



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

This thesis has been submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for a postgraduate degree (e.g. PhD, MPhil, DClinPsychol) at the University of Edinburgh. Please note the following terms and conditions of use:

This work is protected by copyright and other intellectual property rights, which are retained by the thesis author, unless otherwise stated.

A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge.

This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the author.

The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the author.

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given.

How Mark Wrote:
Scripturalization in the Gospel of Mark
and the Second Temple Period

Nathanael Vette

PhD in New Testament and Christian Origins

The University of Edinburgh

2020

I declare that this thesis is entirely my own work and has not been submitted, in whole or in part, for any other degree or professional qualification.

Nathanael Robert Newman Smith Vette

August 22, 2019

LAY SUMMARY

The Gospel of Mark begins with a quotation drawn from the Jewish scriptures (the works that came to be included in the Hebrew Bible). Throughout the Gospel, characters continue to quote and allude to material from the Jewish scriptures, usually in order to interpret an event or support an argument. The Gospel also includes episodes where the narrative resembles familiar episodes or passages in the Jewish scriptures: Jesus sojourns in the wilderness for forty days and calls his disciples, just as the prophet Elijah does; Jesus takes a small number of loaves and multiplies them to feed a multitude, just as the prophet Elisha does; Antipas promises a young girl up to half of his kingdom, just as Ahasuerus promises Esther; Jesus suffers on the cross just as the Psalmist suffers in Psalm 22. This thesis argues that the practice of modelling new episodes on material from the Jewish scriptures—a process which I call ‘scripturalization’—was commonplace in the literature of the Second Temple period (Jewish history from the sixth-century BCE to the end of the first-century CE). The conclusion is borne out by five works roughly contemporary with the Gospel (second-century BCE to first-century CE) which contain episodes modelled on material from the Jewish scriptures. These are then compared with five episodes in the Gospel of Mark which similarly follow a scriptural model. The thesis concludes by asking whether episodes modelled on scriptural material can also contain historical information.

ABSTRACT

Devorah Dimant distinguishes between an ‘expositional use’ and a ‘compositional use’ of the Jewish scriptures in the Second Temple period. The former refers to marked citations or allusions which seek to interpret the meaning of the scriptural text, whilst the latter refers to the unmarked use of scriptural material embedded and re-contextualized in a new work. Studies on the use of the Jewish scriptures in the Gospel of Mark have tended to focus on the first kind, the expositional use of scriptural material (i.e. Mk 1:2-3; 4:12; 7:6-7). Some studies have sought to understand the compositional use of scriptural material in the Gospel with reference to the Jewish liturgy, midrash or Greco-Roman mimesis—and these with mixed results. This study instead looks at Mark’s use of the Jewish scriptures through scripturalization, a compositional technique identified by Judith Newman. Scripturalization describes the re-use of scriptural elements to compose new literature. The study begins by surveying examples of scripturalized narrative in Second Temple literature, with episodes drawn from the *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* (*LAB*), the Genesis Apocryphon (1QapGen), 1 Maccabees (1 Macc), Judith (*Jdt*) and the Testament of Abraham (*T. Ab.*). The focus is on episodes that clearly follow a scriptural model: the use of Dan 3 in the episode of Abram in the fiery furnace (*LAB* 6) and Jair and the fiery furnace (*LAB* 38); the use of Judg 7 in Kenaz’s rout of the Amorites (*LAB* 27); the use of Gen 13-15 in the promise of land to Noah (1QapGen 11); the use of Deut 2:26-36 (and Deut 20:10-14; Judg 11:19-21) in Judas Maccabeus’ siege of Ephron (1 Macc 5:45-51); the use of Judg 4-5 in Judith’s slaying of Holofernes (*Jdt* 10-13); and the use of Job 1-2 in the appearance of Michael to Abraham (*T. Ab.* 1-4; 15:14-15). This section ends by outlining the shared characteristics of scripturalized narrative across these texts. The study then turns to episodes in the Gospel of Mark that appear to follow a scriptural model: the use of 1 Kgs 19 in Jesus’ forty-day sojourn in the wilderness and call of the disciples (Mk 1:12-20); the use of 2 Kgs 4:42-44 in the two-fold feedings of the multitude (Mk 6:35-44; 8:1-9); the use of Esther 2-7 in the execution of John the Baptist (Mk 6:21-28); and the use of Ps 22 (and Pss 38:11; 69:21; Amos 8:9) in the crucifixion of Jesus (Mk 15:21-41). This section closes by noting how the characteristics identified in other Second Temple

texts can be observed in the Gospel. The study then concludes with a summary of its findings and some brief remarks on the tenuous relationship of scripturalized narrative to history.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>Acknowledgements</i>	xiii
<i>Abbreviations</i>	xv
Chapter One: Introduction	1
The Jewish Scriptures in the Gospel of Mark.....	4
Approaches to the Use of the Jewish Scriptures in the Gospel of Mark.....	6
The ‘Dodd Camp’: The 1950s to the 1980s.....	9
The ‘Suhl Camp’: The 1960s to the 1980s.....	12
The ‘Dodd Camp’ Continued: the 1990s to the Present.....	15
Compositional Approaches to the Use of the Jewish Scriptures in the Gospel of Mark.....	22
Scripturalization as a Compositional Approach.....	26
Identifying Scripturalization.....	28
Chapter Two: Scripturalization in the Literature of the Second Temple Period	31
The <i>Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum</i>	31
Different Uses of the Jewish Scriptures in <i>LAB</i>	34
The Compositional Use of the Jewish Scriptures in <i>LAB</i>	36
Excursus: Midrash or Scripturalization?	37
Abram in the Fiery Furnace: <i>LAB</i> 6 and Dan 3.....	40
Jair and the Fiery Furnace: <i>LAB</i> 38 and Dan 3.....	54
Excursus: The Literary Afterlife of Dan 3.....	61
Kenaz and Gideon: <i>LAB</i> 27 and Judg 7.....	63
Concluding Observations.....	73
The <i>Genesis Apocryphon</i>	74
The Compositional Use of the Jewish Scriptures in 1QapGen.....	77
Noah and Abram: 1QapGen 11 and Gen 13, 15 and 26.....	80
1 Maccabees.....	85
The Compositional Use of the Jewish Scriptures in 1 Maccabees.....	88

Judas and Moses: 1 Macc 5:45-51 and Deut 2:26-36 (20:10-14).....	91
Judith.....	98
The Compositional Use of the Jewish Scriptures in Judith.....	101
Jael and Judith (and Jael again): Jdt 10-16 and Judg 4-5 (and <i>LAB</i> 31)...	
.....	106
The <i>Testament of Abraham</i>	113
Abraham and Job: <i>T. Ab.</i> and LXX Job 1-2.....	117
Summary.....	122
Chapter Three: Scripturalization in the Gospel of Mark.....	125
Elijah in Mk 1:1-20.....	125
Elijah and the Messenger: Mal 3:1 in Mk 1:2?.....	125
Elijah and John: LXX 2 Kgs 1:8 in Mk 1:6.....	130
Other Elijah Parallels in Mk 1:4-11.....	134
Other Uses of the Jewish Scriptures in Mk 1:2-11.....	136
Jesus and Elijah: Mk 1:12-20 and 1 Kgs 19.....	139
Jesus and Elijah in the Wilderness: Mk 1:12-13 and 1 Kgs 19:4-8.....	143
The Call of the Disciples and Elisha: Mk 1:16-20 and 1 Kgs 19:19-21.....	149
Jesus and Elisha: Mk 6:35-44 (8:1-9) and 2 Kgs 4:42-44.....	153
Antipas and Ahasuerus: Mk 6:21-28 and Est 2-7.....	163
The Jewish Scriptures in the Passion Narrative.....	173
The Use of the Jewish Scriptures in Mk 14:1-15:20.....	178
The Servant at the Supper?: Mk 14:24 and Isa 53:12 (Mk 14:65; 15:19,27,43-46).....	183
The Shepherd and the Sheep: Mk 14:27 and Zech 13:7 (Amos 2:6; Gen 39:12?).....	186
Grief in the Garden: Mk 14:34 and Ps 42:6.....	191
The Song of the Cross: Mk 15:21-41 and Ps 22 (Pss 38; 69; Amos 8).....	197
Jesus and Esther?: The Compositional Use of Ps 22.....	200
Other Uses of the Jewish Scriptures in Mk 15:21-41.....	206

Summary.....	214
Chapter Four: Conclusion.....	217
Bibliography.....	225
Sources.....	225
Secondary Works.....	230

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A great many people contributed to the completion of this thesis. Some contributed with scholarly advice, others with friendship. I am grateful for both.

My sincere thanks goes to Helen Bond for supervising this thesis. Her counsel and helpful criticism have been indispensable throughout my time in Edinburgh. Without her encouragement this project would not have been possible. Thanks also is due to Paul Foster for his thoughtful and constructive criticism. I would also like to thank the support staff at New College for their tireless work behind the scenes on behalf of PhD students.

Special thanks goes to my colleagues at New College for their encouragement and many afternoons at the Wash Bar: Jo Thor, Scott Bickle, Áine Warren and Sammy Bishop. I would also like to thank the faculty at New College for their generous support, especially Mona Siddiqui and Linden Bicket. To those scholars who were kind enough to offer feedback and send unpublished articles and chapters, I am grateful for their help: Mark Goodacre, James McGrath, Charles Häberl, Stephen Llewelyn and Heikke Omerzu.

My deep thanks also goes to May Howie who so generously donated to me the theological books of the late Gordon Howie. Thanks also goes to Roy Pinkerton and Calum McIver for their help in this.

To my family and friends there is a debt of gratitude that cannot be fully expressed in words. Still, my thanks goes to Tom Muller, Ally Howell and Brooke Burns for their friendship and encouragement from afar. I would like to thank my grandfather-in-law Kal LeMaster for his support and my grandfather Ken Newman—in whose footsteps I followed spending summer retreats at the Burn in Glenesk. I am deeply grateful for Dona Vette, who passed away December 2017. Her kindness and good humour are sorely missed.

The following friends and family deserve special thanks. To my grandmother Margaret Newman I am especially grateful for her generous support and loving correspondence, and for helping make the move from London to Edinburgh a reality. My parents-in-law Laurie Vette and Scott Andrews have been unwavering in their

support and encouragement and for them I am so very grateful. My deep thanks and appreciation goes to Will Robinson for his friendship and peerless scholarly input. Will has read every single word and commented on every single paragraph of this thesis and it is all the better for it. I am grateful beyond measure for my parents Rob and Claire Smith, who inspired my love of scholarship in the first place, and who have been ceaseless in their love and support from the other side of the world. This project is the fruit of many years of encouragement and conversations.

Finally, my wife Rachel Vette has been my constant friend and loving partner throughout all of this. Her kindness, generosity and selflessness have made this thesis possible. To her I owe a life-time of thanks, of which this note is only the start.

Nathanael Robert Newman Smith Vette

August, 2019

ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviations follow *The SBL Handbook of Style* (2nd ed.; Atlanta, GA: SBL Press, 2014). Journals and series not listed there are abbreviated as follows.

BIBALDS	Berkeley Institute of Biblical Archaeology and Literature Dissertation Series
<i>BibAn</i>	<i>Biblical Antiquities</i>
BthSt	Biblisch-Theologische Studien
BU	Biblische Untersuchung
BWANT	Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament
CamSac	Campania sacra
CCME	Culture and Civilization in the Middle East
CS	Cistercian Studies
<i>EC</i>	<i>Early Christianity</i>
FZB	Forschung zum Bibel
HTKNT	Herder theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
IHC	Islamic History and Civilization
JAJSupp	Journal of Ancient Judaism Supplements
LB	Légendes Byzantines
LMW	The Library of Medieval Women
MHS	Monumenta Hispaniae Sacra
PGC	Pelican Gospel Commentaries
SACS	Septuagint and Cognate Studies
SAIS	Studies in the Aramaic Interpretation of Scripture
SBEC	Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity
SBL	Studies in Biblical Literature
SBLEJL	Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and Its Literature
SHG	Subsidia Hagiographica
SL	Serie Litúrgica
SPB	Studia Post-Biblica
SPNT	Studies on Personalities of the New Testament

STAC	Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum
StANT	Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
STML	Studies on Themes and Motifs in Literature
SVTGAASGE	Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum graecum auctoritate academiae scientiarum Gottingensis editum
<i>TCAAS</i>	<i>Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences</i>
TED	Translations of Early Documents
TGST	Tesi Gregoriana Serie Teologia
TM	Tekst en Maatschappij
TTH	Translated Texts for Historians

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

William Blake once wrote, ‘The Old and New Testaments are the Great Code of Art’.¹ Northrop Frye takes the slogan to mean that ‘the framework of the Bible, stretching from Creation to Last Judgment and surveying the whole of human history, [is the] framework of the whole of literary experience, [and] the ultimate context for all works of literature whatever’.² The Bible, so says Frye, is the ‘Great Code’ which provides the mythological structure for all Western literature.³ One need only look at its most enduring types: the underdog is a David, the favourite a Goliath; rival siblings are Cains and Abels; a mass emigration is an Exodus, its leader a Moses; a future state is a Promised Land; an idyllic paradise is an Eden; a tempter a Serpent; a seductress a Jezebel; a betrayer a Judas; a saviour a Messiah; a doubter a Thomas—and so on. The author Marilynne Robinson—no stranger to the biblical form⁴—writes that ‘the Bible is the model for and subject of more art and thought than those of us who live within its influence, consciously or unconsciously, will ever know’.⁵

Whilst Robinson’s comments concern Western literature, she could easily have been speaking about the literature of the Second Temple period. At the heart of these texts is a devotion to—and utilization of—the language, symbols, characters,

¹ William Blake, ‘Laocoön’ (c. 1826-1827). For Blake, this was a critique of the classicists of his day who sought to emulate ‘pagan’ forms over the biblical. Thus he re-casts the classical exemplar ‘Laocoön and his Two Sons’ (cf. Virgil, *Aeneid*, 2.199) as ‘ה’ & his two Sons Satan & Adam as they were copied from the Cherubim of Solomon’s Temple by three Rhodians & applied to Natural Fact or the History of Ilium’.

² Northrop Frye, *The Stubborn Structure: Essays on Criticism and Society* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1970) 170-171.

³ See Frye’s oeuvre from *Fearful Symmetry: A Study of William Blake* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1947) to *The Great Code: The Bible and Literature* (New York, NY: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1982).

⁴ Marilynne Robinson’s *Housekeeping* (New York, NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1980) is modelled in part on the book of Ruth.

⁵ Robinson, ‘The Book of Books: What Literature Owes the Bible’, *The New York Times* (22 December 2011) 22.

narratives and themes found in the Jewish scriptures.⁶ Here one must be careful to avoid anachronism, as the canon of the Hebrew Bible did not emerge until the end of the first-century CE.⁷ And yet despite the fluidity of textual forms and diverse notions of scriptural authority, a collection of writings roughly equivalent to the Jewish scriptures appears to have wielded an unparalleled influence on nearly all the literary output of Jewish antiquity.

But this does not mean that the literature of the period is merely ‘paratext, auxiliary material whose purpose is to contextualize and illuminate the biblical’.⁸ For the most part, scholars simply do not know how these texts viewed themselves in relation to their scriptural antecedents.⁹ Whereas some works appear (at least formally) to supplement a specific writing (i.e. 1QpHab), others explicitly claim authoritative status for themselves (i.e. *Jubilees*).¹⁰ This is also reflected in the way that scriptural material was used in the period. As Devorah Dimant notes, the Jewish scriptures were not just the object of exegesis, they were also the means of composing new and independent literature. Thus she distinguishes between an *expositional* use of scriptural material and its *compositional* use.

⁶ By Jewish scriptures, I mean the works that eventually comprised the canon of the Hebrew Bible. I will not use terms ‘bible/biblical’ and ‘Old/New Testament’ as the former best describes later scholastic practices (the binding of folios into a codex) and the latter is inextricably tied to a supersessionist theology.

⁷ On the process of canonization during the Second Temple Period, see Timothy H. Lim, *The Formation of the Jewish Canon* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2013) 178-185. Of course, some works included in the canon of the Hebrew Bible themselves belong to this period (i.e. Daniel). For an alternative view, see the recent work of Judith H. Newman, *Before the Bible: The Liturgical Body and the Formation of Scriptures in Early Judaism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018), esp. 14-19, which considers the liturgical process through which texts became sacralized in communities.

⁸ Eva Mroczek, *The Literary Imagination in Jewish Antiquity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016) 7.

⁹ James C. VanderKam offers some criteria for determining so-called ‘authoritative’ texts at Qumran: if it is cited as an authority in another text, if it presents itself as a ‘revelation from God’ and if it is the subject of a commentary (*The Dead Sea Scrolls Today* [rev. ed.; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2010] 187). This would seem to include works like *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees*, sectarian literature like the *Damascus Document* and *Community Rule*, as well as works found outside of Qumran. The number of surviving manuscripts is not a reliable indicator of scriptural authority as it may be due to historical accident, so Sidnie White Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times* (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2008) 9. One reason the Jewish scriptures appear so influential in Second Temple literature is that they have survived, allowing scholars to detect their influence upon other texts. Given that much (if not most) of the literature of Jewish antiquity has been lost, the original picture was likely more complicated.

¹⁰ An exegetical work on a scriptural text may also have been considered authoritative in its own right, so Lim, *The Formation of the Jewish Canon*, 135-139.

In compositional use biblical elements are interwoven into the work without external formal markers; in expository use they are presented explicitly as such, with a clear external marker. These two distinctive functions have different aims. In the exposition the divine word is introduced in order to interpret it as such, while the composition is employed when the biblical element is subservient to the independent aim and structure of its new context.¹¹

The expository use of scriptural material features most prominently in exegetical literature, such as the *Peshar Habakkuk*. Here the scriptural lemma is followed by interpretation: ““Why do you stare, traitors, and remain silent when a wicked person consumes someone more upright than himself?” Its interpretation concerns the House of Absalom and the members of their council, who kept silent when the Teacher of Righteousness was rebuked’ (1QpHab 5:8-10; cf. Hab 1:13b). The expository form may also be used to invoke the authority of its scriptural source: ‘No-one should offer anything upon the altar on the sabbath, except the sacrifice of the sabbath, for thus is it written, “except your offerings of the sabbath”’ (CD A 11:17b-18; cf. Lev 23:38). It also appears when one scriptural passage is used to interpret another: ‘Accordingly, it is written in the book of the Law of Moses that anyone who is unwilling to raise up posterity for his brother, his shoe should be removed and one should spit in his face. Joseph’s brothers did not want their brother to live, and the Lord removed Joseph’s shoe from them’ (*T. Zeb.* 3:4-5; cf. Gen 37:18-28; Deut 25:5-10). In the expository use, the scriptural material appears as something external to the work, so that it can be cited as an authority or so that its meaning can be interpreted.

The compositional use of scriptural material is seen most clearly in the works often misleadingly referred to as ‘rewritten Bible’.¹² The book of *Jubilees*, for example, takes the narrative outline of Genesis and Exodus as its compositional model. The Genesis-Exodus material does not appear as something external, but is re-

¹¹ Devorah Dimant, ‘Use and Interpretation of Mikra in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha’ in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (ed. Martin J. Mulder; Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1988) 379-419 (382). Michael Fishbane likewise identifies the use of scriptural material as a ‘Model for Language’ and a ‘Model for Composition’ in the Dead Sea Scrolls, see ‘Use, Authority and Interpretation of Mikra at Qumran’ in *Mikra*, 339-377 (356-359).

¹² On problems posed by the term see Moshe J. Bernstein, “‘Rewritten Bible’: A Generic Category Which Has Outlived Its Usefulness?”, *Textus* 22 (2005): 169-196.

constituted in the new work. The Genesis-Exodus narrative is presented according to the sectarian calendar, whilst the patriarchs are shown performing the Law of Moses—thus demonstrating its pre-existence.¹³ As such, the author of *Jubilees* inserts legal material into the patriarchal narrative, composing episodes which are, according to scriptural chronology, anachronistic: Noah celebrates Shavuot (*Jub.* 6:17; cf. Exod 34:22), Abraham celebrates Sukkot (*Jub.* 16:20-31; cf. Lev 23:34,40-42) and Levi, as High Priest, performs Sukkot and the tithe (*Jub.* 32:3-10; cf. Lev 23:34-44; Num 29:12-40; Deut 14:22-23). Into this narrative, the author also inserts scriptural language from outside of the Torah. Again, this scriptural language is unmarked and embedded in its new context. When the text reads ‘There (will be) no old men and none who is full of days, because all of them will be infants and children’ (*Jub.* 23:28), these are not the words of Isaiah (Isa 65:20), but the words of the LORD to Moses. When it reads ‘I am old and I do not know the day of my death’ (*Jub.* 21:1), the words are attributed to Abraham not Isaac (Gen 27:2). And when God is entreated to ‘Create a pure heart and a holy spirit for them’ (*Jub.* 1:21), it is Moses who speaks not the Psalmist (Ps 51:10). Thus, in the compositional use, scriptural material is woven into the fabric of a new work, providing language or details or serving as a model for a new composition.¹⁴

The Jewish Scriptures in the Gospel of Mark

These two approaches to using the Jewish scriptures can be seen in another work of the Second Temple Period: the Gospel of Mark. The Gospel begins with an *expositional* citation, partly misattributed to Isaiah: ‘As it is written in the prophet Isaiah, “See, I am sending my messenger ahead of you, who will prepare you way; the voice of one crying out in the wilderness: “Prepare the way of the Lord, make his paths straight”’ (Mk 1:2-3). The passage—which conflates LXX Exod 23:20 (Mal 3:1?) and LXX Isa 40:3—is the only editorial citation in the Gospel. Elsewhere, citations or allusions appear in the direct speech of characters. These come in the form of marked

¹³ For example, when Joseph is confronted by Potiphar’s wife, he remembers the Levitical prohibition against adultery (*Jub.* 39:6-7; cf. Lev 20:10) which was written by Abraham (*Jub.* 20:3-4) and read to him by Jacob.

¹⁴ So Dimant, ‘Mikra in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha’, 383.

citations (7:6-7,10; 10:6-8,19; 11:17; 12:10-11,26,29-33,36; 14:27), unmarked scriptural language resembling a citation (1:11; 4:12; 9:7,48; 11:9; 13:24-25; 14:62; 15:34) and allusions with a clear scriptural referent (1:44; 2:25-26; 10:4; 13:14). Here the scriptural material appears as something external to the Markan narrative and is invoked either to support an argument or interpret an event. Each of these examples falls under the expositional category.

On the other hand, the Gospel features unmarked scriptural language woven seamlessly into the narrative. Again, this may appear in direct speech, such as Antipas' offer to the young girl of 'even half of my kingdom' (Mk 6:23) which borrows the language of Est 5:3 (5:6; 7:2). Scriptural language also appears in narrative details, such as the description of John the Baptist wearing 'a leather belt around his waist' (Mk 1:6; cf. LXX 2 Kgs 1:8) or the image of Jesus' tormentors dividing his clothes and casting lots for them (Mk 15:24; cf. LXX Ps 21:19). The Jewish scriptures were not just invoked to interpret the Markan narrative, but also to compose details and episodes in the narrative itself.¹⁵

Studies on the use of the Jewish scriptures in the Gospel of Mark have focused primarily on the expositional use of scriptural material—that is, how Mark's interpretation of the scriptures contributes to the meaning of the Gospel. On this question, scholarship can be divided into two camps. One camp, following C. H. Dodd, believes that Mark interpreted the Jewish scriptures through an overarching thematic framework or schema of prophetic fulfilment.¹⁶ These scholars identify broad scriptural themes in the Gospel and tend to view the original literary context of a citation or allusion as the key to its interpretation. The other camp, following Alfred Suhl, sees little evidence of an overarching schema.¹⁷ Instead, Mark's use of the Jewish scriptures was ad hoc and atomistic—that is, without concern for its original context.¹⁸

¹⁵ The unknown author of the Gospel will be referred to as Mark for convenience. The possibility of sources or redactional traces will be duly noted. The Gospel clearly knows of the destruction of the temple in Jerusalem (Mk 13:2), establishing the *terminus post quem* as 70 CE. That Mark served as the primary source for the Gospel of Matthew, which was written in the same generation following the Jewish war of 66-73 CE, places the *terminus ante quem* at c.a. 85 CE.

¹⁶ C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures: The Sub-Structure of New Testament Theology* (London: Nisbet & Co., 1952).

¹⁷ Alfred Suhl, *Die Funktion der alttestamentlichen Zitate und Anspielungen im Markusevangelium* (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1965).

¹⁸ For the classic definition of atomization, see George F. Moore, *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era: The Age of the Tannaim* (3 vols.; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1927) 1.249-250.

Only a few studies have sought to examine the use of scriptural material in the Gospel as a means of composition—and these with limited success. The following sections will survey the various approaches to the use of the Jewish scriptures in the Gospel of Mark, before outlining what a thoroughgoing compositional approach to the use of the scriptures in the Gospel might look like.

Approaches to the Use of the Jewish Scriptures in the Gospel of Mark

Research into the role of the Jewish scriptures in the Gospel began in earnest over a century before Dodd—as with so much in biblical scholarship—in the work of David Friedrich Strauss.¹⁹ He was among the first to argue that the Jewish scriptures wielded a creative influence over the depiction of Jesus in the Gospels: ‘Den reichsten Stoff zu dieser mythischen Verzierung lieferte (dabei) das alte Testament, in welchem die erste, vornehmlich aus dem Judentum gesammelte Christengemeinde lebte und webte’.²⁰ Following what Strauss saw as the Jewish exegesis of their day, the early Christians both manipulated the scriptures to fit the details of Jesus’ life whilst also inventing stories about him out of scriptural material.²¹ Thus, Jesus does the same things that Moses and Elijah did, whilst his life is told using the language of the Psalms and Isaiah. The figure encountered in the Gospels, so argues Strauss, is the Jesus of myth, fashioned in large part out of the pages of the Jewish scriptures. Strauss had little time for Mark, however, whom he regarded as a shameless epitomizer, and even less time for the literary world of the Second Temple period.²² For Strauss, early Christian exegesis was above all guided by fanaticism: ‘So saben sie, durch ihre Begeisterung für den neuen Messias geblendet, in dem einzigen Buche, das sie lasen dem A. T., ihn überall’.²³

¹⁹ Beginning with the first edition of *Das Leben Jesu: kritisch bearbeitet* (2 vols.; Tübingen: Osiander, 1835).

²⁰ Strauss, *Das Leben Jesu*, 1.73.

²¹ So Strauss; ‘Mit dem Messias muß sich nach dem Alten Testament das und das begeben; Jesus war der Messias; folglich wird sich eben jenes mit ihm begeben haben’ (*Das Leben Jesu*, 1.109).

²² Strauss characterizes contemporary Jewish exegesis as ‘bodenlosen Willkühr’ (*Das Leben Jesu*, 2.340).

²³ Strauss, *Das Leben Jesu*, 2.340-341.

Over the following century, Strauss' views struggled to gain acceptance outside of German scholarship.²⁴ Karl Weidel echoed many of Strauss' sentiments in an article serially published between 1910 and 1912, arguing that the early Christians constructed the life of Jesus out of a *Weissagungsbeweis* drawn from the Jewish scriptures.²⁵ Put simply, 'Auf diesem Wege musste allmählich eine Art von alttestamentlichen Leben Jesu entstehen'.²⁶ Weidel, like Strauss, saw this process going one of two ways: to fulfil the Jewish scriptures, the early Christians invented unhistorical episodes in the life of Jesus, whilst also manipulating scriptural passages to conform to the details of his life.²⁷ This is nowhere more evident than in the Markan Passion Narrative (Mk 14-15): 'In der Tat der Weissagungsbeweis für weite Strecken der Leidensgeschichte die Quelle gebildet hat, das ser also in diesem Teil der evangelischen Überlieferung in höchstem Masse geschichtsbilden gewirkt hat'.²⁸ For Weidel, the complicated interplay between historical details and wholesale invention on the basis of the Jewish scriptures makes the recovery of the historical Jesus nearly impossible. As the earliest Christian kerygma developed, 'Der Gedanke, dass es sich hier doch um wirkliche Geschichte und lebendige Persönlichkeiten handele, verflüchtigte sich allmählich ganz'.²⁹

Weidel's conclusions re-surfaced in a modified form in the work of Martin Dibelius. According to Dibelius, the early Christians interpreted the life of Jesus through a *Schriftbeweis* drawn from the Jewish scriptures. This began with the simple postulate of the post-Easter faith: 'Daß auch das Leiden Jesu nach Gottes Willen geschehen sei'.³⁰ This led to the hermeneutical presupposition of early Christian exegesis that 'Gottes Willen mußte in der Schrift zu finden sein'.³¹ Thus, the early Christians began to tell the life of Jesus using the language of the Jewish scriptures. Like Weidel, Dibelius sees no better example of this than the creative use of the Psalms

²⁴ See Johannes Weiss, *Die Drei Älteren Evangelien* (2nd ed.; Die Schriften des NT 1; Göttingen, 1907) esp. 46; Friedrich K. Feigels, *Der Einfluß des Weissagungsbeweises und anderer Motive auf die Leidensgeschichte* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1910).

²⁵ Karl Weidel, 'Studien über den Einfluss des Weissagungsbeweises auf die evangelische Geschichte', *TSK* 83 (1910): 83-109, 163-195; *TSK* 85 (1912): 167-286.

²⁶ Weidel, 'Studien über den Einfluss', 83.169.

²⁷ Weidel, 'Studien über den Einfluss', 83.194.

²⁸ Weidel, 'Studien über den Einfluss', 85.289.

²⁹ Weidel, 'Studien über den Einfluss', 83.194.

³⁰ Martin Dibelius, *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1919; 6th ed, 1966) 185.

³¹ Dibelius, *Die Formgeschichte*, 185.

in the Markan Passion Narrative. Indeed, one can hear echoes of Weidel in Dibelius' conclusion: 'Man las die Leidenskapitel des Alten Testaments als massgebende Quelle für die Leidengeschichte'.³²

These studies, however, offer little more than provisional comments on the compositional use of the Jewish scriptures in the Gospel of Mark. The purpose of scriptural details in the narrative of the Gospel is always expositional: it is to demonstrate prophetic-fulfilment (a *Weissagungs-* or *Schriftbeweis*). There is virtually no attempt to place the Markan use of scriptural material in a Second Temple context. Strauss, for example, simply notes that early Christian exegesis was indistinguishable from contemporary Jewish exegesis, with the sole exception of Jesus, 'weil der Verstand in jenen Männern durch die Denkart ihres Volks beschränkt war'.³³ Nevertheless, these studies serve as an introduction to both the expositional and compositional approaches to the use of the Jewish scriptures in the Gospel.

During the same period, British scholarship was pre-occupied with the *testimony hypothesis* of J. Rendel Harris.³⁴ The argument, briefly put, was that there existed a written collection of proof-texts drawn from the Jewish scriptures which was used by the early Christians. Proof of this was seen in the recurrence of peculiar readings, sequences of testimonies and misattributions in early Christian literature.³⁵ The goal of scholarship was thus concerned with re-constructing these lost testimonia. Perhaps as a result, only one English-language study on the use of the Jewish scriptures

³² Dibelius, *Die Formgeschichte*, 188; cf. Weidel, 'Studien über den Einfluss', 85.289. Dibelius' view was developed further by Christian Maurer, who distinguishes between a *Schriftbeweis* 'de verbo' and 'de facto'—the former characterized by the fulfilment formulae of Matthew, whilst the latter is best seen in the embedded scriptural details in the Markan Passion Narrative. Thus, where historical details were lacking, Mark or his source used the Jewish scriptures to compose details in the Passion of Jesus: 'So haben wir sehr damit zu rechnen, dass ganze Perikopen der Passionsgeschichte durch den Schriftbeweis nicht nur geformt, sondern auch geschaffen sind, sofern nicht historische Tatsachen dahinterestehen mögen', Maurer, 'Knecht Gottes und Sohn Gottes im Passionsberichte des Markusevangeliums', *ZTK* 50 (1953): 1-38 (10). Suhl, however, roundly criticizes Maurer for his insistence on the formative role of Deutero-Isaiah in the Passion Narrative, see *Die Funktion der alttestamentlichen Zitate*, 58, 114-120.

³³ Strauss, *Das Leben Jesu* (4th ed.; Tübingen: Osiander, 1840) 1.180.

³⁴ J. Rendel Harris, *Testimonies* (2 vols.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1916-1920). For its influence on British scholarship, see R. Hodgson Jr., 'The Testimony Hypothesis', *JBL* 98 (1979): 361-378.

³⁵ Harris, *Testimonies*, 1.8. The testimony hypothesis was effectively put to rest by the criticisms of Dodd and Stendahl; Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, esp. 126; Krister Stendahl, *The School of St. Matthew and Its Use of the Old Testament* (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1968) 216-217. The discovery of 4QTest and 4QFlor, however, has led some to re-evaluate the claim, see J. A. Fitzmyer, "'4Q Testimonia" and the New Testament' in *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament* (SBS 5; Missoula: Scholars, 1974) 59-89.

in the Gospel of Mark emerged from the period before Dodd. In his *A Study in Mark*, Austin Farrer notes that whilst ‘St Mark does not quote the Old Testament much’, he is nonetheless ‘nourished by the substance of it, and so perfectly assimilates it that he can write it into the matter of his own sentence’.³⁶ In composing his portrait of Jesus, Mark was guided by the belief that ‘All that men had been or done had prefigured Christ, and all they had prefigured, Christ did and was’.³⁷ Thus, Jesus was typologically modelled on figures from the Jewish scriptures. These types included Moses, David, Saul and—significantly for Farrer—Elisha. Farrer was perhaps the first to note the extensive parallels between the Elijah-Elisha cycle (1 Kgs 17-2 Kgs 13) and the Gospel of Mark.³⁸ But Farrer offers little by way of argument for his proposed typologies, so that his study verges on what Dale Allison calls ‘Typologicalmania’.³⁹ At the same time, Farrer appears uninterested in the use scriptural typology in other works of the Second Temple period. Although Farrer’s study has been eclipsed by the more influential study of Dodd, its significance is two-fold: it both foreshadows the excesses of later compositional studies whilst anticipating the focus on the Elijah-Elisha cycle and its relevance to the Gospel of Mark.

The ‘Dodd Camp’: The 1950s to the 1980s

The publication of C. H. Dodd’s *According to the Scriptures* in 1952 ushered in a new era of research into the role of the scriptures in the Gospels. Against Harris’ testimony hypothesis, Dodd argues that the shared features of early Christian exegesis owe their form to the kerygma of the earliest period: a ‘common tradition’ of testimonia, governed by the concept of prophetic fulfilment, and preserved through oral tradition.⁴⁰ In Dodd’s words, the early Christians were ‘committed . . . to a formidable task of biblical research, primarily for the purpose of clarifying its own understanding of the momentous events out of which it had emerged’.⁴¹ By examining

³⁶ Austin Farrer, *A Study in Mark* (London: A&C Black, 1951) 321.

³⁷ Farrer, *A Study in Mark*, 185.

³⁸ Farrer sees the use of 1 Kgs 17:17-24 and 2 Kgs 4:18-37 in Mk 5:21-43; 7:25-29; 9:17-29; 2 Kgs 5 in Mk 1:40-45; 2 Kgs 13:21 in Mk 2:1-12. See *A Study in Mark*, 15-18, 47-52, 91-92.

³⁹ Dale C. Allison Jr., *The New Moses: A Matthean Typology* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1993) 18.

⁴⁰ Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, 29.

⁴¹ Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, 14.

passages cited by ‘two or more writers of the New Testament in *prima facie* independence of one another’, Dodd identifies three major scriptural themes common to all early Christian literature which were seen to have their fulfilment in the person of Jesus:⁴² ‘Apocalyptic-eschatological Scriptures’, ‘Scriptures of the New Israel’ and ‘Scriptures of the Servant of the Lord and the Righteous Sufferer’.⁴³ The fulfilment of these themes in the person of Jesus can be found in ‘all main portions of the New Testament’ and as such, should be regarded as the ‘substructure of all Christian theology’.⁴⁴ Unlike Strauss and Weidel, Dodd operates with the conviction that the early Christians paid careful attention to the original literary context of a given citation, remaining ‘true to the main intention of their writers’.⁴⁵ Whilst he allows for a ‘fringe of questionable, arbitrary or even fanciful exegesis’, Dodd concludes that the early Christian use of the Jewish scriptures was ‘consistent and intelligent in itself’ and ‘founded upon a genuinely historical understanding of the process of the religious— [Dodd] should prefer to say the prophetic—history of Israel as a whole’.⁴⁶

Dodd’s approach of examining the expositional significance of broad scriptural themes was continued the following decade in the *New Testament Apologetic* of Barnabas Lindars. Lindars traces so-called ‘shifts in application’ in the early Christian use of the Jewish scriptures. He thus proposes several stages in which the early Christians developed their thematic approach to the scriptures in response to apologetic concerns, beginning with the defence of Jesus’ resurrection and culminating in the prophetic-fulfilment schema of messianic exegesis.⁴⁷ Lindars compares this to what he calls the ‘midrash pesher’ of Qumran, on which basis he concludes that the apparent arbitrariness of Christian exegesis was ‘nothing morally reprehensible’.⁴⁸ Indeed, Lindars follows Dodd in insisting that the early Christians were generally faithful to the original context from which a citation was drawn.⁴⁹ At the same time, the early Christians did not compose details to reflect scriptural

⁴² Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, 28-29.

⁴³ Along with the miscellaneous ‘Unclassified Scriptures’, *According to the Scriptures*, 62-108.

⁴⁴ Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, 127.

⁴⁵ Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, 130.

⁴⁶ Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, 133.

⁴⁷ Barnabas Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic: The Doctrinal Significance of Old Testament Quotations* (London: SCM, 1961) 186.

⁴⁸ Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic*, 27-28.

⁴⁹ Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic*, 14.

material, *pace* Weidel and Dibelius. Rather, it was the ‘astonishingly accurate’ similarities between the scriptures and the ‘facts’ of Jesus’ life that led the early Christians to see events like the Passion of Jesus through a scriptural lens.⁵⁰ Often it was Jesus himself who was responsible for the application of scriptural passages to his person—for example, Lindars believes it was Jesus’ own use of the ‘suffering servant’ theme in Isa 53 that set in motion a ‘doctrine of the Atonement’.⁵¹

The expositional approach of identifying broad scriptural themes developed by Dodd and Lindars influenced a few important studies in the two following generations of scholarship. These include Ulrich Mauser’s study, which argues for the existence of an established ‘wilderness’ (ἔρημος) theme in the Jewish scriptures, which in turn became the thematic basis for the Gospel of Mark, beginning in Mk 1:2-3.⁵² Thus the ‘wilderness’ theme was the ‘string on which the beads of tradition . . . were assembled’.⁵³ The study of Hans-Jörg Steichele likewise focuses on the scriptural theme of suffering in the Markan portrayal of John the Baptist (Mk 1:1-8; 9:9-13), Jesus’ Baptism and Transfiguration (1:9-11; 9:2-8) and Crucifixion (15:20b-41).⁵⁴ By focusing on Mark’s development of this theme, Steichele hoped to uncover ‘ihr Beitrag zum besonderen mk Bekenntnis zu Jesus als dem “Sohn Gottes”’.⁵⁵ In view of this, Steichele concludes that Mark’s use of the scriptural theme of suffering contributes to the depiction of Jesus as ‘der alles erfüllende Sohn Gottes’.⁵⁶ Douglas Moo’s study of the use of the Jewish scriptures in the Passion Narratives focuses on the thematic application of the Isaianic ‘Servant Songs’ and the ‘Psalms of Lament’ to the suffering of Jesus.⁵⁷ Here, one finds many echoes of Dodd and Lindars. Moo insists that the early Christians were not involved in the ‘fabrication of incidents on the basis of Scriptures’.⁵⁸ Rather, the influence proceeded from ‘history to the text rather than vice

⁵⁰ Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic*, 33-34, 91 (34).

⁵¹ Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic*, 79, see discussion in 78-79, 89.

⁵² Ulrich W. Mauser, *Christ in the Wilderness: The Wilderness Theme in the Second Gospel and its Basis in the Biblical Tradition* (SBT 39; Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 1963).

⁵³ Mauser, *Christ in the Wilderness*, 101-102. Here, Mauser is building on a saying popularized by Karl L. Schmidt, *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu* (Berlin: Trowitzsch und Sohn, 1919).

⁵⁴ Hans-Jörg Steichele, *Der leidende Sohn Gottes: Eine Untersuchung einiger alttestamentlicher Motive in der Christologie des Markusevangeliums* (BU 14; Regensburg: Pustet, 1980).

⁵⁵ Steichele, *Der leidende Sohn Gottes*, 40.

⁵⁶ Steichele, *Der leidende Sohn Gottes*, 273.

⁵⁷ Douglas J. Moo, *The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives* (Sheffield: Almond Press, 1983) 360.

⁵⁸ Moo, *The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives*, 380.

versa’, so that the scriptural content of the Passion Narrative was for the most part generated by the ‘correspondence of prophecy with the facts’.⁵⁹ At the same time, the original literary context of a citation or allusion is deemed to be extremely important for the Gospel writers: ‘[it] can unhesitatingly be asserted that Jesus and the evangelists have shown a remarkable faithfulness to the original context in their appropriation of OT verses to interpret the passion’.⁶⁰ And, along with Lindars, Moo is (conveniently) able to find shades of reformed dogmatics in Jesus’s own interpretation of his death using Isa 53, implying the ‘efficacy [of his] vicarious, redemptive suffering’⁶¹—which was ‘voluntary, sacrificial, [and] substitutionary’.⁶²

The ‘Suhl Camp’: The 1960s to the 1980s

As the influence of Dodd and Lindars grew in English-speaking scholarship, the first continental monograph devoted exclusively to the use of the Jewish scriptures in the Gospel of Mark offered a markedly different approach. Reflecting the new interests of the *redaktionsgeschichte Schule*, the 1965 study of Alfred Suhl was the first attempt to examine every citation of, and allusion to, scriptural material in the Gospel, beginning with the Passion Narrative and then the Markan dialogues. Suhl contends that, unlike Matthew and Luke, Mark did not subsume his scriptural material into a ‘Schema von Weissagung und Erfüllung’.⁶³ This belonged to a later stage of exegesis.⁶⁴ Instead, Mark simply told his story in the ‘colours’ of the Jewish scriptures to demonstrate that the life of Jesus happened in accordance with the will of God—as the earliest kerygma put it, κατὰ τὰς γραφάς (1 Cor 15:3-4).⁶⁵ Thus, ‘Indem nam das

⁵⁹ Moo, *The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives*, 380-381; quoting Dodd, *The Apostolic Preaching and its Development* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1936) 53.

⁶⁰ Moo, *The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives*, 376-377.

⁶¹ Moo, *The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives*, 170.

⁶² Moo, *The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives*, 397.

⁶³ Suhl, *Die Funktion der alttestamentlichen Zitate*, 44-45.

⁶⁴ Following his teacher Willi Marxsen, Suhl holds that the Markan community was primarily concerned with the immanence of the parousia. As such, they had little interest in *Heilsgeschichte*—only with the delay of the parousia did the early Christians try to situate Jesus’ place within salvation history. See Suhl, *Die Funktion der alttestamentlichen Zitate*, 169-186; Willi Marxsen, *Der Evangelist Markus: Studien zur Redaktionsgeschichte des Evangeliums* (FRLANT 49; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1959) esp. 89.

⁶⁵ Suhl, *Die Funktion der alttestamentlichen Zitate*, 45, 65, 157-158. Suhl appears to be building on Dibelius, *Die Formgeschichte*, 185.

Neue in den »Farben« des Alten erzählte, machte man deutlich, daß es auch im Neuen um dasselbe wie im Alten, nämlich um Gottes Heilshandeln ging'.⁶⁶

For Suhl, this process was ad hoc and showed little concern for the original context from which a citation or allusion was drawn. Rather, it was the Markan context that governed everything: 'der notfalls auch gegen den ursprünglichen Sinn der Schrift diese für sich in Anspruch nimmt'.⁶⁷ Suhl criticizes earlier studies for making too much of a 'bloßer Gleichklang einzelner Begriffe'—a mere consonance of concepts or words.⁶⁸ For Suhl, an allusion to the Jewish scriptures should not be posited unless 'eine ganze Folge Wörtern die Anspielung evident macht oder die syntaktisch auffallende oder gar störende Stellung einzelner Wörter ihren besonderen Charakter schon anzeigt'.⁶⁹ This minimalist approach offers a fresh alternative to the broad, often impressionistic categories proposed by Dodd and his successors.⁷⁰ Nevertheless, the rigidity of Suhl's rejection of a Markan prophetic-fulfilment schema has won few adherents. Suhl is often dismissed with little more than a cursory reference to the critical review of Erich Grässer.⁷¹ As Grässer notes, it is difficult to see the formulae in Mk 1:2, 7:6, 14:21 and 14:49 as anything other than some sort of prophetic-fulfilment.⁷² The effectiveness of this critique, however, has led to the unjust neglect of this important work. Suhl's most interesting contribution to scholarship—the idea that Mark composed in the 'colours' of the Jewish scriptures—is scarcely discussed outside of the work of South African scholar Willem Vorster.

⁶⁶ Suhl, *Die Funktion der alttestamentlichen Zitate*, 47.

⁶⁷ Suhl, *Die Funktion der alttestamentlichen Zitate*, 47.

⁶⁸ Suhl, *Die Funktion der alttestamentlichen Zitate*, 127.

⁶⁹ Suhl, *Die Funktion der alttestamentlichen Zitate*, 127.

⁷⁰ Howard Clark Kee criticizes Suhl's approach for failing to take into account more allusive uses of scriptural material. See his influential article 'The Function of Scriptural Quotations and Allusions in Mark 11-16' in *Festschrift für Werner Georg Kümmel* (eds. Erich Grässer and E. Earle Ellis; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975) 165-188; as well as the comments in *Community of the New Age: Studies in Mark's Gospel* (London: SCM Press, 1977) 45-49.

⁷¹ See Joel Marcus, *The Way of the Lord: Christological Exegesis of the Old Testament in the Gospel of Mark* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1992) 2-3; Rikki E. Watts, *Isaiah's New Exodus* (WUNT 2/88; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997) 17; cf. the longer discussions in Thomas R. Hatina, *In Search of a Context: The Function of Scripture in Mark's Narrative* (JSNTSupp 232; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002) 27-28; Steichele, *Der leidende Sohn Gottes*, 33, who notes that Grässer's review is not entirely negative. Whilst Suhl is often seen to exemplify the excesses of the *redaktionsgeschichte Schule*, this is much better seen in the brief study of Siegfried Schulz, 'Markus und das Alte Testament', *ZTK* 58 (1961): 184-197, which builds on the work of Wilhelm Brandt, *Die Evangelische Geschichte und der Ursprung des Christentums auf Grund einer Kritik der Berichte über das Leiden und die Auferstehung Jesu* (Leipzig: Reisland, 1893).

⁷² Grässer, 'Review of A. Suhl, *Die Funktion der alttestamentlichen Zitate und Anspielungen im Markusevangelium*', *TLZ* 91 (1966): 667-669.

In two brief articles, Vorster makes the case that Mark tells his Gospel in the ‘language of the Old Testament’, not as an external source, but as part of the narrative itself.⁷³ Again, this process was atomistic—citations and allusions were drawn without ‘direct reference to their Old Testament context(s)’. In this, Mark was simply ‘a child of his time’.⁷⁴ Building on Suhl’s suggestion, Vorster begins to sketch out a compositional approach to the question: ‘One of the inferences one should make from the use of the Old Testament in the Gospel of Mark is that the author created a new story with the aid of intertextual codes that helped him to communicate his own point of view’.⁷⁵ The author creatively weaved together the Jewish scriptures and inherited traditions, and ‘by doing this Mark created a new text from other texts, traces of which can be seen in his text’.⁷⁶ Sadly, Vorster passed away before he was able to explore this further. What he was nevertheless able to see was the seeds of a compositional approach to Mark’s use of the Jewish scriptures in the work of Suhl.

The influence of Suhl can also be observed in two other works from the same period. Hugh Anderson echoes Suhl by noting that whilst Mark was ‘liberally sprinkled with references to the Old Testament’, in comparison to Matthew and Luke, there was a ‘low incidence’ of *πληροῦν* phrases.⁷⁷ For Anderson, this signals that Mark does not use scriptural material to demonstrate prophetic-fulfilment, but simply to show how Jesus conformed to the ‘will of God witnessed to in Scripture’.⁷⁸ Suhl likewise appears to have influenced Donald Juel’s study *Messianic Exegesis*.⁷⁹ For Juel, the early Christian use of the Jewish scriptures began with the early kerygmatic assumption found in 1 Cor 15:3-4: the life and death of Jesus happened ‘in accordance with the scriptures’. This, in turn, led to a ‘highly artful, even fanciful, history of

⁷³ Willem S. Vorster, ‘The Function of the Use of the Old Testament in Mark’, *Neotestamentica* 14 (1980): 62-72 (66); also ‘The Production of the Gospel of Mark: Essay on Intertextuality’, *HTS* 49 (1993): 385-396.

⁷⁴ Vorster, ‘The Function of the Use of the Old Testament’, 67.

⁷⁵ Vorster, ‘The Production of the Gospel of Mark’, 392.

⁷⁶ Vorster, ‘The Production of the Gospel of Mark’, 394.

⁷⁷ Hugh Anderson, ‘The Old Testament in Mark’s Gospel’ in *The Use of the Old Testament in the New and Other Essays: Studies in Honor of William Franklin Stinespring* (ed. J. M. Efird; Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1972), 280-306 (281).

⁷⁸ Anderson, ‘The Old Testament in Mark’s Gospel’, 297; compare with Suhl, *Die Funktion der alttestamentlichen Zitate*, 45, 65, 157-158.

⁷⁹ Donald Juel, *Messianic Exegesis: Christological Interpretation of the Old Testament in Early Christianity* (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1988).

interpretation'.⁸⁰ The early Christians, like their contemporaries in Qumran, viewed the scriptures as 'collections of sacred sentences and words, whose meaning were not bound to an immediate historical or literary context . . . ancient exegetes were interested in uniting the world of text with their own'.⁸¹ Everything in the scriptures was interpreted through the person of Jesus and everything about Jesus was told using the scriptures.⁸² Thus, the life of Jesus was not 'told as a recitation of facts'⁸³—rather, early Christian exegesis moved from 'explanation to heightening the dramatic to the creation of legends that sometimes [became] part of the exegetical tradition'.⁸⁴ But Juel, like Suhl and Vorster before him, does not push this idea further. In the final analysis, the most enduring legacy of the 'Suhl camp' is its skepticism towards schemas of prophetic fulfilment and thematic frameworks in the Gospel as well as its insistence on the atomistic nature of Markan exegesis. However, its most important contribution lies in two unresolved questions: by composing in the 'colours' of the Jewish scriptures, was Mark involved in the 'creation of legends'—that is, the invention of new material in the life of Jesus on the basis of the scriptures? At the same time, can this process be observed elsewhere in the literature of the Second Temple period?

The 'Dodd Camp' Continued: the 1990s to the Present

The 1990s saw a return to Dodd's thematic approach. The 1992 publication of Joel Marcus' *The Way of the Lord* brought the question of Mark's use of the Jewish scriptures to the forefront of Markan scholarship. Marcus sets out to examine the Christological titles used in the Gospel—Christ, Son of David, Son of Man and Son of God—through the use of the Jewish scriptures.⁸⁵ He identifies the composite scriptural citation (Exod 23:20; Mal 3:1; Isa 40:3) attributed to Isaiah in the Markan

⁸⁰ Juel, *Messianic Exegesis*, 13.

⁸¹ Juel, *Messianic Exegesis*, 15.

⁸² Juel, *Messianic Exegesis*, 56-57.

⁸³ Juel, *Messianic Exegesis*, 113.

⁸⁴ Juel, *Messianic Exegesis*, 40.

⁸⁵ This is done through a selection of passages: Mk 1:2-3,9-11; 9:2-8,11-13; 12:10-11,35-37; chs. 14-15 (Marcus, *The Way of the Lord*, 8).

prologue as the hermeneutical key to interpreting the Gospel.⁸⁶ The citation introduces the Isaianic theme of the ‘way’ (ὁδός), through which Mark presents the ‘entire story’ of the Gospel as the ‘fulfilment of the prophecy of holy war victory announced by the prophet Isaiah’.⁸⁷ Again, the original literary context of the Isaianic passage plays a part in the interpretation of the narrative, as it evokes the theme of the ‘second exodus’ as well as the ‘wilderness, the way of the Lord, the enlightening of the blind, [and] the festal procession to Jerusalem’.⁸⁸ By focusing primarily on ‘citation formulas (“as it has been written,” etc.) and/or [passages] that contain significant overlaps in vocabulary with Old Testament text’, Marcus avoids some of the pitfalls of older thematic studies. At the same time, he brings the Markan use of scriptural material into an extensive dialogue with other Second Temple literature. Whether one is persuaded by Marcus’ claim that the misattributed citation in Mk 1:2-3 provides the thematic framework for the whole Gospel, his study offers a plausible case that follows a careful methodology and is thoroughly grounded in the exegesis of the Second Temple period.

By drawing attention to Mark’s use of Isaiah, Marcus prepared the way for the subsequent generation of scholarship.⁸⁹ His work was shortly followed by Richard Schneck’s study of Isaiah in the first half of the Gospel.⁹⁰ Whilst Schneck does not think ‘any NT author would ever attempt to use the Isaian corpus as a model or paradigm to be copied in composing a new writing for the first century CE’, he nevertheless continues Marcus’ thematic approach.⁹¹ Schneck identifies repeated thematic links between Isaiah and Mk 1-8. Again, this is best illustrated in the *Stichwort* citation of Mk 1:2-3: the passages are linked by the statement ‘prepare the way’, which introduces the theme of the exodus, which in turn evokes a much larger

⁸⁶ Marcus, *The Way of the Lord*, 17. Here, Marcus is building on Frank J. Matera, ‘The Prologue as the Interpretative Key to Mark’s Gospel’, *JSNT* 34 (1988): 3-20.

⁸⁷ Marcus, *The Way of the Lord*, 196.

⁸⁸ Marcus, *The Way of the Lord*, 24-26, 46. Marcus sees this contextual approach as indicative of the Markan hermeneutical method, ‘The conjuring up of the larger context of a passage through the citation of a specific verse or two is, as we have seen, a consistent Markan practice, and this practice corresponds to a method of citation found in rabbinic literature’ (199-200).

⁸⁹ On the other end of the spectrum, see Morna Hooker’s influential study questioning the influence of the Isaianic ‘servant songs’, especially in Mark, *Jesus and the Servant: The Influence of the Servant Concept of Deutero-Isaiah in the New Testament* (London: SPCK, 1959); also in her brief article, ‘Mark’ in *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture: Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars, SSF* (eds. D. A. Carson and Hugh G. M. Williamson; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988) 220-230.

⁹⁰ Richard Schneck, *Isaiah in the Gospel of Mark, I-VIII* (BIBALDS 1; Vallejo: BIBAL, 1994).

⁹¹ Schneck, *Isaiah in the Gospel of Mark*, 3.

Isaianic context.⁹² As with other studies in the Dodd mould, Schneck's identification of shared 'theological themes' between two or more passages often appears arbitrary and self-fulfilling. To his credit, Schneck seems aware of this: 'We are really moving from biblical exegesis into the area of biblical theology'.⁹³

The focus on Isaiah is continued in Rikki Watts' *Isaiah's New Exodus and Mark*, which, though independent of Marcus, in some ways presents an intensification of his thesis.⁹⁴ For Watts, Isaiah's 'New Exodus' theme is the 'conceptual framework' for the whole Gospel.⁹⁵ Once again, this is introduced in the opening citation, which, 'as part of the heading [is] programmatic for the prologue and therefore the whole Gospel'.⁹⁶ From here, Mark builds on the 'three-fold structure' of the Isaianic New Exodus: the deliverance of the exiles, the way out of captivity and the triumphal arrival in Jerusalem.⁹⁷ Watts painstakingly details the many ways that Mark's scriptural citations, allusions and motifs can be seen to fit this thematic framework. Thus, he concludes—one suspects by design—that 'the Gospel's basic literary structure is consistent with the [Isaianic New Exodus] schema'.⁹⁸

The turn of the millennium has seen a burgeoning interest in the use of the Jewish scriptures in early Christian writings, spurred on in large part by the influential study of Richard Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*.⁹⁹ Regarding this increase, David Allen has commented that the study of the 'Old Testament in the New'

⁹² Schneck, *Isaiah in the Gospel of Mark*, 31-32, 34-35, 41-42, 246.

⁹³ Schneck, *Isaiah in the Gospel of Mark*, 124.

⁹⁴ The work is a revision of Watts' 1990 doctoral thesis at Cambridge University, thus preceding the 1992 publication of *The Way of the Lord* (see Watts, *Isaiah's New Exodus*, v).

⁹⁵ Watts, *Isaiah's New Exodus*, 370. Mark recognized in Isaiah the 'prophetic transformation of the past Exodus into the future hope of the [New Exodus]' (380-381).

⁹⁶ Watts, *Isaiah's New Exodus*, 56.

⁹⁷ Watts, *Isaiah's New Exodus*, 135.

⁹⁸ Watts, *Isaiah's New Exodus*, 371.

⁹⁹ Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1989). The Haysian approach is most commonly seen in published dissertations: Sylvia C. Keesmaat, *Paul and His Story: (re)interpreting the Exodus Tradition* (JSNTSupp 181; Edinburgh: A&C Black, 1999); Kelly D. Liebengood, *The Eschatology of 1 Peter: Considering the Influence of Zechariah 9-14* (SNTSMS 157; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014); Sarah Harris, *The Davidic Shepherd King in the Lukan Narrative* (LNTS 558; London: Bloomsbury, 2016); with some modifications in Christopher Beetham, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letter of Paul to the Colossians* (BibInt 96; Leiden: Brill, 2008); Kelli S. O'Brien, *The Use of Scripture in the Markan Passion Narrative* (LNTS 384; London: T&T Clark, 2010); the Haysian approach has also been applied to the Jewish scriptures, see Yohan Pyeon, *You Have Not Spoken What is Right About Me: Intertextuality and the Book of Job* (SBL 45; New York, NY: Lang, 2003).

(as it is often called) is now widely ‘viewed as a *specialism*’ and should be regarded as a new sub-discipline within New Testament studies.¹⁰⁰ The sheer number of doctoral dissertations published in this area has led one scholar to liken it to ‘a mechanized production line, with its own methodology and theological agendas’.¹⁰¹ But the division between Dodd and Suhl is still palpable. This can be illustrated in two millennial studies on the use of the Jewish scriptures in the Gospel of Mark—one from the beginning of the period, and one more recent.

Thomas Hatina’s 2002 monograph *In Search of a Context* offers a marked contrast to the Isaianic studies of the 1990s.¹⁰² For Hatina, Mark’s ‘ideological point of view’ may be found in the proclamation of the kingdom in Mk 1:14-15 and not in the Isaianic opening citation of Mk 1:2-3.¹⁰³ Thus, Mark interprets the Jewish scriptures through the prism of the ‘realization of the kingdom of God’ in the person of Jesus and the Markan community.¹⁰⁴ This can be seen in the ethical ‘way’ of the kingdom introduced by the citation in Mk 1:2-3 as well as the use of scriptural material in the various conflicts with those outside of the kingdom (i.e. Mk 4:11-12; 7:6-7; 11:9; 13:24-27). Though Hatina is critical of Suhl, and engages in a thematic study reminiscent of Dodd, he nevertheless follows Suhl in his insistence on the atomistic nature of Markan exegesis.¹⁰⁵ He singles out Marcus for ‘forcing too much of the context of the scriptural passage into the Markan context’.¹⁰⁶ This stems from a failure to realize that ‘atomistic exegesis [was] the norm in early Jewish interpretation’.¹⁰⁷ By noting the supreme role of the Markan context, Hatina is able to provide a model for

¹⁰⁰ David M. Allen, ‘Introduction: The Study of the Use of the Old Testament in the New’, *JSNT* 38 (2015): 3-16 (4). Likewise in the same volume of *JSNT* devoted to the ‘OT in the NT’, Leroy A. Huizenga comments, ‘The study of “the Old Testament in the New Testament” has become an effective sub-discipline within biblical scholarship, with interest generated both by tradition descriptive historical-critical concerns regarding issues behind the text . . . literary and theoretical interest in how texts function within the system of textuality and culture . . . and more normative and prescriptive theological and ecclesial interests’ (‘The Old Testament in the New, Intertextuality and Allegory’, *JSNT* 38 [2015]: 17-35 [17]).

¹⁰¹ Paul Foster, ‘Echoes without Resonance: Critiquing Certain Aspects of Recent Scholarly Trends in the Study of the Jewish Scriptures in the New Testament’, *JSNT* 38 (2015): 96-111 (98).

¹⁰² See Hatina, *In Search of a Context*, 1-4.

¹⁰³ *Pace* Marcus, Schneck and Watts.

¹⁰⁴ Hatina, *In Search of a Context*, 90-92, 376.

¹⁰⁵ See his evaluation of Suhl, *In Search of a Context*, 25-28. Commenting on Moo, Hatina notes, ‘Seeking to explain the use of Scripture within a thematic framework provides a solid beginning in any enquiry on the function of allusions and quotations’ (37).

¹⁰⁶ Hatina, *In Search of a Context*, 42.

¹⁰⁷ Hatina, *In Search of a Context*, 42, for support cites Juel, ‘Review of Joel Marcus, *The Way of the Lord*’, *JBL* 114 (1995): 147-150.

understanding the use of the Jewish scriptures that is sensitive to Mark's narrative and its historical setting. Whilst Hatina does not entirely avoid the procrustean issues inherent to thematic studies, there is surely some truth to his overly broad claim, that 'all the quotations and allusions in Mark contribute in some way to Jesus' announcement, demonstration and establishment of the kingdom of God'.¹⁰⁸

On the other side is the more typical approach of Richard Hays' 2016 study *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels*.¹⁰⁹ Following his ground-breaking work on the Jewish scriptures in the Pauline epistles, Hays turns his hand to the Gospels, devoting the first chapter to the Gospel of Mark. For Hays, Mark's use of the Jewish scriptures is understood through the parabolic disclaimer in Mk 4:21-25, which serves as the 'hermeneutical directive for the Gospel as a whole'.¹¹⁰ This means that Mark's use of scripture is both parabolic and elliptical, repeatedly gesturing 'toward wider contexts and implications that remain not quite overtly stated'.¹¹¹ Again, this is perhaps best seen in the (Hays thinks intentionally) misattributed citation of Exod 23:20, Mal 3:1 and Isa 40:3 in Mk 1:2-3. Following Watts, Hays contends that 'Mark's use of the Isaiah ascription here signals that the conceptual framework for his Gospel is the Isaianic new exodus'.¹¹² The conflated citation thus alludes to the larger contexts of each passage: the new exodus of Isaiah, the entry into the promised land of Exodus and the impending judgment of Malachi.¹¹³ Building on this approach, Hays proposes a labyrinth of quotations, allusions and echoes, some barely perceptible in the text and offered with no argument except the refrain, 'If anyone has ears to hear, let him hear'.¹¹⁴ There is a convenience to this logic—say, if one is unpersuaded by Hays' assertion that the presence of a single word *παρελθεῖν* in Mk 6:48 identifies Jesus as the 'God of Israel', the fault must lie with the reader's deficient hearing and not Hays' argument.¹¹⁵ Indeed, Hays does little to conceal his theological motivations in

¹⁰⁸ Hatina, *In Search of a Context*, 376.

¹⁰⁹ Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2016).

¹¹⁰ Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels*, 101.

¹¹¹ Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels*, 16. Hays call this technique 'metalepsis' (11), following its use by John Hollander, *The Figure of Echo: A Mode of Allusion in Milton and After* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1981) 65.

¹¹² Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels*, 21.

¹¹³ Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels*, 20-23.

¹¹⁴ See Hays' method in *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels*, 23-24, 48-50, 52-53, 58, 69, 102.

¹¹⁵ Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels*, 72. This results from Hays' decision to interpret *παρελθεῖν* exclusively in relation to LXX Exod 33:17-23 (34:6), despite the fact the word occurs over a hundred times in the Septuagint.

repeatedly making this claim—that Mark presents Jesus as ‘both the God of Israel and a human being not simply identical with the God of Israel’¹¹⁶—at one point bidding the attentive reader to go searching for clues of Jesus’ divinity: ‘Such attentiveness will not go unrewarded’.¹¹⁷

But if Hays appears to be inserting his theological will into the text, the same cannot be said for the early Christians. Echoing Dodd and Lindars, Hays insists that the early Christians were not guilty of ‘consciously manipulating snippets of preexisting traditions to craft their own clever imaginative fictions’.¹¹⁸ Rather, they merely listened to the words of ‘Israel’s Scripture’, which, with ‘its own voice’, revealed the person of Jesus through an organic process of “‘dialectical,” rather than “‘heuristic” intertextuality’.¹¹⁹ The Gospel writers thus ‘patiently insist that it was precisely the actual teaching and actions of Jesus that lived in the community’s memory and subsequently catalyzed a retrospective recognition of unforeseen, divinely scripted, figural linkages with Israel’s scripture’.¹²⁰ This reiterates a claim made by Hays in an earlier work, that the early Christians unintentionally found in the Jewish scriptures an ‘unexpected *foreshadowing* of the later story’ of Jesus.¹²¹ That this both assumes the scriptural character of Jesus’ life and the Christian character of the Jewish scriptures should seem obvious. In the final analysis, Hays argues in a circle: he begins with the assumption that ‘Israel’s Scripture prefigures and illuminates the central character in the Gospel stories’ and ends in much the same place.¹²² What Hays has presented is thus a meticulously detailed and beautifully-written work of *biblical theology*—labouring under the confessional presuppositions of Christian orthodoxy. A work of historical criticism it is not.¹²³ For Hays, the early Christians were right to find Jesus in ‘Israel’s Scripture’ because he was, in some sense, already

¹¹⁶ Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels*, 78. Hays writes that whilst Mark ‘shies away from overt ontological declarations’ (62), his presentation of Jesus as the God of Israel maintains a ‘distinction of roles and persons’ (77).

¹¹⁷ Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels*, 69.

¹¹⁸ Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels*, 7.

¹¹⁹ Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels*, 8, referencing *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*, 176-177.

¹²⁰ Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels*, 360.

¹²¹ Hays, *Reading Backwards: Figural Christology and the Fourfold Gospel Witness* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2014) 94, emphasis original.

¹²² Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels*, 7; cf. 347-366, esp. 358-365.

¹²³ Despite Hays’ claim to the contrary, *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels*, 6-7; compare with the theological discussion on 363-366.

there—variations of which claim can be found in the works of Dodd, Lindars and Moo.¹²⁴

This illustrates a problem inherent in studies of the ‘Old Testament in the New’—namely, where does historical criticism end and biblical theology begin? The terminology of the ‘Old Testament’ already implies an ontological relationship with the ‘New’, along with anachronistic canonical boundaries and a Christian theology of prophetic-fulfilment and abrogation. So it can often seem as if scholars see as much or as little of the Jewish scriptures in the Gospel of Mark as their (often confessional) assumptions will allow. Those who follow Dodd in identifying broad scriptural themes and hermeneutical keys are capable of finding traces of them everywhere in the Gospel. These same scholars tend to believe the original literary context of a citation or allusion is the key to its interpretation, so that the Gospel alludes to a much larger body of scriptural material than is ever referenced in the text itself. Scholars who, like Suhl, are more skeptical of overarching frameworks tend to view Mark’s use of the Jewish scriptures as ad hoc and atomistic, but offer little information beyond that. Both camps agree that their main task is identifying ‘citations’ or ‘allusions’ or ‘echoes’ drawn from the Jewish scriptures in order to determine their significance for the interpretation of the Gospel. Using Dimant’s terminology, they have focused almost exclusively on the expositional use of scriptural material in the Gospel of Mark. This has led to countless discussions concerning the exegetical significance of the citation in Mk 1:2-3. Less theologically satisfying examples—like the use of Esther in Mk 6:23—have failed to command the same attention, and are usually omitted from the discussion altogether. One can sympathize with Willem Vorster’s frustration some thirty years ago: ‘Certain data beliefs and assumptions concerning the Gospel have become so dominant that very little progress has been made in the history of interpretation’.¹²⁵ He goes on, ‘We still do not know exactly how [Mark] went about creating his story of Jesus—that is, how he made his Gospel’.¹²⁶

¹²⁴ Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, 130-133; Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic*, 33-34; Moo, *The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives*, 380-381.

¹²⁵ Vorster, ‘The Production of the Gospel of Mark’, 386.

¹²⁶ Vorster, ‘The Production of the Gospel of Mark’, 390.

Compositional Approaches to the Use of the Jewish Scriptures in the Gospel of Mark

The question of whether Mark used the Jewish scriptures to compose his Gospel has, however, been taken up by a few authors. That Mark composed his Gospel to parallel scripture readings from early Jewish and Christian liturgies has been argued in one form or another by Philip Carrington, Michael Goulder and at greatest length by John Bowman.¹²⁷ Bowman seeks to explain ‘How and why the Gospel as a literary form came about’.¹²⁸ For Bowman, the answer is liturgical: a haggadic interpretation of the Exodus narrative ‘provided the pattern not merely for the Last Supper, but for the whole of Mark’s Gospel form’.¹²⁹ Thus Mark composed a ‘New Exodus Haggadah’, reflecting the liturgical practices of his day, which was ‘parallel to the course of the first Exodus story’.¹³⁰ This explains the absence of prophetic-fulfilment formulae in the Gospel¹³¹—in its use of scriptural material, the Gospel is closer to the ‘haggadic midrash’ of later Jewish literature.¹³² Whilst Bowman and his peers can be credited with attempting to situate Mark’s use of the Jewish scriptures firmly within a Second Temple context, virtually no information regarding liturgical practices from the period survives to corroborate the conclusions. It can often seem as if the hypothetical liturgical practices proposed by scholars take the form of whatever is being discussed. How these scholars would go about proving the opposite—that Matthew *did not* compose his Gospel on the basis of the Jewish lectionary (as Goulder), or that Mark *did not* pattern his Gospel after the Passover Haggadah (as Bowman)—is not at all clear. One suspects the arguments preclude falsification.

Bowman’s discussion of midrash leads to the second major compositional approach to the use of the Jewish scriptures in the Gospel. Following the application

¹²⁷ Philip Carrington, *The Primitive Christian Calendar: A Study in the Making of the Marcan Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1952); *According to Mark: A Running Commentary on the Oldest Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960); Michael D. Goulder, *Midrash and Lection in Matthew* (London: SPCK, 1974); *The Evangelist’s Calendar: A Lectionary Explanation of the Development of Scripture* (London: SPCK, 1978); John Bowman, *The Gospel of Mark: The New Christian Jewish Passover Haggadah* (SPB 8; Leiden: Brill, 1965).

¹²⁸ Bowman, *The Gospel of Mark*, 311.

¹²⁹ Bowman, *The Gospel of Mark*, xiv.

¹³⁰ Bowman, *The Gospel of Mark*, 111.

¹³¹ Bowman, *The Gospel of Mark*, 18-19, 25.

¹³² Bowman, *The Gospel of Mark*, 36-43, esp. 43.

of the term to the Gospels by John Drury and Michael Goulder in the 1970s, the following decade saw a spate of studies attempt to understand the Gospel of Mark as a sort of ‘midrash’.¹³³ J. Duncan M. Derrett proposed that the Gospel is a ‘gigantic midrash on scripture’.¹³⁴ The whole work is framed by its use of Lamentations, Canticles and 1 Samuel, whilst Mk 1-12 parallels Exodus, Numbers and Joshua.¹³⁵ Derrett’s methodology seems to consist of little more than the call-and-response, ‘Can that also be found in Lamentations? Indeed it can’.¹³⁶ This ad hoc approach leads to more than a few confusing claims, such as that John the Baptist is both Balaam and an Egyptian whilst the Gerasene demoniac is Amalek, or that the Transfiguration is ‘an attempt to link the dynamic interpretation of Lamentations with the Hexateuchal theme of the conquest of the Land’.¹³⁷ Derrett’s eccentric approach is continued in the study of Dale and Patricia Miller, which argues that the Gospel is ‘essentially midrashic’, so that every single pericope can be traced back to a ‘midrashic source’.¹³⁸ Thus, Mark composed a ‘life-of-Jesus narrative’ out of a ‘mass of details from the Jewish sacred literature’.¹³⁹ The midrashic sources for the Gospel are so named: ‘James/Jacob, 1 John, 1 Peter, Romans, 1-2 Corinthians, Galatians, Hebrews, the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, the Wisdom of Solomon, and 1-2 Maccabees, in addition to the entire canonical Jewish Bible’.¹⁴⁰ Again, this yields perplexing results, such as the claim that Peter warming himself by the fire is a midrash on 1 Pet 1:7 or that the tearing of the temple curtain is a midrash on Heb 9:3 and *T. Lev.* 10:3.¹⁴¹ But perhaps the most problematic aspect of these two studies is their uncritical use of the term midrash.¹⁴²

¹³³ John Drury, ‘Midrash and Gospel’, *Theology* 77 (1974): 291-296; Goulder, *Midrash and Lection in Matthew*.

¹³⁴ J. Duncan M. Derrett, *The Making of Mark: The Scriptural Bases of the Earliest Gospel* (Shipston-on-Stour; P. Drinkwater, 1985) 38.

¹³⁵ Derrett, *The Making of Mark*, 24. Derrett refuses to engage with any scholarship because Markan scholars ‘care nothing about Joshua, Lamentations, and Canticles’ (4).

¹³⁶ Derrett, *The Making of Mark*, 237.

¹³⁷ Derrett, *The Making of Mark*, 46-47, 52-54, 101-102 (113).

¹³⁸ Dale Miller and Patricia Miller, *The Gospel of Mark as Midrash on Earlier Jewish and New Testament Literature* (SBEC 21; Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen, 1990) 385.

¹³⁹ Miller and Miller, *The Gospel of Mark as Midrash*, 27.

¹⁴⁰ Miller and Miller, *The Gospel of Mark as Midrash*, 386.

¹⁴¹ Miller and Miller, *The Gospel of Mark as Midrash*, 353, 365. This freewheeling methodology is on full display in the following statement: ‘Mark is likely to have assumed that Paul was referring to 1 Peter’s midrashic paraphrase of Isa 53’ (216).

¹⁴² See Philip Alexander’s influential critique of Goulder, ‘Rabbinic Judaism and the New Testament’, *ZNW* 74 (1983): 237-246; ‘Midrash and the Gospels’ in *Synoptic Studies: The Ampleforth Conferences of 1982 and 1983* (ed. Christopher M. Tuckett; JSNTSupp 7; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984) 1-18.

The Gospel of Mark bears little resemblance to any text that can be confidently identified as ‘midrash’—a contested term usually reserved for rabbinic exegesis in the form of lemmata followed by commentary like the *Genesis Rabbah* or the *Mekhilta de-Rabbi Ishmael*.¹⁴³ What these scholars mean by ‘midrash’, however, appears to be nothing more than a creative use of scriptural material.¹⁴⁴

A more restrained ‘midrashic’ approach can be found in Wolfgang Roth’s *Hebrew Gospel*.¹⁴⁵ For Roth, the Gospel of Mark follows the ‘scriptural model’ of 1 Kgs 17-2 Kgs 13.¹⁴⁶ Roth notes that Jesus’ sojourn in the wilderness and his call of the disciples in Mk 1:12-20 resembles Elijah’s sojourn in the wilderness and his call of Elisha in 1 Kgs 19:4-21. He also notes the similarity of Jesus’ feeding of the multitudes in Mk 6:35-44 and 8:1-9 with Elisha’s feeding of the multitude in 2 Kgs 4:42-44. More general similarities are noted between the healing miracles of Elijah, Elisha and Jesus.¹⁴⁷ A guiding assumption for Roth is that Mark identifies Jesus as Elisha to John’s Elijah.¹⁴⁸ As Elisha surpassed Elijah’s miracles by eight, so Jesus surpasses Elisha’s miracles by eight.¹⁴⁹ To reach this number, Roth must operate under a generous definition of miracle—the cleansing of the temple and the tearing of the curtain are counted as miracles of Jesus—whilst multiple miracles are enumerated as one (i.e. Mk 5:21-43).¹⁵⁰ Whilst some of Roth’s parallels fail to convince, he nevertheless makes a compelling case that Mark used incidents from the Elijah-Elisha cycle to model episodes in the Gospel. Roth wonders whether this should be compared to haggadic midrash or the Greco-Roman practice of literary imitation—opting instead for a poetic understanding of the Gospel as ‘patterned storytelling’ on 1 Kgs 17-2 Kgs

¹⁴³ On the contested nature of the term in recent scholarship, see Carol Bakhos, ‘Method(ological) Matters in the Study of Midrash’ in *Current Trends in the Study of Midrash* (ed. Bakhos; JSJSupp 106; Leiden: Brill, 2006) 161-188. On distinctive forms of rabbinic midrash, see Günter Stemberger, *Midrasch: Vom Umgang der Rabbinen mit der Bibel. Einführung – Texte – Erläuterungen* (Munich: Beck, 2002) 22-23.

¹⁴⁴ This criticism may also apply to the more recent article by Robert M. Price, ‘New Testament Narrative as Old Testament Midrash’ in *Encyclopedia of Midrash: Biblical Interpretation in Formative Judaism* (ed. Jacob Neusner; 2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 2005) 1.534-574.

¹⁴⁵ Wolfgang Roth, *Hebrew Gospel: Cracking the Code of Mark* (Oak Park, IL: Meyer-Stone Books, 1988).

¹⁴⁶ Roth, *Hebrew Gospel*, xi.

¹⁴⁷ Mk 5:21-43; 7:24-30; cf. 1 Kgs 17:17-24; 2 Kgs 4:18-37 (Roth, *Hebrew Gospel*, 5-7).

¹⁴⁸ Roth, *Hebrew Gospel*, 2 and *passim*.

¹⁴⁹ Roth, *Hebrew Gospel*, 16.

¹⁵⁰ Roth, *Hebrew Gospel*, 4-7, 16.

13.¹⁵¹ But by invoking the *imitatio* of Roman writers, Roth introduces the third compositional approach to the use of the Jewish scriptures in the Gospel.

Following his supervisor Thomas Brodie, Adam Winn argues that Mark modelled his Gospel on the Jewish scriptures using the Greco-Roman practice of *mimesis* or *imitatio*.¹⁵² Just as Virgil used the Homeric corpus when composing the *Aeneid*, so Mark used the Elijah-Elisha cycle of 1 and 2 Kings to compose episodes in his life of Jesus.¹⁵³ ‘The methods of imitation and adaption used by Virgil in his composition of the *Aeneid* existed and were known in the ancient world at the time of Mark’s composition’, so that ‘[Mark] likely would have been aware of the method of Virgilian imitation that is found in it’.¹⁵⁴ A mimetic relationship can be detected when a later text features complex structural similarities as well as specific details found in an antecedent text.¹⁵⁵ Winn notes how the burial of Misenus (*Aen.* 6.156-325) is modelled on the burial of Elpenor (*Od.* 11.75), as they follow the same narrative structure—mourning, the cutting of logs for the pyre, the burning of bodies and the erection of a tomb—whilst including specific details like the setting by the sea and the oar to mark the grave.¹⁵⁶ Like Roth, Winn finds a mimetic relationship between Jesus’ sojourn in the wilderness and the call of the disciples (Mk 1:12-20) and Elijah’s sojourn in the wilderness and the call of Elisha (1 Kgs 19:4-21) as well as the feeding of the multitudes by Jesus (Mk 6:30-44; 8:1-10) and Elisha (2 Kgs 4:42-44). Not quite as strong are his arguments for a literary relationship between Jesus’ healing of a leper (Mk 1:40-45) and Elisha’s healing of Naaman’s leprosy (2 Kgs 5:1-19), Jesus’

¹⁵¹ Roth, *Hebrew Gospel*, 123.

¹⁵² Adam Winn, *Mark and the Elijah-Elisha Narrative: Considering the Practice of Greco-Roman Imitation in the Search for Markan Source Material* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2010). Winn builds on the work of Thomas L. Brodie, *The Crucial Bridge: the Elijah-Elisha Narrative as an Interpretive Synthesis of Genesis-Kings and a Literary Model for the Gospels* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 2000); and the mimetic approach of Dennis R. MacDonald, *The Homeric Epics and the Gospel of Mark* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2000).

¹⁵³ Winn, *Mark and the Elijah-Elisha Narrative*, 10. Similar observations have been made by Bas M. F. van Iersel, *Mark: A Reader-Response Commentary* (trans. W. H. Bisscheroux; JSNTSupp 164; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998) 65-67; and more recently by Heikke Omerzu, ‘Geschichte durch Geschichten. Zur Bedeutung jüdischer Traditionen für die Jesusdarstellung des Markusevangeliums’, *Early Christianity 2* (2011): 77-99, esp. 84-88.

¹⁵⁴ Winn, *Mark and the Elijah-Elisha Narrative*, 12.

¹⁵⁵ Winn, *Mark and the Elijah-Elisha Narrative*, 31-33. It may include the conflation of two or more stories as an imitative model, the reversal or diffusion (into multiple episodes) of the imitative model, the omission or alteration of certain details to fit the new narrative context, as well as the intensification of the imitative model (29-30).

¹⁵⁶ Winn, *Mark and the Elijah-Elisha Narrative*, 31-32.

conversation with the Syrophoenician woman (Mk 7:24-30) and Elijah's conversation with the widow of Zarephath (1 Kgs 17:7-16) and Jesus' three passion predictions and Peter's three denials (Mk 8:31-32; 9:31-32; 10:33-34; 14:66-72) and Elijah's three ascension predictions and Elisha's three affirmations of faith (2 Kgs 2:1-12).¹⁵⁷

Winn ultimately succeeds in his task, as he puts it, 'demonstrating the existence of a significant literary relationship between Mark's gospel and the Elijah-Elisha narrative'.¹⁵⁸ But unlike previous studies, Winn does not posit that Mark's use of the Elijah-Elisha cycle provides the 'interpretive key' for understanding the Gospel. He cautions that 'one must be careful in correlating a narrative's source material with a narrative's meaning or significance'.¹⁵⁹ The author of a work may not intend the reader to pick up on its use of source material or for that material to play a role in the interpretation of the new work. Rather, the material may 'simply serve as a pattern for constructing a new narrative or perhaps as a quarry from which to draw narrative building blocks'.¹⁶⁰ What Winn offers is a compositional approach, one which examines the way that Mark uses the Jewish scriptures to model new episodes and provide narrative details in a manner consistent with other texts in antiquity. One wonders, however, if there is not a literary analogy closer to Mark's orbit than Virgilian mimesis—that is, works which also take the Jewish scriptures as their compositional model.

Scripturalization as a Compositional Approach

Mark Goodacre notes that scholarship continues to be divided over the role of the Jewish scriptures in the Passion Narrative.¹⁶¹ On the one hand, scholars agree that the Passion Narrative is full of language drawn from the Jewish scriptures. But on the other hand, there is profound disagreement as to how much of the narrative originates

¹⁵⁷ See Winn, *Mark and the Elijah-Elisha Narrative*, 72-112.

¹⁵⁸ Winn, *Mark and the Elijah-Elisha Narrative*, 117.

¹⁵⁹ Winn, *Mark and the Elijah-Elisha Narrative*, 117.

¹⁶⁰ Winn, *Mark and the Elijah-Elisha Narrative*, 118.

¹⁶¹ Mark Goodacre, 'Scripturalization in Mark's Crucifixion Narrative' in *The Trial and Death of Jesus: Essays on the Passion Narrative in Mark* (eds. Geert van Oyen and Thomas Shepherd; Leuven: Peeters, 2006) 33-47; 'Prophecy Historicized or Tradition Scripturalized? Reflections on the Origins of the Passion Narrative' in *The New Testament and the Church: Essays in Honour of John Muddiman* (eds. John Barton and Peter Groves; LNTS 532; London: T&T Clark, 2016) 37-51.

from history and how much originates from scriptural reflection. Dominic Crossan characterizes this disagreement as between those who think the Passion Narrative is ‘history remembered’ and those—more critical scholars, like himself—who think it is ‘prophecy historicized’.¹⁶² Goodacre finds Crossan’s binary too severe. Perhaps instead there was ‘from the beginning . . . an intimate interaction between historical event and scriptural reflection, so that the tradition developed in light of Old Testament languages and models’.¹⁶³ Goodacre suggests this process ‘might be described, to utilize an illuminating term from Hebrew Bible scholarship, as *scripturalization*’. So, in place of the cumbersome ‘history remembered’ and ‘prophecy historicized’, Goodacre offers an alternative: ‘tradition scripturalized’.¹⁶⁴

Scripturalization refers to the work of Judith Newman.¹⁶⁵ Following the compositional use of scriptural elements identified by Dimant, Newman proposes ‘scripturalization’ as one way the Jewish scriptures were used to compose prayers in the Second Temple period. She defines it as ‘the reuse of biblical texts or interpretive traditions to shape the composition of new literature . . . the observable recontextualization of identifiable scriptural language’.¹⁶⁶ As such, it encompasses ‘clear references to biblical stories’, as well as ‘biblical wording without regard to its source’, which may serve ‘simply to provide a biblical “ring” to the composition’.¹⁶⁷ This distinguishes it from other uses of scriptural material such as the inner-biblical exegesis proposed by Michael Fishbane since the ‘reuse of scripture does not necessarily entail the presumed author’s *conscious* interpretation of scripture’, though it need not preclude it.¹⁶⁸ In her work, Newman focuses on three scripturalized prayers: Neh 9:5-37; Jdt 9:2-14; 3 Macc 2:2-20. These texts together show the scriptural development of prayer from the post-exilic era through the Second Temple era, with

¹⁶² John Dominic Crossan, *The Birth of Christianity: Discovering What Happened in the Years Immediately After the Execution of Jesus* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998) 520-521.

¹⁶³ Goodacre, ‘Prophecy Historicized or Tradition Scripturalized?’, 42.

¹⁶⁴ Goodacre, ‘Scripturalization in Mark’s Crucifixion Narrative’, 41; ‘Prophecy Historicized or Tradition Scripturalized?’, 42.

¹⁶⁵ Newman, *Praying by the Book: The Scripturalization of Prayer in Second Temple Judaism* (EJL 14; Atlanta, GA: Scholars, 1999).

¹⁶⁶ Newman, *Praying by the Book*, 12-13.

¹⁶⁷ Newman, *Praying by the Book*, 13-14.

¹⁶⁸ Newman, *Praying by the Book*, 13; cf. the ‘taxemic form’ of aggadic exegesis in Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1985) 430.

the compositional use of scriptural material eventually becoming ‘an unquestioned literary convention’ in later Jewish and Christian liturgies.¹⁶⁹

The phenomenon of scripturalization may also describe the reuse of scriptural material in other kinds of literature. These include the scripturalized laws of the *Damascus Document* and the *Community Rule*, the scripturalized hymns of the *Hodayot* and the *Psalms of Solomon* and the scripturalized apocalyptic of *1 Enoch* and *4 Ezra*. Scripturalization may also extend to narrative literature like the Gospel of Mark. Some of the previous studies noted how Mark weaves inexplicit but identifiable scriptural language into the fabric of the narrative. This can be seen in the unmarked use of scriptural language in isolated details like the darkness at noon in Mk 15:33—from Amos 8:9—or the offer of ‘sour wine’ to Jesus in Mk 15:36—from Ps 69:21. It can also be seen in episodes which seem to follow a scriptural model, like the forty-day sojourn of Jesus in the wilderness and the call of the disciples (Mk 1:12-20) and that of Elijah (1 Kgs 19:4-21), or the feeding of the multitudes by Jesus (Mk 6:35-44; 8:1-9) and Elisha (2 Kgs 4:42-44). May these all be considered examples of scripturalized narrative?

Identifying Scripturalization

For Goodacre, scripturalization has the potential to describe how the early community couched the historical events of Jesus’ life in the language of the Jewish scriptures.¹⁷⁰ But this analysis can go one step further: scripturalization may also describe the way that Mark as an author used scriptural material to compose and model episodes in his life of Jesus, creating scripturalized narrative. The likelihood that Mark used the Jewish scriptures this way depends in large part on whether this practice can be identified in other works from the period. If it can be shown across a diverse group of texts that the Jewish scriptures were used to compose new narrative, then it may be appropriate to speak of scripturalized narrative as a stylistic feature of Second Temple literature. As such, this study will be divided into two parts: the first part will look at episodes drawn from five works dating to the Second Temple period which use the

¹⁶⁹ Newman, *Praying by the Book*, 206.

¹⁷⁰ Goodacre, ‘Scripturalization in Mark’s Crucifixion Narrative’, 40, 46; ‘Prophecy Historicized or Tradition Scripturalized?’, 42-44.

Jewish scriptures to compose new material. Special attention will be paid to how these texts use scriptural material to model new episodes and insert scriptural language into a narrative. Against the backdrop of these texts, the second part will examine five episodes in the Gospel of Mark where a scriptural model is evident or scriptural language appears as part of the narrative. Together, these two parts aim to show how the compositional use of the Jewish scriptures in the Second Temple period illuminates Mark's narrative use of scriptural material. And finally, returning to Crossan's dilemma, the postscript will consider what scripturalization means for the historical origins of the Gospel.

But how does one identify scripturalized narrative? The criteria offered by scholars for identifying scriptural allusions or echoes tend to focus on material of an expositional nature.¹⁷¹ The influential criteria offered by Hays, for example, ask whether a proposed echo thematically coheres with the work and contributes to the 'argument' developed by its author.¹⁷² For narrative texts, this limits the discussion to allusions and echoes which seek to interpret an event or support an argument—an external voice brought into dialogue with the new work. It does not cover identifiable scriptural language which contributes little to the meaning of the work, like the words of Ahasuerus on the lips of Herod Antipas, 'even half of my kingdom' (Mk 6:23). A thoroughgoing compositional approach is necessary to identify scriptural language and models that are embedded into the fabric of a new text. Here, Dale Allison's comments on identifying scriptural typology may be useful.

Allison begins by outlining six forms of typological allusion. First, a text may typologically allude to another through 'explicit statement', that is a 'straightforward comparison' between events or figures (*x* is like *y*).¹⁷³ Whilst this is closer to Dimant's expositional use of scriptural material, the other kinds of typological allusion would fall under the compositional use. These include 'inexplicit citation or borrowing' where a text is 'dug up and translated without acknowledgement', 'similar circumstances' where an event recalls 'another circumstantially like it', 'key words or phrases' where 'one may dress up a story with the words of another that is like it and

¹⁷¹ See the survey of criteria in Samuel Emadi, 'Intertextuality in New Testament Scholarship: Significance, Criteria, and the Art of Intertextual Reading', *CBR* 14 (2015): 8-23.

¹⁷² Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*, 29-33.

¹⁷³ Allison, *The New Moses*, 19.

well known’, ‘similar narrative structure’ where one story is modelled on another and ‘word order, syllabic sequence, poetic resonance’ where a text imitates the style of another.¹⁷⁴ The difference between scripturalization and typology lies in its purpose. Allison uses typology to describe the extended assimilation of Jesus with Moses in the Gospel of Matthew with which the author drapes ‘the Messiah in the familiar mantle of Moses’.¹⁷⁵ Scripturalization, on the other hand, is less comprehensive. It is simply the use of a scriptural model or language, drawn from any number of sources, to aid the composition of a new work. Nevertheless, Allison’s criteria for assessing typology may be used to identify scripturalization.

As a matter of common sense, Allison acknowledges that a ‘text can only allude to or intentionally recall another prior to it in time’.¹⁷⁶ At the same time, the proposed source must belong ‘to a book or tradition which held some significance for its author’.¹⁷⁷ From here Allison proposes four criteria specific to typology: there must be a confluence of similar vocabulary and circumstances, the type must be prominent and easily identifiable in the source, the type must have been used in the composition of other works and it must include unusual and uncommon features unlikely to have come from anywhere else.¹⁷⁸ With some modifications, these criteria can be adapted to the study of scripturalization. The identification of scripturalized narrative thus requires *a confluence of similar language and narrative details* that is best explained by positing a literary relationship. The proposed source must be *easily identifiable within its original literary context*—this study will focus primarily on self-contained episodes of a similar length. Any analysis of a scripturalized narrative must show that *similar compositional techniques can be identified elsewhere*—within the same work as well as in others. This is especially relevant if different texts use the same scriptural material to compose narrative. That Mark composed new narrative out of scriptural material will thus appear all the more likely if the practice can be observed elsewhere—and it is to this question that the study will now turn.

¹⁷⁴ Allison, *The New Moses*, 19-20.

¹⁷⁵ Allison, *The New Moses*, 277; also 13.

¹⁷⁶ Allison, *The New Moses*, 21.

¹⁷⁷ Allison, *The New Moses*, 21-22.

¹⁷⁸ Allison, *The New Moses*, 22-23.

CHAPTER 2

SCRIPTURALIZATION IN THE LITERATURE OF THE SECOND TEMPLE PERIOD

The following chapter surveys five works from the Second Temple period that use the Jewish scriptures to shape the composition of new narratives (*scripturalized narrative*). Examples will be considered episodically—self-contained narratives where one or more scriptural source is clearly and repeatedly drawn upon to supply narrative details or shape the structure of the story. The first section is devoted to three episodes taken from the *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*—which, more than any other text of the period, freely re-uses scriptural material in narrative contexts. Following this I examine the compositional use of the Jewish scriptures in individual episodes taken from the *Genesis Apocryphon*, 1 Maccabees, Judith and the *Testament of Abraham*. The five texts cover the three languages of literary composition in Jewish antiquity—Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek—as well as encompassing multiple genres and divergent perspectives, from the dynastic propaganda of 1 Maccabees to the cosmopolitan universalism of the *Testament of Abraham*. These texts by no means exhaust the relevant material from the period, but if similar compositional techniques can be identified across such variegated texts, it might be appropriate to consider scripturalized narrative a stylistic feature of Second Temple literature.

The *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*

It may not be possible to recover every single allusion to or quotation from the Jewish scriptures in the *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*. The cross-references in Harrington's *OTP* translation are exhaustive, but do not distinguish between different types of scriptural use or varying degrees of verbal/formal correspondence.¹⁷⁹ The list

¹⁷⁹ Daniel J. Harrington, 'Pseudo-Philo' in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: Volume Two: Expansions of the "Old Testament" and Legends, Wisdom and Philosophical Literature, Prayers,*

proposed by Lange and Weigold, in their otherwise helpful volume, overlooks a number of parallels, as their methodology does not take into account the unique difficulties posed by the text.¹⁸⁰ The problem is that whilst *LAB* survives in twenty-one partial or complete Latin manuscripts, numerous features appear to be the result of both Hebrew and Greek stages of production.¹⁸¹ Most have followed Cohn in supposing that the ‘style, the expressions, and the method of statement bear an entirely Hebrew character’, thus indicating a Hebrew *vorlage*.¹⁸² However, as Feldman notes, the presence of Hebraisms and affinities with targumic tradition does not preclude a Greek original.¹⁸³ That said, the strongest argument in favour of a Hebrew *vorlage* pertains not to style, but to unusual phrases and words that are best explained by a misreading of an underlying Hebrew text.¹⁸⁴ This is most evident in instances where the Hebrew *vav* appears to have been mistakenly included as part of a name, as with *Visui* (8:13; וישי in Gen 46:17) and *Gedru Messe* (4:9; גתר ומש in Gen 10:23). To this can be added a few cumbersome phrases and seemingly out-of-place verbs that can be easily explained as misread Hebrew words or phrases.¹⁸⁵

Psalms, and Odes, Fragments of Lost Judeo-Hellenistic Works (ed. James H. Charlesworth; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1983) 304-377.

¹⁸⁰ Armin Lange and Matthias Weigold, *Biblical Quotations and Allusions in Second Temple Jewish Literature* (JAJSupp 5; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011) 236-239; for methodology, see 17-19.

¹⁸¹ See the detailed survey of mss. in Harrington, ‘Text and Biblical Text in Pseudo-Philo’s *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*’ (unpublished PhD diss.; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, 1969) 20-24.

¹⁸² Leopold Cohn, ‘An Apocryphal Work Ascribed to Philo of Alexandria’, *JQR* 10 (1898): 311-313, cited at 311. For those following Cohn, see M. R. James, *The Biblical Antiquities of Philo* (TED 1; London: SPCK, 1917; repr. New York, NY: Ktav, 1971) 28-29; Harrington, ‘The Original Language of Pseudo-Philo’s “*Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*”’, *HTR* 63 (1970): 503-514; Charles Perrot, Pierre-Maurice Bogaert and Harrington, *Pseudo-Philon: Les Antiquités Bibliques: Tome II: Introduction Littéraire, Commentaire et Index* (SC 230; Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1976) 75-77; Howard Jacobson, *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo’s Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum: With Latin Text & English Translation* (2 vols.; AGAJU 31; Leiden: Brill, 1996) 1.215-222, see also Jacobson’s discussion on the transmission and translation of the text, 1.257-277; Cf. Louis H. Feldman, ‘Prolegomenon’, in James, *Biblical Antiquities*, xxv-xxvii.

¹⁸³ Feldman, ‘Prolegomenon’, xxvi.

¹⁸⁴ Large portions of *LAB* re-appear in the medieval Hebrew *Chronicles of Jerahmeel*, which for Moses Gaster represents the original Hebrew text of *LAB*, *The Chronicles of Jerahmeel Or, the Hebrew Bible Historiale* (OTFNS 4; London: 1899; repr. New York, NY: Ktav 1971) xxx-xxxix. For agreements between *LAB* and *CJ*, see Harrington, *The Hebrew Fragments of Pseudo-Philo’s Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum Preserved in the Chronicles of Jerahmeel* (TAT 3; Pseudepigrapha Series 3; Missoula, MT: SBL, 1974).

¹⁸⁵ See the list in Jacobson, *Commentary*, 1.217-221. The possibility of an Aramaic original has been raised by Alexander Zeron, ‘Erwägungen zu Pseudo-Philos Quellen und Zeit’, *JSJ* 11 (1980): 38-52; cf. the more judicious comments in Harrington, ‘Text and Biblical Text’, 85-87; and Jacobson, *Commentary*, 1.221f.

But other peculiarities suggest a Greek layer behind the surviving Latin text. Some words appear to be the result of misreading or mistranslation, as in 18:13 where Μαδιαμ is rendered *Mazia*, or 62:8 where *Ionatha* follows the Greek vocative Ιωναθα instead of the indeclinable nominative *Ionathas*.¹⁸⁶ Other words appear to be transliterated from Greek to Latin, i.e. παραθήκην to *paratecem* (3:10), ὠμοτοκεία to *ometocean* (9:2) or ἀντικείμενος to *anteciminum* (45:6).¹⁸⁷ The simplest explanation for this is that the Latin text depends on a Greek translation of a Hebrew original. This is complicated, however, by several instances where *LAB* appears to favour readings adopted by the LXX text over the MT. Examples can be found in the genealogies (i.e. *LAB* 1:2-22; LXX Gen 5:4-32; cf. MT Gen 5:4-32), in names (i.e. Tubal in *LAB* 2:9; LXX and VL Gen 4:22; instead of Tubal-Cain in MT Gen 4:22; cf. *Jub.* 9:11; 1QapGen 12:12), in the placing of the commandments concerning murder and adultery (*LAB* 11:10-11; LXX Exod 20:13,15; cf. MT Exod 20:13-14) and in narrative details, like the role of angels in the giving of the law (*LAB* 11:5; 30:5; cf. LXX Deut 33:2).¹⁸⁸ But, as Feldman notes, *LAB* sometimes agrees with the LXX, sometimes with the MT and sometimes with neither.¹⁸⁹ It is unclear whether this is the result of a version of the LXX or VL being consulted at some stage of production or translation or perhaps a regional variation of the Hebrew text underlying the original.¹⁹⁰ All of this is further complicated by the fact that *LAB* favours paraphrastic quotations. The cumulative effect of these issues is that whilst *LAB* may quote from and allude to the Jewish scriptures more widely than any other text of the period, there exists little to no verbatim agreement between it and surviving texts of the Jewish scriptures, making the task of identifying scriptural use unusually difficult.

¹⁸⁶ See James, *Biblical Antiquities*, 254.

¹⁸⁷ See Harrington, 'Original Language', 506-508; Jacobson, *Commentary*, 1.223-224.

¹⁸⁸ Harrington notes that *LAB* also favours readings adopted by the so-called Lucianic recension, esp. 1 Samuel, 'The Biblical Text of Pseudo-Philo's "Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum"', *CBQ* 33 (1971): 1-17, esp. 13-16.

¹⁸⁹ Feldman, 'Prolegomenon', lii.

¹⁹⁰ See the 'Palestinian' text proposed by Harrington, 'The Biblical Text of Pseudo-Philo's "Liber Antiquitatum"', 1-17.

Different Uses of the Jewish Scriptures in LAB

Despite these methodological difficulties, it is possible to speak of two broad categories of scriptural use in *LAB*. To begin with, *LAB* loosely follows the narrative outline of Genesis to 2 Samuel, often reordering, omitting, altering, epitomizing and expanding the source texts—only rarely following them fastidiously. Bruce Fisk helpfully describes the role of the source text(s) in the narrative as *primary scripture*.¹⁹¹ To take one example, chs. 14-19 roughly follow the contents of Numbers. This begins with the census in Num 1 (*LAB* 14:1-4), which leads into the sending of the twelve spies into Canaan (*LAB* 15; Num 13-14), the rebellion of Korah (*LAB* 16; Num 15-16), the budding of Aaron's rod (*LAB* 17; Num 17) and the oracles of Balaam (*LAB* 18; Num 22-24). The section concludes with the death of Moses (*LAB* 19), which borrows details *passim* from Exodus, Numbers and Deuteronomy.

At the same time, *LAB* utilizes material from analogous or unrelated passages from the Jewish scriptures and incorporates them into the *primary scriptural* narrative. Again, Fisk calls this *secondary scripture*.¹⁹² Returning to the retelling of Numbers in *LAB* 14-19, the narrative of the twelve spies borrows one detail from Josh 14:8 (*LAB* 15:1: *contribulaverunt cor populi dicentes*), the genealogy depends on 1 Chronicles (*LAB* 15:3; 1 Chron 2:51; 4:15; 7:20-27) and God's speech alludes to Gen 1:9 (*LAB* 15:6), 15:13 (15:5), Ex 3:8 (15:4) and 14:22 (15:5), whilst using the language of Ps 18:9 (*LAB* 15:6: *inclinavi celos et descendi*; cf. Isa 64:1). *LAB* ties the death of Korah and his men (16:2-3) to the death of Abel (Gen 4:1-16) as well as the fate of the Egyptian army and those during the flood, whilst also alluding to the eschatological fate of the unrighteous and the final renewal of the earth. The budding of Aaron's rod references the rod of Jacob (*LAB* 17:3; Gen 30:37-39) and God's speech to Balaam

¹⁹¹ Bruce N. Fisk, *Do You Not Remember?: Scripture, Story and Exegesis in the Rewritten Bible of Pseudo-Philo* (JSPSupp 37; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001) 14-16, esp. nn. 6-7. This term could also apply to the primary compositional technique in other texts often referred to as 'Rewritten Bible' (i.e. *Jubilees*, 1QapGen).

¹⁹² Fisk defines *secondary scripture* as 'Scripture from other, sometimes distant, contexts [inserted] into the biblical (or traditional) story, in the form of explicit citations (perhaps with fulfilment formulae), unmarked allusions, narrative flashbacks and biblical echoes' (*Do You Not Remember?*, 15). Richard Bauckham calls the technique 'scripture interpreting scripture', see 'The Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum of Pseudo-Philo and the Gospels as "Midrash"', in *Gospel Perspectives: Studies in Midrash and Historiography: Volume III* (eds. R. T. France and David Wenham; Sheffield: JSOT, 1983) 52-57.

alludes to the *Aqedah* (*LAB* 18:5; Gen 22), the Abrahamic covenant (*LAB* 18:5; Gen 18:17; 22:17) and the story of Jacob wrestling the angel (*LAB* 18:6; Gen 32:24-27). Moses' farewell speech utilizes the language of Ps 78:25 (*LAB* 19:5: *panem angelorum manducastis*; cf. LXX Ps 77:25: ἄρτον ἀγγέλων ἔφαγεν) and possibly 1 Kgs 8:46 (*LAB* 19:9: *Quis est enim homo qui tibi non peccavit?*), whilst gesturing the Israelites back to the Noahide covenant (*LAB* 19:11; Gen 9:13,15). The rest of *LAB* continues in a similar manner, loosely following the primary scriptural narrative whilst incorporating details from secondary scriptures—though the final chapters (chs. 52-65) contain fewer references to secondary scriptural material.

LAB also incorporates secondary scriptural material from corresponding passages which refer to the same episode in the primary scriptural narrative.¹⁹³ For example, whilst recounting the crossing of the Red Sea (10:5), it reads, 'God rebuked the sea and the sea was dried up' (*comminatus est Deus mari et siccatum est*), a phrase not found in Exodus 14, but in the description of the same event in Ps 106:9, '[God] rebuked the sea and it became dry' (ויגער בים סוף ויחרב).¹⁹⁴ Elsewhere, the secondary scriptural material is borrowed from analogous contexts. For instance, when God declares that he will destroy 'all the things that grow on the earth (*et omnia que germinata sunt in terra*) in the flood (*LAB* 3:3), the language does not come from Genesis 6, but from the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, where God destroys everything, even 'what grew on the ground' (Gen 19:25c: וצמח האדמה).¹⁹⁵ At the death of Joshua the text reads that he 'drew up his feet into the bed' (*LAB* 24:5: *complicuit pedes suos in lectum*), a phrase lifted from the death of Jacob, who 'drew up his feet into the bed' (Gen 49:33b: ויאסף רגליו אל-המטה). Sometimes the analogous scriptural material appears in a single isolated detail, as when the infant Moses is placed in an

¹⁹³ See the list of techniques proposed by Jacobson, *Commentary*, 1.224-241; Bauckham, 'Pseudo-Philo and the Gospels as "Midrash"', 35-40; also the discussion in Fisk, *Do You Not Remember?*, 16-33.

¹⁹⁴ See Bauckham, 'Pseudo-Philo and the Gospels as "Midrash"', 43-44. The author of *LAB* regularly utilizes the language of the Psalms in the description of the primary narrative, for example, in *LAB* 11:15, which roughly follows Exodus 25, God calls the sanctuary a 'tabernacle of my glory' (*tabernaculum gloriae meae*)—language borrowed from Ps 26:8.

¹⁹⁵ Jacobson notes that the flood and the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah are linked in Lk 17:26-30 (*Commentary*, 1.313).

ark made of pine wood (*LAB* 9:12; not an ark of bulrushes as in Ex 2:3), which appears to owe to the description of Noah's ark in Gen 6:14.¹⁹⁶

LAB also fashions new episodes not found in the primary scriptural narrative out of seemingly unrelated secondary scriptural material.¹⁹⁷ This is done by using one scriptural episode as a model for a new one, or by weaving scriptural language and distinctive narrative details into the story, resulting in a *scripturalized narrative*.

The Compositional Use of the Jewish Scriptures in LAB

The first episode that appears to follow a scriptural model is the episode Abram in the fiery furnace (*LAB* 6). Here, Abram is miraculously delivered unscathed from a fiery furnace after being sentenced to die for refusing to build the tower of Babel. The impetus for the episode appears to be a word-play on אור in Gen 15:7 (cf. 11:28,31), with 'fire' instead of 'Ur'.¹⁹⁸ Thus, God brings Abram quite literally 'out of the *fire* of the Chaldeans'. This was then associated with Gen 11:3, 'They said to each other, "Come, let us make bricks, and burn (שרף) them thoroughly"'. Much else in the narrative—the command to mass idolatry, the refusal of the righteous men, the deaths of the bystanders and the deliverance from the fiery furnace—is modelled on the story of the three youths in the fiery furnace (Dan 3).

The celebration which follows Joshua's erection of the altar at Gilgal (*LAB* 21:7-10) appears to be, as Jacobson observes, 'pieced together from various reports of celebrations in the Bible (2Sam 6, 1Ki 8, 1Chron 15-16)'.¹⁹⁹ Much of the narrative

¹⁹⁶ Jacobson, *Commentary*, 1.423-424. A similar description appears in Pesh. Exod 2:3. Perrot (*Pseudo-Philon*, 2.107) and Jacobson (*Commentary*, 1.424) agree that *pini* originally read as ארז ('cedar'), though disagree as to its origin. Neither one entertains the possibility that this too might come from traditions concerning Genesis: whilst MT 6:14 famously uses the hapax legomenon גפר (the NRSV favours 'cypress'), rabbinic literature sometimes renders this as 'cedar' (Ar. קדרוס from Gk. κέδρος in *Tg. Onq.* on Gen 6:14; ארז in *Midr. Tanh.* B *Noach* 5:6).

¹⁹⁷ Jacobson provides a helpful, though incomplete, list of examples, *Commentary*, 1.231-233, which I build on here. Bauckham considers many of these examples under the heading 'Interpreting Scripture by Scripture' ('Pseudo-Philo and the Gospels as "Midrash"', 40-59).

¹⁹⁸ This is made clear in the paraphrase of Gen 15:7 in *LAB* 23:5, though the exact phrase *Ur Chaldæorum* (Vg. Gen 11:28,31; 15:7) does not appear in *LAB* (cf. 6:18, *lingua Chaldæorum*). This word-play is expanded upon in rabbinic traditions concerning the death of Haran (Gen 11:28) in fire (אור) and the delivery of Abram (Gen 15:7) out of fire (אור), see *Gen. Rab.* 34:9; 38:13; 44:13; *Tg. Ps.-J.* on Gen 11:28; 15:7; *PRE* 26 188; *Pesiq. Rab.* 33:4; *Cant. Rab.* 1:56; *b. Erub.* 53a; *b. Pesah.* 118a; *Tg. Est.* 1 on Est. 5:14; *Tg. 2 Chron.* 28:3; *Midr. Teh.* 118:5; and the much later *Yashar* 12:1-43.

¹⁹⁹ Jacobson, *Commentary*, 1.232; again at 2.689.

concerning the judge Kenaz (*LAB* 25-28)—all of which is unique to *LAB*—appears to be modelled on the punishment of Achan (Josh 7) and Gideon’s defeat of the Midianites (Judg 7). The following account of the judge Zebul (*LAB* 29)—again, unique to *LAB*—is created out of the inheritance of the daughters of Zelophehad (Num 36), the conquests of Joshua (Josh 15:45-47) and the establishment of the treasury (Josh 6:19-24; cf. Exod 35:4-29).

The episode recounting the assassination of Sisera appears to model Jael on the figure of Judith (*LAB* 31:7; cf. Jdt 13:7,9) whilst the figure of Aod the Midianite magician has been created out of the description of the false prophet in Deut 13:1-4 (*LAB* 34; cf. Judg 6:1). The narrative of Jair and the fiery furnace (*LAB* 38) again originates in a word-play, this time on Judg 10:5, ‘Jair died, and was buried *in Kamon* (בַּקְמוֹן)’. Here, the inclusion of the furnace probably owes to the place-name Kamon (קָמוֹן) being read as the Aramaic or Greek for ‘furnace’ (קָמוֹן/κάμινος). Otherwise, the narrative of seven righteous men thrown into a furnace for refusing to worship Baal only to be rescued by an angel is modelled on Dan 3. The description of Phinehas (*LAB* 48:1) dwelling on a mountain, nourished by an eagle, controlling the rains and ascending to heaven appears to be based on Elijah (1 Kgs 17; 2 Kgs 2; Mal 4:5)—though here the implication is that Phinehas should be identified with Elijah (cf. *Judg. Rab.* 16:1).²⁰⁰

Excursus: Midrash or Scripturalization?

Whilst commentators have described the above episodes as ‘midrash’ or ‘midrashic’, it is not clear how useful these terms are for understanding a work like *LAB*.²⁰¹ Recent scholarship has been hesitant to apply these terms to pre-rabbinic

²⁰⁰ So Robert Hayward, ‘Phinehas—the Same is Elijah: The Origins of a Tradition’, *JJS* 29 (1978): 22-34.

²⁰¹ Used in relation to *LAB* in Cohn, ‘An Apocryphal Work’, 314, 322; Feldman, ‘Prolegomenon’, ix; Renée Bloch, ‘Écriture et traditions dans le judaïsme – Aperçus sur l’origine du Midrash’, *CS* 8 (1954): 29; Geza Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies* (SPB; Leiden: Brill, 1961) 88-90; Perrot, *Pseudo-Philon*, 22.22-28, esp. 27; Gary G. Porton, ‘Defining Midrash’, in *The Study of Ancient Judaism* (ed. Jacob Neusner; New York, NY: Ktav, 1981) 72; Michael Wadsworth, ‘Making and Interpreting Scripture’, in *Ways of Reading the Bible* (ed. Wadsworth; Sussex: Harvester, 1981) 7-22. For critical comments on the usefulness of midrash for *LAB* study, see Frederick J. Murphy, *Pseudo-Philo: Rewriting the Bible* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993) 4-5; Eckhart Reinmuth, *Pseudo-Philo und Lukas: Studien zum Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum und seiner Bedeutung für die Interpretation des lukanischen Doppelwerks* (WUNT 2/74; Tübingen: Mohr

literature, citing the pitfalls of the all-encompassing definitions of Bloch and Vermes.²⁰² The principle reason for this caution is that rabbinic midrash assumes a ‘closed, fixed scriptural canon’, the text of which is inalterable and authoritative²⁰³—something which cannot easily be said about Second Temple literature.²⁰⁴ Whilst similar interpretive decisions may be found in *LAB* and later midrashic texts, the words of scripture function in very distinct ways.²⁰⁵ In rabbinic midrash, the scriptural text is marked and may appear as lemma followed by commentary, as in the *Genesis Rabbah* and the *Mekhilta*, or as part of a larger discourse, as in the *Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer*.²⁰⁶ In *LAB*, on the other hand, scriptural material is for the most part unmarked and there is no distinction between primary and secondary scriptures—both are woven seamlessly into a new narrative. There is no sign that *LAB* was meant to be read

Siebeck, 1994) 13-17; Stemberger, *Midrasch*, 22-23; also the cautious remarks in Fisk, *Do You Not Remember?*, 25-27. Bauckham and Fisk adopt the more roundabout expression ‘scripture interpreting scripture’, ‘Pseudo-Philo and the Gospels as “Midrash”’, 34, 59; *Do You Not Remember?*, 327.

²⁰² At least since Philip Alexander’s influential critique of Goulder’s uncritical use of the term, ‘Rabbinic Judaism and the New Testament’, 237-246; ‘Midrash and the Gospels’, 1-18. For more limited definitions of midrash *pace* Bloch, see Arnold Goldberg, ‘Die funktionale Form Midrasch’, *FJB* 10 (1982): 1-45, and Porton, ‘Defining Midrash’, 55-92; compare with Bloch, ‘Écriture et Tradition’, 9-34; ‘Note méthodologique pour l’étude de la littérature rabbinique’, *RScR* 43 (1955): 194-227; echoed in Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition*, *passim*. See also the survey and discussion in Lim, ‘Origins and Emergence of Midrash in Relation to the Hebrew Bible’ in *Encyclopedia of Midrash*, 2.595-612 (595-599). For midrash as an exclusively rabbinic technique/genre, see Solomon Zeitlin, ‘Midrash: A Historical Study’, *JQR* 44 (1953): 21-36; Lieve Teugels, ‘Midrash in the Bible or Midrash on the Bible? Critical Remarks about the Uncritical Use of a Term’ in *Bibel und Midrasch: zur Bedeutung der rabbinischen Exegese für die Bibelwissenschaft* (ed. G. Bodendorfer and M. Millard; FAT 22; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998) 43-63.

³ Steven D. Fraade, ‘Rabbinic Midrash and Ancient Jewish Biblical Interpretation’ in *The Cambridge Companion to the Talmud and Rabbinic Literature* (ed. Charlotte E. Fonrobert and Martin S. Jaffee; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007) 99-120 (101).

²⁰⁴ See Lim, *The Formation of the Jewish Canon*, 178-188. On differing notions of scriptural authority among the diverse groups of the Second Temple period, see Fraade, ‘Interpretive Authority in the Studying Community at Qumran’, *JJS* 49 (1993): 46-69, esp. 65-66; Florentino García Martínez, ‘Biblical Borderlines’ in *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. Martínez and Julio Trebolle Barrera; Leiden: Brill, 1995) 123-138; George J. Brooke, ‘Between Authority and Canon: The Significance of Reworking the Bible for Understanding the Canonical Process’ in *Reworking the Bible: Apocryphal and Related Texts at Qumran* (eds. Esther G. Chazon, Dimant and Ruth A. Clements; Leiden: Brill, 2005) 85-104; Bernstein, “‘Rewritten Bible’: A Category Which Has Outlived its Usefulness?”, 169-196; Lim, ‘Authoritative Scriptures and the Dead Sea Scrolls’ in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Lim and J. J. Collins; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010) 303-322.

²⁰⁵ See the parallels in Feldman, ‘Prolegomenon’, lxxviii-lxxx.

²⁰⁶ So Stemberger: midrash denotes a ‘klare Trennung von geoffenbartem Bibeltext und Auslegung’. Consequently, ‘Diese simple Tatsache unterscheidet die klassischen Midraschim von den meisten vorrabbinischen Schriften, die man gern als Midrasch bezeichnet, aber auch von vielen biblischen Schriften des Mittelalters, die als Bibelerzählungen die literarische Form von Büchern wie den Biblischen Altertümers Pseudo-Philos wieder aufnehmen’ (*Midrasch*, 22-23).

alongside its scriptural source(s), as a sort of ‘commentary’.²⁰⁷ Episodes like that of Jair and the fiery furnace (*LAB* 38) are not mere exegetical notes on a scriptural text (i.e. Judg 10:5) but self-contained narratives.²⁰⁸ They can be understood without consulting the source text(s). Describing these episodes as midrashic interpretation assumes that their primary function is to explicate the meaning of a core authoritative body of literature.²⁰⁹ This assumption may be appropriate for texts where it is the stated aim (i.e. rabbinic midrash), but scholars do not know how the author of *LAB* viewed their own work in relation to the Jewish scriptures.²¹⁰

On the other hand, scripturalization simply describes *how* scriptural material has been used in the composition of a new work.²¹¹ It need not make any assumptions about the interpretive stance taken by the author towards that scriptural material.²¹² The task of explaining *why* and *to what end* the material has been used is a second order question. In some cases, the answer may be clear, making commentary worthwhile. At times it may only be possible to speculate. It may even be that the author uses scriptural material merely for aesthetic purposes—providing imagery, motifs, language or plot devices. In such cases, examining the interpretive function of the Jewish scriptures would be mostly irrelevant. The focus of scripturalization is on the precise nature of the literary relationship between texts like *LAB* and its sources. The focus is not on how the use of scriptural material contributes to the theological

²⁰⁷ Pace Cohn, ‘An Apocryphal Work, 314; Bauckham, ‘Pseudo-Philo and the Gospels as “Midrash”’, 34. Compare with the relationship of *Jubilees* to its sources, see Ben Z. Wacholder, ‘Jubilees as the Super Canon: Torah-Admonition versus Torah-Commandment’, in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Cambridge, 1995: Published in Honour of Joseph M. Baumgarten* (eds. Bernstein, Martínez and John Kampen; STDJ 23; Leiden: Brill, 1997) 195-211.

²⁰⁸ Whilst the use of secondary scripture in *LAB* may be compared to the midrashic ‘gap-filling’ identified by Daniel Boyarin, the gap-filling of rabbinic midrash is always constrained by the words of the scriptural text, whereas this is not always the case in *LAB* (i.e. Kenaz, Zebul). See Boyarin, *Intertextuality and the Reading of Midrash* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1990) 45.

²⁰⁹ As Mroczek notes, there is tendency among scholars to view Second Temple literature as a ‘satellite of the biblical’ (*The Literary Imagination*, 9).

²¹⁰ So Reinmuth: ‘Es ist folglich unsachgemäß, den *LAB* im ganzen als Midrasch zu charakterisieren. Die Gattungsbezeichnung »Midrasch« kann den Blick für die originäre Aussageabsicht dieser Schrift einschränken’ (*Pseudo-Philo und Lukas*, 16). That *LAB* occasionally alludes to scriptural material not covered in the work—thus assuming the reader’s familiarity with its scriptural sources—hardly makes it a commentary (pace Bauckham). As Reinmuth: ‘dazu verwendet wird, dem Werk ein biblisches Gepräge zu geben und zugleich inhaltlich die eigene Darstellung durch diesen expliziten Bezug auf den biblischen Kontext zu autorisieren’ (*Pseudo-Philo und Lukas*, 111).

²¹¹ See Newman, *Praying by the Book*, 13.

²¹² On the relationship between exegesis and scripturalization, see Newman, *Praying by the Book*, 16-17.

outlook of the work or reveals certain assumptions about the Jewish scriptures—questions pertinent to the study of ‘midrash’ or ‘biblical interpretation’.²¹³ A scripturalized narrative is simply a new episode which has been shaped by the use of unmarked scriptural material.

With this in mind, the following sections will examine three scripturalized narratives: Abram and the fiery furnace (*LAB* 6); Jair and the fiery furnace (*LAB* 38); and Kenaz’s rout of the Amorites (*LAB* 27).

Abram in the Fiery Furnace: *LAB* 6 and Dan 3

Geza Vermes first brought the unusual episode of Abram in the fiery furnace (*LAB* 6) to the attention of wider scholarship in his collection of essays, *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism*. There Vermes considers it an example of the ‘rewritten Bible’ phenomenon—thereby coining the term.²¹⁴ Vermes sets out to demonstrate the historical origin and progressive development of rabbinic midrashic traditions in the works of the Second Temple period. He considers the ‘re-writing of the Bible’ to be one of the earliest stages in this development.²¹⁵ So, Vermes’ interest in *LAB* 6 lies principally in its relation to later haggadic traditions which likewise placed Abraham inside a furnace. It provides a crucial link between the haggadic exegesis of the Second Temple period and that of later rabbinic (even medieval) literature. Vermes notes that *LAB* and later midrashim appear to agree in interpreting אור as ‘fire’ in Gen 15:7 (and also Gen 11:28,31; Neh 9:7).²¹⁶ Thus, Vermes finds a direct connection between the ‘haggadah’ (as he calls it) of Abram in the fiery furnace in *LAB* 6—the oldest surviving account—and the varying versions of the same tale across rabbinic literature.²¹⁷

The connection is more tenuous than Vermes admits. In fact, the narrative of Abram and eleven others being sentenced to death in a fiery furnace by Joktan for

²¹³ As Newman notes, scripturalization ‘does not necessarily entail the presumed author’s *conscious* interpretation of scripture’ (*Praying by the Book*, 13, emphasis original).

²¹⁴ Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition*, 85-90.

²¹⁵ Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition*, 10.

²¹⁶ Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition*, 88.

²¹⁷ Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition*, 85-86.

refusing to bake bricks for the tower of Babel has no clear rabbinic parallel.²¹⁸ Many rabbinic accounts instead resemble the *Genesis Rabbah*, where Abraham is brought before Nimrod by his father for insulting idol-worship and is sentenced to be thrown into a fiery furnace.²¹⁹ The *Rabbah* has the twin purpose of relating the fate of Abraham's brother, Haran, who is asked to pledge his allegiance to the faith of Nimrod or Abraham.²²⁰ Haran hesitates and is thrown into the furnace where 'his inwards were scorched and he died in his father's presence'—thus explicating Gen 11:28, 'Haran died before his father Terah in the land of his birth, in the fire (אור) of the Chaldeans'. One account has Haran consumed by fire from heaven instead of being thrown into the furnace with Abraham.²²¹ The majority of texts simply mention that Abraham was thrown in or rescued from fire or a furnace.²²²

These accounts rarely feature the elements from Dan 3 found in *LAB* 6: the command to mass idolatry, the refusal to participate, the leaping of the flames and the deaths of the bystanders. This is not to say that rabbinic commentators were unaware of the similarities between the episodes. The *Genesis Rabbah* says that the LORD 'smelled the savour of the Patriarch Abraham ascending from the fiery furnace; He smelled the savour of Hananiah, Mishael and Azariah ascending from the fiery furnace' (34:9); likewise, 'R. Liezer b. Jacob said: Michael descended and rescued Abraham from the fiery furnace . . . and when did Michael descend? In the case of Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah' (44:13).²²³ Other traditions relate that Michael and/or Gabriel wished to intervene on behalf of Abraham in the furnace, but God desired to rescue Abraham himself (cf. Gen 15:7).²²⁴ God then promises the angel, 'You will

²¹⁸ Abraham is associated with the tower in *PRE* 24 and *Gen. Rab.* 38:6, though no other features in *LAB* 6 are present. Elsewhere Nimrod is responsible for building the tower: *b. Abod. Zar.* 53b; *b. Hul.* 89a.

²¹⁹ *Gen. Rab.* 38:13; also, *Midr. Teh.* 118:9; *Tg. Ps.-J.* on Gen 11:28; *Frag. Tg.* on Gen 11:27-28; *ARN* A 33.

²²⁰ The death of Haran is absent from *LAB* (he is only mentioned in passing in *LAB* 4:15).

²²¹ *Tg. Ps.-J.* on Gen 11:28.

²²² *Gen. Rab.* 34:9; 44:13; *Exod. Rab.* 23:4; *b. Eruv.* 53a; *b. Pes.* 118a; *PRE* 26 188; *Tg. Neof.* on Gen 11:31, 15:7; *Tg. Ps.-J.* on Gen 15:7; *Pes. Rab.* 33:4; *Cant. Rab.* 1:56; *Tg. Est.* 15:14; *Tg. 2 Chron.* 28:3; *Midr. Tanḥ.* B *Toldot* 4:1. Jerome also witnesses to this tradition, *Qu. hebr. Gen.* 43; *Vg. Neh* 9:7.

²²³ The two are also associated in *Cant. Rab.* 2:16; *b. Sanh.* 93a.

²²⁴ *b. Pes.* 118a; *Exod. Rab.* 18:5; *Midr. Tanḥ.* B *Toldot* 4:1; *Midr. Tanḥ.* B *Tetz.* 12:2; *CJ* 34:13. Conversely, *Cant. Rab.* 1:56 names Michael as Abraham's deliverer, which is denied in *Gen. Rab.* 44:13.

have the merit of saving three of his descendants' (*b. Pes.* 118a)—referring to Hananiah, Mishael and Azariah.

Only in the medieval *Chronicles of Jerahmeel* and *Sefer Ha-Yashar* does one find other details from Dan 3 incorporated into the story.²²⁵ The *Chronicles* narrates the rescue of Abram from the furnace four times—the first (*CJ* 29) seems to depend on *LAB* 6, whereas the other three are similar to those in rabbinic tradition. The first episode includes many of the same Danielic elements found in *LAB* 6, but also includes the detail that Nimrod heated the furnace for 'seven (whole) days' (*CJ* 34:12), which probably comes from Nebuchadnezzar heating the furnace 'seven times more than was customary' (Dan 3:19).²²⁶ The *Sefer Ha-Yashar*, on the other hand, incorporates many details from Dan 3 into the narrative of Abram's rescue, apparently independent of *LAB* 6. Unlike *LAB*, *Yashar* treats the baking of bricks together with the confusion of tongues (9:20-39), narrating Abram's fiery ordeal separately. In *Yashar*'s version, Abram is brought before Nimrod—who has wanted to kill Abram since birth (8:1-9:5; 12:9; cf. *CJ* 34:1-3).²²⁷ As before, Nimrod sentences both Abram and a hesitant Haran to death in a fiery furnace (*Yashar* 12:18-21). As in Dan 3:20, the two men are bound before being thrown into the furnace (*Yashar* 12:22-23). Whereas Haran dies instantly (12:26), the fire melts away Abram's bonds and he walks freely around the furnace, unscathed (12:24-25), as in Dan 3:25. As in Dan 3:22, those who throw Abram into the furnace die in the flames—*Yashar* numbers twenty men (12:26,29-31). As in Dan 3:27, the royal court gathers to witness Abram walking around in the furnace (*Yashar* 12:27).²²⁸ Like Nebuchadnezzar, Nimrod repents upon seeing Abram unharmed amidst the flames, calling him the 'servant' of God (12:32; cf. Dan 3:28). But despite

²²⁵ Islamic tradition also appears to have incorporated Danielic elements into the rescue of Ibrāhīm from the furnace, including the leaping flames, the burning of his shackles and the presence of an angelic figure alongside Ibrāhīm in the flames, see Shari L. Lowin, *The Making of a Forefather: Abraham in Islamic and Jewish Exegetical Narratives* (Islamic History and Civilization 65; Leiden: Brill, 2006) 198.

²²⁶ See the contemporary interpretation of Dan 3:19 in R. Bahya on Lev 10:2, '[Nebuchadnezzar] had stoked the kiln for seven consecutive days'. *LAB* 6:6 also features 'a period of seven days' for the righteous men to decide.

²²⁷ In the *Chronicles*, Abraham's birth is accompanied by a star, which Nimrod's astrologers take as a sign of his greatness. Because of this, Nimrod wishes to kill Abraham, but Terah hides the child from the murderous king (*CJ* 34:1-3). The Chronicler appears to have modelled Abraham's birth on the birth of Jesus (Mt 2:1-15).

²²⁸ For a period of 'three days and nights'—a period which appears in many medieval 'fiery furnace' narratives (see below), perhaps influenced by the period of Jesus' internment (Mt 12:40).

the similar interest in Dan 3, *Yashar* differs considerably from *LAB*: the construction of the tower is narrated separately; the episode stems from Abram's dispute with Terah; the episode prefers Nimrod over Joktan; Haran is thrown into the furnace with Abram; fewer bystanders perish in the flames; Abram walks around the furnace for several days; and the king and the people repent of their wickedness. In this respect, *Yashar* represents a tradition closer to the one found in *Genesis Rabbah* and related texts. *LAB* and *Yashar* thus relate two different versions of the legend of Abram in the fiery furnace and appear to have arrived at the decision to include elements from Dan 3 independently—in *Yashar*'s case, at a considerably later time. For this reason, it is misleading to speak (as Vermes does) of a shared haggadic tradition combining the narrative of Abraham with Hananiah, Mishael and Azariah in the furnace.²²⁹

LAB is thus the sole text in antiquity to include multiple details from Dan 3 in its retelling of the story of Abraham in the fire of the Chaldeans.²³⁰ The only element from Dan 3 shared by all the Abraham-in-the-furnace traditions is the decision to interpret 'fire' (אור) of the Chaldeans in Gen 15:7 as a 'fiery furnace'. Even in this, rabbinic exegetes rarely use the language of Dan 3 in their interpretation of Gen 15:7 (or 11:28-31).²³¹ As it is, אור must have been interpreted as 'fire' before it was reinterpreted as a 'furnace', so any connection with Dan 3 must be, at the very least, secondary.²³² Vermes is therefore mistaken to say that '[the] haggadah of Abram in the fiery furnace does not therefore originate from a verbal pun, but from the reinterpretation of one scriptural passage by another'—that is, the interpretation of Gen 15:7 via Dan 3. To the contrary, the inclusion of the 'furnace' is only made possible by the word-play. *LAB* 6 is like its rabbinic counterparts in this respect. It takes its starting point in the word-play on Gen 15:7, but differs by linking this to the burning (שרף) of the bricks for the building of the tower in Gen 11:3—as well as by

²²⁹ Cf. Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition*, 68-75.

²³⁰ Cf. the examples proposed by Bauckham, 'Pseudo-Philo and the Gospels as "Midrash"', 43, which are discussed below.

²³¹ The Aramaic ארתון נורא from Dan 3 rarely appears in relation to Abraham outside of the Targums (cf. כבשן האש in *Gen. Rab.* 38:13; *b. Erub.* 53a; *b. Pes.* 118a; *PRE* 26 188; *Exod. Rab.* 18:5; *Pes. Rab.* 33:4; *Est. Rab.* 6:2; cf. ארתון נורא in *Tg. Neof.* on Gen 11:31, 15:7; *Tg. Ps.-J.* on Gen 15:7; *Tg. 2 Chron.* 28:3).

²³² For example, the alternate tradition where Abraham sets the idols of Terah on fire (*Jub.* 12:12-15; *Ap. Ab.* 5:1-14) also appears to originate in the word-play on Gen 15:7.

incorporating details from Dan 3 beyond the inclusion of a ‘fiery furnace’. It is primarily the linking of Gen 15:7 and Gen 11:3, however, that determines the place of the narrative within *LAB*. Bauckham is right when he states, ‘It would be quite misleading to call *LAB* 6 “a midrash on Dan 3”’.²³³

Nevertheless, Bauckham downplays the role of Dan 3 in the formation of the narrative, ‘As far as the version in *LAB* 6 goes, it is unlikely that Pseudo-Philo himself (as distinct from the tradition he took up) made deliberate use of Dan 3, and it is certain that the connexion with Gen 11:3 has contributed more to his version of the story than Dan 3 has’. This fails to make an important distinction, as Gen 11:3 relates to the primary scriptural narrative and Dan 3 does not. The baking of the bricks for the tower provides the episode with its narrative setting. *LAB* has combined this with the basic narrative of Abram being rescued from fire—probably no more than reading Gen 15:7 as ‘I am the LORD who brought you from the *fire* of the Chaldeans’.²³⁴ The resulting episode also serves to demonstrate Abram’s righteousness, on which basis he is elected by God (*LAB* 7:4).

But elsewhere it would seem the inclusion of Gen 11:3 has created problems for the narrative. For example, *LAB* must invent a second furnace with which to burn Abram and the bricks, having already burnt bricks earlier in the narrative (6:16; cf. 6:2-4). Even more confusing is the author’s decision to narrate Gen 11:2-4 a second time (*LAB* 7:1), so there are now two Chaldean attempts to build a tower (cf. 6:1).²³⁵ Beyond that, Gen 11:3 contributes little to the narrative. The elements borrowed from Dan 3, on the other hand, function as *secondary scripture*. They do not contribute to the underlying narrative in the same way that the Genesis material does—i.e. by providing the setting, character and place-names. But many of the details not found in the Genesis narrative—the command to mass idolatry, the arrest and trial of those who

²³³ Bauckham, ‘Pseudo-Philo and the Gospels as “Midrash”’, 43. Bauckham seems to be responding to Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition*, 88-90. Whilst Vermes does not use the phrase ‘midrash on Dan 3’, this does appear to be his meaning.

²³⁴ At this stage, the interpretation would be devoid of any Danielic elements.

²³⁵ *LAB*’s creative use of secondary scripture can lead to narrative repetition. There are two fiery furnace episodes (*LAB* 6 and 38); there are two victories involving three hundred men (chs. 27 and 36); and there are multiple selections by lot (20:9; 25:1,3-13; 25:2; 49:1-8). The repetition of the Babel story (*LAB* 6-7) and other difficulties with the text suggest that the scripturalized narrative in *LAB* 6 is the author’s creation.

refuse to participate, the fiery furnace, the burnt bystanders and the deliverance from the flames—can be traced to Dan 3, as the table below demonstrates.

LAB 6	Primary Scriptures	Secondary Scriptures
The Chaldeans settle in the plain of Babylon and come together to build a tower to the heavens and make a name for themselves lest they be scattered (<i>LAB</i> 6:1).	The Chaldeans settle in the plain of Shinar and come together to build a city and a tower to the heavens and make a name for themselves lest they be scattered (Gen 11:2-4).	Nebuchadnezzar sets up the golden statue in the plain of Dura (אֲרָרַת) in the province of Babylon (Dan 3:1).
The Chaldeans write their names on bricks and ‘burn them with fire’ (<i>et incendamus eos igne</i> , <i>LAB</i> 6:2).	The Chaldeans burn bricks thoroughly (Gen 11:3). The LXX has ‘roast them with fire’ (καὶ ὀπτήσωμεν αὐτὰς πυρὶ).	
All the people participate in the burning of the bricks (<i>LAB</i> 6:2-3a).		All the people fall down and worship the golden statue that Nebuchadnezzar has set up (Dan 3:7).
Twelve men refuse to burn bricks for the tower (<i>LAB</i> 6:3a).		Three men refuse to fall down and worship the golden statue (Dan 3:12).
The twelve men are named: Abram, Nahor, Lot, Ruge, Tenute, Zaba, Armodat, Jobab, Esar, Abimahel, Saba, Aufin (<i>LAB</i> 6:3b).	The names of the twelve men are drawn from the sons of Joktan—Elmodad, Eval, Abimael, Saba, Uphir (LXX Gen 10:26-29)—and the descendants of Peleg—Reu, Nahor, Abram, Lot (Gen 11:18-29). ²³⁶	
The Chaldeans accuse the twelve men of refusing to participate (<i>LAB</i> 6:4a).		The Chaldeans accuse the three men of refusing to participate (Dan 3:12).
The Chaldeans bring the twelve men before the chiefs (<i>LAB</i> 6:4a).		The Chaldeans bring the three men before Nebuchadnezzar (Dan 3:12).

²³⁶ The origin of *Tenute* and *Zaba* is uncertain.

The chiefs question the twelve men (<i>LAB</i> 6:4b).		Nebuchadnezzar questions the three men (Dan 3:14).
The twelve men answer that they worship the Lord and will not throw bricks into the fire even if they are thrown into the fire (<i>LAB</i> 6:4c).		The three men answer that they will not worship the golden statue even if the God whom they serve does not deliver them from the furnace (Dan 3:16-18).
The response of the men angers the chiefs (<i>LAB</i> 6:5a).		The response of the men angers Nebuchadnezzar (Dan 3:19).
The chiefs demand that the twelve men either throw bricks into the fire or be thrown into the fire themselves (<i>LAB</i> 6:5).		Nebuchadnezzar demands that they either worship the golden statue or be thrown into a fiery furnace (Dan 3:15).
Joktan allows eleven of the men to escape into the wilderness, but Abram refuses to go. Fenech and Nimrod discover the men have escaped (<i>LAB</i> 6:6-14).	Nimrod is said to establish his kingdom in Babel, Erech and Accad in the land of Shinar (Gen 10:8-10). <i>Fenech</i> may be a mistranslation of the Greek for Peleg (φαλεκ, LXX Gen 10:25; 11:16-19) the brother of Joktan, whose descendants appear in <i>LAB</i> 6:3b. ²³⁷	
The Chaldeans bring Abram before the chiefs who question him about the missing eleven men (<i>LAB</i> 6:15).		
The Chaldeans build a furnace and light it and throw in the bricks that had already been burnt (<i>LAB</i> 6:16a).		

²³⁷ In *LAB* 5:1-4, Fenech is appointed chief of the Japhethites, whereas Peleg is a descendant of Shem (Gen 10:25).

A distressed Joktan throws Abram into the fiery furnace (<i>LAB</i> 6:16b).		The three men are thrown into the fiery furnace (Dan 3:23). Joktan's distress superficially resembles Darius' distress upon throwing Daniel into the lion's den (Dan 6:18).
God causes an earthquake that sends sparks (<i>scintillas</i>) of flame leaping out of the furnace (<i>LAB</i> 6:17a).		Sparks (שֵׁבֵב) of flame leap out of the overheated furnace (Dan 3:22). The flames leap forty-nine cubits out of the furnace (θ' and LXX Dan 3:47). The men of Korah are also consumed by an earthquake and fire from God (Num 16:31-35).
83,500 bystanders die in the flames (<i>LAB</i> 6:17b).		The guards who throw the three men into the furnace die in the flames (Dan 3:22). Bystanders die in the flames (θ' and LXX Dan 3:48).
Abram is not hurt by the flames and emerges from the fiery furnace (<i>LAB</i> 6:17b-18a).	God brings Abraham out of the 'fire' (אֵשׁ) of the Chaldeans (Gen 15:7).	The three men are not hurt by the flames and emerge from the fiery furnace (Dan 3:25-27).
Abram finds the eleven men. The place is named after Abram and called <i>Deli</i> in the language of the Chaldeans, which means 'God' (<i>LAB</i> 6:18).	The place is named 'Babel', because the LORD confused the language of the people (Gen 11:9a).	

The similarities between *LAB* 6 and Dan 3 begin in the setting for both episodes. Following Gen 11:2, *LAB* 6:1 reads, ‘And migrating from the east, they found a plain in the land of Babylon’ (*Et profecti ab oriente invenerunt campum in terra Babilonis*). Both the MT and LXX, however, read ‘the plain (MT: בקעה) in the land of Shinar’. In this respect, *LAB* reflects the later tradition of substituting Babel/Babylon for Shinar in the Genesis narrative, often found in Aramaic texts (1QapGen 21:23; *Tg. Onk.* on Gen 14:1; *Tg. Neof.* on Gen 10:10, 11:2, 14:1,9; cf. *Jos. Ant.* 1.118-119).²³⁸ It may also be motivated out of a desire to make the account cohere more closely to Dan 3. Like *LAB* 6:1, the setting for Nebuchadnezzar’s golden statue in Dan 3 is a plain in Babylon: ‘He set it up on the plain (MT: בקעה) of Dura in the province of Babylon’ (Dan 3:1).²³⁹ Perhaps the author perceived these similarities having already connected the ‘fiery furnace’ of Dan 3:19-26 with Gen 15:7. It is also conceivable that they were independently drawn to the similarities between two large structures built on the plain of Babylon demanding the participation of all people (Dan 3:1-7; Gen 11:1-6).²⁴⁰

²³⁸ The Old Greek of Daniel similarly substitutes Babylon for Shinar: the LXX reads βαβυλῶνα, whereas θ’ Dan 1:2 reads Σεννααρ (MT: שֶׁנְעָר).

²³⁹ As Zakovitch, ‘The Exodus from Ur of the Chaldeans: A Chapter in Literary Archaeology’, in *Ki Baruch Hu: Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical and Judaic Studies in Honor of Baruch Levine* (eds. Robert Chazan, William Hallo and Lawrence Schiffman; Warsaw, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1999) 437, notes, Dura is not always understood as a proper noun: LXX Dan 3:1 reads περιβόλον (‘enclosure’) instead of דורא, whereas LXX N reads πρήσεως (‘bonfire’). Zakovitch argues that בקעה דורא (‘plain of Dura’) is meant to reflect the Abrahamic אור, as he believes the tradition of Abraham-in-the-furnace serves as the model for the fiery furnace episode in Dan 3—not the other way around. However, the attention given to three, otherwise insignificant, young men in Jewish antiquity is difficult to explain if one assumes the priority and ubiquity of the Abraham-in-the-furnace tradition.

²⁴⁰ *LAB* 6:18 states: ‘And they named that place by the name of Abram and in the language of the Chaldeans “Deli,” which means “God”’. No records survive of a Chaldean Deli, though it appears to reflect the Assyrian or Babylonian suffix *-ili* (‘of God’). In this sense, Deli could reflect the Babylonian *Dûr-ili*. θ’ Dan 3:1 translates דורא as Δεῖρα (cf. περιβόλον in LXX Dan 3:1), which, according to Assyriologist Theophilus G. Pinches, refers to *Deru* of southern Babylonia, sometimes rendered *Dûr-ili*, meaning ‘rampart of God’ (‘Dura’, in *Volume 2 of The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia* [ed. James Orr; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1957] 883). However, the variant *Dûr-ili* does not survive outside of Assyrian and Babylonian records. Interestingly, Assyrian literature appears to identify *Dûr-ili* with Uruk, the scriptural ארך—built, according to legend, by Nimrod ‘in the land of Shinar’ (Gen 10:10: בארץ שֶׁנְעָר). See Jean-Vincent Scheil, ‘Cylindres et Légendes Inédits (avec trois planches)’, *RA* 13 (1961): 5-25 (21). On the difficulties of translating דורא, see Edward M. Cook, “‘In the Plain of the Wall’ (Dan 3:1)”, *JBL* 108 (1989): 115-116. Philip Michael Sherman lists other ‘analogical correlations’ between Gen 11 and Dan 3, see *Babel’s Tower Translated: Genesis 11 and Ancient Jewish Interpretation* (BI 117; Leiden: Brill, 2013) 131-140. Later Christian literature apparently connected Gen 11 and Dan 3 without any knowledge of the Abraham-in-the-furnace tradition, see the Old English of Boethius’s *Consolation of Philosophy* 35.4: ‘This Nimrod ordered the building of a tower on the field that was called Sennar, and in the nation that was called Deira (cf. Δεῖρα in θ’ Dan 3:1), very near the city which is now called Babylon’ (*Se Nefrod het wyrcan anne tor*

As Daniel narrates the demand for all people to worship the statue and the refusal of three men (Dan 3:4-18), so *LAB* narrates the demand for all to burn bricks for the tower and the refusal of twelve men (6:2-5). The influence of Dan 3 may also explain why the twelve men confusingly see the building of the tower as an act of idolatry—‘We know the one LORD, and him we worship’ (*LAB* 6:4c)—despite the fact that there is nothing obviously idolatrous in its construction.²⁴¹ In both accounts, the men who refuse to participate are accused by their peers and brought before their respective leaders, who interrogate them and give them an opportunity to participate, which the men again refuse. Note the similar use of the protatic *si/ḥ* in the response of the two groups of men: ‘Even *if* you throw us into the fire with your bricks, we will not join you’ (*LAB* 6:4c); ‘*If* our God whom we serve is able to deliver us from the furnace of blazing fire and out of your hand, O king, let him deliver us. But *if* not, be it known to you, O king, that we will not serve your gods and we will not worship the golden statue that you have set up’ (Dan 3:17-18).²⁴² Similarly, both the Chaldean chiefs and Nebuchadnezzar address (and threaten) the men in a conditional construction: ‘And unless they take part with us in throwing in the bricks, you will have the fire devour them along with your bricks’ (*LAB* 6:5b); ‘Now if you are ready . . . to fall down and worship the statue that I have made, well and good. But if you do not worship, you shall immediately be thrown into a furnace of blazing fire’ (Dan 3:15).²⁴³ Whilst there is no clear verbal agreement here, the broad details of the narrative—the demand that all people join in wickedness, the refusal of a few men, the trial before the leaders, the second offer to join or be thrown into a fiery furnace—are unmistakably of Danielic origin.

The similarities with Daniel 3, however, do not extend to the chief leader of the Chaldeans, Joktan. As Bauckham writes, ‘Joktan’s attitude to Abraham is more

on ḥam felda ḥe Sennar hatte, and on ḥære ḏiode ḥe Deira hatte swiḏe neah ḥære byrig ḥe mon nu hæṯ Babilonia).

²⁴¹ In Gen 11:4, the motivation is not idolatry: ‘Let us make a name for ourselves; otherwise we shall be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth’. See the discussion on idolatry in *LAB* 6 in Murphy, ‘Retelling the Bible: Idolatry in Pseudo-Philo’, *JBL* 107 (1988): 275-287; *Pseudo-Philo*, 41-48; Fisk, *Do You Not Remember?*, 141-152; Jacobson, *Commentary*, 1.355-356; Sherman, *Babel’s Tower Translated*, 135-140.

²⁴² Tarsee Li, *The Verbal System of the Aramaic of Daniel: An Explanation in the Context of Grammaticalization* (SAIS 8; Leiden: Brill, 2009) 118.

²⁴³ Li, *Verbal System*, 121.

like that of Darius in Dan 6 than that of Nebuchadnezzar in Dan 3'.²⁴⁴ Jacobson goes further to say that *LAB* deliberately draws from the language and plot of Dan 6, 'wherein the enemies of Daniel accuse Daniel to the king (as here the enemies of the twelve to Iectan) in order to have him thrown into the lions' den (here into the fire), but the king is reluctant and would like to save the victim (Dan. 6:15), as Iectan is described in these words (*ipse querebat* etc.)'.²⁴⁵ But the similarities between Joktan and Darius—in their desire to save the victim and their distress upon throwing the victim to their fate (*LAB* 6:16b; Dan 6:18)—are only superficial. Joktan grants the men seven days to decide, and, in the intervening period, succeeds in rescuing eleven of them, whereas Darius has till sundown to rescue Daniel, which he fails in doing. Jacobson is closer to the mark in suggesting the influence of Gen 37:22b on *LAB* 6:6c, 'He, however, sought how he might save them from the hands of the people'—with Joktan playing Reuben to the Chaldean chiefs' sons of Jacob.

On this point, Vermes and Bauckham rightly note that in other traditions the furnace episode centres around the leadership of Nimrod, who is sometimes modelled on Nebuchadnezzar.²⁴⁶ This is especially true of the medieval *Sefer Ha-Yashar*, where, like the Babylonian king, Nimrod repents upon seeing Abram alive in the fiery furnace (*Yashar* 12:32-35).²⁴⁷ The influence of Nebuchadnezzar on the depiction of Nimrod is harder to detect in the rabbinic sources that Bauckham proposes (*Gen. Rab.* 38:13; *b. Erub.* 53a; *Tg. Ps.-Jon.* on Gen 11:28; *Tg. 2 Chron.* 28:3). In *Gen. Rab.* 38:13, Nimrod's language may at one point resemble Nebuchadnezzar's ('Let your God whom you worship come and save you from the fire'; cf. Dan 3:15c) and Abram's refusal to worship Nimrod's idol(s) or his 'sovereignty' (*b. Erub.* 53a) could well be an allusion to the golden statue in Dan 3:1-7.²⁴⁸ But Bauckham mistakenly searches for Danielic elements in Joktan, when the role of Nebuchadnezzar is partly fulfilled by the Chaldean chiefs, two of whom are later named (Fenech and, again, Nimrod; *LAB*

²⁴⁴ Bauckham, 'Pseudo-Philo and the Gospels as "Midrash"', 43.

²⁴⁵ Jacobson, *Commentary*, 1.359-360.

²⁴⁶ Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition*, 90; Bauckham, 'Pseudo-Philo and the Gospels as "Midrash"', 43.

²⁴⁷ To this can be added Nimrod's strange dream (*Yashar* 12:45-51), which borrows elements from Nebuchadnezzar's dreams in Dan 2 and 4.

²⁴⁸ As noted earlier, in the medieval *Chronicles of Jerahmeel* 34:12, Nimrod heats the furnace for 'seven days', which probably reflects Nebuchadnezzar ordering 'the furnace heated up seven times more than was customary' (Dan 3:1).

6:14). The leaders, like Nebuchadnezzar, demand that all people participate in an idolatrous scheme, bring those who refuse to participate before them for questioning and angrily sentence them to die in a fiery furnace when they refuse to abjure themselves. The narrative of Joktan, on the other hand, his rescue of the eleven and his vain attempt at persuading Abram to flee, has no obvious scriptural parallel—although his command to the eleven (*LAB* 6:9: ‘Go, hide yourselves there in the valley; you will have drinking water that flows from the rocks’) shares some similarities with Israel drinking water from the rock at Horeb (Ex 17:6; cf. Isa 33:16), as well as Elijah drinking water in the valley of Cherith (1 Kgs 17:3-4) and hiding from the murderous Jezebel in the wilderness (1 Kgs 19:1-9).²⁴⁹

Regarding the fiery furnace itself, Bauckham again downplays the direct influence of Dan 3 on the episode: ‘There is some reason to suspect that the influence of Dan 3 on the tradition behind *LAB* 6 has been obscured by further developments in *LAB* 6. In *Sefer ha-Yashar*, as in Dan 3:22, only a small number of men, those who throw Abraham into the furnace, are consumed by the flames; the massive slaughter of all the bystanders in *LAB* 6:17 is in line with Pseudo-Philo’s habitual exaggeration of numbers’.²⁵⁰ Bauckham accurately points out the disparity between the number of dead in Dan 3:22 (unspecified) and *LAB* 6:17 (where the number is a staggering 83,500). This may be the result of *LAB*’s tendency to embellish pre-existing narratives (often numerically).²⁵¹ But the great number of dead in *LAB* 6:17 might also reflect a tradition concerning Dan 3:27.²⁵² As rabbinic exegetes observed, Dan 3:3 states that Nebuchadnezzar sends for the ‘satraps, the prefects, and the governors, the counselors, the treasurers, the justices, the magistrates, and all the officials of the provinces’, whereas in Dan 3:27 Nebuchadnezzar only calls the ‘satraps, the prefects, the governors, and the king’s counselors’. The question then arises: what happened to the

²⁴⁹ Jacobson notes the similarity of *LAB* 6:7 (*L viros potentes in virtute*) to 2 Kgs 2:16 and the use of ‘fifty men’ in the similar context of 1 Kgs 18:4 (Obadiah hiding the prophets from Jezebel), *Commentary*, 1.360. However, the grouping of ‘fifty men’ is hardly unique (2 Sam 15:1; 2 Kgs 15:25).

²⁵⁰ Bauckham, ‘Pseudo-Philo and the Gospels as “Midrash”’, 43.

²⁵¹ For example, *LAB* has Sisera lead an army of 8,000 chariots and 8,730,000 men (*LAB* 30:3; 31:2; cf. ‘nine hundred chariots’ in Judg 4:3) and increases the number of Philistines slain by Samson to 25,000 and 40,000 (*LAB* 43:2,7; cf. ‘three thousand men and women’ in Judg 16:3,27).

²⁵² The enumeration of the dead in *LAB* 6 may also reflect the numbering of the dead at the rebellion of Korah (Num 16:35,49), with which the episode shares some similarities (the wicked are consumed by earthquake and fire in Num 16:31-5; which also occur in the destruction of the tower in *b. Sanh.* 109a).

treasurers, justices, magistrates and officials? These, too, perished in the fire: ‘When Gabriel came down to deliver Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah, he ordered the fire to scorch all those who had thrown them in . . . Some say that four classes of governors died there; for at first it says: Then the satraps, the prefects, and the governors, the judges, the treasurers, the counsellors, the sheriffs, and all the rulers of the provinces, whilst at this point four are lacking, as it says: And the satraps, the prefects, the governors, and the king’s ministers’ (*Exod. Rab.* 18:5). Whether *LAB* 6:17 reflects this tradition is unclear, but it is worth noting that earlier traditions also exaggerate aspects of the furnace in Dan 3. For example, in the Greek versions of Dan 3, the furnace becomes so overheated that the ‘flame steamed forth above the furnace forty and nine cubits . . . and burned those Chaldeans it found about the furnace’ (LXX Dan 3:47-48: καὶ διεχεῖτο ἡ φλόξ ἐπάνω τῆς καμίνου ἐπὶ πήχεις τεσσαράκοντα ἑνῆα . . . καὶ ἐνεπύρισεν οὓς εὔρε περιὶ τὴν κάμινον τῶν Χαλδαίων).²⁵³ Compare this with *LAB* 6:17b: ‘And it burned all those standing around in sight of the furnace’ (*et combussit omnes circumstantes in conspectu camini*). So, contrary to Bauckham, the great number of dead bystanders may, in fact, reflect Danielic tradition. At the very least, it need not obscure the Danielic elements in the text.

A clearer connection, however, can be made between the ‘sparks of flame’ (*scintillas flamme*) that emit from Abram’s furnace and the ‘spark of fire’ (דִּי נֹרָא (שְׂבִיבָא) that kills the men in Dan 3:22.²⁵⁴ Indeed, the language of the furnace itself seems to reflect Danielic usage. *LAB* adopts *caminus ignis* (6:16-18; cf. used of Dan 3 in Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* 5.5.2; Cyprian, *Test.* 3.10; *de. Dom. Or.* 5), instead of the more commonplace *fornax ignis* (Vg. Dan 3 *passim*; cf. Vg Dan 3:23: *camino ignis*). This reflects the underlying Greek κάμινος τοῦ πυρός (cf. LXX and θ’ Dan 3:6ff; used of Dan 3 in Jos., *Ant.* 10.213; 1 Clem 45:7), a phrase which only appears in the LXX and Theodotion when translating the Aramaic of Dan 3:6ff (אתון נורא).²⁵⁵ Abram’s exit

²⁵³ Likewise θ’ Dan 3:47-48.

²⁵⁴ Most likely σπιυθήρ (LXX and *scintilla* in Vg. Isa 1:31; Wis 2:2; 3:7; 11:18[19]) in the underlying Greek text (cf. LXX Dan 3:23: φλόξ; Vg. Dan 3:22: *flamma ignis*).

²⁵⁵ The phrase κάμινος τοῦ πυρός is not used when translating more commonplace words for ‘furnace’ or ‘kiln’ (כור, תנור, כבשן). The LXX renders כור as κάμινος or κωνευτήριον in the LXX (Deut 4:20; 1 Kgs 8:51; Prov 17:3; 27:21; Isa 48:10; Jer 11:4; Ezek 22:18-22), but never with the genitive τοῦ πυρός; תנור as κλίβανος (Gen 15:7; Ex 7:28; Lev 2:4; 7:9; 11:35; 26:26; Hos 7:4-7; Mal 3:19; Ps 21:10; Lam 5:10); and כבשן as κάμινος or καμιναία (Gen 19:28; Ex 9:8,10; 19:18), but never with the genitive τοῦ πυρός.

from the furnace likewise seems to be influenced by the language of Dan 3: ‘And Abram came up out of the furnace’ (*LAB* 6:18a: *et surrexit Abram de camino*); cf. ‘So Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego came out from the fire’ (Dan 3:26c: נגו מן-גווא נורא (באדין נפקין שדרך מישך ועבד). These verbal similarities may have been more apparent at an earlier stage in the underlying Hebrew or Greek text. However, the author of *LAB* often shies away from verbatim use of secondary scriptures when composing new episodes on a scriptural model.

Still, as noted in the first chapter, the greatest indicator that the author of *LAB* was responsible for the inclusion of Danielic elements is the identification of similar compositional uses of material from Daniel elsewhere in the text. Indeed, one can find such a case in *LAB* 22:3, where the sons of Reuben, Gad and Manasseh answer Joshua and Israel (cf. Josh 22:21-29) with what appears to be a quotation of Dan 2:22: ‘He [God] himself knows what are in the hidden places of the abyss and the light abides with him’ (*ipse scit que in occultis sunt abyssi, et lumen cum eo permanet*). Compare this with MT Dan 2:22: ‘He reveals deep and hidden things; he knows what is in the darkness, and light dwells with him’ (ומסתרתא ידע מה בחשוכא ונהירא ונהורא עמה שרא) (הוא גלא עמיקתא). Harrington and Jacobson both italicize the quote apart from *abyssi*—but this too may originate in Dan 2:22, as *abyssus* could have resulted from misreading βαθύς (θ’ and LXX Dan 2:22; MT: אמיק) as βυθός, thus ἄβυσσος. At the very least, the example shows *LAB* using Danielic material to scripturalize the speech of characters in a primary scriptural episode (Josh 22)—which is the most common function of secondary scriptural material in *LAB*. But this is not the only instance where *LAB* uses Danielic elements to compose new material.²⁵⁶ In fact, *LAB* narrates not one, but two episodes of righteous men being delivered from fiery furnaces.

Jair and the Fiery Furnace: *LAB* 38 and Dan 3

LAB 38 narrates the judgeship of Jair, who is given relatively short shrift in the Jewish scriptures (Judg 10:3-5). *LAB* combines this brief description of Jair with the following account of Israel’s lapse back into Baal-worship (Judg 10:6), making Jair

²⁵⁶ Murphy, *Pseudo-Philo*, 81-83, 161, sees a connection between the trial scenes in Dan 3 and Korah’s rebellion in *LAB* 16 (as well as 2 Macc 6-7), but the similarities are too general to establish literary dependence and may simply be common features of trial scenes.

responsible for the idolatrous turn.²⁵⁷ In *LAB* 38:1, Jair commands the people, ‘Everyone who will not sacrifice to Baal will die’. But seven men refuse to sacrifice. They confront Jair, quoting back to him the words of Deborah (which appear to be the words of Joshua in Josh 1:7-8; cf. Deut 5:32), and challenging him, ‘And now if [Baal] is God as you say, let him speak as God and then we will sacrifice to him’ (*LAB* 38:2b). Jair then orders his servants to throw the men into the fire, at which point the angel Nathaniel extinguishes the fire for the righteous men and burns the servants of Jair (38:3). The angel then strikes the people with blindness allowing the men to escape. When Jair arrives at the scene, he too is burned with fire, and before he dies, the angel of the LORD sentences him to dwell in fire forever (38:4a-b). Afterwards, the angel demolishes the pillar of Baal and burns ‘the people who stood by, that is, a thousand men’ (38:4c).

The story features many of the same elements as the episode of Abram in the furnace. As *LAB* 6 originates in the word-play on Gen 15:7, *LAB* 38 appears to originate in a word-play, in this case, reading the Hebrew place-name קמון as ‘furnace’ (Aramaic: קמין; derived from the Greek: καμίνος) so that Judg 10:5 reads, ‘Jair died, and was buried in the furnace’.²⁵⁸ *LAB* seems to acknowledge this in 38:4b, where it reads, ‘And in the fire in which you will die there you will have a dwelling place’ (*et in quo igne morieris in eo habebis habitationem*). And yet, if *LAB* is drawing the connection between קמון and ‘furnace’, one wonders why the Latin for furnace (*caminus* or *fornax*) never appears in the episode (cf. *LAB* 6 *passim*), despite the narrative requiring something like a furnace.²⁵⁹ The association of Jair with fire may also come from reading איר/יאיר as ‘fire’ (אור). This may have been furthered by *LAB*’s decision to connect Jair to Baal-worship (Judg 10:6), which is sometimes associated with fire (1 Kgs 18:23-29; Jer 19:5; burnt offerings in 2 Kgs 10:18-27). Whatever the

²⁵⁷ Cf. the positive description of Jair in Josephus (*Ant.* 5.254). The author of *LAB* may have identified Jair with the Manassite who conquered towns in Gilead (Num 32:41; Deut 3:14; Josh 13:30; 1 Kgs 4:13; 1 Chron 2:22-23). *LAB* 38:4 reads ‘I have raised you up from the land’ (*levavi te de terra*; ms. Δ adds *Egipti*), echoing Ex 20:2 etc., which, as Jacobson notes, would be ‘chronologically preposterous’ (*Commentary*, 2.943) if referring to the Jair of Judg 10:3-5—unless the author believed that Jair was the same as the son of Manasseh, who, according to some rabbis, survived the wilderness (*b. B. Bat.* 121b).

²⁵⁸ Ginzberg, *Legends*, 6.202, n. 104.

²⁵⁹ *LAB* 38:3b: ‘And his servants took them to burn them in the fire. And when they had put them in the fire . . .’ (*Et acceperunt eos pueri eius, ut incenderent illos igni. Et cum imponerent eos runt eos pueri eius . . .*).

origin, the coupling of Jair with fire seems to have led the author of *LAB* to the story of Abram in the furnace and/or the tale of the three youths in Dan 3. Indeed, many of the same Danielic elements found in *LAB* 6 appear in *LAB* 38: the command to mass idolatry, a select group of men who refuse to participate, a confrontation between the men and the wicked leader(s), the sentencing of the men to death in fire, their rescue from the flames and the deaths of bystanders in the process.

But *LAB* 38 also includes details from Dan 3 not found in *LAB* 6. For example, in *LAB* 38:3 it reads, ‘And [Jair’s] servants took them to burn them in the fire. And when they had put them in the fire, Nathaniel, the angel who was in charge of fire, came forth and extinguished the fire and burned the servants of Jair’ (*Et acceperunt eos pueri eius, ut incenderent illos igni. Et cum imponerent eos super ignem, exivit Nathaniel angelus qui preest igni, et extinxit ignem, et incendit pueros Iair*). Here, as in Dan 3:20, *LAB* 38 has the servants of the wicked leader throw the men into the fire, whereas in *LAB* 6:16, it is the leader, Joktan, who throws Abram into the furnace.²⁶⁰ As in Dan 3:24-25, an angel (in this case, Nathaniel) comes to rescue the men, whereas in *LAB* 6:17, it is God who rescues Abram from the furnace. This difference likely owes to the haggadic developments concerning the rescue of Abram and the three youths in Dan 3—the angels wish to save Abram from the furnace, but the LORD himself desires to save him (as in Gen 15:7), promising in return that Michael or Gabriel will rescue three of Abram’s descendants (i.e. Shadrach, Meschach and Abednego in Dan 3:25).²⁶¹ No reason is given, however, for *LAB*’s decision to name the angel who presides over fire Nathaniel, a role that is usually given to Gabriel in rabbinic tradition—Gabriel is said to extinguish or cool fire for the righteous yet burn the wicked (*b. Pes.* 118a; *b. Yoma* 21b; cf. the unnamed angel in Rev 14:18).²⁶² Ginzberg suggests the name Nathaniel may derive from *Atuniel*, reflecting the

²⁶⁰ Like Dan 3, multiple men are thrown into the fire: *Defal, Abiesdrel, Getalibal, Selumi, Assur, Ionadali, Memihel* (*LAB* 38:1). These names are either corrupt or fictional and have no scriptural counterpart. It is unlikely the choice of seven is intended to reflect the seven brothers of 2 Macc 7—it does not say they are brothers and they survive the ordeal, *pace* James, *Biblical Antiquities*, 59, 187.

²⁶¹ *Gen. Rab.* 44:13; *b. Pes.* 118a; *Exod. Rab.* 18:5.

²⁶² See the discussion in Wadsworth, ‘The *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* of Pseudo-Philo: Doctrine and Scriptural Exegesis in a Jewish Midrash of the First Century A.D.’ (unpublished DPhil diss.; Oxford: Oxford University, 1975) 2.151-152.

Aramaic for ‘furnace’ (אֶתֹּן) as in Dan 3.²⁶³ This may be right, considering the two other angels unique to *LAB* appear to be similarly named: *Ingethel* or *Gethel* (in ms. π) ‘who is in charge of hidden things’ (*LAB* 27:10) may be a misreading of עֲטֵה יֵאֵל/עֲטֵה יֵאֵל from עֲטָה, meaning ‘hid’;²⁶⁴ in the same place, *Zeruel* who is ‘pre-eminent in military might’ and bares up Kenaz’s arms, may come from זֶרִיעַ, meaning ‘strength’ or ‘arm’.²⁶⁵ Still, aside from the blinding of the bystanders, the role of Nathaniel is *mutatis mutandis* the same as that of Gabriel or Michael in traditions concerning Dan 3. This includes the burning of the servants who throw the seven men into the fire, as rabbinic tradition ascribes the fiery deaths of Nebuchadnezzar’s servants in Dan 3:22 to the work of angels.²⁶⁶ The full list of agreements between *LAB* 38 and Dan 3 and related traditions are shown below.

²⁶³ Ginzberg, *Legends*, 6.202, n. 105. The name has no parallel, but is close to עֲתֵנִיָּאֵל in *Gen. Rab.* 58:2 (i.e. Othniel, Judg 1:13). As Perrot notes (*Pseudo-Philon*, 2.185), *LAB* exhibits ‘la singularité de l’angéologie’.

²⁶⁴ Ginzberg 6.183, n. 17.

²⁶⁵ Ginzberg, *Legends*, 6.183-184, n. 17. *CJ* has Gabriel instead (57:34) and does not include the second reference to the angel of the LORD (58:10).

²⁶⁶ *Gen. Rab.* 44:13; *b. Pes.* 118a; *Exod. Rab.* 18:5.

LAB 38	Primary Scriptures	Secondary Scriptures
Jair builds a sanctuary to Baal and demands that the people sacrifice to Baal or die (<i>LAB</i> 38:1a).	Jair is the judge of Israel (Judg 10:3-5) and afterwards the Israelites return to Baal-worship (Judg 10:6).	Nebuchadnezzar builds a golden statue and demands that the people worship it or be thrown into a fiery furnace (Dan 3:1-7).
Seven men refuse to sacrifice to Baal (<i>LAB</i> 38:1b).		Three men refuse to worship the statue (Dan 3:12).
The men answer Jair by quoting the words of Deborah and challenge Baal-worship (<i>LAB</i> 38:2).		The words of Deborah are borrowed from Josh 1:7-8 and the challenge to Baal may reflect 1 Kgs 18:24.
Jair orders the men to be thrown into the fire for their blasphemy (<i>LAB</i> 38:3a-b).		Nebuchadnezzar orders the men to be thrown into the fiery furnace (Dan 3:19-21).
The angel Nathaniel extinguishes the fire for the men (<i>LAB</i> 38:3b).		One with the 'appearance of a god' is with the men in the furnace (Dan 3:25). Tradition relates that this figure is Michael or Gabriel come to extinguish the fire.
Nathaniel burns the servants of Jair with fire (<i>LAB</i> 38:b).		The servants of Nebuchadnezzar are burned by the overheated furnace (Dan 3:22).
The angel lets the men escape from the fire by striking the people with blindness (<i>LAB</i> 38:3c).		The men emerge from the fire unscathed (Dan 3:26). The blinding has no parallel.
Jair dies in the fire and the angel of the LORD tells him that he will have his dwelling place in fire (<i>LAB</i> 38:4a-b).	Jair dies and is buried in Kamon, which could be read as 'furnace' (Judg 10:5: קמון; cf. Aramaic: קמין; derived from the Greek: καμίνος).	
The angel of the LORD demolishes the pillar of Baal, burns Baal and a thousand men who stand by (<i>LAB</i> 38:4c).		In the Greek Dan 3, those standing by the fiery furnace die in the flames (θ' and LXX Dan 3:48). The scene is also similar to 2 Kgs 10:26-27.

Bauckham again sees the purpose of the entire episode as an explication of the scriptural text: ‘Once again, we notice that the story has not simply been created on the basis of Dan 3. It has a startingpoint [sic] in the exegesis of Judges, and Dan 3 has been enlisted to help in the interpretation of Judges’—that is, the interpretation of קמון as ‘furnace’.²⁶⁷ But it is difficult to see how the reader is meant to make this inference when neither the place-name Kamon nor the Latin for ‘furnace’ appear in the text. In the one instance where *LAB* 38 might allude to Judg 10:5, Jair is said only to dwell in ‘fire’ (38:4b: *et in quo igne morieris in eo habebis habitationem*).²⁶⁸ It is, of course, possible that the verbal connection was more explicit in the underlying Hebrew of *LAB* 38 and has since been lost in translation. However, its absence in *CJ* 58:10—whose author was presumably familiar with a Hebrew text of *LAB*—would seem to count against this. In fact, the Chronicler appears to be wholly unaware of the word-play on קמון as ‘furnace’, since after Jair’s death in the flames it unceremoniously reads, ‘And Iair was buried in Qamon’. Perhaps the author of *LAB* inherited a tradition narrating Jair’s death in a ‘furnace’ (Aramaic: קמין)—thus explicitly interpreting Judg 10:5—but in the process of adapting the tradition to the present work, this meaning was lost, so that Jair now perishes in a ‘fire’ rather than a ‘furnace’. The inclusion of elements from the furnace of Dan 3, however, would seem to suggest that the author was himself aware of the ‘furnace’ parallel. In any case, the absence of an actual ‘furnace’ in *LAB* 38 poses a problem for Bauckham’s reading.

There is nothing intrinsic to the text of Judg 10:3-6 that requires a narrative of seven righteous men who refuse to participate in idolatry, leading to their miraculous rescue from fire by an angel. The decision to read קמון as ‘furnace’ in Judg 10:5 would explain the inclusion of material from Dan 3. Having made this connection, the author then composed an episode with the characters and setting of the primary scriptural account (Judg 10:3-6) and the narrative structure of the secondary scriptural episode (Dan 3)—whilst also incorporating other secondary scriptural material (Josh 1:7-8; 1 Kgs 18:24). This was likely the *process* behind the episode’s composition. But does this compositional process reveal the episode’s exegetical *purpose*—that is, to clarify an external scriptural text? Bauckham would answer in the affirmative: ‘Pseudo-Philo

²⁶⁷ Bauckham, ‘Pseudo-Philo and the Gospels as “Midrash”’, 52.

²⁶⁸ *LAB* does not mention the place-name *Kamon*.

is always commenting on and explaining the text of the biblical narrative . . . Other passages of Scripture [i.e. Fisk's *secondary scriptures*] are always utilized as a means of explaining *this* narrative'.²⁶⁹ In other words, episodes, like that of Abram and Jair, composed out of seemingly unrelated scriptural material, exist primarily to interpret the meaning of the underlying primary scriptural narrative to the reader. As Bauckham earlier states, 'LAB must be regarded as a kind of commentary on the biblical text'.²⁷⁰

But, once again, there is no editorial comment as to how the episodes in *LAB* 6 and 38 explain an exegetical difficulty. Nor is there any indication that the episode cannot be properly understood without consulting the scriptural source text.²⁷¹ Indeed, in both fiery-furnace-narratives, the exegetical motivation for the creation of the episode is never made explicit. *LAB* 6 does not alert the readers to the 'Ur/fire of the Chaldeans' (אור כשדים) of Gen 11:31 or 15:7 (cf. *LAB* 23:5; 32:1). And as noted above, *LAB* 38 does not explicitly make the connection between 'Kamon' (קמון) and 'furnace' (קמין) in Judg 10:5. Here, it may be worth distinguishing between episodes clearly *inspired* by verbal cues in the scriptural text, and episodes that actively seek to *interpret* that text for the reader. The emphasis is, of course, slightly different, as *inspiration* concerns the *process* by which a text comes into being, whereas *interpretation* concerns its *purpose*. Given the lack of explanatory detail in *LAB* 6 and 38, it may be more appropriate to understand these episodes as examples of the former rather than the latter.

In the final analysis, Bauckham fairly characterizes the textual origins of the two fiery furnace episodes: 'The process of creating these stories did not begin from Dan 3, since we have seen that in both cases the idea of a furnace was suggested by details in the biblical text (of Gen 11 and Judg 10) which Pseudo-Philo is rewriting, and it is this suggestion in the text which has prompted the use of Dan 3 to help develop

²⁶⁹ Bauckham, 'Pseudo-Philo and the Gospels as "Midrash"', 59, emphasis original.

²⁷⁰ Bauckham, 'Pseudo-Philo and the Gospels as "Midrash"', 34.

²⁷¹ There are four instances where the author of *LAB* explicitly refers readers to a scriptural source (35:7; 43:4; 56:7; 63:5), always in the form 'Are they not written in the book of Judges/Kings?' (*Nonne hec scripta sunt in libro Iudicum/Regnum?*), probably in imitation of the scriptural style (Josh 10:13; 1-2 Kgs *passim*; 2 Chron *passim*; Est 10:2), see Reinmuth, *Pseudo-Philo und Lukas*, 126. In each case, it refers to material covered in the preceding narrative (*LAB* 35:7; 56:7) or material not covered in the present work (43:4; 63:5). At one point, the author invokes Judges after relating a puzzling story of Gideon pouring water on a rock which turns into fire and blood (35:7)—which has no basis in Judges. But, as Reinmuth notes, this is as much a sign that *LAB* intends to supplement the scriptural text as the author using the scriptural text to supplement their own work.

it into an appropriate story'.²⁷² This could do with slight modification: the fiery furnace narratives of Abram and Jair show how details in the scriptural text *inspired* the author of *LAB* to compose scripturalized narratives using the Danielic story of the fiery furnace as a model for new episodes.

Excursus: The Literary Afterlife of Dan 3

By way of excursus, it is worth noting that *LAB* is not the only text in antiquity to use the story of Dan 3 as a model to compose new narratives. For the early Christians, the deliverance of the three men from the furnace became a common type of martyrdom narrative.²⁷³ This begins with the *Martyrdom of Polycarp*, which borrows several details from Dan 3.²⁷⁴ When Polycarp's fire is lit, there is 'a mighty flame flashing forth' (*Mart. Pol.* 15:1: μεγάλης δὲ ἐκλαμψάσης φλογός), corresponding to the 'spark of flame' (שִׁבְיָא דִּי נֹרָא; cf. θ' and LXX Dan 3:47) that emits from the furnace in Dan 3:22 (cf. *LAB* 6:17: *scintillas flamme*). The fire is then likened to a 'furnace' (κάμινος), and is said to give off a 'fragrant smell' like bread or spices, as tradition concerning Dan 3 says, '[The LORD] smelled the fragrance of the flesh of Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah coming up from the heated furnace' (*Gen. Rab.* 34:9). In the clearest sign of indebtedness to Dan 3, Polycarp's executioners see that 'his body could not be consumed by the fire' (*Mart. Pol.* 16:1: μὴ δυνάμενον αὐτοῦ τὸ σῶμα ὑπὸ τοῦ πυρός δαπανηθῆναι), as the Babylonian court perceived 'that the fire had not had power against their bodies' (LXX Dan 3:94: ὅτι οὐκ ἐκυρίευσεν τὸ πῦρ τοῦ σώματος αὐτῶν).²⁷⁵ A similar use of Danielic material can be found in the

²⁷² Bauckham, 'Pseudo-Philo and the Gospels as "Midrash"', 59.

²⁷³ It also supplies the language of eschatological punishment, as in Mt 13:42a (also 13:50a; cf. Rev 9:2), 'they will throw them into the furnace of fire' (βαλοῦσιν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν κάμινον τοῦ πυρός; cf. LXX Dan 3:6: ἐμβалоῦσι αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν κάμινον τοῦ πυρός).

²⁷⁴ Jan Willem van Henten, 'Zum Einfluß jüdischer Martyrien auf die Literatur des frühen Christentums. II: Die Apostolischen Väter', *ANRW* II.27 (1993): 700-723 (723); Gerd Buschmann, *Das Martyrium des Polykarp: Übersetzt Und Erklärt* (Kommentar zu den Apostolischen Vätern 6; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998) 294, n. 8; Jan M. Kozłowski, 'And He Saw His Pillow Being Consumed by Fire (*Martyrium Polycarpi* 5,2): A Proposal of Interpretation', *ETL* 85 (2009): 147-158 (156).

²⁷⁵ Other similarities include the cooling of the flame for the martyrs in *Mart. Pol.* 2:3 (cf. θ' and LXX Dan 3:50) and the prayer of Polycarp: as in the prayer of Azariah (θ' and LXX Dan 3:40), Polycarp prays to be deemed a worthy sacrifice (*Mart. Pol.* 14:2) and his captors are described as 'lawless' men (*Mart. Pol.* 16:1; θ' and LXX Dan 3:32: ἄνομοι).

Syriac version of the *Acts of Paul and Thecla*, when Thecla's persecutors attempt to burn her at the stake, but 'not even an atom of her hair was singed' (*Thecl.* 22), which comes from Dan 3:27, 'the hair of their heads was not singed'—God then sends a storm to extinguish the fire and, as in Dan 3, Thecla emerges unharmed.

With time, Christian martyrologies included more details from the legend of the furnace in Dan 3. In one early medieval account, the martyrs Acislus and Victoria are cast into a fiery furnace, but the bystanders hear songs of joy coming from the furnace, so the martyrs are suspended over fire, but the fire gets out of control and kills the bystanders.²⁷⁶ In another, Christina the Astonishing is thrown into a fiery furnace for five days, where she is unharmed and remains singing with the angels, whilst fifteen-hundred bystanders perish in the flames.²⁷⁷ In the *Sapientia* of Hrotsvit of Gandersheim, Karitas, one of Sophia's three daughters, is thrown into a fiery furnace heated for three nights and days, and comes to no harm, but the furnace explodes and kills five thousand men.²⁷⁸ Likewise Saint Januarius emerges unscathed from a fiery furnace, only to be thrown to the lions, who refuse to touch him (cf. Dan 6:22-23).²⁷⁹ Saint Euphemia too is thrown into a fiery furnace but comes to no harm.²⁸⁰ Famously, Saint Catherine of Alexandria is thrown, not in a fiery furnace, but in front of a breaking wheel, though 'it passed over her without doing any harm, for an angel protected her; but it killed many infidels standing near'.²⁸¹ Perhaps strangest of all, Evagrius Scholasticus and Gregory of Tours relate a story concerning a Jewish boy who is thrown into a fiery furnace by his father for receiving the sacrament, but is protected by an angelic woman (possibly Mary) and suffers no harm from the flames, and is ultimately saved by his mother, who is then baptized with him (whereas the father is crucified).²⁸² The episode of the three young men in the fiery furnace thus

²⁷⁶ Angel Fábrega Grau, *Passionario hispánico* (2 vols.; Monumenta Hispaniae Sacra; Serie Litúrgica 6; Barcelona, 1953) 2.12-13.

²⁷⁷ Jacobus de Voragine, *Legenda aurea* 1:387.

²⁷⁸ Hrotsvit of Gandersheim, *Sapientia* 144-145.

²⁷⁹ Robert Godding, 'Il Dossier di San Gennaro negli *Acta Sanctorum*', in *San Gennaro nel XVII Centenario del martirio (305-2005): atti del Convegno internazionale, Napolie, 21-23 settembre 2005* (ed. Gennaro Luongo; Campania sacra 37-38; Naples: Editoriale Comunicazioni Sociali, 2007) 37-54.

²⁸⁰ François Halkin, *Euphémie de Chalcédoine* (Légendes Byzantines; SHG 41; Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1965) x-xii, 13-33.

²⁸¹ PG 116:275-302.

²⁸² Evagrius Scholasticus, *Hist. Eccl.* 4.36; Gregory of Tours, *Gloria Martyrium*, 100. Medieval attacks against Jews drew inspiration from this ugly episode, see Dominique Rigaux, 'Miracle, Reliques et Images dans la Chapelle du Corporal à Orvieto (1357-64)', in *Pratiques de l'Eucharistie*

continued to be used as a model to compose new literature into the early medieval period, resulting in scripturalized narratives with little or (more often) no basis in history. The episodes of Abram (*LAB* 6) and Jair (*LAB* 38) in the fiery furnace show that this practice can be traced back to the Second Temple period.

Kenaz and Gideon: *LAB* 27 and Judg 7

Unlike the narratives of Abram and Jair in the fiery furnace, the long narrative concerning Kenaz (*Cenaz*) has no obvious starting point in the Jewish scriptures. Kenaz is only mentioned briefly as the brother of Caleb the spy and the father of Othniel, the first judge after Joshua (Josh 15:7; Judg 1:13; 3:9,11; 1 Chron 4:13).²⁸³ Little of this survives in *LAB*, as Kenaz is now the son of Caleb (*LAB* 20:6) and the first judge after Joshua (*LAB* passes over Othniel in silence). Interestingly, Josephus agrees with *LAB* in the second instance, naming Keniaz (Κενιάζος) the first judge after Joshua (*Ant.* 5.182).²⁸⁴ But unlike *LAB*, Josephus simply ascribes the career of Othniel to Keniaz (*Ant.* 5.183-184). Further evidence may be found in the *Lives of the Prophets*, which mentions the cave of a certain Kenaz, ‘who became judge of one tribe in the days of the anarchy’ (10:9)—which as Torrey notes, may have originally read, ‘the first who became judge etc.’.²⁸⁵ Rabbinic exegetes, on the other hand, seem wholly uninterested in the figure of Kenaz beyond his relation to Caleb and Othniel.²⁸⁶ Ginzberg raises the possibility that Kenaz should be identified with the mysterious figure of Cethel, who so fascinated medieval authors, as in the famous lapidary *Book*

dans les Eglises d'Orient et d'Occident (Antiquité et Moyen Age): Actes du Séminaire Tenu à Paris, Institut Catholique, 1997-2004 (ed. Nicole Bériou, Béatrice Caseau and Rigaux; Paris: Institut d'Etudes Augustiniennes, 2009) 1.201-245 (240). On this point, the *Sefer Gezerot* also relates the miraculous deliverance of three rabbis from the flames of a Christian mob in Blois—like the youths in Dan 3, the fire burns the bonds from their hands but does not harm the rabbis, and they are heard singing from the fire (*Sefer Gezerot* 125).

²⁸³ Caleb and Kenaz are the sons of Jephunneh, a Kenizzite (Num 32:12; Josh 14:6,14), that is, a descendant of a different Kenaz, the Edomite (Gen 15:19; 36:11,15,42; 1 Chron 1:36,53).

²⁸⁴ Josephus agrees with the MT and LXX naming Kenaz as the brother of Caleb.

²⁸⁵ Charles C. Torrey, *Lives of the Prophets: Greek Text and Translation* (SBLMS 1; Philadelphia, PA: Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, 1946) 27-28.

²⁸⁶ See the discussion in *b. Tem.* 16a, ‘Now was Caleb the son of Kenaz?’ (also *b. Sot.* 11b-12a). There was clearly some confusion over Josh 15:17 and Judg 1:13 (see Rashi on Num 32:12).

of *Cethel*²⁸⁷—though Feldman’s skepticism here seems warranted.²⁸⁸ *LAB* thus appears singular in its interest in this obscure character.²⁸⁹ Why the author of *LAB* chose to devote an almost equal amount of time narrating this heretofore unknown judge as Moses and Joshua is, to say the least, puzzling. Jacobson rightly calls it ‘one of the great mysteries of *LAB*’.²⁹⁰ This much is clear: Kenaz effectively replaces Othniel in *LAB*’s chronology, as he does for Josephus (*Ant.* 5.182-184). It is therefore possible that *LAB* was influenced by the description of Othniel in Judg 3:9-11. Like Othniel, the spirit of the LORD comes upon Kenaz (*LAB* 27:9), he goes out to war and his hand, quite literally, prevails (*LAB* 27:11). But the remaining narrative concerning Kenaz appears mostly untethered to Judg 1-3, borrowing instead from numerous other scriptural episodes, mostly drawn from Joshua and Judges.

For example, the beginning of the narrative of Kenaz seems to be rooted in Judg 1:1, though here the Israelites are shown inquiring of the LORD whether they should fight the Philistines (*LAB* 25:1), instead of demanding a representative to fight the Canaanites (as in Judg 1:1).²⁹¹ In response, the LORD commands the Israelites cast lots to sort the defiled from the pure—the first of many details which parallel the story of Achan (Josh 7:13-26; cf. mentioned but not narrated in *LAB* 21:3; the parallel is made explicit in 25:7). Before doing this, however, the people demand a leader, selecting Kenaz from the tribe of Caleb by lot (*LAB* 25:2)—possibly drawing from the selection of Saul by lot (1 Sam 10:20-21; cf. the selection of Judah by lot in Josh 19:1).²⁹² Kenaz then addresses the people by quoting the words of Moses and Joshua (closer to Josh 1:7-8; cf. Deut 28:14) and promises to burn with fire those selected by ‘the lot of sin’ (*LAB* 25:3), before quoting Moses again (25:5; Deut 29:18). The sinful men are then selected by lot and imprisoned ‘until it should be known what should be done about them’ (*LAB* 25:4)—a phrase taken from the imprisonment of the wood-gatherer (Num 15:34) and the blasphemer (Lev 24:12).

²⁸⁷ Ginzberg, *Legends*, 6.181, n. 1.

²⁸⁸ Feldman, ‘Prolegomenon’, xiii-xiv, cx-cxi. Ginzberg (*Legends*, 6.181, n. 1) thinks the association with lithology may have grown out of the episode of Kenaz and the sacred stones (*LAB* 26:6-15).

²⁸⁹ *CJ* 57 repeats the text of *LAB* 25-28 with little variation.

²⁹⁰ Jacobson, *Commentary*, 2.738

²⁹¹ This may owe to the association of Judah with the Philistines (Judg 15; 1 Sam 17; 30:16; Ezek 25:15), or perhaps *LAB* knew that the places mentioned in Judg 1:18 (Gaza, Ashkelon, Ekron) were Philistine territory (Bauckham, ‘Pseudo-Philo and the Gospels as “Midrash”’, 48).

²⁹² The ‘tribe of Caleb’ instead of Judah is confusing. The tribe of Judah is also selected by lot in Josh 19:1.

Prompted by one of their number, those selected by lot confess to various sins (25:7-13)—like Achan (Josh 7:19-21). Among the sinners is the tribe of Asher, who kept sacred stones and idols of the Amorites and hid them (*LAB* 25:10-12; possibly inspired by Josh 24:15)—similar again to Achan (Josh 7:21), whilst also alluding to Gen 2:11-12 (*LAB* 25:11: *de terra Evilath*; *LAB* 26:1; 27:15: *in torrentem Fison*). God commands that Kenaz burn the sinful men and everything uncovered in the ban (26:1)—as the Israelites burn the bounty of Achan (Josh 7:24-25).²⁹³ Only the sacred stones (and books previously not mentioned) are left over (*LAB* 26:2)—recalling the ‘great heap of stones that remains to this day’ (Josh 7:26). God then commands Kenaz take the stones and books to the top of a mountain, where angels destroy them, except for twelve stones, which are engraved with the names of the tribes and placed in the ark of the covenant along with the tablets (*LAB* 26:9-12). *LAB* takes the description of the stones entirely from Exod 28:17-21 (closer to the LXX than MT).²⁹⁴ Then, in one of two revelations given to Kenaz, God reveals that the stones will feature in the house of the LORD built by *Iahel* (presumably Solomon), only to be hidden under a mountain at the time of exile (cf. 2 Macc 2:4-8), until the time that God will ‘remember the world’ (*quousque memor sim seculi*; a recurring theme in *LAB*: 16:3; 48:1), at which point the stones will become the light of the righteous (26:12-13; cf. note the similar connection between the stones and light in Rev 21:19-24).²⁹⁵ These two chapters alone demonstrate the ease with which *LAB* composes new episodes out of seemingly unrelated scriptural material.

The technique is on full display again in chapter 27, where Kenaz’s victory over the Amorites is modelled on Gideon’s victory over the Midianites. The chapter begins with the Israelites preparing to fight the Amorites (*LAB* 27:1)—no longer the Philistines (as in 25:1). In response to detractors within his camp (27:2-4), Kenaz selects three hundred men and horses to go up against the Amorite camp by night (27:5)—as Gideon selects three hundred to go down to the Midianite camp (Judg 7:6-

²⁹³ This is similar to Num 16:31-35, where Korah and his men are destroyed ‘with all that belonged to them’.

²⁹⁴ See the table in Feldman, ‘Prolegomenon’, cxiii-cxiv. *LAB* may have been drawn to the stones in Exod 28 via the stones in Josh 7. Why the author connected Kenaz to the story in Josh 7, on the other hand, is unknown.

²⁹⁵ It is difficult to know whether *quod oculus non vidit* (‘eye has not seen etc.’) is a direction quotation of Isa 64:4 or simply a Biblicalism, though James favours the former (*Biblical Antiquities*, 157, n. 13), and cites the similar occurrence in 1 Cor 2:9; cf. Jacobson, *Commentary*, 2.776.

8). Kenaz then leads the three hundred to the Amorite camp, takes trumpets in his hand (as Gideon in Judg 7:8,16) and instructs the men to wait for his trumpet (as Gideon in Judg 7:18), whilst he goes down to the camp alone (Gideon takes only his servant Purah in Judg 7:10-11). Kenaz then asks the LORD for a sign so that the Amorites will recognize him by his sword and ‘know that [the LORD has] delivered them into [his] hands’ (*LAB* 27:7)—as the Midianites recognize ‘the sword of Gideon’ (חרב גדעון) as the sign that they will be ‘given into [his] hand’ (Judg 7:9,15).

Once he reaches the camp, Kenaz overhears the conversation of the Amorites (*LAB* 27:8)—as Gideon overhears the Midianites (Judg 7:13-15). Clothed with the spirit of the LORD (reminiscent of Othniel in Judg 3:10; Gideon at 6:34), Kenaz arises and draws his sword, which shines ‘like a lightning bolt’, so that the Amorites ask, ‘Is not this the sword of Kenaz . . . ?’—as in Judg 7:14, ‘This is no other than the sword of Gideon son of Joash’. Upon hearing this, Kenaz is ‘changed into another man’ (language borrowed from the description of Saul in 1 Sam 10:6) and begins to slay the enemy on his own (*LAB* 27:9-10).²⁹⁶ This detail, it seems, is not drawn from Judg 7—where Gideon is aided by the three hundred—but from reading Judg 6:16, ‘And thou shalt smite Madiam as one man’ (closest to LXX Judg 6:16: καὶ πατάξεις τὴν Μαδιαμ ὡσεὶ ἄνδρα ἓνα). At the same time, God sends the angel *Ingethel* to blind the Amorites so that they begin slaying each other (*LAB* 27:10), reflecting Judg 7:22, ‘the LORD set every man’s sword against his fellow and against all the army’. In Judges, however, this is the result of the trumpets (and jars).²⁹⁷ The angel *Zeruel* also comes to ‘[bear] up the arms of Kenaz’ (*LAB* 27:10), which appears to be connected to God’s promise to Gideon, ‘And afterward your hands shall be strengthened to attack the camp’ (Judg 7:11). The many references to the *hand* (טף) of Gideon (i.e. Judg 7:2,7-11,14-15) may have also put the author in mind of the *hand* (טף) of Othniel (Judg 3:10: ‘And his hand prevailed etc.’), or *vice versa*. The cheirological interest is continued in the following verse where Kenaz is unable to ‘release his hand from the sword’ (*LAB* 27:11)—a detail this time borrowed, not from Gideon or Othniel, but from Eleazar ben Dodo, one of David’s mighty men, who, on his own, ‘struck down the Philistines until his arm grew weary, though his hand clung to the sword’ (2 Sam 23:10; cf. 1 Chron 11:12-

²⁹⁶ The clear use of 1 Sam 10 here makes the parallel between Kenaz’s selection by lot (*LAB* 25:2) and Saul’s selection stronger. This detail from 1 Sam 10:6 is also used in relation to Joshua (*LAB* 20:2).

²⁹⁷ The three hundred and the trumpets ultimately play no role in *LAB* 27 (cf. 27:14).

14). The following narrative appears to grow out of the connection with 2 Sam 23, as Kenaz asks a fleeing Amorite how he might release his hand from his sword, the Amorite answering that it can be freed by slaying a Hebrew man. Unimpressed with this suggestion, Kenaz slays the Amorite soldier instead, whose blood then releases his hand from the sword. The rest of the narrative—Kenaz’s washing, the Israelites’ amazement at his deeds and the burning of the detractors—contains no obvious scriptural parallels.²⁹⁸ The use of the Jewish scriptures in *LAB 27* is detailed in the chart below.

²⁹⁸ However, the conclusion—‘And Kenaz ruled the people fifty-seven years, and there was fear among all his enemies all his days’ (*LAB 27:16*)—is similar to the postscripts of Othniel and the other Judges, though the language is perhaps closest to 2 Chron 20:29: ‘The fear of God came on all the kingdoms of the countries when they heard that the LORD had fought against the enemies of Israel. And the realm of Jehoshaphat was quiet, for his God gave him rest all around’.

<i>LAB 27</i>	Primary Scriptures	Secondary Scriptures
Kenaz leads Israel against the Amorites for two days, but rests on the third day, prompting detractors, who Kenaz arrests, vowing to punish them (<i>LAB 27:1-4</i>).		The narrative of Gideon refers to the ‘gods of the Amorites’ (Judg 6:10), a reference to Josh 24:15, which probably inspired the sin of Asher (<i>LAB 25:10-12</i>).
Kenaz selects three hundred men and horses to go down to the Amorite camp at night (<i>LAB 27:5</i>).		Gideon selects three hundred men to go down to the Midianite camp (Judg 7:6-8). The ambush takes place at night (7:19).
Kenaz sends spies to scout out the position of the Amorite camp (<i>LAB 27:6a</i>).		
Kenaz takes trumpets and goes down with the three hundred, delivering instructions on what to do if he blows the trumpets (<i>LAB 27:6b</i>).		Gideon takes trumpets and jars and gives them to the three hundred, delivering instructions on what to do when he blows the trumpet (Judg 7:16-18).
Kenaz goes down alone (<i>LAB 27:7a</i>).		Gideon goes down only with his servant Purah (Judg 7:10-11). In LXX Judg 6:16, the LORD promises Gideon that he will strike the Midianites ‘as one man’ (ὡσεὶ ἄνδρα ἓνα).
Kenaz prays to the LORD for his sword to be a sign by which the Amorites recognize him, so he will know they have been ‘delivered into [his] hands’ (<i>LAB 27:7</i>).		For the Midianites, the ‘sword of Gideon’ (חרב גדעון) is a sign that God has delivered the Midianites ‘into his hand’ (Judg 7:14).
Kenaz overhears the Amorites saying ‘Rise up, and let us fight against Israel. For we know that our sacred nymphs are there with them, and they will deliver them into our hands’ (<i>LAB 27:8</i> ; cf. 25:11).		Gideon overhears the conversation of the Midianites (Judg 7:13-14). The Amorite call to arms recalls Gideon’s call to arms, ‘Get up; for the LORD has given the army of Midian into your hand’ (7:15; cf. <i>LAB 36:2</i>).

Kenaz is clothed with the ‘spirit of the LORD’ (<i>LAB</i> 27:9a).	The ‘spirit of the LORD came upon’ Othniel (Judg 3:10).	‘The spirit of the LORD took possession of Gideon’ (Judg 6:34).
The sword of Kenaz ‘shone on the Amorites like a lightning bolt’, leading them to exclaim, ‘Is not this the sword of Kenaz . . . ?’ (<i>LAB</i> 27:9b).		The interpretation of the Midianite dream is ‘This is no other than the sword of Gideon’ (Judg 7:14).
Kenaz is ‘clothed with the spirit of power and was changed into another man’ (<i>LAB</i> 27:10a).		Samuel tells Saul that the ‘spirit of the Lord will possess you, and you will be . . . turned into a different person’ (1 Sam 10:6).
The angel Ingethel strikes the Amorites with blindness so that they slay one another (<i>LAB</i> 27:10b).		At the sound of the trumpets, ‘the LORD set every man’s sword against his fellow and against all the army’ (Judg 7:22).
The angel Zeruel ‘bore up the arms of Kenaz lest they should sink down’ (<i>LAB</i> 27:10c).	Othniel’s ‘hand prevailed over’ Israel’s enemies (Judg 3:10).	God promises Gideon that ‘afterward your hands shall be strengthened to attack the camp’ (Judg 7:11). The Midianites are delivered into Gideon’s ‘hand’ (7:7,9,14-15).
Kenaz’s hand becomes attached to his sword so that he cannot release it (<i>LAB</i> 27:11a).		Eleazar ben Dodo ‘struck down the Philistines until his arm grew weary, though his hand clung to the sword’ (2 Sam 23:10).
An Amorite soldier tells Kenaz to slay a Hebrew soldier to release his hand, but Kenaz slays him instead, which releases his hand (<i>LAB</i> 27:11b).		

Kenaz does not replace Gideon in *LAB*'s chronology. The career of Gideon is summarized in *LAB* 35-36, including his rout of the Midianites with the three hundred (36:1-2).²⁹⁹ On the one hand, it is possible that the career of Gideon was added later, or that the author had simply forgotten that various aspects of the career of Gideon had already been supplied to Kenaz. What prompted the linking of Kenaz to Gideon in the first place is unclear. Again, the author could have been drawn to the narrative of Gideon by something in the description of Othniel—both men are possessed by the ‘spirit of the LORD’ (Judg 3:10a; 6:34) and gain victory by their ‘hands’ (3:10b; 7:7,9,14-15). However, the supernatural strengthening of Kenaz’s hands (*LAB* 27:10) is closer to the description of Gideon (Judg 7:11) than Othniel (Judg 3:10).³⁰⁰ As it is, there is nothing in the text of *LAB* 27 that explicitly ties this episode to the scriptural narrative of Judg 1-3. In the absence of any haggadic material equating Kenaz or Othniel with Gideon, the episode in *LAB* 27 was most likely invented by the author without reference to the interpretation of the primary scriptural narrative.

This conclusion is borne out in several instances where *LAB*'s compositional use of secondary scriptural material leads to tensions in the narrative. Many of the details borrowed from the career of Gideon—the selection of the three hundred, the nighttime approach to the enemy camp, the instructions to the three hundred concerning the trumpets—never come to fruition in the episode. Indeed, Kenaz’s decision to fight the Amorites single-handedly seems to undercut all the Gideon material up to that point. That is, unless the author borrowed this detail from earlier in the career of Gideon (Judg 6:16, especially the LXX), where God promises that Gideon will strike down the enemy ‘as one man’ (ὡσεὶ ἄνδρα ἓνα). Of course, one need only read the following chapter (Judg 7)—which the author of *LAB* clearly did—to know that Gideon does not win single-handedly, but is aided by the three-hundred.

²⁹⁹ Compare the brevity of *LAB*'s account of Gideon's victory with the lengthy description of Kenaz's rout of the Amorites. It is not clear why *LAB* chose to give precedence to the victory of Kenaz and epitomize the career of Gideon.

³⁰⁰ If the author associated these two verses, the text shows no clear sign of it. Kenaz's possession by the spirit makes better sense in the context of the allusion to 1 Sam 10:6. Contra Bauckham, there is little reason to see ‘*LAB* 27 as an expansion of Judg 3:9-10’ (‘Pseudo-Philo and the Gospels as “Midrash”’, 49). However, Bauckham raises the interesting possibility that Deut 33:7 and the prayer of Jabez in 1 Chron 4:10 have also influenced the narrative, esp. *LAB* 27:7. For support, he cites rabbinic traditions (*b. Tem.* 16a; *Cant. Rab.* 4:7) that identify Jabez with Othniel. Neither Jabez or Othniel are mentioned in *LAB* (cf. the unknown *Iabis* who prophesies with Phinehas during the reign of Kenaz in *LAB* 28:1).

Nevertheless, it could be that the tension in *LAB* 27:5-10 arises from the author's decision to read one description of Gideon (Judg 6:16) over against another description of Gideon (Judg 7:8-16).³⁰¹ Other tensions include Kenaz's desire that the Amorites recognize him (*LAB* 27:7,9; as with Gideon in Judg 7:14), followed by the detail that he 'was changed into another man' (27:10; borrowed from 1 Sam 10:6), and the admission of Kenaz's detractors to taking part in the Achan-inspired sins of *LAB* 25:9-13 (27:15), despite the fact that 'all those who planned evil deeds' had already been selected and burned (26:5). Note also the confusing change in the identity of Israel's enemy from the Philistines (*LAB* 25:1) to the Amorites (27:1), which may owe to the brief description of the Amorites in the story of Gideon (Judg 6:10; cf. Josh 24:15)—already alluded to in the sin of the tribe of Asher (*LAB* 25:10-12).³⁰² As in *LAB* 6-7, where the creation of the episode of Abram in the fiery furnace leads to the building of two fiery furnaces (6:2-4; 6:16) and two attempts to build the tower (6:1; 7:1), the author's creative use of scriptural material leads to similar narrative problems in *LAB* 25-27.

Like the episodes concerning Abram and Jair, the author of *LAB* has chosen one episode (Judg 7) as the primary model for Kenaz's military victory. The narrative follows the general structure of the scriptural episode (the selection of the men; the approach to the camp; the leader spying on the enemy), whilst incorporating memorable details (the three hundred; the trumpets; the overheard conversation; the 'sword of Gideon/Kenaz'; the confusion of the enemy). As before, this has been supplemented by smaller details borrowed from other accounts, including the election of Saul (1 Sam 10:6) and the description of Eleazar ben Dodo (2 Sam 23:10). At no point does the narrative appear to quote the scriptural source (either paraphrastic or verbatim)—elsewhere this is reserved for the direct speech of characters (i.e. Josh 1:7-

³⁰¹ Kenaz's single-handed victory could reflect the victory of Othniel in Judg 3:10. As no army is mentioned, the verse could be read as Othniel defeating Cushan-rishathaim single-handedly. But given the clear allusion to 2 Sam 23:10, this detail may come from the description of Eleazar ben Dodo, who 'stood his ground' and defeated the Philistines single-handedly when the Israelites withdrew. But again, the parallel is not exact: the Israelites do not withdraw and the enemy is not the Philistines, but the Amorites. However, the exclamation of the Israelites to Kenaz—'When we were awakened, we saw the field full of bodies'—is similar in sentiment to the Israelite troops who, 'returned to Eleazar, but only to strip the dead'.

³⁰² Whereas the inclusion of the Philistines (*LAB* 25:1), instead of the Canaanites (as in Judg 1:1), may owe to their association with Judah, the tribe of Kenaz. Bauckham, 'Pseudo-Philo and the Gospels as "Midrash"', 48.

8 and Deut 29:18 in *LAB* 25:3-5). Still, the dependence of the narrative on key points in the description of Gideon is unmistakable. This makes Bauckham's conclusion—'To what extent [these passages] have contributed to the actual creation of the stories it is difficult to tell'³⁰³—especially puzzling. To the contrary, it shows with some clarity that the narrative of Kenaz—certainly *LAB* 27, and most of *LAB* 25-29—has been composed out of various scriptural episodes in a manner consistent with other scripturalized episodes in *LAB*. As with Dan 3 in *LAB* 6 and 38, the author does not simply apply the career of Gideon to Kenaz wholesale, but follows its general structure as a model, albeit with some considerable variations (Kenaz fights alone without the three hundred), whilst at the same time retaining distinctive narrative details (like the selection of the three hundred and the confusion of the enemy), clearly indicating its source.³⁰⁴

Why the author chose to create such an elaborate portrait of Kenaz out of unrelated scriptural episodes will perhaps remain a mystery.³⁰⁵ The narratives of Abram and Jair offer some pointers as to their origins, but the narrative of Kenaz contains no obvious starting point in Judg 1-3. One possible exception to this is the confusing apocalyptic vision granted to Kenaz before his death (*LAB* 28:6-9). Part of the vision may allude to the apportionment of land given to Achsah, the wife of Othniel, who is given 'the upper springs and the lower springs' (Josh 15:19; Judg 1:15)—as Kenaz sees in his vision a spring emanating from the 'upper' and 'lower' foundations of the earth (*LAB* 28:8). But beyond this, it is hard to draw a line between the brief descriptions of either Kenaz or Othniel in Judg 1-3 and the long, detailed narrative of *LAB* 25-28. The same can be said for the narrative following Kenaz's death, concerning the judgeship of Zebul (*LAB* 29)—another figure apparently invented by

³⁰³ Bauckham, 'Pseudo-Philo and the Gospels as "Midrash"', 50.

³⁰⁴ So Fisk: 'Even when biblical elements are woven into mostly non-biblical material . . . we rarely encounter slavish repetition, what Hays calls "sacramental imitation"' (*Do You Not Remember?*, 318); referencing Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*, 173.

³⁰⁵ Bauckham concludes that the entire career of Kenaz is 'anchored in features of the text of Judges' ('Pseudo-Philo and the Gospels as "Midrash"', 59), despite the unparalleled nature of the material. To the extent that this is true, it is probably more of a reflection of *LAB*'s placing of Kenaz in scriptural chronology (following Joshua, at the beginning of the period of Judges), than any specific exegesis of the text of Judges. Bauckham's insistence that *LAB* never composes new narratives out of scriptural material for any purpose other than exegesis appears to be a presupposition rather than a conclusion. Even when he admits no exegetical motive can be found for the treasury of Zebul (*LAB* 29:3), he wagers, 'though it is possible that further study will uncover such a relationship' (59).

LAB.³⁰⁶ Here, the interest in Kenaz continues as Zebul presides over the division of Kenaz's inheritance between his three daughters (*LAB* 29:1-2), an episode created almost entirely out of the account of the inheritance of the daughters of Zelophehad (Num 27:1-11).

Concluding Observations

In each of these episodes, the author of *LAB* has composed new narratives using unrelated episodes from the Jewish scriptures as a model. The result is that scriptural figures (Abraham, Kenaz) are given the career or features of other scriptural figures (the three young men, Gideon), or that episodes are modelled in whole or in part on other scriptural episodes (i.e. the fiery furnace of Dan 3). In the two fiery furnace episodes, the narrative is based on the interpretation of a single word in the primary scriptural source (Gen 15:7; Judg 10:5). By contrast, Kenaz's defeat of the Amorites appears to be wholly untethered from the scriptural account of Kenaz (likewise the figure of Zebul). In none of these examples does the scripturalized episode replace the material it is modelled on—Kenaz does not replace Gideon, nor is he to be identified with Gideon. Only in the brief episode concerning the ascension of Phinehas does a scripturalized figure appear to be identified with another (in this case, Phinehas *is* Elijah).³⁰⁷

³⁰⁶ It is not clear whether *Zebul* is meant to replace Ehud (Lt. *Aod* in Vg. Judg 3:15-4:1), who follows Othniel in the scriptural chronology. See Ginzberg, *Legends*, 6.184, n. 21; Feldman, 'Prolegomenon', cxv; Perrot, *Pseudo-Philo*, 165; Bauckham, 'Pseudo-Philo and the Gospels as "Midrash"', 50; Harrington, 'Pseudo-Philo', 342, n. 29a; 50; cf. Jacobson, *Commentary*, 6.822. James offers the most plausible explanation that *Zebul* reflects the זבל (Gk. Ζεβουλ; Lt. *Zebul*) of Judg 9:28. The Latin name for Ehud (*Aod*) is instead given to the Midianite magician in *LAB* 34, who follows Deborah in *LAB*'s chronology (Ehud/*Aod* precedes Deborah in the scriptural chronology). This is not the first instance where *LAB* substitutes a well-known figure for an obscure one (i.e. Kenaz for Othniel), though the decision to transform Ehud/*Aod* into an enemy of Israel is inscrutable.

³⁰⁷ The brief description of the ascension of Phinehas (*LAB* 48:1) incorporates language from 1 Kgs 17:3-6, references Elijah's rain miracle in 1 Kgs 17:1, 18:41-45, and the ascension of Elijah (2 Kgs 2:11-12) and his return (Mal 4:5; Sir 48:10). The identification of Phinehas with Elijah can be seen elsewhere: *Tg. Ps.-J.* on Exod 4:13; 40:10; Deut 30:4; *Tg. Yer.* I on Exod 6:18; Num 25:12; Deut 30:4; *Num. Rab.* 21:3; *PRE* 28; 47; Origen, *Comm. Jo.* 6:14. The basis for the identification is unclear but maybe related to their shared 'zeal' (זֵאֵל), see the discussion in Martin Hengel, *The Zealots: Investigations into the Jewish Freedom Movement in the Period From Herod I Until 70 A.D.* (trans. David Smith; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1989) 162-168. For further on the ascension of Phinehas, see Abram Spiro, 'The Ascension of Phinehas', *PAAJR* 22 (1953): 91-114; Hayward, 'Phinehas—the Same is Elijah', 22-34; Zeron, 'The Martyrdom of Phinehas-Elijah', *JBL* 98 (1979): 99-110; Feldman, 'The Portrayal of Phinehas by Philo, Pseudo-Philo, and Josephus', *JQR* 92 (2002): 315-345.

Elsewhere, the most common function of secondary scriptures in *LAB* is to draw analogies between events (Josh 23:14 in *LAB* 33:2) or merge different descriptions of the same (Ps 78:25 in *LAB* 19:5) or similar (Gen 42:8 in *LAB* 12:1) events.³⁰⁸ Secondary scriptural material is also used to fill in narrative details, like the speech of characters (Isa 53:7 in *LAB* 30:5; Jer 1:6 in *LAB* 56:6) or the description of events (Gen 49:33 in *LAB* 24:5; Jdt 13:7,9 in *LAB* 31:7). The three episodes surveyed above represent a different use of secondary scriptural material: its use as a compositional model for a new episode. These episodes share some basic literary features. They follow the structure of a scriptural episode and incorporate distinctive elements from its narrative. They rarely involve verbatim repetition and sometimes include isolated narrative details drawn from elsewhere in the Jewish scriptures. Together they show that scripturalized narratives are a stylistic feature of *LAB* and may serve a variety of interpretive and/or literary purposes.

The *Genesis Apocryphon*

The *Genesis Apocryphon* (1QapGen) was one of the first scrolls discovered at Qumran.³⁰⁹ Whilst the unfortunate title chosen by its first editors implies a derivative status, there is no reason to suppose the covenanters at Qumran held it to be

³⁰⁸ On the question of what motivated the author of *LAB* to so radically re-work their source text, see Reinmuth, *Pseudo-Philo und Lukas*, 118, who thinks the author was governed by a principle of correspondence, ‘Das Korrelationsprinzip setzt voraus, daß Ereignisse durch das Wirken Gottes so korreliert sind, daß sie im Verhältnis der einfachen oder reziproken (bzw. kontrapunktischen) Entsprechung zueinander stehen’. Likewise for Murphy, the association of similar scriptural episodes ‘underlines the structure and interconnectedness of history, which in turn illustrates God’s control of events’ (Murphy, *Pseudo-Philo*, 59). Fisk, on the other hand, concludes that the author writes from ‘a hermeneutical conviction that the key for unlocking Scripture’s meaning is to be found *in Scripture*’ (*Do You Not Remember?*, 327, emphasis original). This is not dissimilar to Bauckham’s claim that *LAB* is always ‘interpreting scripture by scripture’ (‘Pseudo-Philo and the Gospels as “Midrash”’, 34, 59). This seems appropriate when applied to Fisk’s impressive study of *LAB*’s characterization of Moses and Joshua (*Do You Not Remember?*, 264-313). But given the above discussion, there is not always an obvious hermeneutical purpose to the use of ‘subsidiary scripture’—whether in the scripturalized narratives of Kenaz or Zebul, or something as small as the intrusion of a detail from the death of Jacob in the death of Joshua (*LAB* 24:5; cf. Gen 49:33b).

³⁰⁹ Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1 (1Q20): A Commentary* (3rd ed.; *Biblica et Orientalia* 18B; Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2004) 13. Quotations of the English and Aramaic text, unless otherwise stated, come from the recent edition by Daniel A. Machiela, *The Dead Sea Genesis Apocryphon: A New Text and Translation with Introduction and Special Treatment of Columns 13-17* (STDJ 79; Leiden: Brill, 2009).

apocryphal.³¹⁰ Indeed, as Fitzmyer conjectures, ‘One might conceivably argue that it was hidden away in Cave 1 precisely for [the opposite] reason’.³¹¹ Consisting of twenty-three partially preserved columns, the Aramaic text roughly follows the narrative of Gen 5-15, narrated mostly from the first person with three distinct narrative voices: Lamech, Noah and Abram. Aside from this novel mode of narration, 1QapGen exhibits a number of compositional and exegetical techniques in its treatment of the Genesis material.³¹² This includes the author’s decision to have Noah offer sacrifices before exiting the ark so as to provide purification for the earth (1QapGen 10:12-13; cf. Gen 8:15-21), the omission of Noah’s drunkenness in favour of a wine-fueled vision (Gen 9:18-27; cf. 1QapGen 12:13-15:21) and Abram’s dream of the palm and the cedar as the pre-text for Abram and Sarai’s deception of Pharaoh (1QapGen 19:14-21; cf. Gen 12:11-13).

In addition to the Genesis material, 1QapGen shares many details with *Jubilees* and the so-called ‘Book of Noah’ portion of *1 Enoch*. This includes the entire section from cols. 2 to 5:27 which parallels the birth of Noah narrated in *1 En.* 106-107. Whereas the agreement with *Jubilees* can be seen in the descent of the watchers in the ‘days of Jared’ (1QapGen 3:3; *Jub.* 4:15), Enoch learns ‘everything’ (כולא) from the angels (1QapGen 2:20-21; *Jub.* 4:21), Bitenosh/Betenos as Lamech’s wife (1QapGen 2:3-5; *Jub.* 4:28), the description of the flood destroying ‘man and cattle and beasts and birds and everything which walks/moves on the earth’ (1QapGen 6:26; *Jub.* 5:2,20), Noah’s atoning (כפר) sacrifice (1QapGen 10:13; *Jub.* 6:2), the timing of Noah’s harvest (1QapGen 19:7-8; *Jub.* 13:8), Abram and Sarai’s five-year sojourn in Egypt before her abduction (1QapGen 19:23; *Jub.* 13:11) and the quotation of Num 13:22 in connection with their arrival in Egypt (1QapGen 19:9-10; *Jub.* 13:12).³¹³

That there was a literary relationship between *Jubilees* and 1QapGen is certain. The direction of the relationship, however, has been a matter of debate. The tendency

³¹⁰ So Fitzmyer: ‘For this word inevitably evokes its counterpart, a canonical book, and consequently introduces into Qumran literature a slight anachronism’ (*The Genesis Apocryphon*, 16).

³¹¹ Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon*, 16

³¹² Explored in greater detail by Bernstein, ‘The Genesis Apocryphon: Compositional and Interpretive Perspectives’ in *A Companion to Biblical Interpretation in Early Judaism* (ed. Matthias Henze; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2012) 157-179.

³¹³ For a full list of agreements see the table provided by Daniel K. Falk, *The Parabiblical Texts: Strategies for Extending the Scriptures among the Dead Sea Scrolls* (LSTS 63; London: T&T Clark, 2007) 31-35.

of 1QapGen to make corrections to the Genesis material which are unparalleled in *Jubilees*, suggests its posteriority: for example, in 1QapGen 10:13-11:1, Noah offers the sacrifice before exiting the ark so as not to defile the land, whereas Gen 8:15-20 and *Jub.* 6:1-3 have Noah exiting the ark before the sacrifice; Noah's drunkenness is omitted in 1QapGen 12:13-15:21, whereas *Jub.* 7:6-7 mostly preserves Gen 9:21-27; 1QapGen 20:22-23 explains how Pharaoh came to know that Sarai was Abram's wife, whereas Gen 12:18-19 and *Jub.* 13:13-15 offer no such explanation; Abram tours the land in fulfilment of God's command in 1QapGen 21:13-20, whereas in Gen 13:14-17 and *Jub.* 13:19-21, the command is left unfulfilled; and Abram returns the spoils of the king of Sodom in fulfilment of his pledge in 1QapGen 22:24-26, whereas in Gen 14:22-23 and *Jub.* 13:28-29, the pledge is left unfulfilled.³¹⁴ What is more, the chronology shared between *Jubilees* and 1QapGen seems to sit easily with the former's systematization of 'weeks' whilst posing problems for the latter: the author has Sarai held captive for an unusually long 'two years' (1QapGen 20:16-19; cf. *Jub.* 13:11) and struggles to reconcile Abram and Sarai's seven-year sojourn in Egypt with the 'ten years' of Gen 16:3 (1QapGen 22:27-29; cf. *Jub.* 13:10-16).³¹⁵ On the other hand, the presence of similar compositional techniques in its treatment of both Genesis and Enochic material suggests 1QapGen's dependence on *I Enoch* or a related work: the exchange between Lamech and Bitenosh (1QapGen 2:3-18) parallels the exchange between Abram and Sarai (19:17-21) and Lamech's first-person narration fits the testamental character of the scroll.³¹⁶ The additional presence of Enochic language—'watchers and holy ones' (1QapGen 2:1,16,20; *I En.* 1:2; 10:1; 12:2); 'the great holy

³¹⁴ Kugel offers more arguments to this effect, see *A Walk Through Jubilees: Studies in the Book of Jubilees and the World of its Creation* (JSJSupp 156; Leiden: Brill, 2012) 312-323; also VanderKam, *Jubilees 1-21* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2018) 93-94. Cf. Vermes, '2. The Genesis Apocryphon from Qumran' in Emil Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* (rev. Vermes, Fergus Millar and Martin Goodman; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1986) 3.1.318-325, who argues the condensed narrative in *Jubilees* demonstrates its posteriority. To the contrary, the comparative length of a text should not be regarded *prima facie* as a clear sign of its priority, unless it can be shown that the expansion or compression is in response to problems in the related text (such as inserting longer explanatory passages or eliminating problematic ones).

³¹⁵ Kugel, *A Walk Through Jubilees*, 330-332; cf. Wacholder, 'How Long did Abram Stay in Egypt?', *HUCA* 35 (1964): 43-56 (52-53), who thinks 1QapGen's chronology exhibits a less developed view than *Jubilees*, suggesting its priority.

³¹⁶ Expanded by George W. E. Nickelsburg, 'Patriarchs Who Worry About Their Wives: A Haggadic Tendency in the Genesis Apocryphon' in *George W. E. Nickelsburg in Perspective: An Ongoing Dialogue of Learning, Volume 2* (ed. Jacob Neusner and Alan J. Avery-Peck; JSJSupp 82; Leiden: Brill, 2003) 177-199.

one' (1QapGen 2:14,16; *1 En.* 1:3; 10:1)—and Abram's narration to the Egyptian princes from 'the book of the words of Enoch' (1QapGen 19:25,29), makes an Enochic source for 1QapGen 2-5:27 seem all the more probable.³¹⁷ Although the Enochic material appears to be the primary source of columns 2-5, the remaining narrative tends to follow Genesis more closely than it does *Jubilees*, and certainly more so than *1 Enoch*. In this sense, 1QapGen treats the Genesis material as its *primary scripture*—to borrow a phrase from *LAB* scholarship.

The Compositional Use of the Jewish Scriptures in 1QapGen

In its treatment of the Genesis narrative, 1QapGen employs language and details from related and unrelated scriptural texts—in other words, *secondary scriptural* material. Some of this material owes to its source: for example, where 1QapGen agrees with *Jubilees*. In the book of *Jubilees*, the Patriarchs are seen fulfilling the requirements of the law prior to Sinai, and 1QapGen reflects this:³¹⁸ in his first sacrifice, Noah offers a goat (1QapGen 10:13; *Jub.* 6:2; cf. Num 15:24-25), burns fat upon the fire (1QapGen 10:14; *Jub.* 6:3; cf. Lev 4:19), pours out blood on the altar (1QapGen 10:15; cf. Lev 4:18) offers turtledoves kneaded with oil (1QapGen 10:15-16; *Jub.* 6:3; cf. Num 15:24) and salts the sacrifices (1QapGen 10:17; *Jub.* 6:3; cf. Lev 2:13); the Noachide prohibition against consuming blood (Gen 9:4) becomes

³¹⁷ Nickelsburg also notes similarities between Pharaoh and Sarai (1QapGen 20) and the watchers and the women (*1 En.* 6-11), suggesting 1QapGen modelled Sarai's captivity on the Enochic narrative (*Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah* [Minneapolis, MN; Fortress Press, 2011] 176). Whilst Enochic material also appears in *Jubilees*, the presence of Enochic language in 1QapGen absent in *Jubilees* suggests that *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees* were two independent sources for 1QapGen.

³¹⁸ For *Jubilees*, the law eventually revealed at Sinai is both eternal and pre-existent: as God tells Moses, 'Because thus [the law] is written and set upon the heavenly tablets as a testimony for eternal generations' (*Jub.* 23:32; also, Title; 2:33; 3:14; 6:14; 13:25; 32:10; 33:16; 49:17). As such, the righteous Patriarchs obeyed this law: 'And [Jacob] worshiped the LORD with all of his heart according to the commands which were revealed according to the division of the days of his generations' (*Jub.* 36:20b). The book of *Jubilees* does not maintain this idea consistently, however, as Reuben and Judah are excused because the law had not been fully revealed at Sinai (*Jub.* 33:9-20, esp. 16). This inconsistency is amplified by the presence of a redactor who inserted legal material in addition to the *Jubilees* material already harmonized with Leviticus and Deuteronomy: for example, in one instance, Bilhah escapes the punishment prescribed in Lev 20:11 because she was the victim of rape (*Jub.* 33:1-9), whereas, in another, both Reuben and Bilhah escape punishment because the law 'had not been revealed' (*Jub.* 33:16). Nevertheless, for the most part *Jubilees* reflects the idea that the righteous Patriarchs not only upheld the law, but also instituted aspects of it themselves. For the presence of a redactor(s) in *Jubilees*, see Michael Segal, *The Book of Jubilees: Rewritten Bible, Redaction, Ideology and Theology* (JSJSupp 117; Leiden: Brill, 2007) 73-82.

the Levitical prohibition (1QapGen 11:17; Lev 7:26; cf. 3:17; 19:26); and the harvesting of Noah's vineyard (Gen 9:20-21) becomes the Levitical feast of the first-fruits (1QapGen 12:13-16; *Jub.* 7:2; cf. Lev 19:23-25). Like *Jubilees*, 1QapGen also weaves God's post-diluvian mandate to Noah (9:1-7) with the creation mandate in Gen 1:28 (1QapGen 11:16-17; *Jub.* 6:5-9), and mentions the building of Hebron (Num 33:22) in relation to Egypt (1QapGen 19:9; *Jub.* 13:12).

Elsewhere, Abram's dream of the palm and the cedar (1QapGen 19:14-15) appears to borrow the language of Ps 92:13,³¹⁹ the description of the Rephaim (1QapGen 21:18-29) comes from Deut 2:20, and the mention of Helbon (הלבוֹן) is dependent on Ezek 27:18 (1QapGen 22:10; cf. MT and LXX Gen 14:15; Jos., *Ant.* 1.10.1).³²⁰ Whilst somewhat less clear, Pharaoh's gift to Sarai of '[m]uch si[lver and g]old and much clothing of *fine linen and purple*' (1QapGen 20:31: בוֹץ וְאַרְגָּוָן) may reflect Ahasuerus' gift to Mordecai of a 'great golden crown and a mantle of *fine linen and purple*' (Est 8:15: בוֹץ וְאַרְגָּמָן).

1QapGen also includes a few passages which appear to be modelled on secondary scriptural material. Daniel Falk raises the possibility that the song of Hirqanos and the Egyptian officials extolling the beauty of Sarai (1QapGen 20:2-8) is 'a midrash on the ideal Israelite wife from Prov. 31.10-31 combined with Song of Songs, inspired by Gen. 12.11 ("I know well that you are a beautiful woman")'.³²¹ Like the Song of Songs, Hirqanos' song praises Sarai's face (1QapGen 20:2,4; Song 2:14), hair (1QapGen 20:3; Song 4:1; 6:5), eyes (1QapGen 20:3; Song 4:1; 6:5), nose (1QapGen 20:3; Song 7:4), breasts (1QapGen 20:4; Song 4:5; 7:3,7-8) and thighs

³¹⁹ Compare with *Gen. Rab.* 41:1. The identification of Abram and Sarai with the palm and cedar of Ps 92:13 may owe to v. 15: עוֹד יִנְוִבּוּן בְּשִׁיבָה ('In old age they still produce fruit'; cf. Gen 18:11-15). Noah is also identified with the cedar (1QapGen 14:9; *Gen. Rab.* 30:7). For discussion of the significance see John C. Reeves, *Jewish Lore in Manichaean Cosmogony: Studies in the Book of Giants Traditions* (Monographs of the Hebrew Union College 14; Cincinnati, OH: Hebrew Union College, 1992) 99-100; Machiela, *The Dead Sea Genesis Apocryphon*, 95; Esther Eshel, 'The Dream Visions in the Noah Story of the Genesis Apocryphon and Related Texts' in *Northern Lights on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Nordic Qumran Network 2003-2006* (ed. Anders Klostergaard Petersen, Torleif Elgvin, Cecilia Wassen, Hanne von Weissenberg, Mikael Winninge and Martin Ehrensward; STDJ 80; Leiden: Brill, 2009) 41-61. Falk also notes that the lover and his beloved are represented by the cedar and palm in Song 5:15 and 7:7-8 (*The Parabiblical Texts*, 87; this is interpreted as a reference to Abraham in *Tg. Cant.* 7:9).

³²⁰ On הלבוֹן, see Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon*, 243-244.

³²¹ Falk, *The Parabiblical Texts*, 86.

(1QapGen 20:6; Song 7:1).³²² However, only the statement ‘Her beauty *surpasses* (עלִיָּא) that of all women’ (1QapGen 20:7; cf. Prov 31:29: עלִיָּת) offers any verbal correspondence with the portrait in Prov 31.

At the same time, Nickelsburg suggests that 1QapGen 19-20 is modelled, in part, on the story of the watchers and the women as preserved in *1 En.* 6-11.³²³

<i>1 En.</i> 6-11	1QapGen 20
Sons of Heaven see beauty of the women	Pharaoh sees Sarai’s beauty
They desire them	He loves her
They take them as their wives	He takes her as his wife
They have intercourse with them	
The dead, the earth, the holy ones pray	Abram prays
God sends angels for judgment	God sends a spirit
	Pharaoh does not have intercourse with Sarai

These parallels are too loose to prove literary dependence.³²⁴ But the fact that, during the episode, Abram reads to the princes from ‘the book of the words of Enoch’ (לספר מלי חנוך) raises the interesting possibility that here 1QapGen has re-framed Gen 12:14-20 with the help of material from the Enochic corpus.³²⁵ Much more certain, however, is 1QapGen’s use of the similar account of Sara and Abimelech (Gen 20) to refurbish the account in Gen 12:10-20.³²⁶ The detail that Pharaoh Zoan was ‘not able

³²² The praise of Sarai’s forehead, white complexion, arms, hands, palms, fingers and legs, however, is unparalleled. Contrary to Falk, one wonders whether the similarities between 1QapGen 20:2-8 and Canticles owe to their shared *topos* in antiquity—extolling a woman’s physical beauty—not literary dependence.

³²³ As appears in Nickelsburg, ‘Patriarchs Who Worry About their Wives’, 190.

³²⁴ Nickelsburg acknowledges some of the differences: ‘The stories differ in that here God’s judgment prevents intercourse between Pharaoh and Sarai, whereas in 1 Enoch 6-11 the judgment comes after divine-human mating has produced the giants, whose devastating activity triggers the prayer’ (‘Patriarchs Who Worry About their Wives’, 191).

³²⁵ Nickelsburg also suggests that 1QapGen’s portrait of Abram is influenced by the scriptural account of Daniel as a dream-interpreter and champion of the imperial court (‘Patriarchs Who Worry About their Wives’, 189-190). However, surely the analogy is closer to Joseph interpreting dreams in the court of Pharaoh (Gen 40-41), which appears to be referenced in 1QapGen 20:18-19 (cf. Gen 41:8; Exod 7:11).

³²⁶ 1QapGen shows a similar tendency to *LAB* in conflating similar or related episodes, see Bernstein, ‘Compositional and Interpretive Perspectives’, 173-175.

to approach her' (1QapGen 20:17) comes from Gen 20:4, whereas Lot's language appears to come from Gen 20:7: 'Then he will pray over him so that he might live' (1QapGen 20:23). As Bernstein notes, other details may also rely on scriptural language, for example, Pharaoh sends and calls for the 'wise men of Egypt and all the magicians' (1QapGen 20:18-19) as in Gen 41:8 and Exod 7:11.³²⁷

But by far the most extensive use of secondary scriptural material in 1QapGen appears in the covenant given to Noah (1QapGen 11:11-19), wherein Noah is modelled on Abram. The following section will examine this passage more closely.

Noah and Abram: 1QapGen 11 and Gen 13, 15 and 26

As mentioned before, 1QapGen merges details of the creation mandate (Gen 1:28) into the post-diluvian mandate of the Noachide covenant (1QapGen 11:16-17; *Jub.* 6:5-9).³²⁸ This reflects the recapitulation of the creation saga already inherent in the scriptural text (Gen 9:1-7).³²⁹ For example, Gen 1:28 and 9:1 both read 'Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the earth' (פרו ורבו ומלאו את הארץ), but 1QapGen 11:3 adds the detail that Noah and his sons should 'rule over' the earth from Gen 1:28c (cf. LXX Gen 9:1; Philo, *QG* 2.56). 1QapGen 11:5 similarly omits the provision to eat meat in Gen 9:2-3, preserving the vegetation-only diet of Gen 1:29.³³⁰ But the Noachide covenant in 1QapGen 11 also looks forward to the Abrahamic covenant, as God addresses Noah in the language of Gen 15:1 and 26:24 and Noah surveys and tours the land promised to him, just like Abram (Gen 13:14-15,17).

1QapGen 11:11 begins, '[Then] I, Noah, went out and walked through the land, in its length and in its breadth' (אדין אנה נפקת והלכת בארעא לאורכהא ולפותיהא).³³¹ This reflects Gen 13:17, where God commands Abram, 'Rise up, walk through the length and breadth of the land'. The reading is paralleled in the Targums, particularly *Tg. Onk.* and *Neof.* on Gen 13:17: 'through the land, in its length and in its breath'

³²⁷ Bernstein also notes that the inability of the magicians to perform because of their afflictions in 1QapGen 20:20 recalls Exod 9:11, 'Compositional and Interpretive Perspectives', 173.

³²⁸ For a comprehensive discussion, see Falk, *The Parabiblical Texts*, 54-64.

³²⁹ See the lengthy discussion in Carol M. Kaminski, *From Noah to Israel: Realization of the Primaeval Blessing After the Flood* (JSOTS 413; London: T&T Clark, 2004).

³³⁰ The command to abstain from blood is awkward in this context (1QapGen 11:6; cf. Gen 9:3-4; *Jub.* 6:6-7).

³³¹ Translation own.

(הל[ני]ק בארעא לארכה ולפת[יה]).³³² After blessing the land, Noah continues: the LORD ‘a[ppared] to me from heaven, speaking with me and saying to me, “Do not fear, O Noah! I am with you and with those of your sons who will be like you forever”’ (1QapGen 11:15). This appears to be a conflation of Gen 15:1 and 26:24. Gen 15:1 reads, ‘[The] word of the Lord came to Abram in a vision, “Do not be afraid, Abram, I am your shield; your reward shall be very great”’. Concerning Isaac, Gen 26:24 reads, ‘[The] LORD appeared to him and said, “I am the God of your father Abraham; do not be afraid, for I am with you and will bless you and make your offspring numerous for my servant Abraham’s sake”’.³³³ The two verses are conflated again in 1QapGen 22:30-31, where God addresses Abram, ‘And now do not fear; I am with you, and will be for you a support and strength; I am a shield over you, and a buckler for you against those stronger than you’.

The command addressed to Noah in 1QapGen 11:15, ‘Do not fear, O Noah!’ (אל תדחל יא נוה) roughly follows the syntax of Gen 15:1 as rendered in *Tgs. Onk.* and *Neof.*, ‘Do not fear, Abram’ (לא תדחל אברם).³³⁴ The other details, that the LORD ‘appeared ([א]תחזי) . . . saying (אמר) . . . I am with you (עמך אנה)’, reflect Gen 26:24.³³⁵ Compare this with *Tg. Neof.* on Gen 26:24: the *memra* of the Lord was ‘revealed (אתגלי) . . . saying (אמר) . . . I am with you (עמך אנה)’.³³⁶ 1QapGen 22:27-34 more or less reproduces Gen 15:1-4 from ‘After these things’ (בתר פתגמיה).³³⁷ Whilst the detail concerning the shield (מגן עליך) in 1QapGen 22:31 reflects Gen 15:1 (מגן לך in *Tg. Neof.*; cf. *Tg. Ps.-J.*), the phrase ‘I am with you’ (אנה עמך) again comes from the story of Isaac in Gen 26:24. The full list of agreements between 1QapGen 11 and Genesis are shown below.³³⁸

³³² Also, *Tg. Ps.-J.* on 13:17: ‘through its length and through its breath’ (לארכא ולפתיה). Cf. *b. B. Bat.* 15b; 16a; 100a; *b. San.* 111a; *b. Sab.* 118a.

³³³ It is possible that Gen 15:1 and 26:24 also lie behind Isa 41:10, where God says to Abraham, ‘Do not fear, for I am with you, do not be afraid, for I am your God; I will strengthen you, I will help you, I will uphold you with my victorious right hand’.

³³⁴ Also, *Tg. Ps.-J.* on Gen 15:1: ‘do not fear’ (לא תדחל).

³³⁵ The Hebrew text of Gen 26:24c partially preserved in 4Q12 1:4 corresponds with the MT.

³³⁶ The key difference is the decision to interpret the Heb. ירא (‘appear’) with its Ar. equivalent חזי (‘appear’) in 1QapGen 11:15, as opposed to גלי (‘reveal’) in the Targums. The use of גלי as a substitute for divine action is characteristic of the anti-anthropomorphic tendency in the Targums, especially Neofiti. See Martin McNamara, *Targum and Testament Revisited: Aramaic Paraphrases of the Hebrew Bible: A Light on the New Testament* (2nd ed.; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2010) 147-153.

³³⁷ As in *Tg. Ps.-J.*, *Onk.* and *Neof.* on Gen 15:1: בתר פתגמיה.

³³⁸ For more detailed tables on 1QapGen 11 (without Aramaic parallels) see Falk, *The Parabiblical Texts*, 55-68, Tables 5-9.

1QapGen 11	Primary Scriptures	Secondary Scriptures	1QapGen 21-22
Noah went out and walked ‘through the land, in its length and in its breadth’ (1QapGen 11:11).		God commands Abram to walk ‘through the length and breadth of the land’ (Gen 13:17).	God commands Abram to walk and inspect the ‘length and width’ of the land (1QapGen 21:13-19).
The LORD ‘appeared to [Noah] from heaven, spoke with me and said to me’ (1QapGen 11:15a).		‘The word of the LORD came to Abram in a vision’ (Gen 15:1); ‘The LORD appeared to him and said’ (Gen 26:24).	‘God appeared to Abram in a vision and said to him’ (1QapGen 22:27).
‘Do not fear, O Noah’ (1QapGen 11:15b).		‘Do not fear, Abram’ (Gen 15:1b). ‘Do not fear’ (Gen 26:24b)	‘And now do not fear’ (1QapGen 22:30).
‘I am with you’ (1QapGen 11:15c).		‘I am with you’ (Gen 26:24c).	‘For I am with you’ (1QapGen 22:30).
‘Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the land’ (1QapGen 11:16a).	‘Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the earth’ (Gen 9:1; cf. 9:7).	‘Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the earth’ (Gen 1:28a).	
‘Rule over all of them’ (1QapGen 11:16b)		‘Rule over’ every living thing (Gen 1:28b; cf. LXX Gen 9:1).	
‘Behold, I am giving to you . . . everything for food; that of the vegetation and herbs of the land’ (1QapGen 11:16c-17).	‘Every moving thing that lives shall be food for you; and just as I gave you the green plants, I give you everything’ (Gen 9:3).	‘Behold, I have given you every plant yielding seed that is upon the earth, and every tree with seed in its fruit; you shall have them for food’ (Gen 1:29).	
‘But you shall not eat any blood’ (1QapGen 11:17b).	‘You shall not eat flesh with its life, that is, its blood’ (Gen 9:4).	‘You shall not eat any blood’ (Lev 7:26).	
‘The awe and fear of you . . .’ (1QapGen 11:17c).	‘The fear and dread of you shall rest on every animal of the earth’ (Gen 9:2).		

The scripturalized episode serves two purposes: it ties the Noachide covenant to God's promise of land to Abram and his descendants, whilst at the same time associating the post-diluvian mandate with the creation mandate. But whereas the association of the creation mandate with the post-diluvian mandate is already implicit in the text of Gen 9:1-7, the association of the promise of land to Abram to an initial promise of land to Noah has no parallel in the scriptural text and is, by all accounts, unique to the *Apocryphon*.³³⁹ On one level, it would appear to be part of 1QapGen's larger design to elevate Noah's spiritual significance. Having already recounted Noah's miraculous birth (1QapGen 2:1-5:27) and election on account of his righteousness (6:1-6,14-16,23), the modelling of Noah on Abram serves to elevate the significance of the Noachide covenant in Israel's history.

But the equation of Noah and Abram also has an exegetical dimension: the episode in col. 11 is followed by a dream (partially preserved in cols. 12-15) in which God reveals to Noah the land to be inherited by his descendants (cols. 16-17)—which mostly reflects the divisions of the earth among Noah's descendants in *Jub.* 8:10-9:13 (cf. Gen 10:2-31).³⁴⁰ This adds to the Abrahamic presentation of Noah in 1QapGen: like Abram (Gen 12:7; 15:18-21; 1QapGen 21:12), Noah is given land to be inherited by his descendants. In turn, 1QapGen's depiction of Abram comes to resemble the narrative concerning Noah and the division of land among his descendants in cols. 16-17. Later in the narrative, Abram surveys the land from the River of Egypt to Lebanon and Senir, from the Great Sea to Hauran, from Gebal to Kadesh and from the Great Desert to the Euphrates (1QapGen 21:10-14)—an area roughly corresponding to

³³⁹ Kaminski makes a persuasive case that the Genesis narrative connects the promise of progeny to Abram with the post-diluvian mandate in Gen 9:1-7 (*From Noah to Israel*, 92-110), but confusingly overlooks the fact that the *Apocryphon* makes precisely the same connection.

³⁴⁰ On the distinctive geography of *Jubilees* and 1QapGen and its possible sources, see Alexander, 'Notes on the "Imago Mundi" of the Book of Jubilees', *JJS* 38 (1982): 197-213; Francis Schmidt, 'Naissance d'une géographe juive' in *Moïse géographe: Recherches sur les représentations juives et chrétiennes de l'espace* (ed. Alain Desreumaux and Schmidt; Paris: Vrin, 1988) 13-30; James M. Scott, *Geography in Early Judaism and Christianity: The Book of Jubilees* (SNTS 113; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002) 23-43; Eshel, 'The Imago Mundi of the Genesis Apocryphon' in *Heavenly Tablets: Interpretation, Identity and Tradition in Ancient Judaism* (ed. Lynn LiDonnici and Andrea Lieber; JSJSupp 119; Leiden: Brill, 2007) 111-131; Machiela, "'Each to His Own Inheritance" Geography as an Evaluative Tool in the Genesis Apocryphon', *DSD* 15 (2008): 50-66; *The Dead Sea Genesis Apocryphon*, 105-130; Katell Berthelot, 'Casting Lots and Distributing Territories: The Hellenistic Background of the Book of Jubilees and the Genesis Apocryphon' in *Sibyls, Scriptures, and Scrolls: John Collins at Seventy* (ed. Joel Baden, Hindy Najman and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar; JSJSupp 175; Leiden: Brill, 2017) 148-166.

Shem's portion in *Jub.* 8:12-21 (partially preserved in 1QapGen 16:16-25). Abram then walks the land from the Gihon River to Mount Taurus, then along the Great Sea of Salt until the Euphrates River, and from there to Erythrean Sea and then back to where he started at the River Gihon (1QapGen 21:14-19)—this time roughly corresponding to the division among Shem's sons, especially Arpachshad (1QapGen 17:7-14).

By having Abram survey the land given by Noah to Shem and his descendants, 1QapGen ties the Abrahamic covenant to the promise made to Abram's forebears—which can be traced back through Arpachshad, Shem and, ultimately, to Noah. The promise of land to Abram then becomes a recapitulation of the initial promise to Noah: Abram inherits the land *because* it is his birthright as a descendant of Noah through Shem. The use of material from the life of Abram (Gen 13 and 15) in the description of Noah (1QapGen 11:11-15) comes to illustrate an exegetical point: Noah and Abram resemble each other because they are beneficiaries of the same covenant. Indeed, the blessings of this covenant also extend to Abram's descendants³⁴¹—making the intrusion of the blessing to Isaac (Gen 26:24) in 1QapGen 11:15 (and 22:30) perhaps more understandable. This further reinforces 1QapGen's veneration of Noah: God's promise of land to Israel originates, not with Abram, but with Noah.³⁴²

All this has led the author of the *Apocryphon* to create a scripturalized narrative: an episode in the life of Noah, composed using the primary scriptural setting of Gen 9:1-7 and furnished with secondary scriptural details from the narratives of Abram (Gen 13:17; 15:1) and Isaac (Gen 26:24)—as well as the creation mandate (Gen 1:28-29). Here, the choice of the material for scripturalization appears to be significant. By composing this episode, the author grounds the covenantal promise of land to Abram, and therefore all Israel, in an initial promise given to Noah and his descendants. This promise is itself a recapitulation of the creation mandate. By making it more ancient, the *Apocryphon* does to the covenant what *Jubilees* does to the law, so that for both works, the adage applies: the older, the better.

³⁴¹ A promise which may have been explained following the lacuna in the final column (1QapGen 22:34).

³⁴² That the association of Abram with the promise of land to Shem and his descendants is absent in *Jubilees*, again suggests the posteriority of 1QapGen: here, Abram's participation in the promise of land given through Noah is created in response to the division of land in *Jubilees* (8:12-21; 9:4).

1 Maccabees

The book of 1 Maccabees understandably contains fewer clear references to the Jewish scriptures than the *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* or the *Genesis Apocryphon*, where the Jewish scriptures are, in a sense, the main subject. Instead, 1 Maccabees purports to give an account of the events which transpired under the brutal reign of the Seleucid Antiochus IV Epiphanes in the decade following 175 BCE and the first three decades of Hasmonean leadership. 1 Maccabees nevertheless includes a small number of citations from the Jewish scriptures, as well as instances where unmarked scriptural material is woven into the narrative or serves as the model for an episode. However, identifying the use of the Jewish scriptures in 1 Maccabees is especially difficult given that the text was probably not composed in Greek. Whilst all surviving manuscripts depend on a Greek text, the style and language appear to be distinctly Semitic in character, suggesting a Hebrew *vorlage*³⁴³—a conclusion made more probable by the mention of a Hebrew book of the Maccabees by several ancient witnesses.³⁴⁴

This goes some way in explaining why there is no consistent verbatim agreement between 1 Maccabees and any major Greek text of the Jewish scriptures. Even when a scriptural source is clear, the citations tend to be paraphrastic. Consider the formal citation in 1 Macc 7:17, ‘The flesh of your saints and their blood they poured out around about Jerusalem, and there was none to bury them’ (σάρκας ὁσίων σου καὶ αἷμα αὐτῶν ἐξέχεαν κύκλῳ Ἱερουσαλημ, καὶ οὐκ ἦν αὐτοῖς ὁ θάπτων), which no doubt comes from Ps 79(78):2-3, but only partially corresponds to the literal rendering of the Hebrew in the LXX, ‘The flesh of your saints for the wild animals of the earth; they poured out their blood like water, around about Jerusalem, and there

³⁴³ Noted almost a century ago by H. W. Ettelson, ‘The Integrity of 1 Maccabees’, *Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences* 27 (1925): 249-384. This has since been the view of all major commentaries, see Zeitlin, *The First Book of Maccabees* (with English translation of the text by Sidney Tedesche; New York, NY: Harper, 1950) 33-34; John C. Dancy, *A Commentary on 1 Maccabees* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1954) 8-9; Félix-Marie Abel and Jean Starcky, *Les Livres des Maccabées* (Paris: Cerf, 1961) 15; John R. Bartlett, *The First and Second Books of the Maccabees* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973) 14-15; Jonathan A. Goldstein, *1 Maccabees: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 41; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1976) 14-16; Klaus-Dietrich Schunck, *1. Makkabäerbuch* (JSHRZ 1/4; Mohn: Gütersloh, 1980) 289.

³⁴⁴ Origen, quoted in Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 6.25.2; Jerome, *Prologus galeatus* (PL 28.593-604).

was no one to bury them’ (τὰς σάρκας τῶν ὀσίων σου τοῖς θηρίοις τῆς γῆς· ἐξέχεαν τὸ αἷμα αὐτῶν ὡς ὕδωρ κύκλω Ἱερουσαλημ, καὶ οὐκ ἦν ὁ θάπτων).³⁴⁵ In other places, differences between 1 Maccabees and the LXX seem to owe to the idiosyncrasies of the translator: in 1 Macc 12:53, the Gentiles clearly echo the language of the LORD in Deut 32:26, ‘We will blot out the memory of them from among humans’ (ἐξάρωμεν ἐξ ἀνθρώπων τὸ μνημόσυνον αὐτῶν); compare with LXX Deut 32:26, ‘I will stop the memory of them from among humans’ (παύσω δὴ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων τὸ μνημόσυνον αὐτῶν).³⁴⁶ Here, the difference *mutatis mutandis* owes to alternate translations of חָבַשׁ, which in its current *hiphil* form can refer to either ‘stopping’ (cf. Hos 2:11) or ‘removing’ (cf. Ps 89:44)³⁴⁷—thus, the hortatory subjunctive ἐξάρωμεν could conceivably come from the imperfect cohortative חָבַשׁוּ, which better preserves the sense of the Hebrew in Deut 32:26 than the future παύσω of the LXX.³⁴⁸

Elsewhere, partial agreements with the Jewish scriptures may simply be the result of so-called *biblicisms*³⁴⁹—for example, the phrase in 1 Macc 1:39 (‘Her feasts were turned into mourning’) may not be a citation *per se* but expresses a similar sentiment to Amos 8:10 (cf. Tob 2:6), whereas the ‘desolating sacrilege’ (βδέλυγμα ἐρημώσεως) of 1 Macc 1:54 may simply reflect a common expression for the sin of Antiochus, also used in Dan 11:31 (cf. 9:27; 12:11).³⁵⁰ A contributing factor here is the evidently ‘biblical’ style—in language, themes and structure—adopted by the author, perhaps nowhere more evident than in the Deuteronomistic refrain appended

³⁴⁵ LXX translation own.

³⁴⁶ For a comprehensive attempt at re-creating the Hebrew text of 1 Maccabees, particularly in its use of scriptural material, see Günter Neuhaus, *Studien zu den poetischen Stücken im ersten Makkabäerbuch* (Würzburg: Echter-Verlag, 1974) 40-75.

³⁴⁷ See BDB *s.v.* חָבַשׁ.

³⁴⁸ Whilst the LXX often translates חָבַשׁ with παύω (LXX Gen 8:22; 2 Kgs 23:5,11; Isa 14:4 etc.), חָבַשׁוּ is rendered as ἐξαρθήσεται in Ezek 6:6, in what is arguably an analogous context to Deut 32:26.

³⁴⁹ The identification of *biblicisms* depends on the ability to identify the colloquial use of phrases and terms in different contexts—which is extremely difficult given the paucity of literary evidence from the period. For example, it could be that ‘desolating sacrilege’ was an idiom used to describe the events that took place on 15 Kislev in 167 B.C.E., thus explaining its use in 1 Macc 1:54—although it is impossible to rule out the possibility that it came directly from Daniel, since elsewhere the author appears aware of Danielic tradition (1 Macc 2:59-60; cf. Dan 3:1-30; 6:17-24). Whereas ‘desolating sacrilege’ is an unusual phrase, the general sentiment of the song of the Judeans following the defeat of Gorgias, ‘for he is good, for his mercy endures for ever’ (1 Macc 4:24), likely existed as a common refrain apart from Ps 118:1,29 (‘for he is good, his steadfast love endures forever’), see the psalm in the Hebrew ms. B of Sir 51:12.

³⁵⁰ Other potential *biblicisms* include 1 Macc 1:15 (cf. 2 Kgs 17:17); 1:48 (cf. Lev 20:25b); 3:58a (cf. 2 Sam 2:7a); 3:58b (cf. Exod 34:2); 4:24 (cf. Ps 118:1,29); 4:25 (cf. 1 Sam 14:23); 5:31 (cf. 1 Sam 5:12b).

to the career of Judas, ‘Now the rest of the acts of Judas, and his wars and the brave deeds that he did, and his greatness, have not been recorded, for they were very many’ (1 Macc 9:22; also 16:23; cf. 1 Kgs 11:41; 14:19 etc.).³⁵¹ To this can be added the anachronistic descriptions of the surrounding nations as the scriptural ‘sons of Esau’ (5:3,65; cf. Obad 17-21), ‘Amon’ (5:6) and ‘the Philistines’ (5:66,68). This scriptural style serves the overall propagandistic aims of the book: it has the effect of legitimizing Hasmonean rule.³⁵² Whilst the Hasmonean dynasty could not easily lay hold to any of the traditional means of validating their rule—whether in Davidic or Zadokite descent—it did, however, find a malleable tool in the Jewish scriptures.³⁵³ Where hereditary ties were lacking, the author of 1 Maccabees was able to establish a connection between the new Hasmonean rulers and the righteous kings, prophets and conquerors of the Deuteronomistic histories. The Maccabean brothers are thus depicted as the heirs to Israel’s golden age. The military and political triumphs of Judas, Jonathan and Simon are cut from the same literary cloth as those of Moses and David—a fact which was evidently not meant to escape the attention of early readers.³⁵⁴

But the author of 1 Maccabees does more than just imitate the style of the scriptural histories. In quite a few places, the author uses the Jewish scriptures to supply narrative details or compose episodes in the careers of the Maccabean heroes.

³⁵¹ See the brief summary in Uriel Rappaport, ‘A Note on the Use of the Bible in 1 Maccabees’ in *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the First International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 12-14 May, 1996* (ed. Michael E. Stone and Esther G. Chazon; STDJ 28; Leiden: Brill, 1998) 175-179. However, claims regarding the ‘biblical style’ of 1 Maccabees tend to be general rather than detailed—as Rappaport, ‘It is common knowledge that 1 Maccabees follows the model of biblical historiography’ (175).

³⁵² This, in addition to what may be described as more ‘Hellenistic’ modes of validation, see Martha Himmelfarb, “‘He Was Renowned to the Ends of the Earth’ (1 Maccabees 3:9)’ in *Jewish Literatures and Cultures: Context and Intertext* (ed. Anita Norich and Yaron Z. Eliav; BJS 349; Providence, RI; Brown Judaic Studies, 2008) 77-97.

³⁵³ Tessa Rajak compares this to the ‘rediscovered tradition’ of Augustan Rome, ‘Hasmonean Kingship and Tradition’ in *The Jewish Dialogue with Greece and Rome: Studies in Cultural and Social Interaction* (ed. Rajak; AGAJU 48; Leiden: Brill, 2001) 39-60 (50).

³⁵⁴ Berthelot’s skepticism regarding Joshua typology in the presentation of Judas is warranted, *pace* Goldstein, who sees Judas as a ‘second Joshua’—and more recently Knauf, ‘Joshua redivivus’. See Berthelot, ‘The Biblical Conquest and the Hasmonean Wars According to 1 and 2 Maccabees’ in *The Books of the Maccabees*, 45-60 (46-48); cf. Goldstein, *1 Maccabees*, 293; Ernst Axel Knauf, ‘Joshua Maccabeus: Another Reading of 1 Maccabees 5’ in *‘Even God Cannot Change the Past’: Reflections on Seventeen Years of the European Seminar in Historical Methodology* (ed. Lester L. Grabbe; LHB 663; London: T&T Clark, 2018) 203-212 (210).

The Compositional Use of the Jewish Scriptures in 1 Maccabees

The narrative concerning Mattathias (1 Macc 2) features the clearest *expositional* use of the Jewish scriptures in 1 Maccabees. Whilst his opening speech only refers generally to the suffering of scriptural Israel at the hands of the Gentiles (2:7-13; esp. 2:9a; cf. 2 Chron 36:7-18; Jer 52:17-23; 1 Macc 2:9b; cf. Lam 2:21), Mattathias' farewell speech praises the righteous deeds of the fathers as they are told in the Jewish scriptures (1 Macc 2:51-60; cf. Gen 15:6; 22:1-19; 39:7-12; 41:39-45; Num 13:30; 14:6-10,24,30; 25:11-13; 32:12; Josh 24:25; 2 Sam 7:1-17; 1 Kgs 19:10,14; Dan 3:1-30; 6:17-24).³⁵⁵ In his slaying of the Jew at the altar in Modein (1 Macc 2:23-26), Mattathias is also explicitly compared to the scriptural Phinehas, 'Thus he burned with zeal for the law, as Phinehas did against Zimri the son of Salu' (2:26). Here, however, the story of Phinehas (Num 25:6-13) appears to have influenced details in the *composition* of the narrative as well: in both cases, the sin is committed before the 'eyes' (Num 25:6: עיני; 1 Macc 2:23: ὀφθαλμοί) of 'all' (כל; πᾶς) people, and having 'seen' (Num 25:7: ראה; 1 Macc 2:24: ὀράω) what took place, the righteous men slay the sinner.³⁵⁶ This scripturalization may have been triggered by the similarities of the historical Mattathias to Phinehas, especially if the events at Modein took place as narrated—but it also serves a propagandistic function. By laying hold of the legacy of Phinehas, and particularly his 'zeal', the author could associate the Hasmoneans with the 'perpetual priesthood' granted Phinehas on account of his zeal (Num 25:11-13): an association which is elsewhere made explicit, 'Phinehas *our ancestor*, because he was deeply zealous, received the covenant of everlasting priesthood' (1 Macc 2:54).³⁵⁷

³⁵⁵ For further discussion of the use of the Jewish scriptures in the narrative of Mattathias, see Thomas Hieke, 'The Role of "Scripture" in the Last Words of Mattathias', in *The Books of the Maccabees: History, Theology, Ideology: Papers of the Second International Conference on the Deuterocanonical Books, Pépa, Hungary, 9-11 June, 2005* (ed. Géza G. Xeravits and József Zsengellér; JSJ 118; Leiden: Brill, 2007) 61-74; and Friedrich V. Reiterer, 'Die Vergangenheit als Basis für die Zukunft Mattathias' Lehre für seine Söhne aus der Geschichte in 1 Makk 2:52-60' in *The Books of the Maccabees*, 75-100.

³⁵⁶ Similarly, like Phinehas, Mattathias leaves the congregation following the murder—in this case, fleeing to the hills (2:27-28). For further discussion, see Goldstein, *1 Maccabees*, 6-7. The use of scriptural material is perhaps more evident in 1 Macc 2:25, 'And he tore down the altar', which likely reflects Exod 34:13a, 'You shall tear down their altars'.

³⁵⁷ As Elias Bickerman notes, the detail that Judas 'turned away wrath from Israel' (1 Macc 3:8) likely also reflects the scriptural Phinehas, as in Num 25:10, '[Phinehas] has turned back my wrath from the Israelites' (*The God of the Maccabees* [Leiden: Brill, 1979] 20). For the significance of the Phinehaic

This Phinehaic ‘perpetual priesthood’ also likely lies behind the language of the appointment of Simon, ‘And the Jews and their priests decided that Simon should be their leader and *high priest for ever* (ἀρχιερέα εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα)’ (1 Macc 14:41; cf. 16:24)—although this comes with the confusing addendum, ‘until a trustworthy prophet should arise’ (also 1 Macc 4:46; cf. Deut 18:15-19).³⁵⁸

Other events are explicitly associated with scriptural material: for example, the assembly of the congregation at Mizpah (1 Macc 3:46) is associated with the assembly at Mizpah under Samuel (1 Sam 7:5-6), from which it borrows the phrase ‘they fasted that day’ (καὶ ἐνήστευσαν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ; cf. LXX 1 Sam 7:6b: καὶ ἐνήστευσαν ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ), and likewise Judas tells the people not to fear but remember what befell Pharaoh at the Red Sea (1 Macc 4:8-9) as Moses tells Israel not to fear but remember what the LORD did to Pharaoh (Deut 7:18). Elsewhere, scriptural details are unmarked and woven into the narrative, with episodes sometimes appearing to follow a scriptural model. At times, this model is clearly the Mosaic law: in 3:55, Judas ‘appointed leaders of the people, in charge of *thousands and hundreds and fifties and tens*’ (χιλιάρχους καὶ ἑκατοντάρχους καὶ πενηκοντάρχους καὶ δεκαδάρχους), reflecting the language of Exodus, ‘Moses chose able men from all Israel and set them over the people [in] *thousands and hundreds and fifties and tens*’ (LXX Exod 18:25: χιλιάρχους καὶ ἑκατοντάρχους καὶ πενηκοντάρχους καὶ δεκαδάρχους; cf. 18:21b; Deut 1:15).³⁵⁹ Following this, Judas ‘said to those who were building houses, or were betrothed, or were planting vineyards, or were fainthearted, that each should return to his home, according to the law’ (1 Macc 3:56), clearly following the model of Deut 20:5-8. Similarly, in 4:43, at Judas’ command, the Judeans ‘removed the defiled stones to an *unclean place*’ (τόπον ἀκάθαρτον), following Lev 14:40, ‘The priest shall command that the stones in which the disease appears be taken out and thrown into an *unclean place*’ (LXX: τόπον ἀκάθαρτον). They then ‘took *unhewn stones*’ (λίθους ὀλοκλήρους) and ‘built a new altar’ (1 Macc 4:47), as Deut 27:6 commands, ‘You must build the altar of the LORD your God of *unhewn stones*’ (LXX: λίθους

Priesthood to the Hasmonean dynasty, see Vasile Babota, *The Institution of the Hasmonean High Priesthood* (JSJSupp 165; Leiden: Brill, 2014) 269-284.

³⁵⁸ Some identify the ‘trustworthy prophet’ as John Hyrcanus, see Rudolf Meyer, ‘προφήτης C’, *TDNT*. 6.812-828 (815-816); David Aune, *Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1983) 375, n. 19.

³⁵⁹ Translation own.

ὀλοκλήρους). Similarly, the Judeans place a lampstand, altar of incense and a table in the Temple (1 Macc 4:49; cf. Exod 40:4-5a), whilst also placing bread on the table along with hanging curtains (1 Macc 4:51a; cf. Exod 25:30; 26:33). It is, of course, possible that Judas and his followers followed the Mosaic commands this scrupulously, but the description of events depends on the language of the Jewish scriptures, particularly Deuteronomy³⁶⁰—so, the events narrated are, in this sense, literary creations.

The influence of Deuteronomy continues with the detail in 9:50 that Bacchides built ‘strong cities’ (πόλεις ὀχυράς) with ‘high walls and gates and bars’ (τείχεσιν ὑψηλοῖς καὶ πύλαις καὶ μογλοῖς), as in LXX Deut 3:5, Israel’s enemies had ‘strong cities’ (πόλεις ὀχυραὶ) with ‘high walls, gates and bars’ (τείχη ὑψηλά πύλαι καὶ μογλοί). And, as previously mentioned, Deut 32:26 clearly lies behind the threat of the Gentiles in 1 Macc 12:53.³⁶¹ Outside of the Pentateuch, the national lament following Judas’ death (1 Macc 9:21: πῶς ἔπεσεν δυνατός) is likely borrowed from David’s lament for Jonathan (LXX 2 Sam 1:25,27: πῶς ἔπεσαν δυνατοί), though, unlike Jonathan, Judas is named the ‘saviour of Israel’. Unmarked material from Zechariah and Micah also appears in the song praising Simon in 14:4-15: compare 14:8, ‘They tilled their land in peace; the ground gave its increase, and trees of the plains their fruit’, with Zech 8:12a, ‘For there shall be a sowing of peace; the vine shall yield its fruit, the ground shall give its produce’ (cf. Lev 26:4; Ezek 34:27). Compare also 14:9a, ‘Old men sat in the streets’, with Zech 8:4a, ‘Old men and old women shall against sit in the streets of Jerusalem’; and 1 Macc 14:12, ‘Each man sat under his vine and fig tree, and there was none to make them afraid’, with Mic 4:4a, ‘But they shall all sit under their own vines and under their own fig trees, and no one shall make them afraid’ (cf. Zech 3:10).

³⁶⁰ Berthelot considers whether the author’s use of Deuteronomy amounts to a ‘Deuteronomistic ideology’ (‘The Biblical Conquest and the Hasmonean Wars’, 49-53). Whilst she notes the singular influence of Deuteronomy on the work, she finds ‘that the [Deuteronomistic] issue of land (be it promised or holy) is secondary and almost lacking’ (53). In this, she appears to overlook 1 Macc 5:48c: ἀπελθεῖν εἰς τὴν γῆν ἡμῶν.

³⁶¹ Again, continuing the influence of Exodus and Deuteronomy, the phrase concerning Simon, ‘He *extended the borders* (ἐπλάτυνεν τὰ ὄρια) of his nation’ (1 Macc 14:6) appears to reflect the sentiment in Exod 34:24a, ‘For I [the LORD] will cast out nations before you and *enlarge your borders* (LXX: πλατύνω τὰ ὄρια)’ (cf. Deut 19:8).

Thus, scripturalization appears in several distinct ways in 1 Maccabees: it equates two figures (in the case of Mattathias and Phinehas—and thus the Hasmonean leadership with the Phinehaic priesthood); it signals obedience to the law (in Judas’ fulfilment of the Mosaic law); or supplies details to a narrative, speech or song. All contribute in some way to the ‘biblical’ presentation of the Maccabean heroes—their triumphs are painted (and thus legitimized) with the same colours as the heroes of Israel’s past. For the most part, these examples consist of small details inserted into the narrative. But in one case, the author appears to have created an entire episode using one event in the life of Moses—narrated several times—as a model.

Judas and Moses: 1 Macc 5:45-51 and Deut 2:26-36 (20:10-14)

The episode concerning Judas’ defeat of the Ephronites (1 Macc 5:45-51) closely resembles a number of episodes in the Jewish scriptures: Moses’ defeat of the Amorites at Heshbon (esp. Deut 2:26-37; cf. Num 21:21-24; summarized in Judg 11:19-21) and the refusal of passage by the Edomites (Num 20:14-21).³⁶² After ‘Judas gathered together all the Israelites in Gilead’ (5:45), the congregation ‘came to Ephron’, a ‘very strong city on the road’, where they ‘could not go round it to the right or to the left; they had to go through it’ (5:46). Having encountered some resistance, Judas requests peaceful passage through the land, ‘Let us pass through your land to get to our land. No one will do you harm; we will simply pass by on foot’ (5:48). But the Ephronites refuse his request (5:48b), leading Judas to encamp and wage war on the city until ‘the city was delivered into his hands’ (5:50). He ‘destroyed every male by the edge of the sword’ and razed and plundered the city (cf. 5:28), so that the Judeans ‘passed through the city over the slain’ (5:51).

The episodes in Num 20:14-21, 21:21-24 and Deut 2:26-36 share a common structure. For example, in Num 20:14-21, Moses sends messengers to the king of Edom with the request, ‘*Now let us pass through your land* (נַעֲבֹרָה נָא בְּאַרְצֶךָ) . . . we will go along the King’s Highway, not turning aside *to the right hand or to the left*

³⁶² Dimant considers this episode as an example of the ‘compositional use [of] biblical elements’ in a ‘free narrative’ and notes the influence of Num 20:17-20, 21:22, Deut 2:26-29 and Judg 11:19 (*not* Deut 20:10-14) on the narrative, particularly 1 Macc 5:48 (‘Mikra in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha’, 406-407).

(ימין ושמאול) until we have passed through your territory’ (20:17). Edom twice refuses Moses’ request, though, unlike the other episodes, ‘Israel turned away from them’ (20:21). In the second episode, Israel is less amicable: Israel sends a message to the Amorite King Sihon, similar to the first, ‘Let me pass through your land’ (21:22a). Like the Edomites, King Sihon refuses peaceful passage to the Israelites and instead goes out against them in battle at Jahaz (21:23). This time, Israel smites the Amorites ‘by the edge of the sword’ (לפי־חרב), taking possession of their land (Num 21:24). Structurally, however, 1 Macc 5:45-51 is closest to Deut 2:26-37, which again narrates the defeat of Sihon, this time from Moses’ perspective, whilst also conflating the events narrated in Num 20:14-21 and 21:21-24: ‘If you let me pass through your land, I will travel only along the road; I will turn aside neither *to the right nor to the left* (ימין ושמאול)’ (Deut 2:27; cf. Num 20:17). This comes with the additional request of food and water (also found in Num 20:19), with Moses adding, ‘Only allow me to *pass through on foot* (אעברה בגלי) . . . until I cross the Jordan into the land that the Lord our God is giving us’ (Deut 2:28b,29b; also in Num 20:19). As before, King Sihon refuses entry to Moses and instead comes out against the Israelites in battle (Deut 2:30-32). Again, the LORD gives the Israelites victory over Sihon at Jahaz (Deut 2:33), leading to the chilling words of Moses: ‘We utterly destroyed men, women, and children; we left not a single survivor’ (Deut 2:34; cf. Num 21:29-30). The Israelites then continue plundering and razing the high citadels ‘as far as Gilead’ (Deut 2:36).

The opening detail in 1 Macc 5:46 that the Judeans ‘could not go round it to the right or to the left’ (οὐκ ἦν ἐκκλῖναι ἀπ’ αὐτῆς δεξιὰν ἢν ἀριστεράν) of Ephron is similar to both Num 20:17 and Deut 2:27, where Moses and the Israelites promise to travel only on the road, saying they ‘will not turn to the right or to the left’ (ימין ושמאול) (לא נטה/אסור).³⁶³ This parallel is detectable in the Greek (LXX Num 20:17: οὐκ ἐκκλινοῦμεν δεξιὰ οὐδὲ εὐώνυμα; LXX Deut 2:27: οὐχὶ ἐκκλινῶ δεξιὰ οὐδὲ ἀριστερά). Judas’ request in 1 Macc 5:48a, ‘Let us pass through your land to get to our land’ (διελευσόμεθα διὰ τῆς γῆς σου τοῦ ἀπελθεῖν εἰς τὴν γῆν ἡμῶν) is paralleled in some way in all three accounts, especially the cohortative plural of Num 20:17 (cf. Judg 11:17): נעברה־נא בארצך (cf. the singular in Num 21:22; Deut 2:27). Again, the Greek translates the text similarly: παρελευσόμεθα διὰ τῆς γῆς σου (LXX Num 20:17;

³⁶³ Note the minor variant ושמאל in 4Q31 1:8 (cf. MT Deut 2:27).

21:22; cf. παρελεύσομαι in Deut 2:27). Only in Deut 2:29 is the request tied to the eventual destination, though in terms quite unlike 1 Macc 5:48a: ‘into the land that the LORD our God is giving us’ (אל־הָאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר־יְהוָה נָתַן לָנוּ)—compare with 1 Macc 5:48a, ‘to get to our land’ (ἀπελθεῖν εἰς τὴν γῆν ἡμῶν). Here, the source does not come from Numbers or Deuteronomy, but from the brief summary of the defeat of Sihon in Judg 11:19b: ‘Let us pass through your land to our country’ (נַעֲבִירָה נָא בְּאֶרֶץְךָ עַד־מְקוֹמִי).³⁶⁴ Judas’ request in 1 Macc 5:48c, ‘only [let us] pass by on foot’ (πλὴν τοῖς ποσὶν παρελευσόμεθα) is, again, closest to Deut 2:28b (esp. LXX: πλὴν ὅτι παρελεύσομαι τοῖς ποσίν)—although the phrase also appears in the Hebrew of Num 20:19: אַעֲבִירָה בְּרַגְלִי רַק אֵינִי־דֹבֵר בְּרַגְלִי (cf. LXX Num 20:19). However, the agreements with Num 20:14-21 are most likely due to the use of this tradition by Deut 2:26-36³⁶⁵—so, except for the use of Judg 11:19b in 1 Macc 5:48a, the episode from 5:45-48 follows the defeat of Sihon as narrated Deut 2:26-36.

In the following verses (1 Macc 5:49-51), however, some differences emerge: whilst in every episode, Israel is denied entry into the land (Num 20:18,20-21; 21:23; Deut 2:30), only 1 Macc 5:47 narrates that ‘the city shut them out and blocked up the gates with stones’. Likewise, in the scriptural episodes, it is the enemy who initiates the battle (Deut 2:32), whereas in 1 Macc 5:49-50, Judas encamps against the city and besieges the enemy. There is also no counterpart to the divine passive in 1 Macc 5:49, ‘And the city was delivered into [Judas’] hands’ (cf. Deut 2:31,33,36c). Whilst 1 Macc 5:51 mentions the defeat of the Ephronites ‘by the edge of the sword’ (ἐν στόματι ῥομφαίας)—as in Num 21:24, where Sihon is defeated ‘by the edge of the sword’ (לְפִי־חֶרֶב)³⁶⁶—Judas confines the slaughter to ‘every male’ (πᾶν ἀρσενικόν), unlike Moses’ indiscriminate slaughter (Deut 2:34). Judas then plunders the city (1 Macc 5:51), as Moses does to the land of the Amorites (Deut 2:35), though, unlike Moses, Judas also ‘razes’ (ἐκριζόω) the city to the ground (cf. Num 21:25,31-32; Deut 2:34).

³⁶⁴ Again, 1 Macc 5:48 better preserves the Hebrew of Judg 11:19b than the singular of LXX Judg 11:19: παρελεύσομαι διὰ τῆς γῆς σου ἕως τοῦ τόπου μου.

³⁶⁵ A conclusion shared by John E. Harvey, *Retelling the Torah: The Deuteronomistic Historian’s Use of Tetrateuchal Narratives* (JSOTSupp 403; London: T&T Clark, 2004) 16-21.

³⁶⁶ Cf. 1 Macc 5:28(35). Whilst the LXX translates Num 21:24 as καὶ ἐπάταξεν αὐτὸν Ἰσραὴλ φόνον μαχαίρης, elsewhere, Josh 6:21 and 8:24 translate לְפִי־חֶרֶב as ἐν στόματι ῥομφαίας. For further comments on the use of this phrase, see Berthelot, ‘The Biblical Conquest and the Hasmonean Wars’, 48, n. 11.

What accounts for these differences? It appears that the author is no longer relying on Deut 2:26-36 (cf. Num 20:14-21; 21:21-24; Judg 11:19-21), but is now drawing on another source. Whilst the detail that Ephron was a ‘very strong city’ (πόλις . . . ὄχυρα σφόδρα) with ‘gates’ (πύλαι) is likely a reference to Deut 3:5 (as is certainly the case in 1 Macc 9:50), the other details are taken from the instructions concerning *hērem* in Deut 20:10-14.³⁶⁷ The author has already alluded to Deut 20:5-8 in Judas’ command that ‘those who were building houses, or were betrothed, or were planting vineyards, or were fainthearted, that each should return to his home, according to the law’ (1 Macc 3:56). In the same way, the episode in 1 Macc 5:45-51 follows the model of Deut 20:10-14: when Judas approaches Ephron, he offers terms of peace (1 Macc 5:48: λόγοις εἰρηνικοῖς; cf. Deut 20:10-11); when Ephron rejects the terms, Judas wages war on the city (1 Macc 5:49-50a; cf. Deut 20:12);³⁶⁸ after this, ‘the city was delivered into his hands’ (1 Macc 5:50b: καὶ παρεδόθη ἡ πόλις ἐν χειρὶ αὐτοῦ; cf. Deut 20:13a, esp. LXX: καὶ παραδώσει αὐτήν . . . εἰς τὰς χεῖρας σου); Judas then slaughters ‘every male by the edge of the sword’ (1 Macc 5:51a: πᾶν ἀρσενικὸν ἐν στόματι ῥομφαίας; cf. *verbatim* Deut 20:13b: אֶת־כָּל־זָכּוּרָה לַפִּי־חֶרֶב); and finally, Judas plunders (ἔλαβεν τὰ σκῦλα) the city (1 Macc 5:51b; cf. Deut 20:14; σκῦλα in σ’ and θ’ Deut 20:14).³⁶⁹ The full list of agreements may be found below.

³⁶⁷ For a broader discussion of *hērem* in the career of Judas Maccabeus, see Christophe Batsch, *La guerre et les rites de guerre dans le judaïsme du deuxième Temple* (JSJSupp 93; Leiden: Brill, 2005) 438-443.

³⁶⁸ The detail in 1 Macc 5:51 that the Judeans ‘encamped’ (παρενέβαλον) and ‘made war’ (ἐπολέμησεν) on the the Ephronites could reflect Judg 11:20 where the Ammonites ‘encamped’ (παρενέβαλεν) and ‘made war’ (ἐπολέμησεν) on the Israelites, though the similarities do not extend beyond that.

³⁶⁹ Note also the minor variants in the text of Deut 20:10-14 in 4Q38a 2/3:5-9.

1 Macc 5:45-51	Deuteronomy and Judges (cf. Numbers)
The Judeans come to Ephron where they ‘could not go round it <i>to the right or to the left</i> ’ (5:46).	Moses and the Israelites ‘will not turn <i>to the right or to the left</i> ’ of the road through Ammon (Deut 2:27; also Num 20:17).
The Ephronites deny the Judeans entry (5:47).	The Ammonites deny the Israelites entry (Deut 2:30; also Num 21:23; Judg 11:20; cf. Num 20:18,20-21).
Judas sends a ‘peaceful message’ to Ephron (5:48a).	Israelites must send ‘terms of peace’ to a town (Deut 20:10).
‘Let me pass through your land to get to our land’ (5:48b).	‘Let me pass through your land to our country’ (Judg 11:19b; cf. Num 20:17; 21:22; Deut 2:27,29; Judg 11:17).
‘We will simply pass by on foot’ (5:48c).	‘Just let us/me pass through on foot’ (Num 20:19b; Deut 2:28b).
The Ephronites again deny the Judeans entry (5:48d).	The Edomites twice deny the Israelites entry (Num 20:18,20-21; cf. Deut 2:30; also Num 21:23; Judg 11:20).
Judas ‘encamped’ against the city and ‘made war’ on it (5:49-50a).	The Ammonites ‘encamped’ against the Israelites and ‘made war’ on them (Judg 11:20). If a town rejects ‘terms of peace’, the Israelites are to besiege it (Deut 20:12; cf. the war with Sihon: Num 21:23-24; Deut 2:32-33; Judg 11:20-21).
‘The city was <i>delivered into his hands</i> ’ (5:50b).	‘When the Lord your God <i>gives into your hand . . .</i> ’ (Deut 20:13a; cf. 2:33,36b).
‘He destroyed <i>every male by the edge of the sword</i> ’ (5:51a).	The Israelites shall ‘destroy <i>every male by the edge of the sword</i> ’ (Deut 20:13b; cf. Deut 2:34).
The Judeans ‘plundered the city’ (5:51b).	The Israelites are instructed to plunder defeated towns (Deut 20:14; cf. 2:35).

Whatever one makes of the historical issues regarding the incident at Ephron—and there are several³⁷⁰—the episode as it appears in 1 Macc 5:45-51 has been created out of scriptural material: specifically Deut 2:26-36, Judg 11:19-21 and Deut 20:10-14. This includes phrases taken verbatim (1 Macc 5:48a; cf. Judg 11:19b; 1 Macc 5:51a; cf. Deut 20:13b) or near verbatim (1 Macc 5:46b; cf. Deut 2:27b [Num 20:17b]; 1 Macc 5:48b; cf. Deut 2:28b [Num 20:19b]) from the scriptural source, as well as the unmistakable basic structure: the people come to a place and request peaceful passage (1 Macc 5:48; cf. Deut 2:26-29; Judg 11:19 [Num 20:14-17,19; 21:22]), only to be denied (1 Macc 5:47-48; cf. Deut 2:30 Judg 11:20 [Num 20:18,20-21; 21:23]), leading them to defeat the inhabitants in battle (1 Macc 5:50-51; Deut 2:31-36; Judg 11:21 [Num 21:24]). The author is not, however, confined to these two primary models (the defeat of Sihon and the laws of *ḥērem*): the detail that Judas' army 'razed' (ἐκριζώω) the city and passed over the bodies of the slain has no parallel in the scriptural accounts. But there is no question that the bulk of the episode in 1 Macc 5:45-51 has been pieced together from various passages in the Jewish scriptures.

As with 1QapGen 11, the motivation for the creation of this episode appears to be two-fold. On the one hand, the author shows Judas fulfilling the rules of *ḥērem*, as earlier episodes demonstrated his compliance to scriptural law (1 Macc 3:55-56; 4:42-53). This is part of the author's design to consistently present the Hasmonean warriors as obedient to, and zealous for, the law (1 Macc 2:21,26-27,42,50,64,67-68; 3:5-6,48; 13:3; 14:4,29).³⁷¹ The author achieves this not just with editorial comments (1 Macc 3:56b; 4:47,53; 15:21c: κατὰ τὸν νόμον), but also by inserting legal material—the author seems to favour Deuteronomy—into the narrative: either to demonstrate the

³⁷⁰ These include the many discrepancies between 1 Macc 5 and its corresponding account in 2 Macc 12, the uncertain identity and location of most of the towns listed in ch. 5 (including Ephron), as well as the sheer implausibility of Judas amassing a military force capable of waging the scale of warfare described in the chapter. For further discussion on the relationship with 2 Macc 12 and the identity of the towns, see Goldstein, *1 Maccabees*, 293-305; Daniel R. Schwartz, *2 Maccabees* (CEJL; Berlin: Water de Gruyter, 2008) 418ff. For a more optimistic assessment of the identity of the towns, see Aryeh Kasher, *Jews and Hellenistic Cities in Eretz-Israel: Relations of the Jews in Eretz-Israel with the Hellenistic Cities During the Second Temple Period (332 BCE – 70 CE)* (TSAJ 21; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1990) 58-90 (esp. 79-80 on Ephron). On issues regarding 1 Maccabees' characterization of Judea's neighbours, see Seth Schwartz, 'Israel and the Nations Roundabout: 1 Maccabees and the Hasmonean Expansion', *JJS* 42 (1991): 16-38. On historical tensions between 1 Maccabees and Josephus, see Abel, *Les Livres des Maccabées*, xi-xv.

³⁷¹ For a full discussion of 1 Maccabees' treatment of the law, see Francis Borchardt, *The Torah in 1 Maccabees: A Literary Critical Approach to the Text* (DCLS 19; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2014) 189-230.

fulfillment of a particular law (1 Macc 5:68; cf. Deut 7:5 [Exod 34:13]) or simply provide narrative details (1 Macc 9:50; cf. Deut 3:5; 1 Macc 12:53; cf. Deut 32:26). At the same time, the episode serves a more general, but nonetheless significant, purpose: by modelling Judas' victory over Ephron on the defeat of Sihon, the author presents Judas as a military conqueror *like* Moses. This further legitimizes the claim for Hasmonean rule: Judas was not just law-abiding, he was *like* the law-giver. In a conflict that began over the law (1 Macc 1:41-64), the career of Judas begins to fulfil the words of Mattathias (1 Macc 2:64-68): under the leadership of Judas, the law returns to 'Israel' (3:46-56; 4:42-59). In this role as defender and restorer of the law, Judas emerges as a Moses-like figure. Whilst it is by no means the only scriptural model the author relied upon in composing the career of Judas, the presence of the Mosaic model in 1 Macc 5:45-51 shows that, once again, the author of 1 Maccabees has creatively used the Jewish scriptures to dress the Maccabean family in the garb of the heroes of old.

The episode in 1 Macc 5:45-51 thus exhibits all the characteristics of a scripturalized narrative: it follows the model of an episode in the Jewish scriptures (Deut 2:26-36; Judg 11:19-21; cf. Num 20:14-21; 21:21-24), whilst also incorporating other material, sometimes *verbatim*, as narrative details (Deut 20:10-14). But whilst the scripturalized narratives of the *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* or the *Genesis Apocryphon* focused on scriptural subjects, 1 Maccabees composes new material out of the Jewish scriptures using historical subjects. Unlike the narratives of Kenaz (*LAB* 25-28) or Noah (1QapGen 3-17), the narrative concerning Judas Maccabeus is evidently historical in character. The inclusion of the hitherto unknown city of Ephron may reflect some knowledge of the historical Maccabean conquest. Nevertheless, given that the language and structure of 1 Macc 5:45-51 depends almost entirely on scriptural material, the episode of Judas' siege of Ephron—at least in its current form—owes more to the compositional process of scripturalization than it does to historical memory.

Judith

Despite the remarkable³⁷²—and, at times, transgressive³⁷³—afterlife of the tale of Judith, it does not appear to have been widely known during the Second Temple period.³⁷⁴ Commentators have interpreted this silence as a sign that Judith struggled to gain acceptance in some communities due to perceived problems with the work.³⁷⁵ It is perhaps not difficult to imagine why a seductive and deceitful murderess would have offended some sensibilities in Jewish antiquity.³⁷⁶ And yet, the similarly subversive Esther did not suffer the same fate.³⁷⁷ Conceivably, Judith could have been rejected on account of its historical blunders.³⁷⁸ For one, the historical setting is teeming with contradictions: the events are supposed to unfold as the Assyrians ruled from Nineveh (seventh century BCE), in between the twelfth and eighteenth years of the reign of Nebuchadnezzar (593-587 BCE)—who is wrongly called the ‘king of Assyria’—whilst at the same time occurring after the return of the Judeans from captivity (late sixth century).³⁷⁹ Thus, the short narrative of Judith somehow manages to span two centuries

³⁷² See the far-ranging inter-disciplinary studies in Kevin R. Brine, Elena Ciletti and Henrike Lähnemann (eds.), *The Sword of Judith: Judith Studies Across the Disciplines* (Cambridge: OpenBook Publishers, 2010).

³⁷³ See the subversive paintings of Artemisia Gentileschi, *Judith Slaying Holofernes* (c. 1614-1620, Oil on canvas, Galleria degli Uffizi, Florence) and Gustav Klimt, *Judith I* (1901, Oil on canvas, Österreichische Galerie Belvedere, Vienna).

³⁷⁴ Josephus and Philo pass over the figure of Judith in silence and there is no trace of the text at Qumran. The first explicit mention of Judith is in *1 Clem.* 55. For a discussion of the relationship of Judith with *LAB* 31 and the Greek *Additions to Esther*, see below.

³⁷⁵ Zeitlin, ‘Introduction: The Books of Esther and Judith: A Parallel’ in *The Book of Judith: Greek Text with an English Translation, Commentary and Critical Notes* (ed. Morton S. Enslin; JAL 7; Leiden: Brill, 1972) 1-37; Carey A. Moore, ‘Why Wasn’t the Book of Judith Included in the Hebrew Bible?’ in *‘No One Spoke Ill of Her’: Essays on Judith* (ed. VanderKam; SBLEJL 2; Atlanta, GA: Scholars, 1992) 61-71; Crawford, ‘Esther not Judith: Why One Made It and the Other Didn’t’, *Bible Review* 18 (2002): 22-31.

³⁷⁶ See the discussion in David A. de Silva, ‘Judith the Heroine? Lies, Seduction, and Murder in Cultural Perspective’, *BTB* 36 (2006): 55-61.

³⁷⁷ Again, see Zeitlin, ‘The Books of Esther and Judith’, 1-37; Crawford, ‘Esther not Judith’, 22-31.

³⁷⁸ For the additional problem of Judith’s historical origins, see Deborah Levine Gera, *Judith* (CEJL; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2013) 26-44. The story of Judith would eventually become associated with the celebration of Hanukkah, possibly by the time of Vg. Jdt 16:31. See Gera, ‘The Jewish Textual Traditions’ in *The Sword of Judith*, 23-40 (30-36). The association of Judith with Hanukkah can be seen in the many medieval menorahs decorated with an armed Judith figure holding the head of Holofernes, esp. *Hanukkah Lamp with Armed Judith* (Italy, c. 1500-1700, Bronze, cast and engraved; New York, the Jewish Museum).

³⁷⁹ Jdt 1:1,7,11,13; 2:1,4; 4:1,3; 5:19. If the names Holofernes and Bagoas refer to the mid-fourth century BCE. Persian officials Orophones and Bagoas (Diod., *Hist.* 16.47.3; 17.5.3; 31.19.2), then this would be a further violation of historical logic.

and the reigns of three consecutive empires.³⁸⁰ And yet, other narratives with equally tenuous relationships with history—like Daniel, Esther or the *Letter of Aristeas*—appear to have fared much better during the Second Temple period.³⁸¹ That these issues would be an obstacle for Judith’s acceptance and not for other works suggests a problem with the question itself. It is not at all clear the meagre literary evidence from the period is sufficient to prove that a text was either ‘accepted’ or ‘rejected’—terms which belong to a later period. The controversial status of Judith during the Second Temple period may well be a scholarly abstraction. Either way, the effect is the same: despite its affinities with texts like Esther or Tobit, the book of Judith remains something of an outlier in Second Temple literature.³⁸²

Nevertheless, like other texts from the period, the book of Judith repeatedly draws from the Jewish scriptures. But even this is not without its issues. Whilst most major commentators have argued the syntax and style of the Greek text point to a Semitic *vorlage*, recent scholarship has begun to entertain the possibility that Judith may have originally been composed in Greek.³⁸³ At any rate, verbatim agreement with

³⁸⁰ This historical impossibility is rarely disputed, save for the odd ardent defender of Judith’s historicity. For one such defense, see Claus Schedl, ‘Nabochodonosor, Arpaksad und Darius’, *ZDMG* 115 (1965): 242-254. See the survey of theories in Moore, *Judith: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 40; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1985) 52-56.

³⁸¹ Some scholars interpret the absurdity of Judith’s historical setting as a sign the author intended the work to be read as a kind of historical fiction. See the major commentaries: André-Marie Dubarle, *Judith: Formes et sens des diverses traditions. Tome I: Études* (Analecta Biblica Investigationes Scientificae in Res Biblicas 24; Rome: Institut Biblique Pontifical, 1966) 162-164; Enslin, *The Book of Judith*, 38; Moore, *Judith*, 76-85; Gera, *Judith*, 60; or ‘legend’ in Benedict Otzen, *Tobit and Judith* (Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha; London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002) 124-126. This is an argument from silence—as it is when applied to other so-called historical fictions, like Daniel, Esther or the *Letter of Aristeas*. There is no clear sign that any of these texts were read as fiction during the Second Temple period—or were intended by their authors to be read as such. At the same time, the works of Jewish antiquity were more than capable of sincerely embracing the historically absurd. Take the *Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer*, for example, which makes this fantastic claim worthy of Judith: ‘Pharaoh, king of Egypt [of Exod 5-14] . . . went and ruled in Nineveh [in the time of Jonah]’ (*PRE* 43:9). The author of Judith may simply have suffered from a lack of adequate information, a possibility explored in a much overlooked article by Alan Millard, ‘Judith, Tobit Ahiqar and History’ in *New Heaven and New Earth: Prophecy and the Millenium: Essays in Honour of Anthony Gelston* (ed. Peter J. Harland and Robert Hayward; VTSupp 77; Leiden: Brill, 1999) 195-203. Alternatively (and less plausibly), Ernst Haag views Judith’s historical inaccuracies as secondary to its meta-historical purpose, which is pitting the symbolic figure of Nebuchadnezzar against the people of God (‘Gottesvolkes’), *Studien zum Buche Judith: Seine theologische Bedeutung und literarische Eigenart* (Trierer Theologische Studien 16; Trier: Paulinus, 1963).

³⁸² Lawrence M. Wills considers the books collectively as examples of the ‘Jewish novel’ (*The Jewish Novel in the Ancient World* [Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 1995] 68-157).

³⁸³ Other versions of Judith, including the medieval Hebrew legends and midrashim, can all be traced to the Greek text. See the detailed study in Robert Hanhart, *Judith* (Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum graecum auctoritate academiae scientiarum Gottingensis editum 8.4; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979); cf. Dubarle, *Judith*, 7-97, who believes the medieval Hebrew mss. share a Semitic

a surviving text of the Jewish scriptures is markedly absent. There are, however, some similarities with the LXX—similarities which may result from verbal agreement in the respective underlying texts (see Hanhart’s reconstruction of ‘der ursprüngliche Text’ of Judith) or else from the direct influence of the LXX on Judith.³⁸⁴ One such case can be found in Jdt 9:7 (also 16:3a), where the wording agrees almost verbatim with LXX Exod 15:3: ‘You are the Lord who crushes wars; the Lord is your name’ (κύριος συντριβῶν πολέμους. κύριος ὄνομά σοι; cf. LXX Exod 15:3: κύριος συντριβῶν πολέμους, κύριος ὄνομα αὐτῶ).³⁸⁵ A similar instance occurs at Jdt 5:13, which *mutatis mutandis* follows Josh 2:10b: ‘Then God dried up the Red Sea before them’ (καὶ κατεξήρανεν ὁ θεὸς τὴν ἐρυθρὰν θάλασσαν ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν; cf. LXX Josh 2:10b: κατεξήρανεν κύριος ὁ θεὸς τὴν ἐρυθρὰν θάλασσαν ἀπὸ προσώπου ὑμῶν).³⁸⁶

Elsewhere, unmarked scriptural material comes in the form of loose quotations in the direct speech of characters, departing from the wording of both the MT and Greek texts. Consider Jdt 8:16, where Judith says, ‘For God is not like man, to be threatened, nor like a human being, to be won over by pleading’ (ὅτι οὐχ ὡς ἄνθρωπος ὁ θεὸς ἀπειληθῆναι οὐδ’ ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου τῶν ἐχθρῶν ἡμῶν), which clearly comes from Num 23:19a, though differs from the literal translation of the LXX: οὐχ ὡς ἄνθρωπος ὁ θεὸς διαρτηθῆναι οὐδὲ ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἀπειληθῆναι.³⁸⁷ At times, the scriptural source may still be recognizable despite significant alterations: as in Jdt 16:15a, ‘For the mountains shall be shaken to their foundations with the waters; at your presence the rocks shall melt like wax’ (cf. Mic 1:4: ‘Then the mountains will

source with the early Latin Judith. Dubarle is influenced here by Jerome’s confusing comments about a ‘Chaldean’ (presumably Aramaic) original, ‘Preface to Judith’ in Robert Weber (ed.), *Biblia Sacra Iuxta Vulgatum Versionem* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1969) 691; discussed in Enslin (and Zeitlin), *Judith*, 45. For the majority view concerning a Hebrew original, see Enslin (and Zeitlin), *Judith*, 39-40; Moore, *Judith*, 66-67; see also the summary in Otzen, *Tobit and Judith*, 137-141. For a detailed assessment of arguments for both a Semitic and Greek original (appearing to favour the later), see Gera, *Judith*, 79-97. For a more confident pronouncement on the possibility of a Greek original, see the brief comments in Toni Craven, *Artistry and Faith in the Book of Judith* (SBLDS 70; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983) 5.

³⁸⁴ On the possibility of reconstructing the supposed Hebrew text, see Hanhart, *Text and Textgeschichte des Buches Judith* (MSU 14; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979). This possibility was earlier explored by Frank Zimmerman, ‘Aids for the Recovery of the Hebrew Original of Judith’, *JBL* 57 (1938): 67-74. The possible influence of the LXX on Judith has been recently explored by Gera, *Judith*, 91-97.

³⁸⁵ See Judith Lang, ‘The Lord Who Crushes Wars: Studies on Judith 9:7, Judith 16:2, and Exodus 15:3’ in *A Pious Seductress: Studies in the Book of Judith* (ed. Géza G. Xeravits; DCLS 14; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012) 179-187.

³⁸⁶ Dubarle, *Judith*, 143.

³⁸⁷ By translating כַּחַס as ἀπειλιέω, Jdt 8:16 is closer to LXX Num 23:19 than MT Num 23:19.

melt under him and the valleys will burst open, like wax near the fire, like waters poured down a steep place'). At other times, if a scriptural source was once present, it is no longer recognizable (i.e. 2 Kgs 19:19b in Jdt 9:14?; Dan 2:37-38 in Jdt 11:7?; Prov 23:18 in Jdt 13:19?; Isa 66:24 in Jdt 16:17b?).

There are, however, clear references to scriptural narrative scattered throughout Judith, particularly in the speech of Achior (Jdt 5:5-21), which neatly summarizes key events in scriptural history up until the return from exile. Similar allusions to scriptural narrative can be found elsewhere: the testing of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob (Jdt 8:26; cf. Gen 22:1-19; 28:5; 29:1-32:1), the rape of Dinah (Jdt 9:2; cf. Gen 34:1-31) and the creation myth (Jdt 16:14; cf. Gen 1:1-27). In addition to this, the book includes many proper names for characters and places found in scriptural narrative, though these may not necessarily be the result of direct literary dependence (*pace* Scholz and Haag).³⁸⁸ But by far the most prevalent use of the Jewish scriptures in Judith is the compositional use of scriptural material, often concerning scriptural women, to shape the new narrative—a point first made by André-Marie Dubarle, 'Le genre littéraire de Judith se caractérise plutôt comme une broderie d'épisodes à couleur biblique sur un canevas de faits traditionnels beaucoup plus sobre'.³⁸⁹

The Compositional Use of the Jewish Scriptures in Judith

In several places, the author of Judith draws narrative details from similar episodes in the Jewish scriptures. This appears to be the case in 4:9-12, where, upon learning of the threat posed by Holofernes, the Israelites fast and cry out to God, clothing all the inhabitants of Israel, including the cattle, in sackcloth. Whilst the act of putting on sackcloth, fasting and crying to God is hardly a rare occurrence in the Jewish scriptures (Neh 9:1; Est 4:1-4; Pss 35:13; 69:10-11; Isa 58:5; Dan 9:3; Joel 1:13-14), the odd inclusion of cattle clothed in sackcloth brings to mind the lament of

³⁸⁸ It is crucial for Scholz and Haag that the scriptural portrait of Nebuchadnezzar influenced Judith, though there is no verbal support for this beyond the proper noun. See Anton Scholz, *Das Buch Judith—eine Prophetie* (Würzburg: Leo Woerl, 1885) 33-48; Haag, *Studien zum Buche Judith*, 71-78. Nor is it certain that the description of 'the great city of Nineveh' (Jdt 1:1) depends on Jonah ('that great city', Jon 1:2; 3:2; 4:11). There are similarly superlative descriptions of Nineveh in Xenophon (*Anabasis* 3.4.10) and Strabo (*Geog.* 16.1-3). Elsewhere, Judith may be influenced by Jonah (see discussion of Jon 3:8a in Jdt 4:9, 12a below).

³⁸⁹ Dubarle, *Judith*, 164.

Nineveh in the book of Jonah (3:6-9). There, the Ninevites are commanded to fast and put on sackcloth (Jon 3:7-8) and to make their cattle do likewise. Indeed, on this point, Judith appears to reflect the language of Jonah (again, closest in the Greek): compare LXX Jon 3:8, ‘And the people and cattle put on sackcloth, and they cried out earnestly to God’ (καὶ περιεβάλλοντο σάκκουσ οἱ ἄνθρωποι καὶ τὰ κτήνη, καὶ ἀνεβόησαν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν ἐκτενωῶς) with Jdt 4:12, ‘They even surrounded the altar with sackcloth and cried out in unison, [praying] earnestly to the God of Israel’ (καὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον σάκκῳ περιέβαλον καὶ ἐβόησαν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν Ἰσραὴλ ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἐκτενωῶς).

Similarly, both Judith’s anticipatory prayer (9:2-14) and song of victory following the defeat of the Assyrians (16:2-17) borrow details from the Song of the Sea following Israel’s defeat of the Egyptians (Exod 1:1-20): ‘They are exalted, with their horse and rider’ (Jdt 9:7a; Exod 15:1,21); ‘You are the Lord who crushes wars; the Lord is your name’ (Jdt 9:7; 16:3; cf. LXX Exod 15:3); Judith and Miriam both sing ‘with tambourines’ (Jdt 16:3; cf. Exod 15:20; also Jdt 15:12-13).³⁹⁰ Exodus also appears to be in view in the complaint of the Bethulians in two medieval Hebrew mss. of the Judith legend which might reflect an early reading of Jdt 7:16: ‘It is better for us to go into captivity (B)/serve our God under the hand of the King of Assur (C) than to die of thirst’ (cf. Exod 14:12 [17:3]: ‘It would have been better for us to serve the Egyptians than to die in the wilderness’—for a similar use of this phrase, see *LAB* 9:14).³⁹¹

Elsewhere, the author of Judith shows a special fondness for drawing material from descriptions of scriptural women.³⁹² As Ruth declares to Naomi, ‘Your God

³⁹⁰ For further parallels, see Claudia Rakel, *Judit—über Schönheit, Macht und Widerstand im Krieg: Eine feministisch-intertextuelle Lektüre* (BZAW 334; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2003) 250-252; Larry Perkins, “‘The Lord is a Warrior’ – ‘The Lord Who Shatters Wars’: Exodus 15:3 and Judith 9:7; 16:2”, *BIOSCS* 40 (2007): 121-138; Lang, ‘The Lord Who Crushes Wars’, 179-187. See also the discussions in Dubarle, *Judith*, 142-143; Newman, *Praying by the Book*, 146-148; Rakel, “‘I Will Sing a New Song to my God’: Some Remarks on the Intertextuality of Judith 16.1-17’ in *Judges: A Feminist Companion to the Bible* (ed. Athalya Brenner; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999) 27-47 (38-44); Moore, *Judith*, 192, 256-257; Gera, *Judith*, 312-313, 448-450. For the scripturalization of prayer in Judith (esp. 9:2-14), see Newman, *Praying by the Book*, 117-154.

³⁹¹ See Dubarle, *Judith*, 143. Dubarle is convinced that similarities between the medieval Hebrew mss. and the Vulgate point to an early Hebrew version of Judith, possibly used by Jerome, see 20-47. As some commentators have noted, this is difficult to prove. See Gera, *Judith*, 21-22; for a more sympathetic view, see Otzen, *Tobit and Judith*, 138-139.

³⁹² As noted in André Lacocque, *The Feminine Unconventional: Four Subversive Figures in Israel’s Tradition* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1990) 35; Otzen, *Tobit and Judith*, 74-77; Gera, *Judith*, 51f—although, in this last case, not every proposed parallel is equally persuasive (i.e. ‘Hagar, Sarah, Rebecca, Tamar’ etc.).

[shall be] my God' (LXX Ruth 1:16: ὁ θεός σου θεός μου), so Holofernes, in a moment of irony, declares to Judith, 'Your God shall be my God' (Jdt 11:23: ὁ θεός σου ἔσται μου θεός). The Ammonite general Achior likewise echoes the words of another woman, Rahab (Josh 2:10b): 'Then God dried up the Red Sea before them' (Jdt 5:13)—and so it is perhaps no coincidence that Achior, like Rahab, eventually becomes part of Israel himself (Jdt 14:10; cf. Josh 6:25).³⁹³ And as already noted, the song of Judith (15:12-13; 16:2-17) draws on the description of Miriam (Exod 15:20-21) as well as other details in Exod 15, whilst at the same time resembling the song of Deborah (and Barak) following the defeat of the Canaanites (Judg 5).³⁹⁴

Whilst somewhat less straightforward, intriguing similarities exist between Judith and the other *femme fatale* of Second Temple literature, Esther. Already, the plots are similar: women, famed for their beauty, who single-handedly save the Jewish people from an existential threat posed by one Gentile man, using deceit and seduction to sway a weak-willed ruler at a banquet.³⁹⁵ But Additions C and D to LXX Esther reveal a closer semblance between the two: there, Esther takes off her splendid attire and puts on garments of mourning, covering her head with ashes (and dung) (LXX Est 14:1-2). She then prays to God for help (14:3-19), after which she takes off the garments of mourning and 'arrayed herself in splendid attire' (περιεβάλετο τὴν δόξαν αὐτῆς), and then, 'majestically adorned' (γενηθεῖσα ἐπιφανῆς), she brings her two 'maids' (ἄβραι) to go before the king, Ahasuerus (15:1-6). Similarly, before she prays to God for help, Judith takes off the sackcloth and covers her head with ashes (Jdt 9:1), after which she puts away the sackcloth, bathes and 'arrayed herself in her gayest apparel' (ἐνεδύσατο τὰ ἱμάτια τῆς εὐφροσύνης αὐτῆς), and, having 'made herself very beautiful' (ἐκαλλωπίσατο σφόδρα), she brings her maid (ἄβρα) to go before Holofernes (10:1-5). Aside from a single word (ἄβρα), there is no verbal agreement

³⁹³ Compare the similar sentiments in Jdt 14:10, 'When Achior saw all that the God of Israel had done, he believed firmly in God. So he was circumcised, and joined the house of Israel, remaining so to this day', and Josh 6:25a, 'But Rahab the prostitute, with her family and all who belonged to her, Joshua spared. Her family has lived in Israel ever since'. Later interpreters would likewise associate Rahab's deliverance with belief: 'By faith (πίστις) Rahab the prostitute did not perish' (Heb 11:31a; also *1 Clem.* 12; cf. Jas 2:25); cf. '[Achior] believed (πιστεύω) firmly in God' (Jdt 14:10b).

³⁹⁴ More on the similarity between these episodes below. On the association of Exod 15 and Judg 5, see Alan J. Hauser, 'Two Songs of Victory: A Comparison of Exodus 15 and Judges 5' in *Directions in Biblical Hebrew Poetry* (ed. Elaine R. Follis; JSOTSupp 40; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1987) 265-284.

³⁹⁵ There is, however, no clear sign that the story of Judith as a whole was composed with Esther in mind, cf. Paul Haupt, 'Purim', *Beiträge zur Assyriologie* 6 (1906): 1-53 (7).

between the episodes³⁹⁶—however, the general similarities in the prayers of Judith and Esther of the Additions raise the possibility that one served as a literary model for the other.³⁹⁷ On this possibility, Moore notes that Esther’s actions in Additions C and D contribute little to the broader narrative, whereas chs. 9 and 10 are crucial to the development of Judith’s narrative, suggesting that the Judith-like elements in LXX Esther are more likely to be derivative.³⁹⁸ Yet, on the other hand, Linda Day notes that some of the Judith-like elements in LXX Esther are already ‘indirectly suggested’ in the Hebrew text, so they may not be as extraneous to the narrative as Moore suggests.³⁹⁹ Whilst it would not be uncharacteristic of the author of Judith to model a passage in this fashion, one additional similarity between the two women recommends the priority of Judith over LXX Esther. In LXX Est 14:17, Esther prays, ‘And your servant has not eaten at Haman’s table, and I have not honoured the king’s feast or drunk the wine of his libations’. This recalls Jdt 12:1-2, where Holofernes prepares a table with food and wine for Judith, to which she responds, ‘I cannot eat it, lest it be an offense’. An astute reader of Esther, however, knows that she dines with Ahasuerus and Haman at least two times (Est 5:5-8; 6:14-7:1).⁴⁰⁰ The inclusion of this detail from Judith may then have been intended as a corrective to Esther’s behaviour—indeed, the entire prayer scene (LXX Est 14:1-15:5) could be an effort to infuse Esther with some of Judith’s piety.⁴⁰¹ If this is the case, then LXX Est 14-15 may be regarded as a scripturalized narrative, with Judith (esp. chs. 9-10) serving as a model.⁴⁰²

³⁹⁶ The responses of Ahasuerus and Holofernes to Esther and Judith, respectively, are in one place similar (Jdt 11:1; LXX Est 15:9): ‘Take courage’ (θάρασησον/θάρασει).

³⁹⁷ Zeitlin, ‘The Books of Esther and Judith’, 15-21; Moore, *Judith*, 195-197, 212-216; Gera, *Judith*, 299-300. Charl Pretorius Van der Walt postulates a similar *sitz im leben*, ‘The Prayer of Esther (LXX) and Judith Against Their Social Backgrounds: Evidence of a Possible Common “Grundlage”’, *JSem* 17 (2008): 194-206.

³⁹⁸ Moore, *Judith*, 215.

³⁹⁹ Linda Day, *Three Faces of a Queen: Characterization in the Books of Esther* (JSOTSupp 186; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995) 222-225 (224).

⁴⁰⁰ A detail which troubled many ancient interpreters, see Aaron Koller, *Esther in Ancient Jewish Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014) 118-119, 136-138, 193.

⁴⁰¹ For the theory that the book of Judith was composed as a corrective to Esther, see David Daube, ‘Judith’ in *The Collected Works of David Daube: 3: Biblical Law and Literature* (ed. Calum M. Carmichael; Berkeley, CA: Robbins Collection, 1992) 849-870. See also Zeitlin, ‘The Books of Esther and Judith’, 14. For more general comments on the comparison of Esther and Judith, see Crawford, ‘Esther and Judith: Contrasts in Character’ in *The Book of Esther in Modern Research* (ed. Crawford and Leonard J. Greenspoon; London: A&C Black, 2003) 61-76.

⁴⁰² The scripturalized narrative of the Greek Additions appears to have influenced Josephus’ description of Esther (*Ant.* 11.184-296), especially the prayer in 11.232-234, so Feldman, ‘Hellenizations in Josephus’ Version of Esther’, *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 101 (1970): 143-170.

There is one other equally puzzling passage which bears a striking resemblance to Esther, this time in the Old Latin text. In Jdt 4:12 (cf. 9:4), the Israelites pray for God ‘not to give up their infants as prey and their wives as booty, and the cities they had inherited to be destroyed, and the sanctuary to be profaned and desecrated to the malicious joy of the Gentiles’ (τοῦ μὴ δοῦναι εἰς διαρπαγὴν τὰ νήπια αὐτῶν καὶ τὰς γυναῖκας εἰς προνομὴν καὶ τὰς πόλεις τῆς κληρονομίας αὐτῶν εἰς ἀφανισμόν καὶ τὰ ἅγια εἰς βεβήλωσιν καὶ ὄνειδισμόν ἐπίχαρμα τοῖς ἔθνεσιν), a prayer which appears almost verbatim in VL Est 3:15: *non des filios tuos in captiuitatem neque uxores nostras in uiolationem neque in perditionem . . . et non des haereditatem nostram in infamiam ut hostes (gentes) dominantur nostri* (cf. Vg. Jdt 4:10). Again, the direction of this literary relationship is difficult to determine—the Old Latin version of Esther itself likely depends on an earlier Greek text, though there can be no certainty as to whether it predates the Greek text of Judith.⁴⁰³ It is nonetheless indicative of an early tendency to conflate details between the narratives of Judith and Esther—a practice which can be seen continuing in the medieval Hebrew versions of the Judith legend surveyed by Dubarle.⁴⁰⁴

But above all, the story of Judith, particularly in her slaying of Holofernes, draws on the description of one scriptural woman—the tent-dwelling assassin, Jael.

⁴⁰³ This was noted over a century ago by Lewis Bayles Paton, who concluded that the additions to VL Esther (including 3:14ff) ‘bear internal evidence of being translated from a Greek original’ (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Esther* [ICC 19; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1908] 40f). Likewise Bickerman, who considers VL Esther one of ‘four Greek texts of Esther’, see ‘Notes on the Greek Book of Esther’, *PAAJR* 20 (1950): 101-133.

⁴⁰⁴ Especially ms. C, see Dubarle, *Judith*, 161.

Jael and Judith (and Jael again): Jdt 10-16 and Judg 4-5 (and LAB 31)

Jael's gristly assassination of Sisera (Judg 4:17-22) takes place during the military campaign of the prophetess Deborah and her general Barak against the Canaanites (Judg 4:1-16,23-24). Jael, who is introduced as the wife (or more precisely, woman) of Heber the Kenite (4:17), invites the enemy of Israel, the Canaanite general Sisera, into her tent, where she offers him drink and covers him up with a blanket (*hapax* שמיכה) (4:18-19). Once Sisera is asleep, Jael drives a tent peg into his temple with a hammer, killing him (4:21). Jael then comes out to meet Barak and shows him the fallen enemy (4:22), thus fulfilling the prophecy given by Deborah to Barak—Sisera will be given 'into the hand of a woman' (4:9). After the Canaanites are defeated, Deborah and Barak sing a song in which they praise Jael, 'of tent-dwelling women most blessed' (5:24c), and narrate the episode again, adding that the slain Sisera sank and fell and 'lay still at [Jael's] feet (רגל)' (5:27)—which, in this context, could be read as a euphemism for genitals, implying sexual intercourse (cf. Deut 28:57; Judg 3:24; Ruth 3:7; 1 Sam 24:4; 2 Sam 11:8; Isa 7:20; Ezek 16:25; see also the interpretation of Judg 5:27 in *b. Hor.* 10b; *b. Naz.* 23b; *b. Yeb.* 103a).

The episode shares many features with the story of Judith: from the general—Judith, like Jael, only appears late in the narrative (Jdt 8:1; cf. Judg 4:17), whilst the narrative concludes with a song led by a woman (Jdt 16:2-17; cf. Judg 5)—to the specific. Judith makes herself beautiful (Jdt 10:4) to entice the enemy of Israel, the Assyrian general Holofernes, who then invites her into his tent with the hopes of engaging in sexual intercourse (12:5,10-16). Judith then drinks with Holofernes until he falls asleep and they are alone in the tent (12:16-13:2). Once Holofernes is asleep, Judith cuts off his head and pushes his body onto the floor, taking the canopy from his bed and placing his head in a bag (13:6-10). Judith then goes to the leaders of Bethulia and presents Holofernes' head, along with the canopy, declaring, 'The Lord has struck [Holofernes] down *by the hand of a woman*' (13:15). When Holofernes' head is presented to Achior, he praises Judith, saying, 'Blessed are you in every tent of Judah!' (14:7). After the Assyrians are defeated, Judith leads Israel in a song of praise, extolling the victory won 'by the hand of a woman' (16:5).

That the author of Judith knew Judges is evident from the report of Achior in Jdt 5:16: '[the Israelites] drove out before them the Canaanites, the Perizzites, the Jebusites, the Shechemites, and all the Gergesites, and lived there a long time'. The list of conquered nations resembles those in Josh 3:10 (also 24:11; Judg 1), but the unusual inclusion of the Shechemites is presumably a reference to the events narrated in Judg 9:22-57.⁴⁰⁵ Otherwise, the repeated references in Judith to the victory won 'by the hand of a woman' (ἐν χειρὶ θηλείας) (Jdt 9:10; 13:15; 16:5) clearly reflect the language of Judg 4:9 (הַשָּׂרָאֵל; LXX: ἐν χειρὶ γυναικός), whilst the blessing offered to Judith by Achior in 14:7, 'Blessed are you in every tent of Judah' (εὐλογημένη σὺ ἐν παντὶ σκηνώματι Ἰουδα), appears to echo Deborah's blessing of Jael in Judg 5:24, 'of women in the tent may she be blessed' (LXX: ἐκ γυναικῶν ἐν σκηνῇ εὐλογηθεῖη). The shared structure and narrative elements are also unmistakable: two women who on their own face the general of Israel's enemy by enticing him into a tent and kill him by striking him in the head once he has fallen asleep after drinking. This would all seem to confirm the conclusion of Sidnie White Crawford: '[It is] plain the author of Judith used the story of Jael and Deborah in Judges 4 and 5'.⁴⁰⁶

There are nonetheless clear differences between the episodes: for one, it is Jael who invites Sisera into her tent (Judg 4:18), whereas in Judith it is Holofernes who acts as the host (Jdt 12:5,10-16). Jael gives Sisera a skin of milk to drink (Judg 4:19) and curds to eat (5:25), whereas Holofernes gets drunk on his own supply of wine (Jdt 12:13-13:2), which Judith drinks with him (12:17-19). The method and instrument of the murder are different in each case: a tent peg to the temple for Jael (Judg 4:21-22; 5:26) and a sword to the neck for Judith (Jdt 13:8; 16:9). Whereas Jael is liable to the charge of sexual impropriety (on the basis of Judg 5:27; also 4:18-19; see *b. Hor.* 10b; *b. Naz.* 23b; *b. Yeb.* 103a; cf. *Lev. Rab.* 23:10), Judith goes out of her way to absolve herself of the charge, 'I swear that it was my face that seduced him to his destruction, and that he committed no sin with me, to defile and shame me' (Jdt 13:16b)—which

⁴⁰⁵ Judith includes one other reference to the Shechemites in 9:2-4.

⁴⁰⁶ Crawford, 'In the Steps of Jael and Deborah: Judith as Heroine' in *No One Spoke Ill of Her*, 5-16 (5); also Fokkelein van Dijk-Hemmes, 'Gezegende onder de vrouwen: een moeder in Israël en een maagd in de kerk' in *'t Is kwaad gerucht, als zij neit binnen blijft: Vrouwen in oude culturen* (ed. van Dijk-Hemmes; Tekst en Maatschappij; Utrecht: HES, 1986) 123-147. There is less to commend the conclusion of J. Edgar Bruns that 'Judith is none other than the [same] Jael of Judges 4-5' ('Judith or Jael?', *CBQ* 16 [1954]: 12-14).

may itself be an attempt to distance Judith from the suspicion afforded to Jael.⁴⁰⁷ Many details in Judith are, of course, absent from the story of Jael: the maid (Jdt 8:10,33; 10:2,5,10,17; 12:15,19; 13:3,9), the servants (esp. Bagoas, 12:10-15; 14:14-18), the banquet (12:10-13:1) and the duration of Judith's stay at the enemy camp (12:7,10), to name a few. Also absent from the description of Jael is the piety expressed by Judith, which includes her prayers before approaching Holofernes (9:2-14; 12:8) and during the murder (13:4-5,7). Likewise, the canopy (κωνώπιον) from Holofernes' bed, which plays such a central role in Judith's revelation to the Bethulian elders (13:9,15), has no obvious counterpart in the Jael narrative—though, as Crawford fairly speculates, it may be intended to reflect the hapax legomenon שמיכה in Judg 4:18 (see also the κώδιον in Jdt 12:15).⁴⁰⁸

The depiction of Judith is not bound exclusively to the scriptural figure of Jael.⁴⁰⁹ But the influence of Jael on at least some elements in the narrative of Judith is supported by one early reading of the text. The *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* finds and exploits the unmistakable traces of the figure of Jael in Judith—even reading the latter into descriptions of the former, so that now Judith becomes a model for Jael. In the account corresponding to Judg 4:17-22, it reads that Jael 'adorned herself with jewelry' (*ornavit se ornamento*) and went out to meet Sisera as he fled from battle, adding, 'now the woman was very beautiful in appearance' (*LAB 31:3a: mulier autem erat bone specie valde*). She then invites Sisera into her home, offering him 'food and sleep' in return for his favour (31:3b). Upon entering, Sisera sees 'roses scattered on

⁴⁰⁷ As suggested by Colleen M. Conway, *Sex and Slaughter in the Tent of Jael: A Cultural History of a Biblical Story* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016) 29-30. It does not seem to have been entirely effective, as Dubarle shows, some later accounts depict Judith sleeping with Holofernes (*Judith*, 134). The issue of defilement appears to be a central issue for the author of Judith, not only in the reference to the rape of Dinah in Judith's first prayer (Jdt 9:2-5), but also in the name of the (possibly fictitious) town of Bethulia, which, as some commentators have noted, may be a play on the Hb. בתולה, 'virgin'. Thus Holofernes' attempt to invade the narrow pass (4:7) into Bethulia takes on a sexual connotation, see William Loader, *The Pseudepigrapha on Sexuality: Attitudes towards Sexuality in Apocalypses, Testaments, Legends, Wisdom, and Related Literature* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2011) 213-214.

⁴⁰⁸ Crawford, 'In the Steps of Jael and Deborah', 9f. Responding to Crawford, Philip Esler argues that these 'significant disparities . . . prevent us from regarding Jael as a central model for Judith', "'By the Hand of a Woman": Culture, Story and Theology in the Book of Judith' in *Social Scientific Models for Interpreting the Bible: Essays by the Context Group in Honor of Bruce J. Malina* (ed. Bruce J. Malina and John J. Pilch; BibInt 53; Leiden: Brill, 2001) 64-101 (77). Whilst Esler is critical of Crawford, there is much less to commend his alternative proposal that David and Goliath serve as the primary model for Judith and Holofernes.

⁴⁰⁹ As noted by van Henten, 'Judith as Alternative Leader: A Rereading of Judith 7-13' in *A Feminist Companion to Esther, Judith and Susanna* (ed. Athalya Brenner; London: T&T Clark, 1995) 224-252 (esp. 224). See also the comments in Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, 100.

the bed' and desires Jael for his wife (31:3c). Sisera asks Jael for water 'for I am weary' (31:4; a possible echo of Esau at Gen 25:30), at which point Jael goes outside to milk her flock and prays for a sign as to whether she should kill Sisera when he becomes drunk (31:5).⁴¹⁰ When she re-enters, Sisera asks again for a drink—which was to be the sign—so Jael prepares wine mixed with milk and gives it to him until he falls asleep (31:6). Jael then takes a stake in her left hand and approaches Sisera and prays for another sign—this time, if he remains asleep after she pushes him off the bed onto the ground (31:7a). After this, 'Jael took Sisera and *pushed him onto the ground from the bed*' (*impulit eum in terram de lecto*), but he did not wake 'because he was faint' (31:7b).⁴¹¹ Jael then prays, 'Strengthen in me today, Lord, my arm on account of you and your people and those who hope in you', at which point she drives the stake into his temple (31:7c). As he lies dying, Sisera complains that he dies 'like a woman' (cf. Judg 9:54), to which Jael responds, 'Go, boast before your father in hell and tell him that you have fallen *into the hands of a woman*' (31:7d: *in manus mulieris*). The narrative then briefly tells of the desire of Sisera's mother for him to return with 'the daughters of the Hebrews . . . as concubines' (31:8). Following this, Jael goes out to meet Barak, who upon seeing Sisera recalls the words of Deborah's prophecy, 'Into the hand of a woman (*in manum mulieris*) Sisera will be handed over' (31:9b; cf. 31:1c). Barak then cuts off Sisera's head and sends it to his mother, with the words, 'Receive your son, whom you hoped to see coming back with spoils' (31:9c). The agreement between the three accounts is detailed in the table below.

⁴¹⁰ It seems that the author of *LAB* was led to associate the words of Sisera, 'I am thirsty' (כי צמאתי) with the words of Esau, 'I am weary' (כי עייף אנכי) by the inclusion of עייף in Judg 4:21c.

⁴¹¹ The meaning of *dissolvo*, repeated a few times in *LAB* 31, is unclear. In 31:4, the context would suggest exhaustion (cf. עייף in Judg 4:21c), as Jacobson notes (*Commentary*, 2.849), likely reflecting ἐκλύω in the Greek (similarly ἐκλείπω in LXX Gen 25:30). However, elsewhere it appears to be an effect of the drink (31:5,7), suggesting something closer to drunkenness (Harrington confusingly translates *dissolvo* as 'off guard' in 31:5; cf. 'groggy' in 31:7).

Jdt 10-16	Judg 4-5	LAB 31
Judith ‘was beautiful in appearance’ (Jdt 8:7; also 10:4).		Jael ‘was very beautiful in appearance’ (<i>LAB</i> 31:3a).
Judith adorns herself with all kinds of jewelry before meeting Holofernes (Jdt 10:3-4; also 12:15).		Jael ‘adorned herself with jewelry’ before meeting Sisera (<i>LAB</i> 31:3a).
Holofernes invites Judith into his tent (Jdt 12:5,13).	Jael invites Sisera into her tent (Judg 4:18).	Jael invites Sisera into her house (<i>LAB</i> 31:3b).
Holofernes desires to sleep with Judith (Jdt 12:12,16).		Sisera desires to sleep with/marry Jael (<i>LAB</i> 31:3c).
Judith drinks wine with Holofernes until he becomes drunk (Jdt 12:20; 13:2).	Jael gives Sisera milk (and curds in 5:25) to drink (Judg 4:19).	Jael gives Sisera wine mixed with milk to drink so that he becomes drunk (<i>LAB</i> 31:6b).
Because of the wine, Holofernes falls asleep in the tent with Judith (Jdt 13:2).	After drinking, Sisera falls asleep in the tent with Jael (Judg 4:19,21).	Because of the wine mixed with milk, Sisera falls asleep in the house with Jael (<i>LAB</i> 31:6c).
Judith takes Holofernes’ sword and approaches the bed (Jdt 13:6-7a).	Jael takes a tent peg and a hammer in her hand and approaches Sisera (Judg 4:21a).	Jael takes a stake in her left hand and approaches Sisera (<i>LAB</i> 31:7a).
Judith prays, ‘Give me strength today, O Lord God of Israel!’ (Jdt 13:7b).		Jael prays, ‘Strengthen in me today, Lord’ (<i>LAB</i> 31:7c).

Judith strikes Holofernes' neck twice with the sword and cuts off his head (Jdt 13:8).	Jael drives the tent peg into Sisera's temple (Judg 4:21b; 5:26).	Jael takes the stake and hammers it into Sisera's temple (<i>LAB</i> 31:7d). Barak cuts off Sisera's head (31:9c).
Judith 'rolled [Holofernes'] body off the bed' (Jdt 13:9a).	Sisera sinks and falls at Jael's feet (Judg 5:27).	Jael 'pushed [Sisera] onto the ground from the bed' (<i>LAB</i> 31:7b).
Judith shows Holofernes' decapitated head to the leaders of Bethulia (Jdt 13:15) and Achior (14:6).	Jael shows Sisera's body to Barak (Judg 4:22).	Jael shows Sisera's body to Barak (<i>LAB</i> 31:9a). Barak sends Sisera's decapitated head to Sisera's mother (31:9c).
Achior praises Judith, 'Blessed are you in every tent of Judah!' (Jdt 14:7).	Deborah praises Jael, 'of tent-dwelling women most blessed' (Judg 5:24b).	
Victory is won 'by the hand of a woman' (prophesied in Jdt 9:10; repeated in 13:15; 16:5).	Deborah prophesies Sisera will fall 'into the hand of woman' (Judg 4:9).	Sisera falls 'into the hand of a woman' (<i>LAB</i> 31:1c,7d,9b).

The inherent similarities between Judith and Jael are no doubt what prompted the author of *LAB* to use details of one character to shape the other.⁴¹² As noted earlier, this process of conflating similar figures and events is characteristic of *LAB*'s compositional style: for example, the destruction of the flood becomes the destruction of Sodom (*LAB* 3:3; cf. Gen 19:25), the rod of Aaron becomes the rod of Jacob (*LAB* 17:3; cf. Gen 30:37-39), the death of Jacob becomes the death of Joshua (*LAB* 24:5; cf. Gen 49:33b), and already in the account of Jael, the words of Sisera, 'I am thirsty' (Judg 4:19) become the words of Esau, 'I am weary' (*LAB* 31:4; cf. Gen 25:30c; see also Judg 4:22c). In a similar fashion, the author of *LAB* inserts details from the story of Judith into the account of Jael: seen in the description of Jael's appearance (*LAB* 31:3a; cf. Jdt 8:7), her jewelry (*LAB* 31:3a; cf. Jdt 10:3-4; 12:15), the general's lust (*LAB* 31:3c; cf. Jdt 12:12,16), the role of wine (*LAB* 31:6; cf. Jdt 12:20; 13:2), the prayer for strength (*LAB* 31:7c; cf. Jdt 13:7b), pushing the general off the bed (*LAB* 31:7b; cf. Jdt 13:9a) and, ultimately, the beheading (*LAB* 31:9c; cf. Jdt 13:8).

What prompted the author of Judith to incorporate details from the story of Jael, however, is as inscrutable as the purpose of the book.⁴¹³ Given the extensive and distinctive nature of the similarities, it is virtually certain the author drew inspiration from the scriptural figure of Jael when composing the character of Judith, particularly her actions in Jdt 13:2-9. But as to whether the literary figure of Judith was invented under the influence of Jael, or a pre-existing narrative was later given features of the Jael story, it is difficult to know. If the book of Judith was intended to be read as historical fiction—which is, again, impossible to prove—then this would be an example of a knowingly fictional character being composed, at least in part, out of the Jewish scriptures. But as no sign of the author's intention survives, and the events are narrated in the style of other historiographical writings, it may be more appropriate to describe the book as *pseudo-history*—a statement of fact, rather than intention.⁴¹⁴ The

⁴¹² As Bauckham notes, the author of *LAB* may also have been prompted by 'midrashic developments' of the Jael story ('Pseudo Philo and the Gospels as "Midrash"', 50). Feldman details some of these developments, including Jael's beauty and the role of wine, see 'Prolegomenon', cxvii.

⁴¹³ See the wide range of opinions in Moore, *Judith*, 76-77.

⁴¹⁴ I borrow the term 'pseudo-history' from Lionel Pearson, who uses it to describe the fabricated history of the Messenians as recounted in Pausanias (*Descr.* 4.6), 'The Pseudo-History of Messenia and Its Authors', *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* (1962): 397-426. For the relevance of this for Second Temple literature, see Katherine M. Stott, 'Ezra's "Lost Manuscripts": Narrative Context and Rhetorical Function' in *The One Who Reads May Run: Essays in Honour of Edgar W. Conrad* (ed. Roland Boer, Michael Carden and Julie Kelso; LHBOTS 553; London: T&T Clark, 2012) 96-106

events described in Judith did not happen—not least because in some cases they would be impossible (Jdt 1:1,7,11,13; 2:1,4; 4:1,3; 5:19). Whatever historical and literary sources were used in the composition of the narrative are, for the most part, unrecoverable.⁴¹⁵ The one exception to this is the Jewish scriptures.⁴¹⁶ Whilst the majority of details in the text are not attributable to the direct influence of the Jewish scriptures, the *pseudo-historical* narrative nevertheless centres around a scripturalized episode: the slaying of a general in a tent ‘by the hand of a woman’ (Jdt 9:10; 13:15; 16:5; cf. Judg 4:9).

The Testament of Abraham

For a text primarily known for its absence of piety, the decision to include the *Testament of Abraham* here alongside better-known Second Temple texts may appear puzzling.⁴¹⁷ Its inclusion is perhaps even more puzzling in a discussion about the compositional use of the Jewish scriptures when one considers the comments of its translator in Charlesworth’s *OTP*, E. P. Sanders: ‘Almost nothing of the Old Testament appears [in the *Testament*] except the obvious references to Abraham in Genesis’.⁴¹⁸ Indeed, only one monograph has attempted to show the use of scriptural material outside of Genesis in the *Testament* and has been met with strong criticism.⁴¹⁹ Recent work by Dale Allison on the *Testament* would, however, appear to render Sanders’ initial judgment premature.⁴²⁰ Building on Allison’s proposals, this brief final section

(esp. 102-105). For general stylistic similarities between Judith and Greek historical writings, see Gera, *Judith*, 60-78.

⁴¹⁵ Contrary to Mark Stephen Caponigro, ‘Judith, Holding the Tale of Herodotus’ in *No One Spoke Ill of Her*, 47-59. For a survey of proposed literary sources, see Otzen, *Tobit and Judith*, 74-80.

⁴¹⁶ See the similar sentiments in Gera, *Judith*, 56.

⁴¹⁷ Such irreverence includes the ironic description of the archangel Michael as ‘commander-in-chief’ (ἀρχιστράτηγος) given his predilection for crying (*T. Ab.* 3:9-10; 5:10,14) and failure (4:6; 8:1-3; 15:14-15). The *Testament* likewise portrays Abraham as deceitful, disobedient and obdurate to the end, unwilling to obey God and die (not satisfied with his ample 995 years), he instead resorts to tricking God and Michael, until God fatally tricks him in return. The *Testament* also appears to make jokes: in order to get some privacy from Abraham, Michael pretends to urinate (*T. Ab.* 4:5)—despite the fact that angels cannot eat or drink (4:10).

⁴¹⁸ E. P. Sanders, ‘Testament of Abraham’ in *OTP I*, 871-904 (879).

⁴¹⁹ Phillip B. Munoa, *Four Powers in Heaven: The Interpretation of Daniel 7 in the Testament of Abraham* (JSPSupp 28; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998); cf. Michael E. Stone, ‘Review of Munoa, *Four Powers in Heaven*’, *JQR* 90 (1999): 235-237.

⁴²⁰ Allison, ‘Job in the Testament of Abraham’, *JSP* 12 (2001): 131-147; *Testament of Abraham* (CEJL; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2003) 128-30.

will explore how scripturalization can occur in the most unlikely of places—even in an irreverent tale like the *Testament of Abraham*. But first, some preliminary comments about the text of the *Testament*.

The *Testament of Abraham* survives in two quite different Greek recensions, a longer and a shorter recension.⁴²¹ Scholarship has mostly settled on the priority of the longer recension, but as Allison notes, the issue is complicated by the later Greek style of the longer recension and the presence of Christian interpolations in both recensions.⁴²² The issue is best resolved by positing an original Greek text composed by a Jewish author, to which both (Christian) recensions are independently related, but of which the longer recension (hereafter *T. Ab.*) best preserves the more explicitly scriptural (and traditional) character of the original.⁴²³

On its surface, the narrative appears only loosely related to the scriptural report of Abraham's death (Gen 25:7-11; cf. Gen 18:1-8). God sends the archangel Michael who appears by the oak at Mamre to inform Abraham of his impending death, in the hopes that he will amicably forfeit his soul (*T. Ab.* 1:4-7). Instead, Michael grows fond of Abraham and loses the courage to break the bad news (2:1-5:14). Michael is forced to reveal Abraham's fate, however, when Sarah uncovers his angelic identity (6:1-7:11). Abraham proceeds to stall Michael from completing his task, cleverly asking to be taken on a cosmic tour to see all things in creation (9:2-6). Michael and Abraham then embark on their heavenly journey, where they witness several eschatological scenes (10:1-14:14).⁴²⁴ In one scene, Abraham asks for retribution for sins he sees being committed, but upon seeing the judgment scene, he intervenes on behalf of the sinners (14:1-15). When Michael returns Abraham to his home, Death is there to take

⁴²¹ For the Greek texts, see Allison, *Testament*, 4-7; as well as Coptic, Arabic, Ethiopic, Slavonic and Romanian texts and their relationship with the Greek texts, 8-11.

⁴²² See the comprehensive list of issues in Allison, *Testament*, 15-27. For the priority of the longer recension, see James, *The Testament of Abraham: the Greek Text Now First Edited with an Introduction and Notes* (TS 2/2; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1892) 49; George H. Box, *The Testament of Abraham: Translated from the Greek Text with Introduction and Notes* (London: SPCK, 1927) xii-xv; Nickelsburg, 'Structure and Message in the Testament of Abraham' in *Studies on the Testament of Abraham* (ed. Nickelsburg; SACS 6; Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1976) 85-93; Sanders, 'Testament', 872. For the priority of the shorter recension, see Nigel Turner, *The Testament of Abraham: A Study of the Original Language, Place of Origin, Authorship, and Relevance* (Unpublished PhD diss.; London: University of London, 1953) 48-100, 194-257; Francis Schmidt, *Le Testament grec d'Abraham: Introduction, édition critique des deux recensions grecques, traduction* (TSAJ 11; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1986) 115-124.

⁴²³ See Allison, *Testament*, 24-27.

⁴²⁴ This heavenly journey is paralleled in other texts (*LAB* 18:5; 23:6; *Ap. Ab.* 19-21).

his soul (16:6-15). Whilst Abraham continues to resist, Death eventually deceives him with a kiss, at which point, Abraham dies and ascends to heaven (20:8-15).

But despite its clear departure from the scriptural narrative, many phrases appear to depend on the wording of LXX Gen 18-25: for example, God blesses Abraham ‘as the stars of heaven and as the sand by the seashore’ (*T. Ab.* 1:5: ὡς τὰ ἄστρα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ὡς τὴν ἄμμον τὴν παρὰ χεῖλος τῆς θαλάσσης; cf. LXX Gen 22:17: ὡς τοὺς ἀστέρας τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ὡς τὴν ἄμμον τὴν παρὰ τὸ χεῖλος τῆς θαλάσσης); the appearance at ‘the oak of Mamre’ (*T. Ab.* 2:1: τὴν δρῦν τὴν Μαβρὴν; cf. 1:2; 6:4; 16:7; 20:11; cf. LXX Gen 18:1: τῆ δρυὶ τῆ Μαμβρῆ; cf. 13:18; 14:13); and Abraham addresses ‘Isaac his son, “My beloved son”’ (*T. Ab.* 4:1: Ἰσαὰκ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ υἱέ μου ἀγαπητέ; cf. LXX Gen 22:11-12: Ἰσαὰκ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ . . . υἱοῦ σου τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ; cf. LXX Gen 22:2-3,9,16).

Other details appear to be drawn from elsewhere in the Jewish scriptures: as in *T. Ab.* 9:4, where Abraham prays, ‘You have given to me according to my heart and have fulfilled all my plans’ (ἔδωκάς μοι κατὰ τῆς καρδίας μου καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν βουλὴν μου ἐπλήρωσας), reflecting the words of LXX Ps 19:5, ‘May he give to you according to your heart and may he fulfil all your plans’ (δῶη σοι κατὰ καρδίαν σου καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν βουλὴν σου πληρώσαι).⁴²⁵ Later in the same prayer, the language appears to reflect the *Prayer of Manasseh*: ‘all . . . shudder and tremble before your power’ (*T. Ab.* 9:5: πάντα . . . φρίττει καὶ τρέμει ἀπὸ προσώπου δυνάμεώς σου; cf. *Pr. Man.* 4: πάντα φρίττει καὶ τρέμει ἀπὸ προσώπου δυνάμεώς σου).⁴²⁶ The three curses of Abraham also clearly follow a scriptural model: upon Abraham’s request, wild beasts ‘came out . . . of the forest’ (ἐξῆλθον . . . ἐκ τοῦ δρυμοῦ) to devour the first group of sinners (*T. Ab.* 10:5-6), as when Elisha curses and bears ‘came out . . . of the forest’ (ἐξῆλθον . . . ἐκ τοῦ δρυμοῦ) to destroy the forty-two children (LXX 2 Kgs 2:24). For the next group of sinners, upon Abraham’s request, ‘the earth opened up and swallowed them’ (*T. Ab.* 10:10: ἐδιχάσθη ἡ γῆ καὶ κατέπιεν αὐτούς; cf. 10:9), as in Num 16:32, ‘the earth opened and swallowed [the men of Korah]’ (LXX: ἠνοίχθη ἡ γῆ καὶ κατέπιεν

⁴²⁵ Translation own. See the discussion in Allison, ‘Job in the Testament of Abraham’, 133-134; *Testament*, 207.

⁴²⁶ As Allison notes, the language of *Pr. Man.* 4 also appears in *Gk. Apoc. Ezra* 7:7; *Apos. Con.* 8.7.5; and Ps.-Chrysostom, *Prec.* (PG 64.1065) (*Testament*, 207-208).

αὐτούς).⁴²⁷ And for the last group, upon Abraham's request, 'fire came down from heaven and consumed them' (*T. Ab.* 10:12: κατήλθεν πῦρ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ κατέφαγεν αὐτούς; cf. 10:11), as on Elijah's command, 'fire came down from heaven and consumed [the captain and his fifty men]' (LXX 2 Kgs 1:10: κατέβη πῦρ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ κατέφαγεν αὐτόν).

In addition to the compositional use of material from outside of Gen 18-25, the *Testament* may have been influenced by traditions concerning the death of Moses.⁴²⁸ For example, Abraham's confrontation with death (*T. Ab.* 16-20) shares many similarities with Moses' confrontation with death in *Deut. Rab.* 11:10 (also 11:5,8) and *Sifre Deut.* 305:5 (also 339:1; 357:1-27): God sends death/Sammael from heaven to fetch the hero (*T. Ab.* 16:1-6; *Deut. Rab.* 11:10; *Sifre Deut.* 305:5); the hero resists death/Sammael (*T. Ab.* 16:16; 19:2-4; 20:4-5; *Deut. Rab.* 11:10; *Sifre Deut.* 305:5); death/Sammael returns to heaven and reports on his failure (*Deut. Rab.* 11:10; *Sifre Deut.* 305:5; cf. Michael in *T. Ab.* 4:6-11; 8:1-12; 15:11-15); God sends death/Sammael a second time (*Deut. Rab.* 11:10; *Sifre Deut.* 305:5; cf. Michael in *T. Ab.* 4:7-5:1; 8:4-9:1); God instructs the hero that all men must die (*T. Ab.* 8:9; *Deut. Rab.* 11:8; *Sifre Deut.* 339:1); the hero has a vision of everything in creation (*T. Ab.* 10-14; *Sifre Deut.* 357:1-27); the divine name protects the hero from death (*T. Ab.* 17:11; *Deut. Rab.* 11:5,10); the hero dies with a kiss (*T. Ab.* 20:8-9; *Deut. Rab.* 11:10); the hero is taken to heaven (*T. Ab.* 20:12,14; *Deut. Rab.* 11:10).⁴²⁹ The narrative of Abraham's struggle with death in the *Testament* has no obvious starting point in the Jewish scriptures and appears to be without parallel in antiquity,⁴³⁰ whereas speculation about the death of

⁴²⁷ See the discussion in Allison, *Testament*, 226. Allison observes the agreement with LXX Num 16 is closer in some mss. of the shorter recension (B, E, F, G 12:7). The fate of the men of Korah is often used as a model for divine judgment scenes: see *LAB* 6:17 (similarly in *b. Sanh.* 109a); 26:1; Rev 12:16.

⁴²⁸ As observed by Samuel E. Loewenstamm, 'The Testament of Abraham and the Texts Concerning Moses' Death' in *Studies in the Testament of Abraham*, 219-225; Esther Glickler-Chazon, 'Moses' Struggle for his Soul: A Prototype for the Testament of Abraham, the Greek Apocalypse of Ezra, and the Apocalypse of Sedrach', *The Second Century: A Journal of Early Christian Studies* 5 (1985/86): 151-164. Cf. Ludlow, *Abraham Meets Death*, 50-54, is skeptical of the parallel, see the critical comments in Allison, *Testament*, 26, n. 52. Traditions of Moses' death may have also influenced *Gk. Apoc. Ezra* 6:3-7:14, see Chazon, 'Moses' Struggle with Death', 158-162; Allison, *The New Moses*, 64-65.

⁴²⁹ For a more extensive list of related sources, see Allison, *Testament*, 24-25. For an overview of traditions of Moses' death, see Loewenstamm, 'The Death of Moses' in *Studies in the Testament of Abraham*, 185-217.

⁴³⁰ There are, however, Islamic traditions concerning Abraham's struggle with the Angel of Death that bear a striking resemblance to the *Testament*, see Stephen R. Burge, *Angels in Islam: Jalāl al-Dīn al-*

Moses is widely attested and has a much more plausible link to the Jewish scriptures (the rebuke in Deut 3:23-29; the ambiguity of Deut 34:1-6), suggesting its priority.⁴³¹ A plausible explanation is that the author of the *Testament* has been influenced by contemporary Moses traditions which are preserved in much later texts (i.e. *Deut. Rab.* 11:10; *Sifre Deut.* 305:5; *Petirat Moshe* in Jellinek, *BHM* 1.115-129).⁴³²

If this is the case, then Moses is one of two figures from the Jewish scriptures that has influenced the depiction of Abraham in the *Testament*—the other figure is Job.

Abraham and Job: *T. Ab.* and LXX Job 1-2

In *T. Ab.* 4:6, the archangel Michael explains to God that he cannot break the news of Abraham's death, 'Because I have not seen upon earth a man like him—merciful, hospitable, righteous, truthful, God-fearing, refraining from every evil deed' (ὅτι οὐκ εἶδον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἄνθρωπον ὅμοιον αὐτοῦ, ἐλεήμονα, φιλόξενον, δίκαιον, ἀληθινὸν, θεοσεβῆ, ἀπεχόμενον ἀπὸ παντὸς πονηροῦ πράγματος). This description of Abraham clearly depends on the language used to describe Job in the Septuagint: 'That there is none like him on the earth, a man blameless, truthful, God-fearing, refraining from every evil deed' (LXX Job 1:8b: ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν κατ' αὐτὸν τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἄνθρωπος ἄμεμπτος, ἀληθινός, θεοσεβής, ἀπεχόμενος ἀπὸ παντὸς πονηροῦ πράγματος).⁴³³ The *Testament* later makes the Job comparison explicit: Michael again refuses to bring Abraham, because 'there is no man like unto him on earth, not even Job, the wondrous man' (*T. Ab.* 15:15a: οὐκ ἔστιν ἄνθρωπος ὅμοιος αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, οὐ κὰν Ἰὼβ ὁ θαυμάσιος ἄνθρωπος).⁴³⁴

Suyūṭī's al-Habā'ik fī akhbār al-malā'ik (Culture and Civilization in the Middle East; London: Routledge, 2012) 135-136. It is unclear whether these traditions owe directly to the *Testament* or suggest a wider tradition of the conflict between Abraham and Death.

⁴³¹ For the scriptural origins of the Moses legends, see Allison, *Testament*, 26, n. 53; also the brief comments in Loewenstamm, 'The Death of Moses', 185. Loewenstamm also sees the mythical character of Moses in the legends as a sign of antiquity ('The Testament of Abraham', 219-224).

⁴³² Rella Kuschelovsky has collected many of these texts in *Moses and the Angel of Death* (STML 4; New York, NY: Peter Lang, 1995). Allison notes that the Mosaic parallels are stronger in the longer recension of the *Testament* and appear to be a feature of the original Jewish text (*Testament*, 26-27).

⁴³³ Also LXX Job 1:1: καὶ ἦν ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος ἀληθινός, ἄμεμπτος, δίκαιος, θεοσεβής, ἀπεχόμενος ἀπὸ παντὸς πονηροῦ πράγματος; 2:3: ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν κατ' αὐτὸν τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἄνθρωπος ἄκακος, ἀληθινός, ἄμεμπτος, θεοσεβής, ἀπεχόμενος ἀπὸ παντὸς κακοῦ. See Allison, 'Job in the Testament of Abraham', 138.

⁴³⁴ Allison notes the agreement is even closer in Alexandrinus: LXX Job 1:8 A: οὐκ ἔστιν ἄνθρωπος ὅμοιος αὐτῷ (also LXX Job 2:3 A; cf. *T. Ab.* 15:15a: οὐκ ἔστιν ἄνθρωπος ὅμοιος αὐτοῦ). See Allison,

But as Allison notes, the *Testament*'s use of the Job narrative goes beyond the mere borrowing of a phrase.⁴³⁵ The beginning of the *Testament* also appears to be modelled, in part, on the narrative of LXX Job 1-2. Both narratives begin with the praise of the 'righteous' (δίκαιος) hero (*T. Ab.* 1:1; LXX Job 1:1). God and a heavenly being then discuss the fate of the hero in heaven (*T. Ab.* 1:4-7; LXX Job 1:6-12), where the hero's wealth is said to be the result of God's blessing (εὐλογέω). God gives the heavenly being instructions concerning the hero (*T. Ab.* 1:6-7; Job 1:12). A messenger/angel (ἄγγελος) then speaks to the hero (*T. Ab.* 2:1; LXX Job 1:14,16-18), whilst the hero is unaware of the heavenly plot. However, the heavenly being fails to achieve his objective (*T. Ab.* 4:5-6; Job 1:20-22) and appears in heaven a second time (*T. Ab.* 4:5; Job 2:1-2), where he praises the hero: there is none 'on earth like him etc.' (*T. Ab.* 4:6; LXX Job 2:3). God sends the heavenly being a second time (*T. Ab.* 4:7-8,10-11; Job 2:6), but he again fails in his objective (*T. Ab.* 7:12; Job 2:10). The model of Job 1-2 resurfaces again later in the narrative (*T. Ab.* 15:14-15), where Michael twice says that he 'refrain[s] from touching' (φείδομαι τοῦ ἅψασθαι) Abraham because 'there is no man on earth like him, not even Job' (cf. LXX Job 1:8; also 2:3).⁴³⁶ This reference to 'touching' (ἅπτω) also has its origin with Job, where God commands Satan, 'But do not touch him' (LXX Job 1:12b: ἀλλὰ αὐτοῦ μὴ ἅψη). Agreement between the *Testament* and LXX Job 1-2 is laid out in the table below.⁴³⁷

'Job in the Testament of Abraham', 137; *Testament*, 316-318. This variant is also found in mss. 161, 248 and in the margin of Syro-hex. at Job 1:8.

⁴³⁵ Allison, 'Job in the Testament of Abraham', 139-140; *Testament*, 128-130.

⁴³⁶ Allison, *Testament*, 316-318.

⁴³⁷ See also the tables in Allison, 'Job in the Testament of Abraham', 139; *Testament*, 129.

<i>T. Ab. 1-15</i>	Job 1-2
Abraham is introduced as a ‘righteous’ man (<i>T. Ab. 1:1</i>).	Job is introduced as a ‘righteous’ man (LXX Job 1:1).
God and Michael discuss Abraham’s fate in heaven (<i>T. Ab. 1:4-7</i>).	God and Satan discuss Job’s fate in heaven (Job 1:6-12).
Abraham’s prosperity is the result of God’s ‘blessing’ (<i>T. Ab. 1:5</i>).	Job’s prosperity is the result of God’s ‘blessing’ (LXX Job 1:10).
God sends Michael with instructions concerning Abraham (<i>T. Ab. 1:6-7</i>).	God sends Satan with instructions concerning Job (Job 1:12).
An angel (Michael) comes to Abraham bearing terrible news (<i>T. Ab. 2-7</i>).	Messengers (ἄγγελοι) come to Job bearing terrible news (LXX Job 1:14,16-18).
Michael initially fails in his objective (<i>T. Ab. 4:5-6</i>).	Satan initially fails in his objective (Job 1:20-22).
Michael appears in heaven a second time (<i>T. Ab. 4:5</i>).	Satan appears in heaven a second time (Job 2:1-2).
Michael says to God, ‘I have not seen upon earth a man like [Abraham] . . . truthful, God-fearing, refraining from every evil deed’ (<i>T. Ab. 4:6</i>).	God says to Satan, ‘There is none like [Job] on the earth . . . truthful, God-fearing, refraining from every evil deed’ (LXX Job 1:8; cf. 1:1; 2:3).
God sends Michael a second time (<i>T. Ab. 4:7-8,10-11</i>).	God sends Satan a second time (Job 2:6).
Again, Michael fails in his objective (<i>T. Ab. 7:12</i>).	Again, Satan fails in his objective (Job 2:10).
Michael refuses to touch Abraham (<i>T. Ab. 15:14-15</i>).	God commands Satan not to touch Job (Job 1:12).
Michael says, ‘there is no man like [Abraham] on earth, not even Job, the wondrous man’ (<i>T. Ab. 15:15</i>).	God says, ‘there is none like [Job] on the earth’ (LXX Job 1:8; 2:3).

The *Testament* is not the only text in antiquity to use details from the Job narrative in the description of Abraham. Job 1:8 (2:3) clearly lies behind *b. B. Bat.* 15b: '[Satan] said before him, "Lord of the world, I have surveyed the whole world and found none so faithful as your servant, Abraham"'. In *b. Sanh.* 89b, Satan speaks the words of Eliphaz the Temanite to Abraham on his way to the *Aqedah*:⁴³⁸ 'If we try to commune with you, will you be grieved? . . . Behold you have instructed many, and you have strengthened weak hands. Your words have held up him who was falling, and you have strengthened feeble knees. But now it is come upon you, and you faint . . . But should not your fear be your confidence' (cf. Job 4:2-6). Abraham responds to Satan likewise using the words of Eliphaz, 'Remember, I pray you, whoever perished, being innocent' (cf. Job 4:7). Once Satan sees that his words have no effect on Abraham, he again quotes Eliphaz, 'Now a thing was secretly brought to me' (cf. Job 4:12), before revealing that Isaac will not die, but a sheep will be provided as a burnt-offering. Whilst less direct, the heavenly scene of Job 1-2 may lie behind the accusation of Mastema against Abraham in *Jub.* 17:15-16 (also 4QpsJub^a 2:1-2), leading to the test of the *Aqedah*.⁴³⁹

The comparison of Abraham and Job also appears to have been a motif elsewhere in rabbinic literature, often at Job's expense.⁴⁴⁰ Delcor and Weinberg find in the *Testament* a similar attempt to elevate Abraham above Job, possibly in an effort to counter the elevated status of Job in the contemporaneous *Testament of Job*.⁴⁴¹ Indeed, the statement in *T. Ab.* 15:15—'There is no man like unto [Abraham] on earth,

⁴³⁸ In a much later collection, Eliphaz explicitly contrasts Job with Abraham, 'Are your works like those of Abraham? He was tried in ten trials and endured all of them, but you have only been in one trial' (*Midr. Tanh.* [Buber] *Vay.* 8:2; cf. *ARN* A 7). Interestingly, as Allison observes, Job complains of his friends, 'These ten times you have cast reproach upon me' (Job 19:3), the same number of trials faced by Abraham (*Jub.* 17:26-28; *m. Abot* 5:3; *Gen. Rab.* 56:11), see Allison, *Testament*, 317f. However, Joseph also faces 'ten trials' in *T. Jos.* 2:7. See also the comments on the significance and repetition of 'ten' in *Pirkei Avot* 5:1-6.

⁴³⁹ Allison, *Testament*, 318; cf. the more sceptical comments in Jacques T. A. G. M. van Ruiten, *Abraham in the Book of Jubilees: The Rewriting of Genesis 11:26-25:10 in the Book of Jubilees 11:14-23:8* (JSJSupp 161; Brill: Leiden, 2012) 212-214.

⁴⁴⁰ See *b. B. Bat.* 16a; *y. Sot.* 20c; *y. Ber.* 14b; *Gen. Rab.* 49:9; *Deut. Rab.* 11:3; *Midr. Teh.* 26:2; *ARN* A 7. One notable exception to this can be found in the words of R. Yoḥanan in *b. B. Bat.* 15b, 'What is said about Job is more impressive than what is said about Abraham'.

⁴⁴¹ Mathias Delcor, *Le Testament d'Abraham: Introduction, traduction du texte grec et commentaire de la recension grecque longue, suivi de la traduction des Testaments d'Abraham, d'Isaac et de Jacob d'après les versions orientales* (SVTP 2; Leiden: Brill, 1973) 76; Joanna Weinberg, 'Job versus Abraham: The Quest for the Perfect God-Fearer in Rabbinic Tradition' in *The Book of Job* (ed. W. A. M. Beuken; BETL 114; Leuven: Peeters, 1994) 281-296 (291). The *Testament of Job* also appears to reflect legends concerning Abraham, see the comments in Ginzberg, *Legends*, 5.383, n. 10.

not even Job, the wondrous man’—may invite such an explanation. But as Allison rightly observes, ‘this is a way of exalting Abraham, not denigrating Job’.⁴⁴² Alternatively, Allison proposes that the presence of Job material in the description of Abraham functions as a *synkrisis*, through which the lives of Abraham and Job are contrasted for the benefit of the reader.⁴⁴³ According to Allison, the readers of the *Testament* were likely ‘expected to espy the parallels between Abraham and Job’—the identification of which may simply be intended for literary enjoyment rather than exposition.⁴⁴⁴ As a device, however, *synkrisis* aims at revealing the character of a person by way of direct comparison.⁴⁴⁵ This seems appropriate for the fleeting mention of Job in *T. Ab.* 15:15, where Abraham is explicitly compared to Job thus alerting the reader to the comparison. But as for the unmarked use of LXX Job elsewhere in the work, there is no clear sign that the material was intended to function in the same way. At most, the use of scriptural details in the narrative reveals that the author drew on LXX Job as a literary source for the composition of the work. Whether the author then expected readers to see through the invocation of Job at *T. Ab.* 15:15 and thereby identify allusions to the Job narrative elsewhere in the work is difficult to know. In the final analysis, the author’s intention in using the Job narrative may be as inscrutable as the purpose of the work itself.

What prompted the association of Abraham and Job requires less effort: as Allison notes, it was in all probability the latter’s experience with a secret (and initially unsuccessful) heavenly plot that recommended it to the author.⁴⁴⁶ Thus Job 1-2 provided fertile material with which to narrate Abraham’s struggle with Michael and the Angel of Death. In this way, the author’s association of Abraham and Job may have its origin in traditions concerning another scriptural figure: Moses. As noted earlier, the author of the *Testament* appears aware of traditions preserved in later texts of Satan/Sammael (or the Angel of Death) going between heaven and earth in an

⁴⁴² Allison, ‘Job in the Testament of Abraham’, 145. Indeed, the righteousness of Job is so great as to be comparable to that of Abraham, though Abraham ultimately surpasses it.

⁴⁴³ Allison, ‘Job in the Testament of Abraham’, 140-144; *Testament*, 129, 317.

⁴⁴⁴ Allison, ‘Job in the Testament of Abraham’, 146.

⁴⁴⁵ See the summary with examples in Friedrich Focke, ‘Synkrisis’, *Hermes* (1923): 327-368.

⁴⁴⁶ Allison, ‘Job in the Testament of Abraham’, 145-146. Allison also lists general similarities that may have prompted the association, see ‘Job in the Testament of Abraham’, 140-143; *Testament*, 317-318.

unsuccessful bid to fetch Moses' soul (*Deut. Rab.* 11:10; *Sifre Deut* 305:5). This, in turn, may have led the author to the similar bi-worldly narrative of Job 1-2.⁴⁴⁷

But whatever the origins of the association between the figures, the role of LXX Job in the *Testament* is clear: the author has used the narrative of LXX Job 1-2 to model the interactions between God, Michael and Abraham, inserting details (even entire phrases) into this new narrative. For a text sometimes considered marginal to the literature of the Second Temple period, the *Testament* exhibits many of the same stylistic features found in other texts—particularly with its compositional use of unrelated scriptural material to shape a new narrative concerning a well-known scriptural figure. At least in this respect, the *Testament* is hardly an exception to the literary conventions of the Second Temple period.

Summary

This chapter has examined episodes drawn from five very different texts originally composed in Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek—the three languages of composition in the literature of the Second Temple period. These texts cover a variety of genres and subjects—two works which narrate material covered in the Jewish scriptures (*Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*; *Genesis Apocryphon*), one historical account (1 Maccabees), one pseudo-historical account (Judith) and a legendary narrative concerning a scriptural figure (*Testament of Abraham*). Despite the different genres of these texts, the episodes examined above share stylistic features which show new material being created out of the Jewish scriptures. These features point to two distinct, but closely related, compositional techniques.

In the first instance, *a new episode may be modelled in whole or in part on a scriptural episode*. Examples of this may be found in the use of the fiery furnace of Dan 3 as a model for the two fiery furnace episodes in *LAB* 6 and 38, the use of Gideon's rout of the Midianites (Judg 7) as a model for Kenaz's rout of the Amorites (*LAB* 27), the use of the promise of land to Abram in Gen 13-15 as a model for the

⁴⁴⁷ The accounts of Moses' death in *Deut. Rab.* 11:10 and *Sifre Deut* 305:5 both reference material in Job (12:10 and 28:23, respectively). It is possible that the association of these figures also lies behind the detail that Moses (*Deut. Rab.* 11:10), Job (*T. Job* 52:8) and Abraham (*T. Ab.* 20:8-9) each succumbed to death with a kiss.

promise of land to Noah in 1QapGen 11, the use of Moses' defeat of Sihon (Deut 2:26-36) and the rules of *ḥērem* (Deut 20:10-14) as the model for Judas' siege of Ephron (1 Macc 5:45-51), the use of Jael's assassination of Sisera (Judg 4:17-22) as a model for Judith's assassination of Holofernes (Jdt 10-13; reversed in *LAB* 31:3-9) and the use of LXX Job 1-2 as a model for the archangel Michael's interactions with Abraham (*T. Ab.* 1-4; 15:14-15). In each example, the new episode does not follow the scriptural model inflexibly, but preserves distinctive elements which clearly indicate the scriptural source: the rescue of righteous men from a fiery furnace (*LAB* 6:16-18; 38:3-4; cf. Dan 3:19-27); the approach to the enemy camp at night with three hundred men and trumpets, the overheard enemy conversation and the enemy's defeat by their own hand (*LAB* 27:5-10; cf. Judg 7:6-22); the denial of passage through a hostile city and the slaughter of its inhabitants (1 Macc 5:45-51; cf. Deut 2:26-36); an enemy general killed by a woman with a blow to the head in a tent (Jdt 13:6-9; cf. Judg 4:21). At times, these episodes also incorporate traditional material concerning the scriptural model: the role of God and the angels in Gen 15:7 and Dan 3 in the fiery furnace episodes of *LAB* 6 and 38; the use of death of Moses traditions for the death of Abraham in the *Testament*. Often the scriptural source is indicated most clearly by narrative details or phrases (sometimes verbatim) lifted from the source text, which leads to the other compositional technique.

Secondly, *narrative details or phrases may be inserted into the new episode*. These narrative details often preserve the distinctive vocabulary of the scriptural model: for example, the 'sparks' (*scintillas*) emitting from the 'fiery furnace' (*camino ignis*) in *LAB* 6:16-18 (cf. Dan 3:22) or the trumpets, the three hundred men and the 'sword of Kenaz' in *LAB* 27:5-9 (cf. Judg 7:6-18). This is also done with phrases taken from the scriptural source, often near verbatim: Noah walks 'through the land, in its length and in its breadth' (1QapGen 11:11; cf. Gen 13:17) and the Lord appears to Noah, saying, 'Do not fear, O Noah, I am with you' (1QapGen 11:15; cf. Gen 15:1; 26:24); the Judeans are unable to go around Ephron 'to the right or to the left' (1 Macc 5:46; cf. Deut 2:26), and ask, 'Let me pass through your land to get to our land . . . [and] pass by on foot' (1 Macc 5:48; cf. Judg 11:19; Deut 2:27-28), and when the Ephronites deny entry, the Judeans 'destroyed every male by the edge of the sword' (1 Macc 5:51; cf. Deut 20:13); Judith's victory is won 'by the hand of a woman' (Jdt

9:10; 13:15; 16:5; cf. Judg 4:9); and Michael says of Abraham, ‘Because I have not seen upon earth a man like him—merciful, hospitable, righteous, truthful, God-fearing, refraining from every evil deed’ (*T. Ab.* 4:6; cf. LXX Job 1:8).

Sometimes the subject of the scripturalized narrative is a scriptural figure, either well-known (Abraham in *LAB* 6 and *T. Ab.*; Noah in 1QapGen 11) or obscure (Kenaz in *LAB* 27 and Jair in *LAB* 38). At other times, the subject is historical (1 Macc 5:45-51) or pseudo-historical (Jdt 10-13). Sometimes the scripturalization appears to be triggered by an exegetical detail: in *LAB* 6, the ‘Ur/fire’ (אור) of the Chaldeans in Gen 15:7 becomes the ‘fiery furnace’ of the Chaldeans *a la* Dan 3; the place-name ‘Kamon’ (קמון) in Judg 10:5 becomes the unnamed ‘furnace’ (καμινος/קמין) in *LAB* 38 (again) *a la* Dan 3. At other times, the scripturalization is intended to illustrate a theological point: in the *Apocryphon*, the promise of land to Abram originates in the promise given by Noah to Shem, Abraham’s ancestor, therefore the words of the promise to Abram (Gen 13:17; 15:1) are first delivered to Noah (1QapGen 11:11-15); in 1 Maccabees, the actions of Judas happen ‘according to the law’ (3:56; 4:47,53; κατὰ τὸν νόμον), therefore the siege of Ephron (5:45-51) follows the siege of the Amorites by the lawgiver (Deut 2:26-36) and the rules of *hērem* as outlined in Deut 20:10-14. Still, at other times, the origin of the scripturalization has no obvious explanation: whether with scriptural subjects, like the modelling of Kenaz on Gideon in *LAB* 27 or Abraham on Job in *T. Ab.* 1-4 (and 15:14-15), or pseudo-historical subjects, like the modelling of Judith on Jael (Jdt 10-13).

In each of these texts, however, a new episode has been created by following one scriptural episode as a model and by inserting narrative details or phrases into the new episode. That these techniques can be observed across a diverse selection of texts with different interpretive and literary aims suggests that scripturalized narrative should be considered a stylistic feature of literary composition in the Second Temple period. Following this, I will now return to the original task: can the characteristics of scripturalized narrative as outlined in this chapter be observed in the earliest Gospel—the one attributed to Mark?

CHAPTER 3

SCRIPTURALIZATION IN THE GOSPEL OF MARK

This chapter surveys five episodes in the Gospel of Mark where the Jewish scriptures serve as a model for the narrative. These include Jesus' sojourn in the wilderness and the call of the first disciples (Mk 1:12-20), the two feedings of the multitude (6:35-44; 8:1-9), the execution of John the Baptist (6:21-28) and the crucifixion of Jesus (15:21-41). These episodes have been selected as they are of a comparable length and show a similar compositional use of scriptural material: self-contained episodes modelled primarily (though not exclusively) on one scriptural source. For the first (1:12-20) and final (15:21-41) sections, additional comments will be made about the use of the Jewish scriptures in the surrounding narrative—the introduction (1:1-11) and the Passion Narrative (chs. 14-15).⁴⁴⁸ The compositional use of scriptural material in these episodes will be compared with the scripturalized narratives presented in the previous chapter, as well as other relevant texts from the period.

Elijah in Mk 1:1-20

Elijah and the Messenger: Mal 3:1 in Mk 1:2?

The shadow of Elijah hangs over the beginning of Mark's Gospel. Most commentators see the opening citation as a veiled reference to Elijah, 'See, I am sending my messenger ahead of you, who will prepare your way' (Mk 1:2: ἰδοὺ ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου, ὃς κατασκευάσει τὴν ὁδὸν σου). This, of course, closely resembles Mal 3:1, 'See, I am sending my messenger to

⁴⁴⁸ This will not be necessary for the episodes in Mk 6:21-28 and 6:35-44 (cf. 8:1-9) as they follow each other in the Markan chronology.

prepare the way before me' (הגני שלח מלאכי ופנה דרך לפני). Since later in Malachi, Elijah (הליה) is said to appear before the day of the Lord (Mal 4:5 [LXX Mal 3:22]), the figure in Mal 3:1 is often identified as Elijah.⁴⁴⁹ By referencing Mal 3:1, so the argument goes, Mark is subtly introducing a prophecy of the coming of Elijah, who is later identified as John the Baptist (Mk 9:13; cf. 1:6).⁴⁵⁰

But this interpretation runs into two problems. The first is that Mal 3:1 may not be the source for the citation in Mk 1:2. Mal 3:1 itself alludes to another passage, Exod 23:20, which in the LXX reads, 'And see, I am sending my messenger before you in order to guard you on the way' (καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου, ἵνα φυλάξῃ σε ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ).⁴⁵¹ In the context of the Exodus passage, the messenger (ἄγγελος/ἄγγελος) is the angel sent ahead of the Israelites in the wilderness. The Israelites are to listen to it, and thereby listen to the voice (φωνή) of the LORD (LXX Exod 23:21-22). This voice in the wilderness brings to mind the following verse in Mark, 'The voice of one crying out in the wilderness: "Prepare the way of the Lord, make his paths straight"' (Mk 1:3: φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ· ἐτοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου, εὐθείας ποιῆτε τὰς τρίβους αὐτοῦ), which is *mutatis mutandis* a verbatim quotation of LXX Isa 40:3. But as with Mk 1:2b (πρὸ προσώπου σου . . . τὴν ὁδὸν σου), the object of the verb in LXX Exod 23:20 is in the second person (πρὸ προσώπου σου . . . σε ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ), whereas the object in Mal 3:1 is in the first person (LXX: πρὸ προσώπου μου). At least on its surface, the comparison of the passages reveals a greater semblance between Mk 1:2 and LXX Exod 23:20 than LXX Mal 3:1 (cf. 3:22).

⁴⁴⁹ Most have followed Calvin (*Harmony of the Gospels*, 1.119) in thinking the redactional purpose of Mal 4:5 is to identify the figure in Mal 3:1. See Otto Eissfeldt, *The Old Testament: An Introduction* (trans. P. R. Ackroyd; New York, NY: Harper & Row, 1965) 441-442; Andrew E. Hill, *Malachi: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 25D; New York, NY: Doubleday, 1998) 363-366. The first explicit association of Elijah with the figure of Mal 3:1 in Jewish literature is in *PRE* 29:18 (cf. *Deut. Rab.* 4:11). For further discussion, see Marcus Öhler, *Elia im Neuen Testament: Untersuchungen zur Bedeutung des alttestamentlichen Propheten im frühen Christentum* (BZNW 88; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1997) 2-6.

⁴⁵⁰ Most recently argued in Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels*, 20-24. See the classic formulation in Walter Wink, *John the Baptist in the Gospel Tradition* (SNTSMS 7; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968) 2-8. See also the commentaries: Ernst Lohmeyer, *Das Evangelium des Markus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1953) 11; Rudolf Pesch, *Das Markusevangelium* (HTKNT; Freiburg: Herder, 1976-1977) 1.77-78; Joachim Gnilka, *Das Evangelium nach Markus* (EKK 2; Zurich: Benziger, 1978) 1.44; Robert A. Guelich, *Mark 1-8:26* (WBC 34A; Dallas, TX: Word, 1989) 11; Marcus, *Mark: 1-8: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 27; New York, NY: Doubleday, 2000) 142.

⁴⁵¹ Translation own. On the use of Exod 23:20 in Mal 3:1, see David L. Petersen, *Late Israelite Prophecy: Studies in Deutero-prophetic Literature and in Chronicles* (SBLMS 23; Atlanta, GA: Scholars, 1977) 42-43.

Mk 1:2b-c	LXX Exod 23:20a-b	LXX Mal 3:1a-b	Cf. LXX Mal 3:22
ἰδοὺ ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου, ὃς κατασκευάσει τὴν ὁδὸν σου	Καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου, ἵνα φυλάξῃ σε ἐν τῇ ὁδοῦ	ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐξαποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου, καὶ ἐπιβλέψεται ὁδὸν πρὸ προσώπου μου	καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω ὑμῖν Ἡλιαν τὸν Θεοσβίτην πρὶν ἔλθεῖν ἡμέραν κυρίου τὴν μεγάλην καὶ ἐπιφανῆ

As the above table shows, however, Mk 1:2c differs from both LXX Exod 23:20b and LXX Mal 3:1b. On the one hand, the use of the second person favours the Exodus passage, whilst on the other hand, the accusative ὁδὸν is closest to LXX Mal 3:1b (cf. the dative in LXX Exod 23:20b). But the verb κατασκευάζω in Mk 1:2c is unparalleled in both LXX Exod 23:20b (φυλάσσω) and LXX Mal 3:1b (ἐπιβλέπω). Here, the case for Mal 3:1 grows a little stronger. Like Mk 1:2c, the verb in LXX Mal 3:1b appears in the future indicative (cf. the aorist subjunctive in LXX Exod 23:20b). Given their similar form, it is possible the unusual choice of κατασκευάζω in Mk 1:2c owes to the Hebrew of Mal 3:1.⁴⁵² When the verb פנה ('to make clear') appears in the *piel*, as it does in Mal 3:1b, the LXX tends to favour ἐτοιμάζω (LXX Gen 24:31; LXX Isa 40:3; cf. Mk 1:3) or ὁδοποιέω (LXX Ps 79:10; LXX Isa 62:10).⁴⁵³ Only in one place does the LXX render the verb in the third person as ἀποσκευάσαι (LXX Lev 14:36). Significantly, the same verb (ἀποσκευάζω) appears in the translation of σ' Mal 3:1c.⁴⁵⁴ Whilst this shows some precedent for translating פנה with -σκευάζω verbs (though not κατασκευάζω), it is equally possible that פנה was misread as בנה ('to build') which the LXX renders as κατασκευάζω (LXX Num 21:27).

But if the verb originates from פנה in the *piel*, then it provides an additional connection to the following citation from Isa 40:3, which shares with Mal 3:1 the phrase, 'prepare the way' (פנה[-]דרך). In both passages, the preparation precedes the coming of the LORD (Isa 40:3-5; Mal 3:1,5).⁴⁵⁵ These similarities could have led Mark

⁴⁵² The verb in MT Exod 23:20b, שמר ('to guard'), bears no relation to κατασκευάζω.

⁴⁵³ Also rendered as καθαρίζω (LXX Isa 57:14) and λυτρῶω (LXX Zech 3:15). On the other hand, the ἐπιβλέπω of Mal 3:1b is anomalous in the *piel* (though common for the *qal*: i.e. LXX Num 12:10; LXX Judg 6:14; LXX 1 Sam 13:17; LXX Hag 1:9; LXX Mal 2:13; also *hiphil*: LXX Nah 2:9).

⁴⁵⁴ Cf. ἐτοιμάσει in θ' Mal 3:1.

⁴⁵⁵ On the use of Isa 40:1-5 in Second Temple literature, see Klyne R. Snodgrass, 'Streams of Tradition Emerging from Isaiah 40:1-5 and their Adaption in the New Testament', *JSNT* 8 (1980): 24-45.

or his source to conflate the passages. But whatever verbal similarities exist in the Hebrew are not on display here, as the citation of Isa 40:3 in Mk 1:3 follows the LXX in translating פּנָה as ἐτοιμάζω. At the same time, the use of the second person in Mk 1:2c better suits the context of Exod 23:20. Whilst it is possible that Mark or his source consciously weaved the Hebrew of Mal 3:1b into a citation of LXX Exod 23:20, the wording may also owe to a Greek variant of Exod 23:20 which was influenced at some stage by the language of Mal 3:1, or a variant of Exod 23:20 unrelated to Mal 3:1.⁴⁵⁶

Even if one were to grant that Mal 3:1 lies (somewhere) behind the citation in Mk 1:2, the second problem remains. Mark attributes the entire citation to Isaiah, ‘As it is written in the prophet Isaiah’ (καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν τῷ Ἰσαΐα τῷ προφήτῃ). In response to what appears to be a glaring mistake, some scholars have opted for the inventive solution that Mark is using a figure of speech in order to introduce readers to the Isaianic ‘hermeneutical key’ for the Gospel.⁴⁵⁷ And yet, Mk 1:2a leaves little doubt that Mark understood the source of the citation in 1:2b-3 to be Isaiah. The absence of the formula and the omission of Isa 40:3 in Mt 11:10 and Lk 7:27 suggests Mark’s early readers perceived it as an error (cf. Mt 3:3; Lk 3:4).⁴⁵⁸ At this point, the path to seeing Mk 1:2 as a reference to Elijah in Malachi becomes increasingly perilous. It could be that Isa 40:3, Exod 23:20 and Mal 3:1 (as interpreted by Mal 4:5) were so intertwined in contemporary exegesis that an allusion to one was seen as an allusion to all.⁴⁵⁹ In that sense, each was understood to be, in effect, a prophecy of Elijah’s coming. But as it is, there is no clear sign that Isa 40:3 or Exod 23:20 were independently associated with the coming of Elijah.⁴⁶⁰ Although Mal 4:5 (LXX 3:22)

⁴⁵⁶ It could also be that Mark (or his source) inherited the unusual form of the citation (and the mistaken attribution to Isaiah) from a pre-existing *testimonia* source, see Fitzmyer, “4Q Testimonia” and the New Testament’, 59-89.

⁴⁵⁷ Matera, ‘The Prologue as the Interpretive Key to Mark’s Gospel’, 3-20; Marcus, *The Way of the Lord*, 20-22; Watts, *Isaiah’s New Exodus*, 88-90; cf. Steve Moyise, ‘Is Mark’s Opening Quotation the Key to his Use of Scripture?’, *IBS* 20 (1998): 146-158.

⁴⁵⁸ It seems more likely that the separation of Isa 40:3 from the Exod 23:20 and Mal 3:1 conflation owes to the editorial activity of Matthew (and Luke), rather than the independent attestation of *Q*. Cf. W. D. Davies and Allison, *The Gospel According to Saint Matthew: Volume I: Introduction and Commentary on Matthew I-VII* (ICC; London: T&T Clark, 1988) 294.

⁴⁵⁹ Exod 23:20 is associated with Mal 3:1 in *b. Seder* 61a; *Exod. Rab.* 32:9; *Deut. Rab.* 11:19; with Mal 4:6 in *Exod. Rab.* 3:4. Jacob Mann, *The Bible as Read and Preached in the Old Synagogue* (Cincinnati, OH: Jewish Publication Society, 1940) 1.479, argues that the two passages were read together in a liturgical setting. Stendahl, *The School of St. Matthew*, 51-52, asserts without evidence that the three texts were associated in oral tradition.

⁴⁶⁰ Elijah is absent in the use of Isa 40:3 in 1QS 8:13-15; 4QTanh 1:6-9; *ALD* 2:5; likewise in the use of Exod 23:20 in *b. B. Kam.* 93a; *Tg. Ps.-J.* on Deut 1:33; *Midr. Tanḥ. Mish.* 17:7-8. The angel in

was likely inserted as a redactional comment on Mal 3:1, the first explicit declaration in Jewish literature that the ‘messenger’ in Mal 3:1 should be identified with ‘Elijah’ in Mal 4:5 comes in *PRE* 29:18 (cf. *Deut. Rab.* 4:11).⁴⁶¹ It would seem then that if the citation in Mk 1:2-3 functions as an allusion to Elijah in Malachi, it is because Mark elsewhere identifies John as Elijah (9:13), in which case the ‘messenger’ in 1:2 is also incidentally Elijah who is to come.⁴⁶²

But when scholars simply state that, for Mark, John is Elijah, they appear to be reading the clarity of Matthew (11:14b: αὐτός ἐστιν Ἡλίας; also 17:13) into Mark’s more paradoxical account.⁴⁶³ In the discussion in 9:11-13, the disciples ask concerning the coming of Elijah. Jesus responds saying that ‘Elijah has come, and they did to him whatever they pleased, as it is written about him’ (9:13). Whilst Jesus never mentions John, the detail that ‘they did to him whatever they pleased’ appears to identify Elijah with John who suffers at the ‘pleasure’ of the Herodian family in 6:17-29 (esp. 6:19,25). However, the disciples’ question about the coming of Elijah makes little sense in the broader context of the passage—coming as it does directly after Elijah himself appears on the mount of Transfiguration with Jesus and Moses (9:4). As Strauss drily notes: ‘so klingt dieß ganz, wie wenn etwas vorangegangen wäre, woraus sie hätten abnehmen müssen, Elias werde nicht erscheinen, und gar nicht, wie wenn sie eben von einer Erscheinung desselben herkämen’.⁴⁶⁴ It would seem then that the Transfiguration and the discourse imagine two different Elijahs: Elijah as himself, a heavenly being (9:4; cf. 15:35) and Elijah as John the Baptist (9:13; cf. 1:6). The author

Exod 23:20 is identified as מטטרין in *b. Sanh.* 38b; 3 *En.* 10:4-5. The coming of Elijah (Mal 3:1; 4:5) is associated with Isa 40:4 in *Deut. Rab.* 4:11 and Isa 42:1 in *Midr. Teh.* 42:5.

⁴⁶¹ Cf. The messenger in Mal 3:1 is identified as Judah in *Midr. Tanh. Vay.* 10:1-2.

⁴⁶² For the opinion that the messenger of Mk 1:2-3 should be identified with Jesus and not John, see Mary Ann Tolbert, *Sowing the Gospel: Mark’s World in Literary-Historical Perspective* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1996) 239-248; Paul Katz, ‘Wie einer der Propheten? Das biblische Markusevangelium als Darbietung eines “Vorevangeliums”’, *Theologische Zeitschrift* 58 (2002): 46-60.

⁴⁶³ See the survey of scholarship in Nathanael Vette, ‘Who is Elijah in the Gospel of Mark?’ in *Reading the Gospel of Mark in the Twenty-First Century* (ed. Geert Van Oyen; BETL 301; Leuven: Peeters, 2019) 799-810 (799). The comments of Silvia Pellegrini apply here, ‘Die traditionelle Interpretation liest Mk, als ob er Mt wäre, d.h. mit—für Mk—illegitimen Voraussetzungen’, *Elija—Wegbereiter des Gottesohnes: Eine textsemiotische Untersuchung im Markusevangelium* (HBS 26; Freiburg: Peterson, 2000) 382.

⁴⁶⁴ Strauss, *Das Leben Jesu: kritisch bearbeitet* (4th ed.; Tübingen: Osiander, 1840) 2.284.

or redactor appears to have made no effort to harmonize these identifications. On the question of Elijah's identity, at least, Mark is incoherent.⁴⁶⁵

And yet, in both passages in which Elijah explicitly appears (as himself and as John), Malachi lurks in the background. The appearance of Elijah with Moses seems to reflect the pairing of the two figures in contemporary eschatological expectation, which may be traced to their appearance together in Mal 4:4-6 (LXX 3:22-24). The influence of Malachi may be found even more clearly in 9:12a, 'Elijah is indeed coming first to restore all things' (Ἡλίας μὲν ἔλθων πρῶτον ἀποκαθιστάνει πάντα). Here, Elijah 'restores' as he does in LXX Mal 3:23: 'who will restore (ἀποκαταστήσει) the heart of the father to his son and the heart of a man to his neighbour'.⁴⁶⁶ Whether or not the verb ἀποκαθίστημι owes to the direct literary influence of LXX Mal 3:23, the eschatological outlook of Malachi has clearly influenced Mark's presentation of Elijah at this point. Given the influence of Malachi here, one cannot rule out the possibility that Mal 3:1 and Mal 4:5 (LXX 3:22) also lie behind the citation in Mk 1:2-3. But even if one were to grant the influence of Malachi, the purpose of the opening citation is not to identify John as Elijah, but to introduce John the Baptist (1:4), whose primary function is to introduce Jesus (1:7-8). In the final analysis, the garbled citation of LXX Isa 40:3 and LXX Exod 23:20—and possibly Mal 3:1—which is misattributed to Isaiah is, above all, a prophecy concerning the coming of the Lord. Any reference to Elijah, if intended, is secondary to this aim.

Elijah and John: LXX 2 Kgs 1:8 in Mk 1:6

By contrast, there is little doubt that Elijah is in view in Mk 1:6a (*par.* Mt 3:4a): 'Now John was clothed with camel's hair, with a leather belt around his waist' (καὶ ζώνην δερματίνην περὶ τὴν ὀσφὺν αὐτοῦ).⁴⁶⁷ The description is that of Elijah in LXX 2 Kgs 1:8: 'and wearing a leather belt around his waist' (καὶ ζώνην δερματίνην περιεζωσμένος τὴν ὀσφὺν αὐτοῦ). His appearance was apparently so distinguishing

⁴⁶⁵ See Vette, 'Who is Elijah in the Gospel of Mark?', 799-810, esp. 808-810.

⁴⁶⁶ Translation own. Cf. *Sir.* 48:10, where it is Elijah's task 'to turn the heart of the father to the son, and to restore the tribes of Jacob' (ἐπιστρέψαι καρδίαν πατρὸς πρὸς υἱὸν καὶ καταστήσαι φυλὰς Ἰακωβ).

⁴⁶⁷ ζώνην δερματίνην etc. is omitted from Mk 1:6 in mss. D it^[a, b, d] vg^{ms}.

that on this description alone, Ahaziah is able to identify him, ‘This is Elijah the Tishbite’. Here, scriptural material is used in a fundamentally different way than in the opening citation. Mk 1:2-3 resembles the more standard use of scriptural material in Mark: a marked citation separated from the ensuing narrative or argument with a clear interpretive aim (7:6-7,10; 10:6-8,19; 11:17; 12:10-11,26,29-33,36; 14:27). Occasionally an argument is supported with references to scriptural sources without citing them—sometimes the source is clear (1:44; 2:25-26; 10:4; 13:14), at other times less so (9:12-13; 14:21,49). These two types of scriptural language fall under Dimant’s category of *expositional* scriptural usage. Elsewhere, unmarked scriptural language appears in the direct speech of characters whilst nonetheless resembling a citation (1:11; 4:12; 9:7,48; 11:9; 13:24-25; 14:62; 15:34). In Mk 1:6, the unmarked scriptural language appears as part of the narrative. These two types of scriptural language reflect a *compositional* use of the Jewish scriptures: scriptural material has become re-contextualized as part of the narrative or the direct speech of characters. But like the *expositional* examples, the *compositional* use of scriptural language may still have an interpretive function—Mk 1:6 would be one such case. Since Mark appears to identify Elijah with John in 9:13, the description of his appearance is unlikely to be accidental. Perhaps Mark’s readers are, like Ahaziah, meant to identify Elijah by the description of his appearance alone.

That being said, Elijah’s hair and leather belt are hardly his most enduring attributes in the literature of the period. Only Josephus—whose account (*Ant.* 8.13.4-9.2.2) repeats the scriptural narrative with little variation—mentions them in his description of Elijah (*Ant.* 9.2.1). Elsewhere, descriptions of the ‘historical’ Elijah tend to focus on his miracles or ascension (i.e. *Sir* 48:2-5; *1 Macc* 2:58; *Liv. Pro.* 21:4-15; *4 Ezra* 7:109; *Gk. Apoc. Ezra* 7:6; *Ques. Ezra* A 40; *Lk* 4:25-26). Mk 1:6 also differs from the portrait in *2 Kgs* 1:8: John is ‘clothed with camel’s hair’ (ἐνδεδυμένος τρίχας καμήλου), whereas Elijah is described as a ‘hairy man’ (LXX *2 Kgs* 1:8: ἀνήρ δασύς).⁴⁶⁸ Regarding this deviation from the scriptural description, the opinion of Craig Evans is typical, ‘The reference to camel’s hair points to independence of the Old Testament description, which argues further for the historicity of the Synoptic

⁴⁶⁸ Elsewhere, Elijah is said to wear a ‘sheep skin’ (μηλωτή) mantle (LXX *1 Kgs* 19:13,19; *2 Kgs* 8,13-14; cf. ‘ram’s skin’ [עורר של איל] in *PRE* 31:13).

portrait of John'.⁴⁶⁹ It is indeed difficult to see how Mark's description of 'camel's hair' could have originated in the description of Elijah—though it is a non-sequitur to conclude that the detail must therefore be historical.⁴⁷⁰

MT 2 Kgs 1:8 reads 'man [of] hair' (אִישׁ בַּעַל שֵׁעַר) with the *nomen regens* בַּעַל functioning like a genitive preposition to שֵׁעַר (*BDB* confusingly calls it a 'noun of relation'; cf. Gen 37:19; 49:23; Exod 24:14; Prov 29:22 etc.).⁴⁷¹ It is unlikely that someone familiar with Hebrew would have mistaken בַּעַל—which as a common noun refers to a 'master' or 'husband'—with גַּמֶּל ('camel'). However, one can imagine a possible misreading in Aramaic where בַּעַל is rendered בַּעֲלָא in the emphatic state (see 1QapGen 20:23,25; *Tg. Ps.-J.* on Gen 20:3; Lev 21:3-4; Num 5:29; *Tg. Onk.* on Exod 21:3; *Syr. Sir.* 4:10). Thus בַּעֲלָא could have been misread as בַּעוּא (*Syr.* ܒܥܘܐ), a noun referring to the soft hair on a camel's belly.⁴⁷² The same noun occurs in the description of John in the Old Syriac mss. of Mt 3:4: ܕܘܚܠܐ ܕܥܘܒܐ ܕܥܘܒܐ ('clothing of *ba'wa* from a camel').⁴⁷³ Given the grammatical function of בַּעַל in 2 Kgs 1:8, however, it would likely be rendered as it is in *Tg. 2 Kgs* 1:8 (בַּעִיל) and not in the emphatic state (בַּעֲלָא). At the same time, בַּעוּא could conceivably have come from סַעְרָא, the Aramaic equivalent of the Hebrew שֵׁעַר. Torrey speculates that ܕܘܚܠܐ ܕܥܘܒܐ (*Aram.* ܕܘܚܠܐ ܕܥܘܒܐ

⁴⁶⁹ Craig A. Evans, 'The Baptism of John in a Typological Context' in *Dimensions of Baptism: Biblical and Theological Studies* (ed. Stanley E. Porter and Anthony R. Cross; JSNTSupp 234; London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002) 45-71 (48-49); see similar comments in Robert H. Gundry, *Mark: A Commentary on His Apology for the Cross, Chapters 1-8* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000) 44. Cf. J. P. Meier finds no reference to Elijah in the reference to hair, see *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus*, vol. 2, *Mentor, Message, and Miracles* (New York, NY: Doubleday, 1994) 47.

⁴⁷⁰ Joan Taylor notes that the description of John is reminiscent of Josephus' description of his teacher, Bannus (*Life* 11). Taylor speculates, 'When Josephus refers to Bannus wearing what trees provided, he may well have been referring to the camel's hair that stuck to the branches' (*The Immerser: John the Baptist within Second Temple Judaism* [Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1997] 35).

⁴⁷¹ Compare with the description of Esau as a 'hairy man' (Gen 27:11: אִישׁ שֵׁעַר).

⁴⁷² For the definition of ܒܥܘܐ, see Jessie Payne Smith, *A Compendious Syriac Dictionary* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1902; repr. ALR; Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 1999) 50; Francis Crawford Burkitt, *Evangelion Da-Mepharreshe: Volume II: Introduction and Notes* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1904; repr. 2014) 81; Carl Brockelmann, *Lexicon Syriacum* (2nd ed.; Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1928) 83.

⁴⁷³ *syr^{cur}* Mt 3:4; *syr^s* Mt 3:4; Ephrem, *Commentary on the Diatessaron*, 1.17 (L. Leloir, *Saint Éphrem: Commentaire de l'Évangile Concordant Texte Syriaque (Manuscrit Chester Beatty 709) Folios Additionnels* [CBM 8; Leuven: Peeters, 1990] 20); Isho'dad of Merv, *Commentary on Matthew*, 14a (Margaret Dunlop Gibson, *The Commentaries of Isho'dad of Merv: Bishop of Hadatha (c. 850 A.D.): In Syriac and English* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1911] 2.38): ܕܥܘܒܐ ܕܥܘܒܐ ('Mar Ephraim alone calls it *ba'wa*'); cf. *ba'wa* does not appear in Pesh. Mt 3:4 (*par.* Mk 1:6): ܕܘܚܠܐ ܕܥܘܒܐ.

בעוֹא—‘*ba ‘wa* of a camel’) in the Old Syriac may have arisen from סַעֲרָא דְגַמְלָא (camel’s hair) in a lost Aramaic text of the Gospel.⁴⁷⁴ To take Torrey’s argument one step further, Mark’s τρίχας καμήλου (Mk 1:6; *par.* Mt 3:4) could have itself resulted from misreading סַעֲרָא as בעוֹא in an Aramaic text of 2 Kgs 1:8 (cf. סַעֲרָן in *Tg. 2 Kgs 1:8*). This then would have been translated back to ܐܘܫܐ in the Old Syriac of the Gospels. At this point, however, it should be noted that the word *ba ‘wa* is not attested prior to the Old Syriac texts, which could be as late as the fourth-century CE.⁴⁷⁵

A simpler explanation is that the inclusion of κάμηλος reflects the location of John’s ministry. On this point, the description of John eating ‘locusts and wild honey’ (ἀκρίδας καὶ μέλι ἄγριον) has no parallel in the career of Elijah, who eats ‘bread and meat’ (לֶחֶם וּבֶשֶׂר) brought to him by ravens (1 Kgs 17:6a) and ‘a cake baked on hot stones’ (עֲגַת רְצָפִים) brought to him by an angel (1 Kgs 19:6a), whilst drinking ‘from the wadi’ (1 Kgs 17:6b: מִן־הַגַּחַל) and ‘a jar of water’ (1 Kgs 19:6a: צַפְחַת מַיִם).⁴⁷⁶ As James Kelhoffer correctly observes, ‘Despite the attempts of certain scholars, a connection with Elijah or, more broadly, a “biblical” origin for John’s *diet* [is not] readily discerned’.⁴⁷⁷ Instead, John’s unusual diet is better explained by his location ‘in the wilderness’ (Mk 1:4: ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ)—where locusts and raw honey would be some of the only available food. Perhaps the same explanation applies to the inclusion of κάμηλος.⁴⁷⁸ If so, τρίχας καμήλου can be seen as an ‘ecotype’ of the description of Elijah in 2 Kgs 1:8—to borrow a term from folklore studies which describes how an idea can become acculturated into a new physical environment.⁴⁷⁹ The *topos* of the

⁴⁷⁴ Torrey, *Documents of the Primitive Church* (New York, NY: Harper & Brothers, 1941) 257.

⁴⁷⁵ Kurt Aland and Barbara Aland, *The Text of the New Testament: An Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticism* (trans. Erroll F. Rhodes; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1987) 189-190.

⁴⁷⁶ See text-critical note on MT 1 Kgs 17:6 in Dominique Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle de l’Ancien Testament I* (OBO 50/1; Fribourg: Éditions Universitaires—Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982) 368-369.

⁴⁷⁷ James A. Kelhoffer, *The Diet of John the Baptist: “Locusts and Wild Honey” in Synoptic and Patristic Interpretation* (WUNT 176; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005) 5, emphasis original.

⁴⁷⁸ Cf. Clement of Alexandria (*Instr.* 2.11), who regards John’s clothing of camel’s hair and diet as a sign of frugality.

⁴⁷⁹ See the influential study by Carl W. von Sydow, ‘Geography and Folk-Tale Oicotypes’ in *C. W. von Sydow, Selected Papers on Folklore* (ed. L. Bødker; Copenhagen: Rosenkilde and Bagger, 1948) 44-55. This is certainly not the case in Sulipicius Severus, *Life of Martin* 10 (Philip Burton, *Sulpicius Severus’ Vita Martini* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017]), where the disciples of Martin of Tours are said to be ‘clothed in garments of camel’s hair’, which hardly reflects the environment of the Loire valley. That monks actively sought to emulate the appearance of the Baptist, however, is suggested by the gift of Sulipicius Severus in Paulinus of Nola, *Epist.* 29.1 (CSEL 29.251).

‘wilderness’ (Mk 1:4: ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ) in the description of John, however, does reflect the citation of Isa 40:3 in the previous verse (Mk 1:3: ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ). In this sense, the paraphernalia of John’s ministry—the camel’s hair, the locusts, the honey—are in some sense, albeit indirectly, scriptural in origin.⁴⁸⁰

Other Elijah Parallels in Mk 1:4-11

Another connection to Elijah may be found in the location of John’s baptizing, ‘in the river Jordan’ (Mk 1:5: ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ ποταμῷ; cf. 1:10).⁴⁸¹ That this was also the scene of Elijah’s departure from Elisha (LXX 2 Kgs 2:7: ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἰορδάνου; cf. 2 Kgs 2:6,13) has led some to conclude that the Markan scene envisages a similar prophetic succession: as Elisha succeeds Elijah, so Jesus succeeds John.⁴⁸² Several similarities exist between the two episodes in addition to the location at the Jordan: the description of the prophet’s mantle (LXX 2 Kgs 2:8,13-14: μηλωτή; cf. Mk 1:6: τρίχας καμήλου); the two men cross (2 Kgs 2:8) or enter (Mk 1:9-10) the Jordan river; the spirit (πνεῦμα) rests (LXX 2 Kgs 2:15: ἐπαναπαύομαι; cf. 2 Kgs 2:9) or descends (Mk 1:10: καταβαίνω) on one of the men; the intrusion of the extraterrestrial location, ‘heaven’ (LXX 2 Kgs 2:11; Mk 1:10-11: οὐρανός); and the invocation of fatherhood (2 Kgs 2:12: πάτερ πάτερ; Mk 1:11: σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου). Despite these similarities, there is no sign of verbatim agreement between Mk 1:4-11 and LXX 2 Kgs 2:8-12. Moreover, there are notable differences: Elisha and Elijah miraculously cross over the Jordan (2 Kgs 2:8; also 2 Kgs 2:14; cf. Exod 14:21-22) whereas Jesus is baptized by John in the Jordan (Mk 1:9); Elisha receives Elijah’s spirit (2 Kgs 2:9,15) whereas Jesus receives a spirit from heaven (Mk 1:10); Elisha addresses Elijah as ‘father’ (2 Kgs 2:12) whereas the voice from heaven addresses Jesus as ‘son’ (Mk 1:11). Perhaps

⁴⁸⁰ Kelhoffer, *The Diet of John the Baptist*, 122.

⁴⁸¹ On the significance of this location, see Jeremy M. Hutton, ‘Topography, Biblical Traditions, and Reflections on John’s Baptism of Jesus’ in *Jesus Research: New Methodologies and Perceptions: The Second Princeton-Prague Symposium on Jesus Research Research, Princeton 2007* (ed. Charlesworth and Brian Rhea; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2014) 149-177. Cf. *b. Chag.* 25a, where Elijah purifies the road from Galilee to Judea in the messianic age.

⁴⁸² See Roth, *Hebrew Gospel*, 9-10; Marcus, *John the Baptist in History and Theology* (Studies on Personalities of the New Testament; Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina, 2018) 88-89. A clearer example of the succession-model in 2 Kgs 2:8-12 may be found in Ambrose, *Epist.* 15.8-9 (PL 16.957). As Barthélemy notes, the repetitiveness of the narrative surrounding 2 Kgs 2:14 is not the result of corruption but is intended to amplify the traits of Elijah in Elisha (*Critique textuelle de L’Ancient Testament I*, 379).

the most memorable detail of 2 Kgs 2:8-12, the ascension of Elijah to heaven in a ‘chariot of fire’, has no parallel in Mk 1:4-11.

As it is, there is no clear sign that 2 Kgs 2:8-12 lies directly behind John’s baptism of Jesus in the Jordan, although the possibility of its more general influence on the Markan episode is an open question. However, the parallels between Elisha succeeding Elijah (2 Kgs 2:9-15) and Jesus succeeding John (Mk 1:7-8,14) deserve consideration. For Mark, however, this should be amended: Jesus does not so much succeed John, as John precedes Jesus (Mk 1:2-3). Despite further parallels between the miracles of Elisha and the miracles of Jesus (from the general: Mk 1:40-42; cf. 2 Kgs 5:9-14; Mk 5:35-43; cf. 2 Kgs 4:18-37; Mk 16:4-8; cf. 2 Kgs 13:20-21; to the specific: Mk 6:35-44; 8:1-9; cf. 2 Kgs 4:42-44), the figure of Elisha appears to be of little interest to Mark, who does not mention him. There is also no indication that anyone expected the eschatological return of Elisha. According to Mark, popular expectation identified Jesus with either Elijah, one of the prophets or John himself raised from the dead (Mk 6:4-16; 8:28). In Mk 1:4-11, at least, the scriptural account of Elisha is of much greater relevance to the person of John than the person of Jesus. It is, after all, Elisha who instructs Naaman, ‘Go, wash in the Jordan seven times’ (2 Kgs 5:10b). When Naaman follows Elisha’s command, the LXX reads, ‘And Naaman went down and *baptized* (ἐβαπτίσατο) himself *in the Jordan* (ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ) seven times according to the word of Elisha’ (LXX 2 Kgs 5:14a).⁴⁸³ Again, there is no explicit verbal sign that Mark made the connection between John and the episode of Elisha and Naaman in 2 Kgs 5:9-14.⁴⁸⁴ But the possibility that this scriptural episode influenced the consciousness of the historical John cannot be easily dismissed.

The question of whether the figure of Elijah influenced Mk 1:4-11 more generally also deserves to be explored further. Whilst some have seen in John’s proclamation—‘The one who is more powerful than I is coming after me’ (Mk 1:7: ἔρχεται ὁ ἰσχυρότερός μου ὀπίσω μου)—an allusion to Elijah, there is no clear indication that 1:7-8 relies on the language of Malachi or any other passage concerning

⁴⁸³ The verb βαπτίζω appears three other times in the LXX: it is used to describe Judith’s bath before meeting Holofernes (Jdt 12:7) and ritual cleansing after touching a corpse (Sir 34:25); note also the metaphorical use in LXX Isa 21:4.

⁴⁸⁴ The loose similarities with the Naaman episode do not contribute to the characterization of John as Elijah, *pace* Evans, ‘The Baptism of John in a Typological Context’, 49.

Elijah.⁴⁸⁵ Nor is it clear that Mk 1:7-8 has been influenced by some contemporary expectation of Elijah as the messianic forerunner—an idea which does not appear in any definite form prior to Christian literature.⁴⁸⁶ When the coming of Elijah is addressed by Jesus directly in Mk 9:11-13, messianic expectation does not feature explicitly in the disciples' question, 'Why do the scribes say that Elijah must come first?' (9:11). The question follows a discussion concerning the resurrection in 9:9-10, although it is not clear that the question in 9:11 is prompted by an association of Elijah with the eschatological resurrection of the dead. In all likelihood, Mk 9:11 simply envisages Elijah preceding the 'day of the LORD' (Mal 4:5), the eschatological event *par excellence* to which all others are related, including the resurrection of the dead and the coming of the Messiah. As it is, Mk 9:9-13 reveals nothing specific about the event that Elijah is supposed to precede. And yet, Jesus' answer implies that Elijah's coming precedes the present moment in the narrative, and by extension, the Son of Man. Here, it seems that, for Mark, John the Baptist has influenced the depiction of Elijah as much as Elijah has influenced the depiction of John. If Elijah precedes the Messiah, it is because John precedes Jesus, and not the other way around. Rather than reflecting contemporary expectation of Elijah as the precursor to the Messiah, the germ of the idea is encountered for the first time in Mk 1:2-11. And it is this idea, as interpreted by Matthew (Mt 11:13-14; 17:10-13), that would eventually grow into the later Christian concept of Elijah as the Messianic forerunner, first articulated explicitly by Justin Martyr (*Dial.* 49.1).

Other Uses of the Jewish Scriptures in Mk 1:2-11

Aside from the opening citation and the 'leather belt', Mk 1:11 is the only other instance in 1:2-11 which shows signs of direct dependence on the Jewish scriptures.⁴⁸⁷

⁴⁸⁵ Cf. J. A. T. Robinson, 'Elijah, John and Jesus: an Essay in Detection', *NTS* 4 (1958): 263-281 (270); Pesch, *Das Markusevangelium*, 1.83; Marcus, *Mark: 1-8*, 157.

⁴⁸⁶ See the back-and-forth in the *Journal of Biblical Literature* between Morris M. Faierstein, 'Why do the Scribes Say that Elijah Must Come First?', *JBL* 100 (1981): 75-86; Allison, 'Elijah Must Come First', *JBL* 103 (1984): 256-258; and Fitzmyer, 'More About Elijah Coming First', *JBL* 104 (1985): 295-296. The earliest indisputable evidence of this idea in Jewish literature may be found in *b. Shab.* 118a; *b. Erub.* 43a-b. Cf. *b. Ket.* 77b, where Elijah is said to prepare the way before R. Levi.

⁴⁸⁷ Some have seen a reference to Gen 1:2 in the dove of Mk 1:10, in light of *b. Hag.* 15a (cf. *Tg. Cant.* 2:12; *b. Ber.* 3a): Adela Yarbro Collins, *Mark: A Commentary* (Hermeneia 55; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2007) 148; Camille Focant, *The Gospel According to Mark: A Commentary* (trans. L.

But once again, isolating the scriptural sources for the passage is not an easy task. The words spoken by the heavenly voice, ‘You are my son, the beloved; with you I am well pleased’ (σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα), appear to be based on scriptural material. The first clause seems to reflect LXX Ps 2:7, ‘You are my son’ (υἱός μου εἶ σὺ), a passage which is elsewhere associated with messianic expectation (Acts 13:33; Heb 1:5; *b. Suk.* 52a; *Midr. Teh.* 2:9; cf. the possible allusion in 1Q28a 2:11-12; 4 Ezra 7:28).⁴⁸⁸ The origin of ‘the beloved’, however, is not clear. Some have suggested it comes from another famous passage concerning sonship, the *Aqedah*, which repeatedly refers to Isaac as ‘[Abraham’s] beloved son’ (LXX Gen 22:2: τὸν υἱόν σου τὸν ἀγαπητόν; cf. Gen 22:12,16).⁴⁸⁹ A reference to ‘the beloved’ can also be found in an Aramaic expansion of Ps 2:7, ‘You are as beloved to me as a son to a father’ (*Tg. Ps.* 2:7: חביב כבר לאבא), so it is possible that the inclusion of ὁ ἀγαπητός in Mk 1:11 owes to a similar tradition.⁴⁹⁰ Perhaps a more simple explanation is that the common adjective ‘beloved’ (Hb. יָדִיד; Gk. ὁ ἀγαπητός; Aram. חביב) was often used to describe filial or divine-human relations (or in the case of Mk 1:11, both).⁴⁹¹ The inclusion of ὁ ἀγαπητός may also come from another scriptural source.

As many have noted, the final clause, ‘with you I am well pleased’ (ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα), closely resembles MT Isa 42:1b, ‘in whom my soul delights’ (נפשי רצתה).⁴⁹² It is nevertheless difficult to see how Mk 1:11c could have arisen from a literal translation of Isa 42:1.⁴⁹³ The translations of σ’ and θ’ Isa 42:1b show that רצה

R. Keylock; Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2012) 46-47. The ‘tearing’ (σχίζω) of the heavens is unlikely to be a reference to Pss 18:9, 144:5 or Isa 64:1, but may allude to the ‘tearing’ (σχίζω) of the temple curtain at the crucifixion (Mk 15:38), a scene which bears many similarities to the baptism, so Stephen Motyer, ‘The Rending of the Veil: A Markan Pentecost?’, *NTS* 33 (1987): 155-157; David Ulansey, ‘The Heavenly Veil Torn: Mark’s Cosmic *Inclusio*’, *JBL* 110 (1991): 123-125.

⁴⁸⁸ The suggestion of Wilhelm Bousset, *Kyrios Christos: Geschichte des Christusglaubens von den Anfängen des Christentums bis Irenaeus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1913; rev. ed. 1921) 57, n. 2 and Jeremias (‘παῖς θεοῦ’, *TDNT* 5.700-709) that Mk 1:11 originally read ὁ παῖς μου (following Isa 42:1) finds little support elsewhere in the Gospel, where the language is absent.

⁴⁸⁹ For example, Carl R. Kazmierski, *Jesus, the Son of God: A Study of the Markan Tradition and its Redaction by the Evangelist* (Wurzburg: Echter Verlag, 1979) 53-56. The Christian interpolator of the *Testament of Levi* apparently saw an allusion to Abraham and Isaac in the scene (*T. Levi* 18:6-7).

⁴⁹⁰ However, the uncertain date of the targum may count against this: David M. Stec dates the composition between the fourth and sixth century C.E. (*The Targum of Psalms: Translated, with a Critical Introduction, Apparatus, and Notes* [Aramaic Bible 16; London: T&T Clark, 2004] 2).

⁴⁹¹ Cf. Deut 33:12; Pss 60:4 (LXX 59:7); 108:6 (LXX 107:7); 127:2 (LXX 126:2); Bar 4:16; *1 En.* 91:4; *Jub.* 19:27; *LAB* 53:2; *T. Jos.* 1:2; *Ap. Ab.* 9:6; *T. Ab.* A 1:6.

⁴⁹² Dennis E. Nineham, *Saint Mark* (Pelican Gospel Commentaries; Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1963) 62; Pesch, *Das Markusevangelium*, 1.92; Gnllka, *Das Evangelium nach Markus*, 1.50; Guelich, *Mark 1-8:26, 34*; cf. Hooker, *The Gospel According to St Mark* (London: A&C Black, 1991) 47.

⁴⁹³ Cf. LXX Isa 42:1b: προσεδέξατο αὐτὸν ἢ ψυχὴ μου.

could be translated as εὐδοκέω. There are also similarities with the later *Tg. Isa.* 42:1, ‘my Memra has been pleased’ (דארתרעי ביה מימר).⁴⁹⁴ But when the passage is cited more fully in Mt 12:18-21, it appears in a remarkably similar form to Mk 1:11c, ‘Here is my servant, whom I have chosen, my beloved, with whom my soul is well pleased’ (ἰδοὺ ὁ παῖς μου ὃν ἠμέτισα, ὁ ἀγαπητός μου εἰς ὃν εὐδόκησεν ἡ ψυχὴ μου). Here, there is no doubt Isa 42:1-4 is the source. And yet, the language of Mk 1:11c is also present: the verb εὐδοκέω for נצח (in the same form as σ’ and θ’ Isa 42:1b: εὐδόκησεν) and, remarkably, the inclusion of ὁ ἀγαπητός. Why the Matthean citation includes ὁ ἀγαπητός is once again not clear. It could be that Matthew’s citation of Isa 42:1-4 was influenced by Mk 1:11, or by Markan terminology more broadly (Mk 9:7; 12:6).⁴⁹⁵ Then again, the translation of א’ Isa 41:8 also includes ὁ ἀγαπητός, which may point to a variant reading of Isa 42:1. In any case, the similarity between the clear citation in Mt 12:18-21 and Mk 1:11, suggests that the *bat kōl* at Jesus’ baptism contains a confusing, but discernible reference to Isa 42:1.

The context of the baptism may be seen to strengthen the allusion to Isa 42:1. The ‘spirit descending’ (πνεῦμα . . . καταβαῖνον) evokes the clause following Isa 42:1b: ‘I have put my spirit on him’ (LXX Isa 42:1c: ἔδωκα τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐπ’ αὐτόν).⁴⁹⁶ The author of Mk 1:9-11 may have been led to Isa 42:1 by the description of the spirit descending on Jesus’ baptism, or, conversely, the description of the baptism may have been influenced by the language of Isa 42:1f. But one should not read too much into the purpose of the scriptural language in the *bat kōl* of Mk 1:11. As tempting as it may be to view Mk 1:11 as an announcement of the Davidic Messiah (Ps 2:7) who is to be sacrificed (Gen 22:2 etc.) as the servant (Isa 42:1), the primary function of the heavenly voice is not the identification of the scriptural source, but the *phonic* source, which is heaven (οὐρανός). In the context of Mk 1:4-11, the voice functions, not as an explicit scriptural interpretation of the narrative (cf. Mk 1:2-3), but as a divine imprimatur of Jesus’ privileged status, especially in relation to John (cf.

⁴⁹⁴ As observed by Bruce D. Chilton, *A Galilean Rabbi and His Bible* (London: SPCK, 1984) 128-130. Similar language can also be found in *Tg. Isa.* 41:8-9; 43:10.

⁴⁹⁵ However, the form of the citation in Mt 12:18 differs from the Matthean parallels to Mk 1:11 (Mt 3:17; 17:5).

⁴⁹⁶ See Steichele, *Der leidende Sohn Gottes*, 131-133.

in relation to Elijah and Moses in Mk 9:7).⁴⁹⁷ In this regard, Mk 1:11 resembles the many other instances in Second Temple literature where language from the Psalms and Isaiah is attributed to God but appears in different narrative contexts.⁴⁹⁸

In the final analysis, however, Mk 1:11 is one of three instances in 1:2-11 which clearly relies on a scriptural source (the others being 1:2-3 and 1:6b). In each case, the Jewish scriptures serve a different function: Mk 1:2-3 is an editorial marked citation (albeit incorrectly) of LXX Exod 23:20 and LXX Isa 40:3 (Mal 3:1?) that aims to interpret the ensuing narrative (1:4-11); Mk 1:6b weaves unmarked language from LXX 2 Kgs 1:8 into the narrative description of John's attire and so equates him with Elijah (cf. 9:13); and Mk 1:11 ascribes unmarked language from Ps 2:7 and Isa 42:1 to a heavenly voice to signal Jesus' privileged status. The opening citation of Mk 1:2-3 appears as something external to the narrative (i.e. an *expositional* use of scriptural material), whereas the scriptural language of 1:6b and 1:11 is embedded into the narrative or direct speech of characters (i.e. a *compositional* use). Whilst these three passages do not exhaust all the possible uses of scriptural material in the section (i.e. 2 Kgs 2:8-12; 5:9-14; Pss 18:9; 144:5; Gen 22:2), they account for forty-four of the hundred-and-seventy-five words in Mk 1:2-11, so that one quarter of the opening narrative depends on the language of the Jewish scriptures. With the high rate of scriptural language in Mk 1:2-11 in the background, I now turn to the use of the Jewish scriptures in the following section, the sojourn of Jesus in the wilderness and the call of the disciples (Mk 1:12-20).

Jesus and Elijah: Mk 1:12-20 and 1 Kgs 19

The narrative of Mk 1:12-20 finds Jesus leaving the Jordan, driven by the spirit 'into the wilderness' (Mk 1:12: εἰς τὴν ἔρημον). Jesus stays 'in the wilderness forty days' (1:13: ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέρας), where he is tempted by Satan and is

⁴⁹⁷ Compare with Hatina, 'Embedded Scripture Texts and the Plurality of Meaning: The Announcement of the "Voice from Heaven" in Mark 1.11 as a Case Study' in *Biblical Interpretation in Early Christian Gospels: Volume 1: The Gospel of Mark* (ed. Hatina; SSEJC 16; London: T&T Clark, 2006) 81-99, esp. 98-99.

⁴⁹⁸ See Ps 85:10 in *I En.* 11:2; Ps 114:4 in *I En.* 51:4; Ps 18:9 in *LAB* 15:6 and 23:10; Ps 116:15 in *LAB* 40:4; Isa 40:15 in *LAB* 7:3 and 12:4; Isa 51:1 in *LAB* 23:4; Isa 45:21-22 in *Sib. Or.* 8.377; Isa 45:21 in *T. Ab.* A 8:7.

‘with the wild beasts; and the angels waited on him’ (μετὰ τῶν θηρίων, καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι διηκόνουν αὐτῷ). After John is arrested, Jesus begins proclaiming the ‘good news of God’ (εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ) in Galilee (1:14-15). Then, passing along the sea of Galilee, Jesus calls Simon and Andrew as they are casting nets, saying, ‘*Come after me*’ (δεῦτε ὀπίσω μου) and I will make you fish for people’ (1:17), and they immediately leave their nets and ‘followed him’ (1:18: ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ). Farther along, Jesus calls James and John as they are mending their nets, and they immediately leave their father Zebedee with the servants in the boat and ‘followed after him’ (1:20: ἀπῆλθον ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ).

As commentators have long noted, the sequence of Jesus’ sojourn in the wilderness followed by his call of the disciples closely recalls Elijah’s sojourn in the wilderness and his call of Elisha in 1 Kgs 19.⁴⁹⁹ Following his confrontation with Jezebel, Elijah flees ‘into the wilderness’ (LXX 1 Kgs 19:4a: ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ) where he despairs of his life to the LORD. There he falls asleep under a plant until an ‘angel’ (ἄγγελος) twice awakens him (LXX 19:5-7) and provides him with food and water for his journey ‘forty days and forty nights’ (LXX 19:8b: τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέρας καὶ τεσσαράκοντα νύκτας) to Horeb. Following the revelation at Horeb (19:11-18), Elijah finds Elisha plowing twelve yoke of oxen and throws his mantle over him (19:19). Elisha then leaves the oxen and ‘ran after’ (LXX 19:20a: κατέδραμεν ὀπίσω) Elijah, saying, ‘I will kiss my father *and I will follow after you*’ (LXX 19:20b: καὶ ἀκολουθήσω ὀπίσω σου). Having slaughtered the oxen for the people, ‘[Elisha] arose and went after Elijah and served him’ (LXX 19:21c: καὶ ἀνέστη καὶ ἐπορεύθη ὀπίσω Ηλίου καὶ ἐλειτούργει αὐτῷ).

That 1 Kgs 19 served as the compositional model for Mk 1:12-20 can be seen in the shared narrative details and sequence of the sojourn in the wilderness followed by the call of the disciple(s).⁵⁰⁰ In both narratives, a prophetic figure goes ‘into the

⁴⁹⁹ Farrer, *A Study in Mark*, 60-63; Katz, ‘Jesus als Vorläufer des Christus: Mögliche Hinweise in den Evangelien auf Elia als den ‘Typos’ Jesu’, *TZ* 52 (1996): 225-235 (229); Van Iersel, *Mark*, 65, 102; Marcus, *Mark: 1-8*, 167-171; Allison, ‘Behind the Temptations of Jesus: Q 4:1-13 and Mark 1:12-13’ in *Authenticating the Activities of Jesus* (ed. Chilton and Evans; Leiden: Brill, 2002) 195-213 (202-203); Johannes Majoros-Danowski, *Elija im Markusevangelium. Ein Buch im Kontext des Judentums* (BWANT 180; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2008) 163-176; Winn, *Mark and the Elijah-Elisha Narrative*, 71-76; Mary Ann Beavis, *Mark* (Paideia; Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2011) 38-39; Omerzu, ‘Geschichte durch Geschichten’, 85.

⁵⁰⁰ As Winn, *Mark and the Elijah-Elisha Narrative*, 75-76.

wilderness’ for ‘forty days [and nights]’, where he is ministered to by ‘angels/an angel’. Following a revelation from God, the prophetic figure then finds men/a man at work, where he calls them and, leaving their work and father, they ‘follow after’ him. The two narratives share vocabulary: the location ‘in the wilderness’ (Mk 1:13a; LXX 1 Kgs 19:4a: ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ); the duration of ‘forty days’ (Mk 1:13a; LXX 1 Kgs 19:8b: τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέρας); the ‘angels/angel’ (Mk 1:13c; LXX 1 Kgs 19:7a: ἄγγελοι/ἄγγελος); as well as distinctive narrative details: the call of the disciples/Elisha in the midst of work (Mk 1:16,19; 1 Kgs 19:19); the disciples/Elisha leaving their work to ‘follow after’ Jesus/Elijah (Mk 1:18,20b; LXX 1 Kgs 19:20); the disciples/Elisha leaving their father to follow Jesus/Elijah (Mk 1:20b; LXX 1 Kgs 19:20). The similarities are laid out in the table below.

Mk 1:12-20	1 Kgs 19
The Spirit sends Jesus 'into the wilderness' (ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ) (Mk 1:13a).	Elijah flees 'into the wilderness' (ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ) (LXX 1 Kgs 19:4a).
Jesus is in the wilderness 'forty days' (τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέρας) (Mk 1:13a).	Elijah is in the wilderness 'forty days' (τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέρας) and nights (LXX 1 Kgs 19:8b).
Jesus is tested by the Satan (Mk 1:13b).	Elijah despairs of his life (1 Kgs 19:4b; Phinehas/Elijah is 'tested' [<i>probo</i>] in <i>LAB</i> 48:1).
Jesus is with the wild animals and 'angels' (ἄγγελοι) minister to him (Mk 1:13c).	An 'angel' (ἄγγελος) feeds Elijah (LXX 1 Kgs 19:5-7; ravens feed Elijah in 1 Kgs 17:4-6).
Jesus sees the four disciples at work (Mk 1:16,19).	Elijah comes upon Elisha at work (1 Kgs 19:19a).
Jesus calls them from their work, saying 'Come after me' (δεῦτε ὀπίσω μου) (Mk 1:17).	Elijah throws his mantle on Elisha (1 Kgs 19:19c).
The disciples leave their work and father and 'followed after' (ἠκολούθησαν/ἀπῆλθον ὀπίσω) Jesus (Mk 1:18,20).	Elisha says he will 'follow after' (ἀκολουθήσω ὀπίσω) Elijah once he has kissed his father. Elisha leaves his work and 'followed after' (ἐπορεύθη ὀπίσω) Elijah (LXX 1 Kgs 19:20-21).

Although Elijah is the only figure in the Jewish scriptures to sojourn in the wilderness for forty days with angelic support, most studies on Mk 1:12-13 have associated Jesus' sojourn with Israel's forty years in the wilderness led by an angel.⁵⁰¹ There are obvious differences in the subject (Israel/Jesus), the duration (years/days) and the function of the angel (vanguard/servant) between the two accounts. But the language of *temptation*—absent in 1 Kgs 19—may be found in the Exodus tradition. In Jewish literature, the language of 'temptation/testing' (MT: נִסָּה/יָחַד; LXX: πειρασμός/πειράζω; syn. δοκιμή/δοκιμάζω) is usually reserved for the incident at Meribah, where Israel tempts the LORD (Exod 17:7; see Deut 6:16; 9:22; 33:8; Pss 78:18,41; 81:7; 95:8-9; 106:14; 4QTest 15; Heb 3:8-9; cf. Ps 81:7c, where it is the LORD who tests the Israelites at Meribah). Elsewhere in Exodus, the LORD tests (πειράζω) Israel by vowing to rain down bread upon them, 'that I will test them whether they will walk by my law or not' (LXX Exod 16:4: ὅπως πειράσω αὐτοὺς εἰ πορεύσονται τῷ νόμῳ μου ἢ οὐ). In LXX Exod 20:20, Moses tells the Israelites, 'For in order to test you God has come to you' (ἔνεκεν γὰρ τοῦ πειράσαι ὑμᾶς παρεγενήθη ὁ θεὸς πρὸς ὑμᾶς). But where the testing of an individual is concerned, the most common example is Abraham at the *Aqedah* (Gen 22:1; 1 Macc 2:52; Jdt 8:25; Sir 44:20; *Jub.* 17:16-18; Heb 11:17). God also tests righteous persons (1 Chron 29:17; Job 23:10; Pss 17:3; 26:2; 139:23; Prov 17:3; Qoh 3:18; Jer 11:20; 12:3; Sir 2:1; 11QT 54:12; 4QCatena 2:10; *Ps. Sol.* 16:14; 1 Thess 2:4; cf. *T. Mos.* 9:4).

⁵⁰¹ Robert H. Lightfoot, *History and Interpretation in the Gospels* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1935) 65-66; Rudolf Schnackenburg, 'Der Sinn der Versuchung Jesu bei den Synoptikern', *ThQ* 132 (1952): 297-326 (306-307); André Feuillet, 'L'episode de la tentation d'après l'Evangile selon Saint Marc (1,12-13)', *EstBib* 19 (1960): 49-73; Jeffrey B. Gibson, *The Temptations of Jesus in Early Christianity* (London: T&T Clark, 2004) 63; cf. C. E. B. Cranfield, *The Gospel According to St. Mark* (CGTC; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959) 57; Hooker, *The Gospel According to St. Mark*, 49; Ernest Best, *The Temptation and the Passion: The Markan Soteriology* (2nd ed.; SNTSMS 2; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990) 5. Birger Gerhardsson, on the other hand, argues that the Markan temptation abbreviates a longer tradition, preserved in Mt 4:1-11 (*The Testing of God's Son (Matt. 4:1-11 & Par): An Analysis of an Early Christian Midrash* [Lund: Gleerup, 1966] 10-11). The reverse seems to be the case: Mt 4:1-11 is an expansion of Mk 1:12-13. Cf. also the smorgasbord of barely perceptible allusions proposed in Ardel B. Caneday, 'Mark's Provocative Use of Scripture in Narration: "He Was with the Wild Animals and Angels Ministered to Him"', *BBR* 9 (1999): 19-36.

However, Jesus is tempted not by God but the Satan, which has no parallel in the Exodus narrative or related traditions. And yet, one of Mark's early readers clearly associated Jesus' temptation with Israel's experience in the wilderness. In Matthew's expansion of the temptation narrative (Mt 4:1-11; *par.* Lk 4:1-13), it reads that Jesus 'fasted forty days and forty nights' (Mt 4:2a: καὶ νηστεύσας ἡμέρας τεσσαράκοντα καὶ νύκτας τεσσαράκοντα; cf. Lk 4:2), alluding to Moses' forty-day fast on Sinai/Horeb. When the devil tempts Jesus, he responds by alluding to the incident at Meribah, 'Again it is written, "You shall not tempt the Lord your God"' (Mt 4:7 [*par.* Lk 4:12]: πάλιν γέγραπται· οὐκ ἐκπειράσεις κύριον τὸν θεόν σου).⁵⁰² This is a verbatim citation of LXX Deut 6:16: 'You shall not tempt the Lord your God' (οὐκ ἐκπειράσεις κύριον τὸν θεόν σου), which concludes, 'as you tempted in the temptation' (ὃν τρόπον ἐξεπειράσασθε ἐν τῷ πειρασμῷ). Two other responses of Jesus to the Satan appear to be drawn from Deuteronomy (Mt 4:4 [*par.* Lk 4:4]; cf. LXX Deut 8:3; Mt 4:10; Lk 4:8; cf. Deut 6:13). This suggests that some of Mark's early readers saw in Jesus' temptation an allusion to Moses' and Israel's experience in the wilderness.

It is noteworthy that details from Moses' forty-day fast appear in another narrative modelled on 1 Kgs 19:4-8.⁵⁰³ In the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, a text roughly contemporary with Mark, the character of Abraham describes meeting an angel, 'And we went, the two of us alone together, forty days and nights. And I ate not bread and drank no water, because (my food) was to see the angel who was with me, and his discourse with me was my drink. We came to God's mountain, glorious Horeb' (*Ap. Ab.* 12:1-3).⁵⁰⁴ Like 1 Kgs 19:4-8, the *Apocalypse* features a journey of 'forty days and nights' to Horeb (cf. 1 Kgs 19:8) and the appearance of an angel who provides (in this case, metaphorical) food and drink for the journey (cf. 1 Kgs 19:6,8).⁵⁰⁵ However, the

⁵⁰² Translation own.

⁵⁰³ Moses' forty-day sojourn clearly lies behind the forty-day seclusion of Ezra (4 Ezra 14:23,36,44-45), so Allison, *The New Moses*, 62-65.

⁵⁰⁴ On the dating of the *Apocalypse of Abraham* relative to 70 CE, see James R. Mueller, 'The *Apocalypse of Abraham* and the Destruction of the Second Jewish Temple' in *The Society of Biblical Literature 1982 Seminar Papers* (ed. Kent Harold Richards; SBLSP 21; Chico, CA: Scholars, 1982) 341-349 (343-347).

⁵⁰⁵ The flight of Elijah in 1 Kgs 19:1-8 may have influenced *Mart. Ascen. Isa.* 2:7-11, where Isaiah and the prophets flee from their persecutors to a 'mountain in a desert place' (2:8; see also the description of their clothing and diet in 2:10-11), and *LAB* 6:7-12, where the eleven righteous men flee from their persecutors for thirty days in the mountains and they drink 'water flowing from rocks' (6:9; cf. 1 Kgs 17:4; Exod 17:6; Isa 33:16). The journey of Zosimus in the *History of the Rechabites* recalls 1 Kgs 19:6-8, where, having fasted for forty years (*Hist. Rech.* 1:1,4), Zosimus meets an angel:

detail that Abraham ‘ate not bread and drank no water’ is borrowed verbatim from Moses’ forty-day fast on Sinai/Horeb (Exod 34:28b: Deut 9:9c,18b). Interestingly, once Abraham arrives at Horeb, he is tempted by Azazel (*Ap. Ab.* 13:3-14) who appears as an unclean bird (cf. Gen 15:11; Lev 11:13-19).⁵⁰⁶ The association of Moses and Israel in the wilderness with the experience of Elijah in 1 Kgs 19 is natural, when one considers that 1 Kgs 19:4-18 was likely modelled on the experience of Moses on Sinai/Horeb.⁵⁰⁷

Then again, the ‘testing/tempting’ of Jesus could reflect the experience of Elijah in 1 Kgs 19. Whilst the language of ‘testing’ (Hb: *נסו/נבט*; Gk: *πειράζω/δοκιμάζω*) never appears, Elijah is still in some sense tested: following the threats of Jezebel, he is ‘afraid’ (LXX 19:3: *ἐφοβήθη*) and flees for his life (*ἀπῆλθεν κατὰ τὴν ψυχὴν ἑαυτοῦ*) into the wilderness, where he despairs, begging the LORD for death, ‘Take my life away from me’ (LXX 19:4: *λαβὲ δὴ τὴν ψυχὴν μου ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ*). At Horeb, Elijah restates his despair to the LORD, saying, ‘They destroyed your altars and killed your prophets by the sword, and I alone am left, and they seek my life to take it’ (LXX 19:10,14). One text contemporary to Mark uses the language of ‘testing’ (Lt. *probo*) to describe Elijah’s struggles. In the *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*, Elijah appears under the guise of Phinehas (*LAB* 48:1). God tells Phinehas/Elijah to dwell on a mountain, saying, ‘and you will not come down to mankind until the time arrives *and you will be tested in that time*’ (*et proberis in tempore*), alluding to the deeds of Elijah during the reign of Ahab. It is difficult to know what Hebrew or Greek verb lies

‘Then I left the cave, and traveled with the angel (for) forty days’ (2:1). The description of Zosimus is similar to the descriptions of later desert-dwelling ascetics, who are either modelled on or modelled themselves after Elijah (Athanasius, *Vita. Ant.* 7.37 [PG 26.853]; Jerome, *Epist.* 58.5 [PL 22.583]; John Cassian, *Conf.* 18.6 [NPNF 11.481]). To take one example, with the help of angels, Abba Serapion goes on a thirty-day journey to see Mark the hermit, who lives on a mountain where he is ministered to and fed by angels (*Vita S. Marco Atheniensi* 4-5,13). He is also said to have hairs growing on his entire body so that ‘all [his] members were covered’ (*Vita S. Marco Atheniensi* 8; cf. 2 Kgs 1:8). See also the description of Shenoute of Atripe (*Life of Shenoute* 10). For more on the description of ascetics, see Kristi Upson-Saia, ‘Hairiness and Holiness in the Early Christian Desert’ in *Dressing Judeans and Christians in Antiquity* (ed. Upson-Saia, Carly Daniel-Hughes and Alicia J. Batten; London: Routledge, 2014) 155-172. At other times, the model is Elijah’s first sojourn in the wilderness in 1 Kgs 17:2-7, as when Jerome relates that ravens brought bread to Paul of Thebes for sixty years (*Vita Paul* 10 [PL 23.25]; cf. 1 Kgs 17:6). Countless other examples show that the image of Elijah in the wilderness (1 Kgs 17:2-7; 19:4-8) continued to inspire scripturalized narratives beyond Mk 1:12-13, see David T. M. Frankfurter, *Elijah in Upper Egypt: The Apocalypse of Elijah and Early Egyptian Christianity* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1993) 65-74.

⁵⁰⁶ Elsewhere, the *Apocalypse* describes Azazel’s ability to tempt the righteous (*Ap. Ab.* 13:11) and Adam and Eve (22:5-23:13).

⁵⁰⁷ See Allison, *The New Moses*, 41-44.

behind *probo* in *LAB* 48:1, but the Vulgate sometimes has *probo* where the LXX has *πειράζω* (Exod 20:20 for Hb. נִסָּה; Dan 12:10 for Hb. צָרַף).⁵⁰⁸ Whilst it is possible that both the ‘testing’ of Israel and Elijah have influenced the temptation of Jesus in Mk 1:13, neither tradition appears to associate the testing in the wilderness with the wiles of Satan.

The ‘wild animals’ (θηρίον) of Mk 1:13c also have no direct parallel in the Exodus and Elijah traditions. Whilst some following Pesch have seen the inclusion of the ‘wild animals’, along with Satan, as an allusion to the narrative of Gen 2-3,⁵⁰⁹ the animals could also recall Elijah’s first sojourn in the wilderness. In 1 Kgs 17:2-7, God sends Elijah to the Wadi Cherith ‘which is before the Jordan’ (LXX 17:3: τοῦ ἐπὶ προσώπου τοῦ Ἰορδάνου), saying to him, ‘I will command my ravens to feed you there’ (LXX 17:4: τοῖς κόραξιν ἐντελοῦμαι διατρέφειν σε ἐκεῖ).⁵¹⁰ It is difficult, however, to see the ‘ravens’ (מְעַרְבִים/κόρακες) of 1 Kgs 19:4-6 in Mark’s θηρίον—a word which is rarely used as a substitute for birds (cf. Arist., *Birds* 69-70) and never for ravens. There does appear to be some confusion over the identity of Elijah’s creaturely helpers in *LAB* 48:1c, where God says to Phinehas/Elijah, ‘I will command *my eagle* (*aquile mee*) and he will nourish you there’.⁵¹¹ This command concerns the period of time before Phinehas/Elijah returns to humanity to close the heavens (1 Kgs 17:1), and so presumably does not refer to Elijah’s sojourn by the Wadi Cherith. The language is nevertheless borrowed almost verbatim from 1 Kgs 17:4b. As it is, there can be no certainty that the ‘ravens’ (מְעַרְבִים/κόρακες) of 1 Kgs 17:4-6 lie behind the ‘wild animals’ of Mk 1:13. But it is worth noting that a clear reference to scriptural material—like the ‘leather belt around his waist’ in Mk 1:6 (cf. LXX 2 Kgs 1:8)—can be accompanied by an incongruous detail that nevertheless reflects something of the

⁵⁰⁸ Most often, *probo* appears for *δέχομαι*, from which *δοκιμάζω* is derived. Ambrose (*Epist.* 63.28 [PL 16.1257]) says that in the wilderness ‘the Lord was training [Elijah] to the perfection of virtue’ (*Dominus ad virtutis erudiebat perfectionem*).

⁵⁰⁹ Pesch, ‘Anfang des Evangeliums Jesu Christi. Eine Studie zum Prolog des Markusevangeliums (Mark 1,1-15)’ in *Die Zeit Jesu: Festschrift für Heinrich Schlier* (ed. Günther Bornkamm and Karl Rahner; Freiburg: Herder, 1970) 108-144 (130-133); *Das Markusevangelium*, 1.94-96; Petr Pokorny, ‘The Temptation Stories and Their Intention’, *NTS* 20 (1974): 115-127 (120-122); Best, *The Temptation and the Passion*, 6-7; Ulrich Mell, ‘Jesu Taufe durch Johannes (Markus 1,9-15)—zur narrative Christologie vom neuen Adam’, *BZ* 40 (1996): 161-178; Marcus, *Mark: 1-8*, 169-171; Focant, *The Gospel According to Mark*, 44; cf. William Lane, *The Gospel According to Mark* (NICNT 2; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1974) 61, n. 79.

⁵¹⁰ Cf. 2 Bar. 77:24; *Liv. Pro.* 21:13; *Jos., Ant.* 8.13.2.

⁵¹¹ Baruch compares an eagle to the ravens of 1 Kgs 17:4-6 (2 Bar. 77:18-26).

scriptural reference ('camel's hair' [τρίχας καμήλου]; cf. 'hairy man' [בַּעַל שָׂרָשׁוּר/אֲנִיִּר דַּאֲסוּס]). The fact remains, however, that the detail concerning Elijah's creaturely helpers does not come from 1 Kgs 19:4-8, but 1 Kgs 17:2-7. The episode in 1 Kgs 17:2-7 does share some general similarities with Mk 1:12-13: the 'word of the Lord' (LXX 17:2: ῥῆμα κυρίου) sends Elijah eastward to the Wadi Cherith 'which is before the Jordan' (LXX 17:3: τοῦ ἐπὶ προσώπου τοῦ Ἰορδάνου), as in Mk 1:12, the 'spirit' (πνεῦμα) sends Jesus away from the Jordan (1:9: εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνην) into the wilderness. Moreover, the events in Elijah's life are sometimes conflated or re-ordered in contemporary literature (Sir 48:1-8; *Liv. Pro.* 21:4-15; *LAB* 48:1). In this sense, it is possible that the author of Mk 1:12-13 incorporated elements from both of Elijah's sojourns in the wilderness (1 Kgs 17:2-7; 19:4-8). Then again, perhaps a simpler explanation is that the presence of 'wild animals' (θηρίον) is yet another instance of 'eco-typing'—in other words, it simply owes to Jesus' location 'in the wilderness' (ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ; cf. Mk 1:4-6).⁵¹²

Attempts to discount the influence of 1 Kgs 19:4-8 on Jesus' sojourn in the wilderness based on the absence of 'and forty nights' (καὶ τεσσαράκοντα νύκτας) as in 1 Kgs 19:8b are unconvincing.⁵¹³ The redundant 'and nights' (וַיְלֵל/καὶ νύκτας) is often omitted from similar occurrences of 'forty days': see the 'forty days and nights' of Noah (Gen 7:4,12; cf. *om.* 'and nights': Gen 7:17; 8:6; *Jos., Ant.* 1.3.5; Philo, *Ques. Gen.* 2.33; *b. Yom.* 76a); the 'forty days and nights' of Moses (Exod 24:18; 34:28; Deut 9:9 etc.; cf. *om.* 'and nights': *Jos., Ag. Ap.* 2.25; *Ant.* 3.7; Philo, *Mos.* 2.14; Philo, *Alleg. Interp.* 3.48; *Ques. Ezra* A 39; *Clem., Misc.* 3.7.1; *m. Taan.* 4:6; *b. Shabb.* 89a; *b. Yom.* 4b; 76a; *b. Taan.* 8a; *b. Menah.* 99b; *PRE* 46:1-6). Later literature also omits 'and nights' from Elijah's sojourn in the wilderness: in the *Sifre* to Deut 2:2 it reads, 'Is it not a journey [of] forty days in line with what is said concerning Elijah?'. Similarly, Irenaeus has 'Fasting those forty days, like Moses and Elias' (*Adv. Haer.* 3.22.2), as does Tertullian, 'For forty days Moses and Elias fasted, and lived upon God alone' (*Tert., Res.* 61). Returning to Jesus, the Matthean version adds καὶ νύκτας τεσσαράκοντα (Mt 4:2a; cf. Lk 4:2) clearly under the influence of Moses in Exod 34:28

⁵¹² In *T. Naph.* 8:4, angels help the pious whilst devils and wild animals flee.

⁵¹³ Pace Ernst Haenchen, *Der Weg Jesu* (Berlin: Töpelmann, 1966) 64; Hermann Mahnke, *Die Versuchungsgeschichte im Rahmen der synoptischen Evangelien. Ein Beitrag zur frühen Christologie* (BBET 9; Frankfurt: Lang, 1978) 25; Öhler, *Elia im Neuen Testament*, 135, n. 142.

(and *par.*). Whilst no early Greek mss. of Mark include ‘and forty nights’, Origen attributes the following to the Gospel: ‘Mark has the following: “And he was in the desert forty days and forty nights tempted by Satan, and he was with the wild beasts; and the angels ministered to him”’ (*Comm. Jo.* 10.1: ὁ δὲ Μάρκος· Καὶ ἦν, φησὶν, ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέρας καὶ τεσσαράκοντα νύκτας, πειραζόμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ σατανᾶ· καὶ ἦν μετὰ τῶν θηρίων, καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι διηκόνουν αὐτῷ).⁵¹⁴ The Vulgate at Mk 1:13 similarly reads ‘forty days and forty nights’ (*quadraginta diebus, et quadraginta noctibus*).⁵¹⁵ Whether the addition of ‘and nights’ in Origen and the Vulgate points to an early variant of Mk 1:13 not witnessed in the early Greek mss. or (as is more likely) the influence of Mt 4:2, the general point stands that ‘and nights’ may be omitted from otherwise clear references to 1 Kgs 19:8, as it may be included in otherwise clear references to Mk 1:13.⁵¹⁶

There is, however, no clear sign that 1 Kgs 19 has influenced the proclamation of the kingdom in Mk 1:14-15. Against this, Adam Winn has argued that 1 Kgs 19:15-18 and Mk 1:14-15 reflect ‘parallel proclamations about the kingdom of God’, in the sense that Elijah’s task of anointing Hazael, Jehu and Elisha and Jesus’ announcement that the ‘kingdom of God has come near’ (ἤγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ) both concern the establishment of divine rule over human affairs.⁵¹⁷ It is worth noting some other (albeit loose) similarities: Elijah is tasked with anointing kings (LXX 1 Kgs 19:15-16: βασιλέα) whilst Jesus announces the kingdom (Mk 1:15b: βασιλεία) of God and is himself anointed (1:9-11); Elijah receives a revelation at Horeb (1 Kgs 19:9-14) whilst Jesus’ proclamation of ‘good news of God’ (Mk 1:14c: τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ) seems to imply a revelation from God; Elijah retreats into the wilderness following the violent threats of Jezebel (1 Kgs 19:2) and twice entreats God concerning the Israelites, who have ‘killed your prophets with the sword’ (LXX 1 Kgs 19:10,14: τοὺς προφῆτας σου ἀπέκτειναν ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ) whilst Jesus emerges from the wilderness following the arrest of John (Mk 1:14a) who is later beheaded (6:27). As Mk 1:14-15 and 1 Kgs 19:15-18 both fall between their respective ‘wilderness’ and ‘call’ narratives, it is tempting to see them as equivalent episodes despite their clear differences. But the more natural

⁵¹⁴ Likewise Eusebius, *Theo.* 3.55.

⁵¹⁵ Also Augustine, *Harm.* 16.33.

⁵¹⁶ Some mss. later than the eighth-century include καὶ τεσσαράκοντα νύκτας (L^c 33 M).

⁵¹⁷ Winn, *Mark and the Elijah-Elisha Narrative*, 73-76.

conclusion would be that Mark has simply deviated from the scriptural model. Other scripturalized narratives feature similar deviations. For example, in the episode of Abram in the fiery furnace (*LAB* 6), Abram and eleven righteous men are arrested for refusing to commit idolatry (6:1-5) as in Dan 3:1-18, and then Abram is thrown into the fiery furnace but comes to no harm (*LAB* 6:16-18) as in Dan 3:19-27. But in the intervening section (*LAB* 6:6-15), the narrative deviates from the Dan 3 model and instead relates a long and confusing episode in which the eleven righteous men escape into the mountains. Mk 1:12-20 features a similar sort of scripturalized intercalation, with the scripturalized narratives of Jesus in the wilderness (1:12-13) and the call of the disciples (1:16-20) placed either side of Jesus' inaugural proclamation of the kingdom in Galilee—a pivotal moment which acts as the fulfilment of the words of John in 1:7-8, and indeed the ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου of 1:1.⁵¹⁸

The Call of the Disciples and Elisha: Mk 1:16-20 and 1 Kgs 19:19-21

As early as Chrysostom, (*Hom.* 14.3), commentators have noted the similarity of the call narratives in Mk 1:16-20 and 1 Kgs 19:19-21.⁵¹⁹ In both episodes, the prophet comes upon the man/men as they are working, places his mantle upon him/calls them and the man/men leave their work/father and follow after the prophet. Each episode features a disciple leaving their work and family to 'follow after' (ἀκολουθέω . . . ὀπίσω) their master: Jesus sees Simon and Andrew working and says, 'Follow after me' (Mk 1:17b: δεῦτε ὀπίσω μου), at which point they leave their nets

⁵¹⁸ See the discussion in Hatina, *In Search of a Context*, 102-114.

⁵¹⁹ Discussed in modern scholarship at least since Strauss, *Das Leben Jesu: kritisch bearbeitet* (Tübingen: Osiander, 1835) 1.525-526, who comments, 'Könnte es sich klarer, als durch diesen Zug, verrathen, wie die ganze Erzählung bei Matthäus und Markus nur eine überbietende Nachbildung der A. T.lichen ist' (526). See more recent comments in Anselm Schulz, *Nachfolgen und Nachahmen* (StANT 6; Munich: Kösel, 1962) 100-103; Eduard Schweizer, *Das Evangelium nach Markus* (NTD 1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967) 22; Pesch, 'Berufung und Sendung, Nachfolge und Mission: Eine Studie zu Mk 1,16-20', *ZKT* 91 (1969): 1-31 (9-18); *Das Markusevangelium*, 1.109-114; Gnllka, *Das Evangelium nach Markus*, 1.74-75; Marcus, *Mark: 1-8*, 183; Roger D. Aus, 'Jesus' Calling the First Four Disciples in Mark 1:16-20 and Judaic Traditions on Elijah's Calling Elisha as his Disciple in 1 Kgs 19:19-21' in *Stilling the Storm: Studies in Early Palestinian Judaic Traditions* (Binghamton, NY: Global Publications, 2000) 89-135; Allison, *The Intertextual Jesus: Scripture in Q* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2000) 142-143; Winn, *Mark and the Elijah-Elisha Narrative*, 74-75; Focant, *The Gospel According to Mark*, 59; cf. the skeptical remarks in Gundry, *Mark*, 70; Öhler, *Elia im Neuen Testament*, 158.

and ‘followed him’ (1:18: ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ).⁵²⁰ Likewise, Jesus sees James and John, and after he calls them, they leave their father and ‘followed after him’ (1:20c: ἀπῆλθον ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ). In 1 Kgs 19:19-21, Elijah comes upon Elisha working and throws his mantle over him, at which point Elisha says, ‘I will kiss my father and *will follow after you*’ (LXX 1 Kgs 19:20b: ἀκολουθήσω ὀπίσω σου; cf. MT 1 Kgs 19:20), after which he ‘went after Elijah’ (19:21c: ἐπορεύθη ὀπίσω Ηλίου).

The circumstantial differences between the two call narratives are characteristic of scripturalized narratives. For example, whilst the episodes in *LAB* 6 and 38 are both modelled on Dan 3, *LAB* 6 features twelve men sentenced to the furnace for refusing to build the tower of Babel and *LAB* 38 features seven sentenced for refusing to worship Baal in Israel—compared to Dan 3, where three are sentenced for refusing to worship Nebuchadnezzar in Babylon. In the same way, the difference in location, vocation and number of the disciples in Mk 1:16-20 and 1 Kgs 19:19-21 reflects their respective narrative contexts (i.e. the fishermen reflect the Galilean context of Mk 1:14-39). As Pesch observes, ‘Die Ortsangabe „am Meer“ ist durch den Beruf der beiden Brüderpaare bedingt, wie 1 Kön 19,19 das Ochsen gespannt auf dem Acker den Beruf des Elisha symbolisierte; die Angabe verändert den Charakter der „idealen Szene“ nicht, erlaubt aber den Ausbau eines tragfähigen, an Ortsangaben orientierten Erzählfadens’.⁵²¹

Others have sought to contrast the immediacy (εὐθύς) and severity of the disciples’ response in Mk 1:16-20 with Elisha’s request to bid farewell to his father (LXX 1 Kgs 19:20; ‘and mother’ in MT 1 Kgs 19:20).⁵²² But as Roger Aus notes, the language of immediacy also occurs in Josephus’ version of Elisha’s calling, ‘Thereupon Elisha immediately began to prophesy, and, leaving his oxen, followed Elijah’ (*Ant.* 8.13.7: ὁ δ’ Ἐλισσαῖος εὐθέως προφητεύειν ἤρξατο καὶ καταλιπὼν τοὺς

⁵²⁰ At the same time, Jesus’ command (Mk 1:17b: δεῦτε ὀπίσω μου) agrees verbatim with Elisha’s command to the Arameans (LXX 2 Kgs 6:19: δεῦτε ὀπίσω μου), but as there are no other links to this passage, it is likely a coincidence (cf. Pesch, ‘Berufung und Sendung’, 15). Other similarities between Mk 1:16-20 and the call of Elisha seem less worthy of consideration: as tempting as it may be, it is probably unwise to see in the ‘twelve’ disciples a reflection of the ‘twelve’ oxen of Elisha, *pace* Aus, ‘Jesus’ Calling the First Four Disciples’, 96-97.

⁵²¹ Pesch, *Das Markusevangelium*, 1.110.

⁵²² Arguing against the influence of 1 Kgs 19:19-21 on this basis are Gundry, *Mark*, 70; Öhler, *Elia im Neuen Testament*, 158; James R. Edwards, *The Gospel According to Mark* (Pillar New Testament Commentary; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2002) 50.

βόας ἠκολούθησεν Ἡλίου).⁵²³ Note also the severity of Elisha's response in the later *Seder Eliyahu Rabbah*, 'At once Elisha left all that he owned and ran after [him]' (*S. Eli. Rab.* 32: מיד הניח אשש אה כל אשר לו וירא פרוו).⁵²⁴

Indeed, the immediacy and severity that scholars attribute to the Markan call narratives (1:16-20; 2:14) is much better reflected in Matthew and Luke.⁵²⁵ The discourse concerning the would-be disciples in Mt 8:18-22 and Lk 9:47-62 appears to be influenced by both Mk 1:16-20 and 1 Kgs 19:19-21.⁵²⁶ The second would-be disciple says to Jesus, '[Lord,] first let me go and bury my father' (Mt 8:21b: ἐπίτρεψόν μοι πρῶτον ἀπελθεῖν καὶ θάψαι τὸν πατέρα μου; Lk 9:59b: [κύριε,] ἐπίτρεψόν μοι ἀπελθόντι πρῶτον θάψαι τὸν πατέρα μου). This resembles the request of Elisha to Elijah, especially as it appears in LXX 1 Kgs 19:20b: 'I will kiss my father and will follow after you' (καταφιλήσω τὸν πατέρα μου καὶ ἀκολουθήσω ὀπίσω σου; cf. MT 1 Kgs 19:20b: 'and mother'). Whereas Elijah appears to grant Elisha's request (LXX 1 Kgs 19:20c; Jos., *Ant.* 8.7), Jesus denies the request of the would-be disciple (Mt 8:22; Lk 9:60). Luke includes a third would-be disciple, who says, 'I will follow you, Lord; but let me first say farewell to those at my home' (Lk 9:61: ἀκολουθήσω σοι, κύριε· πρῶτον δὲ ἐπίτρεψόν μοι ἀποτάξασθαι τοῖς εἰς τὸν οἶκόν μου). Whilst the disciples' request already resembles that of Elisha (1 Kgs 19:20-21), Jesus' answer makes it more pronounced: 'No one who puts a hand to the plow and looks back is fit for the kingdom of God' (Lk 9:62: οὐδεὶς ἐπιβαλὼν τὴν χεῖρα ἐπ' ἄροτρον καὶ βλέπων εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω εὐθετός ἐστιν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ). This recalls the vocation of Elisha when Elijah calls him, 'he was plowing with oxen' (LXX 1 Kgs 19:19b: ἠροτρία ἐν βουσίν). The 'hand to the plow' (τὴν χεῖρα ἐπ' ἄροτρον) of Lk 9:62 also functions as a metaphor for discipleship in the same way that 'casting a net' (ἀμφιβάλλω) does in Mk 1:16: as Jesus says, 'Follow me and I will make you *fish for people*' (1:17: ἀλιεῖς ἀνθρώπων).

⁵²³ Aus, 'Jesus' Calling the First Four Disciples', 117-121.

⁵²⁴ Instead of bidding farewell to his parents, Elisha immediately 'renounced ownership of all that he had, indeed he salted his entire field so that it became barren' (*S. Eli. Rab.* 32).

⁵²⁵ So Aus, 'Jesus' Calling the First Four Disciples', 123-124.

⁵²⁶ See the studies of H. J. Blair, 'Putting One's Hand to the Plough: Luke ix.62 in the Light of 1 Kings xix.19-21', *ExpTim* 79 (1967-1968): 342-343; Öhler, *Elia im Neuen Testament*, 156-162; Richard A. Horsley, 'Prophetic Envoys for the Renewal of Israel: Q 9:57-10:16' in *Whoever Hears You Hears Me: Prophets, Performance, and Tradition in Q* (ed. Horsley and Jonathan A. Draper; Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1999) 228-259 (240-241); Allison, *The Intertextual Jesus*, 143-144.

In addition to influencing the episode of the would-be disciples in Mt 8:18-22 and Lk 9:47-62, the call of Elisha is behind another call narrative: Phannias ben Samuel, the last high priest before the destruction of the Temple, is said to have been called to the high priesthood whilst he was ‘ploughing, as it says concerning Elisha’ (*t. Yom.* 1:6: חורש כמה שנאמר באלישע; cf. 1 Kgs 19:19).⁵²⁷ More often the relationship of Elijah and Elisha serves as a model for teacher-disciple relationships: Paphnutius writes that Abba Isaac ‘poured water on [the] hands’ of his teacher Abba Aaron, ‘as the great Elisha did for the prophet Elijah’ (Paphnutius, *Hist.* 10b; cf. 2 Kgs 3:11);⁵²⁸ likewise, Ambrose models the bishop Acholius on Elijah and his successor Anysius on Elisha, ‘Like Elijah [Acholius] was carried up to heaven . . . For at the very moment when he was being taken up, he let fall so to speak the vestment which he wore, and invested with it holy Anysius his disciple, and clothed him with the robes of his own priesthood’ (*Epist.* 15.8-9 [PL 16.957]; cf. 2 Kgs 2:11-14).

This association of Elijah and Elisha with teacher-disciple relationships may offer a clue as to what prompted the author to compose a scripturalized narrative modelled on 1 Kgs 19. Contemporary and later Jewish texts describe Elisha as Elijah’s ‘disciple’ (μαθητής in *Jos.*, *Ant.* 8.13.7; 9.2.2; 9.3.1; תלמיד in *Mek.* 13:19; *b. Sot.* 13a; 49a; *b. San.* 105b; *S. Eli. Rab.* 17) and call Elijah his ‘lord’ or ‘rabbi’ (אדוני in *Mek.* 13:19.; אדני in *PRE* 33:8; אדון in 4Q481a 3:4?; רבי in *Tg. 2 Kgs* 2:12; רבו in *Mek.* 13:19; *t. Sot.* 4:8; 12:5).⁵²⁹ Likewise, Jesus has ‘disciples’ (μαθηταί in Mk 2:15-16,23; 3:7 etc.) and he is called ‘lord’ (κύριος in 7:28) and ‘rabbi’ (ῥαββί/ραββουσι in 9:5; 10:51; 11:21; 14:45).⁵³⁰ That Jesus gathered his own disciples appears to have been a widely

⁵²⁷ For this and other examples see Aus, ‘Jesus’ Calling the First Four Disciples’, 98.

⁵²⁸ Tim Vivian, *Histories of the Monks of Upper Egypt; and the Life of Onnophrius by Paphnutius* (Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications, 1993) 26.

⁵²⁹ On the possible relationship between 4Q481a 3:4 and 2 Kgs 2:12, see Ariel Feldman, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Rewriting Samuel and Kings: Texts and Commentary* (BZAW 469; Berlin: De Gruyter, 2015) 154-155. Compare with *Tg. 2 Kgs* 2:12, where the Hebrew אבי אבי has been replaced with רבי רבי; *PRE* 33:8 where Elisha calls Elijah ‘my lord’ (אדני).

⁵³⁰ The medieval *Ma’aseh Torah* relates that Elijah had four disciples—Elisha, Micah, Obadiah and Jonah (Jellinek, *BHM* 2.95; Ginzberg, 6.343). Parts of this tradition belong to an earlier age: Obadiah as disciple of Elijah (*Liv. Pro.* 9:2); Jonah as son of the Zarephathite woman (*Liv. Pro.* 10:6; *PRE* 33:2); cf. Jonah as disciple of Elisha (*S. Olam. Rab.* 19). Other texts envisage a large number of disciples for Elijah (*Tg. Ps.-J.* on Deut 34:3; *Cant. Rab.* 4.11; *Lam. Rab.* 4.25; cf. Elisha: *b. Ket.* 106a; *Tg. Ps.-J.* on Deut 34:3). Elisha’s disciple, Gehazi, on the other hand, becomes the archetypical wicked disciple in later literature (esp. *b. Sot.* 47a; *b. Sanh.* 107b; *y. Sanh.* 10:2 [29b]; cf. the similar episodes in Mk 9:42; 10:13-16).

known tradition (1 Cor 15:5; Rev 21:14),⁵³¹ and it may have been this fact alone that led the author of Mk 1:12-20 to compose a scripturalized narrative in which Jesus calls his disciples in the manner of Elijah: emerging from a forty-day sojourn in the wilderness to call his disciples from their work and families to follow after him. The structure for this episode is provided by 1 Kgs 19:4-8,19-21. In this way, Mk 1:12-20 resembles two other episodes modelled on a scene from the Elijah-Elisha cycle, this time from the career of Elisha: the feeding miracle of 2 Kgs 4:42-44.

Jesus and Elisha: Mk 6:35-44 (8:1-9) and 2 Kgs 4:42-44

In Mk 6:30-34, Jesus and the disciples are attempting to escape into the wilderness in order to rest, when a large crowd follows them. Jesus has compassion for the crowds, because they are ‘like sheep without a shepherd’ (6:34b: ὡς πρόβατα μὴ ἔχοντα ποιμένα). As evening approaches, the disciples ask Jesus to send the crowds away so that they might buy something to eat (6:35-36). But Jesus tells them, ‘You give them [something] to eat’ (6:37a: δότε αὐτοῖς ὑμεῖς φαγεῖν). The disciples respond with disbelief, asking, ‘Are we to go and buy two hundred denarii worth of bread, and give it them to eat?’ (6:37b). Jesus asks, ‘How many loaves have you?’—to which the disciples answer, ‘Five, and two fish’ (6:38). Jesus then orders the crowds to sit on the green grass in groups of hundreds and fifties (6:39-40). Jesus takes the five loaves and two fish, offers a blessing, and then breaks the bread and gives it to the disciples who set it before the people, along with the two fish. Then a miracle occurs: ‘all ate and were filled’ (Mk 6:42: ἔφαγον πάντες καὶ ἐχορτάσθησαν), whilst some was left over, as the disciples collect twelve baskets full of broken bread and fish (6:43). The episode concludes by noting, ‘Those who had eaten the loaves numbered five thousand men’ (6:44: καὶ ἦσαν οἱ φαγόντες [τοὺς ἄρτους] πεντακισχίλιοι ἄνδρες). The miracle occurs a second time in Mk 8:1-9. Again, a great crowd comes before Jesus without anything to eat (8:1). Jesus tells the disciples, ‘I have compassion for the crowd’ (8:2). If the

⁵³¹ The enumeration of twelve disciples appears to have been widely known and likely dates to Jesus’ ministry, see Robert P. Meye, *Jesus and the Twelve: Discipleship and Revelation in Mark’s Gospel* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1968) 192-209; Meier, ‘The Circle of the Twelve: Did it Exist During Jesus’ Public Ministry?’, *JBL* 116 (1997): 635-672; and most recently in Allison, *Constructing Jesus: Memory, Imagination, and History* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2010) 67-76.

crowds go away hungry, so Jesus argues, they will faint (8:3). Again, the disciples respond with disbelief, ‘How can one feed these people with bread here in the desert?’ (8:4). Jesus asks how many loaves the disciples have, and they answer, ‘seven’ (8:5). Jesus then orders the crowd to sit, and having given thanks, he breaks the bread and gives it to the disciples, who distribute it to the crowds. Jesus also does the same with a few small fish. Again, a miracle takes place: ‘[the crowds] ate and were filled’ (8:8a: ἔφαγον καὶ ἐχορτάσθησαν), leaving seven baskets of broken pieces. This time the size of the crowd is enumerated at ‘about four thousand [people]’ (ἦσαν δὲ ὡς τετρακισχίλιοι).

Both episodes appear to be modelled in part on the miracle of Elisha in 2 Kgs 4:42-44.⁵³² The setting is provided by 2 Kgs 4:38a, ‘When Elisha returned to Gilgal, *there was a famine in the land*’ (והרעב בארץ). Having already performed one feeding miracle in 4:38b-41, Elisha receives ‘twenty loaves of barley and fresh ears of grain’ (4:42b: עשרים־להם שערים וכרמל). Elisha says to his servant (presumably Gehazi; cf. 4:12,25b; LXX 4:41), ‘Give it to the people and let them eat’ (4:42c: תן לעם ויאכלו). But his servant responds with disbelief, ‘How can I set this before a hundred people?’ (4:43a: מה אתן זה לפני מעה איש). Elisha repeats, ‘Give it to the people and let them eat’, adding, ‘For thus says the LORD, “*They shall eat and have some left*”’ (4:43c: והותר ויאכלו ויותרו). The servant then sets the food before the hundred men, and as Elisha prophesied, ‘they ate, and had some left’ (4:44b: ויאכלו ויותרו). As with 1 Kgs 19 in Mk 1:12-20, the episodes in 6:35-44 and 8:1-9 follow *mutatis mutandis* the structure of 2 Kgs 4:42-44 whilst incorporating distinctive narrative details: a small amount of food, including loaves, is brought to the prophet (Mk 6:38; 8:5; cf. 2 Kgs 4:42b); the prophet tells his disciples/servant to give it to the people so that they may eat (Mk 6:37a; cf. 2 Kgs 4:42c); the disciples/servant respond with disbelief (Mk 6:37b; 8:4; cf. 2 Kgs 4:43a); the prophet persists despite the disbelief of the disciples/servant (Mk 6:38; 8:5; cf. 2

⁵³² The only full-length study on the literary relationship is Aus, *Feeding the Five Thousand: Studies in the Judaic Background of Mark 6:30-44 par. and John 6:1-15* (Studies in Judaism; Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2010). See also the valuable comments in Alkuin Heising, *Die Botschaft der Brotvermehrung* (SBS 15; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1966) 17-20; Winn, *Mark and the Elijah-Elisha Narrative*, 82-84. Others simply note the parallels: Strauss, *Das Leben Jesu: kritisch bearbeitet* (3rd ed.; Tübingen: Osiander, 1939) 2.233-234; Pesch, *Das Markusevangelium*, 1.354; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2.482; Marcus, *Mark: 1-8*, 415-416; John R. Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel of Mark* (SP 2; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2002) 208; Yarbrow Collins, *Mark*, 320; Focant, *The Gospel According to Mark*, 258-259. Cf. the skeptical comments in Michael Labahn, *Offenbarung in Zeichen und Wort* (WUNT 2/17; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000) 163-164.

Kgs 4:43b); the prophet invokes heaven/the LORD (Mk 6:41a; 8:6b,7b; cf. 2 Kgs 4:43c); the food is set before the people (6:41b; 8:6b-7; cf. 2 Kgs 4:44a); a large number of people eat (Mk 6:42,44; 8:8a,9a; cf. 2 Kgs 4:44b); some food is left over (Mk 6:43; 8:8b; cf. 2 Kgs 4:44c).

Jesus' command to the disciples in Mk 6:37a, 'You give them [something] to eat' (δότε αὐτοῖς ὑμεῖς φαγεῖν) echoes the command of Elisha to his servant in 2 Kgs 4:42c (again in v. 43b): 'Give to the people and let them eat' (תן לעם ויאכלו).⁵³³ A more literal rendering of the Hebrew is found in LXX 4:42c (4:43b): δότε τῷ λαῷ καὶ ἐσθιέτωσαν. Both Mark and the LXX agree in using the second-person plural imperative δότε ('you all give'). The singular ὁ λαός in the LXX, however, better reflects the singular עַם of 2 Kgs 4:42c, although the LXX is capable of rendering עַם as αὐτοῖς (LXX Exod 20:20; LXX Num 14:19; LXX Josh 6:7) as in Mk 6:37a.⁵³⁴ At the same time, whilst Mark's use of the infinitive φαγεῖν would more naturally follow לאכל (as it does in LXX 2 Kgs 4:8,40) rather than the jussive ויאכלו of 2 Kgs 4:42c, the LXX may also render ויאכלו as φαγεῖν (LXX 2 Chron 28:15). Nevertheless, given the equivalent function of the command at this stage in the narrative, there is good reason to think that Jesus' words in Mk 6:37a have their origin in 2 Kgs 4:42c. The detail in Mk 6:41b and 8:6 that the disciples 'set [the food] before' (παρατίθημι) the people seems to reflect the language of 2 Kgs 4:44, where the servant 'set [the food] before them' (ויתן לפניהם). Whilst the detail is absent in LXX 2 Kgs 4:44, the LXX translates the only other instance of ויתן לפניהם (Gen 18:8) with παρατίθημι. And whilst Mk 8:8 uses the noun περίσσευμα ('left over') for the abundance of loaves, it may reflect the food 'left over' (MT: יתר; LXX: καταλείπω) in 2 Kgs 4:43-44, as the Greek renders the verb יתר as περισσεύω (LXX 1 Sam 2:36; α' Gen 49:4; α' and θ' Deut 30:9; α', σ' and θ' Isa 4:3 etc.), the noun יתרה as περίσσευμα (α' Isa 15:7) and יתרון as περισσειά (LXX Eccl 1:3; 2:11,13; 3:9; 5:8,15; 6:8; 7:11-12; 10:10-11; α' Lev 8:25).⁵³⁵ The similarities between the Markan feeding miracles and 2 Kgs 4:42-44 are laid out in the synoptic table below.

⁵³³ The words of Elisha's command also appear in *b. Men.* 66b; *b. Sanh.* 12a.

⁵³⁴ Mark favours the personal pronoun to the point of being unclear (i.e. 9:13). Compared to Matthew and Luke, Mark rarely uses λαός (Mk 7:6; 14:12).

⁵³⁵ Aus likewise notes ויתרון in *Tg. 2 Kgs 4:43 (Feeding the Five Thousand, 112)*. It may also be compared to LXX Ruth 2:14: 'She ate and was satisfied and had some left over' (ἔφαγεν καὶ ἐνεπλήσθη καὶ κατέλιπεν).

Mk 6:35-44; 8:1-9	2 Kgs 4:42-44
The people have nothing to eat (Mk 8:1-2; cf. 6:35-36).	There was a famine in the land (2 Kgs 4:38)
Jesus tells the disciples, 'You give them something to eat' (Mk 6:37a).	Elisha tells his servant, 'Give it to the people and let them eat' (2 Kgs 4:42c).
The disciples respond with disbelief (Mk 6:37b; 8:4).	The servant responds with disbelief (2 Kgs 4:43a).
Jesus persists despite the disbelief (6:38; 8:5).	Elisha persists despite the disbelief (2 Kgs 4:43b).
A small amount of food (including loaves) is brought to Jesus (6:38; 8:5).	A small amount of food (including loaves) is brought to Elisha (2 Kgs 4:42b).
Jesus invokes heaven (Mk 6:41a; cf. 8:6b).	Elisha invokes the LORD (2 Kgs 4:43c).
The food is set before a large group of people (6:41b; 8:6-7)	The food is set before a large group of people (2 Kgs 4:44a).
A large number of people eat (6:42,44; 8:8a,9a).	A large number of people eat (2 Kgs 4:44b).
Some food is left over (6:43; 8:8b).	Some food is left over (2 Kgs 4:44c).

The number of those fed by each miracle differs considerably: from the ‘hundred men’ (LXX 2 Kgs 4:43a: ἑκατὸν ἀνδρῶν) of Elisha’s miracle to the ‘five thousand men’ (Mk 6:44: πεντακισχίλιοι ἄνδρες) and ‘about four thousand’ (8:9: ὡς τετρακισχίλιοι) of Jesus’ miracles. Some have interpreted the great disparity between the numbers of those fed as a sign of Jesus’ superiority to Elisha.⁵³⁶ But since the Gospel makes no mention of Elisha, this is unlikely to be the intention. It is noteworthy that the number of men fed by Elisha is inflated in later literature: the Gemara relates a lesson based on the story of a man who brought ‘a basket of small fish’ (גילדני דבי גילי) to R. Anan, which is compared to the gift of first fruits to Elisha, from which he is said to have fed 2,200 sages—a number arrived at by multiplying each barley loaf by a hundred, along with two meals of first fruits and corn (*b. Ket.* 105b-106a; cf. the distribution of the *omer* in Exod 16:16).⁵³⁷ In a more general sense, scripturalized narratives regularly inflate the numbers of their scriptural source: whilst only a few guards are burnt in Dan 3:22, *LAB* 6:17 has 83,500 burnt bystanders and *LAB* 38:4 has one thousand; whilst only Achan is uncovered in the lot of sin (Josh 7:16-26), Kenaz uncovers 6,110 sinners (*LAB* 25:4).

As with the four fishermen of Mk 1:16-20, the differences between the two feeding miracles of Jesus and 2 Kgs 4:42-44 primarily owe to the demands of the Markan narrative. The inclusion of the fish (Mk 6:38,41,43; 8:7) reflects the setting by the sea of Galilee: the first feeding takes place by the sea, as Jesus and the disciples arrive at the place by boat (6:32), and immediately after, the disciples leave across the sea to Bethsaida (6:45); whilst prior to the second feeding miracle, Jesus ‘went by way of Sidon towards the Sea of Galilee, in the region of Decapolis’ (7:31), and immediately after, he leaves with the disciples across the sea to Dalmanutha (8:10). These areas may be significant for the interpretation of the feeding miracles within the Gospel: as commentators have noted, whilst the first miracle occurs ostensibly in a Jewish region, the second occurs in the predominantly Gentile region of the Decapolis. This distinction may lie behind Jesus’ cryptic comment to the disciples concerning the

⁵³⁶ See Strauss, *Das Leben Jesu*, 2.234; Pesch, *Das Markusevangelium*, 1.354-355; Roth, *Hebrew Gospel*, 37; Aus, *Feeding the Five Thousand*, 148; M. Eugene Boring, *Mark A Commentary* (NTL; Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2006) 185; Robert H. Stein, *Mark* (BECNT; Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2008) 317-318.

⁵³⁷ Noted in Aus, *Feeding the Five Thousand*, 147. Compare with *S. Eli. Zut.* 173 (Braude and Kapstein, 412).

number of baskets of broken pieces: twelve for the five thousand and seven for the four thousand (Mk 8:17-21).⁵³⁸ If the ‘twelve’ is intended as a symbol for the Jews, and the ‘seven’ for the gentiles—though the latter is harder to prove⁵³⁹—the two episodes may be intended to show the mission of Jesus and the disciples extends, not just to the Jews, but to the gentiles as well.⁵⁴⁰ As with other scripturalized narratives, the narrative setting of Mk 6:35-44 and 8:1-9 takes precedence over the scriptural model. In this way, the distinctive elements of the episodes—the circumstances leading to the miracles (6:35-37; 8:1-3), the geographical setting (6:35; 8:4), the inclusion of fish (6:38,41; 8:7) and even the number of baskets (6:43; 8:8)—each reflect their respective Markan contexts.

Other differences owe to the influence of scriptural material beyond 2 Kgs 4:42-44.⁵⁴¹ Jesus’ statement concerning the crowds in Mk 6:34b that they are ‘like sheep without a shepherd’ (ὡς πρόβατα μὴ ἔχοντα ποιμένα) clearly reflects the words of Moses in Num 27:17b: ‘like sheep without a shepherd’ (כצאן אשר אין להם רעה).⁵⁴² And this may not be the only allusion to Moses in the episode. The detail that the crowds were organized into ‘groups of hundreds and of fifties’ (Mk 6:40: πρασιαὶ κατὰ ἑκατὸν καὶ κατὰ πενήκοντα; cf. Lk 9:14c) may reflect the groups of ‘thousands, hundreds, fifties and tens’ in the wilderness (Exod 18:21,25; Deut 1:15), which served as the model for similar groups of ‘thousands, hundreds, fifties and tens’ (1 Macc 3:55; 1QS 2:21-22; CD 13:1-2; 1QM 4:1-4; 4QM^a 1-3:10; 1QSa 1:29-2:1; cf. ‘thousands

⁵³⁸ So Guelich, *Mark 1-8:26*, 405; Gundry, *Mark*, 396-397; Ben Witherington III, *The Gospel of Mark: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2001) 235-236; especially Kelly R. Iverson, *Gentiles in the Gospel of Mark: ‘Even the Dogs Under the Table Eat the Children’s Crumbs’* (LNTS 339; London: T&T Clark, 2007) 67-74.

⁵³⁹ The seven ‘Hellenists’ of Acts 6:3 are often cited here, but the significance of the number is doubtful (cf. Acts 19:14; Jn 21:2). The number is associated with Gentiles in later Jewish literature: seven reflects the number of Noachide commandments (*b. Avod. Zar.* 22a), the seven Canaanite nations (who represent ‘all nations’ in *b. Yev.* 23a; cf. *b. Avod. Zar.* 36b) and in *Midr. Tanh. B Tzav* 1:1 it reads that Balaam, ‘an advocate for the nations of the world’, offered seven altars to God in contrast to the twelve cakes of Israel.

⁵⁴⁰ As the Lukan Jesus notes, the miracles of Elisha (and Elijah) also extended to gentiles (Lk 4:27), see Jeffrey S. Siker, ‘“First to the Gentiles”: A Literary Analysis of Luke 4:16-30’, *JBL* 111 (1992): 73-90.

⁵⁴¹ The reference to ‘the green grass’ (τῷ γλωρῷ χόρτῳ) may contain an allusion to Ps 23:2, so Allison, ‘Psalm 23 (22) in Early Christianity: A Suggestion’, *IBS* 5 (1983): 132-137 (134). Attempts to see Isa 40 or Ezek 34 in the narrative fail to convince, *pace* Paul Owen, ‘Jesus as God’s Chief Agent in Mark’s Christology’ in *Mark, Manuscripts, and Monotheism: Essays in Honor of Larry W. Hurtado* (ed. Dieter Roth and Chris Keith; LNTS 528; London: Bloomsbury, 2016) 40-58 (54-56).

⁵⁴² See the similar use of Num 27:17b in Jdt 11:19, where it refers to Holofernes’ siege of Judah.

and hundreds' in 11QT^a 42:15; 'hundreds and fifties' in 4QPsJoshua^a Frag. 3 2:6-7).⁵⁴³ As commentators have noted, other details may connect Jesus' two feeding miracles with the feeding of *manna* in the wilderness (Exod 16:4-36; Num 11:6-9; cf. Num 11:31-35):⁵⁴⁴ the Israelites are fed 'in the wilderness' (LXX Exod 16:32: ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ) as Jesus' miracles occur in the 'wilderness' (Mk 6:31-32,35: ἔρημον τόπον; 8:4b: ἐρημίας); the *manna* is identified as 'bread' (ἄρτος) in LXX Exod 16:4-36 (also LXX Deut 8:3; LXX Pss 77:24; 104:40; LXX Neh 9:15) as Jesus multiplies 'bread' (ἄρτος);⁵⁴⁵ the meat or the *manna* was sent in the evening (Num 11:9; cf. *manna* in the morning in Exod 16:8,12) as Jesus feeds at a 'late hour' (Mk 6:35: ἡδη ὥρα); the Israelites ate and were 'filled' (ἐμπίπλημι in LXX Pss 77:29; 104:40; LXX Neh 9:25; πίμπλημι in LXX Exod 16:12) as the crowds ate and were 'filled' (Mk 6:42; 8:8a: χορτάζω); and, as Allison notes, at least one tradition has the Israelites eating fish in the wilderness (*Sifre* to Num 95:1) as in Mk 6:38-43 and 8:7.⁵⁴⁶

Whether or not these details were intended to recall Israel in the wilderness, others apparently saw in the feeding of the five and four thousand allusions to Moses and Israel. Whilst the Matthean version does not include the clearest Mosaic parallels from Mk 6:30-44 (Num 27:17b; Exod 18:21,25?), it includes the number of men with the addendum, 'besides women and children' (Mt 14:21b; 15:38b), which may reflect Exod 12:37: 'six hundred thousand men on foot, *besides children*' (לְבָרִים מֵאָה וְשֵׁשׁ).⁵⁴⁷ Even more so, the Johannine feeding of the five thousand associates the episode directly with the experience of Israel in the wilderness. Here, the feeding miracle serves as the introduction to the 'bread of life' discourse, where the crowd tells Jesus, 'Our ancestors ate the manna in the wilderness; as it is written, "He gave them bread from heaven to eat"' (Jn 6:31: οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν τὸ μάννα ἔφαγον ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, καθὼς ἐστὶν γεγραμμένον· ἄρτον ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς φαγεῖν; alluding to LXX Ps 77:24;

⁵⁴³ Noted in Allison, *The New Moses*, 239. Aus' solution is too clever: 2 Kgs 4:1 has been read in light of 1 Kgs 18:4,13, 'hundred prophets . . . fifty to a cave' (*Feeding the Five Thousand*, 44).

⁵⁴⁴ See Larry W. Hurtado, *Mark* (NIBC; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1989) 100-102; William Richard Stegner, *Narrative Theology in Early Christianity* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1989) 53-81; Witherington, *The Gospel of Mark*, 217; cf. Marcus, *Mark: 1-8*, 407 (cf. 419-421).

⁵⁴⁵ Allison suggests that the similar feeding miracles of Exod 16 and Num 11 'would not have been recognized by our spiritual forebears as doublets' (*The New Moses*, 239). To the contrary, the two episodes appear to be conflated in LXX Ps 104:40, where the quails bring 'bread of heaven' (ἄρτον οὐρανοῦ).

⁵⁴⁶ Allison, *The New Moses*, 239.

⁵⁴⁷ Cf. *Midr. Tanh.* B Bo 9:1: '[besides] little ones and women' (קטנים ונשים).

cf. Wis 16:20). Jesus goes on to compare the ‘bread of life’ which prevents death to the *manna*: ‘Your ancestors ate the manna in the wilderness, and they died’ (Jn 6:49: οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν ἔφαγον ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ τὸ μάννα καὶ ἀπέθανον; cf. 6:32). At the same time, the Johannine feeding of the five thousand also strengthens the association with the miracle of Elisha, by including details not found in Mk 6:35-44 and 8:1-9.⁵⁴⁸ The bread is described as ‘barley loaves’ (Jn 6:9a; 13b: ἄρτους κριθίνους) as the man from Baal-shalishah brings ‘barley loaves’ (LXX 2 Kgs 4:42: ἄρτους κριθίνους). Likewise, a ‘boy’ (παιδάριον) supplies the food in Jn 6:9 as Gehazi, ‘the boy’ (LXX 2 Kgs 4:41: τὸ παιδάριον), distributes the food in 2 Kgs 4:43. It is possible John was led to further scripturalize the episode under the influence of Mk 6:35-44.⁵⁴⁹ In any case, the Johannine version shows that the feeding of the five thousand tradition was associated with 2 Kgs 4:42-44 at an early stage.

Returning to Mark, the feeding miracles of 6:35-44 and 8:1-9 also share with 2 Kgs 4:42-44 themes of scarcity and abundance common in antiquity.⁵⁵⁰ Barley bread, the food of 2 Kgs 4:42-44, was often seen as a sign of scarcity or poverty (Jos., *Ant.* 5.220; *War* 5.427; *t. Ber.* 4:11; *Sifre* to Num 89:1; *b. Ber.* 39b; *b. Erub.* 81a; *b. Avod. Zar.* 39b). This is perhaps best illustrated by the rabbinic comparison of the wealthy R. Hisda with the poor Babba Rabba: ‘At Rabbah’s house all they had was barley bread for human beings, and even that they didn’t have’ (*b. Moed Kat.* 28a). The mention of ‘baskets’ (κόφινος) in Mk 6:43 and 8:8 likewise reflects notions of abundance, as having bread in one’s basket was seen as a sign of satiety: ‘For one who has “bread in his basket” is not so hungry as one who does not have bread in his basket’ (*m. Yom.* 6:5). The saying also forms the basis of a *baraita* of R. Eliezer the Great which parallels some synoptic material: ‘Whoever has a piece of bread in his wallet [or basket] and says, “What shall I eat tomorrow” is only one of those of little faith’ (*b. Sot.* 48b; cf. Mt 6:25-31; 16:8 and *par.*).

⁵⁴⁸ As noted in Heising, ‘Exegese und Theologie der Alt- und Neutestamentlichen Speisewunder’, *ZKT* 86 (1964): 80-96 (91-92).

⁵⁴⁹ Aus is alone in seeing multiple allusions to 1 Sam 9-10 in Jn 6:1-15 (*Feeding the Five Thousand*, 47-67).

⁵⁵⁰ See the discussion in Richard. I Pervo, ‘Panta Kiona: The Feeding Stories in the Light of Economic Data and Social Practice’ in *Religious Propaganda and Missionary Competition in the New Testament World* (ed. Lukas Bormann; Leiden: Brill, 1994) 163-194.

It is perhaps no surprise that these themes of scarcity and abundance resurface in other texts which take 2 Kgs 4:42-44 as their model.⁵⁵¹ Rabbinic commentators associated the miracle of Elisha with the distribution of the *omer* (עומר/עמר) in Exod 16:18, and the *omer* of the first fruits in Lev 2:14 and 23:9-14 (*t. Sanh.* 2:9; *b. Keth.* 105b; *S. Eli. Zut.* 2).⁵⁵² Both 2 Kgs 4:42-44 and Exod 16:18 appear to be in view in a miracle during the high priesthood of Shimon HaTzaddik, where a blessing was sent upon the two loaves and shewbread of the *omer*, so that ‘some of [the priests] ate and were sated, while others ate and left bread over’ (*b. Yom.* 39a).⁵⁵³ Christian literature, on the other hand, combined the miracles of Elisha and Jesus. For example, Gregory (*Dial.* 2.21) writes that ‘during a time of famine’ (cf. 2 Kgs 4:38), Benedict’s monastery had nearly run out of bread, so that ‘only fives loaves could be found to set before the community’ (cf. Mk 6:38,41 and *par.*). But Benedict announces to the dejected monks, ‘Tomorrow you will have more than you need’ (cf. 2 Kgs 4:43)—and the next day, two hundred measures of flour appeared at the gates of the monastery. Gregory relates a similar story (*Dial.* 3.37) concerning Lawrence, that ‘because of the famine there was no bread’ (cf. 2 Kgs 4:38), until Lawrence discovers a miraculous loaf of bread with which he feeds a large number of men. Afterwards, ‘when they had all taken their fill, the fragments were gathered up [and] they amounted to more than the original loaf’ (cf. Mk 6:43; 8:8 and *par.*). Lawrence continued feeding the men this way for ten days, so that ‘each meal thus seemed to be a multiplication of bread’. Palladius also narrates that when the monk Elias had run out of bread, he discovered three loaves, with which he was able to feed twenty men ‘to satiety’ and have one loaf left over (*Hist. Laus.* 51).⁵⁵⁴

⁵⁵¹ Whilst it is not modelled on 2 Kgs 4:42-44, the multiplication of loaves in the oven of the wife of R. Hanina ben Dosa occurs despite the fact that there was no bread in her house (*b. Taan.* 25a).

⁵⁵² See Aus, *Feeding the Five Thousand*, 6-9; Michael A. Daise, *Feasts in John: Jewish Festivals and Jesus’ ‘Hour’ in the Fourth Gospel* (WUNT 2/229; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007) 105-112.

⁵⁵³ A similar episode appears in the *Acts of John*, where the Pharisees invite Jesus and the disciples to a banquet (cf. Lk 7:36) and set a loaf before each of them, ‘and [Jesus] would bless his own and divide it amongst us; and from that little piece each of us was filled, and our own loaves were saved intact, so that those who invited him were amazed’ (*Acts John* 93 [ANT 318]).

⁵⁵⁴ W. K. Lowther Clarke, *The Lausiaca History of Palladius* (London: SPCK, 1918) 160. Likewise, in *Hist. mon.* 8.46 (Normal Russell, *Lives of the Desert Fathers* [CSS 34; Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications, 1980] 77), the monk Apollo miraculously multiplies bread to feed hungry men.

Whereas Elijah served as the model for Jesus' forty-day sojourn in the wilderness and his call of the disciples, it is the figure of Elisha who appears to lie behind the feeding miracles of Mk 6:35-44 and 8:1-9. Of the two feeding miracles, the influence of 2 Kgs 4:42-44 is more prominent in the first (Mk 6:35-44) rather than the derivative second miracle (8:1-9).⁵⁵⁵ Whilst many of Jesus' miracles elsewhere resemble those of Elisha—the raising of children, the healing of lepers—Elisha does not appear to be a significant figure for Mark (cf. Elijah in 1:6; 6:15; 8:28; 9:4-5,11-13; 15:35-36).⁵⁵⁶ There is little reason to think Mark portrays Jesus as Elisha to John's Elijah: Jesus is also modelled on Elijah (1:12-13,16-20) and Elijah is not always identified with John (9:2-8; cf. 9:13). It is not clear what prompted the author to select 2 Kgs 4:42-44 as the model for the feeding miracles of Jesus. The multiplication of food was a common feature of miracle-working traditions in antiquity and, at least in Jewish tradition, none was better known than the multiplication of loaves by Elisha.⁵⁵⁷ In this sense, the author may have been led to the well-known miracle in 2 Kgs 4:42-44 by the reputation of Jesus as a miracle-worker. At the same time, Mark shows a fondness for drawing on the Elijah-Elisha cycle (Mk 1:6; cf. LXX 2 Kgs 1:8; Mk 1:12-13,16-20; cf. 1 Kgs 19:4-8,19-21), which itself features similar conflict-oriented miracle stories narrated in an episodic style. But whilst some commentators have seen the influence of the Elijah-Elisha cycle elsewhere in Mark, in none of the proposed episodes does one find verbal and structural parallels comparable to the description of John's attire, Jesus' forty-day sojourn in the wilderness and call of the disciples and the two feeding miracles.⁵⁵⁸ Indeed, one episode often thought to contain allusions to

⁵⁵⁵ Pace Angelika Seethaler, 'Die Brotvermehrung – Ein Kirchenspiegel?', *BZ* 34 (1990): 108-112 (108-109).

⁵⁵⁶ On the similarities between the miracles of Jesus and Elisha, see Raymond E. Brown, 'Jesus and Elisha', *Perspective* 12 (1971): 85-104. Lorne R. Zelyck has recently argued that the fragmentary (and early) *Egerton Gospel* contains an episode in which Jesus performs a miracle by the Jordan modelled on Elisha's purification of water in 2 Kgs 2:19-22 (the parallel is even closer to Jos., *War* 4.460-464), 'Elisha Typology in Jesus' Miracle on the Jordan River (Papyrus Egerton 2,2v.6-14)', *NTS* 62 (2015): 1-8.

⁵⁵⁷ See the many parallels outside of Jewish and Christian tradition in Hendrick van der Loos, *The Miracles of Jesus* (Leiden: Brill, 1965) 625-627. For the significance of Mk 6:35-44 in a Hellenistic context, see Angela Standhartinger, "'And All Ate and Were Filled'" (Mark 6.42 par.): The Feeding Narratives in the Context of Hellenistic-Roman Banquet Culture' in *Decisive Meals: Dining Politics in Biblical Literature* (ed. Nathan MacDonald, Luzia Sutter Rehman and Kathy Ehrensperger; LNTS 449; London: T&T Clark, 2012) 62-82.

⁵⁵⁸ See the proposed parallels in Roth, *Hebrew Gospel*, 5-9 and *passim*; Brodie, *The Crucial Bridge*, 86-95; Winn, *Mark and the Elijah-Elisha Narrative*, 72-112.

Elijah's conflict with Ahab and Jezebel bears a much greater resemblance to the Greek text of Esther: the execution of John the Baptist (Mk 6:17-29).⁵⁵⁹

Antipas and Ahasuerus: Mk 6:21-28 and Est 2-7

When the daughter of Herodias dances and pleases Herod Antipas and those banqueting with him, he tells her, 'Ask me for whatever you wish, and I will give it' (αἰτησόν με ὃ ἐὰν θέλῃς, καὶ δώσω σοι). He then solemnly swears, 'Whatever you ask me, I will give you, even half of my kingdom' (ὅ τι ἐὰν με αἰτήσῃς δώσω σοι ἕως ἡμίσουσ τῆς βασιλείας μου). Commentators have long noted that Antipas' question appears to be borrowed from another episode in Jewish literature where a young girl pleases a king—though the passage is often omitted from studies on the Jewish scriptures in the Gospel. The Persian king Ahasuerus repeatedly asks Esther, 'What is it, Queen Esther? What is your request? It shall be given you, even to the half of my kingdom' (MT Est 5:3: *ךָּ מֵהַלְּךְ אֶסְתֵּר וּמֵהַבְּקִשְׁתֶּךָ עַד־חֲצִי הַמַּלְכוּת וַיִּנְתֵּן לָהּ*; LXX: τί θέλεις, Εσθηρ, καὶ τί σοῦ ἐστὶν τὸ ἀξίωμα; ἕως τοῦ ἡμίσουσ τῆς βασιλείας μου καὶ ἔσται σοι; also MT and LXX Est 5:6; 7:2; cf. 9:12).

Beyond noting the similarity with the MT and LXX, commentators have rarely dwelt on the role of Esther in the episode of John's execution.⁵⁶⁰ Some have even been

⁵⁵⁹ Elijah has a contentious relationship with King Ahab and his wife, Jezebel, who wants (θέλω) to kill him; John also has a contentious relationship with 'king' Antipas and his wife, Herodias, who wants (θέλω) to kill him. Since John is identified as Elijah elsewhere (1:6; 9:13), so the argument goes, John's altercation with Antipas and Herodias must be modelled on 1 Kgs 18-21. There are, of course, considerable differences: Herodias is successful in her bid to kill John, whereas Jezebel is spectacularly unsuccessful (Elijah never dies). But, as the earlier examples show, writers were capable of straying from their scriptural models when it suited them. Scholars are probably right to see shades of Ahab and Jezebel in Antipas and Herodias, as John plays the role of Elijah, though this can be overstated: e.g. David M. Hoffeditz and Gary E. Yates, 'Femme Fatale Redux: Intertextual Connection to the Elijah/Jezebel Narratives in Mark 6:14-29', *BBR* 15 (2005): 199-221; Regina Janes, 'Why the Daughter of Herodias Must Dance (Mark 6.14-29)', *JSNT* 28 (2006): 443-467. And yet, except for Herodias' 'wish' (θέλω) to kill John, the influence of 1 Kgs on the narrative is not as pervasive as that of Esther. There is, however, an overlooked parallel in *1 Enoch* which describes a prophetic sheep who 'escaped alive, and fled away' (cf. 1 Kgs 18:3-8) before God 'caused him to ascend' (*1 En.* 89:52; cf. 2 Kgs 2:11). This Eljijanic prophetic sheep 'cried aloud to the sheep, and they wanted to kill him' (*1 En.* 89:52)—compare with the description of Herodias, who 'wanted to kill him' (ἤθελεν αὐτὸν ἀποκτείνειν), that is, John.

⁵⁶⁰ The Esther parallel is omitted from studies devoted to the use of the Jewish scriptures in the Gospel (Suhl, Marcus, Watts, Hays) and some commentaries (Goguel, Hurtado, Trocmé). See the brief comments in H. B. Swete, *The Gospel According to St Mark* (London: Macmillan, 1905) 119; Cranfield, *The Gospel According to St. Mark*, 212; Vincent Taylor, *The Gospel According to St. Mark* (2nd ed.; London: Macmillan, 1966) 315; Schweizer, *Das Evangelium nach Markus*, 75; Pesch, *Das*

skeptical of the relationship between Antipas' question and Esther in the first place, insisting that the oath of 'up to half' was proverbial in antiquity.⁵⁶¹ The oath does bear some resemblance to LXX 1 Kgs 13:8, where the man of God promises Jeroboam, 'If you give me half your house, I will not go in with you' (ἐάν μοι δῶς τὸ ἥμισυ τοῦ οἴκου σου, οὐκ εἰσελεύσομαι μετὰ σοῦ). One also finds similar language in the promise of Achilles to Phoenix, son of Amyntor, 'Be thou king even as I am, and share the half of my honour' (Hom., *Il.* 9.616: ἴσον ἐμοὶ βασίλευε καὶ ἥμισυ μείρεο τιμῆς).⁵⁶² Then again, the wording of Mk 6:23 provides one of the closest (though often overlooked) instances of verbal correspondence between the Gospel of Mark and the LXX. A closer look at the passage, however, reveals a much greater resemblance to another Greek text of Esther: the so-called Alpha-text.⁵⁶³

Here, the verbal similarities between Mk 6:21-28 and Esther extend beyond the phrasing of Antipas' question to the narrative setting in which the question takes place. Both LXX Est and A 2:9 describe Esther as a 'young girl' (κοράσιον) who 'pleases' (ἤρεσεν)—as the 'young girl' (κοράσιον) dances and 'pleases' (ἤρεσεν) Antipas.⁵⁶⁴ But the similarities with the Alpha-text become most apparent when Mk

Markusevangelium, 1.339; Anderson, *The Gospel of Mark* (NCB; London: Oliphants, 1976) 169; Gnllka, *Das Evangelium nach Markus*, 1.250; Hooker, *The Gospel According to St Mark* 161; Guelich, *Mark 1-8:26*, 332; Marcus, *Mark: 1-8*, 401-402; Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel of Mark*, 202; Yarbrow Collins, *Mark*, 309-310. See the more detailed comments in Eugene, LaVerdiere, *The Beginning of the Gospel: Introducing the Gospel According to Mark, Volume 1* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1999) 164-168; James G. Crossley, 'History from the Margins: The Death of John the Baptist' in *Writing History, Constructing Religion* (ed. Crossley and Christian Karner; Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005) 147-161; *Jesus and the Chaos of History: Redirecting the Life of the Historical Jesus* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015) 149-156. The only study entirely devoted to the literary relationship between Esther and Mk 6:17-29 is Aus, *Water into Wine and the Beheading of John the Baptist* (BJS 150; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1988) 39-74.

⁵⁶¹ Harold W. Hoehner, *Herod Antipas: A Contemporary of Jesus Christ* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1980) 151; Neil R. Parker, *The Marcan Portrayal of the "Jewish" Unbeliever: A Function of the Marcan References to Jewish Scripture* (Studies in Biblical Literature 79; New York, NY: Lang, 2008) 15; Focant likewise emphasizes the differences, *The Gospel According to Mark*, 247, 251.

⁵⁶² To this can be added the promise of Zacchaeus, 'Look, half of my possessions, Lord, I will give to the poor' (Lk 19:8: ἰδοὺ τὰ ἡμίσιά μου τῶν ὑπαρχόντων, κύριε, τοῖς πτωχοῖς δίδωμι). A similar promise also occurs in PRE 50:6 whilst narrating Est 3:1-11, where Haman asks Ahasuerus, 'If it please the king, accept half of my wealth and give me power over [the Jews]' (מממוני ותן לי רשות עליהם) (אם על המלך טוב קח החצי).

⁵⁶³ As given in Hanhart, *Esther* (Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Letterarum Goettingensis editum 8/3; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966); on the relationship of Esther A to the LXX and MT, see Karen H. Jobes, *The Alpha-Text of Esther: Its Character and Relationship to the Masoretic Text* (SBLDS 153; Atlanta, GA: Scholars, 1996).

⁵⁶⁴ The language is uncommon for Mark: the episode has two of the four instances of κοράσιον (cf. 5:41-42), one of two instances of δειπνον (cf. 12:39), and the only instance of the relatively common

6:21-28 is compared with the scene in which Haman is executed (Est A 7:1-12; cf. MT Est 7:1-10): at a ‘banquet’ (συνπόσιον; cf. Est A 5:5: δεῖπνον), Ahasuerus ‘vows’ (ὄμοσεν) to Esther with an ‘oath’ (ὄρκος), promising ‘up to half of my kingdom’ (ἕως [τοῦ] ἡμίσεως τῆς βασιλείας μου).⁵⁶⁵ In response, Esther asks the king to spare her life and the lives of her people (7:3-4), before singling out Haman as the man who had been conspiring against the Jews (7:5-6). Haman is then hanged at the orders of the king (7:9-10). Likewise, it is at a ‘banquet’ (δεῖπνον) where Antipas ‘vows’ (ὄμοσεν) with ‘oaths’ (ὄρκοι) to the daughter of Herodias, ‘even half of my kingdom’ (ἕως ἡμίσεως τῆς βασιλείας μου). Under the influence of Herodias, the girl responds by asking for the head of John the Baptist (6:24-25). The king then orders John to be beheaded (6:27-28). Most significantly, there is verbatim agreement between the Alpha-text and the Markan episode in the promise of ‘even half of my kingdom’ (Est A 5:3,6 [7:2]: ἕως ἡμίσεως τῆς βασιλείας μου; Mk 6:23: ἕως ἡμίσεως τῆς βασιλείας μου), with both omitting the genitive article found in LXX Est 5:3, 7:2 (ἕως τοῦ ἡμίσεως τῆς βασιλείας μου). Given these extensive formal and verbal similarities, it appears that the author of Mk 6:21-2 drew upon the execution of Haman in Est 7:1-10, as well as details elsewhere in Esther (2:9; 5:3,6), using a text resembling the Alpha-text. The author thereby composed a banquet scene in which a king offers half of his kingdom to a young girl who instead requests the death of one man.

But the similarities between Mk 6:21-28 and Esther go further than the Greek Alpha-text. As Roger Aus has meticulously detailed, the Markan episode not only parallels the so-called canonical text(s) of Esther, but also traditional expansions of the Esther narrative.⁵⁶⁶ Of these, the most significant are the later rabbinic commentaries of the Talmudic tractate *Megillah*, the *Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer*, the two Esther targumim and the *Esther Rabbah*.⁵⁶⁷ As the daughter of Herodias dances at Herod’s banquet (Mk

verb ἀρέσχω and the likewise common nouns ἡμισος and ὄρκος. See Lohmeyer on the distinctive vocabulary, *Markus*, 117-118.

⁵⁶⁵ Δεῖπνον also appears in the ‘Old Greek’ of Est 7:9 in mss. *b* 108.

⁵⁶⁶ See Aus, *Water into Wine*, 39-74.

⁵⁶⁷ The medieval commentaries marshalled by Aus (*Abba Gorion*, *Yalkut Shimoni* and the later compilation of *Aggadot Esther*) are too late to be of value. However, over a century ago Jacob Reiss raised the possibility that the Esther targumim depend on the lost Targum Rabbati, which itself depends on the lost Midrash Rabbati (‘Das Targum Scheni zu dem Buche Esther’, *MGWJ* 25 [1876]: 398-406). One similarly wonders whether the extensive shared features of the medieval commentaries owe to an earlier lost midrashic collection(s). See the survey in Myron B. Lerner, ‘The Works of Aggadic Midrash and the Esther Midrashim’ in *The Literature of the Sages: Second Part* (ed. Shmuel

6:21), so dancing is associated with the banquets of Ahasuerus: *PRE* 49:12 notes that it was customary for the harem to be brought in ‘naked, playing and dancing’ (ומרדות ערוה משחקות), but when Queen Vashti refused to do so, she was ‘slain’ (שתשחט). A similar association of dancing and the death of Vashti is found in *b. Meg.* 11b, ‘Along came Satan and danced between them and killed Vashti’ (שטן וריקד ביניהן והרג את ושתי) (בא). Alternatively, in *Tg. Est.* II on 2:8, it says that Esther would not ‘dance’ (מרקדן) like the gentile girls of the harem.⁵⁶⁸ Whilst dancing women may be found in other royal banquet scenes (i.e. *Jos., Ant.* 12.187-189), there is another shared detail that seems less likely to be a matter of co-incidence: *Tg. Est.* I on 1:19 and 1:21 relates that Vashti was beheaded on the recommendation of Memucan, who said, ‘Let the king decree her head be cut off’ (ית מימר מלכא אהשורוש דגזר).⁵⁶⁹ Similarly, whilst *PRE* 49:12 only mentions that Vashti was ‘slain’ (שתשחט), the verb שחט can carry the meaning of throat-cutting or beheading.⁵⁷⁰ However, the most uncanny parallel is found in *Est. Rab.* 4:9, where Memucan advises the king, ‘I shall put her head on a platter’ (בדיסקוס) (ואני מכניס את ראשה). The deed is done in *Est. Rab.* 4:11, as it reads, ‘He made the decree, and he brought in her head on a platter’ (גזר והכניס ראשה בדיסקוס).⁵⁷¹ This, of course, recalls the gruesome scene in the Markan episode where the young girl asks for ‘the head of John the Baptist on a platter’ (Mk 6:25b: ἐπὶ πίνακι τὴν κεφαλὴν Ἰωάννου τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ). Following this, ‘immediately the king sent a soldier of the guard with orders to bring John’s head. He went and beheaded him in the prison, brought his head on a platter and gave it to the girl’ (6:27-28a).⁵⁷²

The *Rabbah*, which bears no other signs of Christian influence, is unlikely to have gleaned this detail from the Gospel of Mark, whilst the fact that the ‘head on a platter’ appears in both texts alongside or as part of Esther material suggests something

Safrai, Zeev Safrai, Peter J. Tomson and Joshua Schwartz; CRINT 2.3; Assen: Royal Van Gorcum, 2006) 133-229 (176-227).

⁵⁶⁸ As the daughter dances before ‘those reclining’ (Mk 6:22: συνανάκειμαι) so Ahasuerus’ harem dances before ‘those reclining’ in the seventh-century *Panim Aherot* B (Buber, 59), noted in Aus, *Water into Wine*, 51-52.

⁵⁶⁹ Compare also the perplexity of Antipas (Mk 6:20) with the ‘confusion’ of Ahasuerus (*Tg. Est.* I on 1:10), noted in Aus, *Water into Wine*, 42-44.

⁵⁷⁰ Jastrow, s.v. שחט.

⁵⁷¹ Aus notes that the Hebrew דיסקוס in *Est. Rab.* is a loan-word from the Greek δίσκος—compare with the Latin *discus* (‘platter’) of Vg Mk 6:28 (*Water into Wine*, 63).

⁵⁷² Note also the unusual inclusion of ספקליטור (from the Latin *speculator*) in *Tg. Est.* II on 5:3, where the executioner brings Esther before the king—compare with Mk 6:27, where a σπεκουλάτωρ brings the head of John the Baptist on a platter (*speculator* in Vg Mk 6:27), so Aus, *Water into Wine*, 60-61.

more than serendipity.⁵⁷³ Far and away the most plausible explanation is that Mk 6:21-28 and *Est. Rab.* 4:9-11, though centuries apart, witness to a tradition as old as the first-century CE which included the grisly image of a ‘head on a platter’ in the retelling of the Esther narrative.⁵⁷⁴ Thus, in addition to modelling the episode on a Greek version of Esther resembling the Alpha-text, the author of Mk 6:21-28 appears to have incorporated this traditional elaboration of the Esther narrative into the new story.⁵⁷⁵ By including traditional material along with the scriptural model, Mk 6:21-28 resembles other scripturalized narratives: the episode of Abram in the fiery furnace in *LAB* 6, although clearly depending on Dan 3, reflects a tradition concerning Gen 15:7 paralleled in later rabbinic interpretation; the same applies to the identification of Phinehas with Elijah in *LAB* 48:1; whilst the *Testament of Abraham* appears to reflect the traditional comparison of Abraham and Job, as well as the legendary death of Moses. The parallels between Mk 6:21-28 and the Alpha-text of Esther and related traditions are laid out below.

⁵⁷³ Pace the influential comments in George W. Buchanan, ‘The Use of Rabbinic Literature for New Testament Research’, *BTB* 7 (1977): 110-122 (112). If the allusion-happy Christian commentators of late antiquity were unable to espy the Esther parallels in Mk 6:21-28 (*par.* Mt 14:6-11), one wonders how the author(s) of the *Rabbah* would have been able to do so.

⁵⁷⁴ That a first-century and sixth-century CE text might reflect a shared tradition is not without precedent: i.e. Mt 7:3-5, *b. Arak.* 16b and *b. Bat.* 15b appear to reflect a common saying concerning the ‘Mote and the Beam’.

⁵⁷⁵ This renders Aus’ theory of an Aramaic *vorlage* for Mk 6:17-29 unlikely (*Water into Wine*, 71). A text composed in Greek (i.e. Josephus’ *Antiquities*; cf. *Ant.* 20.263; *Ag. Ap.* 1.50) may independently attest traditions found in much later Hebrew and Aramaic literature, as recently argued in *Josephus and the Rabbis* [Hebrew] (ed. Tal Ilan and Vared Noam; 2 vols.; Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi, 2017).

Mk 6:21-28	Est A 7:1-10 (2:9; 5:3,6)
Antipas throws a ‘banquet’ (δεῖπνον) (Mk 6:21).	Esther throws a ‘banquet’ (δεῖπνον in Est A 5:5; LXX Est 7:9 b 108; cf. συμπόσιον in Est A 7:12[9]).
A ‘young girl’ (κοράσιον) dances and ‘pleases’ (ἤρεσεν) the king (Mk 6:22).	Esther is described as a ‘young girl’ (κοράσιον) who ‘pleases’ (ἤρεσεν) (LXX and Est A 2:9).
Antipas ‘vows’ (ᾠμοσεν) to the girl with ‘oaths’ (ὄρκους) (Mk 6:23,26).	Ahasuerus ‘vows’ (ᾠμοσεν) to Esther with an ‘oath’ (ὄρκου) (Est A 7:7).
Antipas tells the girl to ask for anything she wants, ‘up to half of my kingdom’ (ἕως ἡμίσεως τῆς βασιλείας μου) (Mk 6:23).	Ahasuerus tells Esther to ask for anything she wants, ‘up to half of my kingdom’ (ἕως ἡμίσεως τῆς βασιλείας μου) (Est A 5:3,6; cf. Est A 7:2; LXX 5:3,6; 7:2).
The girl asks instead for the head of John the Baptist (Mk 6:24-25).	Esther instead singles out Haman the Assyrian (Est 7:3-6).
Antipas orders the execution of John (Mk 6:27).	Ahasuerus orders the execution of Haman (Est 7:9-10).
John the Baptist’s head is brought in on a platter (Mk 6:25,28).	Queen Vashti’s head is brought in on a platter (<i>Est. Rab.</i> 4:9,11; cf. <i>Tg. Est.</i> I on 1:19,21).

It is not clear what prompted the scripturalization of John's death with material from Esther. The episode is, of course, riddled with historical problems. The text wrongly calls Antipas 'king' (Mk 6:14,22,25-27: βασιλεύς) instead of 'tetrarch' (cf. Mt 14:1: τετραάρχης) and names Herodias' first husband Philip (Mk 6:17) instead of Herod II (Jos., *Ant.* 18.109-110,136). The narrative itself also strains credulity, as Joan Taylor notes, 'Antipas did not, in fact, have a kingdom; he had a tetrarchy, and this was not really his to give away freely to his young stepdaughter'.⁵⁷⁶ But whilst on the death of John the more sober account of Josephus (*Ant.* 18.116-119) is to be preferred, it nevertheless shares several important details with Mk 6:17-29:⁵⁷⁷ Herod arresting John, Herod's fear concerning John, an (albeit loose) association of Herod's marriage to Herodias with the death of John and, finally, John's execution at the orders of Herod. On other points, however, they do not agree: whilst in the Markan episode, John opposes Herod's marriage to Herodias, in Josephus, Herod fears the political threat posed by John. Although Josephus mentions Salome, the daughter of Herodias from her marriage to Herod II (*Ant.* 18.136), he makes no mention of the dancing daughter, the birthday banquet or the beheaded prophet. At the same time, Josephus names the site of John's execution as the Herodian palace at Machaerus in Peraea, whereas Mark seems to imagine a Galilean setting: 'Herod on his birthday gave a banquet for his courtiers and officers and for the leaders of Galilee' (Mk 6:21).⁵⁷⁸ Herod may well have ordered John's head to be brought from Peraea to Galilee, but the 'immediacy' (εὐθύς) of the order in Mk 6:27 implies that John's severed head was served to Herodias on a platter at the very same banquet. In the final analysis, the distinctive narrative details of the Markan episode have a legendary quality to them.

⁵⁷⁶ Taylor, *The Immerser*, 246-247. It could even be that Mark imagines Antipas as a 'king' with a 'kingdom' under the influence of Esther, so S. Anthony Cummins, 'Integrated Scripture, Embedded Empire: The Ironic Interplay of "King" Herod, John and Jesus in Mark 6.1-44' in *Biblical Interpretation in Early Christian Gospels: Volume 1: The Gospel of Mark* (ed. Hatina; SSEJC 16; London: T&T Clark, 2006) 31-48 (45).

⁵⁷⁷ On the comparative reliability of the account of Josephus, see Michael Tilly, *Johannes der Täufer und die Biographie der Propheten: Die synoptische Täuferüberlieferung und das jüdische Prophetenbild zur Zeit des Täufers* (BWANT 137; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1994) 57; and most recently, Marcus, *John the Baptist in History and Theology*, 99. For a complementary view of the two accounts, see Evans, 'Josephus on John the Baptist and Other Jewish Prophets of Deliverance' in *The Historical Jesus in Context* (ed. Amy-Jill Levine, Allison and Crossan; Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006) 55-63.

⁵⁷⁸ Cf. Hoehner, *Herod Antipas*, 148, speculates that a Galilean 'deputation' may have been sent to Peraea.

Because of this, some have speculated that the story in Mk 6:17-29 originated with some of the Baptist's followers.⁵⁷⁹ But the episode also bears strong signs of Christian influence—with the placing of John in a tomb in v. 29 acting as an *inclusio* to the claim that Jesus was John raised from the dead (6:14-16), whilst in the same breath prefiguring the empty tomb of Jesus (16:4-6).⁵⁸⁰ The Esther material in the episode, therefore, could very well be the result of Markan compositional or editorial activity, rather than simply a feature of a hypothetical pre-Markan source. In any case, one may venture some possible reasons that Mark or his source may have had for infusing the narrative of John's death with material from Esther. Whilst the function of the Esther material in Mk 6:21-28 is certainly not typological—in which case, it would make John the Baptist into Haman the Assyrian, which hardly seems plausible—it could serve an ironic function. Mark, ever the ironist, flips the logic of the Esther narrative on its head: whereas in Esther the righteous are vindicated by executing the wicked at a banquet, in Mark, it is the wicked who are vindicated by executing the righteous at a banquet.⁵⁸¹ Alternatively, it could serve as a polemic against the Herodian dynasty. By modelling Antipas' court after the orgiastic banqueting of the court of the gentile king Ahasuerus, the episode may invoke the Esther material as an invective against the Idumean Herodian dynasty, whose Jewish identity had always been suspect.⁵⁸² Then again, it is equally possible that the author never intended readers to pick up on the Esther parallels in the first place. It is noteworthy that Matthew, one of Mark's closest readers, excises Antipas' promise of 'even half of my kingdom' from his version of the episode (Mt 14:1-12). Perhaps Mark or his source simply found in Esther a suitable model for a scene in a royal court. There is at least one other example in Jewish literature where an episode is modelled on the banquets of Ahasuerus.

⁵⁷⁹ Rudolf Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition* (trans. John Marsh; 2nd ed.; Oxford: Blackwell, 1968) 301; Pesch, *Das Markusevangelium*, 1.343; Lane, *The Gospel According to Mark*, 215; cf. Guelich, *Mark 1-8:26*, 326-327.

⁵⁸⁰ See S. J. Nortje, 'John the Baptist and the Resurrection Traditions in the Gospels', *Neot* 23 (1989): 349-358; Vette and Will Robinson, 'Was John the Baptist Raised from the Dead? The Origins of Mark 6:14-29', *BibAn* 9 (2019): 335-354 (343-348).

⁵⁸¹ Similarly Cummins, 'Integrated Scripture, Embedded Empire', 44-47.

⁵⁸² See Matthew Thiessen, *Contesting Conversion: Genealogy, Circumcision, and Identity in Ancient Judaism and Christianity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011) 87-110.

1 Esdras relates that king Darius ‘gave a great banquet’ (1 Esdr 3:1a: ἐποίησεν δοχὴν μεγάλην) for his household and ‘for all the nobles of Media and Persia and for all the satraps and generals and district governors that were under him in the hundred [and] twenty-seven satrapies from India to Ethiopia’ (3:1c-2: πᾶσιν τοῖς μεγιστᾶσιν τῆς Μηδίας καὶ τῆς Περσίδος καὶ πᾶσιν τοῖς σατράπαις καὶ στρατηγοῖς καὶ τοπάρχαις τοῖς ὑπ’ αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰνδικῆς μέχρι τῆς Αἰθιοπίας ἐν ταῖς ἑκατὸν εἴκοσι ἑπτὰ σατραπείαις). This appears to be borrowed from the description of Ahasuerus in Est 1:1-3, where the king ‘gave a banquet’ (1:3b: הָשֵׁעַ מִשָּׂעָה; cf. LXX: δοχὴν ἐποίησεν) ‘for all his officials and ministers’ (לְכָל־שָׂרֵי וְעַבְדָּיו), along with the ‘army of Persia and Media and the nobles and governors of the provinces’ (פָּרַס וּמְדֵי הַפְּרָתִים וְשָׂרֵי הַמְּדִינֹת) לְיָהּ; cf. LXX: καὶ τοῖς Περσῶν καὶ Μήδων ἐνδόξοις καὶ τοῖς ἄρχουσιν τῶν σατραπῶν), which are described in v. 1 as ‘one hundred twenty-seven provinces from India to Ethiopia’ (מֵהַדוּר וְעַד־כּוּשׁ שֶׁבַע וְעֶשְׂרִים וּמֵאָה מְדִינָה). Following the banquet, Darius calls ‘all the nobles of Persia and Media and the satraps and generals and governors and prefects’ to hear the three bodyguards debate ‘what one thing is strongest’ (1 Esdr 3:14-17; cf. 3:5).⁵⁸³ The first argues that wine is the strongest (3:17b-24) and the second for the king (4:1-12), whereas the third, Zerubbabel the Jew, argues that women are stronger than wine and the king (4:13-32), but truth is ‘strongest of all’ (4:33-41). As Zerubbabel emerges as the undisputed victor of the symposium, Darius says to him, ‘Ask what you wish, even beyond what is written, and we will give it to you’ (1 Esdr 4:42: αἰτησαι ὃ θέλεις πλείω τῶν γεγραμμένων, καὶ δώσομέν σοι). These words of Darius again recall Ahasuerus’s question to Esther, ‘What is your wish, it shall be given you. And what is your request? Even to the half of my kingdom, it shall be fulfilled’ (Est 5:6; 7:2; cf. 5:3; 9:12).⁵⁸⁴ In some respects the wording of 1 Esdr 4:42 is even closer to Antipas’ first question to the girl, ‘Ask me for whatever you wish, and I will give it’ (Mk 6:22c: αἰτησόν με ὃ ἐὰν θέλῃς, καὶ δώσω σοι; cf. LXX Est O 5:3; Est A 5:6). In any case, the author of 1 Esdras 3-4 appears to have found in Esther suitable material on which to model an episode in the royal court of the Median king

⁵⁸³ Cf. the similar debate among three rulers before Ahasuerus in LXX Est 1:15 (expanded in later literature).

⁵⁸⁴ The wording in 1 Esdr 4:42 is in some respects closer to LXX Est 5:3: τί θέλεις, Εσθηρ, καὶ τί σοῦ ἐστὶν τὸ ἀξίωμα; ἕως τοῦ ἡμίσου τῆς βασιλείας μου καὶ ἔσται σοι; Est A 5:6: τί τὸ θέλημά σου; αἰτησαι ἕως ἡμίσου τῆς βασιλείας μου, καὶ ἔσται σοι ὅσα ἀξιοῖς.

Darius of Jewish legend—a royal court which understandably resembles that of the Persian king Ahasuerus (also of Jewish legend). On this point, the speech of Zerubbabel strikes a remarkably familiar tone: women are even stronger than kings, he argues, because they rule over them. In this, Darius is no exception, following the whims of Apame, his concubine (4:28-31). One wonders here if the author also had in mind another woman who ruled over a king: Queen Esther, the wife of Ahasuerus.

For the episode in Mk 6:21-28, it may simply have been the knowledge that John was executed in a palace by a mercurial ruler (Jos., *Ant.* 18.119) that led to the scripturalization of the Baptist's death with material from Esther. The author's decision to use Esther in this way does not, however, appear to be important for the interpretation of the passage. Indeed, it is the only time Esther features in the Gospel.⁵⁸⁵ Rather, the author of Mk 6:21-28 supplied some of the language from a Greek text of Esther as well as related traditions to the story of John's death. Whilst the scriptural source is significant for the interpretation of some scripturalized narratives—the Dan 3 material in *LAB* 6 reveals an interpretation of Gen 15:7; the use of Gen 13-15 in 1QapGen 11 shows that the Abrahamic promise originates with Noah; the Deuteronomic material in 1 Macc 5:45-51 shows Judas' obedience to the law—in other cases the scriptural source contributes little to the meaning of the narrative. The pseudo-historical figure of Judith is fashioned in part out of the scriptural Jael (Judg 4-5; and *vice versa* in *LAB* 31), but there is no sign the author intended or expected readers to pick up on it. The transferal of narrative details about Job to the figure of Abraham in the A recension of the *Testament of Abraham* appears to arise from little more than a comparison of the two figures. The use of Gideon and the rout of the Midianites with the three-hundred (Judg 7) as the model for Kenaz's rout of the Amorites with the three-hundred (*LAB* 27) appears to serve no purpose other than as a means to tell a story. The use of Greek Esther in Mk 6:21-28 appears to have a similar function. It may be that the author had access to other details about the execution of John that brought the narrative of Esther to mind. It could even be that the execution of John originated in the promise of a ruler to a young girl. Whereas one can only

⁵⁸⁵ Pace Aus, 'The Release of Barabbas (Mark 15:6-15 par. John 18:39-40), and Judaic Traditions in the Book of Esther' in *Barabbas and Esther and Other Studies* (ed. Aus; Atlanta, GA: Scholars, 1992) 1-27.

speculate as to the historical sources for the episode in Mk 6:21-28, a literary source is readily available. The author invokes Esther as a way of telling the story of John's death, a story in which a young girl pleases a king who offers her 'even half of [his] kingdom' but she instead singles out one man for death.

The Jewish Scriptures in The Passion Narrative

Whilst relatively little has been written about the role of the Jewish scriptures in the wilderness and the call of the disciples (Mk 1:12-20), the feeding miracles (6:35-44; 8:1-9) and the execution of John (6:21-28), the same cannot be said for the Markan Passion Narrative. The extensive use of the Jewish scriptures in the scenes of the last supper, Gethsemane, the trial and crucifixion has been the subject of considerable scholarly output since Martin Dibelius.⁵⁸⁶ Dibelius proposed that the Jewish scriptures were a major source for the composition of the Passion Narrative.⁵⁸⁷ Although he was not the first to broach the subject—Dibelius' work echoed many of the same conclusions reached by Karl Weidel a decade earlier⁵⁸⁸—most scholarship on the Passion Narrative in the century since the publication of *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums* can be seen as a response to Dibelius. Form-critical questions concerning the integrity and genre of the supposed pre-Markan source for the Passion Narrative have thus dominated scholarship.⁵⁸⁹ At the same time, Dibelius' comments on the role

⁵⁸⁶ Notable studies include Suhl, *Die Funktion der alttestamentlichen Zitate*, 26-66; Kee, 'The Function of Scriptural Quotations', 165-188; Steichele, *Der leidende Sohn Gottes*, 193-279; Moo, *The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives*; Brown, *The Death of the Messiah: A Commentary on the Passion Narratives in the Four Gospels* (ABRL; New York, NY: Doubleday, 1994), 2.1445-1467; O'Brien, *The Use of Scripture in the Markan Passion Narrative*.

⁵⁸⁷ Dibelius, *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums*, 179-188, 205-206; 217-218; also in 'Das historische Problem der Leidengeschichte' in *Botschaft und Geschichte. Gesammelte Aufsätze. Band 1: Zur Evangelienforschung* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1963) 248-257.

⁵⁸⁸ Weidel, 'Studien über den Einfluss' (1910) 83-109, 163-195; (1912) 167-286.

⁵⁸⁹ Following Dibelius, *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums*, 178-218. Most notably in Bultmann, *History of the Synoptic Tradition*, 275-284; Ludger Schenke, *Studien zur Passionsgeschichte des Markus. Tradition und Redaktion in Markus 14,1-42* (FZB 4; Würzburg: Echter, 1971); Detlev Dormeyer, *Die Passion Jesu als Verhaltensmodell* (NTAbh NF 11; Münster: Aschendorff, 1974); Pesch, *Das Markusevangelium*, 2.1-27; Trocmé, *The Passion as Liturgy: A Study in the Origin of the Passion Narrative in the Four Gospels* (London: SCM, 1983); Crossan, *The Cross That Spoke: The Origins of the Passion Narrative* (San Francisco, CA: Harper & Row, 1988); cf. Eta Linnemann, *Studien zur Passionsgeschichte* (FRLANT 102; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970) 54-68; the influential criticism of Pesch's views in Frans Neirynck, 'L'Évangile de Marc (II). À propos de R. Pesch, *Das Markusevangelium*, 2. Teil. Review of Pesch, R. *Das Markusevangelium. II Teil: Kommentar Zu Kap. 8,27-16,20*', *ETL* 55 (1979): 1-42; Johannes Schreiber, *Die Markuspassion* (2nd ed.; BZNW 68; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1993).

of scriptural material in the Passion Narrative have influenced much of the subsequent debate. For the form critic, a good portion of the Passion Narrative can be traced to scriptural reflection and not to history—in other words, the influence flowed from scripture to history and not *vice versa*.⁵⁹⁰ The darkness at noon occurs in Mk 15:33, not because any such event ever took place, but because the author supplied the image from Amos 8:9. For conservative exegetes, on the other hand, the influence flowed in the other direction, from history to scripture. Early Christians were led to certain scriptural passages by their uncanny resemblance to the historical recollections of the events surrounding Jesus' death.⁵⁹¹ This process may have even been initiated by Jesus himself, who utters the words of Ps 22:1 (LXX 21:1), 'My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?' (Mk 15:34). Once again, Crossan has memorably (and somewhat pejoratively) described these two polarities as 'prophecy historicized' and 'history remembered'—contrasting the nuance of the former with the naïveté of the latter.⁵⁹²

But as Mark Goodacre argues, this binary fails to capture the complexity of the narrative. Whilst few would doubt that the darkness at noon of Mk 15:33 was created entirely on the basis of Amos 8:9, at other times scriptural language is merged with traditional material.⁵⁹³ For example, the inclusion of named women at the crucifixion of Jesus appears to be traditional, but the detail that they looked on 'from a distance' (Mk 15:40: ἀπὸ μακρόθεν; cf. 14:54) nonetheless reflects the language of LXX Ps 37:12 (MT 38:11): 'My friends and fellows approached opposite me and stood, and my next of kin stood *from a distance*' (ἀπὸ μακρόθεν). It is in this vein that Goodacre

⁵⁹⁰ Following Dibelius are Bultmann, *History of the Synoptic Tradition*, 262; Maurer, 'Knecht Gottes und Sohn Gottes im Passionsberichte', 1-38; Burton L. Mack, *A Myth of Innocence: Mark and Christian Origins* (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1988) 249-312; Helmut Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels: Their History and Development* (London: SCM, 1990) 216-240; Crossan, *The Birth of Christianity: Discovering What Happened in the Years Immediately after the Execution of Jesus* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998) 519-523; cf. the critical comments in Allison, *Constructing Jesus*, 387-392.

⁵⁹¹ Gottfried Schille, 'Das Leiden des Herrn. Die evangelische Passionstradition und ihr »Sitz im Leben«', *ZTK* 52 (1955): 161-205 (164); Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic*, 33-34; Moo, *The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives*, 380-381; cf. the more cautious comments in Brown, *Death of the Messiah*, 1.14-24.

⁵⁹² Crossan, *The Birth of Christianity*, 520-521; also *Who Killed Jesus? Exposing the Roots of Anti-Semitism in the Gospel Story of the Death of Jesus* (San Francisco, CA: HarperSanFrancisco, 1995) 1-2. Suhl made the same observation some thirty years earlier: 'Von hier aus ergaben sich für die Beurteilung der Passionsgeschichte zwei Standpunkte: Die einen meinen, in der Überlieferung noch sehr viel Historie entdecken zu können, die anderen halten mehr oder weniger alles für Konstruktion aus dem Weissagungsbeweis' (*Die Funktion der alttestamentlichen Zitate*, 26; also 44-45).

⁵⁹³ See Goodacre, 'Scripturalization in Mark's Crucifixion Narrative', 33-47; 'Prophecy Historicized or Tradition Scripturalized?', 37-51.

proposes *scripturalization* as an alternative to ‘prophecy historicized’ and ‘history remembered’.

It is not as if the women’s witness has been created on the basis of Ps. 38.11, which does not refer solely to women, let alone to those particular named women. Rather, the traditional element is being retold in the light of the passage that they saw it fulfilling. In other words, in this verse we see the exact opposite of the process of ‘prophecy historicized’. A verse taken to be historical has been expressed using the terminology of the scriptures. Tradition was scripturalized.⁵⁹⁴

Whilst Goodacre does not illustrate the process of scripturalization with reference to examples from Second Temple literature, his comments provide an accurate description of other *scripturalized narratives* from the period. In the examples surveyed earlier in this work, only one appears to have been composed entirely out of scriptural material: Kenaz’s defeat of the Amorites (*LAB* 27).⁵⁹⁵ In the other examples, the scripturalization takes place in relation to some pre-existing material. These include the scripturalization of a *primary scriptural* narrative with *secondary scriptural* material (Gen 13-15 in 1QapGen 11; cf. Gen 9:1-7), scripturalized narratives composed on the basis of an exegetical tradition (Dan 3 in *LAB* 6 and 38; cf. Gen 15:7 and Judg 10:5), scripturalization of an episode in the career of a historical person (Deut 2:26-36 and 20:10-14 in 1 Macc 5:45-51) and the scripturalization of a legend derived from the scriptural text (LXX Job 1-2 in *T. Ab.* 1-15; cf. Gen 18:1-15). Even the non-historical figure of Judith was not composed entirely out of Jael in Judg 4-5 (or Deborah or Miriam)—rather, the scripturalization occurs within a much larger pseudo-historical narrative. In each of these examples, something existed prior to scripturalization. The scripturalized narrative of 1QapGen 11, for example, preserves much of Gen 9:1-4, whilst incorporating material from Gen 13:7, 15:1 and 26:24. In the two fiery furnace narratives (*LAB* 6, 38), the episodes seem to be derived in their entirety from the interpretation of a single word (אור in Gen 15:7 and קמון in Judg 10:5). The scripturalized account of Judas’ siege of Ephron (1 Macc 5:45-51) told in the language of Moses’ defeat of Sihon and the laws of *ḥērem* may result from little more than a faint knowledge of a military altercation at an otherwise unknown village. But

⁵⁹⁴ Goodacre, ‘Prophecy Historicized or Tradition Scripturalized?’, 44-45.

⁵⁹⁵ The following narrative of Zebul (*LAB* 29) may be included here.

there is still something of history to the episode (or at least to the military campaign described in 1 Macc 3-5).

Turning to Mark, the scripturalized narratives surveyed thus far may have a similarly tenuous connection to historical memory. But the narratives nonetheless appear to be triggered by some genuine aspect of Jesus' career—his reputation as a teacher with disciples (Mk 1:12-20) or as a miracle-worker (6:35-44; 8:1-9)—as well as the sordid details surrounding John's death (6:21-28). One might expect a similar interaction between pre-existing tradition and scriptural material in the Passion Narrative of Mk 14-15. The description of Jesus' trial and execution contains many elements that cannot be chalked up to scripturalization. The Jesus of the Passion Narrative is no Kenaz. Take away the scriptural material from Mk 14-15, and a coherent narrative still exists.⁵⁹⁶ But the presence of an underlying narrative does not constrain the potential for creative embellishment. The fantastic darkness at noon in Mk 15:33 is as extraneous to the historical events surrounding Jesus' death as the 83,500 who die in a fiery furnace are to the 'fire' of Gen 15:7. There was always room for wholesale invention. But scholars are able to tell when a text like the *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* or the *Genesis Apocryphon* diverges from its underlying sources for one simple reason: the sources have survived (in this case, the Jewish scriptures). No comparable sources survive for historical narratives like 1 Maccabees and the Gospel of Mark. This means that Maccabean and Markan scholars can judge with some confidence when their texts depend on the Jewish scriptures for their content, but not when they depend on historical memory. Judas may well have destroyed 'every male by the edge of the sword' when he besieged Ephron (1 Macc 5:51a), but the only sure thing is that the language comes from Deut 20:13b. It could be that those who crucified Jesus gambled for his clothes (Mk 15:24)—such mockery would surely fit the gruesome spectacle of crucifixion—but as it is, the historian only knows that the language comes from LXX Ps 21:19 (MT 22:18).

But what motivated Mark or his source to scripturalize the details of Jesus' death in this way? For 1 Maccabees, the answer is quite clear: it was the conviction that Judas and the Maccabean brothers behaved 'according to the law' (1 Macc 3:56b; 4:47,53; 15:21c: κατὰ τὸν νόμον) that led the author to compose a scripturalized

⁵⁹⁶ As Allison, *Constructing Jesus*, 387-433; *pace* Crossan, *The Birth of Christianity*, 521.

narrative of Judas besieging like the lawgiver Moses (Deut 2:26-36; Judg 11:19-21) according to the laws of *hērem* (Deut 20:10-14).⁵⁹⁷ Scholars have proposed similar interpretive frameworks for understanding the use of the Jewish scriptures in the Markan Passion Narrative. To some, it presents Jesus as the Davidic messiah.⁵⁹⁸ To others, it demonstrates that Jesus is the Isaianic ‘suffering servant’.⁵⁹⁹ For others, the scriptural material is subsumed under Mark’s eschatological framework.⁶⁰⁰ The scholars advocating these proposals mostly agree that the Jewish scriptures function in the Passion Narrative to demonstrate the fulfilment of prophecy—the *Weissagungs-* and *Schriftbeweis* of Weidel and Dibelius. At first glance, two instances of scriptural language seem to welcome this sort of interpretation (14:21a,49b). But the use of the Jewish scriptures in the Passion Narrative also resembles other texts from the Second Temple period, which describe the suffering of a righteous person using scriptural language—and on balance do not use scriptural material to indicate prophetic fulfilment. In this final section, I propose that no one model is sufficient for understanding the use of the Jewish scriptures in the Markan Passion Narrative. As

⁵⁹⁷ Likewise, it was the conviction that the Hasmoneans were the heirs to the Phinehaic priesthood that led to the scripturalized episode of Mattathias at Modein (1 Macc 2:23-26; cf. Num 25:6-13).

⁵⁹⁸ See Juel, *Messianic Exegesis*, 91-117. More recently, Robert D. Rowe, *God’s Kingdom and God’s Son: The Background to Mark’s Christology from Concepts of Kingship in the Psalms* (AGAJU 50; Leiden: Brill, 2002) 295-306; Harold W. Attridge, ‘Giving Voice to Jesus: Use of the Psalms in the New Testament’ in *Psalms in Community: Jewish and Christian Textual, Liturgical, and Artistic Traditions* (ed. Attridge and Margot E. Fassler; SymS 25; Atlanta, GA: SBL, 2003) 101-112; Watts (also Isaiah), ‘The Psalms in Mark’s Gospel’ in *The Psalms in the New Testament* (ed. Moyise and Maarten J. J. Menken; London: T&T Clark, 2004) 25-45 (41-45); Jocelyn McWhirter, ‘Messianic Exegesis in Mark’s Passion Narrative’ in *The Trial and Death of Jesus*, 69-97; Stephen P. Ahearne-Kroll, *The Psalms of Lament in Mark’s Passion: Jesus’ Davidic Suffering* (SNTSMS 142; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007); J. Samuel Subramanian, *The Synoptic Gospels and the Psalms as Prophecy* (LNTS 351; London: T&T Clark, 2007) 64-69; Max Botner, *Jesus Christ as the Son of David in the Gospel of Mark* (SNTSMS 174; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019) 174-188.

⁵⁹⁹ See Schweitzer (also eschatology), *The Mystery of the Kingdom of God: The Secret of Jesus’ Messiahship and Passion* (trans. Walter Lowrie; New York, NY: Dodd, Mead and Co., 1914) 236-239; Jeremias, *TDNT* 5.709-717; Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, 123-125; Maurer, ‘Knecht Gottes und Sohn Gottes’, 1-38; Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic*, 77-82, 89; Moo, *The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives*, 360; Marcus, *The Way of the Lord*, 186-196; Watts, *Isaiah’s New Exodus*, 365; Otto Betz, ‘Jesus and Isaiah 53’ in *Jesus and the Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 and Christian Origins* (ed. William H. Bellinger Jr. and William R. Farmer; Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1998) 83-87; Darell L. Bock, ‘The Function of Scripture in Mark 15.1-39’ in *Biblical Interpretation in Early Christian Gospels: Volume 1*, 8-17; cf. Hooker, *Jesus and the Suffering Servant*, 86-92 and *passim*; Kee, ‘The Functions of Scriptural Quotations’, 182-183.

⁶⁰⁰ See Schweitzer, *The Mystery of the Kingdom of God*, 223-239. More recently, Allison, *The End of the Ages Has Come: An Early Interpretation of the Passion and Resurrection of Jesus* (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1985) 26-39; to some extent Marcus, *The Way of the Lord*, 177-179; O’Brien, *The Use of Scripture in the Markan Passion Narrative*, 192-200; Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels*, 87-91.

before, the focus will be on instances where unmarked scriptural language appears as part of the narrative, or where an episode or scene seems to be modelled on scriptural material. It will be my contention that the Markan Passion Narrative utilizes scriptural material in a manner similar to the scripturalized narratives surveyed thus far, often using the same scriptural language used by contemporaneous texts to depict the suffering of the righteous. One episode in particular appears to be modelled on a specific scriptural text: the scene of Jesus' crucifixion (Mk 15:21-41). But first, I will examine the use of the Jewish scriptures more generally in the narrative leading up to this episode.

The Use of the Jewish Scriptures in Mk 14:1-15:20

The first time scriptural language appears as part of the narrative is in Jesus' prediction of his betrayal. Jesus says to the disciples, 'Truly I tell you, one of you will betray me, one who is eating with me' (14:18: ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι εἷς ἐξ ὑμῶν παραδώσει με ὁ ἐσθίων μετ' ἐμοῦ).⁶⁰¹ After the disciples protest their innocence, Jesus once again says, 'It is one of the twelve, one who is dipping [bread] into the bowl with me' (14:20: εἷς τῶν δώδεκα, ὁ ἐμβαπτόμενος μετ' ἐμοῦ εἰς τὸ τρύβλιον). This image appears to come from Ps 41:9, 'Even my bosom friend in whom I trusted, who ate of my bread, has lifted the heel against me' (שְׁלוּמֵי אִשְׁרַבְטַחְתִּי בּוֹ אוֹכַל לֶחֶמִי הִגְדִּיל עָלַי עֵקֶב (נִסְיָאֵן)). The agreement is closer with the LXX: 'he who would eat of my bread' (LXX Ps 40:10: ὁ ἐσθίων ἄρτους μου; cf. Mk 14:18c: ὁ ἐσθίων μετ' ἐμοῦ).⁶⁰² As Marcus notes, the 'very awkwardness of the belated phrase "the one eating with me" supports such an identification'.⁶⁰³ O'Brien, on the other hand, finds the association with Ps 41:9 (LXX 40:10) weak for the following reason: 'Simply adding ἄρτους (*bread*) to Mark 14.18 would have strengthened the verbal correspondence, in a very natural

⁶⁰¹ Though the language of 'three days' (8:31; 9:31; 10:34) in the Gospel may allude to Hos 6:2, the similarity of 'after two days' (μετὰ δύο ἡμέρας) in Mk 14:1 with LXX Hos 6:2a (μετὰ δύο ἡμέρας) is likely incidental. Rather, it is part of the chronological arrangement of Mk 14-16, which marks the first day of the Feast of Unleavened Bread (14:12), the night of Passover (14:16-17), the day of Passover (15:1,25), the day of preparation for the Sabbath (15:42) and the first day of the week (16:2). Cf. O'Brien, *The Use of Scripture in the Markan Passion Narrative*, 113-117.

⁶⁰² Compare with the more literal translation of σ' and θ' Ps 40:10: κατεμεγαλύνθη μου πτέρνα.

⁶⁰³ Marcus, *The Way of the Lord*, 172. Likewise Suhl, *Die Funktion der alttestamentlichen Zitate*, 51.

way'.⁶⁰⁴ But after Jesus announces his betrayal in 14:18-20, he does, in fact, share 'bread' (ἄρτος) with his betrayer, as in the Psalm (Mk 14:22; implied in 14:20). It is for this reason that Bultmann concludes that the pericope in Mk 14:17-21 'ist von der christlichen Legende das Motiv gewonnen', growing out of Ps 41:9.⁶⁰⁵

The scene is appended by Jesus' cryptic comment, 'For the Son of Man goes as it is written of him' (Mk 14:21a: ὅτι ὁ μὲν υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὑπάγει καθὼς γέγραπται περὶ αὐτοῦ). The Markan formula καθὼς/ὅτι γέγραπται often precedes a marked citation with a named (Mk 1:2; 7:6) or unnamed but otherwise clear source (11:17; 14:27)—though in one instance it comes with no clear scriptural referent (9:12-13). So, does the formula in Mk 14:21a have Ps 41:9 in mind? Matthew seems not to think so. Whilst Matthew includes the καθὼς γέγραπται περὶ αὐτοῦ of Mk 14:21a (Mt 26:24a), he removes the clearest reference to LXX Ps 40:10 in the passage, so it simply reads, 'one of you will betray me' (Mt 26:21c: ὅτι εἷς ἐξ ὑμῶν παραδώσει με; cf. Mk 14:18c: ὁ ἐσθίων μετ' ἐμοῦ).⁶⁰⁶ For Matthew there is a different scriptural source behind Jesus' betrayal.⁶⁰⁷ Judas hands over Jesus for 'thirty pieces of silver' (Mt 26:15), an image borrowed from Zech 11:13. The same passage also lies behind Judas' suicide in Mt 27:3-10, though Matthew wrongly names Jeremiah as the source, 'Then was fulfilled what had been spoken through the prophet Jeremiah' (27:9a: τότε ἐπληρώθη τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Ἰερεμίου τοῦ προφήτου). By contrast, Luke omits the καθὼς γέγραπται altogether, instead taking Mk 14:21a to imply predestination, 'For the Son of Man is going as it has been determined' (Lk 22:22a: ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς μὲν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου κατὰ τὸ ὀρισμένον πορεύεται).⁶⁰⁸

⁶⁰⁴ O'Brien, *The Use of Scripture in the Markan Passion Narrative*, 91, emphasis original.

⁶⁰⁵ Bultmann, *Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition* (4th ed.; FRLANT 29; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1961) 284. Frederick W. Danker, 'The Literary Unity of Mark 14:1-25', *JBL* 85 (1966): 467-472, goes further to suggest that Ps 41 provides the structure for Mk 14:1-25 as a whole, connecting 'those who consider the poor' in Ps 41:1 with the episode at Bethany in Mk 14:3-9. This argument seems more appropriate for the Johannine parallel. Cf. Lohmeyer who thinks the reference to Ps 41:10 is a later gloss (*Markus*, 301), or Suhl, who attributes it to the Markan redactor (*Die Funktion der alttestamentlichen Zitate*, 51-52).

⁶⁰⁶ At the same time, Mt 26:23 adds a 'hand' (χεῖρ) to the dipping bowl whilst deleting the redundant 'one of the twelve' (also missing in some early mss. of Mk 14:20: A a ff²).

⁶⁰⁷ See Frédéric Manns, 'Un midrash chrétien: le récit de la mort de Judas', *RSR* 54 (1980): 197-203. Cf. the maximalist approach of Charlene McAfee Moss, *The Zechariah Tradition and the Gospel of Matthew* (BZNW 156; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009) 171-188, who finds multiple levels to Matthew's use of Zechariah.

⁶⁰⁸ It could be that Luke understood Mark correctly, and that the καθὼς γέγραπται of Mk 9:13 and 14:21a simply express the will of God rather than a scriptural referent. This may explain the rejoinder

But John—either under the influence of Mark or a remarkably similar tradition—interprets the scene as the prophetic fulfilment of Ps 41:9. Before Jesus announces that one of his disciples will betray him, he says, ‘But it is to fulfill the scripture, “The one who ate my bread has lifted his heel against me”’ (Jn 13:18b: ἀλλ’ ἵνα ἡ γραφή πληρωθῆι· ὁ τρώγων μου τὸν ἄρτον ἐπῆρεν ἐπ’ ἐμὲ τὴν πτέρναν αὐτοῦ). This quotation more closely resembles the MT of the Psalm than the LXX: ‘[the one] who ate of my bread, has lifted the heel against me’ (בו אוכל לחמי הגדיל עלי עקב). The following section then appears to expand on Mk 14:18-20: once again Jesus announces that he will be betrayed (Jn 13:21; cf. Mk 14:18), which perplexes the disciples (Jn 13:22; cf. Mk 14:19), leading Peter and the beloved disciple to enquire further in private (Jn 13:24-25). In response, Jesus says, ‘It is the one to whom I give this *piece of bread* (ψωμίον) when I have dipped [it in the dish]’. Following this, Jesus gives the ‘piece [of bread]’ to Judas (Jn 13:26c-27,30). When Jesus grants him leave, Judas immediately departs (13:27-30), leading some to wonder whether Judas, the treasurer, left to ‘give something to the poor’ (πτωχοῖς ἵνα τι δῶ). With this comment, John ties the scene to the anointing at Bethany earlier in the narrative (Jn 12:1-8; cf. Mk 14:1-9), where he identifies Judas as the one who complains that the perfume could have been sold and the money given to the poor, adding, ‘He said this not because he cared about the poor, but because he was a thief’ (Jn 12:6a: εἶπεν δὲ τοῦτο οὐχ ὅτι περὶ τῶν πτωχῶν ἔμελεν αὐτῷ, ἀλλ’ ὅτι κλέπτῃς ἦν). Judas’ feigned concern for the poor may too reflect Ps 41, which begins, ‘Happy are those who consider the poor’ (Ps 41:1a).⁶⁰⁹ This much, however, is clear: John has further scripturalized the details of Jesus’ betrayal under the influence of Ps 41:9—indicating that early readers saw in Mk 14:18-20, or a similar tradition, the fulfilment of the Psalm.

Perhaps the author of Mk 14:18-21, like John, saw Judas’ betrayal as the fulfilment of Ps 41:9 (LXX 40:10).⁶¹⁰ If so, it would be one of two passages in the Passion Narrative where the idea of prophetic-fulfilment appears to be present (the other being the reference to Zech 13:7b in Mk 14:49b; cf. 14:27b). In both of these

emphasizing human responsibility, ‘but woe to that one by whom the Son of Man is betrayed!’ (14:21b). At the same time, perhaps both the scriptural source and divine predestination are in view.
⁶⁰⁹ Danker, ‘The Literary Unity’, 469-470, believes the use of Ps 41 in the anointing originated with Mark.

⁶¹⁰ A conclusion reached by scholars as dissimilar as Feigel (*Der Einfluß des Weissagungsbeweises*, 47) and Moo (*The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives*, 238).

examples, however, the formulae only relate to their immediate contexts: Judas' betrayal and the desertion of the disciples. They do not introduce a schema of prophetic-fulfilment for the Passion Narrative as a whole.⁶¹¹ Elsewhere in the Gospel, there are isolated instances where certain events seem to correspond to—or happen in fulfilment of—the Jewish scriptures.⁶¹² But Mark lacks the explicit interpretive schema that one finds in the editorial comments of Matthew (1:22; 2:17,23; 4:14; 8:17; 12:17; 13:35; 21:4; 27:9) and John (12:16,38; 15:25; 18:9; 19:24,36).⁶¹³ For the most part, the concept of prophetic-fulfilment appears to be undeveloped in Mark. Thus Suhl concludes that it is more appropriate to speak of Mark composing 'in den »Farben« des Alten'.⁶¹⁴ By preferring poetry over clarity, however, Suhl overlooks models more sensitive to the literary methods of the Second Temple period. Returning to Dimant's schema—here, a better distinction can be made between the *expositional* use of scriptural material and its *compositional* use.

Instances where the scriptures are explicitly invoked to interpret the events in the narrative would fall under the first, *expositional* type. Here, the scriptures appear as something external to the narrative and aim to interpret it, providing a precedent for (LXX Isa 29:13 in 7:6-7), or giving meaning to (LXX Exod 23:20 and LXX Isa 40:3 in 1:2-3) the events described therein. In the Passion Narrative, the words of Jesus in 14:21a would fit this description, as well as 14:49b and the related formal quotation in 14:27. The use of LXX Ps 40:10 (MT Ps 41:9) to describe Jesus' betrayal is, by contrast, *compositional*. The details of the Psalm have been merged with the narrative, so that it does not appear as something external to the text, but as part of it.⁶¹⁵ This can also be compared to two other texts which contain references to Ps 41:9. In *b. Sanh.*

⁶¹¹ Pace Juel, *An Introduction to New Testament Literature* (with James S. Ackerman and Thayer S. Warshaw; Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1978) 145; cf. also the influential comments on prophetic-fulfilment in Kee, 'The Function of Scriptural Quotations', 174, 177.

⁶¹² 1:2-3; 7:6-7; 9:12-13. As noted *contra* Suhl, in Grässer, 'Review', 667-669.

⁶¹³ As observed (sans John) by Suhl, *Die Funktion der alttestamentlichen Zitate*, 42-45; Anderson, 'The Old Testament in mark's Gospel', 281, 305-306. For an overly generous interpretation of prophetic-fulfilment in Luke, see Bock, *The Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern: Lucan Old Testament Christology* (LNTS 12; London: Bloomsbury, 1997).

⁶¹⁴ Suhl, *Die Funktion der alttestamentlichen Zitate*, 47. See here the criticism of Herman Mueller, 'Review of Suhl, *Die Funktion*', *CBQ* 28 (1966) 95-97, 'one wonders at times if one can clearly penetrate the distinction' between prophetic-fulfilment and OT colours (97).

⁶¹⁵ In the corresponding account in Jn 13:18-30, Ps 41:9 is used in both ways: the formal quotation in 13:18 is *expositional*, whereas the incorporation of scriptural details into the narrative is *compositional*.

7a, it reads, ‘There was a man who went around saying, “The man on whom I relied raised his club against me.” Said Samuel to R. Judah, “There is a pertinent verse of Scripture, ‘Yes, mine own familiar friend, in whom I trusted and who ate my bread, has lifted up his heel against me’”. In this example, the scriptural material appears with an introductory formula (קרא כתיב) and seeks to interpret the aforesaid episode—it is, in other words, an *expositional* use of Ps 41:9. Compare this with the *compositional* use of the same passage in 1QH 13:22-25 (esp. 23b-24a).

But I have been the target of sl[ander for my rivals,] cause for quarrel and argument to my neighbours, for jealousy and anger to those who have joined my covenant, for challenge and grumbling to all my followers. *Ev[en those who e]at my bread have raised their heel against me* (ג[מ אר]כלי עלי הגדילו עקב); they have mocked me with an unjust tongue all those who had joined my council; the men of my [congrega]tion are stubborn, and mutter round about.

In this instance, the language of Ps 41:9 has been applied almost verbatim to the first-person speaker of the *Hodayot*.⁶¹⁶ But here it does not appear as something external to the text, rather it becomes part of the hymnist’s own experience, the narrative of suffering (*Leidensgeschichte*) that lies behind the hymn. Indeed, this is one of many instances in 1QH where the hymnist incorporates unmarked language from the Psalms to describe his/their own experience.⁶¹⁷ This *compositional* use of Ps 41:9 is of a piece with Mk 14:18-20. Like the hymnist of the *Hodayot*, Mark or his

⁶¹⁶ For the classic view that the hymnist of the *Hodayot* should be identified with the Teacher of Righteousness, see Jean Carmignac and Pierre Guilbert, *Les textes de Qumran: traduits et annotés* (2 vols.; Paris: Letouzey et Ane, 1961) 1.132-133. For the alternative view that the first-person speaker of the *Hodayot* is constructed for performance in a congregational setting, see Carol A. Newsom, *The Self as Symbolic Space: Constructing Identity and Community at Qumran* (STDJ 52; Leiden: Brill, 2004) 196-208. On the significance of the *Hodayot* for the study of the Jewish scriptures in the Markan Passion Narrative, see Yarbrow Collins, ‘The Appropriation of the Individual Psalms of Lament by Mark’ in *The Scriptures in the Gospels* (ed. Christopher M. Tuckett; BETL 131; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1997) 223-241.

⁶¹⁷ Ps 7:2 in 1QH 13:13-14; Ps 12:6 in 1QH 13:16; Ps 18:5 in 1QH 11:28-29; Ps 22:15 in 1QH 13:31; Ps 26:12 in 1QH 10:29-30; Ps 31:10 in 1QH 13:34; Ps 31:13 in 1QH 12:9; Ps 42:6-7 in 1QH 16:31-32; Ps 54:3 [86:14] in 1QH 10:21; Ps 69:21-22 in 1QH 12:11-12; Ps 88:3-4 in 1QH 16:29-30. On the form of the allusions, see John Elwolde, ‘The Hodayot’s Use of the Psalter: Text-Critical Contributions (Book 1)’ in *Psalms and Prayers: Papers Read at the Thirteenth Joint Meeting of the Society of Old Testament Study and Het Oudtestamentisch Werkegezelschap in Nederland en België, Apeldoorn 21-24 August 2006* (ed. Bob Becking and Eric Peels; OS 55; Leiden: Brill, 2007) 79-108; ‘The Hodayot’s Use of the Psalter: Text-Critical Contributions (Book 2: Pss 42-72)’ in *The Dead Sea Scrolls In Context: Integrating the Dead Sea Scrolls in the Study of Ancient Texts, Languages, and Cultures* (ed. Lange, Tov and Weigold; VTSupp 140; Leiden: Brill, 2011) 1.79-99; ‘The Hodayot’s Use of the Psalter: Text-critical Contributions (Book 3: Pss 73-89)’, *DSD* 17 (2010): 159-179.

source has incorporated unmarked scriptural language into the story of suffering, thereby creating a scripturalized narrative of Jesus' betrayal. Whether the narrative of the betrayal was created entirely under the influence of Ps 41:9 (in this case, LXX 40:10), or whether the author incorporated scriptural material into a pre-existing narrative of Judas' treachery, the pericope in Mk 14:18-20 is the first clear instance of scripturalization in the Passion Narrative.

The Servant at the Supper?: Mk 14:24 and Isa 53:12 (Mk 14:65; 15:19,27,43-46)

The scene then moves to the supper in 14:22-25 and what appears to be an echo of Exod 24:8 (cf. Zech 9:11), 'This is my blood of the covenant' (14:24b: τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ αἷμα μου τῆς διαθήκης; cf. LXX Exod 24:8: ἰδοὺ τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης).⁶¹⁸ The clause that follows—'which is poured out for many' (Mk 14:24c: τὸ ἐκυννόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν)—is unparalleled in Exod 24 and related traditions. For some (often conservative) commentators, the clause is seen as part of the presentation of Jesus as the 'suffering servant' of Deutero-Isaiah.⁶¹⁹ Thus, Jesus is here depicted as the sufferer of Isa 53:12, who 'poured out himself to death . . . yet he bore the sin of many' (נָשַׁךְ וְהוּא חִמָּא דְרַבִּיּוֹת . . . וְהָעֵרָה לְמוֹת . . .). The image of the 'suffering servant' is likewise thought to lie behind a number of other passages in the Passion Narrative (i.e. Mk 14:61,65; 15:5,19,27,43-46).⁶²⁰ Language from the so-called 'servant songs' occasionally appears in other texts (Isa 49:6 in *I En.* 48:4; Isa 52:7 in 11QMelch 2:15-16,23; Isa

⁶¹⁸ Compare with the similar words of institution in 1 Cor 11:25: 'This cup is the new covenant in my blood' (τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ ἑμῷ αἵματι). This raises the possibility that the words of institution in Mk 14:24b owe to common tradition and not directly to Exod 24. But as it is, the language of Mk 14:24b is closer to LXX Exod 24:8 than it is to 1 Cor 11:25.

⁶¹⁹ For conservative commentators, the use of Isa 53:12 is evidence of a Markan theory of 'vicarious' atonement: Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic*, 78-79; France, *Jesus and the Old Testament: His Application of Old Testament Passages to Himself and His Mission* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1982) 122-123; Moo, *The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives*, 397; Evans, *Mark 8:27-16:20* (WBC 34B; Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, 2001) 394. See the substantive criticism in Hooker, *Jesus and the Servant*, 82; Joel B. Green, *The Death of Jesus* (WUNT 2/33; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1988) 320-323.

⁶²⁰ See the survey of proposed allusions in Marcus, *The Way of the Lord*, 186-190.

50:4 in 1QH 15:13; 16:37; Isa 52:1 in *Ps. Sol.* 11:7).⁶²¹ But is there any precedent for using Isa 53:12 to describe the suffering of an individual?

One such example may be found in the *Psalms of Solomon*: ‘For a moment my soul was poured out to death; (I was) near the gates of Hades with the sinner’ (*Ps. Sol.* 16:2: παρ’ ὀλίγον ἐξεχύθη ἡ ψυχὴ μου εἰς θάνατον, σύνεγγυς πυλῶν ἄδου μετὰ ἀμαρτωλοῦ). Like Mk 14:24c, the first part resembles MT Isa 53:12c (וְהָיָה לְמִוְתָנִים), whereas the second part recalls the reckoning with the transgressors in the following clause. The influence of Isa 53:12d is even more evident in *Ps. Sol.* 16:5, ‘I will give thanks to you, O God, who came to my aid for (my) salvation, and who did not count me with the sinners for (my) destruction’ (ἐξομολογήσομαί σοι, ὁ θεός, ὅτι ἀντελάβου μου εἰς σωτηρίαν, καὶ οὐκ ἐλογίσω με μετὰ τῶν ἀμαρτωλῶν εἰς ἀπώλειαν)—compare this with Isa 53:12d, ‘and [he] was numbered with the transgressors’ (וְהָיָה עִם הַפְּשָׁעִים נִמְנָה; cf. LXX: καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀνόμοις ἐλογίσθη).

The image of a righteous one numbered with sinners in death also appears in the Passion Narrative. Jesus is crucified between ‘two bandits, one on his right and one on his left’ (Mk 15:27: δύο ληστὰς, ἓνα ἐκ δεξιῶν καὶ ἓνα ἐξ εὐωνύμων αὐτοῦ). An early copyist apparently saw Isa 53:12 in this scene, adding under the influence of Lk 22:37, ‘And the scripture was fulfilled that says, “And he was counted among the lawless”’ (Mk 15:28: καὶ ἐπληρώθη ἡ γραφὴ ἣ λέγουσα, καὶ μετὰ ἀνόμων ἐλογίσθη).⁶²² If the copyist was able to see Isa 53:12 in the description of the two thieves, one might also ask whether the description of Jesus’ burial by a member of the ruling class (Mk 15:43-46) owes to Isa 53:9a (‘They made his grave with the wicked and his tomb with the rich’), or if the ‘spitting’ (ἐμπτύω) and ‘striking’ (κολαφίζω) that Jesus endures (Mk 14:65; 15:19; cf. 10:34) owes to the ‘spitting’ (קָרַח) and ‘striking’ (מָכָה) endured by the sufferer in Isa 50:6. Given the absence of close verbal agreement with surviving texts of Isaiah, it is unlikely any of these allusions can be established with certainty. But this did not stop one of Mark’s earliest (and closest) readers from finding Isaiah in these passages.

Whilst Mark describes Joseph of Arimathea as a ‘respected member of the council, who was also himself waiting expectantly for the kingdom of God’ (Mk

⁶²¹ See also 1QH 12:8 (also 12:23), ‘They do not esteem me’ (וְלֹא יִחְשְׁבוּנִי) which may echo Isa 53:3 ‘We esteemed him not’ (וְלֹא חִשְׁבֵנוּהוּ).

⁶²² The verse appears in mss. L Θ 0112 0250 *f*^{1.13} *℣* lat syr^{p,h}.

15:43), Matthew simply describes Joseph as a ‘rich man’ (27:57: ἄνθρωπος πλούσιος) and a ‘disciple of Jesus’ (ἐμαθητεύθη τῷ Ἰησοῦ). These changes seem to be brought on by two things. The first is the problem posed by Mark’s assertion that Joseph was a ‘member of the council’ (βουλευτής), presumably the same ‘council’ that had just sentenced Jesus to death (Mk 14:55: συνέδριον; 15:1: συμβούλιον). Whilst Luke attempts to absolve Joseph, ‘who, though a member of the council, had not agreed to their plan and action’ (Lk 23:50b-51a), Matthew removes mention of Joseph’s involvement with the council altogether. The second appears to be an effort to strengthen the association with Isa 53 by describing Joseph as a ‘rich man’ (ἄνθρωπος πλούσιος), as it reads in Isa 53:9a, ‘They made his grave with the wicked and his tomb with the rich’ (ויתן את־רשעים קברו ואת־עשיר במתיו).⁶²³ A similar attempt to bring the passage more in line with Isaiah may be found in the description of Jesus’ abuse. In Mark 14:65 (cf. 15:19), Jesus is spat upon, blindfolded and struck (τινες ἐμπτύειν αὐτῷ καὶ περικαλύπτειν αὐτοῦ τὸ πρόσωπον), whereas in Mt 27:67 it reads, ‘Then they spat in his face and struck him’ (τότε ἐνέπτυσαν εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκολάφισαν αὐτόν). Compare this with Isa 50:6: ‘I gave my back to those who struck me . . . I did not hide my face from insult and spitting’ (גוי נתתי למכים . . . פני לא הסתרתי מכלמות ורק). Here, Matthew may be conforming the wording of Mark to Isa 50:6, so that, like the sufferer, Jesus’ abusers spit in his face.⁶²⁴ But this has an unintended consequence, as by removing the ‘blindfold’ of Mk 14:65, the taunt of Jesus’ abusers no longer makes sense: ‘Prophecy to us, you Messiah! Who is it that struck you?’ (Mt 26:68).

Returning to the words of institution, here too there may be an effort to conform Mark closer to Isaiah. Matthew makes only slight alterations to Mk 14:24, ‘For this is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many’ (Mt 26:28: τοῦτο γὰρ ἐστὶν τὸ αἷμα μου τῆς διαθήκης τὸ πολλῶν ἐκχυννόμενον), before adding, ‘for the forgiveness of sins’ (εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν).⁶²⁵ Given the above efforts, it is possible that Matthew added the prepositional phrase to intensify an allusion to Isa 53:12, as the sufferer ‘poured out himself to death’ (הערה למות) and ‘yet he bore the *sin* of many’

⁶²³ LXX Isa 53:9 likewise uses πλούσιος, though the meaning is antithetical to both the MT and Mt 27:57-61.

⁶²⁴ The image also appears in some early mss. of Mk 14:65—D it^{(a), (d), f} syr^p arm geo—presumably under the influence of Mt 27:67.

⁶²⁵ Some early mss. of Mk 14:24 follow Matthew here (i.e. W a).

(והוא המא־רבים נשא).⁶²⁶ Elsewhere, Matthew alters the wording of Mark in order to make the scriptural source more clear: for example, in Mt 17:11, where Matthew changes the present ἀποκαθιστάνει of Mk 9:12 to the future ἀποκαταστήσει to better reflect LXX Mal 3:23, or in Mt 27:46, where Matthew replaces the εἰς τί of Mk 15:34 with ἰνατί to make it closer to LXX Ps 21:1. Matthew even adds narrative details to Mark’s story in order to better reflect the scriptural source: as in Mt 21:2-8, where Jesus rides into Jerusalem, not on a colt as in Mk 11:2-7, but on a colt *and* a donkey as in LXX Zech 9:9. If Matthew was able to find (and exploit) allusions to Isaiah 50-53 in the Markan Passion Narrative, it would be tempting to see this as evidence that such allusions existed in the first place. But Matthew was equally capable of finding scriptural sources for Mark where none existed.⁶²⁷ In the final analysis, one cannot easily dismiss the possibility that Mark or his source scripturalized details in Mk 14-15 on the basis of Isa 50-53—especially given the similar use of Isa 53:12 in the *Psalms of Solomon* and the reception of the passages in Matthew. And yet, given the faint and fleeting nature of the parallels, one must cautiously conclude with Kee that, in the Markan Passion Narrative, ‘There are no *sure* references to Isa 53’.⁶²⁸

The Shepherd and the Sheep: Mk 14:27 and Zech 13:7 (Amos 2:6; Gen 39:12?)

Following the supper, the scene shifts to the Mount of Olives, which begins with the only marked citation in the Passion Narrative. Jesus says to the disciples, ‘You will all become deserters; for it is written, “I will strike the shepherd, and the sheep will be scattered”’ (Mk 14:27: ὅτι πάντες σκανδαλισθήσεσθε, ὅτι γέγραπται· πατάξω τὸν ποιμένα, καὶ τὰ πρόβατα διασκορπισθήσονται).⁶²⁹ The source here is Zech 13:7b, in a form most similar to LXX A: ‘Strike the shepherd, and the sheep will be scattered’

⁶²⁶ As Gundry, *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew’s Gospel* (NovTSupp 18; Leiden: Brill, 1967) 57-59; Moo, *The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives*, 130-132. A reference to Jer 31:34 here is unlikely, see Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3.474-475.

⁶²⁷ Matthew views Jesus’ entrance into Capernaum as the fulfilment of Isa 9:1-2 (Mt 4:13-16), though there is no sign of this in Mk 1:21; nor is there a scriptural basis for the location of Jesus in Nazareth (Mk 1:9), cf. the unknown source of the fulfilment formula in Mt 2:23.

⁶²⁸ Kee, ‘The Function of Scriptural Quotations’, 183, emphasis mine.

⁶²⁹ The location of the Mount of Olives may be significant. The narrative has already presented Judas in the language of Ps 41:9 (Mk 14:18-20)—a verse which was traditionally understood as referring to Ahithophel, who betrayed David (2 Sam 15:12; *b. Sanh.* 106b). News of Ahithophel’s betrayal reaches David as he is mourning on the Mount of Olives (2 Sam 15:30-31).

(πάταξον τὸν ποιμένα, καὶ διασκορπισθήσονται τὰ πρόβατα).⁶³⁰ It is one of a series of prophecies Jesus makes during the course of the Passion Narrative (14:7-9,13-15,18,25,28,30,62). Some of these prophecies find fulfilment in the narrative itself: the burial (14:7-8; cf. 15:46-47); the preparations for Passover (14:13-15; cf. 14:16); the betrayal (14:18; cf. 14:41-45). Other elements in the Passion Narrative fulfil earlier prophecies of Jesus: the testimony before the council (13:9; cf. 14:53-65; 15:1); the testimony before the governor (13:9; cf. 15:1-15); the betrayal (13:12; cf. 14:41-45); the darkening of the sun (13:24; cf. 15:33); and indeed, the Passion itself (8:31; 9:12,31; 10:33-34,40; cf. 14:43-15:39). Some prophecies in Mk 14-15 were clearly understood to have reached their fulfilment outside of the narrative (14:9,28), or were to be fulfilled imminently (14:62; cf. 13:26).⁶³¹

By contrast, Jesus' prophecy in Mk 14:27 is fulfilled almost immediately. This is announced in 14:49b with a fulfilment formula unusual for Mark: Jesus says, 'But let the scriptures be fulfilled' (14:49b: ἀλλ' ἵνα πληρωθῶσιν αἱ γραφαί). This is the second of two instances in the Passion Narrative where the scriptures appear to be interpreted in terms of prophetic-fulfilment (the other being 14:21a). That Jesus has Zech 13:7b in mind is made clear by the following verse, 'All of them deserted him and fled' (14:50: καὶ ἀφέντες αὐτὸν ἔφυγον πάντες).⁶³² But Jesus also uses the plural 'scriptures' (αἱ γραφαί).⁶³³ Does this imply that the formula refers to scriptural material beyond Zech 13:7b?⁶³⁴ It could conceivably refer back to the scriptural source for Jesus' betrayal 'as it is written of him' (14:21a: καθὼς γέγραπται περὶ αὐτοῦ).⁶³⁵ At the same time, it may be a reference to the scene that follows. In what may well be the

⁶³⁰ LXX A is closer to the MT than the 'Old Greek' of LXX B. See the comments in Stendahl, *The School of St. Matthew*, 80-83. The same passage relates to the execution of R. Simeon ben Gamaliel II in *ARN* A 38, '[R. Ishmael b. Elisha said] Concerning you Scripture says, "Awake, O sword, against my shepherd and against the man who is near to me"'.
⁶³¹ For Lohmeyer and Marxsen, the appearance in Galilee is in the future for the Markan audience: Lohmeyer, *Galiläa und Jerusalem* (FRLANT 34; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1936) 11-13; Lohmeyer, *Markus*, 355-356; Marxsen, *Der Evangelist Markus*, 33-77.

⁶³² Pace Schenke, *Studien zur Passionsgeschichte*, 360.

⁶³³ Matthew instead interprets it generally, 'so that the scriptures of the prophets may be fulfilled' (Mt 26:56; cf. some early mss. of Mk 14:49: N W).

⁶³⁴ In Mt 21:42, αἱ γραφαί refers to only one passage (LXX Ps 117:22-23).

⁶³⁵ A reference to Ps 41:9 (LXX 40:10; Mk 14:21) would be appropriate given that the betrayal occurs in 14:41-45. Cf. Pesch, *Das Markusevangelium*, 2.401, who thinks the referent is the various Psalms applied to the Passion Narrative; cf. Walter Schmithals (*Das Evangelium nach Markus: Kapitel 9, 2-16* [OTK 2/2; Gütersloh: Mohn, 1979] 646) and Marcus (*Mark: 8-16*, 994) who see Isa 53:12 behind the formula. That Mk 14:49 is a general statement à la 1 Cor 15:3, see Gnllka, *Das Evangelium nach Markus*, 2.271.

strangest moment in the Gospel, Mark or his source inserts the following detail: ‘A certain young man was following him, wearing nothing but a linen cloth. They caught hold of him, but he left the linen cloth and ran off naked’ (14:51-52).

The all-too-brief appearance of this scantily clad character has understandably perplexed scholars. Some have followed the fantasy that Mark is identifying himself to the reader as the naked young man.⁶³⁶ Others have speculated that Mark is hereby identifying an eyewitness source, which may also explain the inclusion of other conspicuous characters in the Passion Narrative (15:21,40,47).⁶³⁷ Perhaps the naked young man is to be contrasted with Jesus: Jesus does not flee, is stripped and then wrapped in a linen cloth (15:46: σινδών), whereas the young man flees, and is stripped of his linen cloth (14:51-52: σινδών).⁶³⁸ Could the comparison even be a perverse interpretation of Mk 4:25, ‘For to those who have, more will be given; and from those who have nothing, even what they have will be taken away’—in this case, linen cloths? Then again, it is possible the scene has its origins in the Jewish scriptures.⁶³⁹ In Amos 2:16 it reads, ‘And those who are stout of heart among the mighty shall flee away naked in that day’ (ואמיץ לבו בגבורים ערום ונוס ביום־ההוא). The LXX reads somewhat differently, ‘the naked shall pursue’ (ὁ γυμνὸς διώξεται), in contrast to the more literal translation of α’, σ’ and θ’: ‘shall flee naked’ (γυμνὸς φεύξεται). In this regard, the γυμνὸς ἔφυγεν of Mk 14:52 is closer to the MT (cf. α’, σ’ and θ’) of Amos 2:16 than the LXX. The possibility that Mark or his source composed this detail on the basis of Amos 2:16 may be strengthened by the similar use of Amos 8:9 in Mk 15:33.

But the description of the naked young man may at the same time reflect another scriptural source. When Potiphar’s wife attempts to seduce Joseph—who is elsewhere described as a ‘young man’ (LXX Gen 41:12: νεανίσκος)—by laying hold of his garments, he resists her advances, ‘and leaving his garments behind in her hands he fled and went outside’ (LXX Gen 39:12b: καὶ καταλιπὼν τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν αὐτῆς ἔφυγεν καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἔξω). As in Mk 14:51-52, a ‘young man’ (νεανίσκος)

⁶³⁶ Theodor Zahn, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament* (3rd ed.; Leipzig: Deichert, 1907) 2.250; Josef Schmid, *The Gospel According to Mark* (Staten Island, NY: Alba House, 1968) 273.

⁶³⁷ Lohmeyer, *Markus*, 323-324; Taylor, *The Gospel According to St. Mark*, 562; Barbara Saunderson, ‘Gethsemane: The Missing Witness’, *Biblica* 79 (1989): 224-233.

⁶³⁸ Albert Vanhoye, ‘La fuite de jeune homme nu (Mc 14,51-52)’, *Bib* 52 (1971): 401-406; Harry Fleddermann, ‘The Flight of a Naked Young Man (Mark 14:51-52)’, *CBQ* 41 (1979): 412-418.

⁶³⁹ So Alfred Loisy, *L’Évangile selon Marc* (Paris: Nourry, 1912) 425; Eric Klostermann, *Das Markusevangelium* (5th ed.; HNT 3; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1971) 153.

is caught and ‘fled’ (ἔφυγεν) ‘leaving’ (καταλιπὼν) his garment. One ancient text even has Joseph fleeing naked, possibly under the influence of Amos 2:16: ‘When I saw, therefore, that in her madness she had seized my garment, I shook loose and left it and fled naked’ (*T. Jos.* 8:3: ὡς οὖν εἶδον ὅτι μαινομένη βία κρατεῖ τὰ ἱμάτιά μου, γυμνὸς ἔφυγον).⁶⁴⁰ This raises the possibility that Mark or his source composed the scene in 14:51-52 to illustrate the flight of Amos 2:16 using the image of Joseph fleeing Potiphar’s wife in Gen 39:12.⁶⁴¹ The fleeting and incidental nature of the scene does resemble others in the Passion Narrative which clearly depend on a scriptural source (Mk 15:24,33,36).⁶⁴² The verbal similarities, however, are only scant. As it is, the only passage certainly behind the αἱ γραφαί formula in 14:49b is the marked citation of Zech 13:7b (Mk 14:27).⁶⁴³

Was the flight of the disciples composed on the basis of Zech 13:7b? The question deserves consideration. Mark appears to be the only source for the desertion. Matthew simply repeats Mk 14:50 (Mt 26:56) whilst omitting the flight of the naked man, whereas Luke omits the desertion in its entirety, only noting that Peter followed at a distance (Lk 22:54; cf. Mk 14:54). John appears to be rebutting the tradition of the desertion when he has Jesus explain the absence of the disciples, ‘So if you are looking for me, let these men go’, adding, ‘This was to fulfill the word that he had spoken, “I did not lose a single one of those whom you gave me”’ (Jn 18:8-9; cf. 6:39; 17:12). But why would Mark (or his source) create such a damning portrait of the men whom Jesus chose? Mark elsewhere presents the disciples in an unflattering light. They are shown to be haughty (8:32-33; 14:31), jealous (9:33-34,38; 10:13,37) and above all, ignorant (4:40-41; 6:37,51-52; 8:4,16-21; 9:5-6,28,32; 10:24).⁶⁴⁴ Jesus even calls their leader, Peter, ‘Satan’ (σατανᾶ). But the Passion Narrative shows them to be more than imperfect disciples of Jesus: Judas betrays him, three fail to keep watch, Peter denies

⁶⁴⁰ Note the similar use of κρατέω as in Mk 14:51.

⁶⁴¹ Compare also with the description of the wicked in 2 *En.* 10:5-6, who, ‘to supply clothing, take away the last garment of the naked’.

⁶⁴² Like the use of Amos 8:9, the use of Amos 2:16 could be eschatologically significant. Cf. Allison, *The End of the Ages*, 26-30. The flight of the disciples echoes the words of Jesus in Mk 8:35-38. Given that this pericope reflects a knowledge of the Passion (8:31,34), it may be intended as an indictment of the disciples for deserting Jesus (14:50-52,66-72). They were not those who endured till the end and were saved (13:13b), but those who fled away naked on the day of the LORD (Amos 2:16).

⁶⁴³ As Yarbro Collins, *Mark*, 687.

⁶⁴⁴ On the function of Mark’s negative portrait of the disciples, see Malbon, ‘Disciples/Crowds/Whoever: Markan Characters and Readers’, *NovT* 28 (1986): 104-130.

him and all desert him. It is clear that some early Christian communities contested the authority of those who claimed to be Jesus' disciples (2 Cor 11:1,5,13; 12:11; Gal 2:11-14) and it is conceivable that Mark belonged to such a community.⁶⁴⁵ Thus, the desertion of the disciples in Mk 14:50-52 may have originated in a sectarian context.⁶⁴⁶

But it could also be intended to explain a problem posed by the earliest kerygma: none of Jesus' followers were known to have been crucified with him. That the disciples deserted Jesus may have been inferred solely on the basis of this fact. When the hour came, not a single one of Jesus' disciples was willing to 'drink the cup' that he was about to drink. Why had they not 'taken up their crosses' and died with him, as Jesus demanded (8:34) and Peter promised (14:31)? Why had they not defended Jesus from those who persecuted him until the very end? The other Gospels appear to address this last charge by having Jesus rebuke the disciple who molests the slave of the high priest (Mt 26:51-54; Lk 22:49-51; Jn 18:10-11; cf. Mk 14:47).⁶⁴⁷ For Mark, however, the answer is simple albeit undeveloped: the disciples betrayed and deserted Jesus because of what is written in the scriptures. This does not absolve them of moral responsibility. As those who were unwilling to 'take up their cross' (8:34), who were 'ashamed' (8:38) of the Son of Man and did not endure 'till the end' (13:13), they should expect retribution, worst of all the betrayer (14:21). But there is still an air of fatalism in Jesus' words, 'But let the scriptures be fulfilled'. It could not have been any other way. It may be then that Mark (or his source) sought to explain the absence of the disciples at Jesus' crucifixion by invoking the scriptures. The cowardly and duplicitous disciples were, after all, simply playing their part in the divine plan.

Whether or not Mark (or his source) authored this tradition in its entirety, the question remains as to whether the scriptures—in this case, Zech 13:7b—influenced the narrative beyond the words of Jesus' prophecy in Mk 14:27. Did it lead to the creation of narrative details, as LXX Ps 40:10 influenced the description of Jesus' betrayer eating bread with him? The council and the guards 'strike' (14:65: *κολαρίζω*;

⁶⁴⁵ So Theodore J. Weeden, 'The Heresy That Necessitated Mark's Gospel', *ZNW* 59 (1968): 145-158; *Mark—Traditions in Conflict* (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1971) 26-43; Kelber, *Mark's Story of Jesus* (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1979) 30-42, 88-96.

⁶⁴⁶ As Günter Klein notes, Mk 14:66-72 stands in some tension with the *ἔφυγον πάντες* of 14:50, but this too may contain an anti-Petrine element, 'Die Verleugnung des Petrus: Eine traditionsgeschichte Untersuchung', *ZTK* 58 (1961): 285-328.

⁶⁴⁷ There is no such rebuke in Mk 14:47.

15:19: τύπτω) the shepherd (Jesus), though not in the same words as Zech 13:7b (πατάσσω). The disciples scatter in the sense that they ‘deserted him and fled’ (14:50: καὶ ἀφέντες αὐτὸν ἔφυγον), though again not in the words of Jesus’ prophecy (διασκορπίζω). The crowd comes with clubs and ‘swords’ (μάχαιραι), though not in the same words as LXX Zech 13:7a, ‘Awake, *O sword* (ρόμφαία), against my shepherd’. It would appear then that the words of Zech 13:7b serve to interpret the flight of the disciples, but not to describe the act of desertion itself. The use of Zech 13:7 in the Passion Narrative can thus be compared to the *expositional* use of the same passage in the *Damascus Document*, where it becomes a prophecy concerning the eschatological fate of the wicked: ‘But (over) all those who despise the precepts and the ordinances, may be emptied over them the punishment of the wicked, when God visits the earth, when there comes the word which is written by the hand of the prophet Zechariah: “Wake up, sword, against my shepherd, and against the male who is my companion – oracle of God – strike the shepherd, and the flock may scatter, and I shall turn my hand against the little ones”’ (CD B 19:5-9). Both texts use Zech 13:7 to describe future events: in CD B 19:5-9 it foretells what God will do to the wicked, whereas in Mk 14:27 it foretells what the disciples will do when the Son of Man is handed over.⁶⁴⁸ For Mark, this future arrives swiftly in the night, as the disciples are sleeping (cf. Mk 13:35-37). When it comes, the disciples do what is written of them, forsaking their master. Peter lingers for a little while longer (14:54,66-72), but once the cock crows for a second time, Peter and the disciples vanish from the narrative, never to appear again, leaving Jesus to face his dreadful fate alone.

Grief in the Garden: Mk 14:34 and Ps 42:6

The desertion of the disciples forms an *inclusio* with the prophecy of Zech 13:7b. Placed in between these two markers is the brief interlude in Gethsemane. As he has done before (5:37; 9:2), Jesus withdraws from the other disciples with Peter, James and John. In a moment of humanity, he confesses to them, ‘My soul is deeply grieved, even to death; remain here, and keep awake’ (14:34: περίλυπός ἐστιν ἡ ψυχή

⁶⁴⁸ Cf. the application of Zech 13:7 to the execution of R. Simeon ben Gamaliel II in *ARN* A 38.

μου ἕως θανάτου· μείνατε ὧδε καὶ γρηγορεῖτε).⁶⁴⁹ Jesus' command to 'keep awake' (γρηγορεῖτε), and the disciples failure to heed the command (14:37-42), ties the scene to the Olivet discourse (13:35,37). This is one of many details in the Passion Narrative which mirrors the signs of the end of the age in Mk 13—signaling that for Mark the death of Jesus is a cosmic, eschatological event.⁶⁵⁰ But another text may also lie behind the words of Jesus here. His words echo those of the Psalmist in Ps 42:6b, 'My soul is cast down within me' (עלי נפשי תשתוחח).⁶⁵¹ Whilst the LXX renders the third person hitpolel תשתוחח as ἐταράχθη, the second person תשתוחח in the Psalmist's refrain appears as it does in Mk 14:34, 'Why are you deeply grieved, O my soul' (LXX Ps 41:6,12; 42:5: ἵνα τί περίλυπος εἶ, ψυχῆ). This leaves some confusion as to whether Jesus' words reflect the Hebrew or an unknown Greek variant of Ps 42:6b, or if they reflect the repeated refrain of LXX Ps 42-43.⁶⁵² This is further complicated by the fact no parallel exists in either Psalm to Jesus' words, 'even to death' (ἕως θανάτου). Some have followed Jerome in thinking that Jesus' words owe instead to LXX Jon 4:9b, where Jonah mourns the loss of the pumpkin, 'I am exceedingly grieved, unto death' (σφοδρὰ λελύπημαι ἐγὼ ἕως θανάτου).⁶⁵³ Another often overlooked parallel may be found in the story of Samson, where Delilah taunts him until 'his soul was vexed to death' (Judg 16:16b: ותקצר נפשו למות).⁶⁵⁴ But the fact that Ps 42 (LXX 41) was used to depict the suffering of individuals elsewhere in Second Temple literature makes it the most likely source for the words of Jesus in Mk 14:34.

The most striking parallel may be found, again, in the *Hodayot*: 'Breakers rush against me and my soul within me has weakened right to destruction' (1QH 16:32: ויתעופפו עלי משברים ונפשי עלי תשתוחח לכלה). The second clause reflects *mutatis mutandis* the Hebrew of Ps 42:6b, 'My soul is cast down within me' (עלי נפשי תשתוחח). The first clause may also reflect the pelagic imagery of Ps 42:7b, 'All your waves and your billows have gone over me' (כל־משברִיך וגליך עלי עברו). Interestingly, the *Hodayot* adds

⁶⁴⁹ Translation mine.

⁶⁵⁰ For an overview of the parallels, see Allison, *The End of the Ages*, 36-38.

⁶⁵¹ Cf. MT Ps 6:3 (LXX 6:4).

⁶⁵² The updated *Loci Citati vel Allegati* in NA²⁸ favours the latter. See also Marcus, *Mark: 8-16*, 974-975; Ahearne-Kroll, *The Psalms of Lament in Mark's Passion*, 66-69; O'Brien, *The Use of Scripture in the Markan Passion Narrative*, 125-128.

⁶⁵³ *Jérôme, commentaire sur Jonah* (ed. Yves-Marie Duval; SC 323; Paris: Cerf, 1985) 107-108; similarly Origen, *Comm. Matt.* 90. So also Gundry, *Mark*, 867; cf. Moo, *The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives*, 240-241.

⁶⁵⁴ Translation own. The similarity is noted by Klostermann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 168.

the expression, '[right] to destruction' (לכלה), which, appearing as it does after the language of Ps 42:6b, corresponds to the phrase in Mk 14:34, 'even to death' (ἕως θανάτου).⁶⁵⁵ As already noted, the *Hodayot*, like the Passion Narrative, uses the Psalms (along with other passages) to compose a narrative of suffering (*Leidengeschichte*) which is presented in the laments of the hymnist. Indeed, 1QH 16:32 is not the only place in the *Hodayot* which reflects the language of Ps 42. The words of the hymnist in 1QH 13:33-34, 'I am eating the bread of weeping, my drink is tears without end' (ואוכלה בלחם אנחה ושקוי בדמעות אין כלה), appear to build on the imagery of Ps 42:3a, 'My tears have been my food day and night' (דמעתי לחם יומם ולילה) (היתה לי).

But the language of Ps 42 is also used in narrative descriptions of suffering as well as hymns like the *Hodayot*.⁶⁵⁶ *LAB* 50 features a scripturalized narrative of Hannah's despair as told in 1 Sam 1. Peninnah taunts Hannah using imagery from Isa 56:3, 'What does it profit you that Elkanah your husband loves you, for you are a *dry tree*' (*LAB* 50:1: *lignum siccum*; cf. Isa 56:3: עץ יבש). Adding, 'And I know that my husband will love me, because he delights in the sight of my sons standing around him like a plantation of olives trees' (*tamquam plantation oliveti*)—reflecting Ps 128:3, 'Your children will be like olive shoots' (כשתלי זיתים). In her grief, Hannah begins praying to the LORD, only to stop, for fear that 'Peninnah will then be even more eager to taunt me as she does daily when she says, "Where is your God in whom you trust?"' (*LAB* 50:5b: *et erit ut plus me zelans improperet mihi Fenenna sicut quotidie dicit: Ubi est Deus tuus in quo confides?*). Here, the image of one who 'taunts' (*impropero*) 'daily' (*quotidie*) saying 'Where is your God?' (*Ubi est Deus tuus*) comes directly from Ps 42:3b, 'While people say to me continually (*lit.* all-day), "Where is your God?"' (באמר אלי כל־היום איה אלהיך).⁶⁵⁷

As the hymnist of 1QH 16:23 and Hannah in *LAB* 50:5 use Ps 42 to describe their own suffering, the Markan Jesus uses the language of Ps 42:6b to describe his own suffering to the disciples. Jesus then departs to pray alone (14:35), as he has done

⁶⁵⁵ As noted in Gnllka, *Das Evangelium nach Markus*, 2.259.

⁶⁵⁶ There is also reason to suspect that Ps 42:1 lies behind the description of Jacob in the fragmentary *History of Joseph*: 'to see [Ja]cob as a deer . . . the water' (*Hist. Jos. verso C*).

⁶⁵⁷ *LAB* 50:5b provides one of the rare agreements between *LAB* and the Vulgate: cf. Vg Ps 42:2: *Ubi est Deus tuus*. In the medieval *Midrash Tehillim*, Ps 42:3 refers to Elkanah's words to Hannah in 1 Sam 1:8.

before (1:35; 6:46). He utters an anguished prayer (14:36,40), which appears paltry and pathetic when compared to the effusive prayers of the great Jewish heroines on the eve of their respective contests: Esther before Ahasuerus (LXX Est 14) and Judith before Holofernes (Jdt 9). Instead, Jesus pleads to be delivered from the fate he earlier said was inevitable (8:31; 9:12,31; 10:33-34; 14:21). What accounts for this sudden reluctance on Jesus' part? Interestingly, Matthew and Luke both preserve Mk 14:36 in some form (Mt 26:39,42; Lk 22:42). Only in John does one find any discomfort with the Gethsemane prayer, as Jesus says, 'And what should I say—"Father, save me from this hour"? No, it is for this reason that I have come to this hour' (12:27; cf. 18:11). On the one hand, Mark (or his source) may have sought to capture the deep humanity of Jesus' suffering. As his hour of tribulation arrives, Jesus begs for deliverance, all the while entrusting his fate to God—a model for those who would 'endure to the end' (Mk 13:13b). At the same time, it may be an attempt to distance Jesus from the lust for martyrdom that so characterized the wars of 66-73 CE.⁶⁵⁸ For Mark, Jesus' death, though inescapable, was no suicide. He died, not by his own design, but according to the will of God.⁶⁵⁹ One imagines that Mark could have gladly heard the Pauline hymn, 'He humbled himself and became obedient to the point of death—even death on a cross' (Phil 2:8).⁶⁶⁰

But as the scene departs from Gethsemane, the story nevertheless hurtles towards the inevitable—not just Jesus' impending death, but the end of all things. Like the elect in the Olivet discourse, Jesus is 'handed over' (παραδίδομι) to 'councils' (συνέδρια) and 'governors' (ἡγεμόνες) where he is 'beaten' (δέρω; cf. κολαφίζω/τύπτω). The reader cannot help but see shades of the *eschaton* in Jesus' final hours. The Markan Jesus invites them to make this connection, as he tells the high

⁶⁵⁸ The speech of Josephus against suicide in *War* 3.361-382 may reflect a distaste for martyrdom following the conflict; cf. the speech of Eleazar, *War* 7.358-360. Later rabbinic literature appears to condemn taking one's own life: *b. B. Kam.* 91b; *b. Avod. Zar.* 18a; *Gen. Rab.* 34:13; *Sem.* 2:1-5. The lust for martyrdom in early Christianity finds its purest expression in Ignatius of Antioch, esp. *Rom.* 1-8.

⁶⁵⁹ Clement of Alexandria likewise distinguishes between seeking martyrdom and heeding the will of God: *Strom.* 4.77.1; 7.66. See Arthur J. Droge and James D. Tabor, *A Noble Death: Suicide and Martyrdom Among Christians and Jews in Antiquity* (San Francisco, CA: HarperSanFrancisco, 1992) 141-144.

⁶⁶⁰ On the self-abnegation of Jesus' death in Mark, see Bond, 'A Fitting End? Self-Denial and a Slave's Death in Mark's *Life of Jesus*', *NTS* 65 (2019), forthcoming.

priest, ‘And you will see the Son of Man seated at the right hand of the Power, and coming with the clouds of heaven’ (Mk 14:62). With these words, Jesus draws upon unmarked scriptural language from Ps 110:1 and LXX Dan 7:13, whilst at the same time recapitulating the final sign of the end of the age in Mk 13:26, ‘Then they will see the Son of Man coming in the clouds with great power and glory’. This signals that the rejection of Jesus by the temple elite will have eschatological consequences—the reader already knows that ‘not one stone’ will be left of the temple (13:2). The fate of the temple and its leaders will be sealed at the moment of Jesus’ death (15:38). Thus for Mark, the crucifixion of Jesus is as much about the events of 70 CE as those of c. 30 CE.⁶⁶¹ There is a direct line from the death of Jesus to the destruction of the temple (14:58; 15:29)—a nuance that John was apparently unable to appreciate (Jn 2:21). It is part of Mark’s design that sole responsibility for the death of Jesus lie with the defeated (14:55-65; 15:11-14) and not the victors of the Jewish war (15:2-15). The Passion Narrative becomes a theodicy of sorts. The wrongful execution of Jesus explains (if not rationalizes) the catastrophic losses suffered by the Judeans in 66-73 CE. The outcome of the war was seen as proof of the Jewish leaders’ guilt, as it was proof of the Roman leaders’ innocence (15:6-15,39). Mark’s early readers could not have read the gross miscarriage of justice in Jesus’ trial without recalling what befell the leaders of the temple.⁶⁶² The scene tempts readers to draw a causal connection between the events of c. 30 CE and 70 CE—and indeed one reader did (Mt 27:24-25).⁶⁶³

For the duration of the trial, along with the denial of Peter and the sentencing of Pilate, only a few narrative details may have their origin in the Jewish scriptures. The pleonastic repetition of ‘false testimony’ (Mk 14:56-57: ἐψευδομαρτύρου) may reflect the Mosaic prohibition against bearing false witness (LXX Exod 20:17; LXX Deut 5:16: ψευδομαρτυρήσεις) or the ‘false witnesses’ who rise up against the Psalmist (Ps 27:12: עֲדוּי־שֶׁקֶר).⁶⁶⁴ A scriptural source may also lie behind the awkward

⁶⁶¹ As Paula Fredriksen, ‘Jesus and the Temple, Mark and the War’ in *SBL 1990 Seminar Papers* (ed. David J. Lull; SBLSP 29; Atlanta, GA: Scholars, 1990) 293-310 (esp. 304-307).

⁶⁶² The request to release the ‘rebel’ (στασιαστής) Barabbas foreshadows the popular support for rebel leaders in the period leading up to the war. The involvement of the chief priests appears especially foreboding in light of the slaughter of the temple elite by rebel factions (Josephus, *War* 4.197-333).

⁶⁶³ And did so with tragic consequences, see Jill-Levine, *The Misunderstood Jew: The Church and the Scandal of the Jewish Jesus* (San Francisco, CA: HarperSanFrancisco, 2006) 99-102, 168.

⁶⁶⁴ Cf. the translations of α’ (μάρτυρες ψεύδος) and σ’ (ψευδομάρτυρες). For the influence of Ps 27:12, see Gnilka, *Das Evangelium nach Markus*, 2.279-280; Josef Ernst, *Das Evangelium nach Markus* (RNT 2; Regensburg: Pustet, 1981) 441; Yarbrow Collins, *Mark*, 704. Cf. Suhl, *Die Funktion*

detail that Jesus ‘was silent and did not answer’ (14:61a: ἐσιώπα καὶ οὐκ ἀπεκρίνατο οὐδέν; cf. 15:5), right before he answers the high priest (14:62)—compare with LXX Isa 36:21, ‘But they were silent, and no one answered him a word’ (καὶ ἐσιώπησαν, καὶ οὐδεὶς ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ λόγον).⁶⁶⁵ The scene where the high priest ‘tore his clothes’ (Mk 14:63a: διαρρήξας τοὺς χιτῶνας αὐτοῦ) might also reflect the Levitical rule that the high priest ‘shall not tear his vestments’ (LXX Lev 21:10: τὰ ἱμάτια οὐ διαρρήξει).⁶⁶⁶ But in the final analysis, the only sure sign of scriptural language in Mk 14:53-15:20 is the unmarked composite citation of Ps 110:1 and LXX Dan 7:13 in Jesus’ words to the high priest, which signals that the spectre of the end of the age hangs over all that follows. From here on in, the most colourful images drawn from the Jewish scriptures will be reserved for the penultimate episode in the Gospel, the crucifixion of Jesus. The following section will focus on the episode from the moment of Jesus’ crucifixion to his last breath (Mk 15:21-41). As with the other scripturalized narratives surveyed earlier in the Gospel (1:12-20; 6:21-28,35-44; 8:1-9), the episode is modelled primarily on one scriptural passage—though, as will become clear, this is not the only source for the narrative.

The Song of the Cross: Mk 15:21-41 and Ps 22 (Pss 38; 69; Amos 8)

The scene begins with Pilate reluctantly bowing to the will of the chief priests—first by releasing Barabbas (15:7-11) and then by handing over Jesus to be crucified (15:14-15). But Pilate has the last laugh over the Jewish leaders, putting words in their mouth, ‘the man *you* call King of the Jews’ (15:12: ὑμῖν τὸν βασιλέα τῶν Ἰουδαίων)⁶⁶⁷—an appellation repeated by the soldiers in their mockery (15:17-18) and in a moment of grim irony, affixed to the cross (15:26). Indeed, the chief priests and the scribes play along with this farce, not knowing the joke is on them, ‘Let

der alttestamentlichen Zitate, 60; Gundry, *Mark*, 898. For the influence of Exod 20:17, see O’Brien, *The Use of Scripture in the Markan Passion Narrative*, 133-135. For both, see Pesch, *Das Markusevangelium*, 2.432.

⁶⁶⁵ The verbal agreement is slightly closer in D^{ca}: οὐδεν ἀπεκρίθη. In favour of the allusion is O’Brien, ‘Innocence and Guilt: Apologetic, Martyr Stories, and Allusion in the Markan Trial Narratives’ in *The Trial and Death of Jesus*, 205-228 (219-221); *The Use of Scripture in the Markan Passion Narrative*, 135-138

⁶⁶⁶ In favour of the allusion is Marcus, *Mark: 8-16*, 1008; as Davies and Allison note, Mt 27:65 brings the Markan passage closer to LXX Lev 21:10 (*Matthew*, 3.533).

⁶⁶⁷ Emphasis mine. This time, the irony was not lost on John (Jn 19:21-22).

the Messiah, the King of Israel, come down from the cross now, so that we may see and believe' (15:32). Throughout the sentencing, the mockery and the crucifixion, up until his final moment, Jesus remains silent. The narrative focuses instead on a series of abuses perpetrated against him, beginning with the flogging and mock coronation (15:15-23).⁶⁶⁸ But from the moment of Jesus' crucifixion until his death, one scriptural source comes to the fore: the episode of Jesus on the cross is framed by its use of Ps 22 (LXX 21).

The words of the Psalm are enacted by the soldiers (Mk 15:24b), the crowds (15:29-32) and, finally, Jesus himself (15:34). This begins with the detail, following the perfunctory report of Jesus' crucifixion (καὶ σταυροῦσιν αὐτόν), that his executioners 'divided his clothes among them, casting lots to decide what each should take' (15:24b: διαμερίζονται τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ [ἄ: εαυτου], βάλλοντες κλῆρον ἐπ' αὐτὰ τίς τί ἄρη). There can be little doubt that Mark (or his source) composed this detail using LXX Ps 21:19 (MT 22:18), 'They divided my clothes among themselves, and for my clothing they cast lots' (διεμερίσαντο τὰ ἱμάτιά μου ἑαυτοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν ἱματισμόν μου ἔβαλον κλῆρον). Whilst there may be reason to suspect a historical origin for the scene—the victims of crucifixion were, by some accounts, stripped naked⁶⁶⁹—Mark's early readers were evidently aware of its scriptural origin. Both Matthew and Luke omit the superfluous ἐπ' αὐτὰ τίς τί ἄρη, absent in the Psalm, making the scene closer to LXX Ps 21:19.⁶⁷⁰ John—who appears to rely on a source resembling Mk 15:24b—expands the scene, making the scriptural source explicit (Jn 19:23-25). Much like the quotation of LXX Ps 40:10 in relation to the scene of the

⁶⁶⁸ The offer of expensive wine and the carrying of Jesus' cross may be a continuation of the royal mockery, see Evans, *Mark 8:27-16:20*, 501; Bond, 'Paragon of Discipleship? Simon of Cyrene in the Markan Passion Narrative' in *Matthew and Mark Across Perspectives: Essays in Honour of Stephen C. Barton and William R. Telford* (ed. Kristian A. Bendoraitis and Nijay K. Gupta; LNTS 538; London: T&T Clark, 2016) 18-35; cf. T. E. Schmidt, 'Mark 15.16-32: The Crucifixion Narrative and the Roman Triumphal Procession', *NTS* 41 (1995): 1-18 (11-12). That the entire Passion Narrative is styled after a Roman Triumph, see Winn, *Reading Mark's Christology Under Caesar: Jesus the Messiah and Roman Imperial Ideology* (Downers Grove, IL; IVP Academic, 2018) 151-162.

⁶⁶⁹ Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. rom.* 7.29.2; Josephus, *Ant.* 19.270; Artemidorus Daldianus, *Onir.* 2.61.

⁶⁷⁰ Mk 27: διεμερίσαντο τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ βάλλοντες κλῆρον; Lk 23:24b: διαμεριζόμενοι δὲ τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ ἔβαλον κλήρους.

betrayal (Jn 13:18-30; cf. Mk 14:18-20), John introduces a verbatim quotation from LXX Ps 21:19 with a fulfilment formula following the scene.⁶⁷¹

Returning to Mark, language from the same Psalm appears again in the very next scene. Having noted the time, the inscription and those crucified with Jesus, it reads, ‘Those who passed by derided him, shaking their heads and saying, “. . . save yourself, and come down from the cross!”’ (Mk 15:29-30: καὶ οἱ παραπορευόμενοι ἐβλασφήμουν αὐτὸν κινουῦντες τὰς κεφαλὰς αὐτῶν καὶ λέγοντες . . . σῶσον σεαυτὸν καταβὰς ἀπὸ τοῦ στραυροῦ). This taunt is then echoed by the chief priests and the scribes, ‘He saved others; he cannot save himself’ (15:31b: ἄλλους ἔσωσεν, ἑαυτὸν οὐ δύναται σῶσαι). The image of Jesus’ hecklers shaking their heads (κινουῦντες τὰς κεφαλὰς) and saying ‘save yourself’ (σῶσον σεαυτὸν) reflects the language of LXX Ps 21:8-9, ‘All who saw me mocked at me; they talked with the lips; *they moved the head* (ἐκίνησαν κεφαλὴν): “He hoped in the Lord; let him rescue him; *let him save him* (σωσάτω αὐτόν), because he wanted him”’. This time, only Matthew appears aware of the scriptural source, putting more words of the Psalm into the mouths of the hecklers, ‘He trusts in God; let God deliver him, if he wants to’ (Mt 27:43a: πέποιθεν ἐπὶ τὸν θεόν, ῥυσάσθω νῦν εἰ θέλει αὐτόν; cf. LXX Ps 21:9: ἤλπισεν ἐπὶ κύριον, ῥυσάσθω αὐτόν . . . ὅτι θέλει αὐτόν). The scene of mockery in Mk 15:29-32 is also similar to the words of the wicked in the Wisdom of Solomon, who taunt the righteous one: ‘He professes to have knowledge of God and calls himself a child of the Lord . . . Let us see if his words are true, and let us test what will happen at the end of his life; for if the righteous man is God’s child, he will help him, and will deliver him from the hand of his adversaries . . . Let us condemn him to a shameful death, for, according to what he says, he will be protected’ (Wis 2:13,17-18,20).⁶⁷² The scene in Wisdom may itself

⁶⁷¹ The decision not to ‘tear’ (σχίζω) the ‘seamless tunic’ (χιτὸν ἄραφος) may also reflect the prohibition against tearing the clothes of the high priest (Lev 21:10)—unlike the high priest who tears his own clothes in Mk 14:63a. See Bond, ‘Discarding the Seamless Robe: The High Priesthood of Jesus in John’s Gospel’ in *Israel’s God and Rebecca’s Children: Christology and Community in Early Judaism and Christianity: Essays in Honor of Larry W. Hurtado and Alan F. Segal* (ed. David B. Capes, April D. DeConick, Bond and Troy A. Miller; Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2007) 183-194. Elsewhere, John appears to present Jesus as priestly figure, see John Paul Heil, ‘Jesus as the Unique High Priest in the Gospel of John’, *CBQ* 57 (1995): 729-745.

⁶⁷² Maurer, ‘Knecht Gottes und Sohn Gottes im Passionsberichte’, 26; Stendahl, *The School of St. Matthew*, 140-141; Danker, ‘The Demonic Secret in Mark: A Reexamination of the Cry of Dereliction’, *ZNW* 61 (1970): 48-69 (57). Cf. Suhl, *Die Funktion der alttestamentlichen Zitate*, 59-60.

depend on Ps 22.⁶⁷³ There is no sign, however, that the division of clothes (Ps 22:18) or the mocking gestures (22:7-8) were used in other narrative descriptions in Jewish antiquity⁶⁷⁴—with the possible exception of the two mute men healed by R. Judah in *b. Chag.* 3a, who would ‘shake their heads, and move their lips’ (ומרדקין שפוותיהו (ומניידי ברישייהו). The case is somewhat different regarding the final image from Ps 22 in Mk 15:21-39.

After the sun is darkened, Jesus cries out with a loud voice, ‘Eloi, Eloi lema sabachthani’ (ελωι ελωι λεμα σαβαχθανι)—his first and only words on the cross—which the text translates as ‘My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?’ (15:34: ὁ θεός μου ὁ θεός μου, εἰς τί ἐγκατέλιπές με;). The second part clearly reflects the opening line of the Psalm in Greek, ‘My God, my God, [attend to me;] why did you forsake me?’ (LXX Ps 21:2: ὁ θεός ὁ θεός μου, [πρόσχεσ μοι·] ἵνα τί ἐγκατέλιπές με;), whereas the first part appears to be a transliteration of the Psalm in Aramaic, resembling the later Targum: אלי אלי מלול מה שבקחני (*Tg. Ps.* 22:2).⁶⁷⁵ The inclusion of the Aramaic may have been intended to create the misunderstanding of the following verse—the bystanders mistake Jesus’ cry to God (ελωι) as an invocation of Elijah (Ἠλίας). Matthew, apparently recognizing that ελωι and Ἠλίας did not sound that alike, amends the transliteration to the more homophonous ηλι ηλι (Mt 27:46).⁶⁷⁶ The inclusion of Elijah again may reflect the eschatological character of the crucifixion. Elijah was, of course, the figure most commonly associated with the end of the age (Mal 4:5 [3:22]; Sir 48:10). But the (non-)appearance of Elijah also ties the scene to the transfiguration earlier in the Gospel (Mk 9:2-8). The crucifixion is in some sense a reversal of the transfiguration: Jesus appears, not with the righteous, but the unrighteous; he appears, not in dazzling raiment, but naked; he appears, not in light, but in darkness; he appears, not in the glory of the father, but forsaken by God—and this time Elijah is nowhere to be found. If George Boobyer is right, and the

⁶⁷³ See Omerzu, ‘Die Rezeption von Psalm 22 im Judentum zur Zeit des Zweiten Tempels’ in *Psalm 22 und die Passionsgeschichten der Evangelien* (ed. Sängler; BthSt 88; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2007) 33-76.

⁶⁷⁴ See the division of Esther’s clothes in the much later *Midr. Teh.* 22:7,27.

⁶⁷⁵ So Gnilka, *Das Evangelium nach Markus*, 2.322; Marcus, *Mark: 8-16*, 1054-1055.

⁶⁷⁶ Whilst also altering the Greek to better reflect the wording of the LXX (ἵνατί με ἐγκατέλιπες). See Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3.629. Luke may have omitted it for the very same reason, so Brown, *Death of the Messiah*, 2.1066-1067, n. 95.

transfiguration represents the same scene as Mk 13:26-27, then this would be another instance where the Passion Narrative harkens back to the Olivet Discourse.⁶⁷⁷

The words of Ps 22:1, appearing as they do on the lips of Jesus, continue the theme of suffering evoked by the other material from the Psalm. Here is the Son of Man, alone on a cross, abandoned and bewildered. The scene is one of utter dejection and humiliation. There is no sign in the text that Mark or his source envisions the vindication that the Psalmist experiences at the end of the Psalm (22:21b-31).⁶⁷⁸ If the author wished to express this, they could have inserted language from the *rettungteil* of the Psalm at any point in the narrative.⁶⁷⁹ Instead, the narrative draws exclusively from the *klageteil* of Ps 22, much like other texts from the period.⁶⁸⁰ The language of LXX Ps 21:2 thus gives voice to Jesus' grief in the midst of tribulation. If there is any silver lining, it is in the impending judgment of Jesus' enemies (alluded to in Mk 15:38)—which was in the past for Mark's audience—and the imminence of the eschaton foreshadowed by the darkness at noon (15:33; cf. 13:24-25)—which was yet to come. This image of Jesus, anguished and powerless, appears to have been unacceptable to Luke, who replaces the passivity of Ps 22:1 with the equanimity of Ps 31:5, 'Father into your hands I commend my spirit' (Lk 23:46b: *πάτερ, εἰς χεῖράς σου παρατίθεμαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου*; LXX Ps 30:6: *εἰς χεῖράς σου παραθήσομαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου*).⁶⁸¹ But whilst Luke may have found it distasteful, Jesus' cry of dereliction (Mk 15:34; Mt 27:46) is not the only instance where the opening line of Psalm 22 appears in the narrative description of a suffering individual.

Jesus and Esther?: The Compositional Use of Ps 22

The Talmudic tractate *Megillah* provides a midrashic commentary on the narrative of Esther by associating verses from the scroll with others in the Jewish

⁶⁷⁷ See George H. Boobyer, *St. Mark and the Transfiguration Story* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1942) 29, 119.

⁶⁷⁸ Pace Watts, 'The Psalms in Mark's Gospel', 43-44; Holly Carey, *Jesus' Cry from the Cross: Towards a First-Century Understanding of the Intertextual Relationship between Psalm 22 and the Narrative of Mark's Gospel* (LNTS 398; London: T&T Clark, 2009) 139-170; Rebekah Eklund, *Jesus Wept: The Significance of Jesus' Laments in the New Testament* (LNTS 515; London: T&T Clark, 2016) 43-45; Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels*, 84-86.

⁶⁷⁹ So Foster, 'Echoes without Resonance', 101.

⁶⁸⁰ Omerzu, 'Die Rezeption von Psalm 22', 58.

⁶⁸¹ Compare with John 19:30.

scriptures, often with the formula ‘as it is stated’ (שנאמר). This *expositional* use of scriptural material can be demonstrated with the following detail: ‘What did Esther see that she invited Haman? R. Eliezer says: She set traps for him, *as is said* (שנאמר) “let their table be a trap for them” (*b. Meg.* 15b)—thus citing Ps 69:23. The *Megillah* also features the *compositional* use of scriptural details, as in one scene where Esther is shown enacting the words of Psalm 22.⁶⁸² Like the Greek versions of Esther, the Gemara has Esther in the throes of despair before she approaches Ahasuerus (*b. Meg.* 15b; cf. Est 5:1). According to R. Levi, ‘When [Esther] reached the idol room, the divine presence left her. She said: “My God, my God, why have you abandoned me?”’ (לביית הצלמים נסתלקה הימנה שכינה אמרה אלי אלי למה עזבתני)⁶⁸³ Esther then speculates as to why God has forsaken her, whether it was ‘because I called [Haman] a dog’ (כלב) (על שקראתי) as in Ps 22:21. So instead she ‘called him a lion’ (וקראתו אריה) as in Ps 22:22. The later collection of the *Midrash Tehillim* builds on the scripturalized narrative of *b. Meg.* 15b, showing how each line of Ps 22 applies to the *megillah*.⁶⁸⁴ The words of the Psalm become, almost in their entirety, the words of Esther—with the opening line (אלי אלי) featuring most prominently (*Midr. Teh.* 22:2,6,16,17). Details from the Psalm also become part of the narrative, as the people of the palace plot to divide Esther’s clothes, ‘And everyone said, “I shall take Esther’s apparel,” this one saying “Me, I shall take her ornaments”; and that one saying “Me, I shall take her earrings”; and another one saying “Me, I shall take her royal vesture,” as is known

⁶⁸² *B. Yom.* 29a likewise associates the Psalm with Esther; cf. *Gen. Rab.* 46:7, where the Psalm is associated with the *Aqedah*.

⁶⁸³ On the possibility that Jewish exegesis of Ps 22 was formulated in response to the use of the Psalm by Christians, see Abraham Jacob Berkovitz, ‘Jewish and Christian Exegetical Controversy in Late Antiquity: The Case of Psalm 22 and the Esther Narrative’ in *Ancient Readers and their Scriptures: Engaging the Hebrew Bible in Early Judaism and Christianity* (ed. Garrick Allen and John Anthony Dunne; AGAJU 107; Leiden: Brill, 2018) 222-239. See also the early Byzantine Jewish poem in Aramaic, which associates Jesus and Haman using language from the Psalm, in Ophir Münz-Manor, ‘Carnavalesque Ambivalence and the Christian Other in Aramaic Poems from Byzantine Palestine’ in *Jews in Byzantium: Dialectics of Minority and Majority Cultures* (ed. Guy. G. Stroumsa et al; Leiden: Brill, 2012) 831-845. That the Psalm may have been used polemically in later Jewish conceptions of the Messiah, see Rivka Ulmer, ‘Psalm 22 in Pesiqta Rabbati: The Suffering of the Jewish Messiah and Jesus’ in *The Jewish Jesus: Revelation, Reflection, Reclamation* (ed. Zev Garber; West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press, 2011) 106-128.

⁶⁸⁴ To such an extent that the Psalm becomes a prophecy of Esther: ‘As soon as David foresaw by the help of the Holy Spirit . . . blessed be He, David, thinking upon Esther, arranged this Psalm’ (*Midr. Teh.* 22:7). See Lerner, ‘The Works of Aggadic Midrash and the Esther Midrashim’, 152, on difficulties with dating this midrash.

from Esther's statement: They part my garments among them, and cast lots upon my vesture' (*Midr. Teh.* 22:7; also 22:27).⁶⁸⁵

Evidence that the opening line of the Psalm was used in texts contemporaneous to the Gospel is more fragmentary. Although fragments of the Psalm survive at Qumran (4Q88 Frg. 1-2; 5/6HevPs Frg. 1-2), the opening line is thought to be unattested.⁶⁸⁶ The language of Ps 22:1 could, however, lie behind the unknown Psalm (Frg. 79) in the collection of 4Q381: 'my [G]od, do not forsake [me ...]' ([... תעזבני] אלהי אל [א . . .]). A still more intriguing reference may be found in the *Apocryphon of Joseph* (4Q372), in the narrative corresponding to Gen 37:12-36. When Joseph's brothers sell him to the gentiles, it reads, '[they] consumed his strength and broke *all his bones* (כל עצמיו)', so Joseph 'summoned the powerful God to save him (גבור להושיעו) (כל עצמיו) (וקרא אל אל) from their hands. And he said: "My father and my God, do not abandon me (אבי ואלהי אל תעזבני) in the hands of gentiles"' (4Q372 1:15-16).⁶⁸⁷ Here, the emphatic address to God concerning 'abandonment' (עזב) may reflect the opening line of the Psalm, whilst the detail that 'all his bones' (כל עצמיו) were broken evokes the words of Ps 22:14b: 'And all my bones are out of joint' (והתפרדו כל-עצמותי).⁶⁸⁸

That the rest of the Psalm was used elsewhere in Qumran is much more certain. Three times the *Hodayot* adapts the language of Ps 22:14: 'All [my bones] have fractured, my heart has melted like wax in front of the fire, my knees give way like water which flows down a slope' (1QH 12:33-34); 'The foundations of my build have crumbled, my bones have been disjoined, my entrails heave like a boat in the rage of the storm, my heart pulsates to destruction, a whirlwind swallows me' (1QH 15:4-5); 'My heart pours out like water, my flesh melts like wax, the vitality of my loins has turned into listlessness, my arm is broken at the elbow [with]out my being able to wave my hand' (1QH 16:32-33).⁶⁸⁹ Language from the Psalm occurs again at 1QH 13:31

⁶⁸⁵ Note also the following: "All they that see me laugh to scorn; they shoot out the lip, they shake the head" refers to Haman's sons who laughed Jews to scorn, shot out their lips at them, and shook their heads at them, saying, "On the morrow these will be slain, or hanged" (*Midr. Teh.* 22:21).

⁶⁸⁶ The fragments contain Ps 22:14-17 and 22:4-21, respectively.

⁶⁸⁷ The invocation of God as father closely resembles Sir 51:10, 'I cried out, "Lord, you are my Father; do not forsake me in the days of trouble"'. The language of 4Q372 can also be compared to Pss 27:9; 38:21; 71:9,18.

⁶⁸⁸ The exhaustion of Joseph's 'strength' (כחי) may also allude to the withering of 'strength' (כחי) in Ps 22:15.

⁶⁸⁹ See Omerzu, 'Die Rezeption von Psalm 22', 58-67; Cavicchia Alessandro, *Le sorti e le vesti* (Tesi Gregoriana Serie Teologia 181; Rome: Editrice Pontifica Università Gregoriana, 2010) 135-152; cf. Elwolde, 'The Hodayot's Use of the Psalter (Book 1)', 93.

(cf. 4Q429 4:4), where the hymnist declares, ‘My tongue sticks to {my} palate’ (מדבק ולשוני לה {כי}ה)—compare with MT Ps 22:15b: מדבק מלקוחי ולשוני לה {כי}ה. The deliverance of the hymnist from the lions, who ‘did not open their mouths against me’ (1QH 13:10-11: ולא פצו עלי פיהם) also appears to reflect the language of Ps 22:13, ‘they open wide their mouths at me, like a ravening and roaring lion’ (פצו עלי פיהם אריה טלף ושאג). Indeed, the song of deliverance from the lions in 1QH 13:6-19 may build upon the imagery of Ps 22:13-21 more broadly, though it also contains a clear allusion to Ps 58:6: ‘You closed the mouth of the lion cubs, whose teeth are like a sword, whose fangs are like a sharpened spear’ (1QH 13:9-10; also 13:13-15). The lion imagery of Ps 22:21 may be found again in *Joseph and Aseneth*, a Greek text dating roughly to the same era as the Gospel.⁶⁹⁰ In one scene, Aseneth prays for deliverance from the Egyptian, ‘From his mouth deliver me, lest he carry me off like a lion’ (12:11: ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ ἐξελοῦ με, μήποτε ἀρπάσῃ με ὡς λέων)—which reflects the language of LXX Ps 21:14: ἤνοιξαν ἐπ’ ἐμὲ τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν ὡς λέων ὁ ἀρπάζων. The language of the Psalm resurfaces later in the prayer, where Aseneth declares, ‘And my mouth has become dry as a drum, and my tongue as a horn, and my lips as a potsherd . . . and my entire strength has left (me)’ (*Jos. Asen.* 13:9: καὶ τὸ στόμα μου γέγονε ξηρὸν ὡς τυμπανον καὶ ἡ γλῶσσά μου ὡς κέρασ καὶ τὰ χεῖλη μου ὡς ὄστρακον . . . καὶ ἡ ἰσχὺς μου πᾶσα ἐκέλοιπεν). This builds upon LXX Ps 21:16, ‘My strength was dried up like a potsherd, and my tongue stuck to my throat’ (ἐξηράνθη ὡς ὄστρακον ἡ ἰσχὺς μου, καὶ ἡ γλῶσσά μου κεκόλληται τῷ λάρρυγι μου).

In each of these examples, unmarked language from Ps 22—again, exclusively from the *klageteil* of the Psalm (22:1-21a)—is used to describe the suffering of an individual. Only in the *Hodayot*, does the sufferer speak from the standpoint of salvation—the language of the Psalm relates to the hymnist’s past experience of suffering. In the other examples, the language is used to describe a righteous person in the midst of suffering. Multiple images from the Psalm are applied to the individuals: for Esther (Ps 22:1,21-22 in *b. Meg.* 15b), the hymnist (Ps 22:13-15 in 1QH *passim*) and Aseneth (LXX Ps 21:14,16 in *Jos. Asen.* 12:11; 13:9).⁶⁹¹ In none of these cases does the whole Psalm appear to be in view (unlike the medieval *Midrash Tehillim*).

⁶⁹⁰ Collins favours a first-century CE date, ‘Joseph and Aseneth: Jewish or Christian?’, *JSP* 14 (2005): 97-112.

⁶⁹¹ To this may be added Ps 22:1,14 in 4Q372 1:15-16.

Nor does the purported Davidic authorship of the Psalm play any role in its use. Rather, the Psalm appears to have been selected simply because it relates to suffering.

Mark, on the other hand, shows some concern for Davidic authorship elsewhere. In one of the few marked citations in the Gospel, Jesus quotes LXX Ps 109:1 (MT 110:1) with the formula, ‘David himself, by the Holy Spirit, declared’ (12:26a: αὐτὸς Δαυὶδ εἶπεν ἐν τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ). With this citation, the Markan Jesus appears to argue that the messiah is really the ‘son of God’ (υἱὸς θεοῦ) and not the ‘son of David’ (υἱὸς Δαυὶδ).⁶⁹² Other allusions to Davidic Psalms further contribute to the identification of Jesus as the ‘son of God’ (Ps 2:7 in Mk 1:11; 9:7; Ps 110:1 in Mk 14:62). This is even reflected in non-Davidic Psalms: when the crowds at the triumphal entry invoke the house of David using the words of the *hallel* (Mk 11:9-10; LXX Ps 117:26), the implication seems to be that they have misunderstood Jesus’ true identity. Only once outside of the Passion Narrative does Mark use language from the Psalms (12:10-11)—also from the *hallel* (in this case, Ps 118:22)—without referencing Jesus’ identity: in the context of the parable of the wicked tenants it may refer to the supplanting of the Judeans by the Gentiles, presumably in the events of 66-73 CE. The Psalmic language of sonship does appear in the Passion Narrative in the direct speech of Jesus to the high priest (Mk 14:62). Though unmarked, the use of the Psalm here resembles other *expositional* marked citations or allusions in the direct speech of characters (Mk 1:11; 9:7; 11:9; 12:10-11,36). By contrast, the other examples in the Passion Narrative are of a *compositional* nature as they are unmarked and embedded into the narrative itself (LXX Ps 40:10 in Mk 14:18-20, Ps 42:6 in Mk 14:34, LXX Ps 21 in Mk 15:24-34, LXX Ps 68:22 in Mk 15:36 and LXX Ps 37:12 in Mk 15:40 [14:54]). There is no clear sign that the *compositional* use of the Psalms in the Passion Narrative is intended to contribute to the identification of Jesus, either as the Davidic messiah,⁶⁹³ or—the more appropriate Markan title—‘son of God’.⁶⁹⁴ The declaration of the centurion, ‘Truly this man was God’s son’ (15:39: ἀληθῶς οὗτος ὁ

⁶⁹² See Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, 17; Kelber, *The Kingdom in Mark: A New Place and a New Time* (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1974) 80-81; more recently, Malbon, *Mark’s Jesus: Characterization as Narrative Christology* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2009) 159-169.

⁶⁹³ Pace Matera, *The Kingship of Jesus: Composition and Theology in Mark 15* (SBLDS 66; Atlanta, GA: Scholars, 1982) 125-135; Juell, *Messianic Exegesis*, 93-117; Rowe, *God’s Kingdom and God’s Son*, 295-304; Watts, ‘The Psalms in Mark’s Gospel’, 43-45; Ahearne-Kroll, *The Psalms of Lament in Mark’s Passion*, 215-223; Botner, *Jesus Christ as the Son of David in the Gospel of Mark*, 182-188.

⁶⁹⁴ Pace Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels*, 83-86

ἄνθρωπος υἱὸς θεοῦ ἦν), is not in response to the Psalmic imagery of the crucifixion, but the events of 15:37-38. This particular scene dramatizes the judgment envisioned earlier in the parable of the wicked tenants: ‘He will come and destroy the tenants and give the vineyard to others’ (12:9b)—in this case, the tearing of the temple curtain alludes to the desolation of Jerusalem whilst the confession of the centurion announces the coming of the age of the gentiles.

In the final analysis, it is the description of suffering in the Psalm that led the author to scripturalize the details of Jesus’ crucifixion with LXX Ps 21 (MT 22).⁶⁹⁵ The use of the Psalm is therefore of a piece with the Psalmic descriptions of Esther (*b. Meg.* 15b), the hymnist of the *Hodayot* (1QH *passim*) and Aseneth (*Jos. Asen.* 12:11; 13:9). Unmarked language from the Psalm has been merged into the narrative description of a suffering righteous person. Much like the scripturalized narratives surveyed earlier in the work, Mark or his source repeatedly draws on one scriptural source during the episode—in this case LXX Ps 21. But scripturalized narratives often incorporate material beyond their primary scriptural model: for instance, the episode of Abram in the fiery furnace (modelled on Dan 3) uses the language of Gen 37:22 to describe Joktan (*LAB* 6:6); the episode of the fiery furnace of Jair (also modelled on Dan 3) attributes the words of Joshua (Josh 1:7-8) and Elijah (1 Kgs 18:24) to different characters (*LAB* 38:2); Kenaz’s victory over the Amorites (modelled on Judg 7) borrows phrases from 1 Sam 10:6 and 2 Sam 23:10 (*LAB* 27:10-11); and the siege of Ephron (modelled on Deut 2:26-36 [cf. Judg 11:19-21]) also uses language from Deut 20:10-14 (1 Macc 5:48-51). The episode of Jesus’ crucifixion is no exception to this. Beyond the primary model of LXX Ps 21, isolated details are also drawn from other scriptural sources.

⁶⁹⁵ One other detail that may have recommended the Psalm to the author is found in LXX Ps 21:17c, ‘They gouged (ἄρπξαν) my hands and feet’—a similar variant occurs in 5/6HevPs 8-9, ‘They pierced (כּאַרַי) my hands and feet’ (cf. MT Ps 22:17: ‘like a lion’ [כּאַרַי])—which could bring to mind the ordeal of crucifixion. There is no clear sign, however, that the earliest Christians made this connection (cf. Zech 12:10 in Jn 19:34,37). On issues with the passage, see Kristin M. Swenson, ‘Psalm 22:17: Circling around the Problem Again’, *JBL* 123 (2004): 637-648.

The first of these is the darkness at noon of Mk 15:33a: '[and] when it was noon, darkness came over the whole land' (καὶ γενομένης ὥρας ἕκτης σκότος ἐγένετο ἐφ' ὅλην τὴν γῆν). At least since the time of Irenaeus (*Adv. Haer.* 4.33.12), commentators have identified Amos 8:9 as the source for the image: 'And it will come to pass on that day, says the Lord, and the sun will go down at noon, and the light will become dark upon the earth in daytime' (LXX: καὶ ἔσται ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, λέγει κύριος ὁ θεός, καὶ δύσεται ὁ ἥλιος μεσημβρίας, καὶ συσκοτάσει ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τὸ φῶς).⁶⁹⁶ The 'ninth hour' (ὥρας ἕκτης) in Mk 15:33a establishes the time as midday (μεσημβρία), and although Mark has the noun σκότος instead of the verb σκοτάζω, the image of 'darkness . . . over [the] land' clearly represents the scene of LXX Amos 8:9.⁶⁹⁷ Of the early inheritors of Markan tradition, only the *Gospel of Peter* heightens the agreement with LXX Amos 8:9: '*And it was noon and darkness covered all Judaea* (ἦν δὲ μεσημβρία, καὶ σκότος κατέσχε[ν] πᾶσαν τὴν Ἰουδαίαν). And they were troubled and distressed *lest the sun had already set* (μήποτε ὁ ἥλιος ἔδω) since he was alive. It is written by them, "The sun is not to set on one who has been put to death"' (*Gos. Pet.* 5:15).⁶⁹⁸ Here, the author includes μεσημβρία and ἥλιος in further agreement with LXX Amos 8:9, whereas the concern of the Jews is clearly based on (though verbally dissimilar to) Deut 21:23, '[the criminal's] corpse must not remain all night upon the tree; you shall bury him that same day'.⁶⁹⁹ Whether *Gos. Pet.* developed this image under the influence of Mark or (as is more likely) Matthew, the fact remains that LXX Amos 8:9 has shaped the Markan narrative at this point.

But has the scene been created in its entirety out of Amos 8:9? Attempts to trace a possible historical origin for this scene seem to strain credulity by invoking far-fetched meteorological phenomena (i.e. black sirocco) or appealing to long-discredited

⁶⁹⁶ Cf. the translations of σ' and θ' Amos 8:9: καὶ συνεσκοτάσατο τὴν γῆν.

⁶⁹⁷ The addition of ὅλος is characteristically Markan (Mk 1:28,33,39; 6:55).

⁶⁹⁸ Text and translation taken from Foster, *The Gospel of Peter: Introduction, Critical Edition and Commentary* (TENT 4; Leiden: Brill, 2010) 308. The addition of ἐπὶ πᾶσαν in Mt 27:45 may be an attempt to evoke the darkness of Exod 10:22, see Allison, *Studies in Matthew: Interpretation Past and Present* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2005) 82-83. It is not clear whether the eclipse of Lk 23:45a, 'while the sun's light failed' (τοῦ ἡλίου ἐκλιπόντος), is an attempt to make the scene closer to Amos 8:9, though the variant καὶ ἐσκοτίσθη ὁ ἥλιος (A C³ W Δ Θ Ψ; cf. D) may be an effort to make the scene closer to Joel 2:30-31 (LXX 2:10).

⁶⁹⁹ Following Brown, *The Death of the Messiah*, 2.1037; Foster, *The Gospel of Peter*, 313.

reconstructions of lost sources (i.e. Phlegon, Thallus).⁷⁰⁰ The judgment of Crossan on the matter is sound, if not a little simplistic: ‘that no such *historical* three-hour-long midnight at noon accompanied the death of Jesus, but that learned Christians searching their Scriptures found this ancient description of future divine punishment, maybe facilitated by its mention of “an only son” in the second-to-last line, and so created that *fictional* story about darkness at noon’.⁷⁰¹ Whilst the fantastical nature of the scene can hardly be disputed, it is more than a pure fabrication on the basis of Amos 8:9. The darkness at noon should be compared to the second (and equally fantastical) sign of the crucifixion: the tearing of the temple curtain (15:38). This alludes to the prophecy of the temple’s destruction earlier in Mk 13:2, the ‘beginning of the birth pangs’ (13:8: ἀρχὴ ὠδίνων) which will precede the end. The darkness, too, harkens back to the vision of the end, where it appears in the words of Joel 2:30-31, ‘But in those days, after that suffering, the sun will be darkened’ (Mk 13:24a: ἀλλ’ ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις μετὰ τὴν θλίψιν ἐκείνην ὁ ἥλιος σκοτισθήσεται).⁷⁰² The darkness at noon and the rending of the veil—along with the command to be awake (14:37-41; cf. 13:33-37), the betrayal (14:43-46; cf. 13:12), the testimony before council (14:53-65; cf. 13:9) and governor (15:1-5; cf. 13:9)—thus present the crucifixion as a cosmic, eschatological event. For Mark and his readers, it signals the beginning of the end. Matthew seems acutely aware of this, adding still more fantastical elements to the eschatological drama of the crucifixion: an earthquake (Mt 27:51b; cf. Mk 13:8) and a mass resurrection (27:52-53; cf. Mk 13:27). Against this it may be argued that cosmic darkness was thought to accompany non-eschatological events, such as the deaths of great men, both mythical (i.e. Romulus) and historical (i.e. Julius Caesar).⁷⁰³ Cosmic darkness may also be found in Jewish literature accompanying the deaths of Adam (*LAE* 46:1; *T. Adam* 3:6) and Enoch (*2 En.* 67:1-2). Rabbinic literature associates the

⁷⁰⁰ See the survey in Allison, *Studies in Matthew*, 88-96, for examples in the last century, see 96-97, nn. 67-68.

⁷⁰¹ Crossan, *Who Killed Jesus?*, 1-4 (4), emphasis original. Before him was Bultmann, *History of the Synoptic Tradition*, 282, who classified it as one of several ‘pure novelistic motifs’ in the Passion Narrative.

⁷⁰² Later exegetes also applied images from Joel 2 to the crucifixion, see Allison, *Studies in Matthew*, 87, n. 36.

⁷⁰³ Romulus: Cicero, *Rep.* 2.10; 6.21-22; Dionysius Halicarnassus, *Ant. rom.* 2.56; Livy, *Hist.* 1.16; Ovid, *Fast.* 485-498; Plutarch, *Rom.* 27; Florus, *Epit.* 1.1; Julius Caesar: Virgil, *Georg.* 1.466-467; Pliny, *Nat.* 2.30; Josephus, *Ant.* 14.309; Plutarch, *Caes.* 69; also Augustus: Dio Cassius, *Hist.* 56.29.3. See the other examples in Allison, *Studies in Matthew*, 95-96, n. 63.

darkness of Amos 8:9 with the death of R. Pedat, ‘When R. Pedat’s soul came to rest, R. Isaac b. Eleazar commenced with these words: “This day is as hard for Israel as the day on which the sun set at noon, as it is written, ‘And it shall come to pass in that day . . . that I will cause the sun to set at noon and darken the earth on a clear day’” (*b. Moed. Kat.* 25b). But given the close relationship between the Olivet Discourse and the events of Mk 14-15, an eschatological context featuring the language of LXX Amos 8:9 seems most appropriate for the darkness at noon in Mk 15:33a.

The use of eschatological imagery in the crucifixion continues with the invocation of Elijah following Jesus’ cry of dereliction. Having misheard the Aramaic ‘God’ (ελωι) as ‘Elijah’ (Ηλίας), the bystanders conclude that Jesus is calling Elijah, with one running to offer Jesus something to drink, saying ‘Wait, let us see whether Elijah will come to take him down’ (15:36b: ἄφετε ἴδωμεν εἰ ἔρχεται Ἡλίας καθελεῖν αὐτόν). Later literature speaks of Elijah’s ability to intervene to save the righteous (*b. Avod. Zar.* 17b; 18b; *b. Taan.* 21a; *b. Sanh.* 109a; *PRE* 50:10). Whilst the bystanders may imagine a similar role for Elijah in this instance, there is reason to think it also reflects Markan eschatology.⁷⁰⁴ The Passion Narrative is not the only episode to feature imagery from the Olivet Discourse. As Mk 13:26-27 speaks of the ‘Son of Man’ (υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου) appearing with ‘clouds’ (νεφέλαι) with the ‘angels’ (ἄγγελοι), so the Transfiguration (9:2-8) features the ‘Son’ (υἱὸς) appearing in a ‘cloud’ (νεφέλη) with ‘Elijah with Moses’ (Ηλίας σὺν Μωϋσεῖ). In the passage preceding the Transfiguration, Jesus again speaks of the ‘Son of Man’ coming ‘in the glory of his Father with the holy angels’ (8:38: ἐν τῇ δόξῃ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ μετὰ τῶν ἀγγέλων τῶν ἁγίων). It could be that the Transfiguration provides Jesus’ inner-circle (and thereby readers) with a glimpse of the eschatological scene alluded to in Mk 8:38 and 13:26-27 (also 14:62). One may then wonder if the ‘angels’ (ἄγγελοι) of the *parousia* are not also Elijah and Moses.⁷⁰⁵ Both prophets were expected to return in

⁷⁰⁴ Cf. Öhler, *Elia im Neuen Testament*, 150-152, who thinks the purpose is to counter the popular expectation of Elijah (6:14-16; 8:28); Mark F. Whitters, ‘Why Did the Bystanders Think Jesus Called Upon Elijah Before He Died (Mark 15:34-36)? The Markan Position’, *HTR* 95 (2002): 119-124, who thinks the scene is included to show that Jesus should not be identified with Elijah.

⁷⁰⁵ Cf. Christine E. Joynes, ‘The Returned Elijah? John the Baptist’s Angelic Identity in the Gospel of Mark’, *SJT* 58 (2005): 455-467, who argues that Elijah is identified as an angel in the person of John the Baptist.

the last days (Elijah: Mal 4:5; Sir 48:10; 4Q521 2:3?; 4Q588 1:2?; *Sib. Or.* 2:187-189,194-202; *Apoc. El.* 4:7; 5:32; Justin, *Dial.* 8:4; 49:1; *m. Eduy.* 8:7; *m. Sot.* 9:15; *b. Erub.* 43a-b; Moses: *Liv. Pro.* 2:12-19; *Frg. Tg.* on Exod 12:42; *Frg. Tg.* (P) on Deut 33:21; *Sib. Or.* 5.256-257; *Mem. Mar.* 2:8; both: Mal 4:4-6?; *LAB* 48:1?; Rev 11:3-13; *4 Ezra* 6:26?; *Sib. Or.* 2.245-248; *Deut. Rab.* 3:17; *Sifre* to Deut 342) and are sometimes referred to as ‘angels’ (ἄγγελος/ἄγγελοι; Elijah: Mal 3:1; *b. Ber.* 4b; *Judg. Rab.* 16:1; *PRE* 29:18; Origen, *Comm. Jo.* 2.31; *Comm. Matt.* 10.20; Moses: Sir 45:2?; *T. Mos.* 1:14; *Mem. Mar.* 2:12; 4:3,6,12; 5:3; 6:3).⁷⁰⁶ It could even be that the image of Jesus crucified between two criminals is an anti-type of the Transfiguration/parousia scene, where Jesus appears with the angels Elijah and Moses.⁷⁰⁷ At the very least, the invocation of Elijah, the figure most commonly associated with the end-time in contemporary thought, can once again be seen to evoke the *eschaton* in Jesus’ final moments.

But the detail that Jesus was offered ‘sour wine . . . to drink’ (ὄξους . . . ἐπότιζεν) is a continuation of the Psalmic imagery found elsewhere in the crucifixion. Here, it comes from LXX Ps 68:22 (MT 69:21), ‘And they gave gall as my food, and for my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink’ (καὶ ἔδωκαν εἰς τὸ βρῶμά μου χολήν καὶ εἰς τὴν δίψαν μου ἐπότισάν με ὄξος). This scene is the second time that Jesus has been offered something to drink during the crucifixion. The first is in Mk 15:23: ‘And they offered him wine mixed with myrrh; but he did not take it’ (καὶ ἐδίδουν αὐτῷ ἔσμουρνισμένον οἶνον). Jesus’ refusal to drink no doubt reflects 14:25, ‘Truly I tell you, I will never again drink of the fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God’. The offer of wine mixed with myrrh—which may have been a delicacy (cf. Pliny, *Hist. nat.* 14.15)—could also be a continuation of the mockery of Mk 15:16-20 (cf. Lk 23:36), or even a sedative to lessen the pain of execution (cf. *b.*

⁷⁰⁶ On the angelic identity of Elijah in rabbinic literature, see Kristen H. Lindbeck, *Elijah and the Rabbis: Story and Theology* (New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 2010) 44-62. On the angelic identity of Moses in Jewish and Samaritan literature, see Jarl E. Fossum, *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord: Samaritan and Jewish Concepts of Intermediation and the Origins of Gnosticism* (WUNT 36; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1985) 130-135, 141; Ruth M. M. Tuschling, *Angels and Orthodoxy: A Study in Their Development in Syria and Palestine from the Qumran Texts to Ephrem the Syrian* (STAC 40; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007) 91-92. Cf. on the possibility that Moses was identified as an angel at Qumran, see Phoebe Makiello, ‘Was Moses Considered to be an Angel by Those at Qumran?’ in *Moses in Biblical and Extra-Biblical Traditions* (ed. Axel Graupner and Michael Wolter; BZAW 372; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007) 115-127.

⁷⁰⁷ Cf. Mk 10:40. See Vette, ‘Who is Elijah in the Gospel of Mark?’, 809-810.

Avod. Zar. 38b; *b. Sanh.* 43a).⁷⁰⁸ By contrast, the offer of sour wine in Mk 15:36a is presumably meant to prolong Jesus' life so the bystanders can witness the coming of Elijah—apparently to no avail (15:37). Only Matthew follows Mark in having two offerings of wine. Here, the first offering is also fashioned after LXX Ps 68:22, as Jesus is given 'wine mixed with gall' (Mt 27:34a: οἶνον μετὰ χολῆς).⁷⁰⁹ In Lk 23:36, the offer of 'sour wine' (ὄξος) becomes part of the soldiers' mockery, whereas John conforms the scene even closer to LXX Ps 68:22: 'He said (in order to fulfill the scripture), "I am thirsty." A jar full of sour wine was standing there. So they put a sponge full of the wine on a branch of hyssop and held it to his mouth' (Jn 19:28-29). As before, the image of Ps 69:21 may also be found in the *Hodayot*, as the enemies of the hymnist are said to have 'denied the drink of knowledge to the thirsty, *but for their thirst they have given them vinegar to drink*' (1QH 12:11: וְלִצְמָאם יִשְׁקוּם הַוּמִץ). The verse appears again in *b. Chull.* 87a, where R. Yehuda HaNasi cites Ps 69:21 in exasperation at the prospect of having to dine with a heretic. In Mk 15:36a, however, the language of the Psalm is unmarked and embedded into the narrative. Once again, the offer of 'sour wine' (ὄξος) to Jesus appears to have been created solely on the basis of LXX Ps 68:21.⁷¹⁰

The final instance of Psalmic imagery, however, may reflect something of historical tradition. The detail that certain women were looking on 'from a distance' (Mk 15:40: ἀπὸ μακρόθεν) recalls LXX Ps 37:12 (MT 38:11): 'My friends and my fellows approached opposite me and stood, and my next of kin *stood far off* (ἀπὸ μακρόθεν ἔστησαν)'. The phrase can also be found in Mk 14:54a, where Peter is said to follow Jesus 'at a distance' (ἀπὸ μακρόθεν) to the courtyard of the high priest. Whilst ἀπὸ μακρόθεν appears elsewhere in the Gospel in different contexts (5:6; 8:3; 11:13), given the similar use of Psalmic imagery elsewhere in the Passion Narrative, the image of Jesus' companions standing 'far off' from his affliction (14:54a; 15:40) appears to reflect LXX Ps 37:12. Luke, apparently aware of this, makes the scene closer to the Psalm: 'But all his acquaintances, including the women who had followed

⁷⁰⁸ Cf. LXX Prov 31:6-7. See the relevant sources in Yarbro Collins, *Mark*, 740-744, 756-758.

⁷⁰⁹ Jesus becomes the speaker of Ps 69:10 in Rom 15:3. On this and other similarities between Paul and the Markan Passion Narrative, see Allison, *Constructing Jesus*, 407-411.

⁷¹⁰ The absence of scriptural language favours the priority of Mk 15:23 over 15:36, so Gundry, *Mark*, 956; cf. Crossan, *Four Other Gospels: Shadows on the Contours of Canon* (Minneapolis, MN: Winston, 1985) 138-139.

him from Galilee, *stood at a distance* (εἰστήκεισαν . . . ἀπὸ μαρκόθεν) (Lk 23:49). Elsewhere, the wording of LXX Ps 37:12 appears to lie behind Rev 18:9-19, where the kings, merchants, shipmasters, seafarers and sailors ‘stood far off’ (18:17b: ἀπὸ μαρκόθεν ἔστησαν; cf. 18:10,15) from the suffering of Babylon.⁷¹¹

But unlike the darkness at noon and the offer of sour wine, the detail in Mk 14:50 is unlikely to have been created entirely out of scriptural language. The conspicuous naming of the women—‘Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James the young and of Joses, and Salome’—who are mentioned here for the first time, can hardly be chalked up to the influence of LXX Ps 37:12. They may be compared to the individual who carries Jesus’ cross, who the text names as ‘Simon of Cyrene, the father of Alexander and Rufus’ (15:21)—a detail which presumably identified him to earliest readers.⁷¹² Two of the women are said to witness the burial of Jesus (15:47) and all three are present in the closing scene at the empty tomb (16:1-8). Whilst the writers of Jewish antiquity were more than capable of fabricating names for the sake of narrative—the bizarre names of the seven in the furnace of Jair spring to mind (LAB 38:1: ‘Defal, Abiesdrel, Getaliabl, Selumi, Assur, Ionadali, Memihel’)—the relation of the women to other named figures (James the Younger, Joses) suggests that the names in Mk 15:40 belong to tradition. But why would Mark or his source introduce new characters at such a late point in the narrative? The naïve view that the named women owe to historical memory has some points in its favour.⁷¹³ At the same time, their inclusion may owe to the sensitive nature of Mk 15:42-16:8. The author appears to have been aware that the tradition was not widely known.⁷¹⁴ The fact that in 16:8 the women fail to tell the disciples what they had just witnessed seems to imply that their testimony differed from that commonly associated with ‘the twelve’ (which may be preserved in 1 Cor 15:3-8). If Mark or his source was the first to offer a detailed

⁷¹¹ An allusion to Ps 38:11 is doubtful in 1QH 6:20-21: ‘to the deg[ree . . . I lov]e him, and to the extent that you place him *far off* (ויכרחק), I hate him’.

⁷¹² So Lane, *Mark*, 563; Gerd Theissen, *Lokalkolorit und Zeitgeschichte in den Evangelien. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition* (NTOA 8; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992) 188.

⁷¹³ See Allison, *Constructing Jesus*, 389-391.

⁷¹⁴ ‘And they said nothing to anyone’ (Mk 16:8c: καὶ οὐδενὶ οὐδὲν εἶπαν). So Goulder, ‘Jesus’ Resurrection and Christian Origins: A Response to N.T. Wright’, *JSHJ* 3 (2005): 187-195 (192); Crossley, ‘Against the Historical Plausibility of the Empty Tomb Story and the Bodily Resurrection of Jesus: A Response to N.T. Wright’, *JSHJ* 3 (2005): 171-186 (176 [n. 22], 184-185); cf. Allison, ‘Explaining the Resurrection: Conflicting Convictions’, *JSHJ* 3 (2005): 117-133 (127-130).

description of the burial and empty tomb of Jesus, named witnesses might be expected (*à la* 1 Cor 15:5-8). Whether the named women owed to kerygmatic tradition, or were simply members of the community inserted into the narrative, Mk 16:8 implies that they provided an alternative testimony for the Markan community in contrast to the testimony of ‘the twelve’ in other communities (perhaps the appearance in Galilee of 16:7). An analogy to this may be found in the unique disciples of John’s Gospel (Jn 1:35-51; 21:2), who represent the true belief of the Johannine community in the narrative, often in contrast to Peter (and the communities he represented).⁷¹⁵ But whatever the origin of the names in Mk 15:40, the fleeting detail from LXX Ps 37:12 (*ἀπὸ μαρκόθεν*) plays second fiddle to the role of pre-existing tradition—in the words of Goodacre, ‘Tradition was scripturalized’.⁷¹⁶

In sum, the following can be listed as examples of scripturalization in the episode of the crucifixion (Mk 15:21-41).

⁷¹⁵ So Brown, *The Community of the Beloved Disciple* (London: Chapman, 1979) 81-88.

⁷¹⁶ Goodacre, ‘Prophecy Historicized or Tradition Scriptuarlized?’, 45.

Mk 15:21-41	Ps 22 (Pss 38; 69; Amos 8)
Jesus' executioners 'divided his clothes among them' by 'casting lots' (15:24b).	The Psalmist's enemies 'divided [his] clothes among themselves' and 'for [his] clothing they cast lots' (LXX Ps 21:19).
Those mocking Jesus were 'shaking their heads' and saying 'save yourself' (15:29-30).	Those mocking the Psalmist 'shake their heads' and say 'let him save him' (LXX Ps 21:8-9).
'Darkness' comes over the 'earth' at noon (Mk 15:33).	The sun goes down at noon and 'darkens' over the 'earth' (LXX Amos 8:9).
Jesus cries, 'My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?' (15:34).	The Psalmist cries, 'My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?' (Ps 22:1; cf. LXX Ps 22:1).
Jesus is given 'sour wine' to drink (15:36a).	The Psalmist is given 'sour wine' to drink (LXX Ps 68:22).
Jesus' female followers look on 'at a distance' (Mk 15:40; cf. Peter in 14:45a).	The Psalmist's friends and kin stand 'at a distance' (LXX Ps 37:12).

Summary

The episodes surveyed in this chapter have drawn on the Jewish scriptures in a variety of ways. In Jesus' forty-day sojourn in the wilderness and the call of the first disciples (Mk 1:12-20), the episode roughly follows the forty-day sojourn of Elijah in the wilderness and the call of Elisha (1 Kgs 19), seen in distinctive narrative details (the forty-day sojourn; the ministry of angels; the disciple[s] at work; taking leave of father and trade) and minor verbal agreement (ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ; τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέρας). The two-fold feedings of the multitude (Mk 6:35-44; 8:1-9) are modelled on the miracle of Elisha (2 Kgs 4:42-44), loosely following the structure of that episode and incorporating memorable details (the small amount of loaves; the command to feed the people; the doubting disciple[s]; the feeding of many people; some food left over), but feature no verbal agreement. The execution of John the Baptist (Mk 6:21-28), on the other hand, features language borrowed straight from a Greek text of Esther, including the verbatim promise of 'up to half of my kingdom' (ἕως ἡμίσεως τῆς βασιλείας μου). The episode itself appears to be modelled on Esther's banquet (Est 7:1-10) along with traditional material. The crucifixion of Jesus (Mk 15:21-41), however, differs from the previous examples, as it does not draw on a narrative text but on imagery from the Psalms, primarily Ps 22 (LXX Pss 21:1,8-9,19) but also LXX Pss 37:12, 68:22 and Amos 8:9. In this episode, verbatim phrases and details are taken from the scriptural source and woven seamlessly into the narrative description of Jesus' final moments.

A similar variety of compositional approaches can be seen in the scripturalized narratives surveyed in the previous chapter. Some of the episodes feature extensive (Deut 2:26-36, 20:10-14 and Judg 11:19 in 1 Macc 5:45-51; LXX Job 1-2 in *T. Ab.* 1-4, 15:14-15) or fragmentary (Judg 7:6-22 in *LAB* 27; Gen 13:17 and 15:1 in 1QapGen 11) verbal agreement with their scriptural models, whilst others feature little (Dan 3 in *LAB* 6; Judg 4-5 in Jdt 10-13) to no (Dan 3 in *LAB* 38) verbal similarities. For the most part, these episodes rely on narrative texts as their model (i.e. Genesis, Judges, Daniel), though they occasionally rely on non-narrative texts (i.e. Deut 20:10-14 in 1 Macc 5:45-51). Some episodes follow the structure of their scriptural model (Dan 3 in *LAB* 6; 38; Judg 7 in *LAB* 27; Deut 2:26-36 in 1 Macc 5:45-51; Judg 4-5 in Jdt 10-13),

whereas others simply insert narrative details or phrases into the story (Gen 13:7, 15:1 and 26:24 in 1QapGen 11; LXX Job 1-2 in *T. Ab.* 1-4; 15:14-15).

Mark—like these authors—sometimes used the Jewish scriptures to compose new narrative. At times this was done with a *whole episode modelled on a scriptural story* (1 Kgs 19 in Mk 1:12-20; 2 Kgs 2:42-44 in Mk 6:35-44; 8:1-9; Est 7:1-10 in Mk 6:21-28). At other times it was done by *inserting unmarked scriptural details into the body of a traditional narrative* (Est 5:3 in Mk 6:23; *sic passim* Mk 14-15). In this way, Mark (or his source) was able to compose scripturalized narratives of Jesus calling his disciples from the wilderness like Elijah, multiplying bread for the multitude like Elisha and enduring great suffering like the Psalmist—with John even meeting his fate like the wicked Haman of Esther. What all this means for the interpretation of the Gospel and its relationship to historical memory will be discussed in the concluding remarks.

CHAPTER 4

CONCLUSION

The claim that the scriptural character of early Christian narrative illustrates its non-historical character is one that conservative exegetes have been anxious to dismiss and radical exegetes have been eager to embrace. For conservative exegetes, the scriptural language of the Gospel narratives always has its basis in ‘fact’. Since the literature of Jewish antiquity was not involved in the ‘fabrication of contemporary historical events’ on the basis of the scriptures, neither were the Gospels.⁷¹⁷ When events were described in scriptural language, like the Passion Narrative, ‘the influence proceeded from the history to the text rather than vice versa’.⁷¹⁸ It was precisely the ‘correspondence of prophecy with the facts’ that generated interpretation.⁷¹⁹ The early Christians came to tell Jesus’ final moments using the language of Psalm 22 because of the ‘astonishingly accurate details’ concerning his death.⁷²⁰ Simply by searching the scriptures, the early Christians found an ‘unexpected *foreshadowing* of the later story’ of Jesus.⁷²¹ The early narratives about Jesus thus gained their scriptural character almost by accident. Fictions fabricated on the basis of the scriptures they were not.

Radical exegetes, on the other hand, begin by assuming the non-historical character of the Gospels. On this basis, anything and everything can be seen to have a scriptural origin. At its most extreme: ‘Virtually the entirety of the gospel narratives and much of the Acts are wholly the products of haggadic midrash upon previous scripture’.⁷²² The same has been said for Mark: ‘Each pericope in the Gospel has been

⁷¹⁷ Moo, *The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives*, 381 (and 55); also France, ‘Jewish Historiography, Midrash, and the Gospels’ in *Studies in Midrash and Historiography*, 99-127 (120).

⁷¹⁸ Moo, *The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives*, 380; also Dodd, *History and the Gospel* (London: Nisbet, 1938) 61-63; Schille, ‘Das Leiden des Herrn’, 164; Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic*, 33-34; Evans, ‘The Passion of Jesus: History Remembered or Prophecy Historicized?’, *BBR* 6 (1996): 159-165 (160-161); Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels*, 360.

⁷¹⁹ Dodd, *The Apostolic Teaching and Its Developments*, 53; cited approvingly by Moo, *The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives*, 381.

⁷²⁰ Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic*, 34.

⁷²¹ Hays, *Reading Backwards*, 94, emphasis original.

⁷²² Price, ‘New Testament Narrative as Old Testament Midrash’, 1.534-535.

demonstrated to have possible midrashic sources which could explain its origin without recourse to memories of the church, whether oral or written, going back to historical events'.⁷²³ Few scholars would go this far, but many have questioned the historical character of Mk 14-15 along similar lines: 'Take the scriptural references away, and the story of death has vanished'.⁷²⁴

There may be more in common between these two positions than either side would like to admit. Both are remarkably confident about the ability of scholarship to uncover the historical details behind the Gospels—either in their presence or their absence. Both agree that the scriptural character of the Gospels either has its basis in 'fact' or 'fabrication'—with conservative exegetes opting for the former, radical exegetes the latter. Whereas conservative exegetes compare the Gospels to historical works (1 Maccabees; Josephus) and conclude that they must have their basis in history not scripture, radical exegetes compare the Gospels to exegetical works ('midrash') and conclude that they must have their basis in scripture not history. Given the choice between 'history remembered' and 'prophecy historicized', the exegete will inevitably choose whichever confirms their presuppositions.

But this is a false choice. The historicity or non-historicity of Gospel material should be a conclusion not a starting point. What applies to one pericope may not apply to another. Though few would doubt that the miraculous darkness at noon has been created out of scripture (Amos 8:9), the scripturalized image of named women looking on 'from a distance' (ἀπὸ μακρόθεν; cf. LXX Ps 37:12) has a better claim to history.⁷²⁵ The interplay between historical memory and scriptural language may be even more complex. Whilst the detail that Jesus' executioners divided his clothes and cast lots for them has indeed been created out of LXX Ps 21:19, it may still reflect a kernel of historical truth.⁷²⁶ This truth may be specific—that Jesus was stripped of his clothes

⁷²³ Miller and Miller, *The Gospel of Mark as Midrash*, 385.

⁷²⁴ Kelber, *The Oral and the Written Gospel* (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1983) 196; also Koester, 'Apocryphal and Canonical Gospels', *HTR* 73 (1980): 105-130 (126-128); Mack, *A Myth of Innocence*, 257; Crossan, *Who Killed Jesus?*, 11; *The Birth of Christianity*, 521. This approach can be traced back to Maurer: scriptural material sufficed where historical material was wanting ('Knecht Gottes und Sohn Gottes', 10).

⁷²⁵ So Goodacre, 'Scripturalization in Mark's Crucifixion Narrative', 40-41; 'Prophecy Historicized or Tradition Scripturalized?', 44-45; Allison, *Constructing Jesus*, 387-389.

⁷²⁶ A possibility even Dibelius concedes, *Die Formgeschichte*, 188.

before being crucified—or more general—that the spectacle of crucifixion was a deeply humiliating experience for the victim. Showing that a particular detail or episode owes to the Jewish scriptures is not the same as showing it does not owe to historical memory, though in some cases it may make that conclusion inevitable.

The present study found that scripturalized narratives usually have their basis in some underlying tradition. This is seen most clearly in those episodes which relate to a scriptural figure or episode. At one end, scripturalized narratives can result from a close and profound exegetical engagement with their source—by narrating Gen 9:1-7 in the language of Gen 13 and 15, the *Genesis Apocryphon* is able to tie the Abrahamic covenant to the Noachide covenant. At the other end, long and complicated narratives can be triggered by a single word (the two fiery furnace episodes in the *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*) or simply reflect the similarity of one figure with another (Abraham with Job in the *Testament of Abraham*). Whilst it is possible for a figure to be entirely pieced together out of scriptural material for no perceptible reason (i.e. Kenaz and Zebul in the *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*), this is the exception not the norm. In most cases, the compositional use of scriptural material in scripturalized narratives has been triggered by some aspect of the source text or tradition.

But where these texts may be compared with their primary sources (the Jewish scriptures), the historiographical narratives of 1 Maccabees, Judith and the Gospel of Mark may not. The precise relation of these texts to historical memory is for the most part unrecoverable. Some provisional comments can be made. On the one hand, scholars are relatively confident that 1 Maccabees reflects the broad outlines of history, though its function as dynastic propaganda should not be minimized. On the other hand, scholars are similarly confident that the book of Judith—though presented as historiography—contains almost nothing of history. Where the Gospel of Mark sits in relation to these two works is not immediately clear, especially since the events narrated in the Gospel are often of a supernatural or thaumaturgic character (unlike 1 Maccabees and Judith).

Each of these historiographical works contain episodes that have been modelled on scriptural material and include unmarked scriptural language embedded into the narrative. In 1 Maccabees, Judas Maccabeus' siege of Ephron (1 Macc 5:45-51) is modelled on Moses' siege of Amorite territories (Deut 2:26-36) with other

details drawn from the laws of *hērem* (Deut 20:10-14). It seems unlikely that the small military force amassed by Judas was capable of waging the scale of warfare described in 1 Macc 5:45-51 or its corresponding account in 2 Macc 12:27-28. However, it is plausible that Judas modelled himself on Moses or sought to enact the Deuteronomistic laws—indeed, the author of 1 Maccabees purposefully presents Judas as acting ‘according to the law’ (κατὰ τὸν νόμον; cf. 1 Macc 3:56; 4:47,53). But that the episode as narrated in 1 Macc 5:45-51 has been fashioned for the most part out of scriptural material is certain.

In the book bearing the name of the heroine, Judith’s beheading of the enemy general Holofernes in a tent (Jdt 10-13; esp. 13:1-10) is modelled on Jael’s slaying of the enemy general Sisera in a tent (Jdg 4-5; esp. 4:17-22), so that in both accounts victory is won ‘by the hand of a woman’ (Jdt 9:10; 13:15; 16:5; Jdg 4:9). Unlike 1 Maccabees, there is no clear sign that the story of Judith is rooted in historical memory—though there is likewise no reason to suspect that it was a self-conscious work of fiction. The legendary tale of Judith has nevertheless been presented as historiographical narrative—a pseudo-historical episode that allegedly took place in the post-exilic period. Much of Judith cannot be traced to a scriptural source, but the murder of an enemy general in a tent ‘by the hand of a woman’ unmistakably comes from Jdg 4-5—a fact which was recognized early on by the author of *LAB* 31.

In the Gospel of Mark, Jesus’ forty-day sojourn in the wilderness and the call of the first disciples from their work (Mk 1:12-20) is modelled on Elijah’s forty-day sojourn in the wilderness and the call of Elisha from his work (1 Kgs 19). It is possible that Jesus patterned his own actions after Elijah, as John the Baptist may have done, and later rabbis and Christian ascetics certainly did.⁷²⁷ Jesus appears to have been associated with Elijah at an early stage (Mk 6:15; 8:28) and it is possible that the episode originates from this identification.⁷²⁸ But at the same time, the scripturalized episode may have been triggered by the knowledge of a single detail: the widely known fact that Jesus himself had disciples may have led Mark (or his source) to the

⁷²⁷ That John modelled himself on Elijah has been argued most recently by Marcus, *John the Baptist in History and Theology*, 46-61. On the emulation of Elijah in Christian circles, see Frankfurter, *Elijah in Upper Egypt*, 65-74; in rabbinic literature, see Vermes, ‘Hanina ben Dosa’, *JJS* 23 (1972): 28-50; *JJS* 24 (1973): 51-64.

⁷²⁸ The possibility that Jesus emulated Elijah is explored in Robinson, ‘Elijah, John and Jesus’, 263-281.

most famous of teacher-disciple relationships—Elijah and Elisha. Thus, as Elijah emerged from the wilderness to call Elisha, so Jesus did to his disciples.

The two-fold feedings of the multitude (Mk 6:35-44; 8:1-9) are modelled on Elisha's feeding of the multitude at Gilgal (2 Kgs 4:42-44). As the episode pertains to the miraculous, its origins are not easily sought in historical memory. Unlike Elijah, there is no sign that Jesus was identified with Elisha at an early stage. The reputation of Jesus as a miracle-worker, however, is well attested (Mk 3:22; 6:14-16) and no scriptural figure is better associated with the miraculous than Elisha (Sir 48:12-14; *Liv. Pro.* 22; *Mek.* 12:1).⁷²⁹ It may have been this association that led Mark to compose not one but two scripturalized narratives of Jesus multiplying bread like Elisha.

The episode narrating the banquet of 'king' Antipas, his promise to the pleasing young girl and the execution of John the Baptist (Mk 6:21-28) is modelled on the banquet in the court of king Ahasuerus, his promise to the pleasing young girl Esther and the execution of Haman the Assyrian (Est 2-7; esp. 7:1-10). The oath of Ahasuerus of 'even half of my kingdom' appears on the lips of Antipas (resembling the Greek Alpha-text of Esther) and the tradition of Vashti's severed head being carried in on a platter (*Est. Rab.* 4:9-11) now applies to John. The broad historical outlines of the episode are confirmed by the independent account of Josephus (*Ant.* 18.116-119): John was indeed executed by Herod Antipas, though Josephus understands it as a political calculation by the tetrarch. By contrast, the sensational character of the Markan episode owes in large part to its use of Esther. But by using Esther, the author is not drawing an equivalence between Haman and John the Baptist. Rather, the Esther material is mostly incidental to the episode. Although there may be some significance in the depiction of the Herodian court as a Persian (and therefore gentile) banquet, the Esther material was most likely selected simply for its ability to narrate a courtly scene—as it is likewise used in 1 Esdr 3-4.

The execution of Jesus (Mk 15:21-41), like that of John, has been fashioned partly out of scriptural language. Here, the division of clothes and the casting of lots, the shaking heads of the hecklers and the cry of 'My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?' are modelled on the division of clothes and the casting of lots, the shaking heads of the hecklers and the cry of 'My God, my God, why have you forsaken

⁷²⁹ The similarities between Jesus and Elisha are explored in Brown, 'Jesus and Elisha', 85-104.

me?’ in LXX Ps 21 (MT Ps 22). Other details in the episode are drawn from elsewhere in the scriptures: the darkness at noon comes from Amos 8:9, the offer of sour wine to drink comes from LXX Ps 68:22 and the image of companions looking on ‘from a distance’ comes from LXX Ps 37:12. Whilst some have seen the significance of Ps 22 as proof of Jesus’ Davidic messiahship or a foreshadowing of his vindication, the Psalm appears to be used here as it is elsewhere in Second Temple literature: as a way to describe the suffering of an individual. The cosmic upheaval of the Amos-inspired darkness at noon may have its roots in the eschatological interpretation of the crucifixion by the Markan community, but the other Psalmic imagery simply expands upon the image of suffering initiated by Ps 22.

If the scriptural language is taken away from the crucifixion, the bulk of the narrative remains: the compelling of Simon of Cyrene to carry the cross, the location of Golgotha, the offer of wine mixed with myrrh, the crucifixion itself, the time of the crucifixion, the inscription, the crucifixion of two bandits (though this was later seen to have scriptural significance, see Mk 15:28), the mockery of the chief priests, scribes and bandits, the time of Jesus’ death, the invocation of Elijah (though this is tied to Ps 22:1), Jesus’ final breath, the tearing of the Temple curtain, the confession of the centurion and the presence of named women from Galilee. Not all of these details can be easily traced back to the historical memory of Jesus’ death. The invocation of the Temple’s destruction, the tearing of the curtain, the confession of the centurion and even the rejection of Jesus by the chief priests and scribes are perhaps best seen as an attempt to foreshadow the destruction of the Temple and its elite—as well as the victory of the Romans—in the unjust death of Jesus. The other details may well be genuine historical recollections preserved in the earliest kerygma or else speak in some way to the present situation of the Markan community (or both in the case of the named men and women).

The one indispensable presupposition of the entire episode is the brute fact of the crucifixion itself. Jesus was crucified by the Roman authorities in Jerusalem. Everything else, including the scriptural language, is framed around this fact. The scriptural origin of some of the details in the crucifixion does not preclude the possibility of a historical origin—except perhaps for the fantastic darkness at noon. It does, however, put the case for non-historicity on more solid ground. The historian

may never know whether Jesus' tormentors cast lots for his clothing. But they do know this: the detail, as it appears in Mk 15:24, was composed out of LXX Ps 21:19. It could be that if everything incidental was peeled away from the crucifixion narrative, all that would be left is Mk 15:20, 'Then they led him out to crucify him'.

This study found that at several crucial moments in his Gospel Mark composed scripturalized narrative. It also found that Mark was not the only author to do so. The process of composing new episodes by following a scriptural model or inserting unmarked scriptural material into a narrative has been observed across diverse works of the Second Temple period. These include works originally composed in Hebrew (*Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*; 1 Maccabees; Judith?), Aramaic (*Genesis Apocryphon*) and Greek (*Testament of Abraham*; Judith?) and concern subjects both scriptural and historical (or pseudo-historical). Like these works, the Gospel of Mark features episodes that follow a scriptural model with scriptural language embedded into the narrative. Scripturalized narrative thus appears to be a stylistic feature of both the Gospel of Mark and Second Temple literature more generally. When it came to composing his life of Jesus, scripturalization was clearly one of the tools Mark had at his disposal.⁷³⁰

There is more to be said about scripturalization in Jewish antiquity. Indeed, there is more to be said about scripturalization in the Gospel of Mark: the echoes of Jonah (esp. Jon 1:4-16) in the stilling of the storm (Mk 4:35-41), the images from Exod 24 in the Transfiguration (Mk 9:2-8) and the parallels between Moses' response to

⁷³⁰ These episodes, in particular the execution of John the Baptist (Mk 6:17-29) and the Passion Narrative (chs. 14-15), are often assigned to pre-Markan sources. However, the presence of shared compositional techniques could easily be explained by positing a shared author (i.e. 'Mark'). Two things may count against this. The first is that scripturalization can be seen across variegated texts in different languages and genres. Scripturalized narrative may therefore have been a feature of pre-Markan sources. The second is that the five scripturalized episodes do not use scriptural material uniformly. The examples that draw on the Elijah-Elisha cycle—the wilderness sojourn and call of the disciples (Mk 1:12-20) and the feeding miracles (6:35-44; 8:1-9)—broadly follow the outline of a scriptural episode but contain little verbal agreement. The execution of John the Baptist (6:21-28) likewise broadly follows a scriptural episode, but includes details from elsewhere in Esther (including traditional material) as well as a verbatim phrase. The crucifixion of Jesus (15:21-41) does not follow a scriptural episode, but multiple details from Ps 22, as well as other material. However, one can find similar compositional differences in the scripturalized narratives of the *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* (chs. 6, 27 and 38), which likely owe to the same author. Though the possibility of pre-Markan sources cannot be ruled out, there is good reason to think the above scripturalized episodes are the product of a single author.

Eldad and Medad (Num 11:26-29) and Jesus' response to the exorcist (Mk 9:38-41). It is clear that Mark's greatest expositor, Matthew, made use of scripturalization: in the countless scriptural details in the birth narrative (Mt 1:18-2:23) and the scripturalized narrative of Judas' betrayal (26:14-16; 27:3-10). That scripturalization continued in the narratives of early Christian and Rabbinic literature has been observed throughout this study. The Gospel of Mark itself eventually became the subject of scripturalization—the *Arabic Infancy Gospel* relates an episode where the virgin Mary casts a demon out of a naked woman who lived among the tombs and could not be restrained by chains (*Arab. Gos. Inf.* 14), a legend based on that of the Gerasene demoniac (Mk 5:1-20). This way of composing new literature by following a scriptural model can be traced back to the scripturalized narratives of Jewish antiquity—at least to the Second Temple period and perhaps earlier.⁷³¹ When the first-century CE author of the Passion Narrative set out to compose their account of Jesus' death, they were able to make use of this literary convention. A century later, the Valentinian author of the *Gospel of Truth* could write that Jesus was not crucified naked, but clothed in a book (*Gos. Truth* 20:24).⁷³² Mark was no Valentinian, but the image is one that he might have used: Jesus lived and died as one clothed in the scriptures.

⁷³¹ Some examples of 'inner-biblical typology' identified by Fishbane (*Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*, 350-379) could be classified as scripturalized narrative.

⁷³² Here, the book is not the Torah (cf. Col 2:14-15) or the Jewish scriptures but the 'living book of the living' (*Gos. Truth* 19:35-20:6), see Anne Kreps, 'The Passion of the Book: The Gospel of Truth as Valentinian Scriptural Practice', *J ECS* 24 (2016): 311-335.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Sources

- Acta Sanctorum*. 68 vols. Antwerp: Société des Bollandistes, 1643-1940.
- Aland, Barbara, Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini and Bruce M. Metzger. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. 28th rev. ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2012.
- Alexander, Philip S. *The Targum of Canticles*. ArBib 17A. London: T&T Clark, 2003.
- . *The Targum of Lamentations*. ArBib 17B. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 2007.
- The Ante-Nicene Fathers*. Edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. 10 vols. Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature, 1885-1896. Repr. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994.
- The Babylonian Talmud*. Edited by Isidore Epstein. 30 vols. London: Soncino, 1960-1990.
- Bell, David N. *The Life of Shenoute*. CS 73. Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian, 1983.
- Berman, Samuel A. *Midrash Tanhuma-Yelammedenu: An English Translation of Genesis and Exodus from the Printed Version of Tanhuma-Yelammedenu with an Introduction, Notes, and Indexes*. Hoboken, NJ: Ktav, 1996.
- Bidez, J. and L. Parmentier. *The Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius, with the Scholia*. London: Methuen, 1898.
- Braude, William G. *The Midrash on Psalms*. YJS 13. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1959.
- . *Pesikta Rabbati*. 2 vols. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1968.
- Braude, William G. and Israel J. Kapstein. *Tanna Debe Eliyyahu: The Lore of the School of Elijah*. Philadelphia, PA: JPS, 1981.
- Burkitt, Francis Crawford. *Evangelion da-Mepharreshe: The Curetonian Version of the Four Gospels, with the readings of the Sinai Palimpsest and the early Syriac Patristic evidence*. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1904.
- Burton, Philip. *Sulpicius Severus' Vita Martini*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.

- Charlesworth, James H. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. 2 vols. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983-1985.
- Chilton, Bruce D. *The Isaiah Targum*. ArBib 11. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1987.
- Clarke, W. K. Lowther. *The Lausiac History of Palladius*. London: SPCK, 1918.
- Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*. Vienna: Geroldi, 1886-.
- Danby, Herbert. *The Mishnah: Translated from the Hebrew with Introduction and Brief Explanatory Notes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1933.
- Eidelberg, Shlomo. *The Jews and the Crusaders: The Hebrew Chronicles of the First and Second Crusades*. Madison, WI: Univeristy of Wisconsin Press, 1977.
- Elliott, J. K. *The Apocryphal New Testament: A Collection of Apocryphal Christian Literature in an English Translation based on M. R. James*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1993.
- Field, Frederick. *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1867-1875.
- Friedlander, Gerald. *Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer*. London, 1916. Repr. New York, NY: Sepher-Hermon, 1981.
- Gaster, Moses. *The Chronicles of Jerahmeel*. London, 1899. Repr. 2 vols. New York, NY: Ktav, 1971.
- Gibson, Margaret Dunlop. *The Commentaries of Isho 'dad of Merv: Bishop of Hadatha (c. 850 A.D.): In Syriac and English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1911.
- Ginzberg, Louis. *Legends of the Jews*. Translated by Henrietta Szold and Paul Radin. 7 vols. Philadelphia, PA: JPS, 1909-1938.
- Godden, Malcolm and Susan Irvine. *The Old English Boethius: An Edition of the Old English Versions of Boethius's De Consolatione Philosophiae*. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Grau, Angel Fábrega. *Passionario hispánico*. 2 vols. MHS. SL 6. Barcelona, 1953.
- Greenfield, Jonas C., Michael E. Stone and Esther Eshel. *The Aramaic Levi Document: Edition, Translation, Commentary*. SVTP 19. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Gregory of Tours. *Glory of the Martyrs*. Translated by Raymond Van Dam. TTH 4. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1988.

- Grossfeld, Bernard. *The First Targum to Esther: According to the MS Paris Hebrew Manuscript 110 of the Bibliothèque Nationale*. New York, NY: Sepher-Hermon, 1983.
- . *The Targum Onqelos to the Torah: Genesis*. ArBib 6. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988.
- . *The Targum Sheni to the Book of Esther: A Critical Edition Based on MS. Sassoon 282 with Critical Apparatus*. New York, NY: Sepher-Hermon, 1994.
- . *The Two Targums of Esther*. ArBib 18. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991.
- Haelewyck, Jean-Claude. *Hester*. VL 7/3. Freiburg: Herder, 2003-2008.
- Halkin, François. *Euphémie de Chalcédoine*. LB. SHG 41. Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1965.
- Hanhart, Robert. *Esther*. SVTGAASGE 8/3. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966.
- . *Judith*. SVTGAASGE 8/4. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979.
- Harrington, Daniel J. and A. J. Saldarini. *Targum Jonathan of the Former Prophets*. ArBib 10. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1987.
- Jerome. *Commentaire sur Jonah*. Edited by Yves-Marie Duval. SC 323. Paris: Cerf, 1985.
- . ‘Preface to Judith’. Page 691 in *Biblia Sacra Iuxta Vulgatum Versionem*. Edited by Robert Weber. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1969.
- Jonge, Marinus de. *The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text*. Leiden: Brill, 1978.
- Josephus*. Edited and translated by H. St. J. Thackeray, Ralph Marcus, Louis H. Feldman and Allen Wilkgren. 10 vols. LCL. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1926-1965.
- Kiraz, G. A. *Comparative Edition of the Syriac Gospels, Aligning the Sinaiticus, Curetonianus, Peshîttâ and Harklean Versions*. 4 vols. NTTS 21. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- Lehrman, S. M. *Midrash Rabbah: Exodus*. London: Soncino Press, 1951.
- Leloir, L. *Saint Éphrem: Commentaire de l'Évangile Concordant Texte Syriaque (Manuscrit Chester Beatty 709) Folios Additionnels*. CBM 8. Leuven: Peeters, 1990.

- Macdonald, John. *Memar Marqah: The Teaching of Marqah*. BZAW 83. Berlin: Töpelmann, 1963.
- Machiela, Daniel A. *The Dead Sea Genesis Apocryphon: A New Text and Translation with Introduction and Special Treatment of Columns 13-17*. STDJ 79. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Maher, M. J. *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Genesis*. ArBib 1B. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1992.
- Martínez, Florentino García and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1997-1998. Rev. ed. 2000.
- McNamara, Martin J. *Targum Neofiti 1: Genesis*. ArBib 1A. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1992.
- Mekhilta de-Rabbi Ishmael*. Edited by Ḥayyim S. Horovitz and Israel A. Rabin. Jerusalem: Wahrman, 1970.
- Metzger, Bruce M. and Roland E. Murphy. *The New Oxford Annotated Bible with Apocryphal/Deuterocanonical Books: New Revised Standard Version*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Midrash Bereshit Rabbah*. Edited by Julius Theodor and Chanoch Albeck. 3 vols. 2nd ed. Jerusalem: Wahrman, 1965.
- Midrash Tanḥuma*. Edited by Solomon Buber. 2 vols. New York, NY: Sefer, 1946.
- Midrash Tanḥuma*. Edited by H. Zundel. Repr. Jerusalem: Lewin-Epstein, 1965.
- Midrash Tehillim*. Edited by Solomon Buber. Vilna, 1891.
- Murray, A. T. *Homer: The Iliad Books 1-12*. LCL 170. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1924. Repr. 1998.
- Neusner, Jacob. *Genesis Rabbah: The Judaic Commentary on Genesis: A New American Translation*. 3 vols. BJS 104-106. Atlanta, GA: Scholars, 1985.
- . *Sifre to Deuteronomy: An Analytical Translation*. 2 vols. BJS 98, 101. Atlanta, GA: Scholars, 1987.
- . *The Talmud of the Land of Israel, a Preliminary Translation and Explanation*. 35 vols. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982.
- . *The Tosefta*. 6 vols. New York, NY: Ktav, 1977-1986.

- The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*. Edited by Philip Schaff. Series 1. 14 vols. Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature, 1886-1889. Repr. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994.
- Noah, Moredcai Manuel. *Sefer ha-Yashar or The Book of Jasher Referred to in Joshua and Second Samuel*. New York, NY: W. Reid Gould, 1840. Repr. Salt Lake City, UT: J. H. Parry & Co., 1887.
- Patrologia cursus completus. Series Graeca*. Edited by Jacques-Paul Migne. 166 vols. Paris: Migne, 1857-1886.
- Patrologia cursus completus. Series Latina*. Edited by Jacques-Paul Migne. 221 vols. Paris: Migne, 1844-1864.
- Philo*. Translated by F. H. Colson, G. H. Whitaker and Ralph Marcus. 10 vols. LCL. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1929-1962.
- Pietersma, Albert and Benjamin G. Wright. *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Pirqe Rabbi 'Eli 'ezer*. Edited by David Luria. Warsaw: Bomberg, 1852.
- Rahlfs, Alfred and Robert Hanhart. *Septuaginta*. 2nd ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006.
- Rudolph, Wilhelm and Karl Elliger. *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. 5th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1997.
- Russell, Normal. *Lives of the Desert Fathers*. CS 34. Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian, 1980.
- Schmidt, Francis. *Le Testament grec d'Abraham: Introduction, edition critique des deux recensions grecques, traduction*. TSAJ 11. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1986.
- Seder 'Eliyahu Rabbah we-Seder 'Eliyahu Zuta*. Edited by Meir Friedmann. Vienna: Achiasaf, 1902.
- Stec, David M. *The Targum of Psalms*. ArBib 16. London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Torrey, Charles Cutler. *Lives of the Prophets: Greek Text and Translation*. SBLMS 1. Philadelphia, PA: Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, 1946.
- Ulrich, Eugene. *The Biblical Qumran Scrolls: Transcriptions and Textual Variants*. 3 vols. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Vivian, Tim. *Histories of the Monks of Upper Egypt; and the Life of Onnophrius by Paphnutius*. CS 140. Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian, 1993.

- Voragine, Jacobus de. *Legenda aurea: vulgo historia lombardica dicta; ad optimuorum liborum fidem*. Edited by Theodor Graesse. 3rd ed. Breslau: Gulielmum Koebner, 1890.
- Weber, Robert. *Biblia sacra iuxta vulgatam versionem*. 2 vols. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1983.
- Wilson, Katharina. *Hrotsvit of Gandersheim: A Florilegium of Her Works: Translated with Introduction, Interpretative Essay and Notes*. LMW. New York, NY: Brewer, 1998.

Secondary Works

- Abel, Félix-Marie and Jean Starcky. *Les Livres des Maccabées*. Paris: Cerf, 1961.
- Ahearne-Kroll, Stephen P. *The Psalms of Lament in Mark's Passion: Jesus' Davidic Suffering* (SNTSMS 142; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).
- Aland, Barbara and Kurt Aland. *The Text of the New Testament: An Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticism*. Translated by Erroll F. Rhodes. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1987.
- Alessandro, Cavicchia. *Le sorti e le vesti*. TGST 181. Rome: Editrice Pontificia Università Gregoriana, 2010.
- Alexander, Philip S. 'Midrash and the Gospels'. Pages 1-18 in *Synoptic Studies: The Ampleforth Conferences of 1982 and 1983*. Edited by Christopher M. Tuckett. JSNTSupp 7. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984.
- . 'Notes on the "Imago Mundi" of the Book of Jubilees'. *JJS* 38 (1982): 197-213.
- . 'Rabbinic Judaism and the New Testament'. *ZNW* 74 (1983): 237-246.
- Allen, David M. 'Introduction: The Study of the Use of the Old Testament in the New'. *JSNT* 38 (2015): 3-16.
- Allison Jr., Dale C. 'Behind the Temptations of Jesus: Q 4:1-13 and Mark 1:12-13'. Pages 195-213 in *Authenticating the Activities of Jesus*. Edited by Bruce D. Chilton and Craig A. Evans. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- . *Constructing Jesus: Memory, Imagination, and History*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2010.

- . ‘Elijah Must Come First’. *JBL* 103 (1984): 256-258.
- . *The End of the Ages Has Come: An Early Interpretation of the Passion and Resurrection of Jesus*. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1985.
- . ‘Explaining the Resurrection: Conflicting Convictions’. *JSHJ* 3 (2005): 117-133 .
- . *The Intertextual Jesus: Scripture in Q*. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2000.
- . ‘Job in the Testament of Abraham’. *JSP* 12 (2001): 131-147.
- . *Testament of Abraham*. CEJL. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2003.
- . *The New Moses: A Matthean Typology* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1993).
- . ‘Psalm 23 (22) in Early Christianity: A Suggestion’. *IBS* 5 (1983): 132-137.
- . *Studies in Matthew: Interpretation Past and Present*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2005.
- Anderson, Hugh. *The Gospel of Mark*. NCB. London: Oliphants, 1976.
- . ‘The Old Testament in Mark’s Gospel’. Pages 280-306 in *The Use of the Old Testament in the New and Other Essays: Studies in Honor of William Franklin Stinespring*. Edited by J. M. Efrid. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1972.
- Attridge, Harold W. ‘Giving Voice to Jesus: Use of the Psalms in the New Testament’. Pages 101-112 in *Psalms in Community: Jewish and Christian Textual, Liturgical, and Artistic Traditions*. Edited by Attridge and Margot E. Fassler. SymS 25. Atlanta, GA: SBL, 2003.
- Aune, David. *Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1983.
- Aus, Roger D. *Feeding the Five Thousand: Studies in the Judaic Background of Mark 6:30-44 par. and John 6:1-15*. Studies in Judaism. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2010.
- . ‘Jesus’ Calling the First Four Disciples in Mark 1:16-20 and Judaic Traditions on Elijah’s Calling Elisha as his Disciple in 1 Kgs 19:19-21’. Pages 89-135 in *Stilling the Storm: Studies in Early Palestinian Judaic Traditions*. Edited by Aus. Binghamton, NY: Global Publications, 2000.

- . ‘The Release of Barabbas (Mark 15:6-15 par. John 18:39-40), and Judaic Traditions in the Book of Esther’. Pages 1-27 in *Barabbas and Esther and Other Studies*. Edited by Aus. Atlanta, GA: Scholars, 1992.
- . *Water into Wine and the Beheading of John the Baptist*. BJS 150. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1988.
- Babota, Vasile. *The Institution of the Hasmonean High Priesthood*. JSJSupp 165. Leiden: Brill, 2014.
- Bakhos, Carol. ‘Method(ological) Matters in the Study of Midrash’. Pages 161-188 in *Current Trends in the Study of Midrash*. Edited by Bakhos. JSJSupp 106. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Barthélemy, Dominique. *Critique textuelle de l’Ancien Testament I*. OBO 50/1. Fribourg: Éditions Universitaires—Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982.
- Bartlett, John R. *The First and Second Books of the Maccabees*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973.
- Batsch, Christophe. *La guerre et les rites de guerre dans le judaïsme du deuxième Temple*. JSJSupp 93. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Bauckham, Richard. ‘The Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum of Pseudo-Philo and the Gospels as “Midrash”’. Pages 33-76 in *Gospel Perspectives: Studies in Midrash and Historiography: Volume III*. Edited by R. T. France and David Wenham. Sheffield: JSOT, 1983.
- Beavis, Mary Ann. *Mark*. Paideia. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2011.
- Beetham, Christopher. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letter of Paul to the Colossians*. BibInt 96. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Berkovitz, Abraham Jacob. ‘Jewish and Christian Exegetical Controversy in Late Antiquity: The Case of Psalm 22 and the Esther Narrative’. Pages 222-239 in *Ancient Readers and their Scriptures: Engaging the Hebrew Bible in Early Judaism and Christianity*. Edited by Garrick Allen and John Anthony Dunne. AGAJU 107. Leiden: Brill, 2018.
- Bernstein, Moshe J. ‘The Genesis Apocryphon: Compositional and Interpretive Perspectives’. Pages 157-179 in *A Companion to Biblical Interpretation in Early Judaism*. Edited by Matthias Henze. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2012.

- . “‘Rewritten Bible’: A Generic Category Which Has Outlived Its Usefulness?”. *Textus* 22 (2005): 169-196.
- Best, Ernest. *The Temptation and the Passion: The Markan Soteriology*. 2nd ed. SNTSMS 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Berthelot, Katell. ‘The Biblical Conquest and the Hasmonean Wars According to 1 and 2 Maccabees’. Pages 45-60 in *The Books of the Maccabees: History, Theology, Ideology: Papers of the Second International Conference on the Deuterocanonical Books, Pépa, Hungary, 9-11 June, 2005*. Edited by Géza G. Xeravits and József Zsengellér. JSJ 118. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- . ‘Casting Lots and Distributing Territories: The Hellenistic Background of the Book of Jubilees and the Genesis Apocryphon’. Pages 148-166 in *Sibyls, Scriptures, and Scrolls: John Collins at Seventy*. Edited by Joel Baden, Hindy Najman and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar. JSJSupp 175. Leiden: Brill, 2017.
- Betz, Otto. ‘Jesus and Isaiah 53’. Pages 83-87 in *Jesus and the Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 and Christian Origins*. Edited by William H. Bellinger Jr. and William R. Farmer. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1998.
- Bickerman, Elias. *The God of the Maccabees: Studies on the Meaning and Origin of the Maccabean Revolt*. Translated by Hoerst R. Moehring. SJLA 32. Leiden: Brill, 1979.
- . ‘Notes on the Greek Book of Esther’. *PAAJR* 20 (1950): 101-133.
- Blair, H. J. ‘Putting One’s Hand to the Plough: Luke ix.62 in the Light of 1 Kings xix.19-21’. *ExpTim* 79 (1967-1968): 342-343.
- Bloch, Renée. ‘Écriture et traditions dans le judaïsme – Aperçus sur l’origine du Midrash’. *CS* 8 (1954): 9-34.
- . ‘Note méthodologique pour l’étude de la littérature rabbinique’. *RScR* 43 (1955): 194-227.
- Borchardt, Francis. *The Torah in 1 Maccabees: A Literary Critical Approach to the Text*. DCLS 19. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2014.
- Bock, Darell L. ‘The Function of Scripture in Mark 15.1-39’. Pages 8-17 in *Biblical Interpretation in Early Christian Gospels: Volume 1: The Gospel of Mark*. Edited by Thomas R. Hatina. SSEJC 16. London: T&T Clark, 2006.
- . *The Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern: Lucan Old Testament Christology*. LNTS 12. London: Bloomsbury, 1997.

- Bond, Helen K. 'Discarding the Seamless Robe: The High Priesthood of Jesus in John's Gospel'. Pages 183-194 in *Israel's God and Rebecca's Children: Christology and Community in Early Judaism and Christianity: Essays in Honor of Larry W. Hurtado and Alan F. Segal*. Edited by David B. Capes, April D. DeConick, Bond and Troy A. Miller. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2007.
- . 'A Fitting End? Self-Denial and a Slave's Death in Mark's *Life of Jesus*'. *NTS* 65 (2019), forthcoming.
- . 'Paragon of Discipleship? Simon of Cyrene in the Markan Passion Narrative'. Pages 18-35 in *Matthew and Mark Across Perspectives: Essays in Honour of Stephen C. Barton and William R. Telford*. Edited by Kristian A. Bendoraitis and Nijay K. Gupta. LNTS 538. London: T&T Clark, 2016.
- Boobyer, George H. *St. Mark and the Transfiguration Story*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1942.
- Boring, M. Eugene. *Mark A Commentary*. NTL. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2006.
- Botner, Max. *Jesus Christ as the Son of David in the Gospel of Mark*. SNTSMS 174. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019.
- Bousset, Wilhelm. *Kyrios Christos: Geschichte des Christusglaubens von den Anfängen des Christentums bis Irenaeus*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1913. Rev. ed. 1921.
- Bowman, John. *The Gospel of Mark: The New Christian Jewish Passover Haggadah*. SPB 8. Leiden: Brill, 1965.
- Boyarin, Daniel. *Intertextuality and the Reading of Midrash*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1990.
- Brandt, Wilhelm. *Die Evangelische Geschichte und der Ursprung des Christentums auf Grund einer Kritik der Berichte über das Leiden und die Auferstehung Jesu*. Leipzig: Reisland, 1893.
- Brine, Kevin R., Elena Ciletti and Henrike Lähnemann, eds. *The Sword of Judith: Judith Studies Across the Disciplines*. Cambridge: OpenBook Publishers, 2010.
- Brockelmann, Carl. *Lexicon Syriacum*. 2nd ed. Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1928.

- Brodie, Thomas L. *The Crucial Bridge: the Elijah-Elisha Narrative as an Interpretive Synthesis of Genesis-Kings and a Literary Model for the Gospels*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 2000.
- Brooke, George J. 'Between Authority and Canon: The Significance of Reworking the Bible for Understanding the Canonical Process'. Pages 85-104 in *Reworking the Bible: Apocryphal and Related Texts at Qumran*. Edited by Esther G. Chazon, Devorah Dimant and Ruth A. Clements. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Brown, Raymond E. *The Community of the Beloved Disciple*. London: Chapman, 1979.
- . *The Death of the Messiah: A Commentary on the Passion Narratives in the Four Gospels*. 2 vols. ABRL. New York, NY: Doubleday, 1994.
- . 'Jesus and Elisha'. *Perspective* 12 (1971): 85-104.
- Bruns, J. Edgar. 'Judith or Jael?'. *CBQ* 16 (1954): 12-14.
- Buchanan, George W. 'The Use of Rabbinic Literature for New Testament Research'. *BTB* 7 (1977): 110-122.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. *Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*. 4th ed. FRLANT 29. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1961.
- . *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*. Translated by John Marsh. 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell, 1968.
- Burge, Stephen R. *Angels in Islam: Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī's al-Habā'ik fī akhbār al-malā'ik*. CCME. London: Routledge, 2012.
- Burkitt, Francis Crawford. *Evangelion Da-Mepharreshe: Volume II: Introduction and Notes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1904. Repr. 2014.
- Buschmann, Gerd. *Das Martyrium des Polykarp: Übersetzt Und Erklärt*. Kommentar zu den Apostolischen Vätern 6. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998.
- Caneday, Ardel B. 'Mark's Provocative Use of Scripture in Narration: "He Was with the Wild Animals and Angels Ministered to Him"'. *BBR* 9 (1999): 19-36.
- Caponigro, Mark Stephen. 'Judith, Holding the Tale of Herodotus'. Pages 47-59 in 'No One Spoke Ill of Her': *Essays on Judith*. Edited by James C. VanderKam. SBLEJL 2. Atlanta, GA: Scholars, 1992.
- Carey, Holly. *Jesus' Cry from the Cross: Towards a First-Century Understanding of the Intertextual Relationship between Psalm 22 and the Narrative of Mark's Gospel*. LNTS 398. London: T&T Clark, 2009.

- Carmignac, Jean and Pierre Guilbert. *Les textes de Qumran: traduits et annotés*. 2 vols. Paris: Letouzey et Ane, 1961.
- Carrington, Philip. *According to Mark: A Running Commentary on the Oldest Gospel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960.
- . *The Primitive Christian Calendar: A Study in the Making of the Marcan Gospel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1952.
- Chilton, Bruce D. *A Galilean Rabbi and His Bible*. London: SPCK, 1984.
- Cohn, Leopold. 'An Apocryphal Work Ascribed to Philo of Alexandria'. *JQR* 10 (1898): 311-313.
- Collins, John J. 'Joseph and Aseneth: Jewish or Christian?'. *JSP* 14 (2005): 97-112.
- Collins, Adela Yarbro. 'The Appropriation of the Individual Psalms of Lament by Mark'. Pages 223-241 in *The Scriptures in the Gospels*. Edited by Christopher M. Tuckett. BETL 131. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1997.
- . *Mark: A Commentary*. Hermeneia 55. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2007.
- Conway, Colleen M. *Sex and Slaughter in the Tent of Jael: A Cultural History of a Biblical Story*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.
- Cook, Edward M. "'In the Plain of the Wall" (Dan 3:1)'. *JBL* 108 (1989): 115-116.
- Cranfield, C. E. B. *The Gospel According to St. Mark*. CGTC. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959.
- Craven, Toni. *Artistry and Faith in the Book of Judith*. SBLDS 70. Chico, CA: Scholars, 1983.
- Crawford, Sidnie White. 'Esther and Judith: Contrasts in Character'. Pages 61-76 in *The Book of Esther in Modern Research*. Edited by Crawford and Leonard J. Greenspoon. London: A&C Black, 2003.
- . 'Esther not Judith: Why One Made It and the Other Didn't'. *Bible Review* 18 (2002): 22-31.
- . 'In the Steps of Jael and Deborah: Judith as Heroine'. Pages 5-16 in *No One Spoke Ill of Her*.
- . *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times*. Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2008.
- Crossan, John Dominic. *The Birth of Christianity: Discovering What Happened in the Years Immediately After the Execution of Jesus*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998.

- . *The Cross That Spoke: The Origins of the Passion Narrative*. San Francisco, CA: Harper & Row, 1988.
- . *Four Other Gospels: Shadows on the Contours of Canon*. Minneapolis, MN: Winston, 1985.
- . *Who Killed Jesus? Exposing the Roots of Anti-Semitism in the Gospel Story of the Death of Jesus*. San Francisco, CA: HarperSanFrancisco, 1995.
- Crossley, James G. 'Against the Historical Plausibility of the Empty Tomb Story and the Bodily Resurrection of Jesus: A Response to N.T. Wright'. *JSHJ* 3 (2005): 171-186.
- . 'History from the Margins: The Death of John the Baptist'. Pages 147-161 in *Writing History, Constructing Religion*. Edited by Crossley and Christian Karner. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005.
- . *Jesus and the Chaos of History: Redirecting the Life of the Historical Jesus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.
- Cummins, S. Anthony. 'Integrated Scripture, Embedded Empire: The Ironic Interplay of "King" Herod, John and Jesus in Mark 6.1-44'. Pages 31-48 in *Biblical Interpretation in Early Christian Gospels: Volume 1*.
- Daise, Michael A. *Feasts in John: Jewish Festivals and Jesus' 'Hour' in the Fourth Gospel*. WUNT 2/229. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.
- Dancy, John C. *A Commentary on 1 Maccabees*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1954.
- Danker, Frederick W. 'The Demonic Secret in Mark: A Reexamination of the Cry of Dereliction'. *ZNW* 61 (1970): 48-69.
- . 'The Literary Unity of Mark 14:1-25'. *JBL* 85 (1966): 467-472.
- Daube, David. 'Judith'. Pages 849-870 in *The Collected Works of David Daube: 3: Biblical Law and Literature*. Edited by Calum M. Carmichael. Berkeley, CA: Robbins Collection, 1992.
- Davies, W. D. and Allison. *The Gospel According to Saint Matthew*. 3 vols. ICC. London: T&T Clark, 1988-1997.
- Day, Linda. *Three Faces of a Queen: Characterization in the Books of Esther*. JSOTSupp 186. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- Delcor, Mathias. *Le Testament d'Abraham: Introduction, traduction du texte grec et commentaire de la recension grecque longue, suivi de la traduction des Testaments*

- d'Abraham, d'Isaac et de Jacob d'après les versions orientales*. SVTP 2. Leiden: Brill, 1973.
- Derrett, J. Duncan M. *The Making of Mark: The Scriptural Bases of the Earliest Gospel*. Shipston-on-Stour: P. Drinkwater, 1985.
- Dibelius, Martin. *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1919. 6th ed. 1966.
- . 'Das historische Problem der Leidengeschichte'. Pages 248-257 in *Botschaft und Geschichte. Gesammelte Aufsätze. Band 1: Zur Evangelienforschung*. Edited by Dibelius, Heinz Kraft and Günther Bornkamm. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1963.
- Dijk-Hemmes, Fokkelein van. 'Gezegende onder de vrouwen: een moeder in Israël en een maagd in de kerk'. Pages 123-147 in *'t Is kwaad gerucht, als zij neit binnen blijft: Vrouwen in oude culturen*. Edited by van Dijk-Hemmes. TM. Utrecht: HES, 1986.
- Dimant, Devorah. 'Use and Interpretation of Mikra in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha'. Pages 379-419 in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*. Edited by Martin J. Mulder. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1988.
- Dodd, C. H. *According to the Scriptures: The Sub-Structure of New Testament Theology*. London: Nisbet & Co., 1952.
- . *The Apostolic Preaching and its Development*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1936.
- Donahue, John R. and Harrington. *The Gospel of Mark*. SP 2. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2002.
- Dormeyer, Detlev. *Die Passion Jesu als Verhaltensmodell*. NTAbh NF 11. Münster: Aschendorff, 1974.
- Droge, Arthur J. and James D. Tabor. *A Noble Death: Suicide and Martyrdom Among Christians and Jews in Antiquity*. San Francisco, CA: HarperSanFrancisco, 1992.
- Drury, John. 'Midrash and Gospel'. *Theology* 77 (1974): 291-296.
- Dubarle, André-Marie. *Judith: Formes et sens des diverses traditions*. 2 vols. AnBib 24. Rome: Institut Biblique Pontifical, 1966.

- Edwards, James R. *The Gospel According to Mark*. Pillar New Testament Commentary; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2002.
- Eissfeldt, Otto. *The Old Testament: An Introduction*. Translated by P. R. Ackroyd. New York, NY: Harper & Row, 1965.
- Eklund, Rebekah. *Jesus Wept: The Significance of Jesus' Laments in the New Testament*. LNTS 515. London: T&T Clark, 2016.
- Elwolde, John. 'The Hodayot's Use of the Psalter: Text-Critical Contributions (Book 1)'. Pages 79-108 in *Psalms and Prayers: Papers Read at the Thirteenth Joint Meeting of the Society of Old Testament Study and Het Oudtestamentisch Werkegezelschap in Nederland en België, Apeldoorn 21-24 August 2006*. Edited by Bob Becking and Eric Peels. OS 55. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- . 'The Hodayot's Use of the Psalter: Text-Critical Contributions (Book 2: Pss 42-72)'. Pages 79-99 in vol. 1 of *The Dead Sea Scrolls In Context: Integrating the Dead Sea Scrolls in the Study of Ancient Texts, Languages, and Cultures*. Edited by Armin Lange, Emmanuel Tov and Matthias Weigold. 2 vols. VTSupp 140. Leiden: Brill, 2011.
- . 'The Hodayot's Use of the Psalter: Text-critical Contributions (Book 3: Pss 73-89)'. *DSD* 17 (2010): 159-179.
- Emadi, Samuel. 'Intertextuality in New Testament Scholarship: Significance, Criteria, and the Art of Intertextual Reading'. *CBR* 14 (2015): 8-23.
- Ernst, Josef. *Das Evangelium nach Markus*. RNT 2. Regensburg: Pustet, 1981.
- Eshel, Esther. 'The Dream Visions in the Noah Story of the Genesis Apocryphon and Related Texts'. Pages 41-61 in *Northern Lights on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Nordic Qumran Network 2003-2006*. Edited by Anders Klostergaard Petersen, Torleif Elgvin, Cecilia Wassen, Hanne von Weissenberg, Mikael Winninge and Martin Ehrensverd. STDJ 80. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- . 'The Imago Mundi of the Genesis Apocryphon'. Pages 111-131 in *Heavenly Tablets: Interpretation, Identity and Tradition in Ancient Judaism*. Edited by Lynn LiDonnici and Andrea Lieber. JSJSupp 119. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Esler, Philip. "'By the Hand of a Woman": Culture, Story and Theology in the Book of Judith'. Pages 64-101 in *Social Scientific Models for Interpreting the Bible: Essays*

- by the Context Group in Honor of Bruce J. Malina. Edited by Bruce J. Malina and John J. Pilch. BibInt 53. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Ettelson, H. W. 'The Integrity of 1 Maccabees'. *TCAAS* 27 (1925): 249-384.
- Evans, Craig A. 'The Baptism of John in a Typological Context'. Pages 45-71 in *Dimensions of Baptism: Biblical and Theological Studies*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Anthony R. Cross. JSNTSupp 234. London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.
- . 'Josephus on John the Baptist and Other Jewish Prophets of Deliverance'. Pages 55-63 in *The Historical Jesus in Context*. Edited by Amy-Jill Levine, Allison and Crossan. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006.
- . *Mark 8:27-16:20*. WBC 34B. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, 2001.
- . 'The Passion of Jesus: History Remembered or Prophecy Historicized?'. *BBR* 6 (1996): 159-165.
- Faierstein, Morris M. 'Why do the Scribes Say that Elijah Must Come First?'. *JBL* 100 (1981): 75-86.
- Falk, Daniel K. *The Parabiblical Texts: Strategies for Extending the Scriptures among the Dead Sea Scrolls*. LSTS 63. London: T&T Clark, 2007.
- Farrer, Austin. *A Study in Mark*. London: A&C Black, 1951.
- Feigels, Friedrich K. *Der Einfluß des Weissagungsbeweises und anderer Motive auf die Leidensgeschichte*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1910.
- Feldman, Ariel. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Rewriting Samuel and Kings: Texts and Commentary* (BZAW 469; Berlin: De Gruyter, 2015).
- Feldman, Louis H. 'Hellenizations in Josephus' Version of Esther'. *TAPA* 101 (1970): 143-170.
- . 'Prolegomenon'. Pages ix-clxix in *The Biblical Antiquities of Philo*.
- . 'The Portrayal of Phinehas by Philo, Pseudo-Philo, and Josephus'. *JQR* 92 (2002): 315-345.
- Feuillet, André. 'L'episode de la tentation d'après l'Évangile selon Saint Marc (1,12-13)'. *EstBib* 19 (1960): 49-73.
- Fishbane, Michael A. *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1985.

- . ‘Use, Authority and Interpretation of Mikra at Qumran’. Pages 339-377 in *Mikra*.
- Fisk, Bruce N. *Do You Not Remember?: Scripture, Story and Exegesis in the Rewritten Bible of Pseudo-Philo*. JSPSupp 37. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.
- Fitzmyer, J. A. “‘4Q Testimonia’ and the New Testament’. Pages 59-89 in *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament*. Edited by Fitzmyer. SBS 5. Missoula: Scholars, 1974.
- . *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1 (1Q20): A Commentary*. 3rd ed. BibOr 18B. Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2004.
- . ‘More About Elijah Coming First’. *JBL* 104 (1985): 295-296.
- Fleddermann, Harry. ‘The Flight of a Naked Young Man (Mark 14:51-52)’. *CBQ* 41 (1979): 412-418.
- Focant, Camille. *The Gospel According to Mark: A Commentary*. Translated by L. R. Keylock. Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2012.
- Focke, Friedrich. ‘Synkrisis’. *Hermes* (1923): 327-368.
- Fossum, Jarl E. *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord: Samaritan and Jewish Concepts of Intermediation and the Origins of Gnosticism*. WUNT 36. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1985.
- Foster, Paul. ‘Echoes without Resonance: Critiquing Certain Aspects of Recent Scholarly Trends in the Study of the Jewish Scriptures in the New Testament’. *JSNT* 38 (2015): 96-111.
- . *The Gospel of Peter: Introduction, Critical Edition and Commentary*. TENT 4. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Fraade, Steven D. ‘Interpretive Authority in the Studying Community at Qumran’. *JJS* 49 (1993): 46-69.
- . ‘Rabbinic Midrash and Ancient Jewish Biblical Interpretation’. Pages 99-120 in *The Cambridge Companion to the Talmud and Rabbinic Literature*. Edited by Charlotte E. Fonrobert and Martin S. Jaffee. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- France, R. T. *Jesus and the Old Testament: His Application of Old Testament Passages to Himself and His Mission*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1982.

- . ‘Jewish Historiography, Midrash, and the Gospels’. Pages 99-127 in *Studies in Midrash and Historiography*.
- Frankfurter, David T. M. *Elijah in Upper Egypt: The Apocalypse of Elijah and Early Egyptian Christianity*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1993.
- Fredriksen, Paula. ‘Jesus and the Temple, Mark and the War’. Pages 293-310 in *SBL 1990 Seminar Papers*. Edited by David J. Lull. SBLSP 29. Atlanta, GA: Scholars, 1990.
- Frye, Northrop. *Fearful Symmetry: A Study of William Blake*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1947.
- . *The Great Code: The Bible and Literature*. New York, NY: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1982.
- . *The Stubborn Structure: Essays on Criticism and Society*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1970.
- Gera, Deborah Levine. *Judith*. CEJL. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2013.
- . ‘The Jewish Textual Traditions’. Pages 23-40 in *The Sword of Judith*.
- Gerhardsson, Birger. *The Testing of God’s Son (Matt. 4:1-11 & Par): An Analysis of an Early Christian Midrash*. Lund: Gleerup, 1966.
- Gibson, Jeffrey B. *The Temptations of Jesus in Early Christianity*. London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Glickler-Chazon, Esther. ‘Moses’ Struggle for his Soul: A Prototype for the Testament of Abraham, the Greek Apocalypse of Ezra, and the Apocalypse of Sedrach’. *The Second Century: A Journal of Early Christian Studies* 5 (1985/86): 151-164.
- Gnilka, Joachim. *Das Evangelium nach Markus*. 2 vols. EKK 2. Zurich: Benziger, 1978.
- Godding, Robert. ‘Il Dossier di San Gennaro negli *Acta Sanctorum*’. Pages 37-54 in *San Gennaro nel XVII Centenario del martirio (305-2005): atti del Convegno internazionale, Napoli, 21-23 settembre 2005*. Edited by Gennaro Luongo. CamSac 37-38. Naples: Editoriale Comunicazioni Sociali, 2007.
- Goldberg, Arnold. ‘Die funktionale Form Midrasch’. *FJB* 10 (1982): 1-45.
- Goldstein, Jonathan A. *I Maccabees: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 41. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1976.

- Goodacre, Mark. 'Prophecy Historicized or Tradition Scripturalized? Reflections on the Origins of the Passion Narrative'. Pages 37-51 in *The New Testament and the Church: Essays in Honour of John Muddiman*. Edited by John Barton and Peter Groves. LNTS 532. London: T&T Clark, 2016.
- . 'Scripturalization in Mark's Crucifixion Narrative'. Pages 33-47 in *The Trial and Death of Jesus: Essays on the Passion Narrative in Mark*. Edited by Geert van Oyen and Thomas Shepherd. Leuven: Peeters, 2006.
- Goulder, Michael D. *The Evangelist's Calendar: A Lectionary Explanation of the Development of Scripture*. London: SPCK, 1978.
- . 'Jesus' Resurrection and Christian Origins: A Response to N.T. Wright'. *JSHJ* 3 (2005): 187-195.
- . *Midrash and Lection in Matthew*. London: SPCK, 1974.
- Grässer, Erich. 'Review of A. Suhl, *Die Funktion der alttestamentlichen Zitate und Anspielungen im Markusevangelium*'. *TLZ* 91 (1966): 667-669.
- Green, Joel B. *The Death of Jesus*. WUNT 2/33. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1988.
- Guelich, Robert A. *Mark 1-8:26*. WBC 34A. Dallas, TX: Word, 1989.
- Gundry, Robert H. *Mark: A Commentary on His Apology for the Cross, Chapters 1-8*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000.
- . *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel*. NovTSupp 18. Leiden: Brill, 1967.
- Haag, Ernst. *Studien zum Buche Judith: Seine theologische Bedeutung und literarische Eigenart*. TThSt 16. Trier: Paulinus, 1963.
- Haenchen, Ernst. *Der Weg Jesu*. Berlin: Töpelmann, 1966.
- Hanhart, Robert. *Text and Textgeschichte des Buches Judith*. MSU 14. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979.
- Harrington, Daniel J. 'The Biblical Text of Pseudo-Philo's "Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum"'. *CBQ* 33 (1971): 1-17.
- . *The Hebrew Fragments of Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum Preserved in the Chronicles of Jerahmeel*. TAT 3. Pseudepigrapha Series 3. Missoula, MT: SBL, 1974.
- . 'Pseudo-Philo'. Pages 304-377 in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: Volume Two: Expansions of the "Old Testament" and Legends, Wisdom and*

- Philosophical Literature, Prayers, Psalms, and Odes, Fragments of Lost Judeo-Hellenistic Works*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1983.
- . ‘The Original Language of Pseudo-Philo’s “Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum”’. *HTR* 63 (1970): 503-514.
- . ‘Text and Biblical Text in Pseudo-Philo’s Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum’. Unpublished PhD diss. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, 1969.
- Harris, J. Rendel. *Testimonies*. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1916-1920.
- Harris, Sarah. *The Davidic Shepherd King in the Lukan Narrative*. LNTS 558. London: Bloomsbury, 2016.
- Harvey, John E. *Retelling the Torah: The Deuteronomistic Historian’s Use of Tetrateuchal Narratives*. JSOTSupp 403. London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Hatina, Thomas R. ‘Embedded Scripture Texts and the Plurality of Meaning: The Announcement of the “Voice from Heaven” in Mark 1.11 as a Case Study’. Pages 81-99 in *Biblical Interpretation in Early Christian Gospels: Volume 1*.
- . *In Search of a Context: The Function of Scripture in Mark’s Narrative*. JSNTSupp 232. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.
- Haupt, Paul. ‘Purim’. *Beiträge zur Assyriologie* 6 (1906): 1-53.
- Hauser, Alan J. ‘Two Songs of Victory: A Comparison of Exodus 15 and Judges 5’. Pages 265-284 in *Directions in Biblical Hebrew Poetry*. Edited by Elaine R. Follis. JSOTSupp 40. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1987.
- Hays, Richard B. *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2016.
- . *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1989.
- . *Reading Backwards: Figural Christology and the Fourfold Gospel Witness*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2014.
- Hayward, Robert. ‘Phinehas—the Same is Elijah: The Origins of a Tradition’. *JJS* 29 (1978): 22-34.
- Heil, John Paul. ‘Jesus as the Unique High Priest in the Gospel of John’. *CBQ* 57 (1995): 729-745.

- Heising, Alkuin. *Die Botschaft der Brotvermehrung*. SBS 15. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1966.
- . ‘Exegese und Theologie der Alt- und Neutestamentlichen Speisewunder’. *ZKT* 86 (1964): 80-96.
- Hengel, Martin. *The Zealots: Investigations into the Jewish Freedom Movement in the Period From Herod I Until 70 A.D.* Translated by David Smith. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1989.
- Henten, Jan Willem van. ‘Judith as Alternative Leader: A Rereading of Judith 7-13’. Pages 224-252 in *A Feminist Companion to Esther, Judith and Susanna*. Edited by Athalya Brenner. London: T&T Clark, 1995.
- . ‘Zum Einfluß jüdischer Martyrien auf die Literatur des frühen Christentums. II: Die Apostolischen Väter’. *ANRW* II.27 (1993): 700-723.
- Hieke, Thomas. ‘The Role of “Scripture” in the Last Words of Mattathias’. Pages 61-74 in *The Books of the Maccabees*.
- Hill, Andrew E. *Malachi: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 25D. New York, NY: Doubleday, 1998.
- Himmelfarb, Martha. “‘He Was Renowned to the Ends of the Earth’ (1 Maccabees 3:9)’. Pages 77-97 in *Jewish Literatures and Cultures: Context and Intertext*. Edited by Anita Norich and Yaron Z. Eliav. BJS 349. Providence, RI; Brown Judaic Studies, 2008.
- Hodgson Jr., R. ‘The Testimony Hypothesis’. *JBL* 98 (1979): 361-378.
- Hoehner, Harold W. *Herod Antipas: A Contemporary of Jesus Christ*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1980.
- Hoffeditz, David M. and Gary E. Yates. ‘Femme Fatale Redux: Intertextual Connection to the Elijah/Jezebel Narratives in Mark 6:14-29’. *BBR* 15 (2005): 199-221.
- Hollander, John. *The Figure of Echo: A Mode of Allusion in Milton and After*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1981.
- Hooker, Morna D. *The Gospel According to St Mark*. London: A&C Black, 1991.
- . *Jesus and the Servant: The Influence of the Servant Concept of Deutero-Isaiah in the New Testament*. London: SPCK, 1959.

- . ‘Mark’. Pages 220-230 in *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture: Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars, SSF*. Edited by D. A. Carson and Hugh G. M. Williamson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Horsley, Richard A. ‘Prophetic Envoys for the Renewal of Israel: Q 9:57-10:16’. Pages 228-259 in *Whoever Hears You Hears Me: Prophets, Performance, and Tradition in Q*. Edited by Horsley and Jonathan A. Draper. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1999.
- Huizenga, Leroy A. ‘The Old Testament in the New, Intertextuality and Allegory’. *JSNT* 38 (2015): 17-35.
- Hurtado, Larry W. *Mark*. NIBC. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1989.
- Hutton, Jeremy M. ‘Topography, Biblical Traditions, and Reflections on John’s Baptism of Jesus’. Pages 149-177 in *Jesus Research: New Methodologies and Perceptions: The Second Princeton-Prague Symposium on Jesus Research Research, Princeton 2007*. Edited by Charlesworth and Brian Rhea. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2014.
- Iersel, Bas M. F. van. *Mark: A Reader-Response Commentary*. Translated by W. H. Bisscheroux. JSNTSupp 164. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
- Ilan, Tan and Vared Noam, eds. *Josephus and the Rabbis*. 2 vols. Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi, 2017.
- Iverson, Kelly R. *Gentiles in the Gospel of Mark: ‘Even the Dogs Under the Table Eat the Children’s Crumbs’*. LNTS 339. London: T&T Clark, 2007.
- Jacobson, Howard. *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo’s Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum: With Latin Text & English Translation*. 2 vols. AGAJU 31. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- James, M. R. *The Biblical Antiquities of Philo*. TED 1. London: SPCK, 1917. Repr. New York, NY: Ktav, 1971.
- Janes, Regina. ‘Why the Daughter of Herodias Must Dance (Mark 6.14-29)’. *JSNT* 28 (2006): 443-467.
- Jeremias, Joachim. ‘παῖς θεοῦ’, *TDNT* 5.700-709.
- Jill-Levine, Amy. *The Misunderstood Jew: The Church and the Scandal of the Jewish Jesus*. San Francisco, CA: HarperSanFrancisco, 2006.
- Jobes, Karen H. *The Alpha-Text of Esther: Its Character and Relationship to the Masoretic Text*. SBLDS 153. Atlanta, GA: Scholars, 1996.

- Joynes, Christine E. 'The Returned Elijah? John the Baptist's Angelic Identity in the Gospel of Mark'. *SJT* 58 (2005): 455-467.
- Juel, Donald. *An Introduction to New Testament Literature*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1978.
- . *Messianic Exegesis: Christological Interpretation of the Old Testament in Early Christianity*. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1988.
- . 'Review of Joel Marcus, *The Way of the Lord*'. *JBL* 114 (1995): 147-150.
- Kaminski, Carol M. *From Noah to Israel: Realization of the Primaeval Blessing After the Flood*. JSOTS 413. London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Kasher, Aryeh. *Jews and Hellenistic Cities in Eretz-Israel: Relations of the Jews in Eretz-Israel with the Hellenistic Cities During the Second Temple Period (332 BCE – 70 CE)*. TSAJ 21. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1990.
- Katz, Paul. 'Jesus als Vorläufer des Christus: Mögliche Hinweise in den Evangelien auf Elia als den 'Typos' Jesu'. *TZ* 52 (1996): 225-235.
- . 'Wie einer der Propheten? Das biblische Markusevangelium als Darbietung eines "Vorevangeliums"'. *TZ* 58 (2002): 46-60.
- Kazmierski, Carl R. *Jesus, the Son of God: A Study of the Markan Tradition and its Redaction by the Evangelist*. Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1979.
- Kee, Howard Clark. *Community of the New Age: Studies in Mark's Gospel*. London: SCM Press, 1977.
- . 'The Function of Scriptural Quotations and Allusions in Mark 11-16'. Pages 165-188 in *Festschrift für Werner Georg Kümmel*. Edited by Erich Grässer and E. Earle Ellis. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975.
- Keesmaat, Sylvia C. *Paul and His Story: (re)interpreting the Exodus Tradition*. JSNTSupp 181. Edinburgh: A&C Black, 1999.
- Kelber, Werner. *The Kingdom in Mark: A New Place and a New Time*. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1974.
- . *Mark's Story of Jesus*. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1979.
- . *The Oral and the Written Gospel*. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1983.
- Kelhoffer, James A. *The Diet of John the Baptist: "Locusts and Wild Honey" in Synoptic and Patristic Interpretation*. WUNT 176. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.

- Klein, Günter. 'Die Verleugnung des Petrus: Eine traditions-geschichte Untersuchung'. *ZTK* 58 (1961): 285-328.
- Klostermann, Eric. *Das Markusevangelium*. 5th ed. HNT 3. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1971.
- Knauf, Ernst Axel. 'Joshua Maccabeus: Another Reading of 1 Maccabees 5'. Pages 203-212 in *'Even God Cannot Change the Past': Reflections on Seventeen Years of the European Seminar in Historical Methodology*. Edited by Lester L. Grabbe. LHBOTS 663. London: T&T Clark, 2018.
- Koester, Helmut. *Ancient Christian Gospels: Their History and Development*. London: SCM, 1990.
- . 'Apocryphal and Canonical Gospels'. *HTR* 73 (1980): 105-130.
- Koller, Aaron. *Esther in Ancient Jewish Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- Kozłowski, Jan M. 'And He Saw His Pillow Being Consumed by Fire (*Martyrium Polycarpi* 5,2): A Proposal of Interpretation'. *ETL* 85 (2009): 147-158.
- Kreps, Anne. 'The Passion of the Book: The Gospel of Truth as Valentinian Scriptural Practice'. *J ECS* 24 (2016): 311-335.
- Kugel, James. *A Walk Through Jubilees: Studies in the Book of Jubilees and the World of its Creation*. JSJSupp 156. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Kushelevsky, Rella. *Moses and the Angel of Death*. STML 4. New York, NY: Peter Lang, 1995.
- Labahn, Michael. *Offenbarung in Zeichen und Wort*. WUNT 2/17. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.
- Lacocque, André. *The Feminine Unconventional: Four Subversive Figures in Israel's Tradition*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1990.
- Lane, William. *The Gospel According to Mark*. NICNT 2. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1974.
- Lang, Judith. 'The Lord Who Crushes Wars: Studies on Judith 9:7, Judith 16:2, and Exodus 15:3'. Pages 179-187 in *A Pious Seductress: Studies in the Book of Judith*. Edited by Géza G. Xeravits. DCLS 14. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012.
- Lange, Armin and Matthias Weigold. *Biblical Quotations and Allusions in Second Temple Jewish Literature*. JAJSupp 5. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011.

- LaVerdiere, Eugene. *The Beginning of the Gospel: Introducing the Gospel According to Mark, Volume 1*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1999.
- Lerner Myron B. 'The Works of Aggadic Midrash and the Esther Midrashim'. Pages 133-229 in *The Literature of the Sages: Second Part*. Edited by Shmuel Safrai, Zeev Safrai, Peter J. Tomson and Joshua Schwartz. CRINT 2.3. Assen: Royal Van Gorcum, 2006.
- Li, Tarsee. *The Verbal System of the Aramaic of Daniel: An Explanation in the Context of Grammaticalization*. SAIS 8. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Liebengood, Kelly D. *The Eschatology of 1 Peter: Considering the Influence of Zechariah 9-14*. SNTSMS 157. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- Lightfoot, Robert H. *History and Interpretation in the Gospels*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1935.
- Lim, Timothy H. 'Authoritative Scriptures and the Dead Sea Scrolls'. Pages 303-322 in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Lim and Collins. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- . *The Formation of the Jewish Canon*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2013.
- . 'Origins and Emergence of Midrash in Relation to the Hebrew Bible'. Pages 595-612 in vol. 2 of *Encyclopedia of Midrash: Biblical Interpretation in Formative Judaism*. Edited by Neusner. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Lindars, Barnabas. *New Testament Apologetic: The Doctrinal Significance of Old Testament Quotations*. London: SCM, 1961.
- Lindbeck, Kristen H. *Elijah and the Rabbis: Story and Theology*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 2010.
- Linnemann, Eta. *Studien zur Passionsgeschichte*. FRLANT 102. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970.
- Loader, William. *The Pseudepigrapha on Sexuality: Attitudes towards Sexuality in Apocalypses, Testaments, Legends, Wisdom, and Related Literature*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2011.
- Loewenstamm, Samuel E. 'The Testament of Abraham and the Texts Concerning Moses' Death'. Pages 219-225 in *Studies in the Testament of Abraham*. Edited by George W. E. Nickelsburg. SBLSCS 6. Missoula, MT: Scholars, 1976.

- Lohmeyer, Ernst. *Das Evangelium des Markus*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1953.
- . *Galiläa und Jerusalem*. FRLANT 34. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1936.
- Loos, Hendrick van der. *The Miracles of Jesus*. Leiden: Brill, 1965.
- Lowin, Shari L. *The Making of a Forefather: Abraham in Islamic and Jewish Exegetical Narratives*. IHC 65. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- MacDonald, Dennis R. *The Homeric Epics and the Gospel of Mark*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2000.
- Machiela, Daniel A. “‘Each to His Own Inheritance’ Geography as an Evaluative Tool in the Genesis Apocryphon”. *DSD* 15 (2008): 50-66.
- Mack, Burton L. *A Myth of Innocence: Mark and Christian Origins*. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1988.
- Majoros-Danowski, Johannes. *Elija im Markusevangelium. Ein Buch im Kontext des Judentums*. BWANT 180. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2008.
- Makiello, Phoebe. ‘Was Moses Considered to be an Angel by Those at Qumran?’. Pages 115-127 in *Moses in Biblical and Extra-Biblical Traditions*. Edited by Axel Graupner and Michael Wolter. BZAW 372. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007.
- Malbon, Elizabeth Struthers. ‘Disciples/Crowds/Whoever: Markan Characters and Readers’. *NovT* 28 (1986): 104-130.
- . *Mark’s Jesus: Characterization as Narrative Christology*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2009.
- Mahnke, Hermann. *Die Versuchungsgeschichte im Rahmen der synoptischen Evangelien. Ein Beitrag zur frühen Christologie*. BBET 9. Frankfurt: Lang, 1978.
- Mann, Jacob. *The Bible as Read and Preached in the Old Synagogue*. 2 vols. Cincinnati, OH: JPS, 1940.
- Manns, Frédéric. ‘Un midrash chrétien: le récit de la mort de Judas’. *RSR* 54 (1980): 197-203.
- Marcus, Joel. *John the Baptist in History and Theology*. SPNT. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina, 2018.
- . *Mark: 1-8: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 27. New York, NY: Doubleday, 2000.

- . *Mark: 8-16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 27A. New York, NY: Doubleday, 2009.
- . *The Way of the Lord: Christological Exegesis of the Old Testament in the Gospel of Mark*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1992.
- Martínez, Florentino García. 'Biblical Borderlines'. Pages 123-138 in *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Martínez and Julio Trebolle Barrera. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- Marxsen, Willi. *Der Evangelist Markus: Studien zur Redaktionsgeschichte des Evangeliums*. FRLANT 49. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1959.
- Matera, Frank J. *The Kingship of Jesus: Composition and Theology in Mark 15*. SBLDS 66. Atlanta, GA: Scholars, 1982.
- . 'The Prologue as the Interpretative Key to Mark's Gospel'. *JSNT* 34 (1988): 3-20.
- Maurer, Christian. 'Knecht Gottes und Sohn Gottes im Passionsberichte des Markusevangeliums'. *ZTK* 50 (1953): 1-38.
- Mauser, Ulrich W. *Christ in the Wilderness: The Wilderness Theme in the Second Gospel and its Basis in the Biblical Tradition*. SBT 39. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 1963.
- McNamara, Martin. *Targum and Testament Revisited: Aramaic Paraphrases of the Hebrew Bible: A Light on the New Testament*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2010.
- McWhirter, Joceyln. 'Messianic Exegesis in Mark's Passion Narrative'. Pages 69-97 in *The Trial and Death of Jesus*.
- Meier, J. P. 'The Circle of the Twelve: Did it Exist During Jesus' Public Ministry?'. *JBL* 116 (1997): 635-672.
- . *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus*, vol. 2, *Mentor, Message, and Miracles*. New York, NY: Doubleday, 1994.
- Mell, Ulrich. 'Jesu Taufe durch Johannes (Markus 1,9-15)—zur narrative Christologie vom neuen Adam'. *BZ* 40 (1996): 161-178.
- Meye, Robert P. *Jesus and the Twelve: Discipleship and Revelation in Mark's Gospel*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1968.
- Meyer, Rudolf. 'προφήτης C'. *TDNT*. 6.812-828.

- Millard, Allan. 'Judith, Tobit Ahiqar and History'. Pages 195-203 in *New Heaven and New Earth: Prophecy and the Millenium: Essays in Honour of Anthony Gelston*. Edited by Peter J. Harland and Robert Hayward. VTSupp 77; Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Miller, Dale and Patricia Miller. *The Gospel of Mark as Midrash on Earlier Jewish and New Testament Literature*. SBEC 21. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen, 1990.
- Moo, Douglas J. *The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives*. Sheffield: Almond Press, 1983.
- Moore, Carey A. *Judith: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 40. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1985.
- . 'Why Wasn't the Book of Judith Included in the Hebrew Bible?'. Pages 61-71 in *No One Spoke Ill of Her*.
- Moore, George F. *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era: The Age of the Tannaim*. 3 vols. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1927.
- Moss, Charlene McAfee. *The Zechariah Tradition and the Gospel of Matthew*. BZNW 156. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009.
- Motyer, Stephen. 'The Rending of the Veil: A Markan Pentecost?'. *NTS* 33 (1987): 155-157.
- Moyise, Steve. 'Is Mark's Opening Quotation the Key to his Use of Scripture?'. *IBS* 20 (1998): 146-158.
- Mroczek, Eva. *The Literary Imagination in Jewish Antiquity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.
- Mueller, Herman. 'Review of Suhl, *Die Funktion*'. *CBQ* 28 (1966) 95-97.
- Mueller, James R. 'The *Apocalypse of Abraham* and the Destruction of the Second Jewish Temple'. Pages 341-349 in *The Society of Biblical Literature 1982 Seminar Papers*. Edited by Kent Harold Richards. SBLSP 21. Chico, CA: Scholars, 1982.
- Munoa, Phillip B. *Four Powers in Heaven: The Interpretation of Daniel 7 in the Testament of Abraham*. JSPSupp 28; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
- Münz-Manor, Ophir. 'Carnavalesque Ambivalence and the Christian Other in Aramaic Poems from Byzantine Palestine'. Pages 831-845 in *Jews in Byzantium: Dialectics of Minority and Majority Cultures*. Edited by Guy. G. Stroumsa et al. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

- Murphy, Frederick J. *Pseudo-Philo: Rewriting the Bible*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- . ‘Retelling the Bible: Idolatry in Pseudo-Philo’. *JBL* 107 (1988): 275-287.
- Neiryneck, Frans. ‘L’Évangile de Marc (II). À propos de R. Pesch, *Das Markusevangelium*, 2. Teil. Review of Pesch, R. *Das Markusevangelium. II Teil: Kommentar Zu Kap. 8,27-16,20*’. *ETL* 55 (1979): 1-42.
- Neuhaus, Günter. *Studien zu den poetischen Stücken im ersten Makkabäerbuch*. Würzburg: Echter-Verlag, 1974.
- Newman, Judith H. *Before the Bible: The Liturgical Body and the Formation of Scriptures in Early Judaism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018.
- . *Praying by the Book: The Scripturalization of Prayer in Second Temple Judaism*. EJS 14; Atlanta, GA: Scholars, 1999.
- Newsom, Carol A. *The Self as Symbolic Space: Constructing Identity and Community at Qumran*. STDJ 52. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Nickelsburg, George W. E. *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah*. Minneapolis, MN; Fortress Press, 2011.
- . ‘Patriarchs Who Worry About Their Wives: A Haggadic Tendency in the Genesis Apocryphon’. Pages 177-199 in vol. 2 of *George W. E. Nickelsburg in Perspective: An Ongoing Dialogue of Learning*. Edited by Jacob Neusner and Alan J. Avery-Peck. 2 vols. JSJSupp 82. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- . ‘Structure and Message in the Testament of Abraham’. Pages 85-93 in *Studies on the Testament of Abraham*. Edited by Nickelsburg. SACS 6. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1976.
- Nineham, Dennis E. *Saint Mark*. PGC. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1963.
- Nortje, S. J. ‘John the Baptist and the Resurrection Traditions in the Gospels’. *Neot* 23 (1989): 349-358.
- O’Brien, Kelli S. ‘Innocence and Guilt: Apologetic, Martyr Stories, and Allusion in the Markan Trial Narratives’. Pages 205-228 in *The Trial and Death of Jesus*.
- . *The Use of Scripture in the Markan Passion Narrative*. LNTS 384. London: T&T Clark, 2010.

- Öhler, Marcus. *Elia im Neuen Testament: Untersuchungen zur Bedeutung des alttestamentlichen Propheten im frühen Christentum*. BZNW 88. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1997.
- Omerzu, Heikke. ‘Geschichte durch Geschichten. Zur Bedeutung jüdischer Traditionen für die Jesusdarstellung des Markusevangeliums’. *EC* 2 (2011): 77-99.
- . ‘Die Rezeption von Psalm 22 im Judentum zur Zeit des Zweiten Tempels’. Pages 33-76 in *Psalm 22 und die Passionsgeschichten der Evangelien*. Edited by Dieter Sänger. BthSt 88. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2007.
- Otzen, Benedict. *Tobit and Judith*. Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.
- Owen, Paul. ‘Jesus as God’s Chief Agent in Mark’s Christology’. Pages 40-58 in *Mark, Manuscripts, and Monotheism: Essays in Honor of Larry W. Hurtado*. Edited by Dieter Roth and Chris Keith. LNTS 528. London: Bloomsbury, 2016.
- Parker, Neil R. *The Marcan Portrayal of the “Jewish” Unbeliever: A Function of the Marcan References to Jewish Scripture*. SBL 79. New York, NY: Lang, 2008.
- Paton, Lewis Bayles. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Esther*. ICC 19. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1908.
- Pearson, Lionel. ‘The Pseudo-History of Messenia and Its Authors’. *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* (1962): 397-426.
- Pellegrini, Silvia. *Elija—Wegbereiter des Gottesohnes: Eine textsemiotische Untersuchung im Markusevangelium*. HBS 26. Freiburg: Peterson, 2000.
- Perkins, Larry. “‘The Lord is a Warrior’ – ‘The Lord Who Shatters Wars’: Exodus 15:3 and Judith 9:7; 16:2’. *BIOSCS* 40 (2007): 121-138.
- Perrot, Charles, Pierre-Maurice Bogaert and Harrington. *Pseudo-Philon: Les Antiquités Bibliques*. 2 vols. SC 230. Paris: Cerf, 1976.
- Pervo, Richard I. ‘Panta Kiona: The Feeding Stories in the Light of Economic Data and Social Practice’. Pages 163-194 in *Religious Propaganda and Missionary Competition in the New Testament World*. Edited by Lukas Bormann. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- Pesch, Rudolf. ‘Anfang des Evangeliums Jesu Christi. Eine Studie zum Prolog des Markusevangeliums (Mark 1,1-15)’. Pages 108-144 in *Die Zeit Jesu: Festschrift für Heinrich Schlier*. Edited by Bornkamm and Karl Rahner. Freiburg: Herder, 1970.

- . ‘Berufung und Sendung, Nachfolge und Mission: Eine Studie zu Mk 1,16-20’. *ZKT* 91 (1969): 1-31.
- . *Das Markusevangelium*. 2 vols. HTKNT. Freiburg: Herder, 1976-1977.
- Petersen, David L. *Late Israelite Prophecy: Studies in Deutero-prophetic Literature and in Chronicles*. SBLMS 23. Atlanta, GA: Scholars, 1977.
- Pinches, Theophilus G. ‘Dura’. Page 883 in *Volume 2 of The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*. Edited by James Orr. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1957.
- Pokorny, Petr. ‘The Temptation Stories and Their Intention’. *NTS* 20 (1974): 115-127.
- Porton, Gary G. ‘Defining Midrash’. Pages 55-92 in vol. 1 of *The Study of Ancient Judaism*. Edited by Neusner. New York, NY: Ktav, 1981.
- Price, Robert M. ‘New Testament Narrative as Old Testament Midrash’. Pages 534-574 in vol. 1 of *Encyclopedia of Midrash*.
- Pyeon, Yohan. *You Have Not Spoken What is Right About Me: Intertextuality and the Book of Job*. SBL 45. New York, NY: Lang, 2003.
- Rajak, Tessa. ‘Hasmonean Kingship and Tradition’. Pages 39-60 in *The Jewish Dialogue with Greece and Rome: Studies in Cultural and Social Interaction*. Edited by Rajak. AGAJU 48. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Rakel, Claudia. “‘I Will Sing a New Song to my God’”: Some Remarks on the Intertextuality of Judith 16.1-17’. Pages 27-47 in *Judges: A Feminist Companion to the Bible*. Edited by Athalya Brenner. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- . *Judit—über Schönheit, Macht und Widerstand im Krieg: Eine feministisch-intertextuelle Lektüre*. BZAW 334. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2003.
- Rappaport, Uriel. ‘A Note on the Use of the Bible in 1 Maccabees’. Pages 175-179 in *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the First International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 12-14 May, 1996*. Edited by Stone and Chazon. STDJ 28. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Reeves, John C. *Jewish Lore in Manichaean Cosmogony: Studies in the Book of Giants Traditions*. HUCM 14. Cincinnati, OH: Hebrew Union College, 1992.
- Reiss, Jacob. ‘Das Targum Scheni zu dem Buche Esther’. *MGWJ* 25 (1876): 398-406.

- Reinmuth, Eckhart. *Pseudo-Philo und Lukas: Studien zum Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum und seiner Bedeutung für die Interpretation des lukanischen Doppelwerks*. WUNT 2/74. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994.
- Reiterer, Friedrich V. 'Die Vergangenheit als Basis für die Zukunft Mattathias' Lehre für seine Söhne aus der Geschichte in 1 Makk 2:52-60'. Pages 75-100 in *The Books of the Maccabees*.
- Rigaux, Dominique. 'Miracle, Reliques et Images dans la Chapelle du Corporal à Orvieto (1357-64)'. Pages 201-245 in vol. 1 of *Pratiques de l'Eucharistie dans les Eglises d'Orient et d'Occident (Antiquité et Moyen Age): Actes du Séminaire Tenu à Paris, Institut Catholique, 1997-2004*. Edited by Nicole Bériou, Béatrice Caseau and Rigaux. 2 vols. Paris: Institut d'Etudes Augustiniennes, 2009.
- Robinson, J. A. T. 'Elijah, John and Jesus: an Essay in Detection'. *NTS* 4 (1958): 263-281.
- Robinson, Marilynne. 'The Book of Books: What Literature Owes the Bible'. *The New York Times*. 22 December 2011, 22.
- . *Housekeeping*. New York, NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1980.
- Roth, Wolfgang. *Hebrew Gospel: Cracking the Code of Mark*. Oak Park, IL: Meyer-Stone Books, 1988.
- Rowe, Robert D. *God's Kingdom and God's Son: The Background to Mark's Christology from Concepts of Kingship in the Psalms*. AGAJU 50. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Ruiten, Jacques T. A. G. M. van. *Abraham in the Book of Jubilees: The Rewriting of Genesis 11:26-25:10 in the Book of Jubilees 11:14-23:8*. JSJSupp 161. Brill: Leiden, 2012.
- Subramanian, J. Samuel. *The Synoptic Gospels and the Psalms as Prophecy*. LNTS 351. London: T&T Clark, 2007.
- Sanders, E. P. 'Testament of Abraham'. Pages 871-904 in vol. 1 of *OTP*.
- Saunderson, Barbara. 'Gethsemane: The Missing Witness'. *Biblica* 79 (1989): 224-233.
- Schedl, Claus. 'Nabochodonosor, Arpakšad und Darius'. *ZDMG* 115 (1965): 242-254.
- Scheil, Jean-Vincent. 'Cylindres et Légendes Inédits (avec trois planches)'. *RA* 13 (1961): 5-25.

- Schenke, Ludger. *Studien zur Passionsgeschichte des Markus. Tradition und Redaktion in Markus 14,1-42*. FZB 4. Würzburg: Echter, 1971.
- Schille, Gottfried. 'Das Leiden des Herrn. Die evangelische Passionstradition und ihr »Sitz im Leben«'. *ZTK* 52 (1955): 161-205.
- Schmid, Josef. *The Gospel According to Mark*. Staten Island, NY: Alba House, 1968.
- Schmidt, Francis. 'Naissance d'une géographe juive'. Pages 13-30 in *Moïse géographe: Recherches sur les représentations juives et chrétiennes de l'espace*. Edited by Alain Desreumaux and Schmidt. Paris: Vrin, 1988.
- Schmidt, Karl L. *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu*. Berlin: Trowitzsch und Sohn, 1919.
- Schmidt, T. E. 'Mark 15.16-32: The Crucifixion Narrative and the Roman Triumphal Procession'. *NTS* 41 (1995): 1-18.
- Schmithals, Walter. *Das Evangelium nach Markus: Kapitel 9,2-16*. OTK 2/2. Gütersloh: Mohn, 1979.
- Schnackenburg, Rudolf. 'Der Sinn der Versuchung Jesu bei den Synoptikern'. *TQ* 132 (1952): 297-326.
- Schneck, Richard. *Isaiah in the Gospel of Mark, I-VIII*. BIBALDS 1. Vallejo, CA: BIBAL, 1994.
- Scholz, Anton. *Das Buch Judith—eine Prophetie*. Würzburg: Leo Woerl, 1885.
- Schreiber, Johannes. *Die Markuspassion*. 2nd ed. BZNW 68. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1993.
- Schulz, Anselm. *Nachfolgen und Nachahmen*. StANT 6. Munich: Kösel, 1962.
- Schulz, Siegfried. 'Markus und das Alte Testament'. *ZTK* 58 (1961): 184-197.
- Schunck, Klaus-Dietrich. *I. Makkabäerbuch*. JSRZ 1/4. Gütersloh: Mohn, 1980).
- Schwartz, Daniel R. *2 Maccabees*. CEJL. Berlin: Water de Gruyter, 2008.
- Schwartz, Seth. 'Israel and the Nations Roundabout: 1 Maccabees and the Hasmonean Expansion'. *JJS* 42 (1991): 16-38.
- Schweitzer, Albert. *The Mystery of the Kingdom of God: The Secret of Jesus' Messiahship and Passion*. Translated by Walter Lowrie. New York, NY: Dodd, Mead and Co., 1914.
- Schweizer, Eduard. *Das Evangelium nach Markus*. NTD 1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967.
- Scott, James M. *Geography in Early Judaism and Christianity: The Book of Jubilees*. SNTS 113. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

- Seethaler, Angelika. 'Die Brotvermehrung – Ein Kirchenspiegel?'. *BZ* 34 (1990): 108-112.
- Segal, Michael. *The Book of Jubilees: Rewritten Bible, Redaction, Ideology and Theology*. JSJSupp 117. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Sherman, Philip Michael. *Babel's Tower Translated: Genesis 11 and Ancient Jewish Interpretation*. BibInt 117. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Siker, Jeffrey S. "'First to the Gentiles": A Literary Analysis of Luke 4:16-30'. *JBL* 111 (1992): 73-90.
- Silva, David A. de. 'Judith the Heroine? Lies, Seduction, and Murder in Cultural Perspective'. *BTB* 36 (2006): 55-61.
- Smith, Jessie Payne. *A Compendious Syriac Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1902. Repr. ALR. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 1999.
- Snodgrass, Klyne R. 'Streams of Tradition Emerging from Isaiah 40:1-5 and their Adaption in the New Testament'. *JSNT* 8 (1980): 24-45.
- Spiro, Abram. 'The Ascension of Phinehas'. *PAAJR* 22 (1953): 91-114.
- Standhartinger, Angela. "'And All Ate and Were Filled" (Mark 6.42 par.): The Feeding Narratives in the Context of Hellenistic-Roman Banquet Culture'. Pages 62-82 in *Decisive Meals: Dining Politics in Biblical Literature*. Edited by Nathan MacDonald, Luzia Sutter Rehman and Kathy Ehrensperger. LNTS 449. London: T&T Clark, 2012.
- Stegner, William Richard. *Narrative Theology in Early Christianity*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1989.
- Steichele, Hans-Jörg. *Der leidende Sohn Gottes: Eine Untersuchung einiger alttestamentlicher Motive in der Christologie des Markusevangeliums*. BU 14. Regensburg: Pustet, 1980.
- Stein, Robert H. *Mark*. BECNT. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2008.
- Stemberger, Günter. *Midrasch: Vom Umgang der Rabbinen mit der Bibel. Einführung – Texte – Erläuterungen*. Munich: Beck, 2002.
- Stendahl, Krister. *The School of St. Matthew and Its Use of the Old Testament*. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1968.
- Stone, Michael E. 'Review of Munoa, *Four Powers in Heaven*'. *JQR* 90 (1999): 235-237.

- Stott, Katherine M. 'Ezra's "Lost Manuscripts": Narrative Context and Rhetorical Function'. Pages 96-106 in *The One Who Reads May Run: Essays in Honour of Edgar W. Conrad*. Edited by Roland Boer, Michael Carden and Julie Kelso. LHBOTS 553. London: T&T Clark, 2012.
- Strauss, David Friedrich. *Das Leben Jesu: kritisch bearbeitet*. 2 vols. Tübingen: Osiander, 1835. 3rd ed. 1839. 4th ed. 1840.
- Suhl, Alfred. *Die Funktion der alttestamentlichen Zitate und Anspielungen im Markusevangelium*. Gütersloh: Mohn, 1965.
- Swenson, Kristin M. 'Psalm 22:17: Circling around the Problem Again'. *JBL* 123 (2004): 637-648.
- Swete, H. B. *The Gospel According to St Mark*. London: Macmillan, 1905.
- Sydow, Carl W. von. 'Geography and Folk-Tale Oicotypes'. Pages 44-55 in *C. W. von Sydow, Selected Papers on Folklore*. Edited by L. Bødker; Copenhagen: Rosenkilde and Bagger, 1948.
- Taylor, Joan E. *The Immerser: John the Baptist within Second Temple Judaism*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1997.
- Taylor, Vincent. *The Gospel According to St. Mark*. 2nd ed. London: Macmillan, 1966.
- Teugels, Lieve. 'Midrash in the Bible or Midrash on the Bible? Critical Remarks about the Uncritical Use of a Term'. Pages 43-63 in *Bibel und Midrasch: zur Bedeutung der rabbinischen Exegese für die Bibelwissenschaft*. Edited by G. Bodendorfer and M. Millard. FAT 22. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998.
- Theissen, Gerd. *Lokalkolorit und Zeitgeschichte in den Evangelien. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*. NTOA 8. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992.
- Thiessen, Matthew. *Contesting Conversion: Genealogy, Circumcision, and Identity in Ancient Judaism and Christianity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Tilly, Michael. *Johannes der Täufer und die Biographie der Propheten: Die synoptische Täuferüberlieferung und das jüdische Prophetenbild zur Zeit des Täufers*. BWANT 137. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1994.
- Tolbert, Mary Ann. *Sowing the Gospel: Mark's World in Literary-Historical Perspective*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1996.

- Torrey, Charles Cutler. *Documents of the Primitive Church*. New York, NY: Harper & Brothers, 1941.
- Trocme, Étienne. *L Évangile selon Saint Marc*. CNT 2. Paris: Labor et Fides, 2000.
- . *The Passion as Liturgy: A Study in the Origin of the Passion Narrative in the Four Gospels*. London: SCM, 1983.
- Turner, Nigel. *The Testament of Abraham: A Study of the Original Language, Place of Origin, Authorship, and Relevance*. Unpublished PhD diss. London: University of London, 1953.
- Tuschling, Ruth M. M. *Angels and Orthodoxy: A Study in Their Development in Syria and Palestine from the Qumran Texts to Ephrem the Syrian*. STAC 40. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.
- Ulansey, David. 'The Heavenly Veil Torn: Mark's Cosmic *Inclusio*'. *JBL* 110 (1991): 123-125.
- Ulmer, Rivka. 'Psalm 22 in Pesiqta Rabbati: The Suffering of the Jewish Messiah and Jesus'. Pages 106-128 in *The Jewish Jesus: Revelation, Reflection, Reclamation*. Edited by Zev Garber. West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press, 2011.
- Upson-Saia, Kristi. 'Hairiness and Holiness in the Early Christian Desert'. Pages 155-172 in *Dressing Judeans and Christians in Antiquity*. Edited by Upson-Saia, Carly Daniel-Hughes and Alicia J. Batten. London: Routledge, 2014.
- VanderKam, James C. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today*. Rev. ed. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2010.
- . *Jubilees 1-21*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2018.
- Vanhoye, Albert. 'La fuite de jeune homme nu (Mc 14,51-52)'. *Bib* 52 (1971): 401-406.
- Vermes, Geza. '2. The Genesis Apocryphon from Qumran'. Pages 318-325 in vol. 3 of *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* by Emil Schürer. Rev. Vermes, Fergus Millar and Martin Goodman. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1986.
- . 'Ḥanina ben Dosa'. *JJS* 23 (1972): 28-50. *JJS* 24 (1973): 51-64.
- . *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies*. SPB. Leiden: Brill, 1961.

- Vette, Nathanael. 'Who is Elijah in the Gospel of Mark?'. Pages 799-810 in *Reading the Gospel of Mark in the Twenty-First Century*. Edited by Van Oyen. BETL 301. Leuven: Peeters, 2019.
- Vette, Nathanael and Will Robinson. 'Was John the Baptist Raised from the Dead? The Origins of Mark 6:14-29'. *BibAn* 9 (2019): 335-354.
- Vorster, Willem S. 'The Function of the Use of the Old Testament in Mark'. *NeoT* 14 (1980): 62-72.
- . 'The Production of the Gospel of Mark: Essay on Intertextuality'. *HTS* 49 (1993): 385-396.
- Wacholder, Ben Z. 'How Long did Abram Stay in Egypt?'. *HUCA* 35 (1964): 43-56.
- . 'Jubilees as the Super Canon: Torah-Admonition versus Torah-Commandment'. Pages 195-211 in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Cambridge, 1995: Published in Honour of Joseph M. Baumgarten*. Edited by Bernstein, Martínez and John Kampen. STDJ 23; Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Wadsworth, Michael. 'The *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* of Pseudo-Philo: Doctrine and Scriptural Exegesis in a Jewish Midrash of the First Century A.D.'. 2 vols. Unpublished DPhil diss. Oxford: Oxford University, 1975.
- . 'Making and Interpreting Scripture'. Pages 7-22 in *Ways of Reading the Bible*. Edited by Wadsworth. Sussex: Harvester, 1981.
- Walt, Charl Pretorius Van der. 'The Prayer of Esther (LXX) and Judith Against Their Social Backgrounds: Evidence of a Possible Common "Grundlage"?'. *JSem* 17 (2008): 194-206.
- Watts, Rikki E. *Isaiah's New Exodus*. WUNT 2/88. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997.
- Watts, 'The Psalms in Mark's Gospel'. Pages 25-45 in *The Psalms in the New Testament*. Edited by Moyise and Maarten J. J. Menken. London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Weeden, Theodore J. 'The Heresy That Necessitated Mark's Gospel'. *ZNW* 59 (1968): 145-158.
- . *Mark—Traditions in Conflict*. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1971.
- Weidel, Karl. 'Studien über den Einfluss des Weissagungsbeweises auf die evangelische Geschichte'. *TSK* 83 (1910): 83-109, 163-195; *TSK* 85 (1912): 167-286.

- Weinberg, Joanna. 'Job versus Abraham: The Quest for the Perfect God-Fearer in Rabbinic Tradition'. Pages 281-296 in *The Book of Job*. Edited by W. A. M. Beuken. BETL 114. Leuven: Peeters, 1994.
- Weiss, Johannes. *Die Drei Älteren Evangelien*. 2nd ed. Die Schriften des NT 1. Göttingen, 1907.
- Whitters, Mark F. 'Why Did the Bystanders Think Jesus Called Upon Elijah Before He Died (Mark 15:34-36)? The Markan Position'. *HTR* 95 (2002): 119-124.
- Wills, Lawrence M. *The Jewish Novel in the Ancient World*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 1995.
- Wink, Walter. *John the Baptist in the Gospel Tradition*. SNTSMS 7. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968.
- Winn, Adam. *Mark and the Elijah-Elisha Narrative: Considering the Practice of Greco-Roman Imitation in the Search for Markan Source Material*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2010.
- . *Reading Mark's Christology Under Caesar: Jesus the Messiah and Roman Imperial Ideology*. Downers Grove, IL; IVP Academic, 2018.
- Witherington III, Ben. *The Gospel of Mark: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2001.
- Zahn, Theodor. *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*. 3rd ed. Leipzig: Deichert, 1907.
- Zakovitch, Yair. 'The Exodus from Ur of the Chaldeans: A Chapter in Literary Archaeology'. Pages 429-439 in *Ki Baruch Hu: Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical and Judaic Studies in Honor of Baruch Levine*. Edited by Robert Chazan, William Hallo and Lawrence Schiffman. Warsaw, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1999.
- Zeitlin, Solomon. *The First Book of Maccabees*. With English translation of the text by Sidney Tedesche. New York, NY: Harper, 1950.
- . 'Introduction: The Books of Esther and Judith: A Parallel'. Page 1-37 in *The Book of Judith: Greek Text with an English Translation, Commentary and Critical Notes*. Edited by Enslin. JAL 7. Leiden: Brill, 1972.
- . 'Midrash: A Historical Study'. *JQR* 44 (1953): 21-36.
- Zelyck, Lorne R. 'Elisha Typology in Jesus' Miracle on the Jordan River (Papyrus Egerton 2,2v.6-14)'. *NTS* 62 (2015): 1-8.

- Zeron, Alexander. 'Erwägungen zu Pseudo-Philos Quellen und Zeit'. *JSJ* 11 (1980): 38-52.
- . 'The Martyrdom of Phinehas-Elijah', *JBL* 98 (1979): 99-110.
- Zimmerman, Frank. 'Aids for the Recovery of the Hebrew Original of Judith'. *JBL* 57 (1938): 67-74.