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PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
“The Bible, of all books, is the most dangerous one, the one that has been endowed with the power to kill,” writes Mieke Bal.¹ Like many striking aphorisms, this statement is not quite true. Some other books, notably the Qur‘an, are surely as lethal, and in any case, to coin a phrase, books don’t kill people. But Professor Bal has a point nonetheless. When it became clear that the terrorists of September 11, 2001, saw or imagined their grievances in religious terms, any reader of the Bible should have had a flash of recognition. The Muslim extremists drew their inspiration from the Qur‘an rather than the Bible, but both Scriptures draw from the same wellsprings of ancient Near Eastern religion. While it is true that both Bible and Qur‘an admit of various readings and emphases, and that terrorist hermeneutics can be seen as a case of the devil citing Scripture for his purpose, it is also true that the devil does not have to work very hard to find biblical precedents for the legitimation of violence. Many people in the modern world suspect that there is an intrinsic link between violence and what Jan Assmann has called “the Mosaic distinction” between true and false religion,² or even between violence and monotheism or monolatry.³ Such claims are, no doubt, too simple. Violence and the sacred went hand in hand long before the rise of Akhenaten or Moses, and polytheism can be used to

¹ Mieke Bal, Anti-Covenant: Counter-Reading Women’s Lives in the Hebrew Bible (Sheffield: Almond, 1989), 14.
² Jan Assmann, Moses the Egyptian: The Memory of Moses in Western Monotheism (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997), 1–6.
legitimate violence just as easily as monotheism. But it is biblical monotheism that has dominated the Western world for the last two thousand years, and it is the Bible that concerns us here. At a time when the Western world is supposedly engaged in a war on terrorism, it may be opportune to reflect on the ways in which the Bible appears to endorse and bless the recourse to violence, and to ask what the implications may be for the task of biblical interpretation.

Violence, of course, has many forms. On a broad level, it has been defined as “the attempt of an individual or group to impose its will on others through any nonverbal, verbal, or physical means that inflict psychological or physical injury.” Often the term is reserved for coercion or force that is illegitimate, and is associated with social disorder, although states and governments routinely use forceful and coercive methods to impose order. For the present, I will restrict myself to the most obvious, even crude, forms of violence—the killing of others without benefit of judicial procedure. It is important to bear in mind, however, that the line between actual killing and verbal, symbolic, or imaginary violence is thin and permeable. The threat of violence is a method of forceful coercion, even if no blood is actually shed.

I. The herem or Ban

“The Lord is a warrior,” says the Song of Moses (Exod 15:3), in one of the earliest attempts to characterize the God of Israel. Many of the oldest hymns in praise of this god celebrate “the triumphs of the Lord.” It is as good as certain,” wrote Gerhard von Rad, “that the concept of faith—in other words, that confident trusting in the action of Yahweh—had its actual origin in the holy war, and that from there it took on its own peculiar

---


dynamic.”

Even if we regard von Rad’s statement as exaggerated, it is certainly true that YHWH’s putative power in battle was a major consideration in early Israelite worship. Moreover, the Israelites were expected to “come to the help of the Lord” in battle and were subject to sanctions if they did not, as can be seen from the cursing of Meroz in the Song of Deborah (Judg 5:23). Only in much later times would the power of the deity be taken as a reason for quietism on the part of human worshipers.

The violence associated with the worship of YHWH in antiquity is most vividly illustrated by the *herem*, or ban, the practice whereby the defeated enemy was devoted to destruction. The practice was not peculiar to Israel. A famous parallel is provided by the Moabite Stone, erected by the ninth-century king Mesha:

> And Chemosh said to me, “Go, take Nebo from Israel. So I went by night and fought against it from the break of dawn until noon, taking it and slaying all, seven thousand men, boys, women, girls, and maid–servants, for I had devoted them to destruction for (the god) Ashtar-Chemosh.”

The practice was evidently known in Israel and its environs, although it is not widely attested in the ancient Near East. It was not just a figment of the imagination of later writers.

The Moabite example shows that the slaughter has a sacrificial character; the victims are offered to the god. In the Bible, this is sometimes done at the

---


9 Israelite religion was not at all exceptional in this regard. See the works of Weippert and Kang, cited in n. 4 above.

10 Contra Millard C. Lind (*Yahweh Is a Warrior: The Theology of Warfare in Ancient Israel* [Scottdale, PA: Herald, 1980]), who argues that Israel depended on the miraculous power of YHWH and that Israel’s fighting was ineffective. Lind takes the Song of the Sea in Exod 15 as the archetypical example.


13 For an exhaustive discussion of proposed parallels, see Stern, *Biblical Herem*, 57–87. Stern tries to show “that a specific cast of mind that was responsible for the נַבִּית was also present at varying times and places elsewhere in the ancient Near East” (p. 87), but he admits that none of the parallels is perfect. Kang declares that “the idea of the ban is not attested in the ancient Near Eastern context except in the Moabitic stone and in the Bible” (*Divine War*, 81). Kang follows the analysis of C. H. W. Brekelmans, *De Herem in het Oude Testament* (Nijmegen: Centrale Drukkerij, 1959).

14 The sacrificial character of the ban is argued especially by Niditch, *War in the Hebrew Bible*, 28–55.
deity’s command. 1 Samuel 15:3 may serve as a representative example: “Thus says the Lord of hosts, ‘I will punish the Amalekites for what they did in opposing the Israelites when they came up out of Egypt. Now go and attack Amalek, and utterly destroy (herem) all that they have; do not spare them, but kill both man and woman, child and infant, ox and sheep, camel and donkey.” The herem can also be undertaken on human initiative. In Num 21:1–3, the Israelites respond to a setback at Arad by making a vow to the Lord, that “if you will indeed give this people into our hands, then we will utterly destroy their towns.” When the Lord duly hands over the Canaanites, the Israelites “utterly destroy them and their towns.” The fulfillment of the promise shows that more than the destruction of property was involved. We are reminded of the vow of Jephthah in Judg 11:31: “If you will give the Ammonites into my hand, then whoever comes out of the doors of my house to meet me . . . shall be the Lord’s, to be offered up by me as a burnt offering.” Jephthah clearly intended human sacrifice, though not the sacrifice of his daughter, as transpired.15 The parallel underlines the fact that the ban, too, involves human sacrifice. The do ut des mentality may also be implied in other cases where no rationale is given for the ban: the assumption is that the offering wins the support of the deity. In any case, there is assumed to be a connection between the fulfillment of the ban and success in battle, as is clear in the story of Achan and the conquest of Ai in Josh 7–8, where defeat is attributed to Achan’s violation of the ban.

The ritualistic character of the herem, which leaves no room for individual decision, has sometimes been viewed as a mitigating factor in its morality. It eliminated plunder and exploitation. “Paradoxically,” writes Susan Niditch, “the ban as sacrifice may be viewed as admitting of more respect for the value of human life than other war ideologies that allow for the arbitrary killing of soldiers and civilians.”16 The enemy is deemed worthy of being offered to God. One hopes that the Canaanites appreciated the honor. Rather than respect for human life, the practice bespeaks a totalistic attitude, which is common in armies and warfare, wherein the individual is completely subordinated to the interests of the group.17 Niditch is quite right, however, that the ban as sacrifice requires “a God who appreciates human sacrifice,” and that those who practiced the ban “would presumably have something in common with those who

believed in the efficacy of child sacrifice.”18 All of this helps put the practice in context in the ancient world, but increases rather than lessens its problematic nature from an ethical point of view.

It is now widely recognized that human sacrifice was practiced in ancient Israel much later than scholars of an earlier generation had assumed.19 Abraham is not condemned but praised for his willingness to offer up his son, even though he is not required to go through with it.20 Exodus 22:28–29 appears to require the sacrifice of the firstborn and does not provide for substitution in the manner of the parallel text in Exod 34:19–20.21 The Judean kings Ahaz (2 Kgs 16:3) and Manasseh (2 Kgs 21:6) are accused of child sacrifice. Their practice cannot be dismissed as due to foreign influence, but had venerable precedents in the cult of Yahweh. Nonetheless, by the time of the Deuteronomists this practice had been denounced by prophets (Mic 6:6–8; Jer 19:4–6), and Deuteronomy explicitly condemns it as an abhorrent Canaanite custom (Deut 12:31; 18:10). Yet the same Deuteronomy has no qualms about the practice of the ban, and in fact most of the passages dealing with hegem are found in the Deuteronomistic corpus.

Deuteronomy does not eradicate the sacrificial aspect of the ban, but it seeks to rationalize the practice by justifying it.22 Deuteronomy 20 distinguishes between “towns that are very far from you” and “the towns of these peoples that the Lord your God is giving you as an inheritance.” In the latter, “you must not let anything that breathes remain alive . . . so that they may not teach you to do all the abhorrent things that they do for their gods, and you thus sin against the Lord your God.” Ethnic cleansing is the way to ensure cultic purity. In the case of faraway towns, only the males need be put to the sword. In this case, no justification is deemed necessary; the slaughter is normal procedure in warfare; it is the restraint that is remarkable. Reasons other than the danger of false worship are occasionally offered. Sihon, king of Heshbon, is

18 Niditch, War in the Hebrew Bible, 50.
21 Levenson, Death and Resurrection, 3–4.  
condemned for his lack of hospitality to the Israelites in Deut 2:26–35, and not a single survivor is left. Perhaps the most practical justification is given in Num 33:55: “but if you do not drive out the inhabitants of the land from before you, then those whom you let remain shall be as thorns in your sides; they shall trouble you in the land where you are settling.” The predominant justification for the slaughter, however, is as a precautionary measure against false worship.23

Insofar as the herem applies primarily to the promised land, it also rests on the premise that this land is legitimately given to Israel by its God. The command in Deut 7 is typical and foundational:

> When the Lord your God brings you into the land that you are about to enter and occupy, and he clears away many nations before you—the Hittites, the Girgashites, the Amorites, the Canaanites, the Perizzites, the Hivites, and the Jebusites, seven nations mightier and more numerous than you—and when the Lord gives them over to you and you defeat them, then you must utterly destroy them. Make no covenant with them and show them no mercy. Do not intermarry with them, giving your daughters to their sons or taking their daughters for your sons, for that would turn away your children from following me, to serve other gods. Then the anger of the Lord would be kindled against you, and he would destroy you quickly. But this is how you must deal with them: break down their altars, smash their pillars, hew down their sacred poles and burn their idols with fire. For you are a people holy to the Lord your God; the Lord your God has chosen you out of all the peoples on earth to be his people, his treasured possession. (Deut 7:1–6)

There are two primary factors in these passages that are taken as warrants for violence on the part of Israel. One is the demand that Israel worship only one god, YHWH. Other peoples who might interfere with that demand and Israelites who fail to comply with it may legitimately be killed. The second is the claim that a land is given to Israel by divine grant and that consequently the previous inhabitants not only may be driven out or killed, but should be. The legitimation for violence is not simply monotheism as such. There is no demand that all people must worship YHWH, although that is envisioned as a desirable goal in some prophetic texts.24 The issues concern the status of Israel as YHWH’s chosen people and covenant partner, and the claim of a land as its inheritance. In short, the issue is not monotheism as such, but the advancement of a particular people and the imposition of its cult within the territory it controls.

---

23 Stern argues that the connection with idolatry is primary (Biblical Herem, 221). Exodus 22:19 says that anyone who sacrifices to gods other than YHWH must be devoted to destruction. This does not require, however, that prevention of idolatry was always the primary factor in the use of herem in warfare.

The command to slaughter the Canaanites is not without a certain irony in the context of Deuteronomy. As Moshe Weinfeld has shown, Deuteronomy is one of the great repositories of humanistic values in the biblical corpus. This is the book that repeatedly tells the Israelites to be compassionate to slaves and aliens, remembering that they themselves were slaves and exiles in the land of Egypt. The ethical principle to do unto others as you would have them do unto you was not an innovation of the NT. The laws on slaves and aliens in Deuteronomy show an appreciation of what Emmanuel Levinas calls “the face of the other” as human and call for empathy with our fellow human beings. But this empathy does not extend to the Canaanites, or the peoples of the land. At least by the time Deuteronomy was written, the people of Israel and Judah should have known the heart of the conquered, and known what it was like to have their land overrun and their shrines burned down. Yet there is no appreciation here of the face of the Canaanite and no misgiving about doing to others what they themselves had suffered.

There is also some irony in the way in which these commands of destruction are embedded in the story of the exodus, which has served as the great paradigm of liberation in Western history. But the liberation of the Israelites and the subjugation of the Canaanites are two sides of the same coin. Without a land of their own, the liberated Israelites would have nowhere to go, but the land promised to them was not empty and had its own inhabitants. Read from the Canaanite perspective, this is not a liberating story at all.

Of course, those who have read and recited the story of the exodus over the centuries have been Jews and Christians who identify with Israel in the story. In the not too distant past, biblical scholars gave the Canaanites short shrift. “From the impartial standpoint of a philosopher of history,” wrote

26 Deuteronomy 15:15; 24:18, 22 etc.; cf. Exod 23:9: “You shall not oppress a resident alien; you know the heart of an alien, for you were aliens in the land of Egypt.
27 Some formulation of the golden rule is known to nearly every culture, East and West. See Hans Dieter Betz, \textit{The Sermon on the Mount: A Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount, Including the Sermon on the Plain} (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995), 509–16.
28 Emmanuel Levinas, \textit{Alterity and Transcendence} (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999), 23: “I have already spoken much about the face of the other as being the original locus of the meaningful.”
29 On the exodus paradigm, see Walzer, \textit{Exodus and Revolution}.
William Foxwell Albright, “it often seems necessary that a people of markedly inferior type should vanish before a people of superior potentialities.”31 In a more explicitly theological vein, George Ernest Wright could claim that “the Canaanite civilization and religion was one of the weakest, most decadent, and most immoral cultures of the civilized world at that time,” and that God had a purpose in choosing Israel and giving it the land.32 Most scholars, we should hope, have learned by now that biblical denunciations of the Canaanites cannot be taken at face value and that these texts may tell us more about the purposes of their human authors than about the purposes of God.33

II. History and Ideology

The context of the discussion has changed significantly in recent years with the recognition that the biblical texts are not historically reliable accounts of early Israelite history but ideological fictions from a much later time. The archaeological evidence does not support the view that marauding Israelites actually engaged in the massive slaughter of Canaanites, either in the thirteenth century or at any later time.34 Recent scholarly hypotheses about the origins of Israel tend to be more compatible with modern moral sensibilities, whether the early Israelites are imagined as peasants in revolt,35 or as quiet, hard-working settlers in the hill country.36 But this scarcely relieves the moral problem posed by the biblical texts, which portray Israel as an aggressive, invading force, impelled by divine commands.37 In the words of James Barr:


36 Finkelstein and Silberman, Bible Unearthed, 105–22.

37 Von Rad argued that holy war was an institution for the defense of the amphictony (Holy
“the problem is not whether the narratives are fact or fiction, the problem is that, whether fact or fiction, the ritual destruction is *commended.*”

The texts are not naïve reflections of primitive practice but programmatic ideological statements from the late seventh century B.C.E. or later. We can no longer accept them as simply presenting what happened. Whether we see these texts as reflecting expansionistic policies of King Josiah or as mere fantasies of powerless Judeans after the exile, they project a model of the ways in which Israel should relate to its neighbors. In this perspective, ownership of the land of Israel is conferred by divine grant, not by ancestral occupancy or by negotiation, and violence against rival claimants of that land is not only legitimate but mandatory, especially if these people worship gods other than YHWH, the God of Israel.

It is a commonplace of modern scholarship to say that the books of the Torah and the Deuteronomistic history are engaged in the construction of the identity of “Israel.” What they reflect is not Israel as it was but Israel as the authors thought it should be. Identity is defined negatively by a sharp differentiation of Israel from the other peoples of the land, and positively by the prescriptions of a covenant with a jealous sovereign god. In Deut 7, the peoples of the land are identified chiefly by their worship, which involves sacred poles and pillars and idols. At least some of these cultic accoutrements are associated with the worship of YHWH in Genesis. In Deut 12 we find that any cultic worship outside of “the place that the Lord your God will choose” is illegitimate. The reform of King Josiah described in 2 Kgs 22–23 is evidently an attempt to implement the cultic demands of Deuteronomy, or, to put it differently, Deuteronomy, in some form, was promulgated to authorize the actions of Josiah. Josiah’s actions were directed not against actual Canaanites but against Israelites whose cultic practices did not conform to Deuteronomic orthopraxy. There is much to be said, then, for the view that neither Deuteronomy nor Joshua, in the historical context of their composition, was intended “to incite literal violence against ethnic outsiders,” but rather they were directed at “insiders who pose a threat to the hierarchy that is being asserted.” Whether this really relieves the moral problem might be debated. In fairness to Josiah, we

---

41 The violence might be explained to a degree along Girardian lines, insofar as the “Canaan-
are not told that he practiced *herem* against anyone, although he certainly used violence to suppress the high places. But texts have a life of their own, and the effective history of the conquest stories is based not on critical reconstructions of the underlying history but on the *prima facie* meaning of the texts.

### III. Story and Example

Two examples may suffice here to illustrate the ways in which these biblical texts have served to legitimize violent action. The first is drawn from ancient Judaism, from the book of 1 Maccabees, which, ironically, has the status of scripture in Catholic Christianity but not in Judaism. It is easy enough to sympathize with the story of the Maccabean revolt. In view of the alleged persecution of observant Jews by Antiochus Epiphanes, the actions of Mattathias and his sons can be viewed as self-defense, and therefore legitimate by the standards of any culture. But this is not the only, nor even the primary, aspect of the situation emphasized in 1 Maccabees. Mattathias, we are told, “burned with zeal for the law, just as Phinehas did against Zimri the son of Salu” (1 Macc 1:26). The reference is to the incident at Baal-Peor in Num 25, when the Israelites incurred the wrath of the Lord by having sexual relations with Moabite women and participating in the sacrifices of pagan gods. The unfortunate Zimri brought a Midianite woman into his family in the sight of Moses and the congregation. Phinehas took his spear and followed them into the tent and pierced the two of them. His action was approved in an oracle spoken by Moses:

> Phinehas, son of Eleazar, son of Aaron the priest, has turned back my wrath from the Israelites by manifesting such zeal among them on my behalf that in my jealousy I did not consume the Israelites. Therefore say, “I hereby grant him my covenant of peace.” It shall be for him and for his descendants after him a covenant of perpetual priesthood, because he was zealous for his God, and made atonement for the Israelites. (Num 25:10–15)

---


43 For a full analysis of the passage, see Baruch A. Levine, *Numbers 21–36: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 4A; New York: Doubleday, 2000), 279–303. Verses 1–5, where the problem is of Moabite origin, are usually ascribed to J or JE. The remainder of the story, which concerns a Midianite woman, is Priestly.
A recent monograph entitled *Old Testament Ethics* assures us that “the exemplary dimension of his act was not its violence . . . but Phinehas’s zeal for the Lord and his atoning for the people. These were hallmarks of true priesthood. . . .”44 Mattathias, however, was in no doubt as to what the exemplary dimension of the act required. Like Phinehas, he first kills a compatriot, thereby lending credence to the view that a primary purpose of violence in the biblical texts is to enforce conformity within the people of Israel. But Phinehas also participates, as priest, in the massacre of the Midianites, which follows the practice of the *herem*, or ban, although that word is not used.45 Mattathias also proceeds to wage war against the Gentiles. Moreover, the example both of Mattathias and of Phinehas became the model for the “zealots” who fought against the Romans in the first century C.E.,46 and whose methods would surely qualify for the label “terrorist” in modern political rhetoric.47

The second example is drawn from Christian history. The English Puritan revolution was justified repeatedly by biblical analogies drawn from the OT. Using a rather dubious interpretation of the book of Daniel, the revolutionaries saw themselves as “the Saints of the Most High,” commissioned to execute judgment on kings and nobles.48 Oliver Cromwell drew a parallel between his revolution and the exodus49 and proceeded to treat the Catholics of Ireland as the Canaanites. He even declared that “there are great occasions in which some men are called to great services in the doing of which they are excused from the common rule of morality,” as were the heroes of the OT.50 A generation later, the Puritans of New England applied the biblical texts about the conquest to their own situation, casting the Native American tribes in the role of the

45 Niditch, *War in the Hebrew Bible*, 81. The Midianites lived outside the promised land and were not subject to eradication by the decree of Deuteronomy. The slaughter is justified in Num 25:16–18 on the grounds that “they have harassed you by the trickery with which they deceived you in the affair of Peor.”
50 Bainton, *Christian Attitudes*, 151.
Canaanites and Amalekites. In 1689, Cotton Mather urged the colonists to go forth against “Amalek annoying this Israel in the wilderness.” A few years later, one Herbert Gibbs gave thanks for “the mercies of God in extirpating the enemies of Israel in Canaan.” He was not referring to biblical times. Similar rhetoric persisted in American Puritanism through the eighteenth century, and indeed biblical analogies have continued to play a part in American political rhetoric down to the present.

Of course Americans are not alone in looking to the Hebrew Bible or OT for an exemplary paradigm. The Boers of South Africa applied the story of the exodus to their situation under British rule, and black African liberationists later applied it to their situation under the Boers. Most obviously, biblical narratives have been a factor in the Zionist movement in Israel, shaping the imagination even of secular, socialist Zionists and providing powerful precedents for right-wing militants. Biblical analogies also provide the underpinnings for support of Israel among conservative Christians.

IV. Eschatological Vengeance

The examples of the Zealots and the Puritans may help to dispel any notion that religion evolves in a linear way and that the violence of Joshua or of Phinehas was a vestige of primitive religion, transcended in later Judaism and Christianity. It is true, however, that most of the biblical endorsements of violent human action are set in the context of early Israel, even if they were written later. The highly ritualized accounts of warfare in the books of Chronicles are also set in an earlier time and are unlikely to stir the blood in any case. In the lit-

---

51 Ibid., 168.
52 Ibid.
56 Keith Whitelam finds pervasive analogies with Zionism in the various reconstructions of early Israel by modern scholars (Invention of Ancient Israel, 71–121), but his argument is flawed by overstatement.
erature of the Second Temple period, however, the focus is often on the future rather than on the past. The late prophetic and apocalyptic literature is not necessarily less violent in its rhetoric than Deuteronomy or Joshua, but it has less emphasis on human action and more on the expectation of the eschatological judgment of God.

Again, a few examples may suffice. The prophet of the latter chapters of the book of Isaiah imagines God as a warrior spattered in blood, like a person who has been treading the wine press (Isa 63:3). The day of redemption must also be a day of vengeance on God’s enemies. Here, no one is asked to “come to the help of the Lord”:

I looked, but there was no helper;  
I stared, but there was no one to sustain me;  
So my own arm brought me victory and my wrath sustained me. (Isa 63:5)

In the apocalyptic literature of the Hellenistic and Roman periods, the faithful people are to wait for this divine intervention. The book of Daniel tells how in a time of persecution the wise among the people will instruct the many, even though some of them will fall, “so that they may be refined, purified, and cleansed, until the time of the end.” The archangel Michael does the fighting on their behalf. At the end, when Michael prevails, they are elevated to shine like the stars forever (Dan 12:1-3).

In this literature there is a new factor to be considered: the hope of resurrection. Martyrdom becomes an option, because the reward of the righteous is not in this world but in heaven. The apocalyptic literature is not necessarily quietistic. One apocalypse in the book of Enoch, known as the Animal Apocalypse, apparently endorses the militancy of the Maccabees (1 En. 90:9–16). The War Scroll from Qumran is written in anticipation of human participation in the final conflict, but this is compatible with the pledge to avoid conflict with “the men of the pit” until the Day of Vengeance (1QS 10:19). But the dominant tendency of this literature is quietistic, in the sense that it encourages endurance and even martyrdom in the present era. This is also true of the book of Revelation in the NT, which holds up the crucified Messiah, the Lamb that

57 Obviously, this is not always the case. For example, the story of the sack of Shechem in Gen 34 is retold repeatedly in Second Temple literature. See Reinhard Pummer, “Genesis 34 in Jewish Writings of the Hellenistic and Roman Periods,” HTR 75 (1982): 177–88.
60 Judas Maccabee is represented as a ram with a large horn. See Patrick A. Tiller, A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993), 62–63.
was slain, as the model for Christians to emulate. We find a similar combination of present restraint, in the hope of future vengeance, in the rabbinic tradition. The Mekilta cites Exod 15:6: “Your right hand shatters the foe,” and comments: “it does not say ‘has shattered the foe’ but ‘will shatter the foe’—in the Age to Come” (Mekilta de Rabbi Ishmael, Shirta, 5). And again, quoting Deut 32:35: “Vengeance is mine and recompense—I will punish them myself. Not through an angel and not through a sent one” (Sifre Deuteronomy [ed. Finkelstein], 325).

There is, in fact, an intrinsic connection between present forbearance and eschatological vengeance in this literature. In the Epistle to the Romans, Paul cites the same verse from Deut 32 to illustrate the point that his readers should “never avenge yourselves, but leave room for the wrath of God. . . . No, ‘if your enemies are hungry, feed them; if they are thirsty, give them something to drink; for by doing this you will heap burning coals on their heads’” (Rom 12:19–21). As Krister Stendahl showed in a famous article, this attitude has more to do with the perfection of hatred than with disinterested love: “With the Day of Vengeance at hand, the proper and reasonable attitude is to forego one’s own vengeance and to leave vengeance to God. Why walk around with a little shotgun if the atomic blast is imminent?” The expectation of vengeance is also pivotal in the book of Revelation. The coming fall of Rome is heralded in gloating terms in ch. 18. In ch. 19, Christ appears from heaven as a warrior on a white horse, from whose mouth comes a sharp sword with which to strike down the nations, and who will tread the wine press of the fury of the wrath of God. Even in the Synoptic Gospels, Jesus’ teaching about loving one’s enemies is framed by the prospect of a final judgment when the wheat will be definitively separated from the tares (Matt 13:24–30, 36–43).

65 H. G. L. Peels (The Vengeance of God [Leiden: Brill, 1995]) provides a thorough study of the motif in the Hebrew Bible, but deals with “the intertestamental literature” and the NT only in an appendix (pp. 306–12).
66 The quotation is derived from Prov 25:21–22.
The effective history of apocalyptic literature has varied with the patience of believers. As we have seen, books like Daniel and Revelation were originally intended to encourage patient endurance, and they have often inspired quietistic movements through the centuries. But there also have been numerous examples of people who took it upon themselves to “force the end.” In the Christian tradition, there are several striking examples of this in the late Middle Ages and the period of the Reformation: the Taborites in Bohemia, Thomas Müntzer and the Peasants’ Revolt, John of Leyden, the messiah of Münster. Apocalyptic expectations played a part in the Puritan revolution in England. In most of these cases, however, the revolutionaries drew their inspiration not just from Daniel or Revelation but from an apocalyptic reading of the entire Bible. The examples of Joshua and Phinehas were all the more relevant in the throes of eschatological crisis. Even when the millenarian movements did not initiate violence themselves, they often provoked it by their uncompromising criticism of the authorities and their refusal to compromise. The Branch Davidians in Waco provide a modern example. In some cases, the violence was self-inflicted, as in the latter-day instances of Jonestown and Heaven’s Gate. The expectation of a final Armageddon may not be as directly conducive to violence as a command to kill the idolators next door, but in fact the impact of eschatological texts may not be very different from that of history-like narrative precedents. Few people in any age have taken the *herem* texts of the Hebrew

---


70 On the notion of “forcing the end,” which traditionally had negative implications in Judaism, see Ravitzky, *Messianism*, 18.


72 Barnes, “Images of Hope,” 163: “The most famous case of radical expectancy in this period was that of the Fifth Monarchy Men, who saw it as the responsibility of believers to help bring on the final and most perfect historical age through militant action.” See also Christopher Hill, *Antichrist in Seventeenth Century England* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1971).


Bible as commandments for their own time. Strictly interpreted, they apply only to specific peoples who no longer exist.\textsuperscript{75} Equally, eschatological violence is properly the prerogative of God. But in both cases, the approval of violence in the texts offers dangerous encouragement for militants, which has, on occasion, contributed to disaster.

Like the commands to slaughter the Canaanites in the Deuteronomic literature, the predictions of eschatological judgment also shape group identities. In the Jewish apocalyptic literature, the national identity is already qualified. The elect, or the sons of light, are not simply identical with Israel. The land remains important in the Jewish works, but even there it is relativized. In many cases, the ultimate hope of the elect is for life with the angels in heaven. In the NT, identity is no longer tied to ethnicity or to possession of a particular land. What this literature shares with Deuteronomy, however, is the sharp antithesis with the Other, whether the Other is defined in moral terms, as sinners, or in political terms as the Roman Empire. Both Deuteronomy and the apocalypses fashion identity by constructing absolute, incompatible contrasts. In the older literature, the contrast is ethnic and religious, but regional. In the apocalypses, it takes the form of cosmic dualism. In both cases, the absoluteness of the categories is guaranteed by divine revelation and is therefore not subject to negotiation or compromise. Herein lies the root of religious violence in the Jewish and Christian traditions.

V. Violence and Hermeneutics

“There is a time to kill,” said Qoheleth, “and a time to heal . . . a time for war, and a time for peace” (Qoh 3:3, 8). Not all violence is necessarily to be condemned. The image of God the Warrior and the hope for an apocalyptic judgment have often given hope to the oppressed. Nonetheless, few will disagree that violence is seldom a good option, and that it can be justified only as a last recourse. Most people in the Western world are rightly repelled by the idea that terrorists, such as the perpetrators of the attacks of September 11, 2001, could be inspired by religious ideals. The thrust of my reflections on violence and religion in the biblical tradition is that the problem is not peculiar to Islam, but can also be found in attitudes and assumptions that are deeply embedded in the Jewish and Christian Scriptures. The material of which I have been speaking is what Gerd Lüdemann has called “the dark side of the Bible.”\textsuperscript{76} The

\textsuperscript{75} Walzer, \textit{Exodus and Revolution}, 144; Greenberg, “On the Political Use of the Bible,” 469.

\textsuperscript{76} Gerd Lüdemann, \textit{The Unholy in Holy Scriptures: The Dark Side of the Bible} (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997). Lüdemann provides an extensive discussion of the ban in holy war (pp. 36–54).
issues it raises are not just academic. These texts have had a long effective history, and there is no reason to believe that it has run its course. What are we, as biblical scholars, to say about it at the beginning of the twenty-first century?

There is a long and venerable tradition of interpretation, going back through the church fathers to Philo of Alexandria and Hellenistic Judaism, that sees as its task to save the appearances of the text. Luke Johnson has recently argued that modern interpreters have still much to learn from the church fathers: “Origen shows how much more passionately Scripture is engaged when the reader is persuaded of its divine inspiration, which implies that God’s wisdom is somehow seeking to be communicated even through the impossibilities of the literal sense. If interpreters today were to learn from Origen, they would not rest easy with the practice of excising or censoring troublesome texts, but would wrestle with them until they yielded a meaning ‘worthy of God.’”77 But allegorical interpretation of the kind practiced in antiquity is hardly viable in the modern world. It is all very well to say that the Canaanites that we should root out are vice and sinfulness, but we still have texts that speak rather clearly of slaughtering human beings.

A more promising strategy is to note the diversity of viewpoints within the Bible, and thereby relativize the more problematic ones.78 So, for example, we can emphasize the concern for slaves and aliens in Deuteronomy, or the model of the suffering servant, or the NT teaching on love of one’s enemies. It is not unusual for Christian interpreters to claim that “the biblical witness to the innocent victim and the God of victims demystifies and demythologizes this sacred social order” in which violence is grounded.79 Such a selective reading, privileging the death of Jesus, or the model of the suffering servant, is certainly possible, and even commendable, but it does not negate the force of the biblical endorsements of violence that we have been considering. The full canonical shape of the Christian Bible, for what it is worth, still concludes with the judgment scene in Revelation, in which the Lamb that was slain returns as the heavenly warrior with a sword for striking down the nations. In short, violence is not the only model of behavior on offer in the Bible, but it is not an incidental or peripheral feature, and it cannot be glossed over. The Bible not only witnesses

---


to the innocent victim and to the God of victims, but also to the hungry God who devours victims and to the zeal of his human agents.

And therein precisely lies its power. There is much in the Bible that is not “worthy” of the God of the philosophers. There is also much that is not worthy of humanity, certainly much that is not worthy to serve as a model for imitation. This material should not be disregarded, for it is at least as revelatory as the more edifying parts of the biblical witness. The power of the Bible is largely that it gives an unvarnished picture of human nature and of the dynamics of history, and also of religion and the things that people do in its name. After all, it is only in the utopian future that the wolf is supposed to live with the lamb, and even then the wolf will probably feel the safer of the two. The biblical portrayal of human reality becomes pernicious only when it is vested with authority and assumed to reflect, without qualification or differentiation, the wisdom of God or the will of God. The Bible does not demystify or demythologize itself. But neither does it claim that the stories it tells are paradigms for human action in all times and places.

The least that should be expected of any biblical interpreter is honesty, and that requires the recognition, in the words of James Barr, that “the command of consecration to destruction is morally offensive and has to be faced as such,” whether it is found in the Bible or in the Qur’an. To recognize this is to admit that the Bible, for all the wisdom it contains, is no infallible guide on ethical matters. As Roland Bainton put it, in his survey of Christian attitudes to war and peace, “appeal to the Bible is not determinative.” But historically people have appealed to the Bible precisely because of its presumed divine authority, which gives an aura of certitude to any position it can be shown to support; in the phrase of Hannah Arendt, “God-like certainty that stops all discussion.” And here, I would suggest, is the most basic connection between the Bible and violence, more basic than any command or teaching it contains.

Oliver Wendell Holmes, the great American jurist, reflected late in his career that he had entered the Civil War brimming with certitude over the righteousness of abolition, which surely was a righteous cause. By the end of

---

82 Barr, Biblical Faith and Natural Theology, 218.
83 Bainton, Christian Attitudes, 238.
the war he had drawn a different lesson, that certitude leads to violence. The Bible has contributed to violence in the world precisely because it has been taken to confer a degree of certitude that transcends human discussion and argumentation. Perhaps the most constructive thing a biblical critic can do toward lessening the contribution of the Bible to violence in the world, is to show that that certitude is an illusion.
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Despite a cluster of contrary indications, scholars have routinely interpreted the story of the three-year famine in 2 Sam 21:1–14 as an internally consistent, homogeneous narrative.\(^1\) This perception of the story may derive in part from its place as a link in 2 Sam 21–24, the chain of chapters closing the book of Samuel. Since Julius Wellhausen noted the palistrophe in chs. 21–24 over a century ago, this appendix compiled from disparate elements has tended to invite several kinds of literary approaches: structural analysis concerned primarily with its organization; interest in the lemmatic and thematic links governing its different parts; and a broader redactional view that seeks its meaning within the wider frameworks of the Succession Narrative, 2 Samuel, the complete book of Samuel, and the Deuteronomistic History.\(^2\) At least with regard to the Gibeonite episode, the focus on the literary shape and function of the

Thanks to Isaac Chavel, Baruch Schwartz, Michael Segal, and the JBL critical readers for their helpful comments. Translations are mine except where otherwise attributed.

\(^1\) Survey the standard introductions and commentaries, for example, Carl Steuernagel, *Lehrbuch der Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1912), 311, 326–27, 334–36. Only three attempts have been made to divide the story into sources; see below, nn. 5 and 31.

appendix as a whole seems to have distracted scholars somewhat from the task of an internal literary analysis.³

Other studies, whether seeking literary, historical, or cultic significance in the story, by and large fall into one of two categories. Either they attempt to locate the episode as a complete unit within some broader context, such as the historical role played by Gibeon in ancient Israel, or they concentrate on an obscure matter within it, specifically, the manner and meaning of the deaths of the seven Saulides and the significance of Rizpah’s actions.⁴ Of course, such a

³ Jan Fokkelman has in fact dissected 2 Sam 21:1–14 in his exhaustive structuralist manner, but having postulated the homogeneous character of the piece and the sufficiency of the MT as a matter of interpretive principle, he did not venture beyond the confines of synchronic analysis, which on occasion compelled him to scale the heights of hermeneutic ingenuity rather than delve into a diachronic analysis when faced with incongruity (Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel, Volume 3, Throne and City [II Sam. 2–8 & 21–24] [Assen/Maastricht: Van Gorcum, 1990], 271–92). See the brief but pointed methodological criticism in Jonathan Z. Smith, “Religion Up and Down, Out and In,” in Sacred Time, Sacred Place: Archaeology and the Religion of Israel (ed. B. M. Gitten; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2002), 3–10, at 5.

thumbnail sketch cannot do justice to the studies available, several of which have joined many interests under one rubric to yield a rich mine of analyses and ideas. However, they do all share in having failed to execute a careful literary-critical analysis, which, it turns out, could have led to the edited quality of the text. Two studies have in fact divided the text into sources, but not on the basis of defined, reusable criteria, on something beyond mere intuition.

In one of the clearest, most comprehensive, yet most concise pieces available on identifying sources, Richard Friedman provides a detailed list of ten such criteria: doublets, terminology, contradictions, consistent characteristics of each group of texts, narrative flow, historical referents, linguistic classification, identifiable relationships among sources, references in other biblical books, and marks of editorial work. After applying them to the Pentateuch, he concludes compellingly:

The strength of the identification of the four major sources of the Torah is not any single one of the categories enumerated. . . . Rather it is the convergence of all of these bodies of evidence that is the most powerful argument for this view of the Pentateuch (Friedman’s italics).

Werner Schmidt offers a more distilled programmatic outline for scholarly analysis of biblical texts:

a) analysis of the text for possible literary unevenness or tension;

b) alignment of the textual components obtained into the most likely story or plot lines, namely, not into fragments, which could not have existed independently;

c) comparison with the immediate and farther contexts and, with that, fitting them into a broader flow;

d) interpretation of the final form of the text.

The investigation below of 2 Sam 21:1–14 will take its literary-critical cues specifically from disjunctures in both grammar and syntax, on one hand, and narrative flow, on the other. It will follow diction and theme, enlisting the often

5 Serge Frolov and Vladimir Orel divided the story into two different sources, vv. 1–9 and 10–14, with the respective attributions to J and E basically depending on the use of the name Elohim in v. 14b (“Rizpah on the Rock: Notes on 2 Sam. 21:1–14,” BeO 37 [1995]: 145–54, at 146). The effort, though, fails from several critical angles. Suffice it here to point out, as Budde already intimated long before, that v. 1 requires God’s propitiation in v. 14b for its conclusion (Die Bücher Samuel, 309). This very interdependence led to Pesah Orion’s proposal that vv. 1 and 14b once comprised an originally discrete and complete story—famine strikes; David beseeches YHWH; YHWH yields—which a later author used as a ready-made frame for the story he would insert (“A Note to 2 Sam 21:1–14” (in Hebrew), Bet Mikra 9 [1964]: 123–26, esp. 123–24). But Menahem Ben-yashar refuted Orion’s arguments roundly (“A Study of the Pericope of Rizpah Daughter of Aiah” (in Hebrew), Bet Mikra 36 [1991]: 56–64). On a third, essentially acceptable division, see n. 31 below.


7 Ibid., 618.

untapped resource of textual criticism, to establish two independent threads (section I), then relate each one to the larger book of Samuel (sections II–IV). Finally, it will assess how intertwining the two threads has had an impact on each one of them, from a variety of standpoints (section V).

This analysis has relevance for understanding the methods by which ancient editors brought together multiple textual sources and for evaluating the emergent product. In this case, by merely splicing together literary sources, the editor enhanced the human dimension guiding the story's flow and likewise deepened the story's broader political and theological messages.

I

Literary-critical analysis begins by following the narrative thread until it seems to fray or tangle. According to the flow of the narrative in 2 Sam 21:1–14, a string of three consecutive years racked by famine results from the unavenged bloodguilt of Saul and his household and their unabsolved violation of the vow Israel had previously made to the Gibeonites. In his overzealous bid to establish Israel's complete possession of its land, the narrator explains analeptically, Saul had wrongfully attempted to annihilate the Gibeonites. In doing so, he violated the oath taken before YHWH to preserve them in Israel's midst (see Josh 9:3–27). To redeem this bloodguilt and bring salvation to YHWH's land


10 Scholars all advocate emending the MT אֶלָּלָא בֵּית מָלָא הָדְרוֹם וֹתֶל הַלְּאָלָא בֵּית מָלָא הָדְרוֹם —which matches the LXX ἐπὶ Σαοῦ καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον σύνοι ὀδηγία—although Budde admitted its "confused wording" and felt constrained to rewrite it (Die Bücher Samuel, 306). "The pronoun could not in a case like the present be dispensed with," Samuel R. Driver explained about the MT, troubled it seems by the elliptical style of the appositive clause: Which house? (Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel [2d ed.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1960, 1963], 349). Recall, however, the notoriously abrupt and cryptic nature of oracular material, for instance, the much more ambiguous oracle in Judg 18:6 and the puzzling one in 2 Kgs 8:10. In the words of John Dryden, "He speaks like the Oracles to puzzle the world" (cited in The Compact Edition of the Oxford English Dictionary: Complete Text Reproduced Micrographically [2 vols.; [U.S.A.]: Oxford University Press, 1971, repr. 1981], 2:2, 681). For that matter, the clarification "because he put Gibeonites to death" looks like the narrator's gloss (which is not to say an interpolation) rather than the oracle's own self-amplification.

11 From the parenthetical style of the flashback in v. 2b, the awkward way it interrupts David's speech, and what appears to be a repetitive resumption in vv. 2–3 ("The king summoned
and sustenance to his people, David agrees to the Gibeonites’ demand—made after they subtly ascertained his frame of mind—that he turn over to them seven of Saul’s heirs for impalement. David takes two sons from Rizpah, Saul’s former concubine (2 Sam 3:7), and five grandsons from one of his daughters,

... David said to the Gibeonites”), many scholars have inferred the presence of an interpolation meant to link the story to Josh 9 (e.g., Henry P. Smith, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Samuel [ICC: Edinburgh; T & T Clark, 1899, repr., 1969], 374). Though made with a different aim, Menahem Haran’s point that the oracle specifies only Saul’s bloodguilt, not his violation of the oath, could add support (“The Impaling of the Sons of Saul by the Gibeonites” (in Hebrew), in Studies in the Book of Samuel [2 vols.; ed. B. Z. Luria; Jerusalem, 1962], 1:249-79, at 274). In addition, the Gibeonites negotiating with David themselves fail to mention Saul’s violation of an oath. (A reference to the vow in the number of sons, seven, because of its sacred nature and also through assonance: h[wb`/h[b`—Eng. seven/asseveration]—so Yehuda Kil, 2 Samuel (Da’at Mikra; Jerusalem: Mosad Harav Kook, 1981), 503; and Polzin, David and the Deuteronomist, 209—seems far-fetched.)

However, v. 2b identifies the Gibeonites as Amorites, not as the Hivites of Josh 9:7 (which discrepancy the midrash harmonized cleverly with a bilingual pun in y. Qid. 4.1, 65c [bottom]; Num. Rab. §8.4). It refers neither to Joshua nor to the chieftains, and it mentions none of the terms of the covenant. Indeed, not one lemma has an identifiable counterpart in Josh 9, and the description of the Israelites taking an oath actually contradicts Josh 9:14–18. These discrepancies imply that v. 2b does not refer to the text of Josh 9, making it more likely that it preserves an authentic version of the tradition, which the author used in his composition, not a derived and interpolated reference. As to the repetitive resumption in vv. 2–3, it does not necessarily mark an interpolation into the preexisting text, but may indicate, rather, that the author composed the text from originally discrete materials (so Haran, “Impaling,” 278). From the synchronic point of view of poetics, note the similar technique of analepsis delaying the main action in vv. 12–13a (against the harsh judgment Frolov and Orel passed rather glibly on the “gloss” as “clumsy” (“Rizpah on the Rock,” 152)).

Moreover, the recurring language in vv. 2–3 probably does not even constitute a repetitive resumption: הָלַחְתָּמָה in v. 2a may refer to the act of speaking (“he told them”) rather than introduce the contents of that speech (“he said . . .”); compare Gen 4:8; Exod 19:25; 2 Sam 23:3; Ps 4:5; and Esth 1:18. Finally, the particular sacral aura permeating this episode radiates from something more than Saul’s murder of Gibeonites, namely, his violation of the oath, which, as Malamat argued (“Doctrines of Causality,” 9), makes v. 2b necessary to the story’s internal logic (see further below, nn. 43–44).

12 Jan Fokkelman notes the retributive ratio of seven to one in Ps 79:12 and Gen 4:15 as well (Narrative Art in Genesis: Specimens of Stylistic and Structural Analysis [Assen/Amsterdam: Van Gorcum, 1975], 39 n. 48).

either Michal (MT) or Merab (LXX). Honoring the covenant he had made with Jonathan (1 Sam 18:3–4; 20:8, 12–17, 23, 42), though, David spares Jonathan’s son, Mephibosheth (see 2 Sam 9:1–13). The Gibeonites impale all seven descendants together. Rizpah protects the exposed bodies from birds


13 Scholars overwhelmingly prefer Merab because of the cumulative versional weight and since, according to the narrative, Michal did not bear any children (2 Sam 6:23) and Adriel was Merab’s husband (1 Sam 18:19). For further arguments, see P. Kyle McCarter, Jr., *II Samuel: A New Translation with Introduction, Notes, and Commentary* (AB 9; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1984), 439. To Stoebe’s challenge, “What reasonable motivation can be found for this slip of the pen?” (*Das zweite Buch Samuelis*, 454, v. 8 n. d), Walters already suggested a deliberate change meant to reassign Merab’s inexplicable lack of maternal instinct to the already negative figure of Michal (“Childless Michal, Mother of Five,” 291–94). For other attempts to uphold the MT, see J. J. Glick, “Merab or Michal,” *ZAW* 77 (1965): 72–81; Zafrira Ben-Barak, “The Legal Background to the Restoration of Michal to David,” in *Studies in the Historical Books of the Old Testament* (ed. J. A. Emerton; VTSup 30; Leiden: Brill, 1979), 15–29, at 27.

14 The LXX tradition, echoed in *y. Sanh*. 6.9, 23d, locates the site at Gibeon; the MT at Gibeat Saul. Driver reconstructs a series of corruptions leading to the MT, in which the original Hebrew text, יְהֹוָהּ יְשַׁעְל, becomes יְהֹוָהּ יְשַׁעְל יִבֵּית יִשְׂאָל יְשַׁעְל יִבֵּית יִשְׂאָל, then is “understood in the sense of” MT יְהֹוָהּ יְשַׁעְל יִבֵּית יִשְׂאָל (Notes, 351–52). Retroverted LXX, then, יְהֹוָהּ יְשַׁעְל יִבֵּית יִשְׂאָל, marks a stage immediately prior to the MT. However, not one Greek version preserves a hint of this divine “mount,” referring unanimously, rather, to YHWH’s “chosen.” It also seems odd that the impossible phrase יְשַׁעְל יִבֵּית יִשְׂאָל should ever have existed at all as a correctio stage in the development of the text. Driver’s argument that someone understood Gibeon as Gibeat Saul lacks conviction as well. Finally, note the overloaded and overlapping modifiers in the original text Driver posits: יְהֹוָהּ יְשַׁעְל יִבֵּית יִשְׂאָל יְשַׁעְל. Anyway, nowhere does the Bible refer to a mountain other than Jerusalem’s Temple Mount as “YHWH’s mount” (except for Sinai in Num 10:33; on Gen 22:14, see Hermann Gunkel, *Genesis* [trans. M. E. Biddle; Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1997], 233–40, esp. 236, 237–38). Blenkinsopp suggests that the original text, close to the MT, read יְשַׁעְל יִבֵּית יִשְׂאָל יְשַׁעְל יִבֵּית יִשְׂאָל, and a Deuteronomistic editor changed it to remove the conflict with the Jerusalem sanctuary chosen by YHWH in D (“Are There Traces,” 211–12 n. 15). The reading, though, raises more literary, historical, and literary-historical questions than the text-critical one it answers.

To work through this knotty passage, one perhaps should begin with the surprising phrase יְשַׁעְל יִבֵּית יִשְׂאָל. Apparently late, as basic concordance work reveals, the phrase most probably represents a sympathetic gloss on “Saul” (which now reads either as the narrator’s lament, or as the Gibeonites’ expression of outrage and poetic justice: YHWH’s own elect has violated YHWH’s vow and therefore deserves impalement to and before YHWH). This leaves the original text containing either Gibeon or Gibeat Saul. Given that “Saul” appears uniformly alongside both readings, Gibeon as well as Gibeat, it seems reasonable to infer that Gibeon represents the original text, as in the MT, and furthermore that the gloss יְשַׁעְל יִבֵּית יִשְׂאָל entered the text before Gibeat became Gibeon. In this case, either the copyist penning the LXX Vorlage skipped, writing Gibeon for Gibeat, perhaps because the story concerns the Gibeonites (so Mr. Michael Segal), or else it may manifest discomfort with the idea of impaling Saul’s children at Saul’s own hill. For additional, subtle literary and historical arguments for preferring MT Gibeat Saul as the site of the temple mentioned in the story, see Menahem Haran, *Temples and Temple Service: An Inquiry into Biblical Cult Phenomena and the Historical Setting of the Priestly School* (2d ed.; repr., Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1995), 35–36 and nn. 42–43.
and beasts for an extended period of time, from the beginning of the harvest season until a downpour signals the end of her vigil, probably at the end of the entire harvest season. Hearing of this exemplary devotion and apparently moved to sympathetic response, David retrieves the bones of Saul and Jonathan from Jabesh-gilead, where they have lain since the heroes of Jabesh-gilead recovered them from the Philistines in Beth-shan (1 Sam 31:8–13; 2 Sam 2:4–7; 1 Chr 10:6–12), and reinters them in the family plot in Benjamin:

He brought up the bones of Saul and the bones of his son Jonathan from there. They gathered the bones of those impaled. They buried the bones of Saul and his son Jonathan in Zela, in the territory of Benjamin, in the tomb of his father Kish. (2 Sam 21:13–14a)

The thread at this point begins to show loose ends. In between David’s return with the bones of Saul and Jonathan (vv. 12–13a) and his burial of those bones (v. 14a), the text points out that the bones of the sons impaled by the Gibeonites were collected (v. 13b), yet it does not determine what happened to

The bones of the sons impaled by the Gibeonites were collected (v. 13b). However, tracing the devolution of the fine Hebrew Vorlage behind LXX Luc into the corrupted reading of the MT would require an implausible number of steps or an inordinate amount of speculation. Rather, the MT may contain a doublet caused by the insertion of a marginal gloss, now v. 9b, meant to delimit the general language of v. 9b (see already Stoebe, Das zweite Buch Samuelis, 455, v. 9 n. d, and the predecessors noted there), and the Hebrew Vorlage behind LXX Luc looks like a subsequent attempt to simplify the text (but note the elegant form of the whole now, concentric and rhyming). Although at first glance y. Qid 4.1, 65c seems to support this view, parallel texts in y. Sanh. 6.9, 23d and Num Rab. §8.4 suggest that the text there is corrupt. Either דָּוִא is all that remains from the original text, or else it derives from what simply read דַּוִּית, a subsequently abbreviated form of which, דַּוִּית, was then “corrected” to דְּוָא.

Regarding when the vigil ended, rabbinic tradition unanimously holds that the rains fell at the end of the summer (e.g., Mishnat Rabbi Eliezer [ed. H. Enelow; New York: Bloch, 1933], 166, lines 12–14; Midr. Sam. §28.6 cites two different specific dates). Moderns, however, debate the point; Fokkelman’s arguments support the rabbinic view (Throne and City, 287–88).
them: Were they, for instance, buried or perhaps burned (compare 1 Sam 31:12–13)? The list of buried parties in v. 14 implies that if the sons did receive burial, they did not make it into the family plot in Benjamin, which raises several questions, such as, Why not? Furthermore, the subject switches suddenly from singular to plural: David returns the bones of Saul and Jonathan (vv. 12–13a), while “they” gather the bones of the sons impaled by the Gibeonites (v. 13b). Again, “they” bury Saul and Jonathan (v. 14a). Does “they” refer to the same group of people in both cases, although “they” engage in two activities the text leaves unrelated? Finally, to whom does the next statement, “they did whatever the king commanded” (v. 14a), refer—the group of people who collected the bones, the group who buried Saul and Jonathan (if it is a different one), or yet a third group? The emphasis in such a statement seems out of place in this story, which from the beginning depicts David as the one fulfilling demands, not issuing commands.

Translations, ancient and modern alike, have attempted to circumvent these problems through several means. After the phrase “and [LXX: the bones] of Jonathan his son” in v. 14a, for example, the LXX reads, “and of those impaled”: καὶ τὰ ὀστά ὁμοθάν τοῦ υἱοῦ σύντω καὶ τῶν ἡμισθέντων. The plus, though, creates new problems. First of all, it makes the predicate awkward, since the singular pronoun “his” follows two antecedents, “those impaled” as well as “Saul”: “They buried the bones of Saul . . . and of those impaled . . . in the tomb of his father Kish.” It is clear what the verse must mean, but had the plus subordinated “those impaled” to “Saul” merely by adding the modifier “his sons” (καὶ τὰ ὀστά . . . τῶν ἡμισθέντων τῶν υἱῶν σύντω), the way the modifier “his son” subordinates “Jonathan” to “Saul,” the verse would have read better: “They buried the bones of Saul and . . . of his impaled sons . . . in the tomb of his father Kish.” Second, rather than repeat

17 Contrast the clarity in 2 Sam 4:12.
18 The rabbis recognized that the statement does not refer back to the removal and burial of those impaled, vv. 13b–14a; they therefore invented a different command given by David (Num. Rab. §8.4 [end] and Pirqe R. El., ch. 17). See further n. 31 below.
20 Peter R. Ackroyd alludes to this problem (The Second Book of Samuel [CBC; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977], 199–200). Fokkelman comments elegantly on the MT: “After long wanderings Saul finally lies between ‘his father’ and ‘his son’ who are both so designated in relation to the first king” (Throne and City, 289).
21 Tantalizingly, LXX B reads τῶν ἡμισθέντων τῶν, as if about to introduce a modifier, but then skips abruptly to the location of the burial, ἐπὶ Βένθημαν (“in the land of Benjamin”). The reading may represent no more than ditography—ἡμισθέντων τῶν—but it could also preserve the remains of an attempt to improve the verse with an addition such as τῶν υἱῶν σύντω (“his sons”); interestingly enough, BHS (ad loc.) signals a lacuna after the second τῶν rather than ditography.
the governing phrase “and the bones,” which in the LXX appears with both Saul and Jonathan, the plus relies on the prior mention with Jonathan: “the bones of Saul and the bones of Jonathan his son and of those impaled.” Better style, at least for a Hebrew Vorlage, would employ the governing “bones” with each of the three objects. From the text critic’s standpoint, one must also explain plausibly how the plus dropped out of the MT, especially when one can readily appreciate why the LXX would have added it. No such explanation has been offered.

Such literary and textual phenomena regularly signal secondary work focused on solving a particular crux. In this case, it appears that the LXX has attempted to smooth out rough spots in the text. The original Hebrew text probably read, “the bones of Saul and Jonathan his son.” An early scribe added the contextual harmonization, “and of those impaled.” Within the LXX, subsequent scribes variously preceded that interpolation and “of Jonathan” by the stylistically unifying element, “the bones.”

Other translations and commentators variously transform the plural subjects to the singular or take the plural as the indefinite subject and rephrase it in the passive: the bones were collected, Saul and Jonathan were buried, all was done in accordance with David’s command. However, even if one overlooks the subjective, obfuscating, and perhaps incorrect nature of the renderings, still

---

22 See GKC §128a, and, with greater nuance, Paul Joüon, A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew (rev. T. Muraoka; SubBi 14/1–2; Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1996), §129b. The few LXX manuscripts that do have “and the bones” before “of those impaled” (M, N, and several cursives) probably attest to a later effort to unify the style in the verse.

23 See McCarter, II Samuel, 440. One has to wonder whether the midrash that cites 2 Sam 21:14 as a proof text for the idea that the death of the righteous brings atonement has this plus in mind and refers not to Saul, who died long before this episode, but to the seven sons, whose death, capped by burial, brought atonement; see Tan. B. Aharei §10; Pesiq. Rb. Kah. §26.11 (end); Lev. Rab. §20.7 (end).

24 Contra Driver, Notes, 352. Note that Driver accepted the plus in the LXX, but did not follow the LXX in repeating “and the bones” before “of Jonathan his son,” leading again to a less probable text.

25 It seems likely that “the bones” entered v. 14a to precede “of Jonathan” prior to the addition of “of those impaled,” under the influence of vv. 12–13. Those few LXX manuscripts also adding πάντων (“all”) before τῶν ἧλιονθέπτων (“of those impaled”) seem to stress Rizpah’s success in protecting the corpses—not one bone was lost—and perhaps even laud her for guarding Michal’s sons, too.

none of the permutations put forward resolves all the issues.\textsuperscript{27} The very variety of solutions proposed, the lack of consensus, and the problems left unsolved argue for something other than a text-critical solution.

To offer an alternative, the various difficulties—narrative disjunctures and syntactical anomalies—may signal the mechanical, yet deliberate, even judicious, intertwining of two different stories.\textsuperscript{28} Note first that in vv. 13–14 the narrative thread has frayed and tangled. In terms of both the elliptical alternation in subject and the gaps and inconsistencies in narrative logic, the verbal clauses do not follow smoothly upon one another. However, when disentangled, they do link up into two continuous, logical narrative strands formulated consistently.

The first disjuncture, as noted, occurs between vv. 13a and b. Taking v. 13a, then, as the point of departure for disentangling the strands, it clearly follows v. 12 and picks up again in v. 14a. All three segments deal with David’s reburial of Saul and Jonathan. Moreover, when strung together, these clauses make up a continuous strand and a complete episode, however brief. True, the MT in v. 14a has the plural verb “they buried,” which would seem to sap the argument of its thrust, but LXX A and Luc preserve the singular here.\textsuperscript{29} Such a text attests a smooth, consistent narrative centered on a single active subject, David, and formulated to convey this focus grammatically.\textsuperscript{30}

Setting this short narrative strand aside and recognizing that v. 14b unquestionably concludes the story in vv. 1–11, the remaining clauses, formulated in the plural, include vv. 13b and 14a. The clause in v. 13b, which mentions “those impaled,” resumes the story in vv. 1–11 and anticipates its conclusion in v. 14b. Though not as transparently, v. 14a belongs with this text, too (see the following).\textsuperscript{31}

\textsuperscript{27} Intimating vv. 12a and 13a as something of a repetitive resumption, Budde simply excises almost all of v. 12 as a gloss, similarly removes v. 13b, and, like Smith (\textit{Books of Samuel}, 377), proposes emending v. 14 (“they buried”) to (“he buried them”) and taking the direct object marker in the prepositional sense, “with”: “and he buried them with the bones of Saul . . .” (\textit{Die Bücher Samuel}, 309). But, beyond the very fact of this rather casual wholesale revision, Budde cites no textual evidence and brings no other examples of mem–weaw interchanges.

\textsuperscript{28} For the poetics of the combined text, see, e.g., Fokkelman, \textit{Throne and City}, 271–92; see also section V below.

\textsuperscript{29} Given the revised nature of LXX A and Luc, the variant most likely reflects a genuine Hebrew Vorlage (see Emanuel Tov, \textit{The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research} [rev. ed.; Jerusalem: Simor, 1997], 151–53). In addition, the complicated reading with the singular verb in LXX A and Luc (\ldots \textit{ירבע} \ldots \textit{יאבויו} \ldots \textit{ישת} \ldots \textit{יאבויו}), the homogeneity of the plural verbs in MT vv. 13–14 (\ldots \textit{ירבע} \ldots \textit{יאבויו} \ldots \textit{ישת} 
\ldots \textit{יאבויו})—whether produced deliberately or through scribal error—and the diversity among the versional emendations, together make it appropriate to apply here the principle of the primacy of difficult readings.

\textsuperscript{30} Stoebe rightly affirms the emphasis on David as the actor (\textit{Das zweite Buch Samuels}, 455, v. 12 n. a).

\textsuperscript{31} In this division, I have been anticipated by Ackroyd, in his comment on v. 13 (\textit{Second Book of Samuel}, 199): “The removal of the bones of Saul and Jonathan is here amplified with a reference
Fleshing out the narrative logic in this strand, the story tells how, with David’s help, the Gibeonites avenged themselves against the house of Saul. The story begins with the famine (v. 1) and runs through the report reaching David of Rizpah’s moving act of devotion (v. 11); it continues with the Gibeonites removing the bones of the impaled (v. 13b), perhaps because Rizpah effectively prevented their dispersal and so managed even to soften the Gibeonites’ resolve for complete vengeance.32 The story then notes the Gibeonites’ loyalty to David from then on in return for his cooperation (v. 14aβ).33 Finally, it closes with God’s complete propitiation (v. 14b).34 Precisely because the conflator did not harmonize the two sources by revising them to flow more smoothly, but simply spliced them together, the following eclectic translation can illustrate the division into two stories with roman and italic typefaces:35

32 Ackroyd seems to identify v. 13b as a harmonizing addition (Second Book of Samuel, 199–200), but no substantive reason exists not to attribute it to this story, which, to the contrary, would suffer a gap without it. Ackroyd may have disliked the distance between the pronoun “they” in v. 13b and its antecedent, “the Gibeonites,” back in v. 9, with the Rizpah material intervening. However, Stoebe raised the likelihood that Rizpah’s interlude itself is secondary (Das zweite Buch Samuelis, 460). In this scenario, Ackroyd could be correct, that the Gibeonite story originally had no burial whatsoever, but once the added Rizpah material made burial an issue, v. 13b followed with the Gibeonites collecting the remains Rizpah had protected. On the relationship between Rizpah’s protective actions and the Gibeonites collecting the bones, see further n. 45 below.

33 In non-Priestly biblical style, a comment of the type in v. 14aβ rarely covers actions already completed; rather, it follows commands given but not yet fulfilled. Sensitive to this usage, the midrash did not infer from the expression “whatever the king commanded” the obvious, namely, a command by David to remove the corpses; rather it felt compelled to postulate a command whose fulfillment the story does not relate (Num. Rab. §8.4 [end] and Pirke R. El., ch. 17).

34 Comparing the Gibeonite episode to the census catastrophe in 2 Sam 24, Blenkinsopp takes the use of Elohim in 21:14b and YHWH in 24:25 in the otherwise identical phrase, “Elohim/YHWH yielded to the earth,” as “suggesting comparison with E and J in the Pentateuch” (Gibeon and Israel, 114 n. 40). However, the entire theme of the land’s punishment and entreaty has no place in the story of 2 Sam 24, in which YHWH punishes the people directly. Most likely, because of the parallels already existing between the two stories and to reinforce the palistrophe in chs. 21–24, the compiler of the appendix copied God’s receptiveness to the land’s entreaty from the Gibeonites’ story and tacked it on at the end of the census story; note the presumably secondary linkage in 24:1. On originally similar stories progressively revised to resemble each other further, see Yair Zakovitch, “Assimilation in Biblical Narratives,” in Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism, 175–96.

There was a famine during the reign of David, year after year, for three years. David sought an audience with YHWH. YHWH said, “Because of Saul and the House of Bloodguilt”—because he put Gibeonites to death. The king summoned the Gibeonites and told them. Now the Gibeonites were not of Israelite stock, but a remnant of the Amorites, to whom the Israelites had given an oath, yet Saul had tried to wipe them out in his zeal for the people of Israel and Judah. David asked the Gibeonites, “What shall I do for you? What shall I ransom, so that you will bless YHWH’s estate?” The Gibeonites answered him, “We have no claim for silver or gold against Saul and his household, and we have no claim on the life of any other man in Israel.” He responded, “Whatever you say I will do for you.” So they said to the king, “The man who massacred us and who plotted to eliminate us, so that we should not survive anywhere in the territory of Israel, let seven men from among his issue be handed over to us, and we will impale them to YHWH in Gibeah Saul, the chosen of YHWH.” The king replied, “I shall deliver (them).” But the king spared Mephibosheth son of Jonathan son of Saul, because of the oath of YHWH between them, between David and Jonathan son of Saul. Instead, the king took Armoni and Mephibosheth, the two sons that Rizpah daughter of Aiah had borne to Saul, and the five sons that Merab daughter of Saul had borne to Adriel son of Barzillai the Meholathite, and he handed them over to the Gibeonites. They impaled them on the mountain before YHWH; all seven of them perished at the same time. They were put to death in the first days of the harvest, in the beginning of the barley harvest. Then Rizpah daughter of Aiah took some sackcloth and pitched it by a boulder (staying there) from the beginning of the harvest until rain from the sky fell on them (the corpses); she did not let the birds of the sky settle upon them by day or the wild beasts (approach) by night. David was told what Saul’s concubine Rizpah daughter of Aiah had done. David went and took the bones of Saul and the bones of his son Jonathan from the citizens of Jabesh-gilead, who had made off with them from the public square of Beth-shan, where the Philistines had hung them up on the day the Philistines killed Saul at Gilboa. He brought up the bones of Saul and the bones of his son Jonathan from there. They gathered the bones of those impaled. He buried the bones of Saul and his son Jonathan in Zela, in the territory of Benjamin, in the tomb of his father Kish. And they did whatever the king commanded. After that, God yielded to the earth.
nate themes and take differing, even opposing positions on a variety of issues, from their respective portrayals of David, especially in his relation to Saul and his descendants, to their respective concern for the proper burial of Israelites.

In the story that takes up the majority of the pericope, an episode ushered in by a protracted famine lasting three years, David must send seven of Saul’s progeny to their death for the good of the country. In Josh 9:3–27, YHWH stands behind the oath given to the Gibeonites, implying that he will demand retribution from the one who violates it. Saul, the text here explains, laid claim to that dubious distinction. Unless David as king takes upon himself the responsibility to pay up, YHWH will continue to make all Israel suffer. Whatever sympathy the depiction of Rizpah may elicit and however much the author may have attempted to qualify through it Saul’s violation of the oath to the Gibeonites, the fact of this story remains that Saul bears the blame for the famine and, tragically, for its grisly resolution. David, on the other hand, keeps his vow to Jonathan and spares Mephibosheth. Ultimately, then, the story pits Saul against David on the issue of vows. Saul violates them, bringing death to his family; David upholds them, saving Saul’s family.

36 Scholars, traditional and modern alike, have variously sought to identify the massacre. Candidates include the Nob episode in 1 Sam 22:9–19 (e.g., Hans W. Hertzberg, I & II Samuel: A Commentary [OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1964], 382; see already in particular Mishnat R. El., 165, lines 9–13, but also b. Yeb. 78b; b. B. Qam. 119a: Lev. Rab. §22:3; Num. Rab. §§5:3; 8:4) and the cryptic remark in 2 Sam 4:2–3 (e.g., Moses H. Segal, “Studies in the Books of Samuel: Part II,” JQR n.s. 8 [1917]: 98–99). Blenkinsopp contends that Saul made Gibeon his capital, which move may have eventually ended in the kind of falling out described in the case of Abimelech and Shechem in Judg 9 (“Did Saul Make Gibeon His Capital,” 1–7, esp. 7). G. Henton Davies suggests an attempt by Saul to recover the lost ark (“Ark of the Covenant,” IDB 1:222–26, at 224). See the review by McCarter, who himself feels that the massacre or campaign referred to belonged to a text no longer extant (II Samuel, 441; so already Wellhausen, Die Composition des Hexateuch, 260). In light of the general portrait of David in the book of Samuel as not responsible for the decimation of Saul and his house, and following those scholars who infer an attempt to hide David’s true guilt (see n. 56, below), Meir Malul suggests that Saul never attacked the Gibeonites; rather, the story trumps up a pretext for David to do away with an entire group of Saul’s descendants (“Was David Involved in the Death of Saul on the Gilboa Mountain?” RB 103 [1996]: 517–45, at 523 n. 25).

37 The very aside clarifying Saul’s guilt in v. 2 already softens the indictment by attributing his acts to “his zeal for the people of Israel and Judah” (see Rashi, ad loc.; Stoebe, Das zweite Buch Samuelis, 457). Compare Num 25:10–13, but note the contrast! Phinehas merits for himself and his descendants an eternal covenant of peace and a permanent place inside YHWH’s abode, whereas Saul’s children and grandchildren must die violently, and that—on the mountain “before YHWH,” namely, either at the entrance to or across from his sacred precinct. Moshe Weinfeld raises the possibility that the story of the ruse by which the Gibeonites extracted an oath from the Israelites in Josh 9 meant to justify or at least mitigate Saul’s actions (The Promise of the Land: The Inheritance of the Land of Canaan by the Israelites [Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993], 142).

38 Emphasized already to a certain degree, although elaborated in a somewhat different direction, by Fokkelman (Throne and City, 281–82); see further in his comments for additional ways in which this story sets up a stark contrast between Saul and David (ibid., 277). Weinfeld links
The second story, in which David returns the bones of Saul and Jonathan to the land of Benjamin, draws an entirely different kind of picture.\textsuperscript{39} It does not set David up against Saul. To the contrary, it continues the theme of David's respect, even love, for Saul and Jonathan, bringing it to a climax in what biblical narrative considers an ultimate act of loyalty, proper care for the dead.\textsuperscript{40} The text highlights this personal element by referring to David exclusively by his proper name, never once by the title “the king.” This personal view of David contrasts with the story of the Gibeonites, which makes deliberate and effective use of David's official title, since David acts in his capacity as the person responsible for the nation as a whole and for the previous regime—namely, Saul—in particular.

Indeed, the story of the famine takes it for granted that the responsibility for the nation’s well-being has already devolved upon David’s shoulders, for which reason it falls to him to deal with the Gibeonites, fulfill their demands, and bring blessing to Israel. This story confirms David’s position as king through the implied recognition of YHWH, who vouchsafes David the sought-after oracle, and through the legitimate power it attributes to David to send seven of Saul's house to their deaths.

The brief report about David’s care for Saul’s and Jonathan’s bones works with an alternate set of assumptions and approaches. It depicts David still in the throes of his attempt to establish his credentials as king.\textsuperscript{41} Presenting himself as the caretaker of the previous king's remains, namely, as the designated heir, as the king’s “son,” would have clear implications.\textsuperscript{42} This brief story, then, does not take as its starting point an implicit recognition of David’s kingship and

---

\textsuperscript{39} Fokkelman, an avowedly synchronic reader, calls it “a drastic change in the theme of the piece” (\textit{Throne and City}, 272).

\textsuperscript{40} For example, Gen 47:29–31; 2 Sam 2:5–6. The first story does also portray Rizpah’s concern for the dead, but this element does not constitute the climax of that story or its main theme. If anything, it dramatizes David’s predicament, pitting his sympathy for Rizpah’s gruesome plight against the Gibeonites’ rights to complete propitiation, which normally would conclude with the abuse and dispersion of the corpses through the hand of nature. David compromises, allowing both the Gibeonites to impale the sons and Rizpah to protect the bodies. See further n. 45 below.

\textsuperscript{41} In historiographical terms, the two stories belong to two different periods in David’s life. See further below, at the end of section III and in section IV.

\textsuperscript{42} For David as Saul’s son, see Tomoo Ishida, \textit{The Royal Dynasties in Ancient Israel: A Study on the Formation and Development of Royal-Dynastic Ideology} (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1977), 71–80.
further affirm it by illustrating the legitimate freedoms he may take with the previous royal family; rather, it centers on the role of David, still the aspiring heir to Saul, in bringing the odyssey of Saul’s and Jonathan’s remains to its proper and fitting conclusion.\footnote{Transferring the bones of a group’s hero to the group’s city constitutes one of the characteristic themes in Greek and Israelite “foundation” stories; see Weinfeld, \textit{Promise of the Land}, 15, 34. Compare especially the case of Joseph’s bones in Gen 50:25; Exod 13:19; and Josh 24:32.}

Both the story of Gibeonite vengeance and that of David’s reinterment of Saul and Jonathan move toward the dressing of some open wound to bring rapprochement and closure, but the different narrative elements marshaled to effect this healing process do so in widely divergent ways. David, for instance, acts in a diametrically opposed manner from one story to the next. In the Gibeonite story, he gathers Saul’s living remains in order to hand them over to an aggrieved group. In the reburial episode, he gathers Saul’s and Jonathan’s bodily remains and brings them home, completing their phased transfer from enemy hands to the Benjaminite hearth.

Relatedly, the stories differ in terms of the injured parties and the meaning behind the method of propitiation. In the Gibeonite pericope, Saul’s violation of the vow in hunting down the Gibeonites creates two victims or plaintiffs, the Gibeonites, obviously, but YHWH as well, whose name and reputation Saul has willy-nilly put to the test. The impalement of the sons, then, which lasts for months, does more than exact judicial vengeance for the Gibeonites through vicarious talionic punishment.\footnote{Contra Alexander F. Kirkpatrick (\textit{The Books of Samuel} [CBC; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1930], 414) and Raymond Westbrook (\textit{Studies in Biblical and Cuneiform Law} [CahRB; Paris: Gabalda, 1988], 47–55, esp. 51 n. 54). In Num 25:4 a strictly judicial sense is equally insufficient; see further Arnold B. Ehrlich, \textit{Scripture According to Its Plain Meaning} (in Hebrew; 3 vols.; Berlin: M. Poppelauer, 1899–1901; repr., New York: Ktav, 1969), 1:294; and Haran, “Impaling,” 256–58, 264–65, 274. For straight bloodshed causing famine—but no vicarious impalement—see: in prose narrative, Gen 4:1–12; in poetry, 2 Sam 1:21; in prophecy, Ezek 22:1–24; in law, Num 35:31–34; extrabiblically, \textit{Aqhat} 2 iv 16–3 i 46 (\textit{Ugaritic Narrative Poetry} [trans. Mark S. Smith et al.; WAW 9; ed. S. B. Parker; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997], 165–69).} The setting of the famine, the divine oracle, David’s use of the term \textit{rpk}, the Gibeonites’ power to bring blessing to “YHWH’s estate,” the ritual impalement of Saul’s sons “before YHWH” (see 2 Sam 20:8; 1 Kgs 3:14–15), their nonburial, and the emphasis on YHWH’s propitiation at the story’s end, particularly the term \textit{rtn}—all combine to affirm that impaling the sons amounts to a sacrificial offering to YHWH.\footnote{For the socral side of famine brought on by bloodguilt, see Alexander (Roifer) Rofé, “The Breaking of the Heifer’s Neck” (in Hebrew), Tarbiz 31 (1962–63): 119–43, esp. 135–36; Moshe Weinfeld, “Inheritance of the Land—Privilege versus Obligation: The Concept of the ‘Promise of the Land’ in the Sources of the First and Second Temple Periods” (in Hebrew), Zion 49 (1984): 115–37, esp. 120–22. For the underlying concept as extended in Priestly thought to exile caused by sexual crimes, see Baruch J. Schwartz, \textit{The Holiness Legislation: Studies in the Priestly Code} (in Hebrew), 2 Samuel 21:1–14
say the Gibeonites themselves: “we shall impale them to YHWH” (v. 6).46

The brief account of David’s reburial of the remains of Saul and Jonathan, on the other hand, does not identify any plaintiffs. Neither God nor anyone else makes the demand to retrieve the royal bones; David is the sole actor. The story also establishes no crisis impelling David to act and, correspondingly, does not

---

46 Many scholars have sought to recontextualize the impalement and perhaps dismemberment of Saul’s progeny by reconstructing, on the basis of the Ugaritic Baal Cycle (CTA 6 II-III), a rite meant to facilitate rain and the growing of crops; they extended this interpretation to cover Rizpah’s actions and so to uncover greater significance, either cultic or political or both, beneath the human pathos that both the impalement and Rizpah’s act of devotion illustrate and evoke (Cazelles, “David’s Monarchy,” 167–70; Kapelrud, “King and Fertility,” 41–50; Poulsenn, “Hour with Rispah,” 188–89; and Blenkinsopp, “Are There Traces,” 218 n. 43, who compares, among other parallels between Shechem and Gibeon, the ritual impalement of Saul’s descendants and the seemingly ritual slaughter of Jerubaal’s sons on one rock (Judg 9:5). On the root יָרִית, see Driver, Notes, 353, anticipated in the Zohar to Gen 25:21. On the vicarious punishment in the story as deriving from the sacrilegious affront the majesty of God, see Moshe Greenberg, “Some Postulates of Biblical Criminal Law,” in Studies in the Bible and Jewish Thought (Philadelphia/Jerusalem: Jewish Publication Society, 1995), 25–41, esp. 34–37 (originally published in Yehezkel Kaufmann Jubilee Volume [ed. Menahem Haran; Jerusalem: Magnes; 1960], 5–28). His analysis implies that the affront to God creates a pollution that infects the entire family. On the cultic significance of nonburial, see recently Stoebe, Das zweite Buch Samuelis, 455, v. 10 n. f.
signal a moment of reconciliation. The final due David gives to Saul and Jonathan speaks entirely for itself as a purely human gesture; whatever ritual dimension may exist never penetrates the surface of the text.

Put in terms of legal assumptions, the two stories differ with regard to the prohibition found in Deut 21:22–23 against hanging the bodies of executed criminals overnight:

If a man is guilty of a capital offense and you impale him on a stake, do not let his corpse remain on the stake overnight; rather you shall bury him that very day, because an impaled body is an affront to God, and you shall not defile the land that YHWH your God is giving you as a possession.47

The story of the atonement for Saul’s violation of the oath given to the Gibeonites directs criticism neither at the Gibeonite heirs, who probably expected or even desired that the wild animals would prey upon the corpses, nor at Rizpah, whose protection of the corpses kept them unburied for the duration of an entire agricultural season.48 Nowhere does the story so much as hint at a legal requirement to bury the impaled sons before nightfall.49 To the contrary, illustrating the care Rizpah gave evokes great sympathy for her.50 Moreover, God’s complete propitiation depends on the Gibeonites’ satisfaction, which they signal when they themselves collect the bones of the sons. Indeed, the text does not even bother to specify explicitly that the Gibeonites actually buried the bones.51 Put more succinctly, in the story, the display of the allowed Rizpah her moment even though it forestalled the normal, proper conclusion for treaty violation and now the sons would receive their final rites.

47 Moshe Weinfeld holds that the law means to reject the practice of propitiating God for treaty violation by publicly exposing the violators’ corpses (Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972; repr., Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1992], 51 n. 4). R. Meir Simha Hakohen of Dvinsk (1843–1925) explains the complicated syntax by the compositional principle that arranges two related statements in alternating clauses, as initial clause a + initial clause b + modifier a + modifier b, or a₁b₁a₂b₂: [a] “Do not let his corpse remain . . . because an impaled body is an affront to God” (overnight [v. 23a+ b] and [b] “rather, you shall bury him that very day . . . so that you not defile the land that YHWH your God is giving you as a possession” [v. 23aβ + bβ]); see his commentary on the Pentateuch, Meshekh Hokhnah al Hatorah (ed. Y. Copperman; 2d ed.; 3 vols.; Jerusalem: Haskel, 1983), 3:152.

48 Stoebe notes this contradiction (Das zweite Buch Samuelis, 455, v. 10 n. f).

49 Recognized by Weisman, “Legal Aspects,” 153. Ben-yashar rightly emphasizes Rizpah’s role in keeping the corpses unburied, but he overreaches when he argues that although the Gibeonites would have wanted the corpses buried Rizpah objected so that the blood would dry up first and not defile the land (“Study of the Pericope,” 60 and n. 32). In biblical literature, legitimately spilled blood does not pollute the land; see Num 35:9–34. esp. vv. 33–34.

50 Walters sees a further stab at the Saulide house: giving prominence to Rizpah ultimately highlights the absence of Merab/Michal at this tragic moment (“Childless Michal, Mother of Five,” 293; see already Poulssen, “Hour with Rispah,” 190 n. 1).

51 Citing 2 Kgs 22:20, Kil argues that to be “collected” or “gathered” means burial (2 Samuel, 506). Even if he is correct, 2 Sam 21:13 does not emphasize the burial, only, in essence, the removal
corpses, propitimating God, saves the land; in the law, such display, insulting God, pollutes it.  

By contrast, the story relating how David retrieved Saul’s and Jonathan’s remains to reinter them in Benjamin focuses at the very least on some aspect of proper burial. When seen in conjunction with David’s emphatic praise of the people of Jabesh-gilead for burying Saul (2 Sam 2:5), again, it seems that the correct context for this story consists of improper, insufficient, or temporary treatment of the bones and a concern to rectify the situation.

III

When viewed in light of the running narrative in the book of Samuel, the distinctions between the two separate stories in 2 Sam 21:1–14 come into sharper focus. Each one continues different themes and picks up separate threads found in the larger narrative complex.

The catalyst for the action in the Gibeonite story, Saul’s analeptically recounted sacral violation with its consequences, continues an important theme found in the cycle of stories surrounding Saul prior to David’s arrival. Saul’s confused relationship with vows and following YHWH’s word has continually undercut him as a leader and led to the downfall of his kingship (see 1 Sam 13–15; 28). Now it has secured his demise and that of his house permanently.

To take one example, Saul’s violation of the vow to spare the Gibeonites links up with the Amalekite episode in 1 Sam 15 in several ways. If Saul disqualified himself as king by botching the divine command to annihilate the Amalekites, he seals the fate of his house by again transgressing a divinely sanctioned word, this one against assaulting the Gibeonites. Both stories, then, share in presenting Saul’s downfall through the violation of YHWH’s will regarding the treatment of specific nations in and around Canaan. Moreover, the two

52 See already b. Yeb. 79a; y. Qid. 4.1, 65c; y. Sanh. 6.9, 23d; Num. Rab. §8.4; Midr. Sam., ch. 28. The midrash further notes that the accountability of Saul’s house for his own sins illustrates another concept to which Deuteronomy objects, in Deut 24:16 (b. Yeb. 79a; Num. Rab. §8.4; Midr. Sam., ch. 28). See further n. 86 below. Similarly, the midrash discusses why the famine did not come in Saul’s days (Gen. Rab. 25:3; 64:2; Ruth Rab. 1:4; Midr. Sam., ch. 28; Yal. Sh. 247:153).

53 Picked up on by the rabbis in y. Qid. 4.1, 65c; y. Sanh. 6.9, 23d; Midr. Ps. on Ps 17; Midr. Sam., ch. 28; Pirqe R. El., ch. 17; see Rashi on vv. 1 and 14.

episodes join the narrative complex in Josh 2–9 in suggesting an unremitting and perhaps ideological Benjaminite belligerence toward the Canaanites that characterizes roughly Saul’s time.55

The Gibeonite episode brings Saul’s failures in this regard to a head. Ironically, Saul attempted to destroy the Gibeonites on Israel’s behalf; instead, he ended up bringing famine upon Israel on the Gibeonites’ behalf. Moreover, the only way to right this upside-down situation of Gibeonite domination required first going deeper into it: in a mirror image of the ban, the Gibeonites get to destroy Saul’s family directly in ritual execution. Only after this process plays itself out can nature return to its proper and prospering course.

The Gibeonite story adds a new dimension to the grounds for contrasting David’s success with Saul’s failure. David ensures the future of his kingdom not by punctiliously carrying out the terms of the ban but by applying an alternative policy altogether, one of sociopolitical and perhaps religious inclusion. Throughout the story, David accedes to the demands made by the Gibeonites; after the Gibeonites avenge the wrong done to them, they obey whatever commands David issues: “And they did whatever the king commanded” (v. 14ab). This symbiotic relationship, so different from Saul’s antagonism, merits the divine seal of approval illustrated by the famine’s end: “After that, God yielded . . .” (v. 14b).56

The Gibeonite story adds an important link to the chain of chapters chronicling the demise of Saul’s house. Furthermore, it develops the theme running through those chapters, of how David’s hands stay clean in the midst of that demise, as other forces gather to promote his cause. Up to this point in the narrative, two stories and one brief but pregnant note focus in detail on removing Saulide heirs from contention for the throne: the assassinations of Abner (2 Sam 3) and Ishbosheth (ch. 4) and Michal’s lack of children (6:23). Viewed from a political point of view, David’s patronage of Mephibosheth (ch. 9) may


56 On David shifting Saul’s policy on the ban, see Weinfeld, “Zion and Jerusalem,” 79–81.
belong to this set of stories as well, since, whatever the genuine fidelity to Jonathan, Mephibosheth’s perpetual board “at the king’s table” effectively keeps him under David’s watchful eye, much as David’s request for Michal may intend to contain her as well as reinforce the continuity between him and Saul (3:14). Lame in both feet, Mephibosheth may not have posed the kind of threat that invited the measures David’s supporters deemed appropriate for Abner and Ishbosheth. The story of Gibeonite vengeance against Saul’s family brings closure to the trend—began with the introductory remark that the house of Saul progressively diminishes, while the house of David increasingly develops (3:1)—with emphatic finality. Seven potential agitators meet their fate “in one fell swoop,” as the text itself emphasizes (21:9). Here, not only does Saul’s house diminish and as a result David’s house strengthen, but David himself plays the part of the pivot.


58 Noted by Tomoo Ishida, History and Historical Writing in Ancient Israel: Studies in Biblical Historiography (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 158 n. 1. It is tempting to respond to this theme by paraphrasing the queen’s remark to Hamlet (III.ii.230)—the author doth protest too much, methinks—and to follow those scholars who see in it an apology meant to deny David any role in the methodical elimination of Saul’s house (Ehrlich, Scripture, 2:247; P. Kyle McCarter, Jr., “The Apology of David,” JBL 99 [1980]: 489–504; James C. VanderKam, “Davidic Complicity in the Deaths of Abner and Eshbaal: A Historical and Redactional Study,” JBL 99 [1980]: 521–39; Frederick H. Cryer, “David’s Rise to Power and the Death of Abner,” VT 35 [1985]: 385–94; Polzin, David and the Deuteronomist, 206–7; Mahul, “Was David Involved in the Death of Saul on the Gilboa Mountain?”; see also Ishida, History and Historical Writing, 158–65). However, caution advises against singling out the definitive agenda in these stories with too much confidence. Without the control provided by additional texts, which could confirm several of the details in the stories or, better, offer a different slant on the same general events, it is difficult to separate fact from spin. In an alternative scenario, for instance, the narrative may be telescoping several distant, unrelated, and apolitical Saulide deaths into a brief period and attributing them to David’s supporters in order to dramatize David’s charm. The theme in this case, rather than countering David’s notorious ruthlessness, serves to glorify his ascent by taking a mundane, drawn-out process and recasting it as an inspiring, action-packed account of the extreme devotion the hero aroused. Another reading, akin to but somewhat blacker than Jotham’s parable (Judg 9:6–20) and worse than anything Samuel predicted (1 Sam 8:11–18; 12:13–15, 20–25), would infer the message that kingship substitutes one kind of instability for another, or, if one prefers the more optimistic spirit in Samson’s riddle (Judg 14:14), that the blessing of kingship emerges through violence. Such protean multivalence renders
Related to these same chapters through an additional element, the Gibeonites’ story also picks up the thread pertaining to Rizpah, Saul’s concubine. Twice this woman finds herself in the middle of David’s efforts to forge new alliances at the expense of Saul and his house, alliances seemingly bound up with the ability to rule over a contiguous Israel.

The first time—so the narrator reveals analeptically and through the direct speech of the characters—Abner had slept with Rizpah, in a power play originally meant to crown his rise within the house of Saul and establish himself as Saul’s successor. Ultimately, however, the move led to his defection to David’s camp, for when Ishbosheth later recalls the seditious incident, Abner throws his lot in with David, probably in an effort to save his life (2 Sam 3:6–21)—fruitlessly, as it turns out (2 Sam 3:22–27). Structurally, Abner fills two parts in this, his final episode: the potential successor who meets an untimely death and the party joining David’s ranks.

The second time Rizpah appears, Abner’s dual role splits itself into two characters, or two groups of characters: Rizpah’s sons, who suffer an early death because of their status as potential successors to Saul, and the Gibeonites, whose territory, according to those reading the story with an eye toward military and political geography, had cut Saul’s kingdom in two, in a swath separating north from south.59

Abner had sworn to Ishbosheth that he would hand David the entire kingdom, “from Dan to Beer-sheba” (2 Sam 3:9–10); indeed, he strode the halls of Israelite power to campaign on David’s behalf (vv. 17–19). Similarly, acceding to the Gibeonites’ demands gains David their loyalty (21:14), which in effect gives him a territorially contiguous domain over which to establish and extend his rule.

Rizpah, in these two stories, serves as the linchpin joining the various parts that make up the plot’s structure. In both, whoever has Rizpah, whether as wife/concubine or as mother, marks himself as an heir and potential rival to David, which amounts to slating himself for an early execution; and in both, the execution of those tracing their claims through Rizpah leads or should lead to a united territory for David to rule.

The structural alignments surrounding the figure of Rizpah do not merely repeat themselves in new but ultimately static terms. A change has occurred from one stage to the next. Abner did not fill two roles as an illustration of the

59 Noted, e.g., by Blenkinsopp, “Did Saul Make Gibeon His Capital,” 3.
author’s efficiency; rather he embodied the power still coursing through Saul’s house. A claimant to the throne actually had sufficient stature within Israel to be able to promise its allegiance to his rival (2 Sam 2:8–9). By the time of the Gibeonite story, the limits of the kingdom depend not one whit on Saul’s house, but rather on the people he meant to destroy; Saul’s seven descendants die simply as a matter of political course. In addition to her role as structural linchpin, then, Rizpah also marks the slide of Saul’s house. Underscoring this slide, David does not now take Rizpah for his wife, in the kind of politically advantageous move related in the case of Abigail.60

Finally, Gibeon itself does not make its first appearance in 2 Sam 21:1–14. Open hostilities between the houses of Saul and David first manifested themselves “by the pools of Gibeon” (2 Sam 2:12–3:1). Here, at Gibeon, David’s ascent at the expense of Saulide and Benjaminites lives first begins, and here, at Gibeon, this process achieves closure: David sends a final batch of Saulides to their ritual deaths.61 Here, too, beginning and end show a dynamic movement, from a military struggle between ostensible equals to a situation in which Saul’s descendants have no say in the matter of their deaths, from war to ritual execution.

To sum up, the story of Gibeonite vengeance draws on many of the thematic and structural elements of the stories in 2 Sam 2:12–6:23 and possibly also ch. 9. The common thread running through all these episodes is the essentially open contention between the Saulides and David, whether in military or less fatal, political manifestations. Moreover, in many respects, the Gibeonite story seals shut this chapter in David’s rise, depicting his complete control over Saul’s house.62

By contrast, the story of David’s retrieval and reburial of the bones of Saul and Jonathan has no direct links to any of those episodes and themes. Rather, it seems related to a different theme, framed within a brief account, namely, how the heroes of Jabesh-gilead stole the bodies of Saul and his sons from the Philistines, facilitating their proper burial (1 Sam 31:8–13; 2 Sam 2:4b–7; 1 Chr 10:11–12). In this respect, David’s reburial of the bones joins those accounts that feature a special relationship between Gilead, on one hand, and Saul and Benjamin, on the other (Judg 19–21, esp. 21:1–14; 1 Sam 11).63 In addition, the

61 Noted in part by Polzin, David and the Deuteronomist, 213–14, but with different emphasis. For a further showdown by the pools of Gibeon (where, again, the royal side loses), see Jer 41:11–18.
62 One can pursue this line of analysis between MT 2 Sam 21:8 “Michal” and 6:23 as well.
63 For a succinct enumeration of points explaining the relationship between Saul and the
story also dovetails with David's attempts to win over Saul's tribesmen and allies in Benjamin and Jabesh-gilead, a campaign he began by slaying the Amalekite who boasted of dealing Saul his final blow (2 Sam 1:1–16) and continued by commending the citizens of Jabesh-gilead for rescuing the bodies of Saul and Jonathan from Philistine ignominy (2:4b–7).64 These episodes belong to the period before the opening of direct military hostilities—before, in fact, Abner parades Ishbosheth throughout Israel, including Gilead, to make him king (2:8–9). At this stage, David still stands a chance of presenting himself as Saul's rightful heir. David's care for the remains of the royal family follows this policy.

This distinction in the historical period presumed by each of the two stories manifests itself in a phenomenon noted above. In the running text of the book of Samuel, the narrator does not actually begin openly to refer to David as “the king” until 2 Sam 3:24, after the pivotal character of Abner, who attempted to transfer the kingdom to David, has already done so, in 2 Sam 3:21.65 From then on, the alternation between title and personal name, and their order when standing in apposition (“King David” or “David the king”), often serve as signals of one sort or another for the discerning hermeneut. This alternation exists in the story of the Gibeonites. The brief report about David's reinterment of the remains of Saul and Jonathan, though, exclusively refers to David by his personal name, which suggests that the report belongs to the period prior to Abner’s defection, or at least to the texts depicting that period.

IV

The contrast between the stories of Gibeonite vengeance and royal reinterment goes beyond the differences in theme, narrative stage, and background assumption. General scholarly opinion has it that the story of Gibeonite vengeance originally sat within the actual text containing its related narrative pieces. Most scholars (re)place the story immediately prior to David's search, in honor of Jonathan, for a surviving member of Saul's family (2 Sam 9:1–13),


64 Malul sees the Amalekite episode as part of the agenda to deny David's complicity in the destruction of Saul's house, in this case, in the murder of Saul himself; David kills the Amalekite to "tie up the loose end" ("Was David Involved," 531–36). James Ackerman adds that David's recurring concern with killing God's anointed could mean to establish a precedent so that his own methods do not come back to haunt him (oral communication).

65 2 Samuel 2:11 is a proleptic summary comment with its own set of source-critical problems.
since David begins his search by voicing a presupposition to the effect that the majority of Saul’s heirs are no longer alive:

Then David said, “Is there yet any other remnant of the House of Saul that I may treat him loyally for Jonathan’s sake?” (v. 1)

In this case, David’s sparing of Mephibosheth in 2 Sam 21:7 only makes sense as a subsequent harmonization necessitated by the inclusion of the text among the chapters appended to the book of Samuel.66 Others reject the hypothesis that the story originally preceded 2 Sam 9 and its corollary, that v. 7 constitutes an editorial harmonization. From the internal aspects of the story, no indications, literary or textual, warrant the excision of v. 7 from the original composition. Moreover, the narrative logic leading scholars to identify David’s sparing of Mephibosheth in v. 7 as a secondary harmonization applies equally to the rest of the sons in v. 8: if David chose the sons given to the Gibeonites, how could he not have known of the existence and whereabouts of Mephibosheth and other sons?67 The entire Gibeonite story, then, with v. 7, originally followed David’s patronage (or house arrest) of Mephibosheth in 2 Sam 9. According to this group of scholars, the Gibeonite episode provides the background of the assault by Shimei son of Gera on David (2 Sam 16:5–13), which similarly indicates that Saul’s house met its demise and lays the charge at David’s bloody hands:

Out! Out you unscrupulous murderer! YHWH has avenged all the bloodguilt of Saul’s house, in whose place you rule . . . for you are a murderer! (vv. 7b–8)

And, they reason, within these two outer limits, 2 Sam 9 and 16, the break between chs. 9 and 10 provides the most appropriate location for the story.68 Although the analysis in sections II–III cannot provide the key to decide this debate, it may have repercussions for it. If the story of Gibeonite vengeance does imply that after the rapprochement with the Gibeonites

---

David’s reach now covers all Israel, then the story would fit nicely prior to David’s exploits against Israel’s neighbors in 2 Sam 8. After the bloody consolidation of his internal rule—through the systematically serendipitous elimination of his potential rivals for the throne—and the establishment of political contiguity within Canaan, David turns outward to the lands bordering it.⁶⁹ Whether such a schematic bifurcation of political activity conforms to historical reality or not, it offers the historiographer an elegant organizing principle.⁷⁰

On the other hand, the confidence displayed by David, the ease with which he manipulates the Saulide heirs, and the total lack of apparent restraints all argue for distancing the episode as much as possible from the heart of the live struggle between Saul’s house and David.⁷¹ In the previous incidents David plays no role in removing the Saulides, but rather laments and avenge their deaths (2 Sam 1:1–27; 3:28–39; 4:9–12; see also 16:5–13⁷²). The narrator does not state explicitly that David withheld further relations from Michal, but only reports matter-of-factly that “as for Michal daughter of Saul, she did not have children until the day she died” (6:23), perhaps to imply that God had punished her with barrenness.⁷³ In the case of the Gibeonites, David personally hands over Saul’s children for execution. Furthermore, the Gibeonites formulate their request in the passive, “let them be given over to us,” yet David replies in the active voice, which the narrator then amplifies: “The king said, ‘I will give them over’ . . . The king took . . . The king handed them over” (21:6b–9a)⁷⁴ The contrast serves to underscore David’s direct participation in the destruction of Saul’s house—meant here to bring absolution and propitiation. As David’s hold on the reins of kingship gets stronger, the narrative appears to indicate, so does

---

If one accepts the reasoning of Ehrlich, Segal, Haran, and Fokkelman (in this note and the previous one), then the story of the Gibeonites knows and continues another theme in the book of Samuel, the covenant between David and Jonathan. In any case, note the ironic continuities between 2 Sam 21:3–4 and 1 Sam 20:4.

It remains to debate where precisely before 2 Sam 8 the story may have sat, but such deliberations would take us too far afield.

This principle functions in Joshua–Judges too: in Joshua the Israelites engage and defeat the inhabitants of Canaan, so that in Judges enemies primarily come from beyond its borders (Mr. Itamar Kislev, oral communication; on Judges 1–2, see Weinfeld, *Promise of the Land*, 121–82).

Against Weisman, who, wrongly discounting the sacral side of the story, thinks that David’s total and personal control over the situation, without any judicial or administrative institutions, indicates an early period in his reign (“Legal Aspects,” 153–54).

In 2 Sam 16:12, read probably “yyIn” (“my degradation,” as in Gen 29:32 and 1 Sam 1:11; see also Gen 31:42; Exod 3:7; 4:31; Deut 26:7; 2 Kgs 14:26; Ps 9:14; 25:18; Lam 1:9; Neh 9:9).


The use of the independent first person pronoun (’78’78) serves to emphasize David’s personal participation as well; see GKC §135d–h; Blau, *Grammar*, §70.1; Waltke and O’Connor, *Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, §16.3.2d-e; Joüon-Muraoka, *Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, §146a.
his boldness in dealing with his Saulide adversaries. It would seem, then, from this developmental point of view, that the Gibeonite episode constitutes the final chapter in the struggle against Saul’s house, in which David personally and publicly helps silence a final clamor of Saulide voices.75

In either case, flat-out contradictions between the Gibeonite story and the related narrative elements in 2 Sam 2:8–9:13 do not exist to preclude its once having actually belonged to that text or a forerunner of it.76 By contrast, scholars have overlooked the fact that the story of David’s reburial of the royal bones seems to deviate from the other, similar reports in 1 Sam 31:8–13 and 2 Sam 2:4b–7 in several ways, indicating not a once-continuous text rent by the accidents of history and repatched incompletely, but rather an alternative “take,” which does not quite serve as a complement.77

First of all, the text in 1 Sam 31:1–2 Sam 2:7 seems to have undergone a process of expansion from a story exclusively about Saul’s death and remains, to one that in 1 Sam 31:8, 12–13 includes those of his three sons (probably because in 1 Sam 31:1–7 the three fight and fall beside him), and then to one that in 2 Sam 1:4, 5, 12, 17–27 puts the spotlight on Saul and Jonathan (probably under the impact of the addition of David’s lament, in 2 Sam 1:17–27).78 In

75 But see Stoebe’s arguments against interpreting the story in this direction (Das zweite Buch Samuels, 459–60).
76 Despite the arguments brought for seeing the story as entirely independent of 2 Sam 9, Leonhard Rost contrasted 2 Sam 21:1–14, in which David consults with YHWH, knows the whereabouts of Saul’s family, and spares Mephibosheth because of an oath to Jonathan, and which emphasizes the centrality of divine will, with 2 Sam 9–20, in which David never consults YHWH, knows nothing of the whereabouts of Saul’s family, and spares Mephibosheth for Jonathan without mention of any oath, and which rarely makes divine will explicit (The Succession to the Throne of David [trans. M. D. Rutter and D. M. Gunn; Sheffield: Almond, 1982], 65–66). Alter contended that the loose syntactic style, the weak use of dialogue, the lack of psychological complexity, and the assumption that Saul massacred the Gibeonites all set the story apart from what he calls, “the David story proper” (David Story, 330). Kil noted the absence of the transition, “after that,” which introduces other Davidic episodes, in 8:1; 10:1; 13:1; 15:1 (2 Samuel, 500), while, as Fokkelman observed, the phrase that does appear, “during the reign of David” (v. 1), makes the narrator much later than the events narrated (Throne and City, 275; see already Ehrlich, Scripture, 2:246–47), whereas scholars have long felt the close proximity between narrator and narrated in “the David story proper.” Indeed, the very emphasis that this story, too, belongs to the time of David signals a later piece; compare Num 15:32; Ruth 1:1; Esth 1:1–2. Surely, if Shimei suspected that David had a hand in the deaths of Ishbosheth, Abner, and even Saul and his sons at Gilboa, it would suffice for him to pronounce David awash in the blood of Saul’s house (2 Sam 16:7–8). David’s query in 2 Sam 9:1 could have these same losses in mind, and YHWH’s oracular designation of Saul as a bloodguilty house in 2 Sam 21:1 could echo Shimei’s allegation deliberately to redirect it.
77 Except for Stoebe, Das zweite Buch Samuelis, 60 n. 51.
78 On David’s lament, see Steven Weitzman, Song and Story in Biblical Narrative: The History of a Literary Convention in Ancient Israel (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1997), 133–40. In LXX B its influence extended back into 1 Sam 31:12; the Sahidic version takes this trend even further.
the final result, it appears that, while David focuses in on Saul and Jonathan, the Philistines have absconded with, and the Jabesh-gileadites have returned, the remains of Saul’s sons Abinadab and Malkishua as well. The reinterment story in 2 Sam 21:12–13a, 14α, though, speaks exclusively of Saul and Jonathan, creating the impression that the people of Jabesh-gilead do not have the bones of any other members of the royal family.79

Second, and more significantly, the brief episode embedded in 2 Sam 21 appears to suggest that all the while the bones had lain in Jabesh-gilead they had in fact awaited some final treatment. The account in 1 Sam 31:12–13, though, relates that the people of Jabesh-gilead cremated the bodies and buried the remains in what sounds like final rites. Indeed, burial under a tree (1 Sam 31:13; 1 Chr 10:12) would seem to indicate a holy site (as in Gen 35:6–8, also 35:4)—hardly a candidate for exhumation.80 Accordingly, both the report David receives and his appraisal of it in 2 Sam 2:4b–5 hint at no expectation of further action regarding the matter, “case closed.”81

Whatever the themes shared among David’s reburial of Saul’s and Jonathan’s remains and the reports in 1 Sam 31:12–13 and 2 Sam 2:4b–5, then, it seems that the reinterment story preserved in 2 Sam 21 diverges from the story of Gibeonite vengeance in that it most likely did not once constitute part

79 Kirkpatrick harmonized: they “doubtless” buried the bones “of Saul’s two other sons who fell at Gilboa, though the historian does not specify them by name” (Books of Samuel, 412).

80 Radak, ad loc., addresses this double treatment. Rabbinic tradition (t. Šabb. 8:17; t. Sanh. 4:2–3; b. ‘Abod. Zor. 11a) understands this type of funeral pyre as limited to the king’s linens. Tg. Jon. renders the verse in this spirit. The text in 1 Chr 10:12 simply skips over it. Several cursive LXX manuscripts have a verb derived from κατακλαίω (“bewail, lament”) rather than κατακαίω (“burn”)—a fortuitous error or a deliberate change? McCarter thinks the cremation notice secondary and late, but he offers no explanation for such an anomalous addition (I Samuel: A New Translation with Introduction, Notes, and Commentary [AB 8; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1980], 442). If anything, it stands to reason that the burial under the tree represents a pious correction that ended up next to the original it meant to replace. Actually, though, archaeology reveals that cremation often concluded with the burial of some remains; see Elizabeth Bloch-Smith, Judahite Burial Practices and Beliefs About the Dead (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992), 52–55. Amos 6:10 may offer another example of Israelite cremation, but see Shalom M. Paul, Amos (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991), 214–16. On the significance of burial under a tree, see Bloch-Smith, Judahite Burial Practices, 114–15.

81 Budde also noted the terminological differences, הבטחתי (2 Sam 21:9) vs. הבטחת (1 Sam 31:11), and הבטחת (2 Sam 21:9) vs. הבטחת (1 Sam 31:10, 12); see Die Bücher Samuel, 309. John Mauchline takes the latter pair to indicate divergent historical traditions as to whether the Philistines hung the corpses in the public square or on the city wall (1 and 2 Samuel [NCE; London: Oliphants, 1971], 303), but Stoebe rightly denies the existence of any contradiction here (Das zweite Buch Samuels, 455, v. 12 n. o): archaeology has demonstrated that public squares often abutted city walls; see Biblical Archaeology (ed. Shalom M. Paul and William G. Dever; Jerusalem: Keter, 1973), 18; and Amihai Mazar, Archaeology of the Land of the Bible: 10,000–586 B.C.E. (New York: Doubleday, 1990), 469–70.
of the running text linking the other preserved reports. In this case, though, the divergence between the two stories in 2 Sam 21:1–14 does not simply follow along the lines already emerging, as yet another ramification of the source-critical division. Because this divergence highlights the two stories as mutually exclusive, it actually confirms the division itself.

V

To conclude, it appears that an author or scribe—probably the compiler of all the various texts comprising the appendix in 2 Sam 21–24—came across a story telling how David had the remains of Saul and Jonathan reinterred in the family plot in Benjamin. The scribe incorporated it into the Gibeonites’ story, probably because of their common theme, “the fate of the remains of Saul and his heirs,” specifically, the motifs of impalement and reburial. Incorporating this brief account required nothing more elaborate than a simple “cut and paste” method. One might accuse this conflator of sloppiness for having left traces of the editorial work at the seams. It seems more productive, though, to recognize how the results changed the larger, Gibeonite narrative, ultimately creating a new, more finely modulated composition, with a plot illustrating a more complex attitude toward history and causality.

At the psychological level, the current location of the smaller story touchingly suggests that Rizpah’s devoted efforts to preserve the bodies moved David so, that he felt compelled to match them by retrieving the bones of Saul and Jonathan from Jabesh-gilead to rebury them in the family plot in Benjamin, along with the bones of those sons given into Gibeonite hands. Whatever con-

82 This does not necessarily rule out the possibility that it made use of the parallel story; Galen Marquis notes that v. 12 reverses the order of events in 1 Sam 31 (Explicit Literary Allusions in Biblical Historiography [in Hebrew; Ph.D. diss., Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1999], 171). However, this phenomenon could reflect the poetics of flashbacks rather than scribal techniques for citation.

83 The story possibly had some relationship with the series of Philistine episodes beginning in 2 Sam 21:15, which would help explain the current order of the text in 2 Sam 21 and the use of “further” in v. 15. In the LXX manuscript tradition, some version of vv. 15b–16a appears right before v. 12 (in one text it appears right before v. 11). For a discussion of this “doublet,” see Stephen Pisano, Additions or Omissions in the Books of Samuel (OBO 57; Freiburg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984), 151–55. For a list of lemmatic correspondences and thematic continuities linking 2 Sam 21:1–14 to ch. 20, see Kil, 2 Samuel, 500 n. 5.

84 See Ehrlich, Scripture, 2:249–50. The entire analysis by Frolov and Orel takes its cue from this juxtaposition, but their claim that Rizpah “turns the omnipotent king into her obedient tool” goes too far, while they dismiss the interpretation above as “sentimental” and “anachronistic” unconvincingly (“Rizpah on the Rock,” 145–46). Fokkelman classically turns up several points of
fidence David evinced in dealing with Saul’s descendants Rizpah managed to shake enough to evoke a humane reaction.

At the political level, the inclusion of David’s treatment of Saul’s and Jonathan’s remains effectively mutes his complicity in the deaths of seven of Saul’s sons by emphasizing David’s love for and dedication to Saul, Jonathan, and “doing the right thing.” Saul, the story murmurs, has forced David into this tragic situation; David, for his part, nevertheless continues to pay appropriate respect to Saul and the royal family. The effect humanizes David’s control over Saul’s family, shifting David’s image from that of a cold and too-willing executioner to that of a conflicted ruler, tragically forced to betray his predecessors, but demonstrating an abiding love for them and commitment to their honor.85

Plotting the different textual versions of v. 14a along this map, LXX A and Luc “he buried” highlights that, whatever help David had in removing the bodies of the impaled descendants, he insisted on reburying Saul and Jonathan himself. MT “they buried” suggests that David got the Gibeonites to comply with his reburial interests; put more sharply, after having demanded vengeance against the Israelite king who sought to destroy them, they now help bring him to eternal rest. LXX B “the bones of Saul and the bones of Jonathan and of those impaled” completes the integration of the two sources. The Gibeonites, who demanded the grisly death and ignominious exposure of Saul’s sons, now join in paying last respects to the entire former royal family.

Finally, at the theological and sacral level, in this combined text, the famine comes as the result of two sins rather than one: the insufficient or improper treatment of Saul and Jonathan’s remains as well as Saul’s sacrilegious decimation of the Gibeonites.86 Correspondingly, God hears the land’s entreaty

---

85 Typologically, adding the fragmentary story may imply something akin to a lament by David, parallel to others found at pivotal points in the book of Samuel, for Saul and Jonathan in 2 Sam 1:17–27 and for Abner in 2 Sam 3:33–34a.

86 A midrash in Pirqe R. El., ch. 17, has God charge David with leaving Saul outside the holy land, namely, buried improperly. Another midrash (y. Qid. 4.1, 65c; y. Sanh. 6.9, 23d; b. Yeb. 78b; Midr. Ps. on Ps 17; Midr. Sanh., ch. 28; Num. Rab. §8.4) also splits the apposition between “Saul” and “the House of Bloodguilt” in MT v. 2 into two independent causal clauses by introducing a new explanatory stich (in italics):

“because of Saul”—because he was not eulogized properly;
“and because of the House of Bloodguilt—because it put Gibeonites to death.”

The gloss rounds out the prior asymmetry and resolves the grammatical disagreement between the plural subject “Saul” and “the House of Bloodguilt,” and the third singular verb يتمه. In effect, rereading the apposition as two separate clauses also softens the contradiction with Deut 24:16, since the original motive clause, rendered as “because it put Gibeonites to death,” now refers back not to Saul but to “the house,” implying that the entire “house” took part in the aggression. So...
not only because of the absolved violation of the vow and the cleansed blood-guilt but also because of the relocation of Saul and Jonathan. The effect creates a more ambivalent attitude toward Saul: his sons must die to propitiate the Gibeonites, but God will not relax his own vigil until “YHWH’s chosen” with his eight impaled sons—so inevitably infers the LXX—all come to rest in Benjamin.

Such a vital transformation of two independent compositions by their interwoven juxtaposition confirms dramatically for edited pieces of literature, too, the veracity of the dictum, “the whole is greater than the sum of its parts.”

indeed suggests Mishnat R. El., 165, lines 20–21; on 166, lines 7–10, the Gibeonites ask for the specific seven who assaulted them.

87 In the spirit of the midrash (Num. Rab. §8.4; Pirqe R. El., ch. 17) and Rashi (vv. 1, 14), Fokkelman concludes, “the [plot’s] denouement is not possible until the humane policy of David, which bestows recognition and compassion on the whole house of Saul” (Throne and City, 289–90).
DATING THE TEACHER OF RIGHTEOUSNESS AND THE FLORUIT OF HIS MOVEMENT

MICHAEL O. WISE
mow@nwc.edu
Northwestern College, St. Paul, MN 55116

Shortly after the first fruits of the discovery later known as the Dead Sea Scrolls left the hands of the Bedouin, scholars began trying to explain the ultimate origin of the deposits. Eliezer Sukenik was the first to propose their origin with the ancient Jewish sect known as the Essenes.1 This view immediately attracted other proponents, and by the middle of the 1950s, the theory known as the “Essene Hypothesis” was regnant in the new discipline of Dead Sea Scrolls scholarship. Nor was it long before the Essene Hypothesis took its most recognizable modern form.2

Supported today by a broad consensus, this form of the theory holds that Khirbet Qumran is the place where, in the reign of either Jonathan or Simon Maccabee (i.e., in the period 161–135 B.C.E.), a dissident group of Jews took up a monastic lifestyle. These Essenes had departed from Jerusalem in protest of the current high priest. Leading them was a man their own texts later styled מַרְאֶה הַדִּכְרִית, conventionally translated “the Teacher of Righteousness.” The

I wish to thank Profs. Andrea Berlin and Azzan Yadin for reading and commenting on earlier drafts of this paper. In addition, one of JBL’s (anonymous) peer reviewers, Prof. James VanderKam, took the unusually collegial step of asking that his name be made known to me so that we could engage in additional dialogue. I thank him for his careful reading and comments and the improved study that resulted. Of course, the positions expressed here are my own and should not necessarily be imputed to these kind readers.

1 E. L. Sukenik, מַלְכָּה מַנוֹת וַתֹּחֶר מוֹתִית וַתֹּחֶר מַמְרוֹת מַמְרוֹת חָדוֹת (Jerusalem: Bialik, 1948), 16. The first press release by the American Schools of Oriental Research, appearing in the London Times, 12 April 1948, also made this suggestion.

2 In another context one might usefully distinguish between the two issues of whether the scrolls are primarily Essene products or not, and whether they are products of the second century B.C.E. or not. For my purposes this distinction is beside the point, since I am discussing the regnant form of the hypothesis wherein these two elements come to be combined.
group then lived out their lives in this sere setting overlooking the Salt Sea. Six or seven generations followed them and did likewise, until a Roman army destroyed Khirbet Qumran in 68 C.E. The scrolls represent the library of the Teacher’s followers, hidden in the caves to forestall destruction at the hands of the enemy.

Thus the consensus locates the Teacher of Righteousness and the beginnings of his movement in the early to mid second century B.C.E. Advocates of this chronology have defined its parameters by appeal to three types of evidence: (1) the archaeology of the Khirbet Qumran site; (2) the paleography of the writings produced by the Teacher and his followers; and (3) certain statements in the manuscripts. In the 1950s, these approaches seemed to lend themselves to easy combination. Like the three intertwining cords of a strong rope, they appeared mutually supportive. But it may now be seen that the strength was perhaps more apparent than real. Today we know substantially more about each of these elements than was known when the consensus chronology first took shape; the new information has tended to render that chronology less secure rather than more.

In the pages that follow I want to suggest that the totality of the evidence now available offers at best only ambiguous support for the chronological framework of the traditional form of the Essene Hypothesis. Another synthesis is at least equally viable, one that places the Teacher late in the second century B.C.E. and early in the first, fifty or sixty years later than the consensus view. As the centerpiece of this reformulation, I propose to focus on a method of dating that is, in certain respects at least, more precise than any other we have. Scholars have employed it but little because until recent years they lacked much of the relevant material. Before I take up that method, however, it is important to consider very briefly why none of the three conventional dating techniques necessarily supports the consensus chronology—why, therefore, none stands in the way of a first-century dating.


4 Since I am most interested in dating the Teacher, my focus will be on the beginning of the chronology, but its end-point is also less certain than is usually admitted. A recent reexamination of the numismatic evidence on which that dating is based, carried out by the acknowledged dean of numismatists concerned with ancient Judea, Yaakov Meshorer, comes to the conclusion that the site of Khirbet Qumran fell not in 68 C.E. but in 73 or 74 C.E., at approximately the same time as Masada. See his “Numismatics,” in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (2 vols.; ed. L. Schiffman and J. VanderKam; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 2:619–20. The chronology’s end-point may be crucial when it comes to a proper evaluation of the *Copper Scroll* (3Q15) in particular.
I. Earlier Methods of Dating

Recent studies of the archaeology of Khirbet Qumran argue that the original investigator, Roland de Vaux, was mistaken in some of his dating for the site's habitation phases. He concluded that after an Israelite-period settlement, the site was re-inhabited and expanded during the reign of Simon Maccabee or John Hycananus I. In reaching the latter conclusion the French archaeologist had placed more weight on numismatics than the sparse findings for the earliest period could bear. As Magen Brookh has observed, “a coin of John Hycananus cannot be used as a proof that the site was settled during his reign—coins can only be used as a terminus a quo but not as a terminus ad quem.” The detailed, recent reassessment by Jodi Magness, in particular, argues that the proper date for the refurbishing of Khirbet Qumran, the “foundation date” for Stratum I of the Second Temple period, is somewhere between 100 B.C.E. and 50 B.C.E. If her analysis is correct, then neither the Teacher, his followers, nor anyone else lived at Qumran in the middle of the second century B.C.E. On the other hand, a first-century dating for the Teacher comports nicely with these revised views.

The second type of evidence offered in support of the consensus chronology is that of paleography. In his foundational treatment of the Jewish scripts published in 1961, paleographer Frank Moore Cross established a typology based on the fact that Hebrew and Aramaic scribal handwriting changed over time. He then proposed a method for converting this typology

---

5 Roland de Vaux, *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Schweich Lectures of the British Academy 1959; trans. and rev. ed.; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973), 3–5. Note his statement on p. 5: “... the coins indicate that the buildings of Period Ib were certainly occupied under Alexander Jannaeus, 103–76 B.C., and that they may have been constructed under John Hycananus, 135–104 B.C. This construction marks the concluding date of Period Ia. It is possible that this would have commenced under one of the predecessors of John Hycananus, but we cannot push it back very far...”

6 M. Broshi, “Qumran Archaeology,” in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 2:737. In this article Broshi signals his agreement with J. Magness’s dating (see next note).


to chronology. Paleographic dating of the manuscripts from the caves, he and many others have argued, supports the inference that Qumran was inhabited during the years circa 150 B.C.E. to 68 C.E., a span inaugurated by the Teacher himself.

This argument has proven persuasive in part because the method is seen as “objective.” Yet such is hardly the case even under ideal circumstances. The paleographer compares the morphology of his or her manuscript’s hand (usually focusing on specific letters held to be diagnostic) and that manuscript’s general appearance with the hand and appearance of other literary texts possessing certain or nearly certain assigned dates. These are the ideal circumstances. They do not apply to the Dead Sea Scrolls. For the period of the scrolls we have no dated literary comparanda (though dated documentary texts in documentary hands offer some assistance). In the absence of dated literary hands, the prosecution of paleographic dating necessarily becomes even more subjective than usual.

As paleographers attempt to weigh the earlier and later letter forms that coexist in virtually every DSS hand, it is easy to arrive at strikingly different conclusions about one and the same manuscript. For example, consider the case of 11QMelchizedek (11Q13). The original editor of this work, A. S. van der Woude, argued on the basis of a thorough paleographic analysis that the manuscript probably dated to the first half of the first century C.E. Using the identical approach, J. T. Milik dated the work a hundred or more years earlier, to about 75 B.C.E. This variation amounts to nearly half of the entire time spanned by the scrolls. Yet this amount of variation is not hard to find in the literature on the Dead Sea Scrolls. To give just two other random examples: in prepublication analysis of the 4QDamascus Document manuscripts, Joseph

---

9 To convert typology to chronology Cross made an assumption: “Allowance must be made always for the extension of the professional life of a conservative scribe beyond his generation, or for an individualistic hand which holds out against the powerful current of scribal styles and fashions. However, in the case of a group of scripts belonging typologically to a certain generation, we can assume methodologically that the majority of the group were copied in the normal span of a generation” (pp. 250–51). Thus Cross assumed that the rate of change was generational. In practice he assigned each generation twenty-five years, and his method has become standard in Dead Sea Scroll scholarship. Most editors in the DJD series, for example, cite Cross rather than pursuing independent paleographic dating. Of course, there is no reason to suppose that change really did proceed at roughly the same rate all the time, a fact with obvious consequences for attempts at precise dating by this method.


Baumgarten estimated the age of 4QD\(^f\) (4Q271) as “late Herodian.”\(^{12}\) (Late Herodian in the Cross typology equates with about 50 C.E.) In the *editio princeps* Ada Yardeni assessed the same manuscript as deriving from “late Hasmonean or early Herodian” times—a century earlier.\(^{13}\) Similarly, in the case of the “oldest” manuscript of 4QMMT (4Q398), Elisha Qimron has urged a date of about 75 B.C.E., whereas Yardeni has preferred a date fifty to seventy-five years later.\(^{14}\) Here the absolute difference in the paleographic dating is less substantial than in the other examples; given the character of 4QMMT, however, the historical significance of the difference is potentially much greater.

So paleographic dating is imprecise because it is inherently subjective. A recent statement by Yardeni supporting this judgment goes on to suggest that the method is imprecise for other reasons as well:

> The graphic development of the script does not always fit the chronological order of the documents. Thus, early representatives of developed forms may be found in early documents while archaic forms may be found in late documents. Each letter in the alphabetical system has its own tempo of evolution. There is also a difference in the tempo of evolution of the letters in various places where one and the same script style is in use. Therefore the dating of documents is often based on a relative chronology and is not precise. (emphasis mine)\(^{15}\)

Note her wording: “in various places.” Geographic differences are a basic factor in all paleographic analysis, no less fundamental for categorization than is chronology. Scripts often change at different rates in different locales. Nevertheless, geography was a factor for which Cross did not allow in his typology, proceeding as he did on the assumption—universally held at the time—that all of the texts were composed or copied at the site of Qumran. Leading scholars are no longer confident of this assumption. As Philip Davies has noted, there is reason to question “the theory of a small scribbling sect.”\(^{16}\) Recognition has


\(^{14}\) E. Qimron and J. Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4 V: Miqsat Ma‘ase Ha-Torah* (DJD 10; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 34 (for Yardeni’s estimate), 109 (for Qimron’s).


\(^{16}\) E.g., P. Davies, “Reflections on DJD XVIII,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Fifty: Proceedings of the 1997 Society of Biblical Literature Qumran Section Meetings* (ed. R. Kugler and E. Schuller; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999), 156, concerning J. Baumgarten’s edition of the Damascus Document manuscripts from Cave 4: “Baumgarten’s view seems to be that the Qumran manuscripts all came from Qumran, but that some were copied by professional scribes and some by private indi-
began to dawn of the implications raised by the hundreds of individual scribal hands now recognized among the scrolls.

That there are multiple hands has long been realized. Indeed, the original team of editors relied heavily upon this phenomenon in deciding which fragments belonged to which manuscript. Note the words of John Allegro describing the difficulties of making joins among the often exceedingly meager manuscript materials: “One of the saving factors has been that of the four hundred or so manuscripts we have had to deal with, surprisingly few were written by the same scribe, so that by recognizing the idiosyncrasies of one’s own scribes one could be fairly sure that the piece belonged to his document.”

Since Allegro penned those words, the number of texts identified has climbed to nearly nine hundred. The difficulties posed for the standard synthesis by the multiple hands were realized only much later and were first argued by Norman Golb. He pointed out that the hands ill accord with the standard portrait of scribes laboring at Qumran to produce all the Dead Sea Scrolls. The manuscript profile that one would expect based on that portrait—multiple copies by each of a limited number of scribes—does not emerge. Instead, among nearly nine hundred manuscripts no more than a dozen instances have been uncovered where a given scribe copied more than a single text.

individuals. But, the huge variety of scribal hands throws the theory of a small scribbling sect into some doubt. Even if the settlement at Qumran contained a library of texts, the need for private drafts at Qumran is also surely much less than elsewhere. . . . We certainly do not know where these CD manuscripts were written, only where they were found” (emphasis his). Note also the words of E. Tov, “Hebrew Biblical Manuscripts from the Judaean Desert: Their Contribution to Textual Criticism,” JJS 39 (1988): 5: “It now seems likely that many, if not most, of the [biblical] texts found in this region were copied in other parts of Palestine, so that most of them can be taken as Palestinian texts.”

17 John Marco Allegro, The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Reappraisal (New York: Penguin Books, 1964), 55–56. A proper full-scale, letter-by-letter analysis of all of the texts with a view to a precise count of the number of hands remains a desideratum, but any doubt that there are, indeed, hundreds can be put to rest simply by scanning the photographs of the manuscripts in the DJD volumes.

18 The fullest exposition of Golb’s ideas appears in Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls? (New York: Scribner, 1995), wherein he deals with the hands on pp. 97–98 and passim. His first discussion of the point was in “Who Hid the Dead Sea Scrolls?” BA 45 (1985): 68–82.

19 J. M. Allegro suggests that the scribe of 4Q175 is identical with that of 1QS (Qumrân Cave 4: I [4Q158–4Q186] [DJD 5; Oxford: Clarendon, 1968], 58). E. Ulrich argues that this same scribe was responsible for 4QSamcer, 1QSa, 1QSb, and certain superlinear corrections in 1Qlsa ("4QSamcer: A Fragmentary Manuscript of 2 Samuel 14–15 from the Scribe of the Serek Hayyahad (1QS)," BASOR 235 [1979]: 20). J. P. M. van der Ploeg maintains that the scribe who copied 11Q20 was identical with one of the three scribes of 1QpHab ("Les manuscrits de la Grotte XI de Qumrân," RevQ 12 [1985–87]: 9; and “Une halakha inédite de Qumrân,” in Qumrân: Sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu [ed. J. Carmignac; Paris: Duculot, 1978], 107). One might gather a few additional examples (see Strugnell on the pesharim in n. 25 below), and more research into the hands is needed,
The presence of hundreds of different hands seems inexplicable unless the majority of the scrolls originated elsewhere than at Qumran. While some texts could have been produced at the site, many probably originated in the one true center of Jewish culture in those years, Jerusalem. The rest presumably derive from other, perhaps many other locations scattered throughout Judea. In truth we do not know whence the texts come, and it is unclear how we ever can know.

It therefore seems that the unsettled issue of geography may compromise paleographic dating of the Dead Sea Scrolls profoundly. The typology worked out by Cross and other skilled paleographers is doubtless reliable, but its conversion to chronology is flawed on principle. Yet suppose that the issue of geography could be shown to be unimportant, and that after accounting for its effect the current framework of paleographic chronology stood unchanged. The method still would not support the consensus chronology for the date of the Teacher of Righteousness. Nor would it be problematic for the thesis of a first-century dating. How can such be true? The answer involves another nuance in our understanding of the Qumran caches that has developed in recent years.

Today most specialists acknowledge, as was not the case in the 1950s, that the nonbiblical manuscripts from Qumran include both sectarian and nonsectarian compositions—the latter in significant numbers. By “sectarian,” scholars mean works whose language and concept demonstrably evidence origin with the Teacher or his movement. Taken as a whole, the caches contain the writings of other groups or sects, but these are nevertheless termed “nonsectarian.” In the absence of recognized linguistic and/or conceptual features, one

20 Here I am speaking broadly; few if any scholars in the 1950s assumed that Tobit, for example, was a sectarian work in the sense that the Teacher’s movement had produced it. That there are numerous nonsectarian, nonbiblical writings among the caches is a more recent conclusion of scholarship (cf. also n. 22 below).

21 Groups other than the Teacher’s sect that are represented among the Qumran writings include those responsible for the Enoch writings, those behind Jubilees, and those who produced most of the testamentary literature such as Aramaic Levi, and the like. It is reductionist to think that all of these works were the product of just one earlier group; consider, e.g., the relevant parallel of the internal evidence of the astronomical chapters from 1 Enoch, which testifies to a much more complex reality, as observed by O. Neugebauer, *The ‘Astronomical’ Chapters of the Ethiopic Book of Enoch (72–82)* (Copenhagen: Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters, 1981), 3. Then there were the “gropers for the way” (see below on CD 1:3–11), who represent a precursor movement to the Teacher’s. It is entirely reasonable to imagine that this precursor movement contributed some writings to the Qumran caches, perhaps including, as often suggested, works such as 4QInstruction. See thus the comments of J. Strugnell and D. J. Harrington, *Qumran Cave 4: XXIV Sapiential Texts, Part 2, 4QInstruction (Musar lemevin): 4Q415ff* (DJD 34; Oxford: Clarendon, 1999), 30. Moreover, the precursor group may well have lived on for many years after the breach
cannot assume sectarian origin for any text merely because it was found at Qumran.22

To argue that paleographic evidence supports the Teacher’s presence at Qumran in the mid-second century B.C.E., one must be able to point to sectarian writings that are datable that early. It will not do simply to take any Qumran manuscript and proffer its suggested dating of 150 B.C.E. as proof of the early chronology. Only demonstrably sectarian materials will serve, and to make the argument truly convincing, the central sectarian writings should offer support. What, then, does paleographic analysis of these central sectarian writings indicate?

By “central” sectarian writings, I mean those that both exhibit the requisite features as noted and testify to their own importance by their preservation in multiple copies.23 The works that qualify are the Rule of the Community, the Damascus Document, the Thanksgiving Hymns, the pesharim,24 4QMMT, the War Scroll, and the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice (although some scholars

with the Teacher’s followers, perhaps continuing to produce writings that ended up by a circuitous route among the scrolls. The Teacher’s group was not, after all, hermetically sealed off from contact with others. Then again, many of the liturgical works lack sectarian markers and could conceivably come from any of a variety of movements or groups. The Copper Scroll may have been produced in extremis by priests from Herod’s temple as late as 70 C.E. Thus, the list of possible contributors to the Qumran caches is not a short one, but in the agreed-upon parlance only the Teacher’s group is designated “sectarian.”


23 To this list of central sectarian works some might add the Temple Scroll. In the form represented by 11Q19–20 it arguably shows signs of sectarian connection (e.g., in certain vocabulary usage), though these are not clear-cut. As the matter is greatly disputed by scholars, I leave it aside for the present purposes. One may note, however, that paleographers have assigned late-first-century B.C.E. dates to both of these manuscripts.

24 Although no multiple copies of any pesher have survived, these writings are sectarian by the criteria of language and concept and may conveniently be treated as a group because of their shared character.
question whether this last work is sectarian as defined). As dated by their editors paleographically, the vast majority of the copies of these works (about 85 percent) purportedly originated in the first century B.C.E. More than half date to the final script phase or “generation” of that century. A few date to the first century C.E. Yet not a single one attaches to the period when the consensus


For the editors’ proposed paleographic dating of the 4QD portions, see Yardeni’s discussions scattered throughout Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4 XIII*. For 5Q12 and 6Q15, the estimates are my interpretations of Milik’s wording (according to Cross’s typology) in *Petites Grottes*, 181 and 129, respectively.

As to the *Hodayot*, 1QH is dated between 30 and 1 B.C.E. (early Herodian)—thus Cross, “Jewish Scripts,” 137. The dates for the Cave 4 manuscripts appear in E. Schuller’s article, “The Cave 4 Hodayot Manuscripts: A Preliminary Description,” *JQR* 85 (1994): 137–50. Schuller proposes no essential changes in her *editio princeps* of the 4Q materials; see E. Chazon et al., *Qumran Cave 4: XX Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 2* (DJD 29; Oxford: Clarendon, 1999), 69–236. For the date of 1QHb, see E. Puech, “Quelques aspects de la restauration du Rouleau des Hymnes (1QH),” *JJS* 39 (1988): 39–40, where he describes the hand as virtually indistinguishable from that of 1QH.

The estimated paleographic dates for the pesharim can be found in J. Strugnell, “Notes en marge du volume V des ‘Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan,’” *RevQ* 7 (1969–71): 162–276, except for 4QpIsa, 4QpHos, 4QpPe. These manuscripts, however, all seem to come from the same scribe; so Strugnell, “Notes,” 183. While Strugnell identified these as exemplars of the “rustic, semiformal Herodian” script, he failed to specify a date. The dates for these copies derive from the catalogue statement, *Scrolls from the Dead Sea* (ed. A. Sussmann and R. Peled; New York: George Braziller, 1993), 56. There 4QpHosa is said to have been “copied late first century B.C.E.” By extrapolation the same date is assigned to the other two manuscripts copied by the same or a very similar hand.

For MMT see the datings proposed by Yardeni in Qimron and Strugnell, *Miqsat Ma’ase Ha-Torah*, passim.

For the *War Scroll*, see M. Baillet, *Qumrân Grotte 4: III (4Q482–520)* (DJD 7; Oxford: Clarendon, 1982) on 4Q491–496. Baillet finds the hand of 4Q492 nearly identical to that of 1QM, whereby dating both to the years 30–1 B.C.E.

For the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*, see Carol Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985), passim. She offers dates for only eight of the Qumran manuscripts of the work, 4Q406 being too fragmentary to analyze. Newsom calls the hand of the Masada copy “a late Herodian formal hand,” thus dating it between 50 and 73/74 C.E., when Masada fell.
chronology locates the Teacher, nor even to the second century as a whole. So whether one rejects or embraces paleographic dating as practiced, the method does not contradict the present proposal. Nor, in fact, does it positively support the consensus chronology for the Teacher.

The final cord of the consensus argument is less clearly defined than the other two. Proponents maintain that various statements or phrases within the sectarian scrolls support a second-century dating. Space precludes a full consideration, but virtually every advocate of that chronology has called into play one particular passage, CD 1:3–11. It reads as follows:

For when Israel abandoned Him by being faithless, He turned away from them and from His sanctuary and gave them up to the sword. But when He called to mind the covenant He made with their forefathers, He left a remnant for Israel and did not allow them to be exterminated. In the era of wrath—three hundred and ninety years from the time He handed them over to the power of Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon—He took care of them and caused to grow from Israel and from Aaron a root of planting to inherit His land and to grow fat on the good produce of His soil. They considered their

26 The only arguable exceptions to this statement are 1QS, with its suggested paleographic range of 100–75 B.C.E. (since it is clearly not the autograph), and perhaps the copies of the Rule of the Congregation tentatively identified among the 4Q249 fragments. With regard to 1QS, one must bear in mind the methodological caveat that emerges from recognition of the problem of geography. We can hardly use the paleographic method for confident dating of any single manuscript when its use for the dating of the texts as a whole is fundamentally questionable. And even if the issue of geography went away, we still could not confidently assert the date of any single manuscript among the scrolls; we could only locate it typologically, not chronologically. Such is the case because we cannot know in any given instance the circumstances of manuscript production. We cannot know, for example, whether a manuscript was copied by a scribe now old who used the script he learned in adolescence. His work would appear some fifty years older than its true age (see also n. 9 above). As to 4Q249, several observations are in order. First, the fragments are so exiguous that any identification is perforce very tentative; thus we do not know that these portions really do derive, as their editor Steven Pfann suggests, from nine copies of the Rule of the Congregation. Second, since they are inscribed in the poorly exemplified Cryptic Script A, they cannot be dated paleographically within an order of magnitude even of the uncertainty that appertains to the other forms of the Jewish scripts. And third, Pfann has attempted to triangulate his dating of the cryptic materials largely on the basis of radiocarbon dating performed on 4Q249 some years ago. Since the time of that testing, however, the calibration curve has been updated twice, significantly affecting the original test results. By the recalibrated curve of 1997, 4Q249 may be assigned a date as late as 18 C.E. on the 95 percent ($\alpha$) probability level. And incidentally, by this same curve 1QS may date as late as 122 C.E. at the same level of probability. In both cases the manuscripts are arguably more likely to be Herodian than Hasmonean when dated by this method. On this recalibration and its affect on the radiocarbon dates for Qumran manuscripts, especially those once considered “Hasmonean,” see R. van de Water, “Reconsidering Palaeographic and Radiocarbon Dating of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” RevQ 19 (2000): 423–39, esp. 424 and n. 6. For the editio princeps of the 4Q249 materials see Pfann in Qumran Cave 4: XXVI Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part 1 (ed. S. Pfann et al.; DJD 36; Oxford: Clarendon, 2000), 515–74.
iniquity and they knew that they were guilty men, and had been like the blind and like those groping for the way twenty years. But God considered their deeds, that they had sought Him with a whole heart. So He raised up for them a Teacher of Righteousness to guide them in the way of His heart.\textsuperscript{27}

James VanderKam’s admirable introduction to the study of the scrolls, \textit{The Dead Sea Scrolls Today}, may serve to illustrate how this passage is typically applied to the problem of dating. He writes:

> If one reads the numbers literally, then, according to the generally accepted chronology of ancient Israel, the 390 years would have extended from about 587, when Nebuchadnezzar took Jerusalem, until 197 BCE.\ldots The twenty years of groping would then follow, bringing us down to 177 BCE.\ldots Scholars often say that while one cannot press too literally the $390+20$ years in Damascus Document column 1, they work out pretty well nevertheless.\textsuperscript{28}

VanderKam and other scholars acknowledge that theoretically one should take the numbers \textit{cum grano salis}, but in practice the numbers 390 and twenty are subtracted from 587 B.C.E. and the result is treated as straightforward internal evidence for dating the Teacher. Since the numbers are considered a little “soft,” scholars feel that they can adjust the date 177 B.C.E. a bit, but they still end up with a mid-second-century Teacher.

The fault with this approach lies in where it begins. The year 587 is a date modern scholars have deduced only because they have cuneiform writings to combine with biblical clues. Ancient Jewish chronographers were less fortunate. Indeed, no one in the time of the scrolls was quite sure how long the Persian period had been. The only evidence the ancients had on that point was the biblical books, and those sources failed to provide all the requisite data. Ignorant of when the Persian period began—and, yet more obscure, when it ended—the Jews were unable to calculate directly the date when Nebuchadnezzar took Jerusalem. They had instead to apply an indirect approach. Second Temple Jews calculated the length of the Persian period using the 490 years of Dan 9:24–27.

Standard practice was first to decide when those 490 years had ended or shortly would end (i.e., when Daniel’s prophecies would be fulfilled). Then one reckoned backwards from that very debatable standpoint. The more time passed during the later years of the Second Temple, the shorter became the time span allowable to the Persian period. In the system of the rabbinic chronograph \textit{Seder Olam Rabbah}, for example, the span of Persian domination was

\textsuperscript{27} Translation M. Wise, M. Abegg, and E. Cook, \textit{The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation} (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1996), 52. All translations of the scrolls are taken from this work (henceforth WAC), with occasional slight modifications.

\textsuperscript{28} J. C. VanderKam, \textit{The Dead Sea Scrolls Today} (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), 100.
short of the reality by 163 years; the rabbinic authors of the work dated Nebuchadnezzar to 423 B.C.E.\(^{29}\)

Josephus knew three separate chronologies for the Persian period, all based on Dan 9:24–27. He referred now to one, now to another, and they differed among themselves considerably.\(^{30}\) One terminated Daniel’s sixty-ninth week at the accession of Alexander Jannaeus in 103 B.C.E., implicitly labeling the king’s early reign as the time of the final week (\textit{Ant.} 13.301). This understanding entailed a date for Nebuchadnezzar seventy-five years later than the modern understanding and would put the Teacher in the year 102 B.C.E. Another chronology equated the murder of the high priest Ananus in 67 C.E. with the death of the anointed one in Dan 9:26 (\textit{J.W.} 4.318). Operating with this chronology, CD would put Nebuchadnezzar’s capture of Jerusalem in 416 B.C.E. and the rise of the Teacher in 6 B.C.E.

The only chronograph extant among the Dead Sea Scrolls is the Aramaic work designated 4Q559.\(^{31}\) Unfortunately, the portions of this writing relevant to the question at hand have not survived. Based on the peculiarities of what has survived, which accord with no known system, it is reasonable to suspect that (if it extended that far) its chronology for the Persian period would likewise have differed from both modern and other ancient understandings.

Since, therefore, the author of the \textit{Damascus Document} cannot be presumed to have posited the year 587 B.C.E. for Nebuchadnezzar’s siege of Jerusalem, the only proper methodology for understanding CD 1:3–11 is to turn the usual approach on its head. One must first determine when the Teacher lived, then work backwards from that point to calculate when the author believed Nebuchadnezzar was on the scene. Of course, this is not the problem scholars have tried to solve with the passage. For the solution of that problem the portion is of little use. Given the character of ancient Jewish chronography, the data CD provides fit more or less equally well with any date proposed for the Teacher between 200 B.C.E. and the turn of the eras.


This brief critique of the consensus favoring a mid-second-century B.C.E. date for the Teacher and the rise of his movement makes no particular claims for originality and has necessarily left many details to one side. What has been sketched nevertheless suffices to show that the standard formulation of the chronology is ripe for rethinking. The problem cries out for a different approach. As it happens, one dating method, perhaps the best one, remains largely untapped: search the texts for recognizable historical references and allusions.

II. Historical References and Allusions in the Dead Sea Scrolls

This method has been universal in historical scholarship since antiquity. Because much of the evidence potentially serving this approach was long unavailable, however, scholarship on the scrolls has largely focused elsewhere.32 No one has undertaken the task of compiling allusions and references since the entirety of the scroll materials became available to all researchers in November 1991. That basic task I shall attempt here.

As to definitions: presumably the phrase “historical reference” needs none. A serviceable definition of allusion is that of D. Auchter in her Dictionary of Historical Allusions and Eponyms: “Historical allusions are indirect references to previous events which are cited to draw a comparison to a contemporary situation.”33 Rather than be pedantic, however, I shall use the terms synonymously unless otherwise specified.

For obvious reasons sectarian writings take precedence in this method for dating the Teacher and his movement. Nevertheless, nonsectarian works can also be helpful, because the collection of writings found near Qumran is an intentional, rather than random, gathering. The collection coheres along ideological lines (e.g., favoring varieties of the solar calendar over the lunar; advocating a priestly, anti-Pharisaic approach to legal issues) and along phenomenal lines (i.e., different caves have yielded copies of the same literary works). The latter fact suggests that the deposits represent a unified response to an emergency on the part of a single group (whether a subgroup of Essenes or someone else), rather than multiple, unrelated sequestrations. We may reasonably infer, then, that the collection coheres along chronological lines as well. Mindful of

32 For earlier recognition of the potential importance of allusions for dating purposes, note, e.g., J. Amusin, “The Reflection of Historical Events of the First Century B.C. in Qumran Commentaries (4Q 161; 4Q 169; 4Q 166),” *HUCA* 48 (1977): 143–44.

the different types of information they provide, I will therefore analyze both sectarian and nonsectarian writings.

With the increase in the number of texts available to be analyzed, the number of recognizable allusions has increased proportionately. In particular, we now have fully sixteen references to identifiable historical figures by name. Before 1991 only five such were known to exist. This type of concrete reference is substantially more secure for dating purposes than are coded allusions in the pesharim, however convincingly deciphered. A pattern of dating that emerges from sixteen references to named historical figures must be taken seriously, whereas five may scarcely yield a meaningful pattern at all. Five items are a curiosity; sixteen, a data base.

Consider the type of information allusions provide. A writer’s historical allusions require that he or she lived either at the time of the person, process, or event mentioned or else in the years following. To identify these references is therefore to narrow the chronological range for any given work’s original composition, providing a terminus ante quem non for the autograph. This information is unavailable from any other source, archaeological or paleographic. Other methods offer at best a range of possible dates, one that theoretically extends both forward and backward from the (unknown) “actual” date. The dating range for an allusion stretches in one direction only: down toward the present day. Moreover, this dating will differ more or less from that when any particular copy was produced (the information provided by paleographic analysis in a best-case scenario). Since we are seeking the time of the Teacher’s origins, composition dates are what we most want to know. In this sense the analysis of allusions promises a more precise dating than does any other technique at our disposal.

In the list that follows, the references and allusions that other scholars and I have recognized appear in rough chronological order. Brief summaries include the following elements:

(a) the person, process, or event
(b) a date or temporal span for that reference, whether exact or approximate
(c) the manuscript containing the reference or allusion
(d) the actual wording of such, in the original language and in translation

34 This statement presumes that virtually none of the literary writings from Qumran is an autograph. As opposed to documentary and ephemeral writings, in working with literary texts the presumption is always against identifying any given manuscript as the autograph, simply because the odds against it being such are overwhelming. This was a principle applied early on in research on the scrolls, but it has often been forgotten since. See E. Hammershaimb, “On the Method Applied in the Copying of Manuscripts in Qumran,” VT 9 (1959): 415–18.
(e) the suggested origin of the work, whether sectarian or nonsectarian
(f) any miscellaneous comments

The list is shorter than it might have been, since it includes only reasonably secure references. Accordingly, I have excluded those to named individuals who have so far resisted confident identification. Thus, the \( \text{בר קדשו} \) of 4Q243 frg. 21 line 2, the \( \text{דיבר} \) of 4Q243 frg. 19 line 2, the \( \text{בר} \) of 4Q243 frg. 20 line 1, and the \( \text{תקין פנימיים} \) (Ptolemy) mentioned three times in 4Q578 (\textit{4QComposition historique B}) are left aside. In addition, I have resisted lengthening the list by chains of inference; that is, I have eschewed second-order identifications that depend on the correctness of arguable first-order identifications. By including such items the list might expand to forty-five, fifty, or more, but it would be a weaker list. Ambiguity attends certain identifications in any case, and the list is unavoidably also an argument. For each item I present the interpretation that I think best and will consider the ambiguities more fully a bit later.

1. (a) The high priesthood of Onias III
   (b) 174 B.C.E.
   (c) \textit{Pseudo-Daniel} (4Q245) i 9, in an apparent list of high priests
   (d) \text{והיו[,] "and Onias"}
   (e) Origin: nonsectarian
   (f) The editors recognize that the reference to Onias III is unsure, though they prefer that identification. They consider that Onias IV is also possible.

2. (a) The taking of Jerusalem by Antiochus IV Epiphanes
   (b) 170/169 B.C.E.
   (c) \textit{Pesher on Nahum} (4QpNah; 4Q169) 3–4 i 3
   (d) \text{והא נתי את ירושלים יד ממלכת יי מ_hereיה משל שמשון, "and God did not give Jerusalem into the power of the kings of Greece from (the time of) Antiochus until the rulers of the Kittim arose."}
   (e) Origin: sectarian

---

35 For this last, see Puech, \textit{Qumrân Grotte 4}, 205–8. His suggested identifications are unconvincing because he leaves out (based on overconfidence in the precision of paleographic dating) three or four known “Ptolemies” of the period of the scrolls. Ptolemy Lathyrus, in particular, would be a good possibility to my mind (see Amusin, “Reflection of Historical Events,” 8–10).


3. (a) The high priesthood of Jonathan Maccabee
(b) 161–143/2 B.C.E.
(c) 4Q245 i 10, in the same list of high priests noted above (no. 1)
(d) נְוֵּי, “Jon]athan”
(e) Origin: nonsectarian

4. (a) The high priesthood of Simon Maccabee
(b) 143/2–135/4 B.C.E.
(c) 4Q245 i 10, in the list of high priests (no. 1)
(d) סְמָנָּה, “Simon”
(e) Origin: nonsectarian

5. (a) One or more events involving John Hyrcanus I
(b) 135/4–104 B.C.E.
(c) 4QpapHistorical Text C (4Q331) 1 i 7
(d) יְהוָּנָן לִבְרָא אוֹת [], “Yohanan to bring to [”
(e) Origin: nonsectarian
(f) The nonsectarian origin of this work, previously sometimes called the Annalistic Calendar, is uncertain. Also debatable is whether the name should be taken to refer to John Hyrcanus I or John Hyrcanus II, but the work’s official editor, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, prefers the first option.

38 Flint and Collins, Qumran Cave 4 XVII, 156–60.
39 Ibid.
40 The editio princeps is by J. A. Fitzmyer in Qumran Cave 4: XXVI Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part 1, 275–80. The original editor of the fragments, J. T. Milik, believed that they belonged to a calendrical work, other copies of which he recognized in five or six additional manuscripts. That larger work has been discussed in detail in preliminary studies that shared Milik’s understanding; see M. O. Wise, “Primo Annales Fuere: An Annalistic Calendar from Qumran,” in Thunder in Gemini (JSOTsup 15; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 186–221; and T. Ilan, “Sheleazon Alexander,” in Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls, 2:872–74. The official editor to whom most of Milik’s calendrical materials have fallen, S. Talmon, has now separated 4Q331 and certain other fragments from the calendrical works on material and internal grounds, and those fragments have been assigned to J. A. Fitzmyer for their official editing. Whether this separation will in every case convince scholars remains to be seen, but from a historian’s perspective it does not appear that anything crucial is at stake. The situation for the manuscripts formerly considered part of the “annalistic calendar” is as follows: frgs. 1–3 of 4Q322 now comprise 4Q322 frgs. 1–3; the former frg. 4 has not been discussed by either Talmon or Fitzmyer. Olim 4Q323 1 = 4Q322 1; 4Q323 2 = 4Q323 simplex; 4Q323 3 is not discussed. Olim 4Q324 remains unchanged. Olim 4Q324a 1 = 4Q324a simplex; 4Q324a 2, 4 = 4Q333 1–2; 4Q324a 3 = 4Q324c simplex; 4Q324b 1–2 = 4Q331 1–2. For Talmon’s arguments, see the introductions and discussions of the separate manuscripts in Qumran Cave 4: XVI Calendrical Texts (ed. S. Talmon, J. Ben-Dov, and U. Glessmer; DJD 21; Oxford: Clarendon, 2001), 93–122.
6. (a) John Hyrcanus I as a false prophet
   (b) 135/4–104 B.C.E.
   (c) 4QList of False Prophets (4Q339) frg. 1 line 9
   (d) רָבָּה ֶרֶם ָּחַשְׁך, “[Yohanan son of Sim]on”
   (e) Origin: nonsectarian
   (f) 4Q339 is problematic in several regards. The work is not identifiably
       sectarian according to the criteria discussed above, but any writer who
       would brand John Hyrcanus I a false prophet when he was a recogni-
       zed prophet in official circles (Josephus, J.W. 1.68–69; Ant. 13.300)
       clearly represents an anti-establishment position such as characterizes
       the sectarian writings. The reconstruction itself is a bigger problem.
       The one I prefer was suggested independently by Elisha Qimron and
       Alexander Rofé, but was not adopted by the editio princeps. The edit-
       ors chose instead another suggestion made by Qimron, הָיַּנְיָה ַר ָּח ֶּמ ַנ
       קָנה. To my mind the present reconstruction is superior for two rea-
       sons: (1) It provides a raison d’être for what is otherwise an oddly pro-
       saic list of biblical false prophets; and (2) it follows the pattern of the
       other entries in the list, wherein each false prophet receives a single
       line of description. To prefer הָיַּנְיָה ַר ָּח ֶּמ ַנ קָנה is to assign two lines
       (8–9) to the son of Azur, when he is already adequately defined by
       name and patronymic in line 8. At any rate this allusion is very uncer-
       tain.41

7. (a) The reign of Alexander Jannaeus
   (b) 103–76 B.C.E.
   (c) 4QApocryphal Psalm and Prayer (4Q448) ii 2 and iii 842
   (d) hätניא הָיְנָה ַכ ָּל ָּל ֶל ֶל, respectively meaning “over Jonathan
       the king” and “for Jonathan the king”
   (e) Origin: nonsectarian
   (f) Note that these are actually two distinct allusions. Several scholars,
       Geza Vermes and Émile Puech among them, have argued that the
       Jonathan meant by 4Q448 is rather Jonathan Maccabee.43 But while it
       is true that both Jonathan Maccabee and Jannaeus bore the Hebrew
       name יֵתָנָה, the argument fails to convince because Jonathan Maccabee

41 For the editio princeps, see M. Broshi and A. Yardeni in Qumran Cave 4: XIV Parabiblical
42 The editio princeps is E. Eshel, H. Eshel, and A. Yardeni in Qumran Cave 4: IV Poetical
43 Émile Puech, “Jonathan le prêtre impie et les débuts de la communauté de Qumrân: 4QJonathan
was certainly never designated “king.” Indeed, Josephus makes much of the fact that, in the midst of controversy, Judah Aristobulus (104 B.C.E.) was the first Hasmonean to claim that title (J.W. 1.70; Ant. 13.301). Likewise, Jannaeus’s adoption of the title was a political problem, but there can be no doubt that he did call himself king. Coins inscribed מלך הָאָרְסָפִי are among the most famous ancient Jewish issue.

8. (a) One or more events of the reign of Alexander Jannaeus
(b) 103–76 B.C.E.
(c) 4QJonathan (4Q523) frgs. 1–2 line 2
(d) [ן]אשת כלים, translation very uncertain
(e) Origin: nonsectarian
(f) This manuscript is so fragmentary that any ideas about it are perforce extremely tentative. Puech wants to date the manuscript paleographically to the third quarter of the second century B.C.E., “plus près de 150 que de 100 avant J.-C.” This is an overprecise date in my view. Paleography cannot rule out the possibility that 4Q523 was copied—indeed, first composed—when Jannaeus was king. Puech prefers to assign the reference to Jonathan Maccabee, and that possibility (along with others) cannot be ruled out.

9. (a) The coming of Demetrius III Eucaerus to invade Jerusalem at Pharisee invitation
(b) 88 B.C.E.
(c) Pesher on Nahum (4QpNah; 4Q169) 3–4 i 2
(d) בָּשָׁר שְׁלָלָה בָּשָׁר יִבְשָׁר מֶלֶךְ מִלְחָם יְהוָה בָּשָׁר מֶלֶךְ מִלְחָם יְהוָה בָּשָׁר מֶלֶךְ מִלְחָם יְהוָה BSHAR MLSHML YHWH BSHAR MLSHML YHWH BSHAR MLSHML YHWH BSHAR MLSHML YHWH “the true interpretation concerns Demetrius, king of Greece, who sought to enter Jerusalem on the counsel of the Seekers of Accommodation”
(e) Origin: sectarian
(f) That the scroll means Demetrius III Eucaerus and not another Seleucid is almost universally agreed by scholars, since Josephus refers to Demetrius coming to Palestine to aid those forces, including Pharisees, who were opposed to Alexander Jannaeus. Josephus nowhere records that Demetrius attempted to enter Jerusalem, so here 4Q169 adds to historical knowledge of the civil war against Jannaeus.45

---

45 For the text, full discussion, and bibliography, see Horgan, *Pesharim*, 172–73 and Hebrew insert, 47. A dissenting identification by I. Rabinowitz would identify the figure as Demetrius I.
10. (a) The crucifixion of Pharisee supporters of Demetrius III by Alexander Jannaeus  
(b) 88 B.C.E.  
(c) Pesher on Nahum (4QpNah; 4Q169) 3–4 i 7–8  
(d) נָא בְּחַגְוָה הַלְּכֹת אָסָר יִלֵּהָ אְמַסְס וּרְיֵה [עַל הַנַּי נָאָס הָנָה]  
(he, the true interpreter concerns the final priest, who will stretch out his hand to smite Ephraim)48  
(e) Origin: sectarian  
(f) The probable restoration of the lacuna, and the concomitant inference that the writer of 4Q169 favored what Jannaeus did to the Pharisees, emerges from comparison of this text with 11QTemple 64:6–8. Yigael Yadin was the first to recognize this connection with the Temple Scroll’s legislation, which stipulates crucifixion as the proper punishment for treason against the state.47  

11. (a) The crucifixion of Pharisee supporters of Demetrius III by Alexander Jannaeus  
(b) 88 B.C.E.  
(c) Pesher on Hosea (4QpHosb; 4Q167) frg. 2 lines 1–7  
(d) פִּשְׂרָה [עַל הָוֹת הָאָוֹר] אָסָר יִלֵּהָ וּרְיֵה [עַל הָוֹת הָאָוֹר]  
(For text, see Horgan, Pesharim, Hebrew insert, 47; her interpretive discussion (pp. 176–79) is obsolete because it antedates the publication of the Temple Scroll.)  
(e) Origin: sectarian  
(f) Here the pesher is continuing a discussion of the “Lion of Wrath” (one of the sect’s ciphers, most scholars agree, for Alexander Jannaeus). It attaches events to Hos 5:13: “Ephraim went to Assyria, and sent to King Yareb, but he is not able to heal you, nor can he assuage your sore.” Ephraim is elsewhere a cipher for the Pharisees. As Menahem Kister has explained, “This passage was apparently interpreted by the Sect as referring to the rebellious Pharisees . . . who joined the King of Assyria, i.e., the Seleucid king of Syria, in fighting against Jannaeus.”49

Soter (162–150 B.C.E.), but this suggestion has convinced few; see his “The Meaning of the Key (‘Demetrius’)-Passage of the Qumran Nahum-Pesher,” JAOS 98 (1978): 394–99.
46 For text, see Horgan, Pesharim, Hebrew insert, 47; her interpretive discussion (pp. 176–79) is obsolete because it antedates the publication of the Temple Scroll.
49 Menahem Kister, “Biblical Phrases and Hidden Biblical Interpretations and Pesharim,” in
Thus, two surviving passages in sectarian literature focus on what Jannaeus did to the Pharisees. His actions clearly had tremendous significance for the group, and the reason is not difficult to discern. The pesharists were drawing an analogy from the past to the future. (This was therefore an allusion by the formal definition given above.) Just as God had brought judgment against the Pharisees in the days of Jannaeus for traitorous actions allowing foreign ingress into Jerusalem, so too would he avenge the identical act by the Pharisees in the recently concluded war with Rome. The authors of the two pesharim were asserting a typological identity between the events of 88 B.C.E. and those of their own time, 63 B.C.E.\(^50\)

12. (a) An unidentifiable event involving the Hasmonean queen, Alexandra (Hebrew name Shelamzion)
(b) Presumably during her reign, 76–67 B.C.E.
(c) 4QHistorical Text D (4Q332) ii 4
(d) בַּשְּלַמְזִיָּהוֹת / הָאָבָא שַלְםָזִיוֹן [... foundation/secret counsel (?)], Shelamzion came ...
(e) Origin: nonsectarian
(f) This work was previously designated 4Q322 and considered a copy of the Annalistic Calendar. That it was a calendrical work incorporating references to selected historical events remains a good possibility.\(^51\)

---

\(^{50}\) Jannaeus was not, of course, the last (high) priest of whom the sect had knowledge. He is rather described as “the last priest” (מִלְךַ הַמֶּלֶךְ) as a pun on the other cipher applied to him, מִלְךַ הַמֶּלֶךְ. With the weakening of the gutturals at this time, the words מִלְךַ הַמֶּלֶךְ and מִלְךַ הַמֶּלֶךְ would have sounded nearly identical to many speakers of Hebrew. Incidentally, Jannaeus was probably called the “Lion of Wrath” because he executed the vengeance God required in the present “age of wrath.” Accordingly, it seems possible that the passage in CD 1 discussed above, which locates the rise of the Teacher in an “age of wrath” (מִלְךַ הַמֶּלֶךְ), means to say that he arose when Jannaeus was king.

\(^{51}\) The editio princeps is Fitzmyer, in Qumran Cave 4: XXVI Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part I, 281–86; for discussion as a calendrical work, see Wise, “Annalistic Calendar,” 188–93, and see n. 40 above. Although the original editor, J. T. Milik, never completed his task, he did alert the scholarly world at an early date to the text’s existence and potential importance. He wrote, “un ouvrage, représenté par deux mss. différents, mais malheureusement réduits à quelques petites parcelles, s’apparente au même group de Mishmarot, mais avec des additions d’un intérêt exceptionnel . . . occasionnellement se retrouvent la mention des . . . événements historiques. Ainsi ‘Salamison a tué . . . ’.” See Milik’s “Le travail d’édition des manuscrits du désert du Juda,” in Volume du Congrès: Strasbourg 1956 (VTSup 4; Leiden: Brill, 1957), 25–26. At that time, as his translation indicates, Milik was reading 4Q332 ii 4 as בַּשְּלַמְזִיָּהוֹת. The photograph PAM 42.334, taken in March 1957, represents the reconstruction of the manuscript at the time of Milik’s comments. Later another fragment was found that fit into this line and corrected his reconstruction; the reading is clear and can be checked on PAM 43.336, taken in March 1960. For the dates of these pho-
13. (a) A second unidentifiable event involving Alexandra
   (b) Presumably 76–67 B.C.E.
   (c) 4QpapHistorical Text C (4Q331) 1 ii 7
   (d) ["Shelanzion . . ."
   (e) Origin: nonsectarian.52

14. (a) Shift of control of temple ritual activities from Jannaeus’s faction to the Pharisees
   (b) During the reign of Alexandra, 76–67 B.C.E.
   (c) Pesher on Nahum (4QpNah; 4Q169) 3–4 ii 4–6
   (d) "The true interpretation concerns the rule of the Seekers of Accommodation; never absent from their company will be the sword of the Gentiles, captivity, looting, internal strife, exile for fear of enemies. A mass of criminal carcasses will fall in their days, with no limit to the total of their slain—indeed, because of their criminal purpose they will stumble on the flesh of their corpses!"
   (e) Origin: sectarian
   (f) That these lines describe Pharisaic dominion in Jerusalem in the days of Alexandra is generally acknowledged by scholars. Dominance in the political realm equated with control over the temple rituals. The Pharisees were now able to begin enforcing their interpretations of disputed passages of biblical law.53 For that reason, this is also a very attractive historical context in which to locate the controversies of 4QMMT (on which further see below).

15. (a) Hyrcanus II flees to the Nabateans for asylum and to seek support for a planned rebellion against Aristobulus II
   (b) 67 B.C.E.
   (c) 4QHistorical Text D (4Q332) frg. 2 line 1
   (d) ["to give him honor among the Arab[s"
   (e) Origin: nonsectarian
   (f) While the reference here is uncertain, what is known of the historical period covered by 4Q332 and the related texts 4Q331 and 4Q333 sup-

52 Fitzmyer, in Qumran Cave 4: XXVI Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part I, 277–78.
53 Two other portions in Pesher Nahum, 3–4 i 11–12 and 3–4 iv 5–6, lend additional weight to the proposed interpretation. For text and discussion, see Horgan, Pesharim, 161, 182–83, and Hebrew insert, 48.
ports the possibility that Hyrcanus is in view. He is explicitly mentioned just a few lines later (16). According to Josephus, he fled to Aretas in Nabatea at the urging of Antipater, father of Herod the Great. There he received support and arms, “honor” for his planned coup d’état.\textsuperscript{54}

16. (a) Hyrcanus II rebels against Aristobulus II
(b) 67 B.C.E.
(c) 4QHistorical Text D (4Q332) frg. 2 line 6
(d) [ידורומ"[ברק], “... Hyrcanus rebelled [against Aristobulus"
(e) Origin: nonsectarian
(f) The reading of יד is uncertain, but even if it is mistaken, the line represents an allusion to the time of a “Hyrcanus,” presumably Hyrcanus II, since the related 4Q331 elsewhere refers to Hyrcanus I as “Yohanan” (see on no. 5 above). Josephus describes Hyrcanus rebelling against Aristobulus some time after abdicating the throne to his younger brother (\textit{Ant.} 14.4–7). If the reading proposed here is correct, the work perhaps implies that Aristobulus had reigned ten or eleven months when the rebellion broke out. Consequently, it is possible that this event should be placed in 66 B.C.E. rather than in 67 B.C.E.\textsuperscript{55}

17. (a) Civil war breaks out between Aristobulus II and Hyrcanus II
(b) 67 B.C.E.
(c) 4Q183 i 2 1–3
(d) [יאריבוהא גם יד, "their enemies, and they defiled their sanctuary [...] from them, and they advanced to battles, each man [against his brother . . . those who were faithful] to his covenant, God delivered and [they] escaped [to the land of the north.”\textsuperscript{56}
(e) Origin: sectarian
(f) 4Q183 designates what seems to be a very fragmentary pesher, all of whose biblical quotations have been lost. A scrap of history from a sectarian perspective is all that remains. As Menahem Kister has observed in a perceptive study of the work, “This passage seems to refer to a civil

\textsuperscript{54}See especially \textit{Ant.} 14.14–15. How much time passed at Petra is unclear. For text and discussion, see Fitzmyer in \textit{Qumran Cave 4: XXVI Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part I,} esp. 284; and Wise, “Annalistic Calendar,” 188 and 206–7.

\textsuperscript{55}For full discussion, see Fitzmyer in \textit{Qumran Cave 4: XXVI Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part I,} 283–85, largely following Wise, “Annalistic Calendar,” 188–89, 209–11, and 219 n. 66.

\textsuperscript{56}The \textit{editio princeps} is Allegro, \textit{Qumrân Cave 4}, 81. For the proposed reconstruction at the end of line 3, which differs from WAC, see CD 7:13–14.
war which took place *close to the time when the Sect was established*, a war from which the Sect’s members escaped and were saved” (italics mine).57 The war arose as a result of certain practices in the Jerusalem temple; the text’s description might easily apply to the situation in 67 B.C.E., or, as Kister believes, that of Jannaeus’s time, 94–88 B.C.E. The group fled to the north (if my suggested reconstruction is right). The whole scenario fits well with the *Damascus Document*’s representation of the early period of the Teacher’s followers as a time of exile and sojourn in the Land of Damascus (אֲרָצוֹ דָּםֶשֶׁק).58 If this reasoning is correct, then the early period of the movement, and the Teacher, are to be placed in the first century B.C.E.

18. (a) An action—presumably of a hostile sort—taken against Aristobulus II
(b) 67–63 B.C.E.
(c) *Olim* 4Q323 frg. 3 line 6 (current numbering unknown)
(d) west א[„ and against Ari[stobulus”]
(e) Origin: nonsectarian
(f) The reconstruction (first proposed by Ben Zion Wacholder and Martin Abegg) is attractive, but extremely uncertain.59

19. (a) The coming of the Romans to Palestine under Pompey the Great
(b) 63 B.C.E.
(c) CD 8:11–12
(d) והָא הָפְרִיטִים הוֹא רָאָשׁ מַלְכִּים וּזֹא לַעֲשָׂה בַּהֲמָה, “The poison of vipers’ is the head of the kings of Greece, who came to wreak vengeance on them.”60
(e) Origin: sectarian
(f) This line belongs to a pesher on Deut 32:33 that has been inserted into the Admonition of the *Damascus Document*. Since arguably it can be deduced that the cipher “kings of Greece” was used by the pesharists as a broad rubric that might embrace the Romans (see no. 20 below), the allusion is reasonably understood as a reference to Pompey. He marched on Jerusalem in 63 B.C.E. with auxiliary troops furnished by, among others, the Seleucid “Greeks” (Josephus, *Ant.* 14.48). He was

---

57 Kister, “Biblical Phrases,” 37 n. 27.
59 B. Z. Wacholder and M. Abegg, *A Preliminary Edition of the Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls* (4 vols.; Washington, DC: Biblical Archaeology Society, 1991–), 1:80. The current numbering of this fragment is unknown because it has been discussed by neither Fitzmyer nor Talmon in the wake of the realignment of the manuscript fragments discussed in n. 40 above.
thus a “king of the Greeks.” The pesharist saw Pompey’s attack as God’s vengeance upon the powers in Jerusalem for their treatment of the Teacher and his followers in the preceding years.61

20. (a) The fall of Jerusalem to Pompey’s Roman army
   (b) 63 B.C.E.
   (c) Pesher on Nahum (4QpNah; 4Q169) 3–4 i 3
   (d) חְּלֵאָה מִן אָתָהּ רֹאשְׁלָהָ בֶּרֶד פַּלֶּקָן וּמַעֲבַדִּים פַּלֶּקָן מַעֲבַדִּים פַּלֶּקָן [“but God did not give Jerusalem] into the power of the kings of Greece from (the time) of Antiochus until the rulers of the Kittim arose”
   (e) Origin: sectarian
   (f) The lines just preceding this one in the pesher indicate that, from the pesharist’s perspective, Roman forces are now in Jerusalem (see below on no. 26). Note the correlative grammatical construction בֹּאַם יִשְׂרָאֵל, which makes the Romans “kings of the Greeks” just as much as Antiochus was one.62

21. (a) The defeat of Aristobulus II and his faction at the hands of Hyrcanus II, his faction (including the Pharisees), and his Roman allies
   (b) 63 B.C.E.
   (c) Pesher on Nahum (4QpNah; 4Q169) 3–4 iv 3
   (d) פָּשְׁרָאָה עַל מְשַׁמֵּשׁ לֵכִינָן זְאָרוֹת אָמוֹרֵשׁ מְשַׁמֵּשׁ מְשַׁמֵּשׁ מַלֹּית מְשַׁמֵּשׁ [“The true interpretation concerns Manasseh in the final era, for his kingdom shall be brought low in Is[rael].”63
   (e) Origin: sectarian
   (f) “Manasseh” in the pesharim is often understood to refer to the Sadducees, but this construction is too narrow. The reference is rather to the entire faction of Aristobulus II, as no. 22 makes clear. This faction

---

61 The equation of CD 8:11–12 with Pompey’s march was first recognized by A. Dupont-Sommer, The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Preliminary Survey (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1952), 56. Because his idea did not fit the standard chronology of scroll origins as that developed, Dupont-Sommer’s identification has been ignored by subsequent scholarly discussion.

62 This passage is often read as saying that after Antiochus IV no Greek king took the city until the Romans came, not that the Romans were included among the “Greek” kings. This common reading is certainly possible, perhaps even “obvious” on its face, but it does not take account of the complex biblical exegesis and sectarian intertextuality that apparently lies behind this portion of the pesher. Space precludes a full discussion, but a proper understanding of the passage must take account of its relationship to CD 8:11–12. It must also consider the latter work’s exegesis of Deut 32:33 through the dual lenses of Ezek 38:2 and Gen 10:2, and the evident connection of both writings with the sixth Teacher Hymn of the Hodayot. There the Teacher writes of the foreign “lions” and “serpents” (זְאָרוֹת) who seek his life as he dwells in exile (presumably in the Land of Damascus), sojourning “among a people of flinty face” (בֹּאַם יִשְׂרָאֵל). He quotes Deut 32:33 in that description in 1QH 13:10 (new numbering). See in full Wise, First Messiah, 159–63.

63 For text and discussion, see Horgan, Pesharim, 189–90, and Hebrew insert, 50.
doubtless included some Sadducees, but other groups as well. Josephus consistently refers to its inclusion of “the priests.” Few priests were Sadducees. A further allusion to the fall of Aristobulus’s faction appears at 4QpNah 3–4 ii 8–10.

22. (a) The exile of Aristobulus II, his family, and selected followers to Rome, and the execution of many of the leaders of his faction by the Romans
(b) 63 B.C.E.
(c) *Pesher on Nahum* (4QpNah; 4Q169) 3–4 iv 4
(d) ינב עילואים ופוסו לעל משה נבורי חבורים בחרם יזרע "his women [sc. Manasseh], his infants, and his children shall go into captivity; his warriors and his nobles [shall perish] by the sword."64
(e) Origin: sectarian

23. (a) A massacre of Jews involving a Roman general who served under Pompey, M. Aemilius Scaurus
(b) 63–61 B.C.E.
(c) 4QHistorical Text E (4Q333) frg. 1 lines 3–4
(d)パーヤマ 31/30/29 裏 3/2/1 "[On the first (or, the second; or, the third) day of (the service of the priestly course of) Jehezkel, which is [the twenty-ninth (or, the thirtieth; or, the thirty-first) day of the sixth month, the Day] of the Massacre of Aemilius.”
(e) Origin: nonsectarian
(f) The regular patterning of the calendrical texts from Qumran enables a reasonably confident restoration of the missing words. Josephus does not specifically involve Scaurus in the aftermath of the fall of Jerusalem in 63 B.C.E., but he does say that reprisals followed and that the pro-Aristobulus faction was their target. Probably the Massacre of Aemilius refers to this period. Pompey appointed Scaurus *proquaestor* of Syria and he served from 65 to 61 B.C.E. Conceivably an uprising among the Jews, one unknown to surviving sources, might have led Scaurus to take military action against agitators in the years after 63 B.C.E., but the better possibility is the one suggested.65

24. (a) A second murder or massacre involving Scaurus
(b) 63–61 B.C.E.

64 Ibid., 190, and Hebrew insert, 50.
65 The *editio princeps* is Fitzmyer, in *Qumran Cave 4: XXVI Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part I*, 287–89. For text and full discussion, see Wise, “Annalistic Calendar,” 190 and 211–18; and for further discussion, see D. Schwartz, “Aemilius Scaurus, Marcus,” in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 1:9–10. See also n. 40 above.
25. (a) Exaction of tribute by the Romans beginning in the period after the war
(b) 63 B.C.E. onward
(c) *Pesher on Habakkuk* (1QpHab) 6:6–7
(d) פשר אפר המחלקה את עולם את מסעם שלה יולה וסאם של נבון.
   "the true interpretation is that they impose the yoke of their taxes—this is 'their food'—on all the peoples yearly"
(e) Origin: sectarian
(f) Given the phrase שנה בנה, the pesharist clearly writes in a period when some years have elapsed since the Roman yoke first descended on the Jews.

26. (a) The establishment of Roman soldiers in Jerusalem after the war
(b) 63–57 B.C.E.
(c) *Pesher on Nahum* (4QpNah; 4Q169) 3–4 i 1
(d) פסירה על יהושע בן יהודה [המחלקה], "the true interpretation concerns Jerusalem, which has become] a dwelling place for the wicked of the Gentiles"
(e) Origin: sectarian
(f) The pesharist knew that after the war, the Romans set up a governor and kept some forces in Jerusalem. Josephus implies this fact, too, although scholars have misconstrued his hints concerning the situation in the initial years after the Roman conquest, down to about 57

66 For text and discussion see n. 65.
67 For text, see Horgan, *Pesharim*, 10 (for literature), and Hebrew insert, 4–5.
B.C.E. Gabinius, who followed Aemilius as a governor of Syria, thereafter removed the troops to Damascus. This indwelling by Roman forces is the latest identifiable historical allusion in the Pesher on Nahum, thus dating the work to 57 B.C.E. or shortly thereafter.

27. (a) The rule of the Jews by a succession of rapacious Roman governors (b) 63–40 B.C.E. (c) Pesher on Habakkuk (1QpHab) 4:10–13

(d) "the true interpretation concerns the rulers of the Kittim, who pass—by the counsel of a guilty faction—one after the other; [their] rulers come, [each] in his turn, to destroy the land."

(e) Origin: sectarian

28 (a) A massacre or battle involving Peitholaus (b) 55–51 B.C.E. (c) 4QHistorical Text F (4Q468e) 2–3

(d) "to kill the multitude of men . . . Peitholaus"

(e) Origin: nonsectarian

(f) This tiny fragment of three lines seems to allude to violent actions taken by Peitholaus, a Jewish general who was a party to warfare and massacres in the mid-first century B.C.E. Peitholaus at first allied himself with the Romans and helped punish Jewish rebels who supported Aristobulus’s wing of the Hasmoneans (Josephus, Ant. 14.84–85; J.W. 1.162–63). Later, he switched sides and became an ally of those same partisans. In this role he was involved in a battle with the Romans wherein, again, many Jews lost their lives (Ant. 14.93–95; J.W. 1.172). Shortly thereafter he himself suffered execution at Roman hands (Ant. 14.120; J.W. 1.180).70

68 In Ant. 14.82–84, Josephus refers to the fact that Alexander, son of Aristobulus, had escaped from the Romans and returned to Jerusalem. He and his supporters, says Josephus, were “attempting to raise again the wall of Jerusalem which Pompey had destroyed. But this he was stopped from doing by the Romans there.” Josephus translator R. Marcus, unable to explain the Roman presence, invoked the faintly absurd hypothesis of A. Schalit that the Romans described were merchants (ad loc., LCL). The Pesher on Nahum provides an explanation of who was really involved: a contingent of Roman soldiers, left there with Aemilius when Pompey departed the country.

69 For text and discussion, see Horgan, Pesharim, 31, and Hebrew insert, 3.

70 The official editor of the text, M. Broshi, initially believed that the reference was to a later Greek by the name of Ptollas, a courtier under Herod’s son Archelaus. He then tied the reference
29. (a) Hyrcanus II taken prisoner by the Parthians
(b) 40 B.C.E.
(c) Pesher on Habakkuk (1QpHab 9:9–12)
(d) \text{Pesher on Habakkuk (1QpHab 9:9–12)}
(e) Origin: sectarian
(f) The identity of the “Wicked Priest” has long been a vexed issue in Dead Sea Scrolls research, but as André Dupont-Sommer first observed, Hyrcanus II is certainly one of the viable candidates. Indeed, given the first-century time frame evident elsewhere in the pesharim, he seems the best candidate. When the Parthians invaded Judea in 40 B.C.E. and supported Antigonus as king, Hyrcanus was put at their disposal as one of the backers of the failed Herod. His ears were cropped to render him permanently unfit to serve as high priest (a possible interpretation of the “consuming affliction”), and he was taken back to Parthia as a prisoner. When he was released several years later, Herod, by now installed as Roman client king, arranged his murder.

30. (a) Hyrcanus II taken prisoner by the Parthians
(b) 40 B.C.E.
(c) Pesher on Psalms (4QPsPs 4Q171) 1–10 iv 9–10
(d) \text{Pesher on Psalms (4QPsPs 4Q171) 1–10 iv 9–10}
(e) Origin: sectarian
(f) The identity of the “Wicked Priest” has long been a vexed issue in Dead Sea Scrolls research, but as André Dupont-Sommer first observed, Hyrcanus II is certainly one of the viable candidates. Indeed, given the first-century time frame evident elsewhere in the pesharim, he seems the best candidate. When the Parthians invaded Judea in 40 B.C.E. and supported Antigonus as king, Hyrcanus was put at their disposal as one of the backers of the failed Herod. His ears were cropped to render him permanently unfit to serve as high priest (a possible interpretation of the “consuming affliction”), and he was taken back to Parthia as a prisoner. When he was released several years later, Herod, by now installed as Roman client king, arranged his murder.

\text{to the massacre of protesters in the temple at the Passover following Herod’s death in 4 B.C.E. See M. Broshi, “Ptolas and the Archelaus Massacre (4Q468g = 4QHistorical text B),” JJS 49 (1998): 341–45. Immediately upon Broshi’s publication of this identification, three scholars independently challenged his view, all suggesting Peitholaus as the correct identification. Their reinterpretation is convincing. See W. Horbury, “The Proper Name in 4Q468g: Peitholaus?” JJS 50 (1999): 310–11; D. Schwartz, “4Q468g: Ptollas?” JJS 50 (1999): 308–9; and J. Strugnell, “The Historical Background to 4Q468g [= 4QHistorical B],” RevQ 73 (1999): 137–38. Unfortunately, the editio princeps of the text was evidently unable to take cognizance of the reinterpretation, though, confusingly, the text’s designation has now changed to 4Q468e, and it is no longer called 4QHistorical Text B, but rather F. See Broshi, in Qumran Cave 4: XXVI Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part I, 406–11.}

\text{71 For text and discussion, see Horgan, Pesharim, 44, and Hebrew insert, 7.}

\text{72 A. Dupont-Sommer, The Essene Writings from Qumran (trans. G. Vermes; Gloucester, MA: Peter Smith, 1973), 351–57.}

\text{73 Text and discussion in Horgan, Pesharim, 222, and Hebrew insert, 55.}
The ideological importance of divine retribution against the Wicked Priest comes to the fore in the fact that two separate writings by the Teacher’s followers mention the events. Despite the formally different Hebrew usage, both texts were written after the fact.74

31. (a) The plunder of Jerusalem by the Roman army under Sosius
(b) 37 B.C.E.
(c) Pesher on Habakkuk (1QpHab) 9:4–7
(d) חסרו על ירושלים החזירים אסיר י/*@ו והם יצאו משלם חכמה ושלום ואהבת
,”the true interpretation concerns the later priests of Jerusalem, who will gather ill-gotten riches from the plunder of the peoples, but in the Last Days their riches and plunder alike will be handed over to the army of the Kittim”75
(e) Origin: sectarian
(f) After the city of Jerusalem fell to Herod and his Roman allies in 37 B.C.E., the Roman army was unusually violent and unrestrained in their plundering of the city. Josephus attributes this attitude to their anger at the five-month length of the siege. The historian says of Herod:

He also tried to prevent the plundering that went on throughout the city by strenuously arguing with Sosius that if the Romans emptied the city of its wealth and its men, they would leave him king of a wilderness. . . . And when Sosius said that he had been right to permit his soldiers this plundering in return for their labors in the siege, Herod replied that he himself would distribute rewards to each of them out of his own purse. In this way he purchased security for the rest of the city. (Ant. 14.484–86, trans. R. Marcus, LCL)

Notice how the authors of the pesharim differentiated their descriptions of the two instances when Jerusalem fell to the Romans, in 63 B.C.E. and 37 B.C.E. In the earlier instance, they stipulated that the wealth of the city would fall to “Ephraim” or “the Seekers of Accommodation,” that is, the party of Hyrcanus II and the Pharisees (4QpNah 3–4 i 11–12, 3–4, iii 5). In the second instance, the authors specifically highlighted the role of the Roman army and its plundering, aspects that also impressed themselves on Josephus and his sources.

74 In general, when describing the past from their own temporal perspective, the pesharists use the perfect form. When considering the event from the future-oriented perspective of the biblical prophet, they choose the imperfect.
75 Text and discussion in Horgan, Pesharim, 43–44, and Hebrew insert, 7.
III. Analysis and Conclusions

As one considers the foregoing list, two general observations may be made. First, the list contains sixteen allusions from nonsectarian texts (recall that no. 7 comprises two separate allusions), and sixteen from sectarian writings. Second, it contains six references to second-century B.C.E. people, processes, and events (nos. 1–6) as against twenty-six to those of the first century B.C.E. (including here the reign of Jannaeus, since only three years of his twenty-eight-year reign fell in the second century). This considerable overbalance toward the first century must be accorded due weight. It certainly speaks to the question of the Teacher’s movement’s *floruit*, and unless there is good historical reason to interpose a long period between that *floruit* and the time of the founder, it speaks also to the dating of the Teacher. Remarkably, no references to the first century C.E. appear.

A reasonable working principle is that most of the writings on the list postdate their latest allusion by no more than a generation. This is not a certain principle, of course, and much depends in such matters on the nexus between a given author and the assumed readership. Still, it is common scholarly procedure in the study of antiquity to date a writing near to the time of its latest allusion unless one has reasons not to do so. Proceeding on the basis of this sound methodology, one can break the list down another way by asking, How many references appear in writings that can certainly or almost certainly be assigned to one of the two centuries, and how many are open to interpretation placing them in either century?

Nineteen references occur in texts certainly or very probably written in the first century (nos. 2, 7 [bis], 9–16, 18, 20–24, 26, 28). The remaining thirteen references are ambiguous or much less certain, deriving from works possibly composed in either century (nos. 1, 3–6, 8, 17, 19, 25, 27, 29–31). More than half of this latter group (nos. 17, 19, 25, 27, 29–31) belong to the Pesher on Habakkuk or other pesher materials that consensus scholars have made a part of their second-century synthesis. The patterns of these thirteen ambiguous references invite additional analysis, during which the distinction between sectarian and nonsectarian writings must be kept firmly in mind.

Among the sectarian writings of this group the only allusion unquestionably to the second century B.C.E. is the reference to Antiochus IV in the Pesher

---

76 Allusions constitute a kind of appeal to communal memory, and therefore the question of experiences and values presumed to be shared by the author and the putative audience is of the essence. What is remembered, for how long, and in what way is connected to these shared experiences and values. See the interesting observations on aspects of this connection vis-à-vis dating historical references in E. Leach, “Personal and Communal Memory in the Reading of Horace’s Odes, Books 1–3,” Arethusa 31 (1998): 43–74, and the extensive bibliography there cited.
on Nahum. Yet this allusion occurs in a text that was demonstrably a product of the first century B.C.E. All scholars agree that Pesher on Nahum contains numerous references to events of the period 100–50 B.C.E. So here it seems reasonable to let what we know guide us in trying to assess what we do not. By Ockham’s razor, the definite first-century allusions in the Pesher on Nahum and Pesher on Hosea should incline the historian to assign the Pesher on Habakkuk and CD material to that time also, provided consistent explanations suggest themselves. To my mind they do; as I have tried to show above, all of the pesher allusions have attractive first-century explanations.

Sometimes these first-century explanations are not merely attractive, they are manifestly the best options (e.g., nos. 25, 31). If these two items from the Pesher on Habakkuk are best dated to the latter half of the first century, then the pesher itself dates to that time. One could argue the same way for CD by invoking the well-known literary relationship between it and the Pesher Habakkuk. All of the uncertainly dated sectarian references would then fall in line. All would date to the first century.

Six of the references from the ambiguous group occur in nonsectarian writings (nos. 1, 3–6, 8). None of these appears in a work that can antedate the reign of Simon Maccabee. Pseudo-Daniel (4Q245) mentions an Onias and Jonathan Maccabee, but its latest preserved reference is to Simon Maccabee. The original composition, therefore, cannot antedate the year 143/142 B.C.E.

In fact, the sequence of high priests given by 4Q245 is very possibly incomplete at the point when the fragment breaks off.77 Because the scribe wrote the name of Simon at the left margin, one must allow that the enumeration perhaps wrapped around to the next line. Indeed, in terms of the internal logic of the text, the best reading/restoration of 4Q245i 10–11a is: אֶעָנֶה חָנָנָה [Eunan Hanah] הַכָּבָד הַיָּד [Hayyad Hayad 11 שִׁבְיָא] [She быя Shveya].78 Judah Aristobulus was high priest for just one year, 104 B.C.E. The text may have been composed in that year, or perhaps shortly afterwards in the reign of Alexander Jannaeus.

Item no. 5 apparently refers to John Hyrcanus I, although, as noted, it may name instead Hyrcanus II. In either case, 4QpapHistorical Text C (4Q331) is likely to be related to 4QHistorical Texts D and E (4Q332–333). These other writings refer to first-century figures by name, including Alexandra and M. Aemilius Scaurus. Accordingly, no. 5 probably derives from a first-century composition.

Perhaps one might say the same for no. 6 from 4QList of False Prophets. If the reference is to John Hyrcanus I as a false prophet, such a list might well date to the time of Alexander Jannaeus. But the uncertainty of this reference

77 This is a point conceded by the editors of the text, although they tend to favor the notion that the last name is that of Simon. See Collins and Flint, *Qumran Cave 4 XVII*, 157.
78 In a forthcoming study I set forth the reasoning behind this assertion.
makes any detailed discussion tenuous in the extreme. Likewise for no. 8, which is so fragmentary that it would better be left out of any generalizing conclusions.

If 4Q245 did end with Judah Aristobulus (and leaving aside nos. 6 and 8), then original composition of the writings on the list, sectarian and nonsectarian, would in no case antedate the tail end of the second century B.C.E. In fact, one might reasonably propose that every writing on the list was composed within the first century B.C.E. But to put the matter in terms of what has been demonstrated: nineteen allusions on the list occur in writings certainly composed in the first century B.C.E., none in writings certainly composed in the second century B.C.E.

The impetus of this conclusion for the historian trying to date the Teacher and his movement is clear. If the foregoing reasoning is granted, and judging by their latest references, all of the sectarian writings on the list were probably composed between 60 and 30 B.C.E. On the nonsectarian side of the ledger, the latest reference is to Peitholaus in the years 55–51 B.C.E.—fifty years shy of the turn of the eras. The evidence presented in the list therefore argues that the Teacher of Righteousness was a figure primarily of the early first century B.C.E., and that his movement flourished in the fifty years from about 80 B.C.E. to 30 B.C.E.

But what can one say of the period after 30 B.C.E.? The writers of the Dead Sea Scrolls, whether sectarian or nonsectarian, seem to have nothing to say about the years 30 B.C.E.–70 C.E. Surely this puzzle requires explanation.

From a modern standpoint these years represent perhaps the most tumultuous and significant century in ancient Jewish history—all passed over in silence. The scrolls contain no recognizable reference to any of the signal events of Herod the Great’s reign, although Josephus portrayed that period as a watershed in his people’s history. Herod’s building of a Greek theater and amphitheater in Jerusalem finds no mention anywhere. Neither is there any allusion to Herod’s rebuilding of Samaria. Nor do the scrolls concern themselves, even by a passing reference, with Herod’s dismantling of the Hasmonean temple in Jerusalem in order to replace it with his own. Indeed, consider a few of the other matters of the years 30 B.C.E. to 70 C.E. that go unmentioned: the War of Varus; appointment and dismissal of high priests at will; planned installation of the image of Caligula in the temple at Jerusalem; the reign of Herod Agrippa I, a follower of the Pharisees; various freedom fighters, prophets, and millenarian leaders who appear in Josephus, including John the Baptist; high priestly families battling in the streets of Jerusalem in the years 62–64 C.E.; the outbreak and events of the First Revolt itself.

These are the same kinds of events—involving temple purity and political leadership, war and foreign invasion—about which the writers of the scrolls were downright voluble for the first century B.C.E. For that period both sectar-
ian and nonsectarian writers were much engaged and did not hesitate to express their views, albeit often cryptically. Yet in the first century C.E. the writers seem to have developed lockjaw. Extended silence is not what analogy suggests for any literate millenarian movement, provided it remains vital.

One might suppose that the Teacher’s followers simply ceased to write such works as the pesharim because their eschatological views had changed. This explanation would harmonize with comparative millenarian material. As one expert in the study of millenarian groups has put it, “The key to converting an effervescent apocalypticism into an established, complex religious system includes, above all, an elongation of the eschatological timetable. As long as a group sustains short-term, specific predictions of the end, it remains volatile.”

Did the Teacher’s sect take such a tack? Did they dull the sharp-edged expectations found in such works as the Pesher on Habakkuk, beginning in the reign of Herod to prefer an open-ended wait on the millennium? If so, comparative millenarian evidence would further lead us to expect them to write new texts to explain the new ideas. At least some such texts should be discernible through their allusions. Yet we find none. Why should followers preserve only the older, now “invalid” writings to be hidden in the caves in later years?

One possible explanation is that the apparent absence of new writings is merely that—apparent, fortuitous. On this view, the Teacher’s movement did continue to produce literature, but by sheer bad luck no identifiable portion of those later writings survived. This is a kind of argument from silence, useful to potential advocates to counter what they would, no doubt, brand as itself an argument from silence. Although conceivably correct, the problem with their approach is that it amounts to saying that the best argument is no argument. In fact, historians dealing with antiquity always face the problem that only a small percentage of the evidence has survived. The usual practice—and few would dispute that it is the best practice—is to draw provisional conclusions on the basis of what has survived.

In any case, we are in a better situation here than such advocates would have one believe. To draw an inference from the total absence of allusions to the first century C.E. in the Dead Sea Scrolls is really not an argument from silence. The situation is rather akin to that of the hound in the Sherlock Holmes story “Silver Blaze”: this is a dog that should have barked. The most natural conclusion from the silence is that the dog could not bark: it was either sick, or it was dead. By the beginning of the common era, it seems, the Teacher’s movement had lost vitality, perhaps even ceased to exist. No more than a rivulet survived to flow into the first century C.E.

80 The very few first-century C.E. copies of works such as 4QMMT or the Songs of the Sab-
Leaving aside whatever may have been the situation in the first century C.E., this study has shown that it is reasonable to locate the Teacher of Righteousness in the late second or early first century B.C.E., and that the high tide of his movement was the first century B.C.E. This reformulated chronology is at least as viable as the consensus view that has held sway since the 1950s. As we have seen, the first-century B.C.E. option fits better with the current archaeological dating of Qumran’s habitation phases. It fits as well as the consensus does with the problematic testimony of paleographic dating, and better with the evidence of radiocarbon dating. The first-century option fits well, too—just as well as does the consensus view—with explicit, internal evidence for dating such as one finds in CD.

Today the testimony of identifiable historical allusions is much weightier than it was when the consensus came to be shaped. Some thirty-five people, processes, and events have now to be considered. We have seen that this testimony, in some ways the most precise and therefore the most telling testimony, tends to undermine the consensus chronology as regards both the Teacher and his movement. This voice favors instead a first-century B.C.E. historical setting for both the rise and—perhaps surprisingly—the fall of the movement.

A first-century location fits well, too, with other considerations, though these properly require a full discussion on another occasion. For example, the social setting implicit in 4QMMT argues that the text was written against the backdrop of priestly or Sadducean loss of power over the temple and the concomitant rise of Pharisaic control there. Josephus describes only one possible period of rising Pharisaic power in the years when the Hasmonean dynasty held sway: the reign of Salome Alexandra (76–67 B.C.E.). Recall here reference no. 14 above; so far as we know, Salome’s was the only time in Jewish history when the Pharisees actually wielded the political power the Pesher on Nahum’s term מטעל할 implies. Josephus wrote of this time with thinly veiled disapproval. The Pharisees, he observed, were

A body of Jews with the reputation of excelling the rest of their nation in the observances of religion, and as exact exponents of the laws. To them, being
herself intensely religious, [Alexandra] listened with too great deference; while they, gradually taking advantage of an ingenuous woman, became at length the real administrators of the state, at liberty to banish and to recall, to loose and to bind, whom they would. In short, the enjoyments of royal authority were theirs; its expenses and burdens fell to Alexandra. (J.W. 1.110–12, trans. H. St. J. Thackeray, LCL)

Add to the “fit” of 4QMMT in this period the role that the Roman invasion under Pompey plays in the scrolls. The importance to the scroll writers of the coming of Rome is hard to overstate. Including the tumultuous aftermath of the 50s B.C.E., this is undeniably the complex of historical events most central to the collection as a whole. Note the impetus of the present study: more than half of the references on the list above (nos. 12–28, seventeen out of thirty-two references) probably or certainly pertain to this watershed. For the sectarian writers, in particular, the coming of Rome was a punishment for the sins of the Wicked Priest, the Man of the Lie, and the Jewish people whom they had duped. What makes most sense, therefore, is that the Wicked Priest should have been active in the initial decades of the first century B.C.E., and so also the Teacher of Righteousness. Then the personalities of the pesharim would not be drastically separated in time from the Roman retribution for their acts, as happens in the consensus chronology. They would live to be properly recom-pensed.

The proposal to locate the Teacher and the rise of his movement in the first century B.C.E. has much in its favor. The idea explains the totality of the evidence at least as well as does the consensus worked out in the 1950s. Given the nature of that evidence, this is not an issue on which certainty will ever be possible. Nevertheless, the historian’s goal is still the best possible synthesis. The first-century option deserves consideration as precisely that.
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One of many unresolved issues pertaining to the longer version of the Gospel of Mark known to us from Clement of Alexandria’s Letter to Theodore is the matter of how this writing originated.1 Most scholars consider it to be an expansion of the canonical Gospel, as Clement himself believed (1.18–21, 24–26). Others—most notably, Helmut Koester, Hans-Martin Schenke, and John Dominic Crossan—have argued that longer Mark represents an earlier form of the Markan text.2 The theories presented by those three scholars have

---

1 This letter was published by its discoverer, Morton Smith, in his books Clement of Alexandria and a Secret Gospel of Mark (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1973) and The Secret Gospel: The Discovery and Interpretation of the Secret Gospel According to Mark (New York: Harper & Row, 1973). Translations of the letter in this paper are from Clement of Alexandria, 91, 446–47, except for the phrases in brackets and the letter’s longer Gospel excerpts, which are my own. With the exception of some brief phrases, translations of the NT are from the RSV. I have eschewed Smith’s translation of Clement’s phrase τὸ μυστικὸν εὐαγγέλιον as “the secret Gospel” because it is mistaken: when Clement applied μυστικός to Scriptures, it was in reference to a concealed (i.e., symbolic or allegorical) level of meaning. I prefer the description “longer Gospel of Mark” (or LGM) because μυστικός has no obvious English counterpart, and Clement’s letter does not really support the notion that this text was a secret writing. See Scott G. Brown, “The More Spiritual Gospel: Markan Literary Techniques in the Longer Gospel of Mark” (Ph.D. diss., The University of Toronto, 1999), 145–78; for a positive assessment of the letter’s authenticity, see pp. 63–142.

been extensively critiqued, but the conclusion that longer Mark is an expansion of the canonical Gospel has not been established by default. The basic supposition of the school of longer Markan priority could still be correct even if the specific arguments of its founders are untenable. Scholars who doubt that canonical Mark is an abbreviation of the longer Gospel must therefore offer a more generalized critique of the theory of longer Markan priority and positive evidence that the extant verses of the longer Gospel were not originally part of the Gospel of Mark. That is what this paper will attempt to do.

I. The School of Longer Markan Priority

Koester was the first to develop the theory that the canonical Gospel originated as a revision of the longer Gospel, and this theory was quickly adapted in a modified form by Schenke and in a completely revised form by Crossan. According to Koester and Schenke, canonical Mark is the last version of a Gospel that began as a proto-Mark used by Matthew and Luke. Koester believes that this proto-Mark was elaborated into the “secret” Gospel in the early second century by a redactor interested in portraying Jesus as “a supernatural being endowed with magical powers and with a ‘new teaching’”; this redactor

---

added or developed a number of motifs in the Markan Gospel that are not paralleled in the triple tradition by Matthew or Luke, including a preoccupation with resurrection and wondrous amazement, "‘mystery’ as the sum total of Jesus’ message to the disciples and probably a similar interpretation of the term εὐαγγέλιον (gospel), and a sacramental conception of Jesus’ teachings.4 This redactor also added the incident of the young man who fled naked in Gethsemane (Mark 14:51–52) as well as the two incidents that are known to be unique to the longer Gospel of Mark: the account of Jesus coming to Bethany and raising this young man from the dead (= LGM 1, following Mark 10:34) and the reference to Jesus refusing to receive this man’s mother, his sister, and Salome when Jesus arrives in Jericho (= LGM 2, following the first clause in Mark 10:46).5

According to Koester, in the first half of the second century this longer version of Mark was reworked into the Carpocratian longer version that Clement denounces in the Letter to Theodore.6 The canonical Gospel was produced still later, in the second half of the second century, by the removal of LGM 1 and 2 from the orthodox longer text; these passages were removed because they did not belong in a public Gospel.7 Schenke modifies this part of Koester’s thesis by suggesting that the Carpocratian Gospel was the original version of the longer Gospel. He bases this conclusion on the premise that earliest Alexandrian Christianity was “heretical—according to the view of the specialists.”8 There was no orthodox Christianity in place in the early second century to produce the orthodox version of longer Mark known to Clement, so that version must be a later, purified edition of Carpocrates’ text. The canonical Gospel was then derived from the orthodox longer Gospel through the removal of LGM 1 and 2.

Crossan’s theory is quite different. Impressed by Koester’s insight yet unconvinced by his arguments, Crossan proposes that the production of “secret” Mark and the excision of LGM 1 and 2 that produced the canonical version occurred in the 70s of the first century, before the latter was used by

---

4 Koester, “History and Development,” 55.
5 Clement’s statements describing the location of these passages within Mark are found in the Letter to Theodore 2.21–22 and 3.11–13; 3.14–15. The text of LGM 1 is printed below, within the synopsis titled “Longer Mark’s Discipleship Teaching Cycles.” LGM 2 (in context) reads “And he comes into Jericho. 1 And the sister of the young man whom Jesus loved and his mother and Salome were there; 2 and Jesus did not receive them. And as he was leaving Jericho with his disciples and a great multitude. . . .”
6 Koester, Ancient Christian Gospels, 294–95. Smith has shown that Carpocrates was active during the reign of Hadrian (117–138) and likely made use of the longer text by 125 C.E.; see Clement of Alexandria, 90, 267–68.
7 Koester, “History and Development,” 56; idem, Ancient Christian Gospels, 302.
8 Schenke, “Mystery,” 76.
Matthew and Luke. He suggests that LGM 1, which describes the young man returning to Jesus dressed only in a linen cloth, “was most likely used as baptismal reading and ritual in the Alexandrian church,” but that Carpocratians quickly reworked this part of the longer Gospel into a proof text for their libertinism.9 Thus, in order to counter the Carpocratian longer Gospel of Mark, the redactor of canonical Mark needed not only to eliminate this story and its sequel in LGM 2, but also to discredit these verses as authentic tradition. To this end he dismantled and redistributed the phrases of LGM 1 and 2 throughout the canonical text so that “any resurgence of the [LGM 1 and 2] story could easily be dismissed as a pastiche from canonical Mark.”10

Crossan’s evidence for this process of dismantling and redistributing consists of arguments to the effect that the parallels in canonical Mark to phrases in LGM 1 and 2 are less well suited to their canonical Markan contexts. They seem more natural within LGM 1 and 2, which is what one would expect if they are debris from the longer Gospel.

II. General Problems with the Theory of Longer Markan Priority

David Peabody, Frans Neirynck, Philip Sellew, and Robert H. Gundry have disputed most of the specific arguments that Koester, Schenke, and Crossan have offered in support of the priority of longer Mark. In this section I will point out some general problems with the theory of longer Markan priority that have mostly gone unnoticed in previous discussions. Though I am mainly concerned with problems that would encumber any theory that makes canonical Mark a direct descendant of the longer Gospel, I will still address some fun-

9 Crossan, Four Other Gospels, 119–20; cf. pp. 108, 114, 116–18 (he critiques Koester’s theory in Historical Jesus, 413–14). This theory implies that all three versions of Mark originated in the Alexandrian church in short succession. After writing The Cross that Spoke, Crossan recognized that the hypothesized libertines must have been “Proto-Carpocratians,” since Carpocrates was active a half century later; see “Thoughts,” 165; Historical Jesus, 329, 414.

10 Citing Crossan, “Thoughts,” 165; cf. Four Other Gospels, 121; Historical Jesus, 329. Though Crossan claimed that this theory confirmed his earlier studies of the empty tomb tradition (Cross that Spoke, 283), it has in fact undermined them. His assumption of an Alexandrian provenance for all three versions of Mark is incompatible with his earlier position that “Mark’s theology of Jesus’ absence” arose in response to “an influx of Jerusalem Christians into his Galilean community after the fall of Jerusalem,” who brought with them a Jerusalem theology of presence, that is, an “interest in miracles and apparitions rather than in suffering and service.” See John Dominic Crossan, “A Form for Absence: The Markan Creation of Gospel,” Semeia 12 (1978): 49; idem, “Empty Tomb and Absent Lord (Mark 16:1–8),” in The Passion in Mark: Studies on Mark 14–16 (ed. Werner H. Kelber; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976), 146.
damental, yet previously unrecognized, problems that are specific to the existing proposals. This general critique will shade into a more direct critique of Crossan’s theory, since his reconstruction of an Alexandrian scandal relates directly to matters discussed in the *Letter to Theodore* and is therefore more open to evaluation and the possibility of falsification than are Koester’s hypothesized second-century redactions. This critique of Crossan’s thesis will be followed by a brief evaluation of Schenke’s proposal that the Carpocratian longer Gospel was the initial longer version, since this proposal remains a possibility even when the canonical Gospel is deemed to have been written first.

When one attempts to imagine the canonical Gospel emerging more than eighty years after the production and distribution of the version used by Matthew and Luke, some important problems present themselves. Schenke noticed one, which is tacitly acknowledged in this historical inference:

> Our Second Gospel has shown up as a purified abbreviation of the Secret Gospel of Mark, which is attested to have been available and in use (only) in the church of Alexandria. This fact can, or even must, be understood as an indication that the church of Alexandria may have played a or the decisive role both in the final shaping of Mark and in its consideration for the growing (four-) gospel canon of the whole church. We may indeed be indebted to the church of Alexandria that Mark did not experience the fate of the “Sayings Gospel” (which we call the “sayings source”), which became superfluous and disappeared after its incorporation into the Gospels of Matthew and Luke.¹¹

What Schenke noticed is that, according to Koester’s theory, the hypothesized abridged text of “secret” Mark—or a work presumed to be a mid-second-century redaction of an early-second-century expansion of a much earlier proto-Mark—becomes the sole basis for the Markan manuscript tradition. This is not a very probable scenario. The fact that none of the conjectured earlier editions of Mark left traces in the Markan manuscript tradition shows how unlikely it is that a mid-second-century Alexandrian edition could influence all extant manuscripts of Mark by establishing the archetype.¹² Certainly if a proto-Mark had been circulating since the 70s of the first century, then some manuscripts of Mark should omit the many words and phrases that Koester ascribes to the redactor of the longer Gospel (e.g., Mark 9:14b–16, 26b–27; 10:21a, 38b, 39b; 14:51–52; and various occurrences of the words “gospel,” “teaching,” “to be amazed,” and “after three days”).

---

¹¹ Schenke, “Mystery,” 74–75.

¹² The Long Ending of Mark (16:9–20) offers an instructive comparison. This revision of Mark was produced before the end of the second century and became more popular than the original Short Ending. But it did not influence all extant manuscripts, and its ascendency within the manuscript tradition took more than a century. Indeed, most of the Greek manuscripts of Mark known to Eusebius ended at 16:8. For details, see Parker, *Living Text*, 132–37.
Advocates of a mid-second-century Alexandrian origin for the canonical Gospel will also have difficulty explaining Clement's tradition that Mark wrote this Gospel in Rome prior to Peter's death.\textsuperscript{13} Why would the Alexandrian church dissociate itself from the more popular canonical Gospel a few decades after this work was produced in Alexandria? Why would the community that developed both texts lay claim only to the less familiar version of the Markan Gospel?\textsuperscript{14} This point becomes more forceful if the longer Gospel is thought to be a text that an Alexandrian editor tried to discredit, as Crossan supposes. Crossan's theory envisions all versions of Mark being produced in Alexandria (albeit in the 70s of the first century), but the Alexandrian church laying claim only to the initial version, which supposedly caused it so much trouble.

Further difficulty for the theory of longer Markan priority is posed by the difference in the lengths of the two versions of Mark. Abbreviation is easier to imagine if only a few offending passages are involved. Thus proponents of longer Markan priority are inclined to believe that the letter contains "nothing whatsoever" that might imply that longer Mark differed from canonical Mark in respects other than the quoted passages.\textsuperscript{15} But there is no reason to think that Clement cited all of the passages unique to the longer text, and much reason to believe that he did not.

To begin with, the passages Clement cited are the specific ones about

\textsuperscript{13} Clement relates this tradition in the Letter to Theodore 1.15–18. The origin of (canonical) Mark in Rome is explicit in Eusebius’s paraphrase of comments Clement made in the eighth book of his now lost Hypotyposeis; see Hist. eccl. 6.14.5–7 (cf. 2.14.6–16.1, where origin in Rome is only implicit). See also the Latin translation by Cassiodorus of Clement’s comments on 1 Pet 5:13 from fragments he presumed to be from Clement’s lost Hypotyposeis (Eng. trans. in ANF 2).

\textsuperscript{14} Since longer Mark is only known to have been used in Alexandria, where elders, such as Clement, read it only to worthy individuals (2.1–9), it should follow that any recensions of this text are Alexandrian too. But whereas Crossan and Schenke adhere to this reasoning, Koester has resisted designating Alexandria as the place of origin for either the shorter or the longer version of Mark, despite his impression that the nocturnal instruction of the young man in LGM 1 “fits very well with what is otherwise known about secret rites of initiation among the gnostic sects of Egypt.” An Alexandrian provenance is problematic for him, for he ascribes these Gospels to the same Markan “school” or community, which he locates in Syria. Hence Koester speculates that the shorter and (orthodox) longer texts were brought to Alexandria from Syria and that the longer text arrived first. This supplementary hypothesis can only seem extraneous in comparison to the uncomplicated Alexandrian tradition. See his Introduction to the New Testament (2 vols.; New York: de Gruyter, 1982), 2:166–67, 222–23 (quotation from p. 223, as cited by Schenke in “Mystery,” 76); idem, Ancient Christian Gospels, 295; idem, “History and Development,” 55.

\textsuperscript{15} Meyer, “Youth,” 138; idem, “Beloved Disciple,” 96; cf. Crossan, Four Other Gospels, 107 (citing Koester, “History and Development,” 56–57, but omitting Koester’s note of uncertainty). The denial of differences has since modulated into a confession of agnosticism about whether there were other differences between the two versions. See, e.g., Koester, Ancient Christian Gospels, 295; Koester and Stephen J. Patterson, “The Secret Gospel of Mark” (draft translation, introduction, and notes), in Complete Gospels, ed. Miller, 403–4; and Crossan, Historical Jesus, 411.
which Theodore inquired: “To you, therefore, I shall not hesitate to answer the questions you have asked, refuting the falsifications by the very words of the Gospel” (2.19–20). Clement quoted the resurrection and initiation story in order to prove that the true version did not include “‘naked man with naked man,’ and the other things about which you wrote” (3.13–14). Similarly, Clement quoted the statement about Jesus’ refusal to meet the women in Jericho in order to show Theodore that it did not include “the many other things about which you wrote” (3.17). Thus, there is no reason to suppose that these quotations disclose all the differences between the two Gospels.16

Clement’s descriptions of how Mark revised his Gospel also contain positive indications that the Alexandrian edition was significantly longer:

But when Peter died a martyr, Mark came over to Alexandria, bringing both his own notes and those of Peter, from which he transferred to his former book the things suitable to those studies which make for progress toward knowledge. Thus he composed a more spiritual Gospel for the use of those who were being perfected. Nevertheless, he yet did not divulge the things not to be uttered, nor did he write down the hierophantic teaching of the Lord, but to the stories already written he added yet others and, moreover, brought in certain [traditions] of which he knew the interpretation would, as a mystagogue, lead the hearers into the innermost sanctuary of the truth hidden by seven veils. Thus, in sum, he prepared matters, neither grudgingly nor incautiously, in my opinion, and, dying, he left his composition to the church in Alexandria, where [to this day it is still very carefully preserved], being read only to those who are being initiated into the great mysteries. (1.18–2.2)

According to this scenario, when Mark came to Alexandria he supplemented his existing Gospel with materials taken from two written sources: his own and Peter’s notes. From both sources (ἐξ ὅν) he added to the original “stories” (πράξεις) of the canonical Gospel “others also” (καὶ ἄλλας) along with certain “traditions” (λόγια) whose interpretation could lead the hearer into the innermost sanctuary of the truth. Since both πράξεις and λόγια are plural and apparently denote different kinds of materials,17 they most naturally suggest that the longer text had at least four additional passages. But even four would not


17 I have changed Smith’s translation of λόγια from “sayings” to “traditions” in order to discourage the notion that Clement was distinguishing between “acts” and “sayings.” Clement and other second-century church fathers used λόγια in reference either to the Scriptures as a whole or to certain passages of Scripture that included narrative (note the application of λόγια to Mark 10:17–31 in Quis div. 3.1), and here πράξεις refers to the entire contents of the first Gospel, not just the narrative elements. See Roger Gryson, “A propos du témoignage de Papias sur Matthieu: Le sens du mot λόγια chez les Pères du second siècle,” ETL 41 (1965): 530–47.
account for why the Alexandrian version is described as a “mystical” (2.6, 12) or “more spiritual Gospel” (1.21) in comparison with the shorter Gospel, particularly if the “other” πρόξενες were of a similar nature to those found in the shorter Gospel.¹⁸ The similar contrast Clement made between the “bodily” accounts of the Synoptics and John’s “spiritual Gospel” suggests that Mark’s “more spiritual Gospel” differed to a noticeable degree from the canonical Gospel, and in a way that made it similar to John.¹⁹ The addition of LGM 1 and 2 plus a few other passages would not appreciably affect the nature of Mark’s Gospel, making the shorter version seem “bodily” by comparison. The longer Gospel must have been a great deal longer than the canonical Gospel, and the fate of these other materials is not readily imagined on the basis of Koester’s and Schenke’s theory of excision or, especially, Crossan’s theory of dismantling and redistributing.

What is more, Clement’s descriptions of the materials that were unique to the longer Gospel do not suggest any plausible motive for their removal. Though many of the passages would have been “mystical” and “more spiritual” in nature, these terms are not synonymous with “more in need of suppression”: Clement considered John to be a spiritual Gospel. For Clement, μυστικός and πνευματικότερος meant more overtly symbolic or less overtly concerned with the “bodily” facts than with their inner significance. Moreover, the “other” stories which Mark is said to have added were apparently passages of a nonmystical nature more like those that characterized the shorter Gospel. What happened to those other ordinary stories? What reasons could there be for their elimination? The still unknown passages of the longer Gospel were probably considerable and variegated, and the explanations Koester and Crossan have given for the removal of LGM 1 and 2 cannot be extended to explain the removal of those other passages.²⁰

Indeed, these specific explanations would not adequately account for the removal of LGM 1 and 2. Koester’s supposition that these fifteen sentences were removed because they were not appropriate for a public version conflicts with Clement’s general point that Mark was careful to include only materials

¹⁸ Smith, Clement of Alexandria, 39. It is the λόγια that are distinguished as special. Cf. Smith’s opinion that the longer text “differed considerably from the short one” (p. 92). Raymond E. Brown makes the same argument in The Death of the Messiah: A Commentary on the Passion Narratives in the Four Gospels (2 vols.; ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 1994), 1:296 n. 2.


²⁰ Since, according to the logic of Koester’s theory, it is precisely the complete pericopae added by the author of longer Mark that were removed to form the canonical Gospel, the question arises why the expurgator did not just use proto-Mark as his “despiritualized” Markan Gospel. After all, apart from Mark 14:51–52, proto-Mark would be essentially the same text as canonical Mark, minus the unappealing minor divergences from Matthew and Luke created by the redactor of the longer Gospel.
that could safely be entrusted to writing. The materials that distinguished the longer Gospel were not the hierophantic teachings (of the secret, and therefore unwritten, gnostic tradition) but rather mystical passages whose interpretations could lead one to these truths.\(^{21}\) Hence the unique materials of the longer text were suitable for any audience, though in practice the longer text was read only to Christians who had proved themselves worthy of learning the esoteric mysteries of the Alexandrian church. Crossan’s contention, on the other hand, that LGM 1 and 2 were removed in order to combat a libertine scandal lacks corroborative evidence in the Gospel. One might expect that a redactor who took the unusual measure of dismantling a story that had come to be interpreted erotically would also have taken the positive step of including materials explicitly denouncing sexual immorality and lawlessness. As the Gospel stands, there is no evidence that any redactor of Mark was fighting libertinism.\(^{22}\)

Crossan’s theory that the redactor of canonical Mark was attempting to discredit LGM 1 is also in tension with the letter’s information that the Alexandrian church cherished and preserved its longer text. Crossan addresses this problem when commenting that “Secret Mark must have been important in the baptismal liturgy, or the simplest solution would have been to destroy it completely.”\(^{23}\) But is that not what Crossan argued that the redactor of canonical Mark set out to do? Crossan is presuming both that Mark eradicated a troublesome pericope from his Gospel, carefully dispersing its debris within the new text in such a way that any resurgence of the tradition could only look like an inauthentic pastiche, and that the members of his church continued to preserve the original Gospel because the now inauthentic-looking pericope was an indispensable part of their liturgy. Certainly the continued use of both the longer and shorter texts of Mark in Clement’s church is better explained by Clement’s information that these texts differed substantially from each other and were directed to different audiences—the shorter text to catechumens (1.15–18) and the longer text to “those who were being perfected” (1.20–22).

The letter is in fact quite explicit about how the longer text was used, and

---

\(^{21}\) Clement described his own *Stromateis* in a very similar way, as a book that hinted at gnostic truths that he was highly reluctant to commit to writing—at least in a plain form. See *Strom.* 1.12; 4.2; 7.18.110.4–111.3; and esp. 1.1.14.2–4, where, much as in *Letter to Theodore* 1.27, he explains that this was not done “grudgingly” but out of prudence. See Smith, *Clement of Alexandria,* 32.

\(^{22}\) Hence there is no basis for Crossan’s designation of the shorter text as “the anti-Carpocratian Public/canonical Mark” (*Four Other Gospels*, 120). Even Smith, who saw evidence for libertinism throughout the NT, could cite only Mark 9:42 as a place in Mark “in which polemic against libertinism is fairly clear” (*Clement of Alexandria*, 258); apparently Smith had second thoughts about this, for Mark 9:42 is the only verse omitted from the parallel discussion in *Secret Gospel*, 124–30.

its descriptions rule out the hypothetical baptismal context that Crossan sup-
poses led to a scandal and the eradication of LGM 1 and 2. According to 
Clement, LGM 1 and 2 were among several passages Mark selected for their 
suitability “to those studies which make for progress toward knowledge 
[γνώσις]” and were intended for the use of “those who were being perfected” 
(1.20–22), persons later described as “those who are being initiated into the 
great mysteries” (2.2). Following Smith’s lead, Crossan and many others have 
taken the latter phrase to be a reference to baptism. But elsewhere in Clement’s 
 writings, references to initiation into the great mysteries do not refer literally to 
some form of cultic initiation but figuratively to esoteric instruction in theologi-
cal mysteries; such instruction was reserved for Christians who had reached an 
advanced stage in an ongoing process of perfection in gnosis.24 These Chris-
tians would already have studied the “minor mysteries” of the observable world 
as a preparation to learning the “great mysteries” of theology and metaphysics 
(Strom. 4.1.3.1–3; cf. 1.28.176.1–2; 1.1.15.3); hence they would already be bap-
tized, as Clement himself made plain:

> It is not then without reason that in the mysteries that obtain among the 
Greeks, lustrations hold the first place; as also the laver [baptism] among the 
Barbarians [i.e., Jews and Christians]. After these are the minor mysteries, 
which have some foundation of instruction and of preliminary preparation 
for what is to come after; and the great mysteries, in which nothing remains 
to be learned of the universe, but only to contemplate and comprehend 
nature and things. (Strom. 5.11.71.1)25

Since Clement describes the longer text as a work intended for—and restricted 
to—advanced theological instruction, there is no justification in the letter for 
treating longer Mark as a text devised for neophytes and read in a baptismal 
context. Clement was quite clear in stating that the shorter Gospel was the one 
read to catechumens (1.15–18).26

The likelihood that “secret” Mark was considerably longer than the canonical 
Gospel poses a special problem for Crossan’s theory, which presupposes a

---

24 As in Clement’s other writings, the language of initiation in the letter is metaphorical, a 
standard philosophical appropriation of mystery-religion terminology to describe instruction in 


26 Smith recognized that this word, κατηχούμενοι, was “a technical term for persons receiv-
ing instruction preparatory to admission to the sacraments” (Clement of Alexandria, 26). This 
inconsistency with his baptismal hypothesis led him to propose that “secret” Mark was the liturgy 
for a second, gnostic baptism practiced by an elite inner circle within the Alexandrian church— 
realities for which we have no evidence. Scholars who have accepted the baptismal hypothesis but 
rejected Smith’s notion of a second baptism have not grappled with this basic inconsistency: only 
baptized Christians who had also undergone study of the “minor mysteries” of the physical world 
were permitted to hear the longer Gospel.
“secret” Gospel that is actually shorter than the canonical one. Crossan seems to believe that Clement’s statements about the history of composition of longer Mark are irrelevant and possibly misleading: “Whether Clement actually knew that Public/canonical Mark came second rather than first may be left politely moot.” But regardless of how reliable Clement’s statements actually are, they must necessarily account for the differences between these Gospels. They therefore illuminate the nature of these differences and are relevant to any source-critical theory. So even if the details Clement supplied about the longer Gospel’s composition were nothing more than inferences based on his own knowledge of the differences between the two versions, the explanation he gave for these differences implies that the longer Gospel text he knew differed by possessing more material and only in that respect. Clement’s statements that the more spiritual Gospel contained the same stories plus additional materials leave no room for the conclusion that “secret” Mark was a shorter Gospel, or even a Gospel of roughly the same length. This discrepancy between the letter and Crossan’s theory would appear to disprove Crossan’s premise of dismantling and redistribution all on its own.

Finally, Crossan’s theory that the dismantling of LGM 1 and 2 can account for the parallels these passages exhibit to phrases in canonical Mark proves untenable in at least two places. According to Crossan, the “strange geographical note” in Mark 10:1 is a rewriting of the more natural LGM 1:13, “a simple question of storing some SGM debris somewhere safe.” But LGM 1:13 says that Jesus “returned” to the other side of the Jordan. This comment is necessarily dependent on Mark 10:1, which is the verse that puts Jesus on the other side of the Jordan in the first place: “And he left there [Galilee: 9:30, 33] and went to the region of Judea and beyond the Jordan.” Without 10:1, a return to the region on the other side of this river would make no sense. Hence 10:1 cannot be explained as debris from LGM 1.

The same is true of the burial and empty tomb narratives. When Crossan first published his theory, he did not realize that the last sixteen verses of Mark’s story must also be deemed the dismembered remains of LGM 1 and 2, since

27 In Four Other Gospels, Crossan suggested (p. 119) that “secret” Mark may have contained nothing more than Mark 10:32–46 plus LGM 1 and a fuller version of LGM 2. Even though Crossan now seems to assume that “secret” Mark was the first full-length version of Mark, his suppositions still imply a Gospel shorter than the canonical version. True, it would have the fifteen verses of LGM 1 and 2; but it would be minus the sixteen verses contained in Mark 15:40–47 and 16:1–8. Canonical Mark, on the other hand, would by Crossan’s reckoning be longer than “secret” Mark insofar as it would include the supposedly dismantled remnants of “secret” Mark not accounted for by 15:40–16:8 (e.g., 10:1a, 21a, 47b, 48b; 14:51–52).

28 Crossan, Four Other Gospels, 108.

29 See Smith, Clement of Alexandria, 91.

30 Crossan, Four Other Gospels, 118–19.
they include parallels to the three women (including Salome) in LGM 2, as well as to the young man, the tomb, and the theme of rolling away the stone in LGM 1. Six years later, when he published *The Historical Jesus*, he acknowledged that, without the elements of a young man, a tomb, a great stone, and the women visitors, nothing resembling the burial and the discovery of an empty tomb could have existed in “secret” Mark after 15:39.31 But now that Crossan recognizes this fact, it is incumbent upon him to argue that the parallel phrases in canonical Mark 15:40–16:8 have the appearance of awkwardly scattered debris. And there is the problem, for certainly these elements make as much sense here as they do in LGM 1 and 2. Crossan himself recognized the suitability of the empty tomb pericope to its context when he previously argued that the evangelist Mark “created the tradition of the Empty Tomb . . . as the precise and complete redactional conclusion for his Gospel.”32 It is indeed very difficult to imagine Mark’s story ending with a centurion’s insight that Jesus was the Son of God (15:39). Though that confession marks the climax of the theme of Jesus’ mysterious identity and forms an *inclusio* with Mark 1:1, the story is not complete without some indication that the executed Son of man really did rise after three days (8:31; 9:31; 10:34) and that the slain shepherd did go before his scattered flock back to Galilee (14:28). Crossan acknowledges that “the evidence” for Mark once ending at 15:39 “is internal and circumstantial, tentative, hypothetical, and clearly controversial.”33 I characterize the issue somewhat differently: There is no evidence, and the conjecture is special pleading.

The notion that the Markan Gospel originally ended with the centurion’s confession is one of several peculiar and unsubstantiated historical inferences necessitated by Crossan’s theory. Others include the Alexandrian location of the community that produced the canonical Gospel, the existence of “Proto-Carpocratians . . . within the immediate time and place of Mark’s first composition,”34 and the dating of the Carpocratian version of longer Mark in the early 70s, about a half century before Carpocrates. Considering, then, that this hypothesis finds no support in the canonical Gospel (in the form of sayings denouncing libertinism) and conflicts with the letter’s information about the use of the longer text (in connection with advanced theological instruction rather than neophyte baptism) and its relative length (the additional materials would make it a longer Gospel), Crossan’s theory that LGM 1 and 2 were dismembered and redistributed to form the canonical Gospel can be regarded as disproved.

33 Crossan, *Historical Jesus*, 416.
34 Ibid., 329.
The variation that Schenke made to Koester’s theory deserves further comment, for even if canonical Mark is accepted as earlier than the orthodox longer Gospel, the latter might still have emerged as a purified version of the Carpocratian edition. This position would imply that LGM 1 and 2 are closer to the “heretical” side of early-second-century Alexandrian Christianity than they are to Markan theology. However, studies comparing these passages with Markan literary techniques and theology have found LGM 1 and 2 to be in agreement with the theological outlook of the canonical Gospel. As to Walter Bauer’s influential thesis that earliest Christianity in Alexandria was entirely heretical, a number of studies have questioned this conclusion. James F. McCue and Birger A. Pearson, for instance, have pointed out that an early Valentinian source excerpted by Clement indicates that the Valentinians understood themselves to be the select few represented by the saying “Many are called, but few are chosen” (Matt 22:14); they saw themselves, in other words, as a pneumatic elite chosen from among the many “psychic” Christians who are called (Exc. 58.1). The same text compares the relative numbers of non-Christians, non-gnostic Christians, and gnostics: “Therefore many are material, but not many are psychic, and few are spiritual” (Exc. 56.2). So there was probably a mixture of gnostic and “proto-orthodox” Christians in Alexandria in the early second century, with the latter forming the majority. The origins of Alexandrian Christianity may not have been “heretical” at all.

III. A Composition-Critical Consideration in Favor of Canonical Markan Priority

There are many problems with the theory that canonical Mark was produced by the removal of LGM 1 and 2. But is there positive evidence in favor of viewing LGM 1 and 2 as secondary additions? In matters of Synoptic source criticism, arguments concerning relative priority are usually deemed inconclusive—if not reversible—by those who hold different solutions. But the compo-


sition of the central section of longer Mark may be a special case where the evidence points unequivocally in one direction.

According to Clement's letter, the longer text's thirteen-sentence narrative in which Jesus raises a young man from the dead and then instructs him a week later in the mystery of the kingdom of God is situated between the third passion prediction (Mark 10:32–34) and the request of James and John for places of honor (Mark 10:35–45). This location between Mark 10:34 and 10:35 is within the last sequence of an elaborate threefold cycle. As redaction critics have long noticed, Mark's two stories about Jesus healing blind men (8:22–26; 10:46–52) frame a central journey section of the narrative wherein on three occasions Jesus foretells his coming passion and resurrection (8:31; 9:31; 10:33–34), the disciples demonstrate their inability to accept this reality (8:32; 9:32–34; 10:35–41), and Jesus responds with a teaching on discipleship (8:34–9:1; 9:35–37; 10:42–45). This structure is actually quite elaborate:

- The passion predictions are localized with reference to where Jesus was passing through or heading (8:27; 9:30; 10:32) and are said to have taken place "on the way" (8:27; 9:33, 34; 10:32). The predictions themselves are κατα-paraatactic in style, and whereas there is variation and elaboration in the descriptions of what will be done to the Son of man, all three predictions end with the same active conception: "and after three days he will rise."

- Each prediction is followed by an inappropriate response from the disciples. The first time, Peter takes Jesus aside and begins to rebuke him (8:32). The second time, the disciples do not understand the prediction and are afraid to ask Jesus about it (9:32); but rather than dwell upon this matter, they privately discuss which of them is the greatest (9:34). And the third time, James and John approach Jesus with a request "to sit, one at your right hand and one at your left, in your glory" (10:37).

- Jesus then summons his disciples (8:34; 9:35; 10:42).

- Jesus offers teachings that focus on the need for self-denial (8:34) and servitude (9:35; 10:43–45).

---

38 See n. 5.
• The teachings themselves highlight paradoxical sayings (esp. 8:35; 9:35; 10:43–44), and these paradoxical sayings are followed by further elucidation (8:36–9:1; 9:36–37; and 10:45).

There is also a logical progression to this structure: Jesus’ predictions of his rejection, death, and resurrection lead his disciples to conceive of a more “appropriate” outcome to their journey, a brighter future where Jesus triumphs without dying (the point of Peter’s rebuke) and they themselves attain great status through their association with his glory (the request of James and John). Put differently, the disciples’ election as confidants and emissaries of the divinely empowered Messiah (3:13–19; 4:11) has engendered thoughts of greatness (hence the discussion of which of them is greatest), which are preventing them from grasping the necessity of the passion. So each time Jesus discloses “the things of God” and the Twelve start thinking “the things of men” (8:33), Jesus summons them together and attempts to inculcate an attitude of self-abnegation, explaining that those who would be great must first make themselves insignificant. These paradoxical teachings form the basis of Mark’s Christology and theology of discipleship, and the elaborately constructed threefold pattern is Mark’s way of accentuating these sayings, which are arguably the most important teachings in the Gospel.

What is essential to note about this tight, logical, and highly structured pattern is that the inclusion of LGM 1 disrupts the logic and the parallelism. Because this incident is set after 10:34, the episode depicting the disciples’ self-centered reaction and Jesus’ discipleship teaching (10:35–45) is separated from the third passion prediction by thirteen verses (and a period of one week). The message conveyed by the resulting whole is not appreciably diminished, for all the elements remain and the resurrection and initiation pericope amplifies the same theme of discipleship. But the parallelism that draws attention to these teachings is weakened, and the chronological connection and logical progression between Jesus’ passion prediction and his disciples’ inappropriate reaction do not appear. The problem this fact presents for any theory that canonical Mark was produced by abbreviation of the longer Gospel is obvious: It is far simpler to suppose that a later addition disrupted a well-designed structure than to suppose that the stronger and tighter parallelism which 10:32–45 shares with 8:31–9:1 and 9:31–37 in the canonical version emerged fortuitously from the removal of an inappropriate or troublesome story.

40 Myers, Binding the Strong Man, 237.
43 This observation is most damaging to theories that suppose that the most original form of
The disruption created by LGM 1 is best appreciated when it is laid out visually, so I have prepared an abridged synopsis of Mark's three discipleship teaching cycles, with the longer text's resurrection narrative included, which appears on the next page. This synopsis highlights two additional facts: (1) that no parallelism could have existed in the longer text at the point where LGM 1 appears because the passion predications and inappropriate reactions are inextricably connected in the first and second cycles; and (2) that LGM 1 is conspicuous in this context because of the relative absence of direct discourse by Jesus within this pericope. In this respect it is closer to the transfiguration episode, which is situated outside of the first cycle (9:2–8).

IV. Compositional Considerations and LGM 2

If the raising of the young man is deemed to be a secondary element with respect to the structure of Mark's central section, then the same must also be true of the longer Gospel's subsequent reference to Jesus refusing to meet Salome and the sister and mother of this young man in its lengthier version of Mark 10:46. Nevertheless, something should be said about these two sentences, particularly since proponents of longer Markan priority have suggested that compositional considerations favor the priority of LGM 2. Their basic argument is that the original text of 10:46 must have included some description of what happened in Jericho. LGM 2 provides that information and is therefore more original.

This sort of argument is clearly reversible, for one could propose that LGM 2 was created to fill this lacuna or to improve the sense, like a scribal amendment.44 The assumption that Mark would not have mentioned Jesus entering a place without saying what transpired there is made dubious by the reference to Jesus passing through Sidon and the Decapolis in Mark 7:31; this

---

44 This is only one possible explanation. My own position is that LGM 2 was added within Mark 10:46 in order to frame 10:35–45 with the story of the raising of the young man. Although it might seem odd to suggest that an intercalation was formed by wrapping one story around another rather than by placing one story inside another, there is no reason to assume that only the latter approach is feasible; indeed, it seems quite likely that Mark used the former procedure to produce the intercalation in 11:12–25. See William R. Telford, The Barren Temple and the Withered Tree (JSNTSup 1; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1980), 42–49.
Jesus foretells his rejection, death, and resurrection,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>And he began to teach them that the Son of man must suffer many things, and be rejected by the elders and the chief priests and the scribes, and be killed, and after three days rise again. And he said this plainly.</td>
<td>For he was teaching his disciples, saying to them, “The Son of man will be delivered into the hands of men, and they will kill him; and when he is killed, after three days he will rise.”</td>
<td>“Behold, we are going up to Jerusalem; and the Son of man will be delivered to the chief priests and the scribes, and they will condemn him to death. . . . and after three days he will rise.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

was a certain woman there whose brother had died. And coming, she prostrated before Jesus and said to him, “Son of David have mercy on me.” But the disciples rebuked her. And having become angry Jesus went away with her into the garden where the tomb was. And immediately a great cry was heard from the tomb. And approaching, Jesus rolled the stone from the door of the tomb, and immediately going in to where the young man was, he stretched out his hand and raised him, taking hold of his hand. But the young man, having looked upon him, loved him and began to entreat him that he might be with him. But the young man, having looked upon him, loved him and began to entreat him that he might be with him. And going out from the tomb they went into the house of the young man; for he was rich. And after six days Jesus gave charge to him; and when it was evening the young man comes to him donning a linen cloth upon his naked body, and he remained with him that night; for Jesus was teaching him the mystery of the kingdom of God. Then arising, he returned from there to the region on the other side of the Jordan.

but a preoccupation with power and status prevents his disciples from accepting any talk about his death.

And Peter took him, and began to rebuke him. But turning and seeing his disciples, he rebuked Peter, and said, “Get behind me, Satan! For you are not on the side of God, but of men.” But they did not understand the saying, and they were afraid to ask him . . . and when he was in the house he asked them, “What were you discussing on the way?” But they were silent; for on the way they had discussed with one another who was the greatest.

And James and John, the sons of Zebedee, came forward to him, and said to him . . . “Grant us to sit, one at your right hand and one at your left, in your glory.” . . . And when the ten heard it, they began to be indignant at James and John.

So Jesus calls them to him

And he called to him the multitude with his disciples, and said to them, And he sat down and called the twelve; and he said to them, And Jesus called them to him and said to them,
seems to be a more striking example of the same thing, for Jesus’ route from the region of Tyre to the Sea of Galilee through these places involves a lengthy and unexplained detour. At least Jericho is an appropriate landmark on Jesus’ trip to Jerusalem through Peraea. Moreover, we might ask whether the lacuna of what Jesus did in Jericho is really filled by LGM 2, which concentrates on what Jesus did not do when he was there. The reader learns only that Jesus did not receive three women who were in Jericho and is left to guess what they were doing there, why they wanted to meet with Jesus, and why Jesus was inhospitable to them. So one narrative gap is being “filled” with another narrative gap that now complicates a reader’s comprehension of the plot. Not surprisingly, some of the scholars who have argued that LGM 2 is integral to Mark 10:46 have also argued that someone suppressed the original contents of LGM 2 with the gloss that Jesus did not receive the women. Thus Smith, Koester, and Crossan each speculate about an original encounter between Jesus and Salome of which LGM 2 is but a censored remnant. So the evidence for the priority of LGM 2 really rests on a hypothetical supposition and involves a new difficulty in accounting for why the entirety of LGM 2 was not eliminated from the text.

*If any man would come after me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow me. For whoever would save his life will lose it; and whoever loses his life for my sake and the gospel’s will save it. For what does it profit a man, to gain the whole world and forfeit his life? For what can a man give in return for his life? For whoever is ashamed of me and of my words . . . ."

*If any one would be first, he must be last of all and servant of all.” And he took a child, and put him in the midst of them; and taking him in his arms, he said to them, “Whoever receives one such child in my name receives me; and whoever receives me, receives not me but him who sent me.”

*You know that those who are supposed to rule over the Gentiles lord it over them, and their great men exercise authority over them. But it shall not be so among you; but whoever would be great among you must be your servant, and whoever would be first among you must be slave of all. For the Son of man also came not to be served but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many.”

45 Gundry, “Excursus,” 606; see also 613–14.
46 Smith, Secret Gospel, 69–70; idem, Clement of Alexandria, 121–22; Koester, “History and Development,” 42; Crossan, Four Other Gospels, 109–10; idem, Historical Jesus, 414. Smith did not think canonical Mark was an abbreviation of longer Mark; rather, he thought that the redactor of longer Mark had access to an Aramaic source gospel used by the authors of canonical Mark and John. This redactor reintroduced stories that the author of canonical Mark had dropped from the narrative, translating them into Markan-sounding Greek.
of longer Mark by the person who tried to suppress this conjectured encounter with Salome. Why leave a remnant of the incident that invites so many questions? The same can be said for canonical Mark 14:51–52, which logically should have been removed with LGM 1 and 2.

It seems no less reasonable, then, to suppose that only the bare fact of Jesus’ arrival in Jericho is mentioned in 10:46a because the road from Jericho is where Mark wished to locate the healing of Bartimaeus: Jesus had to enter Jericho before Mark could describe him leaving it.47 Compare the way Mark mentioned the villages of Caesarea Philippi in 8:27 merely because Peter’s confession takes place on the way to that location, while nothing is said about what happened when Jesus actually reached those villages (or even that he did). As so often in Mark, these place-names are landmarks creating the impression of geographical movement within a basically episodic narrative. Unlike LGM 1, then, LGM 2 offers no unequivocal indication of whether it was originally part of its present context.

V. Compositional Considerations and Mark 14:51–52

We have found many reasons to doubt the theory of longer Markan priority. But we have not yet addressed a critical insight that the scholars who developed this theory have been attempting to accommodate, namely, the impression that canonical Mark 14:51–52 looks like “the now incomprehensible remains of something that was originally more extensive.”48 In canonical Mark the reader is given no indication of who this young man is and can only puzzle over the pointed description of him wearing a linen sheet over his naked body.

But is the young man’s naked flight a remnant of a deleted story or a deliberate enigma? Were it the former, its preservation in the canonical Gospel would require us to assume that the expurgator of LGM 1 and 2 missed an important piece of the young man’s subplot; as Schenke’s ad hoc speculation demonstrates, this is not a convincing scenario:

Presumably, [the expurgator] no longer saw the connection between the two passages—the eyes of the readers may have changed—and then he understood the content of 14:51f. as stating a simple fact of the passion narrative, a narrative that now aroused such great interest that he did not want to omit any available information.49

Moreover, in the canonical Gospel, the young man is introduced in a way that implies that he has not already appeared in the story. Mark 14:51 identifies this

49 Schenke, “Mystery,” 77.
character as “a certain young man” (νεανίσκος η’τι) instead of as “the young man” (i.e., the one so described in LGM 1:7, 8, 9, 11) or as “the young man whom Jesus loved” (LGM 2:1). As Sellew has noted, “Mark and the other Gospel writers consistently employ the normal Greek narrative practice of using either this construction with η’τι or, more commonly, an anarthrous noun or proper name, when introducing a previously unmentioned character.” Thus, if this character were a remnant of the longer Gospel, there should still be a definite article indicating that he had already appeared.50

So it is unlikely that Mark 14:51–52 is a remnant of an incomplete excision. Rather, the passage seems to have been designed to provoke questions about this figure and his unusual attire: Who is he? Why is he wrapped only in linen on a chilly spring evening (cf. 14:54, 67)? Why does he appear precisely at the very dangerous moment of Jesus’ arrest and then try to “follow with him”? And what is the significance of his shameful escape? The more spiritual Gospel offers answers to these questions, identifying him as a would-be disciple who was taught the mystery of the kingdom of God. His linen sheet is overtly symbolic of his commitment to undergo Jesus’ “baptism” of suffering and death as the way to glorification (Mark 10:35–40, now intercalated within the two parts of the young man’s narrative); like James and John, he has been taught that only those who drink that cup and are baptized with that baptism can aspire to sit at Jesus’ right or left hand (10:37, 40; cf. 16:5, where he is “sitting on the right side, dressed in a white robe” suggestive of a vindicated martyr).51 And whereas his flight from the garden symbolizes a failure to realize this aspect of discipleship on the part of Jesus’ disciples as a group (cf. 14:31 with 14:50),52 his reap-

50 Sellew, “History of Canonical Mark,” 251–53 (quotation from 251; italics original); cf. Gundry, “Excursus,” 620. Sellew himself opts to believe that νεανίσκος η’τι represents a revision of 14:51 that was made when LGM 1 and 2 were removed to form the canonical Gospel and that this was done to imply that the young man had not appeared earlier in the story. But the supposition that 14:51–52 was slightly redacted only makes more pressing the question of why the whole incident with the young man in Gethsemane was not simply removed with LGM 1 and 2. Why would the naked flight of this man be deliberately retained when LGM 1 and 2 were deliberately removed?

51 For the connection between white robes and vindicated martyrs, see Rev 6:11 and 7:13–14. That the young man at Jesus’ tomb (16:1–8) is the same young man as in LGM 1 and 2 is suggested by the fact that these two very similar resurrection narratives (note the shared elements of a tomb; a large stone; an anonymous young man; the verb “having put on” in reference to his attire; and a group of three women, one of whom is Salome) form a matched pair or bracket around the passion narrative (Brown, “More Spiritual Gospel,” ch. 6). So in longer Mark, the man Jesus returned from the grave is presumably the one who proclaims Jesus’ resurrection at Jesus’ grave.

52 That the flight of the young man is “a commentary on 14:50” and “a dramatization of the universal flight of the disciples” is argued by Harry Fleddermann in “The Flight of a Naked Young Man (Mark 14:51–52),” CBQ 41 (1979): 412–18, at 415.
pearance at the open tomb wearing a white robe symbolizes their restitution and eventual success (16:5–7). The known additions to the longer Gospel elaborate the symbolic dimension of the narrative, as Clement’s terms “mystic Gospel” and “more spiritual Gospel” would indicate. In this respect the longer text was similar to the Gospel of John, which Clement thought developed the inner significance of the outer “facts” contained in the “bodily” Synoptic Gospels.

Though proponents of longer Markan priority have not adequately explained the existence or the enigma of canonical Mark 14:51–52, they have clearly drawn attention to an important fact, which is that the young man dressed in linen is more “‘at home,’ so to speak,” in the longer Gospel. In this detail the shorter Gospel seems to anticipate the longer Gospel, much the way loose ends in a novel can hint broadly at a sequel (though in this case the sequel is a fuller retelling of the same story). But if canonical Mark 14:51–52 already anticipates the longer Gospel, should we not conclude that LGM 1 and 2 were already planned out for this other edition of the Gospel at the time when 14:51–52 was added to the passion narrative of the shorter version? That scenario is entirely plausible and accords with Alexandrian tradition that Mark expanded his Gospel with passages taken directly from his notes. Perhaps, then, the young man’s cameo in the shorter Gospel is a deliberate enigma designed to entice catechumens to inquire more deeply into the truths conveyed in this story through study of the more spiritual Gospel.

VI. Conclusions

The theory of longer Markan priority is belied by the evidence. Its presumption that longer Mark’s unique sentences were deleted to produce a public Gospel conflicts with Clement’s opinion that Mark had carefully selected what was suitable for written transmission. Its supposition that canonical Mark emerged through the elimination of a single episode neglects the indications in

53 This interpretation is developed in Brown, “More Spiritual Gospel,” part 2.
54 See n. 19.
55 Schenke, “Mystery,” 77.
56 Mark 14:51–52 is not integral to the story of Jesus’ arrest and can be removed without affecting the flow of the narrative. I am speculating that these two verses might have been included in the canonical passion narrative as an afterthought when the idea of producing a more esoteric version occurred to Mark. That Mark was the author of the longer text is the thesis of my forthcoming book, tentatively titled Mark’s Other Gospel.
57 As John S. Kloppenborg Verbin has shown, it was not uncommon for ancient writers to publish multiple editions of their own works; see Excavating Q: The History and Setting of the Sayings Gospel (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2000), 109.
the letter that the longer text had a distinctly different nature and was more apt to “initiate” its hearers into the most esoteric theological truths. And this theory’s implication that the canonical form of Mark derived from an exclusively Alexandrian text leaves us wondering why Alexandrians such as Clement came to accept an account of the canonical text’s origin that better served the interests of the church in Rome.58

It would appear, then, that if we were to accommodate the theory of longer Markan priority to the evidence, we would need to imagine an Alexandrian editor purging a treasured Gospel of the passages that made it more spiritual, removing nearly every pericope that cannot be found in Matthew or Luke. Clearly this is not what we would expect from a community known for its love of spiritual writings and anagogical exegesis. The notion that a Gospel with an affinity to John was transformed into a short account of the “bodily facts” is hardly preferable to Clement’s conception that the shorter text was supplemented with “mystical” materials “suitable to those studies which make for progress toward knowledge” (1.20–21). So when we consider the composition-critical observation that the raising and nocturnal instruction of the young man disrupts the elaborate structure of the Markan central section, the clue that this episode was not present when the flight of a certain young man was incorporated within the passion narrative, and the fact that his naked escape should not exist in canonical Mark if the subplot involving this young man had been excised from the longer Gospel, it becomes hard to doubt that longer Mark was an amplification of the canonical Gospel.

Most proposals about the relationship between the longer and shorter Gospels have overlooked Clement’s statements about the distinctive nature of the longer text and its use in advanced theological instruction. This information prevents us from supposing that either version of Mark was the product of casual editing. The people who knew both texts thought that they had been devised for different audiences, the shorter one for catechumens, the longer one for students well advanced in “the true philosophy” (3.18). Both the “orthodox” community and, apparently, the Carpocratians highly valued the longer text for its ability to conceal theological mysteries from the uninstructed and reveal them to the properly initiated. We should therefore imagine LGM 1 and 2 as part of an extensive and deliberative redaction that elaborated the mysteries of Mark’s narrative.

58 See nn. 13 and 14.
At the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature in 2000, the Pauline Epistles Section devoted a full session to a panel review of J. Louis Martyn’s Anchor Bible commentary on Galatians. In the session, Beverly R. Gaventa stated that she understood how the antithesis Jew/Greek in Gal 3:28a related to the situation in Galatia but admitted that she could not comprehend how the antitheses slave/free and male/female in Gal 3:28bc pertained to Paul’s argument. She asked Martyn what Paul meant by these last two antitheses and Martyn responded, “I don’t know.” Such an honest admission from someone who has devoted years to the study of Galatians emphasizes the difficulty of relating the antitheses slave/free and male/female to the situation in Galatia.

I. The Baptismal-Formula Explanation

In his treatment of Gal 3:28, Martyn follows the common explanation that Paul cites these antitheses by rigidly adhering to an early Christian baptismal formula. Martyn comments, “Paul names three of these elemental opposites because he is quoting the formula. In writing to the Galatians, however, he is

---


2 Similarly, Madeleine Boucher states, “It is necessary in explaining Gal 3:28 to account somehow for the addition of the last two pairs, slave/free and male/female, since the passage concerns only the Jew/Gentile question” (“Some Unexplored Parallels to 1 Cor 11,11–12 and Gal 3,28: The NT on the Role of Women,” *CBQ* 31 [1969]: 53).

3 For a list of some other scholars who espouse the baptismal-formula explanation, see Dennis Ronald MacDonald, *There Is No Male and Female: The Fate of a Dominical Saying in Paul and Gnosticism* (HDR 20; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987), 4 n. 7.
interested only in the first pair.”4 Thus, Martyn explains the occurrence of the three pairs of antitheses in Gal 3:28 because this grouping is how Paul finds them in the baptismal liturgy.5 Martyn concludes that the slave/free and the male/female pair have nothing to do with the situation in Galatia but are only vestiges of the formula Paul quotes to remind the Galatians that the Jew/Greek antithesis is abolished by Christian baptism.6

This baptismal-formula explanation of the three pairs of antitheses in Gal 3:28 is not entirely satisfactory, however, for at least three reasons.7 First, this explanation presents Gal 3:28 as the absolute abolition of the distinctions represented by these pairs of antitheses. Martyn comments, “To pronounce the nonexistence of these opposites is to announce nothing less than the end of the cosmos.”8 This interpretation may adequately describe Col 3:11 and perhaps more precisely Tri. Trac. 1.5.132, but the argument in 1 Cor 12:13 presupposes that for Paul the distinctions of these antitheses continue, for otherwise the singular body could not have many members. Even Martyn is forced to admit, “From reading Paul’s other letters, we know that the apostle was aware of the fact that even in the church, the beachhead of God’s new creation, there were as yet some marks of sexual and social differentiation.” Nevertheless, Martyn asserts, “In writing to the Galatians he [Paul] does not pause over that matter.”9 The lack of clear evidence for Martyn’s assertion leaves open the question of whether Gal 3:28 proclaims the absolute abolition of the distinctions represented by these pairs of antitheses.

Second, the precise listing of the pairs in Gal 3:28 occurs in none of the other passages that supposedly contain this formula.10 First Corinthians 12:13

---

4 Martyn, Galatians, 376.
5 Thus, scholars such as Henning Paulsen (“Einheit und Freiheit der Söhne Gottes—Gal 3.26–29,” ZNW 71 [1980]: 87–88) presuppose that the antitheses in Gal 3:28 existed independent of this verse. Gerhard Dautzenberg, however, thinks that the negative formulations as well as γάρ in 3:28b indicate that these antitheses belong to a broader context and did not exist as independent, free-floating sayings (‘’Da ist nicht männlich und weiblich’‘: Zur Interpretation von Gal 3,28,” Kairos n.s. 24 [1982]: 183).
7 Dautzenberg proposes additional arguments for rejecting the baptismal-formula explanation (“Da ist nicht männlich,” 181–206); for a summary of these arguments, see MacDonald, No Male and Female, 5 n. 8.
8 Martyn, Galatians, 376.
9 Ibid., 377.
10 For an analysis of the differences in the Pauline passages, see Bouttier, “Complexio,” 3–11; and Dieter Lührmann, “Wo man nicht mehr Sklave oder Freier ist: Überlegungen zur Struktur
lacks the male/female pair, as does the list in Col 3:11, which nevertheless adds a circumcision/uncircumcision and barbarian/Scythian pair not present in Gal 3:28. Even the Jew/Greek antithesis, which Martyn identifies as so important to Galatians, is missing from the Tripartite Tractate’s (1.5.132) formulation, which adds an angel/human antithesis to the other antitheses found elsewhere. Liturgical and kerygmatic formulas may indeed be flexible in their wording, but such flexibility is not indicative of a fixed baptismal formula that would have constrained Paul to include pairs of antitheses irrelevant to the situation in Galatia.11

Third, the baptismal-formula explanation presupposes that Gal 3:28 is not adapted to the situation in Galatia whereas the other lists are shaped by the situations and contexts in which they occur.12 In contrast to the singular formulation of the other lists, the pairs in 1 Cor 12:13 are plural to fit Paul’s emphasis on the singular body’s having various members such as Jews, Greeks, slaves, and free persons.13 In response to the Cynic critique of the Christian community at Colossae, the list in Col 3:11 includes the barbarian/Scythian pair, not found in any of the other lists.14 Emphasizing Gnostic ontological unity, Tri. Trac.
1.5.132 lists the male/female pair first and concludes with an angel/human pair, which is absent from the other lists. Even if these lists may occur in baptismal liturgies, they are clearly adapted to fit the contextual situations in which they occur. The adaptation of each of these lists increases the probability that, contrary to the baptismal-formula explanation, the list in Gal 3:28 is also adapted to fit the situation in Galatia, even though neither Gaventa nor Martyn—nor apparently anyone else—understands how.

For these reasons, therefore, the baptismal-formula explanation is not completely satisfying. Much more satisfying would be an explanation of these

ties. Ps. Crates (Ep. 14), for example, admonishes the young not even to taste (μὴ γευσθεῖ) fish and wine, and this admonition uses terms similar to the decree (μὴ γευσθεῖ) in Col 2:22. Even though the term “perishable commodities” does not occur in surviving Cynic texts, it nevertheless aptly describes a Cynic distinction between two types of consumer goods: those according to nature that procure freedom and those according to human production that enslave. Second, Downing asserts that “there is no evidence” for Cynic humility in the face of nature and the evidence for Cynic humility in the face of human authority “is ambivalent.” The evidence, however, is neither as absent nor as ambivalent as Downing asserts. When Dio Chrysostom (Exil. 10) adopts the Cynic lifestyle, he dons a humble cloak (τοπευτικός στολή). The term here does not carry its Christian connotations, however, but means poor. The Cynics’ poverty enables them to live according to nature and to repudiate human authority. The use of this word to describe the Cynics’ lifestyle differs from its description of Christian conduct as I explain (pp. 73–78, 143–48) and correlates with the description of the opponents’ ταπεινόφροσυνή in Col 2:23. Third, Downing notes that Diogenes Laertius 6.72 is the only evidence that the elements played any role in the Cynics’ views on diet and that this linkage is Stoic rather than Cynic. In my book (p. 102), I only suggest that this linkage, if it is Cynic, “may explain the Cynic contention that adequate nourishment may be obtained by eating only one type of food.” Even if this linkage is not Cynic, Cynic reasoning from the elements of the cosmos to substantiate Cynic moral maxims (pp. 98–104) still correlates with the description of the opponents in Col 2:8, 20, as the numerous Cynic texts I cite on pp. 98–104 demonstrate. Indeed, the Cynic reliance on the Chronos Myth and rejection of any later creative activity locate the explanation for the cosmos in its elements. See my “The Chronos Myth in Cynic Philosophy,” GRBS 38 (1997): 85–108. Fourth and finally, Downing notes the oddity of the absence from Colossians of the “polemical commonplaces” used by outsiders to disparage Cynics. This absence is easily explained by the rhetorical situation in Colossae and does not prohibit an identification of the opponents as Cynics. Colossians represents a Christian rather than a “commonplace” response to Cynicism. Thus, I conclude that the antithetical pairs in Col 3:11 should be read in the context of a Cynic critique, as I have done (By Philosophy and Empty Deceit, 195–204).

Other explanations proposed by exegetes are also inadequate. F. F. Bruce (The Epistle to the Galatians: A Commentary on the Greek Text [NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982], 187), among others, suggests that the choice of antitheses in Gal 3:28 is determined by the traditional morning prayer of a pious Jew. Bruce was not the first to make this suggestion; see also Thyen, “Nicht mehr männlich,” 139; Dautzenberg, “Da ist nicht männlich,” 186–87; and MacDonald, No Male and Female, 123–24. Paulsen (“Einheit,” 85) and Simon Légasse (L’Épître de Paul aux Galates [LD 9; Paris: Cerf, 2000], 283–84) correctly critique this suggestion. Indeed, the prayer itself probably arises from a Greek “rhetorical commonplace . . . variously attributed to Thales or Plato” that gave thanks for being born a human being rather than a beast, a man rather than a woman, and a Greek rather than a barbarian. For the primary and secondary sources of this com-
three pairs of antitheses in Gal 3:28 that recognizes the continuing distinctions represented by these pairs in Paul’s genuine letters, that releases Paul from rigid adherence to a fixed baptismal formula, and that relates the formulation of these pairs to the situation in Galatia. An adequate understanding of the covenant of circumcision in the Galatian controversy facilitates such an explanation.16

II. The Situational Explanation

In Martyn’s reconstruction of the Galatian controversy, circumcision plays a central role. He assumes that the Galatians are eager to become circumcised after deserting Paul for the circumcision gospel. Martyn’s reconstruction, however, fails to explain why none of the Galatians has submitted to circumcision at the time of Paul’s writing the letter.17 The operation requires only a few minutes to complete. His reconstruction also fails to explain why Paul accuses the Galatians of returning to their pagan time-keeping scheme (Gal 4:10). The immediate context of Gal 4:10 argues for the pagan character of this list. In 4:8, Paul mentions the former pagan life of the Galatian Christians. In 4:9, he asks them how they can desire their former life again. He then proposes their observance of the time-keeping scheme in 4:10 as a demonstrative proof of their reversion to their old life.18

16 Brinsmead locates the three antitheses in Gal 3:28 in the opponents’ teaching about circumcision (Galatians, 159–60). However, he does not relate these antitheses to the stipulations of the covenant of circumcision but rather speculates that the opponents were proposing circumcision as a sacrament that removes the distinctions represented by each of these antitheses. MacDonald appropriately criticizes Brinsmead’s speculation (No Male and Female, 13–14).

17 Paul’s failure to address a means of reintegrating the Galatians who have already submitted to circumcision strongly argues that none of the Galatians has become circumcised.

18 For additional arguments for the pagan nature of this time-keeping scheme, see Troy W. Martin, “Pagan and Judeo-Christian Time-keeping Schemes in Gal 4:10 and Col 2:16,” NTS 42 (1996): 105–19; idem, By Philosophy and Empty Deceit, 124–34.
Martyn’s reconstruction interprets this scheme as a Jewish time-keeping scheme, but the lack of an explanation in Galatians for the incompatibility of this Jewish scheme with Paul’s own Jewish time-keeping scheme renders Martyn’s interpretation improbable.19 His interpretation presumes that the Galatians could astutely discern the subtle distinctions among various Jewish time-keeping schemes while being completely ignorant of the issues associated with circumcision. Martyn’s reconstruction of the Galatian controversy appropriately emphasizes the importance of circumcision but leaves several crucial problems unresolved.

My own reconstruction of the Galatian controversy also emphasizes the importance of circumcision but avoids the problems of Martyn’s reconstruction.20 The Galatians indeed desert Paul for the circumcision gospel and accept this gospel as the valid Christian gospel. Because of their aversion to circumcision, however, they apostatize from Christianity and return to their former paganism. My reconstruction explains why none of the Galatians has submitted to circumcision and why they could recognize without elaboration that their pagan time-keeping scheme mentioned in Gal 4:10 is incompatible with Paul’s Jewish time-keeping scheme.

Martyn’s critique of my reconstruction underscores its avoidance of problems. He comments, “Recently, T. Martin (“Stasis”) has advanced a rhetorical thesis that is so fanciful as to have the effect of suggesting a moratorium of some length in this branch of research.”21 Although Martyn dismisses my reconstruction as fanciful, he offers no substantive argument against my reconstruction. His failure to offer an adequate counter to the arguments I advance for my reconstruction emphasizes that my reconstruction avoids any substantive problems. At least, Martyn identifies none.

Both Martyn’s reconstruction and my own emphasize the importance of circumcision in the Galatian controversy, and the stipulations of the covenant of circumcision in Gen 17:9–14 explain the formulation of the three pairs of

19 Martyn argues that Paul objects to the Teachers’ solar calendar based on Gen 1:14 (Galatians, 414–18). Martyn does not describe the calendar Paul gave to the Galatians but assumes that Paul and his communities operated without a calendar. The evidence from Paul’s letters and Acts contradicts Martyn’s assumption. See my By Philosophy and Empty Deceit, 125–29. Paul and his communities operated with a Jewish time-keeping scheme, and Paul would need to explain the incompatibility of the Jewish solar calendar with his own if indeed Gal 4:10 were to describe such a solar calendar. The lack of such an explanation in Galatians is evidence that Gal 4:10 describes a pagan rather than a Jewish time-keeping system.


21 Martyn, Galatians, 21 n. 26.
antitheses in Gal 3:28 as well as their relevance to the situation in Galatia.22 The passage reads:

9And God said to Abraham, “As for you, you shall keep my covenant, you and your descendants after you throughout their generations. 10This is my covenant, which you shall keep, between me and you and your descendants after you: Every male among you shall be circumcised. 11You shall be circumcised in the flesh of your foreskins, and it shall be a sign of the covenant between me and you. 12He that is eight days old among you shall be circumcised; every male throughout your generations, whether born in your house, or bought with your money from any foreigner who is not of your offspring, 13both he that is born in your house and he that is bought with your money, shall be circumcised. So shall my covenant be in your flesh an everlasting covenant. 14Any uncircumcised male who is not circumcised in the flesh of his foreskin shall be cut off from his people; he has broken my covenant.”

(Gen 17:9–14 RSV)

The establishment of the covenant of circumcision provides the rationale for the selection and formulation of the pairs of antitheses in Gal 3:28.23 This covenant distinguishes between Jews and others such as Greeks, who do not submit to circumcision.24 Jews who belong to the family of Abraham must be circumcised. This surgery designates those who are Jews and those who are not. Even someone born into the family of Abraham but uncircumcised is “cut off from his people.” He is not a Jew. Yet someone not born into the family of Abraham but bought as a slave enters the covenant through circumcision. The covenant of circumcision trumps even biological descent from Abraham as a determination of who is and who is not a Jew. Thus, this covenant supplies the basis for the distinction between Jew and Greek in the antithetical pair in Gal 3:28a.

This covenant also distinguishes between slave and free. Slaves in a Jewish household must be circumcised even if they are not born into the household but bought from foreigners. The covenant recognizes no exceptions but stipulates, “Both he [the slave] that is born in your house and he that is bought with your money, shall be circumcised.” The free person, however, who dwells in a

22 L. Ann Jervis comments, “The inclusion of the phrase ‘male nor female’ in Galatians may be because of the issue of circumcision” (Galatians [NIBCNT; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1999], 107). She does not explain what she means but quotes Justin Martyr’s Dial. 23 (ANF 1:206), which relates circumcision to Gal 3:28 differently than the present article does.

23 Lührmann explains the selection of the pairs of antitheses in Gal 3:28 on the basis of conditions in the Galatian communities that can no longer be known (“Nicht mehr Sklave,” 58). Basing the selection on the covenant of circumcision provides an observable common denominator for the selection that Lührmann overlooks.

24 For other passages where Paul uses Greek for Gentile, see Rom 1:16; 2:9-10; 3:9; 10:12; 1 Cor 1:24; 10:32; 12:13. See also Col 3:11.
Jewish community is not required to be circumcised but is treated as a sojourner or resident alien (πρόωκος). Jewish legal texts frequently refer to such uncircumcised persons in the community (Lev 16:29; 17:10; 19:10; 24:16; Deut 14:21; 24:14). The day laborer may work in the household business alongside the slaves but is not required as a free person to submit to circumcision unless he desires to participate in the Passover meal (Exod 12:45, 48; Num 9:14). Hence, the covenant of circumcision distinguishes between slave and free and provides a basis for the antithetical pair slave/free in Gal 3:28b.

Finally, this covenant distinguishes between male and female, for circumcision is required only of males. The covenant stipulates, “Every male (ἦλθεν) throughout your generations . . . shall be circumcised” and “Any uncircumcised male (ἦλθεν) who is not circumcised in the flesh of his foreskin shall be cut off from his people; he has broken my covenant.” This stipulation pertains to the prepubescent as well as adult males and explains the use in Gal 3:28c of ἄρσεν/θῆλη, which includes children and adults, rather than the pair ἰδιῷ/γυνῆ, which connotes adults. In contrast, the obligation of circumcision does not pertain to females, and Jewish communities never practice female circumcision. The avoidance of circumcision among females contributes to their inferior status in a circumcision community. The covenant of circumcision clearly distinguishes between male and female and establishes a basis for the antithetical pair male/female in Gal 3:28c.

Connecting the male/female pair to the covenant of circumcision is preferable to connecting it to the creation story. Almost all exegetes assume the connection of Gal 3:28c with Gen 1:27 because of the verbal similarity.27 This

25 For a similar use, see Rom 1:26–27. Krister Stendahl comments on Gal 3:28, “This statement is directed against what we call the order of creation, and consequently it creates a tension with those biblical passages–Pauline and non-Pauline–by which this order of creation maintains its place in the fundamental view of the New Testament concerning the subordination of women” (The Bible and the Role of Women: A Case Study in Hermeneutics [FBBS 15; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1966], 32). Stendahl’s comment assumes that the male/female antithesis in Gal 3:28 is taken from Gen 1:27 and abolishes the order of creation. The present essay proposes instead that this antithesis is taken from the covenant of circumcision, stipulated in Gen 17:9–14, and that Gal 3:28 abolishes not the order of creation but the communal distinctions established by this covenant. Hence, Gal 3:28 is not in tension with other Pauline statements based on the order of creation.


27 Thus, Gen 1:27 passes Hays’s second test for an echo; however, a string of only three words is hardly enough to establish a high-volume echo. Furthermore, Gen 1:27 fails Hays’s fourth test,
verbal similarity alone, however, is insufficient to establish a link between Gen 1:27 and Gal 3:28c. Gerhard Dautzenberg correctly notes that the formulation is widespread and comprehensible apart from Gen 1:27. Wayne A. Meeks accurately asserts, “The allusion to Genesis 1:27 in the third pair of Galatians 3:28 has no connection with the immediate context nor with any of Paul’s themes in Galatians.” Hartwig Thyen attempts to refute this assertion by citing Gal 6:15 as proof that Gal 3:28 refers to a new creation that abolishes the antitheses of the old creation. The problem with Thyen’s argument is that Gal 6:15 refers not to the original creation, where circumcision and uncircumcision are absent, but to the covenant of circumcision. Paul’s communities are indeed a new creation compared to the old communities shaped by the covenant of circumcision, but Paul’s concern in Galatians is not overturning the original order of creation but contextualizing the covenant of circumcision. In his argument, Gal 3:28c announces not the abolition of the male/female antithesis but its irrelevance for determining candidates for Christian baptism and membership in the Christian community.

The establishment of the covenant of circumcision in Gen 17:9–14, therefore, relates the three pairs of antitheses in Gal 3:28 to the controversy over circumcision in Galatia. Almost all scholars relate the first antithesis Jew/Greek to the issue of circumcision and a few include the third antithesis male/female as well. Stephen B. Clark comments:

In this context, the phrase “neither male nor female” takes on a special significance, because women could not be circumcised. Circumcision was a sign of the covenant of Israel and was only open to the male. According to Paul, Christians obtain the status of mature sonship through their baptism and initiation into Christ. . . . The woman, then, comes into the covenant relation of God’s people through her own faith and baptism, and is fully part of the covenant relationship with God.

since it does not fit the line of argument Paul is developing. Genesis 1:27 as a precursor text to Gal 3:28c does not illuminate Paul’s argument. For these tests, see Richard B. Hays, Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 29–32.

28 Dautzenberg comments, “Es bleibt aber zu fragen, ob es sich nur um eine durch Gen 1,27 veranlasste stilistische Variation oder um eine auch sachlich bedeutsame und bedachte abweichung vom durch die ersten beiden Glieder vorgegebenen Schema der negativen Korrelation handelt . . . . Die Form arsen ist über den Gebrauch in LXX und Neuem Testament hinaus weit verbreitet, so daß auch mit einer hellenistischen, von Gen 1,27 relativ unabhängigen Verständnismöglichkeit gerechnet werden kann” (“Da ist nicht männlich,” 182).


31 Clark, Man and Woman, 141; see also Witherington, “Rite,” 599; Allworthy, Women, 40–41; and Colin Brown, “ἄρσης,” NIDNTT 2:570.
Scholars such as Clark, however, overlook the relationship of the second antithesis—slave/free—to the issue of circumcision and do not perceive how the covenant of circumcision in Gen 17:9–14 provides the rationale for the selection and integration of each of the three antitheses in Gal 3:28.\footnote{Jacob Jervell asserts, “Das Verhältnis δοῦλος–ελεύθερος spielt nicht dieselbe Rolle wie Jude–Grieche” (Imago Dei: Gen 1,26f. im Spätjudentum, in der Gnosis und in den paulinischen Briefen [FRLANT n.s. 58; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960], 298). He explains that the law subordinates Greeks to Jews and wives to husbands but not slaves to free. Similarly, Paulsen argues that the emphasis falls on the Jew/Greek antithesis rather than the other two antitheses (“Einheit,” 90). Jervell’s and Paulsen’s inability to relate each of these antitheses equally illustrates the failure of scholars to relate all of these antitheses to the stipulations of the covenant and circumcision. Robin Scroggs criticizes attempts to justify the slave/free antithesis in Gal 3:28 by appealing to the slave/free analogy in ch. 4 (“Paul and the Eschatological Women,” JAAR 40 [1972]: 291). He argues, “The usefulness of this analogy depends upon the reality of the distinction, not its abolition.” Scroggs thinks that Gal 3:28 is a rhetorical comment taken from the baptismal liturgy and that only the Jew/Greek antithesis has any relevance for Paul’s argument in Galatians (p. 288). For a critique of Scroggs, see Elaine H. Pagels, “Paul and Women: A Response to Recent Discussion,” JAAR 42 (1974): 538–44.}

Martyn’s reconstruction of the Galatian controversy assumes that the Galatians are so eager to become circumcised that they ask few, if any, questions. My reconstruction proposes that the Galatians are so reticent to become circumcised that they prefer to return to their paganism instead. Such reticence suggests that the Galatians probably inquired about this new obligation and at least ask about the extent of this obligation. Based on the covenant established in Gen 17:9–14, the Agitators respond that the obligation pertains not to females but only to males and not even to those males who are free laborers in the Galatians’ household businesses but only to the slaves who are under the Galatians’ control.\footnote{I still prefer the term Agitators, popularized by Robert Jewett (“The Agitators and the Galatian Congregation,” NTS 17 [1971]: 198–212), even though I recognize that it is not a neutral term. Martyn proposes Teachers as more neutral, but this designation of the opponents is no more neutral than the term Agitators since it arises from and supports Martyn’s historical reconstruction of the situation in Galatia. See J. Louis Martyn, “A Law-Observant Mission to the Gentiles: The Background of Galatians,” SJT 38 (1985): 312–14. A similar critique also pertains to Mark Nanos’s designation of the opponents as Influencers; see Mark D. Nanos, The Irony of Galatians: Paul’s Letter in First-Century Context (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002), 14–16, 193–99. Paul twice uses the verb ταράσσω (Gal 1:7; 5:10) to describe those he opposes. This verb means to stir up, disturb, trouble, and disquiet. This term is also consonant with other descriptions in 3:1; 4:17; 5:7; and 6:12. Thus, the term Agitator is congruent with Paul’s description of the activities of his opponents and is preferable to other terms arising from historical reconstructions external to the text of Galatians itself.} In short, all those males who desire to be Jews and not Greeks must become circumcised.

In contrast to the distinctions that determine the extent of the obligations of circumcision, Gal 3:28 states that none of these distinctions is relevant for
determining candidates for Christian baptism. The covenant of circumcision distinguishes between Jew and Greek, slave and free, male and female. In these antithetical pairs, those described by the first member of the pair have an obligation to be circumcised in a Jewish community while those described by the second member do not. Although not obligated, the Greek and the free person may choose to become circumcised, but the female may not. This feature of the circumcision legislation probably explains the variation in the syntax of Gal 3:28 from οὐκ...οὐδὲ in the first two pairs to οὐκ...καὶ in the third. In Christian baptism, however, none of these distinctions is relevant. Christian baptism recognizes neither Jew nor Greek, slave nor free, and it does not distinguish between male and female. All are baptized into Christ and have put on Christ (3:27). All become one in Christ Jesus (3:28). Christian baptism ignores the distinctions required by the covenant of circumcision and provides a basis for unity in the Christian community.

This unity, however, is not uniformity. In Christian baptism, Jews are baptized as Jews, Greeks as Greeks, slaves as slaves, free persons as free persons, males as males, and females as females. Baptism does not abolish such distinctions but treats them as irrelevant for entrance into the community of faith. Once in this community, of course, the baptized person must still contend with her or his cultural, economic, and gendered status as well as with the differing status of others. Nevertheless, all have full standing in the community.

34 This rationale explains the ordering of the pairs of antitheses better than the chiastic explanation proposed by Dautzenberg (“Da ist nicht männlich,” 183) and Lührmann (“Nicht mehr Sklave,” 57).
35 Eduard Schweizer observes, “There is a problem thinly veiled by this list. A person is born male or female and neither can nor should change this” (The Letter to the Colossians [Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1982], 200). Boutier explains the substitution of καὶ for οὐδὲ as an influence of Gen 1:27 LXX (“Complexio,” 7). For a refutation of the connection of Gal 3:28 with Gen 1:27, see the discussion above.
36 Clark, Man and Woman, 149.
37 Gerhard Delling states, “In Christus sind sie alle eins, aber nicht gleich” (Paulus’ Stellung zu Frau und Ehe [BWA(N)T 108; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1931], 120). See Clark, Man and Woman, 149–55; Thyen, “Nicht mehr männlich,” 155; and especially Dautzenberg, who explains, “1 Kor 12,13 spricht dagegen nicht von der Aufhebung oder Außerkraftsetzung dieser Unterschiede, sondern feiert die Erfahrung, daß jene, die sonst nicht zusammenkommen können, in einem ‘Leib’ verbunden sind, ohne zu sagen, daß die zwischen ihnen bestehenden Differenzen außer Kraft gesetzt sind. Die Juden, Griechen, Sklaven und Freien von 1 Kor 12,13 sind weiterhin das, was sie als solche waren” (“Da ist nicht männlich,” 184).
38 Dautzenberg states, “Die Erweiterung des Gegensatzpaares Juden/Griechen um das Paar Sklaven/Freie ist wohl nur von daher zu verstehen, daß diese Differenz für die Aufnahme in die Gemeinde und für die Teilnahme an ihrem Leben ohne jede Bedeutung war” (“Da ist nicht männlich,” 184).
nity in that all are baptized. The diversity produced by these distinctions creates many members in the one body according to 1 Cor 12:12–14. When Gal 3:28 proclaims that in Christ there is neither Jew nor Greek, slave nor free, and that in Christ there is no male and female, the proclamation only pertains to the absence of these distinctions as requirements for baptism in contrast to the requirements in the covenant of circumcision. This verse does not proclaim the absolute abolition of these distinctions but only their irrelevance for participation in Christian baptism and full membership in the Christian community. According to 1 Cor 12:12–14, these distinctions must remain intact to reflect the true nature of the body as composed of many members.

Nevertheless, later interpreters of the tradition push this verse in the direction of a complete dissolution of these distinctions. After introducing the concept of the new humanity established by Jesus Christ, the author of Col 3:11 writes, “Where there is no Greek and Jew, circumcision and uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, slave, and free but Christ is all and in all.” Eduard Lohse comments, “Where the Body of Christ exists and where his members are joined together into a fellowship, there the differences which separate men from one another are abolished.” As interpreted by Lohse, this text transcends the uniform application of baptism to all the members of the Christian community as in Gal 3:28 and implies that these distinctions are completely abolished in the new community.

The station code in Col 3:18–4:1, however, recognizes that at least some of these distinctions continue to exist in the new community. This station code, which affirms the continuance of the social distinctions, is certainly dissonant with an interpretation of Col 3:11 that proclaims their abolishment. Markus

coram Deo, von der Wirklichkeit der Gleichheit aller in Christus, ohne die soziale Wirklichkeit inner- und außerhalb der Gemeinde in Fragen zu stellen” (“Da ist nicht männlich,” 188).
40 Dautzenberg states that either “among you” or “in Christ” must be supplied to complete the thought of Gal 3:28 (“Da ist nicht männlich,” 182).
41 Eduard Lohse, Colossians and Philemon (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971), 144–45.
42 Tripartite Tractate 1.5.132 emphasizes more explicitly than Colossians the complete eschatological dissolution of the distinctions articulated in Gal 3:28. The relevant portion of the text reads: “For when we confessed the kingdom which is in Christ, <we> escaped from the whole multiplicity of forms and from inequality and change. For the end will receive a unitary existence just as the beginning is unitary, where there is no male nor female, nor slave and free, nor circumcision and uncircumcision, neither angel nor man, but Christ is all in all.” In this text, the restoration of the Pleroma demands the dissolution of these antithetical pairs. See H. W. Attridge and D. Mueller, trans., “The Tripartite Tractate (I, 5)” in NHL, 101. This Gnostic view is often read into Gal 3:28, but Dunn notes, “As so often with the hypothesis of Gnostic influence on Paul, the influence most obviously ran the other way, with a passage like Gal. iii 28 providing one of the points round which the Gnostics wove the detail of their systems” (Galatians, 206–7).
43 Concerning the station code, Meeks comments, “The baptismal reunification formula’s ‘
Barth and Helmut Blanke resolve this dissonance by explaining that the resolution of the contradictions “must still await until the end of time.” Their eschatological explanation interprets Col 3:11 as articulating the essential uniformity of the body of Christ even though the realization of this uniformity awaits the eschaton. Eschatology is the most common way of resolving the apparent dissonance between the station codes and the ideas expressed in Col 3:11 and Gal 3:28.

Nevertheless, several exegetes reject this eschatological interpretation and prefer to interpret Gal 3:28 as describing actual social conditions in the community. Dautzenberg comments, “Dagegen sprechen sowohl Gal 3,28 wie 1 Kor 12,13 von einer Aufhebung oder Versöhnung der Gegensätze in der Gegenwart.” He then lists four areas in which the Pauline community already experiences the dissolution of the antithesis male/female and concludes that the station codes simply contradict Gal 3:28 and reestablish the antithesis. Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza also argues that Gal 3:28 reflects existing conditions in Pauline communities but thinks that the “love patriarchalism” of the Deutero-Pauline station codes develops from Paul’s own modification of Gal 3:28. 

44 Markus Barth and Helmut Blanke, *Colossians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 34B; New York: Doubleday, 1994), 415. Dautzenberg criticizes the translation of oujk in Gal 3:28 as “no longer” or “no more” (“Da ist nicht männlich,” 182). He states that such translations are not grammatically grounded but arise from the interpretation that Gal 3:28 proclaims a new creation as a replacement for the old. Dautzenberg’s criticism pertains also to Barth and Blanke’s (p. 414) translation of Col 3:11.


46 Paulsen (“Einheit,” 94–95) and Averil Cameron (“Neither Male nor Female,” *GR* n.s. 27 [1980]: 64) agree that Gal 3:28 should be interpreted as a present reality in the community and an attempt to resolve the dissonance between Gal 3:28 and the station codes by restricting Gal 3:28 to a theological or spiritual affirmation rather than a sociological description. Their solution does not adequately comprehend the integration of the theological and sociological dimensions of Paul’s thought. Likewise, Delling’s (*Paulus’ Stellung*, 120–21) and Boucher’s (*Unexplored Parallels*, 55–57) restriction of Gal 3:28 to a person’s relationship with God recognizes neither the intimate connection between a person’s relationship with God and others nor the inherent social dimension of the Galatian controversy. James E. Crouch (*The Origin and Intention of the Colossian Haustafel* [FRLANT 109; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972], 144) and Robert Jewett (*The Sexual Liberation of the Apostle Paul,* *JAARSup* 47, no. 1 [1979]: 55–87) also interpret Gal 3:28 as a present reality and recognize the tension between this verse and the station codes. They resolve this tension by proposing that the station codes respond to excesses that arose in Christian communities by an overly enthusiastic application of Gal 3:28. For a summary and critique of their position, see Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her: A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins* (New York: Crossroad, 1983), 205–7.

3:28 in the interests of communal order and propriety (cf. 1 Cor 7 and 11–14). Likewise, Lührmann reasons that Gal 3:28 is a supporting argument and must therefore reflect actual conditions in the community. In contrast to Dautzenberg and Fiorenza, however, Lührmann does not think these conditions were very different from the conditions described in the station codes since both Paul and later Paulinists resorted to existing social structures to organize their Christian communities.

The present essay also rejects the eschatological resolution and agrees with those scholars who understand Gal 3:28 as a description of existing social realities in the churches of Galatia but explains this reality differently. Galatians 3:28 articulates a common entrance requirement that ignores cultural, social, and sexual differences and provides for the full membership of all the baptized. It does not, however, explain how this full membership is understood. Other Pauline passages articulate full membership neither as social homogeneity (1 Cor 7:17–24; 12:12–27) nor as uniformity of social roles and obligations (Rom 12:3–8; 1 Cor 7:1–16, 25–40; 11:2–16; 12:1–11, 28–31). Even though they may not reflect Paul’s own practice, later station codes are not necessarily in tension with Gal 3:28, since everyone addressed in these codes is considered a full member of the community. Contemporary interpreters of Christianity may disagree with these codes, along with their understanding of full membership, and are free to offer other possibilities, but these reformulations exceed the situational context of Gal 3:28.

Later interpreters who use Gal 3:28 to develop idealistic notions of the body of Christ as a reality that completely erases all distinctions and inequalities take Gal 3:28 far beyond its situational context. In response to the Agitators’ insistence on the distinctions in the covenant of circumcision, Paul simply denies that these distinctions have any relevance for determining candidates for Christian baptism and entry into the Christian community. Whereas not everyone in the Jewish community is circumcised, everyone in the Christian community is baptized. Thus, baptism into Christ provides for a unity that cannot be realized in a circumcised community. Nevertheless, Paul still recognizes the distinctions between Jew/Greek, slave/free, and male/female as realities within the body of Christ, which is composed of many members. Later interpreters who transform Paul’s situational antitheses in Gal 3:28 into an absolute ideal unnecessarily place this verse in tension with some other Pauline statements. Galatians 3:28 represents not an absolute ideal but a specific pastoral response to the particular situation in the churches of Galatia. As such, Gal 3:28 is not in tension with other Pauline texts that recognize differing social obligations and responsibilities.

---

48 Schüssler Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her*, 208–33.
III. Conclusion

The situational explanation offered in the present essay avoids the problems of the baptismal-formula explanation and provides a more adequate understanding of the role Gal 3:28 plays in the Galatian controversy. Relating the three pairs of antitheses in Gal 3:28 to the stipulations in the covenant of circumcision, this situational explanation recognizes the continuing distinctions represented by these pairs in Paul’s genuine letters, releases Paul from rigid adherence to a fixed baptismal formula, and relates the formulation of these pairs to the situation in Galatia.

These three pairs of antitheses occur in Gal 3:28 not because of a fixed baptismal formula but because these are the antitheses established by the covenant of circumcision in determining who must be circumcised. According to Gal 3:28, the distinctions represented by these antitheses are irrelevant in Christian baptism, which is open to all those who believe in Christ Jesus without distinction. Whether Jew or Greek, whether slave or free, whether male or female, all members of the Christian community live baptized as full members of the community. This situational explanation provides an adequate response to Gaventa’s question at the SBL annual meeting in 2000 about how the antitheses slave/free and male/female relate to the situation in Galatia.

50 For example, Meeks (“Androgyne,” 182) describes Gal 3:28 as a “utopian declaration of mankind’s reunification as a solemn ritual pronouncement.”
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The work of the Russian literary theorist Mikhail Bakhtin exhibits a far-reaching influence in a number of areas. Bakhtin has been called the father of intertextuality. His thought was introduced to the West and employed by Julia Kristeva, who coined the term “intertextuality.” This was further developed in theories by French (post) structuralists like Roland Barthes and Jacques Derrida, and American postmodernists such as Stanley Fish and Harold Bloom. In addition, feminist theory (and other postmodern methods) has embraced especially Bakhtin’s concept of dialogue. Dale Bauer and Susan McKinstry note that “dialogism, Bakhtin’s theory about encountering otherness through the potential of dialogue,” is valued by feminism because it creates an opportunity for “recognizing competing voices without making any single voice normative.”

In recent years, biblical scholarship has shown a growing interest in


Bakhtin’s work.3 Barbara Green gives a helpful survey of how Bakhtin has been utilized by biblical scholars in the past, as well as what Bakhtin has to offer to the discipline of biblical scholarship in the future. She identifies a number of areas where Bakhtin’s thought might be especially valuable, for instance, questions concerning history and genre.4 In this article, I will focus on the area that Green calls questions concerning the construction of meaning.5 In this regard, I seek to continue the conversation initiated by Carol Newsom and Dennis Olson, both of whom have made some suggestions of how Bakhtin’s dialogical model could be of value for conceiving a biblical theology.6 In light of Bakhtin’s own work, I will expand and appropriate their proposals to provide a model for biblical theology.

Before I come to this model, I will first highlight a number of key points concerning Bakhtin’s theory of dialogue. One should immediately add that these points are hardly exhaustive of Bakhtin’s rich legacy, but are directed toward the goals of this article.

I. Bakhtin in a Nutshell

Mikhail Bakhtin bases his theory of the dialogical nature of language, literature, and truth on his reading of the writings of Fyodor Dostoevsky.7 In his earlier work, Problems of Dostoevsky’s Poetics, Bakhtin argues that “a plurality of independent and unmerged voices and consciousnesses, a genuine polyphony of fully valid voices is in fact the chief characteristic of Dostoevsky’s novels.”8 In Bakhtin’s later work, the collection of essays in Speech Genres and Other Late Essays and his essay, “Discourse in the Novel,” Bakhtin develops these ideas into a more comprehensive theory of literature.9 Bakhtin further

3 The list of scholars employing Bakhtin in biblical studies is long and growing. For a comprehensive list, see Barbara Green, Mikhail Bakhtin and Biblical Scholarship: An Introduction (SemeiaSt 38; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000), 193–205.
4 Ibid., 60–65.
5 Ibid., 62.
9 Mikhail M. Bakhtin, Speech Genres and Other Late Essays (ed. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist; trans. Vern W. McGee; Austin: University of Texas Press, 1986); “Discourse in
maintains that his notion of dialogue is not only limited to literature but also provides a model for truth and life itself. He says: “Life by its very nature is dialogic. To live means to participate in dialogue: to ask questions, to heed, to respond, to agree, and so forth.”10

Within this theory of dialogue, Bakhtin declares, first, that the word or utterance is integrally dialogical in nature.11 This means that no word or text can be heard or read in isolation. Each word or utterance responds in one form or another to utterances that precede it. In this regard, Bakhtin notes that since “the speaker is not Adam,” his or her utterances are inevitably in relation to preceding words or texts. Moreover, the word or utterance is related also to subsequent responses. Bakhtin argues that the speaker is constructing an utterance in anticipation of possible responses, something he calls the “act of responsive understanding.”13 Thus, no word or utterance or text is ever spoken in isolation. It always calls to mind other words, utterances, or texts pertaining to the same theme.

The dialogical character of the word or utterance has a profound effect on the discourses involved in the interaction. Bakhtin describes this as follows:

The word, directed toward its object, enters a dialogically agitated and tension-filled environment of alien words, value judgments and accents, weaves in and out of complex interrelationships, merges with some, recoils


11 Related to Bakhtin’s concept of the dialogical nature of texts are his concepts of heteroglossia and polyphony. Emerson notes that “polyphony” is the term that Bakhtin applied initially to Dostoevsky’s novels and that it was only later that he created the related terms “dialogism” and “heteroglossia” to apply to novels in general. For definitions of these terms, see Caryl Emerson, The First Hundred Years of Mikhail Bakhtin (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997), 129; Green, Mikhail Bakhtin, 53–54; Mary S. Pollock, “What Is Left Out: Bakhtin, Feminism, and the Culture of Boundaries,” in Bakhtin: Carnival and Other Subjects (ed. David Shepherd; Critical Studies 3–4; Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1993), 235; Susan Vice, Introducing Bakhtin (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997), 6, 18.

12 Bakhtin, Speech Genres, 71–72, 94. Bakhtin employs the terms “word,” “discourse,” and “utterance” interchangeably. For Bakhtin, the utterance is the real unit in speech communication. The utterance, which might be represented by a word, discourse, or text, is marked by a change of speaking subjects. Each utterance has a sense of completion as it expresses the particular position of the speaker, to which one is invited to respond. Morson and Emerson note that an utterance may be “as short as a grunt and as long as War and Peace” (Morson and Emerson, Mikhail Bakhtin, 125–26; Green, Mikhail Bakhtin, 52–53). For the purpose of our study, an utterance might be conceived of as a particular text or discourse that forms a distinctive unit and puts forward a particular voice.

13 Bakhtin, Speech Genres, 94.
from others, intersects with yet a third group: and all this may crucially shape discourse, may leave a trace in all its semantic layers, may complicate its expression and influence its entire stylistic profile.\textsuperscript{14}

Bakhtin maintains that the words or utterances involved in the dialogical relation are not left untouched by the interaction. He argues that the text comes alive only by coming into contact with another text (with context). At this point of contact between texts, it is as if a light flashes that illuminates both the posterior and the anterior. Thus, Bakhtin is of the opinion that the real meaning of the text, “its true essence,” develops on the boundary of two texts or “consciousnesses,” as Bakhtin calls it.\textsuperscript{15} “The word lives, as it were, on the boundary between its own context and another, alien, context.”\textsuperscript{16} One could thus argue that meaning is to be found not in one text alone, but in the midst of the dialogue of interacting voices. The meaning created by this dialogical interaction is entirely new. As Bakhtin notes, “it always creates something that never existed before, something absolutely new and unrepeatable.”\textsuperscript{17} At the same time, “what is given is completely transformed in what is created.”\textsuperscript{18} The effect of hearing these texts together or simultaneously is that the meaning of both texts is altered.

Second, an important question to ask is who the designer of this dialogue is. Bakhtin’s argument concerning Dostoevsky’s work is that the author is the artist who creates within a polyphonic novel the space where various voices or consciousnesses can interact. In Bakhtin’s opinion, Dostoevsky was a master in this regard, and his novels are polyphonic in the true sense of the word. Hence, Green concludes that Bakhtin theorized more about the author than about the reader. However, Bakhtin does concede that “authoring” occurs on various levels.\textsuperscript{19} Bakhtin argues that besides the author who created the text, “listeners or readers who recreate and in so doing renew the text—participate equally in the creation of the represented world in the text.” Thus, the reader becomes an active participant in the authoring process.\textsuperscript{20}

Bakhtin also notes that all words, utterances, and discourse have a dialogical quality. In light of this, the emphasis then shifts to the reader, who notices these dialogical overtones associated with the utterance and who constructs, so

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{14 Bakhtin, “Discourse in the Novel,” 276.}
\footnote{15 Bakhtin, \textit{Speech Genres}, 106, 162.}
\footnote{16 Bakhtin, “Discourse in the Novel,” 284; see also idem, \textit{Problems of Dostoevsky’s Poetics}, 88.}
\footnote{17 Bakhtin, \textit{Speech Genres}, 119–20, 124.}
\footnote{18 Ibid., 120; Morson and Emerson, \textit{Mikhail Bakhtin}, 152.}
\footnote{19 Green, \textit{Mikhail Bakhtin}, 33, 62; Morson and Emerson, \textit{Mikhail Bakhtin}, 232.}
\footnote{20 Mikhail M. Bakhtin, “Forms of Time and Chronotope in the Novel,” in \textit{Dialogic Imagination}, ed. Emerson and Holquist, 253; Green, \textit{Mikhail Bakhtin}, 63.}
\end{footnotes}
to speak, this imaginary dialogue. Bakhtin argues that it is from the viewpoint of the third person, one who does not participate in the dialogue but observes it, that the utterance is dialogic. This observer, however, or in the case of texts, the reader, is not completely dissociated from the ensuing dialogue. Bakhtin notes that this observer becomes a participant in the dialogue, although in a special way. Although the reader calls to mind related utterances while reading, and thus observes these texts interacting, the reader is also drawn into the dialogue and responds to the utterance in a variety of ways, such as, “response, agreement, sympathy, objection,” and “execution.” The product of this interactive dialogue is the creation of a whole new meaning.

Third, Bakhtin describes this potential for creating new meaning in terms of the notion of “great time.” Bakhtin defines “great time” as the “infinite and unfinalized dialogue in which no meaning dies.” According to this principle, great works such as Shakespeare continue to live in the distant future. Bakhtin argues that “in the process of their posthumous life they are enriched with new meanings, new significance: it is as though these works outgrow what they were in the epoch of their creation.” Bakhtin states that Shakespeare “has grown because of that which actually has been and continues to be found in his works, but which neither he himself nor his contemporaries could consciously perceive and evaluate in the context of the culture of their epoch.” The fullness of these works is revealed only in great time. Bakhtin formulates this principle as follows:

There is neither a first nor a last word and there are no limits to the dialogic context (it extends into the boundless past and the boundless future). Even past meanings, that is, those born in the dialogue of past centuries can never be stable (finalized, ended once and for all)—they will always change (be renewed) in the process of subsequent, future development of the dialogue. At any moment in the development of the dialogue there are immense, boundless masses of forgotten contextual meanings, but at certain moments of the dialogue’s subsequent development along the way they are recalled and invigorated in renewed form (in a new context). Nothing is absolutely dead: every meaning will have its homecoming.

This notion is based on Bakhtin’s understanding of the dialogical nature of language, according to which words, texts, and utterances cannot help but enter into dialogue with other words, texts, and utterances. As this dialogue is to be viewed from the standpoint of the third-person observer or the reader,

---

21 Bakhtin, *Speech Genres*, 69, 125.
22 Ibid., 169.
23 Ibid., 4–5.
24 Ibid., 170.
one can well imagine that as readers differ over time and space, so also the dialogues will be different.

Fourth, central to Bakhtin’s notion of great time is what he calls the concept of “re-accentuation.” Bakhtin argues that within the dialogue where various utterances interact, an open-ended dialogue begins within the image itself. As contexts change and as one brings different texts and points of view together, the potential is there to create new meaning and insights by re-accentuating the image. However, Bakhtin is of the opinion that this re-accentuation is not a crude violation of the author’s will. This process takes place within the image itself, when changed conditions actualize the potential already embedded in the image.\(^{25}\)

Fifth, within this re-accentuation, Bakhtin’s notion of the “outsider” plays a crucial role. Bakhtin argues that “a meaning reveals its depths once it has encountered and come into contact with another, foreign meaning.” Bakhtin maintains that within this dialogue, the foreign culture or unfamiliar text has the function of challenging us to ask new questions that we have not thought of raising.\(^{26}\) In this regard, Morson and Emerson argue that “the result of these dialogues is to enrich both the text and its interpreter. The exchange creates new and valuable meanings possessed by neither at the outset.”\(^{27}\) To illustrate this principle, Bakhtin uses the example of two people looking over each other’s shoulders. As both people occupy a different position, they look at the same thing in a different way, thus complementing each other’s perspective.\(^{28}\) This example leads to the conception that in order to reveal the hidden potential meanings in a text, it is crucial to have an outside voice to show us what we ourselves do not see. Despite the fact that there is an intimate exchange between the two conversation partners, one should note that the two sides are not somehow collapsed. Bakhtin critiques the notion that “in order better to understand a foreign culture, one must enter into it, forgetting one’s own, and view the world through the eye of this foreign culture.” For Bakhtin,

creative understanding does not renounce itself, its own place in time, its own culture; and it forgets nothing. In order to understand, it is immensely important for the person who understands to be located outside the object of his or her creative understanding—in time, in space, in culture.\(^{29}\)

Both sides of the dialogue are active and stay separate. As Bakhtin notes,

\(^{26}\) Bakhtin, Speech Genres, 7; Morson and Emerson, Mikhail Bakhtin, 289.
\(^{27}\) Morson and Emerson, Mikhail Bakhtin, 289.
\(^{28}\) Holquist, Dialogism, 21; Green, Mikhail Bakhtin, 41.
\(^{29}\) Bakhtin, Speech Genres, 6–7; Morson and Emerson, Mikhail Bakhtin, 230, 289.
“each retains its own unity and open totality, but they are mutually enriched.”30

Finally, this dialogue has what Bakhtin calls an unfinalizable character. The dialogical nature of words or texts presumes that new voices are continually recalled and added to the dialogue.31 This relates to Bakhtin’s view of history as an open-ended process in which new attempts to move to the future are constantly necessary. For Bakhtin, there can never be a first or a last word, for every word or text is only one in a chain of utterances that stretches back to the beginning of history and forward to its end.32 Emerson notes, however, that the fact that Bakhtin believes in the unfinalizability of dialogues does not mean that he rejects the notion of “wholes.” She argues that, for Bakhtin, “the whole of something can only be seen from a position that is outside of it in space after it in time.”33 Once again the observer plays a crucial role, as it is from her standpoint that a sense of wholeness is bestowed on the dialogue. Therefore, at some point frozen in time, the observer, so to speak, “freeze-frames” the dialogue and observes the interaction. This is grounded in the assumption that the dialogue still continues, thus harmonizing the open-endedness of the dialogue with the unity of the event.34

II. Dialogue as Model for a Biblical Theology

In light of the above-mentioned points from Bakhtin’s work, I would like to make the following suggestions as to the shape of a biblical theology. Both Olson and Newsom have suggested that Bakhtin and his notion of the dialogical quality of reality offer a good model for doing biblical theology.35 This dialogical model functions on at least two levels. On the first level, such a model seeks to bring the diversity of voices within the biblical text into a dialogue. Immediately

33 Emerson, *First Hundred Years*, 220–21.
34 Bakhtin, *Problem of Dostoevsky’s Poetics*, 166; Morson and Emerson, *Mikhail Bakhtin*, 228. Dennis Olson’s concept of provisional monologization provides a helpful way to describe something of this “open unity of the dialogue” (“Biblical Theology,” 172, 174).
35 Olson, “Biblical Theology,” 171–72; Newsom, “Bakhtin, the Bible, and Dialogic Truth,” 292–94. See also Walter Brueggemann, who has acknowledged the dialogical and dialectical character of the OT. Although Brueggemann does not employ Bakhtin’s work directly, he admits that Bakhtin’s work “will be crucial for future work in this direction in Old Testament study” (*Theology of the Old Testament: Testimony, Dispute, Advocacy* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1997], 83 n. 57).
one has to agree with Newsom’s point that the Bible is not a polyphonic text in the Bakhtinian sense, that is, an “intentional artistic representation” with a single author who propounds a plurality of voices. However, Newsom argues rightly that when one juxtaposes various voices in the biblical text, they become dialogical. This understanding of a biblical theology relates to Bakhtin’s notion of the dialogical nature of all words, texts, or utterances. As Newsom notes, every word, text, or utterance is “dialogized by its orientation to the already said and the yet to be said.”\(^{36}\) The second level relates to the Bakhtinian notion of the dialogical sense of truth. In light of Bakhtin’s assertion that all life and truth is dialogic, Newsom maintains that the truth about God, human nature, and the world cannot be uttered in one single utterance, thus the “open and unfinalized nature” of a theological claim.\(^{37}\) One sees this notion well illustrated in the variety of theological claims within the Bible itself, but also in the never-ending theological task of trying to speak about God.\(^{38}\)

Within this model, one may well ask who the designer of this dialogue is. One could make a diachronic argument that the creators of the biblical texts have responded to previously uttered words or discourses.\(^{39}\) For instance, Michael Fishbane argues that the Bible is already an interpreted document. He describes the Bible as demonstrating “an imagination which responds to and is deeply dependent upon received traditions; an imagination whose creativity is never entirely a new creation, but one founded upon older and authoritative words and images.”\(^{40}\) In her book *Remember the Former Things: The Recollection of Previous Texts in Second Isaiah*, Patricia Tull Willey names these assumptions in terms of Bakhtin’s theory of dialogue. She investigates how “Second Isaiah, by recollecting the voices of others, organizes and manages the variety of viewpoints present at the end of the exile.”\(^{41}\)

Such a diachronic understanding of the creators of the dialogue demon-

---


\(^{37}\) Newsom, “Bakhtin, the Bible, and Dialogic Truth,” 301, 304.


\(^{39}\) See the helpful discussion concerning intertextuality as “text production” and intertextuality as “text reception” in von Wolde, “Intertextuality,” 429–32. This relates to the diachronic and synchronic understanding of the creation of the dialogue that I have described above.


\(^{41}\) Patricia Tull Willey, *Remember the Former Things: The Recollection of Previous Texts in*
strates both possibilities and problems. For instance, some of the above-mentioned works show well how the biblical traditions have been appropriated and reappropriated in new circumstances, thus illustrating the continuing value these traditions had for each new generation. Walter Reed notes that the advantage of such a diachronic understanding of Bakhtin’s concept of dialogue is that it “encourages the perception of more that one kind of formal ordering and more than one level of significant shaping in the canonical text.”

Thus, such an approach picks up on the reality that there already is in the text itself a dialogue at work. On the other hand, this diachronic approach also runs into a number of problems. For instance, it is in many cases quite difficult to determine the chronological succession of some biblical texts. This is especially a problem with the texts from the Pentateuch. Moreover, within a diachronic understanding of the text, the dialogical relationship between these utterances is only unidirectional. Thus, Fishbane and Willey are only interested in how later material such as Second Isaiah uses earlier biblical material. I argue that in terms of a true Bakhtinian notion of dialogue, such a dialogical relation should be reciprocal. Within a dialogue, the different voices should be able to respond mutually to one another.

An alternative proposal would regard the creator of the dialogue quite differently. Within a synchronic understanding of the dialogical nature of texts, one’s focus would shift to the role of what Bakhtin calls the third-person observer. This observer finds herself outside the ensuing dialogue, and it is from her perspective that the dialogue is created and can be observed. This relates to Newsom’s suggestion that the biblical theologian should create a conversation where the various biblical voices converse on equal footing. She says:

the biblical theologian’s role would not be to inhabit the voice [sic], as the novelist does, but rather to pick out the assumptions, experiences, entailments, embedded metaphors, and so on, which shape each perspective and to attempt to trace the dotted line to a point at which it intersects the claims of the other.

Instead of focusing on how the biblical text developed diachronically, the biblical theologian acts as the orchestrator of this dialogue, bringing various

---

Second Isaiah (SBLDS 161; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997), 3, 7. In her discussion, Willey includes only texts that show verbal similarities and are relatively sure to predate Second Isaiah, thus exhibiting a clear diachronic understanding of the dialogical nature of the text. See also Benjamin Sommer, A Prophet Reading Scripture: Allusion in Isaiah 40–66 (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1998).


Newsom, “Bakhtin, the Bible, and Dialogic Truth,” 304–5; Bakhtin, Problems of Dostoevsky’s Poetics, 89.
biblical voices on the same theme together on a synchronic level, thereby creating the space where a dialogue might ensue. In such a model, participants are able to make provisional judgments about truth and value, which are set into dialogue with other viewpoints.\(^{44}\) Important to note is that the synchronic nature of the conversation does not mean that no attention is given to the historical and cultural particularity of each voice.\(^{45}\) This relates to Bakhtin’s notion that the two sides of a dialogue are not somehow collapsed, renouncing their respective places in time.\(^{46}\) Each text comes to the conversation with its own distinctive perspective, which includes its particular historical and literary context.\(^{47}\)

This dialogue is mutual, so that the texts influence each other reciprocally. The consequence of this is that neither text is left untouched by the interaction. According to Bakhtin, the real meaning of these texts is found not in any singular text but on the boundary of the intersecting texts. The meaning that is created out of the dialogue between the given texts is totally new. At the same time, this interaction has the effect of altering the way in which the original texts are heard.\(^{48}\)

Bakhtin’s notion of “great time” is especially significant for composing a model for biblical theology. It is in great time that new meaning is disclosed. The potential of this new meaning is already embedded in the text itself.\(^{49}\) This concept is particularly significant for questions concerning the reimagining of God. In great time, the “newcomers” to the theological debate such as women, liberation theologians, and others, ask new questions concerning how God should be imagined. These “outsiders” ask questions that have not been asked before and thus serve the function of re-accentuating the traditional imagery found in the biblical texts. Bakhtin points out that this is not a crude violation of the writer’s will, as there already is potential embedded within the text, which is disclosed in great time.

This alternative proposal does not suggest that one should not appropriate Bakhtin in diachronic studies.\(^{50}\) My proposal serves as an alternative that might allow interaction between texts that seem inclined to be joined together, even though it may be difficult or even impossible to show a historical connection. A wonderful example in this regard is the work of Reed, who identifies on a liter-

\(^{44}\) Olson, “Biblical Theology,” 172.
\(^{45}\) Newsom, “Bakhtin, the Bible, and Dialogic Truth,” 305; see also Green, Mikhail Bakhtin, 27, 61.
\(^{46}\) Bakhtin, Speech Genres, 7.
\(^{47}\) Newsom, “Bakhtin, the Bible, and Dialogic Truth,” 305.
\(^{48}\) Bakhtin, Speech Genres, 119–20, 124.
\(^{49}\) Ibid., 4–5.
\(^{50}\) See Green’s explanation of how Bakhtin could be helpful in the field of the Bible and history (Mikhail Bakhtin, 61–62).
ary level some of these imaginative dialogues in the biblical text, for example, how the narrative of Joseph responds to that of Noah.\textsuperscript{51} He also shows masterfully how reading the story of Ishmael and the sacrifice of Isaac as parallel stories “generates meanings and values for both episodes together.”\textsuperscript{52}

A further advantage is that this proposed model for biblical theology emphasizes the role of the reader in the interpretation process—something often overlooked by traditional historical studies.\textsuperscript{53} The reader sees connections between texts by identifying similarities in words, images, and themes. In some sense, the reader is fashioning the dialogue. A question one may well ask in this regard is how one determines which texts are put into a dialogical relationship? What are the criteria for putting some texts together and not others? Bakhtin notes that “dialogical relationships are absolutely impossible without logical relationships” between the different texts. These logical relationships are not only on the level of syntactic and lexical-semantic similarities, but also on a metalinguistic level, where language is used and embodied in the form of an utterance. Bakhtin describes these various connections in terms of the logical relationships of agreement/disagreement, affirmation/supplementation, and question/answer.\textsuperscript{54}

In this regard, one should acknowledge the subjective nature of this pursuit. It is the reader who sees these logical connections between texts. However, the success of this undertaking is dependent on the reader’s ability to persuade others of these connections. These connections cannot be totally random, but should be guided by signs in the text. As Ellen von Wolde argues:

> If sufficient repetition does not exist, then there is no basis for arguing for intertextuality. . . . This proves that intertextuality is not just the idea a reader has made up in his or her mind, but that the markers in the text have made this linking possible.\textsuperscript{55}

Moreover, the reader brings her own self to the dialogue, which has a distinctive influence on the way the dialogue proceeds. This “self” is shaped by a variety of concurrent dialogues of which the reader forms part.\textsuperscript{56} In this regard,

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{51} Reed, \textit{Dialogues of the Word}, 24–25.
\item \textsuperscript{52} Ibid., 7–12.
\item \textsuperscript{53} Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, “The Ethics of Biblical Interpretation.” \textit{JBL}, 107 (1988): 13. See also Brueggemann (\textit{Theology of the Old Testament}, 52, 62), who maintains that there is no innocent or objective reading.
\item \textsuperscript{54} Bakhtin, \textit{Problem of Dostoevsky’s Poetics}, 182–84, 188; see also von Wolde, “Intertextuality,” 432–33. These relationships are based on the assumption that there are points of both similarity and difference within these dialogical relationships. The similarities allow one to see connections, while the differences add to the discussion.
\item \textsuperscript{55} Von Wolde, “Intertextuality,” 433.
\item \textsuperscript{56} Green, \textit{Mikhail Bakhtin}, 63. For a discussion of the differentiated nature of a person’s
\end{itemize}
Olson notes that in the dialogical encounter with the text, the reader should come to the text with her interpretative framework intact.57 Again this relates to Bakhtin’s idea that in a “dialogic encounter of two cultures . . . each retains its own unity and open totality, but they are mutually enriched.”58 The reader is not only observing the dialogue in the text, but is also participating in the dialogue herself. In the process, the reader is shaped by the dialogical encounter with the text, as all participants are changed by the encounter.

Following from this, the dialogue envisioned by the biblical theologian is much richer than the interaction of voices within the biblical text itself. Olson proposes that it would be valuable to introduce an assortment of dialogue partners from various times and places to enrich the ongoing dialogue.59 This is echoed by a number of scholars who have emphasized that we are not the first readers of the biblical text. We form part of a long line of both Jewish and Christian communities who have, as Stephen Fowl and Gregory Jones put it, “asked questions, found answers, formulated texts and given readings of those texts which provide us with resources for our own lives.”60

Such an understanding relates to the efforts of a number of biblical theologians, led by Brevard Childs, to introduce interpretations of premodern interpreters into the exegetical conversation, providing, as Olson argues “‘fruitful prejudices’ (Gadamer) and analogies to consider. . . .”61 Childs’s commentary on Exodus is a wonderful example of putting this into practice, as he consistently pays careful attention to the interpretation history of the biblical text.62 Similarly, in his well-known article “The Superiority of Pre-Critical Exegesis,” David Steinmetz highlights the value of the precritical exegetical tradition. He is of the opinion that modern readers who try to find the one “original” meaning of the text can learn a great deal from the medieval exegetes. The latter believed that the original meaning, the meaning Scripture had within the hist-

---

57 Olson, “Biblical Theology,” 175.
58 Bakhtin, Speech Genres, 7; Morson and Emerson, Mikhail Bakhtin, 56.
historical context in which it was first uttered, is only one of its possible meanings, and it may not even be its primary or most important meaning. Moreover, there is a growing appreciation for the Jewish interpretative tradition. Walter Brueggemann has strongly critiqued the huge chasm between Christian and Jewish interpreters. He contends that “what Jews and Christians share is much more extensive, much more important, much more definitional than what divides us.” As a result, there has been a movement toward recognizing the rabbis as skillful exegetes who deserve to be heard. For instance, Renée Bloch proposed that the midrashic genre and method, and particularly the exegetical midrash, can be quite fruitful for the exegesis of the Old and New Testaments. She notes that especially NT studies have realized the Jewishness of the Christian Scriptures, resulting in the awareness that knowledge of the Jewish tradition and its writings is indispensable.

In light of this, I argue that within the dialogical model for a biblical theology, the biblical theologian has the task of inviting Jewish and Christian interpreters to join the discussion. In this regard, I want to call to mind the Bakhtinian notion of the “outsider.” Bakhtin argues that a foreign culture or an unfamiliar text has the function of providing a different perspective that may prove to be enriching to the dialogue. The “outsider” may offer the impetus to develop the potential present in an image so that it may be heard differently, thus re-accentuating the traditional image. Within modern biblical interpretation, the voices of Christian and Jewish precritical interpreters have often not


66 Brueggemann, *Theology of the Old Testament*, 735. In light of Brueggemann’s plea, it is ironic that he does not once refer to any Jewish source in his expositions. This may relate to his assumption that Jewish and Christian scholars should read together, each bringing her or his own expertise. On the other hand, scholars like Samuel Terrien and Brevard Childs have shown successfully in their biblical theologies how informative the employment of Jewish resources can be. See Brueggemann, *Theology of the Old Testament*, 343–47; Samuel Terrien, *The Elusive Presence: Toward a New Biblical Theology* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1978), 359–89.

been heard and can thus be classified in Bakhtinian terms as “outsiders.” In similar fashion, Fowl and Jones argue that Jews and the Jewish interpretative tradition might be regarded as outsiders to the Christian tradition, but outsiders bearing a family resemblance and whose voices should be heard.  

But how can these “outsiders” be useful within a theological and exegetical study? These interpretative traditions represent quite a different way of perceiving texts, unfamiliar to modern Christian readers, who are sometimes skeptical about the validity of these interpretations. Even Bloch, who advocates the value of the rabbinic texts, argues that “pruned of its excesses of imagination and method,” midrash “could throw light on many points regarding the genesis of the biblical writings.” Yet “the excesses of imagination” need not always be “pruned.” It is exactly these “excesses” that might serve the function of sparking the reader’s imagination, allowing one to read the biblical materials in a fresh way. Correspondingly, Ithamar Gruenwald contends that the midrashic interpretation provides the biblical text with a special dimension of meaning. According to him, meaning is not read out of the text but in reality is imposed on it. The consequence of this is that “once a new meaning is accepted, it is incorporated into the thematic texture of the scriptural text.” One can even say that it becomes part of people’s conceptualization of the text, which has the effect of opening up ever new possibilities for the text and its meaning. Midrash thus becomes “a cognitive looking-glass through which a biblical story is viewed and a religious world constructed.”

This view of Gruenwald can be reformulated in terms of the proposed model. Within a dialogical encounter between texts as constructed by the biblical theologian, the premodern interpreters may stretch the boundaries of our imagination when we ourselves are interpreting texts. Within such a model, arguments concerning the historical causality between texts do not necessarily have to be made. The emphasis falls on the reader who brings these texts together. However, once again, this does not

---

68 Fowl and Jones, Reading in Communion, 109–16. In the rest of their chapter, Fowl and Jones propose strategies for how to listen to the outsider. For instance, one has to realize that the outsider is not us in disguise. Moreover, the outsider is not completely alien, for to recognize the outsider as such is already to have recognized the commonalities (pp. 123–26).

69 Renée Bloch, “Midrash,” in Approaches to Ancient Judaism, ed. Green, 1:49.


71 Ibid., 19.

mean that the texts are merely jumbled together without regard to each text’s distinctiveness. In terms of Bakhtin’s notion of a “dialogic encounter of two cultures,” each text will come to the conversation with the unique literary and methodological issues involved in its interpretation.

Finally, in light of Bakhtin’s notion of the unfinalizable nature of the dialogue, the number of conversation partners could indeed be unlimited. The Jewish and Christian interpretation history of the biblical texts stretches over two thousand years and is vast in its magnitude. For the purpose of creating a manageable dialogue, one therefore has to limit the number of participants. This is done with the understanding that the dialogue continues, that more could have been said—corresponding to Bakhtin’s fusion of his notions of the open-endedness of the dialogue, as well as the unity of the event.

A number of questions might be raised concerning this model. First, does the emphasis on the reader or the plurality of interpretations of the text not lead to relativism, where any meaning becomes acceptable? In this regard, Emerson makes the important observation that one should not confuse relativity with relativism. In his revised Dostoevsky book, Bakhtin adds a sentence in which he says that the polyphonic approach has nothing to do with relativism. Bakhtin sees dialogue as the increased burden our world immersed in relativity has to endure; however, relativism will not be tolerated by Bakhtin’s ethical system.73 Green asserts that “Bakhtin’s devotion to and skill at playing the many textual clues should dispel or discourage any reading that is arbitrary or irresponsible.” Steinmetz makes a similar argument that “the text cannot mean anything a later audience wants it to mean.” Rather, “the language of the Bible opens up a field of possible meanings.” Steinmetz considers “any interpretation which falls within that field” as “valid exegesis of the text, even though that interpretation was not intended by the author.”75 He says:

The original text as spoken and heard limits a field of possible meanings. Those possible meanings are not dragged by the hair, willy-nilly, into the text, but belong to the life of the Bible in the encounter between author and reader as they belong to the life of any act of the human imagination.76

Thus, the proposed model for a biblical theology on the one hand stays close to the language of the biblical text, but at the same time it also realizes that the language of the text opens up a wide range of interpretative possibilities that might be reclaimed by subsequent readers.77

---

74 Green, *Mikhail Bakhtin*, 64.
75 Steinmetz, “Superiority of Pre-Critical Exegesis,” 32.
76 Ibid., 37.
77 This does not mean that one should be uncritical about these interpretations. Fowl notes
Second, one has to realize that Bakhtin’s promising model does not solve all of our problems. Feminist critics have pointed out that questions of power are central to whether it will be at all possible to create a benign encounter between uneven voices. Mary Pollock notes that it is potentially problematic when a weaker voice (e.g., female language) allows a dominant voice (patriarchal language) into her space, as the engagement will not be equal. This is also true of the model for biblical theology that I propose. Within this dialogical interaction, the voices simply are not equal. For instance, the reality remains that the number of biblical texts that present female metaphors for God is minuscule in terms of the overwhelming choir of male metaphors used to describe God. This places an important responsibility on the shoulders of the orchestrator of the dialogue. Green makes a notable comment concerning the role of the author, which I would like to extend to the role of the biblical theologian who orchestrates the dialogue, which consists of biblical voices as well as voices of biblical interpreters:

To author respectfully precludes, avoids domination and control, neither requiring nor permitting the collapse of one into the other. To create in this way is to acknowledge the other with discipline, responsivity, and refinement, to negotiate rather than to bully.

This, to be sure, is a tall order, but at least something to strive for. With this in mind, marginal voices have the potential to be heard, which will, in turn, enrich the whole debate.

III. Conclusion

A dialogical model for biblical theology shows promise in the following ways. First, such a model has potential to bring together the diverse and some-
times even contradictory voices in the Bible. The jury is still out on how to keep
the unity as well as the diversity of the biblical witness together. In recent years,
biblical theologians have suggested that the center of the biblical witness lies in
the polarities and tensions themselves.\textsuperscript{81} A good example of such an approach is
Walter Brueggemann’s \textit{Theology of the Old Testament}, in which he goes to
great lengths to bring what he calls the counter testimony of Israel into play.
This provides him with a way of incorporating Wisdom, and particularly the
unconventional witness of Job and Ecclesiastes into OT theology.\textsuperscript{82} Second,
such a model of biblical theology provides a means for crossing the great divide
between the OT and the NT. Although scholars in principle agree that there is a
unity between the two testaments, few dare to venture outside the safe con-
fines of their own discipline.\textsuperscript{83} The advantage of Bakhtin’s model is that in this
dialogue, the voices interact with one another and mutually enrich one another,
while at the same time the individual voices retain their distinctiveness. Third,
this model for biblical theology provides a means for creatively employing the
wealth of Christian as well as Jewish interpretations of biblical texts—some-
thing that an increasing number of biblical theologians have deemed a valuable
objective. One could imagine that such a model for biblical theology could be
valuable in Jewish and Christian dialogue.\textsuperscript{84} Fourth, such a model relates to a
significant contribution of Bakhtin’s model of dialogue. Bakhtin is concerned

\begin{footnotes}
\textsuperscript{81} See, e.g., Terrien, \textit{Elusive Presence}; Claus Westermann, \textit{Elements of Old Testament Theol-
Paul Hanson, \textit{The Diversity of Scripture: A Theological Interpretation} (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982).

\textsuperscript{82} Brueggemann, \textit{Theology of the Old Testament}, 386–99. The notion of “center” and “mar-
gin” raises the issue of who determines these categories. Ecclesiastes may be a marginal voice from
the perspective of the traditional wisdom theology, but from a different point of view, Ecclesiastes’
views are not all that strange.

\textsuperscript{83} An exception is Brevard Childs, whose \textit{Biblical Theology of the Old and New Testaments:}
\textit{Theological Reflection on the Christian Bible} (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993) is a classic attempt to
incorporate both testaments into a biblical theology. See also R. W. L. Moerly, \textit{Bible, Theology,}
dialogue between critical biblical exegesis and philosophical hermeneutics, see André LaCocque
and Paul Ricoeur, \textit{Thinking Biblically, Exegetical and Hermeneutical Studies} (Chicago: University

\textsuperscript{84} See Jacob Neusner and Bruce Chilton, \textit{The Body of Faith: Israel and the Church} (Valley
Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1996), which is a good example of dialogue between a
Jewish scholar and a NT scholar. James Kugel’s \textit{The Bible As It Was} (Cambridge, MA: Harvard
University Press, 1997) also brings together ancient Jewish and Christian interpretations of penta-
tauchal texts. In addition, see \textit{Eve and Adam: Jewish, Christian, and Muslim Readings on Genesis}
\textit{and Gender} (ed. Kristen Kvam, Linda Schearing, and Valarie Ziegler; Bloomington: Indiana Uni-
versity Press, 1999). A book that helps facilitate dialogue among Judaism, Christianity, and Islam is
John Kaltner, \textit{Ishmael Instructs Isaac: An Introduction to the Qur’an for Bible Readers} (Col-
\end{footnotes}
not so much with large abstract schemes as with what Olson calls, “the small, ordinary and mundane events of everyday life among common people as the locus of real meaning and significance.”85 This modifies the traditional understanding of biblical theology in terms of large governing schemes, as proposed, for example, by Walter Eichrodt (covenant) and Gerhard von Rad (salvation history), where a central theme spans the whole of the Old and New Testaments. Bakhtin’s model of dialogue provides a means whereby a biblical theology may be conceived of in terms of the everyday readings of texts. It occurs on a small scale in each event of bringing texts together and pondering their relationship and the meaning created in the midst of the interaction. Each dialogue is an ongoing event that always seeks to invite more voices to join the conversation.86 These dialogues slowly grow and may merge with other concurrent dialogues. The similarities between texts generate discussion, but at the same time the differences bring new truths. Thus, within this model of biblical theology, there is also room for “the other,” for divergent perspectives that serve to enrich the dialogue.

Finally, this model of biblical theology may indeed be refined and developed further. However, what is most needed is to put this model to the test by constructing dialogues around certain themes in the Old and New Testaments. I look forward to overhearing some of these conversations.

85 Olson, “Biblical Theology,” 173; Newsom, “Bakhtin, the Bible, and Dialogic Truth,” 294; Bakhtin, Problems of Dostoevsky’s Poetics, 93.

86 One example of such a dialogue is the conversation I created in my dissertation, where I apply this model for biblical theology. In my dissertation, I brought together in dialogue a number of pentateuchal texts (Num 11:11–12 and Deut 32:13–16) and biblical interpreters (e.g., b. Yoma 75a; Sifre Num. 89; Exod. Rab. 1:12) dealing with the metaphor of the God who feeds. I introduced into this conversation texts that use the explicitly female metaphor of a mother nursing her child to describe the act of divine feeding, suggesting that these texts extend the traditional metaphor, encouraging us to think of the metaphor of the God who feeds in maternal terms. See also my current project, in which I am extending the metaphor of the God who feeds to the rest of the OT: The God Who Feeds Her Children: An Old Testament Metaphor for God (Nashville: Abingdon, forthcoming).
CRITICAL NOTES

THE GRAMMAR OF RESURRECTION
IN ISAIAH 26:19a–c

For more than a century, Isa 24–27 has been recognized as a distinct unit within the larger context of Isa 1–39. The features that distinguish these four chapters from their surroundings are readily noted: the absence of a plausible connection with the Neo-Assyrian period; distinctive vocabulary and syntax; themes and imagery generally associated with later periods in the history of Israel. Identifying the unifying characteristics of these chapters is more difficult. Similar to oracles against the nations, but with an eschatological perspective, these passages are nonetheless distinct from developed examples of biblical and Jewish apocalyptic. Commentators describe the internal structure of Isa 24–27 with little consistency or agreement and date these chapters with considerable variation.¹

Isaiah 26:19 is a critical passage in the so-called Isaiah Apocalypse, because it describes a future reanimation of the dead. Over millennia, commentators have sought to discern the message of Isa 26:19, but consensus about its grammatical structure and its precise meaning has never formed.²

Close attention to the morphological and syntactic features of Isa 26:19 leads to resolution of its longstanding problematic character. I contend that there is a relatively simple and grammatically satisfying interpretation of the verse that accounts for the morphology of its words, the syntax of its sentences, and the structure of its poetic lines. Once the meaning of Isa 26:19 is clear, the logical sequence of its argument emerges.


² Scholl, Elenden, 141–45; Polaski, Authorizing an End, 238–42.
Isaiah 26 is verse. The lineation of v. 19a–c is set out below:\(^3\)

\[19a\]
\[19b\]
\[19c\]

The MT of Isa 26:19b has a difficult reading in the word יתלבנ in v. 19b.\(^4\) The most ancient Greek translation does not help to explain the Hebrew, because the reading of the LXX, οὴ ἐν τῷ ζωândεμένος, appears to be a Christian interpolation from John 5:28.\(^5\) The divergent syntax of the Greek in this verse further obscures the Hebrew Vorlage. The Vulgate interfecti mei partly follows the consonantal MT, but interprets the noun as a collective and the suffix as first person singular.\(^6\) The Syriac version and the Targums read as if the suffix were third person plural.\(^7\)

Most recent translations accept the MT as the lectio difficilior but translate according to either the Vulgate or the Syriac and Targum. The influence of the Vulgate is evident in, e.g., the AV: "Thy dead [men] shall live, [together with] my dead body shall they arise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in dust." The translation "my dead body" interprets the suffix of יתלבנ as first person singular.

Conjectural emendation of the suffix to third person plural, following the Syriac and Targums, is reflected in the RSV: "Thy dead shall live, their bodies shall rise. O dwellers in the dust, awake and sing for joy!" and in the NIV: "But your dead will live; their bodies will rise. You who dwell in the dust, wake up and shout for joy."\(^8\)

The morphology of יתלבנ is difficult to assess.\(^9\) The suffix יִתְלָּבָנ as widely understood


\(^4\) Also 1QIsa xxi 1. The enhanced digitized image of col. xxi in D. W. Parry and E. Qimron, The Great Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa\(^a\)): A New Edition (STD) 32; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 42, shows the reading clearly.

\(^5\) D. Barthélemy et al., Critique textuelle de l’Ancien Testament: 2, Isaïe, Jérémie, Lamentations (OBO 50/2; Fribourg: Éditions universitaires; Göttingen: Vandenhoek & Ruprecht, 1981), 187. "[T]extual corruption seems to be the fate of passages deemed to be religiously controversial" (Blenkinsopp, Isaiah 1–39, 370).

\(^6\) Barthélemy, Critique textuelle, 187.


\(^8\) Barthélemy provides additional discussion of translations (Critique textuelle, 186).

as a first person pronominal suffix.\textsuperscript{10} Another analysis was proposed by Japheth ben ‘Ali ha-Levi, a tenth-century Karaite scholar from Jerusalem: the suffix is a connecting vowel (\textit{hîreq compaginis}) without semantic value.\textsuperscript{11} The paragogic vowel is most often found affixed to the first substantive of a construct chain, but this is not the syntactic environment in Isa 26:19a.\textsuperscript{12} Hence a paragogic interpretation of the suffix faces syntactic difficulties.

According to the MT vocalization, the substantive \textit{hl;ben”} is feminine singular and in the absolute state. There is a lack of gender and number concord with the verb \textit{@wmwqy}. These features indicate that \textit{hl;ben”} is not the subject of the verb \textit{@wmwqy}. To explain the verse line, we must abandon the common interpretation of the suffix as a personal pronoun and the less common interpretation of the suffix as a paragogic element. I suggest that the “- suffix is not a personal pronoun or paragogic, but a gentilic.\textsuperscript{13}

Syntactically, \textit{hl;ben”} is an \textit{accusative of state}; as a substantive, it is indefinite and refers to the subject of the clause.\textsuperscript{14} An adverbial adjunct, \textit{ytlbn} specifies the state in which the dead are resurrected: “(as) a corpse they [sc. ‘your dead’] shall rise.” A similar use of the gentilic to indicate an accusative of state can be found at Gen 25:25: “The first came out \textit{red}” (Heb. יְרֵם).

With the substantive described as an adverbial accusative, the syntax of Isa 26:19a–b becomes evident. The constituent structure of v. 19a is V(erb)–S(ubject); the constituent structure of v. 19b is A(dverbial)–V(erb). The S(ubject) constituent of v. 19a (Heb. יְרֵם) is deleted or “gapped” in v. 19b. Typologically, Isa 26:19b is a single independent clause line of two constituents of the type A–V.\textsuperscript{15}

The gentilic analysis of the suffix of \textit{hl;ben”} leads to a translation of Isa 26:19a–c in the following manner:

\begin{itemize}
\item[\textsuperscript{11}] Details of his life are unknown, but Japheth ben ‘Ali was active ca. 950–980 C.E. (\textit{A Commentary on the Book of Daniel by Jephet ibn Ali the Karaite} [ed. and trans. J. L. Margoliouth; Oxford: Clarendon, 1889], v–vi; \textit{JE} 7:72–73; \textit{EncJud} 9:1, 286). His Judeo-Arabic commentaries on Tanakh are well preserved. The same explanation of the suffix was advanced, apparently independently, by E. F. C. Rosenmüller, \textit{Scholia in Vetus Testamentum}, pt. 3, \textit{Iesaiae vaticinia} (Leipzig: I. A. Barth, 1793) [not seen]; see Barthélemy, \textit{Critique textuelle}, 187. The paragogic explanation of the suffix is not mentioned in \textit{TDOT} 9:156. On the paragogic suffix in general, see B. Waltke and M. O’Connor, \textit{An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax} (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 127–28 (§8.2).
\item[\textsuperscript{13}] On constructions employing gentilics, see Waltke and O’Connor, \textit{Biblical Hebrew Syntax}, 92–93 (§5.7c).
\item[\textsuperscript{14}] Ibid., 171–72 (§10.2.2d). The noun יְרֵם is not in apposition to יְרֵם, as alleged by van Wieringen (“’I and ‘We’ before ‘Your’ Face,” 246).
\item[\textsuperscript{15}] O’Connor, \textit{Hebrew Verse Structure}, 329. This is a rare line type; there are only three examples in the corpus studied by O’Connor: Ps 106:43a; Deut 33:23d; Zeph 2:3.
\end{itemize}
Your dead shall live. (As) a corpse they shall rise.16
Awake and shout for joy, you who dwell in the dust!17

The passage envisions a political revival of the battered Judahite realm metaphorically, by analogy to the popular idea of personal eschatology referred to in the later Hebrew phrase tēhiyyat ha-mētīm, “revival of the dead.”18 The moribund nation, like the deceased at the end of days, will be reconstituted (v. 19a), at first insensate and lifeless (v. 19b), but then revivified, active and joyful (v. 19c).

Note the conceptual similarity of Ezek 37:1–14. In the process of resurrection as explained to Ezekiel in a vision (37:1–3), the bodies of the dead are first reconstituted (vv. 4–5);19 then spirit (Hebrew נר) is infused in them, and they live again (v. 6). After Ezekiel’s first prophetic utterance (v. 7), the dry bones reassemble and become enfleshed; the newly reconstituted corpses are not yet alive, however, because “spirit [נַחַל] is not in them” (v. 8). A second divine commissioning (v. 9) and a second prophetic utterance (v. 10) are necessary to revive and revitalize the corpses. Oral tradition (b. Sanh. 92b) completes the parallel: the dead revived by Ezekiel’s intervention chanted a song of praise to God as soon as they came to life.20

The third line of the passage, v. 19c, expresses the dawning awareness of the revivified dead (representing the nation) through a conjoined pair of imperatives: נוֹזֵר קָנָה. The earliest witness to the text, 1QIsaa xxi 1, reads נוֹזֵר רָעַם at this point. The imperatives have been assimilated to prefixing forms, imitating the usage of the previous two lines: נוֹזֵר in v. 19a and נוֹזֵר in v. 19b. The MT, supported by Vg, once again gives the more difficult reading.21

The verb נוֹזֵר is appropriate to represent the joy of the future life. Used 52 times in the MT, נוֹזֵר appears 25 times in Psalms, 13 times in Isaiah, 3 times each in Proverbs and Jeremiah, twice in Job, and once each in six other books.22 Precisely one-fourth of its uses are in the Isaian corpus. Thus נוֹזֵר is a characteristic lexical choice for this semantic domain in the book of Isaiah.

18 On the meaning and development of the phrase, see Sysling, Tēhiyyat Ha-Metim, 1–2.
21 Barthélemy, Critique textuelle, 188.
Isaiah 12:6a strongly parallels 26:19c in syntax as well as vocabulary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Loc.</th>
<th>Part.</th>
<th>Imp.</th>
<th>Imp.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Isa 12:6a</td>
<td>יָרֵאֵל יִזְכַּה</td>
<td>יִשָּׁהֵל</td>
<td>יִשָּׁהֵל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa 26:19c</td>
<td>לֹא קִימְךָ</td>
<td>לֹא קִימְךָ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In both cases, יָרֵאֵל is conjoined as the second of two imperatives—singular in Isa 12:6a—followed by a vocative whose constituents are a participle and a locative noun. The only other use of יָרֵאֵל in the Isaiah Apocalypse, in Isa 24:14, has no direct bearing on the passage we are considering.

Interpreted as I have argued above, Isa 26:19b is a statement concerning the condition in which the newly reconstituted dead begin their transition to life again. The dead arise as corpses, awaken, and shout for joy. Ezekiel 37:1–14 implies similar staging of the reanimation process, and postbiblical descriptions of resurrection elaborate individual steps in the sequence. The Isaian image is an adumbration of a mental representation already well formed but sparsely articulated in early Judaism.

Philip C. Schmitz  
philip.schmitz@emich.edu  
Eastern Michigan University, Ypsilanti, MI 48197

---

23 The syntactic matching further supports the textual argument favoring the MT over the Qumran text of Isa 26:19c.


IS THERE HALAKA (THE NOUN) AT QUMRAN?

Scholars concerned with Judaism in its various forms at the turn of the era readily speak of halaḵā when referring to a legal opinion or ruling of an individual or a group that seeks to prescribe the proper conduct of observant Jews in particular situations. Scholarly monographs that discuss the proper interpretation of the halaḵā of Qumran or Jesus or Philo or Josephus are well known.1

This essay does not question the existence at the turn of the era of the phenomenon that we moderns label halaḵā. One need only read the Rule of the Community (1QS) or the so-called Halakic Letter (4QMMT), to say nothing of the extensive treatment of legal issues in the corpus of Philo or in Josephus’s Jewish Antiquities, to settle the question of the existence in the first century B.C.E. and C.E. of the reality that we call halaḵā. The question this essay raises is rather a linguistic one with two implicit parts: (1) Was the Hebrew noun halaḵā in current use in the first century B.C.E. and C.E.; and, if so, (2) did it carry the sense that is clear from the Mishnah onwards, namely, a legal opinion or ruling about proper Jewish conduct in a particular situation?2 In itself, the


2 Not in dispute is the well-known fact that, in the Jewish Scriptures, the verb halaḵ is used with various prepositional phrases to denote action that is in keeping with God’s will as revealed to Israel through the Torah (or similar nouns like “commandment,” “statute,” “ordinance,” or “judgment”). Examples of the verb halaḵ (“to walk,” “to go”) used with the preposition bê (“with,” “in,” “according to”) and various “legal” nouns include, e.g., Exod 16:4; 2 Kgs 10:31; Jer 9:12; 26:4; 32:23; 44:10, 23; Ps 78:10; 119:1; Dan 9:10; Neh 10:50; 2 Chr 6:16 (all with tôrâ, “law”); Lev 18:3–4; 20:23; 26:3; 1 Kgs 3:3; 6:12; 8:61; 2 Kgs 17:8, 19; Jer 44:10, 23; Ezek 5:6–7; 11:12; 20:18; 18:9; 17:20; 13:16, 19, 21; 33:15 (all with huqqâ, “statute”); Ezek 11:12; 36:27 (all with hōq, “statute”); 1 Kgs 6:12; 2 Chr 17:4 (all with mišpâh, “commandment”); Ezek 37:24; Ps 89:31; Job 34:23 (all with mišpât, “judgment,” “ordinance”); and Jer 44:23 (with ēdût, “testimony”). This usage continues into the documents of Qumran; examples include 11QT 59:16 (with hōq, “statute”) and 1QS 8:20 (with mišpât, “judgment,” “ordinance”). These “legal” locutions with the verb halaḵ probably gave rise to the specific rabbinic usage of the noun halaḵā.
question is a narrow one. But biblical scholars should be aware of when they are defining a particular reality with a label whose existence or at least whose technical meaning arose only at a later date. At times our vocabulary may be anachronistic; our concepts and affirmations should not be.3

Hence the question: Can we find any occurrence of the word ḥālākā prior to the Mishnah?4 For all practical purposes, this means: Can we find this Hebrew noun in the Dead Sea Scrolls and related texts? Some scholars reply with a flat no.5 However, the Dictionary of Classical Hebrew (ed. David J. A. Clines; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993–) lists sub voce (2:559) two occurrences of the noun ḥālākā, both from the Rule of the Community (1QS); the noun never occurs in the canon of Jewish Scriptures or in the deuterocanonical/apocryphal book of Ben Sira. As the Dictionary properly indicates, there are problems with both supposed occurrences at Qumran.

In 1QS 1:25, the Dictionary entry first presents the form ḥlktnw as the noun ḥālākā plus the first person plural suffix -nû (“our”). Hence it translates the phrase ḥršnw . . . ḥlktnw as: “We have made our conduct wicked. . . .” However, the entry goes on to note that the Hebrew letter hê at the beginning of ḥlktnw is not clear (this is apparently due to a scribe’s attempt to erase the hê); hence the Dictionary lists the alternate reading blktnw, “in our going” (the preposition bêt with the qal infinitive construct of the verb ḥālak [leket] plus the first person plural suffix). The sense of the whole statement would then have to be: “We have acted wickedly in our conduct. . . .” What is curious in the Dictionary’s first reading is that the letter bêt, which is clearly visible in the photographs of the manuscript, is not represented, while the hê, which is obscured in the text by a scribal erasure (more about this below), is represented.6

3 It is important to emphasize that a certain reality may be present at a point in history when the later technical term for that reality has not yet been coined or at least has not yet been given its precise definition. This is the case, I would claim, with ḥālākā, used in the rabbinic sense of a legal ruling or decision about the proper conduct of an observant Jew in a particular situation. The reality is present abundantly in the Qumran documents, but the reality as yet lacks the precise label of ḥālākā. Here I would disagree with the view of Stephen Goranson, “Others and Intra-Jewish Polemic as Reflected in Qumran Texts,” in The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years (ed. Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam; 2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1998, 1999), 2:534–51, esp. 542. He holds that since “there is . . . no halakhah in Qumran texts [i.e., the word is not used in regard to the Qumranites’ own legal regulations] . . . to call Qumran legal texts halakhah is a distortion of history.” It would be a distortion of history to claim that the Qumranites used the noun ḥālākā to denote their own rules of conduct; but once one admits that they did not use the noun, it is no distortion to state that the reality denoted later on by the noun is widely attested at Qumran.


5 Jaffee, Torah in the Mouth, 43.

Quite rightly, therefore, in their editions of the Qumran texts, both James H. Charlesworth and Elisha Qimron, on the one hand, and Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, on the other, print the Hebrew text with the letter bêt without parentheses or brackets and then the letter hê in parentheses or brackets. Charlesworth and Qimron translate the disputed word as “by our walking”; García Martínez and Tigchelaar translate it as “inasmuch as we walk.” At least the latter translation seems to take the disputed form to be the qal infinitive construct of the verb. Indeed, in his vocalized text, Eduard Lohse simply reads 1QS 1:25 as belekêténâ (the preposition bê plus the qal infinitive construct of the verb plus the first personal plural suffix); he does not even consider the possibility of reading a form of hâlâkâ in this passage. In the end, the state of the manuscript leaves one uncertain. One possibility entertained by scholars like Preben Wernberg-Møller is that bhlktnw was the original reading and that it was subsequently corrected to read bllktnw. This may well be, but it leaves unanswered the more basic question of whether the supposed original bhlktnw was a scribal error or an intelligible and intended form. Jacob Licht suggests that the scribe who wrote 1QS first wrote either bklktnw or bhlktnw (only the top of the second consonant is visible in the manuscript) and then erased the second consonant (be it a hê or a kâp). Presumably, then, the second consonant was from the beginning a scribal error that the original scribe caught and corrected. If one should accept this hypothesis, then 1QS 1:25 would drop out of consideration as a text attesting the use of the noun hâlâkâ at Qumran.

The second occurrence, in 1QS 3:9, would seem, at first glance, to provide solid attestation of the noun. Both the Charlesworth and Qimron edition and the García Martínez and Tigchelaar edition read the key words as lhîkt tmîm; this would seem to be the preposition le ("to," “for”) plus the noun hâlâkâ in the construct state (hilkat, “walking,” i.e., “conduct,” “behavior”) plus tâmîm ("perfect," “perfectly,” “in perfection”). Charlesworth and Qimron render this “for walking perfectly,” while García Martínez and Tigchelaar render it “in order to walk with perfection.”

8 Eduard Lohse, Die Texte aus Qumran (2d ed.; Munich: Kösel, 1971).
10 Jacob Licht, mgylt hrkym: The Rule Scroll (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1965) 68. Prof. James C. VanderKam kindly made available to me his copy of this valuable work along with a summary of Licht’s position.
11 Such a process of scribal error followed by scribal correction would be anything but unique in the Qumran manuscripts. For a clear example, see 1QM 4:6, where a scribe, obviously wishing to say “when they go to battle,” wrote erroneously wblktm (or possibly wbbkltm), which was subsequently corrected by putting a dot above and below the incorrect kâp (or bêt), thus indicating that the true form to be read was wblktm.
12 Charlesworth and Qimron, Dead Sea Scrolls: Volume 1, 14–15; García Martínez and Tigchelaar, Dead Sea Scrolls, 1:74–75.
however, when one compares 1QS 3:9 with fragments of 1QS from Cave 4, specifically 4QS 2:5 (alias 4QpapS4, alias 4Q255, also identified by Charlesworth and Qimron as 4QS MS A, but in any case identified by both editions as coming from the Rule of the Community). Though badly damaged, frg. 2 of this Cave 4 manuscript clearly corresponds to 1QS 3:7–13 (although with some differences in wording), with line 5 of frg. 2 corresponding to the end of 1QS 3:9 and the beginning of 3:10 (almost word for word). However, instead of lhlkt tmym, found in 1QS 3:9, 4QS 2:5 reads lhlk tmym, which, as the Dictionary of Classical Hebrew suggests, might be read as the preposition lè with the piel infinitive construct of the verb (hallèk), a verb form that does not occur in the MT. Alternately, one could read hlk as the qal infinitive construct form hâlôk, which is rare in Biblical Hebrew (seven times in the MT).

Interestingly, in the DJD edition of frg. 2 of 4QS4, the editors, Philip S. Alexander and Geza Vermes, reject a suggestion made by some of the early commentators on 1QS, namely, that lhlkt in 1QS 3:9 should be read as the verbal noun hâlikâ (“going,” “procession,” “advance,” “caravan”). They state that, while hâlikâ is found rarely in Biblical Hebrew (a point that is perfectly true), it never occurs in Qumran Hebrew. Actually, the latter claim does not seem to be true, for hâlikâ is probably found in 4Q223–224 2 i 50, although the initial hé must be supplied. In any event, the word in 4Q223–224 is clearly spelled with a yod (hîlykt), which is not present in the lhlkt of 1QS 3:9. Alexander and Vermes are thus probably correct in refusing to read lhlkt as a form of hâlikâ. Likewise correct, in my opinion, is the suggestion of Alexander and Vermes that lhlkt in 1QS 3:9 represents either (1) a scribal error caused by the dittography of the taw in the following tmym or (2) an imperfect correction by a scribe who tried, without complete success, to change the less common form of lè + qal infinitive construct, namely, lahâlôk (a combination found four times in Biblical Hebrew) to the frequent biblical form lâleket. Both forms of the infinitive construct, lhlk and lhlkt, occur in Qumran Hebrew, but the latter predominates. However, Alexander and Vermes also allow that lhlk could be pointed in frg. 2 as the piel infinitive construct, a suggestion, as we have seen, that is also made by the Dictionary of Classical Hebrew. For our purposes, what is perhaps most striking is that, in their whole treatment, Alexander and Vermes never consider the possibility that the form in 1QS 3:9 might be the noun hâlâkâ.

The suggestion of Alexander and Vermes that lhlkt in 1QS 3:9 might represent an imperfect scribal correction in the direction of the common infinitive construct lâleket conjures up a further hypothesis, one that might explain both 1QS 1:25 and 1QS 3:9 in basically the same way. Both problematic forms might reflect the use of the letter hé as a...
mater lectionis for the vowel ā: bhlktñw (i.e., bālektēnū) in 1QS 1:25 and lhlt (i.e., lāleket) in 1QS 3:9. In this hypothesis, the scribe erased the superfluous hē in the first case but not in the second.

In sum, granted the textual problems connected with both passages from 1QS, and granted the alternate readings championed by some editors, the attestation of the noun hālākā in the pre-Mishnaic Hebrew of Qumran is not as clear as some might think. In my view, 1QS 3:9 is the best candidate for such attestation, but the parallel from Cave 4 and the possibility of hē used as a mater lectionis create doubts. Even if both texts from 1QS did contain the noun, it would have the general sense of “walking,” “conduct,” “behavior” (though certainly in a context dealing with behavior in accordance with or contrary to the Law), not the later rabbinic sense of a legal opinion or ruling on the proper way to act in a particular situation. It remains possible that this more specific rabbinic sense of hālākā was already in use in the first century B.C.E. or C.E. and that it is purely by accident that no written attestation of it has survived. In addition, we must remember that the decipherment of all the puzzles in the Dead Sea Scrolls is hardly completed. All that can be said at the moment is that (1) we have no textual evidence for the existence of the rabbinic sense of hālākā in the first century B.C.E. or C.E.; and (2) even the manuscript evidence for the existence of the noun hālākā at Qumran is at best debatable, at worst nonexistent. Needless to say, unless we engage in a strange form of nominalism, the absence of the noun in no way affects the presence of the reality. Still, it is wise to be aware of when we use labels anachronistically.

This clarification of the status of the noun hālākā at Qumran may also make a slight contribution to the debate over the meaning of the cryptic phrase “the seekers after smooth things” (dōrēšē (ha)hālāqôt), found in 1QH 2 (or, in the alternate enumeration of columns, 10):15, 32; 4QpNah 3–4 i 2, 7; ii 2, 4; iii 3, 6–7; 4Q163 (4QpIsa) 23 ii 10; cf. CD 1:18. While some critics, like Anthony J. Saldarini, think that the phrase refers to a broad coalition opposing Alexander Jannaeus (which included, but was not identical with, the Pharisees),17 many other distinguished scholars hold that the phrase refers disparagingly to the Pharisees.18 Indeed, Stephen Goranson claims that “the identification of Essenes, Pharisees, and Sadducees in the pesharim, especially 4QpNah, is one of the most assured results of Qumran historical research, though a few scholars of late neglect this result.”19 One reason sometimes put forward for the identification of the seekers with the Pharisees is the supposed play on words between hālāqôt and the hālākôt of the Pharisees, with obvious mocking intent.20

There are a number of problems with this reasoning: (1) A play on words, espe-

20 So, e.g., Goranson, “Others and Intra-Jewish Polemic,” 542–43. The remarks that follow concern only the supposed play on words between hālāqôt and hālākôt. I do not intend to engage the larger question of whether the “seekers after smooth things” should be identified with the Pharisees.
cially one with polemical force, must be understood by a reader if it is to have its intended effect. Therefore, claiming such a play on words in dôrêšê (ha)hâlâqût presupposes a relatively early and widespread knowledge and use of the noun hâlâkâ. The observations above call this presupposition into question. (2) The play on words seems to demand that the noun hâlâkâ was especially associated with the Pharisees; otherwise, why would a reader make the intended connection? Yet the only two possible cases of the noun in the Dead Sea Scrolls occur in the document most directly connected with the Qumran community’s own identity, the Rule of the Community. 1QS 1:25 refers to the conduct of candidates seeking membership in Qumran; the candidates confess the sinfulness of their former lives, a sinfulness that is attributed to “the sons of Israel” (line 23: bênê yiśrâ’êl) in general and not to any specific group within Israel. 1QS 3:9 refers in positive fashion to the person joining the community; he must walk “perfectly in all God’s ways” (lines 3–10: [if we accept Lohse’s correction] lâleket tāmûm bêkôl dârkê ‘êl), where Ilkt (or Ilhkt) reflects the favorable light in which Qumran sees the conduct of its own members. There is no evidence in the scrolls (or anywhere else in the pre-70 period) for the use of the noun in connection with any other special group within Judaism. (3) Our investigation above highlighted the fact that, if the noun hâlâkâ does occur at Qumran (and then only twice), the meaning of the noun is the general one of “walking,” “conduct,” “behavior,” not the later technical rabbinic sense. Hence it is difficult to see how there could be a mocking reference to the hâlâkôt of the Pharisees,\(^\text{21}\) since such a veiled reference would seem to demand taking hâlâqût in the later rabbinic sense—a usage not witnessed in any documents in the pre-70 period. Once again, examining our presuppositions may make us more modest in our claims.\(^\text{22}\)

John P. Meier
Meier.10@nd.edu
University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, IN 46556

\(^{21}\) Notice also that the claim that there is a play on words between hâlâqût and hâlâkôt demands as a presupposition that the noun hâlâkâ had already been used regularly in the plural—an idea for which there is absolutely no documentation in the pre-70 period.

\(^{22}\) A special word of thanks must go to my colleagues at the University of Notre Dame, Profs. Hindy Najman, Eugene C. Ulrich, and James C. VanderKam, who generously offered their counsel during the preparation of this essay.
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BOOK REVIEWS


The introduction to Biblical Hebrew by Ross is a prime example of an exercise book written for students to facilitate their understanding and learning of the basic principles of the language and to prepare them for advanced studies. The material is presented in fifty-four lessons subdivided into three principal parts and preceded by a short introduction into Semitic languages in general and the preservation of Biblical Hebrew in particular (pp. 11–16). Lessons 1–6 concentrate on the signs and sounds: consonants and vowels, shewa, dagesh, and quiescent letters, and introduce the use of article and inseparable prepositions (pp. 17–67). Lessons 7–40 deal with the morphology of noun, pronoun and pronominal suffix, regular and irregular verb along with proposals for a mechanical parsing method, and discuss elementary syntax (pp. 69–307). The lessons in parts 1 and 2 list some vocabulary categorized as verb, noun, or other form, and offer some exercises. Lessons 41–54 explore syntactical issues and the use of the Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia (pp. 309–422). The lessons in part 3 provide a detailed study of morphology and syntax of portions taken from Gen 2–4 and 12–15, concluded by a review of the grammar and syntax found in these texts with cross-references to the full discussion in parts 1 and 2. The last part of the book presents a number of study aids: summaries of lessons 1–54 (pp. 425–78), a Hebrew-English glossary (pp. 479–506), an English-Hebrew glossary (pp. 507–543), paradigms of the regular and irregular verbs (pp. 544–555), and two tables with the Masoretic accents. The book is complemented by a subject index (pp. 557–65).

The material is arranged in such a way that the book definitely serves the purpose laid out for the work. The presentation of the signs and sounds in lessons 1–6 may well be somewhat simplified and artificial, but as such quite helpful for beginning students. The introduction of dagesh forte as doubling a consonant that simultaneously closes the preceding syllable and opens the next and the distinction between vocal shewa and silent shewa indeed facilitate a student’s grasp of the morphology. The radical omission of medial shewa from the introductory parts of the book must from this perspective be
commended. Occasional references to medial shewa in the morphology (pp. 177, 227, 234) without any prior introduction of this phenomenon, however, can only come as a surprise for anyone who has worked his way carefully through the book and would better be abandoned. The inclusion of the article and to a lesser extent the inseparable prepositions in this part of the work, on the other hand, contributes to the clear organization of the materials in the book, as the use of the article indeed exemplifies the omission of dagesh forte in gutturals. This organization is, unfortunately, somewhat disturbed by the inclusion of the omission of dagesh forte in words beginning with y + shewa or m + shewa amidst words beginning with gutturals (p. 64).

The presentation of the morphology of noun, pronoun, and verb in lessons 7–40 likewise furthers the learning process. The extensive treatment of prepositions with pronominal suffixes in lessons 13 and 15 and the accusative sign with pronominal suffixes in lesson 16 may seem a little bit tiresome, but may indeed occupy the most obvious position in an exercise book in between the noun, pronoun, and adjective (lessons 7–9, 11), the construct state, and noun with pronominal suffixes (lesson 12 and 14) and the introduction to the regular verb: perfect (lesson 10), participle (lesson 16) and imperfect (lesson 17). Even relatively easy prose texts can hardly be read without knowledge of the prepositions and the accusative sign with pronominal suffixes. The use of the tenses in sequence, the volitional moods, the infinitives and the verb with pronominal suffixes in lessons 18–24 complete the presentation of the regular verb in qal before students are introduced to the other stems (lesson 26–31) and last but not least the verbs with gutturals and irregular verbs (lesson 32–40). The thematic grouping of the various items in this part of the book in addition to an extensive subject index makes it relatively easy for students to search the work for particular information.

The didactic principles behind the presentation of many grammatical details may nevertheless be questioned. The inclusion of rare or nonexistent forms in an introduction intended for beginning students may serve little purpose. The attempt to clarify the denominative meaning of the hiphil by listing he‘epîr, “he threw dust” (p. 214), is dubious in view of the fact that the verb ʿpr occurs only once in the Hebrew Bible in the piel. The need to list the unusual imperatives raš and ye·raš next to the regular imperative re·š (p. 255), as both occur only in the Hebrew Bible in the pausal forms raš (2x) and ye·rašaḥ (1x). The same may hold true for some information provided in the vocabulary. The infelicitous link suggested between Hebrew ʿeres, and English “earth” in the vocabulary may well be the result of misplaced enthusiasm on the part of the author (p. 41). The necessity to record the double gender of ‘ayin, “eye,” “well,” which is only used as a masculine noun in the meaning “engraved eye” (p. 96), and the double gender of yad, which is attested only once as a masculine noun in the Hebrew Bible (p. 124), is not immediately clear. Moreover, the classification of pîm as a plural of peh is simply wrong (p. 124), as the word pîm, occurring once in the Hebrew Bible (1 Sam 13:21), has long been recognized as a measurement. The exercise material may once in a while give occasion to raise one’s eyebrows as well. The clause “God is righteous and man is evil” (p. 75) may well be theologically dubious, but is infinitely better than “Who is righteous? The Lord is righteous. Who is evil? Adam is evil” (p. 62). But what to think of: “Eat with me all the days of your life and I will never forsake you” (p. 231). Finally, the fragments taken from the book of Psalms, which abound in the
exercises from lesson 29 onward, may more often than not be too difficult for beginning
students.

The treatment of several grammatical phenomena may likewise be criticized. The
subsumption of the dual for words with and without a feminine ending under the single
common dual -ayim, without any reference to the transformation that takes place in
words with the feminine ending -âh, does not contribute to a clear presentation of the
morphology (p. 71). The notion of a common dual may also have caused the omission of
the (not uncommon) construct state for dual nouns with a feminine ending in the
paradigm of the noun (p. 101). The distinction made between the long imperfect, the
short jussive, and the short preterite with consecutive waw may admittedly help stu-
dents to grasp the differences between these three tenses: that is, the waw consecutive
is a morphological element that marks the following “imperfect” as a preterite. Unfortu-
nately, the advantages gained by this approach are given up quite readily by the consis-
tent rendering of the waw consecutive preceding a preterite in translation with “and” in
parentheses (p. 137). Similar criticism may be voiced on the adherence to the traditional
distinction between perfect with waw consecutive and perfect with waw conjunctive by
means of the tone (pp. 138–39). It may a priori be very unlikely that such a major oppo-
sition as traditionally assumed for perfect with waw consecutive and perfect with waw
conjunctive could in any one language only be expressed in the first person singular and
the second person singular masculine of a limited number of regular verbs. The range of
meanings covered by perfect with waw consecutive obviates the need to supplement
imperfect, imperfect with waw consecutive, imperfect with waw conjunctive, perfect,
and perfect with waw consecutive with a perfect with waw conjunctive.

The presentation of syntactical issues in lessons 41–54 is more or less in accord-
ance with their occurrence in the portions from Gen 2–4, 12–15 selected for close
reading in this part of the book. A systematic treatment of Biblical Hebrew syntax can of
course not be entirely dependent upon the appearance of syntactical issues in selected
reading portions, but Ross does nevertheless succeed in adding many examples from
the texts in question. The numerous cross-references to morphology and syntax in the
concluding review of grammar and syntax help students to find their way in this part of
the book as well. Minor errors in the leading questions that are supposed to help stu-
dents with their close reading are a little unfortunate. The form yîrašeâkâ (not yîroškâ)
does not exhibit vowel reduction before a pronominal suffix, as yrâ is a verb with an A
class theme vowel (p. 367).

The introduction in lessons 41–54 to the use of the Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia
including the Masoretic notes, the critical apparatus, texts and versions, illustrates the
aim of the book to be more than an introductory grammar of Biblical Hebrew by con-
tributing to the development of exegetical and critical study of Scripture (p. 9). Unfortu-
nately, the information listed in these lessons is on more than one occasion inaccurate,
outdated, or wrong. The small  showing an open paragraph was not “originally used to
start a new line after an empty or incomplete line,” but rather indicates in late manu-
scripts that the line in question was originally left empty or incomplete (p. 311). Nowa-
days the recension of Theodotion is dated about 250 years earlier than the end of the
second century C.E. suggested by Ross (p. 332). The Codex of Leningrad is of course not
the earliest surviving copy, but merely the oldest complete copy of the Masoretic Text
The sigla ʕf and ʕl do not refer to Targum Jonathan to the Prophets, but specify two modern-day printed editions of the Targum based on the Codex Reuchlinianus by Paul de Lagarde (p. 379). Moreover, ʕl does not refer to a Targum to the Prophets, but to a Targum to the Hagiographa!

The summaries of the fifty-four lessons included in part 4 of the book are without a doubt the highlight of the study aids. The “lessons at a glance” are excellent abstracts presenting the essence of the lesson in question in less than one page. Cosmetic imperfections are the introduction of the term “gerund,” which was not mentioned before in the lesson on the infinitive construct (p. 446), and the inconsistent layout of the summary of the lesson on the pual, which, unlike the summaries of the lessons on niphal, piel, hitpael, hiphil, and hophal, begins with the meaning of the verbal stem in question (p. 452). Quite awkward, on the other hand, is the organization of the English-Hebrew glossary with the Hebrew in the lefthand column and the English equivalents arranged alphabetically in the righthand column.

Finally, the introduction to Biblical Hebrew presented by Ross has unfortunately not escaped the fate of errors and misprints suffered by many a first edition of a new Biblical Hebrew Grammar. It is nevertheless a shame to see an author rob himself of much of the credit he deserves for his commendable effort by an increasing number of errors, misprints, and mistakes in addition to numerous inaccuracies in the presentation of grammatical and syntactical phenomena, which could easily have been avoided had the manuscript in question been thoroughly proofread or used on a trial basis in classroom teaching by a couple of his colleagues in the field.

Jan A. Wagenaar, Utrecht University, Utrecht, 3572 RB Netherlands


Person addresses the unsettlingly wide array of conflicting options that encourage skepticism of past attempts to sort out discrete redactional layers in the Dtr history: “the redaction critical method has no basis for distinguishing the work of one from the other” (p. 147). Person offers “four new perspectives” (pp. 147–48) to overcome the impasse: (1) link text criticism with redaction criticism, (2) recognize a vigorous Deuteronomic activity in the postexilic period, (3) explore Deuteronomic activity by investigating scribal culture elsewhere in the ancient Near East, and (4) recognize the oral dimension of Deuteronomic activity. These four perspectives are the subjects of the first four chapters, respectively, and Person reaches the conclusion that “Deuteronomic literature could have evolved gradually over a long period of time, even if no systematic, intentional revisions were made” (p. 151). The remaining three chapters explore the interpretation of Deuteronomic texts in the Persian period and the Deuteronomic school’s relationship to other postexilic works.

Person abandons any distinction between the terms “Deuteronomic” and “Deuteronomistic” (pp. 6–7), opting to use the former. The Deuteronomic school “probably formed in Babylon among exiled scribes, who formerly served in the Jerusalem temple and palace and carried various texts into exile with them” (p. 152),
where they produced the first redaction of the Deuteronomic (Dtr) History. They “probably returned to Jerusalem and participated in the effort to rebuild the temple and its cult” (p. 123) during the governorship of Zerubbabel. With “the failure of Zerubbabel to re-establish the Davidic monarchy” (p. 123), “a certain level of disillusionment” set in, prompting skepticism toward “human institutions in general, including the temple cult,” and a turn instead “to a heightened eschatological perspective” (p. 135). This attitude would be seen as “increasingly defiant of the Persian empire,” which would dispatch Ezra “to lessen the authority of the Deuteronomic school” (p. 135). “The lack of the necessary support of the Jerusalem administration” (p. 149) and “the mission of Ezra probably led to the demise of the Deuteronomic school” (p. 123).

The Introduction briefly surveys the scholarship on the Dtr history and related matters. Chapter 1 assesses the lack of confidence one can place in most redactional analyses of the Dtr history, unless one couples this with text-critical controls: “The prevailing views of the Harvard and Göttingen schools fail methodologically in that they both rely solely on redaction criticism to distinguish one Deuteronomic redactor from another” (p. 24). “I am just as skeptical about the ability of source critics to define the limits of the sources for the Deuteronomic History as I am about the ability of redaction critics to discern redactional layers” (p. 25). A paragraph summarizes Person’s rejection (on linguistic and historiographical grounds) of the position held by those who date the Dtr history to the Persian or Hellenistic period (pp. 26–27).

Chapter 2 aims to refine the study of the redaction of the Dtr history by applying text-critical analysis. On the basis of his own work and the work of others, he argues that the “LXX for the Deuteronomic History . . . generally preserves an earlier stage of the redaction process . . . than the MT” (p. 42). Not everyone agrees with this position, and although he mentions a dissenter (S. McKenzie, p. 39), the dissenter’s arguments are not addressed. Person presents extensive passages where text criticism uncovers “post-LXX [i.e., its Vorlage] additions to the MT” (p. 48) of the Dtr history where Deuteronomic language is also present, supporting his conclusion that the Deuteronomic school was active in the postexilic period. The Chronicler’s use of a redaction “generally closer to LXX-Samuel-Kings than MT-Samuel-Kings” leads Person to conclude that “the later redaction had not yet occurred or . . . had not yet gained the same authority and popularity” (p. 41). But there are more options, such as both redactions being in existence at the same time and one being used simply because it was available to the Chronicler.

He affirms that the earliest redaction of the Dtr history “cannot be before the latest events which it describes—that is, the release of the exiled king Jehoiachin in 561 B.C.E.” (p. 40). But there could be earlier redactions to which this event is appended as a supplement (the position of the so-called Harvard school). Person discusses how the Deuteronomic school would be ideologically comfortable collaborating with the Persians. In reconstructing the fifth-century B.C.E. historical context, Person takes for granted the historical reality of the Megabyzus revolt (p. 56) without alerting readers to the many good reasons for doubting it.

Person acknowledges a law book in Jerusalem between Zerubbabel and Ezra which “most likely differed somewhat” from Ezra’s law book (p. 143). This hesitant speculation becomes more confident elsewhere: “Ezra’s mission [is] to impose a new law in Jerusalem” (p. 152), for he “brings ‘the law with him’” (p. 59), “reintroducing the ‘true’ law of Moses” (p. 73; cf. pp. 143–44). What is the evidence that allows Person to
move from a tentative and undefined difference between legal corpora to the claim that
“Ezra’s law book competed with a body of religious literature that already existed in
Jerusalem” (p. 58)? Where is Ezra portrayed as “imposing” or “bringing” or “(re)introdu-
cing” a new law of Moses/God? These are strong words that stand in stark contrast to
the task Person envisions for the Deuteronomic school, who returned to Jerusalem sim-
ply to preserve and codify already existing material (p. 58). He seems to be assuming an
argument elsewhere that is not explicitly made here.

Chapter 3 briefly surveys a few highlights regarding scribal schools in the ancient
Near East (a discussion centered on pp. 66–68 and based primarily on one book: J. G.
Gammie and L. G. Perdue, The Sage in Israel and the Ancient Near East [Winona Lake,
IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990]) in order to query what we know of the phenomenon in first-
millennium B.C.E. Judah, concluding cautiously that the material “suggests that schools
for the training of professional scribes existed in preexilic Judah and that these scribes
were not necessarily mere copyists” (p. 71). Person prefers to call the Egyptian Udjahor-
resnet a “scribe,” never identifying him by the term that Udjahorresnet prefers to
call himself (twelve times in his inscription), “chief physician.” It is true that Udjahorres-
net once identifies himself as a scribe in an extended list of his bureaucratic credentials,
but in other such listings in his inscription he fails to mention this. Because Ezra is, on
the contrary, most frequently identified as a scribe (less frequently as a priest), there is
on these grounds not the ready parallel with the two officials that Person repeatedly
makes. One should note that the summary statement on the top of p. 74 is more accu-
rate than the summary statement on p. 80, where he describes “the missions of the
scribes of Udjahoresnet [sic] and Ezra, who led groups of scribes to reintroduce reli-
gious texts” (p. 80). Neither Udjahoresnet nor Ezra is described as leading groups of
scribes, nor are they ever said to “reintroduce” religious texts. When Person actually
makes his argument on pp. 73–74, he notes with greater precision that Ezra “probably”
led other scribes back with him to Jerusalem, and that Udjahoresnet was part of
Darius I’s amalgamation of existing laws in Egypt, not new laws.

Scribal issues are further explored in light of Qumran material (which Person
seems to access only second-hand, e.g., pp. 74–75, nn. 37 and 39), enlisted to demon-
strate a conclusion long established (p. 78): scribes worked in two ways: (a) careful copy-
ing and (b) some intentional modifying. Person notes that “scribes who have reached a
higher status . . . had more latitude for scribal interventions and could even produce new
compositions” (p. 78; cf. pp. 80, 99, 151). No evidence is provided for this interesting
observation beyond his confidence that “there must have been some hierarchy among
the scribes” and his suspicion that “probably” lower-ranked scribes at Qumran were
assessed by their accuracy and were required to be more precise in their copying (p. 78;
cf. pp. 99, 150). Why would not higher-ranked scribes be similarly assessed, and indeed
held to a higher standard in order to qualify and maintain their status? Is there more
than intuition to argue for the greater freedom of higher-ranking scribes?

Chapter 4 explores the oral context of Israelite scribal culture: “the ancient
Israelite scribes were literate members of a primarily oral society. They undertook even
their literate activity . . . with an oral mindset” (p. 89) and “what they possibly under-
stood as a faithful copy of their Vorlagen we would understand as containing variants”
(p. 95). Recognition of an oral context allows for the presence of minor textual modifica-
tions and at times even “what we might consider as a significantly different text,” which
would nevertheless “not have been understood as ‘new’ redactions of ‘earlier’ works as long as the redactions were judged to be well within the limits of what the tradition understood as acceptable” (p. 151). The accumulation of variants over a long period of time means that “it is virtually impossible to distinguish one Deuteronomic redactor from another strictly on the basis of phraseology and themes,” and this explains “why there are so many tensions within Deuteronomic literature” (p. 100).

Chapter 5 focuses upon selected texts (Deut 30:1–14; Josh 1:1–11; Judg 17:6; 21:25; 2 Sam 7:1–17; 23:1-7; 1 Kgs 8; 2 Kgs 17; 25:27–30; Jer 11:1–17), whose date of composition—whether exilic or postexilic (and even post-Zerubbabel; see p. 104)—is peripheral to Person’s argument. What is instead crucial for Person is the way in which scribes in “the Deuteronomic school might have interpreted” (p. 117; or reinterpreted according to p. 123) these passages had they read and preserved them during the governorship of Zerubbabel. He concludes that the Deuteronomic school, anticipating God’s intervention in changing human hearts, would have encouraged cooperation with the Persian government during the time of Zerubbabel, such cooperation being perceived as a means to an end in seeing God’s work accomplished as the people are encouraged to strict adherence to the law.

Among the assumptions in addressing how the ancient Deuteronomists “could” (p. 121), “may” (p. 118), “might” (p. 117) interpret texts, Person affirms the bedrock conviction that “the Deuteronomic school would not only support the mission of Zerubbabel, but would also be eager to participate in it” (p. 105). Those with experience in dealing with both politics and scholars can confirm that it is an uphill battle to achieve assent to leadership, political programs, theological priorities, the sharing of power, and the utilization of resources among such individuals. To predict the political program of a group based on its theological commitments alone is a precarious enterprise: not all Jews who attend a particular synagogue support the same political candidates, nor do all Christians who attend a particular church vote for or against the same civic issues. The political and religious history of Israel and postexilic Judaism is one of factions, power struggles, armed confrontations, and assassinations, even among those with shared convictions and backgrounds. There may have been good reasons for scribes in the Deuteronomic tradition to support Zerubbabel, but there may have been factors that prompted other scribes even within the Deuteronomic tradition to disagree vehemently. We do not know. Person himself wisely and repeatedly notes that the Dtr history characteristically portrays human leaders as flawed (e.g., pp. 105, 115, 122), compromising the conviction that Zerubbabel was an obvious magnet for all in the Deuteronomist school.

Person speaks of the “obviously . . . suicidal” nature of rebellion against the Persian empire as a sufficient deterrent for the Deuteronomic school to even consider it as an option (p. 112). But the fact that there were repeated unsuccessful revolts against the Persian empire in the Mediterranean provinces indicates that the “obviously suicidal” option was chosen by many. Since the Dtr history is filled with stories of military endeavors, many of which are related as successful with divine help against disproportionate odds, the Deuteronomist school is not so obviously one to disavow military solutions. According to Person, “the Deuteronomistic school did not advocate armed rebellion against the militarily superior Persians” (p. 130), a position that Person suggests was defended in part by the story of David and Goliath. But since in this “obviously suicidal” encounter David actually fights when all other cowards do not, why could not Deuter-
onomists interpret this text (and many others relating military victories in the Dtr History) as an encouragement to armed conflict? How does Person know that the Deuteronomic school—or a part of it—did not interpret this passage, and the successful military ventures in the Dtr history, as a call to arms? Is it because the Deuteronomic school survived? But history is filled with accounts of failed revolts where the defeated ideologies continued to survive.

Chapter 6 makes the same assumptions and follows the same format as ch. 5, but shifts the time frame of the hypothetical interpretations to the period between the governorship of Zerubbabel and Ezra’s appearance. Passages discussed with possible reinterpretations by the Deuteronomic school are Deut 4:29–31; 30:1–14; Judg 3:1–6; 1 Sam 16–18; 1 Kgs 21:1–20; Jer 7:1–15; 30:1–3; 31:27–34, 38–40 (note that Deut 30:1–14 is discussed in both ch. 5 and ch. 6). Once again, for some texts, Person does not find it “difficult at all to understand the meaning this text would have for the Deuteronomic school in postexilic Judah” (p. 127). Although the stories of David, Saul, and Goliath for Person might have “possible” (p. 128) relevance for Zerubbabel’s non-Davidic successors who would be perceived as illegitimate, for this reader the presumed demise of Zerubbabel before the Persian juggernaut sounds more like Goliath defeating David. How does one referee what putative interpreters might have to say about such texts for times when we have only the barest access to political realities?

Chapter 7 investigates “how the Deuteronomic school may have related to” (p. 137) some postexilic texts (Haggai, Zechariah, Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah). Since the Deuteronomic school continued in the postexilic period, Person argues for and “expands the category of Deuteronomic literature” (p. 142) by finding traces of it in Haggai and Zechariah. At the same time, the books of Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles represent a different trajectory at odds with the Deuteronomic school, so much so that “the clash between these two scribal groups . . . eventually led to the demise of the Deuteronomic school and the rise of another scribal group in Judah” (p. 144). The one paragraph where this position is focused with respect to the book of Ezra (pp. 143–44) leaves unanswered why Ezra is portrayed in the book bearing his name as so supportive of Deuteronomic agendas.

In sum, Person’s skepticism regarding our ability to distinguish discrete redactional layers in the Dtr history will not be welcome to most researchers in this field. But his response is understandable in the light of the competing and mutually exclusive proposals that presently dominate the field. Person’s linking of text criticism with redaction criticism is a welcome emphasis, even if text-critical conclusions are not as univocal as Person proposes. Person’s recognition of Dtr activity in the postexilic period is defensible, but its demise with Ezra remains problematic. We simply do not know what happened in any interstices between Ezra and the Deuteronomic school, and since even the Chronicler preserves and reuses texts associated with the Dtr tradition, the Dtr school at some level is not defunct. We can be grateful that Person has given us cause to look forward to further forays into exploring Dtr activity by investigating scribal culture elsewhere in the ancient Near East, as well as the oral-literate symbiosis that Person develops.

The text proper is well written, but extensive parts of the notes and bibliography were not proofread (the Hebrew of p. 38 n.16 is inscrutable, for example). I will only note more significant corrections in the bibliography to minimize frustration for those
chasing down references using unforgiving computer searches: Pedersén (not Petersén); Entstehung (not Entstellung for Bogaert, Lohfink); Herrmann is not in BZAW but rather in BWANT 5. Folge, Heft 5—der ganzen Sammlung Heft 85; Levenson, JBL 1984 (not 1983); Sweeney, VT 47 (not 46); van der Kooij is in VTSup 66; Brueggemann, Kerygma (not Brueggeman, Keryma); Eerdmans (not Eerdemans, passim); Bogaert, trois (not trios); Baruch is A. Levine’s first name (sub Rofé), Craige (not Craigie).

Samuel A. Meier, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH 43210


At the 2001 annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, Emanuel Tov officially announced that the publication of the Dead Sea Scrolls was all but complete. By declaring that the initial stage of scholarship on the Qumran corpus had come to a close (although there are a few DJD volumes that, while close to completion, are not yet published), Tov highlighted the fact that the next stage of Qumran scholarship is well under way—the task of interpreting and assessing the literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls.

Three recent books from Brill’s Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah series (STDJ) provide an impression of contemporary Qumran scholarship (for a comprehensive listing of recent Qumran scholarship, see The Orion Center Bibliography of the Dead Sea Scrolls (1995–2000) [ed. A. Pinnick; STDJ 41; Leiden: Brill, 2001]). Tigchelaar’s To Increase Learning helps establish the fragmentary text of 4QInstruction, which was recently published. Murphy’s Wealth in the Dead Sea Scrolls illustrates the broad range of resources available for scholars of the Dead Sea Scrolls. This is also evident in All the Glory of Adam, by Crispin Fletcher-Louis, who surveys numerous Qumran and other Second Temple texts to argue that they attest similar anthropological ideas. All three books make important contributions to the study of the Dead Sea Scrolls, but in ways quite different from one another.

Tigchelaar’s To Increase Learning, a title borrowed from 4Q418 221 3, is devoted to the wisdom text 4QInstruction. Published in 1999 in DJD 34, 4QInstruction was the last lengthy Qumran document to be edited formally (John Strugnell and Daniel J. Harrington, Qumran Cave 4, XXIV: Sapiential Texts, Part 2. 4QInstruction (Mûsûr Lû Mîvin): 4Q415ff. With a re-edition of 1Q26 [DJD 34; Oxford: Clarendon, 1999]). This is because of the composition’s fragmentary nature, which makes establishing its text a formidable task. Tigchelaar’s new book is dedicated to this endeavor. To Increase Learning reminds us that, now that most of the Dead Sea Scrolls have been published in DJD, it is important not only to interpret the available literature but also to reassess and evaluate the editions of texts the DJD volumes provide.
To Increase Learning builds on DJD 34. Tigchelaar writes: “Even though I greatly admire the work put into this edition . . . the presentation of the text cannot be considered satisfactory in all respects” (p. 20). This assessment is not intended as a criticism of the editors of DJD 34, but rather as an acknowledgment of the fragmentary state of the text of 4QInstruction. There are several text-critical issues that remain topics of debate, such as the proper transcription of eroded fragments, the reconstruction of columns, the number of 4QInstruction manuscripts, and the text’s overall structure. They are issues about which qualified experts can disagree, and it is important that different scholars assess them (Torleif Elgvin has also written on text-critical aspects of 4QInstruction; see “An Analysis of 4QInstruction” [diss., Hebrew University, 1997], to be published as Wisdom and Apocalyptic in 4QInstruction [STD] 38; Leiden: Brill, forthcoming; see also his earlier views in “The Reconstruction of Sapiential Work A,” RevQ 15 [1995]: 559–80). Tigchelaar’s contributions to the understanding of the physical text of 4QInstruction are most welcome, and To Increase Learning will no doubt become an important companion piece to DJD 34.

After beginning with a concise history of the edition of the composition, Tigchelaar presents the text of 4QInstruction. All fragments of the composition are included in sequential order. Tigchelaar transcribes them all except for minor texts about which he agrees with the editors of DJD 34. The transcriptions are not accompanied by translations, although some key texts are translated in the second section of his book. Tigchelaar’s transcriptions are the product of careful and detailed analysis of the main resources available for the text of the composition—the PAM photographs, the Preliminary Concordance made by the original team of editors of the Dead Sea Scrolls in the 1950s, and the fragments themselves, preserved in the Rockefeller Museum in Jerusalem. One representative example of this comparative work is Tigchelaar’s version of 4Q418 55 10. According to DJD 34, the first portion of this line reads: wlp nτm ykhldî (“According to their knowledge they will receive honour”). Tigchelaar, however, transcribes the first visible traces as a nun, rather than pe and yod, leaving the word unreconstructed. This is also the reading given in the Preliminary Concordance. Tigchelaar writes that the editors’ transcription is “not at all compatible with the preserved traces” (p. 90). This may seem minor, but this difference bears on the question of the relationship between the Hodayot and 4QInstruction since 4Q418 55 10 is generally regarded as matching 1QH 18:28–29 verbatim. Tigchelaar acknowledges that these differences are often modest. He writes regarding the content of the first section of his book: “Many comments are marginal, but in other cases my alternative readings may further the study of the text” (p. 27). Even though the differences are often slight, it is useful to compare the text of 4QInstruction according to DJD 34 against Tigchelaar’s transcriptions.

There are instances where Tigchelaar proposes versions of 4QInstruction fragments that differ significantly from those of DJD 34. Tigchelaar offers new reconstructions of several lines based on original combinations of joins and overlaps. A representative example of the “new” texts of To Increase Learning is its version of 4Q416 1 (see also Tigchelaar, “Towards a Reconstruction of the Beginning of 4QInstruction (4Q416 Fragment 1 and Parallels),” in The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought [ed. Charlotte Hempel, Armin Lange, and Hermann Lichtenberger; BETL 159; Leuven: Peeters, 2002], 99–126). It is generally regarded as the opening of the composition because the fragment has an unusually wide right
Tigchelaar tentatively proposes that the small fragment 4Q418 238 should be placed before the beginning of 4Q416 1 (p. 183). This is an intriguing suggestion since the first visible word of 4QInstruction would then be maskîl. This reconstruction bears on the question of whether 4QInstruction is a product of the Qumran community. The sectarian War Scroll, for example, begins with the phrase l-maskîl, and this is often thought to be the case for the Community Rule (see also, e.g., 1QSb 1:1; 4Q403 1 i 30; 4Q511 2 i 1). Tigchelaar’s reconstruction, if granted, indicates that the beginning of 4QInstruction stressed its overall pedagogical intent to an extent previously unknown. This would make the opening of 4QInstruction similar to that of the book of Proverbs.

Tigchelaar’s composite texts are thought-provoking and plausible, but in general his readings should be treated as possible rather than conclusive. At times Tigchelaar himself makes this clear (p. 183). One must decide on a case-by-case basis if his joins and overlaps should be adopted when interpreting a given passage. This is a consequence of the inherent instability of the text of 4QInstruction.

The second half of To Increase Learning interprets various aspects of 4QInstruction. This section includes several helpful studies of key terms in the composition. This portion of the book also offers detailed analysis of key texts (4Q416 1; 4Q418 55; 4Q418 69 ii; 4Q418 81).

Tigchelaar also makes some positive contributions to the question of how 4QInstruction should be understood vis-à-vis the Community Rule and the Hodayot. Extending the work of T. Elgvin, Tigchelaar demonstrates that there are numerous similarities in terminology between 1QH 5 and 4Q417 1 i. Tigchelaar argues that these similarities suggest that 4QInstruction influenced the composition of 1QH 5–6 (p. 206). This assessment is sound and is supported by the fact that 4QInstruction is generally dated to the beginning of the second century B.C.E., whereas the Hodayot are often dated to the first century B.C.E. (for an overview of the dating of 4QInstruction, see Torleif Elgvin, “Priestly Sages? The Milieus of Origin of 4QMysteries and 4QInstruction,” in Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Sixth International Symposium of the Orion Center, 20–22 May 2001 [ed. Gregory Sterling and John J. Collins; forthcoming]).

Tigchelaar also evaluates striking parallels between 4QInstruction and the Treatise on the Two Spirits (1QS 3:13–4:26). Building on the work of Armin Lange, Tigchelaar thoroughly presents the vocabulary that these texts share. The phrases common to both texts include “the God of Knowledge” and “ways of truth.” Both texts also use the phrase “eternal joy” to describe the eschatological rewards of the righteous and “eternal pit” as the fate of the wicked. Tigchelaar observes that few of the phrases that the Treatise has in common with 4QInstruction are found in 1QS 3:18–4:14. The text’s prominent dualism of light and darkness is also found in this section. Tigchelaar posits that 1QS 3:18–4:14 represents an earlier redactional layer, with the rest of the Treatise added later (p. 202). He also argues that the authors responsible for the secondary stage of the Treatise “were identical to or belonged to the same group as the authors or editors” of 4QInstruction (p. 207). This thesis should be treated with caution. It is not clear that the Treatise falls into two separate layers of text. Tigchelaar himself acknowledges that, on the basis of 1QS 3:17–19, “one cannot completely isolate the two groups” (p. 202). And even if one were to grant this redactional scheme, it does not necessarily follow that a
secondary layer of the Treatise and 4QInstruction should be attributed to the same authors. The two texts have striking similarities of vocabulary and theme. They are both highly deterministic and have types of dualism (e.g., 4Q417 1 i 6–8; 4Q416 2 iii 14–15). Since 4QInstruction has no opposition between light and darkness, the dualism of the Treatise is more elaborate and more developed than that of 4QInstruction. Therefore, in terms of assessing their relationship, it is reasonable to argue that 4QInstruction helped shape the composition of the Treatise.

In the final chapter of To Increase Learning, Tigchelaar speculates on the social setting of 4QInstruction. He revisits a recent article he published on this text (“The Addressees of 4QInstruction,” in Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran: Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Oslo 1998 [ed. Daniel Falk et al.; STDJ 35; Leiden: Brill, 2000], 62–75). In that paper Tigchelaar argued that 4QInstruction was written to people at all levels of society and does not reflect a narrow school setting. He also claimed that the composition should not be understood as instruction given by a teacher to a student. The possibility that the word maskîl may come at the beginning of the work has led him to question his earlier view (p. 245). But he does not change his mind fully. He still argues, because the text has a diversity of addressees, that 4QInstruction was written for “a more general audience than only a special class of students” (p. 248). It is certainly true that 4QInstruction is devoted to a range of different addresses. The addressess included farmers (4Q418 103 ii), artisans (4Q418 81 15), and people without income (4Q417 2 i 19). Some advice is addressed to women (4Q415 2 ii 1-9). It does not necessarily follow from this diversity that the text does not envision “a special class of students.” The addressees of 4QInstruction, despite their differences in profession and social standing, all have elect status. They are told that they are in the lot of the angels and that they have been separated from that which God hates (4Q418 81 1–5). Even if one does not grant Tigchelaar’s composite text of 4Q416 1, it seems that the text as a whole was written for the instruction of a specific group with elect status. Nevertheless, To Increase Learning is a valuable contribution to the study of 4QInstruction because the book helps establish the composition’s fragmentary text.

Catherine Murphy’s Wealth in the Dead Sea Scrolls is a more theme-oriented project than that of Tigchelaar. The author incorporates a wide range of material. She examines all Qumran texts, archaeological evidence and documentary materials from the Dead Sea region, and second-hand testimony from Philo and Josephus that shed light on the economic practices and attitudes toward wealth exhibited by the sect at Qumran. Her book has eight appendices, the first two of which give transcriptions and translations of the many 1QS and CD texts that pertain to wealth. The author also includes five separate bibliographies, four lengthy indices, and ten plates. Murphy has written a massive book on a topic that had been waiting for treatment on this scale.

Taking a phrase from Clifford Geertz, Murphy offers a “thick description” of wealth and economic practices in the Qumran community (p. 24). The author’s success is to be attributed to her judicious and comprehensive treatment of individual texts and other data. An article of this length cannot do justice to all of her arguments.

After Murphy lays out the scope and methodology of the study in ch. 1, in ch. 2 she offers an extensive study of wealth in the Damascus Document. Her analysis incorporates the 4QD material that is now available in DJD 18 (Joseph M. Baumgarten,
Qumran Cave 4, XIII: The Damascus Document (4Q266–273) [DJD 18; Oxford: Clarendon, 1996]). Murphy examines twenty-six passages of the composition that pertain to wealth, which is understood not only as money but also as assets such as food or property (p. 34) (see also her “The Disposition of Wealth in the Damascus Document Tradition,” RevQ 19 [1999]: 83–129). The theme of wealth relates to core features of the document. For example, the author makes clear that wealth is an important boundary marker between the group and its enemies. This is evident, for example, in CD 19:15–24 (par 8:2–12), which states that those who “did not depart from the way of traitors” “strive mightily for wealth and vicious gain” (p. 36). Wealth is also mentioned in rules that legislate the avoidance of foreigners (CD 12:6–11) and apostates (4QDa 11:14–16) (pp. 87–93). This attitude leads Murphy to argue successfully that the second net of Belial (CD 4:14–18), which can be transcribed as hîn (“arrogance”) or hôn (“wealth”), refers to “a specific kind of arrogance, that associated with the abuse of wealth” (p. 40).

Murphy contends that the community did not avoid wealth but rather used it to promote its ideals. For example, the Many are required in CD 14:12–19 to donate two days’ wages per month to the needy “so that the house of the association will not be cut off from among them.” That this donation prevents the community from being “cut off,” she contends, means that the contribution helps the sect “survive as a just society until the advent of the messiah” (p. 83). Perhaps influenced by texts such as Isa 61, the eschatological advent of God was thought by the community to bring vindication to the poor and needy (p. 100). The disposition of wealth is understood as a way to actualize an eschatological ideal in the present. Such a view explains the large number of stipulations guiding the financial life of community members. For example, the first item in the penal codes of both CD and 1QS regards lying about money (14:20–21 and 6:24–25, respectively), a stipulation that presumes some form of private ownership (p. 53).

Wealth is also often mentioned in passages about sacred time (Sabbath and Jubilee legislation) and the sacrificial cult. CD 16:13–20, for example, requires that free-will offerings not be composed of wealth that has been acquired by force, reflecting, Murphy argues, a period of the community’s history in which it was critical of the temple cult while still participating in it (p. 62). Later the community advocated a complete break with the temple (p. 79). This is reflected in texts such as CD 6:11–7:1, which advocates separation from “evil wealth” and the “wealth of the temple” while affirming fidelity to the sect’s covenant. This is carried out through stipulations such as monthly donations for the poor (pp. 75–76). Thus “the Damascus covenanters usurped the priestly role of sanctifying wealth—through the collection and redistribution of offerings” (p. 78). The group’s devotion to its covenant and social justice is realized to a great extent in the Damascus Document’s stipulations on the proper handling of wealth.

The disposition of wealth is an important theme also of the Community Rule, the subject of ch. 3. Murphy makes full use of the 4QS texts (pp. 141–42) (see Philip S. Alexander and Geza Vermes, Qumran Cave 4, XIX: 4QSerekh Ha Yahad and Two Related Texts [DJD 26; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998]). There are fourteen passages of the document that mention wealth. Among the most important are 1QS 1:11–15 and 3:2–3, which show that “[t]he contribution of wealth [by group members] to the community is presented as a demonstration of covenant fidelity” (pp. 117–18). Both of these texts affirm that members shall give their “knowledge,” “strength,” and “wealth” to the com-
community. Murphy persuasively argues that this triad draws on the Shema, especially Deut 6:5, which calls for one to love the Lord with all of his or her heart, soul, and strength (p. 120). This interpretation is supported by the Deuteronomic character of 1QS, which begins with a covenant renewal ceremony (p. 128). The connection between wealth and covenant fidelity is expressed also in 1QS 5:1–4, which declares that group members have separated from the wicked “to become a community in Torah and in wealth” (p. 130). This attitude explains why the document stresses that members should not “mix” (రబ) their wealth with profligate group members (5:14–20; 7:24–25; 8:21–25) (pp. 130–34).

The Community Rule’s combination of language of purity with financial stipulations is clarified, Murphy points out, if one acknowledges that the document redefines the sacrificial system: “Instead of sacrifice, members bring their offerings to a common pool and subject their assets to communal discipline” (pp. 141–42). This attitude is evident in 1QS 9:3–9, which urges the sectarians to separate themselves to form “a holy house for Aaron” and “a holy of holies” so that their “perfection of behavior” will be “acceptable like a free-will offering.” The community’s practice is construed as an offering to God. The group has a “holy spirit” (3:7) that is maintained by a commitment to group unity (e.g., 6:2–3) and covenant fidelity, shaping all features of community life, including its disposition of wealth (p. 153).

Chapter 4 is devoted to 4QInstruction. Murphy does not consider the text to be a sectarian composition, because the document lacks clear sectarian terms such as the “Many” or “Teacher of Righteousness” (p. 163). She thus views the document as “pre-sectarian,” although she grants that it could be sectarian, and later in her book she treats the text as such, causing a degree of confusion (pp. 209, 421, 436).

Regardless of the provenance of 4QInstruction, its relatively large number of manuscripts (at least six) suggests that it was a popular work at Qumran, and it is often concerned with financial matters. Murphy stresses that the text situates its financial advice in a theological understanding of reality that highlights God’s dominion, evident in texts such as 4Q416 1 and 4Q417 1 i (p. 166). This viewpoint is clear also, Murphy contends, in the fact that the addressee’s elect status and his promised eschatological rewards are portrayed with economic terminology such as ﭑبيب (“reward”) and نذل (“inheritance”) (p. 167). Eschatological events are thus thought to rectify economic injustices in the present. This assessment is supported by the composition’s reminders to the addressee that he is poor (e.g., 4Q416 2 iii 8); it is thus financial advice designed for someone in a position of economic vulnerability (4Q417 2 i 17–21).

In ch. 5 Murphy thoroughly surveys other relevant material in the Qumran corpus. She examines well-known material such as the Rule of Blessings (1QSb) and the Hodayot, and recently published texts such as 4QRebukes Reported by the Overseer (4Q477). The author’s readings of individual texts are in general engaging and compelling. Her reading of the sectarian War Scroll, for example, is quite good. The text supports her contention that the community’s eschatology included a resolution of current economic problems (1QM 12:7–14) (p. 228). Murphy divides the literature into two separate categories, sectarian and non-sectarian. This classification is important since, she argues, the sectarian texts treated in this chapter confirm assessments reached in regard to 1QS and CD, such as the community’s use of Deut 6:5 in the expression of its covenant fidelity. The material considered nonsectarian does not reflect conclusions
reached about the sectarian material and thus acts as “a sort of control for our study of wealth at Qumran” (p. 287). The problem is that the classification of texts into these categories can at times seem quite arbitrary. For example, she includes 4QMen of the People Who Err (4Q306), a small fragment which alludes to Deut 6:5, in her sectarian category without any explanation for its placement in that grouping (p. 234). This is also the case with other texts, such as 4QWays of Righteousness (4Q420–21) and 11QMelchizedek (pp. 254, 257).

In chs. 6–8, Murphy turns to other sources for assessing the community’s disposition of wealth—archaeological evidence, documentary texts, and second-hand accounts of the Essenes from Josephus and Philo, respectively. These chapters are quite strong. The author supports the consensus view that the site and the scrolls reflect, to some extent, a single community. The archaeology of Qumran correlates well with Murphy’s assessments of the sectarians’ disposition of wealth that is evident from their literature (see also Jodi Magness, The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002]). The relatively small number of coins found at the site, for example, accords well with the view that their “economic network was largely characterized by barter between members rather than purchase and sale with outsiders,” a system consistent, in her view, with that laid out in CD 13:12–19 (pp. 58, 359). This may also be implied by the relatively small number of deeds and contracts found there. The simple and modest lifestyle of the sectarians is suggested also by the lack of fine ceramic ware at the site (p. 326). While the community tended to remain separate from the larger economy, there was some commercial interaction with nearby regions. This is clear, for example, from an ostrakon excavated in 1996 (KhQ 1), which was at first dubbed the “Yahad” Ostracon (Murphy, like many other scholars, does not believe that this ostracon attests the word yahad). It is a “draft of a deed of gift that was due to be executed in Jericho” (pp. 349, 383). Murphy compares the sectarian literature with contemporary documentary evidence to contend that the community appropriated and redefined prevailing economic practices. For example, at Qumran the oath, which is common in documentary formulary, is restricted to one’s entry to the sect. Murphy also makes a very interesting comparison between the role of commercial agents as evident in contemporary deeds and contracts and the Examiner (mëbaqqêr) and Overseer (pàqîd) of the rule books (p. 373).

Murphy concludes that her analysis of all relevant material demonstrates that the sectarian economy “was motivated by radical covenant fidelity and was modeled on the system of sanctification that the Temple was supposed to provide” (p. 455). She thus contends that the sectarian economy was designed as an alternative to the general economy while being to some extent patterned after it. She also concludes that current debates about private versus communal ownership of property by the sectarians presuppose a modern distinction between the two, whereas in the community goods were dedicated to God and the group as a whole, with the individual still retaining use of the wealth he contributed. Murphy also contributes to the question of social hierarchies within the sect by contending that there was a “hierarchy of practice” based on “insights and deeds in Torah rather than on wealth and power” (p. 454). Drawing all of these numerous strands together, Murphy paints a compelling portrait of the economic practices of the Qumran community: “the Qumran community not only idealized its economy or projected its ideal form into the eschatological future, but actually attempted to
realize the promised redemption and past covenant in the society they created” (p. 455). The Qumran community was composed of simple and humble people whose financial affairs were dictated by their devotion to God and each other.

All the Glory of Adam, by Crispin Fletcher-Louis, is a formidable volume that, like Murphy’s book, examines a large number of Second Temple texts. His engagement with this material is driven by two general claims: “the theology of ancient Judaism took for granted the belief that in its original, true, redeemed state humanity is divine (and/or angelic)” and “this belief pattern was conceptually and experientially inextricable from temple worship . . . because the true temple is a model of the universe which offers its entrants a transfer from earth to heaven, from humanity to divinity” (p. xii). Fletcher-Louis contends that an “angelomorphic anthropology” is pervasive in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Second Temple Judaism in general. Jews believed, the author argues, that some humans “lived an angelic life and possessed an angelic identity or status” (p. 4). He thus goes beyond the commonly accepted view that the sectarians at Qumran believed they enjoyed fellowship with the angels. They are not like angels or become angels after death but rather enjoy a heavenly form of humanity. He is quite aware that this contention may be difficult for readers to grasp. He attributes this difficulty to a dualistic paradigm that dominates scholarship (p. 2). This dualism posits a rigid separation between the realms of heaven and earth, making it impossible to imagine that a human’s earthly existence can be heavenly at the same time.

The first three chapters of the book concentrate on Second Temple texts aside from the Dead Sea Scrolls. Chapter 1 surveys “angelomorphism in late Second Temple Judaism.” He argues that Ben Sira 44:23–45:5 presents Moses as angelomorphic (p. 7). Malachi 2 and Jub. 31 likewise attest an angelomorphic priesthood (p. 13). The Greek Life of Adam and Eve demonstrates “the primeval state of the angelomorphic humanity” (p. 17) and Enoch is construed as “the heavenly High Priest” (p. 20). In ch. 2 Fletcher-Louis argues that Noah is depicted as angelomorphic and priestly. Chapter 3 concentrates on angelomorphic aspects of the priesthood. Fletcher-Louis stresses Ben Sira 50, because it, in his view, depicts the high priest Simon “as the Embodiment of God’s Glory” (p. 72).

Such interpretations come across as rather heavy-handed. Few people would describe the sanctity accorded to Simon by Ben Sira in such maximalist terms. It demands, for example, reading a proposed allusion in Ben Sira 50:7 to the “likeness of the Glory of the Lord” in Ezek 1:28 as literal proof of Simon’s angelomorphic status (p. 73). The claim that Noah is an angelomorphic priest relies on a priestly interpretation of his birth in 1 En. 106–7. This reading depends on his argument that Enoch was a high priest. This contention is based on Enoch’s role in the judgment against Asael, a figure he relates to the Azazel of Lev 16, and thus Yom Kippur (p. 40). However, even if one were to grant that Asael should be read as Azazel, it does not necessarily follow from this that Enoch was a high priest. Proceeding from his priestly construal of Noah’s birth, Fletcher-Louis then argues that the description of the miraculous birth of Cain in the Life of Adam and Eve demonstrates that he lost his priestly status, because the text never describes him in priestly terms (p. 52). It seems more sensible to deduce from this absence that he never was a priest.

The rest of the book is devoted to the Dead Sea Scrolls. In ch. 4 Fletcher-Louis reads many Qumran texts as depicting “humanity as the glory of God” (p. 91). The
author finds angelomorphic anthropology, for example, in the *Words of the Heavenly Luminaries* (4Q504, 506). A phrase from this text that is normally taken to mean that Israel was created “for the glory of God” should be understood as declaring that Israel is “to be” the glory of God (p. 94). This reading is not impossible. But the phrase could easily be read as an assertion of Israel’s chosen status, without appeal to “angelomorphism.” The author likewise sees divine anthropology in the claim of 4QInstruction that a “people of spirit” is made “according to the pattern of the angels” (p. 118). Fletcher-Louis also makes the intriguing suggestion that the phrase “all the glory of Adam” refers to the exalted, original state of humanity (p. 97). To stress this as an important Essene belief, he makes the creative but unpersuasive claim that Josephus’s statement that the Essenes believed that the soul returns to the “Isles of the Blessed” alludes to the view that the Qumran sectarians understood themselves as living in a new Eden (p. 131).

Chapter 5 is devoted to the depiction of Moses in 4Q374 and 4Q377. The author argues that the Qumran sect understood him to be divine and angelic. Chapter 6 emphasizes the “priestly angelomorphism” of the Dead Sea Scrolls. The author considers the high priest in 1QSa 4:24–28 to be angelomorphic since it says that he shall make God’s name glorious (p. 157). The *Songs of the Sage* refer to the “angels of His Glory” in 4Q511 35, a phrase that the author reads as meaning a human priesthood actualizing God’s glory (p. 166). He also makes the striking assertion that line 6 of this fragment says that the *maskil* is a “god causing fear,” dismissing the reasonable possibility that it says the *maskil* is one who fears God (p. 169). 4QInstruction’s 4Q418 81, the author claims, has the same priestly theology as Ben Sira 50 and *Jub.* 31. This fragment is addressed to the Aaronic priesthood because it tells one to glorify God and because of its allusion to Num 18:20, a Priestly text. Thus the “holy ones” of 4Q418 81 denotes the “laity of Israel” while the phrase *qds qdšym* (line 4) means “Aaron is ‘holy of holies’” (p. 179). However, Aaron is by no means a major figure in 4QInstruction and the author acknowledges that the work nowhere else distinguishes between priest and laity (p. 184). The composition’s muted interest in cultic affairs leads many scholars to conclude that it describes the addressee’s elect status in priestly terms, not that he is a priest. Fletcher-Louis also contends that Aaron is depicted as “God and the Angel of God” in 4QVisions of Amram (4Q543, 545) (p. 187). 4QAaron A (4Q541) also attests a heavenly high priest (p. 192) and the newly available 4Q468b describes the “solar High Priest” (p. 193). Heavenly human priests are also found in the *Prayer of Enosh* (4Q369), the *Self-Glorification Hymn* (4Q491c; 4Q427 7), and 11QMelchizedek. Many of the texts he examines are fragmentary and enigmatic, and the author’s novel interpretations should be considered. But the consistency with which Fletcher-Louis unveils heavenly human priests in Qumran texts comes across as a *Tendenz* that he brings to the material. This is perhaps most clear in his reading of 11QMelch (p. 217). The text never explicitly says Melchizedek is a human priest while it, like other texts (i.e., 2 *En.* 71; *Heb* 7), stresses his divine status.

Chapter 7 contends that numerous Qumran texts allude, often elliptically, to physical objects that help endow the high priest with divinity—the breastpiece and the Urim and Thummim. The importance of these objects for the Qumran sect is supported, he argues, by Josephus’s claim that the word “Essene” is derived from the Hebrew *ḥōšen*, “breastplate” (p. 249). Even if one were to grant such allusions to priestly objects, questions remain about the liturgy of a community that was estranged from the temple.
Later on the author speculates that the sectarians had their own temple but “given its sanctity we should not be surprised that they were careful not to leave any trace to twentieth century posterity” (p. 393). He concludes by arguing that they had a temple theology and “cultic cosmology” without having an actual sanctuary (p. 478).

The next four chapters concentrate on the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice. These chapters question Carol Newsom’s widely held view that the Songs depict angels carrying out a heavenly liturgy, which corresponds to an earthly one. Fletcher-Louis attempts to replace her “dualistic” interpretation with his angelomorphism (p. 255). He contends that the songs are “the fullest, most sustained expression” of the righteous enjoying a divine life (p. 391). This point is supported by the contention that terms such as ʾēlōhîm and ʾēlîm refer to human worshipers. He also argues that the composition is not only sectarian but “belongs to the foundational stages of the life of the community” (p. 394). Fletcher-Louis regards the text as a liturgical script, a “kind of touring mystery play” that is performed, as the Essene high priests wear their breastplates, resulting in a communal mystical experience that ritually actualizes the group’s divine anthropology (p. 393).

There are different ways to interpret the Songs. Despite the author’s reluctance to adopt a “dualistic” perspective that envisages a heavenly cult corresponding with an earthly one, it would explain why a human community has the text of a heavenly liturgy. On the other hand, interpreting terms such as ʾēlōhîm and ʾēlîm as referring to humans to the extent the author argues has no clear parallel.

The final chapter of the book is devoted to the War Scroll. As with other Qumran texts, Fletcher-Louis gives this work an angelomorphic interpretation. He grants that the text is “dualistic” in that it distinguishes between God and the Sons of Light over against Belial and the Sons of Darkness (p. 397). He cautions us, however, about making a dualistic distinction between heaven above and earth below. This dualism causes people to emphasize mistakenly the role of angels in the text. He argues that terms such as “gods” (ʾēlîm) and “holy ones” (qēdōšîm), which are universally taken to mean angels, actually refer to heavenly human priests.

Fletcher-Louis supports these assessments with an exegesis of cols. 10–19. These columns are “the ideological heart” of the text rather than cols. 2–9, which describe “the theatre of war” (p. 403). 1QM 10, in his view, demonstrates that Israel is “the one like God in all creation.” In lines 8–9 “the incomparability of God is set alongside the incomparability of Israel” (p. 405). This is clear, the author contends, from the juxtaposition of two questions—“Who is like you, O God of Israel” and “Who is like your people, Israel.” He argues that the latter question answers the first, thus claiming “that Israel’s singularity somehow participates in, or reflects, God’s peculiar majesty.” He also makes the contestable claim that these questions contain a coded reference to Michael (p. 410). This name literally means “who is like God,” and the author understands it not as referring to the archangel but as the “secret name” of Israel, since it is the one who is like God.

Fletcher-Louis also offers an innovative interpretation of Michael with regard to 1QM 13. Line 10 mentions a “prince of light” who is established to assist Israel. This enigmatic figure is normally taken to be the archangel Michael, who appears in 17:7. The author disputes this interpretation, arguing instead that it is a term for Israel’s divine humanity. This is evident from the question of 13:13—“Who is like you in strength, O God of Israel.” He contends that this is answered by the following phrase, which is normally translated as another question: “with the poor ones (is) your mighty
hand” (p. 452). As for 17:7, he argues that the phrase mšrt myq₉l, while it is normally understood as the “authority of Michael,” should be translated “the service of Michael” (p. 463). This opens up the possibility that this service is something rendered by the human priesthood at Yom Kippur. He grants that this is nowhere explicit in the text but argues that it is implied by the name Michael since it is a “secret name” for Israel. This reading, he acknowledges, cannot be fully proven but it is nevertheless endorsed because it avoids “a dualistic surrendering of the responsibility for the defeat of Israel’s enemies into the hands of one or more suprahuman angels” (p. 469). However, such a “dualistic surrendering” seems a more likely option than the author’s angelomorphic proposal since terms such as “holy angels,” “prince of light” (cf. 1QS 3:20), and “Michael” are easily read as referring to angels.

Fletcher-Louis finds angelomorphic anthropology “under virtually every stone” in the course of his examination of Second Temple literature (p. 476). He allows for little degree of difference or the analogical use of angelic terms. His distaste for the “dualistic” separation of heaven and earth unduly influences his interpretations. Nevertheless, it is important to examine the depiction of humans achieving divine or angelic status in Second Temple Judaism, and Fletcher-Louis offers a fresh, even if heavy-handed, approach. The author provides original interpretations of many Second Temple texts, and he is willing to reassess established views. All the Glory of Adam advances scholarship and promotes debate, even if one does not agree with it.

The new books by Tigchelaar, Murphy, and Fletcher-Louis illustrate the diversity of contemporary Qumran scholarship. Tigchelaar makes clear that traditional textual criticism still has an important role in the study of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Murphy and Fletcher-Louis offer theme-based studies that synthesize a wide range of material, and thus open new possibilities for research. With the Qumran corpus now almost entirely available, scholars have more opportunities then ever before to develop new insights and approaches to the Dead Sea Scrolls.

Matthew Goff, Georgia Southern University, Statesboro, GA 30460

**Book Reviews**


This slightly revised 1999 dissertation from the University of Aberdeen seeks to assess the extent of the historical and theological continuity between Jesus and Paul by means of a narrowly focused study on the meaning of “faith.” Yeung’s dialogue partner in this study is the exegetical tradition, represented by W. Wrede and R. Bultmann, that poses a sharp discontinuity between the faith advocated by Jesus and that of Paul. Yeung characterizes this perceived discontinuity in terms of the “miracle faith” assumed by Jesus, understood as the demand for belief in the miraculous powers of Jesus (often a precursor to Jesus’ miracles [e.g., Mark 2:5]), and the “kerygma/salvation” faith of Paul (i.e., belief in Jesus as Christ).

The first task in this revisionist project is to determine a firm point of contact between Jesus and Paul that explicitly engages the issue of faith. The author locates this
at 1 Cor 13:2b ("... but if I have all faith, so as to remove mountains, but have not love, I am nothing"), where Paul refers to Jesus tradition that also surfaces in Mark 11:23 (par. Matt 21:21) and Q (Luke 17:6; Matt 17:20). After an extensive analysis of both biblical and noncanonical parallels, Yeung concludes that this tradition regarding "mountain removal" is eschatological and refers specifically to the elimination of a "holy" mountain ("probably mount Zion"), indicating both judgment upon Israel and the possibility of new creation/restoration. Since, according to OT tradition, this "mountain removal" work is the prerogative of God, Yeung claims "Jesus is actually speaking of a faith that appropriates God’s will... to hurl the covenant mountain into the sea" (p. 44). Among the conclusions reached in this in-depth reading of Mark 11:23 are that: (a) Jesus claims to speak for God as the messiah of Israel, (b) Jesus pronounces judgment upon Israel, (c) God’s promises of restoration are restated, and (d) those who have faith in Jesus as Israel’s Christ will participate with him in some of the activities traditionally assigned to God at the eschaton. In drawing such conclusions, Yeung is able to mitigate the difference recovered by the radical exegetical tradition represented by Bultmann between the “miracle faith” of Jesus and the “kerygma faith” of Paul. In short, Yeung claims that both Jesus and Paul share an understanding of faith that includes elements of eschatological “miracle” and the kerygma that Jesus is Christ, a kerygma that judges institutional Judaism and finds it wanting, while it reconfigures the notion of who are the people of God. Note that in this eschatological reconstruction of Israel, the traditional covenantal boundaries between God and the chosen of God are both transgressed and completely redefined.

Once Yeung has established her “faith” connection between Jesus and Paul on the basis of her exegesis of 1 Cor 3:2, she is ready to move on to the heart of the project. This is the thesis that Hab 2:4—"The righteous will live by his faith" (RSV)—was interpreted in a messianic mode by Jesus so as to provide Paul with a precedent for Paul’s use of Hab 2:4 within his theology of justification. Since there is no direct evidence to substantiate this claim, Yeung builds on Otto Betz’s observation (Was wissen wir von Jesus? [Wuppertal: Brockhaus, 1991], 72) of certain similarities between Hab 2:4 and Jesus’ formulaic saying, “Your faith has saved/healed you,” found in the stories of the healing of the bleeding woman (Mark 5:34 par. Matt 9:22; Luke 8:48), Bartimaeus (Mark 10:52 par. Luke 18:42), the woman with the ointment (Luke 7:50), and the ten lepers (Luke 17:19). Betz’s understanding of Jesus’ interpretation of Hab 2:4 (to those Jesus healed) is paraphrased in the following terms (p. 216): “Your faith in me as God’s representative has given you healing and salvation. He will justify you to righteousness.” This analysis of Betz is bolstered by the observation that the Peshitta’s translation of this tradition reads, “Your faith has made you live." The Aramaic original of Jesus’ saying, Yeung entertains, may have approximated Hab 2:4 more closely than the Greek translation we have in the NT where σωζω (save/heal) rather than the Aramaic ḥayyā (live) appears.

In making the connection between Mark 5:34 (ἡ πίστις σου σεσῶκεν σε) and Hab 2:4, Yeung covers much territory. This includes an extensive analysis, in an approach that is reminiscent of classical history-of-religions work, of the healing traditions associated with the cult of Asclepius as well as wider Judaism. In this analysis, the old distinction between Greek epistemology (which conceived of a human being as dualistic, comprising a soul and a body) and Jewish anthropology (where the human is viewed as a holistic entity) is assumed as definitive. Thus it is claimed that in a Jewish context, one’s
health (or lack of it) was an indicator of the status of one’s relationship with God. Therefore, “healing and salvation refer to the same incident” (p. 131). When Jesus healed, he brought people a salvation that included the forgiveness of sins and the pronouncement of being ritually clean. Though it may well be that Jesus’ healings included subtexts of forgiveness and restoration to ritual purity, the positing of a difference in essence between Greek and Jewish anthropologies does little to explicate this complex tangle of referents. M. Hengel’s critique of such essentialist assumptions in *Judentum und Hellenismus*, which appeared in this same series almost thirty years ago, remains a challenge to such thinking.

What is distinctive about Yeung’s work is the way in which she teases out from a very limited textual pool a Jesus who not only demanded “faith in himself as the Messiah, but also claimed to impart ritual purity (on top of physical healing) to the outcast who came to him in faith” (p. 182). Given this recovery, the easy application to Paul is at hand. As she concludes:

> . . . in pronouncing ἥ pistis sou sesōken se Jesus offers salvation . . . that imparts purity to the ritually impure. His pronouncement reverberates in Paul’s “reckoning” language. Just as Jesus “pronounces” purity to the ritually impure and membership of the Kingdom of God to the non elect on the basis of their faith in his own person, Paul asserts that sinners are “reckoned” righteous on the basis of their faith in Jesus Christ’s atoning sacrifice. The correspondence between the two cannot be accidental but speaks for Paul’s dependence on Jesus. (p. 291)

The power of Yeung’s work lies in the great detail into which she goes to plumb the depths of what amounts to two tradition clusters (“Faith that Can Remove Mountains” and “Your Faith Has Healed/Saved You”). This is also the weakness of the work. Methodologically and rhetorically Yeung has placed many eggs in a very small basket. Although she is committed to a rigorous historical-critical method and goes to great lengths to comb the textual world of antiquity for appropriate comparative material, she is often forced into arguing for what is only a possible rather than a certain reading of the material under review. The desired hard evidence to support her interpretation of these texts is simply not available. One wonders at the wisdom of having so much riding on what, in effect, is a very fragile though intricate web of conjecture. Yet, even if one were to grant Yeung’s reconstructions of the nature of the continuity between Jesus and Paul, she is, oddly, largely silent on the theological significance of Jesus’ death for Paul. Paul reads the crucifixion as a crucial revelatory event that informs his understanding of both God and the purpose of the gospel. Indeed, it is difficult to imagine how Paul would understand the gospel of Christ uncrucified. This, it seems to me, remains the sticky wicket in Yeung’s project. Does a theology of the cross not shift the “faith” discussion into a new key as one moves from the historical Jesus to Paul? Is it not precisely the cross that becomes the stumbling block for Paul and other Jews as well as Gentiles (1 Cor 1:23)? When Yeung does deal with Jesus’ death in Paul, she subsumes it under the category of “miracle” after appropriately linking it with resurrection (p. 282). But is “miracle” the proper category of this revelatory event-complex for Paul? Further, Yeung implies that Paul demands faith in this miracle of death and resurrection (in analogy to Jesus’ demand for faith in his person), a miracle that is paraphrased in terms of “God’s
provision of forgiveness of sins through the atoning sacrifice of Jesus. . . .” Although Paul does not dispute this early Christian understanding of the significance of Jesus’ death, Paul does not speak much of “forgiveness” when he responds to the various issues that arise in the churches that look to him for theological guidance. So, “forgiveness” of sins may not be at the heart of Paul’s thinking. One could also question whether Paul thinks the gospel confronts one as an imperative (“Believe!”). In other words, the theological subtext that Yeung assumes to provide a measure of continuity between Jesus and Paul (i.e., forgiveness of sins is the result of one’s belief) appears to have wobbly legs when one reads Paul carefully.

The strength of this work is found not in the historical hypothesis it argues but in the very close and interesting readings of two important texts of early Christianity that the reader is invited to share with the author. Yeung goes to great lengths to track down the pertinent background materials, and the book is full of eclectic insights, including various philological observations. Given the focus of the book, many interesting connections are made between the Synoptic traditions and Paul’s theology. For instance, Yeung traces a tradition history regarding “Abraham’s children” from John the Baptist’s exhortation in Luke 3:8 (par. Matt 3:7) that “God is able from these stones to raise up children to Abraham” through Jesus (e.g., the healing of the centurion’s son in Matt 8:11, par. Luke 13:28) to Paul’s understanding of Abraham as the father of all those who have faith (e.g., Gal 3:16; Rom 4:16–17). Related to this study of the tradition’s redefinition of who Abraham’s children are is the commitment Yeung displays to think through issues of purity as they relate to the theology of both Jesus and Paul. Although I think her reliance on an essentialist argument (that presupposes a qualitative difference between the Greek and Hebrew “mind”) weakens her case, I share her sense that purity concerns are an important and poorly understood aspect of both Jesus’ and Paul’s distinct missions. It strikes me that Paul the apostle (as opposed to Paul the persecutor of the early messianic movement) and Jesus would have appreciated each other’s reasoning in this area of halakah.

The historical-critical and history-of-religions approaches that dominate this study, however, do let a few important perspectives on the nature of “faith” in the time of Jesus and Paul escape. Given the book’s focus on the concept of faith (pistis), it is odd that an exploration of how this notion functioned in ancient Greco-Roman rhetoric is missing. It has long been noted, for instance, that the word group sharing the pistiv-root was central to the rhetoric of patronage. This word group can refer to either the patron’s or the client’s particular responsibility in the patronal relationship. Thus pistis may indicate either the obligation accepted by the patron to provide some service or the trust placed in the patron by the client (who awaits the fulfillment of the obligation). If the patron–client relationship is to work, it demands the faithfulness of the patron and the trust of the client. Yeung barely touches on this issue in a preliminary footnote (p. 18 n. 73) when she dismisses the importance of the discussion that has sought to specify the meaning of the Pauline phrase pistis Christou (i.e., faith in Christ or the faithfulness of Christ; e.g., Gal 2:16; Phil 3:9; Rom 3:22) for her investigation. The salvific importance of Jesus’ faithfulness (as opposed to Adam’s disobedience), however, is perhaps not so easily swept aside in favor of the traditional understanding that the critical component in Paul’s soteriology is one’s belief in Jesus as Christ. A focus on the way the pistiv-word group functioned in reciprocal relationships of mutual benefit would have provided
Yeung with another way to structure very complex material. Without this perspective, a study of “faith” in antiquity seems incomplete.

Finally, I must stay that I remain perplexed by the characterization of “traditional” scholarship on Paul as “Lutheran” (p. 227). I understand that this has become an academic shorthand in the wake of the “new perspective” on Paul, but it strikes me as an unfortunate one. It reduces a complex history of interpretation on Pauline texts to a binary opposition that obscures as much as it clarifies. It may be time to find another way of constructing one’s own understanding of Paul and Second Temple Judaism than by misrepresenting a living hermeneutical tradition that is not only informed by particular theological constructs of Germany of the 1500s or 1930s, but is also very much engaged in the contemporary discussion regarding the proper interpretation of biblical texts, not least those that stem from Paul.

Erik M. Heen, The Lutheran Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, PA 19119


Paul and the New Perspective is expressly a sequel to the author’s much discussed The Origin of Paul’s Gospel (1981), which argued that the Damascus revelation of the exalted Christ as the “image of God” provided the origins of Paul’s Adam- and Wisdom-Christology, as well as his transformation soteriology. Paul’s visionary experience thus resulted in his gospel, in particular his doctrines of justification and reconciliation. Furthermore, according to Origin, by interpreting the revelation and the apostolic call in the light of Isa 6 and 49, Paul discovered the “mystery” that Israel had been “hardened” until the time of the fullness of the Gentiles (Rom 11:25–26). Although Origin preceded the “new perspective” on Paul, originally having been written as a Ph.D. thesis at the University of Manchester in 1977, when the new perspective did emerge, particularly James D. G. Dunn’s version that the Damascus revelation contained only Paul’s commission to go to the Gentiles and that Paul’s doctrine of justification was the result of later controversies regarding the social situation at Antioch, Kim’s thesis in Origin was quickly recognized as providing substantial opposition to this new perspective. Dunn, therefore, responded to Kim’s ideas in several articles promoting his own version of the new perspective.

Paul and the New Perspective rejoins the debate, offering five original essays and three reprints that defend, clarify, and supplement the original thesis in Origin. In these essays Kim retains his style of passionate exegesis, while reflecting a more careful recognition that Paul’s theology evinces a thoughtful process of development from its roots in the Damascus encounter: “the main features of Paul’s gospel took firm shape within the first few years, although they continued to be refined through his biblical reflection, his controversies with his opponents, and his other experiences in the mission fields, eventually reaching the state in which they are now found in his epistles” (p. 4). This greater regard for process is seen in Kim’s decision to speak now of a “double origin” for Paul’s gospel. He writes, “I would like to modify my fundamental thesis: Paul’s gospel originated from both the Damascus revelation and the Jesus tradition” (p. 296). This process
or “theological method” is described as having two additional sources: the OT and the early church kerygma. Kim realizes that Paul’s theological method needs far more explanation than he supplies in this one volume and, therefore, encourages others to study the interplay of these four features. However, Kim’s description of this fourfold process seems rather mechanical in my view, with Paul constructing a theology out of given elements as building blocks, and, for that reason, and to the degree that such a perception is accurate, it appears to be a rather unlikely description of the development of Paul’s thought. Such elements undoubtedly existed in Paul’s thinking, but they were merged with other elements from the wider Jewish and Greco-Roman world, including ideas and concepts from the literature of postbiblical Judaism and the various sociocultural contexts in the eastern Mediterranean world. Kim fails to appreciate these other important contributing sources. A narrative approach might have avoided this mechanistic tendency, bringing all elements together as a whole perspective or story, and might thereby have shown Paul in a more personal and realistic fashion, demonstrating his particular viewpoint from these elements (e.g., Richard Hays, *Faith of Jesus Christ* [1983; SBLDS 56; repr., Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002]).

Kim’s first essay, “Paul’s Conversion/Call, James D. G. Dunn, and the New Perspective on Paul,” is the longest in the book (pp. 1–84) and functions as an orientation for the whole. In it he argues that Dunn’s restriction of the Damascus event to Paul’s commission to go to the Gentiles cannot be sustained, but that four elements are outstanding—the revelation of the gospel of Jesus, the apostolic call to the Gentiles, endowment with the Holy Spirit, and the revelation of the mystery of Israel’s hardening. Kim states, “Against Dunn’s exclusive stress on Paul’s call to the gentile mission, I would conclude that not that element alone but the four elements combined together made a passionate apostle of Christ to the gentiles out of a Pharisee and ‘zealot’ for the law and Judaism” (p. 82). He shows that the first two elements were received immediately while the last two elements were received mediately by reflection on Isa 42 and Isa 6 and 49. The following chapters develop specific elements of this first chapter. In ch. 2 (“Justification by Grace through Faith in 1 Thessalonians”) Kim disputes Dunn’s claim that the doctrine of justification is absent from 1 Thessalonians and did not emerge until the Antiochean dispute. Following the arguments of Martin Hengel and Rainer Riesner, Kim argues that, although the terminology may be missing, the doctrine is present, the major evidence being Paul’s description of salvation as deliverance from the wrath of God at the last judgment (1:10; 5:9, 23), which necessarily implies forensic justification—acquittal at the last judgment. Additionally he finds support in Paul’s mention of Christ’s vicarious atoning death (4:14), the sovereignty of electing grace in salvation (5:9ff.), and the Christian life as directed by the Holy Spirit rather than the Torah (4:1–8).

Chapter 3 (“Isaiah 42 and Paul’s Call”) offers one of the more significant additions to the argument. Having previously argued that Paul interpreted the Damascus revelation by reflection on Isa 6 and 49, Kim now adds Isa 42 to the mix, finding that this chapter contains “most of the building materials for the ‘mystery’ of Rom 11:25–26” (p. 125). From Isa 42:1 it also becomes clear that Paul “was conscious of having been commissioned as an apostle with the endowment of the Holy Spirit” (p. 126; italics in original). The argument is problematic, however; in fact, the chapter illustrates two recurring problems throughout the book. First, Kim confidently identifies echoes and allusions to
OT texts in Paul's letters, but without explaining the criteria he uses to identify them. Since the publication of Origin there has been a significant “literary turn” in biblical studies, which has resulted in a much greater awareness of the relation of texts to other texts and a greater sensitivity toward the meaning and interpretation of intertexts (quotations, allusions, echoes) in Scripture (e.g., Richard Hays’s Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul [New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989]). Unfortunately, Kim shows no awareness of this development and his work suffers from its neglect, often rendering his conclusions weak and suspect. Second, Kim frequently claims to find echoes of the nontextual Damascus revelation (1 Cor 2:4–10; 2 Cor 1:21–22; 3:6–4:6; etc.), but his demonstration of these echoes is also rarely persuasive. One example will suffice: he states with regard to Rom 5:1–11, “Clearly, in describing generally the justification and reconciliation of the believers, Paul is reflecting on the experience of justification and reconciliation he himself received while on his way to Damascus as an ‘enemy’ of Christ/God” (p. 116). The evidence for this allusion is three or four “words that remind us of Paul’s Damascus conversion: ‘enemies,’ ‘reconciliation,’ ‘peace,’ and probably also ‘the ungodly.’” (p. 116). This evidence is far too slim for the confidence of his claim.

In ch. 4, “Paul, the Spirit, and the Law,” Kim attempts to discover the links that led from Paul’s awareness of his endowment with the Spirit to his antitheses of the spirit–law and spirit–flesh. He finds these links in Paul’s contemplation of Ezek 36–37 and Jer 31:31–34. In his view, the association between the law and sin and the flesh led Paul to the conclusion that it was impossible to keep the law perfectly. For Kim this conclusion supplies the hidden premise in the logic of Gal 3:10–14, where Paul states that a curse rests on “everyone who does not keep all the things written in the law” and then deduces that “those who are of the works of the law are under a curse.” Kim defends his traditional interpretation against the various new-perspective views of E. P. Sanders, Dunn, and N. T. Wright. In the fifth chapter (“Christ, the Image of God, and the Last Adam”), Kim engages in critical interaction with recent studies (esp. Alan Segal) of the throne theophany in Ezek 1, where God appears in human form. This interaction supports and strengthens his original thesis regarding the revelation of Christ as the image of God. The chapter also includes a significant correction of his earlier thesis. Whereas in Origin Kim had discounted the influence of the Son of Man tradition on Paul’s Christology, he now affirms that Jesus’ self-designation as the Son of Man, together with Dan 7 and Ps 8, was crucial in the development of that Christology. The significance of this correction is evident from Kim’s decision to include the Jesus tradition as a vital element in Paul’s theologizing and to augment his thesis to the degree that he now regards Paul’s gospel as having a double origin. “This new discovery has led me to have a glimpse into Paul’s theological method of developing new theological insights by using the Damascus revelation, the Jesus tradition, and the Scriptures (especially Gen 1 and 3; Pss 8 and 110; Dan 7) for mutual interpretation and confirmation” (p. 213).

Chapter 6 reprints “2 Corinthians 5:11–21 and the Origin of Paul’s Concept of Reconciliation” from NovT 1997, in which Kim builds on an earlier suggestion of O. Hofius that Paul’s teaching about reconciliation results from reflection on the fourth Servant Song of Dt-Isaiah (Isa 53) in the light of the Damascus revelation. Chapter 7 reprints “The ‘Mystery’ of Romans 11:25–26 Once More” from NTS 1997, in which Kim argues that Paul’s understanding of the “mystery,” which resulted from contemplation of the Damascus revelation in the light of Isa 6 and 49, must have been fully conceived
by the time he met with Peter during his first visit to Jerusalem in 34/35 (Gal 1:18). Chapter 8 ("The Jesus Tradition in Paul") reprints his "Jesus, Sayings of" from the Dictionary of Paul and His Letters (1993), in which Kim discusses over twenty-five certain or probable allusions to sayings of Jesus in Paul’s letters and over forty possible echoes. This chapter complements Kim’s earlier (ch. 5) discussion of the importance of the Jesus tradition and is crucial for his modified “double origin” thesis. Kim boldly concludes, “So in his christology and soteriology as well as in all the other areas of his theology, Paul echoes Jesus’ sayings. That is, Jesus’ teaching provides Paul with a basis for his theology as a whole” (p. 281; italics in original). The fact that Paul’s letters predate the Gospel sources for this material suggests that a narrative approach to the Jesus tradition would have been more appropriate than Kim’s intertextual approach of seeking echoes and allusions.

Despite the fact that it is a response to contemporary Pauline scholarship, Paul and the New Perspective comes across as slightly dated in regard to its methodology, evincing little awareness of important developments since the writing of Origin. As I have indicated above, attention to narrative and intertextuality, as well as the wider Greco-Roman and Jewish social contexts, might have strengthened this work. And, I hasten to add, Kim’s thesis is well worth strengthening, because I am persuaded that Paul’s experience of the Damascus revelation is at the heart of his gospel and his theology. Thus, these critical comments are not meant to cloud the value of the work. Paul and the New Perspective is an important addition to the growing body of literature critical of the new perspective on Paul. The heuristic value of Kim’s alternative perspective is great, and it is hoped that Kim (and others) will continue to clarify and strengthen it in future work.

Robert Keay, St Mary’s College, University of St Andrews KY16 9JU Scotland


Whereas only a few monographs on the epistle of James appeared in the sixties, seventies, and eighties, the situation has radically changed in the last decade. At the same time, the focus has shifted. Instead of the traditional concentration on 2:14–26 and on the comparison with Paul, the perspective has opened up considerably, and the individual theological significance of James and its themes has been more strongly recognized. In opposition to the classical, derogatory assessment of Martin Luther, the letter has therefore undergone a thorough rehabilitation most recently. In the present review, three newly published monographs documenting these new interests will be presented.

Subsequent to publishing his James and the Q Sayings of Jesus (JSNTSup 47;
Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991) and a number of articles, Patrick Hartin has contributed another monograph, *A Spirituality of Perfection*, in which he draws a comprehensive picture of his understanding of the epistle and simultaneously attempts to unfold the meaning of the letter for today (ch. 7: “On Reading James Today,” pp. 149–69). Hartin belongs to those scholars who emphasize the close connection of the epistle with the Jesus tradition. In this new monograph, his primary intention is portraying “how James’s concept of perfection operates as a unifying theme by giving meaning to the other themes developed throughout the letter” (p. 10). Additionally, Hartin postulates close resemblances between the letter and the Jesus tradition as it is handed down in the Gospel of Matthew, especially in the Matthean Sermon on the Mount.

Prior to analyzing the Jacobean concept of perfection, Hartin offers “An Overview of the Concept of Perfection in the Ancient World as a Background to the Letter of James” (ch. 2, pp. 17–39), in which he presents the concept of perfection in the classical Greek world, the Hebrew Scriptures and the Septuagint, Second Temple Judaism, and the NT. In his opinion, the OT concept of perfection serves as the main background for James’s perception. Hartin discerns three essential aspects here: (1) “the idea of wholeness, or completeness, whereby a being remains true to its original constitution” (p. 26); (2) wholehearted dedication to the Lord; and (3) obedience to the Torah.

As a second preliminary step to the analysis of the idea of perfection in James, Hartin gives attention to the nature or genre of this writing (ch. 3: “The Nature and Purpose of the Letter of James,” pp. 41–56). Hartin follows others in categorizing the epistle as a piece of wisdom literature, but defines the writing more precisely as “protreptic discourse,” which he distinguishes from paraenesis, for example, by its more strongly argumentative character in comparison with the paraenetic collection of loosely connected exhortations. With this last classification, Hartin joins the new *magnus consensus* of James scholarship, insofar as the Dibelian view of the epistle as a loose collection of sayings without any situational reference has generally been surmounted, although Hartin’s definitions of paraenesis and protreptic discourse are questionable. Moreover, since the wisdom classification of the epistle is a highly disputed matter in recent scholarship on the letter, an essential critical point is missed, because Hartin does not engage in intensive discussion with the opposing position.

Chapters 4 and 5 are the center of the monograph. In ch. 4 (“Faith Perfected through Works: A Context for the Moral Instructions in the Letter of James,” pp. 57–92) Hartin analyzes the concept of perfection in the epistle, which he regards as “exercising an ethical role in that it provides the perspective for, and the motivation behind, the various moral actions” (p. 60). Hartin organizes the thematic material under four headings: (1) call to perfection through enduring trials (1:2–4; 5:7–11); (2) wisdom as the horizon for attaining perfection (1:5–8; 1:17 [!]; 3:13–18; 4:4); (3) perfection and the law (1:25; 2:8); (4) faith perfected through works (2:22). He rightly emphasizes the sharp dichotomy between God and the “world” in the letter (4:4). “James calls for total allegiance to the Lord, an allegiance that keeps one unstained from the world” (p. 77). The law, which is to be identified with the biblical Torah, is called “perfect” (1:25) as a gift of God. Moreover, “observance of the Torah leads to the establishment of a wholehearted relationship with the Lord” (p. 81). The love command (2:8) “does not replace the Torah, but gives expression to the pulsating heart and direction of the Torah as God’s
will for God’s people” (p. 84). Hartin especially highlights the more communal rather than exclusively individualistic dimension of the ethos of James, the main focus of which is concern for the poor. Wisdom, defined as “a practical gift, enabling one to know how to act in specific situations” (p. 66), is necessary for treading the path of perfection.

Of some importance for the overall understanding is that Hartin reads the concept of perfection into James’s use of ἁπλοῦς in 1:18: Because “nothing that was imperfect could form part of that offering” (i.e., the offering of the first fruits, M.K.) (pp. 69ff.), James’s metaphorical use of the word implies, according to Hartin, that the Christians “too must be unblemished. They are perfect, not through anything of their own doing, but through God’s actions” (p. 70). On this basis, Hartin asserts that the OT “idea of wholeness or completeness, whereby a being remains true to its original constitution, is the fundamental understanding of the meaning of perfection in James” (p. 89).

The fact that Hartin reads wisdom into 1:17–18 so that it is the gift of wisdom that “brings about regeneration and rebirth” (p. 78) is of no less consequence. This kind of wisdom reading of 1:17ff. is not peculiar to Hartin. Nevertheless, it is rather unconvincing. The only link between 1:17 and wisdom is that James speaks of “wisdom from above” in 3:15, which calls ἀνωθεόν in 1:17 to mind. However, this only implies that wisdom is one of the many good gifts of God. When one of the gifts is exemplified in 1:18, it cannot simply be assumed that the same gift is meant as later in 3:13–18. Rather, proof can be given to the contrary: 1:18 speaks—as Hartin also presumes—of the rebirth of the Christians, that is, of conversion. According to 1:5, however, there are Christians who fully or at least partially lack wisdom. Wisdom is, therefore, not inscribed upon the birth certificates of Christians.

Chapter 5 supplements the previous analysis of the concept of perfection with observations on “Spirituality of Authentic Perfection” in James. Although unfolding his system of belief is not James’s concern, such a system is reflected in his ethical discourse. A peculiarity of the epistle is its theocentric rather than christocentric orientation. Moreover, Hartin discovers the motif of the imitation of God in the letter, although he has to admit that this is not directly stated. “God is one and single minded, which is contrasted to the person who is double-minded” (p. 100). Under the heading “faith in action,” Hartin describes different aspects of the spirituality found in the letter, such as a spirituality of integrity, of friendship with God, of prayer, a spirituality permeated by love of neighbor, and a spirituality of the poor, which Hartin strongly emphasizes. Especially here, the difference over against the world with its striving for status and wealth becomes strikingly apparent, and it is evident that “the spirituality of James is countercultural” (p. 127).

In ch. 6 (“Perfection in the Letter of James and the Sermon on the Mount,” pp. 129–47) Hartin tries to depict the close commonalities between the letter of James and the Sermon on the Mount in their understanding of perfection. From a historical perspective, Hartin concludes that the connections between both texts “point to the development of the traditions of early Christianity within a similar environment or milieu” (p. 145). Despite the affinity between the two texts, their fates have been extremely different: whereas the Sermon on the Mount always belonged to the basic texts of Christianity, the epistle of James was marginalized for the most part. Hartin’s intention is to correct this: “James should be valued alongside Matthew’s Sermon on the Mount as giv-
ing an insight into traditions of early Christianity that lie very close to the person of Jesus” (p. 147).

Without a doubt, Hartin’s interpretation represents an important contribution to recent James research. Nevertheless, there are some questionable points in addition to the one concerning wisdom mentioned earlier. It is striking that a detailed analysis of the use of τελείος in 3:2 is missing from ch. 4. This verse also cannot be easily accounted for in Hartin’s interpretation. According to it, Christians have at least had sins of the tongue attributed to them. A person would only be perfect, however, if he were not to stumble εν λόγῳ. This seems to suggest that perfection in James implies sinlessness and above all that James does not actually reckon with the existence of perfect Christians (by inference, being perfect is not the same as being just!). This can be further illustrated by another consideration. According to Hartin, wisdom is a prerequisite for being perfect. However, God does not give wisdom to the διψυχος, but only to those who ask him εν πιστεί, which comprises wholehearted dedication to God. The sequence in 1:4–8 thus implies that perfection is more than the wholehearted allegiance to God alone. The latter is certainly the fundament of James’s conception, but perfection itself means more, namely, fulfilling this attitude in a perfect way in daily life. Simultaneously, this means that perfection is rather an ideal that should spur the readers onwards. Nevertheless, these questions do not alter the fact that Hartin’s book is a profound enrichment for research on James.

David Hutchinson Edgar’s work is a revision of his doctoral thesis at the University of Dublin, completed in 1996, but not published until 2001. Its aim is to “re-examine the disputed question of the epistle’s setting within the social world of emergent Christianity” (p. 12). Methodologically, Edgar also joins the newer approaches in reading the epistle “as purposeful communication within, and appropriate to, a specific context” (p. 38). Following this line, he first analyzes the self-presentation of the author (ch. 2) and the presentation of the addressees (ch. 3). Chapter 2 contains two different elements. First, Edgar discusses the self-identification of the author as “slave of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ” (1:1) and as a teacher (3:1). The second aspect is the more decisive one, namely, the relation of the epistle of James to authoritative traditions. Edgar points to the Jewish conception of the order of the world as the fundament of the author’s worldview, but above all he stresses—similar to Hartin—the influence of Jesus traditions on the epistle. Edgar lists eighty (!) parallels that he classifies in three categories: (1) close verbal and conceptual correspondence; (2) some degree of verbal and conceptual correspondence, where contact between the epistle of James and the gospel traditions is likely; and (3) more distant verbal and/or conceptual resonances (pp. 65ff.).

The analysis of the addressees’ situation in ch. 3 is twofold again. First of all, Edgar calls attention to the designations of the addressees in the epistle as the “twelve tribes in the diaspora” (1:1), which he understands figuratively, as “brothers” (fifteen times), and, on the other hand, as “adulteresses” (4:4), “sinners” (4:8), and “double-minded” (1:8; 4:8). There is nothing really new in this part of Edgar’s study, and thus the more important section of ch. 3 is the analysis of the specific emphasis of James’s critique of the addressees, which Edgar develops on the basis of an exegesis of 2:5ff. The decisive moment for his overall hypothesis is that he reads the verses within the framework of
Gerd Theissen’s depiction of the Jesus movement. The “poor” are identified with the itinerant radicals who are totally dependent on and who totally trust in God, and the addressees are identified with the group of sympathizers, whereby Edgar stresses again and again that one must not presuppose a clear distinction between Christian and Jewish groups in the social environment of the epistle (for example, one should not “make a sharp differentiation” as to whether the assembly in 2:2–4 “should be seen as either Jewish or Christian” [p. 115]; the “good name” in 2:7 refers to God, not to Jesus [pp. 123–24]). In other words, Edgar not only postulates a strong influence of Jesus traditions; he also combines this with the assumption that the social constellation of the early Jesus movement builds the relevant social context of the epistle. On the basis of this principal presumption, Edgar identifies the poor stranger of 2:2–3 as one of the radical itinerant prophets, whereas the “goldfinger” is seen as a “(prospective) patron, who is attempting to gain the support of clients in the local community” (p. 119). The major problem diagnosed by the author of the epistle is that the sympathizers are not as sympathetic toward the itinerant radicals as they should be in his eyes (pp. 128, 133).

In chs. 4–6, Edgar develops a short exegesis of the letter (“Reading the Text”), which is divided according to his outline of the letter into three sections: 1:2–18 as “opening section”; 1:19–3:18; and 4:1–5:20. Edgar stresses two central aspects here: (1) the depiction of the addressees’ shortcomings accompanied by the exhortation to firm reliance on God; (2) “the depiction of God’s supreme status, authority and beneficence” (p. 137). Edgar interprets the text in an original way primarily when he implements his overall thesis referred to above. The needy in 2:15–16 are again brought into connection with the itinerant radicals, and in 3:1 he discovers “tensions between itinerant radicals, who perpetuated the proclamation of Jesus among local communities, and representatives of those communities” (p. 177). As Edgar concisely summarizes in his conclusion (ch. 7), this all results in the following perspective of the situation of the addressees: “Concretely symptomatic of the addressees’ shortcomings is their treatment of the radical itinerant members of the early Christian movement, who have been received with dishonour, refused material support and had their authority as teachers called into question” (p. 218).

Edgar prefers the option of pseudepigraphical authorship of the epistle, but views the letter, along with other interpreters in most recent James research, as independent of Paul. His decisive argument for locating the writing in the region of Syria-Palestine is, again, the alleged reference to the itinerant radicals of the Jesus movement (p. 225). Or conversely, the hypothesis of itinerant radicals is not substantiated by independent arguments for the letter’s localization; rather, it is employed as the initial argument for the localization. Finally, Edgar also makes a case for the writing of the epistle prior to 66 C.E. with this hypothesis.

The difficulties with Edgar’s overall thesis are apparent. Nowhere does the epistle explicitly restrict the ἐπιστροφὴ to itinerant radicals, nor does it offer any sort of clear indications pointing in this direction. In 2:15–16 as well as in 3:1, this hypothesis is simply forced upon the text, and nothing else can be maintained for 2:2ff. either. On the basis of his postulation of a strong influence of Jesus tradition in James, Edgar reads the social constellation of the Jesus movement into the letter. This, however, is jumping to a rash conclusion, for the Jesus tradition was also transmitted and preserved in other social constellations in early Christianity. Indeed, one must even go a step further and put
Edgar’s traditio-historical hypothesis in question. I give only a few examples: Edgar puts the “parallels” between Jas 1:2 and Matt 5:11ff./Luke 6:22ff. and those between Jas 4:10 and Matt 23:12/Luke 14:11 into the highest category. But the closest parallels to Jas 1:2ff. are 1 Pet 1:6ff. and Rom 5:3–5. James 4:6–10 corresponds most closely to 1 Pet 5:5c–9. It is feasible that the Jesus logion serves as a basis in this last case. Nevertheless, James is dependent on the reception of this logion in an early Christian piece of tradition that is also common to 1 Peter, and not directly upon the Jesus logion in Matthew and/or Luke.

In summary, the impression remains that Edgar has formulated an interesting train of thought that is built, however, on shallow ground. Further, another critical remark must be made: Unfortunately, Edgar has not adequately taken into consideration literature that appeared in the five years between his dissertation and its subsequent publication; even important monographs are missing from the bibliography.

Matt Jackson-McCabe’s *Logos and Law in the Letter of James* primarily focuses on the interpretation of the ἐμφυτὸς λόγος in 1:21. In current James research, the determination of the relationship between λόγος in 1:18, 21, 22 and νόμος in 1:25 still remains a point of contention. Are both entities identical, or is the law a part or aspect of the word? Jackson-McCabe’s approach belongs to the first option, but he modifies it with the assumption—and this is the essential assertion of his book—that the Stoic conception of “natural law” serves as the background for the phrase “implanted word” in James.

After a short introduction, Jackson-McCabe first gives an overview of the interpretation of the phrase “implanted logos” in the exegesis of James (pp. 7–27), in which he briefly touches on the traditional objections to the understanding of the logos as human reason in 1:21: Contrary to the gospel, human reason cannot be heard and done, and it does not save souls. Moreover, the phrase δέχεσθαι τὸν λόγον occurs several times in other early Christian writings, and in 1:18 the author refers to rebirth through the “word of truth,” which designates the gospel in other early Christian literature (e.g., Col 1:5). A significant Stoic influence was only admitted when the epistle was viewed as a Jewish writing (A. Meyer), or at least 1:17–21 as a pre-Christian tradition (Boismard). One of Jackson-McCabe’s basic credos is that a fusion of different traditio-historical strains cannot be excluded as an option if the work is a Christian composition: that is, viewing the epistle as a Christian letter does not automatically mean that logos must necessarily be used in the sense of “gospel.”

In ch. 2, “Law as Implanted Logos: Cicero and the Stoics on Natural Law” (pp. 29–86), Jackson-McCabe depicts the interrelationship of the following ideas: the inchoate logos with which humans are born; the notion of “implanted preconceptions” (ἐμφυτοί προλήψεις), that is, “the human animal’s innate disposition to form concepts like ‘good’ and ‘bad’” (p. 26); and the theory of natural law, which Jackson-McCabe postulates as the traditional background of the phrase in Jas 1:21. Chapter 3, “The Law of Moses, the Teaching of Jesus and Natural Law” (pp. 87–133), complements this by pursuing the creative reception of Stoic theory in Jewish (Philo, 4 Maccabees) and Christian literature (Apostolic Constitutions, Second Apology of Justin Martyr, Methodius), where the Stoic ideas are fused with conceptions alien to them, especially with the notion that the natural law finds its written expression in biblical law. Jackson-McCabe, however, cannot add new references for the phrase ἐμφυτος λόγος in ancient sources. Therefore, results still show that ἐμφυτος is used in the context of Stoic theory (e.g., ἐμφυτον
ēννοιαν in Epictetus, *Diatr.* 2.11.3) and in its reception in the (later) Christian sources named above (but not in Philo and 4 Maccabees!), but the only possible exact evidence for the phrase in question remains Cicero’s definition of law as *ratio summa insita in natura* (*Leg.* 1.6.18), which probably corresponds to the Greek ἐμφύτως λόγος.

With ch. 4, “The Implanted Logos and the Law of Freedom” (pp. 135–92), Jackson-McCabe turns to the analysis of the relation of the ἐμφύτως λόγος and the perfect law of freedom in the epistle of James. According to Jackson-McCabe, the terms “implanted logos” and “law” are functional equivalents and James’s use of these terms “derives from the Stoic identification of human reason as a divinely given natural law” (p. 154). James thereby depicts the same differences with the Stoic conception as the texts analyzed in ch. 3: though internal to the human individual, the logos has an external form as well, and against this background it can be understood that the logos can be “heard” and “done” or “received.” As far as the content of the law is concerned, Jackson-McCabe finds a subtle critique of the use of the love command as the summary of the law in 2:8–11, which heralds his hypothesis of an anti-Pauline thrust in the epistle (for this see M. Ludwig, *Wort als Gesetz* [Frankfurt am M., 1994], 171–75, 185–87). The statements in 2:8 and 2:9 are read as “positing simultaneous rather than formally opposite conditions” (p. 172), and this means that 2:8 should be understood as an ironical statement alongside 2:19 (reflection of the Synoptic double love command). The love command is, thus, only “one command alongside others within a larger body of law” (p. 176), which basically is to be identified with the Torah (not a new Christian law), although the question must finally remain open whether the legislation concerning the cult, purity, diet, the calendar, and circumcision is of any relevance for the author (pp. 177–85). Soteriologically, this means that keeping the (double) love command is not sufficient (pp. 175, 187).

In ch. 5, “Logos and Desire” (pp. 193–239), Jackson-McCabe analyzes the antithetical relationship between logos and desire. For Jackson-McCabe’s overall interpretation it is crucial that on the basis of his postulation of a Stoic background in 1:21 the implantation of the logos is linked to creation. In this context, he simultaneously rejects the widespread interpretation of 1:18 as referring to conversion: Birth by the “word of truth” refers to the creation of humankind in his opinion; 1:18b defines the exalted position of humanity in creation. This is supported by an unconventional interpretation of Jas 1:17. Jackson-McCabe reads the notion of heavenly bodies wandering off their prescribed paths into the phrase that speaks of God as “father of lights.” He thereby discovers an analogy between heavenly lights and humankind: “Just as one cannot infer from God’s creation of the ‘lights’ that he is responsible when they deviate from their prescribed courses, so too, one cannot infer from God’s creation of humanity that he is responsible when they ‘wander’ from the logos he gave to them as their law” (p. 238, cf. p. 216). Moreover, Jackson-McCabe also explains the stumbling ἐν λόγῳ in 3:2 on the basis “of the intimate relationship between speech and the human logos posited by the Stoics” (p. 228). In the conclusion (pp. 241–53) he summarizes his findings and, finally, argues for an anti-Pauline thrust of the epistle: “The author of James writes with an eye to undermining Paul’s position on the significance of the Torah” (p. 250).

Jackson-McCabe has enriched the discussion of the understanding of the “word,” which is important for the general understanding of James, with a new and interesting variant. Especially important in this context is the case he makes for not rashly isolating
different strands of traditions. His interpretation of James, however, does not bear critical scrutiny. Contrary to Jackson-McCabe’s assertion (see, e.g., p.133), the phrase ἐμφυτος λόγος can hardly be proven to be a terminus technicus on the basis of seldom, widely strewn, and—in addition—inexact references. Furthermore, Jackson-McCabe does not discuss other usages of ἐμφυτος at all (Philo, for example, uses this word only in the context of vices). And a passage such as Barn. 9.9 (ὁ τὴν ἐμφυτον δορεάν τῆς διδαχῆς αὐτοῦ θέμενος) plays no part in Jackson-McCabe’s analysis.

However, the fact that Jackson-McCabe does not succeed in invalidating the traditional objections to the Stoic interpretation of 1:21 is more important. That the logos as innate human reason has an external form in the “law of freedom” is hardly a sufficient explanation for the phrase “to receive the logos,” or, respectively, “to hear and do the logos.” To use the terminology of Apos. Con. 8.9.8, the νόμος γραπτός is precisely not what is to be received in James, but rather the ἐμφυτος λόγος itself. Most of all, Jackson-McCabe passes over the traditio-historical roots in the early Christian tradition of 1:18 and 21, which are central to his interpretation. The two-part scheme in 1:21, in which the negative part is formulated with ἀποτίθεσται, has a number of early Christian parallels that belong to the context of postconversional instruction (Rom 13:12–14; Eph 4:22–24; Col 3:8–10; 1 Pet 2:1–2), and these are the only occurrences of this scheme. Moreover, Jas 1:18 corresponds closely to 1 Pet 1:23–25 (Jackson-McCabe dismisses it too quickly; see p. 191). This strongly suggests that James has taken over the entire sequence in 1:18, 21 from an early Christian tradition, which interpreted conversion as a (re-)birth through the word of the gospel leading the convert to the truth, and combined this with the admonition to follow this word from now on. In this context, ἐμφυτος is to be read as a reference back to the birth metaphor in 1:18. And the law in Jas 1:25 is not identical with the word or its external form, but rather is one side or aspect of it.

Furthermore, Jackson-McCabe’s interpretation of the “lights” in Jas 1:17 is hazardous at best. There is no hint at all in the text that James intended to create an analogy between the “lights” and the human race. Finally, 1:18b does not comment on the exalted position of humans in creation, but the ἀπαρχή is the part of God’s creatures set apart for him. Philo (Spec. 4.180) uses the word with reference to the chosen nation (cf. Rev 14:4; 1 Clem. 29.3), and in following this traditional line Jas 1:18 refers to those who became God’s possession by converting to the Christian faith in a similar manner.

With their—to some extent significantly—different perspectives on James, the three monographs presented above display a facet of the plurality of approaches in most recent research on James. Despite the points of criticism mentioned here, they represent meaningful and innovative contributions to the ongoing discussion of the historical context and theological orientation of an early Christian letter much neglected in earlier decades.

Matthias Konradt, University of Bonn, Efeuweg 12, 44869 Bochum, Germany
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