to the community. High holy days, festivals, thank offerings, etc, were not instituted primarily as a political social move to control and distribute excess wealth, but they were a communal theological expression of the community's reliance on God for every good thing in their lives. In addition, ritual lamentations, atonement rituals, and even the prominence of individual laments in the psalms also reveal a community who firmly believed that their god cared for them and would respond to their suffering and to their repentance. Manipulation of blood visually reinforced the sanctity of all life. The priests also provide sanctuary for the innocent, welfare for the homeless, and money to the indebted, not because of a particular business plan, but because they had the responsibility of mediating God's presence and care to every member of society. Although rituals were often coupled with a variety of avenues to address poverty and unfair distribution of wealth, the theological assumptions behind the rituals remained at the forefront. Ezekiel's interactions with God portray the theological motivations for many priestly acts. Without a temple, without a society to maintain, all that is left is the theology.

Priesthood is literally a pivotal role,[32] and it is in this centrality that questions of the intersection of priest and prophet arise. In some sense the priest mediates the divine presence to the community, but this mediation is

---

[32] I avoid the use of the term "liminal" because of its association with rites of passage. The priest's role was not a temporary one. Instead he is a "janus-figure" between God and the people.

of a different character than the mediation of the prophet. Prophetic mediation consists in the mediation of some type of divine communication. There is a message, or substantive issue, one that is tied to a particular historical situation. Priests, on the other hand, mediate a god's presence, and themselves seem to act as a buffer zone between God and the people. Priesthood's involvement with regulating purity issues are an integral part of this mediation. Mediation of divine presence is an ever-present communal need, rather than a situation-specific manifestation. It is the job of the priest to determine God's presence, and conduct rituals and safeguards associated with that presence. Jeremiah repeatedly condemns the priests for allowing the prophets to rule over them; for Jeremiah, because the priest deals with such important issues, the prophet should never control priestly activity.[33]

Ezekiel, although he does not do much to serve God, does many of the priestly activities related to the community. He bears the punishment of the people, a function of the priest as the one who atones for the sins of the people (4:4-8). He prays, albeit unsuccessfully, for the people (9:8). He is called to judge the people (22:1-2 and 23:36), and he is commanded to write down items for future instruction (24:2; 37:16 [bis]; 37:20; 43:11-12).[34] Ezekiel also raises several laments, a job in Mesopotamia often associated with priests (2:10; 19:1 and 14; 21:6-7; 27:1; 28:11; 32:2; and 32:18). The ritual nature of the lament is seen in contrast to the prohibition to him to mourn for the death of this wife (24:18-24), an individual rather than communal action.

As mediator of holiness and divine presence, the priest in some way must bridge the gap between divine and human realms. To what extent did Israelites think that this meant the priest somehow participated in God's holiness, and was a representative of God to the community? Or did they rather think that the priest somehow represented some type of "perfect" (or perfectable) human before God? The answer to these question is not clear, and there may not have been a consistent view of this in ancient Israel. On

---

[33] See Jer 2:8, 5:30-31, 27:16, and chapter 29.

[34] The priests are condemned in the book for not carrying out their duty of instruction (7:26).

the one hand, the stress on the ultimate purity of the priest, and the restrictions on the high priest's behavior, especially with respect to marriage and death, suggest that the priest is treated in ways that mirror (although certainly in a minimal way) God. On the other hand, there are no unambiguous statements that a priest has divine qualities. In many ways priests are often portrayed as simply the most holy among humans, primarily interacting with the community through instruction,[35] and the law.[36]

Halfway through the book of Ezekiel, this question of the priest's relationship to both God and the reading audience is explicitly addressed. In 24:24 and 27, God states that Ezekiel will be a "sign" for the people.[37] This verse belies the duality of Ezekiel's status. In 24:19-27 the author has God address the narrative audience to tell them: (1) Ezekiel is a sign (2) they must do what he does, and (3) then they will know that God is Yahweh. Clearly this call to the people to act like Ezekiel does not refer to his prophetic acts, which are all the result of God's initiatives. In the book as a whole the people are called to purity, or at least to abandon acts that defile. It is Ezekiel's priestly status or at least his fastidiousness in maintaining purity that they more reasonably are called to imitate. The sign, then, relates to Ezekiel's characterization as priest. Ezekiel then is the perfect human, whose purity, status and behavior the people are called to imitate. In addition, Ezekiel is a sign because God's presence and all of its implications are revealed to the community through the prophet. In this way, Ezekiel not only mediates, but also represents God's presence to the people.

---

[35] Jer 14:18; 18:18; Hos 4; Mic 3:11; Ezra 10:10.

[36] Isa 28:7; Jer 2:8; Hos 4; Zeph 3:4. Other functions of the priest in other Israelite texts are the priest as singer (Ezra 3:10), as serving God's presence (Jer 2:8 and Zeph 3:4), as one who prays (Ezra 6:10 and Jer 37) and as God's "messenger" (Mal 2:7 and 3:1).

[37] I disagree with Odell that the references to Ezekiel as a sign intend to substantiate his prophetic office to himself. Here especially the sign is addressed to the audience, and suggests the key to understanding the message of the book is to understand the role of the main human character. There are several "sign" passages in the book, some using the word 'ot (4:3; 14:8; 20:12; 20:20; and 39:15), and some using mopet (12:6; 12:11; 24:24; and 24:27).

Ezekiel as priest functions as a transparent figure: the audience inside the text, as well as the reader of the text sees God through him. He is the ultra-servant of God; even though he does not perform sacrifice or keep up rituals, he does everything God asks, mediates God's presence, and controls access to God. As a sign, he is a model of responsiveness to God; with only one exception, he always fulfills God's commands. As a priest, he is a conduit for true teaching. This priestly role is especially emphasized in the final vision. He is the one who will preserve the torah of this temple vision, and clarify the obligations incumbent upon the community, but in his dialogues with God, he remains utterly human, mortal, debased even.

Ultimately, Ezekiel's priesthood is depicted as wholly dependent on the nature of God. Ezekiel is both priest and prophet because that is what God has chosen. God has created the office of the priest to maintain the created order of the world, and preserve the realization that God is not like us. God is wholly other, something to be feared, mediated, obeyed, worshipped, served. Restoration is only possible with a pure priesthood to maintain, service to both God and the community. Only with the priesthood can God reside in the temple, can sacrifice and ritual be re-instated, can atonement be effectual and lamentations turn to praise.

Conclusion: Playful Ambiguity

When one looks at some of the more general definitions of the priest offered by cross cultural studies, Ezekiel clearly violates many of these. He is no mere conservator of ancient traditions. He is repeatedly depicted as one who innovates, and willingly transgresses older traditions. He is shown to be a clever "parable maker," as well as a lawgiver. He willingly rewrites history, and envisions a new Israel whose whole land is changed. He also does not appear to be one focused solely on getting ritual "right" in a sort of post-magical retention of ritual. Again, when it comes to ritual matters, he understands that violations around the cult do not simply insult a god who has arbitrarily assigned these rituals. The violations do not ruin some magical sequence. Rather, the rituals, along with everything else around the temple, are prescribed to protect the community from committing abominations, violations of approach and access that will ultimately lead

first to social upheaval, but ultimately to either the destruction of the community and the abandonment of that community by God. Correct rituals must be maintained, because they are simply expressions of a world order that exists.

The characterization of Ezekiel as priest achieves several ideological ends. First the status of Ezekiel asserts the importance of the priest over any other social group. Second, Ezekiel's moral rectitude maintains the possibility of a righteous remnant among the old Jerusalem priesthood, without which the restoration to their prior social status is impossible. More important than either of these, however, is the way in which the portrait asserts the priesthood over prophecy. Ezekiel is a better mediator of God's presence to Israel. Ezekiel represents a permanent social vehicle for this mediation, in contrast to the obliteration of prophecy. As mediator, Ezekiel has no false visions, and the message he delivers is always clear.

The book plays with irony in its exploration of the absurd condition of the exile. Ezekiel cannot speak, but he "out-communicates" the prophets. He cannot sacrifice, but he ends up in the place of the high priest. He is no "man of God," but as a lowly "son of man" he is a sign for the people. And even as an exile, he is a righteous sufferer. The greatest irony in the book is that Israel's hope for a future comes, not through the international politics of Zedekiah, but through this exiled "singer of love songs." This singer sees God, and it is only in the recognition of this God, to whom Israel has access through Ezekiel alone, that there is hope for the future.

EZEKIEL
ZADOKITE PRIEST AND VISIONARY PROPHET OF THE EXILE

Marvin A. Sweeney
Claremont School of Theology and
Claremont Graduate University

I

Biblical scholarship has long labored within the literary and theological paradigms formalized by Julius Wellhausen, who posited a fundamental dichotomy between the prophets and the priests.[1] Because of his views that prophecy constituted the most direct and pure expression of human experience of the divine and that the priestly interests in institutional authority, law, and ritual, constituted a self-serving disruption of that relationship, Wellhausen reversed the historical paradigm of the Hebrew Bible, which presents Mosaic Torah as the foundation of Israelite religion and the predecessor of the prophets. Wellhausen's views found expression in the Graf-Wellhausen model for the composition of the Pentateuch, which maintains that the J source, with its model of direct divine-human interaction, constitutes the earliest layer in the Pentateuchal narrative, whereas the P source presents a model of divine inaccessibility that is mediated only through the interrelated institutions of the Temple and the priesthood. The demise of the monarchy, founded with

---

[1] Julius Wellhausen, Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testament (3rd ed. Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1898; repr. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1963); idem, Prolegomena to the History of Israel (Edinburgh: A & C Black, 1885). For discussion of Wellhausen and his impact upon biblical scholarship, see John H. Hayes, An Introduction to Old Testament Study (Nashville: Abingdon, 1979) 159-180; Jon D. Levenson, "The Hebrew Bible, the Old Testament, and Historical Criticism," The Hebrew Bible, The Old Testament, and Historical Criticism (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1993) 1-32, esp. 10-15.

prophetic support, and the rise of a theocracy in the time of Nehemiah and Ezra point to the degeneration of Israelite religion in his understanding as law came to replace direct human experience of G-d. Of course, contemporary scholars have come to recognize that Wellhausen's work is informed by a polemical interest in undermining the Roman Catholic Church together with an antisemitic world view by which he apparently sought to point to a Protestant Christian model, with its inherent prophetic world-view and anti-institutional bias, as the earliest and therefore purest and most authentic form of religious expression in the Hebrew Bible. For this and other reasons, alternative models for reading the Pentateuch are now being explored.

Wellhausen's views have also had their impact on the reading of prophetic literature, with particular significance for the book of Ezekiel.[2] Whereas books such as Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, and Micah have received extensive scholarly treatment in part because they are perceived to represent the earliest works of prophetic literature and because they frequently critique temple priesthoods and their practices, Ezekiel has received less scholarly attention because of the relatively late setting of his work in the exilic period and because of his priestly descent and its influence on his world-view. The issue has been compounded by some rather strange or even bizarre facets of his claims and behavior, such as his visionary experiences and symbolic actions, his supernatural transport from Babylonia to Jerusalem, his prolonged periods of speechlessness, or his refusal to mourn for his deceased wife, which continue to provoke speculative claims that his personality is abnormal, that he employed mind-altering substances, or that he suffered from some form of

---

[2] For discussion of research on Ezekiel, see Bernhard Lang, Ezechiel (Erträge der Forschung 153; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1981); William H. Brownlee, Ezekiel 1-19 (Word Biblical Commentary 19; Waco: Word, 1986) xix-xxiii; Lawrence Boadt, "Ezekiel, Book of," ABD II:711-722; Henry McKeating, Ezekiel (Old Testament Guides; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993); Katheryn Pfisterer Darr, "Ezekiel Among the Critics," Currents in Research: Biblical Studies 2 (1994) 9-24; Marvin A. Sweeney, "The Latter Prophets (Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel)," The Hebrew Bible Today: An Introduction to Critical Issues (ed., S. L. McKenzie and M. P. Graham; Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1998) 69-94, esp. 88-94.

mental disturbance.[3] Indeed, many interpreters point to a sort of "split-personality" in the prophet, i.e., a fundamental conflict between his priestly identity and his prophetic role, to explain some of the unusual features of his book and its message.

As the Wellhausenian paradigm has begun to wane, more recent research has shown far greater interest in the literature, history, and social characteristics of the Exilic and early Second Temple periods, particularly in the institutions of the Jerusalem Temple and its priesthood. Furthermore, critical scholarship has shown greater appreciation for the role of temples, priests, and their rituals in earlier periods as well. A particularly striking facet of such interest is that many ancient Near Eastern texts, such as the Mari letters, and biblical models point to an interrelationship between ancient temples and oracular prophecy or divination, e.g., Mari prophets appear to have functioned especially within the temple of Ishtar of Arbela; prophets such as Moses, Jeremiah, and Zechariah were priests; and even Samuel is portrayed as an oracular prophet situated in the Shiloh Temple.[4] The Wellhausenian dichotomy between prophecy and priesthood can no longer be maintained: many prophets were indeed priests or were closely associated with temples even when their remarks were critical of temple practice.

This raises questions concerning the extent to which priestly identity influences prophetic identity--or vice versa--and even the extent to which prophetic identity might be an expression of priestly identity. The question of course has important implications for understanding Ezekiel, who is identified as both a Zadokite priest and as a visionary prophet during the period of the

---

[3] See most recently David J. Halperin, Seeking Ezekiel: Text and Psychology (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1993) esp. 7-38.

[4] See Frederick H. Cryer, Divination in Ancient Israel and its Near Eastern Environment: A Socio-Historical Investigation (JSOTSup 142; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994); Martti Nissenen, State Archives of Assyria Studies, Volume VII: References to Prophecy in Neo-Assyrian Sources (Helsinki: University of Helsinki, 1998); Simo Parpola, Assyrian Prophecies (State Archives of Assyria 9; Helsinki: University of Helsinki, 1997); Friedrich Ellermeier, Prophetie in Mari und Israel (Herzberg: Erwin Jungfer, 1968)

Babylonian exile. A recent study by Margaret Odell takes an important step in this line of inquiry, in so far as she argues that the portrayal of Ezekiel's commission as a prophet in Ezekiel 1-5 is modelled on the priestly ordination ceremonies presented in Leviticus 8-9, and therefore represents the transition of Ezekiel's identity as a priest to that of a prophet.[5] The purpose of this paper, therefore, is to examine Odell's contention and to build upon it. It argues that a great many features of the book of Ezekiel are dependent upon the world view and practices of the Zadokite priesthood. Indeed, a close examination of these features demonstrates that Ezekiel did not give up his priestly identity for a prophetic role; instead, his prophetic role is an extension of his priestly identity under the influence of the very radically changed circumstances of Ezekiel's life in the Babylonian exile. As a result, the book of Ezekiel presents a priestly vision or interpretation of the role of the Temple in relation to creation as a process by which the Temple itself has been sacrificed in order to bring about the purification or even reconstitution of creation at large.

II

Odell's recent study, "You Are What You Eat: Ezekiel and the Scroll," constitutes an important contribution to the interpretation of Ezekiel in that it points to the dynamics of his transformation from a Zadokite priest of the Jerusalem Temple to a visionary prophet of the Babylonian exile.[6] In contrast to earlier studies that employ genre analysis as a means to define separate narratives concerning Ezekiel's call in Ezek 1:1-3:15 and his symbolic actions in Ezek 3:16-5:17, Odell employs recent advances in form-critical method to argue that genres function within larger texts and that the accounts of Ezekiel's call and symbolic acts must therefore be read together as part of a larger narrative in Ezekiel 1-5 that depicts Ezekiel's transformation from priest to prophet. She points to analogies between Ezekiel 1-5 and the narratives concerning the ordination of priests for holy service in Leviticus 8-9, i.e.,

---

[5] Margaret S. Odell, "You are What You Eat: Ezekiel and the Scroll," JBL 117 (1998) 229-248.

[6] See note 5 above.

whereas priestly ordinands eat the ram of ordination (Lev 8:31), Ezekiel eats the scroll given to him by YHWH (Ezek 2:8-3:3); whereas priestly ordinands sit in seclusion for seven days (Lev 8:33), Ezekiel sits in silence among his people for seven days (Ezek 3:15); whereas priestly ordinands make atonement for the guilt of the people (Lev 9:1-21), Ezekiel bears the guilt of the people although he does not make sacrificial atonement (Ezek 4:4-8); whereas priestly ordinands are admitted to the sanctuary to see the glory of YHWH (Lev 9:23), Ezekiel sees the glory of YHWH as YHWH prepares to destroy Jerusalem and the Temple (Ezekiel 8-11). Furthermore, based upon her interpretation of Ezek 1:1, she argues that Ezekiel's visionary experience begins at the age of thirty, the age at which Levites begin active service in the sanctuary (Num 4:3, 23, 30; cf. Num 8:23-25), and that his visions continue for twenty years until he reaches the age of fifty, the age at which Levites retire from active service. Because Ezekiel lives outside the Temple in an impure land and because he engages in activities that mark him as impure, e.g., he eats impure food, cuts his hair, and is addressed as ben-'ādām, "son of Adam/human," rather than as priest, he does not function as priest. Instead, Odell maintains that he assumes a new role as a prophet as indicated by YHWH's commands to speak as a prophet in Ezekiel 2; 6-7.

One may question various details of Odell's argument without invalidating the overall soundness of her basic theses and insights, i.e., the initial narrative concerning the definition of Ezekiel's role should encompass Ezekiel 1-7 rather than only Ezekiel 1-5 in so far as the date formulae in Ezek 1:1, 2-3 and 8:1 mark the boundaries of the initial literary unit; Ezekiel's actions in eating impure food and cutting his hair mark him as impure but do not indicate that he has given up his priestly status and role; Ezekiel not only bears the guilt of his people like a priestly ordinand, he does indeed offer a sacrifice as atonement in so far as he portrays the destruction of the Jerusalem Temple as a sacrifice that is designed to purify Jerusalem, the nation Israel, and creation at large. Altogether, these observations point to the contention that Ezekiel does not give up his role as a Zadokite priest to become a prophet. Instead, he acts as a Zadokite priest throughout his career, albeit in the impure and changed conditions of life in Babylonian exile outside of the Jerusalem

Temple, and incorporates his prophetic role into his priestly identity. This results not only in a transformation of Ezekiel's role as both priest and prophet, but in a transformation of all creation in so far as the Jerusalem Temple, the holy center of creation, is destroyed and replaced with a new Temple that signals the beginning of a new creation in the aftermath of the Babylonian exile. The following discussion treats several topics, including the portrayal of Ezekiel's priestly role in Ezekiel 1-7, the portrayal of Jerusalem's destruction in Ezekiel 8-11; Ezekiel's symbolic acts, use of tradition, and self-appointed role as watchman throughout the body of the book; and his portrayal of the restored Temple in Ezekiel 40-48, in an effort to support this contention.

III

Ezekiel 1-7 constitutes the initial narrative of the book in which the prophet's identity and role are defined.[7] The narrative is demarcated at the outset by the initial date formulae in Ezekiel 1:1-3, which place the prophet's initial visions and experiences in fifth day of the fourth month (5 Tammuz?) of the fifth year of King Jehoiachin's exile, ca. 593 B.C.E. The initial date formula in Ezekiel 8:1 marks the beginning of a new sub-unit of the book. The appearance of the formula, "the word of YHWH was unto me," in Ezek 3:16; 6:1; and 7:1 indicates that Ezekiel 1-7 is further sub-divided into narratives concerning Ezekiel's vision of YHWH's throne chariot (Ezek 1:2-3:15; his commission as a watchman with its associated symbolic acts (Ezek 3:16-5:17); his commission to prophesy against the hills of Israel (Ezek 6:1-14); and his commission to speak about the end of the land of Israel (Ezek 7:1-27). Throughout these narratives, Ezekiel's identity as a priest undergirds and

---

[7] For discussion of the methodological principles that stand behind the present analysis of Ezekiel, see Marvin A. Sweeney, "Form Criticism," To Each Its Own Meaning: An Introduction to Biblical Criticisms and their Applications (eds., S. L. McKenzie and S. R. Haynes; revised and expanded edition; Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1999) 58-89; idem, "Formation and Form in Prophetic Literature," Old Testament Interpretation: Past, Present, and Future. Essays in Honor of Gene M. Tucker (eds., J. L. Mays, D. L. Petersen, and K. H. Richards; Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1995) 113-126.

defines his role as prophet.

This is evident at the outset of the book in Ezekiel 1:1, which states, "And it came to pass in the thirtieth year, in the fourth month, on the fifth day of the month, while I was in the midst of the exile by the River Chebar, the heavens were opened and I saw visions of G-d." This verse is not strictly speaking a superscription, but it functions as a narrative introduction to the book as a whole. Scholars have advanced various theories concerning the significance of the thirtieth year, i.e., that it refers to the anniversary of Josiah's reform, a jubilee year, the anniversary of Jehoiachin's birth, the reign of the Babylonian king Nabopolassar, or Ezekiel's age at the time of his initial vision.[8] That the reference appears to indicate the age of the prophet at the time of his initial vision appears to be confirmed by the overall chronology presented in the book of Ezekiel and its correspondence to the age of Levitical service. Beginning with the syntactically distinct reference to the fifth day of the fourth month in the fifth year of Jehoaiachin's exile in Ezek 1:2-3 which introduces the initial vision of the throne chariot, the book presents a series of chronological references in Ezek 8:1; 20:1; 24:1; 26:1; 29:1; 29:17; 30:20; 31:1; 32;1; 32:17; 33:21; and 40:1 that extends to the tenth day of the first month (10 Nissan) of the twenty-fifth year, i.e., 573 B.C.E.[9] The sequence is not strictly chronological as there are minor discrepancies. A major discrepancy appears in Ezek 29:17, which dates the oracle concerning Egypt in Ezek 29:17-21 to the first day of the first month (1 Nissan) of the twenty-seventh year, i.e., 571 B.C.E., although it should be noted that many scholars consider this to be a corrected date reference to account for the failure of

[8] For a brief summary of the proposals, see Walther Zimmerli, Ezekiel 1: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel, Chapters 1-24 (Hermeneia; trans. R. E. Clements; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979) 113-114.

[9] For an assessment of these references, see Ernst Kutsch, Die Chronologischen Daten des Ezechielbuches (OBO 62; Freiburg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1985).

Nebuchadnezzar's thirteen year siege of Tyre.[10] Apart from this reference, the chronology of the book of Ezekiel presents a twenty year period of visionary experience that would extend from his thirtieth to his fiftieth year. As noted above, this corresponds precisely to the period of active service for the Levites, who serve at the tent of meeting or the sanctuary for a twenty year period from the age of thirty to the age of fifty. Thus, it would appear that Ezekiel's active career as a visionary prophet coincides with the time and ages of the active career of a Levitical priest. It is noteworthy therefore that Ezekiel's birth would then coincide roughly with the inauguration of Josiah's religious reform in the eighteenth year of his reign, 622 B.C.E. (2 Kings 22:3; Chron 34:8) and that his final vision portrays the restored Temple in Jerusalem in Ezekiel 40-48. One might speculate that Ezekiel saw his life's work somehow as a fulfillment or continuation of the reform process that was initiated at his birth by King Josiah. As Odell, following J. E. Miller, notes, "the reference to the thirtieth year is part of a larger autobiographical structuring of the book in light of crucial moments in the life of a priest."[11]

Ezekiel's priestly identity and perspective is evident throughout the book in his use of the expression, kĕbôd-yhwh, "glory of YHWH," to describe the divine presence in the context of the throne visions and the restoration of YHWH's presence to the Temple (see Ezek 1:28; 3:23; 8:4; 10:3-4, 19; 11:22-23; 43:1-5). Indeed, the expression serves as a technical term to describe the presence of YHWH among the people at the time of the wilderness wandering (Exod 16;7, 10-12), in the tabernacle (Exod 40:34-38), and in the Temple in Jerusalem (1 Kings 8:10-11; 2 Chron 7:1-3; cf. 1 Sam 4:21-22). This is especially significant in that Ezekiel's vision of the throne chariot appears to be based upon the imagery of the ark of the covenant, which prior to the

---

[10] E.g., Moshe Greenberg, Ezekiel 21-37 (AB 22A; New York: Doubleday, 1997) 616-617; Zimmerli, Ezekiel 1 72; idem, Ezekiel 2: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel Chapters 25-48 (Hermeneia; trans. J. D. Martin; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983) 118-119; Ronald M. Hals, Ezekiel (FOTL 19; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989) 210-211.

[11] Odell, "You are what you Eat," 239; J. E. Miller, "The `Thirtieth Year' of Ezekiel 1:1," RB 99 (1992) 499-503.

Babylonian exile was accessible only to the priests in the Holy of Holies of the Jerusalem Temple. Ezekiel's initial reference to "a great cloud with brightness around it and fire flashing forth continuously" recalls the pillar of fire and cloud that accompanied the people of Israel as they journeyed from Egypt through the Sinai wilderness. Of course, it also symbolizes the altar of the Jerusalem Temple from which would rise a column of fire and smoke as sacrifices are consumed upon it as well as the interior of the Temple that is filled with clouds of incense smoke as the lights of the Temple mĕnōrôt or lampstands burn before the ark.

Other features also correspond to such Temple-based motifs. The imagery of "gleaming amber" within the cloud or the "polished bronze" of the four creatures recalls the portrayal of the ark and its cherubim as overlaid with gold (Exod 25:1-22; 37:1-9) as well as the later tradition that Pharaoh Shishak of Egypt stripped the Temple of gold following the death of Solomon so that it had to be replaced with bronze (1 Kings 14;25-28; cf. 2 Kings 18:14-16). The four living creatures that bear the ark in Ezekiel's vision correspond to the two cherubim that are placed upon the mercy seat of the ark in Exod 25:18-22 and the additional two built by Solomon within the Holy of Holies in 1 Kings 6:23-28; 2 Chron 3;10-14. The burning coals in the midst of the living creatures symbolize the coals of the sacrificial altar or those of the incense altars within the Temple, and the enigmatic "wheels within wheels" may represent the rings used to carry the ark in the wilderness period (Exod 25:12-15) or the wheels of the cart used to convey the ark from Kiryat Yearim to Jerusalem (2 Sam 6:3; 1 Chron 13:7). The shining crystal firmament above the heads of the four creatures corresponds to the mercy seat above the ark (Exod 25:17) or the clear pavement beneath the throne of G-d as portrayed in the narrative of the divine banquet in Exod 24:9-11, bearing in mind of course that the ark and its mercy seat symbolize the footstool of G-d above which G-d is enthroned (see Ps 132:7; Isa 66:1; 1 Sam 4:4). Finally, the imagery of the bow in the cloud recalls the rain bow that symbolizes YHWH's covenant with creation in the priestly account of the flood (Gen 9:8-17). Altogether, the imagery of Ezekiel's vision corresponds almost precisely to that of the Ark of the Covenant in the Holy of Holies, and represents what one might expect of

a priest educated for service in the Jerusalem Temple.

Although the imagery of Ezekiel's eating the scroll given to him by YHWH is frequently understood as a prophetic image, particularly since it corresponds to similar imagery in Jeremiah 15:16, it must be considered in relation to Ezekiel's priestly role as well. According to Deut 31:9-13, the priests and Levites are expected to read the Torah to the people of Israel every seven years. Such an obligation appears to lie behind the image of the flying scroll in Zechariah 5:1-4.[12] It should be noted that both Zechariah and Jeremiah are themselves priests of the Zadokite and Elide lines respectively as well as prophets. In so far as Ezekiel consumes the scroll given him by YHWH so that he might communicate its contents to the people, he fulfills this priestly obligation.

Similar considerations apply to the portrayal of Ezekiel's symbolic acts in Ezek 3:16-5:17. Although the narratives concerning Ezekiel's symbolic acts in Ezekiel 4-5 are frequently separated from the preceding material on generic grounds, the reports of Ezekiel's commissioning as a watchman in Ezek 3:16-21 and his dumbness in Ezek 3:22-27 must be read together with the following reports of symbolic actions, especially since they continue the reports of YHWH's speech that commence in Ezek 3:16-21 and 3:22-27. The narratives concerning Ezekiel's role as watchman and his dumbness introduce the reports of YHWH's instructions to engage in symbolic acts.

This observation is particularly significant since both the watchman role and dumbness are characteristic elements of priestly identity. One of the essential roles of the Levitical priesthood is to serve as the gatekeepers for the holy precincts of the Temple (1 Chron 9:17-27; 26:1-19), a role which appears to be represented by the High Priest Jehoiada's posting of guards supervised by Levites during the coup against Athaliah (2 Chronicles 23, esp. vv. 6, 18-19). The role of the Temple gatekeepers and guards is to protect the sanctity of the Temple so that it might not be profaned by the entry of those who are not properly prepared or qualified for holy activity at the site. Ezekiel's role as

---

[12] For discussion of this passage, see Marvin A. Sweeney, The Twelve Prophets (Berit Olam; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 2000) ad loc.

watchman for the people appears to be based on this model, especially since his purpose is to warn the people of YHWH's words so that they might avoid sins and the resulting consequences of their impurity (cf. Ezek 33:1-20). His dumbness also appears to be a priestly attribute in so far as priests remain entirely silent while offering holy sacrifice at the Temple altar. Because the Temple worship ritual is believed to represent that of the heavenly realm, so that the priests are in effect acting as the angels of YHWH's court, human speech cannot express the divine voices of the angels and therefore would compromise the sacred character of the sacrifice.[13] In both cases, Ezekiel appears to have drawn upon aspects of his priestly identity in order to convey his prophetic role.

The symbolic actions also appear to presuppose priestly identity, but they depict the profanation of Ezekiel's priestly status. Odell is correct to point to their transformative nature, but they do not entail that Ezekiel gives up his priestly identity. Priestly status is afterall a fact of birth, and one remains a priest whether or not one is pure. Ezekiel is simply a priest who, like the sanctuary in Jerusalem, has been profaned and will need to be purified. When he lies on his right side for three hundred and ninety days to symbolize the guilt of Israel, and when he lies on his left side for forty days to symbolize the guilt of Judah, he acts as a priest in that he symbolically bears the guilt of his people for whom he is expected to atone. The symbolic portrayal of the city under siege of course symbolizes the reality of divine punishment for the sins of the people that are now born by Ezekiel. Nevertheless, his capacity to act as a priest and to atone for the people's sins is impeded by the impure status of the Temple itself and by his own impurity while living outside of the Temple in an impure land. His eating of common food rather than the sacred portions of the Temple sacrifices and the cutting of his hair both symbolize his own loss of sanctity as priest during a period when the holy precinct of the Temple itself can no longer claim pure or holy status while it stands under conditions of siege as a punishment for the profanation within.

---

[13] See Israel Knohl, The Sanctuary of Silence: The Priestly Torah and the Holiness School (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994).

Odell correctly notes that Ezekiel does not atone for the people's guilt in these narratives; he cannot when even the Temple is compromised.[14] Such atonement requires the purification of the Temple itself. That does not commence until chapters 8-11, and it is Ezekiel the priest and prophet who shows the reader that process of purification. The prophetic oracles presented in Ezekiel 6 and 7 are a necessary part of that process, as indicated by their structural subordination to Ezekiel 1-7 as a whole and their contents. The oracles express verbally what Ezekiel is instructed to express through his symbolic actions, i.e., the land and people of Israel will be punished and brought to an end. Strictly speaking, the repeated references to the pestilence, sword, and famine, in Ezek 6:11-12 and 7:15 indicate that the oracles explain the symbolic actions in which pestilence, sword, and famine figure prominently (e.g., Ezek 5:12); Ezekiel thereby reflects the instructional role of the priesthood, which is to explain the teachings or Torah of YHWH to the people so that they might understand how they are to conduct themselves in conformity with divine expectations. In this case, however, the instruction speaks of the end of Israel's existence--at least as it was known up to that time--and the beginning of the process by which Israel, the Temple, and creation will be transformed as the Temple, Israel, and creation are destroyed and, ultimately, reestablished.

IV

The second major component of the book appears in Ezekiel 8-19. The structural boundaries of this sub-unit are indicated initially by the date formula in Ezek 8:1, "and it came to pass in the sixth year, in the sixth month, on the fifth day of the month (5 Ellul, 592 B.C.E.), while I was sitting in my house and the elders of Judah were sitting before me, that the hand of my lord YHWH fell upon me there," and by the date formula in Ezek 20:1 which marks the beginning of the next sub-unit of the book. Again, the appearance of the formula, "and the word of YHWH came to me saying. . ." in Ezek 11:14; 12:1; 12:17; 12:21; 13:1; 14:1-2; 15:1; 16:1; 17:1; 17:11; and 18:1 mark the various

[14] See her discussion in "You are what you Eat," 239-241.

sub-units of this section that follow from the initial portrayal of Ezekiel's vision concerning the departure of "the glory of YHWH" from the Temple in Jerusalem and its destruction. Each of these sub-units elaborates upon the significance of this departure/destruction, beginning in Ezek 11:14-24 with an oracle concerning YHWH's intention to restore Israel with a new heart and culminating in Ezek 18:1-19:14 with a Levitical discourse on individual moral responsibility followed by allegorical lamentation concerning the punishment of Israel/Judah and its kings.

The initial presentation of Ezekiel's vision concerning the destruction of Jerusalem is particularly important for understanding the priestly character of his prophetic visions and discourse. Fundamentally, it presents the Temple as profaned by the sins or idolatry of the people and therefore in need of sacrifice that will purge it of impurity and begin the process of its restoration and resanctification.

The initial scenes of this text depict Ezekiel's supernatural transportation to the Temple by the agency of an angelic creature like those that bore the throne chariot of YHWH in the inaugural vision of chapters 1-3. The purpose of the journey is so that Ezekiel might see the abominations that are being carried out within the Temple, the holy center of Israel and creation that is supposed to be maintained as a sacred and pure site.[15] The vision depicts various abominations, i.e., the idols of the house of Israel and their worship by the elders; the mourning rituals performed by women for the Babylonian god, Tammuz; and the worship of the sun by a group of twenty-five men. In so far as the Temple is to serve as the holy center of Israel and creation, the vision depicts the violence that permeates the land at large as a result of the disruption of sanctity in the holy center. From the perspective of a priest, such profanity requires purification in order to remove the impurity and to restore the sacred character of the site.

Various narratives concerning the purification of the Temple or the

---

[15] For discussion of the Temple as holy center of creation in ancient Judean thought, see Jon D. Levenson, "The Temple and the World," JR 64 (1984) 275-298; idem, Sinai and Zion: An Entry into the Jewish Bible (Minneapolis: Winston, 1985).

community at large appear throughout the Bible, e.g., the Temple purifications carried out by Hezekiah (2 Kings 18:1-8; 2 Chronicles 29-31), Josiah (2 Kings 23:1-25), Judah the Maccabee (1 Macc 4:36-51), the Levitical purge of the nation at the golden calf incident in the wilderness (Exodus 32), and the purge of Achan and family for theft from the herem or booty dedicated to YHWH in the time of Joshua (Joshua 7). Although the details vary among them, they point to a process in which the impurities are removed from the Temple and destroyed, those who are directly responsible for such abominations are liable for expulsion or execution, and sacrifices are made in order to bring about the resanctification of the Temple and the community. Ezekiel's vision of the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple functions in like manner in so far as it employs the imagery of sacrifice at the Temple altar and the purge of those who are considered to be impure.

The imagery of priestly sacrifice is clear from the outset in the narrative portrayal of the six armed men supervised by a man dressed in white linen with a writing case at his side, who will carry out the execution of the guilty and the destruction of the city beginning with the Temple. The white linen garments of course are the characteristic dress of a priest serving at the Temple altar (Exod 28:29) as well as of angels who are frequently portrayed as the heavenly counterparts of the priests (Dan 10:5). The man in white linen is to mark the foreheads of those who lament idolatry in the city, apparently so that they might be spared. The other six then follow to put the rest of Jerusalem's population to death. Although such details are lacking in the Bible, Mishnah Tamid 1:2; 3:1-9 describe a procedure in which a priestly officer supervises the other priests who engage in sacrifice; likewise, the practice of marking animals that are fit for sacrifice is known in the ancient world.[16] There is a difference, however, in that those who are marked in Ezekiel are innocent and therefore to be spared.[17] Once the slaughter is completed, the throne chariot appears and

---

[16] For discussion of the marking of unblemished animals that are fit for sacrifice in the ancient world, see "Blemish," Encyclopaedia Judaica 4:1081-1084.

[17] N.b., the interpretation of Ezek 9:4, "Go through the city, through Jerusalem, and put a mark on the foreheads of those who sigh and groan over all the abominations

YHWH instructs the man in white linen to take burning coals from under the cherubim and scatter them over the city. YHWH then commands the man in white linen to take fire from within the wheelwork of the throne as the throne chariot ascends and prepares to depart from the city. These images are those of a priest who takes coals and fire in order to ignite the sacrificial offerings at the Temple altar. The sacrificial imagery is further clarified by YHWH's statement in Ezek 11:7, "the slain whom you have placed within it are the meat, and this city is the pot," i.e., the destruction of the city is compared to a sacrifice in which the sacrificial meat is boiled in pots (cf. 1 Sam 2:12-17). This metaphor appears once again in Ezekiel 24:1-14 in which the destruction of Jerusalem is likened to a pot full of meat that is burned entirely until it is purified from rust and residue.

Ezekiel's use of sacrificial imagery to portray the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple indicates the pervasive influence of his priestly identity in his conceptualization of the city's demise. Sacrifice at the Temple is necessary to maintain or restore the holiness, purity, and stability of creation.[18] Insofar as even the Temple has become a place of profanation in Ezekiel's understanding, so the Temple and Jerusalem themselves must be symbolically sacrificed in order to bring about their purification and restoration. The remaining sub-units of Ezekiel 8-19 make this clear in so far as they portray various aspects of the punishment and restoration of Israel (Ezek 11:14-24); the exile of Judah (Ezek 12:1-16); the immediacy of judgment (Ezek 12:17-28); the condemnation of false prophets (Ezek 13:1-23);

---

that are committed in it," is disputed as it is not entirely certain whether or not all of the persons in Jerusalem were to be sacrificed in Ezekiel's view. For discussion, see Moshe Greenberg, Ezekiel 1-20 (AB 22; Garden City: Doubleday, 1983) 176-177; Zimmerli, Ezekiel 1 248.

[18] For overviews of sacrifice in ancient Israel and Judah, see Gary Anderson, Sacrifices and Offerings in Ancient Israel: Studies in their Social and Political Importance (HSM 41; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987); Jacob Milgrom, Studies in Cultic Theology and Terminology (Leiden: Brill, 1983). For the conceptualization of the Temple, see Levenson, "The Temple and the World"; idem, Sinai and Zion; C. L. Meyers, "Temple, Jerusalem," ABD VI:350-369, esp. 359-360.

YHWH's justification for the punishment and call for repentance (Ezek 14:1-23); the allegory of the useless vine that is consumed with fire (Ezek 15:1-8); the allegory of Israel as faithless bride who will be punished and then restored (Ezek 16:1-63); the allegory of the eagles and the vine (Ezek 17:1-10); the explanation of the allegory concerning the actions of Babylonia, Egypt, and the Judean kings and the projection of restoration of Israel once the process of punishment is complete (Ezek 17:11-24); and Ezekiel's discourse concerning the moral responsibilities of the individual and the lamentation concerning Israel's degradation (Ezek 18:1-19:14). Scholars have particularly noted Ezekiel's exposition of moral responsibility in relation to the priestly Holiness Code,[19] which illustrates the priestly role as teacher and expositor of divine Torah. But in fact, the entire sequence of oracles in this section illustrates the priestly vocation and responsibility to instruct the people as Ezekiel employs prophetic oracles, sermons, allegories, etc., to instruct his audience in the significance of YHWH's actions in bringing about the destruction of Jerusalem, i.e., the city is being sacrificed, but YHWH intends to restore Israel once the sacrifice is complete. The use of past traditions, such as the portrayal of Israel as YHWH's bride (cf. Hosea 1-3; Jeremiah 2), and illustrations from the natural world are noteworthy because they the roles of both tradition and creation in expressing Ezekiel's priestly instruction concerning the significance of contemporary events.

V

A series of further sub-units in the book of Ezekiel, each introduced by its own date formula, then follows in Ezekiel 20:1-23:49; 24:1-25:17; 26:1-28:36; 29:1-16; 29:17-30:19; 30:20-26; 31:1-18; 32:1-16; 32:17-33:20; 33:21-39:29. Each is further sub-divided by the appearance of the formula, "and the word of YHWH was unto me saying. . .," which then introduces the following material. These texts treat a variety of topics, including oracles concerned with the fate of Israel/Judah as well as with the nations. A sampling of topics further

---

[19] Knohl, Sanctuary of Silence; cf. Gordon H. Matties, Ezekiel 18 and the Rhetoric of Moral Discourse (SBLDS 126; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990).

demonstrates the role that Ezekiel's priestly identity plays in the formulation of his prophetic viewpoints.

The first is the sanctity of YHWH's divine name, which appears in Ezekiel's theological reflection on Israel's history in the wilderness in Ezekiel 20 and in his portrayal of the purification of Israel in Ezekiel 36:16-38. Both chapters place special emphasis on the sanctity of YHWH's divine name. In Ezekiel 20, YHWH repeatedly states that YHWH acted against Israel in the wilderness period so that the divine name would not be profaned among the nations. Likewise in Ezekiel 36:16-38 YHWH states that the restoration of Israel from exile is motivated by YHWH's concern with the sanctity of the holy name which Israel had profaned among the nations. Indeed, the sanctity of the divine name is the fundamental concern of the Zadokite priesthood. Deuteronomy, for example, designates the site of the Temple as the place where YHWH chooses to cause the divine name to dwell so that the divine name comes to express the sacred character of the Temple site. Furthermore, the divine name appears in the context of covenant stipulations both to identify YHWH as a party to the relationship with Israel and to designate its sacred character. Thus, the ten commandments begin with the divine self-identification formula, "I am YHWH, your G-d," as the foundation for the system of observance that follows (Exod 20:2; Deut 5:6). The formula also appears in YHWH's revelation to Moses in Exod 6:2, and efforts to assert and protect its sacred character appear in the burning bush narrative in Exodus 3, in which YHWH initially declines to reveal the divine name, and in the ten commandments which prohibit frivolous use of the name because of its sacred character (Exod 20:7; Deut 5:11; cf. Lev 19:12; 24:10-23). The formula plays a particularly important role in the Holiness Code of Leviticus 17-26 in which repeated statements, "I am YHWH, your G-d," or, "I am YHWH," presents YHWH's holy name as the basis for the action expected of the people in order to ensure their holiness as well as of the divine name. Indeed, the self identification formula plays an important role in Ezekiel where it appears throughout the book to authorize the prophet's oracles and to indicate their

sacred content.[20] Furthermore, both Ezekiel 20 and 36:16-38 present concern with the sanctity of the divine name together with other issues of particular importance to the priesthood. The presentation of Israel's attempted rebellion against YHWH in the wilderness period emphasizes the profanation of the Shabbat and the rejection of YHWH's holy statutes and ordinances. It also expresses the restoration of Israel by use of the metaphor passing under the staff, an expression that is used in Lev 27:32 in reference to the tithes that are designated as holy to YHWH. Ezekiel's discussion of Israel's restoration for the sake of the divine name in Ezek 116:16-38 emphasizes issues of purity in so far as it compares Israel to a menstruous woman and portrays her purification through water (see Lev 15:19-30; cf. Lev 15:1-18; 14:5-6, 50-52; Num 19:17). Images of priestly sanctity permeate both of these texts.

The second is his allegory concerning the death of his wife in Ezekiel 24:15-27. This passage has been a frequent source of attention and charges that Ezekiel is unbalanced or misogynistic because of his refusal to mourn for the death of his wife and his use of this motif to portray YHWH's refusal to mourn for the loss of Jerusalem.[21] Interpreters generally do not recognize, however, that Ezekiel's actions are consistent with his identity as a priest. Priests are forbidden to have any contact with the dead. Priestly tradition emphasizes that it is the role of the priest to stand between YHWH and the people and thus to stand at the boundary of life and death as human beings cannot survive YHWH's holiness (see Numbers 16, esp. vv. 41-50; 2 Samuel 6; Isaiah 6). Lev 21:1-12 stipulates that the priests may not mourn for the dead unless it is a close blood relation such as a mother, father, brother, or sister. The high priest may not even mourn for these relations. In no instance is a priest permitted to mourn for his wife as she is not a close blood relation. Furthermore, the concluding command in the narrative that Ezekiel may speak

[20] See Walther Zimmerli, "I am YHWH," I am YHWH (trans. D. W. Stott; Atlanta: John Knox, 1982) 1-28.

[21] E.g., Halperin, Seeking Ezekiel 176-183; Julie Galambush, Jerusalem in the Book of Ezekiel: The City as YHWH's Wife (SBLDS 130; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992) esp. 140-141, whose reading of this text is heavily influenced by Ezekiel 16 and 20.

only after the Temple is destroyed reflects the silence of the priests as they officiate at the Temple altar; once the Temple is destroyed, there is no further need for Ezekiel's silence. Ezekiel's actions throughout this narrative are entirely in keeping with his role as a priest.

The third is his portrayal of the valley of dry bones in Ezekiel 37 and the defeat of Gog and Magog in Ezekiel 38-39. Both employ priestly images of purification from contact with the dead to portray the restoration of Israel and creation at large. In the case of Ezekiel 37, Ezekiel sees a valley of dry bones, perhaps the remains of those killed in a battle, that are restored to life. Much of the discussion of this passage focuses upon its implications for understanding the motif of resurrection in the Hebrew Bible,[22] but its significance for issues of priestly purity must also be noted. Death is the fundamental cause of impurity in priestly thought; as noted above, priests stand between death and life, and they are to have very limited contact with the dead. Consequently, the restoration of life to the dead in Ezekiel 37 constitutes an important metaphor for the restoration and resanctification of Israel; it is no accident that following the image of Israel's restoration from the dead in Ezek 37:11-14, verses 15-28 then present a symbolic action in which he joins two sticks to symbolize the restoration and reunification of Israel and Judah. The concluding reference to a covenant of peace draws upon the priestly covenant granted to Phinehas ben Eleazar ben Aaron in Num 25:10-13 as well as the image of YHWH's holy sanctuary placed in the midst of the people Israel. The Gog of Magog oracles in Ezekiel 38-39 fill a similar role, except that they represent the purification of the world or creation at large rather than only Israel. Although much of the discussion of these chapters focuses on various attempts to identify Gog and Magog,[23] the significance of the passage lies in the purification of the land once Gog is defeated. Ezekiel 39 portrays a process in which the corpses left from the battle defile the land and must be properly buried in order to restore its purity. Fires burn for seven years as part of the process of purification, which recalls the seven year sabbatical and agricultural

---

[22] E.g., Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2 253-266.

[23] E.g., Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2 281-324.

cycle of the Temple Jubilee (see Lev 25:1-7; Exod 23:10-11; 21:1-6; Deut 15:1-18). At the end of this process, the land is cleansed and YHWH's name is profaned no more. Such purification enables the glory of YHWH to be displayed among the nations; it would appear then that the purification of Israel and the nations/world at large sets the stage for Ezekiel's vision of the restored Temple which follows in Ezekiel 40-48.

VI

The final section of the book appears in Ezekiel 40-48, which presents Ezekiel's vision of the new Temple to be established in Zion and the return of the glory of YHWH that will enable it to function as the holy center of Jerusalem, Israel, and the cosmos at large. Although many scholars have attempted to argue that these chapters are largely or entirely the work of writers other than Ezekiel, perhaps his own disciples,[24] Levenson rightly points to these chapters as "the crown and consummation of Ezekiel's life work," insofar as these chapters recapitulate the concerns and forms of Ezekiel's initial visions in Ezekiel 1-3; 8-11.[25]

There is little question as to their priestly character. Set in the tenth day of the beginning of the twenty-fifth year of the exile, 573 B.C.E., these chapters present a detailed first person account of Ezekiel's vision concerning the structure and dimensions of the Temple and the return of YHWH's glory (Ezek 40:1-43:12), the structure and dimensions of the Temple courtyards and the holy activities that take place therein (Ezek 43:13-47:12), and the reestablishment of the land and people of Israel at the center of a newly

---

[24] E.g., Hartmut Gese, Der Verfassungsentwurf des Ezechiel (Kap. 40-48). Traditionsgeschichtlich Untersucht (Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 25; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1957); see now Steven Shawn Tuell, The Law of the Temple in Ezekiel 40-48 (HSM 49; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992).

[25] Jon D. Levenson, Theology of the Program of Restoration of Ezekiel 40-48 (HSM 10; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1976) 10.

constituted land and creation that is watered and sustained by the new Temple. Many have noted that Ezekiel's Temple does not correspond to what is known of the structure and character of the Second Temple that was actually built in Jerusalem in the late-sixth century B.C.E.[26] Consequently, medieval exegetes such as Rashi and David Kimhi have indicated that Ezekiel's vision portrays the Third Temple that will be established in the days of the Messiah.[27] Overall, these chapters represent Ezekiel's own understanding of the character and role of the Temple once the punishment of the Babylonian exile is complete and the order of creation is established once again.

There is little need to rehearse the priestly character of the details that are presented here concerning the structure of the Temple complex and its rituals; they demonstrate clearly the priestly identity and expertise of their author. Instead, the role of the Temple as holy center of creation demands attention because this motif points to the comprehensive priestly theological viewpoint that is articulated throughout the book of Ezekiel, i.e., as holy center of creation, the Temple is to be equated with both Mount Zion and the Garden of Eden, and therefore represents the source on which the viability of creation is based. Levenson has already pointed to the pervasive influence of the Garden of Eden imagery in Ezekiel's oracles concerning the king of Tyre in Ezek 28:1-19, which compares Tyre's beauty and wealth to that Eden, and his oracle concerning Egypt in Ezekiel 31, which compares both Assyria and Egypt to the well-watered trees of the Garden of Eden.[28] One might note that various features of the construction of Solomon's Temple as presented in 1 Kings 6-7 also recall motifs from the traditions concerning Eden and creation at large, e.g., the cherubim, palm trees, and pomegranates that decorate the

---

[26] Tuell, The Law of the Temple 1-2, who cites the Rabbinic tradition in bShabbat 13b; bHagigah 13a; and bMenahot 45a that R. Hananiah ben Hezekiah burned three hundred barrels of oil in all-night attempts to reconcile Ezekiel's vision with the Torah of Moses.

[27] See both Rashi and Radak (i.e., Kimhi) on Ezek 40:2, where they cite Isaiah 2 as part of their arguments that Ezekiel is brought to the future Temple.

[28] Levenson, Theology 25-36.

interior of the Temple to represent the cherubim and fruitfulness of the garden; the representation of lions, oxen, etc., to symbolize the animals of the garden; the bronze pillars that represent the foundations of the earth; the bronze sea that represents the sea from which creation proceeds; the Temple lampstands apparently constructed with flowers to symbolize the trees of the garden as well as light; etc. Later texts of the Second Temple period likewise note that the priest in the Temple represents Adam in the Garden of Eden,[29] which may explain the appellation ben-'ādām, "son of Adam" or "mortal," that is consistently applied by YHWH to Ezekiel throughout the book. The fact that only the high priest may enter the Holy of Holies, where the Ark of the Covenant is guarded by cherubim much like the Garden of Eden, reinforces this image.

Indeed, the Eden-like role of the new Temple in relation to all creation appears in the portrayal of the Temple as the source of water that flows eastward to water the Aravah, or the Jordan rift that includes the Jordan River, the Dead Sea, and the dry divide that extends south to the Gulf of Aqaba and the Red Sea.[30] As depicted in Ezekiel 47, this water brings life to this dead region and effectively renews the creation of the world. The imagery appears to be based both on that of the Gihon spring that waters Jerusalem (see 1 Kings 1:32-40; Isa 7:3; 2 Chron 32:4) and the river that flows out of the Garden of Eden to water all of creation (see Gen 2:10-14; Ps 46:4). The role of the Temple as sacred center of creation is also signalled by the designation of the base of the Temple altar as hêq hā'āres, "bosom of the earth," in Ezek 43:14 and the designation of the altar hearth as har'ēl, "mountain of G-d," in Ezek 43:15, which indicate the role played by the altar and Temple sacrifice in

---

[29] See C. T. R. Hayward, The Jewish Temple: A Non-Biblical Sourcebook (London and New York: Routledge, 1996), who cites various Second Temple period texts (e.g., Aristeas, Philo, Jubilees, Josephus) that illustrate this point.

[30] See Katheryn Pfisterer Darr, "The Wall Around Paradise: Ezekielian Ideas About the Future," VT 37 (1987) 271-279, who notes that the depiction of restored creation in Ezekiel focusses on the land of Israel.

sustaining creation.[31] This portrayal of the significance of the Temple in relation to creation at large then provides the basis for placing the tribes of Israel at the center of creation in their assigned territories, with the priests and Levites (together with prince) at the center of Israel, and the Temple at the center of the whole. The theological significance of this centering is articulated in the assignment of gates for entry to the Temple for each of the tribes and in the concluding statement of the book, yhwh šāmmâ, "YHWH is there."

Altogether Ezekiel's vision clearly portrays the Temple as the sacred center of creation, Israel, and Jerusalem, and the source from which all three are sustained. In essence, this is a priestly perspective on the character of the world and the role of the Temple and its priesthood within it.

VII

In conclusion, this essays points the constitutive character of Ezekiel's identity as a Zadokite priest in the formulation of his prophetic perspective concerning the theological significance of YHWH's actions in bringing about the Babylonian exile. Insofar as Ezekiel portrays the destruction of the Temple and the city of Jerusalem as a sacrifice, he articulates a perspective that identifies YHWH's actions as a purge that is designed to cleanse the world from impurity in order that creation might be restored with a new Temple and the people Israel at its center. Although Ezekiel's vision was never implemented in detail, it remains an ideal description of the renewal of both the Temple and creation, that perhaps played a role in motivating efforts to rebuild the Temple in the early Persian period and that continues to play a role in defining expectations of the world to come in Jewish tradition from ancient through modern times.[32]

---

[31] Levenson, Sinai and Zion 139; idem, "The Temple and the World."

[32] Earlier versions of this paper were presented as the William H. Brownlee Memorial Lecture, Institute for Antiquity and Christianity, Claremont, CA, April 13, 2000, and at the Korean Bible Society with the support of the Methodist Theological Seminary, Seoul, Korea, May 18, 2000. I would like to thank the Brownlee family; Karen

Torjesen and Dennis MacDonald, Co-directors of the IAC; Tai-il Wang, Professor of Old Testament, MTS; Young-Jin Min, Professor of Old Testament and Deputy General Secretary, KBS; and the Reverand and Mrs. John Chang, Seoul, for their invitations and support.

God, Cosmos & Church Universal

THE THEOLOGY OF EPHESIANS

Prof. Pheme Perkins
Theology Department
Boston College
Chestnut Hill MA 02467 USA
perkinsp@bc.edu

Introductory Questions and the Theological Problem

Ephesians presents a new challenge for those who come at the letter from discussions of Pauline theology. The particular contexts which shape so much of Paul's theological expression[1] are missing.[2] Yet the Pauline model so dominates scholarly methodology that exegetes consistently feel the need to propose a religious situation to which the theological affirmations of the letter are addressed.[3] Ernest Best has provided a judicious evaluation of the

---

[1]For a survey of recent debate on the methods of Pauline theology see James D.G. Dunn (*The Theology of Paul the Apostle* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998] 1-26). Apart from direct engagement with Col, the issue of whether Rom deserves the priority that Dunn assigns it in his own work would be confirmed if Rom dominates the Pauline theology appropriated by Eph as suggested by Andrew T. Lincoln (Ephesians [WBC 42; Dallas: Word, 1990] lvi-lvii). Pheme Perkins (Ephesians [Nashville: Abingdon, 1997] 18-20) sees Eph as evidence for an early collection of Pauline letters.

[2]On the lack of concrete references to the audience or its setting see Lincoln (Ephesians, lxxiv-lxxxiii); Ernest Best (A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Ephesians. [Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1998] 1-6; even scholars out to defend Pauline authorship of the letter agree that the generality in description distinguishes Eph from other Pauline letters (see Peter T. O'Brien, The Letter to the Ephesians [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999] 49: "No particular problem appears to be addressed in the epistle, and it does not have the same sense of urgency or response to a crisis as do Paul's other letters."]).

[3]Such proposals range from Ephesians as response to a particular religious movement or threat such as Gnostcism, see Hans-Friedrich Weiß ("Gnostische Motive und antignostische Polemik im Kolosser– und im Epheserbrief," in Karl-Wolfgang Tröger ed., Gnosis und Neues Testament. Studien aus Religionswissenshcaft und Theologie

various options and concludes that there is no polemic of any sort in Ephesians. The best one can do for its theological context is recognize the need of converts from divergent religious backgrounds to be rooted in their new faith.[4] For scholars who accept the consensus view, as I do, that Eph was composed after the apostle's death by a Jewish Christian follower of Paul's on the basis of Col and a collection of Pauline letters, there remain two options for analyzing the theology of Eph. One may consider it a sui generis work of early Christian theology.[5] Or one may take the lead from redaction criticism, seeking to measure the theological alterations and/or development that Eph has made in its inherited Pauline traditions.[6]

[Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1973] 311-24); ancient preoccupation with magic and controlling the cosmic powers, so Clinton E. Arnold (Ephesians: Power and Magic. The Concept of Power in Ephesians in Light of its Historical Setting [SNTSMS 63; Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1989] 123-66) or mystery cults in Hierapolis, so Larry J. Kreitzer ("'Crude Language' and 'Shameful Things Done in Secret' [Ephesians 5.4, 12]" Allusions to the Cult of Demeter/Cybele in Hierapolis?" JSNT 71 [1998] 51-77; idem, "The Plutonium of Hierapolis and the Descent of Christ into the 'Lowermost Parts of the Earth' [Ephesians 4,9]," Biblica 79 [1998] 381-93) to more general religious crises occasioned by the death of the apostle, so Lincoln (Ephesians, lxxxv-lxxxvi); the persecutions under Domitian in Asia Minor, so Andreas Lindemann (Die Aufhebung der Zeit: Geschichtsverständnis und Eschatologie im Epheserbrief [Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1975] 14-16) or a religious crisis among Jews caused by the destruction of the Jerusalem temple in 70 C.E., so Martin Kitchen (Ephesians [London/New York: Routledge, 1994]). The proposals to find a religious background in Gnosticism or the mystery religions generally assume that elements which describe the situation can be translated over into Eph. Those who look for some crisis in Jewish religious life, must assume closer contacts between the letter's recipients and the Jewish communities of Asia Minor than seems to be the case (see Perkins, Ephesians, pp. 27-32).

[4]Best, Ephesians, 63-93. Best notes that this non-polemical tone is in striking contrast to other writings from Asia Minor in this period including Col, John and 1 John, Rev (p. 65).

[5]So Lindemann, Aufhebung, 11.

[6]For a defense of this option, grounded in detailed analysis of the evidence for Ephesians' familiarity with Col and the text of other Pauline letters, see Michael Gese (Das Vermächtnis des Apostels. Die Rezeption der paulinischen Theologie im Epheserbrief [WUNT 2 Reihe, 99; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1997]) 1-107. Gese then divides the theological analysis into the categories of salvation event (Eph 2.11-18; and the believer's participation in that event, Eph 2.1-10); community of salvation (use of the formula "in Christ", church as body of Christ in Eph 1.22-23 and 4.7-16, church as temple of God in Eph 2.19-22 with echoes in 3.17-19, church as bride of Christ in Eph 5.25-33);

The extent to which Eph can be seen to depart from the Pauline views on such topics as justification, the relationship between the church and Israel, the centrality of the cross, eschatology and Christology often depends upon one's solution to the authorship question. If one also attributes Col to a Paulinist rather than to Paul, the issue becomes more complex because of the particularly close relationship between the two epistles.[7] Rather than treat the line of dependence as a one-way street, Best has proposed that the authors of Col and Eph belonged to a group of Pauline disciples who shared a common set of theological traditions.[8] Significant theological shifts common to the two letters involve spatio-temporal orientation: (a) identification with the exalted Christ as the present resurrection of believers (Col 2.12; 3.1; Eph 2.6);[9] (b) Christ is the head of a body, the church (Col 2.19; Eph 4.16; 5.23), which in Eph is seen always as the church universal; (c.) salvation has a cosmic frame of reference (Col 1.15-20; 2,8; Eph 1.20-22; 3.10), which is highlighted by use of "fullness" terms (Col 2.9-10; Eph 1.23; 4.10, 13); (d) believers are to take their orientation from above where Christ is exalted rather than the future in which he returns in glory (Col 3.1-3; Eph 1.3; 2.6; 4.9-10).[10]

Gese has made a highly plausible argument for the view that Eph

---

plan of salvation (power of God, Eph 1.19ff; revelation of the mystery, Eph 3.1-13); Paul as the apostle of the mystery of salvation.

[7]See for example, Lincoln, Ephesians, xlvii-lvi; Gese, Vermächtnis, 42-54.

[8]Ephesians, 36-40. Best hesitates to use the term "school" since it suggests more formal organization than was probably the case. He distinguishes the group represented in Col/Eph from that associated with the Pastorals and 2 Thess and perhaps another reflected in Acts (p. 37).

[9]Noting that 1 Cor 4.8 and 2 Tim 2.18 reject the view of resurrection of believers put forward in Col/Eph and that the belief was not common in the late 1st century C.E., Best strengthens the case for a unique link between the two letters (p. 38). The school hypothesis is less necessary, if one retains the consensus view that Eph is dependent upon a written form of Col.

[10]See the lists of close similarities in Best (Ephesians, 38-39); Lincoln (Ephesians, xlix).

considers Col to be an expression of authoritative Pauline tradition.[11] On this hypothesis, a theology of Ephesians as redaction or reinterpretation of inherited tradition would give pride of place to elaborations of and divergence from this common framework. Major landmarks are well known. The cosmic Christ of Col in whom the fullness of divinity dwells (Col 1.19; 2.9) shifts to Christ's body, the church whose members are filled with the fullness of God (Eph 1.23; 3.19). Similar shifts from a cosmic Christology to ecclesiological categories occur in the language of reconciliation (Col 1.20, 22; Eph 2.16) and the content of the mystery of salvation (Col 1.27; Eph 3.6).[12] This ecclesiological turn is accompanied by the re–emergence of a familiar Pauline dichotomy, Jew and non-Jew, circumcised and uncircumcised (Eph 2.11-19). Rather than standing as the legal order which separates all humans from God (Col 2.14), the Law's commandments had barred non-Jews from inclusion in a single humanity with Jews (Eph 2.15).[13] But unlike the earlier Pauline letters, Abraham does not return as the figure through whom non-Jews are incorporated into God's promises (as in Gal 3.29). Eph does not defend the inclusion of Gentiles as the proper interpretation of Scripture. Instead Eph asserts that their inclusion has been preordained in a cosmic plan of redemption now revealed in Christ (Eph 1.3-14; 2.11-22; 3.1-13; also Col 1.27).[14] This lack of engagement with Paul's argument suggests that Eph does not introduce the language of Jew and non-Jew or references to the OT, and the phrases about God's grace toward the elect in order to bring Col into line with theological emphases in other Pauline letters.

From Rhetoric to Reason

---

[11]Gese, Vermächtnis, p. 53: "Der Kolosserbrief scheint die von ihm geachtete *Traditionsnorm* zu sein, an der er sich ausrichtet, die von ihn prägt, die er aber auch beurteilt, weiterführt und verändert."

[12]Gese, Vermächtnis, 50.

[13]Gese, Vermächtnis, 50f.

[14]Best, Ephesians, 47f.

The divergence between Eph and those Pauline letters with which the author appears to be familiar with poses its own methodological problem. How much of the development in Eph is rhetorical and how much is theological? The theological section of the letter is dominated by elaborate periodic sentences clearly intended to give the piece the sound of lofty speech.[15] This high rhetoric is picked up again in the peroration (6.10-20) where the apostle is depicted to the audience's imagination as a chained ambassador, who nonetheless boldly proclaims the gospel (vv 19-20).[16] Lincoln considers the combination of epideictic and deliberative rhetoric appropriate to reinforce Christian identity: "In this light, the discourse of Ephesians is an attempt to reinforce its implied readers' identities as those who have received a salvation which makes them members of the Church (the epideictic rhetoric of 1:3-3:21) and to underscore the necessity of their distinctive role and conduct in the Church and in the world (the deliberative rhetoric of 4:1-6:9)."[17] He introduces battle speeches as the point of comparison between Eph 6.10-17 and ancient rhetorical practice.[18] However, the combination of a summons to arms and prayer points to a more immediate background for the imagery employed, the OT and an apocalyptic account of the struggle against the end-time powers such as one finds in the War Scroll material from Qumran.[19]

---

[15]Perhaps even an example of the verbal wisdom which Paul, himself, finds offensive in those who would preach the gospel (1 Cor 1.17-25; 2.1). On the rhetorical elements in Eph see Lincoln (Ephesians, xxxvi-xlv); Gese, (Vermächtnis, 85-100). Discussions of style in Eph remain focused on the question of authorship rather than its significance for interpreting the letter's theology. Best argues that the author has composed what was intended to be a homily, but cast it as a letter to fit Paul's practice. Therefore, he warns against applying a rigid grid of the Pauline letter to sections of Eph and interpreting them accordingly (Ephesians, 62-63).

[16]On the genre of the conclusion, see Andrew T. Lincoln ("Stand, Therefore . . .": Ephesians 6:10-20 as *Peroratio*," Biblical Interpretation 3 [1995] 99-114).

[17]Lincoln, "Stand," 112.

[18]Lincoln, "Stand," 110f.

[19]So Best, Ephesians, 586; Perkins, Ephesians, 141-49. For a discussion of 1 QM and related traditions at Qumran see, John J. Collins (Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea

Granting that Eph 6.10-20 is a *peroratio*, a brief examination of its rhetorical complexity may serve to delineate the problematic of rhetoric and theology in the epistle. Eph does not draw on Col in this section of the letter but has found the Pauline hook in other epistles, notably the necessity to remain vigilant and armed as the age draws to a close in 1 Thess 5.8.[20] The combination of a general's summons to arms with the depiction of the ambassador in chains points toward Cynic and Stoic topoi concerning the impregnable soul of the wise, a motif which Malherbe has described in 2 Cor 10.3-6.[21] Eph has filled out the description of the divine panoply with allusions to divine armor from Isaiah (11.5 [LXX]; 52.7; 49.2; 59.17) and Wisdom (5.18, 20).[22] In the DSS, the "prince of the congregation" dons the divine armor for a struggle which will renew the covenant, establish the rule of God's people forever, and bring justice to the poor: "May [you strike the peoples] with the power of your mouth . . . . With the breath of your lips may you kill the wicked. . . .May your justice be the belt [of your loins, and loyalty] the belt of your hips. May he place upon you horns of iron and horseshoes of bronze," (1 Q28b 5.21-26). Evidently application of divine armor to human figures belongs to a fluid tradition in Jewish exegesis which had no fixed associations between particular weapons and virtues.

The cosmological orientation adapted from Col prompted identification of believers (Eph 1.1, 15; 3.8, 18) with the "holy ones", that is, the angelic hosts in heaven (Eph 1.18; 2.19). Association of believers, already seated in the heavenly realms (Eph 2.6) with angelic hosts has analogies in the DSS: "God has given them [wisdom, knowledge, righteousness, power, glory] to His chosen ones as an everlasting possession, and has caused them to inherit the lot of the Holy Ones," (1 QS 11.7f).[23] If Eph intended to assert that the

---

Scrolls [London: Routledge, 1997] 91-109).

[20]Gese, Vermächtnis, 62-63.

[21]Abraham J. Malherbe, "Antisthenes and Odysseus and Paul at War," Harvard Theological Review 76 (1983) 143-73.

[22]See the chart in Perkins, Ephesians, 142f.

[23]Best, Ephesians, 167f. The usage of "holy ones" for the elect/angelic hosts has

conflict between believers and *pneumatika tēs ponērias en tois epouraniois* (6.12) was the apocalyptic battle between the angelic armies of light and darkness, one would expect more than armor. Some allusion to angels of light or the angelic defender of the elect as in Dan 12.1 should be detected in the letter.[24] Its absence enhances the plausibility of the argument that the eschatology in Eph is consistently non-apocalyptic. The victory of the exalted Christ over the powers whose benefits are already extended to believers (Eph 1.20-23) has not been challenged by incorporation of battle images in the peroration.[25]

The catalogue of spiritual powers in v 12 bears all the marks of rhetorical inflation. The term *palē* denotes a wrestling match though it is often transferred to other contests.[26] "Principalities" and "powers" were included in the list of those over whom Christ rules (1.21; 3.10). The expression *cosmokratores* is unique to this passage of the New Testament, but may refer to either astrological powers or

---

been picked up from Col 1.12. See the discussion in James D.G. Dunn (The Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996] 75-77. Dunn, who maintains that Paul is the author of Col, concludes that Paul never intends to use "saints" (*hagioi*) for any but human beings. Therefore he reads Col to affirm only the qualification of believers to share inheritance with the angels. This conclusion seems required by the Judaizing tradition of heavenly ascent that is opposed in Col: "And if the passage already has in view the claim to share in worship of angels indicated in 2:18, the inference would be that despite the disparagement of (some of) their fellow citizens in Colossae (2:18), the readers were *already* qualified to share with the angels their common inheritance," (p. 76).

[24]The DSS evidence has made it clear that mixing human and angelic forces in the struggle was a common element of such speculation (see Collins, Apocalypticism, 99-105). 1 QM 17.6-7 is dependent on Daniel for its identification of the angelic helper of Israel, the Prince of Light as Michael (pp. 104f).

[25]Lincoln (Ephesians, xc) observes that what remains of future eschatology in Eph is associated with paraenesis. Possession of an assured salvation does not leave believers without responsibilities in this world. "It is because this victory has been won that believers are involved in the battle at all," (idem, p. 443).

[26]Lincoln, Ephesians, 444. If the author is piling up metaphors for rhetorical effect, one need not seek to render different metaphors coherent as Lincoln does.

the gods of mystery cults, often associate with such forces.[27] The third phrase, *pneumatika tēs ponērias en tois epouraniois,* has no specific referent but serves as a generalizing conclusion.[28] This rhetorical expansion suggests that Eph does not have a particular teaching about evil angels, astrology or magic powers in view. Such a lack of theological precision makes it possible to apply this passage to a variety of mythological powers as in later Gnostic texts.[29]

Since the image of the fully armed soldier has been rhetorically juxtaposed with that of a chained ambassador, the audience is likely to associate the two. In so doing, the rhetorical development generates a jarring logical dilemma. Ambassadors in chains would appear to represent a defeated people, not a victorious one. Lincoln fails to note the ambiguity built in to the dynamic of this section, focusing instead upon the apostle as an example of bravery presented for the reader's admiration and emulation.[30]

The clash of images suggests a link back to another theme where one sees Eph expanding on the Col tradition: making peace as reconciliation of all

---

[27]Arnold, Ephesians, 65-67.

[28]Lincoln, Ephesians, 444.

[29]Eph 6.12 and Col 1.13 are cited in the introduction to *Hypostasis of the Archons* (CG II 86,20-27): "On account of the reality (*hypostasis)* of the authorities (*ekousiai*), (inspired) by the spirit of the father of truth, the great apostle – referring to the "authorities of darkness" (Col 1.13) – told us that "our contest is not against flesh and [blood]; rather, the authorities of the universe and the spirits of wickedness" (Eph 6.12). I have sent you this because you (sg.) inquire about the reality [of the] authorities," (B. Layton trans.; James M. Robinson ed., The Nag Hammadi Library in English [San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1988] 162). The text which follows recounts the origins of antagonism between the gnostic race of Seth and the archons who rule the lower world. The great angel from the light world, Eleleth, reveals to persecuted Norea that the powers have no ability to touch her: "Eleleth, the great angel, spoke to me. "It is I," he said, "who am understanding. I am one of the four light-givers, who stand in the presence of the great invisible spirit. Do you think these rulers have any power over you (sg.)? None of them can prevail against the root of truth; for on its account he appeared in the final ages; and these authorities will be restrained. And these authorities cannot defile you and that generation for your (pl) abode is in incorruptibility, where the virgin spirit dwells, who is superior to the authorities of chaos and to their universe," (93,18-32; NHLE, p. 167).

[30]Lincoln, "Stand," 109.

things in Christ (Eph 2.11-22). Several scholars have suggested that the political realities of Roman rule in Asia Minor are thinly disguised in the reconciliation of non-Jews to the *politeia* of Israel.[31] Christ is the agent of peace, not the Roman emperor. Whereas imperial peace was purchased by enlisting local aristocracies in support of the Roman order[32], Christ abolishes all forms of enmity between peoples. The minority groups, Jews and Christians, are to consider themselves representatives of all humanity. In making this socio-political translation of the cosmic reconciliation of Col 1.20, Eph lays the foundation for a new social mythology.[33]

From this point of view, the opposition of hostile heavenly powers might refer to Rome either as the human agent of demonic opposition to God as in the apocalyptic visions of the DSS or as the alleged favorite of the gods whose founding and destiny are inscribed in the stars. Does this constellation of imagery indicate that Eph advocates a political philosophy of resistance, non-cooperation or withdrawal from the imperial order? No direct echoes of the imperial cult by which Rome propagated its ideology in the cities have been discerned in Eph.[34] Attempts to link the particular emphasis on the *politeia* of Israel with either the experience of Jews in Asia Minor after 70 C.E. or the political philosophy of hellenistic Jewish authors, have been

---

[31]Eberhard Faust. Pax Christi et Pax Caaesaris. Religionsgeschichtliche, traditionsgeschichtliche und sozialgeschichtliche Studien zum Epheserbrief. (Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus, 24; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993); Gerd Theissen, "*Pax Romana* et *Pax Christi*. Le Christianisme Primitif et l'Idée de Paix," Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie 124 (1992) 74-77.

[32]Aelius Aristides who lived most of his life in Asia Minor, delivered a speech in praise of Rome at Rome in 155 C.E. alleging that Rome was the center of a constellation of free, mutually beneficial cities (Ad Rom 94) quite contrary to the realities of Roman power. Local aristocrats profited from Roman rule as local magistrates, (see Martin Goodman, The Roman World 44 B.C. – A.D. 180 [New York: Routledge, 1997] 135-38). "The empire was in effect ruled by a wealth-defined élite paid by grants of privilege rather than salary, unified in their determination to keep power out of the hands of the poor," (idem, p. 139).

[33]Theissen, "*Pax*," 76.

[34]On the use of imperial cult see Goodman, (World, 129-34).

disappointing as well.[35] At best such events as Roman denial of citizen rights sought by Alexandrian Jews under Claudius or suppression of the Jewish revolt in Judea might explain a Jewish Christian blaming the hostility between Jews and their neighbors on the law of commandments and ordinances (2.15). It does not explain the appeal to non-Jews of being incorporated into this new *politeia*. However, the rhetorical cast of the epistle does not require that the author address contemporary civic issues. As a celebration of benefits received, the author adapted his understanding of the deepest socio-cultural divide between humans to praise the universal peace established in Christ.[36]

God and Cosmos

The introduction of reconciliation between Gentile and Jew in Eph has been described as providing an historical grounding for the cosmic imagery of reconciliation inherited from Col. Some scholars detect a hymn in vv 14-16 which originally spoke of Christ as the source of cosmic reconciliation that was subsequently redacted by addition of the references to the Law and to the cross.[37] For Hans-Martin Schenke, the clue to the hymn lies in gnostic

---

[35]Faust devotes much of Pax Christi and Pax Caesaris to conflict between Jews and local populations in the cities arguing for a more determined effort on Rome's part to suppress the ambitions of the formerly autonomous Jewish politeia within the cities and Philo's political philosophy (pp. 226-380). Claudius' decree concerning Alexandrian Jews is the parade example for such arguments. Peter Schäfer considers the social unrest around this episode to be the primary cause of increased social hostility to Jews (Judeophobia. Attitudes toward the Jews in the Ancient World [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997] 136-60).

[36]At the same time, exegetes must be conscious of the lack of specific context for Eph. As Best comments the position of Gentiles before and after they became members of the Church is the author's main concern in Eph 2.11-22 (Ephesians, 235).

[37]Lincoln, Ephesians, 128. Gerhard Wilhelmi, "Der Versöhner–Hymnus in Eph 2,14ff," ZNW 78 (1987) 145-52; Hans-Martin Schenke, "Die neutestamentliche Christologie und der gnostische Erlöser," in Karl-Wolfgang Tröger, Gnosis und Neues Testament (Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1973) 223. Scholars carry the reconstruction into verse 18. However v 17 introduces an allusion to Isa 57.19 (LXX) with the idea of preaching peace from Isa 52.7 (LXX) as part of the application of the metaphor to the example of Jew and Gentile (see Lincoln, Ephesians, 146-49). Such an interruption suggests that the author is engaging in development of an image rather than quoting a

mythology. The light-world or Pleroma is divided from the lower world of the Demiurge by a "veil" or the sphere of the fixed stars, the "wall" of the cosmic hymn. The decrees of the gnostic Demiurge were interpreted as devised to prevent humanity from recognizing its superiority to that deity.[38] However, the more immediate context for this section of Eph appears to be the cosmological speculation in Col. Lincoln proposes a dual reading of vv 14-16, the original cosmological reference and the reapplication to the Jew–Gentile context.[39] This development poses a methodological problem for interpreting the theology of Eph. Does the author consider the "Jew/Gentile" application an rhetorical elaboration on the theme of cosmic reconciliation? In which case, Eph presumably concurs with the cosmic theology of his Col source. Or does Eph assume that the cosmic imagery is a rhetorical way of asserting a truth about salvation which is essentially socio–historical? In which case, Eph is not engaged in developing a cosmological soteriology as later gnostic interpreters thought.

Can we resolve this question without hypothesizing a specific cultural or religious context to which Eph speaks? Not with a high degree of precision. Items of the basic apocalyptic scenario are found in Eph that one may be inclined to assume that it determines the meaning of statements about the world found in the letter. Edward Adams has made a strong case for the need to link context and interpretation when studying the use of *kosmos* and *ktisis* in the undisputed Pauline epistles.[40] Paul uses *kosmos* in 1 Cor largely

---

traditional piece. Against the existence of an earlier hymn in this long sentence which follows the rhetorical style of the opening eulogy see Rudolf Schnackenburg (The Epistle to the Ephesians. Translated by H. Heron. [Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1991] 106f).

[38]Schenke, "Christologie," 221f.

[39]Lincoln, Ephesians, 139.

[40]Edward Adams, Constructing the World. A Study in Paul's Cosmological Language (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 2000) 3-10. He notes that the bulk of the examples of these terms occur in 1 Cor and Rom, letters in which the social and ethical issues discussed are posed by the issue of how Christians are to relate to outsiders (p. 37). That observation certainly carries over to Col, since the religious activities opposed in Col appear to result from the adaption to religious views that originated outside the Christian movement, possibly within a Jewish synagogue at Colossae (so Dunn, Colossians, pp 179-

as a designation for powers ('rulers of this age' 2.6-7), a wisdom or moral stance that is contrary to the life which God's call and the mystery of salvation has opened to the elect (1.18-24). This heavily apocalyptic vision of elect and wicked, the present evil age and the age to come etc. provides a striking shock to the ordinary greco-roman views of the world as well-ordered, ruled by governing divine providence.[41] The cosmos is personified as the subject which stands condemned in God's final judgment (Rom 3.6; 1 Cor 6.2; 11.32).[42] Scholars frequently refer to the life of faith lived between the ages. The death of Christ has taken away the believers' alienation from God but not yet delivered them from the tensions of living in a world which still operates according to the values and dictates of powers which promote sin and death.[43] With the possible exception of Eph 6.10-20, this dialectic of redemption that is already effective but not yet completely realized does not appear in Eph. Christians live out of the new reality.

Adams has departed from the consensus view which reads the meaning of cosmos and creation (*ktisis*) in Romans as equivalent to the apocalyptic understanding employed in 1 Cor. He would argue that the tension between the new life of the Christian and the world in which Christians live has been lessened in Rom as well. Although it is true that the world as Christians experience it displays the ambiguity cause by sin and death, creation is not inherently opposed to God. It was an instrument of positive revelation concerning God (Rom 1.18-23) and its groaning until the time of redemption (Rom 8.19-21) enables believers to see their own lives as part of a larger cosmic struggle.[44] Though elements of an apocalyptic view of salvation remain, Romans is less dualistic than 1 Cor. The language of two ages has

85). Whether or not it can be transferred to Eph depends upon how one envisages the relationship between the two letters.

[41]Adams, World, 101-16.

[42]Adams, World, 15.

[43]See Dunn, Theology, 461-98.

[44]Adams, World, 160-83. Adams opposes Bultmann's reduction of Paul's use of world and creation to metaphors about the human condition.

been dropped. Paul never uses the words "*kosmos*" or "*ktisis*" with a negative or pejorative meaning. Instead God's saving activity is presented as the creator reclaiming his creation. Similarly the ethical advice tendered in Rom 12-13 presumes that believers are to live in harmony with the surrounding society.[45]

The tradition of gnostic interpretation of Eph which highlights the conflict between the believer and the powers certainly suggests that one should locate its depiction of God and the world on the more dualistic, apocalyptic end of the spectrum which Adams detected in 1 Cor. However, the ethical section of the epistle with its incorporation and expansion of the *Haustafel* (Eph 5.22-6.9) falls more squarely in the accommodation mode associated with Romans.[46] As we have noted, Eph lacks other items in the apocalyptic scenario. The resurrection of believers refers to their present status as members of the body of Christ, not the future glorious resolution of all the ambiguities of this life.[47] The certainty of divine judgment only appears in its conventional use to bolster moral effort (Eph 5.5-8).[48] Even in Eph 6.10-20 the extent to which Eph retains an full blown apocalyptic scenario of judgment is undetermined. Some scholars propose to eliminate it altogether. Best concludes that a traditional apocalyptic topos remains but is of little interest to the author. He comments: "Probably the best solution is to see believers as already within the period leading up to the End, even though AE [= author of Ephesians] never suggests that it is close."[49]

The hymn in Col 1.15-20 begins with an affirmation that all things were created in Christ. Widely recognized parallels between this imagery and wisdom traditions indicate that the act of reconciliation of all things in God

---

[45]Adams, World, 188-95.

[46]For a survey of the ethical teaching of Ephesians see Best (Ephesians, 642-59).

[47]Best, Ephesians, pp. 53f.

[48]Even here the scenario of divine judgment is largely suppressed. This passage can hardly be described as a threat to believers (pace Best, Ephesians, 124). It encourages their effort by highlighting the distinction between the elect and outsiders.

[49]Best, Ephesians, 597.

(vv 18-20) is grounded in the cosmological identification of Christ with wisdom.[50] Eph shows little interest in the cosmological section of the hymn. Its echoes of Col 1.15-20 are drawn from the description of redemption (see Eph 1.20-23).[51] The formula in Eph 4.6 draws upon a standard philosophical description of the creative activity of God.[52] For the author's non–Jewish audience, conversion required coming to know God as creator of all things (2.12, 18). Thus Eph certainly affirms that the power of the creator is active throughout the universe.[53] The focus on redemption presumes the affirmation concerning God's creative power without question. Similarly, Eph uses the word *kosmos* in various senses inherited from earlier tradition. God's elect were predestined before creation, "the foundation of the world," (1.4).[54] "World" has a neutral sense of life apart from God in referring to the audience's situation before their conversion (2.12). It can also take on the negative connotations of such a life since it is marked by sin (2.2, "according to the aion of this world"). The expression *ta panta* ("all things", "the universe") occurs in confessional statements about God as creator (3.9; 4.6). But Eph highlights the way in which redemption has lead divine fullness to pervade all things (1.10-11, 19-20, 22f).[55]

By not detailing the relationship between God and creation independently of the events of salvation, Eph leaves the door open for later mythical elaboration such as one finds in gnostic texts. The author does not

---

[50]Dunn, Colossians, 83-96. "The assertion of 1.18a does not evacuate the cosmic claims of 1.15-17 of their christological significance: to assert that Christ is head of the church does not narrow his cosmic mediatorial role; rather it expands the significance of claims made for the church," p. 96.

[51]Lincoln, Ephesians, xliii-lii; Schnackenburg, Ephesians, 30-31. Lincoln argues that Eph assumes the cosmic christology of Col. Its concern is the identity of believers as part of the church, the new humanity in Christ (p. lv).

[52]Pseudo–Aristotle, On the Origin of the World vi.397b; Philo, Cherubim 125-26.

[53]Perkins, Ephesians, 96.

[54]Perhaps reflects the pre-existent Christ of Col 1.15-16 as Lincoln (Ephesians, 24) suggests.

[55]Eph does not pick up the noun *ktisis* from Col 1.15 and 1.23.

explain how God's creation came to need reconciliation. His treatment of sin is less comprehensive than Paul's version in Rom 1-8. The story of sin and reconciliation is focused on the gentiles who did not know God prior to the coming of Christ (2.1-22). By adopting without modification a Jewish view of gentile sin and ignorance over against the enlightenment of the Jewish Christian author, designated "we", Eph makes it appear that no Israel remains except that incorporated in the Christian movement. Best has pointed out the significance of pre–creation election in this regard. Commenting on Eph 1.4, he writes:

> Nothing that has happened since creation led God to elect his people; his election was not a response to human sin (first mentioned in v 7) or the failure of Israel, but was intended from the time he intended the universe. God is not a chess player who makes his next move only after he has seen the last move of his opponent. He works to a plan (cf 1 QH 13.10; CD 2.7; Philo, *Opif Mundi* 16ff) and that plan has always included the church. The church is not then simply a sociological phenomenon appearing under appropriate conditions.[56]

This high doctrine of the church comes at a price, the suppression of Paul's own wrestling with the theological problem of God's fidelity to the covenant with Israel.[57] Once again Eph appears partially tone deaf to the theological dialectic in Paul's thought.

The Church Universal

Scholars recognize that the unity of the universal church is the heart of

---

[56]Best, Ephesians, 120.

[57]For a discussion which is sensitive to the ecumenical and theological problems of this development see Andrew T. Lincoln, "The Church and Israel in Ephesians 2," CBQ 49 (1987) 605-24. He also notes the difficulty which this presentation creates for the modern preference for Rom 9-11 as the canonical statement about the church and Israel: "Given the non-Pauline authorship of Ephesians, it might still be argued that Romans represents the more mature historical Paul, but it would be exceedingly difficult to claim that Romans should be treated as normative for the canonical Paul, when it is flanked on either side by Galatians and Ephesians, in both of which Israel's role is replaced by the church," (p. 621).

theological language in Eph.[58] The sense of *ekklesia* as the local gathering of believers in a particular city or house church characteristic of Paul's letters addressed to particular persons and issues never appears in Eph. All nine reference concern church as a universal phenomenon.[59] This universalizing tendency occurs in Col 1.18a and 24, where the "body of Christ" has shifted from a metaphor used to establish ordered relationships in a divided local community (as in 1 Cor 12.12-31) to a cosmic body. Dunn sees the phrase "of the church" as an addition to a hymnic tradition in which Christ was praised as "head", that is, either ruler or originating principle of the universe.[60] Col 1.18b provides a rationale for the insertion, the resurrection of Christ is the principle of new life for all believers. It is this treatment of reconciliation that is incorporated into the theology of Eph. The shift between the two letters is evident. Eph takes the term *pleroma* from Col 1.19 to describe what has been accomplished through the church (1.23; 3.19; 4.13). Divine fullness is to be found in the church as body of Christ and consequently in believers united to that body rather than as in Col using "fullness" as an attribute of the cosmic Christ. Believers have this fullness because they have received divine blessings "in the heavenlies" (1.3), and are seated "in the heavenlies" where the riches of God's grace are present in Christ (2.6). An even more striking elaboration on exaltation imagery has the revelation of God's plan of salvation in the church serve to put the rulers and powers "in the heavenlies" on notice (3.10-11). Presumably these powers are considered angelic forces of evil rather than expressions of God's sovereignty. This passage exhibits the shifting of an apocalyptic image from

---

[58]For more detailed discussion see the essays on "Church" in Schnackenburg (Ephesians, 293-310) and Best (Ephesians, 622-41).

[59]Paul uses *ekklēsia* in a more general sense on occasion, Gal 1.13 (all followers of Jesus; the object of Paul's actions as persecutor; repeated in 1 Cor 15.9; Phil 3.6); 1 Cor 10.32 (to designate believers in contrast to two groups of outsiders, Jews and Gentiles, might still refer to a local community); 12.28 (the community in which God has provided for various offices).

[60]Dunn, Colossians, 94f. Col 4.15-16 uses "church" in the more common Pauline sense as a reference to the local gathering of Christians.

future to present characteristic of Eph. In this case, the emergence of the church as ordained by God's pre–creation plan represents the judgment of evil powers in heaven prior to the new age or new creation (1 Enoch 16.1-4; 21.11-16; 89.59; 91.16).[61]

Gnostic cosmology will employ the term *pleroma* for the divine world of light from which the souls of the elect had fallen and to which they are to return.[62] This view appears to be a speculative development that is dependent in part on the usage found in Col–Eph rather than their source. A Valentinian tract which exhibits considerable theological reinterpretation, even of earlier gnostic tradition, the *Tripartite Tractate,* concludes that like the heavenly revealer, the church itself must be a pre–existent, divine reality:

> Not only did the Son exist from the beginning, but the Church, too, existed from the beginning. Now, he who thinks that the discovery that the Son is an only son opposes the statement (about the Church) – because of the mysterious quality of the matter it is not so. For just as the Father is a unity and has revealed himself as Father for him alone, so too the Son was found to be a brother to himself alone, in virtue of the fact that he is unbegotten. . . . Those which exist have come forth from the Son and the Father like kisses, . . . the kiss being a unity though it involves many kisses. That is to say it is the Church consisting of many men that existed before the aeons.[63]

The pre–existent Church in Tri.Trac. is part of a speculative development within Valentinian gnosticism which interpreted *pleroma* as the primordial

---

[61]Lincoln, Ephesians, 20. The phrase "the heavenlies" presumes a multi–heaven cosmology. It appears only in Ephesians where it may designate either the sphere of God and Christ (1.3, 20; 2.6) or that in habited by powers opposed to God (3.10; 6.12; see Schnackenburg, Ephesians, 51).

[62]Against a gnostic origin for the use of the term in Col, see Dunn (Colossians, 27-32); also Craig A. Evans, "The Meaning of *plērōma* in Nag Hammadi," Biblica 65 (1984) 259-65.

[63]Tri.Trac. CG. I 57,34-58,30. Translated by Harold Attridge and Dieter Mueller, NHLE, pp. 63f. There is no indication that Eph intended such a theological interpretation of the Church as preexistent (Schnackenburg, Ephesians, 52).

human being. For Valentinus Adam was the image of the Man.[64] The passage cited above exhibits a new concern: reconciling the inherited mytheme concerning the heavenly Church with a growing dogmatic precision concerning the relationship between the Father and Son in third century Christianity.[65]

This example points to the theological speculation which Eph invites. Salvation is no longer accomplished through an apocalyptic end of history. Instead it reveals on the level of earthly human experience divine realities which are eternally inscribed in the heavens. The Jewish origins of this move can also be found in apocalyptic interest in heavenly visions, the worship in the divine court and the like, that is, the speculative developments which provoked Col.[66] At the same time, it also highlights an element in Eph which is obscured when we synthesize the various statements made in the letter into an account of the author's teaching on the church. Eph does not engage in theological speculation. Even those elements in the Pauline tradition which Eph uses that might be invoked to explain why reconciliation of all things in the cosmic body of Christ is the "mystery", the final revelation of divine truth, are not exploited. Both the Adam–Christ typology of Rom 5.12-21 and 1 Cor 15.20-28, 42-49 and the Wisdom Christology of Col 1.15-20 are less explicitly developed than in their original form[67].

---

[64]Clement of Alexandria, Strom. II 36,4; 38,5. See the discussion in Einar Thomassen, Le Traité Tripartite (NH I, 5) (Québec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval, 1989) 308-309.

[65]Thomassen, Traité, 287. Speculation concerning the pre–existence of the Church can be found in earlier Christian and gnostic sources. Thomassen points to *2 Clem* 14.1-2; Hermas *Vis* II.iv,1 and Ignatius, *Eph* prologue as examples (p. 286).

[66]In a fascinating study of ascension as the basis for ecclesiology and cosmology, Douglas Farrow demonstrates the richness of such theological developments (Ascension and Ecclesia. On the Significance of the Doctrine of the Ascension for Ecclesiology and Christian Cosmology. [Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1999]). Eph 1.10, Col 1.15-20 and 1 Cor 8.6 played a critical role in Irenaeus' response to the gnostics. The Son pre–exists creatures which come into being for his sake (p. 54).

[67]Dunn has argued for the importance of both Adam and Wisdom traditions in the emergence of Paul's concept of the preexistent Christ (Theology, pp. 248-93).

Eph has all the pieces that are fundamental to Paul's theology. Ps 110.1 along with the understanding of resurrection as ascension justifies the lordship of Christ over all things (Eph 1.20-23). The spiritual Adam into which believers are transformed by resurrection (1 Cor 15.20-28) turns up in the paraenesis. The body of Christ is built into the "perfect man" (Eph 4.13). How little the Adam typology is in view becomes evident in Eph 4.22-24. Believers are to shed the old man marred by corruptibility and desires to put on the new man created according to God in righteousness. The trope appears to be another rhetorical plea for moral progress. Commentators recognize the ambiguity in the formulation. Does "perfect man" refer to the church as a whole or to its head?[68] Eph exhibits familiarity with some traditions of Genesis exegesis when he expands the Haustafel section on marriage in 5.22-33. There the perfection of the head is to be conveyed to the body, the church. The bond between the two is expressed in Gen 2.24. This text has been the object of considerable discussion which we will not engage here.[69] The allusions to this Adam tradition in the paraenesis show that it belongs to the author's theological repertoire.[70] One also notes that the comments on sin throughout Eph draw on the standard conversionist model which contrast the wickedness of the old life with the glory of the new. None of the meditation on the power of sin or its origins with Adam recognizable to readers of Rom are found in Eph. Sins are simply actions and a way of life which separates persons from God (2.12; 4.18).[71]

---

[68]Schnackenburg (Ephesians, 184) judiciously concludes that the text is not intended to provide a precise answer. He also notes that later gnostic exegetes clarified the relationship between the redeemer and redeemed and mythologized the gathering of the redeemed to restore or "fill up" the Pleroma.

[69]For the gnostic parallels to Eph 5.22-31 see Perkins (Ephesians, 132-36).

[70]Best has made a similar observation about Eph and Adam Christology: "The concept of Christ as the Second Adam may underlie some passages, e.g. 1.22 where Ps 8 is used, and possibly also 5.22-33, if the passage reflects Adam and Eve . . .yet the idea is not featured as much as in the genuine Pauline letters," (Ephesians, 50).

[71]So Best, Ephesians, 201.

With these observations, we return to the dilemma raised earlier. To what extent does Eph present a theological argument? The author is certainly able to craft a rhetorical piece. Within that rhetoric, one has no difficulty acknowledging strong theological convictions about the universality of salvation in Christ. Eph 1.20-23 frames the agenda for the whole. The subjection of "all things" does not await an end-time apocalypse. Its reality is expressed in the church of which Christ is the head. In order to sustain this claim, Eph adopts images and motifs from earlier Pauline tradition to a universalizing perspective. The incorporation of gentiles into the church no longer speaks to the nuts and bolts of incorporating gentile and Jew in the community of faith. "Ephesians has a cool detachment from the Jewish–Christian/Gentile–Christian conflict toward the end of the first century," Lincoln remarks.[72] Instead it serves as the evidence for a universal peace in the body of Christ. This transformation is not trivial insofar as it erodes the ideological foundation of imperial politics. Eph employs strongly theocentric language in speaking of the preordained plan of salvation which culminates in Christ (e.g. Eph 3.19-21).[73] Thus, the universalist element in Eph theology can be summarized in the teaching on recapitulation of all things in Christ which Irenaeus drew from Eph 1.10 to counter gnostic speculation. To quote Farrow:

> The doctrine of recapitulation, in other words, does something more than reserve for Jesus a pride of place at the apex of salvation history, as the one who sets right what has gone wrong. Its first task is to signify that no realm whatever lies beyond the pale of his domain, that there are no autonomous times or spheres over which he is not the Lord – and because the Lord, also the redeemer.[74]

Conclusion

---

[72]Lincoln, "The Church and Israel," 620.

[73]Perkins, Ephesians, 92f.

[74]Farrow, Ascension, 54.

Eph expresses strong theological convictions about God's pre-ordained plan of salvation for the unity of all peoples in the body of Christ, the church. It also reaffirms moral views that were widely held. The difficulties which Eph poses for the interpreter emerge from the preponderance of rhetoric over reflection in the epistle. Elaborate reworking of a theological language inherited from Paul contributes to the persuasive power of Eph, though not to its logical clarity. Does Eph fail to spell out the argument for its convictions or their relationship to other items in the theological symbol system of its time because the author presumes that his audience is familiar with the Pauline letters? Or does Eph fail to do so because the author no longer finds Paul's views on Adam, the universality of sin, justification, future eschatology, the paradox posed by the cross, the dialectic tension of Christian life, God's covenant with Israel, intelligible or compelling?

We cannot decide the answer to this question on the basis of the epistle, itself. The second and third century arguments between orthodox interpreters like Irenaeus and gnostic interpreters like the author of Tri. Trac. are not without merit in reminding us of inherent ambiguities in Eph. Similarly, the widely differing contemporary proposals for contextualizing Eph clarify ambiguities in the epistle by attaching its imagery to divergent contexts in antiquity. The eclectic and universalizing tendency of Eph rhetoric makes it impossible to establish much certainty about which theological conclusions Eph would consider consistent with its statements. One might look toward the other Pauline letters to require that the theology in Eph be developed in terms that are as consistent with Paul as possible. Or one might look forward to the second century and beyond assuming that the apocalyptic trappings of its theology should be shed in favor of a soteriology grounded in the ascension as the permanent victory of divine power over the various destructive forces in the cosmos. Choices on these fundamental questions generate vastly different readings of Eph. Eph 3.3-4 appears to direct the audience of the letter to understand Eph in terms of what has been written before. Hence the predilection of earlier scholarship for Eph as an introduction to a collection of Pauline letters. However, even that conclusion has fallen on hard times. Best sees the phrase as replacing the standard

Pauline reference to what he had told the church when he was with them or in another letter, with a reference back to earlier comments on the mystery in Eph itself.[75]

Lincoln's synthesis of the theology of Eph faces the rhetorical issue squarely. He adopts modern interest in liturgical expression as a source of theology. In the end one sees in Eph a theology of powerfully articulated convictions:

> As the writer encourages his readers to become caught up in doxology, he is reinforcing for them the Pauline gospel's alternative vision of existence in which Christ has triumphed over the powers and given all necessary resources to the Church. Thereby the menace and claims of this age with its perverted patterns of behavior and idolatry (cf. 5.5) and its evil forces are relativized, and the readers are enabled by the same Spirit that inspires their praise to live out the liberation that has been won for them by Christ.[76]

[75]Best, Ephesians, 302.

[76]Andrew T. Lincoln & A.J.M. Wedderburn, The Theology of the Later Pauline Letters (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1993) 144.

The *Psalms of Solomon* and the Ideology of Rule*

Rodney A. Werline
Emmanuel School of Religion
Johnson City, TN

I. Introduction

The need for a critical examination of the *Psalms of Solomon* in our ongoing investigation of wisdom and apocalyptic literature is illustrated by recent historical Jesus studies' reliance on the old synthetic scholarly construction of apocalypticism. For example, John Dominic Crossan uncritically perpetuates that unhistorical synthetic view in setting Jesus against the "apocalyptic" view of the kingdom for which he quotes *Psalms of Solomon* 17 at length along with the *Testament of Moses*, the Parables of *1 Enoch*, and Daniel 7.[1] Even specialists on the *Psalms of Solomon* take psalm 17 as an example of "apocalyptic messianism."[2]

The discussion that follows will examine some basic problems in interpreting the *Psalms of Solomon* through an investigation of its ideology of rule. First, I shall examine and discuss the authors' social and historical location. This influences their view of Hasmonean and Roman rule. In the late 19th century, J. Wellhausen proposed that Pharisaic circles produced the *Psalms of Solomon*.[3] His position dominated scholarship for a large part of

---

* While I was writing this paper I benefited from several conversations with Richard Horsley. He also graciously read the manuscript and gave valuable suggestions. I am grateful to him for his help. Of course, I am responsible for any shortcomings that this essay might contain.

[1] J. D. Crossan, *The Historical Jesus: The Life of a Mediterranean Peasant* (San Francisco: Harper, 1992), 107, 284-286. See also J. D. Crossan, *Jesus: A Revolutionary Biography* (San Francisco: Harper, 1994), 40, 56.

[2] R. B. Wright, "Psalms of Solomon," *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; vol. 2; Garden City: Doubleday, 1985), 642. I follow Wright's translation throughout this essay. For the Greek text, see A. Rahlfs, *Septuaginta, id est Vetus Testamentum iuxta LXX interpretes* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Biblegesellschaft, 1979).

[3] For an extended listing of those who accept this thesis, see K. Atkinson, "On the Herodian Origin of Militant Davidic Messianism at Qumran: New Light from *Psalm of Solomon* 17," *JBL* 118 (1999): 437 n. 4. For a review of the *Psalms of Solomon* in

the 20th century. Late in the last century, however, possible new identities for the group emerged as some suggested that the text originated from a group of Essenes.[4] Other interpreters noted similarities between the *Psalms of Solomon* and the Qumran scrolls.[5] However, recent suggestions that the *Psalms of Solomon* originates from a group of scribal retainers leads to a more precise determination of the authors' social location.[6] Second, I shall reexamine the problem of the genre and the worldview of the *Psalms of Solomon*. Does this text fit the category of apocalyptic literature either in form or worldview? Although, as I shall argue, the *Psalms of Solomon* cannot be understood as apocalyptic literature, comparisons between this text and apocalyptic texts should contribute to this Group's primary interest – a clearer understanding of what constitutes apocalypticism.

Interest in the ideology of rule directs attention primarily to *Psalms of Solomon* 1, 2, 8, and 17, which are about struggling to come to grips with Roman conquest and rule over Judea. The final form of psalm 17, of course, must come from the Herodian period, since certain events described in this psalm happened only when Herod took control of Palestine.[7] Other psalms, those of the individual (*Psalms of Solomon* 3, 4, 6, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16),

---

modern research, see J. L. Trafton, "The *Psalms of Solomon* in Recent Research," *JSP* 12 (1994): 3-19.

[4] E.g., A. Dupont-Sommer, *The Essene Writings from Qumran* (trans. G. Vermes; New York: Meridian Books, 1962), 296; R. R. Hann, "The Community of the Pious: The Social Setting of the *Psalms of Solomon*," *SR* 17 (1988): 169-189.

[5] O. Eissfeldt, "*The Old Testament: An Introduction* (trans. P. R. Ackroyd; New York, 1965), 610-613.

[6] R. A. Horsley, *Jesus and the Spiral of Violence: Popular Jewish Resistance in Roman Palestine* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1987), 203-206; and *Whoever Hears You Hears Me: Prophets, Performance, and Tradition in Q* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity, 1999), 69, 106-107.

[7] K. Atkinson ("Militant Davidic Messianism," 435-460) argues for this date of *Psalms of Solomon* 17. M. de Jonge ("The Expectation of the Future in the Psalms of Solomon," in *Jewish Eschatology, Early Christian Christology and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* [Leiden: Brill, 19991], 14) also believes that the *Psalms* may have been updated and redacted, but was not confident that one could now isolate and date the various layers of the text. Cf. A. Caquot, "Les Hasmonéens, Les Romains et Hérode," in *Hellinica et Judaica: hommage a Valentine Nikiprowetsky* (eds., A. Coquot, H-L Mirieille, J. Riaud; Leuven: Editions Perters, 1984), 213-218.

may contribute to understanding the *Psalms of Solomon*'s ideology of rule.[8] These psalms provide glimpses into the group's struggle in the midst of shifting power in Jerusalem. Further, these other psalms' descriptions of the ideal pious scribe prove invaluable for interpreting the image of the anointed one in *Psalms of Solomon* 17.

II. Historical Background and Allusions

Psalms 1, 2, 8, and 17 contain rather obvious references to the historical events connected with Pompey's arrival in Jerusalem in 63 BCE.[9] His appearance in Jerusalem came as a result of a civil war between Hyrcanus II and Aristobulus II. The rival Hasmoneans and their supporters appeared before Pompey when he interceded in their dispute. A third group of Jews, who wanted neither of these men to rule, petitioned Pompey to restore the old priestly theocracy. When Aristobulus suspiciously left Pompey's company after the general had told the parties to wait for his decision, Pompey followed him to Jerusalem. Hyrcanus' supporters opened the gates of the city to Pompey and his armies, while Aristobulus and his followers barricaded themselves in the temple. Pompey eventually took the temple, although with significant bloodshed. According to Josephus, the soldiers slaughtered the priests who were in the process of sacrificing. Entering the Holy of Holies itself, Pompey reportedly looked around and exited without destroying, looting, or vandalizing the sanctuary. Judea became a Roman province with Hyrcanus installed as high priest, but without the status of kingship. Aristobulus and his family were taken as prisoners to Rome.

Several passages in the *Psalms of Solomon* reflect the circumstances associated with Pompey's siege and capture of Jerusalem. Thus, *Ps. Sol.* 2:1-2 speaks of Pompey's use of a battering ram and his entrance into the sanctuary (cf. *Ant.* 14.4; *J.W.* 1.7). *Ps. Sol.* 8:16 refers to the meeting between Pompey and the Jewish parties, vv. 16b-17 depict Hyrcanus' supporters opening the gates of the city to the general, and vv. 18-22 describe the

[8] G. W. E. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah* (Philadelphia, Fortress, 1981), 209-212.

[9] For Josephus' account, see *Ant.* 14.3-4; *J. W.* 1.6-7.

slaughter in Jerusalem and the taking of prisoners. Psalm 17 refers to Pompey's triumph (v. 7), the killing that took place in Jerusalem upon his entrance into the Temple area (v. 11), and the exile of Aristobulus and his family (v. 12). Psalm 2 also mentions Pompey's death in Egypt in 48 BCE during the civil war in Rome, for the passage pictures his corpse floating ignobly in the waves (v. 27).

The *Psalms of Solomon*, however, at least psalm 17, shows signs of later redaction as some features originate from the era of Herod's reign.[10] The end of the Hasmonean dynasty as described in this psalm – "He hunted down their descendants and did not let even one of them go" (v. 9b) – comes at the hand of Herod, who systematically removed every Hasmonean threat to his kingship. The statement, "So he did in Jerusalem all the things that gentiles do for their gods in their cities" (v. 14), also fits Herod's reign more than Pompey's brief stay in Jerusalem. *Ps. Sol.* 17:18b-19a connects the "lawless one's" advance on the city with a famine: "For the heavens withheld rain from falling on the earth. Springs were stopped, (from) the perennial (springs) far underground (to) those in the high mountains." A famine occurred when Herod besieged Jerusalem, not when Pompey invaded.[11] Therefore, sometime after Herod's rise to power, the "lawless" foreigner or "alien" who attacked the Jews no longer referred to Pompey but the Idumean.

III. Deuteronomic Critique of Rule in the Psalms of Solomon

The *Psalms of Solomon* extensively quotes or alludes to biblical materials. For its understanding and explanation of the events that led to the end of Judean autonomy and beginning of Roman rule, the text employs deuteronomic ideology.[12] According to deuteronomic thought, disastrous events result from the people's and/or the rulers' sins. In the case of the city falling to Rome in 63 BCE, blame lies especially with the Jerusalem rulers, and foremost with the Hasmoneans.

---

[10] See also Atkinson, "Militant Davidic Messianism," 440-444.
[11] Ibid, 443 n. 21; Josephus, *J.W.* 1.17-18; *Ant.* 14.16.
[12] Cf. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, 204

The collection begins with a slight twist on deuteronomic ideology. In psalm 1, which was perhaps composed at a later date as an introduction to the entire corpus as well as to psalm 2, Zion expresses surprise at Rome's assault. She had previously perceived herself as prosperous, which according to deuteronomic ideology is the reward for righteousness (vv. 1-3).[13] However, vv. 4-8 explain that the foreign invasion resulted from Hasmonean policies and activities. First, the author seems to criticize the Hasmoneans' military campaigns of expansion (v. 4).[14] For example, John Hyrcanus I immediately had seized the opportunity upon the death of Antiochus VII to subdue some neighboring territories.[15] Second, alluding to Isa 14:13, the psalmist charges the Hasmoneans with attempting to exalt themselves like pagan kings: "They exalt themselves to the stars."[16] According to psalm 2, such Hasmonean actions profaned the Temple (v. 8). While Zion may not have been able to see the sins of her children because they committed them in secret (v. 7), God saw them and brought punishment as deuteronomic ideology demands. In fact, according to such cause and effect ideology, the presence of punishment confirms that sin has been committed; the two are inextricably linked.

Psalm 2 also employs this same sin-punishment ideology. Making clear allusions to historical events, the author attributes the catastrophe to Judean sins (vv. 7-8). His charge that the people sinned by not "listening" (v. 8b) may reflect the frequent deuteronomic exhortation to "listen to" or "obey" (*šm*ʿ) all God commands the people. This interpretation is quite probable, if, as most scholars think, the *Psalms of Solomon* has a Hebrew *Vorlage*.

The author of psalm 2 also responds to the historical crisis with a confession of God's righteousness: "I shall prove you right, for your judgments are right, O God" (v. 15). Von Rad labeled this kind of declaration

[13] Wright, "Psalms of Solomon," 651 n. 1.

[14] Cf., e.g., Bar 1:1-3:8, which opposes Judas' siege of the Akra and continued aggression against Antiochus V; and 1QpHab; Daniel, as is well known, also does not place hope in Hasmonean policy (Dan 11:34).

[15] See E. Schürer, *History of the Jewish People*, (trans., rev. and ed., G. Vermes and F. Millar; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1973), 206-210.

[16] Wright, "Psalms of Solomon," 651

a "*Gerichtsdoxologie*."[17] During the Second Temple period, such confessions become a standard, formulaic feature in penitential prayers, which deuteronomic ideology also markedly influenced. Like psalm 1, the author of psalm 2 believes that the disaster in Jerusalem reveals that sin filled the city, even though her beauty masked her deeds. God saw through the appearances and brought judgment (v. 18).

Psalm 8, like psalm 1, depicts Zion as initially expressing surprise that such tragedy has visited Jerusalem (vv. 1-6). Then, like psalms 1 and 2, the author of psalm 8 interprets the disaster deuteronomically. The punishment comes as a result of the sins of the leadership, especially the Hasmoneans, whose sins the author catalogues by using stock polemical rhetoric (vv. 9-13). The rulers are guilty of incest (v. 9b), adultery (v. 10b), robbing the temple (v. 11), and uncleanness that defiles the sacrifices – especially not following proper laws about sex after menstruation (v. 12). *Ps. Sol.* 2:11-14 indicts the Judean rulers for similar behavior. These accusations resemble the content of CD 5.6-8:

> And they also defiled the temple, for they did not keep apart in accordance with the law, but, instead lay with her who sees the blood of her menstrual flow. And each man takes as a wife the daughter of his brother and the daughter of his sister.[18]

Such polemical language actually does not reveal much about the disagreements between those responsible for the *Psalms of Solomon* and the Hasmoneans. Instead, it mostly identifies the Hasmoneans as the enemy and connotes the authors' opinion that their rule is illegitimate.[19] Finally, psalm 8 also includes two proclamations of God's righteousness for bringing punishment (vv. 7, 23-24).

---

[17] See R. A. Werline, *Penitential Prayer, Penitential Prayer in Early Judaism: The Development of a Religious Institution* (EJL 13; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998), 52.

[18] The translation is from F. G. Martínez and E. J. C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (Vol. 1; Leiden: Brill, 1997).

[19] For a discussion of polemical language, see L. T. Johnson, "The New Testament's Anti-Jewish Slander and the Conventions of Ancient Polemic," *JBL* 108 (1989): 419-441.

With a few variations, these same deuteronomic features appear in *Psalms of Solomon* 17, a passage about a messianic king. In this psalm, however, the author makes the remarkable claim that the Hasmoneans came to power in the first place because of Judean sin (v. 5). Typically in deuteronomic thought, God punishes the nation by sending a pagan king and his army against the people. Indeed, Pompey – and later Herod – performs this task in the *Psalms of Solomon*. The author of psalm 17, however, places the Hasmoneans in this role. By assigning them this function, the *Psalms of Solomon* highlights the illegitimacy of their rule and erodes their power. Further, in order to denounce the way in which the Hasmoneans came to power, the author charges them with usurping the kingship by force. He alludes to the Davidic covenant in 2 Samuel 7, which promises kingship to the Davidic line: "Those to whom you did not (make the) promise, they took *it* by force" (v. 5b).[20] Beginning with Aristobulus I (104-103 BCE) and continuing until the arrival of Pompey, Hasmonean rulers assumed the title "king."[21] For the author of psalm 17, this claim to kingship "despoiled the throne of David" (v. 6). Like pagan kings whom God sends to punish the people – including Pompey (see below) – the Hasmoneans' arrogance brings their end, for God rewards them for their sin (vv. 6-10).

Thus, Deuteronomic ideology in the *Psalms of Solomon* produces several layers of critique. First, and explicitly, it subverts Hasmonean rule. They did not rise to power on their own merit, or on the merit of the Jews, but because of the people's sin; they were punishment from God. Clearly the authors disagree with the Hasmonean policies of expansion and their adoption of royal titles. All these errors pollute the Temple. Their fall to Rome proves the illegitimacy of their rule and is the way in which God punishes them. Second, the *Psalms of Solomon* also employs deuteronomic ideology in objection to the establishment of Roman power in Palestine. Pompey does not take Jerusalem by his own power, but by an act of God's wrath against the

[20] I alter Wright's translation, who seems to think that the author believed that the Hasmoneans took something away from those associated to the psalmist. If the reference to God's "promise" is the Davidic covenant, the Hasmoneans took the kingship.
[21] Schürer, *History of the Jewish People*, 1:216-217

Jerusalem rulers. Pompey is God's unwitting puppet in the affairs of Palestine and in the history of God's people.

IV. Pompey as a "Dragon" and God as "Savior"

The notion that Pompey, a pagan, is the instrument of God's wrath draws on a recurring motif in biblical and Second Temple literature. For example, in Isaiah God calls the king of Assyria "the rod of my anger" (Isa 10:5) and sends him against Jerusalem. The king of Assyria, however, becomes arrogant and boastful, and he refuses to acknowledge that he served as God's "ax" (10:10-19). Therefore, even though God sends the foreign king against Israel because of its sins, God punishes him. Similar scenarios occur in reference to the king of Babylon in Isaiah 14, the king of Tyre in Ezekiel 28, Pharaoh in Ezekiel 31-32, and Antiochus IV in Dan 11:40-45.[22]

Like these other foreign powers that assaulted Jerusalem, Pompey fails to recognize that God has given the city into his hand. Instead, he is boastful and arrogant about his accomplishments. As mentioned above, he celebrates by taking Aristobulus II, his family, and other Jews to Rome for his triumphal procession. These exploits and attitude invite the authors of the *Psalms of Solomon* to recall the motif of God punishing the foreign power. Thus, the *Psalms of Solomon* celebrates over the news of Pompey's death in Egypt after the battle of Pharsalus in 48 BCE. Indeed, the author of psalm 2 gloats that God responded to his intercessory prayer by bringing Pompey's death:

> And I did not wait long until God showed me his insolence pierced on the mountains of Egypt,
> more despised than the smallest thing on earth and sea.
> His body was carried about on the waves in much shame,
> and there was no one to bury him, for he (God) had despised him with contempt (2:26-27).

[22] De Jonge, "The Future in the Psalms of Solomon," 8.

Other biblical motifs occur in the discussion of Pompey's end in psalm 2. The author explains: "He did not consider that he was a man … He said, 'I shall be lord of land and sea'" (vv. 28-29). Despite his claims, the text labels him a "dragon" (v. 25) who did not understand that God is king (vv. 29b-30). The designation of Pompey as a "dragon" has biblical precedents. The image, which biblical authors originally adopted from Canaanite and other ancient Near Eastern mythologies, depicts the forces of chaos that challenge God and threaten the order of the universe. Biblical authors eventually used this image to speak of ancient Near Eastern rulers because the authors saw them as defiant against God like chaos monsters – because they harassed God's people – and because of the chaos that they caused in the region. Pharaoh is called a dragon in Ezek. 29:3, as is Nebuchadnezzar in Jer 51: 34.[23] Daniel 7 also depicts ancient Near Eastern empires as beasts that rise from the sea.

With these biblical motifs and images, the *Psalms of Solomon* interprets Pompey as another oppressive and imperial chaos dragon that God humbles and dishonors like all preceding monsters. Since Pompey is representative of Roman power in the region, the author of psalm 2 is also critiquing Roman rule. God is king over the earth, and by implication God's kingdom stretches over land and sea. Roman rule in Palestine, and indeed the world, continues only because God permits it, or because Rome is in rebellion against God. The authors believe that God will someday bring an end to this rebellion.

In discussions of Roman rule, the *Psalms of Solomon* consistently affirms God's role as "savior" (*sōtēr*) (e.g., 2:32; 8:33; 17:1, 3, 34, 46). Certainly this is traditional biblical language (see, e.g., Ps 106:21; Isa 43:3, 11; 45:15, 21; 49:26; 60:16). In the context of Greco-Roman ideology, however, where generals and emperors are quick to make such proclamations about themselves, the appellation takes on new significance. Greeks recognized good rulers as "saviors" because of their abilities to conquer those forces that threatened the order of the state.[24] These rulers restored and

[23] Ibid.; Wright, 653, n. a2.

[24] For the definitive presentation on this subject, see S. R. F. Price, "Rituals and Power," in *Paul and the Empire: Religion and Power in Roman Imperial Society* (ed. R. A.

protected civilization.[25] Thus, the Thessalonians honored Philip of Macedon as "savior" (*sōtēr*), as well as "friend" (*philos*) and "benefactor" (*euergetēs*).[26] Several of the Ptolemies and Seleucids either adopted the title *sōtēr* for themselves, bestowed it upon deceased relatives, or were acclaimed thus by their citizens.[27] Greek citizens could also call Roman generals "saviors."[28] As a marble inscription in Mytilene attests, Pompey himself received the titles of "benefactor," "savior," and "restorer" when he granted freedom to the city.[29]

Although Pompey settled the civil unrest caused by the dispute between Hyrcanus II and Aristobulus II, the Jews did not recognize or acknowledge Pompey as "savior." Josephus, in fact, remembers this event as the moment that the Jews lost their freedom and came under Roman rule.[30] The *Psalms of Solomon*, of course, refuses to recognize Pompey as "savior," even if his arrival brought the end of illegitimate Hasmonean rule. For the *Psalms of Solomon*, the title "savior" belongs only to God. With this language, then, the *Psalms of Solomon* challenges the Greco-Roman ideology of rule. Pompey is not ruler of "land and sea" (cf. 2:26, 29).[31] He is simply a "dragon" whom God, the true *sōtēr*, defeats and dishonors.

V. The Messiah of Psalms of Solomon 17

Until the final quarter of the last century, *Psalms of Solomon* 17 stood as the *locus classicus* for understanding Jewish messianic expectation (sometimes inappropriately characterized as "apocalyptic"). The basic assumption was that in the time of Jesus the Jews hoped for a Davidic king

---

Horsley; Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1997), 47-71. For a convenient summary, see J. L. White, *The Apostle of God: Paul and the Promise of Abraham* (Peabody, MS: Hendrickson, 1999), 99.

[25] Ibid. White also notes that this role of the ruler has a religious parallel among the Greeks. "[T]he major gods came to associated with the power of civilization over chaos" (99).

[26] W. Foerster, "*sōtēr*," TDNT 7:1007-1008.

[27] Ibid., 1008-1009.

[28] Ibid., 1008

[29] Ibid.

[30] *Ant.* 14. 4.

[31] Cf. also 1 Macc 8:23 which uses similar language to speak of the extent of Roman rule.

who would overthrow Roman rule and establish a new political state. Not only does this position inadequately represent the variety in Jewish hope for the future, it also fails to represent the peculiar features of the *Psalms of Solomon*, for, as I have argued, one must view these psalms as a response to particular crises. Further, the description of a messianic king in this text must be read within the social, historical, and ideological context of the author and those who shared his beliefs. The author constructed his image of an anointed king so that it addressed the most pertinent problems his group faced. Concerns about the group's social location appear in the text. Infusing the text with his own ideology, the author portrays a scribal messiah who will also apparently be the benefactor and patron to the "pious."

The first indication in *Psalms of Solomon* 17 that something has gone wrong for the author's group arises in v. 5: "Because of our sins, sinners rose up against us, they set upon us and drove us out." According to scholarly consensus, the sinners are the Hasmoneans.[32] These "sinners" apparently persecuted the "pious," a label that designates the author and his associates. The problem reaches such proportions that the pious must flee into the wilderness (v. 17) as the "lawless ones" are chasing them (v. 18). Furthermore, every stratum of society is failing to function properly: "No one among them in Jerusalem acted (with) mercy or truth" (v. 15b); "For there was no one among them who practiced righteousness or justice" (v. 19); "The king was a criminal and the judge disobedient; (and) all the people sinners" (v. 20). For the author, his civilization is in chaos, and he and his associates are disenfranchised.

Elsewhere in the *Psalms of Solomon*, comparable tensions exist between the pious and sinners (e.g., 2:6, 12, 16, 25; 4:21, 24; 2:6; 12:1, 4; 14:4; 15:6). Although it is impossible to conclude that all these references to opponents are Hasmoneans, the authors of the *Psalms of Solomon* certainly felt socially, if not on occasion physically, threatened. They seem vulnerable to religious/political leaders more powerful than they. Most likely, the shifts in power within Palestine from one party to another in the late Hasmonean

[32] For an exception to this position, see J. Tromp ("The Sinners and the Lawless in Psalm of Solomon 17," *NovT* 35 [1993]: 344-361) who holds that the sinners are Romans.

and the beginning of the Roman era, including Herodian rule, made life difficult for the authors of the *Psalms of Solomon*. Several passages suggest that some had lost social power and had been pushed to the margins. For example, *Ps. Sol.* 4:9-13, 20-22 implies that some people associated with the author may have lost property and suffered financially in other ways at the hands of powerful people: "[F]or they deceitfully empty many people's houses and greedily scatter (them) ... for they defraud innocent people by pretense." Similarly, it is probably not a coincidence that psalm 5 contains a prayer that describes God as "the shelter of the poor," a righteous judge, and a strong man whose house cannot be plundered (vv. 1-4). In this psalm, the author also understands himself as a member of a persecuted group (v. 5).

Despite the difficulty of the situation and the chaos in his society, the author of *Psalm of Solomon* 17 continues to profess that "God is king" (vv. 1, 34, 46) and "savior" (*sōtēr*) (v. 3). The human rulers who claim to have power actually have none, and their future destruction is certain. God will restore order by raising up a messianic king. Unlike the Hasmonean rulers, the anointed one can legitimately assume the throne because he is a son of David (v. 21). As God's vice-regent on earth, he will shatter unrighteous rulers and purge Israel of the Gentiles who are trampling it down (vv. 22-27, 41, 51). The language of the text is militant – "To smash the arrogance of sinners like a potter's jar" (v. 23)[33] – even though it is reminiscent of Psalms 2:9; 104:7; and Isa 11:2-4. The messiah's deeds, therefore, bring the removal of the Romans and all Jewish leaders who assist them in their rule.

After the anointed one removes all the wicked from the land, he begins the restoration and reestablishment of a just, civil society as the *Psalms of Solomon* envisions it. He gathers a "holy people" to him and leads them in righteousness (v. 26). Throughout the *Psalms of Solomon*, the text refers to the members of the community as the "pious" (*hosios*), the "righteous"

[33] I agree with K. Atkinson, "Militant Davidic Messiah," 444-445 and J. J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiah's of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Literature* [New York: Doubleday, 1995], 54-55. Atkinson demonstrates that similar ideas appear in five Qumran scrolls from the Herodian period: 4Q161; 4Q285; 4Q246; 4Q252; 4Q174.

(*dikaios*), and the "holy ones" (*hagios*).[34] These designations have special meaning for the author of psalm 17, and he probably would have used the terms "pious," "righteous," and "holy ones" only for himself, his fellow scribes, and any Jews who had a similar theology. While the author of psalm 17 probably did not think that the benefits of the messiah's rule were for him and those associated with him alone to the exclusion of the rest of Israel, his language reflects his concern about his own social location in the present and future eras. Undoubtedly, because he and his associates are pious, they will benefit from the messiah's arrival and rule. Thus, under the rule of the messiah, they will have a better status than they had under the Hasmoneans and the Romans.

A cornerstone of the new society that the messiah inaugurates is his ability to establish justice: "And he will establish justice for the tribes of the people that have been made holy by the Lord their God" (v. 26b).[35] As Richard Horsley argues, the verb *krinein* does not mean "to judge" in the typical English sense of making judicial decisions.[36] Rather, the term has the connotation of the Hebrew word *šapat*, which expresses the idea of "deliverance" or "establishing justice."[37] According to Horsley, the "terms have connotations of deliverance, grace, and salvation, and that God's judging or justice 'regulates the social relationships of the people' and asserts the rights of the oppressed against the oppressors."[38] In the Hebrew Bible, the spirit of God comes upon individuals so that they bring deliverance and liberation from oppressors. This model appears in Isaiah 11 as the spirit of the Lord rests upon the Davidic ruler, which also gives him the spirit of "wisdom," "understanding," "counsel," "might," "knowledge," and "the fear of the Lord" (Isa 11:2). These special attributes then empower him to establish justice, i.e., to deliver and to vindicate the "poor" (vv. 3b-4). With

[34] For "pious," see, e.g., 2:36; 3:8; 4:1, 6; 8:23; 9:3; 10:6; 17:16. For "righteous," see, e.g., 2:34; 3:3, 4, 5; 4:8. For "holy ones," see 17:32, 43.

[35] Here I have departed from Wright's translation of the phrase: "He will judge the tribes…"

[36] Horsley, *Jesus and the Spiral of Violence*, 203-206; and *Whoever Hears You Hears Me*, 69, 106-107.

[37] Horsley, *Jesus and the Spiral of Violence*, 203-204.

the "word of his mouth" and "the breath of his lips" he "kills the wicked" (v. 4b). The author of *Psalms of Solomon* 17 relies upon this very text, Isa 11:2-4, for his description of the messiah and his activities in vv. 29 and 37. Hence, whereas the judges during the Hasmonean and Roman rules were "disobedient," which resulted in an unjust society in which the righteous were oppressed, the messiah will bring and maintain a just world. In *Psalms of Solomon* 4, God effects a similar kind of judgment against the wicked (e.g., 4:24). In order to preserve justice, the author of psalm 17 says that the messiah "disciplines" (*paideusai*) the nation (17:42). Other psalms depict God as disciplining the righteous (cf., e.g., 3:4; 7:3, 9; 10:2; 13:7, 8; 16:11).

While the author of psalm 17 relies on biblical images and language to depict the messiah's peaceful rule, he is also clearly attempting to make sharp distinctions between the messiah and the Hasmoneans and Romans. Unlike the Hasmoneans and Romans, the messiah does not place his confidence in military might and heavy taxation (v. 33). Instead, he resembles the king in Zech 9:9-10 who comes to Jerusalem riding humbly on an ass and bringing peace, cutting off the chariot, the war horse, and the battle bow (cf. *Ps. Sol.* 17:33a). The restrictions placed on the kingship in Deut 17:14-17 also prevented the king from amassing horses and silver.[39] The messiah places his hope in God (*Ps. Sol.* 17:39), and thus he is like the pious who "hope" in God their "savior" (17:3). He is also "strong in the fear of God" (v. 40). Although biblical literature often states that the righteous fear God, this is also a favorite image for the authors of the *Psalms of Solomon* (e.g., 2:33; 3:12; 4:23; 5:18; 12:4; 13:12; 15:13). Therefore, this messianic king will not display the arrogance of Pompey and the Hasmoneans (cf. 17:6. 13. 23. 41). He understands that God is king and he glorifies and honors God (17:30). In fact, there will be no arrogance in the society that the messiah establishes, and, as a result, no one will be oppressed. If anyone has lost property, the messiah will restore it, for he redistributes the land according to tribal inheritance (v. 28). Again, while this is good biblical tradition, it is also in line with the deeds of a great benefactor. Surely, the end of oppression and the

[38] Ibid., 204.
[39] De Jonge, "The Future in the Psalms of Solomon," 12.

security of one's property comprise part of the deepest hope of the author and his community who both live at the margins of their world.

After the messiah has purged the land of arrogant, oppressive Gentile overlords and has established a just society, psalm 17 depicts Gentiles returning to Jerusalem in order to praise the glory of the messiah, Jerusalem, and God (vv. 30-31, 34; cf. Isa 66:18-19). As they come from the ends of the earth to the city, they bring the dispersed Jews with them, an image based upon Isa 66:20: "They shall bring all your kindred from all the nations as an offering to the Lord…"

Thus, the author of psalm 17 has chosen his words with care and intention, for the language used to speak of the messiah are the same words that other texts in the *Psalms of Solomon* employ to describe the ideal pious person. Such language has acquired special meaning in the *Psalms of Solomon*, and it carries the author's particular ideology. As a result, the messiah lives up to the author's ideals, and, indeed, he looks like the scribal author. His rule is legitimate. With all this in mind, the meaning of v. 43 becomes apparent: "His (i.e., the anointed king's) words will be as the words of the holy ones among the sanctified peoples."[40] The author's messiah is a scribal king and a benefactor to the "pious" and to those Jews who share the author's ideas.

This textual analysis of psalm 17 now allows for suggestions about the social location and identity of the *Psalms of Solomon*'s authors. Although the reasons and exact relationships of power are not clear, the *Psalms of Solomon* most likely originates from a group of disenfranchised scribes who lived in Jerusalem. Their status as scribes seems evident from their ability to write, their thorough knowledge of biblical traditions, and their comments about loss of power, which imply that they at one time were nearer the center of power. They probably functioned as scribal retainers sometime during Hasmonean rule. However, in the constant shift of power in Jewish Palestine, these scribes became disaffected; they lost station and power. In an earlier era, Ben

[40] Although I have preserved Wright's translation "holy ones," I do not accept his identification of the "holy ones" as angels. I maintain that the designation refers to pious humans, probably the authors' scribal circle.

Sira' also recognized that one had to be cautious when relating to the powerful (Sir 13:9).[41] That retainers could fall in and out of favor during this period is further confirmed by the stories of the Pharisees during the reigns of Alexander Jannaeus and Salome Alexandra. Any hope that the scribes who wrote the *Psalms of Solomon* may have had about recovering their position when Rome arrived, if indeed they held such notions, was not realized. In the early Roman and Herodian periods, their status did not improve. For these reasons, the scribes anticipated the arrival of the Davidic messiah. In that future era, this scribal group would no longer live on the margins. Life under the scribal Davidic messiah would mean that they would be nearer the center of power, and the injustices that they suffered at the hands of the rulers of this world would cease.

Any further identification of these scribes – whether they are Pharisees or Essenes – goes beyond the evidence. The literature from the era in which the *Psalms of Solomon* emerged actually provides little information about Pharisaic doctrines, while the presentation of the Pharisaic ideas in literature from the common era does not significantly resemble those of the *Psalms of Solomon*. Likewise, Robert Hann's proposal that the text is the product of second generation disenfranchised Essene priests suffers in part from one significant feature of psalm 17.[42] The author looks for a restored Davidic kingship, not a restored priesthood; Davidic kingship will be the instrument for restoring a just society. The author's main concern is about Hasmonean, and then Roman, oppressive rule.

VI. Summary

The *Psalms of Solomon* critiques Hasmonean and Roman rule in several ways. First, using deuteronomic ideology, the authors understand Roman occupation as the result of sin, especially the sin of the Hasmoneans. With this idea the authors declare the illegitimacy of Hasmonean rule.

---

[41] See R. A. Horsley, "Social Relations and Social Conflict in the Epistle of Enoch," in *For a Later Generation: The Transformation of Tradition in Israel, Early Judaism, and Early Christiainity* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, forthcoming).

[42] Hann, "The Community of the Pious," 176.

However, the authors' position also subtly critiques Roman rule, for the Romans do not occupy Palestine because of their own power, but because of God's plan to punish the people. Second, the psalms cast Pompey in the role of the foreign king (though Pompey is not a king) whom God briefly employs. Like other "kings" before him, Pompey's arrogance grows, and God must punish him. In relation to this, psalm 2 depicts Pompey as a chaos dragon that God subdues. While Pompey may have been acclaimed as *sōtēr* by the Greeks at Mytilene, he did not achieve such recognition from the authors of the *Psalms of Solomon*. For them, God is *sōtēr*, and they await the salvation that is to come. Finally, in *Psalms of Solomon* 17, the author presents his scenario of the future messianic king and the deliverance that he brings. While the author borrows from biblical language, he also consciously describes the anointed one as a benefactor who restores a just society and who will embody all the author's ideals of piety.

VII. The Psalms of Solomon and Apocalypticism: Comparisons, Contrasts, and Questions

A. Literary Form

Although earlier generations of scholars included the *Psalms of Solomon* in their broad synthetic category of apocalyptic literature, in regard to genre, this classification is untenable. The *Psalms of Solomon* does not demonstrate the features of Judean apocalypse according to the consensus definition in *Semeia* 14.[43] The text does not assume the form of a narrative that contains a revelation from an "otherworldly being" about events in a transcendent world that influences the terrestrial order. As Nickelsburg states: "There is here no concept of two corresponding levels of reality: the heavenly and the earthly, the mythical and the historical."[44] The reference to Pompey as a "dragon" clearly exemplifies this difference between the *Psalms of Solomon* and texts that fit the category apocalypse. In the *Psalms of Solomon*, the term "dragon" functions as a simple metaphor. Certainly, the word carries

[43] J. J. Collins, "Introduction: Towards the Morphology of a Genre," *Semeia* 14 (1979): 9.
[44] Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, 209.

the rich meanings and symbolism of this image in the Hebrew Bible traditions and other ancient Near Eastern mythologies. However, this is quite different from the way that the author of the apocalypse in Daniel 7 uses the dragon imagery. In Daniel 7, the dragon is a character in a grand vision that the author casts into a narrative which portrays human history and the events that will lead to the eschaton. When the Ancient of Days appears, the dragon will be destroyed, and the righteous will be delivered. This kind of fantastic imagery is simply not a feature of the *Psalms of Solomon*.

The proper literary category for the *Psalms of Solomon* is a collection of psalms. The parallels – both in language and form – between the text and the biblical psalms are numerous. The psalms upon which I have focused, psalms 1, 2, 8, and 17, exhibit the characteristics of so-called Zion hymns, wisdom psalms, psalms about the sinful history of the nation, psalms of deliverance, and laments.[45] In addition, *Psalms of Solomon* 17 borrows several aspects from royal psalms.[46] The writing of psalms is widely attested in Second Temple Jewish literature, and the gospel of Luke also contains a few examples. Besides this, the editing of the biblical psalms may not have been completed when the *Psalms of Solomon* was written. Hence, the activity of writing, editing, and compiling psalms continued to be significant during this period, a phenomenon that continues to receive little attention in modern scholarship.

B. Ideology

I have already established that the *Psalms of Solomon* especially relies on deuteronomic ideology to critique Hasmonean and Roman rule. Ostensibly, the deuteronomic worldview represented in the *Psalms of Solomon* seems to be in complete opposition to what is generally regarded as the apocalyptic worldview. Deuteronomic thought is anchored in the covenant and its requirements. Israel's behavior determines whether blessings or curses visit the people. Thus, according to this line of thought, problems arise

[45] For more on form, see C. Westermann, *Praise and Lament in the Psalms* (trans, K. R. Crim and R. N. Soulen, trans.; Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1981).
[46] See M. de Jonge, "The Future in the Psalms of Solomon," 10.

because the people have sinned. Repentance serves as the way to remove the punishment and regain divine favor. On the other hand, modern interpreters typically hold that apocalypticism reflects a kind of determinism. Problems that come upon the Jews are the result of demonic forces in the world that often assume the form of oppressive empires. Because demonic forces pose a threat that humans cannot overpower, God defeats the powers and brings deliverance for the righteous. While waiting for God's final victory, the proper responses of the righteous are hope and faithfulness. For example, the apocalyptic visions in Daniel 7-12 reflect these features. In Daniel 7, Daniel can only watch as the four beasts arise from the sea. The end of the final kingdom, which climaxes with a reference to Antiochus IV, comes by divine intervention – the arrival of the Ancient of Days. Daniel 10-12 contains a lengthy historical apocalypse and interpretation. Once again, the apocalypse indicates that historical events, including the beginning and end of empires and the rise and fall of rulers, are predetermined. Only at the completion of this scenario does Michael come and deliver the people and does the end come.

Daniel 9, however, presents a curious combination. The text contains a penitential prayer that is marked by deuteronomic ideology. At the same time, the prayer occurs within the context of Daniel receiving the proper interpretation of Jeremiah's seventy years. As is well known, the seventy years become seventy weeks of years – an apocayptic time table. In this text, then, deuteronomic covenantal cause-and-effect and apocalyptic determinism stand together, the author apparently oblivious to the contradictions between the two worldviews.

Likewise, one might think that the *Psalm of Solomon* 17 reflects a degree of historical determinism in the author's ideology. Is this a reason why Wright characterized the messianism apocalyptic?[47] The author of psalm 17 believes that God will raise up the messianic king according to "the time known to you, O God" (v. 21). This may not be a sufficient basis for finding

[47] R. B. Wright, "The Psalms of Solomon," 662, 667 n. p.

determinism in the text, and it is certainly not enough evidence to conclude that the text displays "apocalyptic messianism."

C. Dissident Scribes

While the *Psalms of Solomon* is not an apoclaypse, it reflects a social situation similar to those apparent in some apocalyptic texts. Like the scribes of the *Psalms of Solomon*, the *maskilim* in Daniel were also probably a group of dissident scribes.[48] In Daniel, the nation as a whole is suffering under a foreign ruler. Further, some of the *maskilim* most likely died for their faith (Dan 11:33). At the end of time, when Michael delivers the people and the resurrection occurs, the *maskilim* are vindicated and receive special treatment: "They will shine like the stars" (v. 3). Thus, the authors of Daniel imagined an end to historical crisis in which the problems that they faced found a resolution especially suited for them. Further, as Richard Horsley has recently argued, dissident scribes may be responsible for the Epistle of Enoch (*1 Enoch* 92-104).[49] This text seems to claim that wealthy rulers are oppressing the righteous, perhaps through deceitful business contracts, corrupt courts, and powerful connections to imperial rulers. Under the weight of such suffering, the author encourages the righteous by reminding them that God will punish the powerful, oppressive rulers. The Epistle of Enoch "imagines, somewhat vaguely, a future societal life without sin, without oppression by the wealthy and powerful."[50] The *Psalms of Solomon* displays similar features. Disenfranchised scribes probably produced the text. Like the *maskilim* and the scribes of the Epistle of Enoch, the scribes in the *Psalms of Solomon* envisioned a future in which they regained their positions of influence. They would again enjoy a prominent status when the messiah arrived. Thus, we find texts from scribes with similar social locations, yet they write in very different ways.

---

[48] For a description of the *maskilim*, see Werline, *Penitential Prayer*, 72-74, 85-86.
[49] Horsley, "Social Relations and Social Conflict in the Epistle of Enoch."
[50] Ibid.

VIII. Conclusions

The *Psalms of Solomon* proves a useful text for examining several issues in the ongoing investigations into apocalyptic literature. The text clearly does not fit into the literary category apocalypse, contrary to the vague concepts of earlier scholars. The imprecision and misunderstanding resulted in part from the method of studying apocalyptic literature whereby scholars formulated lists of motifs and characteristics that occurred in apocalypses. These lists, then, were applied to other texts, and when anything on the list appeared in a text, the interpreter called the text apocalyptic. D. S. Russell's work provides an example of this approach, and he includes the *Psalms of Solomon* in his list of apocalyptic texts.[51] As the final section of my essay shows, the *Psalms of Solomon* shares a few motifs with some apocalypses from about the same era. However, there is a difference between sharing a motif and completely adopting apocalyptic ideology. But how does one distinguish between these two possibilities?

Second, studies in apocalypses have tended to reify the category and to make broad sweeping statements about such literature. For example, as I stated above, it is generally assumed that apocalyptic ideology is deterministic and that one would not expect to find deuteronomic thought in an apocalypse. However, examples from apocalypses demonstrate that this assumption is false; apocalypses can be ideologically inconsistent. On the other hand, when a text like the *Psalms of Solomon* exhibits perhaps a hint of determinism, one must not rush to label it ideology apocalyptic.

Third, social location and conflict do not determine genre. Scholars have tended to state that every apocalypse arises from an oppressed group, even though we know that this is not always the case. For example, the Astronomical Book of *1 Enoch* was, by all indications, not born in suffering. Further, those who are oppressed do not always write in the form of apocalypse. The *Psalms of Solomon* testifies to this. The social location of the authors of this text somewhat resembles the social setting of the *maskilim* in

---

[51] D. S. Russell, *The Method and Message of Jewish Apoclayptic: 200 BC-AD 100* (Philadephia: Westminster, 1964), 57-58, 104-139, 233.

Daniel and the scribes of the Epistle of Enoch. The genres of the respective literary products, however, are quite different.

Fourth, scholars have expressed general discomfort in speaking about apoclayptic "groups" and "conventicles," and for good reasons. I agree with Horsley that more investigation needs to be done into the possibility that some protest literature was written by dissident scribes. In this way, we can move away from thinking that every text has a community. Further, the possibility that such texts are the product of scribes may answer why our categories of wisdom and apocalypticism seem to be breaking down. A characteristic of scribes is that they are educated. If so, it seems quite possible that they were familiar with many different kinds of literature, their forms and their ideologies. The problem of categorizing the literature of this era into different genres and ideologies may be the result of very learned scribes capable of employing a number of literary themes, motifs, and forms. They could apparently choose from these literary traditions and adapt them to various circumstances as the situation required.

PAUL'S ANTI-IMPERIAL "DISCOURSE OF THE CROSS": THE CROSS AND POWER IN 1 CORINTHIANS 1 – 4

Demetrius K. Williams
Tulane University, New Orleans

It has been widely recognized since the works of Albert Schweitzer[1] and Ernst Käsemann[2] that Paul is an apocalyptic thinker.[3] As such Paul participates in a current of thought stretching back to the third-century BCE in which Israel, encountering foreign political powers that threatened the sovereignty of God's rule in the lives of the people, sought to make sense of their situation. While it is possible to understand apocalyptic literature and thought as a particular kind of response to historical/political realities (i.e., Daniel 7-12 and Revelation), much of modern scholarship has nevertheless characterized apocalyptic literature and thought in general as "alienated from history"[4] and as "a *religious* outlook which is defined by an *otherworldly* perspective."[5] In addition, it has been proposed that apocalypticists "increasingly abdicated responsibility to the politico-historical order of

---

[1] *Paul and His Interpreters: A Critical History* (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1912 [1911]) and *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle* (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1931 [1930]).

[2] "The Righteous of God in Paul" and "On the Subject of Primitive Christian Apocalyptic," both in *New Testament Questions of Today* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969).

[3] On the whole, scholars have found it helpful to understand Jewish apocalyptic in terms of three categories: (1) apocalypses as a literary genre; (2) apocalyptic eschatology as a religious perspective not confined to apocalypses; and (3) apocalypticism as a socio-religious movement or community that has recourse to apocalyptic eschatology as a way of dealing with social or political alienation. Since Paul wrote no apocalypses and his apocalyptic perspective was not a result of political or social alienation, it is apposite to characterize his thought as *apocalyptic eschatology*. This does not mean, however that Paul was alienated or disengaged from critiquing and challenging social and political realities as we shall suggest below. See Martinus C. de Boer, "Paul and Apocalyptic Eschatology" in John J. Collins, *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism, vol. 1 The Origins of Apocalypticism in Judaism and Christianity* (New York: Continuum, 1998), 347-48. Cf. also Richard E. Sturm, "Defining the Word 'Apocalyptic': A Problem in Biblical Criticism" in Joel Marcus and Marion L. Soards, eds., *Apocalyptic and the New Testament: Essays in Honor of J. Louis Martin* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989).

[4] Richard A. Horsley (*Jesus and the Spiral of Violence: Popular Jewish Resistance in Roman Palestine* [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993], 138) argues against such a view of apocalyptic literature as unconcerned with history.

[5] Werner G. Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament*, rev. English ed., (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1975), 453. [my emphasis]

translating the cosmic vision into terms of the mundane."[6] Since apocalyptic literature and thought has been understood in this way, it has been easy to view them as unconcerned with historical realities. And when apocalyptic literature talks about "this world," it is only in general without any particular reference to historical/political realities. Such views tend to suggest a dichotomy between religion and politics. However, S. R. F. Price in his book, *Rituals and Power,*[7] shows that it is difficult to separate religion from politics. His book, dealing with the emperor cult in Asia Minor, demonstrates that the emperor cult was constituted by a creative union of religion and politics.

In *Rituals and Power* Price makes an insightful comparison between two statements concerning power. He considers the implications of two Greek apophthegms:

> What is a god? Wielding of power (*to kratoun*).
> What is a king? Like a god (*isotheos*).[8]

Concerning these statements, Price sought to discern the relationship of the imperial cult to the religious and the political system of the Roman Empire. Several earlier studies neglected to address the sacred aspect of the king and his political power. Because power is not something that some people have and others lack, power requires more than an adjectival qualification (i.e., "*political* power," "*religious* "power"). This led Price to recognize that power is a network of social relations. Since power is not the intrinsic possession of individuals, it should be viewed in terms of relationships – political, religious, social, personal: "the manifold relations of power which pervade and constitute society."[9] In this view, if power is relational, it does not necessarily depend on force.[10] Moreover, Price cautions us that we must be wary of a Christianizing theory of religion, which assumes that religion is only personal, dealing with personal crises and salvation in distinction from politics. This understanding of religion "obscures the basic similarity between politics and religion: both are ways of systematically constructing power."[11] As Price noted:

---

[6] Paul D. Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic*, 1st ed., (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975), 29. (Cited in Sturm, 35)

[7] *Rituals and Power: The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984). All citations of Price are from Richard A. Horsley, *Paul and Empire: Religion and Power in Roman Imperial Society* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press, 1997).

[8] Price, 64.

[9] Price, 68.

[10] Price, 65-68.

[11] Price, 71.

> The imperial cult stabilized the religious order of the world. The system of ritual was carefully structured; the symbolism evoked a picture of the relationship between the emperor and the gods. The ritual was also structuring; it imposed a definition of the world. The imperial cult, along with politics and diplomacy, constructed the reality of the Roman empire.[12]

Hence, the question of the relationship of the imperial cult to the religious and political system of the Roman empire is answered: the imperial cult was a means of negotiating and constituting power; politics and religion were the modes through which it was expressed.

Turning to Paul's correspondence with his Corinthian community, it is clear that Paul, an apocalyptic thinker, is also concerned with power. In 1 Corinthians 1-4 Paul frames his appeal to the Corinthians regarding their schisms (1:10) by a discussion of power beginning at 1:18 and ending at 4:20:

> For the message (λόγος) about the cross is foolishness to those who are perishing, but to us who are being saved it is the power (δύναμις) of God. (1:18)
>
> For the kingdom of God depends not on talk (λόγος) but on power (δύναμις). (4:20)

As Price has shown in his examination of the relationship between the two Greek apophthegms, considering the implications of Paul's two statements related to power in 1 Corinthians 1-4 might also yield some interesting results for understanding Paul's apocalyptic thought. Moreover, between Paul's bracketing statements regarding power at 1:18 and 4:20 are several other "power expressions" within this discourse: (opening statement) 1:18, "the message about the cross is...the power of God"; 1:23-24, "Christ crucified...is the power and wisdom of God"; 2:4, "demonstration of the Spirit and power"; 2:5, "so that your faith might rest...on the power of God"; 4:19, "I will find out not the talk of these arrogant people but their power"; (closing statement) 4:20, "For the kingdom of God depends not on talk but on power." It is even more evident, then, that Paul is concerned to enter the discourse about power among the Corinthians, and as we shall see within the larger Roman imperial situation.

Thus in the same way that Price reevaluated the emperor cult not only in terms of the relationship of politics and religion but also of power, the prevailing view of apocalyptic may likewise be revised. This newer perspective may have implications for NT studies in general and our understanding of apocalyptic in particular. In fact, in more recent years a few scholars of New Testament and Second Temple Judaism(s) have noticed that

---

[12] Price, 71.

far from being alienated from history and politics, the Judeans (i.e., Jews) are struggling to understand what's going on.[13] They were trying to figure out how they could retain their belief that their God is still sovereign and in charge of history and their lives amidst the forces of earthly ruling powers. This could mean that their apocalyptic literature, as a particular kind of response to historical realties, is very concerned with history (imperial rule and Israel's independence) after all. What might this mean for our understanding of Paul's apocalyptic thought, his gospel, and his apostolic self-understanding?

In addressing these questions I will focus narrowly on 1 Corinthians 1-4, a unified discourse addressing a particular exigency in which Paul makes several "power expressions" ("power of God," "Spirit and power," etc.), although 1 Corinthians as a whole has been recognized as having several apocalyptic features. My concern is not merely with the rhetorical function of Paul's power expressions, although this is an important aspect of my focus. Most important is how Paul envisioned this power as operative in his ministry, his preaching, and in his communities. Paul uses the language of power far more extensively than does any other New Testament writer and he uses it in significant ways.[14] However, the meaning of his power expressions is contextually based. The vital aspects of Paul's power discourse in Corinthians 1-4 are two: the power of which he speaks belongs to God and he speaks concerning it in an apocalyptic framework to address an issue of community strife. In light of Price's proposal, exploring Paul's power language in 1 Corinthians 1-4 with a concept of power as a construction of social relations squares with Paul's own acknowledged aim: to address fractured relations within the Corinthian church (cf. 1:10-17). In view of this, what might we discover if we considered Paul's cross discourse (full of language about *power*) as addressing the Corinthian community *and* the broader context of the culture and values of the Roman imperial society upon which the Corinthians' values were based?

To be sure, Paul's understanding of the cross as a manifestation of God's power challenges the very ideology of Rome's power. Crucifixion was a primary means of maintaining the *pax Romana*. Crucifixion was used by the Romans as a supreme instrument for the punishment and torture of slaves

---

[13] Ernst Käsemann (cf. footnote 2) and Martin Hengel (*Christ and Power* [Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977]) are early witnesses in perceiving politics and religion as a focus for early Christianity. But also Dieter Georgi (*Theocracy in Paul* [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991]), Helmut Koester, "Imperial Ideology and Paul's Eschatology in 1 Thessalonians" in *Paul and Empire* and Richard A. Horsley and others in *Paul and Empire*.

[14] Romano Penna, *Paul the Apostle: Jew and Greek Alike,* vol. 1 (Collegeville, MN: Michael Glazier, 1996), 173. Paul's use of the term δύναμις is far too extensive and unnecessary to reproduce here. Our concern is with the qualified usage of the term in 1 Cor. 1-4.

and criminals and the social control of subject peoples. In essence, its horrors were designed to instill fear in all who resisted Roman rule. According to Martin Hengel:

> In Roman times, crucifixion was practiced above all on dangerous criminals and members of the lowest classes. These were primarily people who had been outlawed from society or slaves who on the whole had no rights, in other words, groups whose development had to be suppressed by all possible means to safe-guard law and order in the state. Because large strata of the population welcomed the security and the world-wide peace which the empire brought with it, the crucified victim was defamed both socially and ethically in popular awareness....[15]

Hengel's statement confirms that the core of the Pauline kerygma (ὁ λόγος ὁ τοῦ σταυροῦ) opposed not only Roman political thinking, but also the whole ethos in ancient Greco-Roman society.[16] But how does the *discourse of the cross* express God's power? To find God's power in a brutal Roman act of torture that in Greco-Roman culture symbolized the ultimate expression of weakness and impotence is *paradoxical*. The cross (i.e., crucifixion of Christ) is the power of God only if it is part of God's apocalyptic plan.

The Crucifixion of Christ as God's Eschatological Plan and Power

Scholars have readily recognized that Paul's apocalyptic eschatology is evident in his understanding of the resurrection of Christ and in those passages that describe a scenario of events that are anticipated at Christ's *parousia* and to the expectation of the *parousia* itself.[17] However, in Paul's discussion of the crucifixion of Christ 1 Corinthians 2:6-10 it is also possible to distinguish several apocalyptic elements. In this passage there can be found the apocalyptic motif of the two ages, God's hidden mystery and the *revelation* of that mystery to God's elect through the Spirit, and the destruction of those powers that are hostile to God's plan.[18] Paul uses these

---

[15] Martin Hengel, *Crucifixion in the Ancient World and the Folly of the Message of* the Cross (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977), 88.

[16] Hengel, *Crucifixion*, 5.

[17] Martinus C. de Boer, "Paul and Apocalyptic Eschatology" in John J. Collins, *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism, vol. 1 The Origins of Apocalypticism in Judaism and Christianity* (New York: Continuum, 1998), 347-49.

[18] Not to mention the language of the passage, which has parallels in apocalyptic texts: *sophia, ho aion houtos, archontes* used of demonic powers, *mysterion apokekrymenos, pneuma* as revealer, *doxa, kyrios tes doxes* and obviously, *apocalypto*. Most of these terms, such as 'wisdom' and 'mystery' and the idea of 'hidden' wisdom, were in common use in antiquity, especially in Jewish wisdom circles, in mystery religions, and in later Gnosticism. Cf. Judith L. Kovacs, "The Archons, the Spirit and the Death of Christ: Do We Need the Hypothesis of Gnostic Opponents to Explain 1 Cor. 2.6-

apocalyptic elements to explicate the crucifixion of Christ, which in turn explains why the cross of Christ is so central to Paul's thought: it is part of God's apocalyptic plan of salvation. It is here also that Paul uses the OT to support his claim that what God had always intended and had foretold in the prophets, he has now accomplished through the crucifixion.[19] Thus 1 Corinthians 2:6-10 is crucial not only to the argument in 1:10-4:21 but to the entire latter in general and Paul's apocalyptic eschatology in particular.

In 2:6 Paul admits that after all he has said to disavow the wisdom of words (2:1-5), he does possess the ability for wisdom speech (σοφίαν δὲ λαλοῦμεν) but it is understood only by the mature (τελείοις). He makes it clear, however, that it is not a wisdom of "this age" (αἰῶνος τούτου). That Paul was familiar the eschatological dualism of the two ages is suggested by his use of the expression "this age."[20] The dualism of the "two ages" is a key feature of apocalyptic eschatology. There is the present ("this") age and the (future) "age to come" both of which are separated temporally, spatially, and cosmically.[21] "The" age to come" puts an end to "this age" and there is no continuity between the two.[22] "This age" is the dispensation and realm of sin, evil, and death, while "the age to come" is the dispensation and the realm of God. The locus of "this age" is the earth, whereas the locus of "the age to come" is heaven.[23] However, while Paul appropriates the language of the "two ages," his apocalyptic eschatology shows that the *power* of "the age to come" has broken into history ("this age"). This is not evident to all but it is God's secret and hidden mystery.

> But we speak God's wisdom in a mystery, secret and hidden ....
> None of the rulers of this age understood this; for if they had, they would not have crucified (ἐσταύρωσαν) the Lord of glory. (2:7-8)

The mystery that has been revealed to Paul, far from dealing with "heavenly visions" or journeys (as in *1 Enoch*, for example), has to do with a historical/political event of the recent past – the crucifixion of the "Lord of Glory." This is a significant aspect of Paul's apocalyptic eschatological understanding of the Christ-event. The mystery of which Paul speaks in 2:7 is

---

16?" in Joel Marcus and Marion L. Soards, eds., *Apocalyptic and the New Testament: Essays in Honor of J. Louis Martin* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989), 218-19.

[19] Gordon D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 68.

[20] Rom. 12:2; 1 Cor. 1:20; 2:6, 8; 3:18; 2 Cor. 4:4; cf. Gal. 1:4 ("the present evil age") = "this world" (1 Cor. 3: 19; 5: 10; 7:31); cf. 4 Ezra 4:2; 8:1. Cf. de Boer, 349.

[21] Philip Vielhauer, "Introduction" to "Apocalypses and Related Subjects," in *New Testament Apocrypha:* Vol. 2, *Writings related to the Apostles; Apocalypses and Related Subjects* (Lousiville: Westminster/John Knox, 1992 [1964]) (Cited in de Boer, 347-48.)

[22] Vielhauer, 550.

[23] de Boer, 348.

none other than the gospel that he proclaims in 1:23-24 – Christ crucified, the wisdom and power of God (cf. 2:1: "When I came to you...announcing the *mystery* of God").[24] The cross may also be "what no eye has seen nor ear heard nor ever entered into the human mind' (v. 9).[25] Thus the cross as God's wisdom and mystery is known only by divine revelation.

It has been recognized in recent years that apocalyptic cannot then be limited to eschatology narrowly understood as predictions of future events. Eschatology as a teaching about "last things" may not be the central concern or topic of an apocalypse. The main feature of apocalypses, it has been argued, is its interest in the revelation of heavenly or divine mysteries.[26] Paul employs the term "revelation" (ἀποκάλυψις) in several passages for his eschatological understanding of Jesus Christ (Gal. 1:2; 1 Cor. 1:7). He will use the noun and the cognate verb (ἀποκαλύπτω) in connection with the communication of divine mysteries that are mediated or induced by the Spirit (1 Cor. 14:26; 1 Cor. 2:10; 14:6, 30; 2 Cor. 12:1, 7; Phil. 3:15; Gal. 2:2).[27] "For Paul "the term πνεῦμα [spirit] is understood in apocalyptic fashion....The Spirit is the divine eschatological gift which has been poured out among the elect at the last times."[28] It is through the Spirit that the cross of Christ is revealed and understood as the eschatological activity of God. This is the wisdom of God that has surpassed the wisdom of the world. Such wisdom provides a new way of viewing the world. J. Louis Martyn has argued that in apocalyptic God grants to the elect a true perception of the present in light of a wondrous transformation in the near future.[29] Just as there is the dualism of the two ages, there are also two ways of knowing. What separates the two ways of knowing is the turn of the ages - the eschatological event of Christ's death/resurrection.[30] Thus there is a wisdom that is characteristic of the old age (σοφίαν του κόσμου), and a way of knowing that is proper to the new age or to that point at which the ages meet (σοφία

---

[24] Raymond E. Brown, *The Semitic Background of the Term "Mystery" in the New Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968), 49.

[25] Kovacs, 221-22.

[26] Christopher Rowland, (*The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity* [New York: Crossroad, 1982]) has argued that the term "apocalyptic" ought to be used only in connection with what is distinctive about apocalypses, namely, their interest in the revelation of "divine mysteries" (1-3, 29-37, 70-72). Rowland also makes a significant contribution in his insistence that apocalyptic is not only concerned with future events (2). (Cited in de Boer, 352.)

[27] de Boers, Apoc, 355-56.

[28] Birger A. Pearson, *The Pneumatikos - Psychikos Terminology in 1 Corinthians* (Missoula, MT: Society of Biblical Literature, 1973), 41.

[29] J. Louis Martyn, "Apocalyptic Antinomies in Paul' s Letter to the Galatians," *NTS* 31 (1985), 420-21.

[30] J. Louis Martyn, "Epistemology at the Turn of the Ages: 2 Corinthians 5.16," W.R. Farmer, C. F. D. Moule, R. R. Niebuhr (eds.), *Christian History and Interpretation: Studies Presented to John Knox* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1961), 273-74.

τοῦ θεοῦ = ὁ λόγος τοῦ σταυροῦ).[31] Paul's apocalyptic eschatology centers on a past eschatological event (the crucifixion/resurrection of Jesus Christ) which precedes the future event (the "coming," *parousia* of Christ). Paul's focus on the past Christ-event makes a significant modification of Jewish apocalyptic eschatology.

This wisdom was hidden from the "rulers of this age" (ἀρχόντων τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου) who are being destroyed (καταργουμένων, v. 6), otherwise they would not have crucified the "Lord of glory" (v. 8). Several interpreters suggest that the phrase "the rulers of this age" refers to the cosmological principalities and powers (Rom. 8:38; 1 Corinthians 15:24) and to Paul's personification of Sin and Death as oppressive cosmic powers that rule over human existence (Rom. 5:12, 21; 1 Cor. 15:26, 56).[32] This cosmological background in earlier scholarship indicated gnostic themes and motifs.[33] Much this confusion has been due to reading the theology of the Deutero-Pauline letters (Colossian and Ephesians) into Paul's uncontested letters. But Niel Elliot has argued recently that a narrowly spiritual interpretation of the "powers" obscures the historical/political implications of the crucifixion.

> It is precisely Paul's own insistence that the Powers remain unconquered until "the end," when they meet their decisive defeat at God's hands, that resists any narrowly spiritual interpretation of the Powers. Paul interprets Jesus' death as the beginning of God's final "war of liberation" against all the Powers that hold creation in thrall through the instruments of earthly oppression....Paul has not obscured the nature of the cross as historical and political oppression; rather he has focused it through the lens of Jewish apocalypticism.[34]

Thus the hidden plan (God's wisdom and mystery) is about history after all. The crucifixion/resurrection of Jesus is the beginning of the destruction and dissolution of cosmic and earthly "rulers and powers." This realization is mediated or revealed through the Spirit. It is through the Spirit that a true perception of God's will and plan for humankind is realized. As we have already observed, this is one of the important functions of apocalyptic: to reveal God's plan to his elect. If the cross is a revelation and also an act of God's power, the spirit then is not only an agent of revelation but also a new

---

[31] Although Martyn is speaking of 1 Cor. 5:16, his conclusion is insightful also for 1 Cor. 2:6-10. He concludes that the opposite of knowing *kata sarka* is not knowing *kata pneuma* but rather knowing *kata stauron*. "Epistemology," 285.

[32] Walter Wink, *Naming the Powers* (Philadelpha: Fortress Press, 1984), 13-35.

[33] Especially Rudolf Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament* (New York: Scribner's, 1951), vol. 1, 175. Pearson challenges this view (*Pneumatikos-Psychikos*).

[34] Neil Elliot, "The Anti-Imperial Message of the Cross," in Horsley, *Paul and Empire*, 180-81, 183.

power in history (cf. 2.4-5) that opposes the "rulers this age" (1 Cor. 2.6, 8).[35] The very concern of apocalypticists was the realization of God's Justice in a world teaming with evil powers.[36] This realization comes through the Spirit of God. The apocalyptic traditions of the Second Temple era of Judaism place high emphasis on the manifestation of the Spirit as evidence of God's presence and wisdom in the last days. In apocalyptic eschatology the Spirit does more than disclose wisdom, however, it also proclaims a *new creation* claiming human beings for an eschatological existence in that new creation.[37] This aspect of a new creation is part of Paul's discourse of the cross, the apocalyptic wisdom and power of God.[38]

The Discourse of the Cross as the "Power of God"

In Paul's opening argument in chapter one, Paul makes two important points: his main point is made in 1:18-25 where he reevaluates *logos* and *sophia* from the apocalyptic perspective of the cross and, secondly, his confirmation of this point in 1:26-31 by an appeal to the Corinthians' own social situation.[39] His message and their call are the results of the "power of God." Paul's concern is to show that "the logos of the cross" radically challenges all human notions of wisdom, status, and power. Paul shows this in v. 18 where he offers a dramatic contrast: "The *logos* of the cross is foolishness to those who are perishing, but for us who are being saved it is the power of God." Paul's choice of opposites is certainly surprising, given the respective values of Greco-Roman and Jewish society. It is more than his juxtaposing of foolishness with power that is intriguing, but the attribution of power to what is recognized as the symbol of ultimate weakness and humiliation, the cross. "A crucified messiah was an oxymoron, a contradiction in terms."[40] How can this manifest the power of God? The concept of God's power is well attested in the Bible where God's power is known preeminently in victory over the enemies of Israel.[41] God's power is

[35] Kovacs, 228.

[36] Elliot, 182.

[37] Alexandra Brown, *The Cross and Human Transformation: Paul's Apocalyptic Word of the Cross in 1 Corinthians* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995), 61-62. [my emphasis].

[38] E. Elizabeth Johnson, "The Wisdom of God as Apocalyptic Power," in *Faith and History: Essays in Honor of Paul W. Meyer*, John T. Carroll et al (eds.) (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990).

[39] Victor Paul Furnish, "Theology in 1 Corinthians" in David M. Hay, ed., *Pauline Theology: Volume II: 1 & 2 Corinthians* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 65.

[40] Ben Witherington III, *Conflict and Community in Corinth: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1995), 109.

[41] Deut 3:24; Josh 4:24; Jer 16:21; Ps 21:2, 14; 46:2; 59:17.

also manifested in his salvific presence.[42] This certainly supplies a conceptual framework for Paul's understanding of God's power. But what is the nature of God's power when both Christ crucified and the proclamation of the gospel manifest the "power of God"?

Several interpreters have suspected that behind this phrase is a sure reference to the resurrection, and for good reason: in several passages in Paul and other New Testament writers the power of God and Christ's resurrection are usually coupled (Rom. 1:14; Phil. 3:10-11; cf. Acts 13:33). But there is a problem in the context of 1 Corinthian 1-4. Romano Penna rightly ponders: "How is it that in a section so theologically complex and rich there is not the least explicit linkage to the resurrection of Christ, but only to his crucifixion?"[43] Likewise, J. Christiaan Beker observes:

> [I]n 1 Corinthians 1 and 2, the resurrection of Christ could have assisted Paul in clarifying the cross as "God's power" (1 Cor. 1:24) and his own preaching as "the power of God and the demonstration of the Spirit" (2:1-5). In short, why is the resurrection as part of "the things of first importance" (*en protois*, 15:3) not the theme or a theme of chapters 1 and 2 as well, and why are these "things of first importance" - which include the death of Christ - interpreted in chapter 15 solely in terms of the resurrection and not in terms of Christ's death?[44]

Penna concludes that the expression, "power of God," applied to Christ is essentially a reference to the resurrection, and that when applied to the "word of the Cross" it is equating the paschal intervention of God with God's action when the kerygma takes place.[45] Beker has a much more difficult time proposing an answer to his own question. He simply concludes: "the interaction between coherent core and contingency is a definite problem in 1 Corinthians."[46]

Both phrases in 1 Cor 1:18 and 24, "the logos of the cross" and "Christ, the power of God and wisdom of God," have caused interpretive difficulties for some exegetes. The reason is that it is immediately assumed that the "power of God" must refer to the resurrection, although there is no mention of it at all in the context. What may offer some light is the way that Paul uses his source, the prophet Isaiah, in v. 19 and works out the meaning

---

[42] Exod 9:16; Neh 1:10; Sir 15;18-19; 42:18-21.

[43] Penna, *Jew and Greek*, 70.

[44] J. Christiaan Beker, *Paul the Apostle: The Triumph of God in the Life and Thought of God* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980), 175.

[45] Penna, *Jew and Greek*, 70; Penna follows the suggestion of K. Muller, "1 Kor. 1,18-25. Die eschatologisch-kritische Funktion der VerkUndigung des Kreuzes," BZ (NF) 10 (1966) 246-272 and L. A. Rood, "Le Christ comme *DUNAMIS THEOOU*," in *Littérature et thélogie pauliniennes, Recherches bibliques* V (Bruges, 1960) 93-108.

[46] Beker, 175.

of the passage in the following verses (vv. 20-25).[47] Paul's quotation of Isaiah 29:14 at v. 19 appears essentially as it does in the LXX (Septuagint), but his use of the quote echoes the larger context in Isaiah chapter 29. After exposing the arrogance of Israel (Isa. 29:16), Isaiah describes a new day (29:18-24): "In that day the deaf shall hear the words of a book, and out of their gloom and darkness the eyes of the blind shall see....And those who err in spirit will come to understanding; and those who murmur will accept instruction." Isaiah describes the creation of a new day, a new era of God's power and presence. Paul also uses the Isaiah text to express God's *creative* power. What Paul shows by his appropriation of the text is that there is now a "turning of the ages"[48]: "Has not God made foolish the wisdom of the world...through the foolishness of our proclamation [of Christ crucified]?" (v. 20). The "*logos* of the cross" expresses the creative power of God, as does the "word of the Lord" for Isaiah (Isa. 55:11) and Jeremiah (cf. 10:12). The Stoics also viewed *logos* as an active creative power.[49] Thus Alexandra Brown states:

> For Paul, as for Isaiah before him [Isa 43:19], *God's power to create* anew dislocates and supercedes the traditions of the wise. Unlike Isaiah, Paul uses the past tense to indicate that this power has been exercised definitively in the past (i.e., in the cross event).[50]

John White concurs:

> Several images in Romans indicate that *God's power* to make things right issues from *God's providential power as creator*. For example, Paul shows by means of God's creative activity in Abraham and Christ (see [Rom.] 3:21-4:25) that God was begetting whole peoples.[51]

But where in our text is the connection between God's power and activity of creating "whole peoples?" The connection is at v. 24 (and 26-30) where Paul says, "to those of us who are *called*, Christ is the power of God and the wisdom of God." The paradox of the logos of the cross is that through it's proclamation, God's power manifests itself by the creation of a new entity, "the called."[52] Turning again to Romans, Paul in 9:22-26 discusses God's election and call - he says:

---

[47] Cf. Brown, 81-94.

[48] Martyn, "Epistemology,"

[49] Kittle, *TDNT* 5 (1967): 84-85. (Cited in Brown)

[50] Brown, 83; [my emphasis].

[51] John White, *The Apostle of God: Paul and the Promise of Abraham* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1999), 151.

[52] Brown, 86.

> What if God, desiring to...*make known his power*...has done so in order to make known the riches of his glory...which he has prepared beforehand for glory – including *us whom he has called*, not from the Jews alone but also from the Gentiles?

Here we find God's power linked to God's call and creation of a new people. Thus the result of the proclamation of the cross is the creation of a new community, a new people of God, and *a new system of relations*. So that the ultimate expression of God's power, in view of the gospel he preaches, is the creation and social-religious constitution of a particular kind of community – the eschatological assembly (*ekklesia*) of Christ. One of Paul's earliest interpreters recognized the creative community-forming aspect of the cross[53]: "He [Christ] is our peace; in his flesh he has made both groups one [Jew and Gentile]...that he might *create* for himself *one humanity...through the cross*" (Eph. 2:14-16). In this way, it is possible that "the *logos* of the cross" and "Christ crucified" express "the power of God" – God's creative power of forming a new social-religious entity, the eschatological *ekklesia* of Christ.

The Cross and the Corinthian's Calling

Paul supports his argument by reminding the Corinthians that God's foolish wisdom and power has been demonstrated in their own experience (1:26-31; cf Gal. 3:1-5). He wants to show that God's power is apparent among them through its effects.[54] They accepted the gospel not based on human wisdom, power, or status (v. 26), but they responded to God's call. This is emphasized in Paul's threefold use of "God chose" (vv. 27-28), and again in the statement that their being "in Christ Jesus" derives entirely from God.[55] And in order that God's power might be recognized, God chose the foolish, the weak, the low, and despised to implement his purpose. The language of vv. 27-28 also evokes images of creation,[56] God's creation of a new community. We turn again to Romans:

> "I will call them 'my people' who are not my people; and I will call her 'my loved one' who is not my loved one, and It will happen that in the very place where it was said to them, "You are not my people,' they will be called 'sons of the living God.'" (Rom. 9:25-26)

---

[53] Cf. Romano Penna, *Paul the Apostle: Wisdom and Folly of the Cross*, vol. 2 (Collegeville, MN: Michael Glazier, 1996), 46.

[54] Barry Barnes, *The Nature of Power* (Cambridge, England: Polity Press, 1988), iv.

[55] Victor Paul Furnish, "Theology in 1 Corinthians" in David M. Hay, ed., *Pauline Theology: Volume II: 1 & 2 Corinthians* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 65.

[56] Brown, 93.

The language of God's calling a people who were formerly not a people is reflected in 1 Corinthians 1:27-28: "God chose...the things that are not, to reduce to nothing things that are." Could this also be Paul's way of saying that the current values they hold have no more validity in their life: "Consider your own call: not many of you were wise by human standards, not many were powerful, no many were of noble birth. But God chose what is foolish to shame the wise." Theissen perceives social categories in Paul's description in 1 Cor 1:26-29, but Paul's language makes it clear that some were claiming to have attained a certain spiritual aristocratic status.[57] The reversal of status was brought about by divine election, so too the reversal of traditional values becomes the basis of the founding of communities of the new age.[58]

The Spirit and Power (of God)

In 2:1-5 Paul elaborates upon the theme began in 1:17, namely, his unconventional mode of proclamation. The content and style of Paul's preaching did not conform to traditional rhetorical standards of wise speech. He proclaimed "Jesus Christ and him crucified," the mystery of God, that was not proclaimed in "lofty words of wisdom" (ὑπεροχὴν λόγου ἢ σοφίας). His style of delivery was also unconventional: it was "in weakness, fear and much trembling" (2:3). In vv. 4-5 Paul reiterates what he said in 2:1-3 with the addition of three important elements. His proclamation was not in "the persuasive (πειθοῖς) words of wisdom, but in the demonstration (ἀποδείξει) of the spirit and power (δύναμις), so that [the Corinthians] faith (πίστις) would not rest in human wisdom but in the wisdom of God." Paul did not proclaim the message of the cross with persuasive words and human wisdom like the influential and eloquent orators of his day. If the gospel depended on individual ability to engender faith (πίστις), it would rest in human power and not the power of God. Therefore, Paul presents himself as a herald because the herald is not responsible for the content or the persuasiveness of the message he carries. The herald simply announces the message of another. A herald of the gospel proclaims the message of the cross faithfully, regardless of its incompatibility with human wisdom.

It appears that here Paul enters the language world of the Corinthians and seeks to redefine and reevaluate their language based on the apocalyptic word of the cross, which discloses the power of God.[59] In this way, Paul may

[57] Horsley, *1 Corinthians*, 32; Gerd Theissen, *The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982), 70-73.

[58] Helmut Koester, "Jesus the Victim," *JBL* 3.1 (1992): 3-15; 14-15.

[59] "Funk suggests that Paul enters the Corinthian's language context." Horsley, Wisdom of Word, 238; citing Robert Funk, "Word and Word in 1 Corinthians 2:1-16," in *Language, Hermeneutic and Word of God* (New York: Harper, 1966), 284-87.

not reject rhetoric as such, but he does reject the cultural values wedded to it.[60] Paul also rejects *logos* in connection with *sophia*[61] but not in connection with the cross, which functions to convey the power of God through the apparent weakness of gospel. The well-structured Greek phrase in 1:18, ὁ λόγος ὁ τοῦ σταυροῦ, is not a typical formulation for Paul as a description of his preaching. He constructs the phrase in this way because he wants to emphasize that he too has a *logos*, but the content is the cross, God's *sophia.* This refers back to v. 17 where Paul says that Christ sent him to preach the gospel "not with eloquent wisdom (ἐν σοφίᾳ λόγου), so that the cross of Christ might not be emptied of its power." But this does not mean that there was a theological problem in Corinth,[62] which called forth his particular discourse on the cross. It is most likely a power struggle, not a theological controversy that calls for Paul's cross discourse. Corinth had a history of factional disputes and the origins of the Corinthian party slogans have a history in the political life of the city-states.[63] The situation in the church at Corinth closely resembles the political conflicts within Greco-Roman city-states described by ancient historians. Paul's advice in 1 Corinthians 1-4 has much in common with speeches on concord by ancient politicians and rhetoricians.[64] Therefore Paul turns the opponent's language back on them redefining it in apocalyptic fashion (esp. 2:1-6).[65] It turns out in the end that the Spirit and power (of God) belong to and is manifested through the foolish

---

[60] Stephen M. Pogoloff, *Logos and Sophia: The Rhetorical Situation of 1 Corinthians* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 121.

[61] Horsley, "Wisdom of Word and Words of Wisdom," *CBQ* 39 (1977): 224-239, 230; (cf. 1:17; 2:1, 4, 13; 4:19-20).

[62] Several interpreters hold this suggestion. See Gordon D. Fee ("Toward a Theology of 1 Corinthians" in David M. Hay, ed., *Pauline Theology: Volume II: 1 & 2 Corinthians* [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993], 38) who states: "The primary issue is a false theology which was informed by popular philosophy tainted with Hellenistic dualism, resulting in a "spirituality" and "higher wisdom" that were generally divorced from ethical behavior." Rather than correcting theological errors among the Corinthians, however, Paul actually assumes a basic agreement on theological matters and uses this fact to defend support claims. Cf. Duane Litfin, *St Paul's Theology of Proclamation: 1 Corinthians 1-4 and Greco-Roman Rhetoric* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 172.

[63] L. L. Welborn, *Politics and Rhetoric in the Corinthian Epistle* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1997), 8, 41: "From the bloody revolution of Cypselus (Herodotus 5.92) to their role in initiating the Peloponnesian War, to the contemptuous act that sparked the revolt of the Achaean League (Strabo *Geogr* 8.6.23). Politics remained a concern of the Corinthians under the empire, though the game was played for lesser stakes."

[64] Welborn, 7-8. He contends that Paul's goal in 1 Corinthians 1-4 is not the refutation of heresy, but what Plutarch (*Mor* 824 C-E) describes as the object of the art of politics as the prevention of [*stasis*].

[65] Pearson, 41.

and weak *logos* of the cross, and not to the "lofty words (*logoi*) of wisdom (*sophia*)," or to those who claim to possess "spirit."

The Kingdom of God and Power

In 4:18-20 Paul contrasts the present situation of the Corinthians with that of the kingdom of God. He has come full-circle from his opening argument in 1:18, for in vv. 18-20 he compares again λόγος and δύναμις:

> But some of you...have become arrogant. But I will come to you soon...and find out not the talk (τὸν λόγον) of these arrogant people but their power (δύναμιν). For the kingdom of God depends not on talk (ἐν λόγῳ) but on power (ἐν δυνάμει).

"The kingdom of God" is well-attested in biblical, apocalyptic, and New Testament literature (especially in the Gospels as the theme of Jesus' preaching) but only rarely does Paul use the term (1 Cor 6:9, 10; 15:24, 50; Rom 14:17;Gal 5:21; cf. 1 Thess 2:12). It is not uncommon for Paul to use the expression, "the kingdom of God," in practical exhortation, especially to compare current problems in his communities with the ultimate goals of his communities. In 1 Corinthians 6:9 Paul discourages litigation in pagan courts by saying, "...wrongdoers will not inherit the kingdom of God." At 1 Corinthians 15:50 in a discussion on the resurrection Paul states: "...flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God." Finally, in Romans 14:17 where he discusses problems in communal relations concerning meat, drink, and observing days, he says: "...the kingdom of God is not food and drink but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit" This indicates further that Paul uses apocalyptic language in 1 Corinthians for the purpose of practical exhortation.

So in 1 Corinthians 4:20, Paul ends his exhortation with a discussion of power. While in 1:18 he associates *logos* with the power of God, he rejects *logos* to the power of God in 4:20.[66] The reason is that the *logos* in 4:20 is not qualified by the cross, for it is the *logos* of the cross that is the power of God – the future power of God's kingdom realized in the present. In the apocalyptic eschatology the coming of the kingdom of God is the ultimate manifestation of God's power. That the kingdom of God is in power and not in word, then, provides a further hermeneutical key to Paul's disavowal of reliance upon rhetorical technique in order to convey his message (2:1-5).[67]

---

[66] Horsley, "Wisdom of Word," 237.

[67] Raymond F. Collins, *First Corinthians* (Collegeville, MN: Michael Glazier, 1999), 101-102; Conzelmann (*1 Corinthians*, 93) concurs: "He grounds the (proposed) measures in the nature of the kingdom of God. The power in virtue of which he will put them to the test is no other than the power indicated in 2:1ff."

But even more importantly, the cross provides a new pattern of social relations. Thus a proper understanding of the *logos* of the cross does not generate community strife (cf. 1:13: "Has Christ been divided? Was Paul crucified for you?"), but genuine unity and cooperation. "While he articulates only vague images of he concrete shape of the future life he anticipated in the 'kingdom of God' following the *parousia*, Paul does indicate at several points how *social relations* in his assemblies should be conducted. And although in his practice Paul may not have lived up to his ideal principles, the latter represent an opposition to and breakthrough of the dominant patterns of *social relations* in imperial society."[68]

The Discourse of the Cross as Anti-Imperial

The discourse of the cross as a part of God's apocalyptic scheme is anti-imperial. Paul's apocalyptic perspective often sharpens the cutting-edge of his cross discourse. To be sure, *stauros* terminology is prevalent in 1 Corinthians 1-4.[69] Thus the very terminology and topic of Paul's preaching is anti-Roman: he preaches about the "power" of the cross of Jesus Christ.[70] For this reason, Paul's discourse (λόγος) of the cross (σταυρός) is highly polemical (in both a Jewish and Gentile context for that matter).[71] But Paul's polemical "discourse of the cross" has been examined primarily in terms of Paul's stance against the Judaism and the law (Galatians) and Gentile religious enthusiasm (1 Corinthians). This means it has been interpreted as a challenge primarily to culturally religious prerogatives. To be certain, Paul had grander designs in mind when he came preaching in Corinth, "determined to know nothing among [them] except Jesus Christ and him crucified" (1 Cor. 2:2). He envisioned the creation of a new people of God, both Jew and Gentile, a new "political" entity (*ekklesia* has highly political overtones[72]).

---

[68] Horsley, *Paul and Empire*, 212. [my emphasis]

[69] Brown, 24, states: "A survey of cross *(stauros)* terminology in Paul's seven undisputed letters reveals that he often places the cross in an apocalyptic frame of reference. While it is more concentrated in [1 Corinthians] than in others, the apocalyptic and perceptual context of *stauros* terminology in 1 Corinthians is consistent with what we find in other letters." Also J. Christiaan Beker, *Paul the Apostle: The Triumph of God in the Life and Thought of God* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980), 135: "The coherent center of Paul's gospel is constituted by the apocalyptic interpretation of the Christ-event."

[70] "Surely the most blatantly anti-Roman imperial aspect of his gospel was its focus on the crucified Christ." Horsley, *Paul and Empire*, 141.

[71] Cf. Ernst Käsemann, *Perspectives on Paul* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971), 36; Hengel, *Crucifixion.*; and Demetrius K. Williams, "The Terminology of the Cross and the Rhetoric of Paul" in *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers 1998* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998).

[72] Georgi, *Theocracy*, 57: "Paul understands the local congregation literally as an assembly of people (*ekklesia*). This word does not appear as a technical term in the Greek of the Jewish Bible or of the Jewish community; neither is it typically religious. It was very

This means that his gospel of the cross was set over against the gospel of the Roman imperial system.[73] Paul's apocalyptic *logos* of the cross represented the "power of God for those who are being saved," a *sophia* (*en mysterio*) that was hidden from "the rulers of this age" (2:8), who were unaware that "the present time has grown short" (7:29) and that God would soon destroy "every ruler and every authority and every power" (15:24). To this end, Paul's "word" or "discourse" of the cross was an *anti-imperial* apocalyptic message.

It is through an apocalyptic perspective that Paul, like other Jews in the Second Temple period, sought to make sense of current historical situations and to respond to them.[74] Through apocalyptic thought Paul could draw upon the myth of holy war, in which God was viewed as a victorious king and sole ruler over the chaos of the "last days."[75] Already in Paul's earliest letter, 1 Thessalonians 4:16ff, Christ is depicted as a "general who descends with military authority ... reminiscent of the early image of Octavian as a military champion."[76] The motif of the holy war was a useful weapon for criticism of earthly powers, whereby through mythological language the apocalypticist could challenge notions of earthly power and authority, exposing oppressive kings and other rulers as pawns of cosmic evil powers in earthly affairs.[77] "In placing the then-current situation in historical perspective the apocalyptic imagination thus also involved a *critical demystifying* of the pretensions and practices of the established order. Emperors were not divine, and high priests were not sacrosanct. Indeed, far from being sacred or 'ordained by God,' the established order was permeated with demonic forces."[78]

The Roman world with its emperor cult had its eschatology and apocalyptic too, and it is most likely Paul's confrontation with the eschatology of Rome that helped also to shape his message about Jesus. The prophet/poets of the Roman imperial system had visions of Rome becoming a dominant world power.[79] And as Price has shown, this power was

---

familiar, however, in the local political life of the Hellenistic city. Paul chose it to indicate that the assembly of those who followed Jesus, the assembly called together in a particular city in the name of the biblical God, was in competition with the local political assembly of the citizenry, the official *ekklesia*."

[73] Cf. Helmut Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels: Their History and Development* (London: SCM Press; Philadelphia: Trinity Press, 1990), 3-4.

[74] Horsley, *Spiral,* 139.

[75] Georgi, *Theocracy*, 9; cf. 1 Thess 5:8 where Paul employs the Near Eastern myth of a primordial battle between the gods. God is the champion in the holy war. Ibid., 27.

[76] White, 135.

[77] Georgi, *Theocracy*, 8.

[78] Horsley, *Spiral*, 144.

[79] Koester, "Jesus the Victim," 10-13 and Dieter Georgi, "Who is the True Prophet," *HTR* 79:1-3 (1986): 100-126; 124.

expressed through a combination of politics and religion. As a result "[t]he period [of the *princeps*] was one of increasing political centralization, and there was a great emphasis on the ideology of Caesar's authority and power."[80] Even ancient authors, such as Polybius and Plutarch, recognized the role of religion in strengthening the Roman social order.[81] The power of Rome was an unavoidable fact in the first century CE. Images, temples, and celebrations in the cities of the East honoring the emperor, the very image of Rome's might, emphasized the power of the empire. Wherever one traveled one could identify with the total package of Augustus's program of cultural renewal.[82] And it is not surprising that Paul would cast certain aspects of his image of Christ from the imprint of the Roman world.

> Although Paul was born, was reared, and spent all but the end of his life in the Greek-speaking East, his picture of Christ as ruler is more like the image of Augustus than like Greek or Jewish kings. Why? There appear to be at least two reasons. First, the cult of the Roman emperor was so universal, and it was represented in such a uniform way throughout the eastern provinces, that it was the primary model of universal rule for Paul. Second, there are enough similarities between Rome and Judaism, in their common hesitation to glorify mortals as gods, that Paul found the image of Augustus as religious and moral exemplar more or less compatible with his Jewish sensibilities and his idea of Christ....Paul's idea of universal rule was probably formed in response to specific imperial images found in the cities where he lived....[83]

Paul's image of Christ as one who rules on God's behalf may have its parallel in Augustus, who was an adopted and divinized son with absolute political authority to rule.[84] The vision of Augustus and his supporters was to bring about a world of unequaled peace, prosperity, and justice – a true "Golden Age." Octavian's act of relinquishing his authority to the senate (a "kenosis," if you will or "emptying of self" and will to power; cf. Phil 2:7) was an act than won him unparalleled favor and a new title "Augustus."[85] He was the "first among equals" (*princeps*), the one who brought about the end of Civil War and the beginning of a period of proverbial peace. But, "the Roman theology of peace...is intimately associated with the restoration of legal authority and power.[86] For Paul, however, by contrast Christ through his

---

[80] Georgi, *Theocracy*, 102.

[81] L. L. Welborn, *Politics and Rhetoric in the Corinthian Epistles* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1997), 35; (Polybius 6,56; 16.12.9-10; Plutarch *Mor* 822b; as well as Diodorus 1.2.2; Cicero *Rep* 2.2.4; *Leg* 2.7.15-16; Pliny NH 2.26).

[82] Paul Zanker, "The Power of Images," in Horsley, *Paul and Empire*, 86.

[83] White, 110.

[84] White, 171.

[85] Galinsky, *Augustan Culture: An Interpretive Introduction* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996), 312-22.

[86] Georgi, *Theocracy*, 101.

death on a Roman cross brings an end to the *abuse* of power and *false claims* of peace. Jesus is a truer and better representative of what the *princeps* claimed to be. Paul conceives Jesus Christ as the true "first among equals" because by his death he establishes a new way of relating in the world – not as a model of hierarchical domination, but rather as a model of horizontal human relationships (Gal. 3:28). There was no longer a need for hierarchical social relationships that created a culture of competition[87] because the example of Christ shows that such social structuring, upon which Greco-Roman culture was based, was no longer necessary. For Paul, the cross of Christ cancels competition and creates the blueprint for authentic community (cf. Phil 2:1-11).[88]

Paul's letters further bear out the fact that he was preaching an anti-imperial gospel. The language in several of his letters borrowed from and opposed images and concepts of the Roman imperial cult and ideology.[89] Dieter Georgi has shown that

> every page of the letter [to the Romans] contains indications that Paul has very concrete and critical objections to the dominant political theology of the Roman Empire under the principate. By using such loaded terms as *evangelion*, *pistis*, *dikaiosyne*, and *eirene* as central concepts in Romans, he evokes their associations to Roman political theology. Monuments of this theology were familiar to his contemporaries throughout the Empire, both east and west.... All attempts to derive the Pauline use of *evangelion* (gospel) from the Septuagint have failed.[90]

Paul's appropriation of the language of royal succession in Romans 1:3-4 shows that he is making more than a religious claim. Paul appropriates this traditional formula to offer a challenge to Rome's idea of rulership. He offers an alternative to the Roman social ideology, "with its promise of universal reconciliation and peace as the prerequisite for undreamed-of achievements resulting in unimagined prosperity."[91] The Roman savior brought the world peace. He also attempted to establish an order of fairness and equity. This was the basis of the "good news" (εὐαγγέλιον) of "the Augustan Age," whose message of universal salvation was hailed throughout the empire.[92] But Paul had other ideas. He appears to include the Jewish origins of Jesus in a letter to the Romans to show that God's plans for humankind runs through Israel, not

---

[87] Dieter Georgi, *Opponents of Paul in Second Corinthians* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986), 406-407.

[88] Beker, 326.

[89] Horsley, *Paul and Politics*,140.

[90] Gerogi, *Theocracy,* 83.

[91] Georgi, *Theocracy*, 86-87.

[92] Georgi, *Theocracy*, 83.

Rome.[93] In his letter to the Thessalonians Paul challenges head-on the Roman proclamation of "peace and security."[94] Paul says: "When they say, 'there is peace and security', then sudden destruction will come upon them...and there will be no escape." While apocalyptic judgment will come suddenly upon those who hold false illusions about peace, the phrase "peace and security" does not originate in apocalyptic traditions.[95] But it emerges from Roman political propaganda[96] and as such, it shows that Paul is not disengaged from the political realities of his day. "If this interpretation is correct, it would imply that Paul points to the coming of the day of the Lord as an event that will shatter the false peace and security of the Roman establishment. Of course, such a view is entirely in keeping with older Jewish and later Christian apocalyptic protest against imperial establishments."[97]

Although Paul does not make explicit references to the emperor's public image, it is this very public image that he applies to Christ. In the Christ-hymn of Philippians 2:6-11 Paul ascribes to Christ the Roman imperial title to Caesar, "Lord," before whom every knee will bow and tongue confess. "The image of universal prostration required of subjects underscores [Christ's] role as imperial ruler."[98] He is not the ruler of Rome, however, but of God's kingdom (βασιλεία). In Philippians 3:20-21 Jesus Christ is the savior (σωτήρ) of the Christian government (πολίτευμα). While Paul says it is a "heavenly polity," the Philippian church is encouraged to "exercise their government" (πολιτεύομαι) in the present, in a manner worthy of the gospel (1:27-30). In Philippi, having long been established as a Roman colony for army veterans, the terms Paul employs to describe Christ and the constitution of the Christian community evoke highly political overtones. They were to remain faithful to the gospel, even in the face of persecution on account of the current imperial situation. Christ would soon

---

[93] Georgi, *Theocracy*, 86.

[94] Helmut Koester, "Imperial Ideology," 162.

[95] Koester, "Imperial Ideology," 162; "[I]t is difficult to place the slogan "peace and security" (*eirene kai asphaleia*) into the context of apocalyptic language. Because parallels in apocalyptic writings are lacking, one usually points to Jer. 6:14: *legenotes eirene: kai pou estin eirene*; and assumes that Paul has replaced the second *eirene* with the synonym *asphaleia*. But nothing else in this context points to a use of Jer. 6:14 or similar prophetic passages. Moreover, this LXX never uses *asphaleia* as an equivalent for Hebrew *slm*. The reference to traditional apocalyptic materials is thus interrupted by Paul with the phrase *hotan legosin...tote...* in order to introduce the slogan *eirene kai asphaleia*."

[96] Koester, "Imperial Ideology," 161-62; "It is unlikely that Paul has coined the slogan. The first two terms, *eirene*, is never used by Paul for the description of a false illusion of peace. The second term, *aspaleia*, never occurs again in the entire Pauline corpus....It is a political term. As a political slogan, *eirene kai aspahaleia* = *pax et securitas* is best ascribed to the realm of imperial Roman propaganda."

[97] Koester, "Imperial Ideology," 162, notes that this was suggested by E. Bammel, "Ein Beitrag zur paulinishen Staatsanschauung," *TLZ* 85 (1960): 837.

[98] White, 189.

return and "transform the body of our humiliation that it may be conformed to the body of his glory, by the power that also enable him to make all things subject to himself" (3:21).

Paul draws further upon language and concepts from Hellenistic and Roman imperial ideology in his understanding of Christ's *parousia*. The term *parousia,*[99] ("presence" or "coming," cf. 6:9-10; 15:50) from the time of the Ptolemies until the second century CE referred to the epoch-making visits of kings and emperors to a city. This was a time when cities minted coins, made elaborate preparations to extend divine honors to the king, and revised calendars to mark the glorious visit of the "savior."[100] Thus the language and imagery Paul used to depict Christ's coming was drawn from the imperial *parousia*, which was well-known to Paul and the people to whom he preached. For Paul, however, the Christ-parousia and "day of the Lord" are usually associated with judgment.[101] Thus Paul's view of Christ's *parousia* borrowed from the Roman imperial ideology, but also made some important eschatological changes.

Thus it is through Paul's apocalyptic understanding of "the cross of Christ," signaling the "last days," and of Christ's imminent return that he envisions the beginning of the dissolution of the Roman imperial order and political dominance. While the imperial cult deified its Caesar after his death, it did not treat that death in a salvific manner.[102] Paul and early Christians, on the other hand, perceived the hidden designs of God behind the horrible *Roman* act of Jesus Christ's crucifixion. Although this apocalyptic perspective among the early Christians did not result in active rebellion, they did not shrink from serious critique of Greco-Roman society.[103] And Paul's critique of Roman imperial society and values, he believed, was needed

---

[99] Joseph Plevnik, *Paul and the Parousia: An Exegetical and Theological Investigation* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson publishers, 1997), 3: "The Christological focus of the day is clear in such expressions as "the day of Christ" (Phil 1:10; 2:16), "the day of Jesus Christ" (Phil 1:6), "the day of the Lord" (1 Thess 5:2; 1 Cor 5:5; cf. 2 Thess 2:2). But the apostle can also simply use "the day' (Rom 13:12; 1 Cor 3:13)."

[100] Plevnik, 6.

[101] Plevnik, 3: "Most Pauline texts dealing with the parousia occur in the context of the end-time judgment (1 Thess 1:10; 2:19; 3:13; 5:1-11, 23). But judgment is associated with the tradition of the day of the Lord, and it incorporates the imagery of the Lord's mighty coming. In fact, Paul uses the terms *parousia* and "day of the Lord" in juxtaposition (1 Thess 4:15; 5:2), and he seems to join the two images also in 1 Cor 4:1-5 and Rom 13:12....The phrase "day of the Lord"...and its variants are thus also employed by Paul for the end-time coming of the Lord." (Plevnik, 11)

[102] Georgi, *Theocracy*, 68.

[103] Alan F. Segal, *Paul the Convert: The Apostolate and Apostasy of Saul the Pharisee* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990), 165. Dieter Georgi has shown that this obtains also in Revelation; cf. "Who is the True Prophet?" *HTR* 79 (1986): 100-126.

among the Corinthian *ekklesia* because he felt that it was in danger of being assimilated into the Roman imperial order.[104]

The Eschatological Community

It was in this world of imperial cult and Roman power that Paul preached the gospel of Jesus Christ. The cross about which he preached was foundational for his communities and his apostolic self-understanding. Paul's view of community is unique because he understands the final days to have already begun in the crucifixion/resurrection of Christ who commissioned him to preach to the nations ("Gentiles"). This aspect of Paul's apocalyptic eschatology is quite extraordinary when compared to other apocalyptic perspectives.[105] If we take Price's suggestion seriously that power is relational and can be constituted by a union of religion and politics, we must take note of what Paul is doing in the Roman Empire. Paul is not only a preacher but he is also an organizer and he is establishing communities (ἐκκλεσίαι, a political-religious term!) with an alternative "polity" (πολίτευμα) and sovereign lord, Jesus Christ. It appears then that *power* works in Paul in the building of communities as an anti-imperial new order. This means that there is an alternative power to that of Rome – the power of God. This becomes apparent in Paul's exhortation in chapters 3 and 4 where he uses several metaphors to express this new reality.

1 Corinthians 3: Paul the "Master (Sophos) Builder"

Paul wants to show here that the *logos* of the cross should represent the perspective of truly "spiritual people" (2:6-16; and confirmed in 3:1-5). For "God's self-disclosure in the cross establishes a radically new norm and context for life in this age."[106] If the Corinthian Christians do not unite around the cross, they have lost the only foundation they have, Christ, the Crucified messiah. But since they are quarreling and divided, they really show that the Spirit is lacking among them. Since the *logos* of cross is the foundation of the Christian community, living together on that basis should prevent schism and strife, because allegiance to the crucified Christ provides the foundation for community relations and should take precedence over allegiance to any other group leader. Therefore, Christ's person alone is the central focus of loyalty. This is the crux of Paul' s argument against the sectarianism in the Corinthian

[104] Richard A. Horsley, *1 Corinthians* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1999), 38.
[105] Segal, 159.
[106] Furnish, *Pauline Theology*, 68.

church.[107] The cross of Christ provides the principle of unity and equality among the members. Only through faith in Christ can the *power* to establish an authentic social bond be found.[108] This is why Paul wrote: "No one can lay a foundation other than the one that is already laid, Jesus Christ" (3:11)."

The Architectural Metaphor

The architectural metaphor was an apt symbol for the promotion of concord in Greco-Roman rhetoric. Providing advice to a young man on the art of politics, Plutarch states that its noblest function is "to instill concord and friendship in those who dwell together and to remove strife, discord, and all enmity.[109] Furthermore "the wise politician is compared to an architect who chooses subordinates and craftsmen who will not spoil his work but will cooperate to perfect it."[110] In 1 Corinthians 3:9-15 the Christian community is compared to a building and its ministers to builders. Both Paul and Apollos are laborers who work together on "God's building" (3:5-9). The difference is that Paul, like the wise politician above, is the "wise (σοφός) builder" who has lain the foundation and others must be careful how they build upon it (3:10-11). Paul elaborates upon the building theme in vv. 12-15 by discussing the building materials. Some materials endure fire while others are consumed. Fee notes that Paul's concern is not necessarily with the particular building items, but with the imperishable quality of some over against the others. Paul's concern, in light of the context of the entire argument, is that the "gold, silver, and costly stones" represent what is compatible with the foundation, the gospel of Jesus Christ and him crucified. What will perish is *sophia* in all of its human forms; it belongs only to this age, and this age is passing away, along with all that belongs to it. Moreover, "gold, silver, and costly stones" recur regularly in the OT to describe the building materials of the Temple.[111] This image moves him to his next point – the Corinthian community is the temple of God (3:16-17). As the temple of God, they must be careful how they conduct themselves. For this reason, Paul ends with an apocalyptic exhortation (3:18-23), encouraging the Corinthians to become "fools" so that they might understand the true wisdom of God. They need not quarrel and boast about human leaders because all things belong to them and ultimately they belong to God.

---

[107] Robert G. Hammerton-Kelly, *Sacred Violence: Paul's Hermeneutic of the Cross* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), 83.

[108] Georgi, *Theocracy*, 36.

[109] Welborn, 61-62.

[110] Welborn, 61-62.

[111] Gordon D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 141.

1 Corinthians 4: Servanthood as the Basis of Community

In 1 Corinthians 4:1-5 Paul employs a different metaphor. He and Apollos should be viewed as "servants of Christ and stewards of the mysteries of God." "The "mysteries of God," harks back to 2:6ff, the apocalyptic secret that Paul has spoken of regarding the divine mystery, Christ crucified as the basis of God's divine plan for human salvation. Paul and Apollos are only the servants of God through whom the Corinthians came to believe. The term servant (ὑπερέτης here but Paul also uses equally διάκονος in other passages) is common in Paul to describe himself and his coworkers. Paul's metaphor of the servant is the basis of his understanding of his relationship both to Christ and his gospel. Paul is a servant of God and of the gospel. In this respect it would appear that Paul has received from the earliest tradition the teaching of Jesus himself (cf. Mark 10:41-45; Luke 22:25-27). Jesus, according to tradition, considered himself as one who served (Luke 22:27). In his teaching he compares his example on proper leadership to the Greek example of leadership: "their rulers lord it over them" (Mark 10:42). The role of leadership in the Jesus community stands in stark contrast to that of Greco-Roman culture! "Hence the irony in Paul's response continues."[112] Through his irony, Paul is not only critiquing the Corinthian's attitude but also the Greco-Roman cultural values upon which it is based. Such models of human relationships have passed away. After a brief personal defense (4:3-5) and an explanation and application of the servant metaphor to the Corinthian's situation by a "covert allusion" (4:6-7), Paul launches into an apocalyptic evaluation of their exalted attitude.

The Corinthian "Kings"

In 4:8 Paul chides the Corinthians who have become satiated with pride and claiming to be "spiritually" wealthy. Even more, they are "reigning as kings." Paul's apocalyptic evaluation of their spiritualized aristocratic attitude is that they are behaving as if they have already realized the fullness of the eschaton, and that, without the apostles. It is most likely the case that Paul through his apocalyptic perspective does as he has been doing all along, reevaluating the Corinthian's attitude and behavior that mimics the cultural values and behavior of the Greco-Roman elite.[113] It is probably not the case, then, that the Corinthians have a realized eschatology, but they have

[112] Fee, *1 Cointhians*, 130.

[113] Richard A. Horsley, "'How Can Some of You Say That There is No Resurrection of the Dead?': Spiritual Elitism in Corinth," *NovT* 20 (1978):203-231; "There is nothing in the text of 1 Cor. Iv.8 to suggest that the already belongs to the language of the Corinthians." (p. 230)

misguided values (cf. 4:6ff)."[114] The exalted value of cultural *sophia* among the Corinthians was sought in a spiritual fashion, so that they too might join the ranks of the wise, nobly-born, rich, and kingly in status. They sought a spiritual transcendence of the Roman imperial order.[115] And, yet, in their quest to imitate the Roman political elite, they suffered the consequences of their hyper-competitive, patronal[116] society: faction, quarreling, inequality, and quests for power and prestige. The Corinthian's quest for such values was the opposite reality for the "foolish" apostles.

The "Foolish" Apostles

The Corinthians believed themselves to be secure and confident in their wisdom and deceptive spiritual power. For this reason Paul has to remind them of the present situation of his apostleship by means of a catalogue of hardships (4:9-13).[117] With this rhetorical device Paul's *logos* of the cross of Christ is being applied to Christian life. The whole purpose of his catalogue is to urge them to adopt his perspective of life in Christ Jesus (vv. 14-17). The life of the Son of God on earth, exemplified ultimately in his crucifixion, serves as the basis and goal of Christian ethics.[118] The "weak" apostles appear to suffer defeat in the world. Unlike the Corinthians who consider themselves to be strong and powerful, the apostles know themselves to be weak and the world perceives them as a foolish spectacle. The world deems them as such because they appear powerless and unable to respond adequately to existence - they fail to retaliate to the abuse others (4:12-13; cf. Wis 2:10-11). And "unlike the Corinthians who powerfully assert their rights against each other (1 Cor 6:1-6; 8:1-13; 10:23-11:1), the apostles are willing to forgo their rights (1 Cor 9), suffer wrong, and be defrauded (1 Cor 6:7). Such conduct is, from the perspective of the world, already a mark of the *atimia* of which Paul will speak next. Whereas the apostles are *atimoi*, the Corinthians are *endozoi*."[119] The apostles, lacking honor and status, are dragged into the arena to fight to the finish "like those sentenced to death." Paul point is clear: "How could they not appear "foolish" to the world?" The apostles are depicted as poor and at the lowest rung of the social order. But they are really powerful because they understand the power of the cross as the power of God – power as the basis of authentic community. Through irony and reversals Paul

[114] Litfin, 169.

[115] Horsley, *1 Corinthians*, 38.

[116] See John K. Chow, *Patronage and Power* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992).

[117] 5 times in the Corinthian correspondence Paul compiles a catalogue of suffering (1 Cor 4:9-13; 2 Cor 4:8-9; 6:3-10; 11:23-29; 12:10. Fitzgerald, 117.

[118] Fee, "Toward a Theology of 1 Corinthians," 45.

[119] Fitzgerald, 139.

attempts to break down the Corinthians' self-perceptions of social status, power and wisdom. His critique challenges the social categories upon which their perceptions are based. He does this by a direct appeal to them to imitate him (14:16), one who as a loving father, gently corrects his children's lack of perception.

Paul "The Father"

Paul, as the founder of the Corinthian community, finally appeals to them on the basis of his "fatherhood" (4:14-21). Paul is using here a widespread family metaphor of the father figure that was employed in the public sphere, including politics and religion. In Roman sources the image was used to emphasize a hierarchical relationship in society. Thus, in their striving for power and status, the Corinthians had apparently imbibed the Roman imperial ideology, which used father-figure imagery to support social stratification and to legitimate a steeply inclined hierarchy of power.[120]

> It was the official ideal to subordinate oneself to a hierarchical structure. We can therefore conclude that Roman Corinth was *not* dominated by old Greek democratic ideals. In contrast the father image seems to have been a powerful tool in asserting imperial authority in this important colony.[121]

The Corinthians, trying to transcend society, find a personal adaptation of aristocratic values in the imperial order. They transfer these values to the spiritual level, with the corresponding implications for social relations within the community. In this way, the father image was co-opted to support the imperial system of power relations. For this reason, it has been argued that Paul's argument suffers an internal breakdown here because when he picks up the father image, he deflates the call to freedom and new possibilities that had not been an option for the poor, women, and slaves.[122] But in light of Paul's preceding arguments on servanthood (4:1-5) and the catalogue of suffering (4:9-13), he appears to aim at a redefinition of the father image. This means that his image as father is not based upon displays of power and authority. Unlike the Roman *paterfamilias* who would use his position to

---

[120] Witherington, 138.

[121] E. M. Lassen, "The use of the Father Image in Imperial Propaganda and 1 Corinthians 4:14-21," *TynB* 42 (1991), pp. 127-36, here p. 129; cited in Witherington, 138; cf. also White, 192ff. for discussion of the Emperor as head of the household.

[122] Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, "Rhetorical Situation and Historical Reconstruction in 1 Corinthians," *NTS* 33 (1987): 386-403. Schüssler Fiorenza agues that Paul's argument breaks down at 4:14ff when he picks up father language (399). The Corinthians' call meant freedom and new possibilities not open to the poor, slave and even freeborn women. In the eyes of Paul their call meant the relinquishment of authority and status (400).

impose and support hierarchical social order, Paul as the Corinthians' "father" makes a gentle appeal to them to imitate him (4:16). His model is based upon the cruciform pattern of the cross of Christ – the power of God for the establishment of the eschatological community.

Conclusion

This essay has attempted to suggest that based on S.R.F. Price's reevaluation of the relation of politics and religion in terms of power, as a system of social relations, apocalyptic in general and Paul's apocalyptic eschatology in particular might also be reevaluated. The key for understanding Paul's new vision of social relations is the cross of Christ through which the "power of God" is expressed by the establishment of a new social and religious entity, the church. Thus the "word" or "discourse of the cross" is most likely a Pauline coinage developed in his debate with his Corinthian opponents.[123] Paul shapes his discourse in 1 Corinthians to provide an apocalyptic eschatological critique of the Corinthians behavior and to provide a rationale for his behavior.[124] Paul sought to cast the Corinthians petty strivings for spiritual status and prestige upon a larger canvas. His life was devoted to the proclamation of the word of the cross, which entailed a reevaluation of human relationships. In 1 Corinthians 1-4 the apocalyptic character of cross unmasks the folly of the Corinthian's quest for spiritual status. The cross manifests the power of the age to come in the present age. So Paul is concerned about the "power of words" (*logos,* i.e., "rhetoric, discourse") but more importantly the way in which "words" *create* and *sustain* community. We should note, however, that Paul is not simply critiquing rhetorical styles but *reevaluating* the entire Greco-Roman culture upon which rhetoric is founded. The ancient Greco-Roman rhetorical tradition that Paul encountered created and sustained a particular *social* and *political* vision of society and human relations.[125] Through "the logos of the cross" God is also creating and sustaining a vision of human relations, which is necessarily opposed to Rome's and any other human vision of such relations. In this way, "Paul's crime was not passive resistance....Rather, it was an active one, an act of political aggression."[126]

---

[123] Litfin, 194. Unlike the suggestion of Hamerton-Kelly, (*Sacred Violence*, 71) that "[t]he "word of the cross" (1 Cor 1:18) and the "scandal of the cross" (1 Cor 1:23; Gal 5:11) are probably Pauline coinages from his days as a persecutor. This is how he once summarized to himself the threat that he sought to eradicate, but now he uses the phrases to summarize the Gospel he holds dear." In my estimation, this obtains only for the phrase "the scandal of the cross."

[124] Litfin, 172.

[125] Cf. Litfin, 21-132.

[126] Georigi, *Theocracy*, 165.

Hence, Paul's apocalyptic eschatology, intentionally or not, engages historical and political realities. This may mean that we may have to read Paul's apocalyptic language differently than we have in the past. Although Paul's apocalyptic perspective was not a result of political or social alienation, his encounter of the resurrected Christ forever transformed his worldview.