SVENSK

EXEGETISK

81 ÅRSBOK

På uppdrag av

Svenska exegetiska sällskapet

utgiven av

Göran Eidevall

Uppsala 2016

Omslagsbild: Odysseus och sirenerna (attisk vas, ca 480–470 f.Kr., British Museum)
Bildbearbetning: Marcus Lecaros

Innehåll

iv

Medarbetare i denna årgång/Contributors in this issue:

Fernando Bermejo-Rubio   fjlmbr@yahoo.se
Jonathan Burke   fortigurn@gmail.com
Sara Järlemyr   sara.c.jarlemyr@gmail.com
Bruce Louden   blouden@utep.edu
Torsten Löfstedt   torsten.lofstedt@lnu.se
Dan Nässelqvist   dan.nasselqvist@lir.gu.se
Karl Olav Sandnes   karl.o.sandnes@mf.no
Sebastian Selvén   sebastian.selven@gmail.com

Agamemnon and the Hebrew Bible

BRUCE LOUDEN

The University of Texas at El Paso, Texas

I have always been a comparatist. I believe that placing a narrative in con-text with other relevant texts is one of the more certain ways to obtain understanding and meaning. As it became increasingly obvious in the twentieth century, as unexpected discoveries greatly expanded our vistas, it dawned on some that Near Eastern narratives provide invaluable con-texts for the study of Homeric epic. However, including the Hebrew Bible among the *comparanda* has greatly lagged behind, until fairly recently. When I began studying correspondences between Homeric epic and the Bible fifteen years ago, I assumed the parallels were best understood as depending on earlier Near Eastern narratives, with which both Greek and Israelite culture had come in contact. But now I have changed my view. When one takes into account how widespread the respective languages were, Greek and Hebrew, which language has earlier documentation, which people enter the historical record first, which culture was a signifi-cant maritime power for over a millennium, and which established an empire including the other, if some form of diffusion, direct or indirect, accounts for the correspondences, the odds are far greater that the direc-tion is from Greek to Israelite culture. I count myself, then, among those who regard the Hebrew Bible, in part, as a response to Greek culture.

Mycenaean Culture and Hittite Texts

Let me start with a brief overview of the historical record of contacts be-tween the Near East and Greek culture. So many revelations came with the early-twentieth century discovery of Hittite texts. Several names rec-orded in the treaties and royal letters are place names and proper names associated with Greek culture of the Mycenaean period.[1] From the four-teenth century are two references to Ahhiya, and from the thirteenth are

---

[1] All discussion of Hittite proper names is based on Gary M. Beckman, Trevor R. Bryce and Eric H. Cline, eds., *The Ahhiyawa Texts* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011).

many mentions of the Ahhiyawa. We now have a strong consensus that these are Hittite equivalents of terms common in Homeric epic, Achaia and Achaian, the latter being Homeric epic's term for the Greeks. Wilusa, a place name, is now regarded as Homeric Ilios/Ilium, and a phrase, "steep Wilusa," as Calvert Watkins argued,[2] is a seeming correspondent to "steep Ilios" (Ἴλιον αἰπεινήν), which occurs six times in the *Iliad*.

Moving to the names of individuals, a treaty of the Hittite king, Muwatalli II, records a god named Apaliunas, "Storm-god of the Army," which name is agreed to correspond to Apeilon, an earlier spelling of *Apollo*. There is Tawagalawa, brother of a King of Ahhiyawa, an exact equation of Eteocles,[3] who, in Greek myth as we have it, is part of the Theban cycle of myths, not the Trojan War. Perhaps most intriguing of all is the name of a king of Wilusa (again, our *Ilium*) Alaksandu, clearly a Hittite rendering of the Greek name Alexandros.[4] Closer to my topic, the "Indictment of Maduwatta"[5] features a king of Ahhiya by the name of *Attarissiya*. More than a few scholars accept the equation of Attarissiya and *Atreus*.[6] In Homer, Atreus is the father of Agamemnon and Menelaus. Elsewhere, a *Great King of Ahhiyawa* is mentioned, but not named. Guterbock, considering the larger society that the Hittite references to Ahhiyawa suggest, notes, "I have argued that the Great King of Ahhiyawa, equal in rank to the king of Hatti and, by implication, to those of Egypt and Babylonia, can only be a ruler of the rank of an Agamemnon."[7]

These attestations establish that the phase of Greek culture that we call Mycenaean was historically so prominent in the region in which the *Iliad* is set, that the Hittites, the other great power exercising control over the area, had extensive relations with them. We call this phase of Greek culture Mycenaean, because both the archaeological record and the *Iliad* agree that Mycenae was its most important and wealthiest city. In Greek myth, Agamemnon is king of Mycenae, wealthiest and most powerful of

---

[2] Calvert Watkins, *How to Kill a Dragon: Aspects of Indo-European Poetics* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 148–49.

[3] Beckman, Bryce and Cline, *The Ahhiyawa Texts*, 119–20.

[4] Beckman, Bryce and Cline, *The Ahhiyawa Texts*, 2.

[5] Beckman, Bryce and Cline, *The Ahhiyawa Texts*, 71, 99.

[6] Martin L. West, "Atreus and Attarasiyas," *Glotta* 77 (2001): 262–66.

[7] Hans G. Guterbock, "Troy in Hittite Texts? Wilusa, Ahhiyawa, and Hittite History," in *Troy and the Trojan War: A Symposium Held at Bryn Mawr College*, ed. John Lawrence Angel and Machteld Johanna Mellink (Bryn Mawr: Bryn Mawr College, 1986), 33–44 (quotation on p. 43).

the many Mycenaean kings, an embodiment of its military might and widespread power. A few Ahhiyawa passages record Greek doings at Cyprus and Miletus, taking us considerably closer to the world of the Hebrew Bible.

Aegean and Philistine Exchanges

We now consider the *Philistines*, both the archaeological record, and passages in the Hebrew Bible. Egyptian commemorative stelae from the reigns of Rameses II and III record unsuccessful invasions of Egypt by a coalition of "Sea Peoples," including the Philistines, and other peoples, a few of which correspond to those featured in the *Iliad* as allies of the Greeks and Trojans. As early as 1899, F. B. Welch suggested that fragments of Philistine pottery were linked in some way to those of the Mycenaean Greeks.[8] We now have a strong consensus that such is the case. The archaeologist Stager regards the correspondences as definitive (1991), "Throwing caution to the wind, I am willing to … state flatly that the Sea Peoples, including the Philistines, were Mycenaean *Greeks*."[9] Archaeologists have convincingly filled out other links between Philistine and Mycenaean Greek culture.

At several major Philistine sites, deep changes are apparent, against the previous patterns of Canaanite culture, that evidence Aegean migration in the twelfth century against the background of thirteenth-century Canaanite culture, and reveal its interaction with the Aegean world.[10] For instance, the "Ashdoda" figurines are a local version of Mycenaean Mother Goddess figurines.[11] Sites in Philistia have Aegean-style hearths, complete Aegean wine-drinking sets, with mixing bowls, spouted or strainer jugs and deep bowls not found in any significant use in Canaan prior to the Philistine migration. Aegean textile practices are now evident, "Aegean-style imperforated loom weights show that domestic textile production was practiced according to an Aegean tradition."[12] Those taking part in the Aegean migration "kept their Aegean tradition of the domestic cult of

---

[8] Assaf Yasur-Landau, *The Philistines and Aegean Migration at the End of the Late Bronze Age* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 2.
[9] Lawrence E. Stager, "When Canaanites and Philistines Ruled Ashkelon," *BAR* 17.2 (1991): 24–43.
[10] Yasur-Landau, *The Philistines*, 8.
[11] Yasur-Landau, *The Philistines*, 306.
[12] Yasur-Landau, *The Philistines*, 343.

an Aegean goddess, which seems to appear everywhere in Philistia."[13] At Miletus, where Hittite texts document the presence of Ahhiyawa, we have "the remains of a Korridorhaus of the type common in the Aegean world": it imitates palatial architecture of mainland Greece.[14] Yasur-Landau further adds, "The rulers used Aegean symbols of rulership, mainly the central hearth, to consolidate their power by ritual feasting and drinking in the Aegean manner."[15]

As Yasur-Landau further notes, "The Cilician, Ugaritic, and Cypriot data show that in a relatively short time, within the first quarter of the twelfth century BCE, evidence for Aegean behavioral patterns appeared in vast areas of the eastern Mediterranean, sometimes but not in all cases following violent destructions."[16] He summarizes the significant changes in architecture:

> A deep change in the plan of a house and its interior arrangements reflects a conscious effort to replicate, in some cases, Aegean house forms and indicates a change in the cultural notion of what a house should look like … every aspect of everyday domestic life at the site mirrors behavioral patterns of Aegean origin previously unattested to in the Late Bronze Age Local, Canaanite tradition … the appearance of Aegean-style cooking and weaving, indicates that the most basic practices were carried out in a non-local manner … the deep change in the behavioral patterns in Philistia can be interpreted only by the arrival of people within the sphere of the expanding Aegean and Aegeanized world of the twelfth century.[17]

Furthermore, the introduction of Mycenaean culture starts to exert influence on the non-Aegean peoples: "Houses, whether built with or without Aegean-style installations, contain assemblages indicative of activities carried out in both the Canaanite and the Aegean manner, which hints at the birth of a multicultural society."[18]

There is considerable continuity in Philistia as well. A seventh-century temple/palace complex at Tel Miqne/Ekron evidences worship of an Aegean earth goddess, in an inscription in Phoenician,[19] detailing that

---

[13] Yasur-Landau, *The Philistines*, 343.
[14] Yasur-Landau, *The Philistines*, 64.
[15] Yasur-Landau, *The Philistines*, 331.
[16] Yasur-Landau, *The Philistines*, 189.
[17] Yasur-Landau, *The Philistines*, 280.
[18] Yasur-Landau, *The Philistines*, 281.
[19] Yasur-Landau, *The Philistines*, 306.

Achish, with a lengthy list of his ancestors, built the temple for the goddess Ptgyh. The goddess's name is non-Semitic, and is thought to equate with the earth goddess at Ashdoda. Thus the cult of the Aegean great mother-goddess Gaia seems to have been preserved in Philistia from the time of the Aegean migration in the twelfth century up to the seventh century. The name of the temple's builder, Achish, requires further comment. The ruler of Ekron, his name is also attested in an Assyrian inscription.[20] The Hebrew Bible has two Achishes. Twice (1 Sam 21:11–15; 27:1–6) David associates with Achish, king of Gath. 1 Kings 2:39–46 mentions another Achish during Solomon's reign, also king of Gath, perhaps grandson to the former. The name is non-Semitic, and derives from *Ἀχαιϝός or *Ἀχαιός – meaning "the Achaean."[21] As Yasur-Landau notes, the name, "Achish … can be traced back to the fifteenth century BCE."[22]

This brings us full circle with the Hittite documents and Homeric epic, Ahhiyawa, Homeric Ἀχαιος, and Biblical Achish. The one attested in the inscription at Ekron is perhaps a century later than Homer, still worshipping a goddess of Aegean descent. While with Achish, David performs acts that help the Philistines. He should perhaps be understood as acquiring aspects of Philistine culture during his lengthy sojourn among them. We return to him below.

Some archaeologists argue that proto-Israelite culture began to identify itself in opposition to Philistine culture.[23] Some of the most definitive markers of Israelite culture, including the taboo against eating pork, arose, they argue, so that the emerging Israelite sense of identity could define itself against, in distinction to, the dynamic Philistine presence.

Greek Culture in the Hebrew Bible

Let us now note passages in the Hebrew Bible that openly reference Greek culture. Javan, a grandson of Noah in Genesis 10, is the same eponym as

---

[20] Yasur-Landau, *The Philistines*, 306.
[21] J. Naveh, "Achish-Ikausu in the Light of the Ekron Dedication," *BASOR* 310 (1998): 35–37.
[22] Yasur-Landau, *The Philistines*, 332.
[23] Schlomo Bunimovitz and Zvi Lederman, "Canaanite Resistane: The Philistines and Beth-Shemesh – A Case Study from Iron Age I," *BASOR* (2011) 37–51; Schlomo Bunimovitz and Zvi Lederman, "A Border Case: Beth-Shemesh and the Rise of Ancient Israel," in *Israel in Transition: From Late Bronze II to Iron IIa (c. 1250–850 B.C.E.), Vol. 1. The Archaeology*, ed. Lester L. Grabbe (Bloomsbury: T&T Clark, 2008), 21–31.

Greek *Ion* (from *᾿Ιαϝων). The name has widespread, international circulation from very early times. Chantrainne cites a Mycenaean form, "*iawone*."[24] It occurs in the *Iliad* as ᾿Ιάονες (13.685), and was also current in ancient India, appearing some fifty times in the *Mahabhârata*, as Yavanas.

In Greek culture Ion is patriarch and eponymous ancestor of the eastern-most branch of the Greek people, the Ionians. According to Euripides, and larger Greek traditions, Ion has four sons, as Athena explains at the end of Euripides' play, "For, from him four sons, born from one root, will bequeath their names to the land, and the people by tribe" (*Ion* 1575–1578).[25] Occurring first in the Bible in the Table of Nations (Gen 10:2, 4), Javan functions as Mr. Greece, if you will, progenitor of the people. As the Greek Ion, Javan has four sons (Gen 10:4): Elishash, Tarshish, Kittim, and Rodanim. Genesis continues (10:5), "From these the peoples of the coasts and islands separated into their own countries."[26] Speiser explains that Elishash corresponds to Alashiya, a name for Cyprus; Kittim corresponds to Kition, a Greek city also on Cyprus, while Rodanim is clearly the inhabitants of Rhodes.[27] In additional passages in 1 Chron 1:5, 7; Isa 66:19; Ezek 27:13; and Zech 9:13, "Javan" can be the entire country personified, but in Genesis and 1 Chronicles it signifies the Ionian Greeks of Asia minor, and, perhaps, of Cyprus in particular.

Obscured by the proliferation of different ethnonyms for what we call Greece, it is abundantly clear that ancient Israelite culture had sustained contact with ancient Greek culture.

The Hebrew Bible as Counter-Curriculum

Let us now consider the scribal culture that produced the Hebrew Bible, and how, in some respects, it may be seen as responding to larger paradigms in Greek culture. Since the Hebrew Bible is not the product of authors, as we think of them, but scribes, Van der Toorn envisions six ways

---

[24] Pierre Chantrainne, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque: Historie des mots, A–K* (Paris: Editions Klincksieck), 475.
[25] Translations of Euripides and Homer are my own.
[26] Translations of the Hebrew Bible are from M. Jack Suggs, Katharine Doob Sakenfield and James R. Mueller, eds., *The Oxford Study Bible* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992).
[27] E. A. Speiser, *Genesis: Introduction, Translation, and Notes*, AB 1 (New York: Doubleday, 1964), 66.

by which scribes produced written texts.[28] In five of these six, a scribe "does not invent his text but merely arranges it; the contents of a text exist first, before being laid down in writing."[29] The Hebrew Bible exhibits "successive layers of scribal interventions. The final compositions reflect the involvement of generations of scribes. To the text as they had received it, they added their interpretations, framework, and other textual expansions."[30] This continues after the Septuagint, where Jeremiah is 15 % shorter than in the eventual Hebrew text. Thus "[s]cholars have concluded that the Greek Jeremiah translates a Hebrew text earlier than that in the Hebrew Bible."[31]

As Van der Toorn and others have argued, the Hebrew Bible's most celebrated example of authorship, Moses as the reputed author of the Pentateuch, is attributed, or fictitious, designed "to legitimize a cultic reform that was carried out in 622 by King Josiah."[32] The Pentateuch itself should likely be seen as the result of the labors of Ezra, under the impetus of the Persian Empire. As Van der Toorn notes, "Ezra was a scholar who received his scribal training in Babylonia. His work on the Pentateuch compares to the editing of the *Gilgamesh Epic* by Sin-leqe-unninni and the editing of the prognostic compendium *Sakikku* by Esagil-kin-apli. The latter used disparate sources ('twisted threads') … to produce a 'new text' … Ezra did the same for the Law of Moses."[33] Positing 450 BCE as a reasonable date, he argues that, "[w]ithout the Persians, there would not have been a Pentateuch."[34]

Van der Toorn also notes how books themselves are a Hellenistic invention.[35] The Hellenistic period caused, he notes, "increasing demand for a national literature by an educated public."[36] In a further reaction, "[t]he Hellenization of the Near East led to an increased production of national- and nationalistic-historiography."[37] Thus he argues that the publication of

---

[28] Karel van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007), 110.
[29] Van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture*, 47.
[30] Van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture*, 7.
[31] Van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture*, 131.
[32] Van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture*, 34.
[33] Van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture*, 250.
[34] Van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture*, 251.
[35] Van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture*, 9.
[36] Van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture*, 259.
[37] Van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture*, 259.

the Prophets, Psalms and the Proverbs "can be viewed as a Jewish re-
sponse to the cultural impact of Hellenism."[38]

Carr considers significant ways in which, in the Hellenistic period in
particular, Israelite culture is impacted by larger movements in Greek
culture. He observes that only fifth- and possibly sixth-century Greece
provides "depictions of people reading texts."[39] References to buying texts
become common in Greece in the fifth century. The first known instances
of authors, in something like the sense that we understand the term, are
Greek, seventh-, sixth-, and fifth-century lyric and dramatic poets. Carr
also notes a new form of cultural identity originating in Hellenistic Greek
culture, "Hellenism introduced the idea of a transethnic 'Greek' identity
defined by whether or not an individual had taken on Greek culture."[40]

For Jews thus surrounded by Greek models of education, texts, and
even the concept of authorship, Carr argues that the Old Testament itself
"is a counter-curriculum to that of Hellenistic education,"[41] that it is a
hybrid form of cultural resistance. Evident in broader ways, the renewed
focus on learning "Hebrew in the Hellenistic period would represent a
form of hybrid cultural resistance to a textual educational system focused
on gaining competence in Greek."[42] He notes as another hybrid form of
cultural resistance,

> the emergence for the first time of a Jewish identity not exclusively based
> in ethnic affiliation. It is around the early second century that we first see
> stories of "conversion" to Judaism and other indicators that Jewish identi-
> ty, like Hellenistic "Greek" identity, is becoming a way of life, a *politeia*,
> rather than national identity.[43]

Perhaps most intriguing are the hybrid conventions that evolved to pro-
duce the Hebrew Bible,

> It borrowed Greek techniques for textual standardization to protect the
> emergent standardization of the Hebrew text. It used Greek-like paragraph
> markers to mark pericopes in the Hebrew corpus. It drew boundaries

---

[38] Van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture*, 259.
[39] David Carr, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature*
(Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 92.
[40] Carr, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart*, 260.
[41] Carr, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart*, 10.
[42] Carr, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart*, 259–60.
[43] Carr, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart*, 260.

around the text that were modeled on yet surpassed the relatively sharp contours of the Hellenistic curriculum. It often was designated in Hellenistic categories like "ancestral laws," even as those categories were modified in often radical ways to fit the emergent Judean way of life … provid[ing] the basis for a broadly aimed educational process that corresponded to the broader, non-temple focused aims of Hellenistic education … [T]his body of indigenous Hebrew texts appears to have represented a hyperversion of the Greek forms of textuality it opposed.[44]

Carr finds the best examples to support his understanding of hybridity in the Hasmonean dynasty, which he sees as embodying "an emerging form of Hellenized, and 'Hellenistic,' Torah-observing Judaism."[45] He sees a unique hybrid of "anti-Greek propaganda along with promotion and extension of a stylized non-Greek indigenous culture," but with "the use of Greek forms to advance such propaganda and culture within a monarchy adopting significant elements of Hellenistic culture … this hybrid Hellenistic/anti-Hellenism mix shaped emergent Jewish education and textuality."[46] It is in 2 Maccabees, in particular, that "contradictions between Hellenistic and anti-Hellenistic elements emerge with particular clarity."[47] Though "saturated with Greek literary genres and … written in Greek and reflect[ing] the author's thorough education in the Greek literary tradition … and [promoting] Greek educational and character values like nobility, reason, beauty, self-control, and the ability to sacrifice familial relationships," to do so it employs "Hebrew examples and constant echoes of Jewish Scriptures like the *Aqedah*."[48] 2 Maccabees thus "is a Jewish example … of Greek-language oral-written textuality."[49]

I will extend aspects of Carr's arguments to areas he does not consider, arguing that some narratives in the Hebrew Bible can also be seen as instances of a similar hybridity, the use of Greek characters and forms to express traditional Israelite culture.

---

[44] Carr, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart*, 270.
[45] Carr, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart*, 258.
[46] Carr, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart*, 258.
[47] Carr, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart*, 258.
[48] Carr, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart*, 258.
[49] Carr, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart*, 258.

External Influence on Biblical Narratives

Let us now turn to the influence of external narratives on the Hebrew Bible. Since the rediscovery of the Gilgamesh epic, we have known that some narratives in the Hebrew Bible originated outside of Israelite culture. Thus Mark Smith can assert, "It is commonly accepted that parts of Gen 1–11 show literary dependence, either directly or indirectly, on Mesopotamian literary tradition."[50] We know the Bible was shaped by the traditions of Israel's neighbors to the east. A brief, partial list of examples, for which scholars have found antecedents outside of Israel, includes:

- Babylonian acrostics and some Psalms;
- Mesopotamian oracle collections and the prophetic books;
- the Babylonian Adapa and some of the traditional features of Old Testament revelations; Babylonian wisdom texts in general;
- the traditional god list and hymns of praise;
- an Aramaic blessing and Psalm 20;
- the Babylonian Theodicy and Job;
- Deuteronomy's central rubric of the covenant, and Hittite and Neo-Assyrian treaty documents;
- and, as earlier noted, possible Persian impetus for formation of the Pentateuch.[51]

Biblical narratives suggest dependency external to Israelite culture in other ways as well. In Genesis 28, Jacob, on his quest east to Harran, stops for the night and dreams his remarkable dream. In the morning, he dedicates a stone to God, but does so on what scholars identify as a pre-existing Canaanite sanctuary. Israelite scribes do similar things in their narratives, I suggest. They build them on pre-existing sacred narratives, reusing the foundations, stones and pillars. The building blocks are put to new use, but the older stones and foundations remain partly visible.

Van der Toorn argues that instruction in foreign languages would have been a standard element in Israelite scribal culture, "the knowledge of foreign languages was part of their profession … The linguistic skills of the scribes would normally have included the mastery of one or more

---

[50] Mark S. Smith, *God in Translation: Deities in Cross-Cultural Discourse in the Biblical World* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 182.
[51] Van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture*, 116, 170, 210, 165, 120, 134, 215, 153, respectively.

foreign languages … In addition to Aramaic, the scribal program may have taught other languages as well, such as Egyptian and, later, Greek."[52] I suggest, however, there is no need to assume a particularly late date for knowledge of Greek by Israel's scribal culture.

I thus argue that Israelite oral traditions and scribal culture were not only acquainted with, but were also influenced and shaped by ancient Greek culture and narratives.

Greek Epic and Hebrew Bible

Owing to diachronic interaction and acquaintance with Greek culture, Israel had more than a little knowledge of what we now call Greek myth. As to how this would have occurred, we need to remain open to multiple, possible scenarios, from different forms of oral performance—some of which should be assumed to go back to the period of Philistine incursion—to interactions between textual traditions. Of the many types of Greek myth that Israelite scribes found useful for their own agendas, the larger cycle of Trojan War myth proved most relevant and most attractive for Joshua through 2 Kings. The crown jewel of Trojan War myth, and most prestigious narrative in ancient Greece, the *Iliad*, offered proud heroes and highly ambivalent depictions of warrior kings involved in national causes, kings who often quarrel with their prophets, and lose the favor of their chief god. Within Greek culture the *Iliad* became an epic paradigm, and I argue that it also did for Israelite scribes, much as Gilgamesh seems to have been. If we accept Janko's dating of the *Iliad*'s text to the last quarter of the eighth century,[53] but keep in mind the likelihood of earlier circulation of oral versions, it is easily early enough to impact a Hebrew Bible undergoing rewriting, revision, and editing, for centuries after that.

Epics build on, even evolve from, earlier epics. Both the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* allude to an earlier epic about Jason and the Argonauts.[54] We are still tracing the echoes of Gilgamesh in Homeric epic, though we will probably never know the nature of the contact. Did a bilingual Greek bard

---

[52] Van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture*, 53.
[53] Richard Janko, *Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982).
[54] Bruce Louden, *Homer's Odyssey and the Near East* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 135–63.

hear a live performance of a Babylonian version? Does the Homeric tradition reflect influence from a textual tradition of Gilgamesh?

Why does the Hebrew Bible lack epic? Epic is inherently polytheistic; and the Hebrew Bible is largely a prose work, which suggests a closer affinity with archives, as Van der Toorn notes.[55] Though lacking epic, it nonetheless contains allusions to it, and re-workings of it. We may have allusions to lost epics in the mentions of Shamgar (Judges) and Nimrod (Genesis), as well as references to the Book of Yashar. On the other hand, commentators have argued that the Hebrew Bible consciously applies epic models of organization and characterization. Mark Smith, in his study of correspondences between David and Jonathan, Gilgamesh and Enkidu, and Achilles and Patroclus, suggests so, "I would sympathize with Cross's conviction that biblical books such as Samuel were 'interpreting the later history of Israel in Epic patterns.'"[56] But which "epic patterns"? Cross no doubt has in mind Ugaritic or Canaanite epic, and, we can assume, additional Babylonian or Assyrian narratives. I am making the case for including ancient Greek epic as well.

In the relevant time period, Greek and Israelite cultures are both still operating under a largely oral paradigm, which tends to employ generic character types, generic type-scenes and situations. In Trojan War myth, Israelite scribal tradition had, ready to hand, characters with developed dynamics between them, more than a little relevant for depicting Israelite saga, some of which reflected historical interactions with the Mycenaean phase of Greek culture. In particular the figures of Agamemnon, the prophet Calchas, and priest Chryseis, Achilles, Clytemnestra, Iphigenia, and the interrelations of these characters, were received as types, seen as appropriate vehicles to help depict several kinds of conflict. Of the six ways Van der Toorn posits by which scribes produced written texts, two are most relevant for my argument: "(5) adaptation of an existing text for a new audience; and (6) integration of individual documents into a more comprehensive composition."[57]

The larger David narrative suggests a prose epic, in several respects, particularly if we apply Carr's model of hybrid cultural resistance. It adopts many of Homeric epic's stylistic traits, but employs them contrary

---

[55] Van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture*, 16.
[56] Mark S. Smith, *Poetic Heroes: Literary Commemorations of Warriors and Warrior Culture in the Early Biblical World* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2014), 39.
[57] Van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture*, 116.

to the norms and expectations of Greek culture. All is now subsumed under a Yahwist agenda, the expected type-scenes of Trojan War myth, in which Greeks defeat Trojans, articulate Israel's conflict with Philistines for a *reverse* outcome, in which Israel will prove victorious, much as Vergil will later shift audience loyalty. David moves freely back and forth in the zones between Philistine and Israelite culture. He might be understood as personifyin*g* and embodying the transmission of some aspects of Mycenaean Greek culture onto Israel. Whatever historical realities his larger narrative depicts, it has been shaped, in many particulars, by awareness of Trojan War saga: larger aspects of David's character correspond to key traits of the Homeric Achilles.[58] An even stronger case can be made for how Saul's character conforms to the Homeric Agamemnon.

The Dubious Character of Agamemnon

What of Agamemnon himself? For over two millennia, larger reception of the *Iliad* remained largely uncritical of his character. However, starting about 1960, a consensus has been building that Agamemnon is a highly flawed character. Whitman sees him as "a foil to Achilles," whom, throughout the *Iliad*, Homer undercuts by having him fail to meet audience expectations of how a king should behave.[59] As Whitman puts it, Homer uses "all his traditional eminence as a means of diminishing" him.[60] For instance, the *Iliad* has four major *aristeiai*, an episode in which a major warrior, inspired by a god, becomes virtually unstoppable, capable of inflicting massive casualties on his opponents. Agamemnon's *aristeia* uniquely achieves, as Whitman notes, "scarcely even a degree of victory."[61] Whitman concludes that Homer's aim is to depict Agamemnon, "as the opposite of Achilles – the nadir, as Achilles is the zenith, of the heroic assumption."[62] Homer's Agamemnon is "a magnificently dressed incompetence, without spirit or spiritual concern; his dignity is marred by pretension … his prowess by a savagery which is the product of a deep uncertainty and fear."[63]

---

[58] Bruce Louden, *The Iliad: Structure, Myth, and Meaning* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006), 157, 161–66, 170–79.
[59] Cedric H. Whitman, *Homer and the Heroic Tradition* (New York: Norton, 1958), 156.
[60] Whitman, *Homer and the Heroic Tradition*, 156.
[61] Whitman, *Homer and the Heroic Tradition*, 159.
[62] Whitman, *Homer and the Heroic Tradition*, 162.
[63] Whitman, *Homer and the Heroic Tradition*, 162.

Greenburg zeroes in on Agamemnon's outrageous treatment of Apollo's priest, Chryses, in the *Iliad*'s first episode. When he comes to him to ransom his daughter, Agamemnon's potential concubine, Agamemnon treats Chryses with contempt. As Greenburg notes, not only does Agamemnon dishonor the priest, he misjudges his influence with Apollo. Chryses' reference to Apollo "embodies a threat of sorts … Agamemnon … understands it and rejects it … He is obviously and erroneously guessing that divinity will not respond to the priest's prayer."[64] He concludes, "It would be a crowning touch if Agamemnon is portrayed as being egotistically unaware of just how offensive he is."[65]

Van Nortwick builds on Whitman's observations, arguing, "The contrast between the expectations raised by his special status and the frequent lapses in leadership and judgment he displays is the key to his characterization in the *Iliad*."[66] He sees Agamemnon as "insecure about his judgment, prone to rash and ill-advised decisions."[67] Three times in the *Iliad*, Agamemnon, out of panic or depression, advises the Greeks to give up the war and return home. When he finally issues an apology to Achilles, who does not fight for the first nineteen books of the *Iliad* because of their quarrel, he claims he "is not responsible for his mistakes because Zeus sent 'blind distraction' … upon him."[68]

When Agamemnon is wounded during his *aristeia* (for which we find a correspondence in Ahab below), in one of the most unique similes in the *Iliad*, he is compared to a woman suffering birth-pangs, taken away to deliver. The ambivalent, mysterious simile is, as Hainsworth notes, "inescapably ironic at several levels in the comparison. The great effort of the King of Men ends with his being rushed off to his surgeons like a woman to her *accouchement*."[69]

As a warrior king who leads a large, national coalition to war, Agamemnon personifies many of the problems associated with kingship. Though a capable warrior, he is often petty, selfish, paranoid and vindictive. He thematically finds himself on the wrong side of prophets and

---

[64] N. A. Greenburg, "The Attitude of Agamemnon," *CW* 86 (1993): 193–205 (197).

[65] Greenburg, "The Attitude of Agamemnon,", 205.

[66] Thomas van Nortwick, "Agamemnon," in *The Homer Encyclopedia*, ed. M. Finkelberg (Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011), 14–16 (15).

[67] Van Nortwick, "Agamemnon," 15.

[68] Van Nortwick, "Agamemnon," 15.

[69] Bryan Hainsworth, *The Iliad: A Commentary, Volume III: Books 9-12* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 254–55.

priests. Out of excessive self-concern he loses sight of the big picture, losing Zeus' favor in the process, which turns instead to Achilles. I argue that the scribal tradition thus draws on him as a type for its own depictions of Saul and Ahab.

If I am correct, however, why are the correspondences not widely known? A few factors may have hindered their due recognition. When a story rooted in a polytheistic tradition is adapted for a monotheistic tradition and audience, key alterations are necessary. Thus when Agamemnon loses Zeus' favor and support, this is far less traumatic than in monotheism. Agamemnon still retains the full support of Hera, Poseidon, and Athena. When Saul loses Yahweh's favor, however, that's it, game over, in monotheism.

There are differences in degree in some of the corresponding elements. Agamemnon's bitter and recurring quarrels with his prophet, Calchas, and Chryses, priest of Apollo, are significant aspects of his character, but for Saul and Samuel, and Ahab with Elijah and Micaiah, the corresponding quarrels are more central elements in the respective narratives, the prophets, Samuel and Elijah are the main characters, in fact.

Lastly we might note the perspective of the vast majority of the Bible's readers. Popular culture, especially in the United States, assumes that David is fully "historical," but Agamemnon entirely mythical. How could a "historical" figure be partly shaped by a fictional one?

I suggest the figure of Agamemnon proved irresistibly paradigmatic for Israelite scribes to articulate specific issues about kingship within their own culture.[70] In different contexts the scribes select and emphasize different aspects of his character and relations with others. Saul and Ahab both share Agamemnon's serial confrontations with prophets; both lose God's favor and support, and both can be understood as embodying projected anxieties and concerns about monarchy itself. But it is only Saul, in his interactions with David, who plays out a version of Agamemnon's dynamic with Achilles.[71] It is only Saul who does so within the larger context of confrontation with the Philistines. Ahab, on the other hand,

---

[70] In addition to the two contexts I discuss here, I argue that the figure of Agamemnon looms behind six additional episodes (Judges 4–5, Judges 11, Judges 19; 2 Samuel 11; Genesis 27, Genesis 34), which I will discuss in a future publication.

[71] For larger discussion of this see Louden, *The Iliad*, 161–66.

offers the most exact correspondences in friction between king and proph-
et, and has a wife unexpectedly correspondent to Agamemnon's Clytem-
nestra.

Agamemnon and Saul

We turn, then to Saul. Like Agamemnon in so many ways, Saul is also a
foil. The most powerful man in Israel, he spends much of his time nerv-
ously observing David's increasing popularity and rise, as Agamemnon
does Achilles. Samuel is not only his almost constant antagonist, but, be-
hind the scenes, exercises greater influence and authority. We thus have a
set of three analogous characters, Saul and Agamemnon, David and Achil-
les, and Samuel and Calchas. The entire saga plays out against confronta-
tion with the Philistines (1 Sam 14:52), indirect affirmation of its links
with Homeric epic, if we accept that the scribal tradition is aware of the
identity of Philistine and Greek culture (though modern audiences are
not).

   Both Saul and Agamemnon are qualified warriors, capable of epic
achievements on the battlefield. Agamemnon has his *aristeia* in *Iliad* 11; 1
Samuel 11:6 presents us with an equivalent scenario for Saul, "the Spirit
of God suddenly seized him." However, while the motif normally initiates
epic acts, as with Jephthah and Samson, here Saul proceeds to cut two
oxen in pieces (perhaps borrowed from Judges 19, the last pre-king narra-
tive), which recapitulates Agamemnon summoning the Greeks to reclaim
Helen (recounted in Apollodorus E.3.6). After defeating the Amalekites,
Saul erects a memorial to himself (1 Sam 15:12), like an Iliadic hero, and
his overriding concern with *kleos*, fame.

   In his interactions with Samuel, and subsequent loss of Yahweh's fa-
vor, Saul moves into even closer correspondence with Agamemnon. After
anointing Saul as king, Samuel places the destruction of the Amalekites
under the ban. When Saul fails to carry this out completely, his relation
with Samuel immediately disintegrates. Saul violates the ban not only by
sparing King Agag, but by keeping some of the Amalekites' choicest pos-
sessions for himself. In so doing he instantiates one of the *Iliad*'s central
concerns, one of Agamemnon's central characteristics, and the main cause
for Agamemnon's quarrel with Achilles: he distributes war winnings in a
selfish, arbitrary manner. When Saul proceeds to set up a monument to

himself, he furthers our impression of excessive self-involvement. The biggest difference with the *Iliad* in these relations is Samuel's more dominant role than Agamemnon's prophets.

A whole book, I suggest, could be written on David and Achilles.[72] When, for instance, he defeats the Philistine Goliath, the Philistine's preliminary arming scene has long been recognized as conforming in almost every respect to the *Iliad*'s arming scenes,[73] and should be understood as referencing all three of its heroic duels, two of which, like that between David and Goliath, are to determine the entire battle between the opposing armies. The *Iliad*'s first duel between Paris and Menelaus employs a parodic arming scene. In 1 Samuel 17, the about-to-be-defeated Goliath's arming scene is also parodic: for all his armor and weaponry he is easily slain. Of the three duels, that between Hector and Aias in *Iliad* 7 is far the closest to the preliminaries in 1 Samuel 17. The climax of the poem, however, is Achilles' duel with Hector, which implicitly seals the Fall of Troy.

Additional tensions between Achilles and Agamemnon suggest they serve as a rubric for Saul and David's interactions. After Achilles' quarrel with Agamemnon erupts at the beginning of Book 1, Zeus supports him, not Agamemnon, for the remainder of the epic. In 1 Samuel, the audience knows David has already been anointed as king, and has Yahweh's favor, near the beginning of his saga. After the quarrel, for the next three fourths of the epic, Achilles does not fight for the Greek army, and in so doing, indirectly renders significant aid to the *Trojan* cause. David, after Saul threatens him repeatedly, goes over to the Philistines, twice entering into relationships with King Achish, the Achaian (1 Sam 21:10–15). During the second occasion (1 Sam 27:1–6), having earned the Philistine king's trust, David is ordered by Achish to take the field against the Israelites (1 Sam 28). Robert Alter sees the unusual circumstance, an Israelite king working with the enemy, as supporting the episode's historicity—why else include such an ambivalent sequence?[74] This may be, yet I suggest it can be understood as Israelite scribes fashioning David's character to

---

[72] For a sketch, see Louden, *The Iliad*, 161–66, 170–79.

[73] Azzan Yadin, "Goliath's Armor and Israelite Collective Memory," *VT* 54 (2004): 373–95; Louden, *The Iliad*, 172–79.

[74] Robert Alter, *Ancient Israel: The Former Prophets: Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings* (New York: Norton, 2013), 400.

conform to a motif prominent in Achilles' interactions with Agamemnon, the harm he causes his fellow Greeks, which Zeus supports, and which is even more prominent in the *Iliad*.

Both Achilles and David are depicted in connection with performances of epic poetry; both shown playing the lyre. Both do so as part of their larger frictions with Agamemnon and Saul. Midway through Agamemnon's quarrel with Achilles, he sends an embassy to him, attempting reconciliation. When they reach Achilles' tent, the embassy finds him (*Iliad* 9.186–189) playing the lyre, singing epic songs, an instance of Homeric epic's well-known self-referentiality, or meta-poetics: the subject of his own epic is singing about other epic heroes. David is also referenced as the subject of something like epics in the recurring refrain, "Saul struck down thousands, but David tens of thousands" (1 Sam 18:6–8; 29:5). As Achilles plays to Agamemnon's embassy, while the deluded leader attempts reconciliation with him, so David in his lyre-playing performs before a troubled, anxious Saul. This motif is much more at home in Homeric epic: both Homeric protagonists, Achilles and Odysseus, are so depicted.

While Agamemnon and Saul share several other corresponding motifs, we conclude with how they are both depicted as visited by an *Evil Spirit*. In Agamemnon's case the Evil Spirit is more metaphorical. When he makes his public apology to Achilles for having begun their quarrel, he says it happened because Zeus sent the goddess, *Ate*, to delude him (below we also discuss the deceptive Dream Zeus sends him). When Saul loses his support, Yahweh repeatedly sends an evil spirit (16:23; 18:10). 1 Samuel combines this motif with the motif of David playing lyre (1 Sam 16:23), "And whenever an evil spirit from God came upon Saul, David would take his lyre and play it, so that relief would come to Saul." Again, a tricky immortal figure seems more at home in the fully polytheistic *Iliad* than in the monotheistic Bible.

Agamemnon and Ahab

Perhaps even more intriguing are correspondences between Agamemnon and Ahab. The latter, though a figure more supported by the historical record than David, not involved with the Philistines, not attended by an Achilles figure, nonetheless, his interactions with prophets, his deportment on the battlefield, and his highly aggressive wife, all find virtually exact parallels in Agamemnon. Ahab's interactions with the prophets Eli-

jah and Micaiah are even closer to Agamemnon's than are Saul's with Samuel, including verbal equivalents. I thus argue that the scribal tradition had, in Agamemnon, an established character type they knew to be a vehicle suited to how they wished to depict Ahab.

In Ahab's disputes with his prophets Elijah and Micaiah, we revisit an earlier theme, but here the parallels are even closer with Agamemnon. Ahab's animosity toward Elijah is more pronounced, has undergone a longer period of gestation than Saul's for Samuel, and resembles Agamemnon's toward Calchas in *Iliad* 1. Ahab's first words to Elijah are contemptuous (18:17), "As soon as Ahab saw Elijah, he said to him, 'Is it you, you troubler of Israel?'" We cannot imagine Saul addressing Samuel this way, but this is precisely Agamemnon's tone to his prophet Calchas, and to Chryses.

The most exact, most sustained, correspondences occur in 1 Kings 22, when Micaiah recounts his vision of the *Enticing Spirit* that will fool Ahab into thinking he can now capture Ramoth-gilead. Let us first set the stage by reviewing Agamemnon's parallel circumstances in book 2 of the *Iliad*. The night after Agamemnon's quarrel with Achilles begins, after a divine council, Zeus, who now supports Achilles over Agamemnon, sends a *Deceptive Dream* (2.6: οὖλος ὄνειρος) to Agamemnon. Zeus' purpose in sending the Dream, is to fool Agamemnon into thinking he can sack Troy the next day. The Dream fulfills Zeus' purpose, leaving Agamemnon, "believing in his heart things that are not going to be accomplished" (2.36).

Extensive deliberations and discussion follow over how to proceed on the basis of the Dream. Agamemnon orders the Greeks into assembly, but first convenes his executive council. Nestor, asserting no one would believe the dream if dreamt by anyone else, says it must be true since Agamemnon himself dreamt it (2.79–83). In his heated exchange with his prophet Calchas on the previous day, when Calchas had declared Agamemnon's abusive treatment of Apollo's priest had brought the god's wrath upon them, Agamemnon replied (1.106–107),

> Seer of evil: never yet have you told me a good thing. Always the evil things are dear to your heart to prophesy (μάντι κακῶν … αἰεί τοι τὰ κάκ' ἐστὶ φίλα φρεσί μαντεύεσθαι).

Agamemnon fails to take Troy on that day, and suffers a major embarrassment before his troops, most of whom now contemplate going home to Greece.

   We return to Ahab's confrontation with Micaiah, with Agamemnon's
Dream in mind, as Ahab and his forces, and King Jehoshaphat, contem-
plate attacking the city Ramoth-gilead. Agreeing to join battle, Jehosha-
phat suggests Ahab first consult with Yahweh. All of Ahab's prophets
prophesy that God will give him victory. When Jehoshaphat asks if there
is another prophet to verify their prophecy, Ahab responds in words that
closely agree with Agamemnon's rebuke of Calchas (22:8), "'There is one
more … but I hate the man, because *he never prophesies good for me,
never anything but evil.* His name is Micaiah son of Imlah.'" Later in the
confrontation Ahab repeats (22:18), "'Did I not tell you that he never
prophesies good for me, *never anything but evil*?'" Micaiah then recounts
a vision (22:19–22):

> I saw the Lord seated on his throne with all the host of heaven in attend-
> ance on his right and on his left. The Lord said, 'Who will entice Ahab to
> go up and attack Ramoth-gilead?' One said one thing and one said anoth-
> er, until a spirit came forward and, standing before the Lord, said, 'I shall
> entice him.' 'How?' said the Lord. 'I shall go out', he answered, 'and be a
> lying spirit[75] in the mouths of all his prophets.' You see, then, how the
> Lord has put a lying spirit in the mouths of all these prophets of yours, be-
> cause he has decreed disaster for you.

Let us review the correspondences:

1. Each king contemplates trying to take a city. Each king leads a
   coalition of forces against another coalition.
2. Detailed deliberations and discussion precede his going into bat-
   tle. Jehoshaphat serves a similar function as Agamemnon's Nes-
   tor.
3. Each king receives a report of divine will ensuring a positive out-
   come of the battle.
4. Each main god converses with a lesser divine being. Zeus in-
   structs the Dream, but the Spirit volunteers for Yahweh, in corre-
   sponding terms: to fool the respective kings into thinking they
   will sack their respective cities that day.
5. The audience, however, knows the reports to be spurious. In the
   Iliad, typical of epic conventions, the audience is itself present at

---

[75] Jack M. Sasson, *Judges 1–12: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*,
AYB 6D (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2014), has "deceiving spirit," 391.

Zeus' deliberations, observing without any doubt that Agamemnon is being deceived. 1 Kings 22 maintains the Hebrew Bible's usual conception of having the prophet as somehow present at the divine council (cf. Isaiah 6), a monotheistic variation on the more traditional polytheistic divine council. Micaiah relays the corresponding information that Homeric epic gives through the principal narrator.

6. Each king proceeds, and fails, on the basis of the false report of divine support.

In a key difference, Ahab's Enticing Spirit account repeats the motif from Elijah's earlier confrontation with Ahab of the one true prophet defeating the many false ones. Thus, as Cogan notes, "the issues of conflicting prophetic viewpoints and the royal response to the word of YHWH dominate,"[76] whereas for Agamemnon conflicting prophetic viewpoints is a non-issue. That the 1 Kings version derives from another is suggested by its being a secondary narrative, told in a tongue-in-cheek manner, and in how it retains polytheistic touches. Several of the motifs are more at home in the *Iliad* than in 1 Kings. Zeus or Athena sending a Dream is common in Homeric epic, for instance, whereas Yahweh's use of the Deceiving Spirit is less so. So also, as Cogan points out, is, "The consultation with prophets rather than priests in preparation for the attack on Ramoth-gilead comes as a surprise."[77] The triumph of the one true prophet over the many false subsumes the narrative under a Yahwist agenda, not relevant to the *Iliad*. Cogan, on the basis of similarities between Micaiah's fortunes and the later Jeremiah, argues the episode "was written toward the end of the period of classical prophecy."[78] So far after the *Iliad*, easily allows for some form of diffusion or adaptation. Ahab's encounter with Micaiah suggests a careful synthesis of Agamemnon's missteps at the opening of the *Iliad*.

Agamemnon and Ahab both, in prominent scenes, are wounded, while fighting from their chariots, and driven from battle. Agamemnon's death, murdered by his wife Clytemnestra and her lover Aigisthos on his return from Troy, is alluded to several times in the *Odyssey*. We recall that his

---

[76] Mordechai Cogan, *I Kings: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 10 (New York: Doubleday, 2001), 496.
[77] Cogan, *I Kings*, 497.
[78] Cogan, *I Kings*, 497.

aristeia ends abruptly when, wounded by a spear in *Iliad* 11.251–255, 265–281, he retreats from battle in his chariot. Likened in simile to a woman suffering birth pangs, the unusual comparison may look ahead to his being slain in the bath, in a sense, "unmanned," by his wife.

Though lacking anything comparable to an *aristeia*, Ahab's exit from battle is suggestive of Agamemnon's, and may also allude to two other prominent deaths in the *Iliad*. As he and Jehoshaphat march on Ramoth-gilead, Ahab is in disguise. In the *Iliad*, Patroclus, whose *aristeia* follows Agamemnon's, goes into battle in disguise, and is slain, the only Greek to die during his *aristeia*. Ahab dies in disguise, and receives his mortal wound from an arrow shot at random (1 Kgs 22:34), both compounding his un-heroic circumstances, "One man … drew his bow at random and hit the king of Israel where the breastplate joins the plates of the armour." The detail may reference the most climactic wound in all of the *Iliad*, when Achilles slays Hector by aiming his spear at the space between his armor and helmet (22.324–327). Ahab remains in battle for a while, propped up in his chariot, blood flowing from his wound, until he dies.

Conclusion

As I hope I have demonstrated, archaeology, and the Hebrew Bible itself, demonstrate that Israelites had sustained, diachronic, awareness of Greeks through multiple phases of Greek culture, over more than a millennium. The interaction is visible in a number of ways, in Javan, in the individuals named Achish, but above all, in the Philistines. While placing the Hebrew Bible in context with Mesopotamian, Egyptian, Ugaritic, and other Northwest Semitic cultures, has long been a fruitful area of Biblical research, it seems shortsighted that we have not initiated broader consideration of how the Hebrew Bible reflects awareness of, and significant interaction with Greek culture. Like Gilgamesh, Homeric epic, and other Greek myth, should be reconsidered for their possible impact on the Hebrew Bible.

We can envision different ways by which Israelite scribes could have responded to Greek narratives. Of the six means Van der Toorn posits for how the scribal tradition generated the Hebrew Bible, most relevant is his fifth, adaptation, which he defines as follows, "Adaptation … is a mode of text production that requires an anterior text. The scribe will use that text

as a model for his own; instead of writing a text, he will be rewriting one."[79] He goes on to note that adaptation includes translation of an anterior narrative from a different language:

> His adaptation can take several forms. It may be a mere translation from the one language into the other; the translation may transform the text substantially by appropriating it for an audience with different religious loyalties.[80]

This strikes me as the likeliest explanation, and accounts for how some motifs seem more at home in Greek epic than in the Hebrew Bible. But also relevant is his sixth, "integration of individual documents into a more comprehensive composition."[81]Hebrew scribes could integrate archival accounts with character types and episodes coming from the *Iliad*:[82]

> [T]he scribe would put them together through juxtaposition, or more elegantly, by dissolving the two texts into their constituent elements, which he would then piece together into a new configuration … [or] to take one document as the master text and to eclectically use the second document to supplement it.

Carr's argument that the Hebrew Bible "is a countercurriculum to that of Hellenistic education,"[83] a hybrid form of cultural resistance, offers further support. According to Carr, Hebrew scribes would knowingly employ conventions of Greek culture in an agenda aimed at undermining that very culture. The most frequent goal would be validation of a Yahwist perspective, and implicit suggestion of higher morality. We should remain open as to when such adaptation or integration could have occurred. Again, as Van der Toorn notes, "There would have been cause … every forty years or so, to prepare a new master copy" of a given book.[84]

Behind the larger contours of Saul and Ahab, the former's paranoia, self-involvement, jealousy of David, dangerous wrath against him, and visitation by evil spirits, the latter's contemptuous treatment of prophets, Deceptive Spirit, unsuccessful attempt to take Ramoth-gilead, less-than-

---

[79] Van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture*, 133.
[80] Van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture*, 133.
[81] Van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture*, 110.
[82] Van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture*, 139.
[83] Carr, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart*, 10.
[84] Van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture*, 149.

heroic wounding on the battlefield, and subsequent death, behind them, the particulars of Agamemnon's character are visible. If my arguments are correct, that Agamemnon, in some degree, looms behind Saul and Ahab, this means that the Biblical scribes were far ahead of Homeric scholars in their reading and understanding of Agamemnon's character. As "outsiders" they had greater objectivity in assessing his character.

A Respectable Gospel:
The Passion 'According to Homer' in Eudocia's *Homerocentones*

KARL OLAV SANDNES
MF Norwegian School of Theology, Oslo

Homer and the New Testament

Homer was the primary text of the ancient world. The *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* were true companions of life, particularly for those with some education. Heraclitus, the Stoic philosopher, puts it succinctly in his *Homeric Problems* 1.4–7:

> From the very first age of life, the foolishness of infants just beginning to learn is nurtured on the teaching given in his [i.e. Homer] school. One might almost say that his poems are our baby clothes, and we nourish our minds by draughts of his milk. He stands at our side as we each grow up and shares our youth as we gradually come to manhood; when we are mature, his presence within us is at its prime; and even in old age, we never weary of him. When we stop, we thirst to begin him again. In a word, the only end of Homer for human beings is the end of life.[1]

Homer was ubiquitous, as his texts were present throughout the various levels of education. It was the means whereby children – mostly boys of the social elite – were introduced to the skills of reading and writing.[2] Homes of the well-situated, as well as public squares, were ornamented

---

[1] Quoted from *Heraclitus: Homeric Problems*, ed. and trans. D. A. Russell and D. Konstan (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005).

[2] See Teresa Morgan, *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 100–19, 320–21; Raffaella Cribiore, *Gymnastics of the Mind: Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001), 140–42, 194–97, 204–5.

with scenes taken from these writings.[3] Literary style and story-telling found a prime model in Homer's writings. These writings were essential for the development of textual interpretation and hermeneutics,[4] and were means of preserving 'Greek-ness' and a cultural identity.[5] They were also means of entertainment, as they were parts of literary contests and performances. 'Homer was a cultural inevitability', as Dennis R. MacDonald has put it.[6] This was the air they breathed. According to Margalit Finkelberg, Homer's writings enjoyed the status as a 'foundational text' since they met three criteria: 1) They occupied a central place in education; 2) They were the focus of exegetic activity aimed at defending his texts from any type of criticism; and 3) These writings were the vehicle by which the identity of the community to which it belonged was shaped.[7]

This was also the wider context in which the New Testament writings came into being. Against the backdrop of Homer's pivotal role in the contemporary world, it is natural that the question of Homer and the New Testament is on the agenda of New Testament and Early Christian scholars. For reasons most natural, the Old Testament writings have been considered adjacent texts to New Testament interpretation, which particularly applies to the narrative texts. With some few exceptions,[8] scholars have

---

[3] Karl Olav Sandnes, *The Gospel 'According to Homer and Virgil': Cento and Canon*, NovTSup 138 (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 8–11.

[4] Robert Lamberton and John J. Keyney, *Homer's Ancient Readers: The Hermeneutics of Greek Epic's Earliest Exegetes* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992); Folker Siegert, 'Early Jewish Interpretation in a Hellenistic Style', in *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of its Interpretation Vol. I.1*, ed. Magne Sæbø (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 130–98; Maren Niehoff, *Jewish Exegesis and Homeric Scholarship in Alexandria* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011). Benjamin Sargent, '"Interpreting Homer from Homer": Aristarchus of Samothrace and the Notion of Scriptural Authorship in the New Testament', *TynBul* 65 (2014): 125–39. Several contributions in Maren Niehoff, ed., *Homer and the Bible in the Eyes of Ancient Interpreters*, JSRC 16 (Leiden: Brill, 2012) are relevant.

[5] Karl Olav Sandnes, *The Challenge of Homer: School, Pagan Poets and Early Christianity*, LNTS 400 (New York: T&T Clark, 2009), 40–58.

[6] Dennis R. MacDonald, *The Homeric Epics and the Gospel of Mark* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000), 8.

[7] Margalit Finkelberg, 'Canonising and Decanonising Homer: Reception of the Homeric Poems in Antiquity and Modernity', in *Homer and the Bible in the Eyes of Ancient Interpreters*, ed. M. R. Niehoff, JSRC 16 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 3–28 (for the criteria see p. 16).

[8] In particular Homer and the Old Testament; see Christoph Auffahrt, *Der Drohende Untergang: 'Schöpfung' in Mythos und Ritual im Alten Orient und in Griechenland*, Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Besinnungen 39 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1991); Bruce Louden, *Homer's Odyssey and the Near East* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011); Meik Gerhards, *Homer und die Bibel: Studien zur Interpretation der Ilias und*

therefore turned a blind eye to the primary text of the surrounding world. Some distinct Homeric phraseology most likely appears in the sea voyage in Acts 27:41 (ἐπέκειλαν τὴν ναῦν) ('they ran the ship aground').[9] But citations and phraseology only form the 'Hinterland', directing the readers to a more sophisticated and creative interplay with the culture and its foundational texts and stories.

In his study *Homer in der frühchristlichen Literatur bis Justinus* (1968), Günter Glockmann says that 'das Neue Testament weder eine Äusserung über Homer noch eine bewusste oder unbewusste Benutzungen der Homerischen Dichtung enthält.'[10] Due to more literary and narrative approaches in New Testament research, the judgement of present-day scholars should be more cautious. Within this process of a re-orientation one man stands out, namely Dennis R. MacDonald. In several works over the last few decades, he has argued that New Testament narrative texts, particularly Mark's Gospel and the Book of Acts, are steeped in the Homeric literary world.[11] In many cases, stories, plot and wording all derive from there. For MacDonald, this implies turning from history and tradition toward aesthetics and fiction.[12]

---

ausgewählter alttestamentlicher Texte, WMANT 144 (Göttingen: Neukirchener Verlag, 2015).

[9] This is pointed out by F. F. Bruce, *Commentary on the Book of Acts* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1965), 498; Susan Marie Praeder, 'Sea Voyages in Ancient Literature and the Theology of Luke-Acts', *CBQ* 46 (1984): 683–706 (701); Dennis R. MacDonald, 'The Shipwrecks of Odysseus and Paul', *NTS* 45 (1999): 88–107 (95); Loveday Alexander, *Acts in its Ancient Literary Context: A Classisist Looks at the Acts of the Apostles* (London: T&T Clark International, 2005), 175.

[10] Günther Glockmann, *Homer in der frühchristlichen Literatur bis Justinus*, TU 105 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1968), 57.

[11] See also Dennis R. MacDonald, *Does the New Testament Imitate Homer? Four Cases from the Acts of the Apostles* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003). MacDonald has recently put together many of his works on the field in *The Gospels and Homer: Imitations of Greek Epic in Mark and Luke-Acts*, vol. 1 of *The New Testament and Greek Literature* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2015) and *Luke and Vergil: Imitations of Classical Greek Literature*, vol. 2 of *The New Testament and Greek Literature* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2015).

[12] MacDonald, *The Homeric Epics and the Gospel of Mark*, 189–90. In a similar way, Thomas L. Brodie, *Beyond the Quest for the Historical Jesus: Memoir of a Discovery* (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2012) argues on the basis of Old Testament mimesis that the historical foundation of the stories is indeed weak. He questions whether Jesus ever lived. Brodie seems to think that historical authenticity is free from literary models. What history is not literary, in drawing upon previous patterns of telling a story? For sure, mimesis poses a challenge for simplistic views on tradition and history in New Testament narratives, but literary dependence by itself is not sufficient to question historicity.

It is not my intention here to enter into a discussion with this doyen of Homeric New Testament studies since I have addressed that elsewhere.[13] In my view, it suffices here to say that MacDonald is overdoing his case, and that the analogies claimed are not always convincing. I hold that a distinction between a reader perspective and the authorial intent is called for in such studies. As claimed by MacDonald, authorial intent comes with many problems. That being said, I find the most intriguing part of his contributions to be the fact that he takes the practice of mimesis in ancient storytelling as his point of departure. MacDonald's contributions are therefore well-situated within new approaches to the Gospels, namely that they are studied within the framework on ancient rhetoric and progymnastic exercises.[14]

One of the things I miss in MacDonald's argument is that he appears almost negligent when it comes to testing his exegesis against the most explicit Christian Homeric text, namely Eudocia's *Homerocentones*.[15] For sure, Eudocia's method is open to multiple applications of Homer's writings; but in any case, her expositions do represent a historical example or a *tertium comparationis*, of the endeavour to which MacDonald has devoted so much work. My aim now is to look into the passion story told within her Homeric Gospel, concentrating on the crucifixion scene.

What Is a Cento?

Centos represent a genre, or rather a compositional technique whereby verses lifted verbatim or with slight modification from classical epics make up new poems. Lines taken from the epics are stitched together, thus

---

[13] Karl Olav Sandnes, 'Imitatio Homeri? An Appraisal of Dennis R. MacDonald's "Mimesis Criticism"', *JBL* 124 (2005): 715–44. See also Margaret M. Mitchell, 'Homer in the New Testament', *JR* 83 (2003): 244–60. MacDonald has responded to myself and Mitchell in his 'My Turn: A Critique of Critics of "Mimesis Criticism"', published at www.iac.cgu.edu. My book *The Gospel 'According to Homer and Virgil'* is a response to MacDonald's claim that the *Homerocentones* might form a model for how the Gospels came into being; see his review in *RBL* 9/2011, http://www.bookreviews.org/pdf/7971_8718.pdf.

[14] It suffices here to mention the works by Samuel Byrskog; see, e.g., 'From Memory to Memoirs: Tracing the Background of a Literary Genre', in *The Making of Christianity: Conflicts, Contacts, and Constructions: Essays in Honor of Bengt Holmberg*, ed. M. Zetterholm and S. Byrskog, ConBNT 47 (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2012), 1–21.

[15] In his recent *The Gospels and Homer*, MacDonald occasionally includes references to *Homerocentones*.

yielding a new text. From the classical legacy, then, a new text was culled, equally epic and biblical. It is an extreme form of paraphrase or intertextuality, in which recognizable lines from another existing poem, mostly highly valued literature, are turned into new texts. Scott McGill puts it in the following way: 'To present a cento is always on one level to trade in cultural capital and to affirm one's highbrow credentials.'[16] Centos therefore represent an idiosyncratic attempt to accommodate biblical narratives within the classical epics.[17] In her recent study on Proba's Latin Virgilian cento, Sigrid Schottenius Cullhed draws on Stephen Harrison's distinction between 'guest' and 'host' to explain the phenomenon: 'centos representing the generic base ("host" genre) that integrates one or several episodic modes from other genres ("guest" genres).'[18] In my view, this assigns to the gospel stories a too modest role in the composition of Christian centos. In my own study on centos, I distinguish between *res* or *sensus*, which is provided by the Gospel stories, and *verba* taken from the epics.

Fundamental to a Christian use of Homer is the way Homer was perceived of in antiquity more generally. The *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* were not only the primary texts; they were also the omniscient texts. With the help of interpretation, Homer's writings were seen to be encyclopedic. By way of interpretation, everything could be extracted from these texts. This is, of course, the reason that questions pertaining to interpretation flourished in ancient Homeric readings. Although Plato says the following with irony, he in fact passes on how these epics were held to be both omniscient and inspired: 'These poets know all the arts and all things human pertaining to virtue and vice, and all things divine (πάντα δὲ ἀνθρώπεια τὰ πρὸς ἀρετὴν καὶ κακίαν, καὶ τά γε θεῖα)' (*Resp*. 598E).[19]

Homer could also be used to understand things of which he himself was not necessarily aware (Ps.-Plutarch, *Vit. poes. Hom.* 218).[20] The pic-

---

[16] Scott McGill, *Virgil Recomposed: The Mythological and Secular Centos in Antiquity*, ACSt 48 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), xvi.

[17] Other attempts at making this, albeit not in the form of a cento, was made by Nonnus of Panoplis in his paraphrase of the Gospel of John, in Christian Latin epics of Juvencus, Sedulius and Arator and in Apollinarius' Platonic dialogues; see Roger P. H. Green, *Latin Epics of the New Testament: Juvencus, Sedulius, Arator* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006); Sandnes, *The Gospel 'According to Homer and Virgil'*, 97–104.

[18] Sigrid Schottenius Cullhed, *Proba the Prophet: The Christian Virgilian Cento of Faltonia Betitia Proba*, MnS 378 (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 12.

[19] Thus also Xenophon, *Symp*. 4.6.

[20] See *[Plutarch] Essay on the Life and Poetry of Homer*, ed. J. J. Keaney and R. Lamberton, ACSt 40 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996).

ture of Homer as one who knew everything made a deep impression on the students. An anonymous schoolboy has aptly expressed this on his writing board, containing the following text: Θεὸς οὐδ᾽ ἄνθρωπος Ὅμηρος, meaning 'Homer is a god, not a human being.'[21] This was the impression given to many students of Homer. He held the key to knowledge on all topics; hence, he was more than an ordinary human being. In his *De Homero* (*Or. 53*), Dion of Prusa (Chrysostom) addresses the issue of Homer's inspiration and considers him a prophet.[22] It follows from this that the epics were open, ready to yield new texts.[23] For Christians, this worked as an invitation to accommodate the story of Jesus and the Gospels within the Homeric legacy, thereby turning the Christian faith into a respectable Christianity if judged by the classical legacy.[24] Eudocia considered Homer's texts as buried treasures of wisdom which she was about to unearth.

Tradition says that Eudocia devoted herself to this task. She was an Athenian who in 421 became the wife of Emperor Theodosius II.[25] For reasons not obvious, Eudocia fell out of favour and left the court to finally settle in the Holy Land.[26] Jerusalem is likely the place where she composed her cento; in the midst of the biblical land, this classical Greek text came to life.

---

[21] See Erich Ziebarth, *Aus der antiken Schule: Sammlung griechischer Texte auf Papyrus Holztafeln Ostraka* (Bonn: Marcus & Weber, 1913), 12 (text no. 26), and Raffaella Cribiore, *Writing, Teachers, and Students in Graeco-Roman Egypt*, ASP 36 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), 220 for detailed information on this text (no. 200 in her list). She also refers to PMich VIII 1100 where the same maxim is found (p. 222 text no. 209).

[22] Sandnes, *The Challenge of Homer*, 46–47. Proba conceives of herself as an inspired interpreter bringing out the full meaning of the prophetic messages of Virgil; see Sandnes, *The Gospel 'According to Homer and Virgil'*, 149–54; Cullhed, *Proba the Prophet*, 129–35.

[23] Sandnes, *The Gospel 'According to Homer and Virgil'*, 118–21.

[24] In *The Gospel 'According to Homer and Virgil'*, 65–105, I give two main reasons for the composition of centos; one is the general feeling of a lack of culture in the Gospels, and the other is the specific decree of Julian the Emperor (362 CE) on teaching that many Christians, especially among the learned, saw as a ban on their participation in the classical legacy.

[25] Brian Patrick Sowers, 'Eudocia: the Making of a Homeric Christian' (PhD Diss., University of Cincinnati, 2008), www.ohiolink.edu/etd/send-pdf.sgi/sowers, 3–4.

[26] For biographical information on Eudocia, see Alan Cameron, 'The Empress and the Poet: Paganism and Politics at the Court of Theodosius II', *YCS* 27 (1982): 270–79. According to Zonaras *Epitome Historiarum* 13.23, a series of event led Eudocia to flee the court; mentioned in particular is the suspicion of a marital affair which upset the Emperor and also the death of her protégé Paulinus.

Crucifixion 'According to Homer'

1854	Above the earth is raised a dry piece of wood (ξύλον) with length about six feet	*Il.* 23.327
1855	of oak or pine; in the rain it does not rot.	*Il.* 23.328
1856	The mark showing (σῆμα) a man that died in time past,	*Il.* 7.89
1857	so huge it was in length and breadth to look upon.[27]	*Od.* 9.324
1858	They bound around the man a twisted rope.	*Od.* 22.175
1859	Forcefully they pulled, trusting their strength and power of their hands.	*Il.* 11.9
1860	Men of the people, who at games arranged everything well.	*Od.* 8.259
1861	Fools, who thus prepared these naught (μήδεα).[28]	*Il.* 8.177
1862	The labourers (δρηστῆρες)[29] on the other hand shouted aloud in the hall.	*Od.* 22.211
1863	Straight on they charged like wolves ready to devour.	*Il.* 17.725 + 5.782
1864	Like a ram (ἀρνειῷ) he seemed to me, a ram of thick fleece,	*Il.* 3.197
1865	walking through a great flock of white sheep.	*Il.* 3.198
1866	A ram, far best of the flock,	*Od.* 9.432
1867	and he moved among them, confidently in his purpose,	*Il.* 2.588
1868	bound with bitter bond, suffering hardships (ἄλγεα πάσχων).	*Od.* 15.232
1869	They bound feet and hands together in the anger of their hearts,	*Od.* 22.189 + 477
1870	led him into the midst, and put up both hands.	*Od.* 18.89
1871	Swiftly laid down his cloak of purple.	*Od.* 14.500
1872	And when the sun had come round to mid-heaven,	*Il.* 8.68
1873	they took him, stood apart and stretched him out	*Il.* 17.391
1874	with stake after stake, now here, now there, incessant,	*Od.* 14.11
1875	naked body, since clothes lay in the palace	*Il.* 22.510
1876	straight up at the foot of the mast-beam, then fastened cables around him,	*Od.* 12.179
1877	very high up in the air, while the mob was shouting behind him.	*Il.* 17.723[30]

---

[27] The line immediately following upon this (*Od.* 9.325) has terminology also found in the Homeric cento l. 1854, thus suggesting that the centonist combines texts with the help of the same key terminology.

[28] The Homeric text here has walls (τ ε ί χ ε α).

[29] The Homeric text here has suitors (μ ν η σ τ ῆ ρ ε ς), quite naturally since this is what the Homeric story is really about.

[30] The translation of line 1872–77 is taken from M. D. Usher, *Homeric Stitchings: The Homeric Centos of the Empress Eudocia* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 1998), 70.

1878	Like this he was left there, stretched in deadly bond (δεσμῷ)	
		Od. 22.200
1879	between earth and starry heaven,	*Il*. 5.769
1880	in spring-time, when days are long,	*Od*. 18.367
1881	that he may stay alive a long time, and suffer harsh torment, (ἄλγεα πάσχων),[31]	*Od*.22.177
1882	not a limb to move nor to raise up,	*Od*. 8.298
1883	nowhere to put firmly the feet or to sit steadfast.	*Od*. 12.434[32]

This text renders the first part of the crucifixion scene, starting in line 1825 and running until line 2017 (CP 1835–2027). The section is closed in the following way: 'Then had ruin come and deeds beyond remedy been wrought' (*Il*. 8.130). That line serves to introduce Judas' destiny. A note on biblical names in the cento is now necessary. Due to the limitations this genre forces upon the centonist, neither biblical names nor places appear, as characters are identified through the help of periphrasis. Judas is often called 'he who did more harm than everyone else put together' (*Il*. 22.380) or 'a man who hides one thing in his heart and says another' (*Il*. 9.113).[33] As a consequence of this, the reading of the cento assumes an intimate familiarity with biblical traditions and passages, and proceeds from this assumption.

Lines 2010–11 leave no doubt that it is about Judas.[34] The 'deadly rope from the ceiling' (*Od*. 11.278), and the fact that 'his gold in no wise availed to ward off woeful destruction' (*Il*. 2.873) make this abundantly

---

[31] This phrase was also used in line 1868, taken from *Od.* 15.232, demonstrating how Eudocia proceeds with the aid of key terminology.

[32] CP lines 1864–93. The five versions (Conscriptio Prima, Conscriptio Secunda, A, B, Γ) of this cento are found in Roco Schembra, ed., *Homerocentones*, CCSG 62 (Turnholt: Brepols, 2007). The differences between the versions are indicative of some kind of 'living text', which implies that a different version circulated. The cento approach was indeed open to be used in different directions. The Greek text used here is the Iviron edition found in M. D. Usher, ed., *Homerocentones Evdociae Avgvstae* (Stuttgart: Teubner 1999), which is identical with Schembra's CP (although the number of lines differs); hence, I will give Schembra's CP in parentheses or footnotes. CS = André-Louis Rey, ed., *Centons Homérique (Homerocentra)*, SC 437 (Paris: Cerf, 1998); A, B, Γ are shorter versions. This translation is first rendered in my *The Gospel 'According to Homer and Virgil'*, 207–8. Quotations from Homer's texts are taken from LCL, or slightly altered. The alterations are due to the fact that Eudocia at points accommodates the Homeric text to the story *she* is telling, and also that I have brought LCL's text up to more modern English.

[33] Usher, *Homeric Stitchings*, 45–49.

[34] CP 2020–2021.

clear. Thirteen times, Jesus is named the God-fearing itinerant prophet Theoklymenus, 'he who hears from God', or he may be called 'he who rules over all gods and men' (*Il.* 12.242).

I will now draw attention to observations illuminating the centonist at work; whenever helpful, I will also look into how the crucifixion scene comes into play at other places in the cento. The passage is Homeric throughout, both in style and wording, but beneath the Homeric surface level lies a narrative plot easily recognizable from the passion stories of the New Testament. The starting point for the composition is the New Testament stories, with Christian traditions developing from them. The crucifixion scene known from there provides not only the *res*, but also the narrative structure into which the Homeric lines are fitted.

Favourite Homeric Type Scenes

At the same time, the crucifixion is accommodated into Homeric scenes, some of which are essential for understanding how the two 'canonical' texts involved merge in this poem. These scenes bring into the picture motives and details unknown to readers of the Gospels. They therefore expand on and add dimensions to these biblical texts.

To be noticed firstly is that the crucifixion is portrayed as a binding with ropes to a pole. This portrayal is due to lines taken from *Od.* 12 (lines 1876, 1883, 1967, 1976[35]), according to which Odysseus had himself fastened or fixed to the mast of his ship, in order to stand firm against the temptations of the Sirenes. Odysseus binding himself to the mast of his ship pictures Christ's crucifixion. In Christian theology, this scene was from quite early on taken as a reference to the crucifixion, most famously found in Clement of Alexandria's *Strom.* 6.10–11 and *Protr.*12/118.4: 'Sail past the song; it works death. Only resolve, and thou hast vanquished destruction; bound to the wood of the cross thou shalt live freed from all corruption. The Word of God shall be thy pilot and the Holy Spirit shall bring thee to anchor in the harbours of heaven.'[36] This tradition explains why Eudocia so consistently depicts crucifixion as binding to a pole.

---

[35] Schembra makes reference to *Od.* 9.68; some lines are stereotypical, and appear more than once in Homer's writings. Here, I follow Usher's edition (line 1976), who mentions *Od.* 12.314. The lines in CP are 1886, 1893, 1977, 1986.

[36] The translation is taken from LCL, but slightly altered. For further references, see Hugo Rahner, *Griechishen Mythen in christlicher Deutung* (Basel: Herder, 1984), 281–328; Sandnes, *The Challenge of Homer*, 134–40, 177.

Hence, this invention comes *not* from Homer directly, but rather from an already established Christian *topos* originally taken from Homer. What to modern readers appears as invention was to Eudocia probably a piece of Christian tradition.

A second Homeric scene, or rather motif, is of outmost importance, since it appears rather frequently; it binds together the plot of the *Odyssey*, the hero's homecoming including the vengeance on the suitors with the death of Jesus (*Od.* 22, with some passages from 23–24 that also pertains to the battle with the suitors) (lines 1858, 1862, 1869, 1878, 1881, 1916, 1918, 1919, 1920, 1926, 1927).[37] The fighting of the suitors comes into play, especially when we notice how the crucifixion works in the cento at large. Bruce Louden has demonstrated how Odysseus' destruction of the suitors in antiquity widely came to represent the inappropriate behaviour of men who did not fear the gods.[38] Within the *Odyssey*, the suitors brought death upon themselves as early as in *Od.* 1.227–229; they provoked divine wrath for their violation of hospitality ideals. Thus, Odysseus' destruction of them towards the end of this epic brings together his doing away of evil with his homecoming. This is important because it paves the way for Eudocia's way to see crucifixion in tandem with homecoming (see below). In the cento itself, the suitors hold a key role in unlocking how Eudocia conceives of the Jesus story.[39] What is this story really about?

Her theological rationale at work in the crucifixion scene is best seen in the light of the Old Testament part of her cento, in which Genesis 2–3 form the backdrop against which the entire cento may be understood. The focus is on humankind's need for salvation. Therefore, the Father made a plan for how to bring salvation to humankind (lines 88–201b; CP 90–205):

88	But there was no one there to protect from the mournful destruction,	*Il.* 6.16
89	for blinded by their folly they perished.	*Od.* 1.7

---

[37] The lines in CP are 1868, 1879, 1888, 1926, 1928, 1929, 1930, 1936, 1937. In addition, there are also lines taken from elsewhere which really are about the suitors, such as line 1941 (CP 1951) (*Od.* 15.327) and 1984 (CP 1994) (*Od.* 24.163). *Homerocentones* CS 1270–1280, 1282–1283 and 1285–1292 use lines from Homeric passages on the suitors in formulating the so-called cleansing of the temple (Mark 11 parr.); see MacDonald, *The Gospel and Homer*, 312–15.

[38] Louden, *Homer's Odyssey and the Near East*, 244–57.

[39] Sandnes, *The Gospel 'According to Homer and Virgil'*, 189–96.

Against this background, the 'best plan ever' (lines 99–100)[40] is orchestrated in the heavenly council (cf. Mt. Olympus) and presented to the son. A rather long section gives a catena of Homeric sins, not unlike Paul in Rom 1:18–3:20. In these lines of the poem, the perspective is widened beyond the woman's sin in the fall; there is no loyalty, no truth, no kindness and no hospitality. The lack of hospitality brings the suitors into the picture, as precisely that was their mischief against Pallas Athena, mentioned in *Od.* 1 (see above). The shameful lifestyle of Penelope's suitors in *Od.* 22.230–232 (lines 108–110) and *Od.* 22.414–445 (lines 113–114) forms the climax of this catena.[41] The plan implies that the son will suffer opposition, being slain and despised (lines 140–147).[42] Lines 166–168[43] elaborate on this by recalling the death of Hector (*Il.* 22.488–490), thus anticipating Jesus' death, which appears later in the story.[44] Lines 467–468[45] introduce the teaching of Jesus by citing from *Od.* 18.351–52, thereby making his ministry an assault against the 'suitors', who represent

---

[40] CP 101–102.

[41] Here is an obvious contradiction to the role of women in Genesis, which Eudocia explored above. The lines in CP are 110–112 and 115–116.

[42] CP 142–149.

[43] CP 168–170.

[44] According to Dennis R. MacDonald's review of my *The Gospel 'According to Homer and Virgil'* (*RBL* 9/2011), a major deficiency is that I have neglected the fact that several times lines also appear in their Homeric sequence in the cento: 'Such examples … suffice to demonstrate that the Byzantine poets recognized affinities between the biblical stories and the Homeric stories that seem to have informed the Evangelist in the first place.' No doubt, centonists claim profound similarities between the biblical accounts and the epic scenes, and the examples where Homeric lines are given in a row serve to emphasize that this similarity applies not only to individual lines, but to scenes as well. In my view, the question if the author of Mark's Gospel (take notice of the authorial perspective) is informed by the tales of epic finds no answer in the fact that sequences of lines appear in the cento. MacDonald's claim about Mark does not follow from this observation regarding the cento. In the preface to Eudocia's cento, the phenomenon of lines given in their Homeric sequence of two or more lines in a row is addressed (lines 15–18): 'If someone should blame me because there are many δοιάδες of Homeric verses in this excellent book, which is not allowed, let him know that we all are slaves of necessity (ἀνάγκης)'; see Usher, *Homerocentones*, ix; and M. D. Usher, 'Prolegomenon to the Homeric Centos', *AJP* 118 (1997): 305–21 (313–15). What is implied in 'necessity' here can, of course, only be a matter of speculation. I suggest that here Eudocia conveys that the fact that she proceeded from a given text (the practice of a four-fold Gospel) had an impact on her cento. If that is so, McDonald's argument with regard to how Mark's Gospel came into being is even less convincing – as far as the cento comparison is concerned. A four-fold gospel tradition is the primary, not the Homeric text.

[45] CP 474–475.

sinful humanity: 'Hear me, suitors of the glorious queen, that I may say what the heart in my breast bids me.'

The suitors represent the evil to which Jesus and his death is opposed. Accordingly, lines from *Od.* 22 describe Jesus' enemies, or the Romans overseeing the crucifixion, as it occurs in line 1862.[46] This fits perfectly well Eudocia's use of the suitors in the beginning of the cento (see above). Then appears a somewhat surprising shift in the cento, in which the binding of the suitors, commanded by Telemachus and Odysseus, serves to describe Jesus on the pole (lines 1858 and 1869).[47] Here, the tables are turned, and lines about the suitors now portray Jesus as the victim. This demonstrates that Eudocia's lines are not always adapted to the scene from which they are taken; at times, it seems that finding appropriate wording is the more important. Obviously, Eudocia is more concerned about finding appropriate terms than with appropriate characters.

Thirdly, Achilles' killing of Hector and the burial of Patroclus (*Il.* 22–23) has provided Eudocia with many lines as she centonizes the death of Jesus.[48] The first is the most famous battle scene in this literature, and the second is connected to Achilles' wrath, which is the centre of the *Iliad*, as stated in the very first lines: 'The wrath do thou sing, O goddess, of Peleus' son, Achilles, that baneful wrath which brought countless woes upon Achaeans, and sent forth to Hades many valiant souls of warriors …' The crucifixion scene is introduced with two lines about the marking of Patroclus' burial place. Line 1875[49] describes Jesus on the pole in terms taken from descriptions of Hector's naked body by the women lamenting his death.

Lastly, *Il.* 17 provides Eudocia with battle-scenes and lines picturing enemies, such as the Roman soldiers. They are compared to wolves ready to devour. It is indeed worth noting that the Homeric text, from which line 1863 is made, has κύνεσσιν (dogs), not wolves.[50] Why wolves then? The reason is that the Homeric texts do not represent the source here. The Ro-

---

[46] CP 1872.

[47] CP 1868 and 1879.

[48] See lines 1875, 1890, 1904, 1930, 1931, 1956. The Jesus–Hector analogy is one of the strongest cases that MacDonald calls upon for claiming that Mark's Passion story depends on *Il.* 22–23. According to MacDonald, 'Mark seems to have created much of the Passion Narrative in imitation of Homeric epic' (*Homeric Epics*, 136). See Sandnes, *The Gospel 'According to Homer and Virgil'*, 211–14, 232–33.

[49] CP 1885.

[50] CP 1873. *Il.* 5.782 has lions.

man soldiers are presented as wolves because they are contrasted with the sheep as their enemies.[51] It therefore becomes clear that the mentioning of sheep is of some importance here, and probably guided the centonist to speak of wolves instead of dogs. In fact, this minor detail is quite significant; it challenges the position of Mimesis Criticism, at least when seen from the perspective of CP, namely that Homeric scenes are sources for the Gospel stories. The biblical idea of lamb or sheep here takes control over the Homeric text, and not the other way around (see below).

The Passion Narrative as Subtext

The pattern according to which the Homeric lines are organized is the passion accounts of the Gospels. In the text rendered above, this subtextual terrain shines through in the details of Jesus being surrounded by an inimical mob, the mentioning of his clothes, and the laying down of his purple cloak (Mark 15:16–20, 29, 31; Matt 27:27–31, 35, 39; Luke 23:34, 36; John 19:1–3, 23–24). This emphasis on details is, in fact, pathways to how the cento really works. This impression is substantiated in the rest of the crucifixion scene:

- Line 1872: 'And when the sun had come round to mid-heaven' (*Il.* 8.68)[52] According to Mark 15:33/Matt 27:45/Luke 23:44, Jesus died at the ninth hour of the day.
- Line 1886: 'they mocked and jeered at him in their talk' (*Od.* 2.323).[53] See Matt 27:27–31, 39–44, Mark 15:16–20, 29–32; Luke 23:35–39; John 19:2–3.
- Line 1888: 'thrice shouted he then loud as a man's head can shout' (*Il.* 11.462).[54] Mark 15:34/Matt 27:46; Luke 23:46; John 19:30.
- Line 1889: 'he was wild with thirst, but he had no way to drink' (*Od.* 11.584).[55] Mark 15:36: Matt 27:34, 48; Luke 23:36; Joh 19:28–29.

---

[51] Thus also Usher, *Homeric Stitching*, 134.
[52] CP 1882.
[53] CP 1896. In the Homeric context, this refers to the suitors.
[54] CP 1898.
[55] CP 1899.

- Line 1890: 'his lips he made wet, but his palate he did not wet' (*Il.* 22.495).[56] This detail is taken from John 19:29 (cf. Matt 27:34).
- Lines 1891–1915 (CP 1991–1925) give a rather long section which takes as its point of departure the Roman centurion. References to "an arrogant young man" (1891, 1939)[57] may also have picked up on the story of the robbers crucified with Jesus.
  For the centurion, see Mark 15:27; Matt 27:54; Luke 23:47. For the robbers, see Mark 15:39; Matt 27:38, 42; Luke 23:32, 39–42; John 19:18.
- Lines 1916–29: Jesus prays to his Father.[58] The dicta of Jesus on the cross are addressed to God.
- Line 1950: 'Save (σῶσον) now, that all may know and understand' (*Od.* 18.30).[59] This echoes the mocking of Mark 15:30; Matt 27:42 and Luke 23:35, 37 formulated in terms of 'saving oneself' (σῶσον σεαυτόν). Worth noticing here is how the Homeric line is understood in light of the Passion Narrative. In the Homeric setting, this line is taken from the fight between Irus and Odysseus, and is the words of Irus as he summons Odysseus to the fight, saying 'Gird (ζῶσαι) yourself now …' In the cento, the only alteration – outwardly speaking – is that σῶσον replaces ζῶσαι (from ζώννυμι); but in fact, this minor change is immense. Preparing oneself for a fistfight is replaced by the mocking of a Roman soldier, as echoed in the Passion Narratives. Such observations, which are found throughout the cento, are to me important when it comes to the question of the nature of this cento. Clearly, 'the host inviting guests' here is the biblical accounts of the passion, and not the other way around.
- Line 1951: 'if not smitten by my spear you will lose your life' (*Il.* 11.433).[60] This line identifies the one who mocks Jesus in the preceding line to be the Roman soldier who pierced Jesus' side with a spear (see the lines below), a tradition known from John's Gospel.

---

[56] CP 1900.
[57] CP 1901 and 1949.
[58] CP 1926–39.
[59] CP 1960.
[60] CP 1961.

- Line 1957: 'all the flesh it tore from his side, nothing prevented it' (*Il.* 11.437).[61]
- Line 1958: 'There did he stab and smite him, tearing the fair flesh' (*Il.* 5.858).[62]
- Line 1959: "Then immortal blood flowed from the wound" (*Il.* 5.870) (cf. line 1951).[63] See John 19:34.
- Line 1996: "O friends, a proud deed has been accomplished (ἐτελέσθη)" (*Od.* 4.663).[64] According to John 19:30, Jesus said: 'It is finished' (τετέλεσται).
- Lines 1967–83, 2002–2006 are long sections on portents given by God in the nature as Jesus passed away.[65] These portents echo Mark 15:33; Matt 27:45, 51; Luke 23:44.
- The way Judas is introduced with clear references to biblical traditions (see above).

These examples manifest the *res* for which Homer provides both *verba* and style. The lines pick up on important details in the narrative accounts of the New Testament, but also pave the way for an important conclusion: Eudocia's cento is a gospel harmony, with an emphasis on both words. Her mentioning of Jesus praying thrice captures this precisely, as the figure of three prayers depends entirely upon a harmony of the Four Gospels. The most famous example of a four-fold gospel is, of course, Tatian's *Diatessaron*.[66] Tatian fixed what already with Justin Martyr had become a practice.[67] Eudocia's cento witnesses to this practice of a unified Gospel, in which lines from all the four make up one continuous story.[68]

---

[61] CP 1967.

[62] CP 1968.

[63] CP 1969.

[64] CP 2006. Here, Schembra makes reference to *Od.* 16.346, which is identical.

[65] CP 1977–83 and 2012–2016.

[66] See e.g. Tjitze Baarda, *Essays on Diatessaron* (Kampen: Pharos, 1994).

[67] A. J. Bellinzoni, *The Sayings of Jesus in the Writings of Justin Martyr*, NovTSup 17 (Leiden: Brill, 1967), 139–42.

[68] It is worth noticing that the blow of the spear (John 19:33–34) in Eudocia's cento comes before the death; in John's Gospel, this takes place afterwards to confirm that Jesus was already dead. Rey, *Centons Homérique*, 452 points out that the chronology of Eudocia here is in accordance with *Diatessaron*. However, this is not necessarily an indication that she is familiar with Tatian's fixed harmony, since a number of manuscripts and translations (Sinaiticus, Vaticanus, Ephraemi Rescriptus, etc.) bring John 19:34 after Matt 27:49, which is before his death.

Theology of Crucifixion

In making a Homeric scene out of the crucifixion, Eudocia is by necessity also involved in *making sense* of this event. What interpretation comes out of the epic poem she composed? Through her Homeric lines, this scene from Jesus' life comes with multiple interpretations, a fact that is not surprising, as Christian tradition from early on developed various ways of making sense of this event.

A Divine Plan of Salvation

It makes sense to distinguish between three modes of interpretation that come into play here. Firstly, there is the idea of fulfilling a divine plan of salvation that Genesis 2–3 called for. We pointed out above that the entire cento is construed as the story about God's plan of salvation (lines 99–176): 'The plan implies that the son will suffer opposition, being slain and despised (lines 140–147).'[69] The lines following upon this elaborate by recalling the death of Hector (*Il.* 22.488–490), thus anticipating the crucifixion scene (lines 166–168). In other words, the divine plan of salvation and the death of Jesus are intimately connected. Hence, Jesus is said to be obedient to his Father (line 1915) (*Od.* 22.23).[70]

According to line 1917, Jesus says: 'Father, surely this is a great marvel (μέγα θαῦμα) that my eyes behold' (*Od.* 19.36). The context of this line is Eurycleia recognizing in the stranger the homecoming of her master Odysseus.[71] At the return of his father, Telemachus, Odysseus' son made this exclamation. In the cento, this phrase becomes an iconic

---

[69] Sandnes, *The Gospel 'According to Homer and Virgil'*, 193.
[70] This line is taken from Odysseus' anguish when he has arrived home, before he turns against the suitors. Speaking to himself, he is able to comfort his troubled heart, and thus to remain obedient to his mandate. Louden, *Homer's Odyssey*, 280–82, has made an interesting observations regarding *Od.* 20.24–54 and the Gethsemane scene in the Gospels, particularly Luke's version. This Homeric passage has several striking similarities to the Gethsemane scene, but it did not attract Eudocia's attention as she formulated her Homeric version of Gethsemane. She took this Homeric passage as a helpful way to formulate Peter's reaction as he regretted having denied Jesus (1807–1811; CP 1817–1821).
[71] Kasper Bro Nilsen, *Recognizing the Stranger: Recognition Scenes in the Gospel of John*, BIS 93 (Leiden: Brill, 2008), has made the story of Eurycleia's recognizing Odysseus' scar the point of departure for reading John's Gospel.

statement for what Jesus accomplished, both in his death and through his re-surrection (see below).[72] Accordingly, the death of Jesus is seen as the fulfillment of 'a proud deed' (μέγα ἔργον) (line 1996).[73]

Destruction of Evil

Crucial for the fulfillment of this plan is the destruction of evil, just like Odysseus did when he finally arrived home and did away with the suitors. The plot of the *Odyssey* equals the purpose of Jesus' ministry according to Eudocia: Both Jesus and Odysseus set out to destroy evil, disguised as 'suitors'. At first sight, the role given to lines taken from Odysseus settling the case with the suitors adds a sense of vengeance, punishment, or even hatred, to the portrayal of Jesus:

- Line 1944: who knows if he one day comes and takes vengeance, (βίας) (*Od.* 3.216)[74]
- Line 1999: take vengeance on the violence (βίας) of overweening men, (*Od.* 23.31).[75]
- Line 2000: take vengeance on their soul-biting outrage and evil deeds (κακὰ ἔργα) (*Od.* 24.326).[76]

All these lines are about Odysseus' coming home to punish and do away with the suitors. The translation that I have rendered here is based on A. T. Murray's Loeb edition (revised by George E. Dimock), and makes 'vengeance' a key word; no doubt that fits the plot of the *Odyssey*, as βία primarily refers to violent acts or punishment.[77] The lines are embedded in a context of vengeance and hatred. Whether we label it a transformation, re-interpretation or emulation, Eudocia clearly shapes and alters the Homeric setting in ways conducive of her Christian faith and tradition (see also below).[78] The centonist allegorizes her Homeric lines, and this is the case with the suitors: They represent evil, sin and death. In that light, the crucifixion becomes the means whereby Jesus defeats all evil powers in

---

[72] Sandnes, *The Gospel 'According to Homer and Virgil'*, 205–7.
[73] CP 2006.
[74] CP 1954.
[75] CP 2009.
[76] CP 2010.
[77] LSJ s.v.
[78] Sandnes, *The Gospel 'According to Homer and* Virgil', 41–44.

line with New Testament passages such as Col 2:15 and early Christian usage of Ps 110:1–2 on the subjection of all powers.[79]

This explains why Hades occupies such an important role in the cruci-fixion scene (lines 1931–1936, 1985–1995).[80] The following lines picture Jesus leading the dead out of the mist of Hades:

1992	'Come, swiftly, I will lead the way.	*Od*. 6.261[81]
1993	There is my father's estate and fruitful vineyard.'	*Od*. 6.293[82]
1994	So he spoke and led the way, and they followed.	*Il*. 13.833
1995	And thus would one speak, when seeing one's neighbor:	
		Od. 13.167
1996	'Oh friends, a proud deed (μέγα ἔργον) has been accomplished (ἐτελέσθη).'	*Od*. 4.663

The 'proud deed' accomplished (line 1996) is that Jesus through his death led the way out of Hades for those who were there. Bruce Louden demon-strates that the phrase μέγα ἔργον in Homer often is associated with be-trayal.[83] This applies to *Od*. 4.663 as well, since this is a statement by Antinous, who plots against Telemachus, but realizes that the hero's son has managed to get away. To Eudocia, however, this depreciatory mean-ing is of no concern here. The opening of the gates and bars of Hades (line 1987) is an invention in the crucifixion scene, but here Eudocia possibly takes advantage of Matt 27:52–53: 'The tombs also were opened, and many bodies of the saints who had fallen asleep were raised. After his resurrection they came out of the tombs and entered the holy city and ap-peared to many.' According to Matthew, this took place in the moment that Jesus passed away. For Eudocia, it is no problem that this event is related to both Jesus' death and resurrection, since her 'homecoming' interpretation of the death of Jesus sees the two as intimately connected in the great plan of salvation, not unlike what happens in the Fourth Gospel in the terminology of Jesus being 'lifted up' (John 3:14; 8:28; 12:32, 34).

---

[79] The role of this mode of interpretation in the early Church and Christian tradition more generally has been worked out in a classic study by the Lund theologian Gustaf Aulén, *Christus Victor: An Historical Study of the Three Main Types of the Idea of the Atonement* (London: SPCK, 1983) (first published 1931).

[80] CP 1941–1946, 1995–2005.

[81] CP 2002.

[82] CP 2003.

[83] Louden, *Homer's Odyssey*, 277.

Lines 1992–1993 are lifted from the scene where Odysseus comes to the land of the Phaecians. Line 1992 is Nausicaa's words as she leads Odysseus into her father's city. This context suggests that Eudocia envisages Jesus bringing the dead to his Father's kingdom. This is a flashback to line 490 about the resurrection, thus showing how closely the two events of crucifixion and resurrection are in Eudocia's cento: 'They shall rise up and return from the realms of misty darkness.' This is said by Achilles after he has killed many Trojans on the river Xanthus (*Il.* 21.56), remarking that it is the best vision (μέγα θαῦμα) given to his eyes (*Il.* 21.54). Vengeful, Achilles hence sees an opportunity to kill his enemies a second time. In its Homeric setting, this line is therefore testimony to the unaltered wrath of Achilles. In Eudocia's text, this grim line becomes an opportunity to present the true μέγα θαῦμα about the resurrection, even though the phrase μέγα θαῦμα is not found here. There is every reason to believe that Eudocia knew perfectly well that this line engaged her with a major plot in the *Iliad*. Wrathful, Achilles unceasingly unleashed war and revenge. A line taken from that particular context attests resurrection! This must have appeared to her as a fundamental example of the outstanding role of Christian faith, a transvaluation of a recurrent theme in the *Iliad*.

Eudocia was concerned about the hatred that the home-coming-analogy with Odysseus brought with it. As the plan for salvation is unfolded, the sufferings of the son appear in the words of Odysseus about his readiness to fight and even die to eliminate the suitors from his house (line 190 = *Od.* 16.107; cf. line 200 = *Od.* 16.189).[84] At this point, Eudocia feels obliged to clarify that Jesus is *not* fighting the sinners, as did Odysseus. Consequently, she has Jesus, the son, say: 'I will rather that your people are saved than perish (βούλομ᾽ ἐγὼ λαὸν σόον ἔμμεναι ἢ ἀπολέσθαι)' (line 199 = *Il.* 1.117).[85] Jesus prepares for fighting as did Odysseus against the suitors, but unlike Odysseus, Jesus' aim is not destruction, but salvation. This runs contrary to the Odyssean story, but Eudocia here brings into her poem an Iliadic line taken from Agamemnon after he had sacrificed his daughter; thus the Homeric hero stated the purpose of the killing of his own daughter. To Eudocia, this line concisely formulates the Father's perspective on the death of his son. Thus, Eudocia transvalues the example of Odysseus with the help of Iphigenia. Father and son have

---

[84] CP 192; cf. 202. For the latter line Schembra gives *Od.* 13.310, which is identical.
[85] CP 201.

agreed on a plan to bestow favour on mankind (χάριν δ᾽ ἄνδρεσσι φέροντες) (line 201b = *Il.* 5.874).[86] This observation paves the way for the next type of observation regarding an interpretation of Jesus' death.

Atonement?

It says that Jesus at the cross appeared like a ram with a flock of sheep (lines 1864–1866),[87] an observation liable to express atonement theology. Its Homeric background is Priam's simile about Odysseus, and the favourite sheep in the flock of the Cyclops, under which Odysseus was able to hide. M. D. Usher considers this an example of the considerable *Verfremdung* accompanying the cento throughout,[88] but he does not explain how. *Verfremdung* is a term that Usher borrows from Berthold Brecht, a heuristic device aimed at 'depriving an event or character of any self-evident, familiar, or obvious quality, and to produce instead astonishment or curiosity about it in order to bring about heightened understanding'.[89] This means that the term is closely associated with the transvaluation at work throughout the cento.[90] This is what MacDonald labels *Kulturkampf*, which is about how the classical epic is brought to convey another and superior message. In short, it is about recasting the meaning of the epics, thereby bringing them to their completion.

A key to understanding how the lines about the ram are being recast is possibly to be found in the combination of the fact that 'Jesus as a lamb' is at home in the interpretative traditions that accompanied the passion stories, as well as the story of the Cyclops' favourite sheep. Odysseus escaped from the cave; he escaped death, as it says in *Od.* 9.466, thanks to his hiding beneath this sheep. For a theologically and Homerically creative mind like that of Eudocia's, this line about Odysseus hiding under a sheep and thus being saved, aptly described the salvation-plan (βουλή) at work. In The Book of Revelation, ἀρνίον is a favourite term for Christ, one intimately connected to his sufferings (Rev 5:6; 6:1; 7:14, etc.). The idea of Jesus as the Lamb of God is also found in John 1:29, 36 and in Christian theology derived from Isa 53:7, e.g., in Acts 8:32 and 1 Pet 1:19.

---

[86] CP 205.

[87] CP 1874–1876.

[88] Usher, *Homeric Stitchings*, 133–34.

[89] Usher, *Homeric Stitchings*, 12–13.

[90] MacDonald, *Does the New Testament Imitate Homer?*, 15; see also Sandnes, *The Gospel 'According to Homer and Virgil'*, 41–43, 95, 233–35.

Lines 1864–1868[91] in the midst of the crucifixion scene bring to mind Isa 53:7: 'Like a lamb that is led to the slaughter.' Eudocia saw this life-saving effect of Jesus' death as a sacrificial lamb at work in Odysseus finding rescue under the sheep of the Cyclops.

Line 1924 may be taken to support a sacrificial interpretation: 'Yes, Father, this desire fulfil thou for me' (*Il.* 8.242),[92] put in the mouth of the centurion who witnessed the μέγα θαῦμα (Mark 15:39). For obvious reasons, here Eudocia replaces Zeus with 'Father' in this prayer. According to line 1923, the centurion says that the plan is to have 'the beloved son' killed, taken from *Od.* 5.18 about the plan of the suitors to have Telemachus killed. The centurion prays that this will not come upon him (line 1925 'allow us to flee and escape' taken from *Il.* 8.243).[93] In Eudocia's allegorical exegesis, that may well be a reference to sacrificial theology. The context from which the lines in *Il.* 8 is taken may offer supportive evidence: 'but upon all I burned the fat and the thighs of bulls, in my eagerness to lay waste well-walled Troy' (240), a reference to Agamemnon's attempt at pleasing Zeus with sacrifices. The centurion's plea to save his life embodies what 'the great or marvellous plan' is really about. However, such exegesis drawing upon the Homeric context always comes with uncertainty in the cento, since the centonist at times leaves us in doubt as to whether she is really concerned about the Homeric setting from which the line is lifted, or if here she only found a helpful line. This is a constant challenge in the interpretation of the Empress' cento.

Recasting *Nostos*

We have noticed that Eudocia brings the homecoming of Odysseus into her crucifixion story. Odysseus' homecoming (*nostos*) is the recurrent motif that sets the plot of the *Odyssey*. The starting point is the hero's longing for his return home (*Od.* 1.13). Throughout the story, he is on his way home (οἴκαδε).[94] This take on the crucifixion unites it with resurrection and ascension in ways comparable only to how the Fourth Gospel narrates the story of Jesus.

---

[91] CP 1874–1878.
[92] CP 1934.
[93] CP 1935.
[94] E.g. *Od.* 1.326–327, 350; 5.19; 12.345; 13.130–139, 305; 19.85; 24.400. See Sandnes, *The Gospel 'According to Homer and Virgil'*, 222–23.

In *Il.* 15.286–287, Eudocia finds a line that aptly describes Jesus' resurrection. Here, it says about Hector in the midst of a battle: 'Now, look you, a great miracle (θαῦμα) my eyes behold, that he has risen again (ἀνέστη) and avoided death' (line 2237), and in *Il.* 1.57 (= line 2248) about Achilles who stood up (ἤγερθεν) to speak.[95] Hence, the two iconic heroes and enemies both give witness to the resurrection. To Eudocia, a simple 'standing up' becomes a line appropriate for expressing resurrection, which is natural since she is familiar with this terminology from her Christian belief and tradition. It is hardly possible to imagine such Homeric lines as the formative basis for the stories of Jesus' resurrection found in the Gospels.[96] The only link between the two is the appearance of key terms. These Homeric lines can only work as witnesses to the resurrection if this had already been established as a story within which this terminology is fixed. In these Homeric lines, Eudocia found terminology that resonated with the New Testament traditions on the resurrection.

The resurrection is conceived of as homecoming, as clearly demonstrated in line 2258: 'now finally, has the desire been fulfilled (ἐκτετέλεσται)' (*Od.* 23.54).[97] This dictum, now in the mouth of Theoclymenus (Jesus), is taken from Eurycleia as she rejoices over her master who has returned home. As she puts it in *Od.* 23.55, 'he has come alive (ζωός) to his own hearth'. Line 2258 brings together the resurrection of Jesus, which in Eudocia's version include several lines taken from *Od.* 23–24 (lines 2252, 2256, 2258; cf. *Od.* 17.35 cited in line 2253 and *Od.* 16.205 cited in line 2259).[98]

The homecoming hero provides Eudocia with both a Homeric scene and language in which to recount Christ's resurrection in tandem with the ascension. By bringing together these two events from Jesus' life, Eudocia brings to mind the Johannine perspective of the Son returning to his Father as dominant in her understanding of his death (John 13:1–3; 14:12, 28; 16:28; 20:17). This becomes very clear as the cento comes to a close with the following lines, inspired by Luke-Acts:

> 2337   He went to his mighty Father's well-built house (πρὸς πατρὸς ἐρισθενέος πυκινόν);   *Il.* 19.355[99]

---

[95] CP 2248 and 2259; as for the latter Schembra gives *Od.* 2.9, which is identical.

[96] *Pace* MacDonald.

[97] CP 2269.

[98] CP 2263, 2267, 2269 and 2270.

[99] CP 2347.

2338	He went amid the clouds up to heaven broad,	*Il.* 5.867[100]
2339	imperishable, decked with stars, pre-eminent among the immortals.	*Il.* 18.370[101]
2343	He started running, and eagerly he arrived with his beloved Father (μάλα δ᾿ ὦκα φίλον πατέρ εἰσαφικανεν)	*Od.* 22.99[102]
2344	and then sat down again at the seat (ἐπὶ θρόνου) from which he had once left.	*Od.* 21.139 = *Od.* 18.157[103]

Eudocia's cento closes with a Homeric line that echoes John 17:5, 24 about Jesus receiving from his Father the glory he once enjoyed with him, before his coming to the world. Line 2337 is about Pallas, who returns to Mt. Olympus, the abode of the gods; for obvious reasons, Eudocia therefore changes the feminine into αὐτός. Line 2338 describes a similar departure, now with regard to Ares. The two last lines are especially interesting since they alter the Homeric homecoming motif in accordance with biblical thought, particularly in its Johannine version. The homecoming Odysseus, obviously the father of his house, becomes in these two lines the son returning to his Father. In their Homeric setting, both lines are really about Telemachus. Line 2343 is about Telemachus embracing his father, whereas line 2344 is about his sitting down in the house of his father. This example demonstrates how the classical homecoming motif is altered by the biblical idea to be expressed, or in other words, how the macro level bends the micro level, which is its immediate Homeric surface.

The macro level, that is the biblical subtext, is not equally visible, so it therefore takes a reader familiar with both texts to get at it. This 'hidden' text informs the reader how the lines are organized in order to create a new text. The macro level in this cento does not come from Homer; instead, it is the biblical texts about resurrection and ascension, thereby providing Eudocia's perspective on crucifixion.

Summary

Taking as its starting point the view that Homer's texts are open to yielding new texts and meanings, Eudocia wrote a cento that brought this epic to its completion. A Christian rearranging of Homer's text represented a

---

[100] CP 2348.
[101] CP 2349.
[102] CP 2353.
[103] CP 2354.

fulfilment of the treasures hidden in the classical text. In so doing, she was certainly idiosyncratic, but still the centonist stood on the shoulders of the ancient culture's trading in the same text. In other words, her procedure is not idiosyncratic. However, her procedure brought with it interpretations that expanded on the biblical texts in various ways.[104] The two 'canonical' texts, Homer and the Bible, represent the micro and macro level, respectively. The macro level is a 'hidden' text, and it takes a reader familiar with the Gospels to get at it. The centonist proceeds from the conviction that there is a need of ameliorating both canonical texts, though in different ways; one with regard to meaning and sense, and the other with regard to words and style. We have studied the crucifixion scene, and observed how it is deeply embedded in a theology derived from both Genesis 2–3 and Odysseus' homecoming to bring the suitors to silence.

---

[104] See Andromache Karanika, 'Female Voice, Authorship, and Authority in Eudocia's Homeric Centos', in *Fakes and Forgers of Classical Literature: Ergo Decipatur!*, ed. J. Martinéz, Metaforms: Studies in the Reception of Classical Antiquity 2 (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 95–107.

A Tale of Cross-Dressers, Mothers, and Murderers:
Gender and Power in Judges 4 and 5

SARA JÄRLEMYR
Lund University

When reading Judges 4 and 5 the different characters of these texts are striking—one, a prose text in its style very much like a lot of the Old Testament literature; the other, a song poetically and at times ambiguously worded. Because they are describing the same event in two different ways, these texts have kept many a scholar busy. The characters of Deborah, Jael, Barak and Sisera seem, although the information is sparse, to awaken the curiosity and creativity of those interpreting these texts both in ancient and present times. My main focus in this article is the four characters at the center of the story. How do they relate to each other? How have their characters been understood and how do I understand them? What role does gender and power serve in this story? Some have made them into complex characters, others into cardboard cutouts. Still some see Jael and Deborah as prominent pious women, or raging feminists, and mothers as military leaders while others focus on murderers, victims or harlots. I will dwell in the topsy-turvy world where men will turn into women and women turn into men. I ask myself what roles women and men had in the context of war, and how Judges 4 and 5 relate to this picture. Perhaps the texts describe a symmetry of switching, where the designated characteristics of men, women and children in the ancient world are turned upside down?

I will begin with an exegesis of the, for this article, important verses of the biblical text.[1] With the help of contemporary interpreters I will highlight a few of the salient motives. After this I will present my own way of

---

[1] My aim in this article is to highlight the ideological and power-related dimensions of the text, and not to present an all-encompassing exegetical study.

interpreting and filling gaps. With the help of relevant subtexts from the ANE, I will discuss both ideology and power in relation to the ancient world.

Deborah—the "Prophetess-woman"

The texts of Judges 4 and 5 are quite different. Judges 4 is a prose text, telling the story from a narrator's perspective, while Judges 5 is a poetic song with ambiguous meanings. When reading Judges 4 and 5 the plot is dramatic and includes features which tend to catch the reader's attention. The unexpected death of a strong man by the hand of a woman puts gender issues at the front and center of the story. But how does the text handle these issues of gender and power? I will, for the purpose of this study, treat the texts of Judges 4 and 5 as one text telling the same story from two different perspectives.[2] Although my main focus is the narrative of Judges 4, a few verses from Judges 5 will be included.

We begin with Judges 4. Alter reflects on the clumsiness of the verse where Deborah is introduced (4:4). Her female gender is emphasized four times in the first verse. The Hebrew noun נביאה ("prophet") already expresses that she is female, then adding "woman" to that which results in the cumbersome "prophetess-woman" (נביאה אשה). This is followed by another "woman" connected to Lappidoth. And then again in the next clause, "she (היא) was judging Israel," the feminine pronoun is unnecessarily repeated in the beginning of the next verse.[3] Gender is indeed an important issue here, so important that the author took pains to make sure no one missed it.

In 4:6 the question is whether Barak is acting in a shameful way, not wanting to go to war without a woman by his hand, or if he is simply realizing that this woman is in contact with the great warrior God YHWH and that it would be foolish to leave her behind. This query relates to the question of authorial intent. Although notoriously hard to conjecture, the intent of Judges 4 and 5 is discussed by many. What does the author want to convey? Either the texts show society as it was, meaning that these women, and presumably others, had the freedom to occupy prominent roles. Or, the women are a tool used to illustrate the state of society—to what

---

[2] This was also the way that interpreters read the text until the scholarly discussions of redaction-criticism of the 20th century.

[3] Robert Alter, *The World of Biblical Literature* (New York: Basic Books, 1992), 41.

had the world come to if women had to be leaders. Lindars relays the first mentioned opinion in his commentary on Judges:

> In general, the characterization of both Deborah and Jael shows an absence of stereotypes and presupposes a freedom of action which suggests a greater degree of social equality of women and men in old Israel than obtained after the rise of the monarchy.[4]

Regarding the influence and or interest of women in the book of Judges Brettler has quite a pessimistic view:

> [W]omen are useful characters in Judges, helping to propel forward the plot of various stories. Their prominence does not mean that the book reflects a real period when women were strong, that it was written by a woman, or even by an author who had a particular interest in women.[5]

This might seem unnecessarily pessimistic, but hoping for a matriarchy on the basis of a few texts is not realistic. It is easy to fall into the trap of further sanctioning the patriarchal system by emphasizing male constructs of women as "free" without problematizing. And in that way I agree with Brettler, because we should always be suspicious readers, especially when women are either sexualized or sanctified. This could mean that the author is writing a dystopia where the only reason that Deborah and Jael were included in the book was to show the hearers/readers what a despicable time it was: a time when the women were obliged to lead armies and do violent acts because of the cowardice of men. There is at least one reason which could point to this, namely the woman of Thebez in Judg 9:53–54. She tries to kill Abimelech by throwing a millstone on his head; however, this does not kill him. To avoid the shame of being murdered by a woman he asks his servant to stab him with his sword. However, as already stated, Deborah was sent by YHWH, and according to her conversation with Barak she was obviously in contact with the deity—this would not be a disadvantage in battle, quite the opposite. LXXa seems to be of this opinion, since it adds the following line to Barak's statement: "Because I do not know on what day the Lord will send his angel to my side."[6]

---

[4] Barnabas Lindars, *Judges 1–5: A New Translation and Commentary* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1995), 172.

[5] Marc Zvi Brettler, *The Book of Judges* (London: Routledge, 2002), 108.

[6] LXXa: ὅτι οὐκ οἶδα τὴν ἡμεραν ἐν ᾗ εὐδοῖ κύριος τὸν ἄγγελον μετ᾽ ἐμοῦ. There are, as Frymer-Kensky points out, parallels from Mari and Assyria where prophets give advice

Barak and Deborah stand out as quite unpredictable. Deborah does per-
haps not act as one would expect women of the ancient world in general to
do. Deborah is both humble and forceful, but not as complicated as the
male characters in the Book of Judges as it continues.[7] The male judges,
much like the patriarchs, are at the same time successful (at least in be-
coming a judge) and failures.[8] Deborah is in a way successful, but she
herself attributes every success to YHWH. Barak can be understood as the
hero of the story because he follows in the footsteps of the other male
judges by being both a winner and a loser.

Jael—the Death-mother

In 4:18 Jael goes out to greet Sisera, as to actively invite him into his tent.[9]
Many have reacted to that Jael's behavior as a hostess was a transgression
of the ancient Near Eastern hospitality rules: you do not attack a person
whom you have invited into your home.[10] But I think the ancient hear-
er/reader would also react to Jael's active invitation. Because of this verse
her character has been understood much like the *femme fatale.* However,
this is only briefly because as soon as Sisera enters the tent Jael's behavior

---

on, and urge, kings to go into battle. The prophets Elijah and Elisha are so important in this
aspect that they are called "Israel's chariot and cavalry." See Tikva Frymer-Kensky, *Read-
ing the Women of the Bible* (New York: Shocken Books, 2002), 48.

[7] For example, Samson is addicted to danger and because of this he ends up in difficult and
unexpected situations. See Caroline Blythe and Teguh Wijaya Mulya, "The Delilah Mono-
logues," in *Sexuality, Ideology and the Bible: Antipodean Engagements*, ed. R. J. Myles
and C. Blyth (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2015), 146–64, esp. 152.

[8] Philippe Guillaume, "Hesiod's Heroic Age and the Biblical Period of the Judges," in *The
Bible and Hellenism: Greek Influence on Jewish and Early Christian Literature*, ed. T. L.
Thompson and P. Wajdenbaum (London: Routledge, 2014), 146–64, esp. 159.

[9] She asks him using the root סור. The root is also used in Prov 9:16 by the foolish woman,
and when used as a noun (in the feminine form it looks the same as the imperative form
used in Judg 4:18) it means "disloyal" or "faithless." This shows the sometimes negative
implications of abandoning the righteous path or to fall away. But it also means to "take
shelter" and in that sense avoiding the enemy, which is probably the way to understand its
usage in this case. LXXb similarly has ἔκκλινον meaning "turn away" while LXXa has
ἔκνευσον meaning "withdraw." See William L. Holladay, *A Concise Hebrew and Arama-
ic Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988), 254–55; Tammi J.
Schneider, *Judges*, Berit Olam: Studies in Hebrew Narrative & Poetry (Collegeville:
Liturgical Press, 2000), 78.

[10] J. Alberto Soggin, *Judges: A Commentary*, trans. J. S. Bowden (Philadelphia: West-
minster, 1981), 77.

is maternal, tucking the general in and bringing him milk to drink—like a child.[11]

Sisera is now ordering Jael to stand at the entrance of the tent, telling the people who ask for a man that there is no man inside.[12] In a way, he is questioning his own masculinity as Jael is instructed to answer no to the question. As if he knew that his masculinity would suffer a bit of a blow, about to be killed by the woman who took him in. He also uses the male imperative-form (עֲמֹד) when asking her, perhaps by mistake, but it could also be an intentional coloring of the text. Either, as Schneider argues, he is in such a relaxed state of mind that he is careless with the grammar.[13] Or this implies the gender-reversal mentioned above: if Jael is male—then what is Sisera?

The act of killing is described similarly in both Judges 4 and 5. The tent peg and the hammer occur in both narratives as well as the action of driving the peg through his temple.[14] Niditch finds the phallic shape of the tent peg important. In her interpretation Jael is performing a reversed rape, overthrowing the usual conventions of war where women would some-times fall victims to rape.[15]

In Judges 4 Sisera is lying down, asleep—in the song he is standing up and falling down as she pierces his temple. Aside from the practical diffi-culties in hammering a tent peg through a man's temple while he is stand-ing up, the song seems to want to stress that Sisera is falling between her feet. It is the word for "feet" or "legs" which points to the sexual implica-tion. Frymer-Kensky and Bal argue that "between her legs" is not a sexual euphemism but a rather grotesque reference to childbirth, hence stressing the nurturing and mothering attributes of Jael. It also makes a connection to the following verses in the song, where we meet Sisera's birth-mother

---

[11] Judg 4:18–19; 5:25.

[12] Judg 4:20.

[13] Schneider, *Judges*, 80.

[14] The word for temple can, according to Fewell and Gunn, be understood as "mouth," interpreting רקתו as related to רקק meaning "spit." See Holladay, *A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon,* 347. Cf. Song 4:3; 6:7. The sliced pomegranate suggests a metaphor for the lips rather than the temple. See Danna Nolan Fewell and David M. Gunn, "Controlling Perspectives: Women, Men, and the Authority of Violence in Judg 4 & 5," *JAAR* 58 (1990): 389–411, esp. 393. This seems to be the way that LXXa and Josephus interpret it (ἐν τῇ γνάθῳ αὐτοῦ), thus making both the euphemism and reversed rape motif even more potent.

[15] Susan Niditch, "Eroticism and Death in the Tale of Jael," in *Women in the Hebrew Bible: A Reader*, ed. Alice Bach (London: Routledge, 2013), 305–17, esp. 307.

as opposed to his death-mother Jael.[16] Stedenbach evaluates that most of the symbolic uses of the word רגל ("foot" or "leg") have to do with sovereignty and subjection.[17] The enemy falls under the feet of the victors.[18]

Sisera's death is the climax of the narratives of both chapters 4 and 5. Although the song continues by introducing Sisera's mother this is only to highlight the fact that he has been killed. Sisera's mother is perhaps portrayed as naïve and shallow as she awaits her son. In that case it is hardly out of compassion for the family of Sisera that this last segment is included. Now that we have reached the end of the biblical rendering, let us look closer at the descriptions of the characters.

The *femme fatale* and the *femme forte*

The salient features of this narrative, or "stars" moving the plot along, are related to gender. The gender of Deborah seems to be important initially but it soon moves into gender confusion. The grammar of the narrative plays an interesting part in the reversal, as the emphasis on Deborah's gender is followed by Sisera asking Jael using the male imperative form.

Concerning Deborah, would we even know that she was female if we changed the name and grammar to describe her as a man? I think we would not. Her gender is stressed almost disproportionately at the beginning of ch. 4, and she describes herself as a mother in ch. 5. But what other characteristics make her female according to the androcentric society's designation of what is female? She is not the *caring* mother, rather a mother who is a military commander. She is a prophet, judge and a leader, all of which are traditional male traits. In Judges 5 the gender does not seem to matter at all, Fewell and Gunn writes:

> As victors, the voices seem not to distinguish between male or female values. It is as though gender is of no concern. Even when the song alludes to specific characters, poetic parallelism balances male and female: "In the days of Shamgar. . . , in the days of Jael;" "Awake, Deborah! . . . ; Arise, Barak!"[19]

---

[16] Frymer-Kensky, *Reading the Women of the Bible*, 52; Mieke Bal, *Death & Dissymmetry: The Politics of Coherence in the Book of Judges* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1988), 228.

[17] Cf. Gen 49:10 and Judg 1:6–7 where the king losing his thumbs and big toes symbolizes the loss of power according to F. J. Stedenbach, "רגל, *regel*," *TDOT* 13: 309–24, esp. 319.

[18] See Ps 18:39(38); 2 Sam 22:39; Ps 47:4(3); cf. also Isa 26:6; Mal 4:3; Dan 7:7, 19.

[19] Fewell and Gunn, "Controlling Perspectives," 400.

Jael is a round character,[20] even though the information given about her is sparse. She too is unpredictable, and has the qualities of both a mother and a fearless assassin. The intention of her crime is not given in the narrative which gives room for speculation. Her people appear to live in peace with the Canaanites,[21] but still she transgresses this relationship by supporting the people of Israel. A reason for this could be that she is aware of the political situation and the unjust treatment of the Israelites. But it could also be that she acts out of self-preservation, which happens to coincide with the interests of the people of Israel. Aside from her intentions she does welcome Sisera into her tent, either by choice or not, and then her actions contradicts the hospitality shown at first. Her appearance is never described nor her age. She could be understood as a seductress based on the invitation into her tent, but this is based on the assumption that there are euphemisms hidden in the text. She does lull him into a false sense of security, taking care of him until he feels safe enough to fall asleep. The Jael-character at first coincides with one way of describing a female in a patriarchal world. The *femme fatale* designation has been a popular theme when interpreting the character of Jael. Pseudo-Philo describes her as very beautiful Judith-like figure,[22] strewing rose-petals on the bed, and seducing Sisera in order to lull him into a false sense of security.[23] In many of the rabbinic texts as well, this theme seems to prevail. One alludes to the milk that she offers Sisera, saying that it is in fact milk from her breast.[24] However, in the commentaries of Pseudo-Philo and in many of the rabbinic sources Jael is not condemned; although she is the archetypal *femme fatal* she is praised for her courage and piety. Deborah is, however, at least

---

[20] As opposed to the simple card-board cutout which is only there to move the plot along, Jael has a personality and appears to act on her own will.

[21] Judg 4:17.

[22] Pseudo-Philo is not alone in mixing Judith and Jael. In fact, I believe Judith can be viewed as a correctional narrative of Judges 4 and 5. Reading Jael through Judith makes Jael fit better into the androcentric environment. She comes out as both a *femme fatale* and a pious woman with the right intentions. Neither loyalty nor ethnicity is a problem with Judith. She embodies Israel without the ambiguousness so poignant in the Judges account.

[23] Howard Jacobson, *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum with Latin Text and English Translation*, vol. 1 (Leiden: Brill, 1996)*,* 147; cf. also Jdt 11:23.

[24] b. Nid. 55b, quoted from Leila Leah Bronner, "Valorized or Vilified? The Women of Judges in Midrashic Sources," in *A Feminist Companion to Judges*, ed. A. Brenner (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), 75–98, esp. 90.

by some rabbinic sources, considered as haughty and difficult.[25] This could be because of Jael's origin; she is not a Jew but a helpful stranger. Deborah, however, is a role model for the women of Israel and so the judgement on her is much harder. Or, it could be because Deborah's job was more threatening to the interpreters than Jael's. A woman could use her sexuality to lure men (on the condition that they do it to help Israel, cf. the Book of Judith), but not be a military leader.

Deborah is never a *femme fatale,* only a *femme forte.* She is, perhaps because of this, never eroticized by the interpreters who gladly make Jael into a seductress. Deborah is, as we have already discussed, not very feminine at all, according to the values of the patriarchal world. Deborah is the military leader, and if it was not for her self designated mother-title she could just as well have been a man. She is crossing boundaries reversing expectations of what it means to be a woman and a mother—a crossdresser in her characteristics rather than in her clothes. She is the opposite of Aphrodite and Clytemnestra in the Greek myths, who are also given male traits, though in their case because they are unfaithful, deceptive and evil.[26] In Greek thought the female sexuality was perceived as a threat to the masculine ideal, and therefore the Greek goddesses were often portrayed as virgins.[27] Jael could be all those things: deceptive, unfaithful and evil—but still she is portrayed and perceived as a hero. Jael is also figuratively a mothering figure when she is nurturing Sisera. If Deborah is the good mother, then Jael is both good and bad. The good part is when she tucks him in and gives him to drink, the bad part is—needless to say—the killing-part. So we have the complex female figures who are two binary extremes at the same time. Deborah is both male and female, Jael is both a mother and a murderer. In a symmetrical way the reversal works out evenly among the characters: the men seem to "borrow" some of the feminine traits from Jael and Deborah, just as they borrow theirs from the men. The

---

[25] See, for example, Psalm 22 section 20 in *The Midrash on Psalms*, vol. 13, trans. W. G. Braude (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1959), which says: "Woe unto the generation whose leader is a woman, as when *Deborah, a prophetess... judged Israel* (Judg 4:4)." See also Louis Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews*, vol. 4: *Bible Times and Characters From Joshua to Esther* (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1913), 36: "She was yet subject to the frailties of her sex," the frailty being inordinate self-consciousness.

[26] Clytemnestra is described as a woman with a man's heart. See Paul Canz and Kalman J. Kaplan, "Cross-Cultural Reflections on the Feminine 'Other': Hebraism and Hellenism Redux," *PastPsy* 62 (2013): 485–96, esp. 490.

[27] Canz and Kaplan, "Cross-Cultural Reflections on the Feminine 'Other,'" 490.

only constant character through this mayhem of cross-dressers[28] is YHWH. I will now further explore this interpretation with the help of a few subtexts on the subject of power and gender in the context of war.

Women and War

In a patriarchal society, women's involvement in traditionally male endeavors, such as war and violence, can be rendered differently. The most common way pertains to women who are reinforcing the prevailing social order. Where there is patriarchy, man is the center of the symbolic order and the instigator of norms and values. Women are linchpins of this system since they are *the Other*, to which maleness is opposed. All that is strong and heroic belongs to men and all that is not must belong to females. In the narratives describing war where women are involved, they are often cast in the roles that we expect them to have. There are, however, a few exceptions. For instance, the gender-roles of a story are sometimes reversed, in some cases to escalate the dramatic effect and reverse expectations, and sometimes to horrify and/or scare the audience.

   During wartime, women were often victims of the male warrior's defeat or the beneficiary of the warrior's victory. In the case of defeat, women were especially vulnerable to the opposing armies as they were collecting their booty. The custom of raping or abducting the women in the community of the defeated army is confirmed in many written sources in the ANE. A recurring motif in the ANE is women being victims of rape or taken as concubines/wives. The Assyrian king boasts of taking 200 nubile girls as booty, and Herodotus describes how the Persian generals, after victory in battle, take the most beautiful girls and send them to the Persian king.[29] Another common fate for women was to be deported, together with their husband and children. When depicting the fugitives on their way to their new designated home, the majority of imagery displays women and children, as to exaggerate the differences of the winning army (strong men) and the deportees (weak women and children).[30] Sisera's mother

---

[28] Again I use the term cross-dresser in regard to traits rather than to actual clothing. I find the term helpful because the characters seem to be able to trade stereotypical gender-characteristics with each other, almost like costumes.

[29] Amélie Kurth, "Women and War," *Journal of Gender Studies in Antiquity* 2 (2001): 1–25, esp. 14.

[30] Kurth, "Women and War," 15.

relates to the custom of taking women as booty when she speaks of Sisera being late because he is dividing the spoil and bringing "a girl or two for every man."[31]

The ideal man, in the ANE, was a strong man and a warrior. This was not the ideal woman, though. The depiction of the woman warrior was a popular motif in visual art in fifth-century BCE Greece. There is a famous example of a bell-shaped object, used when carding wool, depicting women doing wool-work on the one side, and the other showing muscular women preparing for battle. To the Athenian women these motifs would probably show the ideal woman, engaged in domestic chores, and the antithesis—women in the realm of what was considered male activities. At this time the myth of the Amazons, made popular by Homer, gained in popularity. After the Greek army defeated Persia at the Battle of Marathon in 490 BCE, they were depicted in clothing from the Middle East or Asia.[32] The Amazons were thus made to look like the enemy.

Homer wrote of the Amazons participating in the Trojan War, and in the *Iliad* he calls them "the equal of men," as does Lysias. Other Greek epic writers such as Arctinus of Miletus also writes of the Amazon myth. When describing these violent women it is clear that they are both fascinated and appalled by them.[33] There are horrible stories of how the Amazons would kill or otherwise get rid of their children if they were born as boys, and if it was a girl they would cut of their right breast so that they

---

[31] Judg 5:30.

[32] Jeannine Davis-Kimball and Mona Behan, *Warrior Women: An Archeologist's Search for History's Hidden Heroines* (New York: Grand Central Publishing, 2003), 112–14.

[33] Davis-Kimball and Behan, *Warrior Women,* 116–17. There are sources describing them with what seems to be un-emotional objectivity, as well as dismay or appreciation. We do know a little something about women's situation in antiquity, and the general view of women does not correspond with the appreciative view of the Amazons. But here we have a few different options of how to understand the men regarding violent women in a positive manner. First of, the Amazons were most of the time regarded as foreign. As the world that they knew of grew bigger, the Amazon women were said to reside further and further eastwards. Secondly, perhaps they were never viewed as real. They were a literary construction and to this day, the evidence of them existing is at best difficult to prove. As mythological creatures it is easier to accept that they transgress the social conventions. As foreign they are exotic and different from the "I."

would aim better with a bow and arrow.[34] However, Plato praises them for their readiness to engage in battle and Aeschylus called them "virgins fearless in battle."[35]

The characters of Jael and Judith have not been perceived as victims of a war fought by men, but these stories are based on the notions conveyed above. The assumption that women are incapable of being affiliated with both war and violence is part of the associated commonplace from which the characters are composed. Sisera comes to Jael's tent expecting a nurturing mother, Jael then reverses expectations by being violent and disloyal to her people (but loyal to the people of Israel). Judith is invited to the camp of Holofernes because she is perceived as harmless. The men let their guard down and that is the dramaturgical climax, reversing the expectations of the listeners/readers.

It is not unusual in the context of battle that men are compared to or even turned into women, as a way of shaming them. This we have already discussed in relation to both Barak and Sisera, but let us look at some other texts describing this. The victor in battle is portrayed as a man's man while the losers are women, or prostitutes. We will start in the Old Testament, with two occurrences of this phenomenon in Isaiah:

> My people—children are their oppressors,
> and women rule over them.
> O my people, your leaders mislead you,
> and confuse the course of your paths.[36]

> On that day the Egyptians will be like women, and tremble with fear before the hand that the Lord of hosts raises against them.[37]

In the first one the hierarchy is made even clearer where the oppressors are likened by children, over whom women have power. The second example relates to battle where women are weak and afraid. The transformation from man to woman was sometimes used in oaths and treaties. Firstly, a Hittite example:

---

[34] In fact this was believed to be the origin of their name (*a* = without, *mazoz* = breast). But the theory has been questioned. See Davis-Kimball and Behan, *Warrior Women,* 118.
[35] Chastity is otherwise rarely connected with the Amazons; usually their sexual freedom and promiscuity is highlighted. See Davis-Kimball and Behan, *Warrior Women,* 116.
[36] Isa 3:12, NRSV.
[37] Isa 9:16, NRSV. See also Jer 50:37; 51:30; Nah 3:13.

> Whoever breaks these oaths …, let these oaths change him from a man in-
> to a woman! Let them change his troops into women, let them dress in the
> fashion of women and cover their heads with a length of cloth! Let them
> break the bows, arrows (and) clubs in their hands and [let them put] in
> their hands distaff and mirror![38]

It seems that the weapons are what make the warriors men. Bergman as-
sociates the male genitalia to the weapons, which means that the removal
of them would make the men into women metaphorically (cf. Judith tak-
ing the sword of Holofernes).[39] Another version of this is found in a treaty
between Assurnerari V and the king of Arpad called Mati'-lu:

> If Mati'-lu sins against this treaty with Assur-nerari, king of Assyria, may
> Mati'-lu become a prostitute, his soldiers women, may they receive [*a gift*]
> in the square of their cities like any prostitute, may one country *push* them
> to the next; may Mati'- lu's (sex) life be that of a mule, his wives extreme-
> ly old; may Ishtar, the goddess of men, the lady of women, take away their
> bow, bring them to shame and make them bitterly weep.[40]

As we have now seen, to be a woman was essentially to be everything that
a warrior was not. Two different characterizations have become salient
after reading these subtexts. First, the women who belong to one's own
group are the ones who I referred to as linchpins above. They are objects
being acted upon by male warriors in the context of war and violence. The
foreign women or the enemies' women are either, as with the Amazons,
exoticized when portrayed with traditionally male traits, or they are used
to shame the warrior who has lost the battle (as in the case of the deported
women and children above). Another aspect of this is the shame of turning
into a woman as seen in the treaties above. When we look at Jael and
Deborah together with these subtexts, they do not fit straight into either
category. Jael is exoticized by ancient interpreters such as Pseudo-Philo
and some rabbinic texts, but not to the extent that she is a villain. They are
not victims being acted upon; rather they are more vigorous than their
male counterparts. Perhaps this is where the problem lies. For if we shift
our focus from the female characters to the male for a minute, they are

---

[38] Quoted in Claudia Bergmann, "We Have Seen the Enemy, and He Is Only a 'She': The
Portrayal of Warriors as Women," *CBQ* 69 (2007): 651–72, esp. 665.
[39] Bergmann, "We Have Seen the Enemy, and He Is Only a 'She,'" 665.
[40] Quoted in S. T. Kamionkowski, *Gender Reversal and Cosmic Chaos: A Study on the
Book of Ezekiel* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003), 85.

quite passive. Barak lacks the leadership skills to go into war by himself, and Sisera is the victim of a woman's violence. The lack of masculinity from the men can be understood as a way of shaming male warriors. We will further investigate this thought as I now move towards my own concluding interpretation of the characters of the text.

Conclusion

The beginning of the story is, in my view, best understood as entertainment taking place in the crazy world of gender confusion, which is supplemented by a much more serious and dramatic ending. The story's setup works well within the larger context of Judges where comical figures are jumbled with dramatic events. The heroes of Judges are all at the same time heroes and losers, which also fits well with the story (seeing Barak as the aspiring hero).

But there are also layers in the story, especially as we approach the unexpected tent-scene. There is a possibility to look at Jael as a victim of unwanted circumstances. Perhaps Sisera intrudes on her and perhaps she is defending herself. But this does not fit with the invitation of Sisera into her tent. Neither does it fit into her seemingly aware deceit, lulling Sisera into safety and then suddenly turning on him. The vivid language of Jael's act of killing is also something that invites to a metaphoric or euphemistic reading. I have already suggested that the image of childbirth is suitable and that Sisera turns into a child. But if we combine this with the phallic-shaped tent peg, bearing in mind that the weapon can be a euphemism for the male genitalia, we again have a reversal where Jael is not only a violent killer (traditionally thought of as masculine), but she is also using his lost masculinity (the weapon) to kill him.

All of the characters seem to move into an androgynous mass with no clear distinction. The transgression of the traditionally attributed gender roles can be understood as a method of shaming the men involved. Barak turns into a woman while Sisera turns into a child, but the means of changing them are by turning the women into men. Deborah is the one in charge, the instigator of the battle and Jael is the murderer. At first glance, both these actions seem to fall on their lot by chance, but this topsy-turvyness is too symmetrical to be unintentional.

From analyzing the text we learnt that Deborah at the beginning is very much a female; this is emphasized by the grammar in an exaggerated way. We also see how the genders subtly switch places. First Deborah turns

into the military leader that Barak fails to become, then Sisera turns into a child and Jael turns into a violent murderer. The lack of information concerning the characters' backgrounds and their ambiguous marital status is perhaps an intentional way of preparing readers/listeners for the coming reversal.

The subtexts related to the topic of women and war showed us that women who are involved in violence, contradicting the social order, are often exoticized like the Amazons. The women belonging to one's own group are victims of war. They risk rape, abduction, and/or death. And they are linchpins in the patriarchal society, reinforcing the notion of violence and war as belonging to the masculine domain.

Based on this, my own conclusion is that gender is an important part of this narrative, but not in a liberating way. Femininity is not important; it is the lack of masculinity which is important in regard to the men. The women, who are by nature inferior, become more masculine to emphasize the topsy-turvy social order. They can thus be understood as strong and independent women, but by doing this we also sanction the view of femininity as inferior to masculinity. And let us not forget, such a reading also connects masculinity with violence and murder.

Again, let me describe the reversal. Deborah is a mother but also a military leader and a judge. Barak is supposed to be the military leader but he does not succeed. Sisera is the mighty man with nine hundred chariots, but as he enters the tent of Jael he becomes a child lulled to sleep by the caring mother. Jael is a nurturing mother who offers milk when he asks for water, but then suddenly turns into a murderer. She takes his masculinity represented by the phallic shaped tent peg and hits him in the head, as he dies he falls between her feet like a baby being born.

This is the associated commonplace in this story: women are weak and they do not belong in the context of war. This is the contradiction that makes the switching and playing with traditional gender roles work. It is what would have made it entertaining and it is what makes the ending even more dramatic. But if the ultimate goal of the seemingly uncharacteristically loose view of traditional gender roles is to shame men, then it is certainly not the feminists' utopia being described.

The Privilege of Taxation: Jewish Identity and the Half-shekel Temple Tax in the Talmud Yerushalmi*

SEBASTIAN SELVÉN
University of Cambridge

Introduction

That attitudes towards taxation can vary should come as a surprise to no one. One of the more famous quotes by Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr. (1841–1935), of the American Supreme Court, is reported, in one of its versions, by his colleague Felix Frankfurter:

> He did not have a curmudgeon's feelings about his own taxes. A secretary who exclaimed, 'Don't you hate to pay taxes!' was rebuked with the hot response, 'No, young feller. I like to pay taxes. With them I buy civilization.' (Frankfurter 1965, 71)

As we will see, Justice Holmes is hardly the only thinker who has seen taxation as a privilege, rather than as something to be hated. The object of this paper is legal discussion around the biblical half-shekel and temple tax of the Second Temple period, a peculiar system of taxation arising from a number of biblical texts and later Jewish practices. By investigating how Tannaitic and early Amoraic rabbis interpret a number of pericopes (Exod 30:11–16; Neh 10:33–34, 2 Chron 24:6–9) in tractate Šeqalim of the Talmud Yerushalmi,[1] I argue that the rabbinic understanding of the

---

[1] Yerushalmi Šeqalim is one of the earlier rabbinic sources, with material probably stemming from the end of the Second Temple period and compiled at the latest in the early fifth century. Some of the information given in it can be corroborated with Josephus as well as Middot and Tamid, two other early tractates (see Liver 1963, 186). Also, passages from the New Testament touching upon the same issues do not contradict any of the information in Šeqalim. Historically speaking we have no reason to doubt that there was a half-shekel

practice of the temple tax and its biblical sources makes some quite distinctive normative claims on Jewish collective identity, where the paying of a flat-rate temple tax, set at half a shekel, is a privilege unique to the Jewish people.[2] Using this tax as a marker and regulator of Jewish identity, the rabbis also express certain theological ideas of Jewish peoplehood. The themes I will be focussing on are how internal and external relations are managed through the temple tax (who is obliged to pay, and who is barred from doing so), the implications of the legal procedures (the prominent theme of collective, rather than individual, participation) and the theological issues of why there is a temple tax in the first place.

---

temple tax in the late Second Temple period. It is reported in a number of source, including Matt 17:24, where Peter is approached and asked whether Jesus pays the *didrachma*, i.e., the temple tax. He then is instructed by Jesus to catch a fish, in which he finds a *stater* coin (two *didrachmas*), and pays for both himself and Jesus. This accords with the account in the gemara (9b) and is also the sum of the tax later imposed on the Jews under the Roman *fiscus Judaicus* (see Mandell 1984, 223–32; it is also how Philo understands it in *Quis her.* 38.186). From archaeological evidence it also seems clear that the temple tax was, in fact, an historical phenomenon. In Ein-Gedi, a 1964 excavation unearthed, in the plaster wall of a house from the first century, an oil lamp containing 139 *prutot*, the value of a half-shekel (128 *prutot*) with an additional double surcharge, קלבון, of 11 *prutot* (in the Talmud, the double surcharge is discussed at length). It seems that the half-shekel, with קלבון, was put into the wall to ward off the evil eye (Duyrat 2010, 310; Meshorer 2007, 411–21). Another interesting example is what appears to be a record of the half-shekel poll tax in the Aramaic ostraca from Idumea, where the name of an individual is listed, together with 'two quarters of a shekel' (Lemaire 2007, 58–59). This, together with a possible reference to the tax at Elephantine, does point in the direction of a 'pan-Jewish' poll tax already in Persian times. It would seem that, both in Idumea and Elephantine, with their own separate temples to Y-HWH, the temples did not store the taxes, as opposed to the Jerusalem temple, which became the main provincial site of tax collection (Lemaire 2007, 62). The strength of the Idumean finds is that they are actual records of paid taxes, rather than ideological material such as the Talmud. It is far from clear, however, that this tax was annually paid by everyone and that this was the sole source of funds for the daily sacrificial cult, as the rabbis portray it. In fact, there are indications to the contrary. The Qumran group, for example, did not view the half-shekel as an annually recurring event: rather, it was a one-time donation when a man reached the age of twenty (4Q159 frag. 1).

[2] Not too much has been written on the temple tax and the half-shekel; apart from purely biblical scholarship we have Jacob Liver's seminal article from 1963, Sara Mandell (1984), Sara Japhet (1991), Jostein Ådna (1999) and, more recently, Mikael Tellbe (2005) and Jonathan Klawans (2006). Of these, none has written a sustained study on the rabbinic perspectives on the half-shekel and the temple tax, other than as context for an historical investigation or in relation to the New Testament.

The Temple Tax according to the Rabbis

Practical Background: The Collection of the Chamber

Before discussing the themes of the rabbinic reading of the temple tax, however, some background is needed. The rabbinic discussion in Šeqalim mostly takes the format of a halakhic debate concerning a particular, triannual ritualised withdrawal of funds from the temple treasury, the תרומת הלשכה (2a–b). This withdrawal is to be preceded by a formal proclamation by the Sanhedrin on the first of Adar, perhaps through the reading in synagogue of Exod 30:11–16 as the extraordinary reading for the Sabbath closest to the first of the month of Adar, a custom established already by Tannaitic times.[3] The תרומת הלשכה is to be performed on the first of Nissan, on the nineteenth of Iyyar and on the first of Tishrei (Rosh Hashanah); fifteen days before the three pilgrimage festivals of Pesach, Shavuot and Sukkot respectively. The pivotal date here is the first of Nissan, which is the first of the withdrawals from the new shekels. This proclamation is seen as having the status of biblical law (דאורייתא),[4] based on 2 Chron 24:4–14, a retelling of 2 Kgs 12:5–17, where king Jehoash, realising that he cannot depend on the traditional means of funding the temple repairs, places a chest by the temple altar where people deposit money.[5] In 2 Chronicles we see a slight elaboration of this episode (2 Chron 24:6–9):

---

[3] In fact, the set of four extraordinary readings to which this belongs (ארבע פרשיות) is probably the oldest example of set Sabbath readings (Elbogen 1993, 131). It is unclear whether the proclamation is a separate act or if it is, in fact, the Torah reading mentioned above. While this makes sense – synagogues were the main centres of circulation of teaching and information – the fact that the mishnah specifies 'on the first of Adar', which would be on the New Moon of Adar, rather than the Sabbath closest to it, speaks in favour of a separate proclamation.

[4] The difference here is between the two different fundamental categories of commandments: those דאורייתא, 'from the Torah', and those דרבנן, 'from the rabbis'. In legal parlance, דאורייתא could be called primary legislation and has to be demonstrably derived from the biblical text, whereas דרבנן is secondary legislation and rests instead on rabbinic tradition and more indirect modes of ascertaining a text's legal ramifications. It is not uncommon that a single commandment is made up of a core that is דאורייתא, but is *de facto* performed according to embellishments that are דרבנן. For an in-depth discussion of these two terms, see Roth 1986, ch. 2.

[5] In the 2 Kings account, the donation system does not seem to be related to the half-shekel in any sense. If this text describes an old taxation system, enforced in a new way, or a new taxation system, is not entirely clear.

The king called upon Jehoiadah, the chief, and said to him: "Why have you not required of the Levites to bring the tax of Moses (משאת משה), servant of Y-HWH, from Judah and from Jerusalem to the tent of the testimony?" … The king spoke, and they made one chest and set it by the gate of the house of Y-HWH, on the outside. They made a proclamation in Judah and in Jerusalem to bring to Y-HWH the tax that Moses, the servant of G-d, imposed on Israel in the wilderness.

In Šeqalim (2a), this episode is used as a prooftext for the practice of a public proclamation concerning the shekel tax:

What (does it mean when the mishnah says) 'they proclaim'? Rav Huna said: They make a loud announcement[6] (about the obligation to donate the half-shekel), as you say: 'They made a proclamation in Judah and in Jerusalem' (2 Chron 24:9).

The proclamation, however, is only made once, on the first of Adar, giving the people 30 days to give the half-shekel, wherever they are, in Palestine or in the Diaspora. There is an objection to this procedure from a Rabbi Chizqiyah, which takes us closer to an understanding of what the תרומת הלשכה is supposed to be:

Rabbi Chizqiyah asked (rhetorically, based on the assumption that the proclamation was made so as to give enough time for the new shekels to arrive in Jerusalem before the first of Nissan): If so – (what about) the Babylonians, if they proclaim about the shekels at the beginning of the month (of Adar)?[7] Did not (the Sanhedrin make a proclamation) in order that Israel should bring their shekels in the (right) time, and the תרומת הלשכה be collected from the new (shekels) on its date, the first of Nissan?

If the sole reason for making the proclamation on the first of Adar, and collecting the תרומת הלשכה on the first of Nissan, is for the sake of convenience and timing, what about Jews living far from Jerusalem?

---

[6] Here I am inspired by Hüttenmeister's translation "Man ruft aus" for מכריזין, which he takes to be a loanword, from the Greek κηρύσσω. It also fits well into the supporting quote from 2 Chronicles.

[7] Here we have a problem of differing textual witnesses: I have followed MS Leiden, which has מראשו של חודש, 'from the beginning of the month'. The Vilna edition, however, has מראשו של חורף, 'from the beginning of winter', which would change Rabbi Chizqiyah's question to: 'If so – (what about) the Babylonians? Should they not proclaim about the shekels at the beginning of the winter?'

According to this line of reasoning, should not the proclamation be made earlier the further away from Jerusalem one is?

The gemara (2a-b) continues, having accepted Rabbi Chizqiyah's challenge:

> Rabbi Ulla raised a difficulty before Rabbi Mana: But we have (already) learned (this in a mishnah): 'On three occasions during the year did they collect from the chamber. Half a month before Pesach, half a month before Atzeret (Shavuot), and half a month before Sukkot.'[8] (m. Šeqal. 3:1) He said (to Rabbi Mana): Let us say about those who are near (Jerusalem): half a month before Pesach. Those who are farther away: half a month before Atzeret. Those who are (yet) farther away than them: half a month before Sukkot.
>
> (Rabbi Mana) said to him: All of it arrives at one (time). And why did (the rabbis) talk of three occasions? In order to make the thing public.[9]

Rabbi Ulla counters Rabbi Chizqiyah, who seems to assume that there was only one withdrawal of funds, with the statement that they know from another source that there were three withdrawals. His next step, then, is to try and solve the problem through assuming there to be only one proclamation, but three withdrawals during the year, to answer Rabbi Chizqiyah: according to that system, there is no problem that the shekels coming in from the Babylonian Jewry will arrive much later, since they will be included in the third תרומת הלשכה.

Rabbi Mana, however, argues that this does not mean that *the money arrived* in three batches; rather, *the money was collected from the treasury* three times a year, and not at all because of any consideration of distance and timing, but rather to publicise the procedure and embellish it in the eyes of the general populace. The triannual תרומת הלשכה was a 'PR strategy', according to Rabbi Mana, and not connected to the logistics of the half-shekel. We thus have one round of donation to the treasury, but three withdrawals from it, to be performed when many Jews were already gathered in Jerusalem for an upcoming pilgrimage festival.[10]

---

[8] 'Half a month before' here follows Stephanie E. Binder's understanding of בפרוס to come from the Greek πρός (Weinreb 2013, 9). Hüttenmeister understands the word to mean 'Hälfte', with the same general conclusions.

[9] Taking פומבי to be from the Greek πομπή. This is a common use of the term in both Talmudic recensions. The Leiden manuscript even has פ[ומ]פי.

[10] In the discussion of the exegetical basis for the three תרומות, rather than just one, the rabbis muster one of their core source texts: Exod 25:1–3, where the word תרומה is men-

In the discussion of the תרומת הלשכה a number of biblical passages are related to one another: Exod 25; 30; 35; 38; Num 1; 2 Chron 24 are all taken to refer, at least partially, to the same commandment, that of the half-shekel collection in the desert, seen as having been continued as a temple tax. This conflation is not surprising: whereas a reader in a modern

---

tioned thrice (2b): 'Rabbi Chaggai (said) in the name of Rabbi Shmuel bar Nachman: Three collections (תרומות) are mentioned in this pericope (Exod 25:1–3): The collection for sockets (for the beams of the tabernacle), the collection of shekels, and the collection of the tabernacle (itself). "Tell the children of Israel to take for me a gift (תרומה)" (Exod 25:2) – this is the collection (תרומה) of sockets. "From every man whose heart moves him (to give) you shall take a gift (תרומה)" (Exod 25:2) – this is the collection (תרומה) of shekels. "And this is the gift (תרומה) that you are to take from them ..." (Exod 25:3) – this is the collection (תרומה) of the tabernacle. The collection of the tabernacle is for the tabernacle – whatever they want do to with it, they may do. The collection of shekels is for the (communal) offerings – whatever they want to do with it, they may do. In order that all shall have an equal share. The collection of sockets – it is for the sockets. "The rich shall not give more, and the poor shall not give less" (Exod. 30:15).' The three occurrences of the word תרומה in Exod 25:1–3 are taken to refer to three actual תרומות – not the three annual תרומות discussed earlier, but three separate ones: a one-time, obligatory half-shekel donation for the casting of silver sockets for the beams of the tabernacle (Exod 38); an annual, obligatory half-shekel donation for the communal sacrifices (Exod 30); and a voluntary one-time donation for the construction of the tabernacle (Exod 25; 35). To fully explicate the relationship between the biblical pericopes, I think the explanation of the Talmudic commentator Rashi (the alternative explanation on Exo 30:15) can be helpful. In Rashi's reconstruction of the rabbinic argument the Israelites were counted before the construction of the tabernacle, and gave their first offering, namely silver, that went to the sockets. This is described in Exod 38. Then, when being counted in the wilderness in Num 1, which for Rashi is the same counting as the one in Exod 30, they give another offering, which funds the communal sacrifices. Then, lastly, there is a third offering, which was collected once (described in Exod 25 and executed in Exod 35) for the construction of the tabernacle.

Here one should take care to avoid undue harmonisation, but I do not see what would be unreasonable in the readings of modern scholars such as Liver, or classical ones, to read Exod 38:21–31 as an inventory of two different donations, one of which seems to be the half-shekel. The donations of gold (from a source unknown to us, if not Exod 35:4–29, which I take to be the implementation of the divine command from Exod 25 [Meyers 2005, 275]), silver (the same weight as 30:11–17) and bronze or copper (same as with the gold, or – less likely – it might be the women's bronze mirrors from 38:8). While we learn nothing of what happens to the gold, at least from this passage, we get a detailed account of what the silver and the bronze goes to. The silver is the same amount as in the census in Num 1:44–46, which also shares much of the language from Exod 30 and mentions 600,550 men aged twenty and up. This has led many commentators to assume that the two censuses are the same (with the census in Num 26 being the second, rather than the third, in order). One of the strengths of this reading is that it ties the two occurrences of the number 600,550 together, while leaving 601,730 on the plains of Moab (Num 26:51) aside. The round number of 600,000 men participating in the Exodus (Exod 12:37) can be taken to be an approximate number.

academic setting might not instantly connect these passages, for the rabbis every part of the Hebrew Bible refers to every other part; the very basis for much of the midrashic imagination.[11] It should be noted, however, that the intertextual connections are consistently made in order to discuss issues of funds for the tabernacle or temple. The idea of a census is never clearly thematised, and the theme of preventing plague mentioned in Exod 30:12, which would lead to another intertext – the plague provoked by a census in 2 Sam 24 – is never even mentioned.

We have also seen that the shekel goes to fund the temple cult, and that everyone should have an equal share in it.

'We want that money, Lebowski': Collecting from the Right Persons (3b–4a)

With this background in mind we can turn to some of the themes of the rabbinic legal (and further on aggadic) exegesis, the first of which concerns the internal relations of Jews within the people of Israel, where the rabbis defend a thoroughgoing egalitarianism, and the second deals with external relations in terms of Jewish exclusivity vis-à-vis gentiles, all discussed through the temple tax.

Let us begin by considering the internal relations. The procedure of the actual payment is envisioned by the rabbis as starting two weeks after the proclamation: on the fifteenth of Adar, the day after Purim, the money changers,[12] or perhaps tax collectors,[13] set up their tables[14] in the country,[15] for a period of ten days. On the twenty-fifth of Adar they would move to the temple precincts, and from then on start to demand collateral

---

[11] One is reminded of Daniel Boyarin's loose definition of midrash as 'radical intertextual reading of the canon, in which potentially every part refers to and is interpretable by every other part' (Boyarin 1990, 16). We find more examples of this in y. Šeqal. In 6a, *mishnah* 2:3–4, the rabbis assume that Neh 10 and Exod 30 are referring to the same tax, and try to explain the difference in value: ½ of a shekel in Exod 30, or 1/3 in Neh 10.

[12] According to Rashi on Megilla on 29b, Rabbeinu Meshullam and the Rosh.

[13] According to Maimonides, it seems, in *Mishne Torah*, Šeqalim 1:9.

[14] The expression שולחנות, 'tables', referred to in the Mishnah, is also found in the New Testament: in Matt 21:12 where Jesus attacks the 'tables' of the money changers. In the New Testament, the τράπεζα, 'table', is often associated with money; see Matt 25:27. Even today the word means 'bank'.

[15] This understanding is in accordance with the Qorban haEdah, since I find it much less likely that מדינה, 'country' or 'province', refers to the parts of Jerusalem beyond the Temple Mount, as some would have it. Rivevan even understands מדינה to refer to the Diaspora. This seems to be the opinion of Philo, *Spec. Leg.* 1.78, provided that it is the half-shekel tax he is referring to.

from those who had yet to give the half-shekel; a 'payment plan', secured by some of their property.[16] The collateral, however, could only be demanded from some:

> From whom did they demand collateral? Levites, Israelites, converts and freed slaves. But not from women and slaves and minors.[17] And any minor whose father had begun to donate the half-shekel on his behalf – he may not stop paying. They did not demand collateral from priests, for the sake of peace.

Women, slaves, minors and priests make for an odd group of exceptional cases. Whereas the first three – women, slaves and minors – form a classic triad of exemption (not exclusion, in this case), probably based on economic factors,[18] the issue of priestly exemption is more surprising. It is also more surprising to the rabbis, who debate the particular point of whether priests are fully obligated to pay the half-shekel and, if so, whether they are to be forced to pay.

> Rabbi Yehuda said: ben Bukhri testified in Yavne: 'Any priest who gives the half-shekel is not a sinner.'

> Rabban Yochanan ben Zakai (corrected and) said to him: 'Not like that! Rather: any priest who does *not* contribute *is* a sinner.'

---

[16] The reason for this coming into play on the twenty-fifth is probably as Steinsaltz, based on Rabbeinu Meshullam, writes: 'Although the Temple treasurers withdrew money from the chamber for communal offerings only from the beginning of Nisan, they nevertheless began seizing collateral from the public on the twenty-fifth of Adar. On that day they started selecting the lambs designated for the daily offerings, as these lambs had to be set aside to be examined for blemishes four days before they were sacrificed (see *Menahot* 29b)' (in Weinreb 2013, 19). Those lambs would thus be part of the sacrifices of the new year. The point of the collateral is not only to ensure that the shekel would get paid, but also that the person would already have contributed to the sacrifices of the upcoming year; his property would be included as his share, although not sanctified and still in his possession.

[17] This might be an aspect worth pondering when reading the account of Jesus and the *didrachmon* in Matt 17:24–27, since Jesus' argument seems to be that he and Peter are exempt, since they are 'children', but he instructs Peter to pay anyway – but we read nothing about either a collateral or a surcharge (קלבון), since Peter pays for both of them with a *stater*, which would cover the half-shekel for them both, but not the surcharge. See m. Šeqal. 1:6; cf. Levine and Brettler 2011, 32. Interestingly, Jesus seems to assume G-d to be the formal owner of the half-shekels, a theme which is very important to the rabbis, as will be shown below.

[18] Ross 2004, 15–16.

The debate is taken further through a *testimony*, an important genre of rabbinic legal discourse. By testifying, a rabbi would, in effect, claim to have received a tradition from earlier teachers that had the authority of absolute law, and which had to be transmitted verbatim. Here, this is not the case, since ben Bukhri is apparently mistaken, and is corrected by Rabbi Yochanan, before the Sanhedrin at Yavne. The way ben Bukhri remembers it (כל כהן ששוקל אינו חוטא), the testimony means that a priest, though not obligated in the half-shekel, is not considered a sinner if he nonetheless decides to donate. Rabbi Yochanan's version (כל כהן שאינו שוקל חוטא) makes much more sense: a priest *is* obligated in the half-shekel, and if he does not give, he is considered a sinner. In mishnah 4, we read:

> This is how we (should understand what we have) learned (in a mishnah): One must not demand collateral from priests because of respect for their integrity.

> Rabbi Yehuda said (that ben Bukhri) testified (and then Rabbi Yochanan corrected him). Rabbi Berekhyah said: (the source of) rabban Yochanan ben Zakai's (opinion) is: 'This[19] (is what) everyone who passes through the countings shall give' (Exod 30:13). (All) twelve tribes shall give.

Whereas priests were said to be exempted from the collateral 'for the sake of peace' above, the gemara at this point qualifies that statement, saying it is 'because of respect for their integrity', which could be understood as 'because one trusts their integrity and only needs their word' or 'because they are not to go through this potentially shameful process'. There is then an exegetical argument, adding support for Rabbi Yochanan's correction of ben Bukhri's testimony, namely a numerological deduction of the word זה, 'this', used in Exod 30:14. Since the numerical value of זה is twelve, it is implied that all twelve tribes of Israel – including the tribe of Levi, to which the priests belong, should pay the half-shekel.

There is also the issue of when a boy is to be considered a man. In Exod 30, the age mentioned is twenty. This is not, however, the rabbinic age of maturity. This can be seen in mishnah 4:

---

[19] זה, 'this', has the numerical value 12 (7+5). The midrashic reading of this specific proof text is probably brought in to disarm the obvious argument in favour of priestly exemption: the tribe of Levi was never counted, according to Num 1:47–49, if one assumes that these two censuses are one and the same.

'They did not demand collateral from minors'. This (means that when it comes) to claiming, they claim (money from minors)? This that you say: (it applies) to someone who has sprouted two (pubic) hairs. But if he did not sprout two (pubic) hairs, it is not applicable to him. And (when it comes) to demanding collateral, they do no demand collateral (from a minor), even if he has sprouted two (pubic) hairs.

This argument is truncated in form as it refers to a larger discussion about the signs of maturity, since, in rabbinic times, there was no set *bar mitzvah* age. Rather, it depended on physical maturation.[20] What the gemara asks is: considering the language of the mishnah, is it not reasonable to assume that minors are expected to pay, only that one does not seize collateral from them?[21] The gemara answers itself, clarifying that this applies to a boy who has grown two pubic hairs, which is the legal definition of adulthood if it occurs after a boy has turned thirteen. A boy over the age of thirteen who has grown at least two pubic hairs is an adult according to rabbinic law. But since the biblical text explicitly states 'Everyone who passes through the countings, from twenty years old and up, shall give Y-HWH's offering' (Exod 30:14), one cannot claim that he is obligated in this particular commandment. If, however, he has not grown two pubic hairs, he is not obligated at all, neither according to rabbinic law (דרבנן) nor according to the biblical text (דאורייתא). In any event, his obligation before turning twenty is not enough to warrant demanding collateral from him, should he fail to donate the half-shekel.

The concern behind all these considerations is the rabbinic insistence on the equality of all (minimally, male) Jews in the funding of the temple cult, regardless of tribe or caste. We will go through the full implications of this and the halakhic procedures of how the funds were to be collected, but before that, we need to turn to another function of the temple tax, namely as an expression of Jewish privilege over and against gentiles.

---

[20] For the main discussion, see b. Sanh. 68b–69a, concerning the unruly son in Deut 21:18–21.

[21] Since this is the case with priests, who are obligated to donate but from whom one does not seize collateral. Why the same question is not raised concerning women and slaves is unclear, but it might be because of the mishnah's assertion that a minor whose father began to pay for him must continue to pay. While it is not clear from the mishnah whether it is the father or the underage son who is obligated to continue paying the half-shekel, it implies that a minor does have *some* obligation to donate.

We now come to the question of external relations. The problem of delineating the obligated group is not one that of *exemption* but also one of *exclusion.* In mishnah 1:5, this side of the issue is brought up:

> Despite the fact (the rabbis) said that they do not demand collateral from women, slaves and minors – if they nevertheless donate the shekel they accept (the shekel) from them. (But in the case of) a gentile or a Samaritan who donated the shekel, they do not accept it from them ...

> This is the rule: Anything that can be (sacrificed) as a vowed or a voluntary offering, (the priests) accept from (them). Anything that cannot (be sacrificed) as a vowed or a voluntary offering, they do not accept from them. And this was explained accordingly by Ezra, as it is said: 'It is not for you and for us to build the house of our G-d.' (Ezra 4:3)

We see here that Jewish women, slaves and minors are exempted but not excluded (though, to be sure, marginalised) from the half-shekel. Their half-shekel donations are to be accepted by the collectors, and without the surcharge (קלבון)[22] that we learn in mishnah 1:6 is added to the half-shekel given by others (a surcharge that priests, too, are exempted from).[23] There is an important line of demarcation in this system, though, and we discover it in the absolute prohibition on gentiles and Samaritans to contribute. While gentiles and Samaritans may bring individual sacrifices (at least עלה and, more disputed, שלמים offerings)[24] to the temple, they may not bring חטאת and אשם offerings,[25] and may not, under any circumstances, contribute to either the temple or its communal sacrificial cult. This is supported by the verse from Ezra in which the Jews reject the Samaritans' attempt to join them in rebuilding the temple (4:1–3). Stories of the unorthodoxy of the Samaritans, along with the challenge to Jewish identity they posed, played into a larger hostility towards Samaritans that continued all through the Second Temple period and beyond. While the halakhic status of Samaritans vis-à-vis Jews has not been fully solved to

---

[22] This is derived from the Greek κολοβόν, which also figures in the New Testament, in Matt 21:12 as κολλυβιστής.

[23] Interestingly, the law that priests are exempt from the surcharge assumes them to be obligated in the half-shekel. My thanks to Joanna Slusky for pointing this out to me.

[24] See b. Menaḥ. 73b.

[25] The division is probably because these two offerings effect divine forgiveness, something that עלה and שלמים offerings do not.

this day, in rabbinic times the issue was even more confusing, as demonstrated by the gemara (4a):

> 'A gentile or a Samaritan.' Rabbi Ba said: It can be explained according to the one who said that a Samaritan is like a gentile.
>
> As (the rabbis) disagree: 'A Samaritan is like a gentile' – these are Rabbi (Yehuda haNasi's) words. Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel says: 'A Samaritan is like an Israelite in everything.'
>
> Rabbi Yochanan said (concerning Samaritans): From the outset, they accepted neither a specific thing nor a non-specific thing from (them). But later, a nonspecific thing is accepted from them, but a specific thing is not accepted from them. Rabbi Shimon ben Laqish said: Whether from the outset or later, you accept neither a specific thing nor a non-specific thing from them.

This discussion on Samaritans arises from a somewhat unrelated detail[26] as well as from the generally ambiguous position of Samaritans in the halakhic system. We have Yehuda haNasi's position that Samaritans are like gentiles in every respect, and Shimon ben Gamliel's position that, on the contrary, they are like Jews in every respect.[27] Rabbi Yochanan and his study partner Resh Laqish then present their different opinions on whether Samaritans are to be allowed to contribute to the construction of the temple building. Here, there is a certain lack of clarity in the discussion: based on the similar situation in b. ʿArak. 5b–6a, we can assume that 'the outset' and 'later' means that when the Second Temple was still being constructed, Samaritans were not allowed to contribute so as not to gain a claim to the actual building, as per Ezra. Afterwards, however, when the temple was finished, they were allowed to contribute articles which could not be distinguished once given (such as salt for the

---

[26] The detail is whether one accepts the חטאת, אשם or the bird offering of a Samaritan זב or not: in the final exegesis of Rabbi Eleazar, it seems, that the mishnah only forbids gentiles from giving the half-shekel, and forbids Samaritans from giving obligatory offerings (from which gentiles obviously would be excluded). Therefore, an additional discussion concerning Samaritans is needed, concerning the half-shekel.

[27] For example, 'Samaritan women are perpetually impure from menstruation' (בנות כותים נדות מעריסתן), since they are Jewish enough to be ritually unclean, but do not perform the rabbinically mandated rituals for immersion and purification (whereas gentiles are always ritually clean, but counted 'as if' they were זבים, to prevent sexual contact between Jewish and gentile men; t. Nid. 5:1, Sipra: Tazria, parasha 1, and Metzora, Zavim, parasha 1. See Fonrobert 2000, 269–70, and Hayes 2002, 123.

sacrifices), but not articles which could later be identified (the example is of iron spikes on the roof to keep away ravens). Resh Laqish asserts that they are barred from contributing in any way. There is, however, a second way of reading this discussion, namely in the halakhic terms of לכתחילה (*ab initio*) and בדיעבד (*ex post facto*). In that case, Rabbi Yochanan's argument is not tied to the chronology of the construction of the sanctuary but rather comes to say that while one does not *ab initio* accept contributions from Samaritans, if it nevertheless happens it can be permitted, as long as it does not involve a specific article which could later be reclaimed. The rest of the gemara seems to assume this applies to both Samaritans and gentiles, while it is not explicitly stated between Rabbi Yochanan and Resh Laqish. The main concern is clear: to establish who is 'Jewish enough' to contribute to the temple, either its cult or its material features (which here is usually the same, in the context of the half-shekel). In 4b the gemara goes further to state, through Ezra 4:3 and Neh 2:20, that Samaritans and gentiles cannot contribute with specific articles to the temple cult or even contribute to the walls, towers or the aqueduct leading water into Jerusalem. We can see through all these discussions of inclusions, exemptions and exclusions anxieties around the issue of who may have a claim on the temple cult, as it is the central activity of the sacrificial community. The priests cannot be elevated above paying the tax, and gentiles and Samaritans cannot be allowed to participate in it.

The Theme of Collective Participation: Israel as a Sacrificial Community

At this point I would like to return to the ceremony of תרומת הלשכה, since we by now have the means to clarify some of its ambiguities, mainly the theory behind it, and how the rabbis solve the question of distant communities sending their money to Jerusalem. First, though, we need to look at a key mishnah, 3:1 ('On three occasions during the year they collected from the chamber. Half a month before Pesach, half a month before Atzeret (Shavuot), and half a month before Sukkot.') This mishnah is further elaborated in mishnayot 3:3–4:

> The collector would not collect until he asked them (the witnesses): 'Should I collect?' And they would say to him: 'Collect, collect, collect', three times.

> And he collected (from) the first (basket) and covered it with leather covers, and (he collected from) the second (basket) and covered it with leather covers, (but after collecting money from) the third (basket), he did not cover (it). And why did he cover (the first two)? In case he forgot, and collected (again) from that which had already been collected. He collected (from) the first on behalf of the land of Israel, and (from) the second on behalf of the fortified cities nearby, and (from) the third on behalf of Babylonia, and on behalf of Media, and on behalf of the distant countries.

Here we learn of the actual procedure, in which the collector would ask for permission and then collect from all three baskets in the treasury, covering them as he went so as not to accidentally collect twice from any of them, and that he has to have the intention to collect on behalf of Jews living in Palestine, in the neighbouring areas (for example Syria) and in Babylonia, Persia and other distant countries. This intention of including all Jews during the performance of תרומת הלשכה will be important for understanding both the practice and the theory of the half-shekel tax, as the rabbis understood it. In the gemara (9b), we read:

> It was taught (in a baraita): (In the case of one) removing the leather covers (after he had covered a basket with it), all (the shekels in that basket) become שיריים.[28]

> It was taught (in a baraita): The third (collection) was the most abundant of them all, since it included *staters* of gold and *darics* of gold.

> It was taught (in a baraita): (The collector) collected (from) the first (basket) on behalf of the land of Israel and on behalf of all of Israel, (from) the second on behalf of the fortified cities nearby and on behalf of all Israel, and (from) the third on behalf of Babylonia and Media, and on behalf of the distant countries, and on behalf of all of Israel.

> It was taught (in a baraita): (When the collector) had taken from the first (basket), although there were still (shekels) in the first, he would take from the second (too). (When) he had taken from the second, although there were still (shekels) in the second, he would take from the third (too).

---

[28] שיריים signifies the rest of the temple's treasure chamber, which did not have the same sanctity as the shekels. This is because the shekels are classified as a sacrifice, which cannot be used for anything secular after their sanctification. See the discussion in 6a. They were also classified as such under Roman law (see below).

In a series of baraitot, deuterocanonical Tannaitic statements following the format of mishnayot, we learn different details of the תרומת הלשכה, the first of which being the consequences of the collector accidentally removing the leather covers from a basket he has already collected money from. In that case, all the shekels become unfit for the acquisition of communal offerings. Instead, they are diverted to other communal projects of lesser sanctity, such as the upkeep of the city of Jerusalem, and buying wine, oil and flour for selling to visitors.[29] With even this slight lapse, the whole basket (a third of the temple income!) is lost.

The third collection, done fifteen days before Sukkot (that is, on Rosh Hashanah), is the most lucrative of them all, since by now the money from Babylonia, Persia and other outlying areas would have reached Jerusalem.

The most important baraita for our purposes, since it explains the theory behind much of what we have seen, is the one explaining the intention of the collector. The collector needs to collect shekels from all three baskets on each of the three תרומות during the year, and is to be careful not to confound the procedure, since the first basket is taken on behalf of the Palestinian Jews, the second of the Jews living close to the land of Israel, and the third on behalf of the Babylonian and other distant Diaspora Jews. During every collection, each of these communities has to be kept in mind when taking the money, and all of them are to be included under the more general heading 'all of Israel', so as not to distinguish between Jews. The whole people of Israel, whether living in the land of Israel or abroad, whether actually having given money at this moment or not, is to be included under a regime of strict theoretical representation. This is an important part of the rabbinic procedures for the temple tax: when the תרומת הלשכה is performed, all Jews are included, and thus represented in the subsequent acquisition of sacrificial animals. Thus, every Jew has a claim to and a share in the temple, the temple cult, and by extension, all of Jerusalem.[30]

Now, then, one can see why the rabbis fixed the proclamation about the half-shekel to the first of Adar, since Jews living far away from Jerusalem would be theoretically included even in the first תרומת הלשכה, performed

---

[29] See Steinsaltz (Weinreb 2013, 77), and m. Šeqal. 4:3. Hüttenmeister refers to 4:4, but he seems to confuse two concepts here, since it is not altogether clear whether 4:4 is about the שיריים from the תרומת הלשכה or the profit made from selling wine, oil and flour to visitors to the temple.

[30] This is also the understanding of the *Tiqlin Chadatin*.

on the first of Nissan. There would be a 'virtual' participation, until the actual money had arrived. This is also the ruling of Maimonides in the *Mishneh Torah*, *Hilkhot Sheqalim* 2:9, which to me seems halakhically sound:

> When he collected (during the תרומת הלשכה), he had the intention to collect what had been collected and was present in the treasure chamber, and what had been collected but which had not yet reached the treasure chamber, and that which would be collected in the future. Thus the shekels that he had taken out to use (to purchase communal sacrifices) would be an atonement for Israel. And it is as if their shekels had reached the treasure chamber, and the collection collected from them too.[31]

The procedures of the תרומת הלשכה ensure that, in the theory of the sacrificial system, everyone gets represented. This, I suggest, is one of the animating ideas of the rabbinic discourse on the half-shekel and something which would have been a bone of contention among different Jewish groups ever since the return from the Babylonian exile to the then Persian province Beyond the River (עבר נהרה). In Ezra 1:2–4, in the decree of Cyrus, we read that all Jews who so choose may go back to Jerusalem and rebuild the temple, while those staying in Babylon are encouraged to assist the project with 'silver and with gold and with goods and with cattle, together with the voluntary offering to the house of the G-d which is in Jerusalem'. Cyrus himself, while returning the holy vessels belonging to the Jerusalem temple (Ezra 1:7), permitted the rebuilding of the temple (but without pledging to help this come about, it seems).[32] It is clear from sources such as Haggai and Ezra 5 that there was some confusion as to who should cover the expenses, as well as a lack of funds. In Ezra 6, we learn that it is in fact the king's duty to rebuild the temple, and that it should be paid from the royal coffers in the province Beyond the River. The taxes of the province should be diverted to the temple, its rebuilding and its cult (6:9–10). This assures that the temple can be rebuilt, but it is not clear how later interpreters would have read it; is the temple rebuilt by

---

[31] See b. Ketub. 108a: 'They collect (תרומת הלשכה) on behalf of that which was lost and on behalf of that which was collected and that which was to be collected.' We also find this in gemara Šeqalim (5a), on the topic of shekels that were stolen on the way: 'Rabbi Yustai, son of Rabbi Simon said that it is in accordance with the one who said: They collect (the תרומת הלשכה) on behalf of that which was collected and over that which was to be collect-ed.'

[32] See Stevens 2006, 46–48.

the people – i.e., their taxes – or is it rebuilt by the king – i.e., his revenue? I would suggest that it makes more historical sense to read it as the latter, seeing that it was normally the duty of the king to fund the temple.[33] No longer would it have to rely on donations from the people – rather, it would rely on their taxes, belonging to the Persian king. That the king would be involved in the temple's finance seems to have been a given both in the time of Persian imperialism and later; see for example 1 Macc 10:32–42; 2 Macc 3:3; and of course the policies of Herod. Under Roman rule, however, it is clear that the debate still raged over how the temple should be funded; it is reported in the Bavli (b. Menaḥ. 65a) that the Sadducees[34] would permit an individual to donate to the communal sacrifice, but that the rabbis would only permit the daily communal offerings to come from the collective funds (i.e., the half-shekels).[35]

The Theme of Atonement: Why the Need for Sacrifices in the First Place?

Before concluding, I would like to discuss the *theological* side of the rabbinic reading of the half-shekel. The animating idea behind the rabbinic reading is that of כפרה, a word that figures in Exod 30 as well as Neh 10. In Exodus 30, every Israelite man above twenty is commanded to pay a כפר נפשו, 'a ransom for his life', to ensure that there will not be an outbreak of plague. A כֹּפֶר, is of course derived from כִּפֶּר, 'atone', but it is preferable to translate it as 'ransom' in this context, and likewise, the phrase לכפר על נפשתיכם, 'to atone for your lives' from vv. 15 and 16,

---

[33] In Judah, that is. In Babylonia, as Altmann notes, 'the Persian rulers stopped paying the royal tithes that their Neo-Babylonian predecessors had paid' (Altmann 2014, 228). The flow of natural and monetary goods between the temples of the Persian empire and its kings is a very complex issue and it seems the Jerusalem temple, too, 'likely experienced a variety of tax relationships with the Persian authorities, in the form of oversight of temple revenues; support from individual Persian officials and from the state itself; and requirements for delivery of agricultural, metal, or labor resources' (Altmann 2014, 228–29).

[34] In Megillat Taʿanit 1:1, in the Hebrew *scholium*, we have the same debate, but between 'the Sages' and Boethusians, where the dispute is even sharper. The historical reality is very hard to reconstruct: we know that Roman emperors and local rulers would contribute to the cult, but we do not know with what (Schwartz 2001, 55). It is unlikely, however, that *all* of the money for the communal sacrifices came from half-shekel donations.

[35] This is also the position of Josephus in *Ant.* 14.7.2, assuming that he is writing about the half-shekel donation – though it is good to confess agnosticism in this regard, I, however, have a hard time seeing what difference it would make if Josephus were to refer to some other tax coming in from all Jews regardless of territory and belonging to G-d, and I think the burden of proof lies on those claiming this *not* to be the half-shekel, especially since we see the temple tax and the half-shekel conflated already by the time of m. Šeqal.

should be understood in a technical, rather than theological, sense.[36] In his analysis of כפר, Thomas Kazen writes, on Num 17 and 31:

> The infinitive construct seems more or less synonymous with *kofer*, as in the passage on the census in the Covenant Code (Exod 30:12–16), where both verb and noun occur (*kofer nafsho … lekapper 'al-nafshotekem*). The function of the gifts is to remove the offence against the divine that a census was considered to be.

> This fits the proposed translation of *kipper* as »to effect removal«. Both impurity and inadvertent sin may be understood as offences that cause an imbalance and disturb the equilibrium. Impurity can be dealt with by purificatory rites, but they do not remove the offence that has been caused; for this, sacrifices are needed...

> It seems that rites and actions that affect removal (*kipper*) are functionally equivalent to a *kofer*. A *kofer* is not a simple compensatory payment ... *Kofer*, however, is typically used in contexts when the value of what is at stake – human life – *cannot* be compensated for: the owner of the goring ox (Exod 21:29–30), census-taking (Exod 30:11–16), unintentional killing and cities of refuge (Num 35:30–34). (Kazen 2012, 91–92)

Here, according to the scholarly understanding that has been developing during the last decades, it seems that כפר means not 'atonement' so much as a ransom that restores balance between the human and the divine sphere, something that a census destabilises or even offends.[37] For the rabbis, however, the word had more directly theological implications. In the gemara on 6a, the issue is brought up through some aggadic material, introduced through Exod 30:13:

---

[36] Finlan 2013, 59.

[37] See Kazen 2012, 89. William Propp, however, suggests a reading in which כפר carries the usual connotations of expiation through sacrifices, since the silver in any case seems to be used for the sockets of the tabernacle and thus becomes part of the cultic apparatus in which expiation is effected (Propp 2006, 480). This reading, though it ignores the local context in favour of an unnecessarily wide and harmonious model, is, as will be seen below, not far from the rabbinic understanding. Concerning לכפר על נפשתיכם, he writes: 'By concluding with napšōtêkem, "your [masculine plural] [sic] souls," [Y-HWH] addresses future Israelite readers, who, by sacrifice, may still obtain continual Clearing for their day-to-day defilements' (Propp 2006, 477). This, while theologically sound, does not make much sense as an explication of the actual text.

'This (is what) everyone who passes through the countings shall give: (half of a shekel, after the shekel of the sanctuary – twenty *gerah* is that shekel – half of a shekel, an offering to Y-HWH.)'

Rabbi Yehudah and Rabbi Nechemyah (disagree over this). One (of them) said: It is because they sinned (by making the golden calf) at midday, that they should give half a shekel. And one (of them) said: It is because they sinned at the sixth hour of the day that they should give half a shekel, whose sum total is six *garmesin*.[38]

Rabbi Yehoshua of the house of Rabbi Nechemyah (said) in the name of Rabbi Yochanan ben Zakkai: Because they transgressed the Ten Commandments each and every one of them should give ten *gera* ...

Rabbi Pinchas (said) in the name of Rabbi Levi: Because (the ten sons of Jacob with Leah, Bilha and Zilpah) sold (Joseph), the firstborn of Rachel, for twenty silver (*dinars*), and each and every one of them got (the equivalent of) a *tivah* (which is two *dinars*), therefore, each and every (Jew) must give a *tivah* for his shekel every year.

These aggadic midrashim all assume that the different formulations of כפרה mentioned in Exod 30 all refer to atonement for some transgression, and they all assume that the clue to what this sin is can be found in the sum to be paid.

The first one assumes a midrashic tradition found in b. Šabb. 89a, in which the phrase 'And the people saw that Moses delayed (בֹשֵׁשׁ)' (Exod 32:1) is read as באו שש, 'six (hours) have come'. When the Israelites saw, on the sixth hour – midday – of the fortieth day, that Moses had not come down from Mount Sinai, they despaired and decided to make the golden calf. Now, they are punished measure-for-measure through having to pay to the tabernacle instead, half a shekel.

The other suggestion is more precise: for every hour the Israelites did not hold out, they now have to pay a coin (or, according to Jastrow, a gram). The tradition ascribed to Rabbi Yochanan focuses on the sum – ten

---

[38] Hüttenmeister, probably based on Jastrow, understands this as 'Grammata' (he vocalises it as 'gerammasin' and derives it from the Greek γραμμάριον/γραμμή). Thus: 'Weil sie zur sechsten Stunde sündigten, müssen sie den halben Scheqel bezahlen, der sechs Grammata beträgt.' Jastrow recommends the emendation גְרַמְטִין, which would work since a shekel would weigh about 12 grams, and a half-shekel would then weigh around 6 grams. The problem is that we do not, to my knowledge, have a single manuscript with that spelling. I have followed the vocalisation גַרְמְסָן found in the Vilna edition, and followed the *Qorban haEdah*'s understanding of this being a coin, with the value of 1/12 shekel.

gerah – explicitly stated in the Exodus text, and connects this with the first of the Ten Commandments: 'I am Y-HWH your G-d, who brought you out from the land of Egypt, from the house of slavery' (Exod 20:2). Transgressing this commandment, through the worship of the golden calf, was tantamount to breaking all of the Ten Commandments, and so the Israelites have to pay one *gerah* per commandment.

The last midrash focuses not on the golden calf but the selling of Joseph by his brothers in Gen 37:28. The twenty silver pieces are not specified in the Genesis narrative, but the rabbis assume them to be *dinars*, which makes it the equivalent of a half-shekel (see mishnah 3:4).

Whether it is because of the sin of the golden calf or the sin of selling Joseph, the rabbis envision the half-shekel to be an actual atonement of a past transgression in the history of the Israelites. The theme of atonement can be more purely theological, though, as we see in a baraita (t. Šeqal. 1:2):

> 'From (the time) when they had taken place in the temple, they started to demand collateral' (m. Šeqal. 1:3). They started to demand collateral from Israelites for their shekels, so that the communal sacrifices would be made from their funds. A parable: This is like someone who has a sore on his foot, and the physician forces him and cuts off his flesh in order to heal him. So did the Omnipresent demand collateral from Israel on their shekels, so that the (communal) sacrifices would be made from their funds, since the communal sacrifices quicken and atone between Israel and their Father in Heaven. We find (this) concerning the donation of the shekels that the Israelites gave in the wilderness, as it is said: 'And you shall take the atonement silver from the children of Israel and give it to the service of the tent of the meeting, and it shall be a memorial for the children of Israel before Y-HWH, to atone for your lives' (Exod 30:16).

Atonement, the theme in the baraita, is central but not necessarily connected to an event in the collective narrative of Israel – rather, it is connected to a certain theological understanding of the communal sacrificial cult, one that we also find in Neh 10:34, where it is mentioned that the temple is 'for sin offerings to atone (לכפר) for Israel, and all the work of the house of our G-d'. These two themes carry quite different connotations; the one represented by the Yerushalmi portrays Israel as carrying a collective sin – a stain on their shared history – that needs to be atoned for. The one from the Tosefta, more thoroughly worked into the

assumptions about the temple cult and the half-shekel, presents Israel as a privileged group, as the gentile nations do not have any systematised way of atoning for their sins, whereas Israel does.

Conclusions

At this point I would like to sum up the discussion in tractate Šeqalim. The first thing to note is that the rabbis assume their biblical source texts to speak of one and the same phenomenon, which they understand to be: a half-shekel tax, instituted by Moses in the wilderness, for the funding of the sacrificial cult and the upkeep of the tabernacle/temple, which has varied in value or denomination throughout history but which has essentially been the same in function and purpose.

The function of this temple tax, while deriving its value from Exod 30, is the one put forth in Neh 10:33–34: 'for the service of the house of our G-d, for the arranged bread, and for the daily meal offering, and for the daily burnt offering: [for] the Sabbaths, the new moons, for festivals and for consecrations and for sin offerings to atone for Israel, and all the work of the house of our G-d'. The rabbis, further, never once concern themselves with the theme of preventing a plague through the donation of the half-shekel – the story of the plague in 2 Sam 24 is never brought up, and no mention of that theme is made. While the rabbis do seem to connect the half-shekel with the census in Numbers, they never seem to connect it with 2 Sam 24. Instead, exegetically, they focus on the 'atonement' (כפרה), rather than the census, and come up with possible scenarios that the people of Israel would have to atone for collectively. In Exod 30, כפרה seems to mainly signify a removal of the perceived danger involved in taking a public census, and in Neh 10 a theological understanding of the sacrificial cult. In the rabbinic account, it is understood firmly as a form of atonement. Even if one does not take the midrashic readings of the narratives of Genesis and Exodus as halakhically significant, the fact remains that the 'atonement' theme also applies as soon as the rabbis have established that the half-shekel goes to the communal sacrifices, which atones for all of Israel.[39] While most modern readers (but see Propp, above) are not used to

---

[39] Jacob Neusner, ever eager to make an extravagant point, reads Jesus' assault on the money-changers in the temple in Mark 11:15–19 as a wholesale rejection of the efficacy of the sacrificial cult in effecting atonement, instead trying to replace them with the Eucharist (Neusner 1989, 289–90). For a critique of this reading, see Buchanan 1991.

that reading, it is a reading that does make some sense, both when it comes to exegetical methodology and theological coherence.[40] The rabbis, viewing the whole Hebrew Bible as one unified text, seem to have harmonised the different occurrences of כפרה in the different contexts and brought them all under one interpretational lens: atonement through the sacrificial cult.

The most central theological – and sociological – theme is the idea of collective participation in the daily sacrificial cult. Through the contribution of the half-shekel to the daily communal sacrifices every Jew would be a part of the sacrificial collective of the people of Israel. It is not up to the king or any other individual to sponsor the daily sacrifices – in fact, it is absolutely forbidden to get any degree of individual sponsorship in the communal cult – and while an individual can bring personal offerings, Jews in the rabbinic model do not primarily sacrifice as individuals. They sacrifice as one collective whole through a flat-rate tax that includes everyone to the same extent, something that has to be ensured by the procedures of the תרומת הלשכה.[41] We have also seen that this 'tax' is in fact an offering, and governed by the laws that apply to all consecrated property.[42] This is very different from other approaches, for example that of the Sadducees, who according to the rabbis would permit an individual to donate to the communal sacrifice, something which rabbis would not. One useful analysis of this aspect of rabbinic ideology is that of Jonathan Klawans, who reads the rabbis as engaging, through their vision of the temple tax, in a project of inclusion:

> The rabbinic position on the temple tax – that it was paid annually, by *all* Jews, and used to defray the costs of the daily offerings – virtually ensures that the sacrificial service would depend for its day-to-day operation on funds that others would question. Practically by definition – and certainly

---

[40] Where we today would rightly protest, however, is that very assumption that the half-shekel went annually to the communal sacrifices, which is the only basis the rabbis have for their whole complex of readings.

[41] There is a similar logic in m. Pesaḥ. 5:8, where it is reported that the priests would fill a goblet with blood from the floor of the temple after the numerous Pesach lambs and sprinkle it on the altar, to make sure that, through the mixed blood, everyone's Pesach lamb offering would be valid. The rabbis, however, disagree with this particular procedure.

[42] That the money was seen as sacred is something we also find in Roman legislation, which from the time of Julius Caesar and Augustus forbade interrupting the transfer of the half-shekel to Jerusalem, classifying such hindrance as sacrilege (Broshi 1987, 34).

> by any definition acceptable to, for instance, the *Damascus Document*[43] – the revenues from an annual and widely collected temple tax would include at least some money tainted by theft or some other transgression. For the rabbis, presumably, the concern to include all overrides the concern to maintain a taint-free temple purse. (Klawans 2006, 197)

I would, however, want to take this in a slightly different direction: while Klawans focuses on the all-inclusive aspect of the rabbinic reading of the temple tax, I would want to point out that not only do the rabbis include all Jews, they also take pains to include all Jews *as one singular entity*. Their argument, it seems to me, is not only to claim all Jews as participators in the temple cult, no matter how morally deficient they happen to be. They also make sure, through the rituals they describe, that all Jews are included in exactly the same way, to exactly the same extent, with not a trace of individual contribution left.

This model of Jewish group identity is tied in with issues of collective boundaries, since Samaritans and gentiles are excluded from this sacrificial collective, though not from bringing individual sacrifices, so long as these are not obligated by the Torah, which would only apply to Jews. All adult men must bring the half-shekel and are thus counted in this group.[44]

Women, minors and slaves are part of the people, but not as fully autonomous entities, since they are generally subsumed under the authority (and often financial control) of free adult men. Therefore, for socio-economic reasons, they are not obligated, but free to contribute if they want to.[45] It is thus an important identity marker, in the same vein as cir-

---

[43] In which the Qumran group (we might assume) raises heavy criticism against the Jerusalem temple. See, for example, IV 20, V 6–9. This accords with the general stringency of the Qumran group when compared with the Pharisees and proto-rabbis (Shemesh 2009, 130).

[44] That this is probably not a historical fact might be deduced from at least one Tannaitic source, Mekhilta de Rabbi Yishmael (Lauterbach), *baChodesh* 1, and non-rabbinic sources, such as 4Q159 frag. 1 and Matt 17:24. For an in-depth study of the historical temple tax and its relation to the later *didrachmon* tax under the Fiscus Judaicus, see Mandell 1984. Her thesis, while maybe a bit too strong with regard to the evidence, is that the *didrachmon* was only levied on the Pharisaic-rabbinic subgroup, not on the Jews as a whole, and that these were the ones arguing for an annual, all-encompassing temple tax. The group identity being constructed, then, is a *sectarian* identity, but as with other rabbinic texts, the texts concerning the half-shekel donation is presented as pertaining to all Jews. For this tendency in rabbinic literature, see Fonrobert and Jaffee 2007, 4.

[45] This, then, could be the import of Matt 17:24–27 (assuming that it reflects a genuine teaching and does not reflect the Roman tax of later times): that the question of Jewish identity is raised, as a litmus test of whether Jesus is loyal to his people or not, and has a

cumcision and Sabbath observance.[46] Now, the question of collective identity is hardly a new problem. Joseph Blenkinsopp, for example, describes the problem already at the time of the return from exile:

> From the beginning of the Persian period a basic issue was to decide how one qualified for membership in the Jerusalem temple-community. Since the passing of the nation-state, which retained its political institutions though in vassalage to foreign powers, the matter could not be decided purely on grounds of national identity.

> Other factors entered into play including, for the first time, laws governing ritual purity (e.g., Hag. 2:10–14). It is therefore no surprise to find disagreement on the status of specific categories of people, including those who had defiled themselves with idolatry, resident aliens (*gērim*), and eunuchs … For the same reason, marriage with women outside the group became increasingly problematic and emerged as a major issue at the time of Ezra and Nehemiah. (Blenkinsopp 1996, 198–99)

This issue – simply, what the outer boundaries of Jewishness were – had not subsided by the late Second Temple period (nor, for that matter, ever since). In Roman legislation the complexity of the issue of Jewish collective identity was acknowledged through the designation of the Jews as a *gens* or an *ethnos*, a non-territorial administrative entity. This they shared with the Alexandrians, which meant that '[n]o matter where they dwelt, they acted as a nationality with strong common bonds. Like the Jews, Alexandrians were held liable for payment of their tax whether they lived in Alexandria or in Italy.'[47] That Jews were classified as a non-territorial province was a pragmatic response to the reality of the widespread Jewish diaspora, and the changing Jewish identity over the period of Persian and Hellenistic imperialism: as opposed to the biblical, primarily land-based identity, Jewishness was now in need of further demarcation.[48] Especially

---

share in the daily communal sacrifices or not. Jesus' answer would then be that, while technically exempt (either because he and his followers are 'children' or because all Jews are), he still wants to pay it, out of loyalty to the people ('so as not to give offence' could refer both to other Jews and to G-d). It could also be a way of testing how close to the Pharisaic movement he was, something that would have been a concern of the author of Matt.

[46] Tellbe 2005, 19–20.

[47] Mandell 1984, 229.

[48] That Persian imperialism (followed by Hellenistic and Roman) is an important factor in the formation of the half-shekel tax might be evident already in the biblical texts them-

at the time of the rabbis, with the emergence of Christianity, the loss of Jerusalem as a cultic locus, and the general Jewish attitudes towards gentile presence in synagogues changing, this was a pressing issue. The rabbis made use of many religious signals in their effort to establish this Jewish identity: circumcision, an emphasis on matrilineal descent, the establishment of conversion criteria, and added stringency to menstruation laws and Sabbath observance – and the (by the time of the gemara theoretical) half-shekel temple tax. There is a persistent trend in rabbinic legal discourse that everyone involved in the literature is aware of, namely the tendency to disguise prescriptive statements as descriptive explanations. While we have no reason to directly distrust the rabbinic depiction of the practice of the temple tax, as it does not seem to contradict other sources that we know of, we should not fall into the trap of trusting it fully either. We have reason to believe that some communities, like the Qumran group, did not, in fact, pay the temple tax annually and we can be sure that the temple was not fully funded through the temple tax, something which even rabbinic sources bear testimony to. The description of the temple tax in Šeqalim also assumes many rabbinic legal categories, for example of sanctification, and bears many of the marks of Pharisaic and rabbinic thought (for example an egalitarian push towards the inclusion of all Jews, regardless of caste). This, while probably not divorced from the actual historic temple tax, most likely represents a sectarian, here rabbinic, utopian understanding of the practice after it has ceased to be, and expresses the ethos of that group, an ethos according to which, as we have seen, paying taxes is definitely something to be liked.

Works Consulted

Ådna, Jostein. 1999. *Jerusalemer Tempel und Tempelmarkt im 1. Jahrhundert n. Chr.* Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Altmann, Peter. 2014. 'Tithes for the Clergy and Taxes for the King.' *CBQ* 76: 215–29.

Blenkinsopp, Joseph. 1996. *A History of Prophecy in Israel.* 2 ed., rev. and enl. Louisville: Westminster John Knox.

---

selves, since, in the words of Lemaire, the institution of such a tax 'developed the use of coins, and Judah adopted a monetary system connected with the drachma system … As shown by the various lists of payment, during the fourth century, the main unit was apparently the "qu(arter of a shekel)" because it was the equivalent of a drachma' (Lemaire 2007, 60).

Boyarin, Daniel. 1990. *Intertextuality and the Reading of Midrash*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Broshi, Magen. 1987. 'The Role of the Temple in the Herodian Economy.' *JJS* 38: 31–37.

Buchanan, George Wesley. 1991. 'Symbolic Money-changers in the Temple?' *NTS* 37: 280–90.

Duyrat, Frédérique. 2010. 'Bibliographie numismatique de la Syrie IV. Périodes achéménide, hellénistique, romaine et byzantine (2006–2007).' *Syr* 87: 301–17.

Elbogen, Ismar. 1993. *Jewish Liturgy: A Comprehensive History*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society.

Finlan, Steven. 2013. 'Sacrificial Images in the New Testament.' *SEÅ* 78: 57–86.

Fonrobert, Charlotte Elisheva. 2000. *Menstrual Purity: Rabbinic and Christian Reconstructions of Biblical Gender*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Fonrobert, Charlotte Elisheva, and Martin S. Jaffee, ed. 2007. *The Cambridge Companion to the Talmud and Rabbinic Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Frankfurter, Felix. 1965 (originally published in 1938). *Mr. Justice Holmes and the Supreme Court.* New York: Atheneum.

Hayes, Christine Elizabeth. 2001. *Gentile Impurities and Jewish Identities: Intermarriage and Conversion from the Bible to the Talmud*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Japhet, Sara. 1991. 'The Temple in the Restoration Period: Reality and Ideology.' *USQR* 46: 195–251.

Jastrow, Morris. 1990. *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic literature*. London: Trübner.

Kazen, Thomas. 2012. 'Some notes on Sacrificial Removal in Priestly Law.' Pages 89–100 in *Plogbillar och svärd: En festskrift till Stig Norin*. Edited by T. Davidovich. Stockholm: Molin & Sorgenfrei.

Klawans, Jonathan. 2006. *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple: Symbolism and Supersessionism in the Study of Ancient Judaism*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Lemaire, André. 2007. 'Administration in Fourth-Century B.C.E. Judah in Light of Epigraphy and Numismatics.' Pages 53–74 in *Judah and the Judeans in the Fourth Century B.C.E.* Edited by O. Lipschitz, G. N. Knoppers and R. Albertz. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Liver, Jacob. 1963. 'The Half-Shekel Offering in Biblical and Post-Biblical Literature'. *HTR* 56: 173–98.

Mandell, Sara. 1984. 'Who Paid the Temple Tax When the Jews Were under Roman Rule?' *HTR* 77: 223–32.

Meyers, Carol L. 2005. *Exodus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Meshorer, Ya'akov. 2007. 'Appendix 6: The En-Gedi Hoard.' Pages 411–21 in *En-Gedi Excavations, 1: Conducted by B. Mazar and I. Dunayevsky:*

Final Report (1961–1965). Edited by E. Stern. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society.

Neusner, Jacob. 1989. 'Money-Changers in the Temple: the Mishnah's Explanation.' *NTS* 35: 287–90.

Propp, William Henry. 2006. *Exodus 19–40: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. New York: Doubleday

Ross, Tamar. 2004. *Expanding the Palace of Torah: Orthodoxy and Feminism*. Hanover: Brandeis University Press.

Roth, Joel. 1986. *The Halakhic Process: A Systemic Analysis*. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America.

Schwartz, Seth. 2001. *Imperialism and Jewish Society: 200 B.C.E. to 640 C.E.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Shemesh, Aharon. 2009. *Halakhah in the Making: The Development of Jewish Law from Qumran to the Rabbis*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Stern, Ephraim, ed. 2007. *En-Gedi Excavations, 1: Conducted by B. Mazar and I. Dunayevsky: Final Report (1961–1965)*. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society.

Stevens, Marty. 2006. *Temples, Tithes, and Taxes: The Temple and the Economic Life of Ancient Israel.* Peabody: Baker Academic.

Tellbe, Mikael. 2005. 'The Temple Tax as a Pre-70 CE Identity Marker.' Pages 19–44 in *The Formation of the Early Church*. Edited by J. Ådna. WUNT 183. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Classical Sources

Hengel, Martin, and Frowald G. Hüttenmeister, ed.1990. *Übersetzung des Talmud Yerushalmi. Sheqalim = Scheqelsteuer*. Tübingen: Mohr.

Lauterbach, Jacob Z. 2004. *Mekhilta de-Rabbi Ishmael.* 2 vols. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society.

Levine, Amy-Jill, and Marc Zvi Brettler, ed. 2011. *The Jewish Annotated New Testament: New Revised Standard Version Bible Translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Steinsaltz, Adin, and Tzvi Hersh Weinreb, ed. 2013. *Koren Talmud Bavli*, vol. 8: *Shekalim*. Jerusalem: Koren.

Talmud Yerushalmi, Šeqalim: MS Leiden. http://webapp2.netanya.ac.il/talmud/

Are Judas the Galilean and the "Fourth Philosophy" Mere Concoctions? The Limits of Josephus' Inventiveness

FERNANDO BERMEJO-RUBIO
UNED, Madrid

For Henry MacAdam

1. Introduction[1]

The varied nature of Judaism in the first century CE enables us to suspect any clear-cut attempt at describing its complexity as a collection of a few formalized "schools." This is why Josephus' portrayal of contemporary Judaism as composed of three or four "philosophies" appears to be a construct more than anything else. In fact, the notion itself of a "Fourth Philosophy" used in *Antiquitates Judaicae*[2] does not seem to be particularly helpful, among other reasons because it says nothing about its doctrinal content, and because it was presumably never used as a self-definition. Nevertheless, if we take "Fourth Philosophy" not as an accurate label, but rather as a (admittedly clumsy) way of designating a trend of active resistance to Roman rule inspired by religious ideals, the phrase seems to be generically acceptable, and this is how most scholars have approached Josephus' accounts.

It has been sometimes argued, however, that both Judas and the Fourth Philosophy were not historical realities, but merely inventions of Josephus.[3] According to James McLaren, they would have been created by the

---

[2] τετάρτη φιλοσοφία (*A.J.* 18.9); τετάρτη τῶν φιλοσοφιῶν (*A.J.* 18.23). For the use of the term "philosophy" to describe the Jewish trends, see Steve Mason, "Philosophiai: Graeco-Roman, Judean, and Christian," in *Voluntary Associations in the Ancient Mediterranean World*, ed. J. S. Kloppenborg and S. G. Wilson (London: Routledge, 1996), 31–58, esp. 44–46.

[3] James S. McLaren, "Constructing Judean History in the Diaspora: Josephus's Accounts of Judas," in *Negotiating Diaspora: Jewish Strategies in the Roman Empire*, ed. J. Barclay

apologetic interests of the historian, who moved backward in time sixty years the ideology of resistance to Roman rule which in 66 caused the Jewish War (with the active involvement of Josephus himself), as a means of exonerating himself and the priesthood of any responsibility.[4]

Such a proposal is indeed intriguing. Given that Josephus is the only source mentioning a "Fourth Philosophy," and that the often tendentious nature of his work is all too obvious, the hypothesis according to which Josephus invented the movement is not wholly unreasonable at first sight, and should be carefully evaluated.[5] Was the Fourth Philosophy a real thing or rather a mere fabrication? Since a clear answer to this question is extremely relevant for the history of first-century Judaism, and given that I do not know any serious examination of such a proposal, the aim of this article is to survey the claim that Judas and the Fourth Philosophy were invented by Josephus, and to provide a full explanation to why this contention is ultimately unconvincing.

2. The Apparent Existence of Independent Sources

An obvious claim which is implied in the contention that Judas and the Fourth Philosophy were nothing but Josephus' concoctions is the lack of further independent evidence regarding these phenomena. Nevertheless, although the notion of a τετάρτη φιλοσοφία does not occur elsewhere,

---

(London: T & T Clark, 2004), 90–108. The contention that the Fourth Philosophy is unhistorical was also put forward by Israel Ben-Shalom, *The School of Shammai and the Zealots' Struggle against Rome* (Jerusalem: Ben-Gurion University of the Negev Press, 1993) [Hebrew], esp. 126–31, 157–71. According to this scholar, the ideas Josephus attributes to Judah and Saddok belong to the "Zealot–Hasidic" ideology, which in turn goes back to the Hasmonean era. For critical comments on this proposal, see David Goodblatt, *Elements of Ancient Jewish Nationalism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 89–91.

[4] "The accounts of Judas are a crafted and manipulated construction by Josephus. They are not descriptive reports. They are part of a reinterpretation of the past, a deliberate rewriting of what happened in 6 and 66 CE in the light of 70 CE" (McLaren, "Constructing Judean History," 90). "Josephus and his fellow rebel priests advocated rebellion against Roman authority, using as a rallying-point the claim of 'God alone as master'. No direct evidence for this view remains in the War account of 66. It has been deliberately edited out of 66 CE and the war cry has been relocated to another time, group and place, namely, Judas from Galilee and the supposed fourth philosophy" ("Constructing Judean History," 101–2).

[5] In fact the notion that Josephus invented the Fourth Philosophy as a device to attribute the revolt to a few mavericks rather than to the nation as a whole was offered several decades ago, although just as a possibility to be ruled out. See Martin Goodman, *The Ruling Class of Judaea: The Origins of the Jewish Revolt Against Rome A. D. 66–70* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 95.

some sources seem to point to the existence of Judas the Galilean and/or of an anti-Roman resistance movement early in the first century CE.

The first piece of evidence is a famous passage of the Book of Acts. According to Acts 5:35–39, after a hearing of Peter and the apostles before the Sanhedrin, the death penalty is called for. Then Rabbi Gamaliel asks the Sanhedrin's members to leave Peter and the apostles unmolested, and rather to leave their fate in God's hands. He does it in a speech in which he compares Jesus and his followers with Theudas and his movement as well as with Judas the Galilean (Ἰούδας ὁ Γαλιλαῖος) and his movement; he also states that Judas "drew away some of the people after him (ἀπέστησεν λαὸν ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ)," something that matches Josephus' contention that Judas won an abundance of devotees.[6] This seems to be independent confirmation of the existence of the figure, and also of his clash with the Roman power.

Of course, given that it has been argued that Luke might have known Josephus' work,[7] it could be objected that Gamaliel's speech is dependent on the historian's account of events, meaning that it is not an independent witness to the Fourth Philosophy. Luke's dependence on Josephus is a much-debated and thorny issue (all too complex to be tackled here), but, even accepting—for the sake of the discussion—the trustworthiness of such claim, I find some specific problems in the dependence of this concrete passage on Josephus' work. On the one hand, Acts 5:37 contends that Judas the Galilean "rose up in the days of the census (ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῆς ἀπογραφῆς)." Now, a reference connecting Judas with the census is not mentioned in *Bellum*, but only in *Antiquitates*, a work which was written at the end of the first century; unless we accept a rather late date for Acts—a work usually dated around 90—dependence is hard to accept. On the other hand, and more importantly, there is a significant divergence between the two accounts: whilst Josephus does not say anything about the fate of Judas and his followers—in fact, in several passages he asserts that there was continuity between Judas and the events leading to the war, thereby assuming the survival of the movement—Acts 5:37b explicitly states that Judas perished, and that all his followers were scattered (κἀκεῖνος ἀπώλετο, καὶ πάντες ὅσοι ἐπείθοντο αὐτῷ διεσκορπίσθησαν),

---

[6] *A.J.* 18.6; 18.9.
[7] Steve Mason, *Josephus and the New Testament*, 2nd ed. (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2003), 251–95.

so the passage hints at the complete failure of the movement.[8] A further problem is the potentially embarrassing nature of this material: even accepting that the author of Acts knew Josephus, one wonders if the evangelist would have willingly included a speech delivered by a venerable figure which implicitly compares Jesus with troublemakers; it seems to be a reasonable surmise that he would not have made such a dangerous move unless those figures and the existence of strong similarities between them had been well-known by the evangelist's readers.[9]

Some additional works should be taken into account. Niclas Förster has recently paid attention to two patristic sources which, despite their late date, seem to preserve reliable information concerning the first century, namely, Hippolytus' *Refutatio omnium haeresium* and Pseudo-Hieronymus' *Indiculus de haeresibus*.[10] In his *Refutatio*, Hippolytus devotes a section to the Jews in which he uses some sources concerning anti-Roman fighters. In fact he refers to some Jewish groups whose members had adopted a radical stance and praxis against the Romans because of nationalistic and religious reasons. They interpreted the biblical ban on images as a total rejection of images, so it was impossible for them to use Roman coins stamped with images: neither did they make them nor carry them nor look upon them. Moreover, they had refused to call to any man "Lord." This corresponds to what Josephus says about Judas and his followers. Interestingly, Hippolytus uses a formulation (οὐδένα κύριον ὀνομάζουσι πλὴν τὸν θεόν) which widely diverges in its phrasing from that (τοῦ μηδένα ἄνθρωπον προσαγορεύειν δεσπότην) which Josephus uses in *Antiquitates*. Such as Förster has remarked, this dissimilar way of expression might be naturally explained through a different *Vorlage*.[11]

Hippolytus' notice matches some information provided by a fifth-century source, the *Indiculus de haeresibus*, about a Jewish group labeled "Galileans," according to whom the Messiah had taught them not to call

---

[8] Mason tries to minimize this fact by asserting that "Luke's statement that Judas was 'destroyed' is quite vague" (*Josephus and the New Testament*, 279).

[9] See Jeffrey A. Trumbower, "The Historical Jesus and the Speech of Gamaliel [Acts 5:35–39]," *NTS* 39 (1993): 500–517 (509).

[10] Niclas Förster, "Bemerkungen zum Aufstand des Judas Galilaeus sowie zum biblischen Bilderverbot bei Josephus, Hippolyt und Pseudo-Hieronymus," in *Flavius Josephus: Interpretation and History*, ed. J. Pastor et al. (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 87–109. For an edition of Pseudo-Hieronymus' *De haeresibus Judaeorum*, see Niclas Förster, *Jesus und die Steuerfrage: Die Zinsgroschenperikope auf dem religiösen und politischen Hintergrund ihrer Zeit* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 282–300.

[11] See *Haer*. IX 26.2 and *A.J.* 18.24; Förster, "Bemerkungen zum Aufstand," 95, n. 38.

Caesar "Lord" and not to use his coins: *Galilaei dicunt Christum venisse et docuisse eos ne dicerent dominum Caesarem, neve eius monetis uterentur*.[12] In turn, this information presumably goes back to a second-century Christian work, Hegesippus' Ὑπομνήματα, which is now known through some quotations in Eusebius' *Historia ecclesiastica*.[13]

The presence, in several independent sources, of material apparently concerning anti-Roman trends going back to the early first century, which refers to Judas or the ideology associated to him by Josephus, can be adduced as a first and elementary objection to the claim that those phenomena were purely and simply concocted by Josephus.

3. Blatant Contradictions … or Mere Discrepancies?

A major point for the contention that Judas and the Fourth Philosophy are fabrications is the claim that there are several contradictions between the accounts on Judas in *Bellum* and *Antiquitates*.[14] Admittedly, some discrepancies are easily detected. For instance, although Judas is usually said to be a Galilean, in *Antiquitates Judaicae* he is called "a Gaulanite," and Gamala is named as his birthplace.[15] Moreover, whilst in *Bellum Judaicum* Judas appears as the sole founder of the "Fourth Philosophy," in *Antiquitates Judaicae* both Judas and Saddok are cited.[16]

James McLaren indeed makes much of the lack of agreement between these references, but there are alternative explanations to the idea of the textual tensions resulting from a concoction. On the one hand, the description of Judas as "a Gaulanite from a city named Gamala" could be—for

---

[12] The original has *monitis*, but the correct reading is undoubtedly *monetis*; see Förster, *Jesus und die Steuerfrage*, 292.

[13] *Hist. eccl.* IV 22.9. Förster, "Bemerkungen zum Aufstand," 102–5 has compared the information provided in these sources with rabbinic sources which support their contents.

[14] McLaren also remarks that "there are substantial gaps regarding Judas' career" ("Constructing Judean History," 100) as if there was something suspect therein. Josephus, however, issues strikingly terse statements about other historically important figures. For instance, he says virtually nothing about Marcus Ambibulus and Annius Rufus, the prefects following Coponius; and about Valerius Gratus, who—according to the historian—stayed eleven years as prefect in Judaea (*A.J.* 18.35), Josephus uniquely says that he deposed four high priests. Moreover, he says hardly anything about the nearly four decades of Antipas' and Philip's reigns.

[15] Ἰούδας δὲ Γαυλανίτης ἀνὴρ ἐκ πόλεως ὄνομα Γάμαλα (*A.J.* 18.4).

[16] See *B.J.* 2.118; *A.J.* 18.4–10. This is deemed by McLaren "probably the most significant difference between the accounts" ("Constructing Judean History," 98). For helpful reflections on these accounts, see Steve Mason, ed., *Flavius Josephus: Translation and Commentary,* vol. 1B: *Judean War 2* (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 81–83.

instance, and such as this scholar himself remarks—simply "a case of authorial incompetence,"[17] perhaps due to confusion between the Gamala in Gaulanitis and the town by the same name in Upper Galilee.[18] Alternatively, other possibilities have been envisaged to argue that the byname "Gaulanite" does not pose a problem.[19] On the other hand, the different accounts can be read without positing a true contradiction. Judas may have been mentioned in *Bellum* (and again in *A.J.* 18.23–25) as the sole founder of the Fourth Philosophy because he was indeed its most important ideologist, and Saddok might have been mentioned elsewhere as his associate because he was indeed a major associate of him,[20] having not had the same importance (because of having joined Judas in a later phase, or because his contribution to the ideology was not so significant, or because he was a less charismatic figure, or because Josephus had less information on him, or for whatever any other reason).[21] Alternatively, given that Saddok is identified as a Pharisee, perhaps this explains the omission of his name in the earlier work: in *Bellum* Josephus might have carefully censored information about the political involvement of the Pharisees, whilst, by the time he wrote *Antiquitates*, he was less careful

---

[17] McLaren, "Constructing Judean History," 98.

[18] See Louis H. Feldman, *Josephus: Jewish Antiquities XVIII–XIX*, LCL 433 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1965), 5.

[19] See, e.g., Uriel Rappaport, "Who Were the Sicarii?," in *The Jewish Revolt Against Rome: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, ed. M. Popović (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 323–42 (331), who argues that "as the Golan was part of Galilee a man could have been called by both bynames." This scholar refers to the work of Chaim Ben David as having shown that the Golan was considered by rabbinic sources, as well as by Josephus, to be part of Galilee; C. Ben David, *The Jewish Settlement on the Golan in the Roman and Byzantine Period* (Qazrin: Golan Research Institute, 2005), 11–12 [Hebrew]. Others consider "Galilean" to be a surname; see, e.g., Förster, "Bemerkungen zum Aufstand," 91.

[20] This seems to be shown by the facts that also in *A.J.* 18.4 the first figure to be mentioned is Judas, and that Josephus asserts that he "had enlisted the aid of Saddok (Σάδδωκον Φαρισαῖον προσλαβόμενος)."

[21] I find the following point odd also. If, according to McLaren, Josephus wanted to exonerate not only himself but also his fellow aristocratic priests, would he have chosen precisely the name "Saddok"—a name which, as it has been noted by several scholars, resonated with priestly history? See, e.g., Matthew Black, "Judas of Galilee and Josephus's 'Fourth Philosophy'," in *Josephus-Studien: Untersuchungen zu Josephus, dem antiken Judentum und dem Neuen Testament*, ed. O. Betz, K. Haacker and M. Hengel, FS O. Michel (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974), 45–54 (52); David Goodblatt, "Priestly Ideologies of the Judean Resistance," *JSQ* 3 (1996): 225–49, esp. 239–40. Unless one posits what psychoanalysis calls "parapraxis," the choice of this name would have been an extremely risky and imprudent move by Josephus.

and let such information slip out from time to time.[22] There are several reasonable hypotheses that allow us to account for the discrepancies in the accounts without having to see them as blatant contradictions, even less as traces of a concoction.[23]

Furthermore, the confused nature of the resulting picture might have arisen from Josephus' apologetic aims, which are intrinsically somewhat contradictory. Since one of the major purposes of the historian was to free the majority of Jews from responsibility for a war in which so many were involved, he had to pursue different goals. On the one hand, by choosing an identifiable tendency as responsible for shaping events, he needed to downplay the importance and weight of that tendency within traditional Judaism so as to present it as a minority stance of just a few mavericks playing only a secondary role in first-century Judaea; on the other hand, in order to persuade that it had a massive influence in provoking the war he needed to emphasize its relevance.[24] This tension, however, has nothing to do with a concoction or a conscious will to deceive.

Along this line of reasoning there seems to be something odd in McLaren's argument. This scholar assumes that the fabrication of Judas and the Fourth Philosophy was extremely important—even crucial—for Josephus as a means of clearing himself from every suspicion of having being involved in anti-Roman resistance.[25] Now, if he had such a vested interest, it is a reasonable surmise that he would have paid careful attention to make a consistent account of his "alibi." This means, in turn, that when he wrote *Antiquitates* he would have simply repeated the information formerly provided in *Bellum*, or—if he needed to make some adjustment—he would have been careful enough to be consistent so as not to ruin his key apologetic device. But it is McLaren himself who insists on

---

[22] See S. G. F. Brandon, *Jesus and the Zealots: A Study of the Political Factor in Primitive Christianity* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1967), 38; Black, "Judas of Galilee," 50–51; Daniel R. Schwartz, "Josephus and Nicolaus on the Pharisees," *JSJ* 14 (1983): 157–71, esp. 169.

[23] McLaren sees also a "problem" in Josephus' decision to identify a particular founder of the Fourth Philosophy, whilst in the description of the three other schools of thought no founders are named ("Constructing Judean History," 99). In fact this is not so surprising if one takes into account that the other philosophies are rather old (by modern assessments they go back to the 2nd century BCE), whilst the Fourth Philosophy was the most recent one, and accordingly reliable information on its birth could be more easily obtained.

[24] *A.J.* 18.6–10; *B.J.* 7.253–255. See Goodman, *The Ruling Class of Judaea*, 94.

[25] "Clearly Judas was important for Josephus in a manner above and beyond any other figure in his narratives"; see McLaren, "Constructing Judean History," 100 (and 104).

the contradictory character of the two accounts.[26] Now, this means that Josephus would have irredeemably contradicted himself in an issue which he had simply invented *ex nihilo*, and which was allegedly essential for his apologetic needs. It is, however, hard to believe that Josephus was incompetent to such an extent. The discrepancies in his reports are easier to account for if they result from some innocuous and more trivial reason—for instance, if they reflect variants of a received tradition, or if a simple mistake has found its way into the text, or if a conscious change was made by him out of new available information—than if they are the outcome of perfidious concoctions. If there has been a "deliberate authorial manipulation of the subject matter," and if "Judas has a special place in Josephus's historical reconstruction of the first century",[27] we would expect a higher degree of consistency.[28]

   This leads to the detection of a further problem in McLaren's hypothesis, namely, its convoluted nature. Discrepancies between the accounts in *Bellum* and *Antiquitates* are understood by this scholar as the outcome of changes consciously introduced in the versions, and such changes are explained by virtue of the alleged need of Josephus of answering a number of criticisms leveled against the first (*Bellum*) version.[29] Such changes, however, are not consistent, because in *Antiquitates* Gamala is only mentioned once but then Josephus opts again for the label "Galilean";[30] and because, after having named Saddok alongside Judas, in the ensuing account (*A.J.* 18.23–25) Josephus only mentions Judas.[31] Therefore, given that a conscious and intentional plan is assumed, a second rationale is needed, and McLaren then asserts that this second version "was a compromise, and one that was only grudgingly made."[32] This, however, means that when Josephus most needed a defence, he did again incur inconsistency, thereby exposing himself to further criticism. Leaving aside the utmost ineptitude involved in such a procedure, this is not the simplest

---

[26] "Constructing Judean History," 100.
[27] "Constructing Judean History," 91 and 93 respectively.
[28] We could then state the same thing as McLaren does, but with a different sense: "Given the apparent importance of Judas in Josephus's narrative, this lack of agreement is, at the very least, curious" ("Constructing Judean History," 94).
[29] "I propose that they reflect changes that he was forced to make to his original version of the events" ("Constructing Judean History," 105).
[30] *A.J.* 18.23; 20.102.
[31] As McLaren himself admits; see "Constructing Judean History," 98.
[32] "Constructing Judean History," 106–7.

explanation of the evidence, but rather an all too convoluted one. Far from it, the double complication is in fact inexistent if one does not assume McLaren's claims.

4. The Historical Plausibility of Josephus' Provided Date and Setting

The claim that a religious ideology of resistance to the Romans in 6 CE is just the result of a deliberate rewriting which has projected back into the past a later reality betrays a substantial shortcoming in that it has not weighed up the intrinsic plausibility of Josephus' statements. Put otherwise, that claim overlooks the factors which have been advanced to explain the emergence of an anti-Roman ideology precisely about 6 CE.

If—through the eyes of Judaeans who had enjoyed eighty years of independence—the loss of sovereignty after the events of 63 BCE, when Pompey conquered Hasmonean Judaea, must have been felt as dramatic,[33] the ensuing events must have significantly increased the uneasiness of those longing for independence, all the more so because of the pro-Roman politics of Herod and his descendants. Even if Rome, unlike Antiochus IV Epiphanes, did not interfere materially with the free practice of Judaism, and even if Herod had been more considerate towards Judaism than usually admitted, the Hellenistic side of the client ruler must have been more apparent in the eyes of many of his subjects, for he often conducted himself like a benefactor of Greek civilisation.[34] Leaving aside the harshness of Herod's client kingship (let us recall, for instance, the incident of the golden eagle), his support of the emperor's cult might have been a significant factor for resentment.[35] It has been indeed argued that no other among the client rulers in the Roman Empire fostered so strongly the emperor's cult as Herod and his descendants did, and contended that this fact must have had a bearing on the birth of the movement of active resistance called by Josephus "Fourth Philosophy," as far as the emperor's cult im-

---

[33] On this aspect, see Nadav Sharon, "Setting the Stage: The Effects of the Roman Conquest and the Loss of Sovereignty," in *Was 70 CE a Watershed in Jewish History? On Jews and Judaism before and after the Destruction of the Second Temple*, ed. D. R. Schwartz et al. (Brill: Leiden, 2012), 415–45.

[34] See Valentin Nikiprowetzky, "Josephus and the Revolutionary Parties," in *Josephus, the Bible, and History*, ed. L. H. Feldman and G. Hata (Leiden: Brill, 1989), 216–36, esp. 223–25.

[35] See James S. Kennard, "Judas of Galilee and his Clan," *JQR* 36 (1946): 281–86, esp. 283.

plied a genuinely religious challenge to Jewish monotheism.[36] All this must have been considered a serious affront and harmed many sensitivities.

This situation seems to be confirmed by the survey of patterns of material culture. Although the conclusions drawn from studies focused on archaeological materials are always provisional, a significant change seems to have occurred in the Galilean archaeological record around the end of the first century BCE and the beginning of the first century CE, towards the end or just after the rule of Herod the Great. Whereas the people living at Gentile and mixed sites continued to import red-slipped table vessels and mould-made lamps of early Roman style, Galilean Jews set their tables exclusively with locally manufactured saucers and bowls, and lit their homes with local lamps.[37] This sudden and consistent rejection of formerly unobjectionable objects can hardly be explained away by economic or functional causes. It has been suggested that the rejection of these items was the result of individual choice, and that it implied an anti-Roman statement. In this light, the fierce resistance of many Jews in 66 CE to Vespasian's legions, far from being a novel and unheard-of event, goes back to a defiant anti-Roman response which had begun several generations earlier.[38]

If the iron hand with which Herod ruled prevented the open expression of opposition, only a few years after Varus' terrible repression, the deposing of Archelaus would have provided a suitable occasion to voice discontent. In fact, the most obvious moment in which discontent must have reached its peak was precisely 6 CE, when Rome put an end to even the Herodian vassal state and incorporated Judaea directly into the empire.[39]

---

[36] Monika Bernett, *Der Kaiserkult in Judäa unter den Herodiern und Römern: Untersuchungen zur politischen und religiösen Geschichte Judäas von 30 v. bis 66 n. Chr.* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007) has examined the growing significance of the emperor's cult, and contended that Judas' call can be better understood as a reaction against this challenge (see pp. 190–94, 199, 340–42). Also the fact that in Jerusalem's Temple a daily sacrifice to the emperor was offered must have kept anti-Roman tendencies and hostility alive among some sensitive people.

[37] Andrea M. Berlin, "Romanization and anti-Romanization in pre-Revolt Galilee," in *The First Jewish Revolt: Archaeology, History, and Ideology*, ed. A. M. Berlin and J. A. Overman (London: Routledge, 2002), 57–73; Mark A. Chancey, *Greco-Roman Culture and the Galilee of Jesus* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 41.

[38] Berlin, "Romanization and anti-Romanization in pre-Revolt Galilee," 69–70.

[39] It has been reasonably argued that the disintegration of Jewish statehood—an aspect that in 6 CE must have been most clearly experienced—triggered Judas to replace a traditional theocracy through a radical form of it; see Meron Piotrkowski, "Theokratie am Extrem:

With the imposition of a Roman governor, this was the first time in Second Temple history that the Judaeans were subject to *direct* foreign imperial rule, a situation made evident to everyone by the assessment for taxation.[40]

Herein we find several factors explaining why Josephus locates Judas and the birth of the Fourth Philosophy in 6 CE. On the one hand, the fact that Rome was to raise tribute in Eretz Israel was, as it has been noted in a classical work, something *novum et inauditum*.[41] On the other hand, we find intertwined political and religious grounds for opposition to Rome, since conducting a census could be easily seen as going against the Jewish Law and God's will.[42] Unlike what Josephus reports regarding the situation ensuing Archelaus' deposition and banishment, he does not provide reports of revolts in Galilee and Perea following Antipas' deposition and banishment in 39 CE,[43] and there is every indication that this contrast has to do with the fact that the change from Antipas to Agrippa did not involve the specific circumstances which took place after Archelaus' deposition and which were deemed by the most sensitive as unbearable, namely, that a Roman census took place and that Judaea was now under direct Roman rule and tributary.[44] In this context, Josephus' report of the Jews' initial shock becomes fully understandable;[45] such a shock does indeed set the stage for a reaction opposing the Romans and their supporters.[46]

The former reflections show that the most likely setting for the emergence and/or crystallization of the views attributed by Josephus to Judas and the Fourth Philosophy is accordingly that which the historian reports:

Die Auflösung der Formen jüdischer Staatlichkeit und die Genese der 4. Philosophie," *Trumah* 18 (2008): 228–37.

[40] If, as McLaren ("Constructing Judean History," 102–3) states, some priests decided to take the drastic action of banning the sacrifices on behalf of the Romans in the wake of a census by Cestius in 65/66 and the dispute regarding the tribute, one wonders why the first census would not have triggered a not less sharp reaction by at least some patriots in the wake of Quirinius' census.

[41] Emil Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C. – A.D. 135)*, rev. Geza Vermes et al., 3 vols. (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1973–1985), 1:419.

[42] Gen 15:5; 22:17; 2 Sam 24; Hos 2:1. See Hengel, *Die Zeloten*, 134–45.

[43] *A.J.* 18.252–255; *B.J.* 2.183.

[44] See Fabian E. Udoh, *To Caesar what is Caesar's: Tribute, Taxes, and Imperial Administration in Early Roman Palestine (63 B.C.E. – 70 C.E.)* (Providence: Brown University, 2005), 157.

[45] Τὸ κατ᾽ἀρχὰς ἐν δεινῷ φέροντες τὴν ἐπὶ ταῖς ἀπογραφαῖς ἀκρόασιν (*A.J.* 18.3).

[46] Judas "induced multitudes of Jews to refuse to enroll themselves (μὴ ποιεῖσθαι τὰς ἀπογραφάς) when Quirinius was sent as censor to Judaea" (*B.J.* 7.253).

after several successive disappointments, the annexation of Judaea and the imposition of direct tribute seem to have been the straw that broke the camel's back.[47] It would be far-fetched to argue that Josephus placed the birth of the Fourth Philosophy at the time of Archelaus' deposition to provide his alleged invention with a plausible setting. It is rather the opposite that seems to be true: the historian must have been constrained by historical reality to place the movement created by Judas about 6 CE.[48]

5. Evidence of Anti-Roman Turmoil in the Prefects' Period (6–41 CE)

A further weakness in the refusal to accept the historicity of the Fourth Philosophy is that the claim that an ideology of anti-Roman resistance did not arise before the 60s (or, for that matter, before the 50s or 40s) assumes the reliability of the widespread view that an active and violent anti-imperialist stance was a late phenomenon, and that accordingly under Tiberius in Judaea "all was quiet."[49] This notion, however, is unwarranted.

---

[47] "The immediate impetus to this teaching was apparently the imposition of the first Roman census in A.D. 6, with its clear implication that the land now belonged to Rome" (Goodman, *The Ruling Class of Judaea*, 93).

[48] Even if Josephus overemphasized the role played by the Fourth Philosophy in all the subsequent manifestations of anti-Roman movements, Judas' influence does not seem to have vanished as if by magic. This is all the more understandable if his revolutionary demand had grown out of the heart of Jewish faith itself, such as Hengel (*Die Zeloten*, 102–3) argued; for an interesting reassessment of Hengel's view, see Roland Deines, "Gab es eine jüdische Freiheitsbewegung? Martin Hengels 'Zeloten' nach 50 Jahren," in Martin Hengel, *Die Zeloten*, 3rd revised edition, ed. R. Deines and C.-J. Thornton (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 403–48. It should be added that, although Galilee was not occupied by the Romans, it was under their control, which meant not only the intrusion of Roman administration, but also that of Greco-Roman culture. Several aspects of Antipas' rule must have been deeply offensive for nationalistic Jews and kept the discontent alive: the tetrarch called his new Sepphoris after an imperial name, Autocratoris, just as his father had done with Caesarea and Sebaste, and he also built a wholly new city to honour Augustus's successor, Tiberias, around 20 CE. Some scholars consider the zealots and sicarii as different wings of the Fourth Philosophy. See, e.g., Menahem Stern, "The Suicide of Eleazar Ben Yair and His Men at Masada, and the Fourth Philosophy," *Zion* 47 (1982): 367–97 [Hebrew]; Doron Mendels, "Pseudo-Philo's Biblical Antiquities, the 'Fourth Philosophy', and the Political Messianism of the First Century C.E.," in *The Messiah. Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*, ed. J. H. Charlesworth (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 261–75: 273.

[49] See, e.g., Jean Giblet, "Un mouvement de résistance armée au temps de Jésus?," *RTL* 5 (1974): 409–29; Paul W. Barnett, "Under Tiberius All Was Quiet," *NTS* 21 (1975): 564–71; Hernando Guevara, *Ambiente político del pueblo judío en tiempos de Jesús* (Madrid: Cristiandad, 1985), 259; Shaye J. D. Cohen, *From the Maccabees to the Mishnah*, 2nd ed.

Although there were indeed differences between, on the one hand, the extremely turbulent periods 4 BCE–6 CE and 44–66 CE, and, on the other, the period in which Judaea was under Roman prefects (6–41 CE),[50] to draw the inference that this last phase was peaceful and without any anti-Roman turmoil is an obvious *non sequitur*. As it has been recently argued, the current interpretation of Tacitus's sentence is rather simplistic and misleading.[51] Firstly, Tacitus seems only to mean that under Tiberius there were no revolts necessitating direct intervention by the Roman legate in Syria, backed by several legions.[52] Secondly, when read in context, the sentence does not seem to mean what it means at first glance: "Under Tiberius [all] was quiet; when then ordered by Gaius Caesar to set up a statue of him in the Temple *they rather resorted to arms* (*arma potius sumpsere*)—to which uprising the death of the emperor put an end." The readiness of Jews to resort to arms does not denote a particularly peaceful stance! Thirdly, Daniel Schwartz has recently argued that *sub Tiberio quies* may have had the rhetorical function of using Tiberius as a foil for Gaius Caligula. When a critical and contextualizing reading of Tacitus' statement which takes into account its generalizing and rhetorical nature is carried out, the claim that under the Roman prefects all was peaceful appears as unmistakably unfounded and naive.

Besides the traces in Josephus' works which enable us to suspect that under the prefects something must have not been in order,[53] some signifi-

---

(Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2006), 158; Raymond E. Brown, *The Death of the Messiah*, 2 vols. (New York: Doubleday, 1994) 1:678. Tacitus' sentence—"Sub Tiberio quies" (*Hist.* V 9.2)—is usually adduced as a supporting argument.

[50] This is a valid point in Guevara, *Ambiente politico*, 231–32; Brown, *Death of the Messiah*, 1:677–79.

[51] See Daniel R. Schwartz, *Reading the First Century: On Reading Josephus and Studying Jewish History of the First Century* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 134–36.

[52] See John Dominic Crossan, *The Historical Jesus: The Life of a Mediterranean Jewish Peasant* (New York: HarperSanFrancisco, 1991), 101–2. In fact, Martin Hengel rightly suggested that the eventual non-urban resistance is not included in Tacitus' statement: "Das taciteische 'sub Tiberio quies' wird den Kleinkrieg in der Wüste kaum miteinbezogen haben"; see Hengel, *Die Zeloten*, 344.

[53] It has been surmised that the fact that Valerius Gratus deposed four high priests in a relatively short period might indicate a lack of calm already before Pilate's arrival; Jonathan J. Price, *Jerusalem under Siege: The Collapse of the Jewish State, 66–70 C.E* (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 6. As remarked by Eduard Norden a century ago, Josephus portrays the Judean governorship of Pilate as a series of intense clashes between the prefect and the Jews; each one of the episodes of this narrative is depicted through the term θόρυβος (tumult), and he calls the aqueduct episode a στάσις (*A.J.* 18.62). The last incident of the

cant evidence of resistance and bloodshed is provided by the Gospels. Luke 13:1–3 mentions some people telling Jesus about "the Galileans whose blood Pilate mingled with their sacrifices." The most detailed treatment of this episode concluded that it was in all probability historical and that it reflects an actual event in which religiously-inspired Galileans were responsible for some tumult in Jerusalem and were immediately repressed by the prefect's troops.[54] There is every indication that the action carried out by these Galileans had a seditious character, such as it has been often posited in scholarship.[55]

Mark 15:7 and Luke 23:19 refer to an uprising (στάσις) in Jerusalem about the time of Jesus' arrival (or shortly before it), in which rebels (στασιασταί) had been jailed. Unlike the Gospel of Luke—which refers in a rather indeterminate way to "a certain uprising (στάσις τις)"—Mark uses for both substantives the definite article, which is usually interpreted in the sense that the episode was a well-known incident. If this reading is correct, it means that, while on a small scale and nipped in the bud, it must have been significant enough. Given, however, that it is not possible to determine which incident is referred to, some scholars have suggested that it could correspond to some episode mentioned by Josephus.[56] The sobering point is that, even if the στάσις mentioned in Mark could be identified with one of those episodes, unlike Josephus Mark and Luke assert that the

---

account deals with a violent conflict between Pilate and his Samaritan subjects, and we are told that the Samaritans were armed (ἐν ὅπλοις: *A.J.* 18.85–86). In fact, it has been suggested that some of the incidents portrayed as "peaceful" might have involved some bloodshed, and that this aspect could have been silenced by Josephus: his presentation of the violence as one-sided may reflect his desire to present the Jews as generally peaceable. See Joel Marcus, *Mark 8–16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 1029–30; see also Klaus-Stefan Krieger, *Geschichtsschreibung als Apologetik bei Flavius Josephus* (Tübingen: Francke, 1994), 26–27.

[54] Josef Blinzler, "Die Niedermetzelung von Galiläern durch Pilatus," *NovT* 2 (1957): 24–49, esp. 39. Blinzler surmised that these Galileans might have been a part of those enthusiasts who had wanted make Jesus king, according to John 6:15 (pp. 43–49).

[55] See, e.g., Marie-Joseph Lagrange, *Évangile selon Saint Luc*, 6th ed. (Paris: Gabalda, 1941), 379; Oscar Cullmann, *Der Staat im Neuen Testament* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1961), 9; Rudolf Bultmann, *Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*, 8th ed. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970), 57. "Those pilgrims whose blood Pontius Pilate mingled with their sacrifices must have been Galilean revolutionaries" (Geza Vermes, *Jesus the Jew: A Historian's Reading of the Gospels* [London: SCM, 2001], 30 [orig. ed. 1973]).

[56] See, e.g., Robert Eisler, *ΙΗΣΟΥΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ ΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣΑΣ: Die messianische Unabhängigkeitsbewegung vom Auftreten Johannes des Täufers bis zum Untergang Jakobs des Gerechten*, 2 vols. (Heidelberg: Carl Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1929–1930), 2:462–63.

disturbance involved a violent action with murderous result (φόνος). Although the identity of the victims is left unspecified, the use of the term στάσις allows us to surmise that the victim(s) of bloodshed was/were Roman soldiers, or perhaps Jews collaborating with Rome.

Furthermore, according to all Canonical Gospels, a group of men was crucified by Pontius Pilate at Passover,[57] and Mark and Matthew portray the other crucified along with Jesus as λησταί.[58] First and foremost, this means that the Gospels do not refer to an individual, but to a *collective* crucifixion,[59] and the core of these reports seems to be historically reliable.[60] As to the identity of these λησταί, several convergent arguments allow us to draw the conclusion that they were, in all probability, anti-Roman insurgents—not just "thieves," "robbers" or "bandits," as the current translations go. Firstly, according to the available evidence, when the Romans controlled Judaea from 63 BCE until the Jewish War, they only crucified seditionists or those thought to be sympathetic to them.[61] Secondly, λησταί is a term often used by Josephus to refer to Jewish rebels fighting Rome.[62] Thirdly, as we have already remarked, Mark and Luke contain references to a (presumably recent) στάσις and to the στασιασταί who had taken part therein, thereby revealing the existence of a seditious setting which perfectly matches the political interpretation of λησταί.[63] All this indicates that by far the most plausible reading is that the λησταί mentioned by Mark and Matthew were nationalist Jews who had taken part in some kind of insurgent action.

---

[57] As is well known, Passover was usually a time of trouble for the relations of the Jews with the Roman oppressor; see *B.J.* 2.10–11; 4.399–404; 5.98–105; *A.J.* 17.213–216; 18.29–31.

[58] See Mark 15:27; Matt 27:38, 44.

[59] It has been sometimes proposed that more men may have been crucified with the group. See, e.g., Simon Légasse, *Le procès de Jésus: L'histoire* (Paris: Cerf, 1994), 144.

[60] See Fernando Bermejo-Rubio, "(Why) Was Jesus the Galilean Crucified Alone? Solving a False Conundrum," *JSNT* 36 (2013): 127–54, esp. 129–30.

[61] See Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn, "Die Kreuzesstrafe während der frühen Kaiserzeit. Ihre Wirklichkeit und Wertung in der Umwelt des Urchristentums," *ANRW* 25.1 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1982), 648–793 (724).

[62] For references, see Hengel, *Die Zeloten*, 42–47. Of course, Josephus does also use the term to refer sometimes to robbers and brigands: "they carry nothing whatever with them on their journeys, except weapons for fear of brigands (διὰ δὴ τοὺς ληστάς)" (*B.J.* 2.125).

[63] John 18:40 applies the term ληστής to Barabbas, who according to Mark 15:7 was imprisoned "with the insurgents (μετὰ τῶν στασιαστῶν)." The fact that the term λησταί vanishes in the tradition—Luke 23:33 calls the men κακοῦργοι ("malefactors"), whilst the Fourth Gospel merely has "two others"—might be plausibly seen as another example of the de-politicizing process which is perceptible in the Gospels.

Not only some circumstantial evidence provided by the Gospels but also the central story of these writings hint at the existence of anti-Roman resistance under Pilate. Although much Gospel material has been tampered with in the tradition and Jesus the Galilean has suffered a process of de-politicisation aimed at presenting him as a figure unconnected to dirty and worldly matters, there is an important part of the evidence (the crucifixion, the *titulus crucis*, the mocking by the soldiers—assuming Jesus' kingly claims, the logion about "taking up the cross,"[64] the preaching of an impending "kingdom of God," the issue of the tribute,[65] the comparison of Jesus' movement with that of Theudas and the Egyptian in Acts …) pointing to his conflict with the Romans in the 20s or 30s.[66]

In the light of the former evidence, the collective crucifixion at Golgotha constitutes a somewhat obvious case of repression by the Roman prefect of a group of (Galilean?) nationalists having carried out some resistance activities.[67] Given the extent of the editing undergone by the gospel tradition, we cannot be sure of the specific kind of resistance carried

---

[64] Mark 8:34–35 par; Matt 10:38/Luke 14:27. "The implication of the words is that Jesus is aware of an irreconcilable hostility between the Kingdom for which He stands and the Empire represented by Pontius Pilate" (T. W. Manson, *The Sayings of Jesus* [London: SCM, 1949], 131).

[65] Although countless scholars have clung to a reading that views Jesus as approving the payment of the tribute (see now Förster, *Jesus und die Steuerfrage*), interpreting the words of Jesus in Mark 12 as shrewdly stating that nothing whatsoever is owed to Caesar makes the best sense of the episode. In addition, that Jesus did not endorse the payment is strongly supported by Luke 23:2, where witnesses accuse Jesus of forbidding the payment of taxes. For extended arguments see, e.g., Brandon, *Jesus and the Zealots*, 345–48; Hyam Maccoby, *Revolution in Judaea: Jesus & the Jewish Resistance* (London: Ocean, 1973), 132–33; Richard A. Horsley, *Jesus and the Spiral of Violence* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 306–17; William R. Herzog, *Jesus, Justice, and the Reign of God* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2000), 219–32.

[66] For a detailed argument, besides the classical works by Kautsky, Eisler, Brandon and Maccoby, see Fernando Bermejo-Rubio, "Jesus and the Anti-Roman Resistance. A Reassessment of the Arguments," *JSHJ* 12 (2014): 1–105. The convergence of Mark 8:34–35 and John 11:47–50 is sobering: both in a saying ascribed to Jesus himself and in words attributed to one of his alleged adversaries, a violent Roman intervention is envisaged as the unavoidable corollary of the unmolested activities of Jesus and his followers.

[67] Although the evangelists (and many modern scholars) do their best to prevent any association between the two λῃσταί executed at Golgotha and Jesus by presenting them in a very different light, the view that those two men had nothing to do with Jesus is exceedingly improbable from a historical standpoint. That they were possibly members of Jesus' movement has been sometimes advanced; see, e.g., Eisler, *ΙΗΣΟΥΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ ΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣΑΣ*, 2:525–26; Samuel G. F. Brandon, *The Trial of Jesus of Nazareth* (London: Batsford, 1968), 103; Maccoby, *Revolution in Judaea*, 218. For a detailed treatment, see Bermejo-Rubio, "(Why) Was Jesus the Galilean Crucified Alone?," *passim*.

out by these men. Whether or not they were hard-line anti-imperialists, at the very least some anti-Roman propaganda must have taken place, given the references to the opposition of payment of tribute[68] and to subversion.[69] In the light of the references to φόνος in Mark and Luke, to Jesus' injunction to buy swords in Luke 22:35–38 and to the use of swords in Gethsemane in all the Gospels,[70] it is very likely that some kind of violence was involved. Furthermore, we can be reasonably sure that the ringleader of these men, Jesus the Galilean—whom the Romans understandably crucified in their midst as "king of the Jews"—made royal claims,[71] which automatically turned him into a usurper and guilty of *crimen maiestatis imminutae*, in the specific modality of *adfectatio regni*.[72]

Although there is no need to assume that the Fourth Philosophy organized all the resistance to the Romans,[73] the simplest explanation for all

---

[68] If the interpretation of the authors cited in n. 65 is correct, Jesus assumed the ideology "no master but God"—which, according to McLaren, did not appear until the 60s. But even if this interpretation is rejected and one prefers to cling to the traditional view, the reports that Jesus is addressed with the issue of tribute—and the charge brought against him in Luke 23:2—imply that in the 20s/30s of the first century CE the issue of the tribute was already burning.

[69] According to Luke 23:2, 5, 14, the main charge leveled against Jesus was that of instigating sedition and "subverting our nation." The verbs used are ἀναστρέφω, διαστρέφω, ἀνασείω.

[70] Mark 14:47; Matt 26:51; Luke 22:38, 49–50; John 18:10–11. For the contention that the group of Jesus was armed, see recently Dale B. Martin, "Jesus in Jerusalem: Armed and Not Dangerous," *JSNT* 37 (2014): 3–24.

[71] Contrary to the view that this claim was a false accusation, it is historically probable that Jesus considered himself to be a king or God's viceroy. See Maccoby, *Revolution in Judaea*, 165–82; George Buchanan, *Jesus, the King and his Kingdom* (Macon: Mercer, 1984), *passim*; Dale C. Allison, *Constructing Jesus. Memory, Imagination, and History* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010), 233–40, 244–47.

[72] This aspect places Jesus in a series of men claiming kingship (Judas, Simon and Athronges after Herod's death; Menahem and Simon bar Giora in the Jewish War). Anyway, Jesus seems to have thought that the coming of the kingdom depended on God's will. I cannot enumerate here several significant coincidences between Jesus' ideological stance and that of Judas which allow us envisage Jesus' story as an episode in the resistance movement to Roman suzerainty, such as Samuel Brandon surmised: "There seems to be nothing in the principles … enunciated by Judas of Galilee, that we have definite evidence for knowing that Jesus would have repudiated" (Brandon, *Jesus and the Zealots*, 354–55).

[73] See, e.g., Morton Smith, "Zealots and Sicarii. Their Origins and Relation," *HTR* 64 (1971): 1–19 (18); "It is far from certain that all future revolutionary parties were just offshoots of Judas' movement. More likely, he had spread a sort of activist charisma that inspired each of the various parties struggling for the political and mystical freedom of Israel in turn; and they were the first to set an example" (Nikiprowetzky, "Josephus and the Revolutionary Parties," 226–27).

the above-mentioned evidence is that an ideology of active resistance was already at work in the Prefects' period. In fact, a further objection to the claim that such an ideology began only on the eve of the Jewish War lies in the fact that Josephus does not restrict his references to Judas to 6 CE, but establishes genealogical links between Judas and several other people who lived much nearer to his own times. Although McLaren refers to Judas as a man "having no named heritage,"[74] Josephus, writing *Bellum* in the 70s, says that two men crucified by Tiberius Julius Alexander ca. 46 CE were "sons (παῖδες) of Judas,"[75] and that Menahem and Eleazar were also his descendants.[76] If Judas had been nothing but Josephus' invention, would the historian have dared to establish such a number of genealogical relationships between him and people having lived just a few decades or years before the time of his writing—some of them having played such an important role in the war—thereby easily exposing himself to being de-bunked? I find this hard to believe, since it would have been too risky a business.

6. The Logic of the Scapegoat Mechanism

According to James McLaren, Judas and the so-called Fourth Philosophy fulfill an important function in Josephus' strategy of self-exoneration. The historian would have used both the (allegedly non-existent) figure and the movement as a means of diverting responsibility for the revolt from himself and his priestly colleagues. Therefore, time and again, they are labeled as Josephus' "scapegoats."[77]

Admittedly, as virtually every human being—and especially as people having the pressing need of exculpating themselves and blaming others for actions they are responsible of—Josephus was prone to use the scapegoat mechanism.[78] For instance, scholarship has paid attention to the specific emphasis placed by the historian upon the responsibility of Gessius Florus, the last Roman procurator before the war,[79] and it has been often

---

[74] "Constructing Judean History," 105; see also 106.

[75] *A.J.* 20.102.

[76] Menahem is presented as son (υἱός) of Judas (*B.J.* 2.433), whilst Eleazar is described as his ἀπόγονος (*B.J.* 7.253).

[77] "Constructing Judean History," 90, 102 n. 26, 104–8.

[78] After all, the label comes from the ritual of atonement for ancient Israel, described in Lev 16; see Lester L. Grabbe, "The Scapegoat Tradition: A Study in Early Jewish Interpretation," *JSJ* 18 (1987): 152–67.

[79] See *B.J.* 2.280–333; 2.420; *A.J.* 18.25; 20.252–258.

suggested that the historian exaggerated the negative role played by him. In fact the writer himself was well aware of the human tendency to lay responsibility upon others.[80]

Nevertheless, irrespective of whether Josephus was actively involved in the war and of whether he actually needed a scapegoat—let us accept it for the sake of the discussion—this would not imply that he merely concocted Judas and his movement. In fact, the victimary mechanism is all the more effective and credible when the figure(s) chosen as scapegoat(s) is/are known to be real. What is the advantage of blaming someone for something if nobody has ever heard about that person (and/or movement), and if, accordingly, anyone could easily call into question the reliability of that attribution? Any questioning of Judas' existence—a real possibility that Josephus must have weighed up, especially in the light of his awareness of the existence of possible alternative accounts—would have utterly shattered Josephus' apologetic attempt into pieces. It seems to be by far more likely that Josephus used an actual person (having a well-known ideology) to turn him into a scapegoat of all the evils coming from the failure of the war by making all future revolutionary parties just offshoots of his movement.[81] This would be a much more reasonable procedure, because the logic of the victimary mechanism is all the more effective if the target does indeed exist.

Therefore, even if Josephus needed to exonerate himself and his fellow aristocratic priests through a scapegoat—something not at all implausible—the blunt concoction of the figure chosen as scapegoat would have been a rather clumsy and dangerous move. Incidentally, although Josephus often distorted the personality and character of his opponents and enemies, they were anyway real people, and there is always some historical kernel in what he told about them.[82] The fact that Josephus does not

---

[80] See e.g. *B.J.* 2.558: "Cestius dispatched Saul and his companions, at their request, to Nero in Achaia, to inform him of the straits to which they were reduced, and to lay upon Florus the responsibility for the war (τὰς αἰτίας τοῦ πολέμου τρέψοντας εἰς Φλῶρον); for he hoped, by exciting Nero's resentment against Florus, to diminish the risk to himself."

[81] "I suggest that … Josephus' only attempt to mislead is in the claim that the philosophy was of great importance in fostering the dissension which led to the revolt … Josephus tends, when he wishes to mislead, to mislead in this way, with lies not about the facts but about their interpretation" (Goodman, *The Ruling Class of Judaea*, 96).

[82] "He was often besmirching those whom he hated (John of Gischala; Justus; Menahem; etc.) but I do not know about anyone who was constructed by him" (Rappaport, "Who Were the Sicarii?," 332).

seem to have fabricated imaginary personalities elsewhere in *Antiquitates* or in his other writings make McLaren's claim exceedingly implausible.

7. Conclusions and Further Reflections

It is a well known fact that Josephus was not at all a dispassionate historian, and that there are biases, heavy interests and one-sidedness modelling his accounts. There is accordingly an understandable and ongoing debate among scholars as to the degree of historical trustworthiness of his narrative, which is obviously not always reliable. Nevertheless, the claim that Judas the Galilean and the Fourth Philosophy are nothing but Josephus' fabrication is an exceedingly bold contention: Josephus would not only have carried out a major rewriting of the events, but also concocted a whole trend of Jewish thought and practice. It is hard to believe that Josephus dared to do so, especially in the light of his awareness of the existence of possible alternative views, which might have unmasked his inventions as pure and simple lies.

In this article I have argued that the initial scepticism towards that contention is fully justified. I have fleshed out that scepticism by setting forth a whole set of arguments which allows us to infer that the traditional view according to which the core of Josephus' account is trustworthy is by far the most plausible one. The idea that Josephus simply invented Judas and the Fourth Philosophy relies instead on several hypotheses, each one of which is doubtful, not to say untenable.

We could go a step further and surmise a possible explanation for the emergence of this idea in McLaren's article. When otherwise careful scholars frame their historical theories around fragile hypotheses that cannot be supported from the sources we may well suspect that there is ideology at work on one level or another. It has been pointed out that quite a few works of scholars denying the existence of anti-Roman resistance under Tiberius seem to have a hidden agenda, namely, that of undermining the thesis that Jesus should be understood as an anti-Roman rebel: if that phenomenon did not exist at that time, every attempt to establish any association of this Galilean preacher with it lacks any basis, and should be readily ruled out.[83] It is likewise possible to surmise that the denial of the existence of the Fourth Philosophy might—however unconsciously—be

---

[83] See Schwartz, *Reading the First Century*, 136 n. 68 (referring to Paul Barnett); Deines, "Gab es eine jüdische Freiheitsbewegung?," 411 n. 18 (referring to Raymond Brown).

reflecting a similar agenda.[84] After all, it was in the last years of Augustus' rule that Jesus must have undergone the transition to adulthood.

Be that as it may, unlike what has been claimed by some scholars—namely, that Josephus' apologetic has wholly constructed Judas and the Fourth Philosophy—we can still reasonably believe that both the man and the movement did indeed exist, and that the deposition of Archelaus and the subjection of Judaea to direct Roman rule was the most likely moment in which an ideology of anti-Roman resistance arose. Even if we should not credulously believe every point of Josephus' presentation—such as his attempt to turn these realities into the origin of all future evils—his accounts of Judas and the Fourth Philosophy can be deemed as basically reliable. For the inventiveness of the shrewd and skillful Yosef ben Matityahu there were, after all, some limits.

---

[84] In fact, when McLaren tackles elsewhere the trial of Jesus, he neglects the abundant Gospel material betraying Jesus' anti-Roman stance, and simply assumes that his execution was instigated by a group of influential Jews; see, e.g., James S. McLaren, *Power and Politics in Palestine: The Jews and the Governing of their Land 100 BC – AD 70* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991), 88–101. I find exceedingly unfortunate that many scholars go on taking for granted the reliability of the core of the Gospel narratives concerning the responsibility of Jewish authorities in Jesus' arrest and/or attributing mean motives to them. More than a century ago, the Protestant exegete Maurice Goguel radically called into question those narratives, by unveiling in the Passion accounts several traces of an original version according to which the responsible for the arrest would have been the Romans; see Maurice Goguel, "Juifs et Romains dans l'histoire de la Passion," *RHR* 62 (1910): 165–182, 295–322. Furthermore, a plausible argument has been recently made to explain the composition of several key points of the synoptic narratives, particularly the Jewish identity of those who arrest Jesus and the latter's trial before the Sanhedrin, as reflecting episodes which took place several decades later, on the eve of the First Jewish War; see Jonathan Bourgel, "Les récits synoptiques de la Passion préservent-ils une couche narrative composée à la veille de la Grande Révolte Juive?," *NTS* 58 (2012): 503–21.

Jesus the Angry Exorcist:
On the Connection Between Healing and Strong Emotions in the Gospels

TORSTEN LÖFSTEDT
Linnaeus University, Växjö

Exorcism

Exorcism has been defined by Twelftree as "forcing an unwanted spiritual entity to leave its host."[1] Normally it is by addressing the spiritual entity in question and by appealing to stronger powers that the unwanted spiritual entities are driven out.[2] Exorcistic utterances are a form of performative speech; they are equivalent to incantations in other religious systems.[3] The words used in exorcism are thought to be able to effect a change. Exorcism is a drama with one visible character (the exorcist) and at least one invisible character (the demon), and the possessed person himself as the stage. Some form of speech is normally required to allow the audience to follow the course of events.[4] In some cases both the exorcist and the possessing demon speak. In other cases only the exorcist speaks.

Of the four Gospels, Mark gives greatest space to exorcisms. Mark records four accounts of exorcism: the man with an unclean spirit in the synagogue (1:21–28); the Gerasene demoniac (5:1–20); the Syrophoenician woman's daughter (7:24–30); and the healing of boy with unclean spirit (9:14–29). He also mentions an exorcist who, although he was not one of the disciples, cast out demons in Jesus' name (9:38–41). He also makes other references to Jesus or his disciples casting out demons (1:34, 39;

---

[1] Twelftree 2011, 48–49. Thanks to my colleague Jonas Svensson and to Thomas Kazen, Rikard Roitto and others at the Nordic New Testament Conference in Aarhus 2015 for valuable feedback.

[2] Compare Daunton-Fear's summary of exorcistic procedure in the Greek Magic papyri (2011, 73).

[3] As the incantations in the magical papyri show, the two genres are closely connected (Twelftree 2011, 49).

[4] Witmer (2012, 111) notes: "in virtually all the Gospel accounts connected with exorcism, crowds are present."

3:15, 22). Matthew gives less space to exorcism in general than did Mark.[5] There is no parallel to Mark 1:21–26 in Matthew, and Matthew's account of the Gerasene demoniac (Matt 8:28–34) is abbreviated (here Jesus does not ask the demon to identify himself, for example). Matthew's account of the healing of the boy with an unclean spirit is abridged (Matt 17:14–20), and he does not include the passage about the anonymous exorcist. For Matthew, exorcism may have been problematic.[6] Luke 4:33–36 provides a parallel to Mark 1:21–26, and he includes the story of the Gerasene demoniac (Luke 8:26–39), and an abridged version of the healing of the boy with an unclean spirit (Luke 9:37–43), but he does not include a parallel to the healing of the Syrophoenician woman's daughter. John notably does not include any references to Jesus performing exorcisms. The exorcistic accounts in Mark are generally longer and in them Jesus shows more emotion than in the other Gospels, and it is on them I will focus.

Anger in Connection with Exorcisms

Three of the exorcisms that Mark tells of are rather dramatic, while in the fourth one the departure of the demon occurs off stage (Mark 7:24–30). Mark notes that Jesus generally forbad the demons to speak (3:11–12), which suggests that they usually attempted to speak. Two of the exorcism reports tell of battles of words between Jesus and the demon, namely the account of the man with the unclean spirit in the synagogue (1:21–28) and the story of the Gerasene demoniac (5:1–20).

In the beginning of his Gospel Mark relates Jesus' encounter in a synagogue with a man with an unclean spirit. The man cries out,

> "What have you to do with us, Jesus of Nazareth? Have you come to destroy us? I know who you are, the Holy One of God." But Jesus rebuked (ἐπετίμησεν) him, saying, "Be silent and come out of him!" And the unclean spirit, convulsing him and crying with a loud voice, came out of him. (Mark 1:24–26, NRSV)

---

[5] Twelftree (1993, 60): "Matthew … is decidedly reticent about the exorcism stories of Jesus" and "prunes the Markan accounts."

[6] Koskenniemi (2013, 93–97) suggests that Matthew did not want his readers to practice exorcism and removed many of the details regarding how they were performed. Twelftree (2011, 62–63) suggests, "it seems that … Matthew considered that peripatetic ecstatic Christians, whose ministry involved exorcism, were 'savaging' his community (Matt 7:15)." On exorcists who claimed to follow Jesus but are rejected at judgment day, see Matt 7:21–23. See Witmer 2012.

Mark does not specify that Jesus was angry. But his anger is readily inferred; when we hear that the unclean spirit talked back, we naturally imagine that Jesus was forceful in his reply, as may be implied by the verb ἐπετίμησεν, "rebuked" in Mark 1:25, which is also used of Jesus' rebuking Peter (Mark 8:33). Significantly Jesus addresses the spirit the same way he addresses the man he had healed from leprosy a little later that same chapter, forbidding him from talking and sending him out (ἐξέβαλεν) (Mark 1:43). I will return to this point.

The most dramatic exorcism in Mark is the story of the Gerasene demoniac. Here Jesus engages in a debate or an "exorcistic contest" with the demoniac's demon.[7] After Jesus has said, "Come out of the man, you unclean spirit,"[8] the demoniac shouts, "What do you want with me, Jesus, Son of the Most High God? I adjure you by God, do not torment me!" (Mark 5:7, NRSV). The verb translated "adjure," ὁρκίζω, is also used in Acts 19:13, in the context of an exorcism; "I adjure you by the Jesus whom Paul proclaims" (NRSV). Gundry remarks regarding the Markan passage, "Here the unclean spirit tries, so to speak, to exorcise Jesus out of exorcising it."[9] Judging by what he says and how he says it (shouting at the top of his voice), the possessed man (or his unclean spirit) is clearly angry. Mark does not specify whether Jesus' responses were delivered in normal conversational tone, but in my reading they sound authoritative, at the very least.

Mark's account of a man asking Jesus to help them exorcise a mute spirit from his son is intriguing (9:14–29). This account does not include a verbal battle; considering that the unclean spirit in question is described as a mute spirit that is understandable. The spirit is nevertheless portrayed as an agent. The father of the boy with a mute spirit speaks of the spirit throwing him into fire or water "to destroy him" (Mark 9:22); in the view of the father at least, the spirit has evil intentions. In this account Jesus comes across as angry, even before he has addressed the spirit. (Jesus answered them "You faithless generation, how much longer must I be

---

[7] The drama of exorcism is even more apparent in the account of the unsuccessful exorcism performed by the sons of Sceva (Acts 19:11–20). There are other examples of exorcistic dialogue from this period, for example in the Testament of Solomon, quoted in Yarbro Collins 2007, 168, and in *PGM* 8:13 (Twelftree 1993, 66). Gundry uses the phrase "exorcistic contest."

[8] Fitzmyer (1981, 738) argues that the imperfect is used as an inceptive aorist; he translates the corresponding passage in Luke 8:29, "Jesus was about to charge the unclean spirit …"

[9] Gundry 1993, 250. See also ἐξορκίζω (Matt 26:63).

among you? How much longer must I put up with you? Bring him to me"—Mark 9:19.) Jesus' anger sounds excessive,[10] and commentators do not agree on who its target is—the scribes (9:14), the crowd in general, Jesus' disciples, or the father.[11] Jesus' reply to the desperate father's plea, "if you are able to do anything, have pity on us and help us!" comes across as highly insensitive given the circumstances: "If you are able!— All things can be done for the one who believes" (Mark 9:23). Matthew and Luke tune down Jesus' anger. In their accounts of the healing of the boy with the mute spirit, both Matthew and Luke record Jesus' angry words "You faithless and perverse generation" (adding the adjective "perverse": Luke 9:41, Matt 17:17), but the father's second plea and Jesus' seemingly rude answer are dropped; there is no counterpart to Mark 9:23 in Matthew and Luke.

I suggest in regard to the accounts of the healing of the boy with an unclean spirit that Mark records the dialogue and its circumstances in a way that might more accurately reflect what actually happened than the later evangelists. I think it possible that this rudeness that Jesus exhibits comes from the emotional charge that he is building up (consciously or not) in anticipation of the exorcism. I suggest that Jesus in fact usually came across as angry during exorcisms. If Jesus actually showed as strong emotions as he is said to have done in these passages, it is something that those present are likely to have remembered—and it may have made these events especially memorable.[12] Anger in connection to exorcisms is not unique to Jesus. In the single exorcism recorded in Acts, Paul is "very much annoyed" (διαπονηθείς) when he turns to the spirit and says, "I order you in the name of Jesus Christ to come out of her" (Acts 16:18). Whether he is angry at the girl or the prophetic spirit is not specified, but once again we see that anger coupled with personal address is a recurring ingredient in exorcism.

Exorcisms are dramatic performances. The possessed person often behaves aggressively in a way that arouses fear among onlookers while the exorcist mirrors and externalizes the emotions or feelings of the possessed person. At the completion of an exorcism, the patient is typically marked-

---

[10] The phrase "you faithless generation" may be an allusion to Deut 32:20.

[11] Yarbro Collins 2007, 437. In Gundry's view (1993, 489), the term "unbelieving generation" "does not take in the disciples." Writing of the parallel passage in Luke (9:41), Green (1997, 388) is of the opinion that Jesus' words are directed at his disciples who had been unsuccessful at driving out the evil spirit.

[12] Cf. Whitehouse 2004 regarding "episodic memories" or "flashbulb memories."

ly calm.[13] Sometimes additional steps are taken to show that the exorcism was successful. In his account of Eleazar the exorcist, Josephus writes, "Then, wishing to convince the bystanders and prove to them that he had this power, Eleazar placed a cup or foot-basin full of water a little way off and commanded the demon, as it went out of the man, to overturn it and make known to the spectators that he had left the man."[14]

We encounter similar drama in exorcisms today. Austnaberg describes exorcism as practiced in a Lutheran congregation in Madagascar thus:

> The atmosphere during expulsion of demons is very tense. All the shep-
> herds walk around shouting to the evil spirits with a loud voice. They are
> gesticulating all the time, as though they are chasing an invisible enemy.
> The invisible powers in the room are the spirits of darkness and their lead-
> ers, which may cause fear since nobody knows where they will strike next.
> Sometimes the patients scream and shout loudly and some act erratically.
> They may stand up, but the shepherds hold them tight and make them sit
> down again. Sometimes this looks like a real fight and it is difficult for the
> congregation not to watch carefully.[15]

In some Russian Pentecostal and Orthodox circles, the exorcistic contexts with which I am most familiar, the exorcist likewise comes across as angry. In fact, writing about exorcism in his handbook *The Orthodox Pastor*, Russian Orthodox Archbishop John Shahovskoy specifies that anger is necessary for a successful exorcism: "An exorcism pronounced firmly, courageously, from the heart, with complete faith and righteous indignation against the demons, *always* has effect …"[16] While this Orthodox practice is surely based in part on the New Testament texts, I think it also reflects a wider practice and can be used to explain those texts. Successful exorcism hinges on the emotional involvement of the exorcist;[17] the stronger the emotions shown, the more engaged the healer's spirit.[18]

---

[13] Cf. Davis 1977, 215: "Whatever else, exorcism releases emotion." For a vivid description of the exorcism of a Bedouin man, see Al-Krenawi & Graham 1997, 217.

[14] Josephus *Ant.* 8.45–48 (also quoted in Witmer 2012, 45–46; Yarbro Collins 2007, 166).

[15] Austnaberg 2008, 127.

[16] Shahovskoy 2008, 78.

[17] In describing the practice of exorcism in the Church of England, Milner (2000, 267) notes "passion is required, especially in major exorcisms."

[18] On the expectation of the Holy Spirit speaking spontaneously through people in extraordinary situations, see also Mark 13:11: "When they bring you to trial and hand you over, do not worry beforehand about what you are to say; but say whatever is given you at that

In the New Testament, the one doing the exorcising allows the Holy Spirit to work through him—it is by the Holy Spirit that demons are cast out, not by force of the disciples' personality; perhaps the anger that some find so uncharacteristic of Jesus was interpreted as the expression of the Holy Spirit within him. Davies characterizes exorcism as "a drama played by two alter-personae, each recognizing the alter-persona state of the other."[19] The healer is possessed by the Holy Spirit, the one in need of deliverance is possessed by a demon.

In light of the view that demons were malevolent agents, Jesus' anger in the context of performing exorcisms is understandable. Jesus comes across as angry in other connections as well, however. Many interpreters assume that for Jesus to be angry he must always have a concrete object for his anger. On this basis some have suggested that malevolent moral agents were thought to lie behind all phenomena against which Jesus expressed anger. Thus, some argue that not only possession but also diseases and storms were thought to be demonic in origin. I will examine some of these passages now.

Anger in Connection with Healings

The Gospels do not always make a clear distinction between exorcism and healing. Mark gives the impression that Jesus showed anger in connection with healings just as he did in connection with exorcisms. In a passage in Mark's Gospel, telling of Jesus healing a leper, manuscripts differ as to whether he was moved by anger or pity (Mark 1:41), and members of the UBS editorial committee disagreed as to which is the original reading. While the reading saying that Jesus was compassionate (σπλαγχνισθείς) is much better attested, the one saying he was angry (ὀργισθείς) is the more difficult reading, and therefore judged by many to be original.[20] On the

---

[19] Davies 1995, 99.

[20] σπλαγχνισθείς (א, A, B, C …), ὀργισθείς (D, it) (Metzger 1998, 65). In the parallel texts in Matthew (8:3) and Luke (5:13) Jesus' emotional state is not described at all. If the Markan text on which Matthew and Luke based their accounts specified that Jesus was angry, they may have dropped this participle because they found it offensive (Ehrman 2006, 125); an early copyist of Mark would have replaced the same word with σπλαγχνισθείς for the same reason. For a listing of commentators favoring the reading ὀργισθείς see Williams

time, for it is not you who speak, but the Holy Spirit." This is exemplified in Stephen's speech in Acts 7.

other hand, some have found it difficult to believe that Mark could have written that Jesus was angry, as there is no obvious target for his anger. It is hard to believe he was angry at the leper.[21] Some have suggested he was angry at the demon that caused the leprosy. Gundry rejects this interpretation arguing, "we can hardly think of the emotionally charged exorcism of a leprous demon"[22] and opts for the better attested reading σπλαγχνισθείς ("taking compassion"). But we do not have to imagine that Jesus' anger was directed at a demon. It could equally well have been directed at the leprosy itself. I suggest strong emotions were necessary to effect the healing, regardless of whether its cause was thought to be demonic or not.[23]

It has been noted that the language a couple verses later in the same story has an exorcistic flavour, even though the exorcism itself has been completed: "After sternly warning him (ἐμβριμησάμενος) he sent him away (ἐξέβαλεν) at once, saying to him, 'See that you say nothing to anyone; but go, show yourself to the priest, and offer for your cleansing what Moses commanded, as a testimony to them'" (Mark 1:43–44). The verb translated "sternly warning" may also be rendered "upbraiding" (so Yarbro Collins), and expresses anger, an emotion also encountered in connection with Jesus' healings in John's Gospel (see below), while the verb translated "sent him away" is more literally "threw him out," and is also used of driving out spirits in the context of exorcisms.[24] Bonner argues that the participle ἐμβριμησάμενος is appropriate for describing the emotional state before conducting an exorcism, and "has been brought into vs. 43 [from verse 41] by some textual confusion."[25] This explanation is rather convoluted and seems not to have won favor.[26] I agree with commentators who feel that a healer ought to focus his anger on the disease, not on the patient, but for Mark Jesus' anger may not have been problematic.

(2012, 1). Williams argues in support of the reading σπλαγχνισθείς on the basis of a supposed graphic similarity between the two words; I am not persuaded.

[21] Voorwinde (2011, 72) argues that Jesus is angry because he knows that the man will disobey him. I think this is reading too much into the text.

[22] Gundry 1993, 103.

[23] Other explanations for Jesus' anger have been given. Ehrman (2006, 138) argues, "Jesus is angered when anyone questions his authority or ability or heal – or his desire to heal." So too Spencer (2014, 107): "the leper chiefly provokes Jesus' ire by belittling his *desire* or *will* to heal."

[24] Bonner 1927; Ehrman 2006, 133.

[25] Bonner 1927, 181.

[26] Yarbro Collins (2007, 179) argues that "the pneumatic excitement of the healer should play a role before or during the healing, not afterward" and rejects Bonner's thesis.

Jesus often comes across as angry or irritated in Mark's Gospel and as Ehrman has noted it is almost always in connection with a healing of some kind.[27] There is no reason to assume that Jesus' heightened emotion must have the same cause each time,[28] but in connection with exorcisms and healings his anger seems readily explainable, as we shall see.

On his way to healing Jairus's daughter, a woman believing she would be healed of hemorrhages if she could but touch Jesus' cloak, does so, and is healed. "Immediately aware that power had gone forth from him," Jesus asks, "Who touched my clothes?" (Mark 5:30) and again, "Who touched me?" (Mark 5:31). The woman who was healed "came in fear and trembling" and fell down before Jesus (Mark 5:33), evidently afraid. I suggest she is afraid not because she had been considered ritually impure and was afraid she would be charged with spreading impurity (an explanation rejected by Shaye Cohen),[29] but because Jesus was obviously powerful and he came across as angry. I suggest he came across as angry not because his willingness or ability to heal had been questioned—that was precisely not the case here—but because he was caught up in the emotional build-up needed for the successful healing of Jairus's daughter.

One of the more curious displays of anger in Mark's Gospel is the account in which Jesus rebuked (ἐπετίμησεν) a storm (Mark 4:39) in the same way as he rebuked Peter (Mark 8:33), and told the sea to be silent (σιώπα), in the same way the blind Bartimaeus had been told to be quiet (Mark 10:48). We need not read too much into Jesus' addressing the wind and sea; we do not have to conclude that he considered the storm a moral agent.[30] Nor did he see it as a supernatural being.[31] The disciples did marvel that even the wind and the sea obeyed him (Mark 4:41) but this does

---

[27] Ehrman (2006, 130): "Jesus gets angry on several occasions in Mark's Gospel; what is most interesting to note is that each account involves Jesus' ability to perform miraculous deeds of healing."

[28] Mark 3:5 it is specified that Jesus is angry at the Pharisees because of their hardness of heart.

[29] Yarbro Collins 2007, 284.

[30] But see Twelftree 2011, 53: "Jesus does not rebuke sickness, reserving exorcistic language and technique for the removal of demons, nor does he show any interest in exorcising buildings or places."

[31] Contrary to Yarbro Collins 2007, 261: "The reason why the wind and sea are treated like demons is that demons or evil spirits were thought to be responsible for inclement weather." The fact that the Greek word πνεῦμα can mean both wind and spirit is not relevant, contra Kee (1968, 244), as we cannot assume that the two meanings normally co-occur (John 3:8 is an exceptional word play). And more to the point, the word πνεῦμα is not used in this passage in Mark.

not have to mean that the wind and sea were normally seen as person-like entities by Jews in Jesus' time, contrary to Malina and Rohrbaugh.[32] As Gundry writes, "Jesus' personification of the wind and the sea need not demonize them any more than his personification of the barren fig tree [Mark 11:14] will demonize it."[33] I am not aware of any compelling evidence that Jews in Jesus' time believed that forces of nature were animate.[34] In fact, had the wind and sea normally been seen as person-like entities, the disciples would presumably have wondered less at Jesus ability to command them to silence. The passage is saying something about the power of Jesus' word, not about the animacy of nature.[35] It is comparable to the first creation account in Genesis: The conviction that God spoke the world into being says more about the power of God's word than about the previously non-existent world's ability to listen. This passage in Mark clearly echoes Psalm 106:7–9 where a sea is also rebuked: [36]

> Our ancestors, when they were in Egypt, did not consider your wonderful works; they did not remember the abundance of your steadfast love, but rebelled against the Most High at the Red Sea. Yet he saved them for his name's sake, so that he might make known his mighty power. He rebuked [LXX: ἐπετίμησεν] the Red Sea, and it became dry …

The point is that like God saved the Israelites, so too Jesus saves those who call out to him. The point is not that the sea is demonic, but that there is something divine about Jesus.

Jesus' anger is tuned down some in the other Gospels, but we find traces of it in connection with healings there too. In Luke's Gospel Jesus rebukes (ἐπετίμησεν) the fever that troubled Simon's mother-in-law (Luke

---

[32] Malina (1999, 359): "as Malina and Rohrbaugh note (1998), the sea is an animate being, essentially different entity from water ... In the world of Jesus, the wind and the sea, fevers and unclean spirits, were person-like entities who could be spoken to and who might obey or not." Cf. Boyd (1997, 207): "Behind this storm Jesus perceived a demonic power."

[33] Gundry 1993, 240.

[34] The examples given in commentaries refer to angels, not the forces of nature per se. Cf. Gundry 1993, 240. In addition to references from Greek sources, Yarbro Collins (2007, 261) refers to Jewish texts including Jub. 2:2, "The angels of the spirit of the winds"; 1 En. 69:22; 60:16, "the wind of the sea is male and strong." She also notes the reference to a sea spirit in the Testament of Solomon.

[35] So also Calvin on Matt 8:26 and parallels: "Mark relates also the words of Christ, by which addressing the sea, he enjoins silence, that is stillness, not that the lake had any perception, but to show that the power of his voice reached the elements, which were devoid of feeling."

[36] So also Yarbro Collins 2007, 262.

4:39). In Mark's account of this healing, Jesus simply took Simon's moth-er-in-law "by the hand and lifted her up. Then the fever left her" (Mark 1:31). Matthew likewise says nothing about Jesus rebuking the fever (Matt 8:14–16). Thomas finds it likely that Luke considered the fever "demonically induced,"[37] but that is not a necessary conclusion. Twelftree suggests more cautiously that "Luke is blurring the distinction between demon possession and other kinds of sickness, suggesting that all sickness has a demonic dimension or is evil, even though not thought to be caused by a demon."[38]

In John's Gospel, when Jesus hears that his friend Lazarus has died he is also described as speaking in anger (ἐνεβριμήσατο τῷ πνεύματι, 11:33; ἐμβριμώμενος ἐν ἑαυτῷ, 11:38), although many translations choose other expressions (NIV: "deeply moved," NRSV: "greatly disturbed in spir-it").[39] The same verb is used in Mark 1:43 (see discussion above) and in Mark 14:5, of the disciples rebuking a woman for wasting ointment. Mor-ris notes regarding the verb used in John 11:33 "when used of people it usually denotes anger," but he rejects this translation here because, "be-fore we can accept anger as the meaning we must have some indication of the object of the anger and so far this does not seem to be forthcoming."[40] It is questionable whether other translations are in fact possible, however. Schnackenburg writes, "The word ἐμβριμᾶσθαι … indicates an outburst of anger, and any attempt to reinterpret it in terms of an internal emotional upset caused by grief, pain or sympathy is illegitimate."[41] Jesus' anger does not have to present an insurmountable problem, however, if height-ened emotional states were considered normal in conducting healings and exorcisms. We do not have to suppose that Jesus was angry at Lazarus, his sisters, their neighbors, a demon, or death itself. He was angry because he was getting ready for spiritual conflict. Warfield writes, "his soul is held

---

[37] Thomas 2010, 299.

[38] Twelftree 2011, 61–62. See also Green 1997, 225 writing about this verse: "Even if 'fever is often regarded as a demon' (Theissen, *Miracle Stories*, 86), Luke does not seem to think along these lines. After all, it is not only here but throughout his narrative that 'healing' is cast in terms of release from oppression of the devil."

[39] Bonner 1927, 176 translates John 11:33: "The Spirit set him in a frenzy and he threw himself into disorder." Danker (2000, 322) lists three meanings: "1) to insist on someth[ing] sternly …; 2) … scold, censure; 3) to feel strongly about someth[ing], be deeply moved."

[40] Morris 1995, 493. Brown (1975, 435): "he was angry because he found himself face to face with the realm of Satan which, in this instance, was represented by death."

[41] Schnackenburg 1980, 335. See also Beasley-Murray 1987, 192–94, and Lindars 1992.

by rage: and he advances to the tomb, in Calvin's words … 'as a champion who prepares for conflict'."[42] Bonner is on the right track when he writes of the verbs βριμάομαι and ἐμβριμάομαι, "when used of the behavior of a prophet, magician, or wonder-worker, there is a strong presumption that they imply frenzy or raving." He explains, "The narrator doubtless considered such a manifestation of seizure by the Spirit as a natural preliminary to so portentous a miracle."[43] Bonner's suggestion seems not to have won favor, perhaps because interpreters do not wish to think of Jesus behaving in this manner.

One way for the healer to give the Holy Spirit easier access to himself or herself is by entering a state of heightened emotion. I suggested that this is what Jesus did in connection with exorcism and healings, and this is one reason he often came across as angry in these situations. Mark may thus be historically accurate in describing Jesus as seemingly harsh in sending away the leper he had healed. Perhaps Jesus was in such a heightened emotional state during the healing that he could not turn off his feelings immediately after the healing; he was still affected by the adrenalin rush. I have found clearest support for my contention that exorcisms are emotional affairs in ethnographical descriptions of exorcism from our time rather than from New Testament times. If we look at accounts of exorcisms and healings from around the time that the New Testament was written, the evidence is not as good. Josephus offers the only Jewish account of an exorcism from this time, that of the Jewish exorcist Eleazar referred to above. Although the exorcism has theatrical elements, Josephus makes no reference to the emotional state of the exorcist (*Ant.* 8.45–48). This does not mean that strong emotions were not a part of the exorcism, however. There is reason to believe that Josephus has chosen not to mention more emotional parts of Eleazar's procedure as he felt that they would give his readers a negative view of Jews. We know that elsewhere Josephus removed references to strong emotions that may seem unbecoming for a respectable person. In his retelling of the prophet's deeds, Josephus removes references to Elisha's anger and rudeness; this suggests that he has been colored by values of the Hellenistic learned classes and found such behavior inappropriate for someone supposed to be exemplary.[44]

---

[42] Warfield 1912, 61.
[43] Bonner 1927, 176.
[44] Cf. Feldman 1994, 12–13.

As was mentioned, Matthew and Luke tend to downplay Jesus' anger. Perhaps they shared Josephus' feeling that excessive emotion was unbecoming of an exemplary leader. One may ask why Mark included references to Jesus' strong emotions in his account; why did he not consider it problematic? Mark in general shows greater interest in the details of the exorcisms than the other evangelists, and might have included the description of Jesus' emotions for this reason. But Mark probably also found that Jesus' seeming rudeness served to identify him more closely as a prophet in the spirit of Elisha; the author of 2 Kings portrays Elisha as being rude and expressing strong emotions such as anger in several parts of his narrative (2 Kgs 2:23–24; 3:13; 5:27, 13:15–19). Mark patterns Jesus on Elisha in other respects as well; compare for example the feeding of the five thousand (Mark 6:34–44) and Elisha's miraculous multiplication of food (2 Kgs 4:42–44). Similarly in John's Gospel Jesus' seemingly rude response to his mother (John 2:4) is patterned on 2 Kgs 3:13.[45] In Mark, Jesus' anger identifies him as the heir to Elisha.

Conclusion

I suggest that in portraying Jesus as being rude or angry in connection with exorcisms and healings the Gospels may be historically accurate; for an exorcism to be successful the exorcist was expected to be emotionally involved. This need not mean that the exorcist believed malevolent agents were always involved in the maladies addressed. While Matthew and Luke downplay Jesus' strong emotions in these accounts, they serve to make the picture of Jesus as a prophet like Elisha clearer in Mark's Gospel.

Works Consulted

Al-Krenawi, Alean, and John R. Graham. 1997. "Spirit Possession and Exorcism in the Treatment of a Bedouin Psychiatric Patient." *Clinical Social Work Journal* 25: 211–22.

Austnaberg, Hans. 2008. *Shepherds and Demons: A Study of Exorcisms as Practiced and Understood by Shepherds in the Malagasy Lutheran Church*. New York: Peter Lang.

Beasley-Murray, George R. 1987. *John*. WBC 36. Waco: Word.

---

[45] Klink 2005.

Bonner, Campbell. 1927. "Traces of Thaumaturgic Technique in the Miracles." *HTR* 20: 171–81.

Boyd, Gregory A. 1997. *God at War: The Bible and Spiritual Conflict*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity.

Brown, Raymond E. 1975. *The Gospel according to John (i–xii).* AB 29. New York: Doubleday.

Calvin, John. 1845–1850. *Commentary on a Harmony of the Evangelists, Matthew, Mark and Luke*. Translated by W. Pringle. Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society. Available at www.sacred-texts.com

Danker, Frederick W., ed. 2000. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other early Christian literature*. Third edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Daunton-Fear, Andrew. 2011. "Deliverance and Exorcism in the Early Church." Pages 69–85 in *Exorcism and Deliverance*. Edited by William K. Kay and Robin Parry. Milton Keynes: Paternoster.

Davies, Stevan L. 1995. *Jesus the Healer: Possession, Trance, and the Origins of Christianity*. London: SCM Press.

Davis, Derek Russell. 1977. "Dismiss or make whole?" *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine* 72: 215–18.

Ehrman, Bart D. 2006. "A Leper in the Hands of an Angry Jesus." Pages 120–41 in *Studies in the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. Edited by Bart Ehrman. Leiden: Brill.

Feldman, Louis H. 1994. "Josephus' Portrait of Elisha." *NovT* 36: 1–28.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. 1981. *The Gospel according to Luke I-IX*. AB 28. Garden City: Doubleday.

Green, Joel. 1997. *The Gospel of Luke*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Gundry, Robert H. 1993. *Mark: A Commentary on his Apology for the Cross.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Kee, Howard Clark. 1968. "The Terminology of Mark's Exorcism Stories." *NTS* 14: 232–46.

Klink, Edward W. 2005. "What concern is that to you and to me? John 2:1–11 and the Elisha Narratives." *Neot* 39: 255–70.

Koskenniemi, Erkki. 2013. "Miracles of the Devil and His Assistants in Early Judaism and Their Influence on the Gospel of Matthew." Pages 84–97 in *Evil and the Devil*. Edited by Ida Fröhlich and Erkki Koskenniemi. London: Bloomsbury.

Lindars, Barnabas. 1992. "Rebuking the Spirit: A New Analysis of the Lazarus Story of John 11." *NTS* 38: 89–104.

Malina, Bruce, 1999. "Assessing the Historicity of Jesus' Walking on the Sea: Insights from Cross-Cultural Social Psychology." Pages 351–71 in *Authenticating the Activities of Jesus*. Edited by Bruce Chilton and Craig Evans. Leiden: Brill.

Meier, John P. 1994. *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus*. Volume 2: *Mentor, Message, and Miracles*. New York: Doubleday.

Metzger, Bruce M. 1998. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament.* Second edition. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.

Milner, Neal. 2000. "Giving the Devil His Due Process: Exorcism in the Church of England." *JCRel* 15: 247–72.

Morris, Leon. 1995. *The Gospel according to John*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Schnackenburg, Rudolf. 1980. *The Gospel according to St. John.* Volume 2: *Commentary on chapters 5–12.* HTC. London: Burns & Oates.

Shahovskoy, Archbishop John. 2008. *The Orthodox Pastor: A Guide to Pastoral Theology*. Crestwood: St Vladimir's Seminary Press.

Spencer, F. Scott. 2014. "Why Did the 'Leper' Get Under Jesus' Skin? Emotion Theory and Angry Reaction." *HBT* 36: 107–28.

Theissen, Gerd. 2007. *The Miracle Stories in the Early Christian Tradition*. Minneapolis: Fortress.

Thomas, John Christopher. 2010. *The Devil, Disease and Deliverance: Origins of Illness in New Testament Thought*. Cleveland: CPT Press.

Twelftree, Graham H. 1992. "Demon, Devil, Satan." Pages 163–72 in *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels.* Edited by Joel B. Green and Scot McKnight. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press.

———. 1993. *Jesus the Exorcist: A Contribution to the Study of the Historical Jesus.* Peabody: Hendrickson.

———. 2011. "Deliverance and Exorcism in the New Testament." Pages 45–68 in *Exorcism and Deliverance*. Edited by William K. Kay and Robin Parry. Milton Keynes: Paternoster.

Voorwinde, Stephen. 2011. *Jesus' Emotions in the Gospels.* London: T&T Clark.

Warfield, Benjamin Breckinridge. 1912. "On the Emotional Life of Our Lord." Pages 35–90 in *Biblical and Theological Studies by the Members of the Faculty of Princeton Theological Seminary*. New York: Scribner's Sons.

Whitehouse, Harvey. 2004. "Rites of Terror." Pages 133–48 in *Religion and Emotions*. Edited by John Corrigan. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Williams, Peter J. 2012. "An Examination of Ehrman's Case for ὀργισθείς in Mark 1:41." *NovT* 54: 1–12.

Witmer, Amanda. 2012. *Jesus, the Galilean Exorcist: His Exorcisms in Social and Political Context*. London: T&T Clark.

Yarbro Collins, Adela. 2007. *Mark: A Commentary*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress.

Satan and Demons in the Apostolic Fathers: A Minority Report

JONATHAN BURKE
Monash University, Melbourne

The Marginalization of Demons and Exorcism in the Apostolic Fathers

The "Apostolic Fathers," a group of Christian texts written from the late first century to the early second century,[1] are recognized as unusual in their era for their paucity of references to demons, demon possession, exorcism, and illness caused by demons;[2] additionally, rejection of supernatural evil beliefs has also been noted in texts such as the Didache.[3] The fact that a number of texts in the Apostolic Fathers contain explicit reference to supernatural evil, typically a figure identified as Satan,[4] makes it more remarkable that other texts in the same corpus do not contain any such references.

Although texts without references to supernatural evil are a minority report (rather than a growing trend) within early Christian literature, this distinctive feature of these other texts is even more apparent when they are compared with the Christian texts from the mid-second century onwards, which demonstrate a significant development in the role of supernatural evil within Christian theology; the introduction of exorcism and repudiation of Satan at baptism,[5] enlargement of Christian demonology,[6]

---

[1] The list of works in this group has changed over time as some of the texts have been re-dated, but generally includes the Epistle of Barnabas, Didache, 1 Clement, 2 Clement, Shepherd of Hermas, Ignatius, Fragments of Papias, Martyrdom of Polycarp, Polycarp's Letter to the Philippians, Epistle to Diognetus, and Quadratus (Schoedel 1992, 313).
[2] Twelftree 2007; Ferngren 2009.
[3] Jenks 1991, 308; Milavec 2003a, 63.
[4] Epistle of Barnabas, Epistles of Ignatius, Shepherd of Hermas, and possibly Polycarp's Letter to the Philippians.
[5] Russell, 1987, 61.
[6] Ferngren 2009, 51.

adoption of the concept of Satan as a fallen angel,[7] and the identification of fallen angels with demons.[8]

Lack of consensus on the reason for the absence of demons and exorcism from these texts prompts this study. It is proposed that certain texts among the Apostolic Fathers corpus exhibit a significant marginalization of Satan and demons, and that the cause of this is an etiology of evil which is anthropogenic rather than supernatural. Specifically, it is argued that the writers of the Didache, 1 Clement, Shepherd of Hermas, Martyrdom of Polycarp, and 2 Clement, identify humans as the origin and cause of evil, rather than Satan or demons.

Supernatural Evil in the Apostolic Fathers: Scholarly Approaches

Scholarly reference works typically simply assume the Apostolic Fathers believed in a supernatural evil being which they referred to as "satan" or "the devil," without analyzing these texts in detail; Bamberger asserts "[t]hese Apostolic Fathers simply affirm the existence of Satan, seemingly as a reflection of their own inner experience,"[9] Schäferdiek likewise says "the existence and activity of Satan are presupposed and there is no independent reflection or speculation about this,"[10] and Russell says "[t]he Devil was generally believed responsible for the attitude of both the government and the mob."[11]

Russell's standard work on Satan in early Christianity examines 1 Clement, the letters of Ignatius, the Epistle of Barnabas, the Martyrdom of Polycarp and letter of Polycarp to the Philippians, the Shepherd of Hermas, and the fragments of Papias.[12] Russell finds various beliefs in supernatural evil in each of these texts (though he considers Hermas to be ambiguous), but does not synthesize the data. Russell consistently assumes all instances of *satanas* and *diabolos* refer to a personal supernatural evil being, and provides little commentary on each work; his entire review of the seven texts takes up just twelve pages. In addition to the lack of any

---

[7] Cohn 2011, 21.
[8] Martin 2010, 657.
[9] Bamberger 2010, 82.
[10] Schäferdiek 1985, 164.
[11] Russell, 1987, 37.
[12] Russell, 1987, 30–50.

comparative textual or lexical analysis, another significant weakness of his study is the fact that the Didache and the Letter to Diognetus are referred to extremely briefly, in a single footnote.

Conclusions drawn predominantly (or even exclusively) from the presence or absence of satanological terminology in a text are vulnerable. Satanological terminology is used in some Second Temple Period and early Christian texts to refer either to humans or supernatural beings, and an examination of the broader context is necessary to determine the referent. Conversely, lack of satanological terminology in a text is not necessarily a reliable indicator that the writer was deliberately marginalizing or rejecting belief in supernatural evil.

A writer may be avoiding satanological terminology to facilitate communication with their audience. For example, Löfstedt proposes that Paul "adjusts his language to his audience"[13] in three ways; by reducing his use of satanological terminology, by demythologizing satanological terminology (using *satanas* as a synonym for the "evil inclination," the natural human impulse to sin, rather than as a reference to supernatural evil), and by presenting an anthropogenic etiology of sin (rather than a satanological etiology).

Löfstedt argues that Paul does this because those he is addressing "do not have as dualistic a worldview,"[14] and because "[s]ome of Paul's Roman readers may not have believed in the existence of Satan".[15] Nevertheless, this does not necessarily provide an understanding of what Paul himself thought about Satan (in fact Löfstedt himself believes Paul took for granted the existence of a supernatural evil Satan).

This illustrates the difficulties arising from attempting to determine the personal beliefs of a writer on the basis of what they did or did not write. However, it also provides guidance towards a more constructive approach; determining what the writer wanted the audience to believe by assessing their use of language, and comparing it with proximate writings which indicate more clearly the beliefs of their writers.

In the case of Leviticus, Milgrom argues that the Priestly writer has deliberately minimized satanological terminology, demythologized the few satanological terms he has used, and presented an anthropogenic etiology of sin, specifically to teach his audience that "[t]he world of demons is

---

[13] Löfstedt 2010, 126.
[14] Löfstedt 2010, 127.
[15] Löfstedt 2010, 127.

abolished; there is no struggle with autonomous foes because there are none."[16] The aim of the Priestly writer, in Milgrom's assessment, is to reassure his audience that "humans have replaced the demons."[17] Given the radical difference between this teaching and the beliefs common to the era, a good case can be made that the Priestly writer did not believe in demons and did not want his audience to believe in them either.

In the case of Romans, Löfstedt argues that even though Paul uses satanological terminology he does not do so because he wishes his audience to believe in Satan; instead Paul demythologizes the terminology because he wishes his audience to be aware of the danger of the evil inclination (rather than a supernatural evil being). By doing so Paul reinforces his audience's non-belief in a supernatural evil being, which sheds at least some light on his own satanological beliefs; whether he believes in a supernatural evil being called Satan or not, he clearly sees such a being as extraneous to the etiology of evil and uses language calculated to preserve his audience's non-belief in such a Satan.

Atomistic studies focusing merely on individual instances of satanological terminology[18] without considering the broader textual and socio-historical context, remain common. There is little or no study of the etiology of evil within the Apostolic Fathers, which would provide a useful background against which to assess the terminology they use. Since satanological terminology may not always refer to an agent of supernatural evil, instead of deriving a writer's etiology of evil from the individual satanological terms they may or may not use, this study of the Apostolic Fathers first seeks to establish each writer's etiology of sin, and then reads the writer's use of satanological terminology in that context. The next section of this study explains how this approach has proved useful in studies of Second Temple Period etiologies of sin.

---

[16] Milgrom 1991, 43.

[17] Milgrom 1991, 43.

[18] Brief reviews typically rely on Gokey 1961 without further analysis (more detailed treatments cite Gokey infrequently, or not at all), though Gokey's work (now over fifty years old and cited as an example of "[b]asic research in some of these areas" by Boyd 1975, 17), has been criticized for its deference to traditional theology and its lack of scope; a contemporary review included the criticisms that "[t]he point of view is traditional," "the research moves entirely on the conventional horizontal level," and (referring to the bibliography), "[t]here is only a limited number of books specifically on the subject of his study" (McCasland 1963, 465).

Second Temple Period Etiologies of Sin

Texts in both Second Temple Period Judaism and early Christianity often attempted to articulate an etiology for evil in the forms of temptation and personal sin, the presence of evil in the world, the persecution of the righteous, sickness, and eschatological conflict. Jewish and Christian texts exhibit three main sources of evil: God,[19] humans, and Satan and evil spirits (such as demons or fallen angels). These are not necessarily mutually exclusive, and a text may exhibit more than one etiology. However, although Second Temple Period etiology of sin and evil was far from uniform, non-belief in supernatural evil is a recognized trend in Second Temple Period Judaism. Though belief in supernatural evil was prevalent, it did not necessarily involve a satanic figure,[20] and belief in supernatural evil was rejected directly by some Jewish teachers.[21]

There is general agreement that within Second Temple Period Judaism, two conflicting etiologies of evil emerged; the Adamic (an anthropogenic etiology which identified humans as the source of evil, deriving from the sin of Adam), and the Enochic (a satanological etiology which identified supernatural evil beings as the source of evil, through temptation, possession, and affliction with illness).[22] Unlike other etiologies of evil, these etiologies do not co-exist in Second Temple Period texts; they appear as mutually exclusive.

Additionally, there is evidence in Second Temple Period Judaism for a distinct (though marginal) trend of marginalization or non-mythological use of satanological terminology. In literature of this period the term "satan," whether in Greek (*satanas*) or Hebrew (*śāṭān*), is predominantly used as a common noun rather than a personal name, the term "the devil" (*ho diabolos*), is rarely if ever used to refer to a supernatural evil being, and the terms "the tempter" (*ho peirazōn*) and "the evil one" (*ho ponēros*) have no pre-Christian witness with such a meaning.

Despite many references to demonological entities,[23] Qumran literature uses the Hebrew *śāṭān* rarely, and only as a common noun.[24] Contrary to

---

[19] Whether directly or through obedient (non-evil), supernatural angelic agents.

[20] Williams 2009, 88.

[21] Bamberger 2006, 42.

[22] Arbel 2012, 439.

[23] Though it must be noted that scholarly consensus on the Qumran texts has shifted away from the previously held view of ubiquitous cosmic dualism, and there is now recognition that some passages speaking of "evil spirits" are using the language of psychological or ethical dualism rather than referring to supernatural evil; see in particular Xeravits 2010.

suggestions that it is used as a proper noun in the Prayer of Deliverance (11Q5 XIX, 13–16),[25] the context of the passage and comparison with related texts indicates it is not used as a proper noun or name here;[26] in fact Tigchelaar has argued that here it is used of the evil inclination.[27]

The term "the devil" (*ho diabolos*) is virtually never used in pre-Christian Second Temple literature outside the Old Greek texts of the Hebrew Scriptures. In the Old Greek texts it is found in in 1 Chron 21:1 (of the adversary which attacks Israel, prompting David's census), Esth 7:4; 8:1 (of Haman), Psalm 108:6 (of a human slanderer), Job 1:6–9, 12; 2:1–4, 6–7 (of Job's adversary), and Zech 3:1–2 (of the accuser of Joshua); in each case it translates the Hebrew term *śāṭān*,[28] indicating *śāṭān* was not understood as a personal name at this time.

Even in Job and Zechariah (where some scholars consider *śāṭān* to refer to an angelic servant of God), it is not used of a supernatural evil being, still less a tempter.[29] It appears once in 1 Maccabees (1:36), used of human adversaries. It appears once in Wisdom of Solomon (2:24), where death is said to have entered the world due to the envy of the devil. The lack of any other use of the term in this work represents a challenge to its interpretation, but it is significant that it is interpreted in 1 Clement as a reference to Cain,[30] which many scholars believe is the meaning here.[31]

When accompanied by an Adamic etiology of sin, use of satanological terminology with only human referents is an indicator of non-belief in Satan and demons. In Sir 21:27 ("When the ungodly curses the satan he curses himself"), *satanas* is used as a reference to the evil impulses within humans; "Ben Sira means that Satan, is, therefore, nothing but an individ-

---

[24] Hamilton 1992, 988; Kelly 2006, 43; Stuckenbruck 2013, 62–63.

[25] Stuckenbruck 2013, 63.

[26] Kelly 2006, 43–44; Goldingay 2006, 55.

[27] Tigchelaar 2008, 350–51.

[28] Breytenbach and Day 1999, 244.

[29] Job's satan is identified as a personal adversary, but is described as inciting God to destroy Job (Job 2:3), rather than tempting Job to sin; unlike the serpent of Genesis 3, the satan of the Synoptic wilderness temptation pericope, and the Satan of the Talmudic literature who tempts rabbis to sin, there is no personal interaction between Job and the satan (in fact Job appears entirely unconscious of the satan's existence, attributing his misfortunes exclusively to God), the satan is never described as a tempter, and the satan's aim is to influence God to destroy Job rather than to corrupt Job by tempting him into sin.

[30] Byron 2011, 223.

[31] Davies 1987, 56; Kelly 2006, 78; Clifford 2013, 21; Byron 2011, 220; Bouteneff 2008, 19.

ual's impulse to evil and does not exist as a material being who can act in this world according to his own decision."[32] Given Ben Sira's completely anthropogenic etiology of evil, Sacchi concludes that his use of *satanas* exhibits non-belief in a supernatural evil adversary; "For Ben Sira then, the devil does not exist; Satan is only a metaphor for our worst instincts."[33] Boccaccini likewise comments, "In Ben Sira's worldview, there is no room for devils, fallen angels, or evil spirits, not even for a mischievous officer of the divine court as the satan of Job, or for a domesticated demon as the Asmodeus of Tobit."[34]

The presence of the Adamic etiology in a text, together with the marginalization or complete absence of satanological terminology, is a combination of positive and negative evidence which many scholars have considered decisive in determining whether or not the writer held to a worldview in which Satan and demons were a cause of evil. This combination of evidence has led many scholars to conclude that a number of Second Temple Period Jewish texts exhibit non-belief in Satan or demons, the most widely recognized of which are Apocalypse of Baruch,[35] Wisdom of Ben Sira,[36] and 4 Ezra.[37]

First-Century Christian Literature

The term "satan," whether in Greek (*satanas*) or Hebrew (*śāṭān*), is used rarely in pre-Christian literature[38] and never as a proper name.[39] Consequently, Laato notes that "we lack an established tradition whereby the name of the personal Evil or the leader of demons is Satan."[40]

Additionally, throughout the first century the Adamic etiology of sin gradually became increasingly prominent in Jewish texts, to the extent that (according to Boccaccini) even Enochic Judaism "moved away from

---

[32] Capelli 2005, 142.
[33] Sacchi 2000, 351.
[34] Boccaccini 2008, 36.
[35] Emmel 2014, 127; Bamberger 2001, 43; Arbel 2012, 439; Sacchi 1990, 231; Forsyth 1989, 216, 217; Helyer 2002, 424.
[36] Bamberger 2001, 42; Boccaccini 2008, 36; Capelli 2005, 142; Di Lella 2003, 254; Helyer 2002, 424; Sacchi 2000, 351.
[37] Hogan 2008, 119; Sacchi 1990, 231; Eve 2002, 255; Helyer 2002, 424.
[38] Breytenbach and Day 1999, 730.
[39] Jenks 1991, 134.
[40] Laato 2013, 4.

blaming evil on fallen angels towards blaming it on the fall of Adam,"[41] so that "the fallen angels and evil spirits have entirely fallen out of sight, leaving innate human sinfulness as the central problem."[42] Consequently, "[i]n Jewish writings of the end of the first century the devil suddenly disappears."[43]

Emerging within this Second Temple Period background, first-century Christian belief in supernatural evil was similarly non-uniform. According to Löfstedt, there is "some disagreement as to how real the devil was for John,"[44] with some commentators believing the devil in John is "a literary personification of sin rather than as an independently acting being."[45] Thomas notes John never uses satan and demons as an etiology of illness, and "shows no real interest in the topic";[46] he also says "[n]either James nor John give any hint that the Devil or demons have a role to play in the infliction of infirmity."[47]

Caird says "it is a matter of some delicacy to determine how far the New Testament writers took their language literally,"[48] and proposes satan may have been a personification to some in the early church (including Paul), rather than a person.[49] Dunn has argued that in Romans "Paul himself engaged in his own demythologization,"[50] and that Paul used satanological terminology not because of a personal belief in supernatural, but to accommodate his audience; "the assurances at the points cited above were probably largely ad hominem, with a view to reassuring those for whom such heavenly powers were all too real and inspired real fear."[51]

The historical context of the Apostolic Fathers therefore does not consist of a monolithic and uniform belief in supernatural evil; there is a distinct trend of Adamic etiology of sin, correlating with the marginalization of some forms of belief in supernatural evil, in Second Temple Period Jewish literature during the first century.

---

[41] Eve 2002, 173.
[42] Eve 2002, 173.
[43] Sacchi 1990, 231
[44] Löfstedt 2009, 54.
[45] Löfstedt 2009, 58.
[46] Thomas 1998, 162.
[47] Thomas 1998, 301.
[48] Caird 1995, 110.
[49] Caird 1995, 110.
[50] Dunn 1998, 110.
[51] Dunn 1998, 109.

This historical context, together with a lack of evidence for uniform beliefs in supernatural evil in first century Christian literature, and evidence for Christian marginalization of, or even non-belief in, Satan and demons, is good reason for not simply assuming that satanological terminology in the Apostolic Fathers necessarily refers to supernatural evil beings.

This study proposes that the lack of satanological and demonological references in certain of the texts of the Apostolic Fathers is explained efficiently by a trajectory within early Christian thought which inherited from Second Temple Period Judaism an Adamic etiology of sin (and consequently developed an anthropogenic etiology of evil), but which was eclipsed in the second century by the Enochic etiology of sin and evil which became dominant in early Christianity.

Methodology

The same etiological analysis which scholars have previously applied to Second Temple Period literature, will be applied here to the Didache, 1 Clement, Shepherd of Hermas, Martyrdom of Polycarp, and 2 Clement. These texts have been chosen for their length and the scope of their subject matter (as opposed to the short fragments and incomplete texts of the Apostolic Fathers which provide little material to analyze), for the paucity of their use of satanological terminology, and for the fact that their satanological terminology has been discussed widely in the literature, with some scholars arguing for a marginalization or even rejection of belief in supernatural evil beings in these texts.

The aim of the analysis will be to determine whether or not the writers of these texts communicated to their audience concerns about supernatural evil beings such as Satan and demons. To what extent does their writing describe, warn about, and provide advice on how to deal with, such beings? The following content will be looked for specifically.

1. Does the writer communicate an Adamic (anthropogenic) etiology of sin, or an Enochic or Satanic (mythological) etiology of sin?

2. Does the writer exhibit marginalization or demythologization of satanological terminology?

3. Does the writer show concern with cosmic dualism (the world is controlled by opposing supernatural forces of good and evil), eth-

ical dualism (opposition between groups of people, self-identifying as righteous and "othering" their opponents as un-righteous), or psychological dualism (internal conflict between opposing impulses within the human psyche), or some combination of these dualistic views?

A combination of minimizing or avoiding satanological terminology, demythologizing satanological language, a psychological or ethical dualism and an anthropogenic etiology of sin (rather than a supernatural etiology), would suggest strongly that the writer wishes the audience to think about the etiology of evil in a non-mythological way. This is even more likely when proximate texts present strong belief in supernatural evil beings such as Satan and demons.

This method of assessing texts and their use or non-use of satanological terminology on the basis of their etiology of evil avoids arguments from silence and places conclusions on the firm basis of positive evidence with complementary negative evidence. Instead of drawing unconfirmed conclusions from negative evidence (the mere absence of satanological terminology), this method bases conclusions on positive evidence (the writer's explicitly expressed etiology of sin), to which any negative evidence is supplementary. Conclusions based primarily on what the writer has said have a stronger evidential basis than conclusions based on what the writer has not said.

Didache

Scholarly consensus dates the Didache at the end of the first century. Although the Didache shares a Jewish "Two Ways" textual source with the Epistle of Barnabas[52] (represented in Qumran texts such as the "Community Rule" or "Manual of Discipline"; 1QS, 4QS[a-j], 5Q11, 5Q13), it has treated this source very differently to Barnabas. Whereas Barnabas adopted and amplified the supernatural evil found in the Two Ways text, the Didache has eliminated it. This is immediately apparent from a comparison of the opening of the Didache to its parallels in 1QS 3:17–21 and Barn. 18.1.

---

[52] Jefford 1989, 91.

Both 1QS and Barnabas see the two ways as presided over by the angels of God and the angels of satan. In contrast, the Didache has completely removed any reference to satan and his angels.[53] This deliberate anti-mythological approach is followed consistently throughout the Didache.[54] The Didache does not use any of the satananological terminology found in the Epistle of Barnabas or in proximate Jewish and Christian texts; terms such as *satanas*, *diabolos*, Beliar, "the Black One," "the lawless one," and "the Worker [of evil]" never appear.[55] Although the term *tou ponērou* is used (8.2), there is no evidence it refers to a supernatural evil being; such usage has no pre-Christian witness,[56] and the Didache's demythologizing agenda makes such an interpretation counter-intuitive.

Strong evidence for a generic rather than personal referent for the "evil" of 8.2 is the fact that there are no references to "the evil one" anywhere else in the Didache, only generic references to evil; "flee every kind of evil" (3.1, not "flee the evil one"), and "Remember your church, Lord, to deliver it from all evil" (10.6, not "deliver it from the evil one").[57] Consequently, modern translations of the Didache typically render its use of *tou ponērou* as generic: "rescue us from evil" (Kraft),[58] "deliver us from evil" (van den Dungen),[59] "do not lead us into the trial [of the last days] but deliver us from [that] evil" (Milavec),[60] and "deliver us from evil" (Johnson).[61]

The Didache never refers to evil angels, demons, evil spirits, unclean spirits, demonic possession, or exorcism. Most significant is the fact that no reference is made even when discussing topics in which they are typically used as an explanatory recourse by proximate texts. In contrast with Justin Martyr (*1 Apol.* 9), the Didache condemns idolatry without reference to demons (6.3),[62] and says explicitly that the reason for rejection of idol food is "it is the worship of dead gods" (6.3), in keeping with the Didache's consistent warning that pagan practices lead to idolatry (not to

---

[53] Jefford 1995, 97.
[54] Milavec 2003a, 63.
[55] Jenks 1991, 308.
[56] Black 1990, 333.
[57] Hare 2009, 70.
[58] Kraft 2009.
[59] Van den Dungen 2001.
[60] Milavec 2003b, 21.
[61] Johnson 2009, 37.
[62] Russell 1987, 46.

involvement with demons);[63] instead the Didache excludes any associa-
tion of idols with demons (6.3).[64]

Likewise, unlike later Christian texts, the Didache's detailed pre-
baptismal instruction (7.1–4) lacks any renunciation of satan;[65] in fact the
Didache never speaks of demonic possession at all. Additionally, although
the Didache differentiates between true and false prophets (11.5–10),
there is no suggestion that the prophets are speaking with two different
spirits (a divine spirit and a demonic spirit).[66]

Both the true and false prophet are using the same spirit, which is why
the Didache advises that behavior (rather than differentiating between
spirits) is the way to differentiate between true and false prophets (11.8);[67]
the false prophets' action is described as an abuse of the Spirit of God, not
described as being possessed by an evil spirit or demon.[68] Rather than
speaking under the influence of satan or a demon, the false prophet is a
prophet either abusing the gift of speaking "in the [Holy] Spirit," or else
claiming to speak "in the [Holy] Spirit" when in fact he is not.[69] There is
no reference in the Didache to the prophets using two different spirits at
all. The false prophet is not said to have a false spirit, or a demonic spirit,
or a spirit of satan, or a spirit of Belial, or an evil spirit, or any other sa-
tanological or demonological term; no such concept is indicated here. Nor
is the false prophet said to be possessed, nor is there any suggestion of
exorcism of the false prophet, nor is the false prophet said to be a messen-
ger or satan or the devil. There is no suggestion that supernatural evil of
any kind motivates the words and actions of the false prophet.

In its eschatological passage the Didache refers to "the world deceiver"
(16.4), using a Greek term unattested before the Didache itself.[70] Peerbolte
believes this is a reference to Satan,[71] but the suggestion that the Didache
(which to this point has avoided all satanological and demonological ter-
minology), would at this point introduce Satan using a unique term not

---

[63] Niederwimmer 1998, 123.
[64] Milavec 2003a, 63.
[65] Twelftree 2007, 219.
[66] Tibbs 2007, 317–18.
[67] Schöllgen 1996, 54.
[68] Schöllgen 1996, 55.
[69] Witherington 2003, 94; Guy 2011, 34; Hvidt 2007, 87; Freyne 2014, 253; Burkett 2002,
402.
[70] Peerbolte 1996, 181; Niederwimmer 1998, 219.
[71] Peerbolte 1996, 181.

used in any earlier Jewish or Christian texts (instead of using one of the several standard satanological terms), is unlikely in the extreme. Jenks speaks of the "satanic connections" of the world deceiver, whilst differentiating him from Satan.[72] Runions concludes that the Didache is one of a number of Christian texts identifying an evil eschatological figure as human rather than satanic.[73] Similarly, Milavec and Balabanski both note that this figure is differentiated from Satan.[74] Garrow observes that the world deceiver is "portrayed as a human persecutor," and not of the devil.[75] Draper understands the world deceiver to be "an embodiment of a division within the community itself."[76] Kobel likewise describes this section as speaking of "evil emerging from inside the community."[77]

The Didache was elaborated on considerably by later Christians who modified its content in alignment with their own theology. The third century Teaching of the Apostles (Didascalia apostolorum), and the late fourth century Apostolic Constitutions (Constitutiones apostolicae), both used material from the Didache. Both added explicit cosmological dualism and satanalogical references typical of the theology of their era, which are entirely absent from the Didache. These expansions illustrate the fact that the Didache's text was deemed an inadequate expression of the dualism of later Christians, emphasizing the difference between its demythologized content and their strongly mythological views.

In particular, Const. ap. 7.32 includes an eschatology which borrows the Didache's apocalyptic material but modifies it to agree with fourth century beliefs in supernatural evil, adding the term *diabolos* to identify the "world deceiver" (Did. 16.4) as the devil.[78] The fact that this term was added deliberately indicates (at the least) that the compilers of the Apostolic Constitutions felt the Didache had not identified the world deceiver explicitly as satan, and may be evidence that the Didache's demythologized character was recognized by later Christians.

The expansion of the Didache's apocalypse in the Apostolic Constitutions prompts Niederwimmer to suggest it is evidence for a lost ending of

---

[72] Jenks 1991, 310.
[73] Runions 2012, 83.
[74] Milavec 2003a, 64; Balabanski 1997, 195.
[75] Garrow 2013, 56–57.
[76] Draper 1995, 284.
[77] Kobel 2011, 167.
[78] Niederwimmer 1998, 226.

the Didache,[79] whilst expressing caution saying the text "is (if at all) a very loose reproduction of the Didache."[80] Consequently, he foregoes any attempt to reconstruct any such ending.[81] Verheyden advises it is not possible to substitute the end of the Constitutions for that of the Didache, and says it is wiser to characterize the apocalypse of the Constitutions as a paraphrase of the Didache's.[82] Jefford notes that the Epistle of Barnabas (which shared a Two Ways source with the Didache), did not contain an apocalypse at all, making any suggestion that the Didache had a lost apocalyptic conclusion "mere speculation."[83]

Sorensen suggests tentatively that demons may be alluded to in Did. 3.1; 6.1, whilst acknowledging "it is just as conceivable that humans are intended here."[84] He further suggests 8.2; 10.5; 16.4 are "ambiguous passages" which may refer to a satan figure.[85] However, he concludes that the Didache "offers little suggestion that demons play a direct role in contrary human actions."[86] This is an understatement; the deliberate avoidance of any such language in the Didache and its elimination when using a source which included it indicates otherwise. Draper claims the Didache is tacitly aware of demonic forces,[87] but presents no evidence for this. Since there is no reference in the Didache to any demonic forces at all, and since the Didache has followed a systematic program of demythologizing its source which repudiates such beliefs, such speculation does not contribute to an understanding of the text.

The Didache's etiology of sin is thoroughly Adamic. Humans are the cause of evil in the form of sin (3.2; 6.1) and the persecution of the righteous (16.3–4a). A detailed eschatological pericope (16.1–8) concerns signs of the return of Jesus and the appearance of "the world-deceiver," but no cosmic battle involving good and evil angels, or satan and demons. Consequently, scholarly commentary typically describes the Didache as explicitly demythologized. Suggs observes "[t]he Angels/Spirits have disappeared from the very brief introduction," describing the Didache's

---

[79] Niederwimmer 1998, 226.
[80] Niederwimmer 1998, 227.
[81] Niederwimmer 1998, 227.
[82] Verheyden 2005, 207.
[83] Jefford 1989, 89.
[84] Sorensen 2002, 199.
[85] Sorensen 2002, 199.
[86] Sorensen 2002, 199.
[87] Draper 1995, 285.

Two Ways passage as "[r]elatively demythologized and ethicized."[88] Kloppenborg contrasts the redactional source of Barnabas with that of the Didache, characterizing Barnabas as explicitly mythological, and the Didache as radically demythologized,[89] observing the Didache has replaced the cosmological dualism of its source with ethical and psychological dualism.[90] Sandt and Flusser suggest the Didache's "significant reduction of the cosmic dualism in the earlier Two Ways" may be a deliberate demythologization,[91] while Milavec declares it was definitely deliberate.[92]

The intentional nature of the Didache's demythologization is even more apparent when it is compared with three other texts using the Two Ways material. Milavec notes that the first-century BCE Qumran Manual of Discipline, the second-century Epistle of Barnabas, and the third-century Teaching of the Apostles (Didascalia Apostolorum) all contain an explicit mythological dualism which the Didache has clearly avoided.[93] The markedly different treatment of the Two Ways material in these texts indicates the presence of two different traditions in early Christianity; one dualistic (found in the Teaching of the Apostles, and Apostolic Constitutions), the other non-dualistic (found in the Didache). Concurring with this model, Rordorf traces the dualistic tradition from sources such as the Community Rule (Manual of Discipline, 1QS), and the non-dualistic tradition from the "sapiental and synagogal teaching of Judaism."[94]

Brock likewise positions the Didache's non-dualistic view within a tradition drawn directly from the Palestinian Targums, and the dualistic view of Barnabas and the Teaching of the Apostles as influenced by the "intrusion of the non-Biblical moral opposition" found in the Community Rule.[95] Tomson also characterizes the Didache as non-dualistic, and belonging to the tradition found in the New Testament and the Palestinian Tannaite sage Yohanan ben Zakkai;[96] Tomson further describes the Dida-

---

[88] Suggs 1972, 71.
[89] Tite 2009, 177.
[90] Kloppenborg 1995, 95.
[91] Schwiebert 2008, 124.
[92] Milavec 2003a, 63.
[93] Milavec 2003a, 65.
[94] Rordorf 1996, 153.
[95] Brock 1990, 143.
[96] Tomson 2001, 383.

che as non-dualistic, Barnabas as semi-dualistic, and the Community Rule as completely dualistic.[97]

The Didache is therefore witness to a late first-century Christian community which preserved traditional Jewish ethical teaching within a non-dualistic framework, deliberately avoiding all references to supernatural evil and replacing them with a psychological dualism locating temptation and sin within the heart. It is not merely non-mythological but explicitly demythological, teaching an anthropogenic Adamic etiology of sin, in contrast to the belief in supernatural evil found in proximate Jewish and Christian sources.

First Clement

Typically dated to the end of the first century, 1 Clement uses no satanological terminology. There is one use of the present participle of the verb *antikeimai*, "adversary" (51.1). Although this verb is applied to the man of sin in 2 Thess 2:4, the New Testament never uses it of Satan, but does use it of human opponents in Luke 13:17; 21:15; 1 Cor 16:9; Gal 5:17; Phil 1:28; 2 Thess 2:4; and 1 Tim 1:10, which last usage makes its use in 1 Tim 5:14 most likely to be human as well.[98] Consequently there is no Second Temple Period precedent for it referring to Satan in 1 Clement. Although neither *satanas* nor *diabolos* appear in 1 Clement, there is clear evidence for the author understanding *diabolos* with a human referent, in a passage which quotes Wisdom of Solomon:

> For this reason "righteousness" and peace "stand at a distance," While each one has abandoned the fear of God and become nearly blind with respect to faith in Him, neither walking according to the laws of His commandments nor living in accordance with his duty toward Christ. Instead, each follows the lusts of his evil heart, inasmuch as they have assumed that attitude of unrighteous and ungodly jealousy through which, in fact, "death entered into the world." (1 Clem. 3.4)[99]

Here is evidence for Clement's anthropogenic etiology of sin; like James, he attributes sin to the lusts of the evil heart. Reference to the entry

---

[97] Tomson 2014, 94.
[98] Arichea and Hatton 1995, 122; Towner 2006, 356–57; Hendriksen and Kistemaker 1953, 177–78; Guthrie 1990, 118; Delling 1985, 655.
[99] Holmes 1999, 33.

of death into the world is a quotation from Wisdom of Solomon (2:24), where death's entry is attributed to the envy of the *diabolos*. Clement interprets the *diabolos* here as a reference to Cain,[100] which many scholars believe is the meaning intended.[101] This is more likely than a supernatural referent, since "[t]he notion that the devil was motivated by envy is likewise not attested before the first century CE, at the earliest."[102] The fact that Clement understands *diabolos* here as a reference to Cain is evidence for an Adamic etiology of sin, and differentiates him sharply from the many later Christian commentators who read it as a reference to Satan. Either no such tradition existed in Clement's era, or he was ignorant of it, or he was deliberately rejecting it.

To summarize the evidence in Clement, the writer used a verb the New Testament uses for human adversaries (instead of using a proper name or proper noun for Satan), and did not use either *satanas* or *diabolos*, his only reading of *diabolos* interprets it as a human adversary rather than a supernatural being, and he does not refer to demons, evil spirits, fallen angels, demonic possession, or exorcism. Clement's etiology of sin is anthropogenic (Adamic), rather than Satanic; temptation and sin are the products of the human heart. Clement encourages readers to view evil and sin in non-mythological terms.

Shepherd of Hermas

Complications in the textual tradition, and inconsistencies in the internal evidence, have prevented firm consensus on the dating of Hermas. It is cited as a complete work by Irenaeus nearly the end of the second century (c. 175), but a possible reference to Clement of Rome in the earliest part of the work, may indicate an earlier date of initial composition; consequently, there is a tendency in the literature to regard Hermas as a composite document.[103]

Early theories of multiple authorship have given way to a return to acceptance of a basic literary unity resulting from a single author writing over time, followed by several redactions.[104] Apart from a general consen-

---

[100] Byron 2011, 223.
[101] Davies 1987, 56; Kelly 2006, 78; Clifford 2013, 21; Byron 2011, 220; Bouteneff 2008, 19.
[102] Collins 1998, 190.
[103] Holmes 1999, 330–31.
[104] Osiek 1999, 10.

sus that Visions 1–4 constitute the cohesive work of a single author and represent the earliest material, there is comparatively little agreement on the composition of the rest of the text.[105] Evidence that Visions 1–4 and Vision 5 were circulating as complete works at an early date (before the remainder of the text was written)[106] gives grounds for treating these sections independently from the rest of Hermas. Use of the work by late second-century and early third-century Christian writers quoting from multiple sections of Hermas indicates the text was circulating as a united composition by the end of the second century.[107]

Satanological terminology is distributed unevenly throughout the three sections of Hermas: Visions 1–4; Vision 5 and Mandates (typically considered one section); Parables.[108] No satanological terminology is found in Visions 1–4, which has a consistently non-mythological character; there are no evil spirits, demons, or fallen angels. Satanological terminology is found frequently in Vision 5 and Mandates, but there is only one use of *diabolos* in Parables.

Visions 1–4 forms a type of apocalypse, but Hermas does not introduce supernatural evil into his eschatological pericope; there is no cosmological warfare between angels, nor any satanological end time figure, and the multi-colored beast which appears in 4.1.5–10 is explained in 4.3.1–6 as representing the world, the destruction of the world, the salvation of the righteous, and the age to come, not as a supernatural evil being. This is a strongly anthropogenic etiology of evil. The persecution of the righteous, sometimes mentioned in an eschatological context, is said to contribute to salvation (3.2.1), but supernatural evil is never cited as an etiology for this suffering. The etiology of evil is strictly anthropogenic rather than supernatural; sinful humans are responsible for the evil in the world (2.2.2). The cause of sin is also consistently non-supernatural, temptation and sin being attributed to human passions; evil rising up in the heart (1.1.8), evil desire (1.2.4), evil thoughts producing transgression and death (2.3.2), being led away by riches (3.6.6), licentious desires (3.7.2), and fleshly weaknesses (3.9.3). The way of salvation in Visions 1–4 is likewise non-mythological; rather than recourse to supernatural powers, or battles with cosmological foes, salvation is achieved through ethical instruction

---

[105] Osiek 1999, 10; Holmes 1999, 331.
[106] Osiek 1999, 3; Holmes 1999, 330.
[107] Osiek 1999, 4.
[108] Sometimes referred to in the literature as Similitudes, from the Latin name.

(1.3.2), self-control (2.2.3), repentance (2.2.4), ethical behaviour (2.3.2), confession and prayer (3.1.6), charity and almsgiving (3.9.5). This part of Hermas, therefore, which was first circulated independently as a complete work, contains no satanological language at all and presents an entirely non-mythological character.

The majority of Hermas is contained in Mandates 1–12 and Parables 1–10, written later than Visions 1–4 and describing a complex etiology of sin in allegorical terms. Most notable is Hermas' repeated emphasis on an internalized dualism of the human heart, which is ruled by one of two spirits, the "holy spirit" and the "evil spirit," which influence an individual's behaviour according to their attitude (Herm. Mand. 5.1–2). However, for Hermas these spirits are secondary influences on behaviour; it is the individual who must encourage the "holy spirit" by cultivating good thoughts, or risk encouraging the "evil spirit" by succumbing to bad temper (Herm. Mand. 5.1). Unlike demonic possession, the individual is not at the mercy of these spirits.

Hermas presents a Two Ways dualism (introduced in Visions 1), which is similar to 1QS and the Epistle of Barnabas, but in which angels and spirits are said to reside in the heart as integral to the psyche ("There are two angels with man, one of righteousness and one of wickedness," Herm. Mand. 6.2), rather than as independent beings acting externally. The two angels found in 1QS and Barnabas have been internalized by Hermas, so that they exist as two impulses within the human heart, like the "evil inclination" and the "good inclination" of rabbinical hamartiology. [109] Consequently, Wiley notes that Hermas attributes the origin of evil to the *yetzer hara*, the "evil inclination."[110]

This dualism is described with a range of terms, including "spirits" (Herm. Mand. 5.1–2), "angels" (Herm. Mand. 6.2), and "doublemindedness" (Herm. Mand. 9–11), the last of which corresponds to the evil inclination of Second Temple Period Judaism. Hermas' concept of doublemindedness has clear New Testament roots; the exhortation to pray without doublemindedness and the failure of prayer by the doubleminded man (Herm. Mand. 9.4–6), obviously borrows directly from Jas 1:5–8. Boyd says Hermas' references to spirits, angels of the Lord, and angels of satan all represent abstractions rather than realities; for Hermas demons "are personified vices rather than spirits that lead independent existenc-

---

[109] Stroumsa and Fredriksen 1998, 203.
[110] Wiley 2002, 29.

es";[111] grief, for example, is described as "the most evil of all the spirits" (Herm. Mand. 1.2). However, Boyd considers some of Hermas' language suggests evil spirits are independent beings,[112] and does not believe the devil in Hermas is a personification.[113]

Similarly, Russell says it is unclear whether Hermas' two angels are in fact independent cosmic beings, or personifications of the impulses within the human heart (the rabbinic *yetzarim*).[114] He notes Hermas' use of heavily allegorical language to personify vices "as spirits or demons," while observing the differentiation between literal and figurative is not always distinct.[115] Nevertheless, he characterizes the dualism of Hermas as ethical rather than cosmological.[116]

Rousseau believes Hermas' dualism is psychological, with human passions and vices personified as evil spirits and demons.[117] Rosen-Zvi likewise says Hermas has internalized dualistic forces.[118] This conclusion is reinforced by the fact that Hermas never describes exorcism as the means of dealing with these "spirits." Instead the reader is instructed to deal with them precisely as if they were impersonal vices and character flaws; through repentance, faith, self-control, and moral self-renewal (Herm. Mand. 8.1–12; 9.10–12; 10.1–3; 12:1–3).[119]

Although Twelftree characterizes this as "a way of dealing with the demonic without resorting to exorcism,"[120] it would be more accurate to say that it is a replacement of cosmological dualism and supernatural exorcism, with psychological dualism and non-supernatural remedy. The fact that Hermas uses a non-supernatural remedy which is applied by the individual to themselves demonstrates that he is not thinking of a cosmological struggle between the individual and external supernatural force, which can only be remedied by recourse to a third party exercising supernatural power (such as exorcism). Consequently, the remedy Hermas proposes for these "demons" is exactly the same remedy for non-supernatural

---

[111] Boyd 1975, 50.
[112] Boyd 1975, 50.
[113] Boyd 1975, 51.
[114] Russell 1987, 43.
[115] Russell 1987, 45.
[116] Russell 1987, 44.
[117] Rousseau 1999, 137.
[118] Rosen-Zvi 2011, 56.
[119] Twelftree 2007, 213.
[120] Twelftree 2007, 214.

evil impulses within the human heart; repentance, faith, and moral self-renewal.

Hermas has not attributed human passions and vices to demonic possession, he has used the language of demonism to characterize human passions and vices, which nonetheless remain non-supernatural evil impulses. Twelftree's description of this process as "self-applied moral or intellectual exorcism"[121] unintentionally emphasizes the fact that Hermas saw no need to invoke a supernatural response to what he describes as demons and evil spirits, and treated them in the same way as human passions and vices. Unlike the apologists who were his contemporaries, Hermas speaks of idolatry without speaking of demons; idolatry is simply the practice of substituting another authority for God, whether by consulting a false prophet (Herm. Mand. 11.4), or by actually worshipping idols (Herm. Sim. 9.21.3).

Despite the ambiguity of his allegorical language therefore, Hermas advocates a response to "demons" which is consistently non-supernatural, psychological, and moral, rather than supernatural, cosmological, and spiritual. Though he uses the demonological terminology of second century apologists such as Justin Martyr (First Apology, Second Apology), Hermas has deliberately demythologized the language of evil spirits and demons, re-applying it to human passions and vices.[122] Consequently, Hermas' use of *diabolos* as an apparent reference to a supernatural evil tempter (Herm. Mand. 12.5.4) appears anomalous. Given Hermas' consistent demythologization of demonological language, a case could be made that he is using *diabolos* in the same way. However, a simpler and more cautious approach would be to conclude that Hermas still wishes his readers to view the *diabolos* as an independent being despite having demythologized demons and evil spirits. Nevertheless, the sharp contrast between the entirely demythologized Visions 1–4 and the only partially demythologized Mandates and Parables (especially Mandates, with its extensive use of repurposed demonological terminology and its repeated use of *diabolos*), requires more than superficial analysis.

Earlier commentary proposed theories of multiple authorship to address inconsistencies in Hermas and evidence that portions of the text were circulated independently of the whole.[123] Current scholarship views Hermas

---

[121] Twelftree 2007, 214.
[122] Boyd 1975, 137.
[123] Knust 2013, 135.

as a work composed by one author over time, incorporating multiple sources and redactions.[124] There is general agreement that the earliest section (Visions 1–4) was written and circulated as complete document around the end of the first century,[125] and that the entire work was completed around the middle of the second century.[126] This conclusion provides a firm basis on which to advance an explanation of why Visions 1–4 has a strong demythological character which is so unlike the rest of the work.

A simple explanation for the fact that Visions 1–4 reflects the same demythologized content as the Didache and 1 Clement, whereas the rest of the work is very similar (but still not identical) to the mythological views of evil common to the mid-second century, is that the author's own personal views changed during the 30–40 years separating the writing of Visions 1–4 and the later composition of Vision 5, Mandates, and Parables. The proposal that Visions 1–4 reflects the views of the author at an early date, and that the rest of Hermas was written together at a later date (and then appended to Visions 1–4), after the author's views changed, is certainly more parsimonious than more complicated suggestions of multiple redaction and editing over several decades which are found in the literature.

Evidence that Hermas' theological views changed over time is found in the difference between his original and later approach to repentance. In Visions 1–4 Hermas teaches that those who had been baptized have a second chance of forgiveness at the eschaton, but in Herm. Mand. 3.3.1–7 he says only new converts have a second chance. Another example of Hermas' change of theological perspective is the fact that Visions 1–4 lacks any reference to the approach to repentance described in the rest of the work (especially Mandates 12–13 and Parable 9), which clearly indicates mid-second-century practice.[127]

A change in theological views provides an efficient and evidence based explanation as to why the etiology of sin of Visions 1–4 matches the demythologized and Adamic perspective of its contemporary the Didache, while the etiology of sin in the rest of Hermas is much closer to the mythological view of the mid-second century apologists with which it was

---

[124] Knust 2013, 135; Maier 2002, 56.
[125] Rankin 2006, 34.
[126] Nielsen 2012, 169; Rankin 2006, 34–35; Baynes 2011, 172.
[127] Osborne 2001, 55.

contemporary. When writing Visions 1–4 at the end of the first century, the author held a strongly demythologized view, whereas by the mid-second century his views had shifted, resulting in the inclusion of some mythological terminology which he demythologized (rejecting a belief in literal demons and applying demonological language to human vices), but also the inclusion of mythological views which he had adopted (accepting a belief in a supernatural evil tempter, the devil).

The witness of Hermas is therefore mixed, due to its composite nature. However, what can be said with confidence is that Visions 1–4, written at the end of the first century, represents a strongly demythologized work reflecting the same anthropogenic etiology of sin as the Didache, whereas even the later sections of Hermas represent a weak mythological view in which demons are nothing more than personifications of human vices, though the *diabolos* is an independent supernatural tempter.

In summary, in Visions 1–4 the writer of Hermas uses demythologized language to warn readers of their susceptibility to an anthropogenic dualism which they themselves can influence directly by exercising personal self-control. This is an Adamic etiology of sin. The writer does not warn his audience of possession by forces of supernatural evil, nor does he recommend exorcism or magical means of addressing their internal dualism. If at this point he had any belief in a supernatural devil or demons as independent beings, he shows no evidence for it in Visions 1–4. In contrast, Mandates 1–12 and Parables 1–10 show evidence of a theological shift towards supernatural evil in the form of an independent devil figure, whilst still making no mention of demons, demonic possession, or exorcism.

Martyrdom of Polycarp

The Martyrdom of Polycarp is typically dated to the late second century. The extant textual tradition consists of seven Greek manuscripts dating from the tenth to the twelfth century, one thirteenth century manuscript, Codex Mosquensis (the Moscow Manuscript, which is notable for its

many unique readings),[128] quotations in Eusebius, and a Latin transla-
tion.[129] Chapters 21 and 22 contain comments by later writers, and are
themselves likely to be later additions to the original text.[130]

A brief reference to eschatological events makes no mention of satan,
demons, or fallen angels, despite its reference to "the fire of the coming
judgment and eternal punishment which is reserved for the ungodly"
(11.2), where reference to "the eternal fire that has been prepared for the
devil and his angels" (Matt 25:41, New English Translation), might at
least be expected.

There is one use of *diabolos* (2.4), and one use of *ho ponēros*, "the evil
one," or "the evil" (17.1), both as the reason for Christian martyrdom. A
single instance of *satanas* (23.2) appears in a chapter which was not part
of the original text, is found only in the Moscow Manuscript,[131] and con-
sequently need not be considered. The variety of renderings in both the
scholarly English translations and the critical editions of the Greek text
reflects the underlying inconsistencies of the textual tradition, due to poor-
ly preserved manuscripts,[132] textual variants and interpolations,[133] and the
grammatical uncertainty of various passages.[134]

Comparison of the extant manuscripts reveals various forms of editing,
redaction, and interpolation, reducing the integrity of the available textual
witness.[135] This is particularly the case with regard to 2.4 and 17.1, the
only passages in which satanological terminology is used. Although these
recognized textual inconsistencies, interpolations, and ambiguities do not
suggest that either *ho ponēros* or *diabolos* have no place in the text, they
do indicate that these passages have been subjected to modifications in-
tended to alter the intended meaning of these terms by changing their ref-
erents. Standard English translations of 2.4 typically obscure the underly-
ing textual difficulty.

> And in a similar manner those who were condemned to the wild beasts en-
> dured terrible punishments: they were forced to lie on sharp shells and af-
> flicted with various other forms of torture in order that he might, if possi-

---

[128] Ehrman 2003, 363.
[129] Holmes 1999, 302.
[130] Koester 2000, 300.
[131] Hartog 2013, 334.
[132] Hartog 2013,167.
[133] Gibson 2003, 152.
[134] Setzer 1994, 115.
[135] Gibson 2003, 150.

ble, by means of the unceasing punishment compel them to deny their faith; for the devil tried many things against them. (Mart. Pol. 2.4)[136]

A footnote advises that the reading "in order that he might" is only supported by one manuscript in the textual tradition, the Moscow Manuscript;[137] all the other textual witnesses read *ho turannos*, "the tyrant."[138] Brannan's English translation reads "tyrant," following Kirsopp Lake's Greek text;[139] Lieu also notes the variant.[140] The interpretive implications of the original reading will be addressed shortly. Likewise, the text of 17.1–2 historically caused both copyists and interpreters great difficulty.

Although the "evil one" is said to incite Nicetes, it is unclear whether the direct quotation which follows are the words of the "evil one" or Nicetes. The Greek text is even more obscure, since the word for "the adversary" (*antikeimenos*) may refer either to a human or supernatural agent.[141] Gibson notes that the grammar of 17.1 can be parsed in a range of ways, making it "unclear who or what this 'evil one' is,"[142] and that "strained syntax" in 17.2b results in uncertainty as to who it was that expressed concern that the Christians might abandon Jesus and worship Polycarp.[143] She further observes that these ambiguities of grammar and syntax "coincide with instability in the textual tradition."[144] This suggests that copyists of the text struggled with its original lack of clarity and sought to correct it with modifications of their own, resulting in further difficulties for later copyists; Gibson herself notes significant editing in the manuscript tradition at this place in the text, with two manuscripts completely omitting 17.2d and 17.3 altogether.[145]

There is strong evidence that the lack of clarity as to the role of the "evil one" was responsible for the confusion of subsequent copyists, and the consequent instability of the text. Although "the evil one" is the initial subject of the passage, Nicetes is introduced later as the agent of opposition against the Christians wishing to recover the body of Polycarp, then

---

[136] Holmes 1999, 229.
[137] Designated "m" in the footnote.
[138] Holmes 1999, 229.
[139] Brannan 2011.
[140] Lieu 2005, 145.
[141] Lunn-Rockliffe 2015, 123.
[142] Gibson 2003, 154.
[143] Gibson 2003, 154.
[144] Gibson 2003, 155.
[145] Gibson 2003, 155.

finally the Jews are held responsible for instigating the opposition,[146] in a way which makes them appear to be responsible for Nicetes' decision, rather than "the evil one."

Eusebius edited the text in the process of copying it,[147] addressing the ambiguity of the text by making a specific effort to connect "the Jews" with "the evil one."[148] Instead of the ambiguous reading "he incited Nicetes," Eusebius wrote "certain ones suggested Nicetes," and changed the syntax of the paragraph to fit.[149] The consequence is a text from which the influence of "the evil one" has been removed completely, so that the opposition originates from human opponents instead of from "the evil one."[150] The significance of this is that Eusebius saw this as a valid interpretation of the text, despite the presence of "the evil one" at the start of the paragraph. Following Eusebius, Rufinus likewise retained the reference to "the evil one" while reading the remainder of the text as a description of human opponents preventing the removal of Polycarp's body.[151]

These revisions by Eusebius and Rufinus not only illustrate the inherent ambiguities and textual difficulties of the text as they received it, but also the challenge of identifying "the evil one" as responsible for influencing Nicetes to petition the magistrate not to surrender Polycarp's body. Aside from the grammatical ambiguity, it is also possible that neither Eusebius nor Rufinus (both of whom most likely understood "the evil one" to be the devil of their theology), could understand why Satan would not want Christians to abandon their devotion to Christ. However, Eusebius' text results in the Jews fearing that the Christians would renounce Christ in favour of Polycarp, which hardly seems more credible, and is possibly the reason why Rufinus removed all reference to the Jews completely, making Nicetes the one expressing concern for the potential shift in Christian loyalty.

Comparison with the Maccabean literature points towards a simple solution to the identity of "the evil one." It is widely agreed that the Martyrdom of Polycarp has been modeled on the Jewish martyrdom tradition, in particular the martyrology of 4 Maccabees.[152] Use of both 2 and 4 Macca-

---

[146] Lunn-Rockliffe 2015, 123.
[147] Koester 2000, 348.
[148] Gibson 2003, 155.
[149] Lunn-Rockliffe 2015, 123.
[150] Lunn-Rockliffe 2015, 124.
[151] Lunn-Rockliffe 2015, 123–25.
[152] deSilva 1998, 150–51; Clements 2013, 216; Campbell 1992, 227.

bees has been noted by Perler, Baumeister, and Lieu, with Lieu arguing the parallels with Maccabean literature are stronger than those with biblical literature or contemporary Christian influences such as Ignatius.[153] The writer's familiarity with the Maccabean literature is an interpretive key to the understanding of the *diabolos* in 2.4 and the "evil one" in 17.1.

As noted previously, the majority reading of the textual tradition in 2.4 is *ho turannos*, "the tyrant." The Moscow Manuscript lacks *ho turannos*, making *ho diabolos* the subject, instead of the majority reading in which *ho turannos* is the subject and interprets *diabolos*. There are several reasons for preferring the majority reading. On internal considerations, it seems less likely that a copyist would add *ho turannos* ("the tyrant"), to a martyrological passage in which the subject was already identified clearly as *ho diabolos* ("the devil"). It is more likely that a copyist would consider *ho turannos* to cause an unnecessary confusion of the subject by rendering the identity of *ho diabolos* ambiguous, and wish to remove it in order to ensure the presence of the devil is made explicit.

It also seems less likely that a copyist would add *ho turannos*, which would be unusual in this context since "it is not a common term in Christian martyrologies."[154] Even more significantly, *ho turannos* is used of earthly persecutors in Jewish martyrology and was used extensively in 4 Maccabees, the very text on which Martyrdom of Polycarp was modeled.[155]

With the reading *ho turannos*, the *diabolos* in 2.4 then becomes a term for the earthly persecutor, the Roman proconsul mentioned in the very next passage (3.1). Further evidence for this is the fact that *ho diabolos ponēros* ("the evil enemy") is used in 1 Macc 1:36 of the opponents of the Jews under Apollonius,[156] providing a possible source for *ho ponēros* in Mart. Pol. 17.1.

Summarizing the external evidence, the extensive use of Maccabean literature by Martyrdom of Polycarp, the fact that *ho turannos* is used in the text on which it was most dependent, and the fact that *ho diabolos ponēros* is found in 1 Maccabees as a reference to human persecutors, gives good reason to maintain the reading *ho turannos* in Martyrdom of

---

[153] Avemarie and van Henten 2005, 95; Lieu 1996, 79–80.
[154] Lieu 2005, 145.
[155] Lieu 2005, 145; Rajak 1997, 53.
[156] καὶ ἐγένετο εἰς ἔνεδρον τῷ ἁγιάσματι καὶ εἰς διάβολον πονηρὸν τῷ Ισραηλ διὰ παντός (Kappler 1967, 52).

Polycarp, and understand both 2.4 and 17.1 as referring to the Roman proconsul. This harmonizes with the description of the "evil one" in 17.1 as "jealous and envious," which makes sense as a polemical description of the proconsul, who not only wishes to turn the martyrs from worshipping Jesus to worshipping Caesar (thus "jealous" of the worship received by Jesus), but who would also be concerned by the Christians merely transferring their veneration of Jesus, to Polycarp.

Support from this is found in 1 Clement, in which human jealousy is cited repeatedly as the motivation for the persecution of Christians by Roman rulers (5.1–6.2), making this an established martyrological motif. In contrast, it seems considerably less likely that a Christian writer would consider the devil to be jealous of worship (since he is never the subject of worship even by his followers), and dismayed by Christians abandoning their devotion of Jesus for the idolizing of Polycarp. Further evidence for this interpretation is the fact that the "evil one" does not oppose the Christians directly, but seeks the aid of a human assistant, who is then used to petition the magistrate.[157] This seems more than a little clumsy if a supernatural evil being is involved, who could simply move the magistrate directly to oppose the Christians.

Finally, when the centurion eventually burns Polycarp's body, his action is not connected in any way with the "evil one"; instead the Jews are held to blame (18.1), and the devil is not identified as either the proximate or ultimate cause. If the reader is intended to understand that the devil was in fact attempting to obstruct the Christians, it is curious that his carefully orchestrated scheme involving three different people is abruptly dropped from the narrative, and a Roman soldier is successful instead. If the "evil one" is the proconsul, it is more comprehensible that the centurion's independent action, prompted by Jewish opposition to the Christians, preempts the plan of his superior.

The paucity of satanological language in the Martyrdom of Polycarp is remarkable given the genre of the work, especially in comparison with the explicitly supernatural references in Ignatius' descriptions of martyrdom (Ign. *Rom.* 5.3; 7:7; *Magn.* 1.2). Although the writer's etiology of sin is not developed systematically in this text, the emphasis throughout is on humans as the proximate and ultimate source of the persecution of the righteous, rather than Satan and demons.

---

[157] Gibson 2003, 154.

Second Clement

Traditionally listed in the Apostolic Fathers, 2 Clement is now recognized as a pseudepigraphal work of the mid-second century at earliest. There is one use of *diabolos* in 2 Clement, a reference to "the tools of the devil (18.2). Although this appears to be a natural reference to a supernatural evil being, the preceding text (17.4–7) presents an ethical dualism in an eschatological context, without any reference to supernatural evil.

This eschatological commentary uses material from Isa 66:18, 24; Matt 3:12; 13:37–43; 25:31–46; Mark 9:43, 48; and Luke 3:17, but there is no reference to the devil and his angels, despite the use of Matt 25:31–46. This is not evidence that the writer did not believe in a supernatural devil with attendant fallen angels, but the absence is remarkable if he did. Similarly, when the writer speaks of the pagan worship he followed prior to conversion to Christianity, he speaks of worshipping idols as the handwork of men, not worshipping idols behind which were demons (1.6).

This is significant, given that later Christian commentators from at least Justin Martyr onwards would claim the idols were actually dangerous tools of the demons which inherited them (*1 Apol.* 9).[158] The writer of 2 Clement shows no knowledge of such ideas; he wishes his audience to know that idols are merely the "works of men" (1.6), and there is no reference anywhere in 2 Clement to fallen angels, demons, or evil spirits.

Likewise, the writer's etiology of sin is grounded in a non-supernatural "two ways" ethical and psychological dualism which is thoroughly anthropogenic; temptation and sin are products of the human heart, and humans are the only external tempters referred to; in particular 6.1–4;[159]10:1–5; 11:1–5,[160] especially the advice about self-discipline and controlling one's flesh and spirit in 14–15.[161] Numerous passages of Scripture are cited on this theme, but no passages containing any reference to Satan or demons. What is also remarkable is that as in 1 Clement, there is no use in 2 Clement of *satanas* as a proper name; instead there is simply one use of *ho diabolos* in 2 Clem. 18.2, which reads naturally as a referent to non-supernatural opposition.[162]

---

[158] Williams 2009, 148.

[159] Matt 6:24; 16:26; Mark 8:36; Luke 9:25; 16:13; 2 Pet 1:4; 2:12, 19 are all cited.

[160] Num 30:15; Matt 5:8; 1 Tim 1:5; 2 Tim 2:22; Jas 1:8; 2 Pet 1:19; 2:8 are all cited.

[161] Gen 1:27; Ps 72:5; Isa 58:9; Jer 7:11; Matt 12:18; 21:12; Mark 11:17; Luke 19:46; Jas 5:20 are all cited.

[162] Tuckett 2012, 289.

To summarize the evidence in 2 Clement, the writer exhibits a theology which is consistently at odds with that of the second century Apologists, treats temptation and sin using a non-supernatural "two ways" psychological and ethical dualism, uses eschatological material from Matthew which he has stripped of its references to "the devil and his angels," describes idols as inert "works of men" rather than conduits of demons, and makes no reference at all to demons, possession, or exorcism. The text contains demythologized terminology and an anthropogenic etiology of sin. The writer shows no interest in warning his audience of the danger of supernatural evil forces, but does show considerable concern with psychological dualism. On the basis of its theological similarity to 1 Clement and complete contrast with the apologists, it very likely originated within the same Christian community as the earlier letter.

Comparison with Proximate Texts

The distinctive treatment of evil in the texts of the Apostolic Fathers under examination in this study becomes more apparent when they are compared with proximate Jewish and Christian texts written both before and after them. Texts presented here for the purpose of this comparison have been selected because they contain detailed treatments of evil and sin, and because they are chronologically very close to the texts examined by this study.

Earlier Jewish, Christian, and composite Jewish-Christian texts such as Jubilees, the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, the Books of Enoch,[163] and the Qumran Book of Giants and Genesis Apocryphon (some of which influenced early Christianity) not only contain an Enochic etiology of sin but also repeatedly use a variety of personal names for a satan figure, fallen angels (or their offspring), or demons (such as Shemihazah, Azazel, Sammael, Mastema, Ohyah, Hahyah, Mahaway, Gilgamesh, Hobabish, Ahiram, and Belial).[164] An angelic rebellion or fall into sin is also present in these earlier Enochic texts.[165] Yet the writings of the Apostolic Fathers examined in this study are markedly different from these texts; they never

---

[163] Including the Book of the Watchers, Book of Dreams, Astronomical Book, and the Epistle of Enoch.
[164] Laato 2013, 4.
[165] Reed 2005, 82, 96.

mention any of these names for satan, fallen angels, or demons, nor do they ever refer to an angelic rebellion or fall.

The texts examined in this study also show distinct differences in comparison with other texts in the Apostolic Fathers, especially the Epistles of Barnabas and the epistles of Ignatius. Written between 70 CE and 135 CE, with an early second-century date typically preferred, the Epistle of Barnabas presents clear evidence of strong mythological belief, drawing on an earlier Jewish textual source.[166] Though *diabolos* is never used and *satanas* is used only once, it is used explicitly of a supernatural evil referent accompanied by his own angels and presented as God's opponent (18.1); the satan's angels are incorporated into an etiology of sin (18.1–2), though neither demons nor exorcism are mentioned.

Barnabas also refers to this satanic figure as "the Worker [of evil]" (2.3), "the evil one" (2.10; 19.11; 21.3), "evil ruler" or "prince of evil" (4.13), "the lawless one" (15.5), and "the black one" (20.1), describing him as currently in power (2.1; 15.5; 18.2), and as an eschatological enemy of Christ, who will destroy him at his return (15.5). This satan is the primary explanatory recourse for Barnabas' etiology of evil and sin (2.1; 4.9; 15.5), and features in his eschatology (15.5). Barnabas clearly wishes his audience to think of evil and sin in mythological terms.

Typically dated between 110 and 117 CE, seven epistles of Ignatius are recognized as genuine,[167] with the "middle recension" (quoted by Eusebius), considered the most reliable.[168] Ignatius uses the satanological terms "ruler of this age" (Ign. *Eph.* 17.1; 19.1; *Magn.* 1.1; *Trall.* 4.2; *Rom.* 7.1; *Phld.* 6.2), "satan" (Ign. *Eph.* 13.1), and "the devil" (Ign. *Eph.* 10.3; *Trall.* 8.1; *Rom.* 5.3, *Smyrn.* 9.1).

Ignatius treats the *diabolos* as a supernatural evil being. In Ign. *Eph.* 19.1 he speaks of the birth of Jesus being concealed from the devil, and whilst this could be read as a reference to a human ruler (such as Herod, who was unaware of Jesus' birth until informed by the wise men from the east), it would not explain why Ignatius speaks of the devil also being ignorant of Mary's virginity, a passage which seems to indicate Ignatius' struggle to explain the devil's involvement in Christ's death (Ign. *Eph.* 9), despite the fact that this would result in the devil's own destruction. Schoedel discusses two attempts by early Christians to solve this problem,

---

[166] Flusser 2009, 233.
[167] Russell 1987, 34.
[168] Holmes 1999, 132.

and suggests Ignatius' prefers the view that "[t]he powers did not know with whom they were dealing when they persecuted Jesus since he eluded detection when he descended through the heavens."[169]

Such a reading would also fail to explain Ignatius' warning against "the teaching of the ruler of this age" in Ign. *Eph.* 17.1. Likewise, when Ignatius speaks of his fear that Christians would be deceived into attempting to prevent his martyrdom (Ign. *Rom.* 3:1; 5:3; 7:1), it makes little sense to attribute this deception to a human adversary; "Ignatius has the devil in mind."[170]

Ignatius exhibits a strong dualistic warfare between the church and the devil at the individual and corporate level (Ign. *Eph.* 13.2). He exhorts the Romans not to take the side of the "ruler of this age" (Ign. *Rom.* 7.1), and counsels the Ephesians that their frequent congregational meeting thwarts the devil's schemes (Ign. *Eph.* 13.1). This is a further indication that his understanding of the devil is of a supernatural opponent rather than an internal struggle against personal impulses to evil which would indicate a non-mythological perspective.

Ignatius has frequent recourse to the devil or "ruler of this age" in his etiology of evil and sin (Ign. *Phld.* 6.2; *Magn.* 1.2; *Rom.* 5.3), and his description of the way of salvation (Ign. *Eph.* 17.1). His consistent use of the devil as an explanation for of all forms of evil and wrongdoing illustrates its importance to his theology, and reinforces the conclusion that for him the devil is a supernatural evil being rather than a personification of sin or sinful impulse. Rather, Ignatius seemingly takes every opportunity to emphasize the satanic and mythological nature of temptation and sin, including a reference to the occult practice of the "evil eye."[171]

Curiously, Ignatius makes no mention of demons or exorcism, though his attribution to Jesus of the saying "Take, handle me, and see that I am not a bodiless demon" are thought to indicate an existing tradition of belief in demons as bodiless spirits.[172] This is further evidence that Ignatius held to an Enochic etiology of sin.

The Epistle of Barnabas and the epistles of Ignatius demonstrate how the writers of Didache, 1 Clement, Shepherd of Hermas, Martyrdom of Polycarp, and 2 Clement could have communicated to their audience a

---

[169] Schoedel 1985, 89
[170] Schoedel 1985, 180.
[171] Schoedel 1985, 184.
[172] Schoedel 1985, 226.

Satanic etiology of evil in terms which obviously had currency within the Christian community at the time. Yet the treatment of evil in these texts differs significantly from the treatment found in Barnabas and Ignatius, even to the point of avoiding or demythologizing satanological terminology which both Barnabas and Ignatius use.

The texts analyzed in this study show even greater theological distance from the writings of the mid- to late-second-century apologists who introduced new satanological ideas.[173] Justin Martyr was the first to identify the serpent of Genesis 3 as Satan (*Dial.* 79),[174] a novelty which was adopted by other second-century apologists.[175] Justin also introduced an explicitly Enochic etiology of evil (borrowed from Jewish apocryphal writings),[176] in which fallen angels are the origin of evil and sin.

Such borrowing was not unique to Justin; Russell documents how the second-century apologists imported satanological concepts from apocryphal Jewish and Christian texts, even while they opposed their authors.[177] More theological innovation soon followed. Theophilus of Antioch not only identified Satan as a demon and as responsible for the fall of Adam and Eve, but also described demons as the source of temptation and sin.[178] Tatian likewise drew his demonology from a belief in the rebellion of Satan, and developed further the concept of demons seeking to deceive and entrap Christians.[179]

The Didache, 1 Clement, Shepherd of Hermas, Martyrdom of Polycarp, and 2 Clement not only show no evidence of such beliefs, they also show evidence of reinforcing an Adamic etiology of sin and demythologization of satanological terminology, differentiating them from the clearly Enochic etiology of later second century writings, and identifying them as belonging to an earlier Christian tradition.

Two other texts of the Apostolic Fathers warrant mention. The extant fragment of Quadratus (early second century), contains no satanological terminology at all, and people are said to have been "healed of their diseases" and "healed," without any reference to demon possession or illness resulting from affliction by Satan or demons; the text itself is completely

---

[173] Carr 2005, 152.
[174] Kelly 2014, 24; De La Torre 2011, 70.
[175] Kelly 2006, 177.
[176] Russell 1987, 64; Carr 2005, 150.
[177] Russell 1987, 62.
[178] Rogers 2000, 68.
[179] Carr 2005, 161.

non-mythological. This is remarkable for a text written during an era in which Christian demonology had become well developed and demonic possession was a common etiology of illness. The Epistle to Diognetus (late second century), similarly contains no satanological terminology,[180] has an Adamic etiology of sin,[181] cites the serpent in Eden without identifying it with Satan,[182] and notably describes the gods and idols of the heathen as dead, without any reference to demonic beings behind them (completely contrary to his contemporaries).[183]

Brief as they are, these two writings nevertheless exhibit signs of an Adamic etiology of sin and non-mythological etiology of illness, whilst containing no satanological terminology at all. This differentiates them significantly from most of their contemporaries, whilst identifying them closely with the texts of the Apostolic Fathers under examination here, and provides evidence complementing (if not directly in support of) the argument made in his study.

Conclusion

The writers of the Didache, 1 Clement, Shepherd of Hermas, Martyrdom of Polycarp, and 2 Clement consistently identify humans as the origin and cause of evil, rather than Satan or demons. Showing no interest in demons, possession, or exorcism, they exhibit a strong concern with ethical and psychological dualism, and recommend that evil impulses be overcome with internal self-control supplemented by prayer and good thoughts. These texts show a distinct marginalization or even demythologization of satanological terminology, differentiating them sharply from Christian texts immediately proximate or written shortly after. In Second Temple Period literature, use of such language to speak of sin and evil is associated strongly with non-belief in Satan and demons. This should also be considered as an efficient explanation for the content of these texts in the Apostolic Fathers.

However, regardless of whether the writers of these texts personally believed in a supernatural Satan and demons, it is necessary to explain why

---

[180] Edwards 2012, 62.
[181] Jefford 2013, 68.
[182] Jefford 2013, 102; Russell 1987, 46.
[183] Ehrman 2003, 126; Jenott 2011, 50; Richardson 1995, 215.

they do not demonstrate the same concern with supernatural evil beings which is found in the writings of their contemporaries.

The content of the texts analyzed in this study suggests that even if these writers were modifying their language for the benefit of their audience, they did so because their audience either did not believe in such beings or considered them of negligible theological or practical importance.

This study makes three contributions. One is a synthesis of the evidence for, and scholarly commentary on, a strong trend of Adamic etiology of sin within the Apostolic Fathers, as opposed to an Enochic etiology which attributed sin to supernatural evil forces. A second is the evidence it presents for a first century demythological Christianity which survived well into the second century, though only as a minority report. A third is a systematic application of lexicographical and etiological analysis to early Christian satanology, which should be of interest to other researchers in this field.

Works Consulted

Arbel, Daphna. 2012. "On Adam, Enoch, Melchizedek, and Eve." Pages 431–53 in *New Perspectives on 2 Enoch: No Longer Slavonic Only*. Edited by Andrei Orlov, Gabriele Boccaccini, and Jason Zurawski. SJSl 4. Leiden: Brill.

Arichea, Daniel C., and Howard Hatton. 1995. *A Handbook on Paul's Letters to Timothy and to Titus*. UBS Handbook Series. New York: United Bible Societies.

Avemarie, Friedrich, and Jan Willem van Henten. 2005. *Martyrdom and Noble Death: Selected Texts from Graeco-Roman, Jewish and Christian Antiquity*. London: Routledge.

Balabanski, Victoria. 2005. *Eschatology in the Making: Mark, Matthew and the Didache*. SNTSMS 97. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bamberger, Bernard J. 2010. *Fallen Angels: Soldiers of Satan's Realm*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society.

Baynes, Leslie. 2011. *The Heavenly Book Motif in Judeo-Christian Apocalypses 200 BCE–200 CE*. JSJSup 152. Leiden: Brill.

Black, Matthew. 1990. "The Doxology to the Pater Noster with a Note on Matthew 6:13b." Pages 327–36 in *A Tribute to Geza Vermes: Essays on Jewish and Christian Literature and History*. Edited by Philip R. Davies and Richard T. White. JSOTSup 100. Sheffield: JSOT Press.

Boccaccini, Gabriele. 2008. "Where Does Ben Sira Belong?" Pages 21–42 in *Studies in the Book of Ben Sira: Papers of the Third International Conference on the Deuterocanonical Books, Shime'on Centre, Pápa,*

Hungary, 18–20 May, 2006. Edited by Géza Xeravits and József Zsengellér. JSJSup 127. Leiden: Brill.

Bouteneff, Peter. 2008. *Beginnings: Ancient Christian Readings of the Biblical Creation Narratives*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.

Boyd, James W. 1975. *Satan and Māra: Christian and Buddhist Symbols of Evil*. Leiden: Brill.

Brannan, Rick. 2011. *Apostolic Fathers Greek-English Interlinear*. Electronic ed. Logos Bible Software.

Breytenbach, C., and P. L. Day. 1999. "Satan." Pages 730–32 in *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*. Edited by Karel van der Toorn, Bob Becking and Pieter Willem van der Horst. 2nd ed. Leiden: Brill and Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Brock, Sebastian. 1990. "The Two Ways and the Palestinian Targum." Pages 139–52 in *A Tribute to Geza Vermes: Essays on Jewish and Christian Literature and History*. Edited by Philip R. Davies and Richard T. White. JSOTSup 100. Sheffield: JSOT Press.

Burkett, Delbert. 2002. *An Introduction to the New Testament and the Origins of Christianity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Byron, John. 2011. *Cain and Abel in Text and Tradition: Jewish and Christian Interpretations of the First Sibling Rivalry*. TBN 14. Leiden: Brill.

Caird, G. B. 1995. *New Testament Theology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Campbell, Douglas A. 1992. *The Rhetoric of Righteousness in Romans 3.21–26*. Edinburgh: Black.

Capelli, Piero. 2005. "The Outer and the Inner Devil: On Representing the Evil One in Second Temple Judaism." Pages 139–52 in *"The Words of a Wise Man's Mouth Are Gracious" (Qoh 10,12)*. Edited by Mauro Perani. FS G. Stemberger. SJ 32. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Carr, Wesley. 2005. *Angels and Principalities: The Background, Meaning and Development of the Pauline Phrase Hai Archai Kai Hai Exousiai*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Clements, Ruth A. 2013. "Parallel Lives of Early Jewish and Christian Texts and Art: The Case of Isaac the Martyr." Pages 207–40 in *New Approaches to the Study of Biblical Interpretation in Judaism of the Second Temple Period and in Early Christianity: Proceedings of the Eleventh International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, Jointly Sponsored by the Hebrew University Center for the Study of Christianity, 9–11 January, 2007*. Edited by Gary Anderson, Ruth A. Clements, and David Satran. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

Clifford, Richard J., and Daniel Durken. 2013. *Wisdom*. New Collegeville Bible Commentary 20. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2013.

Cohn, Norman. 2011. *Europe's Inner Demons: The Demonization of Christians In Medieval Christendom*. New York: Random House.

Collins, John J. 1998. *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age.* Edinburgh: T&T
    Clark.
Davies, Philip R. 1987. "Sons of Cain." Pages 35–56 in *A Word in Season:
    Essays in Honour of William McKane*. Edited by Philip R. Davies and
    James D. Martin. JSOTS 42. New York: Bloomsbury.
De La Torre, Miguel A. 2011. *Genesis*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox.
Delling, Gerhard. 1985. "Ἀντίκειμαι." Page 655 in *Theological Dictionary of the
    New Testament*. Edited by Gerhard Kittel, Gerhard Friedrich, and
    Geoffrey William Bromiley. Vol. 3. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
deSilva, David. 1998. *4 Maccabees*. Edinburgh: Black.
Di Lella, Alexander A. 2003. "Free Will in the Wisdom of Ben Sira 15:11–20."
    Pages 253–64 in *Auf den Spuren der schriftgelehrten Weisen*. Edited by
    Irmtraud Fischer, Ursula Rapp, and Johannes Schiller. FS J. Marböck.
    BZW 331. Berlin: de Gruyter.
Draper, Jonathan A. 1995. "Social Ambiguity and the Production of Text:
    Prophets, Teachers, Bishops, and Deacons and the Development of the
    Jesus Tradition in the Community of the Didache." Pages 284–312 in
    The Didache in Context: Essays on Its Text, History, and Transmission.
    Edited by Clayton N. Jefford. Leiden: Brill.
Dunn, James D. G. 1998. *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*. Grand Rapids:
    Eerdmans.
Edwards, J. Christopher. 2012. *The Ransom Logion in Mark and Matthew: Its
    Reception and Its Significance for the Study of the Gospels*. Tübingen:
    Mohr Siebeck.
Ehrman, Bart D. 2003. *The Apostolic Fathers: I Clement. II Clement. Ignatius.
    Polycarp. Didache*. Vol. 1. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
Emmel, V. Donald. 2014. *Eliminating Satan and Hell: Affirming a
    Compassionate Creator-God*. Eugene: Wipf & Stock.
Eve, Eric. 2002. *The Jewish Context of Jesus' Miracles*. JSNTSup 231. Sheffield:
    Sheffield Academic Press.
Ferngren, Gary B. 2009. *Medicine and Health Care in Early Christianity*.
    Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2009.
Flusser, David. 2009. *Judaism of the Second Temple Period: The Jewish Sages
    and Their Literature*. Vol. 2. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
Forsyth, Neil. 1989. *The Old Enemy: Satan and the Combat Myth*. Princeton:
    Princeton University Press.
Freyne, Sean. 2014. *The Jesus Movement and Its Expansion: Meaning and
    Mission*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
Garrow, Alan. 2013. *The Gospel of Matthew's Dependence on the Didache*. New
    York: Bloomsbury Academic.
Gibson, E. Leigh. 2003. "The Jews and Christians in the *Martyrdom of Polycarp*:
    Entangled or Parted Ways?" Pages 145–58 in *The Ways That Never
    Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle*

Ages. Edited by Adam H. Becker and Annette Yoshiko Reed. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Guthrie, Donald. 1990. *Pastoral Epistles: An Introduction and Commentary*. TNTC 14. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press.

Guy, Laurie. 2011. *Introducing Early Christianity: A Topical Survey of Its Life, Beliefs & Practices*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press.

Hare, Douglas R. A. 2009. *Matthew*. Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching & Preaching. Louisville: Westminster John Knox.

Hartog, Paul. 2013. *Polycarp's Epistle to the Philippians and the Martyrdom of Polycarp: Introduction, Text, and Commentary*. Oxford Apostolic Fathers. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Helyer, Larry R. 2002. *Exploring Jewish Literature of the Second Temple Period: A Guide for New Testament Students*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press.

Hogan, Karina Martin. 2008. *Theologies in Conflict in 4 Ezra Wisdom, Debate, and Apocalyptic Solution*. JSJSup 130. Leiden: Brill.

Holmes, Michael William. 1999. *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations*. Updated ed. Grand Rapids: Baker.

Hvidt, Niels Christian. 2007. *Christian Prophecy: The Post-Biblical Tradition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jefford, Clayton N. 1989. *The Sayings of Jesus in The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*. Leiden: Brill.

———. 1995. *The Didache in Context: Essays on Its Text, History, and Transmission*. Leiden: Brill.

———. 2013. *The Epistle to Diognetus (with the Fragment of Quadratus): Introduction, Text, and Commentary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jenks, Gregory Charles. 1991. *The Origins and Early Development of the Antichrist Myth*. BZNW 59. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Jenott, Lance. 2011. *The Gospel of Judas: Coptic Text, Translation, and Historical Interpretation of "the Betrayer's Gospel."* Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Johnson, Lawrence J. 2009. *Worship in the Early Church: An Anthology of Historical Sources*. Vol. 1. Collegeville: Liturgical Press.

Kappler, Werner. 1967. *Maccabaeorum Liber I*. Vol. IX, 1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Kelly, Henry Ansgar. 2006. *Satan: A Biography*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 2014. "Adam Citings before the Intrusion of Satan: Recontextualizing Paul's Theology of Sin and Death." *BTB* 44: 13–28.

Kloppenborg, John S. 1995. "The Transformation of Moral Exhortation in Didache 1–5." Pages 88–109 in *The Didache in Context: Essays on Its Text, History, and Transmission*. Edited by Clayton N. Jefford. Leiden: Brill.

Knust, Jennifer Wright. 2013. *Abandoned to Lust: Sexual Slander and Ancient Christianity*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Kobel, Esther. 2011. *Dining with John: Communal Meals and Identity Formation in the Fourth Gospel and Its Historical and Cultural Context*. Leiden: Brill.

Koester, Helmut. 2000. *Introduction to the New Testament*. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Kraft, Robert A. 2009. *Exploring the Scripturesque: Jewish Texts and Their Christian Contexts*. JSJSup 137. Leiden: Brill.

Laato, Antti. 2013. "The Devil In The Old Testament." Pages 1–22 in *Evil and the Devil*. Edited by Erkki Koskenniemi and Ida Fröhlich. LNTS. London: Black.

Lieu, Judith M. 1996. *Image and Reality : The Jews in the World of the Christians in the Second Century*. London: T&T Clark.

———. 2005. *Neither Jew Nor Greek?: Constructing Early Christianity*. London: Black.

Löfstedt, Torsten. 2010. "Paul, Sin and Satan: The Root of Evil according to Romans." *SEÅ* 75: 109–34.

Lunn-Rockliffe, Sophie. 2015. "Diabolical Motivations: The Devil in Ecclesiastical Histories from Eusebius to Evagrius." Pages 119–34 in *Shifting Genres in Late Antiquity*. Edited by Geoffrey Greatrex and Hugh Elton. Burlington: Ashgate.

Maier, Harry O. 2002. *The Social Setting of the Ministry as Reflected in the Writings of Hermas, Clement and Ignatius*. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.

Martin, D. B. 2010. "When Did Angels Become Demons?" *JBL* 129: 657–77.

McCasland, S. Vernon. 1963. "Review: The Terminology for the Devil and Evil Spirits in the Apostolic Fathers, by Francis X. Gokey." *JBL* 82: 465.

Milavec, Aaron. 2003a. *The Didache: Faith, Hope, & Life of the Earliest Christian Communities, 50–70 C.E.* New York: Paulist.

———. 2003b. *The Didache: Text, Translation, Analysis, and Commentary*. Collegeville: Liturgical Press.

Milgrom, Jacob. 1991. *Leviticus 1–16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. New York: Doubleday.

Niederwimmer, Kurt. 1998. *The Didache: A Commentary*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress.

Nielsen, David. 2012. "The Place of the Shepherd of Hermas." Pages 162–76 in *"Noncanonical" Religious Texts in Early Judaism and Early Christianity*. Edited by Lee Martin McDonald and James H. Charlesworth. Jewish and Christian Texts 14. London: Black.

Osborne, Kenan. 2001. *Reconciliation and Justification: The Sacrament and Its Theology*. Eugene: Wipf & Stock.

Osiek, Carolyn. 1999. *Shepherd of Hermas: A Commentary*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress.

Peerbolte, L. J. Lietaert. 1996. *The Antecedents of Antichrist: A Traditio-Historical Study of the Earliest Christian Views on Eschatological Opponents*. Leiden: Brill.

Rajak, Tessa. 1997. "Dying for the Law: The Martyr's Portrait in Jewish-Greek Literature." Pages 39–68 in *Portraits: Biographical Representation in the Greek and Latin Literature of the Roman Empire*. Edited by Mark Edwards and Simon Swain. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rankin, David Ivan. 2006. *From Clement to Origen: The Social and Historical Context of the Church Fathers*. Burlington: Ashgate.

Reed, Annette Yoshiko. 2005. *Fallen Angels and the History of Judaism and Christianity the Reception of Enochic Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richardson, Cyril. 1995. *Early Christian Fathers*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Rogers, Rick. 2000. *Theophilus of Antioch: The Life and Thought of a Second-Century Bishop*. Lanham: Lexington Books.

Rordorf, Willy. 1996. "An Aspect of the Judeo-Christian Ethic: The Two Ways." Pages 148–64 in *The Didache in Modern Research: 1996*. Edited by Jonathan A. Draper. Leiden: Brill.

Rosen-Zvi, Ishay. 2011. *Demonic Desires: "Yetzer Hara" and the Problem of Evil in Late Antiquity*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Rousseau, Philip. 1999. *Pachomius: The Making of a Community in Fourth-Century Egypt*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Runions, Erin. 2012. "Queering the Beast: The Antichrists' Gay Wedding." Pages 79–110 in *Queering the Non/Human*. Edited by Myra J. Hird and Noreen Giffney. Burlington: Ashgate.

Russell, Jeffrey Burton. 1987. *Satan: The Early Christian Tradition*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Sacchi, Paolo. 1990. *Jewish Apocalyptic and Its History*. JSPSup 20. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

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

Schäferdiek, Knut. 1985. "Σατανᾶς." Pages 151–65 in *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Edited by Gerhard Kittel, Gerhard Friedrich, and Geoffrey William Bromiley. Vol. 7. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Schoedel, William R. 1985. *Ignatius of Antioch: A Commentary on the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress.

———. 1992. "Apostolic Fathers." Page 313 in *The Anchor Yale Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David Freedman. Vol. 1. ABRL. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Schöllgen, Georg. 1996. "The Didache as a Church Order; An Examination of the Purpose for the Composition of the Didache and Its Consequences for Its Interpretation." Pages 43–76 in *The Didache in Modern Research: 1996*. Edited by Jonathan A. Draper. Leiden: Brill.

Schwiebert, Jonathan. 2008. *Knowledge and the Coming Kingdom: The Didache's Meal Ritual and Its Place in Early Christianity*. New York: Bloomsbury.

Setzer, Claudia. 1994. *Jewish Responses to Early Christians: History and Polemics, 30–150 CE*. Minneapolis: Fortress.

Sorensen, Eric. 2002. *Possession and Exorcism in the New Testament and Early Christianity*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Stroumsa, Guy G., and Paula Fredriksen. 1998. "Two Souls and the Divided Will." Pages 198–217 in *Self, Soul, and Body in Religious Experience*. Edited by Albert I. Baumgarten, Jan Assmann, and Gedaliahu A. G. Stroumsa. Leiden: Brill.

Stuckenbruck, Loren T. 2013. "The Demonic World of the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 51–70 in *Evil and the Devil*. Edited by Erkki Koskenniemi and Ida Fröhlich. LNTS 481. London: Black.

Suggs, M. Jack. 1972. "The Christian Two Ways Tradition." Pages 60–74 in *Studies in New Testament and in Early Christian Literature: Essays in Honor of Allen P. Wikgren*. Edited by David Edward Aune. Leiden: Brill.

Thomas, John Christopher. 1998. *The Devil, Disease and Deliverance: Origins of Illness in New Testament Thought*. London: Black.

Tigchelaar, Eibert J. C. 2008. "The Evil Inclination In The Dead Sea Scrolls, With A Re-Edition Of 4q468i (4qsectarian Text?)." Pages 347–58 in *Empsychoi Logoi — Religious Innovations in Antiquity: Studies in Honour of Pieter Willem van Der Horst*. AGJU 74. Leiden: Brill.

Tite, Philip L. 2009. *Valentinian Ethics and Paraenetic Discourse: Determining the Social Function of Moral Exhortation in Valentinian Christianity*. Leiden: Brill.

Tomson, Peter J. 2001. *If This Be from Heaven: Jesus and the New Testament Authors in Their Relationship to Judaism*. London: Black.

———. 2014. "Christ, Belial, and Women: 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 Compared with Ancient Judaism and the Pauline Corpus." Pages 79–133 in *Second Corinthians in the Perspective of Late Second Temple Judaism*. Edited by Reimund Bieringer et al. Leiden: Brill.

Towner, Philip H. 2006. *The Letters to Timothy and Titus*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Tuckett, Christopher. 2012. *2 Clement: Introduction, Text, and Commentary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Twelftree, Graham H. 2007. *In the Name of Jesus: Exorcism Among Early Christians*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.

Van den Dungen, Wim. 2001. "JESUS-PEOPLE: The Didache." http://www.sofiatopia.org/equiaeon/didache.htm.

Verheyden, Joseph. 2005. "Eschatology in the Didache and the Gospel of Matthew." Pages 193–215 in *Matthew and the Didache: Two Documents*

from the Same Jewish-Christian Milieu?* Edited by Hubertus Waltherus Maria van de Sandt. Assen: Van Gorcum.

Wiley, Tatha. 2002. *Original Sin: Origins, Developments, Contemporary Meanings*. New York: Paulist.

Williams, Guy. 2009. *The Spirit World in the Letters of Paul the Apostle: A Critical Examination of the Role of Spiritual Beings in the Authentic Pauline Epistles*. FRLANT 231. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Witherington, Ben. 2003. *Revelation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Xeravits, Géza G., ed. 2010. *Dualism in Qumran*. LSTS 76. London: T & T Clark International.

Könsinkluderande språk i nästa svenska bibelöversättning

DAN NÄSSELQVIST
Göteborgs universitet

Sedan mitten av 1980-talet har i princip alla större engelska bibelöversättningar aktivt använt sig av könsinkluderande språk i olika utsträckning för att återge ord och passager som beskriver eller riktar sig till både män och kvinnor.[1] Några översättningar har tillämpat det på fler ställen än så.[2] På svenskt språkområde har de senaste bibelöversättningarna däremot inte arbetat aktivt med könsinkluderande språk. Direktiven för Bibelkommissionen, som producerade Bibel 2000, var redan fastställda när den internationella diskussionen om könsinkluderande språk tog fart på 1980-talet.[3] Svenska Folkbibeln kom till som en reaktion på Bibel 2000 (framför allt översättningen av Nya testamentet, som gavs ut redan 1981) och utifrån dess traditionella perspektiv har det inte varit aktuellt med ett aktivt bruk av könsinkluderande språk, inte heller i den senaste revisionen från 2015.[4] Detsamma gäller Den Svenska Reformationsbibeln, en språklig revidering av Karl XII:s Bibel som gavs ut 2003,[5] liksom Nya världens översättning,

---

[1] Det gäller "ordagranna" översättningar, som New Revised Standard Version (NRSV, 1989), idiomatiska översättningar, som New Jerusalem Bible (NJB, 1996) och New International Version (NIV, 2011), och "friare" översättningar, som Contemporary English Version (CEV, 1995) och New Living Translation (NLT, 1996). Jämför Gordon F. Fee och Mark L. Strauss, *How to Choose a Translation for All Its Worth: A Guide to Understanding and Using Bible Versions* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2007), 97.

[2] Det gäller såväl traditionella översättningar (t.ex. NRSV) som mer radikala (t.ex. *The Inclusive Bible*).

[3] Bibelkommissionen diskuterade frågan internt, men följde i sitt arbete de angivna direktiven, vilka inte nämnde könsinkluderande språk. Se Fredrik Ivarsson. *Evangelium enligt Markus och Maria: Förslag till revidering av NT 81:s översättning av Markusevangeliet utifrån en diskussion om inklusivt språk* (Uppsala: Svenska kyrkans forskningsråd, 1999), 19.

[4] Den gavs ut för första gången 1998 som "Bibeltrogen översättning" (Birger Olsson, *Från Birgitta till Bibel 2000: Den svenska bibelns historia* [Stockholm: Verbum, 2001], 119).

[5] Dess engelska motsvarighet, New King James Version (NKJV, 1982), gavs ut innan könsinkluderande språk blev ett givet – om än omdebatterat – inslag i engelska bibelöversättningar. Den Svenska Reformationsbibeln kom ut i en reviderad version 2015.

Jehovas vittnens bibelöversättning från 1992.[6] Den enda bredare svenska översättning som innehåller omfattande könsinkluderande språk är Nya Levande Bibeln från 2003. Det beror inte på ett aktivt val av översättarna till svenska, utan har att göra med att den översattes direkt från engelska och att dess förlaga, New Living Translation (NLT, 1996), tillämpar könsinkluderande språk i stor utsträckning. Mot den här bakgrunden är det särskilt intressant att ett av direktiven bakom Svenska Bibelsällskapets provöversättning av Galaterbrevet och delar av Lukasevangeliet, som gavs ut 2015,[7] handlade om att översättarna skulle använda könsinkluderande språk.

Det tycks alltså som om den internationella debatten om könsinkluderande språk i bibelöversättningar till sist har gett ett avtryck i den svenska kontexten. Den senaste norska bibelöversättningen, Bibel 2011, använder sig också aktivt av könsinkluderande språk, något som Bibelsällskapet hänvisar till i provöversättningens förord.[8] Som exemplen nedan visar är det dock inte fråga om någon omfattande tillämpning i den norska texten.

Mot den här bakgrunden och inför arbetet med nästa stora svenska bibelöversättning är det hög tid att diskutera vad könsinkluderande språk egentligen innebär och på vilka olika sätt det kan tillämpas på svenska. I den här artikeln gör jag just det, samtidigt som jag analyserar olika typer av könsinkluderande språk i engelska översättningar och de strategier som används för att åstadkomma dem. Jag ger också exempel på hur dessa typer av könsinkluderande språk skulle kunna gestalta sig i en framtida svensk översättning av Nya testamentet. För att kunna ta ställning till frågan om könsinkluderande språk bör användas i framtida svenska bibelöversättningar är det nödvändigt att först göra klart för sig vad som egentligen avses och vilka praktiska konsekvenser det får för översättningsarbetet och den färdiga texten.

---

[6] Den kom ut i en reviderad version 2003. Både denna och den tidigare utgåvan baseras på Jehovas vittnens engelska bibelöversättning, New World Translation (NWT), som gavs ut första gången 1961. Ingen av dessa versioner använder sig aktivt av könsinkluderande språk.

[7] Svenska Bibelsällskapet, *När tiden var inne… Provöversättning av Lukasevangeliet 9–19 och Galaterbrevet* (Uppsala: Bibelsällskapets förlag, 2015).

[8] Bibelsällskapet, *När tiden var inne*, 14.

Könsinkluderande språk i äldre svenska bibelöversättningar

Trots att inte någon svensk bibelöversättning aktivt har använt sig av könsinkluderande språk finns det gott om exempel på att översättare genom historien har gjort val som är tydligt könsinkluderande. På flera ställen har de hebreiska och grekiska uttrycken för "söner" (*bānîm* och υἱοί) översatts på ett könsinkluderande sätt. Frasen *benê yisrāʾēl* ("Israels söner") i 2 Mos 19:6 översattes till exempel med "Israels barnom" i Karl XII:s Bibel (1703), "Israels barn" i 1917 års översättning och "Israels folk" i Bibel 2000. Ingen har reagerat på detta som ett utslag för könsinkluderande språk, eftersom *ben* inte bara betyder "son", utan också "barn" och "ättling". Uttrycket "Israels söner" används på många ställen i Gamla testamentet som en referens till Israels folk. Ett könsspecifikt uttryck (med det maskulina "söner") används alltså om en grupp som består av både män och kvinnor. Det har översättarna uppmärksammat och återgett med de könsinkluderande fraserna "Israels barn" och "Israels folk".

På ett liknande sätt används grekiskans υἱός ("son") inte bara om söner, utan också för "barn" och "ättling". Redan i Gustav Vasas Bibel (1541) översattes υἱοὶ τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς i Matt 5:45 med "idhar fadhers barn som är j himmelen". Här återgavs alltså υἱοί med "barn", eftersom citatet kommer från bergspredikan, som i Matteusevangeliet inte bara riktas till de folkskaror som nämns i början av avsnittet (5:1), utan till alla som läser eller hör Jesus ord. Samma tolkning gjordes av översättarna bakom Karl XII:s Bibel ("edar Faders barn som är i himmelen") och 1917 års översättning ("eder himmelske Faders barn"). Det är därför särskilt anmärkningsvärt att Bibel 2000 innehåller följande översättning av Matt 5:43–45:

> Ni har hört att det blev sagt: *Du skall älska din nästa* och hata din fiende. Men jag säger er: älska era fiender och be för dem som förföljer er; då blir ni er himmelske faders söner. Ty han låter sin sol gå upp över onda och goda och låter det regna över rättfärdiga och orättfärdiga.

Här, precis som på flera andra ställen i Bibel 2000,[9] är texten mer könsspecifik än i äldre översättningar. Svenska Folkbibeln översätter uttrycket

---

[9] Se t.ex. Matt 5:9 ("Saliga de som håller fred, de skall kallas Guds söner") och Rom 8:14 ("Alla som leds av ande från Gud är Guds söner"), som översätts med "Guds söner" i Bibel 2000, men "Guds barn" i andra svenska översättningar.

som "er himmelse Fars barn" och markerar därmed, liksom de äldre svenska översättningarna, att det handlar om både män och kvinnor. Det är tydligt att Jesus uppmaning om att älska sina fiender inte bara riktas till män och därmed har de flesta översättare valt att översätta υἱοί med köns-inkluderande språk ("barn" istället för "söner") för att tydliggöra detta och inte skapa missförstånd hos läsaren.

Könsinkluderande språk har alltså förekommit sporadiskt i äldre svenska bibelöversättningar när källtexten tydligt refererar till både män och kvinnor, även om det inte har tillämpats medvetet (med målet att skapa ett könsinkluderande språk) eller som följd av ett direktiv. När samma term i källtexten (till exempel υἱοί) används för att enbart referera till män har det också översatts könsspecifikt ("söner") istället för köns-inkluderande. Liknelsen om den förlorade sonen inleds i samtliga svenska översättningar med "En man hade två söner" (Luk 15:11).

Det är alltså inte frågan om att könsinkluderande språk antingen inte används alls eller tillämpas överallt i texterna. Valet står snarare mellan en omedveten tillämpning, som i äldre svenska bibelöversättningar, och ett aktivt bruk, som i engelska översättningar från mitten av 1980-talet och framåt. Bibelsällskapets direktiv om att könsinkluderande språk skulle användas i provöversättningen av Luk 9:51–19:28 och Gal är en indikat-ion om att ett skifte håller på att ske från en omedveten till en medveten användning av könsinkluderande språk också på svenskt språkområde. Att könsinkluderande språk tillämpas medvetet och aktivt innebär dock inte att det bara kan ske på ett enda sätt. De engelska översättningarna visar tydligt att det finns olika typer eller grader av könsinkluderande språk. Innan jag går över till att beskriva dessa skall jag dock adressera frågan om vad som har lett till att könsinkluderande språk numera används aktivt i nästan alla engelska bibelöversättningar.

Varför använda könsinkluderande språk?

Som jag har antytt ovan har könsinkluderande språk tillämpats sporadiskt och mer eller mindre omedvetet ända sedan den första svenska bibelöver-sättningen. Detsamma gäller på engelskt språkområde. Redan i den första kompletta engelska översättningen av Bibeln, utgiven av John Wycliffe år

1382, finns könsinkluderande språk på några ställen där källtexterna uttrycker sig könsspecifikt (i maskulinum) samtidigt som de refererar till både män och kvinnor.[10]

Under slutet av 1900-talet förändrades situationen och nästan alla större engelska bibelöversättningar använder sig nu aktivt av könsinkluderande språk i olika utsträckning. Hur kommer det sig? Varför tillämpar översättarna bakom så vitt skilda översättningar som den "ordagranna" och ekumeniska NRSV, den idiomatiska och evangelikala NIV och den "fria" och parafraserande CEV könsinkluderande språk på ett aktivt sätt i sitt översättningsarbete?

Orsaken är åtminstone tvådelad och rör förändringar i översättningsideal och språkanvändning (inom både engelska och svenska). I fråga om översättningsidealet går det rent historiskt att klassificera äldre svenska och engelska bibelöversättningar på en glidande skala mellan "ordagranna" och "fria".[11] Svenska lutherska bibelöversättningar, framför allt Gustav Vasas Bibel (1541), Gustaf II Adolfs Bibel (1618) och Karl XII:s Bibel (1703), var förhållandevis "fria" i förhållande till källtexterna. De berodde till stor del på att de var beroende av Luthers nydanande bibelöversättning, som fokuserade mer på att förmedla Bibelns budskap i dess helhet på naturlig och samtida tyska än att hålla sig strikt trogen mot källtexternas formuleringar och struktur.[12] Under slutet av 1800-talet och stora delar av 1900-talet var allt fler bibelöversättningar i den internationella miljön, inte minst de som var auktoriserade av större samfund, mer eller mindre "ordagranna".[13] Situationen ändrades från 1960-talet, som en följd av Eugene Nidas publikationer om översättningsteori. Han beskrev principerna bakom de olika översättningsidealen och argumenterade effektivt för idiomatiska ("fria") översättningar, vilket har påverkat de flesta större översättningskommittéers arbete sedan dess.[14]

---

[10] Mark L. Strauss, *Distorting Scripture? The Challenge of Bible Translation & Gender Accuracy* (Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 1998), 17.

[11] Birger Olsson, "Fri eller ordagrann översättning", i *Nyöversättning av Nya testamentet: Behov och principer*, red. Utbildningsdepartementet, SOU 1968:65 (Stockholm: Utbildningsdepartementet), 256–94, här 258–65. Jämför Fee och Strauss, *Translation*, 30, 136–43.

[12] Utbildningsdepartementet, *Nyöversättning*, 27.

[13] Fee och Strauss, *Translation*, 139.

[14] Den första publikationen som inledde den här förändringen är Eugene Nida, *Towards a Science of Translating* (Leiden: Brill, 1964).

I och med Nidas bidrag kan översättningsidealen beskrivas tydligare och mer korrekt än med termer som "ordagrann" och "fri". Istället används begreppen formell och funktionell ekvivalens. Formell ekvivalens innebär ett översättningsideal enligt vilket källspråket prioriteras framför målspråket och där översättaren återger originaltextens uttryck och konstruktioner så långt det är möjligt på målspråket, även om det inte är det mest naturliga sättet att uttrycka saken.[15] Fokus ligger på att översätta det som sägs, varefter läsaren får tolka vad det kan betyda. Funktionell ekvivalens innebär att målspråket prioriteras framför källspråket. Översättaren fokuserar mindre på originaltextens form och mer på att uttrycka dess mening på ett motsvarande och naturligt sätt på målspråket.[16]

Moderna bibelöversättningar kan därmed placeras på en glidande skala mellan formell och funktionell ekvivalens, beroende på vilken princip som har dominerat översättningsarbetet. Även om det finns flera moderna bibelöversättningar som utgår från formell ekvivalens har de flesta engelska översättningar från mitten av 1980-talet tydligt påverkats av funktionell ekvivalens.[17] Med detta följer ett fokus på källtextens mening snarare än dess ordalydelse eller form. Översättarens målsättning är att uttrycka textens mening på ett sätt som är naturligt för målspråket, även om det innebär att det sker med en annan struktur eller med andra typer av ord än i källtexten.

Det faktum att allt fler engelska bibelöversättningar under slutet av 1900-talet påverkades av funktionell ekvivalens innebar att de i högre grad använde könsinkluderande språk. När översättare tolkade att textens mening omfattade både män och kvinnor valde de i allt högre utsträckning att tydligt uttrycka det på engelska, även om källtexten använde

---

[15] Källspråk refererar till det språk som man översätter från, medan målspråk anger det språk man översätter till.

[16] Jämför beskrivningen av karaktärsdragen hos formdrivna (formell ekvivalens) och meningsdrivna (funktionell ekvivalens) översättningar i David Dewey, *A User's Guide to Bible Translations: Making the Most of Different Versions* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2004), 34–39.

[17] Fee och Strauss (*Translation*, 34) klassificerar engelska bibelöversättningar i tre kategorier: "literal", "mediating" och "idiomatic". De översättningar som kallas "literal" (de inkluderar NKJV och NRSV) följer formell ekvivalens, medan "mediating" (bland dem återfinns NIV och NJB) är tydligt påverkade av funktionell ekvivalens och "idiomatic" (däribland NLT och CEV) domineras helt av funktionell ekvivalens. De flesta större engelska översättningar från 1980-talets mitt och framåt klassificeras som "mediating" eller "idiomatic".

könsspecifikt språk. De gjorde en klarare skillnad mellan grammatiskt och biologiskt kön och förde inte automatiskt över könsspecifikt (normalt maskulint) språk till målspråket.

Könsinkluderande språk hade dessförinnan använts mer eller mindre omedvetet och i liten skala (till exempel i fråga om att översätta *bānîm* och *vioí* med "children" istället för "sons"), men nu tillämpades det medvetet och aktivt på en rad textställen som uppfattades beskriva eller tilltala både män och kvinnor. När översättarna tolkade att källtexten inte omfattade både män och kvinnor använde de könsspecifika uttryck också på engelska.

Den andra orsaken till att nästan alla engelska bibelöversättningar från 1980-talets mitt och framåt aktivt har tillämpat könsinkluderande språk har att göra med förändringar i nutida språkanvändning. De senaste decennierna har medvetenheten ökat om hur språket både återspeglar och formar världsbild och värderingar. Det är särskilt tydligt i fråga om maskulint könsbundet språk, som ofta används för att omfatta både män och kvinnor. Som ett resultat av att bland annat feminister har kritiserat den dominerande roll som maskulint språk har är de flesta inte längre bekväma med till exempel könsspecifika yrkestitlar.[18] Det är idag vanligare att tala om en "polis" än en "polisman", att använda "riksdagsledamot" istället för "riksdagsman" och att välja termen "lärare" framför den könsspecifika "lärarinna".[19] Detta märks också i nyare bibelöversättningar, som ofta undviker att använda könsspecifika yrkestitlar och beskrivningar.[20]

Den ökande medvetenheten om – och känsligheten inför – könsbundet språk har lett till att maskulina ord och uttryck inte längre på ett självklart sätt används för att referera till både män och kvinnor. Det gäller inte minst generiskt "han", när det maskulina personliga pronomenet "han" används i allmänna utsagor som omfattar både män och kvinnor. Det har fått till följd att de nyare engelska bibelöversättningarna försöker undvika att använda "he" eller "man" i texter som inte exklusivt handlar om män. Notera förändringen i översättningen av det maskulina substantivet

---

[18] Dewey, *Bible Translations*, 90.

[19] Jämför Ivarsson, *Evangelium*, 40–41.

[20] Maskulina yrkestitlar och beskrivningar (t.ex. "workmen", "watchmen", "herdsmen") används i betydligt mindre utsträckning i de nyare engelska översättningarna än tidigare (Dewey, Bible *Translations*, 92). På svenskt språkområde har dock Bibel 2000 inneburit att bruket av t.ex. "förman"/"förmän" och "landsman"/"landsmän" har ökat i jämförelse med 1917 års översättning.

ἄνθρωπος ("människa", "man") i Rom 3:28 från Revised Standard Version (RSV) och New King James Version (NKJV) till de nyare översättningarna (kursiveringen är min):

> λογιζόμεθα γὰρ δικαιοῦσθαι πίστει ἄνθρωπον χωρὶς ἔργων νόμου.[21]

> For we hold that *a man* is justified by faith apart from works of law. (RSV, 1952)

> Therefore we conclude that *a man* is justified by faith apart from the deeds of the law. (NKJV, 1982)

> [S]ince, as we see it, *a person* is justified by faith and not by doing what the Law tells *him* to do. (NJB, 1985)

> For we hold that *a person* is justified by faith apart from works prescribed by the law. (NRSV, 1989)

> We see that *people* are acceptable to God because they have faith, and not because they obey the Law. (CEV, 1995)

> For we hold that *one* is justified by faith apart from works of the law. (ESV, 2001)

Notera att till och med English Standard Version (ESV), vars upphovsmän (kommittén bestod av endast män) aktivt reagerade mot det ökande bruket av könsinkluderande språk, översätter ἄνθρωπος på ett könsinkluderande sätt ("one"). Orsaken är att också översättarna till formellt ekvivalenta versioner som NRSV och ESV uppfattar att Paulus utsaga gäller alla människor, både män och kvinnor, och väljer att uttrycka det tydligt på engelska. David Dewey beskriver det som ett resultat av att könsbundet språk i allmänna utsagor inte bara upplevs stötande, utan dessutom riskerar att missförstås av yngre personer:

> Today, the use of *man* to include both men and women is not only widely offensive, it is often not understood … A younger person or someone

---

[21] Samtliga grekiska textexempel, inklusive detta, är hämtade från NA[28].

unacquainted with biblical language who read that "a *man* is justified by faith" might raise what seems to them an obvious question: "By what then is a *woman* justified?"[22]

Samma typ av förändring som i översättningen av ἄνθρωπος går att finna i hur nyare engelska bibelöversättningar tillämpar könsinkluderande språk också på ställen där källtexten saknar könsspecifika ord eller uttryck (i synnerhet i allmänna utsagor). Det gäller till exempel första halvan av Joh 10:9, som på grekiska uttrycks helt utan könsspecifikt språk. Notera hur de äldre översättningarna trots det valde könsspecifikt språk på engelska (jag har kursiverat det maskulina pronomenet), medan de nyare undviker det:

ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ θύρα· δι᾽ ἐμοῦ ἐάν τις εἰσέλθῃ σωθήσεται

I am the door; if any one enters by me, *he* will be saved (RSV, NKJV)

I am the gate. Anyone who enters through me will be safe (NJB)

I am the gate. Whoever enters by me will be saved (NRSV)

I am the gate. All who come in through me will be saved (CEV)

Könsinkluderande språk tillämpas alltså från och med mitten av 1980-talet alltmer medvetet och aktivt i engelska bibelöversättningar. Bibelsällskapets direktiv om könsinkluderande språk för provöversättningen antyder att samma skifte håller på att ske på svenskt språkområde. Bakgrunden tycks också här vara tvådelad och grunda sig i att översättningsideal och språkanvändning har förändrats. Provöversättningen tillämpar könsinkluderande språk på ett oregelbundet sätt, både inom och mellan de två texterna (Luk och Gal).[23] Därmed är det viktigt att analysera inte bara *om* det används, utan också *på vilket sätt*. De nyare engelska bibelöversättningarna visar tydligt att det finns olika typer av könsinkluderande språk.

---

[22] Dewey, *Bible Translations*, 91.
[23] Se Dan Nässelqvist, "Svenska Bibelsällskapets provöversättning i ett internationellt perspektiv", *STK* 92 (2016): 154–63.

Den första typen: könskorrekt språk

Nästan alla nyare engelska bibelöversättningar använder sig aktivt av könsinkluderande språk och de flesta av dem begränsar bruket till de ställen där källtextens mening är tydligt inkluderande. Den första – och vanligaste – typen av könsinkluderande språk är därmed den som används för att översätta ord och uttryck som i källtexten uttrycks med könsspecifikt (normalt maskulint) språk, men där det är tydligt att textens mening är könsinkluderande, det vill säga omfattar både män och kvinnor. Utgångspunkten för ett sådant resonemang är funktionell ekvivalens, eftersom detta översättningsideal fastställer att en översättning skall följa och uttrycka källtextens mening snarare än dess form. Val av den här typen används dock även i vissa formellt ekvivalenta bibelöversättningar som tillämpar könsinkluderande språk, till exempel NRSV.

Den första typen av könsinkluderande språk kallas ofta för "gender accurate",[24] det vill säga "könskorrekt" språk. Detta för att markera att det inte står i kontrast till traditionella översättningar, utan utgör det bästa sättet att översätta meningen hos specifika ord och uttryck. Om de refererar till en man översätts de med motsvarande maskulina ord eller uttryck på målspråket, men om de refererar till både män och kvinnor översätts de med könsinkluderande språk.

Könskorrekt språk vid specifika maskulina termer

Nyare engelska översättningar som tillämpar könsinkluderande språk använder sig konsekvent av könskorrekt språk, men det blir särskilt tydligt vid maskulina termer som traditionellt har översatts med "son", "far", "bror" och liknande. Könskorrekt språk används genomgående på de ställen där äldre bibelöversättningar mer eller mindre omedvetet gjorde samma sak, till exempel i de fall då "söner" (*bānîm* eller υἱοί) tydligt refererar till både män och kvinnor. Det tillämpas också på en rad ställen där äldre bibelöversättningar inte har valt könsinkluderande formuleringar. Det gäller till exempel när källtexterna använder ord som ἄνθρωπος ("människa", "man"), ἀδελφός ("bror") och πατήρ ("far", "förfader").

Jag beskrev ovan hur ἄνθρωπος i Rom 3:28 har översatts i äldre och nyare engelska bibelöversättningar. Tidigare använde översättare "man",

---

[24] Fee och Strauss, *Translation*, 97–98. Se också Strauss, *Distorting Scripture?*, 14–15, som dock kopplar det explicit till författarens intention (vilken han å andra sidan identifierar som textens mening på flera andra ställen i boken).

som på engelska visserligen uttrycker betydelsen "människa", men gör det med ett maskulint könsspecifikt ord. Nyare översättningar återger det därför med ett könsinkluderande uttryck, "a person" eller "people". När ἄνθρωπος används för att referera just till en man använder dock även de nyare bibelöversättningar som tillämpar könskorrekt språk ett könsspecifikt ord, "man". En könskorrekt översättning handlar helt enkelt om att så tydligt som möjligt återge källtextens mening. Refererar den till en man används könsspecifikt språk i översättningen; refererar den till både män och kvinnor används könsinkluderande språk.

På svenska skapar inte ἄνθρωπος samma problem som på engelska, eftersom det kan översättas med det könsspecifika "man" när det refererar till en specifik man och med det könsinkluderande "människa" när det refererar till både män och kvinnor. Därmed kommer inte en framtida svenska bibelöversättning som väljer att tillämpa könskorrekt språk att ha några problem med att återge ἄνθρωπος. Bibel 2000, som inte har arbetat aktivt med könskorrekt språk, visar det tydligt i översättningen av Joh 1:6 och Rom 3:28 (kursiveringen är min):

> Det kom *en man* som var sänd av Gud, hans namn var Johannes (Joh 1:6)

> Ty vi menar att *människan* blir rättfärdig på grund av tro, oberoende av laggärningar (Rom 3:28)

Den grekiska termen ἀδελφός ("bror") har resulterat i nya formuleringar på engelska när könskorrekt språk används. Precis som ἄνθρωπος kan ἀδελφός användas för att referera till personer av manligt kön; det översätts då med "brother", som i Matt 17:1 ("John the brother of James", NIV). I de nytestamentliga breven förekommer det på många ställen som en referens till brevmottagarna, de troende på en viss plats. Eftersom de flesta tänker sig att dessa troende innefattade både män och kvinnor har det blivit vanligt att i sådana fall använda könskorrekt språk för att översätta ἀδελφός. Jämför översättningen av ἀδελφοί in Fil 4:1 (kursiveringen är min):

> ὥστε, ἀδελφοί μου … οὕτως στήκετε ἐν κυρίῳ

> Therefore, my *brethren* … in this way stand firm in the Lord (NASB)[25]

---

[25] New American Standard Bible (NASB) är den striktast formellt ekvivalenta av de större engelska bibelöversättningarna. Den skapades av amerikanska evangelikala som inte var

So then, my *brothers and dear friends* … hold firm in the Lord (NJB)

Therefore, my *brothers and sisters* … stand firm in the Lord in this way (NRSV, NIV)

Dear friends … Please keep on being faithful to the Lord. (CEV)

Derfor, mine *søsken* … stå fast i Herren (N11BM)[26]

I översättningen av Fil 4:1 syns en tydlig växling från det könsspecifika ”brethren” till uttryck som inkluderar både män och kvinnor, till exempel ”brothers and sisters” och ”dear friends”. Den norska Bibel 2011 använder det könsneutrala ”søsken”, vilket dock inte fungerar lika naturligt i tilltal på svenska (”mina syskon” har inte den familjära ton som finns i ”mina bröder”, ”mina systrar” eller ”mina bröder och systrar”). Motsvarande tendens att tillämpa könskorrekt språk går att finna i Bibelsällskapets provöversättning av Galaterbrevet. På samtliga ställen där ἀδελφοί används (Gal 1:2, 11; 3:15; 4:12, 28, 31; 5:11, 13; 6:1, 18) översätts det med ”bröder och systrar”. Utgivarna tolkar alltså Galaterbrevet (i likhet med de flesta kommentarförfattare) som riktat till både män och kvinnor och väljer därför en könsinkluderande översättning av ἀδελφοί på de ställen där Paulus använder det för att uppmana mottagarna.

Ytterligare ett exempel på ett maskulint ord som kan används både könsspecifikt och könsinkluderande är πατήρ (”far”,”förälder”, ”förfader”). Det används ofta som en referens till en förälder av manligt kön och samtliga översättningar återger det då med det könsspecifika ”father”. Det gäller till exempel Apg 7:14, som talar om hur Josef sände bud till bland annat Jakob, ”his father”.[27] På andra ställen står πατήρ i plural och refererar till någons föräldrar, både fadern och modern. Då väljer samtliga översättningar det könsinkluderande ”parents”. Ett exempel på detta är

---

nöjda med RSV, gavs ut 1971 och reviderades senast 1995. Dess upphovsmän är öppet kritiska mot bruket av könsinkluderande språk och NASB har ofta maskulina uttryck även där källtexten är genusneutral (Dewey, *Bible Translations*, 156–57, 173).

[26] N11BM är en förkortning för bokmålsversion av Bibel 2011, den senaste norska bibelöversättningen, som gavs ut av det norska bibelsällskapet. I detta och samtliga följande exempel från Bibel 2011 återges just bokmålsversionen.

[27] Se t.ex. RSV, NKJV, NASB, NJB, NRSV, NLT, CEV och NIV. Bibel 2000 har ”sin far Jakob”.

Heb 11:23 där Moses föräldrar omnämns med frasen τῶν πατέρων αὐτοῦ, vilket översätts med "his parents" eller "Moses' parents".[28]

På flera ställen används πατήρ för att referera till en släkting av en äldre generation ("förfader"). I sådana fall skiljer sig de översättningar som tillämpar könsinkluderande språk från dem som undviker det. Se till exempel första halvan av Joh 6:31 (kursiveringen är min):

> οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν τὸ μάννα ἔφαγον ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ

> Our *fathers* ate the manna in the wilderness (RSV, NKJV, NASB)

> Our *ancestors* ate the manna in the wilderness (NRSV, NIV)

I Joh 6:31 är det tydligt att οἱ πατέρες inte bara refererar till män, utan till alla israeliter som tog del i ökenvandringen. Det könsinkluderande "ancestors" är därför en mer träffande översättning än "fathers", vilket är poängen med könskorrekt språk.

Svenska översättningar har större problem än de engelska med πατήρ, eftersom svenskan saknar en könsinkluderande term motsvarande "ancestors". "Förfader" och "anfader" är könsspecifika, så en könskorrekt översättning av Joh 6:31 skulle kräva en mer omfattande omskrivning på svenska. I Bibel 2000 används "fäder", "förfäder" och "anfäder" när πατήρ refererar till tidigare generationer (Joh 6:31 inleds med: "Våra fäder åt mannat i öknen") och det kommer att vara en utmaning att hitta ett väl fungerande könsinkluderande uttryck som fångar samma betydelse.[29] Den här problematiken är tydlig i Bibelsällskapets provöversättning. Trots direktiv om att använda könsinkluderande språk så märks det inte i översättningen av de ställen där πατήρ används med referens till tidigare generationer (kursiveringen är min):[30]

> Dom över er! Ni reser minnesstenar över profeterna som *era fäder* (οἱ δὲ πατέρες ὑμῶν) slog ihjäl.[31] (Luk 11:47)

---

[28] Se RSV, NKJV, NASB, NJB, NRSV, NLT, CEV och NIV. Bibel 2000 väljer "Moses föräldrar".

[29] Samma begränsning finns i norska språket. Bibel 2011 inleder Joh 6:31 med "våre fedre".

[30] I samtliga dessa exempel har Bibel 2011 "fedrene".

[31] Provöversättningen följer här Bibel 2000, som också översätter οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν med "era fäder".

Ni är alltså vittnen till vad *era fäder* har gjort (τοῖς ἔργοις τῶν πατέρων ὑμῶν) och ni ger dem ert gillande; de dödade profeterna och ni reser minnesstenar över dem.[32] (Luk 11:48)

Jag gick längre än många av mina jämnåriga landsmän i lojalitet mot judisk sed och hävdade traditionerna från *mina fäder* (τῶν πατρικῶν μου παραδόσεων) ivrigare än de.[33] (Gal 1:14)

Könskorrekt språk i översättningen av generiskt "han"

Könskorrekt språk är inte begränsat till översättningen av nyckeltermer som υἱός, ἄνθρωπος, ἀδελφός och πατήρ; den framträder lika tydligt i översättningen av generiskt "han".[34] Begreppet generiskt "han" refererar till de tillfällen då ett ord i maskulinum används i generella utsagor och alltså refererar till både män och kvinnor. Det rör sig oftast om det maskulina personliga pronomenet i tredje person singular (αὐτός, "han") eller den maskulina bestämda artikeln (ὁ) i ett substantiverat particip.

De nyare engelska översättningar som aktivt tillämpar könsinkluderande språk använder könskorrekt språk för att översätta generiskt "han". Det innebär att maskulina pronomen och artiklar översätts med "he" eller "he who" när de refererar till en man, men med någon form av omskrivning när de förekommer i allmänna utsagor. Det finns åtminstone åtta olika strategier för att skapa sådana omskrivningar på engelska.[35]

Ett av de vanligaste sätten att skapa en könskorrekt översättning (härefter kallad strategi 1) av ett maskulint ord i en generell utsaga består av att ändra numerus från tredje person singular till tredje person plural. Detta beror på att engelskan har könsneutrala pronomen i tredje person plural

---

[32] Provöversättningen följer här Bibel 2000, som också översätter τῶν πατέρων ὑμῶν med "era fäder".

[33] Provöversättningen ligger här nära Bibel 2000, som översätter τῶν πατρικῶν μου med "från våra fäder".

[34] Ett exempel på detta är att NRSV innehåller drygt 4200 färre exempel av "he", "him" och "his" jämfört med RSV (Vern Poythress och Wayne Grudem, *The Gender Neutral Bible Controversy: Is the Age of Political Correctness Altering the Meaning of God's Words?*, updated edition [Fearn: Mentor Imprint, 2003], 128).

[35] Olika författare presenterar delvis överlappande beskrivningar av strategier för att översätta generiskt "han" i allmänna utsagor. Fee och Strauss, *Translation*, 103–5, tar upp fem strategier relaterade till maskulina personliga pronomen, Vern S. Poythress och Wayne A. Grudem, *The TNIV and the Gender-Neutral Bible Controversy* (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2004), 86–95, behandlar fem strategier för både maskulina pronomen och bestämda artiklar, och Strauss, *Distorting Scripture?*, 113–25, nämner eller analyserar sju olika strategier för maskulint pronomen eller bestämd artikel.

som kan användas om människor ("they"), men saknar det i tredje person singular ("it" används om till exempel djur och föremål, men inte om människor).[36] Eftersom generiskt "han" normalt används i generella utsagor, som implicit gäller många människor även om de uttrycks i singular på grekiska, fungerar plural ofta väl.[37] Jämför översättningen av andra halvan av 1 Joh 4:16 (kursiveringen är min):

> ὁ θεὸς ἀγάπη ἐστίν, καὶ ὁ μένων ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ ἐν τῷ θεῷ μένει καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἐν αὐτῷ μένει.

> God is love, and *he* who abides in love abides in God, and God abides in *him* (RSV)

> God is love, and *those* who abide in love abide in God, and God abides in *them*. (NRSV)

RSV har en formellt ekvivalent översättning av 1 Joh 4:16 utan könsinkluderande språk, vilket innebär att såväl den maskulina bestämda artikeln (ὁ) i den substantiverade participfrasen (ὁ μένων) som det maskulina personliga pronomenet (αὐτῷ) översätts med könsspecifika engelska termer ("he" och "him"). NRSV kombinerar formell ekvivalens med könsinkluderande språk och har i det här fallet en könskorrekt översättning. Genom att omvandla meningen till plural undviker NRSV könsspecifika uttryck och fångar därmed att det är en allmän utsaga som inte bara gäller män.[38]

Ett andra sätt (strategi 2) att uppnå en könskorrekt översättning av generiskt "han" med allmän referens är att ändra både person och numerus, från tredje person singular ("he") till andra person plural ("you"). Jämför översättningen av Joh 8:51 (kursiveringen är min):

> ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ἐάν τις τὸν ἐμὸν λόγον τηρήσῃ, θάνατον οὐ μὴ θεωρήσῃ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

> Truly, truly, I say to you, if *any one* keeps my word, *he* will never see death. (RSV)

> I tell you for certain that if *you* obey my words, *you* will never die. (CEV)

---

[36] Samma begränsning återfinns i svenska.
[37] Jämför argumenten i Fee och Strauss, *Translation*, 104–5.
[38] För kritik av en sådan översättning, se Poythress och Grudem, *TNIV*, 87.

Återigen krävs omskrivningar för att undvika könsspecifikt språk i en översättning av en allmän utsaga. Förändringen är avsevärd eftersom utsagan plötsligt riktas direkt till läsarna/åhörarna, men den kan försvaras med att allmänna utsagor på engelska ofta använder andra person plural (till exempel "You get what you pay for").[39]

Ett tredje sätt (strategi 3) handlar om att ändra från tredje person singular ("he") till första person plural ("we"). Den här strategin används sällan, men förekommer bland annat i översättningen av 1 Joh 3:17 (kursiveringen är min):

> ὃς δ' ἂν ἔχῃ τὸν βίον τοῦ κόσμου καὶ θεωρῇ τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ χρείαν ἔχοντα καὶ κλείσῃ τὰ σπλάγχνα αὐτοῦ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, πῶς ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ μένει ἐν αὐτῷ;

> But if *any one* has the world's goods and sees *his* brother in need, yet closes *his* heart against *him*, how does God's love abide in *him*? (RSV)

> If *we* have all *we* need and see one of *our* own people in need, *we* must have pity on *that person*, or else *we* cannot say *we* love God. (CEV)

I 1 Joh 3:17 har CEV valt att översätta framför allt en rad maskulina personliga pronomen med "we". Utgivarna har därmed undvikit könsspecifikt språk i en allmän utsaga genom att låta den handla om avsändarna och mottagarna. Utsagan blir alltså något mindre allmän med den här strategin, eftersom inte alla människor automatiskt ryms i "vi".

Ett fjärde sätt (strategi 4) att skapa en könskorrekt översättning av generiskt "han" med allmän referens är att kombinera singular och plural genom att använda "they" tillsammans med ett korrelat i singular, som i översättningen av Matt 5:41 (kursiveringen är min):

> καὶ ὅστις σε ἀγγαρεύσει μίλιον ἕν, ὕπαγε μετ' αὐτοῦ δύο.

> And *whoever* compels you to go one mile, go with *him* two. (NKJV)

> If *anyone* forces you to go one mile, go with *them* two miles. (NIV)

I grekiskan korrelerar båda pronomen (ὅστις och αὐτοῦ) med varandra vad det gäller numerus; de står i singular. NKJV återger detta med förhållande med två pronomen i singular ("whoever" och "him"). NIV söker en

---

[39] Fee och Strauss, *Translation*, 104.

könskorrekt översättning av vad som tycks vara en allmän utsaga (och som därmed gäller både män och kvinnor), genom att omvandla det andra pronomenet till plural ("them"). En sådan förändring av numerus är inte ovanlig på engelska, men uppfattas av vissa som undermåligt skriftspråk.[40]

Ett femte sätt (strategi 5) består av att det maskulina personliga pronomenet byts ut mot ett substantiv som inte är könsspecifikt. Den här strategin blir snabbt slitsamt repetitiv, men den används sporadiskt i de översättningar som tillämpar könsinkluderande språk. Se översättningen av första halvan av Luk 10:6 (kursiveringen är min):

καὶ ἐὰν ᾖ ἐκεῖ υἱὸς εἰρήνης, ἐπαναπαήσεται ἐπ᾽ αὐτὸν ἡ εἰρήνη ὑμῶν·

And if *a son of peace* is there, your peace shall rest upon *him*; (RSV)

And if *anyone* is there who shares in peace, your peace will rest on *that person*; (NRSV)

Här har NRSV valt könsinkluderande språk för huvudordet υἱὸς εἰρήνης och det personliga pronomen som refererar tillbaka till det (αὐτόν). För att undvika en könsspecifik översättning har det personliga pronomenet ("him") bytts ut mot ett substantiv ("person") med ett demonstrativt pronomen ("that").

Ett sjätte sätt (strategi 6) att skapa en könskorrekt översättning av generiskt "han" med allmän referens har vi redan sett flera exempel på. Det består av att ersätta ett maskulint personligt pronomen med ett obestämt (och därmed könsneutralt) pronomen. Se översättningen av Joh 1:9 (kursiveringen är min):

ἦν τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινὸν ὃ φωτίζει πάντα ἄνθρωπον ἐρχόμενον εἰς τὸν κόσμον.

The true light that enlightens *every man* was coming into the world (RSV)

The true light that gives light to *everyone* was coming into the world (NRSV)

---

[40] Jämför Fee och Strauss, *Translation*, 104; Poythress och Grudem, *TNIV*, 92–93.

Ett sjunde sätt (strategi 7) består av att undvika det maskulina personliga pronomenet i översättningen. Det är möjligt i en rad nytestamentliga allmänna uttryck, till exempel i Mark 4:9 (kursiveringen är min):

> καὶ ἔλεγεν· ὃς ἔχει ὦτα ἀκούειν ἀκουέτω.
>
> And he said, "*He* who has ears to hear, let *him* hear." (RSV)
>
> And he said, "Let *anyone* with ears to hear listen!" (NIV)

RSV använder två maskulina personliga pronomen ("he" och "him") som refererar till samma person. NIV undgår könsspecifikt språk i en allmän utsaga genom att välja ett könsneutralt obestämt pronomen ("anyone") och sedan undvika ett andra personligt pronomen.

Det åttonde sättet (strategi 8) att skapa en könskorrekt översättning av generiskt "han" med allmän referens består av att komplettera det maskulina personliga pronomenet ("he") med ett feminint ("he or she") så att uttrycket blir könsbalanserat. Det är därmed en slags motsvarighet till att översätta ἀδελφός med "brothers and sisters". Jag har inte hittat något konkret exempel på den här strategin i de nyare engelska översättningar jag har granskat, även om den diskuteras i litteraturen.[41] Nedanstående exempel från 1 Kor 8:13 är därför delvis konstruerat (kursiveringen är min):

> διόπερ εἰ βρῶμα σκανδαλίζει τὸν ἀδελφόν μου, οὐ μὴ φάγω κρέα εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, ἵνα μὴ τὸν ἀδελφόν μου σκανδαλίσω.
>
> Therefore, if food is a cause of my *brother's* falling, I will never eat meat, lest I cause my *brother* to fall. (RSV)
>
> Therefore, if what I eat causes my *brother or sister* to fall into sin, I will never eat meat again, so that I will not cause *them* to fall. (NIV)
>
> Therefore, if what I eat causes my *brother or sister* to fall into sin, I will never eat meat again, so that I will not cause *him or her* to fall. (översättning med feminint pronomen)

NIV översätter det första ἀδελφόν med "brothers and sisters" och det andra med "them" (strategi 1). Den konstruerade översättningen avslutar

---

[41] Se Strauss, *Distorting Scripture?*, 113–14.

med det könsbalanserade "him or her" istället för det könsneutrala "them". Resultatet visar att den här strategin riskerar att bli lika otymplig som strategi 5 (då pronomen byts ut mot substantiv), vilket förmodligen är orsaken till varför det inte används aktivt i de översättningar jag har granskat.

Ett nionde sätt (strategi 9) finns inte i engelskan, men används redan i svenskan vid allmänna utsagor. Det består av att använda det generiska pronomenet "man".[42] Det är visserligen vanligt i allmänna uttalanden på svenska (till exempel: "Om man vill komma någon vart måste man jobba för det"), men det är inte givet att det gör texten könsinkluderande för alla eller ens de flesta läsare. Ett slags maskulint uttryck ("han") skulle i så fall bytas ut mot ett annat ("man") – om än inte lika tydligt könsspecifikt – för att referera till både män och kvinnor. Bruket av "man" i allmänna uttryck har också kritiserats för att vara sexistiskt och det mer dialektala "en" har föreslagits som ett alternativ.[43]

De här nio strategierna för att undvika generiskt "han" vid allmänna utsagor är visserligen könskorrekta, men de innebär alla någon typ av förändring i jämförelse med källtexten.[44] De fyra första strategierna handlar om att byta numerus eller både person och numerus hos hela eller delar av meningen. De fem sista strategierna utgår istället från att ett maskulint personligt pronomen antingen undviks (genom att det ersätts med ett substantiv, ett annat pronomen eller raderas helt) eller kompletteras med ett feminint personligt pronomen.

Även om strategierna leder till förändringar i form, så kan de försvaras med att de därmed bevarar källtextens mening, ett argument som väger särskilt tungt i funktionellt ekvivalenta översättningar. Strategierna erbjuder olika sätt att bevara något av det mest centrala i en allmän utsaga, nämligen att den potentiellt gäller alla, inte bara män.

Även om de olika strategierna för en könskorrekt översättning av generiskt "han" erbjuder många möjligheter är de inte lika användbara eller passande i alla sammanhang. Det går alltså inte att välja en av strategierna och tillämpa den på samtliga allmänna utsagor med generiskt "han" i Nya

---

[42] Ivarsson (*Evangelium*, 54) använde "man" för att skapa en mer könsinkluderande översättning av allmänna utsagor i Markusevangeliet.

[43] Östen Dahl, "Från hen till en. Ännu ett svenskt pronomen i farozonen", *Språktidningen* 3/2013, 54–55. Jämför kritiken i Bo Löfvendahl, "'En' ingen självklar ersättare för 'man'", *Svenska Dagbladet* 2014-09-15, http://www.svd.se/en-ingen-sjalvklar-ersattare-for-man. Jag diskuterar användningen av "hen" senare i artikeln.

[44] Jämför Fee och Strauss, *Translation*, 104.

testamentet. Precis som med andra översättningsfrågor finns det ingen genväg runt det faktum att varje textställe måste bedömas för sig.

Könskorrekt språk vid generiskt "han" i svensk översättning

Hur fungerar de åtta strategierna i en svensk bibelöversättning? Nedan ger jag möjliga översättningar av några textställen som har generiskt "han" i Nya testamentet utifrån de nio strategier som har beskrivits ovan.[45] De fungerar som en illustration av att olika strategier behövs i olika sammanhang, samtidigt som de indikerar att några strategier är mer respektive mindre användbara på svenska. Notera att norska Bibel 2011, den enda större översättning på något av de nordiska språken som aktivt har tillämpat könsinkluderande språk, inte genomgående använder könskorrekt språk på något av dessa ställen.

Jag börjar med ett förhållandevis lätthanterligt bruk av generiskt "han", från första halvan av Luk 11:23 (kursiveringen är min):

> ὁ μὴ ὢν μετ' ἐμοῦ κατ' ἐμοῦ ἐστιν, καὶ ὁ μὴ συνάγων μετ' ἐμοῦ σκορπίζει.

> *Den som* inte är med mig är mot mig, och *den som* inte samlar med mig, *han* skingrar (utan könskorrekt språk; från Bibel 2000)[46]

> *De som* inte är med mig är mot mig, och *de som* inte samlar med mig, *de* skingrar (strategi 1, ändra till tredje person plural)

> *Ni som* inte är med mig är mot mig, och *ni som* inte samlar med mig, *ni* skingrar (strategi 2, ändra till andra person plural)

> *Vi som* inte är med mig är mot mig, och *vi som* inte samlar med mig, *vi* skingrar (strategi 3, ändra till första person plural)

> *Den som* inte är med mig är mot mig, och *den som* inte samlar med mig, *de* skingrar (strategi 4, kombinera singular och plural)

---

[45] I nedanstående exempel har jag primärt reviderat befintliga översättningar (Bibel 2000 eller bibelsällskapets provöversättning), snarare än nyöversatt källtexten. Detta för att skillnaderna i hur generiskt "han" kan hanteras på svenska skall bli så tydliga som möjligt genom att översättningarna i övrigt är likartade.
[46] Bibel 2011 har samma typ av översättning som Bibel 2000, utan könskorrekt språk: "*Den som* ikke er med meg, er mot meg. Og *den som* ikke samler med meg, *han* sprer".

> *Den som* inte är med mig är mot mig, och *den som* inte samlar med mig, *den personen* skingrar (strategi 5, byt ut pronomen mot substantiv)
>
> *Den som* inte är med mig är mot mig, och *den som* inte samlar med mig skingrar (strategi 7, ta bort pronomen; från Bibelsällskapets provöversättning)
>
> *Den som* inte är med mig är mot mig, och *den som* inte samlar med mig, *han eller hon* skingrar (strategi 8, komplettera med feminint pronomen)

I ett så pass okomplicerat exempel som Luk 11:23 är det tydligt att det inte finns någon anledning att ta till stora omskrivningar (som i strategi 1–4) för att komma bort från det könsspecifika uttrycket i Bibel 2000 och göra den allmänna utsagan könsinkluderande. Det är också tydligt att strategi 4, att kombinera singular och plural, inte alls fungerar lika väl på svenska som på engelska i ett sådant här sammanhang. Strategierna 6 och 9 kan inte tillämpas på ett bra sätt och strategi 8 är både otymplig och inkonsekvent ("den" och "han eller hon" refererar till samma person). Strategi 7, som handlar om att ta bort det maskulina pronomenet (och som används i provöversättningen), fungerar utmärkt och skapar minimal förändring av formen.[47]

En mer svårhanterlig text finns i Luk 14:28. Här tillämpar inte Bibelsällskapets provöversättning könsinkluderande språk trots att versen framstår som en allmän utsaga, inte minst då 14:25 anger att Jesus talat till ὄχλοι πολλοί, "stora skaror", och då 14:26–27 består av andra allmänna utsagor om lärjungaskap (kursiveringen är min):

> τίς γὰρ ἐξ ὑμῶν θέλων πύργον οἰκοδομῆσαι οὐχὶ πρῶτον καθίσας ψηφίζει τὴν δαπάνην, εἰ ἔχει εἰς ἀπαρτισμόν;
>
> Om någon av er vill bygga ett torn, sätter *han sig* då inte ner och räknar ut vad det kostar, för att se om *han* har råd med bygget? (utan könskorrekt språk; från Bibel 2000)[48]

---

[47] En förutsättning för att kunna använda den här strategin tillsammans med substantiverade particip med maskulin bestämd artikel (t.ex. ὁ μὴ ὤν) är att de översätts könsinkluderande ("den som" snarare än "han som"), men det är ett faktum i Bibel 2000 och har funnits i svensk bibelöversättningstradition sedan Gustav Vasas Bibel (som översätter participfrasen med "then icke medh migh är").

[48] Bibel 2011 har samma typ av översättning som Bibel 2000, utan könskorrekt språk: "Dersom en av dere vil bygge et tårn, setter *han* seg ikke da først ned og regner ut hva det vil koste, for å se om *han* har penger nok til å fullføre det?"

Om någon av er tänker bygga ett torn, sätter *han sig* inte då först ner och räknar ut vad det skulle kosta att slutföra bygget? (utan könskorrekt översättning; från bibelsällskapets provöversättning)

Om någon av er vill bygga ett torn, sätter *de sig* inte först ner och räknar ut vad det skulle kosta, för att se om *de* har råd med bygget? (både strategi 1, ändra till tredje person plural, och strategi 4, kombinera singular och plural)

Om *ni* vill bygga ett torn, sätter *ni* inte *er* först ner och räknar ut vad det skulle kosta, för att se om *ni* har råd med bygget? (strategi 2, ändra till andra person plural)

Om *vi* vill bygga ett torn, sätter *vi* inte *oss* först ner och räknar ut vad det skulle kosta, för att se om *vi* har råd med bygget? (strategi 3, ändra till första person plural)

Om någon av er vill bygga ett torn, sätter *sig* inte *den personen* först ner och räknar ut vad det skulle kosta, för att se om *den* har råd med bygget? (strategi 5, byt ut pronomen mot substantiv)

Var och en som tänker bygga ett torn, sätter *sig* väl först ner och räknar ut vad det skulle kosta att slutföra bygget? (strategi 6, byt personligt pronomen mot obestämt pronomen)

Om någon av er tänker bygga ett torn, sätter *han eller hon sig* inte då först ner och räknar ut vad det skulle kosta, för att se om *han eller hon* har råd med bygget? (strategi 8, komplettera med feminint pronomen)

Om *man* vill bygga ett torn, sätter *man sig* då inte ner och räknar ut vad det skulle kosta, för att se om *man* har råd med bygget? (strategi 9, byt ut pronomen mot "man")

Vid översättning av Luk 14:28 är det tydligt vilka översättningar som fungerar och vilka som inte gör det. Strategi 7 (att ta bort pronomen), som fungerade utmärkt för Luk 11:23, går inte ens att tillämpa på den här texten. Strategi 1 och 4 (som ger samma resultat) fungerar inte på grund av bristande korrespondens mellan "er" och "de". Strategi 2 och 3 leder till stora omskrivningar när också subjektet måste omvandlas till "vi" eller "ni" (istället för "någon av er"). Strategierna 5, 8 och 9 blir omedelbart

repetitiva, något som skulle förvärras ytterligare om Luk 14:29 tas med.[49] Strategi 6 kräver viss omskrivning gentemot källtexten (subjektet översätts med "var och en" istället för "någon av er"), men leder till att singular bevaras genom hela meningen, samtidigt som hänvisningarna till subjektet är könsneutrala. En könskorrekt översättning av Luk 14:28 bör därmed använda sig av strategi 6, att byta ut det personliga pronomenet mot ett obestämt pronomen.

Som tredje och sista exempel skall jag återvända till 1 Joh 4:16, som jag presenterade ovan som en illustration av strategi 1. Här behövs en annan översättningsstrategi jämfört med i Luk 11:23 och 14:28 för att meningen skall fungera väl på svenska (kursiveringen är min):

> ὁ θεὸς ἀγάπη ἐστίν, καὶ ὁ μένων ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ ἐν τῷ θεῷ μένει καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἐν αὐτῷ μένει.

> Gud är kärlek, och *den som* förblir i kärleken förblir i Gud och Gud i *honom*. (utan könskorrekt språk; från Bibel 2000)[50]

> Gud är kärlek, och *de som* förblir i kärleken förblir i Gud och Gud i *dem*. (strategi 1, ändra till tredje person plural)

> Gud är kärlek, och *ni som* förblir i kärleken förblir i Gud och Gud i *er*. (strategi 2, ändra till andra person plural)

> Gud är kärlek, och *vi som* förblir i kärleken förblir i Gud och Gud i *oss*. (strategi 3, ändra till första person plural)

> Gud är kärlek, och *den som* förblir i kärleken förblir i Gud och Gud i *dem*. (strategi 4, kombinera singular och plural)

> Gud är kärlek, och *den som* förblir i kärleken förblir i Gud och Gud förblir i *den personen*. (strategi 5, byt ut pronomen mot substantiv)

> Gud är kärlek, och *den som* förblir i kärleken förblir i Gud och Gud i *honom eller henne*. (strategi 8, komplettera med feminint pronomen)

---

[49] Vid strategi 9 skulle inte problemet lösas om "man" byttes ut mot "en" (se diskussionen ovan om huruvida "man" fungerar bra eller inte för att referera till både män och kvinnor i allmänna uttryck).

[50] Bibel 2011 har samma typ av översättning som Bibel 2000, utan könskorrekt språk: "Gud er kjærlighet, og *den som* blir i kjærligheten, blir i Gud og Gud i *ham*".

Här går det inte att tillämpa strategi 6 (att byta ut personligt mot obestämt pronomen) eller 7 (att ta bort pronomenet), eftersom den avslutande satsen behöver ett tydligt uttryck för vem Gud förblir i. Strategi 4 (att kombinera singular och plural) fungerar liksom i de tidigare exemplen inte bra på svenska. Strategierna 2–3 (att ändra till andra eller första person plural) är möjliga att använda, men begränsar utsagan så att den inte är lika allmän, utan bara gäller en viss grupp.[51] Strategi 5 (att byta ut pronomenet mot ett substantiv) är torr och riskerar att bli enformig, men den skulle kunna användas här. Strategi 8 fungerar dåligt, precis som i Luk 11:23, eftersom den använder "den" och "han eller hon" för att referera till samma person.[52] På svenska är strategi 1 (att ändra till tredje person plural) bäst lämpad för 1 Joh 4:16, eftersom den undviker att begränsa den allmänna utsagan med könsspecifikt språk (som i Bibel 2000) eller avgränsande omskrivningar (som i strategi 2 och 3).

De här tre exemplen visar att det inte går att välja en enda strategi för att uppnå könskorrekt språk vid översättning av generiskt "han" till svenska. I Luk 11:23 fungerade det bäst att ta bort ett maskulint pronomen (strategi 7), i Luk 14:28 var ett byte från personligt pronomen till obestämt pronomen (strategi 6) mest effektivt och i 1 Joh 4:16 behövdes en växling till tredje person plural (strategi 1) för att uppnå god svenska och inte begränsa utsagan. De tre exemplen indikerar därmed helt olika strategier som de mest lämpade, vilket är en påminnelse om att det inte går att tillämpa samma strategi i alla eller ens de flesta sammanhang. De olika valen i Bibelsällskapets provöversättning (könskorrekt i Luk 11:23, men inte i 14:28) beror förmodligen på att direktivet om könsinkluderande språk var vagt och kortfattat formulerat och att det dessutom inte nämnde generiskt "han".[53]

Ytterligare en möjlig strategi för att undvika generiskt "han" är att använda det könsneutrala pronomenet "hen". Det förekom i texter redan på 1960-talet, men har blivit allt vanligare sedan den inflytelserika debattar-

---

[51] Möjligen kan strategi 3 (att växla till första person plural) fungera bättre som en länk till talet i första person plural i 4:17, men å andra sidan försvinner då skillnaden i omfattning mellan den allmänna utsagan i 4:16 och det riktade uttalandet i 4:17.

[52] Alternativet att använda både maskulina och feminina pronomen genom hela versen skulle bli alldeles för repetitivt: "Gud är kärlek, och *han eller hon som* förblir i kärleken förblir i Gud och Gud i *honom eller henne*."

[53] Se Bibelsällskapet, *När tiden var inne*, 14–15, som nästan ordagrant återger det kortfattade direktivet i Svenska Bibelsällskapet, "Tilläggsdirektiv enligt beslut i bibelsällskapets styrelse 2013-09-17", bilaga till § 43.

tikeln "Det behövs ett nytt ord i svenska språket" trycktes i *Svenska Dagbladet* i början av 2012.[54] Därefter har pronomenet diskuteras ivrigt och tagit plats inte bara på bloggar och i tidningsartiklar, utan också i studentuppsatser och i kommunikation från fackförbund och myndigheter.[55] Trots denna snabba spridning används "hen" inte för att översätta antika texter, och Svenska Bibelsällskapet har inte beaktat det som ett alternativ för en könsinkluderande översättning. Jag kommer därför inte att arbeta med det som ett alternativ i de första och andra typerna av könsinkluderande språk. I den tredje typen (radikalt inkluderande språk) kommer jag dock att ge alternativ med pronomenet "hen" i de fall där det är möjligt att tillämpa.

Den andra typen: könsnedtonat språk

Nästan alla nyare engelska bibelöversättningar använder sig av den första typen av könsinkluderande språk (könskorrekt språk), men bara några få går längre än så. Den andra typen av könsinkluderande språk är kumulativ med den första. Översättningar av den här typen använder sig alltså av könskorrekt språk samtidigt som de går längre. Denna andra typ har jag valt att kalla könsnedtonat språk.[56] Med det menar jag att dessa översättningar, utöver att använda könsinkluderande språk på de ställen där källtextens mening är uppenbart könsinkluderande, också har olika strategier för att minska mängden maskulint språk i översättningen så långt det är möjligt utan att göra våld på textens mening.

De mest använda engelska bibelöversättningar som inkluderar både första och andra typen av könsinkluderande språk är NRSV och CEV. Istället för att begränsa könsinkluderande språk till de ställen där källtextens mening tydligt omfattar både män och kvinnor (som i den första ty-

---

[54] Karin Milles, Karin Salmson & Marie Tomicic, "Det behövs ett nytt ord i svenska språket", *Svenska Dagbladet* 2012-01-20, http://www.svd.se/det-behovs-ett-nytt-ord-i-svenska-spraket. För en kort historik över bruket av "hen", se Karin Milles, "En öppning i en sluten ordklass? Den nya användningen av pronomenet *hen*", *Språk & stil* NF 23 (2013): 107–40; Daniel Wojahn, *Språkaktivism. Diskussioner om feministiska språkförändringar i Sverige från 1960-talet till 2015* (avhandling, Uppsala universitet, 2015).

[55] Per Ledin och Benjamin Lyngfelt, "Olika *hen*-syn. Om bruket av hen i bloggar, tidningstexter och studentuppsatser", *Språk & stil* NF 23 (2013): 141–74. Se också pressmeddelandet från Institutet för språk och folkminnen, "Hen allt vanligare hos myndigheter", 2014-08-25, http://www.sprakochfolkminnen.se/om-oss/nyheter-och-press/nyhetsarkiv/nyheter-2014/2014-08-25-hen-allt-vanligare-hos-myndigheter.html.

[56] Andra möjliga termer skulle kunna vara "könsdämpat" eller "könsdiskret" språk.

pen, könskorrekt språk) använder de könsinkluderande språk på alla ställen utom då källtexten tydligt refererar till män. Här används alltså könsinkluderande språk även i osäkra fall. Förordet till NRSV förklarar bakgrunden och tillvägagångsättet:

> During the almost half a century since the publication of the RSV, many in the churches have become sensitive to the danger of linguistic sexism arising from the inherent bias of the English language towards the masculine gender, a bias that in the case of the Bible has often restricted or obscured the meaning of the original text. The mandates from the Division specified that, in references to men and women, masculine-oriented language should be eliminated as far as this can be done without altering passages that reflect the historical situation of ancient patriarchal culture.[57]

Den första delen av det citerade avsnitten talar om den förändring av språkanvändningen som har lett till att mer könskorrekta översättningar behövs för att källtexternas mening skall bli tydlig för läsare och åhörare. Här handlar det alltså om könskorrekt språk, den första typen av könsinkluderande språk. Resten av citatet hänvisar till direktivet att maskulint språk skall undvikas så långt det är möjligt utan att textens mening ändras. Detta är en referens till könsnedtonat språk, den andra typen av könsinkluderande språk. Trots detta svepande uttryck visar översättningen tydligt att direktivet bara har tillämpats på människor, inte på Jesus eller Gud, annat än i mycket begränsad omfattning (se exemplen nedan). NRSV använder sig alltså av både könskorrekt och könsnedtonat språk.

Det finns olika tillvägagångssätt att uppnå ett könsnedtonat språk, vilket NRSV och CEV ger prov på. Det vanligaste är att maskulina könsspecifika ord och uttryck översätts med könsinkluderande motsvarigheter överallt utom på de ställen där det är tydligt att de refererar till män. Det här leder till en hel del svårigheter att fastställa om ett textställe tveklöst refererar till män. Ett exempel på den svårigheten finns i Luk 5:18 (kursiveringen är min):

> καὶ ἰδοὺ ἄνδρες φέροντες ἐπὶ κλίνης ἄνθρωπον ὃς ἦν παραλελυμένος

> Some *men* came carrying a paralyzed *man* on a mat (NIV)

> Just then some *men* came, carrying a paralyzed *man* on a bed (NRSV)

---

[57] Bruce M. Metzger, "To the Reader", i *The Holy Bible, New Revised Standard Version* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989), ix–xii.

and some *people* came carrying a crippled *man* on a mat (CEV)

Some *people* came carrying a *paralytic* on a mat (NIVI)[58]

Frågan här är om de individer som bar fram en lam person till Jesus var män eller inte, liksom om personen som var lam var en man eller kvinna. Den senare frågan klargörs i den följande versen (5:19), där det är tydligt att den lama individen är en man.[59] Mycket tyder på att de som bär fram den lama mannen också är män. De beskrivs som ἄνδρες, en pluralform av ordet ἀνήρ ("man", "make", "person"), som normalt refererar till en man (och som oftare används om män än till exempel ἄνθρωπος). Dessutom beskriver Luk 5:18–20 hur de bär den lama mannen, klättrar upp på ett tak med honom, bryter upp taket och firar ned honom, vilket har tolkats som att det rör sig om män. Ordval och kontext tyder alltså på att de är män och NRSV översätter därmed ἄνδρες med "some men", i likhet med NIV.[60] Översättarna bakom CEV och NIVI har gjort en annan tolkning och väljer här ett könsnedtonat uttryck, "some people".[61]

Ett något mer lättolkat ställe är Matt 12:41, där Jesus talar om hur många i Nineve som skall uppstå eftersom de hade omvänt sig när de hörde profeten Jona (kursiveringen är min):

> ἄνδρες Νινευῖται ἀναστήσονται ἐν τῇ κρίσει μετὰ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης καὶ κατακρινοῦσιν αὐτήν· ὅτι μετενόησαν εἰς τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰωνᾶ,

> The *men* of Nineveh will stand up at the judgment with this generation and condemn it; for they repented at the preaching of Jonah, (NIV)

> The *people* of Nineveh will rise up at the judgment with this generation and condemn it, because they repented at the proclamation of Jonah, (NRSV)

---

[58] New International Version: Inclusive Language Edition (NIVI) är en version av NIV från 1996 med mer omfattande könsinkluderande språk än i tidigare och senare utgåvor av NIV. Den har nu ersatts av de senare Today's New International Version (TNIV, 2005) och den senaste versionen av New International Version (NIV, 2011) och trycks inte längre.

[59] Berättaren anger att de inte kunde bära in "honom" (αὐτόν), utan fick fira ned "honom" (αὐτόν).

[60] Översättarna bakom Bibel 2011 tycks ha gjort samma tolkning och använder uttrycket "noen menn" för ἄνδρες.

[61] NIVI använder dessutom ett könsneutralt uttryck för den förlamade mannen, "a paralytic".

> On the day of judgment the *people* of Nineveh will stand there with you and condemn you. They turned to God when Jonah preached, (CEV)

Här har översättarna bakom både NRSV och CEV dragit slutsatsen att texten förmodligen hänvisar till hela Nineves befolkning (både män och kvinnor) med ett könsspecifikt uttryck (ἄνδρες). Så länge det inte är givet att det enbart handlar om män skall avsnittet därmed översättas könsinkluderande, enligt principerna bakom den andra typen, könsnedtonat språk. NIV, liksom andra engelska översättningar, har här översatt frasen ἄνδρες Νινευῖται med ”the men of Nineve”.[62]

Den här typen av överväganden om huruvida källtextens mening enbart handlar om män är nödvändiga i alla sammanhang där (maskulint) könsspecifikt språk förekommer. Översättare som inte bara arbetar med könskorrekt språk utan också med könsnedtonat språk måste i varje vers överväga om ett maskulint uttryck tveklöst refererar till en man. Om så inte är fallet skall det enligt principerna för den här typen översättas med ett könsinkluderande uttryck.

Det finns sammanhang där övervägandena om könsnedtonat språk skall tillämpas eller inte är särskilt svåra. Det gäller till exempel när ett maskulint uttryck tveklöst används om en man (därmed bör det inte översättas könsinkluderande), men där det används i en berättelse eller en metafor som inte nödvändigtvis förutsätter att huvudpersonen är en man. Poängen med berättelsen är sällan vilket kön huvudpersonen i den har, utan hur han eller hon agerar. Ett exempel på detta finns i Matt 7:24, 26 (kursiveringen är min):

> πᾶς οὖν ὅστις ἀκούει μου τοὺς λόγους τούτους καὶ ποιεῖ αὐτούς, ὁμοιωθήσεται ἀνδρὶ φρονίμῳ, ὅστις ᾠκοδόμησεν αὐτοῦ τὴν οἰκίαν ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν … καὶ πᾶς ὁ ἀκούων μου τοὺς λόγους τούτους καὶ μὴ ποιῶν αὐτοὺς ὁμοιωθήσεται ἀνδρὶ μωρῷ, ὅστις ᾠκοδόμησεν αὐτοῦ τὴν οἰκίαν ἐπὶ τὴν ἄμμον.

> Everyone then who hears these words of mine and acts on them will be like *a wise man* who built his house on rock … And everyone who hears these words of mine and does not act on them will be like *a foolish man* who built his house on sand. (NRSV)

---

[62] Undantaget är återigen NIVI, som liksom NRSV och CEV använder uttrycket ”the people of Nineve”. En intressant parallell är att Bibel 2000 har valt en könsneutral översättning av Matt 12:41 (”Folk från Nineve”), liksom Bibel 2011 (”Folk fra Ninive”).

> Anyone who hears and obeys these teachings of mine is like *a wise person* who built a house on solid rock. Anyone who hears my teachings and doesn't obey them is like *a foolish person* who built a house on sand. (CEV)

I det här avsnittet berättar Jesus en liknelse om en klok man (ἀνὴρ φρόνιμος) och en dåraktig man (ἀνὴρ μωρός) för att illustrera vikten av att lyssna till hans förkunnelse och agera utifrån den. De flesta engelska översättningar, inklusive NIVI och NRSV, återger referensen till de två männen i berättelsen med "a wise man" och "a foolish man".[63] CEV väljer en könsinkluderande översättning ("a wise person" och "a foolish person"), trots att det tycks tydligt att de två exemplen av ἀνήρ handlar om män. Det har förmodligen att göra med att det inte handlar om historiska personer, utan om fiktiva karaktärer i en liknelse.

Även om två översättningar tillämpar könsnedtonat språk kan de alltså göra det i olika utsträckning beroende på hur översättarna har tolkat de ställen som innehåller maskulina uttryck. NRSV har här översatt utifrån det direktiv som nämndes ovan, att översättarna skall undvika maskulint språk så länge det är möjligt utan att ändra på textställen som återspeglar antikens patriarkala kultur. Översättningen i CEV förmedlar textens mening lika tydligt som NRSV, men NRSV bevarar dessutom (liksom andra översättningar) den konkreta berättelsens specifika form (med dess patriarkala utgångspunkt).

De här exemplen visar tydligt att bruket av könsnedtonat språk bör ske i "trohet mot en 'främmande' kultur", ett av bibelsällskapets direktiv inför provöversättningen av Luk 9:51–19:28 och Gal.[64] Det tycks vara möjligt att undvika maskulint könsspecifikt språk på fler ställen än vad som är fallet i en översättning med enbart könskorrekt språk utan att därmed göra avkall på att förmedla källtextens mening.

Utöver det grundläggande tillvägagångssättet att uppnå könsnedtonat språk (genom att tillämpa könsinkluderande språk överallt utom när texten tydligt refererar till män) finns det andra och mer begränsade sätt att närma sig samma mål. Ett av dessa är att undvika maskulina yrkestitlar och beskrivningar. Yrken och sysselsättningar som inte uteslutande bestod

---

[63] Bibel 2011 använder motsvarande norska uttryck, "en klok mann" och "en uforstandig mann".

[64] Jämför *Distorting Scripture?*, 130, om att maskulint språk bör undvikas vid allmänna utsagor, men bevaras när det handlar om generella principer som beskrivs med ett konkret exempel, som liknelsen i Matt 7:24–27.

av män översätts allt oftare med könsinkluderande språk även i bibelöversättningar som endast tillämpar den första typen, könskorrekt språk. Det gäller till exempel yrkestiteln i första delen av Mark 5:14 (kursiveringen är min):

καὶ οἱ βόσκοντες αὐτοὺς ἔφυγον καὶ ἀπήγγειλαν εἰς τὴν πόλιν καὶ εἰς τοὺς ἀγρούς·

The herdsmen fled, and told it in the city and in the country. (RSV)

The men taking care of the pigs ran to the town and the farms to spread the news. (CEV)

Those tending the pigs ran off and reported this in the town and countryside, (NIV)

The swineherds ran off and told it in the city and in the country. (NRSV)

Herdar kan på engelska anges med en könsspecifik term, "herdsmen", eller med en könsinkluderande, "herders". Eftersom kvinnor också kunde vara herdar (jämför 1 Mos 29:6, 9) är det alltså möjligt att referera till dem i Mark 5:14 med den könsinkluderande termen. Sammanhanget runtom visar tydligt att djuren som de har ansvar för är svin (de nämns i varje vers i 5:11–14), vilket har fått de flesta översättare att välja ord eller uttryck som fångar detta. CEV och RSV väljer könsspecifika översättningar med eller utan markering av att herdarna har hand om svin, medan NRSV och NIV väljer könsinkluderande översättningar som också uttrycker att det handlar om svin. Det är förvånande att CEV skapar en så otymplig och könsspecifik översättning, när den i övrigt regelbundet tillämpar könsnedtonat språk.

Ytterligare ett sätt att tillämpa könsnedtonat språk är att i vissa fall reducera antalet maskulina personliga pronomen som används om Gud, så länge meningen kan översättas lika naturligt utan dem. De översättningar som använder könsinkluderande språk av den första och/eller andra typen (könskorrekt och könsnedtonat språk) tillämpar det normalt inte på Gud eller Jesus. Ett undantag är att flera bibelöversättningar (även sådana som i övrigt begränsar sig till könskorrekt språk) undviker att använda för många maskulina pronomen om Gud. En motivering till detta skulle kunna vara att varken de nytestamentliga författarna eller dagens läsare tänker sig att Gud har ett visst kön. Trots det används maskulina metaforer (till exempel av en far) för att beskriva Gud, vilket nästan alla översätt-

ningar vill bevara (undantaget är de översättningar som också tillämpar könsinkluderande språk av den tredje typen; se nedan). Målet för de översättningar som reducerar antalet maskulina pronomen för Gud är alltså inte att ge en könsneutral framställning av Gud utan att minska den totala mängden maskulint språk på de ställen där specifika maskulina metaforer inte används. Ett exempel på detta finns i Gal 3:5 (kursiveringen är min):

ὁ οὖν ἐπιχορηγῶν ὑμῖν τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἐνεργῶν δυνάμεις ἐν ὑμῖν ἐξ ἔργων νόμου ἢ ἐξ ἀκοῆς πίστεως;

Han som gir dere Ånden og gjør under blant dere, gjør *han* det ved lovgjerninger eller ved at dere hører og tror? (N11BM)

Does *he* who supplies the Spirit to you and works miracles among you do so by works of the law, or by hearing with faith? (RSV)

So again I ask, does God give you *his* Spirit and work miracles among you by the works of the law, or by your believing what you heard? (NIV)

Well then, does God supply you with the Spirit and work miracles among you by your doing the works of the law, or by your believing what you heard? (NRSV)

De flesta översättningar av Gal 3:5 använder ett maskulint pronomen någonstans i frågan. NRSV tillämpar istället könsnedtonat språk i den här versen och undviker därmed maskulina pronomen genom att använda "God" i den inledande frasen och genom att undvika ett possessivt pronomen i samband med Anden (det förekommer inte heller i källtexten). Notera att Bibel 2011 (N11BM), som aktivt har tillämpat könsinkluderande språk, har fler maskulina pronomen än de engelska översättningarna.

Fredrik Ivarsson föreslår ett annat sätt att skapa ett mer könsinkluderande språk i svenska bibelöversättningar.[65] Eftersom det handlar om att minska dominansen av maskulint språk placerar jag tekniken här, under könsnedtonat språk. Svenskan böjer adjektiv, i viss likhet med grekiskan, utifrån genus och numerus. Därmed kan adjektivböjningen skilja sig åt mellan maskulinum och femininum, men det gäller inte när adjektivet saknar bestämd artikel, oavsett om det står tillsammans med ett substantiv

---

[65] Ivarsson, *Evangelium*, 61–62.

eller pronomen.[66] Jämför "en *stark* man" och "en *stark* kvinna", liksom
"han är *vacker*" och "hon är *vacker*". Skillnader mellan maskulinum och
femininum återfinns endast hos adjektiv med bestämd artikel (till exempel
substantiverade adjektiv). Jämför "den *starke*" och "den *starka*", liksom
"den *vackre* mannen" och den *vackra* kvinnan". Eftersom böjningen inte
tillämpas lika strikt i dagens svenska och då många avvikelser förekom-
mer kan en könsnedtonad svensk bibelöversättning undvika maskulina
ändelser vid adjektiv som står tillsammans med bestämd artikel utan att
resultatet blir svårförståeligt eller dålig svenska. Se till exempel Mark
10:44 (kursiveringen är min):

> καὶ ὃς ἂν θέλῃ ἐν ὑμῖν εἶναι πρῶτος, ἔσται πάντων δοῦλος·

> och den som vill vara *den förste* bland er skall vara allas slav (Bibel 2000)

> och den som vill vara *främst* bland er skall vara allas slav (Ivarsson)[67]

Det fungerar väl med en könsnedtonad översättning i Mark 10:44, inte
minst eftersom uttalandet inte bara refererar direkt till de tolv lärjungarna i
berättelsen, utan också kan förstås som en instruktion till senare läsare och
åhörare om lärjungaskapets villkor. Hur väl tekniken kan användas när
den tydligt refererar till en man kommer jag att diskutera nedan.

Könsnedtonat språk i svensk översättning

Nedan ger jag möjliga översättningar av några textställen i Nya testamen-
tet utifrån de tekniker för könsnedtonat språk som jag har presenterat
ovan. Den mest grundläggande tekniken för att uppnå könsnedtonat språk
är att använda könsinkluderande språk överallt utom då källtexten tydligt
refererar till män. Jämför följande exempel från Matt 14:34–35 (kursive-
ringen är min):

> καὶ διαπεράσαντες ἦλθον ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν εἰς Γεννησαρέτ καὶ ἐπιγνόντες αὐτὸν
> οἱ ἄνδρες τοῦ τόπου ἐκείνου ἀπέστειλαν εἰς ὅλην τὴν περίχωρον ἐκείνην,
> καὶ προσήνεγκαν αὐτῷ πάντας τοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας

---

[66] Ivarsson noterar inte detta, utan tillämpar medvetenheten om att adjektiv böjs utifrån
genus rent heuristiskt.
[67] Ivarsson, *Evangelium*, 62.

> När de hade farit över sjön kom de till Gennesaret. *Männen* på platsen kände igen honom och skickade ut bud i hela trakten, och *man* förde till honom alla som var sjuka (Bibel 2000)

> Da der var kommet over, la de til land ved Gennesaret. *Folk* der på stedet kjente ham igjen og sendte bud rundt i hele området, og *de* kom til ham med alle som var syke. (N11BM)

> När de hade farit över sjön kom de till Gennesaret. *Folket* där kände igen honom, skickade ut bud i hela trakten, och förde alla som var sjuka till honom (översättning med könsnedtonat språk)

Källtexten använder ἄνδρες för att referera till de personer i Gennesaret som kände igen Jesus, sände bud och förde de sjuka till honom. Bibel 2000 använder två maskulina ord ("männen" och "man") om dessa personer. Eftersom det inte är givet att de uteslutande bestod av män kan en översättning med könsnedtonat språk använda könsinkluderande språk här. Bibel 2011 (N11BM) gör det genom att använda "folk" och "de". För att uppnå motsvarande effekt på svenska behövs bara en liknande mindre omskrivning ("folket där" istället för "männen på platsen") och att de följande satserna översätts utan att subjektet tydliggörs (då behövs inte "man", utan "folket där" fungerar som subjekt också för de efterföljande satserna).

Nästa exempel är hämtat från Luk 17:1–4. Det innehåller en rad maskulina ord, som skulle kunna återges med könsinkluderande språk eftersom undervisningen inte gäller en specifik person, utan varje framtida lärjunge (kursiveringen är min):

> εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ· ἀνένδεκτόν ἐστιν τοῦ τὰ σκάνδαλα μὴ ἐλθεῖν, πλὴν οὐαὶ δι᾽ οὗ ἔρχεται· λυσιτελεῖ αὐτῷ εἰ λίθος μυλικὸς περίκειται περὶ τὸν τράχηλον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔρριπται εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν ἢ ἵνα σκανδαλίσῃ τῶν μικρῶν τούτων ἕνα. προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς. ἐὰν ἁμάρτῃ ὁ ἀδελφός σου ἐπιτίμησον αὐτῷ, καὶ ἐὰν μετανοήσῃ ἄφες αὐτῷ· καὶ ἐὰν ἑπτάκις τῆς ἡμέρας ἁμαρτήσῃ εἰς σὲ καὶ ἑπτάκις ἐπιστρέψῃ πρὸς σὲ λέγων· μετανοῶ, ἀφήσεις αὐτῷ.

> Han sade till sina lärjungar: "Det är oundvikligt att förförelserna kommer, men ve *den* genom vilken de kommer. Det vore bättre för *honom* att ha sänkts i havet med en kvarnsten om halsen än att kunna förleda en enda av dessa små. Ta er i akt! Om din *broder* gör orätt, så tillrättavisa *honom*, och om *han* ångrar sig, så förlåt *honom*. Även om *han* gör orätt mot dig sju gånger om dagen och sju gånger kommer tillbaka och säger: Jag ångrar mig, så skall du förlåta *honom*." (Bibel 2000)

Han sa til disiplene sine: "Det er ikke til å unngå at forførelser kommer, men ve *den som* de kommer fra! Det ville være bedre for *ham* å bli kastet i havet med en møllestein om halsen enn at *han* skulle lokke en av disse små til fall. Ta dere i vare! Dersom din *bror* gjør en synd, så tal *ham* til rette, og hvis *han* angrer, så tilgi *ham*. Ja, om *han* synder mot deg sju ganger på samme dag og sju ganger kommer til deg og sier: 'Jeg angrer', så skal du tilgi *ham*." (N11BM)

Jesus sa till sina lärjungar: "Sådant som leder till människors fall måste komma, men dom över *den* som får det att ske. För *den människan* vore det bättre att få en kvarnsten hängd runt halsen och bli kastad i havet än att få en enda av dessa små på fall. Akta er noga! Om din *broder* gör orätt, så tala *honom* till rätta, och om *han* ångrar sig, så förlåt *honom*. Om *han* också gör dig orätt sju gånger om dagen och sju gånger kommer tillbaka och säger: Jag ångrar mig! så ska du förlåta *honom*." (bibelsällskapets provöversättning)

Jesus sa till sina lärjungar: "Sådant som leder till människors fall måste komma, men dom över *den* som får det att ske. För *den människan* vore det bättre att få en kvarnsten hängd runt halsen och bli kastad i havet än att få en enda av dessa små på fall. Akta er noga! Om andra *lärjungar* gör orätt, så tala *dem* till rätta, och om *de* ångrar sig, så förlåt *dem*. Även om *de* gör orätt mot dig sju gånger om dagen och sju gånger kommer tillbaka och säger: Jag ångrar mig, så skall du förlåta *dem* (översättning med könsnedtonat språk)

Bibel 2000 använder sig av sju olika maskulina pronomen och substantiv,[68] medan Bibel 2011 (N11BM) har hela åtta stycken.[69] Bibelsällskapets provöversättning reducerar antalet till sex genom att byta ut ett könsspecifikt pronomen mot ett substantiv ("för honom" i 17:2 blir "för den människan").[70] En översättning med könsnedtonat språk kan uteslutande tillämpa könsinkluderande språk genom att använda "lärjungar" istället för "din broder" i 17:3 och genom att växla till plural i 17:3–4.[71] En sådan översättning ligger nära både NRSV och CEV, vilka använder könsnedto-

---

[68] Det är ett färre än i Gustav Vasas Bibel, som dessutom hade ett "han" i första versen, "wee *honom*, genom hwilken the komma" istället för "ve *den* genom vilken de kommer" (min kursivering).

[69] Det extra maskulina pronomenet i förhållande till Bibel 2000 återfinns i 17:2 ("han").

[70] Här använder sig alltså översättaren av strategi 5 (byta ut pronomen mot substantiv), som beskrivits ovan.

[71] Växlingen till plural motsvarar strategi 1 (se ovan). Utgångspunkten för att använda "lärjungar" istället för "din broder" är att ὁ ἀδελφός σου här används som en referens till andra troende i allmänhet och till andra lärjungar i synnerhet.

nat språk i plural och återger ὁ ἀδελφός σου med "another disciple" (NRSV) eller "any followers of mine" (CEV). Ett problem med att växla till plural i översättningen är att det inbördes förhållandet mellan lärjungarna (såväl vid tillrättavisning som förlåtelse) inte framgår lika tydligt.[72]

En annan teknik för att uppnå könsnedtonat språk består av att undvika maskulina yrkestitlar och beskrivningar om personer som skulle kunna inkludera kvinnor. De flesta sådana titlar har redan försvunnit ur svenska bibelöversättningar, men några finns kvar, till exempel "rådsherre" och "landsmän".[73] "Rådsherre" bör också finnas kvar i en könsnedtonad översättning, eftersom det refererar till en medlem av en grupp som enbart består av män (Sanhedrin). "Landsmän" kan å andra sidan användas om en grupp som består av både män och kvinnor. I sådana fall bör en översättning med könsnedtonat språk välja en beskrivning som inte är könsspecifik. Det gäller till exempel första halvan av 2 Kor 11:26 (kursiveringen är min):

> ὁδοιπορίαις πολλάκις, κινδύνοις ποταμῶν, κινδύνοις λῃστῶν, κινδύνοις ἐκ γένους, κινδύνοις ἐξ ἐθνῶν

> Ofta har jag varit ute på resor, utsatt för faror i floder, faror från rövare, faror bland *landsmän* och bland hedningar (Bibel 2000)

> Stadig har jeg måttet reise omkring, i fare på elver og i fare blant røvere, i fare blant *landsmenn* og i fare blant utlendinger (N11BM)

> Ofta har jag varit ute på resor, utsatt för faror i floder, faror från rövare, faror bland *mitt folk* och faror bland hedningar (översättning med könsnedtonat språk)

Ytterligare en teknik för att uppnå könsnedtonat språk består i att reducera antalet maskulina personliga pronomen som används om Gud (utan att maskulina metaforer för Gud tas bort). Ovan visade jag hur engelska

---

[72] Det är trots allt skillnad mellan att tillrättavisa och förlåta "din broder" och "andra lärjungar".

[73] I Bibel 2000 används någon form av "rådsherre" i Mark 15:43, Luk 23:50, 24:20 och Joh 7:26. "Landsman" i olika böjningar förekommer i Luk 19:14, Joh 18:35, Apg 7:27, 26:4, 2 Kor 11:26, 1 Thess 2:14, Tit 1:12 och Heb 8:11. I Bibelsällskapets provöversättning läggs det dessutom till i Gal 1:14 ("mina jämnåriga landsmän" istället för "mina judiska jämnåriga" i Bibel 2000).

översättningar gör detta i bland annat Gal 3:5. Det saknas i befintliga svenska (och norska) översättningar, men är möjligt att åstadkomma (kursiveringen är min):

> ὁ οὖν ἐπιχορηγῶν ὑμῖν τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἐνεργῶν δυνάμεις ἐν ὑμῖν ἐξ ἔργων νόμου ἢ ἐξ ἀκοῆς πίστεως;

> När *han* nu ger er Anden och låter underverk ske bland er, är det för att ni fullgör lagen eller för att ni tror på vad ni fått höra? (Bibel 2000)

> *Han* som gir dere Ånden og gjør under blant dere, gjør *han* det ved lovgjerninger eller ved at dere hører og tror? (N11BM)

> Alltså, *den* som bistår er med Anden och låter krafter verka i er, gör *han* det för att ni har gjort vad lagen föreskriver eller för att ni har lyssnat i tro? (Bibelsällskapets provöversättning)

> Är det alltså för att ni har gjort vad lagen föreskriver eller för att ni har lyssnat i tro som *Gud* bistår er med Anden och låter krafter verka i er? (översättning med könsnedtonat språk)

I provöversättningen märks en vilja att lägga sig närmare källtextens form och den inledande frasen med ett substantiverat particip (ὁ οὖν ἐπιχορηγῶν) översätts därmed på motsvarande sätt på svenska ("den som bistår").[74] Det är i linje med att substantiverade particip betydligt oftare översätts med ett könsneutralt uttryck ("den som") än ett könsspecifikt ("han som"). Problemet i provöversättningen är att ett könsneutralt pronomen ("den") kombineras med ett maskulint pronomen ("han") i nästa fras. En översättning med könsnedtonat språk undviker könsspecifikt språk (och därmed maskulina pronomen för Gud) genom att inleda med frågesatsen och använda "Gud" istället för "den som".

En sista teknik för att uppnå könsnedtonat språk består av att undvika maskulina ändelser vid adjektiv med bestämd artikel. Jämför översättningen av andra halvan av Matt 5:35 (kursiveringen är min):

> μήτε εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα, ὅτι πόλις ἐστὶν τοῦ μεγάλου βασιλέως·

> inte vid Jerusalem, ty det är den *store* konungens stad. (Bibel 2000)

---

[74] Det har att göra med det något reviderade översättningsidealet som var aktuellt för provöversättningen (moderat funktionell ekvivalens). Se Bibelsällskapet, *När tiden var inne*, 14–15.

> inte vid Jerusalem, ty det är den *stora* kungens stad. (alternativ 1 – könsnedtonat språk)

> inte vid Jerusalem, ty det är *storkungens* stad. (alternativ 2 – könsnedtonat språk)

Det första alternativet med könsnedtonat språk undviker den maskulint könsspecifika formen av adjektivet ("store"), men resultatet ser inte bra ut i skriftspråk, även om regeln har luckrats upp de senaste decennierna.[75] Det andra alternativet fungerar bättre rent språkligt, eftersom det undviker att bryta mot kongruensböjningen. Däremot används begreppet "storkung" normalt endast om antikens persiska regenter, vilket göra att alternativ två riskerar att förvirra läsaren mer än det verkligen bidrar med att göra språket könsnedtonat.

Ytterligare ett exempel fokuserar på substantiverade istället för attributiva adjektiv. Jämför översättningen av Upp 22:13 (kursiveringen är min):

> ἐγὼ τὸ Ἄλφα καὶ τὸ Ὦ, ὁ πρῶτος καὶ ὁ ἔσχατος, ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ τὸ τέλος.

> Jag är A och O, *den förste* och *den siste*, början och slutet. (Bibel 2000)

> Jag är A och O, *den första* och *den sista*, början och slutet. (översättning med könsnedtonat språk)

I Upp 22:13 kombineras inte ett adjektiv med ett huvudord av ett annat genus (som i alternativ 1 av Matt 5:35, "den stora kungens stad") och översättningen med könsnedtonat språk undviker därmed att bryta mot kongruensböjningen. Även om de substantiverade adjektiven ("den första" och "den sista") refererar till en man (Jesus; jämför Upp 22:16) fungerar de i sitt sammanhang, eftersom de saknar ett explicit maskulint huvudord.

Den tredje typen: radikalt inkluderande språk

Medan nästan alla nyare engelska bibelöversättningar använder sig av den första typen av könsinkluderande språk (könskorrekt språk) är det bara några stycken som också använder sig av den andra typen (könsnedtonande språk), till exempel NRSV och CEV.[76] Den tredje typen av köns-

---

[75] Jämför Ivarsson, *Evangelium*, 61.
[76] Kanske kan också NLT räknas till den här gruppen.

inkluderande språk är kumulativ med den första och den andra. Översättningar av den här typen använder sig alltså av både könskorrekt och könsnedtonande språk, men också av en rad andra strategier. Målet är att skapa översättningar som är både mer inkluderande än källtexterna (eftersom dessa uppfattas som alltför låsta vid en patriarkal kultur) och inkluderande på fler områden än kön. Jag har därför valt att kalla den här typen för radikalt inkluderande språk.

Det finns åtminstone tre stycken engelska bibelöversättningar som aktivt tillämpar radikalt inkluderande språk. *An Inclusive Language Lectionary* (ILL, 1983) är inte en komplett bibelöversättning, utan ett lektionarium med textläsningar ur Gamla och Nya testamentet för söndagens gudstjänst. Översättningen baseras på RSV, men har reviderats på de ställen där "male-biased or otherwise inappropriately exclusive language could be modified to reflect an inclusiveness of all persons".[77] *The New Testament and Psalms: An Inclusive Version* (NTPI, 1995) baseras på NRSV, vars text har reviderats med målet att ersätta eller omformulera "all gender-specific language not referring to particular historical individuals, all pejorative references to race, color, or religion, and all identification of persons by their physical disabilities alone".[78] *The Inclusive Bible: The First Egalitarian Translation* (IB, 2007) är en översättning och inte en revision av RSV eller NRSV. Utgivarna markerar att de vill bevara textens mening, men göra sig av med den sexism som den uttrycks med: "In all circumstances, we seek to recover the expression's meaning within the context in which it is written without perpetuating the sexism."[79]

De översättningar som tillämpar radikalt inkluderande språk använder en rad strategier för att åstadkomma en mer inkluderande text. Den tydligaste är att de omformulerar patriarkala titlar som används om Gud och Jesus. "Father" ersätts med bland annat "God the Father [*and Mother*]" (ILL), "Father-Mother" (NTPI), "Abba God" (IB) och "Loving God" (IB). Istället för "Son of God" används "Child of God" (ILL, NTPI), "God's Own" (IB), "Only Begotten" (IB) och "Eternally Begotten" (IB). När "Lord" refererar till Gud ersätts det med bland annat "God" (ILL), "Sovereign" (ILL, NTPI) eller "Most High" (IB); ibland får det stå kvar (NTPI).

---

[77] *An Inclusive Language Lectionary*, 3 volymer (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1983), I: preface.

[78] *The New Testament and Psalms: An Inclusive Version* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), viii.

[79] *The Inclusive Bible: The First Egalitarian Translation* (Plymouth, Rowman & Littlefield, 2007), vi.

När det refererar till Jesus används till exempel "Jesus" (NTPI), "Christ" (NTPI), "Sovereign" (IB, ILL), "Savior" (IB) eller "Jesus Reigns" (IB): ibland får det stå kvar (NTPI). Jämför hur Fadern och Sonen benämns i följande översättningar av andra halvan av 1 Joh 2:22 (kursiveringen är min):

οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἀντίχριστος, ὁ ἀρνούμενος τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὸν υἱόν.

This is the antichrist, the one who denies *the Father* and *the Son*. (NRSV)

This is the antichrist, the one who denies *the Father-Mother* and *the Child*. (NPTI)

Such a person is an antichrist and is denying *Abba God* as well as *the Only Begotten*. (IB)

En annan vanlig och tydlig strategi för radikalt inkluderande språk är att kraftigt minska antalet maskulina personliga pronomen ("he", "him", "his"). ILL, NTPI och IB eliminerar alla sådana pronomen som refererar till Gud, djävulen eller änglar, det vill säga varelser utan kön. Dessutom reducerar de antalet maskulina personliga pronomen som refererar till Jesus eller människor. Jämför översättningarna av Joh 3:16 för hur detta påverkar talet om Gud och Jesus (kursiveringen är min):

οὕτως γὰρ ἠγάπησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν κόσμον ὥστε τὸν υἱὸν τὸν μονογενῆ ἔδωκεν, ἵνα πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων εἰς αὐτὸν μὴ ἀπόληται ἀλλὰ ἔχῃ ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

For God so loved the world that *he* gave *his one and only Son*, that whoever believes in *him* shall not perish but have eternal life. (NIV)

For God so loved the world that *God* gave *God's only Child*, that whoever believes in *that Child* should not perish but have eternal life. (ILL)

For God so loved the world that *God* gave *God's only Child*, so that everyone who believes in *that Child* may not perish but may have eternal life. (NPTI)

Yes, God so loved the world as to give *the Only Begotten One*, that whoever believes may not die, but have eternal life. (IB)

NIV använder tre maskulina pronomen i översättningen av Joh 3:16, två stycken som refererar till Gud ("he", "his") och ett som används om Jesus

("him"). ILL och NTPI eliminerar samtliga maskulina pronomen i den här versen genom att ersätta "he" med "God", "his" med "God's" och "him" med "that Child". IB, som inte utgår från RSV eller NRSV, översätter versen friare och undviker med hjälp av omskrivningar samtliga maskulina pronomen utan att behöva ersätta dem med ord som snabbt blir repetitiva. Den betydligt smidigare engelska som IB använder har dock ett pris. Relationen mellan Gud och Sonen nämns inte längre ("his one and only Son" uttrycker en relation mellan Fadern och Sonen som saknas i "the Only Begotten One") och tron som krävs av den som vill ha evigt liv är inte längre relaterad till Sonen (evigt liv ges åt "whoever believes" istället för åt "whoever believes in him").

ILL, NTPI och IB reducerar inte bara antalet maskulina pronomen som refererar till människor, de tillämpar också könsneutralt språk på en del mindre centrala personer som inte nämns vid namn. Dessa strategier minskar dominansen av både maskulint språk och män i texterna. Jämför följande exempel från Mark 1:40–43 (kursiveringen är min):

> καὶ ἔρχεται πρὸς αὐτὸν λεπρὸς παρακαλῶν αὐτὸν καὶ γονυπετῶν λέγων αὐτῷ ὅτι ἐὰν θέλῃς δύνασαί με καθαρίσαι. καὶ ὀργισθεὶς ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἥψατο καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ· θέλω, καθαρίσθητι· καὶ εὐθὺς ἀπῆλθεν ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ ἡ λέπρα, καὶ ἐκαθαρίσθη. καὶ ἐμβριμησάμενος αὐτῷ εὐθὺς ἐξέβαλεν αὐτόν,

> A leper came to *him* begging *him*, and kneeling *he* said to him, "If you choose, you can make me clean." Moved with pity, Jesus stretched out *his* hand and touched *him*, and said to him, "I do choose. Be made clean!" Immediately the leprosy left *him* and *he* was made clean. After sternly warning him he sent *him* away at once (NRSV)

> A person with leprosy came and knelt down and, begging Jesus, said, "If you choose, you can make me clean." Moved with pity, Jesus reached out and touched *the person*, and said, "I do choose. Be made clean!" Immediately the leprosy went away, and *the person* was made clean. After a stern warning Jesus sent away *the person* who had been healed, (NTPI)

> A person with leprosy approached Jesus, knelt down and begged, "If you are willing, you can heal me." Moved with pity, Jesus stretched out a hand, touched *the person with leprosy* and said, "I am willing. Be cleansed!" Immediately the leprosy disappeared, and *the person with the disease* was cured. Jesus gave a stern warning and sent *the person* off. (IB)

NRSV har inte mindre än tolv maskulina personliga pronomen i det korta avsnittet, sju som refererar till mannen med spetälska och fem som handlar om Jesus. NTPI och IB undviker de maskulina pronomenen genom omskrivningar och genom att ersätta "him" med "the person".[80] Resultatet är inte särskilt lyckat i NTPI, som repeterar "the person" alltför många gånger på kort tid. IB har återigen en smidigare översättning tack vare fler omskrivningar. Den undviker onödiga repetitioner genom att variera mellan "the person", "the person with leprosy" och "the person with the disease". Oavsett den språkliga kvaliteten på översättningarna lyckas de dölja det faktum att källtexten på olika sätt avslöjar att den spetälske var en man.

Mark 1:40–43 ger också prov på ytterligare en strategi som används i radikalt inkluderande översättningar, att undvika diskriminerande stereotyper om kvinnor, slavar, judar, svarta och personer med funktionsnedsättningar. Den sjuke anges med λεπρός ("spetälsk") och NRSV kallar därför honom för "a leper". Översättningarna av den tredje typen vill undvika att definiera personer efter deras funktionsnedsättning, så NTPI och IB översätter λεπρός med "a person with leprosy" istället för "a leper". Av samma anledning benämns slavar som "enslaved" eller "enslaved people" istället för "slaves". Luk 1:7 kan med hänvisning till samma princip översättas med "they were unable to conceive" (IB) snarare än "Elizabeth was barren" (NRSV),[81] för att undvika att infertilitet framställs som ett problem hos kvinnan.

Strategin att undvika diskriminerande stereotyper leder också till omskrivningar när källtexter använder mörker som en metafor med negativa konnotationer, till exempel när de kontrasterar mörker med ljus. NTPI motiverar det med att de negativa konnotationerna har förts över på mörkhyade personer, medan vithet har kopplats till renhet.[82] Ett exempel på hur översättarna har hanterat detta är hämtat från Joh 1:5 (kursiveringen är min):

> καὶ τὸ φῶς ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ φαίνει, καὶ ἡ σκοτία αὐτὸ οὐ κατέλαβεν.

---

[80] NTPI och IB använder här framför allt strategi 7 (ta bort pronomen) och strategi 5 (byt ut pronomen mot substantiv). Se ovan för beskrivning av de olika strategierna för att minska antalet maskulina pronomen.

[81] NTPI översätter dock frasen som "Elizabeth was infertile".

[82] *The New Testament and Psalms*, xv.

> The light shines in *the darkness*, and *the darkness* did not overcome it. (NRSV)
>
> The light shines in *the deepest night*, and *the night* has not overcome it. (ILL)
>
> The light shines in *the deepest night*, and *the night* did not overcome it. (NTPI)
>
> a Light that shines in *the darkness*, a Light that *the darkness* has never overtaken. (IB)

ILL och NTPI använder samma formuleringar ("the deepest night" och "the night") för att undvika kontrasten mellan ljus och mörker. Resultatet är en lätt förskjuten metafor om hur ljuset lyser upp natten, vilket trots allt förmedlar textens mening på ett tydligt sätt. IB gör inga omskrivningar för att undvika kontrasten mellan ljus och mörker.

Radikalt inkluderande språk i svensk översättning

Vad skulle överväganden av det här slaget resultera i för slags text på svenska? Nedan ger jag möjliga översättningar av några textställen i Nya testamentet med alternativ hämtade från de strategier för radikalt inkluderande språk som jag har presenterat ovan.

Den mest omdiskuterade och märkbara strategin handlar om att omformulera patriarkala titlar som används om Gud och Jesus. Jämför följande översättningar av Gal 1:3–5 (kursiveringen är min):

> χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς καὶ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τοῦ δόντος ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν ὅπως ἐξέληται ἡμᾶς ἐκ τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος πονηροῦ κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἡμῶν, ᾧ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων· ἀμήν.
>
> Nåd och frid från Gud, vår fader, och herren Jesus Kristus, som offrade sig för våra synder för att rädda oss ur den nuvarande onda tidsåldern, efter vår Guds och *faders* vilja. *Hans* är härligheten i evigheters evighet, amen. (Bibel 2000)
>
> Nåd åt er och frid från Gud fadern och vår herre Jesus Kristus, som gav sig själv för våra synder för att rädda oss ur vår onda samtid, efter vår Guds och *faders* vilja. *Hans* är härligheten i evigheters evighet, amen. (bibelsällskapets provöversättning)

> Nåd åt er och frid från Gud vår Fader-Moder och mästaren Jesus Kristus, som gav sig själv för våra synder för att rädda oss ur vår onda samtid, efter vår Guds och *Fader-Moders* vilja. Härligheten tillhör *Gud* i evigheters evighet, amen. (radikalt inkluderande översättning)

Eftersom de radikalt inkluderande översättningarna använder en uppsättning av alternativa titlar och omskrivningar för traditionella uttryck som "Fader", "Son", "Guds son" och "Herre" är den föreslagna översättningen bara en av många möjligheter. I en text som Gal 1:3–5 går det inte att göra omfattande omskrivningar utan att dölja den tydliga brevstrukturen. Den radikalt inkluderande översättningen består därför primärt av en revision av titlarna (i likhet med ILL och NTPI). En mindre omskrivning av 1:5 krävs dock för att komma undan det maskulina pronomenet för Gud ("hans"). Som ersättning för "herre" används "mästaren", som en möjlig version av "Sovereign" (från IB och ILL). "Frälsaren" är ett alternativ (motsvarande "Savior" i IB) som inte fungerar så väl här, eftersom de följande satserna beskriver just detta händelseförlopp (resultatet skulle bli innehållsligt och delvis rent språkligt upprepande: "frälsaren … som gav sig själv … för att rädda").

En viktig strategi för att skapa ett radikalt inkluderande språk består av att reducera antalet maskulina personliga pronomen. De som refererar till Gud, djävulen eller änglar tas bort helt (som också syntes i den nya översättningen av Gal 1:3–5), medan de som används om Jesus eller män reduceras i antal. Ett exempel på hur svårt det kan vara i praktiken syns tydligt i översättningen av de judiska ledarnas hån mot Jesus i Matt 27:42–43 (kursiveringen är min[83]):

> ἄλλους ἔσωσεν, ἑαυτὸν οὐ δύναται σῶσαι· βασιλεὺς Ἰσραήλ ἐστιν, καταβάτω νῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ καὶ πιστεύσομεν ἐπ' αὐτόν. πέποιθεν ἐπὶ τὸν θεόν, ῥυσάσθω νῦν εἰ θέλει αὐτόν· εἶπεν γὰρ ὅτι θεοῦ εἰμι υἱός.

> "Andra har *han* hjälpt, sig själv kan *han* inte hjälpa. *Han* är Israels *kung*, nu får *han* stiga ner från korset, så skall vi tro på *honom*. *Han* har satt sin lit till Gud. Nu får Gud rädda *honom*, om *han* bryr sig om *honom*. *Han* har ju sagt att *han* är *Guds son*." (Bibel 2000)

---

[83] För att kunna markera maskulina pronomen och titlar har jag tvingats ta bort kursiveringen från GT-allusionen (*Han har satt sin lit till Gud. Nu får Gud rädda honom, om han bryr sig om honom*).

"*Han* har hjälpt andra, men kan inte hjälpa sig själv. Israels *monark* får nu stiga ner från korset, så skall vi tro på *honom*. Må nu Gud – om Gud vill, förstås – rädda *honom*, som har förtröstat sig på Gud och sagt sig vara *Guds egen*!" (radikalt inkluderande översättning)

I den nya översättningen har samtliga maskulina pronomen för Gud tagits bort, men istället repeteras "Gud" obekvämt ofta. Antalet maskulina pronomen för Jesus har reducerats kraftigt, från nio stycken till tre. Dessutom har titlar som refererar till Jesus ändrats, "Israels kung" till "Israels monark" (ILL)[84] och "Guds son" till "Guds egen" (IB). Resultatet är en översättning med avsevärt färre exempel på maskulint språk, men den är samtidigt otymplig, repetitiv och riskerar att missuppfattas av läsare/åhörare som inte fångar upp ironin i den avslutande uppmaningen ("må nu Gud … rädda honom!").

Ytterligare en strategi handlar om att använda könsneutralt språk om namnlösa, mindre centrala personer i texterna för att på så sätt minska mansdominansen så mycket som möjligt. Nedan ges ett exempel på hur små förändringar som ibland behövs för att göra att en person inte längre framställs som man. Exemplet, som gäller Luk 22:49–51, visar dessutom hur antalet maskulina pronomen som refererar till Jesus kan minskas (kursiveringen är min):

ἰδόντες δὲ οἱ περὶ αὐτὸν τὸ ἐσόμενον εἶπαν· κύριε, εἰ πατάξομεν ἐν μαχαίρῃ; καὶ ἐπάταξεν εἷς τις ἐξ αὐτῶν τοῦ ἀρχιερέως τὸν δοῦλον καὶ ἀφεῖλεν τὸ οὖς αὐτοῦ τὸ δεξιόν. ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν· ἐᾶτε ἕως τούτου· καὶ ἁψάμενος τοῦ ὠτίου ἰάσατο αὐτόν.

När de som var med Jesus såg vad som skulle hända sade de: "*Herre*, skall vi ta till våra svärd?" Och en av dem slog till mot översteprästens tjänare och högg av honom högra örat. Men då sade Jesus: "Nu räcker det." Och *han* rörde vid *mannens* öra och läkte *honom*. (Bibel 2000)

När de som var med Jesus såg vad som skulle hända sade de: "*Mästare*, skall vi ta till våra svärd?" Och en av dem slog till mot översteprästens tjä-

---

[84] "Monark" är förstås inte mindre patriarkalt än "kung", särskilt inte i ett språkhistoriskt perspektiv (μόναρχος, "den som härskar ensam") och med tanke på hur ordet användes i antiken. Jämför Nino Luraghi, "One-Man Government", i *A Companion to Ancient Greek Government*, red. H. Beck (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2013), 131–45. Jag har dock valt det för att visa på de alternativ som ofta lyfts in i radikalt inkluderande översättningar (i det här fallet från ILL, som regelbundet ersätter "king" med "monarch" eller undantagsvis med "ruler").

nare och högg av högra örat. Men då sade Jesus, "Nu räcker det", och rörde vid örat på *tjänaren*, *vilken* blev läkt. (radikalt inkluderande översättning)

Den nya översättningen eliminerar samtliga maskulina pronomen. Det krävs en omskrivning med ett passivt uttryck i 22:51 ("blev läkt" istället för "läkte honom") för att komma runt de maskulina orden, men i huvudsak används strategierna att ta bort pronomen och att byta ut personliga pronomen mot substantiv ("mannens" blir "tjänaren").[85]

Översättningar med radikalt inkluderande språk undviker diskriminerande stereotyper om kvinnor, slavar, judar, svarta och personer med funktionsnedsättningar. Det sista textexemplet, från Matt 9:2, visar på hur det kan se ut (kursiveringen är min):

> καὶ ἰδοὺ προσέφερον αὐτῷ παραλυτικὸν ἐπὶ κλίνης βεβλημένον. καὶ ἰδὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὴν πίστιν αὐτῶν εἶπεν τῷ παραλυτικῷ· θάρσει, τέκνον· ἀφίενταί σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι.

> Där kom de till honom med *en lam* som låg på en bår. När Jesus såg deras tro sade han till *den lame*: "Var inte orolig, mitt barn, dina synder är förlåtna." (Bibel 2000)

> De kom till Jesus med *en person som var lam* och låg på en bår. När Jesus såg deras tro sade han till *personen som var lam*: "Var inte orolig, mitt barn, dina synder är förlåtna." (radikalt inkluderande översättning)

Istället för att översätta παραλυτικός med "en lam" har jag i linje med till exempel NTPI använt "en person som var lam". Därmed undviker översättningen både att identifiera personen utifrån funktionsnedsättningen och att beskriva icke namngivna mindre karaktärer med maskulina pronomen (även om de har det i källtexten). Omskrivningen "en person som var lam" fungerar visserligen, men den framstår som påfrestande redan

---

[85] Detta motsvarar strategi 7 och 5 (se avsnittet om könskorrekt språk ovan). I det här exemplet skulle det vara möjligt att använda "hen" istället för att eliminera maskulina pronomen, men det ger knappast en bättre översättning: "När de som var med Jesus såg vad som skulle hända sade de: '*Herre*, skall vi ta till våra svärd?' Och en av dem slog till mot översteprästens tjänare och högg av hen högra örat. Men då sade Jesus: 'Nu räcker det.' Och *han* rörde vid *tjänarens* öra och läkte *hen*."

vid andra omnämnandet. Strategin är därmed särskilt svår att tillämpa i längre perikoper som nämner en person med funktionsnedsättning om och om igen.[86]

Sammanfattning

Könsinkluderande språk har tillämpats aktivt i nästan alla engelska bibelöversättningar från mitten av 1980-talet och framåt. Svenska bibelöversättningar har genom historien använt könsinkluderande språk mer eller mindre omedvetet och i mycket liten skala. Det ändrades med Svenska Bibelsällskapets provöversättning, som inkluderade ett direktiv om att översättarna skulle använda könsinkluderande språk. Därmed markerade bibelsällskapet att de avser att nästa stora bibelöversättning också skall använda det. Frågan är därmed vad som egentligen avses med könsinkluderande språk (inte minst med tanke på hur kortfattat och vagt direktivet var inför provöversättningen) och vad det får för konsekvenser för en svensk översättning.

I den här artikeln har jag undersökt flera engelska översättningar som tillämpar könsinkluderande språk och funnit att det används på väldigt olika sätt. Det finns åtminstone tre olika (och kumulativt tillämpbara) typer av könsinkluderande språk. De flesta nyare engelska översättningar (till exempel NIV, NJB och NLT) använder endast den första typen, könskorrekt språk. Den innebär att könsinkluderande språk används när källtextens mening tydligt refererar till både män och kvinnor, till exempel i allmänna utsagor. Den största utmaningen för den här typen är att skapa omskrivningar för generiskt "han" i allmänna utsagor, när ett maskulint ord används för att referera till både män och kvinnor. Det kan ske genom någon av nio strategier, som antingen handlar om att ändra person och numerus eller om att byta ut, ta bort eller komplettera maskulina personliga pronomen.

Den andra typen, könsnedtonat språk, innebär att könsinkluderande språk används på alla ställen utom då källtexten tydligt refererar till män (istället för endast när källtexten tydligt refererar till både män och kvinnor). Det maskulina språket tonas dessutom ned genom att översättaren undviker maskulina yrkestitlar och beskrivningar, reducerar antalet mas

---

[86] Det gäller t.ex. Matt 15:14, som i Bibel 2000 lyder (kursiveringen är min): "Bry er inte om dem: de är *blinda* ledare för *blinda*. Och om en *blind* leder en *blind* faller båda i gropen."

kulina personliga pronomen som refererar till Gud (utan att ta bort maskulina metaforer för Gud) och undviker maskulina ändelser vid adjektiv som står tillsammans med bestämd artikel. Den största utmaningen för den här typen är att fastställa om ett avsnitt enbart refererar till män. Könsnedtonat språk återfinns i bland andra NRSV och CEV.

Den tredje typen, radikalt inkluderande språk, nöjer sig inte med att vara trogen mot källtextens mening, utan går längre för att skapa en bibelöversättning som är tydligt inkluderande för alla. Översättaren åstadkommer detta genom att omformulera patriarkala titlar som används om Gud och Jesus, ta bort maskulina personliga pronomen som refererar till Gud, djävulen eller änglar och reducera antalet maskulina personliga pronomen som refererar till Jesus och män. Dessutom tillämpar översättaren könsneutralt språk på icke namngivna, mindre centrala personer och undviker diskriminerande stereotyper om kvinnor, slavar, judar, svarta och personer med funktionsnedsättningar. Utmaningen för den här typen är att tillämpa strategierna utan att skapa en alltför omskrivande översättning som dessutom gör våld på god svenska. Radikalt inkluderande språk tillämpas i bland andra ILL, NTPI och IB.

Förutom att analysera vilka typer av könsinkluderande språk som används i engelska översättningar och identifiera de strategier och tekniker som översättare använder för att åstadkomma dem har jag också gett konkreta exempel på hur varje typ skulle kunna se ut i en svensk översättning av Nya testamentet. Målet med artikeln är inte att ta ställning för eller emot en viss typ av könsinkluderande språk (även om jag har identifierat hur vissa strategier fungerar sämre i vissa sammanhang och noterat problemet att somliga typer av radikalt inkluderande språk överger avsevärda delar av textens mening för att uppnå något annat). Istället presenterar den en deskriptiv modell av olika typer av könsinkluderande språk, som kan ligga till grund för en diskussion kring huruvida, av vilken typ och i vilken utsträckning det skall användas i nästa stora svenska bibelöversättning. Behovet av en sådan diskussion är uppenbart utifrån det faktum att Bibelsällskapets provöversättning föranleddes av ett mycket kortfattat och smalt direktiv om könsinkluderande språk. Endast när alternativen och konsekvenserna (i fråga om vad de resulterar i för typ av svensk text) är tydliga kan samtalet föras på god vetenskaplig grund.

Summary

Gender-inclusive language has been consciously applied in almost all significant English Bible translations over the last thirty years. It has only recently been introduced into Swedish Bible translation practices, however, with the test translation of Luke 9:51–19:28 and Galatians issued by the Swedish Bible Society. This fact signals that the next Swedish Bible translation will implement gender-inclusive language.

In this article I have discerned and described three different types of gender-inclusive language that can be implemented cumulatively. The first, gender-accurate language, is found in most recent English Bible translations and involves the use of gender-inclusive language in cases where the meaning of the original text clearly refers to both men and women. Nine different strategies can be implemented to create gender-accurate translations of generic "he," instances in which the original text employs gender-specific language to refer to both men and women.

The second type, gender-muted language, which is found in NRSV and CEV, implements gender-inclusive language in all passages except those that exclusively refer to men. The dominance of masculine language is further weakened through minor strategies, such as reducing the number of personal pronouns that refer to God.

The third type, radically inclusive language, is found in those translations (such as ILL, NTPI and IB) that seek to resist sexist language and be inclusive to all present readers even if that involves a departure from the meaning of the original text. The strategies employed to achieve this include abolishing all masculine personal pronouns that refer to God and reducing the number of those that refer to Jesus or men, implementing gender-neutral language for some unnamed lesser characters, and avoiding discriminating stereotypes.

Finally, I have given examples of how each type of gender-inclusive language can be implemented in Swedish translations of a number of New Testament passages. Although I do not argue in favor of a specific type (or, indeed, any of them), I hope that this descriptive model and the practical examples of translations will provide a solid foundation for deliberation about whether, in what manner, and to what extent gender-inclusive language should be implemented in the next Swedish Bible translation.

Recensioner

The Gospel of Matthew and Judaic Traditions: A Relevance-based Commentary, by Herbert W. Basser (Professor Emeritus of Religious Studies and Judaism, Queen's University, Canada) is—as the title suggests—a commentary on the Gospel of Matthew that takes as its point of departure, and is characterized by, its consistent interaction with Judaic tradition. The book is a revision of Basser's commentary on Matthew, *The Mind Behind the Gospels: A Commentary to Matthew 1–14* (published 2009 by Academic Studies Press) to which comments on the remainder of the Gospel now have been added with the aid of Marsha Cohen. The aim of the present work is not to present the definite interpretation of Matthew's Gospel, but to present an understanding given to the reader through reflection on the pertinent Judaic material. Still, what Basser attempts to recover "is not the notion of Jewish/Gospel parallels as much as an idea of a Jewish mind and a Jewish approach to life that lies buried beneath words and episodes in the Gospel of Matthew" (p. 20).

The diversity of the content, in conjunction with the sheer volume (800 pages) of the work, prohibits any systematic appraisal of the commentary proper. Instead this review will focus on the more programmatically oriented "Preface" and "General Introduction" in which Basser sets out his views regarding both the provenance of the Gospel, and the legitimacy of using rabbinic tradition in the interpretation of it.

Without making any claims regarding the geographical and social milieu of the Gospel Basser surmises that it was likely produced by a succession of authors/editors who selectively drew upon various oral and written traditions at their disposal, with the aim to present the story of Jesus' life, death and resurrection. Early Jewish-Christian storytellers, who shared the same general mind-set as other Jews in the Land of Israel at the time, originally passed on these traditions in Hebrew and Aramaic. Accordingly, the Gospel evinces many similarities with the content and shape of Jewish rhetoric throughout history. However, despite the Jewish outlook that permeates much of the narrative "Matthew" was likely a gentile with little regard for Judaism, writing after the initial break between Judaism and Christianity had occurred sometime within two decades after 70 CE. "The plan of Matthew's Gospel, to my mind," Basser explains, "is shaped by a staunch Bible reading Christ follower living in the latter part of the first century who had little sympathy with Jews and anticipated their eventual fadeout from the world-stage. Nevertheless, knowing that Jesus was a Jew, and likely a fully observant one at that, he preserved in the final version of his work accurate traditions of the times and views of Jews that had been part of the Jesus saga in the earlier half of the first century in the final version of his work" (p. 2). In addition

to this traditional material Matthew also interpolated his own ideas, to the effect that the Gospel as we now have it contains both Jewish and anti-Jewish layers. Cognizant of the fact that many other scholars disagree Basser still finds the uneven balance between "praise of the gentile ethic and condemnation of Jewish leaders and their customs" to be an indication that we have to do with more than mere "in-house banter" (p. 20).

Similar works concerned with parallels between the New Testament and rabbinic tradition often—and almost characteristically—lack theoretical and methodological discussions. Delightfully, Basser makes a provisory attempt at a theoretical anchoring of his presentation by claiming that his method is based on *relevance theory*. Unfortunately, the assertion proves superficial considering that the theory is never really explained, or noticeably implemented in the book. Likewise, the methodological approach appears insufficient. According to his own admission, Basser has simply selected from the Judaic sources at his disposal the teachings that he feels solve difficulties in interpretation to his satisfaction. This idiosyncratic approach sometimes makes it difficult to track down the reasons for the selection. The text as it now stands gives an uneven impression with certain choices of parallel material appearing quite more plausible than others.

Still, Basser's own reasoning regarding the use of later rabbinic material in the interpretation of Matthew in particular, but applicable to the New Testament as a whole, proves valuable. Moreover, it might provide a healthy corrective to the over-sceptical view (which still seems to hold sway among New Testament scholars) propagated by Jacob Neusner and his adherents. Basser is well aware that his quite uninhibited implementation of late Jewish traditions in the interpretation of Matthew faces resistance, and proposes two basic arguments in its defence. First of all, he surmises that there is a continuity that links early and late material. Some of the traditions that have only been preserved in writing in late Jewish sources may in fact in oral form be as early as the first century. Basser, thus, adopts a pragmatic stance and remarks, "whatever from these sources helps us to better understand Matthew's text is relevant and ought to be welcome" (p. xv). The second basic argument proposed for the legitimacy of employing rabbinic tradition has to do with the problems attached to the alternative option. In order to interpret the Gospel one needs a hermeneutical filter through which to view the text. This lens can either be invented from the outset by the exegete himself or herself; be amassed out of Jewish traditions from the intertestamental literature that are not nearly as close to Matthew's formulations as the rabbinic formulations are; or—as Basser suggests—one simply uses the already existent and rhetorically similar material preserved in rabbinic tradition (cf. p. xvi).

In conclusion, despite the mentioned shortcomings there is much to commend with *The Gospel of Matthew and Judaic Tradition*. Basser stands out as an independent scholar, willing to tackle old questions anew, and to blaze his own trail when he feels called upon to do so. This ability likely stems from his enviable intimate and encyclopaedic knowledge of Jewish tradition. It will no doubt be of great benefit to future interpreters of Matthew's Gospel to have this material

readily available in an English translation at one's fingertips, even if one does not necessarily agree with Basser's general methodological, or specifically exegetical, conclusions.

Tobias Ålöw, University of Gothenburg

ALICIA J. BATTEN OCH JOHN S. KLOPPENBORG (RED.), *James, 1 & 2 Peter, and Early Jesus Traditions*. LNTS 478. New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2015. Inbunden. XX + 240 sidor. ISBN: 9780567420534. $112.00.

Den huvudsakliga bakgrunden till den av Alicia J. Batten och John S. Kloppenborg redigerade volymen är, som dess redaktörer fastställer i inledningen, att det i dagsläget vid studiet av s.k. "Jesustraditioner" finns ont om undersökningar av brev som ges ett senare tillkomstdatum än de tidigare paulinska breven och evangelierna. Det man därmed har missat enligt dem är många intressanta detaljer om Jesustraditioner främst ur ett receptionshistoriskt perspektiv, d.v.s.: hur använde de närmaste generationerna efter Jesu lärjungar både de skrifter och muntliga traditioner som behandlade Jesu liv och/eller Jesu tal, och som cirkulerade i för oss idag ännu oklar omfattning?

Det som nio forskare därför föresatt sig att göra är att med hjälp av ett fokus på retorik och intertextualitet i tre ofta ignorerade och akademiskt rent av illa behandlade brev – Jakobsbrevet, 1 Petrusbrevet och 2 Petrusbrevet – visa på hur man på olika nivåer och med olika metoder i dessa tre brev kan finna mer eller mindre tydliga spår av en bearbetning av material, muntligt och skriftligt, från såväl Gamla som Nya testamentet och apokryfa texter, med särskilt fokus på Q-källan. Ett minst sagt intressant ämne på ett område som känts tunt behandlat i modern forskning.

Paul Foster klargör i sitt bidrag "Q and James: A Source-critical Conundrum" den stora problematiken som varje forskare möts av som vill forska på Q-källan och/eller Jakobsbrevet. Han belyser det uppenbara problemet att Q-källan är hypotetisk och tänkt att förklara evangelierna, och endast i efterhand har den som en hypotetiskt tidig kristen källa använts intertextuellt med exempelvis Jakobsbrevet. Problemen med Jakobsbrevet i sig är ofta datering, och att brevförfattaren troligen var skolad i s.k. *aemulatio*, d.v.s. en retorisk teknik som använder material och framför det på ett eget sätt.

Patrick J. Hartin analyserar i sitt bidrag "Wholeness in James and the Q Source" Jakobsbrevet utifrån att han uppfattar "wholeness" som det centrala motivet i den teologi som Jakob driver. Han tycker sig även finna att man uppfattat ett hebreiskt ord fel i översättningen (det som på svenska blir "fullkomlighet") nämligen תמים, vilket översatts på grekiska som τέλειος, och som Hartin menar utifrån dess bruk i andra texter bör översättas som "whole" istället för "perfect" som det ofta blir i Jakob. Hartin kommer i sin analys fram till att Jakobs syn på Gud, och därmed bruket av τέλειος som ett centralt motiv, är hämtade från de Jesustraditioner som Jakob funnit i Q.

Dale C. Allison fokuserar mer på mottagarna av Jakobsbrevet i sitt bidrag "The Audience of James and the Sayings of Jesus", och ställer den mycket intressanta frågan huruvida Jakob *ville* att hans åhörare skulle känna till att han an-

vände Jesustraditioner, eller om omskrivningarna och den medvetna avsaknaden av att citera Jesus var en del av hans koncept i författandet av texten i dess *aemulatio*-anda. Det som är problemet med denna retoriska teknik är att den starkt omarbetar material och därmed lämnar osäkra exegetiska spår som kan vara svåra att skilja från rena grammatiska sammanträffanden.

I bidraget "The Urbanization of Jesus Traditions in James" av Alicia J. Batten undersöks hur språket i Jakob tycks anpassat för och skrivet av någon i en urban miljö. Batten framlägger att Jakob tycks se på städer som ett mikrokosmos av fördärv, medan landsbygdens liv är det enkla och rena, och att Jakob hänvisar till saker som stadsbor kan förstå men inte landsbygdens befolkning. Här ser Batten kopplingar till den då populära stoiska filosofin, och ser ett starkt samband mellan Jakobs tal om δίψυχος och stoiska föreställningar att individer döms efter sina själar. Även Jakobs tal om fattiga och rika tycks förutsätta en stadsmiljö där det var vanligt med klient-patron-förhållanden som ofta var utnyttjande. Batten ser här starka likheter med Q-källan, som likt Jakobsbrevet tycks vara skriven i en urban miljö med en välmående församling som mottagare.

Det sista bidraget om Jakobsbrevet är från David A. Kaden, "Stoicism, Social Stratification, and the Q Tradition in James: A Suggestion about James' Audience". Enligt Kaden skriver Jakob på ett elegant sätt om långa block av Q i en mer sofistikerad anda, troligen för en mer välmående och utbildad publik. Han finner intressanta likheter mellan Jakob och Epiktetos, en legendarisk stoiker, som båda intresserar sig för hur ens handlingar är det yttre beviset för en inre kontroll, och för båda är perfektion målet. Slutpunkten blir för Kaden att Jakob uppmanar sina lyssnare, bland vilka flera mäktiga och rika tycks finnas, att inte glömma de fattiga och att genom sina gärningar visa prov på en inre rättfärdighet.

Del 2 inleds med det ytterst intressanta bidraget av David G. Horrell, "Jesus Remembered in 1 Peter? Early Jesus Traditions, Isaiah 53, and 1 Peter 2.21–25". Horrell tar avstamp i Jesaja 53 och menar att detta är förlagan för 1 Pet 2:21–25, där texten även tycks eka passionsberättelsen ur evangelierna. Den inledande 2:21 innehåller inget "Jesajamaterial" enligt Horrell, men de följande 2:22–25 gör det, och syftar enligt honom till att klargöra en kristologi: Jesus syndade inte, och han använde inte lömskt tal. Vidare använder 1 Pet Q för att etablera Jesus som en icke-våldsförespråkare. För Horrell tycks det klart att en äldre Jesustradition används med Jesaja 53 som förebild för att göra en "skriftualisering", d.v.s. att traditioner om Jesus framställs för att likna Skriften.

Duane F. Watson menar i "Early Jesus Tradition in 1 Peter 3.18–22" att Q inte låg bakom det synoptiska material som tycks finnas i 1 Pet. Watson fokuserar istället på hur den s.k. Väktarnas bok i 1 Henok 1–36 används av 1 Pet för att rekontextualisera en utombiblisk legend om änglarna, jättebarnen och flodvågen i Genesis 6–8 i syfte att skapa en kristologi som skall visa på Jesu seger på korset när han stiger ned och talar till de fängslade änglarna. Watson tycks dock komma fram till att 1 Pet gör det på ett så mytologiskt och svårbegripligt sätt att vi, när vi nu vet vad 1 Pet faktiskt avser i denna text, inte vet vad vi skall ta oss till med den.

Terrance Callan betonar i "The Gospel of Matthew and John in the Second Letter of Peter" problematiken i varifrån 2 Pet fått traditionen om Jesu förklaring.

Callan framlägger sedan att det endast är i 2 Pet som Jesus utryckligen utlovar delaktighet i hans gudomliga natur, men i ett intressant resonemang lägger han fram teorin att även Johannesevangeliet tycks utlova detta underförstått, vilket kan visa på ett beroende på detta evangelium från 2 Pet:s sida.

Gene L. Green gör i det avslutande bidraget "The Testimony of Peter: 2 Peter and the Gospel Traditions" en oortodox analys utifrån en psykologisk teori om vittnande. Green använder forskaren Jennifer Lackeys teori om att både åhörare och vittne formar själva vittnandet. Därmed kan han i steg för steg visa hur 2 Pet använder sig av olika vittnen för sin text, först med Petrus vars namns tyngd pseudepigrafen 1 Pet använder för sin teologi, sedan med hänvisning till Paulus, slutligen även till den gudomliga Rösten i 1:17–18 och andra vittnen till detta för att därmed bygga upp ett starkt argument i syfte att förkasta falska lärare med överväldigande "bevis".

Sammanfattningsvis tillför varje bidrag en unik insikt i vart och ett av breven utan att fastna för mycket i samma material eller upprepa grundläggande teorier kring materialet för ofta. Varje bidrag är även en inblick i hur forskningsläget är kring dessa tre brev och var man ännu kan finna rum för en fördjupning. För om det är något som man kan ta med sig är det att forskningen har hittat många nya och intressanta synvinklar och metoder för brevexegetiken, men att det ännu finns många aspekter i breven som tycks oklara och gåtfulla och som kan leda till en spännande exegetisk resa i tre brev som hamnat i skymundan men som nu för-hoppningsvis fått en del ljus kastat på sig.

Leonhard Franke, Lunds universitet

BibleWorks 10. BibleWorks, LLC. 2015. $389.00.

Det finns ett antal digitala hjälpmedel för studier och forskning i Bibeln. Dessa har olika karaktär och olika syften. Enklare produkter som *Olive Tree's Bible Study+* och *Zondervan's Bible Gateway* är gratis nedladdningsbara till såväl Android smartphones och surfplattor som iPhones och iPads, liksom till vanliga datorer. De fungerar utmärkt om man till exempel vill läsa hebreisk eller grekisk text parallellt med någon fritt vald översättning. Här finns även en del tillköpbara lexika och ordböcker. I vissa fall kan man även få hjälp med textanalys och *Bible Gateway* har ett flertal inlästa ljudversioner av översättningar.

På den andra ändan av skalan återfinns t.ex. *Faithlife Logos Bible Software* med digitalt inlästa böcker, där man kan köpa olika nivåer av kompletta bibliotek, och där texten i böckerna är indexerade så att man genom ett sökord kan få upp t.ex. vad såväl kyrkofäder som reformatorer skrivit i ett visst ämne, i original. *Logos Bible Software* har även lingvistiska sökfunktioner, men det är framför allt som ett överdådigt och oslagbart bibliotek det framstår som oöverträffat.

I en annan kategori finns två ungefär likvärdiga produkter, *Accordance* 10 och *BibleWorks* 10. *Accordance* skapades ursprungligen för Mac (och har gratisver-sioner för handhållna enheter med iOS operativsystem), men är liksom *BibleWorks*, som utvecklades på PC-sidan, användbar på båda huvudplattformar-na. Skillnaden mellan dessa produkter har minskat allt eftersom nya versioner av dem båda sett dagens ljus och är idag närmast en smakfråga. Generellt sett är

Accordance känt för sin eleganta design och användarvänlighet, medan *BibleWorks* har ett mer omfattande startpaket. *BibleWorks* har nu extra moduler man kan köpa till, vilket är *Accordance* affärsprincip, och det finns till den även tillgängligare användargränssnitt även på PC-datorer som först kännetecknade Mac-datorer. I och med version 10 har *BibleWorks* för första gången en layout som utvecklaren är helt nöjd med. Den uttalade målsättningen för bägge dessa program, *Accordance* och *BibleWorks*, är att vara redskap för morfologisk analys av bibliska och utombibliska texter, företrädesvis på grundspråken, samt att ge möjligheter att jämföra versioner och översättningar. De har standard-databaser som är "grammatiskt märkta", *tagged*, och specialskrivna analysprogram som agerar på dessa databaser.

Så ser alltså den översiktliga kartan över tillgängliga digitala bibelhjälpmedel ut. För akademiska studier och forskning, särskilt språkvetenskapliga analyser inom Bibelns grundspråk, är det främst dessa två senare program som kommer ifråga. Vill man högre upp när det gäller systematiska tillämpningar på de analytiska datorprogrammens skala, finns t.ex. Eep Talstra Centre for Bible and Computer vid Vrije Universiteit i Amsterdam, vars forskning man kan ta del av.

Denna recension, som alltså gäller *BibleWorks* 10 (BW10), koncentrerar sig på tilläggen i den nyaste utgåvan, version 10, med uppgraderingsmöjligheter från tidigare versioner. Några av de mest framstående nyheterna är: nya färgläggningsscheman (som man själv kan välja mellan) i de olika arbetsfönstren (de lyser upp studietillvaron); automatisk "färgöverstrykning", *highlighting*, som visar på hur olika översättningar skiljer sig åt; automatisk färgläggning av hebreiska och grekiska morfologiskt *tagged*, "märkta", textversioner, samt möjlighet till egen färgmärkning. BW10 är lätt uppskalbart om man i klassrumssituationen vill visa en text eller ett manuskript medelst datorkanon/projektor.

Bildmässigt är The Manuscript Project i BW10 slående och tämligen enastående: Codex Leningradensis är nytt för version 10 (liksom en mängd nya manuskript), medan The Manuscript Project, "manuskriptprojektet", som sådant startade i version 9 för NT med fotografiska, högupplösta, uppskalbara faksimilåtergivningar av Sinaiticus, Vaticanus, Alexandrinus. När man håller muspekaren över dem visas ett "automatiskt minifönster" med aktuell vers i olika versioner (bra för att kunna jämföra den hebreiska texten i en bekant font) och översättningar. Texten ur Codex Leningradensis kan förstoras upp till 300 % för att verkligen ge möjlighet att studera manuskriptet. Att på detta sätt själv kunna se handskriftsmaterialet är fascinerande, minst sagt! Ljudmässigt kan man nu, förutom det grekiska Nya testamentet, sedan årsskiftet 2016 även gratis ladda ned och lyssna på hela den hebreiska Bibeln. Texten följer med ljuduppläsningen.

En nyhet i BW10 är att man kan använda *två* analysfönster. I det ena fönstrets "flikar" kan man välja vilken typ av djupare analys resp. statistik man önskar, och i det andra fönstret kan man ha ett grundtextmanuskript (t.ex. Codex Leningradensis eller Codex Sinaiticus) öppet – med versindikering i hypertextlänkar till en (ny) interlineär version med grammatisk analys.

Filosofin bakom BW är att tillhandahålla ett fungerande baspaket: köper man det klarar man sig långt. Ändå är nyheten med integrerade EPUB-läsare inom BW tilltalande: man kan katalogisera och läsa *unlocked*, "friköpta", böcker/filer i

EPUB-formatet (tyvärr använder sig dock amazon.com i sin e-boksläsare Kindle ett eget format, MOBI) och på så sätt bygga på biblioteket, och söka i dem. Bland baspaketets nyheter i version 10 märks: Hebreiska samaritanska Pentateuken (med modifierad Westminster-Pentateuk för jämförelse), Leidens GT Peshitta, Nestle-Alands 28:e utgåva av Nya testamentet med morfologi, New English Translation av Septuaginta (2007), *BibleViews Holy Land Picture Database, ESV Concise Bible Atlas* (2012).

Bland tilläggsmoduler till BW10 man kan köpa märks Stuttgart Original Languages Package – New Testament Edition (bland det rika innehållet nämner jag en textkritisk apparat av NA28) och Stuttgart Original Languages Package – Old Testament Edition (likaså med många textkritiska editioner och med rätt att ladda ned moduler av Quinta allteftersom den publiceras).

Det krävs en del arbete för att komma in i programmet. Tidsinvesteringar kan ge olika utfall, men beträffande BW10 kan man lugnt påstå att vinsterna är massiva, och frågan är, när fler och fler börjar använda denna typ av program, om någon kan vara utan ett datorprogram av liknande slag; man kommer ju åt informationen så oändligt mycket snabbare. Det finns en stor uppsättning instruktionsvideos online så man slipper, som var fallet förr, att sitta och kämpa i ensamheten med handböcker och manualer. För övrigt finns en inbyggd hjälp: man håller muspekaren över det man undrar över, trycker F1 och hjälpen är kontextualiserad till just detta.

När det gäller den morfologiska analysen av sökresultat gäller det naturligtvis att ha såpass förståelse av lingvistik att man inser betydelsen, meningen, innebörden av lexemet och den grammatiska formen, i sats- och diskurssammanhang. Att man kan göra imponerande grammatiska sökningar och även visa dessa på en mängd raffinerat statistiska sätt innebär ju inte så stor vinst om dessa inte kopplas till meningsfull exeges av texten. Men detta är givetvis ingen begränsning för BW10 eller andra liknande programs del, det visar snarare på den generella utvecklingen där information i vår digitala tid är lätt att få, medan däremot kunskap som leder till insikt och som appliceras på relevant sätt kräver integrerad förståelse. BW10 blir*,* liksom alla digitala hjälpmedel, i ett sådant sammanhang ett värdefullt arbetsredskap, där alla "transportsträckor" av manuellt slående i lexika och grammatikor kan undvikas, och likaså allt mödosamt upprättande av register och statistik. Allt detta åstadkoms istället på en bråkdel av den tid som annars skulle behöva tas i anspråk (och kanske just därför försummas).

"Hantverket" kan i den meningen överlåtas; det blir väl som när ett företag överlåter bokföringen till en revisionsbyrå, eller som slogan lyder: "gör det du är bäst på". Och programmet är förvisso såväl snabbare som tillförlitligare på det som *det* är bäst på. På detta sätt exponeras exegeten faktiskt inför sin verkliga uppgift: att söka mening i bibeltexter.

Bo Krister Ljungberg

DEREK R. BROWN, *The God of This Age: Satan in the Churches and Letters of the Apostle Paul*. WUNT II 409. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015. Paperback. XI + 243 pages. ISBN: 9783161537080. €79.00.

The God of This Age is a revised version of Brown's doctoral dissertation from 2011. This is a well-written and thoroughly researched monograph, with clear structure and informed interaction with secondary literature, that seeks to answer the thesis question, "How and why does Paul refer to the figure of Satan in his letters?" (p. 15). Brown focuses on what is said of Satan in the seven undisputed letters of Paul. Since Satan is not referred to in all these letters, this study is limited to studying references to Satan in four letters (Romans, 1 Thessalonians, 1 and 2 Corinthians), for a total of ten verses. These are verses that use the terms "Satan," "the god of this age," "Beliar," and "the tempter." Brown explains that he does not include references to powers and principalities in his study, because they are in fact not closely connected with Satan in Paul. Brown also specifies that he is not attempting to reconstruct Paul's "theology of Satan," but only to examine how Satan is portrayed in these undisputed letters. As Brown notes, Paul and his first readers shared much more knowledge about Satan than what is made explicit in these texts.

Considering that Brown is focusing on ten verses, one might have expected this to be a very short book. But it feels rather complete. Brown begins with an overview of the most important literature on the subject. This is followed by a helpful summary of biblical and Second Temple Jewish references to Satan and Satan-like figures, as they would have been understood in Paul's time. Brown groups these references into five main roles or images: Satan as accuser, Satan as tempter, Satan as ruler, Satan and the origin of evil, and Satan in history (a more amorphous category in my view). He notes that Paul does not build on all these traditions. For example, Paul makes little use of the tradition of Satan as the heavenly accuser. Brown next provides an overview of Paul's apocalyptic theology, before looking at Paul's understanding of his role as apostle. This is followed by an exegesis of the ten passages on which the study focuses.

What roles does Satan have in Paul's undisputed letters? References to Satan are not just a rhetorical ploy for Paul, contrary to what one scholar (Lee Johnson) has maintained. Paul does not explain the existence of evil by referring to Satan, but he does portray Satan as a ruler of a rebellious world, as the appellation "the god of this age" (2 Cor 4:4) implies. Satan is thus an antithesis to God the Father in Paul's apocalyptically colored dualistic worldview.

Brown argues that Paul does not portray Satan as a disciplinary agent, contrary to some readings of 1 Cor 5:5 and 2 Cor 12:7. Satan is not a "*witting* agent of God" (p. 188, italics Brown), and hardly an agent of God in any meaningful sense of the term. When Paul speaks of handing someone over to Satan (1 Cor 5:5), Brown argues that he means that he should be excommunicated, and thereby handed back to Satan's realm, that is, the world outside the church (p. 140), not that he expected Satan in any sense to be instrumental in punishing him. This is one of a few places where I disagree with Brown's exegesis. I think Brown underestimates the significance of the verbal similarities between 1 Cor 5:5 and Job 2:6 (LXX); Job's book was of central importance for the formulation of early

Christian views of Satan. I do not agree with Brown's endorsement of Thiselton's understanding of the phrase "for the destruction of the flesh" as referring primarily to the destruction of self-sufficient attitude not only the individual but also of the community (p. 144); this seems like a forced reading to me. Brown's view that Paul does not portray Satan as God's disciplinary agent is comforting, but I am not convinced it is accurate. Brown seems to assume that Paul is quite consistent in his thought; I am not so sure.

In these letters Brown finds that Satan is not the tempter of humankind in general (there is no clear identification of the serpent in Eden with Satan in Paul's letters) but he is the tempter of the people of God, as was also the case in Second Temple Judaism. Just as Satan targeted key figures in OT, he now targets Paul and the congregations he founded. Satan is portrayed an "adversary to [Paul's] apostolic labor for his churches" (p. 99), as an "opponent of his ministry" (p. 157). As was mentioned, Brown dedicates a chapter to Paul's view of his role as apostle. There he shows that Paul's concern for the well-being of the congregations he established reflects faithfulness to his apostolic calling. This is a recurring point in Brown's analysis. Brown notes that while Paul uses passive constructions to explain that he was hindered from going to Rome (Rom 1:13, 15:22), a congregation which he had not founded, he blames Satan for keeping him from visiting the congregation in Thessalonica (1 Thess 2:18) to which he has closer personal ties. Brown also notes that Paul switches from the first person plural to speaking in the first person singular in 1 Thess 2:18, 3:5, where he also refers to Satan. When he has a closer personal connection to the congregation in question Paul is more apt to see the personal agency of Satan behind the difficulties they face. This is a reasonable reading, as far as it goes.

As Brown tries to answer not only how but also why Paul refers to Satan in his letters, it would have been of interest to discuss why he does not refer to Satan in other letters written under similar circumstances. If Paul, in part because of his personal attachment to the congregation in Thessalonica, refers to Satan threatening them instead of couching his language in less apocalyptic terms, why does he not refer outright to Satan in his letter to the congregations in Galatia, for which he also had strong personal feelings and about whose wellbeing he was also very concerned? Brown noted that Paul's references to Satan should be understood in the context of apocalyptic thought. But was Paul's thought always colored by apocalyptic categories? To answer this question, the scope of the study would need to be widened to include other explanations of evil in Paul's writings, such as personifications of sin, lawlessness and the flesh. One could discuss possible reasons why Paul in some letters (most notably Romans) personifies sin and makes few or no references to Satan. Are these evidence of a theological development on Paul's part, is he adapting his language to his readership, or what? (In this context I wish Brown had updated his readings in secondary literature; I lack a reference to my own article "Paul, Sin and Satan: The Root of Evil according to Romans" published in this journal, *SEÅ*, 2010).

Although this monograph is of quite reasonable length, I find the standard list of undisputed letters that Brown limits his study to, to be excessively restrictive. If we widened the net and posited that texts such as Colossians, 2 Thessalonians,

and 2 Timothy were also written by Paul, in what ways would our picture of Paul's understanding of Satan change? This would have been a fine opportunity to test the scholarly orthodoxy regarding authorship of the contested letters. Brown anticipates this criticism. He is aware of the limitations of his study, and he does not insist that no other NT texts than these seven undisputed letters were written by Paul. He has limited his study to these letters primarily for practical purposes to make the discussion of more manageable size, and he notes in closing that there is room for a larger study of references to Satan in Pauline literature.

Brown has given us a solid basis upon which more research about references to Satan and other powers of evil in Pauline literature can be carried out. This is a very good work and I highly recommend it.

Torsten Löfstedt, Linnaeus University

WILLIAM P. BROWN (ED.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Psalms*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014. Hardcover. 684 pages. ISBN: 9780199783335. £105.00.

The Oxford Handbooks have established themselves as great resources for students and experts alike, and this volume is no exception. In the preface, William P. Brown states that it 'aims to touch upon, rather than cover, the myriad bases of Psalms study and interpretation, both past and present. Some reflect longstanding precedence and practice, others are novel and just emerging.' So put, this is one of the book's main strengths. Rather than having a focus similar to that of a dictionary, this handbook presents not primarily overviews of research and important contributions made to the various fields of interest surveyed, but contributes itself actively and creatively to these discussions, sometimes even opening up new areas of research. Succeeding in such an endeavour is not self-evident, but already the impressive list of contributors (most of which having already made significant contributions to the broad field of psalm studies) indicates something of the quality of this handbook. In this sense, it is not only a 'modest sampling' (p. ix) of recent research on the Book of Psalms, but an important compilation of several cutting edge contributions.

As to the structure, the handbook is divided into ten main sections, with two to ten chapters in each one: 1) Ancient Near Eastern Backgrounds; 2) Language of the Psalms; 3) Translating Psalms; 4) Composition of the Psalms; 5) History of Interpretation and Reception: A Sampling; 6) Interpretive Approaches; 7) Culturally Based Interpretations; 8) Theologies of the Psalms; 9) Anthropologies of the Psalms and; 10) Practicing the Psalms. Two appendices by Peter W. Flint provide overviews of 'apocryphal' psalms found in the Dead Sea psalms scrolls, and of the psalms scrolls themselves.

So outlined, there is a movement through the volume from *Sitze im Leben* to *Sitze in unserem Leben* (p. x), and as each chapter is provided with a clear and transparent title, the various contributions are easy to locate. The structure of the handbook also possibly betrays something about how aspects of research on the Book of Psalms are understood by the editor. To take one example, it is noteworthy that although there is a section on the 'composition of the psalms' where issues related to the formation of the collection are addressed, the two contribu-

tions of J. Clinton McCann Jr. and Nancy L. deClaissé-Walford (both representing a canonical approach) are placed in section six ('Interpretive approaches'), despite the fact that both argue that what they provide are not only possible readings, but rather relate to redactional intentions behind the compilation as such.

The volume starts with a helpful overview written by the editor himself. Although handbooks of this kind are not often read from cover to cover, I would encourage the reader to take notice of this first chapter, as it provides a clear framework for discussing various areas of research related to the Book of Psalms.

The first section then provides three separate articles on Mesopotamian, Canaanite, and Egyptian parallels, and section two focuses on the language of the psalms, including articles on the poetry of the psalms (well versed in the ancient artefacts), and the psalms in poetry (an article that could also have been placed in section 5), as well as articles on the language of lament, praise, and wisdom respectively. The various methodologies used in these chapters is a clear strength, and one example is Travis J. Bott's thought provoking use of cognitive linguistics in introducing a theory of metonymy that is related to the praise language in the Book of Psalms.

Part three contains three chapters on translation issues, first related to the Aramaic Psalter, then to the LXX, and last in relation to Jerome's Psalters. Then, in part four, come a couple of contributions dealing with the formation of the Book of Psalms. Susan E. Gillingham provides an interesting discussion of the Levite's role in this process, proceeding from her earlier publications on the issue, and Yair Zakovitch explores lesser scale arrangement of psalms, focusing on Pss 136–150. Last, Peter W. Flint provides an introduction to the 45 psalms scrolls from the Judean Desert, and structures the presentation of their impact on the research of the Book of Psalms in four phases. So presented, it repeats several of his earlier publications, but the contribution nonetheless has its given place in a handbook on the Book of Psalms.

A growing area of research relates to the reception history of the psalms, and part five provides a number of interesting contributions to this field, covering not only Christian and Jewish traditions, but also Islamic ones. The various approaches of these chapters align well with the aim of the handbook, and serve as good entry points into scholarly discussions. The same applies to part six, which covers a broad range of interpretive approaches, from canonical approaches and iconography to rhetorical analyses and feminist interpretations.

After three chapters dealing with culturally based interpretations, part eight provides a double perspective on theologies in the Book of Psalms, one Jewish and one Christian. Although treated in separate chapters, their juxtaposition has a potential of providing a platform for fruitful dialogues in the future. Overall, it is a clear strength that the handbook includes articles representing multiple traditions, although the last part (part ten: 'Practicing the Psalms', which follows after two chapters on anthropology) unfortunately deals mainly with Christian practices.

In sum, the handbook contains well-argued and clearly presented contributions, each with extensive bibliographies at the end. The broad range of topics, combined with the expertise of the authors will certainly help students find exit-

ing new avenues of research, and scholars will find articles with which they can instantly engage. In short, this is a highly valuable (although quite expensive) resource for anyone interested in the Book of Psalms.

David Willgren, Lund University

CONSTANTINE R. CAMPBELL, *Advances in the Study of Greek: New Insights for Reading the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2015. Paperback. 256 pages. ISBN: 9780310515951. $34.99.

In *Advances in the Study of Greek: New Insights for Reading the New Testament*, Constantine Campbell attempts an overview of recent developments in the study of the Greek of the New Testament. Campbell claims to cover only issues related to "the cutting-edge discussion" and issues in current development within the field of the study of Greek, particularly in the context of the New Testament. Campbell's book is overall a decent introductory book for his intended audiences, even though certain chapters could have been fuller and more nuanced, particularly chs. 1 and 2. However, this book could for sure be improved upon in a future revised edition.

Ch. 1 briefly discusses Greek studies from the 19th century up to this day, covering the towering figures of Greek studies in the 19th century—such as Winer, Bopp, Curtius, Brugmann, Blass, de Witt Burton—and for the early 20th century: Deissmann, Moulton, and Robertson. Introducing modern linguistics, Campbell covers the work of Saussure, the Prague school, Chantraine, the systemic grammar of Firth, Chomsky's generative grammar, Barr's seminal work on the semantics of biblical language, Halliday's systemic functional linguistics, Greenberg's linguistic typology, McKay's ground breaking work on verbal aspect, Pike's tagmemics and Louw & Nida's work on semantic domains. Finally, Campbell accounts for the "Modern era" (1989–), beginning with the publications on verbal aspect by Porter and Fanning and those following and responding to their works, as well as *The Encyclopaedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics*.

For the 19th century it would have been appropriate to mention Humboldt who was one of the most influential thinkers within general linguistics and Grimm who founded historical linguistics. The Neogrammarians also merit mention, particularly since it was against their atomism that the Prague School (P.S.) reacted. Campbell's presentation of the P.S. is strikingly lacking. The P.S., though admittedly founded by Vilém Mathesius, was rather centred on Roman Jakobson and Nikolai Trubetzkoy. Mathésius was not only "concerned" with the theme/rheme concept, but actually put forth a theory using terms equivalent to what later would be referred to as theme and rheme. Not only functional but also systemic/structural (Jakobson coined the term "structuralism") perspectives were central for the P.S. Surprisingly Campbell does not mention the markedness concept—so central in verbal aspect studies—that was invented by Trubetzkoy and Jakobson. The P.S. influenced the Copenhagen and London Schools (Firth) and Halliday (which Campbell does mention when discussing Halliday) and had a long-term influence with regard to the systemic view of language. Campbell

writes that the P.S. is still influential today, but does not mention a single example of its far-reaching influence specifically in NT language studies, within which a considerable number of NT language scholars make use of P.S. concepts with explicit reference to P.S. scholars. Most of the material on the P.S. that Campbell includes could have been precluded and replaced with material considerably more relevant for NT language studies.

Ch. 2 accounts for some of the most recent and influential theories adopted within NT Greek linguistics. Campbell starts with a discussion regarding the need for linguistic theory and draws attention to various distinctions within linguistics, such as those between general and descriptive linguistics, diachrony and synchrony, theoretical and applied linguistics, and micro- and macrolinguistics. He also notes the major division between generative and functional linguistics, the last of which he accounts for in more detail, with particular attention to its application within New Testament Greek linguistics and especially as exemplified in the study of verbal aspect by Fanning and Porter.

In ch. 3, that deals with lexical semantics and lexicography, Campbell first discusses the significance of context (or co-text), the power of choice, lexical fields and ambiguity, and then proceeds to the lexicographical work of Danker, Lee's important work on methodology within lexicography, as well as Louw & Nida's important contributions to NT lexicography, such as the arrangement of the lexis according to semantic fields and the use of definitions for the indication of meaning.

Ch. 4 accounts for the discussion on deponency and the middle voice. Scholars are increasingly arguing for deponency to be displaced. Campbell accounts for the background for this tendency by covering the discussion from 1908 (Moulton) up to the 2010 SBL conference when all four presenters agreed that the deponent category should be abandoned entirely. Campbell agrees, but notes the remaining challenges of mixed and passive deponents, as well as the complex relationship between voice and lexis.

In ch. 5 Campbell discusses what verbal aspect is, the distinction between aspect and *Aktionsart*, and the relationship between aspect and tense. He briefly accounts for the history of aspect studies, beginning with Curtius and McKay, moves on with the work of Fanning and Porter and those responding and contributing to the debate, such as Decker, Evans, and Campbell himself. He mentions the applied studies of Mathewson and Cirafesi, and Huffman's work on prohibitions. After discussing the issue of aspect and temporal reference, Campbell accounts for the perfect-debate, the interaction between aspect and *Aktionsart*, as well as the role of aspect in narrative and discourse. A mild criticism of Campbell's account of the present state of the understanding of the Greek tenses is that he does not sufficiently underline the fact that among scholars who have actually done research on tense/verbal aspect, at least half (if not more) support a non-temporal understanding of the Greek indicative.

In ch. 6 Campbell first discusses idiolect, noting the individual language profiles of the NT writers and particularly zooming in on the aspectual usage of the Gospel writers. Secondly, he shortly covers the genre of the Gospels (biography) and notes that the aspectual usage varies considerably between the narrative genre

and the epistolary genre. Thirdly, he discusses register as a category that defines it as use in different social situations. Finally, Campbell reflects on how aspect usage is affected by idiolect and register respectively.

Campbell's discussion of discourse analysis (DA) is divided between the approach of Halliday (ch. 7) and those of Steven Runge and Stephen Levinsohn (ch. 8). Chapter 7 accounts for the four major schools within DA: Summer Institute of Linguistics (SIL), a school focused both on Bible translation and DA, particularly on the sentence level; Halliday & Hasan; Continental Europe, with a focus on rhetoric; Louw's South African School of DA. As for Hallidayan DA Campbell discusses the resources of cohesion and their analysis. In evaluating Hallidayan DA, Campbell argues it has not been applied to Greek yet. Here Campbell does not seem to be aware of the work of Long Westfall and Reed, among others. In ch. 8 Campbell accounts for Levinsohn's work that belongs within SIL. Levinsohn's work is eclectic, drawing together functional perspectives, idiolect and markedness. Levinsohn deals with the function of sentence conjunctions, patterns of reference, highlighting and backgrounding devices, the reporting of conversation and boundary features. Some drawbacks, noted by Campbell are too much focus on the sentence level and idiolect, as well as the potential lack of theoretical rigour, resulting in ad hoc solutions. Finally, Campbell accounts for Runge's cohesive categories (in his *Discourse Grammar*), such as connectives, cataphorics, theme/rheme and thematic devices. Among Runge's weaknesses Campbell notes that the analysis is limited to the sentence level, the lack of an overall discourse theory as well as the dependence on a certain view of markedness.

Ch. 9 addresses the infected—but less important—issue of pronunciation of Greek. Even though Erasmian pronunciation most likely is incorrect (as Campbell points out), its pedagogical advantage makes it user-friendlier for a language that already is a challenge to learn. In the final chapter (ch. 10) methods for teaching and learning Greek are addressed.

Overall, what is worrying is that for some sections Campbell seems to rely on only one or two sources. Campbell could have provided a fuller, broader and more nuanced picture of some of the topics that he addresses if he had used a wider variety of sources. In particular, I think it would have been worthwhile for chs. 1 and 2 since perspectives and preferences vary among linguists in terms of what is important and regarding what is "in" or "out."

Jan H. Nylund, Lund University

NANCY L. DECLAISSÉ-WALFORD (ED.), *The Shape and Shaping of the Book of Psalms: The Current State of Scholarship*. Ancient Israel and Its Literature 20. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2014. Paperback. 290 pages. ISBN: 9781628370010. $36.95.

In the last decades, there has been a steady stream of articles, dissertations, and monograph-length studies devoted to issues related to the formation and purpose(s) of the Book of Psalms. Approaching the issues from various directions, these studies could be described as related to two "epicenters." The first is found in North America, and has its roots in the work of Gerald H. Wilson. The second

is in Europe, and revolves, among others, around the numerous publications of Frank-Lothar Hossfeld and Erich Zenger. Although somewhat different in approaches and focal points, both strands of research have an interest in the processes in which the Book of Psalms came into existence, and how to interpret its final shape. The book under review could be seen as a snapshot of this diverse and exciting field, and the preface makes known that many of the contributions were first presented in two sessions at the 2011 SBL Annual Meeting.

In the first chapter, Nancy L. deClaissé Walford provides a helpful overview of the canonical approach. Shedding light on the work of Wilson by relating it to the work of Brevard S. Childs, and James A. Sanders respectively, she first sketches the main contours of the initial stages of this new "era," and then highlights some scholars and publications from the past twenty-five years. Examples are taken from both American and European contexts, and the general picture painted is one with a basic consensus about "the big 'story'–the metanarrative–of the Psalter" (presented in short on p. 2), although Erhard S. Gerstenberger is mentioned as one of the (few) critical voices. So put, the chapter serves as a good entry point into the various studies of the book, although one could perhaps have wished for a more extensive overview of research, or at least a fuller bibliography (some of the studies mentioned in the text are not included in the bibliography, and the other way around).

The second chapter by Harry P. Nasuti engages in particular with Wilson's suggestion that redactors shaped the Book of Psalms to be meditated over, rather than recited from. He finds such a dichotomy unconvincing, especially in light of the reception history of the psalms, and proposes (I think correctly) that "the history of the interpretation and use of the Psalms work against narrowly restricting the meaning of either this book or its component texts to that which they may have had in any one historical situation of the past" (p. 17). Then, in chapter three, J. Clinton McCann Jr. gives a personal and illuminating reflection on the various currents and streams in the research of the last decades.

The fourth chapter is written by Gerstenberger, who focuses on a topic unrelated to issues of shape and shaping—the dynamics of praise in the Ancient Near East. It is well written, but constitutes somewhat of a surprise, given the context and expressed focus of the book, and should perhaps have been provided with a fuller introduction.

Chapter five, written by Jaco Gericke, frames issues of shape and shaping by means of a philosophical approach. Gericke focuses in particular on how to understand both the diversity, and the kind of unity that is created when juxtaposing psalms, and makes an interesting distinction between what he calls the "fallacy of division" (if something is true of the whole, it must be true of all, or some of its parts) and the "fallacy of composition" (something is true of the psalms as a whole if it is true of some part of the whole).

Moving on, Derek E. Wittman considers the possible impact of the placement of Pss 2 and 149, since they "contain the collection's first and last words portraying God as a royal figure and its initial and final references to foreign nations," and argues that they effectuate a primacy and regency effect respectively. Treating Ps 2 as part of a joint introduction with Ps 1, he relates them to Ps 149 and

suggests that the rhetorical function is to point the readers "toward God's king-ship as a concept around which to organize resistance to oppressive foreign dom-ination" (p. 67). Although he provides some interesting interpretations, not least the suggestion that the speaker of Ps 2:3 could be read as the psalmist him/herself, exhorting an Israelite audience, the overall argument is unpersuasive. As it rests on the notion of primacy and regency effect, a more extensive discus-sion on why observations made related to the reading of narratives are applicable to a collection of psalms should have been provided.

The next couple of chapters deal with various sequences of psalms in the Mas-oretic collection. Christine Brown Jones deals with the Asaphite Collection (ar-gued to stand in a "pivotal place"), and Catherine Petrany has a stimulating con-tribution on the didactic function of psalmic wisdom, further underscoring inter-twinement of reflection and performance (she even speaks of a "ritualization of reflection," p. 101). Phil J. Botha argues that all (!) acrostic psalms have been composed and inserted by (the same) wisdom-inspired editors to encourage pious, poor Judeans to persist with their piety in face of arrogant, rich Judeans, and Karl N. Jacobson has a well-written piece on the notion of YHWH sleeping (especially in Pss 7; 35; 43; 44; 74). Last, Sampson S. Ndoga revisits the "theocratic agenda" of book 4, and Jonathan Magonet sketches some avenues for considering Pss 96–99 as liturgy. Many illuminating observations are made throughout these chap-ters, although most are a bit too clustered around the North American epicenter. In fact, some of the studies could have benefited from a look at some German studies. It is, e.g., unfortunate that Ndoga does not interact with the studies by Martin Leuenberger, Egbert Ballhorn, and Zenger, since they are all dealing with the notion of the kingship of God in books 4–5. As for Magonet, his contribution does not quite meet academic standards, as it almost completely lacks *Auseinandersetzung* (the three titles listed in the bibliography are all his own).

Chapters 13 and 14 focus on book 5. First, W. Dennis Tucker Jr. deals with the role of the foe (for a more in-depth assessment, see my review of his *Construct-ing and Deconstructing Power in Psalms 107–150* in the current issue of *SEÅ*), and second, Robert E. Wallace questions Wilson's characterization of David. Rather than being superseded by the notion of YHWH as king, Wallace notes that David is portrayed in quite complex and divergent (even competing) ways, al-though he suggests an underlying sense of expectation, a "move toward and desire for, but not yet a fully realized, David coregency with God" (p. 204).

In chapter 15, Peter W. Flint gives a survey of four periods of research on the psalms scrolls, mainly based on the relation between the discovery and publica-tion of new material and their effect on research on the Book of Psalms. This being a rapidly growing field of study, the bibliography is unfortunately already a bit outdated.

The book concludes with a thought-provoking chapter by Rolf A. Jacobson in which he imagines the future of psalms studies. As for issues of shape and shap-ing, he points to several areas in need of additional consideration, and I was thrilled to see that many of the issues I discuss in my dissertation (*Like a Garden of Flowers: A Study of the Formation of the 'Book' of Psalms,* Lund University 2016) were mentioned as potentially important lines of inquiry, not least those

concerning what we mean by referring to the collection as a "book," and how such a notion could be related to its use in antiquity.

In sum, the anthology gathers contributions from a broad range of scholars, and although most authors relate primarily to the strand of research that has its roots in Wilson's work, the book provides a good entry point—and a great resource—for anyone interested in an updated view on what has happened in the research on the shape and shaping of the Book of Psalms since the 1980s, and what issues that are currently being discussed.

David Willgren, Lund University

NANCY L. DECLAISSÉ-WALFORD, ROLF A. JACOBSON AND BETH LANEEL TANNER, *The Book of Psalms*. NICOT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2014. Hardcover. 1073 pages. ISBN: 9780802824936. $60.00.

In the recent years, several commentaries have been published on the Book of Psams, including the current contribution of Nancy L. deClaissé-Walford, Rolf A. Jacobson, and Beth LaNeel Tanner. Focusing first on the introduction, it is divided into eight parts (p. 51 counts 9 parts, probably by mistake), with Rolf A. Jacobson as the author of all but the fourth, which is written by Nancy deClaissé-Walford.

The first part deals with the main title, text, and translation of the Book of Psalms. Noteworthy is the discussion of the recent studies by William Yarchin (even unpublished by the time) that show that although the text of the individual psalms is quite stable up to, and throughout the medieval period, the enumeration of psalms is not. In fact, this variation implies that the well recognized version found in, e.g., BHS is represented in only a minority of the manuscripts (21 percent, the alternatives range from 143 to 154 psalms). However, it is not quite clear how such an observation is supposed to play out in the commentary. Jacobson writes that they have "chosen to honor the traditional 150-psalm division, because this configuration has provided the shape of the psalter that has been standard for the last 500 years," and although this is certainly reasonable, not least in light of the fact that the commentary is aimed at ministers and scholars alike, hence decreasing possible confusion, it could have been appropriate to discuss how the joining of two psalms effect their interpretation. In fact, in the running commentary, it is most often only noted in passing (see, e.g., the commentary on Ps 114, where the psalm is related primarily to Ps 113, and not Ps 115, to which it is joined in several manuscripts). The only exception is Pss 1–2, the possible combination of which is deemed as having great impact for the reading of the entire Book of Psalms. The various configurations of psalms in the psalms scrolls from the Judean desert are also mentioned, although the main use made of these scrolls in the commentary is text critical. The first part concludes with a presentation of some translation choices made. Noteworthy is the use of inclusive language, such as the translation of singular, masculine nouns into plural, the decision to transliterate rather than to translate *hesed*, and the alternation between "he" and "she" when referring to the psalmist.

The second section deals with authorships, superscriptions, and date. As for authorship, the psalms are treated as anonymous (for "practical purposes"), and this is reflected in, e.g., the translation "Davidic" for לדוד. Jacobson also gives a brief overview of terms featuring in the superscriptions, but no separate discussion of date is found in this section, despite the title.

Third, Jacobson deals with form criticism and historical approaches to interpretation, overviewing the works of, among others, Hermann Gunkel, Sigmund Mowinckel (both as representing a "first approach" that attempted to "get behind" the texts of the psalms), Claus Westermann, and Walter Brueggemann (the latter two as representing a "second approach" that focused on the "forms themselves"), and the section concludes with a brief description of some of the more common forms.

The fourth section is written by deClaissé-Walford, and focuses on insights gained from the canonical approach that has its (North American) roots in the work of Gerald H. Wilson. After an overview of the history of research, some space is dedicated to a walkthrough of the "story" of the Book of Psalms, as argued not least by deClaissé-Walford herself in her *Reading from the Beginning: The Shaping of the Hebrew Psalter* (1997).

Part five deals with poetry. After an introduction to Hebrew parallelism, Jacobson speaks of evocative language, introduced as an important approach in the commentary: "Without denying the power or importance of historical or form-critical approaches to the Psalter …, we recognize that because the psalms are poetry of faith, faithful interpretation must attend both their theological nature … and also to their poetic nature" (p. 42). Ultimately, he states that "the power of language is inseparable from the meaning" (p. 43).

Last, in section six, Jacobson deals with various themes and theologies, and mentions some scholarly attempts to suggest a theological center. This leads to the statement that the commentary will approach notions of theme and theology primarily in relation to each psalm individually, although the larger story of the Book of Psalms (as presented by deClaissé-Walford) will also be taken into consideration, as well as the "twenty-first century world."

A brief outline of the Book of Psalms (part VII), and a select bibliography (part VIII) concludes this well written introduction. Most areas relevant for a study of the Book of Psalms are covered, although something more could perhaps have been said about how the authors perceive the diachronic formation of this collection, and perhaps also something about its later reception and use.

Turning to the commentary proper, each "book" (Pss 1–41; 42–72; 73–89; 90–106; 107–150) is provided with an introduction focusing on its shape and the development of certain themes (3–6 pages, an author is missing on p. 689). A similar introduction is also found in relation to Pss 120–134 (unfortunately, the variant order of these psalms in 11Q5 is not mentioned). Each psalm is then commented upon in a fairly brief and concise manner, and the structure is quite straightforward. First, something is said about form and structure. Second, an outline of the psalm is provided, followed by a fresh translation with text critical and other translation issues placed in footnotes (all Hebrew is transliterated). Then, the commentary goes through the psalm stanza by stanza, and some of the

commentaries also include a final reflection. As the name of the author is provided at the end, it becomes clear that it is only Jacobson that provides these reflections, but as they often cast interesting light on the psalm, not least when related to a more contemporary setting, they could well have been included as a fixed feature. The canonical perspective is not visible in all expositions, although more frequently so in the ones written by deClaissé-Walford.

The fact that the commentary is a single volume inevitably results in the commentaries of each individual psalm being fairly short, but the authors generally capture main features in a clear and lucid way. Evidently, this is not the type of commentary that provides extensive overviews of the state of research (secondary literature is only sparsely noted), nor lengthy discussions on specific details, but rather one that keeps a consistent focus on the general aim with the NICOT commentaries: to combine superior scholarship, an evangelical view of scripture as the word of God, and concern for the life of faith today. In sum, it provides a valuable resource for the study of the Book of Psalms.

David Willgren, Lund University

THOMAS B. DOZEMAN, KONRAD SCHMID OCH BARUCH J. SCHWARTZ (RED.), *The Pentateuch: International Perspectives on Current Research.* FAT 78. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011. Inbunden. XVIII + 578 sidor. ISBN: 9783161506130. €129.00.

Föreliggande volym är en frukt av ett symposium i Zürich i januari 2010, med syfte att föra samman ledande pentateukforskare från olika delar av världen för att försöka bringa samman olika perspektiv.

Såsom utgivarna i inledningskapitlet skissar situationen så står dokumenthypotesen med sina källor J, E, D och P fast bland forskare från USA och Israel med den skillnaden att israelerna ofta daterar P tidigt. I Europa däremot beskrivs dokumenthypotesen som övergiven. Undertecknad är väl inte så övertygad om den beskrivningens riktighet, men hur som helst så har vi här 27 artiklar av lika många forskare, fördelat på fem huvudavdelningar: (1) Current Issues in Methodology, (2) Genesis, (3) Exodus – Deuteronomy, (4) P, H and D och slutligen (5) Pentateuch in the Hebrew Bible and Its History of Reception. Med tanke på den ovan nämnda geografiska analysen kunde det ha varit intressant om det också hade stått vilka länder de olika författarna representerar. I en del fall är det välkända namn men detta gäller långt ifrån alla.

Det övergripande intrycket när man läst boken är att vi här har en lång rad artiklar av vilka de flesta arbetar med gängse litterärkritiska metoder, jämför verser och textavsnitt och försöker konstatera vad som är äldre och vad som är senare. Som en röd tråd ser man också att de flesta daterar det mesta i ganska så sen efterexilisk tid. En fråga som återkommer i många av artiklarna är om P är en källa eller ett bearbetningsskikt eller kanske något annat. Det går inte här att gå in i detalj på alla dessa artiklar men några nedslag skall vi göra i bidrag som undertecknad funnit särskilt intressanta.

Det metodologiska avsnittet börjar med Baruch Schwartz som konstaterar att dokumenthypotesen hittills inte visat sig ohållbar men att den hela tiden förbätt-

ras. Frågan om europeiska forskare övergett dokumenthypotesen besvaras därefter av Konrad Schmid som betonar att också europeiska forskare pekat på förekomsten av olika dokument, om än kanske inte i den traditionella dokumenthypotesens mening, såsom den idag främst är känd i Gerhard von Rads gestaltning. Schmid fastslår att situationen är mera komplicerad än så. Pentateuken innehåller dokument men också fragment och supplement.

En vanlig tendens är att tala om Non-P i stället för J och E. Så beskriver David Carr Pentateuken som tillkommen i två etapper. Först tillkom en komposition bestående av Non-P och D som sedan kombinerades med P-materialet. Man kan här se en strävan efter förenkling. Det är bättre att förutsätta en begränsad mängd rekonstruerbara stadier än att försöka beskriva varje stadium i detalj.

Särskilt intresse tilldrar sig Benjamin Sommers bidrag om fällor när det gäller att datera pentateuktexter. Det har varit mycket vanligt att texter har daterats utifrån de teologiska idéer som framkommer i texterna eller efter historiska händelser som texterna verkar anspela på. Men Sommer betonar att dessa metoder på intet sätt är självklara. Författare kan komma upp med idéer som varit vanligare under en annan tidsperiod. På samma sätt behöver en anspelning på exil inte alltid syfta på händelserna år 587 f.Kr. Exil var alltid ett hot. Alla texter kan inte dateras med precision. Vi känner inte alltid den historiska kontexten, utan kan bara tolka texten utifrån vad vi tror var den historiska kontexten.

När vi kommer till avdelningen om Genesis vill jag stanna inför två av bidragen. Michaela Bauks fokuserar i sin studie av Gen 2–3 särskilt på Gen 2:25, "Både mannen och kvinnan var nakna, och de kände ingen blygsel inför varandra". En vanlig tolkning i många nyare utläggningar är att de två från början inte var medvetna om sin nakenhet, de var som sexuellt omedvetna barn. Först när de ätit av trädet blev de medvetna om sin nakenhet och blygdes. Bauks anför goda skäl för att det inte finns tillräcklig grund för en sådan sexualiserad läsning som förutsätter en inte helt självklar reciprocitet i uttrycket *shenehem 'arummim ha'adam we'ishto welo' yitboshashu*. Verbets *hitpolel*-form är en vanlig reflexiv och "kunskapen och gott och ont" i Gen 2–3 har inget med sexualitet att göra. Verbet *bosh* hör mera till en social än en moralisk kategori och har att göra med sårbarhet. På samma sätt står nakenhet inte för sexuell skam utan för social utsatthet och sårbarhet. Det är denna sårbarhet som kommer i dagen när Gud efter fallet konfronterar de två. Gen 2–3 handlar således inte, som man ibland kan se, om utvecklingen av mänsklig sexualitet utan om skillnaden mellan Gud och det skapade.

Sarah Shectman ställer i sin artikel om Rakel och Lea frågan varför det var viktigt att Isak och Jakob tog hustrur från de arameiska förfäderna under det att Jakobs tolv söner kunde ta vilka hustrur de ville och barnen sågs ändå som rättmätiga arvingar. Lösningen finner Shectman i Gen 31:14. I och med att Rakel och Lea avsäger sig relationen till Labans hus blir det fritt för deras söner att gifta sig med grannarna. När systrarna avvisar sitt band till Laban bryts bandet med araméerna av.

Inom avdelningen om Exodus–Deuteronomium vill jag först stanna inför Erhard Blums artikel om de två versionerna av Dekalogen i Exod 20 och Deut 5. Inledningsvis konstaterar han att exodusversionen normalt ses som den primära

men att också denna genomgått senare förändringar. Vidare hävdar han att andra budet, bildförbudet, är beroende av Deut 4 och därmed ganska sent tillagt. Då har vi nio bud i Exod 20, men då sabbaten firades först under exilen hör detta bud (nr 4) troligen inte heller till den ursprungliga versionen, liksom inte heller budet om föräldrarna (nr 5). Därmed har vi kvar en "heptalog" med bud 1, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9 och10, där hela Exod 20:17 räknas som det tionde budet. Denna "heptalog" har haft sin ursprungliga plats i Exodusberättelsen och varit förlaga för dekalogen som vi har den i Deut 5 där den också kompletterades med bildförbudet från Deut 4. Senare bearbetades den ursprungliga heptalogen i Exod 20 till en dekalog i enlighet med Deut 5. Sabbatsbudet, som nu också fanns med, omarbetades till den prästerliga form vi har i Exodustexten.

Avdelningen avslutas med Joel Badens bidrag om Deuteronomium och dokumenthypotesen. Det är välkänt att E är den av dokumenthypotesens källor som först ifrågasattes, men här visar Baden genom att jämföra ett antal texter i Deuteronomium som har paralleller i Exodus och Numeri att D inte använder ett kombinerat JE-dokument. Det faktum att D enbart använder E betyder alltså att E måste ha varit ett självständigt dokument. Det undertecknad ändå funderar över här är om E för dens skull måste ha varit ett dokument. Skulle det inte också kunna vara så att D och E härrör från samma traditionskretsar?

Avdelningen P, H och D inleds med Saul M. Olyans artikel om omskärelsen och dess användbarhet som kriterium för datering och källanalys. Under vilken tidsperiod passar omskärelsen bäst in som ett avskiljande förbundstecken? Före exilen fanns det flera folk i Israels närhet som praktiserade omskärelsen och på samma sätt kan det ha varit efter exilen. Således passar detta förbundstecken bäst in under exilen eftersom det inte förekom bland babylonierna. Omskärelsen omnämns nu inte så ofta utanför Gen 17, men om Gen 17 är från exiltiden måste exilen också vara den tid då P och H tillkom. Därmed vänder sig Olyan mot Israel Knohl som velat datera H till 700-talet f.Kr. och P ännu tidigare.

Nämnde Knohl är den som står för nästa bidrag. I sin artikel "Who Edited the Pentateuch?" går han inte in på några absoluta dateringar, men konstaterar att den som gav Pentateuken dess slutliga gestalt var just H, dvs. den skola som stod bakom den s.k. Helighetslagen.

I bokens sista avdelning, som handlar om receptionshistorien, möter vi bl.a. Graeme Aulds artikel om relationen mellan Genesis och Samuelsböckerna. Auld finner ganska många beröringspunkter mellan dessa böcker. Tamar finns i båda texterna, David har likheter med såväl Abraham som Jakob och Josef. Laban i Genesis motsvaras av Nabal i 1 Sam 25. Isaks bindande i Gen 22 har en pendang i folkräkningen i 2 Sam 24. Enligt Auld är Samuelsböckerna äldre än Genesis, som han ser som ett protomidrashiskt återberättande av Samuelsböckerna.

Thomas Römer frågar i sitt bidrag om det finns bibeltexter utanför Pentateuken som vittnar om Pentateukens existens. Till frågan om Genesis–Kungaböckerna skall ses som en enda berättelse, eller om Pentateuken är en avgränsad del för sig, anför han Neh 9, som först berättar detaljerat om händelser i Pentateuken under det att texten sedan går över till att tala om avfallet i mera allmänna ordalag. För författaren till Neh 9 bör således Pentateuken ha varit en egen enhet. Därefter går Römer igenom historiska allusioner i Psaltaren. Många psalmer har anspelningar

på berättelser i Pentateuken, men bara ett fåtal sträcker sig längre fram i historien. Sammanfattningsvis konstaterar Römer att Pentateuken bör ha haft en speciell status när dessa psaltarpsalmer skrevs. Nu menar Römer att detta inte skedde mycket senare än 200-talet f.Kr., vilket betyder att Pentateuken då haft en speciell status. Detta skulle också kunna förklara varför Psaltaren är indelad i fem böcker. Att Pentateuken förelåg på 200-talet eller strax efter är det kanske ändå inte så många som tvivlar på. Kanske säger artikeln mera om hur Römer ser på de övriga historiska böckerna men detta skriver han inte så mycket om.

James Watts fortsätter med att beskriva Esras tid som en metodologisk nyckel till att förstå framväxten av helig text "scripture". Det är tre faktorer som sammantaget kallas "ritualisering", som konstituerar en helig text, muntlig föredragning, ikonisk vördnad för texten, och utläggning i förkunnelsen. I Neh 8 ser vi exempel på alla tre faktorerna. Watts menar att detta också förklarar varför till synes motsägelsefullt material har inkluderats i Pentateuken. Den muntliga föredragningen och den ikoniska vördnaden för texterna kräver inte samma litterära konsistens som en semantisk interpretation gör. Här kan man ändå fråga sig om det verkligen tillfogats nytt material efter att texten "ritualiserats". Detta känns knappast troligt.

Sist i volymen kommer Gary Knoppers artikel om relationen mellan den samaritanska och judiska pentateuken. Knoppers börjar med att konstatera att det finns många hundra skillnader mellan dessa två texter men tillägger att det mesta av detta gäller ortografiska detaljer. Samtidigt finns det ett fåtal sektspecifika tillägg i den samaritanska texten. Nu finns det både ett antal septuagintahandskrifter och ett antal texter från Qumran som överensstämmer med den samaritanska texten. 5–6 % av Torah-fragmenten från Qumran är vad man kallar protosamaritanska, men dessa saknar de sektspecifika tilläggen. Däremot finns det liksom i den samaritanska texten en hel del harmoniseringar genom att text från andra Torahställen inkorporerats för att förbättra andra ställen. Det vi kan konstatera är att Pentateuken förelåg i olika textformer århundradena närmast vår tideräknings början. Samaritanerna följde en av dessa textformer, men försåg den med några speciella tillägg och ändringar relaterade till den egna gruppens teologi. I grund och botten var det dock samma Torah som vördades och användes inom båda dessa grupper.

Ja, detta var några axplock ur den rika bukett som denna volym representerar. Vad vi ser är att dokumenthypotesen långt ifrån är död. Argumenten vänds och vrids och finslipas än idag. Teorier och hypoteser avlöser varandra. Men den allvarliga frågan måste ställas: kommer man så mycket längre? Jämföra texter kan man göra i det oändliga, men det som kan driva forskningen framåt torde ändå främst vara nya språkliga rön och nytt utombibliskt jämförelsematerial. Av sådant ser vi inte mycket i denna volym men det är inte heller dess fokus. Vad vi får är en god inblick i det nuvarande forskningsläget när det gäller Pentateukens tillkomsthistoria sett i det litterärkritiska perspektivet, men också en hel del annat.

Stig Norin, Uppsala

OLE JAKOB FILTVEDT, *The Identity of God's People and the Paradox of Hebrews*. WUNT II 400. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015. Paperback. 312 pages. ISBN: 9783161540134. €89.00.

This monograph is a slightly revised version of a PhD thesis submitted to MF Norwegian School of Theology in the summer of 2014. The purpose of the study is to investigate how the letter to the Hebrews "shapes the notion of what it means to belong to and identify as part of God's people, and how identity as a member of God's people is shaped through the Christ event" (p. 1).

Filtvedt wants to frame the debate in Hebrews by taking focus away from the ethnic background of the addressees and by claiming a minimalist view on the socio-historical setting of Hebrews, including assumptions regarding the process of "the parting of the ways." Thus, he interprets Hebrews not as a letter about two different peoples, nor even about two different identities: "It is the past, present and future of Israel which is subject to negotiation in Hebrews, as well as the question of what it means to identify as part of God's people in good standing, now that the Christ event has taken place" (p. 267).

After setting out the question and the parameters of the inquiry, the introductory chapter considers leading proponents of three major approaches taken by previous scholars: "the conflict theory" (I. Salevao as a leading exponent of the view that Hebrews reflects a major "parting" between an emergent "Christianity" and "Judaism), "the in-house theory" (R. B. Hays as a proponent of the view that Hebrews reflects an intra-familial debate, one version of Judaism against others), and "the foil theory" (E. Käsemann as the proponent of the view that Hebrews merely uses references to the Old Testament and Jewish things symbolically, the real concern is to distinguish real/heavenly things from earthly/fleshly ones).

Chapter 2 is given to establishing that in Hebrews Jesus is "the true Israelite." Filtvedt focuses on passages in Hebrews where Jesus is posited as representative for the redeemed, e.g., his suffering and exaltation as paradigmatic for the readers, the redeemed as "brothers" of Jesus, and Jesus as linked with the "house" of God as "Son."

In Chapter 3, Filtvedt discusses the emphasis of "the New Covenant" in Hebrews, seeking to observe precisely in what way the "new" covenant is related to, and distinguishable from, the Mosaic covenant. Unlike other Second Temple Jewish references to a "new covenant," that projected by Hebrews seems more radically new. It is not simply a re-affirmation and/or re-articulation of the Mosaic covenant, but instead something genuinely new, in the light of which the former, Mosaic covenant is now superseded.

Chapter 4 focuses on the treatment of worship in Hebrews, specifically the comparison and contrast between worship of God under the former covenant and the new, correct worship that is to be given under the new covenant. Filtvedt argues that in Hebrews we have a "subversive" advocacy of the new worship that is offered in response to God's new revelation in Jesus. All of this has obvious implications for the identity of the worshippers, who are no longer identified with reference to Moses, Torah, the Jerusalem temple, etc., but are now those who affirm Jesus and form around him.

Filtvedt then continues (ch. 5) to discuss how Hebrews draws upon and re-works the narrative of biblical Israel, developing also a new extension of that narrative that focuses on Jesus. It is argued that this new narrative is not an aban-donment of the narrative of biblical Israel, not a rejection of Israel as such, but is instead a further development of the story of Israel.

In Chapter 6 Filtvedt offers an intriguing argument that the author of Hebrews cleverly uses categories of inside and outside the "camp" to advocate the stance he wishes his readers to affirm. This involves a reversal of typical uses of these images. So, e.g., whereas typically one enters into the "camp" to join and function as part of a given social entity, in Hebrews readers are enjoined to exit the "camp" and join Jesus in his suffering and shame. By exiting the "camp" the readers form a social entity that is marked by its identification with Jesus. Ac-cording to Filtvedt, this does not amount to a renunciation of Israel or the Jewish people as such. Instead, Hebrews implicitly affirms a continuing reality of "Isra-el," but urges that true Israel is comprised of those who affirm Jesus and identify themselves with reference to him.

So, Filtvedt seeks to establish a view of the question of the relation of Hebrews to the ancient Jewish people that is distinctive, not fitting easily into any of the three major approaches outlined in the introductory chapter. He argues that He-brews is not simply another example of the "in-house" theory, in that Hebrews is more radical in the newness of the covenant and the exclusivity that is attached to Jesus. But Hebrews is not an example simply of "conflict theory" either, for the text does not reflect two entities of "Christianity" and "Judaism," and does not renounce "Israel" or denies the term to Jews. Instead, Filtvedt contends, Hebrews promotes a continuing place of "Israel" as the people of God, but re-draws the boundaries of "Israel" as that group that is identified with reference to Jesus. Ultimately, however, the identity of Israel is destabilized and transformed in Hebrews, being between two stable identities. The ambiguities created through the tension between newness and continuity are not finally resolved in Hebrews.

According to Filtvedt, "we simply do not know the historical location of the first addresses, the precise dating of the text or the identity of the author" (p. 24), including the ethnic identity of the addresses. Although Filtvedt is careful to point out that "historical minimalism is not the same as a non-historical approach" (p. 25), he occasionally tends to end up in a minimalistic construct that seems a bit non-historical or, at least, non-contextual.

Filtvedt may be justified in pointing out that Hebrews does not directly address the issue of whether the addressees were Jews or not. Although issues of Jewish ethnicity were obviously not at stake among the addressees of Hebrews, this does not mean, however, that these issues were not in focus or that ethnic identity is not of interest to the author; it could just have been taken for granted. In fact, could Hebrews have been understood without a Jewish pre-understanding or even some kind of a Jewish context? Could the people who still remain "within the camp" have been other than Jews?

Despite some minor points of reservations, Filtvedt's analysis of Hebrews stands out as a highly stimulating and important study. It is well-researched and

clearly written and synthesizes theoretical frameworks and sober exegetical analysis into a cogent and compelling argument. As such, it makes an important contribution to the scholarship of Hebrews.

Mikael Tellbe, Örebro School of Theology

DAVID HELLHOLM, TOR VEGGE, ØYVIND NORDERVAL AND CHRISTER HELLHOLM (EDS.), *Ablution, Initiation, and Baptism: Late Antiquity, Early Judaism, and Early Christianity*. BZNW 176. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011. 3 vols. XLI + 2024 pages. ISBN: 9783110247510. €319.00/$447.00/£239.99.

The volumes under review are the culmination of symposia held in Rome (2008) and on the island of Lesbos (2009). The essays, written in German and English by historians of religion, classicists, Egyptologists, scholars of Bible and Patristics, art historians and archeologists, are as follows:

Volume 1: Christoph Markschies, "Einführung" (xlix–lxiii). *Part I: Methodological Considerations*: Anders Klostergaard Petersen, "Rituals of Purification, Rituals of Initiation: Phenomenological, Taxonomical and Culturally Evolutionary Reflections" (3–40). *Part II: Religions of Late Antiquity – Outside of Judaism and Christianity*: Jan Assmann and Andrea Kucharek, "Wasserriten im Alten Ägypten" (43–68); Anders Hultgård, "The Mandean Water Ritual in Late Antiquity" (69–99); Fritz Graf, "Baptism and Graeco-Roman Mystery Cults" (101–18); Birger A. Pearson, "Baptism in Sethian Gnostic Texts" (119–43); Gregor Wurst, "Initiationsriten im Manichäismus" (145–54). *Part III: Early Judaism*: Antje Labahn, "Aus dem Wasser kommt das Leben: Waschungen und Reinigungsriten in frühjüdischen Texten" (157–219); Seán Freyne, "Jewish Immersion and Christian Baptism: Continuity on the Margins?" (221–53); Clare K. Rothschild, "'Echo of a Whisper': The Uncertain Authenticity of Josephus' Witness to John the Baptist" (255–90); Dieter Sänger, "'Ist er heraufgestiegen, gilt er in jeder Hinsicht als ein Israelit' (bYev 47b): Das Proselytentauchbad im frühen Judentum" (291–334).

Part IV: Earliest Christianity: Michael Labahn, "Kreative Erinnerung als nachösterliche Nachschöpfung: Der Ursprung der christlichen Taufe" (337–76); Hans Dieter Betz, "Jesus' Baptism and the Origins of the Christian Ritual" (377–96); Lars Hartman, "Usages — Some Notes on the Baptismal Name-Formulae" (397–413); David Hellholm, "Vorgeformte Tauftraditionen und deren Benutzung in den Paulusbriefen" (415–95); Tor Vegge, "Baptismal Phrases in the Deutero-pauline Epistles" (497–556); Jens Schröter, "Die Taufe in der Apostelgeschichte" (557–86); Samuel Byrskog, "Baptism in the Letter to the Hebrews" (587–604); Halvor Moxnes, "Because of 'The Name of Christ': Baptism and the Location of Identity in 1 Peter" (605–28); Udo Schnelle, "Salbung, Geist und Taufe im 1. Johannesbrief" (629–54); Kirsten Marie Hartvigsen, "Matthew 28:9–20 and Mark 16:9–20: Different Ways of Relating Baptism to the Joint Mission of God, John the Baptist, Jesus, and their Adherents" (655–715); Turid Karlsen Seim, "Baptismal Reflections in the Fourth Gospel" (717–34); Oda Wischmeyer, "Hermeneutische Aspekte der Taufe im Neuen Testament" (735–63).

Volume 2, *Part V: The Patristic Period*: Andreas Lindemann, "Zur frühchrist-lichen Taufpraxis: Die Taufe in der Didache, bei Justin und in der Didaskalia" (767–815); Dietrich-Alex Koch, "Taufinterpretationen bei Ignatius und im Barnabasbrief: Christologische und soteriologische Deutungen" (817–48); Vemund Blomkvist, "The Teaching on Baptism in the Shepherd of Hermas" (849–70); Eve-Marie Becker, "Taufe bei Marcion – eine Spurensuche" (871–94); Einar Thomassen, "Baptism among the Valentinians" (895–915); William Tab-bernee, "Initiation/Baptism in the Montanist Movement" (917–45); Øyvind Norderval, "Simplicity and Power: Tertullian's *De Baptismo*" (947–72); Henny Fiskå Hägg, "Baptism in Clement of Alexandria" (973–87); Gunnar af Hällström, "More Than Initiation? Baptism According to Origen of Alexandria" (989–1009); Anders Ekenberg, "Initiation in the *Apostolic Tradition*" (1011–50); Enno Edzard Popkes, "Die Tauftheologie Cyprians: Beobachtungen zu ihrer Entwicklungsge-schichte und schrifthermeneutischen Begründung" (1051–70); Jürgen Wehnert, "Taufvorstellungen in den Pseudoklementinen" (1071–1114); Michael Lattke, "'Taufe' und 'untertauchen' in Aphrahats *taḥwyāṯā*" (1115–38); Serafim Seppälä, "Baptismal Mystery in St. Ephrem the Syrian and *Hymnen de Epiphania*" (1139–77); Juliette Day, "The Catechetical Lectures of Cyril of Jerusalem: A Source for the Baptismal Liturgy of Mid-Fourth Century Jerusalem" (1179–1204); Ilaria L. E. Ramelli, "Baptism in Gregory of Nyssa's Theology and Its Orientation to Eschatology" (1205–31); Rudolf Brändle, "Johannes Chrysostomus: Die zehn Gaben (τιμαί oder δωρεαί) der Taufe" (1233–52); Reidar Aasgaard, "Ambrose and Augustine: Two Bishops on Baptism and Christian Identity" (1253–82); J. Patout Burns, "The Efficacy of Baptism in Augustine's Theology" (1283–1303); Otmar Hesse, "Der Streit über die Wirkung der Taufe im frühen Mönchtum: Die Taufe bei Makarios/Symeon, Markos Eremites und den Messalianern" (1305–45); Hugo Lundhaug, "Baptism in the Monasteries of Upper Egypt: The Pacho-mian Corpus and the Writings of Shenoute" (1347–80).

Part VI: Thematic Surveys: Christian Strecker, "Taufrituale im frühen Chris-tentum und in der Alten Kirche: Historische und ritualwissenschaftliche Perspek-tiven" (1383–1440); Karl Olav Sandnes, "Seal and Baptism in Early Christianity" (1441–81); Hans-Ulrich Weidemann, "Taufe und Taufeucharistie: Die postbap-tismale Mahlgemeinschaft in Quellen des 2. und 3. Jahrhunderts" (1483–1530); Hermut Löhr, "Kindertaufe im frühen Christentum: Beobachtungen an den neu-testamentlichen Apokryphen" (1531–52); Reinhart Staats, "Das Taufbekenntnis in der frühen Kirche" (1553–83).

Part VII: Archaeology and Art History: Olof Brandt, "Understanding the Structures of Early Christian Baptisteries" (1587–1609); Dieter Korol (with Jan-nike Rieckesmann), "Neues zu den alt- und neutestamentlichen Darstellungen im Baptisterium von Dura-Europos" (1611–72); Robin M. Jensen, "Baptismal Prac-tices at North African Martyrs' Shrines" (1673–95); Hannah Schneider, "Die Entwicklung der Taufbecken in der Spätantike" (1697–1719); Diane Apostolos-Cappadona, "'I understand the mystery, and I recognize the sacrament.': On the Iconology of Ablution, Baptism, and Initiation" (1721–41); Margaret M. Mitch-ell, "The Poetics and Politics of Christian Baptism in the Abercius Monument" (1743–82).

Volume 3 contains 106 photos and drawings, many in color (1786–1886), as well as three lists of abbreviations (1887–88), lists of Greek, Latin, Syriac, Coptic, Graeco-Coptic, Mandean and Egyptian technical terms (1889–91), three indices (modern authors, subjects, and ancient passages, 1893–2018), and a list of editors and contributors (2019–24).

Together, the three volumes provide an unparalleled interdisciplinary resource to which scholars will turn for years to come. Many of the contributors are recognized authorities on the topics they address. Naturally, one could quibble with some of the essays or wonder, for example, why the Sethian "gnostic" texts are segregated among non-Jewish and non-Christian religions of late antiquity (Part II, 1:119–43), whereas Valentinian baptism is aptly situated among analyses of other patristic literature (Part V, 2:895–915). Later this year, three analogous volumes, on *The Eucharist – Its Origins and Contexts: Sacred Meal, Communal Meal, Table Fellowship in Late Antiquity, Early Judaism, and Early Christianity* (eds. David Hellholm and Dieter Sänger), will appear with Mohr Siebeck.

James A. Kelhoffer, Uppsala University

WESLEY HILL, *Paul and the Trinity: Persons, Relations, and the Pauline Letters*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015. Paperback. 224 pages. ISBN: 9780802869647. $26.00.

Wesley Hill, Assistant Professor of biblical studies at Trinity School for Ministry in Ambridge, Pennsylvania, has converted his PhD-thesis from Durham University in 2012, into a neat presentation of his major arguments and conclusions concerning trinitarian theology in the Pauline letters. His conviction is "that Pauline interpreters ought to return to the 'trinitarian' model when it comes to the task of explicating the identities of God, Jesus, and the Spirt" (p. 1).

In modern discussions, the description of Pauline theology has been dominated by the language of "high" and "low" christologies. This conceptuality offers the image of a vertical axis, with "God" at the top and the interpretative question of how close or how distant "Jesus" and "the Spirit" are from God. Hill takes James D. G. Dunn as an example of "low" christology, representing a developmental understanding of New Testament christology wherein Jesus Christ remains subordinate to God and does not infringe on the status of the one God. As two representatives of "high" christology Hill takes Larry Hurtado and Richard Bauckham, who both reject a developmental model for early christology and argue that "high" christology was already implicated from the beginning in a redefined monotheism.

Others scholars, such as Nils Dahl, Leander Keck, Francis Watson, and Kavin Rowe, have instead argued for a more complex, dynamic, and relational approach, seeing God, Jesus and the Spirit as equally primal, mutually determinative, relationally constituted. God, on this account, is unspecifiable apart from Jesus and the Spirit, all three existing in a web or skein of relationality that makes each of the three who they are.

Hill wants to take this position a step further, arguing for a horizontal axis in depicting the relation between God, Jesus and the Spirit, and allowing "some of

the conceptualities of trinitarian doctrine to serve as a hermeneutical lens for rereading Paul's letters" (p. 169). Fourth- and fifth-century trinitarian doctrine, argues Hill, may thus be used retrospectively to shed light on and enable a deeper penetration of the Pauline texts in their own historical context.

Exploring central christological passages such as Rom 4:24; 8:11; Phil 2:6–11; 1 Cor 8:5–6 and 15:24–28, Hill argues for a relational mutuality where God is not only who God is in relation to Jesus, but also where Jesus is who he is only in relation to God. By applying the concept of "asymmetry," Hill opposes that Jesus' dependency on God for his identity involves a "subordination" to God that is out of step with trinitarian theology. Instead, Hill talks about "redoublement", maintaining that God and Jesus share the divine identity (unity) but their personal uniqueness is not thereby impaired (distinction). Hill ends up in what he calls the "asymmetrical mutuality" between God and Jesus, whereby God is not who God is as "father" without Jesus and Jesus is not who he is as the raised and exalted one without God. God's and Jesus' identities are thus constituted in and by their differing ways of relating to one another.

Hill objects to those interpreters who view Paul's theology as "binitarian" but not fully "trinitarian," arguing from 1 Cor 12:3; Gal 4:4–6 and 2 Cor 3:17 that the Spirit's identity is grasped by recognizing his personal identity to be derived from God and Jesus: "The mutually constituted identity of God as Father and Jesus as Son is, therefore, inclusive of the Spirit" (p. 170). For Paul, the Spirit is necessary if we are to identify God and Jesus, just as we must have recourse to God's and Jesus' identities if we are to identify the Spirit.

Hill's study is a stimulating piece of work that has its strength in the attempt to keep together a careful exegesis of the Pauline texts with the results of fourth- and fifth-century trinitarian theologians, thus bringing together biblical and systematic theology in a fresh way. Hill demonstrates that the relational trinitarian theology of the church fathers can be used as a valid hermeneutical tool in order to elaborate on the Pauline texts. However, the strength of the book is at the same time its weakness. Some of the trinitarian terminology and distinctions give me a certain sense of anachronism as they are not inductively found in the texts themselves but are, at least partly, imported into the texts from later Greek philosophical categories.

Hill rejects the notion that all Pauline christological references should be interpreted against the benchmark of Paul's pre-Christian Jewish monotheism and that Paul's movement of thought runs from Paul's theology proper (his understanding of God) to his christology. Thus, since God can not be defined without Jesus and vice versa, Hill repudiates the idea that Paul's monotheism is opened up or expanded so that it might enclose Jesus' actions and identity. According to Hill, God himself is now disclosed, through the gospel events, as having always been differentiated.

However, this conclusion does not go without saying. In my perspective, it seems more historically legitimate to start with the Jewish monotheism of Paul and how Jesus could have fitted into this. The central question still remains: How could the Jewish Messiah—not in itself a divine title—become God? Hill neglects to deal with the Messiah-concept as such and thus he avoids the historical

question of how Paul could have included Jesus as Messiah and "son of God" into the story of Israel and his Jewish monotheism.

Moreover, I find it hard to follow Hill in his rejection of the term "binitarianism" in favour of "trinitarianism" in Paul. In particular so since Paul on many occasions seems more concerned to explicate the relation between God and Jesus than that between God, Jesus and the Spirit.

Despite these remarks, Hill's book remains an important contribution to contemporary discussions about theology and christology in the Pauline literature. As such, I recommend Hill as a provocative and stimulating discussion partner.

Mikael Tellbe, Örebro School of Theology

DOUGLAS S. HUFFMAN, *Verbal Aspect Theory and the Prohibitions in the Greek New Testament*. Studies in Biblical Greek 16. New York: Peter Lang, 2014. Hardcover. XXIV + 571 pp. ISBN: 9781433123580. €164.60.

Verbal Aspect Theory and the Prohibitions in the Greek New Testament by Douglas S. Huffman is a real page-turner, considering it is a volume on Greek linguistics. In an elegant and lucid prose Huffman provides the reader with a full tour through the world of New Testament Greek prohibition. Huffman's focus is on identifying how prohibitions are expressed. However, his volume does indeed not offer more than exactly what the title promises. That is, it is not primarily a book on verbal aspect *in* Greek prohibitions but the two main parts are mostly – and that is the major drawback of the work – kept apart as two separate subjects. Rather than dealing with the difficult issues in New Testament prohibitions Huffman lists them in his conclusion as issues for future research.

Following the front matter (with table of contents, list of tables, editor's preface, author's preface and abbreviations), the volume consists of two main parts: 'The Great Prohibition Debate' (chs. 1–4) and 'All the Prohibitions in the Greek New Testament' (chs. 5–13). After rounding up his results in the concluding ch. 14, Huffman provides four appendices (appendix A traces *Aktionsart* views of prohibitions, appendix B compares different verbal aspect models, appendix C accounts for the guidelines for counting NT prohibitions and in appendix D perfect imperatives are covered), a bibliography, a Scripture index and an author index.

The first main part consists of four chapters, discussing the *Aktionsart* approach and its failures in relation to Greek prohibitions as well as the verbal aspect approach and its successful application to Greek prohibitions. This is the most substantial and important part of Huffman's contribution.

In ch. 1 it is demonstrated that the traditional *Aktionsart*-based understanding of the negated present imperative, as a command to stop doing something, and the negated aorist subjunctive as a command not to start an action, is a distinction not as old as indicated by some scholars, but in fact only had its beginning with Gottfried Hermann in 1805 and was introduced into NT Greek studies as late as 1906 (Moulton). Huffman identifies three versions of the *Aktionsart* approach, ranging on a cline from harsh to soft, where the Cessative-Ingressive (CI) position is the harshest, the Durative-Punctiliar (DP) position is in the middle and the General-

Specific (GS) position is the softest. All three positions have had followers from the 1800s up to present time, whereas some scholars adopt mixed *Aktionsart* positions.

In ch. 2 Huffman demonstrates that the *Aktionsart* approach very unlikely was the rule that the NT writers used. He argues that none of the three *Aktionsart* approaches to prohibitions (CI, DP and GS) offers a good alternative, and moreover, the three versions are between themselves in agreement in only 16 % of the cases. It is also noted that the *Aktionsart* approach cannot satisfyingly explain the different choices of verb form by the synoptic writers in parallel passages. The variation of prohibitions with the same reference within a pericope (e.g., Matt 6) is also difficult to explain on the basis of *Aktionsart*.

Ch. 3 introduces verbal aspect theory. Huffman provides a short overview of the history of verbal aspect from Smotritsky (1619) to the more recent contributions of Fanning, Porter and Campbell, and concludes that the prohibition debate is limited to the two tenses regarding which there is much agreement, i.e., the present and aorist. He then accounts for verbal aspect perspectives on prohibitions from 1845 (George Andrew Jacob) to 2008 (Constantine R. Campbell). Huffman concludes that the verbal aspect approach offers the best explanation of prohibitive use in the New Testament.

Parallel with the noted (in ch. 2) textual incongruence arising from the application of the *Aktionsart* approach with regard to synoptic parallels and within pericopes, Huffman repeats the same procedure in ch. 4, applying the verbal aspect approach to the same textual material. He concludes that verbal aspect has more explanatory power than the *Aktionsart* approach. He also shortly notes the continued difficulties how to understand the relationship between aspect and *Aktionsart*.

The second main part (chs. 5–13) of Huffman's volume attempts a full account of all NT prohibitions. Huffman identifies 15 groups (with more than twice as many subgroups) of prohibitions: Negated present imperatives (175), negated aorist subjunctives (89), negated aorist imperatives (8), negated future indicatives (21), negated hortatory subjunctives (8), negated optatives (17), negated infinitives (85), negated participles (39), negated object clauses (65), negated final clauses (101), lexical prohibitions (185), prohibitory emulation statements (123), prohibitory questions (156), warnings and promises as prohibitions (214) and other negatives expressions as prohibitions (130). Huffman places his categories along a scale, ranging from very explicit morphologically grammaticalised prohibitions to pragmatic categories where the prohibitions are expressed by implicatures. Between these end poles we find syntactically expressed prohibitions and lexical prohibitions. All in all Huffman lists 1416 prohibitions. In terms of frequency most of these groups have quite a few occurrences (see frequencies above). Huffman's large set of categories demonstrates what is intrinsic to any language, viz. the manifold and varied possibilities of expressing a semantic value.

Each category in chs. 5-6 is introduced by a discussion regarding the prohibition in question and statistics are provided and commented on. Then examples are given first in Greek, followed by a comment whether the example makes sense from the viewpoint of the three versions (CI, DP, GS) of the *Aktionsart* rule. Then

a verbal aspect based translation into English is offered. If any of the seven major Bible translations (NASB, ESV, NKJV, NRSV, HCSB, NIV, NTL) is fit to serve this function one of these is used, if not, Huffman offers his own translation, which – since the rendition of the aspectual value is prioritized over smoothness – at times may be somewhat awkward. At the end of each section a (statistically based) assessment is offered, concluding that the *Aktionsart* rule does not fare well in the understanding and interpretation of NT prohibitions.

For the groups presented in ch. 7 (that deals with grammatical-syntactical prohibitive expressions) onwards, the fit with the *Aktionsart* approach is not taken into consideration since these prohibitive categories have not been part of the debate so far. Instead Huffman's aim is 'modestly limited to identification and classification'. For each prohibitive example Huffman first provides a translation that is close to the Greek and then another one that explicitly spells out the prohibitive element. Ch. 8 deals with prohibitions that use negated dependent clause constructions. Ch. 9 covers prohibitions expressed by lexical means, i.e. the lexical value communicates the prohibition as in α-privative words and prohibitions that are implied by indirect discourse. In ch. 10 on prohibitory emulation statements the prohibitions are merely implicatures, where, e.g., 'But you are not so' ≈ 'Do no have this behaviour among you'. The same function can be attributed to prohibitory questions discussed in ch. 11 and prohibitions communicated through warnings and promises ch. 12. In ch. 13 Huffman covers the prohibitory 'leftovers' that include four different manners by which prohibitions are expressed.

The value of Huffman's contribution consists in his rejection of the *Aktionsart* rule in favour of the verbal aspect approach in his first four chapters (that make up the first main part), but also in chs. 5–6 (at the beginning of the second main part) as well as his comprehensive classification of prohibitions in the NT. But beyond that one would have expected much more verbal aspect theory applied to and discussed with regard to his categories. In particular, the vexed issue of the relationship between verbal aspect and lexis in prohibitive expressions is only shortly mentioned, but not really addressed in his analysis. Also, prohibitions could have been discussed in terms of markedness and in discourse settings. Huffman is already aware of these issues, mentioning them and several others in his section (in ch. 14) on prospects for future research.

Rather than making the classification of prohibitions his main point he could have placed these in an appendix as a resource to be consulted and instead focused on a couple of these more challenging issues. Nevertheless, it remains a fact that Huffman's volume is a solid contribution with its particular fortes.

Jan H. Nylund, Lund University

THOMAS KAZEN, *Scripture, Interpretation, or Authority? Motives and Arguments in Jesus' Halakic Conflicts*. WUNT 320. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013. Inbunden. 364 sidor. ISBN: 9783161528934. €119.00.

Detta är en viktig bok som för forskningen om den historiske Jesus framåt (vilket är mer än man kan säga om flera böcker om den historiske Jesus som kommer ut

varje år). Kazen tar sig an konfliktberättelserna om sabbaten, renhet och skils-
mässa med avsikt att komma fram till de tidigaste debatterna som lämnat spår
efter sig i evangelierna.

Kazens analys utmärker sig genom hans sofistikerade användning av rabbinsk
litteratur. Genom att utvärdera relevanta rabbinska texter kontextualiserar han
åsikterna som tillskrivs Jesus och drar slutsatser om utvecklingen av Jesus-
traditionerna. Detta låter inte så nydanande, förstås. Ända sedan Strack-Billerbeck
har Jesusforskare lyft fram judiska texter, inklusive rabbinska texter, som jäm-
förelsematerial. Kazen kritiserar dock sådana arbeten som ger en lång lista av
möjliga paralleller utan att hjälpa läsarna att urskilja vad som är relevant. Man
kan dock, tycker jag, uttrycka uppskattning för Stracks och Billerbecks gedigna
arbete som skedde då antisemitiska stämningar var vanliga bland nytestamentliga
exegeter. Att det pågående arbetet "The New Testament Gospels in Their Judaic
Contexts" har samma approach kan dock med rätta kritiseras. Kazen hävdar att
många stora Jesusforskare helt enkelt inte behärskar det rabbinska materialet
eftersom de inte använder sig av ordentliga metoder för att utvärdera det. Det
finns några undantag såsom Peter Tomson, Lutz Doering och David Instone-
Brewer. Kazen har dock inte mycket positivt att säga om den inflytelserike John
P. Meiers forskning om Jesus och lagen (vol. 4 av *A Marginal Jew*). Denne igno-
rerar till stor del de rabbinska texterna (s. 72). Enligt egen utsaga använder sig
Meier bara flyktigt av dem ("a quick glance forward"). Dessutom använder sig
Meier, som så många andra, av de traditionella äkthetskriterierna för att komma åt
den historiske Jesus vilka Kazen hävdar är förlegade ("his methodology belongs
to an earlier phase of historical Jesus research", s. 12).

Kazen diskuterar också "social memory theory" som blivit populär. Dess värde
ligger framför allt i att visa på svårigheterna i försöken att spåra autentiskt
material. Den approach som Kazen förespråkar – och som är ytterligare en
anledning till att hans bok skiljer sig från många andra – är att undersöka *varför*
en tradition uppkommer: "If we are looking for the historical Jesus we should *not*
primarily be looking for the *original* sayings, but for *hypotheses* about possible
traditions and events behind extant sayings and narratives, which have a superior
explanatory value for the shape, function and interpretation of the present form of
the saying or narrative" (s. 28, kursivering Kazen). Denna infallsvinkel är givande
och gör att undersökningarna blir spännande. Ibland påminner Kazens arbete om
ett detektivarbete då han låter läsarna få följa varje steg han tar och denna recen-
sent fann det ibland svårt att lägga ifrån sig boken. Men ibland dyker argument
upp som påminner mycket om "gamla" kriterier, t.ex. att avsaknaden av kristolo-
giska tolkningar pekar på att en tradition är tidig, vilket påminner om dissimilari-
tetskriteriet. Här kan även nämnas referens till "multiple use" av en utsaga vilket
talar för dess tidiga ursprung (s. 108) som låter som kriteriet "multiple attestat-
ion". Även om de traditionella kriterierna inte är styrande för Kazen, finns de
ibland med i bakgrunden. Detta breda grepp gör dock att analysen överlag blir
övertygande.

I kap. 1, "The new turn: development of halakic reasoning" (s 31–48), utlägger
Kazen den senaste forskningen om hur *halakah* har utvecklats inom judendomen
under andra templets tid och hänvisar t.ex. till Adiel Schremer, Daniel Schwartz

och Vered Noam. Han lyfter fram Aharon Shemeshs förklaringsmodeller för att förstå relationen mellan *halakah* i Dödahavsrullarna och rabbinsk litteratur, en utvecklingsmodell som pekar på utvecklingen från en prästerlig (Qumran/saddukeer) tidig *halakah* till en rabbinsk. Från ett annat perspektiv reflekterar rabbinsk litteratur tidiga debatter mellan prästerliga grupper och fariseer. Olika lagfrågor kan utvärderas utifrån dessa modeller, vilken som passar bäst skiftar från fall till fall. I Kazens presentation av Shemeshs modeller förblir det dock något otydligt hur dessa två modeller förhåller sig till varandra. Kazen lyfter också fram utvecklingen av exegetiska tolkningsprinciper från enkla (*a minore ad maius* och analogi) till mer avancerade metoder, som leder till tolkningar som ligger längre från den uppenbara meningen i texten. Att hitta dolda meningar i texten är därför en senare utveckling. Han medger emellertid att Filon är ett tidigt exempel på detta. Man kan däremot undra varför Kazen inte tar upp *pesharim* från Qumran, som ju är tidiga tolkningar av dolda meningar i skriften. En mindre negativ detalj är att Kazen använder termen "sectarian" utan definition. Även om Kazen här antagligen syftar till Qumranrörelsen är det otydligt eftersom fariseerna också skulle kunna ses som en sekt. Efter denna genomgång tar sig Kazen an konfliktberättelserna angående sabbaten, renhet och skilsmässa varav de två första delarna utvärderas nedan.

För alla nytestamentliga texterna gör Kazen redaktionskritiska analyser som ligger till grund för jämförelserna med judisk litteratur. Han spårar kärnor i konflikterna kring helande och brytande av ax på sabbaten, medan han antar som många andra att de narrativa inramningarna är senare konstruktioner. Jesus uppfattningar i frågorna om sabbaten kan ses utifrån pågående debatter om lagobservans. Slutsatserna är inte nya, men han presenterar konflikterna inom kontexten för hur judisk *halakah* utvecklats vilket gör att hans slutsatser är väl underbyggda. Läsaren får ta del av ett stort rabbinskt material som är relevant. Att plocka ax bör ha setts som olovligt av andra auktoriteter. Jesus argument för att plocka ax framstår som mycket basalt och "is hardly exegesis" (s. 103), vilket talar för dess tidiga ursprung. Jesus poäng är att mänskliga behov såsom hunger går före sabbatslagen, vilket utsagan i Mark 2:27 uttrycker (om att sabbaten är gjord för människan). Detta är ett exempel på en traditionell, tidig "realistisk" lagtolkning. Det fanns olika uppfattningar om man fick försöka bota en person under sabbaten som inte var livsfarligt sjuk. Jesus uppfattning sammanfaller med en äldre och enklare syn på sabbaten som Kazen spekulerar var vanlig bland vanliga bybor och i en krets bland fariseerna. En intressant poäng är att exemplet om ett djur som fallit i en grop utgör ett allmänt känt skolexempel om sabbatsregler. Kazen hävdar att folk i allmänhet skulle veta att man inte drar upp ett djur, men däremot en människa, som det står i Damaskusskriften (fast det finns en debatt angående användning av redskap). En viktig poäng är att Jesus inte ger uttryck för någon gudomlig auktoritet utan att hans lagtolkningar är tidstypiska.

Vad gäller renhetsfrågor är Kazen en världsledande expert som redan skrivit utförligt i ämnet. Denna gång fokuserar han på debatten kring mat och renhet i Markus 7 och paralleller som har formen av en konfliktberättelse. Han tar även upp kritiken mot fariseernas syn på renhet gällande kärl och jämförelsen av fariseerna med gravar (vitkalkade eller dolda). Han förklarar olika former av orenhet

ingående med tonvikt på utvecklingen av lagarna för dessa. Intressant är till exempel att associationen mellan döda kroppar och orenhet är en sen syn som uppkommer genom persiskt inflytande. Kazen förklarar i detalj utvecklingen av handtvätt; fariseernas tradition utvecklades utifrån bibliska lagar (3 Mos 11:32; 15:11) som svar på den nya strikta trenden med dopp före måltiderna, vilket enligt Kazen syns i texterna från Qumran (s. 163, 176). Qumrantexterna är dock, enligt mig, inte så entydiga vad gäller ett dagligt dopp som Kazen hävdar. Enligt Kazen kan uttalandet om *korban* i sak kan gå tillbaka till Jesus (s. 179–80) men konstrasten mellan Guds och människors lagar speglar senare kristen polemik. För Mark 7:15 ger Kazen en relativ tolkning, som han gjort tidigare, och han avfärdar ingående olika forskares (såsom Furstenberg, Booth och Avemarie) alternativa tolkningar i frågan. I Mark 7:15 framhäver Jesus värdet av inre renhet, "i hjärtat", jämfört med rituell renhet, yttre renhet, dock utan att Jesus förkastar rituell renhet (s. 191). Kazen finner samma poäng bakom kritiken mot fariseerna i traditionerna om kärl och gravar. Narrativen kring kärnan, Mark 7:15, har däremot vuxit fram i efterhand, inklusive de moraliserande tongångarna i dessa. Att ställa yttre och inre renhetsideal mot varandra påminner ju inte om någon realistisk halakisk tolkning, men här syns istället "a prophetic attitude bent on social criticism" (s. 194). Inre renhet för Jesus handlar om social och ekonomisk rättvisa (s. 288). Kazen kopplar inte ihop Mark 7:15 specifikt med debatten över handtvätt: "I have repeatedly emphasized that all textual narratives are literary creations … This is not least true for Mark 7:15" (s. 190). Men vad var Jesus ställning i debatten över handtvätt? Finns det en kärna i konflikten som går tillbaka till Jesus? Här hittar inte denna läsare några entydiga svar (trots försök att tolka s. 193 som att en kärna i Mark 7:1–5 kan vara tidig eftersom 7:6–13 är sen). Mot Kazen kan man diskutera om konflikterna kring renhet främst handlar om social rättvisa eller om den kopplingen inte till viss del speglar en senare utveckling. I det halakiska debattklimatet som Kazen målar upp, där man är oense över om man ska bada eller tvätta händerna före måltider, kan det tyckas lite märkligt att Jesus skulle höja upp konflikten på ett högre etiskt plan. Kanske Jesus helt enkelt inte tyckte att man behövde tvätta händerna just för att fariseerna tyckte att man skulle göra det.

Kazens djupgående analyser av Jesustraditionerna och judiska texter är en guldgruva för Jesusforskare och för alla som är intresserade av de judiska halakiska diskussionerna under första århundradet (vilket nytestamentliga exegeter borde vara). Sammantaget utgör också boken en viktig påminnelse om att man inte lättvindigt kan använda antikt material genom att påvisa ytliga kontraster eller likheter. Varje text måste förstås i sitt sammanhang som en del i den pågående diskursen. Kazens *Scripture, Interpretation, or Authority?* borde vara en självklar läsning för forskare och för avancerade studenter som vill lära sig mer om den historiske Jesus i hans miljö.

Cecilia Wassén, Uppsala universitet

JUDITH M. LIEU, *Marcion and the Making of a Heretic: God and Scripture in the Second Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015. Hardcover. XVI + 502 pages. ISBN: 978110702904. £70.00/$110.00.

This momentous study is the fruit of Judith M. Lieu's twenty years of fascination with Marcion and his legacy. An introductory chapter surveys scholarship (1–7)—above all, seminal studies by Harnack and their influence. Lieu also lays out the problem of the different Marcions presented by antiheretical authors (7–9), and her goal of ascertaining what can be known about Marcion in his second-century context (9–11). Part I (chs. 2–7) analyzes the polemical witnesses to Marcion, Part II (chs. 8–10) Marcion's writings, and Part III (chs. 11–15) his life and theology. A brief summary (ch. 16), an extensive bibliography, and two indices (ancient authors and sources, and subjects) complete the volume.

With the aptly chosen term *Making* in the book title, Lieu does not, of course, imply that Marcion was a heretic, but conveys, rather, her purpose in Part I ("The polemical making of Marcion the heretic," 13–180) of tracing the various allegations laid against him during the second, third and later centuries. She argues persuasively that one cannot hope to arrive at an accurate (if partial) understanding of Marcion without, first, carefully weighing the agendas of those who so vehemently criticized him. This painstaking, prerequisite investigation is indispensible because "the Marcion who is met on the pages of his various opponents is a Marcion constructed by the rhetoric of each author" (9). Chapters 2–7 analyze separately (and occasionally comparatively) the Marcions portrayed by Justin Martyr, Irenaeus and Tertullian, as well as later authors, including Ps.-Hippolytus of Rome, Epiphanius, Clement of Alexandria, Origen and Ephraem.

Since the accounts of Marcion's theology and writings differ significantly, and since each of those accounts bequeaths interpretive uncertainties, scholars must be cautious about to what extent the historical Marcion's views and writings can be reconstructed. Even individual heresy-hunters often present not one but two irreconcilable caricatures, perhaps due to clumsy collecting of disparate sources (94–96, on Ps.-Hippolytus; 110–15, on Epiphanius) or a desire to depict Marcion as duplicitous or disingenuous. Further complicating matters is the tendency of some polemicists (Irenaeus, Tertullian and Ephraem) to conflate several different opponents' views. For example, "[t]hroughout, it is the rhetorical needs of his [Ephraem's] argument that drive Ephraem, not any desire to portray accurately the precise relationship between their [Marcion, Bardaisan and Mani's] positions" (157).

Part I is the longest of the book's three parts: Lieu's detailed, informative and masterfully presented analyses aptly censure some scholars for too quickly reconstructing Marcion's oeuvre and thought without adequately grappling with the tendencies of his purported witnesses. Some modern scholarship, Lieu alleges, uncritically harmonizes divergent portrayals of Marcion, thereby inscribing and spawning misunderstandings. Perhaps intentionally, Part I leaves the impression that much remains unresolved. Time and again in Parts II and III, Lieu tackles particular interpretive questions, earning rich dividends on groundwork she laid in Part I.

In Part II, Lieu holds that Marcion's "Gospel" "followed the same structure and sequence of textual units as canonical Luke, but … may have lacked some of the passages and verses now part of the latter" (209). Accordingly, "Marcion did edit the version of the written Gospel that he received, although arguably not to such an extent as his opponents believed" (209). This conclusion correlates with Lieu's innovative proposal that Marcion's rather lightly redacted "'Gospel' is in many ways *neutral*: It can only have served to inspire and support his system to the extent that he *interpreted* it" (209, emphases added). Lieu can thus explain how Marcion's detractors could use copious parts of his Gospel against him to certify Jesus' humanity and continuity with Old Testament prophecies: an inconsistent (and partially non-Marcionite) Gospel text would readily allow for such rebuttals (210–11, 221–22). For example, it would be mistaken to generalize that Marcion "systematically remove[d] all references to 'Old Testament' figures" from his Gospel: a striking counterexample is the presence of Moses and Elijah at Jesus' transfiguration, which Tertullian, Epiphanius and Ephraem deride as a contradictory inclusion (230). Above all, what may have separated Marcion from his eventual critics was not only use of different Gospel passages but also different *interpretations* of the *same* (or similar) Lukan materials (232).

As Lieu points out, the type of editing Marcion did produced Luke and other Gospels; it was, in fact, typical of how Christ-believers edited gospel materials (for example, the secondary endings of Mark and John): "redaction and 'correction' were widespread textual strategies in the second century, and there is no good reason for excluding Marcion from their exercise" (203). Lieu does not ascribe all differences between Marcion's Gospel and canonical Luke to the former's redaction, however: certain differences bespeak the editing of Luke *after* Marcion. That said, Lieu demurs from recent attempts to demonstrate that those changes *responded to* Marcion (209). The remainder of ch. 8 examines key aspects of Marcion's Gospel—title, beginning, account of Jesus' death and resurrection, christology, and depictions of God as father and creator (212–33).

Ch. 9 on the *Apostolikon* (Marcion's edition of Paul's letters) concludes that his moderate redaction is similar to that of his Gospel: "Marcion's Paul was evidently not so much a mutilated Paul as an interpreted one … [H]e appears to be the first to draw from them [Paul's letters] not isolated proof-texts … but a narrative about Paul and about the revealer" (269). Concerning Marcion's other writing, the so-called *Antitheses*, in ch. 10 Lieu rebuts the conclusions of Gerhard May, who was "over-pessimistic" to question whether it ever existed (275), and of Harnack, that it "must have incorporated every distinctive feature of Marcion's teaching" (276). Insightfully, Lieu finds a precedent for such a writing in how Plutarch used *exempla* and *sententiae* to point out "[t]he Contradictions of the Stoics" (278). Lieu holds that Marcion's *Antitheses* "would appear to establish a set of premises and of examples for reading the 'Gospel'" (283). Moreover, this writing "do[es] assume that the scriptural accounts offer an appropriate foundation for investigating the character of God" (286).

The studies of Marcion's writings lay the groundwork for Part III ("The second-century shaping of Marcion," 291–432) on "Marcion in his second-century context" (ch. 11) and four thematic examinations of Marcion's thought (chs. 12–

15). Ch. 11 discusses how the "parallel life" of Justin Martyr (298–317) "provides something of a template" for understanding "the far more fragmentary and distorted" witnesses to Marcion (298): both Christian teachers came from the east and founded schools in Rome. By discussing "Marcion not just over against Justin but also alongside him," Lieu counterbalances the heresiological jab that Marcion's "school" followed his splitting from the "church" (317–22 at 322).

The next four chapters offer abundant insights on principles of Marcion's thought and their context—on God (323–66), on the Gospel (367–86), on life and practice (387–97), and on the contradictions of the Gospel (398–432). The monograph's subtitle foreshadows Lieu's arguments in these chapters that Marcion's views of God and Scripture need to be understood in their second-century context, and that Marcion took up many philosophical and interpretive problems that several other second- and third-century Christian authors likewise addressed. Furthermore, Marcion and his Christ-believing contemporaries adapted and developed solutions already given in both Hellenistic Jewish and Hellenistic philosophical circles.

Lieu's approach to contextualizing Marcion strikes a chord with recent studies by Michael W. Williams, Karen L. King, and David Brakke treating "gnostic" writings not as subversive alternatives to the (singular) tradition of the "great church" but as voices that, along with proto-orthodox ones, played a role in shaping ways that Christian thought evolved. According to Lieu, Marcion likewise deserves serious consideration not as a peripheral aberration but as a decidedly Christian (exegetical) voice among many choristers serenading second-century Christ-groups. If one differs from some of Lieu's finer points, it is only after gaining much from her lucid presentations of the evidence. This important monograph merits careful study.

James A. Kelhoffer, Uppsala University

L. MICHAEL MORALES (RED.), *Cult and Cosmos: Tilting Toward a Temple-Centered Theology*. BITS 18. Leuven: Peeters, 2014. Inbunden. XIV + 429 sidor. ISBN: 9789042930254. €78.00.

Kopplingen mellan skapelsen och templet är det sammanhållande temat för denna antologi, bestående av 24 tidigare publicerade artiklar och separata kapitel ur böcker av kända forskare under 1900-talet. L. Michael Morales, som också är författare till *The Tabernacle Pre-Figured: Cosmic Mountain Ideology in Genesis and Exodus* (2012) i samma serie, är redaktören för denna "hall of fame" av viktiga röster om kulten och kosmos i Mellanöstern under antiken och i den hebreiska kanon. Det skall dock poängteras att Morales urval är koncentrerat till sådant som ursprungligen har publicerats på engelska. Till exempel har ingen artikel på tyska hittat sin väg in i boken. Sammanfattningsvis kan *Cult and Cosmos* beskrivas som en guidebok för grundläggande akademiska studier om tempelkulten i den hebreiska kanon. Texterna är ihopsamlade för att ledsaga läsaren på en resa igenom en särskild aspekt av det antika Israels religion – nämligen dess kultiska teologi.

Förordet av Morales presenterar bokens innehåll, men är också en inledande diskussion i ämnet, vilket dess rubrik röjer: "Tilting Toward a P-Centered Theology". Morales ställer frågan om någon text i hebreiska kanon, med säkerhet, kan identifieras som icke-P med tanke på hur central idén om kulten är i hebreiska kanon. Naturligtvis vill Morales också motivera en sådan här återpublicering av arbeten, och ett huvudskäl är att artiklarna på något sätt har bidragit till att föra forskningen av Gamla testamentets bibelteologi till att ha ett mer kultcentrerat fokus. Morales vill också i sitt förord ge artiklarna i boken ett sammanhang med hjälp av ett brett perspektiv på forskningshistoria om studiet av kulten, med utgångspunkt från Wellhausen. Han förklarar däremot att det återpublicerade materialet är långt ifrån de enda viktiga rösterna i studiet av templet, kulten och kosmos, vilket inte är svårt att hålla med om. Morales beskriver också urvalet som en aptitretare och källa för fortsatta studier av ett ämne där ännu mycket återstår att upptäckas.

Det går alltid att diskutera vilka personer som skall vara inkluderade i denna typ av volym, och i ett avseende saknas en motröst i urvalet. Alla bidragen verkar vara överens om att Eden och dess trädgård ursprungligen, eller senare, uppfattades som det första templet, och blev en inspiration för beskrivningar av senare helgedomar – tabernaklet, Salomos tempel och ett eskatologiskt tempel i framtiden (se t.ex. Hesekiel). Daniel I. Block, med sin artikel "Eden, A Temple? A Reassessment of the Biblical Evidence" (2013), är en sådan motvikt. Han är inte övertygad om att författaren till 1 Mos 1–3 uppfattade vare sig kosmos eller Eden som ett tempel. Han hänvisar till flera av författarna Morales inkluderar i sin volym, och exempelvis påpekar han en misstolkning av Wenham beträffande verbet הִתְהַלֵּךְ i 1 Mos 3:8.

I vilket fall, artiklarna i Morales bok är välkända. Värdet med att samla ihop dem till en bok är att man i en enda volym kan jämföra och analysera dessa texter tillsammans utifrån det gemensamma ämnet. På det viset är boken i högsta grad en källa för fortsatta studier, speciellt som det finns mycket kvar att utforska, vilket också Morales ger förslag på (ex. tabernaklets/templets förkroppsligande av Guds berg och översteprästernas adamitiska identitet). Ett annat skäl till värdet av denna bok förklaras med att flera av artiklarna är svåra att få tag i, och att det därför är praktiskt att ha dem samlade för läsning i en kurs om gammaltestamentlig teologi och Pentateuken.

Antologin, *Cult and Cosmos*, är uppdelad i tre sektioner: 1) "Cult and Cosmos", som ger ett arkeologiskt perspektiv (Albright, Burrows, Lundquist, Clements, Clifford och Stager), 2) "Cult, Cosmos, and Biblical History", som är mer textbaserad (Kearney, Vogels, Weinfeld, Wenham, Azevedo, Holloway, Blenkinsopp, Levenson, Luyster, May, Batto och McCarter), och 3) "Cult, Cosmos, and Biblical Theology" (Eliade, Fretheim, Och, Gorman Jr, Anderson och Fishbane). Med detta upplägg vill Morales visa på en rörelse från arkeologi/komparativt studium av Mellanöstern under antiken till bibelteologi, som pekar på behovet av en multidisciplinär metod, för att i slutändan formulera just bibelteologi om kulten i den hebreiska kanon. Frågan är om det inte är en självklarhet som Morales vill illustrera – att all bra exegetik, och i slutändan bibelteologi, bör bygga på gedigen forskning om bibeltexternas historiska och kulturella kontext.

Denna indelning i tre sektioner är alltså tänkt som progressiv (obs, inte krono-
logisk), och i min mening intressant, när författarna hänvisar till varandra och
ibland är oense i tolkningsfrågor. Ett sådant exempel är Peter J. Kearneys artikel,
"Creation and Liturgy: The P Redaction of Ex 25–40", som flera författare i
bokens andra sektion refererar till. Varken Weinfeld (s. 150) eller Levenson (s.
232) håller med Kearney om att de sex befallningarna i 2 Mos 25–31 skulle mot-
svara de sex skapelsedagarna. En annan redaktionell finess i boken är att Morales
har markerat den ursprungliga pagineringen i texterna med klamrar, så att läsaren
kan hänvisa till källan i vilken respektive artikel ursprungligen är publicerad,
istället för till *Cult and Cosmos*.

Beroende på vad man är intresserad av, blir vissa arbeten i boken mer värde-
fulla än andra. Exempelvis fann jag följande särskilt viktiga och aktuella för mitt
avhandlingsarbete om Jes 65–66, listade i den ordning de kommer i Morales bok:
John M. Lundquist, "The Common Temple Ideology of the Ancient Near East"
(1984); Lawrence E. Stager, "Jerusalem and the Garden of Eden" (1999); Walter
Vogels, "The Cultic and Civil Calendars of the Fourth Day of Creation (Gen.
1:14b)" (1997); Moshe Weinfeld, "Sabbath, Temple and the Enthronement of the
Lord: The Problem of the *Sitz im Leben* of Genesis 1:1–2:3" (1981); Gordon J.
Wenham, "Sanctuary Symbolism in the Garden of Eden Story" (1986); Joaquim
Azevedo, "At the Door of Paradise: A Contextual Interpretation of Gen. 4:7"
(1999); Joseph Blenkinsopp, "The Structure of P" (1976); Jon D. Levenson,
"Cosmos and Microcosm" (1988); P. Kyle McCarter, "The River Ordeal in Isra-
elite Literature" (1973); Terence E. Fretheim, "The Reclamation of Creation:
Redemption and Law in Exodus" (1991); Frank H. Gorman, Jr., "Priestly Rituals
of Founding: Time, Space, and Status" (1993); Gary A. Anderson, "The Cosmic
Mountain: Eden and its Early Interpreters in Syriac Christianity" (1988).

En artikel, som också förtjänar att omnämnas, är Steven W. Holloway, "What
Ship Goes There? The Flood Narratives in the Gilgamesh Epic and Genesis con-
sidered in Light of Ancient Near Eastern Temple Ideology" (1991). Holloway
redogör för kopplingar mellan båtarna i syndaflodsberättelserna och tempel, men
är inte helt övertygande om varje detalj i Salomos tempel som han vill associera
med Noas ark. Irving L. Finkels senaste bok, *The Ark Before Noah: Decoding the
Story of the Flood* (2014) kan också möjligtvis ifrågasätta några av Holloways
slutsatser om arkens form. Även Robert Luyster gör en intressant analys av 1 Mos
1:2 i sin artikel "Wind and Water: Cosmogonic Symbolism in the Old Testament"
(1981). Han misslyckas dock, enligt min mening, att visa varför רוח i den versen
inte kan syfta på Guds ande. Till sist, ett par av alstren platsar sämre i boken än
de övriga, då de förhållandevis lite vidrör bokens huvudtema: Herbert G. May,
"Some Cosmic Connotations of *Mayim Rabbîm*, 'Many Waters'" (1955) och
Bernard F. Batto, "The Reed Sea: Requiescat in Pace" (1983).

Summan av det hela är att *Cult and Cosmos* är en mycket användbar bok, och
kan fungera utmärkt som en ingång till studiet om templet och skapelsen. Morales
har samlat ihop en rad viktiga engelskspråkiga arbeten som visar progressionen
temat har genomgått, trots några svagheter i urvalet av arbeten.

Stefan Green, Åbo Akademi

MARK D. NANOS OCH MAGNUS ZETTERHOLM (RED.), *Paul within Judaism: Restoring the First-Century Context to the Apostle*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2015. Häftad. X + 350 sidor. ISBN: 9781451470031. $39.00.

Mark Nanos sammanfattar i introduktionen väl vad målet är med boken *Paul within Judaism*: "If one might say that the latter oppose the New Perspective for being *too new* for their traditional theological positions to embrace, the contributors to this volume oppose it for being *not new enough*" (s. 5). Med "the latter" menas traditionella, framför allt protestantiska Paulusforskare. I den fruktbara mylla som uppstod efter inte minst E. P. Sanders, James D. G. Dunns och Krister Stendahls nyläsningar av Paulus, och försök att återvända till den kontext Paulus faktiskt befann sig i, så har mycket intressant forskning uppstått. Den har inneburit att Paulusforskningen i högre grad fått upp ögonen för Paulus judiskhet – inte bara judiska bakgrund. Saul från Tarsos – en hebré född av hebreer (Fil 3:5) – har blivit S:t Paulus, den kristna religionens största missionär. Men som antologins författare på många sätt understryker, och har som grundläggande premiss, finns det många anakronismer i begreppet S:t Paulus, kristen missionär (jfr s. 77 och diskussionen innan). De forskare som medverkar i boken bidrar på ett konstruktivt och teoretiskt medvetet sätt till dessa anakronismer skall kunna brytas ner och omformuleras på ett mer korrekt sätt. I enlighet med de ovan citerade orden av Nanos så vill bokens deltagare än mer kontextualisera Paulus, förstå honom på hans egna villkor, och utifrån hans samtids teologiska sammanhang. Man skulle kunna säga att målet med boken är att genomföra The New Perspective helt konsekvent, beroende på hur man uppfattar detta perspektiv. Åtta spännande och överlag väl genomförda artiklar, från visserligen ganska disparata perspektiv, innehåller volymen. Dessutom skriver Terence L. Donaldson (University of Toronto) en kritisk utvärdering utifrån en mer renodlad New Perspective-horisont, vilket innebär att boken i sin helhet utgörs av nio kapitel.

Magnus Zetterholm (Lunds universitet) inleder med en kritisk utvärdering av hur framförallt normativ kristen teologi påverkar forskningsresultaten, och efterfrågar mer rigorös historieforskning, fri från dogmatik. En sådan forskning kommer kanske inte att leda till de tidigare förväntade resultaten (postmoderna teoribildningar lär oss åtminstone om vikten av utgångspunkt), utan kommer slutligen att leda till att vi når bättre, säkrare, mindre ideologiskt färgade resultat.

Anders Runesson (McMaster University) problematiserar begreppsapparaten i traditionell (Paulus-)forskning – som ovan antytts är begreppen kristendom och judendom inte bara anakronistiska utan skapar därtill motsättningar som inte fanns inom "apostolisk judendom", vilket Runesson (tillsammans med Nanos) vill införa som begrepp istället för urkyrka eller tidig kristendom.

Vad var det egentligen att hålla Torah? Karin Hedner Zetterholm (Lunds universitet) visar i en spänstig artikel, med exemplifiering både från Paulus levnadstid och från vår egen tid, att *halakah* inte handlar om *en* enda väg för att hålla Torah, utan att olika rörelser inom judendomen hade och har olika sätt att hålla Torah på, utifrån tolkning av vilka bud som är viktiga och mindre viktiga vid olika tillfällen. Utifrån 1 Kor 8–10 jämförs och kontextualiseras Paulus råd till icke-judar i en samtida kontext av olika judiska rörelsers sätt att förhålla sig till den omgivande, helleniserade världen.

På ett liknande sätt diskuterar Mark Nanos (University of Kansas) Paulus syn på omskärelse i kontexten av hur olika judiska grupper förhöll sig till denna rit när en vuxen icke-judisk man försökte att hålla Torah. Var det självklara steget att låta omskära sig, eller kunde det finnas andra vägar? Som intressant och logisk parallell lyfter Nanos fram berättelsen från Josefus om kung Izates, en icke-judisk kung som försökte leva efter Torah. Paulus argumentation är inte olik den Eleasar använder när han betonar *pistis* – tro(het) gentemot Gud som väg för icke-juden, emedan denne redan befinner sig i Kristus. Nanos för i detta sammanhang en intressant diskussion med E. P. Sanders begreppspar *getting in* och *staying in* som problematiskt emedan tro(het) i denna kontext betyder väldigt olika saker för jude resp. icke-jude.

Vilka är då egentligen de där hedningarna-i-Kristus? Den frågan ställer och utforskar Caroline Johnson Hodge (College of the Holy Cross) på ett förtjänstfullt sätt utifrån olika tematiseringar i Paulus brev, med dess olika klangbottnar av renhetslagar, av Esras brottning med likande frågeställningar etc. Johnson Hodge påpekar utifrån feministisk teori att Paulus inte så mycket beskriver som skapar (describe/prescribe, jfr s. 170) en icke-judisk identitet, som inte kan beskrivas med den anakronistiska termen ”kristen”, utan snarare som att Paulus i sin beskrivning har hittat ”ett sätt för en trogen jude att spela sin roll i berättelsen om Israels frälsning” (s. 173). Icke-juden lämnar någonting för att på ett annat sätt än en jude ställas i nära relation med JHVH genom Jesus, Messias.

Neil Elliot (redaktör, Fortress Press) brottas i sin artikel med de försök som gjorts att läsa Paulus i ett nytt ljus av ett antal nyare forskare, men som alla har haft en underliggande essentialistisk syn på kristendom (som därmed blivit anakronistisk) respektive judendom på ett eller annat sätt latent i sina resonemang. På flera nivåer analyserar Elliot vad diasporajudendom i det romerska imperiet innebar – och kontrasterar det med artiklar av Jörg Frey (2007), Bruce Malina och John Pilch (2006) respektive John Barclay (1996). Dessa olika infallsvinklar (i sig själva av varierande kvalité enligt Elliot) skapar en mångbottnad artikel om judisk identitet, likaväl som vilken identitet som helst i det romerska imperiet.

Kathy Ehrensperger (Univerity of Wales) analyserar Paulus utifrån två perspektiv; dels hur Paulus syn på kvinnor som den kommer till uttryck i framförallt 1 Korinthierbrevet förhåller sig till judiska (även fariseiska) könsroller. Dels analyseras Paulus utifrån det senare uppkomna perspektivet att det icke-judiska sättet att leva är idealet för ett liv i Kristus, vilket jämförs med det imperialistiska Roms sätt att hålla nere uttryck för andra former av liv än den härskande (manliga) elitens. Ehrensperger sätter bland annat fingret på de tendenser att läsa in förtryckande könsmönster från judendomen som helt enkelt inte finns där (jfr s. 259) hos Paulus, samt sätt latenta i forskningen att läsa Paulus med en form av ”imperialistiska” ögon, där icke-judisk efterföljelse av Kristus är normen (s. 275 för sammanfattning).

Bokens respondent Terence Donaldson avslutar så boken med en stringent kritisk utvärdering utifrån The New Perspectives horisont. Det är en intressant diskussion som följer, inte minst i ljuset av Mark Nanos inledning som kommenterar Donaldsons kritik. Diskussionen gäller två saker; om judiska perspektiv på frälsning för hedningarna, som en slags återställelse-teologi, där hedningarna pil-

grimsvandrar till Jerusalem etcetera, samt till vilken grad dessa hedningar skall iakttaga Torah i sina liv. Donaldson och artikelförfattarna är inte överens (s. 286), vilket ger en spänst till boken, och öppnar upp för fortsatt intressant forskning. I inledningen av boken kommenterar Nanos detta faktum med att Donaldson efterlyser djupare forskning, och artikelförfattarna har på andra ställen börjat bedriva den (s. 26). Detta sätter också upp frågan om gränsdragning inom forskningen. De forskningsrörelser som kallas New Perspective on Paul och Paul within Judaism rör sig inom samma område, söker ibland samma forskningsområden (jfr s. 26). Donaldson diskuterar dessa gränsdragningar, och ställer upp viktiga frågor, till exempel: Om Paulus är "within Judaism", betyder det att församlingarna med icke-judar också var "within Judaism" (s. 300)?

Boken som helhet belyser och spetsar till dessa frågeställningar på ett fruktbart sätt. Att man efteråt ifrågasätter tidigare gränsdragningar inom Paulusforskningen måste man ur ett Paul within Judaism-perspektiv se som ett lyckligt utfall.

Martin Landgren, Lunds universitet

CAROL A. NEWSOM OCH BRENNAN W. BREED, *Daniel: A Commentary*. OTL. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2014. Inbunden. LIV + 416 sidor. ISBN: 9780664220808. $50. Häftad. ISBN: 9780664260163. €35.00.

Old Testament Library (OTL) har en lång tradition bakom sig med många betydelsefulla kommentarer. Sedan flera år pågår en förnyelse av serien, och år 2014 kom Carol Newsoms utläggning av Daniels bok som ersättare för Norman W. Porteous kommentar från 1960-talet. Hon har skrivit den tillsammans med Brennan W. Breed, som bidragit med receptionshistoriska översikter.

Carol Newsom är en etablerad gammaltestamentlig forskare med sin speciella profil. Hon är väl orienterad i dagens bibelvetenskapliga diskussion och har särskilt intresserat sig för postkoloniala och feministiska studier.

Hennes kommentar till Daniels bok följer i stort mönstret för OTL. Efter en längre inledning med de vanliga isagogiska frågorna följer den egentliga kommentaren med översättning, noter, innehållsöversikt och löpande kommentar av texten. Inriktningen är historisk. Newsom förutsätter kunskaper i arameiska och hebreiska, men de ord som citeras återges i transkriberad form. Några exkurser finns utspridda i boken. Så långt är kommentaren klassisk i sin uppläggning. Det nya är de receptionshistoriska avsnitt som följer varje kommenterat avsnitt.

Danielsbokens texthistoria är speciell, och Newsom för i inledningen ett resonemang kring detta. Hon följer i sin utläggning den masoretiska texten men är väl medveten om att textfynden från Qumran har gett varianter som – enligt gängse datering av boken – ligger bara ett femtiotal år efter bokens tillkomst. Hon konstaterar i samband med detta att redigeringen av Daniels bok rimligen har gått ganska snabbt. Och hon talar genomgående om bokens författare i pluralis.

Daniels bok är ingen lättkommenterad skrift, men Newsom och Breed har gett oss ett arbete som säkert kommer att stå sig länge. De traditionella frågorna behandlas på ett föredömligt sätt med tydliga resonemang och i dialog med andra

forskare. Visserligen kommer en del att vara kritiska till hennes sena dateringar, men det är troligen omöjligt att skriva en kommentar till Daniel som blir allmänt accepterad när det gäller just dateringsfrågorna.

Mycket i Newsoms kommentar är naturligt nog sådant som finns i många andra kommentarer; det hör till genrens villkor. I den meningen är kommentaren knappast omvälvande. Det nya är Breeds bidrag med de receptionshistoriska översikterna. Det är något nytt, och det inslaget är det verkligt förnyande med Newsoms arbete. När hon bad Breed att komplettera framställningen med dessa översikter breddade hon också serien på ett hälsosamt och givande sätt.

LarsOlov Eriksson, Johannelunds teologiska högskola

MAREN NIEHOFF (RED.), *Homer and the Bible in the Eyes of Ancient Interpreters*. JSRC 16. Inbunden. 378 sidor. Leiden: Brill, 2012. ISBN: 9789004221345. €148.00.

Intresset för likheter mellan det grekiska litterära arvet och Bibeln är inte nytt men förnyat, såsom det framkommer av denna boks omfattande litteraturförteckningar, och såsom det också framkommer av temat för detta nummer av *SEÅ*. Detta förnyade intresse tar dock en något annorlunda riktning i *Homer and the Bible in the Eyes of Ancient Interpreters*. Medan (den religionsvetenskapliga) forskningen tidigare studerat Homeros inverkan på judendomen respektive på den tidiga kristendomens framväxt, och därmed behållit fokus på de två religiösa traditionernas utveckling, ligger intresset i denna bok istället på de tolkningsmetoder samtidens lärda använde på antikens två stora litterära samlingar, Homeros och den hebreiska Bibeln.

Antologins redaktör specificerar således bokens tre utgångspunkter: (a) avgränsning till Homeros skrifter och (den hebreiska) Bibeln, (b) med uppgiften att studera det sätt på vilket uttolkningen av Homeros skrifter respektive Bibeln bedrevs (c) i syfte att undersöka eventuellt utbyte mellan uttolkarna av respektive textsamlingar. Boken karakteriseras därmed av metodologisk bredd representerad i det tvärvetenskapliga författarurvalet som presenterar skilda perspektiv på och djupdykningar i ämnet.

Boken är indelad i tre större tematiska avsnitt. Först ges en kortare inledning bestående av fyra artiklar som tar upp metodologiska överväganden genom att reflektera över relationen mellan kanon, kontext och kollektiv identitet. Därefter kommer två sektioner om sex artiklar var som studerar verk som på olika sätt relaterar till Homeros och/eller Bibeln, den första sektionen med fokus på lärda uttolkare som skrev på grekiska, och den andra med fokus på dem som skrev på hebreiska och/eller arameiska. I det följande vill jag presentera tre aspekter i boken, som jag ser som särskilt förtjänstfulla, och också hänvisa läsaren, som vill ha en sammanfattning av artiklarna, till den utmärkta synopsis Maren Niehoff inleder med (s. 3–14).

För det första erbjuder boken en välkommen reflektion över begreppet "kanon" samt föreslår ett alternativt begrepp som överbryggar skillnaden mellan religiös kanon och litterär sådan, nämligen begreppet "foundational texts". Redan i första sektionen definieras begreppet enligt tre kriterier: de är grundläggande för

bildningen, är föremål för omfattande uttolkning och är texter som skapar och
stärker den kollektiva identiteten i samhällen där de traderas (M. Finkelberg,
s.15). Emedan både Homeros texter och Bibeln möter dessa kriterier, är det sär-
skilt fängslande att notera de många beröringspunkterna dem emellan. G. Darshan
visar exempelvis hur standardiseringen av Homeros texter i 24 böcker, efter gre-
kiskans 24 bokstäver, hade en direkt inverkan på standardiseringen av den hebre-
iska Bibeln i 24 böcker. Därmed sattes de hebreiska skrifterna i nivå med samti-
dens mest auktoritativa litterära samling, samtidigt som antalet texter, som kunde
få plats i denna auktoritativa samling, starkt begränsades.

Den andra punkten, som är särskilt framträdande i denna antologi, är det sätt
varpå antologin fördjupar insikten om Homeros texter och den alexandrinska
skolans oerhörda betydelse för utvecklingen av den grekiska kulturen, men också
deras inverkan på judiska och senare kristna lärda tänkare och teologer fram till
det bysantinska rikets fall. Homeros lästes under århundranden i de grekiska
skolorna där hans texter åtnjöt så stor auktoritet att filologisk rekonstruktion av de
homeriska texterna hade direkt inverkan på tillkomsten av den första grekiska
grammatiken, och trohet mot Homeros likställdes med trohet mot det grekiska
språket (F. Pontani). På liknande sätt var Homeros en grundläggande del av den
kristna bildningen då det var angeläget att presentera kristendomen som en tradit-
ion som vittnar om lärdom i likhet med den klassiskt grekiska (G. Stroumsa).
Men medan Homeros representerade klassisk bildning, representerade Bibeln
tron, den gudomliga sanningen och instruktionen för hur var och en ska leva sitt
liv. Denna skillnad möjliggjorde att Homeros undervisades i kristna skolor under
århundraden.

För den mer textkritiskt intresserade läsaren finns artiklarna om de alexan-
drinska lärdes metodologiska principer i arbetet med Homeros och andra grekiska
texter: R. Nünlists artikel om specifika metodologiska principer (*topos didaskali-
kos* och *anaphora*) på vilka Aristarchos från Samothrake byggde sin omfattande
kommentarserie till klassiska grekiska texter, eller de sätt som filologerna i Alex-
andria använde tecken (*semeia*) i arbetet med texterna, som sedan Origenes tog
över i arbetet med variation i manuskriptversionerna till den hebreiska Bibeln (F.
Schironi**)**.

Den alexandrinska skolans inverkan på de judiska lärde i Alexandria presente-
ras konkret i två artiklar som lyfter fram Filon och hans typiskt alexandrinska sätt
att tolka de judiska skrifterna. Niehoff analyserar Filons metoder i jämförelse med
Plutarchos arbete med Homeros texter och framhåller att dessa båda platonismens
försvarare var först med att förena platonisk tradition med Homeros genom bru-
ket av Aristoteles litterära teknik. K. Berthelot utvecklar denna tanke vidare och
visar hur Filons intresse för att försvara Homeros mot Platons kritik gick hand i
hand med hans intresse att försvara de bibliska texterna mot densamma.

Den alexandrinska skolans påverkan är tydlig i andra sammanhang också: den
inspirerade den rabbinska skolan till den specifika tolkningen av Bibelns texter
(Y. Paz, I. Rosen-Zvi och Y. Furstenberg), den inspirerade den exegetiska pole-
miken, som de tidiga kristna kyrkofäderna riktade mot judarna och deras påstådda
"misstolkning" av sina egna skrifter (S. Weisser), samt i det bysantinska rikets
sista tid. I den grekiska översättningen av delar av den hebreiska Bibeln (*Graecus*

Venetus) får den kristna kanon en "homeriserad" bibeltext i det att översättaren
använde Homeros, från klassisk grekiska avvikande, språk i syfte att illustrera
skillnaden mellan arameiska och hebreiska i sin översättning av Daniels bok (C.
Aslanov).

En tredje punkt jag vill lyfta fram är det faktum att antologin drar blicken till
den livsmiljö inom vilken respektive kanon traderades, snarare än till själva ka-
nons innehåll. Det framstår tydligt i hela antologin att texterna tolkas i en levande
starkt text- och kommentarcentrerad miljö från Alexandria till Jerusalem och
bortanför, där de lärda uttolkarna av Homeros respektive Bibeln tycks använda
emellanåt identiska medel för att uppnå egna mål. Denna miljö tas särskilt upp
som en fråga om metod i Y. Moss artikel som visar att forskarsamhället idag
utgår ifrån en gemensam kulturell miljö, som både de alexandrinska och de jeru-
salemitiska lärde delade och påverkades av, snarare än från idén att det var de
grekiska lärde som utövade inverkan på de lärde i Jerusalem. Men det är just på
denna punkt som en viss frustration uppstår hos läsaren, en känsla av diskrepans i
boken.

Även om grundtanken om en kulturell miljö i vilken den homeriska veten-
skapen och den bibliska frodades hand i hand är välkommen som en utgångs-
punkt, som ett betraktelsesätt, blir det svårt att föreställa sig fullständig jämställ-
het mellan de lärda traditionerna. Detta särskilt mot bakgrund av de många exem-
pel artiklarna i boken ger på mer eller mindre direkt inverkan från Alexandria mot
nordväst, från Homeros mot Bibeln i både judiska och kristna sammanhang.

Slutligen, det jag saknar i denna antologi är en artikel om den babyloniska ju-
dendomens kontakter med den alexandrinska texttolkande excellensen. Att lärda
judar i Alexandria var påverkade av Homeros lärde och delade samma kulturella,
textcentrerade miljö, är ett faktum. Att de lärde i Jerusalem var väl bekanta med
den alexandrinska Homeros-exegetiken är i vissa avseenden ställt bortom all
tvivel. Däremot är frågan om den babyloniska judendomen exponering för den
hellenistiska Homeros-skolan inte avgjord, men refereras till indirekt här och där i
boken.

I sin helhet var denna bok en sann njutning att läsa. Artiklarna är tydliga och
fokuserade på antologins grundfrågor, som löper som en röd tråd igenom hela
boken. Antologin ger en kärnfull presentation av arbetet med de texter som har
haft så avgörande påverkan på den västerländska idéhistorien, och gör detta från
så olika vetenskapliga perspektiv. Med detta demonstrerar antologin värdet i och
nödvändigheten av att lära av varandra, de skriftlärde emellan i Alexandria och
Jerusalem under antiken, liksom forskare emellan i vår egen bokkunniga tid.

Blaženka Scheuer, Lunds universitet

KURT L. NOLL, *Canaan and Israel in Antiquity: A Textbook on History and Relig-
ion*. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2013. 2 uppl. Häftad. 356 sidor.
ISBN: 9780567204882. $42.95.

K. L. Noll är Associate Professor vid Brandon University, Kanada, och hans bok
är redan inne på sin andra upplaga (den första kom 2002). Enligt baksidestexten
är den gamla upplagan reviderad och genomgången med bl.a. hänsyn till de sen-

aste arkeologiska rönen. Den första upplagan tycks ha fått ett entusiastiskt mottagande, vilket förmodligen är anledningen till att en andra upplaga kommer efter bara lite drygt tio år. Och entusiasmen kring boken är inte svår att förstå.

Boken vänder sig enligt förordet till den läsare som ännu inte har stött på det akademiska studiet av den antika världen och den antika Främre Orienten. En lite mer avancerad läsare undrar då först vad utbytet ska bli av en introduktionsbok som förutsätter låga eller inga förkunskaper. Men det visar sig att denna deklaration av den tänkta målgruppen är i anspråkslösaste laget; Noll har skrivit en gedigen introduktion till antik historieskrivning med avseende på Främre Orienten, som enligt min mening kan användas på avancerad nivå. Att jag karaktäriserar boken som en introduktion till "antik historieskrivning" är för att Noll diskuterar just vad det innebär att använda framför allt de bibliska texterna som historieskrivning i modern bemärkelse – något han menar inte är görbart, eftersom den antika kategorin historia innebär något helt annat än den moderna förståelsen av vad historia är. Framför allt har detta att göra med historieskrivarens ambition att förmedla vad som är sant; en antik historieskrivning var framför allt, menar Noll, ett spektakulärt försök att roa eller retoriskt övertyga läsaren, och kan liknas vid våra dagars historiska romaner. Historieskrivning som underhållning, kort sagt.

Nolls poäng är att de bibliska texterna inte är skrivna för att fungera som sanningshaltig information i den bemärkelse vi förväntar oss, och att vi därför får se upp så att vi inte hamnar i de gamla vanliga anakronistiska fällorna. Och liksom vi måste vara medvetna om detta, påpekar Noll också att vi måste vara medvetna om att Gamla testamentet/den hebreiska Bibeln – den enskilt viktigaste skriftsamling vi äger från denna tid – inte är en bok utan en antologi bestående av flera böcker eller skrifter, och att vi därför inte får läsa den som en bok i modern bemärkelse. Denna diskussion, som i förstone kan verka självklar, är en mycket stor fördel, eftersom en så pass gedigen diskussion av denna problematik ofta saknas i de introduktionsböcker som studenter möter för första gången, och för den delen även i böcker på mer avancerad nivå. Utan en grundläggande förståelse av det diametralt annorlunda syftet bakom de antika texterna – deras intentioner och deras sanningsanspråk – är det svårt att inte läsa dem som man skulle ha läst ett modernt historiskt verk.

En annan stor förtjänst hos Noll är det komparativa perspektivet. Det är nu knappast något ovanligt i litteratur av detta slag, som behandlar det gamla Israels relation till sina omgivande kulturer och folk. Men vad som sticker ut i Nolls bok är att Israel (som folk och som geografisk enhet) inte står i förgrunden, utan snarast i bakgrunden av framställningen. Det är direkt kopplat till Nolls syn på de bibliska texterna som historiografi och som "segrarnas litteratur", och som därför egentligen inte är den naturliga utgångs- och jämförelsepunkten om man vill söka teckna en så heltäckande bild som möjligt av den historiska situationen. (Detta kan t.ex. jämföras med Albrights bibelarkeologi, där Bibelns sanningshalt förutsattes, och där sedan bibelarkeologin hade som uppgift att ge belägg för denna sanningshalt – ett motsatt perspektiv är alltså att, som Noll, låta de bibliska texterna få träda i bakgrunden och deras bevisbörda därmed i förgrunden.)

Det finns naturligtvis saker att invända mot i Nolls bok. Många argument och resonemang är spekulativa och tillspetsade. Ett sådant är det avsnitt där Noll

diskuterar religiös tro och religiös erfarenhet, i förhållande till vad som kommer till uttryck i texterna. Han kommer då in på gudsbegreppet, och vad det kan sägas betyda att antikens människor var religiöst troende, att de trodde på en gud (eller flera gudar). Noll menar att en gud, eller kanske snarare en gudsbild, är en direkt konsekvens av två förhållanden: 1) våra hjärnor, som är biprodukter av det mänskliga släktets utveckling, och 2) de socioekonomiska och historiska förhållanden vi befinner oss i. Det påminner om Feuerbachs tes: gud är inget annat än en direkt avspegling av våra mänskliga förhållanden, en projektion av våra mänskliga behov. Nu är inte detta en religionsfilosofisk bok, och det hade därför varit förtjänstfullt om Noll avstått från denna typ av diskussioner, och lämnat metafysiken i fred. Noll menar vidare att religionen genomsyrade de antika samhällena, men snarast på en organisatorisk nivå, och inte i bemärkelsen personlig tro. Religionen upplevdes i de flesta sammanhang som en uppsättning sociala regler eller pålagor. Men precis som spekulationer kring hur våra mänskliga hjärnor fabulerar ihop en gudstro eller inte, hör inte denna typ av gissningar kring hur religion "upplevdes" av antikens människor hemma i en sådan här bok.

För att återkomma till frågan om historieskrivning och anakronismer, slår Nolls ambition att avvisa anakronistiska tolkningar ibland tillbaka på honom själv, eftersom de i mina ögon leder till orimliga slutsatser. I diskussionen kring hur Gamla testamentet/den hebreiska Bibeln "antologiserades" konstaterar Noll att det, som alla vet, finns upprepningar och motsägelser av olika slag i texterna. Noll pekar på att det inte finns en enhetlig Torah, utan att den finns utspridd i flera olika delar i t.ex. Exod 21–23 (förbundskoden) och Lev 17–26 (helighetskoden) med sinsemellan olika karaktärer (Noll talar till och med om "flera Torahs"). Detta skulle vara ett tecken på att de som kopierade och antologiserade denna litteratur inte avsåg att den skulle vara religiöst auktoritativ, eftersom de då hade sett till att antologin vore enhetlig, med ett tydligt religiöst budskap. Att skrivare redigerade och gjorde ändringar i texterna är alltså beviset på att dessa texter inte ägde religiöst auktoritativ status. Frågan är om inte Noll själv gör sig skyldig till den anakronism han varnat för: att läsa Bibeln (eller i detta fall närmare bestämt Gamla testamentet/den hebreiska Bibeln) som en bok, och inte just som en antologi. Och bara det faktum att texterna traderades måste väl anses tyda på att texterna var normerande eller auktoritativa för en viss religiös grupp, och att traderingen inte bara skedde som ett tidsfördriv i största allmänhet.

Oaktat dessa anmärkningar är Nolls bok verkligen att rekommendera. Den är gedigen och ärlig, och Noll driver tydligt sina egna uppfattningar på ett förtjänstfullt sätt. Den är enkelt och rakt skriven, och de spekulationer man kan ha invändningar emot stimulerar ju i själva verket en diskussion kring de frågor som Noll lyfter. Och trots intentionen att vara en nybörjarbok kan den alltså definitivt användas på avancerad nivå.

Richard Pleijel, Uppsala universitet

KEN PARRY (ED.), *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Patristics*. Wiley Blackwell Companions to Religion Series. Chichester: Wiley, 2015. Hardcover. XVI + 530 pages. ISBN: 9781118438718. £120.00.

In the last decades, the study of Patristics has been transformed in many ways. The traditional limitation to Greek and Latin literature from the second to the eighth centuries has been expanded to include Syriac, Coptic, Armenian, Georgian, Ethiopic and Arabic writings in a wide array of genres, written by both men and women. Scholars have looked beyond the boundaries of their own dogmatic tradition to study authors classified as "heretics" as well as those venerated as saints. The importance of asceticism and monasticism for the development of the Christian movement has been recognized. In view of these transformations, Ken Parry has edited *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Patristics* aiming to provide a series of reception-historical studies of a selection of early Christian writers illuminating how their reputations were shaped through the centuries, as well as a number of other studies relevant for patristic studies.

The bulk of the volume consists of chapters on Irenaeus of Lyons, Clement of Alexandria, Origen of Alexandria, Athanasius of Alexandria, Ephrem of Nisibis, John Chrysostom, Augustine of Hippo, Cyril of Alexandria, Shenoute of Atripe, Nestorius of Constantinople, Dionysius the Areopagite, Severus of Antioch, Gregory the Great, Maximus the Confessor, John of Damascus, Gregory of Narek, Gregory Palamas, the Cappadocian Fathers, the Desert Fathers and Mothers, and the Iconophile Fathers. These chapters typically comprise a short biography of the author, an overview of his writings, a history of his ancient, medieval and modern reception, as well as a two-page bibliography of modern editions and relevant monographs. Sometimes, a brief overview of a contested topic or a plea to distinguish between the historical author and his later followers is also included. With a focus on reception history, these chapters will allow the reader to discern different stages of interpretation, and in different geographical areas. These differentiations are particularly interesting in the case of Nestorius of Constantinople, for which distinctions can be made between the views of the historical Nestorius, the *Feindbild* created by his contemporary adversaries, the venerated image of the eastern "Nestorian" churches, and efforts by Reformation theologians to rehabilitate him. With the inclusion of some lesser-known figures, the selection of authors becomes broad and inclusive, even if the exclusions of, for instance, Justin Martyr, Jerome, and Isaac of Nineveh remain unexplained.

Among other contributions in the volume, Alexander Alexakis provides a useful overview of the ancient collections of patristic writings—catenae, florilegia, questions and answers—that constitute both an early predecessor to patristic studies and important sources to writings that may not be preserved in any other form. Angelo Di Berardino expands this history into modern times, with Johannes Gerhard's seventeenth-century *Patrologia* up to twenty-first-century contributions. Paul Blowers reflects on the use of Scripture by patristic authors, and the role of Origen's rule of faith in its interpretation. Stephanos Efthymiadis traces the development of hagiography as a genre, from Athanasius's *Life of Antony* through John Chrysostom, John of Damascus and Gregory Palamas, stressing that the genre is firmly rooted in ancient biography and panegyric. Hugh Wybrew

explores written liturgies as a patristic source, accentuating the difficulties of connecting liturgical texts to specific individuals. Richard M. Price reflects on the relationship between the Fathers and the ecumenical councils, remarking that the term "father" first came to be used of the bishops attending a council—which only rarely included any of the famous early Christian authors. James R. Ginther surveys the scholastic reception of patristic authors, including various strategies of harmonizing them. Irena Backus extends this history to the Reformation, when an increasing number of patristic writings were made available as complete texts, not only in the form of short quotations. Alexander Treiger presents a commendable overview of Arabic translations of patristic authors, and the ensuing reception among Arab Christian and Muslims, noting especially how concepts such as *henosis* (union with the divine) and *theosis* (human deification) are toned down in Arabic translations. Klaas Bentein gives an impressive analysis of how the Greek language of early Christian literature developed through the social growth of the movement into higher strata of society, illuminating specific features of five sample texts. Carolinne White presents a similar study of patristic Latin. Kim Haines-Eitzen concludes the volume with an interesting reflection on the value of theory in patristics, especially with regard to Elizabeth Clark's monograph, *History, Theory, Text*, from 2004, on historians and the linguistic turn.

Each chapter is followed by a multi-page bibliography providing a starting-point for deeper study. The bibliographies include recent scholarly works not only in English, but also in French, German and Italian, and is clearly aimed at post-graduates.

This is not a book to put in the hands of undergraduate students in their first encounter with Late Ancient Christianity, but their teachers will find it a valuable resource, both in brushing up on individual authors and in gaining new insights into reception history.

Carl Johan Berglund, Uppsala University

RALF ROTHENBUSCH, *"... abgesondert zur Tora Gottes hin": Ethnisch-religiöse Identitäten im Esra/Nehemiabuch*. HBS 70. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 2012. Hardcover. XII + 468 pages. ISBN: 9783451307706. €60.00.

This substantial and well-researched monograph, the author's 2008 *Habilitationschrift* at the University of Freiburg, joins a constantly growing body of literature, which explores the formation of religious identities and community structures in Persian period Yehud. According to Rothenbusch, Ezra-Nehemiah reflects the rise of a specific Israelite identity, initiated and led by the returning exiles from Babylon and with the temple in Jerusalem as its cultic centre. This identity was less a matter of ethnicity and more about voluntary adherence to the teaching of the Torah. Given these religious aspects, ethnically non-Israelites were able to join the community.

The monograph falls into two main parts. Chapter 1 offers a thorough History of Research on general matters relating to the scholarly understanding of Ezra-Nehemiah. For example, what was the role of the Chronist in the compilation of

Ezra-Nehemiah? Was he a redactor of the material as a whole and/or was he the specific author of the Ezra account? Moreover, what is the function of the account of Ezra's public reading of the Law in its current position in Neh 8?

This introduction forms the basis for Chapter 2, which is devoted to a detailed analysis of the literary structure of Ezra-Nehemiah and its gradual formation (roughly 200 pages). Rothenbusch proceeds systematically through the material. He discusses the chronological framework spanning Ezra-Nehemiah which testifies to a book-wide redaction, the temple-building narrative in Ezra 1–6, the Ezra narrative in Ezra 7–10; Neh 8, and the Nehemiah narrative in Neh 1:1–7:7, 12:27–43; 13:4–31. He concludes with an overarching discussion of the dating and relative chronology of the independent textual units and their incorporation into the gradually growing Ezra-Nehemiah corpus. Rothenbusch argues for an early textual layer consisting of select parts of Ezra 1–6 (Ezra 2:1a, 3–62, 4:7–8, 11b–23) and the Nehemiah narrative (Neh 1–7*, 13:4–31), stemming from the fifth century BCE. In these early compositions, the concept of Torah plays no role. In contrast, the Ezra narrative (Ezra 7–10*, Neh 8), understood to be a later composition from the fourth century BCE, assigns a central role to the Torah. Notably, the claim that the Nehemiah narrative is earlier than the Ezra narrative goes hand-in-hand with Rothenbusch's suggestion that the historical figure of Nehemiah arrived in Yehud prior to Ezra. Rothenbusch further identifies examples of *Fortschreibungen*, namely, a set of additions to Ezra 10, as well as the material in Neh 1:5–11 and Neh 9–12. He proposes that the final form of Ezra-Nehemiah is a product of the late fourth century BCE.

This chapter is carefully argued and highlights internal inconsistencies in the text. At the same time, a reader eager to learn more about identity formation in Persian-period Yehud may find the extended redaction-critical discussions overly detailed.

The second half of the book, consisting of Chapter 3, explores matters of ethnicity. It builds in part of the redaction-critical model reached in the preceding chapter, in that it distinguishes chronologically between the perspective of the earlier fifth century material in the Nehemiah narrative and the later fourth century material in the Ezra narrative. Rothenbusch begins his discussion by asking how the identity of the exiles was shaped by their diaspora experience and their life as an ethnic minority in Babylon. He notes that it is common for diaspora communities to maintain that they preserve the traditions of the 'motherland' more faithfully than those living in the 'old country'. One aspect of the Jewish diaspora community in Babylon was its focus on ethnicity which led to the ban of intermarriage. Meanwhile, the community in Yehud developed their identity along other, more inclusive, lines. Rothenbusch further suggests that the diaspora community in Babylon, through Nehemiah and Ezra, gradually influenced the self-understanding of the community in Yehud. Identity formation is not a static endeavour; it is a process. What we see in Ezra-Nehemiah is thus a reformulation of the identity of the diaspora community, generated by its encounter with the community in Yehud.

The concepts of Torah and Covenant played important roles in this process. According to Rothenbusch, the Torah in its written and canonical form served as

the very foundation of the diaspora community. This understanding later came to characterize the Jewish community also in Yehud, as evidenced especially by the Ezra narrative.

In the concluding short Chapter 4, Rothenbusch discusses the internal and external factors, which contributed to the formation of an Israelite religious group identity. He highlights two key areas. The Neo-Babylonian destruction of monarchic Judah with its capital Jerusalem and its temple in 586 BCE left the survivors without a nation of which they could be citizens. This disaster, in turn, gave rise to two Jewish centres, one in Yehud and one in Mesopotamia, which created two different ways of conceptualizing Jewish identity. While the people in Yehud upheld continuity with their earlier monarchic community ideals, the people in the diaspora needed to develop a new approach, which would keep them together as an ethnic and religious minority, separate from the peoples around them. Not only that, they maintained that they preserved the 'true' Israelite identity up and against the diluted version in Yehud. In parallel, the increased influence of the Persian central power in the Levant, leading to Nehemiah's mission to Yehud, resulted in increased influence of the Babylonian diaspora community upon the ethnic and religious identity of the population of Yehud. Together, these factors shaped a community centred around the Torah and the temple in Jerusalem.

Lena-Sofia Tiemeyer, University of Aberdeen

MICHAEL L. SATLOW, *How the Bible Became Holy*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2014. Inbunden. 386 sidor. ISBN: 9780300171914. $35.00.

I *How the Bible Became Holy* berättar Michael Satlow, professor i judaistik vid Brown University i USA, historien om hur Bibeln blev till och hur den kom att hållas som helig av kristna och judar. Det är en populärvetenskaplig bok som spårar Bibelns tillkomsthistoria ända tillbaka till 900-talet f.v.t. och som sedan sträcker sig framåt i tiden till rabbinismens tillblivelse under andra och tredje århundradet efter Kristus. Det är en berättelse om kungar, profeter och heliga kvinnor och män, men framför allt är det en berättelse om skriftlärda (eng. "scribes"). Det skrivna ordet, som utan överdrift kan sägas vara allestädes närvarande i vårt samhälle idag, har som bekant inte alltid haft samma självklara roll – och det är mot den bakgrunden som Satlow skisserar den historiska utveckling som ledde fram till att en helig text, Bibeln, kom att betraktas som själva fundamentet för både judendom och kristendom.

Att läs- och skrivkunnigheten var mycket begränsad i det gamla Israel visste vi som forskare förhoppningsvis redan, men för studenter och den bibelintresserade allmänheten ges garanterat här nya och utmanande perspektiv på den Bibel de trodde att de redan kände. *How the Bible Became Holy* är dock inte en bok som endast sammanfattar och återger konsensusuppfattningar, utan Satlow framträder också som en originell forskare som presenterar sin egen syn på saker och ting och som inte är rädd för att framstå som kontroversiell. Exempelvis har han en uppfattning om sadducéerna som han nog är ganska ensam om, något jag återkommer till senare. Genom boken driver han dessutom en tydlig tes som redovisas i inledningen när han skriver: "I will argue that *Jews and Christians gave to*

the texts that constitute our Bible only very limited and specific kinds of authority until well into the third century CE and beyond" (s. 3, kursivering Satlow). Denna tes, att de bibliska texterna inte från början ägde den auktoritet för människor som de senare skulle få, kommer inte att få erfarna bibelforskare att trilla av stolen, men den ger framställningen en viss udd och tillför läsningen en klart uppfriskande dimension.

Auktoritet ("authority") är alltså ett nyckelbegrepp för Satlow och han skiljer inledningsvis mellan tre olika former av auktoritet (s. 4). För det första talar han om "normativ" auktoritet. Denna form syftar på en auktoritet som dikterar vårt beteende. En juridisk, eller moraliskt bindande text av annat slag, kan utgöra exempel på en text som innehar denna typ av auktoritet. Satlow poängterar att normativ auktoritet, som ofta tillskrivs bibeltexterna i en nutida nordamerikansk kontext, inte är ett särskilt relevant begrepp för att beskriva hur antikens judiska och kristna läsare förhöll sig till desamma. Igenom boken spårar han flera försök från elitens sida (kung Josia, Esra, saddukeerna) att få folket att betrakta de heliga skrifterna på detta sätt, men resultatet blir gång på gång ett misslyckande.

Den andra formen av auktoritet, som Satlow kallar för litterär ("literary"), är knuten till hans uppfattning om Bibelns tillkomst inom ett skrivarsammanhang. Mycket av den bibliska litteraturen är ett arbete *av skrivare för skrivare*. De skriftlärda, som utgjorde en mycket liten del av befolkningen, kopierade och omarbetade ständigt befintliga texter. Det är i deras verkstad, menar Satlow, som många av de viktigaste bibeltexterna har utvecklats i flera led och tagit form. De texter som utvecklats har inte nödvändigtvis varit normativt bindande för de skrivare som arbetat med dem, men de måste ha haft någon typ av "litterär auktoritet", som gjort att man ansett texterna vara värda att kopiera, vidareutveckla, och efterlikna. Det är mot en sådan här historisk bakgrund som man ska uppfatta Pentateukens framväxt och fyrkällshypotesen ("the documentary hypothesis"), menar Satlow (s. 74–75).

Den tredje och vanligaste formen av auktoritet som dessa texter hade i antiken var dock den som Satlow kallar för orakulär ("oracular"). Ett orakel är ju någon som förmedlar ett budskap från den gudomliga sfären, ofta något som har med framtiden att göra. På samma sätt fungerar en text, som innehar en orakulär auktoritet. Genom att studera texten kan ett budskap, nedlagd i den av Gud, om samtiden upptäckas. Flera målande exempel på detta förfarande tas upp i boken och många känner nog igen det både från Dödahavsrullarna och Nya testamentet. Ett särskilt intressant exempel som Satlow nämner (s. 144) återfinns dock i Första Mackabeerboken där det berättas att Judas Mackabaios och hans bröder inför en strid samlades och "öppnade skriftrullen med lagen för att få den vägledning som hedningarna sökte hos sina avgudabilder" (3:48). Texten förväntas här tala in i en specifik situation där man söker Guds vilja för ens handlande.

Kopplat till diskussionen om vilken auktoritet som Bibelns texter hade i antiken så uppehåller sig Satlow även mycket vid frågan om de icke-nedskrivna traditionernas roll i förhållande till Skrifterna. Han lanserar tesen att det under hasmoneernas styre växte fram två skilda hållningar i detta avseende. Genom att hänvisa till Josefus presentation av de olika judiska "skolorna" i *Antiquitates* 13:297–298 så argumenterar Satlow (på s. 140–42) för att "fariseerna" var en

traditionalistisk grupp, kopplade till den judeiska aristokratin och som därför trivdes med sakernas tillstånd, och lade kraftig betoning vid de icke-nedskrivna sedvänjorna vilka ansågs vara bindande. Emot dessa stod en annan grupp, "sadd-ukeerna", vilka förkastade aristokratins anspråk och menade att endast sådant som fanns nedskrivet i de heliga böckerna kom från Gud och därmed ägde normativ auktoritet. Han skriver: "I propose that the members of this loose group, whom Josephus calls the 'Sadducees,' were linked (exactly how and to what degree is unclear) to those who had earlier produced the writings in 1 Enoch, the Aramaic Testament of Levi, and the Daniel oracles. These texts all elevate the authority of writing" (s. 142). Med Satlows sätt att uttrycka sig blir hädanefter "sadduké" likställt med någon som anser att det heliga *skrivna* ordet bär en särskild auktoritet.

Vilken av dessa två grupper vann då till slut? Med de bägges upplösande i samband med Jerusalems fall år 70 och rabbinismens uppkomst skulle en kompromiss uppstå som dock pekade emot att saddukeerna vunnit i och med att Skriften blev konstituerande för en allmän judendom. Samtidigt, kan detta uppfattas som något av en pyrrhusseger, eftersom "The text was objectified … Phrases, words, and letters were ripped out of their context for creative interpretation" (s. 259). Genom det sätt på vilken texten skulle komma att betraktas som auktoritativ hamnade faktiskt den verkliga makten hos uttolkarna, och dessa tolkade den fritt utifrån de icke-nedskrivna traditionerna.

Satlows framställning är medryckande, den röda tråden är tydlig boken igenom, och jag uppskattar hur han blandar konventionella uppfattningar med egna, ibland utmanande, teorier; något som håller läsaren vaken och uppmärksam. Jag har tidigare använt boken i undervisningen med studenter som läst bibelvetenskap någon eller några terminer tidigare och kommer att så göra igen. Dessa studenter har uppskattat den mycket eftersom den erbjuder en lagom dos igenkännande och repetition av sådant de redan lärt sig å ena sidan, samt, å andra sidan, nya insikter om texterna och inte minst om Bibeln som helhet.

Martin Wessbrandt, Lunds universitet

BIRKE SIGGELKOW-BERNER, *Die jüdischen Feste im* Bellum Judaicum *des Flavius Josephus*. WUNT II 306. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011. Inbunden. 441 sidor. ISBN: 9783161505935. €89.00.

Mycken antikforskning har under århundraden varit hjälpvetenskaper till utforskningen av Nya testamentet. Under de två senaste årtiondena har vi sett en tydlig trend där enskilda forskningsområden får en självständig ställning med en egen inomdisciplinär utveckling. Dit hör t.ex. Septuagintaforskningen och Josefusforskningen. Birke Siggelkow-Berners avhandling är ett exempel på det. Den tillhör i sak inte den nytestamentliga disciplinen även om hon haft nytestamentliga handledare (Florian Wilk och Reinhard Feldmeier) och boken är tillägnad Hartmut Stegemann och ingår i en nytestamentlig forskningsserie. Referenserna till Nya testamentet är mycket få. Hon disputerade i Göttingen 2009 och är numera präst i Evangelisch-lutherische Landeskirche Hannovers.

Titeln på avhandlingen var "Die literarische Funktion der jüdischen Feste im *Bellum Judaicum* des Flavius Josephus" och den är mer adekvat än bokens mer öppna titel med tanke på dess innehåll. Den nuvarande titeln kan få läsarna at tro att boken ger ny historisk kunskap om de judiska festerna men så är icke fallet. Det är en litteraturvetenskaplig avhandling. Syftet är att beskriva "festtematiken" i Josefus tidiga arbete om det judiska upproret mot Rom på 60-talet, dess egen diktion och funktion i de olika kontexterna och dess relation till verkets intention och adressater. *Bellum Judaicum* är enligt Siggelkow-Berner skriven mellan år 71 och 79 och riktar sig framför allt till icke-judiska läsare i det romerska riket. Josefus driver tesen att det endast var ett fåtal judiska ledare som startade upproret mot Rom medan förhållandet mellan det judiska folket och Rom alltid i grunden har varit positivt.

Siggelkow-Berner analyserar medvetet, noggrant och var för sig alla de avsnitt som refererar till judiska fester, inte minst genom ordet *heortē*. Nära hälften av dessa textavsnitt handlar om påsken/det osyrade brödets högtid, som ses som en enda fest. Därtill kommer en genomgång av händelser som inträffar vid Veckofesten, vid Lövhyddefesten och vid "Träbärarfesten", en fest där alla judar ska bära ved till templet och bidra till dess offerkult. I god tysk avhandlingsstil sammanfattas varje textavsnitt och varje festavsnitt för sig och helhetsresultatet summeras på några sidor till sist.

De olika festangivelserna har framför allt en tidslig funktion. Men författaren går ett stycke vidare och söker leda i bevis att festmotivet bidrar till bestämningen av verkets intention och belyser vilka Josefus vänder sig till i sitt arbete. Josefus har "die jeweiligen Feste bewusst literarisch funktionalisiert" och använt festtematiken "für die Zwecke seines Werkes" (s. 392). Festerna har genom sin vallfartskaraktär bundit händelserna till det judiska folket som helhet, gett det som beskrivs en frälsningshistorisk förankring (påsken i *Bell* 4.402; 5.99) och betonat de kultiska och religiösa ordningar som finns i den fäderneärvda Lagen. Veckofestens karaktär av förbundsförnyelse antyds genom de judiska upprorsmännens sätt att avbryta den, och Lövhyddefesten framstår som ett paradigm för judisk religionspraxis. Träbärarfesten, som endast här i de antika texterna kallas för en årlig fest, får en likartad betydelse genom sin knytning till templet.

Denna festtematik hos Josefus förstärker hans syfte att för läsaren betona att det inte var ett krig mellan Rom och det judiska folket utan endast med några judiska upprorsledare. Rom kom egentligen till det judiska folkets räddning. "Rom ist damit Teil der jüdischen Heilsgeschichte mit seinem Gott" (s. 397). Judarna har även i framtiden enligt Josefus all anledning att bevara en positiv inställning till den romerska överhögheten. Resultatet kan synas magert, men det är ett välmotiverat bidrag till den nu alltmer blomstrande Josefusforskningen.

Birger Olsson, Lund

LENA-SOFIA TIEMEYER OCH HANS M. BARSTAD (RED.), *Continuity and Disconti-nuity: Chronological and Thematic Development in Isaiah 40–66*. FRLANT 255. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2014. Inbunden. 259 sidor. ISBN: 9783525536148. €89.99.

Artiklarna i detta samlingsverk är ett resultat av en konferens på Department of Divinity and Religious Studies vid King's College, University of Aberdeen, den 7–8 oktober 2011. Redaktörerna förklarar i förordet: "The focus of the meeting was the relationship between the different texts within Isaiah 40–66", och artik-larna syftar till att "reinvestigate and challenge the traditional divisions between chapters 40–55 and 56–66 and explore new ways of reading the last 27 chapters of the book of Isaiah" (s. 7). I princip räcker det att läsa förordet för att få en god uppfattning om vilka frågor de 12 olika artiklar i boken vill besvara. Däremot finns det inte något index, som kunde vara till ytterligare hjälp för att söka i artik-larnas innehåll. Nedan följer korta sammanfattningar och reflektioner över bokens innehåll.

Lena-Sofia Tiemeyer inleder med en forskningsöversikt i två delar. Den första delen ger en bra introduktion till teorier om hur Jes 40–60 har växt fram, med ett konstaterande att det inte är färdigforskat – konsensus saknas om Jes 40–66 kom-positionshistoria. Den andra delen introducerar olika nyckelteman i Jes 40–66, vilket återigen visar på behovet av fortsatt forskning. Tiemeyers artikel innehåller få direkta nyheter, men den sammanfattar bra terrängen och öppnar upp Jes 40–66 som forskningsområde för den intresserade.

Hans M. Barstad inleder med att introducera Jes 40–55 och 56–66, innan han kommer till det han vill ha sagt under rubriken "Why A New Reading is Ne-cessary". Introduktionen verkar vara tänkt som bakgrund till problematiserande och förslag på ny läsning av Jes 56–66, med fokus på budskapet i texten. Barstad urskiljer två nyckelteman i Jes 56–66 som båda förekommer i 56:1–8 och blir då startpunkten för en läsning av 56–66: 1) sabbaten och 2) inkluderande av främ-lingen och eunucken. Barstads disposition av material är inte helt logisk, men artikeln är ändå ett bra exempel på sökandet efter helhet i Jesajaboken.

Ulrich Berges diskuterar var Tritojesaja börjar i Jesajaboken och argumenterar för att Tritojesaja börjar med 54:17b. Begreppet "tjänare" blir pluralis i den ver-sen och förblir så till slutet av boken. Efter en redogörelse för konsekvenserna, särskilt med tanke på Jes 55 och 56, förklarar Berges att både den litterära kom-positionen och den sociologiska bakgrunden blir tydligare och mer trolig med en delning vid 54:17b. Men argumenten för Jes 56–66 som en meningsfull enhet är också starka, tack vare kopplingarna mellan 56:1–8 och 65–66 (se Schmid och Stombergs artikel), vilket gör Berges förslag inte helt självklart.

Joseph Blenkinsopps bidrag om kontinuitet-diskontinuitet i Jes 40–66 handlar om den ursprungliga geografiska platsen för Jes 40–55. Blenkinsopp utvärderar olika argument för och emot den babyloniska tesen och drar slutsatsen att fokus bör vara på budskapet om Sions framtid, inte på var texten ursprungligen författa-des. Detta hindrar dock inte Blenkinsopp från att presentera ytterligare två ar-gument för ett babyloniskt ursprung: 1) Att sionismen är ett "diasporic phenome-non" och 2) att namnet Jakob är en hänvisning till det bortförda folket i Jes 40–55. Det skall bli intressant att följa vad Blenkinsopp får för reaktioner på detta.

Elizabeth R. Hayes argumenterar för att bildspråk med växter och träd spelar en viktig retorisk roll i Jes 40–66. Hennes definitioner av "Conceptual metaphor" och "Conceptual blending" kan vara svåra att greppa vid första intrycket, även om de förtydligas med efterföljande exempel. Dispositionen av artikelns andra del med exempeltexter är däremot delvis förvirrande och texten en aning slarvigt redigerad. Förvånande är också att Jes 61:3 inte finns med i listan över metaforer. Hayes ser inga tydliga kontinuitetsmarkörer i exempeltexterna, men anar ändå ett intressant mönster som reflekterar allmän rörelse i texterna som helhet.

Corinna Körting undersöker hur Sion blir drottning i GT via två olika vägar. Den första (Jes 62:1–7) går genom lidande, upprättelse och upphöjelse för att bli mer än vad hon har varit, d.v.s. en drottning och arvtagerska till det davidiska riket. Den andra (Ps 45) visar på en annorlunda väg mot framtiden för Sion än den presenterad i Jes 62:1–7, för att bli just en drottning. Den senare vägen förtydligar den förra, och genom att jämföra de båda skapar Körting nya intressanta frågor och bjuder på en del spännande insikter om sionteologi.

Øystein Lund argumenterar för att de parallella teman "väg" och "rätt" i Jes 40:27 fortsätter som en tematisk tråd efter Jes 55. Därmed är de sammanhängande genom hela Jes 40–66, och sammankopplar dessa kapitel till centrala diskurser i Jes 40–55. Lund spårar detta tecken på kontinuitet och hans slutsats är att "väg" och "rätt" används i texter från Jes 40–66 på ett sådant sätt att det skapas en serie av kopplingar där dessa teman behandlas någorlunda konsekvent. Lund diskuterar inte vem som har skrivit Jes 40–66, men han föreslår ändå att "väg" och "rätt" skall beaktas när det forskas om dessa texters ursprung.

Joachim Schaper undersöker hur monoteism, polemiken mot avgudar och skapandet hänger ihop i Jes 40–66. Schaper undrar vad detta förhållande kan betyda för vår förståelse av jesajabokens budskap och bakgrund. Han vill visa hur polemiken mot avgudar i Jes 40–55 anspelar på P-material i Gen 1 och därmed betonar att enbart Herren, Gud skaparen, har auktoriteten och förmågan producera avbilder på sig själv. Schaper menar emellertid att tonen mot avgudar blir mindre polemisk i Jes 56–66, vilket kan stämma tills vi kommer till kap 57, 65–66, där avguderiet är en central fråga, något Schaper inte alls går in på.

Blaženka Scheuer har författat en intressant artikel, där anklagelsen i Jes 63:17 mot Herren och den direkta uppmaningen till gudomligheten att omvända sig, står i fokus. Hennes slutsats är att författaren i Jes 63:15–19a vägrar lägga skulden på folket, utan istället förebådas frågan om teodicé, d.v.s. vem som ytterst sett är ansvarig för mänskligt lidande. Det jag saknar i Scheuers artikel är en diskussion av Jes 65:1–66:17 som ett svar på 63:7–64:11, där 63:17 ingår (se däremot fotnot 37). Hur vi tolkar relationen mellan dessa två textenheter måste rimligtvis påverka hur vi skall förstå en text som 63:17 i sitt sammanhang.

Konrad Schmid undersöker beroende av tidigare bibliska texter i Jes 65:17–25, men också litterär kontakt med Pred 1:9–11. Schmid drar slutsatsen att Guds eskatologiska verk i 65:17–25 resulterar i en ny permanent skapelse istället för ett nytt exodus; och eftersom Jes 65–66 hänvisar tillbaka till Jes 1, är Jes 65:17–25 också slutstationen för jesajatraditionens utveckling, där Toran också anspelas på som helhet. Detta är en välskriven och värdefull artikel, men några få anmärk-

ningar kan noteras – som t.ex. en till synes motsägelse i fotnot 8 jämfört med påståendet att Jes 65:17–25 enbart var riktad till de trofasta (s. 178).

Jacob Stromberg argumenterar för att profetiorna i Jes 40–55, om återupprättelse av Israel genom Kyros den store, omtolkades i Jes 56–66 för att tillämpas på en avlägsen framtid i linje med Dan 9. Stromberg visar på ett utmärkt sätt bland annat att Jes 65 inte bara är ett tidigt litterärt steg mot judisk apokalyps, utan att dess vision kan ha direkt påverkat Daniels hermeneutik. Ett annat fall där Jes 56–66 har påverkat Daniels förståelse av Jes 40–55 är Jes 66:22–24 och Dan 12:2. Exempel som dessa visar vilket dynamiskt inflytandet Jesajaboken måste ha haft på senare texter inom den judiska traditionen.

H. G. M. Williamson skriver om ”Jakob”, ett begrepp som är ganska ojämnt utspritt över Jes 40–66. Williamson ställer frågor vad detta beror på, speciellt gällande de två förekomsterna i Jes 49:1–6, som enligt honom visar på ett viktigt skifte från Jakob till Sion när rollen som tjänare övergår från folket till en profet. Precis som Williamson säger är detta ett smalt tema, som kanske inte tillför så mycket i vissa avseenden, men mer i andra avseenden i förståelsen av kontinuitet och diskontinuitet i Jes 40–66.

Stefan Green, Åbo Akademi

W. DENNIS TUCKER JR., *Constructing and Deconstructing Power in Psalms 107–150*. Ancient Israel and Its Literature 19. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2014. Paperback. 240 pages. ISBN: 9781589839724. £28.95.

As indicated in the title, this study by W. Dennis Tucker Jr. focuses on the way in which (a selection of) psalms throughout "book" 5 of the Book of Psalms deconstructs and constructs power in response to the ideology of the Persian empire. In so doing, it relates to a growing number of studies on book 5, and provides a stimulating and fresh perspective on an issue that has so far been largely overlooked. The book is structured into seven chapters, and each chapter is helpfully provided with a final conclusion, drawing together the important observations made, and several short summaries are found along the way.

The first chapter introduces the task at hand. Beginning with a general description of research on the Persian Empire, he observes that such studies have largely ignored the Book of Psalms, but notes that Erich Zenger has made some important contributions. Although judged as promising in several ways, Tucker points to at least two areas in need of some additional consideration—Zenger's failure to differentiate between the critique of imperial power found within Israel and that which is found beyond, and a failure to "identify the basis for an anti-imperial theology," (p. 6) especially as related to foreign threats. Then, Tucker provides an overview of recent research on book 5, focusing especially on the works of Gerald H. Wilson, Martin Leuenberger, and Egbert Ballhorn, followed by a discussion of the possibility to understand foreign nations as the enemies in the psalms. This leads to the statement that "[t]hrough a close reading of selected psalms, this study will consider the manner in which human power is envisioned and note the way in which a certain 'rhetoric of resistance' emerges. This rhetoric generates an ideology that remains firmly anti-imperial in orientation. It is an

ideology that at once seeks both to deconstruct and construct power" (p. 15). Moreover, Tucker emphasizes the sociocultural context of the text, and suggests that the threat from the Persian Empire could serve as an appropriate backdrop.

The investigation proper begins by sketching out the contours of the ideology promulgated by the Persian Empire. A brief overview of Cyrus' rise to power is provided, focusing specifically on his portrayal as a liberator bringing order to society, since these notions constitute the roots of the more fully developed ideology under Darius. As for the latter, three main aspects are presented: 1) a worldwide (divinely willed) scope; 2) joyous participation of subjects (including subjugated nations) throughout the empire and; 3) the bringing about of a cosmic order. Ultimately, "those who acknowledge the worldwide empire of the dynasty and participate joyously in it will reap the benefits of an ordered world" (p. 41). Tucker then makes plausible that this ideology was well known throughout the empire, hence providing an important background to the deconstruction and construction of power in the psalms.

Moving on, chapters three and four provide close readings of a selection of psalms from book 5. The first part focuses on Pss 107–118, and the second deals with Pss 120–145. Tucker guides the reader through the texts with a safe hand, and two sets of conclusions are drawn. First, and most importantly, he demonstrates (convincingly) the political connotations of several recurring terms, and taken together with other observations, he concludes that no psalm (!) provides a positive assessment of empire. Rather, they deconstruct the power of these empires by describing them as tormentors, captors, and obstacles that prevent Israel from flourishing and enjoying the land as her נחלה. Even more, they construct an alternative, often by means relating past experiences of the acts of YHWH to current realities. When he then relates the conclusions back to the basic tenets identified in chapter two, the full force of the argument is seen.

The second set of conclusions (or presuppositions) regards the issue of literary context. Although Tucker generally navigates skilfully between various levels of interpretation and distinguishes between readings related to various stages of transmission, he does not quite succeed in showing why the literary context (*Sitz im Buch*) provides an important context of interpretation. In fact, I would argue that such a canonical approach is somewhat superfluous to his overall argument, as I will show below.

The fifth and sixth chapter deal with images of YHWH and the identity of his people. Here, Tucker makes a plethora of interesting observations, not least relating to the reshaping of Zion theology in the post-exilic period and its relation to imperial ideologies (YHWH is portrayed as a God of heaven, yet near to the people). A highlight is also his discussion of the poor, where he reverses Rainer Albertz' description of the relation between religious and social connotations to the language of the poor (pp. 174–75) and concludes that the psalmists self-describe as poor servants of YHWH, a God who, in turn, responds to those declared among the poor (pp. 184–85).

Ultimately, Tucker shows convincingly how the three main aspects of imperial ideology are undercut: 1) there is no worldwide Persian empire, because all belongs to YHWH (Ps 108:4–7); 2) rather than nations participating joyously under

the empire, the empire(s) participate joyously in the praise of YHWH (Ps 138); and 3) rather than bringing cosmic order, the effect of the empire is chaos. Order is only possible by means of YHWH protecting his people (Ps 124:3b–5).

So what about the notion of literary context? Consider the analysis of Pss 108–110 (pp. 68–81) as an example. They are introduced as a "short collection" (p. 69), and the close readings of each psalm accumulate a set of lexical and thematic links that seemingly confirms the importance of paying attention to literary context when analyzing the way these psalms deconstruct and construct power. A case in point would be Ps 109, a psalm that deviates from the "patterns seen earlier in Pss 107–108" (p. 72). In making a distinction between the possible interpretation of the psalm "apart from the collection" (p. 73) and its current literary setting, Tucker argues that a new perspective is provided so that it no longer portrays an unjustly accused individual, but "a powerless people surrounded, both literally, and literarily, by the *Feindevölkerwelt*" (p. 78). The case is well presented, and the readings proposed quite orderly. However, I am not quite convinced that the conclusions depend on the notion of a *Sitz im Buch*. In fact, the analysis itself dissolves the borders of the Davidic collection, as Ps 107 (a psalm outside the collection) is one of the most important intertexts used to reinterpret Ps 109 (see, e.g., the elegant comparison of the use of פי in Ps 107:42 and Ps 109:1b–2). Even more, Tucker shows interestingly the connections to Ps 106, which could indicate that the "book" division should not be considered an insurmountable obstacle in a study of this kind (see also the discussion of Ps 104 on pp. 145–46), and as the study moves on to other psalms, it seems clear that the main focus is not on book 5 *per se*, but on a selection of psalms that illustrate the way in which power is deconstructed and constructed. One might perhaps even suggest that a slight shift in focus can be seen in the book itself, since both introduction and conclusions prefer to speak about a "selection of psalms," rather than "book 5."

To contribute to the discussion, I might suggest that a distinction between purpose of selection and purpose of organization could have been helpful. If so, it would have become clear that what Tucker shows is not so much that *sequences* of psalms now found in the Book of Psalms have been organized or arranged to deconstruct and construct ideologies of power and empire, but that *individual psalms* dealing with such issues have been purposefully selected and included in the current collection. In fact, such a distinction could even strengthen the importance of uncovering the historical circumstances, and hence fit better with Tucker's main conclusions.

Now, this critique of the "canonical slant" does not affect the quality of the study in any major way. Overall, Tucker provides a fresh and thought-provoking re-conceptualization of notions of power and kingship in a selection of psalms from book 5, and casts new light on the notion of YHWH as king. He provides careful readings of the texts, sensitive to nuances and reluctant to simplified harmonizations. He is well versed in the secondary literature, not least German scholarly work (he even translates all the German quotes into English), and due to the clear presentation and coherent argumentation it will certainly stimulate further studies.

David Willgren, Lund University

HELMUT UTZSCHNEIDER OCH WOLFGANG OSWALD, *Exodus 1–15*. International Exegetical Commentary on the Old Testament. Övers. P. Sumpter. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2015. Inbunden. 360 sidor. ISBN: 9783170225718. €79.99.

Skrivandet av bibelkommentarer tycks fortsätta i oförminskad eller ökande omfattning. Det ligger naturligtvis något naturligt i detta. Med tanke på att den vetenskapliga bibelforskningen förändras, tar in nya perspektiv och omprövar tidigare resultat, är det inte orimligt att också kommentaren ändrar utseende och inriktning. Det är i linje med detta som den nya serien International Exegetical Commentary on the Old Testament (IECOT) ska ses.

Den första volymen av två till Exodus är den ena av två "provkommentarer" i serien. Den är författad av två exegeter i samarbete: Helmut Utzschneider och Wolfgang Oswald. Boken ges ut i både tysk och engelsk utgåva. Avsikten med serien är att vara internationell, ekumenisk och samtida.

Det internationella märks i redaktionens sammansättning och valet av författare, även om intrycket är att tyska namn dominerar. Det ekumeniska syns dels i att författarna i serien har mycket olika religiös bakgrund, inklusive judisk, dels i att även de gammaltestamentliga apokryferna ska kommenteras. När det gäller det samtida är bilden mer splittrad. Grundtanken är att föra samman de två perspektiv som brukar inordnas under termerna "synkrona" och "diakrona". Avsikten är att låta de två perspektiven vara komplementära snarare än motsatta. I förordet till serien ges en närmare definition av de två. Förenklat uttryckt förs traditionella tolkningsmetoder av texternas slutstadium till det synkrona, medan textens förhistoria och efterhistoria behandlas i det diakrona avsnittet.

Kommentaren till Exodus första femton kapitel ansluter väl till programförklaringen för serien. De två författarna ansvarar i huvudsak för var sin inriktning: Utzschneider står för det synkrona, Oswald för det diakrona. I kommentarens inledning behandlas genrefrågor, förslag till struktur för hela bibelboken och avfattningstid för de fem större samlingar som kommentarförfattarna identifierar. En stor del av inledningen speglar resonemang kring fyrkällshypotesen, och delvis är framställningen ganska snårig – och hypotetisk.

Själva kommentaren är pedagogiskt upplagd med en tydlig struktur och tydliga marginalrubriker. Efter en ofta lång överskrift följer översättning av den hebreiska texten med textkritiska och översättningskommenterande noter. Sedan kommer den synkrona analysen med kontext, struktur och andra iakttagelser utifrån den föreliggande texten. Därefter följer den diakrona analysen med en placering av perikopen i dess texthypotetiska fack. Här ingår även en hel del hänvisningar till paralleller i främreorientaliskt material och en del tematiska utblickar samt uppgifter om textens receptionshistoria. Sist presenteras en förhållandevis kortfattad syntes.

Det är välkommet med en kommentar som försöker samla upp och sammanfatta de i dag väldigt disparata metoderna och inriktningarna inom gammaltestamentlig forskning. Det är dessutom välkommet att detta görs på ett så pedagogiskt och lättöverskådligt sätt som är fallet med IECOT. Serien är onekligen modern i god mening. Därför är det samtidigt lite besvärande att den är så förankrad i de hypotetiska resonemangen kring källskrifter; det diakrona tar enligt min uppfattning helt enkelt för stort utrymme.

När genomgången av en perikop är gjord och det är dags för en sammanfattning saknar jag en utläggning av textens budskap eller innebörd. Kanske beror det på att kommentaren försöker spänna över för mycket, och kanske har det att göra med att de teologiska aspekterna på texten inte kommit med i någon större utsträckning. Och kanske beror det även delvis på att – trots det internationella anslaget – åtminstone denna volym är alltför tyskorienterad, inte minst vad gäller urval av litteratur. Det märks även på flera andra sätt att kommentaren är en översättning från tyskan.

Allt detta sagt ska det dock tilläggas att som försök att spegla den gammaltestamentliga forskningens mångfald, är IECOT ett välkommet bidrag till den rika floran av bibelkommentarer. Och det ska bli spännande att ta del av kommande volymer i serien.

LarsOlov Eriksson, Johannelunds teologiska högskola

URBAN C. VON WAHLDE, *The Gospel and Letters of John*, vol. 1: *Introduction, Analysis, and Reference*. ECCo. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010. Häftad. XII + 756 sidor. ISBN: 9780802809919. $60.00.

URBAN C. VON WAHLDE, *The Gospel and Letters of John*, vol. 2: *Commentary on the Gospel of John*. ECCo. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010. Häftad. XVII + 941 sidor. ISBN: 9780802822178. $60.00.

URBAN C. VON WAHLDE, *The Gospel and Letters of John*, vol. 3: *Commentary on the Three Johannine Letters*. ECCo. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010. Häftad. XII + 444 sidor. ISBN: 9780802822185. $60.00.

Sedan 1979 har Urban C. von Wahlde, professor i Nya testamentet vid Loyola University i Chicago, skrivit många artiklar om enskilda johanneiska problem och böcker om *The Earliest Version of John's Gospel* (1989) och *The Johannine Commandments: 1 John and the Struggle for the Johannine Tradition* (1990). De har ingått i ett långsiktigt och målmedvetet arbete som nu resulterat i tre böcker, sammanlagt drygt 1800 sidor, om tillkomsten och tolkningen av Johannesevangeliet och Johannesbreven. Den första delen påminner om litterärkritikernas analyser kring år 1900, som utifrån olika slags kriterier försökte få fram enskilda skriftliga källor bakom bibeltexten, som vi nu har den. De två andra delarna är kommentarer till evangeliet resp. breven, i ett format som påminner om The Anchor Bible (översättning, noter, analys och utläggning, stycke för stycke).

Von Wahldes mycket noggranna litteräranalys leder fram till fyra huvuddokument inom den johanneiska rörelsen: tre versioner av evangeliet och ett "brev", Första Johannesbrevet. Den första editionen av evangeliet, förkortad 1E, med fokus på Jesu underverk och människors tro eller otro, kom till på 50-talet och liknar i mycket det som tidigare i Johannesforskningen kallats för semeia-källan.

Den andra versionen, förkortad 2E, ger en teologisk fördjupning, framför allt en s.k. hög kristologi och en kraftig kritik av samtida judendom i samband med att de johanneskristna måste lämna synagogan och den judiska gemenskapen. Den kom till under mitten av 60-talet.

Det tredje dokumentet, Första Johannesbrevet, skrivet under första delen av 70-talet av rörelsens ledare, kallad Presbytern, är också ett svar på en ny situation för rörelsen, i detta fall en inomjohanneisk kris med oenighet om hur man teologiskt skulle tolka den johanneiska traditionen. Presbytern skrev senare också två brev till, 2 Joh och 3 Joh.

Den tredje versionen av evangeliet, förkortad 3E, skrevs först under början av 90-talet. Presbytern dog på 80-talet och förhållandet till andra kristna blev då mer och mer aktuellt. I detta läge ska en av Presbyterns lärjungar ha skrivit en tredje version för att säkra den tolkning av traditionen, som fanns hos Presbytern, och för att närma rörelsen till den samtida kyrkan. Petrus får en roll vid sidan av den lärjunge som Jesus älskade, ett nytt namn i 3E på Presbytern, och tydliga spår av de synoptiska evangelierna kom med i den slutliga versionen, den som sedan blev den kanoniska texten.

Dessa fyra skriftliga dokument från den johanneiska rörelsen är inte tagna ur luften utan de är framtagna genom en mycket noggrann analys utifrån bestämda kriterier och motiveringar av olika slag. För 1E finns 28 kriterier, för 2E 30 kriterier och för 3E 57 kriterier. De delas in i terminologiska kriterier (varje edition har sina termer), narrativa kriterier (olika sätt att presentera materialet) och teologiska kriterier (innehållsliga skillnader). I en första omgång jämförs särskilt 1E och 2E, senare 2E och 3E.

I 1E beskrivs t.ex. judiska ledare som fariseer, överstepräster eller rådsmedlemmar, Jesu under kallas för tecken, ordet judarna används bara om folk från Judeen. Enskilda mönster återkommer som t.ex. att tecken leder till tro på Jesus, tro på person A leder till tro på Jesus, folk tror på Jesus och fariseerna reagerar negativt på det, trycket från fariseerna blir starkare och starkare, många olika grupper kommer till tro. Judiska seder, begrepp och namn översätts, vi möter bara traditionella judiska förväntningar, Jesus är en ny Mose, en s.k. hög kristologi saknas, tron baseras endast på undren, Jesus döms till döden p.g.a. sina under.

I 2E beskrivs däremot de judiska ledarna som "judarna", undren som gärningar (*erga*), Jesu gärning som helhet som verk (*ergon*). Judarna är ständigt negativa till Jesus, folket fruktar judarna och diskuterar inte med dem, judarna är nästan alltid i dialog med Jesus, de har egentligen inte olika uppfattningar om Jesus. En normal judisk världsuppfattning kännetecknar 2E, men ingen slutdom utan domen äger rum nu (otro), ingen dualism men väl kontraster av typ kött – ande. Fokus är på trons innehåll och bekännelse, hög kristologi och missförståndsteknik. Det andliga betonas: födelse av Anden, evigt liv genom Anden, rening från synd genom Anden. Jesus döms till döden därför att han gjort sig till Gud, hans död beskrivs inte som försoning utan som en bortgång. En rad termer införs som sedan utvecklas i 3E (Gud som Fadern, Jesus som Sonen, Jesus som sänd av Fadern, evigt liv, härlighet, vittnesbörd).

3E är mer brokig än tidigare versioner eftersom den bevarar delar av 1E och 2E, tar upp viktiga grundläggande drag från 1 Joh, förstärker vissa uttryck i 2E och för in nya johanneiska begrepp och även en del ord och fraser från synoptikerna (57 kriterier!). Vissa nya termer dyker upp i 3E: Jesus som Herren, Jesus Kristus, göra någons gärningar = någons vilja, bröder som medkristna, barn (*tekna, teknia*) som beteckning på medlemmar i den johanneiska gemenskapen,

bud som beskrivning av Jesu uppdrag från Fadern och "de tolv" om en grupp lärjungar. Andra utmärkande drag är kontrasten ljus – mörker, fraser som vara söner till, vara av någon, förbli i någon, stiga ner och stiga upp, upphöjas om Jesu korsfästelse, denna världens furste, älska (bara) varandra. Liksom i synoptikerna talas det om Människosonen, Guds rike, den sista dagen, den Onde, slutdomen. Kristologin har utvecklats genom ord som Herren, Människosonen, min Herre och min Gud, enföd son, jag-är-orden, preexistenstanken. Andens knyts mera till Jesus och hans ord genom Parakleten, att bevara Jesu ord är avgörande, Jesus och hans död säkrar frälsning och evigt liv, också köttet har blivit viktigt (Joh 1:14), dop och nattvard nämns, Skriften citeras med orden "för att Skriften ska fullbordas", tro baseras på ett antal vittnesbörd, Presbytern beskrivs som den lärjunge som Jesus älskade. Och mycket mera.

Efter denna presentation av kriterierna följer en sammanfattande beskrivning av de tre evangelieupplagorna. 1E blir en rätt enkel berättelse om Jesu under som leder till tro eller till otro. Framställningen håller sig inom den judiska föreställningsvärlden och är i hög grad historiskt trovärdig. Jesus fullbordar folkets förväntningar om Profeten som skulle komma (en ny Mose). 2E präglas av ett massivt intresse för kristologin. En s.k. hög kristologi träder fram. Undren tolkas symboliskt och tron grundas på vittnesbörd. Anden ges dem som tror (en smörjelse), den renar från synd, den förmedlar evigt liv. En presentisk eskatologi. Inga etiska direktiv, inga riter, inget kyrkobegrepp. Att känna Gud som en följd av Andens utgjutande (Jer 31) står i centrum. 3E har som framgått ovan en betydligt mer komplicerad karaktär betingad av en mer brokig bakgrund (tidigare versioner, schism inom rörelsen, Presbyterns död, relation till andra kristna).

Sist i den 705 sidor långa kommentarintroduktionen återfinns en detaljrik översikt över den johanneiska teologins utveckling med tanke på kristologi, tro, pneumatologi, evigt liv, eskatologi, att känna Gud, soteriologi, etik, antropologi, ecklesiologi och synen på den fysiska verkligheten. Framställningen fokuserar på de fyra grunddokumenten i den johanneiska rörelsen, och bakgrunden i Gamla testamentet och samtida judendom, särskild i Dödahavsrullarna och i De tolv patriarkernas testamenten, fördjupar framställningen. Ett intressant alternativ till andra framställningar av johanneisk teologi. Evangeliet är, särskilt i sin tredje version, enligt von Wahlde, en teologisk framställning med många narrativa gap, eller aporier, för att använda en litterärkritisk term.

Att här redovisa vad denna litterärkritiska analys har för följder för utläggningen av evangeliet och de tre breven låter sig inte göras inom ramen för en recension. I mycket är det ju fråga om en form av cirkelresonemang. Den litterärkritiska analysen bygger på enskilda tolkningar av textelement som sedan återkommer i kommentardelen. Med hjälp av de fyra dokumenten kan von Wahlde ofta precisera sina tolkningar och få ytterligare argument i valet mellan olika alternativ i tolkningshistorien. Von Wahldes hela tolkningsprojekt är på många sätt beroende av amerikanen R. E. Browns arbete med de johanneiska texterna. I utläggningen av breven säger han också uttryckligen att han i första hand arbetar i dialog med Browns kommentar från 1982 och senare kommentarer (vol. 3, s. 1; se också s. 183).

Von Wahlde läser i Browns efterföljd de johanneiska breven utifrån ett inomjohanneiskt perspektiv: motståndarna i 1 Joh har vidareutvecklat traditionen i 2E, medan Presbytern driver en mer traditionell tolkning, som görs tydligare i 3E. Gnostiska påverkningar, eller än mindre inomjudiska perspektiv, har inte någon plats i von Wahldes analys. Det märks tydligast i tolkningen av vissa centrala kristologiska utsagor (1 Joh 2:22–23; 4:3–4; 5:6). De beskrivs alla som "elliptical" (vol. 3, s. 94, 148 och 183); "cryptical formulas", "a kind of shorthand" (s. 87), "a kind of theological jargon" (s. 94), "a slogan" (s. 142). "Because they are so brief, their meaning is debated today" (s. 183).

I ett inomjohanneiskt utvecklingsperspektiv blir tolkningarna onekligen många. Von Wahlde visar det tydligast i utläggningen av 1 Joh 5:6 (s. 185–88). Först redovisar han olika utläggningar av Brown, Schnackenburg, Smalley, Strecker, Klauck, Grayston och de Boer och sedan till sist sin egen. Vatten är i 2E symbol för Anden, som Jesus skulle ge sina lärjungar, och givandet av Anden är den centrala soteriologiska händelsen enligt 2E. Att Jesus "kom med vatten" är ett sätt att säga att genom Jesu död gavs Anden till lärjungarna. Det håller båda parter med om. Men Presbytern gjorde ett livsviktigt tillägg: Genom Jesu död sonades världen med Gud (1:7; 2:2; 4:10). Både Anden och försoning är resultat av Jesu död. I min egen kommentar till Johannesbreven finner jag att ett inomjudiskt perspektiv på konflikten i 1 Joh ger betydligt enklare läsningar av de kristologiska utsagorna i brevet.

Bortsett från de slutsatser som dras om fyra grunddokument inom den johanneiska rörelsen har von Wahldes analyser flera förtjänster. Den bekräftar den sammansatta karaktär som både evangeliet och det första brevet har, särskilt med tanke på de krav på berättande enhetlighet och koherens som kan ställas på texter, även om man försöker utgå från antika förhållanden. I en mening är evangeliet en mosaik, inte minst ur innehållslig eller teologisk synpunkt. Von Wahlde har rätt när han hävdar att evangeliet i första hand är en teologisk text. Det är innehållet som ger den bästa sammanhållningen, även om där finns väldigt många teologiska element som återkommer på olika sätt och i olika sammanhang. Samtidigt som man kan hävda att evangeliet är en teologisk mosaik kan man analysera nästan vilken johanneisk text som helst och komma fram till likartade teologiska budskap. På något sätt hör de många spridda elementen ihop.

Detta är av intresse med tanke på genrebestämningen. Tyvärr tar von Wahlde inte upp genrefrågan till någon utförligare analys, möjligen med undantag för den första evangelieversionen. Det är svårt att veta vad han menar med genre när begreppet återkommer i synteserna om 2E och 3E. Jag föreslog 1974 att de judiska targumerna är den närmaste genreparallellen till evangeliet och har sedan inte hittat något bättre alternativ. Targumerna bygger på ett återkommande gudstjänstligt återberättande av heliga texter med omformuleringar och utvidgande tolkningar som betingas av t.ex. språkliga egenheter i texten eller rådande kontexter. De var från början ett muntligt material, men så småningom skrevs de ner för fortsatt bruk. Parakleten, Hjälparen i Johannesevangeliet, framställs på flera sätt som en meturgeman och evangeliet framstår som en produkt av Parakleten.

Det finns en rad premisser som inte analyseras i von Wahldes framställning, bl.a. att texterna hör till en kristen gemenskap med Presbytern/Älsklingslärjungen

som grundare och traditionsansvarare, att det material vi har bevarat är en produkt av lång utveckling, att evangeliet i första hand är ett teologiskt dokument och att 1 Joh betingas av motsatta tolkningar av den johanneiska traditionen. Den mest grundläggande utgångspunkten för von Wahldes analys är att det rör sig om en *skriftlig* process med enskilda dokument som resultat, en föreställning som särskilt utmärker den gamla litterärkritiken. Jag har inte hittat någon diskussion hos von Wahlde om denna helt avgörande premiss.

Den exegetiska utbildning jag fick i Uppsala på 60-talet gjorde mig mycket kritisk till litterärkritiker och deras sätt att foga samman *skriftliga* dokument från *skriftliga* källor. Litterärkritikens fader Julius Wellhausen var mig veterligt den förste som beskrev Johannesevangeliets tillkomst utifrån olika skriftliga källor (1907). Det finns fortfarande skäl att betrakta den johanneiska processen som en i stort muntlig process. Mycket i von Wahldes analys kan användas i en beskrivning av en muntlig process inom den johanneiska rörelsen.

Johannesevangeliet och Johannesbreven har enligt min mening sin utgångspunkt i en inomsynagogal gemenskap av judar som trodde att Jesus var den väntade Messias. I återkommande samlingar i synagogan eller i hem återberättades vad Jesus hade sagt och gjort. Tron på Jesus fördjupades efterhand beroende på fortsatta studier, inte minst av GT, och på nya kontexter som påverkade det muntliga återberättande av Jesu ord och gärningar. Orden om Jesus blev så småningom heliga ord dräktiga på många betydelser. Vi får sida vid sida nya formuleringar, nya kombinationer och nya tolkningar av Jesustraditionen, som i hög grad var beroende av gemenskapens växlande situationer. Mångfalden berikade deras tro och deras bekännelser. Åtminstone fem viktiga skeenden kom att påverka återberättandet av Jesustraditionen: uteslutning ur den judiska synagogala gemenskapen, utvandring till en diasporajudisk miljö, en delning av den johanneiska gemenskapen där en del medlemmar återgick till sin synagogala gemenskap, Presbyterns död, han som varit huvudansvarig för den johanneiska traditionsprocessen, och mötet med andra kristna traditioner (andra evangelier, relationen mellan Petrus och Presbytern/Älsklingslärjungen). Liksom i samtida judendom samlades olika tolkningar av en och samma händelse eller utsaga sida vid sida i de muntliga berättelserna, något som nog uppfattades mera som en rikedom än som problem.

Behovet att bevara den johanneiska traditionen när Presbytern hade dött och att göra den tillgängligt för andra kristna ledde till att en skrivare som stod Presbytern nära redigerade det mångfaldiga materialet och skrev ner det. Vi fick ett evangelium och ett "brev", disponerade på ett likartat sätt, och i Presbyterns namn skrev denne *grammateus* också 2 Joh och 3 Joh. Både evangeliet och brevet är alltså redigeringar av muntligt material. Möjligen fanns, liksom i fråga om targumerna, en del i skriftlig form.

I ett sådant muntligt perspektiv har jag rik användning av von Wahldes analyser. Och var och en som arbetar med johanneisk teologi har glädje av hans långtgående dissekering av teologiska element i den johanneiska textväven. Fokusering på enskilda innehållsliga enheter och reflektion kring deras innebörder, beroende på olika sociala villkor och innehållsliga utvecklingar kan, enligt min mening, tydliggöra och fördjupa teologin i de johanneiska skrifterna.

Birger Olsson, Lund

BENJAMIN L. WHITE, *Remembering Paul: Ancient and Modern Contests over the Image of the Apostle*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014. Inbunden. 376 sidor. ISBN: 9780199370276. $68.00.

Borde nytestamentliga forskare sluta upp med att ställa frågor om den "riktige" och den "historiske" Paulus, för att i stället erkänna att den enda Paulus vi idag verkligen kan nå är den "traderade" eller "ihågkomna" Paulus? Om Benjamin L. White, verksam vid Clemson University i USA, fick bestämma skulle det bli det sistnämnda. I sin nyutkomna bok, *Remembering Paul: Ancient and Modern Contests over the Image of the Apostle*, en reviderad version av hans doktorsavhandling vid University of North Carolina i Chapel Hill, under Bart Ehrmans handledning, förklarar och demonstrerar White varför han med bestämdhet anser detta.

Att det florerade en mängd olika Paulusbilder under det andra århundradet och att det till och med pågick någon slags kamp om vilken grupp som hade den korrekta bilden av aposteln är välkänt och har diskuterats i otaliga studier. Markion, valentinianerna, och de så kallade "proto-ortodoxa", alla hade de sina bilder av Paulus, som på olika sätt användes för att legitimera de egna ståndpunkterna. I *Remembering Paul* kopplar White skapandet av Paulusbilder på 100-talet till 1800-talets vetenskapliga Pauluskonstruktioner där de fyra "huvudbreven" – Romarbrevet, 1 och 2 Korinthierbreven, och Galaterbrevet – ansågs utgöra kärnan av äkta "paulinism". Liksom de antika Paulusbildkonstruktionerna hade ideologiska bakgrunder och syften, något som forskare är väl medvetna om och vana vid att analysera, så har den moderna historieskrivningen sina underliggande orsaker, vilka White är mån om att föra upp till ytan.

Det finns två tydliga antagonister i den här boken; båda är tyskar som levde under 1800-talet. Den ena, Leopold von Ranke (1795–1886), är historieteoretikern, som i positivistisk anda menade att historieskrivningens mål är att beskriva det förflutna *såsom det verkligen hände*. Det är på grund av honom och hans sätt att tänka om "historia", som forskare alltjämt är benägna att tala om och söka efter den "riktige" Paulus ("the real Paul"), menar White. Den andre är en av den kritiska Paulusforskningens stora förgrundsgestalter, Ferdinand Christian Baur (1792–1860). Under inflytande av Hegels filosofiska dialektik och Schleiermachers protestantiska tolkning av den kristna tron, formade Baur en förståelse av den tidiga kristendomen där den "frihetlige" Paulus utgjorde själva antitesen till den "lagiske" Petrus och hans "judekristna" anhang. 100-talets kyrka övergav sedermera Paulus frigörande och andliga budskap och tappade intresse för aposteln – ett intresse som inte på allvar togs upp igen förrän i och med Augustinus (354–430) – och istället blev det "kätterska" grupper som förvaltade apostelns arv. Att ärkeheretiker som Markion och Valentinos knöt sina anspråk till Paulus gjorde det dessutom omöjligt för de "katolska" kristna att använda Paulus utan att själva bli misstänkliggjorda. Detta perspektiv på den tidiga kyrkohistoriens utveckling kallar White av den anledningen för "the Pauline Captivity narrative".

Baurs berättelse är felaktig, menar White, eftersom den bygger på felaktiga premisser. Den hegelianska dialektiken och den positivistiska historiesynen har ju för länge sedan upphört att vara på modet och därför bör även Baurs empiri i grunden ifrågasättas. Detta att Baur ifrågasatte äktheten hos samtliga Paulusbrev, utom de fyra huvudbreven, är det tydligaste exemplet på hur ideologin har styrt

resultaten; allt som inte lät som den "Paulus" som Baur ville ha förkastades. Det var Baurs protestantiska "Paulus" som var fången hos kättarna, medan en "katolicerad", tämjd variant av densamme (och därmed inte den "riktige") förvaltades av 100-talets stora kyrka. White menar att vi, genom att återuppväcka frågan om brevens äkthet, får en mer komplex bild, där olika sidor av Paulus person och budskap har bevarats av olika grupper. Ingen har bevarat *den* riktige Paulus, men alla har bevarat något fragment av honom. Vi ska inte sätta oss till doms över de olika gruppernas Paulusbilder och försöka komma bakom dem, utan istället bör vi bejaka pluraliteten och nöja oss med att kartlägga mångfalden av Paulusreceptioner. White ser visserligen detta perspektiv som redan realiserat inom forskningen och han kallar det för "the Pauline Fragmentation narrative". Det finns dock flera sätt att gå längre och på allvar ta konsekvenserna av denna nya berättelse, förtjänstfullt presenterade i bokens sista kapitel, där det främsta är att sluta privilegiera vissa skrifter framför andra, genom att skilja mellan äkta och oäkta Paulusbrev.

Whites bok engagerar och han sätter fingret på en hel del intressanta saker. Kanske är det just därför den här boken samtidigt provocerar mig så mycket. White verkar ju vara en både beläst och intelligent person, vilket får mig att på flera punkter undra om jag har missförstått honom.

För det första har vi frågan om de äkta och de oäkta breven. White uttrycker sig som om forskningen okritiskt tagit över Baurs uppfattning om vilka Paulusbrev som är de mest centrala och att det är detta som har lett till att en viss bild av aposteln blivit allmänrådande. Jag undrar: känner inte White till de ändlösa diskussioner som förts och fortfarande förs om vilka brev som möjligen kan vara autentiska? Argumenten emot autenticitet tryter knappast. Det är ju inte heller ovanligt att hypoteser, som är ideologiskt motiverade vid sin tillkomst, ändå i stora stycken visar sig stämma även efter det att ideologin som drev fram dem har övergetts.

För det andra undrar jag varför White inte reflekterar över vilken ideologi som ligger bakom "the Pauline Fragmentation narrative". Menar White att forskningen, i och med att man övergett "the Pauline Captivity narrative", har befriat sig ifrån de begränsade perspektivens sfär och stigit upp till den metanivå som tidigare var onåbar? När Baur kritiserades uppfattade jag nämligen att själva poängen var att "äkta" historia var omöjlig att nå, men nu omtalas fragmenteringsberättelsen som om den ändå beskriver det förflutna *såsom det verkligen hände*. Varför är det möjligt att nå den berättelsen, men inte Paulus? Det är ju lätt att se att fragmenteringsberättelsen ger uttryck för vår egen tids intellektuella trend och att den otvivelaktigt i sinom tid kommer att ersättas av ett nytt paradigm.

För det tredje undrar jag över sneglandet på *Jesus Remembered*-vågen inom den historiske Jesus-forskningen, med dess fokus på minne och tradition, som White betraktar som ett föredöme i teoretiskt och metodologiskt avseende. Det finns förstås alltid lärdomar att hämta från andra fält, och att som Paulusforskare hänga med i vad som händer inom den historiske Jesus-forskningen ligger nära till hands. Vad jag saknar är dock en reflektion över de olika förutsättningar som gäller för de båda grannfälten. Alla är ju faktiskt överens om att vi trots allt har tillgång till vissa skrifter som Paulus själv har författat; skrifter som av naturliga

skäl måste anses ha ett särskilt källvärde i förhållande till frågor om den "historiske" Paulus. Denna ganska grundläggande skillnad emot den historiske Jesus-forskningen varken nämns eller problematiseras av White.

Jag välkomnar Whites bidrag till diskussionen eftersom han lyfter en rad spännande frågor, inte minst av kunskapsteoretisk art, som jag hoppas kommer att leda till fler framåttänkande inlägg om framtidens Paulusforskning. Som framgått finns det ett flertal centrala aspekter som behöver förtydligas, men detta hindrar inte att jag ändå kan rekommendera boken.

Martin Wessbrandt, Lunds universitet

Till redaktionen insänd litteratur

Efter denna årgång av *SEÅ* upphör redovisningen av "Till redaktionen insänd litteratur". After the present volume of *SEÅ*, the listing of received literature shall be discontinued.

Basser, Herbert W. med Marsha B. Cohen. *The Gospel of Matthew and Judaic Traditions, A Relevance-based Commentary*. The Brill Reference Library of Judaism 46. Leiden: Brill, 2015. Inbunden. XXII + 794 sidor. ISBN: 9789004291799. €232.00.

Brown, Derek R. *The God of This Age: Satan in the Churches and Letters of the Apostle Paul*. WUNT II 409. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015. Häftad. XI + 243 sidor. ISBN: 9783161537080. €79.00.

Brown, William P. (red.). *The Oxford Handbook of the Psalms*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014. Inbunden. 684 sidor. ISBN: 9780199783335. £105.00.

Campbell, Constantine R. *Advances in the Study of Greek: New Insights for Reading the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2015. Häftad. 256 sidor. ISBN: 9780310515951. $34.99.

DeClaissé-Walford, Nancy (red.). *The Shape and Shaping of the Book of Psalms: The Current State of Scholarship*. Ancient Israel and Its Literature 20. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2014. Häftad. 290 sidor. ISBN: 9781628370010. $36.95.

DeClaissé-Walford, Nancy L., Rolf A. Jacobson och Beth LaNeel Tanner. *The Book of Psalms*. NICOT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2014. Inbunden. 1073 sidor. ISBN: 9780802824936. $60.00.

Dozeman, Thomas B., Konrad Schmid och Baruch J. Schwartz (red.). *The Pentateuch: International Perspectives on Current Research*. FAT 78. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011. Inbunden. XVIII + 578 sidor. ISBN: 9783161506130. €129.00.

Filtvedt, Ole Jakob. *The Identity of God's People and the Paradox of Hebrews*. WUNT II 400. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015. Häftad. 312 sidor. ISBN: 9783161540134. €89.00.

Hellholm, David, Tor Vegge, Øyvind Norderval och Christer Hellholm (red.). *Ablution, Initiation, and Baptism: Late Antiquity, Early Judaism, and Early Christianity*. BZNW 176. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011. 3 volymer. XLI + 2024 sidor. ISBN: 9783110247510. €319.00/$447.00/£239.99.

Hill, Wesley. *Paul and the Trinity: Persons, Relations, and the Pauline Letters*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015. Häftad. 224 sidor. ISBN: 9780802869647. $26.00.

Huffman, Douglas S. *Verbal Aspect Theory and the Prohibitions in the Greek New Testament*. Studies in Biblical Greek 16. New York: Peter Lang, 2014. Inbunden. XXIV + 571 sidor. ISBN: 9781433123580. €164.60.

Kazen, Thomas. *Scripture, Interpretation, or Authority? Motives and Arguments in Jesus' Halakic Conflicts*. WUNT 320. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013. Inbunden. 364 sidor. ISBN: 9783161528934. €119.00.

Lieu, Judith M. *Marcion and the Making of a Heretic: God and Scripture in the Second Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015. Inbunden. XVI + 502 sidor. ISBN: 978110702904. £70.00/$110.00.

Morales, L. Michael (red.). *Cult and Cosmos: Tilting Toward a Temple-Centered Theology*. BITS 18. Leuven: Peeters, 2014. Inbunden. XIV + 429 sidor. ISBN: 9789042930254. €78.00.

Newsom, Carol A. och Brennan W. Breed. *Daniel: A Commentary*. The Old Testament Library. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2014. Häftad. LIV + 416 sidor. ISBN: 9780664260163. €35.

Niehoff, Maren (red.). *Homer and the Bible in the Eyes of Ancient Interpreters*. JSRC 16. 378 sidor. Inbunden. Leiden: Brill, 2012. ISBN: 9789004221345. €148.00.

Noll, Kurt L. *Canaan and Israel in Antiquity. A Textbook on History and Religion*. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2013. 2 uppl. Häftad. 356 sidor. ISBN: 9780567204882. $42.95.

Parry, Ken (red.). *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Patristics*. Wiley Blackwell Companions to Religion Series. Chichester: Wiley, 2015. Inbunden. XVI + 530 sidor. ISBN: 9781118438718. £120.00.

Rothenbusch, Ralf. *"... abgesondert zur Tora Gottes hin": Ethnisch-religiöse Identitäten im Esra/Nehemiabuch*. Herders Biblische Studien 70. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 2012. Inbunden. XII + 468 sidor. ISBN: 9783451307706. €60.00.

Satlow, Michael L. *How the Bible Became Holy*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2014. Inbunden. 386 sidor. ISBN: 9780300171914. $35.00.

Siggelkow-Berner, Birke. *Die jüdischen Feste im* Bellum Judaicum *des Flavius Josephus*. WUNT II 306. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011. Inbunden. 441 sidor. ISBN: 9783161505935. €89.00.

Tiemeyer, Lena-Sofia och Hans M. Barstad (red.). *Continuity and Discontinuity: Chronological and Thematic Development in Isaiah 40–66*. FRLANT 255. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2014. Inbunden. 259 sidor. ISBN: 9783525536148. €89.99.

Tucker Jr., W. Dennis. *Constructing and Deconstructing Power in Psalms 107–150*. Ancient Israel and Its Literature 19. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2014. Häftad. 240 sidor. ISBN: 9781589839724. £28.95.

Utzschneider, Helmut och Wolfgang Oswald. *Exodus 1–15*. International Exegetical Commentary on the Old Testament. Övers. P. Sumpter. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2015. Inbunden. 360 sidor. ISBN: 9783170225718. €79.99.

Von Wahlde, Urban C. *The Gospel and Letters of John*, vol. 1: *Introduction, Analysis, and Reference*. ECCo. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010. Häftad. XII + 756 sidor. ISBN: 9780802809919. $60.00.

Von Wahlde, Urban C. *The Gospel and Letters of John*, vol. 2: *Commentary on the Gospel of John*. ECCo. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010. Häftad. XVII + 941 sidor. ISBN: 9780802822178. $60.00.

Von Wahlde, Urban C. *The Gospel and Letters of John*, vol. 3: *Commentary on the Three Johannine Letters*. ECCo. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010. Häftad. XII + 444 sidor. ISBN: 9780802822185. $60.00.

White, Benjamin L. *Remembering Paul: Ancient and Modern Contests over the Image of the Apostle*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014. Inbunden. 376 sidor. ISBN: 9780199370276. $68.00.

.

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 (www.exegetiskasallskapet.se). Där återfinns också anvisningar för medverkande.

SEÅ senaste årgångar

75	2010	Moseböckerna i aktuell forskning / The Pentateuch in Recent Research
76	2011	Apokalyptikens ansikten / Faces of Apocalypticism
77	2012	Receptionshistoria i den tidiga kyrkan / Reception History in the Early Church
78	2013	Offer i Bibeln / Sacrifice in the Bible
79	2014	Etnicitet i Bibeln och i bibelvetenskaplig forskning / Ethnicity in the Bible and in Biblical Scholarship
80	2015	Judiska och kristna grupper i den grekisk-romerska världen / Jewish and Christian Groups in the Greco-Roman World
81	2016	Homeros och Bibeln / Homer and the Bible

****

SEÅ 82 (2017)

”När Bibeln skrevs om …”
Rewritten Bible

Innehåller bland annat material från
Exegetiska dagen i Göteborg
26 september 2016

Se program på
www.exegetiskasallskapet.se