UNIVERSITÀ DI NAPOLI L'ORIENTALE
DIPARTIMENTO ASIA, AFRICA E MEDITERRANEO

Creative Fidelity, Faithful Creativity

The Reception of Jewish Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity

Edited by **Michael A. Daise** and **Dorota Hartman**

UniorPress

Creative Fidelity

UNIVERSITÀ DI NAPOLI L'ORIENTALE
DIPARTIMENTO ASIA, AFRICA E MEDITERRANEO

Creative Fidelity, Faithful Creativity
The Reception of Jewish Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity

Edited by Michael A. Daise and Dorota Hartman

UniorPress
Naples 2022

Front cover: Jusepe de Ribera, *Saint Peter and Saint Paul*, ca. 1616
© Musée des Beaux-Arts de Strasbourg (Wikimedia Commons, 2022)

Creative Fidelity, Faithful Creativity: The Reception of Jewish Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity,
Edited by Michael A. Daise and Dorota Hartman
UniorPress, Naples 2022. ISBN 978-88-6719-258-8

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License

UniorPress - Via Nuova Marina 59 - 80133 Naples, Italy
www.uniorpress.unior.it

Table of Contents

Introduction
Soundings on Jewish Scripture in Early Judaism and Nascent Christianity

Michael A. Daise

In this volume we offer contributions made to a conference titled 'The Reception of Jewish Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity', held at the University of Naples in June 2017. The event was sponsored by several institutions: the Centro di Studi Ebraici and the Cattedra di Filologia ed Esegesi Neotestamentaria, both from the University of Naples L'Orientale, as well as the Program in Judaic Studies at the College of William & Mary. And our participants numbered sixteen, bringing expertise to bear on this issue from four fields of inquiry: Second Temple Judaism, Rabbinics, the New Testament and Patristics.

By 'reception of Jewish scripture' we do not mean a formal link to any of the trajectories arising from Hans-Georg Gadamer's *Wirkungsgeschichte*.[1] Our aim has more modestly been to take soundings on the use of that scripture (and related tradition) in the four spheres represented, placing no theoretical or methodological expectations on the way participants might wish to do so. This notwithstanding, midway through the event one of our number, Joseph Sievers, detected a consistent dynamic at work in our presentations, which led him to suggest the primary title we have now used. Regardless of how they went about it, the tradents of our texts engaged scripture with imagination while assimilating extra-biblical tradition with fealty, so that, whether Jewish or Christian, Semitic or Hellenized, writing BCE or CE, their 'fidelity' to the former was manifestly 'creative' while their 'creativity' in using the latter was ever 'faithful'. And so, if the idea of 'reception' coalesces around any factor in what follows, it is the vigor of *Creative Fidelity, Faithful Creativity* in engaging Jewish sacred tradition.[2]

---

[1] The application of Gadamer's hermeneutic to the reception of (biblical) texts seems to have drawn principally from the section 'Das Prinzip der Wirkungsgeschichte' in his *Wahrheit und Methode*; see *Hermeneutik I, Wahrheit und Methode: Grundzüge einer philosophischen Hermeneutik*, vol. 1 of *Gesammelte Werke*, 6th ed., 10 vols. (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1990), 305-12. Compare, for instance, the detailed synopses in Robert Evans, *Reception History, Tradition and Biblical Interpretation: Gadamer and Jauss in Current Practice*, Scriptural Traces 4/LNTS 510 (London: Bloomsbury, 2014), 2-9; and Régis Burnet, *Exegesis and History of Reception: Reading the New Testament Today with the Readers of the Past*, WUNT 455 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2021), 59-64. The various ways in which this application has developed, together with a critique of the degree to which they have done so accurately, is amply set out in Burnet, pp. 64-69.

[2] Although Professor J. Sievers was unable to add his paper to the publication of this volume, we are delighted to have his title on its cover!

We have organized the contributions as they were presented at the conference, by the 'religions' with which they are identified: first, Judaism in its Second Temple and Rabbinic eras; next, Christianity in its New Testament and Patristic periods. And we have placed the articles of each 'religion' in a rough chronological sequence, according to the literature engaged in their discussions: for Judaism, from *1 Enoch* in the 3rd century BCE to *Midrash Tanḥuma* in the 9th century CE; for Christianity, from Jesus in the 1st century CE to Jerome in the 5th century CE—this last, brokered through the Italian Reformer Giovanni Diodati in the 17th century.

Scripture in Early Judaism

Our venture begins with Eric Noffke, who examines the complex relationship that obtains between the parameters of Jewish scripture (as it has come to be canonized) and *1 Enoch*. Noffke notes that the Enochic stance toward scripture comes particularly into relief in its portraits of biblical characters; and with this in view, he charts the contours of that stance by tracking the 'primordial people' who appear in its text, figures of earliest humanity which feature throughout the corpus. He looks, of course, for Enochic representations of Adam and Eve (Genesis 2-3). But he also finds references to other primeval characters—Sirach's 'glorious' Adam (Sirach 49:16), Ezekiel's glorious 'first man' (Ezekiel 28:1-19), Job's wise man 'created before the mountains' (Job 15:7-8). By tracking their omissions or mutations through the *Book of Watchers*, the *Book of Dream Visions*, the *Animal Apocalypse*, the *Book of Parables* and the *Apocalypse of Weeks*, he uncovers a significant index to the position which Enochic Judaism took toward the emerging Hebrew canon. Not only does it espouse rival standpoints on sin, evil, predetermination and human responsibility. It reaches back prior to Torah, to find authoritative tradition in 'a more ancient past of the Israelite religious tradition'.

Corrado Martone follows, treating a body of literature to which *1 Enoch* is integral: the texts discovered near Khirbet Qumran. Where Noffke was concerned with a writing which reworked or vied with Jewish scripture, Martone is taken up with the Qumran biblical texts themselves. There is longstanding agreement that variants in those texts may betray alternate textual traditions to the MT or SP. Martone suspects, however, that those variants number so many, and concur so often with *Yaḥad* ideology, that they must also reflect a suffusion of that ideology into the biblical texts. Cases for this can be (and have been) made. But here Martone furnishes support from another quarter, the similarly 'free attitude toward the biblical text' one finds in sectarian exegetical and foundational literature. Taking note of three factors—the liminal position occupied by Qumran rewritings of the Bible (between biblical text and commentary), the *sensus plenior* assumed for the prophets in the *pesharim* and the manipulation of *lemmata* in formative sectarian documents such as *Pesher Habakkuk* and the *Cairo Damascus Document*—Martone

detects a liberty in dealing with scripture which, he contends, doubtless reaches into the biblical manuscripts themselves.

Broaching yet another sector of Judaism, Miriam Ben Zeev Hofman treats two diasporic works which negotiate biblical tradition against the Mediterranean/North African cultures in which they were composed: Ezekiel's *Exagoge* and the historical narrative of Artapanus, both likely written in Egypt and both brokered by Polyhistor through Eusebius of Caesarea. Ben Zeev Hofman fixes her attention on the portrayal of Moses in these writings. After careful consideration of introductory issues, she notices that each omits any mention of Moses receiving Torah while at the same time importing stories about Moses laden with features distinctive of their surrounding Gentile cultures. For Ezekiel, it is a dream in which, with echoes of Homeric epic, Moses ascends heaven's throne after a manner not unlike the coronation of *Diadochi* kings. For Artapanus (besides rationale for his killing an Egyptian), it is a list of Moses' accomplishments resonant with Greek and Egyptian heroism. Both tales, according to Ben Zeev Hofman, signal an embrace of non-Jewish identity: Artapanus' work indicates 'a cultural context where Jewish, Egyptian and Greek motifs are tightly interwoven'; Ezekiel's *Exagoge*, 'a complex and multifaceted cultural identity, which appears to be fully at home both in the classical and in the Jewish worlds'. They do not do so, however, at the expense of Jewish identity. To the contrary, she concludes, by casting Moses as they do, Ezekiel and Artapanus create leverage to frame the Jews as superior to their neighbors. Far from capitulating to Hellenism, both are written '*ad maiorem Iudaeorum gloriam*'.

Finally for this first segment, Dario Garribba and Piero Capelli bring early Jewish reception of scripture into the Common Era with studies of the way hermeneutics were shaped by political factors, particularly, the 1st and 2nd Wars against Rome. For Garribba, it is the effect of the 1st War on diasporic interpretation of Maccabean martyrdom, as rendered in *4 Maccabees*. Dating *4 Maccabees* to the late 1st/early 2nd century, Garribba compares its accounts of the deaths of Eleazar and the mother with her seven sons to their exemplars in 2 Maccabees and finds shifts in two of its themes: 'Judaism' (ἰουδαϊσμός) is now disassociated from Hasmonean militarism; and 'the enemy' is reduced from the complex network of Jewish and Greek persecutors in 2 Maccabees to the single foreign sovereign Antiochus IV. Garribba traces these changes to a new existential embouchure cultivated in the post-70 CE Jewish diaspora; and this, he finds, lies behind the *4 Maccabean* rewrite. Judaism, it was now held, was no longer a territory, state or cult, but an 'ethos' under the imperial hostility of Rome. Consequently, its martyred forebears had to reflect the same.

As for Capelli, the issue is the effect of the 2nd War against Rome on Jewish interpretation of Deuteronomy 20, the 'most complete form' of Israel's 'principles and methods of sanctified warfare'. After observing the use of this passage to

justify violent expansionism (even until recent times), Capelli traces its reception in early Judaism from the Book of Joshua to midrash from the Geonic period and locates a dramatic turning point at 'the catastrophic conclusion' of the Bar Kosiba War. Until then, he shows, it served as the catalyst driving accounts of the Maccabean Revolt and Hasmonean expansion (1-2 Maccabees, Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities*, *Megillat Antiokhus*), as well as conventions for holy (*Temple Scroll*) and apocalyptic (*War Scroll*) battle. From that point on, however, though its status as 'scripture' remained, its impact was rendered benign by 'a hermeneutics of Torah not always prone to its literal sense or to the supposed intentions of its implicit authors'. And so, Capelli demonstrates, through '*dynamic* fidelity to the sources', among rabbis from *Mishnah* to *Midrash Tanḥuma*, the biblical template for sacred war was reframed to serve political peace.

Scripture in Early Christianity

As we turn to Jewish scripture within early Christianity (or within literature later claimed by Christianity), we are launched by Fernando Bermejo-Rubio, who considers it in relation to Jesus research. Bermejo-Rubio begins by noting that the Jesus of the gospels 'is somehow a fictional being' and that 'by far the most convenient way' this came about is owed to the evangelists' use of literary models, particularly (though not exclusively) models from scripture: the Genesis Joseph narratives, Elijah-Elisha, Ahikar, Esther, Daniel, Wisdom, the Psalter, Isaiah's 'Servant Songs'. Troubling him, however, is the degree to which this 'fictional' aspect of Jesus has been pushed by 'mythicism'. Mythicists allege that, not part, but all of the gospels' Jesus has been constructed, largely from Jewish scripture; and sailing between the Scylla of such scepticism and the Charybdis of fideistic naïveté, Bermejo-Rubio argues that, while mythicism offers much to Jesus research, it has overreached on this point. Using accounts of Jesus' arrest and crucifixion as case studies, and with appeal to Maurice Goguel and Carlo Ginzburg, he makes a case that, when amalgamated, a number of incongruities in the scripture-laden narratives of Matthew to John 'betray the existence of an alternative and presumably more original version' of these events. The gospels, he insists, carry 'traces' and 'clues' to an historical profile buried beneath their pericopes; and so, for the issue at hand, they are 'not reducible to the influence of the scriptures'.

Chronologically next is Paul, addressed by Georges Massinelli. Massinelli is taken up with the way Paul defined his collection for the Jerusalem poor; and here he finds a link between Paul's notion of 'almsgiving' in 2 Corinthians 8-9 and certain lexical changes in late biblical/Second Temple literature. Paul's collection, Massinelli sees, does not fit easily 'in the Greco-Roman repertoire of exchanges'. Paul defined it, rather, by manipulating some of the classifications within that repertoire, and in 2 Corinthians 9 he did so with the category

'almsgiving' by following a line of midrash running from Daniel to Sirach. Key here is the term 'righteousness' (δικαιοσύνη) in Paul's quotation of Psalm 112 (111):9 at 2 Corinthians 9:9, 'He scatters abroad, he gives to the poor; his righteousness (ἡ δικαιοσύνη αὐτοῦ) endures forever'. Assuming it translates Hebrew צדקה, Massinelli observes that in Daniel, Tobit and Sirach that word had, in fact, come to mean charitable acts to the poor; and triangulating with Paul's reference to the 'cheerful giver' of LXX Proverbs 22:8a in v. 7, he suggests that Paul was aware of such usage and employed it in this quotation so as to classify his collected funds as charity. 'There remains little doubt', Massinelli concludes, 'that Paul, while never using the technical word ἐλεημοσύνη ('almsgiving'), does understand and frame the collection as almsgiving'.

Treating the canonical gospels (which come next) are four articles: one for Matthew; one for Mark; and two for John, with the last also addressing early Christian apocalypses. For Matthew, Giulio Michelini dovetails Capelli's interest in rabbinic interpretation by bringing nuance to a longstanding issue in the Matthean and rabbinic understandings of a verse from the Prophets, Hosea 6:6. Its first colon is quoted at Matthew 12:7, 'But had you known what this means, "I desire mercy, not sacrifice", you would not have condemned the guiltless'. Since the work of W.D. Davies, Michelini relates, scholarship has seen the Matthean and rabbinic communities at conscious odds with one another, and this has been no less the case in its understanding of this verse, which Yoḥanan ben Zakkai also cites in *'Abot de Rabbi Nathan*. Since both communities took this *locus* as an alternative to blood sacrifice, some Matthean scholars have proposed that the first evangelist knew the rabbinic interpretation of the verse and cited it at Matthew 12:7 deliberately to attack that reading. Michelini revisits this Matthean quotation with four matters in view—its original context; its form in Matthew; its new context in Matthew; and its reception by Matthew's readers—and, with recourse to Umberto Eco, he suggests its posture toward the rabbinic counterpart is, in fact, more refined. He concedes that a polemic of sorts would have been discerned by any culturally astute reader of Matthew's gospel. He adds, however, that this was not the aim of the evangelist. Matthew's exegesis, he contends, was done irenically. Any threat posed to the rabbis would have only come as an inadvertent by-product of his (otherwise innocent) hermeneutics—an *intentio intertextualitatis*, to use the term borrowed from Eco.

For the Gospel of Mark, Sandra Huebenthal addresses our theme through her work on 'frames'. By 'frames' Huebenthal means the hermeneutical dynamics which enable a literary work to remain meaningful to a community through the vicissitudes of its life. Applied to Mark, she explains, that gospel's first readers would have interpreted its most significant terms in light of the 'socio-cultural and religious frames' of its initial time and place. As it was disseminated elsewhere over time, however, those 'frames'

would have ineluctably altered, since adherents from new cultures and later eras would likewise read it to address their own needs. Huebenthal discerns that, through a methodological shift from positivist historiography to cultural studies hermeneutics, Markan scholarship is now poised to explore such dynamics; and in this article she does so by investigating Mark's use of Isaiah as a device for recollecting Jesus. Drawing from social memory theory, she is concerned with how Mark's gospel employs the prophet Isaiah to 'frame' or 'key' the figure of Jesus; and using the opening τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ('of the gospel') as a point of departure, she finds 'the whole gospel can be read against the background of the eschatological comfort announced in Isaiah 40-55'. To signal the potential of this approach, Huebenthal closes by offering a glimpse of the way Isaiah frames continued to operate as Christianity expanded over the ensuing decades. Turning her attention to Luke, she finds that 'the Isaianic frame...is no less prominent than in Mark; it simply differs in character'.

Where Huebenthal leaves off with Luke on Isaiah, Dorota Hartman shifts focus to Luke on the Pentateuch. Hartman begins with a broad survey covering the 'multifaceted' way in which Luke employs scripture, as well as the scholarly debates over his *Vorlagen* and text forms. Hartman's primary interest, however, lies in the grist that could be threshed from examining Luke's quotations from the Pentateuch, and toward that end she engages in detailed examinations of two such *loci*: Jesus' listing of the commandments in Luke 18:20 (Exodus 20:12-16; Deuteronomy 5:16-20); and the evangelist's recitation of laws for the consecration of a first born and purification after childbirth in Luke 2:22-24 (Exodus 13:2, 12, 15; Leviticus 12:8; cf. 5:11). Besides detecting several factors behind the innovations in Luke's renderings—recourse to liturgy, halakhic inference, citing from memory—she finds good cause to locate the provenance of Luke and (at least some of) his recipients within Judaism. Luke's 'profound knowledge of scripture and of Hellenistic Jewish exegetical methods', she concludes, 'leads us to the suspicion that the author of the Third Gospel actually hailed from a Jewish milieu'; moreover, 'his audience was hardly Gentile, but Jewish or at least a mixed audience, formed of God-fearers and Jews'.

Next, Michael Daise picks up the thread of Dead Sea sectarian interpretation of scripture introduced by Martone and weaves it into the Gospel of John. The issue he addresses turns on the quotation of Isaiah 6:10 at John 12:40. As part of the evangelist's commentary on the Jews' rejection of Jesus' public ministry, this reference plays a critical role in the Fourth Gospel's narrative. But with a significantly reworked text, it obscures as much as it explains. Daise finds a vantage point for revisiting both these aspects of the reference in a fragment from a weekly cycle of sectarian or pre-sectarian prayers which similarly cites Isaiah 6:10, 4QDibre Ha-Me'orot[a], one of three manuscripts attesting the *Words of the Luminaries*. By comparing the way each work treats this verse—transposing its genre, manipulating its language and placing it in juxtaposition to Deuteronomy 29:1-3—he shows that

its rendering in John, as well as the close of John's first twelve chapters (the 'Book of Signs'), fits 'comfortably within Second Temple hermeneutics'.

Also engaging the Fourth Gospel are Adriana Destro and Mauro Pesce, who perceive it to have assimilated scripture through the medium of divinely wrought visions inscribed in the peer literature of early Jesus followers. After reviewing several facets of rewritten scripture, Destro and Pesce trace the process which would have unfolded between the reception of a vision and its textualization, with a view to defining its effect when inserted into a biblical rewrite. Before coming to print, they assert, a vision is given to a dislocated seer, the seer is offered (or makes) an interpretation and that interpretation is conveyed and analysed by the seer's audience. Consequently, its written version (when it appears) is not the vision itself, but 'the textualization of its re-interpretations'; and by such 'narrative transposition' it 'builds and enforces the authority of a text'. Destro and Pesce discern that the portion of Jewish scripture most prone to this kind of rewriting is the oracular prophets; and employing the *Ascension of Isaiah* and *Apocalypse of Abraham* as case studies, they show how such 'narrative transpositions' conceivably lay behind two passages of the Fourth Gospel in which biblical figures are said to have known Jesus: the first, Isaiah 'seeing his glory' in John 12:38-41; the second, Abraham 'seeing his day' in John 8:56-58.

As our coverage nears completion, we are brought into the 2nd (perhaps 3rd) century of Christianity by John Kloppenborg. Kloppenborg takes up the reception of Jewish scripture in the so-called Epistle of James and shows that in this work it was done through *aemulatio*, a rhetorical technique whereby 'an author evoked a predecessor text but intentionally paraphrased and recast it in a way appropriate to his or her intended audience'. On several grounds, Kloppenborg recounts, the Epistle of James is clearly pseudepigraphic and late (2nd-3rd centuries?); and as appears in the reference to Q (11:9-13) at James 1:5, its author plainly employs *aemulatio* in his reception of Jesus tradition. Inasmuch as the work is also 'steeped in the Jewish scriptures', Kloppenborg suspects the author uses the same technique for that corpus; and in this article he demonstrates as much through an examination of the reference to Genesis 1:26 at James 3:7, a classification of created species which appears amidst an extended discourse on the tongue (James 3:1-12). By measuring the vocabulary in this classification against similar lists in other biblical, peritestamental and early Christian literature, and by drawing an analogy with *aemulatio* to reference the *Iliad* in Dio Chrysostom's *De regno i*, Kloppenborg finds that the author employs this technique using language redolent with 'psychagogic discourse' in Homer and the fifth century Greek poets. As such, he concludes, the author of James can be culturally situated within the sphere of Philo Judaeus, *Pseudo-Phocylides* and the Wisdom of Solomon; and his audience can be safely cast as Hellenized and sophisticated.

Riccardo Maisano brings our effort to its end by scrutinizing Jewish scripture in Jerome and tracing its legacy in the Italian Reformation. Maisano sees a paradox in Jerome's profile when the view of his scholarship among his contemporaries is seen against its interpretation by later Reformers. To peers Jerome was an innovator for translating the Hebrew Bible into Latin when the canonical standard was the Septuagint and its Latin translations; to devotees of the Lutheran Reformation, by contrast, he was a backwater, whose translation was instead deemed 'the symbol of conservative tradition'. Against such contradiction, and complicating it more, Maisano notices a further oddity, that in peculiarly difficult passages of the Bible Jerome's exegetical choices counterintuitively held sway over the Italian Reformer Giovanni Diodati; and in this piece he tracks this influence by offering a detailed review of some twenty-five passages from Isaiah treated by Diodati in his *La Sacra Bibbia*. At the conclusion of his analysis Maisano remarks that his selections from Diodati are but a 'specimen' of a cross-denominational practice that occurs more broadly between Catholic and Protestant exegesis; and such interplay, he asserts, bodes well for Christian interpretation of scripture. 'The exchange between Catholic and Reformed translations and exegetical approaches to interpreting difficult biblical passages', he writes,

> looks lively and fruitful. This helps to show us that Jerome's example of encountering the sacred languages, followed by Diodati holding his own dialogue with Hebrew, Greek and Latin languages, did not remain an isolated example. It was indeed a pattern for an effective approach to the scriptures.

A 'Middle Distance'

And so, from Enoch to the Geonim, from Jesus to the Reformers—a cross-section of 'creative fidelity' and 'faithful creativity' in the early Jewish and Christian reception of scripture. If we might draw from one strand of *Wirkungsgeschichte*, in the opening pages of his book, *Reception History: Why Should We Care What Earlier Christians Thought about the Bible?*, John L. Thompson defines the tradition of scriptural reception as 'the "middle distance"—the paths by which a text comes to be handed on to us...by others who have read and valued and interpreted it'.[3] In this volume we have sought to clear away some of the brush from these 'paths' in the earliest eras of Jewish and Christian reception of scripture. We anticipate that readers will discern more from these contributions than we have distilled (or even seen) in this summary. We trust, though, that such a differential will only enhance the four fields represented, stimulating broader exploration, deeper analysis and more enlightened discussion.

[3] Grove Biblical Series 70 (Cambridge: Grove Books Ltd., 2013), 5.

Bibliography

Burnet, Régis. *Exegesis and History of Reception: Reading the New Testament Today with the Readers of the Past*. WUNT 455. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2021.

Evans, Robert. *Reception History, Tradition and Biblical Interpretation: Gadamer and Jauss in Current Practice*. Scriptural Traces 4/LNTS 510. London: Bloomsbury, 2014.

Gadamer, Hans-Georg. *Hermeneutik I, Wahrheit und Methode: Grundzüge einer philosophischen Hermeneutik*. Vol. 1 of *Gesammelte Werke*. 6th ed. 10 vols. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1990.

Thompson, John L. *Reception History: Why Should We Care What Earlier Christians Thought about the Bible?* Grove Biblical Series 70. Cambridge: Grove Books Ltd., 2013.

Part 1
The Reception of Jewish Scripture in Early Judaism

The *First Book of Enoch* (Ethiopic) between the Old and New Testaments: The Case of Adam and Eve

Eric Noffke

1. Enoch *and the Old Testament*

Scholars who have worked on *1 Enoch* stress, at least for the major part of the work, numerous references to the Old Testament: first at the level of its language; second on the matter of literary genres, in particular, those typical of the prophets and wisdom books, as James VanderKam and George Nickelsburg have made evident.[1] Even in sections of *1 Enoch* that apparently have little in common with Old Testament literature, like the *Book of Astronomy*, we can nonetheless note references to Genesis, as in *1 Enoch* 81:6, where the chronology seems to presuppose that of Genesis 5:22-23.[2]

On yet a third level we can note implicit references to biblical characters and their stories that are profoundly re-elaborated. A good example is the figure of the Son of Man in the *Book of Parables*, theologically and literarily shaped by putting together elements from different biblical sources: personified Wisdom, the Suffering Servant, Psalm 2 and, of course, Daniel 7. All of these elements are used to construct a new messianic figure, having characteristics quite original compared to the models from which it has been taken and given that this Son of Man is the eschatological judge at the end of times who summarizes in himself what in the Old Testament are probably characteristics of collective representations. The prologue of *1 Enoch*, as well, according the detailed essay by Lars Hartmann,[3] reveals a strong dependence on Deuteronomy 33:1 and Numbers 22-24, but often mixes phrases and images to create a new original text.

At a further level we can see how the Old Testament was considered but one authoritative scripture among other ancient traditions, open to various interpretations. For instance, in the *Animal Apocalypse* (*1 Enoch* 85-90) and the *Apocalypse of Weeks* (*1 Enoch* 93),

---

[1] George W. E. Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch*: A Commentary on the Book of* 1 Enoch*, Chapters 1-36, 81-108*, ed. Klaus Baltzer, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001); idem and James C. VanderKam, 1 Enoch *2: A Commentary on the Book of* 1 Enoch*, Chapters 37-82*, ed. Klaus Baltzer, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2011); James C. VanderKam, 'Biblical Interpretation in *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees*', in *The Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation*, ed. James H. Charlesworth and Craig A. Evans, JSPSup 14/Studies in Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity 2 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), 96-125.

[2] VanderKam, 'Biblical Interpretation in 1 Enoch and *Jubilees*', 100.

[3] Lars Hartmann, *Asking for a Meaning: A Study of 1 Enoch 1-5*, ConBNT 12 (Lund: Liberläromedel/Gleerup, 1979).

two reconstructions of Israel's history, the order of the events is mainly that of the biblical texts, but their authors felt free to introduce some new elements. First, history is seen as aiming towards its end and its judgement (the period in which the authors of those writings lived was usually seen as immediately preceding the *eschaton*). Second, in the story of the chosen people in the *Animal Apocalypse* two events from the Genesis account receive particular attention because they are considered theologically vital, namely, the sin of the Watchers and the subsequent birth of giants (exterminated by the flood)—and both receive a profoundly new meaning.

It is also important to see which persons or events are omitted. For instance, there is no mention of the promises made to Abraham or Moses: Moses is esteemed worthy of becoming an angel but does not receive the Torah on Mount Sinai; the attention is rather placed on the construction of the tabernacle (*1 Enoch* 89:36). The absence of references to Moses' law, in fact, is one of the surprising aspects, not only of the *Animal Apocalypse*, but of *1 Enoch* as a whole. Because of this, the basis on which the concepts of righteousness and unrighteousness are defined is not clear.[4]

This remark leads to another good example of *1 Enoch*'s relationship both to the Old Testament and to other ancient traditions, namely, the transgression of the Watchers (*1 Enoch* 6-11), a constant theological reference point for the whole book. Even if the connection to Genesis 6:1-4 is evident, the decidedly greater amplitude of the story here told makes it doubtful that we are simply dealing with an expansion of the very short biblical text. The impression is that we have two parallel and distinct evolutions of a single, more antique tradition. The biblical and extra-biblical references are used in a new theological context, profoundly different and very original, that also raises once more the issue of whether we have here a polemical

[4] The reason for this omission is also disputed. In fact, George Nickelsburg, addressing Andreas Bedenbender, contests that in *1 Enoch* we find an opposition to Moses' law and to those priests in Jerusalem who put it at the center of their theology; Nickelsburg, 'Enochic Wisdom and Its Relationship to the Mosaic Law', in *The Early Enoch Literature*, ed. Gabriele Boccaccini and John J. Collins (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 81-94; Bedenbender, 'The Place of the Torah in the Early Enoch Literature', in *The Early Enoch Literature*, 65-79; but see also Paolo Sacchi, *La Regola della Comunità: Introduzione, traduzione e commento*, Studi biblici 150 (Brescia: Paideia, 2006), 45-52; idem, *Tra giudaismo e cristianesimo: Riflessioni sul giudaismo antico e medio*, Antico e Nuovo Testamento 7 (Brescia: Morcelliana, 2010), 149-58, 164-66. Nickelsburg points to the fact that *1 Enoch* never openly rejects Moses' law: it just does not show any interest in it, having a certain respect for some traditions contained in the Pentateuch but being more keen on wisdom and prophecy (which have a similar attitude to the Mosaic Torah). Simply, *1 Enoch* and the Pentateuch have different interests. Nickelsburg's arguments are quite important, but *1 Enoch's* silence about the law, especially in the context of the 2nd century crisis sparked by the suppression of Moses' law by Antiochus IV, remains problematic: this omission leaves the impression, if not of hostility, at least of a deep distance between the 'Enochians' and the "traditionalists" (even if Judas Maccabee is held in high esteem in the *Animal Apocalypse*).

stand in the face of that part of Judaism that had Moses' law as its theological core, namely, the temple priestly aristocracy.[5]

Recapitulating all of this, the elements of the Old Testament tradition that strike us the most by their absence or modification in *1 Enoch* are the following:

1. Reference to Moses's law is absent.
2. The theological reference to Sinai becomes secondary to the revelation given to Enoch (while there is a curious reference to Mount Hermon).
3. The idea of covenant (as a consequence of 1. and 2.) does not seem to have a particular role.
4. Reference to Abraham is nearly absent from *1 Enoch*'s theological horizon: he appears only one time, in the *Apocalypse of the Animals* (*1 Enoch* 89:9-12), represented as a white bull (like Adam).
5. Neither the Davidic monarchy nor the Jerusalem temple play a particular role in the historical accounts; the temple, especially after its reconstruction, seems to be in a perennial condition of contamination.
6. The Israelite Kingdom of the North does not seem to have existed in the Enochic perception of their history.
7. Final judgement, election of individuals, a certain opening up toward other nations, immortality and the resurrection of bodies, as well as continuity between biblical and post-biblical events, are the most significant novelties with respect to the Old Testament.
8. In particular, because they are the recipients of heavenly secrets, Enoch and Noah are assigned fundamental roles that go well past those they have in their respective biblical narratives.

Using VanderKam's words:

> In summary, the highly composite book of 1 Enoch exhibits a variety of ways in which its writers used earlier Scriptures – which do not always appear to be identical with the ones that were later to be categorized as canonical – and applied them to new situations. It seems fair to say that the ancient texts are never explored as an interesting

[5] Nickelsburg is in favor of reading *1 Enoch*'s version of the story of the Watchers as an expansion of the biblical text on the basis of: 1) verbal similarities; 2) a threefold structure similar to that of Genesis; 3) connections in content (see particularly, 1 Enoch, 166-67). I am not convinced, for two main reasons—1) literary: the Genesis version of the story seems to be a summary of a larger story and presupposes that the readers already know the events; 2) theological: the whole section Genesis 1-11 is intended to 'cleanse' the primeval stories from any mythological element, the story of the Watchers here is devoid of any theological meaning. The Genesis authors are interested in focusing on human sins as the cause of the growing distance between God and humankind, creating the context of Abraham's call in Genesis 12.

> exercise in and of itself; rather, the concern is with what they have to say to the writer's day—whether by showing the course of history and its impending end (the apocalypses and the parables) or by serving as moral examples of the need to live righteously now in order to avoid the kind of divine judgment that had come with the flood. The writers could make their points by concentrating on a single passage ... or, more often, by creating a full, rich text from a variety of biblical and extra-biblical models.[6]

2. Adam and Eve between the Old Testament and 1 Enoch

We now come to the example of the first couple created by God and living in Eden (Genesis 2-3), a story that can help us bring into relief the theological characteristics of the authors of *1 Enoch* and their relationship to the biblical tradition. In the Old Testament we meet at least three different accounts related to 'primordial people': a) the best known is that of Adam and Eve in Genesis 2-3; b) Ezekiel 28 tells of a glorious first man, also driven from Eden, but here because of his arrogance; and c) in Job 15:7 there is a quick mention of a wise man, 'created before the mountains', without any mention of a 'fall' or any sinful behavior.

Considering later Jewish and Christian interpretations of the sin committed by Adam and Eve,[7] it seems important to stress that in the Old Testament none of these primordial figures is considered the cause of humanity's loss of immortality,[8]

---

[6] VanderKam, 'Biblical Interpretation in *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees*', 117.

[7] The most famous is *4 Ezra* 7:116-22: 'I answered and said, "This is my first and last word, that it would have been better if the earth had not produced Adam, or else, when it had produced him had taught him not to sin. For what good is it to all if they live in sorrow now and expect punishment after death? O Adam, what have you done? For though it was you who sinned. the misfortune was not yours alone, but ours also who are your descendants. For what good is it to us, if an immortal age has been promised to us, but we have done deeds that bring death? Or that an everlasting hope has been predicted to us, but we are miserably shamed? Or that safe and healthful treasuries have been reserved for us, but we have erred wickedly? Or that the glory of the Most High will defend those who have led a pure life, but we have walked in the most wicked ways? Or that a paradise shall be revealed, whose fruit does not spoil and in which are abundance and healing, but we shall not enter it, because we have lived in unseemly places? Or that the faces of those who practiced self-control shall shine more than the stars, but our faces shall be blacker than darkness? For while we lived and committed iniquity we did not consider what we should suffer after our death'"; translation by Michael Stone, Fourth Ezra: *A Commentary on the Book of* Fourth Ezra, ed. Frank Moore Cross, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990) ad loc.; see also Rom 5:12-21; 1 Cor 15:21-22.

[8] But see Lester Grabbe, '"Better Watch Your Back, Adam": Another Adam and Eve Tradition in Second Temple Judaism', in *New Perspectives on* 2 Enoch*: No Longer Slavonic Only*, ed. Andrei A. Orlov and Gabriele Boccaccini, Studia Judaeoslavica 4 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 273-82. Here Grabbe, in discussion with John R. Levison, defends the idea that Ezekiel 38 and other texts (*Testament of Abraham*, Philo, Sirach, *Life of Adam and Eve*) presuppose the loss of at least a higher status of humankind; see Levinson, 'Adam as a Mediatorial Figure in Second Temple Jewish Literature', in *New Perspectives on* 2 Enoch, 243-72.

nor do their actions condition anyone else; they do not even make humanity inclined to or subjugated to sin. Figures b) and c) are used as literary references to traditions otherwise known only to the ancient readers, while the Genesis account of Adam is rather intended to affirm that human beings, because of their transgression, cannot live in Eden but rather dwell in a world where they must sweat to survive.[9] Immortality remains a wish that is inaccessible to a humankind that was created mortal. It is very interesting to see how these three stories about primordial men will find their continuation in Middle Jewish literature and, particularly, that it will be the Enoch tradition which introduces into Jewish thought the idea of an 'original sin' (that of the Watchers), which has corrupted the good creation of God and rendered humanity mortal and sinful, without mentioning the sin of our first parents in Eden.

a) Adam and Eve in the Book of Watchers

It becomes significant, then, in the light of later theological developments in other writings, that in *1 Enoch* the figure of Adam receives only few implicit references, which, in fact, lead in a quite different direction, that is, which give him no role in this primeval and ominous event. It is the Watchers (and their children, the giants), who are accused of having spread sin and suffering in the originally good creation of God, instead of keeping it safe as they were supposed to do. Beside this, their sin is different than that of the first couple, because it is first of all of sexual origin: enamored of human women, they have intercourse with them and give birth to the giants, terrible creatures that will disseminate death and destruction in the world.

> They have gone in to the daughters of the men of earth, and they have lain with them, and have defiled themselves with the women. And they have revealed to them all sins, and have taught them to make hate-inducing charms. And now look, the daughters of men have born sons from them, giants, half-breeds. ... And the whole earth is filled with iniquity.[10]

---

[9] Even if the Christian tradition, following Paul, later attributed mortality and human sinfulness to the sin of Adam, today the exegetical world rather agrees in denying that this was the intent of the writers of the text of Genesis. James Barr allows for the failed attempt of the first couple to become like God; but being driven from Eden does not imply any change in human nature: only a worsening of the conditions of life and the knowledge that it is not possible to conquer the divine condition; *The Garden of Eden and the Hope of Immortality: The Read-Tuckwell Lectures for 1990* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993).

[10] *1 Enoch* 9:8-9. Translations of *1 Enoch* are from George W. E. Nickelsburg and James C. VanderKam, trans., 1 Enoch*: The Hermeneia Translation*, 2nd ed., Book Collections on Project MUSE (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012).

In a certain way, it is the story of Adam upside down: instead of man seeking the prerogatives of divinity (knowledge and eternal life), it is the sphere of the divine that comes down, illicitly mixing heaven and earth. Added to this is a second aspect of the sin of the angels: the gift of knowledge to human beings, knowledge that should have been denied them. In the Genesis story the desire to know is one of the forces that pushes Adam and Eve to sin, but in this case, as well, the account is inverted: instead of people seeking knowledge, it is knowledge donated to them by the angels.

Both Genesis and *1 Enoch* face similar problems, but give different answers to the issue of evil and sin: Genesis 1-11, in fact, intends to explain how, starting from the good creation of God, humanity has progressively gone away from Eden and from God through its own free will, pushing itself always further away. Abraham's calling (Genesis 12) and the promise of the chosen people of Israel (with the later gift of the Law at Sinai) becomes the very moment at which God starts a new story. The reason for the growing distance from God is seen in the will of humanity to give in to sin which, as much as it maintains an element of mysterious appeal (the temptation of the serpent), is attributed to the full responsibility of the individual. The serpent is not requested to give the reason for his action: it is only an animal, while the human being is held capable of choosing.

The scheme of Genesis is strictly opposed to that of *1 Enoch*. *1 Enoch* speaks of a corruption of the world attributed to an illegitimate action of angelic Watchers who belong to the heavenly world, a corruption in which humanity is led astray by evil spirits and illicit teachings and that will necessarily bring about the end of this epoch, judgement on humankind and a return of men and women to their original perfection—elements all foreign to the Old Testament (with the exception of the book of Daniel). The responsibility of single individuals does not seem to be the primary interest of the *Book of the Watchers*. On the contrary, humans seem to be crushed by the weight of creation's corruption, perpetrated by the Watchers and by the violence of the giants: here the human being is more a victim of sin than its maker, a point of view that will be mitigated in the other Enochic books.

In Genesis and *1 Enoch*, then, we find two different understandings of the world and sin, which have their roots, respectively, in two different myths: Adam, on the one side, and the Watchers, on the other—this, notwithstanding that Genesis 2-3 is known to the final editor of the *Book of Watchers*, who refers to it twice and in a meaningful way, recalling in Enoch's heavenly journeys the tree of life and the tree of knowledge:

> And I proceeded beyond them, and I saw seven glorious mountains, all differing each from the other, whose stones were precious in beauty. And all (the mountains) were precious and glorious and beautiful in appearance—three to the east were firmly set one on the other, and three to the south, one on the other, and deep and rugged ravines, one not approaching the other. The seventh mountain (was) in the middle of these, and it rose above them in height, like the seat of a throne. And fragrant trees

> encircled it. Among them was a tree such as I had never smelled, and among them was no other like it. It had a fragrance sweeter smelling than all spices, and its leaves and its blossom and the trees never wither. Its fruit is beautiful, like dates of the palm trees. Then I said, 'How beautiful is this tree and fragrant, and its leaves are lovely, and its blossoms are lovely to look at'. Then Michael answered me, one of the holy angels who was with me and was their leader, and he said to me, 'Enoch, why do you inquire and why do you marvel about the fragrance of this tree, and why do you wish to learn the truth'? Then I answered him—I, Enoch—and said, 'Concerning all things I wish to know, but especially concerning this tree'. And he answered me and said, 'This high mountain that you saw, whose peak is like the throne of God, is the seat where the Great Holy One, the Lord of glory, the King of eternity, will sit, when he descends to visit the earth in good-ness. And (as for) this fragrant tree, no flesh has the right to touch it until the great judgment, in which there will be vengeance on all and a consummation forever. Then it will be given to the righteous and the pious, and its fruit will be food for the chosen. And it will be transplanted to the holy place, by the house of God, the King of eternity. Then they will rejoice greatly and be glad, and they will enter into the sanctuary. Its fragrances <will be> in their bones, and they will live a long life on the earth, such as your fathers lived also in their days, and torments and plagues and suffering will not touch them'. Then I blessed the God of glory, the King of eternity, who has prepared such things for people (who are) righteous, and has created them and promised to give (them) to them.[11]

In *1 Enoch* 25:6 a parallel is made between the epoch of Adam and Eve and the end times, when the tree of life will again be available and people will live a 'long life on the earth, such as your fathers lived also in their days'. The problem is that the author of these words must have had in mind an idea on the origin of death but was not interested in making it more explicit than this. The episode where we find the description of the places in which the souls are gathered (waiting for the resurrection of the bodies) presupposes the immortality of the soul, which at the last judgement will be reunited to its resurrected body. This is particularly striking given that no other element in the *Book of Watchers* suggests that an original immortality was lost.[12] But the simple witness of one isolated sentence seems to me a

---

[11] *1 Enoch* 24:2–25:7.

[12] Only in *1 Enoch* 69:6-11 do we find a statement on the origin of death, traced to a quite different reason: 'And the name of the third is Gadre'el. This is the one who showed all the blows of death to the sons of men, and he led Eve astray, and he showed the shield and the coat of mail and the sword for battle and all the implements of death to the sons of men. And from his hand they have gone forth against those who dwell on the earth from that day and for-ever and ever. And the name of the fourth is Penemue. This one showed the sons of men the bitter and the sweet and showed them all the secrets of their wisdom. He gave humans knowledge about writing with ink and papyrus, and therefore many went astray from of old and forever and until this day. For humans were not born for this pur-

small basis for supposing that the *Book of Watchers* is the first to interpret Genesis 2-3 as an account of the loss of first couple's immortality, which would otherwise have been guaranteed by their permanent residence in the garden of Eden and access to the tree of life. It is more likely that this sentence was a later comment that became part of the text.

b) The Book of Dream Visions

With the *Book of Dream Visions,* the historical background changes completely with respect to the times of the late Persian and early Hellenistic dominations, when the *Book of Watchers* was written. Here, in fact, we are historically in the heart of the Maccabean struggle, in a tormented and convulsive political climate. If the confrontation with Persian culture and religion was peaceful (if, indeed, there was any confrontation), the encounter with the Greek culture became a clash in the 2nd century BCE, first cultural and then military, when Antiochus IV, Hellenistic sovereign of Syria, decided to press the Hellenization of Jerusalem in order to better integrate Judaea into his kingdom. This political move of religious assimilation, promoted by part of the Jewish elite in favor of Hellenization, will bring about a strenuous resistance that will eventuate in the armed revolt led by the Maccabees, who, exploiting the political situation for their own ends, will be able to create an independent state that will survive until 63 BCE, when Judaea will progressively fall into the orbit of the future Roman Empire (albeit maintaining a certain autonomy under Herod the Great and some of his descendants).

c) The Animal Apocalypse

Only in the *Book of Dream Visions* do we find a clear reference to Adam and Eve. They are spoken of within the so called *Animal Apocalypse*, where the history of Israel (and of the world, since it starts with the creation) is represented through a succession of different animals, each symbolizing its different historical protagonists until the coming of the imminent kingdom of God. The vision, whose scheme of events (as we have seen above) is drawn principally from the Old Testament, opens

---

pose, to confirm their trustworthiness through pen and ink. For humans were not created to be different from the angels, so that they should remain pure and righteous. And death, which ruins everything, would not have laid its hand on them. But through this, their knowledge, they are perishing, and through this power it devours us'; *1 Enoch* 69:6-11. I think we should consider first that this text belongs to the latest strata of *1 Enoch*, when the issue was at stake and developed in some contemporary writings; and, second, that here we have a short sentence in a context that talks about other matters. The question about the origin of death in *1 Enoch* is just not theologically developed.

with the birth of Adam[13] from the earth in the appearance of a bull colored white, a symbol of purity (*1 Enoch* 85:3). And immediately after him rises Eve from the earth and simultaneously two other calves: Cain (a black bull) and Abel (a red bull). Here the family relations established by Genesis 2-4 seem changed, not least because later the sons of Cain are also generated by Eve (*1 Enoch* 85:5).

Two elements of the *Animal Apocalypse* are particularly important for our study. First, from Adam and Eve descend cattle, both white and black, to indicate that righteousness and unrighteousness are attributed to people from birth, with no explanation as to the reason. This strong predeterminism draws the author of the text near to the theology that later will be expressed at Qumran. Second, in the following passages the predetermined affirmation of evil runs in tandem with the fall of the Watchers and the resulting generation of giants, symbolized here by donkeys, camels and elephants (*1 Enoch* 86:4) who bring destruction and ruin to the world (in the *Book of Watchers* the angels' descent defiles the creation and brings sin into the world).

The parallel with Genesis 2-3 is limited substantially to the single fact that Adam is the first human to be created, rising from the dust. Much more conspicuous and significant are the differences: Eve is born from the earth (and not from Adam's rib) together with Cain and Abel; there is no mention of Eden; Adam is white, that is, pure and glorious—a characteristic absent in Genesis but present in Sirach 49:16 and some writings from Qumran.[14] This characterization reminds us, on the one hand, of the first man of God's court in Job 15:7-8 and, on the other hand, of the perfect being of Ezekiel 28 before the fall. Nowhere in the *Book of Dream Visions* is there any mention of the transgression of our first parents.

To what can we attribute these noteworthy differences between the two versions of this ostensibly single story? The first plausible explanation is that the *Book of Dream Visions* is engaged in polemics with that part of Judaism which attributed the full responsibility of sin to the single individual, a thesis that could be exemplified in the biblical story of Adam and Eve and their transgression of the single God's commandment they were supposed to keep.[15] At the same time this section of *1 Enoch*, even if faithful to the Enochic traditions of the fall of the angels that we have met in the *Book of Watchers*, does not seem to impute to them the corruption

---

[13] The text of the *Animal Apocalypse* does not indicate anyone by name. Those names are rather inferred here, based on the evident fact that the author mainly follows the biblical scheme.

[14] See, for instance, CD iii 20; 1QH[a] iv 14-15. For further readings, Crispin H.T. Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls,* STDJ 42 (Leiden: Brill, 2002); Nicholas A. Meyer, *Adam's Dust and Adam's Glory in the Hodayot and the Letters of Paul: Rethinking Anthropology and Theology*, NovTSup 168 (Leiden: Brill, 2016).

[15] Gen 2:16-17.

of creation, preferring to put the accent on the predetermination of history: good, bad; all seems to happen according to a precise plan of God. Wishing to picture human life oppressed by evil and sin, the Enochians found the story of the Watchers fit for their purpose, choosing not to use Genesis 2-3, as the apostle Paul will do two centuries later.

It seems reasonable to think, therefore, that the *Book of Dream Visions* is based on a tradition with regard to Adam (or, to be more precise, to the 'first man') that differs from Genesis 3, mentioned above (Job 15:7-8; Sirach 49:16). In it a glorious and wise first man is spoken of, as apparently never to have fallen from his condition of purity and wisdom. It is a tradition that must have predated Genesis 2-3 and remained parallel to it for a long time, to be eventually forgotten in favor of the canonical version. The author of the *Animal Apocalypse* surely knew both, but preferred to base his account above all on the more ancient one, because it was theologically closer to his thought and because it gave him the possibility of creating a connection between the first perfect man and the Messiah that will arrive at the end of times.

d) A Second Adam?

As a matter of fact, at the end of the *Animal Apocalypse*, in *1 Enoch* 90:37, the image of a bull 'white as snow' returns (there is added that it has big black horns), which begins an offspring of white cattle. For Milik,[16] Black[17] and Nickelsburg[18] this image represents the 'second Adam', a figure that, despite having no traits of the Davidic messiah,[19] inaugurates the new era, that of purity.[20] This figure is very interesting, because it offers a possible precedent to the Pauline doctrine of the second Adam (see Rom 5:12-21; 1Cor 5:21-22, 45-47). As we have seen, a similar 'glorious' idea of Adam is found also in Qumran literature.

---

[16] Jósef T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976), 45.

[17] Matthew Black, The Book of Enoch *or* I Enoch*: A New English Edition with Commentary and Textual Notes*, SVTP 7 (Leiden: Brill, 1985), 279-80.

[18] Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch, 406-07.

[19] See James C. VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition*, CBQMS 16 (Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984), 168.

[20] Paolo Sacchi, *Storia del Secondo Tempio: Israele tra VI secolo a.C. e I secolo d.C.* (Torino: Società Editrice Internazionale, 1994), 216. But Daniel C. Olson defends the idea that the white bull at the end of times recalls Jacob as representative of all Israel; *A New Reading of the Animal Apocalypse of* 1 Enoch, SVTP 24 (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2013), 31, 54-55, 228-29, 243.

e) 1 Enoch *60:8*

There is also a quick reference to Adam in *1 Enoch* 60:8, where he is defined as the first human created by God. The fact that Eden is spoken of in the same context is interesting, but it is said that in it dwell 'the chosen and righteous', where Enoch also dwelt, 'the seventh from Adam'. Here we are by now in the *Book of Parables*, dated to the middle of the 1st century BCE. As in the case of *1 Enoch* 32:3-6, Adam's sin does not have any role in the explanation of the world's corruption or human mortality, which is rather clearly attributed to the prohibited knowledge received by the angels.[21]

f) 1 Enoch *93*

1 Enoch's relationship with the biblical stories of Genesis is puzzling in one more implicit reference to Adam. In the *Apocalypse of the Weeks* (*1 Enoch* 93) the initial part of the *Epistle of Enoch*, there is a summary of the universal history of creation at the end of times or, better, from the times of Enoch (first week) to the advent of God's kingdom (seventh week). Why is there no reference to creation or to Adam? To the latter there is only an implicit reference, when Enoch says: 'I was born the seventh' (*1 Enoch* 93:3), most probably counting from Adam. No more words are said on our forefather.

3. Conclusion

1 Enoch attests to the existence of a group of theologians who, at least since the late Persian epoch, persisted for some centuries in expressing the originality of their thought and could also plant their roots in the ancient past of pre-exilic Israelite religion, even maintaining an open dialogue with at least part of biblical tradition—particularly starting from the 2nd century BCE, when Enochic Judaism tried to find a connection with Mosaic Judaism.[22] The few references to Adam and Eve in *1 Enoch* witness both to their original theological elaboration and to their ties with a more ancient past of the Israelite religious tradition.

---

[21] See note 12.

[22] Paolo Sacchi and Gabriele Boccaccini have worked on the definition of Enochic Judaism, its roots in ancient Judaism and its relationship with Mosaic Judaism; see Gabriele Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways between Qumran and Enochic Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998); idem, *Roots of Rabbinic Judaism: An Intellectual History, from Ezekiel to Daniel* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002); idem, 'Enochians, Urban Essenes, Qumranites: Three Social Groups, One Intellectual Movement', in *The Early Enoch Literature*, 301-27; Paolo Sacchi, 'Da Qohelet al tempo di Gesù: alcune linee del pensiero giudaico', *ANRW* II.19.1:3-32; idem, *Tra giudaismo e cristianesimo*; idem, *Storia del Secondo Tempio*.

Bibliography

Barr, James. *The Garden of Eden and the Hope of Immortality: The Read-Tuckwell Lectures for 1990*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993.

Bedenbender, Andreas. 'The Place of the Torah in the Early Enoch Literature'. Pages 65-79 in *The Early Enoch Literature*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and John J. Collins. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

Black, Matthew. *The* Book of Enoch *or* I Enoch*: A New English Edition with Commentary and Textual Notes*. SVTP 7. Leiden: Brill, 1985.

Boccaccini, Gabriele. *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways between Qumran and Enochic Judaism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.

____. 'Enochians, Urban Essenes, Qumranites: Three Social Groups, One Intellectual Movement'. Pages 301-27 in *The Early Enoch Literature*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and John J. Collins. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

____. *Roots of Rabbinic Judaism: An Intellectual History, from Ezekiel to Daniel*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.

Fletcher-Louis, Crispin H.T. *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. STDJ 42. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

Grabbe, Lester. '"Better Watch Your Back, Adam": Another Adam and Eve Tradition in Second Temple Judaism'. Pages 273-82 in *New Perspectives on* 2 Enoch*: No Longer Slavonic Only*. Edited by Andrei A. Orlov and Gabriele Boccaccini. Studia Judaeoslavica 4. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

Hartmann, Lars. *Asking for a Meaning: A Study of* 1 Enoch *1-5*. ConBNT 12. Lund: Liberläromedel/Gleerup, 1979.

Levison, John R. 'Adam as a Mediatorial Figure in Second Temple Jewish Literature'. Pages 243-72 in *New Perspectives on* 2 Enoch*: No Longer Slavonic Only*. Edited by Andrei A. Orlov and Gabriele Boccaccini. Studia Judaeoslavica 4. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

Meyer, Nicholas A. *Adam's Dust and Adam's Glory in the Hodayot and the Letters of Paul: Rethinking Anthropology and Theology*. NovTSup 168. Leiden: Brill, 2016.

Milik, Jósef T. *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1976.

Nickelsburg, George W. E. 1 Enoch*: A Commentary on the Book of* 1 Enoch*, Chapters 1-36, 81-108*. Edited by Klaus Baltzer. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001.

____. 'Enochic Wisdom and Its Relationship to the Mosaic Law'. Pages 81-94 in *The Early Enoch Literature*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and John J. Collins. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

Nickelsburg, George W. E. and James C. VanderKam, trans. 1 Enoch*: The Hermeneia Translation*. 2nd ed. Book Collections on Project MUSE. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012.

____. 1 Enoch *2: A Commentary on the Book of* 1 Enoch*, Chapters 37-82*. Edited by Klaus Baltzer. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2011.

Olson, Daniel C. *A New Reading of the Animal Apocalypse of* 1 Enoch. SVTP 24. Boston: Brill, 2013.

Sacchi, Paolo. 'Da Qohelet al tempo di Gesù: Alcune linee del pensiero giudaico'. *ANRW* II.19.1:3-32. Edited by Hildegard Temporini and Wolfgang Haase. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1972-1996.

____. *La Regola della Comunità: Introduzione, traduzione e commento*. Studi biblici 150. Brescia: Paideia, 2006.

____. *Storia del Secondo Tempio: Israele tra 6. secolo a.C. e 1. secolo d.C.*. Torino: Società Editrice Internazionale, 1994.

____. *Tra giudaismo e cristianesimo: Riflessioni sul giudaismo antico e medio*. Antico e Nuovo Testamento 7. Brescia: Morcelliana, 2010.

Stone, Michael. Fourth Ezra: *A Commentary on the Book of* Fourth Ezra. Edited by Frank Moore Cross. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990.

VanderKam, James C. *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition*. CBQMS 16. Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984.

____. 'Biblical Interpretation in *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees*'. Pages 96-125 in *The Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth and Craig A. Evans. JSPSup 14/Studies in Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity 2. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.

Creative Reception: The Bible and its Interpretations at Qumran*

Corrado Martone

Introduction

Biblical interpretation is among the main literary genres found in the Qumran library. According to Moshe Bernstein:

> The picture of biblical interpretation at Qumran is but a piece of the larger mosaic of Jewish biblical interpretation in antiquity. Although it may not have comprised a major component of that body of exegesis during the Second Temple period, Qumran biblical interpretation now constitutes a principal element in our delineation of the overall system of early biblical interpretation. The significance of the Dead Sea Scrolls in this area is based not merely upon the number of manuscripts discovered, but also on the diversity in its corpus and the way in which the collection seems to mirror Second Temple Jewish literature as a whole. It can thus serve as a virtual representative of a much broader body of material.[1]

In fact, any introduction to the Qumran literature and any anthology of Qumran texts has a chapter devoted to 'Exegetical Literature' or the like. However, the main problem relating the interpretation and reception of the Bible at Qumran concerns the very notion of 'Bible' in this context. A number of Qumran texts show a fluid textual status, which makes it difficult to set a clear distinction between text and interpretation, and therefore to have a clear picture of the reception of a given biblical text. Paradoxically, this situation recalls the state of the art of the most recent 'reception history' in the field of biblical studies. Timothy Beal points out that one of the main problems of reception history today is the lack of what he calls 'origination'.[2] At the time of the Qumran reception the

---

* I want to thank Dorota Hartman and Michael A. Daise, the organizers of the Naples conference 'The Reception of Jewish Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity', for the most congenial atmosphere of a superbly successful conference.

[1] See Moshe J. Bernstein, 'Interpretation of Scriptures', in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam, 2 vols. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 1:376. The bibliography in this field is simply boundless; however, one cannot fail to mention the two useful collections of essays edited by Matthias Henze, ed., *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran*, Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005); and more recently, idem, ed., *A Companion to Biblical Interpretation in Early Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012).

[2] Timothy Beal, 'Reception History and Beyond: Toward the Cultural History of Scriptures', *BibInt* 19 (2011): 357–72 (in particular, p. 367).

original text was still in progress; today, according to many scholars, we are no longer able to reconstruct it.[3]

1. Textual Instability in the 'Biblical' Qumran Manuscripts

As mentioned, one of the main features of the Qumran library is undoubtedly the textual instability of the various works to be found there.[4]

This instability has long been recognized among the so-called 'biblical' texts from Qumran, and Emanuel Tov remarked in a seminal study how difficult and risky it is to label a given Qumran biblical text as belonging to a given tradition. Moreover I will analyze how this kind of free approach to a given textual tradition can be regarded as a sort of reception of that tradition, a reception that directly acts upon the text, so as to become a creative reception.

As for the well-known case of 4QSam[a], a Qumran manuscript of Samuel from Qumran dating to the mid-1st century BCE, Tov maintains that this text

> shares important readings with the LXX, but when these are examined together with the differences between the two, and with the unique readings of both, the scroll cannot be characterized any longer as 'Septuagintal'. Furthermore, not even all common readings of 4QSam[a] and the LXX bear on this comparison.[5]

Shemaryahu Talmon, as early as 1964, wrote that '[t]he more ancient manuscripts are being discovered and published, the more textual divergencies appear'.[6] And in fact we can see that, not only the manuscripts originally labelled as Septuagintal share variant readings with other textual traditions, but in many cases also the manuscripts labelled as (proto)-Masoretic tend to deviate from the tradition ascribed to them.

---

[3] For a discussion on this point see Corrado Martone, 'All the Bibles We Need: The Impact of the Qumran Evidence on Biblical Lower Criticism', in *The Scrolls and Biblical Traditions: Proceedings of the Seventh Meeting of the IOQS in Helsinki*, ed. George J. Brooke, Daniel K. Falk, Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar and Molly M. Zahn, STDJ 103 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 47–64.

[4] On this point see Corrado Martone, 'Textual Fluidity as a Means of Sectarian Identity: Some Examples from the Qumran Literature', in *The Hebrew Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Nóra Dávid, Armin Lange, Kristin De Troyer and Shani Tzoref, FRLANT 239 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011), 117-26.

[5] Emanuel Tov, 'A Modern Textual Outlook Based on the Qumran Scrolls', *HUCA* 53 (1982): 21. For a criticism of Tov's views, see Bruno Chiesa, 'Textual History and Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Old Testament', in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls. Madrid 18-21 March, 1991. Volume One*, ed. Julio Trebolle Barrera and Luis Vegas-Montaner, STDJ 11 (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 257-72.

[6] Shemaryahu Talmon, 'Aspects of the Textual Transmission of the Bible in Light of Qumran Manuscripts', *Text* 4 (1964): 95-132.; see also Eugene Ulrich, 'Horizons of Old Testament Textual Research at the Thirtieth Anniversary of Qumran Cave 4', *CBQ* 46 (1984): 613-36.

It should be remembered in passing that even a clearly non-Septuagintal text such as the great Isaiah Scroll from Qumran might have some surprise in store for us in this regard. If Millar Burrows wrote in 1948 that 1QIsa[a]

> agrees with the Masoretic text to a remarkable degree ... in wording. Herein lies its chief importance, supporting the fidelity of the Masoretic tradition,[7]

Joseph Ziegler has carefully collected and, most importantly, evaluated a huge number of agreements between the LXX of Isaiah and 1QIsa[a] against the Masoretic text.[8]

Moreover, it is possible to see in 1QIsa[a] possible hints of a reworking of the text from a sectarian point of view. Isaiah 52:14 reads as follows:

> כַּאֲשֶׁר שָׁמְמוּ עָלֶיךָ רַבִּים כֵּן־מִשְׁחַת מֵאִישׁ מַרְאֵהוּ ...
>
> As many were astonished at him – his appearance was so marred, beyond human semblance ...

1QIsa[a] has an interesting variant reading, which might be intended as referring to a messianic interpretation of the passage:

> כאשר שממו עליך רבים כן משחתי מאיש מראהו ...

This might be translated as follows:

> Just as many were astonished at you, so I anointed his appearance beyond anyone else...

I will not enter now the long-debated question of the interpretation of this Qumran reading of Isaiah 52:14, which has been carefully re-examined by Emiliano Urciuoli in a study appearing in the *Revue de Qumran* ten years ago.[9] The point here is simply to highlight the free attitude toward the biblical text even in the 'biblical' manuscripts from Qumran.[10]

---

[7] 'Variant Readings in the Isaiah Manuscript', *BASOR* 111 (1948): 16-17; see the comments of Paolo Sacchi, 'Il Rotolo A di Isaia. Problemi di storia del testo', *Accademia Toscana di Scienze e Lettere 'Colombaria'* 30 (1965): 31-111.

[8] Joseph Ziegler, 'Die *Vorlage* der Isaias-Septuaginta (LXX) und die erste Isaias-Rolle von Qumran (1QIsa)', *JBL* 78 (1959): 34-59; and see Francolino Gonçalves, 'Isaiah Scroll', in *ABD* 3: 471-80.

[9] See Emiliano Rubens Urciuoli, 'A Suffering Messiah at Qumran? Some Observations on the Debate about 1QIsa A', *RevQ* 24 (2009): 273-81; see also Piero Capelli, 'Appunti sugli usi di Isaia 6 nell'ebraismo rabbinico della tarda antichità', *Annali di Scienze Religiose* 5 (2000): 111-30.

[10] Alexander Rofé, 'The History of Israelite Religion and the Biblical Text: Corrections Due to the Unification of Worship', in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov*, ed. Shalom M. Paul, Robert A. Kraft, Lawrence H. Schiffman and Weston W. Fields, VTSup 94/1 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 759–93; Julio Trebolle, 'Kings (MT/LXX) and Chronicles: The Double and Triple Textual Tradition', in *Reflection and Refraction: Studies in Biblical Historiography in Honour of A. Graeme Auld*, ed. Robert Rezetko, Timothy H. Lim and W. Brian Aucker, VTSup 113 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 483–

The same attitude might be presumed to be extant in 1QIsaiah[b].[11] It is true that this scroll does not offer any significant variation from the consonantal skeleton of the MT, but it is just as true that a careful analysis and measurement of the manuscript's lacunae allow us to see a text much shorter than the MT.[12]

2. Textual Instability and Reception of Jewish Scripture in the Exegetical Qumran Texts

A free approach to scripture is the main trait of the so-called parabiblical texts.

Parabiblical is, as far as I know, a definition created especially for some Qumran works[13] that may be summarized as follows:

> a literature that begins with the Bible, which retells the biblical text in its own way, intermingling it and expanding it with other, quite different traditions. Every one of these compositions has its starting point in specific texts of the Torah or of the Prophets but, unlike the exegetical literature, rather than interpreting the biblical text, they elaborate on it, augmenting it with other material.[14]

A case in point is the *Temple Scroll*. As is well-known, the *Temple Scroll* is usually considered an exegetical work, in which the laws of Deuteronomy are presented as given directly from God, without Moses' mediation. Well, it is clear that in this case we are on the border between text and interpretation. In fact, if we ask ourselves

---

501; Corrado Martone, 'Sectarian Variant Readings and Sectarian Texts in the Qumran Corpus and Beyond: Reflections on an Elusive Concept', in *Ricercare la sapienza di tutti gli antichi (Sir. 39,1): Miscellanea in onore di Gian Luigi Prato*, ed. Marcello Milani and Marco Zappella, Supplementi alla Rivista Biblica 56 (Bologna: Dehoniane, 2013), 393-400.

[11] On 1QIsa[b] see Peter W. Flint and Eugene Ulrich, 'The Variant Textual Readings in the Hebrew University Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa[b])', *JJS* 60 (2009): 60–79; Peter W. Flint, 'Variant Readings and Textual Affiliation in the Hebrew University Isaiah Scroll from Qumran (1QIsa[b])', in *Qumran Cave 1 Revisited: Texts from Cave 1 Sixty Years after Their Discovery. Proceedings of the Sixth Meeting of the IOQS in Ljubljana*, ed. Daniel K. Falk, Sarianna Metso, Donald W. Parry and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, STDJ 91 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 33–53; idem, 'Non-Masoretic Variant Readings in the Hebrew University Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa[b]) and the Text to be Translated', in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Contemporary Culture: Proceedings of the International Conference Held at the Israel Museum, Jerusalem (July 6-8, 2008)*, ed. Adolfo D. Roitman, Lawrence H. Schiffman and Shani Tzoref, STDJ 93 (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 105-17.

[12] Giovanni Garbini, '1QIsa[b] et le texte d'Esaïe', *Hen* 6 (1984): 17-21. See also Dominique Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament. Tome 3: Ézéchiel, Daniel et les 12 Prophètes*, OBO 50 (Fribourg [Suisse]/Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992), 24-36.

[13] For a history of the term, created in 1967 by L.H. Ginzberg, see Daniel K. Falk, *The Parabiblical Texts: Strategies for Extending the Sriptures among the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: T & T Clark, 2007), 4-5.

[14] Florentino García Martínez ed., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated: The Qumran Texts in English*, trans. Wilfred G.E. Watson, 2nd ed. (Leiden: Brill/Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 218.

if the *Temple Scroll* may be considered an authoritative text, the short answer is yes. Which text might be more authoritative than one in which God himself speaks in the first person to his people?[15] And in my opinion this well-known feature of the *Temple Scroll* makes it somehow difficult to label our text as an exegetical text: as far as I know, no exegetical text adopts the voice of God.[16] The *Temple Scroll* does not explain or at least does not explicitly explain any norm or rule: it simply promulgates norms and rules.

So the *Temple Scroll* may not be considered a simple commentary, but on the other hand in Second Temple times the time for writing a Torah was over. How could its author convince its readers of the authenticity of this work in the Second Temple period? Was it possible to rewrite the text of Deuteronomy and to have people accept it in about the 2nd century BCE? As has been put forward by Ze'ev Falk, by that time the authenticity of a new Torah could easily be checked.[17] Again we are faced with the problem of blurred boundaries between a given scripture and its reception.

This situation is to be found also in the so-called exegetical texts from Qumran, though to a minor degree. I will content myself with some examples taken from the

---

[15] See James C. VanderKam, 'Authoritative Literature in the Dead Sea Scrolls', *DSD* 5 (1998): 382–402; see also Molly M. Zahn, 'New Voices, Ancient Words: The Temple Scroll's Reuse of the Bible', in *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel*, ed. John Day, JSOTSup 422 (London: T & T Clark International, 2005), 435-38: 'The great lengths to which the author went to make the Sinaitic claim as believable as possible seem to make the conclusion unavoidable that *TS* was indeed intended as authoritative Torah' (p. 452).

[16] See Johann Maier, trans. and ed., *Die Tempelrolle vom Toten Meer und das 'Neue Jerusalem'*, 3rd ed., Uni-Taschenbücher 829: Theologie, Judaistik und Archäologie (München: Reinhardt, 1997), 45.

[17] Ze'ev Wilhelm Falk, 'The Temple Scroll and the Codification of Jewish Law', *JLA* 2 (1979): 33-44. On this, see the learned essay by Zahn, 'New Voices, Ancient Words', 435-58. Zahn rightly remarks on the confusion of terminology regarding pseudepigraphy: 'The key questions are thus not whether the Scroll is Torah or pseudepigraph, but what precisely is meant by the pseudepigraphic claim to be Torah, what that claim implies about the Scroll's relationship to the canonical Pentateuch, and what difference that claim makes to the composition of the Scroll' (p. 441); see also Bernard M. Levinson, *Deuteronomy and the Hermeneutics of Legal Innovation* (New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997). In Levinson's view, Deuteronomy itself is a sort of pseudepigraphon, in that it reworks earlier traditions: 'Imitation becomes the sincerest form of encroachment' (p. 150). For a discussion of this topic, see Hindy Najman, *Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism*, Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 77 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 5-7 (with extensive bibliography on the complex relationship between forgery and pseudepigraphy). According to Najman, 'the goal of rewriting was not to replace but rather to honor the past, while re-presenting it to their distinctive audience(s)' (p. 44); see also Maxine L. Grossman, 'Beyond the Hand of Moses: Discourse and Interpretive Authority', *Prooftexts* 26 (2006): 299; as well as Corrado Martone, 'Authority and Text in the *Temple Scroll*', *Hen* 36 (2014): 21–34.

so-called *pesharim*.[18] In the well-known Habakkuk *pesher* it is possible to clearly distinguish between scripture and exegesis,[19] even if we must remember that it shows us that a two-chapter version of the book of Habakkuk existed in the Second Temple period. The *pesher* literature may be defined as a form of exegesis that intends to reveal the right sense of the biblical text, reading it in the light of the corresponding vicissitudes of the Community itself.[20] Further, the *pesher* exegesis is based on the assumption that the time of the final redemption is going to be fulfilled in the near future, so that Florentino García Martínez has rightly defined such a methodology as a process of systematically bestowing an eschatological character onto scripture.[21] Needless to say, the author (or authors) of the *pesharim* consider(s) the meaning that the biblical text has for the present situation to be much more significant than its original historical context. It may be added as an aside that in this regard it would be perhaps more appropriate to speak of a *pesher* 'hermeneutic' than of a *pesher* exegesis.

The *pesher* to Habakkuk clearly asserts the right of the Teacher of Righteousness to a personal approach to the scripture. I quote from 1QpHab vii 1-5:[22]

וידבר אל אל חבקוק לכתוב את הבאות על 2 על הדור האחרון ואת גמר הקץ לוא הודעו 3 vac ואשר
אמר למען ירוץ הקורא בו 4 פשרו על מורה הצדק אשר הודיעו אל את 5 כול רזי דברי עבדיו הנבאים

[18] On the Qumran *pesher* literature, see the classic stud**ies** by Maurya P. Horgan, *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books*, CBQMS 8 (Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1979); Michael Fishbane, 'Use, Authority and Interpretation of Mikra at Qumran', in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading, and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, ed. Martin Jan Mulder and Harry Sysling, (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1988), 339-76. More recently Yael Fisch offers a finely honed analysis of the modes of biblical interpretation in different areas of ancient Judaism, pointing out how similar interpretations are enacted with different ends in mind; '"Midrash-Pesher": A Shared Technique of Interpretation in Qumran, Paul, and the Tannaim', *RevQ* 32 (2020): 213–33.

[19] See Alex P. Jassen, 'The Pesharim and the Rise of Commentary in Early Jewish Scriptural Interpretation', *DSD* 19 (2012): 363–98; Reinhard Gregor Kratz, 'Biblical Interpretation and Redaction History', *HBAI* 9 (2020): 209–46.

[20] Timothy H. Lim, *Holy Scripture in the Qumran Commentaries and Pauline Letters* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997).

[21] Florentino García Martínez, 'El Pesher, Interpretacion Profética de La Escritura', *Salm* 26 (1979): 125-39; idem, 'Escatologizacion de Los Escritos Proféticos En Qumran', *EstBib* 44 (1986): 101-16; see also, more recently, Ulrich Dahmen, '"Keine Widerrede"! Die Pesharim aus Qumran zwischen Auslegung und absolutem offenbarungstheologischen Exklusivitätsanspruch', in *Das Alte Testament und seine Kommentare: Literarische und hermeneutische Orientierungen*, ed. Christoph Dohmen, SBB 81 (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 2021), 105–25.

[22] Transcriptions of Qumran texts are taken from Emanuel Tov and Donald W. Parry, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader*, 6 vols. (Leiden: Brill, 2004); translations are taken from Michael Wise, Martin Abegg, Jr. and Edward Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation*, rev. ed. (San Francisco: Harper, 2005).

> 1 Then God told Habakkuk to write down what is going to happen to 2 {to} the generation to come; but when that period would be complete He did not make known to him. 3 *vac* When it says, 'so that with ease someone can read it', 4 this refers to the Teacher of Righteousness to whom God made known 5. all the mysterious revelations of his servants the prophets.

The Teacher's interpretation of scripture goes beyond the self-understanding of the Prophets, concerning what they were saying or writing. In fact, this interpretation is the result of God's revelation, which allows the Teacher's *easy* reading of the words of scripture. Besides, it is interesting to note that such a statement is, in turn, based on a peculiar interpretation of Habakkuk 2:2 and of the verb רוץ, which may be plainly translated as follows: 'Write the vision and make it plain upon the tablets, so that the one reading it may run'.[23]

From this passage we may also understand that the content of the revelation given to the Teacher of Righteousness deals with the eschatological time, which the Community considered already present, as clearly stated in 1QpHab ii 5-10:[24]

> 5 וכן vac פשר הדבר[על הבו]גדים לאחרית א 6 הימים המה עריצ[י הבר]ית אשר לוא יאמינוא 7
> בשומעם את כול הבאֹ[ות ע]לֹ[ ]הדור האחרון מפי 8 הכוהן אשר נתן אל ב[לבו בינ]ה לפשור אֹת
> כול 9 דברי עבדיו הנביאים[אשר]בֹידם ספר אל את 10 כול הבאות על עמו יש[ראל]

> 5 and finally, *vac* it refers [to the trai]tors in the Last 6 Days. They are the enem[ies of the covena]nt who will not believe 7 when they hear everything that is to co[me up]on the latter generation that will be spoken by 8 the Priest in whose [heart] God has put [the abil] ity to explain all 9 the words of his servants the prophets, through [whom] God has foretold 10 everything that is to come upon his people Is[rael].

On the other hand, the *pesharim*'s relationship with the scripture fits another trait of the ideology of the Community, namely, the strict determinism described and theorized in the well-known *Doctrine of the Two Spirits* (1QS iii 13-iv 26). If the history of the Community is considered to be foretold in the Prophets' words, this will surely strengthen a concept of human history as fixed forever by God.[25] Moreover, the Qumran group used this fluid approach to the text of scripture in order to elucidate the historical vicissitudes of the group itself and of its leader, as well as to provide its own ideological views with a (stronger) scriptural basis.

---

[23] See Paolo Sacchi, *The History of the Second Temple Period*, JSOTSup 285 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 313-15.

[24] See Corrado Martone, 'Torah, Legge e Sacre Scritture a Qumran: La Bibbia di una comunità sacerdotale in polemica col sacerdozio', *RStB* 16 (2004): 219–30; see also Ludwig Monti, 'L'esegesi variegata di testi profetici a Qumran come espressione di un vincolo di subordinazione', *RStB* 23 (2011): 75–89.

[25] See Sacchi, *History of the Second Temple Period*, 328-53.

I will not deal with the many historical allusions quoted in the *pesharim* on which there is no agreement among scholars because of the obscure references in the texts. It is worth noting, however, the only case in which we may identify a precise historical event, in a well-known passage from the Nahum *pesher* (4Q169 3-4 i 1-3):[26]

1 [...]מדור לרשעי גוים vac אשר הלך ארי לבוא שם גור ארי 2 [ואין מחריד פשרו דמי]טריוס מלך יון אשר בקש לבוא ירושלים בעצת דורשי החלקות 3 [...]ביד מלכי יון מאנתיכוס עד עמוד מושלי תיים ואחר תרמס

1 [ ]a dwelling-place for the wicked of the Gentiles. *vac* 'Whither the lion went to bring the lion's cub 2 [and there was none to frighten' (Nahum 2:12). Its interpretation: concerning Deme]trius, king of Greece, who sought to come (upon) Jerusalem at the counsel of the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things 3 [ ]*byd* the kings of Greece from Antiochus until the rising of the rulers of the Kittim. And afterwards will be trampled.

In this passage, the text of Nahum is interpreted as referring to Demetrius III's siege of Jerusalem during Alexander Jannaeus' reign in 88 BCE. The *pesher* also uses Nahum's text to describe and explain Alexander Jannaeus' cruel retaliation against the Pharisees (4Q169 3–4 i 4–10):[27]

4 [*v*]*ac* ארי טורף בדי גוריו [ו]מחנק ללביותיו טרף 5 [על כפיר החרון אשר יכה בגדוליו ואנשי עצתו 6 [וימלא טרף] חיריה ומעונתו טרפה vac פשרו על כפיר החרון 7 [...]מות בדורשי החלקות אשר יתלה אנשים חיים 8 [...]בישראל מלפנים כי לתלוי חי על העץ [יק]רא הנני אלי[כה] 9 נא[ם יהוה צבאות והבערתי בעשן רובב]ה וכפיריכה תאכל חרב והכר[תי מארץ ט]רפה vac 10 ולא י[שמע עוד קול מלאכיכה vac

4 [*v*]*ac* 'The lion tears at his cubs, and strangles his lionesses for prey' (Nahum 2:13). 5 [...] upon the Young Lion of Wrath who will smite his great ones, and the men of his counsel 6 ['And he fills with prey] his holes and his lairs with torn flesh' (Nahum 2:13). *vac* Its interpretation: concerning the Young Lion of Wrath 7. [...]*mwt* on the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things, that he will hang people alive 8 [...] in Israel aforetimes, for of one hanged alive o[n the tree is to be re] ad: 'Behold I am against [you'], 9 it is the declar[ation of the Lord of Hosts. 'I will burn in smoke you]r [multitude,] and your young lions the sword will consume. I will cut [off p]rey, [from the land] 10 and no [longer will be heard the voice of your messengers' (Nahum 2:14).

As mentioned above, the biblical text is used to explain and comprehend the historical vicissitudes of the group and of the world around it, and the key to these explanations lies in the revelation given to the Teacher by God directly.

[26] See James H. Charlesworth, *The Pesharim and Qumran History: Chaos or Consensus?* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002). For a different, though idiosyncratic, interpretation of this passage, see Gregory L. Doudna, *4Q Pesher Nahum: A Critical Edition*. (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001).

[27] This episode has been related by Josephus, *Ant.* 13.379-380.

Since the relationship of the Teacher (and his followers) with God is based on a revelation, it comes as no surprise that the Teacher and his followers do not hesitate to use a free approach to God's word, when necessary.

This is the case in 1QpHab v 8-12, which quotes and interprets Habakkuk 1:13 as follows:

> 8 ... למה תביטו בוגדים ותחריש בבלע 9 רשע צדיק ממנו vac פשרו על בית אבשלום 10 ואנשי עצתם אשר נדמו בתוכחת מורה הצדק 11 ולוא עזרוהו על איש הכזב vac אשר מאס את 12 התורה בתוך כול עדתם

> 'How can you look on silently, you traitors, when 9 the wicked destroys one more righteous than he' (Habakkuk 1:13b)? *vac* This refers to the family of Absalom 10 and the members of their party, who kept quiet when the Teacher of Righteousness was rebuked, 11 and they did not help him against the Man of the Lie, *vac* who had rejected 12 the Law in the presence of their entire company.

The *pesher* changes the appeal to God in the biblical text ('why do you look on the traitors'/ לָמָּה תַבִּיט בּוֹגְדִים) to an invective against unidentified traitors guilty of not helping the Teacher of Righteousness when he was attacked by his enemies ('how can you look on silently, you traitors'/למה תביטו בוגדים). In this case the author of the *pesher* has added commentary and changed Habakkuk's text on the basis of his own interpretive needs.[28]

3. Reception of Scripture and the History of the Qumran Sect

The same can be said for the works that have been labelled as sectarian. The use and mode of the reception of scripture that we find in some of them might shed some light on the group's historical evolution and in particular on the establishment of the Zadokite element within it. In fact, a number of Qumran texts ascribe the greatest importance to the Zadokite element, seen as the elite of the sect. This makes at least plausible the identification of the Community's elite with a group which no longer acknowledges the Jerusalem priesthood as the legitimate priesthood after the end of the Zadokite descent.[29]

We find an interesting variant reading in the *Community Rule*: in the manuscript 1QS v 1-4 we find a passage where it is clear that the leadership of the group was Zadokite. Well, in the parallel passages in two other manuscripts from cave 4 of the same work there is no reference to a Zadokite leadership. It should be also noted that both of the 4Q manuscripts represent an earlier stage than the one represented

---

[28] On the concept of ideological variant readings, see Alessandro Catastini, '4QSam[a]: I. Samuele il "Nazireo"', *Hen* 9 (1987): 161–95; idem, '4QSam[a]: II. Nahash il "Serpente"', *Hen* 10 (1988): 17–49.

[29] See also Giovanni Garbini, *Mito e storia nella Bibbia* (Brescia: Paideia, 2003), esp. pp. 133-37.

by 1QS in the redaction of the *Community Rule*.[30] Therefore, this variant reading may well provide us with a trace of a change in the leadership of the group: at some point a group of Zadokites took over the Essene/Enochic tradition because of its eschatological elements. After the death of Onias III, the Zadokite descent is definitely removed from the historical scene and only these eschatological elements may offer a last hope to see the legitimate priesthood re-established in its office.[31]

This shift of the Zadokite priesthood from a historical to an eschatological level is pointed out in CD iii 21-iv 4, where, again, a sort of creative reception of scripture may be detected:[32]

> [Col. iii] 21 הקים אל להם ביד יחזקאל הנביא לאמר הכהנים והלוים ובני [Col. iv] 1 צדוק אשר שמרו את משמרת מקדשי בתעות בני ישראל 2 מעלי הם יגישו לי חלב ודם vac הכהנים הם שבי ישראל 3 היוצאים מארץ יהודה והנלוים עמהם vac ובני צדוק הם בחירי 4 ישראל קריאי השם העמדים באחרית הימים
>
> iii 21 God promised them by Ezekiel the prophet, saying, 'The priests and the Levites and the sons of iv 1 Zadok who have kept the courses of My sanctuary when the children

---

[30] On this topic, see Corrado Martone, *La 'Regola della Comunità': edizione critica*, Quaderni di Henoch 8 (Torino: Zamorani, 1995); idem, 'Nuovi Testimoni Qumranici della *Regola della Comunità*', *Hen* 16 (1994): 173-87; Sarianna Metso, *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule*, STDJ 21 (Leiden: Brill, 1997); eadem, 'The Textual Traditions of the Qumran Community Rule', in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Cambridge, 1995: Published in Honour of Joseph M. Baumgarten*, ed. Moshe J. Bernstein, Florentino García Martínez and John Kampen, STDJ 23 (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 141–47; eadem, 'The Redaction of the Community Rule', in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years after Their Discovery. Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20-25, 1997*, ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman, Emanuel Tov and James C. VanderKam (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society – The Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum, 2000), 377–84; see also Alison Schofield, *From Qumran to the Yaḥad: A New Paradigm of Textual Development for The Community Rule*, STDJ 77 (Leiden: Brill, 2009).

[31] This is not the place to delve into the complex and unresolved issue of the temple possibly founded by Onias IV at Leontopolis. Suffice it to say that the temple of Leontopolis was not (and could not be) considered a wholly legitimate temple, as can be seen both from the fact that it is not mentioned at all in the narrative of 2 Maccabees and from the discussion in rabbinic literature (see e.g. *m. Menaḥ*. 13:10). On the matter see Fausto Parente, 'Onias III's Death and the Founding of the Temple of Leontopolis', in *Josephus and the History of the Greco-Roman Period: Essays in Memory of Morton Smith*, ed. Fausto Parente and Joseph Sievers, StPB 41 (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 69–98; Corrado Martone, 'The Qumran "Library" and Other Ancient Libraries: Elements for a Comparison', in *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Qumran and the Concept of a Library*, ed. Sidnie White Crawford and Cecilia Wassen, STDJ 116 (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 55–77 (p. 75n86).

[32] See Corrado Martone, 'Zadokite Interpolators at Work: A Note on CD III, 21-IV, 4', in *Textual Criticism and Dead Sea Scrolls Studies in Honour of Julio Trebolle Barrera*, ed. Andrés Piquer Otero and Pablo A. Torijano Morales, Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 157 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 235–39.

of Israel strayed 2 from Me, they shall bring Me fat and blood' (Ezekiel 44:15). *vac* 'The priests': they are the repentant of Israel, 3 who go out of the land of Judah, and the Levites are those accompanying them; *vac* 'and the sons of Zadok': they are the chosen of 4 Israel, the ones called by name, who are to appear in the last days.

The scriptural passage quoted here is Ezekiel 44:15, which is a little bit different:

וְהַכֹּהֲנִים הַלְוִיִּם בְּנֵי צָדוֹק אֲשֶׁר שָׁמְרוּ אֶת-מִשְׁמֶרֶת מִקְדָּשִׁי בִּתְעוֹת בְּנֵי-יִשְׂרָאֵל מֵעָלַי--הֵמָּה יִקְרְבוּ אֵלַי לְשָׁרְתֵנִי; וְעָמְדוּ לְפָנַי לְהַקְרִיב לִי חֵלֶב וָדָם—נְאֻם אֲדֹנָי יְהוִה

'But the levitical priests, the descendants of Zadok, who kept the charge of my sanctuary when the people of Israel went astray from me, shall come near to me to minister to me; and they shall attend me to offer me the fat and the blood', says the Lord God.

The quotation in the *Damascus Document* plays subtly and skilfully with the conjunctions and reads הכהנים והלוים ובני צדוק אשר שמרו את משמרת מקדש. It is clear, in my opinion, that our text aims at a distinction of the Zadokites from other priests. This way the Zadokite priests are provided with a central role: they are no less than the בחירי ישראל קריאי השם העמדים באחרית הימים.[33] So it comes as no surprise to see the Zadokite priesthood raised to an eschatological level and given a central role in a well-known passage of 1QS[a] (i 1-3):

1 וזה הסרך לכול עדת ישראל באחרית הימים בהאספם[ליחד להתה]לך 2 על פי משפט בני צדוק הכוהנים ואנושי בריתם אשר סר[ו מלכת ב]דרך 3 העם המה אנושי עצתו אשר שמרו בריתו בתוך רשעה לכפ[ר בעד האר]ץ

1. This is the rule for all the congregation of Israel in the Last Days, when they are mobilized [to join the Yahad. They must l]ive 2. by the law of the Sons of Zadok, the priests, and the men of their covenant, they who ce[ased to walk in the w]ay 3. of the people. These same are the men of His party who kept His Covenant during evil times, and so aton[ed for the lan]d.

In my opinion, this same concept is even more patent in 4Q174 (4QFlorilegium), 1–2 i, 21:16–17:[34]

16 העֹם הזה והמה אשר כתוב עליהמֹה בספ[...]ר יח[...]ֹקאל הנביא אשר לו[א יטמאו עוד בכול]
17 גֹל[ו]ליהמה המה בני צדוק וֹאֹ[נו]שי עצ[תמ]ה רוח[קים מרע] אֹחריהמֹה [בעצת] ה̇יחד

16 ... And they (are) the ones about whom it is written in the book of Ezekiel the prophet, who ['shall] ne[ver defile themselves with all] 17 their id[o]ls' (Ezekiel 37:23).

---

[33] See also Clemens Leonhard, *The Jewish Pesach and the Origins of the Christian Easter: Open Questions in Current Research* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2006), 250; a different evaluation in Benedikt Eckhardt, *Ethnos und Herrschaft: Politische Figurationen Judäischer Identität von Antiochos III* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2013), 364.

[34] On this passage see more recently Devorah Dimant, '4QFlorilegium and the Idea of the Community as a Temple', in *History, Ideology and Bible Interpretation in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Collected Studies*, FAT 90 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 269–88.

> They (are) the Sons of Zadok and the m[e]n of [the]ir Council who ke[ep (far) from evil] after them [in the Council of] the Community.

In this passage, the sectarian text interprets Ezekiel's prophetic dream of a reunited Israel as referring only to the בני צדוק.

In sum, the 4QS reading is more ancient and represents a first stage in the development of the Community, the origin of which may be cautiously called Essene. At some point after Onias III departs, a Zadokite element enters and gains power in this Community. As noted above, however, these Qumran-Zadokites, far from changing radically the Enochic/Essene tradition, adopt it. This new stage is represented by the 1QS reading[35] —and we are able to sense this situation thanks to the Qumran sect's creative reception of their scriptures.

4. One Final Remark

As mentioned above, in general terms the reception of the Bible at Qumran shows that for the author (or authors) of the *pesharim* the meaning that the biblical text has for the present situation is much more significant than its original historical context. Even better, we may say that the reception of the biblical text at Qumran represents a situation of creative reception in which a Sacred text needs to be explained under altered cultural conditions and in which the explanation of a given text does not hesitate to somehow create a new text.

All in all, even a cursory analysis of the attitude of the Teacher of Righteousness and his followers toward the text of scripture confirms Abraham Geiger's insight that polemics between the Pharisees and Sadducees led to deliberate alterations in the biblical text, and therefore

> [t]he extreme care taken in more recent times to preserve the biblical text inviolate should not induce us to draw conclusions *a posteriori* that the same care was taken also in an earlier era. In older times the text was often dealt with in quite an independent,

[35] On this topic see also Robert A. Kugler, 'A Note on 1QS 9:14: The Sons of Righteousness or the Sons of Zadok'? *DSD* 3 (1996): 315-20; idem, 'Priesthood at Qumran', in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, ed. Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam, 2 vols. (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 2:93-116; idem, 'The Priesthood at Qumran: The Evidence of References to Levi and the Levites', in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues*, ed. Donald W. Parry and Eugene C. Ulrich, STDJ 30 (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 465–79; Émile Puech, 'Le grand prêtre Simon (III) fils d'Onias III, le Maître de Justice'?, in *Antikes Judentum und frühes Christentum: Festschrift für Hartmut Stegemann zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Bernd Kollmann, Wolfgang Reinbold and Annette Steudel, BZNW 97 (Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 1999), 137–58. For a thorough reassessment of the matter, see now Charlotte Hempel, 'Do the Scrolls Suggest Rivalry Between the Sons of Aaron and the Sons of Zadok and If So was it Mutual'?, *RevQ* 24 (2009): 135-93.

even arbitrary manner, and the care exercised subsequently was simply a healthy reaction against this long continued process of summary text revision.[36]

Bibliography

Barthélemy, Dominique. *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament. Tome 3: Ézéchiel, Daniel et les 12 Prophètes*. OBO 50. Fribourg (Suisse)/Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992.

Beal, Timothy. 'Reception History and Beyond: Toward the Cultural History of Scriptures'. *BibInt* 19 (2011): 357–72.

Bernstein, Moshe J. 'Interpretation of Scriptures'. Vol. 1 pages 376–83 in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam. 2 vols. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Burrows, Millar. 'Variant Readings in the Isaiah Manuscript'. *BASOR* 111 (1948): 16–24.

Capelli, Piero. 'Appunti sugli usi di Isaia 6 nell'ebraismo rabbinico della tarda antichità'. *Annali di Scienze Religiose* 5 (2000): 111–30.

Catastini, Alessandro. '4QSam[a]: I. Samuele il "Nazireo"'. *Hen* 9 (1987): 161–95.

____. '4QSam[a]: II. Nahash il "Serpente"'. *Hen* 10 (1988): 17–49.

Charlesworth, James H. *The Pesharim and Qumran History: Chaos or Consensus?* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.

Chiesa, Bruno. 'Textual History and Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Old Testament'. Pages 257–72 in *The Madrid Qumran Congress : Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls. Madrid 18-21 March, 1991. Volume One*. Edited by Julio Trebolle Barrera and Luis Vegas-Montaner. STDJ 11. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1992.

Dahmen, Ulrich. '"Keine Widerrede"! Die Pesharim aus Qumran zwischen Auslegung und absolutem offenbarungstheologischen Exklusivitätsanspruch'. Pages 105-25 in *Das Alte Testament und seine Kommentare: Literarische und hermeneutische Orientierungen*. Edited by Christoph Dohmen. SBB 81. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 2021.

Dimant, Devorah. '4QFlorilegium and the Idea of the Community as a Temple'. Pages 269–88 in *History, Ideology and Bible Interpretation in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Collected Studies*. FAT 90. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014.

[36] English citation taken from Max Wiener, *Abraham Geiger and Liberal Judaism: The Challenge of the Nineteenth Century*, trans. Ernst J. Schlochauer (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1981), 219. See Abraham Geiger, *Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel in ihrer Abhängigkeit von der innern Entwickelung des Judenthums, von Dr. Abraham Geiger* (Breslau: Hainauer, 1857): 'Die spätere ausserordentliche Sorgfalt für die Reinhaltung des Bibeltextes darf uns nicht zu einem Rückschlusse auf die früheren Zeiten verleiten. In der älteren Zeit ist die Behandlung des Textes eine weit selbstständigere, ja oft willkürliche gewesen, und die spätere Sorgfalt ist gerade als eine heilsame Reaction gegen dieses lange fortgesetzte Verfahren der eigenmächtigen Textes-gestaltung aufgetreten' (p. 97).

Doudna, Gregory L. *4Q Pesher Nahum: A Critical Edition*. London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.

Eckhardt, Benedikt. *Ethnos Und Herrschaft: Politische Figurationen Judäischer Identität von Antiochos III*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2013.

Falk, Daniel K. *The Parabiblical Texts: Strategies for Extending the Scriptures among the Dead Sea Scrolls*. New York: T&T Clark, 2007.

Falk, Zeev Wilhelm. 'The Temple Scroll and the Codification of Jewish Law'. *JLA* 2 (1979): 33–44.

Fisch, Yael. '"Midrash-Pesher": A Shared Technique of Interpretation in Qumran, Paul, and the Tannaim'. *RevQ* 32 (2020): 213–33.

Fishbane, Michael. 'Use, Authority and Interpretation of Mikra at Qumran'. Pages 339-76 in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading, and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*. Edited by Martin Jan Mulder and Harry Sysling. LIPSTT1/CRINT 2. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1988.

Flint, Peter W. 'Variant Readings and Textual Affiliation in the Hebrew University Isaiah Scroll from Qumran (1QIsa^{b})'. Pages 33–53 in *Qumran Cave 1 Revisited: Texts from Cave 1 Sixty Years after Their Discovery. Proceedings of the Sixth Meeting of the IOQS in Ljubljana*. Edited by Daniel K. Falk, Sarianna Metso, Donald W. Parry and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar. STDJ 91. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

____. 'Non-Masoretic Variant Readings in the Hebrew University Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa^{b}) and the Text to be Translated'. Pages 105–17 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Contemporary Culture: Proceedings of the International Conference Held at the Israel Museum, Jerusalem (July 6-8, 2008)* . Edited by Adolfo D. Roitman, Lawrence H. Schiffman and Shani Tzoref. STDJ 93. Leiden: Brill, 2011.

Flint, Peter W. and Eugene Ulrich. 'The Variant Textual Readings in the Hebrew University Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa^{b})'. *JJS* 60 (2009): 60–79.

Garbini, Giovanni. '1QIsa^{b} et le texte d'Esaïe'. *Hen* 6 (1984): 17–21.

____. *Mito e storia nella Bibbia*. Brescia: Paideia, 2003.

García Martínez, Florentino, ed.. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated: The Qumran Texts in English*. Translated by Wilfred G.E. Watson. 2nd ed. Leiden: E.J. Brill/Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996.

____. 'Escatologizacion de Los Escritos Proféticos En Qumran'. *EstBib* 44 (1986): 101–16.

____. 'El Pesher, Interpretacion Profética de La Escritura'. *Salm* 26 (1979): 125–39.

Geiger, Abraham. *Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel in ihrer Abhängigkeit von der innern Entwickelung des Judenthums, von Dr. Abraham Geiger*. Breslau: J. Hainauer, 1857.

Gonçalves, Francolino. 'Isaiah Scroll'. Vol. 3 pages 471-80 in *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David Noel Freedman. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.

Grossman, Maxine L. 'Beyond the Hand of Moses: Discourse and Interpretive Authority'. *Prooftexts* 26 (2006): 294–301.

Hempel, Charlotte. 'Do the Scrolls Suggest Rivalry Between the Sons of Aaron and the Sons of Zadok and If So was it Mutual'? *RevQ* 24 (2009): 135–93.

Henze, Matthias, ed. *A Companion to Biblical Interpretation in Early Judaism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012.

____, ed. *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran*. Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.

Horgan, Maurya P. *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books*. CBQMS 8. Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1979.

Jassen, Alex P. 'The Pesharim and the Rise of Commentary in Early Jewish Scriptural Interpretation'. *DSD* 19 (2012): 363–98.

Kratz, Reinhard Gregor. 'Biblical Interpretation and Redaction History'. *HBAI* 9 (2020): 209–46.

Kugler, Robert A. 'A Note on 1QS 9:14: The Sons of Righteousness or the Sons of Zadok'? *DSD* 3 (1996): 315–20.

____. 'Priesthood at Qumran'. Vol. 2 pages 93–116 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*. Edited by Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1998.

____. 'The Priesthood at Qumran: The Evidence of References to Levi and the Levites'. Pages 465–79 in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues*. Edited by Donald W. Parry and Eugene C. Ulrich. STDJ 30. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

Leonhard, Clemens. *The Jewish Pesach and the Origins of the Christian Easter: Open Questions in Current Research*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2006.

Levinson, Bernard M. *Deuteronomy and the Hermeneutics of Legal Innovation*. New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Lim, Timothy H. *Holy Scripture in the Qumran Commentaries and Pauline Letters*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.

Maier, Johann. *Die Tempelrolle vom Toten Meer und das 'Neue Jerusalem'*. 3rd ed. Uni-Taschenbücher 829: Theologie, Judaistik und Archäologie. München: Reinhardt, 1997.

Martone, Corrado. 'All the Bibles We Need: The Impact of the Qumran Evidence on Biblical Lower Criticism'. Pages 47-64 in *The Scrolls and Biblical Traditions: Proceedings of the Seventh Meeting of the IOQS in Helsinki*. Edited by George J. Brooke, Daniel K. Falk, Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar and Molly M. Zahn. STDJ 103. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

____. 'Authority and Text in the *Temple Scroll*'. *Hen* 36 (2014): 21–34.

____. *La 'Regola della Comunità': edizione critica*. Quaderni di Henoch 8. Torino: S. Zamorani, 1995.

____. 'Nuovi Testimoni Qumranici Della *Regola Della Comunità*'. *Hen* 16 (1994): 173–87.

____. 'Sectarian Variant Readings and Sectarian Texts in the Qumran Corpus and Beyond: Reflections on an Elusive Concept'. Pages 393-400 in *Ricercare la sapienza di tutti gli antichi (Sir. 39,1): Miscellanea in onore di Gian Luigi Prato*. Edited by Marcello Milani and Marco Zappella. Supplementi Alla Rivista Biblica 56. Bologna: Edizioni Dehoniane Bologna, 2013.

____. 'Textual Fluidity as a Means of Sectarian Identity: Some Examples from the Qumran Literature'. Pages 117–26 in *The Hebrew Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Nóra Dávid, Armin Lange, Kristin De Troyer and Shani Tzoref. FRLANT 239. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011.

____. 'The Qumran "Library" and Other Ancient Libraries: Elements for a Comparison'. Pages 55-77 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Qumran and the Concept of a Library*. Edited by Sidnie White Crawford and Cecilia Wassen. STDJ 116. Leiden: Brill, 2016.

____. 'Torah, Legge e Sacre Scritture a Qumran: La Bibbia di una comunità sacerdotale in polemica col sacerdozio'. *RStB* 16 (2004): 219-30.

____. 'Zadokite Interpolators at Work: A Note on CD III, 21-IV, 4'. Pages 235–39 in *Textual Criticism and Dead Sea Scrolls Studies in Honour of Julio Trebolle Barrera*. Edited by Andrés Piquer Otero and Pablo A. Torijano Morales. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 157. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

Metso, Sarianna. *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule*. STDJ 21. Leiden; New York: Brill, 1997.

____. 'The Textual Traditions of the Qumran Community Rule'. Pages 141–47 in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Cambridge, 1995: Published in Honour of Joseph M. Baumgarten*. Edited by Moshe J. Bernstein, Florentino García Martínez and John Kampen. STDJ 23. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

____. 'The Redaction of the Community Rule'. Pages 377–84 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years after Their Discovery. Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20-25, 1997*. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman, Emanuel Tov and James C. VanderKam. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society—The Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum, 2000.

Monti, Ludwig. 'L'esegesi variegata di testi profetici a Qumran come espressione di un vincolo di subordinazione'. *RStB* 23 (2011): 75–89.

Najman, Hindy. *Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 77. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Parente, Fausto. 'Onias III's Death and the Founding of the Temple of Leontopolis'. Pages 69-98 in *Josephus and the History of the Greco-Roman Period: Essays in Memory of Morton Smith*. Edited by Fausto Parente and Joseph Sievers. StPB 41. Leiden: Brill, 1994.

Puech, Émile. 'Le grand prêtre Simon (III) fils d'Onias III, le Maître de Justice'? Pages 137–58 in *Antikes Judentum und frühes Christentum: Festschrift für Hartmut Stegemann zum 65. Geburtstag*. Edited by Bernd Kollmann, Wolfgang Reinbold and Annette Steudel. BZNW 97. Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, 1999.

Rofé, Alexander. 'The History of Israelite Religion and the Biblical Text: Corrections Due to the Unification of Worship'. Pages 759–93 in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov*. Edited by Shalom M. Paul, Robert A. Kraft, Lawrence H. Schiffman and Weston W. Fields. VTSup 94/1. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2003.

Sacchi, Paolo. 'Il Rotolo A di Isaia. Problemi di storia del testo'. *Accademia Toscana di Scienze e Lettere 'La Colombaria'* 30 (1965): 31–111.

____. *The History of the Second Temple Period*. JSOTSup 285. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.

Schofield, Alison. *From Qumran to the Yaḥad: A New Paradigm of Textual Development for The Community Rule*. STDJ 77. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2009.

Talmon, Shemaryahu. 'Aspects of the Textual Transmission of the Bible in Light of Qumran Manuscripts'. *Text* 4 (1964): 95–132.

Tov, Emanuel. 'A Modern Textual Outlook Based on the Qumran Scrolls'. *HUCA* 53 (1982): 11–27.

____, and Donald W. Parry, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader*. 6 vols. Leiden ; Boston: Brill, 2004.

Trebolle, Julio. 'Kings (MT/LXX) and Chronicles: The Double and Triple Textual Tradition'. Pages 483–501 in *Reflection and Refraction : Studies in Biblical Historiography in Honour of A. Graeme Auld*. Edited by Robert Rezetko, Timothy H. Lim and W. Brian Aucker. VTSup 113. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2007.

Ulrich, Eugene. 'Horizons of Old Testament Textual Research at the Thirtieth Anniversary of Qumran Cave 4'. *CBQ* 46 (1984): 613-36.

Urciuoli, Emiliano Rubens. 'A Suffering Messiah at Qumran? Some Observations on the Debate about 1QIsa A'. *RevQ* 24 (2009): 273–81.

Vanderkam, James C. 'Authoritative Literature in the Dead Sea Scrolls'. *DSD* 5 (1998): 382–402.

Wiener, Max. *Abraham Geiger and Liberal Judaism: The Challenge of the Nineteenth Century*. Translated by Ernst J. Schlochauer. Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1981.

Wise, Michael, Martin G. Abegg, Jr. and Edward Cook. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation*. Rev. ed. San Francisco: Harper, 2005.

Zahn, Molly M. 'New Voices, Ancient Words: The Temple Scroll 's Reuse of the Bible'. Pages 435–58 in *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel*. Edited by John Day. JSOTSup 422. London: T&T Clark International, 2005.

Ziegler, Joseph. 'Die *Vorlage* der Isaias-Septuaginta (LXX) und die erste Isaias-Rolle von Qumran (1QIsa)'. *JBL* 78 (1959): 34–59.

The Biblical Figure of Moses in Jewish Hellenistic Literature: The Accounts by Ezekiel and Artapanus as a Case Study

Miriam Ben Zeev Hofman

In most of the literary works composed by Jews in Egypt in Hellenistic times the biblical figure of Moses is mentioned according to the biblical narrative. However, the accounts are by no means similar. Each of them displays its own particular flavor, focus and tone, and details, too, often differ. The case of Ezekiel and Artapanus may be singled out in that both of them present the figure of Moses in an unconventional fashion, including variations and additions to the biblical account which are liable to sound astonishing to the modern reader.

The literary works of Ezekiel and of Artapanus have the same transmission history. They reach us indirectly, quoted by Eusebius (4th century CE), who in turn cites from the anthology of Alexander Polyhistor (1st century BCE). In spite of this long transmission chain, there seems to be no question about their basic authenticity. Polyhistor was a compiler of quotations, who stands within the tradition of compilers such as Agatharchides of Knidos and Juba of Mauretania. No bias has been detected in the way he doctored his sources, and no historiographical tendentiousness in abbreviating them.[1] He cites authors not only from divergent, but also from hostile traditions,[2] and his cited passages consist in a series of loosely connected fragments accompanied by the authors' names and the titles, without critical comments. Even when turning the original *oratio recta* into *oratio obliqua*, it appears that he still manages to preserve some of the flavor and style of each

---

[1] Cornelius Alexander of Miletus, surnamed Polyhistor, probably born between 112 and 102 BCE, was brought young as a captive to Rome, where he pursued an active scholarly career until his death sometime in the thirties. See John Strugnell, 'General Introduction with a Note on Alexander Polyhistor', in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, ed. James H. Charlesworth, 2 vols. (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1985), 2:777-78. On his literary work see John J. Collins, 'Reinventing Exodus: Exegesis and Legend in Hellenistic Egypt', in *For a Later Generation: The Transformation of Tradition in Israel, Early Judaism, and Early Christianity. Festschrift for George W.E. Nickelsburg*, ed. Randal A. Argall, Beverly A. Bow and Rodney A. Werline (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2000), 53; and Claudio Zamagni, 'Alexandre Polyhistor et Artapan: Une mise en perspective à partir des extraits d'Eusèbe de Césarée', in *Interprétations de Moïse: Égypte, Judée, Grèce et Rome*, ed. Philippe Borgeaud, Thomas Römer and Youri Volokhine, with Daniel Barbu, Jerusalem Studies in Religion and Culture 10 (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2010), 64-78.

[2] Gregory Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition: Josephus, Luke-Acts and Apologetic Historiography*, NovTSup 64 (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 151n91.

author.[3] Indeed, the very fact that he worked with neither imagination nor critical judgment is to our advantage, for by retaining the style of his sources he enables us to learn something of the character of the individual authors cited.[4] It definitely appears that Polyhistor transmitted his texts faithfully, even if not with the care of a critical scholar.[5] As for Eusebius, he did occasionally modify the original passages when citing ancient authors, either by cutting at key places or by nuancing the texts. When citing Jewish authors in his *Praeparatio evangelica*, however, he seems to have been fairly precise,[6] in order to show that the theology of these ancient authors, whom he considered apologists of an earlier era, was superior to that of the Greeks.[7] This was meant to add to the prestige of the Christians, who were Jews' direct heirs, by showing that the Jewish tradition was held in high esteem and that Greek intellectuals such as Polyhistor knew the Jews through the works he cited.[8] Eusebius' faithfulness to the texts, it has been noted, may have also been designed to show his intellectual integrity in the face of criticism that Christians embraced 'an illogical faith without inquiry'.[9] Eusebius, therefore, appears to have had several good reasons for being careful while quoting from the work of Polyhistor, and, in fact, he closely copied his text, so much so that he took pains to cite even the editorial notes that Polyhistor inserted between the different excerpts from the Jewish authors.[10] There is no question, therefore, about the basic authenticity of the fragments of Ezekiel and of Artapanus quoted in the work of Eusebius.

Unfortunately, we know nothing about the authors themselves, since both Polyhistor and Eusebius limited themselves to citing the fragments without adding any information about the lives and the chronological and geographical settings of their authors. Their narratives, therefore, are all that remains which allows us to grasp something of their cultural and ideological background and purposes.

---

[3] Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition*, 145, 151.

[4] James E. Crouch, 'Demetrius the Chronographer and the Beginning of Hellenistic Historiography', *Kwansei Gakuin University Annual Studies* 30 (1981): 1.

[5] Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition*, 152.

[6] Sabrina Inowlocki, *Eusebius and the Jewish Authors: His Citation Technique in an Apologetic Context*, AGJU 64 (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 186. In terms of the wording of the quotations, deviations, which appear to be few, are only minor matters which do not affect the meaning of the text. See Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition*, 142.

[7] Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition*, 223; Inowlocki, *Eusebius and the Jewish Authors*, 276n286.

[8] Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition*, 143.

[9] *Praep. ev.* 1.1.11.

[10] Inowlocki, *Eusebius and the Jewish Authors*, 276-78.

A chronological framework is extremely difficult to establish. In the case of Ezekiel, a *terminus post quem* has been often identified by Ezekiel's account of the phoenix, the mythological bird which is reported by Tacitus[11] to have appeared in Egypt during the reign of Ptolemy III Euergetes in the second half of the third century BCE.[12] However, later dates to the second century BCE have also been frequently suggested and cannot be ruled out.[13] In the case of Artapanus' work, too, several possibilities have been raised by scholars, none of which can be proved.[14] For both Ezekiel and Artapanus, therefore, the only firm point remains the *terminus ante quem*, namely, the death of Polyhistor, who quotes them, in the thirties BCE.[15]

As for the geographical background, Artapanus' Egyptian origin is not disputed since his narrative focuses heavily on Egypt. As for Ezekiel, his extraordinary proficiency in Greek literature makes an intellectual center such as Alexandria a probable home,[16] the more so since he makes use of the Egyptian calendar.[17]

1. The Figure of Moses in the Work of Ezekiel

Ezekiel's tragedy, the *Exagoge*, is the first Jewish tragedy composed in Hellenistic times in Greek in iambic trimeters according to the style and rules of the Greek

---

[11] *Ann.* 6.28. See Howard Jacobson, 'Tacitus and the Phoenix', *Phoenix* 35 (1981): 260-61.

[12] See Carl R. Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors*, 4 vols. (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983-1996), 2:309; Ben Zion Wacholder and Steven Bowman, 'Ezechielus the Dramatist and Ezekiel the Prophet: Is the Mysterious *Zoon* in the *Exagogé* a Phoenix?', *HTR* 78 (1985): 253-77; Howard Jacobson, 'Phoenix Resurrected', *HTR* 80 (1987): 229-33; Kristine Ruffatto, 'Polemics with Enochic Traditions in the *Exagoge* of Ezekiel the Tragedian', *JSP* 15 (2006): 195-96n1. For a later Christian date, see Rick Van de Water, 'Moses' Exaltation: Pre-Christian?', *JSP* 21 (2000): 59-69.

[13] See Howard Jacobson, *The* Exagoge *of Ezekiel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 5-13; Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors*, 2:310-11; Larry W. Hurtado, *One God, One Lord: Early Christian Devotion and Ancient Jewish Monotheism*, 3rd ed. (London: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2015), 60. Even a later pre-Christian date has been suggested; Van de Water, 'Moses' Exaltation: Pre-Christian?', 59-69.

[14] See Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors*, 1:196n11; Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition*, 168n175; Eve-Marie Becker, 'Artapanus. Judaica: A Contribution to Early Jewish Historiography', in *Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Yearbook 2006: History and Identity: How Israel's Later Authors Viewed Its Earlier History*, ed. Nuria Calduch-Benages and Jan Liesen (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2006), 298, 316; Daniel Barbu, 'Artapan: Introduction historique et historiographique', in *Interprétations de Moïse*, 14-18.

[15] Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition*, 144.

[16] Holladay, *Fragments from* Hellenistic *Jewish Authors*, 2:312-13. On other possible, but not probable, locations, see Jacobson, *The Exagoge of Ezekiel*, 13-17, 180n1.

[17] See *Ezek. Trag.* 156-58, 168, 175-79; and Nina L. Collins, 'Ezekiel, the Author of the *Exagoge*: His Calendar and Home', *JSJ* 22 (1991): 201-11.

tragedy. As in 2 Maccabees, the form of this work is completely Greek while the content, centering on the Exodus, is entirely Jewish.[18] Its importance is well outlined by Van der Horst:

> It is the only play with considerable portions still extant while almost all of the extensive Greek dramatic literature of the Hellenistic period has been lost. Moreover, it is also the earliest Jewish play in history, and as such a fascinating example of what can happen when a Hellenized Jew tries to mould biblical material into Greek dramatic forms by means of techniques developed by Greek tragedians.[19]

In its main lines, the content of the *Exagoge* follows the biblical text, but it is by no means a paraphrase of the Septuagint. Ezekiel feels free to use material from one episode, transferring it to another one when it suits his needs and purposes;[20] certain episodes are reversed, the order of the plagues is rearranged,[21] and occasional departures appear, as in the case where Ezekiel states that Moses escaped to Libya, not to Midian. Details are sometimes omitted – in his treatment of the Passover, for example, Ezekiel neglects to mention the requirement of circumcision[22] – and non-biblical features are sometimes added to enhance the attractiveness of the story,[23] as, for instance, his lengthy description of the phoenix, which has no parallel in the biblical text.[24] From time to time, personal attitudes and concerns creep in, such as a preoccupation with issues relating to intermarriage,[25] which may well reflect an ongoing concern in the Jewish communities of Egypt in Ezekiel's time. The ideological background of the *Exagoge* is variously traced. A midrashic substra-

---

[18] The *Exagoge* is quoted in the ninth book of Eusebius' *Praeparatio evangelica*, chapters 28-29, which in seventeen fragments present 269 lines of iambic trimeter verse. A small part of this material is also presented by Clement of Alexandria in his *Stromateis*.

[19] Pieter W. Van der Horst, 'Moses' Throne Vision in Ezekiel the Dramatist', in *Essays on the Jewish World of Early Christianity* (Freiburg, Schweiz: Universitätsverlag, 1990), 63-64; first publ. in *JJS* 34 (1983).

[20] Jacobson, *The* Exagoge *of Ezekiel*, 98.

[21] Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors*, 2:326n36.

[22] John J. Collins, *Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000), 225, 230.

[23] Additions to the biblical account include Zipporah's description of the land of Libya (which stands instead of Midian) and of her father's position (fragment 4), her justification for marrying a stranger (fragment 5), a speech by Moses about a dream of the throne vision and its explanation (fragments 6 and 7), a speech concerning the rod and its miraculous powers (fragment 12), description of the oasis of Elim (fragment 16) and a speech describing a spectacular bird (fragment 17), probably referring to the phoenix.

[24] Collins, *Between Athens and Jerusalem*, 228-29.

[25] In fragment 5, for example, Zipporah provided justification for marrying a stranger.

tum is suggested by Jacobson, who observes that several passages can be well understood by comparing them to extant later midrashic sources. Ezekiel, it appears, was well versed in the traditional exegesis of the biblical text with which we are most familiar from various later rabbinic works.[26] At the same time, and in spite of its close adherence to the Septuagint in matters of content, the *Exagoge* displays a striking familiarity with the tragic formal techniques found in Greek classical works such as Homer, Hesiod and Herodotus. In particular, the vocabulary, phraseology and style and the larger realm of dramatic technique and structure of the play display an amazing similarity to that of the tragedians.[27] The whole series of its acts is difficult to reconstruct because of the fragmentary status in which the *Exagoge* reaches us, and therefore it is impossible to establish whether Ezekiel conformed to, or violated, the Aristotelian prescription for unity of time and place.[28] His metrics are very close to those of the late Euripides and his immediate successors,[29] while the themes treated are very similar to those dealt with by Aeschylus. Jacobson emphasizes the similarity with the *Persae* in the messenger scene, where Ezekiel seems to have seen the Hellenic counterpart to the Jews' victory over the Egyptians. In each case the small, seemingly helpless people overcome the awesome and hubristic enemy with divine aid.[30] Parallels have also been emphasized with Sophocles' tragedies, especially his *Oedipus Coloneus*, where Ezekiel may have perceived a Greek paradigm for the biblical events which he presents.[31] There is no doubt that Ezekiel was well-schooled – in fact, extremely well-schooled – in the classical Greek tradition.[32]

---

[26] Jacobson, *The* Exagoge *of Ezekiel*, 20-21, 183n3. See also pp. 21-23 on haggadic exegesis of biblical accounts found in Alexandria and the way Ezekiel might have learnt about them.

[27] Strugnell, 'General Introduction with a Note on Alexander Polyhistor', 453.

[28] Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors*, 2:323n18.

[29] Carl R. Holladay, 'The Portrait of Moses in Ezekiel the Tragedian', *SBLSP* 10 (1976): 451; Pieter W. Van der Horst, 'Some Notes on the *Exagoge* of Ezekiel', in *Essays on the Jewish World of Early Christianity*, 76; first publ. in *Mnemosyne* 37 (1984).

[30] Jacobson, *The* Exagoge *of Ezekiel*, 23-28, esp. p. 24.

[31] 'The mysterious sense of intimacy between Oedipus and the divine forces, the picture of a man who is in some sense chosen by deity, a theme that is nowhere so dominant and moving in extant Greek tragedy as it is in the *Oedipus Coloneus*, might have suggested a sort of relationship like that between Moses and God depicted in the Bible. Both Moses and Oedipus are murderers in exile who are destined to bring benefits to their nations ... Ezekiel may have seen the *Coloneus* as a Greek dramatic exemplar for Moses' exile from his native land, his encounter with divinity on sacred ground, and his future role as benefactor of the nation'; Howard Jacobson, 'Two Studies on Ezekiel the Tragedian', *GRBS* 22 (1981): 175-78.

[32] See Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors*, 2:303.

Whether the drama was written in order to be performed or simply to be read is uncertain. On one hand, the unusually large number of scene changes speaks against the likelihood of performance, and it is well known that the practice of writing plays for a reading audience was well established in Alexandria.[33] On the other hand, there is some indication that Ezekiel recasts the biblical material with a view to the technical demands of production and performance. While treating the plagues, for example, which were technically challenging, if not impossible, Ezekiel incorporates them into a monologue by God,[34] so that the audience would hear them related but not see them performed.[35]

The identity of the intended audience of this play is not easy to trace. Holladay claims that the work was written with a Gentile audience in mind,[36] while Collins observes that the Greek form may have served to reassure Hellenized Jews that their tradition was capable of expression in a Greek form.[37] In fact, as Jacobson suggests, the *Exagoge* may well have been written both for Jews and non-Jews. For the non-Jews the play would have been intended as educational and propagandistic, to teach the Greeks something about Jewish history and to impress upon them the greatness and special qualities of the Jewish people and their heroic leader. For the Jews, it may have been a reminder of their noble history and perhaps an attempt to draw them away from contemporary pagan influences. Also, it would have provided evidence that Jewish history and tradition could be comfortably and successfully accommodated to the ancient art forms of the Greek world. It is no wonder, Jacobson observes, that Ezekiel leaves out material from the biblical narrative that would be offensive to non-Jews or that would put the Jews in a bad light before them. At the same time, he occasionally introduces adaptations of the biblical account that seem to exploit and take for granted a Jewish acquaintance with post-biblical exegetical material.[38] Gruen points out that

> Ezekiel's most inventive scenes have heightened force to Jewish traditions by commingling them with features arising from Greek culture and society. For a readership of Hellenistic Jews, tragic drama with such themes would be a source of both comfort and pride.[39]

---

[33] See Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors*, 2:329n45.

[34] Fragment 13, ll. 6-24, vv. 132-50.

[35] Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors*, 2:315. On the *pro* and *contra* of each possibility, see Jacobson, 'Two Studies on Ezekiel the Tragedian', 171.

[36] Holladay, 'The Portrait of Moses in Ezekiel the Tragedian', 447-52.

[37] Collins, *Between Athens and Jerusalem*, 225.

[38] Jacobson, *The* Exagoge *of Ezekiel*, 8, 17-20.

[39] Erich S. Gruen, *Heritage and Hellenism: The Reinvention of Jewish Tradition* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1998), 135.

The Exodus is presented in a series of speeches by Moses and by God.[40] Astonishingly, there is no mention of the Law and of its delivery by Moses. Nor is this the only feature which strikes the reader. No less puzzling is a dream presented by Ezekiel, which not only has no parallel in the biblical text, but is surprising from several points of view.

> I dreamed that on the summit of Mount Sinai
> was a great throne which reached to the corners of Heaven.
> On it was seated a noble man,
> who had a diadem (on his head) and a great scepter
> in his left hand. And with his right hand
> He beckoned me, and I took my stand before the throne.
> He handed me the scepter and he summoned me
> to sit upon the great throne. And he also gave me
> the royal diadem, and he himself descended from the throne.
> And I saw the full circle of the earth
> and what was below the earth and above heaven.
> And a multitude of heavenly bodies fell on their knees
> before me and I counted all of them.
> And they moved past me like a host of mortals.
> Thereafter I awoke from my sleep in a frightened state.

Moses' father-in-law then interprets the dream:

> Stranger, it is a good thing that God has shown to you.
> I hope to be still alive when these things happen to you.
> For behold you will raise a great throne

[40] A speech by Moses summarizing Jacob's migration to Egypt, the rise of the new Pharaoh and the circumstance of his birth (fragment 1); a speech by Moses recounting his upbringing by Pharaoh's daughter, his slaying the Egyptian and escape to Midian (fragment 2); Moses' remark on seeing the daughters of Raguel (fragment 3); Zipporah's response to Moses describing the land of Libya and her father's position in the land (fragment 4); a dialogue between Chum and Zipporah where she offers justification for marrying a stranger (fragment 5); a speech by Moses recounting to Raguel a dream of the throne vision (fragment 6); Raguel's interpretation of the dream (fragment 7); a speech by Moses recounting the burning bush episode (fragment 8); a speech by God to Moses at the burning bush commissioning him to rescue the Jews (fragment 9); a speech by Moses apologizing for his limited speaking ability (fragment 10); God's response to Moses appointing Aaron (fragment 11); a dialogue between God and Moses concerning the rod and its miraculous powers (fragment 12); a speech by God forecasting the ten plagues and prescribing regulations for the observance of Passover (fragment 13); an unattributed speech concerning Passover preparations (fragment 14); a speech by a messenger relating the Jews' departure from Egypt, Pharaoh's pursuit and the Egyptians' destruction in the Red Sea (fragment 15); a speech by a scout to Moses describing Elim (fragment 16); a speech describing a spectacular bird (fragment 17). See Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors*, 2:304-06.

> and you will sit in judgment and be a leader of mortals.
> And that you saw the earth and the whole inhabited world
> and the things below and the things above God's heaven,
> (this means that) you will see what is, and what was before, and what will be hereafter.[41]

While dreams are a fixed component of Greek tragedies,[42] for good reasons this particular one has been defined as an 'astoundingly audacious' one in that it presents Moses swapping places with God and God withdrawing,[43] contradicting a statement by the same Ezekiel, which claims that God cannot be seen.[44]

Different and contradictory interpretations have been offered to this vision. Scholars such as Gruenwald[45] and Van der Horst link this scene to the vision of the divine throne described in the first chapter of Ezekiel:

> No doubt, the vision of God in human shape seated on the throne is based on the first chapter of the biblical Ezekiel. Furthermore, our author has been influenced by Exodus 24, with its anthropomorphic representation of God on Sinai. The same holds true for the scene in Daniel 7, where God bestows eternal kingship and most probably a throne on someone of human appearance. Finally, Joseph's dream in Genesis 37 also has the motif of heavenly bodies falling on their knees before a mortal, and in Psalm 147 we read that God counts all the heavenly bodies.[46]

In fact, this is one of the earliest post-biblical throne-visions, which are later often found in the so-called *merkavah* (the divine throne-chariot) literature.[47] The exaltation of Moses shares many features later found in the Enochic literature—*1 Enoch*, *2 Enoch* and especially *3 Enoch*—including the patriarch's ascent and vision of God's

---

[41] *Ezek. Trag.* 67-90 = *Praep. ev*. 9.28.2-4; 9.29.5-16. The translation is that offered by Van der Horst, 'Moses' Throne Vision in Ezekiel the Dramatist', 23.

[42] Dreams predicting future events occur in Aeschylus' *Persae*, in Sophocles' *Electra* and in Euripides' *Hecuba*. See Van der Horst, 'Moses' Throne Vision in Ezekiel the Dramatist', 66; as well as Pierluigi Lanfranchi, 'Moses' Vision of the Divine Throne in the *Exagoge* of Ezekiel the Tragedian', in *The Book of Ezekiel and its Influence*, ed. Henk Jan de Jonge and Johannes Tromp (Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2007), 105-06; and idem, 'Il sogno di Mosè nell'*Exagoge* di Ezechiele il tragico', *Materia giudaica* 8 (2003): 105-06.

[43] See Jane Health, 'Homer or Moses? A Hellenistic Perspective on Moses' Throne Vision in Ezekiel Tragicus', *JJS* 58 (2007): 3.

[44] 'Take courage, O child, and listen to my words / for you cannot see my face / since you are mortal, but my words you are allowed / to hear' (Fragment 9, l. 7, v. 101).

[45] Ithamar Gruenwald, *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism*, AGJU 14 (Leiden: Brill, 1980), 127-30.

[46] Van der Horst, 'Moses' Throne Vision in Ezekiel the Dramatist', 66.

[47] See Peter Schäfer, ed., *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literature (in Zusammenarbeit mit Margarete Schlüter und Hans Georg von Mutius)*, TSAJ 2 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1981).

throne and the accompaniment of an angelic guide/interpreter.[48] The purpose of Ezekiel, it has been suggested, was to convey to his readers (or spectators) the notion that Moses, as God's vice-regent who liberated the people of Israel from the Egyptians, was not merely a personage from the distant past but was still present and ruling over the universe, and that through his heavenly enthronement the nation of the Jews was validated as divinely established.[49]

The similarity with the Enochic literature, on the other hand, is also liable of being interpreted as polemic. Attributing to Moses what was claimed for Enoch, it has been argued, Ezekiel may have intended to establish the primacy of Moses, in which case his elevation may well have been intended as a challenge to the accounts of an exalted Enoch.[50] Symbolic meanings, too, have been offered for Moses' dream,[51] as well as possible links to Jewish mystery cults,[52] messianic intents[53] and later Samaritan writings.[54]

Classical patterns have been identified, too. Gruen emphasizes the model of Hellenistic kingship to be found in the background of this dream:

> Moses' ascension to the throne and acquisition of royal emblems signals his appointment as the Lord's surrogate in governing the affairs of men. That meaning is rein-

---

[48] Parallels and differences are dealt with by Holladay, 'The Portrait of Moses in Ezekiel the Tragedian', 450; Van der Horst, 'Moses' Throne Vision in Ezekiel the Dramatist', 66; and in detail by Andrei A. Orlov, *The Enoch-Metatron Tradition*, TSAJ 107 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 262-68; idem, 'Moses' Heavenly Counterpart in the *Book of Jubilees* and the *Exagoge* of Ezekiel the Tragedian', *Bib* 88 (2007): 168-69.

[49] Van der Horst, 'Moses' Throne Vision in Ezekiel the Dramatist', 71.

[50] The Enochic literature and the *Exagoge* present competing paradigms, each presenting its own favored patriarch as superior. Ezekiel's portrayal of Moses and his received esoteric revelation on Sinai would therefore be a challenge to the Enochic tradition's revelation of Enoch and his revelation: Ruffatto, 'Polemics with Enochic Traditions in the *Exagoge* of Ezekiel the Tragedian', 210. Against this possibility, however, see Van der Horst, 'Some Notes on the *Exagoge* of Ezekiel', 83-84.

[51] Richard Bauckham sees the divine throne in the highest to be a key symbol of monotheism, representative of one of the essential characteristics definitive of the divine identity: 'The Throne of God and the Worship of Jesus', in *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism: Papers from the St. Andrews Conference on the Historical Origins of the Worship of Jesus*, ed. Carey C. Newman, James R. Davila and Gladys S. Lewis, Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 63 (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 53, 56-57.

[52] Erwin R. Goodenough, *By Light, Light: The Mystic Gospel of Hellenistic Judaism* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1935), 288-91; Lucien Cerfaux, 'Influence des Mystères sur le Judaisme Alexandrin avant Philon', in *Recueil Lucien Cerfaux: Études d'exégèse et d'histoire religieuse de Monseigneur Cerfaux, réunies a l'occasion de son soixante-dixième anniversaire*, 3 vols., BETL 6, 7, 18 (Gembloux: Duculot, 1954-1962), 1:81-85.

[53] Esther Starobinski-Safran, 'Un poète judéo-hellénistique: Ezéchiel le tragique', *Museum Helveticum* 31 (1974): 223-24.

[54] Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors*, 2:317-18, 325n31; Van der Horst, 'Some Notes on the *Exagoge* of Ezekiel', 75-76.

> forced when Moses' father-in-law interprets the dream. He explains that Moses will cause a great throne to rise, will exercise jurisdiction, and will be a leader of mortals. The explanation evidently foresees Moses as executor of God's will on earth, with absolute authority on a royal model ... The admixture of the dream episode both magnifies Moses' figure and renders it more accessible to the dramatist's contemporary society. ... (Ezekiel) expresses the power of Hebrew prophets in terms that applied to Greek seers. And he draped Moses in the emblems of royal power that would resonate with those who lived in the era of the great monarchies. The author reinvents the position of Moses on the model of Hellenistic kingship.[55]

The classical background of this dream is emphasized also by Holladay and by Health. Holladay argues that here Moses plays the role of Apollo, who, as a *mantis*, issues his oracles under the promptings of Zeus. The interchange between Moses and God, therefore, would be an intentional counterpart to the Zeus-Apollo relationship in which Apollo serves as the spokesman for Zeus.[56] Health, on the other hand, singles out the figure of Homer as a counterpart to that of Moses, suggesting that Ezekiel engaged with contemporary widespread images of Homer as prince of poets, enthroned as sceptered Zeus:

> The popular images of Homer which were seen on coins, venerated in sculpture and celebrated in verse was evoked by the ambitious poet in his own presentation of Moses in a vivid scene that was itself a testimony to his own literary achievement. In tune with the visual imagination of his audience, he appeals to them through this, interacting with their material and cultural environment.[57]

These interpretations, which are not mutually exclusive, undoubtedly attest to the exceptionally vast cultural background of Ezekiel.[58] Moses' dream, and the *Exagoge* as a whole, reflect a complex and multifaceted cultural identity, which appears to be fully at home both in the classical and in the Jewish worlds.

2. The Figure of Moses in Artapanus' Work

A multifaceted cultural background may be detected also in Artapanus' work, but in a completely different fashion.

---

[55] Gruen, *Heritage and Hellenism*, 134-35.

[56] Lines 4-17, especially 10-12, of the dream-scene may very well have been inspired by a passage such as Aeschylus, *Eumenides* 17-19, in which Zeus seats Apollo as *mantis* upon his throne with the result that Apollo becomes Dios' prophet. See Holladay, 'The Portrait of Moses in Ezekiel the Tragedian', 451-52. This interpretation is rejected by Collins, *Between Athens and Jerusalem*, 226, who argues that Zeus does not vacate his throne for Apollo and that the 'mantic throne' is not described in royal terms, as in the case of Ezekiel.

[57] Health, 'Homer or Moses?', 16.

[58] Jacobson, *The* Exagoge *of Ezekiel*, 89-97.

The beginning of Moses' biography somehow follows the biblical outline with embellishments, additions and omissions. Both Pharaoh's daughter and her husband are given proper names, Merris and Chenephres, and she is said to be barren.[59] Chronology has meaningful gaps: the time from Abraham to Moses is reduced to three generations—Abraham, his son, whose name is not Yitzhak but Mempsasthenoth, and then the story of Moses' adoption. Pharaoh is called Palmanothes,[60] yet it is not Palmanothes who deals with Moses but his son-in-law, Chenephres.[61]

At this point a major departure from the biblical account takes place, where Artapanus inserts an unexpected and astonishing list of Moses' accomplishments:

> (Moses) as a grown man was called Mousaeus by the Greeks. This Mousaeus was the teacher of Orpheus. As a grown man he bestowed many useful benefits on mankind, for he invented boats and devices for stone construction and the Egyptian arms and the implements for drawing water and for the warfare, and philosophy. Further he divided the state into 36 nomes and appointed for each of the nomes the god to be worshiped, and for the priests the sacred letters, and that they should be cats and dogs and ibises. He also allotted a choice area to the priests. He did all these things for the sake of maintaining the monarchy firm for Chenephres, for formerly the masses were disorganized and would at one time expel kings, at others appoint them, often the same people but sometimes others.[62]

With good reasons this passage has been seen as a stumbling block. Moses is depicted not as the deliverer of the Law but as a Greek and/or Egyptian hero, a charismatic figure whose cultural benefactions are strikingly similar to those attributed to the Egyptian Pharaoh Sesostris in the work of Diodorus. Artapanus' account of Moses' accomplishments belongs to a cultural context where Jewish, Egyptian and Greek motifs are tightly interwoven. Most of the names mentioned are Egyptian,[63] and Egyptian are the religious identifications as well, such as that of the goddess Isis with the earth.[64] Egyptian motifs coexist with Greek ones. Moses is called Mousaios and is said to have been the teacher of Orpheus,[65] reversing the usual relationship of Orpheus as teacher of Mousaios. The tradition reported by Hecataeus, surviving in Diodorus, has Orpheus bring back cultural and religious

---

[59] *Praep. ev.* 9.27.3.

[60] *Praep. ev.* 9.27.1.

[61] *Praep. ev.* 9.27.3.

[62] *Praep. ev.* 9.27.3-5.

[63] For example, as seen above, Mempsasthenoth instead of Yitzhak: *Praep. ev.* 9.27.1.

[64] *Praep. ev.* 9.27.32.

[65] *Praep. ev.* 9.27.3-4; see Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition*, 178.

lore to Greece from his travels in Egypt,[66] so that by inverting the normal order of succession Artapanus has cleverly made Greece dependent upon Moses, implicitly claiming that Moses was the ultimate source also of Greek culture.[67] Then Artapanus adds that Moses is also called Hermes 'because of his interpretation of the hieroglyphics', possibly reflecting the Hellenized Egyptians' association of Hermes with Thoth-Mosis, the scribe of the gods and supervisor of good order.[68] According to Mussies, the association of Moses with Thoth-Mosis, no doubt aided by the similarity of names, would imply that in worshipping Hermes the Egyptians were in fact paying honor to Moses.[69]

Moses' slaying of the Egyptian is not mentioned at all. Artapanus has Moses flee because of the envy of the king, who plots against his life. The story has King Chenephres, envious of Moses' prowess, plot to have him killed by sending him as a general in command of an inadequate army against the Ethiopians. Moses' military expedition to Ethiopia has no parallel in the biblical account but is probably not Artapanus' own invention, and it is later mentioned also by Josephus.[70] Details in Artapanus and in Josephus' works, however, differ[71] and it is clear that Josephus' account is not de-

---

[66] Diodorus, *Bib. hist.* 1.96.4.

[67] Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition*, 178. See also the bibliography cited in Collins, *Between Athens and Jerusalem*, 41n62.

[68] On Thoth as Hermes, see Patrick Boylan, *Thoth, the Hermes of Egypt: A Study of Some Aspects of Theological Thought in Ancient Egypt* (1922; repr., Chicago: Ares, 1987); Garth Fowden, *The Egyptian Hermes: A Historical Approach to the Late Pagan Mind* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993); as well as David Flusser and Shua Amorai-Stark, 'The Goddess Thermuthis, Moses and Artapanus', *JSQ* 1 (1993-1994): 217-33.

[69] Gerard Mussies, 'The *Interpretatio Judaica* of Toth-Hermes', in *Studies in Egyptian Religion Dedicated to Professor Jan Zandee*, ed. M. Heerma van Voss *et al.*, SHR 43 (Leiden: Brill, 1982), 89-120. Against Avigdor Shinan's interpretation ('Moses and the Ethiopian Woman: Sources for a Story in the Chronicles of Moses', in *Studies in Hebrew Narrative Art throughout the Ages*, ed. Joseph Heinemann and Shmuel Werses, ScrHier 27 [Jerusalem: Magnes Press; Hebrew University, 1978], 67-69) see Pieter W. Van der Horst, 'The Interpretation of the Bible by the Minor Hellenistic Jewish Authors', in *Essays on the Jewish World of Early Christianity*, 203; first publ. in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading, and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, ed. Martin Jan Mulder and Harry Sysling, LJPSTT 1/CRINT 2 (Assen: Van Gorcum/Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988); as well as John M.G. Barclay, 'Manipulating Moses: Exodus 2.10-15 in Egyptian Judaism and the New Testament', in *Text as Pretext: Essays in Honour of Robert Davidson*, ed. Robert P. Carroll (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992), 33; idem, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora: From Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE – 117 CE)* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1998), 129.

[70] Josephus, *Ant*. 2.238-256.

[71] On similarities and differences between Artapanus' account and that found in Josephus, see Tessa Rajak, 'Moses in Ethiopia', *JJS* 29 (1978): 118-22; and Robert Doran, 'Jewish Hellenistic Historians before Josephus', *ANRW* II.20.1:246-97 (esp. p. 260). See also Albert-Marie Denis, 'Le portrait de Moïse par

rived from that of Artapanus, but possibly from one or more sources similar to those on which Artapanus relied, either in written or oral form.[72] Surprisingly, Moses returns triumphant from the campaign. Then Chenephres persuades a friend, Chanethothes, to assassinate Moses. Moses, however, tipped off by one of the other conspirators and by Aaron, decides to flee. Chanethothes ambushes him on his way to Arabia, and Moses, in self-defense, rebuffs the attack and kills him.[73] Artapanus has Moses kill in self-defense, thereby exonerating him from all possible charges of misconduct. The slaying of the Egyptian was certainly a delicate story for Hellenistic Jewish exegetes.[74]

From this point on, the story runs more or less parallel to the biblical account. Moses flees to Arabia (not Midian), lives with Raguel and marries his daughter (who is given no name). Parallels are coupled with variations. Raguel 'wished to campaign against the Egyptians, wishing to restore Moses and establish dominion for his daughter and son-in law. But Moses restrained him, taking thought of his compatriots'.[75] Then Moses 'prayed to God that he might thereupon give the people an end to their sufferings' (no detail added). 'God was propitiated', and

> fire was suddenly kindled from the earth and it burned although there was no wood or other kindling material in the place. Moses was afraid of what had happened, and fled. But a divine voice bade him campaign against Egypt, rescue the Jews and lead them to their ancient homeland.[76]

Here there is no burning bush, the fire emanates directly from earth and the divine voice invites him to 'campaign against Egypt'. Moses goes back to Egypt and meets Pharaoh. The encounter, however, is entirely different from that of the biblical account. Artapanus has Moses taken to prison and then miraculously released when the doors of the prison open by themselves.[77] This detail, which is a common theme in ancient literature, was probably aimed both at enhancing the miraculous power of God, which is brought to the fore by the sacred name, and underscoring Moses' status as the hero of the story.[78]

---

l'antisémite Manéthon (III s. av. J.-C.) et la réfutation juive de l'historien Artapan', *Mus* 100 (1987): 64; Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition*, 180n227; Barclay, 'Manipulating Moses', 33-34; and Zamagni, 'Alexandre Polyhistor et Artapan', 81.

[72] See Daniel Jeremy Silver, 'Moses and the Hungry Birds', *JQR* 64 (1973): 131.

[73] *Praep. ev.* 9.27.18.

[74] See Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition*, 180; and Barclay, 'Manipulating Moses', 34n2.

[75] *Praep. ev.* 9.27.19.

[76] *Praep. ev.* 9.27.21.

[77] *Praep. ev.* 9.27.23.

[78] See the sources quoted by Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition*, 181n228.

Then come the plagues. They are different from those of Exodus both in number and sequence, the wave of darkness and the death of the Egyptian first born are omitted and a new one is added, the occurring of earthquakes.[79] Details, too, differ. Moses' (not Aaron's)[80] striking of the Nile with his rod does not turn the water of the Nile into blood. Rather, the water 'became stagnant and stank and destroyed the creatures that live in rivers and the people perished from thirst'.[81] Surprisingly, not all the plagues are presented as punishments. Moses' striking of the Nile, for example, is said to have had positive consequences for the Egyptians since 'from that time on the flooding of the Nile took place'.[82]

After the plagues, 'finally, the king released the Jews, since he had encountered such disasters'.[83] Moses 'touched the water with the rod and thus the flowing water separated and the host went through a dry path'; but when the Egyptians went in with them and pursued, 'fire shone out from in front of them and the sea again flooded the path. All the Egyptians were destroyed by both the fire and the flood. The Jews escaped the danger and spent forty years in the wilderness. God rained for them meal like millet, very similar in color to snow'.[84] The narrative ends with a note on Moses' physique: 'Moses was tall, ruddy, gray with long hair, most venerable. He did those things when he was about eighty-nine years old'.[85]

It is striking that from the Red Sea the narrative switches to the millet in the wilderness. No mention is made of the divine revelation on Mount Sinai and the giving of the Torah. Moses is presented not as the lawgiver but rather as a standard Egyptian hero, a charismatic figure, a miracle worker, a holy man.[86]

---

[79] *Praep. ev.* 9.27.33.

[80] On the reduction of the role of Aaron, see Patricia Ahearne-Kroll, 'Constructing Jewish Identity in Ptolemaic Egypt: The Case of Artapanus', in *The 'Other' in Second Temple Judaism: Essays in Honor of John J. Collins*, ed. Daniel C. Harlow *et al.* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2011), 445n44.

[81] *Praep. ev.* 9.27.28.

[82] For a different interpretation, see Howard Jacobson, 'Artapanus and the Flooding of the Nile', *ClQ* 56 (2006): 602.

[83] *Praep. ev.* 9.27.34.

[84] *Praep. ev.* 9.27.36-37.

[85] *Praep. ev.* 9.27.37.

[86] On Moses as a 'holy man', see Carl R. Holladay, *Theios Aner in Hellenistic Judaism: A Critique of the Use of this Category in New Testament Christology* (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977); and Nikolaus Walter, 'Der Mose-Roman des Artapanos und die Frage nach einer Theios-Anër Vorstellung im hellenistischen Judentum sowie nach "paganen" Einflüssen auf die neutestamentliche Christologie', in *Jüdische Schriften in ihrem antic-jüdischen und urchristlichen Kontext*, ed. Herman Lichtenberger and Gerbern S. Oegema, Studien zu den Jüdischen Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit 1 (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2002), 289.

As in the case of Ezekiel, various views on the literary categorization of this narrative have been suggested.[87] As for the sources used by Artapanus, scholars agree: something resembling the biblical account, remodeled and embellished, and a variety of traditions drawn from Greek and Egyptian hero stories, probably in both oral and written form,[88] strikingly similar to those used by Herodotus and later by Hecataeus, which survived in the work of Diodorus Siculus.[89] Jewish traditions external to the biblical account, too, may be detected, such as that of Moses' war in Ethiopia.[90] The different traditions are woven together in a most original and unique narrative, where, using Zellentin's expression, they are 'simultaneously imitated and subverted'.[91]

Artapanus' purposes were clearly manifold. The depiction of Moses as a national hero was meant to bolster the ethnic pride of Jews by fabricating a more glorious history than that of other peoples. It was, as Barclay points out, an ambitious claim to national superiority. Egypt was widely regarded as the source of Greek civilization, so to claim the Jewish origins of Egyptian lore was no trivial matter.[92] Judeans are elevated over the Egyptians, and similarly their God, who is depicted as 'the master of the universe', dumps all the gods of Egypt into the Red Sea. At one and the same time, Jews are also encouraged to adapt to their cultural

---

[87] See Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors*, 1:190-91, 196-97n1; Harold W. Attridge, 'Historiography', in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*, ed. Michael E. Stone (Assen: Van Gorcum/ Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), 167-68; John J. Collins, 'Artapanus', in *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, 2:891-92; idem, *Between Athens and Jerusalem*, 39-40; Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition*, 186; Robert Kugler, 'Hearing the Story of Moses in Ptolemaic Egypt: Artapanus Accommodates the Tradition', in *The Wisdom of Egypt: Jewish, Early Christian and Gnostic Essays in Honor of Gerard P. Luttikhuizen*, ed. Anthony Hilhorst and George H. Van Kooten, AGJU 59 (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 70; Howard Jacobson, 'Artapanus Judaeus', *JSJ* 57 (2006): 219; Becker, 'Artapanus', 301; Karen Strand Winslow, 'Moses' Cushite Marriage: Torah, Artapanus, and Josephus', in *Mixed Marriages: Intermarriage and Group Identity in the Second Temple Period*, ed. Christian Frevel, LHBOTS 547 (New York: T&T Clark International, 2011), 284.

[88] On the question whether Artapanus made use of oral or written sources, or both, see Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors*, 1:192; Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition*, 169n201; and Jacobson, 'Artapanus Judaeus', 219.

[89] See Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition*, 176nn204-06; Collins, *Between Athens and Jerusalem*, 43; and Holger M. Zellentin, 'The End of Jewish Egypt: Artapanus's Second Exodus', in *Antiquity in Antiquity: Jewish and Christian Pasts in the Greco-Roman World*, ed. Gregg Gardner and Kevin L. Osterloch, TSAJ 123 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 33-34, on Diodorus' sources.

[90] See Rajak, 'Moses in Ethiopia', 115.

[91] Zellentin, 'The End of Jewish Egypt', 34.

[92] Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora,* 128-29.

environment since the narrative consistently emphasizes that there was no incompatibility between Jewish and Greco-Egyptian traditions.

As for Artapanus' public, it must have been a public strongly influenced by its Egyptian environment,[93] interested in the Egyptian tradition where history, myth and legend freely intermingled, and ready to enjoy miraculous tales.[94] Artapanus' narrative, however, does not deal only with fairy tales. It also engages with pressing, delicate and controversial themes, indirectly addressing many of the charges leveled against the Jews which seem to have been quite widespread in Hellenistic Egypt, as one may infer from Flavius Josephus' refutations.[95] A long and impressive list of connections with issues dealt with by Manetho has been compiled by Collins,[96] who stresses that the portrait of Moses was determined, not by the biblical story, but rather by the demands of competitive historiography.[97] Artapanus' message was clear: Moses is the cult benefactor and political leader who successfully establishes *harmonia* and cares for the stability of the country and for the well-being of his Egyptian neighbors.

---

[93] David Lenz Tiede, *The Charismatic Figure as Miracle Worker*, SBLDS 1 (Missoula, MT: Society of Biblical Literature for the Seminar on the Gospels, 1972), 176. See also Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition*, 184; and Kugler, 'Hearing the Story of Moses in Ptolemaic Egypt', 74.

[94] See the different views of Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors*, 1:196n16; and Erich S. Gruen, 'The Twisted Tales of Artapanus: Biblical Rewritings as Novelistic Narrative', in *Early Christian and Jewish Narrative: The Role of Religion in Shaping Narrative Forms*, ed. Ilaria Ramelli and Judith Perkins (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015), 42. One may also think of a non-Jewish public, either the Ptolemaic ruling class (Donna Runnals, 'Moses' Ethiopian Campaign', *JSJ* 14 [1983]: 136-37; Denis, 'Le portrait de Moïse par l'antisémite Manéthon [III s. av. J.-C.] et la réfutation juive de l'historien Artapan', 65) or Hellenized Egyptians (Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora*, 127).

[95] Emilio Gabba, 'The Growth of Anti-Judaism or the Greek Attitude towards the Jews', in *The Hellenistic Age*, vol. 2 of *The Cambridge History of Judaism*, ed. William D. Davies and Louis Finkelstein (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 640; Barclay, 'Manipulating Moses', 33n1; Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors*, 1:197n17; Runnals, 'Moses' Ethiopian Campaign', 145; Martin Goodman, 'Jewish Literature Composed in Greek', in Emil Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.-A.D. 135)*, ed. Geza Vermes and Fergus Millar, rev. ed., 3 vols. (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1973-1987), 3/1:523; trans. of *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, 4th ed. (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1911); Doran, 'Jewish Hellenistic Historians before Josephus', 262; Denis, 'Le portrait de Moïse par l'antisémite Manéthon (III s. av. J.-C.) et la réfutation juive de l'historien Artapan', 53-60; Van der Horst, 'The Interpretation of the Bible by the Minor Hellenistic Jewish Authors', 202; Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition*, 182-83.

[96] Collins, 'Artapanus', 892; Silver, 'Moses and the Hungry Birds', 133, 135, 137-40.

[97] Collins, *Between Athens and Jerusalem*, 43-44. Gruen, 'The Twisted Tales of Artapanus', 38, disagrees: 'The extant fragments of Artapanus' composition nowhere possess the character of a polemic'.

As for Artapanus' cultural identity, his mixed theology was certainly far away from Judaism. He identifies Moses with Mousaios and Hermes, stresses Moses' positive attitude towards the animal cult, a cult which he attributes to Moses' own authority, and he has Moses assign gods to the Egyptians: cats and dogs and ibises. No doubt these statements appear rather weird in the mouth of a Jew, and Artapanus, it appears, was a Jew. As Ahearne-Kroll points out, at the time non-Jewish Greek authors display no awareness of the Septuagint translation and, moreover, their writings do not portray the superiority of non-Greeks.[98] His mixed theology indicates that his identity, too, must have been a mixed one, characterized by a remarkable degree of cultural assimilation and accommodation to his pagan environment.[99] In the place where he lived and wrote, it appears, local strong Egyptian influences were felt, responsible for the colorful mixture of notions and insights which show up in his narrative. Artapanus' outline of Moses' figure as a multi-national cultural hero, therefore, stems from the very nature of the culturally and theologically mixed and complex world in which he must have lived.

3. Conclusions

The works of Ezekiel and Artapanus are different in literary genre, tone and approach, and many details, too, differ, but have certain features in common: they fail to mention Moses' role as law-giver, completely ignore the Jewish law and never mention the land of Israel.

In spite of these characteristics, which reflect cultural identities highly influenced by the cultural milieu of the places where these authors lived and wrote, they both write *ad maiorem Iudaeorum gloriam*, as Sterling aptly observes. Both of them claim the superiority of the Jewish nation over both Eastern peoples and the Greeks – a claim which may well have been intended to answer charges and reassure those who had heard those charges. The surviving fragments presuppose both an international audience, to whom their cultural claims could be made, and compatriots, who, for all their acceptance of Hellenism, remained indubitably Jewish. These works, Sterling observes, served to give the Jewish people a new identity in a new world. Presenting their own ancestors as *Kulturbringer* made them able to

---

[98] On Artapanus' Jewishness, see Ahearne-Kroll, 'Constructing Jewish Identity in Ptolemaic Egypt: The Case of Artapanus', 438-48.

[99] See Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors*, 1:193; Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora*, 127-32; Goodman, 'Jewish Literature Composed in Greek', 523; Erkki Koskenniemi, 'Greeks, Egyptians and Jews in the Fragments of Artapanus', *JSP* 13 (2002): 30; Zellentin, 'The End of Jewish Egypt', 51; Erich S. Gruen, 'Hellenism and Judaism: Fluid Boundaries', in *Follow the Wise: Studies in Jewish History and Culture in Honor of Lee I. Levine*, ed. Zeev Weiss *et al.* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2010), 59.

identify with Hellenism while maintaining a superior posture: since their ancestry was nobler than that of any other people, they could proudly take their place, knowing that their past had been greater than that of any other nation.[100]

Bibliography

Ahearne-Kroll, Patricia. 'Constructing Jewish Identity in Ptolemaic Egypt: The Case of Artapanus'. Pages 434-56 in *The 'Other' in Second Temple Judaism: Essays in Honor of John J. Collins*. Edited by Daniel C. Harlow, Karina Martin Hogan, Matthew Goff and Joel S. Kaminsky. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2011.

Attridge, Harold W. 'Historiography'. Pages 157-84 in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*. Edited by Michael E. Stone. Assen: Van Gorcum; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.

Barbu, Daniel. 'Artapan: Introduction historique et historiographique'. Pages 3-23 in *Interprétations de Moïse: Égypte, Judée, Grèce et Rome*. Edited by Philippe Borgeaud, Thomas Römer and Youri Volokhine. Jerusalem Studies in Religion and Culture 10. Leiden/Boston: E.J. Brill, 2010.

Barclay, John M.G. *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora: From Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE – 117 CE)*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1998.

____. 'Manipulating Moses: Exodus 2.10-15 in Egyptian Judaism and the New Testament'. Pages 28-46 in *Text as Pretext: Essays in Honour of Robert Davidson*. Edited by Robert P. Carroll. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press Ltd., 1992.

Bauckham, Richard. 'The Throne of God and the Worship of Jesus'. Pages 43-69 in *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism: Papers from the St. Andrews Conference on the Historical Origins of the Worship of Jesus*. Edited by Carey C. Newman, James R. Davila and Gladys S. Lewis. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 63. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

Becker, Eve-Marie. 'Artapanus. Judaica: A Contribution to Early Jewish Historiography'. Pages 297-320 in *Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Yearbook 2006: History and Identity: How Israel's Later Authors Viewed Its Earlier History*. Edited by Núria Calduch-Benages and Jan Liesen. Berlin/New York: W. de Gruyter 2006.

Boylan, Patrick. *Thoth, the Hermes of Egypt: A Study of Some Aspects of Theological Thought in Ancient Egypt*. 1922. Repr., Chicago: Ares, 1987.

Cerfau, Lucien. 'Influence des Mystères sur le Judaisme Alexandrin avant Philon'. Vol. 1 pages 65-112 in *Recueil Lucien Cerfaux: Études d'exégèse et d'histoire religieuse de Monseigneur Cerfaux, réunies a l'occasion de son soixante-dixième anniversaire*. 3 vols. BETL 6, 7, 18. Gembloux: J. Duculot, 1954-1962.

Collins, John J. 'Artapanus'. Vol. 2 pages 889-903 in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. 2 vols. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1985.

[100] Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition*, 223-25.

____. *Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 2000.

____. 'Reinventing Exodus: Exegesis and Legend in Hellenistic Egypt'. Pages 52-62 in *For a Later Generation: The Transformation of Tradition in Israel, Early Judaism, and Early Christianity. Festschrift for George W.E. Nickelsburg*. Edited by Randal A. Argall, Beverly A. Bow and Rodney A. Werline. Harrisburg, PA.: Trinity Press International, 2000.

Collins, Nina L. 'Ezekiel, the Author of the *Exagoge*: His Calendar and Home'. *JSJ* 22 (1991): 201-11.

Crouch, James E. 'Demetrius the Chronographer and the Beginning of Hellenistic Historiography'. *Kwansei Gakuin University Annual Studies* 30 (1981): 1-14.

Denis, Albert-Marie. 'Le portrait de Moïse par l'antisémite Manéthon (III s. av. J.-C.) et la réfutation juive de l'historien Artapan'. *Mus* 100 (1987): 49-65.

Doran, Robert. 'Jewish Hellenistic Historians before Josephus'. *ANRW* II.20.1:246-97. Edited by Hildegard Temporini and Wolfgang Haase. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1972-1996.

Flusser, David and Shua Amorai-Stark. 'The Goddess Thermuthis, Moses and Artapanus'. *JSQ* 1 (1993-1994): 217-33.

Fowden, Garth. *The Egyptian Hermes: A Historical Approach to the Late Pagan Mind*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.

Gabba, Emilio. 'The Growth of Anti-Judaism or the Greek Attitude towards the Jews'. Pages 614-56 in *The Hellenistic Age*. Vol. 2 of *The Cambridge History of Judaism*. Edited by W.D. Davies and Louis Finkelstein. Cambridge, U.K./New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Goodenough, Erwin R. *By Light, Light: the Mystic Gospel of Hellenistic Judaism*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1935.

Goodman, Martin. 'Jewish Literature Composed in Greek'. Vol. 3/1 pages 521-25 in Emil Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.-A.D. 135)*. Edited by Geza Vermes and Fergus Millar. 3 vols. Rev. ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, Ltd., 1973-1987. Translation of *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*. 4th ed. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1911.

Gruen, Erich S. 'Hellenism and Judaism: Fluid Boundaries'. Pages 53-70 in *Follow the Wise: Studies in Jewish History and Culture in Honor of Lee I. Levine*. Edited by Zeev Weiss, Oded Irshai, Jodi Magness and Seth Schwartz. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2010.

____. *Heritage and Hellenism: The Reinvention of Jewish Tradition*. Berkeley/Los Angeles/London: University of California Press, 1998.

____. 'The Twisted Tales of Artapanus: Biblical Rewritings as Novelistic Narrative'. Pages 31-44 in *Early Christian and Jewish Narrative: The Role of Religion in Shaping Narrative Forms*. Edited by Ilaria Ramelli and Judith Perkins. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015.

Gruenwald, Ithamar. *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism*. AGJU 14. Leiden: Brill, 1980.

Health, Jane. 'Homer or Moses? A Hellenistic Perspective on Moses' Throne Vision in Ezekiel Tragicus'. *JJS* 58 (2007): 1-18.

Holladay, Carl R. *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors*. 4 vols. Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1983-1996.

____. 'The Portrait of Moses in Ezekiel the Tragedian'. *SBLSP* 10 (1976): 447-52.

____. *Theios Aner in Hellenistic Judaism: A Critique of the Use of this Category in New Testament Christology*. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977.

Hurtado, Larry W. *One God, One Lord: Early Christian Devotion and Ancient Jewish Monotheism*. 3rd ed. London: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2015.

Inowlocki, Sabrina. *Eusebius and the Jewish Authors: His Citation Technique in an Apologetic Context*. AGJU 64. Leiden/Boston: E.J. Brill, 2006.

Jacobson, Howard. 'Artapanus and the Flooding of the Nile'. *ClQ* 56 (2006): 602-03.

____. 'Artapanus Judaeus'. *JSJ* 57 (2006): 210-21.

____. *The* Exagoge *of Ezekiel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

____. 'Phoenix Resurrected'. *HTR* 80 (1987): 229-33.

____. 'Tacitus and the Phoenix'. *Phoenix* 35 (1981): 260-61.

____. 'Two Studies on Ezekiel the Tragedian'. *GRBS* 22 (1981): 167-78.

Koskenniemi, Erkki. 'Greeks, Egyptians and Jews in the Fragments of Artapanus'. *JSP* 13 (2002): 17-31.

Kugler, Robert A. 'Hearing the Story of Moses in Ptolemaic Egypt: Artapanus Accommodates the Tradition'. Pages 67-80 in *The Wisdom of Egypt: Jewish, Early Christian and Gnostic Essays in Honor of Gerard P. Luttikhuizen*. Edited by Anthony Hilhorst and George H. Van Kooten. AGJU 59. Leiden/Boston: E.J. Brill, 2005.

Lanfranchi, Pierluigi. 'Il sogno di Mosè nell'*Exagoge* di Ezechile il tragico'. *Materia giudaica* 8 (2003): 105-12.

____. 'Moses' Vision of the Divine Throne in the *Exagoge* of Ezekiel the Tragedian'. Pages 53-59 in *The Book of Ezekiel and its Influence*. Edited by Henk Jan de Jonge and Johannes Tromp. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2007.

Mussies, Gerard. 'The *Interpretatio Judaica* of Toth-Hermes'. Pages 89-120 in *Studies in Egyptian Religion Dedicated to Professor Jan Zandee*. Edited by M. Heerma van Voss, D.J. Hoens, G. Mussies, D. van der Plas and H. te Velde. SHR 43. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1982.

Orlov, Andrei A. 'Moses' Heavenly Counterpart in the *Book of Jubilees* and the *Exagoge* of Ezekiel the Tragedian'. *Bib* 88 (2007): 153-73.

____. *The Enoch-Metatron Tradition*. TSAJ 107. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.

Rajak, Tessa. 'Moses in Ethiopia'. *JJS* 29 (1978): 111-22.

Ruffatto, Kristine. 'Polemics with Enochic Traditions in the *Exagoge* of Ezekiel the Tragedian'. *JSP* 15 (2006): 195-210.

Runnals, Donna. 'Moses' Ethiopian Campaign'. *JSJ* 14 (1983): 135-56.

Schäfer, Peter, ed. *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literature (in Zusammenarbeit mit Margarete Schlüter und Hans Georg von Mutius)*. TSAJ 2. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1981.

Shinan, Avigdor. 'Moses and the Ethiopian Woman: Sources for a Story in the Chronicles of Moses'. Pages 66-78 in *Studies in Hebrew Narrative Art throughout the Ages*. Edited by Jo-

seph Heinemann and Shmuel Werses. ScrHier 27. Jerusalem: Magnes Press/Hebrew University, 1978.

Silver, Daniel Jeremy. 'Moses and the Hungry Birds'. *JQR* 64 (1973): 123-53.

Starobinski-Safran, Esther. 'Un poète judéo-hellénistique: Ezéchiel le tragique'. *Museum Helveticum* 31 (1974): 216-24.

Sterling, Gregory. *Historiography and Self-Definition: Josephus, Luke-Acts and Apologetic Historiography*. NovTSup 64. Leiden/New York/Köln: Brill, 1992.

Strugnell, John. 'General Introduction with a Note on Alexander Polyhistor'. Vol. 2 pages 777-78 in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. 2 vols. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1985.

Tiede, David Lenz. *The Charismatic Figure as Miracle Worker*. SBLDS 1. Missoula, MT: Society of Biblical Literature for the Seminar on the Gospels, 1972.

Van de Water, Rick. 'Moses' Exaltation: Pre-Christian?'. *JSP* 21 (2000): 59-69.

Van der Horst, Pieter W. 'The Interpretation of the Bible by the Minor Hellenistic Jewish Authors'. Pages 187-219 in *Essays on the Jewish World of Early Christianity*. Freiburg, Schweiz: Universitätsverlag, 1990. First publ. pages 519-46 in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading, and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*. Edited by Martin Jan Mulder and Harry Sysling. LJPSTT 1/CRINT 2. Assen: Van Gorcum/Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988.

____. 'Moses' Throne Vision in Ezekiel the Dramatist'. Pages 63-71 in *Essays on the Jewish World of Early Christianity*. Freiburg, Schweiz: Universitätsverlag, 1990. First publ. in *JJS* 34 (1983): 63-71.

____. 'Some Notes on the *Exagoge* of Ezekiel'. Pages 72-93 in *Essays on the Jewish World of Early Christianity*. Freiburg, Schweiz: Universitätsverlag, 1990. First publ. in *Mnemosyne* 37 (1984): 72-93.

Wacholder, Ben Zion and Steven Bowman. 'Ezechielus the Dramatist and Ezekiel the Prophet: Is the Mysterious *Zoon* in the *Exagogé* a Phoenix'? *HTR* 78 (1985): 253-77.

Walter, Nikolaus. 'Der Mose-Roman des Artapanos und die Frage nach einer Theios-Anër-Vorstellung im hellenistischen Judentum sowie nach "paganen" Einflüssen auf die neutestamentliche Christologie'. Pages 284-303 in *Jüdische Schriften in ihrem antik-jüdischen und urchristlichen Kontext*. Edited by Hermann Lichtenberger and Gerbern S. Oegema. Studien zu den Jüdischen Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit 1. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2002.

Winslow, Karen Strand. 'Moses' Cushite Marriage: Torah, Artapanus, and Josephus'. Pages 280-302 in *Mixed Marriages: Intermarriage and Group Identity in the Second Temple Period*. Edited by Christian Frevel. LHBOTS 547. New York: T&T Clark International, 2011.

Zamagni, Claudio. 'Alexandre Polyhistor et Artapan: Une mise en perspective à partir des extraits d'Eusèbe de Césarée'. Pages 57-82 in *Interprétations de Moïse: Égypte, Judée, Grèce et Rome*. Edited by Philippe Borgeaud, Thomas Römer and Youri Volokhine, with Daniel Barbu. Jerusalem Studies in Religion and Culture 10. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2010.

Zellentin, Holger M. 'The End of Jewish Egypt: Artapanus's Second Exodus'. Pages 27-73 in *Antiquity in Antiquity: Jewish and Christian Pasts in the Greco-Roman World*. Edited by Gregg Gardner and Kevin L. Osterloch. TSAJ 123. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.

The Reception and Development of the Maccabee Martyr Tradition in *4 Maccabees*

Dario Garribba

1. Why 4 Maccabees*?*

The reception of Jewish scripture in early Judaism and Christianity is broad and offers a number of approaches. Any work that intends to contribute to it must necessarily select only one of these approaches, and this paper is no exception. Its subject is a text, *4 Maccabees*, custodian of a story that, though entirely Jewish, has seen incredible development in the Christian domain. This is to some extent unusual: on one hand, as its title reveals,[1] it relies on the events narrated in the two biblical books of Maccabees (particularly 2 Maccabees 6-7) and, therefore, falls within the 'national', 'ethnic' tradition of Second Temple Judaism; on the other, the story that unfolds in its eighteen chapters has made it a pioneer of Christian martyr tradition—a literary model and a hagiographic source for subsequent Christianity, a basis for veneration of the Maccabean martyrs, having great success in Eastern Christianity and beyond.[2] From these factors we can see how a lesser or

---

[1] The earliest testimony to the title of this work comes from Eusebius of Caesarea in *Hist. eccl.* 3.10.6, 'Another work of no little merit has been produced by the same writer (Flavius Josephus), Περὶ αὐτοκράτορος λογισμοῦ (On the Supremacy of Reason), which some have called Μακκαβαϊκόν, because it contains an account of the struggles of those Hebrews who contended manfully for the true religion, as is related in the books called Maccabees'. The double epithet, as well as the attribution to Josephus, is found in Jerome a century later (*Vir. ill.* 13; *Pelag.* 2.6) and in subsequent authors, and it was also transmitted by the manuscript tradition. Cf. André Dupont-Sommer, *Le quatrième livre des Machabées. Introduction, traduction et notes*, BEHEH 274 (Paris: Champion, 1939), 1-2; Raphaëlle Ziadé, *Les Martyrs Maccabées: De l'histoire juive au culte chrétien. Les homélies de Gregoire de Nazianze et de Jean Chrysostome*, Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae 80 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 33.

[2] Cf. Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 3.10.6; 5.2.41-42; 5.2.53-55; Gregory of Nazianzus, *Hom. in Mach*. (PG 35,923); John Chrysostom, *Eleaz. Puer.* (PG 50,620); Ambrosius, *Jac.* 1,1-8; 2,43-58. On the reception and Christian developments in the story of Eleazar and the seven brothers, see Jan Willem van Henten, 'The Martyrs as Heroes of the Christian People: Some Remarks on the Continuity between Jewish and Christian Martyrology, with Pagan Analogies', in *Martyrium in Multidisciplinary Perspective: Memorial Louis Reekmans*, ed. Mathijs Lambegrits and Peter van Deun, BETL 117 (Leuven: Leuven University Press/Peeters, 1995), 303-22; Luigi F. Pizzolato and Chiara Somenzi, *I sette fratelli Maccabei nella Chiesa antica d'Occidente*, Studia Patristica Mediolanensia 25 (Milano: Vita e Pensiero, 2005), 3-45; David Arthur DeSilva, 'An Example of How to Die Nobly for Religion: The Influence of *4 Maccabees* on Origen's *Exhortatio ad Martyrium*', *JECS* 17 (2009): 337-56; Ziadé, *Les Martyrs Maccabées*, 66-103.

at least incidental biblical episode—the story of Eleazar and the mother with seven sons—has developed into several, perhaps unexpected, directions; and so, we might offer it as a paradigmatic example of the phenomenon being investigated in this collection of essays.

The story of the Maccabean martyrs has developed along very different paths over time, making it impossible to follow all lines of its evolution from the initial narrative nucleus. I will therefore limit myself to comparing the story of *4 Maccabees* with its literary model, in order to understand the reasons that led to its birth and the circumstances that caused its reworking, that is, the conditions in the first and early second centuries CE that led someone to rewrite the story of Eleazar and the seven brothers. What is the historical context of *4 Maccabees*? Let's proceed in order.

2. 4 Maccabees*: Structure, Date and Origin*

4 Maccabees consists of eighteen chapters and re-elaborates, in a philosophical-rhetorical tone, the story of the death of nine Jews at the hands of Antiochus IV. Its content is well known. A general introduction of explicitly[3] philosophical nature (*4 Maccabees* 1:1-3:18) guides the reader through a demonstration of the superiority of religious reason (ὁ εὐσεβὴς λογισμός) above passions. This is the central theme of the book[4] and constitutes the key to understanding the more properly narrative sections (chapters 4-17). There are two narrated episodes: the martyrdoms of the elderly Eleazar and of the seven brothers killed with their mother, both set during the persecution of Antiochus IV Epiphanes—which, though marginal to our interest here, is a very important event in Jewish history. Eleazar, along with many others, is arrested for refusing to abandon ancestral laws and eat unclean foods, contravening the tyrant's decrees. Eleazar is a priest, from a priestly family, (τὸ γένος ἱερεύς), a legal expert (νομικός),[5] described as a man known and esteemed even by

[3] Cf. *4 Macc* 1:1: Φιλοσοφώτατον λόγον ἐπιδείκνυσθαι μέλλων, εἰ αὐτοδέσποτός ἐστιν τῶν παθῶν ὁ εὐσεβὴς λογισμός συμβουλεύσαιμ' ἂν ὑμῖν ὀρθῶς ὅπως προσέχητε προθύμως τῇ φιλοσοφίᾳ.

[4] Cf. John M.G. Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora: From Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE – 117 CE)* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1996), 369; Giuseppe Scarpat, *Quarto libro dei Maccabei*, Biblica 9 (Brescia: Paideia, 2006), 85-89.

[5] In 2 Macc 6:18 Eleazar is described as one of the most notable among the scribes (τις τῶν πρωτευόντων γραμματέων ἀνήρ). There is a disagreement between *4 Maccabees* and its source, which seems intentional and so must therefore be explained: in *4 Maccabees* the temple is largely absent or marginal, as are the figures that revolve around it (high priest, priests, Levites, scribes). Using the term γραμματεύς would imply the need for a number of explanations that our author does not wish or feel necessary to offer to his Gentile readers; so he uses a more generic term, νομικός, which corresponds to a meaning that the Jews attributed to the γραμματεύς. But there is still a need to dignify the figure of Eleazar, hence the expression τὸ γένος ἱερεύς. It is an epithet that cannot fail to recall the presentation that

the royal court. Antiochus IV turns to Eleazar in order to persuade him to eat pork and abandon an attitude that he (Antiochus) judges to be senseless (*4 Maccabees* 5:8-13). After Eleazar's response, wholly aimed at proud obedience to the Jewish law (*4 Maccabees* 5:16-38), follow the violent tortures that lead to his death, faced by him with full awareness of the exemplary value they will obtain for future generations (*4 Maccabees* 6:16-23).

Antiochus, then, angry over this failure, orders the other prisoners ἐκ τῆς λείας τῶν Ἑβραίων (*4 Maccabees* 8:2) to be brought before him; and so come the seven brothers with their elderly mother. Here, in a more or less similar way, the same scene is repeated: through promises and threats the tyrant tries to turn each brother away from their religious beliefs in order to adopt 'the Greek way of life' (*4 Maccabees* 8:8). Every proposal is disdainfully rejected, however, by appeal to the law and its place in the Jewish nation. In the face of such pride the action of the executioners becomes more and more cruel, so that under the command of Antiochus they allow themselves the most atrocious tortures without mercy.[6] Their elderly mother faces the same fate; but, having proudly witnessed the death of her sons and encouraged them not to yield to the flatteries of the sovereign, she throws herself against the fires 'rather than they should touch her person' (*4 Maccabees* 17:1). A large hortatory section then occupies the final part of the work. And a fictitious epitaph is followed by an exhortation for young Jews not to desist from obeying the law and living according to religious piety (*4 Maccabees* 18):

> Here lie buried an old priest, an old woman and seven children because of the violence of a tyrant who wished to destroy the Hebrew way of life. They won justice for their nation by fixing their eyes on God and enduring torture to the point of death.[7]

The textual tradition has been rather stingy on the date and placement of the work, both of which remain conjectural or based on internal clues. The date ranges

---

Josephus makes of himself in *Vita* 2. As with Josephus, however, it does not seem to refer to the accomplishment of the priestly duty, but to the social class with which one belongs: that is, the title's only purpose is to make Eleazar's respectability perceived, even to a reader who does not know very much about Judaism.

[6] In an interesting article Marie-Françoise Baslez has shown how Jewish martyrdom described in 2 Maccabees and *4 Maccabees* is both dependent on and opposed to Greek culture; '*Hellenismos-Ioudaismos*: Cross Approaches of Jewish-Greek Literature of Martyrdom', *Hen* 22 (2010): 19-33. In fact, if overly meticulous attention to tortures and sufferings reflects the Greek criminal model, in which a man convicted of a crime loses his human nature (p. 27), Eleazar, in view of the Greek code of honor, is subject to a humiliating death and ends up being an object of remembrance, the only one to be the guardian of the most noble values of Judaism.

[7] *4 Macc* 17:9-10.

between 20 and 135 CE;[8] though later dates are considered,[9] most scholars today place it between the middle of the 1st[10] and the beginning of the 2nd century.[11] Following Jan Willem van Henten, I am inclined to date it between the end of the 1st and the beginning of the 2nd century because of its portrayal of Jewish institutions and especially because of the atmosphere of deep tension with state authority that it conveys—a matter to which we return below. Moreover, many points in common with Josephus' *Contra Apionem*[12] also contribute to such a dating, since they could suggest a similar political and cultural climate.

The place of composition is even more uncertain: in fact, even though there is unanimous agreement in considering it a diasporan work,[13] its geographical location is controversial. Relying on analogies with *Contra Apionem* and the Epistle to the Hebrews, Giuseppe Scarpat, author of the latest Italian commentary on *4 Maccabees*, traces the place of origin to Roman synagogal environments.[14] It is a fascinating thesis, that should not be underestimated, though it has a weak point in treating only literary issues. Van Henten places this work in one of the cities of

---

[8] On the dating of *4 Maccabees*, see David Arthur DeSilva, *4 Maccabees: Introduction and Commentary on the Greek Text in Codex Sinaiticus*, Septuagint Commentary Series (Leiden: Brill, 2006), xiv-xviii; and more recently, Brian J. Tabb, *Suffering in Ancient Worldview: Luke, Seneca and 4 Maccabees in Dialogue*, LNTS 569 (London: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2017), 72-74.

[9] Douglas A. Campbell places the work after 135 CE for stylistic reasons, but even more for its relationship to the stories of Christian martyrdom, on which, according to the author, it depends; *The Rhetoric of Righteousness in Romans 3.21–26*, JSNTSup 65 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992), 221-28.

[10] Elias J. Bickerman placed the work in the first half of the 1st century, highlighting how the designation of Posidonius in *4 Macc* 4:2 as στρατηγός of Syria, Phoenicia and Cilicia reflected the subdivision of the provinces of the East, which was valid from 19 to 54 CE; 'The Date of Fourth Maccabees', in *Louis Ginzberg Jubilee Volume on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*, 2 vols. (New York: American Academy of Jewish Research, 1945), 1:105-12; repr., vol. 1 pages 266-71 in *Studies in Jewish and Christian History*, ed. Amram Tropper, 2 vols. (Leiden: Brill, 2007). Against this stance, see Jan Willem van Henten, *The Maccabean Martyrs as Saviours of the Jewish People: A Study of 2 and 4 Maccabees*, Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 57 (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 73-81. See also the mid-1st century dating in DeSilva, *4 Maccabees*, xvi-xvii.

[11] Van Henten, *The Maccabean Martyrs as Saviours of the Jewish People*, 55; Tessa Rajak, 'The Fourth Book of Maccabees in a Multi-Cultural City', in *Jewish and Christian Communal Identities in the Roman World*, ed. Yair Furstenberg, Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity 94 (Boston: Brill, 2016), 138-39.

[12] Cf. Scarpat, *Quarto libro dei Maccabei*, 54-55.

[13] DeSilva, *4 Maccabees*, xvii-xx.

[14] Scarpat, *Quarto libro dei Maccabei*, 49-58, 91-92. Scarpat assumes, with conscious boldness, that *4 Maccabees* was composed in the same synagogue as was the later Epistle to the Hebrews (written in response to it).

Asia Minor (specifically, Cilicia), based mainly on the words used in the epitaph—especially the form Ἐνταῦτα [....] ἐγκεκήδευνται at *4 Maccabees* 17:9—which recalls epigraphic formulas found in Asia Minor (Ionia, Galatia, Lycaonia, Lydia and Phrygia). The author of *4 Maccabees*, in imagining a possible burial inscription for his heroes, would draw on similar epigraphic models: obviously an archaeological proof can never be definitive, but it is still a plausible conjecture, which takes on some strength if combined with other data.[15]

I would be rather cautious about an Antiochian origin, which is also supported by many scholars. In fact, the case for this hypothesis is based on the subsequent religious luck of the Maccabean martyrdom in a Christian environment, that is, on the spread of Christian worship of the Maccabean martyrs, which located their tombs in Antioch. Thus, Tessa Rajak argues, albeit with caution, that the birth of Christian worship would be better explained by postulating that the Jews of Antioch retained the memory of this tradition. Rajak deems the re-emergence of the story of Eleazar and the seven brothers to be a Jewish reaction to the hard social tensions with the Gentiles of that city, even though she does not consider that it was revived because of harsh persecution of the Jews.[16] This is *a posteriori* reasoning that can be also overturned. In fact, it could be argued that the Christians of Antioch have embraced this story and have subsequently located an area of martyrdom in which to encourage its cult: the late origin of the worship in Antioch (4th century) suggests that this cult depends on the text, that it was 'established' taking into account the text and therefore did not exist before it.

It is also necessary to credit Rajak for having questioned the historical background of *4 Maccabees*, that is, its value for reconstructing 1st century CE Judaism. Unlike the great attention the book has received in studies on Christian martyrdom, *4 Maccabees* has not piqued the same interest in the realm of historiography. The literary nature of the book, its rhetoric along with its wealth of philosophical remarks, has led to the overthrow of its value as historical testimony and has reduced its importance for the image of Judaism.[17] What can we see of the diaspora behind its text? What were the phases of recovery and reworking in the history of

---

[15] Jan Willem van Henten, 'Datierung und Herkunft des vierten Makkabäerbuches', in *Tradition and Re-Interpretation in Jewish and Early Christian Literature: Essays in Honor of Jürgen C. H. Lebram*, ed. J.W. Wesselius *et al.*, StPB 36 (Leiden: Brill, 1986), 146-49; idem, 'The Martyrs as Heroes of the Christian People', 316.

[16] Rajak, 'The Fourth Book of Maccabees in a Multi-Cultural City', 141-47. Similar conclusions are found in Marie-Françoise Baslez, *Le persecuzioni nell'antichità*, Supplementi alla Introduzione allo studio della Bibbia 70 (Brescia: Paideia, 2016), 177-78.

[17] Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora*, 370-71; van Henten, 'The Martyrs as Heroes of the Christian People', 317.

the Maccabean martyrs? What led to the creation of a book that would remain a *unicum* of Jewish literature, a text devoted entirely to martyrdom?

During the 1st and 2nd centuries CE there was a large circulation of tales about heroic deaths: many flowed into the stories of Christian martyrs, but also affected Hellenistic-Jewish and rabbinic literature.[18] The remarkable analogies between these stories, the presence of recurring narrative schemes both in Christian martyrology and in Jewish texts, have given rise to a heated debate on the origin of martyrdom, expressed in several publications by Daniel Boyarin.[19] Indeed, we are faced with a narrative scheme that ostensibly belongs to different cultural contexts (Christianity, paganism, Judaism) but which crosses those boundaries with fluidity: the beginning of an age of persecution, the capture, the interrogation before a tyrant/torturer, the proud opposition to the flatteries of the torturers, the description of the terrible pains suffered, the noble death.[20]

It is not necessary to seek a direct literary relationship between texts; only to recognize a common lexical heritage, as well as shared images and stories, which circulated (probably in oral form) and were continuously reworked and readapted according to the needs of the individual communities that used them. Examples (among many) are the variation in the sacrifice of Taxo in the *Assumption of Moses* 9:1-7, or even that of the father with his seven sons in Josephus' *Bellum judaicum* 1.309-313 and *Antiquitates judaicae* 14.429-430. And, given the difficult conditions Jews and Christians faced during the 1st century CE, it is not implausible that in diaspora synagogues (or even in some Christian communities) there might be collections of stories of noble deaths for homiletic use.[21]

To take just the sphere of Judaism, heroic death in defense of the law is already a literary *topos* in 1 Maccabees 2:29-37. Josephus, who wrote in the period of *4 Maccabees*, includes it among the peculiarities of Judaism in *Contra Apionem* 2.218 and 2.277. In *Bellum judaicum* 1.150 /*Antiquitates judaicae* 14.65-67 he remembers the many priests who at Pompey's entrance into the temple 'went on with their divine worship and were slain ... preferring the duties of their worship to God before their own preservation'. Judas, the son of Saripheus, and Matthias, 'the son of Margalothus, two of the most eloquent men among the Jews, condemned to death by Herod, affirm in front of the king ... Accordingly we will undergo death and all sorts of punishments which you

[18] Cf. Baslez, *Le persecuzioni nell'antichità*, 159-61.

[19] 'Martyrdom and the Making of Christianity and Judaism', *JECS* 6 (1998): 577-627; idem, *Dying for God: Martyrdom and the Making of Christianity and Judaism* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999).

[20] Van Henten, 'The Martyrs as Heroes of the Christian People', 307; cf. also Baslez, *Le persecuzioni nell'antichità*, 141-58.

[21] Cf. Baslez, *Le persecuzioni nell'antichità*, 159-60; Scarpat, *Quarto libro dei Maccabei*, 85-88.

can inflict upon us with pleasure, since we are conscious in ourselves that we shall die, not for any unrighteous actions, but for our love of religion'.[22] And yet in *Antiquitates judaicae* 18.58 Josephus tells of a crowd of Jews who, at Pilate's decision to place images of the emperor in Jerusalem, 'said they would take their death very willingly, rather than the wisdom of their laws should be transgressed'. Likewise in *Antiquitates judaicae* 18.263-278, faced with news of the imminent placement of a statue of Caligula in the temple, thousands of Jews went to the governor Petronius saying they were willing to die: 'If you propose at all costs to bring in and set up the image, slay us first before you carry out these resolutions. For it is not possible for us to survive and to behold actions that are forbidden us by decision both of our lawgiver and of our forefathers who cast their votes enacting these measures as moral law'.[23]

In this framework is also to be placed *4 Maccabees*, composed perhaps as a synagogal sermon, later reworked and maybe expanded,[24] then incorporated certainly into a well-established tradition. However, peculiarities must be recognized in it. First of all, in *4 Maccabees* the episode of Eleazar and the seven brothers acquires its own independent literary dimension: it has become a work in itself that has the task of reinterpreting a typically Jewish theme – the death in defense of the law – according to interpretative criteria proper to Greek philosophy. It is an authorial choice that reveals the desire to reach an audience of readers also sought by the Gentiles, who can not simply admire the courage of the martyrs, but must also convince themselves of the rationale behind martyrs' behavior. In terms of content – and this is a notable second aspect – *4 Maccabees* maintains a strong dependence on 2 Maccabees 6-7, or rather it is a deliberate rewriting of this biblical passage in which what has been omitted, expanded or added reveals the stances of the author and helps us to shed light on the historical reasons that led to the drafting of *4 Maccabees*. It is rare and offers us a precious opportunity: to observe the differences between a text and its source. All that has been omitted, added or modified during the rewriting phase can help to reveal the author's own motives, to understand the historical reasons that led to the creation of *4 Maccabees*. And I think two aspects are worthy of consideration: a different idea of ἰουδαϊσμός; and a different identification of the enemy it is fighting.

---

[22] *Ant*. 17.149-167. It is very surprising that Josephus does not mention 2 Maccabees 6-7. It is always difficult to determine why an author has not used available information; we can only hypothesize. I offer two hypotheses. First, in the episode of the golden eagle the words of the two scribes closely resemble those of Eleazar: Josephus might therefore have omitted the episode here in order to use it in other sections. Second, we could imagine more personal reasons, namely, that emphasizing 2 Maccabees 6-7 would have highlighted the unheroic behavior that Josephus displayed during the siege of Jotapata.

[23] *Ant*. 18.264 (Feldman, LCL).

[24] Tabb, *Suffering in Ancient Worldview*, 84; Scarpat, *Quarto libro dei Maccabei*, 85-88.

3. The Ἰουδαϊσμός of 4 Maccabees

2 Maccabees 6 recovers a concept that is also found in 1 Maccabees 1:62-63: '(many in Israel) stood firm and were resolved in their hearts not to eat unclean food, and they chose to die rather than be defiled by food or profane the holy covenant'. It develops this idea by focusing on our two stories, which doubtless were originally autonomous and independent from each other.[25] This is clearly a literary operation, which raises many doubts about the veracity of the tale and which, even from a strictly narrative point of view, appears rather forced (it also suggests a later interpolation into the text).[26] However, it reveals a clear ideological intent in the author of 2 Maccabees, namely, to assimilate the episode of the martyrs to the events of the Maccabean heroes, so that the reader comes to consider the death of Eleazar and the seven brothers as an expression of the same fidelity to Judaism expressed by Judas Maccabeus through military action (2 Maccabees 2:21; 8:1-7).[27] The author then executes a similar operation in later chapters with the story of Razis, who decides to kill himself in defense of the ἰουδαϊσμός (2 Maccabees 14:38).

In my opinion, at this level there is a clear difference between the two works: *4 Maccabees* wants to enter into the Maccabean literary tradition but also intends to remain alien to the Hasmonean political tradition, with which it rejects any kind of contiguity or continuity. Neither Judas nor other members of the family are mentioned in it, nor even the possibility of an armed resistance; suffering and dying for the law is the only recognized form of heroism— 'martyrdom has become a fight: both a military and athletic metaphor, unknown to 2 Maccabees'[28] These heroes do not fight but set obedience of the law over against violence; they have the task of defending and redeeming the nation (πολιτεία) of the Jews against those who want to destroy it (cf. *4 Maccabees* 17:9-10). But where does that come from? What brings the heroes in *4 Maccabees* to martyrdom? Which ἰουδαϊσμός is to be defended? And from what?

In my judgment the points of divergence here are very profound: 2 Maccabees uses the term ἰουδαϊσμός for the first time in 2 Maccabees 2:21 (then also in 2 Maccabees 14:38), referring to the military feats of those who 'behaved themselves manfully to the honor for Judaism, so that, being but a few, they overcame the whole country and chased barbarous multitudes, and recovered again the temple renowned the

---

[25] Dario Garribba, '"Moriamo tutti nella nostra innocenza" (*1Mac* 2,37): Il martirio nell'epopea maccabaica', in *Sulle frontiere dell'umano: Interpretazioni esclusive e inclusive*, ed. Ettore Franco and Carlo Manunza, Aloisiana, nuova serie 6 (Trapani: Il Pozzo di Giacobbe, 2015), 51-61.

[26] Shmuel Shepkaru, *Jewish Martyrs in the Pagan and Christian World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 24.

[27] Cf. Van Henten, 'The Martyrs as Heroes of the Christian People', 315.

[28] Baslez, *Le persecuzioni nell'antichità*, 175.

world over, and freed the city and upheld the laws which were collapsing'. Although I do not want to deal with the complicated matter of the meaning of ἰουδαϊσμός, I observe that, besides cultural and religious value, it has an indisputable territorial and political meaning for the author of 2 Maccabees. For him respect for the Jewish traditions has been compromised because the Jewish places, particularly the temple, have been attacked and occupied. The heroes of 2 Maccabees reply and base their own pillar of identity on this: defense of traditions and territorial autonomy.[29]

It is not the same in *4 Maccabees*. The term ἰουδαϊσμός is used only once, in *4 Maccabees* 4:26, depending on the verb ἐξόμνυσθαι ('refuse', 'abjure': αὐτὸς ... ἕνα ἕκαστον τοῦ ἔθνους ἠνάγκαζεν μιαρῶν ἀπογευομένους τροφῶν ἐξόμνυσθαι τὸν ἰουδαϊσμόν) with a clear reference to the 'entirety of laws and religious beliefs according which one [a Jew] wants, and must live'.[30] The defense of Judaism is devoid of any territorial and autonomous claim; and the sanctity of the temple, which is also referred to in chapter 4, is completely removed from the rationale and interests of the martyrs.[31] For them the factors which connects individuals to ἰουδαϊσμός is their common law of divine origin; the factor to which they are opposed is the threat to their individual and daily experience of being Jews. They are not concerned with the destiny of Jerusalem and the temple, or with the illegitimacy of the high priest; nor do they intend to spread Jewish practices to others. To the contrary, they entrust the evidence of their Judaism to the free profession of faith[32], to their lifestyle and above all to the pains they are willing to suffer.[33]

To explain this, it is not enough to trace *4 Maccabees* to diaspora environments.[34] There is something more. Since the 3rd century BCE diasporan Judaism,

---

[29] Van Henten, 'The Martyrs as Heroes of the Christian People', 314-15.

[30] *4 Macc* 4:26: 'When, therefore, his decrees were despised by the people, he himself (Antiochus IV) compelled by means of tortures every one of this race, by tasting forbidden meats, to abjure the Jewish godliness'. Here the term indicates 'not an ethnic membership but the entirety of laws and religious beliefs according which one [a Jew] wants, and must live'; Scarpat, *Quarto libro dei Maccabei*, 182.

[31] Van Henten has underlined the fact that in *4 Maccabees* temple and institutions are evoked as something abstract; 'The Martyrs as Heroes of the Christian People', 315-16.

[32] We find the content of the παρρησία in Christian martyrdom, although we must remember that it had origins in Stoicism and that under Domitian in Rome some philosophers were removed from the city because of their freedom of speech towards the sovereign; cf. Suetonius, *Dom.* 10.3; Tacitus, *Agr.* 2.1; Aulus Gellius, *Noct. att.* 15.11.4.

[33] Cf. *4 Macc* 9:29: 'How sweet is every form of death for the godliness (εὐσήβειαν) of our fathers'. The term εὐσήβεια, which in *4 Maccabees* is constantly used to indicate the martyrs' religion, expresses the idea of a religiosity, of a lived piety: not religious knowledge, but 'an action related with the knowledge'; Scarpat, *Quarto libro dei Maccabei*, 76.

[34] DeSilva, *4 Maccabees*, xix.

though far from the homeland and precluded from immediate attendance at the sites of Judaism, continued to maintain a clear geographical consciousness that places its center in Jerusalem and the temple, and that defines certain aspects of its Jewish identity in relation to these places—pilgrimage and, above all, temple-tax payment, a right guaranteed by the Roman authorities themselves, as long as the temple existed (which, indeed, Josephus underlines in the section of *Antiquitates judaicae* devoted to the so-called *privilegia judaica*).[35] In *4 Maccabees*, by contrast, there is no trace of this geographical consciousness; the πατρίς repeatedly invoked is an abstract defense of patriotic values rather than a bounded territory. 70 CE seems to be already over; the claim being made is a recognition of the freedom of practice and, above all, the dignity of Judaism, which is represented as a philosophy[36] but interpreted as an ethos, that is, as an indispensable way of living that finds in law its guide to identity.[37] More than one scholar has pointed out that *4 Maccabees* has no real philosophical texture and that the Greek philosophy which it invokes conceals a firm cultural antagonism to the Gentile world and constitutes only a patina, serving to support the claims of the Jewish people and confirming their relationship with 'the Jewish way of life'.[38] I think this is right; but it is also true that this 'conflict' does not include any 'nationalistic' element; using categories that can be understood by non-Jews as well, the writer instead chooses to challenge on the ground of intellectual confrontation: to demonstrate through philosophical argumentation that the righteousness and legitimacy of the Jews' obedience to their laws is the only way to safeguard their identity.

This seems to be borne out in the text. In *4 Maccabees* 5:6-38 there is a zealous, playful banter between Antiochus and Eleazar which has no counterpart in 2 Maccabees. The king makes a series of observations on the meaning of the Jews' behavior: 'it does not seem to me that you are a philosopher (οὔ μοι δοκεῖς φιλοσοφεῖν) when you observe the religion of the Jews' (τῶν Ἰουδαίων, used in the work only to the detriment of the preferred Ἑβραίων) (*4 Maccabees* 5:7). Refusing to eat pork is irrational (ἀνόετον) and unfair,[39] because it means rejecting the gifts that nature

[35] Cf. *Ant.* 14.215; 16.160-173.

[36] Cf. *4 Macc* 1:1.

[37] Cf. Scarpat, *Quarto libro dei Maccabei*, 79-81.

[38] Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora*, 374, cf. 375-79; cf. Tabb, *Suffering in Ancient Worldview*, 84.

[39] Cf. *C. Ap.* 2.137. Even more interesting is the similarity to *C. Ap.* 1.210, in which, mentioning Hecataeus of Abdera, Josephus defines madness (ἄνοια) as preferring death to Sabbath violation: 'these men, in observing this mad custom of theirs, instead of guarding the city, suffered their country to submit itself to a bitter lord; and their law was openly proved to have commanded a foolish practice'.

offers (*4 Maccabees* 5:8). Antiochus questions the claim of Judaism to appear as a philosophy (cf. *4 Maccabees* 5:11) and Eleazar's remarks seem to him as ravings, 'an empty opinion on the truth' (κενοδοξῶν περὶ τὸ ἀληθές), to which he opposes the truth of expediency (τὴν τοῦ συμφέροντος ἀλήθειαν). Eleazar's response is probably very close to the thought of the author, if only because it is free from any type of literary model:

> We, O Antiochus, who are persuaded that we live (πολιτεύεσθαι) under a divine law, consider no compulsion to be so forcible as obedience to that law; wherefore we consider that we ought not in any point to transgress the law. And indeed, were our law (as you suppose) not truly divine, and if we wrongly think it divine, we should have no right even in that case to destroy (ἀκυρόω = also 'invalidate, deprive of authority') our sense of religion.

This is a very interesting reply, because Eleazar is on the defensive and does not want to prove the divine truth of the law, nor does he seek to assert his superiority. He defends the sense of truth that the Jews associate with their law (cf. *Contra Apionem* 2.160) and links the possibility of feeling himself to be a Jew—and the survival of Jewish identity itself—solely to the observance of the law (cf. *4 Maccabees* 5:33). At the same time, in the words that follow Eleazar does not give up showing how the Jewish *paideia* produces a good social person (*4 Maccabees* 5:23-24); that is, he feels the need to prove the possibility of mutual respect between Jews and Gentiles.

4. 4 Maccabees *and Roman Empire*

But whom do the Maccabean martyrs fight against? Who is the enemy of Judaism for our anonymous author? In this instance, as well, a comparison between the works can help us understand better. In 2 Maccabees 6 Eleazar is sentenced to death by anonymous persecutors, probably Jews who are in favor of Hellenization, who know and try to persuade Eleazar to eat unclean foods (2 Maccabees 6:21, 29). They work in Jerusalem under the command of 'an old man of Athens (sent by the king Antiochus) to compel the Jews to depart from the laws of the fathers and not to live after the laws of God'. Only in the next chapter, 2 Maccabees 7, does Antiochus enter the scene, which, in an apparently prison-like environment, closely follows the tortures and deaths of the young brothers. In *4 Maccabees*, by contrast, the author, removing some contradictions in his exemplar,[40] offers a much more ho-

[40] In 2 Macc 6:21 Eleazar volunteers to be tortured in a somewhat confused situation. Banquet officials (clearly philo-Greeks), 'because of the length of time for which they had known him, took him aside and privately urged him' to obey; the seven brothers are arrested, so that the action appears to take place in a prison context; and further, the persecutors remain anonymous, while at the same time there is the direct and active participation of Antiochus IV himself, whose presence in the narrative

mogenous and simplified picture: since his decrees were despised, Antiochus 'himself (αὐτός) tried through torture to compel everyone in the nation to eat defiling foods and to renounce Judaism' (*4 Maccabees* 4:26). Antiochus, and no one else, is therefore the persecutor: the tyrant (τύραννος is the title given to Antiochus through the whole work), in a theatrical (almost ahistorical) representation, sits on a high platform, with the council members and soldiers at his side,[41] and works from this position. He does not express any political view, nor does he have a plan; but he is the absolute personification of a violent and coercive power.

There has undoubtedly been a simplification, but it does not seem to depend solely on narrative needs. In fact, the nature of the challengers has changed. 2 Maccabees asserts the existence of philo-Greek Jews (2 Maccabees 4:10-15; cf. 14:37), who, giving little importance to patriarchal glories, considered Hellenic glories as the most noble (2 Maccabees 4:15): these are those who, from within, threaten the existence of Judaism and constitute a breeding ground for the political plan of Antiochus IV.[42] In *4 Maccabees*, however, the enemy is external and the whole Jewish nation is opposed to it (*4 Maccabees* 4:11; 9:18; 13; 17:9-10; 17:20-22; 18:3-4); thus, the Jews (Eleazar's friends) appointed to the sacrificial banquet in 2 Maccabees 6:21 become ordinary followers of the king (τινες τοῦ βασιλέως) in *4 Maccabees* 6:13; and, if in 2 Maccabees 6:31 death is an example for 'the great body of his nation' (τοῖς πλείστοις τοῦ ἔθνους)—but not for all—in *4 Maccabees* 18:5 'in no way whatever was (Antiochus) able to compel the Israelites to become pagans and to abandon their ancestral customs'.

But there is something else to look at. In *4 Maccabees* the conflict is vertical, that is, between the Jewish subjects and the king. As we have already seen, Rajak finds in *4 Maccabees* a trace of tensions and disputes between Antiochians and Jews after 70 CE.[43] Nevertheless, it does not seem to me that urban conflicts are men-

---

is unexpected (2 Macc 7:1-3)—the beginning of chapter 6, in fact, refers to the sending by the king of 'an old man of Athens to compel the Jews to depart from the laws of the fathers, and not to live after the laws of God' (2 Macc 6:1). It is equally possible to detect differences in the themes concerned. If both episodes are represented as persecutions committed against those who follow Jewish practices and obey the law (*in primis*, food rules), the value attributed by martyrs to their death differs between them: Eleazar wants to leave young people 'a noble example of how to die a good death willingly and nobly for the revered and holy laws' (2 Macc 6:28; cf. also 6:31), while for the seven brothers death takes the value of atonement—'For we are suffering because of our own sins. And if our living Lord is angry for a little while, to rebuke and discipline us, he will again be reconciled with his own servants' (cf. 2 Macc 7:32-33).

[41] *4 Macc* 5:1; cf. Scarpat, *Quarto libro dei Maccabei*, 186.

[42] Cf. Giulio Firpo, 'Il contesto storico', in *Quarto libro dei Maccabei*, by Scarpat, 34-45.

[43] Rajak, 'The Fourth Book of Maccabees in a Multi-Cultural City', 145-49; cf. *J.W.* 7.41, 55-62.

tioned; the writer does not want to defend the rights of a Jewish minority threatened by the Gentiles of this or that city. The conflict is much wider: it turns on the freedom of Jews to be Jews in the face of a sovereign who no (longer) recognizes such a right. Josephus and Philo have amply shown how the Jewish communities of the diaspora, when their rights were endangered by local *élites*, did not hesitate to turn to imperial authority.[44] And again in 70 CE, when the citizens of Antioch ask Titus to intervene to expel the Jews from the city (*Bellum judaicum* 7.103,108), the future emperor, though not showing any sympathy for the Jews, protects their rights (*Bellum judaicum* 7.109-111).

In *4 Maccabees* there is a new situation, in which all the safeguards that were in some way guaranteed by the previous sovereigns (cf. chapter 4) are suddenly deleted by a decree. It is a reality that once again refers to the years after 70 CE, when imperialist politics embarked on a road markedly hostile to Judaism. As I have tried to show elsewhere,[45] the measures already adopted by Vespasian towards the Jews are largely punitive, beginning with the establishment of the *Fiscus judaicus*; and they tend to consider the Jews, wherever they are located, equally responsible for the war.[46] It is a hostile attitude, but politically understandable: victory over the Jews offered Vespasian an opportunity to legitimize his power and this induced him to turn a military campaign aimed at suppressing an internal uprising into a conquest war worthy of every celebration.[47] With Domitian, then, things got worse: the increased exaction of the *Fiscus*, as well as the manipulative charge that his political opponents were philo-Jewish, probably did not directly involve Jewish

---

[44] Cf. *Ant.* 16.160-173. On this, see Horst R. Moehring, 'The *Acta pro Judaeis* in the *Antiquities* of Flavius Josephus: A Study in Hellenistic and Modern Apologetic Historiography', in *Judaism before 70*, vol. 3 of *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults: Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty*, ed. Jacob Neusner, 4 vols., SJLA 12 (Leiden: Brill, 1975), 124-58.

[45] Dario Garribba, 'I diritti delle comunità della diaspora nel I secolo d.C.', in *Giudei e cristiani nel I secolo: continuità, separazione, polemica*, ed. Maria Beatrice Durante Mangoni and Giorgio Jossa, Oi christianoi: Sezione antica 3 (Trapani: Il Pozzo di Giacobbe, 2006), 92-102.

[46] Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora*, 76-77; idem, trans., *Against Apion*, vol. 10 of *Flavius Josephus: Translation and Commentary*, ed. Steve Mason (Leiden: Brill, 2006), xxxvi-xxxvii.

[47] For this victory a triumph was celebrated which conjured up the Augustan splendors and involved the entire Flavian dynasty: celebratory coins were minted, with the legend *Iudaea capta*; the magnificent Temple of Peace was built, which received part of the trophies of war, including the golden menorah, and which was part of the exceptional Flavian building plan, largely funded by the booty of war; and the triumphal arch of Titus, at the entrance of the Sacred Way (and probably inaugurated after the emperor's death), put once again the victory over the Jews at the center of Vespasian's narrative system. The tax imposed on Jews must therefore be read in ideological and political terms, even before its economic aspects.

communities of the diaspora. They certainly contributed to creating 'an atmosphere', however, 'in which Judean culture was the target of particular and hostile attention'[48] and in which the acceptance of attitudes or customs that could be assimilated to Jewish ones was considered an insult to the state.

And so, with the Flavian dynasty begins a process of redefining the relationships between Roman authorities and Jews living in the empire, and this has a profound effect on the way Judaism is perceived and represented. Martial's epigrams,[49] Tacitus' contemptuous ethnographic report or even Quintilian's chastising words on Moses[50] reflect well a public opinion openly hostile to Jewish culture. In his *Contra Apionem* Josephus' effort to refute infamous rumors of Egyptian origin (similar to the endeavor in *4 Maccabees*) suggests that such stories also circulated in Rome; that is to say, in the Domitian age the anti-Jewish pamphleteer narrative had a certain dissemination. This is not the place to carry out an in-depth analysis, but we can say that, in the face of Flavian propaganda, there is a progressive disregard for the Jewish nation—for Judaism as *ethnos*—which does not exhaust itself with Domitian but continues to a great extent with the following emperors. To this climate, of which we have great testimony also in Christian literature,[51] Josephus responds in *Contra Apionem* by demanding 'a tolerance without attacks and an admiration that, when you know Judaism [...] ... you cannot deny it'.[52] And the anonymous author of *4 Maccabees* reacts: the innocent death of his heroes becomes the charge of a condition felt to be unfair, the claim of a religious and cultural legitimacy no longer recognized, the exhortation to defend a Jewish identity that the events of history may be erasing.

Bibliography

Barclay, John M. G. *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora: From Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE – 117 CE)*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1996.

____. trans. *Against Apion*. Vol. 10 of *Flavius Josephus: Translation and Commentary*. Edited by Steve Mason. Leiden: Brill, 2006.

Baslez, Marie-Françoise. '*Hellenismos-Ioudaismos*: Cross Approaches of Jewish-Greek Literature of Martyrdom'. *Hen* 22 (2010): 19-33.

[48] Barclay, *Against Apion*, xxxviii.

[49] Mart. *Epigr*. 7.30.50, 7.35.3-4; 7.82.5-6.

[50] *Inst.* 3.7.21.

[51] Heb 10:32-34; 12:4; 1 Peter; the Apocalypse of John; *1 Clem* 1:1.

[52] Francesca Calabi, ed., *In difesa degli Ebrei (Contro Apione)/Flavio Giuseppe*, Collana di classici greci e latini. Letteratura universale Marsilio (Venezia: Marsilio, 1993), 35.

____. *Le persecuzioni nell'antichità*. Supplementi alla Introduzione allo studio della Bibbia 70. Brescia: Paideia, 2016.

Bickerman, E.J. 'The Date of Fourth Maccabees'. Vol. 1 pages 105-12 in *Louis Ginzberg: Jubilee Volume on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*. 2 vols. New York: The American Academy of Jewish Research, 1945. Repr., Vol. 1 pages 266-71 in *Studies in Jewish and Christian History*. Edited by Amram Tropper. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

Boyarin, Daniel. *Dying for God: Martyrdom and the Making of Christianity and Judaism*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999.

____. 'Martyrdom and the Making of Christianity and Judaism'. *JECS* 6 (1998): 577-627.

Calabi, Francesca, ed. *In difesa degli Ebrei (Contro Apione)/Flavio Giuseppe*. Collana di classici greci e latini. Letteratura universale Marsilio. Venezia: Marsilio, 1993.

Campbell, Douglas A. *The Rhetoric of Righteousness in Romans 3.21–26*. JSNTSup 65. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992.

DeSilva, David Arthur. *4 Maccabees: Introduction and Commentary on the Greek Text in Codex Sinaiticus*. Septuagint Commentary Series. Leiden: Brill, 2006.

____. 'An Example of How to Die Nobly for Religion: The Influence of *4 Maccabees* on Origen's *Exhortatio ad Martyrium*'. *JECS* 17 (2009): 337-56.

Dupont-Sommer, André. *Le quatrième livre des Machabées. Introduction, traduction et notes*. BEHEH 274. Paris: Honoré Champion, 1939.

Firpo, Giulio. 'Il contesto storico'. Pages 13-46 in *Quarto libro dei Maccabei*, by Giuseppe Scarpat. Biblica. Brescia: Paideia 2006.

Garribba, Dario. 'I diritti delle comunità della diaspora nel I secolo d.C.'. Pages 67-103 in *Giudei e Cristiani nel I secolo: Continuità, separazione, polemica*. Edited by Maria Beatrice Durante Mangoni and Giorgio Jossa. Oi christianoi: Sezione antica 3. Trapani: Il Pozzo di Giacobbe, 2006.

____. '"Moriamo tutti nella nostra innocenza" (*1Mac* 2,37): Il martirio nell'epopea maccabaica'. Pages 51-62 in *Sulle frontiere dell'umano: Interpretazioni esclusive e inclusive*. Edited by Ettore Franco and Carlo Manunza. Aloisiana, nuova serie 6. Trapani: Il Pozzo di Giacobbe, 2015.

Josephus. Translated by Henry St. John Thackeray, Ralph Marcus, Allen Wikgren and Louis H. Feldman. 13 vols. LCL. London: W. Heinemann/New York: Putnam, 1926-1965.

Moehring, Horst R. 'The *Acta pro Judaeis* in the *Antiquities* of Flavius Josephus: A Study in Hellenistic and Modern Apologetic Historiography'. Pages 12-58 in *Judaism before 70*. Vol. 3 of *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults: Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty*. Edited by Jacob Neusner. 4 vols. SJLA 12. Leiden: Brill, 1975.

Patrologia Graeca. Edited by J.-P. Migne. 162 vols. Paris, 1857-1886.

Pizzolato, Luigi F. and Chiara Somenzi. *I Sette Fratelli Maccabei nella Chiesa Antica d'Occidente*. Studia Patristica Mediolanensia 25. Milano: Vita e Pensiero, 2005.

Rajak, Tessa. 'The Fourth Book of Maccabees in a Multi-Cultural City'. Pages 134-50 in *Jewish and Christian Communal Identities in the Roman World*. Edited by Yair Furstenberg. Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity 94. Boston: Brill, 2016.

Scarpat, Giuseppe. *Quarto libro dei Maccabei*. Biblica. Brescia: Paideia, 2006.

Shepkaru, Shmuel. *Jewish Martyrs in the Pagan and Christian World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Tabb, Brian J. *Suffering in Ancient Worldview: Luke, Seneca and 4 Maccabees in Dialogue*. LNTS 569. London: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2017.

Van Henten, Jan Willem, 'Datierung und Herkunft des vierten Makkabäerbuches'. Pages 136-49 in *Tradition and Re-interpretation in Jewish and Early Christian Literature: Essays in Honor of Jürgen C. H. Lebram*. Edited by J.W. Wesselius, Peter T. van Rooden, Henk Jan de Jonge and Jan Willem van Henten. StPB 36. Leiden: Brill, 1986.

____. *The Maccabean Martyrs as Saviours of the Jewish People: A Study of 2 and 4 Maccabees*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 57. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

____. 'The Martyrs as Heroes of the Christian People: Some Remarks on the Continuity between Jewish and Christian Martyrology, with Pagan Analogies'. Pages 303-22 in *Martyrium in Multidisciplinary Perspective: Memorial Louis Reekmans*. Edited by Mathijs Lambegrits and Peter van Deun. BETL 117. Leuven: Leuven University Press/Uitgeverij Peeters, 1995.

Ziadé, Raphaëlle. *Les Martyrs Maccabées: De l'histoire juive au culte chrétien. Les homélies de Gregoire de Nazianze et de Jean Chrysostome*. Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae 80. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

From Bad Example to Good Advice: Reading and Reworking Deuteronomy 20 in Late Antique Judaism[1]

Piero Capelli

1. Deuteronomy 20: A Code for Holy War

One of the various representations of God in ancient Israelitic imagery is that of a warlord leading his people to victory. It already appears at the very beginning of Israel's sacred history, in the exodus from Egypt. In the so-called 'Song of the Sea' (Exodus 15) Moses and the Israelites thank their God for rescuing them from the Egyptians running after them, and they praise him as a sovereign triumphing over his foes in battle (a traditional similitude in ancient Near Eastern literature):

> (...) I want to sing to Yhwh, because he triumphed highly:
> he threw the horse and its rider in the sea! (...)
> Yhwh is a man of war:[2] Yhwh is his name!
> He hurled in the sea Pharaoh's chariots and army;
> the best among his commanders are drowned in the Red Sea (...)
> Your right hand, O Yhwh, is glorious in its strength;
> your right hand, O Yhwh, crushes the foe!
> In your great triumph you throw down all those who rise against you,
> you unleash your wrath that devours them like stubble.[3]

In Israel, as in the other ancient Near Eastern cultures, warfare became a sanctified social practice.[4] In ancient Israelite literature the principles and methods of sanc-

---

[1] My thanks to Ilaria Briata, Corrado Martone and Joseph Sievers for their precious suggestions; all mistakes or omissions are solely mine. This article develops ideas earlier published in Piero Capelli, 'Dalla guerra alla pace. La storia degli effetti di Deuteronomio 20 nell'ebraismo tardoantico', in *Guerra santa, guerra e pace dal Vicino Oriente antico alle tradizioni ebraica, cristiana e islamica. Atti del convegno internazionale Ravenna 11 maggio – Bertinoro 12-13 maggio 2004*, ed. Mauro Perani, Associazione italiana per lo studio del Giudaismo, Testi e studi 14 (Firenze: Editrice La Giuntina, 2005), 169-87.

[2] On this expression, see Mauro Perani, '*Yhwh iš milḥamah* (Es. 15,3). L'espressione "Yhwh è un uomo di guerra" nell'esegesi ebraica', in *Guerra santa,* 141-50.

[3] Exod 15:2-7. Unless otherwise noted, all translations from the sources are mine.

[4] On the idea of holy war in ancient Israel, see Gerhard von Rad, *Holy War in Ancient Israel*, trans. Marva J. Dawn (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991); trans. of *Der Heilige Krieg im alten Israel* (Zürich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1951); Susan Niditch, *War in the Hebrew Bible: A Study in the Ethics of Violence* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993); and Reuven Firestone, *Holy War in Judaism: The Fall and Rise of a Controversial Idea* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012).

tified warfare are formulated in their most complete form in the Torah, specifically in chapter 20 of the book of Deuteronomy. Here Yhwh dictates to Moses and the Israelites the rules for the war that he himself commands them to wage until they have exterminated the pagan nations (codified in the formulaic number of seven) then settled in Canaan, the land he has promised to give to the Israelites:

> *General exhortation*
> When you go to war against your enemies and see horses, chariots and troops larger than your own, fear them not, for Yhwh, your God, is with you, he who brought you out of the land of Egypt. In the imminence of battle, the priest shall come forth and speak to the people and tell them, 'Hear, O Israel! Today you are going to fight against your enemies: let not your heart faint! Fear not, waver not, nor be distressed in front of them, for Yhwh, your God, is walking with you, so as to fight for you against your enemies and rescue you'.
>
> *Categories exempted from battle*
> The officers shall speak to the people,'Who has built a new house and has not yet inaugurated it? Let him go back to his house, lest he die in battle and someone else inaugurate it! Who has planted a vineyard and has not yet enjoyed its fruit? Let him go back to his house, lest he die in battle and someone else enjoy it! Who has betrothed a woman and has not yet taken her? Let him go back to his house, lest he die in battle and someone else take her'! The officers shall tell the people further, 'Who is scared and feels that his heart is fainting? Let him go back to his house, lest he transmit the anguish of his heart to the hearts of his brethren'!
>
> *Rules for waging war against the Canaanites*
> When the officers have spoken to the people, princes of the armies shall be appointed at the head of the people. When you draw near to a city to wage war against it, you shall offer peace to it. If it accepts peace and opens to you, all the people in it shall pay tribute to you and serve you. But if it does not make peace with you and makes war against you, you shall besiege it. When Yhwh, your God, gives it into your hand, you shall put to the sword all the males in it. The women, the children, the cattle and everything else in the city, all its loot, you shall take as loot for yourselves, and you shall eat the loot of your enemies which Yhwh, your God, has given to you. Thus you shall do to all the cities which are very far from you and are not part of the cities of these nations. Only in the cities of these nations that Yhwh, your God, gives to you as an inheritance, you shall keep alive nothing that breathes, but rather you shall utterly exterminate them: the Hittites, the Amorites, the Canaanites, the Perizzites, the Hivvites and the Yebusites,[5] as Yhwh, your God, has commanded you, lest they teach you to do all the abominations they do for their gods, and you sin against Yhwh, your God. When you besiege a city for several days, making war against it in order to con-

[5] The number of the Seven Nations (like that of the Twelve Tribes) often oscillates in the sources; cf. the complete list in Josh 3:10, at the beginning of the conquest of Canaan.

> quer it, you shall not destroy its trees with an axe: eat their fruits but do not cut them down. Is a tree in the field a man, that it retreats from you inside the city under siege? You shall destroy and cut down only the trees which you know do not bear fruit. You shall use them to make siegeworks against the city you are making war against, until it falls.[6]

This chapter, when read from an historian's or anthropologist's perspective, is an expression of the same ethics of clanic societies that can still be seen at work in inter-ethnic conflicts in Sub-Saharan Africa or elsewhere. In such contexts, law is granted by the strength of the clan, and victory in war is made safe only through the extermination of the enemy and its offspring—which may otherwise be committed to avenge the killed generation through blood feud. We read in Genesis that 'Cain is avenged sevenfold, Lamech seventy-sevenfold';[7] the same idea is found in the ethos of archaic Hellenic warrior aristocracy, for instance in Homer and Archilocus.[8] Moreover, Deuteronomy 20 is immediately preceded by one of the classic formulations of the principle of retaliation: 'Your eye shall have no mercy: a life for a life, an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth, a hand for a hand, a foot for a foot'.[9]

The Deuteronomic narrative of the conquest of Canaan (whose normative formulation is found in our chapter 20) was used well into the modern age as a tool for legitimation of expansionist violence directed against ethnic and/or religious otherness. Telling and sad examples can be read in several sermons of Puritan preachers encouraging colonial troops against the natives of New England in the late 17th and early 18th centuries. Their Anglican worldview, deeply rooted in the principle of *sola Scriptura*, modeled itself around the idea that New England was the new Canaan—a land of idolatry and sin—whereas the colonists (the Protestant, not the Catholic) were the new chosen people. Even more than to the general commandment of Deuteronomy 20 Puritan preachers referred to the way this protocol is prescribed by God to King Saul through the prophet Samuel against the Amalekites:

> Thus speaks Yhwh of hosts, 'I considered what Amalek did to Israel—what they did to them along the road while they were coming out of Egypt. Now go and smite Amalek, and utterly exterminate all their belongings: have no mercy on them, rather kill both the men and the women, both the children and the sucklings, both the oxen and the sheep, both the camels and the asses'.[10]

---

[6] Deut 20:1-20.

[7] Gen 4:24.

[8] Cf. Archilocus, fr. 126 West: 'I know only one thing, but a great one: to return terrible evil upon the one who does evil to me'. Text for Archilocus, Martin L. West, ed., *Iambi et elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum cantata*, 2nd ed., 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989-1992), 1:50.

[9] Deut 19:21.

[10] 1 Sam 15:2-3.

In keeping with this model the famous preacher Cotton Mather (also active in the Salem witchcraft trials at the end of the 17th century) encouraged the soldiers who were fighting the 'just war' against the natives, so that they could march 'with your lives in your hands, against the Amalek that is now annoying this Israel in the wilderness'.[11] And similarly, in 1704 Henry Gibbs compared the 'deliverance' of the Promised Land accomplished by the Israelites to that of New England by means of the colonists' artillery:

> When Israel was to Enter and Possess Canaan, they must encounter their Enemies with force of Arms; although God gave them the Land, yet their Enemies were dispossest thereof in a Warlike manner. And afterwards, when any notable deliverance was given to Israel from the Oppressions and Ravages of their Enemies, some certain Persons were raised up, who signaliz'd themselves with a Martial Spirit, to be their Saviours: the Valour and Power of the Judges were from the Spirit of the Lord moving in and resting on them. And of later days, the Salvations afforded to the People of God, have been wrought out, or effected for them in this way. Conclude we then, that the People of God may, yea it is their Duty, to employ their Arms against their Enemies, when Environ'd and molested by them; that vigilance and diligence are to be exprest for this purpose; and those who thus employ them in a rightful cause, do as truly fight the Battels of the Lord, as those of old did.[12]

Later, when the natives even allied with the French papists during the French and Indian War of 1754-1763, Reverend James Cogswell reminded the British soldiers that 'the Israelites of old by the immediate command of God almighty made war on the nations of Canaan (...) and God was exceedingly displeased with Saul (...) for not entirely destroying Amalek'.[13] Such was the ideology of the Puritans towards native Americans—whereas, when fighting the Dutch colonists who were their core-

---

[11] Cotton Mather, *Soldiers Counselled and Comforted: A Discourse Delivered Unto Some Part of the Forces Engaged in the Just War of New England Against the Northern and Eastern Indians. Sept. 1. 1689* (Boston: Samuel Green, 1689), 37, http://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/evans/N00394.0001.001/1:2?rgn=div1;view=toc.

[12] Henry Gibbs, *The Right Method of Safety; or, the Just Concern of the People of God, to Joyn a Due Trust in Him, with a Diligent Use of Means. As it was Propounded in a Sermon Preached at Boston to the Artillery Company, of the Massachusetts-Bay in N.E. on the 5th of June 1704, Being the Day of their Election of Officers* (Boston: B. Green, 1704), 14-15, http://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/evans/N00965.0001.001/1:1?rgn=div1;view=toc.

[13] James Cogswell, *God, the Pious Soldier's Strength and Instructor: A Sermon Deliver'd at Brooklyn in Pomfret to the Military Company under the Command of Capt. Israel Putnam, on the Thirteenth Day of April, 1757* (Boston: John Draper, 1757). Here I draw from Roland H. Bainton, *Christian Attitudes toward War and Peace: A Historical Survey and Critical Re-evaluation* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1960), 167-69 (quotation page 169). The reference is to 1 Samuel 15, where the prophet Samuel reveals to Saul that God has turned his favor from him because, after defeating the Amalekites, Saul had transgressed the commandment of Deuteronomy 20 by sparing their king and part of the loot.

ligionists, they tried to keep to a code of just warfare. The Quakers alone experimented in certain circumstances with a friendly attitude towards the natives.[14]

But let us go back to ancient Judaism, and precisely to the Second Temple Period (6th century BCE–1st century CE), when the text of Deuteronomy 20 was eventually canonized as 'Torah of Moses from Sinai', the most sacred part of Hebrew scripture.

The first twelve chapters of the book of Joshua are an epic, quasi-western account of the Israelite conquest of Canaan. The ruling of Deuteronomy constitutes the ideological framework for the whole book of Joshua, which recounts that at the beginning of the conquest Joshua performed a public transcription and reading of the Torah.[15] According to the book's narrative, the Israelites observed rigorously the commandment of exterminating the foes they had defeated in the sieges of Jericho, Ai, Makkedah, Libnah, Lachish, Gezer, Eglon, Debir, Hazor and all the cities nearby, and, last, all the cities of the people of the Anakim.[16] The narrative consistently stresses Joshua's zeal as a full-fledged second Moses in observing the obligations listed in Deuteronomy 20:

> Joshua smote the whole land, the hills, the Negev, the Shefelah, the slopes before the hills and all their kings. He left no one surviving and utterly destroyed every living being, as Yhwh, the God of Israel, had commanded.[17]

> It was Yhwh who hardened their heart to make war against Israel, so that Israel utterly destroyed them, and treated them with no mercy, but rather annihilated them as Yhwh had commanded Moses. At that time Joshua went and wiped out the Anakim from the hill country, from Hebron, Debir, Anab and from all the hill country of Judah and all the hill country of Israel; Joshua utterly destroyed them with their cities.[18]

Only once did an Israelite, Achan, break the divine commandment and steal for himself a part of the booty from Jericho. On that occasion, Yhwh's wrath punished all Israelites by causing them to be defeated in battle. The conquest of Canaan could start again only after a collective ritual of atonement and after returning to God the ill-gotten gain together with the culprit himself and all of his offspring, cattle and belongings: 'all Israel stoned him; the others they burned in fire or stoned'.[19]

---

[14] See Niditch, *War in the Hebrew Bible*, 3-4 (on Deuteronomy 20 as a code, see pp. 66-68). On the role of the Bible in the formative period of the United States, see James P. Byrd, *Sacred Scripture, Sacred War: The Bible and the American Revolution* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013); Harry S. Stout, *Upon the Altar of the Nation: A Moral History of the American Civil War* (New York: Viking, 2006).

[15] Josh 8:32-35.

[16] Josh 6:17, 21; 8:24-26; 10:28, 30, 32-33, 35, 39; 11:11-14, 21.

[17] Josh 10:40.

[18] Josh 11:20-21.

[19] Josh 7:25.

2. The Wars of the Maccabees and of the Hasmoneans

A series of wars that the Israelites conducted for explicit religious reasons is narrated in the deuterocanonical books of 1-2 Maccabees. These wars were waged by the Maccabean dynasty (167-134 BCE.) against the Seleucid kings and other non-Jewish populations, first for the sake of independence, then for the sake of expansion. The narrative follows the historiographical and ideological model of the biblical epic of the conquest of Canaan, focusing in particular on Deuteronomy 20:3.[20] We are thus told that in order to 'protect the Law from the arrogance of the nations and the kings', Mattathias Maccabeus and his allies from the Hasidean party 'demolished (pagan) altars and forcibly circumcised all the uncircumcised boys they could find in the territory of Israel. They granted no quarter to the haughty, and their endeavor turned out well'.[21]

Judas Maccabeus, in his turn, performed ritual penance and fasting, consulted the 'Book of the Law' and subdivided his army 'according to the Law'—that is, following exactly the precepts of Deuteronomy 20:5-9 (as we read in 1 Maccabees 3:46-56).[22] In his campaign of 163 BCE against the non-Jewish populations of Idumaea (the 'sons of Esau') and Acrabattene (the 'sons of Baean'), if we are to follow 1 Maccabees, Judas once again strictly enforced the extermination prescribed in Deuteronomy 20 and practiced in the conquest of Canaan according to the book of Joshua: he besieged and conquered cities and destroyed the defeated by 'setting fire to the towers with everyone inside'.[23] He equally besieged, conquered and looted several cities of Transjordan, setting them on fire and killing all their male inhabitants: thus he did in Bozrah, Alema, Carnaim and Ephron,[24] not because of a craving for heroism, but for sheer observance of the Law, according to the ideology of the author of 1 Maccabees. In 160 BCE, fighting first Nicanor's army in Beth-Horon and then its survivors scattered around Judaea, Judas utterly exterminated the foes and seized the loot.[25] Finally, according to 2 Maccabees, he intended to

[20] Cf. Johann Maier, *Le Scritture prima della Bibbia*, Supplementi alla Introduzione allo studio della Bibbia 11 (Brescia: Paideia, 2003), 121.

[21] 1 Macc 2:45-48.

[22] Similarly, in 2 Macc 8:23 Judas summons the priest Eleazar, orders him to read the 'sacred book' and commands his soldiers to attack Seleucid troops. Maier thinks that the 'book' mentioned here (and in 1 Macc 3:48) was a copy belonging to the temple, which was used in war time; *Le Scritture prima della Bibbia*, 122. For the subdivision of troops, cf. also Exod 18:21; 2 Sam 18:1; 2 Kgs 1:9-14.

[23] 1 Macc 5:5.

[24] 1 Macc 5:28, 35, 44, 51. On 1 Macc 5:44, cf. 2 Macc 12:26 (the extermination of 'Karnion' and the pagan shrine of Atargatis); and on 1 Macc 5:51, cf. 2 Macc 12:27-28 (25,000 slain).

[25] 1 Macc 7:46-47.

'eradicate' the non-Jewish inhabitants of Jaffa, who had killed some Jews,[26] and carried out 'an unspeakable number of massacres' against the 'mixed population' gathered in Caspin of Gilead, who had insulted him and 'were even blasphemous and said things against the Law'.[27]

But the most detailed account of the belligerent expansionism of the Maccabees and of their successors, the Hasmoneans, is found in books 12 and 13 of Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities* (1st century CE). Josephus, too, states that the Maccabees and the Hasmoneans kept to the commandments of Deuteronomy 20 in conducting their wars. The defeated were obliged to adhere to Jewish Law, including acceptance of circumcision: if they accepted, they became Jews and were subjected to the winners; if they refused, all the males were slain and their cities burned or razed. Thus, according to Josephus, did Judas Maccabeus in Bosora of Moab and in Mella of Gilead.[28] Thus also did the Hasmonean John Hyrcanus (134-104 BCE) later against the Idumaeans (who accepted circumcision and 'Jewish laws')[29] and against Samaria (which instead was seized by starvation and razed).[30] And eventually thus also did the Hasmonean Alexander Jannaeus (103-76 BCE) against Pella of Transjordan, which was destroyed because its inhabitants did not accept the 'ancestral customs of the Jews'.[31] It is worth observing that Josephus held in the highest esteem at least one among these expansionist and militarist king-priests, namely, John Hyrcanus, whom he defines as a pious man whom God loved so much as to bestow on him the gift of prophecy, the quasi-prophetic privilege of hearing a voice descending from heaven while he was offering sacrifices in the Temple.[32]

We cannot rest assured that the Maccabean and Hasmonean sovereigns actually adhered to the precepts of Deuteronomy 20 in their politics and warfare—or whether it was the authors of the books of Maccabees and, even more so, Josephus who built their accounts of those wars using Deuteronomy as a model for theological and literary inspiration. It is nonetheless beyond doubt that Deuteronomy 20

---

[26] 2 Macc 12:7.

[27] 2 Macc 12:13-16.

[28] *Ant*. 12:336, 340; cf. 1 Macc 5:28.

[29] *Ant*. 13:257-258. Text for Josephus: Benedictus Niese, ed., *Flavii Iosephi opera*, 7 vols. (Berolini: apud Weidmannos, 1885-1895).

[30] *Ant*. 13:276, 281.

[31] *Ant*. 13:397; cf. also the description of the conquest of Gaza by Alexander Jannaeus in *Ant*. 13.356-364.

[32] *Ant*. 13.299-300; *J.W.* 1.68-69. Cf. also the episode in *Ant.* 13.282-283, where Hyrcanus hears a voice from heaven while sacrificing in the temple. By contrast, in Josephus' account Jannaeus was a drunkard who had killed one of his brothers (*Ant.* 13.323, 398), slaughtered other Jews—resorting even to such a heinous method as crucifixion (*Ant.* 13:376, 380)—and hired soldiers who were pagan and therefore impure (*Ant.* 13.374).

worked as a very effective model for the belligerent and expansionist ideology of ancient Israel—or for its representation in literature—in what was to be Israel's last period of political independence and military autonomy.

3. Deuteronomy 20 in Qumran

We can gather further information on the diffusion and uses of Deuteronomy 20 in the late Second Temple Period from the Dead Sea scrolls. These include three manuscripts of our text, all from the 1st century BCE (the time of the last Hasmonean kings and the beginning of the Herodian dynasty).[33] What is most relevant, though, is that large parts of the *Temple Scroll* and *War Scroll*—both among the longest and most important texts of extra-biblical literature from Qumran—are mere repetitions of Deuteronomy 20 or are entirely modeled after it.[34]

1. The *Temple Scroll* (whose oldest manuscript dates from the end of the 1st century BCE) can be defined as a new formulation of the code of the covenant between God and Israel, in the form of a corpus of laws that is at many points a very autonomous reworking of the dictates of the Torah (already textually canonized by the time of the writing of the *Scroll*). In column lv God, speaking in the first person, commands to inquire and, if necessary, to wage war against Israelite cities that have lapsed into pagan worship. The rules for this warfare follow very precisely those of Deuteronomy 20:

> (...) and if the thing is really certain and such abomination was committed in Israel, you shall certainly put to the sword all the inhabitants of that city, and you shall exterminate it; and you shall put to the sword everyone in it and all of its cattle. You shall gather its whole loot in the middle of its square, and you shall set fire to the city and to its whole loot, for the sake of Yhwh, your God. It shall be a heap of ruins forever and shall never be rebuilt, nor shall anything destined to extermination cling to your hand, so that I refrain from the fury of my wrath and have mercy on you; I shall have mercy on you and multiply you as I told your fathers.[35]

Further, the rules for warfare in lxi 12-15 and lxii 3-6 are literal reprises of those in Deuteronomy 20:1-4 and 20:8-18, respectively. The only noteworthy variations are that the *Temple Scroll* mentions 'judges' (*šofeṭim*) instead of 'officers' (*šoṭerim*—a reading nonetheless attested for Deuteronomy 20:8 in 4QDeut^{k2} from Qum-

[33] Frgs. 4QDeut^{f} (Deut 19:17-20:6, 75-50 BCE), 4QDeut^{k2} (Deut 20:6-19, end of 1st century BCE) and 4QDeut^{i} (Deut 20:9-13, first half of 1st century BCE). Cf. Corrado Martone, *The Judean Desert Bible: An Index*, Quaderni di Henoch 11 (Torino: S. Zamorani, 2001), 57-58, 141; Eugene Ulrich, *The Biblical Qumran Scrolls. Transcriptions and Textual Variants*, VTSup 134 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 217-19.

[34] Maier, *Le Scritture prima della Bibbia*, 121.

[35] 11QT^{a} lv 5-12. Text for the Dead Sea Scrolls: Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, 2nd ed., 2 vols. (Leiden: Brill, 1999).

ran),[36] that God speaks in the first person and that the Seven Nations are actually seven (with the integration of the Girgashites).

2. The *War Scroll* (whose main manuscript also dates from the late 1st century BCE) is an eschatological text describing the final battle that will take place between the 'sons of Light', faithful to the pristine covenant with God, and the 'sons of Darkness', destined to ultimate defeat and destruction. Column x, when declaring that God will side with the sons of Light in the final battle, quotes almost literally Deuteronomy 20:2-4 and reworks Deuteronomy 20:5-9:[37]

> [God] instructed us of old for our generations saying, 'When you are in the imminence of battle, the priest shall stand and speak to the people, "Hear, O Israel! Today you are in the imminence of battle against your enemies: fear not, let not your heart faint, waver not, nor be distressed in front of them, for your God is walking with you, so as to fight for you against your enemies and rescue you"'. Our officers shall speak to all the brave at heart who are ready for battle, in order to strengthen them with God's power and to send back all those who despair in their heart and strengthen [them] along with all the valiant soldiers. And this is what you said through Moses, '*When a war will come to your land*[38] *against an enemy attacking you, you shall sound the trumpets, and shall be remembered before your God and rescued from your enemies*'.[39]

4. After 135 CE

The defeat in both the wars of independence against the Romans in 66-73 and 132-135 CE determined many radical changes for the Jews of Palestine. One was obviously the loss of any possibility to conduct a military politics of their own. At the beginning of the 4th century, when the Roman empire was officially christianized, the Jews rapidly became an ethnic and religious minority in their own homeland.[40] Their sacred scripture therefore started being adopted as their 'portable homeland'.[41] The text of Deuteronomy 20 had been canonized as scripture centuries ear-

---

[36] See Julie Ann Duncan, ed., '4QDeut^{k2}', in *Qumran Cave 4/IX: Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Kings*, ed. Eugene Ulrich *et al.*, DJD 14 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), ad loc.

[37] For a detailed comparison, see Giovanni Ibba, *Il* Rotolo della Guerra*: edizione critica*, Quaderni di Henoch 10 (Torino: S. Zamorani, 1998), 146.

[38] The Masoretic text reads, 'When you will go to war in your land' (*tavo'u* instead of *tavo*').

[39] 1QM x 2-8, citing Num 10:9.

[40] See Günter Stemberger, *Jews and Christians in the Holy Land: Palestine in the Fourth Century*, trans. Ruth Tuschling (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000), 19-21; trans. of *Juden und Christen im Heiligen Land: Palästina unter Konstantin und Theodosius* (München: C.H. Beck, 1987).

[41] This well-known expression (*portatives Vaterland*) is from Heinrich Heine, *Geständnisse* (1854), in *Vermischte Schriften* (Hamburg: Hoffmann und Campe, 1854), 1:85.

lier, and could no longer be eliminated nor modified. Its aggressively anti-pagan message—if centered on the Seven Nations of pre-Israelite Canaan alone—was now a problem for the new rabbinic leading class, that of the rabbis, who would gradually come to wide adjustments with Roman power and religion.[42] The Bar Kokhba war of 132-135 CE had been particularly characterized by strong expectations of messianic redemption (which could have already been the case in the Jewish revolts in various provinces of the empire between 116 and 117 CE).[43] Recalling the victorious wars of independence from the past (such as the ones described in the books of Maccabees), or imagining new wars of liberation at the end of times (such as the ones described in apocalyptic literature and in the *War Scroll* from Qumran), could lead to reviving those very expectations of independence that had just proved fateful for the Jewish people, and to providing such expectations with a solid root in sacred scripture. As La Rochefoucauld would put it, one often gives good advice in order to console oneself for no longer being able to give a bad example.[44] I will argue that rabbinic Judaism engaged in gradually defusing the belligerent message of Deuteronomy 20, and that this task was accomplished by working on three different levels: (a) the constitution of the canon of sacred scripture; (b) the hermeneutics of scripture itself; and (c) preaching.[45]

When rabbinic Judaism constituted its own canon of the Bible, it excluded from it the books of Maccabees, the apocalypses (with the partial exception of Daniel) and the other eschatological literature attested in Qumran.[46] This, too, was the fate of the *Megillat Antiokhus* ('The Scroll of Antiochus'), another text describing the independence war led to victory by the Maccabees.

---

[42] On the relationship between the rabbinic class and Roman power, see among others Martin Goodman, *The Ruling Class of Judaea: The Origins of the Jewish Revolt against Rome, A.D. 66-70* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987); idem, *Rome and Jerusalem: The Clash of Ancient Civilizations* (London: Allen Lane, 2007); Seth Schwartz, *Imperialism and Jewish Society, 200 B.C.E. to 640 C.E.*, Jews, Christians, and Muslims from the Ancient to the Modern World (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001), 101-76.

[43] Cf. Miriam Pucci ben Zeev, 'The Uprisings in the Jewish Diaspora, 116-117', in *The Late Roman-Rabbinic Period*, vol. 4 of *The Cambridge History of Judaism*, ed. Steven T. Katz (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 93-104 (particularly, pp. 93-94).

[44] François de la Rochefoucauld, *Réflexions, ou Sentences et maximes morales* (Paris: Barbin, 1665), n° 95.

[45] See Miguel Pérez Fernández, 'La propuesta de paz de los Rabinos: Una lectura sincrónica de la tradición', in *Biblical, Rabbinical, and Medieval Studies*, vol. 1 of *Jewish Studies at the Turn of the Twentieth Century: Proceedings of the 6th EAJS Congress. Toledo, July 1998*, ed. Judit Targarona Borrás and Angel Sáenz-Badillos (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 334-41.

[46] Roland de Vaux thought that the *War Scroll* might have been 'inspired by the fanatism of those Zealots who took part in the revolts against the Romans'; *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions*, trans. John McHugh, 2nd ed. (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1965), 267.

5. *The* Megillat Antiokhus

Like the books of Maccabees, the *Megillat Antiokhus* tells the persecution of the Jews under Antiochus IV and his lieutenant Bagras (Bacchides), the real villain of the story, and the victorious Jewish revolt led by the Maccabees until the rededication of the Temple. The text is today thought to have been written in the 2nd century CE[47] (the same period of the great pseudepigraphical apocalypses *2 Baruch* and *4 Ezra*); it was meant for liturgical reading during *Ḥanukkah*, the commemoration of the rededication of the Temple. In the *Megillat Antiokhus* God's war against the pagans is once again presented following the biblical model of the conquest of Canaan, not without a penchant for gore, for instance, at the beginning of the Maccabean epic according to the Hebrew liturgical text:

> (...) On that day Mattathias set out with his sons. They waged war against the Nations, and the God of heaven placed all the heroes of the Nations in their hands. They exterminated them with great slaughter: all those who wielded the sword and drew the bow, the generals and lieutenants of the army, nothing was left of them (...) The Jews rejoiced because those who hated them had been placed in their hands. Some they burned in fire, others they ran through with their swords, others they hanged on the wood.[48]

The *Megillat Antiokhus* was not transmitted in all the *minhagim* (local liturgical traditions) of rabbinic Judaism: for instance, it is not found in Sephardic prayer books,[49] whereas it appears in some of the Italian ones.[50] Although it was not canonized as sacred scripture, this text enjoyed relevant popularity as part of the liturgy for *Ḥanukkah*. Yet, its prestige within Jewish piety and ideology was fluctuating in different periods and liturgical traditions.

6. *Rabbinic Ideology of Peace in the* Mishnah

The founding text of rabbinic Judaism is the *Mishnah*, a corpus of 63 tractates of religious law written at the beginning of the 3rd century CE and marking the textualization of the oral religious traditions that the rabbis maintained as 'oral Torah'—one of the two parts (along with the written Torah) of the revelation transmitted by God to Moses on Sinai.

---

[47] Following Menachem Zewi Kaddari, '*Megillat Antiokhus* ha-arammit', *Bar-Ilan* 1 (1963): 81-105; 2 (1964): 178-214 (Hebrew).

[48] Text for *Megillat Antiokhus*: Menachem Emanuele Artom, ed., *Machazor di rito italiano secondo gli usi di tutte le Comunità*, 3 vols., Collana di testi liturgici ebraici 2-4 (Roma: Carucci, 1988-1990), ad loc.

[49] Cf., for instance, Shlomo Bekhor, ed., *Sìyach Yitzchàk, Libro di preghiere tradotto e commentato: rito sefardita*, Edizioni DLI (Milano: Mamash, 1998), 756-67.

[50] Cf., for instance, Artom, *Machazor di rito italiano secondo gli usi di tutte le Comunità*, 1:716-25, where the *Megillat Antiokhus* is found in an appendix, with prayer and hymns which fell out of usage.

The *Mishnah* tractate *Soṭah* ('woman suspected of adultery') is dedicated to the ordeal prescribed in the written Torah to test a woman suspected of being an adulteress.[51] Some parts of the tractate are actual redactional erratic boulders, whose content is not related to the rest of the text—their character being, not juridical, but rather homiletical-edifying or even apocalyptic (for instance, chapter 9). The whole eighth chapter thus happens to be a *midrash* (edifying commentary) to Deuteronomy 20:2-9.[52]

The *midrash* in *Mishnah Soṭah* 8 is meant to limit as much as possible the belligerent message of the biblical passage in question. First, the *midrash* omits completely the cruel rules for extermination of the Seven Nations (20:10ff.).[53] It manifoldly endeavors to orientate the understanding of vv. 2-9 in an anti-belligerent direction:[54]

> When the (priest) anointed for war spoke to the people, he did so in the holy tongue,[55] as it is written, '"*In the imminence of battle, the priest shall come forth*"—this is the priest anointed for war—"*and speak to the people*"—in the holy tongue—"*and tell them*, 'Hear, *O Israel! Today you are going to fight against your enemies*'" (Deut 20:2-3) ...You are moving against your enemies: if you fall in their hands, they will not have mercy on you'.[56]

At the time of the redaction of the *Mishnah*, the priest 'anointed for war' had long disappeared as an institution. By referring to him the *Mishnah* placed the ruling of Deuteronomy 20 in a temporally remote dimension—either a mythical past reconsidered from an antiquarian perspective or an eschatological utopia.

> '*Let not your heart faint!... for Yhwh, your God, is walking with you*' (Deut 20:3-4): they go forth with the strength of human beings, but you go forth with the strength of the Omnipresent. The Philistines went forth with the strength of Goliath (1 Sam 17): and what was his end? In the end he fell by the sword and they fell along with him. The

[51] Num 5:11-31.

[52] An extremely precise textual parallel to this chapter is found in §192 of a lengthy rabbinic *midrash* to Deuteronomy known as *Sifre to Deuteronomy*, which we consider below.

[53] Deut 20:10-18.

[54] My following analysis is indebted to Günter Stemberger, 'La guerra nella *Mišnah* e nei *midrašim* halakici', 131-39, in *Guerra santa*.

[55] That is, in Hebrew, not in Aramaic, the most widespread language among Palestinian Jews at the time the *Mishnah* was written.

[56] *M. Soṭah* 8:1-2. Text for *Mishnah*: MS Kaufmann A 50 (Southern Italy, 11th-12th cent.), Jewish National and University Library, Hebrew University in Jerusalem Department of Talmud and the David and Fela Shapell Family Digitization Project, *Online Treasury of Talmudic Manuscripts*, https://web.nli.org.il/sites/NLI/Hebrew/collections/jewish-collection/ Talmud/ Pages/default.aspx.

> Ammonites went forth with the strength of Shobach (2 Sam 10: Shobach was the commander of the Ammonites in their war against David): and what was his end? In the end he fell by the sword and they fell along with him. But you will not fall, '*for Yhwh, your God, is walking with you, so as to fight for you*'—this is the camp of the Lord.[57]

Where the Kaufmann MS has 'the camp of the Lord' (*maḥaneh ha-adon*), several other manuscripts read 'the camp of the Ark' (*maḥaneh ha-aron*).[58] It is a trivial variant reading determined by the very similar shape of the Hebrew letters *dalet* (*d*) and *resh* (*r*). But if one reads *aron*, the 'Ark' is the Ark of the Covenant that contained the Tables of the Law and was destroyed by the Babylonians in 586 BCE. This variant reading therefore restricts the validity of the rulings of Deuteronomy 20 to the remote period between the giving of the Tables on Sinai and the destruction of the First Temple.

> '*The officers shall speak to the people, "Who has built a new house and has not yet inaugurated it? Let him go back..."*': it is the same thing if he has built a barn, or a stable, or a woodshed, or a deposit; it is the same thing if he has built it, or bought it, or inherited it or received it as a gift.
>
> '*Who has planted a vineyard and has not yet enjoyed its fruit? Let him go back to his house*': it is the same thing if he planted a vineyard, or if he planted five fruit trees (even if of five different species), or if he planted (the vineyard), or propagated it by layering, or grafted it, or bought it, or inherited it or received it as a gift.
>
> '*Who has betrothed a woman and has not yet taken her? Let him go back to his house*': it is the same thing if he has betrothed a virgin, or if he has betrothed a widow (even one awaiting levirate marriage),[59] or even if he has heard that his own brother died in battle[60]—he goes back home. All these listen to the priest's words about the regulations for the battle, then they go back and provide water and food and fix the roads.

---

[57] *M. Soṭah* 8:3. That is, the camp of the Israelites marching through the wilderness towards the Promised Land and carrying the Ark of the Covenant with the Tablets of the Law.

[58] Thus, manuscripts Parma, Biblioteca Palatina, De Rossi 138 and Cambridge University Library T.-S. E1.97, as well as the *editio princeps* by Yehoshua' Shelomoh Soncino (Naples 1492); cf. t. *Soṭah* 7.18. *Tosefta* is quoted according to the subdivision of the text in Moses Samuel Zuckermandel, ed., *Tosefta* (1882; repr. [of supplement to *Tosefta*], Jerusalem: Bamberger and Wahrman, 1963).

[59] Deut 25:5-10 prescribes that the brother of a man who died childless was obliged to marry the widow (levirate marriage, from the Latin *levir*, 'brother-in-law') and the firstborn would be considered son of the deceased. If the brother refused, the widow was obliged to summon him in the presence of the elders, pull out an item of his footwear and spit in his face. This ritual, called *ḥaliṣah* ('removal of footwear'), rendered void the obligation to levirate marriage.

[60] And, therefore, that he should marry his widow.

> These cannot go back: one who has built a house for the keeper, or an exedra or a terrace; one who has planted four fruit trees, or five trees not producing fruit; a high priest who has married a widow, or an ordinary priest who has married a woman who had been repudiated or had performed *ḥaliṣah*, or an Israelite who has married a bastard woman or an oblate woman,[61] or a bastard or an oblate who has married an Israelite woman—these cannot go back. Rabbi Yehudah says, 'Also one who rebuilt his house as it was and where it was earlier cannot go back'. Rabbi Le'azar says, 'Also one who built a house of bricks in Sharon cannot go back'.
>
> These cannot stir from their place: one who has built a house and has inaugurated it; one who has planted a vineyard and has enjoyed its fruits; one who has married his betrothed; one who has consummated his union with the childless widow of his own deceased brother, as it is written, '(*A man who has newly married shall not go to war, nor shall he be charged with any commitment; he shall be) free* (*for one year*) *to take care of his house*' (Deut 24:5): '*of his house*' applies to his house; '(*he shall be) free*' applies to his vineyard; '*and he shall make happy his wife*' applies to his wife; '*whom he married*' (is said) in order to include also the childless wife of his deceased brother. These do not provide water or food, nor do they fix the roads.
>
> '*The officers shall say further to the people, "Who is scared and feels that his heart is fainting? Let him go back to his house,* (*lest he transmit the anguish of his heart to the hearts of his brethren!*)"'. Rabbi 'Aqiva says, '"*Who is scared and feels that his heart is fainting*" is to be understood literally: one who cannot bear the clash of armies in battle nor the sight of an unsheathed sword'. Rabbi Yose the Galilean says, '"*Who is scared and feels that his heart is fainting*" is one who is scared on account of the transgressions that he committed; therefore the Law links him to these others, that he may give back thanks to them'.[62] Rabbi Yose says, 'A high priest who has married a widow, or an ordinary priest who has married a woman who had been repudiated or had performed *ḥaliṣah*,[63] or an Israelite who has married a bastard woman or an oblate woman, or a bastard or an oblate who has married an Israelite woman: these "*are scared and feel that their hearts are fainting*"'.[64]

Deuteronomy 20:8 rules that soldiers seized by panic be dismissed from the army so that they do not spread demoralization among the others. By contrast the rabbis quoted in the *Mishnah* are not concerned with removing the obstacles to victo-

---

[61] The oblates (*netinim*) were a class of temple servants mentioned in the books of Ezra, Nehemiah and 1-2 Chronicles. The *Mishnah* prohibited oblates and persons of mixed ethnicity ('bastards') from marrying Israelites or members of the priestly and Levitical classes; *m. Qidd.* 4:1.

[62] According to Jewish traditional commentaries (e.g., that of 'Ovadyah of Bertinoro, 1455-1516) this means that the transgressor was thus spared the shame of declaring his transgressions publicly.

[63] See note 59.

[64] *M. Soṭah* 8:4-6, 8-9.

ry, as much as they are with widening as much as possible the number of categories exempted from participating in the war:[65]

> '*When the officers have spoken...*(*to the people, princes of the armies shall be appointed at the head of the people*) (and at the rearguard of the people)'. They placed ahead of them and behind them soldier guards holding iron axes and empowered to break the legs of those who sought to go back, since the beginning of flight brings forth defeat, as it is written, '*Israel fled in front of the Philistines and there was a great slaughter among the people*' (1 Sam 4:17). And there is written, '*The Philistines waged war against Israel, and the men of Israel fled in front of the Philistines and fell by the sword on Mount Gilboa*' (1 Sam 31:1).
>
> To what does all that has been said till now apply? To a war waged for free deliberation; but in a war waged for commandment everyone goes out (to battle), even '*a bridegroom out of his wedding room and a bride out of her wedding baldachin*' (Joel 2:16). Rabbi Yehudah said, 'To what does all that has been said till now apply? To a war waged for commandment; but in a war waged in duty everyone goes out to battle, but in a compulsory war all go out to battle, even "*a bridegroom out of his wedding room and a bride out of her wedding baldachin*"'.[66]

This passage applies for the first time to Deuteronomy 20 the juridical and religious distinction between a war waged for free deliberation (*milḥemet ha-rešut*, that is, a war waged to defend oneself) and one waged in compliance with a religious commandment (*milḥemet miṣwah*, that is, one waged to defend one's religion). Here it is also stated that Deuteronomy 20:10-18 only concerns voluntary warfare.[67] Elsewhere the *Mishnah* proclaims that voluntary warfare must be deliberated by a court (*sanhedrin*) composed of seventy-one members and that the Israelites must be led in war by their king.[68] As in the case of the priest anointed for war in *Mishnah Soṭah* 8:1, here, too, reference is made to institutions that belonged to Israel's remotest past. Declaring an actual war was therefore not only unrealistic, but also juridically impossible. Furthermore, the quotation from Joel 2:16 refers in its original context to the 'day of Yhwh', that is, to the end of times. In all likelihood, therefore, the redactors of the *Mishnaic* passage quoted this verse to signify that even the commandment of mandatory warfare is to be understood as valid only for the end of times—that is to say, it was completely outside of human deliberation.

---

[65] Thus, Elisabetta Abate, '"Il vostro cuore non venga meno" (Deut 20:3): la paura della battaglia secondo *mSot* 8', in '*Let the Wise Listen and Add to Their Learning' (Prov 1:5): Festschrift for Günter Stemberger on the Occasion of His 75th Birthday*, ed. Constanza Cordoni and Gerhard Langer, Studia Judaica Forschungen zur Wissenschaft des Judentums 90 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2016), 304.

[66] *M. Soṭah* 8:10.

[67] Thus also in *t. Soṭah* 7.24 (parallel to Rabbi Yehudah's saying) and *Sifre Deut.* §§190.203; see further under *Sifre to Deuteronomy* (below).

[68] *M. Sanh.* 1:5; 2:4.

7. *Tractate* Avot *and* Pereq ha-Šalom

At a much later time, probably already in the Islamic age, tractate *Avot* ('Fathers', also known as *Pirqe Avot*, 'Chapters of the Fathers') was incorporated into the canon of the *Mishnah*. It is a collection of wisdom sayings and moral precepts attributed to the rabbis of the early generations (from the 1st century BCE to the end of the 2nd century CE). Starting from its first chapter, the tractate highlights peace as one of the founding values of rabbinic ethos (which parallels the exclusion from the biblical canon of all the texts that could be taken again as supports for armed nationalistic ideologies):

> Hillel says, 'Be of the disciples of Aaron, who love peace and pursue peace, love human beings and draw them close to the Torah'.[69]

Further:

> Rabban Shim'on ben Gamli'el says, 'The world stands on three things: on judgment, truth and peace (as it is written, "*You shall render judgment according to truth and for the sake of peace*" [Zech 8:16])'.[70]

The *Pereq ha-Šalom* ('Chapter on Peace') is another rabbinic work specifically dedicated to peace. It is one of the so-called minor tractates of the *Babylonian Talmud*, since it was not included in its canon but was transmitted together with it as an appendix to its fourth part since the Giustiniani edition (printed in Venice, 1546-1551). The *Pereq* is a collection of nineteen lengthy wisdom sayings on peace attributed to various rabbis, all introduced by the anaphora 'Great is peace, because...'—a rhetorical device typical of the genre of homily.[71] The first dimension of peace acknowledged and protected in the *pereq* is the private one, within one's family:

> Rabbi Yishma'el said, 'Great is peace, because we find (in Scripture) that the Holy One, blessed be he, allowed his own name—which was written down in sanctity—to be diluted in water in order to make peace between a husband and a wife'.[72]

---

[69] *M. Avot* 1:12. The expression 'who love peace and pursue it' is a reprise of Ps 34:15b, 'Look for peace and pursue it'.

[70] *M. Avot* 1:18. The prooftext from Zechariah only appears in some manuscripts.

[71] A whole section of *Leviticus Rabbah* (the largest collection of rabbinic sayings and *exempla* on peace as a value) is built around this same anaphora. This is why the *Pereq ha-Šalom* is considered more recent than *Leviticus Rabbah* (not earlier than the 6th century) and derived from it.

[72] *Pereq ha-Šalom* 9. Text for the *Babylonian Talmud*, in general, and *Pereq ha-Šalom*, in particular: *Talmud Bavli*, 20 vols. (Jerusalem: Torah la-'Am, 1962).

This saying is taken from an older rabbinic compilation, the *Tosefta* (3rd century CE),[73] and refers to the biblical ritual of the 'water of bitterness'.[74] In this ordeal, a special imprecation including God's name was written in ink on a parchment that was then washed with holy water. Dust from the floor of the Tabernacle was then diluted in the resulting admixture of ink and water. A woman suspected of being an adulteress (a *soṭah*) was forced to drink such 'water of bitterness': if she felt sick, she was considered guilty and put to death. It is slightly difficult to agree with Rabbi Yishma'el that this was an ideal method for restoring conjugal peace.[75]

According to the compiler of the *Pereq ha-Šalom* the quest for peace should not be circumscribed to the domestic realm. Psalm 34:15b—the basis for the above mentioned saying about Aaron 'who loves peace and pursues peace'—is interpreted by Rabbi Ḥizqiyyah as follows, where 'another place' means one's neighbor:

> '(...) *Look for peace and pursue it*': search for it in your place and pursue it in another place.[76]

The quest for peace is deemed so important that for its sake one can even forsake keeping one of the Ten Commandments, the prohibition to bear false witness:

> Rabbi (Yehudah the Patriarch) said, 'All lies are prohibited, but one is allowed to lie in order to make peace between someone else and his neighbor'.[77]

Later on, this principle is exemplified by resorting once again to the story of Aaron, Moses' brother and the first Israelite high priest:

> Aaron the priest was praised only on account of peace (...) If he saw two men hating each other, he went to one of them and asked him, 'Why do you hate So-and-so? He just came to my house, became restless (or, he bowed down) in front of me and told me, "I sinned against So-and-so". Go make peace with him'. Then he left, went to the other, and told him the same thing he had said to the first. Thus he made peace, love and friendship between a man and his neighbor.[78]

Peace is nurtured as a virtue even in heaven, where God cares to keep it among the angels:

> Bar Qappara said, 'Great is peace, because the angels harbor no animosity, nor envy, nor hatred, nor heresy (*minut*), nor meanness nor strife among themselves, since the Holy One, blessed be he, makes peace among them'. What is the meaning of the verse '*Domi-*

---

[73] *T. Šabbat* 13.5.

[74] Num 5:11-31.

[75] This tradition is found also in *Deut. Rab.* on Deut 5:15, where it is ascribed to Rabbi 'Aqiva.

[76] *Pereq ha-Šalom* 4.

[77] *Pereq ha-Šalom* 5.

[78] *Pereq ha-Šalom* 18.

> *nation and fear are with him who makes peace from high heaven*' (Job 25:2)? '*Domination*' is (the archangel) Michael, '*fear*' is (the archangel) Gabriel: the latter does not prevail on the first, yet the first is made of fire and the latter is made of water.[79] All the more so mankind (is in need of peace), among whom all those characteristics are to be found.[80]

The rabbis did not assign eschatological expectations a central role in their model of Jewish spirituality. They *had* nevertheless learned from biblical prophetical literature (from Isaiah, for instance) that definitive peace among mankind will only be established by God at the end of times.[81] The motif of final peace that can only be achieved by God through the messiah he will send in some undefined future is frequently attested in the *Babylonian Talmud* (5th-6th centuries), where it is stressed that messianic peace will only come after a long age of suffering and warfare for Israel and the whole world.[82] The messiah will therefore be a pacifier, whose role is described in the *Pereq ha-Šalom* as follows:

> Rabbi Yose the Galilean says, 'Even the name of the messiah is "Peace", as it is written, "*And he is called (...) Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace*" (Isa 9:5) (...) Great is peace, because the hour when the king messiah will reveal himself to Israel will only begin with peace, as it is written, "*How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of the messenger of good tidings who announces peace!*" (Isa 52:7) (...) Great is peace, because (even) an hour of warfare will only begin with peace, as it is written, "*When you draw near to a city to wage war against it, you shall offer peace to it*"' (Deut 20:10).[83]

At this point the *Pereq ha-Šalom* shifts from celebrating peace in the private dimension of everyday familiar and social relationships to declaring its collective, eschatological perspective. This is done by means of a quotation from Deuteronomy 20, the classical biblical example of the idea of sanctified warfare. As stated above, starting from the mid-16th century the *Pereq* was transmitted along with the *Babylonian Talmud*, where it is still today placed right after the two tractates of *Derekh Ereṣ* ('Good Manners'), containing behavioral and moral rules specifically meant

---

[79] Cf. *Deut. Rab.* (on Deut 5:12).

[80] *Pereq ha-Šalom* 8.

[81] Cf. Isa 2:2-4, 'At the end of days...(Yhwh) shall judge between the nations and decide between many peoples; they shall forge their swords into plowshares and their spears into scythes; one nation shall no more lift up its sword against another, neither shall they learn war any more'. On ultimate peace sent by God, cf. Isa 9:5-6; 11:1-9; 32:18; 54:10; Mic 4:1-3; Ps 72:3, 7.

[82] Cf. *b. Sanh.* 97a-98b (the theme of the 'birth pangs of the messiah', that is, the sufferings that will precede his coming, is already found in prophetical and apocalyptical literature: Isa 13:7-8; Ezek 38-39; Rev 12:1-2). See Piero Capelli, 'La profezia irrealizzabile nel presente: l'eschaton come utopia', *RStB* 1 (1999): 149-78; idem, 'Come i rabbini della tarda antichità attendevano il messia', *Humanitas* 60 (2005): 28-56.

[83] *Pereq ha-Šalom* 11.

for the young disciples of the rabbis. The *Pereq* has therefore enjoyed (and still enjoys) an almost canonical prestige within Talmudic literature, and has played a precise role in the formation of the rabbinic class.

8. Liturgy: The Hafṭarot *of the* Parašah *of* Šofeṭim *and the* ʻAmidah *Prayer*

Liturgy is the privileged moment for transmitting the system of values within any religious tradition. The sacralized reading of scripture in synagogue liturgy for Shabbat was soon structured in three main moments:

i. Reading of one section (*parašah*) taken from the Torah: the founding document that God gave on Sinai to Moses and the Israelites is celebrated and sacralized.

ii. Reading of one text (*hafṭarah*, literally 'opening') taken from one of the prophetical books of scripture: another founding document—also given by God to Israel through a prophet—is juxtaposed to the *parašah*, in order to introduce a pivotal concept that can direct the interpretation of the *parašah*.

iii. Homily (*derašah*): on the basis of the *parašah* and its *hafṭarah*—but not only nor always starting from them—the constitutive values of the rabbinic ethos are taught to the community.

In late antique rabbinic Palestinian Judaism the reading of the Torah was programmed over three years. Deuteronomy 20 is attested as the *parašah* for the 146th and 147th Shabbats of the triennial cycle.[84] According to most of the evidence, the *parašah* for the 147th Shabbat began with Deuteronomy 20:10 ('When you draw near to a city to wage war against it, you shall offer peace to it'); and its *hafṭarah* was Isaiah 66:12-16, where God promises to let peace flow 'like a river' towards Jerusalem before the final judgment. The presence of the word 'peace', *šalom*, in both Deuteronomy 20:10a and Isaiah 66:12a is the verbal hooking[85] by which a *hafṭarah* centered on peace is drawn together with a *parašah* centered on war. Such an interpretive choice was clearly functional to the teaching which the Palestinian rabbis of the first centuries CE meant their community to derive from that passage in the Torah.[86]

---

[84] See Charles Perrot, *La lecture de la Bible dans la Synagogue: les anciennes lectures palestiniennes du Shabbat et des fêtes*, Collection Massorah, Série 1/Etudes classiques et textes 1 (Hildesheim: Gerstenberg, 1973), 84.

[85] I borrow the expression from Perrot, *La lecture de la Bible dans la Synagogue*, 84 (*accrochage verbal*).

[86] Later, in the *minhagim* of the diaspora of Europe, the *parašah* of *Šofeṭim* (including Deuteronomy 20) has been coupled more often with other *hafṭarot* that are not related to the theme of war and peace. In the *Bibbia ebraica* edited by Dario Disegni two *hafṭarot* are listed for *Šofeṭim*: (1) 1 Sam 8:1-22 in the Italian rite (according to Elia S. Artom, 'the *parašah* lays down the regulations for the ideal king; in the *hafṭarah* Samuel explains what the king will exact from the people'); and (2) Isa 51:12-52:12 in the Spanish and German rites ('I, I am he who consoles you': the *hafṭarah* bears no connection to the top-

Peace is also strongly highlighted as a value in daily prayer, both individual and collective. This can be seen for instance in the *'Amidah* ('[Prayer] recited while standing'—also called *Šemoneh 'Eśreh*, 'Eighteen', the number of supplications and blessings it includes), a widespread prayer that the *Babylonian Talmud* dated back to the foundational moment of rabbinic Judaism itself, that is, the synod that was purportedly held in Yavneh ca. 100 CE.[87] The supplications and blessings of the *'Amidah* culminate in a prayer that God would grant peace to Israel as its highest good:

> Grant peace, good, blessing, life,[88] grace, goodness and mercy to us and to all Israel your people. Bless us, our father, because with the light of your countenance you gave us, O Yhwh, our God, a Law of life, love, goodness, justice, blessing, salvation, mercy, life and peace. Let it be your will that you bless all your people Israel[89] with your peace forever, in every time and in every hour. Blessed be you, O Yhwh, who bless your people Israel with peace. Amen![90]

9. Deuteronomy 20 in Targum *and* Midrash

The Aramaic translations of scripture (*targumim*) that were used in preaching grant no relevant information about the use of Deuteronomy 20 in rabbinic liturgy. They usually expand on the biblical text by integrating explanations into it. In the case of Deuteronomy 20, though, the various *targumim* are all peculiarly literal. Even in a very paraphrastic translation it was not easy to introduce irenic messages so divergent from the literal content of the biblical passage under scrutiny.

We have nonetheless very relevant examples of rabbinic hermeneutics applied to Deuteronomy 20 from the 5th to the 8th centuries, the age during which rabbinic Judaism gradually established itself as the leading trend in Jewish society and piety. First, I will consider two large homiletical commentaries (*midrashim*) to the whole book of Deuteronomy: *Sifre to Deuteronomy* and *Deuteronomy Rabbah*.

10. Sifre to Deuteronomy

This large, mainly juridical commentary to Deuteronomy expands on the distinction between mandatory and voluntary warfare that, as we have seen, was already applied to Deuteronomy 20 in *Mishnah Soṭah*. As in the *Mishnah*, here too the text of

---

ic of the *parašah*, and it is called 'consolatory *hafṭarah*', because its *parašah* is read in one of the *Shabbats* that follow the anniversary of the destruction of the temple on the 9th of Ab); *Bibbia ebraica: Pentateuco e Haftaroth*, 3rd ed. (Firenze: Giuntina, 1995), 443-46.

[87] *B. Ber.* 28b-29a.

[88] This word appears only in the *minhagim* of Turin, Milan and Rome.

[89] 'Let it be your will that you bless us and bless all your people Israel', in the *minhagim* of Milan and Rome.

[90] Text for the *'Amidah:* Artom, *Machazor di rito italiano*, 272.

Deuteronomy 20:10-18 is said to concern voluntary warfare alone;[91] the severe prescription of warfare against the Seven Nations is therefore practically neutralized. For this reason, the distinction between mandatory and voluntary warfare would be reutilised in all subsequent midrashic hermeneutics.[92]

Retreat is prohibited also in voluntary warfare,[93] since this is nonetheless God's war, and God marches in battle by his people's side:

> '*For Yhwh, your God, is walking with you*' (Deut 20:4): they (the enemies) come forth (trusting) in a victory of flesh and blood, whereas you come forth (trusting) in the victory of the Lord. '*For Yhwh, your God, is walking with you*': he who was with you in the wilderness will be with you in the time of distress; this is why Scripture says '*Yhwh will fight for you while you stay still*'.[94]

The battle must be conducted in keeping with the regulations dictated by God in Deuteronomy. If these rules are observed, victory will be achieved; otherwise, Israel will perish in the fight:

> '*Lest he die in battle*' (Deut 20:6): if he does not heed the priest's words, he will eventually die in battle (...) '*When Yhwh, your God, gives it in your hand*' (Deut 20:13): if you accomplish all that is prescribed about this, the Lord, your God, will eventually place (the city) in your hand.[95]

All in all, on the exegetical level, *Sifre to Deuteronomy* fully confirms the entire harsh biblical ruling about war against the Seven Nations, including the obligation to exterminate the defeated foe and the right to loot. On the homiletical level, though, a decisive swerve is taken at one specific point of the text. The commentary to Deuteronomy 20:10 (the precept to offer peace to a city before besieging it) first circumscribes and attenuates the commandment of siege; then it uses the prescription of offering peace before the siege as a hinge to distantiate itself decidedly from the text and to turn it into an exhortation no longer related to religious law, but only aimed at edifying the audience and proclaiming peace as the founding value of Jewish and universal ethos:

> '*When you draw near to a city*' (Deut 20:10): Scripture speaks about voluntary warfare. '*To a city*': not to a great city. '*To a city*': not to a village. '*To wage war against it*' (Deut 20:10): not to take it by hunger, nor by thirst nor to make it ill to death. '*You shall offer peace to*

---

[91] *Sifre Deut.* §§190.203.

[92] Cf. *Midrash Tanna'im* and *Midrash ha-Gadol*, as well as Rashi's commentary to Deut 20:10, 19 (Northern France, 11th century).

[93] *Sifre Deut.* §198 (on Deut 20:9).

[94] *Sifre Deut.* §§192-193. Text for *Sifre to Deuteronomy*: Louis Finkelstein, ed., *Sifre 'al Sefer Devarim*, Corpus Tannaiticum: Sectio tertia, Veterum doctorum ad Pentateuchum interpretationes halachicas continens/Pars tertia, Siphre d'be Rab, fasciculus 2 (1939; New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1969).

[95] *Sifre Deut.* §§195.200.

> *it*' (Deut 20:10): great is peace, because even the dead need peace; great is peace, because even in Israel's war there is need for peace; great is peace, because those who dwell in the highest are in need for peace, as it is written, '*He who makes peace in the highest*' (Job 25:2); great is peace, because the priestly blessing ends with it.[96] Moses too loved peace, as it is written, '*I sent messengers from the wilderness of Kedemot to Sichon the king of Heshbon with words of peace*' (Deut 2:26).[97]

11. Deuteronomy Rabbah

Deuteronomy Rabbah (*Midrash Rabbah to Deuteronomy*) is another exegetical compilation on Deuteronomy, of an even more homiletical character, and aimed at a wider, more variegated audience. Here the interpretation of Deuteronomy 20:10 is structured in a lengthy section that opens with a list of rabbinic arguments about how God, in creating the universe, bore in his mind the principle of peace between heavenly bodies and human beings.[98] The points made in the section—and duly supported by quotations from the Bible—are the following:

i. The biblical context deals with God-given regulations for holy war. Nevertheless, the *midrash* stresses that peace is anyway the best thing, even when it goes against God's previous intention:

> The Holy One, blessed be he, told (Joshua) to wage war against Sihon of Og, as it is written, '*And wage war against him*' (Deut 2:24). Yet he did not, rather '*I sent messengers from the wilderness of Kedemot to Sichon the king of Heshbon with words of peace*' (Deut 2:26). God said to him, 'I told you to wage war against him, yet you began with peace. By your life! I shall confirm your decision: every war the Israelites enter, they will begin it with peace, as it is written, "*When you draw near to a city* (*to wage war against it, you shall offer peace to it*)"' (Deut 20:10).[99]

ii. One should not even despise one's enemy, as can be inferred by juxtaposing Deuteronomy 23:8 ('You shall not abhor the Idumaean, for he is your brother; nor shall you abhor the Egyptian, because you were a foreigner in his land') and Psalm 34:15b ('Look for peace and pursue it').[100]

---

[96] The priestly blessing (Num 6:24-26) ends as follows: 'May Yhwh lift his countenance towards you and grant you peace!'.

[97] *Sifre Deut.* §199. As stated above, the anaphora 'Great is peace...' is a typical rhetorical device in the genre of oral preaching.

[98] *Deut. Rab.* 5:12 (on Deut 20:10). A wider discussion of the theme is found in *b. Giṭ.* 59a.

[99] *Deut. Rab.* 5:13 (on Deut 20:10). Text for *Deuteronomy Rabbah* (unless otherwise indicated): Saul Lieberman, ed., *Midrash Devarim Rabbah*, 2nd ed. (Jerusalem: Wahrman, 1965).

[100] Though the Idumaeans had been made brethren of the Jews by the Hasmonean kings only by means of war and forced circumcision, if we are to follow Josephus' account in *Ant.* 13:257-258.

iii. As in *Sifre to Deuteronomy*, Deuteronomy 20:10 is the hinge around which the content of the biblical passage is turned upside down and peace is promoted as the absolute value:

> Our rabbis say, 'Know how great is the power of peace, since even (about) war—which one wages only with sword and spear—the Holy One, blessed be he, said, "When you go wage war, do not begin unless with peace". This derives from what we read, "*When you draw near to a city to wage war against it,* (*you shall offer peace to it*)"' (Deut 20:10).[101]

The issue here is not peace in its generic dimension—be it familiar, cosmic or eschatological: it is concrete political peace between nations as an alternative to warfare. Further on in the *midrash* Deuteronomy 20:10 is quoted again at the opening of a compilation of *aggadot* (*exempla* and tales for the edification and the pleasure of the audience) on peace as a value within the family, in society at large and particularly in the relationship between nations.[102] I translate here the two first examples, respectively, about peace between God and the pagan nations, and about peace between the Israelites and their Egyptian oppressors:

> Another explanation of '*You shall offer peace to it*' (Deut 20:10). See how great is the power of peace! Come and see: if a person of flesh and blood has someone who hates him, he continually seeks to do him (harm). What does he do to him? He goes to someone who is his superior and honors him, so that the latter does harm to the one who hates him. But the Holy One, blessed be he, is not like that. Rather, all the worshipers of the stars make him angry, then go to sleep, and all (their) souls ascend to him (How do we [know this]? From the verse '*In whose hand is the soul of every living being*' [Job 12:10]); then in the morning he returns every soul to each one (How do we know this? From the verse '*He who gives breath to the people on it*' [the earth, Isa 42:5]).
>
> Another explanation: if a person of flesh and blood hurts his neighbor, the evil done never leaves the latter's soul. But the Holy One, blessed be he, is not like that. Rather, when the Israelites were in Egypt and the Egyptians enslaved them and made them work with bricks and mortar, notwithstanding all the evil they had done to the Israelites, Scripture had mercy on them and said, '*Nor shall you abhor the Egyptian, because you were a foreigner in his land*' (Deut 23:8); rather, you shall pursue peace, as it is written, '*Look for peace and pursue it*' (Ps 34:15b).[103]

---

[101] *Deut. Rab.* 5:12 (on Deut 20:10); cf. *Lev. Rab.* 11:7 (on Lev 9:1).

[102] With parallels in *Lev. Rab.* 9:9 (on Lev 7:11-12).

[103] *Deut. Rab.* 5:15 (on Deut 20:10). Text for *Deuteronomy Rabbah* here: Mosheh Mirkin, ed., *Devarim Rabbah*, vol. 11 of *Midrash Rabbah*, 11 vols. (Tel Aviv: 1956-1967).

12. Pesiqta de-Rav Kahana *and* Pesiqta Rabbati

Pesiqta de-Rav Kahana and *Pesiqta Rabbati* are the two most distinctly homiletic *midrashim* dedicated to the Torah sabbatical reading cycle in its articulation into *parashiyyot*. Both pass Deuteronomy 20 over in a silence that in poor journalism would be labeled 'deafening' and that I deem indicative of the embarrassment that their authors must have experienced before a text that did not let itself be easily excavated in search of edifying values for preaching to the community. Only *Pesiqta de-Rav Kahana* includes Deuteronomy 20:17 (the precept to exterminate the Seven Nations), in a compilation of biblical passages where it is juxtaposed to Numbers 33:55 ('But if you do not drive out the inhabitants of the land before you, those among them that you will leave there will become like thorns in your eyes...') and to Joshua 6:25 (in which Rahab, the prostitute who had granted shelter to Israelite scouts before the conquest of Jericho, is said not to have been killed and her offspring not to have been driven out after the conquest).[104] Here the *midrash* proceeds by progressive associations towards an attenuation of the message of the biblical text: (1) the Israelites must exterminate the Seven Nations;[105] (2) if they do not drive them out (now it is no longer about exterminating), they will become like thorns in their eyes;[106] (3) nevertheless, Rahab's offspring was not driven out;[107] (4) this all because, according to the *midrash*, Rahab was to become the ancestor of prophet Jeremiah, whose harsh words would indeed be like thorns in the eyes of the Israelites.

13. Midrash Tanna'im *and* Midrash ha-Gadol

Midrash Tanna'im, also sometimes called *Mekhilta Deuteronomy*, is a *midrash* to Deuteronomy mainly concerned with religious law. It was reconstructed in 1908 by David Hoffmann[108] from its quotations in a huge medieval compilation called *Midrash ha-Gadol* ('The Great Midrash', usually ascribed to David ben 'Amram of Aden, 13th century). The redactional ties between the older and the newer compilation are not easily defined: I use here *Midrash ha-Gadol* following the edition of Solomon

---

[104] *Pesiq. Rab Kah.* 13.5. Text for *Pesiqta de-Rav Kahana*: Bernard Mandelbaum, ed., *Pesiḳta de-Rav Kahana: A Critical Edition*, 2 vols. (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1962).

[105] Deut 20:17.

[106] Num 33:55.

[107] Josh 6:25.

[108] *Midrasch Tannaïm zum Deuteronomium*, Jahres-Bericht des Rabbiner-Seminars zu Berlin (Berlin: Druck von H. Itzkowski, 1908—).

Fisch,[109] which shows no difference from Hoffman's edition in the passages that I will be quoting.

In its exegesis of Deuteronomy 20, *Midrash ha-Gadol* is an almost slavish repetition of *Sifre to Deuteronomy*, with minor differences in two points, so as to further soften the harsh regulations prescribed in scripture:

i. *Sifre to Deuteronomy* §199 (on Deut 20:10) reads, 'Great is peace, because even in Israel's war there is need for peace'; *Midrash ha-Gadol* eliminates the clause 'of Israel', thus giving the saying a much more general, rather universal meaning.

ii. At Deuteronomy 20:16 (the obligation to exterminate by the sword the inhabitants of the cities of the Seven Nations), differently from *Sifre to Deuteronomy* §201, *Midrash ha-Gadol* derives from the adverb *raq* ('alone') in the biblical text the possibility that, however peremptory the biblical command can be, a pacific settlement of conflict is nonetheless permitted. This argument is built upon a saying by Shemu'el bar Naḥman (Palestine, 4th century) found in other older rabbinic texts, stating that before starting the armed conquest of Canaan, Joshua offered the Seven Nations opportunities of peace that some of them actually accepted:

> Rabbi Shemu'el bar Naḥman said, 'Joshua sent to the Land of Israel three injunctions before (the Israelites) entered the Land: anyone who wanted to go away might go away; anyone who wanted to make peace might make peace; anyone who wanted to make war might do so. The Girgashites went away, believed in the Holy One, blessed be he, and moved to Africa: "*Until I come and take you to a land like your own*"(2 Kings 18:32), that is, in Africa.
>
> The Gibeonites made peace, "*The inhabitants of Gibeon had made peace with Israel*" (Josh 10:1)'.[110]

14. Midrash Tanḥuma

The last *midrash* I will consider is *Midrash Tanḥuma*. As with almost all *midrashim*, dating *Tanḥuma* is very difficult; after Leopold Zunz it is commonly deemed not older than the 9th century.[111] The version published in Warsaw in 1875—the one I

---

[109] David ben 'Amram ha-'Adeni, *Sefer Devarim*, vol. 5 of *Midraš ha-Gadol 'al Ḥamišah Ḥumše Torah*, ed. Solomon Fisch, 5 vols. (Jerusalem: Mosad ha-Rav Kook, 1972).

[110] *Y. Šeb.* 6:1, 36c (4th–5th cent.). Text for *Yerushalmi*, Heinrich W. Guggenheimer, ed., *Talmud Yerushalmi: Edition, Translation, and Commentary*, SJ 18-21, 23, 29, 68 (Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2000–); parallels in *Lev. Rab.* 17:6 (on Lev 14:34); *Deut. Rab.* 5:14 (on Deut 20:10); and *tosefet* to *b. Giṭ.* 46a (gloss, Northern France, 12th–14th cent.). See the analysis by Yishai Kiel, 'The Morality of War in Rabbinic Literature: The Call for Peace and the Limitation of the Siege', in *War and Peace in Jewish Tradition: From the Biblical World to the Present*, ed. Yigal Levin and Amnon Shapira, Routledge Jewish Studies (New York: Routledge, 2012), 126-27.

[111] See Marc Bregman, 'Tanḥuma Yelammedenu', *EncJud*[2] 19:503-04; Moshe David Herr, '*Tanḥuma Yelammedenu*', *EncJud* 15:793-96; Hermann L. Strack and Günter Stemberger, *Introduction to the Talmud and*

use here—is different from the one edited by Salomon Buber in Vilna in 1885, whose text (maybe of a European origin) lacks Deuteronomy 20.

The commentary to the section *Šofeṭim* (including Deuteronomy 20) follows the rules of the genre of *midrash*: a number of verses from the Bible are extrapolated from their original contexts and juxtaposed to the biblical passage under scrutiny, in order to be used as prooftexts for the message that the author of the *midrash* wants to derive from that passage and convey to the community. In our case the obligation to warfare is reaffirmed, but only against those who hate the Israelites and are first in 'not having mercy on *them*'.

> '*When you go to war...*' (Deut 20:1). As it is written above, before this *parašah*, '*The judges will investigate carefully*' (Deut 19:18); once the judges have ruled, go out to war and you will win! For this reason David said, '*I have done what is right and just: do not leave me to my oppressors*' (Ps 119:121). It is also written, '*Be a warrant for good to your servant! Let not the haughty oppress me*'! (Ps 119:122). Also the Holy One, blessed be he, is glorified in this world only by means of judgment, as it is written, '*Yhwh of hosts is extolled in judgment*' (Isa 5:16). Rabban Shim'on ben Gamli'el says, 'The world stands on three things: on judgment, on truth and on peace, as it is written, "*You shall render judgment according to truth and for the sake of peace*"' (Zech 8:16).[112] Rabbi Yehoshua' ben Levi said, 'And these things all depend on judgment, because peace is made through judgment and truth is made through judgment'. Thus, when the Israelites practice judgment, the Holy One, blessed be he, overthrows in front of them those who hate them, as it is written, '*O if my people listened to me... I would soon humiliate their enemies...*' (Ps 81:14-15). Which are the ways of the Holy One, blessed be he? Justice and judgment, as it is written, '*Let them keep the way of Yhwh to do what is just and right*' (Gen 18:19). Therefore it is written in the section of *Šofeṭim*, '*They shall judge the people with righteous judgment*' (Deut 16:18). And further, '*When you go to war against your enemies*' (Deut 20:1). What is the meaning of '*against your enemies*'? The Holy One, blessed be he, said, 'Go against them as enemies: as they have no mercy on you, so have no mercy on them'. See what they say, '*Come, let us wipe them out as a nation: let the name of Israel be remembered no more*'! (Ps 83:5)—that very name of which it is said, '*Blessed be Yhwh, the God of Israel*' (Ps 106:48). Thus, 'Go against them as enemies'. Said Israel, 'O Lord of the universe, how long will they stand against us'?, as it is written, '*O God, arrogant people rise against me; a band of violent men threatens my life*' (Ps 86:14). He answered them, 'They did not rise against you alone, but also against me, as it is written, "*The kings of the earth rise up, the rulers gather against Yhwh and his anointed*" (Ps 2:2); look rather at how much they hate (you)', and therefore it is written, '*When you go to war against your enemies*'.[113]

Midrash, trans. and ed. Markus Bockmuehl (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991), 302-306; trans. of *Einleitung in Talmud und Midrasch*, 7th ed. (München: C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung [Oscar Beck], 1982).

[112] The saying of Shim'on ben Gamli'el is taken from *m. Avot* 1:18.

[113] *Tanḥ. Šofeṭim* §15. Text for *Midrash Tanḥuma*, David Kantrowitz, ed., *Midrash Tanḥuma* (Visberg edition, Warsaw 1875), in the *Judaic Classics Library*, CD ROM Version 2.2 (Chicago: Davka, 2001).

Earlier in the text of *Tanḥuma* (*Šofeṭim* §13) Deuteronomy 20:1 had been already juxtaposed to Proverbs 21:31 ('The horse is ready for the day of battle, but salvation belongs to Yhwh') and referred to the exodus from Egypt.

15. Conclusions

I have tried to show how chapter 20 of the book of Deuteronomy remained a vital and influential literary model until the end of the period of the wars against Rome. The authors of 1 and 2 Maccabees, Josephus and the *Megillat Antiokhus* recount the independence war of the Maccabees and the expansionist wars of the Hasmoneans as rigorously following the divine commandments listed in the biblical source. The *Temple Scroll* from Qumran, too, fully reconfirms the Deuteronomic regulations for war against the pagans.

But after the catastrophic conclusion of the second war against Rome, and at pace with the emergence and gradual predominance of the rabbinic version of Judaism, the new leading class took care that sacred scripture could not by any means be used to legitimate any nationalist drive within Judaism. Therefore the rabbis excluded from their biblical canon *both* the books that narrated the epic of the Maccabees and the Hasmoneans, *and* the books that projected liberation for Israel in an eschatological perspective, like the *War Rule* from Qumran and many other apocalyptic works patterned after the violent prophetic imagery of the 'day of Yhwh' and its final battle.[114]

In this perspective, Deuteronomy 20 was a potentially dangerous text. Still, by then it had already been part of the canonical Torah for centuries. It could therefore no longer be defused by simply excluding it from the canon of scripture; it required a thorough reworking in the realm of exegesis. The history of the effects of Deuteronomy 20 in early rabbinic literature shows how free and autonomous the rabbis could be in engaging with the requirements of scripture and with its system of values, so that the influence of chapter 20 in later Jewish tradition came to be extremely different from the one it could have generated—and eventually did generate, in other provinces of Western tradition, as we have seen. Rabbinic exegesis of Deuteronomy 20, particularly in its homiletical aim, managed effectively to utterly change the meaning and the effect of that whole part of scripture without diminishing by any means its sacredness. There was no need to deny the biblical postulate that, when Israel fought, its God fought by its side; all that was needed was stating that fighting was not suitable for Israel. This was no revolutionary innovation; rather, it was the simple acknowledgment of the present situation, since Israel was anyway no longer able to take arms or fight against anyone. Deu-

[114] See, particularly, Isa 2:12-21; 13:6-22.

teronomy 20 excellently exemplifies how rabbinic Judaism managed to transform the biblical mandate to holy war into an education for peace. This quite counter-intuitive result was achieved through careful selection of the books that were to be Israel's sacred scriptures, as well as through a hermeneutics of Torah not always prone to its literal sense or to the supposed intentions of its implicit authors.

All this is to be seen against the background of an eschatological perspective, by which universal peace will be ultimately accomplished by God alone through his messiah. Yet the rabbis of the first centuries CE generally maintained a healthily detached attitude towards messianic expectations (even though they *almost* never recanted them and went on producing apocalyptic literature, if only a minor one):[115] there had already been too many false messiahs like Bar Kokhba, and following them had already caused too much disaster for the Jews. In an Israel that was defeated, dispersed and totally aware of its own irremediable subjugation, an ethos of political engagement had no longer any meaning nor any market.[116]

Even revealed religions, consistently depending on their own written sources, can develop new values if they manage to keep a non-absolutist, dialectic—even elusive—relationship to those sources: a relationship in which dynamic fidelity to the sources can prevail over iconoclastic innovation or anarchistic acceptance of models from outside. The founding fathers of rabbinic Judaism read biblical tradition—at least the regulations for the holy war—in an actualising, non-fundamentalist way, the main principle of which, in my opinion, can be recovered in our age too. One can resign oneself to expect the Bible not to be what it is, namely, an anthology of texts that in many cases promote values that our worldview can no longer share. But if one considers peace as a value for building and directing social life, one can also refrain from envisaging the eschatological dimension, in which peace was projected by biblical prophets such as Joel and Isaiah, and even more so by their successors the apocalyptic thinkers. Jesus himself in the Sermon on the Mount called blessed 'those who work to make peace' (εἰρηνοποιοί)[117]—not those who pray and wait for the messiah to bring it at the end of times. This can perhaps work as a scriptural basis for the secular hope that peace, *any* peace, can be pursued, maybe even achieved, without having to wait for the next messiah to come bring it to us.

---

[115] See Günter Stemberger, 'Das Fortleben der Apokalyptik in der rabbinischen Literatur', in *Biblische und Judaistische Studien: Festschrift für Paolo Sacchi*, ed. Angelo Vivian (Frankfurt am Main: P. Lang, 1990), 335-47; John C. Reeves, ed., *Trajectories in Near Eastern Apocalyptic: A Postrabbinic Jewish Apocalypse Reader*, SBLRBS 45 (Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005).

[116] Cf. Capelli, 'Come i rabbini della tarda antichità attendevano il messia', passim.

[117] Matt 5:9.

Bibliography

Abate, Elisabetta. '"Il vostro cuore non venga meno" (Deut 20:3): La paura della battaglia secondo *mSot* 8'. Pages 291-305 in '*Let the Wise Listen and Add to Their Learning' (Prov 1:5): Festschrift for Günter Stemberger on the Occasion of His 75th Birthday*. Edited by Constanza Cordoni and Gerhard Langer. Studia Judaica Forschungen zur Wissenschaft des Judentums 90. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2016.

ben 'Amram ha-'Adeni, David. *Sefer Devarim*. Vol. 5 of *Midraš ha-Gadol 'al Ḥamišah Ḥumše Torah*. Edited by Solomon Fisch. 5 vols. Jerusalem: Mosad ha-Rav Kook, 1972.

Artom, Menachem Emanuele, ed. *Machazor di rito italiano secondo gli usi di tutte le Comunità*. 3 vols. Collana di testi liturgici ebraici 2-4. Roma: Carucci, 1988-1990.

Bainton, Roland H. *Christian Attitudes toward War and Peace: A Historical Survey and Critical Re-evaluation*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1960.

Bekhor, Shlomo, ed. *Sìyach Yitzchàk, Libro di Preghiere tradotto e commentato: Rito sefardita*. Edizioni DLI. Milano: Mamash, 1998.

Ben Zeev, Miriam Pucci. 'The Uprisings in the Jewish Diaspora, 116-117'. Pages 93-104 in *The Late Roman-Rabbinic Period*. Vol. 4 of *The Cambridge History of Judaism*. Edited by Steven T. Katz. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Bregman, Marc. '*Tanḥuma Yelammedenu*'. Vol. 19 pages 503-04 in *Encyclopedia Judaica*. Edited by Fred Skolnik and Michael Berenbaum. 2nd ed. 22 vols. Detroit: Macmillan Reference USA, 2007.

Byrd, James P. *Sacred Scripture, Sacred War: The Bible and the American Revolution*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Capelli, Piero. 'Come i rabbini della tarda antichità attendevano il messia'. *Humanitas* 60 (2005): 28-56.

____. *'Dalla guerra alla pace. La storia degli effetti di Deuteronomio 20 nell'ebraismo tardoantico'*. Pages 169-87 in *Guerra santa, guerra e pace dal Vicino Oriente antico alle tradizioni ebraica, cristiana e islamica. Atti del convegno internazionale Ravenna 11 maggio – Bertinoro 12-13 maggio 2004*. Edited by Mauro Perani. Associazione italiana per lo studio del Giudaismo, Testi e studi 14. Firenze: Editrice La Giuntina, 2005.

____. 'La profezia irrealizzabile nel presente: l'eschaton come utopia'. *RStB* 1 (1999): 149-78.

Cogswell, James. *God, the Pious Soldier's Strength and Instructor: A Sermon Deliver'd at Brooklyn in Pomfret to the Military Company under the Command of Capt. Israel Putnam, on the Thirteenth Day of April, 1757*. Boston: John Draper, 1757.

de la Rochefoucauld, François. *Réflexions, ou Sentences et maximes morales*. Paris: Barbin, 1665.

de Vaux, Roland. *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions*. Translated by John McHugh. 2nd ed. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1965.

Disegni, Dario, ed. *Bibbia ebraica: Pentateuco e Haftaroth*. 3rd ed. Firenze: Giuntina, 1995.

Duncan, Julie Ann, ed. '4QDeut[k2]'. Pages 99-105 in *Qumran Cave 4/IX: Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Kings*. Edited by Eugene Ulrich, Frank Moore Cross, Sidnie White Crawford, Julie Ann Duncan, Patrick W. Skehan, Emanuel Tov and Julio Trebolle Barrera. DJD 14. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995.

Finkelstein, Louis, ed. *Sifre 'al Sefer Devarim*. Corpus Tannaiticum: Sectio tertia, Veterum doctorum ad Pentateuchum interpretationes halachicas continens/Pars tertia, Siphre d'be Rab, fasciculus 2. 1939. Repr., New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1969.

Firestone, Reuven. *Holy War in Judaism: The Fall and Rise of a Controversial Idea*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.

García Martínez, Florentino and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*. 2 vols. 2nd ed. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

Gibbs, Henry. *The Right Method of Safety; or, the Just Concern of the People of God, to Joyn a Due Trust in Him, with a Diligent Use of Means. As it was Propounded in a Sermon Preached at Boston to the Artillery Company, of the Massachusetts-Bay in N.E. on the 5th of June 1704, Being the Day of their Election of Officers.* Boston: B. Green, 1704. http://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/evans/N00965.0001.001/1:1?rgn=div1;view=toc.

Goodman, Martin. *Rome and Jerusalem: The Clash of Ancient Civilizations*. London: Allen Lane, 2007.

_____. *The Ruling Class of Judaea: The Origins of the Jewish Revolt against Rome, A.D. 66-70.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Guggenheimer, Heinrich W., ed., *Talmud Yerushalmi: Edition, Translation, and Commentary*. SJ 18-21, 23, 29, 68. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 2000–.

Heine, Heinrich. *Geständnisse*. Vol. 1 pages 1-122 in *Vermischte Schriften*. Hamburg: Hoffmann und Campe, 1854.

Herr, Moshe David. '*Tanḥuma Yelammedenu*'. Vol. 15 cols. 794-96 in *Encyclopedia Judaica*. Jerusalem: Keter, 1972.

Hoffman, David., ed. *Midrasch-Tannaïm zum Deuteronomium*. Jahres-Bericht des Rabbiner-Seminars zu Berlin. Berlin: Druck von H. Itzkowski, 1908—.

Ibba, Giovanni. *Il* Rotolo della Guerra*: Edizione critica*. Quaderni di Henoch 10. Torino: S. Zamorani, 1998.

Kaddari, Menachem Zewi. '*Megillat Antiokhus* ha-arammit'. *Bar-Ilan* 1 (1963): 81-105; 2 (1964): 178-214.

Kantrowitz, David, ed. *Midrash Tanḥuma* (Visberg edition, Warsaw 1875). In the *Judaic Classics Library*. CD ROM Version 2.2. Chicago: Davka, 2001.

Kiel, Yishai. 'The Morality of War in Rabbinic Literature: The Call for Peace and the Limitation of the Siege'. Pages 116-38 in *War and Peace in Jewish Tradition: From the Biblical World to the Present*. Edited by Yigal Levin and Amnon Shapira. Routledge Jewish Studies. New York: Routledge, 2012.

Lieberman, Saul, ed. *Midrash Devarim Rabbah*. 2nd ed. Jerusalem: Wahrman, 1965.

Maier, Johann. *Le Scritture prima della Bibbia*. Supplementi alla Introduzione allo studio della Bibbia 11. Brescia: Paideia, 2003.

Mandelbaum, Bernard, ed. *Pesiḳta de-Rav Kahana*: *A Critical Edition*. 2 vols. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1962.

Martone, Corrado. *The Judean Desert Bible: An Index*. Quaderni di Henoch 11. Torino: S. Zamorani, 2001.

Mather, Cotton. *Soldiers Counselled and Comforted: A Discourse Delivered Unto Some Part of the Forces Engaged in the Just War of New England Against the Northern and Eastern Indians. Sept. 1. 1689.* Boston: Samuel Green, 1689. http://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/evans/N00394.0001.001/1:2?rgn=div1;view=toc.

Mirkin, Mosheh Aryeh, ed. *Devarim Rabbah*. Vol. 11 of *Midrash Rabbah*. 11 vols. Tel Aviv: 1956-1967.

Niditch, Susan. *War in the Hebrew Bible: A Study in the Ethics of Violence*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Niese, Benedictus, ed. *Flavii Iosephi opera*. 7 vols. Berlin: Weidmann, 1885-1895.

Perani, Mauro. 'Yhwh iš milḥamah (Es. 15,3). L'espressione "Yhwh è un uomo di guerra" nell'esegesi ebraica'. Pages 141-50 in *Guerra santa, guerra e pace dal Vicino Oriente antico alle tradizioni ebraica, cristiana e islamica. Atti del convegno internazionale, Ravenna, 11 maggio—Bertinoro 12-13 maggio, 2004*. Edited by Mauro Perani. Associazione Italiana per lo Studio del Giudaismo, Testi e studi 14. Firenze: Giuntina, 2005.

Pérez Fernández, Miguel. '*La propuesta de paz de los Rabinos: Una lectura sincrónica de la tradición*'. Pages 334-41 in *Biblical, Rabbinical, and Medieval Studies*. Vol. 1 of *Jewish Studies at the Turn of the Twentieth Century: Proceedings of the 6th EAJS Congress. Toledo, July 1998*. Edited by Judit Targarona Borrás and Angel Sáenz-Badillos. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

Perrot, Charles. *La lecture de la Bible dans la Synagogue: Les anciennes lectures palestiniennes du Shabbat et des fêtes*. Collection Massorah, Série 1/Études classiques et textes 1. Hildesheim: Gerstenberg, 1973.

Reeves, John C., ed. *Trajectories in Near Eastern Apocalyptic: A Postrabbinic Jewish Apocalypse Reader*. SBLRBS 45. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005.

Schwartz, Seth. *Imperialism and Jewish Society, 200 B.C.E. to 640 C.E.* Jews, Christians, and Muslims from the Ancient to the Modern World. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001.

Stemberger, Günter. 'Das Fortleben der Apokalyptik in der rabbinischen Literatur'. Pages 335-47 in *Biblische und Judaistische Studien: Festschrift für Paolo Sacchi*. Edited by Angelo Vivian. Frankfurt am Main: P. Lang, 1990.

____. 'La guerra nella *Mišnah* e nei *midrašim* halakici'. Pages 131-39 in *Guerra santa, guerra e pace dal Vicino Oriente antico alle tradizioni ebraica, cristiana e islamica. Atti del convegno internazionale, Ravenna, 11 maggio—Bertinoro 12-13 maggio, 2004*. Edited by Mauro Perani. Associazione italiana per lo studio del Giudaismo, Testi e studi 14. Firenze: Giuntina, 2005.

____. *Jews and Christians in the Holy Land: Palestine in the Fourth Century*. Translated by Ruth Tuschling. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000. Translation of *Juden und Christen im Heiligen Land: Palästina unter Konstantin und Theodosius*. München: C.H. Beck, 1987.

Stout, Harry S. *Upon the Altar of the Nation: A Moral History of the American Civil War*. New York: Viking, 2006.

Strack, Hermann L. and Günter Stemberger. *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*. Translated and edited by Markus Bockmuehl. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991. Translation of *Einleitung in Talmud und Midrasch*. 7th ed. München: C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung (Oscar Beck), 1982.

Talmud Bavli. 20 vols. Jerusalem: Torah la-'Am, 1962.

Ulrich, Eugene. *The Biblical Qumran Scrolls. Transcriptions and Textual Variants*. VTSup 134. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

Von Rad, Gerhard. *Holy War in Ancient Israel*. Translated by Marva J. Dawn. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991. Translation of *Der Heilige Krieg im alten Israel*. Zürich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1951.

West, Martin L. ed. *Iambi et elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum cantata*. 2nd ed. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989-1992.

Zuckermandel, Moses Samuel, ed. *Tosefta*. Trier, 1882. Repr. (of supplement to *Tosefta*), Jerusalem: Bamberger and Wahrman, 1963.

Part 2
The Reception of Jewish Scripture in Early Christianity

The Jewish Scriptures in the Gospels' Construction of Jesus: The Extent of a Literary Influence and the Limits of Mythicism

Fernando Bermejo-Rubio

1. The Issue and Its Relevance

Irrespective of whether the evangelists believed that they were reporting a true story or not, it is an indisputable outcome of critical scholarship that the gospels are largely fictional accounts of their main character, Yeshua ha-Notzri/Jesus of Nazareth. These writings were intended to create a life-enhancing understanding of this Galilean preacher, and were accordingly composed as propaganda material following his unexpected and shameful death. This means that Jesus is somehow a fictional being, constructed as a kind of spiritual superhero. By 'fictional' I do not mean that a certain Jesus from Galilee living under Augustus and Tiberius did not exist (I will return later to this issue), but rather that to a great extent the gospel image of him is a fabricated exaggeration.[1]

This fabrication seems to have taken place through several means. One of them is the anachronistic projection of later events and ideas into Jesus' life.[2] Another one is sheer invention, like the fictitious dialogue between John the Baptist and Jesus in Matthew 3:14-15. But by far the most convenient way of 'constructing' Jesus is the use of literary models which were available to the evangelists. Since the gospels were presumably composed in the second half of the first century CE in the Mediterranean basin, both Jewish and Greco-Roman literary patterns seem to have had a bearing on this creative enterprise. For instance, as it is well known, Dennis MacDonald has devoted most of his scholarly efforts to tracing the influence of

---

[1] As has been asserted, 'the content of the Gospels is frequently not "Jesus", but "what certain persons in the first century wanted us to think about Jesus"'; Randel Helms, *Gospel Fictions* (Buffalo, NY: Prometheus, 1988), 16. 'Fiction' is here defined as 'a narrative whose purpose is less to describe the past than to affect the present' (ibid., 10). For an extended and recent treatment of Jesus' construction, see Fernando Bermejo-Rubio, *La invención de Jesús de Nazaret: Historia, ficción, historiografía*, 4th ed. (Madrid: Siglo XXI de España Editores, S.A., 2021), 337-513.

[2] For instance, it has been recently argued that the Synoptic narratives of the Passion contain a stratum composed in Judaea on the eve of the Great Revolt, and that they anachronistically reflect some facts which actually took place in the 60s in that province; see Jonathan Bourgel, 'Les récits synoptiques de la Passion préservent-ils une couche narrative composée à la veille de la Grande Révolte Juive?', *NTS* 58 (2012): 503-21.

classical Greek literature on Jewish and Christian texts, in what has been labeled 'mimesis criticism'.[3]

Although other cultural influences in the gospels have been detected—let us think, for instance, about the possible Buddhist influence on Matthew 14:28-33 (Peter walking over the water and then sinking)[4] or the bearing of Greco-Roman ideas[5]–study of intertextual references in these writings for the most part leads to the Jewish scriptures.[6] Given the specific subject of this conference, I will tackle the role of the Jewish scriptures (especially in Greek translation) as the key sources for the complex process as it applies to Jesus.

Of course, detection of this literary influence should be carefully distinguished from the use that Jesus himself might have made of the biblical tradition in presenting himself.[7] Let us take, for instance, the Book of Zechariah. The influence of this prophetic work on some episodes told in the gospels has been long recognized

---

[3] According to this scholar, Mark imitated the Homeric epics that centuries earlier had come to define Greek cultural identity, retaining this unrivaled status for at least a millennium. The author of the Gospel of Luke would have read Mark as a historical fiction and expanded its imitations to include even more Homeric episodes; see e.g. Dennis R. MacDonald, *Mythologizing Jesus: From Jewish Teacher to Epic Hero* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2015); idem, *The Homeric Epics and the Gospel of Mark* (New Haven: Yale University Press 2000). For some criticism of his approach, see Margaret M. Mitchell, 'Homer in the New Testament'?, *JR* 83 (2003): 244-58; Karl Olav Sandnes, 'Imitatio Homeri? An Appraisal of Dennis R. MacDonald's "Mimesis Criticism"', *JBL* 124 (2005): 715-32. But see now Christopher B. Zeichmann, 'Ulyssean Qualities in the *Life* of Josephus and Luke-Acts: A Modest Defence of Homeric Mimesis', *Neot* 53 (2019): 491-515.

[4] Ralph Stehly, 'Bouddhisme et Nouveau Testament: à propos de la marche de Pierre sur l'eau (Matthieu 14, 28s)', *RHPR* 57 (1977): 434-37. On the ways through which Buddhism arrived in Syria, see W. Norman Brown, *The Indian and Christian Miracles of Walking on the Water* (Chicago: Open Court, 1928), 62-65.

[5] See, for instance, Henk Versnel, 'Making Sense of Jesus' Death: The Pagan Contribution', in *Deutungen des Todes Jesu im Neuen Testament*, ed. Jörg Frey and Jens Schröter, WUNT 181 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 213-94; David M. Litwa, *Iesus Deus: The Early Christian Depiction of Jesus as a Mediterranean God* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2014).

[6] Even MacDonald recognizes this point: 'This is not to deny Mark's Jewish concerns or the influence of the Septuagint. Like many ancient narratives, the earliest gospel was eclectic in its dependence on literary models; Mark was an equal opportunity imitator'; *The Homeric Epics and the Gospel of Mark*, 189.

[7] See, for instance, R. T. France, *Jesus and the Old Testament: His Application of Old Testament Passages to Himself and His Mission* (1971; repr., Grand Rapids: Baker, 1982); Tobias Hägerland, ed., *Jesus and the Scriptures: Problems, Passages and Patterns*, Library of Historical Jesus Studies 9/LNTS 552 (London: Bloomsbury T. & T. Clark, 2016). For the use of the scriptures by John the Baptist, see J. A. Trumbower, 'The Role of Malachi in the Career of John the Baptist', in *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel*, ed. Craig A. Evans and W. Richard Stegner, JSNTSup 104 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 28-41; and James D. G. Dunn, 'John the Baptist's Use of Scripture', in *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel*, 42-54.

in scholarship. At the same time, however, some eschatological views contained in that book seem to have had a bearing on Jesus' own apocalyptic outlook. A particularly probable candidate is the function of the Mount of Olives in the gospels as the place of Jesus' arrest. According to Zechariah 14, the eschatological miracle would take place on the Mount of Olives as its epicenter. This location became relevant in the eschatological expectations of later Jews, as is proved in the episode of the prophet from Egypt, mentioned by Josephus. But it presumably also had a deeply religious significance for an apocalyptic preacher like Jesus.[8]

In any case, although the influence of the Law and the Prophets, and also of the Psalms, in Jesus' self-understanding must have been pervasive, such an influence is particularly perceptible in the construction of his character by the gospel writers. The biblical influence does indeed extend from the beginning to the end, namely, from the infancy narratives to the resurrection accounts. Nativity legends depend on the Septuagint's passages in variegated forms: from Isaiah 7:14 for the virgin birth[9] through Micah 5:2 for the importance of Bethlehem as the birthplace of David and his dynasty to Hosea 11:1 for Egypt as the place where Jesus and his family would flee and thence return.[10] See also LXX Wisdom 7:3-4 and LXX 2 Kingdoms 7:8 for the swaddling clothes and the manger as the proper birth place for the new prince of Israel. So crucial is the Bible, that, as it is well known, even non-existing passages are referred to, as can be seen in Matthew 2:23—'This was to fulfill the words spoken through the prophets, "He shall be called a Nazarene"'.

The miracle stories in 1-2 Kings about Elijah and Elisha—who mediate striking deeds, such as the creation of abundance from little and the resurrection of a dead child—provided the basis for a number of the miracles attributed to Jesus. A particularly clear example is the raising of the widow of Nain's son, which betrays its literary origins in LXX 3 Kingdoms 17:8-10, 17, 19-23. The parallels are so many and so close that it is clear that either Luke or his source consciously modeled the story set in Nain after the miracle at Sarepta. Even more striking is that all the gospel stories of Jesus' resurrecting a dead loved one are based on the resurrections in the books of Kings.[11] Likewise the stories about the miraculous increase of food in Eli-

---

[8] See Hyam Maccoby, *Revolution in Judaea: Jesus and The Jewish Resistance* (London: Ocean, 1973). For an extended treatment, see Fernando Bermejo-Rubio, 'The Day of the Lord is Coming: Jesus and the Book of Zechariah', in *Jesus and the Scriptures*, 111-31, esp. 123-27.

[9] The source of this motif, however, is rather the widespread pagan belief in the divine conception upon various virgins of a number of mythic heroes and famous persons in the ancient world; Helms, *Gospel Fictions*, 50; Litwa, *Iesus Deus*, 37-67.

[10] Matt 2:15.

[11] Helms, *Gospel Fictions*, 63-65.

jah/Elisha stories[12] served as a source for two versions of a story about Jesus feeding the multitudes, found in Mark 8. And there is wide agreement that the stories about Jesus showing his power over nature and water are reliant on Psalm 107 and Jonah 1.[13] Something similar can be said about the fabrication of many parables and narratives.[14]

It goes without saying that, at one level, connections between the gospels and the Hebrew Bible are clear for everybody. The evangelists frequently cite the older scriptures, especially the Psalms and Prophets, according to the hermeneutical conviction that 'the old is fulfilled in the new'. Nevertheless, the claim of some scholars is far stronger, namely, that the dependence is not only overt (in occasional quotations), but massive and implicit, and that it has been largely unacknowledged. It would be superfluous to recall the large quantity of details because several scholars—Randel Helms, Thomas L. Brodie and Robert Price, among others—have shown how story after story in the gospels has been based on similar stories from the Septuagint; their authors are creating, not reporting. The scope of that influence is indeed wide-ranging.[15]

Even more importantly, beyond the many details and episodes, the overall outlook of Jesus' career seems to depend on a biblical pattern. In an article published in 1980, George Nickelsburg convincingly argued that the Markan passion narrative is based on a model concerning a wise (or righteous) human being who is the object of a conspiracy or plot, and who is persecuted, consigned to death, rescued, vindicated and exalted to a high position in the royal court. Such a model is found in the Joseph narratives in Genesis 33-50, the story of Ahikar, the Book of Esther,

---

[12] 2 Kgs 4:42-44.

[13] Helms, *Gospel Fictions*, 76-80.

[14] For instance, although most scholars presume an origin of the parable of the Good Samaritan in the allegedly creative mind of the historical Jesus, a solid argument can be mounted for the claim that it was entirely composed by the evangelist whom we call Luke: according to 2 Chr 28:8-15, some northern Israelites from the city of Samaria took pity on prisoners carried off by the Israelite army, clothed the naked among them, gave them food and drink, anointed them, put the weak on donkeys and brought them to Jericho, to be cared for by their fellow Judaeans; see e.g. John P. Meier, *Probing the Authenticity of the Parables*, vol. 5 of *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus*, Anchor Yale Bible Reference Library (New York: Doubleday, 2016), 207.

[15] 'The same phenomenon of dependence on the Old Testament pervades all the Gospels and Acts. It will take decades to spell out all the details, but sufficient evidence is already in place that it is no longer plausible to base claims to the historical Jesus on the Gospels or Acts'; Thomas L. Brodie, *Beyond the Quest for the Historical Jesus: Memoir of a Discovery* (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2012), 160. See also Robert M. Price, who treats New Testament narrative as a midrash on the literature which would later become the Hebrew Bible; *The Christ Myth Theory and Its Problems* (Cranford, NJ: American Atheist Press, 2011), 59-244.

Daniel 3 and 6, Wisdom 2-5, Psalm 22; Isaiah 52:13-53:12 and so on.[16] Jesus' story greatly resembles all those stories, characterized by the common theme of the rescue and vindication of a persecuted innocent person, which define a specific literary genre.

All of the above poses an obvious challenge for the historical Jesus enterprise: the claim by some scholars that virtually *everything* within the gospel stories depends on the Jewish scriptures calls into question the historicity of their main character itself.

2. Mythicism, or Jesus as Nothing but a Literary Construct

The thesis according to which our sources on Jesus are wholly literary fabrication—that is, the rewriting and reworking of earlier (mostly Hebrew Bible) texts—means that they do not rely on historical memories or oral tradition stemming from historical events, thereby making Jesus' historicity superfluous.[17] The question of what information in the gospels might be used by historians to write a factual sketch of Jesus is, according to mythicists, a false one and a distraction. Given the heavy commitment of many scholars to the idea that the New Testament faithfully reflects historical facts, when we come to think about the intertextual development of the gospels and the extent of the influence of Jewish scriptures on Jesus' story, our stance must be clarified in the face of the so-called mythicism. After all, the goal of this paper is—as its subtitle indicates—to make plain, at one and the same time, the extent of the literary influence of the Jewish scriptures on the gospels' construction of Jesus and the limits of mythicism.

Some scholars have denied the historical existence of Jesus since the 18th century at least, usually claiming that he is a purely literary phenomenon. This topic was tackled by quite a few authors at the end of the nineteenth century and the first third of the twentieth century, but since then the notion that Jesus never existed is typically viewed as so weak, fanciful or bizarre that it is ignored within the guild, or, at best, its treatment is relegated to footnotes; until very recently it was

---

[16] George W.E. Nickelsburg, 'The Genre and Function of the Markan Passion Narrative', *HTR* 73 (1980): 153–84. See also Burton L. Mack, *A Myth of Innocence: Mark and Christian Origins* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988), 265-70.

[17] 'In essence: once the literary connection is seen, the historical explanation is unnecessary; it goes beyond what is needed to explain the data'; Brodie, *Beyond the Quest for the Historical Jesus*, 159. 'Explaining the data does not require invoking the historical existence of Jesus. The explanation that suffices without invoking Jesus' historical existence is the simplest; therefore, in respect for a basic rule of method, it is to be preferred' (ibid.).

unfamiliar to many New Testament scholars.[18] I think this oversight is ill-advised. Although the issue of the non-historicity of Jesus is admittedly not a widespread position, it has been a long-running side current and nowadays it is no longer a strictly marginal one. Scholars like Thomas Thompson and Richard Carrier have carried out a revival of the non-historicity hypothesis. Moreover, along with mythicists, other scholars like Robert Price or Hector Avalos declare themselves 'agnostic' as to Jesus' existence.[19] Although sometimes these approaches have been blithely dismissed as 'anti-Christian',[20] some recent works –like that of the Roman Catholic priest Thomas L. Brodie (a member of the Dominican order)– prove that they are making inroads into 'normative' Christianity and that they are not held simply because of purely ideological (polemical) reasons.

I guess most in the field tend to think that mythicist arguments are old and outdated (even outlandish), and that they were fairly dealt with one hundred years ago, so that mythicism does not deserve scholarly attention. Although by no means am I a mythicist, I disagree with this scornful treatment, because I think there is more than preposterous claims in this kind of approach.[21] Its starting-point is indeed a fact, namely, the truly problematic nature of the sources available for the study of Jesus: their apologetic and tendentious character, and the high percentage of non-historical material they contain, should give all serious historians food for thought.

---

[18] This might rely on Rudolf Bultmann's sharp judgment: 'Of course the doubt as to whether Jesus really existed is unfounded and not worth refutation'; *Jesus and the Word*, trans. Louise Pettibone Smith and Erminie Huntresse Lantero (New York: Scribners, 1958), 13. See also Robert E. Van Voorst, 'The theory of Jesus' nonexistence is now effectively dead as a scholarly question'; *Jesus Outside the New Testament: An Introduction to the Ancient Evidence* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 14.

[19] 'This book treats of the historical Jesus and whether we can know anything about him, whether even there is anyone to know about! [...] Generations of Rationalists and freethinkers have held that Jesus Christ corresponds to no historical character: There never was a Jesus of Nazareth. We might call this categorical denial "Jesus atheism". What I am describing is something different, a "Jesus agnosticism". There may have been a Jesus on earth in the past, but the state of the evidence is so ambiguous that we can never be sure what this figure was like or, indeed, whether there was such a person'; Robert M. Price, *Deconstructing Jesus* (Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books, 2000), 9, 17. 'I am an agnostic when it comes to the historical Jesus. I am not a so-called "Jesus mythicist" [...] I do affirm that we do not have sufficient data from the actual time of Jesus to fully corroborate any particular portrayal of Jesus that one finds in the Gospels'; Héctor Avalos, *The Bad Jesus: The Ethics of New Testament Ethics*, The Bible in the Modern World 68 (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2015), 11.

[20] Quite a few authors try to discredit Christianity by way of attacking the historicity of its alleged founder.

[21] After all, as Northrop Frye argued, 'accepted myths soon cease to function as myths; they are asserted to be historical facts or descriptive accounts of what "really happened"'; *Words with Power: Being a Second Study of 'The Bible and Literature'* (San Diego: Harcourt, Brace & Jovanovich, 1990), 34.

After having hinted at the great extent of the literary influence of Jewish scriptures on the gospels' construction of Jesus, my first contention is that the most sophisticated versions of mythicism do indeed deserve attention, not because they are ultimately compelling, but because reflection on at least some of the arguments set forth by their champions could only improve critical research. To start with, there is a not inconsiderable degree of overlap between the work of the most thoughtful mythicists and any responsible approach to Christian sources.[22] Both share a considerable dose of skepticism towards the sources, but the difference lies in that mythicists push this skepticism to the limit and deny the existence of a non-fictitious core. In this way, whilst many scholars simply assume the historical reliability of the sources, mythicists carry out a ruthless survey, detecting real problems in those sources as historical quarries. Moreover, in their search for parallels both in Judaic and Greco-Roman cultures, mythicists are an interesting counterweight to the hosts of confessional-driven scholars obsessed with proving at any cost Jesus' alleged uniqueness.[23] A further advantage of this position lies in the unveiling of many self-styled historical reconstructions of Jesus as untenable and fanciful.[24] In fact, I think that, paradoxically, mythicism has been, is and will be to a certain extent nurtured by standard mainstream scholarship, inasmuch as the many credulous creators of hoary-howlers found in the field cannot understandably persuade critical minds. Mythicists (and 'Jesus-agnostics') are right in their diagnosis that arbitrariness and fantasy prevail in much of the self-styled historical Jesus research.[25]

In my opinion, the questions raised by mythicists can enrich our agenda. Seriously taking into account their soundest claims would have an extremely healthy effect on Jesus studies, since it would compel any critical scholar to recognize that the available evidence about this Galilean preacher is scanty and therefore that any historical reconstruction can only be sketchy. Contemporary scholars go on affirming the most ludicrous and whimsical things about Jesus, as if we know more than we actually do, which is very little indeed. Although many confessional-driven exegetes and theologians go on writing books on Jesus as if they had lived in

---

[22] This aspect has been perceptively observed by Franco Tommasi, *Non c'è Cristo che tenga. Silenzi, invenzioni e imbarazzi alle origini del cristianesimo: qual è il Gesù storico più credibile?* (Lecce: Manni, 2014), 286-87.

[23] For a recent survey, see Richard Carrier, *On the Historicity of Jesus: Why We Might Have Reason for Doubt* (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2014), 65-234.

[24] See, for instance. some claims by Bruce Chilton rightly criticized in Carrier, *On the Historicity of Jesus*, 24-25.

[25] See e.g. Price, *Deconstructing Jesus*, 13-16; Carrier, *On the Historicity of Jesus*, 25. Even some non-mythicists share this opinion; see Burton L. Mack, *The Christian Myth: Origins, Logic, and Legacy* (2001; repr., New York: Continuum, 2003), 34-35.

first-century Galilee and Judaea and had had direct access to his thoughts, the plain truth is that only a minimalistic approach is justified. The mythicists' warnings should encourage us to be much more cautious about making historical claims than in the past and could even give rise to a moratorium regarding historical work. According to Brodie, 'Biblical studies are plagued by a premature rush towards historical issues, without taking the necessary time to do the detailed preliminary literary homework'.[26] I think this is a reasonable and healthy warning, and this is the reason why we must pay attention to the extent of literary influences in the gospels.

Acknowledgement of the critical value of the mythicist position and of the scholarly respectability of their most sophisticated versions does not amount, however, to accepting the validity of all their arguments or assuming their conclusions. In fact, even scholars who have readily granted the wide indebtedness of the gospel authors to intertexts or 'antetexts' state that it does not imply that Jesus himself was a myth.[27] It simply means that Jesus, to put it in MacDonald's words, was injected with 'narrative steroids', his figure being embellished and depicted as far more compassionate—spiritually and morally stronger, and thus wiser than the average man, thereby letting him compete with the gods and heroes of the classical world.[28]

3. Rethinking Gospel Reports on Jesus' Arrest and Crucifixion, or the Limits of Mythicism

The point I would like to make now is that, once we recognize the extent of the process of mythmaking, there are still several aspects left, and that these aspects are overlooked not only by mythicists but also—what is more revealing—by the overwhelming majority of mainstream scholarship. For the sake of brevity, here I will focus on just two aspects of the gospels, more particularly of the Passion accounts, namely, the arrest and the crucifixion. Both episodes are obviously connected, both are apparently historical, both are crucial for any reconstruction of the fate of Jesus and both present many problems of reliability when attentively surveyed, since both narratives are riddled with scripture allusions.

The most cursory reading of the strikingly brief gospel accounts of the arrest cannot but arouse utmost perplexity. Even leaving aside the supernatural elements

---

[26] Brodie, *Beyond the Quest for the Historical Jesus*, xxi.

[27] The fact that Jesus was equipped with a mythical biography can be recognized 'without needing to insist that all the mythical biographies of this figure entirely disregard his genuine acts'; Helms, *Gospel Fictions*, 10.

[28] 'The indebtedness of Mark and Luke to the Homeric epics does not call into question Jesus' existence; the Evangelists simply injected him with narrative steroids to let him compete with the mythological heroes of Greeks and Romans'; MacDonald, *Mythologizing Jesus*, 10.

in some of them—in Luke Jesus carries out the miracle of healing a severed ear, and according to the Fourth Gospel the throng sent to arrest Jesus falls on their knees at his sight[29]—all the versions make reflective observers raise their eyebrows. Since I have elsewhere expounded the incongruities of these accounts,[30] I will just enumerate them in a very brief way. The report that the group in charge of Jesus' arrest was heavily armed and acting at night seems to indicate that Jesus' group was not harmless; far from it, the most natural explanation is that the authorities knew in advance that Jesus' gang was not a harmless group and that armed resistance was to be expected.[31] In the face of the violence carried out with clearly homicidal intentions by one of the disciples,[32] no reaction by the companions of the attacked man is reported; such a lack of reaction is, however, highly unlikely, and not the usual way in which armed throngs behave. Matthew, Luke and John present Jesus as opposing the violence of his disciple, but in each case the reaction is different. Moreover, there is nothing of the sort in Mark and this is indeed a curious absence, since if Jesus had actually stopped violence, this would have been worth citing by the earliest gospel. But even if, for the sake of the argument, we accept the gospel version according to which Jesus rebuked violence, or—at the very least, as in Mark—did not oppose resistance to the armed crowd, the odd thing is that according to these same works he is precisely the only man who is arrested (and later crucified), whilst the disciple who has resorted to sword and violence is left unscathed.[33] According to Luke, all the disciples seem to be armed with swords and

---

[29] Luke 22:51b; John 18:11.

[30] For a more detailed treatment, see Fernando Bermejo-Rubio, 'Between Gethsemane and Golgotha, or Who Arrested the Galilean(s)? Challenging a Deep-Rooted Assumption in New Testament Research', *Annali di Storia dell'Esegesi* 33 (2016): 312-15.

[31] Referring to the attack of one of Jesus' disciples against a member of the arresting group, George Aichele wonders, 'Would this happen if Jesus and his followers were not already a violent group'?; 'Jesus' Violence', in *Violence, Utopia and the Kingdom of God: Fantasy and Ideology in the Bible*, ed. Tina Pippin and George Aichele (London and New York: Routledge, 1998), 83. Besides, if the story of Judas' betrayal deserves any credit, it makes sense if a coup had been prearranged: 'Da gab es etwas zu verraten, da gab es ein Geheimnis, das zu erkaufen lohnte'; Karl Kautsky, *Der Ursprung des Christentums: Eine historische Untersuchung* (Stuttgart: J.H.W. Dietz Nachfolger, 1908), 388.

[32] The act portrayed in Mark 14:47 was not a minor one, but 'Gewaltanwendung mit möglicher Todesfolge'; Gerd Theissen, *Lokalkolorit und Zeitgeschichte in den Evangelien: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*, NTOA 8 (Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989), 198.

[33] 'Gerade er wird verhaftet, der den friedlichen Weg predigt, dagegen behelligt man nicht im mindesten die Apostel, die ihre Schwerter zogen und dreinhieben [...] Ein ganz unbegreiflicher und sinnloser Vorgang'; Kautsky, *Der Ursprung des Christentums*, 389.

are ready to use them,[34] but in spite of that they are not the target of the throng. Once more, this is (to say the least) highly improbable both from an historical and from a psychological point of view.

This survey proves that even in the rather terse accounts of the arrest there are quite a few suspicious points and a striking lack of coherence. In fact, there is every indication that the earliest account of the Passion, namely, that in the Markan gospel, is essentially an apologetic reconstruction of the events leading to the crucifixion of Jesus.[35] Put otherwise, it is nothing but a *version* of the facts, and one which—despite the proclivity of so many scholars to endorse it as truth—cannot be taken at face value. In light of the above-mentioned incongruities, I do not think an honest historian—all the more so if (s)he is aware of the many other inconsistencies and tendentiousness in the gospels[36]—can readily use those accounts as building blocks for a sound and reliable reconstruction of Jesus' story. At the very least, one must recognize that there are very serious reasons to doubt the trustworthiness of the gospel version of the facts.

Furthermore, even in the extremely terse accounts of the arrest, biblical echoes are not missing. Judas' betraying kiss could be taken from the account in 2 Samuel 20:7-10, where Joab, planning to kill Amasa, greets him holding his beard as if to kiss him. According to Mark 14:50, the disciples flee: 'And they all forsook him, and fled'. But in Mark 14:27 Jesus predicts the falling away of the disciples with a citation of Zechariah 13:7, 'You will all become deserters; for it is written, "I will strike the shepherd and the sheep will be scattered"'. This is interesting, because most scholars—including those presumably most skeptical ones—accept the gospel version according to which the disciples did indeed flee,[37] although such a flight is historically suspect. The most likely clue to the origin of the fleeing young man who loses his sole garment to escape naked[38] is Amos 2:16, 'And he who is stout of heart among the mighty shall flee away naked in that day'.

The combination of internal incongruities and biblical echoes could easily lead some skeptical minds to deny any historicity to the gospel accounts of the arrest.

---

[34] Luke 22:49.

[35] This was clearly stated by Samuel G.F. Brandon, 'Jesus and the Zealots: Aftermath', *BJRL* 54 (1971): 55-57.

[36] See Kautsky, *Der Ursprung des Christentums*, 418-32; Paul Winter, *On the Trial of Jesus*, 2nd ed. (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1974), passim.

[37] See, for instance, John Dominic Crossan, *The Birth of Christianity: Discovering What Happened in the Years Immediately After the Execution of Jesus* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1998), 559. The odd thing is that elsewhere Crossan recognizes the scriptural basis of this statement; see idem, *Who Killed Jesus? Exposing the Roots of Anti-Semitism in the Gospel Story of the Death of Jesus* (New York: HarperCollins, 1995), 68.

[38] Mark 14:51.

Nevertheless, more than a century ago Maurice Goguel wrote an important article in which he argued that several features of the Passion accounts seem to betray the existence of an alternative and presumably more original version, according to which the Romans were not passive spectators of Jesus' fate but those who took the initiative in his arrest.[39] The fact that Goguel's piece has been read and cited by only a handful of New Testament scholars is itself sobering,[40] but is even more worrying when we realize that mainstream scholarship has not, and still does not, pay attention to the textual problems identified by the French savant.

Let us now come to the episode of the crucifixion. As it is depicted in the gospels, the scene does not make sense at all. Leaving aside the darkness coming 'over the whole earth'[41] and the rending of the sanctuary veil,[42] there are many aspects of these accounts that defy credibility. To start with, the evangelists would have us believe that a collective execution of a small group took place in which the people crucified had no relationship to each other. This is, however, only the starting-point of ceaseless puzzlement. Why on earth would the Romans have executed some 'bandits' (or 'malefactors') through crucifixion, if, as far as we know, in first-century Judaea, they only crucified seditionists or those reckoned to be sympathetic to them?[43] Why on earth is a man charged with claiming to be 'the king of the Jews' executed among bandits, namely, common criminals? How on earth can we believe the report that the chief priests went out of the city to observe the crucifixion of a coreligionist and to publicly mock him?[44] Should we believe that the men co-cruci-

---

[39] Maurice Goguel, 'Juifs et Romains dans l'histoire de la passion', *RHR* 62 (1910): 165-82, 295-322. For a brief exposition of Goguel's ideas, see Bermejo-Rubio, 'Between Gethsemane and Golgotha', 315-19.

[40] It is striking that this article is not cited by most scholars tackling Jesus' fate. Nor is it cited in an article dedicated to Goguel's works on Jesus; see Elian Cuvillier, 'Maurice Goguel (1880-1955)', *Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français* 149 (2003): 549-67.

[41] Mark 15:33 and Synoptic parallels. This could evoke one of the exodus plagues, namely, darkness 'over all the land' for *three* days (Exod 10:21-23). Mark mentions the sixth and the ninth hours as the beginning and end of *three* hours of darkness.

[42] Mark 15:38 and Synoptic parallels.

[43] 'Vom Beginn der Römerherrschaft 63 v. Chr. bis kurz vor Ausbruch des Jüdischen Krieges 66 n. Chr. sind in Palästina offenbar nur Aufständische bzw. solche, die dafür galten oder mit Aufständischen sympathisierten, auf diese Weise hingerichtet worden'; Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn, 'Die Kreuzesstrafe während der frühen Kaiserzeit: Ihre Wirklichkeit und Wertung in der Umwelt des Christentums', *ANRW* II.25.1:724.

[44] The lack of verisimilitude of these reports has been remarked upon by several scholars; see, for instance, Adela Yarbro Collins, *Mark: A Commentary*, ed. Harold W. Attridge, Hermeneia (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2007), 751. The depiction of the chief priests and scribes coming out of the city sounds artificial: 'Dieser Zug fällt aus dem Rahmen und wirkt künstlich'; Ludwig Schenke, *Der gekreuzigte Christus: Versuch einer literarkritischen und traditionsgeschichtlichen Bestimmung der vormarkinischen*

fied with Jesus also mocked him?[45] And does the report of a Roman centurion delivering a resounding vindication of a crucified Jew as 'son of God'[46] deserve any credence? To be fair, all of this is implausible at best, and ludicrous at worst, because it blatantly contradicts what we know about how the Roman Empire worked and how human psychology manifests itself. No serious historian would use any of this material to reconstruct Jewish life under Roman rule in Judaea in the first century CE.

As for biblical echoes, the influence of Psalms 22 and 69 as appropriate quarries for the crucifixion and vindication of Jesus—both beginning with individual supplication from the depths of anguish and ending with a corporate hymn of praise for deliverance—is well known. Psalm 22:18 ('They divide my clothes among themselves and for my clothing they cast lots') is used as Passion narrative in Mark 15:24 and parallels: 'They… divided his clothes among them, casting lots to decide what each should take'.[47] Whilst in the Synoptics and the *Gospel of Peter* Psalm 22:18 lies latent behind the story, in John its presence is rendered explicit.[48] Psalm 69:21, 'They gave me poison for food and for my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink', is turned into narrative in the several crucifixion accounts among the canonical gospels and in the *Gospel of Peter*, although in different ways.[49] As to Mark 15:29-32, the portrayal of the passersby as reviling Jesus and shaking their heads, along with the portrayal of the chief priests and scribes and the crucified men mocking him, does again evoke Psalm 22(LXX 21):8-9, 'All who saw me sneered at me; they spoke with their lips, they shook their heads'. Moreover, the dying scream of Jesus quotes the opening line of the same psalm.[50]

Once again a cursory reading focusing on these incongruities and seeing biblical passages transformed into historical narrative might make some scholars think that they are allowed to deny even the historical reliability of the barest report of

---

Passionsgeschichte, SBS 69 (Stuttgart: KBW-Verlag, 1974), 84. Maccoby describes those reports as 'slanders'; *Revolution in Judaea*, 218.

[45] Things are even worse, because a careful survey of the depiction of these men allows us to deconstruct what the evangelists meant; see Fernando Bermejo-Rubio, '(Why) Was Jesus Crucified Alone? Solving a False Conundrum', *JSNT* 36 (2013): 138-41.

[46] Mark 15:39.

[47] See also Matt 27:35; Luke 23:34b; John 19:23-25; *Gos. Pet.* 4:12.

[48] See Crossan, *Who Killed Jesus?*, 141-42.

[49] See Mark 15:23, 34-36; Matt 27:34; Luke 23:36; John 19:28-30; *Gos. Pet.* 5:15-17. See Crossan, *Who Killed Jesus?*, 143-46.

[50] Mark 15:34; Ps 22(LXX 21):2.

the crucifixion.[51] This is what happens with mythicists and philo-mythicists.[52] For them, Jesus' crucifixion is just *cruci-fiction* –a wordplay used, for instance, by Robert Price.[53] Irrespective of whether one ultimately agrees or not with the overall judgment, it is hard to disagree with Price when he asserts, 'Even the account of the crucifixion itself is a patchwork quilt of (mostly unacknowledged) scripture citations rather than historical reportage'.[54] As for Crossan, although his distinction between 'prophecy historicized' and 'history remembered' can be a little too simplistic,[55] any critical scholar will basically agree with his contention that 'the individual units, general sequences, and overall frames of the passion-resurrection stories are so linked to prophetic fulfillment that the removal of such fulfillment leaves nothing but the barest facts'.[56]

Of course, the common ground of mythicists and agnostics is the conviction that the gospel story of Jesus is reducible to earlier literary precedents, either Jewish scriptures or classical works or, for that matter, to the pattern of the Mythic Hero archetype; but in any instance the result is imitation 'in every detail, with nothing

---

[51] Significantly, Carrier must use a broad definition of crucifixion: 'I shall mean by crucifixion (and "being crucified" and all other cognate terms and phrases) as any hanging up of the living or dead as a punishment, regardless of the exact details of how'; *On the Historicity of Jesus*, 61.

[52] See e.g. Carrier, *On the Historicity of Jesus*, 405; Thomas S. Verenna, 'Born Under the Law: Intertextuality and the Question of the Historicity of the Figure of Jesus in Paul's Epistles', in '*Is This Not the Carpenter'? The Question of the Historicity of the Figure of Jesus*, ed. Thomas L. Thompson and Thomas S. Verenna, Copenhagen International Seminar (Durham: Acumen, 2012), 131-59. The disappointing treatment of this episode by Crossan is pointed out by Mack, *The Christian Myth*, 36-37.

[53] See Price, *Deconstructing Jesus*, 213.

[54] See Price, *Deconstructing Jesus*, 258.

[55] See Mark Goodacre, 'Scripturalization in Mark's Crucifixion Narrative', in *The Trial and Death of Jesus: Essays on the Passion Narrative in Mark*, ed. Geert Van Oyen and Tom Shepherd, CBET 45 (Leuven: Peeters, 2006), 39-42.

[56] Crossan, *The Birth of Christianity*, 521. Crossan's *Who Killed Jesus?* works as an alternative to Raymond E. Brown's apologetic approach in *The Death of the Messiah: From Gethsemane to the Grave: A Commentary on the Passion Narratives in the Four Gospels*, 2 vols., Anchor Bible Reference Library (New York: Doubleday, 1999). Although Brown sees the creation process as involving embellishment from the Christian imagination (see, for instance, 1:14), he insists in seeing the 'basic incidents' of the Passion Narrative as derived from 'early Christian memory' (1:16). For instance, regarding the outcry of the Jewish crowd ('Crucify him'), he speaks of 'verisimilitude' (1:721). As to the notice about the presence of members of the Sanhedrin observing the crucifixion and mocking Jesus, according to him, it 'is not at all implausible' (2:1027). Brown's credulity is unbecoming to any critical historian.

left over'.[57] Unlike Crossan, they do not accept the existence of a set of 'bare facts'. Here is where I disagree and come to a parting of the ways regarding mythicism (and 'Jesus-agnosticism'). Although the proponents of these positions will surely consider those who disagree with them unduly credulous, I do not simply assume that there *must have been* a historical Jesus at the root of the biblical accounts. I think this is a conclusion that can be inferred as extremely probable from a careful survey of the evidence.

Just as in the case of the arrest, so also in the crucifixion accounts: as several scholars from different ideological backgrounds have argued, there are traces from which an alternative (and by far more plausible) version to that offered by the gospels can be drawn. That version can be reconstructed when the elements of the accounts which do not fit well into the main story-line—or which are never satisfactorily explained, much less in a unified manner—are seriously taken into account. Among these I enumerate these major ones: 1) The collective nature of the Golgotha execution (an extremely important clue because most accounts of crucifixion in the Roman empire—and particularly in the provincial realm—are collective executions);[58] 2) the description of the crucified in Mark and Matthew as

[57] See Price, *Deconstructing Jesus*, 250.

[58] I am well aware that not only mythicists (for instance, Earl Doherty, *Jesus, Neither God Nor Man: The Case for a Mythical Jesus* [Ottawa: Age of Reason Publications, 2009], 458) but also some mainstream scholars have argued that scriptural reflection on LXX Isa 53:12 may have prompted the creation of the scene of a collective crucifixion. For an answer to this objection, see Bermejo-Rubio, '(Why) Was Jesus Crucified Alone?', 129-30. According to some mythicists, 'a story about a crucified God who rose from the dead and ascended does predate the Passion narrative and Paul's crucified savior', and 'that the Messiah must undergo a humiliating, brutal and painful death was expected in some Jewish circles', so that 'such a view would not have shocked or disgusted his audience the way some scholars believe it would'; Verenna, 'Born Under the Law', 143-44. But if it were true, then why would Christians have created a *collective* crucifixion? There are, however, more problems. Even if such an idea existed, it would entail nothing about how widespread it was, nothing about its acceptability by a broader audience and nothing about the probability that it was the best (or just a good) option to persuade people within a Jewish and a Roman setting. And this means, in turn, that such a view would have indeed shocked or disgusted a part of the audience. Similar problems arise with Carrier's suggestion that Plato's *Resp.* 2.361b-362a, where Glaucon says that the only way to know if a man is truly just is to treat him completely as an unjust man, punished to the utmost and finally impaled/suspended (ὁ δίκαιος μαστιγώσεται, στρεβλώσεται, δεδήσεται, ἐκκαυθήσεται τὼφθαλμώ, τελευτῶν πάντα κακὰ παθῶν ἀνασχινδυλευθήσεται), is pertinent and illuminating for the reports on Jesus' crucifixion; *On the Historicity of Jesus*, 211-12. Incidentally, this passage has been used by Christian apologists (see, for instance, Joseph Ratzinger, *Jesus von Nazareth: Beiträge zur Christologie*, vol. 6/1 of *Gesammelte Schriften* [Freiburg: Herder Verlag GmbH, 2013], 574) with very different goals, although both Carrier and Ratzinger make the same double mistake: they translate ἀνασχινδυλεύω as 'crucify', and establish a

λῃσταί (this is also exceedingly significant because the most probable meaning of λῃσταί in this episode is not 'brigands', 'bandits', 'common criminals' or 'malefactors'—even less so 'thieves'—but anti-Roman insurgents);[59] 3) the overwhelming presence of the title 'king of the Jews' applied to Jesus in the Passion accounts and its consistence with several other traces of a royal claim by him;[60] 4) the presence of Jesus and his group at the Mount of Olives, which takes on special significance in the light of scriptural passages[61] and Josephus' report on the Egyptian rebel, and which, according to popular belief, was to be the place of the Messiah's or God's eschatological appearance; 5) the armed character of Jesus' group with swords and the coherence of this fact with Jesus' injunction to acquire swords,[62] along with the report that armed resistance was offered in Gethsemane;[63] 6) the reports on the armed character of the troops sent to arrest Jesus (a significant item, because nobody uses a sledgehammer to crack a nut); 7) the traces of revolutionary atmosphere in Jerusalem during this period, particularly the references to the στάσις and the στασιασταί in Mark 15:7 and Luke 23:19, and to violence with murderous result (φόνος). When the snippets (*disiecta membra*) hinting at an anti-Roman stance in Jesus' career are gathered and systematized,[64] and then added to the above-mentioned survey, one can begin to glimpse a very different—and by far more credible—story than that told by the gospel authors.

The underlying story of Jesus which is thereby unveiled has been told several times by critical authors at least since the sixteenth century: Martin Seidel,[65] Hermann

---

link between magnitudes lacking any historical or logical relationship (the Platonic passage and Jesus' story). *Ex absurdo quodlibet*.

[59] See Bermejo-Rubio, '(Why) Was Jesus Crucified Alone?', 129-35.

[60] See Dale C. Allison, *Constructing Jesus: Memory, Imagination, and History* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010), 233-40, 244-47; Fernando Bermejo-Rubio, 'La pretensión regia de Jesús el Galileo: Sobre la historicidad de un motivo en los relatos evangélicos', *Studia Historica – Historia Antigua* 33 (2015): 135-67; idem, 'Did Jesus the Galilean Redefine the Concept of Kingship? Apologetic Agendas from Ancient Texts to Modern Scholarship', *Annali di Storia dell'Esegesi* 35 (2018): 54-59.

[61] Zech 9:9; 14:21.

[62] Luke 22:35-38.

[63] On the armed character of Jesus' group, see, for instance, Dale B. Martin, 'Jesus in Jerusalem: Armed and Not Dangerous', *JSNT* 37 (2014): 3-24; idem, 'Response to Downing and Fredriksen', *JSNT* 37 (2015): 334-45.

[64] For an extensive treatment, see Fernando Bermejo-Rubio, 'Jesus and the Anti-Roman Resistance: A Reassessment of the Arguments', *JSHJ* 12 (2014): 1-105; idem, *La invención de Jesús de Nazaret*, 141-335.

[65] Martin Seidel, a Silesian proto-deist, wrote at the end of the sixteenth century. The detachment of the pages he devotes to Jesus, and the historical plausibility of his insightful remarks, make him a true landmark in the *Leben-Jesu-Forschung*. Long before Reimarus, Seidel realized the simultaneously reli-

Samuel Reimarus, Karl Kautsky, Robert Eisler, Samuel Brandon, Hyam Maccoby, Joel Carmichael and George Buchanan are only a few examples. It is the story of a first-century Jewish visionary who, religiously and nationalistically inspired, made a royal claim and, after having been involved in some anti-Roman preaching and/or activities, ended his life, along with other insurgents, at the hand of the Romans. Unfortunately, a reading of the above-mentioned aspects of the crucifixion accounts is missing from the works of mythicists and 'Jesus agnostics' alike (as, incidentally, it is also from mainstream scholarship).[66] In fact, they would claim that the unveiled story is nothing more than a mirage. There are, however, some remarkable points. First, the story makes sense, both internally (it is consistent) and contextually (it matches the political, social religious and economic circumstances of the first third of the 1st century CE). Second, it is not a copy of any other already known: it has a lot of parallels with many others—something to be expected—but it also presents some specific features – something to be also expected, since human beings are usually not carbon copies of others. This was clearly expressed by Alfred Loisy more than a century ago in his criticism of the ideas of Arthur Drews: the Jesus who can be critically reconstructed from the gospels is unmistakably a Jew of his age, but at the same time he is an individual with his own personality.[67] Third, the story itself helps explain the emergence of the gospel accounts and the development processes which have been detected in early Christian literature, namely, the increasing de-politicization, de-historicization and de-judaization of Jesus,

---

gious and political character of Jesus' (and his group's) hopes and goals, which he contextualized within the contemporary prophetic and messianic movements described by Josephus. See Francisco Socas and Pablo Toribio, eds., *Origo et Fundamenta religionis christianae: Un tratado clandestino del siglo XVII/Martin Seidel: edición, traducción y estudio*, Nueva Roma 46 (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 2017). For a more specific treatment, see Fernando Bermejo-Rubio, '*Hanc credo esse historiam veram de Jesu*: Martin Seidel's *Origo et Fundamenta religionis christianae*, An Overlooked Milestone in the Critical Study of Western Religion', *JR* 100 (2020): 295-326.

[66] In a chapter supposedly dedicated to crucifixion, Price only pays fleeting attention to crucifixions appearing in ancient Roman novels, but not to the many real crucifixions of rebels and dissidents throughout the Roman Empire. When he mentions the men crucified with Jesus, he follows a well-trodden path referring to 'thieves'; *Deconstructing Jesus*, 190. The same mistake is also made by others, for instance, Doherty, *Jesus, Neither God Nor Man*, 73, 458; Thomas L. Thompson, *The Messiah Myth: The Near Eastern Roots of Jesus and David* (2005; repr., London: Pimlico, 2007), 99 ('criminals', 'thieves'); Crossan, *Who Killed Jesus?*, 133-41.

[67] 'Jésus, étant juif, ayant été élevé dans le judaïsme, ne dit rien qui ne se puisse expliquer par le judaïsme. Mais ce qu'il dit n'en porte moins l'empreinte de sa personnalité, n'en est pas moins en rapport avec la mission qu'il se donne, et n'en forme pas moins un enseignement homogène, original, qui n'appartient qu'à lui, que ses disciples ont reçu de lui et qu'ils n'auraient pas su combiner pour le lui prêter'; Alfred Loisy, *À propos d'histoire des religions* (Paris: Chez L'Auteur, 1911), 286-87.

which betrays the unpalatable nature of his original story. In fact, although the terseness of the gospel accounts in some key respects is understood by mythicists as proof of the fictional and non-referential character of the narratives, it can be more convincingly explained in terms of the 'selective forgetting' envisaged by Cognitive Dissonance Theory in the case of failed millenarian groups.[68]

4. Methodological Remarks

In the last section, terms like 'traces' and 'clues' were used. I am there referring to the 'evidential paradigm' set forth by the Italian historian Carlo Ginzburg in the influential centerpiece of his already classical volume *Miti, emblemi, spie*, translated into English as *Clues, Myths, and the Historical Method*.[69] In this contribution Ginzburg places historical knowledge in a long tradition of cognitive practices connecting medical symptomatology, art criticism, detective work and psychoanalysis. Within this paradigm the researchers divert their attention from the general impression and main features of an object (a body, a picture or a text), and lay stress on the significance of minor details and usually unconsidered, unnoticed trifles. It is, so to say, a method of interpretation based on discarded information and marginal data, which ultimately reveal themselves as very significant. Through it details usually considered of little importance, even trivial, provide the key for approaching higher matters.[70] As Ginzburg put it, 'infinitesimal traces permit the comprehension of a deeper, otherwise unattainable reality'.[71] This is also the method followed by Sigmund Freud when treating the meaning of parapraxes (what in English are collectively called 'Freudian slips') in his *Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis*:

> Are there not very important things which can only reveal themselves, under certain conditions and at certain times, by quite feeble indications?...So do not let us under-estimate small indications; by their help we may succeed in getting on the track of something bigger.[72]

---

[68] See Leon Festinger, A *Theory of Cognitive Dissonance* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1957), 163; Fernando Bermejo-Rubio, 'The Process of Jesus' Deification and Cognitive Dissonance Theory', *Numen* 54 (2017): 131-33.

[69] Carlo Ginzburg, *Miti, emblemi, spie: morfologia e storia*, Nuovo Politecnico 152 (Torino: Einaudi, 1986).

[70] When it comes to the study of religious phenomena, it is amusing to recall what Morelli wrote: 'I miei avversari si compiacciono di qualificarmi per uno il quale non sa vedere il senso spirituale di un'opera d'arte e per questo dà una particolare importanza a mezzi esteriori'; apud Ginzburg, *Miti, emblemi, spie*, 164.

[71] 'Tracce magari infinitesimali consentono di cogliere una realtà più profonda, altrimenti inattingibile. Tracce: più precisamente, sintomi (nel caso di Freud) indizi (nel caso di Sherlock Holmes) segni pittorici (nel caso di Morelli)'; Ginzburg, *Miti, emblemi, spie*, 165.

[72] 'Gibt es nicht sehr bedeutungsvolle Dinge, die sich unter gewissen Bedingungen und zu gewissen Zeiten nur durch ganz schwache Anzeichen verraten können? [...] Lassen Sie uns also die kleinen

Although Ginzburg argued that the emergence of this epistemological model took place towards the end of the nineteenth century in the humanities, I would like to add that some precedent for this evidential paradigm can be found in Reimarus' *Apologie oder Schutzschrift für die vernünftigen Verehrer Gottes*, written in the mid-eighteenth century. A section of this work—posthumously published by Lessing as *Von dem Zweck Jesu und seiner Jünger*—aims at critically reconstructing the historical figure of Jesus.[73] The rationale underlying the use of these traces is that, since the belief system which is clearly conveyed in the gospels is that of a spiritual savior of mankind, one can confidently accept as reliable vestiges of the original view those passages hinting at a political deliverer and at a material, this-worldly kingdom.[74] This is what Reimarus calls 'the remnants of the old system' or 'the traces of the former system'.[75]

The evidential paradigm becomes significant when the approach of mythicists and philo-mythicists is carefully scrutinized. These scholars constantly compare Jesus' gospel stories to the lives of characters like Moses, Solomon, Theseus, Herakles, Odysseus or Dionysus. But unlike the wholly fictitious lives of so many legendary figures, which offer a relatively harmonious portrayal of the main character, the gospels are not a seamless tunic. In the gospels we have scattered pieces of information that do not fit well into the main story-line of a universal savior bringing peace and love, and alien to contemporary political conflicts. Among these elements we find, for instance, the deep hostility between Jesus and Herod Antipas;

Anzeichen nicht unterschätzen; vielleicht gelingt es, von ihnen aus Grösserem auf die Spur zu kommen'; Sigmund Freud, *Vorlesungen zur Einführung in die Psychoanalyse*, *Gesammelte Werke XI* (1944; repr., Frankfurt am Main: S. Fischer, 1973), 20. We could also cite a statement by Sherlock Holmes: 'It has long been an axiom of mine that the little things are infinitely the most important'; Arthur Conan Doyle, *The Adventures of Sherlock Holmes* (London: George Newnes, 1892), 64.

[73] The seven fragments published by Lessing between 1774 and 1778 were part of a larger work by Reimarus which was not edited until the past century; see Gerhard Alexander, ed., *Apologie; oder, Schutzschrift für die vernünftigen Verehrer Gottes*, 2 vols. (Frankfurt: Insel Verlag, 1972).

[74] Or, as Joel Carmichael put it, 'anything that conflicts with this transformation of perspective is likely to be true'; *The Death of Jesus: With a 'New View' Constituting a Fundamental Revision of the History of the Origins of Christianity* (New York: Barnes & Noble, 1982), 12.

[75] 'Überbleibsel des alten Systematis', 'Spuren ihres vorigen Systematis'; Gotthold Ephraim Lessing, *Werke, Siebenter Band: Theologiekritische Schriften I und II*, vol. 7 of *Werke*, ed. Herbert G. Göpfert with Helmut Göbel, 8 vols. (1970-1979; repr. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1996), 545-46 (*Von dem Zwecke Jesu und seiner Jünger: Noch ein Fragment des Wolfenbüttelschen Ungenannten*); see also Alexander, *Apologie* 2:145. Reimarus clearly perceived that the relative scarcity of those traces is due to the fact that the original story has been tampered with (see further, Alexander, *Apologie*, 2:141-42).

a lot of evidence indicating that Jesus considered himself a king or God's viceroy; the presence of swords in his group; Jesus' promise to his disciples that they would sit on thrones to judge and rule Israel's twelve restored tribes;[76] the this-worldly, material dimensions of the announced kingdom of God; the expectation of a political deliverance of Israel by Jesus;[77] the evidence indicating that Jesus opposed the payment of tribute to Rome;[78] the demand for a readiness to undergo crucifixion which is implied in the exhortations of Jesus to take up the cross;[79] the political charges against Jesus in Luke 23:2, 5; the violent character of the Temple's incident; the bellicose nature of Jesus' most intimate disciples; and so on.[80]

The sobering lesson is that all these pieces, put together, present a consistent story which makes sense, and delineate a figure somehow involved in anti-Roman resistance. The convergence of these and many other related items constitutes a pattern that is obviously at odds with the overall impression conveyed by the evangelists, according to which Jesus had nothing to do with the dirty matters of politics in first-century Judaea. Thus the presence of this pattern means that the inconsistent character of the gospel accounts is not a random or an enigmatic phenomenon. To use Polonius' words in Hamlet, there is a method in this apparent madness. Or, as Carmichael put it, 'the gospel narrative... gives us a general impression of incoherence, which is reinforced by a study of the details. Nor is this merely the incoherence of an imperfectly remembered event; the incoherence is the result of dynamic factors–it is *tendentiously* incoherent'.[81] The fact that an underlying story can be glimpsed behind the gospels means, in turn, that, in these writings not everything is reducible to literary borrowing.

The former reflections strongly suggest that the gospels' Jesus was not created *ex nihilo*. Had it been created in this way, the accounts about him would presumably have been far more homogeneous. The fact that our sources are systematically inconsistent and are riddled with incongruities is better explained if we assume that a real figure on the stage of history was modified in the later tradition. Such transformation happened not because the original figure was a myth, but rather because

---

[76] Matt 19:28; Luke 22:36-38.

[77] See Luke 24:21; Acts 1:6.

[78] A reading of Mark 12:13-17—in the sense that nothing whatever is owed to Caesar presumably in the same line and with the same rationale as Judas the Galilean—is strongly supported by Luke 23:2; see, for instance, Richard A. Horsley, *Jesus and the Spiral of Violence: Popular Jewish Resistance in Roman Palestine* (1987; repr., Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 306-17.

[79] Mark 8:34-9:1; Matt 16:24-28; Luke 9:23-27.

[80] For a more exhaustive list, see Bermejo-Rubio, 'Jesus and the Anti-Roman Resistance', 8-15.

[81] Carmichael, *The Death of Jesus*, 41 (italics original).

he was, so to say, *far too historical*–in the sense that he was embedded to such an extent in temporal, spatial and ideological circumstances, that these quickly became disturbing for the exaltation process undergone by the memory of him.[82] After all, the view of Jesus as a man sharing the ideology and values of many of his contemporaries gives the lie to the myth of his uniqueness. The view of him as a nationalistic-minded Jew, showing partiality and not being indifferent to the Roman control of his land, deals a fatal blow to the idea of the Universal Lord.[83] The view of him spearheading an armed group debunks the notion of the pacific and meek Man of Sorrows. The view that he was actively involved in anti-Roman resistance makes exceedingly implausible the idea that he went to his death voluntarily[84] and shatters to pieces the moving story of a helpless victim. Key elements of the Christian myth accordingly begin to collapse. Unfortunately, however, mythicists do not even admit the possibility of envisaging any meaning in the available sources. They do not seem to detect the traces and, assuming the non-historicity of Jesus, do not make the effort at obtaining a historically credible reconstruction.[85]

A connected shortcoming of mythicists is their stance towards the so-called 'criteria of historicity'. They are admittedly right in pointing out the flaws of these criteria, because the problems with many criteria as used in mainstream scholarship are real, as has been argued for decades by some savants (like Morna Hooker) and has been further argued more recently.[86] Nevertheless, the outright refusal of their validity is a sweeping procedure that is at best debatable because, even accepting—for the sake of the discussion—that the debunking of the traditional cri-

---

[82] The formula 'far too historical' is used by Bart D. Ehrman, *Did Jesus Exist? The Historical Argument for Jesus of Nazareth* (New York: HarperOne, 2012), 334.

[83] Samuel G.F. Brandon was correct that in Christian thought the development of the doctrine of the divinity of Christ and his role as the savior of all mankind makes it hard to contemplate that he could have involved himself in Jewish domestic affairs, especially of a revolutionary kind; *Jesus and the Zealots: A Study of the Political Factor in Primitive Christianity* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1967), 320.

[84] As Maccoby has remarked, 'When Jesus entered Jerusalem in his final bid for power he knew he was risking his life; but he did not *aim* at losing his life. He aimed at success, at defeating the Romans and establishing the kingdom of God on earth'; *Revolution in Judaea*, 135-36 (italics original).

[85] In fact, in the abundant bibliographies of their volumes the works of Reimarus, Eisler, Brandon, Maccoby, Buchanan, Carmichael and other scholars like them are usually conspicuous by their absence. This happens, for instance, with Carrier, *On the Historicity of Jesus*. It is also true of the 'Jesus agnostics', for instance, in the (otherwise very lengthy) bibliography of Avalos, *The Bad Jesus*.

[86] See, for instance, Chris Keith and Anthony Le Donne, eds., *Jesus, Criteria, and the Demise of Authenticity* (London: T. & T. Clark, 2012); Dale C. Allison, 'How to Marginalize the Traditional Criteria of Authenticity', in *How to Study the Historical Jesus*, vol. 1 of *Handbook for the Study of the Historical Jesus*, ed. Tom Holmén and Stanley Porter, 4 vols. (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 3-30.

teria is well-grounded, this would not lead us necessarily to an impasse, since such tools are not the only ones which can be used to critically reconstruct a historical figure. In fact, even Dale C. Allison, who has been vocal about the limits of the criteria, has recently restated an alternative access that had been already advanced on several occasions in the history of Jesus research; this method—now enhanced by modern cognitive studies of memory—does not aim at establishing a residuum of single items, but consists in the realization of the existence of recurring motifs and patterns across the gospels. Furthermore, although the present methodological discussion has also involved criticisms of the usefulness of the criterion of embarrassment—also by some mythicists[87]—I have extensively argued elsewhere that those criticisms are not justified. In fact, the criterion of embarrassment is not an idiosyncratic concept merely dreamed up for Jesus studies, because its logic applies in other fields of history in which truth assessment of suspect sources is sought.[88] My point is that the most promising criteria (recurrent patterns, embarrassment and contextual plausibility) can be applied to the above-mentioned material, which contradicts the main story-line of the gospels.

Now, the interesting thing is that, as I have argued elsewhere, a close reading of the gospel accounts compels us to reconstruct the events of Jesus' arrest and crucifixion in a way which is rather different from the version concocted by the evangelists or their forerunners. That reconstruction, which takes seriously into account the traces of a different story, is not reducible to the influence of the scriptures and is not only by far more plausible and meaningful, but also epistemologically and heuristically more satisfactory: the disturbing nature of that version for Jesus' followers in the last third of the first century contributes to explaining the emergence of the gospels themselves as works whose authors tampered with the evidence.

5. An Unfathomable Chaos?, or Where Mythicism and Martin Kähler's School Agree

Mythicism is not the only school of thought in the field which claims that the historical Jesus enterprise is doomed to failure. At least since the end of the nineteenth century a confessional-driven trend, going from Martin Kähler to Luke Timothy Johnson and beyond, maintains the irrelevance, and even the impossibil-

---

[87] Carrier claims to have demonstrated that this criterion 'is simply incapable of extracting reliable history from the Gospels'; *On the Historicity of Jesus*, 400; see idem, *Proving History: Bayes's Theorem and the Quest for the Historical Jesus* (Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books, 2012), 124-69.

[88] Fernando Bermejo-Rubio, 'Changing Methods, Disturbing Material: Should the Criterion of Embarrassment be Dismissed in Jesus Research?', *REJ* 175 (2016): 1-25.

ity, of historical research about Jesus.[89] There are several intriguing points within that approach. The first one is that their claims are ultimately untenable, and have been indeed shattered by several convincing criticisms, which have unveiled in them ideological and apologetic interests.[90] The second one is that some basic claims of these authors overlap with those of the mythicists: in both apparently different approaches is found the contention that the existence of many contradictory versions of Jesus reflects a confused and chaotic mass of disparate opinions which, in turn, show the entire quest for criteria to have failed.[91]

Our former conclusions, however, debunk the widespread view that the manifold scholarly reconstructions of a historical Jesus have 'nearly equal plausibility', so that they 'cancel each other out'.[92] There is every indication that this is simply untrue. On the one hand, some portraits of Jesus are not mutually exclusive; for instance, there is no contradiction at all between being a religious teacher and being a seditionist.[93] Since people engaged in nationalistic resistance need not be monomaniacs, Jesus can have been an apocalyptic preacher who gathered a group of disciples, harbored a royal claim and gained fame as an exorcist and healer.[94] On the other hand, the several hypotheses which have been set forth are not at all equivalent. The degree of contextual plausibility and explanatory power of the hypothesis of a Jesus who, whatever else might be true, was 'politically revolutionary' is unparalleled in any other alternative: it provides the simplest and most co-

---

[89] See Martin Kähler, *Der sogennante historische Jesus und der geschichtliche, biblische Christus* (Leipzig: A. Deichert, 1892); Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Real Jesus: The Misguided Quest for the Historical Jesus and the Truth of the Traditional Gospels* (San Francisco: Harper-San Francisco, 1996). A more recent representative in the aftermath of Kähler is Klaus Wengst, *Der wirkliche Jesus? Eine Streitschrift über die historisch wenig ergiebige und theologisch sinnlose Suche nach dem 'historischen' Jesus* (Stuttgart: Verlag W. Kohlhammer, 2013).

[90] See Robert J. Miller, 'The Jesus of Orthodoxy and the Jesuses of the Gospels: A Critique of Luke Timothy Johnson's *The Real Jesus*', *JSNT* 68 (1997): 101-20; idem, 'History Is Not Optional: A Response to *The Real Jesus* by L.T. Johnson', *BTB* 28 (1998): 27-34; idem, *The Jesus Seminar and Its Critics* (Santa Rosa, CA: Polebridge Press, 1999), 79-107. Johnson's fallacies and inconsistencies have also been unveiled in Fernando Bermejo-Rubio, 'Historiografía, exégesis e ideología: La ficción contemporánea de las "tres búsquedas" del Jesús histórico (II)', *RCT* 31 (2006): 76-85.

[91] See e.g. Carrier, *Proving History*, 12-13; Wengst, *Der wirkliche Jesus?*, 209, 250-51.

[92] See e.g. Price, *Deconstructing Jesus*, 16; Carrier, *Proving History*, 12: 'the many contradictory versions of Jesus now confidently touted by different Jesus scholars are all so very plausible'.

[93] Let us recall the case of the two great Torah teachers (σοφισταί) who encouraged their disciples to cut the Roman eagle down from above the temple gate as Herod lay dying (*J.W.* 1.648-651); Judas the Galilean is also called a σοφιστής (*J.W.* 2.118). When referring to the death of John the Baptist (*Ant.* 18.18), Josephus shows that Herod Antipas was not bothered about such distinctions.

[94] See Bermejo-Rubio, 'Jesus and the Anti-Roman Resistance', 49-51.

gent explanation for a large amount of data—not least the crucifixion, which, unlike that which many scholars in parrot-fashion repeat, is not at all an 'enigma' or a 'mystery'. Whilst the 'explanations' found in the gospels and modern mainstream scholarship are patently inadequate—that Jesus was crucified because he was hated by priests, because he had blasphemed, because he was misunderstood, because Pilate was the victim of pressure by the malevolent Jewish authorities, and so on—Jesus' actual opposition to Roman rule makes his execution on the cross wholly understandable. Moreover, if he was the leader of a movement, the report of a collective crucifixion makes perfect sense. This explanatory power of the hypothesis, which allows us to provide a unifying explanation for the evidence, is a most compelling reason for any independent historian to integrate the seditious aspects into their reconstruction of Jesus.[95]

When one takes the trouble of assessing the explanatory power of the hypotheses which have been set forth in the research, it becomes clear that the contention of their basic equivalence not only does not hold, but it is intellectually irresponsible. This irresponsibility is evident, given that some scholars take to task historical Jesus studies by affirming that 'the link between the teachings of Jesus on the one hand and the story of his crucifixion on the other is missing' and that 'the textual data for reconstructing the historical Jesus are inadequate'.[96] This is admittedly a sound criticism of mainstream scholarship, which, being clearly allergic to identifying politically subversive material in Jesus' message, is thereby incapable of providing a compelling explanation of his crucifixion. As an overall judgment on Jesus research, however, it is—as I have argued above—entirely unsound.

Another typical procedure through which the value of Jesus research is often downplayed or relativized in some quarters is to posit the alleged projective nature of every portrait of the Galilean preacher. According to this already familiar charge, scholars see just a reflection of their own faces looking down into the depths of a well rather than revealing any portrait of the historical Jesus. Such a widespread contention asserts that research is irretrievably subjective insofar as people who carry it out see nothing of the historical Galilean but rather render him in their own image. Both mythicists and conservative scholars in the wake of Martin Kähler repeat once and again this trite notion; in Jesus research, as Price puts it, there is nothing but 'hermeneutical ventriloquism'.[97] Although this criti-

---

[95] For an extensive treatment of the explanatory value of this hypothesis, see Bermejo-Rubio, 'Jesus and the Anti-Roman Resistance', 51-85.

[96] Mack, *The Christian Myth*, 36-37.

[97] See Price, *Deconstructing Jesus*, 177-78: 'Jesus remains the ventriloquist dummy of Christian dogma'; Wengst, *Der wirkliche Jesus?*, 208-09.

cism is fair indeed in many cases, as a generalization it is simply unfounded. The reconstruction of Jesus I have already referenced cannot be honestly reduced to a mere 'projection' or some kind of spurious interest, not only because the views of its first proponents (Seidel and Reimarus) were very different from those of the historical Jesus they detected in the gospels,[98] but also because those views have been endorsed through the centuries by scholars with very different cultural and ideological backgrounds.

6. Conclusions and Further Remarks

As it has been argued above, some mythicist claims should be seriously taken into account, inasmuch as their proponents are right in pointing out the serious problems of the available sources and the great extent of their literary borrowings. This attention to an often hastily discarded trend can only improve the critical regard of the historian. At the same time, I have argued that the main contention of mythicists (and 'Jesus-agnostics') seems to be ultimately unconvincing.[99] As proved in the survey of the episodes regarding Jesus' arrest and crucifixion—whose details are never satisfactorily explained by mythicists[100]—the hypothesis that an underlying story of a Galilean preacher involved in anti-Roman resistance has been tampered with and partially replaced by fanciful and embellished narratives accounts for the many gospel inconsistencies and makes sense of the whole evidence. This implies that a certain Jesus existed, although there is every indication that he was significantly different from the mythic hero created by the evangelists and the underlying tradition represented by Paul.

The explanation that an all-too-human being named Jesus did indeed exist as a first-century Galilean Jew, that his unexpected failure triggered among his followers a considerable reinterpretation of his fate and that, despite the glorifying and divinizing process which was carried out by them, traces of his historical personality and activities remain embedded in our biased sources is, in my opinion, by

[98] Wengst remarks that Reimarus ascribed to Jesus a 'rational religion', thereby indicating that this is a projective procedure; *Der wirkliche Jesus?*, 40-42, 208. This remark is correct, and shows that even such a critical thinker as the German *Aufklärer* was a son of his time and made some obvious mistakes. Nevertheless, this is not a fair assessment, because the core of Reimarus' work lies elsewhere.

[99] For further recent criticisms, see Daniel N. Gullotta, 'On Richard Carrier's Doubts', *JSHJ* 15 (2017): 310-46; and Simon J. Gathercole, 'The Historical and Humane Existence of Jesus in Paul's Letters', *JSHJ* 16 (2018): 183-212, who argues that the mythicist claims are seriously undermined by the evidence of the undisputed Pauline epistles.

[100] This is perceived, for instance, in Price's 'explanation' of Jesus' entry into Jerusalem and the crucifixion as a mixture of disparate sources, 'a Christian mosaic'; *Deconstructing Jesus*, 241-46.

far the simplest and most cogent explanation for the whole available evidence. A basic rule of method in scientific research is that (all things being equal—the *ceteris paribus* clause must be respected) the simplest explanation that also covers the largest amount of data is to be preferred. This rule can be applied precisely in our case. Therefore, Occam's Razor makes this hypothesis compelling in a scientific context. Admittedly, given the obvious limits of our sources (which contain large tracts of fiction), this conclusion should be responsibly regarded for its greater plausibility, but not for its absolute certainty.[101]

The alternative hypotheses contrived to oppose this solution happen to be somewhat far-fetched. In fact, mythicism is not a minimalist, but a maximalistic theory, inasmuch as it asserts that no evidence hinting at the historical existence of Jesus is reliable.[102] This contention compels mythicists to display a whole complex set of auxiliary hypotheses and sub-hypotheses in order to claim that every source is a fabrication or means something different than its apparent meaning. The problem lies in the fact that quite a few of these auxiliary hypotheses are far from settled, to say the least.[103] When one realizes that some of them are not particularly convincing—and that others are probably untenable—the probability that Jesus did not exist exponentially decreases.[104]

---

[101] *Pace* Ehrman, *Did Jesus Exist?*, 4, 173.

[102] We should emphatically assert that demand of further evidence on Jesus beyond that which is available sounds odd, given the scarce historical evidence for so many characters in antiquity, particularly for those figures having a low socio-economic status. As it has been rightly observed, 'to deny his existence based on the absence of such evidence, even if that were the case, has problematic implications; you may as well deny the existence of pretty much everyone in the ancient world': Justin J. Meggit, '"More Ingenious than Learned"?: Examining the Quest for the Non-Historical Jesus', *NTS* 65 (2019): 459.

[103] For instance, Carrier states the following: the existence in the pre-Christian epoch of a notion of a dying-and-rising Messiah; the idea that the most plausible explanation for the gap found in the *Annals* of Tacitus (from the middle of 29 to the middle of 31 CE) is the embarrassment at its omission of any mention of Jesus; the wholly fictitious character of the *Testimonium Flavianum* and of the mention of Jesus' brother in *Jewish Antiquities*; the idea that Tacitus' notice on Jesus is an interpolation; the interpretation of the names 'Alexander' and 'Rufus' in Mark 15:21 as a symbolic reference to Alexander the Great and Musonius Rufus; the notion that someone invented the story that Jesus was crucified by Romans and the names of his relatives; and so on—see *On the Historicity of Jesus*, 36-37, 73, 303, 332-42, 344-46, 444-51, 453-54, respectively. The bizarre extremes at which some mythicists arrive cheapen and detract from the legitimate points they undoubtedly make.

[104] For instance, the hypothesis that the *Testimonium Flavianum* is a whole (Christian) creation cannot convincingly explain the several traces hinting at the existence of a negative *Vorlage* of that passage. For a detailed treatment of this matter, see Fernando Bermejo-Rubio, 'Was the Hypothetical *Vorlage* of the *Testimonium Flavianum* a "Neutral" Text? Challenging the Common Wisdom on *Antiquitates Ju-*

The debatable nature of the mythicist stance is also seen in other improbable corollaries. On the one hand, it compels us to attribute a large measure of systematic deception to the compilers or creators of the Pauline letters and the gospels; although this is not impossible, it is not the simplest and most natural explanation. On the other hand, it compels us to argue that all sayings ascribed to Jesus are not authentic and were attributed to him by people of later date; but then we must again believe in the existence of wonderfully creative mind(s) who invented such a complex character.[105] This may perhaps stretch our credence even more than the traditional view that the gospel writers transmitted some sayings that had been handed down to them, but that they added others.[106]

Once more, Alfred Loisy's concise formulation deserves to be cited: 'We can explain Jesus, (but) we cannot explain those people who would have invented him'.[107] To put it in a more qualified manner, it seems to be simpler and easier to account for the existence of a critically 'reconstructed' or 'reformulated' Jesus than to explain the identity, the methods and the reasons of those who would presumably have carried out a wholesale concoction of this figure.

Bibliography

Aichele, George. 'Jesus' Violence'. Pages 72-91 in *Violence, Utopia and the Kingdom of God: Fantasy and Ideology in the Bible*. Edited by Tina Pippin and George Aichele. London and New York: Routledge, 1998.

Alexander, Gerhard, ed. *Apologie oder Schutzschrift für die vernünftigen Verehrer Gottes*. 2 vols. Frankfurt: Insel Verlag, 1972.

Allison, Dale C. *Constructing Jesus: Memory, Imagination, and History*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010.

____. 'How to Marginalize the Traditional Criteria of Authenticity'. Pages 3-30 in *How to Study the Historical Jesus*. Vol. 1 of *Handbook for the Study of the Historical Jesus*. Edited by Tom Holmén and Stanley Porter. 4 vols. Leiden: Brill, 2011.

daicae XVIII 63-64', *JSJ* 45 (2014): 326-65. This approach has been recently endorsed by John Curran, '"To Be or to Be Thought to Be": The *Testimonium Flavianum* (Again)', *NovT* 59 (2017): 71-94.

[105] 'We have, admittedly, no proof that Jesus authored any of the materials that, once heard, are hard to forget. So doubt we will always have with us. At the same time, all the relevant items are attributed to him, not to anyone else, and I know of no explanatory advantage in assigning them to some anonymous contemporary or contemporaries of his'; Allison, *Constructing Jesus*, 24.

[106] See Hyam Maccoby, *Jesus the Pharisee* (London: SCM Press, 2003), 90-91.

[107] 'On s'explique Jésus. On ne s'explique pas ceux qui l'auraient inventé'; Loisy, *À propos d'histoire des religions*, 290.

Avalos, Héctor. *The Bad Jesus: The Ethics of New Testament Ethics*. The Bible in the Modern World 68. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2015.

Bermejo-Rubio, Fernando. 'Between Gethsemane and Golgotha, or Who Arrested the Galilean(s)? Challenging a Deep-Rooted Assumption in New Testament Research'. *Annali di Storia dell'Esegesi* 33 (2016): 311-39.

____. 'Changing Methods, Disturbing Material: Should the Criterion of Embarrassment be-Dismissed in Jesus Research'? *REJ* 175 (2016): 1-25.

____. 'Did Jesus the Galilean Redefine the Concept of Kingship? Apologetic Agendas from Ancient Texts to Modern Scholarship'. *Annali di Storia dell'Esegesi* 35 (2018): 53-84.

____. '*Hanc credo esse historiam veram de Jesu*: Martin Seidel's *Origo et Fundamenta religionis christianae*, An Overlooked Milestone in the Critical Study of Western Religion', *JR* 100 (2020): 295-326.

____. 'Historiografía, exégesis e ideología: La ficción contemporánea de las "tres búsquedas" del Jesús histórico (II)'. *RCT* 31 (2006): 53-114.

____. 'Jesus and the Anti-Roman Resistance: A Reassessment of the Arguments'. *JSHJ* 12 (2014): 1-105.

____. *La invención de Jesús de Nazaret: Historia, ficción, historiografía*. 2nd ed. Madrid: Siglo XXI de España Editores, S.A., 2018.

____. 'La pretensión regia de Jesús el Galileo: Sobre la historicidad de un motivo en los relatos evangélicos'. *Studia Historica – Historia Antigua* 33 (2015): 135-67.

____. 'The Day of the Lord is Coming: Jesus and the Book of Zechariah'. Pages 111-31 in *Jesus and the Scriptures: Problems, Passages and Patterns*. Edited by Tobias Hägerland. Library of Historical Jesus Studies 9/LNTS 552. London: Bloomsbury T. & T. Clark, 2016.

____. 'The Process of Jesus' Deification and Cognitive Dissonance Theory'. *Numen* 54 (2017): 119-52.

____. 'Was the Hypothetical *Vorlage* of the *Testimonium Flavianum* a "Neutral" Text? Challenging the Common Wisdom on *Antiquitates Judaicae* XVIII 63-64'. *JSJ* 45 (2014): 326-65.

____. '(Why) Was Jesus Crucified Alone? Solving a False Conundrum'. *JSNT* 36 (2013): 127-54.

Bourgel, Jonathan. 'Les récits synoptiques de la Passion préservent-ils une couche narrative composée à la veille de la Grande Révolte Juive'? *NTS* 58 (2012): 503-21.

Brandon, Samuel G. F. *Jesus and the Zealots: A Study of the Political Factor in Primitive Christianity*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1967.

____. 'Jesus and the Zealots: Aftermath'. *BJRL* 54 (1971): 47-66.

Brodie, Thomas L. *Beyond the Quest for the Historical Jesus: Memoir of a Discovery*. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2012.

Brown, Raymond E. *The Death of the Messiah: From Gethsemane to the Grave: A Commentary on the Passion Narratives in the Four Gospels*. 2 vols. Anchor Bible Reference Library. New York: Doubleday, 1999.

Brown, W. Norman. *The Indian and Christian Miracles of Walking on the Water*. Chicago: Open Court, 1928.

Bultmann, Rudolf. *Jesus and the Word*. Translated by Louise Pettibone Smith and Erminie Huntresse Lantero. New York: Scribners, 1958.

Carmichael, Joel. *The Death of Jesus: With a 'New View' Constituting a Fundamental Revision of the History of the Origins of Christianity*. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1982.

Carrier, Richard. *On the Historicity of Jesus: Why We Might Have Reason for Doubt*. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2014.

____. *Proving History: Bayes's Theorem and the Quest for the Historical Jesus*. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books, 2012.

Collins, Adela Yarbro. *Mark: A Commentary*. Edited by Harold W. Attridge. Hermeneia. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2007.

Conan Doyle, Arthur. *The Adventures of Sherlock Holmes*. London: George Newnes, 1892.

Crossan, John Dominic. *The Birth of Christianity: Discovering What Happened in the Years Immediately After the Execution of Jesus*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1998.

____. *Who Killed Jesus? Exposing the Roots of Anti-Semitism in the Gospel Story of the Death of Jesus*. New York: HarperCollins, 1995.

Curran, John. '"To Be or to Be Thought to Be": The *Testimonium Flavianum* (Again)'. *NovT* 59 (2017): 71-94.

Cuvillier, Elian. 'Maurice Goguel (1880-1955)'. *Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français* 149 (2003): 549-67.

Doherty, Earl. *Jesus, Neither God Nor Man: The Case for a Mythical Jesus*. Ottawa: Age of Reason Publications, 2009.

Dunn, James D. G. 'John the Baptist's Use of Scripture'. Pages 42-54 in *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and W. Richard Stegner. JSNTSup 104. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.

Ehrman, Bart D. *Did Jesus Exist? The Historical Argument for Jesus of Nazareth*. New York: HarperOne, 2012.

Festinger, Leon. A *Theory of Cognitive Dissonance*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1957.

France, R. T. *Jesus and the Old Testament: His Application of Old Testament Passages to Himself and His Mission*. 1971. Repr., Grand Rapids: Baker, 1982.

Freud, Sigmund. *Vorlesungen zur Einführung in die Psychoanalyse*, *Gesammelte Werke XI*. 1944. Repr., Frankfurt am Main: S. Fischer, 1973.

Frye, Northrop. *Words with Power: Being a Second Study of 'The Bible and Literature'*. San Diego: Harcourt, Brace & Jovanovich, 1990.

Gathercole, Simon J. 'The Historical and Humane Existence of Jesus in Paul's Letters'. *JSHJ* 16 (2018): 183-212.

Ginzburg, Carlo. *Miti, emblemi, spie: Morfologia e storia*. Nuovo politecnico 152. Torino: Einaudi, 1986.

Goguel, Maurice. 'Juifs et Romains dans l'histoire de la passion'. *RHR* 62 (1910): 165-82, 295-322.

Goodacre, Mark. 'Scripturalization in Mark's Crucifixion Narrative'. Pages 33-47 in *The Trial and Death of Jesus: Essays on the Passion Narrative in Mark*. Edited by Geert Van Oyen and Tom Shepherd. CBET 45. Leuven: Peeters, 2006.

Gullotta, Daniel N. 'On Richard Carrier's Doubts'. *JSHJ* 15 (2017): 310-46.

Hägerland, Tobias, ed. *Jesus and the Scriptures: Problems, Passages and Patterns*. Library of Historical Jesus Studies 9/LNTS 552. London: Bloomsbury T. & T. Clark, 2016.

Helms, Randel. *Gospel Fictions*. Buffalo, NY: Prometheus, 1988.

Horsley, Richard A. *Jesus and the Spiral of Violence: Popular Jewish Resistance in Roman Palestine*. 1987. Repr., Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993.

Johnson, Luke Timothy. *The Real Jesus: The Misguided Quest for the Historical Jesus and the Truth of the Traditional Gospels*. San Francisco: Harper-SanFrancisco, 1996.

Kähler, Martin. *Der sogennante historische Jesus und der geschichtliche, biblische Christus*. Leipzig: A. Deichert, 1892.

Kautsky, Karl. *Der Ursprung des Christentums: Eine historische Untersuchung*. Stuttgart: J.H.W. Dietz Nachfolgerin, 1908.

Keith, Chris and Anthony Le Donne, eds. *Jesus, Criteria, and the Demise of Authenticity*. London: T. & T. Clark, 2012.

Kuhn, Heinz-Wolfgang. 'Die Kreuzesstrafe während der frühen Kaiserzeit: Ihre Wirklichkeit und Wertung in der Umwelt des Christentums'. *ANRW* II.25.1:648-793. Edited by Hildegard Temporini and Wolfgang Haase. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1972-1996. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 1982.

Lessing, Gotthold Ephraim. *Werke, Siebenter Band: Theologiekritische Schriften I und II*. Vol. 7 of *Werke*. Edited by Herbert G. Göpfert with Helmut Göbel. 8 vols. 1970-1979. Repr., Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1996.

Litwa, David M. *Iesus Deus: The Early Christian Depiction of Jesus as a Mediterranean God*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2014.

Loisy, Alfred. *À propos d'histoire des religions*. Paris: Chez l'Auteur, 1911.

Maccoby, Hyam. *Jesus the Pharisee*. London: SCM Press, 2003.

____. *Revolution in Judaea: Jesus and The Jewish Resistance*. London: Ocean, 1973.

MacDonald, Dennis R. *Mythologizing Jesus: From Jewish Teacher to Epic Hero*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2015.

____. *The Homeric Epics and the Gospel of Mark*. New Haven: Yale University Press 2000.

Mack, Burton L. *A Myth of Innocence: Mark and Christian Origins*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988.

____. *The Christian Myth: Origins, Logic, and Legacy*. 2001. Repr., New York: Continuum, 2003.

Martin, Dale B. 'Jesus in Jerusalem: Armed and Not Dangerous'. *JSNT* 37 (2014): 3–24.

____. 'Response to Downing and Fredriksen'. *JSNT* 37 (2015): 334-45.

Meggit, Justin J. '"More Ingenious than Learned"?: Examining the Quest for the Non-Historical Jesus', *NTS* 65 (2019): 443-60.

Meier, John P. *Probing the Authenticity of the Parables*. Vol. 5 of *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus*. Anchor Yale Bible Reference Library. New York: Doubleday, 2016.

Miller, Robert J. 'History Is Not Optional: A Response to *The Real Jesus* by L. T. Johnson'. *BTB* 28 (1998): 27-34.

____. 'The Jesus of Orthodoxy and the Jesuses of the Gospels: A Critique of Luke Timothy Johnson's *The Real Jesus*'. *JSNT* 68 (1997): 101-20.

____. *The Jesus Seminar and Its Critics*. Santa Rosa, CA: Polebridge Press, 1999.

Mitchell, Margaret M. 'Homer in the New Testament'? *JR* 83 (2003): 244-58.

Nickelsburg, George W. E. 'The Genre and Function of the Markan Passion Narrative'. *HTR* 73 (1980): 153-84.

Price, Robert M. *Deconstructing Jesus*. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books, 2000.

____. *The Christ Myth Theory and Its Problems*. Cranford, NJ: American Atheist Press, 2011.

Ratzinger, Joseph. *Jesus von Nazareth: Beiträge zur Christologie*. Vol. 6/1 of *Gesammelte Schriften*. Freiburg: Herder Verlag GmbH, 2013.

Sandnes, Karl Olav. 'Imitatio Homeri? An Appraisal of Dennis R. MacDonald's "Mimesis Criticism"'. *JBL* 124 (2005): 715-32.

Schenke, Ludwig. *Der gekreuzigte Christus: Versuch einer literarkritischen und traditionsgeschichtlichen Bestimmung der vormarkinischen Passionsgeschichte*. SBS 69. Stuttgart: KBW-Verlag, 1974.

Socas, Francisco and Pablo Toribio, eds. *Origo et fundamenta religionis christianae: Un tratado clandestino del siglo XVII/Martin Seidel: edición, traducción y estudio*. Nueva Roma 46. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 2017.

Stehly, Ralph. 'Bouddhisme et Nouveau Testament: à propos de la marche de Pierre sur l'eau (Matthieu 14, 28s)'. *RHPR* 57 (1977): 434-37.

Theissen, Gerd. *Lokalkolorit und Zeitgeschichte in den Evangelien: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*. NTOA 8. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989.

Thompson, Thomas L. *The Messiah Myth: The Near Eastern Roots of Jesus and David*. 2005. Repr., London: Pimlico, 2007.

Tommasi, Franco. *Non c'è Cristo che tenga. Silenzi, invenzioni e imbarazzi alle origini del cristianesimo: qual è il Gesù storico più credibile?*. Lecce: Manni, 2014.

Trumbower, Jeffrey. A. 'The Role of Malachi in the Career of John the Baptist'. Pages 28-41 in *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and W. Richard Stegner. JSNTSup 104. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.

Van Voorst, Robert E. *Jesus Outside the New Testament: An Introduction to the Ancient Evidence*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.

Verenna, Thomas S. 'Born Under the Law: Intertextuality and the Question of the Historicity of the Figure of Jesus in Paul's Epistles'. Pages 131-60 in '*Is This Not the Carpenter*'? *The Question of the Historicity of the Figure of Jesus*. Edited by Thomas L. Thompson and Thomas S. Verenna. Copenhagen International Seminar. Durham: Acumen, 2012.

Versnel, Henk. 'Making Sense of Jesus' Death: The Pagan Contribution'. Pages 213-94 in *Deutungen des Todes Jesu im Neuen Testament*. Edited by Jörg Frey and Jens Schröter. WUNT 181. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.

Wengst, Klaus. *Der wirkliche Jesus? Eine Streitschrift über die historisch wenig ergiebige und theologisch sinnlose Suche nach dem 'historischen' Jesus*. Stuttgart: Verlag W. Kohlhammer, 2013.

Winter, Paul. *On the Trial of Jesus*. 2nd ed. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1974.

Zeichmann, Christopher B. 'Ulyssean Qualities in the *Life* of Josephus and Luke-Acts: A Modest Defence of Homeric Mimesis'. *Neot* 53 (2019): 491-515.

Righteousness, Good Works and the Personification of the Heavenly Treasure: Paul's (and Others') Metamorphosis of Jewish Almsgiving (2 Corinthians 9:6–14)

Georges Massinelli

The last century has seen an increased interest in Paul's collection for the poor among the saints in Jerusalem.[1] Scholars generally concur in observing that the

[1] Main studies focusing on the collection for Jerusalem: Karl Holl, 'Der Kirchenbegriff des Paulus in seinem Verhältnis zu dem der Urgemeinde', in *Der Osten*, vol. 2 of *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte*, ed. Hans Leitzmann, 3 vols. (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1921-1928), 44-67; first publ. in *SPAW* 12 (1921); Wilbur M. Franklin, *Die Kollekte des Paulus* (Scottdale, PA: Mennonite Publishing House, 1938); Dieter Georgi, *Remembering the Poor: The History of Paul's Collection for Jerusalem* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1991); trans. of *Die Geschichte der Kollekte des Paulus für Jerusalem*, TF 38 (Hamburg-Bergstedt: Reich, 1965); Keith F. Nickle, *The Collection: A Study in Paul's Strategy*, SBT 48 (Naperville, IL: A.R. Allenson, 1966); Klaus Berger, 'Almosen für Israel: Zum historischen Kontext der paulinischen Kollekte', *NTS* 23 (1977): 180–204; Hans Dieter Betz, *2 Corinthians 8 and 9: A Commentary on Two Administrative Letters of the Apostle Paul*, ed. George W. MacRae, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985); Verlyn D. Verbrugge, *Paul's Style of Church Leadership Illustrated by His Instructions to the Corinthians on the Collection* (San Francisco: Mellen Research University Press/Lewiston, NY: Edward Mellen Press, 1992); Burkhard Beckheuer, *Paulus und Jerusalem: Kollekte und Mission im theologischen Denken des Heidenapostels*, Europäische Hochschulschriften Reihe 23, Theologie 611 (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1997); Stephan J. Joubert, *Paul as Benefactor: Reciprocity, Strategy and Theological Reflection in Paul's Collection*, WUNT 2/124 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000); Steven S.H. Chang, 'Fund-Raising in Corinth: A Socio-Economic Study of the Corinthian Church, the Collection and 2 Corinthians' (PhD diss., University of Aberdeen, 2000); Sze-kar Wan, 'Collection for the Saints as Anticolonial Act: Implications of Paul's Ethnic Reconstruction', in *Paul and Politics: Ekklesia, Israel, Imperium, Interpretation: Essays in Honor of Krister Stendahl*, ed. Richard A. Horsley (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2000), 191-215; Kieran J. O'Mahony, *Pauline Persuasion: A Sounding in 2 Corinthians 8–9*, JSNTSup 199 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000); Byung-Mo Kim, *Die paulinische Kollekte*, Texte und Arbeiten zum neutestamentlichen Zeitalter 38 (Tübingen: Francke, 2002); James R. Harrison, *Paul's Language of Grace in Its Graeco-Roman Context*, WUNT 2/172 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003); Gary Webster Griffith, 'Abounding in Generosity: A Study of Charis in 2 Corinthians 8–9' (PhD diss., University of Durham, 2005); Deborah Elaine Watson, 'Paul's Collection in Light of Motivations and Mechanisms for Aid to the Poor in the First-Century World' (PhD diss., University of Durham, 2006); David J. Downs, *The Offering of the Gentiles: Paul's Collection for Jerusalem in Its Chronological, Cultural, and Cultic Contexts*, WUNT 2/248 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008); Mark A. Jennings, 'Patronage and Rebuke in Paul's Persuasion in 2 Corinthians 8–9', *JGRChJ* 6 (2009): 107–27; Steven J. Friesen, 'Paul and Economics: The Jerusalem Collection as an Alternative to Patronage', in *Paul Unbound: Other Perspectives on the Apostle*, ed. Mark D. Given (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2010), 27-54; Julien M. Ogereau, 'The Jerusalem Collection as Κοινωνία:

collection was likely the most ambitious undertaking of Paul's career—spanning several years, involving groups of believers in different regions of the Roman Empire and cutting across linguistic, cultural and ethnic boundaries—yet they fail to reach an agreement as to the meaning Paul attributed to it, with ideas ranging from a tax to be paid to the mother church, to an expression of gratitude for the spiritual gift of the gospel, to an act of worship to God, the great benefactor.

The difficulty scholars have pinpointing Paul's view of the collection relates to its unique nature. According to John Davis, every culture conceives of exchanges of goods and services in a limited range of ways, a strictly local 'repertoire' of exchanges through which people classify their economic interactions.[2] In this sense, part of a person's cultural identity is constructed through the exchanges practiced in his or her social context.[3] Greeks and Romans, for instance, were accustomed to gifts between friends, benefactions to civil bodies or private associations, patronage of poets and other clients, as well as more common exchanges in the marketplace or between relatives. The failure of all scholarly attempts to provide a convincing historical parallel to the collection results from its defying classification in the Greco-Roman repertoire of exchanges. It is an anomaly.

Mary Douglas draws particular attention to anomalies and ambiguities in classifications as 'uncomfortable facts which refuse to be fitted in'.[4] These phenomena cause confusion and anxiety. While on the individual level reactions can go from disgust to laughter, social groups, whose categories tend to be more authoritative and more rigid, deal with an anomaly either by ignoring and removing it or, more positively, by creating a new classification in which it has a place.[5] On the one hand, acknowledging the anomalous character of the collection can account in part for the resistance that some in the Pauline communities appear to have mounted against it. This new kind of economic interaction was probably quite confusing to believers, who could not easily decipher its meaning within the familiar social conventions that regulated exchange. Some, like the Macedonians, enthusiastically joined the

---

Paul's Global Politics of Socio-Economic Equality and Solidarity', *NTS* 58 (2012): 360–78; L.L. Welborn, '"That There May Be Equality": The Contexts and Consequences of a Pauline Ideal'. *NTS* 59 (2013): 73–90.

[2] John Davis, *Exchange*, Concepts in Social Thought (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1992), 28–46.

[3] Chris Hann, 'The Gift and Reciprocity: Perspectives from Economic Anthropology', in *Handbook of the Economics of Giving, Altruism and Reciprocity*, ed. Serge-Christophe Kolm and Jean Mercier Ythier, 2 vols., Handbooks in Economics 23 (Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2006), 1:215.

[4] Mary Douglas, *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo* (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1966), 36.

[5] Douglas, *Purity and Danger*, 38.

effort, but others, like the Corinthians, hesitated. On the other hand, Davis adds that anomalies 'may be an opportunity, give people room for manoeuvre, scope for inventiveness and creativity'.[6] In dealing with anomalous exchanges, exchange actors can manipulate traditional categories in order to pursue their aims.[7]

This seems to be exactly Paul's strategy. He employs a number of categories to describe the collection, an otherwise anomalous and undefined exchange, and manipulates such categories for specific purposes. Scholars have already highlighted some of the categories that Paul adopts (for instance, worship, gratitude, benefaction). Others include friendship as equality,[8] Christly self-giving[9] and almsgiving.[10] Each category appears to contribute to the construction of Christian identity as it relates to God, other believers, other groups of believers (especially the Jerusalem group) and more generally the poor.

As a test case for this larger theory, I will consider how Paul uses and manipulates the exchange category of almsgiving and discuss his aims in doing so. It should not go unnoticed how far-fetched Paul's move is. The collection and almsgiving are two strikingly different forms of exchange. Almsgiving is most often an anonymous and extemporaneous gift of a negligible amount of money, food or other goods that takes place between two individuals who hardly have any connections. The collection involved two groups of believers united by a common faith, a lengthy, multi-year preparation, an official delegation of representatives, and was probably aimed at the establishment or strengthening of cordial relations between the groups. Paul's use of almsgiving as a category describing the collection seems therefore quite peculiar. In fact, scholars rarely draw attention to the references to almsgiving and do not deem it a useful model to explain the collection.[11] Yet Paul did, an attestation to his ability to manipulate categories of exchange.

---

[6] Davis, *Exchange*, 54.

[7] Davis's use of 'manipulation', which is the one adopted here, does not necessarily carry a negative connotation. Rather, it implies that individuals can use and adapt exchange categories in unconventional ways for their own purposes without entailing any moral judgment on such purposes.

[8] Rom 15:26; 2 Cor 8:4, 13-14; 9:13.

[9] 2 Cor 8:5, 9.

[10] 2 Cor 9:6-12.

[11] An attempt to read the collection in terms of almsgiving is made by Berger, who focuses on the redemptive function of alms but in a specifically covenantal framework. According to Berger, alms could reveal the relationship of outsiders, sympathizers (namely, God-fearers) or new converts with the Jewish people and were applied to the group 'in der und vor der man sich als "zugehörig" und als "gerecht" erweisen wollte'; 'Almosen für Israel', 192. In other words, Berger does not refer to the common experience of almsgiving to the poor but to gifts from the Gentiles symbolizing some degree of affiliation to the Jewish people. Similarly, Kim, *Die paulinische Kollekte*, 156–60.

1. The Collection as Almsgiving

Paul devotes two chapters of his Second Letter to the Corinthians to a series of arguments urging the Corinthian followers of Christ to provide financial support to the Jerusalem group. In the central section of chapter 9 Paul dwells on the agricultural themes of sowing and harvesting.[12] Just as the harvesters reap in proportion to how much grain they sow, so will the Corinthians reap abundance of blessing from God insofar as they are generous toward Jerusalem.[13] Although alien to the urban experience of Paul and the groups he led, agricultural metaphors were probably accessible to everybody in the ancient world and their use was common in Paul's context.[14] In order to clarify Paul's use of this metaphor, I will discuss its scriptural background, its connections with traditional views of almsgiving and the ways in which Paul reshapes the common motif of almsgiving in a specific way.

At the heart of 2 Corinthians 9:6-10 is a direct quote of Psalm 112:9: 'He scatters abroad, he gives to the poor; his righteousness endures for ever'.[15] An intense de-

---

[12] 2 Cor 9:6-10. Kim argues that a new unit begins in 2 Cor 9:8. His main point is that while 2 Cor 9:5–7 focuses on the human donor, 2 Cor 9:8–15 centers on God's gift of grace to humans; *Die paulinische Kollekte*, 74–76. There are, however, crucial connections between the two sections: 1) the presence of biblical quotations and allusions; 2) the quotations from Proverbs and Psalms both describe the collection as almsgiving; 3) the agricultural imagery that is present in 2 Cor 9:6 returns in 2 Cor 9:10.

[13] The agricultural metaphor appears to be a *topos* that Paul uses to encourage generosity in financial matters. In 1 Cor 9:10–11 Paul argues for the right of apostles in general, and his right in particular, to receive financial support for their ministry. He first depicts the agricultural tasks of plowing and threshing as done with a view to receiving a share of the harvest, thus establishing the rationale for the expectation of remuneration for services rendered. Then he proceeds to describe apostolic support in terms of harvesting 'fleshly' goods after having sown 'spiritual' ones. Similarly, Gal 6:7–9 employs the metaphors of sowing and harvesting to support an exhortation to do good toward all, especially toward those who share the same faith. To do good in this context appears to be a general appeal, yet the context indicates that it includes financial support of those who teach the word among the Galatians (Gal 6:6). Larry Hurtado, following J.B. Lightfoot and H. Lietzmann, argues that the entire section Gal 6:6–10 is 'a unified appeal for support' and that it alludes to the collection for Jerusalem; 'The Jerusalem Collection and the Book of Galatians', *JSNT* 5 (1979): 53-57. Nickle interprets the similarity between Gal 6:6–10 and 2 Cor 9:6–10 as a sign of the impact of the collection on the vocabulary Paul used to encourage sharing of resources; *The Collection*, 59n55—and see the discussion in F.F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Galatians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1982), 266. Nickle also suggests that Paul's allusive remark to the Romans, 'that I may reap some harvest among you as I have among the rest of the Gentiles' (Rom 1:13), may indicate that 'Paul contemplated the later voluntary participation of the Roman Christians in the collection' (pp. 69–70).

[14] See Betz, *2 Corinthians 8 and 9*, 102.

[15] 2 Cor 9:9 (NRSV).

bate revolves around the referent of this quote. On the one hand, the original context of the psalm clearly identifies the giver as a man, he who fears the Lord and greatly delights in God's commandments.[16] This makes obvious sense in Paul's exhortation, where he urges the Corinthians to *give* to the Jerusalem Christians. On the other hand, some argue that the righteous giver in the quotation is God.[17] They observe that it is God, in the context, who provides the Corinthians with abundance and supplies seed to the sower and bread for food. In my opinion, the issue is conclusively solved in the following verse, where 'their righteousness', a concept Paul draws from the psalm, unquestionably refers to the Corinthians.[18]

One may think that the difficulty some have accepting the anthropological interpretation of this quotation is loosely connected with the concept of righteousness as it appears in Galatians and Romans especially. Paul would see God's gracious gift of righteousness and good works such as almsgiving as two mutually exclusive ways to God. This kind of concern transpires, for instance, in Anthony Tyrell Hanson's comment:

> It is very difficult to reconcile with Paul's theology any view except that the 'righteousness which remains for ever' is Christ's righteousness in Christians, rather than an 'alms-righteousness' of their own. We can hardly envisage Paul as preaching in Galatians and Romans a doctrine of justification in Christ, and in 2 Corinthians a doctrine of justification by alms-giving.[19]

---

[16] Alfred Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle of St Paul to the Corinthians*, ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1915), 261; E.-B. Allo, *Saint Paul: Seconde épître aux Corinthiens*, 2nd ed., Ebib. (Paris: Gabalda, 1956), 235; C.K. Barrett, *A Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, HNTC (New York: Harper & Row, 1973), 238; Margaret E. Thrall, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, 2 vols., ICC (London: T&T Clark, 1994–2000), 2:581; Joubert, *Paul as Benefactor*, 196n107; Kim, *Die paulinische Kollekte*, 78–79.

[17] Georgi, *Remembering the Poor*, 98; Anthony Tyrrell Hanson, *Studies in Paul's Technique and Theology* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1974), 179-80; Victor Paul Furnish, *II Corinthians*, AB 32A (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1984), 449; Betz, *2 Corinthians 8 and 9*, 111; Beckheuer, *Paulus und Jerusalem*, 167; Wan, 'Collection for the Saints as Anticolonial Act', 213.

[18] See summaries of the exegetical possibilities in Furnish, *II Corinthians*, 446–50; Thrall, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, 580–83. David I. Starling chooses a *via media* and suggests that the ambiguity of the referent of Paul's quotation has a deeper purpose. Readers are 'provoked to discuss and ponder the relationship between divine and human grace and righteousness, and encouraged to reframe their understandings of benefaction and righteousness'; 'Meditations on a Slippery Citation: Paul's Use of Psalm 112:9 in 2 Corinthians 9:9', *Journal of Theological Interpretation* 6 (2012): 254. Although the debate above proves beyond doubt that Paul's quotation has provoked discussion among modern scholars, it seems questionable whether this was Paul's purpose in quoting the psalm.

[19] Hanson, *Studies in Paul's Technique and Theology*, 180. Note Hanson's phrase 'of their own', which connects 2 Cor 9:9 with Paul's discussion of justification in texts such as Rom 10:3 ('being ignorant of the righteousness

Paul, it is maintained, could not possibly think that human generosity is a source of righteousness. The issue becomes even more sensitive if we think that righteousness is here explicitly identified with a good work and that a financial gift is associated with a concept often connected with soteriology, as though the Corinthians could hear Clement of Alexandria's advice: 'One buys immortality with money'![20] In other words, the uneasiness with this quotation from Psalm 112 may reflect the centuries-old, painful debate over the relationship between divine and human agency in Christian soteriology.

Nonetheless, righteousness is probably the most direct reference to almsgiving in the text.[21] In Psalm 112 the Greek word δικαιοσύνη, the one Paul often uses in soteriological discussions, here translates the Hebrew *ṣᵊdāqâ*, a word originally meaning justice or righteousness that eventually came to mean 'almsgiving', the provision of material help for the poor.[22] It is hard to establish exactly when and

---

that comes from God, and seeking to establish *their own*, [the Jews] have not submitted to God's righteousness' [NRSV]) or Phil 3:9 ('[I may] be found in him, not having a righteousness *of my own* that comes from the law, but one that comes through faith in Christ, the righteousness from God based on faith' [NRSV]).

[20] *Quis div.* 32 (my translation).

[21] Kim argues that δικαιοσύνη is here to be understood as ἐλεημοσύνη ('almsgiving'); *Die paulinische Kollekte*, 79–80—see also Susan Sorek, *Remembered for Good: A Jewish Benefaction System in Ancient Palestine*, SWBA 5 (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2010), 237. Admittedly, Paul's word choice is determined by the Septuagint translation of the psalm. We may assume that the ordinary meaning of δικαιοσύνη for Paul was not almsgiving but covenant righteousness.

[22] For the evolution of the meaning of *ṣᵊdāqâ* in the Jewish context, see Franz Rosenthal, 'Sedaka, Charity', *HUCA* 23 (1950–1951): 411-30; Klaus Berger, *Die Gesetzesauslegung Jesu: Ihr historischer Hintergrund im Judentum und im Alten Testament*, WMANT 40 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1972), 157-58; Sorek, *Remembered for Good*, 237–40. There has been debate as to whether the collection was really aimed at relieving poverty in the Jerusalem group. Holl argues that the term πτωχοί, which Paul uses with reference to the collection in Rom 15:26 ('the poor of the saints in Jerusalem'), is not a socioeconomic designation but rather a theological title—those who feel especially close to God in the way that the destitute and the oppressed do; 'Der Kirchenbegriff des Paulus in seinem Verhältnis zu dem der Urgemeinde', 59-60—and see also Ernst Bammel, 'πτωχός, πτωχεία, πτωχεύω', *TDNT* 6:909. In the collection texts, however, Paul consistently prefers to refer to the Jerusalem group as 'the saints' (Rom 15:25, 31; 1 Cor 16:1; 2 Cor 8:4; 9:1, 12). It is, therefore, more likely that in Rom 15:26 Paul uses the term πτωχοί as a socioeconomic marker and that the phrase has a partitive sense: 'The poor *among* the saints in Jerusalem'; see Georgi, *Remembering the Poor*, 175–76n51; Leander E. Keck, 'The Poor Among the Saints in the New Testament', *ZNW* 56 (1965): 100-29; idem, 'The Poor Among the Saints in Jewish Christianity and Qumran', *ZNW* 57 (1966): 54–78; Douglas J. Moo, *The Epistle to the Romans*, NICNT (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1996), 903-04; Beckheuer, *Paulus und Jerusalem*, 70. However, even if the phrase were to be understood theologically, its immediate, socioeconomic denotation could not be lost in the context of the collection. Paul also uses the phrase οἱ πτωχοί in Gal 2:10, without any further clarification. In this case, it is unclear

why this semantic shift took place, but there are reasons to believe that a connection between *ṣᵊdāqâ* and charitable acts toward the poor existed well before Paul's time.[23] For instance, in the book of Daniel, after interpreting an ominous dream for king Nebuchadnezzar, Daniel suggests a way for the king to escape his grim fate: 'Atone for your sins with *ṣidqâ* and your iniquities with *miḥan* to the poor, so that your prosperity may be prolonged'.[24] The NRSV translates the two Aramaic terms *ṣidqâ* and *miḥan* with 'righteousness' and 'mercy', respectively because those were the semantic areas commonly associated with the roots *ṣdq* and *ḥnn*. In Daniel, however, at least *miḥan*, but probably *ṣidqâ* also, is to be directed specifically to the poor. The two roots also appear in a significant number of proverbs and sapiential psalms in connection with generous giving or lending to the poor.[25] In these instances the two roots seem to refer not just to the general virtues of righteousness and mercy but specifically to material help (loans and gifts) to the needy.[26] Their combined use in Daniel 4:24 suggests that Daniel also uses them this way, but Daniel adds to this nexus of ideas by regarding support of the poor as a means to atone for sins.[27]

---

whether the poor whom Paul mentions there are Jerusalem believers or geographically unidentified, thus including (but certainly not limited to) the Jerusalem group. For an overview of the interpretive possibilities, see Beckheuer, *Paulus und Jerusalem*, 66–74; Bruce W. Longenecker, *Remember the Poor: Paul, Poverty, and the Greco-Roman World* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2010), 157–82.

[23] Gary A. Anderson has shown that a number of Second Temple texts already expressed the view of almsgiving that would become prevalent in later centuries; 'Redeem Your Sins by the Giving of Alms: Sin, Debt, and the "Treasury of Merit" in Early Jewish and Christian Tradition', *Letter & Spirit* 3 (2007): 39–69; idem, *Sin: A History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 135-51; idem, 'How Does Almsgiving Purge Sins'?, in *Hebrew in the Second Temple Period: The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and of Other Contemporary Sources. Proceedings of the Twelfth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature and the Fifth International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Sirach, jointly sponsored by the Eliezer Ben-Yehuda Center for the Study of the History of the Hebrew Language, 29-31 December, 2008*, ed. Steven E. Fassberg, Moshe Bar-Asher and Ruth A. Clements, STDJ 108 (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 1-14.

[24] Dan 4:24 (NRSV with transliterated terms).

[25] Pss 37:21, 26; 109:12; 112:3-5, 9; Prov 8:18; 10:2; 11:4; 14:21, 31; 19:17; 28:8.

[26] Avi Hurwitz, 'Reshitam Ha-Miqra'it shel Munahim Talmudiyyim: Le-Toledot Tsemihato shel Musag Ha-Sedaqâh', in *Mehqarim be-Lashon 2–3* (Jerusalem: Center for Jewish Studies, 1987), 156-58; Roman Garrison, *Redemptive Almsgiving in Early Christianity*, JSNTSup 77 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), 49-51; *contra* Roman Heiligenthal, 'Werke der Barmherzigkeit oder Almosen? Zur Bedeutung von ἐλεημοσύνη', *NovT* 25 (1983): 296n16; David J. Downs, *Alms: Charity, Reward, and Atonement in Early Christianity* (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2016), 50-56.

[27] Anderson argues that the redemptive character of generosity toward the poor is explained by the introduction of the metaphor of debt into Jewish discourse about sin, an introduction linked to Aramaic linguistic usage; *Sin: A History*, 142-43; idem, 'How Does Almsgiving Purge Sins?', 1–4.

The Greek version of the book of Tobit, a Jewish novel from about the same time as Daniel, employs the Greek term ἐλεημοσύνη to indicate generosity to the poor.[28] In Tobit 4:5-11 Tobit formulates a long exhortation for his son Tobias to give alms.[29] In the last lines he says:

> So you will be laying up a good treasure for yourself against the day of necessity. For almsgiving (ἐλεημοσύνη) delivers from death and keeps you from going into the Darkness. Indeed, almsgiving (ἐλεημοσύνη), for all who practice it, is an excellent offering in the presence of the Most High.[30]

Tobit clearly states the redemptive power of almsgiving as deliverance from death. In doing so, however, he makes reference to two of the abovementioned *ṣᵊdāqâ* proverbs: 'Treasures gained by wickedness do not profit, but righteousness (*ṣᵊdāqâ*) delivers from death'; and 'Riches do not profit in the day of wrath, but righteousness (*ṣᵊdāqâ*) delivers from death'.[31] Tobit draws elements from both proverbs, but what stands out is that the term *ṣᵊdāqâ*, which originally had a more general sense, is now interpreted as referring to almsgiving and translated into Greek as ἐλεημοσύνη. Generosity toward the needy is prescribed by Tobit on the basis of its power to save from death. The book of Sirach also makes a number of references to almsgiving.[32] In most places where the Hebrew fragments of Sirach have *ṣᵊdāqâ*, the Septuagint translates ἐλεημοσύνη,[33] an indication of the same linguistic evolution

---

[28] For almsgiving in Tobit, see Anderson, *Sin: A History*, 144–49; idem, *Charity: The Place of the Poor in the Biblical Tradition* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013), passim; Downs, *Alms*, 58–70. The Greek translator of Dan 4:24 renders *ṣidqâ* with ἐλεημοσύναις. The plural indicates that the translator interpreted the Aramaic noun, not as an abstract virtue ('righteousness'), but as concrete actions ('acts of mercy'); see Garrison, *Redemptive Almsgiving in Early Christianity*, 52. More generally, wisdom tradition employs ἐλεημοσύνη, as well as δικαιοσύνη, as an inclusive term for a range of merciful deeds toward people in need of help; see Heiligenthal, 'Werke der Barmherzigkeit oder Almosen?', 290-92. In Tobit, for instance, ἐλεημοσύνη identifies giving food to the hungry and clothing to the naked (which are to be regarded as alms) but also burying abandoned dead bodies (Tob 1:16–18). Downs rightly emphasizes that 'the word ἐλεημοσύνη contributes a broader understanding of Tobit's compassionate actions, one that doubtless includes his charitable giving (so 1:6–8, 17a) but should not be limited to economic dispossession'; *Alms*, 59. As ἐλεημοσύνη is an inclusive term, however, what the book of Tobit states about merciful deeds in general must be taken to apply to almsgiving in particular.

[29] In Tobit 4 the term ἐλεημοσύνη refers unequivocally to material gifts to the poor; see Heiligenthal, 'Werke der Barmherzigkeit oder Almosen?', 291, 296n17; Downs, *Alms*, 62–63.

[30] Tob 4:9-11 (NRSV).

[31] Prov 10:2; 11:4 (NRSV). Garrison, *Redemptive Almsgiving in Early Christianity*, 54; Anderson, *Sin: A History*, 145.

[32] For almsgiving in Sirach, see Anderson, *Charity*, 41–52; Downs, *Alms*, 71–81.

[33] Sir 3:14, 30; 7:10; 12:3; 16:14; 40:17, 24.

witnessed in Tobit. These observations suggest that the semantic shift of *ṣᵊdāqâ* toward almsgiving was occurring well before Paul quoted Psalm 112. More importantly, Psalm 112 is among those which employ the root *ṣdq* to denote kindness and righteousness in the specifically economic context of financial aid to the poor. Whether or not *ṣᵊdāqâ* had assumed the technical meaning of 'almsgiving' by his time, in choosing that quotation Paul demonstrated awareness of the economic nuances of *ṣᵊdāqâ*/δικαιοσύνη.[34]

The quotation of Psalm 112 suggests that Paul may refer to almsgiving, but it is hardly conclusive. Let us then turn to another scriptural reference. As an additional reason for generosity, Paul states that 'God loves a cheerful giver'.[35] This is an allusion to the Septuagint version of Proverbs 22:8, which adds the following words to the Masoretic text: 'God blesses the cheerful man and the giver'.[36] The connection between the two texts is clear if we consider that both 'cheerful' and 'giver' (ἱλαρός and δότης) are *hapax legomena* in the New Testament; 'cheerful' only occurs six times in the Septuagint; 'giver' is also a *hapax legomenon* in the Septuagint. Paul probably had that scriptural verse in mind.[37]

---

[34] Surveying ancient Greek sources, Berger reaches a similar conclusion for the use of δικαιοσύνη. In Greek thought δικαιοσύνη is the highest expression of just and appropriate behavior toward fellow human beings and is contiguous with φιλανθρωπία ('benevolence'); *Die Gesetzesauslegung Jesu*, 149. It is often observed that Matt 6:1-21 begins with an exhortation to do righteous acts (δικαιοσύνην ποιεῖν) and ends with the motif of treasure in heaven. In that text the introductory δικαιοσύνη cannot be restricted to almsgiving, as it is followed by three instructions which, in addition to almsgiving (Matt 6:2-4), also include prayer (Matt 6:5-15) and fasting (Matt 6:16-18). There is space for debate as to whether ἐλεημοσύνη in Matt 6:2-4 refers specifically to almsgiving or more generally to acts of mercy (Downs, *Alms*, 113–16), yet the contextual association with the by-then traditional theme of treasure in heaven strongly favors the first interpretation. Matt 6:1-21 is especially relevant, as it shows a complex relationship between δικαιοσύνη and almsgiving, where the former includes but is not limited to the latter; W.D. Davies and Dale C. Allison, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew*, 3 vols., ICC (London: T&T Clark, 1988–1997), 1:577–78. The status of δικαιοσύνη in 2 Cor 9:9, however, is different. Paul apparently uses it in a direct quotation from a Septuagint text which refers to almsgiving. We cannot know whether he would have chosen δικαιοσύνη to refer to almsgiving—he never uses ἐλεημοσύνη either—but it appears that he chose Ps 112:9 for that very purpose.

[35] 2 Cor 9:7 (NRSV).

[36] My translation. On the relationship between the Masoretic and Septuagint versions of this proverb, see Betz, *2 Corinthians 8 and 9*, 106. The Septuagint uses the verb εὐλογέω, whose cognate εὐλογία appears four times in 2 Cor 9:5–6 and links the two sections 2 Cor 9:1–5 and 2 Cor 9:6–10. Paul, however, uses the verb ἀγαπάω. Griffith suggests that 'the change could be due to Paul quoting from memory or from him using a Greek text different from the Septuagint'; 'Abounding in Generosity', 167.

[37] Betz suggests that the texts in Proverbs and Paul are different enough to question whether Paul is quoting Prov 22:8 or 'a proverb which he knew by heart because it circulated in his cultural environ-

The connection between these texts is related to two additional facts. First, although scholars are right in saying that the topos 'you reap what you sow' was widespread well beyond biblical wisdom,[38] there is no need to go very far to learn where Paul drew the idea to include it in this discussion. LXX Proverbs 22:8 begins by saying, 'The one who sows evil reaps iniquity'.[39] It is Proverbs 22:8, a verse to which Paul alludes in its Septuagint version, that connects the sowing and harvesting metaphor with generosity. Paul is simply expanding on the same notion.

Second, read in its context, Proverbs 22:8 refers to almsgiving. In fact, the following verse says, 'The one who gives alms to the poor (ὁ ἐλεῶν πτωχόν) will be supported. He gave of his own bread to the poor'.[40] The proximity of these two verses strongly suggests that the 'cheerful giver' is the one who gives alms. It appears that Paul constructed 2 Corinthians 9:6-10 as an amplification of LXX Proverbs 22:8–9, a text that illustrates almsgiving with agricultural themes and the motif of cheerful giving. Further proof of the importance Paul attached to this text from Proverbs comes from a brief instruction he gives in a paraenetic section in Romans: 'The one who gives alms, in cheerfulness'.[41] Paul takes ὁ ἐλεῶν from Proverbs 22:9 and cheerfulness, ἱλαρότης (another *hapax legomenon* in the NT), from Proverbs 22:8.[42] If we triangulate Proverbs 22, Romans 12 and 2 Corinthians 9, there remains little doubt that Paul, while never using the technical word ἐλεημοσύνη, does understand and frame the collection as almsgiving.

2. The Collection as Redemptive Almsgiving

Paul uses almsgiving texts from Psalms and Proverbs, but it is unclear whether Paul attributes any redemptive value to almsgiving, whether he thinks that through participation in the collection the Corinthians will obtain favor from God. In Second Temple texts this favor could take the form of deliverance from death and danger or atonement for sins. For instance, it has been mentioned that Tobit combines two proverbs centered on *ṣᵊdāqâ* and states, 'So you will be laying up a

---

ment'; *2 Corinthians 8 and 9*, 106. Yet, the contextual presence of agricultural language in both texts and the rarity of the language support the idea of dependency between the two texts.

[38] For examples from Greek and Hellenistic Jewish literature, see Thrall, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, 575.

[39] My translation.

[40] LXX Prov 22:9 (my translation).

[41] Rom 12:8 (my translation).

[42] C.E.B. Cranfield, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, 6th ed., 2 vols., ICC (London: T&T Clark, 1975–1979), 627-28; Robert Jewett, *Romans: A Commentary*, ed. Eldon Jay Epp, Hermeneia (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2007), 754.

good treasure for yourself against the day of necessity. For almsgiving delivers from death and keeps you from going into the Darkness'.[43] Sirach's longest text on almsgiving[44] also connects the themes of treasure, salvation and true profit. The same set of ideas appears in the gospels.[45] For instance, Matthew narrates the encounter between Jesus and a rich man (with parallels in Mark 10:17–22 and Luke 18:18-23):

> Then someone came to him and said, 'Teacher, what good deed must I do to have eternal life'? And he said to him, 'Why do you ask me about what is good? There is only one who is good. If you wish to enter into life, keep the commandments'. He said to him, 'Which ones'? And Jesus said, 'You shall not murder; You shall not commit adultery; You shall not steal; You shall not bear false witness; Honor your father and mother; also, You shall love your neighbor as yourself'. The young man said to him, 'I have kept all these; what do I still lack'? Jesus said to him, 'If you wish to be perfect, go, sell your possessions and give the money to the poor, and you will have treasure in heaven; then come, follow me'. When the young man heard this word, he went away grieving, for he had many possessions.[46]

In this text, Jesus associates the radical divestment of one's possessions required by discipleship with the trope of laying up treasure through almsgiving to the poor. According to Tobit's reading of Proverbs 10:2 and 11:4, the metaphor of the treasure implies the redemptive character of almsgiving,[47] but Jesus reinforces this by explicitly locating this treasure in heaven and thus indicating that it can be used in heavenly transactions with God.[48] This story suggests that almsgiving, along with keeping the commandments, is one good deed to do in order to have eternal life.[49] The eschatological dimension of the heavenly treasure is also affirmed in a Lukan logion: 'Sell your possessions, and give alms. Make purses for yourselves that do not wear out, an unfailing treasure in heaven, where no thief comes near and no moth destroys'.[50] Paul is less explicit in promising this kind of heavenly, divine return, before or beyond death, for earthly gifts to the poor. The initial metaphor of sowing and harvesting seems to imply a reward ('the one who sows sparingly will also reap

---

[43] Tob 4:9–10 (NRSV).

[44] Sir 29:8-13.

[45] For almsgiving in the gospels, see Downs, *Alms*, 103–33.

[46] Matt 19:16–22 (NRSV).

[47] Tob 4:9-11.

[48] Downs, *Alms*, 109–10.

[49] Anderson, *Sin: A History*, 167–69.

[50] Luke 12:33 (NRSV).

sparingly, and the one who sows bountifully will also reap bountifully'),[51] but the exact nature and origin of the harvest remain ambiguous.[52] God is the subject of several verbs: God loves the cheerful giver; God provides the Corinthians with every blessing in abundance; God supplies and multiplies what the Corinthians sow.[53] But God's love and blessing are never unequivocally connected with Corinthian generosity or lack thereof. In other words, the connection between charitable giving to the poor and divine recompense is thoroughly compatible with what Paul writes—maybe even implied, but never explicitly stated.[54]

3. The Transformation of the Treasure in Heaven

In order to understand the specific way in which Paul frames the divine reward, it can be useful to compare Paul's text with two roughly contemporary evolutions of the treasure-in-heaven trope. In particular, Paul ends his discussion of the collection by highlighting that the Jerusalem receivers will respond to the gift with intercessory prayer on behalf of the Corinthians.[55] Late antique Christian writers and preachers often argued that almsgiving would benefit donors by virtue of the prayers and supplications that recipients of alms would raise on their behalf.[56] One early attestation

---

[51] 2 Cor 9:6 (NRSV).

[52] The harvest may be interpreted in terms of an eschatological reward; see Hans Windisch, *Der zweite Korintherbrief*, 9th ed., KEK 6 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1924), 275; Beckheuer, *Paulus und Jerusalem*, 164. Against this view, Harrison, *Paul's Language of Grace in Its Graeco-Roman Context*, 304–07.

[53] 2 Cor 9:7-8, 10.

[54] Downs believes that through the metaphor of sowing and harvesting, 'Paul encourages the Corinthians to give to the Jerusalem collection because their generosity will benefit *both* the recipients of their gift and the Corinthians themselves...Some measure of reward is implied'; *Alms*, 170. He further maintains that the reward the Corinthians receive from God is 'the harvest of being in right-relationship with God and others' (p. 172). Downs seems to base this conclusion on Paul's statement that God will increase 'the harvest of your righteousness' (τὰ γενήματα τῆς δικαιοσύνης ὑμῶν; 2 Cor 9:10), where he understands the genitive as epexegetic. That is to say, the reward of the Corinthians' righteous act is righteousness itself. This is, in fact, a very sophisticated ethical rationale, but apparently in dissonance with traditional understandings of almsgiving, according to which God's reward is some form of deliverance, either before or after death. It seems more plausible that the phrase τὰ γενήματα τῆς δικαιοσύνης ὑμῶν is a genitive of production ('the harvest produced by your righteous acts'), especially in light of the semantic field of γενήματα; Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1996), 104-06.

[55] 2 Cor 9:14.

[56] See examples in Richard D. Finn, *Almsgiving in the Later Roman Empire: Christian Promotion and Practice (313–450)*; Oxford Classical Monographs (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 179–82.

of this belief is in the early second-century writing known as the *Shepherd of Hermas*.[57] The second Similitude of the *Shepherd* is an extended exhortation, in parabolic form, to interdependence between rich and poor servants of God.[58] The *Shepherd* describes how the elm and the vine support each other and can only bear fruit together.[59] The elm, in fact, appears to be fruitless, yet the vine only produces good grapes if it grows upon the elm.[60] The *Shepherd* provides an interpretation of this image:

> The rich person has money, which is poor in the sight of the Lord, and is distracted about wealth. Such a person's petition and praise are therefore very small in the sight of the Lord, and what he or she has is weak and small and has no holy power. So when the rich person relies upon the poor person and supplies to him or her what is needed, the rich person believes that whatever is done to the poor will be able to find its reward from God; for the poor person is rich in prayer of petition and praise, and his or her intercession has great power before God. Therefore the rich person supplies everything to the poor one without hesitating. So the poor one, sustained by the rich, prays to God in thanksgiving for the one who gives; and the rich person is continually concerned about the poor, that the poor may continue unceasing in life, for the rich one knows that the prayer of the poor is acceptable and rich in the sight of the Lord.[61]

The *Shepherd*'s view of almsgiving is straightforward. The rich provide material support for the poor, and the poor express their gratitude by interceding for them before God.[62] First, the *Shepherd* states clearly that the reward comes from God. The nature of this reward is initially left unspecified but eventually clarified in *Similitude* 2.9: 'The one who does these things will not be abandoned by God but will be

---

[57] For the date of the *Shepherd of Hermas*, see Carolyn Osiek, Shepherd of Hermas*: A Commentary*, ed. Helmut Koester, Hermeneia (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1999), 18-20.

[58] For an analysis of the second similitude in the *Shepherd*, see Carolyn Osiek, *Rich and Poor in the* Shepherd of Hermas*: An Exegetical-Social Investigation*, CBQMS 15 (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1983), 78–90; Martin Leutzsch, *Die Wahrnehmung sozialer Wirklichkeit im* 'Hirten des Hermas', FRLANT 150 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989), 113-37; Norbert Brox, *Der* Hirt des Hermas, Kommentar zu den Apostolischen Vätern 7 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991), 290–97; Osiek, Shepherd of Hermas, 161–64; Downs, *Alms*, 250–54.

[59] The image of the elm and the vine was commonly used by Roman writers to emphasize mutuality in discussions of personal relationships, especially erotic or matrimonial ones; see Leutzsch, *Die Wahrnehmung sozialer Wirklichkeit im* 'Hirten des Hermas', 113–21; Brox, *Der* Hirt des Hermas, 291–93.

[60] Herm. *Sim*. 2.2-4.

[61] Herm. *Sim*. 2.5–6 (translation here and elsewhere, Osiek, Shepherd of Hermas).

[62] Translation, Osiek. A similar concept is expressed in *1 Clem*. 38:2, 'Let the rich provide for the poor; and let the poor give thanks to God, because God has given him someone through whom his poverty may be relieved' (my translation). In *1 Clement*, however, the ideas of intercession and divine reward are lacking; see Osiek, *Rich and Poor in the* Shepherd of Hermas, 79–83.

enrolled in the books of the living', a biblical image of salvation and eternal life.[63] Second, the *Shepherd* emphasizes the 'power' of the poor. The similitude stresses mutual dependence rather than hierarchy between the rich and the poor, so much so that it is fairly difficult, if not impossible, to establish how they relate to the symbolic elements of the parable, the elm and the vine, and whether the rich support the poor or vice versa.[64] The language of power and divine approval, however, consistently favors the poor and expresses a traditional bias toward them.[65] Third, in spite of this evident bias, the *Shepherd* does not seem to express any desire to change the socioeconomic circumstances of the poor.[66] The relationship between the poor and the rich is one of economic dependency and is accepted as enduring and, as a matter of fact, natural.[67] The *Shepherd*'s positive comments on poverty as

[63] For instance, Rev 20:15. Osiek, *Rich and Poor in the* Shepherd of Hermas, 87. Downs underplays the mention of the books of the living by claiming that they are records of deeds (namely, to be assessed later at the final judgment) and not of persons (as a pledge of future salvation). To bolster this assertation, he claims, 'The subject of the future verb ἔσται in 2.9c is ταῦτα (not ὁ ποιῶν)'—the *schema Atticum*—'and the clause should be translated: "The one who does these things will not be abandoned by God, but they (i.e., the things done) will be written in the books of the living"... The rich Christian may be able "to do some good work" (2.10), but the rich believer is not promised atonement or salvation on the basis of material support of the poor'; *Alms*, 253. The thrust of Downs's argument is clear, but it appears to rest on a questionable grammatical assumption. The complete sentence is ταῦτα οὖν ὁ ποιῶν οὐκ ἐγκαταλειφθήσεται ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, ἀλλ᾽ ἔσται ἐπιγεγραμμένος εἰς τὰς βίβλους τῶν ζώντων. Most manuscripts have lacunae, but at least some Greek manuscripts and the Latin translations have the masculine singular participle from ἐπιγράφειν or cognate verbs, while the neuter plural assumed by Downs is an unnecessary emendation of the text with no support in the manuscript tradition; see Carl Schmidt and Wilhelm Schubart, eds., *Altchristliche Texte*, Berliner Klassikertexte 6 (Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1910), 14; Adolphus Hilgenfeld, ed., Hermae Pastor*: Veterem latinam interpretationem e codicibus* (Leipzig: Reisland, 1873; repr., Whitefish, MT: Kessinger, 2009), 73; as well as the critical editions of Molly Whittaker, ed., *Der* Hirt des Hermas, 2nd ed., GCS 48 (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1967); and Robert Joly, *Hermas le pasteur*, SC 53 (Paris: Cerf, 1958). The periphrastic future perfect ἔσται ἐπιγεγραμμένος unequivocally requires a masculine singular subject and surely refers to ὁ ποιῶν (not ταῦτα). Hence, the books of the living record persons, just as the 'books of life' in Herm. *Vis.* 3.2, which Downs believes 'reveal inclusion in heavenly and/or eternal life'; *Alms*, 253.

[64] For detailed discussions—with opposite conclusions!—of the correlation between the parabolic elements and the social groups, see Osiek, *Rich and Poor in the* Shepherd of Hermas, 85–86; Brox, *Der* Hirt des Hermas, 293–96.

[65] Osiek, *Rich and Poor in the* Shepherd of Hermas, 84. See, in reference to Chrysostom, Blake Leyerle, 'John Chrysostom on Almsgiving and the Use of Money', *HTR* 87 (1994): 43.

[66] Downs, *Alms*, 251.

[67] For the enduring character of the relationship between the poor and the rich, see Leutzsch, *Die Wahrnehmung sozialer Wirklichkeit im* 'Hirten des Hermas', 123.

a source of spiritual power might even be seen as fairly insensitive to their plight. This lack of concern for socioeconomic inequalities might reflect a shift of the membership within some Christian groups toward a greater presence of individuals with wealth and high status.[68]

The kind of paternalism implied by the *Shepherd of Hermas* creates a relationship of dependency between the rich and the poor in many ways similar to patronage, a relationship in which the *fides* of the clients is expressed as intercessory prayer.[69] The *Shepherd* appears to advocate the institutionalization of a 'Christian' patronage as the solution to the problem of poverty in Christian communities. The rich are urged to use their wealth to establish clientelistic relationships with the poor. The poor in turn are to reciprocate the financial support of the rich with their 'rich' intercession.[70] That the *Shepherd* does not address socioeconomic change, however, does not necessarily mean that it prescribes social dependency or endorses hierarchy. On the contrary, its emphasis falls rather on mutual dependency and mutual assistance.

An active reciprocation from the poor is also envisioned by one of the most notoriously untractable verses of the Gospel of Luke, namely, the conclusion of the so-called Parable of the Unjust Steward: 'Make friends for yourselves by means of dishonest wealth so that when it is gone, they may welcome you into the eternal homes'.[71] The reference to friends reflects the reciprocity motive of the steward's actions. He appears to be generous toward his master's debtors by writing off part of their debts, but clearly his goal is to 'make friends' among them, friends who will

---

[68] Helen Rhee, *Loving the Poor, Saving the Rich: Wealth, Poverty, and Early Christian Formation* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2012), 58-59. Denise Kimber Buell observes, 'The model (of almsgiving) does not lend itself to a critique of economic differences. That is, even when almsgiving is legible as potentially mutual and when the poor can be interpreted as agents of charity, this does not mean that these practices in themselves embody radical critiques of economic difference. The active/passive division between giver and receiver in the almsgiving model more frequently has been used to justify and sustain economic divisions within Christian communities, rather than to serve as a basis to critique them as unjust'; '"Be Not One Who Stretches Out Hands to Receive but Shuts Them When It Comes to Giving": Envisioning Christian Charity When Both Donors and Recipients Are Poor', in *Wealth and Poverty in Early Church and Society*, ed. Susan R. Holman, Holy Cross Studies in Patristic Theology and History (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic/Brookline, MA: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 2008), 47.

[69] Osiek, Shepherd of Hermas, 163–64.

[70] Leutzsch, *Die Wahrnehmung sozialer Wirklichkeit im* 'Hirten des Hermas', 124-26. Brox criticizes Leutzsch's interpretation of Herm. *Sim.* 2 in terms of patronage because he thinks that the personal relationship between two individuals ('Eins-zu-Eins-Beziehung') which the metaphor of the elm and the vine usually describes in Roman literature does not necessarily apply to the *Shepherd*; *Der* Hirt des Hermas, 293n3.

[71] Luke 16:9 (NRSV).

support him when he is out of a job.[72] The parable's moral, however, shifts the reciprocation to heaven and tells the gospel's audience that their friends will reciprocate their earthly generosity by welcoming them 'into the eternal homes'.[73]

Two elements indicate that the parable's conclusion refers to almsgiving. First, the 'dishonest wealth' (τοῦ μαμωνᾶ τῆς ἀδικίας) echoes the 'treasures of wickedness' (θησαυροὶ ἀνόμους in the LXX) in the familiar Proverbs 10:2. The similarity is even more evident if we compare the Lukan expression with Sirach's rendering of the proverb: 'Do not depend on dishonest wealth (χρήμασιν ἀδίκοις), for it will not benefit you on the day of calamity'.[74] Second, Luke observes that dishonest wealth eventually fails (ὅταν ἐκλίπῃ). Of the heavenly treasure, on the other hand, Luke says that it does not fail (θησαυρὸν ἀνέκλειπτον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς;[75] here the heavenly treasure is explicitly linked with alms). Therefore, the parable's interpretation suggests that since material wealth does not endure, we should employ it to 'make friends' among the poor by means of alms.

The heavenly treasure, however, does not directly appear in Luke 16:9 and is replaced by heavenly friends in the eternal homes. The close correspondence between the two, however, becomes clear if we compare the wording of Luke 16:9 and the abovementioned Luke 12:33.

> Make friends for yourselves (ἑαυτοῖς ποιήσατε φίλους) by means of dishonest wealth so that when it is gone, they may welcome you into the eternal homes.[76]
>
> Sell your possessions and give alms. Make purses for yourselves (ποιήσατε ἑαυτοῖς βαλλάντια) that do not wear out, an unfailing treasure in heaven.[77]

Although the heavenly friends seem to assume the redemptive function of the heavenly treasure (even at the level of grammar), Luke 16:9 deeply reconfigures the traditional motif of almsgiving. The recipients of alms acquire agency and therefore become able to reciprocate in an enduring relationship with their donors.[78] The

---

[72] Luke 16:3-4.

[73] The unusual metaphor of the 'eternal homes' is probably driven by the unjust steward's expectation to be welcomed into the homes of those whom he has benefited (Luke 16:4).

[74] Sir 5:8 (NRSV).

[75] Luke 12:33.

[76] Luke 16:9 (NRSV).

[77] Luke 12:33 (NRSV). For the relation between the two verses, see Richard H. Hiers, 'Friends by Unrighteous Mammon: The Eschatological Proletariat (Luke 16:9)', *JAAR* 38 (1970): 33.

[78] Francis E. Williams, 'Is Almsgiving the Point of the "Unjust Steward"'?, *JBL* 83 (1964): 293–97; Anthony Giambrone, '"Friends in Heavenly Habitations" (Luke 16:9): Charity, Repentance, and Luke's Resurrection Reversal', *RB* 120 (2013): 540–43.

Shepherd of Hermas and Luke both put the recipients of alms in a position of power. In Luke, however, the poor's power and agency are postponed to eschatology and coincide with the failure of dishonest wealth. Only in heaven, it seems, only when mammon is finally out of the way, can the power relations based on economic inequality be transformed into friendly and equal ones.

The *Shepherd of Hermas* explicitly frames the poor's agency in terms of intercession, but Luke's reference to a welcome into the eternal homes is rather vague. It is difficult to infer from these few words in what the friends' agency exactly consists and how it interacts with or participates in God's own agency. Nonetheless, there appears to be some degree of incorporation of reciprocity into an exhortation to almsgiving. Within this new reciprocal relation the poor are no longer helpless individuals dependent on the ephemeral favor of the powerful but friends who will reciprocate in heaven the gifts they have received on earth.

4. Reciprocity in the Collection

The transformation of the treasure-in-heaven motif that Luke and the *Shepherd* carry out maintains the redemptive nature of almsgiving while conferring agency to the receivers of alms. The similarities with Paul are striking. In 2 Corinthians 9:6-10 Paul frames the collection as a charitable act toward the poor through references to scriptural texts on almsgiving. In the following verses Paul describes the receivers of the gift as raising thanksgiving and prayers to God on behalf of the Corinthians.[79] Both actions are mentioned by the *Shepherd*, but more generally, the thanksgiving, although directed to God, underscores the special dynamics of reciprocity in the collection, where the return gift is mediated by the divine.[80] In contrast to the *Shepherd*, Paul does not elaborate on what the intercessory prayer of the saints in Jerusalem produces, but the references to grace, abundance, increase of righteousness and enrichment 'in every way'[81] indicate that the Corinthians can expect a multiplicity of gifts from God, both spiritual and material.

The comparison of 2 Corinthians 9:6-15 with the *Shepherd* and Luke reveals a similar thought pattern in these early Christian references to almsgiving.[82] The most remarkable aspect of these texts is the attribution of agency to the poor. In-

---

[79] 2 Cor 9:11-14.

[80] Joubert, *Paul as Benefactor*, 152.

[81] 2 Cor 9:8-11.

[82] Garrison suggests a dependence of the *Shepherd* on Luke or 2 Corinthians; *Redemptive Almsgiving in Early Christianity*, 90. The formulations, however, are so dissimilar that analogous thought patterns seem to explain the connections better than direct dependence.

deed, most ancient discussions of almsgiving were characterized by the disappearance of the poor. Susan Holman, writing about patristic texts, states:

> The poor exist primarily as a passive tool for redemptive almsgiving, a signifier by which the Christian donor may gain honor and divine reward. Relieving destitution is not usually defined in terms which recognize the recipients as fellow bodies in a divinely created material world of equals in the sight of God.[83]

Alyssa Gray has argued that this is also the case in Tannaitic writings, and it also applies to biblical and apocryphal wisdom texts.[84] The disappearance of the poor probably reflects the elite nature of these texts, which were written by the wealthy for the wealthy and primarily reflect the ethos and identity of the wealthy. This is patently obvious, for instance, in Luke's parable of Dives and Lazarus.[85] Despite being worthy of receiving a name, Lazarus does not do or say anything in the parable. He has no agency. He is a passive and silent presence around which the fate of the rich Dives is discussed. On the contrary, Paul, Luke's Parable of the Unjust Steward and the *Shepherd* all portray the poor as rising from passivity to a certain degree of agency. They pray, intercede and welcome their benefactors into eternal homes. They are effectively put in a position of power, albeit only in a divine world order that does not necessarily affect the earthly one. This appears to be a remarkable development of the treasure-in-heaven theme, a development that will gain wide currency in Late Antiquity and form the ethos and social relationships of generations of Christians.[86]

I would like to suggest that this peculiar theological development reflects a change in role for the poor within the social world in which these texts were produced. The traditional approach to almsgiving, in which the poor are nameless and faceless individuals, portrays the poor as 'others', while the exclusive focus on the

---

[83] Susan R. Holman, *The Hungry Are Dying: Beggars and Bishops in Roman Cappadocia*, OSHT (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 54. See also, Richard Finn, 'Portraying the Poor: Descriptions of Poverty in Christian Texts from the Late Roman Empire', in *Poverty in the Roman World*, ed. Margaret Atkins and Robin Osborne (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 133-34; Sorek, *Remembered for Good*, 198–99. As an example of the anonymity of beggars, consider Acts 3–4, where the person asking for alms is described as 'a man lame from birth' (Acts 3:2 [NRSV]), 'the one who used to sit and ask for alms at the Beautiful Gate of the temple' (Acts 3:10 [NRSV]), 'this man' (Acts 3:16 [NRSV]), 'someone who was sick' (Acts 4:9 [NRSV]), 'the man who had been cured' (Acts 4:14 [NRSV]) and 'the man on whom the sign of healing had been performed' (Acts 4:22 [NRSV]). Never do we know his name, although everybody seemed to know him.

[84] Alyssa M. Gray, 'Redemptive Almsgiving and the Rabbis of Late Antiquity', *JSQ* 18 (2011): 153.

[85] Luke 16:19-31.

[86] Already developed in Clement of Alexandria, *Quis div*. 33–35.

givers of alms—either to praise their generosity or to blame their lack thereof—suggests that, here as elsewhere, discourse about the 'others' is really a means of defining group identity and boundaries.[87] Discussions of almsgiving appear to be primarily reflections on elite selfhood and ethos.

That the poor slowly rise to agency is a manipulation of the traditional understanding of almsgiving that responds to shifts in the social environment of early Christianity, in which the rich and the poor live now side by side and share the same religious, if not social, space. Studies on the economic level of Pauline groups have sometimes produced conflicting results, but all seem to agree that at least part of the constituency of these early groups belonged in the lower economic strata of urban society.[88] In early Christian groups the poor were real people with whom the rich interacted, not just on isolated occasions (as was normally the case with almsgiving to beggars like Lazarus), but in a more close and enduring relationship. Contrary to Dives, wealthy Christians had let the poor into their homes, precisely the kind of 'Christian' patronage envisioned by the *Shepherd*.

Therefore, the transformation of the treasure-in-heaven theme through the attribution of redemptive agency to the poor represents, at the same time, a theological shift and a manipulation of the exchange category of almsgiving, both of which were apparently occasioned by the more diverse constituency of early Christianity. In other words, as the poor became members of the same social group as donors and, therefore, permanent exchange partners, the lasting nature of their relationship with wealthier believers required them to be able to reciprocate, to have some kind

---

[87] According to Henri Tajfel and Joseph P. Forgas, 'There exists, in human beings, a drive to evaluate their opinions and abilities, and ... such evaluations are accomplished by reference to the opinions and abilities of others'. They also argue that such a creation of group identity through comparisons with other status groups takes place primarily in discursive representations (what they call 'phantasy level'). They sum up their views pithily by saying, 'We are what we are because *they* are not what we are'; 'Social Categorizarion: Cognitions, Values and Groups', in *Social Cognition: Perspectives on Everyday Understanding*, ed. Joseph P. Forgas, European Monographs in Social Psychology 26 (London: Academic Press, 1981), 124-26.

[88] Adolf Deissmann, *Paulus: Eine kultur- und religionsgeschichtliche Skizze*, 2nd ed. (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1925); idem, *Das Urchristentum und die unteren Schichten*, 2nd ed. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1908); E.A. Judge, *Social Distinctives of the Christians in the First Century: Pivotal Essays*, ed. David M. Scholer (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2008); Gerd Theissen, *The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity: Essays on Corinth*, ed. and trans. John H. Schütz (Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 2004); Wayne A. Meeks, *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul*, 2nd ed. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003); Justin J. Meggitt, *Paul, Poverty and Survival*, SNTW (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998); Steven J. Friesen, 'Poverty in Pauline Studies: Beyond the So-called New Consensus', *JSNT* 26 (2004): 323–61; Bruce W. Longenecker, 'Exposing the Economic Middle: A Revised Economy Scale for the Study of Early Urban Christianity', *JSNT* 31 (2009): 243–78; idem, *Remember the Poor*, passim.

of agency.[89] The connection between ability to reciprocate and suitability for social intercourse and financial support is fundamental. In fact, the general Greco-Roman disregard for beggars and other kinds of indigent people was partly motivated by their inability to repay the help they received.[90] In her foreword to Marcel Mauss's *The Gift*, Douglas clarifies why reciprocation is so essential to relationships:

> The whole idea of a free gift is based on a misunderstanding. There should not be any free gifts. What is wrong with the so-called free gift is the donor's intention to be exempt from return gifts coming from the recipient. Refusing requital puts the act of giving outside any mutual ties. Once given, the free gift entails no further claims from the recipient. For all the ongoing commitment the free-gift gesture has created, it might just as well never have happened. According to Marcel Mauss that is what is wrong with the free gift. A gift that does nothing to enhance solidarity is a contradiction.[91]

Admittedly, the destitute have very little with which to reciprocate besides gratitude, but early Christian authors found a model for agency in the biblical traditions about the powerful prayer of the poor.[92]

Paul's manipulation of the traditions of Jewish almsgiving is also related to the social makeup of early Christianity, but in a different way. The collection has far weaker similarity with almsgiving than the care for the poor of the local group described by the *Shepherd*. The poor whom the collection is supposed to help are not fellow members of the same local groups. They are not just socially but also physically invisible to the Corinthian donors. At best we can imagine that the Corinthians had sporadic interactions with a few Jerusalem believers who were traveling as delegates on behalf of the Jerusalem group or for other reasons—an instance, however, that fell into the well-established category of hospitality. The collection is directed toward unknown individuals, whose connection with the Corinthians was largely symbolic or, as Paul would put it, spiritual.[93] Moreover, the collection aims to create

---

[89] For the Jerusalem group's intercession as a form of reciprocation, see Joubert, *Paul as Benefactor*, 148, 151; Harrison, *Paul's Language of Grace in Its Graeco-Roman Context*, 298. In reference to later, patristic discussions of almsgiving, Finn observes a similar development: 'The meaning of almsgiving as a redemptive activity winning the prayers of the πτωχοί turned the previously passive, who as such had little value, into more valued agents of redemption'; *Almsgiving in the Later Roman Empire*, 182–83.

[90] John M.G. Barclay, *Paul and the Gift* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2015), 43.

[91] Mary Douglas, 'Foreword: No Free Gifts', foreword to *The Gift: The Form and Reason for Exchange in Archaic Societies*, by Marcel Mauss, trans. W.D. Halls (London: Routledge, 2002), ix–-x; trans. of 'Essai sur le don: Forme et raison de l'échange dans les sociétés primitives', *L'année sociologique*, seconde série (1923-1924): 30-186.

[92] For instance, Exod 22:22, 26; Job 34:28; Pss 9:13; 34:7. For the use of this notion in Chrysostom, see Leyerle, 'John Chrysostom on Almsgiving and the Use of Money', 29–47.

[93] Rom 15:27.

an enduring relationship between the predominantly Gentile groups led by Paul and the Jewish group in Jerusalem. The early Christian movement was characterized by an unusual degree of ethnic and cultural heterogeneity, which is copiously illustrated in the New Testament and especially in Paul's letters. In the context of the collection economic poverty is therefore coupled with ethnic and geographic distance.

In light of this character of the collection it is all the more striking that Paul seems to envisage an enduring exchange relationship between the two groups, to the point that he foresees a hypothetical time when the flow of goods goes from Jerusalem to Corinth.[94] The Jerusalem group's active role in the collection—namely, their intercession on behalf of the Corinthians—is essential to the establishment of a reciprocal relationship that can endure through time. It is beyond the scope of this paper to discuss all the implications of Paul's efforts to establish such a lasting relationship, but such efforts appear to be his attempt to bridge the distance between individual groups in the complex configuration of early Christianity.

In conclusion, among the exchange categories that he employs to describe the collection, Paul refers to almsgiving through traditional texts connected with it: Psalm 112:9 and LXX Proverbs 22:8. As an economic phenomenon, the collection is strikingly different from almsgiving—the two differ especially in the identity of the exchange partners and duration of their relationship—and their association shows Paul's talent as an exchange manipulator. If Paul attributes redemptive value to the collection, he only does so by transforming the motif of the treasure-in-heaven through the mediation of the intercessory prayer raised by the Jerusalem beneficiaries. This transformation is part of a larger shift in early Christianity, in which the poor acquire agency in the form of an ability to reciprocate the gifts they receive and therefore genuine membership in the same social and religious group as their wealthier benefactors. In Paul's collection the integration of the economically weak is present but subordinate to the purpose of building bridges between groups of believers that cut, not only across economic levels, but also across geographic distance and ethnicity.

Bibliography

Allo, E.-B. *Saint Paul: Seconde épître aux Corinthiens*. 2nd ed. Ebib. Paris: Gabalda, 1956.

Anderson, Gary A. *Charity: The Place of the Poor in the Biblical Tradition*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013.

____. 'How Does Almsgiving Purge Sins'? Pages 1–14 in *Hebrew in the Second Temple Period: The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and of Other Contemporary Sources. Proceedings of the Twelfth*

[94] 2 Cor 8:14.

International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature and the Fifth International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Sirach, jointly sponsored by the Eliezer Ben-Yehuda Center for the Study of the History of the Hebrew Language, 29-31 December, 2008. Edited by Steven E. Fassberg, Moshe Bar-Asher and Ruth A. Clements. STDJ 108. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

____. 'Redeem Your Sins by the Giving of Alms: Sin, Debt, and the "Treasury of Merit" in Early Jewish and Christian Tradition'. *Letter & Spirit* 3 (2007): 39–69.

____. *Sin: A History*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009.

Bammel, Ernst. 'πτωχός, πτωχεία, πτωχεύω'. Vol. 6 pages 888-915 in *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Edited by Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1964-1976.

Barclay, John M.G. *Paul and the Gift*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2015.

Barrett, C.K. *A Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians*. HNTC. New York: Harper & Row, 1973.

Beckheuer, Burkhard. *Paulus und Jerusalem: Kollekte und Mission im theologischen Denken des Heidenapostels*. Europäische Hochschulschriften Reihe 23, Theologie 611. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1997.

Berger, Klaus. 'Almosen für Israel: Zum historischen Kontext der paulinischen Kollekte'. *NTS* 23 (1977): 180–204.

____. *Die Gesetzesauslegung Jesu: Ihr historischer Hintergrund im Judentum und im Alten Testament*. WMANT 40. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1972.

Betz, Hans Dieter. *2 Corinthians 8 and 9: A Commentary on Two Administrative Letters of the Apostle Paul*. Edited by George W. MacRae. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985.

Brox, Norbert. *Der* Hirt des Hermas. Kommentar zu den Apostolischen Vätern 7. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991.

Bruce, F.F. *The Epistle to the Galatians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1982.

Buell, Denise Kimber. '"Be Not One Who Stretches Out Hands to Receive but Shuts Them When It Comes to Giving": Envisioning Christian Charity When Both Donors and Recipients Are Poor'. Pages 37–47 in *Wealth and Poverty in Early Church and Society*. Edited by Susan R. Holman. Holy Cross Studies in Patristic Theology and History. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic/Brookline, MA: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 2008.

Chang, Steven S.H. 'Fund-Raising in Corinth: A Socio-Economic Study of the Corinthian Church, the Collection and 2 Corinthians'. PhD diss., University of Aberdeen, 2000.

Cranfield, C.E.B. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. 6th ed. 2 vols. ICC. London: T&T Clark, 1975–1979.

Davies, W.D. and Dale C. Allison. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew*. 3 vols. ICC. London: T&T Clark, 1988–1997.

Davis, John. *Exchange*. Concepts in Social Thought. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1992.

Deissmann, Adolf. *Paulus: Eine kultur- und religionsgeschichtliche Skizze*. 2nd ed. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1925.

____. *Das Urchristentum und die unteren Schichten*. 2nd ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1908.

Douglas, Mary. 'Foreword: No Free Gifts'. Foreword to *The Gift: The Form and Reason for Exchange in Archaic Societies*, by Marcel Mauss. Translated by W.D. Halls. London: Routledge, 2002. Translation of 'Essai sur le don: forme et raison de l'échange dans les sociétés primitives'. *L'année sociologique*, seconde série (1923-1924): 30-186.

____. *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1966.

Downs, David J. *Alms: Charity, Reward, and Atonement in Early Christianity*. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2016.

____. *The Offering of the Gentiles: Paul's Collection for Jerusalem in Its Chronological, Cultural, and Cultic Contexts*. WUNT 2/248. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.

Finn, Richard D. *Almsgiving in the Later Roman Empire: Christian Promotion and Practice (313–450)*. Oxford Classical Monographs. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

____. 'Portraying the Poor: Descriptions of Poverty in Christian Texts from the Late Roman Empire'. Pages 130–44 in *Poverty in the Roman World*. Edited by Margaret Atkins and Robin Osborne. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Franklin, Wilbur M. *Die Kollekte des Paulus*. Scottdale, PA: Mennonite Publishing House, 1938.

Friesen, Steven J. 'Paul and Economics: The Jerusalem Collection as an Alternative to Patronage'. Pages 27–54 in *Paul Unbound: Other Perspectives on the Apostle*. Edited by Mark D. Given. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2010.

____. 'Poverty in Pauline Studies: Beyond the So-called New Consensus'. *JSNT* 26 (2004): 323–61.

Furnish, Victor Paul. *II Corinthians*. AB 32A. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1984.

Garrison, Roman. *Redemptive Almsgiving in Early Christianity*. JSNTSup 77. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.

Georgi, Dieter. *Remembering the Poor: The History of Paul's Collection for Jerusalem*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1991. Translation of *Die Geschichte der Kollekte des Paulus für Jerusalem*. TF 38. Hamburg-Bergstedt: Reich, 1965.

Giambrone, Anthony. '"Friends in Heavenly Habitations" (Luke 16:9): Charity, Repentance, and Luke's Resurrection Reversal'. *RB* 120 (2013): 529–52.

Gray, Alyssa M. 'Redemptive Almsgiving and the Rabbis of Late Antiquity'. *JSQ* 18 (2011): 144–84.

Griffith, Gary Webster. 'Abounding in Generosity: A Study of Charis in 2 Corinthians 8–9'. PhD diss., University of Durham, 2005.

Hann, Chris. 'The Gift and Reciprocity: Perspectives from Economic Anthropology'. Vol. 1 pages 207–23 in *Handbook of the Economics of Giving, Altruism and Reciprocity*. Edited by Serge-Christophe Kolm and Jean Mercier Ythier. 2 vols. Handbooks in Economics 23. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2006.

Hanson, Anthony Tyrrell. *Studies in Paul's Technique and Theology*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1974.

Harrison, James R. *Paul's Language of Grace in Its Graeco-Roman Context*. WUNT 2/172. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.

Heiligenthal, Roman. 'Werke der Barmherzigkeit oder Almosen? Zur Bedeutung von ἐλεημοσύνη'. *NovT* 25 (1983): 289–301.

Hiers, Richard H. 'Friends by Unrighteous Mammon: The Eschatological Proletariat (Luke 16:9)'. *JAAR* 38 (1970): 30–36.

Hilgenfeld, Adolphus, ed. Hermae Pastor*: Veterem latinam interpretationem e codicibus*. Leipzig: Reisland, 1873. Repr., Whitefish, MT: Kessinger, 2009.

Holl, Karl. 'Der Kirchenbegriff des Paulus in seinem Verhältnis zu dem der Urgemeinde'. Pages 44–67 in *Der Osten*. Vol. 2 of *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte*. Edited by Hans Leitzmann. 3 vols. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1921-1928. First publ. in *SPAW* 12 (1921): 920–47.

Holman, Susan R. *The Hungry Are Dying: Beggars and Bishops in Roman Cappadocia*. OSHT. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Hurtado, Larry W. 'The Jerusalem Collection and the Book of Galatians'. *JSNT* 5 (1979): 46–62.

Hurwitz, Avi. 'Reshitam Ha-Miqra'it shel Munahim Talmudiyyim: Le-Toledot Tsemihato shel Musag Ha-Sedaqâh'. Pages 155–60 in *Mehqarim be-Lashon 2–3*. Jerusalem: Center for Jewish Studies, 1987.

Jennings, Mark A. 'Patronage and Rebuke in Paul's Persuasion in 2 Corinthians 8–9'. *JGRChJ* 6 (2009): 107–27.

Jewett, Robert. *Romans: A Commentary*. Edited by Eldon Jay Epp. Hermeneia. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2007.

Joly, Robert. *Hermas le pasteur*. SC 53. Paris: Cerf, 1958.

Joubert, Stephan J. *Paul as Benefactor: Reciprocity, Strategy and Theological Reflection in Paul's Collection*. WUNT 2/124. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.

Judge, E.A. *Social Distinctives of the Christians in the First Century: Pivotal Essays*. Edited by David M. Scholer. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2008.

Keck, Leander E. 'The Poor Among the Saints in Jewish Christianity and Qumran'. *ZNW* 57 (1966): 54–78.

____. 'The Poor Among the Saints in the New Testament'. *ZNW* 56 (1965): 100–29.

Kim, Byung-Mo. *Die paulinische Kollekte*. Texte und Arbeiten zum neutestamentlichen Zeitalter 38. Tübingen: Francke, 2002.

Leutzsch, Martin. *Die Wahrnehmung sozialer Wirklichkeit im* 'Hirten des Hermas'. FRLANT 150. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989.

Leyerle, Blake. 'John Chrysostom on Almsgiving and the Use of Money'. *HTR* 87 (1994): 29–47.

Longenecker, Bruce W. 'Exposing the Economic Middle: A Revised Economy Scale for the Study of Early Urban Christianity'. *JSNT* 31 (2009): 243–78.

____. *Remember the Poor: Paul, Poverty, and the Greco-Roman World*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2010.

Meeks, Wayne A. *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul*. 2nd ed. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003.

Meggitt, Justin J. *Paul, Poverty and Survival*. SNTW. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998.

Moo, Douglas J. *The Epistle to the Romans*. NICNT. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1996.

Nickle, Keith F. *The Collection: A Study in Paul's Strategy*. SBT 48. Naperville, IL: A.R. Allenson, 1966.

Ogereau, Julien M. 'The Jerusalem Collection as Κοινωνία: Paul's Global Politics of Socio-Economic Equality and Solidarity'. *NTS* 58 (2012): 360–78.

O'Mahony, Kieran J. *Pauline Persuasion: A Sounding in 2 Corinthians 8–9*. JSNTSup 199. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.

Osiek, Carolyn. *Rich and Poor in the* Shepherd of Hermas*: An Exegetical-Social Investigation*. CBQMS 15. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1983.

____. Shepherd of Hermas*: A Commentary*. Edited by Helmut Koester. Hermeneia. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1999.

Plummer, Alfred. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle of St Paul to the Corinthians*. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1915.

Rhee, Helen. *Loving the Poor, Saving the Rich: Wealth, Poverty, and Early Christian Formation*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2012.

Rosenthal, Franz. 'Sedaka, Charity'. *HUCA* 23 (1950–1951): 411–30.

Schmidt, Carl and Wilhelm Schubart, eds. *Altchristliche Texte*. Berliner Klassikertexte 6. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1910.

Sorek, Susan. *Remembered for Good: A Jewish Benefaction System in Ancient Palestine*. SWBA 5. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2010.

Starling, David I. 'Meditations on a Slippery Citation: Paul's Use of Psalm 112:9 in 2 Corinthians 9:9'. *Journal of Theological Interpretation* 6 (2012): 241–56.

Tajfel, Henri, and Joseph P. Forgas. 'Social Categorizarion: Cognitions, Values and Groups'. Pages 113–40 in *Social Cognition: Perspectives on Everyday Understanding*. Edited by Joseph P. Forgas. European Monographs in Social Psychology 26. London: Academic Press, 1981.

Theissen, Gerd. *The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity: Essays on Corinth*. Edited and translated by John H. Schütz. Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 2004.

Thrall, Margaret E. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians*. 2 vols. ICC 47. London: T&T Clark, 1994–2000.

Verbrugge, Verlyn D. *Paul's Style of Church Leadership Illustrated by His Instructions to the Corinthians on the Collection*. San Francisco: Mellen Research University Press/Lewiston, NY: Edward Mellen Press, 1992.

Wallace, Daniel B. *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1996.

Wan, Sze-kar. 'Collection for the Saints as Anticolonial Act: Implications of Paul's Ethnic Reconstruction'. Pages 191–215 in *Paul and Politics: Ekklesia, Israel, Imperium, Interpretation: Essays in Honor of Kirster Stendahl*. Edited by Richard A. Horsley. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2000.

Watson, Deborah Elaine. 'Paul's Collection in Light of Motivations and Mechanisms for Aid to the Poor in the First-Century World'. PhD diss., University of Durham, 2006.

Welborn, L.L. '"That There May Be Equality": The Contexts and Consequences of a Pauline Ideal'. *NTS* 59 (2013): 73–90.

Whittaker, Molly, ed. *Der* Hirt des Hermas. 2nd ed. GCS 48. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1967.

Williams, Francis E. 'Is Almsgiving the Point of the "Unjust Steward"'? *JBL* 83 (1964): 293–97.

Windisch, Hans. *Der zweite Korintherbrief*. 9th ed. KEK 6. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1924.

Intertextual Connections between Matthew's Gospel and Early Jewish Writings: The Case of Hosea 6:6 in Matthew 12:7

Giulio Michelini

The present research will focus on the second intertextual quotation of the prophet Hosea in the Gospel of Matthew (Hosea 6:6 in Matthew 12:7), which seems to represent a common ground for Judaism and Christianity in the post-70 CE crisis.

1. Two Communities Facing the Same Tragedy

Since W.D. Davies's 1964 book *The Setting of the Sermon of the Mount*,[1] many scholars assume that confrontation with rabbinic Judaism is the most important key to interpret the gospel of Matthew. This gospel represented an alternative to those Jews of the future 'formative Judaism' (or 'Jamnian Judaism') who tried to build a community that could survive the loss of the Temple, and whose program, according to another scholar, 'was exemplified in a quotation from the prophet Hosea beloved of the leader of the Jamnian movement, Yoḥanan ben Zakkai: "I desire mercy and not sacrifice"'.[2] We refer to *'Abot de Rabbi Nathan*, a text dated to the second or third century CE (but by others as late as the ninth century), in a story where tanna Yoḥanan ben Zakkai, coming from the destroyed Jerusalem, is asked by Rabbi Joshua about the future of sacrifices and atonement. 'Yoḥanan answered, "Do not be afraid. We have another atonement instead of it". He asked, "What is it"? Johanan answered, "For I desire loving kindness and not sacrifice (Hosea 6:6)"'.[3]

In Matthew 12:7 the first evangelist quotes the same text, Hosea 6:6, a second time (after Matthew 9:13), in this case to give a response to the Pharisees' criticism of Jesus' disciples, who were plucking grain on the sabbath.[4] In the context in which Matthew writes his gospel, that is, after the fall of the Temple of Jerusalem, the interpretation of Hosea 6:6 receives a new insight, since there is no more possible risk to criticize the Temple and sacrificial cults, which have already been replaced by the study of Torah.

---

[1] William D. Davies, *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964).

[2] Ian Boxall, *Discovering Matthew: Content, Interpretation, Reception* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 2014), 63.

[3] *Abot R. Nat.* B, 8. Text: Anthony J. Saldarini, ed. and trans., *The Fathers According to Rabbi Nathan (Abot de Rabbi Nathan) Version B: A Translation and Commentary*, SJLA 11 (Leiden: Brill, 1975).

[4] Matt 12:1-8.

The community of Matthew, as well as Pharisaic Judaism with Yoḥanan ben Zakkai, are coping with the same historical turmoil represented by the fall of the Temple. Between the Matthean community and Pharisaic one, even if various differences are evident (and the main one concerns the role of the Law and of Jesus, where Jesus, according to Matthew, *is* the interpreter of the Law), many more points of contact are present. This one is the use of the same intertextual reference, Hosea 6:6, but in different situations—with different results.

2. Intertextual Process in the Citation of Hosea 6:6 in Matthew 12:7

In the practice of intertextuality at least four factors interact when quoting a text in another text:[5] (1) the pre-text or source text from which the quotation has been taken, with its original meaning; (2) the quotation itself; (3) the new context, or the text into which the quotation is inserted; and (4) the readers' cooperation, with his/her knowledge.

(1) The *pre-text* or *context* of the quotation is Hosea 6:1–3, which describes what at first glance looks like genuine repentance on the part of Israel, while in verses 4–10 the prophet shows that the repentance is not sincere: this is because only sacrifices are made and God is not satisfied with rituals. Notwithstanding differences in the use of the quotation of Hosea 6:6 in Matthew, 'as in Matthew's context, Hosea is not abolishing the sacrificial system, but rather is declaring its meaningless apart from heartfelt repentance demonstrated through consistently chanced behaviour'.[6] The same applies to the later interpretation in the *'Abot de Rabbi Nathan*, where no critics to sacrifices are present.

(2) The *new interpretation* given to MT Hosea 6:6, translated and quoted in the Gospel of Matthew, gives no room for an opposition between mercy and sacrifices, and is an explication of what will be found also in rabbinical sources: 'It is largely accepted that Matthew's καὶ οὐ [in ἔλεος θέλω καὶ οὐ θυσίαν] in Matt 12:7 is not a starkly contrastive assertion but a Hebraic idiom of "dialectical negation" meaning "I desire mercy *more* than sacrifice"'.[7] According to Ulrich Luz, 'This was clearly the understanding of Hosea himself, the Targum, and contemporary Jewish exegesis. It also best fits the

[5] See on this point, Heinrich F. Plett, 'Intertextualities', in *Intertextuality*, ed. Heinrich F. Plett, Untersuchungen zur Texttheorie 15 (Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1991), 3-29; and Wilhelmus Johannes Cornelis Weren, *Intertextualiteit en bijbel* (Kampen: Kok, 1993), 18.

[6] Craig L. Blomberg, 'Matthew', in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, ed. George K. Beale and Donald A. Carson (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 34.

[7] Daniel M. Gurtner, 'Matthew's Theology of the Temple and the "Parting of the Ways": Christian Origins and the First Gospel', in *Built Upon the Rock: Studies in the Gospel of Matthew*, ed. Daniel M. Gurtner and John Nolland (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 134.

thought of Matthew himself, who did not abolish the cultic law but made it inferior to the love command.[8] He understands Hos 6:6 in the sense of total obedience. If someone is not merciful toward the neighbor, all sacrifices avail nothing'.[9]

(3) The *contexts* in which the quotation of Hosea 6:6 arrives, in Matthew's narrative (Galilee, before 70 CE) and in Yoḥanan ben Zakkai's story (just outside Jerusalem, after 70 CE), are different. As for Matthew, chapters 9 and 12 quote Hosea in two different contexts, both of which originate in a polemic with the Pharisees and include the presence of disciples. Strictly speaking, Jesus is still in Galilee *before* the fall of Jerusalem, and the discussions are focused on eating with sinners or with observing Sabbath; the Gospel of Matthew, however, was written *after* the fall of the Temple. As for the quotation of Hosea 6:6 in the new context of *'Abot de Rabbi Nathan*, we should not forget – apart from differences seen above, of space and time – that the tanna is having a discussion with a different opinion, namely, the one of Rabbi Joshua, on sacrifices and atonement.

(4) Coming to the last point of the intertextual process, it is obvious that the most complex point of that process is the *reader*, due to his/her world of knowledge, or, as Umberto Eco says, his/her 'culture' or 'the chain of previous influences', that is, 'the universe of the encyclopedia'.[10] From the point of view of the reader, we might assume that the issue of the Temple is at stake, too, with the pericope in the Gospel of Matthew, but *only if a competent reader is able* to connect Jesus' words *and* the post-70 CE situation. In such a case that reader of the Gospel of Matthew could be aware of the interpretation that the late Pharisees, like Yoḥanan ben Zakkai, would give to the text. It might be true, as Martin Hengel wrote, that 'in contrast to Luke, Matthew no longer directs his gaze backwards to the destruction of city and temple; for him both are worth mentioning only as a divine act of judgment. He no longer makes any mention of a lament of Jesus over Jerusalem; rather, he strictly and firmly points to the coming of judgment of the Son of man (ch. 25)'.[11] But the 'gaze' of the reader is different from the one of the author, and goes beyond the author's eyes.

Indeed, it could also be possible that a dialectical interaction with the tale of Yoḥanan ben Zakkai and rabbinic arguments were presumed by the author of the gospel himself (as Nina Collins, who proposes a direct interaction between Rabbi

---

[8] Matt 5:18–19, 23–24; 23:23–28.

[9] Ulrich Luz, *Matthew 8-20: A Commentary*, ed. Helmut Koester, trans. James E. Crouch, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001), 34.

[10] Umberto Eco, *On Literature*, transl. Martin McLaughlin (Orlando: Harcourt, 2002), 119.

[11] Martin Hengel, *The Four Gospels and the One Gospel of Jesus Christ: An Investigation of the Collection and Origin of the Canonical Gospels*, trans. John Bowden (London: SCM Press, 2000), 195.

Akiva and Matthew, believes).[12] However, we can come to the same conclusion from another way, based on the theory of intertextuality. According to Eco, in the process of intertextuality a quoted text influences the author when writing: together with an *intentio auctoris*, an *intentio operis* and an *intentio lectoris*, there is also an *intentio intertextualitatis*.[13] Speaking of the relationship of influence between two authors, authors A and B may be contemporaries (like, in this case, Matthew and Yoḥanan ben Zakkai), and one can discuss whether there is any influence between them. There is also the case that A comes before B, and so the question is the influence of A on B; but there is also 'a(n) X at the top of the triangle', which is, as said before, 'the universe of the encyclopedia'. But what is even more important, according to Eco, is that an author – who is influenced by culture – is (1) either fully conscious of an influence from another author or (2) is *not completely aware* of that influence, which is consequently recognized by the readers.[14]

This leads to the following conclusion. (a) Should Matthew have been aware of the new context in which rabbis such as Yoḥanan ben Zakkai used the text of Hosea, then the author of this gospel was confronting his opponents (that is, the Pharisees, which Jesus also confronted) – on the same ground, quoting a verse from Hosea that the rabbis used to insist on a different problem. (b) But if Matthew was not aware of the influence of Hosea 6:6, it could have been recognized by a competent reader: the gaze of the reader of Matthew's Gospel, as noted above, could see what the author was not aware of doing and did not see.

3. Hosea 6:6 as Common Ground for Mutual Knowledge or Direct Interaction

The very brief text of Hosea 6:6 became in the first century CE a common ground, either for the Tannaim or for the followers of Jesus, confronting each community in a dialectical research of identity. The same sentence was quoted by Matthew's Gospel and by the rabbis, and the quotations were not set against the meaning of the verse in the original context (the book of Hosea), since in both these new contexts they had no anti-cultic assumptions: since the destruction of the Temple, new solutions for atonement of sins had to be sought. Nevertheless, these two interpretations of Hosea 6:6 were different, based mainly on christological premises, for Matthew, and representing a reinterpretation of Judaism, for the rabbis. Since reading presupposes a cooperation by the reader, competent readers of Matthew 12 and Judaic writings were those who, ultimately, could recognize *also* in the Gos-

---

[12] See Nina L. Collins, *Jesus, the Sabbath and the Jewish Debate: Healing on the Sabbath in the 1st and 2nd Century CE*, LNTS 474 (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2014), 270–87.

[13] Eco, *On Literature*, 121.

[14] Cf. Eco, *On Literature*, 121–22.

pel of Matthew those issues that were evident for Yoḥanan ben Zakkai (that is, how to react to the post-70 crisis and the destruction of the Temple).

However, the usage of the same verse, Hosea 6:6, might presume a mutual knowledge of contexts in which the verse of the prophet was used (the community of Matthew and Yoḥanan ben Zakkai), and perhaps also a direct interaction (as Collins thinks) between members of what will be later different religions, after the parting of the ways. While reading the gospels, they should always be compared with early Jewish sources, since they share the same *milieu* and may even influence one another. Rabbinic writings are the proof of influences and interactions with the followers of Jesus, and the quotation of Hosea 6:6 in Matthew's Gospel seems to confirm it.

Bibliography

Blomberg, Craig L. 'Matthew'. Pages 1-110 in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*. Edited by Gregory K. Beale and Donald A. Carson. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.

Boxall, Ian. *Discovering Matthew: Content, Interpretation, Reception.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 2014.

Collins, Nina L. *Jesus, the Sabbath and the Jewish Debate: Healing on the Sabbath in the 1st and 2nd Century CE*. LNTS 474. London: Bloomsbury T. & T. Clark, 2014.

Davies, W.D. *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964.

Eco, Umberto. *On Literature*. Translated by Martin McLaughlin. Orlando: Harcourt, 2002.

Gurtner, Daniel M. 'Matthew's Theology of the Temple and the "Parting of the Ways": Christian Origins and the First Gospel'. Pages 128–53 in *Built Upon the Rock: Studies in the Gospel of Matthew*. Edited by Daniel M. Gurtner and John Nolland. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.

Hengel, Martin. *The Four Gospels and the One Gospel of Jesus Christ: An Investigation of the Collection and Origin of the Canonical Gospels.* Translated by John Bowden. London: SCM Press, 2000.

Luz, Ulrich. *Matthew 8-20: A Commentary.* Edited by Helmut Koester. Translated by James E. Crouch. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001.

Plett, Heinrich F. 'Intertextualities'. Pages 3-29 in *Intertextuality*. Edited by Heinrich F. Plett. Untersuchungen zur Texttheorie 15. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1991.

Saldarini, Anthony J., ed. and trans. *The Fathers According to Rabbi Nathan (Abot de Rabbi Nathan) Version B: A Translation and Commentary.* SJLA 11. Leiden: Brill, 1975.

Weren, Wilhelmus Johannes Cornelis. *Intertextualiteit en bijbel*. Kampen: Kok, 1993.

Framing Jesus and Understanding Ourselves: Isaiah in Mark's Gospel and Beyond

Sandra Huebenthal

> The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God. As it is written in Isaiah the prophet, 'Behold, I am sending my messenger ahead of you; he will prepare your way. A voice of one crying out in the desert, "Prepare the way of the Lord; make straight his paths"'.

1. Reading Mark in the 21th Century

a. What is Written and How Do You Read?

When reading these words, particular images emerge before the inner eyes of contemporary readers. Our attention is captured by the terms 'gospel', 'Christ', 'Son of God' and 'Isaiah', and we are inclined to load them with familiar interpretations and patterns. 'Gospel' denotes a literary genre or at least the good news of Jesus Christ that is read and proclaimed in the Sunday service. 'Christ' and 'Son of God' resonate with dogmatic conceptions of trinity, personal union, pre-existence and hypostatic union, virgin birth, ascension, promise and fulfilment—to name a few: Christ is the only Son of the Father, 'begotten, not made, of one being with the Father, through him all things are made'. The voice in the wilderness, the precursor of the Son of God and Lord Jesus, must consequently be John the Baptist, who will appear in person in the next verse.

As it can easily be checked using a Bible, the initial quotation in Mark 1:2–3 is not assigned correctly—or rather, it is *falsely ascribed to Isaiah*. It is, in fact, a conflation of Isaiah 40:3; Exodus 23:3; and Malachi 3:1. For a long time this observation has led to questions about Mark's *Vorlage.* Did he quote from memory or was the *Vorlage* flawed? Which other traditions did Mark use when he compiled his text—a job he is considered to have done with little or no regard for facts.[1] '*Don't know much about history*, (...) *don't know much about geography*', the first lines of the first two stanzas of Sam Cooke's famous *Wonderful World* (1960), could as well be an ironic self-characterization of Mark.

---

[1] The two most (in)famous positions in this area, frequently quoted in exegetical secondary literature, might be 'Mark is not sufficiently master of his material to be able to venture a systematic construction himself' and 'Mark is using material given to him by the tradition, which apparently he does not fully understand himself'—respectively, Rudolf Bultmann, *History of the Synoptic Tradition*, trans. John Marsh (Oxford: Blackwell, 1963), 350; Vincent Taylor, *Formation of the Gospel Tradition: Eight Lectures by Vincent Taylor* (London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd, 1933), 147.

These are only a few observations an exegetically and (at least) semi-literate faithful reader in the 21st century could make. He or she would more or less consciously use the categories and interpretative frames of their own times. Questions about correct quotations, history and geography are just as much questions of the modern age as the terms 'Christ/Messiah' and 'Son of God' are for Christian dogmatics. Jesus' followers of the first century lacked these frames. They most probably did not even understand themselves as Christians. The initial audiences of Mark's gospel knew nothing about the virgin birth or the pre-existence of the Son of God.

It is nevertheless quite illustrative to start our considerations with a brief look at these frames, for they, no less than the composition of New Testament texts, are oriented toward current and available motifs, patterns and frames. Interpreters, too, make use of what they have at hand. While Mark's initial audiences could draw from similar cultural frames like the author himself, the congruence of frames diminishes with local and temporal distance. Accordingly, Mark's gospel is understood differently in different contexts. While we today might read it as a normative and formative founding text of Christianity,[2] urban Roman Christians towards the end of the first century might have understood it as an anti-gospel to the rise of the Flavian dynasty.[3]

Socio-cultural and religious frames inform both interpretations. These are shaped by a focus on particular connecting factors and a disregard for others. Most readings do not activate all four of the aforementioned key concepts and usually limit themselves only to 'gospel', 'Christ' and 'Son of God'.[4] The fourth, 'Isaiah', and

---

[2] Cf. Werner Kelber, 'The Works of Memory: Christian Origins as MnemoHistory – A Response', in *Memory, Tradition, and Text: Uses of the Past in Early Christianity*, ed. Alan Kirk and Tom Thatcher, SemeiaSt 52 (Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005), 244; Hubert Frankemölle, *Frühjudentum und Urchristentum: Vorgeschichte – Verlauf – Auswirkungen (4. Jahrhundert v. Chr. bis 4. Jahrhundert n. Chr.)*, Kohlhammer Studienbücher Theologie 5 (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2006), 296—both building on the work of Jan Assmann. The first monograph dealing with the question is Sandra Huebenthal, *Das Markusevangelium als kollektives Gedächtnis*, FRLANT 257 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2014; 2nd ed. 2018); eadem, *Reading Mark's Gospel as a Text from Collective Memory* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2020).

[3] For a survey of the contributions in the field, see Tobias Nicklas, 'Jesus und Vespasian? Das Markusevangelium als politisch interessiertes "Anti-Evangelium" zum Aufstieg der Flavier?', in *Reading the Political in Jewish and Christian Texts*, ed. Julia Synder and Korinna Zamfir, BTS 38 (Leuven: Peeters, 2020), 159-78. For a discussion of the idea from a cultural studies perspective, Sandra Huebenthal, 'Anti-Gospel Revisited', in *Reading the Political in Jewish and Christian Texts,* 137–58.

[4] The text critical question whether υἱοῦ θεοῦ was part of the original text is under discussion and the witnesses allow for both scenarios. After a careful evaluation of the arguments, the latest research is in favor of the longer reading. See Tommy Wasserman, 'The "Son of God" was in the Beginning (Mark 1:1)', *JTS* 62 (2011): 20–50; Dean B. Deppe, 'Markan Christology and the Omission of υἱοῦ θεοῦ in Mark 1:1', *Filología Neotestamentaria* 21 (2008): 45–64.

the interpretative frame tied to it are usually not actualized. 'Isaiah' drops out for a Gentile-Christian urban Roman audience in the late first century, because the lemma does not denote much more than 'Jewish prophet' in this encyclopedia. It hardly signifies more than Jesus' Jewish lineage. The contemporary reader, on the other hand, when reading the word 'Isaiah' might think in categories of canon and link quotations in New Testament texts to the later scheme of promise and fulfilment or assign it an apologetic character in the disputes related to 'the parting of the ways'. Isaiah might be mentioned as the source of the quotation, but—as the modern reader instantly recognizes—this is not entirely correct. Already in the second verse of the gospel the meticulous eye of the professional biblical scholar will suspect an unreliable author and chronicler, but not an unreliable *narrator*.

b. New Ways in Markan Scholarship

Biblical scholarship still has issues letting go of this reservation, but there is hope. In the last decades, the discipline has undergone major changes and shifts of paradigm, some of which are still waiting to be embraced fully. These shifts include the turn from the search for the *historical* Jesus to investigation of the Jesus *remembered* and, fueled by the growing importance of orality and memory studies, a different perception of the processes of memory and tradition. The entire game has changed and there seems to be no way back to the times when gospels were considered to be dealing with the historical Jesus. In the aftermath of the *cultural turn*, (biblical) texts are regarded no longer as images or copies but as constructs of reality.[5] Read from a cultural studies perspective, New Testament texts do not report what happened, but rather bear witness to particular constructs of reality.

Research on the references to or quotations from Isaiah in Mark's gospel is a good example to show how much research questions and approaches have changed. In the late 1980s Hubert Frankemölle dedicated a long article in the Festschrift for Joachim Gnilka to the question of whether Jesus is Second Isaiah's messenger (*deuterojesajanischer Freudenbote*), not only in Mark's perception, but also in Jesus' perception. In this contribution, Frankemölle also put *traditionsgeschichtliche Exegese* to the test.[6] The question he was dealing with was not whether Jesus *is* Second Isaiah's messenger who brings joy, nor was it whether the Gospel according to Mark understands

[5] For a brief introduction to the concept and an application to biblical scholarship, see Peter Lampe, 'Der Modellfall Auferstehung Jesu: Zu einer konstruktivistischen Theorie der Geschichtsschreibung', *EvT* 69 (2009): 186–93.

[6] Hubert Frankemölle, 'Jesus als deuterojesajanischer Freudenbote? Zur Rezeption von Jes 52,7 und 61,1 im Neuen Testament, durch Jesus und in den Targumim', in *Vom Urchristentum zu Jesus: Für Joachim Gnilka*, ed. Hubert Frankemölle and Karl Kertelge (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1989), 35.

him in these terms; rather it was whether *the historical Jesus understood himself* in these categories.[7] His answer was that this question cannot be answered, because exegetical methods do not offer any safe road behind the text—neither to the actual historical event nor to the traditions reworked in a text like Mark's gospel.[8] One of his methodological conclusions goes to the core of the problem—traditions are anything but stable: 'Traditionen sind Elemente, die im Text auftreten und nicht nur vor, sondern auch neben und nach ihm ein Eigenleben führen'.[9] It took time until the implications of these findings—much debated at the SNTS Annual Meeting in Cambridge in 1988—began to be accepted in the discipline. In subsequent years the road has lead from questions about Jesus' self-perception via the investigation of *plausibility* to a more cultural-studies oriented exegesis and the growing insight that New Testament texts are theological texts in the first place. They are texts, in which people try to understand their experiences within their own socio-cultural contexts and with the help of familiar religious motifs, literary forms and cultural frames.

Approaching a text like Mark's gospel with a cultural studies hermeneutical framework allows for distinguishing the different levels of the question: When Mark frames Jesus, his message and his ministry in terms of Isaiah, the text makes a statement, not about who Jesus was or how he saw himself, but about how the people behind the text understand him. Mark's gospel is thus not about history or geography, but about theology. The different levels, however, are not always separated clearly. In his informative article 'From Gospel to Gospel: The Function of Isaiah in the New Testament', Craig Evans states, 'We have here every indication that Jesus understood his call and ministry in terms of (Second) Isaiah. In short, Jesus' gospel is essentially Isaiah's gospel'.[10] It remains unclear whether this is an assertion about the historical Jesus or Jesus as he is remembered in Mark's gospel. It would be helpful if a sentence like 'Jesus again appears to be familiar with the Aramaic tradition'[11] read '*Mark's Jesus* again appears to be familiar with the Aramaic tradition'; this would avoid the impression of taking the New Testament text too literally. Even then, a little caution is in order, as Frankemölle has also pointed

---

[7] Frankemölle, 'Jesus als deuterojesajanischer Freudenbote?', 43.

[8] Idem, 54.

[9] Idem, 67.

[10] Craig A. Evans, 'From Gospel to Gospel: The Function of Isaiah in the New Testament', in *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretative Tradition*, ed. Craig C. Broyles and Craig A. Evans, 2 vols., VTSup 70/FIOTL 1-2 (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 2:671. As Evans supports his argument with reference to the research of Harnack, Burrows and Betz, it is likely that his conclusion, in fact, relates to the historical Jesus.

[11] Evans, 'From Gospel to Gospel', 2:670.

out.[12] Scholarship indebted to the cultural turn is much more cautious and reserved about historical conclusions and would rather say that a text like the Gospel according to Mark presents Jesus in these categories, similar to what Evans states a couple of paragraphs later: 'Moreover, Jesus' exorcisms and healings were probably understood in terms of Isaiah's prophecy of God's reign'.[13]

One could thus say that it is not Jesus who understood himself to be the messenger of Isaiah's gospel, but the Gospel according to Mark, which sees Jesus in this tradition and frames him as Isaiah's anointed son of god, the eschatological messenger of the kingdom of God. The question is no longer how Jesus understood himself or whether it is plausible that the historical Jesus quoted Isaiah in arguments,[14] but how later generations made sense of the Christ event. When this is taken seriously, each New Testament text has a particular approach and a unique perspective when it comes to understanding Jesus. It also implies that there is no sense in adding up or combining different versions of the *Jesus remembered* from different texts in order to learn something about the historical Jesus. Reading the texts as individual theological outlines of the Jesus event, however, will speak volumes of how early groups of Jesus followers tried to understand him with the help of (familiar) categories like Isaiah's prophecy.

Reading the Gospel according to Mark against this hermeneutical background renders it more and more obvious that this text is not composed clumsily or without regard for history or geography; nor does its author make random use of quotations from Jewish scriptures, which are sometimes falsely ascribed. Drawing from social memory theory, I will argue in this article that Mark on the contrary makes conscious use of Jewish scriptures, and especially the book of Isaiah, using the prophecy and the book as a frame for a proper understanding of Jesus. We will see that references to Isaiah can be traced though all parts of the gospel text and that they prove to be a much stronger interpretative frame, for instance, than references to Elijah or Moses. By negotiating the Isaiah-frame with other current Jesus perceptions, Mark also makes a suggestion for a particular understanding of Jesus that offers connectivity for both Jews and Gentiles and that retains a social identity for Jesus followers which is deeply rooted in Isaiah's prophecy. This perception of Jesus

---

[12] Cf. Frankemölle, 'Jesus als deuterojesajanischer Freudenbote?', 56-64. Here again, Frankemölle argues convincingly with regard to both content *and* methodology.

[13] Evans, 'From Gospel to Gospel', 672–73.

[14] Thomas R. Hatina's study is a good example for this debate; 'Did Jesus Quote Isaiah 29:13 against the Pharisees? An Unpopular Appraisal', *BBR* 16/1 (2006): 79–94. In the article, Hatina defends the plausibility of historical context against the notion of a Markan redaction. The question of the form of the quotation (rather derived from the LXX than from Aramaic traditions) is then resolved through Christian redaction. The additional value of this study lies in its insights into scribal discussions of the first century.

does not only draw heavily from pre-Markan traditions, but was also embraced happily by the later Synoptic gospels and other New Testament writings. A closer look at these texts will indicate that, while later New Testament books mark quotations from Isaiah more clearly in and seem to focus on a few core texts only, the whole book of Isaiah remains an important cultural frame in Early Christianity.[15] As groups of Jesus followers and their interpretations change over time, the hermeneutical lenses used to understand experiences and insights must be adapted to ever changing conditions. These processes, too, can be detected when reading New Testament texts diachronically, in the form of a chronological longitudinal cut.

2. Social Memory Theory and Framing Jesus

The Gospel according to Mark is occupied deeply with who Jesus is. To my perception, this is the main question the text deals with. In his account of the Jesus story, Mark uses particular images and ideas to convey this message to hearers and readers. In order to make plausible what happened, Mark presents the traditions of Jesus' life, words and destiny in a coherent written form. In doing so, he *interprets* the figure that speaks and is spoken of in those traditions.[16] In social memory theory this way of making sense is known as 'framing' or 'keying'.[17] Read from the perspective of social memory theory, Mark does not describe what has happened—with all the distortions human memory is prone to exhibit. His recollection of Jesus serves a different end and is fully in line with the findings about recollection in antiquity. In contrast to modern assumptions, ancient memory was heuristic, not simply mimetic. 'The work of memory was not to re-present, not to reduplicate,

[15] The paper presented at the conference in Naples, as well as the first version of this article, made use of the term 'Second Isaiah'. Realizing that this idea, too, is a modern interpretation and that the authors of the texts which later became the New Testament knew neither 'Second Isaiah', 'Third Isaiah' nor the 'Servant Songs' (which were at first been isolated from their context in Bernhard Duhm's 1892 commentary), I decided to refrain from using these expressions here.

[16] Francis Watson, *Gospel Writing: A Canonical Perspective* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013), 217.

[17] Framing and keying found their way into biblical studies partly via the work of Barry Schwartz, 'Collective Memory and the Social Change: The Democratization of George Washington', *American Sociological Review* 56 (1991): 221–36; and idem, *Abraham Lincoln and the Forge of National Memory* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000). Schwartz's work has been highlighted by Alan Kirk, Tom Thatcher, Werner Kelber and Chris Keith—cf. Kelber, 'The Works of Memory', in *Imprints, Voiceprints and Footprints of Memory: Collected Essays of Werner Kelber*, ed. Werner Kelber, RBS 74 (Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013), 265-96; Chris Keith and Tom Thatcher, 'The Scar of the Cross: The Violence Ratio and the Earliest Christian Memories of Jesus', in *Jesus, the Voice, and the Text: Beyond the Oral and the Written Gospel*, ed. Tom Thatcher (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2008), 197-217.

but to construct, to deliver a place for images', as Arthur Dewey has put it.[18] Understood this way, memory does not depict, but unlock. It serves as a frame for making sense of what has happened.

Reading the Gospel according to Mark as a text that is framing or keying experiences people have made with Jesus and his gospel is a particular way of dealing with tradition. It goes a step beyond the search for motifs. Unlike a more classical approach it does not try to tackle exact sources or investigate how and why they were worked into a text. The key difference between this type of approach and 'interpretative keying'[19] is that, while the classical approach looks for sources, keying works with memory figures or *topoi*, it serves constructive, not explicatory ends.[20] In keying tradition is used to make sense of events. In the case of Mark's gospel, this is the Christ event. The initial quotation in Mark 1:2–3 is a good illustration of the difference. While the classical approach claims that the quotation is not correct and wonders about its *Vorlage*, interpretative framing recognizes the quotation's programmatic character and the beginning of three different traditional threads running through the text. Read this way, the reference to Malachi opens an Elijah-frame, the allusion to the exodus opens a Moses-frame and the mentioning of Isaiah opens an Isaiah-frame, as Heike Omerzu has pointed out.[21]

a. Who Then is This? Cultural Frames for a Crucial Question

It is fascinating to explore Mark's use of Isaiah in more detail and to analyse how it informs the perception of Jesus in Mark's gospel.[22] The narrator seems to answer the question 'Who is Jesus'? in the initial verses already. Regardless of the potential for understanding the three key words εὐαγγέλιον, χριστός and υἱός θεοῦ outside Mark's gospel, the way the beginning of the text is phrased indicates that in this particular work they are determined by the fourth one, '*Isaiah the prophet*'.

---

[18] Arthur J. Dewey, 'The Locus for Death: Social Memory and the Passion Narratives', in *Memory, Tradition, and Text: Uses of the Past in Early Christianity*, 126.

[19] Cf. Alan Kirk, 'The Memory of Violence and the Death of Jesus in Q', in *Memory, Tradition, and Text: Uses of the Past in Early Christianity*, 191-206.

[20] Werner Kelber, 'Memory and Violence, or Genealogies of Remembering', in *Imprints, Voiceprints and Footprints of Memory*, 361.

[21] Heike Omerzu, 'Geschichte durch Geschichten: Zur Bedeutung jüdischer Traditionen für die Jesusdarstellung des Markusevangeliums', *Early Christianity* 2 (2011): 83.

[22] Research for the conference paper which forms the first part of this article coincided with the work on my contribution about Mark's gospel for Chris Keith *et al.*, eds., *The Reception of Jesus in the First Three Centuries*, 3 vols. (New York: T&T Clark, 2020). As both manuscripts were written roughly at the same time, there are considerable verbatim overlaps.

From the notion of *good news of the emperor* non-Jewish audiences might have understood υἱός θεοῦ to be referring to the emperor as a *divi filius* and may have taken an 'anointed one' to be referring to something akin to deity.[23] I find it much more convincing, however, that εὐαγγέλιον is alluding to the good tidings proclaimed in Isaiah 40–55. Given the use of Isaiah in the entire text, it is more likely that the expression is derived from the corresponding participle εὐαγγελιζόμενος, used in Isaiah 40:9; 52:7 (LXX) and 61:1. The reference in Isaiah 40:9–11 is particularly interesting here, as it follows the passage quoted in Mark 1:3.[24] It expresses that there will be a time when the announcements of Isaiah 35:5–6 are fulfilled, if people change their ways. The call to return to God is another feature Mark and Isaiah 40–55 share, and it will be the content of Jesus' first words in Mark 1:14–15.

The fact that Mark's gospel brings in the prophet and book of Isaiah *ab initio* and directly refers to them several times again in the text indicates that both are of major importance for understanding Mark's text. To put it differently, the references to the Isaiah-tradition must not be missed—neither by Jewish nor by non-Jewish readers. The provenance of quotations from Isaiah is mentioned twice[25] and identifiable quotes from the book are distributed all over the Markan text. Table 1 (below) provides a survey of the direct quotations (bold) and possible allusions to Isaiah, as they have been traced and detected by different critical editions and scientific studies:

Table 1: Quotations and Possible Allusions to Isaiah in Mark's Gospel

Isaiah	Mark	Content
5:1–7	12:1	Song of the vineyard
6:9–10	**4:12**	**Hearing, but not understanding; seeing, but not perceiving**
10:2	12:40	Depriving the needy of justice
11:1–2; 6–8	1:12–13	Eschatological peace of the animals
13:10; 24:19	**13:24–25**	**Coming judgement day of the Lord**

[23] Cf. Morna D. Hooker, 'Isaiah in Mark's Gospel', in *Isaiah in the New Testament*, ed. Stephen Moyise and Marten J.J. Menken, NTSI (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2005), 36–37. Not every recipient, however, will have instantly understood the term εὐαγγέλιον this way. As the noun is not used in the Septuagint, there have been speculations that the term could rather be derived from the imperial cult, where it denotes 'good news' about the emperor. Especially non-Jewish audiences in the Roman Empire are likely to have made this connection, and even Jewish audiences might have heard an echo of this use; but the connection to Isaiah is too strong to be excluded completely. See Huebenthal, 'Anti-Gospel Revisited'.

[24] Cf. Omerzu, 'Geschichte durch Geschichten', 91.

[25] Mark 1:2; 7:6.

19:2; 13:13; 8:21	13:8	Coming disaster
25:6–8	6:35–44	Eschatological banquet
28:7	3:21	Confusion and losing one's senses
29:13	**7:6–7**	**People draw near with their words, but remove their hearts**
35:5–6	7:37	The blind will see, the deaf will hear, etc.
40:3	**1:2–3**	**A voice in the wilderness calls: 'Prepare the way of the Lord'**
42:1	1:11; 9:11	Affiliation with God is communicated
43:3f	10:45	Giving life as a ransom
43:25	2:7	Forgiving sins
45:21	12:32	There is no other God
49:24f	3:27	Can prey be taken from a mighty man?
50:6	10:34	Humiliation and spitting
51:17	10:38; 14:36	The cup Jesus is reluctant to drink
51:6	13:31	God's salvation shall be forever
52:7-9	1:15	The paces of the eschatological messenger and God's reign
53:3	9:12	A man despised and forsaken
53:6.12	14:21	He poured himself to death
53:7	14:49, 61	He did not open his mouth
53:10–12	10:45	The servant will serve the many
53:12	14:24	He bore the sins of the many
53:12	15:25–28	He was numbered with the transgressors
56:7	**11:17**	**The temple will be called a house of prayer**
62:5	2:19ff	God as the bridegroom
64:1 (LXX 63:9)	1:10	Rending the heavens
65:4	5:3.11	Those who sit among graves
66:24	**9:48**	**Warning of possible destruction in contrast to a reward**

At first glance, the amount of quotations and possible allusions is overwhelming and does not appear to be easily unlocked. When we focus our attention on the most important connections, it becomes apparent that the 'beginning of the good news of Jesus, the anointed one, son of God ' does not begin 'as it is written in Isaiah, the prophet' accidentally. Rather, it is on purpose. In Isaiah, too, there is 'an anointed one'. It is understandable to ask at this point whether the arrangement of the text indicates that Mark's 'anointed son of God' should be understood in the categories of Isaiah's prophecy. In order to have this question clarified, we might expect to find a direct reference to Isaiah 61:1 (as in Luke 4:18), in order to make sure no one misses the point: 'The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me, because the LORD has anointed me to bring good news to the afflicted...' Research has shown,

however, that framing does not necessarily work according to this principle:[26] if the point is to use the text for heuristic purposes and invoke a particular memory figure or idea, it might not be necessary to flag the use of an individual text that introduces or supports this idea. This, of course, requires an audience familiar with Isaiah—or at least hearers and readers who are willing to make themselves familiar with him when they realize the significance of the prophet and the book assigned to him. If the initial quotation is the indicator that the whole story should be understood in light of Isaiah's prophecy, it explains why such an emphasis is put on Isaiah in Mark 1:1–3 and renders it less surprising that this reference is the only authorial quotation in the whole text.

b. Mark's Favourite Frame: Isaiah's Anointed Son of God

In order to answer the question whether Mark's 'anointed one' is to be understood in terms of Isaiah, a logical next step is an analysis of the other occurrences of χριστός in Mark's gospel.[27] A close look at the second occurrence, however, might be sufficient to understand the idea. Peter's confession of Jesus as the 'anointed one',[28] usually referred to as Peter's confession of Jesus as the Messiah (*Messiasbekenntnis*), is sometimes understood to be a fracture of both Mark's messianic secret (*Messiasgeheimnis*) and the disciples' lack of comprehension (*Jüngerunverständnis*). Once more, we are dealing with interpretative frames. Both the messianic secret and the disciples' lack of comprehension are modern interpretative categories and not features of the text. Paired with the historical-critical tendency of reading individual pericopae instead of longer passages, they might in fact be more confusing than enlightening. Read according to later Christological categories, Peter's statement is indeed somewhat surprising. When 'Markan Christology' is about the suffering Messiah who can only be adequately understood as Christ and Son of God though cross and resurrection, Peter's testimony can only be seen as oddly premature. Peter seems to say something that, according to the logic of the narrative, he cannot know at this point. Matthew seemingly 'solves' this problem by ascribing a divine revelation to him: 'Jesus said to him in reply, "Blessed are you, Simon son of

[26] Cf. Kelber, 'Memory and Violence, or Genealogies of Remembering', 360–64.

[27] The expression χριστός is found eight times in Mark's gospel. In Mark 1:1 it is used by the narrator and in Mark 8:29 it is again picked up by Peter. Jesus uses the expression in Mark 9:41 and 13:22, each time in an eschatological context, and again in Mark 12:35 and 13:21 quoting others. In Mark 14:61 the high priest makes use of it during Jesus' tribunal, and the high priests and scribes echo this scene in their mocking under the cross in Mark 15:32.

[28] Mark 8:29.

Jonah, for flesh and blood has not revealed this to you, but my heavenly Father"'.[29] This reading is understandable, for it allows for retaining later Christological categories. The elephant in the room, however, might not be Christology after all, but Isaiah's anointed son of God.

Most intriguingly, Mark 8:27–29 repeats a theme that was discussed already in Mark 6:1–16, namely, different approaches to understanding Jesus. Leaving aside for the moment suggested structural patterns for the text—and following the logic of the narrative—the question is not whether Peter's insight is slightly premature, but rather, *what has Peter seen up to this point?* and *on what experience does he verbalize his impression?* At this point, a production-oriented diachronic reading of Mark's gospel, which is predominantly interested in the shape and origin of the smaller pre-Markan units, might lose its way. A synchronic reader, however, who is following the story, will have little trouble answering that Peter last saw Jesus restore the sight of a blind man. This released the man, not only from darkness, but also from poverty, for with his sight restored he would be able to work and lead a normal life.[30] Peter has also seen that Jesus, refusing to give signs, is neither a signs prophet, like Theudas, nor a political messiah, like Judas the Galilean.[31] Finally, Peter has seen Jesus feeding hungry people and healing a deaf man who spoke with difficulties.[32] In Mark 7:37 presumably non-Jewish characters even praise God in the words of Isaiah 35:5: 'Then the eyes of the blind will be opened, and the ears of the deaf will be unstopped'.

This last episode, in particular, is quite an interesting turn of events for the reader who has carefully been following the story up to this point. In Mark 4:11 a strange kind of spell was imposed on Jesus' (Jewish) audience, again using words from Isaiah and again without being marked as words from the prophet:

> And He said, 'Go, and tell this people,
> "Keep on listening, but do not perceive;
> keep on looking, but do not understand.
> Render the hearts of this people insensitive,
> their ears dull, and their eyes dim,

[29] Matt 16:17.

[30] For blindness as a social problem, see Bernd Kollmann, 'Krankheitsbilder und soziale Folgen: Blindheit, Lähmung, Aussatz, Taubheit oder Taubstummheit', in *Die Wunder Jesu*, vol. 1 of *Kompendium der frühchristlichen Wundererzählungen*, ed. Ruben Zimmermann, 2 vols. (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2013-2017), 87-93.

[31] For Theudas, see Flavius Josephus, *Ant*. 20.97-99; and for Judas the Galilean, *J.W.* 2.117-118; *Ant*. 18.1-10.

[32] This assumes that the disciples are present in Mark 7:24–37, something the text does not explicitly say. Here the synchronic reader of the story has an advantage.

> lest they see with their eyes, hear with their ears,
> understand with their hearts, and return and be healed'".[33]

One way to read this passage is that its spell is addressed only to Jewish characters and that the crowds that praise Jesus in Mark 7:37 are of non-Jewish origin. This makes the Isaianic frame of their praise even more surprising, for it requires an audience that either is already familiar with Isaiah or has made itself familiar with the prophet and his message. Other than in Luke's gospel, where Isaiah's prophecy is made known to the audience,[34] the untrained reader will not be able to pick up the connection in Mark and will miss the irony that, while Jewish characters have been cast under an Isaianic spell, presumably non-Jewish ones praise Jesus in the words of the same prophet.

Peter could have seen and understood all these things.[35] Read in an Isaianic framework, his assessment that Jesus is the χριστός means that he is 'the anointed Son of God', Isaiah's eschatological messenger of the kingdom of God. Peter's evaluation would thus not only be correct, but almost compelling. He simply verbalizes what everybody familiar with Isaiah's prophecy could have seen and understood. Once realized, the Isaianic framework becomes more and more apparent in the text, and quickly turns out to be the dominant concept for understanding Jesus. This applies, not only to Peter's testimony, but also to the following transfiguration scene, which is equally crucial for properly understanding Jesus. As we will see now in that episode, it is not only Jesus' character that is transformed; his perceptions, too, are taken to another level.[36]

c. Renunciation, Absorption and Stabilization: Mark's Treatment of Other Frames

Mark's gospel addresses the question about Jesus in different stages. In the *first part*,[37] which is located in and around Galilee, the characters want to know who Jesus is and how his words and deeds can be best understood. Jesus is first allowed

---

[33] Isa 6:9–10.

[34] Luke 4:18–19; Isa 61:1; 58:8.

[35] Unless, of course, he is not affected himself and one who sees, but does not understand; and hears, but does not perceive. The idea is not too far off, because before he witnesses the healing in Bethsaida, Jesus asks the disciples, 'Do you not yet see or understand? Do you have a hardened heart?'; Mark 8:17.

[36] Cf. David du Toit, 'Treasuring Memory: Narrative Christology In and Beyond Mark's Gospel: Miracle-Traditions as Test Case', *Early Christianity* 6 (2015): 334–53. In his article, du Toit discusses the frames 'Elijah/Elisha', 'Moses' and 'prophet' along with the Isaianic frame 'anointed son of God'. His conclusion is that in the end they are considered subordinate to God's anointed son.

[37] Mark 1:16–8:26.

to introduce himself,[38] and after a first round of 'evaluations' by other characters, the question finally is asked directly: 'Who then is this'?[39] This first part introduces most of the different Jesus images the text deals with; the more political titles are introduced closer to the Passion narrative: 'Son of David' (υἱὸς Δαυὶδ), 'King of the Jews' (βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων) and 'King of Israel' (βασλεὺς Ἰσραὴλ). Table 2 provides a survey of the different ideas put forward by different characters:

Table 2: Different Ideas about Jesus Presented in Mark's Gospel

Who		**Supported Image**
Characters from the human sphere	Peter	Anointed One (χριστός)
	Centurion	Son of God (υἱός θεοῦ)
	Unspecified others	Prophet (προφήτης)
	Unspecified others	Elijah (Ἠλίας)
	Herod, unspecified others	John the Baptist (Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτίζων)
	Bartimaeus	Son of David (υἱὸς Δαυίδ)
	Pilate, mocking soldiers	King of the Jews (βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων)
	Scribes under the cross	King of Israel (βασιλεὺς Ἰσραήλ)
	Syrophoenican woman	Lord (κύριος)
	Disciples, Jairus' people, father of a possessed boy, rich young man, Pharisees and Herodians, Sadducees, a scribe	Teacher (διδάσκαλος)
	Peter, Jude, Bartimaeus	Rabbi (ῥαββί/ῥαββουνί)
	Scribes	Possessed (Βεελζεβούλ/πνεῦμα ἀκάρθαρτον ἔχων)
Jesus		Son of Man (υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου)
Characters from the numinous sphere	Voice from heaven/voice from the clouds	My beloved Son (ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός)
	Demons	Son of God (υἱός θεοῦ)
	Unclean spirit	God's holy one (ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ)
	Young man in tomb	Crucified one (ἐσταυρωμένος)
Narrator		Anointed One (χριστός)
		Son of God (υἱός θεοῦ)

[38] Up until Mark 3:6.

[39] Mark 4:41.

In the *second part*,[40] which narrates Jesus' way to Jerusalem, Jesus asks the disciples about the different ways people understand him. They mention John the Baptist, Elijah or another prophet as reception categories suggested so far. Jesus then asks the disciples how they themselves perceive him. As discussed above, Peter repeats the narrator's answer as it was introduced in the first line of the text: χριστός. Although he is correct according to the narrator, the character Jesus commands Peter to keep silent about it.

Other than asking whether the messianic secret is fractured here, the scene can also be seen as a reminder of the adequate perception of Jesus. This reading is supported by the verses which follow. Here Jesus reminds both the disciples and the reader of his self-concept as 'Son of Man'[41] and a few verses later he reminds them of his core message, namely, the proclamation about 'the kingdom of God'.[42] Even more strikingly, the subsequent transfiguration scene reminds the reader of the voice from heaven he and Jesus have already heard in Mark 1:11. Unlike the Baptism scene, where only Jesus and the reader hear the voice from above, the voice is now also audible to Peter, James and John, who are introduced to the idea that Jesus is the beloved 'Son of the Most High'.[43] After this experience, Jesus commands them to keep silent until the 'Son of Man' is raised from the dead. At this point in the narrative both the 'anointed one' and the 'Son of God' are flagged as important, but prone to misunderstanding; hence the characters are urged not to talk about them.

On the way back the disciples discuss Jesus' words, but do not return to the question of whether Jesus is best understood as 'anointed one', 'Son of Man' or 'Son of God'. They are rather concerned with a different issue: what resurrection from the dead means. This passage serves as a bridge for the reader and explains that Jesus is neither John the Baptist (*redivivus*) nor Elijah. After the beheading of the Baptist, the multiplication of the loaves has already implicitly communicated that something more than Elijah is at hand. Jesus now makes this explicit: when applying eschatological schemes, you have to get them right. Indeed, Elijah has to come first; it is not Jesus, however, who is the returning prophet, but John the Baptist. Why so? Because a) Jesus claims to be the 'Son of Man' and b) Elijah has just been seen talking to him.

As for negotiating the proper understanding of Jesus, Mark 8:27–9:13 is most interesting. Unnoticed by the characters, it negotiates and clarifies different pos-

[40] Mark 8:27–10:52.

[41] Mark 8:31; cf. 2:10, 28.

[42] Mark 9:1; cf. 1:14–15.

[43] The combination is once again resumed in Jesus' trial in Mark 14:61, when the high priest interrogates Jesus and asks whether he is the χριστός, the υἱὸς τοῦ εὐλογητοῦ.

sible perceptions of Jesus to the point that only three categories are left: 'anointed one', 'Son of Man' and 'Son of God'. Two of them were already mentioned in the first line of the text: 'The beginning of the gospel of Jesus the anointed one, the Son of God'. For the time being Jesus is allowed to keep the concept 'Son of Man', but as the narrative continues, this concept is successively linked more closely to the 'anointed one', until at the eschatological *Parousia* both concepts actually apply to the same person. The character Jesus and the narrator are thus both right, although they seemingly contradict each other at first. In the end, it will become apparent that Jesus is indeed 'God's anointed Son'. The historical Peter might not have been able to see this, but due to Mark's presentation the character Peter cannot but recognize in Jesus 'God's anointed Son' and the eschatological messenger of God's kingdom 'as it is written in the prophet Isaiah'.

With the Isaiah-frame firmly established, the narrative also turns to the Elijah-and-Moses-frame in the transfiguration scene. We have seen that the conflated quotation in Mark 1:2–3 opened different frames for understanding Jesus, which reconvene once more in that event. In this scene, Elijah and Moses transgress the boundaries of the interpretative frame and appear in person. Once more, the transfiguration serves as a turning point. Jesus, it becomes obvious, is neither the revenant of Moses nor of Elijah, but the eschatological messenger of God's kingdom whom Isaiah announces. This also has implications for the other frames: the Elijah-frame no longer appears after Mark 9:13. When Jesus and the disciples descend from the mountain, the Moses-frame changes and becomes less prominent. Unquestioned by all the characters in Mark's gospel, the historical figure Moses is alluded to as the authoritative giver of the law. The Moses tradition is, however, not completely without prophetic and eschatological twists, and here older traditions come in that the gospel happily embraces on the structural level. They provide another explanation for Jesus' miraculous deeds up to the transfiguration scene: Jesus' authority can also be seen in terms of Jesus being the eschatological prophet like Moses, announced in Deuteronomy 18:15–22 and 34:10–11.[44] The double pericopae of feeding the crowds and walking on the sea[45] could thus be read in light of the Moses (and Joshua)-traditions, as David du Toit has convincingly worked out. Du

[44] Especially the feeding miracle might play a role here, 'if one considers that Numbers 27 is concerned with the nomination of Joshua (Greek: Jesus!) as Moses' successor, and who is presented in that passage as endowed with God's spirit (Num 27:18, cf. Deut 34:9), as a future bearer of Moses' splendour (27:20) as well as the one to whom Israel will be obedient in the future (27:20). In this connection, it should be recalled that Joshua's first acts as successor of Moses were the miraculous crossing of the Jordan (Joshua 3–4), the restoration of the covenant (Joshua 5) and the feeding of the masses with the fruits of the land (Joshua 5 = termination of nourishment with manna)'; du Toit, 'Treasuring Memory', 334-53, 349.

[45] Mark 6:30–52.

Toit suggests that the idea of 'a prophet like Moses', based on Deuteronomy 18 and 34 in connection with other traditions about Moses and Joshua, provides a stable frame to structure and organize Jesus memories and Jesus traditions.[46] Though more subtle, the idea that Jesus is a prophet 'like Moses' is a much stronger idea than the Elijah-frame. Particularly when taken together with the traditions about Moses and Joshua and connected to Isaiah 61:1, the eschatological messenger of God becomes the dominant feature. Technically speaking, after the transfiguration, the Moses-frame moves more and more into the Isaiah-frame, until it is completely absorbed by it. Isaiah's anointed son of God exhibits all the features of the 'prophet like Moses'. In a similar way, the assignment of eschatological roles is clarified, for neither Elijah nor Moses, but Jesus is God's final messenger: He is the prophet announced by God in Deuteronomy 18:15–22.[47]

3. First Insights: Framing Jesus is also about Understanding Ourselves

As regards the four items 'gospel', 'anointed one', 'Son of God' and 'Isaiah', mentioned in the introduction, we can conclude that 'The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God. As it is written in Isaiah the prophet...' is not just a falsely ascribed quotation or a composition principle. It is rather a crucial—and perhaps the most important—frame to understand Jesus. The text depicts Jesus to be the 'anointed Son of God', God's final eschatological messenger, who proclaims the arrival of God's reign as it was already prophesied in Isaiah and as it was accompanied by circumstances anticipated there: the eyes of the blind are opened; the ears of the deaf are first stopped, then unstopped; the lame walk; and there is shouting for joy, because the tongue of the dumb is loosened. The two most prominent categories for understanding Jesus in the gospel's opening, χριστός and υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, are also the two reception categories that offer the most connectivity for non-Jewish audiences. The gospel leaves no doubt, however, that they must be read in the light of and through the prophecy of Isaiah. Mark's proclamation of Jesus is framed in categories of Isaiah.

These observations imply further that once modern readers are willing to put their Christological categories to sleep, they are likely to see Isaiah as the dominant frame pervading every part of Mark's text.[48] The use of Isaiah is distributed so

---

[46] Du Toit, 'Treasuring Memory', 348.

[47] David du Toit, '"Gesalbter Gottessohn" – Jesus als letzter Bote Gottes: Zur Christologie des Markusevangeliums', in '*... was ihr auf dem Weg verhandelt habt': Beiträge zur Exegese und Theologie des Neuen Testaments. Festschrift für Ferdinand Hahn zum 75. Geburtstag*, ed. Peter Müller, Christine Gerber and Thomas Knöppler (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neunkirchner, 2001), 42.

[48] The connection to Isaiah and eschatological readings of Isaiah is not a novelty of Mark's gospel. Quite the contrary, the text is very likely to be drawing from existent and current traditions: eschatological

evenly through all of Mark's text that the whole gospel can be read against the background of the eschatological comfort announced in Isaiah 40–55. Jesus' ὁδός, generally considered to be the second main part of the text,[49] might also appear to be painted in Isaianic colours as the 'way of the Lord', now with a stronger emphasis on suffering and drawing from Isaiah's suffering servant,[50] which is also prominent in the Passion narrative.[51] The most obvious case of interpretative keying in Mark's gospel is indeed the reception of the Passion as the fate of the innocent righteous. There are further hints, however, to a framing of the Passion in terms of Isaiah's suffering servant,[52] and these provide a first answer to the question about Jesus' fate. This is, however, neither Mark's key concern nor is there any obvious flagging in terms of marked quotations or obvious allusions. The hints are indeed faint enough, and the possibility that the contemporary reader draws connections that Mark did not envision cannot be ruled out entirely.[53]

Making visible the Isaianic frames in Mark's gospel helps to understand how the text itself provides frames for understanding Jesus. Read as an externalization of collective memory, the Gospel according to Mark not only negotiates different frames, as we have seen; rather, by suggesting a particular way to make sense of the Jesus event, it allows for collective identity constructions on that basis.[54] This does not exclude the possibility of a *different* perception of Jesus—for instance, as a returned Moses or Elijah (*redivivus*). It is indeed possible to understand Jesus as a

---

understanding of Isaiah, especially Isaiah 40–55, is also found in Qumran (1QS viii 12–16; ix 17–29), and especially Aramaic traditions which have made their way into the Targum and exhibit a use of Isaiah similar to that in Mark. Likewise, understanding Jesus and his ministry on the basis of Isaiah can already be found in Paul (for instance, 2 Cor 6:2, referring to LXX Isa 49:8) and can thus also be considered a tradition Mark makes use of; see Evans, 'From Gospel to Gospel', 682–91.

[49] Mark 8:27–10:52.

[50] Isa 52:13–53:12.

[51] Cf. Omerzu, 'Geschichte durch Geschichten', 92.

[52] Cf. Werner Kelber, 'The Works of Memory', in *Imprints, Voiceprints and Footprints of Memory*, 293–95; and idem, 'Memory and Violence, or Genealogies of Remembering', 333–66.

[53] For a solemn warning, see Hooker, 'Isaiah in Mark's Gospel', 46–47: 'In all these cases, it is difficult to be certain as to whether possible allusions are deliberate. Those who shaped the tradition before Mark may or may not have been aware of the biblical echoes it contained; Mark himself may or may not have been consciously using Isaiah's words; Mark's first readers may or may not have picked up the allusions. What is certain is that subsequent readers, alerted by Mark's opening reference to Isaiah, would have read his gospel in the light of their knowledge'.

[54] For a detailed discussion of this concept and its theoretical foundation in the work of Maurice Halbwachs and Jan and Aleida Assmann, see Huebenthal, *Das Markusevangelium als kollektives Gedächtnis*, 124–55.

prophet, Son of David or royal aspirant; but the people behind Mark's gospel express a different perception: at this time, in this place and in this text Jesus is understood to be *the anointed Son of God according to Isaiah's prophecy*.

As regards methodology, the preceding observations have also shown that the connection of narrative and intertextual analyses for reading an entire biblical book in a cultural studies perspective not only uncovers the book's theological profile, but also discloses which cultural frames are, are not or are no longer used to structure and organize Jesus memories. For those standing behind the text, Mark's gospel does not say who Jesus *was*; rather, with the help of an Isaiah framework, it discloses who Jesus *is*. I would not be surprised if understanding Jesus as 'God's anointed son' in terms of Isaiah was an identity marker of the group that gathered around the Gospel according to Mark.

Having gone that far, an intriguing set of subsequent questions arises almost instantly. How does the story of Isaiah as a cultural frame continue in early Christianity? Do other New Testament writings exhibit a similar importance and use of this particular text? Do they use the same parts of Isaiah in the same way? How does the reception of Isaiah and of the Christ event framed in terms of Isaiah change in the first generations of Jesus followers? A proper appreciation of these questions would require a much more detailed inquiry than the remainder of this article allows; thus, I will limit myself to some first ideas that might stimulate further research in this area.

4. Isaiah as a Frame in the Next Generation

a. To be Continued? Expectations Based on Social Memory Theory

Biblical scholarship has convincingly shown that in Second Temple Judaism, in general, Isaiah was widely used as a lens or a frame to understand one's own situation. The first generations of Jesus followers are part of this bigger picture and their dealing with Isaiah is not an exception, but rather the rule—or as Florian Wilk puts it, 'Diese intensive Nutzung entspricht der verbreiteten Hochschätzung des Jesajabuches im Judentum der hellenistisch-römischen Zeit'.[55] Wilk's conclu-

[55] Florian Wilk, 'Die Geschichte des Gottesvolkes im Licht jesajanischer Prophetie: Neutestamentliche Perspektiven', in *Josephus und das Neue Testament: Wechselseitige Wahrnehmungen. II. Internationales Symposium zum Corpus Judaeo-Hellenisticum, 25.-28. Mai 2006, Greifwald*, ed. Christfried Böttrich und Jens Herzer, WUNT 209 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2007), 246. Wilk further refers to D.D. Hannah, 'Isaiah within Judaism of the Second Temple Period', in *Isaiah in the New Testament*, 7–33, as well as Michael A. Knibb, 'Isaianic Traditions in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha', in *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretive Tradition*, ed. Craig C. Broyles and Craig A. Evans, 2 vols., VTSup 70 (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 2:633-50. See also Daniel J. Brendsel, *'Isaiah Saw His Glory': The Use of Isaiah 52–53 in John 12*,

sion, which is very much in line with what social memory theory would call 'framing', suggests that the readers perceive the history of the people of God, as well as their own history, in light of Isaiah's prophecy.

If this is true, knowledge of Isaiah and Isaianic frames would have been current among the first generations of Jesus followers, and traditions would have been discussed among them. Paul might have introduced some parts of Isaiah into the discourse of the first generations of Jesus followers,[56] and not just Mark will have picked up current traditions and developed them further. The process would have been different from the way it is frequently envisioned: if we mentally move from the authorial mastermind to a vivid group, it becomes more plausible that engaged discussions had taken place among Jesus followers among different groups in the first generations of Christianity before the ideas were finally put to page. One key to a better understanding might be to think less in terms of academic writing and more along the lines of oral or pastoral processes.[57] Mark then ceases to be a one-man-show and a lone genius author, who gathered traditions quietly in his study or met other early Christian missionaries and preachers with whom he shared his knowledge.

This notion might match the scenario of a biblical scholar and the preacher/leader of a more traditional and maybe large community; according to all we know by now, however, it hardly does justice to the first generations of Jesus followers. They did not meet in a highly organized and hierarchized setting and they did not have the type of defined positions and offices with which we are now familiar. The Pauline letters draw the image of quite vivid smaller groups, who were deeply engaged in worship, discussion and (missionary) work. Making sense of what they experienced and how it informed their understanding of themselves and the world was not left to the leaders of the group (who informed the others of their decisions) but was a mutual and open process, in which everyone was involved. In the end, the house group (*Hauskreis*) or Bible study groups we know from our own times might be of much greater help in getting an idea of how texts like Mark's gospel came about—that is, how those texts are the product of socio-religious and cultural frames for understanding rather than the idea of a community leader or evangelist acting alone.

BZNW 208 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2014), 7, with reference to Franklin W. Young, 'A Study of the Relation of Isaiah to the Fourth Gospel', *ZNW* 64 (1955): 215–33.

[56] Cf. Dietrich-Axel Koch, 'The Quotations of Isaiah 8,14 and 28,16 in Romans 9,33 and 1 Peter 2,6.8 as Test Case for Old Testament Quotations in the New Testament', *ZNW* 101 (2010): 240.

[57] In his *Forschungsüberblick* to the Gospel according to Matthew, Matthias Konrad has proposed a related scenario regarding the formation of Matthew. He proposes a longer reflection process for the group behind the gospel together with the evangelist. This process reflected both (oral) traditions and scripture, and was only gradually textualized; see 'Die Rezeption der Schrift im Matthäusevangelium in der neueren Forschung', *TLZ* 135 (2010): 919-32.

A plausible scenario for the development in the next generation could look like this: over time, the composition of the early groups of Jesus followers changes. This is due, not only to a larger temporal and, in most cases, spatial distance from the Christ event, but also to the fact that the groups become more variegated over time and more non-Jews join them. A third area of influence is the modified social environment of these groups. This includes different locations within the Roman Empire, as well as incidents like the Jewish-Roman War, the destruction of the Second Temple or the death of the first generation of Jesus followers.

A typical response to all of these changes would be to align the founding stories and identity forming patterns of the groups. In the case of Isaiah, it could be expected that the influence of this particular *frame* diminishes as more and more non-Jews join and dominate the groups. Since Isaiah is not part of their own cultural memory, one would not expect to find a network of mostly unmarked references to an important text from the Jewish tradition in writings of the third generation of Jesus followers. It seems more likely that the groups retained references to Isaiah in a modified form which respects on the one hand the impact Isaiah's prophecy had for the first generations of Jewish Jesus followers, and on the other hand considers that most members of the group(s) no longer have a living connection to this tradition and, thus, cannot detect or understand even the most obvious allusions to it. One scenario could be that only a few 'typical' points of reference from the book of Isaiah will be quoted in later texts and that over time they will turn into genuine 'Christian' points of reference, which, in turn, are used and quoted without regard to their original contexts. Candidates for this scenario are Isaiah 6:9-10; 40:3; 61:1 or the entirety of Isaiah 53. A second scenario could be that the frame is retained but has to be explained to those who were not raised in this tradition. In this case, one could expect a similar amount of references to Isaiah, but with indications and explanations as to why it is such an important frame. It should be rather easy to put the scenarios to the test: a survey of quotations and allusions to Isaiah should reveal whether the use of the book decreases, whether the same quotations or clusters of references occur to address the same questions and whether they all exhibit a similar (proto-)Christian connotation.

To begin such a test, the first insight from a survey of the use of Isaiah in the New Testament is that the book seems to retain its significance. Although the exact number for identified references varies from source to source, Isaiah is undoubtedly the most frequently quoted and insinuated text from the Jewish scriptures in the New Testament after the psalms.[58] The survey of New Testament quotations from Isaiah in the Appendix (Table 3) indicates that the name 'Isaiah' is

[58] See, for instance, Wilk, 'Die Geschichte des Gottesvolkes im Licht jesajanischer Prophetie', 248; or Evans, 'From Gospel to Gospel', 651.

mentioned only in the narrative texts and in Paul's letter to the Romans. Although Paul makes use of Isaiah in all of his letters, he only mentions the name of the prophet in Romans, and with one exception[59] all of these quotations directly assigned to Isaiah occur in Romans 9-10.[60] Unlike the narrative tradition, Paul does not use fulfilment quotations.[61]

As we have already seen, in the Gospel according to Mark the name 'Isaiah' is mentioned twice and each time precedes a direct quotation; thus two of the five quotations from Isaiah are directly ascribed to Isaiah.[62] The trend continues in the other narrative texts of the New Testament. In Matthew, six of the ten quotations from Isaiah are assigned directly to the prophet[63] and three are flagged as fulfilment quotations.[64] In Luke, two of the six quotations from Isaiah are assigned directly[65] and one of them can be regarded as a fulfilment quotation;[66] and in Acts, two of five quotations are directly assigned.[67] In John, finally, three of the four quotations are assigned directly[68] and two of them are flagged as fulfilment quotations.[69] None of the quotations in these narrative texts is marked as a fulfilment quotation more than once, and the only two passages from Isaiah quoted in all of the gospels are Isaiah 6:9-10[70] and Isaiah 40:3-5.[71] Both passages serve as fulfilment quotations in one of the gospels; and the latter is assigned directly to Isaiah in all

---

[59] Rom 15:12

[60] Rom 9:27, 28; 10:16, 20-21. Even though Paul had already quoted Isaiah in his earlier letters, he only mentions the name Isaiah in Romans, thus distinguishing the prophet from other voices in Israel's scriptures, like Moses and David; cf. Florian Wilk, 'Paulus als Nutzer, Interpret und Leser des Jesajabuches', in *Die Bibel im Dialog der Schriften: Konzepte intertextueller Bibellektüre*, ed. Stefan Alkier and Richard B. Hays, Neutestamentliche Entwürfe zur Theologie 10 (Tübingen: Francke, 2005), 96.

[61] Maarten J.J. Menken begins his study on the use of scripture in Matthew with an instructive survey of the fulfilment quotations in the whole of the New Testament; *Matthew's Bible: The Old Testament Text of the Evangelist*, BETL 173 (Leuven: University Press/Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters, 2004), 1-10.

[62] Mark 1:2-3; 7:6-7.

[63] Matt 3:3; 4:15-16; 8:17; 12:18; 13:13-15; 15:8-9.

[64] Matt 4:15-16; 8:17; 12:18.

[65] Luke 3:4-6; 4:18-19.

[66] Luke 4:18-19.

[67] Acts 8:32-33; 28:26.

[68] John 1:23; 12:38.40, the fourth, 6:45 is assigned to a prophet.

[69] John 12:38. 40.

[70] Mark 4:12; Matt 13:13-15; Luke 8:10; John 12:40; and Acts 28:16.

[71] Mark 1:2–3; Matt 3:3; Luke 3:4-6; John 1:23.

the gospels. In the other books of the New Testament, the references to Isaiah go entirely unflagged, though not necessarily unnoticed.

This indicates that things are not as easy as initially thought. The impact of the Jewish scriptures does not diminish as more and more non-Jews join the early groups of Jesus followers. References to Isaiah do not generally decrease, nor are they marked more clearly and/or reduced to a set of 'typical' references, which are used to address particular topics. Once one scratches beneath the surface, it becomes clear that for the groups behind or addressed by the New Testament texts Isaiah remains an important frame of reference. The trend might rather be that *if* Isaiah is mentioned and referred to directly, the book serves as a hermeneutical frame beyond the actual quotations and contains more subtle references to Isaiah within it.[72] At least in one point the prediction proves to be correct: in cases where Isaiah is not referred to directly, no Isaianic frame is found either.[73]

The interesting question is thus, what does change in the use of Isaiah? Here one can ask what intention the use of Isaiah serves in the different books of the New Testament, and from what traditions it is drawn in each case. Alternatively, one might investigate how the use of Isaiah changes over time and what theological ideas are linked to it. We will allow for a brief glance at Luke's gospel, in order to obtain an idea of what might lie behind the retained Isaianic framework with its clearly marked quotations.

---

[72] Paul, Mark, Matthew, Luke-Acts, John and 1 Peter. 1 Peter is an especially intriguing case, as quotations in 1 Pet 2:6, 8 (the only instances where quotations from Isaiah are introduced as scripture) seem to be dependent on Romans 9:33, as Koch has shown; 'The Quotations of Isaiah 8,14 and 28,16 in Romans 9,33 and 1 Peter 2,6.8 as Test Case for Old Testament Quotations in the New Testament', 223-40 The references to Isa 65:17 and 66:22 in 1 Pet 3:13 might as well be referring to or coming from Rev 21:1. In 1 Pet 2:22–25 the author indeed seems to use a Christian tradition based on Isa 53; cf. Cilliers Breytenbach, 'Christus litt euretwegen: Zur Rezeption von Jes 53 im 1. Petrusbrief', in *Deutungen des Todes Jesu im Neuen Testament*, ed. Jörg Frey and Jens Schröter, 2nd ed. (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 437-54; Wolfgang Kraus, 'Jesaja 53 LXX im frühen Christentum – Eine Überprüfung', in *Beiträge zur urchristlichen Theologiegeschichte*, ed. Wolfgang Kraus, BZNW 163 (Berlin: De Gruyter 2009), 172–74. This is not to claim that 1 Peter is not familiar with Isaiah, but rather that an intra-Christian discussion and tradition of Isaiah might be in operation. It is debatable whether such a discussion necessarily leads to Stephen Moyise's conclusion that 'the author of 1 Peter seldom strays from the church's standard proof texts (Isa. 8, 11, 28, 40, 53) and is clearly indebted to much traditional exegesis'; 'Isaiah in 1 Peter', in *Isaiah in the New Testament*, ed. Stephen Moyise and Marten J.J. Menken, NTSI (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2005), 188. A detailed investigation of Isaiah in 1 Peter with regard to interpretative frames might prove to be quite fruitful and support the idea that the author's 'indebtedness to Isaiah is clear and goes beyond mere proof-texting' (ibid.).

[73] The deutero-Pauline letters, 1-3 John, Jude and 2 Peter. Hebrews and Revelation are special cases, since they use the whole body of the Hebrew Bible as a frame of reference.

b. A Test Case for the Next Generation: Isaianic Frames in Luke

As we have seen, Mark's gospel calls for an audience that is literate in Isaiah; otherwise, the core points of the gospel's message will not be fully accessible to them. A reader not fully fluent in Isaiah is, however, not entirely lost, for Mark's text works on two levels. A recipient who does not have a Jewish cultural background and is not versed in the Jewish tradition will in any case be able to understand the gist of the gospel's message and he will be able to connect it to his own cultural background. He will nevertheless realize at some point that he misses important parts of the message. A reader who does have this background, on the other hand, will be able to make the connections to Isaiah and realize that Jesus, his life, his gospel and his fate make perfect sense when understood within an Isaianic framework. Depending on how well this reader is versed in Isaiah, he might need a greater or lesser number of hints to understand that this text serves as a frame. For some readers the initial quotation might be enough; others might need greater assistance. The question is not whether all readers are able to detect all hints, but rather whether they become aware of the general idea—and whether they might even subsequently share their own ideas regarding the question of how Jesus can be understood in light of Isaiah. This strategy of Mark's text is in line with ancient rhetoric, where quite frequently a speaker quotes without saying whom he cites. If this is true, it is a strong argument against the idea that Mark is a gospel for the mission to Gentiles. It also proves that the pragmatics of the gospel's composition was to write, not a missionary statement or apology, but an identity constitutive text, reminding the reader who Jesus is 'for us' and what follows from this understanding.

We have further seen that Mark's gospel presents Jesus as the eschatological messenger of God's kingdom, the 'anointed son of God' according to Isaiah's prophecy. Jesus' character as the 'anointed one' (χριστός) is mentioned only twice in the first part of the gospel.[74] One might be prone to ask whether this is enough to insure that the reader gets the message. As du Toit has shown, Isa 61:1, πνεῦμα κυρίου ἐπ' ἐμέ, οὗ εἵνεκεν ἔχρισέν με εὐαγγελίσασθαι..., is standing behind the scene of Jesus' baptism in Mark, but the text is not directly quoted or alluded to.[75] In addition, the events in Mark 1:10–11 are only visible and audible to the character Jesus and the reader, for the reader is drawn into the character's perception here. If we take the narrator seriously, John the Baptist and all the bystanders have not heard or seen anything and, accordingly, the characters wonder who this Jesus is. This might as well reflect the situation of the early groups of Jesus followers who were also struggling with this question and who only gradually began to un-

[74] Mark 1:1; 8:29.

[75] Du Toit, 'Treasuring Memory', 339–41.

derstand, once they started applying Isaiah as a hermeneutical lens. Although well informed by the narrator and by sharing this experience with Jesus, the reader can still attend the disciples' journey to understanding up to Peter's insight in Mark 8:29. Some readers, especially those of the first of the groups introduced above, might still wonder at that point, how Peter arrived at his conclusion, while members of the second group will nod and say that this was obvious.

How does Luke now deal with this problem? When we turn to the baptism scene, as it is narrated in Luke 3:21–22, we find it to be quite different from the Markan version. In Luke Jesus' baptism is not mentioned itself; only what happens while Jesus is praying afterwards: the heavens open, the Holy Spirit descends upon him in bodily form (that is, visibly) and a voice from heaven is audible. It uses exactly the same words as in the Markan version,[76] but the effect is different. While in Mark it is Jesus alone who sees the heavens torn open, who sees the Spirit descending like a dove and who hears God's message for him, in Luke it is everybody except Jesus (whom we know to be praying) who sees and hears what happens. While in Mark God seems to introduce Jesus to the unique relationship they would now have between them, in Luke God rather introduces this unique relationship to the world. Characters and readers cannot and must not miss the point.

(1) The childhood narrative (Luke 1–2)

How does Jesus himself then learn about this unique relationship with God? According to Luke's gospel, it happened gradually as Jesus grew up. It is not a coincidence that the episode of the twelve year old in the temple[77] is framed by two narratorial comments—one, about Jesus growing in wisdom, the other, about God's grace being upon him.[78] At the end of the childhood narratives in the first two chapters of Luke, Jesus knows who he is. With the help of the narrator, the reader can put together the pieces of information delivered by the characters: the angel informs Jesus' mother that Jesus will be called 'Son of the Most High';[79] Elizabeth calls him 'my Lord';[80] and the angel announces the birth of the 'savior, anointed one and Lord' to the shepherds.[81] Luke takes a little longer than Mark, but the key concept, χριστός, is mentioned also before the character Jesus enters the stage. To make sure that no

[76] Mark 1:11/Luke 3:22.

[77] Luke 2:41–51.

[78] Luke 2:40, 52.

[79] Luke 1:32, 35.

[80] Luke 1:43.

[81] Luke 2:11.

one misses the point, the narrator introduces Simeon a couple of verses later as the one to whom it was revealed by the Spirit that he would not die before having seen God's anointed one, τὸν χριστὸν κυρίου.[82] Simeon's words are as remarkable and important as his introduction: he recognizes in Jesus the salvation God has prepared in the sight of *all* peoples.[83] In case anyone has missed the point, Simeon clarifies 'a light of revelation for the Gentiles *and* glory for your people Israel'.[84] The attentive reader will notice that the nations/Gentiles are mentioned *before* Israel and the reader versed in Isaiah will recognize Isaianic framing with Isaiah 42:6 (and 49:6, 9) being recalled. What makes this reference to Isaiah particularly intriguing is not only that Simeon has reversed the order of Isaiah 42:6 (a covenant to the people, a light to the nations). It is also that the subsequent words in Isa 42:7 reveal the servant's mission 'to open the eyes of the blind, to bring out prisoners from confinement and from the dungeon those who live in darkness'. Simeon's words anticipate the future course of events: Jesus will become a sign that will be contradicted, the cause for the fall and rise of many in Israel; and this will be a painful process, not only for his own mother.

Readers rooted in the Jewish tradition will have little problem understanding the first two chapters, with their dense network of references to Israel and her holy scriptures, while non-Jews are introduced to a new and possibly alien universe. Following Luke's carefully crafted and masterfully told story, they will eventually get the point that Jesus cannot be properly understood without this Jewish framework. At the end of the gospel the risen Jesus himself explains to disciples on the road to Emmaus and in Jerusalem that the 'anointed one' can only be understood properly within the Jewish framework.[85] Moses, the prophets and the scriptures have foretold what has happened. Towards the end of Luke's text, the circle closes. Simeon's prediction that Jesus will be in trouble, because some will not like his message and ideas, has become comprehensible for non-Jewish readers. A reader who is well versed in Jewish tradition, however, is already warned by Simeon's words and understands probably much sooner that they carry implications for the groups of Jesus followers. Though oriented to Isaiah's prophecy (and, thus, deeply rooted in Israel's tradition), their mission that 'God's anointed son' must be proclaimed to all the nations[86] will be an obstacle for many Jews who see it differently. The later conflicts already appear on the horizon.

---

[82] Luke 2:26.

[83] Luke 2:31.

[84] Luke 2:32.

[85] Luke 24:26-27, 44–47.

[86] Luke 24:47.

(2) Jesus' 'Inaugural Sermon' in Nazareth (Luke 4:16–30)

The reader gets a first impression of what awaits Jesus and those who follow him when they read his 'inaugural sermon' in Nazareth, the town where he grew up.[87] That this episode is located in the place where he comes from and where people think they know him is not a coincidence. To my perception, the story is less about the prophet who is not accepted in his hometown than it is a first hint at the fulfilment of Simeon's prophecy; and it has, of course, Isaianic framing. In this scene, the reader meets Jesus in the synagogue of Nazareth, where, as was his habit, he attends the Sabbath service and is called to read. The reader is told that Jesus is given the scroll of Isaiah and is given a quotation of the text it contains; but he does not hear Jesus read. It is only after Jesus has read, is seated and begins to teach that the reader is tuned in. Jesus' teaching begins with the words that the very scripture the reader and the characters have heard is πεπλήρωται today.[88]

Similar to Mark's Jesus, the first thing the Lukan Jesus publicly says is that something is πεπλήρωται. In Mark, it is the καιρός and the effect is that God's kingdom has arrived;[89] in Luke, it is the γραφή, Isaiah, and has a similar result.[90] Both scenes share the use of the word from the same origin: εὐαγγέλιον/εὐαγγελίζω,[91] which has Isaianic coloring. Although the people in the synagogue first marvel at Jesus' words, the situation changes dramatically in almost no time and the examples by which Jesus chooses to make his point are particularly offensive. Both the widow from Zarephath and Naaman the Syrian are Gentiles. Against the background of Simeon's prophecy, this can be read as a first indication that things will become quite messy, and the Nazarenes' attempt to lead Jesus to the brow of the hill and hurl him down headlong indicates that his behavior is regarded as that of a heretic.[92]

---

[87] Luke 4:16–30.

[88] Luke 4:21.

[89] Mark 1:15.

[90] Luke 4:21.

[91] Mark 1:15; Luke 4:18.

[92] Non-Jewish readers might have also got that point. In their inspiring paper '"Throw the Blasphemer off a Cliff": Luke 4:16–30 in Light of The Life of Aesop', Margaret Froelich and Thomas E. Phillips connect the scene in Nazareth with the Life of Aesop: 'toward the end of Aesop's Life (130–42), the Delphians concluded that the fabulist's misuse of the traditions of their ancestors has blasphemed their homeland and threatened their temple. Aesop is condemned as a blasphemer (against Delphi) and a temple thief (against the temple) at Delphi and sentenced to death. Aesop's death sentence was to be carried out by the crowd throwing him off a cliff'; (paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, Boston, MA, 20 November 2017), quotation from the abstract.

(3) Jesus' Answer to the Baptist's Question (Luke 7:18–23)

A third passage helping to unlock the Isaianic frame in Luke is 7:18-23. In this episode, John the Baptist sends two of his disciples to Jesus in order to find out whether Jesus is the one who is to come or whether they have to wait for someone else.[93] The reader will recall that in Luke 3:15 people had wondered whether John himself might be the 'anointed one'. John rejects this, indicating that his role is only that of the precursor. As Jesus' baptism (with his introduction as God's beloved son) is the next thing to happen,[94] the connection of χριστός and υἱός θεοῦ is not difficult to make. When John's disciples have delivered their question to Jesus, the narrator first reminds the reader of Jesus' deeds—that at that time he cured many of their diseases, sufferings and evil spirits, that he granted sight to many who were blind.[95] The character Jesus then is allowed his summary in Isaianic coloring, a blending of at least Isaiah 26:19; 29:18; 35:3-5; 42:18; 49:6; and 61:1—'Go and tell John what you have seen and heard: the blind regain their sight, the lame walk, lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead are raised, the poor have the good news proclaimed to them'.[96] The closing sentence, which seems a bit odd at first, makes sense in light of Simeon's prophecy, the incident in Nazareth and their long-term implications: only those who believe will be saved.[97] The reader versed in Isaiah will instantly get the point; but—unlike the case in Mark—the reader who is not versed in Isaiah will also get the point immediately.[98] By carefully weaving the different strands together, Luke manages to get both types of readers on board and both understand the significance of Isaiah, not only for understanding Jesus, but also their own situation.

(4) The Character of Luke's Isaianic Frames

In Luke's gospel the references to Isaiah offer an explanation for why the events 'that have been fulfilled among us' are in line with Jewish tradition, and the Isaianic frame also offers an explanation for why the larger part of Luke's Jewish contemporaries rejected the idea. In Acts, the author will address this question further, and he is here building on the discussion, which the New Testament reader can already witness in the Pauline letters—especially in Romans, where Paul tries

[93] Luke 7:19-20.

[94] Luke 3:21-22.

[95] Luke 7:21.

[96] Luke 7:22.

[97] Luke 7:23.

[98] Two chapters later, when Jesus asks his disciples who they think he is (Luke 9:18–22), Peter's answer is no longer surprising: τὸν χριστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ.

to make sense of the same situation: non-Jews receive Jesus' gospel while Jews do not. This calls for an explanation, and Paul, too, turns to Isaiah in order to find it.[99]

That Luke marks the use of Isaiah 61:1 (where Mark does not), thus, suggests that knowledge of Isaiah was decreasing and that a generation later, towards the end of the first century, there are much more mixed communities than in Mark's times. This, however, does not confirm the notion that the Isaianic frame became less important or less visible. Quite the contrary, a closer look makes it clear that the Isaianic frame in Luke is no less prominent than in Mark; it simply differs in character. Not only is Luke's Isaianic frame more visible to non-Jews; it is also explained much better. Even those who do not know Isaiah will learn something about the prophet's message—and about why it is and will remain important for the groups of Jesus followers. Those from a Jewish tradition will find Isaiah to be, not only one of the main points of reference when it comes to a proper understanding of Jesus, but also the main point of reference to explain their own situation. Both the mixed communities of Jews and Gentiles and the rejection of this project by many members of God's people, Israel, seem to be predicted in Isaiah, since the anointed Son of God and eschatological messenger of God's kingdom is 'numbered with transgressors'.[100] Contrary to initial expectations, Isaiah remains important for the groups of Jesus followers, whom we might now call 'Christians' according to Acts 11:26. In both Luke and Acts the message to the Gentile newcomers seems to be: even though the prophet Isaiah and his message might not have been part of your cultural heritage and tradition before you encountered Jesus, *now* that you are Jesus followers, it becomes part of your tradition—otherwise it is impossible to understand both Jesus *and* the situation of our groups of Jesus followers.

Although the Gospels according to Mark and Luke both operate with an Isaianic frame—and at times even with the same points of reference—there are some

[99] Wilk grades quotations from Isaiah in the New Testament into five different categories: 'a) zur Explikation der Eigenart der Christusbotschaft und der Identität Jesu Christi, b) zur Darlegung des Selbstverständnisses von Trägern des Heilshandelns Gottes, c) zur Definition des Wesens der Christengemeinde und der Grundsätze ihres Lebens, d) zur Beschreibung der Stellung Israels zu Christus und Christusbotschaft, e) zur Klärung der Endzeiterwartungen'; 'Die Geschichte des Gottesvolkes im Licht jesajanischer Prophetie', 248. The range of types Wilk has described confirms the findings of the reading from a cultural studies/social memory perspective. Despite the differences in terminology, his conclusion is also supported by a reading that sees Isaiah as a cultural frame: 'Im Neuen Testament wird das Jesajabuch als Zeugnis und Interpretament des Christusgeschehens verwendet: Einerseits lässt erst das Christusgeschehen Sinn und Intention vieler Jesajaworte zutage treten, andererseits macht erst die Prophetie Jesajas etliche Aspekte und Implikationen des Christusgeschehens verständlich' (p. 259).

[100] Luke 22:37, quoting Isa 53:12.

significant differences. The most obvious is that, while Mark seems to focus on the question who Jesus is, Luke addresses both who Jesus is *and* what implications the Christ event has for those who follow him now. One of the burning issues of the early generations of Jesus followers, the reception of Jesus as God's anointed son by Gentiles and his rejection by Jews, is always in the background in Luke.[101]

5. Conclusion and Further Questions

The closer examination of passages in Mark and Luke with regard to Isaiah as an important hermeneutical frame leads to the following conclusions. One might first assume that the references to Isaiah will decrease in number and range, and that they will become more stereotypical because groups of Jesus followers have more members that are non-Jewish. A survey of references to Isaiah in the New Testament, combined with a preliminary analysis of the texts, however, clearly shows that this is not the case. It likewise becomes clear that the investigation of Isaianic frames in the New Testament requires more than just listing quotations, allusions and echoes, and asking whether they have been cited correctly. The use of different parts of Isaiah further exhibits a deep knowledge of (and living connection to) that book on the part of those who stand behind the New Testament. They turn to Isaiah to find answers to their situations, and these answers differ over time.

Paul's question about the relationship between Jews, Gentiles and the history of God and his people in the face of the Christ event, which is addressed in Romans against the background of Isaiah 53[102]—and not, as might be expected, with reference to Isaiah 6:9-10—also appears in Luke, but with a different focus. Simeon's prophecy about Jesus being 'a light of revelation for the Gentiles and glory for your people Israel' indicates early on how Paul's question has been answered. With more Gentiles being part of the groups of Jesus followers, it becomes necessary for them to explain better the references to Isaiah as an important hermeneutical frame for understanding Jesus and themselves. Luke's story helps them to get far beyond the stage of realizing that Isaiah and his prophecy are important for Jews. Together with their Jewish brothers and sisters, they are enabled to recognize Isaiah as a frame for the Christ event and its aftermath; that is, they can see it as being foretold in Jewish prophecy.

Compared to Mark's gospel, the references to Isaiah do not decrease in range and number in the later narrative books of the New Testament. Quotations might be

---

[101] This is a point of contact with Paul who, two generations earlier, also had to deal with this problem. Paul, too, has turned to Isaiah and found the situation prophesied; see Wilk, 'Paulus als Nutzer, Interpret und Leser des Jesajabuches', 113–14. The question of how Paul used Isaiah is fascinating to follow up, for it provides another important point for a longitudinal cut through the reception of Isaiah in early Christianity.

[102] Kraus, 'Jesaja 53 LXX im frühen Christentum – Eine Überprüfung', 166-68.

marked differently and be assigned more clearly to Isaiah, but the whole texture of allusions to Isaiah remains dense and might at times even become denser. This could, for example, be deduced from the growing importance of Isaiah 53 and the application of the servant tradition to Jesus in later texts—another important text that can only be briefly touched upon and needs a more thorough investigation from a social memory perspective. While Mark emphasizes Jesus as God's anointed Son and the eschatological messenger of God's kingdom, in Luke we already hear overtones of the servant tradition which will unfold in John, where Jesus is clearly presented in the tradition of Isaiah's servant, though without explicitly saying it.[103] We could also assume that, where Mark is predominantly concerned with the question of who Jesus is, Luke focuses on why he must suffer while John explains why this development is an honor and the only way to salvation. All three draw heavily from Isaiah to support their theological arguments. Paul, however, might have marveled at John's use of Isaiah 53:1.[104] While he used the same verse in Romans 10:16 to address the problem that parts of Israel rejected the gospel, John connects the idea in John 12:38 with the application of the servant tradition to Jesus.

To put it differently, while references to Isaiah 53 in earlier texts do not convey the notion of substitution in suffering,[105] in John the allusions and echoes around the 'typical quotes from Isaiah' in John 12 provide a stable Isaianic frame and speak much more clearly about Jesus as Isaiah's servant than is the case in Mark and Matthew.[106]

---

[103] This connection was first noted by Johannes Beutler, 'Greeks Come to See Jesus (John 12, 20f.)', *Bib* 71 (1990): 333-47.

[104] Paul uses Isa 53 in neither a christological nor soteriological way but in order to understand his own mission, cf. Kraus, 'Jesaja 53 LXX im frühen Christentum – Eine Überprüfung', 167; and Dietrich-Axel Koch, *Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums: Untersuchungen zur Verwendung und zum Verständnis der Schrift bei Paulus*, BHT 69 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1986), 232–39.

[105] That also applies to the quotations of Isa 53:4 in Matt 8:17; of Isa 53:7 in Acts 8:32–33; and of Isa 53:12 in Luke 22:3, as Kraus has demonstrated; 'Jesaja 53 LXX im frühen Christentum – Eine Überprüfung'. The problem with Isa 53 and the servant tradition in general might be that later readers who know the Songs of God's suffering servant as a hermeneutical frame for Jesus from their own times sometimes run the risk of 'finding' it already in early traditions of the New Testament. The application of the servant tradition to Jesus seems to be, in fact, a later tradition. The assumption of Isa 53 as a hermeneutical lens to understand Jesus' death is also supported by Johannes Woyke, 'Der leidende Gottesknecht (Jes 53)', in *Die Verheißung des Neuen Bundes: Wie alttestamentliche Texte im Neuen Testament fortwirken*, ed. Bernd Kollmann, Biblisch-theologische Schwerpunkte 35 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2010), 200-25.

[106] See Johannes Beutler, *Das Johannesevangelium: Kommentar* (Freiburg: Herder, 2013), 364–65. Brendsel's conclusion, however, might be taking the issue a bit too far: 'We may conclude, therefore, that for

Recent studies about the use of Isaiah in the New Testament assume that the authors of the New Testament had knowledge of the entire text of Isaiah instead of individual passages or quotations from it. This assumption goes hand in and with a tendency to move away from a simple scheme of promise and fulfilment when it comes to investigating the Old Testament in the New. Wilk has convincingly shown, not only that Paul knew the whole book of Isaiah, but that there is a chronological (and theological) development of the apostle's use of the scroll.[107] Marten J. J. Menken has shown the same for Matthew[108] and Rouven Genz in his study presents the state of research for Luke-Acts, which also points into the same direction.[109] Given the range of different quotations and allusions, I would assume the same for Mark and John. This also means that the first generations of Jesus followers retained a living connection to the Jewish tradition. Contrary to what is often assumed, they did not work with *testimonia*, but used the whole of Isaiah's prophecy.

This also supports the assumption that the process was different than it usually is envisioned to be. Orality played a much more prominent role, and the groups behind the texts had vivid and engaged discussions, not only about who Jesus is, but also about who they are in the light of the Jesus event. The evidence from our test case supports the thesis that the first generations of Jesus followers used Isaiah as a hermeneutical frame and that they turned to Isaiah to make sense of the particular questions, problems and events of their times. Contrary to initial expectations, Isaiah did not become less important over time; rather, the way the book was used changed through different periods and contexts. Paul was facing different questions than Mark, and in the times of Luke (and later, John) the situation had changed again.[110]

John the new exodus wrought in Jesus is the new exodus prophesied by Isaiah. Moreover, the emphasis in John 12 on the rejection, suffering, and death of Jesus as Isaiah's Servant forms a declaration that Isaiah's new exodus is finally coming to fruition'; *'Isaiah Saw His Glory'*, 217.

[107] Wilk has carried out extended research in this area; cf. *Die Bedeutung des Jesajabuches für Paulus*, FRLANT 179 (Göttingen: Vandenhoek & Ruprecht 1998); idem, 'Die Geschichte des Gottesvolkes im Licht jesajanischer Prophetie', 245-64; idem, 'Jesajanische Prophetie im Spiegel exegetischer Tradition: Zu Hintergrund und Sinngehalt des Schriftzitats in 1 Kor 2,9', in *Die Septuaginta: Entstehung, Sprache, Geschichte. 3. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 22.–25. Juli 2010*, ed. Siegfried Kreuzer, Martin Meiser and Marcus Sigismund, WUNT 286 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012); or idem, 'Paulus als Nutzer, Interpret und Leser des Jesajabuches', 115.

[108] Menken, *Matthew's Bible*, 279–83.

[109] Rouven Genz, *Jesaja 53 als theologische Mitte der Apostelgeschichte: Studien zu ihrer Christologie und Ekklesiologie im Anschluss an Apg 8,26-40*, WUNT 2/398 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015), 1-16.

[110] As regards the Christology in John, with its reference to Isaiah's servant, we might also trace points of contact to 1 Peter, cf. Kraus, 'Jesaja 53 LXX im frühen Christentum – Eine Überprüfung', 172-74.

Finally, on methodology, the New Testament books do indeed work with cultural frames and the search for these frames proves helpful to detect lines of theological development, which are difficult to find in an exclusively intertextual or motif-critical analysis. Isaiah might just be one of the most prominent examples of creatively using cultural memory.

Bibliography

Beutler, Johannes. *Das Johannesevangelium: Kommentar.* Freiburg: Herder, 2013.

____. 'Greeks Come to See Jesus (John 12, 20f.)'. *Bib* 71 (1990): 333-47.

Brendsel, Daniel J. *'Isaiah Saw His Glory': The Use of Isaiah 52–53 in John 12*. BZNW 208. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2014.

Breytenbach, Cilliers. 'Christus litt euretwegen: Zur Rezeption von Jes 53 im 1. Petrusbrief'. Pages 437-54 in *Deutungen des Todes Jesu im Neuen Testament*. Edited by Jörg Frey and Jens Schröter. 2nd ed. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.

Bultmann, Rudolf. *History of the Synoptic Tradition*. Translated by John Marsh. Oxford: Blackwell, 1963.

Deppe, Dean B. 'Markan Christology and the Omission of υἱοῦ θεοῦ in Mark 1:1'. *Filologia Neotestamentaria* 21 (2008): 45–64.

Dewey, Arthur J. 'The Locus for Death: Social Memory and the Passion Narratives'. Pages 119-28 in *Memory, Tradition, and Text: Uses of the Past in Early Christianity*. Edited by Alan Kirk and Tom Thatcher. SemeiaSt 52. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005.

du Toit, David. '"Gesalbter Gottessohn" – Jesus als letzter Bote Gottes: Zur Christologie des Markusevangeliums'. Pages 37-50 in '*... was ihr auf dem Weg verhandelt habt': Beiträge zur Exegese und Theologie des Neuen Testaments. Festschrift für Ferdinand Hahn zum 75. Geburtstag*. Edited by Peter Müller, Christine Gerber and Thomas Knöppler. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner, 2001.

____. 'Treasuring Memory: Narrative Christology In and Beyond Mark's Gospel: Miracle-Traditions as Test Case'. *Early Christianity* 6 (2015): 334–53.

Evans, Craig A. 'From Gospel to Gospel: The Function of Isaiah in the New Testament'. Vol. 2 pages 651-91 in *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretative Tradition*. Edited by Craig C. Broyles and Craig A. Evans. 2 vols. VTSup 70/FIOTL 1-2. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Frankemölle, Hubert. *Frühjudentum und Urchristentum: Vorgeschichte – Verlauf – Auswirkungen (4. Jahrhundert v. Chr. bis 4. Jahrhundert n. Chr.)*. Kohlhammer Studienbücher Theologie 5. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2006.

____. 'Jesus als deuterojesajanischer Freudenbote? Zur Rezeption von Jes 52,7 und 61,1 im Neuen Testament, durch Jesus und in den Targumim'. Pages 34-67 in *Vom Urchristentum zu Jesus: Für Joachim Gnilka*. Edited by Hubert Frankemölle and Karl Kertelge. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1989.

Froelich, Margaret and Thomas E. Phillips. '"Throw the Blasphemer off a Cliff": Luke 4:16–30 in Light of The Life of Aesop'. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature. Boston, MA, 20 November 2017.

Genz, Rouven. *Jesaja 53 als theologische Mitte der Apostelgeschichte: Studien zu ihrer Christologie und Ekklesiologie im Anschluss an Apg 8,26-40*. WUNT 2/398. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015.

Hannah, D.D. 'Isaiah within Judaism of the Second Temple Period'. Pages 7-33 in *Isaiah in the New Testament.* Edited by Stephen Moyise and Marten J.J. Menken. NTSI. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2005.

Hatina, Thomas R. 'Did Jesus Quote Isaiah 29:13 against the Pharisees? An Unpopular Appraisal'. *BBR* 16/1 (2006): 79–94.

Hooker, Morna D. 'Isaiah in Mark's Gospel'. Pages 35–49 in *Isaiah in the New Testament.* Edited by Stephen Moyise and Marten J.J. Menken. NTSI. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2005.

Huebenthal, Sandra. 'Anti-Gospel Revisited'. Pages 137-58 in *Reading the Political in Jewish and Christian Texts.* Edited by Julia Synder and Korinna Zamfir. BTS 38. Leuven: Peeters, 2020.

____. *Das Markusevangelium als kollektives Gedächtnis*. 2nd ed. FRLANT 257. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2018.

____. *Reading Mark's Gospel as a Text from Collective Memory*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2020.

Keith, Chris, Helen Bond, Christine Jacobi and Jens Schröter, eds. *The Reception of Jesus in the First Three Centuries*. 3 vols. New York: T&T Clark, 2020.

Keith, Chris and Tom Thatcher. 'The Scar of the Cross: The Violence Ratio and the Earliest Christian Memories of Jesus'. Pages 197-217 in *Jesus, the Voice, and the Text: Beyond the Oral and the Written Gospel*. Edited by Tom Thatcher. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2008.

Kelber, Werner. 'Memory and Violence, or Genealogies of Remembering'. Pages 333-66 in *Imprints, Voiceprints and Footprints of Memory: Collected Essays of Werner Kelber*. Edited by Werner Kelber. RBS 74. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013.

____. 'The Works of Memory'. Pages 265-96 in *Imprints, Voiceprints and Footprints of Memory: Collected Essays of Werner Kelber*. Edited by Werner Kelber. RBS 74. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013.

____. 'The Works of Memory: Christian Origins as MnemoHistory – A Response'. Pages 221-48 in *Memory, Tradition, and Text: Uses of the Past in Early Christianity*. Edited by Alan Kirk and Tom Thatcher. SemeiaSt 52. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005.

Kirk, Alan. 'The Memory of Violence and the Death of Jesus in Q'. Pages 191-206 in *Memory, Tradition, and Text: Uses of the Past in Early Christianity*. Edited by Alan Kirk and Tom Thatcher. SemeiaSt 52. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005.

Knibb, Michael A. 'Isaianic Traditions in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha'. Vol. 2 pages 633-50 in *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretive Tradition*. Edited by Craig C. Broyles and Craig A. Evans. 2 vols. VTSup 70. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Koch, Dietrich-Axel. *Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums: Untersuchungen zur Verwendung und zum Verständnis der Schrift bei Paulus*. BHT 69. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1986.

____. 'The Quotations of Isaiah 8,14 and 28,16 in Romans 9,33 and 1 Peter 2,6.8 as Test Case for Old Testament Quotations in the New Testament'. *ZNW* 101 (2010): 223-40.

Kollmann, Bernd. 'Krankheitsbilder und soziale Folgen: Blindheit, Lähmung, Aussatz, Taubheit oder Taubstummheit'. Pages 87-93 in *Die Wunder Jesu*. Vol. 1 of *Kompendium der frühchristlichen Wundererzählungen.* Edited by Ruben Zimmermann. 2 vols. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2013-2017.

Konradt, Matthias. 'Die Rezeption der Schrift im Matthäusevangelium in der neueren Forschung'. *TLZ* 135 (2010): 919-32.

Kraus, Wolfgang. 'Jesaja 53 LXX im frühen Christentum – Eine Überprüfung'. Pages 149-82 in *Beiträge zur urchristlichen Theologiegeschichte.* Edited by Wolfgang Kraus. BZNW 163. Berlin: De Gruyter 2009.

Lampe, Peter. 'Der Modellfall Auferstehung Jesu: Zu einer konstruktivistischen Theorie der Geschichtsschreibung'. *EvT* 69 (2009): 186-93.

Menken, Maarten J. J. *Matthew's Bible: The Old Testament Text of the Evangelist*. BETL 173. Leuven: University Press, Uitgeverij Peeters, 2004.

Moyise, Steve. 'Isaiah in 1 Peter'. Pages 175-88 in *Isaiah in the New Testament.* Edited by Stephen Moyise and Marten J.J. Menken. NTSI. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2005.

Moyise, Stephen and Maarten J.J. Menken, eds. *Isaiah in the New Testament.* NTSI. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2005.

Nicklas, Tobias. 'Jesus und Vespasian? Das Markusevangelium als politisch interessiertes "Anti-Evangelium" zum Aufstieg der Flavier'? Pages 159-78 in *Reading the Political in Jewish and Christian Texts.* Edited by Julia Synder and Korinna Zamfir. BTS 38. Leuven: Peeters, 2020.

Omerzu, Heike. 'Geschichte durch Geschichten: Zur Bedeutung jüdischer Traditionen für die Jesusdarstellung des Markusevangeliums'. *Early Christianity* 2 (2011): 77–99.

Schwartz, Barry. *Abraham Lincoln and the Forge of National Memory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.

____. 'Collective Memory and the Social Change: The Democratization of George Washington'. *American Sociological Review* 56 (1991): 221-36.

Taylor, Vincent. *Formation of the Gospel Tradition: Eight Lectures by Vincent Taylor*. London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd, 1933.

Wasserman, Tommy. 'The "Son of God" was in the Beginning (Mark 1:1)'. *JTS* 62 (2011): 20-50.

Watson, Francis. *Gospel Writing: A Canonical Perspective*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013.

Wilk, Florian. *Die Bedeutung des Jesajabuches für Paulus*. FRLANT 179. Göttingen: Vandenhoek & Ruprecht 1998.

____. 'Die Geschichte des Gottesvolkes im Licht jesajanischer Prophetie: Neutestamentliche Perspektiven'. Pages 245-64 in *Josephus und das Neue Testament: Wechselseitige Wahrnehmungen. II. Internationales Symposium zum Corpus Judaeo-Hellenisticum, 25.-28. Mai 2006, Greifwald.* Edited by Christfried Böttrich und Jens Herzer. WUNT 209. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2007.

____. 'Jesajanische Prophetie im Spiegel exegetischer Tradition: Zu Hintergrund und Sinngehalt des Schriftzitats in 1 Kor 2,9'. Pages 480–504 in *Die Septuaginta: Entstehung,*

Sprache, Geschichte. 3. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 22.–25. Juli 2010. Edited by Siegfried Kreuzer, Martin Meiser and Marcus Sigismund. WUNT 286. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.

____. 'Paulus als Nutzer, Interpret und Leser des Jesajabuches'. Pages 93–116 in *Die Bibel im Dialog der Schriften: Konzepte intertextueller Bibellektüre*. Edited by Stefan Alkier and Richard B. Hays. Neutestamentliche Entwürfe zur Theologie 10. Tübingen: Francke, 2005.

Woyke, Johannes. 'Der leidende Gottesknecht (Jes 53)'. Pages 200-25 in *Die Verheißung des Neuen Bundes: Wie alttestamentliche Texte im Neuen Testament fortwirken.* Edited by Bernd Kollmann. Biblisch-theologische Schwerpunkte 35. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2010.

Young, Franklin. 'A Study of the Relation of Isaiah to the Fourth Gospel'. *ZNW* 64 (1955): 215–33.

Appendix: Table III Isaiah in the New Testament: Quotations[111]

Isaiah	**Paul**	**Mark**	**Matthew**	**Luke/Acts**	**John**	**Deutero-Paul**	**Catholic Epistles**	**Hebrews**	**Revelation**
1:9	**Rom 9:29**								
6:3									4:8
6:9–10		4:12	**13:13-15**	Luke 8:10 **Acts 28:26***	**12:40** +				
7:14			1:23* +						
8:8			1:23* +						
8:12-13							1 Pet 3:14-15		
8:14	Rom 9:33 △						1 Pet 2:8 △		
8:17								2:13	
8:18								2:13	
8:23–9:1			**4:15-16*** +						
10:22–23	**Rom 9:27**								
11:2							1 Pet 4:14		
11:10	**Rom 15:12**								
12:2								2:13	
13:10		13:24-25	24:29						
13:34		13:24-25	24:29						
22:13	1 Cor 15:32								
24:19		13:24-25							
25:8	1 Cor 15:54 △								7:17 21:4
26:13						2 Tim 2:19			

[111] Data are based on the NA[28]; Moyise and Menken, eds., *Isaiah in the New Testament*; and Wilk, 'Die Geschichte des Gottesvolkes im Licht jesajanischer Prophetie'.

26:19		13:24-25	[11:5 ○]	[Luke 7:22 ○]					
26:20								10:37 ▽	
27:9	Rom 11:27 △								
28:11–12	1 Cor 14:21 △								
28:16	Rom 9:33 △ Rom 10:11 △						1 Pet 2:6 △		
28:22	**Rom 9:28**								
29:10	Rom 11:8 △								
29:13		**7:6-7** △	**15:8-9***						
29:14	1 Cor 1:19 △								
29:18			[11:5 ○]	[Luke 7:22 ○]					
34:4			24:29	Luke 21:26					
35:5–6			[11:5 ○]	[Luke 7:22 ○]					
37:16									
40:3(–5)		**1:2-3*** △	**3:3***	**Luke 3:4-6***	**1:23***				
40:6f							1 Pet 1:24▽		
40:8f							1 Pet 1:25 ▽		
40:13	1 Cor 2:16▽ Rom 11:34								
42:1–4			**12:18** +						
43:21							1 Pet 2:9		
45:14	1 Cor 14:25								
45:23	Rom 14:11 △								

49:6				[Luke 2:29-32] [Luke 7:22 ○] Acts 13:47 (△)					
49:8	2 Cor 6:2 ▽								
49:18	Rom 14:11 △								
52:2	Rom 2:24 ▽								
52:7	Rom 10:15 △								
52:11	2 Cor 6:17 ▽								
52:15	Rom 15:21 △								
53:1	**Rom 10:16**				**12:38*** +				
53:4			**8:17*** +				1 Pet 2:22-25		
53:5-6							1 Pet 2:22-25		
53:7				**Acts 8:32-33***			1 Pet 2:22-25		
53:9							1 Pet 2:22-25		14:5
53:12				Luke 22:37 △ +			1 Pet 2:22-25		
54:1	Gal 4:27 △								
54:13					6:45*				
55:3				Acts 13:34 (△)					
55:10	2 Cor 9:10								
56:7		11:17 △	21:13 △	Luke 19:46 △					
58:6				**Luke 4:18-19*(+)**					

59:7–8	Rom 3:15 △								
59:20f	Rom 11:26 △								
61:1(f)			[11:5 ○]	**Luke 4:18-19*(+)** [Luke 7:22 ○]					
62:11			21:5* +						
65:1	**Rom 10:20**								
65:2	**Rom 10:21**								
65:17							2 Pet 3:13□		[21:1]
66:1				Acts 7:48–49*					
66:22							2 Pet 3:13□		[21:1]
66:24		9:48							

Legend:

bold	mentions 'Isaiah'
*	mentions 'prophet'
+	fulfillment quote
△	'it is written'/reference to scripture
▽	γάρ or other unspecific introduction
○	can also be read as referring to material earlier mentioned in the macrotext
□	can also be traced back/referring to earlier New Testament tradition
[]	rather an allusion than a proper quote.

'As It Is Written in the Law of the Lord' (Luke 2:23): Quotations from the Pentateuch in the Gospel of Luke

Dorota Hartman

It is well known that scripture plays a very important role for the author of the Third Gospel. In the Gospel of Luke, the first public appearance of Jesus shows him discussing the Law with the διδάσκαλοι at the temple,[1] and ends with the risen Jesus explaining the scripture.[2] From this narrative device alone, it is obvious that Luke makes reference to scripture on various levels. The use of scripture in the Third Gospel and Acts is in fact rather multifaceted, as evident from quotations, allusions and the conscious imitation of OT stories.[3] However, despite his interest

---

[1] Luke 2:41–50.

[2] Luke 24:44–47. The importance of presenting Jesus as an interpreter of scripture in these verses was underlined by Bart J. Koet, *Five Studies on Interpretation of Scripture in Luke-Acts,* SNTA 14 (Leuven: Leuven University Press/Uitgeverij Peeters, 1989), 149; see also Emerson B. Powery, *Jesus Reads Scripture: The Function of Jesus' Use of Scripture in the Synoptic Gospels*, BibInt 63 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 242.

[3] Due to limits of space, this article will mainly discuss OT quotations in the Gospel of Luke, not in Acts. There are countless books and articles on use of the OT in Luke-Acts; as it is impossible to provide a full list here, we will mention only a few, such as Richard N. Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1999), 123-24; and, for a general overview of the use of the OT in Luke, David W. Pao and Eckhard J. Schnabel, 'Luke', in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, ed. G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic/Nottingham: Apollos, 2007), 251–414. Among other studies, there are Charles Kingsley Barrett, 'Luke/Acts', in *It Is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture. Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars, SSF*, ed. D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 231–44; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, 'The Use of the Old Testament in Luke-Acts', in *Society of Biblical Literature 1992 Seminar Papers*, ed. Eugene H. Lovering, Jr., SBLSP 31 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 524–38; Kenneth Duncan Litwak, *Echoes of Scripture in Luke-Acts: Telling the History of God's People Intertextually*, JSNTSup 282 (London/New York: T&T Clark, 2005); Charles A. Kimball, *Jesus' Exposition of the Old Testament in Luke's Gospel*, JSNTSup 94 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994); Martin Rese, *Alttestamentliche Motive in der Christologie des Lukas*, SNT 1 (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1969); Darrell L. Bock, *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern: Lucan Old Testament Christology*, JSNTSup 12 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987); Dietrich Rusam, *Das Alte Testament bei Lukas*, BZNW 112 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2003); and François Bovon, *Luke the Theologian: Fifty-Five Years of Research (1950-2005)*, 2nd rev. ed. (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2006), 87–121. Regarding Acts in particular, Martin Rese, 'Die Funktion der alttestamentlichen Zitate und Anspielungen in den Reden der Apostelgeschichte', in *Les Actes des Apôtres: Traditions, rédaction, théologie*, ed. Jacob Kremer, BETL 48 (Gembloux: J. Ducolot/Leuven: Leuven University, 1979), 61–79; John T. Carroll, 'The Uses of Scripture in Acts', in *Society of Biblical Literature 1990 Seminar Papers*, ed. David J. Lull, SBLSP 29 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990),

in the OT and in creating intertextual relations with it, Luke does not quote extensively from the OT, more frequently making use of allusions than explicit quotations.[4] Most of these quotations are to be found in the speeches in the first fifteen chapters of the Acts; in his Gospel, the biblical quotations are concentrated in the final part of the work. Moreover, while the infancy narrative is full of OT echoes, in the central part of the Gospel the quotations are less frequent.

The independent quotations in Luke's Gospel are mainly from Isaiah, the Psalms and the Minor Prophets.[5] In the Passion narrative, as in other Synoptics, there is a significant number of quotations from the Psalms, but Luke adds another important quotation from Isaiah that is quoted only by him.[6] As has already been noted, in Lucan writings there are no direct quotations from the historical books, yet this certainly does not mean that Luke did not know them.[7] Luke certainly knew the tripartite division of the Hebrew scripture, which he introduces as the 'Law of Moses, Prophets and Psalms'[8] or more simply as 'Moses and the Prophets'.[9] Except in Acts 2:17–21, he never uses long quotations, and those he does are usually embedded in direct speech: in fact, all but three quotations in his Gospel occur in direct speech.[10] In eighteen instances of explicit quotation, Luke uses introductory formulas.[11] Such introductory formulas

512–28; Gert J. Steyn, *Septuagint Quotations in the Context of the Petrine and Pauline Speeches of the* Acta Apostolorum, CBET 12 (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1995), 8–14, 32–35; and Carl R. Holladay, 'Luke's Use of the LXX in Acts: A Review of the Debate and a Look at Acts 1:15–26', in *Die Septuaginta und das frühe Christentum – The Septuagint and Christian Origins*, ed. Thomas Scott Caulley and Hermann Lichtenberger, WUNT 277 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 233–300.

[4] A fundamental problem in the study of these quotations is indeed that of distinguishing between a quotation and an allusion, which is not always possible; in fact, the distinction between them is often quite arbitrary, see Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period*. We will assume as quotations those texts that agree substantially with the OT text in wording, and that are often identified as a reference to scripture by the author, frequently by the use of an introductory formula.

[5] Bovon, *Luke the Theologian*, 114.

[6] Luke 22:37 (Isa 53); see Bovon, *Luke the Theologian*, 92.

[7] Pao & Schnabel, 'Luke', 251.

[8] Luke 24:44.

[9] Luke 24: 27.

[10] Luke 2:23, 24; 3:4–6.

[11] On introductory formulas in scriptural quotations in the NT, see Joseph A. Fitzmyer, 'The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in the Qumran Literature and in the New Testament', *NTS* 7 (1961): 297–305, where it is shown that the NT introductory formulas are similar to those found in the Qumran texts. See also Bruce M. Metzger, 'The Formulas Introducing Quotations of Scripture in the NT and the Mishnah', *JBL* 70 (1951): 297–307.

show that Luke was very careful to indicate that he was drawing from scripture, and precisely from where: for example, in Luke 3:4 and 20:42.

Finally, the quotations in the Third Gospel and Acts must be elaborated separately, because of the different natures of the two parts of the Lucan corpus. One main difference is that, in Luke's Gospel, the quotations are often drawn from the same tradition known to other Synoptics. Therefore, some Lucan quotations are adaptations from Mark or Q, and do not stem directly from the underlying OT text: thirteen quotations appear in the Triple tradition,[12] five in the Double tradition,[13] while in the material peculiar to Luke, we find only six.[14] It is meaningful that, even when Luke draws his quotations from Mark or Q, he is careful about the original context in which the quotation appears.

1. Research on the Use of the OT in Luke

The most important aspect of the use of scripture in Luke is certainly the theological perspective it entails, and much attention has been paid to interpretive frameworks that might account for Luke's use of the OT. Amid this line of enquiry, one prominent theory is that it is meant to reflect the theology of promise and fulfillment, or 'proof from prophecy' pattern: as this is not a concern of the present article, it will be mentioned here only briefly. The assertion that Luke uses the OT in an apologetic manner to demonstrate the fulfillment of God's plan in the ministry of Jesus originates in Henry J. Cadbury's *The Making of Luke-Acts*.[15] This claim was further investigated by Paul Schubert, and subsequently by others. Schubert has argued that 'proof from prophecy' is a core tenet of Lucan theology in both the Gospel and Acts. Luke uses this pattern as the basis of his chapter 24, which is crucial to the theological unity of the Gospel.[16] Hans Conzelmann has described Luke's intent in using the OT as illustrating promise and fulfillment, on the one hand, and apologetics on the other.[17] The introductory formulas show that the scripture is understood as prophecy in Luke. Conzelmann also stresses the priority of chapter 24 of the Third Gospel, while Martin Rese and Darrell Bock focus on the Christolog-

---

[12] Luke 3:4-6; 7:27; 8:10; 10:27; 18:20; 19:38, 46; 20:17, 28, 37, 42-43; 21:27; 22:69.

[13] Luke 4:4, 8, 10-11, 12; 13:35.

[14] Luke 2:23, 24; 4:18–19; 22:37; 23:30, 46. Kimball, *Jesus' Exposition of the Old Testament in Luke's Gospel*, 48.

[15] Rev. ed. (London: SPCK, 1958), 303–06.

[16] 'The Structure and Significance of Luke 24', in *Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann zu seinem 70. Geburtstag am 20. August 1954*, ed. Walther Eltester, ZNW 21 (Berlin: Töpelmann, 1954), 165-86.

[17] *The Theology of St. Luke* (New York: Harper, 1961); trans. of *Die Mitte der Zeit: Studien zur Theologie des Lukas*, BHT 17 (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1954).

ical use of the OT. After first examining the quotations in Acts and then those in the Third Gospel, Rese contests the validity of assuming a 'proof from prophecy' theme since, in his opinion, Luke's intent in quoting scripture was mainly hermeneutical. Bock aimed to challenge Rese's study, re-examining all the Christological quotations, allusions and OT themes in the Gospel of Luke and Acts, particularly with an eye to 'proof from prophecy'.[18] His conclusion is that Luke's use of the OT represents neither 'proof from prophecy' nor its rejection; he describes Luke's hermeneutical method in his use of the OT as 'proclamation from prophecy and pattern'.[19] Bock – who asserts that Luke's conceptual form of argumentation is not solely dependent on the Septuagint (LXX) – makes the important point that Luke could just as well have used the Hebrew text. Moving beyond direct quotations and indirect allusions, Kenneth Litwak extends the research to Luke-Acts' intertextuality with the OT, arguing that the promise-fulfillment pattern is not sufficient to explain Luke's purpose in using such OT references: Luke rather uses the references to scripture hermeneutically, namely, to frame the discourse, and his main aim is ecclesiology.[20] A main goal of Litwak's book is to demonstrate that Luke saturated his writings with echoes of scripture in order to demonstrate the continuity between the events of the OT and the life and ministry of Jesus.

2. Luke's Dependence on the Septuagint and the Form of the Quotations

Another well-known fact is that, particularly in the first two chapters of his Gospel, Luke seems to depend heavily on the LXX. Apart from the Gospel's intertextuality with the OT, as seen in the rewriting of some biblical motifs or in OT typology,[21] Luke also imitates the style and language of the LXX, and can easily switch between language registers.[22] The good classical Greek style of the preface is only a literary device: as soon as the core story begins, Luke switches to another kind of language, one well-rooted in Jewish literary tradition. The conscious imitation of

---

[18] Rese, *Alttestamentliche Motive in der Christologie des Lukas*.

[19] Bock, *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern*, 278-79.

[20] Litwak, *Echoes of Scripture in Luke-Acts.*

[21] See, for example, Bovon, *Luke the Theologian*, 101–08. On the OT figures in Luke, or on the imitation of Deuteronomy in Luke's narratives, see, for example, David P. Moessner, *Lord of the Banquet: The Literary and Theological Significance of the Lukan Travel Narrative* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989); Craig A. Evans, 'Luke 16:1–18 and the Deuteronomy Hypothesis', in *Luke and Scripture: The Function of Sacred Tradition in Luke-Acts*, ed. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993); and John S. Kloppenborg and Joseph Verheyden, eds., *The Elijah-Elisha Narrative in the Composition of Luke*, LNTS 493 (London/New York: Bloomsbury, 2014).

[22] Luke 1:4–5.

the LXX's language and style can, according to many scholars, explain the Semitic elements recognizable in the Third Gospel. Fitzmyer says that 'the Semitisms of Lucan Greek which are found in the LXX should be frankly labelled as "Septuagintisms"'.[23] However, the question of these Semitisms is more complex, and the dependence on the LXX cannot explain all the Semitic elements in Luke's work. Some instances seem to indicate that Luke might also have consulted the Hebrew text, or even have been bilingual;[24] still other explanations of Lucan Semitisms are possible, such as the use of different sources or the influence of the Jewish Greek milieu. The question of Luke's Semitisms was particularly pursued by Charles Torrey, who concentrated his research on the first fifteen chapters of Acts: a section known for its strong 'biblical' flavor which, according to Torrey, reveals an Aramaic source. Research into the Semitic background of Acts was later continued by Matthew Black and Max Wilcox, yet without reaching any satisfactory conclusion.[25] Nonetheless, even if a Semitic influence on Luke cannot be excluded, it seems that – especially in the narrative sections – Luke simply used the LXX also as a literary and linguistic model.[26] In this regard, it seems clear enough that the main source of his scriptural quotations was usually the LXX,[27] not the Hebrew text.[28] To make the question even more arduous, there are also instances of quotations that do not conform to the text of the LXX, but may derive from a different Greek textual tradition or from Testimonia.

---

[23] Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I-IX: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary,* Anchor Yale Bible Commentaries (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1970), 114

[24] See, for example, the quotation from Isa 53:12, peculiar to Luke (22:37), which is closer to the MT than to the LXX. A very extensive discussion of the various theories on the presence of Semitisms in Luke's work can be found in Albert Hogeterp and Adelbert Denaux, *Semitisms in Luke's Greek: A Descriptive Analysis of Lexical and Syntactical Domains of Semitic Language Influence in Luke's Gospel*, WUNT 401 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018). The authors discuss some of the most important phenomena, such as the use of sources, imitation of Old Testament language, influence of the so-called 'Greek of the ancient synagogue', code-switching and bilingualism.

[25] Charles C. Torrey, *The Composition and Date of Acts,* HTS 1 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1916); Max E. Wilcox, 'The Old Testament in Acts 1-15', *ABR* 5 (1956): 1–42; and idem, *The Semitisms of Acts* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1965); Matthew Black, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts with an Appendix on the Son of Man by Geza Vermes*, 3rd ed. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1967).

[26] Adelbert Denaux and Rita Corstjens, *The Vocabulary of Luke: An Alphabetical Presentation and a Survey of Characteristic and Noteworthy Words and Word Groups in Luke's Gospel*, BTS 10 (Leuven: Peeters, 2009), 508.

[27] It was already argued that the LXX was the main source of Luke's style and quotations: H.F.D. Sparks, 'The Semitisms in St. Luke's Gospel', *JTS* 44 (1943): 129–38.

[28] The use of Amos 9:11-12 in Acts 15:16-18.

Therefore, while Luke did draw from the LXX, it remains to determine both the extent of his knowledge of the text, and what stage of text he had access to. As stated above, studies on the textual form of Lucan quotations have mainly focused on Acts because of the high concentration of scriptural citations in its first fifteen chapters. After having analysed these quotations in Acts, Lucien Cerfaux deemed those quotations inconsistent with the LXX to be from the collections of Testimonia.[29] In his above-mentioned work on Semitisms in Acts, Wilcox analyzes some of the quotations in Acts and concludes that, since many diverge from the LXX, they must preserve the Targumic textual tradition; in other instances, where the text seems to be closer to the Hebrew (Masoretic) text, he considers the possibility that Luke used a Hebraicizing version of the LXX.[30]

An enduring study on this topic is Traugott Holtz's *Untersuchungen über die alttestamentlichen Zitate bei Lukas*.[31] Holtz's conclusions are quite interesting, as he argues that Luke knew the LXX of Isaiah, the Psalms and the Minor Prophets, but not that of the Pentateuch and the Former Prophets; thus, when quoting or alluding to them, he must have relied on other sources. When Luke fails to reproduce the LXX version of a quotation, it is because he did not have access to the text.[32] His quotations from the Minor Prophets seem to be consistent with the LXX Alexandrian manuscript group. Holtz continues to conclude that, since the Lucan quotations from the Pentateuch usually differ from the LXX text, Luke not only lacked access to this text, but he also had no particular interest in the ancient laws as expressed in the OT. His quotations from the Pentateuch are thus traditional: Luke derived them from collections of liturgical texts like the Testimonia.[33] The problem of Luke's use of Testimonia has also been explored by other scholars. On the Christian Testimonia – a collection of messianic texts similar to 4Q175 *Testimonia* – from which NT writers drew, J. Rendel Harris has completed an early

[29] 'Citations scripturaires et tradition textuelle dans le Livre of Acts', in *Aux sources de la tradition chrétienne: Mélanges offerts à M. Maurice Goguel à l'occasion de son soixante-dixième anniversaire*, ed. Philippe H. Menoud and Oscar Cullmann (Neuchâtel/Paris: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1950), 43–53. Among other studies on the quotations in Acts, see W. K. Lowther Clarke, 'The Use of the Septuagint in Acts', in *The Beginning of Christianity, Part 1: The Acts of the Apostles*, ed. F. J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake, 5 vols. (1920-1933; repr., Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1965-1966), 2:66-105; Ernst Haenchen, 'Schriftzitate und Textüberlieferung in der Apostelgeschichte', *ZTK* 51 (1954): 153–67.

[30] Wilcox, *The Semitisms of Acts*, 20–55.

[31] TUGAL 5, Reihe 49-51 (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1968).

[32] As in, for example, Stephen's speech in Acts.

[33] Holtz, *Untersuchungen über die alttestamentlichen Zitate bei Lukas*, 81–82.

study, followed by C.H. Dodd and others.[34] The discovery of such collections of proof texts in Qumran would later lend more support to their hypotheses. Martin Albl has compiled a review of Testimonia research and, regarding Luke, examined various quotations from the speeches in Acts.[35] Kenneth Thomas likewise demonstrates that the quotations in Synoptics were liturgical quotations preserved in Septuagintal form.[36] Various other scholars working on Acts have assumed Luke's use of Testimonia.[37] Rese has criticized Holtz's conclusions, maintaining that where Luke's quotations depart from the LXX text, it is due to his redactional activity and theological exigences.[38]

Among other treatments, we may recall the short study of Helmer Ringgren, who examined the textual form of the quotations in Luke, dealing first with the quotations shared by the other Synoptics, then with the quotations peculiar to Luke, the allusions in the hymns of the infancy narrative and finally the quotations in Acts.[39] He reaches the conclusion that the differences between the LXX and Luke are due to Luke's quoting the text by heart. In another essay, C.K. Barrett narrows the focus to quotations with an introductory formula, comparing the Lucan quotations to those in Mark and Matthew.[40] He also concludes that Luke had no particular interest in the interpretation of the OT. In his doctoral thesis, Wayne Litke discusses the thesis that Holtz elaborated, arguing that Luke used the LXX as the source of his quotations

---

[34] J. Rendel Harris, *Testimonies*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1916–1920); C.H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures: The Sub-Structure of New Testament Theology* (London: Nisbet, 1952). Harris's hypothesis was that a single Testimonia book was circulating in the first century, but later scholars have rather supposed many smaller collections. A modified version of the Testimonia hypothesis has survived in other works. Pierre Prigent demonstrated how the writer of Pseudo-Barnabas used many collections of Testimonia, *Les testimonia dans le christianisme primitif: L'Épître de Barnabé I–XVI et ses sources*, EBib (Paris: J. Gabalda, 1961); see also Oskar Skarsaune, 'From Books to Testimonies: Remarks on the Transmission of the Old Testament in the Early Church', in *The New Testament and Christian-Jewish Dialogue: Studies in Honor of David Flusser*, ed. Malcolm Lowe (Jerusalem: Ecumenical Theological Research Fraternity in Israel, 1992), 207–19.

[35] *'And Scripture Cannot be Broken': The Form and Function of the Early Christian Testimonia Collections*, NovTSup 96 (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 190–201.

[36] 'Liturgical Citations in the Synoptics', *NTS* 22 (1976): 205–14 (207–09).

[37] George D. Kilpatrick, 'Some Quotations in Acts', in *Les Actes des Apôtres*, 81–97. This study focuses on quotations from Acts.

[38] *Alttestamentliche motive in der Christologie des Lukas,* 208–09; 217–23. See also Bovon, *Luke the Theologian*, 98–101.

[39] 'Luke's Use of the Old Testament', *HTR* 79 (1986): 227–35.

[40] Barrett, 'Luke/Acts', 231–44.

from all the OT books.[41] Some scholars, most notably John Drury and Michael Goulder, building on the thesis of Christopher Evans – who claimed that Luke composed his central section as a parallel to LXX Deuteronomy 1–26 – use the expression 'literary midrash' to describe the technique Luke adopts in his Gospel: they claim that the author of the Third Gospel would have used the LXX to create his narratives.[42] Drury, in particular, maintains that Luke used the LXX, Mark and Matthew as his sources, while the parts that are peculiar to his Gospel are merely rewritings of the stories he found in the LXX.[43] Goulder extends this thesis, developing a 'lectionary cycle' theory. The Gospel of Luke would thus have been a liturgical gospel read in worship, and Luke's quotations would reflect the Jewish 'lectionary cycle' of Torah and Prophets.[44]

3. The Problem with the Pentateuch

It is indeed difficult to establish the accuracy of Luke's biblical quotations, especially as we are nowadays aware of the fluidity of the LXX text in its first centuries of life. Quotations not conforming to the LXX's later, fixed text might have originated from another version (or versions) of the Greek scripture in circulation at that time. On the other hand, these quotations can reveal the form of the LXX text in the first century; the same materials can inform us of the existence of such secondary LXX textual forms. It is known that there was a movement that promoted the revision of the Greek Bible in line with the Hebrew text, as the Minor Prophets scroll from Naḥal Ḥever has clearly shown. It seems probable that Luke also used a Greek text of the Minor Prophets that was revised in line with the Hebrew text.[45] When the quotation diverges from the LXX, however, we cannot always be sure

---

[41] 'Luke's Knowledge of the Septuagint: A Study of Citations in Luke-Acts' (Ph.D. diss., McMaster University, 1993).

[42] Christopher F. Evans, 'The Central Section of St Luke's Gospel', in *Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot*, ed. Dennis E. Nineham (Oxford: Blackwell, 1957), 37–54. It is important to note that Evans did not use the term 'midrash' when describing the use of LXX Deuteronomy in the central section of Luke.

[43] *Tradition and Design in Luke's Gospel: A Study in Early Christian Historiography* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1976).

[44] He draws attention to P^{75}, whose system of divisions reflects the lectionary cycle, see *The Evangelists' Calendar: A Lectionary Explanation of the Development of Scripture* (London: SPCK, 1978); idem, *Luke: A New Paradigm*, 2 vols., JSNTSup 20 (Sheffield: JSOT, 1989). An overview of Goulder's theory is in Mark Goodacre, *Goulder and the Gospels: An Examination of a New Paradigm*, JSNTSup 133 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996). See the critique of Goulder's theory in Christopher Francis Evans, 'Goulder and the Gospels', *Theology* 82 (1979): 425–32.

[45] Litke, 'Luke's Knowledge of the Septuagint', 100.

whether the difference is due to the fact that the quotation is traditional or originates from Testimonia or a different LXX text, or if it is due purely to the author's redactional activity. This process becomes even more complicated when attempting to trace the origins of the indirect allusions.

Luke shows a preference for quotations from the Prophets and Psalms, while he seems less interested in the Pentateuch. Perhaps because of their many textual problems, quotations from the Pentateuch in Luke's Gospel have been less studied. This corpus consists mainly of composite quotations[46] that are usually short and, compared to quotations from Psalms and Prophets, more frequently depart from the LXX. In his Gospel, Luke quotes from the Pentateuch ten times, the Book of Numbers excluded.[47] In the whole two-volume Lucan corpus, there are thirty-five references to the Pentateuch altogether, not counting mere allusions. In the Third Gospel, all but three Pentateuchal quotations are found in direct speech, usually in the conversations of Jesus. While the quotations from other books are often Christological, and are used to explain the necessity of the Messiah's suffering, the quotations from the Pentateuch aim to underline adherence to the Law. Luke repeatedly emphasizes the importance of the 'law of the fathers'.[48]

4. Textual Problems: Luke 18:20 (Exod 20:12–16; Deut 5:16–20)

As mentioned above, the Third Gospel features many citations that Luke found in his sources Mark or Q.[49] Here, accepting the two-source hypothesis, we will present just one example of a quotation from the material that Luke draws from Mark.

For some reason, Luke was not satisfied with the Marcan form of the quotation, and thus revised it. The quotation, which contains the commandments from the second table of the decalogue,[50] appears in all three Synoptics, in the episode

---

[46] On composite quotations in Luke-Acts, see Stanley Porter, 'Composite Citations in Luke-Acts', in *Composite Citations in Antiquity: Volume 2, New Testament Uses*, ed. Sean A. Adams and Seth M. Ehorn, LNTS 593 (London: T&T Clark, 2018), 62–94.

[47] Luke 2:23/Exod 13:2, 12; Luke 2:24/Lev 12:8; Luke 4:4/Deut 8:3; Luke 4:8/Deut 6:13; Luke 4:12/Deut 6:16; Luke 10:27/Deut 6:5; Lev 19:18; Luke 12:35/Exod 12:11; Luke 18:20/Exod 20:12–16; Deut 5:16–20; Luke 20:28/Deut 25:5; Gen 38:8; Luke 20:37/Exod 3:6. Kimball adds a quotation in Luke 1:15 from Lev 10:9 (Kimball, *Jesus' Exposition of the Old Testament in Luke's Gospel*, 204).

[48] Luke 2:23, 24, 39; Acts 22:3.

[49] In the Third Gospel, five quotations appear in the Double Tradition (4:4, 8, 10–11, 12; 13:35), and thirteen in the Triple Tradition (3:4–6; 7:27; 8:10; 10:27; 18:20; 19:38, 46; 20:17, 28, 37, 42–43; 21:27; 22:69).

[50] Exod 20:12–16 = Deut 5:16–20. Jews considered Exod 20:2 (and Deut 5:6) the first commandment, and Exod 20:3–6 the second. The first five commandments, regarding God, were inscribed on the first tablet, and the other five, regarding humans, on the second.

of the rich man asking Jesus about eternal life.[51] Regarding the order of the sixth, seventh and eighth commandments in the Qumran fragments, Josephus and the Samaritan Pentateuch, the order is the same as that transmitted by the Masoretic Text. Nonetheless, in the Alexandrian Jewish milieu another order was known, as we see from both the LXX and Philo. Both in Exodus and Deuteronomy the MT presents the thematic order of these commandments as murder, adultery, theft, whereas in the LXX, the prohibition on adultery appears first.[52] Whether the change in order was motivated by some particular emphasis on the crime of adultery is a matter of discussion; while some scholars believe this, the order may simply derive from a different *Vorlage*.[53]

Exodus 20:12–16
12 τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα ἵνα εὖ σοι γένηται καὶ ἵνα μακροχρόνιος γένῃ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς τῆς ἀγαθῆς ἧς κύριος ὁ θεός σου δίδωσίν σοι
13 οὐ μοιχεύσεις
14 οὐ κλέψεις
15 οὐ φονεύσεις
16 οὐ ψευδομαρτυρήσεις κατὰ τοῦ πλησίον σου μαρτυρίαν ψευδῆ

Deuteronomy 5:16–20
16 τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα σου ὃν τρόπον ἐνετείλατό σοι κύριος ὁ θεός σου ἵνα εὖ σοι γένηται καὶ ἵνα μακροχρόνιος γένῃ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἧς κύριος ὁ θεός σου δίδωσίν σοι
17 οὐ μοιχεύσεις
18 οὐ φονεύσεις

---

[51] Mark 10:19; Matt 19:18–19; Luke 18:20. Thomas, 'Liturgical Citations in the Synoptics', 207–09; Kimball, *Jesus' Exposition of the Old Testament in Luke's Gospel*, 138–39; Porter, 'Composite Citations in Luke-Acts', 74–77; Rusam, *Das Alte Testament bei Lukas*, 118–19.

[52] The order of the MT, in both Exodus and Deuteronomy, is murder, adultery, theft. The same order appears in 4QDeut^{n}, the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Peshitta. The order of the prohibitions in LXX Exodus is adultery, theft, murder; in Deuteronomy, adultery, murder, theft. See John W. Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus*, SCS 30 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990), 314.

[53] In the MT Exodus, adultery is low on the list of prohibitions, and the wife is treated as part of the husband's possessions; in Deuteronomy, wives are separate from possessions; and in the LXX's Exodus and Deuteronomy, adultery is a more serious offence. This could indicate a change of approach, possibly due to the emphasis on fornication in Hellenistic Judaism – cf. Liliana Rosso Ubigli, 'Alcuni aspetti della concezione della "porneia" nel tardo giudaismo', *Hen* 1 (1979): 201–45 – but might also indicate the availability of a different text to the translators. See Leonard J. Greenspoon, 'Textual and Translation Issues in Greek Exodus', in *The Book of Exodus: Composition, Reception and Interpretation*, ed. Thomas B. Dozeman, Craig A. Evans and Joel N. Lohr, VTSup 164, FIOTL 7 (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 341–42.

> [19] οὐ κλέψεις
> [20] οὐ ψευδομαρτυρήσεις κατὰ τοῦ πλησίον σου μαρτυρίαν ψευδῆ

In fact, the text of the quotation in Mark already differs from that in the LXX, where we find:

> τὰς ἐντολὰς οἶδας· μὴ φονεύσῃς, μὴ μοιχεύσῃς, μὴ κλέψῃς, μὴ ψευδομαρτυρήσῃς, μὴ ἀποστερήσῃς, τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα.[54]

Mark substitutes μή with the subjunctive for οὐ with the future indicative found in the LXX. He changes the order of the commandments to murder, adultery, theft, bearing false witness, honoring one's parents. Thus, Mark puts τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα after the first four prohibitions. He also adds another prohibition, μὴ ἀποστερήσῃς, 'do not defraud', which is neither in the LXX nor in the MT, and probably derives from the catechetical tradition.[55]

The version in Matthew, on the other hand, reads:

> [18] λέγει αὐτῷ· ποίας; ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν· τὸ οὐ φονεύσεις, οὐ μοιχεύσεις, οὐ κλέψεις, οὐ ψευδομαρτυρήσεις, [19] τίμα τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα, καὶ ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν.[56]

Matthew follows the LXX, omitting the Marcan addition of μὴ ἀποστερήσῃς; he retains the LXX οὐ with the future indicative for the prohibitions.[57] He adds, 'you shall love your neighbour as yourself'.

Luke further modifies the quotation found in Mark:

> τὰς ἐντολὰς οἶδας· μὴ μοιχεύσῃς, μὴ φονεύσῃς, μὴ κλέψῃς, μὴ ψευδομαρτυρήσῃς, τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα.[58]

Like Mark, Luke maintains the commandment form of μή with the aorist subjunctive. as opposed to the LXX, where the negated future indicative is found (as in

---

[54] Mark 10:19.

[55] Thomas, 'Liturgical Citations in the Synoptics', 207. The NT authors were not interested in the first commandments, regarding images and idolatry. Moreover, later on, two commandments from Exod 20:2–6 were merged into one. On the commandments in the NT, see David Flusser, 'The Ten Commandments and the New Testament', in *The Ten Commandments in History and Tradition*, ed. Ben-Zion Segal and Gershon Levi, Sidrat sefarim le-ḥeḳer ha-Miḳra mi-yisudo shel S. Sh. Peri (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1990), 219–26.

[56] Matt 19:18-19.

[57] Matthew's quotation reflects the A text of Deut 5:16–20. The differences between the Lukan and Matthean versions of the quotation – despite their agreement on the common omission of the Marcan addition μὴ ἀποστερήσῃς – makes Luke's dependence on Matthew improbable.

[58] Luke 18:20.

Matthew).[59] The aorist subjunctive is typical of Luke, who uses it consistently in prohibitions,[60] so he may have found this more apt. He omits the Marcan addition of μὴ ἀποστερήσῃς, which is lacking in the LXX, and, surprisingly, reverses the order of the commandments to μὴ μοιχεύσῃς, μὴ φονεύσῃς, μὴ κλέψῃς. Since it does not seem that Luke wanted to place particular emphasis on the prohibition of adultery here, as it is not relevant to the episode of the rich man, the change is not redactional, but probably simply due to the text he was following. It also seems that Luke here is referring not to the LXX of Exodus, but to Deuteronomy 5:16–20, and the order of the prohibitions is the same as that attested in the B text of LXX Deuteronomy. The same order is found in other early Christian authors, such as Paul in Romans:

> τὸ γὰρ οὐ μοιχεύσεις, οὐ φονεύσεις, οὐ κλέψεις, οὐκ ἐπιθυήσεις, καὶ εἴ τις ἑτέρα ἐντολή, ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ ἀνακεφαλαιοῦται [ἐν τῷ]· ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν.[61]

or in James:

> ὁ γὰρ εἰπών· μὴ μοιχεύσῃς, εἶπεν καί· μὴ φονεύσῃς· εἰ δὲ οὐ μοιχεύεις φονεύεις δέ, γέγονας παραβάτης νόμου.[62]

According to Holtz, Luke used a quotation drawn not from the LXX, but from the liturgical tradition. This is probable, and must have been a tradition already circulating in Jewish circles, as noted above, since the same order is visible in Philo, for whom the prohibition on adultery is particularly relevant.[63] Indeed, in Philo we find: ἡ δ' ἑτέρα πεντὰς τὰς πάσας ἀπαγορεύσεις περιέχει· μοιχείας, φόνου, κλοπῆς, ψευδομαρτυριῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν.[64] The same order of the sixth to eighth commandments appears in the Nash Papyrus, which attests to the use of the ten commandments in liturgy.[65] The text of the Nash Papyrus is conflated, but it reflects a different textual tradition than the MT and the LXX. Even if the order of the commandments is similar to that in LXX

---

[59] Kimball, *Jesus' Exposition of the Old Testament in Luke's Gospel*, 138–39.

[60] Luke 6:29; 8:28; 10:4; 12:22, Acts 7:60; 18:9.

[61] Rom 13:9; cf. also 1 Cor 6:9.

[62] Jas 2:11.

[63] *Decal.* 168–71; *Spec.* 3.7–4.40. See Ulrich Kellerman, 'Der Dekalog in den Schriften des Frühjudentums: Ein Überblick' in *Weisheit, Ethos und Gebot: Weisheits- und Dekalogtraditionen in der Bibel und im frühen Judentum*, ed. Henning Graf Reventlow, Biblisch-theologische Studien 43 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2001), 161–70; Innocent Himbaza, 'Le Décalogue de Papyrus Nash, Philon, 4QPhyl G; 8QPhyl 3, et 4Qmez A', *RevQ* 20 (2002): 411–28, esp. pp. 421–24.

[64] *Decal.* 1:51.

[65] The Nash Papyrus contains the Decalogue in the mixed version of Deuteronomy and Exodus (Deut 5:6–21, Exod 20:2–17), Deut 4:45 and the Shema': see the classic exposition of William F. Albright, 'A Biblical Fragment from the Maccabaean Age: The Nash Papyrus', *JBL* 56 (1937): 145–76.

Deuteronomy in Vaticanus B, the text of Nash Papyrus differs from the LXX in other respects.[66] The Nash Papyrus was found in Egypt, but its actual provenance is unknown, and it should be recalled that – as demonstrated by Emmanuel Tov – there are strong affinities between this text and the Palestinian liturgical traditions, not with the LXX.[67] This fact attests that the alternative order of the commandments that we also find in Luke was circulating in Jewish milieus.

This example makes it less probable that Luke corrected the Marcan quotation to the text of the LXX similar to the text preserved in Codex Vaticanus. More probable is that he corrected it according to the tradition he was familiar with. Since there are other instances where it seems that Luke knew the Jewish exegesis of scripture, it is probable that he revised the quotation under its influence. The example also shows that, in the material drawn from Mark, Luke deliberately changed the OT quotations and modified them. These changes were not due to particular theological reasons, but simply because he followed the tradition he preferred or knew better.

5. Luke 2:22–24

Our second example is a cluster of quotations in the infancy narrative, which has no parallel in other Synoptics.[68] These quotations are particularly interesting because, being peculiar to Luke, they show his knowledge of the biblical texts and the Jewish background of these texts.[69]

---

[66] See Emmanuel Tov, 'The Papyrus Nash and the Septuagint', in *A Necessary Task: Essays on Textual Criticism of the Old Testament in Memory of Stephen Pisano*, ed. Dionisio Candido and Leonardo Pessoa da Silva Pinto, AnBib 14 (Rome: G&B Press, 2020), 38.

[67] The Decalogue section of the Nash Papyrus is often described as similar to the LXX, but Tov demonstrates that the papyrus is close neither to the textual tradition of LXX Deuteronomy nor to LXX Exodus. Tov draws attention to the fact that the text of the Decalogue and the Shema' transmitted in the Nash Papyrus is parallel to certain *tefillin* found in the Judaean Desert, and therefore more probably reflects Palestinian tradition; see Tov, 'The Papyrus Nash and the Septuagint'.

[68] Being impossible here to quote all the extensive literature on the infancy narrative, see just Raymond Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah* (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1977), who rejects the historicity of most of the material in the Lucan infancy narrative. For a different opinion, see Bock, *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern*, 55-90; Stephen Farris, *The Hymns of Luke's Infancy Narratives: Their Origin, Meaning and Significance*, JSNTSup 9 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985). On the problem of the original language, see Chang-Wook Jung, *The Original Language of the Lukan Infancy Narrative*, JSNTSup 267 (London: T&T Clark, 2004). We assume here that Luke composed his infancy narrative himself, in Greek.

[69] See Gert J. Steyn, 'Intertextual Similarities between Septuagint Pretexts and Luke's Gospel', *Neot* 24 (1990): 229-46. Steyn notes also that the same can be observed for Acts, where the explicit quotations are found in speeches which are Luke's own creation: see *Septuagint Quotations in the Context of the Petrine and Pauline Speeches of the* Acta Apostolorum, 23.

The study of quotations from the Pentateuch in Luke is also connected with some broader questions: the possible source of the infancy narratives, and the extent of Lucan redactional activity, or his authorship of the first two chapters of the Third Gospel. The quotations in Luke 2:23–24 are also among the very few Pentateuch quotations in the Gospels that are not attributed to Jesus.[70] Section 2:21–40 of the Third Gospel is concerned with matters of purification after birth and with the presentation of Jesus by his parents at the temple on the eighth day after his birth. Apart from the Pentateuchal references, these verses echo the presentation of Samuel to the 'House of the Lord' at Shiloh in 1 Sam 1:22–24.[71]

Luke 2:22–24 is carefully structured around two references to OT law: the law concerning the firstborn (2:23) and that concerning purification of the mother (2:24):

> 22 Καὶ ὅτε ἐπλήσθησαν αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ αὐτῶν κατὰ τὸν νόμον Μωϋσέως, ἀνήγαγον αὐτὸν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα παραστῆσαι τῷ κυρίῳ,
> 23 καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν νόμῳ κυρίου ὅτι πᾶν ἄρσεν διανοῖγον μήτραν ἅγιον τῷ κυρίῳ κληθήσεται, 24 καὶ τοῦ δοῦναι θυσίαν κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον ἐν τῷ νόμῳ κυρίου, ζεῦγος τρυγόνων ἢ δύο νοσσοὺς περιστερῶν.[72]

These presentation ceremonies are delineated as part of the Law of Moses or of the Lord, and three times Luke underlines obedience to the Law: κατὰ τὸν νόμον Μωϋσέως (v. 22); καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν νόμῳ κυρίου (v. 23); κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον ἐν τῷ νόμῳ κυρίου (v. 24).[73] The quotation in verse 23 pertains to the dedication of the firstborn, but it is preceded by a mention of another rite, that of purification after birth, in the phrase 'when the time came for their purification' in Luke 2:22, though the actual description of this rite is found only later on, in verse 24. According to some authors, Luke confounded the two rites – the purification of the mother after birth, in Leviticus 12, and the dedication of the firstborn, in Exodus 13:2 – putting them together.[74] In any case, Luke focuses here on Jesus' parents fulfilling the requirements of the Law. The author of the Third Gospel, in fact, frequently emphasizes that the ministry of Jesus is to be seen as a fulfillment of the Law of the Lord,

---

[70] There are only five quotations from the Pentateuch in the Gospels that were not pronounced by Jesus himself (and seventeen pronounced by him); cf. Kenneth J. Thomas, 'Torah Citations in the Synoptics', *NTS* 24 (1977): 85-96.

[71] Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah*, 450-51; Pao-Schnabel, 'Luke', 268-71; Rusam, *Das Alte Testament bei Lukas*, 49.

[72] Luke 2:22–24.

[73] The structure could be derived from a source according to Bock, *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern*, 306n114.

[74] Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah*, 447.

the νόμος κυρίου.[75] Further, as the narrative of the Gospel continues, adherence to the Law is mentioned again, 'and when the parents brought in the child Jesus, to do for him what was customary under the law',[76] and 'When they had finished everything required by the law of the Lord, they returned to Galilee, to their own town of Nazareth'.[77]

The term 'Law', νόμος, appears nine times in the Third Gospel, five of which are in the infancy narrative.[78] First, in chapter 2:22, Luke uses the expression 'law of Moses', which appears five times in the Lucan corpus[79] as well as in the LXX.[80] Moses is clearly connected with the Law:

> Καὶ ὅτε ἐπλήσθησαν αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ αὐτῶν κατὰ τὸν νόμον Μωϋσέως, ἀνήγαγον αὐτὸν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα παραστῆσαι τῷ κυρίῳ.[81]

Luke 2:22 begins with the mention of the purification rite: καὶ ὅτε ἐπλήσθησαν αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ αὐτῶν; the use of the third-person plural pronoun in τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ αὐτῶν is interesting, because it does not follow the text of LXX Leviticus, which instead contains the regulation ἕως ἂν πληρωθῶσιν αἱ ἡμέραι καθάρσεως αὐτῆς.[82] In the LXX, as also in the MT, the singular feminine pronoun referring to the mother appears, while Luke uses the third-person plural pronoun in τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ αὐτῶν, 'their purification'. Since all the available manuscripts of LXX Leviticus contain the feminine αὐτῆς, the change in pronoun must derive from something other than the different text of the LXX followed by Luke.[83] The pronoun αὐτῶν could indicate that both Joseph and Mary have to be purified; otherwise, it could refer to Mary and Jesus. The regulations in Leviticus mention only

---

[75] Luke 2:24; 4:8, 10, 12; 19:46.

[76] Luke 2:27.

[77] Luke 2:39.

[78] Luke 2:22, 23, 24, 27, 39, also 10:26; 16:16, 17; 24:44, and another fifteen occurrences in Acts. See Stephen G. Wilson, *Luke and the Law*, SNTSMS 50 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 1.

[79] Luke 2:24; Acts 13:38; 15:5; 28:23. Meanwhile, it appears only three times in other NT writings (John 7:23; 1 Cor 9:9; Heb 10:28). Moses is clearly connected with the Law and his association with it is more frequent in Luke than in other NT writers.

[80] 1 Kgdms 2:3; 1 Esd 9:39; Tob 7:13; Dan 9:11.

[81] Luke 2:22.

[82] Lev 12:4.

[83] All the available manuscripts of LXX Leviticus contain the feminine αὐτῆς: see John W. Wevers, ed., *Leviticus*, vol. 2.2 of *Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986), 38.

the purification of the mother after birth.[84] In the LXX, there is clearly a feminine pronoun, αὐτῆς:

> λάλησον τοῖς υἱοῖς Ισραηλ καὶ ἐρεῖς πρὸς αὐτούς γυνή, ἥτις ἐὰν σπερματισθῇ καὶ τέκῃ ἄρσεν καὶ ἀκάθαρτος ἔσται ἑπτὰ ἡμέρας κατὰ τὰς ἡμέρας τοῦ χωρισμοῦ τῆς ἀφέδρου αὐτῆς ἀκάθαρτος ἔσται
>
> Speak to the people of Israel, saying: 'If a woman conceives and bears a male child, she shall be ceremonially unclean for seven days; as at the time of her menstruation, she shall be unclean'.[85]
>
> καὶ τριάκοντα ἡμέρας καὶ τρεῖς καθήσεται ἐν αἵματι ἀκαθάρτῳ αὐτῆς παντὸς ἁγίου οὐχ ἅψεται καὶ εἰς τὸ ἁγιαστήριον οὐκ εἰσελεύσεται ἕως ἂν πληρωθῶσιν αἱ ἡμέραι καθάρσεως αὐτῆς
>
> Her time of blood purification shall be thirty-three days; she shall not touch any holy thing, or come into the sanctuary, until the days of her purification are completed.[86]

The reading αὐτῶν is found in the best witnesses of the Gospel of Luke: Sinaiticus, A, B and L. Textual variants, however, attest that the scribes were puzzled by αὐτοῦ, as it did not correspond to the prescription in Leviticus. Thus, Codex D has αυτοῦ (also in Sahidic and in Synaitic Syriac), a singular pronoun that could refer either to Jesus or to Joseph. Some Vetus Latina manuscripts and the Vulgata have *eius* – equivalent to αὐτῆς, in αἱ ἡμέραι καθάρσεως αὐτῆς[87] – to indicate that only the purification of Mary was intended: however, this could derive from scribal harmonization with the LXX of Leviticus 12:4. Other witnesses omit the pronoun entirely: 435, bo^{pt}; Ir^{lat}. Since αὐτῶν seems to be the better *lectio*, most commentators think that the pronoun refers to Joseph and Mary.[88] This does not agree with the prescription found in Leviticus, but Luke – who is usually thought to have been of Gentile origin – could simply have been ignorant of Jewish regulations regarding purification after childbirth. Clearly, this would strengthen the argument of Luke's ignorance of the Pentateuch;[89]

---

[84] Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I-IX*, 424.

[85] Lev 12:2.

[86] Lev 12:4.

[87] Lev 12:4.

[88] Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I-IX*, 424; Raymond Brown, 'The Presentation of Jesus (Luke 2:22–40)', *Worship* 51 (1977): 2–11.

[89] It is not possible to mention all the commentators that share this view. See Brown, 'The Presentation of Jesus (Luke 2:22–40)', 3; Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I-IX*, 424; François Bovon, *A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 1:1–9:50*, vol. 1 of *Luke*, ed. Helmut Koester, 3 vols., Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002), 99; trans. of *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, 4 vols., EKKNT 3 (Zürich: Benziger/Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchen, 1989-2009); and I. Howard Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC 3 (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1978), 116.

others, however, assume that Luke was not precise because his main focus here was the visit to the temple and presentation of the child, not matters of purification.[90] Therefore, Luke does not aim to give technical details here. Origen, however, in his *Homilies on Luke*, thinks that the plural refers not to Mary and Joseph, but to Mary and Jesus.[91] If the pronoun refers to Mary and Jesus, it would mean that the child also needed purification.

Why would Luke change the text of LXX Leviticus 12:4? This question has been pursued by Matthew Thiessen.[92] Leviticus 11–16 is concerned with matters of impurity, and chapter 12 concentrates on impurity after childbirth.[93] As a consequence of bearing a child, a woman is impure, and cannot touch holy things or enter the sanctuary. After the birth of a male, she is impure like a menstruant (כימי נדת דותה תטמא/κατὰ τὰς ἡμέρας τοῦ χωρισμοῦ τῆς ἀφέδρου αὐτῆς).[94] After seven days, the male child is circumcised, but the mother is still in a state of downgraded impurity for thirty-three days. After the birth of a female, the period of uncleanness lasts for fourteen days, after which her downgraded impurity doubles to sixty-six days. On completion of this period, the mother has to present a lamb for the burnt offering (עלה), and a pigeon or turtledove for the purification offering (חטאת).[95] In Leviticus, only the mother is described as impure, but there is no mention of the child. Thiessen argues that the legislation in Leviticus is only a very concise description of the impurity rules, and possibly not exhaustive: other Jewish traditions probably also described the newborn child as ritually impure.[96] This seems to be confirmed in *Jubilees* 3:8-14, which contains evidence that the child also undergoes a period of impurity.[97] This text reflects on longer periods of impurity after giving birth to daughters: the Garden of Eden is described as an archetypal temple, and Adam and Eve become impure after birth, even if they have no

---

[90] Wilson, *Luke and the Law*, 21.

[91] *Hom. Luc.* 14:3–6.

[92] 'Luke 2:22, Leviticus 12, and Parturient Impurity', *NovT* 54 (2012): 16–29.

[93] See Jacob Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 3 (New York: Doubleday, 1991); Thiessen, 'Luke 2:22, Leviticus 12, and Parturient Impurity', 19–20.

[94] Lev 12:2.

[95] Lev 12:6–8.

[96] Thiessen, 'Luke 2:22, Leviticus 12, and Parturient Impurity', 18.

[97] Thiessen, 'Luke 2:22, Leviticus 12, and Parturient Impurity', 24. For the Book of *Jubilees*, see James C. VanderKam, *The Book of* Jubilees*: A Critical Text*, 2 vols., CSCO 510-511, Scriptores Aethiopici 87-88 (Louvain: Peeters, 1989); Linda S. Schearing, 'Double Time … Double Trouble? Gender, Sin, and Leviticus 12', in *The Book of Leviticus: Composition and Reception*, ed. Rolf Rendtorff and Robert A. Kugler, VTSup 93, FIOTL 3 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 431–32.

mother. Since Eve was created after Adam, her entrance to the Garden of Eden was subsequent to that of the man, so bearing a daughter entails a longer period of impurity. The text also implies that all those associated with childbirth are unclean. The impurity pertains not only to the husband of a woman who has given birth, but also to the newborn itself.[98]

Another text connecting entrance into the Garden of Eden with the legislation in Leviticus 12 is 4Q265.[99] This text also implies the impurity of the child itself.[100] But why would the question of the child's impurity bother Luke? Differently than in the text of Leviticus 12, Luke explicitly describes the newborn Jesus' entrance into the sacred space when his parents present him to the Lord at the temple. Since, as mentioned above, Luke was very careful to demonstrate Jesus' family's complete adherence to the Law, he was concerned that the child's entrance might bring impurity to the sanctuary. If Thiessen's proposal is correct, Luke displays a deep knowledge of the impurity rules, as well as knowledge of other Jewish texts dealing with impurity, apart from the instructions given in Leviticus 12. It is hard to imagine that Luke would have ignored the legislation of Leviticus, or that he had no access to the text of LXX Leviticus. He must have wanted to underline that the child was purified before his parents presented him to the Lord, so he slightly modified the text of the LXX according to other Jewish prescriptions he knew.

Thiessen, however, does not mention the problem found in the following section:

> Καὶ ὅτε ἐπλήσθησαν αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ αὐτῶν κατὰ τὸν νόμον Μωϋσέως, ἀνήγαγον αὐτὸν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα παραστῆσαι τῷ κυρίῳ.[101]

The verb ἀνήγαγον,[102] which is connected with αὐτῶν, seems to refer to Joseph and Mary, not to Mary and the child. This could just be bad syntax, but it could also mean that the pronoun αὐτῶν refers to Joseph and Mary, or to the entire family. If

---

[98] Joseph M. Baumgarten, 'Purification after Childbirth and the Sacred Garden in 4Q265 and *Jubilees*', in *New Qumran Texts and Studies: Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Paris, 1992*, ed. George J. Brooke and Florentino García Martínez, STDJ 15 (Leiden: Brill 1994), 3–10. Such is the interpretation given to this passage of *Jubilees* by Syncellus, who declares that, after birth, newborns were impure like their mothers, and could not be introduced into the temple before a period of purification (Syncellus, *Chronography* 5, quoted by Thiessen, 'Luke 2:22, Leviticus 12, and Parturient Impurity', 26).

[99] This text was reconstructed by Baumgarten, 'Purification after Childbirth and the Sacred Garden in 4Q265 and *Jubilees*', esp. p. 5.

[100] Thiessen, 'Luke 2:22, Leviticus 12, and Parturient Impurity', 25.

[101] Luke 2:22.

[102] The verb is an allusion to 1 Kgdms 1:22: καὶ Αννα οὐκ ἀνέβη μετ' αὐτοῦ ὅτι εἶπεν τῷ ἀνδρὶ αὐτῆς ἕως τοῦ ἀναβῆναι τὸ παιδάριον ἐὰν ἀπογαλακτίσω αὐτό καὶ ὀφθήσεται τῷ προσώπῳ κυρίου καὶ καθήσεται ἐκεῖ ἕως αἰῶνος.

this is the case (however, see below), the impurity after birth is, for Luke, extended to all those associated with childbirth, again in accordance with other Jewish texts, such as *Jubilees* and 4Q265.

6. Luke 2:23

In the next verse, Luke describes the reasons for the dedication of the firstborn. The focus on the firstborn's total dedication to the Lord in Luke 2:23 is again a sign of Luke interpreting scripture according to Jewish exegetical tradition. The firstborn's presentation to the Lord is strictly connected with the purification rite described in the previous verse, and here it is clear that, differently than in the text of Leviticus, Luke is describing the child entering the temple's sacred space; thus, the focus on matters of impurity is not connected only with the mother. Here we find one of the three quotations in Luke that do not appear in direct speech.[103] The quotation is announced with an introductory formula, καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν νόμῳ κυρίου,[104] thus specifying the source of the quotation as the 'Law of the Lord':[105]

> καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν νόμῳ κυρίου ὅτι πᾶν ἄρσεν διανοῖγον μήτραν ἅγιον τῷ κυρίῳ κληθήσεται
>
> As it is written in the law of the Lord, 'Every firstborn male shall be designated as holy to the Lord.'[106]

Luke clearly states that he is referring to scripture here. The ὅτι clause is introduced by καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν νόμῳ κυρίου. Elsewhere in his Gospel, Luke does not use καθὼς γέγραπται, but it appears two times in Acts.[107] This is the only instance in Luke's work where a quotation from the Pentateuch is announced as being from 'the Law of the Lord'. This formula, however, frequently introduces quotations in the LXX.[108] The lack of an article in ἐν νόμῳ κυρίου has occasionally been attributed to its translation from Hebrew, but this argument is not strong, as the same

---

[103] On this quotation, see Thomas, 'Torah Citations in the Synoptics', 91; Rese, *Alttestamentliche Motive in der Christologie des Lukas*, 140-42.

[104] Luke 2:23.

[105] This is the only place where such an expression occurs. In Luke 10:26, we find 'in the law', ἐν τῷ νόμῳ τί γέγραπται, without κυρίου; cf. Matt 22:36.

[106] Luke 2:23.

[107] Acts 7:42; 15:15. Denaux and Corstjens, *The Vocabulary of Luke*, 131; Jung, *The Original Language of the Lukan Infancy Narrative*, 69.

[108] Cf. 2 Kgdms 14:6; 2 Chr 23:18; 25:4; Dan 9:13.

expression appears with an article in v. 24.[109] Further, the expression appears both with and (more frequently) without an article in the LXX;[110] thus, it is more probable that the expression is a Septuagintism. The quotation refers to the regulations in Exodus 13 pertaining to firstborn sons, who have to be consecrated to the Lord in honor of the firstborns' lives being spared during the Passover in Egypt. Luke's quotation seems to be a conflation of Exodus 13:2, 13:12 and 13:15. Because the wording of the quotation does not correspond exactly to either of the LXX verses, Holtz classifies the quotation as originating in the tradition, and argues that it does not indicate the Third Gospel author's knowledge of the LXX text.[111] Of the same opinion is Bock, who treats this quotation as a conflated one, originating in the early tradition.[112] However, since the quotation is preceded by the introductory formula, it is clear that Luke was intending to quote explicitly from scripture.[113] The quotation specifically speaks of a firstborn that is holy to the Lord; we can thus assume that the reference is to Exodus 13:2:

> קַדֶּשׁ־לִי כָל־בְּכוֹר פֶּטֶר כָּל־רֶחֶם בִּבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל בָּאָדָם וּבַבְּהֵמָה לִי הוּא
> (MT)

> ἁγίασόν μοι πᾶν πρωτότοκον πρωτογενὲς διανοῖγον πᾶσαν μήτραν ἐν τοῖς υἱοῖς Ισραηλ ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπου ἕως κτήνους ἐμοί ἐστιν
>
> Consecrate to me every firstborn, firstproduced, opening every womb among the sons of Israel, from human being to animal. It's mine![114]

Or:

> καὶ ἀφελεῖς πᾶν διανοῖγον μήτραν τὰ ἀρσενικά τῷ κυρίῳ πᾶν διανοῖγον μήτραν ἐκ τῶν βουκολίων ἢ ἐν τοῖς κτήνεσίν σου ὅσα ἐὰν γένηταί σοι τὰ ἀρσενικά ἁγιάσεις τῷ κυρίῳ
>
> You shall also set apart everything opening the womb, the males, for the Lord. Everything opening the womb from the herds or among your animals, whatever belongs to you, you shall consecrate the males to the Lord.[115]

---

[109] See Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah*, 437; Jung, *The Original Language of the Lukan Infancy Narrative*, 74.

[110] So, ἐν τῷ νόμῳ κυρίου 2 Chr 31:3; 1 Esd 1:31; Ps 1:2; ἐν νόμῳ κυρίου 4 Kgdms 10:31; 1 Chr 16:40; 2 Chr 35:26; Sir 46:14; Ps 118:1.

[111] Holtz, *Untersuchungen über die alttestamentlichen Zitate bei Lukas*, 82–83.

[112] Bock, *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern*, 83.

[113] David New, who has a very strict definition of quotations, believes that, despite the introductory formula, this is not a quotation, as it does not correspond exactly to any OT text: *Old Testament Quotations in the Synoptic Gospels and the Two-Document Hypothesis*, SCS 37 (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1993), 90.

[114] Exod 13:2 (NETS).

[115] Exod 13:12 (NETS).

In Luke's quotation, the main difference is that πᾶν is connected with ἄρσεν, instead of the διανοῖγον of Exodus 13:12 or πρωτότοκον of Exodus 13:2. Even though the quotation is not exact, there are some arguments that it is based on the LXX of Exodus 13:2. First, the expression πᾶν ἄρσεν διανοῖγον μήτραν is rather peculiar, and should be considered a Septuagintism. Both LXX Exodus 13:2 and 13:12 have διανοῖγον μήτραν. פֶּטֶר,[116] 'anything coming first', is translated in the LXX with neuter διανοῖγον. Even if Luke favors the verb διανοίγω (which he uses seven times elsewhere, three times with the meaning 'to open'), διανοίγω in connection with μήτρα 'womb' is typical of the LXX,[117] so it is an obvious argument for his dependence on the LXX.[118] Moreover, the word μήτρα for 'womb' appears only here in Luke, who elsewhere consistently chooses κοιλία (also in the infancy narrative), so this use must be Septuagintal.[119] Exodus 13:2 refers to the firstborn being holy to the Lord. In the MT, *bᵉḵôr* is used with reference to the eldest son;[120] Luke knew this, as he added the specification that the child is a male ἄρσεν, a neuter singular, as opposed to the neuter plural ἀρσενικά in the LXX of Exodus 13:2. The extra specification reflects Luke's profound knowledge of scripture, and the Pentateuch in particular. The main argument against the quotation originating from the LXX of Exodus 13:2 could be that the Lucan quotation lacks πρωτότοκος; this could indicate that the quotation is traditional.[121] However, Luke does use the term πρωτότοκος, albeit only once, in chapter 2:7.[122] Thus, the omission could be intentional; perhaps because Luke was focusing on the child's dedication to the Lord, the fact that the child was a firstborn was less relevant. Further, in Exodus 13:12, there is no reference to the firstborn, so if Luke was quoting this verse, he had no reason to use πρωτότοκος.

The other element present in Luke's quotation, but found neither in the LXX nor in Exodus 13:2 or 13:12, is the verb κληθήσεται in ἅγιον τῷ κυρίῳ κληθήσεται,[123] which is redactional. In Exodus 13:12, there is ἁγιάσεις τῷ κυρίῳ, which is probably the origin of the Lucan ἅγιον τῷ κυρίῳ. Luke frequently uses καλέω, particularly

---

[116] Exod 13:2, 12.

[117] Except in Exod 13:2, 12, 15; and Gen 29:31; 30:22; Exod 34:19.

[118] Jung, *The Original Language of the Lukan Infancy Narrative*, 81–82. Holtz, *Untersuchungen über die alttestamentlichen Zitate bei Lukas*, 83, considers the expression 'a technical idiom'; however, it does not appear outside the LXX.

[119] Luke 1:15; 1:41–42, 44; 2:21.

[120] Gen 10:15; Exod 6:14.

[121] Bock, *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern*, 307n117.

[122] As in Heb 1:6 and Col 1:15; Litke, 'Luke's Knowledge of the Septuagint', 227.

[123] Luke 2:23.

in prophecies about Jesus and John.[124] The use of καλέω in connection with ἅγιος echoes the messenger angel's words to Mary:

> καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ ἄγγελος εἶπεν αὐτῇ· πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐπελεύσεται ἐπὶ σὲ καὶ δύναμις ὑψίστου ἐπισκιάσει σοι· διὸ καὶ τὸ γεννώμενον ἅγιον κληθήσεται υἱὸς θεοῦ.[125]

The child is twice called ἅγιος, and is dedicated to God. The use of Exodus 13 in underlining the importance of Jesus being wholly dedicated to the Lord is again an echo of Jewish tradition: such an exegesis of Exodus 13 in connection with total dedication to God can be found, for example, in Philo.[126] Therefore, the choice of καλέω is intentional, and indicates the amount of Lucan redactional activity.

Summing it up, it seems that Luke abridged the quotation of Exodus 13:12, probably also making a mental connection with Exodus 13:2.

7. Luke 2:24

In v. 24, Luke completes the description of the rite of purification he began in v. 22. This quotation also has a problematic origin, but is frequently believed to be drawn from Leviticus 12:8.[127] Verse 24 explains the complete dedication of Jesus and his activity to God, as further developed in the *Nunc Dimittis*, Luke 2:29–32:

> καὶ τοῦ δοῦναι θυσίαν κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον ἐν τῷ νόμῳ κυρίου, ζεῦγος τρυγόνων ἢ δύο νοσσοὺς περιστερῶν.[128]

Here, Luke is returning to the laws of purification drawn from Leviticus, as mentioned above. Following the period of blood purification after birth, the mother has to offer a lamb for the burnt offering, and a pigeon or turtledove for the sin offering.[129] If she cannot afford a lamb, she shall use two turtledoves or two pigeons, one for the burnt offering and the other for the sin offering. The fact that Mary offers only the pigeons in this verse is probably mentioned because Luke is always concerned with poverty and, in general, with socio-economic matters.

The quotation is again prefaced by an introductory formula, with a slight variation compared to the previous verse: instead of καθὼς γέγραπται (v. 23), we find

---

[124] Luke 1:13, 31, 32, 35, 60, 76.

[125] Luke 1:35.

[126] *Sacr.* 97; *Spec.* 1.248.

[127] Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah*, 437. See also Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I-IX*, 426; Litke, 'Luke's Knowledge of the Septuagint', 229.

[128] Luke 2:24.

[129] Lev 12:6.

'according to what is stated in the Law of the Lord', κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον ἐν τῷ νόμῳ κυρίου. The expression τὸ εἰρημένον, which introduces a quotation, also appears in Acts 2:16 and 13:40; thus, the author's intention of quoting from the OT is evident. The quotation, as it seems from the context of the purification after birth depicted in the Gospel, should be from Leviticus 12:8:

> δύο τρυγόνας ἢ δύο νεοσσοὺς περιστερῶν μίαν εἰς ὁλοκαύτωμα καὶ μίαν περὶ ἁμαρτίας καὶ ἐξιλάσεται περὶ αὐτῆς ὁ ἱερεύς, καί καθαρισθήσεται.

The only difference, apart from the slight variation of νεοσσούς as νοσσούς,[130] is the Lucan use of ζεῦγος, 'a pair', instead of δύο with the genitive τρυγόνων (the LXX of Leviticus has δύο τρυγόνας). MT Leviticus 12:8 clearly states שְׁתֵּי־תֹרִים אוֹ שְׁנֵי בְּנֵי יוֹנָה – in both cases, 'two' – and there are no known variants that could justify the use of ζεῦγος in the LXX of Leviticus 12:8. This leads Holtz to conclude that Luke did consult the LXX directly, but drew the quotation from another source.[131]

The word ζεῦγος is rather rare; it specifically means a yoked pair of oxen or donkeys – ζεῦγος ὄνων,[132] ζεύγη βοῶν[133] – and usually translates צֶמֶד ('yoke, pair'). Its use as a translation of שְׁנַיִם, 'two', appears exclusively in LXX Leviticus 5:11:

> ἐὰν δὲ μὴ εὑρίσκῃ αὐτοῦ ἡ χεὶρ ζεῦγος τρυγόνων ἢ δύο νεοσσοὺς περιστερῶν καὶ οἴσει τὸ δῶρον αὐτοῦ περὶ οὗ ἥμαρτεν τὸ δέκατον τοῦ οιφι σεμίδαλιν περὶ ἁμαρτίας οὐκ ἐπιχεεῖ ἐπ' αὐτὸ ἔλαιον οὐδὲ ἐπιθήσει ἐπ' αὐτὸ λίβανον ὅτι περὶ ἁμαρτίας ἐστίν
>
> וְאִם־לֹא תַשִּׂיג יָדוֹ לִשְׁתֵּי תֹרִים אוֹ לִשְׁנֵי בְּנֵי־יוֹנָה וְהֵבִיא אֶת־קָרְבָּנוֹ אֲשֶׁר חָטָא עֲשִׂירִת הָאֵפָה סֹלֶת לְחַטָּאת לֹא־יָשִׂים עָלֶיהָ שֶׁמֶן וְלֹא־יִתֵּן עָלֶיהָ לְבֹנָה כִּי חַטָּאת הִיא

Since the Hebrew expression 'two turtle doves or two young pigeons' in Leviticus 5:11 is identical to that in Leviticus 12:8 (לִשְׁתֵּי תֹרִים אוֹ לִשְׁנֵי בְּנֵי־יוֹנָה), and the translation of 'two' in ζεῦγος τρυγόνων ἢ δύο νεοσσοὺς περιστερῶν is not common – it appears only in the LXX of Leviticus 5:11 – Luke must have drawn it from the LXX. There is indeed the possibility that Luke, when quoting Leviticus 12:8, made a connection with the passage on the sin offering in Leviticus 5:11, where the word ζεῦγος appears. Otherwise, he may have intended to quote Leviticus 5:11, not 12:8, even if the context of Leviticus 5:11 seems less apt: the passage in Leviticus 5:11 is concerned with the sin offering in general, while Leviticus 12:8 specifically concerns the purification of the woman after giving birth. However, if Luke intended to explain that the purification from sin applied to both Mary and to Joseph, as the

---

[130] In the LXX νεοσσός is used for a young dove (Lev 5:7, 11; 12:6, 8; 14:22); see *LEH*, 415. Meanwhile, Luke uses the syncopated form, more widespread in Hellenistic Greek.

[131] Holtz, *Untersuchungen über die alttestamentlichen Zitate bei Lukas*, 83.

[132] 2 Sam 16:1.

[133] As in Luke 14:19.

pronoun in αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ αὐτῶν in Luke 2:22 might suggest, he could have been referring to Leviticus 5:11. Perhaps Luke wanted to emphasize Joseph's participation in the purification.[134]

The best explanation of all, in this case, may be that Luke was quoting the passage from memory, thus conflating two different quotations. This would confirm that the quotation is not traditional, revealing his real knowledge of the LXX Pentateuch. It is possible that Luke quoted the Pentateuch by heart, as he knew the text well and felt little urge to check the quotation (especially as his quotations from the Pentateuch are always short). As François Bovon states about not checking the texts one knows well, 'the verbatim quotations often come from books that the author knew less, and to which he must refer to the text in order to verify it'.[135] Luke must have been less inclined to check the Pentateuch quotations, but he also knew other traditions diverging from the LXX text.

8. Conclusions

Unlike the quotations from Isaiah and the Psalms, which are better suited for theological purposes, the quotations from the Pentateuch in the Third Gospel are found in contexts where they serve to underline the importance and continuity of OT law in the life and ministry of Jesus and his family; so they appear especially in the infancy narrative. Frequently highlighting the fulfilment of the νόμος κυρίου was very important to Luke.

Luke assumes that his readers are competent in scripture, which accounts for the frequency of his allusions, loose quotations and scriptural echoes. The most important aspect of the Lucan use of the Pentateuch is that, as in Jewish exegetical tradition, Luke's use of the text of scripture is rather free: he sometimes conflates different quotations, and sometimes doesn't hesitate to modify the text to conform to his exigencies, or to reflect the actual conditions in which scripture was being used in his day and in the context he knew.[136] Luke also seems conscious of the original context of each quotation, and even when using Mark or Q as a source, he is often not satisfied with the form of the text he has found in his sources, modifying them according to the other texts and traditions he knew or that were available to him. He appears by no means passive in his reception of scripture, but becomes an interpreter of it. The Lucan use of the Pentateuch can be described as a 'creative reception', such as can be seen in other contemporary Jewish texts.

---

[134] Bock, *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern*, 83; Jung, *The Original Language of the Lukan Infancy Narrative*, 91.

[135] Bovon, *Luke the Theologian*, 115.

[136] On the use of scripture in Qumran, see Corrado Martone's article, this volume.

The quotations from the Pentateuch in Luke are short and loose but, because of some specific Septuagintal expressions, it is possible to trace their origin back to the LXX. Contrary to Holtz's opinion, we think that Luke not only knew the LXX of the Pentateuch, but also demonstrates a rather profound knowledge of this material. So why does he not strictly follow the LXX text? Textual deviations from the LXX are due both to Luke's adjusting the text based on the traditions he preferred, and to his tendency to quote from memory. Luke probably knew the Pentateuch better than other books, and did not feel compelled to check the text. Did he use other traditions, such as Testimonia? Though the question is too broad to be pursued here,[137] it is certain that some quotations display knowledge of traditions that go beyond the biblical text. Luke certainly does not limit himself to quoting from the OT, but he draws from traditions known to other Jewish authors too: he was clearly aware of the Jewish methods of interpretation.

As Bart Koet says of Luke: 'By the manner in which he deals with interpretation of Scripture he reveals not only something about Jesus, the disciples, and the community for which he wrote, but also something about himself'.[138] His profound knowledge of scripture and of Hellenistic Jewish exegetical methods leads us to the suspicion that the author of the Third Gospel actually hailed from a Jewish milieu.[139] Luke not only reveals his own scriptural competence here and there, but also takes his audience's deep knowledge of scripture for granted. As Robert Maddox has noted, if Luke's audience was not competent in scripture, many of his scriptural allusions would have been missed.[140] This also leads us to infer that his audience was hardly Gentile, but Jewish or at least a mixed audience, formed of God-fearers and Jews.[141]

---

[137] It is noteworthy that one of the criteria that may indicate the use of a collection of testimonies is, for example, a lack of awareness of the original context of the quotation; however, Luke is usually aware of this. The use of composite quotations may also be due to the use of testimonies, but, as mentioned above, it may also derive from quoting the text by heart.

[138] *Five Studies on Interpretation of Scripture in Luke-Acts*, 159–60.

[139] Luke certainly knew the Jewish exegetical *middah Gezerah Shawah*, as can be seen, e.g., in Luke 4:18–19 or Acts 13:22: see Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period*, 98; Jan W. Doeve, *Jewish Hermeneutics in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1954), 172; Bovon, *Luke the Theologian*, 115, 117, 120. It is not possible to elaborate on the topic here, but Kimball, *Jesus' Exposition of the Old Testament in Luke's Gospel*, demonstrates that, in Luke's Gospel, various first-century Jewish exegetical techniques are used in the discourses of Jesus, including formulas, patterns and terminology.

[140] *The Purpose of Luke-Acts*, ed. John Riches (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1982), 14.

[141] See Philip Esler, *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts: The Social and Political Motivation of Lucan Theology*, SNTSMS 57 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 32. On the opinion that Luke was a Jewish priest, see Rick Strelan, *Luke the Priest: The Authority of the Author of the Third Gospel* (Aldershot, UK/

Bibliography

Albl, Martin C. *'And Scripture Cannot be Broken': The Form and Function of the Early Christian Testimonia Collections*, NovTSup 96. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

Albright, William F. 'A Biblical Fragment from the Maccabaean Age: The Nash Papyrus'. *JBL* 56 (1937): 145–76.

Barrett, Charles Kingsley. 'Luke/Acts'. Pages 231-44 in *It Is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture. Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars, SSF*. Edited by D.A. Carson and H.G.M. Williamson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Baumgarten, Joseph M. 'Purification after Childbirth and the Sacred Garden in 4Q265 and *Jubilees*'. Pages 3–10 in *New Qumran Texts and Studies: Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Paris, 1992*. Edited by George J. Brooke and Florentino García Martínez. STDJ 15. Leiden: Brill 1994.

Black, Matthew. *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts with an Appendix on the Son of Man by Geza Vermes*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1967.

Bock, Darrell L. *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern: Lucan Old Testament Christology*. JSNTSup 12. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987.

Bovon, François. *A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 1:1–9:50*. Vol. 1 of *Luke*. Edited by Helmut Koester. 3 vols. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002. Translation of *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*. 4 vols. EKKNT 3. Zürich: Benziger/Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchen, 1989-2009.

____. *Luke the Theologian: Fifty-Five Years of Research (1950-2005)*. 2nd rev. ed. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2006.

Brown, Raymond. *The Birth of the Messiah*. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1977.

____. 'The Presentation of Jesus (Luke 2:22–40)'. *Worship* 51 (1977): 2–11.

Cadbury, Henry J. *The Making of Luke-Acts*. Rev. ed. London: SPCK, 1958.

Carroll, John T. 'The Uses of Scripture in Acts'. Pages 512–28 in *Society of Biblical Literature 1990 Seminar Papers*. Edited by David J. Lull. SBLSP 29. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1990.

Cerfaux, Lucien. 'Citations scripturaires et tradition textuelle dans le Livre of Acts'. Pages 43–53 in *Aux sources de la tradition chrétienne: Mélanges offerts à M. Maurice Goguel à l'occasion de son soixante-dixième anniversaire*. Edited by Philippe H. Menoud and Oscar Cullmann. Neuchâtel/Paris: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1950.

Conzelmann, Hans. *The Theology of St. Luke*. New York: Harper, 1961. Translation of *Die Mitte der Zeit: Studien zur Theologie des Lukas*. BHT 17. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1954.

Denaux, Adelbert and Rita Corstjens. *The Vocabulary of Luke: An Alphabetical Presentation and a Survey of Characteristic and Noteworthy Words and Word Groups in Luke's Gospel*. BTS 10. Leuven: Peeters, 2009.

Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2008); see also Jacob Jervell, *Luke and the People of God: A New Look at Luke-Acts* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1972).

Dodd, Charles H. *According to the Scriptures: The Sub-Structure of New Testament Theology.* London: Nisbet, 1952.

Doeve, Jan W. *Jewish Hermeneutics in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts*. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1954.

Drury, John. *Tradition and Design in Luke's Gospel: A Study in Early Christian Historiography.* London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1976.

Esler, Philip F. *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts: The Social and Political Motivation of Lucan Theology.* SNTSMS 57. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Evans, Christopher F. 'The Central Section of St Luke's Gospel'. Pages 37–54 in *Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot*. Edited by D.E. Nineham. Oxford: Blackwell, 1957.

____. 'Goulder and the Gospels'. *Theology* 82 (1979): 425–32.

Evans, Craig A. 'Luke 16:1–18 and the Deuteronomy Hypothesis'. Pages 121–39 in *Luke and Scripture: The Function of Sacred Tradition in Luke-Acts*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993.

Farris, Stephen. *The Hymns of Luke's Infancy Narratives: Their Origin, Meaning and Significance.* JSNTSup 9. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *The Gospel According to Luke I-IX: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Yale Bible Commentaries. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1970.

____. 'The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in the Qumran Literature and in the New Testament'. *NTS* 7 (1961): 297–333.

____. 'The Use of the Old Testament in Luke-Acts'. Pages 524–38 in *Society of Biblical Literature 1992 Seminar Papers*. Edited by Eugene H. Lovering, Jr. SBLSP 31. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1992.

Flusser, David. 'The Ten Commandments and the New Testament'. Pages 219–26 in *The Ten Commandments in History and Tradition*. Edited by Ben-Zion Segal and Gershon Levi. Sidrat sefarim le-ḥeḳer ha-Miḳra mi-yisudo shel S. Sh. Peri. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1990.

Goulder, Michael D. *The Evangelists' Calendar: A Lectionary Explanation of the Development of Scripture*. London: SPCK, 1978.

____. *Luke: A New Paradigm*. 2 vols. JSNTSup 20. Sheffield: JSOT, 1989.

Greenspoon, Leonard J. 'Textual and Translation Issues in Greek Exodus'. Pages 322–48 in *The Book of Exodus: Composition, Reception and Interpretation*. Edited by Thomas B. Dozeman, Craig A. Evans and Joel N. Lohr. VTSup 164, FIOTL 7. Leiden: Brill 2014.

Haenchen, Ernst. 'Schriftzitate und Textüberlieferung in der Apostelgeschichte'. *ZTK* 51 (1954): 153–67.

Harris, J. Rendel. *Testimonies*. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1916–1920.

Himbaza, Innocent. 'Le Décalogue de Papyrus Nash, Philon, 4QPhyl G; 8QPhyl 3, et 4Qmez A'. *RevQ* 20 (2002): 411–28.

Holladay, Carl R. 'Luke's Use of the LXX in Acts: A Review of the Debate and a Look at Acts 1:15–26'. Pages 233–300 in *Die Septuaginta und das frühe Christentum – The Septuagint and Christian Origins*. Edited by Thomas Scott Caulley and Hermann Lichtenberger. WUNT 277. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.

Holtz, Traugott. *Untersuchungen über die alttestamentlichen Zitate bei Lukas*. TUGAL 5, Reihe 49-51. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1968.

Jervell, Jacob. *Luke and the People of God: A New Look at Luke-Acts*. Minneapolis, IN: Augsburg Publishing, 1972.

Jung, Chang-Wook. *The Original Language of the Lukan Infancy Narrative*. JTSNTSup 267. London: T&T Clark, 2004.

Kellerman, Ulrich. 'Der Dekalog in den Schriften des Frühjudentums: Ein Überblick'. Pages 147–226 in *Weisheit, Ethos und Gebot: Weisheits- und Dekalogtraditionen in der Bibel und im frühen Judentum*. Edited by Henning Graf Reventlow. Biblisch-Theologische Studien 43. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2001.

Kilpatrick, George D. 'Some Quotations in Acts'. Pages 81–97 in *Les Actes des Apôtres: Traditions, rédaction, théologie*. Edited by Jacob Kremer. BETL 48. Gembloux: J. Ducolot/Leuven: Leuven University, 1979.

Kimball, Charles A. *Jesus' Exposition of the Old Testament in Luke's Gospel*. JSNTSup 94. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994.

Kloppenborg, John S. and Joseph Verheyden, eds. *The Elijah-Elisha Narrative in the Composition of Luke*. LNTS 493. London and New York: Bloomsbury, 2014.

Koet, Bart J. *Five Studies on Interpretation of Scripture in Luke-Acts.* SNTA 14. Leuven: Leuven University Press/Uitgeverij Peeters, 1989.

Litke, Wayne D. 'Luke's Knowledge of the Septuagint: A Study of Citations in Luke-Acts'. Ph.D. diss., McMaster University, 1993.

Litwak, Kenneth Duncan. *Echoes of Scripture in Luke-Acts: Telling the History of God's People Intertextually*. JSNTSup 282. London and New York: T&T Clark, 2005.

Longenecker, Richard N. *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1999.

Lowther Clarke, William K. 'The Use of the Septuagint in Acts'. Vol. 2 pages 66–105 in *The Beginning of Christianity, Part 1: The Acts of the Apostles*. Edited by F. J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake. 5 vols. 1920-1933. Repr., Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1965-1966.

Lust, Johan, Erik Eynikel and Katrin Hauspie, eds. *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*. Rev. ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2003.

Maddox, Robert. *The Purpose of Luke-Acts.* Edited by John Riches. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1982.

Marshall, I. Howard. *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC 3. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1978.

Metzger, Bruce M. 'The Formulas Introducing Quotations of Scripture in the NT and the Mishnah'. *JBL* 70 (1951): 297–307.

Milgrom, Jacob. *Leviticus 1–16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 3. New York: Doubleday, 1991.

Moessner, David P. *Lord of the Banquet: The Literary and Theological Significance of the Lukan Travel Narrative.* Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989.

New, David D. *Old Testament Quotations in the Synoptic Gospels and the Two-Document Hypothesis*. SCS 37. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1993.

Pao, David W. and Eckhard J. Schnabel. 'Luke'. Pages 251–414 in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*. Edited by Gregory K. Beale and Donald A. Carson. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic/Nottingham: Apollos, 2007.

Porter, Stanley. 'Composite Citations in Luke-Acts'. Pages 62–94 in *Composite Citations in Antiquity: Volume 2, New Testament Uses*. Edited by Sean A. Adams and Seth M. Ehorn. LNTS 593. London and New York: T&T Clark, 2018.

Powery, Emerson B. *Jesus Reads Scripture: The Function of Jesus' Use of Scripture in the Synoptic Gospels*. BibInt 63. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Prigent, Pierre, *Les testimonia dans le christianisme primitif: L'Épître de Barnabé I–XVI et ses sources*. EBib. Paris: J. Gabalda, 1961.

Rese, Martin. *Alttestamentliche Motive in der Christologie des Lukas.* SNT 1. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1969.

____. 'Die Funktion der alttestamentlichen Zitate und Anspielungen in den Reden der Apostelgeschichte'. Pages 61-79 in *Les Actes des Apôtres: Traditions, rédaction, théologie*. Edited by Jacob Kremer. BETL 48. Gembloux: J. Ducolot/Leuven: Leuven University, 1979.

Ringgren, Helmer. 'Luke's Use of the Old Testament'. *HTR* 79 (1986): 227–35.

Rusam, Dietrich. *Das Alte Testament bei Lukas*. BZNW 112. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2003.

Schearing, Linda S. 'Double Time … Double Trouble? Gender, Sin, and Leviticus 12'. Pages 429–500 in *The Book of Leviticus: Composition and Reception*. Edited by Rolf Rendtorff and Robert A. Kugler. VTSup 93. FIOTL 3. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Schubert, Paul. 'The Structure and Significance of Luke 24'. Pages 165–86 in *Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann zu seinem 70. Geburtstag am 20. August 1954*. Edited by Walther Eltester. ZNW 21. Berlin: Töpelmann, 1954.

Skarsaune, Oskar. 'From Books to Testimonies: Remarks on the Transmission of the Old Testament in the Early Church'. Pages 207-19 in *The New Testament and Christian-Jewish Dialogue: Studies in Honor of David Flusser*. Edited by Malcolm Lowe. Jerusalem: Ecumenical Theological Research Fraternity in Israel, 1992.

Sparks, H.F.D. 'The Semitisms in St. Luke's Gospel'. *JTS* 44 (1943): 129–38.

Steyn, Gert J. 'Intertextual Similarities between Septuagint Pretexts and Luke's Gospel'. *Neot* 24 (1990): 229–46.

____. *Septuagint Quotations in the Context of the Petrine and Pauline Speeches of the* Acta Apostolorum. CBET 12. Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1995.

Strelan, Rick. *Luke the Priest: The Authority of the Author of the Third Gospel*. Aldershot, UK/Burlington, VT: Ashgate: 2008.

Thiessen, Matthew. 'Luke 2:22, Leviticus 12, and Parturient Impurity'. *NovT* 54 (2012): 16–29.

Thomas, Kenneth J. 'Liturgical Citations in the Synoptics'. *NTS* 22 (1976): 205–14.

____. 'Torah Citations in the Synoptics'. *NTS* 24 (1977): 85–96.

Torrey, Charles C. *The Composition and Date of Acts*. HTS 1. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1916.

Tov, Emmanuel. 'The Papyrus Nash and the Septuagint'. Pages 33–50 in *A Necessary Task: Essays on Textual Criticism of the Old Testament in Memory of Stephen Pisano*. Edited by Dionisio Candido and Leonardo Pessoa da Silva Pinto. AnBib 14. Rome: G&B Press, 2020.

Ubigli, Liliana Rosso. 'Alcuni aspetti della concezione della "porneia" nel tardo giudaismo'. *Hen* 1 (1979): 201–45.

VanderKam, James C. *The Book of* Jubilees*: A Critical Text*. 2 vols. CSCO 510-511, Scriptores Aethiopici 87-88. Louvain: Peeters, 1989.

Wevers, John W., ed. *Leviticus*. Vol. 2.2 of *Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986.

____. *Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus*. SCS 30. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990.

Wilcox, Max E. 'The Old Testament in Acts 1–15'. *ABR* 5 (1956): 1–42.

____. *The Semitisms of Acts*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1965.

Wilson, Stephen G. *Luke and the Law*. SNTSMS 50. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Isaiah 6:10 in the Gospel of John and the *Words of the Luminaries*

Michael A. Daise

Introduction

The quotation of Isa 6:10 at John 12:40 is at once pivotal to the Fourth Gospel's story and vexing to its exegetes. Pivotal, because, with the quotation of Isa 53:1 at John 12:38, it casts the Jews' mass rejection of Jesus (at John 12:37) as prophecy fulfilled. Vexing, because, with its considerably reworked text, it resists efforts to trace its version, or even to discern the new referents to which (or to whom) it is being applied. Illuminating for both matters is a fragment from a text found near Khirbet Qumran, 4QDibre Ha-Me'orot[a], *Words of the Luminaries* (hereafter, 4QDibHam[a]).[1] Though small (only six lines), it similarly applies this verse to a new context and alters its language, and so offers cognate light on this significant but perplexing Johannine *locus*. That light has been sought for one of the issues at stake: the identity of the agent (or agency) which is said to have 'blinded' the 'eyes' and 'hardened' the 'heart' of the Jews.[2] It offers more, however, and will here be revisited with an eye toward three broader matters: the settings in which Isa 6:10 is cast; the revisions made to its text form; and the relationships into which it is put with Deut 29:1-3. Put as questions, into what contexts do these *loci* place Isa 6:10? How do they manipulate its language? And how do they position it in relation to Deut 29:1-3? The comparison will be show that, by its transposition of genre, its perspective on Israel's history, its midrashic assumptions and its linguistic liberty, the Johannine rendering of this verse fits comfortably within Second Temple hermeneutics.

1. Isaiah 6:10 in John

First, Isa 6:10 in John. The Fourth Gospel's quotation of Isa 6:10 is the second of a two-fold citation from that prophet designed to interpret the Jews' large-scale unbelief in Jesus as fulfilled prophecy. After the evangelist describes Jesus departing public life,[3] he interjects that, despite the many 'signs' Jesus had done among the

---

[1] 4QDibHam[a] 18 1-6.

[2] Michael A. Daise, *Quotations in John: Studies on Jewish Scripture in the Fourth Gospel*, LNTS 610 (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2020), 116-19.

[3] John 12:36.

Jews, none 'were believing in him'. The reason this occurred, he continues, was 'in order that the word of Isaiah the prophet might be fulfilled', and he cites that word more specifically as a combination of Isa 53:1 and Isa 6:10.

> But though he had done so many signs before them, they were not believing in him,
> that the word of Isaiah the prophet might be fulfilled, which he said,
> 'Lord, who has believed our report?
> And to whom has the arm of the Lord been revealed'? (Isa 53:1)
> For this reason they were not able to believe, for again Isaiah said,
> 'He has blinded their eyes
> and hardened their heart,
> lest they see with the eyes
> and discern with the heart,
> and turn, and I heal them'. (Isa 6:10)
> These things Isaiah said, because (or when) he saw his glory and spoke about him.[4]

1.1 Isaiah 6:10 as Disclosure

Both Isa 6:10 and Isa 53:1 in this passage are cited as 'scripture'. This is clear, if only from the formulae by which they are introduced.[5] A closer look, however, shows that they are in fact cast more richly, that is, in terms of the event which was thought to have given rise to them: a vision experienced by Isaiah in which Isa 6:10 serves as a response of the pre-incarnate Christ to his lament over unbelief.[6]

The visionary context is fashioned on the attention given to the person of Isaiah the prophet, who is named three times in these verses. It begins with the very way the quotations are cited: where elsewhere in John such references are routinely quoted anonymously, as 'scripture' in general,[7] here they are more pre-

---

[4] John 12:37-41. Alongside the NA[28] choice of ὅτι for John 12:41 ('because he saw his glory'), a significant textual tradition reads 'when (ὅτε) he saw his glory'; D K Γ Δ family[13] 565 700 892 1241 1424 and a majority of manuscripts.

[5] The formula 'in order that X might be fulfilled (πληροῦν)' or 'completed (τελειοῦν)', by which Isa 53:1 is introduced, also introduces some six references to scripture that follow: John 13:18; 15:25; 17:12; 19:24, 28, 36. And the follow-up 'for again Isaiah said', for Isa 6:10, is matched by the clause 'and again another scripture says', which introduces the quotation of Zech 12:10 at John 19:37. On the scriptural referents cited at each of these junctures, see Michael A. Daise, 'Christology in John's Crucifixion Quotations', in *Fountains of Wisdom: In Conversation with James H. Charlesworth*, ed. Gerbern S. Oegema, Loren T. Stuckenbruck and Henry W. Morisada Rietz (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2022), 127-32.

[6] Much of this discussion draws upon a more detailed examination in Daise, *Quotations in John*, 67-124.

[7] If not (in some form) 'that which is written' or 'scripture', then they are introduced as 'written in the prophets', 'written in your law', 'from the law' or 'the word written in their law'; John 2:17; 6:31, 45;

cisely ascribed to the figure of Isaiah himself: 'the word of Isaiah the prophet' (Isa 53:1); 'again Isaiah said' (Isa 6:10). Moreover, once cited, they are immediately defined in the next verse as utterances proceeding from a revelatory event: 'These things Isaiah said, because/when he saw his glory and spoke about him'. Conventionally that event has been taken to be the throne room vision at the death of Uzziah in Isaiah 6:1-13, the passage from which Isa 6:10 is drawn.[8] In their contribution to this volume, however, Adriana Destro and Mauro Pesce make the intriguing suggestion that it may rather refer to a later vision Isaiah is portrayed as receiving during the reign of Hezekiah, in the pseudepigraphal *Ascension of Isaiah*.[9] Whichever it may be (if not a conflation of both), it is clear from John 12:41 (together with the personalized introductory formulae) that Isa 53:1 and Isa 6:10 are certainly deemed 'scripture', but also something more. They are a disclosure, Isaiah's account of a visionary experience in which he encountered divine glory.

That experience is detailed further, in two respects. First, it is structured as a dialogue between Isaiah and the Lord. This follows from the sequence in which the quotations have been placed. In John's rendering, Isa 6:10 closes (verbatim) with the LXX καὶ ἰάσομαι αὐτούς (v. 10g), and so has the Lord speaking its cola in the first person. With the verbs of the first two cola altered to third singular preterites (detailed below), it reads as the Lord in first person explaining his inability to 'heal' by recounting the impairment made by a third person agent or agency: 'He/it has blinded their eyes and hardened their heart, lest they…turn, and I (the Lord) heal them'. Being immediately preceded by Isa 53:1, this first person dis-

---

7:38, 42; 8:17; 10:34; 12:15, 34; 13:18; 15:25; 17:12; 19:24, 28, 36-37. Exceptions are references to Moses and (again) Isaiah as specific authors: Moses at John 1:45; Isaiah at John 1:23.

[8] Support for this inference comes from *Targum Isaiah*, which explicitly depicts the Lord's presence in this vision with language of 'glory': where in the HB Isaiah sees 'the Lord' (Isa 6:1) and his eyes see 'the King, Lord Sabaoth' (Isa 6:5), in the targum he sees 'the glory of the Lord' (ית יקרא דיוי) and his eyes see 'the Shekinah glory of the perpetual king (ית יקר שכינת מלך עלמיא), Lord Sabaoth' (*Tg. Isa.* 6:1, 5). Text for the *Targumim of the Prophets*, Alexander Sperber, ed., *The Latter Prophets according to Targum Jonathan*, vol. 3 of *The Bible in Aramaic Based on Old Manuscripts and Printed Texts* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1962), ad loc. The abbreviation HB (for Hebrew Bible) is used rather than MT (for Masoretic Text), to include non-Masoretic textual attestations found among Judaean desert texts.

[9] See 'Rewriting the Jewish Scriptures: The Function of Visions', in this volume. Destro and Pesce locate this vision in the twentieth year of the reign of Hezekiah; *Asc. Isa.* 9:27-42 (specifically verses 27, 33, 37), here using the versification in R.H. Charles, ed. and trans., *The* Ascension of Isaiah*: Translated from the Ethiopic version, which, together with the new Greek fragment, the Latin versions and the Latin translation of the Slavonic, is here published in full* (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1900), ad loc. The twentieth year of Hezekiah's reign would have occurred several decades after the death of Uzziah, the date of the vision in Isaiah 6.

course of the Lord becomes a response to the prophet's lament articulated in that verse. The cola of Isa 53:1 are rhetorical questions which vent grief over wholesale unbelief, despite the manifestation of the Lord's power ('the arm of the Lord'); and the vocative 'Lord' by which they are introduced constructs them explicitly as being uttered by Isaiah to God: 'Lord, who has believed our report? And to whom has the arm of the Lord been revealed'?[10] In sequence, then, the Lord's first-person address in Isa 6:10 answers this lament in what amounts to a trope of prophetic and apocalyptic tradition, the all-knowing deity consoling a despairing prophet:

Isaiah to the Lord	'Lord, who has believed our report? And to whom has the arm of the Lord been revealed'?	(Isa 53:1)
The Lord to Isaiah	'He/it has blinded their eyes and hardened their heart, lest they see with the eyes and discern with the heart, and turn, and I heal them'.	(Isa 6:10)

As such, Isa 6:10 not only reflects a vision experienced by Isaiah; it functions in that vision as the Lord's response to that prophet's grief over want of faith. Isaiah mourns blanket unbelief; the Lord explains the obstruction which accounts for it.[11]

Second on this vision, in the theology of the Fourth Gospel the 'Lord' speaking in Isa 6:10 is Jesus, in a state of existence prior to his birth as a human.[12] That Jesus in John enjoyed such a state is evident throughout the narrative.[13] As for his presence in this visionary dialogue, it has been inferred on a number of bases,[14] but most telling is the Fourth Gospel's wider notion of the 'glory' Isaiah is

[10] The initial vocative 'Lord' appears in the LXX, not the HB, and is followed by John.

[11] See the note on John 12:37 by Ernst Haenchen, *John 1-2*, ed. and trans. Robert W. Funk, 2 vols., Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 2:101.

[12] For conceptions of Jesus' life prior to his birth, 'pre-incarnate' is a more apt modifier than 'pre-existent', since by default that pre-human state would not have preceded his 'existence'; see also John Painter, 'The Quotation of Scripture and Unbelief in John 12.36b-43', in *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel*, ed. Craig A. Evans and W. Richard Stegner, JSNTSup 104/SSEJC 3 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 436n1.

[13] John 1:1-5, 30; 8:56-58; 17:5.

[14] It has been argued, for instance, that since Jesus is the antecedent to the personal pronoun in John 12:42 ('many of the rulers believed in him'), he must also be the figure whose 'glory' is seen by Isaiah in John 12:41 (and therefore the first-person figure speaking in the quotation at John 12:40); Painter, 'The Quotation of Scripture and Unbelief in John 12.36b-43', 446n1. Or again, that earlier in the narra-

alleged to have witnessed in John 12:41. This runs along two lines, neither exclusive of the other. One equates the 'glory' seen by Isaiah with the person of Christ himself. That is, if divine 'glory' is a projection of God's essence one step removed from his actual person, the incarnate Jesus serves this purpose in John for the Father,[15] and so doubtless did the same in his pre-incarnate state.[16] The other line understands the 'glory' in Isaiah's vision as belonging to Christ himself; that is, instead of speaking to Isaiah as the 'glory' of the Father, the pre-incarnate Christ does so in the mode of his own glory. This too finds support elsewhere in the Fourth Gospel: like Isaiah in John 12:41, the authorial 'we' in the Prologue attests to 'beholding' the 'glory' of the incarnate Christ.[17] The verbs of 'seeing' differ between these two *loci*: ὁρᾶν for Isaiah at John 12:41; θεᾶσθαι for the corporate authors at John 1:14. The experience, however, is the same[18] and offers a second theological lens for interpreting Isaiah's vision christologically. The 'glory' seen by Isaiah, then, is either the pre-incarnate Christ as the 'glory' of the Father or the pre-incarnate Christ in his own 'glory'. Whichever is taken, if not both,[19], the figure whom Isaiah is said to see in John 12:41 is the pre-incarnate Christ, and that same identity carries back to the first-person speaker in the quotation of Isa 6:10 at John 12:40.[20] Taken together with the framing of that quotation as a response to Isaiah in a visionary experience, Isa 6:10 here is cast as

---

tive Jesus is depicted performing the 'healing' (ἰᾶσθαι) of which the first person speaks in the quotation at John 12:40 (John 4:47; 5:13); Bruce G. Schuchard, *Scripture within Scripture: The Interrelationship of Form and Function in the Explicit Old Testament Citations in the Gospel of John*, SBLDS 133 (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1992), 98n30.

[15] John 1:18; 5:37; 6:46.

[16] See again, Schuchard, *Scripture within Scripture*, 98n30. Such a conception is supported by a textual tradition to John 12:41, D Θ family[13] 1, wherein Isaiah is described as seeing, not simply 'his glory' (τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ), but 'the glory of [his] God' (τὴν δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ [αὐτοῦ]).

[17] 'And the Word became flesh and camped among us; and we beheld his glory (τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ), glory (δόξαν) as of an only-begotten from a F/father...'; John 1:14.

[18] The interrelationship of both texts on this point is noted by Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel according to John*, 2 vols., AB 29-29A (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1966/1970), 1:487.

[19] Rudolf Schnackenburg, for instance, understands Isaiah to see Jesus' pre-incarnate glory, but per John 17:5 takes that glory to have been shared with the Father; *The Gospel according to St John*, trans. Kevin Smyth *et al.*, 3 vols. (New York: Crossroad, 1990), 2:416-17; trans. of *Das Johannesevangelium*, HThKNT 4 (Freiburg: Herder, 1965–75).

[20] Complicating the discussion (but not indulged here) are arguments that in John's quotation of Isa 6:10 Jesus is not the first person speaker who would heal but the third person actor who impairs; Judith M. Lieu, 'Blindness in the Johannine Tradition', *NTS* 34 (1988): 85-86; Bruce Hollenbach, 'Lest They Should Turn and Be Forgiven: Irony', *BT* 34 (1983): 313, 316-18.

'scripture' yes, but more so—it is a visionary response of the pre-incarnate Christ to Isaiah's lament over unbelief.

1.2 Isaiah 6:10 as Explanation of Unbelief

Regarding the quotation of Isa 6:10 itself, it should first be noted that a significant textual tradition attests the verb ἐπώρωσεν ('he hardened') in the second colon of John's rendering as ἐπήρωσεν ('he maimed').[21] This reading is regarded by the UBSGNT Committee as a later scribal attempt to find a verb more apt than 'harden' (πωροῦν) for the object 'heart' (τὴν καρδίαν) which follows.[22] It has found support nonetheless among exegetes; and by Jan de Waard, in particular, it has been taken as a citation drawn from 1QIsa[a], which for HB 'smear over' (השע) instead reads 'make desolate' (השמ): 'and their eyes make desolate' (ועיניו השמ).[23]

As for text form (regardless of this textual option), apart from its closing 'and I heal them' (καὶ ἰάσομαι αὐτούς), which (as noted above) matches LXX Isa 6:10g verbatim, it is fraught with differences from both Hebrew and Greek *Vorlagen*, each of which also differs dramatically from the other.[24] Four among these, however, are ideologically significant and furnish suggestive points of comparison with the fragment from 4QDibHam[a]. Two resonate readily with the Jews' unbelief in 'signs' registered at John 12:37: the cola treating 'ears' and 'hearing' (Isa 6:10be) are omitted; and the first two remaining cola (treating 'heart' and 'eyes', respectively) are inverted, restructuring the original *chiasmus* of heart-eyes-eyes-heart into a repeated sequence of eyes-heart-eyes-heart. Reinforcing this new symmetry are two more subtle modifications: the phrase 'heart of this people' (in Isa 6:10a) has been reduced to 'their heart' (in John 12:40b), to match the preceding 'their eyes' (in John 12:40a); and the verb of the second colon dealing with 'heart' (יבין/συνῶσι in

[21] P[66] P[75] א K W 579.

[22] Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 2nd ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft/United Bible Societies, 1994), 203.

[23] Jan de Waard, *A Comparative Study of the Old Testament in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the New Testament*, STDJ 4 (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1965), 7-8. For the text of 1QIsa[a], Eugene Ulrich and Peter W. Flint, eds., *Qumran Cave 1. II: The Isaiah Scrolls*, 2 vols., DJD 32 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2010), ad loc. and 2:100. Also arguing for πηροῦν (on different grounds) is Maarten J.J. Menken, '"He Has Blinded Their Eyes..." (John 12:40)', in *Old Testament Quotations in the Fourth Gospel: Studies in Textual Form*, ed. Maarten J.J. Menken, CBET 15 (Kampen: Kok Pharos Publishing House, 1996), 103-04; first publ. in *BZ* NF 32 (1988). Against it, Daise, *Quotations in John*, 74n278, 80-81, 92-94.

[24] A detailed analysis is offered by Daise, *Quotations in John*, 72-76; cf. also Edwin D. Freed, *Old Testament Quotations in the Gospel of John*, NovTSup 11 (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1965), 85-86; and Schuchard, *Scripture within Scripture*, 92-95.

Isa 6:10f, νοήσωσιν in John 12:40d) has been placed before its object (rather than after, as in the original), doubtless to align with the word sequence in the clauses which precede and follow it:

MT Isaiah 6:10	LXX Isaiah 6:10	John 12:40
השמן לב-העם הזה ואזניו הכבד ועיניו השע פן-יראה בעיניו ובאזניו ישמע ולבבו יבין ושב ורפא לו	ἐπαχύνθη γὰρ ἡ καρδία τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου, καὶ τοῖς ὠσὶν αὐτῶν βαρέως ἤκουσαν καὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν ἐκάμμυσαν, μήποτε ἴδωσι τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς καὶ τοῖς ὠσὶν ἀκούσωσι καὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ συνῶσι καὶ ἐπιστρέψωσι καὶ ἰάσομαι αὐτούς.	τετύφλωκεν αὐτῶν τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς καὶ ἐπώρωσεν/ἐπήρωσεν αὐτῶν τὴν καρδίαν, ἵνα μὴ ἴδωσιν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς καὶ νοήσωσιν τῇ καρδίᾳ καὶ στραφῶσιν, καὶ ἰάσομαι αὐτούς.
Make the heart of this people fat, and their ears render heavy, and their eyes smear over, lest they perceive with their eyes, and with their ears hear, and their heart understand, and they turn back and he heal them.	For the heart of this people grew fat, and with their ears they heard in disgust, and their eyes they shut; lest they perceive with the eyes, and with the ears hear, and with the heart understand, and turn and I heal them.	He has blinded their eyes and hardened/maimed their heart, lest they perceive with the eyes and discern with the heart, and turn, and I heal them.

The removal of the cola on 'ears' and 'hearing' brings the cola on 'eyes' and 'seeing' into relief, and thus tailors the prophecy more pointedly to the unbelief in 'signs' (rather than 'words') depicted in John 19:37. And the reconfiguration of the *chiasmus* reinforces the Johannine epistemology that faith is to be evoked by 'signs' and removes the prospect, latent in the original, that the sequence could be the other way around, that is, that perceiving signs properly is the result (rather than cause) of believing.

Two further departures in the Johannine rendering redefine the cause of this unbelief. The first concerns the figure (or entity) acting on the 'eyes' and 'heart'. In the HB it is Isaiah, commissioned by God to 'smear over' their eyes and 'make fat' their heart; in the LXX it is the people themselves, 'shutting' their own eyes and allowing their heart to 'grow fat'. In John, however, it is a third person actor (or agency) which can be neither Isaiah (as in the HB) nor the people (as in the LXX), since Isaiah (in the quotation of Isa 53:1 at John 12:38) is the one to whom the pre-incarnate Christ is responding, and the people (referenced only in the 3rd person plural αὐτῶν, not in the singular collective העם הזה or ὁ λαὸς οὗτος) cannot be the subject of the 3rd person singular verbs τετύφλωκεν and ἐπώρωσεν/ἐπήρωσεν.

The second departure concerns the action by which this third person agent (or agency) has obscured the 'eyes' and 'heart'. In the HB it is 'smearing over' (לשע)

and 'making fat' (לשמן); and in the LXX it is 'shutting' (καμμύειν) and 'growing fat' (παχύνειν). In John, however, it is 'blinding' (τυφλοῦν) and 'hardening' (πωροῦν) or 'maiming' (πηροῦν), verbs which differ from the respective LXX translations of the HB and which are not used elsewhere in the LXX to translate those Hebrew terms: τυφλοῦν is never used to translate לשע; nor is πωροῦν or πηροῦν ever used to transπ late לשמן or לשם, respectively. Debate is now waged over the identity of this third person actor, dubbed by John Painter 'the cause of obduracy'.[25] Painter and this author have contended it is the 'ruler of this world', referenced at John 12:31; 14:30; and 16:11.[26] Most dominant, however, is the view that it is God the Father, 'blinding' and 'hardening' many as a (sovereign) counterpart to his 'drawing', 'teaching' and 'giving' only some to Jesus.[27] But also entertained are hypotheses that it is Jesus (in a radically different reading of the context),[28] Jesus' 'signs' (inasmuch as third person singular verbs can take a neuter plural subject)[29] or Jesus' message (since, similar to 'signs', the subject of these verbs could just as well be inanimate).[30]

1.3 Isaiah 6:10 and Deuteronomy 29:1-3

Finally, to these factors on the quotation of Isa 6:10 must be added one on the assertion of mass unbelief at John 12:37. It has long been deemed an allusion to Deuteronomy 29:1-3, Moses' reprimand to the failed wilderness generation of Israelites.

> Moses called to all Israel and said to them,
> 'You have seen all that the Lord did before your eyes in the land of Egypt,
> to Pharaoh, to all his servants and to all his land,
> the great ordeals which your eyes have seen,
> the signs (האתת/τὰ σημεῖα) and those great wonders.
> But the Lord has not given you a heart to know,
> nor eyes to see nor ears to hear to this day'.

The cue on which the allusion turns is the shared term 'signs' (האתת/τὰ σημεῖα), or more to the point, the common articulation in both passages of a mass rejection despite the manifestation of 'signs': the Jews were not believing in Jesus, despite the 'signs' he

---

[25] Painter, 'The Quotation of Sscripture and Unbelief in John 12.36b-43', 435.

[26] Painter, 'The Quotation of Scripture and Unbelief in John 12.36b-43', 439-58; Daise, *Quotations in John*, 114-24.

[27] John 6:37, 39, 44-45, 65; 10:29; 17:2, 6, 9; 18:9. Schnackenburg uses this reading of John 12:40 as a point of departure for his excursus on predestination and the human responsibility for faith, 'Personal Commitment, Personal Responsibility, Predestination and Hardening'; *Gospel according to St John*, 2:259-74; see also Craig A. Evans, 'The Function of Isaiah 6:9-10 in Mark and John', *NovT* 24 (1982): 136-38.

[28] See Lieu & Hollenbach, note 20.

[29] Considered (but rejected) by Painter, 'The Quotation of Scripture and Unbelief in John 12.36b-43', 437-38.

[30] Schuchard, *Scripture within Scripture*, 100-01.

performed; the Israelites did not perceive the import of the 'signs' performed by Moses. The force of the allusion, however, runs deeper and wider, both in the Johannine and in the exodus stories. Like Deut 29:1-3 in relation to the exodus story, John 12:37 is the climax of an exodus typology that pervades the prior narrative of Jesus' public ministry.

In the exodus story the association of Moses with 'signs' begins with the three 'signs' (also called τὰ σημεῖα/האתת) he is given by the Lord to validate his divine commission to deliver Israel from Egypt,[31] and it continues through the deliverance from Egypt and the wilderness wandering: the term 'signs' (האתת/τὰ σημεῖα), sometimes with 'wonders' (המפתים/τὰ τέρατα), is similarly used for the plagues Moses casts upon Egypt and for the miracles he performs during the wilderness sojourn.[32] As for the Fourth Gospel, a typology of the first three 'signs' given to Moses was proposed by Marie-Émile Boismard in his essay *Moses or Jesus: An Essay in Johannine Christology*. He observed that, like the 'signs' (σημεῖα) given to Moses in Exodus 4, three of the 'signs' (σημεῖα) performed by Jesus in disparate parts of the Johannine narrative are similarly numbered;[33] and from this he concluded that in an earlier, putative tradition they were arranged contiguously in sequence, so as to make Jesus' commission to the Jews echo Moses' commission to the Israelites, that is, to cast Jesus as the 'prophet like Moses' foretold in Deuteronomy 18:18-19.[34]

The connection, however, need not be so (speculatively) diachronic or narrow. With the term 'works' (ἔργα),[35] 'signs' is the term used for all Jesus' works of power in the Fourth Gospel, at one juncture with 'wonders' (τέρατα).[36] And as Boismard noticed for the 'signs' given to Moses in Exodus 4, the 'signs' performed by Jesus

---

[31] Exod 4:1-9; cf. Exod 4:17, 28.

[32] Apart from Exod 4:1-9 and Deut 29:1-3, Exod 7:3; 8:19; 10:1-2; 11:9-10 [LXX only]; Num 14:11, 20-23; 26:10 [LXX only]; Deut 4:32-34; 6:22; 7:17-19; 11:2-3; 26:8; 34:10-12; Josh 24:16-17 [HB only]; Pss 78(77):42-43; 105(104):26-27; 135(134):8-9; Wis 10:15-16; LXX Sir 45:3.

[33] His turning of water to wine is described as 'a beginning of the signs...in Cana of Galilee' (John 2:11; cf. John 2:1-11); his healing of the court official's son is called 'the second sign' Jesus did 'when he had come from Judaea into Galilee' (John 4:54; cf. John 4:46-54); and his provision of the large catch of fish is designated as 'the third (time) Jesus was made manifest to the disciples' (John 21:14; cf. John 21:1-14).

[34] Trans. B.T. Viviano (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press/Leuven: Peeters Press, 1993), 42-59; trans. of *Moïse ou Jésus: Essai de christologie johannique*, BETL 84 (Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters and Leuven University Press, 1988).

[35] The semantic overlap between 'signs' (σημεῖα) and 'works' (ἔργα), with cognates, appears in John 6:30 and John 9:3-4, 16. In the first Jesus is asked, 'What sign (σημεῖον) do you do, then, that we might see and believe you? What do you work (τί ἐργάζῃ)'? In the second, the healing of the man born blind which Jesus numbers among his 'works of God' (τὰ ἔργα τοῦ θεοῦ) is by others classified with 'such signs' (τοιαῦτα σημεῖα) as he had earlier been performing.

[36] John 4:48.

throughout his public ministry similarly carry the 'apologetic function'[37] of attesting his commission by God. Among the several christological roles assigned to him in the Fourth Gospel, Jesus (like Moses) is 'the one sent' from the Father;[38] and, as the Lord designed them for Moses in Exodus 4, Jesus' 'signs' in John serve as a second line of validation for any who doubt his 'words'. The correspondence appears most saliently in Jesus' discourse to the Jews at large in John 10 and to his disciples in John 14:

Exodus 4:1-9	John 10:37-38; 14:10-11
Then Moses responded and said, 'But suppose they will not believe me or listen to my voice; for they will say, "The Lord has not appeared to you"'? The Lord said to him, '... If they will not believe you or listen to the voice of the first sign (האת הראשון/τοῦ σημείου τοῦ πρώτου), they will believe the voice of the next one (האת האחרון/τοῦ σημείου τοῦ ἐσχάτου). And if they will not believe even these two signs (לשני האתות האלה/τοῖς δυσὶν σημείοις τούτοις) or listen to your voice, you shall draw from the water of the Nile and pour onto the dry ground; and the water which you take from the Nile will become blood on the dry ground'.	'If I am not doing the works of my Father (τὰ ἔργα τοῦ πατρός μου), do not believe me. But if I am, even if you do not believe me, believe the works (τοῖς ἔργοις), that you may become aware and know that the Father is in me and I in the Father'. 'Do you not believe (Philip) that I am in the Father and the Father is in me? The words which I speak to you I do not speak from myself; but the Father abiding in me does his works (τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ). Believe me, that I am in the Father and the Father in me. If not, believe because of the works themselves (διὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτά)'.

Thus, in the Fourth Gospel John 12:37 not only alludes to Deut 29:1-3. It functions in the same manner: it marks the culmination of the Jews' unyielding resistance to all the 'signs' performed by Jesus in the same way Deut 29:1-3 marks the Israelites' unyielding resistance to all the 'signs' performed by Moses. As such, it has moved exegetes to see in John 12:37 the finale of a profound wilderness typology in the Book of Signs. 'John 12:37', writes Bruce Schuchard, 'appears to have been constructed in order to suggest that Jesus, the prophet like Moses, was no more successful in persuading Israel than was his predecessor'.[39] Raymond Brown, in fact, goes so far as to suggest that the vocabulary of Deuteronomy 29 has informed the reworking of Isa 6:10 in John 12:40. 'It is not impossible', he writes, 'that...John is blending OT citations, and that the quotation from Isaiah has been influenced by the quotation from Deut xxix 3-4 which lies behind vs. 37'.[40]

[37] Boismard, *Moses or Jesus*, 57.

[38] John 3:17, 34; 4:34; 5:23-24, 30, 36-38; 6:29, 38-39, 44, 57; 7:16, 28-29, 33; 8:16, 18, 26, 29, 42; 9:4; 10:35-36; 11:42; 12:44-45, 49; 13:20; 14:24; 15:21; 16:5; 17:3, 8, 18, 20-23, 25; 20:21.

[39] Schuchard, *Scripture within Scripture*, 89n17; see also Brown, *Gospel according to John*, 1:485-86; C.K. Barrett, *The Gospel according to St. John*, 2nd ed. (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1978), 430; Craig A. Evans, *To See and Not Perceive: Isaiah 6.9-10 in Early Jewish and Christian Interpretation*, JSOTSup 64 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1989), 134-35.

[40] Brown, *Gospel according to John*, 1:486.

2. Isaiah 6:10 in 4QDibre Ha-Me'orot[a]

The fragment under consideration is classified with the earliest of three manuscripts from Cave 4 at Khirbet Qumran which attest the liturgical document Dibre Ha-Me'orot, *Words of the Luminaries* or *Words of the Lights*.[41] It consists of six lines, only four of which contain full words.

4QDibre Ha-Me'orot[a] (4QDibHam[a]) 18 1-6[42]	
]*hnw l t* [	] vt ל ת[
You have g]iven[43] them a heart[to know]	נ]תתה להמה לב[לדעת]
[and eyes] to see and ear[s to hear] ...	[ועינים] לראות ואוזנ[ים לשמוע]
]at the last, and you have smeared over[their eyes]	[לאחרון ותשע[עיניהמה]
]to wander *b* [	]ארוח ב [
]*r mk* [	]ר מכ [

[41] The phrase דברי המארות appears on Fragment 8 of 4QDibHam[a] and is thought to represent the title given the work by its author or editor; see Maurice Baillet, ed., '4Q504 Paroles des Luminaires (i) (Pl. XLIX-LIII)', in *Qumrân Grotte 4: III (4Q482–4Q520)*, DJD 7 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), 137-38. A case to the contrary (arguing that the document rather attests a 'Taḥanun-type' liturgy) has been argued by Manfred Lehmann but has found little support; Manfred R. Lehmann, 'A Re-Interpretation of 4QDibrê Ham-Me'oroth', *RevQ* 5 (1964): 106-10; cf. Lawrence H. Schiffman, 'Liturgical Texts from Qumran Cave IV', in *Proceedings of the Ninth World Congress of Jewish Studies: Jerusalem, August 4-12*, 4 vols., Pirsume ha-Igud ha-'olami le-mada'e ha-Yahadut (Jerusalem: Ha-Igud ha-'olami le-mada'e ha-Yahadut, 1986), 1:187-88; Esther G. Chazon, 'Is *Divrei Ha-Me'orot* a Sectarian Prayer'?, in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research*, ed. Devorah Dimant and Uriel Rappaport, STDJ 10 (Leiden: Brill/Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, The Hebrew University/Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 1992), 9-13. Points made by Schiffman in the article cited here are also found in idem, 'The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Early History of the Liturgy', in *The Synagogue in Late Antiquity*, ed. Lee I. Levine (Philadelphia: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1987), 40-41; and idem, *Qumran and Jerusalem: Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the History of Judaism*, Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 228-29.

[42] The text is Baillet, '4Q504 Paroles des Luminaires (i) (Pl. XLIX-LIII)', 165. For the radicals which appear in the fragment, the transcription by Dennis Olson does not alter that of Baillet, save to read the initial ל in line 4 as reconstructed rather than visible; see Dennis T. Olson, 'Words of the Lights (4Q504—4Q506)', in *Pseudepigraphic and Non-Masoretic Psalms and Prayers*. vol. 4A of *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*, ed. James H. Charlesworth, 8 vols., PTSDSSP (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck]/Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1997), ad loc. It does not, however, offer the reconstructions by Baillet on which this comparison turns, and so will not figure in the discussion of the lines themselves.

[43] This translation, 'you have g]iven', corrects the rendering of the verb as a 3rd masculine singular perfect with resumptive pronominal suffix in Daise, *Quotations in John*, 116-118. For הת- as 2nd person masculine singular perfect, see Elisha Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, HSS 29 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), 23, 43.

2.1 Isaiah 6:10 as Prayer

The immediate context of this fragment cannot be discerned with certainty; and, despite its suggested location in the larger work by Émile Puech and Dennis Olson (see below), it is best considered after (rather than before) examining the text itself. From what is known of the larger document, however, it can at least be said that the lines form part of a daily prayer that was used by the Dead Sea sectarians, perhaps originating with a community of their forebears. On the latter issue (sectarian or pre-sectarian authorship), 4QDibHam[a] dates ca 150 BCE, prior to the sectarian settlement near Khirbet Qumran,[44] and this has raised a question on its relation to the sectarians. Maurice Baillet, editor of the *editio princeps*, identified it as the work of a pre-sectarian group such as the Hasideans;[45] others, however, see factors that allow for sectarian authorship,[46] and this has left the issue open.

As for genre, the work was early on defined by Jean Starcky as a 'collection of liturgical hymns' (*recueil d'hymnes liturgiques*).[47] From the point of its reconstruction by Hartmut Stegemann, however, and even by Starcky himself (elsewhere), it has been more precisely identified as a weekly cycle of seven daily prayers;[48] and this has been crystallized by Puech, who detected a numerical sequence to the prayers in Baillet's edition and reworked them accordingly into such an order.[49] Lawrence Schiffman calls the work 'a series of daily supplications for liturgical use, for each day of the week';[50] and Olson now suggests that these prayers 'were led by priests from within the Community'.[51] Aside from the Sabbath (which has its own formula),

---

[44] Maurice Baillet, 'Un recueil liturgique de Qumrân, Grotte 4: « Les Paroles des Luminaires »', *RB* 68 (1961): 235-38; idem, '4Q504 Paroles des Luminaires (i) (Pl. XLIX-LIII)', 137.

[45] Baillet, '4Q504 Paroles des Luminaires (i) (Pl. XLIX-LIII)', 137; cf. idem, 'Un recueil liturgique de Qumrân, Grotte 4: « Les Paroles des Luminaires »', 246-47.

[46] Émile Puech, review of *Qumrân Grotte 4: III (4Q482–4Q520)*, by Maurice Baillet, *RB* 95 (1988): 409; Chazon, 'Is *Divrei Ha-Me'orot* a Sectarian Prayer'?, 3-17.

[47] Reported by Baillet, 'Un recueil liturgique de Qumrân, Grotte 4: « Les Paroles des Luminaires »', 195-96.

[48] Baillet, '4Q504 Paroles des Luminaires (i) (Pl. XLIX-LIII)', 137; and see the private communication of Stegemann to Chazon in Esther G. Chazon, '*Divrei Ha-Me'orot*: Liturgy or Literature', in *Proceedings of the Tenth World Congress of Jewish Studies, Jerusalem, August 16-24, 1989: Division A, The Bible and Its World* (Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1990), 234n2; eadem, 'Is *Divrei Ha-Me'orot* a Sectarian Prayer'?, 11n30. Starcky, of course, himself recognized the collection as 'composed of prayers'; J.T. Milik *et al.*, 'Le travail d'édition des fragments manuscrits de Qumrân', *RB* 63 (1956): 66.

[49] Puech, review of *Qumrân Grotte 4: III (4Q482–4Q520)*, 407-09.

[50] Schiffman, 'Liturgical Texts from Qumran Cave IV', 1:188.

[51] Olson, 'Words of the Lights (4Q504—4Q506)', 108. Olson, in fact, suggests that in its title דברי might carry more substance, so as to mean 'Liturgies' or 'Acts of the Lights'.

each weekday prayer registers the numbered day on which it is to be said, followed by the vocative formula 'Remember, Lord' (זכור אדוני),[52] then the supplication proper in second person address.[53] Fragment 18 has been placed by Puech at the bottom of his Column x, as part of the prayer for the fourth day.[54] And Olson appears to have followed suit, locating it as fourth in a sequence of fragments that follow the introduction to prayer on the fourth day at 4QDibHam[a] 3 ii 5.[55]

2.2 Isaiah 6:10 as Liturgical Affirmation

The reference to Isa 6:10 in this manuscript occurs in line 4. After the word לאחרון ('at the last'?) appears a 2nd person singular hiphil imperfect of לשע ('to smear over'):]ותשע. Being preceded with the perfect נ[תתה at line 2, the *vav*-consecutive construction of that form carries preterite force ('you have smeared over'); and this, likely coupled with the lexical and thematic affinity between Isa 6:10 and lines 2-3 which precede it,[56] has led Baillet to reconstruct the lost text immediately following it as [עיניהמה] ('their eyes')[57] and to identify the two words as a reference to Isa 6:10c, 'and you have smeared over[their eyes]'.

Taken as such, this rendering diverges from the HB form in three respects, each curiously similar to the divergences in John 12:40. First (and most salient), similar to John it reads the HB imperative (השע) as a preterite (ותשע). Where in John that preterite is the 3rd person singular perfect of a verb lexically remote from לשע (τετύφλωκεν, 'he has blinded'), in this fragment it is a 2nd person masculine singular imperfect (with perfect force) of the same verb as is found in the HB ('you have smeared over'). Common to both, however, is that the metaphorical visual impairment commanded to be done in the original (Hebrew) form of Isa 6:10c is now considered accomplished in its cited form: in John, 'he/it has blinded'; in 4QDibHam[a], 'you have smeared over'.

As for the second and third differences from the HB, where the HB places the object 'eyes' prior to the verb, 4QDibHam[a] in Baillet's reconstruction, like John,

---

[52] In the order they appear, 4QDibHam[a] 8 1; 5 ii 3; 3 ii 5 (Olson).

[53] See Chazon, '*Divrei Ha-Me'orot*: Liturgy or Literature', 231.

[54] Puech, review of *Qumrân Grotte 4: III (4Q482–4Q520)*, 408; idem, *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future: Immortalité, résurrection, vie éternelle? Histoire d'une croyance dans le judaïsme ancien*, 2 vols., EBib, NS 21-22 (Paris: Lecoffre, J. Gabalda, 1993), 2:564-65.

[55] 4QDibHam[a] 3 ii 5-19; 23 1-3; 21 1-3; 7 1-20; 18 1-6 (Olson).

[56] 'Heart' (לב), 'eyes' (עינים), 'ears' (אזנים), 'see' (לראות), 'hear' (לשמע).

[57] The suffixal form of the pronoun is the 3rd person masculine plural attested in manuscripts found at Qumran; see Qimron, *Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 58, 62-63. Though employed by sectarians, it may reflect prior, pre-sectarian scribal practice; Chazon, 'Is *Divrei Ha-Me'orot* a Sectarian Prayer'?, 6.

places it after. And where the HB modifies that object with a 3rd person masculine singular pronominal suffix (ועיניו) whose antecedent is 'this people' (העם הזה) at Isa 6:10a, 4QDibHam[a], again as in John, employs a 3rd person masculine plural suffix, doubtless referencing the same antecedent as lies behind the plural pronoun 'them' (להמה) in line 2.

4QDibHam[a] 18 4	John 12:40
ותשע[עיניהמה]	τετύφλωκεν αὐτῶν τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς
'and you have smeared over[their eyes]'	'he has blinded their eyes'

2.3 Isaiah 6:10 and Deuteronomy 29:3

Further, and likewise similar to the quotation of Isa 6:10 at John 12:40, the two lines preceding this reference in 4QDibHam[a] form a paraphrase of Deut 29:3. In his notes on these lines Baillet lists a number of *loci* with similar language and sentiment.[58] He identifies the lines themselves, however, as a paraphrase of this verse, 'which seems to permit the restorations and suggest the short lines'.[59] Doing so requires placement (not offered by Baillet) of the negative particle לוא[ו] prior to נ[תתה in line 2:

4QDibre Ha-Me'orot[a] 18 2-3	Deuteronomy 29:3
ולוא נ[תתה להמה לב[לדעת] [ועינים] לראות ואוזנ[ים לשמוע]	ולא-נתן יהוה לכם לב לדעת ועינים לראות ואזנים לשמע עד היום הזה
And you have not g]iven them a heart[to know] [nor eyes] to see nor ear[s to hear]...	But the Lord has not given you a heart to know, nor eyes to see nor ears to hear to this day.

With Deut 29:3 as its *Vorlage*, the reference would carry three semantic variations, similar to the kind of paraphrase made of Isa 6:10 in line 4. First, the 3rd person masculine singular 'he has not given' (ולא-נתן) in the HB has become 2nd person masculine singular: 'And you have not g]iven...' (ולוא נ[תתה). Second, and consistent with the change from 3rd person account to 2nd person prayer, the name 'Lord' is omitted: presumably, 'the Lord' is the 'you' being addressed. Finally, the 2nd person plural object 'you' (לכם) in the HB has become 3rd person plural 'them' (להמה).[60]

With Isa 6:10, then, immediately preceded by Deut 29:3, a word can be said about its function in this piece. As Esther Chazon has noted, the weekday prayers of this document are both 'motivated by historical reminiscences' and apt to have

[58] Ezek 12:2; Pss 115:5-6; 135:16-17; Qoh 1:8; 1QH[a] xv 5-6 (Suk vii 2-3).

[59] Baillet, '4Q504 Paroles des Luminaires (i) (Pl. XLIX-LIII)', 165.

[60] For the pronominal suffix המה-, see Qimron in note 57.

a 'tendency…to draw extensively upon Scripture'.[61] As such, over their sequence they unfold in a chronological review of the biblical story, from the creation of Adam on the first day[62] to the return from exile and need for subsequent deliverance on the sixth day,[63] while at the same time pulling scripture from elsewhere to interpret that story as it develops. This being so, the role of Isa 6:10 would coincide with (and depend upon) the stage of the biblical story this fragment represents in the weekly prayer cycle. If that stage is the close of the wilderness wandering, the historical review would be represented by Deut 29:3 (the failed wilderness generation) and Isa 6:10 would serve as commentary. If it is the post-Davidic apostacy, the review would be represented by Isa 6:10 (the death of Uzziah) and Deut 29:3 would furnish the commentary.[64]

Conclusion

To summarize, 4QDibHam[a] Fragment 18 attests a reference to Isa 6:10 which, like that in John 12:40, frames that verse in a new genre, perceives its fulfillment to have already come, interprets that fulfillment in concert with Deut 29:1-3 and alters its language accordingly. The means by which it does so differs in detail: where John casts the verse as an apocalyptic disclosure, 4QDibHam[a] transposes it into calendrical prayer; where John dates its fulfillment at the close of Jesus' public ministry, 4QDibHam[a] puts it in the biblical story of Israel's past; where John has it address an anti-type of Deut 29:1-3 in the Jews' unbelief toward Jesus, 4QDibHam[a] has it comment upon (or commented upon by) the type itself; and where John goes so far as to omit, rearrange and replace its cola and vocabulary, 4QDibHam[a] turns its divine command to Isaiah into a liturgical supplication to the Lord. These differences notwithstanding, as a sectarian or pre-sectarian Jewish liturgy of the early 2nd century BCE, 4QDibHam[a] 18 at the very least shows the end of the Fourth Gospel's Book of Signs to have been conceived within a hermeneutical mindset at home in Palestine of the Second Temple Period.

---

[61] Chazon, '*Divrei Ha-Me'orot*: Liturgy or Literature', 230, 232.

[62] 4QDibHam[a] 8 4-6 (Olson).

[63] 4QDibHam[a] 2 v 6-21; vi 2-19; vii 1-2 (Olson).

[64] In either case Fragment 18, it seems, would come later than its placement in Olson's text: for the close of the wilderness wandering, somewhere within or after Frgs 6 6-12; 1 i 8-10; for the post-Davidic apostacy, somewhere within or after Frg 2 v 3-6.

Bibliography

Baillet, Maurice, ed. '4Q504 Paroles des Luminaires (i) (Pl. XLIX-LIII)'. Pages 137–68 in *Qumrân Grotte 4: III (4Q482–4Q520)*. DJD 7. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982.

____. 'Un recueil liturgique de Qumrân, Grotte 4: « Les Paroles des Luminaires »'. *RB* 68 (1961): 195-250.

Barrett, C.K. *The Gospel according to St. John*. 2nd ed. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1978.

Boismard, Marie-Émile. *Moses or Jesus: An Essay in Johannine Christology*. Translated by B.T. Viviano. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press/Leuven: Peeters Press, 1993. Translation of *Moïse ou Jésus: Essai de christologie johannique*. BETL 84. Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters and Leuven University Press, 1988.

Brown, Raymond E. *The Gospel according to John*. 2 vols. AB 29-29A. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1966/1970.

Charles, R.H., ed. and trans. *The* Ascension of Isaiah*: Translated from the Ethiopic version, which, together with the new Greek fragment, the Latin versions and the Latin translation of the Slavonic, is here published in full*. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1900.

Chazon, Esther G. '*Divrei Ha-Me'orot*: Liturgy or Literature'. Pages 229-36 in *Proceedings of the Tenth World Congress of Jewish Studies, Jerusalem, August 16-24, 1989: Division A, The Bible and Its World*. Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1990.

____. 'Is *Divrei Ha-Me'orot* a Sectarian Prayer'? Pages 3-17 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research*. Edited by Devorah Dimant and Uriel Rappaport. STDJ 10. Leiden: Brill/Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, The Hebrew University/Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 1992.

Daise, Michael A. 'Christology in John's Crucifixion Quotations'. Pages 127-41 in *Fountains of Wisdom: In Conversation with James H. Charlesworth*. Edited by Gerbern S. Oegema, Loren T. Stuckenbruck and Henry W. Morisada Rietz. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2022.

____. *Quotations in John: Studies on Jewish Scripture in the Fourth Gospel*. LNTS 610. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2020.

Destro, Adriana and Mauro Pesce. 'Rewriting the Jewish Scriptures: The Function of Visions'. Pages 275-304 in *Creative Fidelity, Faithful Creativity: The Reception of Jewish Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity*. Edited by Michael A. Daise and Dorota Hartman. Naples: UniorPress, 2022.

Evans, Craig A. 'The Function of Isaiah 6:9-10 in Mark and John'. *NovT* 24 (1982): 124–38.

____. *To See and Not Perceive: Isaiah 6.9-10 in Early Jewish and Christian Interpretation*. JSOTSup 64. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1989.

Freed, Edwin D. *Old Testament Quotations in the Gospel of John*. NovTSup 11. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1965.

Haenchen, Ernst. *John 1-2*. Edited and translated by Robert W. Funk. 2 vols. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.

Hollenbach, Bruce, 'Lest They Should Turn and Be Forgiven: Irony'. *BT* 34 (1983): 312–21.

Lehmann, Manfred R. 'A Re-Interpretation of 4QDibrê Ham-Me'oroth'. *RevQ* 5 (1964): 106-10.

Lieu, Judith M. 'Blindness in the Johannine Tradition'. *NTS* 34 (1988): 83–95.

Menken, Maarten J.J. '"He Has Blinded Their Eyes..." (John 12:40)'. Pages 99–122 in *Old Testament Quotations in the Fourth Gospel: Studies in Textual Form*. Edited by Maarten J.J. Menken. CBET 15. Kampen: Kok Pharos Publishing House, 1996. First publ. in *BZ* NF 32 (1988): 189-209.

Metzger, Bruce M. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. 2nd ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft/United Bible Societies, 1994.

Milik, Jósef T., Maurice Baillet, Frank Moore Cross, Jr., Patrick Skehan, John M. Allegro, John Strugnell, Jean Starcky and Claus-Hunno Hunzinger, 'Le travail d'édition des fragments manuscrits de Qumrân'. *RB* 63 (1956): 49-67.

Olson, Dennis T. 'Words of the Lights (4Q504—4Q506)'. Pages 107-53 in *Pseudepigraphic and Non-Masoretic Psalms and Prayers*. Vol. 4A of *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. 8 vols. PTSDSSP. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck)/Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1997.

Painter, John. 'The Quotation of Scripture and Unbelief in John 12.36b-43'. Pages 429–58 in *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and W. Richard Stegner. JSNTSup 104/SSEJC 3. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.

Puech, Émile. *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future: Immortalité, résurrection, vie éternelle? Histoire d'une croyance dans le judaïsme ancien*. 2 vols. EBib, NS 21-22. Paris: Lecoffre, J. Gabalda, 1993.

____. Review of *Qumrân Grotte 4: III (4Q482–4Q520)*, by Maurice Baillet. *RB* 95 (1988): 404-11.

Qimron, Elisha. *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. HSS 29. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986.

Schiffman, Lawrence H. 'Liturgical Texts from Qumran Cave IV'. Vol. 1 pages 183-90 in *Proceedings of the Ninth World Congress of Jewish Studies: Jerusalem, August 4-12*. 4 vols. Pirsume ha-Igud ha-'olami le-mada'e ha-Yahadut. Jerusalem: Ha-Igud ha-'olami le-mada'e ha-Yahadut, 1986.

____. 'The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Early History of the Liturgy'. Pages 33-48 in *The Synagogue in Late Antiquity*. Edited by Lee I. Levine. Philadelphia: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1987.

____. *Qumran and Jerusalem: Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the History of Judaism*. Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.

Schnackenburg, Rudolf. *The Gospel according to St John*. Translated by Kevin Smyth, Cecily Hastings, Francis McDonagh, David Smith, Richard Foley, S.J. and G.A. Kon. 3 vols. New York: Crossroad, 1990. Translation of *Das Johannesevangelium*. HThKNT 4. Freiburg: Herder, 1965–1975.

Schuchard, Bruce G. *Scripture within Scripture: The Interrelationship of Form and Function in the Explicit Old Testament Citations in the Gospel of John*. SBLDS 133. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1992.

Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum auctoritate Societatis Litterarum Gottingensis editum. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1931–(2019).

Sperber, Alexander, ed. *The Latter Prophets according to Targum Jonathan*. Vol. 3 of *The Bible in Aramaic Based on Old Manuscripts and Printed Texts*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1962.

Ulrich, Eugene and Peter W. Flint, eds. *Qumran Cave 1. II: The Isaiah Scrolls*. 2 vols. DJD 32. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2010.

de Waard, Jan. *A Comparative Study of the Old Testament in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the New Testament*. STDJ 4. Leiden: Brill, 1965.

Rewriting the Jewish Scriptures: The Function of Visions

Adriana Destro – Mauro Pesce

1. Rewritings of the Bible

Among the many ways in which the Jewish scriptures have been used (in homiletic commentaries, theological argumentations, exegesis, etc.) we focus here on their *rewriting*. In particular, we will examine the relationship between the rewritings of the Bible and the visions of the divine world in some texts of Jesus' first followers.

Several classifications of Bible rewritings have been proposed.[1] If we look at the content, we can identify five types of such rewritings.

(a) The most famous type is represented by the targum paraphrases and the great re-presentations of biblical history, such as the *Liber antiquitatum biblicarum* of Pseudo-Philo, the book of *Jubilees* and the *Jewish Antiquities* of Flavius Josephus. Also *Genesis Apocryphon* could be added to this list.

(b) A second type of rewriting is represented by new and autonomous texts, which, however, use almost exclusively literary genres and elements drawn from the Bible: an example is the genealogy of Jesus in Matthew 1:1-14.[2]

(c) A third type of rewriting consists of autonomous texts, which are, however, thought of as an extension and integral part of the biblical texts. For example, the *Ascension of Isaiah*, which is the insertion of haggadic sections on the history of Isaiah into the books of Kings (specifically, 2 Kings 20-21) and descriptions of Isaiah's visions not contained in the canonical book of Isaiah.[3]

(d) A fourth type of rewriting is the result of some normative clarifications and narrative additions into a biblical text. An example is *Mishnah* tractate *Sotah*, which

---

[1] See (including the bibliography), Moshe J. Bernstein, '"Rewritten Bible": A Generic Category Which Has Outlived its Usefulness?', *Text* 22 (2005): 169–96. Bibliography on the different rewritings of the Bible is enormous; see recently, for instance, Jesper Høgenhaven, Jesper Tang Nielsen and Heike Omerzu, eds., *Rewriting and Reception in and of the Bible*, WUNT 396 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018).

[2] Adriana Destro and Mauro Pesce, 'The Cultural Structure of the Infancy Narrative in the Gospel of Matthew', in *Infancy Gospels: Stories and Identities*, ed. Claire Clivaz, Andreas Dettwiler, Luc Devillers and Enrico Norelli, WUNT 281 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 94–115.

[3] Mauro Pesce, 'Presupposti per l'utilizzazione storica dell'*Ascensione di Isaia*. Formazione e tradizione del testo: genere letterario, cosmologia angelica', in *Isaia, il Diletto e la chiesa: Visione ed esegesi profetica cristiano-primitiva nell'*Ascensione di Isaia. *Atti del Convegno di Roma, 9-10 aprile 1981*, ed. Mauro Pesce, TRSR 20 (Brescia: Paideia, 1983), 35–40.

rewrites Numbers 5:13-31.[4] The *Yoma* tractate of *Mishnah* rewrites Leviticus 16, describing a number of ritual actions that necessarily have to be performed in order to carry out the biblical laws for *Yom ha-Kippurim*.[5]

(e) A fifth type of rewriting is given by the *testimonia*.[6] They cite a biblical passage, sometimes in a transformed and reformulated form, often contaminating it with other biblical passages. One case, which we will examine, is that of rewriting Isaiah 6:9–10 in John 12:40; Mark 4:12; and the *Ascension of Isaiah* 11:14. The *pesharim* of Qumran are somehow of this kind. An example is given by the rewritings of some passages from Daniel.[7]

Leaving aside any predetermined definition, we consider rewriting as a multifaced practice of excavation, selection and re-formulation of an authoritative text. The rewriting of the Bible is an interpretation that, unlike other interpretations, wants to integrate, transform or enhance a previous writing endowed with expressive power and normative value.[8] In relation to the biblical text, rewriting stands between two poles that are in dialectical connection. Firstly, to achieve its integrative purpose, a text rewriting the Bible aims to remain within the cultural territories of the biblical text, since it needs a certain kind of cultural reliability. Secondly, rewriting has to introduce changes in the Bible, novelties based on the views, needs and goals of the groups, persons and institutions that it intends to legitimize.[9]

---

[4] Adriana Destro, *The Law of Jealousy: Anthropology of* Sotah, BJS 181 (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1989).

[5] Adriana Destro and Mauro Pesce, 'Il rito ebraico di Kippur: il sangue nel tempio, il peccato nel deserto', in *Interpretazione e Perdono: Atti del Dodicesimo Colloquio sull'interpretazione, Macerata, 18-19 marzo 1991*, ed. Giuseppe Galli, Pubblicazioni della Facoltà di lettere e filosofia, Università di Macerata 60/Atti di convegni 17 (Genova: Marietti, 1992), 47–73.

[6] Enrico Norelli, '*Il Martirio di Isaia* come testimonium antigiudaico'? *Hen* 2 (1980): 37–57; idem, 'Due testimonia attribuiti a Esdra', *Annali di Storia dell'Esegesi* 1 (1984): 231–82; idem, 'Il dibattito con il giudaismo nel II secolo: Testimonia; Barnaba; Giustino', in *Da Gesù a Origene*, vol. 1 of *La Bibbia nell'antichità cristiana*, ed. Enrico Norelli, Collana la Bibbia nella storia 15/1 (Bologna: Edizioni Dehoniane, 1993), 199-233; idem, 'Avant le canonique et l'apocryphe: Aux origines des récits de la naissance de Jésus', *RTP* 126 (1994): 305–24.

[7] 4QPrNab ar ; 4QpsDan[a-c] ar; 4QapocrDan ar; 4QpapApocalypse ar; 4QDanSuz? ar, 4QFour Kingdoms[a-b] ar. See Luca Arcari, 'Testi "apocalittici" qumranici all'origine di tradizioni canoniche differenziate: Modalità estatiche all'origine di scritture autorevoli', *RStB* 23 (2011): 110–16.

[8] By this we do not presuppose a 'codified and canonized bible', since in the first century CE the biblical text is *in fieri*; Corrado Martone, 'Interpretazione delle Scritture e produzione di testi normativi a Qumran', *RStB* 12 (2000): 156.

[9] Enrico Norelli, 'Le statut des textes chrétiens de l'oralité à l'écriture et leur rapport avec l'institution au IIe siècle', in *Recueils normatifs et canons dans l'Antiquité: Perspectives nouvelles sur la formation des ca-*

The multiplication of rewritings of the Bible arises from the fact that the Jewish scriptures contain the basic cultural elements that within Jewish culture found the legitimacy of a group, an institution, a practice or a conception. This means that, on one hand, in order to be acceptable and effective, the conceptions and practices of the different Jewish groups must be integrated into the ideal and conceptual biblical framework. On the other hand, the Bible must be adapted to the existential and historical situation of groups seeking legitimacy in it, precisely because it offers a foundational basis accepted by everyone. In substance rewriting of the Bible is in some way *a necessity* that derives from the cultural function of the Bible itself.

In any case, the cultural mechanism of rewriting the Bible is justified first of all by the belief that the changes introduced are at least implicitly already contained in the Bible. It is, however, also justified by the presupposition that these changes are consistent with it. In fact, many elements introduced by the rewritings lie, independently of the Bible, in the deep layers of Jewish culture. For example, there are Jewish legends or tales about biblical characters like Abraham or Isaiah that add elements to the stories contained in the Bible.[10] In substance, in the Jewish cultural heritage there is an efflorescence of legends, myths, norms, related to issues that are considered coherent with the Bible.

Another factor that justifies the rewritings of the Bible is the belief that it implicitly contains the entire interaction between God and the Jewish people and/or the whole of humanity.[11] Any historical event of some significance for Jewish and/or human history is considered as contained or foreseen in the Bible itself. Exem-

---

nons juif et chrétien dans leur contexte culturel. Actes du colloque organisé dans le cadre du programme plurifacultaire 'La Bible à la croisée des savoirs' de l'Université de Genève, 11-12 avril 2002, ed. Enrico Norelli, Publications de l'Institut romand des sciences bibliques 3 (Prahins: Editions du Zèbre, 2004), 147–94; idem, 'Scrivere per governare: Modi della comunicazione e rapporti di potere nel cristianesimo antico. Introduzione al convegno', *Rivista di storia del cristianesimo* 3 (2006): 5–30. See also Corrado Martone, 'Modalità di utilizzazione della Scrittura a Qumran', *RStB* 19/2 (2007): 33–46. '... Parabiblical literature: literature that begins with the Bible, which retells the biblical text in its own way, intermingling it and expanding it with other, quite different traditions. Every one of these compositions has its starting point in specific texts of the Torah or of the Prophets but, unlike the exegetical literature, rather than interpreting the biblical text, they elaborate on it, augmenting it with other material'; Florentino García-Martínez, ed., *Testi di Qumran*, Biblica: Testi e studi 4 (Brescia: Paideia, 1996), 366. See also Martone, 'Modalità di utilizzazione della Scrittura a Qumran', 37.

[10] See Devorah Dimant and Reinhard G. Kratz, eds., *Rewriting and Interpreting the Hebrew Bible: The Biblical Patriarchs in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, BZAW 439 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2013); Jean-Daniel Kaestli, 'Abraham, visionnaire apocalyptique: Lectures midrashiques de Genèse 15', in *Abraham: Nouvelle jeunesse d'un ancêtre*, ed. Thomas C. Römer, Essais bibliques 28 (Genève: Labor et Fides, 1997), 35–52.

[11] Cf. Sir 24:22; Bar 4:1.

plifying this belief are the *pesharim* of Qumran.[12] On this basis, the story of Jesus appears to his followers in some way present or foreseen, more or less clearly, in the biblical texts.[13]

A further factor that generates rewritings is that the Bible is a written text. Writing is certainly a powerful communication tool, but it does not possess unlimited capacity of transmission. It cannot replace other media of communication such as, for example, images. Today's culture, dominated by images and mass media, is aware of the limitations of writing, but also the ancient cultures were aware of those limitations. The fact that the Bible is a textualization of the Jewish culture actually implies that it can only partially express the cultural phenomena it speaks about. For this reason it can be rewritten and integrated.

From our point of view, we differentiate the kinds of Bible rewritings on the basis of the *tools* they use. Some use exegesis, that is, a rational mechanism for the interpretation of the biblical text. Others seek to establish a link between norms, conceptions or narratives of the Jewish culture and a specific biblical text. Others appeal to revelations from the divine world and/or visions of it. As we have pointed out at the beginning, we will limit ourselves to the examination of the relationship between visions of the divine world and rewritings of the Bible.

In the following pages we will take into consideration two forms of rewriting the Bible of the first followers of Jesus, in which rewriting is justified on the basis of visions of God and the divine world. The first case is given by the *Ascension of Isaiah*. The second concerns two passages of the Gospel of John, John 12:38–41 and John 8:56–58.

2. Images and Texts

The fact that some Bible rewritings are justified on the basis of presumed visions requires a theoretical clarification of the relationship between the act of seeing

---

[12] See also 11QMelch 4-6; 1QpHab xi 12-15; Arcari, 'Testi "apocalittici" qumranici all'origine di tradizioni canoniche differenziate', 110; Martone, 'Modalità di utilizzazione della Scrittura a Qumran', 40–43. More specifically, 'the type of modality of use of the Scriptures recognizable in the pesharim has been defined as a modality of use tending to an eschatologization of the biblical text, which is understood as a prophecy whose precise meaning was unknown even to the prophet who first pronounced it: *the mystery of a prophetic word, in fact, remains so until it is revealed to someone* who gives it the correct interpretation. This someone to whom the mystery of the words of the prophets is revealed, so that he can give the right interpretation to the community, is the Master of Justice, the very founder of the community ... The essence of the pesharim, therefore, *is the revelation* that brought to light the occult sense of the prophetic words' (pp. 41–42, italics ours).

[13] 1 Cor 10:4; Gal 3:16, 21–31.

and the act of writing.[14] Between them there is first of all a difference of *medium*. A qualitative distance exists between seeing an object and writing what has been seen in a text.[15]

The relationship and/or correspondence between an image and a written text continues today to stimulate questions and investigations. In the 1970s Meyer Schapiro, in his essay *Words and Pictures: On the Literal and Symbolic in the Illustration of a Text*,[16] analyzed the relationship (from late antiquity to the eighteenth century) between an artistic image (painting and sculpture) and a previously written text.[17] Schapiro takes into consideration a well-known fact. In the figurative arts, the subjects, the figures and the circumstances were mostly assumed by authoritative or classic texts and/or by antecedent images (which, in turn, came from ancient fundamental texts). Not surprisingly, through the centuries the textual basis of innumerable artworks came from the Bible. Schapiro points out that images of the figurative arts, though depending on precise Bible texts, often depart from them by adding elements or omitting or modifying others. Sometimes a complex text was reduced to a simplified and approximate illustration. In other cases a biblical story was developed or even potentiated by adding new figurative elements.[18]

The relationship between *words* and images, which constitutes Schapiro's center of interest, can be seen from a different point of view. Rather than the translation of the phrase 'into a visual image',[19] what interests us is the translation of visions into writings. We are trying to understand the influence of images (of mental visions) on texts and not the influence of texts on images. We try to identify how the visionary experience can lead to the composition of a text, not in the sense

---

[14] Adriana Destro and Mauro Pesce, 'Remembering and Writing: Their Substantial Differences', in *Memory and Memories in Early Christianity: Proceedings of the International Conference Held at the Universities of Geneva and Lausanne (June 2–3, 2016)*, WUNT 398 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018), 50-54.

[15] On the difference between image and text and on the concept of *pathos formel* (the formulas of pathos by which images transmit fundamental cultural phenomena) elaborated by Aby Warburg, see Carlo Ginzburg, *Paura, reverenza, terrore* (Milano: Adelphi, 2015), 11–18.

[16] Approaches to Semiotics, Paperback Series 11 (The Hague/Paris: Mouton, 1973).

[17] See also Ottavia Niccoli, 'Le due stanze della storia', *Scienza e politica* 29 (2003): 3–8; eadem, 'Immagini e visioni tra Rinascimento e Controriforma: due esempi', in *Voir l'au-delà: L'expérience visionnaire et sa représentation dans l'art italien de la Renaissance. Actes du colloque international (Paris, 3-5 juin 2013)*, ed. Andreas Beyer, Phillipe Morel and Alessandro Nova, Études renaissantes 22 (Turnout: Brepols, 2017), 219–28; and Vernon K. Robbins, Walter S. Melion and Roy R. Jeal, eds., *The Art of Visual Exegesis: Rhetoric, Texts, Images*, Emory Studies in Early Christianity 19 (Atlanta, GA: SBL Press, 2017).

[18] *Words and Pictures*, 11-12.

[19] *Words and Pictures*, 9.

that a vision necessarily generates a written text, but in the sense that writing in some cases is justified by a vision.

3. The Formation of a Vision

Focusing on the relationship between visions[20] and rewritings of portions of the Bible, we need to highlight some phases or conditions of the process that lead from the visionary event to its textualization.

A vision can be considered as a result of a long process of cultural creation. Normally it is not an instantaneous act; it does not occur outside of precise cultural and existential situations. The seer experiences the visionary event thanks to his specific cultural background.[21] We want to highlight certain aspects or circumstances that give rise to visions, especially those aimed at a 'meeting with the deity'. Visions do not happen by chance but in specific times and, most importantly, in specific states (during drowsiness, in sleep, in dreams, in an ecstatic state, during a heavenly journey or in connection with natural phenomena because of dietary regimes, severe physical discipline, etc.). In other words, visionary experi-

---

[20] The extensive bibliography on visions from historical-religious and anthropological points of view is here considered to be known. For recent studies on the visions among Jesus' first followers, see Adriana Destro and Mauro Pesce, 'Continuity or Discontinuity Between Jesus and Groups of his Followers? Practices of Contact with the Supernatural', in *Los comienzos del cristianismo: IV simposio internacional del Grupo Europeo de investigación interdisciplinar sobre los Orígenes del Cristianismo (G.E.R.I.C.O.)*, ed. Santiago Guijarro-Oporto, Bibliotheca Salmaticensis, Estudios 284 (Salamanca: Universidad Pontificia de Salamanca, 2006), 53-70; Frances Flannery, Colleen Shantz and Rodney Alan Werline, eds., *Experientia*, 2 vols., SBL Symposium Series 40/SBL Early Judaism and Its Literature 35 (Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008-2012), particularly vol. 2; John J. Pilch, 'Visions in Revelation and Alternate Consciousness: A Perspective from Cultural Anthropology', *List* 28 (1993): 31-44; idem, 'The Transfiguration of Jesus: An Experience of Alternate Reality', in *Modelling Early Christianity: Social-Scientific Studies of the New Testament in its Context*, ed. Philip F. Esler (London: Routledge, 1994), 47-64; idem, 'Altered States of Consciousness Events in the Synoptics', in *The Social Setting of Jesus and the Gospels*, ed. Wolfgang Stegemann, Bruce J.Malina and Gerd Theissen (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2002), 103-15; idem, *Visions and Healing in the Acts of the Apostles: How the Early Believers Experienced God* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2004).

[21] See Adriana Destro and Mauro Pesce, 'The Heavenly Journey in Paul: Tradition of a Jewish Apocalyptic Literary Genre or Cultural Practice in a Hellenistic-Roman Context'?, in *Paul's Jewish Matrix*, ed. Thomas G. Casey and Justin Taylor, Bible in Dialogue 2, Studies in Judaism and Christianity (Rome: Gregorian and Biblical Press/Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 2011), 167–200; eidem, 'Die Himmelsreise bei Paulus: Eine "religiöse" Praktik der antiken Welt', in *Alte Texte in neuen Kontexten: Wo steht die sozialwissenschaftliche Bibelexegese?*, ed. Wolfgang Stegemann and Richard E. DeMaris (Stuttgart: Verlag W. Kohlhammer, 2015), 315–32; Luca Arcari, *Visioni del figlio dell'uomo nel Libro delle Parabole e nell'Apocalisse*, Antico e Nuovo Testamento 19 (Brescia: Morcelliana, 2012).

ences relating to divinity are in close connection with the empirical situation of those who 'see'. At the root of the visionary phenomenon—summarized in the phrase 'seeing the gods'—there is an important range of spatial phenomena.[22]

The intent of seeing superior beings and communicating with them may involve a dislocation of the visionary (and of his/her possible group) to places where the deity has its residence or where it is thought to have chosen to manifest itself. This physical dislocation can take place in the form of heavenly journey, pilgrimage or entrance into a ritual space (where temporary or permanent traces of the divine may exist). These situations, albeit different, have in common the fact that they are displacements that modify the conditions of the visionaries. When these subjects change their place or cross territories, they are able to get the vision or to influence its manifestation.

Visions can also arise from simple environmental conditions without precise dislocations. Ecstatic states or surprising sensory conditions can be produced by the sight of a statue of the divinity, or by the roll of a shamanic drum or by the murmur of water and leaves: see, for instance, 1 Kings 19:12, where the divinity becomes present in 'a light wind'. Or they may arise from a specific ritual place: a cave, for example, as in the case of 1 Kings 19:13.[23]

Also the architecture of a temple can have a special role in the formation of visions.[24] It can, for example, regulate the gaze of the seer and activate his/her attention. The space of the temple is conceptualized through the human body and its activities.[25] The human subject—for the state to be located in the spatial dimension of a temple—is urged to think in terms of revelations, oracles, judgments and precepts emanating from the supernatural.[26] The experience of vision involves—to

---

[22] John R. Clarke, 'Constructing the Spaces of Epiphany in Ancient Greek and Roman Visual Culture', in *Text, Image, and Christians in the Graeco-Roman World: A Festschrift in Honor of David Lee Balch*, ed. Aliou Cissé Niang and Carolyn Osiek, Princeton Theological Monograph Series 176 (Eugene: Pickwick, 2012), 257–73.

[23] Some visual events arise from the architectural features of the spaces the seer crosses and uses. Tombs, mausoleums, commemorative stones or sacralized basins and springs can play a significant role from a visual point of view. Among the architectural spaces temples are especially to be emphasized, because of their functions in highly symbolic ritual activities.

[24] For instance, Isa 6:1–4; Ezek 10:1–22.

[25] David Le Breton, *La sociologie du corps*, 9th ed., Que-sais-je? (Paris: PUF, 2016).

[26] In other words, the human body is directed, ordered, orchestrated along precise axes that can lead it to 'see and be seen by God'; Clarke, 'Constructing the Spaces of Epiphany in Ancient Greek and Roman Visual Culture', 269–70. In Isa 6:1-6 the vision is related to the temple, to its architectural elements (such as 'the pivots on the thresholds') and to ritual materials such as the 'live coal that had been taken from the altar with a pair of tongs'. Connection to the temple is also evident in Ezek 10:1-22, in

sum up—a long march of approach to divinity, a long gestation of the event of contact with the divine, during which the seer accepts norms and structural behaviors through body treatment, food refusal, visiting wild places or overcrowded ones, etc.

A second moment of the visionary's process consists in the interpretation and re-elaboration of his/her vision.[27] Here we take into account the vision only as a *visual* fact, which can be experienced only through the sense of sight. As we have seen, once the vision is obtained, the seer must necessarily interpret it. The interpretive grids applied to vision depend on the different cultural expectations, but also on the personal capabilities of the seer. The vision, in essence, is perceived only through a recoding process that draws on a mythological, narrative and experiential patrimony.

The interpretation of the visionary event culminates in an explicit account elaborated by the seer and directed to other individuals. Once transmitted, however, the vision can be analyzed and evaluated by those who have not experienced it or have just heard of it. The re-elaborations of those who have received the narrative of a vision, in turn, can be reworked many times. The post-event analysis is undoubtedly highly problematic.

The final phase concerns putting the vision into a written report[28] of what has been seen and is to be communicated. When the narration becomes a formal and written text, we have, of course, not the vision in itself, but the textualization of its re-interpretations. In other words, the visual experience that is at the origin of the process is incommunicable. In order to be effective it has to go through the mediation of words or must be poured into more or less formal oral and written texts. Here we have to remember that all the visions contained in the Bible and in Jewish and early Christian texts are only written descriptions of visions (not visions in themselves).[29]

We insist: the verbal or written description of a vision is not a vision. However, the narrated version of a vision is always the only thing we have about the visionary phe-

---

the vision of the throne and chariot; Peter Schäfer, *The Origins of Jewish Mysticism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009), 34–52 ('Chapter 1, Ezekiel's Vision: The Cosmos as Temple').

[27] See, for instance, Dan 8:15–16.

[28] See, for instance, Dan 7:1; Rev 1:11; 14:13.

[29] Ancient Jewish culture rarely uses images, but uses visions (that is, images of the mind) and transmits them through written representations. Some texts therefore appear as an *ekphrasis* of mental visions. In a rhetorical work attributed to Hermogenes (2nd century CE) the *ekphrasis* is defined as 'a descriptive discourse that places the object under the eyes with efficacy' (*Prog.* 10: 22); see George A. Kennedy, *Invention and Method: Two Rhetorical Treatises from the Hermogenic Corpus*, WGRW 15 (Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005). People, things, circumstances, places, times and many other factors are enumerated as themes of description, characterized by *enargeia* (the force of visual representation).

nomenon. The reason is that speaking and writing are communicable, seeing is not (as hearing, smelling, touching and tasting are not). It is thanks to the fact that a vision is reported, represented and commented upon that its meaning and value—constructed on literary and textual norms—become a shared patrimony and last over time.

The narrative transposition of the vision builds and enforces the authority of a text. Writing a visionary phenomenon may have the power to give consistency to the religious role of some subjects, to illustrate their task as masters or mediators and as writers of texts. The textualization of a vision, therefore, can have the aim of becoming the foundation stone for a group (and its leader) or the instrument of launching a reform. In this sense it has its own justification. Once written, furthermore, the visionary event is utilized by readers and listeners, that is, by persons and groups that provide it with new specific meanings.

4. Visions in Biblical Texts

In the Pentateuch and in the historical books visions are not an essential tool of God's revelation. Of course, from Abraham to Moses direct and personal revelations establish and legitimize special persons chosen by God. What matters, however, is that God spoke to certain persons, not the vision of God himself, that is, not a description of his appearance and of his supernatural realm. If the biblical text relates visions, this is aimed at certifying that the revelation has certainly taken place.[30] What the prophet says has therefore a supernatural legitimation.

On the contrary, in the visions related in the book of Ezekiel[31]—as well as in Isaiah[32] and Daniel[33]—the content of the vision of the supernatural world becomes fundamental. It is not a pure function of an ethical-religious message. It has a value and purpose in itself. Visions happen through a specific mechanism: the so-called 'opening of the heavens'[34] and/or a heavenly journey. They give access to the divine world that is observed and carefully described.

A comparison with Jeremiah's book helps to emphasize the specificity of Ezekiel. In Jeremiah prophecy never happens through visions. The text merely states

---

[30] Gen 15:1; 17:1; 18:1; 28:12; Num 20:6; Josh 5:13–14; 6:11–12; 13:6. Many times in the Pentateuch and the historical books dream and vision are strictly connected, so that there is no dream without vision and often the vision is conceived to happen within a dream (Gen 15:12; 28:12; Num 22:8–13; 22:20; 1 Kgs 3:5-15; 9:2). See, for instance, Gen 13:14 and the interpretation of this passage in 1QapGen ar xxi 8; as well as Gen 12:11 and the interpretation in 1QapGen ar xix 14, 18.

[31] Ezek 1:1; 1:28; 2:1; 3:12; 3:24; 8:1; 10:1–22; 11:1; 11:28.

[32] Isa 1:1; 2:1; 6:1; 13:1; 22:1.

[33] Dan 7:1–28; 8:1–27; 9:2-27; 10:1; 12:5–13.

[34] For instance, Ezek 1:1.

that God speaks to the prophet. Everything focuses on the ethical-religious content of what God communicates verbally. In Ezekiel, on the other hand, we are faced with a religious necessity to *see* the heavenly world, to know how God imagines the human and mundane reality. This is possible through access to the supernatural world in which future human affairs are already present and visible. This means that in a particular form of Judaism there is a need for a visual experience of both the divine world and the human future.

The need for visions of the divine world arises from the desire to identify, or to decipher, in the divine plans the future destiny of the Jewish people, subjected as they may be to political subordination or experiencing a state of moral degeneration. A direct contact with the supernatural world that constitutes the religious foundations of Jewish society is particularly needed in situations where the Jewish institutions seem to the seer to be incapable of giving an answer to situations of crisis, or in which particular innovations are required.

The visionary experiences of this kind often imply a Jewish imagination in which human history is the effect of parallel events which take place in the heavenly world. A fundamental example of this evidently asymmetrical correspondence between the above and the below can be found also in some conceptions of Jewish worship activities, which are sometimes considered parallel to a celestial cult.[35] Even the historical facts that take place in human history are sometimes considered as preordered by actions occurring in the celestial world. This is why having visions of the divine sphere and of what is happening in heaven is essential. One can see beforehand in the skies what will happen on earth.

What is also important is that visions permit a better understanding of what is written in the Bible, since, as we have already said, the Bible reflects the divine Wisdom. In order to understand the holy scriptures, visions can become essential: they are the only mechanism that leads one to 'observe', so to say, the celestial world. This means that visions permit the knowledge of something that is rarely represented in biblical texts. In essence, rewriting the Bible on the basis of supernatural visions is an instrument that permits incorporating into the biblical text new elements which enhance a more adequate interpretation of it.[36]

---

[35] 4QShirShab^{a-h}; 11QShirShab. Carol A. Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition*, HSS 27 (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1985); eadem, 'Merkabah Exegesis in the Qumran Sabbath Shirot', *JJS* 38 (1987): 11–30; James H. Charlesworth and Carol A. Newsom, eds., *Angelic Liturgy: Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*, vol. 4B of *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*, 8 vols. PTSDSSP (Tubingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck]/Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1999).

[36] The relation between rewriting the Bible and visions has been carefully analyzed by Arcari. See, for instance, his affirmation: 'rewritings of *testimonia* that are functional to a re-codification of visionary experiences'; 'Testi "apocalittici" qumranici all'origine di tradizioni canoniche differenziate', 244.

Already in Daniel, visions can have the function of clarifying what in the Bible is not clearly affirmed and needs an interpretation: Daniel 9:2, for instance, where Daniel tries to find the interpretation of the seventy years prophesied by Jeremiah 25:11–12. Visions can also be at the origin of a rewriting of the Bible: accordingly, Daniel 9:23–-27, in which the seventy years of Jeremiah are explained after the vision. The *Ascension of Isaiah* or the *Apocalypse of Abraham,* for example, describe visions of the supernatural world attributed to Isaiah or Abraham that the biblical text did not transmit. In this way these rewritings of the Bible allow for information about the supposed baggage of knowledge of biblical prophets and patriarchs which the Bible does not contain but which these two figures knew, thanks to personal visions.[37]

5. Visions and Rewriting of the Bible in the Ascension of Isaiah *and in John*

In some texts of the first followers of Jesus we find an *explicit relationship* between vision and rewriting of the Bible. As an example of this relationship we will take into consideration the *Ascension of Isaiah* 6–11, which describes a vision and a heavenly journey of the prophet Isaiah. The *Ascension* inserts the vision into the narrative structure of the book of 2 Kings and locates it in the fourteenth year of the reign of Hezekiah.[38] The work thus appears as rewriting the Bible.

According to the vision narrated in the *Ascension*, Isaiah ascends through the seven heavens and reaches the dwelling of God, where he sees the glory of the Beloved, of the angel of the Holy Spirit and—indirectly—of God:

> And I saw a certain One standing, whose glory surpassed that of all, and His glory was great and wonderful. And after I had seen Him, all the righteous whom I had seen and also the angels whom I had seen came to Him. And Adam and Abel and Seth and all the righteous first drew near and worshipped Him, and they all praised Him with one voice, and I myself also gave praise with them and my giving of praise was as theirs. And then all the angels drew nigh and worshipped and gave praise. And I was (again) transformed and became like an angel. And thereupon the angel who conducted me said to me,

---

[37] Celia Deutsch has identified a connection between visions and the interpretation of the Bible for certain passages of Philo and Clement of Alexandria—'Text Work, Ritual and Mystical Experience: Philo's *De Vita Contemplativa*', in *Paradise Now: Essays on Early Jewish and Christian Mysticism*, ed. April D. DeConick, SBL Symposium Series 11 (Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), 287–311; eadem, 'Visions, Mysteries and the Interpretive Task: Text Work and Religious Experience in Philo and Clement', in *Inquiry for Religious Experience in Early Judaism and Christianity*, vol. 1 of *Experientia*, 83–103. On the relationship between mysticism and the interpretation of scripture, see Steven T. Katz, ed., *Mysticism and Sacred Scripture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 7-67.

[38] Pesce, 'Presupposti per l'utilizzazione storica dell'*Ascensione di Isaia*', 37-40.

> 'Worship this One', and I worshipped and praised. And the angel said unto me, 'This is the Lord of all the praise-givings which thou hast seen'.[39]

Subsequently, the prophet Isaiah sees the glory of the angel of the Holy Spirit:

> And whilst he was still speaking, I saw another Glorious One who was like Him, and the righteous drew nigh and worshipped and praised and I praised together with them. But my glory was not transformed into accordance with their form. And thereupon the angels drew near and worshipped Him. And I saw the Lord and the second angel, and they were standing.[40]

Finally, Isaiah sees (or does not see) the glory of God:

> And I saw the great glory, the eyes of my spirit being open, and I could not thereupon see, nor yet could the angel who was with me nor all the angels whom I had seen worshipping my Lord. But I saw the righteous beholding with great power the glory of that One.[41]

The prophet Isaiah then sees that God sends Jesus into the world:

> And I heard the voice of the Most High, the Father of my Lord, saying to my Lord Christ who will be called Jesus, 'Go forth and descend through all the heavens, and thou wilt descend to the firmament and that world: to the angel in Sheol thou wilt descend, but to Haguel thou wilt not go'.[42]

After the descent through the heavens, Isaiah sees the birth of Jesus, his earthly activity and finally also his crucifixion, resurrection and ascension to heaven.[43]

In essence, the vision that Isaiah had in the fourteenth year of King Hezekiah makes it possible to affirm that Isaiah had knowledge of the whole story of Jesus, because he had contemplated it centuries before in the divine world thanks to a celestial journey. The book of Isaiah can therefore be read as referring to Jesus and his story. The *Ascension of Isaiah*, in substance, is a type of rewriting in which the Bible is integrated on the basis of a visionary phenomenon that allows knowing in advance what takes place in human history.

---

[39] *Ascen. Isa.* 9:27–32. Translation (here and in following pages) by R.H. Charles, ed. and trans., *The Ascension of Isaiah: Translated from the Ethiopic version, which, together with the new Greek fragment, the Latin versions and the Latin translation of the Slavonic, is here published in full* (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1900).

[40] *Ascen. Isa.* 9:33–35.

[41] *Ascen. Isa.* 9:37–38.

[42] *Ascen. Isa.* 10:7–8.

[43] *Ascen. Isa.* 11:2–10, 18–23.

6. Rewriting of the Bible in the Gospel of John

The Fourth Gospel connects the rewriting of some sentences from the canonical book of Isaiah to a particular vision that the prophet would have had. John 12:41 asserts:

> These things said Isaiah, because he saw his glory and spoke of him.

John affirms here two things: Isaiah saw the glory of him (the Son); Isaiah spoke of him. The things that Isaiah 'said' are the ones just quoted in John 12:38–41, in which he speaks of the unbelief of the 'Jews':

> ...they did not believe in him. This was to fulfill the word spoken by the prophet Isaiah, '*Lord, who has believed our message, and to whom has the arm of the Lord been revealed*'? And so they could not believe, because Isaiah also said, '*He has blinded their eyes and hardened their heart, so that they might not look with their eyes, and understand with their heart and turn, and I would heal them*' (rewriting of Isaiah 6:9-10).[44] Isaiah said this because he saw his glory and spoke about him.[45]

It seems that John tries here to explain how Isaiah can have knowledge of things about Jesus. His explanation is that the prophet had a vision of Jesus' glory. We have tried elsewhere to demonstrate the dependence of John on the *Ascension of*

---

[44] Parallel passages: Ezek 12:2, 'you are living in the midst of a rebellious house, who have eyes to see but do not see, who have ears to hear but do not hear'; Jer 5:21, 'foolish and senseless people, who have eyes but do not see, who have ears but do not hear'; see also Ezek 2:5; Matt 13:17/Luke 10:23.

[45] Ταῦτα εἶπεν Ἠσαΐας ὅτι εἶδεν τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐλάλησεν περὶ αὐτοῦ. On this passage, cf. C.H. Dodd, *Secondo le Scritture: Struttura fondamentale della teologia del Nuovo Testamento*, trans. A. Ornella, Studi Biblici 16 (Brescia: Paideia, 1972), 36-39; trans. of *According to the Scriptures: The Sub-Structure of New Testament Theology* (New York: Scribner, 1953); Craig A. Evans, 'Obduracy and the Lord's Servant: Some Observations on the Use of the Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel', in *Early Jewish and Christian Exegesis: Studies in Memory of William Hugh Brownlee*, ed. Craig A. Evans and William F. Stinespring, Homage Series (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1987), 221–36; idem, *To See and Not Perceive: Isaiah 6.9-10 in Early Jewish and Christian Interpretation*, JSOTSup 64 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1989), 129-37; Giuseppe Segalla, *Giovanni: Versione, Introduzione, Note*, 7th ed., Nuovissima versione della Bibbia dai testi originali 36 (Cinisello Balsamo, Milano: Edizioni Paoline, 1990), 348–51; Raymond E. Brown, *Giovanni: Commento al vangelo spiritual*, ed. Giampaolo Natalini, trans. Anita Sorsaja, 2 vols., Commenti e studi biblici (Assisi: Cittadella, 1991), ad loc.; trans. of *The Gospel according to John (i-xii)*, AB 29 (Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1966); Bruce G. Schuchard, *Scripture within Scripture: The Interrelationship of Form and Function in the Explicit Old Testament Citations in the Gospel of John*, SBLDS 133 (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1992), 85-106; Yves Simoens, *Secondo Giovanni: una traduzione e un'interpretazione*, Testi e commenti (Bologna: Edizioni Dehoniane Bologna, 1996), 507-16; Francis J. Moloney, *The Gospel of John*, ed. Daniel J. Harrington, SP 4 (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1998), 362–69.

Isaiah.[46] In any case, this explanation is different from what we find in 1 Peter 1:10-12, which asserts the desire of the angels to have a vision of the future:

> Concerning this salvation, the prophets who prophesied of the grace that was to be yours made careful search and inquiry, inquiring about the person or time that the Spirit of Christ within them indicated when it testified in advance to the sufferings destined for Christ and the subsequent glory. It was revealed to them that they were serving not themselves but you, in regard to the things that have now been announced to you through those who brought you good news by the Holy Spirit sent from heaven—things into which angels long to look (παρακύψαι).[47]

Vision is presented here as a tool that is not only desirable, but necessary for knowing 'things' that are not contained in the Bible but are related to it. The theory that this text presents is that the Bible contains hints, as we have already mentioned, about the history of Christ and, in particular, about his passion. But in order for these hints to be clear, an interpretation is needed and therefore a rewording/rewriting of biblical phrases. Full comprehension is only possible through supernatural visions that permit direct visual experience or knowledge in advance.

A conception about the relation between biblical texts and the act of seeing may be implicit in a statement common to Matthew and Luke:

> But blessed are your eyes, for they see, and your ears, for they hear. Truly I tell you, many prophets and righteous people longed to see what you see, but did not see it, and to hear what you hear, but did not hear it.[48]
>
> Blessed are the eyes that see what you see! For I tell you that many prophets and kings desired to see what you see, but did not see it, and to hear what you hear, but did not hear it.[49]

The conception presupposed by this sentence is that the vision of the last times permits a full comprehension of the Bible. Following some biblical passages, only

---

[46] Mauro Pesce, '"Isaia disse queste cose perché vide la sua gloria e parlò di lui" (Gv 12, 41): il Vangelo di Giovanni e l'*Ascensione di Isaia*', *StPat* 50 (2003): 649–66.

[47] See *1 En.* 9:1, τότε παρακύψαντες Μιχαὴλ καὶ Οὐριὴλ καὶ Ῥαφαὴλ καὶ Γαβριήλ, οὗτοι ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐθεάσαντο αἷμα πολὺ ἐκχυννόμενον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς: 'Then Michael, Uriel, Raphael and Gabriel peering, these beheld from heaven much blood being poured out upon the earth', translation by Joseph B. Lumpkin, *The Books of Enoch: The Angels, The Watchers and the Nephilim (with Extensive Commentary on the Three Books of Enoch, the Fallen Angels, the Calendar of Enoch, and Daniel's Prophecy)*, 2nd ed. (Blountsville, AL: Fifth Estate, 2011), 30. Here the angels see what is happening on earth; in this case they are not seeing in advance in heaven what will happen in the future on earth.

[48] Matt 13:17.

[49] Luke 10:23–24.

the vision of the future could permit one to understand what some prophets and kings or righteous people were speaking about or the sense of what was happening during their life.

In Luke's version the phrase comes after a passage where the theme of vision is paramount. Jesus claims to have had the vision of Satan falling from heaven;[50] then he asserts that the wise did not know the things now revealed to the disciples, who see what the prophets desired to see. Here, too, the vision is linked to the understanding of hints or traces contained in the Bible. For this reason visions allow a re-formulation and, in some special cases, even a rewriting of the Bible.

1 Peter justifies the predictions of the prophets on the presupposition that the Holy Spirit inspired them to prophesy. The difference is clear. For the Gospel of John, on the contrary, Isaiah can speak of Jesus because he had a vision, not because the Holy Spirit spoke in him. John's affirmation is closely related to his theory of the pre-existence of the Son. John seems to presuppose here knowledge of *Ascension of Isaiah* 9:27–39, where the prophet, after a heavenly journey through the seven heavens, can see the divine figure of the pre-existent Beloved standing between God and the Holy Spirit. Afterwards, the prophet sees the descent of the Beloved on earth, his death and his ascension to the heavens.[51]

7. *The* Ascension of Isaiah *as a Source of the Gospel of John*

Up to 12:36 John's Gospel presents a narration. This is a long narrative that essentially starts at John 1:19. In John 12:37, with the assertion 'Although he had performed so many signs in their presence, they did not believe in him', John does not continue the previous account and does not start a new story. The author comes face to face with his audience and begins to speak in the first person and to present his own ideas on the activity of Jesus. He does not shift to a metalanguage. He *goes out of the story*; *abandons the narrative* of Jesus' story. It is therefore a *digression*[52] in which he appeals to materials outside the narration of the text, which were not contained in the previous narrative. John 12:37-43 is perhaps one of the most important passages in John for understanding how the author thinks. John presents here what Chaïm Perelman and Lucie Olbrechts-Tyteca call 'self-deliberation'.[53]

---

[50] Luke 10:18.

[51] *Ascen. Isa.* 11:1-33.

[52] Heinrich Lausberg, *Elementi di retorica*, Itinerari (Bologna: Il Mulino, 2002), § 434.

[53] *The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation*, trans. John Wilkinson and Purcell Weaver (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1971), § 9; trans. of *Traité de l'argumentation: La nouvelle rhétorique*, 2 vols. (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1958).

John begins presenting his judgment on the historical facts: 'they did not believe in him'. At this point he tries to give an explanation of this fact. But he does not provide argumentation based only on his rational judgment. His explanation is also based on the sacred Jewish scriptures: 'This was to fulfill the word spoken by the prophet Isaiah'. Then John offers a second explanation of why the Jews could not believe. This is also based on the canonical text of the prophet Isaiah: 'they could not believe, *because* Isaiah also said'. In the first explanation, John quotes Isaiah 53:1:

> Who has believed what we have heard? And to whom has the arm of the LORD been revealed?

In the second explanation John quotes Isaiah 6:9-10:

> He has blinded their eyes
> and hardened their heart,
> so that they might not look with their eyes,
> and understand with their heart and turn—
> and I would heal them.

It should be remembered that the theme of eye blindness and heart hardening is found in the Jewish scriptures also in Ezekiel and Jeremiah:

> ...you are living in the midst of a rebellious house, who have eyes to see but do not see, who have ears to hear but do not hear...[54]
> ...foolish and senseless people, who have eyes, but do not see, who have ears, but do not hear.[55]

But the Gospel of John draws this quotation, not from Ezekiel or Jeremiah, but from Isaiah. The use of Isaiah to explain why there has been disbelief towards Jesus is not a novelty. Long before John Jesus' followers used these two passages of Isaiah to give a response to Jewish unbelief. In essence, John is using sources, and these sources are *testimonia*, previously elaborated by various groups of Jesus' followers. Isaiah 53:1 was used by Paul perhaps fifty years earlier in Romans 11:16, to explain disbelief towards Jesus. The use of Isaiah 6:9–10 is found in Roman 11:8, 10; Mark 4:11–12; 8:17-18; Luke 8:10; 19:42; Matthew 13:13–15; Acts 28:26-28; and the *Ascension of Isaiah* 11:14.[56]

> And he said to them, 'To you has been given the mystery of the kingdom of God,
> but to those outside everything comes in parables, in order that

[54] Ezek 12:2.

[55] Jer 5:21.

[56] Enrico Norelli, *Ascensio Isaia: Commentarius*, CC Series Apocryphorum 8 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1995), 555–60. See also Moloney, *Gospel of John*, 363-64; 'the narrator (vv. 38–41) falls back on traditional use of Isaiah' (p. 363).

> "while seeing, they might see and not perceive;
> and while hearing, they might hear and not understand;
> lest they turn back and be forgiven'".[57]

> For this reason I speak to them in parables, because, while seeing, they do not see and, while hearing, they do not hear, nor do they understand.
> And with them is fulfilled the prophecy of Isaiah which says,
> 'You will indeed hear, and not understand;
> and, while seeing, you will see and not perceive.
> For the heart of this people has grown fat,
> and with the ears they have heard sluggishly,
> and their eyes they shut;
> lest they perceive with the eyes,
> and with the ears hear,
> and with the heart understand,
> and turn, and I heal them'.[58]

> And being in disaccord with one another, they broke up, Paul speaking one (final) word:
> 'Well did the Holy Spirit speak through Isaiah the prophet to your fathers saying,
> "Go to this people and say,
> 'You will indeed hear, and not understand;
> And, while seeing, you will see and not perceive.
> For the heart of this people has grown fat,
> and with the ears they have heard sluggishly,
> and their eyes they shut;
> lest they perceive with the eyes,
> and with the ears hear,
> and with the heart understand,
> and turn, and I heal them'"".[59]

> Everybody will harden his heart about him and will not know where he came from.[60]

While the text of Isaiah 53:1 is quoted according to the LXX, the quotation from Isaiah 6:9–10 does not faithfully reproduce the LXX of Isaiah's book. In fact, John quotes Isaiah 6 in a profoundly modified way:

> LXX Isaiah 6:10
> ἐπαχύνθη γὰρ ἡ καρδία τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου,
> καὶ τοῖς ὠσὶν αὐτῶν βαρέως ἤκουσαν

[57] Mark 4:11–12.

[58] Matt 13:13–15.

[59] Acts 28:25–27.

[60] *Ascen. Isa.* 11:14.

καὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν ἐκάμμυσαν,
μήποτε ἴδωσι τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς
καὶ τοῖς ὠσὶν ἀκούσωσι
καὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ συνῶσι
καὶ ἐπιστρέψωσι καὶ ἰάσομαι αὐτούς.

For the heart of this people has grown fat,
and with their ears they have heard sluggishly,
and their eyes they shut;
lest they perceive with the eyes,
and with the ears hear,
and with the heart understand,
and turn, and I heal them.

John 12:40
τετύφλωκεν αὐτῶν τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς
καὶ ἐπώρωσεν αὐτῶν τὴν καρδίαν,
ἵνα μὴ ἴδωσιν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς
καὶ νοήσωσιν τῇ καρδίᾳ
καὶ στραφῶσιν, καὶ ἰάσομαι αὐτούς.

He has blinded their eyes
and hardened their heart,
so that they might not look with their eyes,
and understand with their heart and turn—
and I would heal them.

From a literary point of view almost all verbs and nouns have been changed by John: instead of ἐπαχύνθη we have ἐπώρωσεν; instead of ἐκάμμυσαν, τετύφλωκεν;[61] instead of συνῶσιν, νοήσωσιν; instead of ἐπιστρέψωσιν, στραφῶσιν; and instead of τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου, αὐτῶν. From a theological point of view, it is God who acts on the heart and on the eyes. It is not human beings who harden their hearts[62] and become responsible for their inability to understand and see.[63]

[61] Dodd has rightly shown that this literary form of quoting Isa 6:10 is found in Paul; *Secondo le Scritture*, 39. Unlike the LXX, Paul uses the very same verbs as John 12:40—2 Cor 3:14, ἐπωρώθη τὰ νοήματα αὐτῶν (where we have, not only the same verb, but also the same substitution of 'their' for 'of the people'); and 2 Cor 4:4, ἐτύφλωσεν τὰ νοήματα.

[62] It is also possible that John thinks it is the power of evil to blind, and not God, on the basis of 1 John 2:11 (ὅτι ἡ σκοτία ἐτύφλωσεν τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτου), which has a close literary affinity with John 12:40. This would bring John near to the *Ascension of Isaiah*.

[63] The fact that John 12:40 does not quote Isa 6:10 to the letter is all the more significant, since immediately before it (John 12:38) he quotes Isa 53:1 verbatim from the LXX.

We then find a significant reversal and also an omission in Isaiah's passage quoted by John. The LXX writes (a) the heart of this people has become hardened; (b) their ears have become heavy; (c) their eyes are closed. John 12:40 omits (b)—that is, it does not mention the ears—and reverses the order of the other two members by first quoting the eyes and then the heart: 'He blinded their eyes and hardened their heart'. These modifications of the biblical passage cannot be understood by simply analyzing the literary composition of John's text. It is necessary to reconstruct the history of this biblical *testimonium*, which is an important element of previous theological reflections.

It is interesting that this *testimonium* is quoted by Matthew and by the Acts of the Apostles according to the LXX. By contrast, Mark and John modify the biblical passage, but differently. Our hypothesis is that the two different modifications (in Mark and John) depend on the fact that the *testimonium* was elaborated within the different groups that handed it down in divergent forms. The fact that John quotes Isaiah 53:1 from the LXX and Isaiah 6:9–10 in a free form leads one to think that John used the form of the *testimonium* that circulated in the Johannist environment. This is very important, because it allows us to understand John's next sentence, in which he makes a polemical use of this *testimonium*:

> Nevertheless, many even of the authorities believed in him. But because of the Pharisees, they did not confess it, for fear that they would be put out of the synagogue.[64]

John appeals to his knowledge of the facts to dispute the use of this *testimonium* in other environments, perhaps in other Johannist groups.

From the point of view of John's use of sources, however, the most important statement is another: 'Isaiah said this because he saw his glory and spoke about him'.[65] Two actions are attributed to Isaiah: (a) he saw the glory of Him (the Son); (b) he spoke of Him. The phrase means that John tries to explain how Isaiah could have known things about Jesus in the two sentences that would refer to him, that is, in Isaiah 53:1 and Isaiah 6:9–10. His explanation is that Isaiah had seen the glory of Jesus. He spoke of Jesus because he saw the glory of Jesus.

The key point, in our opinion, is precisely that Isaiah sees the glory of Jesus and therefore sees Jesus in his supernatural state. Glory is a divine substance that in the highest rank belongs to God. Having seen the glory of Jesus, however, is not the same thing as having seen in advance the events relating to Jesus. The vision concerns the 'glory' of Jesus. Isaiah had a vision that allowed him to see the supernatural dignity of the Son. He saw the pre-existing Son in his divine glory. For the

---

[64] John 12:42.

[65] John 12:41.

author of the Gospel of John Jesus is the pre-existing Logos.[66] The glory of the pre-existing Jesus is of greatest importance in John[67] and equally fundamental is seeing it:

> Father, I desire that those also, whom you have given me, may be with me where I am, to see my glory, which you have given me because you loved me before the foundation of the world.[68]

It should not be forgotten that for many of the Jews in the Gospel of John unbelief consists simply in not accepting the supernatural dignity of Jesus. Isaiah's vision of the Son's glory is, therefore, absolutely essential to the Johannist theory. Furthermore, the Gospel of John reads Isaiah 6:9–10 in the light of the *Ascension of Isaiah* 11:19–20, respectively:

> He has blinded their eyes and hardened their heart, so that they might not look with their eyes, and understand with their heart...
>
> And after this the adversary envied Him and roused the children of Israel against Him, not knowing who He was, and they delivered Him to the king, and crucified Him and He descended to the angel (of Sheol). In Jerusalem indeed I saw Him being crucified on a tree.

Thanks to the rewriting of the Bible contained in the *Ascension of Isaiah*, the Gospel of John can affirm that when Isaiah in his canonical book speaks of hardening and blindness, he is actually talking about the persecution and crucifixion to which some Jews have submitted Jesus because of their hardening and blindness.

Summing up, our hypothesis is that John 12:41 presupposes knowledge of the vision of Isaiah described in the *Ascension of Isaiah* chapters 6–11. This text contains all the elements that are needed to explain the statements of John 12:38–41. First, (a) the fact that Isaiah had a vision explains the statement of John that Isaiah saw the glory of Jesus, because when Isaiah comes to the dwelling of God, the prophet sees the glory of God and the glory of the Beloved.[69] Second (b), the fact that Isaiah also sees in advance the persecution and death of Jesus[70] allows John to affirm that the prophet Isaiah was able to speak in Isaiah 6:9–10 of the hardening and blindness of the Jews in relation to Jesus. Again, (c) Isaiah's vision described in the *Ascension of Isaiah* contains a christological conception that for John is absolutely essential: that of the pre-existence of Jesus as a divine figure. Fourth, (d) the ascen-

---

[66] John 1:1–14.

[67] See John 17:5, 17, 24.

[68] John 17:24.

[69] *Ascen. Isa.* 9:27–31.

[70] *Ascen. Isa.* 11:19–20.

sion of Jesus through the heavens to the dwelling of God[71] in the *Ascension of Isaiah* allows John to make plausible his idea that the Son can give the Spirit only if he goes back to God;[72] the prophet in fact also sees the angel of the Spirit[73] next to God and the Beloved. Lastly, (e) one must not forget that the cosmology of the *Ascension of Isaiah* is extremely close to that of the Gospel of John for the opposition between high and low (including the fracture reflected in the atmosphere dominated by demons).

In 12:37–43 John wants to give an explanation for the disbelief of the Jews towards Jesus. His explication consists in a complex argumentation based on the Jewish sacred scriptures. In this argumentation he makes use of three kinds of sources: two *testimonia* (Isaiah 53:1 and Isaiah 6:9–10), an early Christian rewriting of the Book of Isaiah (the *Ascension of Isaiah*) and his own historical experience. He moves also from his self-deliberation and takes a position in front of a very combative context: the conflict between Jesus and 'the Jews', between the followers of Jesus and the Pharisees and between himself and other Johannists.

8. John 8:56 and the Apocalypse of Abraham

The use by John of rewritings of the Bible based on supernatural visions is confirmed by another passage of the gospel. In 8:56–58 John affirms that Abraham also 'saw' Jesus, and this was possible because Jesus pre-existed Abraham:

> Jesus answered...'Your ancestor Abraham rejoiced that he would see my day; he saw it and was glad'.[74] Then the Jews said to him, 'You are not yet fifty years old, and have you seen Abraham'? Jesus said to them, 'Very truly, I tell you, before Abraham was, I am'.

Even in the case of Abraham, according to the Gospel of John, it is a vision (obtained thanks to a heavenly journey) that allows him to know the story of Jesus in advance.[75] The assertions of John 8:56 that are to be highlighted are (a) that Abra-

---

[71] *Ascen. Isa.* 11:23–33.

[72] John 16:7.

[73] *Ascen. Isa.* 9:33-35; 11:33.

[74] Ἀβραὰμ ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ἠγαλλιάσατο ἵνα ἴδῃ τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ἐμήν, καὶ εἶδεν καὶ ἐχάρη (John 8:56).

[75] See Pesce, '"Isaia disse queste cose perché vide la sua gloria e parlò di lui" (Gv 12, 41)' 59-61; and Kaestli, 'Abraham, visionnaire apocalyptique', 50-51. Deutsch has identified a connection between visions and the interpretation of the Bible for certain passages of Philo and Clement of Alexandria; 'Text Work, Ritual and Mystical Experience', 293-95; eadem, 'Visions, Mysteries and the Interpretive Task', 91-93, 96-97. On the relationship between mysticism and the interpretation of scripture, see Katz, *Mysticism and Sacred Scripture*, 7–67.

ham hoped to see Jesus' day; (b) that Abraham saw the day of Jesus; (c) that he rejoiced to have seen it. Our hypothesis is that the source from which John derives his idea that Abraham *saw* 'the day of Jesus' is the *Apocalypse of Abraham*.[76]

As is well-known, the *Apocalypse of Abraham* is divided into two originally distinct parts (chapters 1-8 and chapters 9–31). We are interested in the second part of the work. In it God promises Abraham that he will reveal to him all the events of the future story:

> There I will show you the centuries ...
> And I will announce to them what is coming...[77]

In a heavenly journey Abraham is carried by the angel Iaoel above the seven heavens and from that height contemplates the future history of the world. In the final scene Abraham sees what will happen at the end of times and sees, in particular, a messianic figure in the temple of Jerusalem. The *Apocalypse of Abraham* writes:

> ... and I [Abraham] saw a man going out from the left side of the heathen. Men and women and children, great crowds, went out from the side of the heathen and they worshiped him. And while I was still looking, those on the right side went out, and some shamed this man, and some struck him, and some worshiped him. And I saw that as they worshiped him, Azazel ran and worshiped, and having kissed his face he turned and stood behind him.[78]
>
> Hear, Abraham, the man whom you saw insulted and beaten and again worshiped is the liberation from the heathen for the people who will be born of you. In the last days, in this twelfth period of the age of my fulfillment, I will set up this man from your tribe, the one whom you have seen from my people. All will imitate him...(you) consider him as one called by me...(they) are changed in their counsels. And those you saw coming from the left side of the picture and worshiping him, this (means that) many of the heathen will trust in him. And those of your seed whom you saw on the right hand, some insulting him, some beating him, and others worshiping him, many of them will be offended because of him. It is he who will test those of your seed who have worshiped him in the fulfillment of the twelfth hour, in the curtailing of the age of impiety.[79]

---

[76] See Pesce, '"Isaia disse queste cose perché vide la sua gloria e parlò di lui" (Gv 12, 41)', 59-61; and Kaestli, 'Abraham, visionnaire apocalyptique', 50-51. On the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, see Schäfer, *The Origins of Jewish Mysticism*, 86–93; and the many studies of Andrei A. Orlov—for instance, *Heavenly Priesthood in the* Apocalypse of Abraham (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013); and idem, *The Atoning Dyad: The Two Goats of Yom Kippur in the* Apocalypse of Abraham, Studia Judaeoslavica 8 (Leiden: Brill, 2016).

[77] *Apoc. Ab.* 9:8–9. We follow the translation of Alexander Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha: Toward the Original of the* Apocalypse of Abraham, Text-Critical Studies 3 (Leiden: Brill, 2005).

[78] *Apoc. Ab.* 29:4–6.

[79] *Apoc. Ab.* 29:8–11.

The point we want to highlight is this: the *Apocalypse of Abraham* is the only text that affirms that Abraham had a vision of a messianic figure in eschatological times.

The man who leaves the temple of Jerusalem ('a man going out from the left side of the heathen'), in fact, could easily be identified by John with Jesus. Some scholars have also thought that chapter 29:8–11 could be a 'Christian' addition to the text. It is, however, also possible to think of an anti-Christian text, because Azazel kisses the messianic personage and worships him: 'Azazel ran and worshiped, and having kissed his face he turned and stood behind him'.[80] We do not argue that the text speaks explicitly of Jesus. We suggest that the author of John's Gospel knew the *Apocalypse of Abraham* and interpreted it in reference to Jesus. John could apply the vision of Abraham contained in this book to Jesus because (a) the vision had the eschatological times as object; (b) a messianic figure was represented in it; (c) an internal division took place between supporters and opponents of him within the people of Israel; and (d) the messianic figure was an object of worship among the Gentiles.

A further element that seems to connect John 8:56–58 with the *Apocalypse of Abraham* is the theme of Abraham's joy. In verse 56, from a strictly literary point of view, John's text speaks twice of the rejoicing of Abraham (ἠγαλλιάσατο; ἐχάρη) and twice affirms that Abraham had a vision (ἵνα ἴδῃ; εἶδεν). John's text seems to think of a rejoicing that took place in two phases: a joy in the moment in which Abraham hopes to see; and the rejoicing that happens after he has seen.

In the *Apocalypse of Abraham* the theme of rejoicing appears before the vision:

> Stand up, Abraham, go boldly; be very joyful and rejoice.[81]

It is not explicitly said that Abraham experiences feelings of joy. It is the angel Iaoel that encourages him to rejoice. In any case this may mean that the text alludes to a rejoicing in view of what will be seen, as it is said in John 8:56. This passage of the *Apocalypse of Abraham* remains the only parallel we have found to the double rejoicing of Abraham in John 8:56.

The theme of rejoicing returns two more times in the *Apocalypse of Abraham*. One is in the messianic passage:

> And they will rejoice over me forever...
> They will see me joyfully rejoicing with my people.[82]

---

[80] *Apoc. Ab.* 29:4–6.

[81] *Apoc. Ab.* 10:15; Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 18.

[82] *Apoc. Ab.* 29:19-20; Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 33–34.

This constitutes a fairly probable parallel to John 8:56, because it is a joy that takes place in seeing the messianic days.

John 8:56-58	**John 8:56-58**	***Apocalypse of Abraham***
Ἀβραὰμ ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν	Your ancestor Abraham	Stand up, Abraham, go boldly (10:15)
ἠγαλλιάσατο ἵνα ἴδῃ τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ἐμήν	rejoiced that he would see my day;	be very joyful (10:15)
καὶ εἶδεν	he saw it	
καὶ ἐχάρη	and was glad.	and rejoice (10:15)
εἶπον οὖν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι πρὸς αὐτόν·	Then the Jews said to him,	
πεντήκοντα ἔτη οὔπω ἔχεις καὶ Ἀβραὰμ ἑώρακας;	'You are not yet fifty years old, and have you seen Abraham'?	
εἶπεν αὐτοῖς Ἰησοῦς·	Jesus said to them,	
ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, πρὶν Ἀβραὰμ γενέσθαι ἐγὼ εἰμί.	'Very truly, I tell you, before Abraham was, I am'.	
		And they will rejoice over me forever...(29:19).
		They will see me joyfully rejoicing with my people (29:20).

Finally, there is a last element connecting John with the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, the theme of messianic 'days', called by the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, 'the last days'.[83] This expression may be parallel to that of John 8:56, 'He saw my day'. Even the expression 'your day' is found in the *Apocalypse of Abraham* 22:4, though not in relation to Abraham or the Messiah: 'Those who are on the left side are all those born before your day and afterwards'.

Following Jean-Daniel Kaestli, John 8:56 does not depend on the text of the *Apocalypse of Abraham*. He only shares a broad and widespread conception based on Genesis 15, that attributes to Abraham a vision of universal history: 'reprend ici une traditione juive qui attribuait à Abraham un expérience visionnaire'.[84] This 'tradition' is attested in a good number of Jewish texts. *4 Ezra* 3:13-15 states that God reveals to Abraham what will be at the end of time: 'and you loved him and to him only you revealed the end of the times, secretly by night'.[85]

[83] *Apoc. Ab.* 24:3 ('everything that will be in the last days'); 29:9 ('In the last days, in this twelfth period of the age of my fulfillment').

[84] 'Abraham, visionnaire apocalyptique', 36.

[85] Translation, B.M. Metzger, 'The Fourth Book of Ezra (Late First Century A.D.)', in *Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments*, vol. 1 of *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, ed. James H. Charlesworth, 2 vols. (New York: Doubleday, 1983), 17-59. See also Orlov, *Heavenly Priesthood in the* Apocalypse of Abraham, 157n10: 'it is

The fact that this happens at night connects this revelation with the account of Genesis 15, in which verses 12 and 17 'situent clairement la scène après le coucher du soleil, dans l'obscurité'.[86] Baruch's *Syriac Apocalypse* claims that on that same occasion, as described in Genesis 15, God showed Abram the heavenly Jerusalem, as he also showed it to Moses on Sinai.[87] *Targum Neofiti* at Genesis 15:11-12, 17 attributes a revelation of God to Abraham on future history. *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* 23:5–6 testifies to an 'apocalyptic' interpretation of Genesis 15. And this is also found in *Genesis Rabbah* and in *Mekilta de-Rabbi Ishmael*.[88] Each text of this vast tradition adds some element to what Abraham saw in the vision of Genesis 15. It would therefore not be necessary to think that the Gospel of John knew the *Apocalypse of Abraham*.

Kaestli has well demonstrated the dependence of the *Apocalypse of Abraham* on the narrative structure of Genesis 15. He also showed that one novelty of that work consists in introducing a heavenly journey to the dwelling of God, which was by no means contained in Genesis 15. This is a novelty in relation to the biblical narrative, because the vision of Genesis 15 'devient ascension jusqu'au trône de Dieu'.[89] Kaestli also shows that the vision of Abraham, obtained thanks to the heavenly journey, is inspired by both the biblical revelation to Moses on Horeb and the vision of Ezekiel 1.

Now it is true that on the basis of Abraham's vision in Genesis 15 many Jewish texts claim that Abraham had knowledge of the future. And it is also true that each of them could attribute to Abraham the knowledge of particular facts, different facts according to the different texts. However, the *Apocalypse of Abraham* is the only text which affirms that Abraham saw a messianic figure and the Messiah's vicissi-

---

possible that the early Christian accounts might also be cognizant of Abraham's visions and revelation of the upcoming events to him. Thus, Louis Ginzberg suggests that some New Testament materials like the Gospel of John 8:56 and Acts 7:7 might also allude to the fact that the future course of Israel's history was revealed to Abraham'. Ginzberg, *Legends of the Jews*, 5.228–29.

[86] Kaestli, 'Abraham, visionnaire apocalyptique', 37.

[87] 'And after these things I showed it to My servant Abraham in the night between the portions of the victims. And again I showed it also to Moses on Mount Sinai when I showed the likeness of the tabernacle and all its vessels'; *2 Bar.* 4:4–7. Translation, A.F.J. Klijn, '2 (Syriac Apocalypse of) Baruch (Early Second Century A.D.)', in *Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments*, 615-52.

[88] *Gen. Rab.* 44:22 (on Gen 15:18); see Kaestli, 'Abraham, visionnaire apocalyptique', 41-42, 49; *Mekilta* on Exod 20:15-19 (*Baḥodesh* 9.22-41).

[89] 'Abraham, visionnaire apocalyptique', 49.

tudes; and it is the only text that speaks of the joy of Abraham. Between the two alternatives—that John used the text of the *Apocalypse of Abraham* or, to the contrary, that he used a 'tradition' that attributed to Abraham the knowledge of eschatological times—we find the first more probable for the arguments we have mentioned above.

In conclusion, among some groups of Jesus' followers the recourse to visions of the divine world, most through a heavenly journey, was considered an essential tool for a correct interpretation of the Bible. The visions led to a better understanding of biblical texts and even to the production of rewritings of the Bible. The purpose of this recourse to visions and its subsequent rewritings of the Bible was to legitimize early conceptions and practices of Jesus followers within the Judaism of their time. For a Jew of the first century the Bible was a text to be read and understood together with all its rewritings. Rewritings are part of the Bible, itself, at least in the sense that they are not separable from it. A correct understanding of the Bible necessarily implies their knowledge.

Bibliography

Arcari, Luca. 'Testi "apocalittici" qumranici all'origine di tradizioni canoniche differenziate: Modalità estatiche all'origine di scritture autorevoli'. *RStB* 23 (2011): 91-144.

____. *Visioni del figlio dell'uomo nel Libro delle Parabole e nell'Apocalisse*. Antico e Nuovo Testamento 19. Brescia: Morcelliana, 2012.

Bernstein, Moshe J. '"Rewritten Bible": A Generic Category Which Has Outlived its Usefulness?'. *Text* 22 (2005): 169-96.

Brown, Raymond E. *Giovanni: Commento al vangelo spirituale*. Edited by Giampaolo Natalini. Translated by Anita Sorsaja. 2 vols. Commenti e studi biblici. Assisi: Cittadella, 1991. Translation of *The Gospel according to John (i-xii)*. AB 29. Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1966.

Charles, R.H., ed. and trans. *The Ascension of Isaiah: Translated from the Ethiopic version, which, together with the new Greek fragment, the Latin versions and the Latin translation of the Slavonic, is here published in full*. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1900.

Charlesworth, James H. and Carol A. Newsom., eds. *Angelic Liturgy: Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*. Vol. 4B of *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*. 8 vols. PTSDSSP. Tubingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck)/Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1999.

Clarke, John R. 'Constructing the Spaces of Epiphany in Ancient Greek and Roman Visual Culture'. Pages 257-79 in *Text, Image, and Christians in the Graeco-Roman World: A Festschrift in Honor of David Lee Balch*. Edited by Aliou Cissé Niang and Carolyn Osiek. Princeton Theological Monograph Series 176. Eugene: Pickwick, 2012.

Destro, Adriana. *The Law of Jealousy: Anthropology of* Sotah. BJS 181. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1989.

Destro, Adriana and Mauro Pesce. 'Continuity or Discontinuity Between Jesus and Groups of his Followers? Practices of Contact with the Supernatural'. Pages 53-70 in *Los comienzos del cristianismo: IV simposio internacional del Grupo Europeo de investigación interdisciplinar sobre los Orígenes del Cristianismo (G.E.R.I.C.O.)*. Edited by Santiago Guijarro-Oporto. Bibliotheca Salmaticensis, Estudios 284. Salamanca: Universidad Pontificia de Salamanca, 2006.

____. 'Die Himmelsreise bei Paulus: Eine "religiöse" Praktik der antiken Welt'. Pages 315-32 in *Alte Texte in neuen Kontexten: Wo steht die sozialwissenschaftliche Bibelexegese?* Edited by Wolfgang Stegemann and Richard E. DeMaris. Stuttgart: Verlag W. Kohlhammer, 2015.

____. 'Il rito ebraico di Kippur: il sangue nel tempio, il peccato nel deserto'. Pages 47-73 in *Interpretazione e Perdono: Atti del Dodicesimo Colloquio sull'interpretazione, Macerata, 18-19 marzo 1991*. Edited by Giuseppe Galli. Pubblicazioni della Facoltà di lettere e filosofia, Università di Macerata 60/Atti di convegni 17. Genova: Marietti, 1992.

____. 'Remembering and Writing: Their Substantial Differences'. Pages 45-78 in *Memory and Memories in Early Christianity: Proceedings of the International Conference Held at the Universities of Geneva and Lausanne (June 2–3, 2016)*. WUNT 398. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018.

____. 'The Cultural Structure of the Infancy Narrative in the Gospel of Matthew'. Pages 94-115 in *Infancy Gospels: Stories and Identities*. Edited by Claire Clivaz, Andreas Dettwiler, Luc Devillers and Enrico Norelli. WUNT 281. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.

____. 'The Heavenly Journey in Paul: Tradition of a Jewish Apocalyptic Literary Genre or Cultural Practice in a Hellenistic-Roman Context'?. Pages 167-200 in *Paul's Jewish Matrix*. Edited by Thomas G. Casey and Justin Taylor. Bible in Dialogue 2, Studies in Judaism and Christianity. Rome: Gregorian and Biblical Press/Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 2011.

Deutsch, Celia. 'Text Work, Ritual and Mystical Experience: Philo's *De Vita Contemplativa*'. Pages 287–311 in *Paradise Now: Essays on Early Jewish and Christian Mysticism*. Edited by April D. DeConick. SBL Symposium Series 11. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006.

____. 'Visions, Mysteries and the Interpretive Task: Text Work and Religious Experience in Philo and Clement'. Pages 83-103 in *Inquiry for Religious Experience in Early Judaism and Christianity*. Vol. 1 of *Experientia*. Edited by Frances Flannery, Colleen Shantz and Rodney Alan Werline. 2 vols. SBL Symposium Series 40/SBL Early Judaism and Its Literature 35. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

Dimant, Devorah and Reinhard G. Kratz, eds. *Rewriting and Interpreting the Hebrew Bible: The Biblical Patriarchs in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. BZAW 439. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2013.

Dodd, C.H. *Secondo le Scritture: Struttura fondamentale della teologia del Nuovo Testamento*. Translated by A. Ornella. Studi Biblici 16. Brescia: Paideia, 1972. Translation of *According to the Scriptures: The Sub-Structure of New Testament Theology*. New York: Scribner, 1953.

Evans, Craig A. 'Obduracy and the Lord's Servant: Some Observations on the Use of the Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel'. Pages 221-36 in *Early Jewish and Christian Exegesis: Studies in Memory of William Hugh Brownlee*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and William F. Stinespring. Homage Series. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1987.

____. *To See and Not Perceive: Isaiah 6.9-10 in Early Jewish and Christian Interpretation*. JSOTSup 64. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1989.

Flannery, Frances, Colleen Shantz and Rodney Alan Werline, eds. *Experientia.* 2 vols. SBL Symposium Series 40/SBL Early Judaism and Its Literature 35. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008-2012.

García-Martínez, Florentino, ed. *Testi di Qumran*. Biblica: Testi e studi 4. Brescia: Paideia, 1996.

Ginzberg, Louis. *Legends of the Jews*. Translated by Henrietta Szold. 7 vols. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1909-1938.

Ginzburg, Carlo. *Paura, reverenza, terrore.* Milano: Adelphi, 2015.

Høgenhaven, Jesper, Jesper Tang Nielsen and Heike Omerzu, eds. *Rewriting and Reception in and of the Bible*. WUNT 396. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018.

Kaestli, Jean-Daniel. 'Abraham, visionnaire apocalyptique: Lectures midrashiques de Genèse 15'. Pages 35-52 in *Abraham: Nouvelle jeunesse d'un ancêtre*. Edited by Thomas C. Römer. Essais bibliques 28. Genève: Labor et Fides, 1997.

Katz, Steven T., ed. *Mysticism and Sacred Scripture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Kennedy, George A. *Invention and Method: Two Rhetorical Treatises from the Hermogenic Corpus*. WGRW 15. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005.

Klijn, A.F.J. '2 (Syriac Apocalypse of) Baruch (Early Second Century A.D.)'. Pages 615-52 in *Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments*. Vol. 1 of *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. 2 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1983.

Kulik, Alexander. *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha: Toward the Original of the* Apocalypse of Abraham. Text-Critical Studies 3. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

Lausberg, Heinrich. *Elementi di retorica*. Itinerari. Bologna: Il Mulino, 2002.

Le Breton, David. *La sociologie du corps*. 9th ed. Que-sais-je? Paris: PUF, 1992.

Lumpkin, Joseph B. *The Books of Enoch: The Angels, The Watchers and the Nephilim (with Extensive Commentary on the Three Books of Enoch, the Fallen Angels, the Calendar of Enoch, and Daniel's Prophecy)*. 2nd ed. Blountsville, AL: Fifth Estate, 2011.

Martone, Corrado. 'Interpretazione delle Scritture e produzione di testi normativi a Qumran'. *RStB* 12 (2000): 149-56.

____. 'Modalità di utilizzazione della Scrittura a Qumran'. *RStB* 19/2 (2007): 33-46.

Metzger, B.M. 'The Fourth Book of Ezra (Late First Century A.D.)'. Pages 517-59 in *Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments*. Vol. 1 of *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. 2 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1983.

Moloney, Francis J. *The Gospel of John*. Edited by Daniel J. Harrington. SP 4. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1998.

Newsom, Carol A. *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition*. HSS 27. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1985.

____. 'Merkabah Exegesis in the Qumran Sabbath Shirot'. *JJS* 38 (1987): 11-30.

Niccoli, Ottavia. 'Immagini e visioni tra Rinascimento e Controriforma: Due esempi'. Pages 219-28 in *Voir l'au-delà. L'expérience visionnaire et sa représentation dans l'art italien de*

la Renaissance. Actes du colloque international (Paris, 3-5 juin 2013). Edited by Andreas Beyer, Phillipe Morel and Alessandro Nova. Études renaissantes 22. Turnout: Brepols, 2017.

____. 'Le due stanze della storia'. *Scienza e politica* 29 (2003): 3-8.

Norelli, Enrico. 'Avant le canonique et l'apocryphe: aux origines des récits de la naissance de Jésus'. *RTP* 126 (1994): 305–24.

____. *Ascensio Isaia: Commentarius*. CC Series Apocryphorum 8. Turnhout: Brepols, 1995.

____. 'Due testimonia attribuiti a Esdr'. *Annali di Storia dell'Esegesi* 1 (1984): 231–82.

____. 'Il dibattito con il giudaismo nel II secolo: Testimonia; Barnaba; Giustino'. Pages 199–233 in *Da Gesù a Origene.* Vol. 1 of *La Bibbia nell'antichità cristiana.* Edited by Enrico Norelli. Collana la Bibbia nella storia 15/1. Bologna: Edizioni Dehoniane, 1993.

____. '*Il Martirio di Isaia* come testimonium antigiudaico'? *Hen* 2 (1980): 37–57.

____. 'Le statut des textes chrétiens de l'oralité à l'écriture et leur rapport avec l'institution au IIe siècle'. Pages 147-94 in *Recueils normatifs et canons dans l'Antiquité: Perspectives nouvelles sur la formation des canons juif et chrétien dans leur contexte culturel. Actes du colloque organisé dans le cadre du programme plurifacultaire 'La Bible à la croisée des savoirs' de l'Université de Genève, 11-12 avril 2002.* Edited by Enrico Norelli. Publications de l'Institut romand des sciences bibliques 3. Prahins: Editions du Zèbre, 2004.

____. 'Scrivere per governare: Modi della comunicazione e rapporti di potere nel cristianesimo antico. Introduzione al convegno'. *Rivista di storia del cristianesimo* 3 (2006): 5-30.

Orlov, Andrei A. *Heavenly Priesthood in the* Apocalypse of Abraham. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

____. *The Atoning Dyad: The Two Goats of Yom Kippur in the* Apocalypse of Abraham. Studia Judaeoslavica 8. Leiden: Brill, 2016.

Perelman, Chaïm and Lucie Olbrechts-Tyteca. *The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation.* Translated by John Wilkinson and Purcell Weaver. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1971. Translation of *Traité de l'argumentation: La nouvelle rhétorique*. 2 vols. Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1958.

Pesce, Mauro. '"Isaia disse queste cose perché vide la sua gloria e parlò di lui" (Gv 12, 41): il Vangelo di Giovanni e l'*Ascensione di Isaia*'. *StPat* 50 (2003): 649-66.

____. 'Presupposti per l'utilizzazione storica dell'*Ascensione di Isaia*. Formazione e tradizione del testo: genere letterario, cosmologia angelica'. Pages 13-76 in *Isaia, il Diletto e la chiesa: Visione ed esegesi profetica cristiano-primitiva nell'*Ascensione di Isaia. *Atti del Convegno di Roma, 9-10 aprile 1981*. Edited by Mauro Pesce. TRSR 20. Brescia: Paideia, 1983.

Pilch, John J. 'Altered States of Consciousness Events in the Synoptics'. Pages 103-15 in *The Social Setting of Jesus and the Gospels*. Edited by Wolfgang Stegemann, Bruce J.Malina and Gerd Theissen. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2002.

____. 'The Transfiguration of Jesus: An Experience of Alternate Reality'. Pages 47-64 in *Modelling Early Christianity: Social-Scientific Studies of the New Testament in its Context*. Edited by Philip F. Esler. London: Routledge, 1994.

____. *Visions and Healing in the Acts of the Apostles: How the Early Believers Experienced God.* Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2004.

____. 'Visions in Revelation and Alternate Consciousness: A Perspective from Cultural Anthropology'. *List* 28 (1993): 31-44.

Robbins, Vernon K., Walter S. Melion and Roy R. Jeal, eds. *The Art of Visual Exegesis: Rhetoric, Texts, Images*. Emory Studies in Early Christianity 19. Atlanta, GA: SBL Press, 2017.

Schäfer, Peter. *The Origins of Jewish Mysticism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009.

Schapiro, Meyer. *Words and Pictures: On the Literal and Symbolic in the Illustration of a Text*. Approaches to Semiotics, Paperback Series 11. The Hague/Paris: Mouton, 1973.

Schuchard, Bruce G. *Scripture within Scripture: The Interrelationship of Form and Function in the Explicit Old Testament Citations in the Gospel of John*. SBLDS 133. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1992.

Segalla, Giuseppe. *Giovanni: Versione, Introduzione, Note*. 7th ed. Nuovissima versione della Bibbia dai testi originali 36. Cinisello Balsamo, Milano: Edizioni Paoline, 1990.

Simoens, Yves. *Secondo Giovanni: Una traduzione e un'interpretazione*. Testi e commenti. Bologna: Edizioni Dehoniane, 1996.

The Reception of the Jewish Scriptures in James

John S. Kloppenborg

The letter of James presents various puzzles, not least of which is James' relation to the scriptures of Israel. Most interpreters are persuaded that the opening address, 'James, a slave of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ to the twelve tribes in the Diaspora', is intended to evoke the brother of Jesus, James of Jerusalem. Most are also persuaded that the letter is a pseudepigraphon. It is doubtful that James of Jerusalem, if he was literate at all, was capable of the level of Greek that is seen in James. The letter is replete with high-register words that belong to epic and lyric vocabularies, and it betrays interest in philosophical psychagogy. This linguistic and conceptual profile is hardly imaginable for a figure who likely had craftsman literacy at best. Moreover, James pretends to be the work of a prominent member of the Jerusalem Jesus group, killed in 62 CE; but curiously the first unambiguous citations of the letter in the Greek East are not until the early third century: Origen, after his move to Caesarea in 231 CE,[1] and the Pseudo-Clementine *Epistula de virginitate*, usually dated to the early third century CE.[2] The first attestation in the West is Hilary of Poitiers in the mid-fourth century.[3] The fact that the letter appears on the scene so late seems scarcely compatible with a composition in the first century, still less that it was the work of the most prominent member of the Jerusalem Jesus group.

It is clear, nonetheless, that the author is steeped in the Jewish scriptures. He is able to provide near verbatim citations at several points (Jas 2:8 = Lev 19:19; Jas 2:11 = Exod 20:13-14 / Deut 5:17-18; Jas 2:23 = Gen 15:6; and Jas 4:6 = Prov 3:34). Commentators frequently note that the letter is replete with allusions to the scrip-

---

[1] *Comm. Jo.* 19.23: ὡς ἐν τῇ φερομένῃ Ἰακώβου ἐπιστολῇ ἀνέγνωμεν ('as we read in the letter of James that is in circulation'). Text: Erwin Preuschen, ed., *Der Johanneskommentar*, vol. 4 of *Origenes Werke*, GCS 2 (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1903).

[2] The *Epistula de virginitate* cites Jas 1:5 (1.11.10); 1:26 (1.3.4); 1:27 (1.12.1); 3:1 (1.11.4); and 3:2 (1.11.4); and it alludes to 2:1 (1.12.8); 2:17-18 (1.2.2); 3:1 (1.11.8); 3:15 (1.11.9); and 4:6 (1.8.3). Nowhere, however, does it identify the source as 'James'.

[3] *De Trinitate* 4.8 (ca. 356 CE). Hippolytus (170-235 CE), in a commentary on the Apocalypse (4:7-8), preserved only in a fifteenth century Arabic manuscript, refers to 'the tribes (that) were dispersed, as the saying of Jude in his first letter to the twelve tribes proves: "which are dispersed in the world"'. See Gottlieb Nathanael Bonwetsch *et al.*, eds., *Hippolytus Werke*, 2nd ed., 4 vols., GCS 36 (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1897-1929), 1.2:231. It is not clear whether Hippolytus has confused Jude with James, but the late date of this manuscript renders any conclusions drawn from it extremely tenuous.

tures and James' examples are drawn from figures of the Hebrew Bible: Abraham, Rahab, Job and Elijah.

1. James' Citations of the Jesus Tradition

One of the striking peculiarities of James is the fact that the letter is peppered with allusions to the Jesus tradition—mostly the sayings that are usually thought to come from Q[4]— but none of these sayings is marked as a saying of Jesus or as a quotation at all. Even more interestingly, the sayings of Jesus that are present are not cited verbatim but are heavily paraphrased and adapted to the argumentative texture in which James uses them. This, in fact, finds an explanation if the author of James, surely not a semi-literate Galilean artisan, but rather a writer with at least modest literary pretensions, employed the rhetorical practice of *aemulatio*—the technique of rhetorical paraphrase, whereby an author evoked a predecessor text but intentionally paraphrased and recast it in a way appropriate to his or her intended audience. *Aemulatio* (in Greek, ζῆλος), was widely practiced in rhetoric and literary composition, and depended on the orator or writer knowing that the audience would both recognize the allusion to the predecessor text and would then appreciate the artistry involved in redeploying that text in a new context.[5] As Quintilian says, the duty of *aemulatio* is to 'rival and vie (*aemulatio*) with the original in the expression of the same thoughts'.[6]

Regarding James' allusions to the Jesus tradition, there is general agreement that James 1:5 evokes and paraphrases Q 11:9-13—εἰ δέ τις λείπεται σοφίας, αἰτείτω παρὰ τοῦ διδόντος θεοῦ πᾶσιν ἁπλῶς καὶ μὴ ὀνειδίζοντος καὶ δοθήσεται αὐτῷ ('if anyone lacks wisdom, let them ask from the God who gives to all, simply and without reproach, and it will be given to them'). But the paraphrase takes up Q's 'ask/give' pair, ignoring the 'seek/find' and 'knock/open' binaries. Moreover, James' paraphrase elaborates the character of God, especially as one who 'gives', taking up and condensing Q's homely illustrations of what earthly fathers are inclined to do[7] into the single

[4] For varying assessments of the number of allusions to the Jesus tradition, see Dean B. Deppe, 'The Sayings of Jesus in the Epistle of James' (ThD diss., Free University of Amsterdam, 1989); Patrick J. Hartin, *James and the 'Q' Sayings of Jesus*, JSNTSup 47 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991).

[5] See John S. Kloppenborg, 'The Reception of the Jesus Tradition in James', in *The Catholic Epistles and the Tradition*, ed. Jacques Schlosser, BETL 176 (Leuven: Peeters, 2004), 93-139. For explorations of the use of literary imitation more widely, see Dennis R. MacDonald, ed., *Mimesis and Intertextuality in Antiquity and Christianity*, SAC (Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 2001).

[6] *Inst*. 10.5.5: Neque ego paraphrasin esse interpretationem tantum volo, sed circa eosdem sensus certamen atque aemulationem (Butler, LCL).

[7] Q 11:11–13.

notion that God gives gifts ἁπλῶς and without reproach. Second, the elaboration that follows in James 1:6-8 turns its attention to the problem of the interior conditions that attend 'asking', insisting that just as God gives gifts 'singly' (ἁπλῶς), the one who asks cannot be 'double-souled' (δίψυχος) and expect to receive anything. The principal good to be sought, moreover, is wisdom (σοφία), rather than some lesser good. In other words, James takes up Q's rather extraordinary and unqualified assurance, αἰτεῖτε καὶ δοθήσεται, and paraphrases it in order to explain *what* is to be sought, and *how* it is to be sought. At chapter 4:3 James returns to the aphorism, now explaining αἰτεῖτε καὶ οὐ λαμβάνετε, διότι κακῶς αἰτεῖσθε, ἵνα ἐν ταῖς ἡδοναῖς ὑμῶν δαπανήσητε. This effectively reverses the assurance when the conditions of the petitioner are not conducive to its fulfillment. These kinds of paraphrases betray an interest on the part of the author of James in Stoic psychagogy and other popular philosophical reflections on the cultivation of a self such that is not subject to the passions and pleasures, but is on the contrary singly oriented to τὸ καλόν.[8]

2. James' Citation of the Jewish Scriptures

If James routinely engages in paraphrase (or *aemulatio*) of the Jesus tradition, we might also expect him to do the same with other knowledge sources, in particular the Jewish scriptures. That is, he may offer verbatim citations when there is a particular argumentative need to cite exactly,[9] but otherwise his tendency is to engage in rhetorical *paraphrasis*. In what follows I will examine a single allusion to a text of the Jewish scriptures, showing how James paraphrases it, retaining enough of the original quotation to alert the reader to the predecessor text, but adapting that text to his own purposes—which is precisely the goal of *aemulatio*.

At James 3:7 James enumerates all living creatures in the context of his discourse on the tongue.[10] The overall discourse draws on several classical psychagogic metaphors of the control of the self and the dangers of the speech: the equestrian image of 'bridling' (χαλιναγωγέω) the passions,[11] the nautical metaphor of the

---

[8] This is further illustrated in John S. Kloppenborg, 'James 1:2-15 and Hellenistic Psychagogy', *NovT* 52 (2010): 37-71.

[9] This point is developed elsewhere in John S. Kloppenborg, 'Verbatim Citations in James', in *'To Recover What Has Been Lost': Essays on Eschatology, Intertextuality, and Reception History in Honor of Dale C. Allison Jr.*, ed. Tucker Ferda, Daniel Frayer-Griggs and Nathaniel C. Johnson, NovTSup 183 (Leiden: Brill, 2021), 254-69.

[10] Jas 3:1-12.

[11] Philo often uses the cognates χαλινός (1988×), χαλινόω (7×), ἀχαλινός (14×), ἐγχαλινόω (5×) and ἀχαλίνωτος (8×) as a metaphor for the control of the passions and desires, the tongue and anger—in a way that is comparable to James' use of these equestrian metaphors; see *Agr.* 69, 70 (cf. 73); *Mut.* 240 (on bridling the tongue as a way to control speaking falsely, swearing falsely, deceiving, practicing sophistry,

pilot or the rudder controlling the entire ship by the application of small quantities of force,[12] and the tongue as a dangerous and fiery instrument.[13] The peroration of the discourse underscores the dual character of speech, and how it is used for both beneficial and destructive ends.[14] In this context James contrasts the ease with which animals are tamed with the impossibility of taming the tongue:

> πᾶσα γὰρ φύσις θηρίων τε καὶ πετεινῶν ἑρπετῶν τε καὶ ἐναλίων δαμάζεται καὶ δεδάμασται τῇ φύσει τῇ ἀνθρωπίνῃ· τὴν δὲ γλῶσσαν οὐδεὶς δαμάσαι δύναται ἀνθρώπων· ἀκατάστατον κακόν, μεστὴ ἰοῦ θανατηφόρου.[15]
>
> For every species of beast and bird, reptile and sea-creature is tamed and has been tamed by the human species; but no one is able to tame the tongue of humans; it is a disorderly evil, full of death-dealing poison.

Dale Allison is no doubt right that James 3:7 evokes Genesis 1:26 and its division of the animal kingdom into four groups. The allusion to Genesis is inescapable not only because James 3:7 concerns the domination of animals—James prefers the verb δαμάζειν to Genesis' ἀρχέτωσαν—but also because in v. 9 James refers to 'those who are in the likeness of God' (τοὺς καθ' ὁμοίωσιν θεοῦ γεγονότας), recalling Genesis 1:26a, ποιήσωμεν ἄνθρωπον κατ' εἰκόνα ἡμετέραν καὶ καθ' ὁμοίωσιν.[16]

---

giving false information); *Spec.* 1.235; 4.79; *Det.* 53; 44 (on people with an unbridled tongue [ἀχαλίνῳ γλώττῃ] displaying folly); *Deo* 47 (contrasting animals which have yokes and bridles to control them with humans who are self-controlled); *Leg.* 3.155; *Praem.* 154; and many examples of the 'unbridled tongue/mouth': *Her.* 110; *Abr.* 29, 191; *Spec.* 1.53, 241; *Det.* 174; *Somn.* 2.132; *Ios.* 246; *Mos.* 2.198; *Legat.* 163.

[12] Jas 3:3. Philo uses the metaphor of the rudder (πηδάλιον) or pilot (κυβερνήτης) for the wise person's control of the passions, anger and the rational direction of the body, comparable to James' argument that control of the tongue is a kind of rudder on the entire self; see *Leg.* 2.104; 3.80, 118, 223–224; *Sacr.* 45, 51; *Det.* 141; *Agr.* 69; *Conf.* 22; *Migr.* 67; *Somn.* 2.201; *Abr.* 272. See also Plutarch, *Garr.* 507A-B.

[13] 'Just as it is an easy matter to check a flame which is being kindled in hare's fur or candle wicks or rubbish, but if it ever takes hold of solid bodies having depth, it quickly destroys and consumes "with youthful vigour lofty craftsmen's work"'; Plutarch. *Cohib. ira* 454E (Helmbold, LCL). See also Stefan Radt, ed., *Aeschylus*, vol. 3 of *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, ed. Bruno Snell, 5 vols. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1985), 422, no. 357; and Diogenes of Oenoanda, frag. 38 in C.W. Chilton, ed. and trans., *Diogenes of Oenoanda: The Fragments* (London: Oxford University Press, 1971), 17.

[14] Compare Plutarch, *Garr.* 506C: 'Pittacus did not do badly when the king of Egypt sent him a sacrificial animal and asked him to cut out the best and the worst meat, when he cut out and sent him the tongue, as being the instrument of both the greatest good and the greatest evil (ὄργανον μὲν ἀγαθῶν ὄργανον δὲ κακῶν τῶν μεγίστων)' (Helmbold, LCL).

[15] Jas 3:7-8.

[16] Dale C. Allison, 'The Audience of James and the Sayings of Jesus', in *James, 1 & 2 Peter, and Early Jesus Traditions*, ed. Alicia Batten and John S. Kloppenborg, LNTS 478 (London and New York: Bloomsbury

Allison observes, however, that the naming of the divisions and their sequence in James does not correspond to any of the divisions of the animal kingdom attested in the biblical and parabiblical literature:[17]

James 3:7	θηρίων	πετεινῶν	ἑρπετῶν	ἐναλίων
Genesis 1:26	ἰχθυῶν	πετεινῶν	κτηνῶν	ἑρπετῶν
Genesis 1:28	ἰχθυῶν	πετεινῶν	κτηνῶν	ἑρπετῶν
Genesis 7:14	θηρία	κτήνη	ἑρπετόν	πετεινόν
Genesis 7:21	πετεινῶν	κτηνῶν	θηρίων	ἑρπετόν
Genesis 8:1	θηρίων	κτηνῶν	πετεινῶν	ἑρπετῶν
Genesis 8:19	θηρία	κτήνη	πετεινόν	ἑρπετόν
Genesis 9:2	θηρίοις	ὄρνεα	κινούμενα	ἰχθύας
Deuteronomy 4:17–18	κτήνους	ὀρνέου	ἑρπετοῦ	ἰχθύος
3 Kingdoms 5:13	κτηνῶν	πετεινῶν	ἑρπετῶν	ἰχθύων
Psalm 148:10	θηρία	κτήνη	ἑρπετά	πετεινά
Ezekiel 38:20	ἰχθύες	πετεινά	θηρία	ἑρπετά
Hosea 4:3	θηρίοις	ἑρπετοῖς	πετεινοῖς	ἰχθύες
1 Enoch 7:5	πετεινοῖς	θηρίοις	ἑρπετοῖς	ἰχθύσιν
Acts 10:12 *varia lectio*	τετράποδα	θηρία	ἑρπετά	πετεινά
Acts 11:6	ἰχθυῶν	πετεινῶν	κτηνῶν	ἑρπετῶν
Gk *LAE* 29.11	θηρία	πετεινά	ἑρπετὰ	ἐν τῇ γῇ καὶ θαλάσσῃ

Other divisions of the animal kingdom are also attested, some using a triadic division: Genesis 1:30; Hosea 2:14, 20; and Theophilus, *Ad Autolycum* 2.11 all have τὰ θηρία – πετεινὰ – ἑρπετά.[18]

What is noteworthy is that in none of these lists does ἐνάλιος occur. Nor does it appear in other Christian literature before Theophilus of Antioch[19] in the later part of the second century CE and then much later, in Epiphanius.[20] One wonders why James had not been satisfied with ἑρπετῶν τε καὶ ἰχθυῶν or ἑρπετῶν τε καὶ

T&T Clark, 2014), 59; idem, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle of James*, ICC (New York and London: Bloomsbury, 2013), 542-43.

[17] This table is adapted from Allison, 'The Audience of James and the Sayings of Jesus', 60.

[18] *Autol.* 1.10 also lists five types of animals worshipped by Egyptians: ἑρπετῶν τε καὶ κτηνῶν καὶ θηρίων καὶ πετεινῶν καὶ ἐνύδρων νηκτῶν ('serpents, sea monsters, beasts, birds and swimming things'). Text: Theophilus of Antioch, *Ad Autolycum*, ed. and trans. Robert M. Grant, OECT (Oxford: Clarendon, 1970).

[19] At *Autol.* 1.6 Theophilus uses a four-fold classification (τετραπόδων – πετεινῶν – ἑρπετῶν – νηκτῶν), but then subdivides water-creatures into river and sea creatures (ἐνύδρων τε καὶ ἐναλίων).

[20] Epiphanius, *Pan.* 3.26: οὕτω καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ζῴων καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν πετεινῶν, οὕτω καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν κτηνῶν καὶ ἑρπετῶν καὶ ἐναλίων....; also *Pan.* 2.162; 3.74. Text: Karl Holl, Marc Bergermann and Christian-Friedrich Collatz, eds., *Epiphanius*, 2nd ed., 2 vols. (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2013).

τῶν πελαγίων or ἑρπετῶν τε καὶ τῶν ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ, any of which would have conveyed the sense of maritime creatures and have done so with ordinary vocabulary.

While the term ἐνάλιος is not attested in any of the other allusions to Genesis 1:26, it does have a distinguished literary profile. It appears in the *Odyssey* only three times,[21] but seven times in Pindar to describe maritime gods and monsters, sea-faring ships, coastal cities,[22] and especially in Euripides (19×), Sophocles (5×) and Callimachus' Hymn 4 *to Delos* (3×). Of the eighty occurrences of forms of ἐνάλιος prior to James, the majority are in poetic and dramatic works. The term appears with special frequency in relation to Poseidon and other δαίμονες ἐνάλιοι.[23]

James' treatment of Genesis 1:26 is an example of *aemulatio:* it is not a citation but a rewriting of the text that makes both vocabularic and stylistic adjustments; the allusion is typically not marked as to its ultimate source, although the audience is expected to perceive the predecessor text. The style and lection of the paraphrase are geared to the audience that is being addressed.

An instance of this kind of emulation is found in Dio Chrysostom's first discourse on kingship. In the course of enumerating the characteristics of a good ruler, including the ruler's ability to control anger, pain, fear, pleasure and desire, and to attend both to himself and his subjects, Dio says of the ruler,

> ἀλλ' οἷον οὐδὲ καθεύδειν αὑτὸν ἀξιοῦν δι' ὅλης τῆς νυκτός, ὡς οὐκ οὖσαν αὐτῷ σχολὴν ῥᾳθυμεῖν.
>
> but he ought to be just the sort of person who would suppose that he should not sleep the entire night, for he has no leisure to be lazy.[24]

Although Dio mentions Homer in the immediate context,[25] he does not indicate that this statement is in fact a paraphrase of *Iliad* 2.2.24, 61, οὐ χρὴ παννύχιον εὕδειν βουληφόρον ἄνδρα ('A man who is a counselor should not sleep throughout the night'). Dio's paraphrase substitutes better Attic equivalents for two of Homer's uncommon words,[26] and then elaborates on the reason for not sleeping the

---

[21] *Od.* 4.443; 5.67; 15.479.

[22] Pindar, *Pyth.* 2.79; 4.27; 4.39; 4.204; 11.40; 12.12; *Ol.* 9.99.

[23] For Poseidon, Pindar, *Pyth.* 4.204; Sophocles, *Oed. col.* 888; *Sib. Or.* 5.157; Philo *Decal.* 54; Aristonicus, *De signis Iliadis* on *Il.* 1.404. For maritime gods and monsters, Pindar, *Pyth.* 12.12; Euripides, *Iph. aul.* 976; Philo, *Decal.* 54; Oppianus, *Halieutica* 5.421; Lucian, *Ver. hist.* 1.33; Claudius Aelianus, *Nat. an.* 9.35.

[24] Dio Chrysostom, *1 Regn.* 1.13 (Cohoon, LCL).

[25] Dio Chrysostom, *1 Regn.* 1.12, 14.

[26] The Homeric βουληφόρος and παννύχιον were evidently not common in the first and following centuries; they appear, respectively, in Apollonius Sophista's *Lex. hom.* 52.30 (I CE) and Julius Pollux's *Onom.* 1.64 (II CE).

entire night. So extensive is the paraphrase that not a single lexeme of the original remains. Nevertheless, the audience would immediately see Homer standing in the background, especially since this Homeric verse was widely quoted elsewhere in the first and second centuries CE in a *chreia* concerning Alexander the Great and Diogenes of Sinope.[27]

James' paraphrase of Genesis 1:26 likewise departs from its predecessor text in a variety of ways: the paratactic construction of Genesis 1:26 is avoided in favor of parallel τε καί constructions. This is not only better Greek, but also identifies within Genesis' unorganized division of animals two pairs of closely related animals, beasts and birds, on the one hand, and reptiles and maritime creatures on the other.[28] The substitutions of θηρία for κτήνη (usually used to refer to *domestic* animals) and ἐνάλιοι for ἰχθύες are probably an effort to make the description more comprehensive of all terrestrial and aquatic life. This division could be seen as a proto-scientific impetus towards classification.

James' paraphrase of Genesis 1:26 is also unmarked. That is, unlike the citation of Leviticus 19:18 and the Ten Words in James 2, marked by κατὰ τὴν γραφήν or ὁ γὰρ εἰπών, James 3:7 simply assumes that the reader or auditor will perceive the allusion to Genesis 1:26. As I have noted above, the role of *aemulatio*, as Quintilian says, is to 'rival and vie with the original'[29] for beauty and appropriateness, and James does this both by his stylistic reformulation and by his gestures in the direction of nuancing the classificatory system of Genesis.

The transformations that James effects on Genesis 1:26 provide some insight into the nature of his intended or ideal reader. First, James assumes that the reader of his letter will recognize the ultimate source of his enumeration of living creatures. This is in accord with other indications in James: his introduction to the prohibitions of adultery and murder, with the simple phrase ὁ γὰρ εἰπών (2:11), presumes that the reader will know that the 'speaker' here is God and that the source is the Decalogue in Deuteronomy 5. Likewise, the writer assumes that his readers know the salient details of the story of the sacrifice of Isaac (2:21) and how Rahab was justified in her dealings with the 'messengers' (2:25). He assumes that they know about the patience of Job (5:11) and Elijah's prayer that stopped the rain (5:17).

---

[27] See Epictetus *Diatr.* 3.22.90; Aelius Theon, *Progymnasmata* (Leonard von Spengel, ed., *Rhetores graeci*, 3 vols., BSGRT [Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1853-56], 2.98). The verse is also quoted in Cornutus, *Nat. d.* 37.9 and in Hermogenes, *Progymnasmata* (Hugo Rabe, ed., *Hermogenis Opera*, Rhetores graeci 6 [Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1913], 10).

[28] τε καί is used infrequently in translations of the Hebrew Bible: only 6x in the LXX Pentateuch; but 8x in 1 Esdras, 3x in the more idiomatic LXX rendering of Esther. It is used 12× in 1–4 Maccabees; once in Matthew; but 32× in Luke-Acts; 8× in Paul; and 10× in Hebrews.

[29] *Inst.* 10.5.5 (see above, n6).

Second, James accommodates the syntax of his version of Genesis 1:26 to a higher level of Koinē, while his more extensive coverage of the animal kingdoms appeals, presumably, to sophisticated and analytic propensities in his audience. But in order to render his prose even more elevated in its cultural register, he includes a poetic word, ἐνάλιος, from the classical past, rather than avoiding poetic terms as Dio did. James' usage of a word drawn from epic and lyric vocabulary, along with the various rare philosophical words he uses elsewhere, is designed to lend to his prose the impression of erudition, apt, of course, in a small discourse that is focused on the qualities of good teachers.[30]

Another vocabularic item in this discourse has resonances with Homeric vocabulary. The same sentence that we have been discussing, James 3:7, and the next, James 3:8, contain the verb δαμάζειν, used both in the present and the perfect:

> πᾶσα γὰρ φύσις θηρίων τε καὶ πετεινῶν ἑρπετῶν τε καὶ ἐναλίων δαμάζεται καὶ δεδάμασται τῇ φύσει τῇ ἀνθρωπίνῃ· τὴν δὲ γλῶσσαν οὐδεὶς δαμάσαι δύναται ἀνθρώπων· ἀκατάστατον κακόν, μεστὴ ἰοῦ θανατηφόρου
>
> For every species of beast and bird, reptile and sea-creature is tamed and has been tamed by the human species; but no one is able to tame the tongue of humans; it is a disorderly evil, full of death-dealing poison.

The *aemulatio* of Genesis 1:26 continues in the notion of the 'training' or domination of animals by humans. Genesis 1:26 uses the cohortative ἀρχέτωσαν, 'and let them (humans) rule'. Genesis 1:28 reiterates the statement in Genesis 1:26 by adding κατακυριεύσατε ('dominate') in relation to the earth and ἄρχετε ('rule') in relation to animals. These are unexceptional choices: Aristotle uses ἄρχω both in its active and passive senses to describe the practice of rule:

> τὸ γὰρ ἄρχειν καὶ ἄρχεσθαι οὐ μόνον τῶν ἀναγκαίων ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν συμφερόντων ἐστί… καὶ εἴδη πολλὰ καὶ ἀρχόντων καὶ ἀρχομένων ἔστιν καὶ ἀεὶ βελτίων ἡ ἀρχὴ ἡ τῶν βελτιόνων ἀρχομένων, οἷον ἀνθρώπου ἢ θηρίου….
>
> Authority and subordination are conditions not only inevitable but also expedient… And there are many varieties both of rulers and of subjects and the higher the type of the subjects, the loftier is the nature of the authority exercised over them, for example to control a human being is a higher thing than to tame a wild beast.[31]

The other common verbs for 'to tame' are ἡμερεῖν, attested in the Wisdom of Solomon 16:18 meaning 'to restrain [a flame]' (ἡμεροῦτο φλόξ), its adjective, ἥμερος,[32]

---

[30] Jas 3:1-2.

[31] *Pol.* 1.2.8 (1254a.22-27) (Rackham, LCL).

[32] 4 Macc 2:14; 14:15. The verb is used in Plato, *Resp.* 493β, and the noun in Plato, *Soph.* 222b; Aristotle, *Hist. an.* 488a29.

and ὀχμάζειν, 'to grip', but used of horses to mean 'to make horses obedient to the bit'.[33]

James' use of this verb is striking because of the 552 occurrences of it before the second century CE: almost one-third (178) are in Homer (mostly the *Iliad*), and if one includes the Homeric Hymns (3×), Hesiod (22×), Theognis (6×), Pindar (16×), Aeschylus (18×), Euripides (17×), Sophocles (4×) and the Homeric citations in Aristonicus's *De signis Odysseae*, *De signis Iliadis*, as well as Apollonius' *Lexicon Homericum*, the percentage of occurrences of the verb in pre-fourth century literature rises to over 60%. Thus, although the verb is not restricted to epic, lyric and tragic vocabularies, it is strongly identified with poetry of the fifth century BCE and earlier. The verb often means 'to overpower', 'to subdue' and even 'to kill', but it is used of taming animals at *Iliad* 23.665 and *Odyssey* 4.637, and later in Xenophon,[34] Diodorus Siculus,[35] Philo[36] and the *Testament of Abraham*.[37]

As with James' paraphrase of Genesis' list of animals and his use of ἐνάλιος, the paraphrase of ἄρχω with δαμάζειν is an instance of an *aemulatio* of the predecessor text. But while *aemulationes* often involved invoking a Homeric text and substituting more common Attic or Koine words for Homeric vocabulary, as Dio Chrysostom had done in the case of *Iliad* 2.2.24 (see above), James invokes a text from Genesis and substitutes vocabulary whose resonances are with Homer and classical poets. We must ask, why does James do this?

Homer used the verb δαμάζω in its literal sense to describe broken (tamed) and unbroken mules:

> ἡμίονον ταλαεργὸν ἄγων κατέδης' ἐν ἀγῶνι
> ἑξέτε' ἀδμήτην, ἥ τ' ἀλγίστη δαμάσασθαι·
>
> A sturdy mule he brought and tethered in the place of assembly,
> an unbroken mule of six years, which is hardest of all to break.[38]

And

> Ἀντίνο', ἦ ῥά τι ἴδμεν ἐνὶ φρεσίν, ἦε καὶ οὐκί,
> ὁππότε Τηλέμαχος νεῖτ' ἐκ Πύλου ἠμαθόεντος;

---

[33] Euripides, *El.* 817; Sophocles, *Ant.* 351.

[34] *Mem.* 4.1.3; 4.3.10.

[35] *Bibliotheca historica* 5.69.4.

[36] *Congr.* 159; *Leg.* 2.104.

[37] Version A 2.29, δύο ἵππους εὐμενεῖς καὶ ἡμέρους δεδαμασμένους. Text: Michael E. Stone, trans., *The Testament of Abraham: The Greek Recensions*, SBLTT, Pseudepigrapha Series 2 (New York: Society of Biblical Literature, 1972).

[38] *Il.* 23.654–655 (Murray, LCL).

νῆά μοι οἴχετ’ ἄγων· ἐμὲ δὲ χρεὼ γίγνεται αὐτῆς
Ἤλιδ’ ἐς εὐρύχορον διαβήμεναι, ἔνθα μοι ἵπποι
δώδεκα θήλειαι, ὑπὸ δ’ ἡμίονοι ταλαεργοὶ
ἀδμῆτες· τῶν κέν τιν’ ἐλασσάμενος δαμασαίμην.

Antinous, know we at all in our hearts, or do we not, when Telemachus will return from sandy Pylos? He is gone, taking a ship of mine, and I have need of her to cross over to spacious Elis, where I have twelve brood mares, and at the teat sturdy mules as yet unbroken. Of these I mean to drive one off and break him in.[39]

Homeric usage of δαμάζω, however, became the occasion for psychagogic discourse, in particular about the control of the self. In Book 4 of the *Odyssey*, the bard describes Odysseus:

πάντα μὲν οὐκ ἂν ἐγὼ μυθήσομαι οὐδ’ ὀνομήνω,
ὅσσοι Ὀδυσσῆος ταλασίφρονός εἰσιν ἄεθλοι·
ἀλλ᾽ οἷον τοδ’ ἔρεξε καὶ ἔτλη καρτερὸς ἀνὴρ
δήμῳ ἔνι Τρώων, ὅθι πάσχετε πήματ’ Ἀχαιοί.
αὐτόν μιν πληγῇσιν ἀεικελίῃσι δαμάσσας,
σπεῖρα κάκ’ ἀμφ’ ὤμοισι βαλών, οἰκῆι ἐοικώς,
ἀνδρῶν δυσμενέων κατέδυ πόλιν εὐρυάγυιαν·
ἄλλῳ δ᾽ αὐτὸν φωτὶ κατακρύπτων ἤισκε,
δέκτῃ, ὃς οὐδὲν τοῖος ἔην ἐπὶ νηυσὶν Ἀχαιῶν.
τῷ ἴκελος κατέδυ Τρώων πόλιν, οἱ δ᾽ ἀβάκησαν πάντες·

All the labors of steadfast Odysseus I cannot tell or recount;
but what a thing was this which that mighty man wrought
and endured in the land of the Trojans, where you Achaeans suffered woes!
Marring his own body with cruel blows (αὐτόν μιν πληγῇσιν ἀεικελίῃσι δαμάσσας),
and flinging a wretched garment about his shoulders,
in the fashion of a slave he entered the broad-wayed city of the foe,
and he hid himself under the likeness of another, a beggar,
he who was not at all such at the ships of the Achaeans.
In this likeness he entered the city of the Trojans,
and all of them were deceived.[40]

Odysseus’ ‘marring’ or ‘taming’ (δαμάζειν) himself and the practice of taming animals came to serve as a metaphor of the taming of the self, both controlling anger and controlling the tongue. In *Tarsica prior* Dio Chrysostom attacks the people of Tarsus for their interest in what philosophy has to offer, but their unwillingness to receive the harsh correction of philosophy. He contrasts speakers who simply flatter and praise their audiences with the one who rebukes and upbraids his hearers, revealing their

[39] *Od.* 4.632–637 (Murray, LCL).

[40] *Od.* 4.240–250 (Murray, LCL).

sins by his words. He invokes Odysseus entering Troy as an example, but reconfigures Odysseus not as one who destroys, but as one who has tamed his body in order that 'he may unobtrusively do them some good' by harsh and stubborn words.[41]

The taming of animals came to be a standard psychagogic metaphor for the control of the self. Philo, in *Legum allegoriae*, invokes the example of the training of horses in order to make them more compliant as a metaphor for the 'taming' of the passions (δαμάζων τὰ πάθη) so that the rider is not drowned in the sea – the sea serving as a metaphor for the unruly and unstable self.[42] Plutarch compares the taming of horses and oxen to eliminate their 'rebellious kicking and plunging' (τὰ πηδήματα καὶ τοὺς ἀφηνιασμούς) with the 'taming of the passions' (τοῖς πάθεσι δεδαμασμένοις) by Reason.[43] As a Platonist, Plutarch did not think that Reason could or should extirpate the passions, but it makes the passions, once tamed, the servant (τὸ ὑπηρετικόν) of Reason.

The control of the self for Plutarch is also a way to control anger, with which James is also concerned.[44] For Plutarch, of all the passions anger especially must be tamed and trained (δαμάζοντος καὶ καταθλοῦντος) since without such taming, the power of anger can easily destroy the subject.[45]

In the second century Maximus of Tyre repeatedly cited *Odyssey* 4.242 in order to illustrate the self-discipline used by Diogenes of Sinope:

> ἀλλ' οὐδ' ἑαυτοῦ ἀπείχετο, ἀλλ' ἐκόλαζεν καὶ παρεῖχεν ἑαυτῷ πράγματα,
> αὐτόν μιν πληγῇσιν ἀεικελίῃσι δαμάσσας,
> σπεῖρα κάκ' ἀμφ' ὤμοισι βαλών.
>
> Ἐῶ λέγειν ὅτι ὁ μὲν ἀγαθὸς ἀνὴρ πράττων καὶ μὴ ἐπαναχωρῶν μηδὲ ἐξιστάμενος τοῖς μοχθηροῖς ἑαυτὸν ἂν σώζοι καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ἐπὶ τὸ βέλτιστον τρέποι·
>
> Nor did he spare himself but punished (his body) and subjected it to many things, 'he tamed himself by ignominious blows (αὐτόν μιν πληγῇσιν ἀεικελίῃσι δαμάσσας) and throws rags over his shoulders carelessly'. I omit to mention that a good man when he engages in active pursuits without drawing back or yielding to the depraved, will both preserve himself and turn others to a better life.[46]

---

[41] *1 Tars.* 33.15.4.

[42] *Leg.* 2.104.

[43] *Virt. mor.* 451D.

[44] Jas 1:19-20; 3:9.

[45] *Cohib. ira* 459B. See the Homeric notion of 'taming anger' in *Od.* 560-64: 'Yet no other is to blame but Zeus, who bore terrible hatred against the host of Danaan spearmen and brought on you your doom. Yes, come here, prince, that you might hear my word and my speech; and *tame your anger* (δάμασον δὲ μένος καὶ ἀγήνορα θυμόν) and your proud spirit' (Murray, LCL).

[46] *Dissertatio* 15.9.19–10.3. Text: Michael B. Trapp, ed., *Maximus Tyrius Dissertationes*, BSGRT (Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1994), my translation.

And

> κάλει μοι καὶ τὸν ἐκ τοῦ Πόντου ἀθλητήν· ἀγωνιζέσθω καὶ οὗτος ἀγῶνα ἰσχυρὸν πρὸς ἀνταγωνιστὰς πικρούς, πενίαν καὶ ἀδοξίαν καὶ λιμὸν καὶ κρύος· ἐγὼ δὲ αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰ γυμνάσια ἐπαινῶ·
>
> αὐτόν μιν πληγῆσιν ἀεικελίῃσι δαμάσσας,
> σπεῖρα κακ' ἀμφ' ὤμοισι βαλών,
>
> οὐ χαλεπῶς διὰ τοῦτο ἐκράτει. τοιγαροῦν στεφανῶ τοὺς ἄνδρας καὶ ἀνακηρύττω νικηφόρους τῆς ἀρετῆς·
>
> I must also mention that champion from Pontus [Diogenes]. Let him engage in a strenuous contest against bitter antagonists, poverty and infamy, hunger and cold. I praise his exercises:
>
> He tames himself with ignominious blows
> and throws rags over his shoulders carelessly.
>
> He did not easily on that account triumph. Therefore, I crown the men and proclaim them as conquerors in the cause of virtue.[47]

The Homeric verb δαμάζειν and Homer's story of Odysseus 'taming' himself achieved widespread currency as a metaphor for the philosophical discipline of control of the self. Thus James' paraphrase of Genesis 1:26 with δαμάζειν in place of ἄρχειν exploits the semantic range of the δαμάζειν, which in the first part of James 3:7, πᾶσα γὰρ φύσις ... δαμάζεται καὶ δεδάμασται τῇ φύσει τῇ ἀνθρωπίνῃ,[48] has the connotation of 'to subdue or dominate', while in the second part, τὴν δὲ γλῶσσαν οὐδεὶς δαμάσαι, evokes the psychagogic model of Odysseus as one who 'tamed' himself through self-discipline. The semantic range of the Homeric verb was the ideal tool for the purpose, and at the same time lifted the linguistic register of James 3:7 into the range of learned and cultured discourse.

3. Conclusion

What does James' use of language indicate about the author and the actual audience to whom the letter is addressed? James' habits of citation are similar to those of classical authors. Except where there is a rhetorical or argumentative need to

---

[47] *Dissertatio* 34.9.13 (my translation).

[48] Joseph Mayor notes that James' use of the present passive and perfect (δαμάζεται καὶ δεδάμασται) is also attested in Juvenal *Sat*. 3.190 *quis timet aut timuit gelida Praeneste ruinam aut positis nemorosa inter iuga Volsiniis aut simplicibus Gabiis aut proni Tiburis arce?* ('Who at cool Praenest or at Volsinii amid its leafy hills was ever afraid of his house tumbling down'?) and 8.70 *qos illis damus ac dedimus quibus omnia debes* ('in addition to those honours which we pay, and have paid, to those to whom we owe your all'); *The Epistle of St. James: The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes and Comments*, 3rd ed. (London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd, 1910), 119-20.

cite a text verbatim, the author of James adopts the erudite rhetorical practice of *aemulatio*. The suite of concerns that are evident in the document, which include the pursuit of wisdom as the highest good, the suppression of desire (ἐπιθυμία) and control of the tongue, the avoidance of both *hybris* and rivalry, the fundamental unity of the Law[49] and the indivisibility of πίστις and ἔργα, point to an author interested in the control of the self and the production of moral subjects. The Judaean texture of the letter, with its appeals to *exempla* drawn from the Hebrew Bible, suggests a location in the same general orbit as that of Philo, *Pseudo-Phocylides* and the Wisdom of Solomon.

James' appeals to philosophical and epic/lyric vocabulary should not be thought of as forced or artificial, but instead reflect a linguistic register common to psychagogic discourses that drew their *exempla* from the heroes of the past and turned them into models who exemplified the virtues of prudence, justice, self-restraint, courage and piety.

To suggest that the linguistic register of James is related to that of Hellenistic psychagogy is not to suggest that this is the only linguistic register in which its author functioned. Speakers (and audiences) typically function in multiple registers, depending on the kinds of activities in which they are engaged, whether it is marketplace transactions, or dinner repartee, or child rearing, or sports or other activities, each with its own register. The choice of a register is likely largely unconscious. '*All* language functions in contexts of situation, and is relatable to those contexts', says Michael Halliday.[50]

> We do not, in fact, first decide what we want to say, independently of setting, and then dress it up in a garb that is appropriate to it in the context.... The 'content' is part of the total planning that takes place. There is no clear line between the 'what' and the 'how'; all language is language-in-use, in a context of situation, and all of it relates to the situation, in the abstract sense in which I am using the term here.[51]

If this is so, the author of James evokes and re-performs predecessor texts from the Jewish scriptures (and sayings from the Jesus tradition) in a linguistic register that is peppered with both philosophic and Homeric vocabulary. This is because this is the register appropriate to the audience in view and appropriate to the kind of psychagogic discourse he envisages. It is a register in which learned paraphrase of predecessor texts is expected and appeal to moral exemplars, both Greek and Jewish, only adds to the persuasive force of his words.

---

[49] Jas 2:10.

[50] Michael A.K. Halliday, *Language as Social Semiotic: The Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning* (London: Edward Arnold, 1978), 32.

[51] Halliday, *Language as Social Semiotic*, 33.

Bibliography

Allison, Dale C. 'The Audience of James and the Sayings of Jesus'. Pages 58–77 in *James, 1 & 2 Peter, and Early Jesus Traditions*. Edited by Alicia Batten and John S. Kloppenborg. LNTS 478. London and New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2014.

____. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle of James*. ICC. New York and London: Bloomsbury, 2013.

Aristotle. *Politics*. Translated by H. Rackham. LCL. London: W. Heinemann, 1950.

Bonwetsch, Gottlieb Nathanael, Hans Achelis, Paul Wendland and Adolf Bauer, eds. *Hippolytus Werke*. 2nd ed. 4 vols. GCS 36. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1897–1929.

Chilton, C.W., ed. and trans. *Diogenes of Oenoanda: The Fragments*. London: Oxford University Press, 1971.

Cohoon, J.W., trans. *Dio Chrysostom*. 5 vols. LCL. London: W. Heinemann, Ltd., 1932-1964.

Deppe, Dean B. 'The Sayings of Jesus in the Epistle of James'. ThD diss., Free University of Amsterdam, 1989.

Halliday, Michael A.K. *Language as Social Semiotic: The Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning*. London: Edward Arnold, 1978.

Hartin, Patrick J. *James and the 'Q' Sayings of Jesus*. JSNTSup 47. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991.

Holl, Karl, Marc Bergermann and Christian-Friedrich Collatz, eds. *Epiphanius*. 2nd ed. 2 vols. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2013.

Homer. *Iliad*. Translated by A.T. Murray. 2 vols. LCL 170-171. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999.

____. *Odyssey*. Translated by A.T. Murray and George E. Dimock. Rev. ed. 2 vols. LCL 104-105. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995.

Kloppenborg, John S. 'James 1:2–15 and Hellenistic Psychagogy'. *NovT* 52 (2010): 37–71.

____. 'The Reception of the Jesus Tradition in James'. Pages 93–139 in *The Catholic Epistles and the Tradition*. Edited by Jacques Schlosser. BETL 176. Leuven: Peeters, 2004.

____. 'Verbatim Citations in James'. Pages 254-69 in *'To Recover What Has Been Lost': Essays on Eschatology, Intertextuality, and Reception History in Honor of Dale C. Allison Jr*. Edited by Tucker Ferda, Daniel Frayer-Griggs and Nathaniel C. Johnson. NovTSup 183. Leiden: Brill, 2021.

MacDonald, Dennis R., ed. *Mimesis and Intertextuality in Antiquity and Christianity*. SAC. Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 2001.

Mayor, Joseph B. *The Epistle of St. James: The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes and Comments*. 3rd ed. London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd, 1910.

Plutarch. *Moralia*. Translated by Frank Cole Babbitt and W.C. Helmbold. 16 vols. LCL. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press/London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1949-1976.

Preuschen, Erwin. *Der Johanneskommentar*. Vol. 4 of *Origenes Werke*. GCS 2. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1903.

Quintilian. Translated by H.E. Butler. 4 vols. LCL 124-27. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press/London: W. Heinemann, 1995-1998.

Rabe, Hugo, ed. *Hermogenis Opera*. Rhetores graeci 6. Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1913.

Radt, Stefan, ed. *Aeschylus*. Vol. 3 of *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*. Edited by Bruno Snell. 5 vols. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1985.

Stone, Michael E., trans. *The Testament of Abraham: The Greek Recensions*. SBLTT, Pseudepigrapha Series 2. New York: Society of Biblical Literature, 1972.

Theophilus of Antioch. *Ad Autolycum*. Edited and translated by Robert M. Grant. OECT. Oxford: Clarendon, 1970.

Trapp, Michael B., ed. *Maximus Tyrius Dissertationes*. BSGRT. Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1994.

Von Spengel, Leonard, ed. *Rhetores graeci*. 3 vols. BSGRT. Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1853-1856.

Isaiah, Jerome and Giovanni Diodati

Riccardo Maisano

The work of Jerome as a translator and exegete of the Hebrew scriptures takes its place between tradition and innovation. As a Bible scholar he influenced late antique culture, as he did the Middle Ages, Humanism and the Renaissance, up through the modern age[1]—this is why he merits particular attention.

At the end of the fourth century, when his Latin edition of the Bible and his commentaries began to circulate, the Greek text of the Septuagint and its ancient Latin translations were 'the common text': Jerome himself quoted it as the *Vulgata Editio*. The reception and spread of Jerome's new translation were difficult at the beginning, because of the authority gained by the common text in liturgical and catechetical use. So Jerome during his lifetime represented innovation in biblical scholarship, while the Septuagint, even in Latin dress, remained the canonical text.

During the Middle Ages the political and religious separation between the Eastern and Western Empire increasingly developed. So Jerome's edition of the Latin Bible spread all over Western Europe, thanks to the favor gained among the Roman Church and the missions, chiefly during the pontificate of Gregory the Great (590-604).[2] At the same time the fortune of Jerome as an exegete also increased.

Great attention was paid to Jerome during the period of Humanism and the Renaissance. He was considered a model of biblical scholarship in the best sense of the word but, on the other hand, he provided plenty of topics for classicist censure. Meanwhile, the Lutheran Reformation singled out his work as the symbol of conservative tradition, overlooking his attempts to promote a critical approach to scriptures during his lifetime.

Jerome has been for a long time the bulwark of Tridentine Catholicism and the controversial target of its opponents. Finally, after the Second Vatican Council, the use of Latin in Catholic Churches all over the world has been reduced: so Jerome's work as a translator and an exegete has ceased to be seen just as the bearer of an 'authentic' and 'authoritative' text, and has become the main document for the study of medieval Latin literature and Romance languages. In this perspective it

---

[1] I will offer here some topics drawn from my introduction and notes in Riccardo Maisano, ed., *Commento a Isaia, Girolamo / Hieronymi Explanationes in Esiam*, 4 vols., Opere di Girolamo (= Hieronymi opera) 4 (Rome: Città nuova, 2013-2015).

[2] See Roger Gryson and Jean-Marie Auwers, 'L'histoire du texte Latin d'Isaïe au miroir du cantique d'Ézéchias', *RTL* 24 (1993): 692.

may be interesting to focus on a phenomenon not adequately evaluated: we can often notice that in the interpretation of difficult Bible passages, when real linguistic skill is required, Jerome's exegetical choices deeply influenced Giovanni Diodati, one of the most important Protestant biblical scholars, the author of the reference translation of the Reformed Italian Churches. To highlight the contiguity between the two exegetes, we will recall some of their most significant convergences in the interpretation of Isaiah.[3]

• *Comm. Isa.* 1.1. At the beginning of his work, after quoting Matthew 13:52 and Canticles 7:13, Jerome announces his exegetical purpose with these words: 'I will comment on Isaiah, so to demonstrate that he is not only a prophet, but an evangelist and an apostle'. He had already expressed this idea some years earlier in a letter to the bishop Paulinus of Nola.[4] Diodati recalls the idea in the introductory note to his translation of the book—'Con ottima ragione, un buon Padre antico lo nominò: il quinto Evangelista'.

• *Comm. Isa.* 2.11. The Hebrew text of Isaiah 3:6 is not clear, and the ancient Greek translators give different renderings. Jerome translates literally—*Ruina autem haec sub manu tua*—and Diodati follows him word for word: 'Sia questa rovina sotto la tua mano'. Other modern translators, who are usually in debt to Diodati, walk along different roads: so, Martini, 'Porgi la mano tua a questa rovina'; Luzzi, 'Porgi la mano tua a queste ruine';[5] Vaccari, 'Prendi in mano questo sfasciume'; Friedenthal, 'Questo paese rovinato sia sottoposto al tuo dominio'; and Ceronetti, 'Ferma con le tue mani lo sfacelo!'.

• *Comm. Isa.* 3.8. Explaining Isaiah 6:8 ('I then heard the voice of the Lord saying, "Whom shall I send? Who will go for us"'?), Jerome recognizes a hint of the Trinity in the plural 'for us': 'In this command of the Lord the order is given by the Trinity'. Diodati agrees without reserve to this interpretation in his footnote, supplementing it with other references: 'Vedi di questa ineffabile maniera di consulta della sacra Trinità 1,26; 3,22; 11,7'.

• *Comm. Isa.* 3.18. The text of Isaiah 7:16 is open to question. Jerome translates it: *Derelinquetur terra quam tu detestaris a facie duorum regum suorum*. Diodati is misled by the apparent meaning of the sentence ('the land that you hate will be deserted

---

[3] The following segments are ordered according to Jerome's *Commentariorum in Isaiam libri XVIII*. Quotations and translations of Jerome are drawn ad loc. from Maisano, *Commento a Isaia, Girolamo*; those of Diodati from Giovanni Diodati, trans., *La Sacra Bibbia*, ed. Michele Ranchetti and Milka Ventura Avanzinelli, 3 vols. (Milano: A. Mondadori, 1999).

[4] *Epist.* 53.8.

[5] It is noteworthy that the well-known Bible scholar Giovanni Luzzi, minister in the Reformed Church, who was a great appraiser of Diodati's translation, is here in agreement with the Catholic archbishop Antonio Martini. To this point we shall come back below.

in the presence of the two kings') and follows the literal meaning of the Latin translation ('La terra che tu abbomini sarà abbandonata dalla presenza de' suoi due re'), neglecting the explanatory note that follows, where the specific meaning of *detestor* ('to fear') in this passage is clarified: *Domus David liberetur a duobus regibus quos metuit*.

• *Comm. Isa.* 4.18. In Isaiah 11:15 ('The Lord... will raise his hand on the river with the heat of his breath') the prophet, immediately after a topical reference to the Nile, is alluding to the Euphrates: the exiles will be able to ford it and go back to their land. Jerome insists on identifying the river with the Nile and he recognizes in the prophetical sentence a prefiguration of the state of the church under Roman domination. Diodati follows Jerome in his own footnote: 'Tutto questo è detto per figura, per accennare che nulla potrà impedire la liberatione, e l'adunamento della Chiesa'.

• *Comm. Isa.* 5.2. Explaining Isaiah 13:1 (*Onus Babylonis, quod vidit Esaias filius Amos*), Jerome encounters the meanings of the Hebrew word *maśśā'* (both 'verdict' and 'burden'). While the Greek translators interpret the word according to its context, Jerome, for his part, always chooses *onus* ('burden') and gives it a figurative meaning ('prediction of punishments').[6] Luther and Diodati, the two leading translators in the Reformation church, are both followers of Jerome's interpretation in their translations. Particularly, Diodati translates here, 'Il carico di Babilonia', and follows Jerome even in the footnote—'*carico*: questa parola significa spesso ne' profeti una profetia di minacce, e maladittioni, che sono come un peso importabile sopra 'l capo di coloro contr' a cui son lanciate'.

• *Comm. Isa.* 5.4. Translating Isaiah 13:3 ('I have issued orders to my sacred warriors') Jerome uses a word that at first sight seems unacceptable, being a reference to the Medes: *Ego mandavi sanctificatis meis* ('I have given a command to my "delegates"'). Jerome writes *sanctificatis*, keeping in mind the meaning of the Latin verb *sancio* ('to ratify', 'to appoint'), connected with *sanctus*. Diodati, unlike Martini ('preparati'), Vaccari ('addetti') and others, agrees with this interpretation: 'Io ho data commessione a' miei diputati'.

• *Comm. Isa.* 5.20. Isaiah 13:21 describes the neglected houses of Babylon after the ruin of its empire. Jerome's translation follows the Hebrew text: *pilosi saltabunt* (literally, 'hairy creatures will dance there'). Indebted to the Aramaic *targum*,[7] he explains, '"Hairy creatures will dance there" is intended as a reference to the

---

[6] See Pierre Jay, *L'exégèse de Saint Jérôme d'après son* Commentaire sur Isaïe (Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1985), 345–46.

[7] *Tg. Isa.* 13:21. Text: Giovanni Lenzi, ed. *Il* Targum Yonathan. *Traduzione a confronto con il testo masoretico: 1. Isaia* (Genova/Milano: Marietti, 2004).

devils'. Modern translators generally find here a reference to wild goats; instead Diodati—here also—is a follower of Jerome: 'Vi salteranno i demoni'. This interpretation is also underlined by a footnote.

• *Comm. Isa.* 5.136. Explaining Isaiah 23:10 (*Transi terram tuam quasi flumen, filia maris*: 'Cross your country like a river, you daughter of the sea'), Jerome remarks, 'You can cross easily on foot a river—or rather a brook (*ior*), as the Hebrew text says with more precision'. The meaning of the Hebrew word is not exactly this, and furthermore the prophet is referring here to the river *par excellence*, namely, the Nile. Nevertheless Diodati keeps in mind Jerome's remark in his translation: 'Passa fuor del tuo paese, come un rivo'.

• *Comm. Isa.* 6.21. Explaining Isaiah 14:1-2 ('Foreigners will join them, attaching themselves to the house of Jacob...and the house of Israel will take them as slaves, men and women, on the Lord's soil'), Jerome understands as follows:

> Through the apostles, the chosen, namely all the nations, will join the house of Jacob, and they will keep with them the rescued of the house of Israel. They will drive them in their own land and will let them live in their own tents. The house of Israel will have them at their service in the land of the Lord.

In his footnote Diodati follows Jerome, combining the literal exegesis with the allegorical one: 'Profetia adempiuta in parte nella tornata del popolo dalla cattività di Babilonia: e perfettamente nella liberatione spirituale della Chiesa per lo Messia'.

• *Comm. Isa.* 8.13. Explaining Isaiah 25:11 (*Extendet manus suas sub eo sicut extendit natans ad natandum, et humiliabitur gloria eius cum allisione manuum eius*: 'He will stretch out his hands under him like a swimmer stretches out his hands to swim, and his pride will be humbled with the striking of his hands'), Jerome writes, 'The swimmer stretches out his body, and in the same way Moab shall be stricken, and its power shall lay down on the ground'. The explanation is toilsome and shows uncertainty in interpreting the image of the swimmer shaking his hands. It offers a clue, however, to the meaning of the rare word *allisio* ('strike'), used only here in the *Vulgata* in correspondence to the rare κατάρρηγμα of Symmachus' translation (attested by Eusebius in his commentary on Isaiah). Diodati agrees here also with Jerome: 'Egli stenderà le sue mani in mezzo d'esso, come chi nuota stende le mani per notare: ed abbasserà la sua alterezza, co' colpi rovesci delle sue mani'. Ancient and modern translators waver between 'artifizio', 'insidia', 'abilità', 'sforzo' and the like.

• *Comm. Isa.* 8.30. Quoting Zechariah 3:1 (in modern translations, 'with Satan standing on his right to accuse him'), Jerome writes, 'Satan, that is the Opponent (*adversarius*), was standing on his right to oppose him (*ut adversaretur ei*)'. The Latin word *adversaretur* allows a connection with *adversarius*. In modern translations ('to accuse him') Jerome's etymological hint gets lost, achieving a semantic overlap of Greek *diabolos* and Hebrew *haśāṭān*–just what Jerome wants to avoid, recalling the

literal Hebrew meaning of *haśāṭān*. Remarkable exceptions are the King James Bible and Diodati: respectively, '...to resist him'; 'Satàn stava alla sua destra, per essergli contra, come parte avversa'.

• *Comm. Isa.* 9.9. Explaining Isaiah 29:1 ('Woe Ariel, the city David captured'!), Jerome suggests two different meanings for the name 'Ariel': 'Jerusalem, once very strong, is called Ariel, that is "the lion of God". Others think that this name refers to the temple and the altar of God, that are in Jerusalem'. Diodati mentions this interpretation in his note on the passage: 'Da *Ez* 43,15s. appare che questo era un nome dell'Altare degli holocausti, o della parte superiore d'esso. Significa il leone di Dio ...perché v'erano delle figure di leoni nell'Altare'.

• *Comm. Isa.* 9.14. Explaining Isaiah 29:24 ('Erring spirits will learn to understand, and murmurers will accept instruction'), Jerome explicitly recalls Israel's experience during the exodus: 'Those who once in the wilderness grumbled against the Lord shall learn the Law'. In Diodati's note on the passage we find the same recollection: '*i mormoratori*: termine tolto dagli atti frequenti del popolo nel diserto'.

• *Comm. Isa.* 9.25. Explaining Isaiah 30:19 ('The people of Zion will have its home in Jerusalem'), Jerome notes, 'The people that once were prisoner, being freed thanks to the Lord's passion, could have their home in Zion ("the look-out") and in Jerusalem ("the vision of peace"), that is in the Church'. We find the same note in Diodati's comment: 'Sotto questa figura è compresa la spirituale ristoratione della Chiesa per Iesu Christo'.

• *Comm. Isa.* 10.5. Explaining Isaiah 31:4 ('Just so, Yahweh Sabaoth will descend to fight on Mount Zion and on its hill'), Jerome needs to specify: 'not *against* Mount Zion and its hill, but *on* Mount Zion against its enemies'. The specification is required owing to the Hebrew preposition *'al*, which in the language of the Bible always gives to the verb a negative connotation.[8] In his note to the passage Diodati shows consciousness of Jerome's trouble: 'Altri... in luogo di "per lo monte", spongono "contr' al monte", e fanno cominciar la promessa nel vers. Seguente'. Moreover, in the translation he accepts Jerome's interpretation: 'Per guerreggiare per lo monte di Sion, e per lo colle d'essa'.

• *Comm. Isa.* 10.12. Jerome translates Isaiah 33:14 as follows: 'The sinners in Zion are terrified, and fear seizes on the hypocrites'. The Hebrew text and the Septuagint are speaking about the impious (ἀσεβεῖς), but Jerome prefers to take into account the interpretation of the other Greek translators (τοὺς ὑποκριτάς).[9] In this way he

[8] See, for instance, Isa 29:7.

[9] Recorded in manuscript 86; see Joseph Ziegler, ed., *Isaias*, vol. 14 of *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum auctoritate Societatis Litterarum Gottingensis editum*, 3rd ed., 16 vols. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983), ad loc.

can easily insert a quotation of the well-known word of the gospel: 'Alas for you, scribes and Pharisees, you hypocrites'![10] In Diodati's translation we find the same choice: 'Tremito occuperà gl'hipocriti'.

• *Comm. Isa.* 10.12. In Isaiah 33:15 ('The one who walks on the roads of righteousness and says truth') the Hebrew text reads 'righteousness' and 'truth' in the plural. Both in his translation (*qui ambulat iustitiis et loquitur veritates*) and in the commentary Jerome underlines the weight of the two words: 'Who walks *in many roads* of righteousness chooses the right roads not once, but always'.[11] Modern translators usually choose the singular; but not Diodati. He keeps in mind Jerome's exegesis and adopts it in his translation: 'Colui che cammina in ogni giustizia, e parla cose diritte'.

• *Comm. Isa.* 10.12. Explaining Isaiah 33:17 ('Your eyes will gaze on the king in his glory'), Jerome provides a predictable allegorical interpretation: 'The one who is so will behold Christ the King in his brightness'. Diodati draws on this interpretation in his note: 'Figura della venuta di Cristo nel suo regno celeste'.

• *Comm. Isa.* 11.4. Jerome translates Isaiah 37:4 as follows: 'Rabsaces, whom his master, the king of Assyria, has sent to insult the living God and mock him with the words that Yahweh your Lord has heard'. The Hebrew text and most translators furnish a different meaning: '...may Yahweh your Lord punish the words he has heard'. It is remarkable that Diodati, although he was (as it is known) an authority on biblical Hebrew, follows Jerome's interpretation: '...per fargli rimproveri, con le parole che 'l Signore Iddio tuo ha udite'.

• *Comm. Isa.* 11.21. Pondering the opening words of Second Isaiah—and, particularly, Isaiah 40:2 (*solutum est peccatum illius*: 'her sin has been absolved')—Jerome makes a distinction between *remissio* and *solutio*:

> *Et hoc notandum quod non solvantur nostra peccata, nisi de manu domini receperimus ea.*
> *Nec idem est solvi peccata atque dimitti; cui enim dimittuntur, solutione non indiget...;*
> *cui autem solvuntur, propterea solvuntur, quia purgata sunt et soluta per poenas.*
>
> Remission and refund of sins are not the same thing.
> The one to whom sins are forgiven does not need to pay;
> ... instead those who receive the absolution are absolved
> because their sins have been expiated and refunded through penitence.

[10] Matt 23:13.

[11] See J. Alec Motyer, trans., *Isaia: Introduzione e commentario*, Commentari all'Antico Testamento (Roma: Gruppi Biblici Universitari, 2002); trans. of *Isaiah: An Introduction and Commentary*, Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries 18 (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1999): 'È un plurale di ampiezza, indicando la giustizia intesa in ogni suo aspetto e durante tutta la vita'.

The distinction is made between 'remission' through an act of divine mercy and 'absolution' consequent to the payment of a penalty. If we keep in mind the technical meaning of the Italian word 'quietanza' ('receipt'), we can easily recognize the echo of Jerome's remark in Diodati's translation: 'La sua iniquità è quitata'.

• *Comm. Isa.* 13.4. Explaining Isaiah 45:17 ('Israel has been saved by the Lord everlastingly'), Jerome says, 'The Israel saved by God with an everlasting redemption is the rank of the apostles with their converts'. Diodati draws on this interpretation in a note: 'Il che si dee intendere spiritualmente del Regno di Christo'.

• *Comm. Isa.* 13.12. In Isaiah 47:8-11 the prophet mocks the arrogance of Babylon, so self-confident to be under the illusion that she would never become a widow and never know sterility. Jerome writes, 'Two scourges together strike Babylon unexpectedly, sterility and widowhood: she will not have sons anymore—namely, subject peoples—and not even a husband, which we can understand as a reference to the king'. Diodati writes, 'Per li figli pare ch'intenda il popolo, e per lo marito il re'.

• *Comm. Isa.* 13.25. In Isaiah 49:24-26 'the strong man' is mentioned. Jerome draws on Matthew 12:29 and explains, 'The strong man, the giant, is the devil...won by the power of the Lord'. Diodati writes, 'Sotto questa figura è additata la redentione della Chiesa dalla tirannia del diavolo, che operava con potenza'.

• *Comm. Isa.* 16.16. Translating Isaiah 58:3 Jerome writes, *Omnes debitores vestros repetitis* ('you torment all your debtors'), approaching the meaning of the Hebrew text and moving away from the Septuagint (πάντας τοὺς ὑποχειρίους ὑμῶν ὑπονύσσετε: 'you trouble all those who are subject to you'). Most ancient and modern translators are influenced by the Greek text. Diodati in his translation, however, shows himself aware of Jerome's translation and commentary: 'Riscotete tutte le vostre rendite'.

The examples we have reviewed, just as a *specimen*, have been restricted to an enquiry into Jerome's commentary on Isaiah. There are many other clues to Diodati's debt to Jerome as an exegete. I will quote here only the case of Matthew 19:12, concerning the problem of eunuchs. In most cases the passage is translated as follows:

> There are eunuchs born so from their mother's womb,
> there are eunuchs made so by human agency
> and there are eunuchs who have made themselves so for the sake of the kingdom of heaven.
> Let anyone understand this who can (ὁ δυνάμενος χωρεῖν χωρείτω).

Jerome translates the last words: *qui potest capere capiat*.[12] However, in a letter he abandons the common text and chooses a more exact rendering: *qui potest sustinere sustineat*.[13] This is an indication of his pondering over the actual meaning of χωρέω

[12] *Comm. Matt.*, ad loc.

[13] *Epist.* 49.15.

here. Moreover, in his comment on the passage he points out that Jesus adds the last words 'so that each one could test his own strength, wondering if he is able to fulfil his obligations toward virginity and chastity or not'.[14] The translation by Diodati is fitting: 'Chi è in grado di accettarlo, lo accetti'; and it seems to be influenced by Jerome.

I would end this review with a remark. Dealing with biblical textual criticism, the attitudes of Catholic exegesis, on the one hand, and of Protestant exegesis, on the other, are not so far away from each other as one might believe at a first sight. On the contrary, they are often open to mutual, albeit undeclared, influence. I had the chance of noticing for the first time this phenomenon many years ago,[15] before having the opportunity of verifying it through a close examination of Jerome's commentary on Isaiah. I was studying the history of the interpretation of Ephesians 5:16, ἐξαγοραζόμενοι τὸν καιρόν, ὅτι αἱ ἡμέραι πονηραί εἰσιν/*redimentes tempus, quoniam dies mali sunt* ('redeeming the present time, for it is a wicked age'), when I noticed that changes in reading the passage were approximately equivalent among Catholic and Reformed Churches. In the translation by the archbishop of Florence, Antonio Martini (first published in 1771), the only translation admitted among Italian Catholic believers until the Second Vatican Council, it was as follows: 'Ricomperando ("buying back") il tempo, perché i giorni sono cattivi'. In the translation of Diodati (1607), 'Ricomperando il tempo'. In the translation of the Protestant minister and biblical scholar Giovanni Luzzi (1908), 'Approfittando delle opportunità ("taking advantage of the opportunities")',[16] partially imitated in the old editions published by the Italian Episcopal Conference (CEI): 'Profittando del tempo presente ("taking advantage of the current time")'. In the latest CEI edition (2008), 'Facendo buon uso del tempo ("making good use of time")'. In the inter-confessional translation in everyday language, 'usate bene il tempo che avete ("use well the time you have")';[17] and in the commentary of Ernest Best, 'Facendo il miglior uso possibile del tempo ("Taking the best possible use of time")'.[18]

---

[14] *Comm. Matt.*, ad loc.

[15] Riccardo Maisano, '"Ricompriamo il tempo": *Efesini* 5,16 da san Paolo ad Alessandro Manzoni', in *Roma, la Campania e l'Oriente cristiano antico: Giubileo 2000. Atti del Convegno di studi, Napoli 9-11 ottobre 2000*, ed. Luigi Cirillo and Giancarlo Rinaldi (Napoli: Università 'L'Orientale', 2004), 313–25.

[16] Giovanni Luzzi, *Le lettere di san Paolo agli Efesini, ai Colossesi, a Filemone, ai Filippesi: traduzione, commentario, riflessioni* (1908; repr., Firenze: Claudiana, 1990), 48–49.

[17] *La Bibbia. Parola del Signore: Traduzione interconfessionale in lingua corrente* (Leumann, Torino: Elle Di Ci/Roma: Alleanza biblica universale, 1985), 301.

[18] *Lettera agli Efesini*, trans. Donatella Zoroddu, Commentario Paideia, Nuovo Testamento 10 (Brescia: Paideia Editrice, 2001), 572; trans. of *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Ephesians*, ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998).

The exchange between Catholic and Reformed translations and exegetical approaches to interpreting difficult biblical passages looks lively and fruitful. This helps to show us that Jerome's example of encountering the sacred languages, followed by Diodati holding his own dialogue with Hebrew, Greek and Latin languages, did not remain an isolated example. It was indeed a pattern for an effective approach to the scriptures.

Bibliography

Best, Ernest. *Lettera agli Efesini*. Translated by Donatella Zoroddu. Commentario Paideia, Nuovo Testamento 10. Brescia: Paideia Editrice, 2001. Translation of *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Ephesians*. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998.

Diodati, Giovanni, trans. *La Sacra Bibbia*. Edited by Michele Ranchetti and Milka Ventura Avanzinelli. 3 vols. Milano: A. Mondadori, 1999.

Gryson, Roger and Jean-Marie Auwers. 'L'histoire du texte Latin d'Isaïe au miroir du cantique d'Ézéchias'. *RTL* 24 (1993): 325-44.

Jay, Pierre. *L'exégèse de Saint Jérôme d'après son* Commentaire sur Isaïe. Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1985.

La Bibbia. Parola del Signore: Traduzione interconfessionale in lingua corrente. Leumann, Torino: Elle di ci/Roma: Alleanza biblica universale, 1985

Lenzi, Giovanni, ed. *Il* Targum Yonathan*. Traduzione a confronto con il testo masoretico: 1. Isaia*. Genova/Milano, Marietti, 2004.

Luzzi, Giovanni. *Le lettere di san Paolo agli Efesini, ai Colossesi, a Filemone, ai Filippesi: Traduzione, commentario, riflessioni*. 1908. Repr., Firenze: Claudiana, 1990.

Maisano, Riccardo, ed. *Commento a Isaia, Girolamo/Hieronymi Explanationes in Esiam*. 4 vols. Opere di Girolamo (= Hieronymi opera) 4. Rome: Città nuova, 2013-2015.

____. '"Ricompriamo il tempo": *Efesini* 5,16 da san Paolo ad Alessandro Manzoni'. Pages 313-25 in *Roma, la Campania e l'Oriente cristiano antico: Giubileo 2000. Atti del Convegno di studi, Napoli 9-11 ottobre 2000*. Edited by Luigi Cirillo and Giancarlo Rinaldi. Napoli: Università degli Studi di Napoli 'L'Orientale', 2004.

Motyer, J. Alec, trans. *Isaia: Introduzione e commentario*. Commentari all'Antico Testamento. Roma: Gruppi Biblici Universitari, 2002. Translation of *Isaiah: An Introduction and Commentary*. Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries 18. Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1999.

Ziegler, Joseph, ed. *Isaias*. Vol. 14 of *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum auctoritate Societatis Litterarum Gottingensis editum*. 3rd ed. 16 vols. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983.

Authors

Miriam Ben Zeev Hofman
Ben Gurion University of the Negev
miriambz@bgu.ac.il

Fernando Bermejo-Rubio
Universidad Nacional
de Educación a Distancia, Madrid
fbermejo@geo.uned.es

Piero Capelli
Università Ca' Foscari, Venezia
piero.capelli@unive.it

Michael A. Daise
College of William & Mary,
Williamsburg, VA
madais@wm.edu

Adriana Destro
University of Bologna
adriana.destro@unibo.it

Dario Garribba
Pontificia Facoltà Teologica dell'Italia
Meridionale - Sezione San Luigi, Napoli
dario.garribba@gmail.com

Dorota Hartman
Università di Napoli L'Orientale
dmhartman@unior.it

Sandra Huebenthal
Universität Passau
sandra.huebenthal@uni-passau.de

John S. Kloppenborg
University of Toronto
john.kloppenborg@utoronto.ca

Riccardo Maisano
Università di Napoli L'Orientale
riccardo.maisano@virgilio.it

Corrado Martone
Università di Torino
corrado.martone@unito.it

Georges Massinelli, OFM
Istituto Teologico di Assisi
frageorges@gmail.com

Giulio Michelini, OFM
Istituto Teologico di Assisi
giuliomichelini@gmail.com

Eric Noffke
Facoltà Valdese di Teologia, Roma
eric.noffke@facoltavaldese.org

Mauro Pesce
University of Bologna
mauro.pesce@unibo.it

IL TORCOLIERE • Officine Grafico-Editoriali d'Ateneo
Università di Napoli L'Orientale
prodotto nel mese di dicembre 2022

Early tradents of Jewish scripture often betray an intricate dynamic at work between loyalty to precedent and a penchant for innovation. They engaged their emerging Bible with imagination while assimilating extra-biblical sources with fealty, so that their 'fidelity' to the one (scripture) was manifestly 'creative' while their 'creativity' in using the other (apocrypha) was ever 'faithful'. In these contributions to a conference held at the Università di Napoli L'Orientale in 2017 fourteen specialists from Second Temple Judaism, Rabbinics, the New Testament and Patristics capture some of this vigor as it occurred in the nascent eras of Jewish and Christian history. From *1 Enoch* to *Midrash Tanḥuma*, from Jesus to Jerome—this last, brokered through the Italian Reformer Giovanni Diodati—the present volume offers a vivid cross-section of 'creative fidelity' and 'faithful creativity' in the early Jewish and Christian reception of Israel's scripture.

Michael A. Daise holds the Professorship in Judaic Studies at the College of William & Mary, where he teaches Formative Judaism and Christian Origins for the Department of Religious Studies and the Program in Judaic Studies.

Dorota Hartman teaches Philology and Exegesis of the New Testament at the Department of Asian, African and Mediterranean Studies of the University of Naples L'Orientale.

ISBN 978-88-6719-258-8