

SVENSK EXEGETISK ÅRSBOK
82



På uppdrag av Svenska Exegetiska Sällskapet
utgiven av Göran Eidevall

Uppsala 2017

Utgivare och redaktör: Göran Eidevall (goran.eidevall@teol.uu.se)
Redaktionssekreterare: David Willgren (david.willgren@altutbildning.se)
Recensionsansvarig: Rosmari Lillas-Schuil (rosmari.lillas@gu.se)

Redaktionskommitté:

Göran Eidevall (goran.eidevall@teol.uu.se)
Rikard Roitto (rikard.roitto@ths.se)
Blaženka Scheuer (blazenka.scheuer@ctr.lu.se)
Cecilia Wassén (cecilia.wassen@teol.uu.se)

Prenumerationspriser:

Sverige: SEK 200 (studenter SEK 100)

Övriga världen: SEK 300

Frakt tillkommer med SEK 50. För medlemmar i SES är frakten kostnadsfri.

SEÅ beställs hos Svenska Exegetiska Sällskapet via hemsidan eller postadress ovan, eller hos Bokrondellen (www.bokrondellen.se). Anvisningar för medverkande återfinns på hemsidan eller erhålls från redaktionssekreteraren (david.willgren@altutbildning.se). Manusstopp är 1 mars.

Tidskriften är indexerad i Libris databas (www.kb.se/libris/), samt ATLA Religion Database®, publicerad av the American Theological Library Association, 300 S. Wacker Dr., Suite 2100, Chicago, IL 60606; e-mail: atla@atla.com; webb: www.atla.com.

Omslagsbild: Del av 11Q19, ”Tempelrullen”, daterad till mellan första århundradet f.v.t och första århundradet v.t.

Svenska Exegetiska Sällskapet
c/o Teologiska institutionen
Box 511, S-751 20 UPPSALA, Sverige
www.exegetiskasallskapet.se



ISSN 1100-2298

Uppsala 2016

Tryck: Bulls Graphics, Halmstad

Innehåll

EXEGETISKA DAGEN 2016

<i>Eidevall, Göran</i> , 80 år senare: Exegetiska sällskapet, <i>SEÅ</i> och de exegetiska dagarna – tal vid exegetiska sällskapets 80-årsjubileum	1
<i>Crawford, Sidnie White</i> , Textual Growth and the Activity of Scribes.....	6
<i>Laato, Antti</i> , Rewriting Israel's History in the Apocalyptic Context: Animal Apocalypse in First Enoch	28
<i>Docherty, Susan</i> , Why So Much Talk? Direct Speech as a Literary and Exegetical Device in Rewritten Bible with Special Reference to Pseudo-Philo's <i>Biblical Antiquities</i>	52

ARTIKLAR

<i>Spjut, Petter</i> , Polemisk etikett eller saklig beteckning? En studie av svenskspråkiga opinionsbildares användning av termen "gnosticism" och dess implikationer för bibelvetenskaplig och kyrkohistorisk forskning	76
<i>Hedlund, Simon</i> , Who Are the ἀρσενοκόϊται, and Why Does Paul Condemn Them (1 Cor 6:9)?	116
<i>Kelhoffer, James A.</i> , Simplistic Presentations of Biblical Authority and Christian Origins in the Service of Anti-Catholic Dogma: A Response to Anders Gerdmar	154

REPLIKER

<i>Gerdmar, Anders</i> , The End of Innocence: On Religious and Academic Freedom and Intersubjectivity in the Exegetical Craft – A Response to James Kelhoffer	179
<i>Kelhoffer, James A.</i> , A Diverse Academy Recognizes No Boundaries for Critical Inquiry and Debate: A Rejoinder to Anders Gerdmar	210

RECENSIONER

Aichele, George, <i>Simulating Jesus: Reality Effects in the Gospels</i> (Joel Kuhlin)	223
Amos, Roger, <i>Hypocrites or Heroes? The Paradoxical Portrayal of the Pharisees in the New Testament</i> (Tobias Ålöw)	226
Collins, John J., <i>Encounters with Biblical Theology</i> (Stig Norin)	230
Dochhorn Jan, Susanne Rudnig-Zelt, and Benjamin Wold (eds.), <i>Das Böse, der Teufel und Dämonen – Evil, the Devil, and Demons</i> (Torsten Löfstedt)	235
Ehrman, Bart D., <i>Jesus Before the Gospels: How the Earliest Christians Remembered, Changed, and Invented Their Stories of the Savior</i> (Joel Kuhlin)	239
England Emma och William John Lyons (red.), <i>Reception History and Biblical Studies: Theory and Practice</i> (Mikael Larsson)	243
Fewell, Danna Nolan (ed.), <i>The Oxford Handbook of Biblical Narrative</i> (Josef Forsling)	245
Gordon, Robert P. and Hans M. Barstad (eds.), <i>“Thus speaks Ishtar of Arbela”: Prophecy in Israel, Assyria and Egypt in the Neo-Assyrian Period</i> (Magnus Halle)	249
Giuntoli Federico and Konrad Schmid (eds.), <i>The Post-Priestly Pentateuch: New Perspectives on Its Redactional Development and Theological Profiles</i> (Jan Retsö)	256
Hayes, Elizabeth R. och Lena-Sofia Tiemeyer (red.), <i>“I Lifted My Eyes and Saw”: Reading Dream and Vision Reports in the Hebrew Bible</i> (Stefan Green)	261
Heilig, Christoph, <i>Hidden Criticism? The Methodology and Plausibility of the Search for a Counter-Imperial Subtext in Paul</i> (Joel Kuhlin)	264
Kim, Yeong Seon, <i>The Temple Administration and the Levites in Chronicles</i> (Jan Retsö)	268
Klein, Anja, <i>Geschichte und Gebet: Die Rezeption der biblischen Geschichte in den Psalmen des Alten Testaments</i> (Lars Olov Eriksson)	272
Klink III, Edward W., och Darian R. Lockett. <i>Understanding Biblical Theology: A Comparison of Theory and Practice</i> (Bo Krister Ljungberg)	274
Knoppers, Gary N., <i>Jews and Samaritans: The Origins and History of Their Early Relations</i> (Cecilia Wassén)	278

Markschies, Christoph, <i>Christian Theology and Its Institutions in the Early Roman Empire: Prolegomena to a History of Early Christian Theology</i> (Carl Johan Berglund)	282
Mettinger, Tryggve N. D., <i>Reports from a Scholar's Life: Select Papers on the Hebrew Bible</i> (Cian Power)	285
Neusner, Jacob och Alan J. Avery Peck (red.); William Scott Green och Günter Stemberger (rådgivande red.), <i>Encyclopedia of Midrash. Biblical Interpretation in Formative Judaism. Volume I-II</i> (Tobias Ålöw)	289
Porter, Stanley E. och David I. Yoon (red.), <i>Paul and Gnosis</i> (Paul Linjamaa)	291
Smith, Geoffrey S., <i>Guilt By Association: Heresy Catalogues in Early Christianity</i> (Martin Wessbrandt)	295
Strauss, Mark L. och Paul E. Engle (red.), <i>Remarriage After Divorce in Today's Church</i> (Bo Krister Ljungberg)	299
Willgren, David, <i>The Formation of the 'Book' of Psalms: Reconsidering the Transmission and Canonization of Psalmody in Light of Material Culture and the Poetics of Anthologies</i> (Anja Klein)	302
Wright, Tom, <i>The Day the Revolution Began: Rethinking the Meaning of Jesus' Crucifixion</i> (Mikael Tellbe)	306

80 år senare: Exegetiska sällskapet, SEÅ och de exegetiska dagarna – tal vid exegetiska sällskapets 80-årsjubileum

GÖRAN EIDEVALL

Ordförande för Svenska Exegetiska Sällskapet
och utgivare av *Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok*

Året var 1936. Diktaturer kastade mörka skuggor över Europa. Men den 28 maj 1936 träffades 21 personer på Hushållsskolan i Uppsala. Där och då grundades Uppsala Exegetiska Sällskap. Initiativtagare var professor i Nya testamentets exegetik i Uppsala, Anton Fridrichsen.

I protokollet från mötet återges innehållet i det programtal som Fridrichsen höll vid denna sammankomst. Inledningsvis framhåller han vikten av ”den filologiska och historiska forskning, vi fått i arv från tidigare skeden”. Därefter betonar Fridrichsen att ”den religionshistoriska forskningen har brutit den äldre exegetikens begränsning”, men också att bruket av komparativ metod ”har skärpt vår blick för det egenartade och särpräglade i Bibelns religiösa värld”. Nu, hävdar Fridrichsen, i ett läge när ”den kulturella och politiska utvecklingen blir mer och mer skrämmande”, gäller det att ”aktivisera förhållandet mellan forskningen och vidare kretsar”. Dessa ”vidare kretsar” visar sig i första hand vara kyrkliga. Efter att ha proklamerat att Bibelns ord utgör ”den fasta orienteringspunkten i tillvaron”, särskilt i oroliga tider, sammanfattar Fridrichsen: ”Detta tillsammans gör att tiden är inne att sammanföra de krafter, som finnas, och att vidga sambandet med en vidare kyrklig miljö”.

Sällskapets konkreta syfte var från första början tvåfaldigt:

- 1) att utge ”en exegetisk årsbok” som skulle vara ett organ för svensk bibelforskning

2) att varje år ”anordna exegetiska dagar” med offentliga föreläsningar

Nu har det gått 80 år sedan grundandet av Uppsala Exegetiska Sällskap. Under sin långa levnad, fram till idag, har Sällskapet lyckats väl med att förverkliga dessa båda målsättningar. Första volymen av *Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok* utkom 1936. Med undantag för några få dubbelnummer har det utkommit en ny volym varje år. Nyligen utkom årgång 81. De exegetiska dagarna, ursprungligen tre till antalet, blev så småningom en: Exegetiska dagen. Med reservation för att dokumentationen är något ofullständig, ser det faktiskt ut som om denna tradition varit obruten sedan starten 1937. Här idag, i Göteborg måndagen den 28 september 2016, samlas vi alltså för åttionde gången till vad som kommit att bli en modern höstfest med bibelvetenskaplig forskning i centrum. Men Sällskapets och Årsbokens historia präglas av både kontinuitet och förändring. I det följande försöker jag skissera några viktiga utvecklingslinjer.

Under de första 60 åren var Årsboken och Exegetiska dagen/dagarna två separata företeelser som kompletterade varandra. Det hände ibland att någon föreläsning från en exegetisk dag senare publicerades i *SEÅ*, men en publicering av samtliga (tre) föredrag från föregående års exegetiska dag sker faktiskt för första gången så sent som i årgång 50 (1985). De senaste femton åren har detta blivit praxis. Exegetiska dagen har nu alltid ett sammanhållande tema (något som föreslogs 1986, i samband med 50-årsjubileet). De tryckta versionerna av föreläsningarna utgör en första, tematisk del av varje volym av *SEÅ*. Men detta är alltså en ganska ny tradition, som fann sina former först under 2000-talet. En uppräkningslista av teman för de tio senaste årgångarna (72–81, 2007–2016) kan ge en bild av ambitionen att spegla den aktuella exegetikens bredd: Psykologi och exegetik; Qumranfynden 60 år; Vägar till Jesus: Minnesbilder och muntlig tradition; Moseböckerna i aktuell forskning; Apokalyptikens ansikten; Receptionshistoria i den tidiga kyrkan; Offer i Bibeln; Etnicitet i Bibeln och i bibelvetenskaplig forskning; Judiska och kristna grupper i den grekisk-romerska världen; Homeros och Bibeln.

Enligt utgivarens (= Fridrichsens) förord till första årgången av *SEÅ* (1936) var målsättningen att föra ut nya exegetiska ”uppslag, upptäckter

och rön” till en svensk läsekrets (och därmed ersätta *Bibelforskaren* som lades ned 1923). Vidare skulle Årsboken genom recensensavdelningen ”hålla sina läsare underrättade om de viktigaste nya arbeten, som framkomma inom bibelforskningen”, med en särskild tonvikt på ”nordisk bibelvetenskaplig litteratur”. Längre var nästan allt innehåll på svenska. Internationella bidrag översattes som regel. På försättsbladet till dubbelnumret årgång 17/18, som utkom 1954, aviseras en mer internationell inriktning för både Sällskapet och Årsboken: ”Membership of the Uppsala Society of Exegesis (Uppsala Exegetiska Sällskap) has hitherto been confined to Scandinavia. The Society has now decided to enlarge its sphere on an international basis”. Men motiveringen är intressant, då det bland annat hänvisas till det svenska språkets relativt starka ställning:

Since the ability of reading Swedish abroad has increased in a most gratifying way, and since it is also our intention to a certain extent to publish papers in English, French and German, we hope that the Annual of the Society (*Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok*) will prove to be of interest to foreign readers as well.

Tiderna har förändrats. Idag är oftast mer än hälften av innehållet i *SEÅ* på engelska. Det finns inga förhoppningar om att läsare utanför Norden förstår svenska. Men en viktig målsättning har blivit att föra ut svensk och skandinavisk exegetik till en internationell läsekrets. Från och med volym 78 (2013) görs alla tryckta artiklar även fritt tillgängliga digitalt (”open access”). Därmed kan forskare och allmänintresserade världen över ta del av Årsbokens innehåll.

Exegetiska dagen/dagarna har, till skillnad från *SEÅ*, haft en starkt internationell inriktning från första början. År 1937 medverkade bland andra Ernst Lohmeyer (regimkritisk professor i Greifswald) och Rafael Gyllenberg från Åbo. Så småningom utvecklades följande grundmodell, som (med variationer) förblivit oförändrad fram till idag: tre talare inbjuds. Två av dem är oftast internationella, det vill säga utomnordiska. Vanligtvis är bibelvetenskapens båda discipliner, Gamla testamentets (eller Hebreiska bibeln) exegetik och Nya testamentets exegetik, representerade. Dagen avslutas med årsmöte och supé. Genom åren har många ”stora namn” inom bibelvetenskapen hållit föredrag. Till Exegetiska dagen 2016 inbjöds dessa tre forskare: Susan Docherty (Birmingham),

Antti Laato (Åbo) och Sidnie White Crawford (Lincoln, USA). Två av de tre är kvinnor, något som väl knappast uppfattas som anmärkningsvärt. Men ur ett genusperspektiv har det skett en markant förändring. Enligt mina efterforskningar hette den första kvinnliga föreläsaren Raija Sollamo (Helsinki). Året var 1984!

Nu har det gått åttio år sedan Sällskapet grundades. En viktig förändring skedde vid årsmötet 2007, året efter 70-årsjubileet. Sällskapet bytte namn, från Uppsala Exegetiska Sällskap till Svenska Exegetiska Sällskapet. Styrelsen bestod fram till dess främst av Uppsala-forskare, och Exegetiska dagen ägde alltid rum i Uppsala. Nu finns ett flertal svenska lärosäten representerade i styrelsen, och Exegetiska dagen kan arrangeras även på andra orter än Uppsala. Hittills har detta skett i Lund (2011, 2013, 2015) och i Göteborg (2016).

Svenska Exegetiska Sällskapet har överlevt under åttio år, trots återkommande ekonomiska kriser. I nuläget finns det strax under 200 betalande medlemmar, vilket är fler än de 21 personer som närvarade vid den allra första sammankomsten, men mycket mindre än medlems-talet under storhetstiden på 50- och 60-talet. Vid 25-årsjubileet 1961 fanns det 1126 medlemmar! Detta säger eventuellt något om att bibelvetenskapen blivit mer marginaliserad i samhället, men det bör främst ses som del av en nedåtgående trend som berör alla traditionella föreningar med medlemsavgift. Unga människor tycks idag föredra andra former för sitt engagemang. Som ett kuriosum kan man notera att Fridrichsen år 1937, vid det första årsmötet, hävdade att Sällskapet borde ha högst 200 medlemmar – med motiveringen att bara de verkligt intresserade skulle få vara med. Å andra sidan tog man på den tiden in-trädesavgift till föreläsningarna som hölls under de exegetiska dagarna. Skulle det vara möjligt idag?

80 år är en hög ålder för en människa. Då kanske minnet och krafterna börjar svikta. Det kan vara dags för rullator och hemtjänst. Men för Sällskapet och dess båda barn, *Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok* och Exegetiska dagen, är detta förhoppningsvis bara början.

Årsboken kommer nu ut i både tryckt och digital form. Av ekonomiska och andra skäl kan en övergång till enbart elektronisk utgivning bli aktuell. Men Sällskapet kommer att verka för att *SEÅ* lever vidare. Det samma gäller Exegetiska dagen, som har visat sig vara ett

slitstarkt och framgångsrikt koncept. Det finns planer på att återigen utvidga formatet, till två ”exegetiska dagar”: en dag med offentliga föreläsningar om aktuell exegetisk forskning, följd av en dag med pedagogisk inriktning (för aktiva akademiska lärare i bibelvetenskap).

Mycket har förändrats, jämfört med år 1936. Den akademiska exegetiken i Sverige riktar sig inte längre främst till kyrkliga avnämare. Men också i vår tid faller mörka skuggor över Europa. Även nu, 80 år senare, är det läge att ”sammanföra de krafter som finns”, både inom och utanför de akademiska kretsarna, för att främja bibelvetenskapens utveckling och spridningen av ny exegetisk forskning – i förhoppning om att vi därigenom också i någon mån kan bidra på ett positivt sätt till det samhälle och den värld vi lever i.

Textual Growth and the Activity of Scribes

SIDNIE WHITE CRAWFORD

University of Nebraska-Lincoln

scrawford1@unl.edu

The line between “Bible” and “not Bible,” once so firmly drawn in biblical scholarship, has become very blurry in recent years, almost to the point of disappearance. This drastic change in scholarly thinking has been caused by the discovery of ancient manuscripts of the books found in the Jewish canon of scripture in the Judean Desert caves in the second half of the twentieth century. While today communities of faith, Jewish and Christian alike, embrace canons of scripture that make a clear distinction between “biblical” and “non-biblical” literature, evidence from the Judean Desert scrolls shows no such distinction in the period of Second Temple Judaism, which ended with the destruction of the temple in Jerusalem in 70 CE.

When the Judean Desert Scrolls, especially the Qumran scrolls, were first discovered in the 1940s and 50s, the scholars responsible for their publication divided them, understandably, according to the categories extant at the time, that is, “biblical” and “non-biblical.” The books that appeared in the canons of Judaism and Protestant Christianity were labelled “biblical,” while those that did not were labelled “non-biblical.”¹ Further, only manuscripts that conformed to the received text of the Hebrew Bible, that is, the Masoretic Text (with some allowance for variation that agreed with other extant versions such as the Septuagint and

¹ The use of the adjective “Protestant” is deliberate; those books found in non-Protestant Christian canons were designated “non-biblical.” For example, Tobit, part of the deuterocanonical literature in Roman Catholicism and part of the Eastern Orthodox canon, was assigned to the non-biblical category. This despite the fact that fully half of the members of the Cave 4 team were Roman Catholic!

the Samaritan Pentateuch), were considered “biblical.” Other manuscripts, which were deemed to deviate too far from the received text, such as 4QReworked Pentateuch, were relegated to the “non-biblical” group.² It has become clear in recent decades, however, that that division is a false one for the Second Temple period, and that those categories should be discarded.

Jews in the last two centuries BCE and the first century CE, the late Second Temple period, had of course inherited from earlier centuries works that we might characterize as the “classical” literature of ancient Israel. Many of these works later became canonical in both Judaism and Christianity. However, what we observe from the Qumran manuscripts is that the texts of these books were not yet fixed or closed. Instead, texts were subject to greater or lesser degrees of scribal intervention. That is, the scribes, the professional text scholars of Second Temple Judaism who were responsible for passing down the classical literature of ancient Judaism, were not constrained by our notions of the importance of ex-

² The history of the 4QReworked Pentateuch manuscripts is illustrative in this regard. The 4QRP manuscripts were originally assigned to the lot of Frank Moore Cross; that is, they were considered biblical. Cross, however, decided that they strayed too far from the received text, and turned them over to John Strugnell, thus changing their designation to non-biblical. Strugnell referred to the manuscripts as containing a “wild Pentateuch,” and named them “Pentateuchal Paraphrases.” The editors of the manuscripts, Emanuel Tov and the present author, renamed the manuscripts “Reworked Pentateuch,” moving them closer to biblical, but not yet placing them firmly in that category. Much discussion ensued over the next fifteen years about the proper categorization of these manuscripts, as “Bible” or “Rewritten Bible.” A consensus has developed in recent years, supported by the editors, that they should be considered Pentateuch manuscripts with an expanded text. 4Q364 and 365 were probably complete manuscripts of the Pentateuch when whole; 4Q366 and 367 (as well as 4Q158) were “special use” manuscripts, i.e. small manuscripts created for study purposes. For a discussion of this history, see Weston W. Fields, *The Dead Sea Scrolls, A Full History: Volume One, 1947-1960* (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2009), 232–33. See also Emanuel Tov, “From 4QReworked Pentateuch to 4QPentateuch (?)” in *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, Septuagint: Collected Essays, Volume 3* (SVT 167; Leiden: Brill, 2015), 45–59, where he mentions the “identity crisis” of these manuscripts (46).

act copying without variation with which we approach the passing down of scripture. That sort of copying evidently did occur, but scribes also felt free to change the text in front of them by adding to, rearranging and occasionally omitting material from their received text for purposes of clarification and/or exegesis. This scribal pursuit is a form of “rewriting” of the biblical text.

This scribal activity in the transmission of texts was first noted by Shemaryahu Talmon in the 1950s. Talmon argued for what he called a “variegated transmission” of the scriptural text in the latter part of the Second Temple period. He put a great deal of emphasis on the role of the scribe, claiming that scribes enjoyed “a controlled freedom of textual variation.” In other words, scribes were not merely copyists, but were “literary practitioners,” playing active roles in all aspects of the transmission of the text of scripture. As we consider all the evidence of the Qumran Pentateuch scrolls, it is clear that Talmon was correct in his assessment that the activity of scribes was paramount in the transmission of the still-fluid scriptural text in the period under consideration.³

THE TEXT OF THE PENTATEUCH AT QUMRAN

The greater part of our evidence for this kind of scribal activity comes from the scrolls of the five books of the Pentateuch uncovered in the Qumran caves and the other Judean Desert sites. These scrolls have presented scholars with a wealth of new evidence concerning the textual history of those books. Over the sixty years since the discovery of Cave 4, textual critics have had to revise their thinking many times to integrate the new information conveyed by the manuscripts. I believe we are in the midst of another major revision in our thinking, in which the older model of linear growth, that is, where one form or “edition” of a

³ See Talmon’s articles on the subject collected in Frank Moore Cross and Shemaryahu Talmon, eds., *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text* (Cambridge: Harvard University, 1975); and Shemaryahu Talmon, *Text and Canon of the Hebrew Bible: Collected Studies* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2010).

text succeeds another, is breaking down and being replaced by non-linear models of textual transmission. By “non-linear” I am referring to a scenario in which scribes, working in different places and at different times, passed down manuscripts with a variety of textual variants. The variants of a particular manuscript might be copied and passed down, or they might not. Our evidence suggests that most manuscripts have different proportions of shared and unique variants, pointing to the activity of individual scribes.

In this article, I will consider four examples of scribal intervention, each taken from a Qumran manuscript, into the text of a book of the Pentateuch. The first example, taken from Exodus, agrees with one of the textual traditions that later became the canonical text of a religious group, the Samaritan Pentateuch. The last three examples, from Numbers and Deuteronomy, were not passed on in any textual tradition, and thus were lost until their rediscovery in the Qumran manuscripts. The article will close with an attempt to locate geographically the communities of scribes responsible for passing down the classical texts of ancient Israel.

The five books of the Pentateuch reached their final shape sometime prior to the third century BCE. Our controls for that statement are the translation of the books of the Pentateuch into Greek in the mid-third century, and the paleographic dating of our oldest Pentateuch manuscript, 4QExod-Lev^f, also to the mid-third century.⁴ By my most recent count, there were ninety-seven Hebrew manuscripts of the Pentateuch found in the Qumran caves. The breakdown by book is as follows: twenty manuscripts of Genesis, eighteen of Exodus, seventeen of Leviticus, seven of Numbers, and thirty-five of Deuteronomy. This count includes five manuscripts that contained more than one book. In addition, I have included four manuscripts of the Reworked Pentateuch group, B through E, in this Pentateuch group, for a total of 101. Thus

⁴ Frank Moore Cross, *Qumran Cave 4, VII: Genesis to Numbers* (DJD 12; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), 134.

we have a large amount of evidence for the transmission by scribal copying of the books of the Pentateuch in the last three centuries BCE and the first century CE.

Some manuscripts appear to indicate that their scribes attempted to copy their *Vorlagen* exactly, and to transmit the text without change, although of course this happened imperfectly and room must be allowed for minor variants, especially “mistakes of the eye,” and orthographic variants. Manuscripts of this sort, which exhibit a short, unexpanded text, that is, a text which has not been deliberately revised, include 4QExod^c and 4QDeut^g.⁵ The manuscripts of Leviticus, a book of laws, also as a whole do not demonstrate many deliberate scribal revisions.⁶

Many manuscripts, however, exhibit revisions from older readings (preserved in other witnesses to the text); many of these revisions are expansions of the text. Since scribes had, in Talmon’s words, a “controlled degree of freedom” in their approach to the texts they were copying, these revisions exist along a spectrum, from relatively minor changes to full-scale, systematic revisions.

The Samaritan Pentateuch is of course a parade example of a text containing full-scale, systematic revisions. The Samaritan Pentateuch exhibits content editing and harmonization of large blocs of material, most prominently in the importation of elements from Deuteronomy 1–3 into the relevant sections of Exodus and Numbers, and the command/execution formula of the Plague Narratives in Exodus 7–11. The discovery of the Qumran scrolls made it clear, very early on, that this revisionist approach was not unique to the Samaritan Pentateuch and the

⁵ In the Pentateuch, the MT also preserves, in most of its readings, a short, unexpanded text. See, e.g., Frank Moore Cross, “The History of the Biblical Text in Light of the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert,” *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text*, ed. Frank Moore Cross and Shemaryahu Talmon (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1975), 177–95, 185.

⁶ Sarianna Metso, “Evidence from the Qumran Scrolls for the Scribal Transmission of Leviticus,” *Editing the Bible: Assessing the Task Past and Present*, ed. John S. Kloppenborg and Judith H. Newman (RBS 60; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012), 67–80, 76–78.

Samaritan community, but was found in manuscripts in the possession of the Judean community at Qumran.⁷ The first century BCE manuscript 4QpaleoExod^m, for example, contains every expansion found in SP Exodus that is not specifically Samaritan in origin.⁸ Our first example comes from that manuscript.

EXODUS 18:25: MOSES JUDGES THE PEOPLE

At Exod 18:25, both 4QpaleoExod^m and the Samaritan Pentateuch contain a long insertion taken from the parallel passage in Deuteronomy, 1:9b–18. The preceding verses in Exodus, 14–24, cover the advice to Moses from his father-in-law to appoint judges to adjudicate minor disputes among the people, but only briefly reports Moses putting the plan into action. The parallel passage in Deuteronomy presents that idea as coming from Moses himself, rather than his non-Israelite father-in-law, and has Moses put it into action. 4QpaleoExod^m harmonizes the two passages, producing an Exodus version that retains the advice of Moses' father-in-law but shows Moses putting the plan into action:⁹

14 וירא חתן משה את כל אשר הוא עשה לעם ויאמר מה הדבר הזה אשר אתה אשה לעם מדוע אתה ישב לבדך וכל העם נצב עליך מן הבקר ועד הערב 15 ויאמר משה לחתנו כי יבוא אלי העם לדרש אלהים 16 כי יהיה להם דבר באו אלי ושפטתי בין איש ובין רעהו והודעתיו את חקי האלהים ואת תוריו 17 ויאמר חתן משה אליו לא טוב הדבר אשר אתה עשה 18 נבל תבל גם אתה גם העם הזה אשר עמך כי כבד ממך הדבר לא תוכל עשותו לבדך 19 עתה שמע בקולי אעיצך ויהי אלהים עמך הוי אתה לעם מול האלהים והבאת אתה את הדברים אל האלהים 20 והזהרת אתם את החקים ואת התורה והודעת להם את הדרך אשר ילכו בה ואת המעשה אשר יעשון 21 ואתה תחזה לך מכל העם אנשי חיל יראי אלהים אנשי אמת שנאי בצע ושמת עליהם שרי אלפים ושרי מאות שרי

⁷ See, for example, Patrick W. Skehan, "Exodus in the Samaritan Recension from Qumran," *JBL* 74 (1955): 182–87.

⁸ Patrick W. Skehan, Eugene Ulrich, and Judith E. Sanderson, "4QpaleoExodus^m," in *Qumran Cave 4, IV: Palaeo-Hebrew and Greek Biblical Manuscripts* (DJD 9; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992), 53–130, 54–56.

⁹ Words or partial words preserved by 4QpaleoExod^m are underlined. In the English translation, the harmonization taken from Deut 1:9b–15 is in italics.

חמשים ושירי עשרות ²² ושפטו את העם בכל עת והיה כל הדבר הגדול יביאון אליך וכל הדבר הקטן ישפטו הם והקל מעליך ונשאו אתך ²³ אם את הדבר הזה תעשה וצון אלהים ויכלת עמד וגם כל העם הזה אל מקומו יבוא בשלום ²⁴ וישמע משה לקול חתנו ויעש כל אשר אמר ²⁵ ויאמר משה אל העם לא אוכל אנכי לבדי שאת אתכם יהוה אלהיכם הדבה אתכם והנכם היום ככוכבי השמים לרב יהוה אלהי אבותיכם יסף עליכם ככם אלף פעמים ויברך אתכם כאשר דבר לכם איכה אשא לבדי טרחכם משאכם וריבכם הבו לכם אנשים חכמים ונבונים וידעים לשבטיכם ואשימם בראשיכם ויענו ויאמרו טוב הדבר אשר דברת לעשות ויקח את ראשי שבטיהם אנשים חכמים וידעים ויתן אתם ראשים עליהם שרי אלפים ושירי מאות שרי חמשים ושירי עשרות ושוטרים לשבטיהם ויצו את שפטיהם לאמר שמעו בין אחיכם ושפטתם צדק בין איש ובין אחיו ובין גרו לא תכירו פנים במשפט כקטן כגדול תשמעון לא תגורו מפני איש כי המשפט לאלהים הוא והדבר אשר יקשה מכם תקריבון אלי ושמעתיו ויצו אתם את כל הדברים אשר יעשון

¹⁴ When Moses' father-in-law saw all that he was doing for the people, he said, "What is this that you are doing for the people? Why do you sit alone, and all the people stand around you from morning until evening?" ¹⁵ And Moses said to his father-in-law, "Because the people come to me to inquire of God; ¹⁶ when they have a dispute, they come to me and I decide between one person and another, and I make them know the statutes of God and his laws." ¹⁷ Moses' father-in-law said to him, "What you are doing is not good. ¹⁸ You and the people with you will certainly wear yourselves out, for the thing is too heavy for you. You are not able to do it alone. ¹⁹ Now obey my voice; I will give advice, and God be with you! You shall represent the people before God and bring their cases to God, ²⁰ and you shall warn them about the statutes and the laws, and make them know the way in which they must walk and what they must do. ²¹ Moreover, look for able men from all the people, men who fear God, who are trustworthy and hate a bribe, and place such men over the people as chiefs of thousands, of hundreds, of fifties, and of tens. ²² And let them judge the people at all times. Every great matter they shall bring to you, but any small matter they shall decide themselves. So it will be easier for you, and they will bear the burden with you. ²³ If you do this, God will direct you, you will be able to endure, and all this people also will go to their place in peace." ²⁴ So Moses listened to the voice of his father-in-law and did all that he had said. ²⁵ *And Moses said to the people, "I am not able to bear you by myself. Yahweh your God has multiplied you, and behold, you are today as numerous as the stars of heaven. May Yahweh, the god of your fathers, make you a thousand times as many as you are and bless you, as he has promised you! How can I bear the weight and burden of you and your strife? Choose for your tribes wise, understanding and experienced men, and I will appoint them as your heads." And they answered and they said, "The thing that you have spoken is good for us to do." He took the heads of their tribes, wise and knowledgeable men and set them as heads over them, chiefs of thousands, of hundreds, of fifties,*

and officers, throughout their tribes. And he charged the judges, saying, "Hear the cases between your brothers, and judge righteously between a man and his brother or the alien with him. Do not be partial in judgment. You shall hear the small and the great alike. You shall not be intimidated by anyone, for the judgment is God's. And the case that is too hard for you, you shall bring to me, and I will hear it." And he commanded them concerning all the things that they should do.

From the existence of 4QpaleoExod^m and other manuscripts that preserve readings also preserved in the Samaritan Pentateuch (e.g. 4QExod-Lev^f, 4QTestimonia), we have come to realize that the expansive, harmonistic text tradition found in the Samaritan Pentateuch was not unique to the Samaritan community, but was a text tradition extant in Palestine and used by both Jews and Samaritans in the Second Temple period.

However, the type of editorial changes found in these texts (usually referred to as pre-Samaritan) are inconsistent; that is, not every instance of differences within and among the books of the Pentateuch was smoothed over by the scribes. This gives rise to the possibility that these editorial changes were not made all at once by one scribe, but were made gradually over time by many scribes, each adding revisions that were then passed on (or not) in the tradition.¹⁰ Support for this scenario is offered by the story of the Daughters of Zelophehad, found in Numbers 27 and 36.

NUMBERS 27:1–11: THE DAUGHTERS OF ZELOPHEHAD

In Num 27:1–11, Zelophehad's daughters come before Moses to complain that, under the scheme of apportionment of the land laid out in Numbers 26, their father's family will be omitted, since he had no sons, but only daughters. Yahweh, through Moses, acknowledges the justice of their complaint, and makes provision for the inheritance of daughters when there are no sons.

¹⁰ See also Gary N. Knoppers, *Jews and Samaritans: The Origins and History of their Early Relations* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013), 189.

However, in 36:1–12 the leaders of Manasseh, the tribe of Zelophehad, come to Moses with their own complaint: if the daughters of Zelophehad marry outside the tribe, their portion of the tribal inheritance will go to the husband's tribe. Moses resolves this difficulty by decreeing that the daughters must marry within their father's tribe, which they proceed to do. Finally, outside the Pentateuch, Josh 17:3–4 narrates that Zelophehad's daughters finally received their inheritance from Joshua and Eleazar the priest.

These two Numbers passages would seem ripe for scribal intervention in the form of editorial combination or harmonization as we find elsewhere in the Samaritan Pentateuch, but such a harmonization does not appear in the Samaritan Pentateuch or any other later version. However, it is found in two Qumran manuscripts, 4QNum^b and 4QReworked Pentateuch C (4Q365), albeit in different ways.

4QReworked Pentateuch C (4Q365), frg. 36, seems to combine the two passages in a simple juxtaposition, without any indication of a break between the two.¹¹

- | | |
|---|---|
| [אין] אחים לאביו ונתתם את נחלתו לשארו הקרוב אליו ממשפחתו] | 1 |
| [וירש או] תה והיתה לבני ישראל לחוקת משפט כאשר צוה יהוה את] | 2 |
| [מושה ^{36:1} ויקרב] ראשי האבות למשפחות בני גלעד בן מכיר בן מנשה ממשפחות] | 3 |
| [בני יהוסף לפני] מושה ולפני הנשיאים ראשי האבות לבני] | 4 |
| [ישראל ^{36:2} ויואמרו] את אדוני צוה יהוה לתת את הארץ בנחלה] | 5 |
| [בגורל ל]בני ישראל | 6 |

- 1 ^{27:11} (And if) [his father] has [no brother, then you shall give his inheritance to the nearest kinsman of his clan,]
- 2 and he shall possess i[t. And it shall be for the Israelites a statute, an ordinance, according as Yahweh commanded]
- 3 Moses. ^{36:1} And[the heads of the fathers' houses of the descendants of Gilead, son of Machir, son of Manasseh, from the tribes]
- 4 of the descendants of Joseph drew nea[r] before [Moses and before the leaders, the heads of the fathers of the children]

¹¹ Emanuel Tov and Sidnie White, "4QReworked Pentateuch^c," in *Qumran Cave 4, VIII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 1*, ed. Harold W. Attridge et al. (DJD 13; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), 255–318, 310–11.

- 5 of Israel.^{36:2} And they said, [Yahweh commanded my lord to give the land as an inheritance] by lot to[the children of Israel ...

Because the fragment lacks context, we cannot tell where in 4Q365 it would have appeared, in chapter 27 or in chapter 36, thus repeating or displacing one of the passages from its original place. We also cannot tell whether or not the intervening material between the two pericopes was omitted, although, in view of the fact that elsewhere 4Q365 preserves running text in the known biblical order, and its tendency is toward expansion rather than omission, this seems unlikely. However, it is clear that some sort of scribal intervention has occurred.¹²

4QNum^b gives us more information with which to work. First of all, since 4QNum^b is better preserved than 4Q365, more of the context of our passages is extant. Col. XXI, frgs. 42–47, contain Num 26:64–27:10. 27:1 follows directly after 26:64, and there is no indication of any interpolation from chapter 36. The situation is different, however, when we reach chapter 36. At the bottom of col. XXXI, lines 29–31, Num 36:1–2 appears, following directly (with a small *vacat*) the end of chapter 35. The next column, XXXII, preserves 36:4 (line 14) followed by a recapitulation of 36:1–2, finally picking up 36:5–7 at the bottom of the column. Nathan Jastram, the editor of the manuscript, estimates that there were approximately twelve lines of text between the bottom of col. XXXI and the extant portion of col. XXXII.¹³ He very plausibly reconstructs the missing portion of col. XXXII thus:

Col. XXXI (36:1–2)

[ויקרבו ראשי האבות למשפחת בני] גלעד בן מכיר [בן מנשה ממשפחות בני יוסף]^{36:1} 29
 וידברו לפני מושה ולפני אל[עזר הכהן ולפני ה]נשיאים ראשי האבות לבני
 [ישראל]² ויואמרו את אדוני צ[זה יהוה לתת את] הארץ בנחלה בגורל לבני

¹² See also Molly M. Zahn, *Rethinking Rewritten Scripture: Composition and Exegesis in the 4QReworked Pentateuch Manuscripts* (STDJ 95; Leiden: Brill, 2011), 117–20.

¹³ Nathan Jastram, “4QNum^b,” in *Qumran Cave 4, VII: Genesis to Numbers*, ed. Eugene Ulrich, Frank Moore Cross et al. (DJD 12; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), 205–68, 262.

Col. XXXII (36:2 cont'd; 27:1–11; 36:3–7)

- 1 [ישראל ואדני צוה ביהוה לתת את נחלת צלפחד אחינו לבנתיו ^{2b} ביום ההואה]
 2 [עמדו בנות צלופחד לפניכה ולפני אלעזר הכוהן ולפני הנשיאים וכול העדה פתח]
 3 [אוהל מועד לאמור אבינו מת במדבר והואה לוא היה בתוך העדה הנועדים על יהוה]
 4 [בעדת קורח כיא בחטאו מת אבינו ובנים לוא היה לו למה יגרע שם אבינו מתוך]
 5 [משפחתו כיא אין לו בן תנו לנו אחוזה בתוך אחי אבינו ותקרב את משפטן לפני]
 6 [יהוה *vacat* וידבר יהוה אליכה לאמור כן בנות צלופחד דוברות נתון נתן]
 7 [להנה אחוזה נחלה בתוך אחי אביהן והעברתה את נחלת אביהן להנה ואל בני ישראל]
 8 [תדבר לאמור איש כיא ימות ובן אין לו ונתתם את נחלתו לבתו ואם אין לו בת ונתתם]
 9 [את נחלתו לאחיו ואת אין לו אחים ונתתם את נחלתו לאחי אביו ואם אין אחים לאביו]
 10 [ונתתם את נחלתו לשאריו הקרוב אליו ממשפחתו ויירש אותו והיתה לבני ישראל לחוקת]
 11 [משפט כאשר צוה יהוה את מושה *vacat* ³ ועתה אם תהיינה לאחר מבני]
 12 [שבטי בני ישראל לנשים ונגרעה נחלתן מנחלת אבותינו ונוספה על נחלת המטי אשר]
 13 [תהיינה להמה ומגורל נחלתנו יגרע ^{4a} ואם יהיה היובל לבני ישראל ונוספה נחלתן על]
 14 נחלת המטי אשר תהיינה להמה ומנחלת מטי אבותינו יגלע נחלתן ^{4b} וידברו לפני מושה
 ולפני]
 15 אלעזר ה[כוהן ולפני הנשיאים ראשי האבות לבני ישראל ויואמרו את אדוני ואת יהשוע בנ]
 16 נון ואת כ[לב בן יפניה צוה יהוה לתת את הארץ בנחלה ⁵ ויצו מושה את בני ישראל על פי]
 17 יהוה לאמור כ[ן מטי בני יוסף דוברים ⁶ זה הדבר אשר צוה יהוה לבנות צלופחד לאמור
 לטוב]
 18 בע[יניהמה]הי[ה תהיינה לנשים אך למשפחת מטי אביהן תהיינה לנשים ⁷ ולוא תסוב]
 19 נ[חלה לבני ישראל ממטי אל מטי כיא איש בנחלת מטי אבותיו ידבקו בני ישראל *vacat*]

Col. XXXI (36:1–2)

- 29 ^{36:1} And the heads of the ancestral houses of the tribe of the children of
 Gilead the son of Machir, son of Manasseh, of the tribes of Joseph drew
 near,
 30 and they spoke before Moses and before Eleazar the priest, and before the
 leaders of the ancestral houses of the children
 31 of Israel. ² And they said, “Yahweh commanded my lord to give the land as
 an inheritance by lot to the children

Col. XXXII (36:2 cont'd; 27:1–11; 36:3–7)

- 1 of Israel; and my lord was commanded by Yahweh to give the inheritance of
 Zelophehad our brother to his daughters. ^{2b} On that day
 2 the daughters of Zelophehad stood before you and before Eleazar the priest
 and before the leaders and all the congregation at the opening
 3 of the tent of meeting, saying, “Our father died in the wilderness, but he
 was not part of the company who rebelled against Yahweh,
 4 in the company of Korah, but in his own sin our father died; and he had no
 sons. Why should our father’s name be removed from the midst

5 of his clan because he had no son? Give to us a possession in the midst of
 our father's kin." You brought their case before
 6 Yahweh. *vacat* And Yahweh spoke to you, saying, "The daughters of
 Zelophehad have spoken rightly. You shall indeed give
 7 to them a possession, an inheritance in the midst of their father's kin and
 pass their father's inheritance to them. And speak to the children of Israel,
 8 Any man who dies and does not have a son, you will give his inheritance to
 his daughter. If he has no daughter, you will give
 9 his inheritance to his brothers. If he has no brothers, you shall give his
 inheritance to his father's brothers. If his father had no brothers,
 10 you shall give his inheritance to his nearest kin from his clan, and he shall
 possess it. This will be a statute of judgment for the children of Israel
 11 according as Yahweh commanded Moses." *vacat*³ But now, if they marry
 one from another
 12 tribe in Israel, their inheritance will be removed from the inheritance of our
 fathers and be added to the inheritance of the tribe into which
 13 they marry, and be removed from the lot of our inheritance.^{4a} And when
 the jubilee comes for the children of Israel, their inheritance will be added
 to the inheritance
 14 of the tribe into which they marry, and their inheritance will be removed
 from the inheritance of the tribe of our fathers.^{4b} And they spoke before
 Moses and before
 15 Eleazar the priest and before the leaders, the heads of the ancestral houses of
 the children of Israel, and they said, "Yahweh commanded my lord and
 Joshua son
 16 of Nun and Caleb son of Jephunah to give the land as an inheritance."
⁵ And Moses commanded the children of Israel according to the word
 17 of Yahweh, saying, "The tribes of the sons of Joseph are speaking rightly.
⁶ This is the word that Yahweh commands concerning the daughters of
 Zelophehad, saying, 'Let them
 18 marry whoever seems good to them, only they must marry into a clan from
 their father's tribe,⁷ so that no
 19 inheritance from one tribe of the children of Israel will be added to another
 tribe, for every one of the children of Israel will continue to possess the
 inheritance of the tribe of their fathers.'" *vacat*

In this version of the story of Zelophehad's daughters, the original legal decision in chapter 27 is interpolated into the narrative of the second legal question, recapitulating already narrated material. This is a classic harmonization; its only unusual feature is its direction, inserting an interpolation forward from an earlier narrative, rather than backwards

from a later one.¹⁴ Most major interpolations from Numbers come from Deuteronomy; that is, they are inserted backwards from a later passage into the earlier narrative.

This passage in 4QNum^b contains one further variant, indicative of a scribal intervention. 36:1, both at its first appearance at the bottom of col. XXXI and its recapitulation in col. XXXII, line 15, adds “and before Eleazar the priest.” This addition, which is not found in MT, SP or 4Q365, is shared with LXX, and anticipates the fact that it is Joshua and Eleazar who actually grant Zelophehad’s daughters their inheritance in Josh 17:4.¹⁵ Since this addition is shared with LXX, it must have been made before the translation of Numbers into Greek in the third century BCE, thus adding another layer of scribal revision of the text of Numbers. The recapitulation of 36:2 also adds, uniquely, “Joshua son of Nun and Caleb son of Jephunah,” which is at least a partial anticipation of Josh 17:4, in which Joshua acts. The time of this expansion is also unknown, although since it is not shared with LXX it may be later than the middle of the third century BCE.

These parallel but not identical revisions are found in two manuscripts that are dated paleographically to the latter part of the first century BCE. 4Q365 is copied in a late Hasmonean hand, that is, around 50 BCE. 4QNum^b was copied between approximately 30 BCE and 20 CE.¹⁶ This is noteworthy because these dates fall after the destruction of the Samaritan temple on Mt. Gerizim by John Hyrcanus at the end of the second century BCE. This event, which marked the definitive rupture between the Judeans and the Samaritans, was also, I would suggest, the triggering event for the selection of one exemplar of the books of the Pentateuch, with an expanded, harmonized text and in paleo-

¹⁴ Nathan Jastram, “The Text of 4QNum^b,” in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18-21 March, 1991*, ed. Julio Trebolle Barrera and Luis Vegas Montaner (Vol. 1; Leiden/Madrid: Brill/Editorial Complutense, 1992), 177–98, 196.

¹⁵ Jastram, “The Text of 4QNum^b,” 191.

¹⁶ Jastram, “The Text of 4QNum^b,” 211.

Hebrew script, as the canonical text of the Samaritan Yahwistic community. Other evidence supports this suggestion. Richard Purvis has argued that the paleo-Hebrew script of the Samaritan Pentateuch developed from a late Hasmonean paleo-Hebrew script, and that its orthography too is late Hasmonean.¹⁷ Stefan Schorch has shown that a distinctive Samaritan reading tradition developed in the late second-early first centuries BCE.¹⁸ Thus, various pieces of evidence converge to indicate that the Samaritans chose their canonical text in the early first century BCE.

Further, once they had selected this particular Samar text, they made certain sectarian changes that marked the text as *Samaritan* and not a general Palestinian text. Most prominently, they added the Mt. Gerizim commandment to the Decalogue following Exod 20:17 and Deut 5:18. This commandment is found only in the Samaritan Pentateuch, not in any Qumran manuscript. In constructing this commandment they used exactly the same scribal technique that made the earlier changes to the Pentateuch texts, as we saw in 4QpaleoExod^m and 4QNum^b. They combined various verses from different parts of the Pentateuch to create a new commandment, which they inserted into their text of the Pentateuch at Exod 20:14 and Deut 5:18:

והיה כי יביאך יהוה אלהיך אל ארץ הכנעני אשר אתה בא שמה לרשתה והקמת לך
 אבנים גדולות ושדת אתם בשיד וכתבת על האבנים את כל דברי התורה הזאת והיה
 בעברכם את הירדן תקימו את האבנים האלה אשר אנכי מצוה אתכם היום בהרגריזים
 ובנית שם מזבח ליהוה אלהיך מזבח אבנים לא תניף עליהם ברזל אבנים שלמות תבנה
 את מזבח יהוה אלהיך והעלית עליו עלות ליהוה אלהיך וזבחת שלמים ואכלת שם
 ושמתח לפני יהוה אלהיך ההר ההוא בעבר הירדן אחרי דרך מבוא השמש בארץ
 הכנעני היושב בערבה מול הגלגל אצל אלון מורא מול שכם

¹⁷ James D. Purvis, *The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Origins of the Samaritan Sect* (HSM 2; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1968). See also the discussion in Magnar Kartveit, *The Origins of the Samaritans* (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 288–90.

¹⁸ Stefan Schorch, “Die Bedeutung der samaritanischen mündlich Tradition für die Textgeschichte des Pentateuch (II),” *Mitteilungen und Beiträge der Forschungsstelle Judentum, Theologische Fakultät Leipzig* 12–13 (1997): 53–64, and “Die Bedeutung der samaritanischen mündlichen Tradition für die Exegese des Pentateuch,” *Wort und Dienst* 25 (1999): 77–91.

When Yahweh your God brings you into the land of the Canaanites that you are entering to possess, set up some large stones for yourself and cover them with plaster. Write on the stones all the words of this law. And when you cross the Jordan, set up these stones on Mt. Gerizim, as I command you today. Build there an altar to Yahweh your God, an altar of stones. Do not use any iron tool upon them. Build the altar of Yahweh your God with unhewn stones and offer burnt offerings on it to Yahweh your God. Sacrifice whole offerings and eat them there and rejoice in the presence of Yahweh your God. This mountain is across the Jordan, westwards towards the setting sun, in the territory of the Canaanites who dwell in the Arabah facing Gilgal, near the large tree of Moreh, facing Shechem. (Exod 20:14b)

The verses in question are Deut 11:2b, 27:2b–3a, 4a, 5–7, and 11:30 in that order, but with some variants. Thus, we can see that the Samaritan scribes (most likely located around Mt. Gerizim, where the Samaritan temple stood until its destruction by John Hyrcanus) were well-versed in the scribal technique demonstrated above, and did not hesitate to use it to revise what had then become their canonical text.

DEUTERONOMY 5:12–15: THE SABBATH COMMANDMENT

The fourth example of scribal rewriting I would like to use is found in 4QDeutⁿ, which contains a scribal intervention found in no other text tradition.¹⁹ 4QDeutⁿ is a “special use” manuscript; that is, it was never a complete scroll of the book of Deuteronomy, but was a small, “pocket-sized” manuscript which contains excerpted passages from Deuteronomy. It was most likely meant for study, or possibly liturgical use. The passages in question are Deut 8:1–5 and 5:1–6:1, where the manuscript breaks off, in that order.

In its version of the Sabbath commandment, 4QDeutⁿ uses the same technique of harmonization between parallel passages that we saw in

¹⁹ Sidnie White Crawford, “4QDeutⁿ,” in *Qumran Cave 4, IX: Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Kings*, ed. Eugene Ulrich, Frank Morre Cross et al. (DJD 14; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), 117–28.

4QpaleoExod^m. Its version of the fourth commandment reads as follows (Deut 5:12–15; cols. 3 9–4 7):

Col. 3

9 שמור את יום השבת לקדשו כאשר צוך יהוה
 10 אלוהיך ששת ימים תעבוד ועשית את כול מלאכתך
 11 וביום השביעי שבת ליהוה אלוהיך לוא תעשה בו כל מלאכה
 12 אתה בנך בתך עבדך ואמתך שורך וחמורך

Col. 4

1 ובהמתך גריך אשר בשערך למען ינוח עבדך ואמתך
 2 כמוך וזכרתה כי עבד היית בארץ מצרים ויציאך
 3 יהוה אלוהיך משם ביד חזקה ובזרוע נטויה
 4 על כן צוך יהוה אלוהיך לשמור את יום השבת
 5 לקדשו כי ששת ימים עשה יהוה את השמים יאת הארץ
 6 את הים וכול אשר בס וינוח ביום השביעי על כן ברך יהוה
 7 את יום השבת לקדשו

Col. 3

9 Observe the Sabbath day to sanctify it, according as Yahweh
 10 your God has commanded you. Six days you shall labor and
 do all your work,
 11 but the seventh day is a Sabbath to Yahweh your God.
 You shall not do in it any labor;
 12 you, your son, your daughter, your male slave and your female slave,
 your ox or your ass

Col. 4

1 or your beast, the sojourner who is in your gates, in order that your male
 slave and your female slave may rest
 2 like you. And remember that you were a slave in the land of Egypt, and
 3 Yahweh your God brought you forth from there with a mighty hand
 and an outstretched arm;
 4 therefore Yahweh your God commanded you to observe the Sabbath day
 5 to sanctify it. For in six days Yahweh made the heavens and the earth,
 6 the sea, and all which is in them, and he rested on the seventh day.
 Therefore Yahweh blessed
 7 the Sabbath day to sanctify it.

The scribe of 4QDeutⁿ has taken material from the parallel Decalogue in Exod 20:1–17 and incorporated it into his version of the fourth commandment (the incorporated material is in italics). The governing text is clearly Deut 5:12–15; at the end of those verses the scribe inserts the word לְקַדְּשׁוֹ (“to sanctify it”), and then continues with Exod 20:11, ending with לְקַדְּשׁוֹ as a *wiederaufnahme*, signaling the end of the interpolation. Since this is a unique variant found in a “special use” manuscript, it is most likely the work of the scribe of 4QDeutⁿ himself, and may even have been done by one of the scribes who resided at Qumran.

JEWISH AND SAMARITAN TEXT TRADITIONS

The evidence of the manuscripts 4QpaleoExod^m, 4QNum^b, 4Q365, 4QDeutⁿ and the Samaritan Pentateuch indicates that the scribal technique which felt free to rewrite its parent text for exegetical purposes was at home in both the Samaritan and Judean communities. That is, it was a scribal technique found in more than one location in Palestine in the latter half of the Second Temple period. One of these locations would most likely have been the Samaritan community around Mt. Gerizim, which must have included trained scribes in the large and thriving sanctuary located there. Another, I would suggest, is Qumran, where manuscripts were being both collected and produced. While we cannot be certain, given our available evidence, if 4QNum^b, 4Q365 or 4QDeutⁿ were produced at Qumran or brought in from elsewhere, we can be certain that the scribal manipulations of the story of the daughters of Zelophehad took place away from the Samaritan scribal center on Gerizim, since they do not appear in the Samaritan Pentateuch. Therefore, these changes occurred in a Judean milieu, and Qumran or its related communities is a likely location.

What of the manuscripts of the Pentateuch that do not display the scribal technique we have described, but passed on the short, unrevised forms of Exodus, Numbers and Deuteronomy? Since these manuscripts were also discovered in the Qumran caves, it is obvious that this text tra-

dition was equally at home in Judea, especially since exemplars of this technique were chosen as the canonical text of the Pentateuch within Judaism. But where was it at home, and when was it chosen?

The Pentateuch manuscripts from the other Judean Desert find sites are important in this regard. As has been observed many times, the manuscripts of scriptural texts from Masada, Nahal Hever and Wadi Murabba'at, all closely adhere in consonants to the MT text as found in Codex Leningradensis.²⁰ While most of these manuscripts date to the second century CE, by which time, according to scholarly consensus, a canonical text of the Pentateuch had been chosen by the Jewish community, the Masada manuscripts date before the fall of the Jerusalem Temple in 70 CE. These manuscripts were almost certainly brought from Jerusalem to Masada by the fleeing rebels. Their identity with the later rabbinic text indicates, as Emanuel Tov and others have suggested, that Pentateuch manuscripts associated with the Temple in Jerusalem at that time (second half of the first century CE) were of the short, unrevised form of the text.²¹ There can hardly be any doubt that scribes and a library were associated with the Jerusalem temple complex.²² Armin Lange has suggested that, beginning in the first century BCE, the authorities in Jerusalem decided to promulgate an "authorized version" of the Pentateuch, which included the short, unrevised forms of Exodus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy, while Tov has argued that the "master copy of the Torah" kept in the Temple court reflected the consonantal

²⁰ Frank Moore Cross, *From Epic to Canon: History and Literature in Ancient Israel* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998), 213; Ian Young, "The Stabilization of the Biblical Text in the Light of Qumran and Masada: A Challenge for Conventional Qumran Chronology?" *DSD* 9 (2002): 364–90; Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (3rd ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012), 29.

²¹ Emanuel Tov, "Scriptures: Texts," in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam (Vol. 2; New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), accessed online.

²² Josephus, *Ant.* 5.51; 10.57–58; 12.138–144; *J.W.* 7.150, 162; *Vita* 75; *C. Ap.* 1.28–29; and 2 Macc 2:13–15.

MT.²³ Given the evidence from Masada, whose scrolls predate the destruction of the temple in 70 CE, it seems apparent that Tov is correct, and that the short, unrevised form of the Pentateuch was favored in the temple milieu; however, we do not know if the temple authorities attempted to “authorize” that form for general Jewish practice in any way.

Regardless of whether the short form of the Pentateuch text was authorized or simply favored, I would like to suggest that this choice was not arbitrary, but may have been made in reaction to the Samaritan choice of the revised form of the text, which, as we have seen, they revised still further to reflect Samaritan ideology. Prior to the late first century CE, both forms of the text were in circulation in Judea, and, at least at Qumran, the scribal technique that produced revised forms of the text was still active and accepted. However, after the destruction of the Gerizim sanctuary by Hyrcanus in the late second century BCE, a clear differentiation between Samaritans and Judeans became important for both communities. The Samaritans rejected the sanctity of the Jerusalem temple, and chose a form of the Pentateuch which they further revised to emphasize the chosen status of the Gerizim sanctuary. The Samaritan Tenth Commandment, given above, is the best example of the Samaritan editing.

The Judeans, most likely led by the priests and scribes of the Jerusalem temple, chose in response a different form of the Pentateuch, a short, unrevised form, which they then also edited in order to discredit the sanctity of Mt. Gerizim and to foreshadow the choice of Jerusalem as the elected sanctuary location. This editorial activity is evident at Deut 27:4, where MT and LXX read **בהר עיבל**, “on Mt. Ebal,” while the SP reads **בהגריזים**, “on Mt. Gerizim.” Until recently this variant was considered a polemical change on the part of the Samaritans,

²³ Armin Lange, “‘They Confirmed the Reading’ (y. Ta’an. 4:68a): The Textual Standardization of Jewish Scriptures in the Second Temple Period,” in *From Qumran to Aleppo: A Discussion with Emanuel Tov about the Textual History of Jewish Scriptures in Honor of his 65th Birthday*, ed. Armin Lange et al. (FRLANT 230; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009), 29–80; Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 30–31.

like the addition of the Samaritan Tenth Commandment, emphasizing the choice of Mt. Gerizim as the proper place for God's sanctuary. Recently, fresh considerations of the evidence have led to a reevaluation of the variant. In addition to the SP, two independent witnesses from the Greek tradition, a *Vetus Latina* manuscript (Codex Lugdunensis) and a Greek manuscript, Papyrus Giessen 19, preserve the Gerizim reading.²⁴ Thus it can be argued that the reading בהרגרזים ("on Mt. Gerizim") is an ancient reading, one that in fact accords better with its context, in which blessings are to be pronounced on Mt. Gerizim and curses on Mt. Ebal (Deut 11:29 and 27:12–13).²⁵

Recently a small fragment of Deuteronomy, purporting to be from Qumran Cave 4, has been published by James H. Charlesworth.²⁶ This fragment reads:

²⁴ The Giessen Papyri were first published by Paul Glaue and Alfred Rahlfs, "Fragmente einer griechischen Übersetzung des samaritanischen Pentateuchs," *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen* (1911): 167–200. The fragments have since disappeared, so one must rely on the photographs and transcriptions supplied by Glaue and Rahlfs. The reading at 27:4 appears on col. 1, recto right, lines 3–4, εν αρ(?)γαρ[ι]ζιμ ("on Mt. Gerizim"). According to Tov, it cannot be determined from the photograph and transcription whether or not αρ(?)γαρ[ι]ζιμ was written as one word or two. Tov suggests that this could be "an ancient not yet sectarian reading" (Emanuel Tov, "Pap. Giessen 13, 19, 22, 26: A Revision of the Septuagint?" in *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint*, ed. Emanuel Tov [SVT 72; Leiden: Brill, 1999], 457–75, 462, 472). Codex Lugdunensis was first published by Ulysse Robert, *Pentateuchi versio Latina antiquissima e Codice Lugdunensi: version Latine du Pentateuque antérieure a Saint Jérôme. Publie d'après le manuscrit de Lyon. Avec des facsimilés, des observations paléographiques, philologiques et littéraires sur l'origine et la valeur de ce texte* (Paris: Librairie de Fermin-Didot et Cie, Imprimeurs de l'Institut de France, 1881). The Latin reading is in "Monte Garizin."

²⁵ See Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 88 n. 140; Stefan Schorch, "The Samaritan Version of Deuteronomy and the Origin of Deuteronomy," in *Samaria, Samaritans, Samaritans*, ed. József Zsengellér (Studia Samaritana 6; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011), 23–37, 26–28; Knoppers, *Jews and Samaritans*, 202.

²⁶ James H. Charlesworth, "What is a Variant? Announcing a New Dead Sea Scrolls Fragment of Deuteronomy," *Maarav* 16 (2009) 201–12, 273–74.

]היום בהרגרזים ושדת[2

2]today, on Mt. Gerizim, and you will plaster[

The authenticity of this fragment, which was sold by the Kando family to Azusa Pacific University in the early part of this century, has been called into question.²⁷ If this fragment is authentic, it would support the argument given above that the reading “Mt. Gerizim” is earlier, while MT-Deut’s “Mount Ebal” is a late, polemical change. Regardless, on the basis of the Greek evidence it can be plausibly argued that the MT text of the Pentateuch also underwent alteration at the hands of the scribes for polemical, theological purposes.²⁸

The textual evidence from Qumran suggests that expanded versions of the Pentateuch did continue in circulation until the end of the Second Temple period, regardless of the preference of the Jerusalem temple authorities. However, the destruction caused by the Jewish Revolt against Rome in 66-73 CE, which also caused the destruction of Qumran in 68 CE, caused the disappearance of alternative text forms of the Pentateuch in the Jewish community, and the proto-rabbinic text, from which the MT descends, gained hegemony.

²⁷ See Armin Lange, *Handbuch der Textfunde vom Toten Meer, Band 1: Die Handschriften biblischer Bücher von Qumran und den anderen Fundorten* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 106, who argues on the basis of its paleography that the fragment is a forgery. See also Eibert Tigchelaar, “Post-2002 Dead Sea Scrolls Fishy Fragments—Or Forgeries? On Provenance and Authenticity: Some Cases” (unpublished paper; https://www.academia.edu/27658971/Post-2002_Dead_Sea_Scrolls_Fishy_Fragments_or_Forgeries), 4.

²⁸ For another example of scribal editing in the text of the MT, see Deut 32:8, for which the MT (and SP) reads לְמוֹסַפֵּר בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, “according to the number of the sons of Israel,” against LXX, which reads υἱων (or ἀγγέλων) θεοῦ (“the sons [or angels] of God”). The LXX reading is reflected in the Hebrew of 4QDeut: בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים. It is likely that the MT/SP tradition has been edited to remove the suggestion of polytheism from the text. See Sidnie White Crawford (with Jan Joosten and Eugene Ulrich), “Sample Editions of the Oxford Hebrew Bible: Deuteronomy 32:1–9, 1 Kings 11:1–8, and Jeremiah 27:1–10,” *VT* 58 (2008): 352–66.

CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, I hope I have demonstrated that the activity of “rewriting” scripture was part of the ongoing process of the transmission of the classical texts of ancient Israel by the scribes of the Second Temple period. That scribal activity, which we can trace through all phases of the text of the Pentateuch, only came to an end in the aftermath of the Great Jewish Revolt, when the proto-rabbinic text became the accepted Hebrew text of the Torah for the Jewish community.

Rewriting Israel's History in the Apocalyptic Context: Animal Apocalypse in First Enoch

ANTTI LAATO

Åbo Akademi University

alaato@abo.fi

The aim of this article is to deal with the apocalyptic theology of the unknown writer who rewrote the biblical history of Israel in the Animal Apocalypse (1 En. 85–90). The thesis is that this rewriting process received much inspiration from the texts of the Book of Isaiah. Both the Animal Apocalypse and the Book of Isaiah focused on the future glory of Jerusalem. A good example of this Jerusalem oriented reading of the Book of Isaiah can be seen in the Book of Sirach 48:18–25.¹ But before proceeding, some words should be said about the term “Rewritten Bible.”

REWRITTEN BIBLE: A MODERN META-LEVEL TERM

In 2006, the international scholarly network Studies in the Rewritten Bible (= SRB) was established on the initiative of Åbo Akademi University (ÅAU). Our aim was to deal with the question of reception history of biblical stories in the three monotheistic Abrahamic religions, and we

¹ For the meaning of Ben Sira in understanding the message of the Book of Isaiah concerning Jerusalem, see recently Antti Laato, “Understanding Zion theology in the Book of Isaiah,” in *Studies in Isaiah: History, Theology, and Reception*, ed. Greger Andersson, Tommy Wasserman and David Willgren (LHBOTS 654; Edinburgh: T&T Clark & Bloomsbury, 2016), 22–46.

had the intuition that the concept “Rewritten Bible” could be a suitable umbrella term for our aims. In this respect, the story has no happy end. At every conference, we found ourselves called to discuss what “Rewritten Bible” is, and what it is not. This resulted in a decision to change the name of SRB to “Studies in the Reception History of the Bible”. Nevertheless, it may be interesting for readers to know what kind of reflections I had for the term “Rewritten Bible”.

The modern concept of “Rewritten Bible” was introduced by Geza Vermes, who applied it to a literary phenomena which was typical of certain texts. Vermes referred to the following texts: the Palestinian Targum, Josephus’ *Jewish Antiquities*, Ps-Philo’s *Biblical Antiquities*, *Jubilees*, *Genesis Apocryphon*, and the later rabbinical midrashic *Yashar*.² Since then, Vermes’ study scholars have discussed the definition of the term. The main problem has concerned how the concept should be understood: does it refer to a specific interpretive process or to a literary genre?³ Vermes himself did not concentrate on the generic definition of the “Rewritten Bible.” He seems to have understood this term as referring mainly to certain interpretive processes which are detectable in rabbinical midrash (*Yashar*), in translations (the Palestinian Targum), in historical writings (*Ant.* and *LAB*) and, in particular, in new presentations of Genesis material (*Jubilees* and the *Genesis Apocryphon*). He emphasizes that these texts “in their own way show how the Bible was rewritten.”⁴

² Geza Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism* (Studia Post-Biblica; Leiden: Brill, 1961), 67–126, esp. 95.

³ For this discussion, see, e.g., Erkki Koskenniemi and Pekka Lindqvist, “Rewritten Bible, Rewritten Stories: Methodological Aspects,” in *Rewritten Bible Reconsidered: Proceedings of the Conference in Karkku, Finland August 24-26 2006*, ed. Antti Laato and Jacques van Ruiten (SRB 1; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns 2008), 11–39; Antti Laato, “Gen 49:8–12 and Its Interpretation In Antiquity – A Methodological Approach to Understanding of the Rewritten Bible” in *Rewritten Biblical Figures*, ed. Erkki Koskenniemi and Pekka Lindqvist (SRB 3; Turku: ÅAU/Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns 2010), 1–26.

⁴ Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition*, 95. Later, Vermes speaks of “a ‘rewritten’ Bible, a

The “Rewritten Bible” was no ancient concept, and it is impossible to find any mention in the ancient sources of how it would have been understood. “Rewritten Bible” is rather a typical meta-level term which has been developed by modern scholars in order to denote certain interpretive tendencies in antiquity.⁵ This being the case, the discussion concerns certain interpretive phenomena in antiquity for which Vermes coined the term “Rewritten Bible,” and whether it is possible to find corresponding literary activity in the ancient textual evidence. This indicates that the definition of the term “Rewritten Bible” is open to different applications. The situation does not fit terms such as “targum,” “pesher,” and “midrash,” because they all occur in ancient sources. Hence, it is possible to determine how they were used, understood and modified in antiquity. The rewritten Bible, on the other hand, is a later concept and therefore, the discussion is not dependent on the ancient application of the term, but rather on the way in which its use is meaningful in modern scholarly studies. I proposed my own way of understanding the “Rewritten Bible” in literary activities of late antiquity when I wrote the above-mentioned article on Gen 49:8–12 (n. 3).

In my article, I concluded that Vermes’ analytical term—“Rewritten Bible”—can be related to many different interpretive processes in antiquity. It is not limited to a specific literary form. I argued that the “Rewritten Bible” is a literary phenomenon where the reader creates a referential world for the object of his reading by filling its gaps. He arranges the content of the text in its referential world and creates a

fuller, smoother and doctrinally more advanced form of the sacred narrative,” and treats all textual examples under the title “Biblical midrash.” See Emil Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ: 175 B.C. – A.D. 135*, ed. Geza Vermes, Fergus Millar and Martin Goodman (Vol. 3.1; Edinburgh: Clark 1986), 308–41, esp. 308. Even here, however, it is difficult to infer that Vermes understood the “Rewritten Bible” as a form-historical genre.

⁵ Cf., Michael Segal, “Between Bible and Rewritten Bible,” in *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran*, ed. Matthias Henze (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 10–28. In his article, Segal writes that “it is necessary first to address how ancient readers understood this fundamental concept” (12). His question is anachronistic, however.

planned, logical series of events which have a beginning, a middle, and an end. In antiquity, such reading processes led to new texts where a reader creates a referential world for the biblical text. This referential world contains elements not attested in the biblical text. The referential world was presented in a new text and such new texts may have been of different kinds. I argued that translation, *peshar* and *midrash* are all connected with the reading process where new elements are attested in the text. The same is true of *pseudepigrapha*, Christian interpretive activities, and theological occupations in Qur'an. The best examples of these new texts, where the referential world is arranged in a logical sequence, incorporating additions and interpretive modifications, are *Jubilees*, *Genesis Apocryphon*, Josephus and LAB, that is, the texts that had provided Vermes with examples of "Rewritten Bible."

In this article, my thesis is that the rewritten version of the biblical history in 1 En. 85–90 is based on the writer's combination of historical records with an apocalyptic referential world based on the Book of Isaiah. The past events in the biblical books were not only historical records for the writer. Rather, they were part of a secret, divine plan which began with the creation of the world and would end with future eschatological events that were introduced in the Maccabean period. The Book of Isaiah provided the writer with good tools to rewrite the biblical history from this apocalyptic perspective.

AN APOCALYPTIC UNDERSTANDING OF THE HISTORY OF ISRAEL

The Animal Apocalypse in 1 En. 85–90 follows the main lines of the biblical historical writings, and a modern reader acquainted with the Hebrew Bible can easily recognize correspondences.⁶ Scholars often compare the content of the Animal Apocalypse to the Book of Daniel,

⁶ An illustrative list can be found in George W. E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress 2001), 358.

since both stem from the same historical and religious milieu (related to the Maccabean period). There are four significant similarities between the Animal Apocalypse and the Book of Daniel:

- 1) Examples of historical credos where the history of Israel has been presented in a short form are found already in the Hebrew Bible itself.⁷ In the Book of Daniel, for example, such a way of presenting the history of Israel was related to the “pseudo-prophecy” of the ancient Near Eastern literary form.⁸ In Daniel 11, the future is seen through several *vaticinia ex eventu* prophecies which provide a paradigm for future events. The theological emphasis is put in high relief: God has everything in his control.
- 2) Apocalyptic chronology is a specific attempt to calculate when the end will come. In both the Animal Apocalypse and the Book of Daniel, such apocalyptic calculations are based on the prediction of seventy years' captivity found in Jeremiah (Jer 25:11–12; 29:10). The Chronicler understood the Jeremiah prediction about the exile of 70 years in such a way that the return from the exile would be realized only when “the country has paid off his Sabbaths” (2 Chr 36:21). This implies that the period of seventy years has been understood as corresponding to seventy sabbatical years. According to this way of thinking, the 70 years came to corresponding to 70 weeks of year, that is, a total of 490 years in Dan 9:24–27. The same period of 70 weeks of year is also presented in 1 En. 89–90.
- 3) The typical feature in eschatological thinking is that the primeval paradisiacal period will be realized in the eschatological future. This phenomenon is visible already in some prophetic texts of the Hebrew Bible (see, e.g., Isa 65:17–25; Ezek 47:1–12; Am 9:13; Joel 4:18; Zech 14:8) and then, later, in the Book of Daniel (Dan 9:24; 12:2–3) and, as we shall see, in the Animal Apocalypse.
- 4) Finally, I would like to emphasize that important theological topics in the rewritten version of the history of Israel of the Animal Apocalypse can be related to the Book of Isaiah. Joseph Blenkinsopp has shown con-

⁷ For these historical credos see Gerhard von Rad, *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament* (TB 8; Munich: Kaiser 1961), 9–86.

⁸ William W. Hallo, “Akkadian Apocalypses,” *IEJ* 16 (1966): 231–42; Maria de Jong Ellis, “Observations on Mesopotamian Oracles and Prophetic Texts: Literary and Historiographic Considerations,” *JCS* 41 (1989): 127–86.

vincingly that the Book of Isaiah has been understood as an important apocalyptic source in the Book of Daniel.⁹ He also argues that the Book of Isaiah was popular in pre-Christian Judaisms, and that it was understood as an apocalyptic source. This being the case, it would be no wonder if the Book of Isaiah also lurked behind the Animal Apocalypse. In the following sections (3–6) I will discuss four important topics in the Animal Apocalypse which are repeated in different contexts, and in different ways demonstrate that they form a skeleton, or plot, of the rewritten version of the history of Israel. I shall then show that all these four topics of the Animal Apocalypse are related to the content of the Book of Isaiah.

THE ANIMAL METAPHORS OF “BULL” AND “SHEEP”

The history of Israel from Adam to the end of days is presented in the Animal Apocalypse by the use of animals as metaphors for biblical figures. The metaphor of “bull” dominates from Adam to Abraham and Isaac (1 En. 89:10–12) but with Jacob, the metaphor of ram (and sheep) is used for the first time, and this metaphor dominates until the eschatological end, when again a white bull is born (1 En. 90:37). Something important took place after Abraham and Isaac. Jacob did in some sense begin a new period in the history of Israel. How could such a presentation be understood?

The change from bulls to sheep is apparently related to the fact that bulls lived longer than sheep. Jacob’s own words in Gen 47:9 indicate that he did not live as long as his father and grandfather: “The years of my sojourning are a hundred and thirty. My years have been few and difficult, and they do not equal the years of the pilgrimage of my fathers.” A similar explanation for this shift from bull to sheep during the time of Abraham (and Isaac) can be found in Jub. 23:8–31, which recounts the death of Abraham. The writer of Jubilees has apparent problems in understanding why the righteous Abraham lived for only 175

⁹ Joseph Blenkinsopp, *Opening the Sealed Book: Interpretations of the Book of Isaiah in Late Antiquity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 2006), 18–27.

years. He compares Abraham's life with the patriarchs who lived before the great flood, and notes that while the former lived only three and a half jubilees, the patriarchs of the old period lived for up to 19 jubilees. The writer's explanation for this phenomenon is that sin increased in the world after the angels descended from the heaven. This was the reason why the length of the life of human beings was decreased:

Then it will be said: "The days of the ancients were numerous—as many as 1000 years—and good. But now the days of our lives, if a man has lived for a long time, are 70 years, and, if he is strong, 80 years." All are evil and there is no peace during the days of that evil generation. During that generation the children will find fault with their fathers and elders because of sin and injustice, because of what they say and the great evils that they commit, and because of their abandoning the covenant which the Lord had made between them and himself so that they should observe and perform all his commands, ordinances, and all his laws without deviating to the left or right. (Jub. 23:15–6)¹⁰

This being the case, Abraham was in some sense contaminated by these collective sins. However, his righteousness was the reason why he lived much longer than ordinary people (maximum 70 or 80 years).

The writer of Jubilees also paints a scenario that in the future, when the stipulations of the Torah are followed, the people will begin to live longer again. He apparently has Isaiah 65:17–25 in mind when he writes:

In those days the children will begin to study the laws, to seek out the commands, and to return to the right way. The days will begin to become numerous and increase, and mankind as well—generation by generation and day by day until their lifetimes approach 1000 years and to more years than the number of days (had been). There will be no old man, nor anyone who has lived out his lifetime, because all of them will be infants and children. They will complete and live their entire lifetimes peacefully and joyfully. There will be neither a satan nor any evil one who will destroy. For their entire lifetimes will be times of blessing and healing. (Jub. 23:26–29)¹¹

¹⁰ Translations from the Book of Jubilees are taken from James C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees* (Leuven: Peeters 1989).

¹¹ James C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees* (Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press 2001).

This way of understanding the epoch of human history—that a willingness to follow the stipulations of the Torah could increase the length of human life again—would also explain the end of the Animal Apocalypse where a new white Bull (some sort of new Adam) is born and all sheep become bulls:

And the eyes of all were opened, and they saw good things; and there was none among them that did not see. And I saw how that house was large and broad and very full. And I saw how a white bull was born, and its horns were large. And all the wild beasts and all the birds of heaven were afraid of it and made petition to it continually. And I saw until all their species were changed, and they all became white cattle. And the first one became “word”¹² among them (and that “word” was a large animal), and there were large black horns on its head. And the Lord of the sheep rejoiced over it and over all the cattle. (1 En. 90:35–38)

These verses are related to the description of final judgment and the New Jerusalem in 1 En. 90:20–38. The Lord of the sheep rejoiced when the white bull was born, and the sheep were transformed into cattle. In the presentation of the Animal Apocalypse, this indicates some sort of metamorphosis back to the primeval period when human beings were

¹² The Ethiopian text reads *nagar*, “a word.” It seems clear that “word” cannot be the original reading. An old proposal by Dillmann was that the Ethiopian text would have read a Greek text where the Hebrew (or alternatively Aramaic) word of “wild ox” (רֶאֱמָא/רֶאֱמָא) had been transliterated as ρημ/ρημα. This would have been misinterpreted as ρημα, “the word” (August Dillman, *Das Buch Henoch* [Leipzig: Vogel, 1853], 287–88; so also Robert Henry Charles, *The Ethiopic Version of the Book of Enoch Edited from Twenty-Three MSS* [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1906], 188, although he also mentions the view of Goldschmidt, who argues that the original טלה [“lamb”] was corrupted to מלה [“word”]). According to Lindars, the consonants of the Aramaic אמר (“a lamb”) were read to mean “a word” (Barnabas Lindars, “A Bull, a Lamb and a Word: 1 Enoch XC.38,” *NTS* 22 [1976]: 483–86; see further Michael Anthony Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments* [Vol. 2; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978], 216). Nickelsburg’s proposal is that that the Aramaic דרב (“leader”) was read in Hebraizing fashion as “word.” He argues that the verb דרב (“to lead”) in the Animal Vision (89:14) is attested in 4QEn^c 4 2:16 (Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 402; for this, see also Jozef T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4* [Oxford: Clarendon Press 1976] 241).

bulls and cattle. A good background for such metamorphosis is Isaiah 65–66.¹³ Isa 65:17–25 in particular refers to a period when a new heaven and a new earth will be created, when human beings will once again live a long life, and when there will be a peaceful coexistence between human beings and animals.

THE METAPHOR OF MAN

In the Animal Apocalypse, the metaphor of “man” is used to describe angels (1 En. 87:2; 90:21). However, in two cases, it is noted that even human beings “became men.” The first case is Noah:

And one of those four went to <one of the white bulls>¹⁴ and taught it a mystery—trembling as it was.¹⁵ It was born a bull but became a man.¹⁶ And he built himself a vessel and dwelt in it, and three bulls [Shem, Ham and Japhet] dwelt with him on that vessel, and the vessel was covered and roofed over them.

¹³ In Åbo Akademi University, Stefan Green is completing his doctoral dissertation on Isaiah 65–66 where he discusses in which ways these chapters reflect proto-apocalyptic ideas. Among the points of comparison is the Book of Enoch. I recommended the reader to consult his study when it is completed.

¹⁴ The singular reading is attested only in manuscript m, while all other Ethiopian manuscripts read “those white bulls.” There is reason to follow 4QEn^c 4 1:13 הד מן תורי (see Milik, *Enoch*, 238).

¹⁵ Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 364–65, follows the reading “trembling as he was” (*’enza yere’ed*, attested in the manuscripts mt,β), while Patrick A. Tiller, *A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch* (SBL Early Judaism and Its Literature 4; Atlanta: Scholars Press 1993), 161, proposes “without his trembling” (*’enza ’iyere’ed*, attested in the manuscripts gqu). This difference is interesting, since it shows that copyists had difficulties in understanding the reference to “trembling.” The same verb is also used in 1 En. 89:31, 34 (on this, see further in section 7 below).

¹⁶ It is remarkable that Noah was born as a bull and transformed into a man. However, it is worth noting that the Aramaic text (4QEn^c 4) does not contain such an idea (for this, see Milik *Enoch*, 238–39). A similar transformation is related to Moses (1 En. 89:36), and for that verse, even the Aramaic text has been preserved.

The second case is Moses:

And I saw in this vision, until that sheep¹⁷ became a man and built a house for the Lord of the sheep and made all the sheep stand in that house. (1 En. 89:36)

It may be significant that Noah built the ark and Moses built the house.¹⁸ Was the theme of “becoming a man” in some way related to these important epochs in human history and in the history of Israel? And what is the meaning of the phrases that Noah and Moses became men?¹⁹

To answer these questions, it is best to begin with the case of Moses, since the Aramaic version confirms the reading that he became a man, while the case of Noah is textually insecure. There is one interesting text in the Book of Isaiah which may explain the transformation of Moses to an angel, namely Isa 63:11:

ויזכר ימי־עולם משה עמו איה המעלם מים את רעי צאנו
איה השם בקרבו את־רוח קדשו

Then he [= God] recalled the days of old, the days of Moses and his people—
where is he who brought them through the sea, with the shepherd of his flock?
Where is he who set his Holy Spirit in him.

It is possible to interpret the Hebrew text as God transforming Moses into an angel by putting “the spirit of his holiness” inside him. Indeed, the Hebrew *רוח* can be interpreted as “an angel,” something which is presented in the 4QSongs of the Sabbath Sacrifice where angels are

¹⁷ The Aramaic text adds *ו אתהפך ו* (“was changed and,” 4QEn^c 4 10; Milik, *Enoch*, 205).

¹⁸ It seems reasonable to assume that in the case of Moses, “the house” refers to the tabernacle, because later in 1 En. 89:40 it is said: “And I saw those sheep until they were satisfied, and that house [tabernacle] was in their midst in the pleasant land.” In the case of Solomon (1 En. 89:49–50) the “house” (Jerusalem?) is distinguished from the temple (“high tower”).

¹⁹ Concerning Jewish interpretations that a human being can ascend to heaven, see Martha Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypse* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993).

called אלים, אלהים, אלהים, קדשים, רוחות, among other terms.²⁰ A similar idea is also detectable in Ex 7:1, where it is said that Yahweh will make Moses a אלהים לפרעה (נתתיך אלהים לפרעה).

Turning to Noah, no text relating to a transformation to an angel-like figure can be found in the Hebrew Bible. However, God did make a covenant with Noah, and this covenant is characterized as eternal (Gen 9:8–17). At first sight, there is nothing special here, since the descendants of Noah, as well as all animals, are included in the covenant. Nonetheless, there is a text in the Book of Isaiah, namely Isa 54:9, which may have inspired an ancient interpreter (or some later editor responsible for the Ge'ez version of the Animal Apocalypse) to think more about the character of Noah:

כִּי־מִי נַח זֹאת לִי אֲשֶׁר נִשְׁבַּעְתִּי מֵעַבְרָה מִיַּנְח עוֹד עֲלֵה־אָרֶץ
 כֵּן נִשְׁבַּעְתִּי מִקֶּצֶף עֵלֶיךָ וּמִגַּעַר־בַּד

To me this is like the days of Noah, when I swore that the waters of Noah would never again cover the earth. So now I have sworn not to be angry with you, never to rebuke you again. (Isa 54:9)

By referring to “Noah’s water,” this verse implies that the covenant accounted for in Genesis 9 was especially related to Noah himself. So, if Yahweh’s covenant with Noah was eternal, then Noah must also live on after his “death.” By combining Isa 54:9 with Gen 9:8–17 the writer may have concluded that even Noah would have been taken into the heavenly court, which, in turn, would imply that he was transformed into an angel. The ancient interpreter may have found additional proof for his conclusion in the fact that in the stories of both Noah and Moses, God saved the righteous ones through waters of chaos, as indicated in Isa 54:9–10 and Isa 63:11–12.

²⁰ For this, see Carol Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition* (HSM 27; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985), 23–38; Lawrence H. Schiffman, “Sabbath,” in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 805–807, esp. 806–807.

THE METAPHORS OF HOUSE AND TOWER

The Animal Apocalypse contains two important concepts, “house” (בית), and “tower” (*māxfad*), which are related to the cultic community or cultic building. The first time the house is mentioned in the Animal Apocalypse is in 1 En. 89:36 (see above). Whether this house refers to the tabernacle or not cannot be taken for granted, but the tabernacle is a good option, especially if Milik’s reconstruction of מ[שכן] in 4Q En^c 4 10 is right.²¹ Later in the Animal Apocalypse, it becomes clear that “house” can no longer refer to the tabernacle, but rather to the city of Jerusalem:

And a little sheep became ram [Solomon] instead of it, and it became ruler and leader of those sheep. And that house became large and broad. And a large and high tower [Temple] was built upon that house for the Lord of the sheep. That house was low, but the tower was raised up and was high. And the Lord of the sheep stood upon that tower, and they spread a full table²² before him. (1 En. 89:49–50)

Instead of the word “house,” the text uses “tower” to denote the Temple. The Testament of Levi 10:5 confirms that Jerusalem has been called “house” in the Book of Enoch:²³ “For the house which the Lord shall choose shall be called Jerusalem, as the book of Enoch the righteous maintains.” There are certainly plenty of possibilities to argue about which biblical texts may lurk behind the identification of Jerusalem with “house.” For the thesis of this study, it is certainly significant that

²¹ For this, see Milik, *Enoch*, 206.

²² Reference is made to the offerings and sacrifices (cf. Ex 25:30).

²³ This has been noted already by Robert H. Charles, *The Book of Enoch* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1893), 240–41. It is worth noting too that Kee, whose translation to Testament of Levi I use here, notes that “no known parallel in Enochic literature” can be found for T. Levi 10:5 (Howard C. Kee, “Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs,” in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha Volume 1: Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments*, ed. James H. Charlesworth [Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983], 775–828, esp. 792).

the Book of Isaiah contains important key texts where “house” can be taken as denoting Jerusalem. For example, the central and programmatic text of in Isa 2:2–4 contains this possibility:

ונעלה אל־הר־יהוה
אל־בית אלהי יעקב
וירגו מדרכיו
ונלכה בארחתיו
כי מציון תצא תורה
ודבר־יהוה מירושלם

“Come, let us go up to the mountain of Yahweh,
to the house (בית) of the God of Jacob.
He will teach us his ways,
so that we may walk in his paths.”
The law will go out from Zion,
the word of Yahweh from Jerusalem. (Isa 2:3)

This text speaks about “the mountain of Yahweh,” Zion, Jerusalem, and “the house of the God,” terms that may all have been understood as designations for the holy city. Such a reading would also be suitable in Isa 2:2, which speaks about “the mountain of the house of Yahweh.” Here, it might be suggested that the “house of Yahweh” was interpreted as referring to, not only the temple mountain, but the whole city. A similar possibility to understand “house” as referring to the whole city of Jerusalem can be found in Isa 66:20: “my holy mountain, [that is] Jerusalem” (הר קדשי ירושלם).

The term “tower” as a reference to the Temple of Jerusalem may be related to the idea that it is a copy of the heavenly sanctuary, something which is implied in Ex 25:9. In 1 En. 87:3, the corresponding word, “tower,” has been used for the heavenly locale, indicating that the reference is made to the sanctuary:

And those three who came after took hold of me by my hand and raised me from the generations of the earth, and lifted me onto a high place, and they showed me a tower high above the earth,²⁴ and all the hills were smaller.

²⁴ This high tower probably refers to a heavenly sanctuary, an idea which is implied in Ex 25:9 and a well-known topic in inter-testamental Jewish writings.

Again, it is possible to find a text in the Book of Isaiah which features a relationship between the earthly and the heavenly temple, namely Isa 66:1: “Heaven is my throne, and the earth is my footstool. Where is the house you will build for me? Where will my resting place be?” Even though this is a criticism of the people, the continuity in Isa 66:20 indicates that it is precisely Jerusalem that is conceived as the holy place for Yahweh. Therefore, the link between heaven and Jerusalem is put in high relief in Isaiah 66.

The Animal Apocalypse has a different attitude toward the cult of the First and the Second Temple. As quoted above, 1 En. 89:50 refers to the first temple as “a large and high tower (Temple),” it was “raised up and was high. And the Lord of the sheep stood upon that tower, and they spread a full table before him.” However, in the case of the Second Temple it is said:

And they began again to build as before and they raised up that tower and it was called the high tower [Second Temple]. And they began again to place a table before the tower, but all the bread on it was polluted and not pure. (1 En. 89:73)²⁵

What implications does this critical attitude toward the cult of the Second Temple have for the understanding of the history of Israel? It is again possible to find traces of this criticism of the Second Temple in the Book of Isaiah. As already noted, Isaiah 66 contains a criticism against the temple, which had been rebuilt.²⁶ Other texts in Isaiah 56–66 make this criticism apparent. The people did not live according to the will of God and, therefore, they could not expect God to hear their prayers, even though they were delivered in the Temple itself (Isa 59:1–2).

²⁵ This is an important observation on the nature of the sacrificial cult in the Second Temple.

²⁶ Concerning this criticism, see, especially, Stefan Green, “The Temple of God and Crises in Isaiah 65–66 and 1 Enoch,” in *Studies in Isaiah: History, Theology, and Reception*, ed. Greger Andersson, Tommy Wasserman and David Willgren (LHBOTS 654; Edinburgh: T&T Clark & Bloomsbury, 2016), 47–66.

BLINDNESS AND OPENING OF EYES

Blindness and the opening of eyes are important topics in the Animal Apocalypse. The topic of blindness is mentioned for the first time in 1 En. 89:21: “And I looked at the sheep until they went out from the wolves, and the wolves’ eyes were blinded,²⁷ and the wolves went out pursuing those sheep with all their might.” Blindness implies that great works of Yahweh have not been understood, and the consequence is a penalty. The first time blindness is mentioned in the case of Israel is in the events of Ex 32, which are retold in 1 En. 89:32:

And again that sheep [Moses] that led them went up to the summit of that rock, and the sheep began to be blinded and to stray from the path that it had shown them, but that sheep [Moses] did not know about these things.²⁸

The topic of blindness is subsequently taken up regularly in the rewriting of the history of Israel (1 En. 89:33, 41, 54, 74; 90:7, 26).

In addition to blindness, the opening of eyes is mentioned several times in the Animal Apocalypse. The first mention of this topic is in 1 En 89:28:

But the sheep departed from that water and went out to a desert, where there was no water or grass, and they began to open their eyes²⁹ and see. And I saw <until> the Lord of the sheep was pasturing them and giving them water and grass, and that sheep was going and leading them.

This theme is then repeated in several times in the rewritten version of the history of Israel (1 En 89:41, 44; 90:6, 10, 35).

It seems clear that blindness and the opening of eyes are closely connected. In 1 En. 89:41, the topic of Judges 2 has been summarized

²⁷ The motif of blindness appears here for the first time. It refers to the Egyptians, but later, the same motif is also used for Israelites together with the motif of “opening eyes.”

²⁸ Nickelsburg’s translation follows the text of 4QEn^c 4 4 (ואמרה לא ידע בהון), see Milik, *Enoch*, 204). The Ethiopian text has “but that sheep did not know.”

²⁹ 4QEn^c 4 3:17 reads ועיניהון התפתחו “and their eyes were opene[d]” (Milik, *Enoch*, 243).

by using both metaphors: “And sometimes their eyes were opened, and sometimes they were blinded [the period Judges], until another sheep [Samuel] arose and led them and brought them all back, and their eyes were opened.” A similar process is repeated in Maccabean times:

⁶ And behold, lambs were born of those white sheep, and they began to open their eyes and to see [Hasidim!?] and to cry out to the sheep. ⁷ But they did not listen to them nor attend to their words, but they were extremely deaf, and their eyes were extremely and excessively blinded [unbelievers during the Maccabean time].” (1 En. 90:6–7)

James C. VanderKam has proposed that the opening of eyes is a motif which is related to the ancient etymology of the name of Israel.³⁰ This may well be so, but for the thesis of this paper it is important to note that the theme of blindness and opening of eyes is a central theme in the Book of Isaiah.

Blindness is related to the hardening motif and the opening of eyes texts in the Book of Isaiah. These topics are attested both in Isaiah 1–35 and in 40–66, and it is one of the most central thematic parallels between the two parts of the book.³¹ The majority of the people are blind (Isa 6:9–10; 29:9–12), while there is a remnant whose eyes are opened (Isa 29:15–24; 50:4–9).³² The most important text in the Book of Isaiah is Isa 29:9–24. In verses 9–14, the people are criticised because of their blindness and inability to read and understand the prophetic message.

³⁰ James C. VanderKam, “Open and Closed Eyes in the Animal Apocalypse (1 Enoch 85–90),” in *Idea of Biblical Interpretation: Essays in Honor of James L. Kugel*, ed. Hindy Najman and Judith H. Newman (SJSJ 83; Leiden: Brill 2003), 279–92.

³¹ For a discussion, see Ronald E. Clements, “Beyond Tradition History: Deutero-Isaianic Development of First Isaiah’s Themes,” *JSOT* 31 (1985): 95–113 (reprinted in Ronald E. Clements, *Old Testament Prophecy: From Oracles to Canon* [Westminster: John Knox, 1996], 78–92); H. G. M. Williamson, *The Book Called Isaiah: Deutero-Isaiah’s Role in Composition and Redaction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), 46–51; Antti Laato, “About Zion I Will Not Be Silent”: *The Book of Isaiah as an Ideological Unity* (ConBOT 44; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1998), 96–102.

³² Note in particular Williamson, *The Book Called Isaiah*, 94–115, who sees the connection between the sealed book in Isa 8:16–18 and Isa 29:18; 50:4–9.

On the other hand, in Isa 29:17–24, it is prophesized that the time of blindness will end, and that the people will receive a wonderful future.

According to Isa 29:18, in the time of salvation, the *blind* will see the deeds of Yahweh, and the *deaf* people will hear the voice of Yahweh (see similar predictions in Isa 32:3; 35:5). There are many texts in Isaiah 40–66 where the deaf and blind are present (42:16, 18–19; 43:8; 44:18). Isa 42:16 states that in the coming time of salvation, the blind and deaf people will see and hear (see also 41:20; cf. 40:21; 52:15). This seeing and hearing is an indication that the people will no longer be hardened, but rather ready to experience the salvation of Yahweh. This salvation is also implied in Isa 6:12–13. Furthermore, Isa 29:18 speaks about “the words of the book” which will be understood in the coming day of salvation. This book must be the same as the (sealed) book in 29:11.

The Animal Apocalypse refers to “the sealed books” (1 En. 90:20; *masāhefta xetumāta*) where the actions of the 70 shepherds, as well as of human beings, are written down (1 En. 89:68–72, 77). That the books are called “sealed books” may be an association with Isa 29:11 and Dan 12:4, 9. The function of the sealed books in the Animal Apocalypse is to indicate how much evil the seventy shepherds can do to the sheep of Yahweh until the end comes. At the same time, this indicates that in the end-time, there is a group who will begin to understand the message of the sealed books. In these writings, an explanation is given as to why the sheep of Yahweh have been the object of much terror. Notably, Isa 29:18–21 contains a similar message:

18 ושמעו ביום־ההוא החרשים דבר־יספר
ומאפל ומחשך עיני עורים ראינה
19 ויספו ענוים ביהוה שמחה
ואביוני אדם בקדוש ישראל יגילו
20 כי־אפס עריץ
וכלה לץ
ונכרתו כל־שקדי און
21 מחטיאי דם בדבר
ולמוכיח בשער יקשון
ויטו בתהו צדיק

- 18 In that day the deaf will hear the words of the scroll,
and out of gloom and darkness
the eyes of the blind will see.
- 19 Once more the humble will rejoice in the Lord;
the needy will rejoice in the Holy One of Israel.
- 20 The ruthless will vanish,
the mockers will disappear,
and all who have an eye for evil will be cut down—
- 21 those who with a word make someone out to be guilty,
who ensnare the defender in court
and with false testimony deprive the innocent of justice.

It is significant that these same verses have been interpreted in Qumran (4QpIsa^c), but unfortunately in a very fragmentary text.³³ However, it seems as if the text has been interpreted to mean that the Qumran community and its Teacher have earned the ability to read and understand the sealed Book of Isaiah. In 4QpIsa^c, the pesher of Isa 29:17 contains the Hebrew word מורה, and the interpretation is related to Zech 11:11. This indicates that the reference is made to the Teacher of the Righteousness. Therefore, an attractive proposal is that the Teacher of Righteousness is understood as someone who is able to understand the secret message of the sealed book (Isa 29:11).³⁴ A similar understanding is plausible in the Animal Apocalypse too.

THE BOOK OF ISAIAH AND THE ANIMAL APOCALYPSE

As I have shown above, there are good grounds to understand the four important (and often repeated) theological topics of the Animal Apocalypse as being related to similar themes in the Book of Isaiah. Conse-

³³ See these texts in, for example, Maurya P. Horgan, *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books* (CBQMS 8; Washington: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1979), 94–124; Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Study Edition Volume One 1Q1–4Q273* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 318–27.

³⁴ For this, see also Blenkinsopp, *Opening the Sealed Book*, 122.

quently, it can be argued that the Book of Isaiah has provided a theological framework for the writer of the Animal Apocalypse from which he understands the biblical history of Israel that he rewrites. Proceeding from such an observation, I will conclude this article by demonstrating in which ways the central existential problems dealt with in the Animal Apocalypse receive their answer from the Book of Isaiah.

The silence of God in the postexilic period emanates as a difficult issue already in the Hebrew Bible, where it is manifested in particular in three prayers preserved in Ezra 9, Neh 9 and Dan 9. Similarly, Isa 63:7–64:11, which also deals with the problem of God's silence in the postexilic period, is an important passage of theodicy in the Book of Isaiah. As Williamson has shown, it contains good parallels to Nehemiah 9.³⁵ Part of this passage, Isa 63:11–14, has already been treated above, where we say that it can explain the idea found in the Animal Apocalypse that Moses was transformed into an angel.

The postexilic reality of God's silence received its particular form in apocalyptic chronologies preserved in both Dan 9:24–27 and in the Animal Apocalypse. I have devoted a separate study to this problem in which I argue that the four periods of 12 + 23 + 23 + 12 weeks of year correspond to chronological periods that were known to the author, who followed a chronological system of Demetrius:³⁶

- 1) The first period of 84 years is the period from the reform of Josiah until the end of the exile. It was calculated in the following way: 13 (the last regnal years of Josiah after his reform) + 11 (Jehoiakim's regnal years including Shallum's three months' reign) + 11 (Zedekiah's regnal years including Jekoniah's three months' reign) + 49 years (the duration of the exile according to Dan 9:24–27) = 84 years.
- 2) The second period of 161 years corresponds to the period from the rebuilding of the Second Temple during Darius' second year, to the rise of

³⁵ H. G. M. Williamson, "Isaiah 63,7–64,11: Exilic Lament or Post-Exilic Protest?" *ZAW* 102 (1990): 48–58.

³⁶ Antti Laato, "The Chronology in the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch 85–90," *JSP* 26 (2016): 3–19.

Alexander the Great where the writer follows Demetrius' chronology, a chronology which is 26/27 years shorter than our absolute chronology, i.e., 520 BCE – 187/188 years = 333/332 BCE.

- 3) The third period of 161 years corresponds to our absolute chronology, because it is clear from 1 Macc that the Greek chronological system from Alexander the Great onwards was known to Jewish authors. This means that the third period ends at 172/171 BCE, which corresponds to the time of the murder of Onias III. If we assume that the author followed Demetrius' chronology, it is also significant that the same year is derived from the chronological system of the Damascus Document.³⁷

By using this apocalyptic chronology, the writer of 1 En. 85–90 wanted to show that God's silence had a meaning. He has calculated beforehand every year until the end. Something essential began in the Maccabean period and onwards when Yahweh began to open the eyes of the lambs and gave answers to the prayers of his people. It is from this perspective that the author of 1 En. 85–90 looked at passages of the Book of Isaiah where it is prophesied that in the future, the eyes of the people will be opened and that they would once more hear the word of Yahweh.

The apocalyptic chronology begins with the note that the shepherds will destroy more than Yahweh has commanded them. This topic of punishment of the people, and especially of the righteous ones, is an important theme in the Books of Maccabees. I have argued elsewhere that essential features of this martyr theology are based on Isaiah 53.³⁸ It is worth noting that even Daniel 11–12 (describing the martyrs of the Maccabean period) contains clear allusions to Isaiah 53. In the Animal Apocalypse, the martyr theology does not dominate in a similar way, which may be an indication that the acute persecutions of the Maccabean period had already passed, and the writer was rather looking for-

³⁷ See Antti Laato, "The Chronology of the Damascus Document of Qumran," *RevQ* 60 (1992): 605–607; idem, *Guide to Biblical Chronology* (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press 2015), 83–86.

³⁸ See Antti Laato, *Who Is the Servant of the Lord? Jewish and Christian Interpretations on Isaiah 53 from Antiquity to the Middle Ages* (SRB 4; Turku: ÅAU/Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2012).

ward to a new, marvelous period under the Hasmoneans. Such an interpretation receives support from the apocalyptic chronology, which dates the beginning of the fourth period to the beginning of the Maccabean period.

The use of the verb “tremble,” *r'd*, may also be significant in the Animal Apocalypse, where it appears four times (1 En. 86:6; 89:1, 31, 34). The first text refers to the watchers in front of which “all the sons of the earth began to tremble and quake before them, and to flee.” However, the second text is more difficult to understand (1 En. 89:1): “And one of those four went to <one [Noah] of the white bulls> and taught it a mystery—trembling as it was.” Nickelsburg thinks that “trembling” in the case of Noah “may be a typical reaction to the angelophany.”³⁹ It seems to me that Noah’s “trembling” is related to his attitude toward Yahweh, which enables the angel to reveal “a mystery” (*mestir*) to him. Blenkinsopp has further noticed that Isa 24:16–17 contains an Aramaic loanword, רז, which appears only here and in the Book of Daniel. In the latter, it functions as “a key component of the interpretive process” (Dan 2:18–19, 27–30, 47; 4:6).⁴⁰ Even though no pesher on Isa 24:16–17 is available in the Qumran writings, it is significant that the alliterative triple פחד ופחת ופח (“terror, trap, pit”) is explained in the Damascus document (CD 4 14) as referring to the three nets of Belial: “fornication,” “wealth,” and “desecration” (of the Temple).⁴¹ The content of the mystery taught to Noah is apparently related to the coming destruction of the humankind. But why Noah is depicted as “trembling”? One possible explanation can be found from the Book of Isaiah. The Ethiopic *r'd* is semantically equivalent to the Hebrew חרד, as can be seen from Ezra 10:3, 9, where a group of חרדים is also called מרעידים. On the other hand, in 1 En. 89:31, the Ethiopian *r'd* used to denote the people’s reaction in Sinai is clearly based on Ex 19:16, where the verb חרד is used. This would indicate that the attitude of “trembling” and the teach-

³⁹ Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 375.

⁴⁰ Blenkinsopp, *Opening the Sealed Book*, 17.

⁴¹ Blenkinsopp, *Opening the Sealed Book*, 25.

ing of “mystery” are related to each other. Noah is one who receives the revelation of God and trembles at that message.

In the Book of Isaiah, there are two verses where the attitude of trembling is related to the word of God, namely Isa 66:2, 5. The group favored by Yahweh is depicted as follows in verse 2: “These are the ones I look on with favor: those who are humble and contrite in spirit, and who tremble at my word.” As is clear from Isa 66:5, this group is hated by the majority of the people: “Hear the word of the Lord, you who tremble at his word: Your own people who hate you, and exclude you because of my name, have said, ‘Let the Lord be glorified, that we may see your joy!’ Yet they will be put to shame.” This analysis suggests that Noah was depicted as one who belonged to the group of חרדים or מרעידים. He received the message of mystery which was related to the coming destruction of the world and the salvation of the righteous ones, something which, according to the Animal Apocalypse, would be realized again in the future. As in Isa 66:5, the Animal Apocalypse also has a clear reference to the idea that the majority of the people paid no attention to the words of the loyal sheep:

And behold, lambs were born of those white sheep, and they began to open their eyes and to see [Hasidim!?] and to cry out to the sheep. But they did not listen to them nor attend to their words, but they were extremely deaf, and their eyes were extremely and excessively blinded [unbelievers during the Maccabean time]. (1 En. 90:6–7)

The religious group behind the Animal Apocalypse was especially worried about the fate of Jerusalem. It may well be that Isa 61:1–3 was understood as referring to those loyal sheep who were sorrowful over the fate of Jerusalem and who will receive comfort from the prophet behind the Book of Isaiah. Isa 61:1–3 was a central text at the time when the Animal Apocalypse was written, and it was seen to reflect the eschatological message of Isaiah (see Sir 48:17–25; 4Q521; 11QMelch).

In 1 En. 90:20–38, the eschatological scenario of doom, and the coming future of Jerusalem are closely related to the texts on Jerusalem described in the Book of Isaiah. In 1 En. 90:20–27, the punishment of

the seventy shepherds and disloyal sheep is depicted. Most significant is the depiction of the great abyss outside Jerusalem:

²⁶ And I saw at that time that an abyss like it was opened in the middle of the earth, which was full of fire. And they brought those blinded sheep, and they were all judged and found to be sinners. And they were thrown into that fiery abyss, and they burned. And that abyss was to the south of that house. ²⁷ And I saw those sheep burning and their bones burning.” (1 En. 90:26–27)

The location of the abyss to the south of Jerusalem parallels the end of the Book of Isaiah where it is said:

And they will go out and look on the dead bodies of those who rebelled against me; the worms that eat them will not die, the fire that burns them will not be quenched, and they will be horror to all mankind.” (Isa 66:24)

In this verse, the reference is to the people who have come to worship Yahweh in Jerusalem and who, when they go out from the city, will see all who have rebelled against Yahweh in the great furnace.⁴²

After the scene of judgment, 1 En. 90:28–36 depicts a new city of Jerusalem. This new Jerusalem is something totally different to the first Jerusalem:

And I stood up to see, until that old house was folded up—and they removed all the pillars, and all the beams and ornaments of that house were folded up with it—and they removed it and put it in a place to the south of the land. And I saw until the Lord of the sheep brought a new house [new Jerusalem], larger and higher than that first one, and he erected it on the site of the first one that had been rolled up. And all its pillars were new, and its beams were new, and its ornaments were new and larger than (those of) the first one, the old one that he had removed. And all the sheep were within it. (1 En. 90:28–29)

The description corresponds to Isa 2:2, according to which “the house of God” (interpreted as Jerusalem) will be upon all other mountains and hills. The continuation in Isa 2:3, according to which peoples come to Jerusalem to pay homage there, also parallels 1 En. 90:30 in a nice way,

⁴² It is worth noting that the word *הורא* (“horror,” Isa 66:24) is also used in Dan 12:2, who depicts the eschatological doom against faithless ones. For this, see also Blenkinsopp, *Opening the Sealed Book*, 18.

according to which “all the animals upon the earth and all the birds of heaven were falling down and worshiping those sheep and making petition to them and obeying them in everything.”

In summary, this survey on the Animal Apocalypse has shown that the writer received much inspiration from the Book of Isaiah when he rewrote the history of Israel. He seemed to have argued that the Book of Isaiah contained a secret message pertaining to the future of Jerusalem, which would be realized in the future, and which had now been given to the faithful ones whose eyes had been opened. They now had a message for other members of the people of Yahweh.

Why So Much Talk? Direct Speech as a Literary and Exegetical Device in Rewritten Bible with Special Reference to Pseudo-Philo's *Biblical Antiquities*

SUSAN DOCHERTY

Newman University, Birmingham
s.e.docherty@staff.newman.ac.uk

INTRODUCTION: DIRECT SPEECH IN SCRIPTURAL NARRATIVES AND REWRITTEN BIBLE

Even the most casual reader of the *Biblical Antiquities* can hardly fail to be struck by the sheer volume of direct speech it contains: almost every single chapter includes a dialogue, a monologue, a testament, or some other kind of talk. Yet a survey of the secondary literature reveals that this feature of the work has attracted very little serious attention from commentators, a fact that is all the more surprising given that speeches are similarly prominent in all the other generally accepted examples of the genre of “Rewritten Bible”:¹ the *Book of Jubilees*; the Qumran *Gene-*

¹ This term is used here in its widely accepted sense to refer to a group of texts which retell large portions of the books which came to form the Jewish scriptures, through a combination of expansion, abbreviation, direct quotation and interpretation, although I fully recognise the difficulties and anachronisms inherent in this classification; see further the discussion in, for example, Philip Alexander, “Retelling the Old Testament” in *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture. Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars*, ed. Donald A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 99–118; Moshe J. Bernstein, “‘Rewritten Bible’: A Generic Category Which Has Outlived its Usefulness?” *Textus* 22 (2005): 169–96; Sidnie White Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times* (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 2008); Geza Vermes,

sis *Apocryphon* (1Q20); and Josephus' multi-volume *Jewish Antiquities*. This article has two aims, therefore: first, to demonstrate the extent to which direct speech functions as a key literary and exegetical device for this author; and second, to draw out some of the implications of this textual evidence for an understanding of the view of scripture underpinning both the *Biblical Antiquities* and the rewritten bible texts more broadly.

The *Biblical Antiquities*, or LAB (from the initials of its Latin title *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*), is a lengthy re-telling of the scriptural narratives from the time of Adam to the death of Saul. Its author is unknown, but is generally referred to as Pseudo-Philo, because the text was transmitted together with Latin versions of Philo's work. Now extant only in Latin manuscripts, it was almost certainly composed originally in Hebrew in the first century CE, then translated into Greek, and from Greek into Latin. Although commentators are divided on the question of whether it is to be dated before or after the fall of Jerusalem in 70 CE, that it belongs to a time broadly contemporary with many of the New Testament writings is widely accepted.² Considerable research has been undertaken into the forms of scriptural interpretation found in LAB and in rewritten bible more generally.³ This includes valuable stud-

Scripture and Tradition in Judaism (SPB 4; Leiden: Brill, 1961).

² There is no clear indication of date and provenance within the text, so commentators must draw inferences from the sparse references to the Temple and its sacrificial system (e.g. 13:1; 19:7; 22:8; 26:15), and from other indications such as vocabulary and the form of the biblical text in quotations and allusions. Jacobson argues most forcibly for a date post-70 CE (Howard Jacobson, *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum with Latin Text and English Translation* [2 vols.; AGAJU 31; Leiden: Brill, 1996], 1.199–210). An earlier date is preferred by a number of other commentators, however: see, e.g., Daniel J. Harrington, "Pseudo-Philo," in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha Volume 2*, ed. James H. Charlesworth (New York: Doubleday, 1985), 297–377, 299; Frederick J. Murphy, *Pseudo-Philo, Rewriting the Bible* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 6; Charles Perrot and Pierre-Maurice Bogaert, *Les antiques bibliques. Tome 2: introduction littéraire, commentaire et index* (Sources Chrétiennes 230; Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1976), 67–70.

³ See, e.g., Moshe Bernstein, "Re-arrangement, Anticipation and Harmonization as

ies of the presentation within these writings of central figures such as Abraham,⁴ of the treatment of particular themes, like covenant,⁵ and of the historical development of the interpretative traditions woven into their retelling of individual episodes, for instance the *Aqedah*.⁶ However, attempts to explore specifically the exegetical methods employed by these authors, and to identify their underlying hermeneutical and scriptural axioms, are far rarer. In the case of the *Biblical Antiquities*, for example, only Pseudo-Philo's most characteristic exegetical technique, the forging of connections between different parts of scripture, is widely discussed by commentators. This situation is due in part to the serious complexities inherent in properly investigating these writings. Since two of them, *Jubilees* and the *Biblical Antiquities*, are available in full only in

Exegetical Features in the Genesis Apocryphon," *DSD* 3 (1996): 37–57; Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture*; John C. Endres, *Biblical Interpretation in the Book of Jubilees* (Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America Press, 1987); Louis H. Feldman, *Studies in Josephus' Rewritten Bible* (Atlanta: SBL, 2005); Bruce N. Fisk, *Do You Not Remember? Scripture, Story and Exegesis in the Rewritten Bible of Pseudo-Philo* (JSPSup 37; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001); Howard Jacobson, "Biblical Interpretation in Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*" in *A Companion to Biblical Interpretation in Early Judaism*, ed. Matthias Henze (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012), 180–99.

⁴ See, e.g., C. T. R. Hayward, "The Figure of Adam in Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*," *JSJ* 23 (1992): 1–20; Jacques T. A. G. M. van Ruiten, *Abraham in the Book of Jubilees* (JSPSup 161; Leiden: Brill, 2012); cf. Louis H. Feldman, "The Portrayal of Phinehas by Philo, Pseudo-Philo and Josephus," *JQR* 92 (2002): 315–45.

⁵ See, e.g., Betsy Halpern-Amaru, *Rewriting the Bible: Land and Covenant in Post-Biblical Jewish Literature* (Valley Forge: Trinity Press International, 1994); Hindy Najman, *Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism* (JSPSup 77; Leiden: Brill, 2003).

⁶ Bruce N. Fisk, "Offering Isaac Again and Again: Pseudo-Philo's Use of the *Aqedah* as Intertext," *CBQ* 62 (2000): 481–507; James L. Kugel, *In Potiphar's House: The Interpretive Life of Biblical Texts* (2nd edn.; London: Harvard University Press, 1994); Jack P. Lewis, *A Study of the Interpretation of Noah and the Flood in Jewish and Christian Literature* (Leiden: Brill, 1969); Philip M. Sherman, *Babel's Tower Translated: Genesis 11 and Ancient Jewish Interpretation* (BI 117; Leiden: Brill, 2013); Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition*.

translation, and a third, the *Genesis Apocryphon*, has survived only partially, it is often difficult to establish with certainty the form of both the original text and of the scriptural sources being used within it. Distinguishing between citations and allusions is similarly problematic, given that these authors paraphrase so much of the scriptural narrative, rather than quoting it directly. However, Daniel Harrington in particular has sought to move forward the debate about Pseudo-Philo's biblical text.⁷ The focus of this article on direct speech also minimises these obstacles, because there is usually little doubt about whether a speech is integral to the original narrative, or about whether it reproduces a scriptural dialogue (however exactly or allusively) or is a new authorial creation.

It is important to acknowledge from the outset that the amount of speech included in the rewritten bible literature is influenced by the form of the scriptures themselves, the texts which they seek to retell and interpret. The name of Robert Alter is associated above all with the developing scholarly appreciation over the last three decades of the particular literary style of the Hebrew Bible, as he drew attention to the fact that within it "...third-person narration is frequently only a bridge between much larger units of direct speech..."⁸ Since dialogue is so pervasive in these narratives and indirect speech is employed quite rarely, it is only to be expected that later Jewish authors would imitate the scriptural models. This preference for direct rather than reported speech itself raises interesting questions about the presuppositions of those who composed and edited the documents which make up the Hebrew Bible. Perhaps they felt that this added to the drama and vividness of their accounts, or else served to foreground and illuminate the central figures in their story. Alter has even suggested that this tendency to turn all the thoughts, feelings and intentions of the characters into an actual speech

⁷ Daniel J. Harrington, "The Biblical Text of Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*," *CBQ* 33 (1971): 1–17; see also Howard Jacobson, "Biblical Quotation and Editorial Function in Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum*," *JSP* 5 (1989): 47–64.

⁸ Robert Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative* (New York: Basic Books, 1981), 65.

may indicate something significant about the authors' understanding of language or the human mind:

One is tempted to conclude that the biblical writers did not distinguish sharply between the two [speech and thought] in their assumptions about how the mind relates to reality. Perhaps, with their strong sense of the primacy of language in the created order of things, they tended to feel that thought was not fully itself until it was articulated as speech.⁹

Whatever the reason for it, then, direct speech passages underlie much of the material which is being re-presented in the works of rewritten bible. This study seeks to uncover how far these later texts retain the same focus on speech as their scriptural sources; whether and how they increase the amount of direct speech in their version of events; how direct speech is treated and functions within these new narratives; and what might be the reasons for these literary and exegetical practices.

CREATING NEW SPEECHES

The first noteworthy feature of the *Biblical Antiquities* is the frequency with which the numerous supplementary additions to the scriptural narrative take the form of first person direct speech. Thus Israel's leaders are constantly depicted as offering prayers, singing hymns, and making death-bed testaments; this is true of, for instance, Moses (12:8–9; 19:2–5, 8–9), Joshua (21:2–6; 24:1–5), Kenaz (27:7), Deborah (32:1–17; 33:1–5), Phinehas (46:4; 47:1–2) and David (59:4; 60:2–3). Childless wives like Hannah also pray earnestly about their situation (50:4; cf. Manoah's wife 42:2), and the words of lamentation uttered by mourners are sometimes included in full (e.g. 24:6; 33:6), with those spoken by Jephthah's daughter Seila before she is killed as a result of her father's foolish vow (40:5–7) one of the best-known parts of the work. Lengthy speeches are attributed to characters who are silent in scripture, for instance, Kenaz (25:3–6), and wholly new speaking characters are

⁹ See Alter, *Art of Biblical Narrative*, 68.

introduced, such as Aod the magician (34:1–5). New dialogues are often created to expand the biblical material: there is, for example, the story of the refusal of Abram and his companions to join in the building of the Tower of Babel (6:2–18), and of Amram, father of Moses, debating with his fellow-elders in Egypt whether the Hebrews should continue to bear children in the face of the threat of infanticide (9:2–8).

These additions serve both literary and exegetical purposes for Pseudo-Philo. First, they can function to heighten the dramatic impact of particularly significant episodes. Kenaz's prayer before the attack on the Amorites, for instance, is set on the eve of a decisive battle (27:7). Second, they may signal important transition points within the narrative, such as the shift to a new leader, a moment which is often marked by a farewell testament (see e.g. 19:1–20:5; 48:1–5). Third, speeches can be inserted to improve the flow of the storyline, by explaining the sequence of events more fully, or by removing a perceived disjuncture in the underlying scriptural account. Amram's appeal to the Israelites in Egypt (9:3–8), for example, helps to smooth over the potentially awkward jump from the announcement of the barbaric policy of the slaughter of all newborn Hebrew baby boys in Exod 1:22 straight to the description of the conception of Moses in Exod 2:1–2:¹⁰ "Now therefore I will go and take my wife, and I will not consent to the command of the king; and if it is right in your eyes, let us all act in this way..." (9:5).¹¹ Similarly, Pseudo-Philo's Korah announces the reason for his rebellion against Moses which is unstated in scripture – his anger about the promulgation of the law of tasselled garments: "In that time he command-

¹⁰ Bauckham also reads LAB chapter 9 in this way (Richard Bauckham, "The Liber Antiquitatum of Pseudo-Philo and the Gospels as 'Midrash'," in *Gospel Perspectives III. Studies in Midrash and Historiography*, ed. R. T. France and David Wenham [Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1983], 33–76, 54). He also makes the wider observation relevant to this investigation, that: "At many points in LAB, prophecies and divine speeches, added to the biblical narrative, function to give theological interpretations to the narrative (e.g. 44:6–10; 45:6; 47:3–8; 49:7–8)..." (37).

¹¹ All English translations of the text of *Biblical Antiquities* are taken from Harrington, "Pseudo-Philo."

ed that man about the tassels. And then Korah and two hundred men with him rebelled and said, ‘Why is an unbearable law imposed upon us?’” (16:1; cf. Num 15:37–16:3)

Fourth, speeches and prayers also act as windows into the emotions, thoughts and inner motivation of the scriptural characters. Readers are likely to be moved by the obvious distress caused to Hannah by the taunts of her rival wife Peninnah (50:1–5; cf. 1 Sam 1:1–11), for instance, and can better understand both the reasons for Jael’s murder of Sisera and the divine sanction for her action (31:3–8; cf. Judg 4:17–22):

And when Sisera was sleeping, Jael went out to the flock and got milk from it. And when she was milking she said, “And now be mindful, Lord, of when you assigned every tribe or race to the earth. Did you not choose Israel alone and liken it to no animal except to the ram that goes before and leads the flock? And so look and see that Sisera has made a plan and said, ‘I will go and punish the flock of the Most Powerful One...’ But this will be the sign that you act along with me, Lord, that, when I enter while Sisera is asleep, he will rise up and ask me again and again, saying, ‘Give me water to drink,’ then I know that my prayer has been heard.” (31:5)

A particularly good example of dialogue being used in this way is to be found in Pseudo-Philo’s account of the Israelites reaching the shore of the Red Sea after their escape from Egypt. He depicts the tribes urgently discussing their various options, wondering aloud whether they should stand and fight, or surrender to the pursuing Egyptians and return to their slavery, or throw themselves into the sea to die rather than face mass slaughter at the hands of their enemies (10:3). This debate draws the audience in to the hard choices their ancestors had to take, and is evidently based on traditional interpretation, as a similar three-way or four-way division of opinion is recorded also in Samaritan tradition (*Memar Marqah* 4.8) and in Targum Neofiti.¹²

¹² For further discussion of this verse, see, e.g., Bauckham, “Liber Antiquitatum and the Gospels,” 44–46; Harrington, “Pseudo-Philo,” 317; Jacobson, *Commentary on Pseudo-Philo, I*, 436–37; Murphy, *Pseudo-Philo*, 62.

Finally, the monologues and dialogues created by the author function throughout the text as a vehicle for his scriptural exegesis, serving especially to support his main theological emphases – on God’s enduring faithfulness to the covenant, and on God’s great mercy which will ultimately triumph over the justifiable divine anger at peoples’ sins. This theme is reinforced, for example, in Amram’s exhortation to his fellow-elders before the conception and birth of Moses, at a time when the very survival of the Hebrew people in Egypt is in doubt:

It will sooner happen that this age will be ended forever or the world will sink into the immeasurable deep or the heart of the abyss will touch the stars than that the race of the sons of Israel will be ended. And there will be fulfilled the covenant that God established with Abraham... For God will not abide in his anger, nor will he forget his people forever, nor will he cast forth the race of Israel in vain upon the earth; nor did he establish a covenant with our fathers in vain... (9:3–4; cf. 19:11; 21:4; 22:5; 27:7; 28:5; 35:3; 39:4–7; 49:3).

Significantly, the kind of expansion of dialogue and the creation of prayers and speeches which is so characteristic of the *Biblical Antiquities* is a notable feature of the rewritten bible literature more generally. This aspect of Josephus’ twenty-volume *Jewish Antiquities* is widely recognised, for instance, so need not be laboured here at length.¹³ Josephus composed a substantial number of lengthy speeches, and commentators like Harry Attridge and Louis Feldman have highlighted the way he uses this additional material to enhance the dramatic impact of his narrative, and to bring out the inner thoughts and motivations of important scriptural characters.¹⁴ These speeches also enable him to voice his own theo-

¹³ See, e.g., Harold W. Attridge, *The Interpretation of Biblical History in the Antiquitates Judaicae of Flavius Josephus* (Missoula: Scholars, 1976); Louis H. Feldman, *Josephus’ Interpretation of the Bible* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988); Feldman, *Studies in Josephus’ Rewritten Bible*; Donna R. Runnals, “The Rhetoric of Josephus,” in *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330 B.C. - A.D. 400*, ed. Stanley E. Porter (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 737–54.

¹⁴ See, e.g., Attridge, *Interpretation of Biblical History*, 88.

logical and ethical convictions, such as the belief in divine providence and in the certainty of reward for the righteous and punishment for the wicked.¹⁵

This feature may be less pronounced in the *Book of Jubilees* than in the later writings of Josephus or Pseudo-Philo, yet nonetheless it is present. Speeches and prayers occur throughout the text, supplementing the scriptural material with new information and a greater vividness, and enabling the author to explain the meaning of the narrative, or to express some of his key theological ideas. Prayers are offered by Noah (10:3–6) and Abraham (12:19–21), for example, and several of the patriarchs deliver a farewell testament (e.g. Noah, 7:26–39; Abraham, 20:6–10; 21:1–26; Isaac, 36:1–11) or a blessing over their descendants (Terah on Abraham, 12:29; Abraham on Jacob, 19:26–29 and 22:11–24; Rebecca on Jacob, 25:15–23). Through these additional speech passages, *Jubilees* stresses above all the importance of remaining faithful to the covenant and the law, particularly by avoiding idolatry and intermarriage with gentiles. An impassioned oration decrying the worship of dumb idols is attributed to the youthful Abram (12:2–5), for instance, and both his death-bed testament and his blessing of Jacob centre on the dangers of fornication, marriage to non-Israelite women, and worship of other gods (20:6–9; 22:16–22; cf. 25:1–3). Isaac's last words to his sons echo this warning against idolatry and recall the everlasting nature of the Abrahamic covenant:

And regarding the matter of idols, I command you and admonish you to scorn them and hate them and not to love them because they are full of error for those who worship and bow down to them. Remember, my sons, the Lord, the God of Abraham, your father, and (that) I subsequently worshiped and served him in righteousness and joy so that he might multiply you and increase your seed like the stars of heaven with regard to number and (so that) he will plant you on the

¹⁵ See, e.g., Attridge, *Interpretation of Biblical History*, 109, 182; and Harold W. Attridge, "Josephus and his Works," in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period. Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*, ed. Michael E. Stone (Vol. 2; CRINT; Assen/Philadelphia: van Gorcum/Fortress, 1984), 185–232, 213, 218–19.

earth as a righteous planting which will not be uprooted for all the eternal generations... (36:5–6)¹⁶

The Qumran *Genesis Apocryphon* is a much looser retelling of the scriptures than *Jubilees*, and the extant portions of it treat only Noah and Abram, but this text too includes large sections of first person direct speech.¹⁷ Additional dialogue is created between the patriarchs Abram and Lamech and their relatives (Col. XIX, 17–21; Col. II, 3–21), for example; three Egyptian princes give Pharaoh a glowing verbal report of Sarai's beauty (Col. XX, 2–8); and a prayer of Abram for the safety of his wife after she is taken away by Pharaoh is also recorded (Col. XX, 12–15).

The rewritten scriptures are not, of course, original or unique in either their interest in the emotions and thoughts of their characters or in their tendency to create speeches for them. On the contrary, these features are widespread in Second Temple Jewish literature generally, and are particularly evident in the deuterocanonical books of Judith, Susanna, Tobit and Greek Esther. The prayers composed by the authors of rewritten bible also follow a similar pattern to those found in the Apocrypha (see, e.g., Jud 7:23–28; 9:2–14; 16:1–17; Tobit 3:1–6, 11–15; 8:5–6, 15–17; 11:14–15; 13:1–18; Est 14:3–19). The inner lives of individual scriptural figures are further developed in interesting ways in pseudepigraphical texts like Joseph and Aseneth, The Life of Adam and Eve, and the Testament of Job. The reason for the prevalence of speeches and prayers in rewritten bible thus doubtless owes a great deal, not only to scriptural norms as has already been observed, but also to contempo-

¹⁶ All English translations of the text of *Jubilees* are taken from Orval S. Wintermute, "Jubilees," in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha Volume 2*, ed. James H. Charlesworth (New York: Doubleday, 1985), 35–142.

¹⁷ *Jubilees* and the *Genesis Apocryphon* share a number of common exegetical traditions and text-forms, so some kind of relationship between them is widely accepted, but commentators differ in their views about their order of composition and the direction of dependence: see, e.g., the discussion and references to further literature in Wintermute, "Jubilees," 43–44; cf. Geza Vermes, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (London: Penguin, 1997), 449.

rary literary conventions, both specifically Jewish and wider Graeco-Roman expectations. The influence on Josephus in particular of Greek literary and historiographical models is generally acknowledged, for example.

Nevertheless, it is important to stress just how often the scriptural narrative is supplemented in the rewritten bible literature with lengthy direct speech passages, and to probe further the significance, effects and purposes of this technique. In a recent study of the interpretative re-use of scripture in early post-biblical Jewish prayers, for instance, Judith Newman has highlighted how these function to reinforce a shared understanding of Israel's history (see, e.g., Jud 9:2–14; Est 14:3–19; cf. Neh 9:5–38), and it seems that prayers operate in this way in the *Biblical Antiquities*, too.¹⁸ Deborah's hymn after her victory over Sisera, for example, provides an opportunity to remind the audience of LAB of the many previous occasions when God has acted to protect the Israelites in faithfulness to the covenant promises. Here, the election of Abraham, the deliverance of Isaac from potential slaughter, the blessing of Jacob and the Sinai theophany are all recalled to evoke from the people the desired response: "So we will not cease singing praise, nor will our mouth be silent in telling his wonders, because he has remembered both his recent and ancient promises and shown his saving power to us" (32:12). The testaments created by Pseudo-Philo offer an especially appropriate setting for this kind of theological retelling of history in speech, as a patriarch recalls significant events in both his own life and in the life of Israel in order to exhort his descendants to continued trust in God (e.g. 19:2–5; 23:4–13; 32:1–17; cf. Jud 8:11–27; 11:5–19; Tobit 4:3–21; 14:3–11).

¹⁸ Judith H. Newman, *Praying by the Book: The Scripturalization of Prayer in Second Temple Judaism* (SBLEJL 14; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999).

USING DIRECT SPEECH WITHIN SUMMARY NARRATIVE

In addition to such newly created speeches, a second important feature of the *Biblical Antiquities* is the author's treatment of the dialogues which are already present in the underlying scriptural narratives. It is very striking how often these spoken words are actually cited rather than paraphrased, even where other elements of the story are summarised. It is not the case that biblical episodes can *never* be retold without speech: in those which are reported in a heavily condensed form, for example the Hagar episode or the Joseph story (8:1, 9–10), dialogue is completely lacking. However, when a narrative is rewritten more fully, there is a distinct preference for including at least some parts of the original direct speech. Pseudo-Philo's account of the flood (3:1–12) serves to illustrate this point well. No fewer than seven separate scriptural direct speech citations are included here, making up about two thirds of this chapter. These quotations follow the sequence and content of the spoken exchanges recorded in Genesis fairly closely (see Gen 6:3, 7, 13–21; 7:1–4; 8:15–17, 21–22; 9:1–17), sometimes summarising it (3:4; cf. Gen 7:1–4), and at other times expanding and updating it (e.g. 3:9–10; cf. Gen 8:21–22). Although the flood narrative is compressed overall, then, almost all of the direct divine speech of God to Noah is retained in some form in this retelling. The same pattern can be seen in, for instance, Pseudo-Philo's presentation of the Tower of Babel incident (7:1–5; cf. Gen 11:1–9), the interaction between Balaam and Balak (18:1–14; cf. Num 23:1–30), and the call of Samuel (53:1–13; cf. 1 Sam 3:1–18).¹⁹ Even in the lengthy genealogy which opens LAB, the one example of direct speech from the underlying section of Genesis is retained, albeit in considerably altered form: "And Lamech... called

¹⁹ Fisk and Murphy have both previously observed that the direct discourse elements in the Balaam episode are emphasised in LAB chapter 18, without drawing any wider conclusions; see Fisk, *Do You Not Remember*, 227; and Murphy, *Pseudo-Philo*, 84.

him... Noah saying, "This one will give rest to us and to the earth from those who dwell on it – on account of the wickedness of whose evil deeds the earth will be visited..." (1:20; cf. Gen 5:29).

In a further exegetical move, Pseudo-Philo frequently depicts God as quoting himself in later speeches, thereby accentuating even further the importance, truth and ongoing relevance of the divine words. To take just one of numerous examples, at the time of the making of the golden calf, God addresses Moses as follows: "Are the promises that I promised to your fathers when I said to them, 'To your seed I will give the land in which you dwell' – are they at an end?" (12:4; cf. Gen 12:7; cf. LAB 11:1; 14:2; 15:5; 16:2; 18:5; 19:11; 20:2; 23:5). This technique is widely recognised by commentators, with Frederick Murphy terming it "nested quotations," for instance, and Bruce Fisk "subsidiary citations," but existing studies have not emphasised sufficiently the fact that it is *direct divine speech* which is often reiterated and re-contextualised in this way.²⁰ Through this repetition of God's words as spoken in scripture, the author establishes his central theological messages, especially the hope for the realisation of the covenant promises to Israel.

This method of including direct speech citations within summary narrative is not confined to the *Biblical Antiquities*, but is employed in other examples of the rewritten bible genre, too. In the account in *Jubilees* of Eve being persuaded to eat of the fruit of the forbidden tree, for instance, the scriptural dialogue between Eve and the serpent is reproduced in its entirety, as are the curses spoken by God to both Adam and Eve (Jub. 3:17–25; cf. Gen 3:1–19). Similarly in the *Genesis Apocryphon*, God is presented as speaking directly to Abram after his parting from Lot about the land which he has been promised (Col. XXI, 8–14; cf. Gen 13:14–17), and much of the conversation between Abram and the King of Sodom following the slaughter of the kings is included, to-

²⁰ Murphy, *Pseudo-Philo*, 140, 181; Fisk, *Do You Not Remember*, 20–22, 137, 162; and Bruce N. Fisk, "Scripture Shaping Scripture: The Interpretive Role of Biblical Citations in Pseudo-Philo's Episode of the Golden Calf," *JSP* 17 (1998): 3–23, 10.

gether with the words of the blessing recited by Melchizedek on this occasion (Col. XXII, 15–24; cf. Gen 14:19–24).

Indeed, so central is direct speech to the retelling of scripture for these interpreters that they can even sum up an entire episode in one speech citation. Presumably they intended such quotations to encapsulate the story, and bring to mind the whole of it for their audience, but it is surely significant that it is the spoken word and not a narrative report which functions in this way. The encounter between Judah and Tamar is not related in full in the *Biblical Antiquities*, for instance, but it is, so to speak, expressed in a nutshell through the quotation of one verse in the speech attributed to Amram, Tamar's declaration when she is accused of committing adultery that: "He who owns this staff and this signet ring and the sheepskin, from him I have conceived..." (9:5; cf. Gen 38:25). The announcement of Sarah's conception of Isaac is similarly passed over speedily by Pseudo-Philo in a couple of sentences, but this brief summary consists almost entirely of divine direct speech:

And God appeared to Abram, saying, "To your seed I will give this land, and your name will be called Abraham, and Sarai, your wife, will be called Sarah. And I will give to you from her an everlasting seed, and I will establish my covenant with you." And Abraham knew Sarah, his wife, and she conceived and bore Isaac... (8:3; cf. Gen 17:1–18:15; 21:1–2)

This technique is also employed in *Jubilees*, where, although the flood narrative is greatly abridged, it opens with a direct statement by God: "And the Lord said, 'Let everything which is upon dry land be blotted out: men and cattle and beasts and birds of the heaven and whatever moves on earth...'" (5:20; cf. Gen 6:7, 17; 7:4).

It is important to recognise that these dialogues and divine declarations do not always reproduce the underlying scriptural words exactly, or even closely. The authors of the rewritten bible texts can, therefore, employ direct speech within narrative accounts as a vehicle for presenting their own theology, values and interpretations, just as they do through the supplementary prayers and speeches which they create. It seems, then, that it is the *form* of direct speech, rather than the specific content of the words, with which they were most concerned. This con-

clusion is important, because it suggests that scriptural speech may have held a special status within late Second Temple Jewish exegesis, a potential hermeneutical axiom which will be explored further below.

ALLOCATING A NEW SPEAKER FOR SCRIPTURE'S WORDS

Added confirmation of the significance and unique position of scriptural direct speech for the interpreters responsible for the rewritten bible texts is provided by a third salient feature of its treatment by Pseudo-Philo: the placing of words originally spoken by one character on the lips of an entirely different person in the retold narrative. This exegetical operation is clearly exemplified throughout the *Biblical Antiquities*, as in the attribution to Saul when he is chosen as king of the protest which is uttered by Jeremiah according to the scriptures: "For I do not understand what you are saying, because I am young" (56:6; cf. Jer 1:6). This is a move closely related to Pseudo-Philo's more general technique of making connections between different parts of scripture, so as to establish parallels between characters and events and highlight recurring patterns of human and divine behaviour.²¹ In this case, for instance, he goes on to draw out explicitly the correspondence between two men chosen for God's service while still in their youth, indicating that he was fully aware that this remark actually originated from Jeremiah: "And Samuel said to Saul, '... consider this, that your words will be compared to the words of the prophet whose name will be Jeremiah...'" (56:6). The spo-

²¹ To mention but a few of a multiplicity of examples of this technique within LAB, the priests at Nob are said to be as wicked as the sons of Eli (63:1); correspondences between the terrible incidents at Sodom and Gibeah are highlighted (45:1-4; cf. Gen 19:1-14; Judg 19:10-29); Korah's rebellion against Moses is interpreted as of a kind with Cain's slaughter of Abel and the pursuit of the Hebrew slaves by the Egyptians (16:2-3; cf. Gen 4:9-10; Exod 14:21-29 at LAB 15:5-6); and the parallels between the near-sacrifice of Isaac and the death of Jephthah's daughter are underscored (40:1-9; 18:5; 32:3; cf. Judg 11:36; Gen 22:1-19; cf. LAB 12:1; 17:1; 48:1; 49:8). This method has been most fully explored by Bruce Fisk; see *Do You Not Remember?*; and "Offering Isaac Again and Again."

ken words are retained and reproduced then, but they can be transferred to a new context to which they seem equally appropriate. Thus, when Joshua is seeking a divine revelation, he uses the words of Balaam: "And so wait here this night and see what God will say to me on your behalf" (23:2; cf. Num 22:19). Similarly, it is Gideon rather than Abraham who voices a plea that God should not be angry with him for speaking back (35:6; Gen 18:30–32; Judg 6:17; cf. also LAB 19:14, where Moses makes a similar entreaty); and God promises nourishment to Phinehas in the same terms in which Elijah is addressed in 1 Kings (48:1; cf. 1 Kings 17:4): "And I will command my eagle, and he will nourish you there."²² The suitability of Israel's leaders like Joshua and Deborah to be successors of Moses is also subtly indicated through the ascription to them of sayings voiced in scripture by him (e.g. 23:2; cf. Deut 6:4; 24:1; cf. Deut 4:26).

While most prominent in the *Biblical Antiquities*, this interpretative technique does occur also in *Jubilees*. There, for instance, Rachel and Leah are said to respond to Jacob's plan to return to Canaan in words familiar from the Book of Ruth: "we will go with you anywhere you go" (29:3; cf. Ruth 1:16–17; Gen 31:14–16). Even the fragmentary *Genesis Apocryphon* shows traces of this approach, as Sarai is praised before Pharaoh by the Egyptian princes as the "loveliest of women" and described in terms very reminiscent of the poetry of the Song of Solomon (Col. XX, 2–7; cf. Song 1:8, 15; 4:1–5; 5:9; 6:1, 5–7; 7:1–7).

SCRIPTURAL AXIOMS

This re-application of direct speech to new characters within the rewritten bible literature reveals something important about the understanding of scripture held by these interpreters. Pseudo-Philo, for instance,

²² Jacobson provides a long list of other instances of what he calls such "borrowing from analogous biblical contexts" in his *Commentary on Pseudo-Philo, I*, 225–27; see also Bauckham, "The Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum and the Gospels," 41.

doubtless believed that the words attributed to Abraham or Moses or Jeremiah or other named individuals were actually spoken by them at the time and in the circumstances reported in the scriptures. However, he appears to have assumed also that the significance of these speeches was not confined to the single situation in which they were first uttered. The fact that they are *scriptural* words – and so ultimately divine communication – makes them suitable for continuous re-allocation to other speakers in analogous contexts. This hermeneutical axiom reflects a strong commitment to the internal coherence and unity of the scriptures. Many of the sayings which are redeployed in the *Biblical Antiquities* in this way do have a rather general or ambiguous meaning, which can readily be made to fit a variety of different settings. For example, Gideon is addressed in LAB by an angel with a greeting which in scripture is uttered by the old man at Gibeah on meeting the Levite and his concubine, but which is appropriate for any traveller: “From where have you come, and where is your destination?” (35:1; cf. Judg 6:12; 19:17). The words of Ps 42:3 “Where is your God?” are similarly transformed from a general taunt into the specific abuse directed at Hannah by Peninah (50:5). It seems, then, as if Pseudo-Philo regarded scripture as something akin to a vast treasury of sayings which are potentially available for ascription to other characters in an infinite range of new contexts.²³ These spoken words are highly valued in their own right, and it is more important to reproduce and re-apply them than to relate their original narrative setting.

This emphasis on direct speech requires an explanation. Two important factors underlying this feature have already been mentioned: the extensive use of dialogue and direct speech within the scriptural writings themselves, and contemporary literary models and norms. Murphy has suggested two other possible reasons for Pseudo-Philo’s evident preference for direct speech over indirect. First, he highlights the rhetorical

²³ In her study of early Jewish prayers referred to above, Judith Newman has similarly observed that they reveal that scripture “can be endlessly mined for quotations and endlessly interpreted” (*Praying by the Book*, 2).

impact of this form, and its potential for drawing an audience into the narrative: “Direct address allows readers to experience the characters’ words and actions firsthand, creating the illusion that the readers witness the action directly, not through a narrator.”²⁴ Second, he considers that this device enhances the authority of the author’s particular interpretation of Israel’s history: since the main speakers are God, whose words can be assumed to be absolutely true and reliable, and the patriarchs and judges and other heroic leaders who were deeply involved in the affairs being reported, their “testimony” or version of events can be trusted.

These conclusions are valid, and do go some way towards accounting for the expansion of speech and dialogue in LAB. Pseudo-Philo certainly does stress the idea of scripture as true testimony, as in Zebul’s exhortation to the Israelites: “look to the testimonies that our predecessors have left as witnesses” (29:4; cf., e.g., 21:1; 22:6; 24:1; 32:8). The certainty that its words will be fulfilled is, for example, an important plank in his central message that the covenant promises will be realised (see, e.g., 9:3; 14:2; 21:9; 23:11; cf. 7:4. For his emphasis on the fulfilment of other passages, see, e.g., 4:5; 15:5; 19:8; 20:5; 21:5; 26:8; 49:7; 56:1; 58:1).²⁵ Even scriptural texts which do not appear on the surface to be predictions are interpreted as foretelling specific future events. The making of the golden calf is read as a fulfilment of the words spoken by God at the time of the building of the Tower of Babel, for instance: “And now unless I stop them, everything that they propose to do they will dare, and even worse” (12:3; cf. Gen 11:1–9; 32:1–35. For other instances of this technique, see, e.g., Deut 29:18 at LAB 25:5; Deut 22:6 at LAB 53:10; and Deut 17:15 at LAB 56:1). However, it seems necessary to go beyond the observations of Murphy and other commentators to fully explain why the rewritten bible texts should be characterised by so strong an emphasis on direct speech, and why scriptural speech is

²⁴ Murphy, *Pseudo-Philo*, 20–21; cf. 3, 22.

²⁵ Bauckham, for example, has noted the importance within LAB of a prediction-fulfilment pattern; see his “Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum and the Gospels,” 59–60.

more likely than scriptural narrative to be reproduced within them. It seems that these authors may have been motivated by a previously overlooked hermeneutical axiom, namely that scriptural direct speech has a special status and should serve as a particular focus of exegetical activity. The question of how far this principle was shared more widely within late Second Temple Jewish interpretation will be addressed below, through a comparison with another literary corpus, the New Testament.

SCRIPTURAL SPEECH IN EARLY JEWISH INTERPRETATION: THE NEW TESTAMENT AS A COMPARATIVE CASE STUDY

The preponderance of scriptural citations in the New Testament which take the form of first person direct speech is immediately evident from even the briefest survey of the synoptic gospels (e.g. Matt 2:6; 3:17; 11:10; 12:18–21; 13:14–15; 21:5, 42; 22:4; 26:31; 27:46 and synoptic parallels). In Acts, too, the citations at the heart of the major speeches attributed to Paul and the other disciples are largely comprised of first person direct speech (see e.g. 2:17–21, 25–28, 34–35; 13:33–35, 41, 47; 15:16–18; 28:26–27; cf. the shorter text cited by Paul in support of his argument at 23:5). As in the rewritten bible literature, these quotations function to support the main themes of Acts, such as the claim that the people of Israel had an enduring propensity to reject God's messengers (7:26–28; cf. 7:51–53). Likewise, in Hebrews, only three of the thirty-plus citations which are included do not reproduce scriptural direct speech (Gen 2:2 at Heb 4:4; Gen 5:24 at Heb 11:5; Gen 47:31 at Heb 11:21).²⁶ From all seven citations in the first chapter right through

²⁶ This total counts repeated citations (e.g. Ps 95:7–11; Jer 31:31–34) more than once. While the main citations in Hebrews can be easily identified, there is debate about whether some other uses of scripture are best classified as allusions or citations, so the number given by commentators generally ranges from 32–41. For an overview of this discussion, see Gareth L. Cockerill, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (NICNT; Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2012), 42–43. In reaching the figure of three non-speech citations, I am excluding Heb 7:1–2 and 12:29, which I take as allusions rather than direct citations (to

to the very last one (13:6), then, this author's predilection for speech-texts is marked, and the oral dimension of these quotations is further emphasised by his choice of introductory formulae employing verbs of speaking, such as λέγειν and λαλεῖν. In particular, scriptural direct speech is often used in exhortatory passages to intensify the immediacy of the divine address to the early Christian communities and highlight its continuing relevance for a new generation: "Today, when you hear his voice, do not harden your hearts" (Heb 3:7, 15; cf. Ps 95:7; cf. Prov 3:11–12 at Heb 12:5; Lev 11:44–45 at 1 Pet 1:15–16; cf. 3:8–12).²⁷

Furthermore, the way in which these direct speech citations are recontextualised in the New Testament closely parallels the exegetical practice of Pseudo-Philo. Just as scriptural texts can be assigned to a different speaker or provided with a new setting in LAB, so in the early Christian writings they can frequently be attributed to Jesus (e.g. Ps 22:22 in Heb 2:12; Isa 8:17, 18 in Heb 2:13; Ps 40:6–8 at Heb 10:5–9), or interpreted as relating to a specific situation involving his followers. Peter's protestation during his vision of unclean animals at Joppa echoes that of Ezekiel when God instructed him to eat unclean bread, for instance, and so sets up correspondences between the two figures and their actions: "No, Lord; for I have never eaten anything that is common or unclean" (Acts 10:14; cf. Ezek 4:14). This presupposes a belief in an integral relationship between scriptural narratives and later events which is made explicit in Stephen's speech in Acts: "As your fathers did, so do you" (Acts 7:51).

It is equally significant that the New Testament writings manifest the same tendency as the rewritten bible texts to retain elements of direct speech within summary narratives. For example, the selective retelling of

Gen 14:17–20 and Deut 4:24 respectively), although they are listed as quotations in some sources (see, e.g., Gleason L. Archer and Gregory Chirichigno, *Old Testament Quotations in the New Testament* [Chicago: Moody, 1983], xxii). Neither of these are presented in Hebrews as first person utterances, although Deut 4:24 does form part of a speech of Moses in its original scriptural setting.

²⁷ All translations of the New Testament follow the RSV.

Israel's story in Stephen's address in Acts chapter 7 is regularly interspersed by citations of first person direct speech from the underlying scriptural sources (7:3, 7, 26–28, 32–34, 35, 37, 40). Two further direct speech citations from the prophets are also introduced to supplement this account (Amos 5:25–27 at Acts 7:42–43; Isa 66:1–2 at Acts 7:49–50). It would appear, then, that these speech-texts are included deliberately in Acts, even though their substance could have been communicated adequately by means of a paraphrase. A similar pattern is present in Paul's sermon in the synagogue at Antioch in Pisidia, where his brief historical review includes a citation of direct speech, based loosely on 1 Samuel (Acts 13:16–22; cf. 1 Sam 13:14). In Hebrews, too, three citations of scriptural first person direct speech are inserted into the summary narrative of the Sinai theophany at 12:18–29 (Exod 19:12–13 at Heb 12:20; Deut 9:19 at Heb 12:21; Hag 2:6 at Heb 12:26). These quotations are key to establishing the author's argument, as they function to emphasise the unattainability of Mount Sinai (Exod 19:12–13; Heb 12:20) and the terror attendant on encounters with God under the former dispensation (Deut 9:19; Heb 12:21). There is a further one such citation included in the account of the sealing of the Mosaic covenant (Exod 24:8 at Heb 9:20), which heightens the emphasis on the use of blood in its rituals. Likewise, the presentation of the ancient exemplars of faith in Heb 11, although largely a paraphrase of the events recorded in scripture, also contains a direct citation, recalling God's promise to Abraham of many descendants: "By faith Abraham, when he was tested, offered up Isaac, and he who had received the promises was ready to offer up his only son, of whom it was said, "Through Isaac shall your descendants be named"" (11:17–18; cf. Gen 21:12). In addition, there are cases within the New Testament of speech citations being employed to summarise larger narratives, a technique identified above as operative in both the *Biblical Antiquities* and *Jubilees*. The establishment of the Abrahamic covenant, for example, is recalled in both Hebrews (6:14) and Acts (3:25) by quoting God's words from Gen 22:17–18. The construction of the tabernacle is also described in

Hebrews by means of a single citation of direct speech (Exod 25:40 at Heb 8:5).

There is ample evidence, then, of a particular focus on scriptural speech in the New Testament as well as in rewritten bible, and within both corpora, scriptural speech is more likely to be retained and augmented than scriptural narrative. That this approach is a feature of early Jewish interpretation more widely receives further confirmation from the research of Alexander Samely into the Pentateuchal targumim.²⁸ He concludes, firstly, that scriptural texts containing first person speech are almost always reproduced fully in the Aramaic version, and are not generally omitted or paraphrased. Second, he demonstrates that a particular individual (such as one of the patriarchs, a more minor scriptural character, or an angel) is frequently specified as the speaker of words which appear anonymous or indefinite in their original scriptural context.²⁹ In Targum Pseudo-Jonathan, for instance, the two Hebrew men whom Moses sees fighting (Exod 2:13–14) are identified with some of the rebellious associates of Korah from the later wilderness period (Num 16:12, 24):

And Moses went out on the second day *and observed*. And behold, *Dathan and Abiram*, Jewish men, were quarrelling. *And when he saw that Dathan raised his hand against Abiram to strike him* he said *to him*: “Why do you strike your companion?” And *Dathan* said *to him*: “Who is the one who appointed you ruler and judge over us? Do you want to kill me as you killed the Egyptian?” And Moses was afraid and said, “In truth, the thing has become known...” (targumic additions to the MT in italics)³⁰

²⁸ See Alexander Samely, *The Interpretation of Speech in the Pentateuch Targums: A Study of Method and Presentation in Targumic Exegesis* (TSAJ 27; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992).

²⁹ Samely, *Interpretation of Speech*, 165–83.

³⁰ Samely, *Interpretation of Speech*, 12.

CONCLUSIONS: SCRIPTURAL SPEECH AND EXEGETICAL AXIOMS IN REWRITTEN BIBLE

The extent to which direct speech is employed within the *Biblical Antiquities* and within rewritten bible more widely, then, deserves to be recognised and further explored. The authors of these texts are retelling a source which is already particularly replete with speech units, but they enhance this aspect of the Jewish scriptures in their interpretation. Numerous additional speeches are included in all of these writings, taking a variety of forms, including testaments, prayers, laments, monologues, and new or extended dialogues, and serving both literary and theological functions. On the literary level, this supplementary direct speech adds drama to the narrative, highlights the significance of certain key events, and provides scope for a more defined characterisation of the central figures, offering an insight into their inner thoughts and motivations, in a manner expected of both Jewish and Graeco-Roman writing in this era. Theologically, speeches and dialogues are an important vehicle for emphasising an author's major themes, such as God's faithfulness to the covenant, or the serious dangers of idolatry. They are also employed by Pseudo-Philo in particular as exegetical tools to smooth over disjunctures in the scriptural narrative, or to put across a certain interpretation of it. In addition to newly created discourse, a marked tendency within rewritten bible to avoid summarising or paraphrasing scriptural direct speech has been identified here. Thus speech units which are present in the biblical source are usually retained in the retelling, even though they may not be reproduced accurately and can be expanded or attributed to a different speaker.

This investigation of the textual evidence has led to a significant conclusion about the scriptural axioms underpinning the work of authors like Pseudo-Philo. Their treatment of scriptural speech suggests that it enjoyed a different status from scriptural narrative, prompting interpreters to focus their exegetical activity on it in a special way. The notable concern to include scriptural speeches within the rewritten bible texts and re-apply them to new contexts implies an underlying assump-

tion that their full significance was not confined to the single situation in which they were first uttered. Scriptural words are regarded as divine communication, irrespective of the person named as initially voicing them, so they quite literally “speak” to God’s people for all time in all circumstances. The prominence of speech in other corpora of early Jewish exegetical writings, the New Testament and the targumim, confirms that this view of scripture was not confined to rewritten bible, but was more widely shared. It is an attitude which chimes well with other techniques and principles characteristic of Jewish exegesis, such as the belief that the whole of scripture is intimately connected so that one passage can be used to interpret another; that the scriptures are absolutely true; that they are prophetic in nature so will be seen to be fulfilled in the future; and that they are intended to be heard afresh by each new generation and are not only a record of Israel’s past. It is this understanding which helps to explain *why* there is so much talk in the rewritten bible literature: God’s spoken words are naturally perceived as having an ongoing relevance, a guarantee of truth, and an especially significant and solemn character, meaning that they are worthy of preservation and endless repetition.

Polemisk etikett eller saklig beteckning? En studie av svenskspråkiga opinionsbildares användning av termen ”gnosticism” och dess implikationer för bibelvetenskaplig och kyrkohistorisk forskning*

PETTER SPJUT

Uppsala Universitet

petter.spjut@teol.uu.se

Muß der Geschichtsforscher nicht ebenso wie der Richter über den Parteien stehen und das Audiatur et altera pars als höchsten Grundsatz handhaben? Hat der Richter – und mutatis mutandis – der Historiker – nicht die Pflicht, wenn die eine Seite aus Angst, Verwirrung oder Unbeholfenheit nicht recht zur Geltung kommen kann, ihr, so gut er vermag, zur Entfaltung zu verhelfen, statt sich der geistige Beweglichkeit und Unerschütterlichkeit, dem Scharfsinn und Wortschwall der Anderen einfach zu unterwerfen?¹

INTRODUKTION

Kan ett begrepp som i artiklar, krönikor och bloggar används för att nedvärdera en ideologisk eller religiös motståndare också fungera som en ”neutral” beteckning i ett akademiskt sammanhang? Denna artikel

* Ett särskilt tack till James Kelhoffer, Paul Linjamaa och Carl-Johan Berglund, vars goda kommentarer har bidragit till en bättre artikel.

¹ Walter Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1934), 1.

syftar till att presentera och kritiskt diskutera användningen av ordet gnosticism i populär opinion. Det finns tre huvudsakliga skäl som motiverar en sådan undersökning.

För det första har värdeladdningen i termen gnosticism vissa implikationer för dess lämplighet i ett akademiskt sammanhang. De senaste tjugo åren har begreppet i allt högre grad kommit att ifrågasättas. Argumenten emot användningen av gnosticism botten främst i diskrepansen mellan den klassiska bilden, som bygger på kyrkofädernas polemiska porträtteringar, och de primärkällor som brukar identifieras som gnostiska. Flera av de antaganden som ofta görs om gnosticism – att dess kristologi skulle vara uteslutande doketisk, eller att dess etik skulle vara antingen radikalt asketisk eller utsvävande libertinsk – har nämligen visat sig sakna stöd i dessa källor. Två övriga motargument som brukar anföras är termens artificialitet och dess polemiska laddning. Under antiken fanns det en tendens bland heresiologer att genealogiskt föra samman olika heretiska rörelser för att visa på deras släktskap. Därigenom kom en hop disparata grupper, som egentligen hade lite eller ingenting med varandra att göra, att klumpas ihop under samma beteckning. Till följd har vissa forskare (t.ex. David Brakke och Michael Allen Williams) föreslagit en radikal omdefiniering av begreppet, alternativt namnbyte. Andra forskare (t.ex. Ismo Dunderberg och Karen King) har till och med kommit att förespråka ett övergivande av begreppet gnosticism till förmån för den vidare paraplybeteckningen kristendom. I ljuset av denna debatt kan det därför vara värdefullt att undersöka hur begreppet används utanför akademien.

För det andra väcker användningen av ordet gnosticism i populär opinion frågor kring relationen mellan konfessionellt motiverad användning och akademi. Ett flertal av de opinionsbildare som använder gnosticism för att ogiltigförklara en motståndares ideologiska och religiösa ståndpunkt är inte bara disputerade forskare utan även verksamma lärare. Denna problematik förstärks av glidningar mellan en undervisande ton och en starkt polemisk hållning. Det som börjar som en historisk redogörelse över de antika gnostiska rörelserna går omärkt över i varningar för "samtida gnostiker". Det är, med andra ord, svårt att veta

när författaren slutar skriva med docentens auktoritet och istället övergår till att tala som religiös apologet.

För det tredje är den mediala användningen av ett religiöst laddat språk av allmänt intresse för religionsvetare. Begreppet gnosticism används dessutom inte uteslutande i intra-religiös opinion, utan förekommer även som polemisk beteckning i sekulära sammanhang, där exempelvis politiska måltavlor (Maud Olofsson; ”vänstern”) anklagas för gnosticism.

Artikeln inleds med en bakgrund till begreppsdebatten, där jag introducerar problemet, samt redovisar min egen utgångspunkt. Eftersom forskningsfältet kan sägas ha revolutionerats de senaste tjugo åren har jag utelämnat äldre litteratur. Därefter följer en presentation av hur termerna ”gnosticism” och ”gnostiker” har kommit att användas i populär opinion mellan 1997 och 2015. Artikeln avslutas med en diskussion av resultatet, samt möjliga implikationer för den terminologiska debatten inom bibelvetenskaplig forskning.

BAKGRUND TILL BEGREPPSDEBATTEN

För tjugo år sedan publicerades Michael A. Williams studie *Rethinking “Gnosticism”: An Argument for Dismantling a Dubious Category*.² Williams dekonstruktion av gnosticism-begreppet var på många sätt banbrytande, den kom att få stort internationellt genomslag,³ och i sin studie gav han flera skäl till varför gnosticism-begreppet var missvisande och oanvändbart.

² Michael A. Williams, *Rethinking “Gnosticism”: An Argument for Dismantling a Dubious Category* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996).

³ I kölvattnet av Williams studie följde flera studier kritiskt inställda till gnosticism-begreppet: Karen L. King, *What is Gnosticism?* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003). Antti Marjanen, red., *Was There a Gnostic Religion?* (Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 87; Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society, 2005). Ismo Dunderberg, *Gnostic Morality Revisited* (WUNT 347; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015).

För det första visar de så kallade gnostiska texterna en betydande inbördes variation av teologiska föreställningar.⁴ Problematiskt nog har de texter som hittades vid Nag Hammadi 1945 kommit att bli närapå synonyma med gnosticism, och på så vis också buntats ihop, trots att de, i avseende på genre, teman och värdering av olika bibliska karaktärer, är mycket disparata. Medan vissa av Nag Hammadi-texterna uppvisar en radikal dualism mellan en negativt värderad skapargud (ofta refererad till som "demiurg" i sekundärlitteraturen) och ett mer transcendent gudaväsen, saknar många andra texter detta inslag helt och hållet. Att sammanföra så olika teologiska system under en och samma beteckning gör inte den enorma variation som Nag Hammadi-texterna uppvisar rättvisa. David Brakke, som också ser problem i behandlingen av det spretiga materialet, menar att den klassiska bilden av gnosticismen är resultatet av ett klippande och klistrande där den föregående generationens forskare eklektiskt har tagit delar från motstridiga källor och skapat en religiös rörelse som aldrig funnits.⁵

Ytterligare problem utgör de felaktiga föreställningar som ofta relateras till gnosticism. Under 1900-talets första hälft, innan Nag Hammadi-fynden hade publicerats och offentliggjorts, var gnosticismforskningen beroende av kyrkofädernas ofta mycket polemiska redogörelser. Forskare som Hans Jonas tecknade utifrån dessa beskrivningar ett porträtt av gnostikerna som antika metafysiska rebeller som uttryckte sitt avståndstagande från världen antingen genom extrem asketism eller ett utsvävande antinomiskt beteende.⁶ Efter Nag Hammadi-fyndens publikation har forskare observerat att denna sorts etiska tankar inte existerar i den "gnostiska" primärlitteraturen. Det äldre paradigmets idéer om gnostikernas etik har under de senaste tjugo åren fått motta en förgörande

⁴ Williams, *Rethinking "Gnosticism,"* 28.

⁵ David Brakke, *The Gnostics: Myth, Ritual, and Diversity in Early Christianity* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2010), 15.

⁶ Hans Jonas, *The Gnostic Religion: The Message of the Alien God and the Beginnings of Christianity* (2 rev. uppl.; Boston: Beacon Press, 1991), 270–81.

kritik.⁷ Till liknande ”klichéer” som man ofta stöter på i beskrivningar av gnosticism, men som har ytterst begränsat stöd i primärkällorna, räknas bland annat en doketisk kristologi,⁸ en exklusiv och deterministisk syn på frälsning,⁹ samt förståelsen av gnosticism som en förkristen ”parasitreligion” som kommit att infiltrera kristendomen utifrån.¹⁰

Även om en forskarmajoritet är överens om behovet att omdefiniera begreppet gnosticism, finns det ingen enighet kring hur detta ska genomföras. Williams har exempelvis föreslagit ett begreppsbyte från gnosticism till ”bibliska demiurgtraditioner”,¹¹ eftersom han menar att det senare är mer deskriptivt och saknar den laddning som gnosticism kommit att få. Brakke vill bibehålla termen, men kraftigt reducera dess omfång. Istället för att omfatta alla de motstridiga teologiska perspektiv vi finner i Nag Hammadi-kodexarna ska termen enbart användas för att beteckna det material som traditionellt sett kallats sethiansk gnosticism.¹²

Karen King och Ismo Dunderberg hör till de forskare som vill överge termen helt. Till skillnad från Williams vill denna grupp av forskare inte ersätta gnosticism med någon annan beteckning, utan föredrar den mer övergripande makro-kategorin kristendom. En stor del av Kings och Dunderbergs argumentation motiveras av en kritik mot konfessionellt motiverad forskning och den tendens att sära på kristendom och gnosticism som har genomsyrat mycket av den tidiga kristendomens historieskrivning. King lyfter bland andra fram Adolf von Harnack som exempel på forskare med denna tendens.¹³ Som många andra protestantiska teologer under 1800-talets slut framställde von Harnack den tidigaste kristendomen som någonting radikalt nytt som inte kunde

⁷ Se särskilt King, *What is Gnosticism?*, 201–208; Williams, *Rethinking “Gnosticism,”* 163–88. Dunderberg, *Gnostic Morality Revisited*, 13.

⁸ King, *What is Gnosticism?*, 208–13.

⁹ Williams, *Rethinking “Gnosticism,”* 189–212.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 80–95.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 21–23.

¹² Brakke, *The Gnostics*, 31–32.

¹³ King, *What is Gnosticism?*, 55–70.

jämföras med någon annan religiös strömning. Kristendomens unika karaktär och ursprungliga renhet kom att förfalla när rörelsen blev ”helleniserad” och späddes ut genom främmande influenser. Det är problematiskt, menar King och Dunderberg, att idén om att de så kallade gnostiska rörelserna på något sätt skulle representera en mindre ren och autentisk form av kristendom är så djupt förankrad i den bibelvetenskapliga och kyrkohistoriska forskningen.¹⁴ Vidare menar Dunderberg att dikotomin mellan kristendom och gnosticism bidrar till att betydande likheter mellan enskilda Nag Hammadi-texter och andra kristna texter förbises, medan skillnader överbetonas. Genom att göra sig av med termen gnosticism till förmån för beteckningen kristendom hoppas King och Dunderberg kunna upplösa motsättningen mellan Nag Hammadi-fyndets texter och annat tidigt kristet material.

Efter denna korta bakgrund till begreppsdebatten vill jag övergå till att diskutera hur man förhåller sig till termen gnosticism i svenskspråkig forskning. I vilken grad har den internationella debatten färgat av sig? Har Williams ”nedmontering” av begreppet bidragit till en mer nyanserad användning av gnosticism? Innan frågan besvaras bör det poängteras att mycket lite har skrivits om gnosticism i svenska akademiska sammanhang de senaste tjugo åren, och att den information som finns att tillgå om gnosticism oftast antingen är av populärvetenskaplig karaktär eller betydligt äldre än Williams studie, vilket innebär att den av naturliga skäl förmedlar forskningsperspektiv som idag inte längre är aktuella. Det finns, mig veterligen, bara tre forskare som i någon av sina svenskspråkiga publikationer diskuterar termen gnosticism i ljuset av de senaste tjugo årens debatter: Jesper Svartvik; Jörgen Magnusson; och Paul Linjamaa. Ytterligare en forskare, Kent Gunnarsson, diskuterar begreppet gnosticism utförligt i sin avhandling, men väljer att inte ta hänsyn till nyare forskning. Jag diskuterar därför Gunnarssons framställning av gnosticism nedan, under rubriken ”Föräldrade perspektiv i framställningen av gnosticism”.

¹⁴ King, *What is Gnosticism?*, 2–3; Dunderberg, *Gnostic Morality Revisited*, 5–10.

GNOSTICISM I SVENSKSPRÅKIG FORSKNING

I läroboksantologin *Jesus och de första kristna* refererar Jesper Svartvik till både King och Williams, samt inbjuder läsaren till en kritisk diskussion av begreppets lämplighet. Till skillnad från King och Williams propagerar inte Svartvik för ett avståndstagande från termen, utan lanserar istället en participomskrivning ("gnosticerande") som i och med att den fungerar som attribut till kristendom, snarare än som ett självständigt stående substantiv, mildrar motsättningen mellan kristendom och gnosticisism. Svartvik betonar också att gnosticisism, i den mån begreppet används, bör beteckna en tendens snarare än ett självständigt tanke-system.¹⁵

Paul Linjamaa, för närvarande doktorand vid Lunds Universitet, har skrivit en populärvetenskaplig bok om valentinianism, där termen gnosticisism diskuteras utifrån de senaste årens begreppsdebatter. I sin syn på gnosticisism som kategori ligger Linjamaa nära Magnusson. Han menar att tidigare generationer av forskare alltför okritiskt har förlitat sig på kyrkofädernas polemiska rapporter i sin konstruktion av begreppet gnosticisism. Linjamaa identifierar åtta missförstånd rörande gnostikerna som orsakats av detta:

- 1) att gnostiker utgjorde en enhetlig religiös grupp;
- 2) att gnostiker inte var kristna;
- 3) att gnostiker förnekade Gamla testamentet och det judiska arvet;
- 4) att gnostiker var feminister;
- 5) att gnostiker var förespråkare för doketism
- 6) att alla gnostiker sökte hemlig frälsande kunskap;
- 7) att gnostiker var ointresserade av frågor om etik och moral;
- 8) att gnostiker var dualister, och ointresserade av livet på jorden.¹⁶

¹⁵ Jesper Svartvik, "Gnosticerande kristendomstolkningar", i *Jesus och de första kristna: Inledning till Nya testamentet*, red. Dieter Mitternacht och Anders Runesson (Stockholm: Verbum, 2008), 363.

¹⁶ Paul Linjamaa, *Valentiniernas evangelium: Gnosticisismen och den antika kristna idévärlden i ljuset av texterna från Nag Hammadi* (Arcus teologi 15; Lund: Arcus förlag, 2017), 198.

Linjamaa identifierar ändå vissa för de gnostiska rörelserna sammanhållande mytologiska drag: att ”människan ansågs vara av gudomlig härkomst” och att ”kosmos uppfattades vara format av en demiurg”.¹⁷ Utifrån detta menar Linjamaa att det kan vara berättigat att använda begreppet, även om han betonar att kategorier för klassificering av sociala grupper är ”dynamiska och föränderliga”.¹⁸

De flesta av de svenskspråkiga publikationerna om gnosticism stammar från Magnussons penna, och den kanske mest uttömmande svenskspråkiga diskussionen om gnosticismsens vara eller icke-vara möter vi i artikeln ”Bortom vägs ände, eller klarsyntheten som förblindade: En analys av en så kallad akosmisk etik i Sanningens evangelium från Nag Hammadi”, publicerad i ett tidigare nummer av *SEÅ*.¹⁹ Magnussons artikel är nyanserad och har många förtjänster, inte minst för att den, till skillnad från många andra bidrag i gnosticismdebatten, inte bara river ner, utan också på ett konstruktivt sätt föreslår en väg framåt. Magnusson är positiv till att omdefiniera gnosticism genom att rensa kategorin från inslag som inte har stöd i primärkällorna (till exempel föreställningen att det gnostiska levnadssättet antingen är libertinskt eller asketiskt).²⁰ Däremot ifrågasätter Magnusson Kings och Dunderbergs förslag om att överge gnosticismen som kategori. Magnusson menar nämligen att ett övergivande av termen gnosticism till förmån för det vidare begreppet kristendom skulle innebära ett nytt osynliggörande av de gnostiska rörelserna.²¹ Risken finns, menar Magnusson, att forskare genom sitt avståndstagande från det äldre paradigmet går för långt åt andra hållet, så att karaktäristiska särdrag i Nag Hammadi-litteraturen slätas ut och förbises.

¹⁷ Linjamaa, *Valentiniernas evangelium*, 195.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 199.

¹⁹ Jörgen Magnusson, ”Bortom vägs ände, eller klarsyntheten som förblindade: En analys av en så kallad akosmisk etik i Sanningens evangelium från Nag Hammadi”, *SEÅ* 77 (2012): 225–53.

²⁰ Magnusson, ”Bortom vägs ände”, 227, 231.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 230.

Magnusson har här en god poäng. Kings diskussion av synen på kroppen i *Johannesapokryfen* är ett typexempel på denna tendens.²² *Johannesapokryfen* har länge ansetts vara en av de Nag Hammadi-texter som uppvisar den mest negativa kroppsynen. Trots att *Johannesapokryfen* uttryckligen liknar kroppen vid en gravkammare och boja,²³ menar King att texten i själva verket är positivt inställd till kroppen, eftersom kroppen är den arena där striden emot de onda makterna och kampen för frälsning äger rum. Kroppen är, med andra ord, en förutsättning för att människan ska kunna frälsas. Genom att läsa *Johannesapokryfen* på detta sätt går King så långt ifrån 1900-talets gnosticismparadigm som möjligt, men hennes tolkning är, enligt min mening, inte särskilt övertygande.

Att överge gnosticism-begreppet behöver dock inte nödvändigtvis innebära en sådan utveckling. Som Hugo Lundhaug poängterar har utmärkt forskning producerats under det tidigare paradigmet. Problemet är dock att vissa aspekter av texterna som upplevts vara mindre gnostiska har förbisetts. Lundhaug skriver följande:

In the history of scholarship the use of the category of “Gnosticism” has over the years contributed to the production of an abundance of perceptive and interesting interpretations of the Nag Hammadi texts and other late antique sources. However, the category has also blocked from view a great number of alternative interpretations of the same material, interpretations that may be brought to light by bringing other categories and interpretative frameworks to bear on the sources.²⁴

²² Karen L. King, *The Secret Revelation of John* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2006), 123–24.

²³ Denna negativa värdering i kroppen finns i såväl den längre (NH II 21:9–12) som den kortare (BG 55:9–55:13) versionen av *Johannesapokryfen*.

²⁴ Hugo Lundhaug, *Images of Rebirth: Cognitive Poetics and Transformational Soteriology in the Gospel of Philip and the Exegesis on the Soul* (Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies 73; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2010), 18. För en vidare diskussion om hur gnostiska texter som upplevts innehålla få klassiskt gnostiska karaktärsdrag kommit att förbises, se Ulla Tervahauta, *A Story of the Soul’s Journey in the Nag Hammadi Library: A Study of Authentikos Logos (NHC VI,3)* (NTOA 107; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015), 9–11, 19–30.

Att inte uteslutande läsa Nag Hammadi-texterna utifrån "gnostiskt" komparativmaterial kan öppna upp för många andra spännande tolkningsmöjligheter, utan att klassiska särdrag för den sakens skull måste ignoreras eller slätas över.

Det stora problemet är, enligt min mening, inte så mycket kategorin gnosticism i sig utan essentialism i största allmänhet. Religiösa kategorier är av nödvändighet förenklande och karikatyrartade, eftersom de fenomen de gör anspråk på att beskriva ofta saknar tydliga gränser. Tankeströmningar tenderar alltid att korsbefrukta varandra, och medlemmar från olika bakgrunder tenderar att komma och gå. Att vända sig emot all sorts analytiska kategorier vore dock absurt, och skulle omöjliggöra bredare komparativt arbete. Magnusson har alltså delvis rätt på denna punkt. Om man arbetar över religionsgränserna och har behov av en term som beskriver radikalt dualistiska tankeströmningar som också betonar kunskapens frälsande funktion kan en term som gnosticism underlätta arbetet.²⁵

För egen del har jag en pragmatisk inställning till begreppet gnosticism. Jag ser inga problem i att använda begreppet, *förutsatt att man är medveten om* att 1) begreppet är en typologisk konstruktion avsedd att beteckna en samling föreställningar, snarare än en enskild sammanhållen rörelse vars ursprung är möjligt att spåra genealogiskt; samt att 2) en forskarmajoritet är överens om att kategorin gnosticism är i behov av omdefiniering och finjustering. De flesta samtida forskare har tagit avstånd från många av de gnostiska karaktärsdrag som betonats av äldre forskning, och det bör den som använder begreppet känna till.

En ytterligare förutsättning är att begreppet faktiskt fyller en funktion, och att det gör mer nytta än skada. Problemet är bara att begreppet sällan tillför någonting. Detta gäller särskilt inom bibelvetenskaplig eller patristisk forskning som inte arbetar lika brett, eller med en lika stor mångfald av religiösa uttrycksätt som exempelvis komparativt orienterad

²⁵ Magnusson, "Bortom vägs ände", 232–33.

religionshistoria gör.²⁶ Mer specifikt menar jag att det finns tre huvudsakliga skäl till att ett bibehållande av gnosticisism-begreppet kan vara problematiskt inom bibelvetenskap och kyrkohistoria: 1) avsaknaden av underkategorier; 2) föråldrade perspektiv i presentationen av gnosticisism; samt 3) den polemiska laddningen i ordet.

Bibelvetenskapens och kyrkohistorians avsaknad av underkategorier

Kyrkohistoriker och bibelvetare använder ofta klassificeringar såsom ebioniter, markioniter och arianer. Samtliga av dessa är polemiskt motiverade beteckningar, avsedda att åtskilja legitim och illegitim kristendom. Men trots att en liknande mångfald förekommer bland de så kallade "proto-ortodoxa" rörelserna saknas motsvarande terminologi där.²⁷ I bästa fall ersätts "den tidiga kyrkan" i singular med "de tidiga kyrkorna" i plural. I vår tid, då forskare vet att heresi och ortodoxi inte längre är acceptabla akademiska kategorier, menar jag att mikrokategorier som gnosticisism har blivit kryphål för den som vill presentera en viss typ av kristendom som "det andra".

Föråldrade perspektiv i presentationen av gnosticisism

Ett andra skäl till varför användningen av gnosticisism-begreppet kan ifrågasättas är kategorins problematiska arv, samt det faktum att många av de karaktäristiska särdrag som presenteras som gnostiska faktiskt inte

²⁶ För en liknande uppfattning, se Linjamaa, *Valentiniernas evangelium*, 198: "Termen gnosticisism används fortfarande på ett värderande och generaliserande sätt i vissa kretsar och jag sympatiserar därför med de forskare som väljer att inte använda termen alls. I den religionshistoriska diskursen däremot – där jag har min bakgrund – har kategorin i min mening inte samma polemiska och värderande konnotationer och i de fall då termen används på ett adekvat och värdeneutralt sätt anser jag att den ändå kan fylla en viktig roll för att peka ut specifika religiösa och historiska skeenden."

²⁷ Jämför exempelvis disparata "proto-ortodoxa" texter som Pastoralbrevet och Paulus- och Theklaakterna, Hebreerbrevet och Uppenbarelseboken, Galaterbrevet och Jakobsbrevet, Markusevangeliet och proto-Jakobs evangelium.

stämmer överens med några primärkällor. Specialister på Nag Ham-madi-litteraturen har ägnat de senaste tjugo åren åt att debattera gnosti-cismens vara och icke-vara. Även om få framsteg har gjorts i frågan om vad gnosticis-men är, finns det en relativ samstämmighet om vad gnosti-cismen *inte* är. Såväl förespråkare som motståndare till begreppet är öv-erens om att vissa av gnosticisomens klassiska egenskaper saknar källstöd och bör betraktas som opålitliga och polemiskt motiverade. Exempel på sådana är, som nämnts ovan, världsfrånvändhet som resulterar i antin-gen radikal askes eller en utsvävande libertinsk etik, doketisk kristologi, en exklusiv och deterministisk syn på frälsning, samt förståelsen av gnosticism som en förkristen ”parasitreligion” som kommit att infiltrera kristendomen utifrån.

För att illustrera hur detta kan ta sig uttryck i svenskspråkig forskning behöver vi här diskutera presentationer av gnosticism som är skrivna av disputerade forskare, men inte publicerade i fackgranskade sammanhang. Skälet är helt enkelt att mycket lite svenskspråkig forskning har producerats på detta område under de senaste tjugo åren. Tre exempel tas därför upp redan här, för att sedan återkomma i min diskussion av gnosticism i populär opinion: Kent Gunnarssons avhan-dling *Den kristna gnosticisomens återkomst*, försvarad 2004;²⁸ Mikael Tellbes populärvetenskapliga artikel ”Gnosticism: den tudelade and-ligheten” från 2010;²⁹ samt Per Beskows appendix till den nya översät-ningen av Irenaeus verk *Mot Heresierna* från 2016.³⁰ Som synes är de två senare verken populära publikationer, men då dessa två författare är

²⁸ Kent Gunnarsson, ”Den kristna gnosticisomens återkomst: ett studium av Ulf Ekmans teologi” (Avhandling, Uppsala Universitet, 2004).

²⁹ Mikael Tellbe, ”Gnosticis-men – den tudelade andligheten”, Dagen, 5 augusti 2010, <http://www.dagen.se/kultur/gnosticis-men-den-tudelade-andligheten-1.156867>. Tellbe har informerat mig om att den ursprungliga artikeln var nästan dubbelt så lång som den tryckta versionen. I och med att han tvingades korta ner texten blev också slutprodukten mindre nyanserad, och diskussionen om begreppet gnosticism inte lika uttömmande.

³⁰ Per Beskow, ”Appendix: Villolärarna”, i *Mot heresierna*, övers. Olof Andrén (Skellefteå: Artos & Norma Bokförlag, 2016).

docenter i Nya testamentets exegetik respektive kyrkohistoria är det ändå motiverat att inkludera dem i denna sektion, inte minst eftersom det finns så lite svenskspråkigt vetenskapligt material publicerat om gnosticicism.

I sin avhandling visar Gunnarsson att han är medveten om Williams bok genom att han påpekar att ”en livlig definitionsdiskussion” om begreppet har förts och refererar till Williams i en fotnot.³¹ Gunnarsson poängterar också att Williams har kritiserat Jonas ”utifrån en partikularistisk hållning”, men preciserar tyvärr inte vad han menar med detta. Med tanke på det genomslag Williams studie hade kommit att få när Gunnarsson skrev sin avhandling är det olyckligt att han inte diskuterar Williams kritik av gnosticicism-begreppet.

Gunnarssons presentation av den antika gnosticismen i avhandlingens andra kapitel saknar primärkällor och förlitar sig helt och hållet på sekundärlitteratur, ofta av den typ som Williams kritiserar som föråldrad. Huvuddelen av kapitlet bygger på Hans Jonas *The Gnostic Religion* och Kurt Rudolphs *Gnosis: The Nature and History of Gnosticism*.

Det finns flera problem i Gunnarssons framställning. Gunnarssons historiografi över den tidigaste kristendomen kretsar kring två rörelser som befinner sig i ett diametralt motsatsförhållande: ”den tidiga kristna kyrkan” (i singular) och gnostikerna.³² Denna dikotomiska historieskrivningstendens har, som synes ovan, blivit mycket kritiserad. Gunnarsson anger två möjliga förklaringsmodeller till frågan om gnosticisomens relation till kristendomen och andra religioner. Enligt den första är gnosticismen resultatet av en akut hellenisering av kristendomen (à la Harnack).³³ Gnosticismen kom utifrån, och dess introduktion av grekiskt tankegods och inslag från orientaliska religioner kom att förorena och degenerera en ursprungligen obefläckad kristendom. Enligt den andra förklaringsmodellen har en ”verbal kristianisering av andra religioner” inträffat – den kristne apostaten har brutit sig ur gemenskapen

³¹ Gunnarsson, ”Den kristna gnosticisomens återkomst”, 9 n. 8.

³² *Ibid.*, 15.

³³ *Ibid.*, 17.

och kommit att föra med sig ett kristet språkbruk till andra religioner. Dessa kan nu framstå som kristna i och med den nya vokabulären, men i själva verket inte de är det. Dessa två modeller har mycket gemensamt med varandra. Båda bygger på en essentialistisk förståelse av religioner som isolerade entiteter vars ”renhet” riskerar att blandas ut genom interaktion med andra. Gunnarsson väljer dock att inte ta ställning för någon av dem, utan menar att de båda har ett visst förklaringsvärde.³⁴

Gunnarsson använder också synkretism som analytisk kategori: ”Gnosticismen kännetecknades, som redan nämnts, av synkretistiska tendenser genom att man inlemmat olika idéer från andra religioner och sedan format dessa till egna doktriner.”³⁵ Termen synkretism medför dock samma problem som de två förklaringsmodellerna ovan. En förutsättning för att det ska vara meningsfullt att etikettera någonting som ”blandat” är att det finns motsvarande fenomen som är ”rena” och ”oblandade”. Då religioner är ytterst komplexa sociala fenomen som uppstår, formas och utvecklas i ständig interaktion med sin omgivning är det ytterst tvivelaktigt om någon religion kan klassificeras som ”oblandad”. Därför kan man fråga sig vilket analytiskt värde motsatsparen ren–förorenad faktiskt besitter. Som King påpekar opererar alltid så kallade ”anti-synkretistiska diskurser”, utsagor där ren religion avskiljs från degenererade avarter, utifrån en starkt ideologiskt präglad taxonomi av indelningar i bättre och sämre.³⁶ ”Det blandade” är alltid undermåligt i relation till ”det rena”.³⁷

Gunnarssons gestaltning av gnosticismen innehåller även andra problematiska inslag. Bland annat skriver han att gnostikerna ”brukade dela in människorna i tre grupper”,³⁸ trots att denna idé har mycket litet

³⁴ Ibid.

³⁵ Ibid.

³⁶ King, *The Secret Revelation of John*, 31–33.

³⁷ För en vidare diskussion av synkretism och motsatsparen ren–förorenad, se Petter Spjut, ”The Protestant Historiographic Myth and the Discourse of Differentiation in Scholarly Studies of Colossians”, *SEÅ* 80 (2015): 169–85, 172–73, 181–83.

³⁸ Gunnarsson, ”Den kristna gnosticisomens återkomst”, 18.

stöd i primärkällorna. Även av kyrkofäderna tillskrivs den framförallt de valentinianska skolorna. Det saknas alltså belägg för att merparten av de så kallade gnostiska grupperna skulle ha gjort denna indelning. Gunnarsson framställer också den gnostiska etiken som antingen utpräglat libertinsk eller asketisk.³⁹ Gunnarssons presentation är i hög grad påverkad av Hans Jonas idéer om hur den gnostiska livsföringen gestaltades som en metafysisk revolt mot skaparguden. Genom att ett libertinskt uppträdande, vilket innebar ett bejakande av en utsvävande sexualitet och allmänna ”omoraliska” praktiker, visade gnostikern att denne stod över den världsliga ordningen. Den radikala askesen var ett annat sätt att ta avstånd från, och fullkomligt försaka, världen. Denna förståelse av den gnostiska etiken utgör, som vi sett ovan, en av de mest kritiserade stereotyperna om gnosticism. Gunnarssons bok innehåller också rena felaktigheter, som exempelvis att namnet Sophia skulle betyda visdom på hebreiska.⁴⁰

Flera av de idéer vi möter hos Gunnarsson figurerar också hos Tellbe och Beskow. Likt Gunnarsson identifierar Tellbe, docent i Nya testamentets exegetik och lärare vid Örebro Teologiska Högskola, och Beskow, docent i kyrkohistoria, två huvudspår i den gnostiska etiken: ett libertinskt och ett asketiskt.⁴¹ Tellbe framställer också den gnostiska teologin som doketisk, en ståndpunkt som vi såg ovan hade kritiserats utförligt av bland andra Karen King på grund av dåligt stöd i primärkällorna.⁴²

³⁹ Ibid., 18.

⁴⁰ Ibid., 16.

⁴¹ Beskow skriver: ”Viktigast var en radikal åtskillnad mellan himmelskt och jordiskt och en nedvärderande inställning till allt kroppsligt. Det kunde resultera i en radikal asketism eller tvärtom i en lika radikal lössläpphet” (Per Beskow, ”Appendix: Villolärarna”, i *Mot heresierna*, övers. Olof Andrén [Skellefteå: Artos & Norma Bokförlag, 2016], 20), medan Tellbe formulerar sig på följande vis: ”Å ena sidan utvecklades en mer asketisk inställning där man genom strikt återhållsamhet skulle befrias från kroppens begär, och å andra sidan en mer libertinistisk, frigjord hållning där man ville bryta ner kroppen genom ett liv i utsvävningar” (Mikael Tellbe, ”Gnosticisemen”).

⁴² Tellbe, ”Gnosticisemen”.

Föreställningen att gnosticismen skulle vara mer elitistisk än ”proto-ortodox” kristendom stöter vi också på hos både Beskow och Tellbe, och likt Gunnarsson betonar också båda dessa forskare gnosticisomens utomkristliga ursprung. Beskow skriver:

En viktig insikt som [Nag Hammadi-]fyndet gav är att gnosticismen inte har uppstått inom kristendomen utan från börjat har tillförts den utifrån, från judiska, kanske också från andra orientaliska miljöer.⁴³

Teorier om att gnosticismen skulle ha förkristna rötter stöter vi dock på långt före Nag Hammadi-fyndet. Beskows text ger intryck av att ett eventuellt utomkristligt ursprung skulle ha bekräftats av Nag Hammadi-texterna, men fallet är snarare det motsatta. Under 70- och 80-talet var teorier om ett judiskt ursprung populära, och flera forskare föreställde sig att texter såsom *Johannesapokryfen* ursprungligen hade saknat kristna inslag. Dessa hade istället tillfogats senare. Problemet med den judiska hypotesen är dock att de ”gnostiska” texter vi har tillgång till också innehåller kristna drag, medan judiska, ”förkristna” förlagorna saknas. Idag förespråkas därför detta perspektiv enbart av en minoritet.⁴⁴

Tellbe skriver på ett liknande sätt att ”det gnostiska tänkandet existerade före kristendomens början”.⁴⁵ Här har han inte nödvändigtvis fel, men det är oklart exakt vad han menar med ”gnostiskt tänkande”. Att det skulle finnas beröringspunkter mellan idéer inom kristendomen och andra antika tankeströmningar är okontroversiellt. Problemet med Tellbes och Beskows retorik är att den, liksom Gunnarssons, reproducerar den konfessionellt motiverade dikotomi mellan ”sann kristendom”

⁴³ Beskow, ”Villolärarna”, 20.

⁴⁴ För en relativt färsk forskningshistorik över den judiska ursprungshypotesen, samt hur denna under 80- och 90-talet kom att lämna plats för idén om gnosticisomens som en kristen idéutveckling, se Jaan Lahe, *Gnosis und Judentum: Alttestamentliche und jüdische Motive in der gnostischen Literatur und das Ursprungsproblem der Gnosis* (Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies 75; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2012). Lahe förespråkar själv den judiska hypotesen och utgör, tillsammans med bland andra Birger Pearson, den minoritet av Nag Hammadi-forskare som fortfarande argumenterar för att gnosticismen har ett utomkristligt ursprung.

⁴⁵ Tellbe, ”Gnosticismen”.

och gnosticism som King och Dunderberg kritiserar. Detta blir särskilt tydligt i Beskows fall. Likt von Harnack skriver Beskow att kristendomen under 100-talet infiltrerades och togs över av ”spekulativt anlagda kristna som ville omvandla den kristna tron till en exklusiv vishetslära”.⁴⁶

Sammantaget står det klart att föräldrade perspektiv i hög grad lever kvar i svenska forskares presentationen av gnosticism, vilket försvårar användandet av begreppet.

Den polemiska laddningen i ordet

Ett tredje skäl till att sluta använda begreppet gnosticism i bibelvetenskaplig och kyrkohistorisk forskning är den nästan genomgående polemiska användningen av begreppet gnosticism i populär opinion och de i dessa publikationer stundtals glidande gränserna mellan akademi och konfessionell teologi. Att använda begreppet gnosticism har visat sig vara en populär och relativt vanligt förekommande strategi för att hävda att den teologiska motståndarens kristendom inte håller måttet. Vid flertalet tillfällen är det disputerade forskare inom bibelvetenskap och kyrkohistoria som, så att säga, fäller domen.

Här, precis som i anslutning till frågan om föräldrade perspektiv ovan, blir det alltså tydligt att gnosticism-begreppet synliggör en intressant dynamik mellan akademi och populär opinion som är viktig att analysera vidare. Detta är också artikelns huvudsakliga fokus, och om vi hittills hållt oss till akademien kommer nästa sektion att behandla exempel hämtade från populär opinion.

⁴⁶Beskow, ”Villolärarna”, 19.

GNOSTICISM I POPULÄR OPINION

Materialurval

I den följande översikten har jag använt mig av material publicerat mellan 1997 och 2015 som på något sätt använder gnosticism i värderande mening och verkar opinionsbildande genom att para ihop antik gnosticism med samtida rörelser, fenomen eller personer. Texter som Dick Harrisons populärvetenskapliga artikel om gnosticism, publicerad på *Svenska Dagbladets* historieblogg, faller därmed utanför inom ramarna för denna översikt.⁴⁷ Detsamma gäller Paul Linjamaas artikel ”Gnosticis- men – har den funnits?” i tidskriften *Signum*.⁴⁸ Skälet till detta är att Harrisons och Linjamaas presentationer genomgående är värderingsfria och att de inte gör anspråk på någonting annat än att ge en orientering över de så kallade gnostikerna i deras antika kontext. Av avgränsningsskäl har jag också valt att exkludera yttranden om gnosticism på kommentarsfält till bloggar och tidningar.

Det behandlade materialet spänner över flera olika genrer: populärvetenskapliga böcker; insändare; artiklar; och blogginlägg. Två av de texter som inkluderas behöver kommenteras här. Eftersom Marianne Fredriksson i sina romaner tar en stark ställning för den antika gnosticis- men som ett kvinnovänligt, progressivt och andligt alternativ till de bakåtsträvande kyrkorna, har jag valt att förstå hennes skönlitterära alster som opinionsbildande material. Det samma gäller Kent Gunnarssons doktorsavhandling, som introducerats ovan. Eftersom Gunnarsson anger i sin introduktion att han vill visa på de gnostiska dragen i Ekmans teologi för att motivera ett avståndstagande kan han anses ha en opinionsbildande funktion. Därför har jag valt att inkludera den i denna kategori, trots att en avhandling egentligen hör till den akademiska världens domäner.

⁴⁷ Dick Harrison, ”Gnostikerna”, *Historieblogger*, 24 november 2012, <http://blog.svd.se/historia/2012/11/24/gnostikerna/>.

⁴⁸ Paul Linjamaa, ”Gnosticis- men – har den funnits?”, *Signum* 4 (2017): 27–32.

I min översikt ligger tyngdpunkten på yttranden om gnosticism, inte på de individer som gett upphov till dem. Jag vill understryka att syftet inte är att hänga ut enskilda opinionsbildare, utan snarare att visa på allmänna tendenser i attityder till, och värderingar av, ”gnosticism” och ”gnostiker”. Jag har inkluderat yttranden från såväl forskare som lekmän. Eftersom en doktorstitel ofrånkomligt medför en viss auktoritet och därmed aktualiserar frågan kring termens lämplighet i ett akademiskt sammanhang, har jag dock valt att uppmärksamma om en opinionsbildare har disputerat i ett religionsvetenskapligt ämne. Att belysa en opinionsbildares akademiska bakgrund, samt att även inkludera lekmän i översikten, gör det också lättare att se likheter och skillnader mellan forskares och lekmäns användning av gnosticism i populär opinion.

Jag har dock medvetet valt att inte gå in närmare på enskilda författares och opinionsbildares samfundstillhörighet, förutom när detta är av omedelbar relevans för kontexten. Ett exempel på ett sådant fall är debatterna som följde efter publikationen av Gunnarssons doktorsavhandling. Gunnarsson blev nämligen hårt kritiserad för bristande vetenskaplighet av Anders Gerdmar, som i sin tur anklagades av Gunnarssons handledare Jørgen Straarup för att vara ideologiskt driven, i och med sitt engagemang i Livets Ord (se nedan). Gerdmars samfundstillhörighet erbjuder därmed en viktig bakgrund till debatten och gör den lättare att förstå.

Feministteologer som gnostiker

Staffan Bergman, som tidigare varit verksam som präst, inleder sin artikel ”Gnosticism – ett tidens tecken?” med en historisk överblick, innan han går vidare till att vederlägga vad han kallar modern gnosticism.⁴⁹ I likhet med det tidiga 1900-talets jämförande religionshistoriska skola framställer Bergman gnosticismen som en förkristen religion som

⁴⁹ Staffan Bergman, ”Gnosticism – ett tidens tecken”, *Lutheranen* 3 (1999), <http://luk.se/luthwebbarkiv/Luth1999-3.htm>.

vid mötet med kristendomen kom att anta kristna drag. Gnosticismen utgjorde en lockelse för många, men bekämpades av den kristna kyrkan. Under historiens gång har den sedan legat slumrande och bitvis skymtat fram i olika alternativreligiösa, kätterska strömningar. Som ett exempel på detta menar han att rättroende kristna som idag läser Marianne Fredriksson, en författare påverkad av gnostiska tankegångar, ”upplever samma känsla av grov förvrängning och hädelse som de första kristna gjorde, när de konfronterades med gnostisk kristendom”.⁵⁰

Men vad är då den moderna gnosticisism som Bergman varnar för? Framför allt är det feministiska tänkare inom och utanför kyrkan, och då i synnerhet feministteologer, eftersom feministteologi enligt Bergman är en rörelse sprungen ur gnosticisismen:

Den s.k. feministteologin har rötter i gnosticisismen. De gnostiska samfundet hade, som vi tidigare nämnt, ofta kvinnliga präster – alldeles tvärt emot många kvinnoprästförespråkares argument att Jesus och apostlarna under trycket av rådande patriarkaliska ordningar inte hade möjlighet att då öppna ämbetet för kvinnor. För gnostikerna var tanken på skapelsegivna olika roller för man och kvinna befängd. Fanns sådana så hörde de till Demiurgens onda skapelse. Gnostikerna var ivriga att ge gudsbilden också kvinnliga drag och de gudomliga eonerna åkallades under kvinnliga namn. Det vi i dag hör från feministteologer om Gud, ”vår moder” och Jesus, ”vår syster” och Anden som ”livgiverskan” är ett tydligt eko i vår tid från den gamla gnostiska gudstjänstliturgin. Biskop Anders Nygren i Lund var klarsynt, när han 1958, vid beslutet om kvinnoprästreformens genomförande i vårt land, sade att Svenska kyrkan nu växlat in på ett främmande, gnostiskt spår.⁵¹

Bergman målar upp en tydlig dikotomi mellan den tidiga kristna kyrkan och gnosticisismen, som enligt honom uppstod som en självständig religion århundranden före vår tidräknings början och senare kom att infiltrera kristendomen. Genom att förflytta denna dikotomi till modern tid och framställa feministteologer som gnostiker ogiltigförklarar Bergman feministiska uttolkare.

⁵⁰ Staffan Bergman, ”Gnosticisism”.

⁵¹ Ibid.

Bergman är inte ensam om att koppla samman feministteologi och gnosticism. En nästan identisk retorik finner vi hos Rune Imberg, disputerad kyrkohistoriker och lärare vid församlingsfakulteten i Göteborg, som i del två av sin opinionsbildande artikelserie ”Teologiska trender i tiden”, varnar för ett kommande krig mellan ”sann kristendom” och gnostisk feminism:

Förr eller senare kommer sann kristendom att hamna i en kamp på liv eller död mot feministteologin – precis som man i fornkyrkan tvingades göra med gnosticismen. Detta är ingen tillfällighet, *eftersom feministteologin ur många aspekter är en ”andlig” arvtagare till gnosticismen* [Imbergs kursivering].⁵²

Gnosticism har dock inte bara använts för att beteckna feministteologer, utan även för att beteckna kritiker av könsrollsnormer i allmänhet. Ett exempel på detta finner vi i ett debattinlägg i tidningen *Dagen*, författat av Olof and Mona Edsinger.⁵³ Edsinger och Edsinger kritiserar här könsrollsnormer och queerteori i största allmänhet utifrån föreställningen att en binär könsuppfattning är given av Gud. I deras argumentation blir kritik mot tvåkönsnormen därmed också en kritik mot skapelsen, och på så vis kan den betecknas som gnostisk.

Trosrörelsens representanter som gnostiker

I Gunnarssons avhandling möts vi av en diskurs som är mycket lik den vi sett ovan hos Bergman. Gnosticismen fungerar som ett slags anti-typ mot vilken den legitima kristendomen kontrasteras, och i fokus står nu trosrörelsen. Mer specifikt skriver Gunnarson om Ulf Ekman, dåvarande pastor i Livets Ord, och syftet formuleras på följande vis:

Varför är det intressant att undersöka om Ekmans teologiska uppfattningar kan karaktäriseras som gnostiska? Det finns ett allmänt intresse från de kristna kyrkorna att på djupet förstå Ekmans teologi. Vad är det i trosförkunnelsen som

⁵² Rune Imberg, ”Teologiska trender i tiden 2, Feministteologi”, *Hälsning från Församlingsfakulteten 2* (2000), <http://www.brogren.nu/rune3.htm>.

⁵³ Mona Edsinger och Olof Edsinger, ”Upphävda könsgränser skapar vilshenhet”, *Dagen*, 1 september 2006, <http://www.dagen.se/ledare/upphavda-konsgranser-skapar-vilshenhet-1.213507>.

på en och samma gång är både lockande och som inger tveksamheter? Avståndstaganden från Ekmans teologi har både från kristet och ickekristet håll legat på ett ytligt plan, där vissa beteenden har pekats ut som osunda och farliga. Kritiken har för det mesta inte trängt ner på djupet och identifierat grundproblemen i hans tänkande. Inte heller har kritiken synliggjort de samband som finns mellan Ekmans trosförkunnelse och andra till det yttre skilda fenomen i kulturen. Ekman har också anspråk på att Gud själv har givit honom uppdraget att utrusta kyrkan med en ny förståelse av vad tro är. Hur förhåller sig denna nya förståelse till det som brukar anges som en huvudlinje i den kristna traditionen? För den kristna kyrkan har det ett värde att få Ekmans teologi inplacerad på en teologisk karta. Ett eventuellt avståndstagande från Ekmans teologi bör vara genomreflekerat och inte vila på lättvindiga resonemang.⁵⁴

I inomkyrkliga debatter har Ulf Ekman alltså, enligt Gunnarsson, utpekats som en infiltrator i den svenska ortodoxin, men kyrklig opinion har inte riktigt kunnat identifiera var skon egentligen klämmer. En möjlig kategorisering som gnostiker menar Gunnarsson skulle göra problematiken tydlig och legitimera ett avståndstagande från Ekmans teologi.

I tidningen *Dagen* recenserar Anders Gerdmar, docent i Nya testamentets exegetik och rektor vid Skandinavisk Teologisk Högskola (tidigare rektor för Livets Ords Teologiska Seminarium), Gunnarssons studie, som han menar inte bara brister i vetenskaplig stringens utan också i forskningsetik:

Det som bedrövar mest i Gunnarssons avhandling är ändå inte dess uppenbara akademiska brister utan anklagelsen att Ulf Ekman skulle ha en dold agenda, och här är Gunnarssons påstående direkt kränkande.⁵⁵

Vidare menar Gerdmar att Gunnarsson drar sina slutsatser utifrån ett knapphändigt och mycket selektivt material om Ulf Ekmans teologi. Gerdmar fick dock mothugg från Jørgen Straarup, som var Gunnarssons huvudhandledare.⁵⁶ Genom att hänvisa till Gerdmars religiösa hemvist

⁵⁴ Gunnarsson, "Den kristna gnosticisomens återkomst", 7–8.

⁵⁵ Anders Gerdmar, "Avhandlingen följer inte spelreglerna", *Dagen*, 24 juni 2004, <http://www.dagen.se/kultur/avhandlingen-foljer-inte-spelreglerna-1.234517>.

⁵⁶ Jørgen Straarup, "Germar spelar rollen som lojal underhuggare", *Dagen*, 6 juli

försöker Straarup påvisa att Gerdmars kritik av Gunnarsson är konfessionellt motiverad och ”osaklig”. Avhandlingens polemiska ton gör det svårt att ta Straarups parti. Om Gerdmar har konfessionella intressen eller ej är överhuvudtaget inte relevant, eftersom hans kritik av Gunnarsson är berättigad. Avhandlingens premisser och syfte, att legitimera ett avståndstagande från Ulf Ekman genom att sammankoppla honom med antik gnosticism, bygger på normativa antaganden av den typ som varken hör hemma inom kyrkohistoria eller bibelvetenskap. Lika bristfällig är också, som vi sett ovan, Gunnarssons presentation av gnosticismen.

Men oavsett sakfrågan är det Gerdmars och Straarups inställning till den forskningsetiska frågan som är mest anmärkningsvärd. När de diskuterar huruvida det är etiskt försvarbart att sätta etiketten ”gnostiker” på Ulf Ekman sker detta utifrån en förståelse av gnosticism som en niddbeteckning, något som det är djupt kränkande att bli kallad för. Eventuella reflektioner över rimligheten i att framställa en antik religiös rörelse som en så polemiskt laddad anti-typ saknas helt och hållet, både i Gunnarssons avhandling och i Gerdmars respektive Straarups efterföljande debatter.

Ulf Ekman är dock inte den ende av trosrörelsens profiler som kommit att anklagas för gnosticism. Efter att tevepredikanten Benny Hinn gjort ett framträdande på Livets Ord träder flera bloggare och skribenter fram och identifierar honom som gnostiker. En av dessa är Ulf Ekman själv, som menar att Hinns distinktion mellan kropp och ande klingar gnostiskt.⁵⁷ I en insändare i Dagen refererar Håkan Arenius till Hinns undervisning som den ”gamla gnostiska surdegen”,⁵⁸ och i en krönika där skribenten Sam Wohlin sammanfattar sommarens stora kristna hän-

2004, <http://www.dagen.se/kultur/gerdmar-spelar-rollen-som-lojal-underhuggare-1.235008>.

⁵⁷ Ulf Ekman, ”Benny Hinns besök”, *Ulf Ekman's blogg*, 26 juli 2010, <http://ulfekman.nu/2010/07/26/benny-hinns-besok>.

⁵⁸ Håkan Arenius, ”En irrlärore på Livets Ord”, *Dagen*, 28 juli 2010, <http://www.dagen.se/ledare/en-irrlarare-pa-livets-ord-1.142363>.

delser, nämner han debatten om gnosticism och Hinn som en av dessa.⁵⁹ Wohlin identifierar gnosticismen som ett reellt hot, men väljer att inte ta ställning i frågan om Hinns eventuella gnostiska koppling, då han själv inte var närvarande under Hinns predikan. På bloggen *Predikan och undervisning av Elvor och Hannes* identifierar Karin Jansson inte bara Hinns läror som gnostiska, hon skriver också att Hinn förlitar sig på spiritism, och att hans helanden sker med okristliga kundalinitekniker, snarare än genom den heliga Anden.⁶⁰

Då gnosticism har alltså varit ett av sommaren 2010:s stora modeord i kristen opinion blir Tellbe, i egenskap av specialist på tidig kristendom, ombedd av tidningen *Dagen* att förklara begreppet i den korta artikel som introducerats ovan. Tellbe bekräftar kortfattat i inledningen till artikeln att Hinns antropologi onekligen klingar gnostiskt och går vidare med att visa på likheter mellan samtidens New Age-rörelser och den antika gnosticismen. Artikeln antar sedan en undervisande ton, förklarar begreppet och ger läsaren en introduktion till antikens religiösa rörelser. Artikeln avslutas med varningar för, och förmaningar mot, gnostiskt tänkande i samtiden. En alltför individcentrerad andlighet och ökande grad av narcissism riskerar att leda den kristne in på gnosticisms bana:

Man kan fråga sig vad det är som gör att de gnostiska tankegångarna ständigt tycks återkomma i historien? I grund och botten är det den urgamla lögnen från Eden som poppar upp, nämligen att kunskapen förmår göra människan gudomlig. Människans problem förläggs utanför henne själv och istället för att tala om människan som syndare talas det om människans brist på insikt.⁶¹

⁵⁹ Sam Wohlin, "Jesus leder aldrig någon bort från det mänskliga", *Dagen*, 5 augusti 2010, <http://www.dagen.se/kronikor/jesus-leder-aldrig-nagon-bort-fran-det-manskliga-1.152746>.

⁶⁰ Karin Jansson, "Läror & Debatter: Sverige – Karins nyhetsbrev", *Predikan och undervisning av Elvor och Hannes*, 31 juli 2010, http://www.elvorochjanne.se/old-web/laror-debatter/sverige/Karin_31-7-10.html.

⁶¹ Tellbe, "Gnosticismen".

Vidare menar Tellbe att gnosticisms elitism och betoning på kunskap utgör ett maktproblem. Ett sista problem med de samtida gnostiska tankegångarna är dess tendens att negligera det svaga hos människan och istället söka perfektion.

Vad som skiljer Tellbes presentation av, och historiska bakgrund till, gnosticismen från exempelvis Harrisons eller Linjamaas populärvetenskapliga översikter över samma ämne är framförallt Tellbes nedvärderande hållning gentemot de gnostiska rörelserna. Likt Gunnarsson talar Tellbe om gnosticismen som ett hot, en infiltrator i den samtida kristenheten som måste exponeras och vederläggas. Detta gör att Tellbes presentation av gnosticismen, i likhet med Gunnarssons, befinner sig i gränslandet mellan akademi och apologetik. Den antika gnosticismen blir inte bara ett studieobjekt, utan fungerar också som anti-typ.

Gnosticism som ljudbilden i frikyrklig julmusik

En betydligt mindre polemisk, men ändå för sammanhanget intressant jämförelse mellan gnosticism och frikyrklighet finner vi på bloggen *Läsarna*. Till skillnad från många andra opinionsbildare gör skribenten Joseph Sverker inga uttalanden om eventuella gnostiska inslag i måltavlornas teologiska profiler, utan uppehåller sig istället vid ljudbilden i kristen musikproduktion. Sverker menar att i sin strävan efter perfektion har den frikyrkliga julmusiken kommit att bli snarast gnostisk. Dess ljudbild är artificiell och speglar inte det spruckna och trasiga i den jordiska tillvaron:

Den finns en perfektionism och ensidighet i arrangemang och produktion i mycket av julmusiken som i det närmsta liknar en gnosticism, alltså en rädsla för (eller egentligen nedvärdering av) det materiella. Och detta passar så utmärkt i mycket av estetiken i frikyrkan med sin strävan efter det perfekta ljudet, den perfekta mixningen eller det perfekta "cleana" gitarrsolot. Det var inte okej att lyssna på Led Zeppelin, men Toto klarade sig eftersom det "lät" så rent och musikerna var så ofantligt duktiga (till skillnad från Led Zeppelin då?). Saker och ting har säkert förändrats bland ungdomar i frikyrkan sedan dess, och

förhoppningsvis till det bättre, men jag undrar om inte gnosticisms lockelse och estetik dyker upp då och då?⁶²

Sverkers uttalande är intressant, eftersom det visar hur en diskurs kommit att etableras där gnosticism har blivit sinnebilden för någonting som i kyrkliga sammanhang framställs som suspekt och negativt. Precis som Imberg och Gunnarsson kan använda gnosticismen för att associera samtida profiler eller rörelser med de antika gnostikerna, kan Sverker visa att det är något som inte stämmer i frikyrkans vurmande för en särskild ljudbild genom att förknippa detta med gnosticism.

Svenskkyrkliga profiler som gnostiker

Efter Anders Gerdmars förgörande kritik av Gunnarssons avhandling kan det tyckas något oväntat att se honom själv tillgripa samma polemiska strategi – att anklaga en teologisk motståndare för gnosticism. Ändå är det detta som sker 2013, strax efter det att Antje Jackelén har tillträtt som ärkebiskop, i debattinlägget ”Gnostiska idéer i Ärkebiskopsgården”, publicerat i tidningen *Världen idag*.⁶³

Gerdmar kritiserar Jackelén för att inte stå ”för centrala trossatser som jungfrufödelsen, att Jesus är enda vägen och klassisk tro i äktenskapsfrågan”. Det är särskilt den första punkten, en icke-bokstavlig tro på jungfrufödelsen som Gerdmar anser motiverar en etikettering som gnostiker. Gerdmar uttrycker sig dock försiktigare än Gunnarsson och Tellbe, dels genom att visa sig vara införstådd med att begreppet gnosticism missanvänds, och dels genom att inte uttryckligen placera etiketten själv, utan istället mena att en kyrkofader skulle ha kallat Jackelén gnostiker.

⁶² Joseph Sverker, ”Julevangeliet enligt Leonard Cohen: Sprickor i julfasaden och varför Jussi Björling inte bör sjunga O helga natt”, *Läsarna: Bildning & fromhet*, 18 december 2015, <http://www.lasarna.se/julevangeliet-enlig-leonard-cohen-sprickor-i-jul-fasaden-och-varfor-jussi-bjorling-inte-bor-sjunga-o-helga-natt/>.

⁶³ Anders Gerdmar, ”Gnostiska idéer i Ärkebiskopsgården”, *Världen idag*, 16 oktober 2013, <http://www.varldenidag.se/gastkronika/gnostiska-ideer-i-arkebiskopsgarden/cbbmjppfkyUovQaOFkO17DEM1djA/>.

För en fornkyrklig teolog skulle Jackeléns teologi nog bedömas som heretisk och gnostisk. Det senare begreppet används ofta slarvigt, men just jungfrufödelsen var en punkt som kyrkofadern Irenaeus fick försvara mot gnostikerna. I trosbekännelserna är nämligen jungfrufödelsen konkret och biologiskt menad.⁶⁴

Även om Gerdmars retorik är försiktigare än exempelvis Imbergs, är hans användning av begreppet tydligt värdeladdat och polemiskt motiverat. Jackeléns ”gnostiska” teologi utgör det huvudsakliga skälet till varför hon skulle vara opassande som ärkebiskop.

Gerdmar är dock inte ensam om att etikettera Antje Jackelén som gnostiker. I ett debattinlägg i *Kyrkans Tidning* skriver Micael Grenholm att Antje Jackeléns teologi ”luktar gnosticism” eftersom hon inte tar ”det fysiska” på allvar och bara tycks förstå Kristus som Guds son på ett symboliskt plan.⁶⁵ Grenholms utsaga tycks därmed vara baserad på ett likställande av gnosticism och doketism.

Rune Imberg, kyrkohistorikern som vi såg likställa feministisk teologi med gnosticism, ser även likheter mellan gnostiska tankegångar och svenskkyrkliga företrädares inställning till sexualitetsfrågor:

Det som i dag proklamerats av biskopar och många andra ”kristna ledare” har inte med biblisk förståelse av äktenskap och sexualitet att göra. Det handlar snarare om en blandreligion med kristen fernissa som liknar antikens hellenism och gnosticism: Var och en snickrar ihop sin egen gudsbild och etik ur en ”politiskt korrekt” plocklåda.⁶⁶

⁶⁴ Anders Gerdmar, ”Gnostiska idéer”.

⁶⁵ Micael Grenholm, ”Varför jag inte håller med Antje Jackelén”, *Kyrkans tidning*, 9 oktober 2013, <http://www.kyrkanstidning.se/debatt/varfor-jag-inte-haller-med-antje-jackelen>.

⁶⁶ Rune Imberg, ”Svenska kyrkans sexualsyn rätt – förr”, *Dagen*, 2 april 2004, <http://www.dagen.se/debatt/svenska-kyrkans-sexualsyn-ratt-forr-1.93858> (se också hans ”Topprankad biskopskandidat bjuder in kritiserad biskop”, *Världen idag*, 2 mars 2009, <http://www.varldenidag.se/nyheter/topprankad-biskopskandidat-bjuder-in-kritiserad-biskop/cbbicb!BhMjnhIglKu075mMAdFpWA/>), där han kritiserar ”gnostiska” liberalteologer i allmänhet).

Genom att placera ”kristna ledare” inom citationstecken antyder Imberg i sitt debattinlägg att de profiler inom svenska kyrkan som företräder en progressiv syn på sexualitet inte är sanna kristna. Auktoritetspositioner inom svenska kyrkan upptas av infiltratörer som, likt antikens gnostiker, till det yttre antar kristen skepnad men i själva verket företräder någonting annat – en eklektisk blandreligion med influenser från alla möjliga håll.

Att svenskkyrkliga företrädares hållning till sexualitet skulle ha gnostiska undertoner möter vi också på bloggen *BloggarDag* som drivs av Dag Sandahl, docent i kyrko- och samfundsvetenskap:

Gnosticismen håller sig med en uppsättning bibelord. ”Störst av allt är kärleken” är en bra text att sätta på en kondomförpackning (kondomprosten i Luleå) eller på en svart t-shirt för de kyrkliga från Svenska kyrkan i Växjö under pridefestivalen (domprosten i Växjö, väl?).⁶⁷

Till skillnad från Imberg är det inte främst synkretism som karaktäriserar det gnostiska hotet, utan ett visst förhållningssätt till bibeltolkning. Sandahl menar att gnosticismen ser på Guds ord som någonting som inte är klart och som måste tolkas av människor med insikt. Dessa gnostiker kan sedan förvränga betydelsen av en specifik vers och få den att betyda nästan vad som helst. Ytterst står Svenska kyrkan i ett gnostiskt förfall, och detta spårar han tillbaka till 1958, när beslut togs om att kvinnor skulle få bli präster:

Utifrån dessa insikter kan Svenska kyrkan växlas in på främmande spår år 1958. Gnostikers och svärmandars, nämligen. Biskopen Anders Nygren kände igen gnostikernas och svärmandarnas tänkesätt. Nygren var världsberömd teolog. Han borde känna igen något som funnits med i Kyrkans tidigare historia. Detta att bibelord anförs, ska inte imponera. Alla heretiker har andragit något för sitt syfte lämpligt bibelord.⁶⁸

⁶⁷ Dag Sandahl, ”Gnosticism, narcissism och nihilism”, *BloggarDag*, 12 maj 2015, <http://bloggardag.blogspot.se/2015/05/gnosticism-narcissism-och-nihilism.html>.

⁶⁸ Ibid.

Liksom Imberg visar Sandahl hur någonting som egentligen inte är legitim kristendom har nästlat sig in i Svenska Kyrkan och därigenom kommit att accepteras, trots sin tvivelaktiga natur. Kunskapen om det förflutna, vilken auktoriteter såsom Anders Nygren besitter, hjälper den renlärlige kristne att i sin samtid skilja mellan ortodoxi och heterodoxi.

Gnosticism som motsättning mellan tro och vetenskap

I populär opinion används också "gnostiker" som beteckning på dem som finner en motsättning mellan tro och vetenskap. I en insändare i *Dagen* skriver Samuel Varg Thunberg att det är "gnostiskt" att sätta tron i motsatsförhållande till medicin och läkarvetenskap.⁶⁹ På ett liknande sätt menar Micael Grenholm på bloggen *Hela Pingsten* att åtskillnaden mellan underverk och naturlagar är del av ett gnostiskt ramverk, eftersom det antyder att Gud skulle vara ointresserad av den materiella världen.⁷⁰

En liknande kritik av gnosticismen framkommer också i en ledare om relationen mellan kristendom och vetenskap publicerad i tidskriften *Signum*.⁷¹ I ledaren efterlyser Philip Geister, professor och rektor vid Newmaninstitutet, en mer nyanserad och mindre dikotomisk syn på relationen mellan kristendom och vetenskaplighet. Geister finner ordet religion problematiskt, eftersom alltför disparata åskådningar tenderar att klumpas ihop under denna paraplybeteckning – både åskådningar som är förenliga och oförenliga med vetenskaplighet. Som illustration av en religiös rörelse som inte är förenlig med en vetenskaplig grundsyn tar Geister upp gnosticismen, som han betecknar som en världsfrånvärd och spekulativ insider-religion. Gnosticismen ställs emot kristendomen

⁶⁹ Samuel Varg Thunberg, "Bön är inte en behandlingsmetod", *Dagen*, 16 december 2013, <http://www.varldenidag.se/debatt/bon-ar-inte-en-behandlingsmetod/cbbmlp!AVwRGRy@mDIW18GeNDTAzw/>.

⁷⁰ Micael Grenholm, "Ska vi sluta använda ordet 'övernaturligt'?", *Hela Pingsten*, 23 mars 2013, <https://helapingsten.com/2013/03/23/ska-vi-sluta-anvanda-ordet-overnaturligt/>.

⁷¹ Philip Geister, "Sluta tala om 'religion'", *Signum* 1 (2013): 1–2.

och får representera det irrationella och ovetenskapliga. I sammanhanget bör det dock nämnas att Geister, även om han ger en nedlåtande bild av gnosticisismen och använder den som negativt exempel, är mindre polemisk och mer nyanserad än många av de övriga gnosticisism-kritiker som introducerats ovan, och att han avstår ifrån att identifiera personer i sin egen samtid som gnostiker.

Politiska motståndare som gnostiker

I och med att Balder Jonssons opinionstext ”Politisk gnosticisism”, publicerad i *Nya Wermlands-Tidningen*, riktar sig till en sekulär publik skiljer den sig från de övriga exemplen, som i huvudsak använt gnosticisism för att skilja på legitim och illegitim religiositet. Trots detta har Jonssons tillvägagångssätt och värdering av gnosticisismen ändå mycket gemensamt med övriga opinionsbildare.

Liksom de andra framställningarna svänger Jonsson mellan en undervisande ton, där han berättar om de antika religiösa grupperna, och en polemisk ton, där han övergår till att diskutera paralleller till dagens gnostiker. Dagens politiska gnosticisism, skriver Jonsson, ”har tre huvuddrag gemensamt med den antika föregångaren: En känsla av utanförskap, en tro på språkets makt och frigörelsen av människan genom att göra henne till gud”.⁷² Liksom gnostikern lever den vänsterpolitiska anhängaren enligt Jonsson i en fantasivärld från vilken denne känner sig fjärrad: ”Demiurgen, den onde skaparguden, går i dag under andra namn som patriarkatet eller vithetsnormen.”⁷³ Vidare ägnar sig den moderne gnostikern åt magiskt tänkande och besvärjelser: genom att använda könsneutrala pronomen såsom ”hen” tror sig gnostikern (felaktigt, enligt Jonsson) kunna omforma verkligheten. För att möjliggöra samtal över de partipolitiska gränserna måste vänstern renas från dessa vanföreställningar och ge upp sina gnostiska drag:

⁷² Balder Jonsson, ”Politisk gnosticisism”, *Nya Wermlands-Tidningen*, 25 juli 2015, <http://nwt.se/asikter/signerat/2015/07/25/politisk-gnosticisism>.

⁷³ Ibid.

Om vi verkligen vill vända trenden i det offentliga samtalet måste vi rycka upp den gnostiska föreställningsvärlden med rötterna och visa att vår verklighet, med alla sina fel och brister, är den enda möjliga.⁷⁴

I Jonssons framställning blir gnostikern sinnebilden för den som är oförmögen att se verkligheten ”som den är”. Liksom i den kyrkliga polemiken fungerar gnosticismen även här som en etikett som sätts på motståndaren för att diskreditera.

Det är dock inte bara vänsterpolitiker som får sig en släng av gnostiker-sleven. På sin blogg skriver Håkan Sunnliden, som har en licentiatexamen i kyrkohistoria, att Maud Olofsson, på grund av sina åsikter om relationen mellan stat och kyrka, är gnostiker:

Hon vill att Svenska kyrkan ska syssla med det andliga, men inte att det andliga ska inkarneras, det vill säga förverkligas. Faktum är att samtliga exempel ovan kan tillskrivas en gnostiker. Gnostikerna utgjorde den största faran för urkyrkan och kyrkan förde en mycket tuff kamp mot gnosticismen. Vi är där igen.⁷⁵

Det gnostiska i Olofssons politik, menar Sunnliden, utgörs bland annat av bristen på reciprocitet i hennes kyrkopolitik. Staten ska påverka kyrkan, men kyrkan får ingen möjlighet att inverka på statens domäner och saknar i allt högre grad möjligheten att ta beslut vad gäller inomkyrkliga frågor, såsom kvinnoprästfrågan och vigning av homosexuella par. Det är dock inte enbart Centerpartiet som utifrån denna definition har gnostiska inslag i sin kyrkopolitik: ”Tyvärr gäller nog Maud Olofssons hållning också övriga partier. Hur ska vi ta upp kampen mot gnosticismen?”⁷⁶

Sunnlidens diskussion om gnosticism är särskilt intressant, eftersom det även utifrån en föräldrad definition av begreppet är svårt att se kopplingen mellan gnosticism och den kyrkopolitiska tendens som han tar avstånd ifrån. Att gnosticismen, som ofta framställs som så avlägsen en

⁷⁴ Jonsson, ”Politisk gnosticism”.

⁷⁵ Håkan Sunnliden, ”Är Maud Olofsson gnostiker?”, *Håkan Sunnlidens blogg*, 20 augusti 2010, <http://hakansunnliden.blogspot.se/2010/08/ar-maud-olofsson-gnostiker.html>.

⁷⁶ Ibid.

centraliserad och förstatligad kristendom man kan komma, plötsligt har blivit bilden för pragmatiska politiseringar av kyrkan visar i vilken hög grad termen har kommit att bli ett skällsord, vars närmare innebörd och konnotationer är mindre viktiga än dess polemiska tyngd.

Det romantiserande porträttet av gnostikerna

“Gnostiker” framställs inte uteslutande negativt i populär opinion och populärkultur. Marianne Fredrikssons romansviter om bibliska gestalter såsom Adam, Eva, Seth, Kain och Maria Magdalena relaterar ofta till klassiska gnostiska teman. Här får inte gnosticismen den negativa klang som vi stött på i exemplen ovan, utan representerar istället en positiv motpol till majoritetskyrkans dogmatiska hållning. Fredrikssons gnostiker är antika individualister och fritänkare. Deras kyrka är inte byggd på hierarkiska strukturer, utan går i jämlikhetens tecken. I boken *Enligt Maria Magdalena* blir Maria nedtystad när hon försöker berätta för apostlarna i Jerusalem om sitt möte med den uppståndne Jesus. Förtvivlad återger hon hur apostlarna är ”rotade i urgamla fördomar att kvinnan inte har någon själ och att mannen är den enda människan”.⁷⁷ Det är först i den gnostiska gudstjänsten som hon kan känna igen sig och uppleva att det är hennes egen version av händelserna vid uppståndelsen, och inte apostlarnas, som har bevarats.⁷⁸ Gnostikerna saknar också hierarki, drar lott om vem som ska leda gudstjänsten, och förkastar alla skillnader mellan män och kvinnor.

Liknande idéer stöter vi också på i antropologens Gunilla Hultgrens studie *Brudrov: En nedtystad kvinnohistoria*.⁷⁹ I denna populärvetenskapliga bok utforskar Hultgren historiska alternativ till patriarkala samhällssystem. Gnosticismen, menar Hultgren, utgjorde ett mer kvin-

⁷⁷ Marianne Fredriksson, *Enligt Maria Magdalena* (Stockholm: Wahlström & Widstrand, 2003), 96.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 180–81.

⁷⁹ Gunilla Hultgren, *Brudrov: En nedtystad kvinnohistoria* (Stockholm: Instant Book, 2009).

novänligt alternativ till den dogmatiska och patriarkala ortodoxa kyrkan:

Gnosticismen var kvinnovänlig, den företräder en dyad, en moder-fader, alltså egentligen den matrilineära balansen mellan manligt och kvinnligt, inte olikt det österländska yin och yang. Detta tror jag är avgörande för det hat och det motstånd gnosticismen väckte hos fanatiska anhängare av den ortodoxa grenen av den nya kristna rörelsen som i grunden var kvinnofientlig.⁸⁰

Ironiskt nog finns det stora likheter mellan Fredrikssons och Hultgrens framställningar av gnosticism, och gnosticism- och feminismkritiker som Bergman och Imberg. I sina porträtteringar är de nämligen överens om att de antika gnostikerna var proto-feminister och företrädare för en mjukare, mer filosofisk, och i högre grad individualiserad andlighet bortom allmänkyrkliga dogmer. Detta är i linje med Karen Kings observation att romantiserade skildringar av gnosticismen (som också återfinns på amerikanskt håll) har många gemensamma drag med kyrkofädernas skildringar, men betydligt mindre stöd i primärkällorna.⁸¹

Yet this portrait of Gnostics is equally reliant on the attacks of the polemicists – only the appraisal differs. Whether such portraits provoke admiration or condemnation, they both manage to present the polemicist's view as objective history.⁸²

De positivt värderade porträtteringarna av gnosticism har alltså mer gemensamt med de polemiskt motiverade framställningarna än med det faktiska primärmaterialet för dessa ”gnostiska” rörelser.

⁸⁰ Hultgren, *Brudrovet*, 149.

⁸¹ För en kritik av förståelsen av gnostiker som feminister, se Paul Linjamaa, ”Gnostiker som antikens feminister? Kvinnans roll och bilden av det feminina i antik gnosticism”, *STK* 92/1 (2016): 40–47.

⁸² King, *What is Gnosticism?*, 8.

Sammanfattning av undersökningsmaterialet

Undersökningen har visat att gnosticism i huvudsak används som negativt exempel, för att illegitimisera en teologisk motståndares förståelse av kristendomen. Gnosticism är i regel en nidbeteckning som appliceras på fienden, oavsett om denne är feministteolog, karismatisk förkunnare, svenskkyrklig ledare, står för en alltför rigid uppdelning mellan teologi och vetenskap, eller en politisk profil (både från vänster- och högerhåll).

Som vi har sett finns det även ett fåtal röster som värderar gnosticism som någonting positivt, som en motpol till en alltför dogmatisk och hierarkiskt uppbyggd kyrka, men i linje med King kunde det konstateras att denna förståelse av gnosticism hade mycket gemensamt med de mer negativt värderande framställningarna.

AVSLUTANDE DISKUSSION

Gnosticism har i alla tider varit ett mångtydigt och gäckande uttryck vars närmare innebörd har visat sig svår att ringa in. Ironiskt nog verkar just denna skiftande betydelse vara ett av dess mest beständiga drag. Redan under antiken ser vi att kyrkofäderna betecknar en mångfald av grupper som gnostiska, grupper vars främsta gemensamma nämnare utgörs av den motvilja de väcker hos författaren. Samma funktion har vi sett att gnosticismen har i populär opinion idag.

Gnosticism har visat sig vara en nidbeteckning möjlig att applicera på allt från ljudbilden i frikyrklig julmusik till vänsterns normkritik, på teologiska profiler så olika som Ulf Ekman och Antje Jackelén. Det har också visat sig att begreppet kan betyda nästan vad som helst i populär opinion. Precis som kyrkofäderna använde begreppet för att främmandegöra och exkludera är en sådan polemisk funktion fortfarande den mest framträdande.

Problemet med akademisk auktoritet

Frågan om huruvida gnosticism bör användas i religionsvetenskapliga sammanhang aktualiseras av att många av de opinionsbildare som använt sig av begreppet gnosticism i polemiska syften även är disputerade forskare och aktiva inom den akademiska världen: Kent Gunnarssons polemik mot Ulf Ekmans "gnostiska" teologi har gett honom en doktorstitel vid Umeå Universitet; Rune Imberg, som har förutspått en kamp på liv och död mellan "sanna kristna" och feministteologiska gnostiker, är disputerad i kyrkohistoria och undervisar vid församlingsfakulteten i Göteborg; Håkan Sunnliden, som identifierar bland andra Maud Olofsson som gnostiker, har en licentiatexamen i kyrkohistoria; Dag Sandahl, som använder begreppet gnosticism för att utpeka svenskkyrkliga profiler som okristliga, är docent i kyrko- och samfundsvetenskap; Anders Gerdmar, som har använt sig av beteckningen gnostiker för att diskreditera Antje Jackelén, är docent i Nya testamentets exegetik och rektor för Skandinavisk teologisk högskola i Uppsala; Mikael Tellbe, som polemiserar mot vad han kallar gnostiska tankegångar i vår samtid, är också docent i Nya testamentets exegetik och undervisar vid Örebro Teologiska Högskola.

Denna problematik förstärks inte minst av den undervisande ton som flera av skribenterna anlägger. Hur ska den intresserade allmänheten och de studenter som läser dessa skribenter veta när de övergår från att skriva med docentens auktoritet till att bli den apologetiske förkunnaren som fördömer andras kristendomstolkningar?

När Hans Ulfvebrand bjöd in den liberalteologiske biskopen John Shelby Spong till en konferens med temat "Ny tid – ny kristendom?" opponerade sig Imberg mot beslutet och skrev att "[d]en som kan något om kyrkohistoria ser att det luktar gnosticism lång väg, men i episkopal tappning".⁸³ Imberg, som har disputerat i kyrkohistoria, använder här sin akademiska auktoritet för att gå teologiska ärenden. Trots att kopplingen mellan Spongs teologi och antikt gnostiskt tänkande är

⁸³ Imberg, "Topprankad biskopskandidat".

långtifrån glasklar antyder Imberg att den som inte har lyckats skönja de gnostiska dragen i Spongs tänkande besitter otillräcklig kunskap. Den som inte själv har den kyrkohistoriska kompetensen är helt enkelt utelämnad att lita på Imbergs bedömning. Ett liknande resonemang såg vi också hos Sandahl. Skillnaden där var dock att det inte var Sandahl själv som var auktoriteten, utan Anders Nygren, som var biskop och professor i teologi under 1900-talets första hälft. Eftersom Nygren var en internationellt erkänd auktoritet, skulle man lita på hans omdöme. Om Nygren identifierar gemensamma drag mellan antikens gnosticism och en samtida teologi som öppnar upp möjligheten för kvinnor att bli präster, finns det goda skäl att förhålla sig skeptisk till kvinnoprästfrågan, menade Sandahl. Återigen ser vi hur den som har en akademisk auktoritet också besitter makten att bestämma vem som är den moderna gnostikern och kan på så vis legitimera eller illegitimera den andres teologi.

Problemet med föråldrade forskningsperspektiv

Ytterligare ett problem är att en polemisk användning av gnosticism går hand i hand med föråldrade forskningsperspektiv. Gemensamt för flera av de historiska kontextualiseringar av antik gnosticism som presenteras för läsaren är att de ofta gör anspråk på att förmedla en majoritetssyn, trots att de i själva verket förlitar sig på inaktuell forskning (Bergman, Gunnarsson, Tellbe, Imberg). Dessa äldre forskningsperspektiv är dock en förutsättning för att gnosticismen ska behålla sin polemiska tyngd. Williams, Brakkes, Kings och Dunderbergs problematiseringar av begreppet är inte förenliga med en alltför polemisk användning, eftersom dessa forskares rekonstruktioner har resulterat i att de mest karikatyrartat laddade egenskaperna (libertinisk etik, social determinism och elitism, etc.) därmed försvinner.

Det är på många sätt ironiskt att polemiska uttolkare kritiserar gnostikernas brist på inblandning i världen, deras likgiltighet inför den träsiga verkligheten och deras ovilja att göra någonting åt faktiska problem (Tellbe, Sverker, Grenholm). Lance Jenott har nämligen uppmärksam-

mat att det är på grund av sin inblandning i världsliga ting som en grupp identifierad som gnostiker ådrar sig kritik från filosofen Plotinus.⁸⁴ I *Enn.* II 9 klandrar Plotinus gnostikerna för att de i alltför hög grad umgås med de fattiga i Rom, och för att de ägnar sig åt socialt arbete.⁸⁵ Gnostikerna, skriver Plotinus, missionerar bland de fattiga och försöker bota dem från sjukdomar. De ställer sig kritiska till den oproportionella fördelningen av rikedom och, noterar Plotinus föraktfullt, protesterar mot de (enligt Plotinus rättmätiga) straff som utmätts gentemot förbrytare.⁸⁶

Plotinus skildring är naturligtvis bara en av många med varandra oförenliga redogörelser för gnosticism. Lance Jenott menar dock att denna syn finner stöd i vissa av primärkällorna (*Johannesapokryfen; Adamsapokalypsen; Den store osynlige andens heliga bok*), där vikten av mission och ett föredömligt liv betonas.⁸⁷ Jag instämmer med Jenott att Plotinus skildring kan betraktas som mer trovärdig än många av kyrkofädernas beskrivningar, dels på grund av att Plotinus inte gör anspråk på att beskriva mer än *en* social grupp (istället för försöka konstruera en genealogi mellan en hel uppsjö av grupper), men också för att det finns en överensstämmelse mellan Plotinus beskrivning och vissa av våra primärkällor. Att visa omsorg för de fattiga är dessutom någonting som vi vet att kristna under denna period ägnade sig åt. Vi bör dock ändå vara restriktiva med att dra slutsatser om ”gnostiker” som grupp utifrån Plotinus beskrivning. Som bland andra Williams och King har demonstrerat krackelerar illusionen om att en teologiskt och socialt enhetlig grupp (eller samling av grupper) kan rymmas under betecknin-

⁸⁴ Lance Jenott, ”Emissaries of Truth and Justice: The Seed of Seth as Agents of Divine Providence”, i *Gnosticism, Platonism and the Late Ancient World: Essays in Honour of John D. Turner*, red. John Douglas Turner, Kevin Corrigan och Tuomas Rasimus (Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies 82; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2013), 44–45.

⁸⁵ *Enn.* II 9 9:1–5; 14; 18:17–20.

⁸⁶ Plotinus, *Ennead II 9 [33] ”Against the Gnostics”: A Commentary*, red. Nicola Spanu (Studia Patristica Supplement 1; Leuven: Peeters, 2012); *Enn.* II 9:9.

⁸⁷ Jenott, ”Emissaries of Truth and Justice”, 59.

gen gnosticism när vi ställer de antika sekundärkällorna och Nag Ham-madi-fyndets primärkällor bredvid varandra.

Forskarens etiska ansvar

I ljuset av den polemiska användningen av gnosticism i populär opinion framträder ytterligare en problematisk aspekt av begreppet. Som vi har sett finns det flera undervisande forskare som är negativt inställda till ett av sina studieobjekt och som, istället för att försöka förstå och kontextualisera de tidiga kristna rörelserna som har betecknats som gnostiska, har valt att framställa dessa som teologiska fiender.

I sin monografi *The Roots of Theological Anti-Semitism: German Biblical Interpretation and the Jews, from Herder and Semler to Kittel and Bultmann* visar Gerdmar hur teologer under 1800-talet och 1900-talets första hälft systematiskt har främmandegjort och svartmålat judar, samt konstruerat en ideologiskt snarare än empiriskt grundat bild av motsatsförhållandet mellan judendomen och kristendomen, respektive judendomen och hellenismen.⁸⁸

Nu finns det visserligen betydande skillnader mellan konsekvenserna av kristna teologers främmandegörande av judar och deras motsvarande behandling av gnostiker. Min avsikt är minst av allt att förminska de systematiska förföljelser som forskningen tyvärr kommit att legitimera, eller att förringa det ofantliga lidande och de många kränkningar som judar genom tiderna har fått utstå. Medan judendomen utgörs av högst levande grupper, vars medlemmar i högsta grad påverkas av anti-semitiska porträtteringar, är de antika kristna grupper som främmandegörs och används som avskräckande exempel sedan länge utdöda.

Faktum kvarstår dock att många av Gerdmars synpunkter och utmärkta analys av anti-semitiska strukturer även går att tillämpa på användningen av ordet gnosticism. Gerdmar har visat hur kategoriseringar

⁸⁸ Anders Gerdmar, *Roots of Theological Anti-Semitism: German Biblical Interpretation and the Jews, from Herder and Semler to Kittel and Bultmann* (Studies in Jewish History and Culture 20; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2009).

har förmågan att cementera negativa strukturer, och hans kritik av den artificiella dikotomin mellan judendom och hellenism är på många sätt träffande:

Just as serious scholarship hardly uses the term “Late Judaism” anymore, ideologically tainted dichotomic patterns in the area of historiography need to be abandoned. The fundamental Hegelian-type dichotomy between Judaism and Hellenism does not hold water empirically, yet it retains its place in exegetical textbooks and studies, whereas historians seriously question the nature and scope of Hellenism.⁸⁹

Precis som dikotomin mellan judendom och hellenism riskerar att upprätthålla en föråldrad och ideologiskt motiverad struktur, kan indelningen i gnosticicism och kristendom ha en liknande effekt. Gerdmar påpekar även att bibelvetenskap på intet sätt är en oskyldig disciplin och att exegeten har ett visst socialt ansvar för sitt arbete:

The results of this study call exegesis and theology to self-critical reflection. The first caveat is to see that exegesis is socially relevant and therefore entails a responsibility; the exegete, like all others involved, is a moral agent.⁹⁰

I och med att judendomen är en högst levande religion blir implikationerna av en anti-semitisk bibeltolkning klart tydligare och allvarigare. Men är det verkligen fritt spelrum att demonisera de kristna rörelser som brukar refereras till som gnostiska bara för att de är utdöda? Uppenbarligen har även denna polemiska användning konsekvenser, eftersom gnosticicism så frekvent används för att omyndigförklara samtida kristnas teologi. Det är därför nödvändigt att ställa två frågor:

- 1) Är det berättigat att demonisera vissa antika kristna rörelser och idealisera andra, när man professionellt arbetar med tidig kristen historia? Redan under 1900-talets första hälft identifierade Walter Bauer liknande problematiska tendenser i bibelvetares och kyrkohistorikers histo-

⁸⁹ Gerdmar, *Roots of Theological Anti-Semitism*, 611.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 610.

rieskrivning.⁹¹ Jag vill därför uppmana till att, tillsammans med Bauer, ställa frågan om det inte är ett ideal att försöka *förstå* sitt studieobjekt istället för att *bedöma* eller, i värsta fall, *fördöma* det.

- 2) Är det etiskt försvarbart att använda dessa antika rörelser för att ogiltigförklara sina samtida medmänniskors åskådningar? I populär opinion har gnosticism blivit ett trumfkort, färdigt att spela ut för den som fått slut på sakliga argument. Som översikten har visat är skällsordet inte beroende av måltavlans teologiska hemvist. "Gnostiker" har ju visat sig vara applicerbart på såväl Ulf Ekman som Antje Jackelén, på den politiska vänstern såväl som på Maud Olofsson. Har man väl lyckats associera motståndaren med "gnostikerna" har man redan vunnit den teologiska striden.

Denna senare fråga måste också Gerdmar själv ta ställning till. Ett anti-semitiskt uttalande inte blir mindre oroande för att det läggs i munnen på en religiös auktoritet. Det legitimeras lika fullt, skribenten behöver inte själv göra utlåtandet. På så vis blir hans uttalande om Antje Jackelén som gnostiker problematiskt, trots att han använder Irenaeus för att etikettera.

För närvarande är gnosticism en problematisk term i bibelvetenskapliga och kyrkohistoriska sammanhang – en beteckning med litet deskriptivt värde och alltför stor polemisk tyngd. Någon gång i den avlägsna framtiden, när disputerade forskare har slutat använda sig av begreppet gnosticism som en teologisk anti-typ, kan vi kanske återuppta det i bibelvetenskapliga sammanhang. Jag misstänker dock att vi vid det laget har insett att vi klarar oss lika bra utan det – om inte bättre.

⁹¹ Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit*, 1, citerad i artikelns inledning.

Who Are the ἀρσενοκοῖται, and Why Does Paul Condemn Them (1 Cor 6:9)?

SIMON HEDLUND

Uppsala University

simon.hedlund2@svenskakyrkan.se

INTRODUCTION

The Christian Bible, however one views it, contains but a few verses regarding same-sex sexual acts.¹ Yet, they have had a large impact on views regarding same-sex sexuality throughout history. One of these verses is First Corinthians 6:9, with its apparent Pauline neologism ἀρσενοκοῖται. This word is rendered differently in different translations,

¹ Usually mentioned are Gen 19:1–13; Lev 18:22; 20:13; Deut 23:17–18; Rom 1:25–27; 1 Cor 6:9; and 1 Tim 1:10 (with a few others less frequent). This article will not actively use the term “homosexual” and its derivatives, in order to avoid obvious anachronism (discussed in, e.g., Anthony Heacock, *Jonathan Loved David: Manly Love in the Bible and the Hermeneutics of Sex* [Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2011], 3; Craig A. Williams, *Roman Homosexuality: Ideologies of Masculinity in Classical Antiquity* [New York: Oxford University Press, 1999], 4–5, 97; Dale B. Martin, “Arsenokoitês and Malakos: Meanings and Consequences” in *Biblical Ethics & Homosexuality: Listening to Scripture*, ed. Robert L. Brawley [Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996] 117–36, 118; and Eva Cantarella, *Bisexuality in the Ancient World* [New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992], vii–viii). By avoiding “homosexual,” I also avoid hiding the difference in status between the penetrator and the penetrated in the ancient world, see Kenneth James Dover, *Greek Homosexuality* (London: Duckworth, 1978), 67, 104; Dale B. Martin, *The Corinthian Body* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 177; Williams, *Roman Homosexuality*, 197–98. I will instead use “same-sex sexual acts,” a choice discussed in Hedlund, Simon, “You Shall Not Lie with a Male as with a Woman; It Is an Abomination’ (Lev 18:22; 20:13): Come again?” (Master Thesis, University of Uppsala, 2016), 5.

and sometimes in combination with the preceding *μαλακοί*.² A few common suggestions for its translation are “homosexuals,” “pedophiles,” “sodomites,” and “men who lay with men.” The sheer difference between these suggestions raises questions, and I will argue that such translations have lost touch with the historical and literary context, which has a negative impact on their attempts at dynamic equivalence. This article will question the practice of a joint translation of *μαλακοί* and *ἀρσενοκοῖται*, suggest considerations for a more dynamically equivalent translation, and a new translation.

MEANING AND TRANSLATION

Dynamic equivalence is by no means a universal ideal of translation. However, in the case of a controversial and historically potent word like *ἀρσενοκοῖται*, I find it valuable, since I would argue that a translation of such a word should understand, and attempt to reproduce, as much as possible of what it meant in its original context.³ As we discuss the literal meaning of *ἀρσενοκοῖται*, it will also become clear that no modern

² Rendered on its own, *μαλακοί* is often translated “effeminate,” which is also problematic, given what was considered effeminate in the ancient world. It is a notion that could include “chasing” women in a way considered unrestrained, performing oral sex on a woman, wanting sexual relations with married women, being lazy, having a weak eye, pale skin, or having too much love of excess and luxury (see Williams, *Roman Homosexuality*, 136, 143, 152, 199; Martin, “Arsenokoitês and Malakos,” 125; and Martin, *Corinthian Body*, 33, 125). In Josephus’ *J.W.* 7.334–338, it is even said that those who hesitate to kill their families and commit suicide instead of ending up in the hands of the enemy are “most effeminate.” *Μαλακός*, then, referred to all aspects of being less than a man, and those notions were not necessarily the same as today. When “effeminacy” is used in this article, it will refer to the ancient notion.

³ I am here influenced by Eugene A. Nida’s opinion that if dynamic equivalence is to be achieved, both the modern and the ancient culture, as well as the literary context, must govern the translation (Eugene A. Nida, *Contexts in Translating* [Amsterdam: Benjamins, 2001], 13, 68). For a more thorough discussion on ideals of translation, I refer the reader to Dan Nässelqvist, “Könsinklunderande språk i nästa svenska bibelöversättning,” *SEÅ* 81 (2016): 169–216.

translation of it adheres to strict formal equivalence, but are based on specific interpretations of contemporary and literary contexts. One enlightening example is the New American Standard Bible (NASB), usually focused on formal equivalence.⁴ The NASB translates ἀρσενικοῖται as “homosexuals” instead of the literal “male layers/bedders,” thereby interpreting ἀρσενικοῖται in a specific way. In this article I will argue that such an interpretation entails, among other things, an anachronistic understanding of sexuality, that it wrongly includes women and inclination, and that it does not sufficiently transmit social background. Further, it is worth noting that the emotional impact of the translation of ἀρσενικοῖται is often overlooked.⁵ Since, as I will argue, 1 Cor is a deliberative letter, and since ἀρσενικοῖται is a powerful word, this aspect should be considered.

When finding a base of meaning for a dynamically equivalent translation, knowledge of the historical context of both author and first (intended) recipients⁶ will help us understand what interpretive principles they received and reproduced.⁷ Implicit here is the idea that Paul used a word he thought his recipients could, and would, interpret in a way similar to himself.⁸ We also need to look at the textual context within

⁴ Nässelqvist, “Könsinkluderande Språk,” 179–80.

⁵ For a discussion on emotional impact and translations, see Eugene A. Nida and Charles R. Taber, *The Theory and Practice of Translation* (Leiden: Brill, 1969), 95.

⁶ Gadamer has correctly noted the difficulty of delineating who the first recipients of a text actually were (Hans-Georg Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, trans. Joel Weinsheimer and Donald G. Marshall [London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013], 413). However, as Paul is sending his letter to a specific group of people, whom he seems to have been familiar with, the problem of who the first intended recipients were is not as acute here as in the case of many other texts. I presuppose that there is an overlap between the intended recipients and those who actually received the letter – albeit that overlap is not an exact one.

⁷ So Stanley Eugene Fish, *Is There a Text in This Class? The Authority of Interpretive Communities* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1980), 14, 16. See also Martin, *Corinthian Body*, xiv.

⁸ Cf. Alexander Miller, *Philosophy of Language* (London: UCL Press, 1998), 153, 162, 165.

the letter, since the surrounding themes affects understanding, and analyze what point Paul is trying to argue. By attaining such an educated prejudice before focusing on smaller textual units, we will be better posed to understand them as part of a whole.

Since part of our understanding of the Corinthian community will come from a historical reconstruction based on Paul's deliberative letter, a note of caution on the relation between facts and rhetorical means is due.⁹ Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza argues, for example, that the community was not as fractioned as Paul suggests in 1 Cor 1. Rather, they were seeking the advice of different authoritative figures on how to live, while Paul wanted to extend his influence by posing the alternatives as either-or.¹⁰ To avoid painting the congregation only through Paul's eyes, I will use a wider historical reconstruction from which the letter will be read. However, first we will turn to the issue of the origins of ἀρσενοκοῖται.

Ἀρσενοκοῖται

Paul is the first known user of ἀρσενοκοίτης, using it once.¹¹ It is composed of ἄρσην (“male”) and κοίτη (“bed,” “sleeping mat”). The latter word in the construction has a verbal force, rendering the literal transla-

⁹ Dated to the mid-fifties CE (John Barclay, “1 Corinthians,” in *The Oxford Bible Commentary*, ed. John Barton and John Muddiman [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001], 1108–33, 1109; and Ben Witherington III, *Conflict and Community in Corinth: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995], 73). A more precise dating is not needed here. Further, there seems to have lived Jews in the congregation (1 Cor 7:18; 9:8–10, 20–22; 10:1–13), but while the culture was predominantly Roman, it is not clear how many (Charles Kingsley Barrett, *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians* [London: Black, 1968], 2; Witherington, *Conflict and Community*, 6–7, 24).

¹⁰ For a comprehensive discussion on historical reconstructions from a deliberative address, see Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, “Rhetorical Situation and Historical Reconstruction in 1 Corinthians,” *NTS* 33/3 (1987): 386–403, esp. 396–98.

¹¹ Assuming here that 1 Tim (1:10) was not written by Paul himself.

tion “male layers/bedders.”¹² A plausible background is found in Lev 18:22 and 20:13 (LXX), which uses ἀρσην and κοίτη in relation to male same-sex sexual matters. It seems likely that Paul had them in mind when creating ἀρσενοκοῖται.¹³ Translated, they read:

And you shall not sleep with a male as in a bed of a woman, for it is an abomination. (Lev 18:22)

And he who lies with a male in a bed for a woman, both have committed an abomination; by death let them be put to death; they are liable. (Lev 20:13)¹⁴

Even though the place, a bed for a woman, rightly has been placed in focus, the verses seem to have been understood as a circumlocution for male-male sex.¹⁵ However, since context affects understanding, and most (or all) modern translations of 1 Cor 6:9 make assumptions based on some understanding of the context of Paul, we have to look at that context to see what connotations, cognitive and emotional, that might have been raised by such a circumlocution. Before that, however, a brief overview of the history of research.

¹² John Boswell, *Christianity, social Tolerance, and Homosexuality: Gay People in Western Europe from the Beginning of the Christian Era to the Fourteenth Century* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005), 342 (he translates it “male fuckers”); David F. Wright, “Homosexuals or Prostitutes: The Meaning of Arsenokoitai (1 Cor 6:9; 1 Tim 1:10),” *Vigiliae Christianae* 38/2 (1984): 125–53, 130–32; Barrett, *Commentary*, 140; Anthony C. Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000), 447–48.

¹³ So Wright, *Homosexuals*, 129; Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 447; and Victor Paul Furnish, *The Moral Teaching of Paul: Selected Issues* (3rd ed.; Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2009), 80. Of course, it would be unnecessary to claim that no other influence is possible. For example, the latin *coitus* and the Greek κοιτάζω might also have influenced Paul, but that would not render the connection to Lev 18:22 and 20:13 less significant.

¹⁴ The translation is made by Dirk L. Büchner and is available online here: <http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/nets/edition/03-leu-nets.pdf>.

¹⁵ As an example of this, see Philo's *Spec. Laws* 3.39, where he discusses male same-sex sexual relations and calls for a death penalty, in agreement with Lev 20:13 (cf. *Abraham* 133–36; Louis Crompton, *Homosexuality & Civilization* [Cambridge, MA: Belknap, 2003], 44).

A BRIEF SUMMARY OF SCHOLARSHIP

An appropriate starting point for this summary of scholarship is the study of John Boswell from 1980, since it is still being quoted by commentaries writing on our verse.¹⁶ Boswell has two main points. First, he argues that the Pauline corpus says hardly anything about homosexuality, and that the juxtaposition of ἀρσενοκοῖται and πόρνος in 1 Tim 1:10 suggests that ἀρσενοκοῖται refers to male (possibly homosexual) prostitutes. His second point is that it is improbable that ἀρσενοκοῖται denotes "homosexuals" since no one during the following three centuries used it in such a way.¹⁷

Although important, not many of Boswell's conclusions are left standing, and the study has become more of a starting point for critique. One powerful critic has been David F. Wright, who, in an article from 1984, argues that the study of Boswell was important, but flawed. One of the first points of critique is that Boswell fails to take Lev 18:22 and 20:13 into account.¹⁸ He goes on to show that the structure of the word does not support the conclusions drawn from it by Boswell. According to Wright, when κοίτης is used in a compound the first part usually denotes the object. Further, the difference made by Boswell between ἀρρεν- and ἀρσεν- has not found support, and Wright considers it quite unlikely to have any support at all. He also argues that "in most if not all of the compounds in which the second half is a verb or has verbal force, the first half denotes its object, irrespective of whether it is ἀρρενο- or ἀρσενο-".¹⁹ Last, but not least, he shows that Boswell underestimated the use of ἀρσενοκοίτης in the early Church fathers. Ultimately, Wright concludes that ἀρσενοκοίτης encompassed all forms of homosexual acts between males.²⁰

¹⁶ Boswell, *Christianity*.

¹⁷ Boswell, *Christianity*, 341, 343–44, 346–49.

¹⁸ Wright, *Homosexuals*, 126–27.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 130–32. Among his examples are the more common words δουλοκοίτης and μητροκοίτης, where the first part of the word is referred to as the object of the second.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 135, 141, 143, 144, 146.

While the critique is harsh, and often justified, Wright also makes a few unfounded assumptions. The most important one is that he does not allow the context of 1 Cor to properly inform his interpretation of the word. This is a problem he shares with Victor P. Furnish, who states that the list is a random collection of gentile vices.²¹ Arguing for the opposite are Charles K. Barrett and Anthony C. Thiselton, who claim that the list of vices are contextual and based on what Paul knows about the congregation in Corinth.²² I find this view more convincing, given the list's thematic connection to the rest of the letter (see 3:3; 4:6, 18–19; 5:1–5; 6:12; 11:17–34),²³ and if, as seems likely, it was Paul himself who created the word ἀρσενοκοῖται, that would suggest that the list is composed to fit the specific context. As Barrett claims, Paul probably used the common rhetorical device of making a list of vices, and filled it with content he found suitable given his understanding of the Corinthian context.²⁴ I find it plausible that the list is not a general note on sins, but an address to specific issues Paul either had seen in the congregation or found them at risk of doing, as they lacked clear boundaries towards the outside world.²⁵

A common understanding of the meaning of ἀρσενοκοῖται is “pederasts” or “the active male partner in a pederastic relationship” (with *μαλακοί* being the passive partner). This interpretation is supported by, among others, Ben Witherington III and Herman C. Waetjen.²⁶ Some

²¹ Furnish, *Moral Teaching*, 82–83.

²² Barrett, *Commentary*, 140; Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 447–48.

²³ Connections like these are also pointed out by Gordon Fee, who seems to presuppose that the vices are not there at random but closely connected to the letter (Gordon D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987], 242).

²⁴ Barrett, *Commentary*, 140.

²⁵ See 1 Cor 3:3; 4:17; 5:6 (and 5:10–11, where Paul shows the important difference between the ones in the congregation and the ones outside of it, a boundary that cannot be too strict with regard to association, but the more so with regard to behavior – cf. also 5:1–5).

²⁶ Herman C. Waetjen, “Same-Sex Sexual Relations in Antiquity and Sexuality and

problems should be noted. Larry W. Hurtado points out that there were other words available to Paul to describe pederasty instead of creating a new one.²⁷ Hurtado also notes that it is unlikely that ancient people viewed the pederastic relationship as a victimization in the way that we do, so to attribute a protest against such victimization to Paul could be dangerous. Further, girls were given in marriage at the same age as boys were taken as lovers, possibly even younger.²⁸ If Paul wanted to protest against pederastic relationships in general, it would have been misguided to use a word denoting only men.²⁹

The concept of pederasty was not used in the same way in ancient Rome as it is in modern Sweden. The Romans understood *παιδεραστία* as a form of stuprum, that is, an “offense consisting in the violation of the sexual integrity of freeborn Romans of either sex,” and could also be seen as a Greek custom.³⁰ The latter stems from the fact that in Greek culture it was not only allowed but even encouraged for a grown man to have sex with a *freeborn* boy. Such a qualification is important, since it reveals a big difference between the attitudes of the two cultures. In Roman culture, freeborn boys were off limits, while slave boys were not.³¹ The difference originates from different ways of viewing the sexual act itself. In Greek culture, the man helped teach the boy and passed on virtues by knowledge and by intercourse.³² In Roman culture on the

Sexual Identity in Contemporary American Society” in *Biblical Ethics & Homosexuality: Listening to Scripture*, ed. Robert L. Brawley (1st ed.; Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1996), 103–16, 107; Witherington, *Conflict and Community*, 166.

²⁷ Larry W. Hurtado, “The Bible and Same-Sex Erotic Relations,” *Crux* 32/2 (1996): 13–19, 16–17.

²⁸ Cornelia B. Horn and John W. Martens, “*Let the Little Children Come to Me*”: *Childhood and Children in Early Christianity* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1996), 15.

²⁹ Hurtado, “Same-Sex Erotic Relations,” 16–17. His critique focuses primarily on interpretations of Rom 1:26–27, but he also raises the issue of 1 Cor 6:9, where the critique is also valid.

³⁰ Quote from Williams, *Roman Homosexuality*, 96.

³¹ Williams, *Roman Homosexuality*, 30–31; Cantarella, *Bisexuality*, 99.

³² Cantarella, *Bisexuality*, 6, 8.

other hand, all sexual acts were a display of power, rule, and imposition of the will of the penetrator upon someone else. To penetrate a Roman boy would be to make him submissive, the complete opposite of what was aimed for.³³ A man having sex with a freeborn Roman boy would thereby be seen as violating both the “sacrosanct” body of a citizen and the “propriety claims of the *paterfamilias*,” and the act blurred the distinction between free and slave.³⁴

Both Waetjen and Halperin argue that there was no such thing as reciprocal homoerotic desire known to the ancient world.³⁵ This argument finds support in Kenneth J. Dover, who states that “the reciprocal desire of partners belonging to the same age-category is virtually unknown in Greek homosexuality.”³⁶ The evidence from Roman culture, however, speaks, contrary to Waetjen and Halperin, about men who wanted to be penetrated, seemingly as a part of the everyday life. There even existed a few words to describe them – *cinaedi*, *impudicus*, *pathicus*.³⁷ They were ridiculed and disadvantaged in the eyes of the law, but simultaneously considered “handy, even pleasurable, outlets for men’s sexual pleasures.”³⁸ It seems, then, that 1) it was conceivable for a man to desire to be penetrated, and 2) the objections against a sexual relationship between men was that someone had to “be the woman,” not that they were in what we would call a male homosexual relationship. Also, when Aristotle asks why it is “that some men enjoy being acted

³³ Cantarella, *Bisexuality*, 100.

³⁴ Williams, *Roman Homosexuality*, 97, 99; John J. Winkler, *The Constraints of Desire: The Anthropology of Sex and Gender in Ancient Greece* (New York: Routledge, 1990), 48.

³⁵ Waetjen, “Same-sex,” 107; David M. Halperin, *One Hundred Years of Homosexuality: And Other Essays on Greek Love* (New York: Routledge, 1990), 21.

³⁶ Dover, *Greek Homosexuality*, 16.

³⁷ It should be noted that although all men who wanted to be penetrated were designated as such, the designation also included men who did not want to be penetrated.

³⁸ Williams, *Roman Homosexuality*, 172, 175, 182.

upon sexually, whether or not they also enjoy being active,”³⁹ he shows an awareness that it could occur, which perhaps necessitates a nuancing of the conclusion drawn by Dover above. The desire was probably not unknown, but since there was no “egalitarian model for sexual relations,” implying that someone had to lose if two men had sex, the fact that a man was willing to lose appeared strange.⁴⁰

SOME CONSIDERATIONS ON SEXUALITY IN CONTEMPORARY GRECO-ROMAN CONTEXT

Today, sex might be ideally described as someone doing something *with* someone. In the ancient Greco-Roman context it was more suitably described as someone doing something *to* someone. There was the active, penetrating, masculine partner, and the feminine, passive, penetrated partner.⁴¹ To be penetrated was considered inferior, not physically enjoyable to men, and “homosexual anal penetration [was] treated ... as an aggressive act demonstrating the superiority of the active to the passive partner.”⁴² This inferiority was also ascribed to women, but in that case, subordination was expected. Such a subordination was also, in varying degrees, expected from slaves, prostitutes, non-citizens and freed slaves. The only ones supposed to be off limits for a freeborn Roman man were other freeborn Roman men and women (his wife excepted).⁴³

³⁹ Aristotle, *Problems*, book 4, problem 26.

⁴⁰ Cf. Williams, *Roman*, 7–8, 183, 186, 250–51.

⁴¹ Martin, *Corinthian Body*, 177. The use “passive” and “active” to describe the participants in a same-sex sexual act is problematic. Yet, I choose to do so here, since it seems to be quite an accurate depiction of how they were perceived in ancient Greco-Roman culture – the “active” being the penetrator and the “passive” the penetrated.

⁴² Dover, *Greek Homosexuality*, 67, 104. The perspective of “aggressive act” was probably true also in the case of oral sex (see Williams, *Roman Homosexuality*, 4–5). Thiselton also holds that there was a close connection between the “homosexuality” prevalent in the time of Paul and slavery, social dominance and idolatry (Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 451).

⁴³ Williams, *Roman Homosexuality*, 4–5, 19, 100, 226.

The emphasis on the social status of participants and roles played in the intercourse highlights a significant aspect concerning gender in the ancient world. Instead of mere biology, what you *did* with the partner, and that person's social status, was of great importance. A man who wanted to be penetrated was seen as effeminate (*μαλακός*), and not living according to "the central imperative of masculinity: control and dominion."⁴⁴ It seems to have been known that some men had a preference for penetrating men or women, but that preference did not exclude penetrating someone of the less preferred sex.⁴⁵ Further, reputation was of great import in the ancient world (very much so in Corinth), and men would (generally) do what they could to avoid damaging it.⁴⁶ To be seen as masculine was good for one's reputation, and accusations of being the penetrated partner could be devastating.⁴⁷

Sex, then, was a manifestation of a zero-sum game⁴⁸ where the feminine lost to the masculine. By penetrating a man, one reached an ideal of Roman masculine virility in putting another man down.⁴⁹ This perspective is in some ways also applicable to Greek culture. A Greek man was encouraged to have a sexual relation with a young boy, but to have sex with another grown man was a different matter, and being penetrated was to be feminized.⁵⁰ Such a feminization, prevalent in both cultures, was not for everyone to choose to either experience or avoid. Slaves and freed men, for example, did not have control over their sexuality – the *paterfamilia* had the opportunity to use them as he wished, as

⁴⁴ Williams, *Roman Homosexuality*, 126–27.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 172. For a with no ascription of value to such alternatives, see Plato's *Symp.* 191c. For an example of a text with clear value judgments, see Ovid, *Am.* 2.683–686.

⁴⁶ Corinth seems to have been a place where it was very important to rise through the social hierarchies – see Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 13; Witherington, *Conflict and Community*, 8, 22. Paul seems to be addressing the issue in, e.g., 4:6–16.

⁴⁷ Williams, *Roman Homosexuality*, 110, 165. See also Quintillian's *Inst.* 11.1.84; and Suetonius' *Jul.* 2, 49.

⁴⁸ So Winkler, *Constraints*, 54.

⁴⁹ Cantarella, *Bisexuality*, 98.

⁵⁰ Dover, *Greek Homosexuality*, 103–104.

long as he was the one penetrating.⁵¹ Given that up to 40% of the population of the Roman empire in the century before Jesus was born were slaves, and then adding freed men, prostitutes and non-citizens of different sorts who were “available,” free men had a lot of sexual opportunities.⁵² There were some restrictions,⁵³ but on the whole, the freeborn man could enforce his sexual will on a lot of people that were socially weaker than himself.⁵⁴

Furnish argues that the two most common expressions of male same sex sexual acts in Paul’s time was “sexual exploitation of youthful male slaves by their masters, and ... the sale of sexual favours by teenage boys to older male clients.”⁵⁵ Corinth was definitely no exception.⁵⁶ Categories similar to these are also in focus when authors during the late Augustan era denounce male same-sex sexual acts; free men who abandon their roles as dominant men, effeminization, and male prostitution.⁵⁷ The elements of domination and humiliation, greed and sexual exploitation, as well as the will for excess and lack of moderation, are prominent ingredients behind the opinions of philosophers like Dio Chrysostom, Seneca the Younger, Plutarch, and Musonius Rufus, who were all against these sexual acts.⁵⁸

⁵¹ Cantarella, *Bisexuality*, 99; Williams, *Roman Homosexuality*, 31.

⁵² Cantarella, *Bisexuality*, 80.

⁵³ For instance, a man was supposed to keep his pleasures at a moderate level (see Williams, *Roman Homosexuality*, 38). If a man had too much sex, for example, he would become weaker due to the loss of semen, as it was seen as distilled manliness (Martin, *Corinthian Body*, 200). Furthermore, it was frowned upon to have sex with another man’s slave since the slave was that man’s property (Cantarella, *Bisexuality*, 103; Williams, *Roman Homosexuality*, 30).

⁵⁴ Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 451.

⁵⁵ Furnish, *Moral Teaching*, 70.

⁵⁶ Fee, *First Epistle*, 244. Witherington further holds that “many in Corinth were already suffering from a self-made-person-escapes-humble-origins-syndrome” (Witherington, *Conflict and Community*, 8). In a milieu like that, it is more likely that people would go to any length to become self-made escapers of their humble origins.

⁵⁷ Thomas K. Hubbard, ed., *Homosexuality in Greece and Rome: A Sourcebook of Basic Documents* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2003), 15.

⁵⁸ Furnish, *Moral Teaching*, 72–74. Cf., e.g., Dio Chrysostom, *Or.* 7, 151–52;

I argue that the pertaining perspective of a zero-sum game, rigged for abuse against the socially weak, informed Paul in condemning ἀρσενοκοῖται in 1 Cor. If my inference is correct, it should be clear that ἀρσενοκοῖται cannot simply refer to modern “homosexuality,” unless we affirm the same values about honour and sexual dominance as those pervading in the time of Paul. Of course, there were men who did not care about being seen as effeminate,⁵⁹ but to conclude that the sex was always consensual would be naive. Further, where there are people with influence and a will to penetrate, there is also a chance of finding people who agree to being penetrated in exchange for benefactions of that influence.⁶⁰

We should remember that views on male same-sex sexual relations were changing in the shift between the Augustan and the Imperial era.⁶¹ There is an increasing polarization between approval and disapproval. As Thomas K. Hubbard argues, the texts that comment negatively on male same-sex sexual acts right before, and during, the Augustan era, does it with focus on the “morally debilitating effects of wealth, power, and

77/78:36; Musonius Rufus, *On Sexual Indulgence* 12:1–10; Plutarch, *Amat.* §4–§5; Seneca, *Ep.* 47.7. As noted by Hubbard, *Homosexuality*, 185, Seneca and Musonius Rufus were minority voices in questioning the sexual relations a man could have with his slaves. Further, in the Augustan era there seems to have been an increased worry about dropping birth-rates in higher social strata-families (since men could have sex outside of marriage, but the children resulting from that were not seen as legit or necessarily kept alive), so Augustus created laws to promote marriage, halt adultery and encourage the rearing of children within marriage (*lex Julia de maritandis ordinibus* and *lex Julia de adulteriis*).

⁵⁹ Williams, *Roman Homosexuality*, 157.

⁶⁰ Hence I agree with Furnish, *Moral Teaching*, 70, regarding the most common expressions of male same-sex sexual activities.

⁶¹ With the changing views, it could be dangerous to invoke texts of a significantly older date of composition for views on male same-sex sexuality pertaining in the time of Paul. There might also be a danger in seeing the texts as normative, since they were more or less written by an elite. They might, however, still give us a hint as to some pertaining views in society.

appetitive excess.”⁶² On one end, there were writers like Seneca the Younger who, on the basis of the mistreatment of slaves, held that male same-sex sexual acts were wrong.⁶³ On the other end, we have texts like Tibullus’ *Elegiae* 1.4 and Propertius’ *Elegiae* 2.4.17–22, who show a romanticizing of pederasty that had earlier been more uncommon.⁶⁴

SOME CONSIDERATIONS ON MALE SAME-SEX SEXUAL RELATIONS IN CONTEMPORARY JUDAISM

As we have seen, the Torah (Lev 20:13) calls for punishment by death for male-male sexual acts, and there seems to have been prevalent negativity in Jewish thought towards such acts. A Jewish person was likely to be considered by the Jewish community as at risk of “suffering” such acts, not ever wanting to partake.⁶⁵ Paul himself, in Romans 1:18–32, considers such acts a punishment from God.⁶⁶ But what grounds for

⁶² Hubbard, *Homosexuality*, 16, 383.

⁶³ Seneca, *Ep.* 47.7. For examples of the treatment of slaves, see Pliny the Elder, *Nat.* 9.39.77; Juvenal, *Sat.* 6; and Martial, *Epigram* 2.49.

⁶⁴ Hubbard, *Homosexuality*, 345, 383.

⁶⁵ Crompton, *Homosexuality*, 47, referring to, for example, b. Kiddushin 82a.

⁶⁶ Note that here Paul is assuming quite a harsh stance in discussing female and male same-sex sexual acts together (cf. b. Yebam. 76a, where female same-sex sexual acts are hardly enough to disqualify a woman from marrying a priest). I want to emphasize the danger in using Rom 1:18–32 when interpreting 1 Cor 6:9, since it is written to a different setting, from a different place. Further, the acts discussed are put in diametrically different perspectives – as a result of God’s wrath (Rom) or as an act making God angry enough to not grant the perpetrator a place in the Kingdom of God (1 Cor). There are also more obvious reasons; ἀρσενοκοῖται is not used in the letter to the Romans, and that letter also includes sexual acts of women. Ultimately, to use Rom 1:18–32 would be a matter of subjective speculation; one could argue that it might enlighten our understanding of Paul’s view on same-sex sexual acts, or argue that if Paul is discussing the nature of same-sex sexual acts in Romans, he must be making some other point in 1 Cor 6:9, given the stark differences between the perspectives of the letters.

opposing male same-sex sex are assumed?⁶⁷ Was such opposition accepted at face value? There are different interpretations worth noting in discussing this question, and here, we will have to focus on two important ones. We have already seen that Philo wanted to inflict death penalty because of worries concerning population growth (see above, 120 n. 15). Further, he drew a connection between male same-sex sexual acts, excess, and the sin of Sodom (*Abraham* 133–36).⁶⁸ In Josephus we also find what might be a similar trail of thought.⁶⁹ In *Jewish Antiquities* 1.11.1, he writes that the people of Sodom, among other sins, τὰς πρὸς ἄλλους ὁμιλίας ἐκτρέπεσθαι (“distort to each other [m.] the companionships/intercourses,” my translation). It is not certain what the last sentence means, the word ὁμιλία can mean both “intercourse” and “companionship” (it denotes the latter in 1 Cor 15:33), and in Josephus, it is used in both ways.⁷⁰ There are, however, a few reasons to interpret it sexually in this case. Earlier in the sentence, the word ὕβρις is used, as well as ἀσεβεῖς (“to be impious”) towards God, and ἄλλους ὁμιλίας ἐκτρέπεσθαι is one of the examples of that. To do ὕβρις is often, in both Philo and Josephus, connected to sexual or conjugal matters, and added by them to the text of the LXX when those subjects are either implicit or explicit.⁷¹ There are, then, two words in the sentence that carry possi-

⁶⁷ I believe that we can only speak of assumptions here, given the abundance of suggestions to the origins of Lev 18:22 and 20:13 (for some examples, see Jacob Milgrom, *Leviticus 17–22: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* [New York: Doubleday, 2000], 1566).

⁶⁸ According to Crompton, *Homosexuality*, 39, Philo might have been the first, or at least among the first, to make a connection between the sin of Sodom and male same-sex sexual activities. Philo argues that excess was the foundational sin of Sodom, which then gave rise to male same-sex sexual acts.

⁶⁹ The inclusion of Josephus here is not to argue that he had a direct influence on Paul, but rather that he and Paul were part of the same sphere of ideas.

⁷⁰ See, for example, *Ant.* 1.1.4, where it is used to denote the company of God, which Adam tries to avoid since he has eaten from the fruit of the forbidden tree, and 2.4.2, where it is used to denote what the wife of Potiphar wants Joseph and her to do.

⁷¹ For a discussion on this, see Daniel B. Levine, “Hubris in Josephus’ *Jewish Antiquities* 1–4,” *Hebrew Union College Annual* 64 (1993): 51–87, esp. 52, 58–59.

ble connotations to sexual matters. Further, Philo was, to Josephus, a “model for rewriting the Bible,”⁷² and as noted, Philo connected the excess of Sodom to male same-sex sexual acts. Also, both of them have clear connections to contemporary stoicism,⁷³ in which male same-sex sex, excess, and greed were connected (cf. Seneca the Younger, Dio Chrysostom, and Musonius Rufus, above). I argue, then, that it is likely that Josephus, given his context, his connections to Philo, and the use of the word ὑβρις connected to ὀμιλία, sees a sexual connection here.⁷⁴

By reading ὀμιλίαν as “intercourse,” we find in this passage that the sin of Sodom was a moral collapse that had its origin in misplaced pride, excess, and greed, something that was expressed through impiety towards God, unjustness towards men, hate against strangers, and distortion of the sexual intercourse – an interpretation close to the one given by Philo.⁷⁵

⁷² Louis H. Feldman, *Josephus's Interpretation of the Bible* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998) 14.

⁷³ Feldman, *Josephus's Interpretation*, 193; Stefan Nordgaard “Paul’s Appropriation of Philo’s Theory of ‘Two Men’ in 1 Corinthians 15:45–49,” *NTS* 57/3 (2011): 348–65, 363.

⁷⁴ Levine, “Hubris,” 58, places his discussion on Josephus’s treatment of the story of Sodom in the section with the title “Sex, Marriage, and *Hubris*,” and shows that he, too, finds the passage to be connected to sex.

⁷⁵ There were, of course, others who did not connect the Sodom-story to male same-sex sexual practices. In the gospels of the New Testament, focus is on greed, with no trace of male same-sex sexual acts (Matt 10:14–15; Luke 10:10–12; 17:28–29), and this overlaps with the view found in the Hebrew Bible, where Ezekiel specifies Sodom’s sin as different sins against charity (Ezek 16:49). The interpretive tradition that focused on greed continued in the time after Paul. Pirke De-Rabbi Eliezer, originating in the first or second century CE (with later redactions), says that the sin of Sodom was that the riches of the city were not shared with “the wayfarer or the stranger” (PRE XXV:4). Furthermore, in b. Sanh. 109a-b (compiled between c. 370 and 500 C. E), for example, it is said that Sodom did its best to avoid helping the poor. However, Genesis Rabbah 50:7 (7th century CE) says that the sodomites used male same-sex rape against strangers to keep them from visiting the city. In this later text, then, the clear connection to male same-sex sexual thoughts and acts and Sodom that were observed in Philo and Josephus is back.

An important question to raise, however, is whether Paul was enough influenced by the line of thinking behind the view of Philo (and probably Josephus) to reach a similar conclusion. In light of that question, it is essential to remember that that view on the sin of Sodom was not a majority view in their time. So to argue that Paul held a view similar to theirs, and that he made a similar connection based on the Sodom story, one should be able to show a plausible trail of influence. Below, I will argue that such a trail is evident.

First of all, one should note that Philo, Josephus, and Paul all seem to have been quite heavily influenced by contemporary stoicism. The ideas of excess and greed leading to unwanted behaviour was, then, probably quite familiar. Second, scholars have found an indirect connection between Paul and Philo in a common intellectual tradition.⁷⁶ Stefan Nordgaard, however, goes further, and by investigating 1 Cor 15:45–49 in light of Philo, he argues that it is quite possible that there was a direct link between the two, and that people in Corinth used Philo in a way that Paul did not agree with.⁷⁷ Similarly, Gregory E. Sterling sees a clear link in exegetical tradition between Paul, Philo, and the congregation in Corinth, but then goes on to propose that there is a good possibility of a direct link between Paul and Philo, through Apollos.⁷⁸ Even if a direct link is not a view held by all scholars, Nordgaard and Sterling make a convincing case that there is a shared foundation between the two.⁷⁹ A connection between Paul and Philo, as well as the line of thinking of

⁷⁶ To mention just one example, Arkady. B. Kovelman, “Jeremiah 9:22–23 in Philo and Paul,” *Review Of Rabbinic Judaism* 10/2 (2007): 162–75, 172–75, points primarily to 1 Cor 1:26–31 and 2 Cor 1:12–14. He also sees a connection between Philo’s theory of the “two men” and 1 Cor 15:45–49, the very point Nordgaard argues throughout his article (Nordgaard, *Paul’s Appropriation*).

⁷⁷ Nordgaard, *Paul’s Appropriation*, 349, 352, 364.

⁷⁸ Gregory E. Sterling, “‘Wisdom among the Perfect’: Creation Traditions in Alexandrian Judaism and Corinthian Christianity,” *NovT* 37/4 (1995): 355–84, 382–83.

⁷⁹ See also Kovelman, “Jeremiah 9:22–23,” who finds, at least, an intellectual connection in the use and similar interpretations of Jeremiah 9:22–23.

Josephus, therefore seems plausible.⁸⁰ The ideas underlying the interpretations made by Philo might then be relevant as part of the context informing Paul in his reading of Lev 18:22 and 20:13. Such an interpretation does not negate the common Jewish hostility towards male same-sex sexual acts in the time of Paul, but it places the *motives* for that hostility partly in a hellenistic, stoic understanding by contextualizing it as in some sense Philonic.

Considering the now discussed perspectives on male same-sex sexual acts in the time of Paul, I argue that it is untenable to translate ἀρσενοκοῖται in a way that does not convey 1) the emotional impact of the polarizing between those who approved and those who disapproved of male same-sex sexual acts, and 2) the close connection between power, abuse, and sex. With that in mind, we now turn to investigate the more immediate social context of Paul and the Corinthians.

PAUL AND THE FIRST LETTER TO CORINTH

Among the members of the congregation in Corinth, there seems to have been a clear social stratification, with the few from the higher social stratas being very influential,⁸¹ and Paul intentionally grouping himself with people from lower social stratas.⁸² He also, by working, made

⁸⁰ There is, furthermore, an interesting connection between Rom 1:26 and *Ag. Ap.* II.273. In the latter, Josephus calls the will of males to mix sexually with males as παρὰ φύσιν (“against nature”), and so does Paul. That they use the same two words does not prove a direct connection, but might suggest that they had part in the same intellectual tradition with regard to male same-sex sexual acts.

⁸¹ Gerd Theissen, *The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity: Essays on Corinth* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982), 69, 101; Witherington, *Conflict and Community*, 22; Wayne A. Meeks, *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983) 68; Martin, *Corinthian Body*, 69; Bruce W. Winter, *Philo and Paul among the Sophists* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 242.

⁸² This is done by, among other things, performing physical labor (see Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 13; Martin, *Corinthian Body*, 51; and Cicero, *Off.* 1.42, where different

himself independent of the rich in Corinth, which could affect their status as followers.⁸³ To not accept gifts might have been seen as a rejection of friendship,⁸⁴ but Paul seems to have called for a different way of measuring social stratification, where his role as independent apostle (9:1, 11–12) should be seen as a socially potent one,⁸⁵ something to be imitated (4:16). Paul lowered himself to “everyone’s slave” (9:19), and in advocating a different way of measuring social stratification (see 1:30–31, where a shift in focus is made clear, and also 2:14–15), he chal-

occupations that are and are not highly esteemed are enumerated. Among those that require physical labour, only agriculture is worthy of esteem). Paul’s rhetorical abilities suggest that he was educated, and the fact that he, as a Jew, had full citizenship in the Roman empire tells us that he probably came from a well-off family (Witherington, *Conflict and Community*, 3, 21; Martin, *Corinthian Body*, 51–52, Theissen, *Social Setting*, 104–105). Regarding “social stratification,” as well as “higher” and “lower” stratas, I will use categories mentioned by Paul himself in 1 Cor 1:26 – education, power, and family – in evaluating stratification. Further, it is relevant to add wealth. Paul is refusing monetary compensation from the congregation in Corinth (1 Cor 9; see also 2 Cor 11) – to give money of gifts was a way to assert social influence and power for those who had the money (see Witherington, *Conflict and Community*, 22). Furthermore, wealth seems to have been an important ingredient in the struggles within the congregation (see, e.g., 11:17–34), which Wayne Meeks holds to be the clearest example that there was a conflict between the “relatively rich” and the “relatively poor” (Meeks, *First Urban*, 67–68). It is obviously impossible to draw an absolute line between “higher” and “lower” stratas, as it is impossible to draw an absolute line between rich and poor, well-educated and poorly educated, today. Still, these concepts mean something to us, and similarly, the concepts of powerful, educated, rich, and of noble birth meant something to Paul (categories like family and possessions were important already to the writers of Exod 22:21–26 and Amos 2:6b. In the latter, the word אֲבִיּוֹן means “needy” or “poor.” In the LXX, the word used is πένητα, which also occurs in 2 Cor 9:9 [πένησι]). Therefore, we must use these categories as categories that were important to, and affecting, Paul, while at the same time allowing ourselves not to know who exactly were included in them. We must also be aware that the categorization “high” and “low” stratas are tools enabling us to grasp and discuss a reality separated from our own.

⁸³ Theissen, *Social Setting*, 54–55, Witherington, *Conflict and Community*, 9, 20–21.

⁸⁴ Martin, *Corinthian Body*, 83–84.

⁸⁵ In 9:1, he puts it directly after “free” – ἐλεύθερος.

lenged the “old” way of doing it – thereby in some sense challenging those who were perceived as having a high social stratification by that measurement.

In 1:26, Paul indicates that the recipients are a social mix (using the designations σοφοὶ κατὰ σάρκα, δυνατοί, and εὐγενεῖς).⁸⁶ It seems that to him, the bulk of the issues in the congregation were caused, or could be solved, by members of a small but influential (or aspiring-to-be influential) group of people,⁸⁷ and throughout the letter, there are examples of Paul challenging them. One of the more obvious examples, 11:17–34, shows the apostle being upset with the wealthy in the congregation, who eats and drinks what they have brought along, while people of lesser means (and probably of lower social stratification) are hungry.⁸⁸

Paul is, however, not fighting for egalitarianism (7:20–21), but wants people from higher social stratas to treat people from lower stratas with respect.⁸⁹ In 1 Cor 7, this shows to be the opposite of considering the foot (often a slave) of the social body as worth less than the head (often the father of the house).⁹⁰ He wanted to minimize the effects of differences stemming from where one belonged on the social scale.⁹¹

⁸⁶ Barrett, *Commentary*, 23; Theissen, *Social Setting*, 55, 70; Origen, *Cels.* III 48.

⁸⁷ Cf. Witherington, *Conflict and Community*, 20; Fiorenza, “Rhetorical Situation,” 399.

⁸⁸ Theissen, *Social Setting*, 96, 163. Also interesting is 10:15, where he says that he is talking ὡς φρονίμοις (“as to reasonable/wise people”). This might resonate with the few σοφοὶ κατὰ σάρκα (“wise according to the flesh”) in 1:26.

⁸⁹ Theissen, *Social Setting*, 109.

⁹⁰ Martin, *Corinthian Body*, 31, 75, 94, observes that the analogy was not unusual in the ancient world to describe society, but Paul used it not to motivate, but to disprove a suppressive status hierarchy. He also states that Paul often undermined the ideological basis of the hierarchy, although the “people” of low social stratas referred to were men, not women (199).

⁹¹ Theissen describes Paul’s solution as one that “acknowledges class-specific differences within the community while minimizing their manifestations” (Theissen, *Social Setting*, 164). He emphasizes the economical aspect of stratification, and uses “class” to discuss it. However, I find that he might be taking his perspective too far, as is also pointed out by Meeks, *First Urban*, 70. I would therefore replace “class-specific

Such a focus on social stratification and on minimizing its effects can also be helpful when reading 1 Cor 6, a passage where Paul, among other things, addresses the issue of congregants going to court to settle disputes. Courts were controlled by the higher stratas,⁹² and trials that dealt with disputes were not subjected to a jury, but handled by a judge from those stratas.⁹³ These and other circumstances caused a structural bias,⁹⁴ and Paul knew that socially weak people in most cases did not have a chance to use the court, while the powerful could use it against the socially weak as they pleased. Changing the venue for disputes from court to congregation might therefore decrease the effects of social differences.⁹⁵ This conclusion means that the “you” (ὁμεῖς) in 1 Cor 6 would primarily refer to people from higher social stratas in the congregation. However, that they were the ones primarily addressed does not mean that only they were meant to hear it, or that they were the only ones affected by the critique. It was probably meant for the entire congregation to hear,⁹⁶ although it was primarily debunking the behaviour of a smaller group.

The difference in perspective between Paul and some members of the higher social stratas in the congregation seems also to be visible in the ways in which they understood the pollution of the body. Paul’s focus was on intrusion, that is, that pollution might enter and pollute the body.⁹⁷ For the higher social stratas however, this was mostly not the

differences” with “differences stemming from where you belonged on a scale of social stratification,” since “class” carries a lot of baggage, and wealth was not the only, or necessarily an always important, mark of social status.

⁹² Jo-Ann Shelton, *As the Romans Did: A Source Book in Roman Social History* (2 ed.; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 10.

⁹³ Witherington, *Conflict and Community*, 162.

⁹⁴ For a fuller discussion, see Witherington, *Conflict and Community*, 162–63; and Martin, *Corinthian Body*, 76.

⁹⁵ Martin, *Corinthian Body*, 78.

⁹⁶ Theissen, *Social Setting*, 56; Witherington, *Conflict and Community*, 36.

⁹⁷ Martin, *Corinthian Body*, 163. See also 1 Cor 5:6–8, 11; 6:12, 18.

issue. Instead, the focus was on the balance of the body.⁹⁸ Paul, then, promotes a different perspective on the body, one more commonly held by people of lower social stratas, and one that might resonate with the Lev 18:24 through the shared motif of keeping the community from becoming impure.⁹⁹

Paul obviously came from a background coloured by both Judaism and Hellenism. Siding with the socially weak is promoted more than once in the Hebrew Bible and this might well have been a source for Paul's ethical perspective.¹⁰⁰ The rhetoric of the letter is, however, more Hellenistic, and First Corinthians can be classified as a deliberative letter with the main goal of keeping the congregation free of pollution and disorder.¹⁰¹ One way of achieving that was by creating a respectful relationship between the members of different social stratas. A deliberative letter would also be presenting arguments with the aim to convince, which points to an important consideration in translating ἀρσενικοῖται: it should be an argumentative translation.

TEXTUAL CONTEXT OF 1 COR 6:9–10 AND THE PAIRING OF μαλακός AND ἀρσενικοῖτης

The passage about not going to court ends in 6:11,¹⁰² and the following passage, vv. 12–20, discusses the problem of πόρνηια, “fornication,” which is also the first word in the list in 6:9–10. Consequently, the list of vices occurs in a transition from the subject of using one's social posi-

⁹⁸ Martin, *Corinthian Body*, 163.

⁹⁹ Martin, *Corinthian Body*, xvi. Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 451, argues that Paul did not “surrender an emphasis on the holiness and corporate identity of the covenant people of God in favor of Stoic views of ‘nature’ as a basis for ethics.”

¹⁰⁰ See, e.g., Exod 22:25; Lev 19:10; Deut 24:17; Isa 58:7; and the interesting Amos 2:7, where the sin of not helping the poor is followed by the sin of a son sharing a woman with his father (cf. 1 Cor 5).

¹⁰¹ Martin, *Corinthian Body*, 38–39.

¹⁰² Witherington, *Conflict and Community*, 164; Barclay, “1 Corinthians,” 1110.

tion against someone weaker to fornication. My understanding, which I aim to motivate in the following, is that the list harbours both of these, while staying within an argument for a minimization of the effects of differences in social stratification in the Corinthian congregation.

Before moving on, I want to note that the first five vices of the list might all be considered as sexual in some way,¹⁰³ and aimed at controlling with whom a man had sex. Such an argument could find support, for example, in Paul's argument in 1 Cor 7, where he holds that sex should only take place within a marriage between man and woman. However, Paul seems to supply another reason for marriage as perhaps even more important when he opens his whole argument by saying that marriage is needed because of all the *πορνεία* (7:2). That fornication is used to motivate marriage suggests that Paul found it to be a serious problem. If we understand *πορνεία* as a behaviour expressing social abuse, as our contextualization will suggest, we find that Paul, in 1 Cor, places his sexual ethics in the context of social order. That inference does not negate that he could have considered legitimate sex to occur only within a marriage between man and woman. However, it does tell us that in Corinth, the problem of social abuse was, from Paul's point of view, large enough to convince him to place his argument about sexual partners within the context of social abuse. Consequently, a sole focus on the issue of "with whom" cannot give us a sufficient perspective on why the list was incorporated, and why the partner in a sexual relation was important to discuss in this specific letter, using a neologism, and it prevents us from uncovering aspects that might be lost in over-simplistic readings which take the "with whom" issue at face value. These considerations, then, motivates further investigation.

I take the first term on the list, *πόρνος*, with its thematic connection to the following *εἰδωλόλατρης*, to mean "fornicator."¹⁰⁴ Given the un-

¹⁰³ Idolatry could be considered an act of fornication with other gods than the God of Israel in Jewish tradition; cf. n. 104, below.

¹⁰⁴ Cf. LS, "πόρνος." See also James A. Kelhoffer, *Persecution, Persuasion and Power: Readiness to Withstand Hardship as a Corroboration of Legitimacy in the New Testament*

derlying issue of social status in 6:1–8, it is interesting to note some substantial connections to that theme; in order to attract a partner, one would have to care for one's appearance, as well as have both the time and means to meet and attract women. There was a bigger chance of having these means if one was part of higher social stratas. This aspect of *πόρνος* entails a close link to both *μοιχός* and *μαλακός*, as we will see below. Further, Paul declares in 4:18 that some in the congregation have *ἐφυσιώθησαν* ("boasted themselves"). In 4:19, he goes on to say that when he comes to visit the congregation, he will find out about *οὐ τὸν λόγον τῶν πεφυσιομένων ἀλλὰ τὴν δύναμιν* ("not the speech of the boasters but the power"). The term used in both instances for the people boasting is *φυσιώω*, which is used again in 5:2, when Paul says that those who did not cast out a man guilty of *πόρνος* (5:1) are boasters. Interesting here is the connection between these boasters and *τὴν δύναμιν* ("the power") that Paul ascribes them (4:19). This resonates with the *δυνατοί* in 1:26, and there seems to be a connection between those who boast even in light of *πορνεία*, and the ability to cast someone out of the congregation. The powerful, who had a lot of influence by being able to lend the congregation resources, also seemed to be the ones who could, and, according to Paul, should, have cast the fornicator out, but did not.

These inferences connects 6:1–11 to 6:12–20, in that they both discuss social problems arising in the body of Christ (the congregation) caused primarily by the higher social strats. In that context, it should also be noted that when Paul argues that a person who commits fornication defiles the body of Christ by defiling his own body (6:12–20), he is pursuing an argument that wants to emphasize the dangers of intrusion, over against balance.

Further, and perhaps more obvious, *πόρνος* relates to the idea of creating a functioning body of Christ in that it is problematic if men of

(Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 155–56. *πόρνος* is frequently used in the LXX in discussing the unfaithfulness of Israel with gods other than YHWH (e.g., Lev 17:7; 20:5; Judg 2:17; 8:33).

high social stratification force their sexual will on others through means of social power – which as we have seen was quite common. It would also be problematic if a member of the congregation tried to sell themselves to people of influence (not least since Paul is advocating either sex within marriage or abstinence, 1 Cor 7), since that would be a way of manipulating one's social position (cf. 7:20–21).

Idolatry (εἰδωλολάτρης), which is next on the list, was, of course, a possibility of unfaithfulness against YHWH for both high and low stratas, and caused a problem on more than one level for a monotheist like Paul. However, in 1 Cor 8 and 10, he specifically raises the issue in light of what food one can eat. Meat was quite exclusive in the Roman Empire, and people from low social stratas almost never had it. The meat they did get was often cultic and therefore probably, to them, more attached to idolatry than it was to members of higher social stratas.¹⁰⁵ When high-strata people ate meat, then, it might have been seen as idolatry by the lower social stratas. The meat made an “intrusion” into their bodies, and thereby into the body of Christ. The risk of committing idolatry, or acts that might be perceived as such by other members of the congregation, was greater if one was part of the high-status community, or wanted to be, since there would be a need to have good relations to pagans.¹⁰⁶ As becomes obvious in 8:12–13, the per-

¹⁰⁵ For a discussion of food and social stratification, see Theissen, *Social Setting*, 126. Cf. Ovid *Metam.* 8.664–668; Pliny the Younger, *Ep.* 2.6.1–2. For an interesting description of the food one might attain (lousy wine and mouldy bread), see Juvenal *Sat.* 5.12–22, 24, 25, 67–71.

¹⁰⁶ Theissen, *Social Setting*, 126–28, 131. Meeks adds another argument to why the discussion of meat is an indicator of conflicting views of higher and lower social ends of society. In 1:26, Paul mentions, as we have seen, the few σοφοί (“wise”). Then, in 8:1, Paul mentions γνῶσις, “knowledge,” and shows that those having this knowledge (the wise) are insisting on being free to eat what they want, including cultic meat. These stand opposed to ὁ ἀσθενῶν, “the weak” (8:11), whose conscience is weak and thereby cannot eat cultic meat. Moreover, they might be led astray by seeing the ones with knowledge eat it (Meeks, *First Urban*, 69; see also 1 Cor 8:1, 4, 7, 9; 9:4, 5, 6, 12, 18; 10:23, 24, 29). Note also the care that Paul is promoting in chapter eight, where he claims that by eating cultic meat in a way that might lead one's brother astray, one is

ceived idolatry of a person was a risk to the congregation, and in this case, members of the higher social stratas were to think of their fellow Christ-believers so as to not lead them astray as a result of their social status.

Μοιχός, the third word of the list, translates into “adulterer” or “paramour.”¹⁰⁷ As with εἰδωλολάτρης, it can be taken as applying to everyone. There are, however, two reasons to suppose that there is, once again, a primary focus on the higher social stratas. First, both of the textual pericopes surrounding the list are primarily aimed at members of higher social stratas. Thereby, a thematic “shadow” is cast. Second, it seems wise to highlight both the “adulterer” and the “paramour” that the word might entail, since even if the partner differs, they have a shared trait in that they seduce women.¹⁰⁸ As already mentioned, in order to successfully seduce women you had to have both the time to find them, and the opportunity to care for your appearance, which was a luxury primarily afforded by the more well-off in society. By understanding μοιχός in this way, we also discover a close link between μοιχός, πόρνος and μαλακός. Before further discussing that link, a short comment on μαλακός and the common pairing with ἀρσενοκοίτης is needed.

The reasons that other scholars have for interpreting μαλακός and ἀρσενοκοίτης together seem to be twofold: 1) there has to be a reason for them standing next to one another; and 2) both of them have been seen as sexual vices. Since μαλακός *can* denote a man who wanted to be penetrated, it is natural to see ἀρσενοκοίτης as the penetrator. There are, however, points to be made against these inferences. The restriction of μαλακός to a male same-sex sexual aspects of the word can only be supported if it is paired with the word following it, rather than with the one

sinning against Christ (8:12). The problem is that the brother in Christ is led astray. Consequently, it is more important to Paul to create respect in the congregation than to allow some members to enjoy their freedom.

¹⁰⁷ Cf. LS, s.v. “Μοιχός.”

¹⁰⁸ Boswell, *Christianity*, 337.

preceding it. Dale B. Martin argues that an ancient person would not have seen any more of “homosexual” than “heterosexual” acts in the word *μαλακός* itself,¹⁰⁹ and while finding the pairing of *μαλακός* and *ἀρσενοκοίτης* to be intentional in 1 Cor 6:9, Witherington nevertheless notes that the latter, if not paired with the former, denotes both partners in a male same-sex sexual relation.¹¹⁰ Wright further claims that *ἀρσενοκοίτης* simply denotes both the active and the passive partner in all sorts of male same-sex sexual acts, regardless of age and *μαλακός*.¹¹¹ Given the fact that *ἀρσενοκοῖται* is used without *μαλακός* in 1 Tim 1:10, we might also infer that in its early reception, the word was probably found to encompass both of the participants.¹¹²

Further questions arise when we look at the verses from Leviticus that might have informed Paul’s use of *ἀρσενοκοίτης*, since Lev 20:13 condemns both the active and passive partner to death. The need for another word to condemn the passive does not seem to exist. Of course, we do not know if all of the readers were able to see the connection to Leviticus, or if Paul thought that they all could do so. However, there seems to be no substantial reasons as to why the recipients would *not* have interpreted *ἀρσενοκοῖται* as encapsulating *both* of the men participating in homoerotic sexual acts. The notion of separating them seems to be an interpretation based on the pairing with *μαλακοί*. That inter-

¹⁰⁹ Martin, “Arsenokoitês and Malakos,” 127.

¹¹⁰ Witherington, *Conflict and Community*, 166, esp. n. 18.

¹¹¹ Wright, *Homosexuals*, 146. My conclusion is also partly supported by Martin “Arsenokoitês and Malakos,” 123, who states that it is impossible to know what *ἀρσενοκοῖται* meant, but that the strongest suggestion is one that sees the word as referring to “a particular role of exploiting others by means of sex, perhaps but not necessarily homosexual sex.” However, I do not agree with his conclusion that other forms of sex than male same-sex sex were included.

¹¹² A note of caution is raised by Wright, however, who holds that 1 Tim 1:10 does not help in clarifying the meaning of *ἀρσενοκοῖται* (Wright, *Homosexuals*, 132). The fact that 1 Tim is a reception of, rather than a source for, 1 Cor, and the fact that the list is closely connected to the situation in Corinth speaks in favor of such a conclusion. The presented assumption also rests on the presupposition that the author of 1 Tim wanted to condemn both men involved in the intercourse.

pretation *forces* ἀρσενικοῦται to denote only the active partner, since μαλακοί would never be used in such a way. But if the words are not read together, there is no clear basis for removing the passive partner from ἀρσενικοῦται, and thereby nothing that says that people not familiar with the LXX would have understood the word to not include both of the partners in a male same-sex sexual intercourse.

If we now return to the list, the case can be made for relating μαλακός closer to μοιχός, with the term “womanizer” as a fair translation. Men who notoriously chased women, who “love women too much,” could be called effeminate.¹¹³ They would do things such as remove the hair from their legs and chest and be, in the eyes of their peers, too meticulous about their appearance. One was a μαλακός in order to be a successful μοιχός, and perhaps also a successful πόρνος. No matter if this focus on appearance was to attract women or men, the behaviour was considered effeminate. Furthermore it can be argued that “men who sought to be sexually penetrated by other men were ... thought quite capable of [also] being adulterers.”¹¹⁴ The μαλακός was seen as a threat by married men, since he was attractive to women as well. In light of an emphasis on the “paramour” aspect for μοιχός, and the idea that a person guilty of this vice had to have a certain amount of wealth and high social ranking, it is worth remembering that the term μαλακός could also denote a person living in luxury and excess while “chasing” women (cf. n. 2 above). These words, then, seem to overlap in some respects, and could probably be interpreted as aspects of πόρνος. In the case of this list, however, given that it contains πόρνος as well as μοιχός and μαλακός, it is possible that they might relate to each other with slightly different meanings – men who have sex with prostitutes, or prostitute themselves (πόρνος); men who have sex with women other than their wives (μοιχός); and men who have multiple sexual partners while themselves not being married (μαλακός). This division is, of

¹¹³ Martin, “Arsenokoitês and Malakos,” 127.

¹¹⁴ Williams, *Roman Homosexuality*, 3, 129, 132.

course, not beyond doubt, especially since it is hard to know exactly why Paul would include a word with a wide range of meanings like πόρνος and then specify certain forms of “illicit” sex. However, no matter the division, it is clear that the possible social impact on a congregation where people (men) viewed others as threats to their own marriage or the ability of their daughters to marry, or posed such threats themselves would be a problematic one, causing problems within and between social stratifications. Further, it would be a problem to remain a slave (7:21) and live in accordance with Pauline sexual ethics while being at the mercy of the sexual wishes of the *paterfamilia*. These problems were highlighted by the opportunity for some to take better care of their appearance and/or to use the bodies of some people as they (sexually) pleased. Given the textual context, it seems probable that an awareness of social impacts and social abuse was one of the main reasons for Paul to mention these specific vices as unrighteous. Hence, they are contextual conditions that should have an impact on our translation.

What do we do with the neologism, then? We might assume that Paul, in using ἀρσενοκοῖται, is condemning something that he found necessary, or at least favourable, to create a new word for. It is a condemnation related to a situation in Corinth that called for a specific word, and it is introduced in close proximity to, among other things, theft, idolatry, and fornication. It is also (thematically) enclosed in an admonition to keep the body of Christ free from internal fighting and pollution, to treat each other with respect, and it is linguistically related to a call for death penalty. Furthermore, there is an overarching concern with things that cause, highlight, or reinforce stratificational differences within the community. Πόρνος, μοιχός and μαλακός all relate to the use of one’s advantageous situation for sexual pleasures, and εἰδωλόλαττης is later used in terms of leading one’s siblings in Christ astray on behalf of demands of one’s social position. Μαλακός can, as we also have seen, further denote a person who is too lazy to do hard work, someone who lives a life in luxury and excess, and thereby is able to seduce women (cf. n. 2 above). Such a display of luxury could certainly highlight social differences. After ἀρσενοκοῖται, the vices are connected to greed, excess,

taking what does not belong to oneself (κλέπτῃς, πλεονέκτῃς, ἀρπαγεύς),¹¹⁵ and socially disruptive behaviors like drinking too much (μέθυσος) and to abuse or rail (λοιδορός).¹¹⁶ All these are problems that would disturb the community, while also potentially stem from, highlight, and/or reinforce social differences. The importance of communal order and social status is obvious in understanding ἀρσενικοῦται; maintaining communal order seems to be an important focus in the whole of 1 Cor, an order Paul found to be disturbed by people primarily from higher social stratas. Since the communal problems of Corinth are, by nature, specific for Corinth, I also continue to emphasize the idea that Paul's neologism must be viewed as a situational response to them.

PHILOLOGICAL OBSERVATIONS

It seems quite clear by now that Paul aimed to condemn all forms of male same-sex sexual acts and all of its participants. However, it would be a gross simplification to not contextualize that statement. In doing so, it will be important to remind ourselves that the rationale given for Paul's opposition in Rom 1:18–32 does not seem to be applicable here (cf. n. 66 above). Further, while Lev 18:22 and 20:13 are probably a source of inspiration for Paul, we have to take into account what he might have understood and contributed to their meaning in reading them.

The idea that stratificational differences are behind the vices in 1 Cor 6:9–10 correlates with the inference that Paul viewed the homoerotic activities of the active partner in Corinth as an expression of people from higher stratas taking advantage of their socially powerful position. To Paul, this behaviour caused them to pollute the bodies of members

¹¹⁵ LS, s.v. “κλέπτῃς;” “πλεονέκτῃς;” and “ἄρπαξ;”

¹¹⁶ LS, s.v. “λοιδορός;” “μέθυσος;” Wine might have been available to people of lower financial status (see, e.g., Ovid, *Metam.* 8.664–668 where wine is used for preservation), but better wine, with nicer flavour, was more expensive (cf. Pliny the Younger, *Ep.* 1.15, where wine is mixed with honey for a sweeter taste).

from the lower stratas, like the slaves and freed men who did not have the right to say no, and probably also their own bodies. By this intrusive pollution, they also polluted the body of Christ and created disharmony in the congregation. When Paul then tells the congregants to remain what they were when they were called, even a slave (7:21), he is simultaneously trying to create a community where there is enough respect to keep bodies free from pollution, since it was common knowledge that a slave was not always in the position to control his body.¹¹⁷

It would have been quite pointless for Paul to condemn a slave for being the passive partner since he, if the *paterfamilia* so wished, could do nothing else. Yet, I believe that Paul wanted to do two things by using a word that through its scriptural and linguistical connotations included the passive partner:

- 1) Halt the use of sex to climb the social ladder and/or attaining an influential patron.¹¹⁸ As mentioned, to use sex in order to gain some form of social status was quite a common rationale for male same-sex sexual activity in the time of Paul. Such behaviour was certainly not necessary or wanted if the Lord was going to appear soon¹¹⁹ – hence the advises in 1 Cor 7 on the matter of staying what you are. It would also have had a disruptive effect on the social construct of the congregation. This form of sexual passivity was to Paul an expression of social greed, aimed at gaining social powers. He probably also viewed the passive partner as a polluter of the body of Christ, since he tempted others to make an “intrusion” into his body.

¹¹⁷ Another way to deal with that might be to invoke the notion that one was not supposed to have sex with another man's slave. Paul says that the slaves are now freed men *of Christ*, bought by Him (7:22–23).

¹¹⁸ It might be of interest to see that Aristophanes (5th century BCE) seems to have made a difference between boys who *had* to sell themselves and those who did not, going easier on boys who had to do it (Aristophanes, *Eq.* 1241–1242; *Ran.* 145–151). To him, there was, then, an awareness of a difference between these categories (see also n. 56 above).

¹¹⁹ John A. Ziesler, *Pauline Christianity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983), 113.

- 2) As Paul does in 1 Cor 8, he might here be trying to invoke a Christian's responsibility for the salvation of others. He is pointing attention towards the "weak" (who are made passive by the "strong") and thereby tries to, once again, minimize the effects of the power structures. By saying that also the passive partner will not inherit the kingdom of God, just like the brother who is lead astray by someone eating "idol meat," Paul shows that if a man uses his social status to impose himself sexually on someone (or for that matter seduces an influential man – Paul, in ch. 7, seems to be aware that the temptations of the flesh can be hard to resist) he will cause both himself *and* the other to lose their part in the heavenly inheritance. The responsibility for one's brother in Christ and for the welfare of the community is more important than one's freedom.

A clarifying comment might be needed here. That social concerns were behind Paul's condemnation in this particular letter does not mean that he was pro egalitarian same-sex sexual acts, performed in a loving context. Given the background painted earlier, it is my conviction that it, in Paul's mind, did not exist any form of egalitarian same-sex sexual acts between men. They were to him, as far as we can tell, the result of social abuse or the wrath of God (Rom 1:18–32). Any further inferences as to what Paul would say about same-sex sexual acts in another context with another understanding of such acts would be speculative, since he (as everyone) acted within a specific context and a specific, contextual and personal, understanding and conviction.

It is important to note that all men, even those from lower social stratas, who had sex with men are condemned by Paul. However, since the letter is primarily addressing problems stemming from the higher social stratas, the *primary* intention of Paul was probably not to tell, for example, a poor boy in need of food that he was going to lose his place in the kingdom of God by prostituting himself. Yet, that is the consequence. In light of imminent eschatology and the will to save as many as possible, it was probably not strange for Paul to use it anyway. In the same way, it was not strange to use a word condemning those who stole, even if it were to be used against the poor, since it was more important to keep one's place in the kingdom of God than the one on earth (see, e.g., 1 Cor 9:16 in relation to 15:30–31). Further, Paul is propagating a

sense of communal responsibility, which it seems reasonable to assume stretches to social care like alleviating starvation. This inference means that even though the list of vices are written in a context where those at fault are primarily from higher social stratas, it could have an effect on the whole congregation. Behaviours performed at the cost of the peace of the community was to be avoided by everyone.

One could ask why, if it is correct that Paul wanted to do away with sex as a disturbing factor in the community, he limits his direct address to men, excluding women. Why not forbid all kinds of sexual intercourse if sex was a zero-sum game?¹²⁰ To start with, it should be remembered that in the letter, Paul is first and foremost addressing men from a male point of view. To these men, it was obvious that free women should not have any sex partner but her husband.¹²¹ Second, in 6:9–10, Paul forbids men to have sex with prostitutes, women married to other men, and he condemns men who “chase” women, or have sex with many different women (including unmarried), so Paul is indirectly excluding some of the forms of sex that are not part of marriage also for women, and to have sex within marriage was expected. Further, there were not the same kind of power-aspects involved in sex between two females, and so it might not, to Paul, have had the same disorderly effect on the community.¹²²

As stated earlier, Paul seems to have found the need for a neologism. I argue that this is because to him no other word adequately encompassed all male same-sex sexual behaviours (with boys as well as grown

¹²⁰ Note, however, that he wished that everyone would live like him, i.e., in celibacy (1 Cor 7:7).

¹²¹ Shelton, *As the Romans*, 55.

¹²² It is worth mentioning that the vices in 6:9–10 might be taken, given a patriarchal understanding of male ownership of property and women, as acts against males. Therein might, according to Paul, lie one reason for their abilities to disturb social order. Also important is the fact that if the lack of a clear power-aspect contributes to Paul not including women here, despite including them in Rom 1:18–32, that would strengthen the inference that the aspect of power is crucial to understanding our neologism. However, as indicated in note 66, such inferences are uncertain.

men) while also highlighting the seriousness of the deeds. Ἄρσενο and κοίτη, however, carried connotations to both the active and the passive partner and a death penalty from Lev 18:22 and 20:13. It is possible that by situating the offence within the linguistic context of the Hebrew Bible, Paul wanted to point the congregation to the specific laws from Leviticus. Of course, some would not have picked this up when hearing or reading the text, but some would.¹²³ These people could have enlightened their fellow congregants on the connection, and thereby highlight the severe nature suggested. I admit that these inferences are in some sense only educated guesses, as is the case with all attempts to understand motivations. This is especially true when the act that is to be motivated is one that does not quite make sense; why use an unknown word when addressing people about something that is serious enough to cost a person their heavenly inheritance? Especially in a congregation as diverse as the Corinthian? However, I would argue that my educated guess rests on a plausible understanding of the culture(s) affecting Paul, as well as the linguistic and situational context. If the above inferences are correct, it would have made sense, not least rhetorically, to use the new word in a deliberative letter addressing the problems Paul thought to be relevant in the congregation in Corinth concerning how the higher social stratas treated the lower social stratas (or might treat them), and how people tried to use their bodies to gain social powers. Given the Jewish (Philonic) line of interpretation of Lev 18:22 and 20:13 that I argue Paul to be part of, excess and greed seem to have been reoccurring themes, and given the Greco-Roman context, the thought of exploitation was probably not far-fetched to him – they are all things that would upset the social peace of the congregation.¹²⁴ Even though the connection to the verses from Leviticus might initially have been

¹²³ See 1 Cor 7:18; 9:8–10, 20–22; 10:1–13; Barrett, *Commentary*, 2, Witherington, *Conflict and Community*, 6–7, 24 (and n. 9 in this paper).

¹²⁴ It is not fruitful to view this as a case of the Jewish inheritance of Paul being applied to one partner (the active), and the Greco-Roman to the other (the passive). For Paul, these elements were probably inseparably intermingled.

lost on some of the first readers, the literary context of the word would have placed sexual acts between men on a par with, for example, theft, fornication, and blatant abuse of social power (as suggested by, for example, the close proximity to 6:1–8 and the connections between *πορνοί* and “the powerful”).

As stated, Paul probably intended to condemn all forms of male same-sex sexual acts. I find it probable that that was not lost on the first recipients, since they were formed by interpretive principles from a context that was heavily influenced by the idea that a man could not enjoy being penetrated, that sex was a zero-sum game, and that (free) men were born to put others down, for example by penetrating them. Further, they would have known that men could, and did, sell themselves sexually for social powers. When they then heard a ban on *ἀρσενοκοῖται*, a neologism placed within a context of socially abusive and disruptive behaviours through exploitation of financial and/or sexual kind, most people in the Corinthian congregation would probably have heard a ban on a behaviour emanating from the same problems that gave rise to theft, idolatry, abusing the legal system, and socially powerful men chasing women and abusing their slaves. That behaviour would have encompassed *all* forms of sexual relations between men, since they were, by many, understood as socially abusive.¹²⁵

TRANSLATION: SOME CONSIDERATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

Throughout this article, I have noted a few considerations that should be remembered in a translation: the connection to a death penalty; the increased polarization in the time of Paul with regard to views held on male same-sex sexual acts; the deliberative nature of the letter (aimed at minimizing the results of social stratification); and the close cultural and

¹²⁵ Note the “by many.” Men who were attracted to other men, and who enjoyed sexual relations with men, would not necessarily have agreed. However, as can be seen also today, they are not always heard in the discussion, and at times, their existence is even denied.

literary connection between power, abuse, and sex. Further, it seems safe to assume that Paul did not have a positive view on the male same-sex sexual activities in his contemporary world, nor in the context of the Corinthian congregation, and that Paul wanted the term ἀρσενοκοῖται to be noted – it is a word with connections to the death penalty in a deliberative address.

Another case in point is the need to clarify the objects of ἀρσενοκοῖται. The ones addressed are men of all ages and all social classes who in any way are, or might be, participating in a same-sex sexual act. They are also people who are not doing these acts as a punishment from God. The word is placed in a context where the sharpest edge is aimed towards the higher social stratas, but it will be hard, if not impossible, to supply a translation which shows this focus without distorting the fact that others are included as well.

The main problem might, however, be to show that Paul held all same-sex sexual relations between men to be condemnable, and that the Corinthian congregation would have understood that (agreeing or not), while also showing that that perspective on such acts was created and maintained within a specific context and a specific mindset. If *all* sexual acts between men were construed as socially abusive today, it would perhaps be possible to simply supply “men who have sex with men” as a translation. However, as that is not the case, some other form of translation has to be created. One suggestion could be “men who have socially abusive sex with men.” This translation would clarify that the sex was understood as socially abusive, but it would also suggest that Paul would not have minded non socially abusive sex between men. As mentioned, any inference of that nature is purely speculative. However, it is equally speculative to translate it “men who have sex with men” (or something similar) since that suggests that Paul also disagreed with egalitarian forms of sexual acts between men. None of these options are possible to prove to be correct. The problem becomes worse when considering the fact that ἀρσενοκοῖται does not take substantially more space than any of the other vices, and the list is quite short. If a translation contains a lot of words, it risks breaking the flow of the passage and ascribe too

much spatial focus to this specific word. Further, to include any form of the word “homosexual” would demand some further modifier, showing that women are not addressed, and that actions, not inclination, are in focus.

Given these considerations, I would suggest adding a short explanatory note to the translation. I also suggest a translation that would draw attention to the problematic nature of translating the neologism, so as to discourage simplistic readings or simply failure to see that there is a note. Such a translation could be the aforementioned “men who have socially abusive sex with men,” supplied with a note reading something like “Paul is in 1 Cor addressing, among other things, issues of social abuse and communal disturbance, and in his context, sex between men was considered such an issue by many. We can assume that Paul strongly agreed with that. We also know that in Rom 1:18–32, he treats such acts as a punishment from God, but that seems not to be the case here. We can only speculate as to what Paul would have said about other forms of sexual relations between men, while holding that he connected the form he knew of to the death penalty in Lev 20:13.” Not everything can be said in a note, but this suggestion would mention literary and wordly context, differences in opinion in his time, the problem of interpreting the word in light of Rom 1:18–32, the connection to the death penalty in Lev 20:13, and the speculative nature of what Paul would say about egalitarian sexual relations between men. Yet, I admit that the translation is quite long and does not carry the emotional force that is likely to have been transmitted by ἀρσενοκοῖται.

What, then, if a note is not an option, as is the case for a lot of Bible translations? I find that we end up with two options – one that suggests that Paul was against all forms of same-sex sexual acts between men, and one that suggests that he was for sexual acts between men, as long as they were not socially abusive. As noted, both of these are problematic. I would, however, prefer the second option, since it contains an opening towards not knowing. One could infer, from “men who have socially abusive sex with men,” that Paul did not mind sex between men when not abusive. However, one *does not have to* infer that. On the other

hand, if a translation like “men who have sex with men” is used, there is no opening for any uncertainty – it is a blanket prohibition against all forms of sexual acts between men.

CONCLUSION: THE MEANING OF PAUL’S NEOLOGISM ἀρσενοκοῖται IN 1 COR 6:9

I have argued that ἀρσενοκοῖται denotes males participating in a same-sex sexual act understood within a literary and cultural mindset which marks such acts as in all instances socially abusive. I have suggested the translation “men who have socially abusive sex with men,” preferably supplied with an explanatory note, as closer to dynamic equivalence than earlier attempts have been.

The participants in male same-sex intercourse are included in the list because they, according to Paul, are part of a social disturbance and pollute themselves, each other, and the body of Christ by this behaviour, and thereby lose their own heavenly inheritance and cause others to do the same. Paul wants to put an end to these behaviours in order to create a community that, while maintaining a hierarchy, minimizes the negative effects of it.

Finally, I want to emphasize that this article does not suggest that Paul was trying to get rid of social hierarchies. However, he advocated respect, in order to keep pollution away from the bodies partaking in the body of Christ. Neither is it suggesting that Paul was pro modern male, or female, homosexuality or homosexual acts. It says, rather, that Paul, in 1 Cor 6:9, did not express an opinion on all forms of homosexual acts as perceived today, nor on homosexuality as an inclination. I have instead argued that Paul commented on what he had perceived in his distinct context, and that the modern form of egalitarian homosexuality did not, in his mind, exist. What did exist, however, was the widespread and pertaining notion of using male same-sex sex as a tool for/of social powers.

Simplistic Presentations of Biblical Authority and Christian Origins in the Service of Anti-Catholic Dogma: A Response to Anders Gerdmar

JAMES A. KELHOFFER

Uppsala University
james.kelhoffer@teol.uu.se

WHY A RESPONSE TO THIS BOOK IS WARRANTED IN A SCHOLARLY EXEGETICAL JOURNAL

By any academic measure, Anders Gerdmar (G.) is a well-qualified biblical scholar. His 2001 Uppsala University dissertation appeared in the *Coniectanea Biblica* series, and a second monograph on the roots of theological anti-Semitism among German exegetes and theologians from the 1750s to the 1950s is a substantial contribution.¹ He has also published a number of articles and essays, and with my predecessor at Uppsala University – also his *Doktorvater* – he wrote the lion's share of an introductory textbook still in use at Swedish universities.² In 2009, G. applied for, and received from the theological faculty at Uppsala

¹ Anders Gerdmar, *Rethinking the Judaism-Hellenism Dichotomy: A Historiographical Case Study of Second Peter and Jude* (ConBNT 36; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 2001); idem, *Roots of Theological Anti-Semitism: German Biblical Interpretation and the Jews, from Herder and Semler to Kittel and Bultmann* (Studies in Jewish History and Culture 20; Leiden: Brill, 2009).

² Anders Gerdmar with Kari Syreeni, *Vägar till Nya testamentet: Metoder, tekniker och verktyg för nytestamentlig exegetik* [*Paths to the New Testament: Methods, Techniques and Tools for New Testament Exegesis*] (Lund: Studentlitteratur, 2006). Here and elsewhere, English translations of Swedish are mine.

University, the distinction of “docent” (\approx a German *Privatdozent*); as the external examiner of G.’s application for that distinction, Heikki Räisänen (Helsinki) wrote an unequivocal and enthusiastic endorsement. Gerdmar deservedly belongs to the prestigious Society of New Testament Studies and to the Gesellschaft für Wissenschaftliche Theologie.

Published by the press operated by an independent charismatic church,³ G.’s latest book, *Guds Ord räcker: Evangelisk tro kontra romersk-katolsk* [*God’s Word Is Sufficient: Evangelical Faith against Roman Catholic (Faith)*],⁴ is aimed at a popular audience and concerns views of Scripture, theological method, and a posited contrast between the evangelical Protestant and Roman Catholic faiths. Given the audience and foci of this book, one may wonder why it merits attention in an academic, nonconfessional journal of biblical studies, such as *Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok*. Further, one could ask why I, who am not an expert in either Catholicism or Swedish Evangelicalism, would be interested in responding to such a book.

The reasons, I will suggest, are several. Substantial parts of the book primarily concern the NT and Christian origins and assert a multitude of pre-critical views that many exegetes might believe had been abandoned generations ago. Having a faith, and basing arguments on faith, is anyone’s right. In this book, however, G. presents his arguments as though they were based on sound scholarship and legitimized by his own academic standing. If left unchallenged, those uncritical views belie the credibility of biblical studies as an academic discipline.⁵ They can

³ According to the National Library of Sweden (*Kungliga biblioteket*), the publisher Areopagos is owned and operated under the jurisdiction of the Word of Life church in Uppsala (<http://www.kb.se/isbn-centralen/sok-forlagsregistret/svenska-forlag/>). I do not know whether that publisher requires “peer review” of submitted book manuscripts.

⁴ Anders Gerdmar, *Guds Ord räcker: Evangelisk tro kontra romersk-katolsk* (Uppsala: Areopagos, 2016).

⁵ See James A. Kelhoffer, “Nya testamentets exegetik som akademiskt ämne med relevans för andra ämnen,” *SEÅ* 77 (2012): 55–70; English translation in idem, *Conceptions of “Gospel” and Legitimacy in Early Christianity* (WUNT 324; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 3–18.

also foster the construction of a parallel moral and religious universe, from whose vantage point – and presumed authority – adherents can lament and assail the views of their coreligionists, not to mention the results of nonconfessional biblical, theological and religious studies. Therefore, a response in this journal is both warranted and needed.

SUMMARY

Unconventionally, the book commences with ten “forewords” (*förorord*) – nine by Swedish “Christian leaders” (*kristna ledare*) who heartily endorse the book,⁶ and one by G. himself.⁷ The book consists of twelve chapters:

- 1) “Varför jag aldrig valde att konvertera” (“Why I Never Chose to Convert”) (27–40);
- 2) “Allt tillhör oss: vår gemensamma tro” (“Everything Belongs to Us: Our Common Faith”) (41–50);
- 3) “Om Bibeln och traditionen” (“On the Bible and the Tradition”) (51–73);
- 4) “Bibeln över kyrkan eller kyrkan över Bibeln? Om Bibelns kanonisering” (“The Bible over the Church or the Church over the Bible? On the Bible’s Canonization”) (75–88);
- 5) “Är romersk-katolska kyrkan den enda kyrkan?” (“Is the Roman Catholic Church the Only Church?”) (89–99);
- 6) “Är påven och kyrkan ofelbara? Om auktoritet och ledarskap” (“Are the Pope and the Church Infallible? On Authority and Leadership”) (101–24);
- 7) “Maria: troshjälte eller himmelsk varelse?” (“Mary: Hero of Faith or Heavenly Being?”) (125–50);
- 8) “Nattvarden – bruk och missbruk” (“The Lord’s Supper – Use and Misuse”) (151–63);
- 9) “Skärseld och avlat” (“Purgatory and Penance”) (165–77);
- 10) “Är protesten över?” (“Is the Protest Finished?”) (179–81);
- 11) “Att de alla ska bli ett” (“That They All Shall Be One”) (183–96);
- 12) “Till dig som funderar” (“To You Who Are Deliberating”) (197–200).

Extensive summaries are given at the end of chapters 2–7, and very brief summaries appear at the end of chapters 8, 9 and 11. The book ends with eleven endnotes to preceding chapters, endnotes that curiously lack reference to the page numbers to which the notes refer. Biblical transla-

⁶Gerdmar, *Guds Ord räcker*, 9–19. The endorsements are from Sven Nilsson (9–11), Stanley Sjöberg (11), Carl-Erik Sahlberg (11–12), Linda Bergling (12–15), Hans Augustsson (15), Stefan Swärd (16–17), Stefan Gustavsson (17), Joakim Lundqvist (17–18), and Lukas Berggren (18–19).

⁷*Ibid.*, 21–26.

tions are occasionally G.'s own but are mostly from the Svenska Folkbibeln 2015 translation popular in many Swedish evangelical circles,⁸ rather than from the Bibel 2000 translation produced by the Swedish Bible Society.

Chapter 1 is largely autobiographical, highlighting how G.'s charismatic experience of "baptism in the Spirit" (*andedop*) as an adult fed his dissatisfaction with both the high church Lutheran tradition of his upbringing and with the Roman Catholic and Orthodox Christian traditions, to which a number of his friends converted. Gerdmar also lays out a central thesis of the book: "There is one truth: God's Word is truth."⁹ He objects strongly not only to adding "the Tradition"¹⁰ to the Bible (a problem that he dubs "Bible Plus"), but also to eliminating certain biblical teachings (which he dubs "Bible Minus"), which, he holds, is the result of "liberal theology." He thereby identifies two dangerous foes that, in his view, jeopardize the faith of all Christians: adding traditions to Scripture and not accepting God's Word in its totality.

Chapter 2 defines Christians' "common faith" as a "faith in all of God's Word and the early Christian confessions," the latter having been produced by the early church's ecumenical councils that addressed, among other things, Christology and the Trinity.¹¹ Chapter 3 asserts, and defends, the authority of "the Bible alone" (*sola scriptura*) in the Christian church, drawing a sharp contrast between evangelical traditions that emphasize the preaching of the Word and Catholic and Orthodox traditions that emphasize liturgy and the Eucharist. For G., evangelicals' affirmation of the "apostolicity" (*apostolicitet*) of the divinely inspired words that the apostles wrote down contrasts markedly with

⁸ For a review of Svenska Folkbibeln 2015 as a confessional Bible translation, see Birger Olsson, "Svenska Folkbibeln – en evangelikal bibelöversättning" ["Svenska Folkbibeln – an Evangelical Bible Translation"], *STK* 91/3 (2015): 130–37, esp. 131–33, 137.

⁹ Gerdmar, *Guds Ord räcker*, 27.

¹⁰ Swedish: "Traditionen" (singular, capitalization original), *ibid.*, 27.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 46.

Catholic and Orthodox understandings of Scripture in relation to later church traditions.¹² Gerdmar rejects, for example, later revelations attributed to the Virgin Mary as well as to the medieval mystic St. Bridget of Sweden (*S:ta Birgitta*). By contrast, it is only “the Bible, God’s Word, which for eternity is the canon [*rättesnöret*] and which helps us to see clearly.”¹³

Chapter 4 holds that “the New Testament canon comprises Scriptures that were inspired from their inception” and that “a canon was formed early, not by some church meeting but because believers in the whole of Christ’s body recognized the revelation in Scripture.”¹⁴ Chapter 5 counters the Roman Catholic Church’s claim to being the only legitimate church. Chapter 6 criticizes the rise of the monarchical episcopate as a “postbiblical” development that is not normative for evangelical churches. Additionally, G. challenges the notions of apostolic succession and papal authority. The demotion of the Bishop of Rome is followed, in chapter 7, by a demotion of Jesus’ mother, Mary, from being a heavenly agent in redemption (*co-redemptrix*) to being affirmed as “a role model for all believers.”¹⁵ Chapter 8 contrasts evangelical and Catholic teachings and praxes concerning the Eucharist, and chapter 9 similarly addresses forgiveness, purgatory and penance. The very short chapter 10 holds that the protests and reformations of the church that Martin Luther began 500 years ago rightfully continue, and that “the protest is the Lord’s.”¹⁶ Chapter 11 contrasts a Roman Catholic perspective on church unity with a charismatic evangelical understanding of church unity “that builds on the truth as it is found in Scripture and [the truth] in the Spirit’s unity.”¹⁷ The final chapter implores a non-Catholic reader who may be considering whether to convert to Catholicism not to do

¹² Gerdmar, *Guds Ord räcker*, 54–55.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 72.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 88.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 149.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 180.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 196.

so, due to unbiblical Catholic teachings and practices, including praying to Mary or other saints.

CRITIQUE

Due to my own limitations and the focus of this journal, this critique examines primarily G.'s treatment of biblical literature. Other parts of the book could be better addressed by historical, dogmatic or systematic theologians; by modern church historians; or by experts in Catholic Studies.

The Bible and Tradition

Guds Ord räcker abounds with inconsistencies, several of which I will attempt to highlight. In particular, I find arbitrary G.'s definition of "God's Word" in contrast to both later church traditions and critical scholarship. The biblical literature itself represents not only an inheritance of earlier traditions and *augmentations* of certain traditions (\approx G.'s "Bible Plus") but also *departures* from other traditions, including earlier biblical traditions (\approx G.'s "Bible Minus"). Remarkably, any acknowledgement of diverse perspectives within biblical literature is absent from this book. As we will see, G.'s simplistic presentation of biblical and apostolic unity undergirds his polemics against certain Catholic views that are said to deviate from the earliest apostolic unity.

Chapter 2 describes much about "our common faith" with which many, if not most, Christians through the centuries could readily agree. Nevertheless, the insistence on "faith in all of God's Word"¹⁸ as the primary basis of the common Christian faith is particular to recent and contemporary fundamentalist Protestant traditions.¹⁹ Biblical literature

¹⁸ Gerdmar, *Guds Ord räcker*, 46.

¹⁹ On this feature of Protestant fundamentalism, see James Barr, *Fundamentalism* (London: SCM, 1977; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1978), 11–21; Nancy T. Ammerman, "North American Protestant Fundamentalism," in *Fundamentalisms Observed*, ed.

says precious little about faith *in* the written word. Jesus' teachings stress the centrality of faith in God, and church tradition emphasizes the centrality of God's revelation in Christ, to which the Scriptures attest.

One may also ask to what extent G. is consistent in his stance on the authority of the Bible in relation to later church tradition when he holds that the early ecumenical church councils are also essential to the "common faith" that all Christians share.²⁰ Those councils (beginning with Nicaea, 325 CE) are clearly postbiblical chronologically and affirm numerous postbiblical credenda. Even G. acknowledges a need for *something* from Nicene and post-Nicene theological developments. His appeal to acceptance of the councils as a basis for Christian unity undercuts his repeated assertions about the sufficiency of faith alone in all of God's Word.

Something more may be said about the uncomplicated hermeneutic that G. earnestly and repeatedly advocates in *Guds Ord räckter* when he, for example, lauds the ideal that the "truth of God's Word be allowed to stand pure and clear."²¹ He seems to affirm that biblical truths do not need to be interpreted but, rather, just need to be believed. Such a reading strategy differs markedly from the above-mentioned textbook by Gerdmar and Syreeni, who, building on Hans-Georg Gadamer and Paul Ricœur, recognize the role of the interpreter and of the interpreting community, and point out potential influences from particular communities on their adherents' subjective views ("intersubjectivity").²² In Gerdmar and Syreeni's book, the theological educator has a fine Swedish-language resource to guide students through many introducto-

Martin E. Marty and R. Scott Appleby (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1991), 1–65, esp. 5–6, 15–16.

²⁰ See above, on chapter 2 of Gerdmar, *Guds Ord räckter*, 46.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 27. According to G., that ideal comes with a promise: "If we fill ourselves with the truth of God's Word, our life will be true ... and we need no other canon (*rättesnöre*)" (27–28). The last term in the sentence, "*rättesnöre*," could be translated "canon," "rule," "criterion," or "guiding principle." I return to this citation, below.

²² See the preface (attributed to both authors) in Gerdmar with Syreeni, *Vägar till Nya testamentet*, 10–11; cf. see further, 101–102.

ry principles on method and hermeneutics. The contrast between the Gerdmar of 2006 and the “flat” hermeneutic he espouses a decade later is remarkable.

Alleged Witnesses to an Early New Testament Canon

For G.’s arguments about the NT canon to be plausible, he needs, in chapter 4, to establish two facts – the apostolic origin of the NT writings, and a nearly instantaneous reception of those writings as Scripture by the whole church. In regard to the decisive authority claimed for the first apostles, G. marshals support from an assortment of NT verses,²³ apparently overlooking that a number of calls for, or claims to, unity in the NT actually betray contentious situations of *disunity* amidst the very apostolic authorities among whom G. would find unanimity. One can thus recognize here the operative effect of G.’s “flat” hermeneutic.

One of G.’s examples about unity in the earliest church is Eph 2:20, which proclaims that God’s household is “built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets.”²⁴ What is peculiar about that appeal to Ephesians is that the letter’s later, deuteropauline author summons for himself – and for that pseudonymous letter – an apostolic authority that he could lay claim to only by impersonating an apostle such as Paul.²⁵

²³ Gerdmar, *Guds Ord räcker*, 75–78.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 76.

²⁵ On the non-Pauline authorship of Ephesians, see, e.g., Helmut Koester, *History and Literature of Early Christianity*, vol. 2 of *Introduction to the New Testament*, 2nd ed. (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982 [1980]), 267–72; Victor Paul Furnish, “Ephesians, Epistle to the,” *ABD* 2:535–42, esp. 539–41 (cf. 536–37, on the use of Colossians); Udo Schnelle, *The History and Theology of the New Testament Writings* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1998 [2nd German ed. 1994]), 300–303; Nils A. Dahl, “Einleitungsfragen zum Epheserbrief,” in *idem.*, *Studies in Ephesians*, ed. D. Hellholm et al. (WUNT 131; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 3–105, esp. 18–28, 48–60; Bart D. Ehrman, *Forgery and Counterforgery: The Use of Literary Deceit in Early Christian Polemics* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013), 182–90.

Moreover, Ephesians reworks significant portions of Colossians,²⁶ an earlier letter also attributed to Paul but that a majority scholars today regard as pseudonymous.²⁷ As a result, the continuity claimed in Ephesians is most likely at least two steps removed from what could be construed as the apostolic time of Paul's activity.

Similarly, G. finds in Col 4:16 support for his inference of an early recognition of a NT canon of Scripture: "It is very possible that as soon as an apostolic writing came into existence it was regarded as the Lord's word and began to be read during worship."²⁸ No such claim can be supported by Col 4:16. The verse calls for that letter of "Paul" to be read in Colossae and in Laodicea, thereby asserting the letter's apostolic origins and reception in earlier Pauline congregations.²⁹ Due to the earthquake that struck nearby Laodicea in 60/61 CE,³⁰ it may have been impossible to refute Colossae as the intended destination for a pseudonymous letter, since there may not have been any Christ-believers from Colossae or Laodicea who could question such a letter's authenticity.³¹ Claims about apostolic origins and authority in Colossians

²⁶ In regard to the reuse of significant parts of Colossians in Ephesians, see Dahl, "Einleitungsfragen," 39–48; Furnish, "Ephesians," 536–37, and other studies listed in the preceding footnote.

²⁷ Even among some critical scholars, the Pauline authorship of Colossians is sometimes still affirmed. A point to which I will return, below, is G.'s complete disregard for such scholarly debates. For arguments that Colossians, like Ephesians, is a pseudepigraphon, see Koester, *Introduction*, 2:263–67; Victor Paul Furnish, "Colossians, Epistle to the," *ABD* 1:1090–96, esp. 1092–94; Schelle, *History and Theology*, 282–88; Ehrman, *Forgery and Counterforgery*, 171–82.

²⁸ Gerdmar, *Guds Ord räcker*, 81–82.

²⁹ Col 4:16 (English translation mine): "And whenever this letter has been read among you, see to it that it is read also in the church of the Laodiceans and that you, too, read the [letter] from Laodicea."

³⁰ See Tacitus, *Ann.* 14.27.1 (English translation mine): "In that year [60/61 CE], one of the famous cities of Asia, Laodicea, was overthrown by an earthquake and, with no relief from us, recovered itself by its own resources."

³¹ This inference is based on the likelihood that Colossae (roughly 18 km southeast of Laodicea) was also substantially damaged by that earthquake, which would be relevant for dating Colossians and for the possibly fictitious characterization of the

and Ephesians, on the one hand, and in *Guds Ord räcker*, on the other hand, are anachronistic.

What G. does not mention to his audience is that debates about the non-Pauline authorship of Colossians and, especially, of Ephesians were settled decades ago for most biblical scholars. Nevertheless, G. repeatedly presents Ephesians as a letter of Paul – without argument or even acknowledging any debate about the letter’s authorship.³² As a result, *G.’s readers never have an opportunity to make an informed decision* about those letters’ “apostolicity.”³³ Naturally, a reputable scholar can hold a differing view on a particular isagogic point, such as a NT writing’s authorship or dating. In that case, it would be expected, first, to acknowledge the existence of dissension among learned colleagues and, second, to argue for one’s own position. Time and again, in this book, G. does neither in his treatment of the NT and Christian origins. His assertion of the acceptance of the NT writings as Scripture by the whole church shortly after they were written is an oversimplification of a long, complex and sometimes haphazard process of canonization. The author’s responsibility for presenting such a spurious reconstruction is hardly mitigated by the book’s pastoral genre and polemical agenda.

Construals of Origins, “Heretics,” and Authorship

According to G., another indication of the existence of an emerging NT canon already in the early second century is the supposed “attacks of

addressees by its pseudonymous author. See further, James A. Kelhoffer, *Conceptions of “Gospel” and Legitimacy*, 234–37; James S. Murray, “The Urban Earthquake Imagery and Divine Judgement in John’s Apocalypse,” *NovT* 47 (2005): 142–61, esp. 150–58 at 157; Richard Bauckham, “Eschatological Earthquake in the Apocalypse of John,” *NovT* 19 (1977): 224–33.

³² See above, on Gerdmar, *Guds Ord räcker*, 76; see also 103 (on Eph 4:11), 115 (on Eph 2:20), 187 (on Eph 2:18; 3:6–7), 188 (on Eph 4:2–6), and 195 (on Eph 4:11–16).

³³ Cf. above, on Gerdmar, *Guds Ord räcker*, 54–55.

Marcion and the other Gnostics”³⁴ against such a canon. Several widely acknowledged points of scholarly consensus could be brought to bear to correct that inference. Marcion was not a “Gnostic;”³⁵ the “Gnostics” did not exist as an identifiable group in the second century;³⁶ and neither Marcion nor the vast majority of “gnostic” writings found at Nag Hammadi oppose a particular canon of Scripture; in fact, quite a number of “gnostic” writings develop and complement certain NT writings rather than oppose NT writings’ authority or canonical status.³⁷ In addition, G.’s uncritical presentations of the highly polemical and, at times, historically dubious antiheretical caricatures of “heretics” by Irenaeus of Lyons and other church fathers perpetuate misunderstandings about the origins of the NT canon, misunderstandings that bolster G.’s polemical agenda against viewpoints embraced by many Roman Catholics, and even by some Protestants.³⁸

³⁴ Swedish: “Markions och de andra gnostikernas angrepp” (Gerdmar, *Guds Ord räckter*, 82–83 at 83). The term *angrepp* (“attack”/“attacks”) could be singular or plural. Above, I infer that the plural (“attacks”) is meant.

³⁵ See, e.g., Judith M. Lieu, *Marcion and the Making of a Heretic: God and Scripture in the Second Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2015), 28–33, on Irenaeus’s mistaken linking of Marcion with “Gnosticism.” See also Michael L. Williams, *Rethinking “Gnosticism”: An Argument for Dismantling a Dubious Category* (Princeton: Princeton University, 1996), 23–26; David Brakke, *The Gnostics: Myth, Ritual, and Diversity in Early Christianity* (Cambridge: Harvard University, 2010), 90–111, esp. 96–99, 111.

³⁶ See Williams, *Rethinking “Gnosticism,”* 29–53, esp. 44–45: even for Irenaeus, “gnosis” signifies false teaching, not one particular group of Christians. See also Karen L. King, *What Is Gnosticism?* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University; London: Belknap, 2003), 218: “By perceiving how thoroughly the study of Gnosticism is tied to defining normative Christianity, we have been able to analyze where and how the academic study of Gnosticism in the twentieth century reinscribes and reproduces the ancient discourse of orthodoxy and heresy.”

³⁷ See Williams, *Rethinking “Gnosticism,”* 54–79 and, among the writings found at Nag Hammadi, the *Hypostasis of the Archons*, where Paul is hailed as the great apostle and Eph 6:12 is cited (NHC II 86.20–26).

³⁸ It is not only Roman Catholics who are subjected to G.’s admonishment. For example, to exemplify the encroachment of unbiblical Catholic traditions in non-

Another tenet that would be exceedingly difficult to demonstrate historically is the clear demarcation upon which G. insists between the uniform apostolic faith and several lamentable, quasi-Catholic developments that came afterward, especially the rise of the monarchical episcopate. If we hold, as most scholars do, that the NT writings were composed ca. 50-140 CE, Ignatius of Antioch's calls for congregations to be subject to the bishop and the elders (ca. 110 CE) occur well within the so-called apostolic period, thereby blurring G.'s posited demarcation. Furthermore, the apostolic origin of several NT writings is highly doubtful. In addition to six likely pseudepigrapha that are attributed to Paul (Eph; Col; 2 Thess; 1 Tim; 2 Tim; Titus), 1 Peter and 2 Peter apparently stem from two different pseudonymous authors and have no direct connection to the historical apostle Peter.³⁹

Herein lies an irony in G.'s argumentation: much of his evidence for the supposedly apostolic origins of the NT writings comes not from Scripture but, rather, from subsequent church tradition.⁴⁰ Consequently, *a key tenet in his biblicist antidote* to a slough of postbiblical Catholic views *is itself postbiblical*. His commendation of beliefs about the Bible's origins based not on Scripture but on the musings of later church fa-

Catholic circles he cites at length a prayer to Mary read in March 2014 by Antje Jackelén, the current Archbishop of the (Lutheran) Church of Sweden (Gerdmar, *Guds Ord räcker*, 145–47).

³⁹ The different Greek styles of 1 Peter and 2 Peter strongly suggest two different authors. In addition, the rather sophisticated Greek of the two letters renders highly unlikely the hypothesis that the historical apostle Peter (an illiterate fisherman whose mother tongue was Aramaic) wrote either of them. On these observations, see, e.g., Koester, *Introduction*, 2:292–97 (on 1 and 2 Peter); John H. Elliott, “Peter, First Epistle of,” *ABD* 5:269–78, esp. 276–78; idem, “Peter, Second Epistle of,” *ABD* 5:282–87, esp. 283; Schnelle, *History and Theology*, 400–403 (on 1 Peter), 425–27 (on 2 Peter); Ehrman, *Forgery and Counterforgery*, 239–59 (on 1 Peter), 259–63 (on 2 Peter).

⁴⁰ Although some attributions by Church Fathers concerning the authorship of biblical writings could be accurate historically, quite a number of them are likely legendary or based on later, unreliable traditions. In any case, scholarship usually recognizes the need for argumentation when embracing a later tradition as historically reliable.

thers is itself a paradigmatic example of the “heresy” he calls “Bible plus,” albeit an evangelical Protestant rather than a Catholic example.

To the best of my knowledge, G. has no “peer-reviewed” publications (nor even a conference paper) on any of his idiosyncratic views about the origins of the NT writings and canon. In an endnote, he acknowledges a single popular – and, it should be noted, apologetic – study on the subject.⁴¹ It is indeed possible for a scholar to make worthwhile contributions around the edges of a discipline – in G.’s case, weighing in on the categories used to describe the backgrounds of two NT letters, and on the history of biblical scholarship⁴² – and thereafter to make exceptionally contentious assertions about matters central to the discipline without ever engaging scholarship about those central matters. The result is nonetheless baffling.

The “Protestant Historiographic Myth” of Origins as a Rhetorical Weapon

Apparently informing G.’s conceptual approach to the unity of the earliest apostolic church is what Jonathan Z. Smith critiques as the “Protestant historiographic myth.” In an influential essay, Smith exposes as deeply problematic the apologetic aim of many 19th and 20th century biblical scholars and church historians to find a pure “essence” (German: *Wesen*) within earliest Christianity.⁴³ To varying degrees, that original

⁴¹ Gerdmar, *Guds Ord räcker*, 201 n. 5 (referring to *ibid.*, 83), acknowledges one chapter in Michael J. Kruger, *Canon Revisited: Establishing the Origins and Authority of the New Testament Books* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2012), a study that likely was not vetted in a “peer-review” process. For a critique of that study as “fundamentally an apologetic work ... with an unfalsifiable thesis,” see Michael W. Holmes, review of *Canon Revisited: Establishing the Origins and Authority of the New Testament Books*, by Michael J. Kruger, *Religious Studies Review* 39/3 (2013): 176.

⁴² See above, on Gerdmar, *Rethinking*; *idem*, *Roots*.

⁴³ Jonathan Z. Smith, *Drudgery Divine: On the Comparison of Early Christianities and the Religions of Late Antiquity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1990), 1–45, esp. 39–45. Building on Smith, Petter Spijt, “The Protestant Historiographic Myth and the Discourse of Differentiation in Scholarly Studies of Colossians,” *SEÅ* 80 (2015): 169–

purity has been construed as having eventually been lost, due to the work of purported “heretics” who compromised an originally unadulterated gospel message as a result of influences, for example, from Judaism, Hellenism or “Gnosticism.” David Brakke critically encapsulates this approach, noting a precedent in Irenaeus’s late second-century polemics:

[T]he legacy of Irenaeus has continued to affect how historians think in at least two important ways. First, his view that Christianity started out as a single, fairly uniform religion and then became more diverse, whether for good or for ill, has remained influential. Scholars may not share Irenaeus’s confidence that Jesus himself taught a true Christian doctrine that later bishops faithfully preserved, but *they have at times reproduced his basic story in their own ways*. For example, the great nineteenth-century German theologian Adolf von Harnack argued that the essence of Christianity is to be found in the original preaching of Christ, but this essential Gospel developed into orthodox dogma through a process of adaptation to Greek culture (or “Hellenization”) that was both necessary and tragic.⁴⁴

Countering such a problematic oversimplification, Ismo Dunderberg criticizes “the dualistic conception of early Christianity as fundamentally divided into two opposed poles, with the early church at the one end, and the ‘gnostics’ at the other. This model,” holds Dunderberg, “obviously *presupposes too much unity at both ends*, at the ‘church’ end as well as in that of ‘the gnostics.’”⁴⁵

85 at 170, has recently pointed out that, as a result of utilizing the Protestant historiographic myth, “‘pure’ Christianity is placed *outside* of history and it is through subsequent interactions with the cultural and historical environment that the decline starts” (emphasis original).

⁴⁴ Brakke, *Gnostics*, 3 (emphasis added).

⁴⁵ Ismo Dunderberg, *Gnostic Morality Revisited* (WUNT 347; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015), 7 (emphasis added). Likewise, Brakke, *Gnostics*, 133, points out that even grouping together the allegedly “proto-orthodox” writings from early Christianity can result in distortions: “If the construction of a ‘Gnosticism’ obscured the characters of the persons and groups assigned to it, likewise the category ‘proto-orthodox’ can homogenize and so distort the diversity of pre-Constantinian Christianity.” See further, King, *Gnosticism*, 110–15; James A. Kelhoffer, “Second Clement and ‘Gnosticism’: The *Status Quaestionis*,” *Early Christianity* 8/1 (2017): 124–49 at 145–47; Brakke, *Gnostics*, 3–18.

However artificial or contrived, the identification of an ostensibly pure expression of apostolic teaching can serve as a powerful rhetorical weapon against whichever ancient or modern “impure” forms of Christianity one may wish to attack. In his study of the roots of theological anti-Semitism, G. ruefully critiques the essentialist presentations of ancient Judaism and of early Christianity by Harnack and other influential German theologians, and especially how those presentations undergirded anti-Semitism.⁴⁶ Nonetheless, *Guds Ord rækker* seems indebted to such a “Protestant historiographic myth” about the essential unity and doctrinal purity of earliest Christianity. Whereas Harnack’s characterizations combatted a feared Catholicization of German Protestant churches,⁴⁷ what is distinctive in G.’s line of reasoning is the adoption of an essentialist reconstruction of earliest Christian “apostolicity” to vaccinate Scandinavian evangelical churches against an epidemic of Catholic viruses.⁴⁸

Essentialist Characterizations: Biblical, Evangelical, Catholic

Another drawback of the book is a plethora of oversimplified presentations of biblical, evangelical and Catholic teachings. If there actually were, at present, a dominant Scandinavian evangelical position, a book like this one would hardly be needed. Gerdmar’s argumentative tone evinces, however, that he engages in what, for him, is a heated debate about defining his evangelical, charismatic tradition relative to (perceived) Catholic errors. Although he repeatedly and, apparently, accu-

⁴⁶ See Gerdmar, *Roots*, 141, 245–47, on Harnack, *Das Wesen des Christentums: Sechzehn Vorlesungen vor Studierenden aller Fakultäten im Wintersemester 1899/1900 an der Universität Berlin* (Leipzig: Hinrichs’sche, 1908).

⁴⁷ See, e.g., Wolfram Kinzig, *Harnack, Marcion und das Judentum: Nebst einer kommentierten Edition des Briefwechsels Adolf von Harnacks mit Houston Stewart Chamberlain* (Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2004), 6.

⁴⁸ To G.’s credit, his denunciations of Catholic teachings are devoid of anti-Judaism, in contrast to Harnack and others, who are justly critiqued in that regard in Gerdmar, *Roots*.

rately cites Catholic teachings in numerous official documents, his reading of those documents is consistently flat, overlooking the contexts, debates, compromises and reappraisals behind many of them. Despite his acknowledgment of considerable diversity nowadays on numerous issues among individual Catholic Christians,⁴⁹ G.'s process consistently follows the pattern of referring to official Catholic Church teaching, pointing out discrepancies with his construal of the biblical teaching, and implying that the views of any biblically literate Catholic would be irreconcilable with either the church or Scripture. It comes as no surprise that, in G.'s view, the charismatic evangelicals prevail on every issue over the stances he attributes to Catholicism. Still, the question remains: is there only one set of beliefs at the core of either of evangelical or Catholic faith? Such obvious oversimplification could nonetheless be attractive to those who would obfuscate complexities and porous borders between faith communities, trends and movements.

To me as an exegete, more troubling than G.'s simplistic presentations of evangelical and Catholic teaching is his disregard for diversity of expression within the biblical writings. According to G., "there is only one standard, the apostolic Christianity that we find in the New Testament."⁵⁰ For example, he concludes chapter 9 (on forgiveness, purgatory and penance): "The New Testament's teaching (*lära*, singular) about sin and grace is clear and leads to freedom and assurance based on grace and grace alone."⁵¹ Apparently, G. surmises that the disparate NT texts he discusses (from Mark; John; Rom; 1–2 Cor; Gal; Heb; and 1 John) in that chapter speak to one and the same "teaching about sin and grace."⁵² Some interaction with scholarship would doubtless yield a more complex picture of the NT theologies on those subjects.⁵³

⁴⁹ Gerdmar, *Guds Ord räcker*, 40.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 181.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 177.

⁵² *Ibid.*, 166–76.

⁵³ Already Vincent Taylor, *Forgiveness and Reconciliation: A Study in New Testament Theology* (London: Macmillan, 1942). See also, e.g., Ingrid Goldhahn-Müller, *Die*

Gerdmar unquestionably writes with the best intentions of defending biblical truth and the church's well being, as he understands them. Probably few, if any, believers would question his central thesis that "God's Word is sufficient." The questions *what is* God's Word, and *for what* it is sufficient, are naturally beyond the scope of this article. Those questions merit much more satisfactory and nuanced answers from theologians, including theologians from evangelical Protestant traditions.

POSSIBLE REPERCUSSIONS OF GERDMAR'S BOOK FOR CONGREGATIONAL LIFE, ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND CONSTRUCTIONS OF AUTHORITY

An antiheretical treatise does not exist in a vacuum but, on the contrary, can often be seen to emerge from a concrete (if, sometimes, unspecified) situation or conflict. *Guds Ord räcker* has the explicit purpose of influencing people's beliefs and choice of congregational affiliation. Having discussed, above, several shortcomings of *Guds Ord räcker*, in this section I suggest some potential adverse effects. In addition, I outline some implications of G's argumentation and make a few points pertinent to the book's origin, marketing and overall message.

Erecting Boundaries Can Impact both Congregational Life and Academic Freedom

A plausible outcome of this book is the erecting, or reinforcing, of a wall between some Swedish evangelicals and the academy. In the long run, no one benefits from such segregation, except perhaps those who foster

Grenze der Gemeinde: Studien zum Problem der Zweiten Buße im Neuen Testament unter Berücksichtigung der Entwicklung im 2. Jh. bis Tertullian (Göttinger Theologische Arbeiten 39; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989); David Konstan, *Before Forgiveness: The Origins of a Moral Idea* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2010); James K. Voiss, *Rethinking Christian Forgiveness: Theological, Philosophical, and Psychological Explorations* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2015).

it. Gerdmar's *regula fidei* insists on trust in the Bible as he defines its origins, authority and unified message. His teaching in *Guds Ord räcker*, if accepted, guarantees that one is experiencing the richness of God's Spirit. His readers do not, however, have the opportunity to learn why other scholars may think differently from the way he does. At best, his call for "faith in God's Word" is a gross oversimplification of a rich and complex revelation and its reception. At worst, mandating such a confession of faith can amount to an idolatrous bibliolatry with a focus not primarily on faith in God but, rather, on whether one agrees with a particular theology of revelation. Giving assent to G.'s views about what is "biblical" could, as a result, become determinative of a person's standing in a faith community. Although G. eschews the authority and infallibility of a pope, he implicitly assumes such a prophetic role – a mediator of God's revelation.

If giving assent to G.'s views were mandated in a faith community, the potential for manipulation, extremism and misuse of power could be alarming. This may not be idle speculation, given that nine Swedish "Christian leaders" contribute forewords to *Guds Ord räcker* endorsing its teaching.⁵⁴ Together, G. and those leaders could aspire to comprise a kind of evangelical curia. Anyone under the influence of such leadership who would defy the leadership's teaching could risk being ostracized. Nevertheless, for some believers it may be reassuring and empowering to trust in an inerrant Bible whose truth is corroborated by their experiences of the Spirit in an extemporaneous charismatic congregational setting unencumbered by a rigid, traditional liturgy focused on the Eucharist.

The advice given in this book not to convert to Catholicism but, rather, to rely on God's Word alone could also inspire overconfidence among those convinced that they possess a, or the, correct understanding of the Bible, as confirmed by their ecstatic experiences. Incredibly, G. promises his readers, "If we fill ourselves with the truth of God's

⁵⁴ See above, on Gerdmar, *Guds Ord räcker*, 9–19. Hopefully, the leaders who endorsed this book did not fully grasp its flaws and potentially deleterious effects.

Word, our life will be true (*blir vårt liv sant*) ... and we need no other canon.”⁵⁵ However well I may (or may not) understand the Bible, it would be ethically naïve to suppose that a correct understanding would *ipso facto* somehow make my life “true” – and, by implication, could render as *untrue* the lives of those who disagree with me. Society could well have reason to question the agenda of such overconfident followers of any religion or movement.⁵⁶

If giving assent to G.’s views were essential in an academic setting, serious questions could be raised, for example, about the students’ and the faculty’s academic freedom. A case in point is the new Scandinavian School of Theology (*Skandinavisk teologisk högskola*) in Uppsala that G. founded in 2014.⁵⁷ Of the nine people who endorse *Guds Ord räcker*, one is an adjunct instructor (*timplärare*) there,⁵⁸ and five of them are featured on the school’s homepage as “experienced servants of the Lord” who regularly give lectures on campus.⁵⁹ Additionally, one endorser serves with G. on the school’s governing board of trustees (*styrelse*).⁶⁰ Under what circumstances might it be permitted for a student or teacher to take issue with G.’s theological programme, as outlined in *Guds Ord räcker*, and, afterward, to remain in good standing at such an institution?

⁵⁵ Gerdmar, *Guds Ord räcker*, 27–28. On the term “canon,” (*rättesnöre*), see n. 21.

⁵⁶ For me, personal faith has come to include a readiness to acknowledge and wrestle with the numerous interpretive problems and dissonant voices that we inherit from the diverse biblical writings. Such problems, which, in all honesty, we must eventually face, commend humility and dialogue between exegetes of different confessions (or none), among different churches, and between Christian churches and other religions.

⁵⁷ On the founding of this new school of theology in 2014, see below.

⁵⁸ On Carl-Erik Sahlberg as a *timplärare*, see <https://www.teol.se/om-oss/larare-administration>.

⁵⁹ Those endorsers are Joakim Lundqvist, Sven Nilsson, Carl-Erik Sahlberg, Stanley Sjöberg, and Stefan Swärd. See, under “MiniCampus,” <https://www.teol.se/utbildning/sthl/medverkande>.

⁶⁰ The current seven-member board includes Stefan Swärd. See <https://www.merinfo.se/foretag/Skandinavisk-Teologisk-H%C3%B6gskola-AB-5569735078/2k42r3a-1d3g5/styrelse-koncern>.

The Construction of Authority amidst Contemporary Conflict

How G. shores up his standing to argue in *Guds Ord räcker* is paradoxical. On the book's dust jacket, he is presented as "Th.D. and *docent* in New Testament Exegesis at Uppsala University, as well as the founder and President (*rektor*) of the Scandinavian School of Theology." He cites his academic credentials from Uppsala University as a substantial source of his qualification to censure foundational principles of academic biblical studies, apparently to vaccinate Swedish Evangelicalism contra Catholicism's contamination. However indirectly and unaware, Uppsala University, and the academy in general, have contributed to G.'s claim of authority to make the pronouncements in this antiheretical treatise.

It would be thoroughly unremarkable for an uneducated pious preacher to proffer these views about the NT and Christian origins. I wonder why an eminently qualified colleague would do so. A definitive answer may prove to be elusive. In an autobiographical essay, "Bibeln under attack" ("The Bible under Attack"), G. offers some clues when he expresses alarm that not only at a secular Swedish university he attended in the 1970s but also nowadays, at certain Swedish evangelical schools of theology, what he deems an unacceptably critical stance toward the Bible and its authority is taught.⁶¹ For G.'s faith, deeply shaken by his early university studies in theology, relief did not come until seven years later, when, he shares, "the Holy Spirit came into my life."⁶² Very recently, in the church newspaper *Världen idag*, he gives a similar account of his earlier struggles, concluding that the church needs "knowledgeable and well educated theologians, who can both defend God's Word and can themselves go deep in the Word."⁶³ In both of these memoirs, there

⁶¹ See Anders Gerdmar, "Bibeln under attack," no date, <http://www.livetsord.se/kronikor/bibeln-under-attack#.WJnuChIrLdQ>.

⁶² *Ibid.*, Swedish: "den helige Ande kom in i mitt liv."

⁶³ See Gerdmar, "Bibelkritiken höll på att förstöra min gudsrelation" ("Biblical Criticism Nearly Destroyed My Relationship with God"), *Världen idag*, 3 February

is a subtle advertisement promoting G.'s own school – previously, Livets Ord Theological Seminary, and now the Scandinavian School of Theology – in contrast to what he deems as less trustworthy evangelical institutions.

For G. decades ago, a charismatic experience of the Spirit and an uncompromising stance on Scripture's reliability opened a door to renewed faith. Numerous scholars, myself included, can sympathize with the crisis of faith that G. experienced as a young theology student. Several coping strategies could be explored, albeit not in this article.⁶⁴ What is significant to note from the aforementioned memoirs, I suggest, is the *argumentum a fortiori* ("from the greater to the lesser"). As G. tells it, biblical criticism nearly destroyed his relationship with God. Therefore, how much more will biblical criticism threaten to destroy the relationship with God for any layperson who engages in biblical criticism? In Swedish charismatic circles today, there is probably no one within biblical studies who has greater academic merits or more extensive university experience than does G. himself. The greater example (G.'s nearly destroyed faith) is a model to laypeople – including current and prospective students. A likely effect of his argumentation would be to inspire fear of the academy in certain conservative theology students, who may believe that a church-related institution is their only safe alternative.

As the apostle Paul's life teaches us, people can change in unanticipated ways, and unexpected challenges can lead to unforeseen responses and developments (Gal 1:15–17; cf. Acts 9:1–9). In 1977, the distinguished German NT scholar Eta Linnemann caused a stir when she renounced her Lutheran tradition, her professorship, and "the his-

2017, <http://www.varldenidag.se/gastkronika/bibelkritiken-holl-pa-att-forstora-min-gudsrelation/Bbbqar!ECQPoluvMnt8qrVK4F@pNg>.

⁶⁴ Already in 1977, James Barr's critique of fundamentalism appeared (*Fundamentalism* [London: SCM, 1977; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1978]), and in 1984, Barr followed with numerous suggestions to recovering fundamentalists (*Escaping from Fundamentalism* [London: SCM, 1984] = *Beyond Fundamentalism: Biblical Foundations for Evangelical Christianity* [Philadelphia: Westminster, 1984]).

torical-critical method,” and eventually found a niche teaching at a Pentecostal seminary in Indonesia.⁶⁵ A contrast in how Linnemann and Gerdmar related to biblical scholarship after their respective alienations from Lutheran churches and after their charismatic experiences may also be observed: whereas the former disavowed her previous publications, even throwing them away and imploring others to do the same,⁶⁶ G. presents himself as a trustworthy authority largely on the basis of his academic standing as a *docent* in New Testament Exegesis at Uppsala University.

From Crisis to Attack: *Guds Ord räcker* in Its Argumentative Context

Doubtless, an expert in modern Scandinavian church history or the phenomenon of global Pentecostalism could add insights and contextualize *Guds Ord räcker* in ways that I (a Lutheran from the U.S. and living in Sweden since 2010) cannot. In such a contextualization, a few details could be relevant. In March 2014, pastor Ulf Ekman, the recently retired founder of the Word of Life charismatic megachurch and of the Livets Ord Theological Seminary in Uppsala, announced that he

⁶⁵ See Eta Linnemann, *Wissenschaft oder Meinung? Anfragen und Alternativen* (2nd enlarged ed.; Nuremberg: VTR, 1999); English translation: *Historical Criticism of the Bible: Methodology or Ideology? Reflections of a Bultmannian Turned Evangelical*, trans. Robert W. Yarbrough (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2001). The notion that the so-called “historical-critical method” is a single method is mistaken, however (see James A. Kelhoffer, “New Testament Exegesis,” 10–14).

⁶⁶ Linnemann, *Historical Criticism*, 20: “I regard everything that I taught and wrote before I entrusted my life to Jesus as refuse. I wish to use this opportunity to mention that I have pitched my two books *Gleichnisse Jesu ...* and *Studien zur Passionsgeschichte*, along with my contributions to journals, anthologies, and Festschriften. Whatever of these writings I had in my possession I threw into the trash with my own hands in 1978. I ask you sincerely to do the same thing with any of them you may have on your own bookshelf.” See further, Robert W. Yarbrough, “Eta Linnemann: Friend or Foe of Scholarship?” *The Master’s Seminary Journal* 8 (1997): 163–89.

would soon convert to Roman Catholicism.⁶⁷ Only a few weeks earlier had come the sudden announcement that the church's seminary would close at the end of the spring 2014 term.⁶⁸ That seminary is where G. worked for two decades (1994-2014) as a lecturer and, eventually, as President (*rektor*); the vast majority of G.'s time there was in close collaboration with Ekman.

Gerdmar's response to those startling developments apparently included two related undertakings: writing *Guds Ord räcker* and, already in 2014, founding the Scandinavian School of Theology, where he continues to work as President, as lecturer in New Testament Exegesis and Homiletics, and with fundraising for the school.⁶⁹ Although it would be gratuitous to over-historicize this book, thereby reducing it to a response to the particular situation from which it apparently arose, exegetes routinely base their work on the supposition that information about a writ-

⁶⁷ See Ulf Ekman, "Därför lämnar jag Livets Ord och blir katolik" ("Therefore I Am Leaving Livets Ord and Becoming Catholic"), *Dagens Nyheter*, 9 March 2014, <http://www.dn.se/debatt/darfor-lamnar-jag-livets-ord-och-blir-katolik/>. See further, Ruth Moon, "Conversion of Sweden's Most Influential Pastor Causes 'Pain and Disillusion,'" *Christianity Today*, 14 March 2014, <http://www.christianitytoday.com/gleanings/2014/march/sweden-pentecostal-converts-catholicism-ulf-ekman-word-life.html>.

⁶⁸ See Mårten Gudmundhs, "Livets ord lägger ner sitt teologiska seminarium" ("Livets Ord Closes Its Theological Seminary"), *Världen idag*, 11 February 2014, <http://www.varldenidag.se/nyheter/livets-ord-lagger-ner-sitt-teologiska-seminarium/cbbnbk!1rm086K5uBxGCCp9frg/>.

⁶⁹ See <https://www.teol.se/en/about-us/faculty-and-administration/anders-gerdmar>. See further, Andréas Glandberger, "Skandinavisk Teologisk Högskola hotas av nedläggning" ("Scandinavian School of Theology Threatened with Closure"), *Aletheia – Blogg & Tankesmedja*, 16 June 2015, <http://aletheia.se/2015/06/16/skandinavisk-teologisk-hogskola-hotas-av-nedlaggning>, who reported in June 2015 that, according to a letter sent by Gerdmar on behalf of the school, a decision about whether to close the new school would be made later that month (i.e., at the end of the school's first academic year) and that, in the meantime, donations were actively being sought from individual believers, congregations and businesses with the hope of keeping the school open. See further, on the school's reported annual profit margins and organization as a privately owned foundation, <https://www.merinfo.se/foretag/Skandinavisk-Teologisk-H%C3%B6gskola-AB-5569735078/2k42r3a-1d3g5>.

ing's origin, audience and opponents is invaluable for understanding the writing's message and purpose. Curiously, *Guds Ord räcker* never mentions Ekman's conversion.⁷⁰

Several decades ago, some academics wondered why James Barr, already an established scholar at the University of Manchester and, subsequently, at Oxford University, would take the trouble to write *Fundamentalism* and *Beyond Fundamentalism*.⁷¹ David Parker explains that although “[f]undamentalism is often not taken seriously in scholarly circles,” Barr viewed it as a powerful and growing movement that threatened both the church and the academy.⁷² To the extent that any of Barr's critiques in *Fundamentalism* could be applied to *Guds Ord räcker* – and I think that some of them could be quite germane – Barr's concern about the alarming growth of fundamentalist churches and movements in Britain and America during the 1970s and 80s would seem to be forebodingly relevant even nowadays in some parts of Sweden. One can only speculate how, in the decades subsequent to G.'s crisis as a young theology student, he might have developed as a scholar and person of faith if he had found adequate guidance from the remedies offered in Barr's *Beyond Fundamentalism*.⁷³

⁷⁰ Elsewhere, in an interview published in the church newspaper *Världen idag*, G. acknowledges Ekman's leadership and influence: “There are few people who have meant so much for faith in the Bible (*bibeltro*) and for God's congregation in Sweden during the last decades as Ulf Ekman has” (David Högfeldt, “Ekmans ändrade bibelsyn är största frågan” [“Ekman's Changed View of the Bible Is the Largest Question”], *Världen idag*, 6 November 2015, <http://www.varldenidag.se/nyheter/ekmans-andrade-bibelsyn-ar-storsta-fragan/cbbokf!LXcQMq8yLH658CeGQ5FJ0Q/>).

⁷¹ See above, on Barr, *Fundamentalism*; *Beyond Fundamentalism*.

⁷² David Parker, “Deprogramming a Cult: James Barr and Fundamentalism in Australia,” *Colloquium* 17 (1984): 18–26, esp. 18–20 at 18. Parker summarizes part of Barr's critique that fundamentalism is “a dogmatic and rationalist type of Christianity which interprets the Bible to harmonise with its own conservative tradition by means of false hermeneutics based on the concept of inerrancy or infallibility and by use of an outdated pre-critical popular philosophical framework” (19).

⁷³ Barr, *Beyond Fundamentalism*, holds that believers can indeed remain faithful to their evangelical tradition while rejecting the pseudo-intellectual accoutrements of fundamentalism.

It will be interesting to see how G.'s theology, biblical interpretation and new school of theology unfold. Perhaps, with time, he will find a way to moderate from the peculiar views of the NT and Christian origins marshaled in a book published on the heels of a close colleague's conversion and abandonment of their long-time educational and ecclesial endeavors. One lesson to be gleaned from early church history is that the particularities of an individual's or a movement's inception are not necessarily emblematic of subsequent developments. Regardless of where G.'s journey takes him, the academy has a responsibility to speak out when its credentials are being co-opted to legitimize the dissemination of such misinformation.

The End of Innocence: On Religious and Academic Freedom and Intersubjectivity in the Exegetical Craft – A Response to James Kelhoffer

Anders Gerdmar

Skandinavisk Teologisk Högskola
anders.gerdmar@teol.se

This is a response to James Kelhoffer's review of my book *Guds Ord räcker: Evangelisk tro kontra romersk-katolsk* [*God's Word Is Enough: Protestant Faith versus Roman-Catholic*].¹ I will argue that:

- 1) it is surprising that Kelhoffer writes, and *SEÅ* publishes, a review of a confessional and popular book, written and available in Swedish, whereas the review is in English so that the reader cannot evaluate Kelhoffer's critique;
- 2) that Kelhoffer makes the mistake to apply scholarly rules of the game to quite another game, confessional theology, and that he himself thereby takes on a role that is confessional rather than scholarly;
- 3) that modern theological academia must be multi-vocal, whereas Kelhoffer seems to favour that one consensus should rule the academic work;
- 4) that Kelhoffer fails to show that my positions in the scholarly issues he addresses are characterised by unsound scholarship; and

¹ James A. Kelhoffer, "Simplistic Presentations of Biblical Authority and Christian Origins in the Service of Anti-Catholic Dogma: A Response to Anders Gerdmar," *SEÅ* 82 (2017): 154–78; Anders Gerdmar, *Guds Ord räcker: Evangelisk tro kontra romersk-katolsk* (Uppsala: Areopagos, 2016).

- 5) that Kelhoffer, through baseless speculations about myself and Christian leaders who have endorsed the book, goes beyond the pale and erects a wall between his department at Uppsala University and large portions of Swedish Christianity.

THE BOOK AND ITS BACKGROUND

One Sunday in March 2014, an elderly woman asked me: “Do I need to become a Catholic to be a real Christian?” The background was that her pastor, Ulf Ekman, had announced his conversion to the Roman-Catholic Church, which caused an earthquake in his great network.

As a theologian in the same circles, I felt obliged to give a pastoral response, so I wrote a blog which surprisingly was shared by thousands.² This confirmed that there was a need for pastoral advice in this confessional network. When people continued to ask similar questions, I decided to write a book.

The Genre and Audience

In the foreword, I clearly state the purpose and target group for the book. The book is pastoral, written for normal churchgoers in Swedish free-church circles, and in no way aimed for the scholarly community, as I explicitly state on page 21:

I’m primarily writing this book out of this pastoral (counseling) perspective, not as a debate book in order to discuss with my Roman Catholic Colleagues. That would have been another, thicker book with footnotes aiming to meet all counter arguments. The purpose of the book is to offer guidance to many brothers and sisters in the faith, not least in Pentecostal-Charismatic circles, who are confused and at a loss.

² Anders Gerdmar, “Varför jag aldrig valde att konvertera till Rom,” *Anders Gerdmar*, 13 March 2014, <http://www.andersgerdmar.com/swedish/varfor-jag-aldrig-valde-att-konvertera-till-rom/699/>; English version: idem, “Why I Never Chose to Convert to Roman-Catholicism,” *Anders Gerdmar*, 15 March 2014, <http://www.andersgerdmar.com/blog/why-i-never-chose-to-convert-to-roman-catholicism/708/>.

Appreciating the genre and context of the book is thus necessary. The audience neither wants nor needs long footnotes with isagogical discussions. In terms of method and intention, the parts referring to the Bible belong within the field of biblical theology. Most of the readership is fairly unaware of issues such as the historicity of Corpus Paulinum, and the book was not written to discuss such questions. There is a place for these issues, but this was not the place. Thus, the book could be compared to a pastoral book written by a Lutheran on baptism or Catholic on the pope, or a pamphlet against faith in Jesus.

Kelhoffer is of course right in that the questions discussed in *Guds Ord räcker* are far more complex than such a book can accomplish. Unfortunately, he fails to appreciate that most of the problems he addresses have to do with confessional tenets of faith, and had he appreciated that, his review would probably not have been written. This also results in Kelhoffer's misguided critique that my book does not have the interpretive and critical depth it would have had, had it been written for an academic audience. Apparently, Kelhoffer's main concern is of another kind, namely to voice his own agenda.

The Reception of the Book

The reception of the book has been predominantly positive, with many reviews in both journals and blogs. Thankfully, a typical remark has been that the book is both to the point and friendly in tone. As an example, a leading Roman-Catholic blogger wrote a post called "Anders Gerdmar has not written an anti-Catholic book."³ The friendly tone is

³ Bengt Malmgren, "Anders Gerdmar har inte skrivit en antikatoisk bok," *Bengts Blogg*, 11 August 2016, <https://bengtalmgren.wordpress.com/2016/08/11/anders-gerdmar-har-inte-skrivit-en-antikatoisk-bok>. For more blog reviews, see <http://victura.nu/bloggat-om-guds-ord-racker>. Some reviews are written by scholars, see, e.g., Docent Dr. Christian Braw, "Gedigen granskning av den katolska katekesen" ("Substantial Scrutiny of the Catholic Catechism"), *Dagen*, 19 September 2016, http://www.dagen.se/kultur/gedigen-granskning-av-den-katolska-katekesen-1.778848?cx_art; Docent Dr. LarsOlov Eriksson, "Romersk-katolsk teologi jämförs med evangelisk"

natural to me, with many close friends and relations who are Roman-Catholic. I also cherish my opportunities to minister to Roman-Catholic charismatics.

It thus seems as if my aim to give pastoral advise to people has been accomplished, and combining a pastoral role with a scholarly one is quite common for theologians. I was ordained as *Verbi Divini Minister* before I pursued a scholarly career, and I see no problem combining the two roles.

It is therefore peculiar that Kelhoffer, as a chair in New Testament Studies, with such a fervour attacks a book which in no way is addressed to the scholarly community. That *Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok* publishes it as a peer-reviewed article, and that the reviewers approved it, is also surprising. Having myself been responsible for the editing of the annual,⁴ I have never seen any article addressing a pastoral book like this. It would be as surprising should Kelhoffer attack the confessional writings of a Roman-Catholic, an agnostic, or a feminist fellow exegete.

Trying to Give a Fair Description of Roman-Catholic Doctrine

Furthermore, Kelhoffer tries to describe my book as an “antiheretical treatise,” whereas even people who do not agree consider the book friendly and to the point.⁵ Yet, Kelhoffer criticises my way of defining what he calls “evangelical, charismatic tradition relative to (perceived) Catholic errors.”⁶ Firstly, I have not said that the Roman-Catholic church is heretical, nor that my discussion is anti-heretical. “Heresy” is normally distinguished from “schism.” It should not be used lightly, and

(“Roman-Catholic Theology is Compared to Protestant [Theology]”), *Världen Idag*, 9 September 2016, <http://www.varldenidag.se/recension/romersk-katolsk-teologi-jamfors-med-evangelisk/BbbphC!CGgfXZqIKTe3jXQc3ijGUQ/>. The latter notes that “Gerdmar’s presentation is objective (*saklig*) and illuminating (*upplysande*).”

⁴ *SEÁ* 68 (2003)–70 (2005).

⁵ Kelhoffer, “Simplistic Presentations,” 170, 173.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 168.

I do not. The only context is when I talk about heresy is in connection with Marcion and the Gnostics. I hold them to be heretical, a view that I share with most Christians.

Secondly, Kelhoffer is almost the first to criticise the tone in the book. As already noted, a Roman-Catholic blogger wrote that: “Anders Gerdmar *has not written an anti-Catholic book*,”⁷ and I do neither, as Kelhoffer claims, engage in any “heated debate.” I clearly state that “it is no secret that the book is written to argue for a Protestant position.”⁸ But instead of majoring on all kinds of popular Roman-Catholic piety, building a “straw man” and then criticising it, as many considerably more polemical books do, I chose to let the official Catechesis of the Catholic Church (CCC) describe Roman-Catholic faith.⁹ Kelhoffer argues that my reading is “consistently flat, overlooking the contexts, debates, compromises and reappraisals behind many of them.”¹⁰ However, every reader understands that discussing all of these questions would take several volumes, and that would not be a pastoral book. The CCC is an official teaching aid in the Roman-Catholic church, and of course, there is a world of theology and documents behind the CCC. I also know that there is a whole continuum of opinions among Roman-Catholic theologians (some of which I have known for almost 40 years), and I could have chosen to discuss only one of the party lines. But that had not been fair, and in an attempt not to misrepresent Roman-Catholic faith, or to present a biased view, I used the Catechesis.

⁷ See above, 181.

⁸ Gerdmar, *Guds Ord räcker*, 23. Swedish original: “Det är ingen hemlighet att boken är tillkommen för att ge skäl för en evangelisk position.” Worth noting here is that I do not confess to be evangelical, which is how Kelhoffer labels me. That is something else than the German *evangelisch* or the English “Protestant.”

⁹ It is available online: http://www.vatican.va/archive/ENG0015/_INDEX.HTM accessed 2017-06-02; a Swedish version is found here: <http://www.katekesen.se>.

¹⁰ Kelhoffer, “Simplistic Presentations,” 169.

RELIGIOUS AND ACADEMIC FREEDOM:
A CASE FOR FREEDOM OF FAITH AND INTERSUBJECTIVITY

Kelhoffer fails to appreciate that I am expressing opinions of faith and not scholarly ones. Under the heading “The Bible and Tradition,” Kelhoffer states that my notion of God’s Word is “particular to recent and contemporary fundamentalist Protestant traditions.”¹¹ Firstly, the view of Bible and tradition is a matter of faith, and not one of scholarship. As scholars we can describe, but not prescribe faith. Roman-Catholic doctrine has certain views, and they are, of course, matters of faith, just as Protestant doctrines. But there is no scholarly method to verify or falsify any of them.

When Kelhoffer therefore criticises my view of the Bible as being arbitrary, he himself is taking a confessional position, criticising my faith, and that of classical Christianity and of Protestantism.¹² For example, according to Luther, the Bible is God’s Word inspired by the Spirit of God.¹³ The same view is expressed in the foundational documents of Protestantism. The preface of *Confessio Augustana* says: “...the doctrine of which, derived from the Holy Scriptures and pure Word of God...” *The Lausanne Covenant*, which is accepted by most of the evangelical world, states in article 2 that: “We affirm the divine inspiration, truthfulness and authority of both Old and New Testament Scriptures in their entirety as the only written word of God.”¹⁴ In my pastoral capacity I agree to these tenets of faith, and as for *Confessio Augustana*, this would be the norm for ordained ministers in the Church of Sweden.

Faith is anyone’s right, even an exegete’s. Kelhoffer, the present author, or any other individual is, from an academic perspective, free to

¹¹ Kelhoffer, “Simplistic Presentations,” 159.

¹² For this, see Ingemar Öberg, *Bibelsyn och bibeltolkning hos Martin Luther* (Skellefteå, Artos, 2002).

¹³ *Ibid.*, 45.

¹⁴ *The Lausanne Covenant* is available online here: <http://www.lausanne.org/content/covenant/lausanne-covenant>.

think or believe whatever he wants about the Bible. However, Kelhoffer is not correct when he suggests that I am of the opinion that biblical truths do not need to be interpreted. This is contradicted firstly by *Guds Ord räcker*,¹⁵ and secondly by my scholarship, where I have specialised in how ideology and theology influences exegetes in their interpretation, especially in connection with antisemitism.¹⁶

When Kelhoffer criticises my view on tradition, he misrepresents my view on post-biblical creeds. Using the term “Tradition under the roof of Scripture” I argue for a positive view of tradition—but different from a Roman-Catholic one—which accords with a *Sola Scriptura*-position:

One can see Scripture as a roof under which a range of different things can exist, culturally different and time-conditioned expressions of faith, traditions, if you like. This is not wrong, but self-evident.¹⁷

I also say that the Nicene creed is “tradition in the best meaning of the word, but still subordinated to Scripture;”¹⁸ it can be seen as a summary of central scriptural tenets.

In sum, my views are not, as Kelhoffer states, “particular to recent and contemporary fundamentalist Protestant traditions,” but rather commonplace in a Protestant faith environment. But most importantly, all of these questions are confessional in character, to which scholarly rules do not apply.

¹⁵ Gerdmar, *Guds Ord räcker*, 28, 61, 70, 134f, 155.

¹⁶ See Anders Gerdmar, “Exegesis, Postmodernism, and Auschwitz: On Human Dignity and the Ethics of Interpretation,” *Studia Theologica* 51 (1997), 113–143; idem, *Rethinking the Judaism-Hellenism Dichotomy: A Historiographical Case Study of Second Peter and Jude* (ConBNT 36; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 2001); idem, *Roots of Theological Anti-Semitism: German Biblical Interpretation and the Jews, from Herder and Semler to Kittel and Bultmann* (Studies in Jewish History and Culture 20; Leiden: Brill, 2009); idem, “Baur and the Creation of the Judaism-Hellenism Dichotomy,” in *Ferdinand Christian Baur and the History of Early Christianity*, ed. Martin Bauspiess, Christof Landmesser and David Lincicum (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), to mention a few examples.

¹⁷ Gerdmar, *Guds Ord räcker*, 68f.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 69–70.

The Chimera of Objectivity and Exegesis as Intersubjective Dialogue

Kelhoffer argues as if there only existed one scholarly truth and no place for different interpretations. He fears that if my interpretations were correct, they would “foster the construction of a parallel moral and religious universe.”¹⁹ Firstly, this makes my book too important. Secondly, there is no such thing as *two* competing universes—there are many, and scholarship today is not uni- but multivocal.

During the 20th century, the Humanities and Social Sciences, including religion and theology, underwent a significant change, a *hermeneutical turn*. This is the discovery that there are indeed *many* symbolic universes, and that the positivistic idea of objectivity is only a chimera. Hans-Georg Gadamer says: “It is the tyranny of hidden prejudices that makes us deaf to what speaks to us in tradition;”²⁰ here, “tradition” could also refer to the texts we are interpreting. Some “truths” are so self-evident to us in the scholarly, cultural, and research tradition in which we are raised, that we are not aware of the prejudices and *Vorverständnis* which are there even before we begin our investigation.²¹ Instead, we must appreciate the necessity of people with different symbolic universes finding ways of cooperating instead of ostracising the Other.

During my doctoral study, research and teaching at Uppsala University 1995-2005, a majority of the members of the Higher Seminar in

¹⁹ Kelhoffer, “Simplistic Presentations,” 156.

²⁰ Hans-Georg Gadamer, *Truth and Method* (London: Bloomsbury, 2013), 282, as noted in Björn Skogar, *Viva vox och den akademiska religionen: Ett bidrag till tidiga 1900-talets svenska teologihistoria* (Stehag: Symposium graduale, 1993), 24.

²¹ Cf. Ludwig Wittgenstein: “Die Idee sitzt gleichsam als Brille auf unsrer Nase, und was wir ansehen, sehen wir durch sie. Wir kommen gar nicht auf den Gedanken sie abzunehmen” “Where does this idea come from? It is like a pair of glasses on our nose through which we see whatever we look at. It never occurs to us to take them off.” Ludwig Wittgenstein, L. 1986 (1945). *Philosophical investigations*. Translated by G. E. M. Anscombe (Oxford: Basil Blackwell), 45 (§103).

New Testament Studies were ordained or active in different confessional seminaries. There were Roman-Catholics, liberal and High-Church Lutherans, pastors from free-churches, feminists, perhaps someone with agnostic leanings. Faith was basically no issue: the discussion focussed on the subject matter. To me this was a fruitful experience, getting to see new perspectives. Sharp discussions on methods and results were normal. Outside the seminar the scholars were pastoring and writing confessional pieces on baptism, the Eucharist, prayer, worship, mysticism, or feminism.

An article by the feminist scholar Jane Flax, "The End of Innocence,"²² became a hermeneutical wake-up call for me, showing that all scholarly activity is dependent on perspective. This perspective stimulated the writing of a New Testament methodology where also Kari Syreeni contributed, the first chapter being called "Hermeneutical exegesis."²³ Under the heading "Fair Play" we stated the following:

We see exegesis as a cooperation between different scholars, just as you in a sport agree on different rules. The truth is that this belongs to the great advantages of the academy: different perspectives enrich one another.... The academy is the place of this interaction, and here, no reading has the monopoly, neither any of the modern nor the post-modern reading ... exegesis with a hermeneutical perspective can help us to show how interpretation is affected by our spectacles.²⁴

Different games have different sets of rules. In handball, it is forbidden to kick the ball, in soccer it is forbidden to touch the ball with your hands. When in the university, the scholar discusses scholarly problems, when in church, she preaches Mariology or *Sola Scriptura*. But in the scholarly game, no reading has inherent precedence, the value is in the strength of the arguments.

²² Jane Flax, "The End of Innocence," in *Feminists Theorize the Political*, ed. Judith Butler and Joan W. Scott (London: Routledge, 1992).

²³ Anders Gerdmar with Kari Syreeni, *Vägar till Nya testamentet: Metoder, tekniker och verktyg för nytestamentlig exegetik* (Lund: Studentlitteratur, 2006).

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 12.

Thus, in evaluating my book, Kelhoffer applies a scholarly set of rules to a book that follows another the set of rules, those of faith. I on my part defend the right of my fellow scholars to write whatever they wish in their confessional environments. However, in a scholarly discussion at Uppsala University or at Scandinavian School of Theology, only the academic set of rules should apply, and what cannot be convincingly argued in an intersubjective way has no weight in that discourse. Seemingly, Kelhoffer has also misunderstood the concept of intersubjectivity in the book mentioned. Intersubjectivity is a self-critical and respectful interaction between two interpreters:

Every fellow-player (*medspelare*) is a subject and since the rules of the game are those of scholarship, hypotheses and readings should be intersubjectively testable. That is, all fellow-players are able to see and assess each other's readings, and challenge them to prompt further re-examination and in-depth study.²⁵

Thus, even though Kelhoffer has the freedom to express whatever he likes regarding for example, Mariology or Pentecostal-Charismatic views; he can do so as a private person, but not in his capacity as an academic authority.

In fact, even the historical-critical method is biased. Daniel Patte rightly points to the need of a non-hierarchical relationship between "critical" and "ordinary" readers;²⁶ the exegetes often believe that they have the "true" interpretation, in contrast to people's "interested uncritical interpretations":²⁷

We presuppose that by contrast with these interpretations our critical interpretations are at least partially free from pre-understandings and partially objective;

²⁵ Gerdmar with Syreeni, *Vägar till Nya testamentet*, 12. Swedish original: "Varje medspelare är ett subjekt och eftersom det är vetenskapens spelregler som gäller bör hypoteser och läsningar vara intersubjektivt prövbara. Det vill säga: alla medspelare kan se och pröva varandras läsningar, och utmana till omprövning och fördjupning."

²⁶ Daniel Patte, *Ethics of Biblical Interpretation: A Reevaluation* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1995), 62.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 54–55.

that is, they are presentations of truths about the text ... that should be acknowledged by everyone.²⁸

Instead, any exegete unavoidably operates out of some kind of ideological perspective, such as one of faith or one of “methodical atheism.” From a hermeneutical perspective, methodical atheism is no more objective than methodical theism.

It is no longer possible to accept a hierarchical model where the historical-critical professor acts as a schoolmaster, lecturing others as to what is the proper interpretation, perhaps even imagining that she is objective, innocent and “just telling the truth.” Such a dated Enlightenment-oriented religious stream becomes an “academic religion,” where the professor is the high priest, the canon is whatever is in vogue, and initiation is to acknowledge a certain academic creed.²⁹

The sound aspects of post-modern interpretation put a halt to such a development. Objectivity is a chimera—in academia we should instead promote intersubjective dialogue between peers, as equals, each one acknowledging his or her perspective. Therefore, I cannot accept Kelhoffer’s way of telling what perspectives are acceptable. A Protestant Pentecostal-Charismatic stance is not more biased than a liberal Lutheran or a Roman-Catholic stance.

SOME EXEGETICAL ISSUES: IS PSEUDONYMITY AXIOMATIC? OR: CONSENSUS AS ARGUMENT

Kelhoffer raises some exegetical questions, and I am more than happy to answer them.³⁰ Below I argue that Kelhoffer oversimplifies the debate on Pauline pseudonymity, and that my views on canonicity is in line with one honourable line in the debate about canon.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 54.

²⁹ For the term “Academic religion,” see Skogar, *Viva vox*, and the very title. Unfortunately, he does not major on the term as such.

³⁰ To discuss all his questions would take much more space, so I choose the most important ones.

Firstly, Kelhoffer criticises my use of “Paul” when mentioning Ephesians and Colossians. Firstly, in my book, I do not enter into any isagogical debate, since this would be irrelevant to the audience. This was rather introduced by Kelhoffer. Moreover, as noted above, I do not deem it advisable to footnote a pastoral text or one written with the purpose to edify, nor a sermon, with isagogical questions. Few churches or denominations would. A church normally reckons with a canon, and lectionaries and different teaching aides are used without much isagogy. From a canonical point of view, the texts form a unity. Furthermore, as I will discuss below, the canon and its limits is another matter of faith that scholarship never can finally settle. It can describe, but not prescribe.

Secondly, as for pseudonymity, to Kelhoffer, the “debates about the non-Pauline authorship of Colossians and, especially, of Ephesians were settled decades ago for most biblical scholars.”³¹ To him, the pseudonymity of the two letters seems axiomatic, and he quotes a range of predominantly tertiary sources to support his view. Contrary to what one would expect from a scholar aiming for objectivity, Kelhoffer refers to no sources that support the authenticity of the letters, even though roughly 50% of the modern commentators on these letters do support their authenticity (see below). Due to my doctoral work on 2 Peter and Jude, I am well aware of the problems of pseudepigraphy, and in that study, I was able to show how a picture of two letters so petrified in research tradition could be turned upside down through reversed heuristics.³² I have also analysed research traditions long enough to not simply sing along with the choir.³³ In fact, the power of such traditions can often be stronger than the arguments themselves.³⁴ A scholar does not eas-

³¹ Kelhoffer, “Simplistic Presentations,” 163.

³² Gerdmar, *Rethinking*, 300–342.

³³ This has been a theme in my research ever since the beginning, see, for example, Gerdmar, *Rethinking*; idem, *Roots of Theological Anti-Semitism*, both quoted above.

³⁴ This is also true of the anti-Jewish and antisemitic prejudices in exegetical research tradition (see, e.g., *ibid.*).

ily break with the dominant research tradition, and the recalcitrant easily becomes ostracised. These are just the mechanics of “Normal science,” as described by Thomas S. Kuhn in his *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*.³⁵

Kelhoffer here simply follows one research tradition when he refers to a broad consensus, as if the pseudonymity of the letters were axiomatic. But this is to oversimplify the problem. I teach my students that “consensus is a road sign, but never an argument,”³⁶ which basically means: “go and look in that direction, but remember that only arguments count, not how many scholars agree.”

The debate on Ephesians and Colossians is not, as Kelhoffer indicates, settled. It is true that anyone reading the original texts of Ephesians and Colossians sees that they linguistically differ from other parts of the Pauline corpus, and some themes are treated here which are not discussed in other parts of Corpus Paulinum. But the discussion is ongoing. In a recent Brill volume, Paul and pseudonymity gets a thorough treatment.³⁷ For example, questions of language and style are intricate indeed.³⁸ Given that only Ephesians and the Pastoral Epistles are presented as written by Paul only—the rest seem to have co-authors or amanuenses involved³⁹—the question of Paul’s own style is extremely difficult.³⁹

³⁵ Thomas S. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1970).

³⁶ See my early contribution, Anders Gerdmar, “Consensus as Argument: Methodological Remarks on the Jesus Seminar,” *SEÅ* 62 (1997), 175–87.

³⁷ Stanley E. Porter and Gregory P. Fewster, eds., *Paul and Pseudepigraphy* (Pauline Studies 8; Leiden: Brill, 2013).

³⁸ So Andrew W. Pitts, “Style and Pseudonymity in Pauline Scholarship: A Register Based Contribution,” in *Paul and Pseudepigraphy*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Gregory P. Fewster (Pauline Studies 8; Leiden: Brill, 2013), 113–52.

³⁹ Rom: Paul as author, Tertius as amanuensis (16:22); 1 Cor: Paul and Sosthenes plus “my greeting with own hand” (16:21); 2 Cor: Paul and Timothy; Gal: Paul, probably with amanuenses (see 6:11: “with my own hand”); Eph: Paul, no mention of amanuensis; Phil: Paul and Timothy; Col: Paul and Timothy, probably amanuensis (see 4:18: “My, Paul’s, greeting with own hand”); 1 Thess: Paul, Silas, Timothy; 2 Thess:

As for pseudonymity, there is no agreement that such a device was accepted in early Christianity. To the contrary. Donald Guthrie, discussing Acts of Paul, which was forged by a presbyter, comments that “[t]he condemnation of the Asian presbyter ... who admitted the production of the Acts of Paul shows clearly enough that where the pseudonymous device was recognised it was not merely not tolerated but emphatically condemned.”⁴⁰ The presbyter was condemned and deprived of his office,⁴¹ as Tertullian notes:

... let men know that in Asia the presbyter who compiled that document, thinking to add of his own to Paul’s reputation, was found out, and though he professed he had done it for love of Paul, was deposed from his position. (*Bapt.* 17)

Moreover, the Muratorian Canon rejects the letters to the Laodiceans and the Alexandrians as forgeries on lines 63–67:

... there is current also (an epistle) to the Laodiceans, (and) another to the Alexandrians, (both) forged in Paul’s name to (further) the heresy of Marcion, and several others which cannot be received into the catholic church for it is not fitting that gall be mixed with honey.⁴²

Paul, Silas, Timothy, with Paul’s “signature” in 3:17: “I, Paul, write this greeting with my own hand. This is the mark in every letter of mine; it is the way I write”; 1 Tim: Paul; 2 Tim: Paul; Tit: Paul; Philem: Paul and Timothy, although it is indicated that Paul did not hold the reed (see v. 19: “I, Paul, write this with my own hand”). On amanuenses, see E. Randolph Richards, *The Secretary in the Letters of Paul* (WUNT II:42; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1991); and Jonas Holmstrand, “De paulinska breven,” in *Jesus och de första kristna: Inledning till Nya testamentet*, ed. Dieter Mitternacht and Anders Runesson (Stockholm: Verbum, 2006), 240–79, 243, who wisely abstains from terms as “authentic,” “psedopauline” and “deuteropauline” due to the complexity of the questions of authorship.

⁴⁰ Donald Guthrie, *New Testament Introduction* (Leicester: Apollos, 1990), 1019.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 1016.

⁴² Translation is from Armin D. Baum, “Authorship and Pseudepigraphy in Early Christian Literature: A Translation of the Most Important Source Texts and an annotated Bibliography,” in *Paul and Pseudepigraphy*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Gregory P. Fewster (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 21.

Hence, there is evidence of churches rejecting a forger, but there is no evidence of churches accepting a forgery. It is also very plausible that the early church “remembered” which texts were authentic and which letters Paul had written. Until it is proven that pseudonymous texts were accepted as authoritative in first century Christianity, we need to be careful in accepting hypotheses of pseudonymity.

In fact, it is only much later that Ephesians and Colossians came to be regarded as pseudonymous. Colossians is accepted as Pauline by, for example, Irenaeus (*Haer.* 3.14.1), Tertullian (*Praescr.* 7), and Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* 1.1). Its authenticity was first questioned in 1838, when Ernst T. Mayerhoff claimed to have found un-Pauline thoughts in the letter.⁴³ Moreover, Kelhoffer mentions the popular view that Colossians was written after the earthquake in 60/61 CE, since the disappearance of the city would make it impossible to refute that the letter was pseudonymous. This, however, remains a both highly hypothetic and unlikely scenario, yet to be substantiated. Lacking external proof, we are left with internal arguments, which places the questions of authorship in a quagmire with license for much speculation.

The first to question the authenticity of Ephesians was Edward Evanston in 1792. However, it is the first Pauline letter to be attested in early Christianity,⁴⁴ and Kelhoffer is not correct when he argues that the “debates about the non-Pauline authorship ... especially of Ephesians were settled decades ago for most biblical scholars”.⁴⁵ The consensus (even though I have argued that consensus is not an argument) in the case of Ephesians, is not at all that clear, as Harold W. Hoehner has

⁴³ Ernst Mayerhoff, *Der Brief an die Colosser, mit vernehmlicher Berücksichtigung der drei Pastoralbriefe kritisch geprüft* (Berlin: Mayerhoff, 1838); cf. Peter T. O’Brien, *Colossians-Philemon* (WBC 44; Grand Rapids: Zondervan), xlii. Whatever “un-Pauline thoughts” are, the argument easily becomes circular, since one first has to decide that the thoughts of the undisputed letters are the Pauline thoughts, and then exclude the other letters.

⁴⁴ See Harold W. Hoehner, *Ephesians: An Exegetical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002), 1–6.

⁴⁵ Kelhoffer, “Simplistic Presentations,” 163.

shown, listing all the commentators. Between 1901 and 2001, 52% (116) of these were for Pauline authorship, 40% (91) were against, and 8% unsure.⁴⁶ Between 1991 and 2001, the number was 50/50.⁴⁷ In fact, the classical issues of suggested impersonal nature of Ephesians; language and style; purported “un-Pauline” theology of Ephesians; and literary relationship between Colossians and Ephesians are all disputed, and to dogmatically say that the question is settled is simply not correct. It also remains to be proven that there were “Pauline schools” which could have produced forgeries of Pauline letters,⁴⁸ and that early Christianity would accept such products. Noteworthy is that Kelhoffer dismisses other “likely pseudepigrapha” including 1–2 Peter (but not Jude!?) by referring to consensus alone—not to any argument.⁴⁹

Therefore, the question remains: who is bowing his knees in Ephesians (Eph 3:1, 14 – note the anacoluthon)? Is it a forger, a disciple or the apostle? The question is very important, since a pseudonymous authorship of Ephesians and Colossians, among other things, heavily affects the understanding of Pauline Christology and ecclesiology.

In summary, in my book, I neither argued *for* nor *against* any pseudonymity of the letters, since isagogical discussions were irrelevant. Nevertheless, responding to Kelhoffer I note that his demand for a consistent isagogical treatment of New Testament texts used in pastoral or confessional contexts is unrealistic. As I have shown, when Kelhoffer, in connection with pseudonymity, describes the reference to Paul as author as “exceptionally contentious assertions about matters central to the discipline” he is not correct. They are not exceptionally contentious, since half or more of the commentators on Ephesians believed in its authenticity. Therefore, my views are not idiosyncratic, and the issue of Pauline pseudonymity is not that self-evident. In the name of objectivity, I think

⁴⁶ Hoehner, *Ephesians*, 19.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 20. Hoehner includes complete lists of these commentators.

⁴⁸ See e.g., John Reumann, *Variety and Unity in New Testament Thought* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), 105–28.

⁴⁹ Kelhoffer, “Simplistic Presentations,” 165.

Kelhoffer should have admitted to the unresolved status of the matter instead of neglecting the views of a large group of scholars.

How Canon Became Canon

Here I will argue that the limits of the canon is a faith decision, not something scholarship can decide, and that my views on canon history well accord with an honourable line of scholarship, whereas Kelhoffer critiques me for oversimplifying the long process of canonisation.

Firstly, the acceptance and reception of a canon is a normative matter of faith, whereas the historical development of it is a descriptive matter of history. The canon of, say, James Joyce or Winston Churchill is established only by enumerating the works written by that author whereas a canon of sacred texts is established by a faith community recognising them as sacred.

In my book, I am expressing a belief which is fundamental in Protestant faith, namely that the biblical texts are inspired. To believe or not believe in any canon is anyone's right, but scholarship cannot tell what is sacred and not, since it eludes scholarly verification or falsification. I also express the belief that the canon became as it is through the work of the Holy Spirit. The Scriptures...

... (what I call canon proper [*reell kanon*]) is a work by the Holy Spirit and was given to the Body of Christ as divine revelation. The Body of Christ in different places, independently of one another, acknowledged the biblical texts as the Word of God, since they understood that these are holy, inspired texts, and began using them in the worship just as they used the Old Testament...⁵⁰

This is close to what the nestor of textual and canon criticism Bruce M. Metzger says in his classic book on the canon:

...a high degree of unanimity concerning the greater part of the New Testament was attained among the very diverse and scattered congregations of believers not only throughout the Mediterranean world, but also over an area extending from Britain to Mesopotamia.⁵¹

⁵⁰ Gerdmar, *Guds Ord räckter*, 79–80.

⁵¹ Bruce M. Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and*

Secondly, my context and purpose is to argue against the Roman-Catholic view that the canon was established through decisions by the (Roman-Catholic) Church.⁵² My argument is partly historical: we do not have evidence that this is how canonisation took place. In spite of Kelhoffer's denial of this fact, I do tell the audience that the process was complex: some texts were antilegomena, there was a variation between the canon of different churches,⁵³ and so, with broad strokes of the brush, I try to explain how the New Testament emerged.

The scholarship around canonicity is large and active, with different opinions.⁵⁴ Again, to pretend that there is only one picture in the scholarly universe is simply an oversimplification. Not being a Marcion scholar, I am nevertheless standing in a long tradition which emphasises Marcion's and the Apologetes' importance⁵⁵ for the emergence of the canon. Metzger states that the church may well have established its canon as early as Marcion, but to him:

It is nearer to the truth to regard Marcion's canon as accelerating the process of fixing the Church's canon, a process that had already begun in the first half of the second century. It was in opposition to Marcion's criticism that the Church first became fully conscious of its inheritance of apostolic writings. As Grant aptly puts it, "Marcion forced more orthodox Christians to examine their own presuppositions and to state more clearly what they already believed."⁵⁶

Restoration (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), 75, 254.

⁵² I am not alone in saying this, cf., e.g., Harry Y. Gamble, "The New Testament Canon: Recent Research and the Status Quaestionis," in *The Canon Debate*, ed. Lee Martin McDonald and James A. Sanders (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002), 267–94, 291.

⁵³ Gerdmar, *Guds Ord räcker*, 80.

⁵⁴ As indicated by Lee Martin McDonald and James A. Sanders, eds., *The Canon Debate* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002), a 579 page long book showing a variety of scholarly opinions on the diverse issues in the canon debate.

⁵⁵ For Marcion in recent research, see John Barton, "Marcion Revisited," in *The Canon Debate*, ed. Lee Martin McDonald and James A. Sanders (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002), 341–54.

⁵⁶ Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament*, 99.

Later research, such as Barton's, minimise Marcion's influence,⁵⁷ but a suggestion as Metzger's remains a possibility. If 2 Pet 3:16 is early, this would support an even earlier beginning of the process.

Mentioning Marcion, Kelhoffer criticises my formulation: "attacks of Marcion and the other Gnostics."⁵⁸ He is right that later research has problematised the use of the (highly disputed) term Gnostic for Marcion, as well as the use of the term of gnosticism at large.⁵⁹ However, there are affinities between later "Gnostics" and Marcion, and to Heikki Räisänen, "The much-debated issue of whether or not Marcion was a gnostic is largely a question of definition," and he talks of Marcion's thought as "a brand of Paulinism already open to gnostic influence."⁶⁰

Also, the dates of the canonisation process are disputed, from the date of Canon Muratori,⁶¹ to suggestions that already Origen includes a canon list which could be regarded original.⁶² Trobisch's fascinating sug-

⁵⁷ According to Barton, "the New Testament books, or at any rate the central 'core' of the Gospels and the Pauline and Catholic Epistles, were already used very widely in the time before Marcion, and continued to be so used after him" (Barton, "Marcion Revisited," 343).

⁵⁸ Gerdmar, *Guds Ord räcker*, 82–83 at 83. Swedish: "Markions och de andra gnostikernas angrepp."

⁵⁹ The finds of the Nag Hammadi corpus was a game changer, as already appreciated by Giovanni Filoramo, *A History of Gnosticism* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1991).

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 107. "The much-debated issue of whether or not Marcion was a gnostic is largely a question of definition.... Marcion's notion of an inferior creator God, his negative view of the world and corporeality, and his criticism of the Old Testament come close to views commonly considered "gnostic," but other views of his do not.... The roots of Marcion's theology are in Paul's thought. Perhaps one can speak of 'a brand of Paulinism already open to gnostic influence.'" Antti Marjanen and Petri Luomanen, eds., *Companion to Second-Century Christian 'Heretics'* (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 107. See also Barton quoted above.

⁶¹ Peter Balla, "Evidence for an Early Christian Canon (Second and Third Century)" in *The Canon Debate*, ed. Lee Martin McDonald and James A. Sanders (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002), 372–85, 381.

⁶² Edmon L. Gallagher, "Origen via Rufinus on the New Testament Canon," *NTS* 62 (2016): 461–76, concludes: "If the argument favouring the basic authenticity of this list proves persuasive, then scholars will need to give consideration to this passage in

gestion of a very early canon manifested as “The First Edition of the New Testament” is also worthy of consideration,⁶³ and the research into the connection between the emergence of the codex, the use of *Nomina Sacra*, and an early canon may also support an early date.⁶⁴

In summary, in my book *Guds Ord rücker*, I have described the canonisation, as one should in a popular book, with broad strokes, but even in contemporary research the perspective I have presented is as legitimate as any other. My central historical thesis in the book does hold water. What Kelhoffer calls my “idiosyncratic views” are not peculiar at all.

Apostolicity as Criterion

Kelhoffer is able to gather more theology from my book than I thought was there:⁶⁵ he argues that I am expressing the “Protestant historiographic myth,” although he does not provide any examples from my text. His problem is that I refer to the unity of the earliest apostolic church, and am talking about the “sharpness, fullness and breadth (*bredd*)” of apos-

their histories of the canon. The recent dominant view has maintained that lists of Christian Scripture began to appear only in the fourth century with the work of Eusebius and those who followed him, an idea that also plays a significant role in the fourth-century dating of the Muratorian Fragment. The late dating of that text, though having gained popularity in the wake of the publication of Hahneman’s book, has never won a consensus.”

⁶³ David Trobisch, *The First Edition of the New Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000). For a seemingly balanced view on Trobisch’s suggestions, see Everett Ferguson, “Factors Leading to the Selection and Closure of the New Testament Canon: A Survey of Some Recent Studies,” in *The Canon Debate*, ed. Lee Martin McDonald and James A. Sanders (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002), 295–320, 312.

⁶⁴ See Tomas Bokedal, *The Scriptures and the Lord: Formation and Significance of the Christian Canon. A Study in Text, Ritual and Interpretation* (ThD Diss., Lund University, 2005), 128–56.

⁶⁵ See Umberto Eco et al., *Interpretation and Overinterpretation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992) and his musings over the eisegesis of the reviewers of *The Name of the Rose*.

tolic Christianity. Again, what I am doing in *Guds Ord räcker* is presenting a Protestant view on authority, not any religio-historical analysis. From a theological point of view I see no problem in stating that the Holy Spirit was able to form a sharpness, fullness and breadth in Apostolic Christianity. On apostolicity as criterion in early Christianity, F. F. Bruce concludes that “the teaching and example of the Lord and his apostles, whether conveyed by word of mouth or in writing, had axiomatic authority to them.”⁶⁶ From a historical point of view, of course the diversities in early Christianity must be explored as I have when criticizing the oversimplification of New Testament historiography that the Judaism-Hellenism dichotomy meant.⁶⁷ But that is less than relevant to the readers of *Guds Ord räcker*.

THE ETHICS AND THE POSSIBLE REPERCUSSIONS OF
KELHOFFER’S ARTICLE FOR CONGREGATIONAL LIFE,
ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND CONSTRUCTIONS OF AUTHORITY

The academic issues brought up by Kelhoffer are worth discussing, but in the last part of his article, he turns to foul play. He attacks not only me but the nine Christian leaders who have endorsed the book, and who represent a growing constituency in Swedish Christianity, by calling us an “evangelical curia,”⁶⁸ and warning others about coming under their, and my, influence.

In the heading above, taken from Kelhoffer’s article, I only substituted my name for Kelhoffer’s when he warns against our influence, since his way of arguing has implications for the relationship between congregational life and the Department of Theology at Uppsala University.

⁶⁶ F. F. Bruce, *The Canon of Scripture* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1988), 255.

⁶⁷ In my dissertation (Gerdmar, *Rethinking*), I tried to sketch a view of the early development beyond the Judaism-Hellenism dichotomy, and in *Roots of Theological Anti-Semitism*, I discussed how an anti-Jewish bias had distorted the historiography of early Christianity.

⁶⁸ Kelhoffer, “Simplistic Presentations,” 171.

Kelhoffer now enters the areas of church politics and academic politics, and criticizes not only my opinions in the book reviewed but also things irrelevant for a scholarly evaluation. The general tone in his presentation of my book is also highly ironical. For example, talking of “Gerdmar’s *regula fidei*,”⁶⁹ as if I had presented my own views as authoritative, Kelhoffer is purporting that I mean that my “teaching in *Guds Ord räcker*, if accepted, guarantees that one is experiencing the richness of God’s Spirit.”⁷⁰ I have neither expressed, nor thought anything of the kind. He also finds the following sentence in my text outrageous (although he does not quote it correctly): “If we fill our lives with the truth of God’s Word [here, he omits ‘and the Spirit of truth’] our life becomes true—and as exciting as it can be, and we need no other canon.”⁷¹ I cannot see that this is against the mainstream of Christian tradition, but Kelhoffer surprisingly calls for society(!) to take action and “question the agenda of such overconfident followers of any religion or movement.” Kelhoffer is free to have any opinion he wants on faith, but again he misrepresents my text and my views.

Finally, Kelhoffer claims that my views would lead to “an idolatrous bibliolatry with a focus not primarily on faith in God but, rather, on whether one agrees with a particular theology of revelation.” This being a baseless caricature of the message in the book, Kelhoffer only criticises a straw man of my theology.

A Caricature of Respected Christian Leaders

Furthermore, Kelhoffer goes beyond the pale when he not only critiques my book, but warns against the consequences of assenting to the views expressed there. This includes warning against what he ironically calls an

⁶⁹ Ibid.

⁷⁰ Ibid., 171.

⁷¹ Ibid., 171; cf. Gerdmar, *Guds Ord räcker*, 27–28. Swedish original: “Om vi fyller oss med Guds ords sanning och sanningens Ande blir vårt liv sant – och hur spännande som helst, och vi behöver inget annat rättesnöre.”

“evangelical curia,” comprised of myself and the nine respected Christian leaders who endorsed my book. Kelhoffer argues that:

If giving assent to G.’s views were mandated in a faith community, *the potential for manipulation, extremism and misuse of power could be alarming*. This may not be idle speculation, given that nine Swedish “Christian leaders” contribute forewords to *Guds Ord räckert* endorsing its teaching. Together, G. and those leaders could aspire to comprise a kind of evangelical curia. Anyone under the influence of such leadership who would defy the leadership’s teaching could risk being ostracized (italics mine).⁷²

See also Kelhoffer’s footnote 54 where he states: “Hopefully, the leaders who endorsed this book did not fully grasp its flaws and potentially deleterious effects.”

The first question is whether this is the verdict of the chair of New Testament Exegesis at Uppsala University, or if it is to be understood as a private opinion. If the first is the case, a high official of a state university is caricaturing, not only a colleague, but a great portion of Swedish Christianity, both their historical traditions and current practice. This would be less than wise. Is a classical Protestant position, as presented in my book, to be ostracized from a Swedish state university?

Secondly, the Christian leaders (by Kelhoffer ironically put within quotation marks) and called “an evangelical curia,” are indeed highly respected in Sweden. Among them are legends like Olof Djurfeldt, the long-term editor of the Christian newspaper *Dagen*; docent Dr. Carl-Erik Sahlberg, once a high-ranking candidate for archbishop in the Church of Sweden and instrumental for the “Miracle in Clara,”⁷³ a rare combination of social work and evangelism; pastor Stanley Sjöberg, a leading free-church pastor for half a century; pastor Sven Nilsson, nestor of the charismatic movement; Stefan Swärd and Stefan Gustavsson,

⁷² Kelhoffer, “Simplistic Presentations,” 171.

⁷³ “Miraklet i Klara” (The Miracle in Klara) was a documentary in national Swedish TV describing the remarkable Christian social, evangelistic and charismatic work in S:ta Clara, an independent parish in Church of Sweden tradition in Stockholm. The visionary leader of this was docent Carl-Erik Sahlberg, who also teaches at Scandinavian School of Theology.

leading evangelical profiles; Hans Augustsson and Linda Bergling, with highly respected counseling ministries; and more. Where is the evidence that these leaders are forming any curia, or are perceived as one, other than in Kelhoffer's imagination? Furthermore, given Kelhoffer's demands for thorough scholarly argumentation, *where is the evidence to substantiate Kelhoffer's offensive and insulting talk of "manipulation, extremism, and misuse of power?" and that "[a]nyone under the influence of such leadership who would defy the leadership's teaching could risk being ostracized.*"⁷⁴ Does he understand that such statements attack large portions of Swedish Christianity? And does he understand that such statements indeed erect a wall between his institution and these groups?

A final example of this tendency is Kelhoffer's suggestion that my advice to rely on God's Word alone would lead to an "overconfidence among those convinced that they possess a, or the, correct understanding of the Bible, *as confirmed by their ecstatic experiences.*"⁷⁵ But there is no mention of such an argument in the book, rather, I state that every kind of prophecy and similar charismatic phenomena is subordinated to the written Word of God,⁷⁶ and so, his statement seems rather to be another attack on Pentecostal-Charismatic Christianity according to Kelhoffer's own unsubstantiated picture of the same. He is free to do so, but it represents a large group in the constituency of the Department of Theology at Uppsala University. What is more, in Sweden, the movement is on the rise, serving 250 000 people, while classical free-churches and evangelical Lutherans are at 305 000, declining.⁷⁷ As the fourth "church tradition" with 500–600 million adherents,⁷⁸ it also represents the fastest growing constituency of Christianity world-wide (the four

⁷⁴ Quoted above.

⁷⁵ Kelhoffer, "Simplistic Presentations," 171 (emphasis mine).

⁷⁶ Gerdmar, *Guds Ord räcker*, 28.

⁷⁷ Statistics are from Torbjörn Aronson, pers. comm. 2017-06-12.

⁷⁸ Todd M. Johnson, David B. Barrett, and Peter F. Crossing, "Christianity 2010: A View from the *New Global Atlas of Global Christianity*," *International Bulletin of Missionary Research* 34/1 (2010): 29–36; cf. World Christian Database, <http://www.worldchristianitydatabase.org/wcd>.

“traditions” being Roman-Catholics, Orthodox, Protestants, and Pentecostal/Charismatic⁷⁹). To my mind, informing this growing movement in the areas of exegesis and hermeneutics is an important task, whereas Kelhoffer without substantiation expresses his prejudice about this “fourth tradition” of Christianity.

Erecting Boundaries That Can Impact Both Congregational Life and Academic Freedom

Kelhoffer’s remarks about an evangelical curia, and his attack on classical Protestant views of the Bible and its interpretation not only lack substantiation, but are also “erecting boundaries that can impact both congregational life and academic freedom.” The latter is a quote from Kelhoffer’s article, suggesting that the standpoints in my book would erect such boundaries, but it is Kelhoffer’s views that threaten to do so.⁸⁰ If Kelhoffer’s views would be the only legitimate ones in his department, the relationship between large parts of Pentecostal-Charismatic Christianity and Uppsala University would be at risk. Uppsala University is a state university, and its professors are public servants. Is a confession to certain tenets of exegetical research tradition obligatory to be part of the New Testament department at Uppsala University? Of course not.

Moreover, Kelhoffer, again without any evidence, questions the academic freedom of the teachers and students at Scandinavian School of Theology (*Skandinavisk teologisk högskola*). This is baseless. The teachers are well qualified, a majority from Lund and Uppsala University, and those of our graduates that have pursued academic careers, have continued their studies in prestigious universities. Several have earned their doctorates.⁸¹ As for Kelhoffer’s questioning of religious freedom, students come from, and graduates are serving in, a variety of Christian

⁷⁹ For this categorisation, see Douglas Jacobsen, *The World’s Christians. Who They are, Where They are, and How They Got There* (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012).

⁸⁰ Kelhoffer, “Simplistic Presentations,” 170.

⁸¹ Under its present and previous brand (Livets Ord Theological Seminary) the school has graduated 102 theologians with Bachelor’s or Masters degrees.

denominations (ranging from Roman-Catholic to free-church contexts). In the academic classroom of Scandinavian School of Theology only one thing counts: intersubjectively testable arguments. Suggesting anything else without substantiation is a break against collegial spirit.

Kelhoffer also questions my standing as docent at Uppsala University due to my positions in *Guds Ord räcker*. As for my own credentials or integrity, I will not try to vindicate myself.⁸² I can only note that my doctorate and docent competency from Uppsala University have never been questioned, nor has my teaching abilities at the same institution, where I also mentored new academic teachers for a number of years. I have been elected into several scholarly societies, I am active in international research, in publishing, conferences and different networks. Kelhoffer surprisingly suggests that my academic standing should be incompatible with writing pastorally or arguing confessional theological standpoints. But every exegete, including agnostics, read the texts through the spectacles of their ideology. And Kelhoffer's suggestion that I could not combine my academic standing as docent in New Testament exegesis at Uppsala University and my pastoral role just because I stand for a classical Protestant view of the Bible is not feasible. The university did not grant me the doctorate or the standing as docent based on anything but my scholarly and pedagogical work. According to the Swedish law of freedom of religion, they could not ask about my faith, even though I know that my road may have been steeper because of my former church affiliation.⁸³ To question someone's credentials on the grounds of her faith is as wrong for a liberal as for a conservative colleague.

⁸² In his initial pleasantries Kelhoffer also mentions this.

⁸³ This meant extra work for me when applying to the doctoral program just because I was member of Word of Life, and I had to earn my credentials the hard way. The same was true for Roman-Catholic scholars in Sweden a generation before, according to my friend and first supervisor René Keiffer RIP, who in spite of highest marks on his research was side-stepped for promotion because of being Roman-Catholic. Such things of course has been a constant experience for women, as well as for different minority groups.

Using Speculation and Vague, Pejorative Categorisations

In trying to contextualise *Guds Ord räcker*, Kelhoffer admits that he, as a Lutheran from the U.S. and living in Sweden, cannot put his evaluation into context. I agree; his judgement of the Christian leaders and the Swedish situation shows a lack of understanding and discernment. Kelhoffer also tries to give a psychological background to my book. That Ulf Ekman's conversion was a decisive factor is no secret, and Kelhoffer questions why I am not mentioning Ekman.⁸⁴ The answer is that there is something called honour; I did not want the book to be considered a personal attack, because it was not. In spite of obvious disagreements, I also acknowledge the many good things Ekman has done, for example that he, as a rare Pentecostal-Charismatic leader in Europe, invested 20 years of efforts in building an academic institution. Kelhoffer, again merely speculatively, suggests that the writing of *Guds Ord räcker* had to do with the closing of Livets Ord Theological Seminary. However, the new school, Scandinavian School of Theology, is founded on a vision and a calling, it was not founded in reaction to the Roman-Catholic Church or anything else. Moreover, the bylaws of the school expressly states its "openness to all of the Body of Christ."⁸⁵ Thus, Kelhoffer's speculations lack foundation.

Even more questionable is his use of the term "fundamentalist" to describe my views.⁸⁶ This kind of "name calling" is of course inappropriate in scholarly works. According to Kelhoffer, my views are "particular to recent and contemporary fundamentalist Protestant traditions."⁸⁷ Us-

⁸⁴ Kelhoffer, "Simplistic Presentations," 177.

⁸⁵ *Stiftelseurkund och stadgar för Stiftelsen Skandinavisk teologisk högskola* (Sverige, 2014).

⁸⁶ The meaning of the term has changed considerably since *The Fundamentals*, published from 1910 to 1915, which represented classical Protestant views. Today, the term "fundamentalist" is even less helpful in scholarly contexts than when Barr wrote his books.

⁸⁷ Kelhoffer, "Simplistic Presentations," 159.

ing the word fundamentalist, he is not only wrong, but employs a highly ambiguous and pejorative term, something which scholars should never do. Firstly, the term is highly disputed, and often used in relation to American right-wing politics, or Islamic or Hindu fundamentalism. That is, it is often used for anything that one abhors. Secondly, his use of the term fundamentalist is an *ad hominem* argument, which also is unworthy of scholarly discussion. Kelhoffer qualifies the term by referring to the outdated and highly Americo-centric books by James Barr, who writes that:

while the word ‘fundamentalist’ does carry the suggestion of narrowness, bigotry, obscurantism, and sectarianism, it remains an open question whether this suggestion, though unpleasant, is not a true and just one.⁸⁸

It is not fair to refer to such descriptions when evaluating me or my book. Kelhoffer also refers to David Parker to describe fundamentalism (the title of Parker’s work is “Deprogramming a Cult” [!]):

a dogmatic and rationalist type of Christianity which interprets the Bible to harmonise with its own conservative tradition by means of false hermeneutics based on the concept of inerrancy or infallibility and by use of an outdated pre-critical popular philosophical framework.⁸⁹

Returning to a psychological reflection, Kelhoffer muses on what would have happened had I “found adequate guidance from the remedies offered in Barr’s *Beyond Fundamentalism*.”⁹⁰ Kelhoffer then refers Barr’s view that “believers can indeed remain faithful to their evangelical tradition while rejecting the pseudo-intellectual accoutrements of fundamentalism.”⁹¹ However, if Kelhoffer only had trusted my hermeneutical-exegetical perspective, as practiced in my research and *Vägar till Nya*

⁸⁸ James Barr, *Fundamentalism* (London: SCM, 1981), 3.

⁸⁹ Kelhoffer, “Simplistic Presentations,” 177, n. 72; cf. David Parker, “Deprogramming a Cult: James Barr and Fundamentalism in Australia,” *Colloquium* 17 (1984): 18–26, 19.

⁹⁰ Kelhoffer, “Simplistic Presentations,” 177.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 177, n. 73.

testamentet, he would not have needed to speculate like this. It certainly does not present “outdated pre-critical popular” views, but a philosophically quite fresh and realistic approach:

The hermeneutic is primary, and exegesis “rests” in the hermeneutic ... This does not mean an unrestrained subjectivity, but an exegesis with a hermeneutical consciousness of the conditions of subjectivity and the demands of intersubjectivity.

The purpose is an exegesis which is hermeneutically conscious, but that is also as far as one gets within the academic rules of the game. With only those rules, one can hardly answer the questions put in confessional or other contexts where Bible texts have direct relevance for faith.... In fact, it begins with our identity as interpreters and our community of interpretation, then to exegesis of texts, then to attempts to integrate the results into our situation in life, et cetera....

What we as professional exegetes can offer is methods, techniques and tools—and hermeneutical reflection—plus our suggestions for interpretations of New Testament texts. This does not mean that we see exegetes or other scholars as priests in an academic religion. It is churches or other communities and individuals that must grapple with the text out of the respective interpretive environment and tradition, or in dialogue with other traditions. It is in order to support the interpreter on his or her way to an individual, responsible, intersubjectively testable interpretation we have presented techniques, methods and models for New Testament exegesis ... and we need hermeneutical consciousness using them.⁹²

⁹² Gerdmar with Syreeni, *Vägar till Nya testamentet*, 134–35. Swedish original: “Hermeneutiken är alltså primär, och exegetiken ’vilar’ i hermeneutiken.... Det betyder inte heller en ohämmad subjektivitet, bara utan en exegetik med hermeneutiskt medvetande om subjektivitetens villkor och intersubjektivitetens krav. Målet för exeges av nytestamentliga texter är då en saklig, hermeneutiskt medveten exeges, men det är också så långt man kommer med akademiens spelregler. Med endast dessa spelregler kan man knappast svara på de frågor man ställer i konfessionella eller andra sammanhang där bibeltexten har direkt relevans för tron.... Faktiskt med början i vår identitet som tolkare och vår tolkningsgemenskap, sedan till exeges av texter, sedan till försök att införliva resultaten i vår livssituation, etc.... Vad vi som fackexegeter kan erbjuda är metoder, tekniker och redskap – och hermeneutisk reflektion – samt våra förslag till tolkningar av nytestamentliga texter. Det betyder inte att vi ser exegeter eller andra forskare som präster i en akademisk religion. Det är kyrkor eller andra gemenskaper och individer har att brottas med texten utifrån repektive tolkningsmiljö och

This was and is my interpretive strategy, and if using Barr's and Parker's definitions, there is certainly nothing "fundamentalist" in any of my books, but rather twenty years of scholarship, from my first scholarly article⁹³ to my latest, with a thoroughgoing hermeneutical and ideology-critical perspective. This does not collide with my pastoral position. What I, or any other docent at Uppsala University does in church, Roman-Catholic, liberal or conservative Lutheran, free-church—or if she does not attend any—and whether she is writing books on *Sola Scriptura* or on the Rosary, is none of the business of the Uppsala University staff.

From Foul Play to Fair Play

In this response, I have shown

- 1) that my book *Guds Ord räcker* is a pastoral book written for a popular and confessional audience, not meant for the scholarly guild;
- 2) that the book, contrary to Kelhoffer's description, has been well received, both for its attempt to objectivity and its friendly tone;
- 3) that my views on the Bible and the relationship between Scripture and tradition are confessional and can neither be verified nor falsified with scholarly methods; and
- 4) that the exegetical talking points brought up by James Kelhoffer are precisely *talking points*: my views on Pauline pseudonymity, or the formation of the canon, or the emergence of early Christianity are not extreme, but as well argued as any other, and shared with a considerable part of the scholarly guild.

The last part of his article has to do with Kelhoffer's ethics where he speculates about groups in Swedish Christianity, using vague and pejo-

tolkningstradition, eller i samtalet mellan olika tolkningstraditioner. Det är för att stödja tolkaren på vägen till en sådan egen, ansvarig, saklig och intersubjektivt prövbar tolkning som vi här presenterat tekniker, metoder och modeller för nytestamentlig exegetik.... och en hermeneutisk medvetenhet när vi använder dem."

⁹³ Anders Gerdmar, "Exegesis, Postmodernism, and Auschwitz – On Human Dignity and the Ethics of Interpretation," *Studia Theologica* 51 (1997), 113–43.

rative descriptions. Even worse, he is caricaturing a whole group of respected leaders as an evangelical curia with baseless insinuations of them ostracising people with other views. This is foul play, and should not have been accepted in a scholarly periodical. However, to my mind there is a way forward. As Kari Syreeni and myself note in the foreword to *Vägar till Nya testamentet*, scholars with different background can agree on methods. Their diverse backgrounds are not decisive, and different perspectives can be enriching.⁹⁴ In our cooperation, we called this “fair play.” In closing, I would like to quote another author:

A university shall not allow discrimination based on religious confession or other factors. *Opportunities to study and conduct research in theology and religious studies shall be open not just to liberal Lutherans, (liberal) Catholics and (liberal?) agnostics but, indeed, to all who value critical examination and scholarly methods of inquiry.*⁹⁵

Rereading this text, which is from Kelhoffer’s own installation lecture at Uppsala University, I see that we are very much in agreement when it comes to both methodological and hermeneutical questions.

Let us, then, open up for dialogue between all competent exegetes with different perspectives: liberal or conservative Lutherans, liberal or conservative Catholics, agnostics and Pentecostal-Charismatics, and more. In doing so, real “fair play” can begin, and anyone interested in informed readings of the New Testament can benefit from the products of our common toil. But a precondition for this is an “end of innocence”—the naïve idea that others are biased, but I myself am not.

⁹⁴ Gerdmar with Syreeni, *Vägar till Nya testamentet*, 8, 13.

⁹⁵ James A. Kelhoffer, “New Testament Exegesis as an Academic Discipline with Relevance for Other Disciplines,” *CurBR* 11 (2013): 221 (emphasis mine).

A Diverse Academy Recognizes No Boundaries for Critical Inquiry and Debate: A Rejoinder to Anders Gerdmar

JAMES A. KELHOFFER

Uppsala University

james.kelhoffer@teol.uu.se

Therefore, I believe it is essential to “move” biblical interpretation’s primary place from the academy to the church and [to move] its framework to the universal Christian faith. Then biblical interpretation will be in its correct milieu.¹

οὐ γάρ ἐστιν κρυπτὸν ὃ οὐ φανερόν γενήσεται οὐδὲ ἀπόκρυφον
ὃ οὐ μὴ γνωσθῆι καὶ εἰς φανερόν ἔλθῃ (Luke 8:17)

I would like to thank Anders Gerdmar (G.) for such a thoughtful and stimulating response to my review article of his book *Guds Ord räcker*.² The issues at stake are significant and deserve to be debated in academic forums, including this journal, and can be meaningful for scholars, lay

¹ Anders Gerdmar, “Bibelforskningens primära ‘plats’” [“The Primary ‘Place’ of Biblical Scholarship”], *Stefan Swärd: Allt mellan himmel och jord*, 15 December 2012, <http://www.stefansward.se/2012/12/15/har-kommer-ett-till-gastblogginlagg-av-anders-gerdmar-2>. Swedish original: “Därför tror jag att det är väsentligt att ‘flytta’ bibeltolkningens primära plats från akademien till kyrkan och dess ram till den allmänliga kristna tron. Då får bibelforskningen sin rätta miljö.”

² Anders Gerdmar, “The End of Innocence: On Religious and Academic Freedom and Intersubjectivity in the Exegetical Craft – A Response to James Kelhoffer,” *SEÅ* 82 (2017): 179–209, responding to James A. Kelhoffer, “Simplistic Presentations of Biblical Authority and Christian Origins in the Service of Anti-Catholic Dogma: A Response to Anders Gerdmar,” *SEÅ* 82 (2017): 154–78, review of Gerdmar, *Guds Ord räcker: Evangelisk tro kontra romersk-katolsk [God’s Word Is Sufficient: Evangelical Faith against Roman Catholic (Faith)]* (Uppsala: Areopagos, 2016).

people, and the general public. In his response, G. outlines five main objections to my review. This rejoinder will address each of those objections.³

My principal theme will be that scholarly arguments made in a popular book are subject to scholarly review. Gerdmar's claim to an exemption from such critique on the grounds that he addresses a popular audience amounts to a plea for special treatment. Since G. repeatedly presents his theology as if it were consistent with sound exegetical scholarship, he applies a double standard to assert credibility from scholarship without engaging in pertinent scholarly debates on some level, even in a popular book. This is where G.'s use of his scholarly credentials is relevant: he writes as a "docent" in New Testament Exegesis at Uppsala University, and uses that academic standing to add weight to his teaching. This rejoinder will also object to G.'s inference that calling into question one scholar's views of biblical literature suggests a lack of tolerance for diverse viewpoints. On the contrary, any worthwhile academic discourse requires the freedom to both give and receive critique and to engage in debate.

APPEALS TO SCHOLARSHIP IN A POPULAR BOOK MAY BE SUBJECT TO REVIEW

First, G. holds that an academic journal should not review a popular book and that, in any case, such a review should have been published only in the same language as the book under review.⁴ I am of the opin-

³ I thank the editors of *SEÅ* for offering Gerdmar the opportunity to respond to my review article and for allowing me to respond in this rejoinder. Due to the journal's publication schedule, after G.'s response arrived I was given one week to submit this reply. Given the word limit and schedule prescribed by the editors, this rejoinder is selective.

⁴ Gerdmar, "Innocence," 179: "[I]t is surprising that Kelhoffer writes, and *SEÅ* publishes, a review of a confessional and popular book, written and available in Swedish, whereas the review is in English so that the reader cannot evaluate Kelhoffer's critique."

ion that any material in the public domain pertinent to scholarship can, and should, inform academic discourse. The question of what is pertinent can, and should, be debated. But, in any case, it is unclear to me just who within, or outside of, the academy would be qualified to judge for the academy as a whole what should or should not be subject to scholarly review. One Swedish theologian, Christian Braw, describes G.'s book as last "fall's most discussed book in Swedish Christendom."⁵ It is perhaps not surprising that a writing of such interest, by an exegete and supported by numerous interpretations of biblical literature, would be of interest to an exegetical journal.

To be shielded from critique of the scholarly positions taken would, in effect, remove the author from a shared discourse, placing him outside of it – or even above it – unless and until he decides that he is engaging with scholars rather than a popular audience. Gerdmar chose to publish his views in a popular book rather than, first, to subject them to "peer review" and, subsequently, to produce a version for the general public. In this journal, moreover, he has the opportunity to defend those views in an academic forum.

The objection to my responding in English to a Swedish-language book is curious. Gerdmar himself wrote an impressive monograph in English, treating German-language exegetes and theologians.⁶ I believe that readers of that monograph can evaluate his earnest critiques and, likewise, that readers of my review article can evaluate my assessment of G.'s Swedish-language book. Presumably, G. and I would agree that biblical studies is an international and multilingual discipline. I do not understand an insistence that the book be reviewed only in Swedish. One

⁵ Christian Braw, "Gedigen granskning av den katolska katekesen" ["Substantial Scrutiny of the Catholic Catechism"], *Dagen*, 19 September 2016, http://www.dagen.se/kultur/gedigen-granskning-av-den-katolska-katekesen-1.778848?cx_art. Swedish: "höst-ens mest omdebatterade bok i svensk kristenhet."

⁶ Anders Gerdmar, *Roots of Theological Anti-Semitism: German Biblical Interpretation and the Jews, from Herder and Semler to Kittel and Bultmann* (Studies in Jewish History and Culture 20; Leiden: Brill, 2009).

reason I chose to write in English is that several issues stemming from his book merit attention and debate in an international context.

As G. sees it, the mixing of the popular/ecclesial with the academic is inappropriate. He is naturally entitled to his views on that matter, but it would be unreasonable to insist that all people in the church or the academy affirm the same limits and distinctions as he does. Notably, G. himself has recently reviewed in a church newspaper a popular, nonconfessional book on the historical Jesus written by two exegetes.⁷ This first objection is not compelling as an indictment of a scholar for writing the review or of a journal for deciding to publish it.

A CRITIQUE OF APPEALS TO SCHOLARSHIP IS NEITHER CONFSSIONAL NOR ANTI-CONFSSIONAL

Second, I am alleged to require that “scholarly rules of the game” apply to “confessional theology,” a requirement that G. labels as itself “confessional.”⁸ It is true that G.’s book has to do with faith – a contrast he draws between two types of Christian faith, the charismatic evangelical and the Roman Catholic. My article states clearly that my purpose is not to take sides in that confessional debate. Above all, what I respond to is that *Guds Ord räcker* defends G.’s views on faith with numerous seemingly academic arguments, including problematic arguments about biblical literature and that literature’s purported origins, apostolic unity, and nearly instantaneous canonization by the church. I focus on stances

⁷ Anders Gerdmar, “Jesus var ingen misslyckad profet” [“Jesus Was Not a Failed Prophet”], *Världen idag*, 13 February 2017, <http://www.varldenidag.se/recension/jesus-var-ingen-misslyckad-profet/Bbbqba!G5mAkykZBosYBVCH@zfhfg/>, reviewing Cecilia Wassén and Tobias Hägerland, *Den okände Jesus: Berättelsen om en profet som misslyckades* [*The Unknown Jesus: The Story about a Prophet Who Failed*] (Stockholm: Langenskiöld, 2016).

⁸ Gerdmar, “Innocence,” 179: “Kelhoffer makes the mistake to apply scholarly rules of the game to quite another game, confessional theology, and that he himself thereby takes on a role that is confessional rather than scholarly.”

that G. presents as based in biblical scholarship to support a confessional theology. I do not demand that G.'s – or anyone else's – theology follow particular "scholarly rules." In the use of scholarship to prove his views or disprove Roman Catholic views, G. does not merely express his opinions about faith but also acts in his capacity as an established scholar. My review article is neither confessional nor anti-confessional when noting that some of G.'s attempts to defend his faith or to attack another faith are inconsistent with scholarly opinions that he himself has affirmed in previous publications – for example, concerning hermeneutics and opposition to an essentialist historiography.⁹

One of my review's central contentions is that the choice of genre and forum is not a license to escape critique for misusing, or presenting skewed views of, scholarship. Those who appeal to scholarship to promulgate their views should, in all fairness, be prepared to face feedback, and even critique, from fellow researchers. The author does not seem ready to meet that prerequisite for participating in a mutual give-and-take academic discourse about his argumentation in *Guds Ord räcker*. In his reply to my review, G. dismisses my objections to his scholarship as if I were making confessional attacks on his faith, a dismissal that reduces our differences to two contrasting confessional opinions. I must reject that relativist oversimplification of our disagreements.

Even a popular book – perhaps especially a popular book – ought to have such a solid foundation in scholarship that it can withstand scrutiny, since its audience is most susceptible to being misled by an unbalanced presentation. Therefore, as an exegete I take seriously the potential of popular books both to inform and to mislead the general public. I also believe that a popular audience is capable of handling more complex alternatives and ambiguities than emerge from *Guds Ord räcker*. For these reasons, I do not see G.'s second objection as a serious challenge.

⁹ See Kelhoffer, "Response to Anders Gerdmar," 160–61, 166–68.

THE ACADEMY MUST BE BOTH
MULTI-VOCAL AND OPEN TO CRITIQUE

Third, G. thinks I hold “that one consensus should rule the academic work.”¹⁰ This objection inaccurately attributes to me an extreme and intolerant position, with the implication that his own view is unfairly marginalized. In fact, I agree with G. that “modern theological academia must be multi-vocal.”¹¹ Nothing that I wrote affirms a single consensus for academic work. My calling attention to certain views that are untenable in the light of scholarship does not amount to an affirmation of a monolithic “consensus.” Again, this would reduce our differences to two opposing dogmatic views.

A similarity may be noted in the argumentation in *Guds Ord räcker* and in this third objection: in both, numerous complexities and possible nuances are reduced to *a choice between two posited alternatives*. In the review, I characterize G.’s contrast between evangelical and Catholic positions as oversimplified, if also rhetorically advantageous for the aim of dismissing one alternative while commending the other. This third objection implies another questionable dichotomy: either the author’s views must be exempted from critique, or there is a problem with intolerance in the academy. That objection is a misuse of postmodernist and intersubjective principles, principles that rightly have a place in academic discourse. I acknowledge that no person is completely objective, but that does not mean that any person’s views, including my own, are exempted from critique. Since at least as far back as the 1800s, it has been commonly accepted that the results of anyone’s research may be questioned. In short, *the academy must be both multi-vocal and open to critique*. A multi-vocal setting without freedom to give and receive critique would not be a worthwhile academic milieu.

¹⁰ Gerdmar, “Innocence,” 179: “[M]odern theological academia must be multi-vocal, whereas Kelhoffer seems to favour that one consensus should rule the academic work.”

¹¹ Ibid.

A further example of an either-or dichotomy concerns reference to the so-called “historical-critical method.” As G. sees it, “even the historical-critical method is biased,” and the only acceptable alternative for scholarship today is to foster an “intersubjective dialogue.”¹² Elsewhere in his response to my review, G. cites an article in which I address the questions, “What is the relationship between newer and more traditional methods in New Testament Exegesis, and Is the so-called historical-critical method just *one* method?”¹³ My position of affirming a plurality of methodological approaches and perspectives within biblical studies should be clear from that article.

To refer to the “historical-critical method” as if it were a single method is therefore an egregious simplification.¹⁴ To label the method as “biased” is a desperate attempt to use postmodernity to his advantage, destabilizing scholarly consensus and opening the door to legitimizing as proper scholarship pre-critical assertions about biblical literature. Although I agree with G. about the need for “intersubjective dialogue,” for humility among all scholars, for awareness of one’s blind spots and agendas, and for every voice to be heard, no amount of intersubjectivity is going to erase the gains of 200 years of historical criticism.

When, in my review, I mention that “uncritical views” about biblical literature, such as those voiced in *Guds Ord räckter*, can “foster the construction of a parallel moral and religious universe,”¹⁵ I do not, as G. alleges, suppose that there are only “two competing universes.”¹⁶ Rather, my point is that there are certain views that fall outside the diverse cho-

¹² Gerdmar, “Innocence,” 188–89.

¹³ James A. Kelhoffer, “Nya testamentets exegetik som akademiskt ämne med relevans för andra ämnen,” *SEÅ* 77 (2012): 55–70 at 63–67; English translation (referenced in Gerdmar’s reply): “New Testament Exegesis as an Academic Discipline with Relevance for Other Disciplines,” *CurBR* 11 (2013): 218–33 at 224–26; revised version: *Conceptions of “Gospel” and Legitimacy in Early Christianity* (WUNT 324; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 3–18, at 10–14.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁵ Kelhoffer, “Response to Anders Gerdmar,” 156.

¹⁶ Gerdmar, “Innocence,” 186 (emphasis original).

rus of scholarly voices that fervently engage in academic debates. No amount of listening to other voices is going to increase the likelihood that the apostle Paul would, as G. assumes in *Guds Ord räcker*, have written a letter like Ephesians.¹⁷ Nor would any amount of philosophizing about a “hermeneutical turn” render as plausible G.’s explanation that the whole church instantaneously accepted the NT writings as Scripture.¹⁸ Nor would a multi-vocal dialogue be likely to compensate for G.’s disregard in *Guds Ord räcker* for diversity of expression within the biblical writings.¹⁹

Therefore, my review article should not be construed as an expression of intolerance. Nor, in light of this journal’s invitation to G. to participate in a debate, can this journal be deemed intolerant. Nobody is excluded, and each person’s viewpoints are expressed freely and openly. This third objection shifts the focus of the debate from questionable appeals to scholarship to claims of academic intolerance and attributes to me an extreme hierarchical and positivist position that I do not affirm and that cannot be derived from my critiques of G.’s argumentation or from my other publications.

A POPULAR AUDIENCE DESERVES TO KNOW ABOUT RELEVANT DEBATES AND UNCERTAINTIES

Fourth, G. is unconvinced that his views are “characterised by unsound scholarship.”²⁰ This part of his response addresses only part of my objection that the book embraces several pre-critical positions, presents them as if they were backed by sound scholarship, and never hints that those positions are debated among scholars. That is problematic, especially when addressing a popular audience that can hardly be expected to see

¹⁷ See Gerdmar, *Guds Ord räcker*, 76, 103, 115, 187, 188, 195.

¹⁸ Gerdmar, *Guds Ord räcker*, 81–83; idem, “Innocence,” 195–98.

¹⁹ See further, Kelhoffer, “Response to Anders Gerdmar,” 169.

²⁰ Gerdmar, “Innocence,” 179: “Kelhoffer fails to show that my positions in the scholarly issues he addresses are characterised by unsound scholarship.”

through the oversimplifications. Might it also be ethically questionable for G., as President of the Scandinavian School of Theology, to engage in fundraising among that same misinformed audience?²¹

Although the constraints of a popular book understandably limit how much could have been said about differing perspectives, the book's genre is no excuse for ignoring debates or perpetuating misinformation. Were G. presenting only his own theology, omitting any mention of scholarly debate could be understandable. But since the theology is presented as if it were consistent with sound scholarship, a double standard seems to lend credibility from scholarship while eschewing engagement in pertinent scholarly debates at least on some level.

It comes as no surprise that, in his response, G. can list recent publications that support some of his views about biblical literature and its origins. That he aligns himself, for example, with Donald Guthrie and David Trobisch illustrates how far from mainstream biblical scholarship he places himself. However, I must commend him for taking up some critical issues – for example, pseudonymity. I sincerely hope that he will continue to do so in his future teaching and publications, whether scholarly or popular.

THE ASSESSMENT OF POWER STRUCTURES IS AN INTRINSIC PART OF CRITICAL INQUIRY

Fifth, G. asserts that I have put forth “baseless speculations” and erected a wall between my university faculty and certain churches.²² Worth mentioning here is his explicit goal, cited at the beginning of this rejoinder, of moving biblical interpretation from “the academy” to “the

²¹ See Kelhoffer, “Response to Anders Gerdmar,” 176.

²² Gerdmar, “Innocence,” 180: “Kelhoffer, through baseless speculations about myself and Christian leaders who have endorsed the book, goes beyond the pale and erects a wall between his department at Uppsala University and large portions of Swedish Christianity.”

church.”²³ The aspiration is one of segregation and freedom for church-based biblical interpretation vis-à-vis the academy, a move that G. envisions as essential for ecclesiological and hermeneutical renewal. He has every right to define the habitus of his scholarship outside the academy and within what he recognizes as “the universal Christian faith.” Parts of *Guds Ord räcker* may be viewed as an attempt to realize that vision and to concentrate control over biblical interpretation within churches that affirm a, or the, universal view of the Christian faith, albeit not a Roman Catholic view.

The allegation that my review erects a wall is without merit. No member of my university faculty could do that. Nor, to the best of my knowledge, would any of us would want to do so. For most of my colleagues, academic theology does not separate itself from church life but fulfills its task when it enters into a critical dialogue with diverse pastoral realities. Nonetheless, even pastoral theology is expected to respect scholarly criteria and to be prepared to defend its own methods, assumptions, and conclusions.

Let us now consider the objection to my purported speculations. To gather toward the beginning of *Guds Ord räcker* the affirmations of nine recognized religious leaders as a collective imprimatur for the teachings set forth is a remarkable assertion of power seeking to influence others. It is relevant and appropriate in a review to suggest likely effects of a book in wider contexts, including congregational and educational milieux. Further, an important part of academic freedom is the right to analyze structures of power and their likely or actual consequences – whether positive, negative, or both.

In the article, I demarcate critiques of the book,²⁴ on the one hand, and “possible repercussions” of the book,²⁵ on the other hand. However tentative, the latter also have a rightful place in scholarly discourse.

²³ See the citation of Gerdmar, “Bibelforskningens primära ‘plats,’” at the beginning of this rejoinder (page 210, above).

²⁴ Kelhoffer, “Response to Anders Gerdmar,” 159–70.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 170–79.

Gerdmar's soliciting of approval from nine leaders and the choice to use their collective approval to bolster the validity of his views are within the legitimate purview of a scholarly review. Gerdmar is incorrect, however, to allege that I "attack ... the nine Christian leaders who have endorsed the book."²⁶ What I do take issue with is a likely *effect* of G.'s *collecting* their endorsements at the beginning of a dogmatic book, which amounts to the assembling of an evangelical curia – an implicit warning to anyone who would disobey their judgment. I continue to wonder under what circumstances G.'s institution, the Scandinavian School of Theology, would provide a tolerant and multi-vocal environment that would allow a student or teacher there to question aspects of *Guds Ord räcker*. Contrary to G.'s strenuous objections, there is no "foul play" in raising such questions.²⁷

Gerdmar also bemoans alleged speculations about his life, although he does not specify to what he objects or give an alternate explanation. In the review, I summarize how G. himself has openly described a crisis he faced in his 20s, when he nearly lost his faith as a young theology student.²⁸ Just three years ago, the conversion of a close colleague to Roman Catholicism and the sudden closure of the school where G. had worked for twenty years may likewise have been traumatic. It is perhaps not merely idle speculation to wonder if those crises play some role in the control he would now exert over his coreligionists and fellow academics, for *Guds Ord räcker* makes extraordinary demands on how people should read the Bible, define their faith, and reject the tenets of another faith.

²⁶ Gerdmar, "Innocence," 199.

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ See Kelhoffer, "Response to Anders Gerdmar," 174.

FROM DENYING EXEMPTION FOR PRE-CRITICAL
STANCES TO HOPE FOR RAPPROCHEMENT

A final comment may be made about the title of G.'s response, an allusion to Jane Flax in regard to "the end of innocence."²⁹ All of us in the academy, in the church, and in society at large have the right and even the duty to raise questions and to critique of what we find problematic. The raising of questions should not presume a naïve or innocent objectivity, however. A central point in this rejoinder is the rejection of G.'s unfounded supposition that a popular book should not be subject to scholarly review. His first defense of the book is that it is a response to a pastoral situation.³⁰ The same could be said of much, if not most, Christian literature through the centuries, beginning with the undisputed Pauline and the Deuteropauline letters in the New Testament. The credulous excuse of defending one's tradition could, hypothetically, be mustered to shield some of the antisemitic theology that G. justly criticizes in other publications. A pastoral focus is no excuse for poor scholarship or questionable theology, and even the noble goal of building up, or defending, a religious movement can have lamentable consequences for insiders as well as outsiders. Therefore, a book like *Guds Ord räcker* deserves to be debated, even in an academic forum.

It is commendable to make academic subjects, including biblical interpretation, accessible to the wider public, and I would not say that G. has irreparably damaged his position in the academy by writing *Guds Ord räcker*. One problem that I have raised in this rejoinder is that the book makes claims based on the author's position as a scholar, and yet asserts an exemption from scholarly critique. It would be unfortunate if, as a result, some colleagues would be inclined to question G.'s readiness to participate in a mutual, multi-vocal, give-and-take academic discourse.

²⁹ See Gerdmar, "Innocence," 187.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 180–81.

Nevertheless, one can hope for better circumstances for reciprocal admonition, learning, and exchange. Gerdmar is as welcome as he always has been in the Uppsala University New Testament research seminar. During my first years in Uppsala, he occasionally attended the seminar and made constructive and appreciated contributions. The discourse in the seminar would be poorer were he not to return. I hope that he will receive not only my critiques of his latest book but also my standing invitation to participate in the seminar.

Recensioner

GEORGE AICHELE

Simulating Jesus: Reality Effects in the Gospels

New York: Routledge, 2014, Inbunden, 258 s., £72, ISBN: 978-1-84553-680-0

Poststrukturalistisk teori sammankopplas sällan på ett konstruktivt sätt med en historiekritisk läsning av NT. Allt för ofta rör sig till exempel derridianska eller intertextuella läsningar på ett abstrakt plan och åsyftar främst att ifrågasätta hur en närmar sig läsa-akten som sådan eller textbegreppet. Vilken skillnad poststrukturalistiska läsningarna skulle kunna få för *historiske Jesus forskning* eller *redaktionskritik*, förblir därmed oklart. Det kan därmed för en NT-exeget framstå som att poststrukturalismen är ett mer eller mindre destruktivt projekt gentemot mer modernt inriktade perspektiv. Denna arketyp förstärks tyvärr i och med *Simulating Jesus (SJ)*, av George Aichele. Men så hade inte behövt vara fallet. Alla pusselbitar för ett möjligt konstruktivt möte mellan teori och praktik finns på plats i boken. Saknas gör dock ett intresse att använda teoretiska kunskaper på diverse konkreta diskussioner som sker inom evangelieforskning. Med detta sagt gör *SJ* intressanta anspråk. Särskilt för den som är beredd att omförhandla textbegreppet, eller har ett övergripande intresse för teoretiska diskussioner, är boken relevant.

SJ består av tre delar: kap 1–2 ("Virtual Bible," "Virtual Gospel") rör övergripande frågor om kanon, evangelier och relationen mellan olika Jesusbilder på ett teoretiskt plan; kap 3–6 fokuserar fyra "Jesusarna" ("Four Jesuses") som simuleras i de kanoniska evangelierna och rör sig alltså på ett narrativt plan; och slutligen kap 7–10 ("Canonical Reality Effects") som behandlar hur de evangelierna som kanoniska skrifter interagerar och på olika sätt skapar en enhetlig virtuell Jesusbild. Om del I kan förstås som teori är del II metodisk analys som bygger på apparaturen i föregående del. Del III förklarar hur kanon producerar en koherent Jesusbild samt en avslutande plädering för varför exegeter bör ta till sig insikterna från del I och II.

Aichele arbetar huvudsakligen med begreppen virtualitet, simulation samt *simulacrum*. Begreppen åstadkommer, enligt Aichele, ett sätt att återvända till evangeliernas textualitet och ger dem en chans att låta de tala på ett nytt, främmande vis. Begreppen kan illustreras med hjälp av bokens struktur. Kap 1–2 kan ses som en förklaring av begreppet ”virtualitet”, och betecknar en ideal bakomliggande struktur som styr hur en text blir läst. Den kristna bibliska kanon är en sådan virtualitet. Del I består såtillvida av en dekonstruktion av kanon som begreppslig förståelse av evangeliernas Jesus. Aichele visar hur evangeliernas olika ”Jesusar” tolkas i relation till den kristna kanon som virtuella helhet. I linje med poststrukturalisterna Jaques Derrida, Gilles Deleuze och kanske främst Roland Barthes, utgår författaren från en alternativ struktur som teoretiskt privilegierar en primär skillnad eller pluralism. Därför talas om *Jesusar* istället för en singular Jesusbild. Kanon skapar en sammanhängande Jesusbild som inte bara styrde den historiska kanoniseringprocessen under 300-talet v.t. utan även påverkar exegetikens förhållande till olika Jesusbilders inbördes förhållande. Resultatet av del I är att evangeliernas Jesusar inte går eller bör förenas. Evangelierna bör avkanoniseras (”be de-canonized”) av forskare, så att olika Jesusbilderna, eller ”Jesusar”, tillåts framträda och upphör stå i relation till en styrande kanonisk och grundläggande singular Jesusbild.

Kap 3–6 kan läsas som en metodisk användning av begreppet ”simulacrum”. Termen betyder ”en kopia av en kopia” (i kontrast till ”en kopia av ett original”). Med en Jesus-simulacrum (tänkt Jesuskopia) avser Aichele redogöra för hur de olika kanoniska evangelierna producerar egna versioner av Jesus utan att styras av en primär, singular Jesusbild. Kort sagt, evangeliernas ”Jesusar” står inte i relation till ett original som de efterliknar, utan är ”fria” kopior. De fyra kapitlen aktualiserar den teoretiska agendan från del I och frigör de kanoniska evangeliernas Jesusbilder från sitt virtuella fängelse, genom intertextuell och icke-kanonisk analys.

I kap 3 analyseras Matteusevangeliet med hjälp av Pasolinis film *The Gospel According to Saint Matthew* (1964), och visar hur en textnära filmatisering reproducerar strukturer och rörelser från evangeliet som så-

dant. I kap 4 sker en, något så när, mer traditionell form av exeges av Markusevangeliet, och särskilt tematiken om barn och barnslighet. Den intertextuella läsningen består dock genom att författaren rör sig fritt mellan Barthes insikter och de kanoniska evangelierna utan att strikt avgöra eller förhålla sig till deras inbördes relation. Aichele menar till slut att "to become a child requires something that the adult reader is not: something alien, posthuman, even monstrous" (90) och bygger denna slutsats på en säregen tolkning av Mark 3:28, där att bli som barn i Markus betyder att bli monströs.

I kap 5 jämförs Miévilles roman *King Rat* (1998) med Lukasevangeliet, för att blottlägga hur Gud våldför sig på jungfru Maria. Den narrativa handlingen från *King Rat* fungerar som en alternativ ingång till Lukas. I linje med övriga kapitel i del II, är poängen att alienera läsaren från en "typiskt" kristen ideologisk förståelse av händelseförloppet i evangeliet, så att en med nya ögon kan återvända till texterna.

Kap 6 och behandlingen av Johannesevangeliet är inget undantag från denna alienation, men är, likt analysen av Markus, inte kopplad till något utom-kanoniskt verk. Istället fungerar Derrida som referenspunkt till hur Joh 7:53–8:11 skildrar tematiken kring skrift/skrivande i evangeliet. Aichele argumenterar för hur den förlorade skriften i sanden kan ses som en hermeneutisk nyckel, som öppnar författarfrågan för hela evangeliet ånyo. Alla jämförelser söker avförtrolla förförståelsen av de kanoniska evangelierna och erbjuder nya, inte helt okontroversiella, läsningar av välkända texter.

Kap 7–10 kan läsas som en förklaring av begreppet "simulation". Med denna term försöker Aichele beskriva hur det går till när Jesuskopior skapas från en specifik virtuell för-förståelse (dvs. kanon). I den avslutande delen av *SJ* visar Aichele hur det går till när evangelierna i sin kanoniska kontext simulerar realistiska illustrationer (s.k. *reality effects*) av en Jesus. Den avslutande delen gör motsatsen av del I och II, och visar hur en kristen ideologisk läsning av Jesus fungerar. Kap 7 undersöker hur Markus går att förstå som undanträngd eller mindre intressant i relation till de övriga synoptikerna. Jesuskopian i Markus förbättras av både Matteus och Lukas, vilket i förlängningen leder till en förminskad

roll för Markus. I kap 8 fortsätter liknande tankegångar genom att Aichele lyssnar på argument från Mark Goodacre och underminerar Q som källa. Q kan inte sägas simulera en egen Jesuskopia, enligt Aichele. Kap 9 visar hur Lukas och Johannes har liknande simuleringsprocesser och därmed överlappande Jesuskopior, som vidare kommer dominera en kanonisk Jesusbild. Kap 10 består av en summerande reflektion över skillnaden mellan del II och del III av boken.

I slutändan är *SJ* ett intressant, men teoretiskt försök att blottlägga vissa teologiska för-förståelser som påverkar exegetik. Bokens agenda är främst ett negativt projekt då fokus inte är hur det konkreta exegetiska arbetet kan ske annorlunda. Ett problem med boken är till exempel att för många teoretiska begrepp presenteras. Förutom virtualitet, simulation och simulacrum som jag kort redogjort för ovan, introducerar Aichele även *phantastic*, *semiosis*, *oneiric phantasm*, *writerly text*, *texts of pleasure*, och inte minst *reality effects*. Symptomatiskt för *SJ* är en tendens att över-teoretisera och fjärma sig från konkreta exegetiska diskussioner.

Boken hade mått bra av en tydligare tes eller frågeställning i relation till det explicita teoribygget. Vidare har jag velat se en större vilja att föra samman de faktiska exegetiska diskussionerna, som redan förs, med några utvalda koncept, istället för att överväldiga läsaren med nya begrepp. Som jag påpekade tidigare, postmoderna perspektiv har allt för ofta en tendens att de-konstruera snarare än re-konstruera. Så är tyvärr även fallet i *SJ*.

Joel Kublin, Lunds Universitet

ROGER AMOS

*Hypocrites or Heroes? The Paradoxical Portrayal
of the Pharisees in the New Testament*

Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 2015, Paperback, xi + 242 s., \$29, ISBN: 978-1-49822-027-9

Föreliggande monografi är den doktorsavhandling som den numer pensionerade baptistpastorn Roger Amos skulle ha skrivit om han hade fullföljt sina akademiska studier på forskarnivå – vilket han enligt egen utsaga inte har gjort (x). Syftet med undersökningen är tvåfaldigt: å ena

sidan är den ett försök att ge en sammanhängande bild av fariséerna i allmänhet; å andra sidan intresserar sig Amos i synnerhet för Jesu relation till fariséerna (jfr 9). Vad gäller det första syftet så har denna fråga behandlats vid ett flertal tillfällen tidigare och Amos framställning tillför således bibelvetenskapen knappast något nytt. Jag kommer sålunda inte uppehålla mig vid denna aspekt.

Det är istället i frågan om Jesu relation till fariséerna som Amos kommer med ett självständigt bidrag. Enligt Amos var Jesus farisé. Detta är i sig inte en ny tanke (se nedan), men några av de argument som anförs är hittills oprövade. Författaren framför sex omständigheter (se 164–65) som talar för denna slutsats: (1) fariséerna förväntade sig att Jesus och hans lärjungar skulle följa fariseisk *paradosis* (jfr Matt 15:1–6; Mark 7:1–13), vilket enklast förklaras av att fariséerna räknade dem som medlemmar av sin egen rörelse; (2) fariséerna erkände Jesus som lärare, vilket är förvånande om han inte själv var farisé; (3) Jesus och fariséerna delade teologiska övertygelser och kritiserade aldrig varandra för dessa; (4) fariséerna skulle aldrig ha debatterat med Jesus om inte han själv vara farisé; (5) Jesus använder ofta en typisk fariseisk vokabulär, representerad av till exempel ”syndare” och ”Guds rike”; (6) Jesus påbjuder sina åhörare att hörsamma fariséernas undervisning (Matt 23:2–3) och skulle göra sig själv till lika mycket en hycklare, som han anklagar fariséerna för att vara, om han själv inte följde denna undervisning.

Till denna idé om att Jesus var farisé hör också den tvetydiga relation mellan Jesus och fariséerna som framträder i evangelierna. Fariséerna tycks om vartannat vara välvilliga eller fientligt inställda till Jesus. Detta förhållande menar Amos förklaras av att Jesu relation till fariséerna förändrades med tiden. Trots att evangelierna inte följer en strikt kronologi menar han att Jesu verksamhet sönderfaller i två faser. Under den första perioden var Jesus en respekterad medlem av den fariseiska rörelsen och rättade sig efter dess regelverk, men han var samtidigt medveten om dess fel och tillkortakommanden och försökte reformera rörelsen. Denna fas kom dock till sitt slut då Jesus kritiseras för att hela den lame mannen, som sänks ned genom taket och förlåta hans synder (Mark 2:1–12 par.). Han insåg då att det skulle bli omöjligt att re-

formera fariseismen och övergick till en alternativ agenda. Jesu mål blev nu att bygga upp en ny rörelse – kyrkan (212) – bestående av omvända syndare och exkommunicerade judar. Relationen mellan Jesus och fariséerna försämrades sålunda allt mer och de blev ökat kritiska mot varandra. Att evangelisterna aldrig skriver fram detta paradigmskifte tydligare beror, enligt Amos, på att de första läsarna var så väl förtrogna med detta förhållande att de utan problem skulle kunna placera in enskilda händelser i detta övergripande ramverk (163).

Det sammantagna intrycket av *Hypocrites or Heroes?* är att Amos, i sin identifikation av Jesus som farisé, i grund och botten har en intressant och vederhäftig idé – även om man kan och bör diskutera detaljerna. Denna bedömning är kanske inte så förvånande med tanke på att undertecknad själv försökt påvisa samma slutsats, med samma/liknande/andra argument, i andra sammanhang. Rekonstruktionen av två faser framstår dock som betydligt mer tentativ. Det grundläggande problemet är att Amos inte läser evangelierna så som de ämnades läsas, det vill säga som sammanhängande berättelser med en egen unik dramaturgi, utan skapar en syntes utifrån alla evangelierna vilket resulterar i en bild utan direkt stöd i någon av primärkällorna.

Till bokens förtjänster hör att Amos skriver lättförståeligt och spänstigt, och hans framställning förtjänar beröm för sin förmåga att kommunicera med en bredare publik, men det är också på denna punkt som framställningen öppnas upp för kritik. Boken skulle kunna vara en tillfredställande populärvetenskaplig framställning riktad till en intresserad allmänhet, men gör anspråk på att vara en akademisk/vetenskaplig text – som tidigare nämnts beskriver Amos den som den ”doktorsavhandling” han aldrig skrev, och boken är utgivet av ett imprint (Wipf & Stock) som har som uttalat syfte att betjäna såväl kyrka som akademi – och lämnar som sådan en hel del att önska.

Dels så uppvisar boken grundläggande metodiska brister. Detta gäller dels Amos behandling av den historiske Jesus. För trots att författaren är medveten om svårigheten, så tas steget från evangeliernas Jesus:ar till den historiske Jesus allt som oftast med allt för stor lättvindighet. Vidare är relationen till tidigare forskning genomgående

problematisk. Forskningsöversikten är högst summarisk. Amos nämner N. T. Wright, G. Jossa, A. J. Saldarini, E. P. Sanders, H. Maccoby, R. Deines, E. Rivkin och S. Motyer. Av dessa forskare är det, så vitt jag vet, endast Maccoby som arbetat med samma frågeställning som Amos. Samtidigt utelämnas viktiga bidrag av forskare som faktiskt behandlat samma – eller åtminstone mycket närliggande – problemställningar som Amos, och i vissa fall dessutom kommit till slutsatsen att Jesus var farisé. Jag tänker här på A. Geiger, J. Klausner, M. Buber, P. Winter, P. Culbertson, K. Berger, W. E. Phipps, H. Falk, J. Pawlikowski, med flera. Framställningen av tidigare forskning saknar dessutom en tydlig struktur och bidragen listas varken kronologiskt, eller enligt någon synbar tematisk princip. Den bristfälliga interaktionen med sekundärlitteraturen blir också tydlig, inte bara i litteraturlistan, som huvudsakligen består av kommentarer företrädesvis till Matteusevangeliet – var är specialstudierna av fariséerna: Neusner (*The Rabbinic Traditions About the Pharisees Before 70: I–III*), Bowker (*Jesus and the Pharisees*), Marshall (*The Portrayals of the Pharisees in the Gospels and Acts*) – utan även i själva brödtexten där Amos inte positionerar sig i relation till sekundärlitteraturen i tillräcklig utsträckning. Istället kan sida efter sida följa med påståenden utan några hänvisningar om var informationen är hämtad ifrån. Amos kan i dessa fall inte stödja sig på sin egen auktoritet, eller anföra informationen som allmänt accepterat exegetiskt tankegod. Det blir således något ironiskt att Amos själv kritiserar H. Maccoby för hans: "...failure to provide citations supporting the arguments to which he alludes" (161).

Även vad gäller innehåll uppvisar boken ett antal problem. Amos behandlar i sin genomgång "The Pharisees in the New Testament" fariséer och skriftlärda som synonymer, vilket är anmärkningsvärt särskilt i de fall då *skriftlärdd* förekommer frikopplad från *farisé*. Amos anammar likaså idén om att fariseismen konstituerade "normative Judaism", baserat på R. Deines och H. Maccoby. Men trots att han är medveten om att detta är långt från det enda sättet att se på saker och ting, så saknas det en diskussion med meningsmotståndarna, och ett citat av Deines (133) får utgöra tillräcklig grund för att han sedan kan påstå vid

upprepede tillfällen att ha etablerat ("established") detta faktum (jfr 142, 157, 168).

Jag finner dessutom framställningen som övergripande rörig och det är svårt att skönja en tydlig progression i argumentationen. Det är likaså stundtals svårt att se hur bokens olika delar samverkar för driva Amos hypotes framåt. Ett konkret exempel på detta är presentationen av Johannesevangeliets bruk av termen "judarna", vilka Amos delar upp i fyra kategorier ("neutral", "authority", "hostile", "violent") baserat på graden av motstånd gentemot Jesus och hans efterföljare. Amos skriver dock att den första kategorin är "hardly relevant to our study" (91), men fortskrider likväl med att presentera detta irrelevanta material, med motiveringen att han kommenterar vissa intressanta aspekter.

Påståendet om att detta skulle vara den doktorsavhandling som Amos – formellt sett – aldrig skrev, framstår i ljuset av ovan nämnda kritik som orimligt, men väcker samtidigt funderingar om hur argumentationen hade kunnat vässas om materialet regelbundet ventilerats i relation till handledare, i seminarium och vid vetenskapliga konferenser. Amos grundidé är god, men förtjänar en mer stringent behandling.

Tobias Ålöw, Göteborgs Universitet

JOHN J. COLLINS

Encounters with Biblical Theology

Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005, Paperback, 254 s, \$23, ISBN: 978-0-80063-769-9

Föreliggande bok är ett försök att överbrygga klyftan mellan biblisk teologi och historiskt kritisk forskning, om det nu finns någon sådan klyfta. Boken består av en sammanställning av artiklar som alltifrån 1977 och framåt varit publicerade i tidskrifter och samlingsvolymerna av olika slag. Ett kortare avsnitt, "The Reception of Daniel in Millenarian Theology" har utgivarens hustru Adela Yarbro Collins som författare.

Materialet har disponerats inom fem huvudrubriker: (1) "Theoretical Issues"; (2) "Topics in the Pentateuch"; (3) "Wisdom and Biblical Theology"; (4) "Apocalyptic Literature"; och (5) "Christian Adaptations of Jewish Traditions".

Inledningsvis konstaterar författaren att många bibliska texter har mer än en mening, ett konstaterande som vi kan känna igen från en tysk centralgestalt som Gerhard von Rad, men som tål att upprepas. En texts ursprungliga mening är naturligtvis viktig, men det är inte den enda meningen. En text kan få en ny mening i ett nytt sammanhang. I avslutning till Walter Brueggemann konstaterar han också att de olika bibeltexterna innehåller olika perspektiv. Collins är därför skeptisk till att tala om bibeltexten som "vittnesbörd". Han konstaterar att Bibeln skrevs för länge sedan i en kultur väldigt annorlunda än vår. Därför den inte utan vidare appliceras på vår tid. Men det är en kraftfull bok, inte enbart i kyrka och synagoga utan i hela samhället. Därför kan den inte ignoreras. Boken består av femton artiklar om olika ämnen. Allt kan inte kommenteras här, men det får bli några nedslag.

Del 1: "Theoretical Issues". Frågan är här hur man skall få ihop historisk-kritisk forskning och biblisk teologi. Författaren konstaterar att långt ifrån alla forskare är intresserade av teologi, men han nämner också en rad kollegor som varit inne på frågan. Han nämner att biblisk teologi inte behöver vara detsamma som konfessionell teologi. Istället förespråkar författaren ett slags öppen och kritisk teologi. I de följande kapitlen förtydligas och exemplifieras vad detta innebär.

I ett avsnitt, som gäller teorier om Israels ursprung, refereras kort en rad kända forskare, som W. F. Albright, N. Gottwald, K. W. Whitelam och I. Finkelstein. Författaren konstaterar att all beskrivning av Israels historia är ensidig, men att Finkelsteins beskrivning ändå troligen är den som kommer närmast sanningen. Finkelstein såg bosättarna i det centrala israelitiska höglandet som proto-israeliter, men konstaterar att inget tyder på att de kom från en kultur utanför Kanaan. Således var det inte heller någon våldsam erövring. Samtidigt finns det också något att lära av de andra. Det är nyttigt att lyssna till röster i marginalen. Det finns alltid mer än en synpunkt. Men samtidigt som han säger detta konstaterar han också hur viktigt det är att forskningen når en konsensus för att inte helt falla sönder.

Del 2: "Topics in the Pentateuch". Här diskuteras till att börja den kända texten om Isaks bindande, 1 Mos 22, en text som vållat många

läsare huvudbry. En del utläggare konstaterar att det finns tillräckligt många antydningar i texten som säger att detta var ett test som aldrig var avsett att slutföras, och att också Abraham var medveten om detta, men här håller Collins inte med. Från andra texter måste vi konstatera att barnoffer kunde förekomma, men hur skall vi se på Abrahams agerande? Kan man prisa Abraham för hans vilja, men fördöma själva gärningen? Texten fokuserar på att Abraham följer ett bud från Gud, men många läsare ser ett problem och försöker lösa det. Enligt judisk tradition, som utgår från att Sara i nästa kapitel dör vid en ålder av 127 år, är Isak en vuxen man som frivilligt underkastar sig offret.

Men hur skall berättelsen förstås av moderna människor? Det må vara att Abraham handlade rätt i sin kontext, men kan berättelsen användas som ett positivt moraliskt exempel? Författaren konstaterar att ingen jude eller kristen kan tro på värdena i Gen 22 utan reservationer.

Som recensent måste jag här också ställa mig frågande. Kanske har det att göra med att boken är skriven för en amerikansk läsekrets, men för undertecknad känns det mycket konstigt att någon ens skulle komma på tanken rycka en berättelse som denna ur sin kontext för att göra den till ett allmänt moraliskt föredöme idag. Är det någon generell regel man kan dra av denna text så är det i så fall att människooffer inte behagar Gud.

Nästa avsnitt handlar om Exodustraditionerna. Författaren konstaterar att samtidigt som Exodus är centralt i en biblisk teologi, så är den historiska basen för ett Exodus, såsom det skildras i Bibeln, väldigt svag. Kopplingen mellan Exodus och laggivningen på Sinai är sekundär. Därmed kommer man också in på frågan – hur skall bibeltexterna användas för teologiska syften? Var ligger auktoriteten? I de äldsta traditionerna eller, som B. Childs har hävdad, i den kanoniska bibeltexten?

I Bibeln själv har Exodus en betydelse utöver historien. Varje generation läser de auktoritativa texterna i ljuset av sin egen plats i livet. Vad betyder detta för den moderna debatten? Bibeln kan inte längre ge oss en objektiv moral, men utan Bibeln kan vi inte heller kalla oss kristna. Principer kan inte kallas kristna om de inte står i kontinuitet med Bibeln, men vad detta innebär är svårare att säga.

Del 3: "Wisdom in Biblical Theology". Vishetslitteraturens betydelse för teologin kan sammanfattas i fyra punkter:

- 1) Visheten är en integrerad del av judisk-kristen biblisk tradition.
- 2) Visheten uttrycker den religiösa dimensionen av universell mänsklig erfarenhet.
- 3) Visheten försöker korrelera universell mänsklig erfarenhet med Israels speciella traditioner.
- 4) Analogier med vishetslitteraturen antyder att naturlig teologi också finns i övriga Bibeln.

Författaren konstaterar att ordspråkslitteraturen är en egen litteraturform oberoende av Israels historia. Ordspråken är mer paradigmen än lagar och alla ordspråk passar inte i alla situationer. Ordspråken står för ordningen i tillvaron under det att profeterna ifrågasätter ordningen. Vishetslitteraturen är emot avgudadyrkan, men visar sympati för upplysta grekiska filosofer.

Del 4: "Apocalyptic Literature". Apokalyptiken handlar om att världen skall förändras, inte genom mänsklig aktion utan genom en gudomlig intervention. Det skall bli ett slut på en ond världsordning och alla mänskliga imperier skall förgås. Som inledningsvis nämnts följer här ett avsnitt av Adela Yarbro Collins om hur Danielsboken har använts inom så kallad *Millenarian Theology*. Hon konstaterar att Daniels bok inte haft särskilt stor betydelse i amerikansk teologi, även om den haft ett visst inflytande inom millenariska fundamentalistiska kretsar. Endast gradvis har den rika symbolismen med sina rötter i främre-orientalisk mytologi uppskattats. Daniels bok är ett viktigt dokument om sin tid. Men den utgör varken ett trovärdigt vittne om historien eller en pålitlig förutsägelse om framtiden. Som författaren ser det är uppdelningen av människorna i onda och goda det mest problematiska i apokalyptiken. Martyrerna fasthet är beundransvärd, men den tro de dog för är problematisk i den moderna världen. Apokalyptikens arv är komplext, men det positiva är att den står för ett hopp om en bättre värld.

Del 5: "Christian Adaptions of Jewish Traditions". Här behandlas till att börja med messianska föreställningar inom judendomen, och det konstateras att dessa inte var så utbredda som man skulle kunna tro. I

kapitlet behandlas också en del intressanta Qumrantexter, som den om en lidande messias i 4Q541, om Guds son i 4Q246 och om en profetisk messias i 4Q521. Författarn konstaterar att de flesta judar inte uppfattade Jesus som en davidisk messias. Det var först hans efterföljare som gjorde detta. Därför kan han hävda att föreställningen om människosonen som skall komma tillbaka passar bäst in efter Jesu död.

Bokens sista kapitel handlar om judisk monoteism och kristen teologi. Hur kunde judar under första århundradet acceptera Jesus som den preexisterande Guds son och ändå inte anse sig överträda traditionell judisk monoteism? Här ställs frågan om judendomen verkligen var monoteistisk. Han menar att detta kan ifrågasättas. Tron på änglar är i grund och botten en transformerad kanaaneisk mytologi och dyrkan av änglar kan ha förekommit. De synoptiska evangelierna går enligt författaren lätt att förena med judisk monoteism och det går ganska bra även med Justinus martyren och Origenes. Slutpunkten blir att det var först gradvis som den kristna uppfattningen om Kristus och Den helige ande nådde en punkt som var inkompatibel med judisk monoteism.

Bokens syfte var, som nämnts, att försöka överbrygga klyftan mellan bibelteologi i vid mening och historisk-kritisk bibelforskning. Eller anorlunda uttryckt: Kan Bibeln trots sina konstigheter ändå ha något att erbjuda samhället idag? Boken innehåller helt klart mycket intressant stoff, men själva huvudtanken känns ändå inte helt tillfredsställande.

Kan det finnas en bibelteologi som inte är konfessionell? Om man med bibelteologi menas att, som G. von Rad, beskriva de tankar och föreställningar som präglar Bibelns olika delar är svaret självklart ja. Men kan man finna en icke-konfessionell, men ändå på något sätt för dagens människor, normerande teologi?

Gamla testamentet, som det här mest gäller, kan läsas med en judisk eller kristen tolkningsnyckel. Eller så kan man, som författaren här vill göra, försöka hitta en icke konfessionell tolkningsnyckel, men som ändå ger en vägledning för hur texten skall förstås idag. Men då blir det som att läsa en bok vilken som helst, där jag kan tycka bra om något och sämre om annat, allt efter som jag själv tycker det är relevant. På det sät-

tet kan jag naturligtvis använda vilken text som helst för att förstärka de uppfattningar jag redan har, men vad vinner jag med detta?

Stig Norin, Uppsala

JAN DOCHHORN, SUSANNE RUDNIG-ZELT, AND BENJAMIN WOLD (EDS.)

Das Böse, der Teufel und Dämonen – Evil, the Devil, and Demons

WUNT II 412, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016, Paperback, xiv + 297 pp., €84,

ISBN: 978-3-16152-672-5

This anthology about evil, the Devil and demons includes the work of 13 authors. The contributions are written in German (six chapters) and English (nine chapters). The contributions are generally characterized by careful exegesis and very good knowledge of the latest secondary literature. Most of the chapters address either Biblical or Qumranic material.

Susanne Rudnig-Zelt introduces the work with a German summary of the various chapters. This is followed by the first of two chapters which focus on Old Testament material. Here Rudnig-Zelt offers plausible readings of Old Testament passages relating to Satan, rightly questioning projections of modern understandings of monotheism on this material. Job's book, for example, suggests that Satan could actually cause God to act against his better judgment. This chapter provides a good overview of the *status quaestionis*.

In the second chapter, with an Old Testament focus, Markus Saur studies the portrayal of evil in Wisdom literature. Whereas Proverbs teaches that the good prospers and shows how evil may best be avoided, Job explores the suffering of the righteous, showing how unpredictable God is in his boundless sovereignty and how limited people are in contrast. Saur argues that this insight in human limitations contributes to making us more human, which is a central goal of Wisdom literature. Considering our human limitations, Qoheleth in turn advises doing nothing in excess. As befits this lesson, Saur's chapter is reasonable though not revolutionary.

Three chapters focus on material from Qumran; two by Matthew Goff, one by Miryam Brand. Matthew Goff's first contribution investigates the relationship between giants and demons, Azazel and Satan in

Enochic literature, especially the *Book of the Watchers*. He offers *inter alia* a convincing explanation for why being turned into spirits could be seen as the ultimate punishment for the ever-hungry giants.

Goff's second contribution shows that 4Q184 probably does not refer to Lilith as a female demon, contrary to Baumgarten, but is a further development of the motif of the Strange Woman in Proverbs 7. His writing is lucid and his arguments are convincing.

Miryam Brand compares how Belial is used in the Community Rule from Qumran with the term's use in 4QBerakhot and the Damascus Document. Brand shows how these texts, though dualistic, are less deterministic than has been previously thought; she also shows how one cannot generalize on the basis of a single text to the theology of the community as a whole. The Community Rule does not refer directly to the demon Belial, but only to the people of Belial's lot. Those who belong to Belial's lot have themselves to blame. People could decide to join the community, making them part of God's lot, or they could decide to stay outside, in which case they were Belial's lot. In contrast, according to the Damascus Document, those who refused to join the community had been deceived by Belial himself in their decision.

Six chapters address primarily New Testament material. The first two deal with apotropaic texts. Scholars have noted that in Second Temple Judaism, Psalm 91 was used as an apotropaic text, to ward off demons; it is included among exorcistic hymns in the Qumran manuscript 11Q11, for example. Why then does Satan himself quote this psalm in Matthew's and Luke's temptation narratives? Michael Morris notes passages where the Gospels portray demons as trying to exorcise Jesus, and argues convincingly that the temptations should be read in the same light: "The Devil mocks the apotropaic efficacy of Psalm 91 in order to intimidate Jesus" (99).

Benjamin Wold studies formulas in two Qumran texts, the Plea for Deliverance and the Prayer of Levi, that ask God to protect the person from demonic beings. Noting similarities with the final petition in Matthew's version of the Lord's Prayer, Wold asks whether the formulation "deliver us from the evil one" was also an apotropaic prayer. The

parallels Wold identifies strengthen the case that Jesus taught his disciples to pray for protection from “the evil one” rather than from evil in general.

Drawing on parallels offered by the Japanese reception of Christianity, Erkki Koskenniemi offers a plausible explanation for why Paul, who evidently assumed the existence of the devil and had a “well thought out” idea of him, downplays Satan’s role in his letters and sermons. Koskenniemi argues that Satan and cosmological dualism were concepts that were too foreign to Paul’s non-Jewish readers, so he relies on eschatological dualism instead, which was easier for them to accept.

Jan Dochhorn contributes two chapters to this anthology. The first one is on 1 Cor 5:5, arguing that Paul is telling the congregation to exclude the man who was guilty of gross immorality from the congregation in that Satan may kill him, so that the man’s soul may be spared on judgment day. This interpretation, he notes, may be troublesome to Protestants, but he carefully explains why it is more likely than other alternatives.

Dochhorn’s second article is a study of the Jewish background to the expression “Cain who was of the evil one” in 1 John 3:12. Building on a neglected article by Nils Dahl, he studies references in Targum Pseudo-Jonathan, and other rabbinic sources, to Samael having fathered Cain, and examines use of this motif by early Christian authors, such as Polycarp (7:1). He shows that there is reason to believe that the notion that Cain was fathered by Samael, or Satan, was well established in Jewish and Christian circles at the time 1 John was written. The question about how literally this expression was intended by the authors of the various texts is something that Dochhorn leaves open, however.

Oda Wischmeyer writes on references to the devil, demons and evil in James, concluding that although the author clearly assumes cosmological dualism, he deliberately avoids working with these categories in order to focus on human responsibility for evil. While James characterizes the flesh as evil and earthly, he does not speculate about how it might have come to be this way or how that might affect free will. James’ focus is on dealing with evil within the Christian congregation.

For James, sins are the concrete expression of evil, just as good deeds are the concrete expression of faith. Wischmeyer's reading of James is persuasive.

Hector Patmore investigates how Targum Jonathan, the Aramaic translation of the Prophets, translates four potential references to demons (2 Sam 22:5; Isa 13:21, 34:14; Hab 3:5) and what that says about when and where this translation was carried out. He finds that Targum Jonathan does not read demons into these texts, leading him to conclude that this text was probably written in the context of "(pro-)Rabbinic Palestinian" rather than Babylonian Judaism.

In a thought-provoking and well-argued chapter Ryan Stokes shows how the expressions "unclean spirit" and "demon" are not always used synonymously in Biblical and intertestamental texts. He also argues that *satan* is never used as a proper name in OT, and that in legal contexts it tends to signify not so much an accuser, but an executioner.

Jörn Bockmann's study of a version of the medieval legend of Judas and St Brendan, although interesting, is more likely to interest another group of readers than those most interested of this volume. The same goes for Ole Davidsen's contribution, a reading of biblical narratives relating to Satan, death, and evil and their positive counterparts in the light of Greimas's narrative semantics. He argues that our way of thinking is inherently dualistic, and that religion tries "to explain, and eventually surmount, mixed and dualistic reality" (257). I don't find that narrative semantics contributes to a better understanding of the texts in question.

With its many high quality contributions, this volume contributes to our understanding of Judaism and early Christianity. Although the contributors to this volume work on similar themes and in some cases refer to the same texts, their contributions are very much their own; the editors do not put forward any concluding consensus, showing that there is room for more research in this field. Scripture and author indexes increase the usefulness of this volume.

Torsten Löfstedt, Linnaeus University

BART D. EHRMAN

Jesus Before the Gospels: How the Earliest Christians Remembered, Changed, and Invented Their Stories of the Savior

New York: HarperOne, 2016, Inbunden, 336 s., \$27.99, ISBN: 978-0-06228-520-1

Bart Ehrman har fått ett stort genomslag i den engelsktalande världen med hjälp av ett tillgängligt språk och syfte att bilda allmänheten. I sin senaste monografi, *Jesus Before the Gospels* (*JBG*), tar Ehrman sig an "memory studies" (MS) och dess relation till historiske Jesus-forskning. Enligt "Introduction" är *JBG* resultatet av två års "självständiga" studier om minne utifrån psykologiska, sociologiska och antropologiska perspektiv och har som huvudsyfte att "for a general-reading audience [... explain] the form-critic's views and [delve] into the issues they raised in a non-technical (and interesting!) way" (19). Med "formkritikers perspektiv" menar Ehrman en analys av muntlighet och eventuella för-evangeliska traditioner samt de mekanismer aktiva i förmedling över tid. Ehrman gör alltså inget av de tidiga formkritikernas metod (att spåra former såsom t.ex. *paradigm*) utan är endast intresserad av minnets roll i muntlig tradering. Ehrman vandrar i Gerhardssons snarare än Bultmanns efterföljd.

I kapitel 1, "Oral Tradition and Oral Invention", summeras skickligt muntlighetstradering inom MS, bland annat med hjälp av anekdoter från till exempel Barry Schwartz böcker om Abraham Lincoln, samt begreppen "episodic" och "semantic memory". I kommande kapitel kommer även andra huvudbegrepp såsom "collectiv memory" att på liknande vis presenteras och styr till viss del kapitelindelningen av *JBG*. En återkommande tendens i diskussioner om "mnemo-begrepp" måste redan nu betonas. Första kapitlets två huvudkategorier (som skulle kunna parafraseras som "händelseminne" respektive "kunskapsminne") är förvånansvärt irrelevanta för *JBG* som helhet och spelar endast en marginell roll för bokens agenda, som kan sammanfattas på följande vis: en historisk bedömning av fragila, felaktig eller falska ("frail, faulty or false") minnen i evangelietraditioner (22, 38, 52 etc.). Detta stämmer alltså även i relation till begreppet "kollektivt minne." När *JBG* till di-

verse evangelietraditioner upprepar frågan "Are these accurate memories?" används främst *en generell bild av mänskligt minne som bräckligt och poröst och inte ett analytisk behandlande av begrepp, såsom "semantic memory"*. Evangelietexter bedöms som fragila, felaktiga eller falska minnen utifrån "sannolikhet" ("plausibility") snarare än just via kriterier som växt fram genom MS. Möjligtvis bör vi förlåta Ehrman med tanke på att boken inte är riktad till exegeter. Ett generellt perspektiv på minne som konstruktion och formbart fenomen är trots allt, i sin helhet, korrekt. Men jag skulle vilja driva tesen att det är troligt att Ehrman de facto inte har funnit att minnesforskning kan bidra med särskilt mycket till Jesus-forskning annat än ett slags "nytt språk" för att tala om evangelietraditionens utveckling under den historiska tystnad "forty to sixty-five years after Jesus' death" (8, 17, 21, 71, 155, 187, 243, 246) som möter forskaren innan Markusevangeliet ankomst.

Om vi kort summerar kapitel 1 är syftet att inledande argumentera för att ett historiskt faktum inte med nödvändighet kan anses skildras på korrekt vis med hjälp av minnet hos en viss muntlig kultur. Minne måste ställas i relation till en plausibel historisk händelse. I kapitel 2, "The History of Invention", formuleras huvudärendet sålunda: hur en historiker bedömer diskrepanser hos tidiga källor, såsom de kanoniska evangelierna, med hjälp av "minne". "Distorted memory" är namnet på medvetet eller omedvetet falsifierade evangelietraditioner, som inte kan sägas representera den historiska händelse de handlar om. Apokryfa evangelier får fungera som falska minnen par excellence och avslöjar därmed att Ehrmans framställning tryggt vilar på en konsensusåsikt om *Markan priority* och en generell tvåkälls-hypotes, när det gäller datering av de synoptiska evangelierna. Denna konsensusåsikt beläggs också genom en förtjänstfull exposé från Reimarus till nutida rön. Historiekritisk exegetik handlar om avslöjande av fiktion i evangelietradition och inte minst i dess muntliga fas, menar Ehrman.

I kapitel 3, "Eyewitness Testimonies and Our Surviving Gospels", har författaren hunnit ikapp samtida forskning och ägnar tid åt att syna till exempel R. Bauckham, samt kyrkofader Papias syn på ögonvittnen i evangelietradering. Slutsatsen blir att *ögonvittnen* inte är en särskilt plau-

sibel förklaring till en trovärdig förmedling av historiska data i evangelierna. Papias tillförlitlighet undermineras, vilket även skapar problem för Bauckhams tilltro till ögonvittnen, enligt Ehrman.

I kapitel 4, "Distorted Memories and the Death of Jesus", får läsaren en genomgång av passionsberättelsens historiska trovärdighet. Ehrman menar att ett "händelse-skelett" som i punktform sammanfattar Jesus sista vecka i livet *är* tillförlitlig, men har ingen större tilltro till skelettets "kropp". I kontrast till formkritikerna diskuterar Ehrman inte tesen om en tidigt sammanfogad passionsberättelse, utan ser att den innehåller "distorted memories".

Kapitel 5, "Distorted Memories and the Life of Jesus", fortsätter där tidigare kapitel slutade och gör en översikt av Jesu liv i ljuset av sannolikheten hos ännu ett "händelse-skelett". Sannolikheten bedöms till exempel som stor att Jesus döptes av Johannes, men mindre att födelse-narrativen är historiskt tillförlitliga. Sin vana trogen sållas mellan getter och får med hjälp av minne, *som metaforik* och med historisk sannolikhet, *som bedömningsfaktor*. I likhet med tidigare kapitel följer Ehrman en mer eller mindre okontroversiell åsikt inom historisk Jesus-forskning och betonar Jesus som den apokalyptiska profeten som proklamerar tidens slut och gudsrikets ankomst. Minne är fortsatt sekundär, i metodologisk mening. Följande uttalande (om Jesu intåg i Jerusalem) är typisk: "I find it completely implausible. I think it must be a distorted memory" (170). *Distorted memory* är alltså namnet för en negativ historisk bedömning av en viss evangelietradition. Minne hjälper oss inte att avgöra en bedömning av enskilda evangelietraditioner utan är namnet på ett negativt historiskt resultat.

I kapitel 6, "Collective Memory: Our Earliest Gospel of Mark", och kapitel 7, "The Kaleidoscopic Memories of Jesus: John, Thomas, and Range of Others", sker huvudsakliga upprepningar av Ehrmans nu etablerade perspektiv: *Markan Priority*, en generell tvåkälls-hypotes och okontroversiell datering av diverse apokryfa evangelier, ställs i relation till minnesmetaforik. Allt från Halbwegs "collective memory" till Jan Assmanns begrepp "mnemo-history" lyfts fram som kompatibla med forskning om Markus-, Johannes- samt Thomasevangeliet, på ett intres-

seväckande och tillgängligt sätt. Men eftersom det yttersta syftet är att ge en historisk skiss av traditionsförmedling hamnar Ehrman i problem. Till exempel blir bokens brist på en saklig Q-diskussion frustrerande och skapar onödigt otydlighet i frågan om minne och muntlighet. Eftersom Markus dateras till kring år 70 v.t., blir det uteblivna ställningstagandet och dateringen av Q problematisk. Q-källans vara är, trots allt, högst aktuell i en diskussion om både muntlighet, apokryferna (främst Thomas ev.) samt evangelietraderingens tillförlitlighet.

Kapitel 8, "In Conclusion: A Paeon to Memory", visar tydligt att *JBG* inte främst är skriven för ett NT-seminarium utan snarare för ett amerikanskt evangelikalt sammanhang, där evangelierna ses som historiska biografier i någon mening. Ehrman ägnar tid åt att nyansera falska minnen om Jesus och försäkrar läsaren att de kan göra sanninganspråk, dock ej i en historisk mening. Här ser vi också Ehrmans metod, som består i ett belysa minnets porösa karaktär med hjälp av anekdoter från MS, men även via historiska jämförelser för att till sist genomföra en slags sannolikhetsbedömningar av evangelietraditioner, utifrån datering av synoptikerna, samt andra tillgängliga samtida källor. Minne bör fungera som ett negativt historiskt korrektiv till de Ehrman kallar "konservativa" forskare och läsare av de kanoniska evangelierna, som tenderar att tillskriva stora delar hög historisk tillförlitlighet.

Ehrman visar att minne till stor del är ett böjligt fenomen i relation till sociala sammanhang. *Jesus Before the Gospels* är värd att läsa även för en exeget. Kanske till och med i undervisningssyfte. Om inte annat ger *JBG* en provokativ introduktion till de större namnen inom MS och medföljande begrepp. Men Ehrman använder "minne" som en slags metaforik som historikern kan använda som en språklig palett snarare än som metod. Ehrman kommer säkerligen möta stort motstånd från NT-exegeter som är mer involverade i MS än vad han själv är.

Joel Kublin, Lunds Universitet

EMMA ENGLAND OCH WILLIAM JOHN LYONS (RED.)

Reception History and Biblical Studies: Theory and Practice

LHBOTS, Scriptural Traces 615, London: Bloomsbury, 2015, Hardcover, 256 s., £80, ISBN: 978-0-56766010-7.

Vad är vitsen med receptionshistoria och hur kan fältet bäst bidra till bibelvetenskapen (och humaniora) i stort? Det uppfattar jag som grundfrågorna i England och Lyons ambitiösa och länge emotsedda antologi. För trots att fältet nu knappast längre kan kallas nytt är samsynen kring uppgiften, tillvägagångssätten eller de teoretiska utgångspunkterna närmast obefintlig. Till skillnad från de senaste årens ström av programförklaringar om vad receptionshistoria bör vara (Beal, Sawyer, Boer, Spieckermann, Breed etc.) vill England och Lyons avstå från att presentera metodpaket eller från att sätta gränser för fältet. Deras uttalade syfte är att ge ”exempel på teoretiska och praktiska interaktioner mellan text, kontext och publik” (5) och på så sätt stimulera en fortsatt utveckling. Det klingar väl blygsamt och neutralt i mina öron. Utgångspunkten är snarare att bibelvetenskapen befinner sig i en akut kris (av försnävning och marginalisering) och att det inte längre är hållbart att betrakta receptionshistoria som något katten släpat in, när fältet istället kan bidra till tillväxt och förnyelse inom hela disciplinen.

Antologin är indelad i fyra huvuddelar. Den inledande ”Reception history, historical criticism and biblical studies” riktar blicken inåt. En återkommande synpunkt är att uppdelningen mellan receptionshistoria och historisk-kritisk forskning är kontraproduktiv och döljer mer än den förklarar (Harding, Crossley, Morgan). Är egentligen allt historia eller allt reception? Gillingham uppvisar störst självdistans, i sin personliga reflektion över en förflugen kommentar från en kollega, ”Receptionshistoria är bibelvetenskap på semester”. Ja, kanske är det precis vad vi behöver, ett perspektivbyte, både vad gäller material och metoder.

Nästa del, ”Conceptualizing reception history”, ger en provkarta på olika sätt att teoretisera reception, med kortare textexempel. Vander Stichele presenterar och utvärderar tre väl valda ingångar (Culler, Balsam samt Deleuze och Guattari) för att sedan ”tillämpa” dessa på berättelsen om Johannes Döparens död. Breed fortsätter att intressera sig för vad en

text ”gör”. Mot textkritikens ”moraliserande” diskurs (där texter ”korumperas”) föreslår han istället en ”etiologisk”. Hellre än att sträva efter en förlorad idealiserad text, bör vi acceptera att texten uppträder i olika former genom historien och studera dessa förutsättningslöst. Tongue visar i sin tolkning av samtida hebreisk poesi (Amichai) hur distinktionen mellan konfessionell – icke-konfessionell bryter samman. Framträder receptionshistorien som en särskilt lämplig arena för att studera komplexet religion och sekularism. Gunda närmar sig en liknande problematik, fast i en vidare sociokulturell kontext. Vad har koloniala och post-koloniala tolkningar av Gen 19 med samtida Zimbabwisk lagstiftningen mot sodomi att göra?

Tredje delen, ”Practical implications, difficulties and solutions”, bjuder på betraktelser över personliga forskarresor i receptionshistorien. Boer landar hos Lenin, Calvin och Nick Cave. Boxall tar oss med till ön Patmos och visar vad han lärt av pre-kritiska läsningar av Uppenbarelseboken. England gläntar på dörren till digitala humaniora och berättar om de vedermödor och möjligheter som följer med databasbyggande (för barnbiblar). West gör en tresiktad läsning av AmaNazarethas liturgiska och rituella textanvändning (Jeftas dotter) under 1900-talet. I den avslutande delen ”Bible, reception and popular music” får vi slutligen några konkreta studier, av en massivt manlig corpus med Cohen, Depeche Mode och U2.

Låt mig först säga att detta är en synnerligen genomtänkt och välkomponerad antologi. Delarna följer naturligt på varandra och beröringspunkterna mellan bidragen är många (t.ex. i ifrågasättandet av ”bibeln” som ett enhetligt objekt), utan att skiljelinjerna tonas ned (t.ex. i synen på uppgiften). Del två framstår som matnyttigast genom sin inventering/problemativering av nyare och mer beprövade teoretiska ansatser, även om exemplen bitvis är alltför skissartade för att potentialen ska framträda tydligt. Jag måste dock erkänna att jag inte delar den lätt alarmistiska attityd som uttrycks i första delen (men det kan säga mer om mina privilegier/position/naivitet). Jag tror inte på svulstiga programförklaringar, men om vi genom samtal kan övervinna ett

fyrkantigt paradigmatänkande och istället ge rum för mångfald i samexistens är mycket vunnet.

De avslutande faktiska analyserna lever inte upp till mina (högt ställda) förväntningar. Här ser jag en överraskande obalans mellan gammalt och nytt. Jacobus grepp kan närmast beskrivas som etiologiskt (kontra Breeds etologiska) med fokus på genetisk intertextualitet. Cohens klassiker "Who by Fire?" fungerar här primärt som avstamp till en undersökning av babyloniska influenser till den judiska liturgiska texten *Unetaneh toqef*. Lyons arbetar i hög utsträckning med biografisk metod (uppväxt, intervjuer) när han mejslar fram ett "evangelium enligt Gore" ur Depeche Modes version av "John the Revelator". Med Blooms "anxiety of influence" undersöker Gilmour intertextualiteten mellan Lennons "God", U2s "God part II" och Normans "God part III" vad gäller synen på religion och på musikens kraft. Sista ordet går till religionssociologen Abraham som levererar relevant, men bitvis svepande kritik, till exempel att receptionsforskare tenderar att behandla lätttexter väl närstynt som "heliga texter" eller att forskarna inte intresserar för elefanten i rummet: de faktiska lyssnarna. Däremot visar antologins två afrikanska bidrag (Gunda och West) hur receptionsforskning produktivt kan beakta större sociala förändringar.

Reception History and Biblical Studies ger en kvalificerad lägesbeskrivning av fältets möjligheter och utmaningar. Dess främsta styrka ligger i de teoretiska bidragen, enligt min mening, men den utmanar oss också till att lyfta blicken och självkritiskt fundera över vad receptionshistoria i synnerhet, och bibelvetenskap i allmänhet, är till för.

Mikael Larsson, Uppsala universitet

DANNA NOLAN FEWELL (ED.)

The Oxford Handbook of Biblical Narrative

New York: Oxford University Press, 2016, Hardcover, xi + 644 pp., £97,

ISBN: 978-0-19996-772-8.

The jacket states that this handbook "is a state-of-the-art anthology, offering critical treatments of both the Bible's narratives and topics related to the Bible's narrative constructions," which is a good summary of

the book. It is not a beginner's handbook, but rather written for the serious student and scholar. Being a large volume featuring fifty-one chapters distributed over five parts, I will highlight several, but not all of the chapters, in what follows, and finish with a more general remark.

The first part, "Overtures," presents theoretical issues. Danna Nolan Fewell starts with a general chapter on narrative theory, and can be said to sketch "the narrative turn in the humanities," including Biblical Studies. She also discusses how narratives construct identities and form social interaction, and attend to the composite nature of the biblical texts.

Stephen D. Moore sketches the development of biblical narrative analysis more specifically. This is, according to Moore, an approach that has been very much influenced by New Criticism, which has hindered the integration of post-classical narratologies in Biblical Studies, something which Moore sees as urgently needed.

Robert S. Kawashima depicts the narratives of the Hebrew Bible in their literary milieu, and argues that in comparison to the monological epic works of the ANE, the Hebrew Bible's dialogical narratives represent the birth of prose literature. In similar fashion, Austin Busch explores the connections between New Testament narratives and Greco-Roman literature, especially those between Aratus' *Phaenomena* and Euripides *Bacchae* and Acts, and echoes of Homer's *Odyssey* in Mark. Raymond F. Person analyses the borderland between epic and historiography in chapter five, especially in regard to Samuel-Kings, and concludes that the biblical historians were faithful performers of historical discourse according to their own cultural standards. The last chapter of the first part elucidates the use of poetry in biblical narratives. Tod Linafelt makes a highly interesting and compelling case that poetry is used to supplement the terseness of narratives in the Hebrew Bible, injecting figurative language and feeling etc. in them.

The chapters of the second part of the volume, "Biblical Narratives," each covers a specific book, or range of books, in the Bible. Those left out are the poetic books of the Hebrew Bible (apart from Job), and, in the New Testament, the letter to the Hebrews, and the letters of Jacob,

Peter, and John. I believe this depends primarily on the lack of narrative research on these books. More intriguing is that the apocryphal books of Tobit, Judith, and 1–2 Maccabees are not allotted separate treatment.

David M. Gunn opens this part by covering “the Bible’s first story,” i.e. Gen–2 Kings. Gunn shows how these books have been read as one long story, and presents readings of it from both biblical and non-biblical quarters. Fewell has co-written the following chapter on Genesis with R. Christopher Heard, focusing on how it is a communally constitutive story, promoting survival. Moving to Leviticus, Bryan D. Bibb notes that it has seldom been read as a narrative, but, since it is a literary work appearing on one scroll, it is part of the larger Pentateuch, and since it has short narrative insertions (such as Lev 1:1), it is a narrative and merits narrative analysis. Adrienne Leveen is more cautious in her analysis of Numbers, saying that it is “an anthology of texts of great variety” (147), which, nevertheless, were carefully edited as a description of Israel’s wilderness journey.

Further on, Ovidiu Creanga analyzes the themes of land, identity, and memory in Joshua, and outlines a spatial-critical reading of the conquest. Deryn Guest traces narrative and related research on Judges, and focuses on Yahweh as a character from the perspective of masculinity, psychological and queer theory. Rachelle Gilmour looks at the two dominating concerns of the books of Samuel as the rise and fall of leaders, and the election of David, while Keith Bodner traces the motif of death, among other things, throughout the books of Kings.

Patricia K. Tull takes on the Latter Prophets, and starts by shortly arguing for the narrativity of the prophetic books, but then primarily analyzes the narratives found in the prophetic books (e.g. Isa 6:1–13; 36–39). Carol A. Newsom’s learned and stimulating chapter on Job, holds the prose and poetic parts separate, while at the same time manages to let them shed light on each other.

Turning to the New Testament, Scott S. Elliott analyzes Mark’s gospel, concluding that much narrative research has agreed to analyze the final form, to separate story and discourse, and to assume the posi-

tion of the ideal reader. Elliott makes an alternative reading to this by studying time and focalization in Mark 6:7–30.

Melanie Johnson-Debaufre, outlines the narrative study of Paul's letters, which have focused on the narrative substructure to the letters, and portrayals of Paul through narrative historiography. However, these readings are challenged by the multiplicity of stories in Paul's letters.

The third ("The Bible and Bodies") and fourth ("The Natural, Social, and Conceptual Landscapes of Biblical Story Worlds") parts proceed mainly from ideological and post-colonial readings, and also incorporate social-scientific theory. Jeremy Schipper starts by elucidating the implications of the dearth of body description in the Hebrew Bible, for the portrayal of disability and non-disability. In a chapter on feminist criticism, Judith E. McKinley sketches how scholars have worked with the portrayal of women in the biblical texts, retrieval of 'forgotten' women, but also how male reading practices have been challenged. In a similar vein, Eric Thurman traces the study of masculinity and its constructions from the 1990's and forward, and Kathleen Gallagher Elkins and Julie Faith Parker looks at children and childist interpretation.

Turning to more social-scientific inspired research, Jennifer L. Koosed focuses on food in the Bible, and its connections to sustenance and survival. Martien A. Halvorson-Taylor devotes his chapter to "diaspora novels," such as Esther and Joseph, and the social reality of exile. Linda A. Dietch takes a broader view on social-scientific research, and uses Durkheim and Bourdieu to analyze the story of Ehud in Judg 3.

The fifth and last part is termed "On Reading." Here Jione Havea and Monica Jyotsna Melanchthon perform a cross-cultural reading of Israel's meeting with the Gibeonites in Joshua 9, and theirs and others' trickery. Gerald West outlines how the Bible was leaked, stolen, and integrated into a southern African context. Finally, Gary A. Phillips probes "the ethical turn" in narrative studies and the importance of accountability in interpreting the texts.

The *Handbook* is, as seen from this short and partial overview, a rich resource to biblical narrative. It is an anthology and not uniform. However, reading through the volume I kept wondering what is meant by

“narrative.” The concept would seem to include almost anything, and I miss a chapter that would problematize not only the different contexts and uses of narratives, but the very concept itself. How can the book of Jonah, Genesis–2 Kings, and Leviticus all at the same time be termed narratives? Tellingly, literary scholars such as Käte Hamburger, Lars-Åke Skalin, and Richard Walsh, who have argued that “narrative” covers several and not one phenomena, are not included. Even so, this handbook is a must read for anyone interested in the study of biblical narrative, and should form the starting point for many a groundbreaking narrative analysis.

Josef Forsling, Teologiska högskolan, Stockholm

ROBERT P. GORDON AND HANS M. BARSTAD (EDS.)

*“Thus speaks Ishtar of Arbela”: Prophecy in Israel,
Assyria and Egypt in the Neo-Assyrian Period*

Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2013, Cloth, xiv + 322, \$49.50,
ISBN: 978-1-57506-282-2.

This volume collects fourteen articles presented at the 2009 symposium of the Edinburgh Prophecy Network (founded in 2006), the principal aim of which was to study prophecy within the limited time-frame of the Neo-Assyrian period, during which “classical” Israelite prophecy is thought to originate. The biblical texts discussed include the major prophetic texts associated with the pre-exilic period: Hosea, Amos, Micah and Proto-Isaiah.

Apart from the well-known texts of the Hebrew Bible, two corpora of prophetic texts from the Ancient Near East exist: the Mari texts (18th cent. BCE) and the Neo-Assyrian texts of the seventh century BCE, which date from the troubled reigns of Esarhaddon (681–669 BCE) and Ashurbanipal (669–627 BCE). This relatively small corpus of cuneiform tablets in Akkadian was retrieved from the royal archives of the ruins of Nineveh. The volume’s title quotes the introductory formula referring to the goddess Ishtar that regularly occurs in these oracles: Ishtar was the deity who pronounced the decisions of the divine assembly. As M. Nissinen – who drew attention to the relevance of the Neo-Assyrian

prophetic for comparative purposes as long ago as in the 1993 Festschrift to Kurt Bergerhof – reminds us in his keynote essay on prophecy as a social construct, these extra biblical texts (a term which he wisely shuns to the preferment of “ancient Near Eastern” or even “ancient Eastern Mediterranean”) “have been the object of active study for only a short period and their ideology is probably not internalized by many researchers.” This is an understatement that reminds us how saturated the study of “prophecy” sometimes is in biblical (and Christianized) conceptions of prophecy as genre.

While a few of the contributions focus solely on biblical prophetic books, thought to originate in the Neo-Assyrian period – for example, co-editor H. M. Barstad’s article “Hosea and the Assyrians” – most articles attempt to treat the several prophetic traditions of the Ancient Near East from a comparative perspective, and cautiously seek to elucidate points of contact, possible interrelatedness and contrast, the underlying assumption being the relevance of the Ancient Near East (or in some cases even the Mediterranean) material texts to contextualize biblical prophetic texts and the religious phenomenon of prophecy. The contributors generally emphasize the distinctiveness and cultural embeddedness of each tradition and a methodological awareness permeates the collection - any bold assertions about Ancient Near Eastern prophecy/prophets as the progenitors or the prophecy of the Hebrew Bible is absent. As co-editor R. P. Gordon reminds his readers, the evidence for prophecy in the Ancient Near East (even by a broad definition) is surprisingly meagre, and prophecy as a phenomenon seems to have been “unevenly experienced and variously regarded in Mesopotamia and adjacent regions.” Whether we can speak confidently of a “Near Eastern prophetic continuum” or not (Gordon believes we can), and what this proposition entails, remains disputed. The paucity of the Assyrian material is noteworthy, even compared to the Mari texts, which make up about two-thirds of the total of 130 independent texts known from these two cultures, separated by a millennium. The deafening silence elsewhere in the region is striking, as Gordon notes.

Evidently, even the notion of “biblical” vs. “extra-biblical” prophecy betrays a prejudiced stance and needs to be questioned, as it implies a biased view of “classical” Israelite prophecy as the pinnacle of ancient prophetic tradition. Most of the contributors are affiliated with departments of Biblical Studies, and (as is to be expected) approach the subject from the biblical perspective. Their emphasis on the need to assess and contextualize the “Old Testament” testimony within a much broader cultural context is therefore to be welcomed. Some contributors touch on the need to contextualize prophecy itself within the broader category of Ancient Near Eastern divination, to which it properly belongs. As the title implies, this anthology predominantly focuses on the Neo-Assyrian corpus of prophetic texts of the period. The Egyptian material receives short shrift and only receives scant treatment by J. W. Hilber, who probes common themes in selected texts of royal cultic prophecy in Assyria, Judah and Egypt, among them Egyptian royal hymns.

The texts from the Nineveh archives were published piecemeal as early as the 1870s (and some translations duly appeared in Pritchard's *Ancient Near Eastern Texts* as “Assyrian oracles”), yet they merited little attention from Old Testament scholars throughout the twentieth century, especially when compared to the much older Mari texts, which antedate the Assyrian texts by a millennium. In his article “Prophecy in the Mari and Nineveh archives,” co-editor R. P. Gordon suggests that this was due to the Assyrian texts offering “no promise of fresh insight into the origins or cultural matrix of Israelite prophecy,” whereas the Mari texts “included circumstantial detail ... not paralleled in the Nineveh oracles” (the Mari and Nineveh corpora were compared by K. van der Toorn in *Prophecy in its Ancient Near Eastern Context* [SBL, 2000]). The lack of interest may also be ascribed to the fact that Mari was seen as culturally closely affiliated with Israelite prophecy by reason of their Northwest-Semitic cultural proximity (and perhaps receiving additional support through the so-called “Western hypothesis,” which dictated that prophecy reached Mesopotamia from its westernmost fringes), while the Assyrian texts were perceived as culturally (Eastern, “Babylonian”) and

linguistically (Akkadian) more alien. The re-editing and translation into English of the entire corpus of Nineveh texts related to prophecy under the aegis of the Finnish *State Archives of Assyria Project* (as volumes 7 and 9 of the SAA series, eds. S. Parpola and M. Nissinen), has, however, made the Akkadian texts accessible and invigorated the comparative study of Ancient Near Eastern prophecy.

In his keynote essay, M. Nissinen (Helsinki) discusses prophecy from the perspective of social constructionism as a “socially and historically contingent phenomenon.” Prophetic activity and scholarly perceptions of prophecy are seen as products of culturally contingent processes. Nissinen proceeds to analyse the symbolic universe within which the oracular responses of Ishtar acquired their meaning in the Neo-Assyrian empire. The Assyrian oracles are “ideological representations, in and through which the Assyrian state ideology exists.” The royal ideology, then, is the cultural matrix within which the constructs of prophecy materialize, and prophecy is but one form of divination on which this ideology rests. As mouthpieces of the divine council (their “word” often identified with the goddess Ishtar’s pronouncements), oracles proclaim the world dominion of the Assyrian kingship, whose theology revolves around “the king’s crucial position in the divine world order.” In times of crisis, prophecy legitimates the royal succession, contested at the time of ascension of Esarhaddon and Ashurbanipal. The divine oracular responses, then, are representations not only of “Neo-Assyrian prophecy,” but also of Assyrian state ideology, the cultural matrix of the prophecies. Nonetheless, this ideology (or world view) is not in itself false – the image or construct we are left with, is both “constructed and real.” Not simply rehearsing the ideology of the ancient texts (“mimetic reading”), then, becomes a major challenge to scholarship, Nissinen argues, quietly nodding at the excesses of Old Testament scholarship. Yet, “[h]owever critically we attempt to read our sources,” Nissinen concludes, we must accept that their very existence depends on this vast construct.

Nissinen then turns his attention to modern-era Biblical scholarship’s constructs of Biblical prophecy, which from the nineteenth century onwards tended to see *the* prophet as a “brave and independent indi-

vidual” in the evolution of Israelite religion, representing moral standards and genuine spirituality, whose genuine words had been blurred by unworthy and decadent successors. In this process, prophecy becomes dissociated from all other forms of divination and prophecy is established as a distinct (and positive?) historical phenomenon. Nissinen describes the persistence of this legacy as “astonishing,” and in some respects, this late-nineteenth century scholarly agenda “still provides the general matrix for scholarly constructs of prophecy.” Nissinen finely demonstrates the relevance of the social constructionist perspective as entirely different constructs of prophecy result from widely different historical and social processes. Ancient and modern constructs of prophecy inhabit different symbolic universes.

In a comparative study of intercession in Neo-Assyrian and biblical texts, L-S. Tiemeyer initially asks whether the Neo-Assyrian prophets can be seen as intercessors. Whereas divine intercession dominates the Assyrian sources, Tiemeyer identifies three instances where humans (prophets, cultic functionaries) intercede on behalf of their fellow humans, although the divine assembly remains closed to them. Based on the verbal forms used, she concludes that “the Neo-Assyrians perceived human and divine intercession differently.” However, this does not entail that human and divine intercession can be construed as two entirely distinct phenomena, according to Tiemeyer. She contrasts the Neo-Assyrian instances with intercession in the Hebrew Bible, where human intercession occurs regularly (Abraham, Moses, Job, Samuel, Hezekiah). The identity of the intercessor is what distinguishes the Neo-Assyrian from the biblical texts; Tiemeyer draws attention to the fact that neither in the extant Neo-Assyrian nor the biblical texts do human intercessors intercede explicitly in the divine council, whereas biblical prophets have access to it, and, as Tiemeyer sees it, can “take an active part in events” (Zech 3, Isa 6). Tiemeyer further suggests that a conceptual connection between the divine assembly and intercession can be traced in a few biblical texts (Amos 7, Exod 32–34), and that the Mesopotamian idea of divine intercession in the divine assembly has shaped the biblical account of Moses’ intercession on behalf of Israel on Mt Sinai (Exod 32–

34) – the prophetic characters' intercessory role in the Hebrew Bible is described as "a monotheistic version of the Neo-Assyrian notion of divine intercession, known through the Neo-Assyrian prophets." The role of the biblical prophet fuses the Neo-Assyrian (and Mesopotamian) concepts of human and divine intercession, and the uniquely biblical notion that prophets had access to the divine council and took an active part in it served to enhance their intercessory role. Whereas Tiemeyer convincingly argues that the textual evidence support the notion of human intercession in the Assyrian sources (and her discussion of the Assyrian texts is thorough), her suggestions regarding the numerous biblical texts and the comparisons drawn point to the temptation to blur the distinction between prophecy as a socio-religious historical phenomenon and prophetic texts as literary (and ideological) constructs.

In his article "Prophecy in Israel and Assyria: are we comparing apples and pears?," J. Schaper (Aberdeen) cautions against wide-ranging comparisons of the prophetic traditions of the Neo-Assyrian and Israelite prophetic traditions on methodological grounds, especially since they display widely diverging and unique transitional processes from orally delivered oracles to subsequent stages of textualization. Schaper thus contrasts the transmission processes of the Israelite and Assyrian texts. In Schaper's view, recent scholarship attempts to level the differences between the two, which leads to "methodological muddle and falsified results." Schaper concentrates on "the material aspect of their transition from oral to written texts" and of aspects of material preservation (archives) and intended audience. He compares material aspects of the respective traditions, and unlike the Israelite and Judean tradition, the Neo-Assyrian oracles, stored in the royal archives, "never triggered a living literary tradition" – obviously, the formation of prophecies (or source texts) into literary texts is often seen as the hallmark of the 'prophetic' texts of the Hebrew Bible. With regard to the Neo-Assyrian prophecies, their textualization was never intended to create any sort of coherent narrative, and Schaper draws attention to the fact that "prophetic texts" only account for a very small percentage of divination reports preserved from Nineveh. Neo-Assyrian prophets, as he sees it, in

all likelihood never addressed the populace, and even if texts were put on public display at temple gates, only a select few could read them. In sharp contrast, Schaper, argues, the “important question is how fixing the oral texts in writing changed the way oracles were preserved (and handed on) and determined the delivery of future prophetic oracles.” Schaper contrasts the Neo-Assyrian practices with Israelite and Judean prophetic material, where, in Schaper’s view, “wide ranging publicity ... was the original objective of documenting the oracles,” indeed they were read out “among the general populace.” The ensuing process of literary embellishment distances them even further from their Neo-Assyrian counterparts. Schaper thus questions conclusions which fail to acknowledge this chasm between the materiality of communication of the Judean and Neo-Assyrian material as an integral part of the prophetic traditions themselves. It will be evident that Schaper’s claims regarding the controversial subject of the transmission process (orality/literacy, etc.) of the biblical material in particular may be questioned, yet he draws attention to central aspects of the materiality of communication and how the failure to acknowledge these as methodologically relevant allows for comparisons between “apples and pears.”

Only two essays deal exclusively with non-biblical texts of the period: C. L. Crouch explores how Assurbanipal “relies on Ishtar to legitimate his military activities.” This historically-oriented study focuses on inscriptional evidence other than the prophetic texts of the period. J. Atkinson (Edinburgh) re-evaluates the divine speech episodes in the late Neo-Assyrian text “The dialogue between Assurbanipal and Nabu” and concludes that “the divine utterances attributed to Nabu are best understood as prophetic,” based on criteria established by M. Nissinen in his 1997 study of references to prophecy in Neo-Assyrian sources. Atkinson thus adds to the meagre harvest of prophetic texts of the period.

The remainder of the essays adopt a comparative perspective, although clearly the biblical prophetic texts remain the focal point of attention throughout the volume. In fact, only a small handful of the essays discuss the Neo-Assyrian prophetic material in any real depth. While this may be due to the constraints of the admittedly limited

sources at hand, it is also a testament to the resilience of the view of the Hebrew Bible's "classical prophecy" as the original matrix of prophecy. In fairness, the brevity of the format (10–20 pages) does not allow for any extensive comparisons. No two contributors discuss the same biblical texts nor do they pursue identical themes or concepts within the texts discussed. This broad approach may be welcomed by some readers. In my view, it leaves us with a collection that seems more disparate than perhaps was necessary. Several authors note the need to contextualize prophecy within the broader category of divination. This is hopefully the next step in the comparative study of the texts discussed in this volume.

Magnus Halle, Lund University

FEDERICO GIUNTOLI AND KONDRAD SCHMID (EDS.)

*The Post-Priestly Pentateuch: New Perspectives on
its Redactional Development and Theological Profiles*

FAT 101, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015, Hardcover, viii + 351 pp., €114,
ISBN: 978-3-16-153121-7

One of the contributors to this volume (M. Köckert) mentions, not without a whiff of nostalgia "[jene glückliche Tage] als es in der Pentateuchforschung noch Gewissenheiten gab, die von den meisten geteilt wurden." Everyone familiar with the developments in the study of the Torah-book knows that since at least three decades those happy days are gone. The classic four-source hypothesis once so brilliantly presented by Julius Wellhausen has in the view of many crumbled with only ruins remaining.

The present volume, a collection of articles dedicated to Jean Louis Ska on the occasion of his seventieth birthday, deals with the aspect of dating, an issue which was put on the table once again by some of the iconoclasts in the seventies. The book contains 17 contributions, all by well-known names in the field. The introductory chapter by K. Schmid (1–18) gives a survey of the discussion about the "post-P" elements in the Pentateuch showing how the sections seen as additions or developments of the final P-layer tend to grow according to several scholars.

Schmid gives credit to one of the pioneers on this field, viz. Julius Popper, who already in 1862 presented arguments for postdating Exodus 36–39, especially pointing out linguistic similarities between this section and the Samaritan Pentateuch. Schmid's paper gives the basic perspective for the following contributions.

D. Carr (19–34) also refers to Popper. He discusses several passages which indicate harmonisations between D and P as well as material which is “mid-second Temple,” for example the so-called *mal'ak*-layer which consequently is later than the final priestly shape of the text. He is less convinced about the lateness of Genesis 14 and 15 as well as Joshua 24 as post P. R. Achenbach (35–51) discusses the use of divine names in contexts where “heathens” acknowledge the Israelite god and identify their own *'elôhîm* with YHWH. In light of this Genesis 20 must be post-P. R. Albertz (53–74) belongs to those who assume a Hexateuch redaction encompassing Genesis-Joshua (Blum; Schmid; Römer; e.a.). Albertz' Hexateuch redaction is more comprehensive than assumed by many others, and appears almost identical with the old Elohist. Unlike Wellhausen & co. Albertz dates this layer after Nehemiah. B. Jackson (75–111) discusses the relationship between the levirate marriage law in Leviticus and the book of Ruth, marking the differences between institutionalized written law and local practice illustrated in the book. B. Levinson (114–23) deals with one of the most central texts in the discussion of the sources of the Pentateuch, viz. the Flood story in Genesis 6–8. He sees it as a redaction of a P-variant and a non-P-story by a post-P redactor whose ambition was to harmonize the differences. Chr. Levin (125–43) argues that the promises to the patriarchs outside the Priestly Code are literary additions to the patriarchal stories. Some are yahwistic and pre-P but most are post-P. J. Blenkinsopp (145–56) analyses Genesis 17, i.e. P's circumcision story, and arrives at the conclusion that 17:1–8 is original P, the rest is from late Achaemenid times. M. Köckert (157–76) analyses Genesis 20–22 and finds most of it post-P: most of the stuff in the section is *Bearbeitung* of the material in chapters 12–19 and at least chapter 22 is definitely a post-P composition. A. Rofé (177–84) deals with the admonitions not

to leave the Holy Land reflected in Genesis 24 and 26 and the related chapter 46 and adduces several quite convincing arguments that these texts are post-P. Th. Römer then tackles the Joseph story (185–201). His conclusion is that the Joseph story was not known to P, and that its content connects it with what is told in the book of Esther and Daniel. According to him it is a diaspora novella composed during the Persian period. F. Giuntoli gives a thorough analysis of Genesis 48, i.e. the chapter about the two sons of Joseph – Ephraim and Manasseh (203–32). According to Giuntoli, the two names represent the returning exulants from Babylonia, and the function of the chapter is to give legitimacy to the returnees over those who had remained in the land, reflecting conditions described in Ezra and Nehemiah. J. Chr. Gertz (233–51) argues that the linking of the Joseph novella and the Exodus story belongs to the Priestly text, thus a late redaction. L. Schmidt (253–75) analyses the passages about the rod of Moses, arguing that most of them belong to a post-P redaction. A pre-P layer is visible in Exodus 4, 17 and Numbers 20, which has been expanded by a post-P redactor to whom most of the other remarks about the rod belongs. H.-Chr. Schmitt (277–303) puts the “Sinai overture” in Exodus 19:3b–9 in a larger context, assuming an “enneateuch” layer that is traceable until 2 Kings, characterized among other things by the concept “listening to YHWH’s voice,” the purpose of which is to mediate between, or even amalgamate, the two separate theological strains of D and P. We are thus in a post-P stage. Chr. Nihan (306–29) studies Leviticus 26:39–46, i.e. the conclusion of the so-called Holiness Code, arguing that the section has a clear post-exilic character combining elements and concepts from D, P and also other layers. Like the Sinai overture it mediates between the main theological strains in the Pentateuchal tradition. Finally E. Otto (331–41) gives a lucid *exposé* of the discussion about the relationship between Deuteronomy and the Priestly Code. Like many others he claims the existence of a post-P redaction of the Torah book. And he is quite explicit that D including Joshua might be post-P additions to the work. Schmid’s and Otto’s articles are in fact excellent introductory and

concluding extensive surveys of central issues in the debate and provide a suitable framework for the intervening contributions.

Two remarks of a more comprehensive kind will be made, which actually represent two sides of the same problem. The first is the absence of linguistic considerations in the studies. Among the 17 contributions which all deal with the problem of dating – relative and/or absolute – only one (A. Rofé) adduces linguistic arguments as support for the suggested late dating of the text analysed (Genesis 24). The track suggested already by J. Popper, one and a half century ago, is not followed. But this creates a problem which should be tackled and which is noted by D. Carr (30). Since almost all contributors assume additions to the text after the final formulation of the Priestly Code, we end up with texts composed after Ezra-Nehemiah at the same time as Chronicles, and even later texts like Esther and Daniel. At the same time, almost all of these supposed late additions linguistically represent Standard Biblical Hebrew (SBH), whereas the late canonical texts just mentioned are in Late Biblical Hebrew (LBH). Only A. Rofé is able to point to LBH elements in Genesis 24, which support his late dating. A dramatic example of the contrary is Römer's analysis of the Joseph story where he quite convincingly shows its parallel to Esther and Daniel as far as thematic contents are concerned. But the problem is that that text is a paradigmatic example of SBH with no traces of LBH. In fact, both the Priestly Code and Deuteronomy seem to be good SBH, their language quite distinct from that of e.g. Ezra, Nehemiah and Chronicles, let alone Esther and Daniel.

A solution to this problem is the assumption that SBH and LBH were contemporary linguistic registers that could be used alternatively and that the difference has no importance for dating. This idea was launched a decade ago by a group of scholars led by I. Young. But several competent linguists have put their theses into serious doubts and it is obvious that the problem cannot be ignored. It seems clear that the claim by Young & co. is very problematic at best and possibly untenable.

This leads to the second remark. We are faced with a dilemma: many of the arguments of the present volume on the post-P additions to the Pentateuch make sense and often give elegant explanations of the passages treated. But what about the language-question? If it is unlikely that perfect SBH was written during the entire Achaemenid period and even into the Hellenistic age what do we do with the obvious post-P texts singled out in the present volume? Only one solution seems possible: if the additions are post-P and their language is impeccable SBH we have to ascribe an earlier date to P than the traditional one. This is clearly the implication of Otto's study in which he dates Deuteronomy after the Priestly Code. In fact, the studies collected in the present volume give strong support for an early date of P – perhaps against the intentions of many of the contributors. In fact, their arguments for the texts treated to be seen as post-P show that P must be older than assumed by them.

This means that some of the analyses may have to be adjusted. The Joseph novella definitely has an exilic perspective, but it does not follow that it must be almost contemporary with Esther and Daniel. There were Israelite exulants before that. The image of the sons of Joseph in Genesis 48 may well reflect an exilic perspective, but could it not refer to an exile before the time of Ezra and Nehemiah? Why are the forebears of the two Joseph tribes used as legitimization of returning exulants after 539 BCE? One would rather expect a story about Judah. It looks more as a legitimization of the return of the Israelites, i.e. the northerners.

It rarely happens that someone gets the final word in the discussion about the Pentateuch and these studies are no exceptions. But we have received fresh food for new thought.

Jan Retsö, Gothenburg University

ELIZABETH R. HAYES OCH LENA-SOFIA TIEMEYER (RED.)

*“I Lifted My Eyes and Saw”: Reading Dream
and Vision Reports in the Hebrew Bible*

LHBOTS 584, London: Bloomsbury, 2014, Inbunden, 253 s., €81.00,

ISBN: 978-0-56760-566-5

Precis som titeln förklarar, fokuserar denna antologi på drömmar och visioner i den hebreiska Bibeln, det som från ett genreperspektiv beskrivs som visionsrapporter. Ursprungligen har bidragen presenterats vid två EABS-möten, ett i Thessaloniki (2011) och ett i Amsterdam (2012), inom ramen för forskningsgruppen ”Vision and Dream Accounts in the Hebrew Bible, the New Testament, Early Judaism, and Late Antiquity”. Artiklarna avspeglar en variation av metoder och lässtrategier, som illustrerar en mångfald av tillvägagångssätt i läsningen av bibliska drömmar och visionsrapporter. Redaktörerna förvarnar att detta resulterar i ett antal presentationer som föreslår ömsidiga motstridiga tolkningar av en text. Detta gäller särskilt Sakarjas nattvisioner, vilket visar hur komplicerad en läsning av Sak 1–6 kan bli.

De första två artiklarna ger ett bredare perspektiv på visionsrapporter med tyngdpunkt på fenomenologiska och retoriska aspekter (Verline; Tiemeyer), men majoriteten av bidragen undersöker drömmar och syner i bibeltexter (von Heijne; Scalise; Hayes; Lyons; Radine; Boda; Pettersson; Hallaschka; Stead). En av artiklarna koncentrerar sig på visionsrapporter som en del av en kontinuitet, där tidigare material återanvänds och transformeras för omskrivning i senare texter (Lear). Sista gruppen av artiklar studerar hur visionsrapporter har uppfattats i senare texter (Wagner; Klein; Tooman), även om exempelvis Anja Kleins detaljrika diskussion om de förtorkade benen i Pseudo-Hesekiel (DSS) och bibliska Hesekiel (MT) går bortom bokens tema och även blir ett inlägg i debatten om den hebreiska kanon. Mitt intryck är att redaktörerna har skött sitt jobb väl och att deras inledning tydligt presenterar antologins innehåll och syfte(n).

Vad är det då vi mer exakt erbjuds i Hayes och Tiemeyers bok? Sex av artiklarna fokuserar på Sakarja. Fyra artiklar ägnar sig helt eller delvis åt Hesekiel. Jesaja får en hel artikel och en del i en annan, totalt två

artiklar, detsamma gäller Jeremia. I varsin artikel diskuteras drömmarna i berättelsen om Josef (med implicita paralleller till berättelserna i Daniel) och Amos visioner. En artikel analyserar en biblisk text utanför den hebreiska Bibeln, från Uppenbarelseboken, och kopplingen till den profetiska litteraturen i GT. Således, förutom det som handlar om metoder och lässtrategier, får boken ett särskilt värde för den som är intresserad av Sakarja, med Hesekiel som god tvåa. De övriga profetböckerna i antologin får mer sparsam uppmärksamhet. Om något saknas, skulle det vara apokalyptiken i Daniel, trots att 10 utav 15 artiklar refererar till Dan 7–12 någon gång, särskilt Michael A. Lyons artikel om Hes 40–48.

Artikelförfattarna är verksamma i Canada, Tyskland, USA, Sverige, Scotland, Sydafrika, och Australien, och består av sex kvinnor och nio män, vilket får betraktas som en hyfsad bredd av exegeter inom ett relativt avgränsat ämnesområde. Här följer en genomgång av deras artiklar med kortfattade sammanfattningar av slutsatserna.

Rodney A. Werline, "Assessing the Prophetic Vision and Dream Texts for Insights into Religious Experience". Werline menar att det kulturella forandet av en person påverkar hennes förståelseförmåga. Det öppnar i sin tur upp för möjligheten att verkliga erfarenheter ligger bakom profettexterna.

Lena-Sofia Tiemeyer, "The Polyvalence of Zechariah's Vision Report". Tiemeyer argumenterar för att en visionsrapport är pluralistisk; till exempel att Sak 1:8–17 har mer än en innebörd även om de medföljande oraklen föreslår en bestämd mening.

Camilla von Heijne, "The Dreams in the Joseph Narrative and their Impact in Biblical Literature". Von Heijne vill visa att Josefs och faraos drömmar är symboliska och därmed unika. Josef är den ende israeliten i Bibeln med egna drömmar, och är tillsammans med Daniel de enda drömuttolkarna, vilket signalerar ett litterärt samband.

Pamela Scalise, "Vision Beyond the Visions in Jeremiah". Syftet med Scalise studium är att upptäcka om andra delar i Jeremia än kap. 1, 24 och 38:21b–23 kan identifieras som visionsrapporter. Bästa sättet att

göra det är att betrakta Jeremia som Guds budbärare med tillgång till "Herrens rådslag".

Elizabeth R. Hayes, "The Role of Visionary Experiences for Establishing Prophetic Authority in Isaiah, Jeremiah and Ezekiel: Same, Similar, or Different?". Hayes svar blir att varje profets auktoritet som Guds budbärare och ambassadör etableras genom en kombination av vision och talakt.

Michael A. Lyons, "Envisioning Restoration: Innovations in Ezekiel 40–48". Lyons argumenterar för att de nya element som präglar Heskies tempelvision finns med i senare visionslitteratur. Profeten var också först med att använda en visionsrapport för att skildra ett omstrukturerande och återupprättande av sitt folk.

Jason Radine, "Vision and Curse Aversion in the Book of Amos". Radine menar att Amos visionsrapporter är jämförbara med inskriften *Deir 'Alla Combination I*, vilket visar att de båda kan ha fungerat som "curse aversion texts".

Mark J. Boda, "Writing the Vision: Zechariah within the Visionary Traditions of the Hebrew Bible". Enligt Boda tillhör Sak 1:7–6:15 en äldre profetisk genreform, men att dess författare av retoriska skäl introducerar innovativa element för en ny publik, med större betoning på observatören, uttolkaren och scenen.

Anthony R. Petterson, "The Eschatology of Zechariah's Night Visions". Petterson går emot Finitisis' idé att Sakarjas eskatologi är förverkligad och annorlunda än den apokalyptiska. Istället liknar nattvisionerna i hög grad profetisk eskatologi om en ljus framtid.

Martin Hallaschka, "Interpreting Zechariah's Visions: Redaction-Critical Considerations on the Night Vision Cycle (Zechariah 1.7–6.6) and Its Earliest Readers". Hallaschka uppfattar Sakarjas visioner som en del av en redaktionell process och kan analyseras på samma sätt som de åtföljande sekundära oraklen.

Michael R. Stead, "The Interrelationship between Vision and Oracle in Zechariah 1–6". Till skillnad från Hallaschka finner Stead ingen anledning att separera visioner och orakel från varandra i Sak 1–6, utan de hör ihop som en helhet.

Sheree Lear, "Visions of Locusts: The Composition of Revelation 9.7–11". Lear visar med tre exempel från Upp 9:7, 11 hur Johannes läste GT (2 och 3 Mos, Hes och Joel) och förstod dess interrelation.

Thomas Wagner, "More than a Source? The Impact of Isaiah 6 on the Formation of the Book of Isaiah". Wagner vill bevisa att synen på Gud som Juda Kung i Jes 6 förändras i receptionen, i och med formerandet av Jesajaboken, till Gud som regent och skapare av hela kosmos, men kommer ner till de fattiga och rättfärdiga.

Anja Klein, "Resurrection as Reward for the Righteous: The Vision of the Dry Bones in Pseudo-Ezekiel as External Continuation of the Biblical Vision in Ezekiel 37.1–4". Resultatet av Kleins detaljerade studium visar att postbiblisk exegetik börjar där innerbiblisk exegetik slutar, och att innerbiblisk exegetik blir postbiblisk exegetik.

William A. Tooman, "'To Do the Will of Their Master': Re-Envisioning the *Hayyôt* in Targum Jonathan of Ezekiel". Toomans slutsats är att de ansvariga för TJ var mycket måna om MT Skriftens enhet, vilket gör att TJ Hes 1 om änglar också är en kommentar till själva hebreiska förlagans inre väsen.

För att bli uppdaterad på den senaste forskningen kring drömmar och visionsrapporter i hebreiska Bibeln, eller för att förstå mer om en särskild genres betydelse för exegetik och hermeneutik, så kan denna bok rekommenderas. Mina kritiska synpunkter är begränsade till att det i enstaka fall förutsätts mer förkunskap än vad som kan förväntas av en läsare, att vissa författare pressar in för mycket information i sina artiklar och att ett par artiklar hade behövts struktureras tydligare. Några artiklar skapar följdfrågor, vilket enbart är positivt för fortsättningen.

Stefan Green, Åbo Akademi

CHRISTOPH HEILIG

*Hidden Criticism? The Methodology and Plausibility
of the Search for a Counter-Imperial Subtext in Paul*

Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015, Mjukband, xiii + 199 s., ISBN: 978-3-16153-795-0

Vanligtvis kan en läsare förvänta sig att ett inledande kapitel innehåller en forskningsöversikt och/eller en kontextualisering av de huvudsakliga

problem som kommer undersökas. Christoph Heilig börjar i en annan ände. Inledningsvis jämförs Filon av Alexandria med Paulus från Tarsos i en slags analogi, genom att titta närmare på exempel på kritik av imperialistisk ideologi i den förras oeuvre. Med detta intressanta grepp väcker Heilig intresse samt tydliggör en spänning som föreligger i relationen mellan de två inflytelserika och samtida diaspora judarna. I linje med en tes om en möjlig ”tredje väg” att kritisera Rom, som Heilig driver i boken, påvisas Filons olika sätt att hantera romersk politisk ideologi, och tydliggör därmed bokens huvudproblem genom att ta avstånd från ett monolitiskt perspektiv på kritik av imperial ideologin under 1:a århundradet v.t. Bokens syfte är alltså att röra sig bort från den ”antingen-eller” positionering som präglar diskussionen när det gäller anti-imperial kritik i Paulus.

Kapitel två är ren metodologi och innehåller en del oväntade och intressanta förslag från Heiligs sida. Exempelvis den centrala syntesen mellan Richard Hays intertextualitet och matematikern Thomas Bayes (1702-1761) teorem om sannolikhet. Denna oväntade mix signalerar Heiligs tydliga intresse för samtida vetenskapsteori. Men tyvärr ger inte författaren en behövlig kontextualisering av sannolikhetslära för NT-exegetik, som en läsare icke förtrogen med denna typ av resonemang kan förvänta sig. Heilig menar vidare att Bayes teorem inte är en *ny* metod som sådan, utan ”simply means to *make the logical substructure more explicit that underlies all solid historical conclusions*” (28, författarens kursivering). Likande, historiografiska penseldrag fortsätter när Heilig menar att samma teorem ”just [is] *the logic of rational inference in the presence of uncertainty*” (28 n. 27, författarens kursivering). Liknande anspråk behöver dock en mer solid teoretisk förankring, enligt min mening, vilket tyvärr uteblir. Istället presenterar Heilig en metodologi som väver samman vetenskapsteori med exegetiska rön, men tenderar i slutändan att värdera den strikt vetenskapsteoretiska diskursen högst av de två.

I kapitel tre genomför Heilig sitt försök att etablera en medelväg mellan de två extremerna *helt öppen* samt *dold kritik* av romersk ideologi, i *Corpus Paulinum*. Öppen kritik liknas främst med vad stats-

vetaren John C. Scott benämner "Public Transcript". Motsatsen kallas av Scott, och dennes många efterföljare, för "Hidden Transcript". Heilig beskriver förtjänstfullt hur olika inflytelserika Paulusforskare går att placera i relation till denna dualism, men lägger även grunden för sitt eget försök att etablera ett tredje alternativ: *Corpus Paulinum*, lokaliserat någonstans mellan "Public Transcript" och "Hidden Transcript".

Kapitel fyra söker etablera en trovärdig bakgrund för att närmare förankra begreppet "Public Transcript". Med andra ord redogör Heilig för spänningen emellan kejsarkulten och samtida romersk imperial ideologi, samt hur dessa fungerade i en "öppen publik diskurs". Denna jämförelse ställs sedan i relation till en genealogi av kejsarkulten samt den imperiala ideologin. Avsnittet är välskrivet och Heilig kommer fram till att Paulus, likt samtida jämförbara profiler, antagligen var väl förtrogna med kejsarkulten som uttryck för romersk imperial ideologi och hade ett grundläggande incitament att kritisera denna kult.

Kapitel fem följer etablerad praxis i tidigare kapitel och söker svar på en huvudsaklig fråga genom en komparativ studie av tidigare forskning på området. Denna gång vilar fokus specifikt på Pauli generella attityd gentemot det romerska imperiet, enligt N. T. Wright och John Barclay. Om tidigare kapitel grundlade möjligheten för en paulinsk kritik av imperial ideologi, är det nu som Heilig driver hem sin poäng och tar ställning: Pauli primära intention verkar inte vara att kritisera Caesar *via negativa*. Men detta betyder inte att en sekundär intention inte fungerade just som en sådan kritik. (Denna "både-och" kan, för övrigt, sägas vara summan av Heiligs bok i stort.) I kontrast till Wrights parafras av Pauli ståndpunkt som "Jesus is Lord and Caesar isn't", samt Barclays tydligt motsatta förståelse av aposteln, går alltså Heilig en medelväg. Både Wright och Barclay har rätt; Paulus är både öppen i sin kritik, samtidigt som han inte är helt tydlig med den. Den paulinska hållningen sammanfattas som "You know these claims of Caesar to be 'Lord' – *that is what Jesus is!*" (134, författarens kursivering). Paulus formulerade aldrig ett argument *ad negativum* som Wright föreslår, utan lämnar till åhörarna att uppfatta och avkoda det anti-imperialistiska budskapet.

Det sista analys-kapitlet är dedikerat frågan om särskilda ord/fraser och deras eventuella kopplingar till en anti-imperialistisk kritik. Termer som guds son, herre, frälsare diskuteras som eventuella *terminus technicus* i relation till en romersk statsideologi. Tyvärr landar kapitlet i det mer eller mindre okontroversiella konstaterande att varje specifik paulinsk perikop (i relation till LXX och den synkrona kontexten) bör avgöra huruvida texterna har en möjlig kritisk hållning. Med tanke på bokens uttalat moderata hållning gentemot tidigare forskning, som tenderar att gå mellan motsatta extrema poler, är denna slutsats dock inte oväntad.

Eftersom boken är "metodtung" kommer jag i resterande del fokusera på metodologi. Jag ser här två brister i *Hidden Criticism*, som består i att Heilig aldrig tydligt redogör för 1) vad en subtext är, eller 2) hur en subtext fungerar. Detsamma gäller, för övrigt, även det centrala begreppet (anti-imperialistisk) *kritik* ("criticism"). Gällande dessa två termer kan dock en mer eller mindre detaljerad skiss av "subtextualitet" samt kritik målas upp utifrån de val av huvudsakliga samtalsparter i boken, som görs i de olika diskussionsavsnitten i boken (J. White; R. Hayes; N. T. Wright; J. Barclay; J. Elliot; samt John C. Scott).

Kritik kan definieras, från författarens perspektiv, som, avsiktlig ("intentional") fördömelse av en ideologisk aspekt eller ideolog som sådan. Heilig har alltså inget större intresse av mottagarnas perspektiv, vilket leder till en teoretisk död vinkel, det vill säga receptionen av de Paulinska breven av de tidiga kyrkofäderna. Den antika receptionen, samt tendenser i de tidigaste manuskripten, av till exempel Rom 13:1–7 förblir därmed en oanvänd resurs för Heilig. Även om valet skulle kunna försvaras med avgränsning som skäl, är det trist att frågor som ligger utanför författar-intention inte behandlas. Här avslöjas vidare Heiligs idealistiska historiesyn, som lägger stor metodologisk tyngdvikt vid Pauli "inre värld" snarare än texternas faktiska funktion eller den receptionen av texterna som indikation på fungerande kritik.

Subtextualitet liknas bäst vid en slags textuell *undermedvetenhet*. Analogin till psykoanalys är från min sida avsiktlig, eftersom subtexter, likt freudianska felsägningar, främst blir uppenbara i korta instick i en

till synes vanlig diskurs, som resulterar i en helt ny utvärdering av diskursen. Ett visst ord, en särskild fras eller ett ”eko” (för att tala med Hays) undersöks av Heilig med syfte att belysa hur Pauli medvetet eller undermedvetet (men trots allt *avsiktligt*, likt den freudianska felsägningen) kritiserar kejsarkulten, eller andra delar av officiell romersk politisk ideologi. Kom här ihåg att felsägningar i psykoanalys avslöjar *vad du verkligen menar*, oavsett vad den som uttalar felsägningen tror.

Jag anser inte att en psykoanalytisk prövning av NT texter som sådana är förbjuden metodologisk mark, men förväntar mig dock en något mer utförlig diskussion om den teoretiska tillgången till Pauli intentioner och inre värld än vad som ges i *Hidden Criticism*. Frågan som jag väcker här är alltså inte om intentions-forskningen vara eller icke vara inom NT-exegetik, utan snarare om dess funktion och resultat i förhållande till de antaganden som metoden kräver. Är det inte metodologisk smidigare att bortse från Pauli intentioner och undersöka diskursens funktion och reception?

Joel Kublin, Lunds Universitet

YEONG SEON KIM

The Temple Administration and the Levites in Chronicles

CBQMS 51, Washington DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 2014,

viii + 232 pp., \$16, ISBN: 0-915170-50-7

The large temple communities with their innumerable servants are characteristic features of the Ancient Middle East. Especially in Mesopotamia we have large archives preserved through which we can get a detailed picture not only of cultic practices but also of administrative routines and the organisational structure of the communities. From the temples in Syria we do not have similar documentations, which is especially deplorable when it comes to the enormous temple complexes in Hierapolis, Palmyra, Damascus and Baalbek. But there is one exception: the temple in Jerusalem that was consecrated in the year 516 BCE on the site of the earlier temple built during the monarchic period but destroyed in 586 BCE. From the Second Temple we do not have

archival material as in Mesopotamia but we have some literary documents, above all the Book of Chronicles, which give insights into the activities in that sanctuary during the first centuries of its existence, i.e. the Achaemenid period. The book by Yeong Seon Kim (YSK) deals with an important aspect of the organisation of the personnel of that temple, viz. the position of the Levites.

The identity and function of the Levites in ancient Israel have often been discussed since the image given in the Old Testament of this group is contradictory. On the one hand, they are one of the twelve tribes, sons of Leah, the patriarch Jacob's first wife (so also 1 Chronicles 23:28), on the other they have functions which are more like that of a craft guild or fraternity than that of a traditional tribe. Even today a Jewish community is divided into three groups: priests (*kôhanîm*), Levites, and Israelites, which becomes visible during the recitation of the torah in the synagogal liturgy. This terminology is worth noticing and is actually found in 1 Chronicles 9:2.

In the so-called Priestly Code (P) in the Pentateuch the Levites have the function of protectors of the movable sanctuary as well as the task of carrying its parts during the wilderness wandering. In spite of the fact that also the priests are seen as descendants of Levi ben Ya'qob P makes a sharp distinction between them and the Levites. This distinction is upheld in Chronicles. In texts datable to the beginning of the 6th century, Deuteronomy and Ezekiel, the distinction seems to be deleted and at least in D priests and Levites are identical.

In a short Introduction (1–6) YSK presents the main problem when using Chronicles as a source for information about the temple in the Achaemenid period: the author of that work actually wants us to believe that he describes the First Temple and he also uses sources like the Books of Kings that deal with that temple. Consequently, a scholar has to be able to distinguish what these sources say about the First Temple and what refers to the Chronicler's own time. At the same time this is essential in order to understand the message of Chronicles: according to YSK the Chronicler in several cases describes practices that do not "reflect the actual practices of his own day but an idealized representation

of temple practices he wished to see enacted” (3). Ultimately, his ambition is to legitimize these practices by giving them divine authority which, according to YSK, is made in a very subtle way: the Pentateuch is not directly quoted anywhere, instead the Chronicler uses the cultic practices of David as the link between his own time and the authority of revelation. The differences between the practices envisaged by the Chronicler and the commandments of the Pentateuch are due to David’s innovations (e.g. 1 Chronicles 23:28–32) – the Chronicler hides himself behind the great king.

YSK’s book is divided into four chapters. The first, “Groundwork,” presents the texts analysed by YSK: 1 Chronicles 5:27–41; 6; 9; 23–26; 2 Chronicles 17–19; 29–31; 34–35. A section (18–26) is devoted to the problem of the dating of Chronicles as well as the discussion about the unity of the work since several important scholars (M. Noth; W. Rudolph; P. Welten; H. G. M. Williamson) have argued that several passages, for example those about David, are interpolations (26–34). YSK agrees with scholars like S. Japhet, I. Kalimi, and G. N. Knoppers in seeing the work as the accomplishment of one writer (33). As a matter of fact, these passages in YSK’s analysis appear to belong to the very basic cornerstones of the Chronicler’s work.

Chapter two (35–97) deals with three groups of personnel in the temple: gatekeepers, treasurers, and tax-collectors. These groups are not mentioned in the priestly legislation (the Priestly Code). They appear in Ezra and Nehemiah in their description of the Second temple and again in the Chronicler’s work. Unlike Ezra/Nehemiah he makes them all Levites. YSK describes how the Chronicler achieves this identification by establishing a line between a certain Shallum, as it seems from his own time, via a Zechariah in the time of David who is made a descendant of Korah. The Chronicler further, by inventing new terms, is able to draw other sections of the temple personnel into the Levite fold: treasurers and tax-collectors. Remarkable is the association with Korah, a Levite, or rather a group among the Levites, who is condemned in the Priestly Code (Num 16).

In chapter three (98–161) YSK investigates the financial system of the temple as far as it is documentable from his source. It is shown that the writer partly builds on traditions about the First Temple (102–109) but then integrates these facts with the situation of his own time. It is pointed out that there is no trace of the Achaemenid authority in the Chronicler's work. The image is that of a sanctuary without royal control, dominated by Levites. It becomes clear, according to YSK, that the aim of the Chronicler is not to give an exact picture of the situation in his own time, but by relating everything to the time of David and ultimately to Mosaic times, he presents his view on how the temple *should* operate.

Chapter four (162–93) deals with the question of why the Chronicler gives this evidently ahistorical description. The answer is given on page 169: the reason for the Chronicler's expansion of the category of Levites is to provide a legal basis for the financing of the personnel of the temple, which in the Achaemenid period was without royal support. The main source of income was the contributions of the people of Yehud. According to the ruling of the Priestly Code only priests and Levites could be supported by these contributions named *trûmôt* for the *kôh^anîm* and *ma^{ca}serîm* for the others. By claiming Levitical status for the entire temple staff everyone should be paid from the temple's coffers. It can be added that his use of the authority of David, and not Moses, may be due to the fact that innovations by David were acceptable since the whole temple project, initiated by David and realized by Solomon, was a considerable innovation and change in relationship to the prescriptions of the Priestly Code. The Chronicler has clearly realized the dichotomy between the Jerusalem temple tradition and the Priestly Code, something which has not always been observed by modern scholars who usually have assumed that the cultic prescriptions of P are simple reflexes of that of the temple.

An interesting detail is why the Chronicler uses Korah as the connection between his "new" Levites and the traditional ones. YSK speculates that there might have existed priestly groups using the Korah-episode in order to discredit any attempt at changing the organization of the tem-

ple staff. That there was a continuing discussion about the extension of Levite identity during the Second Temple period is shown by YSK in the final section of chapter four (171–90) where the position of Levites in the deuterocanonical works like Tobit, LXX Ester, several of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Jubilees, the Testament of Levi as well as in Josephus is studied. Striking is their absence in Ben Sira and 1 and 2 Maccabees. Chronicles appears as representing one standpoint among several others on this issue which seems to have lost its importance with the destruction of the temple. It would, in fact, have been interesting to have a following-up of the position of the Levites in the rabbinic literature.

Yeong Seon Kim's book is a well-researched and well-balanced study of a complicated subject and a substantial contribution to a field much more interesting and important than traditional OT scholarship has thought. Not the least in protestant scholarship, Chronicles has often been seen as a fairly unnecessary repetition of the Book of Kings, spiced with endless genealogies, unrealistic and unhistorical additions to Israelite history and petrified theology. Yeong Seon Kim's book is part of a renewed interest among scholars in Chronicles in general and the book shows that this trend is well-motivated.

Jan Retsö, Gothenburg University

ANJA KLEIN

*Geschichte und Gebet: Die Rezeption der biblischen
Geschichte in den Psalmen des Alten Testaments*

FAT 94, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014, xii + 435 s., €114, ISBN: 978-3-16-153241-2

I tysk tradition och med tysk grundlighet har Anja Klein genomfört ett studium av nio texter från Gamla testamentet för att undersöka sambandet mellan historia och bön. Med utgångspunkt från Israels segersång i Exodus 15, följer hon temat genom sju så kallade historiska psalmer – Psaltaren 78, 105, 106, 114, 135, 136, 137 – för att slutligen landa i den långa bönen i Nehemja 9. Av allt har det blivit en lärd, mångsidig och inte alltför lättläst bok. Arbetet består av sex kapitel. Det första är en inledning med en kort forskningsöversikt som framför allt

refererar till tyska arbeten. Här anges undersökningens syfte och uppläggning. Det handlar om en inomgammaltestamentlig receptionshistorisk studie, som också försöker besvara frågor om hur Psaltaren som bok vuxit fram och redigerats.

Kapitel 2–5 utgör arbetets huvuddel. De utvalda texterna närstuderas enligt ett bestämt mönster som delvis påminner om ett ganska traditionellt interpretationsschema. Först ges en kommenterad översättning, sedan följer en detaljerad textanalys med struktur, litterär kontext, teologi och så vidare. Särskilt intresse ägnas naturligt nog hur israeliternas historia skildras. Ett särdrag är frågan om textens plats i helheten och hur dess placering kan säga något om Psaltarens framväxt som samling.

Med tanke på bokens detaljrikedom är det knappast möjligt att ge annat än glimtar från dess innehåll. Därför noterar jag bara några iakttagelser, som ändå kan ge en uppfattning om arbetet som helhet.

Om Exodus 15 säger författaren att det är ett paradigm för sammanförandet av historia och bön. Det blir sedan utgångspunkten för de historiska psalmerna som vidareför "genren", och Klein kommer till slutsatsen att det går en redaktionshistorisk linje från Exodus 15, via de övriga psalmer som hon undersöker, fram till Psaltaren 137 och slutligen till Nehemja 9.

I anknytning till Psaltaren 78 för Klein ett ganska invecklat resonemang om psalmens tillväxtprocess, och jag är inte övertygad om att det säger särskilt mycket av vikt för förståelsen av psalmen eller den sak hon är ute efter att undersöka. Det säger kanske mera om en viss forsknings-tradition än om texten. Däremot är hennes iakttagelse viktig att detta är den första historiepsalmen i Psaltaren, och att den som sådan kan ha en programmatisk funktion genom att visa hur sambandet historia och bön kan förstås. Sedan hör det till saken att Psaltaren 78 ändå utmanar den forskning som betonar böneaspekten, eftersom psalmen så tydligt är didaktisk.

I samband med genomgången av psalmerna 105–106 och 135–136, och för den delen även Psalm 78, resonerar Klein utförligt kring dessa psalmers litterära kontext. Här noterar hon åtskilliga träffande iakt-

tagelser, även om en del slutsatser inte är självklara. Det förefaller mig till exempel inte helt avgjort att Psalm 135 är sekundärt fogad till psalm 136 för att vara en läsanvisning till den senare psalmen. Däremot är det träffande att se hur Psalm 137 individualiserar historien jämfört med de tidigare historiska psalmerna i Psaltaren.

Det sista kapitlet i Kleins arbete är summerande och innehåller även en kortare genomgång av Nehemja 9 som exempel på senare inomgamaltestamentlig reception. I kapitlet diskuterar författaren också psalmernas kultsituation och noterar den osäkerhet som finns kring den frågan.

Sammantaget har Klein med sin bok gett oss ett arbete att ta spjörn emot om vi vill försöka förstå både de historiska psalmernas plats i Gamla testamentets bönbok och kanske komma lite närmare den spännande frågan om Psaltarens redigering.

LarsOlov Eriksson, Johannelunds teologiska högskola

EDWARD W. KLINK III OCH DARIAN R. LOCKETT

Understanding Biblical Theology: A Comparison of Theory and Practice

Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2012, Paperback, 193 s., \$17.99,

ISBN: 978-0-31049-223-8

Författarnas utgångspunkt är att man kan karakterisera bibelteologier enligt hur dessa befinner sig på en skala mellan "historia" och "teologi", och finner så fem typer. Undertiteln, "En jämförelse mellan teori och praktik" blir förståelig när även frågan om *var* bibelteologi skall bedrivas och *av vem* behandlas: kyrka eller akademi. De fem typerna presenteras i olika kapitel, där varje typ ges en teoretisk beskrivning, vilken sedan följs av ett exempel på en modern "bibelteolog" (även om någon företrädare nog skulle värja sig mot den beteckningen). Man går så igenom de fem bibelteologiska typerna.

"Bibelteologi som historisk beskrivning": ingen helbiblisk teologi blir möjlig, eftersom de olika författarnas teologier är så olika. Dessa skall studeras i akademien endast av de som skolats i de discipliner som gör att man exegetiskt kan klarlägga vad texten betydde för de då samtida. Den historisk-kritiska metoden kontrollerar helt och hållet denna ansats:

man söker beskriva den teologi som rådde inom tid, plats och kultur, det vill säga den rekonstruerade tiden och platsen (*Sitz im Leben*); inte den spatio-temporal kontext som framgår ur textens extra-språkliga denotation (referens); vidare genom förståelse av textens olika traditions-lagers tolkningar. Bibelns teologi, så förstådd, behöver upptäckas genom samtida forskningsmetoder.

James Barr (1924-2006), presenteras som denna riktning mest framträdande företrädare. Hans *The Semantics of Biblical Language* (1961) attackerade "Bibelteologirörelsen" och dess tankar om skillnad mellan hebreiskt och grekiskt tänkande samt idén om att ord bar med sig samma etymologiska betydelse i alla syntaktiska förekomster. Titeln på Barrs sista bok, *The Concept of Biblical Theology* visar dock att ämnet ständigt sysselsatte honom. Författarna menar att Barrs styrka – hans ovevkliga och svidande kritik av andra – även var hans egen svaghet: själv ger han ingen metodisk vägledning hur bibelteologi skall gå till.

"Bibelteologi som återlösningshistoria": här görs en medveten koppling mellan de båda testamentena genom att teologiska kriterier ger en "speciell historia" som fortlöper kronologiskt. Denna återlösningshistoria följer vissa temata: förbundet, kungadömet, löfte/fullbordan och blir förståelig endast som den progressiva uppenbarelsen av Guds syften i historien. Det är akademiens uppgift att exegetiskt sålunda beskriva historien, men den teologi som härigenom uppkommer är till för kyrkan; denna typ har hermeneutiskt två foci: "vad det betydde och vad det betyder".

D. A. Carson (f. 1946), verksam i Trinity Evangelical Theological Seminary i Chicago, USA, ser bibelteologi som en "brobyggande disciplin" mellan exegetik och systematisk teologi. Medveten om alla exegeters förförståelser ("presuppositions") styrs han ändå, enligt författarna, av sin höga uppfattning om skriftens auktoritet. Klink & Lockett framhåller Carsons ambition att bibelteologi skall styras av exeges, och ligger därför närmare texten än den systematiska teologin med bas i "atemporal tänkande och filosofi". De menar ändå att den störs av att han inte ger historieskrivandets abstraherande karaktär rättvisa: "historia

är inte så neutral som Carsons underförstådda konstruktion ger vid handen” (89).

”Bibelteologi som världsbild/berättelse”: denna karakteriseras av den litterära genren *narrative*, ”berättelse”, vilken sammanbinder GT och NT, men uppfattas här även som en filosofisk kategori i sig. Rent konkret är det berättelseperspektivet i Paulus (eller NT:s) användning av Israels historia som utgör det positiva anslaget; många av dess företrädare avvisar den historisk-kritiska metoden som primär. Här uppskattas anslaget i Hans Freis *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative*, med kritik av ”kritiken” för att den förlorat det större perspektivet genom att rekonstruera historiska och sociologiska bakgrunder till texten. Man startar varken med teologiska propositioner eller med historiska rekonstruktioner utan syftet är att låta ”berättelsen” (”story”) som egen kategori skapa en världsbild. Teorin återkopplar till filosofiska tänkare som Alasdair MacIntyre och Paul Ricoeur: vår förståelse av oss själva och förståelsen av världen omkring oss är ofrånkomligt gjuten i berättelsens skepnad; alltså inte som emballage utan som förståelsekategori. Litterärt hänvisas till Gérard Genettes distinktion mellan *story* och *narrative*, den senare berättar den förra från flera perspektiv. ”Bibelns enhetliga berättelse framställer i själva verket en ’värld’; den skapar en ny verklighet i vilken vi som läsare inbjuds att finna oss själva” (107).

Denna bibelteologiska teori har sett en delning bland utövare (N. T. Wright kontra Richard Hays) över begreppet *story:s* relation till ”historia”. N. T. Wright (f. 1948) är denna teoris främste företrädare, (jfr *New Testament and the People of God*). Förutom på begreppet *story* grundar han sitt arbete på begreppet *world-view* (”världsbild”), som har med förståelse att göra (”presuppositional and precognitive,” 112), samt på vad han kallar *critical realism* (”kritisk realism”), vilken vänder sig mot positivismens naiva övertro på absolut objektiv kunskap; all mänsklig kunskap är i stället ofullständig. Hans ”världsbildsberättelse” tar sin utgångspunkt i den historiska verkligheten hos och förväntningarna inom Andra Tempets Judendom (520 f.Kr-70 e.Kr).

”Bibelteologi som kanon”: kanon ses som en såväl historisk som teologisk kategori, och ger perspektiv på textens historiska mening och

samtida kristna mening. Med detta kanonbegrepp följer övertygelser angående uppenbarelse och sanning som gäller identitet, karaktär och litterära källor. Vad som förenar kanoniska arbetssätt är fokus på kanons förmåga att återspegla olika användningar och tillämpningar av Skriften. Ingen är närmare förbunden med denna teori än Brevard Childs (1923-2007), vars *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture* var tänkt som ett sätt att läsa Bibeln. Childs förstår ”kanon” som: 1) mottagandet och erkännandet av dess litteratur som ”avgörande” (”authoritative”); 2) den process genom vilken denna samling nådde fram till stabilitet; samt 3) den teologiska förlängningen av texternas primära betydelse. Författarna menar dock att Childs bruk av begreppet ”kanon” knappast förstås, och skapat mycken förvirring (spec. 152–53).

”Bibelteologi som teologisk rekonstruktion”: här är *teologi* definierat som vad den bekännande kyrkan tror. Man positionerar sig utanför akademiens uppdelning i bibliska studier och systematisk teologi, och hävdar att Bibeln är de kristnas Bibel och inte tillhörig ett främmande folk i en gången tid och i ett avlägset land. En teologisk förförståelse gör att denna typ hör hemma i kyrkan; man engagerar sig inte i sekulära sanningsmodeller, utan arbetar med inomkyrkliga begrepp. För Francis Watson (f. 1956) måste en trogen läsning av Skriften betrakta Bibelns budskap som att det hänför sig till närvarande tid (”referring to the present tense,” 171), för även om det är rotat i det förgångna fortsätter den gudomliga ”egen-kommunikationen” (”self-communication”). Författarna noterar hur Watsons kritiker sett sambandet med Karl Barth, och berättigt anklagats för att vara eklektisk och omstörtande.

På det hela taget är författarna återhållsamma med värderande omdömen och även med direkta, i meningen ”konfronterande”, jämförelser. Framställningen kunde ha vunnit på om språket inte varit så omständligt och ordrikt; detta ger inte någon särskild precision, utan döljer snarast kärnan av substans och insikt. Klink och Locketts uttalade syfte är att erbjuda ett ”heuristiskt schema”. De gör inte anspråk på att definiera vad bibelteologi är utan vill initiera dialog, genom att visa hur ”bibelteologier” praktiseras, och vilka teorier som är verksamma i dessa.

Bo Krister Ljungberg

GARY N. KNOPPERS

Jews and Samaritans: The Origins and History of Their Early Relations

New York: Oxford University Press, 2013, Inbunden, 352 s., \$58,

ISBN: 978-0-19532-954-4

Gary Knoppers undersöker samariernas historia från de tidigaste källorna fram till romersk tid. Han intresserar sig för deras identitet och relation till judarna och baserar sin analys både på skriftliga och arkeologiska källor. Enligt honom har forskare ofta accepterat bibliska porträtt av det samariska folket alltför okritiskt och han söker nyansera bilden betydligt. Trots att det skriftliga materialet är knapphändigt lyckas han presentera en historisk rekonstruktion som är övertygande och som vittnar om att samariernas historia är en viktig del av landets historia. Boken innehåller en omfattande bibliografi, index till primära källor samt ett författar- och ämnesindex. Märkligt nog saknas en innehållsförteckning.

Kapitel 1, "Samaritans, Jews, and the Contested Legacy of Classical Israel", utgör en lång introduktion till boken och här lägger Knoppers fram sina resultat som han ämnar bestyrka. Han betonar att samarierna var ett stort folkslag. Under de neo-babylonska (538-332 f.v.t.), persiska (538-332) och hellenistiska (332-164) perioderna fanns det fler samarier än judar i Palestina. Det är välkänt att området Samarien drabbades svårt under den assyriska erövringen under 700-talet, men det återuppbyggdes och provinsen Samaria blev både större och mäktigare än sin södra granne Yehud fram till Hellenistisk tid. Knoppers pekar på de stora likheterna mellan samarier och judar: språket (hebreiska), traditioner om samma förfäder (Abraham, Isak, Jakob), de 5 Moseböckerna, liknande ritualer och högtider. Samarierna ansåg sig vara ättlingar till Josefs söner, Efraim och Manasse. Från judiskt håll sågs däremot samarierna som en blandning av ursprungsfolk och utlänningar som flyttade till nordriket i och med den assyriska invasionen. Den förhärskande synen på samarierna har påverkats av 2 Kung 17 som beskriver de norra stammarna som ett blandfolk som dyrkade både den israelitiska guden ("Herren") och avgudar. Knoppers kritiserar forskare för att acceptera beskrivningen i 2 Kung 17 och anta att israeliterna i Samaria, de norra

stammarna, skulle ha deporterats och dödat så att nya folkslag i stort sett skulle tagit över. Myten om Israels förlorade stammar är falsk. Var skulle de tagit vägen? Knoppers hävdar att de tio stammarna till stor del aldrig var förlorade utan stannade kvar. Han hävdar också att relationen mellan judar och samarier förblev stark, även efter förstörelsen av samariernas tempel på berget Gerisim.

I kapitel 2, "The Fall of the Northern Kingdom and the Ten Lost Tribes" betonar Knoppers att 2 Kung 17 är deuteronomistisk propaganda vilken även omfattar påståendet om att befolkningen i Israel skulle ha ersatts av utlänningar som det hävdas i 17:24 "Den assyriske kungen flyttade folk från Babylon, Kut, Avva, Hamat och Sefarvajim och lät dem bosätta sig i Samariens städer i stället för israeliterna. Samarien tillföll dem, och de slog sig ner i städerna". Här pekar Knoppers på arkeologiska lämningar som vittnar om förstörelse i Galileen och norra Transjordanien, men också om en fortsättning av den tidigare kulturen i Efraim och Manasse bergsbygd. Han drar slutsatsen att den inhemska populationen reducerades i storlek, men att den inkommande befolkningen inte var särskilt stor.

Det tredje kapitlet "God and Country" handlar om religiösa uttryck i Samarien i efterexilisk tid. Här kan noteras ett par roliga underrubriker såsom "Give Me that Old-Time Religion" (som ju är titeln på en klassisk gospel). Här ifrågasätter Knoppers den vanliga uppfattningen (igen) att befolkningen skulle vara utom-israelitisk. Han pekar på att Hoseas predikningar och även traditioner om profeterna Elia och Elisha som kom med i sydkets litteratur. En historisk utveckling är troligtvis att den traditionella israelitiska religionen, det vill säga Yahvism, fortsatte utan avbrott.

I kapitel 4, "The Fall of the Northern Kingdom as a New Beginning in Northern Israelite–Southern Israelite Relations" analyserar Knoppers synen på Samarien i Krönikeböckerna. En del forskare har ansett att samma författare också skrivit Esra-Nehemja, en uppfattning Knoppers avfärdar. Istället för den fientliga synen gentemot Samarien i det sistnämnda verket, finner Knoppers en mer neutral inställning till Samarien. I Krönikeböckerna framkommer en alternativ historie-

beskrivning av Israels situation efter den assyriska erövringen. Här förekommer ingen stor inflyttning av utländska grupper, utan istället bevarar folket i norr sin israelitiska identitet. Han betonar att den anti-samariska attityden som förekommer i Esra-Nehemja bara utgjorde ett perspektiv bland andra.

Kapitel 5, "Ethnicity, Communal Identity, and Imperial Authority", fokuserar på relationen mellan Samaria och Juda/Yehud i tidig efterexilisk tid. Knoppers lyfter fram stora likheter i judisk och samarisk kultur: språk (hebreiska och arameiska), avsaknad av arkeologiska lämningar efter pagan religiositet, och jahvistiska namn. Han argumenterar för att den jahvistiska samariska kulturen – som är snarlik den judiska – ska ses som resultatet av en naturlig utveckling av den israelitiska kulturen.

I kapitel 6, "Ethnicity, Communal Identity, and Imperial Authority" söker Knoppers förklara dispyten mellan samarierna och judarna. Inte överraskande ser han Nehemjas nationalistiska program som en viktig orsak bakom den växande spänningen mellan folken. Nehemjas strategi gick ut på att både stärka den judiska identiteten och att begränsa den israelitiska gemenskapen till judar. I detta sammanhang är det intressant att han pekar på motsättningar inom Yehud över Nehemjas strikta linje. Dennes motståndare hade en mycket vidare syn på israelitisk identitet än Nehemja – speciellt i en tid då många judar bodde utanför Yehud – och motsatte sig uteslutandet av samarier i den israelitiska gemenskapen.

Kap 7 "The Torah and 'the Place[s] for Yhwh's Name'" behandlar samarisk-judiska relationer i senare hellenistisk tid och under Mackabéer-perioden. Hyrkanus förstöring av templet på Gerisim (112-111 f.v.t.) befäste Judas politiska, sakrala och ekonomiska makt över Samarien. Det var också ett försök att få samarierna att besöka Jerusalems tempel istället för Gerisim, vilket Knoppers menar att somliga gjorde. Trots sämre relationer mellan folken pekar Knoppers på en fortsatt relation och ekonomiska och kulturella utbyten. Religionerna uppvisar stora likheter, men det finns viktiga skillnader: omfånget av auktoritativa skrifter (samarierna erkände bara de 5 Moseböckerna), texttradition (samariska Pentateuken uppvisar vissa ändringar jämfört

med MT och Dödahavsrollarna), synen på Mose (enligt samarierna hade han en mycket upphöjd status) och kalendern. Vilka skillnader som förelåg mellan kalendrarna går Knoppers dessvärre inte in på.

I avslutningskapitlet, "An Absolut Breach" utvärderar Knoppers skillnader och kontaktpunkter mellan folken under det första århundradet v.t. och framåt. Utifrån nytestamentliga texter (t.ex. Matt 10:5; Joh 4:9) och Josefus beskrivningar konstaterar Knoppers att relationen mellan folken försämrades ytterligare. Knoppers noterar samtidigt att rabbiner i Mishnah utgår ifrån att samarier är judar medan senare amoraim ser dem som icke-judar. Gällande kulturella likheter tar Knoppers upp synagogorna. Precis som judar byggde samarier synagogor, vilka inte skiljde sig arkitektoniskt från varandra. Båda grupperna använde *mezuzot* även om utformningen och textvarianterna var olika. Ytterligare en likhet är placeringen av renhetsbad, *miqva'ot*, på specifika platser, speciellt vid synagogor (235). Han kopplar placeringen vid synagogor till det samariska prästerskapet, som behöll auktoriteten över befolkningen, till skillnad från det judiska prästerskapet som förlorade sin höga status efter templets förstörelse. Här brister analysen i flera avseenden. Han uppmärksammar inte den självklara likheten, nämligen att båda grupperna använde *miqva'ot* vilket inte andra grupper gjorde. Placeringen av dessa vid synagogor är i sammanhanget inte särskilt relevant: få judiska *miqva'ot* har hittats vid synagogor och de samariska reningsbaden är daterade senare än dessa. Dessutom är kopplingen mellan *miqva'ot* och präster, vilket han tar för givet, inte alls självklar.

Knoppers har skrivit en viktig bok om samarierna och bidragit till att deras historia inte glöms bort. Skickligt visar han hur de kända texterna om samarierna i den hebreiska Bibeln speglar ett anti-samariskt perspektiv samtidigt som han lyfter fram andra mindre kända texter som ger en bättre insikt i deras historia. Boken är mycket lättläst och kräver få förkunskaper. En nackdel med den läsarvänliga texten är dock att forskningsläget presenteras med få nyanser. Boken kan varmt rekommenderas till studenter och forskare som intresserar sig för Israels och Judas historia.

Cecilia Wassén, Uppsala universitet

CHRISTOPH MARKSCHIES

*Christian Theology and Its Institutions in the Early Roman Empire:
Prolegomena to a History of Early Christian Theology*

Baylor–Mohr Siebeck Studies in Early Christianity. Waco: Baylor, 2015, Hardcover,
xxv + 689 pp, €79, ISBN: 978-1-48130-401-6

New ideas cannot be established in society without the social basis of institutions. This sociological theorem is the basis of Christoph Marksches's 2007 monograph *Kaiserzeitliche christliche Theologie und ihre Institutionen: Prolegomena zu einer Geschichte der antiken christlichen Theologie*, which now is available in a considered and accessible English translation by Wayne Coppins. Marksches's aim is to understand the social institutions of second- and third-century Christianity—such as the schools of Justin and Origen, the circle of disciples around the Montanist prophets, and the Eucharistic prayers offered in early Christian worship services—and the roles they played in the development of early Christian theology. Marksches argues that while the quartet of worship service, office, rule of faith, and canon have been addressed in many studies of early Christian development, these are just a sample of the institutions that may be of relevance. A measure of norm-setting, canonization, dogmatization and hierarchalization comes with any establishment of new ideas—not primarily as a result of a specific strategy, but more or less automatically, Marksches argues. Within his concept of “institution” falls, therefore, not only the first traces of the episcopal hierarchy that later came to be allied to the imperial power, but every sociological effort to consolidate early Christian theology and enables it to outlive the current generation.

Marksches stresses that all forms of Greco-Roman education were thoroughly ingrained with pagan traditions. In order to master the Greek language, Christian students had to copy, recite, and discuss numerous writings lauding Zeus, Apollo, and the whole Greco-Roman pantheon. Nevertheless, the participation of Christians as both students and teachers seem to have been generally regarded as unproblematic. Even when Apollinarius and Origen made efforts to Christianize their curricula, large portions of the Greek *παιδεία* remained. Even in Grego-

ry's *Address of Thanksgiving* to Origen, which describes the education given in what Markschie calls "the first clearly attested private Christian university" (84), the Greco-Roman model shines through. This discrepancy might be explained by the gradual fading of pagan religious texts into popular cultural mythology, but Markschie prefers to speak of a limited "degree of Christianization among the adherents of the new religion" (48) and the interest of Origen's school "in being able to release its students again" (89). In Markschie's view, early Christian teachers lived in a decidedly pagan world.

A more difficult comparison is the one Markschie makes between pagan oracles and the Montanist prophets. While both collected and spread what they claimed to be divine words from human mouths, the well-established urban institutions of pagan oracle sites were very different from the radical splinter group from a minority religion that Montanus led. The "new prophesy" doubtlessly benefitted from its proximity to well-known pagan oracle sites, but the similarities are more a matter of convergence of religious forms than of any common origin, Markschie concludes.

While higher education was limited to larger cities, and the Montanists were marked by their specific religious environment, the theologies supported by various forms of Christian worship services were more widespread, Markschie asserts. With a refreshing respect for the difficulties of the source situation, Markschie discusses Eucharistic prayers in the *Didache*, *Apostolic Tradition*, *Acts of John*, *Acts of Thomas*, *Pistis Sophia*, and various early Christian authors. He concludes that the implicit theologies that prayers such as these made available to the majority of early Christians were remarkably diverse in form, in the educational level they presumed in their audiences, and in what problems they were addressing. In this diversity, Markschie discerns efforts to adapt the forms in which Christian theology is communicated to existing cognitive categories—precisely as in the cases of education and prophecy. Just like Justin aimed to present Christianity as the true philosophy and Montanus claimed to hand down oracles from the true

God, Cyprian—even in the absence of a sacrificed animal—spoke of a true and complete sacrifice.

As an example of the connection between norm and institution in early Christianity, Markschies explores the action of making biblical texts binding for the larger community. This is a prolonged and complex process, whose sources invariably have other aims than to specify a canon of books. When Athanasius of Alexandria presents an authoritative list of writings, his larger aim is to argue against certain opposing free teachers—and Markschies suggests that similar aims may lie behind the enigmatic Muratorian Fragment. Marcion's aim was perhaps not to establish a canon, but merely to determine a philologically correct edition of a text whose authority was already established. Serapion of Antioch discussed the orthodoxy of the Gospel of Peter not to establish a canon, but as a factor for determining the orthodoxy of a community who apparently read it. Clement of Alexandria used texts as canonical to derive axioms for the argument he was trying to make, not to establish a canon for other areas. The holdings of early Christian libraries do not match early canon lists. Markschies concludes that the norm of a biblical canon originates with several different institutions—free teachers, established schools, bishops, synods, and liturgies—and that the canons developed in different circumstances differ both in content and in emphasis.

Markschies finds both Walter Bauer's concepts of "orthodoxy" and "heresy" and the more recently established model of "inculturation" of the gospel into a specific culture, to be lacking, since they imply that a culturally "pure" gospel can be separated from an equally "pure" culture. In their stead, Markschies prefers to frame further discussion in terms of "identity" and "plurality." Markschies understands "identity" as a property of the individual formed in interaction with a community—such as when early Christians participated in worship and education. "Plurality" can be understood either as a systematic network in which such individualities can still be captured, ordered, or framed by conceptions of unity—or as a vaguer variety where such limitations no longer hold. For the Christian movement in the second and third centuries, Markschies

holds that the former understanding fits best. Most of the diversity of early theologies can be explained by the experimental contextualization prompted by diverse circumstances, and the common conception of a “crisis” of Christian theology in the second century is unnecessary, Markschiefs argues. Amidst the many different Christian theologies developed in various circumstances, Markschiefs estimates that a shared theological center—Jesus of Nazareth as the crucified and resurrected Christ, certain ideals of a Christian life in a Christian community, and a basic stock of holy scriptures—is enough to speak of a common identity, even though this identity is a plural one.

With its terminological precision and detailed analysis of Greek, Latin and Syriac sources, Markschiefs’s monograph has already proven to be valuable in the on-going conversation of how best to conceptualize the theological developments in the early church. It will prove to be even more useful in this attractive English translation.

Carl Johan Berglund, Uppsala University

TRYGGVE N. D. METTINGER

Reports from a Scholar’s Life: Select Papers on the Hebrew Bible

Edited by Andrew Knapp, Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2015, Hardcover,
xxv + 349 pp., \$59.50, ISBN: 978-1-57506-379-9

This book contains a selection of short works in English by Tryggve N. D. Mettinger, internationally renowned and highly influential Professor of Hebrew Bible at Lund University from 1978 to 2003. The works, including one monograph, twelve articles and essays, and three reviews, published 1970-2008, reflect the primary focuses of his work on the history of ancient Israelite religion and theology, royal ideology, and the book of Isaiah. A retrospective lecture delivered by Mettinger upon retiring is also published here for the first time.

Reports is divided into six parts. Part I addresses the central theme of Mettinger’s scholarship: “the Study of the *Gottesbild*” (ch. 2), that is, the development of Israelite images of God in their ancient Near Eastern milieu. In ch. 3, “The Elusive Essence,” Mettinger argues that the Canaanite heritage of Israelite religion is evident in the fact that Yahweh

displays traits of both El (royal) and Baal (martial) as known from Ugarit. In ch. 4, “Yhwh Sabaoth,” Mettinger uses ancient iconographic and textual evidence to show that this title emphasizes Yahweh’s role as the king of a divine council who sits, invisible, upon a cherub throne in the temple on Zion. Ch. 5, “The Name and the Glory,” proposes that, in response to the temple’s destruction in 587 B.C.E., divine immanence was reconceived in the theologies of Yahweh’s name (Heb. *shem*—in the Deuteronomistic History) and his glory (*kabod*—in P and Ezekiel). In ch. 6, “The Dying and Rising God,” Mettinger renews the arguments that this contested mytheme is attested for at least certain Near Eastern gods.

Part II concerns aniconism in Israel. In ch. 7, “The Veto on Images,” Mettinger argues that “the Israelite cult was aniconic from the beginning” (171): Bethel’s bull and Jerusalem’s cherubs were pedestals for the invisible god. In ch. 8, “A Conversation with my Critics,” Mettinger introduces a distinction now fundamental in the debate, namely, between *de facto* (non-prohibitive) aniconism and programmatic (prohibitive) aniconism. Mettinger relates the *de facto* aniconism of early Israel to the widespread West Semitic “material aniconism” of standing stones (*massebot*). The Decalogue’s distinctively Israelite programmatic aniconism arose during the exile.

Royal ideology is the subject of Part III. Ch. 9, “The Last Words of David” is a detailed philological analysis of 2 Sam 23:1–7. In ch. 10, “Cui bono?,” Mettinger proposes that the earliest function of 2 Sam 7—Yahweh’s dynastic promise to David—was as rhetoric legitimizing Solomon’s succession.

The book of Job is highlighted in Part IV. In ch. 11, “Intertextuality,” Mettinger shows that the heavily allusive nature of Job’s poetry aims at challenging basic tenets of Israelite faith. In ch. 12, “The Enigma of Job,” Mettinger analyses how the conflicting *Gottesbilder* present in the book function together to construct a theodicy.

Part V brings back into print Mettinger’s brief, but devastating 1983 monograph, *A Farewell to the Servant Songs* (ch. 13). Here Mettinger systematically assaults the arguments in favour of Duhm’s once widely-

accepted hypothesis concerning an originally independent “servant” corpus within Isa 40–55. Mettinger thereby undermines the foundation of much subsequent exegetical work. In ch. 14, “In Search of the Hidden Structure,” Mettinger links Chaokamp motifs in Isa 40–55 with Yahweh’s kingship.

Three book reviews constitute Part VI, two of which appear in English for the first time (chs. 15 & 16). Apart from the review in ch. 17, in which Mettinger responds to criticisms of his own views, the relevance of the reviews to the wider work is unclear.

The image of Mettinger gathered from reading these works is extremely positive. The roughly chronological arrangement within the parts shows Mettinger’s increasing scholarly maturity. He “accepts correction,” adjusting his opinions in light of critique, and nuances his claims (cf. the stances taken on Isa 49:5–6 in chs. 13 and 14). In this, Mettinger evinces the philosophy of Karl Popper, whom he cites frequently and according to whom science is a series of “conjectures and refutations” (13). Additionally, Mettinger’s writing is a pleasure to read. He states his questions clearly, argues methodically and perspicuously, and offers succinct summaries. Furthermore, Mettinger admirably distinguishes between sure conclusions, probable inferences, and speculation.

As an edition, *Reports* has much to commend it. The volume is well structured, each of Parts I–V presenting the central theses or approaches of one or more of Mettinger’s monographs. The book therefore makes available in a single volume the chief results of Mettinger’s research, and any repetition that is presents serves to reinforce these core ideas. *Reports* would function well, then, as a “Mettinger Primer,” as its editor Andrew Knapp points out (xv). Knapp’s preface provides a helpful overview of the book and of Mettinger’s scholarship. A bibliography of the author’s English works is included, as is an index of scriptural references.

The edition, however, has certain deficiencies. Most frustrating is the fact that, apart from in ch. 1, cross references to Mettinger’s own works contained in this collection are not highlighted. Only the initial publication information and original pagination (not preserved in these essays) are given, making quickly flipping between articles impossible. A

comprehensive bibliography of works cited would also have been convenient, and important images (e.g., of Phoenician cherub thrones) could have been gathered in one place instead of appearing numerous times.

For a volume such as this to be more than a monument to a scholar's legacy, the studies it reproduces must be valuable and relevant today. Two aspects of Mettinger's work are potential obstacles to an enduring appreciation of *Reports*. First, Mettinger regards the Hebrew Bible as a useful source for early Israelite history. This is a view rejected by many contemporary biblical scholars, not just the "Copenhagen school" (cf. 18). Uncharacteristically, in *Reports* Mettinger ignores the challenges both of the exegetical "minimalists" and of archaeologists like Israel Finkelstein who question the evidence for Judah's statehood before the 8th century BCE and for a Jerusalem temple-palace complex. This does not seem satisfactory for studies published within the last decade, like ch. 10. Secondly, while Mettinger embraces "intertextuality" as a tool for literary analysis, he does so within a framework which accepts notions of authorship and recoverable intention (see ch. 11). His dismissal of much of "the post-modern theorizing that has spread like a pandemic disease" in the humanities (15) is a barrier to scholars who prioritize just such approaches.

Despite these remarks, few of Mettinger's positions are wholly outside today's scholarly consensus. Indeed, many continue to shape contemporary discourse, most notably in the area of Israelite aniconism and in the study of Deutero-Isaiah. In fact, what might be regarded as the distillation of Mettinger's oeuvre, and the end result of his "unconscious quest for the distinctive features of Israelite faith" (9) is extremely current and bears repeating: Israel's difference was not present *ab initio* nor did it arise *ex nihilo*; rather it developed gradually, in response to historical experiences, out of materials present in its ancient Near Eastern setting. Overall, then, *Reports from a Scholar's Life* proves to be highly valuable and relevant. I am convinced that this book will ensure that the remarkable achievements of this great Swedish exegete will be appreciated for many years to come.

Cian Power, Uppsala University

JACOB NEUSNER OCH ALAN J. AVERY PECK (RED.);
 WILLIAM SCOTT GREEN OCH GÜNTER STEMBERGER (RÅDGIVANDE RED.)
Encyclopedia of Midrash. Biblical Interpretation
in Formative Judaism. Volume I-II

Leiden: Brill, 2005, Inbunden, xi + 1077 s., \$482.00, ISBN: 978-9-00414-166-7

JACOB NEUSNER OCH ALAN J. AVERY PECK (RED.)
Encyclopedia of Midrash. Biblical Interpretation
in Formative Judaism. Volume I-II

Atlanta: SBL Press, 2016, Paperback, 1100 s., \$149.95, ISBN: 978-0-88414-129-7

Förhandenvarande referensverk utgör en systematisk framställning av bibeltolkning inom judendom under perioden från före 200 f.v.t. till omkring 700 e.v.t. Även om begreppet *midrash* ofta kommit att associeras specifikt med den rabbiniska traditionen så anlägger alltså detta uppslagsverk ett bredare perspektiv genom att definiera termen som "bibeltolkning" i allmänhet och att även beakta icke-rabbiniskt material. Trots att fokus läggs med tyngdpunkt på rabbinisk skriftutläggning så inkluderar verket sålunda artiklar om bibeltolkning även i konst och liturgi, hos Filon, Josefus, Qumran, Nya Testamentet, kyrkofäder, Jubiléerboken, Pseudo-Filon, Septuaginta, etc., och man eftersträvar till synes ett heltäckande perspektiv på judisk skriftutläggning under ovan nämnda period.

De respektive artiklarna är författade av framträdande forskare inom studiet av antik judendom och dess texttolkning, verksamma i USA, Israel och Europa. J. Neusner har – föga förvånande – själv bidragit med närmare hälften av materialet (22 av 56 artiklar), och den som sedan tidigare är bekant med hans ytterligt omfattande författarskap känner igen en stor del av materialet, som sannolikt hämtats från tidigare verk. Man kan dock fundera över om Neusner själv verkligen är den främsta auktoriteten vad det gäller de ämnen han ansvarar för, eller hur det kommer sig att hans bidrag är så oproportionerligt stort i jämförelse. Tyvärr skapar detta förhållande en viss likriktning som annars inte är synbar i verket. Utöver Neusner så har bland annat S. Fine, L. H. Schiffman, S. Fraade, F. Siegert, G. Porton, R. B. Kern-Ulmer, D. In-

stone-Brewer, L. Feldman, G. Stemberger, R. S. Sarason, W. D. Nelson, H. Basser, R. M. Price, T. H. Lim, P. Fleisher, D. J. Harrington, och B. D. Chilton, med flera bidragit i förhållande till sina respektive expertisområden. Därmed är artiklarna, med något undantag, *up-to-date* (eller var åtminstone så när verket utkom för första gången för omkring tolv år sedan) och tämligen representativa för forskningens mittfåra. Det är följaktligen värdefullt att så mycket forskningsresultat nu tillgängliggjorts i ett och samma verk.

Som kan förväntas i verk av detta slag, där många olika författare ger sina respektive bidrag, finns det skillnader mellan de olika artiklarna. Den kanske mest påtagliga avvikelserna är den att enbart vissa artiklar men inte alla, inkluderar fotnoter och/eller en kort avslutande bibliografi, vilket är både beklagligt och påfallande märkligt. Särskilt bibliografierna är värdefulla och hade med förtjänst kunnat inkluderas som ett konsekvent förekommande komplement till de referenser till sekundärlitteraturen som återfinns i fotnoterna i vissa av artiklarna. Här kan noteras att åtminstone en av författarna sedermera har publicerat en kompletterande litteraturlista separat (se A. Kamesar, "The Church Fathers and Rabbinic Midrash: A Supplementary Bibliography, 1985-2005", *Review of Rabbinic Judaism* 9/1 [2006], 190–96).

Till skillnad från G. Stembergers standardverk *Einleitung in Talmud und Midrasch* (som utkommit i sin nionde och fullständigt omarbetade utgåva 2011), där fokus läggs på isagogik, betonar *Encyclopedia of Midrash* istället mer innehållsmässiga aspekter och stort utrymme ges till långa citat från primärkällorna (särskilt i Neusners bidrag, vilket är typiskt för hans sätt att skriva). Detta är å ena sidan värdefullt då det på ett konkret sätt illustrerar de utläggningstekniker som diskuteras, men upptar samtidigt mycket onödig plats. Man kan i anslutning till denna reflektion också fundera över varför texten satts i två kolumner per sida, vilket gör den besvärlig att läsa och dessutom bidrar till verkets redan omfattande sidantal.

I innehållsförteckningen listas artiklarna i alfabetisk ordning vilket är förtjänstfullt då det underlättar sökandet efter relevant material, men arrangemanget skymmer samtidigt det heltäckande perspektiv som ver-

ket eftersträvar. Redaktörerna är medvetna om detta och ger sålunda i förordet såväl en kortfattad och hjälpsam alternativ översikt, som en parallell uppställning av materialet enligt kategorierna: "General Introduction to Rabbinic Midrash and its Traits" – "Rabbinic Readings of Biblical Books" – "The Theology of Rabbinic Midrash" – "Rabbinic Midrash in Historical Contexts" – "Privileged Translation: The Targumim and Rabbinic Midrash" – "Formative Rabbinic Midrash: Midrash in Synchronic Context; Special Topics". Gemensamt index över antika källor och diskuterade ämnen hittas i slutet av den andra volymen. I och med det nya paperback-formatet har priset sjunkit drastiskt och närmar sig överkomliga nivåer.

Jag har, till avslutning, svårt att se att *Encyclopedia of Midrash. Biblical Interpretation in Formative Judaism* skulle kunna komma att ersätta Stemberger, CRINT eller *CHJ* IV, men den är likväl ett välkommet och, med tanke på sin spännvidd, ett varmt rekommenderat tillskott på bokhyllan jämte dessa verk. I och med det nya lägre priset kanske "bokhyllan" i detta fall till och med kan vara den egna och inte enbart universitetsbibliotekets.

Tobias Ålöw, Göteborgs Universitet

STANLEY E. PORTER AND DAVID I. YOON (RED.)

Paul and Gnosis

Pauline Studies, Leiden: Brill, 2016, Inbunden, 222 s., €99, ISBN: 978-9-00431-668-3

Den här boken är det nionde numret i Brill-serien "Pauline Studies", alla redigerade av Stanley E. Porter; de senaste tre tillsammans med någon av hans yngre medarbetare. Ytterligare sex antologier planeras utkomma, ett nytt för varje år. Serien behandlar, som namnet indikerar, Paulus utifrån något specifikt tema och för den föreliggande boken är temat "gnosis" och "gnosticism" – vilket behandlas i tio artiklar. Boken är uppdelad i två block. Del I behandlar Paulus och hans relation till "gnosis". Eftersom termen betecknar ospecificerad "kunskap" så kan detta, vilket redaktörerna också gjort, tolkas väldigt brett.

Del I börjar med en studie av Paulus användning av konceptet ”kunskap”, genomförd av Stanley E. Porter. Artikeln är analytiskt dämpad och består huvudsakligen av en lexikal genomgång av Paulus (inklusive de deuteropaulinska samt pastoralbreven) användning av konceptet kunskap. Det centrala bidraget i denna studie är, i min mening, att Porter inkluderar även andra ord än de som börjar med $\gamma\nu\omicron$ -roten, till exempel $\omicron\tilde{\delta}\alpha$. Efter genomgången drar Porter några slutsatser, bland annat att flera av de deuteropaulinska brevens användning av kunskapsbegreppet passar in med användningen i några av de autentiska breven, bättre till och med än vissa av de autentiska breven sinsemellan. För att denna slutsats ska vara intressant, emellertid, så förutsätter det att Paulus hade en enhetlig användning av kunskapsbegreppet överhuvudtaget.

Nästa artikel i del I är författad av bokens andre redaktör, David Yoon. Här diskuteras 2 Kor 12, som omnämner törnet i Pauls kött ($\sigma\acute{o}\lambda\omicron\psi\ \tau\tilde{\eta}\ \sigma\alpha\rho\kappa\acute{\iota}$). Yoon presenterar en historisk översikt över de många och oförenliga tolkningarna av begreppet. Han avfärdar bland annat tanken att Paulus syftar på en fysisk åkomma eftersom det vore okarakteristiskt av en person, som verkar ha utstått så mycket förföljelse (inklusive fysisk sådan) att klaga över en kroppslig åkomma, och Yoon tillägger: ”Paul probably would not have cared too much about these sorts of things” (26). Yoon presenterar sedan en egen exeges och slutsatsen blir att begreppet $\sigma\acute{o}\lambda\omicron\psi\ \tau\tilde{\eta}\ \sigma\alpha\rho\kappa\acute{\iota}$ syftar på en djävulens budbärare som ständigt påminner Paulus om hans tidigare aktiviteter som förföljare av kristna. Detta passar väl med Adolf Schatters hypotes från 1960-talet, att Paulus talar om sitt samvete i denna passage.

Del I fortsätter sedan med en artikel av Andrew W. Pitts som behandlar 1 Kor 15 och diskussionen om Paulus syn på uppståndelsekroppen. Artikelns huvudsyfte är att omkullkasta Richard Carriers hypotes om att Paulus här presenterar en doktrin om att uppståndelsekroppen är immateriell. Nästa artikel i del I, författad av Adam Z. Wright, presenterar en ny metod för att identifiera allusioner i den paulinska korpusen – allusioner till GT såväl som litteratur från Paulus grekiskromerska kontext. Wright baserar sin metod på Gian Biagio Contes syn

på allusioner som ”poetiskt minne”, och att temat i allusionen måste identifieras innan lexikala eller konceptuella jämförelser påbörjas. Chris S. Steven är författaren till sista artikeln i del I och här diskuteras Paulus uppfattning om sig själv och sin roll. Steven argumenterar att Paulus uppfattade sig som en ny Elia, en profet, och inte bara en apostel, detta trots att Paulus inte brukar betecknas som en profet bland de tidigaste kristna.

Del II av boken övergår i att diskutera Paulus och ”gnosticism”. Del II öppnar med en artikel av D. G. Dunn som konstaterar att gnostiker och även Markion inspirerades mycket av Paulus. Dunn argumenterar för att de inspirerades av Paulus, men missförstodde och gjort våld på Paulus teologi. Gnostiker och Markion presenterade Paulus på ett förenklat sätt vilket också är orsaken till att Paulus blev så populär bland dem, eftersom de var grupper som önskade enkla svar i en komplicerad värld. Den andra artikeln i del II, författad av Hughson T. Ong, undersöker heresin som nämns i 1 och 2 Tim. Efter analyser av tidigare ställningstaganden, som identifierat heresin som gnosticism, proto-gnosticism och synkretism, sluter sig Ong till – eftersom kontexten i 1 Tim skiljer sig från 2 Tim – att vi förmodligen har att göra med två olika former av heresi i 1 och 2 Tim. Den tredje artikeln i del II är Michael Kalers genomgång av Paulusreceptionen i Nag Hammadi-texterna. Kaler visar vidden av olika användningar av Paulus som finns i text-samlingen och därmed också att det inte fanns en reception av Paulus bland de som ibland kallas gnostiker. De flesta av Nag Hammadi-texterna bör helt enkelt förstås som representationer av tidig kristendom, snarare än texter från en heterodox minoritet som stod emot ortodoxin. Den näst sista artikeln, Tide Bak Halvgaards text, är en analys av begreppet *fullheten* (pleroma) i den paulinska litteraturen och dess reception i Nag Hammadi-texterna. Halvgaard visar på utvecklingen av konceptet *fullhet* som sker från Paulus skrifter, via de deuteropaulinska breven och receptionen av båda i Nag Hammadi-texterna där den fungerar som en teknisk term för kollektivet av eoner i flera texter. I den sista artikeln, av Panayotis Coutsoumpos, diskuteras omnämmandet av ”de starka” i församlingen i 1 Kor. Coutsoumpos presenterar en kort överblick och

analys över forskningsläget och sluter sig till att ”de starka”, de som hade mer kunskap än de svaga, inte kan sägas ha representerat en gnostisk grupp eller någon form av gnosticism eller proto-gnosticism. De starka syftar helt enkelt på de i Korinth som hade mer kunskap än andra.

Det finns några brister i den här boken, förutom den apologetiska hållning som lyser igenom i några av texterna, speciellt Dunns artikel. Redaktörerna refererar kort i inledningen till forskningen som bedrivits kring fenomenet gnosticism och uppmärksammar problematiken kring begreppet. Det förefaller dock som om de bortsett från budskapet i forskningen eftersom inga åtgärder vidtagits för att motverka oklarheterna kring termen ”gnosticism” i utformningen av boken. Artiklarna i den första delen har inte mycket med varandra att göra, mer än att de handlar om Paulus och att termen ”gnosis” ibland omnämns (ofta utan att definieras).

Bokens andra del innehåller flera intressanta artiklar, framförallt Halvgaards och Kalers bidrag, men eftersom en definition aldrig presenteras i början av boken så lämnas läsaren att undra vad som egentligen för artiklarna i del II samman. Vad är ”gnosticismen” som studeras? Några artiklar arbetar dessutom utifrån en daterad och polemisk syn på gnosticism. Vid ett tillfälle presenteras ”gnostiker” – som inte närmare definieras – som libertiner eller världsförnekande asketer (195). Denna skildring är baserad på Irenaeus polemiska redogörelser (som helt saknar grund i förstahandskällorna vi nu har tillgång till) och borde ha nyanserats, men accepteras istället okritiskt av Coutsoumpos i den sista artikeln i del II (195).

För att boken skulle nått sin fulla potential så borde insikterna som den senaste gnosticismforskningen delgett oss ha implementerats mer aktivt. Några oklarheter finns också i inledningen där gnosticismforskningen diskuteras kort. Redaktörerna skriver att en del forskare övergett termen ”gnosticism” och istället använder termen ”sethiansk gnosticism” och ”klassisk gnosticism”, och här anges två referenser: Karen King och Michael A. Williams. Mig veterligen förespråkar varken King eller Williams att termen gnosticism byts ut till ”klassisk gnosticism” eller ”sethiansk gnosticism”. Williams förespråkar snarare att ter-

men ”bibliska demiurgiska traditioner” används istället för ”gnosticism” medan Karen King helt vill överge termen och menar att det räcker med att tala om antik kristendom; behöver man närmare precisera sig så ska andra begrepp än det polemiska och oprecisa konceptet gnosticism användas, menar King. Boken *Paul and Gnosis* är en bra illustration över Kings och Williams poänger: termen ”gnosticism” har ett ytterst begränsat analytiskt värde (ibland direkt vilseledande) om det används generaliserande.

Hade termen ”gnosticism” definierats tydligt och om artiklarna hade utgått från denna definition och implementerat den genomgående på ett värdeneutralt sätt så hade bokens förtjänster som helhet utan tvekan utvidgats.

Paul Linjamaa, Lunds Universitet

GEOFFREY S. SMITH

Guilt By Association: Heresy Catalogues in Early Christianity

Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014, Inbunden, xvi + 196 s., \$78,

ISBN: 978-0-19938678-9

Går det att lita på kyrkofäderna? När det kommer till kunskap om de tidigaste århundradena av kristendomens historia är vi allt som oftast hänvisade till vittnesbörd från individer med namn som Papias, Polykarpos, Justinus, Hegesippus, eller Irenaeus—kyrkoledare och teologer som levde och verkade under 100-talet. Men är dessa herrar att lita på när de exempelvis uttalar sig om den mångfald av kristna grupperingar som fanns och var verksamma under deras livstid? Ett grundläggande problem när den frågan ska besvaras är att de många gånger inte ens skulle tillstå att en mångfald existerade, utan snarare skulle de skilja mellan den enda äkta varan och en mängd förfalskade imitationer.

I monografen *Guilt by Association: Heresy Catalogues in Early Christianity*, utgiven 2014 på Oxford University Press, gräver Geoffrey S. Smith i dessa frågor, och reflekterar utförligt över frågor om kategorisering och identitetsskapande bland de tidiga kristna. Smith, som disputerade vid Princeton 2013 med Elaine Pagels som handledare, är inte minst intresserad av historiska frågor som rör valentinianism och den så

kallade "gnosticismen", något som han framför allt diskuterar i bokens sista kapitel. Skrifter som återfinns bland Nag Hammadi-bibliotekets böcker figurerar återkommande i den här studien.

Som undertiteln till boken antyder så utgörs det primära undersökningsmaterialet av det som Smith kallar för "heresy catalogues", till svenska möjligen översatt till "kättarkataloger". Vad är då detta? Det mest kända exemplet går att finna i Irenaeus *Adversus haereses*, bok 1, där kyrkofadern räknar upp olika grupper av "kättare" samt diskuterar deras ursprung och trosuppfattningar. Ett senare verk inom denna kategori som blivit mycket betydelsefullt är Epifanaios av Salamis (verksam under 300-talet) *Panarion* som är ständigt återkommande i diskussioner om olika grupperingar inom den tidigaste kyrkan. Smith klargör dock i bokens inledning att det inte är dessa utförliga kättarkataloger som han vill undersöka utan fokus ligger i stället vid genrens begynnelse under hundratalet.

Tidigare forskning som rör kättarkataloger saknas inte, men Smith är starkt kritisk mot det förhållningssätt som oftast präglat detta vetenskapliga arbete. Han skriver: "Rather than study heresy catalogues for what they are, early Christian instruments of self-definition and discredit, scholars usually regard them as archives of historically reliable information that can be used to reconstruct the beliefs and practices of the Simonians, Basilidians, and other sects that would have disappeared from the historical record if not for their mention in heresiological literature" (xii). Det är i denna kritik, vilken ger upphov till en nyläsning av materialet, som Smiths verkliga bidrag tycks ligga.

I kapitel ett ställs frågan om vad som fanns innan kättarkatalogerna och som gav upphov till denna genre. I viss tidigare forskning har man velat se listandet av filosofer, där dessa bestämdes genealogiskt och deras respektive läror redovisades på ett strukturerat sätt, som inspirationskälla och föregångare till kättarkatalogerna. Smith avvisar med rätta denna förklaring med hänvisning till att sådana listor hade en helt annan funktion än kättarkatalogerna. Den alternativa förklaring han själv ger identifierar istället pastoralbrevens ursprung, men är lite väl underfundig för att framstå som sannolik. Smith menar nämligen att

pastoralbrevens pseudepigrafiskt-polemiska karaktär tillåter författaren att tala om "falska lärare" på två tidsmässiga nivåer, en "historisk" som rådde på Paulus tid, och en samtida när författaren själv var verksam. Det är alltså pastoralbrevens tal om villolärornas ursprung och återaktualisering som skulle ha gett upphov till kättarkatalogernas utformning. Jag har svårt att se varför det skulle vara viktigt att så avgjort ursprungsbestämna katalogerna bakåt i tiden. Måste litterära genrer på ett tydligt sätt ha föräldrar?

I det andra kapitlet diskuteras Justinus Martyrens roll i förhållande till kättarkatalogernas framväxt och spridning. En förlorad skrift som Justinus refererar till ("Syntagma against All the Heresies" som Smith kallar den på engelska) och som traditionellt har uppfattats vara skriven av Justinus, sägs ligga till grund för mycket av materialet i Irenaeus *Adversus haereses*, bok 1. Huvudsyftet med kapitlet är att visa att Justinus troligtvis inte var författare till verket utan endast propagerade för dess spridning. Återigen är jag inte helt övertygad och ställer mig till viss del undrande inför just den frågans relevans i det större perspektivet. Särskilt som Smith själv medger att hans tes inte hänger på frågan om huruvida Justinus var författare till verket eller inte (70 n. 60).

Det tredje kapitlet ägnas åt att undersöka flera olika kättarkataloger med huvudsyfte att visa att gränsdragningen mellan "ortodoxa" och "kättare" var en pågående process under hundratalet. Det var inte bara sådana författare som senare skulle betraktas som "ortodoxa", som till exempel Justinus och Irenaeus, som ägnade sig åt den här typen av gränsdragning, där man placerade grupper och uppfattningar som ogillades utanför den egna fällan. Även *Den tredelade traktaten*, en valentiniansk skrift som återfinns i Nag Hammadi-biblioteket, och fragment ur *Sanningens vittnesbörd*, också den en Nag Hammadi-skrift, diskuteras ingående som texter som innehåller kättarkatalogiserande. Inkluderandet av dessa texter i diskussionen vidgar kättarkatalogsbegreppet och skänker ett delvis nytt och dynamiskt perspektiv på den tidiga kristendomen.

I det fjärde och sista kapitlet fokuserar Smith slutligen på bok 1 av Irenaeus verk, *Adversus haereses*, som här får representera kättarkatalo-

gens fullmogna stadium och det som tidigare exempel ska leda fram till. Genom sitt stora inflytande skulle Irenaeus skrift påverka framtida generationers uppfattning om hur gränserna inom den kristna rörelsen skulle dras och hur de dragits sedan begynnelsen. Irenaeus är också den som introducerar kategorin ”gnostiker”, en polemisk konstruktion och ett hopbuntande av ”kätterska” grupper och uppfattningar med syfte att lättare kunna avfärda dessa. Genom att utmåla dessa som skolmän och filosofer avsåg Irenaeus att distansera dem från kyrkan och därmed lättare kunna visa att dessa inte var några riktiga kristna.

Att Smith luckrar upp kategorier som ”ortodox” och ”kättersk” genom denna historiskt fokuserade studie är välbehövligt och utgör ett stort framsteg i relation till mycket av den äldre litteratur som han kritiserar. Vidare är perspektivet på antika skrivna texter, att inte betrakta dem som trovärdiga vittnen som erbjuder fönster till historiska företeelser och skeenden, utan att istället värdera deras utsagor utifrån vad de gör och hur de är ämnade att fungera, något som går igenom hela boken och tillhör dess verkliga styrkor.

Något jag uppskattar mindre är den flitiga användningen av marknads- och företagsterminologi i boken och den bild av historien som förmedlas genom denna språkanvändning. Smith talar till exempel på ett ställe om ”a variegated religious marketplace in which enterprising teachers compete for popular opinion by advertising their unique approaches” (54). I vilken grad är detta metaforer och i vilken grad är det menat att reflektera de historiska aktörernas bild av sig själva och sina verk? Eller är det Smiths egen uppfattning att religioner och världsåskådningar är som vilken handelsvara som helst, som säljs och köps enligt marknadens reguljära logik? Vilket det än är så finns det anledning att reflektera vidare kring detta språkbruk och hur det svarar mot vår uppfattning om den antika världen.

Martin Wessbrandt, Lunds Universitet

Mark L. Strauss och Paul E. Engle (red.)

Remarriage After Divorce in Today's Church (with contributions by

Gordon J. Wenham, William A. Heth, and Craig S. Keener)

Counterpoint Series, Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2006, Paperback, 161 s., \$16.99,

ISBN: 978-0-31025-553-6

Titeln är viktig, för det är inom dess ramar som boken med dess skilda bidrag är skriven. "Omgifte efter skilsmässa": alltså inte omgifte efter att ena parten dött, och heller inte enbart "skilsmässa". "I dagens kyrka": alltså en hermeneutisk tillämpning. Formatet är likaså viktigt: de tre författarna presenterar vardera sin syn på ämnet, följt av återkopplingar av de två övriga. Detta borgar för en klar genomlysning.

Boken är intressant ur det perspektivet att den dels handlar om seriös exegetik av bibeltexter för att utröna hur de ursprungliga mottagarna bör ha uppfattat betydelsen, dels vad detta bör innebära för troende idag. Det är kanske i den senare tillämpningen som författarnas evangelikala grundsyn slår igenom som tydligast; ingen av dem postulerar ett svalg mellan Nya testamentets tid och vår. Den exegetiska analysen är rigorös, och torde kunna accepteras även av dem som inte delar denna grundsyn. Men man kommer alltså till olika slutsatser: Gordon Wenham menar att omgifte efter skilsmässa aldrig, under några omständigheter, är tillåtet. William Heth argumenterar för att omgifte efter skilsmässa är tillåtet efter otrohet eller när ena parten övergivit äktenskapet. Craig Keener håller med Heth, men vill även inkludera "övergrepp" som skäl. Vad som kanske förtjänar att framhållas, är att ingendera av författarna menar att omgifte efter skilsmässa skulle vara tillåtet av andra skäl i kyrkan av idag.

Wenham är först ut. Han undersöker Mark 10:11 och Luk 16:18 och drar slutsatsen att en skilsmässa aldrig bryter ett äktenskap och att ett nytt giftermål därför blir att likna vid otukt. Han ser 1 Kor 7:10–11 och Rom 7:2–3 i samma ljus: skilsmässa (väl = separation) är tillåtet, men inte omgifte. Vad gör Wenham av Matt 19:9, "Jag säger er att den som skiljer sig från sin hustru av annat skäl än otukt och gifter om sig, han är en äktenskapsbrytare"? Höll Jesus med den konservative Sham-mai, som tillät skilsmässa av endast få skäl, eller den mer liberale Hillel?

Wenham menar ingendera, utan att Jesus hade en skapelsegrundad (Matt 19:4–6) avvisande hållning. Varför gör han det? Att inom samtida judendom skilsmässa innebar en rätt till omgifte för inte med sig att Jesus skulle ha accepterat detta; han gick ändå emot så mycket av vedertagna sanningar; när Jesus använder ordet *apolyein* ”skiljas” gör han det i sin egen diskurs.

Så hur menar Wenham att detta skall implementeras i dagens Kyrka? Taktiskt: dels genom att göra skillnad mellan acceptans och tolerans; dels genom omvårdnad om de ensamstående skilda; genom undervisning och ”församlingstukt” så långt situationen tillåter (utan att pastorn får avsked, och då ändå inget vunnits) med målet att på sikt ”bli återhållsam” med att viga skilda och att ”inse det olämpliga” i att utse omgifta som ledare.

William Heth menar sig representera majoriteten inom anglosaxisk evangelikal kristendom (enligt undersökning i *Christianity Today* 1992-12-14, 31) då han säger att två skäl godtas för omgifte efter skilsmässa: äktenskaplig otrohet (Matt 19:9, jfr 5:32) och övergivande av äktenskapet av en icke-troende (1 Kor 7:15). I historisk belysning skall Wenhams åberopande av konsensus hos kyrkofäder om omgiftesförbud ses i ljuset av då allmänt ökande asketiska tendenser.

Heth undersöker förbundsbegreppet som bakgrund för äktenskapet, men konstaterar att det finns en kvalitativ skillnad mellan Guds förbund med mänskligheten representerat av Jesus och förbund mellan människor: det senare kan brytas. Han hänvisar till Matt 19:6: ”Vad Gud har fogat samman får människan alltså inte skilja åt,” och noterar att detta inte betyder ”kan människan inte skilja åt”, utan ”det är möjligt att skilja åt, men ni bör inte göra det”. Att Markus och Lukas inte har med omgiftesmöjligheten vid otrohet menar Heth beror på att Matteus skrev senare och behövde fylla i förklaringar som för tidigare åhörare var självklara.

Det andra undantaget Heth anför – omgifte efter övergivande av den icke troende – ligger i uttrycket ”inte bunden” *ou dedoulotai*, 1 Kor 7:12–16 (15b), vilket i samtida kultur förstods som innefattande rätten till omgifte (vilket Paulus förutsätter då sker med en kristen).

Heths tillämpning: ”I fallet med genuina undantag [från förbudet mot skilsmässa], efter det att den oskyldiga parten gjort allt som rimligen kan krävas för att rädda äktenskapet, bör varken kyrkosamfund eller missionsorganisationer brännmärka en person som därefter går vidare in i ett nytt äktenskap” (78). Heth menar vidare att en sådan person inte bör hindras från ledarskapspositioner i en församling: ”en kvinnas man” *mias gunaikos andra* 1 Tim 3:2, syftar liksom de övriga kvalifikationerna på egenskaper, och skall översättas ”trogen i sitt äktenskap” och inte ”gift bara en gång” (social historia). Han sammanfattar: minoritets-uppfattningen (omgifte aldrig tillåtet) vill hindra vad Gud tillåter, medan majoritets-uppfattningen (omgifte tillåtet vid dessa två undantag) löper risken att öppna dörren för en alltför vid tillämpning, i en kultur som är indränkt av ”självförverkligande-tänkande.”

Craig Keener, slutligen, argumenterar för omgifte vid otrohet, övergivande *och* ”missbruk/övergrepp” (”abuse”). Om Wenham och Heth hävdar sina respektive uppfattningar utifrån exegetisk analys primärt, och sekundärt drar tillämpningsslutsatser, går Keener något annorlunda tillväga i sin analys av vad ”missbruk” kan innebära.

Keener postulerar att om Paulus kunde följa Jesus exempel genom att vidga rätten till skilsmässa/omgifte när den icke troende överger ett äktenskap, så kan vi följa Paulus i vidare mening. Annars skulle vi aldrig kunna ta ställning i sådana frågor där ingen explicit undervisning finns i Bibeln, som till exempel beträffande abort, avskaffandet av slaveri, drogmissbruk, pornografi, våld i hemmet, och andra stora frågor. Skall vi läsa Bibeln dynamiskt så att vi tillämpar den analogt, eller ”djupfrysa den i antik historia?” (111). Keener menar att nytestamentliga undantag (från förbudet mot skilsmässa/omgifte) visar hän mot principer som kan vägleda i extrema situationer som NT inte uttryckligen tar upp.

En huvudpunkt för Keener är att Jesus använder grafiskt, hyperboliskt språk (= orimliga överdrifter). Konsekvensen blir att uppfatta syftet som att förhindra skilsmässor – inte att deklarera äktenskapets ontologiska oupplösbarhet – så att den drabbade parten som utsatts för skilsmässa mot sin vilja, egentligen fortsatt vore gift, och att ett nytt äktenskap vore ett ständigt pågående äktenskapsbrott. Andra uttalanden

av Jesus i Matt 5 behandlas regelmässigt som hyperboler, och själv kallar Jesus religiösa skrymtare ”dårar”, Matt 23:17.

Keeners position *tillåter* skilsmässa/omgifte vid otrohet, övergivenhet och missbruk. Samtida skilsmässogrunder som ”oförenlighet”, ”djup och varaktig söndring”, liksom ”att växa ifrån varandra” avvisar han dock som icke giltiga. Han accepterar dock nya äktenskap för den skyldiga parten (vid genuin, uppvisad omvändelse; men förordar ”församlingstukt”, ”church discipline”) i fall av ogiltiga skilsmässor. I övrigt argumenterar han på ungefär samma sätt som Heth, ibland med starkare emfas: vi bör upprätthålla en standard men ”att tillämpa den på den drabbade och inte på överträdaren är som att straffa våldtäktsoffret därför att vi är emot våldtäkt” (119).

Även om detta faller utanför det ämne författarna diskuterar förtjänar ändå det hermeneutiska anslaget en kommentar: i alla västerländska samhällen är samboende nu vanligare än äktenskap, det vill säga förbundet som sådant kommer aldrig in i bilden. Det hade varit intressant att höra författarnas synpunkter på detta. I övrigt ger redaktörernas inledning och avslutningar en inkännande pastoral ram för samtalet.

Bo Krister Ljungberg

DAVID WILLGREN

The Formation of the 'Book' of Psalms:

*Reconsidering the Transmission and Canonization of Psalmody
in Light of Material Culture and the Poetics of Anthologies*

FAT II/88, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016, Sewn paper, 491 pp., €99,

ISBN: 978-3-16154-787-4

This volume represents the slightly revised version of the author's doctoral thesis, submitted to the University of Lund in 2016 under the title: "Like a Garden of Flowers: A Study of the Formation of the 'Book' of Psalms." In his thesis, David Willgren starts from the seminal study of Gerard H. Wilson on *The Editing of the Hebrew Psalter* (1983), but he dissociates himself from Wilson's classification of the Psalter as a book. Instead, Willgren proposes to conceptualise its formation as an anthology.

The substantial study is clearly divided into six parts, comprising seventeen chapters. The first part (“Framing the Task at Hand”) outlines the problem and introduces Willgren’s methodology. He first demonstrates that the mainstream of scholarship since Wilson’s study has been preoccupied to demonstrate a linear formation process of the Psalms as a book with a literary setting. To open this discussion, he wants to provide answers to how the diachronic growth of the collection of psalms can be reconstructed (“how”), and to what end psalms are being juxtaposed in this process (“why”). As a way forward, Willgren points to the conceptualisation of the Psalms as an anthology, which he defines as “a compilation of independent texts, actively selected and organised in relation to some present need, inviting readers to platform of continuous dialogue” (25). Characteristics of the genre comprise that updating of collections was possible and that “editorial” paratexts (following the model by Gérard Genette) play a decisive role in the conception and understanding of the collections.

Willgren further states that scribal and material circumstances should be considered, which leads to the second chapter that focuses on several ancient collections, which qualify as anthologies (“Anthologies Compared”) – proving the point that these collections show interest in selection of compositions rather than in their arrangement. The third chapter (“The Artifacts”) moves to the literature of Qumran, undertaking a comparison with the Psalms materials, especially the great Psalms scroll 11Q5. Willgren’s main point is that the common notion of a gradual stabilisation of the Psalms’ sequence in 11Q5 is misleading, and he further refutes an understanding of the scroll as a main representative of the “Book” of Psalms – rather, it should be seen as an accidentally surviving species.

In the next chapters, the study turns to the biblical Psalter, firstly on the search of paratexts (“In Search of the Artificial”), focusing on these features that have usually been considered to have editorial function: 1) Psalms 1–2 as a preface of the Psalter, 2) superscriptions, 3) Ps 72:20 as a possible colophon, 4) doxologies and their possible role as “book dividers,” and 5) the closure function of the so-called “Small Hallel” in

Pss 145–150. Rather unsurprisingly, Willgren concludes that all these phenomena do not qualify as editorial testimony. In the case of Pss 1–2, he argues that the two psalms do fall short in having an introductory purpose, while the compiling function of the superscriptions is diminished when the MT is no longer considered to be the authoritative text. Willgren acknowledges the division into five parts by way of the doxologies in Pss 41, 72, 89, 106, but he regards the doxologies as later additions, “having little to do with the actual psalm preceding them” (242). Furthermore, he argues that the fivefold division actually points to a Psalter ending with Ps 136, while the Small Hallel attests to an overwriting of the doxologies in terms of a Hallelujah; this thesis similarly disqualifies the doxologies as a redactional closure of a five-fold Psalter. Regarding the end verse Ps 72:20 that comprises the enigmatic notion that “the prayers of David are ended,” Willgren comes up with the intriguing explanation that this verse represented an older colophon, once closing a first material scroll of psalms.

The fifth chapter (“Psalms on Repeat”) moves to a range of texts that contain epitexts, quotes, and allusions to psalms, in order to assess external evidence for the formation of the Psalms. Here, Willgren demonstrates convincingly that notions of scripture and authority initially related to individual psalms, while a “Book” of Psalms was only recognised and referred to by the end of the 2nd century BC.

Finally, the sixth chapter (“The Formation of the Psalms”) summarises the results of the study under the initial questions of “how” and “why.” When it comes to the formation, Willgren acknowledges that three identifiable stages of development can be distinguished: 1) a collection of Pss 1–119, divided by the colophon in Ps 72:20 from the Persian Period, 2) a doxological compositional stage of Pss 1/2–135/136 (contemporaneous to 1–2 Chronicles), and 3) Pss 1–150, representing the Hallelujah version of the Psalms. Yet he argues that this formation does not correspond to a linear development. Rather, the process of “selecting psalms from a wide stream of ancient Hebrew psalmody and arranging them in collections that grew and acquired new shape over time” (391) should be conceptualised as an anthology, allowing for “an

intricate web of multiple traditions that are preserved and put in dialogue with each other” (392). Proceeding to the question of “why,” Willgren assumes that the selection of the psalms would have been motivated partly by their status within the communities. Thus, the anthology served as a container of authoritative psalms, making the formation a creative preservation of tradition.

Overall, Willgren’s book is not only an extremely well-conceived study of the formation of the Psalms, but also an anthology of careful observations and thought-stimulating conclusions. Furthermore, even if the concept of the anthology has been used previously to describe the formation of the Psalms (see e.g. John Kselman), Willgren’s work is exemplary in contextualising the discussion within the appropriate methodological framework and in augmenting it with meticulously compiled external evidence. The question arises, though, if he does not find fault with the notion of a “book” only to replace this concept with the likewise problematic hermeneutics of an anthology. It is especially in the first part of the Psalter that the idea of an anthology succeeds to capture the idiosyncrasies in the compilation of the single psalms. However, the arrangement of the psalms in the second part of the Psalter is much more indicative of redactional techniques that seem to presuppose the context of a book rather than that of an anthology. Here, the limits of the present study become obvious, as Willgren simply cannot engage with the textual evidence in its entirety. It might be the case that both the idea of a book and the idea of an anthology are equally inadequate to capture how the ancient authors conceived of their work. Especially the material of Qumran is ample evidence that we still struggle to understand the techniques and hermeneutics that governed the composition and transmission of not only the psalms, but these ancient texts in general. However, while previous studies might have been overly confident in assuming the notion of a book, Willgren’s study represents an important and welcome counterweight that will contribute greatly to further discussion in the field.

Anja Klein, The University of Edinburgh, Scotland

TOM WRIGHT

*The Day the Revolution Began:**Rethinking the Meaning of Jesus' Crucifixion*

London: SPCK, 2016, Inbunden, 440 s., £19.99, ISBN: 978-0-28106-145-7

N. T. Wright har genom ett flertal böcker gjort sig känd som en ledande Paulusforskare, inte minst genom hans senaste opus, *Paul and the Faithfulness of God* (2 vol., SPCK, 2013). I vissa sammanhang, inte minst i mer konfessionella, har dock Wright kritiserats för att vara otydlig i hur han förstår betydelsen och innebörden av Jesu korsdöd. För att råda bot på detta har Wright – nu som Tom Wright – gett ut en mer populariserad text som syftar till att nå en bredare publik.

Boken består av fyra delar. I bokens första del (3–69) gör Wright en översiktlig genomgång av hur Jesu korsdöd har tolkats i kyrkans historia. Han kommer till slutsatsen att såväl den systematiska teologin, som den kristna förkunnelsen i allmänhet, kört fast i allt för många avancerade och spekulativa soteriologiska modeller och teorier. Wright vill särskilt göra upp med föreställningen om att Jesus på korset tog på sig Guds vrede för att rädda människor från helvetet och föra dem till himlen. Problematiken med en sådan tolkning är att människans problem moraliseras (synden definieras enbart som lagbrott), lösningen ges en hednisk förklaringsmodell (en vred fader som straffar sin son), och målet får en platonisk överbyggnad (att komma till himlen när man dör). Wright vill inte minst göra upp med en klassisk luthersk soteriologi som han menar bygger på ett ”works contract”-paradigm (med betoning på individens gärningar och moral) och inte ett ”covenant of vocation”-paradigm (med betoning på människans uppgift i förbundet). Syndens problem handlar inte primärt om ett moraliskt problem utan om avgudereri och falsk tillbedjan. Jesus kom inte för att föra människor till himlen utan för att upprätta dem till att leva ett gudstillvänt liv som gestaltar Guds eskatologiska befrielse av och i den här världen.

Bokens andra del (73–142) fokuserar på den gammaltestamentliga bakgrunden till den nytestamentliga korsteologin. Wright ser tre tydliga narrativa kontexter för denna: berättelsen om Abraham och förbunds-

gemenskapen med Gud, exodusberättelsens befrielsemotiv och profetlitteraturens exilmotiv. Genom ett nytt exodus, den slutliga påskhögtiden, väntade det judiska folket såväl på slutet på exiltiden som på Guds uppgörelse med synden och ondskan. I Jesajas tjänar-motiv formades hoppet om den som skulle komma för att förkroppsliga ("embody") Guds befriande kärlek till Israel. Wright är dock tydlig med att understryka att det inte finns något i den judiska teologin, som helt motsvarar de messianska föreställningar som den tidiga kyrkan så småningom kom att lägga i tolkningen av Jesu korsdöd.

I bokens huvuddel, den tredje delen (145–352), tar sig Wright an de nytestamentliga texterna och sätter in dessa i den större berättelsen om Israel som förbundsfolk, exilen och det nya exodus. Wright läser kors-teologin som en del av gudrikesteologin, där Jesus genom sin verksamhet och tjänst kommer för att gestalta och förkroppsliga Guds eskatologiska kommande till Israel. Genom Guds uppgörelse med ondskan kopplas riket och korset samman. Wright förespråkar en "representative substitution", det vill säga att Jesus dör som Israels (människans) representant och i Israels (människans) ställe. Wright gör dock upp med läran om "penal substitution", där Jesu död förstås som ett blickande av Guds vrede ("propitiation"). Wright tolkar grekiskans *hilastērion* (Rom 3:25) som "nådstol", men inte som en plats där Guds vrede används utan som en mötesplats mellan Gud och människa. Wright förkastar varje tanke på att korsdöden skulle ha med ett blickande att göra, vilket han menar bygger på hedniska föreställningar. Så förklarar, till exempel, upphävandet av "den allsmäktiges vrede" i 4 Mack 7:37–38 som ett uttryck för hur författaren riktar sig till icke-judiska mottagare med syfte att förklara innebörden i de judiska martyrernas död för folket.

Boken avslutas med en fjärde, mer tillämpande del (355–416), där Wright riktar sig till ett mer konfessionellt sammanhang. Wright ser det som den kristna kyrkans viktigaste mission att implementera det revolutionerande budskapet om Guds förlåtelse av synd, och uppgörelse med ondskan på ett kors. Världen efter korset var en annan plats, där Jesu död och uppståndelse markerade en smärre revolution – början på Guds nyskapande krafter i historien. Kyrkans uppgift är därför ytterst eskato-

logisk; den består inte i att rädda människor bort från denna värld till en annan (himlen), utan att identifieras sig med, förmedla och gestalta den nya skapelsens krafter i en gammal värld.

Wright styrka ligger i hans förmåga att skapa narrativ bibelteologi. Han återkommer ständigt till den stora berättelsen om Israel som förbundsfolket, med exodushändelsen och exiltiden som centrum. Kors-händelsen får sin betydelse och innebörd i den stora berättelsen om Guds handlande med Israel och Guds uppgörelse med synden och ondskan. Wrights styrka skulle dock även kunna ses som en svaghet, där de gammaltestamentliga texterna tenderar att läsas selektivt och harmoniseras i strävan efter koherens och enhet.

Wrights uppgörelse med den klassiska läran om ”penal substitution”, med en vredgad Gud som blidkas genom Jesu korsdöd, känns i många stycken fräsch och viktig. Samtidigt undviker han de texter som in någon mening läser *hilaskomai*-verben i betydelsen av att beveka/avvända Guds vrede, till exempel Sak 7:2; 8:22; Mal 1:9 och Ps 106:29–30 (LXX), eller de texter där *hilaskomai*-verben används i kontexter av Guds vrede, till exempel Num 16:47; 2 Kung 24:4; Ps 78:38; 106:29–32 (LXX). Frågan är även om 4 Mack 7:37–38 kan avfärdas enbart med förklaringen att vredesmotivet bakom martyrernas död är ett hedniskt inslag. Inte heller i hans utläggning av Rom 1–5 blir vredesmotivet ordentligt behandlat.

Att Wright skriver mer populärt och vänder sig till en bredare läsekrets märks tydligt. Diskussionerna och utläggningarna är direkta och går rakt på sak, vanligtvis med tydliga sammanfattningar och slutsatser. Här saknas dock en mer genomgripande diskussion med andra teologer och forskare, inklusive fotnotsreferenser och bibliografi. I flera fall tenderar Wright att generalisera i syfte att ta hem sina poänger, inte minst när han beskriver sina meningsmotståndares uppfattningar (det är nog tveksamt om till exempel Aquinas, Luther och Calvin skulle känt igen sig i Wrights mer polemiska uttalanden). Dessutom blir Wright allt som oftast onödigt ”pratig” och upprepande. Boken skulle därför mått bra av en mer stringent redigering.

Detta förtar dock inte bokens värde, nämligen Wrights narrativa framställning av den nytestamentliga korsteologin med utgångspunkt från berättelsen om Israel. Som helhet är hans utläggning rimlig och relevant. Här finns en hel del matnyttigt att hämta, såväl för bibelteologen som för förkunnaren.

Mikael Tellbe, Örebro Teologiska Högskola

SVENSKA EXEGETISKA SÄLLSKAPET (SES)

Svenska Exegetiska Sällskapet (tidigare Uppsala Exegetiska Sällskap) grundades 1936. SES är en sammanslutning av personer med ett intresse för bibelvetenskap i dess skilda former. Sällskapet anordnar varje år Exegetiska dagen och ger också ut *Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok (SEÅ)*. Styrelsen strävar efter att hålla Årsbokens kvalitet på hög internationell nivå. En fullständig förteckning över tidigare årgångar och deras innehåll finns på hemsidan.

Medlemskap i Svenska Exegetiska Sällskapet är öppet och kan anmälas på hemsidan. Medlemsavgiften är SEK 100 per år. Kostnaden för Årsboken är SEK 200 (för studenter SEK 100; utanför Sverige SEK 300). För medlemmar i SES är frakten kostnadsfri; i övriga fall tillkommer frakt med SEK 50. Äldre årgångar av Årsboken kan beställas via hemsidan (<http://www.exegetiskasallskapet.se>). Där återfinns också anvisningar för medverkande.

SEÅ:S SENASTE FEM ÅRGÅNGAR

- | | | |
|----|------|--|
| 78 | 2013 | Offer i Bibeln
<i>Sacrifice in the Bible</i> |
| 79 | 2014 | Etnicitet i Bibeln och i bibelvetenskaplig forskning
<i>Ethnicity in the Bible and in Biblical Scholarship</i> |
| 80 | 2015 | Judiska och kristna grupper i
den grekisk-romerska världen
<i>Jewish and Christian Groups in
the Greco-Roman World</i> |
| 81 | 2016 | Homeros och Bibeln
<i>Homer and the Bible</i> |
| 82 | 2017 | ”När Bibeln skrevs om...”
<i>Rewritten Bible</i> |

KOMMANDE NUMMER OCH EXEGETISKA DAGEN

SEÅ 83, 2018

Översättning som tolkning

Translation as Interpretation

Numret innehåller bland annat material från Exegetiska dagen i Uppsala den 2 oktober 2017. Inbjudna föreläsare är dr. Mikael Winninge, prof. Jan Joosten och dr. Eveline van Staaldvine-Sulman. Under dagen uppmärksammas även nyöversättningen av Dödahavsrollarna till svenska.

För program, se www.exegetiskasallskapet.se