CURRENTS IN BIBLICAL RESEARCH

Volume 3.1   October 2004

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL FOREWORD

Contemporary biblical scholarship is changing at a rapid pace. The variety of methods for interpreting the Bible has increased dramatically in recent years, as shown, for example, by the growing interest in literary approaches such as narrative criticism, and in approaches focused on areas outside both literary and biblical research, for instance, the recent articles on biblical themes as interpreted in the cinema. The past twenty-five years have seen a growing interest by biblical scholars in structuralist criticism, reader response criticism, rhetorical criticism, social-scientific criticism, feminist interpretation, ideological criticism and deconstructive criticism, in addition to major advances in the work being done on the broader world within which ancient Israel and early Christianity developed. Long-standing methods of research have undergone substantial reappraisal, as, for instance, in the areas of 'biblical' archaeology and the history of early Israel. The field now reaches well beyond the encompassing historical-critical consensus that had dominated biblical scholarship throughout most of the twentieth century. This increasing variety and flexibility in method has added richness and depth to our understanding of the Bible and its contextual world.

The growing variety of approaches is healthy and energizing, and indicates the vitality of contemporary biblical scholarship. However, this variety also makes it very difficult for scholars, especially those who teach or write across a broad spectrum of biblical studies, to stay informed about the numerous recent developments in the many different areas of biblical scholarship. Add to this the virtual explosion in books, journals, *Festschriften*, encyclopedias and online sites, and one can immediately see the need for a journal to keep readers apprised of recent developments in this rapidly expanding field of scholarship. Given this increasing diversity of methods and interests in contemporary biblical scholarship, the need for *Currents* is even clearer today than it was when the first issue was published in 1993.

For these reasons, several changes are in the works for *Currents*. The first is that, beginning in the fall of 2005, *Currents* will appear in three

issues per year, rather than, as is now the case, two issues per year. Second, we are welcoming as our third editor Jonathan Klawans of Boston University, under whom *Currents* will widen its reach to publish articles covering recent research in ancient Judaism. Hence, *Currents* will now welcome proposals for articles relating to all facets of Judaism in the late second temple and early rabbinic periods. This will include, but not be limited to, essays on recent research in Pseudepigrapha, Qumran, Mishnah, Midrash and Talmud, as well as studies on ancient Jewish interpreters such as Josephus and Philo. We will be especially interested in articles that address texts and issues of interest to the field of biblical studies, broadly conceived. Jonathan looks forward to hearing from any readers who have proposals for articles for this new area of interest for *Currents*. He should be contacted before any manuscripts are submitted.

Currents will also launch, in the fall of 2005, a supplement series titled 'Library of Biblical Research'. Each volume will contain extensive discussions, with bibliographies, of recent and contemporary scholarship on: an individual biblical book or cluster of books; a specific method of interpretation, or topics around which interpretive issues revolve; specific subjects in ancient Judaism, such as midrash or rabbinic halachah; new and promising methods of interpretation, and so on. Volumes currently in preparation will treat the Major Prophets, the Minor Prophets, and Jesus and the Gospels. The editors welcome suggestions for specific volumes our readers consider important to the field, or that they would like to help develop. The editors would be pleased to discuss these ideas, suggestions and proposals in detail.

In addition to these new developments, *Currents* will continue to summarize the spectrum of recent research on particular topics, methods or biblical books. Each article will provide an inclusive treatment of its subject, without in most cases being exhaustive, owing to the rapid publication of new books and articles. Each article will conclude with a bibliography that provides a basic knowledge of significant articles and books on the topic being treated, and supplies sufficient information to launch a thorough investigation of the topic. In addition to the new area of recent research in ancient Judaism, as described above, articles in *Currents* will continue to cover specific biblical books or clusters of books, ancillary ancient literature, archaeology, historical studies, as well as new and developing areas of study.

Articles are assigned by the editors to scholars well acquainted with the specific topic being treated. The editors also welcome proposals for articles, although no manuscript should be submitted unless a proposal has

been discussed with one of the editors and an agreement has been reached. Since *Currents* is designed to provide summaries and analyses of recent scholarship in specific areas of research, proposals for articles with a different purpose will not be approved.

We wish to acknowledge the substantial assistance of Elizabeth Tester and Crystal Aycock in the preparation of this issue of *Currents*.

Alan J. Hauser
Senior Editor and Editor for Old Testament
Department of Philosophy and Religion
Appalachian State University
Boone, NC 28608
USA
hauseraj@appstate.edu

Scot McKnight
Editor for New Testament
Department of Religious Studies
North Park University
3225 West Foster Avenue
Chicago, IL 60625
USA
smcknight@northpark.edu

Jonathan Klawans
Editor for Ancient Judaism
Department of Religion
Boston University
145 Bay State Road
Boston, MA 02215
USA
jklawans@bu.edu

ABBREVIATIONS

AB	Anchor Bible
ABR	*Australian Biblical Review*
AF	P. Stenhouse, *Kitāb al-Tarīkh of Abū 'l-Fatḥ: New Edition* (Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Sydney, 1980; Arabic and English); ᴇᴛ 1985 in *idem, The Kitāb al-Tarīkh of Abū 'l-Fatḥ: Translated into English with Notes* (Studies in Judaica, 1; Sydney: The Mandelbaum Trust, 1985; Arabic version: E. Vilmar, *Abulfathi Annales Samaritani* [Gothae, 1865]). *Chapter and page numbers refer to the Arabic manuscript in Stenhouse 1980 according to its arrangement in Stenhouse 1985.*
ALUOS	Annual of Leeds University Oriental Society
AnBib	Analecta biblica
ANRW	Hildegard Temporini and Wolfgang Haase (eds.), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung* (Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1972–)
ASNU	Acta seminarii neotestamentici upsaliensis
BA	*Biblical Archaeologist*
BBR	*Bulletin for Biblical Research*
BEATAJ	Beiträge zur Erforschung des Alten Testaments und des Antiken Judentums
BETL	Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium
Bib	*Biblica*
BIS	Biblical Interpretation Series
BJRL	*Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester*
BN	*Biblische Notizen*
BNTC	Black's New Testament Commentaries
BO	*Bibliotheca orientalis*
BR	*Biblical Research*
BT	*The Bible Translator*
BTB	*Biblical Theology Bulletin*
BZ	*Biblische Zeitschrift*
BZAW	Beihefte zur *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*
CBQ	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly*
CIS	Copenhagen International Seminar

CNT	Commentaire du Nouveau Testament
CRINT	Compendia rerum iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum
CTM	*Concordia Theological Monthly*
DSD	*Dead Sea Discoveries*
EBC	Expositor's Bible Commentary
EKKNT	Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
Enc	*Encounter*
EvQ	*Evangelical Quarterly*
EvT	*Evangelische Theologie*
ExpTim	*Expository Times*
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
GAC	*The Gospels for All Christians*
HNT	Handbuch zum Neuen Testament
HNTC	Harper's NT Commentaries
HSM	Harvard Semitic Monographs
HTKNT	Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
HTR	*Harvard Theological Review*
HUCA	*Hebrew Union College Annual*
HUT	Hermeneutische Untersuchungen zur Theologie
ICC	International Critical Commentary
IEJ	*Israel Exploration JournaI*
INE	Isaianic New Exodus
Int	*Interpretation*
IOSCS	International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies
IRB	*Irish Biblical Studies*
JA	*Journal asiatique*
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JJS	*Journal of Jewish Studies*
Jos. *Ant.*	Josephus, *Antiquities of the Jews*
Jos. *War.*	Josephus, *The Wars of the Jews*
JQR	*Jewish Quarterly Review*
JR	*Journal of Religion*
JRH	*Journal of Religious History*
JRS	*Journal of Religious Studies*
JSAI	*Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam*
JSJS	Supplements to the *Journal for the Study of Judaism*
JSNT	*Journal for the Study of the New Testament*
JSNTSup	*Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, Supplement Series
JSOT	*Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*
JSOTSup	*Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*, Supplement Series
JSS	*Journal of Semitic Studies*
JTS	*Journal of Theological Studies*
JTTL	*Journal of Translation and Text-Linguistics*

KCSS	Key Concepts in the Social Sciences
KEK	Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament (Meyer-Kommentar)
LB	*Linguistica biblica*
MT	Masoretic Text
NCB	New Century Bible
Neot	*Neotestamentica*
NICNT	New International Commentary on the New Testament
NIGTC	The New International Greek Testament Commentary
NovT	*Novum Testamentum*
NovTSup	*Novum Testamentum*, Supplements
NTOA	Novum Testamentum et orbis antiquus
NTR	New Testament Readings
NTS	*New Testament Studies*
PEQ	*Palestine Exploration Quarterly*
PNTC	Pillar New Testament Commentary
PRSt	*Perspectives in Religious Studies*
PTMS	Pittsburgh Theological Monograph Series
REJ	*Revue des études juives*
ROSE	Reprints of Scholarly Excellence
RQ	*Restoration Quarterly*
SBL	Society of Biblical Literature
SBLDS	SBL Dissertation Series
SBLSP	SBL Seminar Papers
SBLSS	SBL Semeia Studies
SBT	Studies in Biblical Theology
SJLA	Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity
SJOT	*Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament*
SJT	*Scottish Journal of Theology*
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
SNTU	*Studien zum Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt*
SP	Samaritan Pentateuch
SPB	Studia postbiblica
Them	*Themelios*
TSK	*Theologische Studien und Kritiken*
TvT	*Tijdschrift voor theologie*
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WuD	*Wort und Dienst*
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
ZAW	*Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*
ZDMG	*Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft*
ZKT	*Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*
ZNW	*Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*
ZTK	*Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*

WHAT DO SAMARITANS AND JEWS HAVE IN COMMON?
RECENT TRENDS IN SAMARITAN STUDIES

Ingrid Hjelm

The Carsten Niebuhr Department, University of Copenhagen
ihj@hum.ku.dk

ABSTRACT

Apart from the later period of the Hasmonaean kingdom, Samaritans and Jews were always separate peoples who had either Gerizim or Jerusalem as their main cult place. While Jewish perspectives on Samaritan origin and history still prevail in recent research, future research will have to broaden the perspective and take into consideration Samaritan claims for authenticity in respect to origin, belief and traditions. These claims have recently been substantiated by excavations on Mount Gerizim, which have unearthed structures of a major Persian Period cult place that may date as early as the sixth century BCE. These finds, as well as finds of about 400 inscriptions and 13,000 coins, have just begun to be published. The present article presents the most recent development in research on Samaritan history and literature, in order to offer a base for the necessary rewriting of both Samaritan and Jewish history.

Introduction

As the title indicates, this article does not promise to give a detailed account of Samaritan studies since the first impact of Samaritan tradition and history on biblical studies in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. For this, I rather refer to works of Pummer (1976, 1977, 1992), Egger (1986), de Robert (1988), Macuch (1988a, 1991), Noja (1989), Dexinger (1992) and Hjelm (2000a). Of the works mentioned, Pummer's is the most comprehensive, while de Robert, Macuch and Noja concentrate on research on linguistics and literature, and Egger, Dexinger and Hjelm mainly discuss research on the origin and early history of the Samaritans. Although

Samaritan studies are still in their infancy, compared to Jewish and biblical research, the field has increased considerably in the last three decades. It is no longer possible to give a comprehensive account, covering all fields of samaritanology, for which the latest updated bibliography (Crown 1993) lists 3,653 entries, about 850 titles more than the 2,806 entries listed in the first edition of the book (1984). A third, updated and annotated edition by Crown and Pummer is forthcoming (2005), which will add yet another thousand entries, making a total of 4,700 entries. The last two decades have nearly doubled the number of articles and books on Samaritan matters, covering vast areas of research and supplying scholars with an increased number of tools for textual, linguistic and historical studies. The main impetus for this increase are, on the one hand, a heightened effort by the Samaritans themselves—now about 670 people living in Ḥolon and on Mt. Gerizim—to study and convey the knowledge of their traditions and history to the Western scholar; and, on the other hand, the establishment of the Société d'Études Samaritaines (henceforth SÉS) in 1985 at the initiative of André Caquot, Jean-Pierre Rothschild, Jean Margain and Guy D. Sixdenier (Macuch 1991: 13).

The Samaritan contribution comprises *A.B. The Samaritan News*, a biweekly newspaper established in 1969 by the brothers Benyamim and Yefet b. Ratson Tsedaka, which keeps members of the community and researchers updated in four languages (Samaritan Hebrew, Hebrew, Arabic and English) with latest news about the community's life, as well as scholarly achievements by the foremost researchers in the field of samaritanology: articles and congress papers, book reviews, and so on (see B. Tsedaka 1995). In addition to this, the Samaritan Research Institute (the A.-B. Institute of Samaritan Studies in honour of the late Yefet b. Abraham Tsedaka) was established in 1981 in Ḥolon for the purpose of supplying scholars with guidance and literary sources from their library of ancient and modern literature of and on Samaritans, as well as conducting their own research in Samaritan studies, concerning manuscripts, language, genealogy, demography, history, cult, religion, social life, art, music, and so on (B. Tsedaka 1995, 2000; Tsedaka and Tsedaka 2001). The institute operates a publishing house, the main publications of which are *The Samaritan Torah Fully Punctuated According to Samaritan Readings* (I. Tsedaka 2000), *A Summary of the History of the Samaritan Israelites* (B. Tsedaka 2001), prayer books in three volumes, containing ancient prayers, catalogues of the world-wide dispersed Samaritan manuscripts, in addition to films, music, student papers (BA and MA), calendars, cook books, and so on. Still available is *Jewish and Samaritan*

Versions of the Pentateuch—With Particular Stress on the Difference between Both Texts by A.N. Tsedaka and R. Tsedaka (1961–65). Recent accomplishments by the Samaritans are the websites *The Israelite Samaritans* (www.mystae.com/samaritans.html), and *The Samaritan Update* (www.the-samaritans.com).

The SÉS was constituted in Paris in 1985 (see Rothschild and Sixdenier 1988). The organization has arranged several congresses (Tel Aviv 1988, Oxford 1990, Paris 1992, Milan 1996, Helsinki 2000 [the next meeting is scheduled for Haifa in 2004]). Congress papers have been published *ex eventu* in Tal and Florentin (1991), Crown and Davey (1995) and Morabito, Crown and Davey (2000). Papers from Helsinki 2000 have not yet been published. In addition, the most comprehensive collection of articles, presenting the prevailing views of its time on Samaritan research in the fields of history, literature, language, theology, liturgy, diaspora, and so on, is still Crown's *The Samaritans*, which appeared in 1989. The aim of *The Samaritans* was not to supply its reader with simple answers, but to stimulate further research and serve as a replacement for the still widely used book by Montgomery (1907, reprinted as late as 1968 and still available through Good Books' Scholarly Reprints). Montgomery's book, valuable for its comprehensiveness, does not represent the present state of knowledge of Samaritan matters, and unfortunately presents misleading opinions about the kind of 'sect' the Samaritans supposedly are. The counterpart to Montgomery's 'Jewish' perspective on Samaritan origin and history, which is based on biblical narratives and Josephus, and relegates Samaritan traditions to a secondary status, is Gaster's similarly comprehensive book (1925 [reprinted 1980]), which seeks to harmonize Samaritan traditions about the history of the Samaritans with biblical traditions. Both these books are indeed useful for understanding the parameters for scholarly research on Samaritanism, but not for their results, most of which are based on the historicist reading of biblical narratives that dominated Old Testament studies prior to the 1960s.

A Hebrew companion to Crown's *The Samaritans* is the recent book edited by Stern and Eshel, *Sefer Hashomronim* (*The Book of the Samaritans* [2002]), which consists mainly of thirty-one translated and updated (until 1996) articles published in earlier works. The book is divided into four parts, dealing with Samaritan history in Assyrian, Babylonian and Persian periods; Samaritans in the Hellenistic period; Samaritans in the Roman and Byzantine periods; and, finally, Samaritans during the Middle Ages and the modern period. The book is offered as a supplement and updating corrective to the *Sefer Hashomronim* by ben Zvi, published in

1935 with revised editions in 1970 and 1977 (Stern and Eshel 2002: 1). Unfortunately, I did not get the book in time to integrate it with this article. From the table of contents, the book appears to supplement Crown (1989) and Dexinger and Pummer (1992). It is more oriented toward archaeology and epigraphy (e.g. Ayalon; Barkay; Dar; Eph'al; Eshel and Eshel; Magen; Meshorer and Qedar; Naveh; Reich; and Stern) and political conditions (e.g. Kedar; Rabello; Schur; and di Segni) than these books, and seems to be fairly updated with recent achievements in these fields. As the majority of authors belong to Israeli scholarship, the book is an important source to the history on Samaritan research among Israeli scholars. Unfortunately, one looks almost in vain for clear bibliographic references to sources of the translated and revised articles. The book includes footnotes and a combined subject and author index, which is a great help, especially as it has no bibliography or English summary.

To date, Crown's *The Samaritans* (1989), supplemented by the small 'encyclopaedic dictionary': *A Companion to Samaritan Studies* edited by Crown, Pummer and Tal (1993); Crown's *A Bibliography of the Samaritans* (1984; rev. edn, 1993); Dexinger and Pummer's *Die Samaritaner* (1992); and Stern and Eshel's *Sefer Hashomronim* (2002), are the basic tools with which to enter, but not to stay, in the manifold world of Samaritan studies. This world, once centred on the history, cult and theology of the Samaritans, has become far more occupied with manuscripts and linguistics (Noja 1989), aiming at giving access to the huge collections of Samaritan biblical and non-biblical manuscripts (Robertson 1938, 1962; Shunnar 1974; Anderson 1977; Shehadeh 1981, 1988, 1991; Rothschild 1985, 1989; Crown 2001; Jamgotchian 2001, 2003), held in custody in quite a number of libraries all over the world (cf. 'The Internet Resource for Samaritan Manuscripts and Inscriptions, including Internet websites: www.the-samaritans.com, providing links to updated worldwide collections and catalogues of Hebrew, Aramaic and Samaritan manuscripts). Most of the Samaritan manuscripts date from the tenth century CE onwards, but reflect discussions that are known from other sources to have taken place in the centuries around the turn of the era. As partakers in these discussions, and as witnesses to the textual development of Jewish biblical traditions and manuscripts, most of which likewise date from medieval times, the literary tradition of the Samaritans has far greater importance for biblical studies than hitherto assumed (Hjelm 2000a; 2004a). Before stepping into this development, which becomes most apparent in the articles published in the SÉS volumes, we will take a look at what is new in research on the ancient history of the Samaritans.

*From Montgomery's 'Jewish Offshoot'
to Gaster's 'Samaritan Israelites'*

The changes in both these fields (samaritanology and biblical studies) rest on several new approaches to both the history of the formation of the manuscripts of the Jewish biblical canon, and to theories of the origins of Jews and Samaritans in post-exilic time. These provide little place for a biblical Israel's common origin from eponymous lines of fathers, leaders, priests and kings in a distant past. This origin tradition, shared by Samaritans and Jews alike in the traditions of the Pentateuch (Samaritan Pentateuch [SP] and the Masoretic Text [MT]), seeks to create a common origin rather than to offer historical information. Using that departure, other narratives in the Samaritan chronicles, and the biblical Former Prophets and book of Chronicles, have been generated to explain the existence of such distinct geo-political and religious entities as schisms (Coggins 1975; Kalimi 2000, 2002; Hjelm 2003b, 2004a). These include Samaritan narratives about Eli's departure from the original cult on Gerizim to Shiloh in *AF* (*Kitāb al-Tarīkh* by Abū 'l-Fatḥ), chs ix-x, pp. 40-46 (ET Stenhouse 1985); Juynboll, *Liber Josuae*, ch. xliv (1848; ET 1890); Saul and David's choice of Jerusalem as a cult place (*AF*, ch. x, pp. 46-47 [ET Stenhouse 1985]); and Jeroboam's establishment of cult places in Samaria and Dan (*AF* ch. xiv, p. 57 [ET Stenhouse 1985]). Also relevant are biblical narratives about David's removal of the ark to Jerusalem (2 Sam. 6); the division of the Davidic–Solomonic kingdom (1 Kgs 12); the displacement of the Northern Israelites as a result of the Assyrian conquest (2 Kgs 17), with its partial confirmation in the book of Ezra's return narrative (Ezra 4 —counterparts of which are found in the return narratives of the Samaritan chronicles [*AF* chs xviii-xix, pp. 67-79 (ET Stenhouse 1985)]; B. Tsedaka 1991: 193); and quarrel and expulsion narratives about Jerusalemite priests (Neh. 13), most of which have been elaborated in Josephus's narratives about Samaritan origins in Jerusalem, and are held together in a chain of narratives in which Josephus presents the Samaritans (called Cuthaeans in Josephus's biblically related narratives) as apostates (Hjelm 2000a: 192-238; 2000b).

A theory of a pre-exilic origin of Samaritans as foreigners who adopted an Israelite-Jewish faith (2 Kgs 17) has been for the most part abandoned. Alternative proposals favour a pre-exilic origin, either as: 'proto-Samaritans' (Dexinger 1981; 1992; Mor 1989; Zsengellér 1998); 'descendants from the ten tribes of Israel' (Schur 1989: 23); 'the remnant of Ephraim

and Manasseh' (Talmon 1974; cf. Corinaldi 2000: 2.88; Schur 1995: 289-90, based on Eph'al 1991 and Na'aman 1988); 'true descendants of the B'nay Yisrael' (i.e. the non-exiled Israelites and Judaeans; Crown 1995); or a Persian-Hellenistic origin as dissident priests (Kippenberg 1971: 57-59; Böhm 1999: 63-64). An idea still taken seriously is that of a schism in either Persian or Hellenistic times, followed by a final split, from which the Samaritans arose as a distinct 'Jewish sect' (Dexinger 1995) in the second-first century BCE, as a result either of the replacement of the Zadokite priesthood in Jerusalem by the Hasmonaeans (Kippenberg 1971: 92-93; Dexinger 1981; Böhm 1999: 84), or of the alleged destruction of the Samaritan temple on Gerizim by John Hyrcanus and the production of the SP (Dexinger 1992: 136; Purvis 1968, 1981: 'an ironic anomaly—an anti-Jewish sect'; and Mor 1989: 18: 'a sect outside Judaism').

Although this 'two-episode paradigm' (Hjelm 2000a: 30) of a first and a second split had been severely criticized by Coggins as early as 1975, Cross's reassessment of Josephus's Alexander legend about the building of the Samaritan temple in the course of the Persian-Greek transition (Cross 1966, 1969, 1975) won the day, in spite of its obvious shortcomings (Widengren 1977: 507-509; Grabbe 1987; Williamson 1978, 1992; Hjelm 2000a: 43-45). Where one might have expected a revision of the 'evidence' from the Bible and from Josephus in light of new material (*Samaria Papyri*), Cross smooths away the contradictions introduced by this material in even more fanciful reconstructions of five generations of Sanballats, created on the basis of the sons of Sanballat mentioned in the Elephantine and Samaria Papyri, and a hypothesis of two sons of Judaean high priests, carrying the name of Yojada/Yaddua, who marry two daughters of Sanballats (Cross 1975: 6-7). The primary purpose of Cross's list is not to establish the house of Sanballat as governors of Samaria in the Persian period, but to create evidence for the historicity of Neh. 13.28 and Jos. *Ant*. 11.302-303, both of which tell different stories about the marriage of a son (Neh. 13.28) or a brother (Jos. *Ant*. 11.302-303, 322) of the Judaean high priest Yojada/Yaddua with a daughter of Sanballat. Neither of them tells both stories and neither offers evidence of the succession of the Sanballats. Josephus, in fact, simply 'transferred' the name Sanballat to his Alexander legend and did not use it for his Nehemiah narratives in *Ant*. 11.159-83 [174-83] (Hjelm 2000a: 43). Unfortunately, such a tendency of harmonization still encourages scholars to write Samaritan-Jewish history by adding 'evidence' to their paraphrase of Josephus, rather than being skeptical about his goals and accuracy (Hjelm 2000a: 200-206, 227).

While the classical 'two-episode paradigm' is based on theory of cult centralization and a biblically based Judaism as early as the sixth-fifth century BCE (Hjelm 2000a: 45), this has generally been abandoned in favour of a development of Samaritanism from Judaism's formative period, from the third century BCE onwards. In Coggins's opinion, the context for this development was, for Samaritanism, similar to what it had been for other factions and currents within Judaism: disagreements over cult, belief and society, which resulted in the formation of Jewish communities outside of Jerusalem: Qumran, Leontopolis, Elephantine, Araq-el-Emir, and so on. The Deuteronomistic cult centralization probably was practised in a less restricted manner than had been assumed earlier, and final breaks did not occur until centuries later (Coggins 1975: 163, based on Smith 1971). Against this background, the term 'schism' has been misleading, presuming both an earlier unity, and an orthodox norm, neither of which was present in Judaism until the Christian era (Coggins 1975: 163, with ref. to Ackroyd 1970). Assuming a closure of the composition of most of the books of the Tanak before 250 BCE, Coggins concludes that

> there is no reference to the Samaritans in the Hebrew Old Testament. Some of the allusions in the work of the Chronicler may point to a situation, which would later develop into Judaeo-Samaritan hostility, but that is the most that can be said. (1975: 163; re-asserted 1993)

One effect of Coggins's conclusion was a growing interest in Pseudepigrapha, Apocrypha, DSS and other writings from at least the third century BCE until well into early rabbinic times as sources for understanding Samaritan-Judaean relationships. It is only in the last decade of scholarship that increased studies in DSS have reminded us that the Jewish canonization of scripture and text belongs to the Common Era. In the formative periods of these texts, the Samaritans were as much part of Palestine's intellectual milieu as were other religious and political groups (Crown 1989; Schur 1989: 39-56, 1995: 289; Nodet 1992, 1997 [see below]; Hjelm 2004a). Neither Samaritan 'narrowing of the Samaritan community' from, first, all Israel to the ten tribes, and second, the ten tribes to the tribes of Ephraim and Manasseh, nor Josephus's attribution of his post-722 BCE population of the Assyrian province of Samaria to his Kuthaean nation on Gerizim, reflects pre-fifth century CE reality. For both, the decimation is based, on the one hand, on a biblical remnant theology, and, on the other hand, on a *pars pro toto* pattern, in which the cult place and ethnic and religious exclusivity are made the foci of the overall dispute (Hjelm 2000a: 254; 2003a).

Coggins's position of a schism in the first-third century CE has been taken up by Dexinger (1981), Schiffman (1985), Crown (1991), and Grabbe (1993). Dexinger (1992) instead places this event in the first century BCE. In his view, the impetus to the growing animosity between Samaritans and Jews must be sought in the emerging monopoly of Jerusalem's cult during the fourth century BCE (1992: 101), which deemed the ethnicity, cult and traditions of the Yahwistic proto-Samaritans, with their pre-exilic cult place, already established on Gerizim (1992: 92), as non-Israelite and syncretistic. The proto-Samaritans replied to such accusations by deeming Jerusalem irrelevant (1992: 140). Dexinger found evidence for this development in the Elephantine papyri: Jer. 41.5; Chron. 30.6-10; and Ezra 4.1-5's '*am ha-aretz*' ('people of the land'), whom, following Mantel (1970: 164) and Delcor (1962: 284-85), Dexinger distinguishes from 'the enemies of Judah' as proto-Samaritans. The building on Mt Gerizim of the Samaritan temple, which might not have existed at all (Dexinger 1992: 107), Dexinger nevertheless asserts (on the basis of Josephus, '*die einzigen antike Bericht*'—'the only ancient account' [p. 110]; 2 Macc. 6.1-2; Neh. 13.28; Elephantine and Samaria papyri and Cross's reconstruction), as having taken place in the interim between the Persian and Greek rule (Dexinger 1992: 110-11; Mor 1989: 6-7; Crown 1995; Zsengellér 1998: 154-55; cf. also Spiro 1951: 34 [312] and Reicke 1968: 21-22).

The possibility that the Samaritan 'temple' consisted of a stone podium with a movable tent (Campbell 1979; Anderson 1991), as prescribed in the Pentateuch and found in most Samaritan sources (Pummer 1989: 172; Bóid 2003; Hjelm 2004a), or had been (re)built more than a hundred years later in the time of Antiochus III when the city of Luzah with its 3.5 km wall and 10,000 inhabitants was also founded on the summit (Magen 1986, 1990, 1993a; Pummer 1992: 59), do not affect Dexinger's conclusion. That Josephus never mentions Antiochus III's activities in Samaria, but 'addresses all of Antiochus's documents to the restoration of the temple and temple cult in Jerusalem' (Hjelm 2000a: 234), is not dealt with by Dexinger. Following Rowley (1955–56) and Coggins, Dexinger argues that the building of the temple does not explain either origin or schism, both of which date to other periods (Dexinger 1981: 101; 1992: 116).

According to Dexinger, the pre-Josianic Zadokite priesthood, shared by both Samaritans and Jews, secured continuity but created 'problems with mixed marriages and internal rivalries' (Dexinger 1981: 101; 1992: 127; Kippenberg 1971: 57). Dexinger (1981) hesitates to follow Bowman's contention that the Samaritans 'are our only link to the old Zadokite priesthood of Jerusalem' (Bowman 1958–59: 54; Crown 1995). Dexinger

tentatively suggests that it was mixed up with 'an old priestly class' which became authorized as Zadokites in the time of Nehemiah (Dexinger 1981: 102; 1992: 127). The Hasmonaean replacement of the Zadokite priesthood in Jerusalem, and emerging Judaism after 180 BCE, brought 'matters to the verge of a definitive break' (Dexinger 1981: 102; Kippenberg 1971: 92-93; Böhm 1999: 84). Subsequently, Dexinger (1992: 137-38) stresses the cult monopoly in the time of John Hyrcanus as the occasion for the development of proto-Samaritans into fully-fledged Samaritans.

Egger (1986) had, rather unsuccessfully (cf. Pummer 1992: 11; Grabbe 1993; Hjelm 2000a: 219), challenged Josephus's alleged anti-Samaritanism by distinguishing between Josephus's use of the terms Samarians/Samaritans, Chuthaeans, Shechemites, Sidonians and 'those on Gerizim' as historically motivated by chronology and gentilic affiliations. Dexinger rejected Egger's conclusions, and sought to establish evidence of a growing anti-Samaritanism by dividing Josephus's Alexander legend into five distinct sources, as had been done also by Büchler, Shmuelis and Segal (Dexinger 1981: 96-97; 1992: 103): a Macedonian source, pro-Samaritan Sanballat and Manasseh traditions, and two Jewish reactions in anti-Samaritan Jaddua and Sanballat traditions, held together by Josephus's reference to the origin of Samaritans as Cuthaeans (Jos. *Ant*. 11.321 and the first part of 324). Dexinger considers the Macedonian source to be the oldest part of the narrative (1992: 104), followed by the pro-Samarian Sanballat tradition's legitimizing of the Samaritan temple in the third century BCE (1992: 109-10), the Manasseh tradition around 220 BCE (1992: 122), and finally the anti-Samaritan parts, which he dates to the first century BCE (Dexinger 1992: 138-39, followed by Zangenberg 1994: 59-64, and in slightly revised form by Zsengellér 1998: 151-52).

Dexinger's analysis, which does not fully examine Josephus's use of the biblical traditions in 2 Kings 17, the books of Ezra and Nehemiah, and the non-biblical *1 Esdras*, fails to notice the comprehensive progression in all of Josephus's Samaritan stories (Hjelm 2000b). Dexinger does not explain Josephus's lack of reference to sources for his anti-Samaritan perspective, nor for Josephus's rather neutral treatment of Samaritans in *War*, in contrast to his pro-Jewish biased narratives in *Antiquities*. Kasher (1995: 225) assumes that Nicolaus of Damascus is the source behind Josephus's 'pro-Roman and pro-Samaritan' biased narratives of the Roman period in *War*, which Josephus has 'correctly' supplied with the pro-Jewish bias found in *Antiquities*. Hjelm (2000a: 222-28) argues that Josephus's pro-Jewish bias in *Antiquities* reflects the re-ignited competition over cult places caused by the destruction of Jerusalem's temple in

70 CE. If Josephus did not add more than a few lines of introduction to his Alexander legend (Dexinger 1992), he must have taken over a complete story in which were also Josephus's other Samaritan stories (Rappaport 1990; Hjelm 2000a: 236); and we must therefore ask, who wrote that story and from which sources? (Rappaport 1995: 288; 1990). The *Megillat Ta'anit* (Lichtenstein 1931–32) and the parallels to Caesar's campaign to Egypt mentioned by Dexinger only give a possible date, not a source.

A thorough examination of the relationship between Josephus and the Samaritan Sanballat and Alexander legends, none of which are included in Dexinger's examination, might be useful in spite of uncertainty about their origin (Whaley 1992). Dexinger, having established the independent origin of the Samaritans, and having judged the often asserted syncretism and exclusion models irrelevant (1992: 114, 133-34), in fact presents Samaritan perspectives as told by the Samaritans, without using their sources. In passing, we note that in the Samaritan Sanballat tradition (*AF* chs xix-xx, pp. 70-79 [ET Stenhouse 1985]), the Samaritans returned to Gerizim under the leadership of Sanballat and the High Priest 'Abdal, and rebuilt their cult place, which does not owe its existence to Alexander but to Darius (I?). As noted also by Crown (1995: 152), Josephus's chronology arouses suspicion when he has 'the Samaritans—whose chief city at that time was Shechem, which lay beside Mount Gerizim'—invite Alexander less than a year later (Jos. *Ant*. 11.325, 342), to come and revere 'their city and honour the temple as well' (Jos. *Ant*. 11.342). We note that in *AF* ch. xxvi, pp. 92-96 (ET Stenhouse 1985), Alexander visits the Samaritans in Shechem and on Gerizim in a narrative mirroring Josephus's story about Alexander's visit to Jerusalem (Jos. *Ant.* 11.325-339). Temple construction, Sanballat and Manasseh, are not mentioned in that narrative, and Alexander's wish to erect statues and build a 'place of worship for himself' on the Mountain (pp. 93-95) is kindly refused. In place of the requested images and monuments 'that cannot speak or move', the Samaritans offer to call all new-born children after Alexander's name as 'images of you that have minds and can speak' (*AF* ch. xxvi, p. 94 [ET Stenhouse 1985]; cf. *Liber Josuae*, ch. lxvi).

In no Samaritan chronicle do Samaritan priests come from Jerusalem, and the coincidence of names with lists of high priests in the books of Chronicles is, as correctly pointed out by Grabbe (1987), too sparse to establish a Zadokite origin. De Robert's (1995) suggestion of an anti-Hasmonaean polemic in Samaritan Eli traditions—as echoed in Josephus and Pseudo-Philo—is an interesting suggestion that deserves further scru-

tiny. So also is Mikolášek 1969 (ET 1995), Purvis 1981: 323 and Nodet's 1992 (ET 1997: 269) allegation of an independent origin of the Samaritan priesthood.

Most challenging, however, to attempts at rehabilitating Josephus by dating the Samaritan temple to the late Persian rather than the Hellenistic period, are Magen's recent reports of the excavations on Mount Gerizim since 1985. These excavations have shown that the stone podium underneath the Roman temple dates to the Roman (Magen 1993a; 1993b) rather than to the Hellenistic period, as had been asserted by earlier excavators. Findings of more than sixty dedicatory inscriptions in paleo-Hebrew, Aramaic (lapidary and early Jewish) and Greek scripts, dating from the fifth century BCE to the fourth century CE, and in Samaritan script from the Middle Ages (di Segni 1990; Naveh, in Naveh and Magen 1997: 10-17), as well as burned bones of year-old cattle, sheep, goats and pigeons (Magen, in Naveh and Magen 1997: 9), underneath the Byzantine Mary Theotokos church, suggests that, if not a temple, at least a cult place of the Samaritans had been located in this place in the Hellenistic period (Magen 1993b: 139; cf. Zangenberg 1998: 44). Magen (in Naveh and Magen 1997: 9; and Magen 2000: 97) mentions two building stages of the ancient precinct. He places one 'in the time of Nehemiah', and associates the other with the reign of Antiochus III. The finds include great quantities of coins, pottery and metalware, dating from the Persian period to the time of John Hyrcanus and Alexander Jannaeus, and again from the Byzantine (fourth century CE) to the Umayyad period, times in which the Samaritans 'had observed their cult on the mountain' (Magen, in Naveh and Magen 1997: 10). Recent excavations have added to the number of inscriptions, and a total of 480 marble inscriptions, ninety percent of which are dedicatory inscriptions in Aramaic, have been uncovered thus far. The totality of the inscriptions indicates the existence of an Israelite holy centre to which people brought tithes and donations from as early as the beginning of the Persian period (*The Samaritan Update* 2003). The inscriptions, unprecedented in Israel, have recently been published (Magen, Misgav and Tsefania 2004). The temple, which Magen assumes had stood in the western part of the sacred precinct, 'was modeled after the temple at Jerusalem', as stated by Josephus (*Ant*. 11.310-311) and 'corroborated by the finds'. The construction, however, does not date to the reign of Alexander the Great as Josephus claimed, since 'we now know that it was built in the time of Nehemiah' (Magen, in Naveh and Magen 1997: 10; Magen 2000: 117: 'in the first half of the fifth century BCE, in the time of Nehemiah and Sanballat the first [*sic*], the Horonite'). The dating of the holy centre,

Magen now argues, must be placed in the sixth century BCE, 'long before the period of Ezra and Nehemiah' (2003). These hitherto unnoticed statements, relying on a corroboration of the book of Nehemiah with archaeological finds and Samaritan tradition (Magen 2000), certainly undermines allegations of any reliability of Josephus's Alexander narrative. The structures of the Samaritan cult place fit the description of the temple in Ezekiel's vision, measurements of which, however, cannot be tied to Jerusalem's temple earlier than the Hellenistic or Roman periods (Magen 2000: 109). As Josephus got it wrong regarding the building of the Samaritan temple, he neglected its enlargement and Gerizim's change from cult place to temple city in the time of Antiochus III (Magen 2000: 117-18). The destruction of the temple, Josephus argues, had taken place at the beginning of the reign of John Hyrcanus (135–104 BCE), rather than at the end of his reign. From the coinage, a dating later than 111 BCE is the more probable (Magen 2000: 118). The duration of the Samaritan temple to '*Yahweh-el-'Eljon*' (Magen 2000: 108, 113) was not the 200 years stated by Josephus (*Ant.* 13.256), but rather closer, and maybe even far beyond the 343 years that he ascribes to the existence of the temple in Heliopolis/Leontopolis (*War* 7.436), stories of which Josephus mingles with stories about Gerizim (Hjelm 1999; 2000a: 227-32).

Recently, Eshel (1991: 131-32) has argued for two Samaritan temples, one at Samaria in the middle of the fourth century BCE, and another at Mount Gerizim in the beginning of the second century BCE. The suggestion has been refuted by Mor (1993), reasserted by Eshel 1994, with Mor's reply the same year (Mor 1994; cf. Kalimi 2000: 2.45-46). The discussion, based on the 'sparse' evidence of a Persian period cult place on Gerizim (Mor 1993: 327), is interesting for the history of research, but rather unimportant for questions regarding Samaritan history and the establishment of a Samaritan cult place on Gerizim in either the second or the fourth century BCE. With the new evidence, the foundations for such discussions have changed radically.

While several scholars (e.g. Anderson 1991; Pummer 1993b; Zangenberg 1994: 192, followed by Böhm 1999: 73 [cf. Bóid 2003]; and Hjelm 2000a: 262), following Stenhouse's English translation of *AF* (1985), suggest the mention of a stone building *in place of* the Tabernacle in this Samaritan chronicle (Bóid 2003), their seeming mistake seems less problematic in light of the recent finds. As noted by Pummer, *AF* (ET Stenhouse 1985) is unclear on this point, and some suppression of temple ideology might be implied (Pummer 1989: 172: 'there cannot have been a temple after Eli, therefore there was none'). It still needs to be investigated

whether a similar suppression might be indicated regarding the altar in Bethel in 1 and 2 Kings.

Much in line with Egger's examination of Josephus's terminology, Lindemann (1993), Zangenberg (1998) and Böhm (1999) have undertaken analyses of terminology and topography in the New Testament. General results of these analyses are that the Samaritans in the New Testament form a distinct geographical and religious group that can be equated with a similar distinct group called Jews, and that the New Testament authors offer Christian theology as a solution to the 'either Jerusalem or Gerizim' question asked in John 4 (Zangenberg 1998: 224-25; Böhm 1999: 310). While Böhm has basically adopted Egger's method of historicist reading of the material, Zangenberg stresses the literary and metaphorical qualities of geographic and gentilic terms. Implicitly, these studies reveal the existence of a significant difference between the New Testament and Josephus. While the New Testament, based on Old Testament reconciliation theology in the books of Chronicles, Isaiah, Jeremiah and Ezekiel, argues for an inclusion of Jews, Samaritans and gentiles in the new covenant (Zangenberg 1998: 206-209; Böhm 1999: 310), Josephus (and rabbinic tradition) rejects the Samaritans more than once (Hjelm 2000a; Shahal 2001). The implied antagonist in these disputes is the 'orthodoxy', which should be replaced by either Christianity's or Judaism's 'New Jerusalem' theologies (Hjelm 2000a: 115). While Pummer (1992: 47) calls for caution in assuming Samaritan influence on the development of New Testament doctrines because of the lack of clear information about '*samaritanischer Religion*', which '*höchstwahrscheinlich*' (most probably) '*zu dieser Zeit nicht existierte*' (did not exist at this time), Anderson (1995: 131) suggests further study because 'Samaritans could have influenced almost every sect and geographical location of Christianity and awareness of their tradition could potentially illuminate the complex sectarian picture of the first century in northern Palestine'. For such questions, Isser (1976); Purvis (1981); and Fossum (1989) provide basic information. Recently, Pummer (2002) has published a study that illuminates the conditions of the Samaritans in Palestine under Roman and Byzantine rule to late medieval times, from contemporary Christian sources (see also Hjelm 2004b).

While Mor (1989) and Dexinger (1981; 1992) fail to include Samaritan sources in their reconstruction of the early history of the Samaritans, this is not the case with Crown (1991), who argues that neither temple building nor its destruction was decisive for the final schism, which cannot be dated earlier than after the bar Kochba revolt. Based on early rabbinic sources and the Samaritan chronicle, the *AF* (ET Stenhouse 1985), Crown con-

cludes that it was increased Samaritan activity, carried out by the Samaritan reformer Baba Rabba (third century CE), which led to the irreversibility of Jewish-Samaritan antagonism. In this politically rather peaceful period, the Samaritans sought to spread Samaritan thought and *halachah*, based on their recently revised and canonized Samaritan Pentateuch, to all places within and outside of Palestine where Samaritans lived. This activity became decisive for the Judaean-Samaritan relationship. 'After Baba, Judaism reached its limit of toleration of Samaritanism because it had produced a Torah version at variance with that which was accepted as canonical in Judaea' (Crown 1991: 50). Crown's conclusion is based paradigmatically on Purvis 1986 and Dexinger 1981, and transfers the usual dating of the schism in the second century BCE to the third century CE.

The dating of the Samaritan Pentateuch after 135 BCE is based by Crown on the negative evidence from the Dead Sea Scrolls (1991: 49; cf. Freedmann and Matthews 1985; Sanderson 1986) and the characteristics of Origen's citation of the *Samareitikon*, which do not fit these earlier texts. For recent discussions about the textual families of the DSS, of which the pre-SP and the proto-MT represent independent text traditions among other contemporary traditions, see Tov (1991, 1992, 1998, 2003) and Naveh, in Naveh and Magen (1997: 16-17). For recent discussions about the *Samareitikon*, see Pummer (1995, 1998). The few occurrences of clashes or events involving Samaria in the New Testament (Jn 4.3-4; Lk. 9.52) and Josephus (*War* 2.232-33; *Ant.* 20.118-38) were in Crown's opinion exceptions, which were few enough to become reported (Crown 1991: 27-28).

This reconstruction of events did not prevent Crown from describing Samaritans as a Jewish *sect* ('a religious subgroup of a main religion that remains so close in belief and practice that it cannot be regarded as a different religion' [Crown's definition (1991: 21, n. 11)]), which had originated from Judaism, 'and certainly were Jews before the schism', and this in a more conservative form in regard to circumcision, sabbath, passover ritual and so on, for which Samaritans preserved 'pre-rabbinic' practices (i.e., practices derived directly from the Pentateuch; Crown 1991: 21; Rappaport 1999). In line with this argument, Crown prefers the term 'pre-rabbinic Jewish sect'. While Crown is well aware of anachronisms in Josephus's presentation of the Samaritans, he nevertheless follows rabbinic Judaism's characterization of these as schismatic sectarians in constant conflict with the Jews about the placement of the temple. Thus, 'open hostilities are rare' (Crown 1991: 27) and probably are exaggerated in Josephus's account. At the same time, the temple at Gerizim gives reason for 'an increasing difficulty of the second temple period' and becomes a

'dangerous rival' to the temple in Jerusalem (p. 31) because of its situation and its connection to the Pentateuch traditions, which did not support the claim for a primacy of the temple in Jerusalem according to cult, architecture and high-priestly genealogy.

> The Samaritans argued that their temple stood on a site made sacred by the sacrificial activities of the Patriarchs and by the fact that the first sacrifice in Canaan (Deut 27:4) took place thereon, since it was the Mount of Blessing. There are ample indications that the equation Gerizim = Bethel = Moriah was already made by the Samaritans in the second century BCE (and probably before). This was the basis of their claim for Gerizim being the sacred mountain. In the matter of the sanctity and centrality of Mount Gerizim, the Samaritan belief may be more primitive than innovative. If indeed, one reads the patriarchal accounts with a critical eye, Bethel and Shechem seem to be the same, or at least proximate, places. The association of Bethel with all the events in the patriarchal accounts linked with Bethel, Shechem, Moriah and Gerizim can be made directly from the Torah. The Septuagintal reading of Shiloh instead of Shechem (Jos. 24) and the statement in the Testament of Joseph (2.6) that Joseph was buried in Hebron rather than near Shechem suggests that the Jewish authorities were already troubled by Samaritan interpretations of the sacred writ in favour of Shechem and Mt Gerizim. There is also clear evidence from the polemics between Eliezer ben Simeon and the Samaritans over their reading of Gen. 12.6 that by the mid-second century CE the Samaritan claims about Shechem were proving irksome to the tannaim (Crown 1991: 32).

Not only had the destruction caused an increasing hostility of the Samaritans against the Jewish temple in the second century BCE, but it was the loss of both cult places which led to open rivalry and to increasingly polemical activity from the middle of the second century CE (p. 40).

Shahal (2001) basically agrees with Crown in her discussion of relations between Jews and Samaritans after 70 CE according to the Jewish rabbinic sources (Mishnah, Tosephta, Talmuds, Masseket Kutim and Aggadic Midrashim), and compared with Apocrypha, Josephus, the New Testament, Church Fathers and Samaritan writings (pp. v, xvi). Based on a historicist reading of the Old Testament and Josephus, and relegating Samaritan sources to a secondary status (p. vi), she argues that the Jewish-Samaritan animosities of the post-70 CE period reiterate the atmosphere of the Second Temple period. While as early as the Yavneh generation 'the two sides overcame an emotional barrier in order to have an optimal relationship free of past tensions', the shift in this relationship appears 'as early as the days of the Mishna' (p. xviii). From a continuous deterioration, it reached its nadir at the end of the third century CE (p. xxiii). The

deterioration was motivated by policy and economy rather than religion (Shahal 2001: xx). Shahal's almost negligent handling of Samaritan sources (which 'in general do not refer to the historic conflict with the Jews' [p. xvi]), supports what she considers to be a mental interim between the works of Josephus and the rabbinic sources. In contrast to her selected sources, however, *AF* (ET Stenhouse 1985) claims the existence of a consistent hatred between Jews and Samaritans since the return of the Babylonian exiles, and a deterioration of Samaritan–Jewish relations beyond repair by the second century CE (Schur 1989: 49; Hjelm 2000a: 260-67). The reliability of this story is, of course, disputable (Schur 1989: 49-50), and discussions as well as reality seem to have been moving forth and back. It is true that in the Mishna rules for co-existence dominate (Shahal 2001: xvii; Hjelm 2000a: 105), but co-operation, in the sense of accepting or adopting Samaritan belief and practice, was not the goal of rabbinic discussions.

Unfortunately, Crown's lack of stringent thinking tends to destroy his otherwise meritorious, innovative arguments. Some of the inconsistencies are only partly resolved by Crown in his 1995 article on Samaritan origins. In this article, his harmonization of biblical and non-biblical narratives with (biblical) archaeology leads to a confirmation of the Samaritans as 'the old Israel' which 'is set aside' [by the returned exiles as the new Israel] resulting in 'a separation of Judah and Israel in the form of Yahud and Samaria. The latter may well have included many old Judaean families, which had escaped captivity and were now to join the Samarians in a separatist venture'. It is this combined religious and political development into 'a Samarian body politic', which, in Crown's opinion, 'becomes the Samaritan heresy and sect' (1995: 141). Samaria's refusal to join the Judaeans in the anti-Persian Tennes rebellion (c. 351/350 BCE) became decisive for this development. As a reward, Artaxerxes III gave the Samarians, who were under the governorship of Sanballat III, the revenue from the nations round about for their rebuilding of Shechem and the temple on Gerizim (p. 151; see, however, Ahlström 1993: 892 and Briant 2002: 1004-1005, for a refutation of scholarly allegations of Jewish and Samaritan involvement in the revolt). The building of the temple created the Samarians as the Samaritan people, independent of Jerusalem, whose tabernacle and shrine they imitated 'though surely [*sic*] on a smaller scale' (Crown 1995: 155). Correcting Josephus, but nevertheless applying his templates, Crown further asserts that these pre-Alexander Samaritans were 'the true descendants of the B'nai Yisrael', whose stock later on became 'diluted by an influx of Greek colonists' (p. 155). As this statement con-

flicts with Samaritan sources, Crown's closing remark that 'There was a continuum between Israel and the Samaritans that has to be given full weight when assessing Samaritan religion and history in the period from the first century BCE to the fourth century CE' (p. 155) appears to be only a courtesy to the Samaritans, since Samaritan sources are demonstrably neglected in his reconstruction. While Crown's article provides much recent material for which it deserves attention, his insistence on viewing Samaritans from a Jewish perspective creates unavoidable anachronisms in his assertion of Jerusalem's political and religious sovereignty at a time when such did not exist. Like Dexinger (1981) and Mor (1989: 4) before him, Crown wrongly assumes that the Samaritan authorities had been approached by the Jews in Elephantine as Jews (Crown 1995: 149). However, this misinterpretation of the Elephantine Jewish garrison's addressing Persian authorities in Jerusalem and Samaria at a time when the Persian governor was absent from Egypt (Eleph. pap, Cowley 1923: pap. 30; cf. also Bagoas and Delaiah's reply, pap. 32; Porten 1996: letters B 17, 19, 20, 21) is necessary for the creation of the interim, in which the 'Judaean-Samaritan rift' can develop into well-advanced form before the invasion of Alexander the Great (Crown 1995: 149). In sum, while Crown 1991 offers radical alternatives to standard opinions of the development of the Judaean-Samaritan relationship, this is not the case with his 1995 reassessment of Dexinger and Mor's 'Jewish' Samaritans.

The search for an Israelite origin of the Samaritans as a replacement for 'theories of a pagan and syncretistic origin fostered in rabbinical tradition' (Dexinger 1995: 175; Corinaldi 2000) has in most cases led to a misleading application of the term 'Jewish', such as one finds in Feldman (1992), Rappaport (1999: 16-17), and in Dexinger's 1995 conclusion:

> The structure of the Samaritan Pentateuch is, generally speaking, represented in Qumran textually as well as graphically. This clearly identifies the Samaritans as a Jewish group of the pluriform Judaism of that age. As long as this unity was felt and was ideologically possible, we should call this specific Jewish group 'proto-Samaritans' and only after the overstressing of separating doctrines such as the exclusivity of Gerizim we could call them Samaritans (p. 175).

In light of the DSS, it would, in fact, be more appropriate to replace the term 'sect' with 'variant traditions', as has been suggested by Purvis, who nevertheless retains the term sect 'for convenience' (1981: 323-24; 1986: 91-95), and Macchi, who suggests that the Samaritans should not be considered a Jewish sect, but rather another branch of the religion of Yahweh, centred around a holy place different from Jerusalem (1994: 43;

1999: 241). B. Tsedaka concluded that 'Both traditions grew up from the common ground of the ancient Israelite religion. It is not the "Jewish religion" nor the "Samaritan religion" posed before us, but a "Jewish tradition" and a "Samaritan tradition", both daughters of the Israelite religion' (1992: 51). The present status of the Samaritans in the state of Israel as 'an Israelite sect' (Corinaldi 2000: II, 96) at least underlines such Samaritan integrity in past and present. As stated by Schur 1995: 289: 'Samaritans were and are not only members of a religious sect. They are also a people, perhaps even a nation'. Such ambiguities fit the treatment of Samaritans in most works on Jewish sects (Baumgarten 1997: 11, who does not reckon Samaritans to be a Jewish sect).

Focusing around exactly such anachronistic problems, Nodet (1992; ET 1997) revives the discussion about the Samaritans as 'original Israelites', as had been argued by Gaster (1925) and Macdonald (1964). In their view, it was post-exilic Judaeans influenced by Nehemiah and Ezra who developed religious ideas at variance with those of the Pentateuch shared by Jews and Samaritans alike. Placing these reforms in the third century BCE, rather than the fifth or fourth, Nodet attempts to show

> that the simplest way to take into account various anomalies and many scattered bits of information is to presuppose, schematically, the following: that the Samaritans of Gerizim were the most direct heirs of the ancient Israelites and their cult; that the material in the Hexateuch should generally be attributed to them, with the conscious exception of the weekly sabbath; that Judaism, dispersed throughout the whole Seleucid Transeuphrates, was an import from Babylon and was made up of ancestral traditions and memories of the Kingdom of Judah; that the union between these two, that is to say between two quite restricted groups, took place a little before 200 BCE, and was followed by an intense literary activity; that Judaism was given legal status at Jerusalem by Antiochus III (1997: 12).

The synthesis created thereby would bring the Bible from the Shechem assembly in Joshua 24 to the Mishnah.

Nodet's work was motivated by a growing doubt in the credibility of Josephus, about whom it had become clear that he 'was no better informed than we are and we often have the feeling that he is deliberately drawing out a meagre documentation in order to fill up centuries that are especially empty' (1997: 9, 331). The status of the temple in Jerusalem was difficult to fit into classical historiography: 'artificially magnified in the story of Alexander, it is astonishingly marginal for Nehemiah as well as for the Pharisees, which does not, however, prevent strong claims being made about it' (1997: 62). The inauguration of the altar on the 25th of Kislew in

164 BCE by Judas Maccabaeus had no immediate institutional conse-
quences, and it was evident that it was not the temple but the temple insti-
tution as such which played the most central role during the Maccabaean
crisis (1997: 62).

Another motivation for Nodet's work was the question of the status of
the Bible in Judaism. In the post-exilic period it underwent a change,
which, as reflected in rabbinic literature, challenged the teaching of the
Bible and in several instances made the biblical text inferior to the oral
tradition (*y. Sanh*. 11.6). It probably was this insecurity about the Bible's
authority that had, in the beginning, led Rabbi Akiba's school to attempt
a synthesis of the written and oral Torah. This condition stood in strange
contrast to the attitude toward the Bible represented by Samaritans, Saddu-
cees, Philo, Josephus and even the New Testament letter to the Hebrews,
all of which ascribe to the Pentateuch a central position as a source for
law, history and philosophy (1997: 10).

Much in line with Smith (1971), Nodet sought the evidence for the
development of the Pentateuch in a comparison of its implicit discussions
with extra-biblical material's exposition of what had been regarded as
firm theological doctrines. Discussions about the sabbath in the books of
Maccabees' argument for armed resistance on the sabbath (e.g. 1 Macc.
2.41), and Josephus's Sidonians, who declared that they had only recently
adopted the sabbath from the Jews and that they were ready to give it up to
avoid reprisals, were the markers which prompted Nodet's suggestion that
the weekly sabbath had been recently instituted (1997: 63-64). Nodet here
follows Josephus's description of the Samaritans as those 'Sidonians' liv-
ing around Shechem and maintaining the cult at Gerizim. They 'could have
been the dissidents, degraded by foreign marriages and lax observances. In
fact, they constituted a limited group and had undergone some Jewish
influence (Sabbath, Sabbatical year). Yet before these influences, they had
been the heirs of the Israelites (Jacob, Joseph)' (1997: 381), who seem to
appear 'at each moment in the development of ancient Judaism, and that
Josephus in particular systematizes their opposition, from Cyrus to the
Maccabees' (1997: 62).

In Nodet's view, the origin of these Samaritans is hidden in the complex
pre-history of Israel. They probably are not those from 2 Kings 17's and
Josephus's imported Cuthaeans, but relate to a local Yahweh cult centred
around Shechem (1997: 147), with strong local traditions connected to
Jacob–Yisrael. They furthermore are connected to the Aaron traditions via
Bethel, which must be identified with Shechem or a nearby sanctuary,
whose origin is lost (1997: 167-82). At some time, not later than Alexander

the Great, the Gerizim cult originated with the traditions connected to them (1997: 381). From this came the Hexateuch traditions, the connection to Joshua, the Jacob traditions, which had been written down around 250–200 BCE and were accredited with the authorization as the 'Law of Moses' without the weekly sabbath, interpolated in a later redaction. The meeting with the returned Nehemiah Jews led to an acceptance of some of their customs, *inter alia* the weekly sabbath (cf. *Ant.* 12.259). This resulted in a considerable literary activity and probably also in a common Pentateuch, which became dispersed to the diaspora (1997: 191-95).

> [T]he Samaritan Pentateuch has interesting contacts with the Qumran frag-
> ments and with the least revised forms of the LXX (Philo, New Testament).
> The Letter of Aristeas which presents a Jerusalem high priest ruling over
> the twelve tribes, conferred authority on a revision, in a more Judean or
> more balanced sense, of a translation of the Pentateuch that had been
> judged to be too 'Samaritan'. Since Antiochus III, the importance of Judaea
> had only kept on growing, but the Samaritan text, despite later corruption,
> should be regarded as the first heir of the primitive edition (Nodet 1997:
> 381).

Because of the Nehemiah Jews' self-assertion as heirs to all Israel, they collided in Jerusalem with another tradition, which was 'cultic, prophetic and perhaps also royal. This forms the prehistory of the Maccabaean crisis', in which the Samaritans, in Nodet's presentation, did not partici-pate (1997: 191). The role of the Samaritans in Jewish history had ended. Concentrated around the high-priestly governed life (1997: 269) on their windswept mountain, they could do nothing but wait for extermination in 107 BCE.

In spite of some obvious weaknesses in Nodet's work (see Hjelm 2000a: 71-75), it deserves much attention for its innovative ideas regarding the pre-Maccabaean Samaritan-Jewish relationship. It certainly is one of Nodet's greatest achievements that he brings up the question of the Penta-teuch afresh. Its origin and transmission raise urgent questions about the primacy and authority of what we are wont to call Judaism. It also opens up a path to recent discussions about relationship between the Pentateuch and the Former and Latter Prophets, such as we find in, for instance, Mikolášek (1969 [ET 1995]); Van Seters (1992, 1994); Macchi (1994, 1999); Mullen (1997); Shearing and McKenzie (1999); and Hjelm (2004). The ambigui-ties voiced in the Pentateuch (Bóid 1989a: 329) might reflect co-operation rather than adoption by one group or another. The formation of the canon might not have given impetus to the split, as has been suggested by Kart-veit (2000: 3.28), but it certainly closed the path for either group to find a

common religious basis apart from the Pentateuch, as voiced in *AF*'s narrative (*AF*, chs xix-xx, pp. 71-78 [ET Stenhouse 1985]) about Samaritan-Jewish discussions in the Persian court before the return from exile.

Summary

Although much has been written on Samaritan history, very little is, in fact, known of either the origin or the development of the Samaritan people. In recent scholarship, hypotheses of an origin of the Samaritan people from a pre-722 BCE Israel have in most instances led to conclusions of a development of this people into a Jewish sect sometime between the fourth century BCE to the second century CE. Although Josephus's narratives about Samaritan origins have been questioned, most scholars make paradigmatic use of them in efforts to explain common elements of Samaritanism and Judaism, which otherwise might be hard to understand. Behind such explanations are assertions of a pluriform Judaism in the post-exilic period, from which stem the factions, which scholars term 'sects' or 'heresies'. The anachronism of such terms is self-evident. It implies assumptions of a normative Judaism and a biblical canon long before the realization of such entities. While in scholarship of the 1980–90s on Samaritanism, several scholars have dated to the first–third century CE the development of the so-called 'proto-Samaritans' into fully-fledged Samaritans, it has again become common to view the Maccabaean period as the formative period of such alleged development. In most cases, the argument is based on allegations of a Samaritan promotion of a so-called sectarian variant of the Pentateuch, which argues the exclusivity of Gerizim. This, however, is at best a slippery indicator, as no manuscripts of the Samaritan Pentateuch can be dated that early. To call the paleo-Hebrew fragments of the Pentateuch, found among the Dead Sea Scrolls, 'Samaritan' or 'pre-Samaritan' is misleading (Ulrich 1999: 65; Hjelm 2000a: 93). As a text type, however, they represent the most common text type of the second century BCE, used and preserved by the Samaritans also. From extra-biblical sources of the second century BCE onwards, the existence of Samaritans and Jews as distinct peoples can be inferred; however, they are as yet without clear political or religious profiles before their appearance in literature from the Common Era. In this literature, the Samaritans (and the Sadducees) are viewed as preserving ancient beliefs against the innovations suggested by post-exilic Judaism(s) and Christianity.

Because of the excavations by Magen *et al.* in Samaria and on Gerizim since 1985, the question of the Samaritan temple(s) has gained increasing importance as an indicator of the origin of the Samaritans. The finding of

temple structures beneath the Byzantine Mary Theodokos church that date
to the early Persian and the Hellenistic periods, along with about 450 dedi-
catory inscriptions and burned bones of year-old animals, indicates the
existence of a Yahwistic holy centre on Mount Gerizim for a period of
more than 400 years, until its destruction around 111 bce. The impact of
these new sources for understanding the early history of the Samaritans
certainly will affect the discussions as soon as excavation reports are avail-
able to a wider audience. Four more volumes of *Mount Gerizin Excava-
tions* are projected to appear in the next decade (subtitles are uncertain):
vol. II: *Mt. Gerizim and the Samaritans* (forthcoming 2005); vol. III: *The
City of Luzah* (forthcoming); vol. IV: *Coins and Seals* (forthcoming); vol.
V: *The Byzantine Period and the Greek Inscriptions* (forthcoming). The
existence of such a major holy centre will affect discussions, not only about
the Pentateuch, but also about the ancient history of Israel, the Jewish
canon, and the Samaritan literary traditions that are not part of their
canon. Although these Samaritan traditions date to a later time, they may
preserve ancient traditions, as can be inferred from the literature of the
centuries around the turn of the common era.

<p style="text-align:center;">*Samaritan Literature in Recent Research:
Some Aspects of the Debates*</p>

Samaritan Chronicles
As mentioned in the introduction, research in the fields of literature and
linguistics has grown considerably during the past twenty years. For ques-
tions regarding Samaritan 'historiography', scholars can no longer rely
solely on either the modern chronicles published and translated by Adler
and Séligsohn, *Chronicle Adler* (= *Une nouvelle chronique samaritaine* =
New Chronicle, 1902–1903), and by Macdonald, *Samaritan Chronicle II*
(1969), or on the late medieval Arabic Chronicle *Kitāb al-Tarīkh* by Abū
'l-Fatḥ (*AF*; published by Vilmar in 1865, re-edited by Stenhouse in 1980
and translated into English in 1985). Neither can scholars rely solely on
Juynboll's *Arabic Book of Joshua* (commented on, and translated into
Latin in 1848; ET by Crane 1890), nor on editions of Hebrew versions of a
Samaritan book of Joshua, published by Gaster (1908), Yellin (1902) and
Niessen (2000). Nor can scholars rely on Zangenberg's (1994) insufficient
excerpts of Samaritan sources in German translation, useful for its huge
number of references to Samaritan issues among early 'Jewish' and 'Chris-
tian' authors, most of which must be read in larger contexts than those
offered in the compilation (see Pummer 2002 on such contexts).

Since Samaritan historiography has not achieved a standardized canonical form, but consists of a continuous chronicle tradition resulting in a variety of manuscripts reflecting linguistic and cultural tastes of their own time, each manuscript must be treated independently. The continuous process of updating makes it extremely difficult to separate earlier tradition from later development (Cohen 1981: 187-88; Pummer 1992: 27: '*schwer zu bestimmen, wenn überhaupt*' ['difficult to determine, if possible at all']; Niessen 2000: 16-17). Attempts based mainly on linguistic criteria (e.g., Ben-Ḥayyim 1957–77; Cohen 1981; Florentin 1999; Niessen 2000), about which there is no absolute consensus, tend to neglect, although they express awareness of, the methodological problem that manuscript and text are not identical entities (cf. the discussions in, for example, Gaster 1908: 534; 1927: 180; Cohen 1981: 187-92; Wedel 1991: 310; Niessen 2000: 16; Crown 2001: 4).

While Macdonald (1969: 69-71) argues that his main manuscript H1: JR(G) 1142 = Ryl. Sam. MS 375, written in 'pure classical Hebrew' (p. 8), should be dated to 1616, and represents 'the best and most accurate of all the chronicles', Ben-Ḥayyim (1970) refutes both its date and its authenticity, and concludes that the manuscript is a modern compilation written in 1908. He furthermore states that the Joshua part of Macdonald's *Chronicle II* is identical with Gaster's *Buch Josua* (1908), based on three different Hebrew manuscripts: Text A, cod. Gaster 864, 4º = JR(G) 864 = Ryl. Sam. MS 268 with additional use of Text B, cod. Gaster 863, 8º = JR(G) 863 = Ryl. Sam. MS 257, and Text C, cod. Gaster 874 = JR(G) 874 = Ryl. Sam. MS 3370. The high antiquity of these manuscripts, argued by Gaster (1908: 235: '*lange vor Josephus liegte*'; 1925: 134-40), had already been rejected by Kahle (1908), Yahuda (1908a; 1908b) and Yellin (1908). Macdonald, who had not altogether neglected this critique of Gaster (Ben-Ḥayyim 1970; cf. Pummer 1992: 24), made additional use of Yellin's text (J4), which he considered to represent an earlier stage than Gaster's.

Cohen (1981: 174-76, 212) supported Macdonald's dating, but considered Macdonald's H2 (JR[G]1168 = Ryl. Sam. MS 259), written in Samaritan Aramaic, to antedate Macdonald's H1, which he considered to be 'a later, revised and supplemented version of H2' (p. 176). Parts of this manuscript, consisting of 264 folios, were published by Gaster in 1927 ('The Samaritan Story of the Death of Moses', based on cod. Gaster 1168, fol. 1b-8b: 55-59 [appendix; text] and 303-21 [trans.]), Cohen in 1981 (fol. 174a, 4-195b, 13: 6-57 [text] and 58-109 [trans.]), and Niessen in 2000 (fol. 8b-53a: 40-146 [text] and 147-85 [trans.]). Cohen presents H2 in parallel columns with his 'redacted' H1 (Niessen 2000: 15), and

comments on each. His English translation, however, conflates the two texts. In Macdonald, variant readings in H2 are presented in the apparatus to his first 84 folios of H1.

Gaster dated his text to the fourth century CE because of its 'pure Samaritan Aramaic' and similarities with 'the last poem of Markah' (1927: 178). The tradition, however, Gaster dates even earlier, on the basis of close similarities with *The Assumption of Moses*, as well as testimony to its content in Josephus (*Ant.* 4.8, 45) and in the *Arabic Book of Joshua* (ch. VI; see Juynboll 1848; ET 1890). He dates the compilation of the entire manuscript to modern times (p. 178). In contrast, Cohen dates the entire manuscript to the fourteenth century, because of its 'evenly-balanced synthesis of Hebrew and Aramaic' (1981: 176). Niessen disagrees with both, and especially with Cohen's conclusion that the manuscript shows no traces of Arabic. In Niessen's opinion, H2 is replete with Arabisms and mixed language (2000: 20-21), representing a late stage of Arabic influence:

> *als die Arabisierung der Samaritaner abgeschlossen war und das Arabische als primäre Sprache die Sprache der in ihrer Gemeinde weitergegebenen Traditionen nicht nur überlagerte, sondern völlig dominierte.*

> when the Arabic influence in Samaritan communities was complete and Arabic as the primary language not only affected, but completely dominated their transmitted literary traditions (p. 37).

Niessen does not give an exact date for the manuscript, but seems to imply that the late Samaritan Hebrew, which he argues is the basic language of the manuscript (2000: 20: '*Spät-Samaritanisches Hebraisch*' [late-Samaritan Hebrew]) dates to modern rather than to medieval times. This language was used for prose writings, such as Samaritan correspondence with European scholars, chronicles, and late nineteenth to early twentieth-century Hebrew translations of Samaritan Arabic works (Shehadeh 1995: 553-54). A similar mixed language termed Samaritan neo-Hebrew has been used by poets since the fourteenth century (Florentin 1989; cf. Shehadeh 1995: 553).

While Crown (1972: 284) had argued for an early Samaritan Joshua tradition, and especially Macdonald's main manuscript JR(G) 1142 (= Ryl. Sam. MS 357), as underlying all Samaritan chronicles, he later (1992: 309-11) proposed that it was Gaster's Text A (JR[G] 864 = Ryl. Sam. MS 268) that was an authentically third-fourth century CE work, antedating the Arabic manuscript written in Samaritan script (Leiden, Or. MS 249, written in 1362 and extended in 1513), published by Juynboll (*Liber Josuae*, 1848 [ET 1890]), and also antedating Abū 'l-Fatḥ's chronicle of 1355

(manuscripts of which date from the sixteenth century, published by Vilmar 1865; ET Stenhouse 1985), as well as Macdonald's *Chronicle II* (= *Sefer Hayamim*, JR(G) 1142 = Ryl. Sam. MS 375). Samaritan chronicle traditions should therefore not be classified according to Macdonald's grouping in seven different traditions (Macdonald 1964: 44-49; 1969: 225), since this classification represents 'a description of the finished product and does not indicate the process by which these chronicles were enlarged or composed. Nor does it show their true relationship' (Crown 1972: 283). In Crown 2001, neither the classification of Gaster's Text A, nor its early dating, is argued (see pp. 29-32). On the contrary, Crown now argues that Gaster's Hebrew manuscript for his *Buch Josua* and the *Nouvelle Chronique = Chronicle Adler* (ch. VII), published by Adler and Séligsohn (1902–1903), as well as Macdonald's *Chronicle II* (1969), should be dated to the nineteenth to twentieth century CE. The *Arabic Book of Joshua* (Leiden, Or. MS 249), behind which 'one can find sources in Greek, Aramaic and Hebrew', is now Crown's 'principal manuscript on which all other copies [of the Book of Joshua] are based' (Crown 2001: 29).

Crown's theories (1972, 1973) have been discussed by Zsengellér (1998: 28-33), who partly follows Crown, regarding an independent book of Joshua and an independent *Sefer Ha-yamim*, but argues that 'there must have been an independent tradition about the high priest, i.e., a kind of *Tolidah* [genealogy] or *Shalshalah* [chain] and an *Asatir* type of tradition. They did not have to precede each other, but they may have existed concurrently' (Zsengellér 1998: 33). Apart from Zsengellér's suggestion of an early independent *Sefer Ha-yamim*, Crown (2001) seems to agree with Zsengellér, as can be inferred from his presentation of Samaritan chronicles according to a generally agreed chronology of manuscripts:

1. The *Asatir*;
2. The *Tulidah* (1149, with add. 1346 and 1859);
3. Abū 'l-Fatḥ's *Kitāb al-Tarīkh* (1355);
4. The *Arabic Book of Joshua* (1362, with additions from 1513);
5. Gaster's *Hebrew Book of Joshua (Buch Josua)* ('inseparable' from Adler and Séligsohn's *New Chronicle* [*Nouvelle chronique*], which 'should be considered to be, in effect, the *Sefer Hayamim*' [Crown 2001: 31]);
6. The *Shalshalat*;
7. Macdonald's *Chronicle II*, which 'seems to represent a mélange of Jewish Biblical texts and material drawn from the *Kitāb al-Tarīkh* or other chronicles' (p. 31).

Crown dates the *Asatir*, placed first in his list, to the tenth century rather than to the third century CE or even earlier, as is argued by Gaster (1927: 158-68; cf. Ben-Ḥayyim 1943–44: 110), although only one of its manuscripts comes from the seventeenth century; the rest are modern copies (Crown 2001: 27). The book is written in Aramaic and is influenced by Arabic and Islamic thought. According to Tal (1989: 466), 'its form, as handed down to our times, was fixed not later than the twelfth century'. While Crown states that Abū 'l-Fatḥ's *Kitāb al-Tarīkh* and the *Arabic Book of Joshua* draw on earlier material, the *Tulidah* (and the *Asatir*?) appear to be the only available sources. What is 'claimed to be the autograph manuscript' of the *Tulidah* in the possession of the Samaritans (Crown 2001: 28; Stenhouse 1989: 228) has been published by Bowman in 1954 and Florentin in 1999 (Hebrew). A later manuscript (in the Bodleian Library, Oxford University, MS Or. 651) dating to 1859, has been published by Neubauer (1869) and Heidenheim (1870).

Pummer (1992: 22-29), who completely neglects the *Arabic Book of Joshua*, states that AF's *Kitāb al-Tarīkh* (ET Stenhouse 1985) and the *Tulidah* are the most important historical works of the Samaritans. The statement is the more interesting as the *Arabic Book of Joshua*, published and translated into Latin by Juynboll (1848; ET Crane 1890), is notably shorter than *Kitāb al-Tarīkh* by Abū 'l-Fatḥ, published by Vilmar (1865; ET Stenhouse 1985). Both Juynboll (1848: 35, 37) and Stenhouse (1980, ch. 5: 7-8) state that 'The book of Joshua is older than *Kitāb al-Tarīkh* by Abū 'l-Fatḥ. It was, in fact, used when compiling his work' (Stenhouse 1985: xxx n. 1; 1989: 243-48). Juynboll furthermore (*Chronicon*, pp. 75ff.) deduced 'that the Book of Joshua represented only chs 9–25 of the Scaliger MS (Leiden, Or. MS 249). The introductory chapters (i.e., 1-8) and the concluding chapters (i.e., 26-50) he considered to have been drawn from various sources' (Stenhouse 1988: 251).

Other sources listed by Abū 'l-Fatḥ, for example, the *Shalshalah* (which is actually a *Tulidah*) and three incomplete Hebrew stories (about which 'it cannot be excluded' that they were different parts of 'one archetypal *Tarikh* or *Sefer Hayamim*' [Stenhouse 1989: 248-49]) are discussed by Stenhouse (1989: 240-60). While these terms are 'frequently convertible', they are not found to have been used instead of *Shalshalah* or *Tulidah* (p. 225). Zsengellér (1998: 26) notes that 'ten more sources are mentioned by name at different points in the text besides the seven listed'. These are not dealt with in Stenhouse 1989.

Bóid (1988: 604; 1989a: 46) argues that there are two rescensions of the history of Abū 'l-Fatḥ: the one edited by Vilmar (1865), and the other

translated by Stenhouse (1985). Stenhouse, who added further manuscripts to Vilmar's text, disregarded as 'conflated versions' the manuscripts of FamB(*) (Stenhouse 1985: xxii), which is the recension that Bóid believes is the more original. This longer recension (Stenhouse FamB[*] = Bóid C), according to Bóid, was not written later than 1298/1303 CE. Its unpublished copies from 1890 and 1900 (MS Sulzberger 14 of the Jewish Theological Seminary, and MS Berlin quarto 963 = B), go back to a common manuscript dating between 1881 and 1885 (cf. the support of Bóid in Daiber 2002: 306, 316). The text published by Cohen (1981) is 'essentially a Hebrew translation of a part of recension C of Abū 'l-Fath' (Bóid 1988: 604).

Comparative analyses of various manuscripts to Juynboll's *Arabic Book of Joshua* (1848; ET 1890) and the *Kitāb al-Tarīkh* by Abū 'l-Fath, some of which appear in Payne-Smith (1863), Vilmar (1865) and Stenhouse (1980, 1985), have been undertaken by Jamgotchian (1995, 2003). About twenty codices with a total of 350 folios in the Firkovich collection of the Russian National Library, St Petersburg, have been analysed. Several instances of insecure readings in Juynboll's text have been shown by Jamgotchian (2003) to have been restored correctly by Crane (1890). Although Jamgotchian's book is in Russian, it is accessible and indeed useful because of the many Arabic variants listed, photographs of manuscripts, English summary and bibliography.

Summary. Apart from the chronicles, which are written in different languages, and therefore pose a considerable problem regarding dating of manuscripts and tradition, Samaritan literature also consists of theological and liturgical literature written in Arabic and Aramaic. A short presentation of recent achievements regarding the character and identification of this literature, from the periods in which Arabic (basically, second millennium CE) or Aramaic (basically, first millennium BCE and CE) prevailed in Samaritan writings, will guide the reader to more fully comprehend the problems raised in the foregoing section.

Other Samaritan Literature in Arabic: Halachah, Treatises, Commentaries

The Samaritans' rejection of the Hebrew Bible and their recognition of only the Pentateuch do not imply that they never developed their own traditions of commentary and *halachah*. As Jews did not consider the Pentateuch to give answers to all matters of life, so the Samaritans gave a certain credit to tradition and to the interpretation of the Pentateuch. Since the Pentateuch

embraces life, tradition and theology, all literature, including commentaries, historical books, philosophical books, grammars, midrashim and halachot, were written purposely to give insight into the commandments of the Pentateuch, and to offer advice on how to live in accordance with them. This part of Samaritan literature, most of which is written in Arabic, is not well known to me, and detailed information and bibliographies must be sought in works by Noja (1970); Pohl (1974); Powels (1977); Lowy (1977); Wedel (1987); Bóid (1988; 1989a; 1989b); Pummer (1992: 34-39); Tal (1993); and Crown (2001: 32-39).

From late medieval times, we find the Arabic tractate *Kitāb al-Kāfi* by Yūsuf bin Salāmah bin Yūsuf al 'Askarī (1041/42) (see Noja 1970; Bóid 1989a, 1989b), which seems to be a halachic compendium (Gaster 1992: 156-57), and *Kitāb al-Ṭabbāḥ* composed by Abū l-Ḥasan al-Ṣūrī between 1030 and 1040, in which halachic rules are combined with philosophical discussions and Pentateuchal exegesis, aimed at clarifying differences in halachah and belief between Samaritans, Jews and Karaites (Wedel 1987; Gaster 1992: 149-55; Bóid 1989a: 346; see also Noja 1970; Bóid 1989b). These works have been supplemented with various treatises on calendrical, juridical and ritual matters. The *Kitāb al-Khilāf* (the *Book of Differences* [between Samaritans and Jews]) written by Munajjah bin Ṣadaqa in the mid-twelfth century, seems not to have been published *in extenso* (see Bóid 1989a). According to Gaster (1992: 160), the demonstration of differences between Samaritans and Jews is more elaborated in *Kitāb al-Khilāf* than in the earlier works *Kitāb al-Kāfi* and *Kitāb al-Ṭabbāḥ*. The polemical character of *Kitāb al-Khilāf* reveals the author's knowledge of the works of the medieval Jewish philosopher Sa'adyā Gaon (Halkin 1943). It is dealt with in Bóid 1989a, who has maintained the first comprehensive study of halachic differences related to very specific questions regarding male and female impurity. Several manuscripts on Samaritan halachah are presented, analysed and compared with similar halachic issues discussed in Rabbanite, Karaite and Qumran literature. Main conclusions of Bóid's analyses are: 'the agreements between Jews and Samaritans by far outnumber the disagreements' (1989a: 328) and 'both the Torah and the halachic tradition go back to common "all Israel" traditions' (p. 328). These had begun to differ independently of the division between Samaritan and Jews before the Torah received its final form. In Bóid's opinion, the wording of the Torah is 'precisely vague and unequivocally ambiguous [in the sections in which there are disagreements] so that it will bear a certain number of interpretations and no more, and will agree with all the halachic traditions in mind' (p. 331). The possibility that the ambiguity might have

invited different halachic interpretations is rejected by Bóid (pp. 330-42). *Kitāb al-Farâ'iḍ* (The Book of Commandments) by Abū l-Faraj bin Kallār from the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries includes 613 commandments, of which 365 (the days of a year) are prohibitions and 248 (the number of the parts of the body) are prescriptions (Baillet 1976; 1988; Bóid 1989a: 23; 1989b). Some of the Arabic material has been translated into Samaritan neo-Hebrew since the nineteenth century CE. Commentaries on the Pentateuch from medieval times are written in Middle Arabic. With the exception of lexicographic and grammatical material, they exhibit traits of medieval thought in philosophy, astronomy, astrology and medicine. For recent research in this material see Lowy (1977); Dexinger (1986); Bóid (1988); Macuch (1988b) and Tal (1988).

Literature in Aramaic (ca. first century BCE-twelfth CE): Targum, Teachings, Liturgy

From the Aramaic period, we have the *Samaritan Targum*, which has been published for the first time *in toto* in a critical edition by Tal (1980–83) on the basis of several manuscripts. Comparative studies of these manuscripts reveal stages of linguistic development of Aramaic and attempts at adapting 'this tool of learning and understanding of the Torah to the changing conditions of the society' (Tal 1983 [vol. III]: 6-8; 52-104; 1989: 448; Noja 1989: 803-804; Pummer 1992: 20-21; Crown 2001: 17-19; see further the articles by Le Déaut, Margain, Sixdenier, Tal and Macuch in Rothschild and Sixdenier 1988: 109-58).

From this period we also have *Mimar* or *Memar Marqah* (= *Tībåt Mårqe*), which contain the teachings accredited to the philosopher, poet and reformist Marqah from the third-fourth century CE. Macdonald's 1963 edition has not met with general approval (Ben-Ḥayyim 1988b: 165; Bóid 1988: 598; Tal 1989: 463; Noja 1989: 807; Pummer 1992: 32), and a new edition based on a manuscript different from that of Macdonald, with an introduction (history of research, manuscripts, language and date), has been published by Ben-Ḥayyim (1988a). According to his linguistic examinations, Books I–II go back to the fourth century CE, with additions from the eleventh-thirteenth century CE, while Books III–VI date to the ninth century CE, but may contain earlier traditions (Pummer 1992: 33). The manuscripts may not date before the fourteenth century CE (Crown 2001: 19). The works of Kippenberg (1971) and Dexinger (1986), since they are based on Macdonald's edition of *Memar Marqah*, should be used with caution, and compared with Ben-Ḥayyim's edition (1988a; 1988b: 165;

see also Dexinger 2000: I, 57). Broadie (1981) has studied the philosophical character of the work.

The main publication of liturgical texts from the Aramaic period is still Cowley (1909). Ben-Ḥayyim has published several articles on the subject in Hebrew, in addition to his presentation of 'Samaritan Prayers for Joyous Occasions' (1957–77, III/2 [1967]; cf. Tal 1989: 450-62).

Philology, Codicology, and the Problem of Manuscript versus Tradition
'During their long history, the Samaritans have made use of five languages: Samaritan Hebrew, Greek, Samaritan Aramaic, Samaritan Neo-Hebrew [the so-called Shomronit; cf. Florentin 1989] and Arabic' (Shehadeh 2000: 2.47). In modern times, the mother tongue of young Samaritans living in Ḥolon is Modern Hebrew, while young Samaritans who used to live in Nablus, but are now living in Kiryat Luzah on Mount Gerizim, speak Arabic.

Samaritan, Hebrew and Aramaic have been dealt with considerably in works by Ben-Ḥayyim (bibliography in Crown, Pummer and Tal 1993), Margain (bibliography in Amphoux, Frey and Schattner-Rieser 1998), Macuch (1969; 1982); and Tal (2000). Studies in Samaritan neo-Hebrew and Arabic, respectively, have been carried out by Florentin and Shehadeh.

Ben-Ḥayyim's five-volume work on *The Literary and Oral Tradition of Hebrew and Aramaic amongst the Samaritans* (1957–77), in Hebrew, is the standard work for the examination of the Hebrew and Aramaic languages of the Samaritans. A presentation of the work is given by Macuch (1991: 24-27). The fifth volume of Ben-Ḥayyim's work, *A Grammar of the Pentateuch* (1977), appeared in a revised edition in English in 2000. In 1969, Macuch published his *Grammatik des samaritanischen Hebräisch*, followed by *Grammatik des samaritanischen Aramäisch* in 1982. Tal's critical edition of the *Samaritan Targum of the Pentateuch* (1980–83) has been supplemented by *A Dictionary of Samaritan Aramaic* in two volumes (2000), based on the vocabulary of the manuscripts. In spite of its title, the dictionary is not 'a comprehensive dictionary of Samaritan Aramaic, it is a dictionary of the major Samaritan pieces written *mainly* in Aramaic' (Tal 2000: II, xv). In addition to the manuscripts of the Samaritan Aramaic Targum, these pieces consist of the late medieval glossary *Ha-Melīṣ*, *Tībåt Mårqe*, and the *Asatir* in Ben-Ḥayyim's editions, Samaritan Aramaic Liturgy based on Cowley's edition, and the *Tulidah* published by Florentin. This incompleteness, related to lexical as well as philological issues, is the main point of critique in Müller-Kessler (2003). Florentin's doctoral dis-

sertation on the study of the grammar and lexical characteristics of Samaritan neo-Hebrew (1989 [Hebrew]) has not been published.

Shehadeh's dissertation, 'The Arabic Translation of the Samaritan Pentateuch: Prolegomena to a Critical Edition' (1977), led to his two-volume *Arabic Translation of the Samaritan Pentateuch* (1989, 2002). Volume I (1989) treats the books of Genesis and Exodus, while volume II (2002) continues with Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy. On the Samaritan web page, Shehadeh's work has been compared with:

> the parallel works of Prof. Z. Ben Ḥayyim on Memar Marqeh, the fourth century A.D. Samaritan Midrash on the Pentateuch, and Prof. A. Tal on the Samaritan Aramaic Targum of the Pentateuch. Based on all ancient and old manuscripts, in hand, of the Samaritan-Arabic translation of the Pentateuch, Dr. Shehadeh examines 94 manuscripts in the second volume, 34 of them from the Firkovich collection of 1348 Samaritan Manuscripts in St. Petersburg. Dr. Shehadeh's book is a great contribution to the study of Samaritan literature in Arabic and comparative research of its various objects. (*The Israelite Samaritans Online* 2003)

These and other studies have enlightened our knowledge of changes in Samaritan languages. It is commonly agreed that while Samaritan Aramaic ('a western Palestinian dialect' [Shehadeh 2000: 2.47]) replaced Hebrew in the first centuries of the common era, in late medieval times '[Samaritan] Arabic replaced Aramaic in all aspects of community's life, with the exception of religious activity. For liturgical purposes, a new language arose, which consisted of amalgamated Hebrew and Aramaic' (Ben-Ḥayyim 1991: 332-33; see also Shehadeh 2000: 2.47). Since the thirteenth century, Arabic was also used in translations of the Pentateuch (Shehadeh 1988: 205-206; 2000: 2.47; Niessen 2000: 19). Arabic, however,

> never entered their liturgy which is either Hebrew or Aramaic, the former language being holy, the latter hallowed by the Targum and the liturgical hymns, the most ancient of which were written in the fourth century and the latest are still attributed to the greatest Samaritan Arabic writer Abū l-Ḥasan al-Ṣūrī, of the eleventh century (Macuch 1989: 534).

Macuch's statement seems to have been proved wrong by Shehadeh, who, among the works written in Arabic 'since the middle of the eleventh century until the present day' lists 'poetry or liturgy' together with 'grammar and lexicography, Pentateuchal exegesis, historical works, Halachah and Law, medicine, astronomy and calendar, apologetic works against other sects, such as Jews, Christians, Karaites and Muslims, eschatology and life after death, biographies, proverbs' (Shehadeh 2000: 2.47-48).

Since most Arabic manuscripts, a huge number of which are located in the National Library in St Petersburg and the John Rylands Library in Manchester, have never been edited (Shehadeh 2000: 2.48), Macuch's utterance basically reflects the standard opinion about Samaritan Arabic and liturgical texts. From Shehadeh's examination of eleven manuscripts with a total of more than 15,000 rhymed lines in Arabic, housed in the libraries at St Petersburg and Manchester, as well as the British Library in London, the Bodleian Library in Oxford, Yad Ben-Zvi Library in Jerusalem, and in Samaritan houses in Ḥolon and Nablus, it is apparent that 'the gist of Samaritan Arabic poetry falls within the scope of religion' (Shehadeh 2000: 2.74). It was recited at ceremonies such as circumcision, bar-mitzva, weddings (2.54), births of children, Moses' birthday celebration (*Molad-Moshe*), pilgrimages, Friday evenings (2.64, 2.67), during vowed sacrifices and peace offerings (2.78), 'but'—and here Shehadeh is in agreement with Macuch—'it was not absorbed into the ceremonies of the Samaritan synagogue' (2.83).

From the time when Arabic became the mother tongue of the Samaritans, it appears also in Hebrew writings, which, 'in spite of its Hebrew basis is thoroughly saturated by Aramaic and occasionally also Arabic elements or neologisms formed from both languages; its syntax is entirely influenced by Arabic' (Macuch 1989: 533). The 'flourishing' of this 'Samaritan neo-Hebrew' seems to have been in the early twentieth century (Macuch 1989: 534). Needless to say, this time span of about 500 years creates great uncertainty in dating Samaritan manuscripts on linguistic criteria alone, although linguists have sought to set up standards with which to distinguish the earlier strata from the later (Florentin 1989; Shehadeh 1995), when the Arabic influence had reached its nadir (cf. the different opinions in Cohen 1981 and Niessen 2000, above).

Several Samaritan texts are written in polyglots with Hebrew, Aramaic and Arabic in parallel columns. To offer some help with the reading of these texts, a glossary (*ha-Mēlīṣ*) was composed in the tenth-eleventh centuries. It includes Hebrew and Aramaic; and, in the eleventh-fourteenth centuries, it was supplemented in Arabic. An almost complete manuscript from 1476 has been published by Ben-Ḥayyim 1957–77 (*LOT*, II: 435-616).

Studies in codicology and palaeography are presented in Crown 1998a and 2001. The twelve chapters of Crown's 2001 book consist mainly of the revised updating of about a dozen lengthy articles, which appeared between 1978 and 1995 in the *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester*. Although 'new evidence has been incorporated in

these studies', 'the original thrust of the evidence remains intact' (Crown 2001: vii). Crown's book is not a book for beginners in samaritanology. Much valuable information is offered in the book about the scribal traditions and literary history of Samaritan biblical and, to some extent, non-biblical, works. It has some serious mistakes, as have been noted in reviews on Crown's articles in *BJRL*. The most serious criticism is Crown's identification of scribes, a criticism he has sought to meet in ch. 10 (pp. 384-466) of the book *An Index of Scribes, Witnesses, Owners and Others Mentioned in Samaritan Documents, with a Key to the Principal Families Therein* (1986). The author's examination of Samaritan manuscripts and inscriptions has been harmonized with: lists in various catalogues (e.g. Crown 1993, which contains seventy-six entries to catalogues), especially with Pummer's list in his two-volume study of Samaritan *Ketubbah* (Pummer 1993a; Pummer and Tal 1997); as well as readers' notes in manuscripts (Crown 2001: 384). The list of scribes is not purported to be complete. As several scribes, especially in bilingual texts, had their names listed in 'Biblical Hebrew' [*sic*], Arabic and perhaps also Aramaic, the transcription of names is done on the basis of their 'Hebrew spelling' [*sic*, p. 388], rather than on the Arabic, when more than one form of a scribe's name appears in the manuscript. This 'transcription', however, appears to reflect modern British pronunciation of biblical Hebrew (e.g., Isaac, Jacob, Ozzi [Uzzah], Aaron) rather than Hebrew or Samaritan usage. As no standardized transliteration of names of Samaritan authors and copyists exists, a precise identification should be based on formal transliteration supplied with the Samaritan, Hebrew and Arabic forms. As it stands, the guidelines for identification, which the author attempts to establish, have the potential of utterly confusing matters (Hjelm 2003b).

While linguistic studies can answer *ad quem* questions, *a quo* questions must be based on other criteria, including comparative material from the periods under analysis. This was Gaster's basic method, with which he sought to establish a high antiquity for Samaritan traditions on the basis of Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphic literature, and of Samaritan Aramaic literature from the late Roman and Byzantine periods. The suspicion that some early 'Jewish' writers (e.g., Theodotus, Thallus, Ezekiel the Trage-dian, Pseudo-Eupolemus, Cleodemus-Malchus; see Crown 2001: 5-7) were, in fact Samaritans, and the existence of a Samareiticon, whether originally Samaritan or adapted (Pummer 1995, 1998), give reasons to believe that the Samaritans took an active part in ancient literary discussions over cult and belief.

Hjelm (2004a) argues for the necessity of including Samaritan material, together with DSS, the Septuagint, Pseudepigraphic and Apocryphal literature, in redaction-critical studies of the Masoretic Hebrew Bible. As has been noted by several scholars (Broadie 1981: *passim*; Gaster 1925: 134-38; 1927: *passim*; Nodet 1997: 180-201; Hjelm 2000a: 272), points of agreement among Samaritan traditions, Pseudepigrapha, Philo, Josephus, Septuagint, and the Dead Sea Scrolls are too numerous to be neglected. The notable similarity between the Samaritan Pentateuch (SP) as a text type and expansionist biblical texts of the Dead Sea Scrolls has led to renewed interest in the SP as a witness to the redaction history of the Hebrew and Greek bibles (Ulrich 1999: *passim* esp. 31-41). If specific traits in Samaritan non-Pentateuch traditions do not date to ancient times, Samaritans must have written their traditions on the basis of the mentioned ancient literature in the medieval period and later. While much work has been done in the area of establishing traits of intellectual influence in support of linguistic observations, scholars still need to examine whether Samaritan traditions have a commonality either with the literature of ancient writers from the centuries around the turn of the era, or with the reception of these works circulating in Jewish, Samaritan, Muslim and Christian circles in late medieval times. If, in fact, a Samaritan Hebrew book of Joshua—not the existent compilations—antedates the Arabic versions by more than a millennium, and indications are in favour of that (Gaster 1908: 544-46; Crown 1992: *passim* [310]; Nodet 1997: 198-200; Zsengellér 1998: 28-33), one must think of the Arabic versions as secondary. As the Arabic *AF* claims (see Stenhouse 1985: 3-4), and the Samaritan Hebrew *Samaritan Chronicle II* shows (Macdonald 1969: 9-10, 70-72), both are compilations that include a Samaritan book of Joshua. This section, paralleling biblical Joshua-Judges and Eli traditions, is found in all Samaritan chronicles. The material might differ, but the degree of standardization suggests that an independent Samaritan Hexateuch might have existed (Hjelm 2004a: ch. 4). It is only in later Samaritan-Hebrew compilations from the nineteenth to twentieth centuries, such as those presented in *Chronicle Adler* (= *Chronicle VII*; see Adler and Séligsohn 1902–1903) and Macdonald, *Samaritan Chronicle No. II* (1969), that seemingly synthesized narratives appear as close parallels to the Masoretic biblical tradition in the Former and Later Prophets.

In the Arabic chronicles, *Liber Josuae* exposes a gap in the history from the period of Eli and Samuel's heresy, and the Philistines' capture of the ark, until the arrival of Nebuchadnezzar and the exile (*Liber Josuae*; Juynboll 1848: chs xliv-xlv; ET 1890). Interestingly, Book 5 of Josephus's

Antiquities also closes with the capture of the ark, the death of Eli, the birth of Ichabod, and the genealogy of Eli as the first high priest from the House of Ithamar, who held the office 'down to the times of the reign of Solomon. Then the descendants of Eleazar once more recovered it' (Jos. *Ant.* 5.362). *Liber Josuae* names three 'biblical judges' (called 'kings'; *Liber Josuae*, ch. xxxix), but reveals knowledge of twelve kings, of which Joshua is the first and Samson the last. 'Solomon, son of David' is mentioned as constructor of buildings and monuments, which are destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar (*Liber Josuae*, ch. xlv; cf. Hjelm 2004a: ch. 4).

In *AF* (ET Stenhouse 1985), the gap is from the reign of Jeroboam—at which time the Samaritans, belonging to the houses of Phinehas and Joseph, separated from the rest of Israel (*AF* ch. xiv, p. 56 [ET Stenhouse 1985])—until the reign of Yūma'qīm (Jehoiachin), who, appointed by Nebuchadnezzar to gather the tribute, is said to rule over all the tribes of Israel (*AF* ch. xvi, p. 60). This period, missing in most chronicles (Macdonald 1969: 65), is presented in *AF* ch. xvi, pp. 59-60 chronistically, as a 'recollection of the Great High Priests' and some of the chiefs of the families.

It is a strange coincidence that references to 'the Chronicles' (דברי־הימים) as a source, mentioned in the Masoretic books of Neh. 12.23; Est. 2.23; 6.1; 10.2 and 1 Chron. 27.24; and referred to throughout 1 and 2 Kings (of the 'Kings of Israel': 1 Kgs 14.19; 15.31; 16.5, 14, 20, 27; 22.39; 2 Kgs 1.18; 10.34; 13.8, 12; 14.15, 28; 15.11, 15, 21, 26, 31, and of the 'Kings of Judah': 1 Kgs 14.29; 15.7, 23; 22.46; 2 Kgs 8.23; 12.20; 14.18; 15.6, 36; 16.19; 20.20; 21.17, 25; 23.28; 24.5), cover exactly this period. It begins with the conclusion of the narratives about Jeroboam (1 Kgs 14.19) and Rehoboam (1 Kgs 14.29), and ends with the conclusion of the Jehoiachim narrative (2 Kgs 24.5) and the introduction of Jehoiachin (Hjelm 2004a: ch. 4). A similar phenomenon is found in Eupolemus's story about Jewish kings, in which the building of the temple in Jerusalem and its destruction are connected (Wacholder 1974: 227). Eupolemus's spelling of Jehoiachin's name (Gr.: Ἰωναχέμ) has puzzled scholars (Macchi 1994: 28; Wacholder 1974: 227-28).

In *AF*, we learn that it was Solomon who had dug water tunnels under Jerusalem, 'reaching as far as Jericho and Lydda' and 'from Bethlehem to Jerusalem' (*AF* ch. xvi, p. 61 [ET Stenhouse 1985]). The book has a detailed narrative about Nebuchadnezzar's siege of Jerusalem. Whether or not this is a distorted version of biblical traditions, it is worth noticing that *AF*'s lengthy 'summary' of several biblical narratives, incorporated in a single event and figure (Macchi 1994: 27), to some extent matches what

scholars such as de Jong, Hardmeier, Laato and Smelik have argued about late seventh-early sixth century BCE events as an origin for the Hezekiah narrative (Hjelm 2004a: ch. 3). *AF*'s 'reuse' of such traditions, which might not have been based on Hebrew Old Testament manuscripts (Macchi 1994: 28), is combined with similarly 'reused' traditions in, for example, the books of Maccabees (Hjelm 2004a: chs 4, 6). *AF*, thus brings Yūma'qīm's men to Antioch (*AF* ch. xvi, p. 62) instead of Ribla, and has Yūma'qīm's '*two* sons' slaughtered in his presence (*AF* ch. xvi, p. 62) instead of his '*sons*' (2 Kgs 25.7; Jer. 39.6), thus reflecting 1 Macc. 12.48–13.24, in which Jonathan is taken captive to Ptolemais/Antioch, and his *two* sons are offered as ransom, in vain. *Liber Josuae* (Juynboll 1848; ET 1890), which does not have such close parallels to elements found in Isaiah's and 2 Kings' Hezekiah narrative, nevertheless places Nebuchadnezzar's attack in the fourteenth year. Referring to 'the Chronicles of Nebuchadnezzar', the author mentions that they were submissive for twelve years, revolted in the thirteenth year, with the king marching against them in the fourteenth year (*Liber Joshua*, ch. xlv; Juynboll 1848, ET 1890; cf. SP Gen. 14.4-5: 'they served Chedorlaomer for twelve years, in the thirteenth year they revolted and in the fourteenth year came Chedorlaomer' [cf. also Isa. 36.1 and 2 Kgs 18.13: the fourteenth year of Hezekiah]; Hjelm 2004a: ch. 4).

Summary. While most scholars would recognize the validity of incorporating the Samaritan Pentateuch in the redaction history of the Hebrew and Greek Bibles, the Samaritan non-Pentateuch traditions are either unknown to biblical scholars, or less valued. The foregoing section dealing with Samaritan literature is intended to open a window into the rich world of Samaritan non-biblical literature, and to discuss the difficulties that confront the scholar who takes the time and courage necessary to investigate these matters. Although the Samaritan chronicle manuscripts differ in length and language, they derive from very few common sources that might be of high antiquity. The almost century-old problem of distinguishing between Samaritan manuscripts and traditions, raised effectively by Gaster in his insistence on a high antiquity of Samaritan traditions, has led to increasing studies in the linguistic characteristics of Samaritan manuscripts. On the basis of such studies, linguistic chronologies for the Samaritan languages: Hebrew, Aramaic, Arabic, and mixed forms in Samaritan neo-Hebrew, so-called *Shomronit*, that might be more correctly termed Medieval Samaritan Hebrew, and late Samaritan Hebrew have been established as indispensable tools for the dating of Samaritan texts. As most of

these texts, however, are copied from earlier manuscripts and could be translations—which might furthermore have been transcribed into Samaritan script—making distinctions among manuscripts, text and tradition is, indeed, quite difficult.

Identification of scribes and manuscripts by colophons, language, paleography, epigraphy, fonts and bindings, is the first step in sorting out the chronology and sociology of the huge number of yet unexamined Samaritan manuscripts in the custody of quite a large number of libraries. The identification must be supplemented with literary examinations and comparison with other texts and traditions from related areas. Publications of Samaritan chronicles based on uncertain dating or on what is known to be nineteenth to twentieth-century manuscripts must be used with great caution. Unlike the standardization of the historical books of the Masoretic Bibles, Samaritan chronicles must be referred to independently as books and families of manuscripts; and no chronicle can carry more than its own argument. There are ample indications that an ancient Samaritan Hebrew book of Joshua existed as a closing part of a Samaritan Hexateuch tradition (Nodet 1997; Hjelm 2004a), but the matter needs further investigation. For such, a synopsis of the Jewish and Samaritan books of Joshua in their Hebrew, Greek, Samaritan and Arabic forms is a desideratum.

In addition to their importance for studies in religious history and linguistics, major achievements in the fields of liturgical and halachic literature, as well as translations of the Samaritan Torah, have added considerably to our possibilities for establishing sociologies of medieval Samaritanism's interactions with the cultures in which Samaritans lived. Such have also the impressive presentation and discussion of early Christian authors' views on Samaritans and Samaritanism, as well as research on Samaritan marriage contracts, both of which are useful in regard to Samaritan history in either the first millennium CE or the second half of the second millennium CE.

In preparation is a 'New Samaritan Chronicle' of about 500 pages, based on the *Tulidah*; the Arabic book of Joshua; the *Kitāb al-Tarīkh* by Abū 'l-Fatḥ; a continuous chronicle written in Arabic in the fifteenth century CE and translated into Hebrew; the Hebrew book of Joshua from the nineteenth century; *Chronicle Adler*; as well as sectional historical testimonies from different periods; testimonies of writers and scribes; testimonies in poetry; and various other kinds of literature, letters and documents (B. Tsedaka forthcoming). The book, which conflates its sources in a continuous narrative with general, rather than with exact, references is not meant to be a shortcut to scholarly research on Samaritan chronicles. It is written in the

Hebrew of the Pentateuch, with the main purpose of providing a modern Samaritan chronicle for the Samaritan people.

Epilogue

'The present we know, but the past changes every day'. I have worked to demonstrate the validity of this utterance in this article, parts of which will be outdated when it is published by new discussions and works in the various fields of samaritanology. I also hope to have demonstrated the importance of samaritanology for biblical studies, not merely for attempts at writing Samaritan history, but more than that, for attempts of writing Samaritan–*Jewish* history. In spite of the differences between these two peoples, they held enough factors in common that viewing this 'family' saga from one perspective only creates serious distortions. The field is not easily accessible, not only because of the many languages of the Samaritans, but also because of the international character of Samaritan studies. It is indeed a strange paradox that this tiny people, who remained for more than two millennia in the Mediterranean area, and since the seventeenth century have lived mostly in Palestine (Schur 1989; Anderson and Giles 2002), has seen their literature spread over several continents, occupying the minds of scholars whose numbers exceed the number of Samaritans living today.

The paradox becomes even stranger when it is seen in light of recent excavations. While for more than 1,500 years, Samaritan history and traditions could be relegated to a minor, or even a neglected, status in biblical studies, this is no longer the case. The history of the first millennium BCE kingdoms and provinces known as Israel and Judaea of greater Syria–Palestine will no longer be the same. Neither the Hebrew Bible, nor Josephus, nor Samaritan traditions give us full historical information. They give us glimpses of the reality they create. In this article, I have discussed some of the problems such glimpses pose to modern scholarship. As I have worked to make clear, the templates from which these problems have been discussed are beginning to break down. In coming years, new paradigms must be discussed and established. To facilitate this process, I have argued the necessity of broadening the areas of research, with the effect that Judaean and Samaritan history must be written independently, albeit in close relationship with each other.

Although Samaritans and Jews have always been two peoples, who for most periods of their early histories lived as separate religio- and geopolitical entities, they are nevertheless linked together by common traditions and belief, most of which they also shared with their neighbours.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ackroyd, P.R.
    1970   *Israel under Babylon and Persia* (New Clarendon Bible, Old Testament, 4; Oxford: Clarendon Press).

Adler, E.N., and M. Séligsohn
  1902–1903 'Une nouvelle chronique samaritaine', *REJ* 44 (1902): 188-222; 45 (1902): 70-98, 160, 223-54; 46 (1903): 123-46. [serial]
    1903   *Une nouvelle chronique samaritaine/Texte samaritaine transcrit et édité pour le première fois avec une traduction française par Elkan-Nathan Adler et M. Séligsohn* (Paris: Librairie Durlacher).

Ahlström, G.W.
    1993   *The History of Ancient Palestine from the Paleolithic Period to Alexander's Conquest* (JSOTSup, 146; Sheffield: JSOT Press).

Amphoux, C-B., A. Frey and U. Schattner-Rieser (eds.)
    1998   *Études sémitiques et samaritaines offertes à Jean Margain* (Histoire du Texte Biblique, 4; Lausanne: Éditions du Zèbre).

Anderson, R.T.
    1977   *Studies in Samaritan Manuscripts and Artifacts. The Chamberlain-Warren Collection* (Cambridge, MA: American Schools of of Oriental Research).
    1991   'The Elusive Samaritan Temple', *BA* 54.2 (June): 104-107.
    1995   'Samaritan Studies and Early Christianity', in Crown and Davey (eds.) 1995: 121-32.

Anderson, R.T., and T. Giles
    2002   *The Keepers: An Introduction to the History and Culture of the Samaritans* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson).

Ayalon, E.
    2002   'Horbat Migdal (Tsur Natan)—An Ancient Samaritan Village', in Stern and Eshel (eds.) 2002: 272-88.

Baillet, M.
    1976   'Quelques manuscrits samaritains', *Semitica* 26: 143-66.
    1988   'Commandements et lois (*Farâ'iḍ* et *Tûrot*) dans quartre manuscrits samarit-aines', in Rothschild and Sixdenier (eds.) 1988: 259-70.

Barkay, R.
    2002   'Samaritan Sarcophagi', in Stern and Eshel (eds.) 2002: 310-38.

Baumgarten, A.
    1997   *The Flourishing of Jewish Sects in the Maccabaean Era: An Interpretation* (JSJS, 55; Leiden: E.J. Brill).

Ben-Ḥayyim, Z.
  1943–44 'The Book of Asatir, with Translation and Commentary', *Tarbiz* 14 (1943): 104-25, 128, 174-90; 15 (1944): 71-87 (Hebrew).
  1957–77 *The Literary and Oral Tradition of Hebrew and Aramaic amongst the Samaritans* (= *LOT*; 5 vols.; Jerusalem: Academy of the Hebrew Language; Hebrew [see also Ben-Ḥayyim 2000]).
    1970   'A Samaritan Text of the Former Prophets?', *Leshonenu* 35: 293-302 (Hebrew).
    1988a   *Tîbåt Mårqe. A Collection of Samaritan Midrashim. Edited, Translated and Annotated* (Jerusalem: The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities [Hebrew]).
    1988b   'Towards a New Edition of Tîbåt Mårqe', in Rothschild and Sixdenier (eds.) 1988: 161-79.
    1991   'The Language of *Tibåt Mårqe* and Its Time', in Tal and Florentin (eds.) 1991: 331-45.

Ben-Ḥayyim, Z. (with assistance from A. Tal)
  2000   *A Grammar of Samaritan Hebrew. Based on the Recitation of the Law in Comparison with the Tiberian and Other Jewish Traditions. A Revised Edition in English* (rev. ET of 1957–77 [vol. V]; trans. P. Rodman; Jerusalem: The Hebrew University Magnes Press).
Böhm, M.
  1999   *Samarien und die Samaritai bei Lukas: Eine Studie zum religionshistorischen und traditionsgeschichtlichen Hintergrund der lukanischen Samarientexte und zu deren topographischer Verhaftung* (WUNT, 111; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).
Bóid, I.R.M.
  1988   'Use, Authority and Exegesis of Mikra in the Samaritan Tradition', in M.J. Mulder (ed.), *Mikra: Text Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (CRINT, 2.1; Assen: Van Gorcum): 595-633.
  1989a   *Principles of Samaritan Halachah* (Leiden: E.J. Brill).
  1989b   'The Samaritan *Halachah*', in Crown (ed.) 1989: 624-49.
  2003   Review of M. Böhm, *Samarien und die Samaritai bei Lukas: Eine Studie zum religionshistorischen und traditionsgeschichtlichen Hintergrund der lukanischen Samarientexte und zu deren topographischer Verhaftung* (WUNT, 111; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999) in *BO* 60.3-4: 444-47.
Bowman, J.
  1954   *Transcript of the Original Text of the Samaritan Chronicle Tolidah* (Leeds: University of Leeds Press).
  1955   'Is the Samaritan Calendar the Old Zadokite One?', *PEQ* 91: 73-78.
  1955–56   'Ezekiel and the Zadokite Priesthood', *Transactions of the Glasgow University Oriental Society* 16: 1-14.
  1958–59   'The Importance of of Samaritan Researches', *ALUOS* 1: 43-54.
  1975   *The Samaritan Problem: Studies in the Relationships of Samaritanism, Judaism and Early Christianity* (PTMS, 4; Pittsburgh: Pickwick Press).
  1977   *Samaritan Documents Relating to their History, Religion and Life* (Pittsburgh: Pickwick Press).
Briant, P.
  2002   *From Cyrus to Alexander: A History of the Persian Empire* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns; orig. French: *L'histoire de l'Empire perse* [trans. P. Daniels; Paris: Librairie Arthème Fayard, 1996]).
Broadie, A.
  1981   *A Samaritan Philosophy: A Study of the Hellenistic Cultural Ethos of Memar Marqah* (SPB, 31; Leiden: E.J. Brill).
Campbell, E.F.
  1979   'Jewish Shrines of the Hellenistic and Persian Periods', in Cross (ed.) 1979: 159-67.
Coggins, R.J.
  1975   *Samaritans and Jews: The Origins of Samaritanism Reconsidered* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell).
  1993   'Anti-Samaritan Polemics', in Crown, Pummer and Tal (eds.) 1993: 17-20.
Cohen, J.A.
  1981   *A Samaritan Chronicle: A Source-Critical Analysis of the Life and Times of the Great Samaritan Reformer Baba Rabbah* (SPB, 30; Leiden: E.J. Brill).
Corinaldi, M.
  2000   'The Personal Status of the Samaritans in Israel', in Morabito, Crown and Davey (eds.) 2000: 2.85-96.
Cowley, A.E. (ed. and trans.)
  1909   *The Samaritan Liturgy* (2 vols.; Oxford: Oxford University Press).
  1923   *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Crane, O.T.
1890 *The Samaritan Chronicle or The Book of Joshua, the Son of Nun. Translated from the Arabic with Notes* (New York: John B. Alden).

Cross, F.M., Jr
1963 'The Discovery of the Samaria Papyri', *BA* 26: 110-21.
1966 'Aspects of Samaritan and Jewish History in Late Persian and Hellenistic Times', *HTR* 59: 201-11; repr. in Dexinger and Pummer (eds.) 1992: 312-23.
1969 'Papyri of the Fourth Century B.C. from Dâliyeh: A Preliminary Report on Their Discovery and Significance', in D.N. Freedman and J.C. Greenfield (eds.), *New Directions in Biblical Archaeology* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday): 41-62.
1975 'A Reconstruction of the Judean Restoration', *JBL* 94: 4-18.

Cross, F.M., Jr (ed.)
1979 *Symposia Celebrating the Seventy-Fifth Anniversary of the Founding of the American Schools of Oriental Research* (1900–1975) (Cambridge, MA: American Schools of Oriental Research).

Crown, A.D.
1972 'New Light on the Inter-Relationships of *Samaritan Chronicles* from Some Manuscripts in the John Rylands Library' (I), *BJRL* 54: 282-313.
1973 'New Light on the Inter-Relationships of *Samaritan Chronicles* from Some Manuscripts in the John Rylands Library' (II), *BJRL* 55: 86-111.
1986 *An Index of Scribes, Witnesses, Owners and Others Mentioned in Samaritan Documents, with a Key to the Principal Families Therein* (Manchester: Rylands University Library).
1989 'The Samaritan Diaspora', in Crown (ed.) 1989: 195-217.
1991 'Redating the Schism between the Judeans and the Samaritans', *JQR* 82/1-2: 17-50.
1992 'The Date and Authenticity of the Samaritan Hebrew Book of Joshua as Seen in its Territorial Allotments' (repr. from *PEQ* 96, with Addendum, 1986), in Dexinger and Pummer (eds.) 1992: 281-311.
1993 *A Bibliography of the Samaritans* (ATLA Bibliography Series, 32; London: The Scarecrow Press, 2nd edn; 1st edn, 1984).
1995 'Another Look at Samaritan Origins', in Crown and Davey (eds.) 1995: 133-55.
1998a *A Catalogue of Samaritan Manuscripts in the British Library* (London: British Library Publishing).
1998b 'Codicography and Codicology in Samaritan Manuscripts', in Amphoux, Frey and Schattner-Rieser (eds.) 1998: 165-84.
2001 *Samaritan Scribes and Manuscripts* (Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism, 80; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Crown, A.D. (ed.)
1989 *The Samaritans* (Tübingen: J.B.C. Mohr [Paul Siebeck]).

Crown, A.D., and L. Davey (eds.)
1995 *New Samaritan Studies of the Société d'Études Samaritaines III-IV: Essays in Honour of G.D. Sixdenier* (Studies in Judaica, 5; Sydney: Mandelbaum Publishing).

Crown, A.D., and R. Pummer
forthcoming *A Bibliography of the Samaritans* (ATLA Bibliography Series; Metuchen, NJ; London: Scarecrow Press, 3rd edn, rev., expanded, annotated).

Crown, A.D., R. Pummer and A. Tal (eds.)
1993 *A Companion to Samaritan Studies* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck]).

Daiber, H.
2002 'Der Aristoteleskommentator Alexander von Aphrodisias (2./3. Jh.n.Chr.) und die samaritanische Gelehrte Levi über die Ewigkeit der Welt', *JSAI* 27: 305-47.

Dar, S.
2002 'Samaritan Rebellions in the Byzantine Period—The Archeological Evidence', in Stern and Eshel (eds.) 2002: 444-53.

Déaut, R. le
    1988   'Manuscrits du Targum samaritain et targum juifs', in Rothschild and Sixdenier (eds.) 1988: 109-21.
Delcor, M.
    1962   'Hinweise auf das samaritanische Schisma im Alten Testament', *ZAW* 74: 281-91; repr. in Dexinger and Pummer (eds.) 1992: 250-62.
Dexinger, F.
    1981   'Limits of Tolerance in Judaism: The Samaritan Example', in E.P. Sanders (ed.), *Judaism, Jewish and Christian Self-Definition* (3 vols.; London: SCM Press): II, 88-114.
    1986   *Der Taheb. Ein 'messianischer' Heilsbringer der Samaritaner* (Salzburg: Otto Müller).
    1992   'Der Ursprung der Samaritaner im Spiegel der frühen Quellen' (Originalbeitrag 1991), in Dexinger and Pummer (eds.) 1992: 67-140.
    1995   'Samaritan Origins and the Qumran Texts', in Crown and Davey (eds.) 1995: 169-84.
    2000   'Die Moses-Terminologie in Tibåt Mårqe (Einige Beobachtungen)', in Morabito, Crown and Davey (eds.) 2000: I, 57-70.
Dexinger, F., and R. Pummer (eds.)
    1992   *Die Samaritaner* (Wege der Forschung, 604; Darmstadt: Wissenschäftliche Buchgesellschaft).
Egger, R.
    1986   *Josephus Flavius und die Samaritaner. Eine terminologische Untersuchung zur Identitätsklärung der Samaritaner* (NTOA, 4; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).
    1991   'Josephus Flavius and the Samaritans: Aspects of the Origin of the Samaritans and of their Early History', in Tal and Florentin (eds.) 1991: 109-14.
Eph'al, I.
    1991   'The Samarian(s) in Assyrian Sources', in M. Cogan and I. Eph'al (eds.) *Ah, Assyria: Studies in Assyrian History and Ancient Near Eastern Historiography Presented to H. Tadmor* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press): 36-45.
    2002   'The "Samaritans" in the Assyrian Sources', in Stern and Eshel (eds.) 2002: 34-44.
Eshel, Ḥ.
    1991   'The Prayer of Joseph, a Papyrus from Masada and the Samaritan Temple on ΑΡΓΑΡΙΖΙΝ', *Zion* 56: 125-36 (Hebrew).
    1994   'The Samaritan Temple on Mount Gerizim and the Historical Research', *Beit Mikra* 39: 141-55 (Hebrew).
Eshel, E., and Ḥ. Eshel
    2002   'The Date of the Samaritan Pentateuch in the Light of the Biblical Scrolls from Qumran', in Stern and Eshel (eds.) 2002: 129-52.
Feldman, L.H.
    1992   'Josephus' Attitude Toward the Samaritans: A Study in Ambivalence', in Mor (ed.) 1992: 23-45.
Florentin, M.
    1989   ' "Shomronit": A Grammatical Description and Lexical Characterization' (PhD dissertation; Tel Aviv University [Hebrew]).
    1999   *The Tulidah: A Samaritan Chronicle. Text, Translation and Commentary* (Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi [Hebrew]).
Fossum, J.
    1989   'Sects and Movements', in Crown (ed.) 1989: 293-389.
Freedman, D.N., and K.A. Matthews
    1985   *The Paleo-Hebrew / Leviticus Scroll (IIQPaleoLev)* (Winona Lake, IN: American Schools of Oriental Research).

Gaster, M.
1908   'Das Buch Josua in hebräisch samaritanischer Rezension. Entdeckt und zum ersten Male herausgegeben', *ZDMG* 62: 209-79, 494-549.
1925   *The Samaritans, Their History, Doctrines and Literature. The Schweich Lectures 1923* (London: Oxford University Press; repr. 1980).
1927   *The Asatir. The Samaritan Book of the 'Secrets of Moses' Together with the Pitron or Samaritan Commentary and the Samaritan Story of the Death of Moses* (Royal Asiatic Society, 26; London: Royal Asiatic Society).
1992   'Die Samaritanishe Literatur', in Dexinger and Pummer (eds.) 1992: 141-86; repr. from 'Samaritaner', in *Enzyklopädie des Islām* (vol. 4C; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1925): 1-17.

Grabbe, L.L.
1987   'Josephus and the Reconstruction of the Judaean Restoration', *JBL* 106: 231-46.
1993   'Betwixt and Between: The Samaritans in the Hasmonean Period', in E.H. Lovering (ed.), *SBLSP, 1993* (Atlanta: Scholars Press): 334-47.

Halkin, A.S.
1943   'The Relation of the Samaritans to Saadia Gaon', in *Saadia Anniversary Volume* (Texts and Studies, 2; New York: American Academy for Jewish Research).

Heidenheim, M.
1870   'Die Samaritanische Chronik der Hohenpriesters Eleasar aus dem 11 Jahrhundert, übersetzt und erklärt', *Deutsche Vierteljahrschrift für Englische Theologische Forschung* 15.3: 347-89.

Hjelm, I.
1999   'Cult Centralization as a Device of Cult Control?', *SJOT* 13.2: 298-309.
2000a   *The Samaritans and Early Judaism: A Literary Analysis* (JSOTSup, 303; CIS, 7; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).
2000b   'The Samaritans in Josephus' Jewish History', *AB The Samaritan News* 770-72: 109-23.
2003a   'Brothers Fighting Brothers: Jewish and Samaritan Ethnocentrism in Tradition and History', in T.L Thompson (ed.), *Jerusalem in Ancient History and Tradition* (JSOTSup, 381; CIS, 13; London and New York: T. & T. Clark International): 197-222.
2003b   Review of Alan D. Crown, *Samaritan Scribes and Manuscripts* (Text and Studies in Ancient Judaism, 80; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 2001), in *Review of Biblical Literature* 06/2003. [print and online]
2004a   *Jerusalem's Rise to Sovereignty: Zion and Gerizim in Competition* (JSOTSup, 404; CIS, 14; London and New York: T. & T. Clark International).
2004b   Review of Reinhard Pummer, *Early Christian Authors on Samaritans and Samaritanism: Texts, Translations and Commentary* (Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism, 92; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002), *Theological Studies* (in press).

Isser, S.
1976   *The Dositheans: A Samaritan Sect in Late Antiquity* (SJLA, 17; Leiden: E.J. Brill).

Jamgotchian, H.S.
1995   'The Manuscript of Abū 'l-Fatḥ's Chronicle from Leningrad Public Library Firk. Sam. VI 19 and its Place in the traditions of Samaritan MSS', in Crown and Davey (eds.) 1995: 353-64.
2001   *The Recently Discovered and Other Unpublished Arabic Fragments of the Samaritan Pentateuch from the Collection of the Russian National Library* (Moscow: University of Moscow Press [Russian with Eng. summary and bibliography]).
2003   *Earliest Fragments of Samaritan Arabic Chronicles in the Russian National Library* (Moscow: University of Moscow Press [Russian with Eng. summary and bibliography]).

Josephus, F.
    1980   *The Works of Josephus: Complete and Unabridged, New Updated Edition* (trans. W. Whiston; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson).

Juynboll, T.G.J.
    1846   *Commentarii in historiam gentis samaritanae* (Leiden: S. & J. Luchtmans).
    1848   *Chronicon samaritanum, arabice conscriptum, cui titulus est Liber Josuae. Ex unico cod. Scaligeri* (Leiden: S. & J. Luchtmans; trans. O.T. Crane, *The Samaritan Chronicle, or the Book of Joshua the Son of Nun* [New York: John B. Alden, 1890]).

Kahle, P.
    1908   'Zum hebräischen Buch Josua', *ZDMG* 62: 550-51.

Kalimi, I.
    2000   'Zion or Gerizim? The Association of Abraham and the Aqedah with Zion/ Gerizim in Jewish and Samaritan Sources', in Morabito, Crown and Davey (eds.) 2000: 2.32-46.
    2002   *Early Jewish Exegesis and Theological Controversy: Studies on Scriptures in the Shadow of Internal and External Controversies* (Jewish and Christian Heritage Series, 2; Assen: Van Gorcum).

Kartveit, M.
    2000   '*The Martyrdom of Isaiah* and the Background of the Formation of the Samaritan Group', in Morabito, Crown and Davey (eds.) 2000: 3.15-28.

Kasher, A.
    1995   'Josephus on Jewish-Samaritan Relations under Roman Rule (BCE 63–CE 70)', in Crown and Davey (eds.) 1995: 217-36.

Kedar, B.Z.
    2002   'The Samaritans under Frankish Rule', in Stern and Eshel (eds.) 2002: 591-601.

Kippenberg, H.G.
    1971   *Garizim und Synagoge: Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zur samaritanischen Religion der aramäischen Periode* (Berlin: W. de Gruyter).

Lichtenstein, H.
  1931–32   'Die Fastenrolle, eine Untersuchung zur jüdisch-hellenistischen Geschichte', *HUCA* 8-9: 257-342.

Lindemann, A.
    1993   'Samaria und Samaritaner im Neuen Testament', *WuD* 22: 51-76.

Lowy, S.
    1977   *Principles of Samaritan Bible Exegesis* (Leiden: E.J. Brill).

Macchi, J.D.
    1994   *Les Samaritains: Histoire d'une légende. Israël et la province de Samarie* (Le monde de la Bible, 30; Geneva: Labor et Fides).
    1999   *Israël et ses tribus selon Genèse 49* (Orbis biblicus et orientalis, 171; Freiburg: Universitätsverlag).

Macdonald, J.
    1963   *Memar Marqah: The Teaching of Marqah* (BZAW, 84; 2 vols.; Berlin: W. de Gruyter).
    1964   *The Theology of the Samaritans* (New Testament Library; London: SCM Press).
    1969   *The Samaritan Chronicle no. II (or: Sepher Ha-Yamin). From Joshua to Nebuchadnezzar* (BZAW, 107; Berlin: W. de Gruyter).

Macuch, R.
    1969   *Grammatik des samaritanischen Hebräisch* (Studia Samaritana, 1; Berlin: W. de Gruyter).
    1982   *Grammatik des samaritanischen Aramäisch* (Studia Samaritana, 4; Berlin: W. de Gruyter).
    1988a   'Der gegenwärtige Stand der Samaritanerforschung und ihre Aufgaben', *ZDMG* 138: 17-25 (in appendix).

1988b   'Les bases philologiques de l'herméneutique et les bases herménetiques de la philologie chez les Samaritains', in Rothschild and Sixdenier (eds.) 1988: 149-58.

1989   'Samaritan Languages: Samaritan Hebrew, Samaritan Aramaic', in Crown (ed.) 1989: 531-84.

1991   'The Importance of Samaritan Tradition for the Hermeneutics of the Pentateuch', in Tal and Florentin (eds.) 1991: 13-31.

Magen, I.

1986   'A Fortified Town of the Hellenistic Period on Mount Gerizim', *Qadmoniot* 19: 91-101 (Hebrew).

1988   'Excavations at Mt-Gerizim—A Temple City', *Qadmoniot* 23: 70-96 (Hebrew).

1990   'The Church of Mary Theotokos on Mount Gerizim', in G.C. Bottini *et al.* (eds.), *Christian Archaeology in the Holy Land: New Discoveries. Archaeological Essays in Honour of Virgilio C. Corbo* (Collectio Maior, 36; Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing Press): 333-42.

1993a   'Gerizim, Mount', in E. Stern (ed.), *The New Encyclopaedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land* (4 vols.; New York: Simon & Schuster): II, 484-92.

1993b   'Mount Gerizim and the Samaritans', in F. Manns *et al.* (eds.), *Early Christianity in Context: Monuments and Documents* (Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing Press): 91-147.

2000   'Mt. Gerizim—A Temple City', *Qadmoniot* 33.2 (120): 74-118 (Hebrew).

2002a   'The Areas of Samaritan Settlement in the Roman-Byzantine Period', in Stern and Eshel (eds.) 2002: 245-71.

2002b   'The Samaritans in the Roman-Byzantine Period', in Stern and Eshel (eds.) 2002: 213-44.

2002c   'Samaritan Synagogues', in Stern and Eshel (eds.) 2002: 382-441.

2003   'Dr Magen: "We found about 480 marbles inscriptions, and 13,000 coins, on Mt Gerizim." The new findings of the Ancient Luza, from the Persian period till the Roman period may agitate the historical research world', *The Samaritan Update*, www.the-samaritans.com/news.html#OldNews, accessed 23 July 2003.

Magen, Y., H. Misgav and L. Tsefania

2004   *Mount Gerizim Excavations.* I. *The Aramaic, Hebrew and Samaritan Inscriptions* (ET E. Levin and M. Guggenheimer; Judea & Samaria Publications, 2; Jerusalem: Staff Officer of Archaeology, Civil Administration of Judea and Samaria) (Hebrew and English).

Magen, Y., L. Tsfania and H. Misgav

2000   'The Hebrew and Aramaic Inscriptions from Mt. Gerizim', *Qadmoniot* 33.2 (120): 125-32 (Hebrew).

Mantel, H.C.D.

1970   'The Secession of the Samaritans', *Bar Ilan* 7.8: 162-77.

Margain, J.

1988   'Targum samaritain. Aspects de la langue du ms. J.', in Rothschild and Sixdenier (eds.) 1988: 123-29.

1993   *Les particules dans le Targum Samaritain de Genèse—Exode: Jalons pour une histoire de l'araméen samaritain* (Hautes Études Orientales, 29; Geneva: Librairie Droz SA).

Mazar, B.

1957   'The Tobiads', *IEJ* 7: 137-45, 229-38.

Meshorer, Y., and S. Qedar

1991   *The Coinage of Samaria in the Fourth Century BCE* (Jerusalem: Numismatics Fine Arts International).

2002   'The Coins of the Persian Period', in Stern and Eshel (eds.) 2002: 71-81.

Mikolášek, A.

1969   'Les samaritaines gardiens de la Loi contre les Prophètes', *Communio viatorum*

12: 139-48; repr. 1995: 'The Samaritans: Guardians of the Law against the Prophets', in Crown and Davey (eds.) 1995: 85-94.

Montgomery, J.A.
1907   *The Samaritans: The Earliest Jewish Sect. Their History, Theology and Litera-ture* (Philadelphia: John C. Winston; repr. New York: Ktav, 1968).

Mor, M.
1989   'The Persian, Hellenistic and Hasmonaean Period', in Crown (ed.) 1989: 1-31.
1993   'The Samaritan Temple on Mount Gerizim', *Beit Mikra* 38: 313-27 (Hebrew).
1994   'The Samaritan Temple Once Again: Josephus Flavius and the Archaeological Find', *Beit Mikra* 40: 43-64 (Hebrew).
2003   *From Samaria to Shechem: The Samaritan Community in Antiquity* (Jerusalem: The Zalman Shazar Center for Jewish History [Hebrew]).

Mor, M. (ed.)
1992   *Jewish Sects, Religious Movements and Political Parties. Proceedings of the Third Annual Symposium of the Philip M. and Ethel Klutznick Chair in Jewish Civilization Held on Sunday-Monday, October 14-15, 1990* (Studies in Jewish Civilization, 3; Omaha, NE: Creighton University Press).

Morabito, V., A.D. Crown and L. Davey (eds.)
2000   *Samaritan Researches V: Proceedings of the Congress of the SÉS (Milan, July 8-12, 1996) and of the Special Section of the ICANAS Congress (Budapest, July 7-11, 1997)* (Studies in Judaica, 10; Sydney: Mandelbaum Publishing).

Mullen, E.T.
1997   *Ethnic Myths and Pentateuchal Foundations: A New Approach to the Formation of the Pentateuch* (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press).

Müller-Kessler, C.
2003   Review of Abraham Tal, *A Dictionary of Samaritan Aramaic* (2 vols.; Leiden: E.J. Brill), in *BO* 60.3-4: 428-44.

Na'aman, N.
1988   'Population Changes in Palestine following Assyrian Deportations', *Cathedra* 54 (December): 43-63 (Hebrew).

Naveh, J.
2002   'Script and Inscriptions in Ancient Samaria', in Stern and Eshel (eds.) 2002: 372-81.

Naveh, J., and Y. Magen
1997   'Aramaic and Hebrew Inscriptions of the Second Century BCE at Mount Gerizim', *Atiqot* 32: 9-17.

Neubauer, A.
1869   'Chronique samaritaine suive d'un appendice contenant de courtes notices sur quelques autres ouvrages samaritaines', *JA* 14.6: 385-470.

Niessen, F.
2000   *Eine Samaritanische Version des Buches Yehošua' und die Šoḇaḵ-Erzählung: Die Samaritanische Chronik Nr. II, Handschrift 2: JR(G) 1168 = Ryl. Sam. MS 259, Folio 8b-53a* (Texte und Studien zur Orientalistik, 12; Hildesheim: Georg Olms).

Nodet, E.
1992   *Essai sur les origines du Judaïsme: de Josue aux Pharisiens* (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf).
1997   *A Search for the Origins of Judaism: From Joshua to the Mishnah* (trans. E. Growley; JSOTSup, 248; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, rev. edn of Nodet 1992).

Noja, S.
1970   '*Kitāb al-Kāfi' dei Samaritani* (Napoli: Istituto Orientale di Napoli).
1989   'The Last Decade in Samaritan Studies', in Crown (ed.) 1989: 802-14.

Payne-Smith, R.
    1863   'The Samaritan Chronicle of Abū 'l-Fatch, the Arabic Text from the Ms in the Bodleian Library, with a Literal English Translation', *Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift für evangelische theologische Forschung* 1863.2: 304-55, 431-59.
Pohl, H.
    1974   *Kitāb al-Mīraṯ. Das Buch der Erbschaft des Samaritaners. Abū Isḥāq Ibrāhīm. Kritische Edition mit Übersetzung und Kommentar* (Studia Samaritana, 2; Berlin: W. de Gruyter).
Porten, B. *et al.*
    1996   *The Elephantine Papyri in English: Three Millennia of Cross-Cultural Continuity and Change* (Documenta et Monumenta Orientis Antiqui; Leiden: E.J. Brill).
Powels, S.
    1977   *Der Kalender der Samaritaner anhand des Kitāb Ḥisāb as-Sinīn und andere Handschriften* (Studia Samaritana, 3; Berlin: W. de Gruyter).
    1989   'The Samaritan Calendar and the Roots of Samaritan Chronology', in Crown (ed.) 1989: 691-742.
Pummer, R.
    1976   'Present State of Samaritan Studies: I', *JSS* 21: 39-61; repr. in *AB Samaritan News* 1978: issues 211-17.
    1977   'Present State of Samaritan Studies: II', *JSS* 22: 27-47.
    1989   'Samaritan Material Remains and Archaeology', in Crown (ed.) 1989: 135-77.
    1992   'Einführung in den Stand der Samaritanerforschung', in Dexinger and Pummer (eds.) 1992: 1-66.
    1993a   *Samaritan Marriage Contracts and Deeds of Divorce*, I (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz).
    1993b   'Temple', in Crown, Pummer and Tal (eds.) 1993: 229-31.
    1995   'The *Samareitikon* Revisited', in Crown and Davey (eds.) 1995: 381-455.
    1998   'The Greek Bible and the Samaritans', *REJ* 157/3-4: 236-358.
    2002   *Early Christian Authors on Samaritans and Samaritanism: Texts, Translations and Commentary* (Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism, 2; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).
Pummer, R., with assistance from A. Tal
    1997   *Samaritan Marriage Contracts and Deeds of Divorce*, II (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz).
Purvis, J.D.
    1968   *The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Origin of the Samaritan Sect* (HSM, 2; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).
    1981   'The Samaritan Problem: A Case Study in Jewish Sectarianism in the Roman Era', in B. Halpern and J. Levinson (eds.), *Traditions in Transformation: Turning Points in Biblical Faith* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns): 323-50.
    1986   'The Samaritans and Judaism', in R. Kraft and G.W.E. Nickelsburg (eds.), *Early Judaism and its Modern Interpreters* (Atlanta: Scholars Press): 81-98.
Rabello, A.M.
    2002   'The Samaritans in Roman Law', in Stern and Eshel (eds.) 2002: 481-95.
Rappaport, U.
    1990   'The Samaritans in the Hellenistic Period', *Zion* 55.4: 373-96 (Hebrew; Eng. summary, p. xv).
    1995   'The Samaritans in the Hellenistic Period', in Crown and Davey (eds.) 1995: 281-88.
    1999   'Reflections on the Origins of the Samaritans', in Y. ben-Artzi, I. Bartal and E. Reiner (eds.), *Studies in Geography and History in Honour of Yehoshua Ben-Arieh* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press): 10-19.
Reich, R.
    2002   'Samaritan Amulets from the Late Roman and Byzantine Periods', in Stern and Eshel (eds.) 2002: 289-309.

Reicke, B.
    1968   *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte. Die biblische Welt von 500 v. Chr. bis 100 n. Chr.* (Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 2nd edn [1965]).
Robert, P. de
    1988   'La naissance des études samaritaines en Europe aux XVIe et XVIIe siècles', in Rothschild and Sixdenier (eds.) 1988: 15-26.
    1995   'Observations sur l'histoire sainte samaritaine', in Crown and Davey (eds.) 1995: 47-56.
Robertson, E.
    1938   *Catalogue of the Samaritan Manuscripts in the John Rylands Library, Manchester*, I (Manchester: Manchester University Press).
    1962   *Catalogue of the Samaritan Manuscripts in the John Rylands Library, Manchester.* II. *The Gaster Manuscripts* (Manchester: Manchester University Press).
Rothschild, J.P.
    1985   *Catalogue des manuscrits samaritains* (Paris: Bibliotheque Nationale).
    1989   'Samaritan Manuscripts: A Guide to the Collections and Catalogues', in Crown (ed.) 1989: 771-801.
Rothschild, J.P., and G.D. Sixdenier (eds.)
    1988   *Études samaritaines. Pentateuque et Targum, exégèse et philologie, chroniques—(Communications présentées à la table ronde internationale "Les Manuscrits samaritains. Problèmes et méthodes" [Paris 7-9 octobre 1985])* (Leuven: E. Peeters).
Rowley, H.H.
    1955–56   'Sanballat and the Samaritan Temple', *BJRL* 38: 166-98; repr. 1963, in *Men of God: Studies in Old Testament History and Prophecy* (London: Thomas Nelson): 246-76.
Sanders, E.P., A.I. Baumgarten and A. Mendelson (eds.)
    1981   *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition*. II. *Aspects of Judaism in the Graeco-Roman Period* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press).
Sanderson, J.E.
    1986   *An Exodus Scroll from Qumran: 4QPaleoExod and the Samaritan Tradition* (HSM, 30; Atlanta: Scholars Press).
Schiffman, L.H.
    1985   'The Samaritans in Tannaitic Halakhah', *JQR* 75.4: 323-50.
Schur, N.
    1989   *History of the Samaritans* (BEATAJ, 18; Frankfurt AM: Peter Lang).
    1995   'Some Instances of the Impact of Samaritan Studies on the Historiography of the Holy Land', in Crown and Davey (eds.) 1995: 289-94.
    2002a   'Persecutions of the Samaritans by the Abbasids and the Disappearance of the Samaritan Rural Population', in Stern and Eshel (eds.) 2002: 587-90.
    2002b   'The Samaritans in the Mamluk and Ottoman Periods, and in the Twentieth Century', in Stern and Eshel (eds.) 2002: 602-47.
Segni, L. di
    1990   'The Church of Mary Theotokos on Mount Gerizim: The Inscriptions', in G.C. Bottini *et al.* (eds.), *Christian Archaeology in the Holy Land: New Discoveries. Archaeological Essays in Honor of Virgilio C. Corbo* (Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing Press): 343-50.
    2002   'Samaritan Revolts in Byzantine Palestine', in Stern and Eshel (eds.) 2002: 454-80.
Shahal, R.
    2001   'Transformed Relations between Jews and Samaritans in the Period after the Destruction of the Second Temple' (Unpublished PhD dissertation, Bar-Ilan University [Hebrew]).

Shearing, L.S., and S.L. McKenzie (eds.)
  1999   *Those Elusive Deuteronomists: The Phenomenon of Pan-Deuteronomism* (JSOTSup, 268; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).
Shehadeh, H.
  1977   'The Arabic Translation of the Samaritan Pentateuch: Prolegomena to a Critical Edition' (3 vols.; unpublished PhD dissertation; Jerusalem: Hebrew University; Hebrew and Arabic).
  1981   *Description of the Samaritan Manuscripts in the Ben Zvi Institute* (Jerusalem: Hebrew University).
  1988   'The Groups of the Samaritan Manuscripts of the Arabic Translation of the Pentateuch', in Rothschild and Sixdenier (eds.) 1988: 205-17.
  1989   *The Arabic Translation of the Samaritan Pentateuch: Edited from Manuscripts with an Introductory Volume* (vol. I, *Genesis–Exodus*; Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Science and Humanities [Hebrew; Arabic and English]).
  1991   'A New Group of Manuscripts Including an Arabic Translation of the Samaritan Pentateuch (ATSP)', in Tal and Florentin (eds.) 1991: 275-92.
  1995   'The Arabic of the Samaritans and its Importance', in Crown and Davey (eds.) 1995: 551-75.
  2000   'The Samaritan Arabic Liturgy', in Morabito, Crown and Davey (eds.) 2000: 2.47-84.
  2002   *The Arabic Translation of the Samaritan Pentateuch: Edited from Manuscripts with an Introductory Volume* (vol. II, *Leviticus–Numbers–Deuteronomy*; Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities [Hebrew; Arabic and English]).
Shunnar, Z.
  1974   *Katalog Samaritanischer Handschriften I* (Berlin: W. de Gruyter).
Sixdenier, G.D.
  1988   'Le targum samaritain du Pentateuque: examen comparé de quelques variantes à témoins rares des versions de l'Exode', in Rothschild and Sixdenier (eds.) 1988: 131-37.
Smith, M.
  1971   *Palestinian Parties and Politics that Shaped the Old Testament* (New York: Columbia University Press).
Spiro, A.
  1951   *Samaritans, Tobiads and Judahites in Pseudo-Philo: Use and Abuse of the Bible by Polemicists and Doctrinaires* (New York: American Academy for Jewish Research); repr. from *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research* 20 (1951): 279-355.
Stenhouse, P.
  1980   'The *Kitāb al-Tarīkh* of Abū 'l-Fath: New Edition' (Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Sydney).
  1985   *The Kitāb al-Tarīkh of Abū 'l-Fath: Translated into English with Notes* (Studies in Judaica, 1; Sydney: Mandelbaum Trust).
  1988   'The Reliability of the Chronicle of Abū 'l-Fath, with Special Reference to the Dating of Baba Rabba', in Rothschild and Sixdenier (eds.) 1988: 233-57.
  1989   '*Samaritan Chronicles*', in Crown (ed.) 1989: 218-65.
Stern, E.
  2002   'A Hoard of Persian Period Bullae from the Vicinity of Samaria', in Stern and Eshel (eds.) 2002: 82-106.
Stern, E., and H. Eshel (eds.)
  2002   *Sefer Hashomronim (The Book of the Samaritans)* (Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi [Hebrew]).
Tal, A.
  1980–83   *The Samaritan Targum of the Pentateuch: A Critical Edition* (3 vols.; Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University Press).

1988   'L'exégèse samaritaine à travers les manuscrits du targum', in Rothschild and Sixdenier (eds.) 1988: 139-48.

1989   'Samaritan Literature', in Crown (ed.) 1989: 413-67.

1993   'Halachich Literature', in Crown, Pummer and Tal (eds.) 1993: 108-11.

2000   *A Dictionary of Samaritan Aramaic* (Handbook of Oriental Studies, 50; 2 vols.; Leiden: E.J. Brill).

Tal, A., and M. Florentin (eds.)

1991   *Proceedings of the First International Congress of the Société d'Études Samaritaines, Tel-Aviv, April 11-13, 1988* (Tel-Aviv: Chaim Rosenberg School for Jewish Studies, Tel Aviv University).

Talmon, S.

1974   'Biblical Tradition of the Early History of the Samaritans', in J. Aviram (ed.), *Eretz Shomron: The 30th Archaeological Convention* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society): 19-37 (Hebrew).

Tov, E.

1991   'A New Understanding of the Samaritan Pentateuch in the Wake of the Discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls', in Tal and Florentin (eds.) 1991: 293-303.

1992   *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press).

1998   'Rewritten Bible Compositions and Biblical Manuscripts, with Special Attention to the Samaritan Pentateuch', *DSD* 5.3: 334-54.

2003   'The Nature of the Large-Scale Differences between the LXX and MT S T V, Compared with Similar Evidence from Qumran and the SP and with Similar Reference to the Original Shape of the Bible', in A. Schenker (ed.) *The Earliest Text of the Hebrew Bible: The Relationship Between the Masoretic Text and the Hebrew Base of the Septuagint Reconsidered* (Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series, 52; IOSCS, 52; Atlanta: Scholars Press): 121-44.

Tsedaka, A.N., and R. Tsedaka (eds.)

1961–65   *Jewish and Samaritan Versions of the Pentateuch—With Particular Stress on the Difference between Both Texts* (Tel Aviv: [privately published] [Hebrew]).

Tsedaka, B.

1991   'Special Samaritan Traditions in Non-Samaritan Sources', in Tal and Florentin (eds.) 1991: 189-201.

1992   'Samaritanism-Judaism or Another Religion?', in Mor (ed.) 1992: 47-51.

1995   'The Contribution of "A.B.-*The Samaritan News*" to Samaritan Studies', in Crown and Davey (eds.) 1995: 107-18.

2000   'The Samaritans' Own Contribution to Samaritan Studies', in Morabito, Crown and Davey (eds.) 2000: 1.51-56.

2001   *A Summary of the History of the Samaritan Israelites* (Ḥolon: A.B. Institute).

forthcoming   *History of the Samaritans Based on their Own Sources* (Ḥolon: A.B. Institute).

Tsedaka, B., and Y. ben Ratzon Tsedaka

2001   *Objects and Challenges of A.B. Institute of Samaritan Studies in Israel at the Dawn of the Third Millennium CE* (Ḥolon: A.B. Institute).

Tsedaka, I.

2000   *The Samaritan Torah Fully Punctuated According to Samaritan Readings* (Ḥolon: A.B. Institute).

Ulrich, E.

1999   *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible* (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Leiden: E.J. Brill).

Van Seters, J.

1992   *Prologue to History: The Yahwist as Historian in Genesis* (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press).

1994   *The Life of Moses: The Yahwist as Historian in Exodus–Numbers* (Kampen: Kok Pharos).

Vilmar, E.
    1865   *Abulfathi Annales Samaritani: quos Arabice edidit cum prolegomenis* (Gothae: F.A. Perthes).
Vilsker, L.H.
    1981   *Manuel d'Araméen Samaritain. Traduit du russe par Jean Margain* (Paris: Éditions du centre national de la recherche scientifique).
Wacholder, B.Z.
    1974   *Eupolemus: A Study of Judeo-Greek Literature* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press).
Wedel, G.
    1987   'Kitâb al-Ṭabbâḫ des Abū l-Ḥasan aṣ-Ṣūrī: Kritische edition und Kommentierte Übersetzung des ersten Teils' (unpublished PhD dissertation, Freie Universität Berlin).
    1991   'Abū l-Ḥasan aṣ-Ṣūrī's Kitâb al-Ṭabbâḫ. Results of the Edition, Translation and Commentary of Half of the Book', in Tal and Florentin (eds.) 1991: 305-12.
Whaley, E.B.
    1992   'Josephus' *Antiquities* 11.297-347: Unravelling the Evidence Regarding the Founding of the Gerizim Temple and the Background of the Samaritan Religious Community', in Mor (ed.) 1992: 1-21.
Widengren, G.
    1977   'The Persian Period', in J. Hayes and M. Miller (eds.), *Israelite and Judean History* (London: SCM Press): 489-538.
Williamson, H.G.M.
    1978   'The Historical Value of Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities* xi 297-301', *JTS* 28: 49-66.
    1992   'Sanballat', in D.N. Freedman (ed.), *The Anchor Bible Dictionary* (New York: Doubleday): V, 973-75.
Yahuda, S.
    1908a   'Über die Unechtheit des Samaritanischen Josuabuches', *Sitzungsberichte der Berliner Akademie des Wissenschaftes* 39: 887-914.
    1908b   'Zum Samaritanischen Josua: eine Erklärung', *ZDMG* 62.4: 754.
Yellin, D.
    1902   'Das Buch Josua der Samaritaner in hebräisch', *Jerusalem Yearbook* 6.2: 138-55 and 6.3: 203-205 (Hebrew).
    1908   'A Book of Joshua or a Sepher Hayamim', *Jerusalem Yearbook* 7.7 (1908).
Zangenberg, J.
    1994   *Samareia: Antike Quellen zur Geschichte und Kultur der Samaritaner in deutscher Übersetzung* (Texte und Arbeiten zum Neutestamentlichen Zeitalter, 15; Tübingen: A. Francke Verlag).
    1998   *Frühes Christentum in Samarien: Topographische und traditionsgeschichtliche Studien zu den Samarientexten im Johannesevangelium* (Texte und Arbeiten zum Neutestamentlichen Zeitalter, 27; Tübingen: A. Francke Verlag).
Zsengellér, J.
    1998   *Gerizim as Israel: Northern Tradition of the Old Testament and the Early History of the Samaritans* (Utrechtse Theologische Reeks, 38; Utrecht: University of Utrecht).
Zvi, I. ben
    1935   *Sefer Hashomronim* (Tel Aviv: Shtibel; rev. edns 1970, 1977; Jerusalem: Yad Ishak Ben-Zvi [Hebrew]).

Web Sites
The Israelite Samaritans (www.mystae.com/samaritans.html).
The Samaritan Update (www.the-samaritans.com) [continually updated].

THE GOSPEL COMMUNITY DEBATE: STATE OF THE QUESTION

Edward W. Klink III

University of St. Andrews
St Andrews, Fife, Scotland
ewk@st-andrews.ac.uk

ABSTRACT

For the last few decades the growing assumption has been that a community exists behind each of the four canonical Gospels. Elaborate reconstructions and reading techniques have been employed to draw out the characteristics of these communities, with the assumption that if we can see 'behind the text', we could better interpret the text itself. Recently the scholarly reconstruction of the communities behind the Gospels has been challenged by *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences*, edited by Richard Bauckham. Since the publication of *The Gospels for All Christians*, several discussions have begun concerning the nature of the Gospel communities, as well as the overall methods for reading the Gospels. This article attempts to place the Gospel community debate in the current discussion and direct it toward future resolve.

Introduction

For decades Gospels research has considered it axiomatic that the four evangelists all wrote for their own particular Christian communities. Elaborate reconstructions of the four Gospel communities have been proposed using technical reading techniques that attempt to get 'behind the text' of each Gospel. A recent trend has developed in Gospels study that challenges this current understanding of the Gospels' origin and audience. This challenge was proposed in 1998 by Richard Bauckham in *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences* (*GAC*) with contributions from several other British scholars. The most crucial and well-received essay in *GAC* is the initial chapter by Richard Bauckham entitled 'For Whom Were Gospels Written?', which presents the main argument for a

paradigm shift in reading the Gospels. In his critique of *GAC*, David C. Sim (2001: 5) admits: 'Without a doubt the most important chapter in this volume is the first essay, "For Whom Were Gospels Written?" by Richard Bauckham himself. It is this offering that presents the most sustained attack on the consensus position and the most detailed account of the alternative hypothesis'.

Bauckham's thesis challenges and refutes the current consensus in Gospels scholarship which assumes that the Gospels were written for a specific church or group of churches, and proposes that it is more probable that the Gospels were written for general circulation around the churches with a general Christian audience in view. 'Their implied readership is not specific but indefinite: any and every Christian community in the late-first-century Roman Empire' (1998a: 1-2). Bauckham's important thesis has four primary and cumulative parts, each of which we should now summarize.

First, the assumption that a more specific audience is intended is simply taken for granted. In fact, as Bauckham argues, whereas the Christian background of the audience is often given extensive support and argumentation in its discussion, the question of the specific or general nature of the audience is remarkable for having never been discussed in print (1998b: 10). This assumption is an old view in British scholarship, going back to at least the end of the nineteenth century. But it was made commonplace by B.H. Streeter's *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins* (1924). Central for Streeter was the view that each of the four Gospels must have originated in a major center of Christianity; only this accounts for the prestige of all four and their eventual canonization. According to Streeter, 'Thus we are led on to the view that the Gospels were written in and for different churches, and that each of the Gospels must have attained local recognition as a religious classic, if not yet an inspired scripture, before the four were combined into a collection recognized by the whole church' (p. 12).

Around the same time Streeter was developing his major source-critical work, German scholarship was formulating an understanding of the Gospels creation that would carry even further the concept of the Gospel 'community'. According to the form critics, the Gospels were created in and for their own *Sitz im Leben*, which can and must be defined if the Gospels are to be read correctly. Martin Dibelius, one of the early and most influential form critics, defined *Sitz im Leben* as 'the historical and social stratum in which precisely these literary forms were developed' (1934: 7). Later with redaction criticism, the Gospel's *Sitz im Leben* received even more attention. Willi Marxsen (1969) was the first to introduce three *Sitze im Leben*. According to Marxsen (p. 23), the first life-setting is the unique

situation of Jesus' activity (i.e. the historical Jesus); the second life-setting is the situation of the primitive church (i.e. form criticism); finally, the third life-setting is the unique situation of the evangelist's creation of the Gospel (i.e. redaction criticism). Following in the work of these early and founding redaction critics, the late 1960s and 70s saw the production of works on the Gospels that were specifically concerned with the unique community and situation of each of the Gospels, and eventually the increasingly sophisticated use of social-scientific methods for reconstructing the community behind each Gospel.

Second, the ramifications of building upon a false assumption inevitably led to the acceptance of unproven hypotheses. Bauckham questions whether the assumption being practiced in current Gospels research is in any way confirmed by the fact that multiple conclusions and results have been built upon it. For Bauckham, the derived results are simply the consequences of applying a particular reading strategy to the text, not of showing that this particular reading strategy does 'better justice to the text than another reading strategy' (1998b: 22).

Third, it seems more appropriate to assume, based upon historical evidence, that someone writing a Gospel in the late first century would have envisaged a more general audience (1998b: 26-27). This seems to be an appropriate counter-assumption to the community reconstructions simply by contrasting the Gospels with the Pauline epistles. The Pauline epistles were addressed to identifiable Christian communities with specific problems. In this way, the epistles could be better understood by the historical context of the addressees. The Gospels, unlike epistles, have no particular addressees assumed within the document. The difference in literary genre between epistles and the Gospels implies a different type of reading, hence a different or less specific readership. This does not imply a Gospel's audience would be completely indefinite, for the Gospels were limited by their historical time and first-century geographical context. Nor does it imply that early Christian traditions concerning Gospel authorship and provenance were in error, for as Bauckham explains, 'whereas letters (though not invariably) stopped at their first recipients, anyone in the first century who wrote a book such as a *bios* expected it to circulate to readers unknown to its author' (1998b: 29).

> The careful literary crafting of each…and the small size of individual congregations in the first century make it unlikely that any of the Gospels were composed for the strictly local and intramural use of a single community. Broader dissemination in Christian circles, if not beyond, must have been intended from the outset (Gamble 1995: 102).

Fourth, the consensus that views an early Christian community as a seg-regated, self-sufficient, introverted group, having little contact with other Christian groups, and little sense of a broad Christian movement is an unrealistic depiction. The general character of the early Christian move-ment should not be pictured as 'a scattering of isolated, self-sufficient communities with little or no communication between them, but quite the opposite: a network of communities with constant, close communication among themselves' (Bauckham 1998b: 30). This aspect of the early church is not an assumed reconstruction but is supported by the historical evidence we have concerning the late first and early second centuries of Christianity (Casson 1974; Malherbe 1977: 64-68; Thompson 1998). But physical communication was not the only definable aspect of early Christian inter-connectedness. 'The local groups of early Christians not only enjoyed a high level of cohesion and group identity, they were also made aware that they belonged to a larger movement, "with all who invoke the name of the Lord Jesus Christ in every place" (1 Cor. 1.2)' (Meeks 1983: 107).

Gospels for All Christians: Coming Warnings

It seems as though the ground was ripe for the broader audience concept promoted by *GAC*. As early as 1979, Luke Timothy Johnson criticizes the community reconstructions in the Gospel of Luke. For Johnson, recon-structing Pauline communities is difficult; reconstructing Gospel commu-nities is disastrous. Even if we assumed that a community existed behind the Gospel, we would not be certain how to apply the information from the text to the specific community. He uses the example of the discussion of prayer in Luke: Are we to suppose that Luke stresses praying because his community does not pray (or that some in the community do not pray)? Or are we to assume his community is correcting an inappropriate view on prayer; one that requires a theological lesson (p. 91)? For Johnson, any-thing but a general description of Luke's readers does an injustice to the text; it destroys the text's intended literary meaning.

Following Johnson, several other interpreters, some who continued to use community reconstructions, also saw methodological problems. In 1988, Dale Allison argued that even the term 'Lukan community' should not be used in application to the Gospel. In a volume dealing with the approaches to Matthaean community reconstructions (Balch 1991), Jack Dean Kingsbury gives a surprising warning to such a methodological practice. Kingsbury admits that 'the text itself is not regarded as the pri-mary concern but as a vehicle for getting at something else, namely, the

social situation of the community of Matthew' (1991: 262). Kingsbury argues that such a method is not inappropriate per se, but it may be also appropriate for the historian to ask herself if more thought should be given to the question of how one moves from text to a particular social situation.

We even find a similar warning discussed in Graham Stanton's *A Gospel for a New People* (1992). Stanton discusses the ability to find the Matthaean community within the text of Matthew. He admits, 'A reconstruction on these lines must inevitably draw heavily on the disciplined imagination of the historian. One's overall map of the "parting of the ways" between Christians and Jews in the latter half of the first century and in the early decades of the second will be as important as the text of the gospel itself' (p. 281). In a later article he revisits his previous warning (1994). In this article Stanton's thesis is to show 'that some of the more recent work on other early Christian writings…is a further reminder of the value of setting Matthew in the broadest possible context within early Judaism and early Christianity' (p. 9). The methodological key, for Stanton, is that a Gospel is not a letter. Since a letter does not give a clear window onto the social situation of the recipients, a Gospel must then be treated with even more caution. Stanton even states, 'Matthew's gospel should not be expected to provide us with detailed information about the social setting of the first recipients. I am convinced that Matthew's choice of literary genre and the evidence of the text of the gospel itself both point in this direction' (p. 11).

In 1992, Frederik Wisse argued, in an article entitled 'Historical Method and the Johannine Community', that the hypotheses used to determine the historical circumstances of the Gospel of John's composition through indirect data is highly problematic. According to Wisse, 'Such information is able to provide only a few faint and idiosyncratic hints of individuals but not something that clearly applies to whole communities' (p. 39). To solve major historical uncertainties in the history of early Christianity, Gospel scholars made the startling assumption that the early Christian writings are virtually unique among literary texts in that they bear the transparent imprint of the historical situation of a community. The practice of this hypothesis reveals, according to Wisse, that biblical scholars 'have great difficulty facing up to the disappointment that the historical conclusions warranted by the evidence are very limited' (p. 42). A similar critique of Johannine community reconstructions was presented by Thomas Brodie from a source-oriented approach in 1993.

Even within the field of social scientists and social historians, warnings of the illegitimacy of explicit communities drawn from the text of the Gospels were being given. According to Edwin Judge:

> This objection rests upon the assumption that the contents of the gospels will have been shaped by the interests of the communities for which they were composed. Therefore if the gospels condemn wealth, this implies a community which does not enjoy it. But one only needs to recall Seneca to recognize the capacity of the well-to-do and cultivated to admire the strictures of philosophy while safely insulated against their consequences. Should one not also allow the possibility of a gospel compiler sharply critical of the use of wealth amongst those for whom he wrote (cf. the epistle of James)? (1980: 208)

A similar critique is given a decade later by Bengt Holmberg (1990). Dealing with an appraisal of the same debate and other sociological approaches used to derive the social context behind the Gospel texts, he states: 'The postulate of complete and positive correlation between a text and the social group that carries and receives it is implausible. To read the gospel narratives as if they were uniformly allegories of early church life is, if nothing else, somewhat unimaginative' (pp. 124-25).

Finally, Stephen Barton surveys the current community research in his 1992 article, 'The Communal Dimension of Earliest Christianity: A Critical Survey of the Field'. In this article Barton describes how current study of the New Testament has had an 'explosion of interest' in the early church communities. Barton argues that both the critical developments in New Testament research, as well as the theological emphases on church and community in recent years, have led to this trend. Barton gives a warning that a pure allegorical reading of the Gospels used to derive a supposed community behind them may be inappropriate. Barton states, 'For the way in which the Gospels are read often as virtual allegories of communities or groups, whose needs, interests and history they are supposed to reflect in a quite transparent way, is open to serious doubt' (p. 425). Barton was not attempting to disallow Gospels research from looking at the communal dimension, but simply be forced to comply with 'a much greater methodological accountability' (p. 425). Thus, we have seen that there were hints of a coming warning just prior to the work of Bauckham.

Gospels for All Christians: The Aftermath

When *GAC* arrived, its thesis brought forth various responses in various degrees. Some responses were positive and perceived the new paradigm to be in general agreement with other areas of New Testament research. An example of this can be seen in a monograph by Graham H. Twelftree (1999). Twelftree builds upon Bauckham's argument of a broader audi-

ence in order to explain his theory of the silence of exorcisms in the Gospel of John (p. 222). But, as we will discuss below, others were not as convinced. Since a full discussion of responses and related interaction to *GAC* is beyond the scope of this article, we will detail the highlights in a chronological fashion to show how the Gospel community debate has developed and the hermeneutical areas around which it has centered.

One of the first scholars to provide criticism of Bauckham's thesis was his own colleague, Philip Esler, in 1998. Although Esler presented criticisms of several contributors in the volume and at several areas of the new paradigm, his primary critique was that Bauckham *et al.* had failed to consider the cultural distance between the modern interpreter and the first-century readers. Discourse, he argued, can only be understood within particular social contexts and can only be retrieved by the scholars who use the resources available to them from the social sciences (p. 237). Esler argued, 'The detailed familiarity with the ancient data, which is an admirable characteristic particular of Bauckham but also of the other contributors, will normally not be enough if the data is still viewed within interpretive frameworks derived from North Atlantic ways of understanding the world' (pp. 237-38). In the same journal volume, Bauckham (1998d) gives a specific response to the criticisms presented by Esler. Already we have the old and new paradigms clashing against one another.

A second major critique came from within the pages of a commentary on Mark by Joel Marcus in 2000. In a section of his introduction called 'Setting: The Markan Community', Marcus summarizes Bauckham's thesis and argues that the Gospels should still be seen as having been directed 'in the first instance' to individual communities (p. 26). Marcus's arguments against this thesis are based upon what Marcus considers to be Bauckham's contradictory understanding of the nature of writing and the use of documents in antiquity. Marcus claims that the very fact the church kept and used four different Gospels supports the community hypothesis. In the end, according to Marcus, the text of the Gospel of Mark does not support Bauckham's thesis (pp. 26-28). Marcus concludes:

> Bauckham may well be correct in speculating that Mark hoped his Gospel would eventually reach a wider readership, and this desire may explain its fairly quick appropriation by the Matthean and Lukan groups. But it was also probably still intended in the first instance as a teaching tool for Mark's local church (2000: 28).

In the same year, *The Origins of Mark: The Markan Community in Current Debate* (2000), the revised doctoral dissertation of Dwight N. Peterson, entered the Gospel community debate with a helpful response to

these hermeneutical issues. Interestingly, although Peterson mentions Bauckham and *GAC*, it appears that the dissertation on which the monograph is based was written before *GAC* was published. Peterson approaches the Gospel community debate by studying the hermeneutical principles used by proponents of such an interpretive method. He argues that the common practice of reconstructing communities behind the Gospels are means of attaining 'interpretive control' and using a particular 'interpretive strategy' in order to achieve desired results (pp. 156-61). The nature of such a method, whereby the text is used as a window to see the originating aspects of an early Christian community so that the text can be understood, is a circular and illegitimate practice (p. 3; see also pp. 52-55).

Peterson presents his critique of the Markan community reconstructions by looking specifically at three major Markan proponents: Werner Kelber (1974; 1979), Howard Clark Kee (1977) and Ched Myers (1988). After giving an introduction and survey of the development of the Markan community, and a chapter to each of these scholars and their interpretive methods, Peterson concludes with his most important chapter: a hermeneutical critique of the Markan community construction. Peterson lists and explains four problematic and 'unjustified assumptions which are entailed within the drive to construct communities behind documents' (2000: 158).

First, Markan community constructors assume it is possible to get into the mind of the author of Mark in a way that will enable us to determine the author's intended meaning. According to Peterson, we should be cautious in our attempts to define authorial intent in Mark when we are not even certain who the author actually was. All the more then, it is just as dangerous to write

> as if one can reconstruct the intention of an author when one has no information about who the author was, or why that author wrote, other than that abstracted from the document one is reading, and then use that reconstructed 'intention' as a measuring stick against which to judge appropriate and inappropriate readings of Mark (2000: 159).

Peterson argues that intentionality of a document is not the basis of interpretation, but the result.

Second, Markan community constructions assume they know about the condition of the original audience, and that this original audience is somehow constitutive of the meaning of the text. Peterson states plainly that 'This assumption is central if the hermeneutical maneuver of referring to the historical Markan community for explanatory power is going to work' (2000: 161). For Peterson the work of Dan O. Via (1988: 74) is helpful here: the employers of community reconstructions claim to be moving from

'context to text' when in reality they are moving 'in the opposite direc-
tion'. Since the community behind Mark cannot be known from sources
other than Mark, but must rather be constructed from the text of Mark, the
historical certainty of such a construction is weak at best (p. 163).

Third, Markan community constructions assume the apparent belief that
influence is a one-way street, namely, that the community behind Mark
existed in time and space. This understanding places the social context as
primary; the social and historical context of the community 'controls' and
'influences' what it is the text is allowed to do and say (p. 169). Thus, as
Peterson states:

> In this understanding of influence…the socio-historical setting must first be
> sketched out from the narrative before it can be held to *influence* the mean-
> ing of the narrative. Influence thus *appears* to be unidirectional, but in these
> cases is *actually* (although not admittedly) at least two directional. This idea
> of 'influence,' in which the Gospel of Mark is understood to 'reflect' prior
> socio-historical circumstances, also does insufficient justice to the ways in
> which a narrative such as Mark may have been embedded in its social-his-
> torical situation, simultaneously exerting influence and being influenced in
> (at least) dialogical fashion (2000: 168; emphasis original).

Thus, even the supposed historical reality behind which the text of the
Gospel (of Mark) was produced is unrealistic, hence, unhistorical.

Fourth, the use of Markan communities as the basis for one's reading of
Mark is a procedure that only hides the real interests of the interpreter: 'It
tends to obscure the interests of the reader of Mark behind a screen of
alleged historical "objectivity"' (p. 170). The so-called objectivity of the
interpreter, who uses a reconstructed socio-historical community, in most
cases, only frees that same interpreter to apply to the text their desired
methodological devices. Such an approach is not only anti-historical, but
results in an unnecessary constraint being placed on the text.

Finally, also in 2000, Martin Hengel's *The Four Gospels and the One
Gospel of Jesus Christ* promoted an independent version of the broad
audience hypothesis. Hengel states:

> Contrary to a widespread view, none of the four Gospels was written for
> one particular community; far less do they simply reproduce the views of
> one individual community. They give primarily the views of their authors.
> We cannot even say with certainty whether they ever came into being in
> one community, for the missionaries of the early church traveled a great
> deal and could be authoritative teachers at different places. So we should
> stop talking automatically about 'the community of Mark', 'of Luke', 'of
> Matthew', 'of John' as the one really responsible for the composition of a
> Gospel writing and its theology (2000: 107).

Although Hengel's primary focus is on the origin and use of the term 'gospel' in the early church and its unified meaning, he deals briefly here with the concept of the canonical Gospels and their message of salvation for the 'whole' church (2000: 106-15). It is interesting that despite a note concerning one of the *GAC* essays dealing with the interconnectedness of the early church (Thompson 1998), he neglects to mention a book with a similarly radical thesis published two years earlier.

The most detailed critique of Bauckham's thesis came from David C. Sim in a 2001 article directly responding to *GAC*. Sim's critique of Bauckham's thesis is that it is circumstantial in nature and does not give legitimate evidence for the hypothesis which it supports (p. 9). Sim claims that Bauckham's concept of the early church, its travel and communicative nature, and its self-conscious existence, is in no way represented by the picture provided by Bauckham. Sim spends time laying out his critiques of not only Bauckham but of all the contributors of this broad audience thesis. Overall, Sim lays a heavy-laden critique at Bauckham which labels all his arguments as both unsupported by the texts themselves and unsupported by our knowledge of the early church. It seems as if Sim's critique is intended to do more than respond to *GAC* since, as he admits, he published a detailed study of the Matthaean community the same year *GAC* was published (1998). Sim notes concerning the reception of his book on the Matthaean community, 'In the subsequent reviews of this book, no less than three reviewers (thus far) independently referred to the Bauckham volume, and each of them made the point that my work had been compromised to some extent by the arguments presented in this particular book' (2001: 4).

Congresses and Conferences: The Debate Continues

The new paradigm that Bauckham *et al.* proposed in *GAC* was not limited to technical articles and monographs on the Gospels. The discussion that was initially between individuals has recently moved to a more public stage. The scholarly community at large has begun to participate in the debate because this new paradigm touches upon a whole range of issues; issues important to several sub-disciplines within biblical studies. As the survey above has shown, *GAC* was not the lone voice promoting this new paradigm, or at least warning of the current paradigm's potential dangers. Many voices were a part of this shift. Thus, what we have called the Gospel community debate has officially arrived. The effect can be seen most clearly in three major conferences that dealt with various aspects of the Gospel community debate. A summary of each is given below.

Society of Biblical Literature 2002

The first public venue for discussing an aspect of the Gospel community debate was the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature in November 2002. A session was held in the Johannine Literature section with the theme: Current Issues in the Gospel of John. The main paper was given by Robert Kysar with prepared responses given by D. Moody Smith and Gail O'Day, as well as an invited brief remark by J. Louis Martyn at the close. A discussion of the issues of that session and its relation to the Gospel community debate now follows.

Robert Kysar is well known for his chronicling the history of interpretation in the Gospel of John (1975). Kysar's paper, 'The Expulsion from the Synagogue: A Tale of a Theory' (2002), sketches a tale of the past thirty-five years of Johannine scholarship around the questions of the origins and dating of the Fourth Gospel and its community. Specifically, the tale tells the 'state of the question' of the scholarly work that links the origins of the Johannine community with an expulsion from the synagogue. This theory is deeply embedded in the groundbreaking book first published in 1968 by J. Louis Martyn (2003), although others, particularly Raymond Brown (1966; 1970; 1979), played a significant role. Before discussing the other papers a brief look at Martyn's important work is in order.

It was in the 1960s, in the high point of redactional activity in all four of the Gospels, that Johannine scholarship was drastically affected by Martyn's *History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel* (2003). John Ashton states that this book, 'for all its brevity is probably the most important single work on the Gospel since Bultmann's commentary' (1991: 107). D. Moody Smith concurs: 'Martyn's thesis has become a paradigm, to borrow from Thomas Kuhn. It is a part of what students imbibe from standard works, such as commentaries and textbooks, as knowledge generally received and held to be valid' (1990: 293). Martyn stated his purpose in his introduction:

> Our first task…is to say something as specific as possible about the actual circumstances in which John wrote his Gospel. How are we to picture daily life in John's church? Have elements of its peculiar daily experiences left their stamp on the Gospel penned by one of its members? May one sense even in its exalted cadences the voice of a Christian theologian who writes *in response to contemporary events and issues* which concern, or should concern, all members of the Christian community in which he lives? (2003: 29; emphasis original)

To achieve this, according to Martyn, the text of John needs to be read on two levels: one that saw the tradition of the church and the other that was involved in the contemporary issues of the particular community (2003:

30-31). By assuming that all the Gospels drew from a similar cistern of tradition, Martyn uses a redaction-critical method to see how the Gospel of John applied this tradition (the constant) to the unique social and religious circumstance in which the evangelist lived and ministered (the variable). Martyn explains: 'Consequently, when we read the Fourth Gospel, we are listening both to tradition and to a new and unique interpretation of that tradition' (p. 30). With the results of form criticism and the community concept already in play, Martyn simply applied redaction criticism to help define more clearly the community standing behind the Fourth Gospel.

All of this, according to Martyn, allows us to read John through the historical era in which it lived; an era with increasing conflict between Jews and Christians. This is where the theory of the expulsion from the synagogue becomes important. Therefore, the Johannine literature section, and Robert Kysar's paper, are not merely looking at Christian expulsion from the synagogue in a historical sense, but the entire hermeneutical matrix in which such a theory has grown to encompass, specifically the ability to reconstruct a 'community' behind the Gospel of John.

For Kysar (2002), the tale of this theory is related to him personally as it tells the direction of his thought in recent years. Almost thirty years ago Kysar stated the following concerning the theory of the Johannine community:

> Contemporary Johannine scholarship has confirmed that the gospel is a community's document… The gospel cannot be read meaningfully apart from some understanding of the community out of which and to which it was written. Certainly no significant level of understanding of the text can be achieved without a prerequisite historical knowledge… It is incumbent upon the reader to know as much about that occasion as possible (1975: 269-70).

But concerning the importance of knowing 'as much as possible about the [historical] situation', Kysar now concludes: 'An investigation of the past usually tells us more about the investigator than the past' (2002: 12). He continues: 'Maybe we are just learning that the testing of any hypothesis is an ongoing necessity and that working hypotheses do not always "work" without flaw' (p. 15). 'As I am grateful for the work of scholars like Brown and Martyn, I suppose I have simply tired of playing the game of abstract speculative constructions' (p. 14).

The responses to Kysar's paper by D. Moody Smith (2002) and Gail R. O'Day (2002) tell a different tale. Smith admits that the title of his response should have been 'Getting at the Root of a Tale' (2002: 10). Smith spends time discussing the development of the expulsion theory by looking at Martyn's own progression beginning with his PhD dissertation

(1957). According to Smith, Martyn's original purpose was to investigate Rudolf Bultmann's claim that the salvation-history perspective is missing from the Fourth Gospel. He attempted this by 'seeking to discern the conceptual background, intended readers, and purpose in writing of the Fourth Evangelist in order to understand the Gospel's meaning back then' (2002: 3). Eventually Martyn, contra Bultmann, places the Gospel of John in a Jewish conceptual background, not Gnostic, and comes to find that the fourth evangelist 'writes for readers who are now excluded from synagogues whose experience includes this traumatic rupture. Church and synagogue are now separate' (Smith 2002: 4). While such specific reconstructions concerning the background of the Gospel of John can go astray, Smith is not convinced it is useless. 'I do not…think that the investigation of the Gospel's Christian setting need be entirely abandoned, or that Martyn would want exegesis to abandon it' (2002: 6). He continues:

> As biblical exegetes we have to deal with questions of what happened… proof beyond a reasonable doubt may be a chimera, but one we shall inevitably pursue. Absolute certainty? Almost never, especially in historical research. But probable results remain worth seeking (2002: 10).

The tale presented by O'Day (2002) is also different. Going further back than Martyn's dissertation, O'Day looks at how the classical introduction questions of provenance and date from the nineteenth and twentieth centuries were the real impetus for the eventual theory proposed by Martyn. By the time of Martyn, although the older questions of provenance and date were no longer asked, origins were still front and center (O'Day 2002: 3). The strength in Martyn's theory was how well he incorporated all aspects of critical study in his reading of John. The weakness, related to its strength, was that Martyn's theory 'became totalizing, not because his claims or even intents and methods were totalizing, but because he read [John] so well and so easily that we forgot it was a construction of the data' (p. 5). Thus, for O'Day, the tale of Martyn's theory should not lead us to reject all hypotheses based on data as an act of 'abstract speculative construction', for that never really happens. Public scholarly conversation keeps theories grounded in reality (p. 7). Rather, our scholarly conversations need to ask questions about history and even the construction of hypotheses, while 'keeping our work public and therefore available for scrutiny' (p. 7).

At the end of the session the moderator invited J. Louis Martyn to make a brief remark. Martyn claimed that his motive was and still is to allow

John to be read in its own setting, as far as we are able to do that; this is essential if we really want to hear its own voice, as a voice quite distinct from our own voices! Unfortunately, the strength in Martyn's motivation became its weakness: the only voice interpreters heard were his. In the end, the seminar revealed unknowingly the crisis facing the entire Gospel community debate even though its focus was much narrower. It too, in seeking to find the most appropriate historical context in which to place the Gospel of John, was forced to deal with the nature of hypothetical constructions and their interpretive influence.

Life in Abundance: An International Conference on the Gospel of John
The second conference related to the Gospel community debate was an international conference on the Gospel of John paying tribute to the life of Raymond E. Brown in October 2003. One of the sessions was entitled, 'The Whence and Whither of the Johannine Community', the same as the main paper given by Robert Kysar (2003), with a prepared response given by Hans-Josef Klauck (2003). In his second paper related to the debate, Kysar explored further the origin of the Johannine community reconstructions by looking not only at Martyn, but several of the key scholars and movements in the creation of Gospel communities. According to Kysar, there are four originating events that fostered the origin of the community concept now common in Johannine research. The first was the work of Raymond E. Brown, who first published his view of the Johannine community in the introduction to his commentary on John (1966). His later works (1970; 1979; 1982 and 1984) all contributed in some way to establishing the concept of a Johannine community as a key hermeneutical tool. The second was the work of J. Louis Martyn, whose work is discussed above. The third was the work of Wayne A. Meeks (1972), whose use of the methods of sociology of knowledge did much to fashion a view of the 'sectarian' Johannine community for years to come. Furthermore, Meeks's use of sociology was the spark that ignited a wide range of social-scientific investigations of the reconstructed Johannine community (Kysar 2003: 4). Finally, the fourth was the discoveries at Qumran, which linked the model of a Johannine 'sect' to another known sect in the first century. 'These four pivotal events…formed a magnetic force in Johannine scholarship. The six years between 1966 and 1972 were to set in motion a deluge of studies that took the community as their focus' (2003: 4-5); hence the 'Whence' of the community.

But as Kysar goes on to explain, the 'Whither' was not far behind. There are two problems that now confront the concept of a Johannine community

and two future challenges that need to be addressed. The first problem has to do with the evidence for such a hypothetical construction as the Johannine community (2003: 5). There are more questions than there are answers concerning the method to determine the type and make-up of a Johannine community. Kysar admits: 'If the effort to determine what constitutes evidence for the Johannine community becomes widely questioned, I fear the methodology on which it is based will prove in and of itself enough to weaken fatally the community interpretation' (p. 6). A second problem, related to the first, is that we have no way to go about testing the veracity of the proposed Johannine community.

> [I]s it the case that a supposition that seems to give meaning to specific passages is necessarily true? Is it not possible that a faulty supposition might do the same? Simply because a hypothesis illumines the possible meaning of a passage does not necessarily prove that the hypothesis is true (2003: 7).

The first challenge to the future of the Johannine community hypothesis is the entire postmodern movement, which has weakened the historical-critical method and has increased the popularity of other interpretive methods. 'Obviously, if postmodernism prevails, it will mean the death of the historical critical method of biblical interpretation and all the historical reconstructions which were results of the method, including those involving the Johannine community' (2003: 8). The second challenge, related to the first, is the rise of these new interpretive methods. A flood of studies within the new literary criticism have come onto the scene, some of which are totally incompatible with historical criticism, especially relating to the question of the locus of meaning.

> The distinction between the text as a window and as a mirror is now well known (and perhaps over used), but it entails the issue I think is vital. Of course, the meaning of a text for the historical critic lies in the occasion behind the text, so that they are required to pick up clues in the text and its larger literary context reading the events that shaped the text itself. Some literary critics, however, argue that the meaning of any text is found and discernible in the text itself without reference to the history behind it (2003: 8).

These problems and challenges that do or will confront the Johannine community hypotheses are centered on interpretive method and how one approaches the text. Kysar's forecast is that with the oncoming change in method, the current community results will be forced to change as well. For Kysar, the fact that the reconstruction of the Johannine community is

based upon historical and interpretive methods now under siege and being dismantled piece by piece gives it a dim future, if not a total demise (2003: 9-10).

The response to Kysar's paper by Hans-Josef Klauck was entitled 'Community, History, and Text(s)—a Response' (2003). Klauck agreed with the historical development of the Johannine community that Kysar presented, as well as doubts concerning its future. Thus, rather than repeat what Kysar and he have in agreement, Klauck took up one of the related issues in the Gospel community debate: the referentiality of texts. How are we to reconcile the new text-centered methodologies and postmodern theories with the salvageable aspects of historical criticism (2003: 1)?

To answer this question of referentiality in texts Klauck turns to the issue of genre (2003: 1-2). In reference to the Johannine community, the genre of the Gospel of John is an important issue as well as the assumed connection between the Johannine epistles. For Klauck, the epistles and Gospel may be seen as related, thus giving a 'partial' picture of what stands behind them (p. 2). Thus, the theoretical discussions going on in modern historiography are important to the Gospel community debate. Klauck explains the importance of this issue:

> If I understand them correctly, historians no longer pretend that they can reconstruct the past. What they do is construct history. The past can never be repeated or revived, but textual and material remains of the past may be used to construct meaningful narratives that help us to a better understanding of the situation we find ourselves in… This is exactly what we are doing just now, in discussing the rise and potential fall of an influential and respectable model in our field, i.e. the construction of the history of the Johannine community (2003: 5).

In the end, both Kysar and Klauck agree: the reconstruction of the Johannine community, as well as the other Gospel communities, has become a precarious enterprise.

Society of Biblical Literature 2003

The most recent conference related to the Gospel community debate was the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature in November 2003. In the Synoptic Gospels section a session was held with the theme: 'Gospels for All Christians? Rethinking Gospel Audiences'. Unlike the previous conferences that did not even mention *GAC*, this session was specifically designed to discuss the new paradigm presented by Bauckham *et al.* Since Bauckham was unable to be in attendance, Richard Burridge, one of the contributors to *GAC* (1998), restated the thesis of *GAC*, fol-

lowed by prepared responses by Mark A. Matson and Margaret M. Mitchell. Since the thesis of Bauckham has already been discussed above, we shall only deal with the responses given by Matson and Mitchell.

Matson's response (2003) was a rhetorical exploration in the Gospel of Matthew which asks a different question of the text than is usually asked by redaction critics. Instead of assuming the first evangelist was aware of Mark but was writing to an audience that was ignorant of Mark, Matson asks the questions: How might we read Matthew if the author was address-ing an audience already competent with the narrative of Jesus—the Gospel of Mark? How might that influence the way one understands Matthew's rhetorical force (p. 5)? After asking these questions of several texts in Matthew, Matson concludes: 'The idea that Matthew's audience had, or Matthew imagined that they had, Mark is certainly not proven' (p. 30). Unfortunately, according to Matson, this exploration neither proved nor disproved the thesis of *GAC*.

The most important part of the session was the prepared response by Margaret M. Mitchell (2003). Mitchell's paper, entitled 'Patristic Counter-evidence to the Claim that "The Gospels Were Written for All Chris-tians"', presented a powerful critique to the new paradigm promoted by Bauckham. Although Mitchell agrees with Bauckham 'that redaction criti-cal readings can dissolve into excessive "allegorical" readings of the gos-pels', she thinks the general paradigm that Bauckham proposes has both logical and methodological difficulties and does not fit with the patristic evidence (p. 2). Concerning the former, Mitchell accuses Bauckham of making overtly generalized statements concerning the Gospel literature, the nature of the Christian movement, authors, audiences and rhetorical appropriateness, and the overall logical expression of the thesis (pp. 3-11). Concerning the latter, Mitchell attempts to show that far from being unconcerned with a local audience, the patristic writers were very con-cerned with the local origins of each of the Gospels. An extended explana-tion by Mitchell is important here:

> My conclusion is that, in a rush to present patristic exegetes…as uniformly opposed to anything like 'redaction criticism,' Bauckham has overlooked the extent to which patristic interpretation of the gospels was very self-consciously and complexly working at the fulcrum between the universality and particularity of the gospels (including at times an insistence upon their original local audiences)… The gospels ultimately were read as addressing 'all Christians' in that they were regarded as having communicated a universal divine truth. That they could so effectively be read in this way was in fact their genius and was…a major factor in the rise and missionary

success of the Christian cult. But that universal readership did not concomitantly require later Christian readers (as Bauckham insists is necessary) to disregard circumstances of origin, local origin. Patristic authors found many creative ways to hold in tension their historical particularity and theological universality (2003: 12).

From this Mitchell deals with several examples of patristic texts that she claims contradicts the paradigm presented by Bauckham in *GAC*. Mitchell has provided valuable insight into the patristic issues of the Gospel community debate.

The Gospel Community Debate: The Way Forward

The above survey reveals that the Gospel community debate is far from over. But, as Robert Kysar explains, 'Contemporary biblical scholarship is deeply embedded in its culture and is, therefore, most often the result of a complex of influences, many of which are elusive' (2003: 1). While the new paradigm has created a stir, not all are convinced the paradigm needs to be as extreme as Bauckham has argued (for 'all Christians'). For example, Craig Blomberg (2001) agrees that all four Gospels would have circulated quite widely quite quickly but doubts that they were specifically written with a broad or general audience in mind. Rather, according to Blomberg, 'it is entirely plausible to combine the two approaches: the Evangelists had specific communities foremost in view, but expected their writings to be copied and passed on, and eventually to be read widely' (2001: 47). Another example has been suggested by Andrew Lincoln (2000). Lincoln agrees that one should not simply assume that writers of the Gospels either represent or write for a particular community. But, in the case of John, the 'we' language and the phenomenon of the epistles most plausibly indicates a group that stands behind the Gospel (2000: 264-65). But this need not mean that the community in which the Gospel was created was identical with the implied audience. As Lincoln explains in relation to his own work:

> [T]his study takes care to distinguish between this group, from which the Gospel emerged, and either the implied readers or intended audience that it addresses. The former may well be included in, but certainly does not exhaust, the latter. In other words, in the view posited here, although the narrative is shaped by and addresses the needs of the group from which it emerged, it also gives clear indications in its final form that its perspective transcends any particular experiences of this group and is addressed to a wider audience… We do not, however, need to banish all discussion of communities behind particular Gospels and any consideration of the herme-

> neutical significance that the enquiries behind such a discussion might have
> (2000: 265).

Thus, the nuanced positions of Blomberg and Lincoln make clear that the
Gospel community debate is a debate over definitions. The future of the
discussion centers upon four such areas.

The first area that needs definition is the use of the term 'community'. A
good example of this is the proposal above by Lincoln (2000), which,
though valid, is too vague to be of any help. How does he plan to dif-
ferentiate between the community that created the Gospel and the commu-
nity(ies) for which the Gospel was intended? If he does not want to banish
discussion of communities, a more appropriate definition is needed. There
are inherent dangers when one applies formative terms such as Gospel
'community', 'group' or 'sect' to the discussion of the audience of the
Gospels. The social anthropologist Anthony Cohen states the case plainly,
' "Community" is one of those words—like "culture" "myth", "ritual",
"symbol"—bandied around in ordinary, everyday speech, apparently
readily intelligible to speaker and listener, which, when imported into the
discourse of social science, however, causes immense difficulty' (1985:
11; see also Gusfield 1975; Barton 1993; 1998). Cohen explains further:

> [T]he community is not approached as a morphology, as a structure of
> institutions capable of objective definition and description. Instead, we try
> to understand 'community' by seeking to capture members' experience of
> it. Instead of asking, 'What does it look like to us? What are its theoretical
> implications?' we ask, 'What does it appear to mean to its members?'
> Rather than describing analytically the form of the structure from an exter-
> nal vantage point, we are attempting to penetrate the structure, to look
> *outwards* from its core (1985: 20).

Only by defining the contours of a community will the use of 'community'
terminology become helpful.

The second area that needs definition is the nature of the Gospel genre.
As Stanton (1994) already warned, a gospel is not a letter and cannot be
read like one. The work on Gospel genre by Burridge (1992; 1998) has
helped define what a Gospel is; what is needed is further discussion of
what a Gospel can do. Here the proposed question by Klauck (2003) is
helpful: the basic question is about referentiality of texts. Klauck lists
several important questions concerning referentiality:

> Do texts only refer to themselves and function as a closed system (structural
> and narrative criticism)? Do they, beyond that, only refer to other texts and
> textual worlds (intertextuality)? Do they, if they open up at all, only open
> up to the readers who create the meaning (reader-response criticism, recep-

tion history, and, in some ways, rhetorical criticism, too)? Or do they refer also to extra-textual realities, events, figures, social structures, and so on? Do they, in other words, refer to their historical context (historical criticism; social science approach)? And what does that imply? Do we need this knowledge at all, or are we better off without it? (2003: 1)

The third area that needs definition is the use and function of the Gospels in the early church. Mitchell (2003) challenges the new paradigm with patristic evidence. According to Mitchell, the patristic evidence points to numerous local audience traditions that were interested in the historical and local origins of Gospels. For Mitchell, these Gospel origins acted as a 'hermeneutical key' for later readers of the Gospels: 'the fact that these traditions arose at all…is indicative of the hermeneutical awareness in the early church of the multi-dimensional addressees of the gospel literature' (p. 17). But could the same evidence be read in a different way? What, for example, does Mitchell mean by 'hermeneutical key' or 'hermeneutical awareness'? Two questions seem most pertinent here. First, do the patristic writers actually possess knowledge of the specific historical circumstances of the individual Gospels? Related to this is the formation and use of tradition in the early church. The second question is connected to the first: To what extent do these traditions reflect their own agendas (i.e. different from the modern historical-critical understanding)? Related to this is the use of the Gospels in worship and as scripture (Cullmann 1953; Moule 1967: 100-14; 1981: 122-24; Hengel 2000; Smith 2000), the interrelation between the Gospels (Bauckham 1998b; Sproston North 2003), and the fourfold Gospel (Cullmann 1956; Stanton 1997). As Mitchell has reminded us concerning the Gospel community debate, the path forward cannot ignore the voices from the past.

Finally, the fourth area that needs definition is the postmodern critique of modernity's historical-critical emphasis. Kysar (2003) suggested that the 'Whither' of the Gospel community was connected to the postmodern critique of the historical-critical method. The rise of postmodern interpretive methods that press upon the old paradigm will forge the way ahead. The alternative approaches to the text will take their stand against the old redaction-critical method of seeing in every word and phrase in the Gospels an image standing behind it. The denial of postmodern interpretation that the text is merely a means to an end presents a radical challenge to the way a 'text', specifically a Gospel text, is read.

Were the Gospels written for 'all Christians'? How should one read and understand Matthew, Mark, Luke and John? These questions have not been answered here. Our goal has been to place the Gospel community

debate in its context and within the current discussion. Martyn was correct when he said that we need to listen to the voice of the Gospels and not to our own voices. The challenge before Gospels scholarship, and all readers of the Gospels, is to listen to them, as much as humanly possible, as they are meant to be heard.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alexander, L.
    1998   'Ancient Book Production and the Circulation of the Gospels', in R. Bauckham
                (ed.), *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences* (Grand
                Rapids: Eerdmans): 71-111.
Allison, D.
    1988   'Was There a "Lukan Community?" ', *IRB* 10: 62-70.
Ashton, J.
    1991   *Understanding the Fourth Gospel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
Balch, D. (ed.)
    1991   *The Social History of the Matthean Community* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press).
Barton, S.
    1992   'The Communal Dimension of Earliest Christianity: A Critical Survey of the
                Field', *JTS* 43: 399-427.
    1993   'Early Christianity and the Sociology of the Sect', in F. Watson (ed.), *The Open
                Text: New Directions for Biblical Studies?* (London: SCM Press): 140-62.
    1998   'Can We Identify the Gospel Audiences?', in Bauckham (ed.) 1998: 173-94.
    2000   'Christian Community in the Light of the Gospel of John', in D.G. Horrell and
                C.M. Tuckett (eds.), *Christology, Controversy, and Community: New Testament
                Essays in Honour of David R. Catchpole* (NovTSup, 99; Leiden: E.J. Brill): 279-
                301.
Bauckham, R.
    1998a   'Introduction', in Bauckham (ed.) 1998: 1-7.
    1998b   'For Whom Were Gospels Written?', in Bauckham (ed.) 1998: 9-48.
    1998c   'John for Readers of Mark', in Bauckham (ed.) 1998: 147-71.
    1998d   'Response to Philip Esler', *SJT* 51: 249-53.
    2001   'The Audience of the Fourth Gospel', in R.T. Fortna and T. Thatcher (eds.),
                Jesus in Johannine Tradition (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox): 101-
                111.
Bauckham, R. (ed.)
    1998   *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences* (Grand Rapids:
                Eerdmans).
Baxter, T.
    2001   Review of *The Gospels For All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences*,
                edited by Richard Bauckham, in *Evangel* 19: 55.
Blomberg, C.L.
    2000   Review of *The Gospels For All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences*,
                edited by Richard Bauckham, in *Them* 25: 78-80.
    2001   *The Historical Reliability of John's Gospel: Issues and Commentary* (Downers
                Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press).
Bowe, B.E.
    2000   Review of *The Gospels For All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences*,
                edited by Richard Bauckham, in *CTM* 27: 295.

Brodie, T.L.
 1993 *The Quest for the Origin of John's Gospel: A Source-Oriented Approach* (New York: Oxford University Press).
Brown, R.E.
 1966 *The Gospel According to John* (AB, 29; Garden City, NY: Doubleday).
 1970 *The Gospel According to John* (AB, 29a; Garden City, NY: Doubleday).
 1977 'Johannine Ecclesiology—The Community's Origins', *Int* 31: 379-93.
 1979 *The Community of the Beloved Disciple: The Life, Loves, and Hates of an Individual Church in New Testament Times* (New York: Paulist Press).
 1982 *The Epistles of John* (AB, 30; London: Geoffrey Chapman).
 1984 *The Churches the Apostles Left Behind* (London: Geoffrey Chapman).
Burge, G.M.
 2001 'Situating John's Gospel in History', in R.T. Fortna and T. Thatcher (eds.), *Jesus in Johannine Tradition* (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press): 35-46.
Burridge, R.A.
 1992 *What are the Gospels? A Comparison with Graeco-Roman Biography* (SNTSMS, 70; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
 1998 'About People, by People, for People: Gospel Genre and Audiences', in R. Bauckham (ed.), *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans): 113-45.
 2000 'Gospel Genre, Christological Controversy and the Absence of Rabbinic Biography: Some Implications of the Biographical Hypothesis', in D.G. Horrell and C.M. Tuckett (eds.), *Christology, Controversy, and Community: New Testament Essays in Honour of David R. Catchpole* (NovTSup, 99; Leiden: E.J. Brill): 137-56.
Casson, L.
 1974 *Travel in the Ancient World* (London: Allen & Unwin).
Cohen, A.
 1985 *The Symbolic Construction of Community* (London: Routledge).
Cullmann, O.
 1953 *Early Christian Worship* (trans. A. Stewart Todd and J.B. Torrance; SBT, 10; London: SCM Press).
 1956 'The Plurality of the Gospels as a Theological Problem in Antiquity', in A.J.B. Higgins (ed.), *The Early Church* (trans. S. Godman; London: SCM Press).
 1976 *The Johannine Circle* (trans. J. Bowden; London: SCM Press).
Culpepper, R.A.
 1975 *The Johannine School: An Evaluation of the Johannine-School Hypothesis Based on an Investigation of the Nature of Ancient Schools* (SBLDS, 26; Missoula, MT: Scholars Press).
 1983 *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Literary Design* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press).
Dibelius, M.
 1934 *From Tradition to Gospel* (trans. B.L. Woolf; London: Ivor Nicholson).
Duff, J.
 1999 Review of *The Gospels For All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences*, edited by Richard Bauckham, in *Anvil* 16: 134-35.
Eco, U.
 1981 *The Role of the Reader: Explorations in the Semiotics of Texts* (London: Hutchinson).
Ellingworth, P.
 1999 Review of *The Gospels For All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences*, edited by Richard Bauckham, in *EvQ* 71: 273-75.
Esler, P.F.
 1998 'Community and Gospel in Early Christianity: A Response to Richard Bauckham's *Gospels for All Christians*', *SJT* 51: 235-48.

Filson, F.V.
    1939   'The Significance of Early House Churches', *JBL* 58: 105-12.
Gamble, H.F.
    1995   *Books and Readers in the Early Church* (New Haven: Yale University Press).
Gusfield, J.R.
    1975   *Community: A Critical Response* (KCSS; Oxford: Basil Blackwell).
Hägerland, T.
    2003   'John's Gospel: A Two-Level Drama?', *JSNT* 25: 309-22.
Hengel, M.
    1989   *The Johannine Question* (Philadelphia: Trinity Press International).
    2000   *The Four Gospels and the One Gospel of Jesus Christ* (trans. J. Bowden; London: SCM Press).
Holmberg, B.
    1990   *Sociology and the New Testament: An Appraisal* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press).
Hurtado, L.W.
    2003   *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans).
Johnson, L.T.
    1979   'On Finding Lukan Community: A Cautious Cautionary Essay', *SBLSP*: 87-100.
Judge, E.
    1980   'The Social Identity of the First Christians: A Question of Method in Religious History', *JRH* 11: 201-17.
Kee, H.C.
    1977   *The Community of the New Age: Studies in Mark's Gospel* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press).
    1995   *Who are the People of God? Early Christian Models of Community* (New Haven: Yale University Press).
Kelber, W.
    1974   *The Kingdom in Mark: A New Place and a New Time* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press).
    1979   *Mark's Story of Jesus* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press).
Kingsbury, J.D.
    1991   'Conclusion: Analysis of a Conversation', in D. Balch (ed.), *Social History of the Matthean Community* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press): 259-69.
Klauck, H.-J.
    2003   'Community, History, and Text(s)—a Response' (paper delivered at Life in Abundance: An International Conference on the Gospel of John: A Tribute to Raymond E. Brown, Baltimore, Maryland, 16-18 October).
Kügler, J.
    1984   'Das Johannesevangelium und seine Gemeinde—kein Thema für Science Fiction', *BN* 23: 48-62.
Kysar, R.
    1975   *The Fourth Evangelist and His Gospel: An Examination of Contemporary Scholarship* (Minneapolis: Augsburg).
    1977   'Community and Gospel: Vectors in Fourth Gospel Criticism', *Int* 31: 355-66.
    2002   'The Expulsion from the Synagogue: A Tale of a Theory' (paper delivered at the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature in Toronto, 23-26 November).
    2003   'The Whence and Whither of the Johannine Community' (paper delivered at Life in Abundance: An International Conference on the Gospel of John: A Tribute to Raymond E. Brown, Baltimore, Maryland, 16-18 October).
Lincoln, A.T.
    2000   *Truth on Trial: The Lawsuit Motif in the Fourth Gospel* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson).

Malherbe, A.J.
1977 *Social Aspects of Early Christianity* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press).

Malina, B.J.
1994 'John's [*sic*]: The Maverick Christian Group: The Evidence of Sociolinguistics', *BTB* 24: 167-82.

Marcus, J.
2000 *Mark 1–8* (AB, 27; New York: Doubleday).

Martyn, J.L.
1957 'The Salvation-History Perspective in the Fourth Gospel' (PhD dissertation, Yale University).
1979 *The Gospel of John in Christian History: Essays for Interpreters* (New York: Paulist Press).
2003 *History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel* (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 3rd edn [1st edn, 1968]).

Marxsen, W.
1969 *Mark the Evangelist: Studies on the Redactional History of the Gospel* (trans. J. Boyce, D. Juel and W. Poehlmann; Nashville: Abingdon Press).

Matson, M.A.
2003 'Interactive Rhetoric in Matthew: An Exploration of Audience Knowledge Competency' (paper delivered at the Annual Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature in Atlanta, 22-25 November).

Meeks, W.A.
1972 'The Man from Heaven in Johannine Sectarianism', *JBL* 91: 44-72.
1983 *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press).
1985 'Breaking Away: Three New Testament Pictures of Christianity's Separation from the Jewish Communities', in J. Neusner and E.S. Frerichs (eds.), *'To See Ourselves as Others See Us.' Christians, Jews, 'Others' in Late Antiquity* (Chico, CA: Scholars Press): 93-115.

Mitchell, M.M.
2003 'Patristic Counter-evidence to the Claim that "The Gospels Were Written for All Christians" ' (paper delivered at the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature in Atlanta, 22-25 November).

Moule, C.F.D.
1967 *The Phenomenon of the New Testament: An Enquiry into the Implications of Certain Features of the New Testament* (SBT, 2/1; London: SCM Press).
1981 *The Birth of the New Testament* (BNTC, 1; London: Continuum, 3rd edn [1st edn, 1962]).

Moxnes, H.
1999 'The Social Context of Luke's Community', *Int* 48: 379-89.

Myers, C.
1988 *Binding the Strong Man: A Political Reading of Mark's Story of Jesus* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books).

Neyrey, J.H.
1988 *An Ideology of Revolt: John's Christology in Social-Science Perspective* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press).

O'Day, G.R.
2002 'Response: "The Expulsion from the Synagogue: A Tale of a Theory" ' (paper delivered at the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature in Toronto, 23-26 November).

Painter, J.
1993 *The Quest for the Messiah: The History, Literature and Theology of the Johannine Community* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 2nd edn [1st edn, 1991]).

Peterson, D.N.
    2000   *The Origins of Mark: The Markan Community in Current Debate* (BIS, 48; Leiden: E.J. Brill).
Rensberger, D.
    1988   *Johannine Faith and Liberating Community* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press).
Riches, J.K.
    1993   'The Synoptic Evangelists and their Communities', in J. Becker (ed.), *Christian Beginnings: Word and Community from Jesus to Post-Apostolic Times* (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press): 213-41.
Rodd, C.S.
    1981   'On Applying a Sociological Theory to Biblical Studies', *JSOT* 19: 95-106.
Saldarini, A.J.
    1994   *Matthew's Christian-Jewish Community* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).
Scroggs, R.
    1975   'The Earliest Christian Communities as Sectarian Movement', in J. Neusner (ed.), *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults: Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty* (SJLA, 12; Leiden: E.J. Brill): II, 1-23.
    1980   'The Sociological Interpretation of the New Testament: The Present State of Research', *NTS* 26: 164-79.
Sim, D.C.
    1998   *The Gospel of Matthew and Christian Judaism: The History and Social Setting of the Matthean Community* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark).
    2001   'The Gospels for All Christians: A Response to Richard Bauckham', *JSNT* 84: 3-27.
Smith, D.M.
    1990   'The Contribution of J. Louis Martyn to the Understanding of the Gospel of John', in R.T. Fortna and B.R. Gaventa (eds.), *The Conversation Continues: Studies in Paul and John* (Nashville: Abingdon Press): 175-94.
    2000   'When Did the Gospels Become Scripture?', *JBL* 119: 3-20.
    2002   'Response to Robert Kysar, "The Expulsion from the Synagogue: The Tale of the Theory" ' (paper delivered at the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature in Toronto, 23-26 November).
Sproston North, W.E.
    2003   'John for Readers of Mark? A Response to Richard Bauckham's Proposal', *JSNT* 25: 449-68.
Staley, J.L.
    2001   'What Can a Postmodern Approach to the Fourth Gospel Add to Contemporary Debates about its Historical Situation?', in R.T. Fortna and T. Thatcher (eds.), *Jesus in Johannine Tradition* (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press): 47-57.
Stanton, G.N.
    1992   *A Gospel for A New People* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark).
    1994   'Revisiting Matthew's Communities', *SBLSP*: 9-23.
    1997   'The Fourfold Gospel', *NTS* 43: 317-46.
Stendahl, K.
    1954   *The School of St. Matthew* (ASNU, 20; Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup).
Streeter, B.H.
    1924   *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins* (London: Macmillan).
Thompson, M.B.
    1998   'The Holy Internet: Communication between Churches in the First Christian Generation', in Bauckham (ed.) 1998: 49-70.
Twelftree, G.H.
    1999   *Jesus the Miracle Worker* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press).
Via, D.O.
    1988   *The Ethics of Mark's Gospel: In the Middle of Time* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press).

Wansbrough, H.
    2000   'The New Israel: The Community of Matthew and the Community of Qumran',
                SNTU 25: 8-22.
Watson, F.
    1998   'Toward a Literal Reading of the Gospels', in Bauckham (ed.) 1998: 195-217.
Weiss, H.
    1979   'Footwashing in the Johannine Community', *NovT* 41: 298-325.
Wisse, F.
    1992   'Historical Method and the Johannine Community', *Arc* 20: 35-42.

RECENT SCHOLARSHIP ON THE STRUCTURE OF JAMES

Mark E. Taylor

Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary,
Fort Worth, TX, USA
mtaylor@swbts.edu

ABSTRACT

The letter of James, although often neglected in the history of New Testament scholarship, has received renewed interest in the last three decades. Much of the discussion has focused on the letter's structure, and the result has been a significant departure from the old paraenetic, 'unstructured' view of James set forth by Martin Dibelius in favor of a view that sees much more unity and ordering within the composition. Since an assessment of structure virtually determines interpretation, one is not surprised to discover within recent scholarship a thorough re-evaluation of the letter. This shift in perspective raises important questions. Why has scholarship generally set aside Dibelius's long-standing approach? What new structures have been offered? How crucial is a definitive 'structure' to our understanding of the content of the letter? While the overall question of the structure of James is far from settled, some areas of consensus have emerged, and the stage is set for further dialogue.

The last three decades have witnessed a rigorous reassessment of the content, significance and interpretation of the epistle of James (see Edgar 2001: 13-43). At the forefront of the discussion has been the challenging issue of the letter's structure. For the greater part of the twentieth century scholarship was generally unified in its approach to James as an essentially unstructured composition. This was due in large measure to the persuasive arguments of Martin Dibelius, who asserted that the content of the epistle consists of loosely connected pericopes with little, if any, integration and no unifying train of thought (Dibelius 1976: 2). His assertion seemed plausible in light of the content of the letter. Certain sections of James exhibit an obvious, coherent theme (e.g. 2.1-13; 2.14-26; 3.1-12), but other por-

tions are different. The opening chapter appears to defy any particular structural arrangement in that it is composed of brief units or sayings devoted to various topics (e.g. trials, 1.2-4; wisdom, 1.5-8; poverty and wealth, 1.9-11; temptation, 1.13-15; God's good gifts, 1.17; obedience, 1.19-25; and the marks of genuine religion, 1.26-27). Proverbial expressions throughout the letter appear isolated, at times even intrusive, raising the question of their contextual function (e.g. 1.12; 1.19-20; 2.13; 3.18; 4.11-12; 5.9; and 5.12). The assumption was that the nature of the letter demonstrates that sequential argument was never intended, therefore rendering any attempt to trace the author's thought doubtful (Ropes 1916: 2-4).

In recent years, however, an increased focus on the literary aspects of biblical texts has invigorated interest in the composition and arrangement of James and has led modern studies in a direction very different from the approach articulated by Dibelius. James is now widely perceived as a document with some intentional ordering, but while scholarship has moved in a direction of appreciation for the letter as a whole, there is no consensus on the exact nature of James's literary design. The discussion has centered on the relationship of individual units and expressions to each other, to the composition as a whole, and whether or not there is any progression, coherence or unifying theme that takes into account the content and character of the letter. This dialogue over structure has had significant implications for how the letter is read, whether in terms of social function (Perdue 1990; Elliot 1997; Wachob 2000; Edgar 2001), a unifying theological motif such as suffering (Fry 1978; Davids 1982: 34, 38) or eschatology (Mussner 1964: 210; Wall 1990: 11-12; Penner 1996), or some other thematic thread that might be discerned through the application of rhetorical criticism (Wuellner 1978; Baasland 1988: 3655-59; Frankenmölle 1990; Thurén 1995) or linguistics (Terry 1992; Cargal 1993). This diversity demonstrates that structure does, in fact, determine exegetical decisions at all levels of the discourse.

In order to illustrate the point more precisely, one need only to compare Dibelius with virtually any modern interpretation of James. For example, Dibelius approached the text in an atomistic manner that precluded any contextual reading. So, he read a section like Jas 3.13–4.10 as nothing more than loosely arranged, isolated units: 3.13-17 deals with one topic, 3.18 is completely isolated, and 4.1-6 takes up a whole different agenda. For Dibelius a text like this exhibits 'no unity in the train of thought nor a unity of form' (1976: 208). On the other hand, Johnson offered a more

unified approach because he viewed the structure of the text differently. Based upon linguistic parallels, thematic considerations and rhetorical criticism, he argued for the thematic importance of envy and insisted that the section must be interpreted as a whole (1996: 268-69). Such diversity of opinion is commonplace in modern discussion.

The following survey will address the recent trends in scholarship on the structure of James and will proceed around a simple division: James as an unstructured composition and James as a structured composition. The former focuses on Dibelius and his followers. Although certainly not recent, Dibelius is the appropriate starting point because all modern studies react to him in some way, and it is important to note why his arguments have been set aside in favor of a new direction. The latter category, James as a structured composition, takes into account the modern reassessment of Dibelius. This survey will also note that, while the overall question of structure is unsettled, some areas of consensus have emerged and the stage is set for yet further dialogue.

Prelude to the Modern Era: The Influence of Dibelius

Dibelius was by no means the first to suggest an unstructured arrangement of James. He gave expression to an already prevailing view (see Holtzmann *et al.* 1890: 141-42; Jülicher 1904: 215; Mayor 1910: cxxi; Ropes 1916: 2-4), but with a manner of persuasion that effectively controlled subsequent views of James for half a century. At the outset, one must note that by 'unstructured' Dibelius did not mean 'chaotic' or 'incoherent'. He granted that certain pericopes within the letter sustain an identifiable, coherent theme. The core of the letter, 2.1–3.12, was recognized as a series of three treatises marked by the style of the Greek diatribe. But, in his view, these three treatises have no relationship to each other, and they are framed by material of a different sort. Dibelius described 3.13–5.6 as a 'group of sayings', material containing small, self-contained units, less unified texts, and even isolated sayings. For 1.1-27 and 5.7-20 he preferred the designation 'series of sayings' (1976: 1-2).

Dibelius's evaluation of James grew out of the presupposition that the letter was part of a long history of Greek and Jewish paraenetical traditions (1976: 3). According to Dibelius, five characteristic features marked paraenesis. First, there is a pervasive eclecticism in the employment of ethical traditions so that the author is more concerned with transmission than with originality. Second, paraenesis is characterized by a lack of continuity, the stringing together of saying after saying. Third, while there

is no continuity to be discerned, there are formal, purely external connections via cognate 'catchwords' whereby one saying is linked to another. Fourth, paraenesis is characterized by thematic repetition in different places within the same writing. Therefore, repetition does not necessarily imply logical or thematic development. Finally, admonitions in paraenetic literature do not apply to a single audience or to a single set of circumstances. There is no definitive social setting or theology to be discerned (pp. 5-11).

Dibelius's arguments set the tone of Jamesian studies for the next fifty years. Marxsen, for example, noted in his introduction to the New Testament that in James one is 'struck immediately by the fact that there seems to be no particular pattern' (1968: 226). Likewise, Perrin argued that James defies a structural analysis and that insights applicable to other texts in the New Testament 'simply do not apply to the homily of James' (1974: 256). Even as recently as 1980, Laws, while not giving a full discussion of structure in her commentary, followed an approach that perceives little or no connection between successive paragraphs (Laws 1980). Others adopted a similar approach (Easton 1957; Barclay 1960; Reicke 1964; Mitton 1966; Cantinat 1973).

If a general consensus of scholarship attributed to James a loosely arranged design, then what precipitated a shift of perspective in the last thirty years? The answer to the question is twofold. First, there has been an increasing interest in the literary and rhetorical aspects of Scripture. Second, and more importantly, contemporary scholarship has called into question some of the most basic assumptions set forth by Dibelius regarding the character of paraenesis.

Dibelius has been challenged primarily on three fronts. First, while James obviously is composed of traditional material, it does not necessarily follow that the articulation or use of these traditions lacks a coherent structure (see Johnson 1978–79; Verner 1983: 118-19; Stowers 1986: 23; Penner 1996: 125-28). Second, contrary to Dibelius, the author of paraenetic material may have a particular audience in mind, that is, the 'paraenetic' designation should not rule out a social setting (Perdue 1981; 1990; Wachob 2000: 40-52). Third, the classification of paraenesis as a genre is obscure. Johnson argued that Dibelius 'wrongly identified paraenesis as a genre. It is better described as a mode of ethical teaching which can be fitted to many different literary genres' (Johnson 1985: 167; see also Edgar 2001: 15-16). In light of these points of contention, Popkes recently observed that 'the time has come to sever the traditional linkage between

James and what has been understood by paraenesis, including the consequences for a textual coherence and references to an actual situation' (Popkes 1995: 547-48). Thus, the fundamental assumptions that undergirded Dibelius's view have been displaced in favor of new considerations that have led to new ways of reading James.

James as a Structured Composition

The modern discussion of the structure of James was initiated by Fred Francis in 1970 in his groundbreaking article, 'The Form and Function of the Opening and Closing Paragraphs of James and I John', although antecedents to his proposal appeared in the German-speaking world prior to Dibelius (see Pfeiffer 1850; Cladder 1904). Peter Davids took up Francis's basic concept and articulated a highly organized structure for James in his 1982 commentary (pp. 22-29). Subsequent scholarship followed this trend and a growing consensus emerged regarding the unity of the letter. Since then, the fundamental questions about James have focused primarily on the nature of its unity. The following discussion summarizes the findings of those who discern structure in James and organizes the proposals generally as follows: James as a chiastic arrangement of themes, other thematic approaches, rhetorical analyses, and a mediating position. One exception to this arrangement is the inclusion of this writer's own textlinguistic investigation into the structure of James and a forthcoming proposal by George Guthrie that is based, in part, on this analysis. These two proposals will be included last as a springboard for further dialogue.

A Chiastic Arrangement of Themes

The thematic repetition characteristic of James naturally led to a consideration of the presence of *chiasmus* in the structuring of the letter as a whole. The most detailed and significant of these were offered by Francis and Davids. Other proposals followed that discerned some sort of chiastic arrangement as well (see Reese 1982; Crotty 1992). There is nothing unprecedented about this understanding of James, only that earlier literary approaches never received widespread acceptance. In the German-speaking world, for example, Pfeiffer and Cladder argued for thematic introduction, repetition and expansion, but their contributions were simply overshadowed by Dibelius's monumental work on James. However, a brief review of their contributions is helpful as one begins to assess the re-emergence of similar ideas in recent scholarship.

German Precedents to Modern Trends: Pfeiffer and Cladder

Pfeiffer (1850) maintained that Jas 1.19 set the agenda for the rest of the letter. The expression 'quick to hear, slow to speak, slow to wrath' corresponds to 1.21–2.26, 3.1-8 and 4.1–5.6 accordingly and thus introduces themes that reappear in the letter body. Cladder (1904) adopted and expanded this approach and discerned a skillfully arranged introduction, body and conclusion organized around multiple chiasms.

Although the term σοφία (*sophia*, 'wisdom') occurs only at 1.5 and 3.15-18, Cladder asserted that the concept was central to the structure of James because the characteristics specified in 3.17 expands the concept thematically to the entire composition. He noted that, following the designation of wisdom as 'pure', a threefold division emerges that is exactly parallel to the triad describing 'pure' religion in 1.26-27. He viewed these parallel sections (1.26-27 and 3.17) as forming a thematic *inclusio* and at the same time providing a statement of the major themes of the letter body (2.1–3.12). Thus, a chiastic pattern develops in an 'a b c C B A a b c' arrangement as follows (Cladder 1904: 45-48).

inclusio a b c	*body* C B A	*inclusio* a b c
1.26 (bridle the tongue)	2.1-11 (no partiality)	3.17 (peaceable, gentle)
1.27 (visit orphans and widows)	2.14-26 (works of mercy)	3.17 (full of mercy)
1.27 (unspotted from world)	3.1-12 (bridle the tongue)	3.17 (no partiality)

Cladder saw further chiastic arrangement in 3.13–4.8, albeit in a different form. Here, the strong rebuke relates to the three main themes of the letter. For example, the fruit of wisdom in 3.15-18 represents the opposite of the sins of the tongue. In 4.1-3, James reproaches the readers for their covetousness, the opposite of God's wisdom which demands care for the needy brother. Finally, in 4.4-8a, the reproach reaches its height and condemns 'friendship with the world'. Thus, the single points of the author's rebuke may also be placed chiastically against the treatises (pp. 48-49).

Cladder also detected a skillfully arranged introduction to the letter. He divided the opening into two parts: 1.1-8 and 1.9-25. The first part consists of a double admonition to a joyful perseverance in trial and to believing prayer with wisdom. The second is a general introduction that establishes and demands a refusal of the 'world'. Within this general exhortation, 1.19-25 anticipates the thematic development of the letter, specifically in the threefold command of 1.19, as noted previously by Pfeiffer.

Finally, in Cladder's scheme, all that follows 4.12 relates back to the introduction. In 4.13–5.6, the author turns on those who did not make the

choice demanded in 1.9-25. Likewise, 5.7-20 relates back to 1.2-8 in the same manner in which the letter began, with exhortations to prayer and patience. Appropriately, the letter concludes with a command to reclaim the wandering brother (p. 55).

Cladder's article appeared one hundred years ago and so is certainly not a 'recent' trend in scholarship. However, many modern arguments remarkably parallel him in their approach to the text. Dibelius may have eclipsed Cladder and set the agenda for the greater part of the twentieth century, but the end of the century has vindicated, to some extent, Cladder's basic approach and ideas.

Francis

The modern trend that has moved decisively away from Dibelius began with Francis's seminal article in 1970, which challenged the atomistic approach of previous years from both a literary and historical perspective. In similar fashion to Pfeiffer and Cladder, Francis observed that in both James and 1 John themes laid out in the opening verses of both letters are restated and expanded in the body. Consequently, he examined Hellenistic letters to see if this pattern corresponded to an accepted pattern of ancient Hellenistic epistolography (pp. 110-11).

Francis examined and compared the writings of Josephus, 1 Maccabees, the Pauline letters, 1 John, and James and discovered that ancient Hellenistic letters exhibit two characteristics: a double-opening statement as well as opening and closing greetings that structure the entire letter (pp. 111-17). Additionally, Francis noted that the epistolary conclusion of James combines eschatological instruction, thematic reprise, and references to prayer, all of which have a strictly epistolary function as born out in comparison with other early Christian letters and general Hellenistic epistolography (pp. 124-26). This means that James's seemingly abrupt ending was a 'live option in Hellenistic epistolary form' (p. 125). These observations led Francis to an assessment of James as a carefully structured epistle.

First, Francis argued that the opening section of James (1.2-25) has a twofold structure, which introduces the main argumentative interests of the letter in carefully balanced thematic statements (1.2-11 and 1.12-25). Like 1 Macc. 10.25-45 and Phlm. 4–7, these two paragraphs are headed by technical liturgical-epistolary terms for 'joy' and 'blessedness'. Moreover, there is close parallel development. The same three elements are introduced in identical order with complementary effect: testing leads to steadfastness (1.2-4 and 1.12-18), wisdom-words-reproaching (1.5-8 and 1.19-21), and rich-poor-doers of the word (1.9-11 and 1.22-25).

Second, 1.26-27 serves as a 'literary hinge' that recapitulates the preceding introduction and turns the reader to the initial argumentative section of the body of the epistle. The body consists of two main sections (2.1-26 and 3.1–5.6), both of which are developed in light of the 'testing' theme of the introduction.

Third, Francis asserted that the thematic essentials of the introduction occur in reverse order in the body of the epistle, thus displaying a chiastic structure that enables the writer to move directly from the recapitulation of 1.26-27 to the development of the same themes at length. Thus, Francis concluded that James offers the following overall pattern: A B C–A B C in the opening; C–B in the body; A (testing) underlies the whole (p. 118).

Davids

Davids accepted Francis's proposal regarding the twofold introduction in its entirety but developed it a step further. He applied the principle of inverse development within the main body (2.1–5.6) more consistently in that he divided the text into three sections instead of two. He also viewed James as a redacted work, a text full of traditional material, sayings which were originally separate but now part of a greater whole. This, in his view, accounts for the eclecticism in James which 'is only apparent when one fails to move beyond form criticism to redaction criticism' (1982: 24).

According to Davids, James begins with an epistolary introduction (1.1) and moves via catchword into the double opening statement (1.2-27). The first segment (1.2-11) introduces the three themes of the epistle: testing, wisdom and wealth. The second section (1.12-25) recapitulates these themes in terms of testing, speech and generosity/doing, and ends with a summary and transition (1.26-27). Like Francis, Davids viewed the second segment as more than restatement; themes develop and merge as they are taken up again. The testing theme develops the idea of failure in the test (testing God), the wisdom theme is developed in terms of pure speech (see also 3.1-18), and the wealth theme is developed in terms of obedience and sharing. Thus, theme expansion and merging gives the double-opening statement cohesion.

Following the introduction and transition, the major blocks of material in the body take up the themes in reverse order, giving a chiastic effect: 2.1-26 addresses wealth, 3.1–4.12 develops wisdom and 4.13–5.6 reiterates testing. The closing statement consists of eschatological exhortation coupled with thematic reprise (5.7-11), which could have ended the letter. The author continues, however, with topics normally included in epistolary closings (1982: 25-26). Davids outlined James as follows.

I.   Epistolary introduction 1.1
II. Opening statement 1.2-27
     A. First segment: testing, wisdom, wealth 1.2-11
     B. Second segment: testing, speech, generosity 1.12-27

III. The excellence of poverty and generosity 2.1-26
     A. No partiality is allowable 2.1-13
     B. Generosity is necessary 2.14-26

IV. The demand for pure speech 3.1–4.12
     A. Pure speech has no anger 3.1-12
     B. Pure speech comes from wisdom 3.13-18
     C. Pure prayer is without anger/in trust 4.1-10
     D. Pure speech is uncondemning 4.11-12

V.   Testing through wealth 4.13–5.6
     A. The test of wealth 4.13-17
     B. The test by the wealthy 5.1-6

VI. Closing statement 5.7-20
     A. Endurance in the test 5.7-11
     B. Rejection of oaths 5.12
     C. Helping one another through prayer/forgiveness 5.13-18
     D. Closing encouragement 5.19-20

Other less detailed chiastic proposals that merit attention include that of Crotty (1992) and Reese (1982). Their proposals sought to isolate the 'core' of the letter by identifying the peak of a chiastic arrangement. Crotty's thesis was predicated on the parallels between 1.16-18 and 5.19-20, an *inclusio* that frames the letter. Working inward from these external boundaries he isolated 4.1-3, 'the human person/the center of struggle', as the nucleus of the letter. Reese suggested a less elaborate chiasm, noting that the author had in mind a concentric structure in which in innermost circle conveys the central message and unifies the whole. He suggested that the center is 3.1-18 which is placed in two circles of balanced pieces (1.2-27//5.7-20 and 2.1-26//4.1–5.6).

All of the proposals that see James in terms of a chiastic arrangement of themes have great appeal on the surface and remove some of the frustration related to the disjointed appearance of the letter. Above all, they demonstrate an interaction and expansion of common themes within the composition, giving the letter a sense of cohesion and coherence previously denied. However, sometimes the suggested parallelism is not as tight and consistent as it could be. The tendency in such arrangements is to make sweeping judgments about large sections within the letter that fail to capture the full

intent or content of the text. For example, Davids's suggestion that wealth, wisdom and testing are major themes worked out in the body of the letter is defensible, but his proposal of an inverse progression of these themes is questionable. James 4.11-12, for example, cannot be entirely subsumed under 'speech' in light of the notable parallels of these verses with 2.12-13. A combination of ideas appears to be at work in concert with each other.

Along the same lines, the suggestion of a double opening statement has been subject to criticism (see Cargal 1993: 22; Penner 1996: 144). The themes of testing, wisdom and wealth are clearly indicated in the opening exhortation, but whether or not everything that follows in the second opening is intentionally parallel to these motifs is not clear. And the proposals of Crotty and Reese simply point out that different 'centers' can be identified with an appeal to chiastic arrangement. This suggests that some degree of caution is in order. Some chiastic proposals appear strained in order to fit a preconceived pattern. *Chiasmus* may be a legitimate structuring principle, but any such assertation for any given text must be consistent and linguistically defensible in order to withstand scrutiny, something that has been very difficult for a letter like James.

Other Thematic Approaches

The contributions of Francis and Davids opened the door for new readings of James that were in some way tied into the issue of structure. These approaches were also thematic, although without some overarching chiastic design. Some of the more important recent proposals include those of Vouga, Martin, Johnson, Penner and Cargal.

Vouga and Martin

Vouga and Martin were both appreciative of the contributions of Francis and Davids, although neither adopted their proposed divisions of the text. They both agreed, however, that certain themes introduced in the opening chapter provide a basis for the coherence that follows and holds the key to the letter's structure. Martin adopted and modified Vouga's proposal. For this reason, they can be considered together.

Vouga proposed three main divisions of the letter, each beginning with a major 'faith' theme: 1.2-19a, the testing of faith; 1.19b–3.18, the obedience of faith; and 4.1–5.20, the fidelity of faith (1984: 19-20). In addition to this threefold division, he noted a triad of tests that follows the thematic opening statement of 1.2-4, each of which is paralleled in the closing of the letter: diversion and opportunism (1.5-8//4.13-17), riches (1.9-11//5.1-6)

and determinism (1.13-19a//5.12-20). This sequence of tests is interrupted by the beatitude of 1.12 that parallels 5.7-11.

Vouga designated 1.19b–3.18 as the central portion of the epistle. The introduction to this unit, 1.19b-27, introduces five themes that are further developed within the letter body. These include the imperative of love (1.27a//2.1-13), obedience to the word (1.22-24//2.14-26), guarding the tongue (1.19-20, 26//3.1-13), being prudent to avoid worldly wisdom (1.19//3.14-18), and the responsibility to shun the 'world' (1.27b//4.1–5.20).

The final section of the epistle brings the argument to a climax by showing that 'fidelity to faith' is demonstrated by fulfilling the Christian vocation within the world by speaking in humility and submission (4.1-10) and without resentment or judging (4.11-12). Final admonitions which recapitulate the opening themes serve to round out James's message in 4.13–5.20 (1984: 21-23).

Martin critiqued Vouga's lack of detail in his development of the threefold categorization of faith, but otherwise followed his scheme very closely and adopted his three main divisions of the text. Like Vouga, Martin considered ch. 1 as the key to the letter's structure and noted the exact same parallels between the opening and closing of the epistle (1.5-8//4.13-17; 1.9-11//5.1-6; 1.12//5.7-11; and 1.13-15//5.12-20). He even considered 1.19-27 as an overture to themes recapitulated within the letter, albeit with a slightly different twist.

First, the concept of 'true religion' (1.27a) is further developed in 2.1-13. Second, the heart of genuine religion, the 'word', is to be observed as well as heard (1.22-24) since it is 'implanted' (1.18). This is expanded in 2.14-26 as an emphasis on the root-fruit analogy. Third, a disquisition on human words (1.18-20, 26) receives further development in 3.1-13. Fourth, the wrong use of words (1.19), especially by teachers, leads to a two-paneled contrast between wisdom from below/wisdom from above (3.15-18). Finally, the duty of Christians to live 'in the world' is further explained in 4.1–5.11 (Martin 1988: cii-ciii). Martin outlined James as follows.

    I.   Address and greeting 1.1

    II.   Enduring trials 1.2-19a
       A. Trials, wisdom, and faith 1.2-8
       B. The reversal of fortunes 1.9-11
       C. Testing: its source and mischief—and rationale 1.12-19a

    III. Applying the word 1.19b–3.18
       A. The obedience of faith 1.19b-27
       B. Problems in the assembly 2.1-13

       C. Faith and deeds—together 2.14-26
       D. Warning about teachers and tongues 3.1-12
       E. Two types of wisdom 3.13-18

   IV. Witnessing to divine providence 4.1–5.20
       A. Community malaise and its antidote—false hopes 4.1-10
       B. Community problems—godless attitudes 4.11-17
       C. Judgment on rich farmers 5.1-6
       D. Call to patience 5.7-11
       E. Community issues: oath-taking, reactions to trouble, etc. 5.12-18
       F. Final words and fraternal admonitions 5.19-20

Johnson

In his recent commentary in the Anchor Bible series, Johnson offered yet another thematic approach to James by suggesting that the author of James consciously used common Hellenistic themes and *topoi* in the construction of the letter (1996: 28-29). He followed the lead of most recent analyses in viewing the opening chapter as the key to the letter's structure which he deemed an '*epitome* of the work as a whole' (p. 15). Johnson's own analysis emphasized the rhetorical structure of the text and at the same time stressed the necessity of assuming a surface and syntactically discernible connection between statements. Even isolated verses between extended essays 'should seriously be considered as particularly important authorial commentary' (p. 14). For Johnson, a deep structure of polar opposition between 'friendship with the world' and 'friendship with God' undergirds the discourse as a whole. This organizing principle in James 'is a set of convictions of two construals of reality and two modes of behavior following from such diverse understandings' (p. 14). Johnson combined these insights with the conviction of a thematic and literary coherence to the whole of the letter and the observation that 1.2-27 could be aligned with the essays of 2.1–5.18 in a fairly simplistic fashion. Johnson divided James into seven sections.

   First, Johnson considered ch. 1 as a table of contents which functions within the larger letter to anticipate themes developed more fully by way of extended essays. The opening section of James (1.2-27) has its own distinct character and accomplishes the polar oppositions that James works with throughout the composition. Chapter one is also set apart in its emphasis on 'understanding' by virtue of the fact that in these opening verses there are seventeen terms touching on one aspect of knowing or another (1996: 175-76).

   Johnson considered the second major section (2.1-26) as a splendid example of deliberative rhetoric abounding in features of the Greek diatribe.

Johnson argued that this chapter does not move from topic to topic but rather coheres around the topic of faith and deeds. Interpretations of 2.14-26 are often wrongly cast by way of engagement with Paul. Rather, points of discussion should be found in connection with 2.1-13 (1996: 218-29).

Johnson labeled the third section (3.1-12) the 'Power and Peril of Speech' and noted that this is one of the more obviously self-contained sections in the letter. Like 2.1, this section begins with a general prohibition, and like 2.26, it concludes with a short aphorism. Rather than a loose collection of maxims, this section gives evidence of a carefully constructed argument (1996: 253-54).

Unlike previous commentators, Johnson considered 3.13–4.10 as a unit. He noted in particular the intensely sermonic character of the section which has a coherent structure that falls into two parts: 3.13–4.6 sets up an indictment to which 4.7-10 responds. The whole section is held together by the topic of 'envy'. Johnson gave this section the heading, 'A Call to Conversion' (1996: 268-69).

Johnson considered 4.11–5.6 a unit based upon the identifiable theme of behavior marked by arrogance. This section is linked with the previous one by three examples of arrogance: slandering a neighbor, pretentious boasting, and condemning/murdering the innocent, all connected by James's final rhetorical question in 5.6 (1996: 292).

Unlike other analyses of James, Johnson isolated 5.7-11 as a self-contained unit, a 'hinge' standing between 4.11–5.6 and the final exhortations of 5.12-20. This section responds to the three modes of arrogance and the attack upon the oppressive rich in 5.1-6 as indicated by the connective which joins 5.6 and 5.7 and the continuation of the theme of judgment which began in 4.11. In addition, the threefold repetition of 'ἀδελφοί' (*adelphoi*, 'brothers') (5.7, 9, 10) and the fundamentally positive and reassuring character of the exhortations mark an explicit turn in the text to the community readers in 5.12-20. Johnson also noted other stylistic touches which isolate this section, such as the threefold repetition of ἰδού (*idou*, 'behold') and an *inclusio* formed by references to patience. Above all, its transitional character makes it distinct. These verses bring to expression two themes: just as 4.13–5.6 fills out the negative side of the reversal of 1.9-11, so 5.7-11 fills out the positive side sketched in 1.12. All is held together by the theme of judgment in the context of eschatology (1996: 311-12).

Finally, Johnson designated 5.12-20 as the closing section in his analysis of James and gave it the heading 'Speech in the Assembly of Faith'. He noted the use of the formula 'πρὸ πάντων' (*pro pantōn*, 'above

all') as marking the transition to the final portion of the letter. Far from being a disjointed series of exhortations, Johnson considered this final section a 'unified discourse on the positive modes of speech in the community' (1996: 326).

Johnson's analysis of James represents one of the most thorough treatments to date of the letter's structure. His combination of attention to the rhetorical conventions of the first century and the linguistic structure of the text itself strengthen his argument. Any structural assessment must engage with his sound argumentation.

Penner

Todd Penner's 1996 monograph represents yet another thematic reading of James that is based, in part, on assumptions related to structure. He proposed that an eschatological *inclusio* (1.2-12//4.6–5.12) frames the letter and controls its reading. This restricted his research primarily to the opening and closing portions of James, at which point he departed notably from previous assessments. Thus, his arguments deserve a closer look.

Penner agreed with previous estimates that understood the introductory verses of James as anticipatory of themes to follow and conforming to an established pattern in the epistolary tradition. However, contrary to most approaches, he set forth two reasons why the opening should be limited to 1.2-12 instead of 1.1-18 or 1.2-27. First, he noted an internal and deliberately chiastic design, an A B A pattern structured around the linguistic connections between 1.2-4 and 1.12 that form an *inclusio* around two independent units 1.5-8 and 1.9-11. All units relate to the testing tradition in some way. This pattern, he argued, is more easily recognizable and more cohesive than the alignment offered by Francis or Davids. Second, Penner noted how 1.2-12 provides a strong connection of key words and motifs which reoccur as flashbacks throughout the text of James and, in particular, the closing of the main body (4.6–5.12). In light of the fact that rare terms occur twice in the same letter and seem to be carefully placed in particular contexts, he concluded that the opening and closing forms an *inclusio* for the main body (1.13–4.5) and provides the stock themes and words upon which it draws (1996: 146-49).

Penner also departed from previous analyses in his delineation of the conclusion of the body proper (5.13-20). Although there is general agreement that the conclusion of James begins at 5.7 among those who see structure in James, Penner suggested three reasons why 5.13 is preferable. First, the eschatological instruction is clearly connected to what precedes

it. The οὖν (*oun*, 'therefore') in 5.7 connects 5.7-11//12 with the eschato-logical denunciation of the rich. Thus, Jas 5.7-11 is not the eschatological conclusion of the letter, contra Francis. It is the conclusion to the argument of 4.6–5.6. There is a clearer break in thought at 5.13 rather than at 5.7. Second, 5.12 is to be linked with 5.7-11 on the basis of the common theme of judgment, a series of imperatives that establish a structural link (5.7, 8, 9), and the presence of the coordinating particle δέ (*de*, 'but'). Third, the recurrence of the phrase 'τις ἐν ὑμῖν' (*tis en humin*, 'anyone among you') (5.13, 14, 19) provides a cohesive strand running through 5.13-20. Penner viewed this as an important structuring technique corresponding to that of 1.2-12 (1996: 150-51).

Yet another unique aspect of Penner's proposal was his suggestion that the conclusion to the main body begins at 4.6 instead of 4.13. Again he cited three reasons. First, there appears to be a structural shift at 4.6, a tran-sition to 4.7-11 that is cast by the phrase 'μείζονα δὲ δίδωσιν χάριν' (*meizona de didōsin charin*, 'but he gives more grace') and the citation of Prov. 3.34 (cf. 1 Pet. 5.5b-11) that 'may represent some form of common eschatological conclusion to paraenetic discourse in the early church' (1996: 155). Second, from 4.6 to 5.13 there is a concentrated use of verbal and thematic parallels with 1.2-12 suggesting some intentionality on behalf of the author. Third, following the lead of Alonso Schökel (1973), Penner noted the connection between 4.6 and 5.6 in the repetition of ἀντιτάσσω (*antitassō*, 'to resist'), a rare word appearing only six times in the LXX and five times in the New Testament, two of which are citations of Prov. 3.34. The Proverbs text is introduced and then commented on in reverse order; 4.7-10 treats the second part (God gives grace to the humble) and 4.13–5.6 comments on the first part (God resists the proud). In addition, a series of imperatives forms a structural link between 4.7-10 and 4.11-12 and ties into the theme of the coming judgment. Furthermore, there is a similar function between 4.11-12 and 5.12, both independent units that relate to their respective sections (4.11-12 belongs to 4.7-10 and 5.12 belongs to 5.7-11), and, as a result, establishes a structural parallel in the unit begin-ning in 4.6 and concluding in 5.12. Thus, Penner argued for another A B A pattern similar to the letter opening (1.2-12) as follows.

> Jas 4.6-12   Injunctions to the community (A)
> Jas 4.13–5.6   Indictment of the rich/proud (B)
> Jas 5.7-12   Injunctions to the community (A)

Both units of community injunctions in this chiastic pattern end with the switch from aorist to present imperative, and are distinctly marked off by

a reference to judgment in the community (1996: 155-57). Based upon his findings, Penner offered the following outline of James.

I.   Epistolary greeting 1.1
II.   Opening 1.2-12
III. Letter body proper 1.13–4.5
IV.   Conclusion of the letter body 4.6–5.12
V.   Epistolary conclusion 5.13-20

Since Penner was concerned only to show that James was framed by eschatological injunctions, his analysis did not extend to the entire letter. Nevertheless, his linguistic insights combined with thematic analysis and close attention to the actual features of the text are helpful. On the other hand, his assertion that the eschatological framework controls the reading of the entire epistle is doubtful. While the epistle may have been written in an eschatological context and the perspective of the author is certainly in keeping with the tenor of the rest of the New Testament, it is difficult to isolate this as the major theme of the letter.

Additionally, Penner's designation of an *inclusio* for the letter body (1.1-12 and 4.6–5.12) is subject to criticism. There are certainly significant parallels here, but his analysis overlooks the importance of 4.11-12 and its tight connection with 2.12-13. Also, few have restricted the opening statement to 1.2-12. Most opt for the entirety of ch. 1 or at least extend the opening to 1.18. A good case can be made for the distinctiveness of the opening chapter, thus setting it off from the rest of the composition. One must account for the summary/transition of 1.26-27 and the definitive shift that follows in 2.1. Also, the significant parallels between 1.2-25 and 5.7-20 might suggest a larger *inclusio* than the one Penner suggested (see Taylor 2001: 94-97).

Cargal

In light of the apparent polarization that exists among scholars with respect to the structure of James, Cargal advocated a new approach, a communication paradigm based upon Greimasian structural semiotics. According to Cargal, this model answers questions related to structure and purpose where form and redaction-critical approaches failed because of their exclusive focus on historical concerns and a reliance upon genres of the Greco-Roman period such as paraenesis and epistolary literature (1993: 29). In his estimation, one should look for a series of themes and figures in the letter rather than logical progression. In broad terms, he argued for the

thematic importance of 'restoration' in James based upon the inverted parallelism of the beginning (1.1, the 'Diaspora') and the conclusion (5.19-20, the reclamation of the wandering brother).

Cargal contended that a semiotic model provides three distinct advantages over previously attempted historical and linguistic models. First, he argued that all discourses have multiple coherences which occur on different levels in terms of discursive syntax (logical sequence), discursive semantics (thematization and figurativization used to express meaningful relationships), or its narrative semantics (micro-semantic universe or system of convictions). Discursive sub-units may be identified by the parallels of 'inverted' and 'posited contents' of their introductions and conclusions respectively. These inverted parallelisms may be constructed by discursive syntax or discursive semantics. Previous approaches to James have failed to present a consistently coherent structure of the letter in terms of its discursive syntax, therefore one must consider the possibility that James is primarily organized in terms of its discursive semantics. Second, Cargal noted that a structural semiotic method allows one to envision discourses with goals other than traditional historical reconstructions which 'occasion' a letter. In religious discourse, for example, one purpose attempted by the author is to convince the implied reader to adopt a certain 'system of convictions' (micro-semantic universe) regarding how to perceive and order the realm of human experience. Third, semiotics offers semantic organizations based fundamentally on issues of ontology (Euro-American) or value (first-century Jewish) (1993: 36-44).

Cargal's application of a semiotic model to James resulted in four major divisions of the text: 1.1-21; 1.22–2.26; 3.1–4.12; and 4.11–5.20. His examination of the inverted parallelisms at the opening (1.1) and closing (5.19-20) led to a determination that the author's purpose is to enable the readers to see themselves as the 'Diaspora', literally and metaphorically, and to 'restore' them through the letter. The four major discursive units all contribute to this overall purpose.

In summary, the recent thematic approaches identified above have significantly advanced the discussion regarding the structure of James. Although there is certainly disparity of perspective, one should note a common theme that seems to run through most judgments about the letter, and that is the significance of the introductory chapter. This, of course, corresponds to the findings of Davids and Francis. Cargal's reliance upon 'inverted parallelisms' is, in part, a reaction to the failure of

previous attempts to find coherence in James. His method, in principle, corresponds to identifying inclusions marking units of text, but it is also inherently very subjective. Johnson and Penner commendably engaged in a serious literary analysis and have done much to advance new insights into James. More of this type of analysis holds promise for clarifying the organization of the letter.

James as Rhetorical Discourse

A number of recent studies of James have emphasized the value of rhetorical criticism as a possible solution to the riddle of its structure. This emphasis was based upon the conviction that the text should be analyzed in light of the literary conventions of the Greco-Roman world with the intent that the discovery of the 'rhetorical situation' would furnish insight into the social context and interpretation of the text. Two notable rhetorical analyses of James were offered in the modern discussion of James's structure in the contributions by Wuellner (1978) and Frankenmölle (1990).

Wuellner
Wuellner applied the 'new rhetoric' (see Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca 1971) in conjunction with semiotic and communication theory to the text of James. For Wuellner, textual issues are the primary focus of investigation since the meaning of the text unfolds as it is read or heard in its particular social setting in light of the pragmatic relations within the text itself (Wuellner 1978: 12-21). His pragmatic analysis consisted of four steps: the choice of media (*Medienwahl*), genre (*Gattungswahl*), argumentation (*Argumentationswahl*), and the choice of linguistic and stylistic means (*die Wahl der sprachlichen und stilistischen Wirkmittel*) (pp. 21-64). Based upon a rhetorical perspective, Wuellner divided the text into eight 'speech sections' (*Redeabschnitte*) all of which are relatively short and of the same length. He noted the parallels of the introduction (1.1-12) and conclusion (5.7-20), which he designated as *exordium/narratio* and *peroratio* respectively, that serve as a parenthesis around the *argumentatio* (1.13–5.6). Specifically, Wuellner divided the *argumentatio* into six 'speech sections': 1.13-27; 2.1-13; 2.14-26; 3.1-18; 4.1-12; 4.13–5.6. According to Wuellner, the appropriateness of the length of the arguments is mandated by three factors: (1) the original speech-situation; (2) the choice of the length of the original media and text choices; and (3) the actual intention of the entire text (p. 36). Wuellner's proposal may be illustrated as follows.

I.   Introductory 'speech section'—1.1-12
     A. Brief prescript (1.1)
     B. *Exordium* (1.2-4)
     C. *Narratio* (1.5-11)
     D. Comprehensive proposition (1.12)

II. *Argumentatio* (1.13–5.6)
     A. 1.13-27 (negative, 1.13-16; positive, 1.17-27)
     B. 2.1-13 (negative, 2.1-7; positive, 2.8-13)
     C. 2.14-26 (use of *exempla* and connection with 1.19-27)
     D. 3.1-12 (negative, 3.1-12; positive, 3.13-18)
     E. 4.1-12 (negative, 4.1-4; positive, 4.5-12)
     F. 4.13–5.6 (doing good/sin, 4.13-17; relationship between God
         and believers as the basis and goal of all behavior, 5.1-6)

III. Concluding 'speech section'—5.7-20
     A. 5.7-12 (negative)
     B. 5.13-20 (positive)

Frankenmölle

One of the most concerted and sophisticated literary analyses of James in recent years was offered by Frankenmölle (1990). He, too, applied rhetorical criticism to James, but with an appreciation for the work of Cladder, Davids, and others who argued for the significance of the opening chapter (1990: 163). Frankenmölle designated 1.2-18 as the *exordium* and 5.7-20 the *peroratio*, sections that 'frame' the letter. Furthermore, in concert with others, he argued that the opening section announces key themes of the letter and that, structurally, each of the topics in James can be attached to one of the brief exhortations found in 1.2-18.

   Frankenmölle asserted that Jas 1.2-3 introduces the overriding theme of testing and the resulting steadfastness as the goal of the Christian life. This is followed by the foundational thesis of the discourse in 1.4, the resulting perfection and completeness of the testing process. The call to be mature and complete is taken up again in 1.19-27 and 3.1-12. The lack of wisdom in 1.5 is repeated in 3.13-18. The lack of faith in 1.6-8 finds a more complete expression in 2.14-26. The inadequacy of a proper assessment between the rich and poor in 1.9-11 recurs in 2.1-13 and 5.1-6. Finally, 1.13-18 is linked to 4.1-12 in its stress on humility before God and constitutes the theocentric foundation of all chapters (1990: 193). The following illustrates Frankenmölle's proposal.

1.1: Prescript

1.2-18: Exordium

   1.2: manifold testing

         1.3:   steadfastness of faith as goal

         1.4:   foundational thesis
               lack of complete obedience   1.19-27: complete obedience
               lack of complete existence   3.1-12:   complete person

         1.5:   lack of wisdom   3.13-18: complete wisdom

         1.6-8: lack of faith   2.14-26: true faith

         1.9-11: lack of proper   2.1-13:   solidarity between rich
               assessment between rich   5.1-6:   and poor
               and poor

     1.12:   reward of trial at the end

     1.13-15: temptation from one's own   4.1-12:   humility before God
            desire

     1.16-18: God as the foundation of   [theocentric foundation of
            Christian existence   all chapters]

5.7-20: Peroratio
         appeal for steadfastness
         outlook of the end
         health and sickness
         life and death

The greatest contribution of rhetorical approaches to James is the demonstration of coherence to the whole in a rhetorical situation. Yet, the riddle of structure remains as there is still the same disparity on divisions in the text and how the smaller units interact to form the whole. Rhetorical criticism offers valuable insights into the interaction of themes, patterns of argumentation, and means of persuasion, but in and of itself, it is inadequate.

Bauckham and Moo: A Mediating Position

A mediating approach has been advocated by Bauckham in his recent monograph on James (1999). In light of the wide variety of proposals for the structure of James resulting from different methods (sometimes even different results from the same method!) and little sign of any consensus,

Bauckham noted that 'one suspects that something must be wrong with the goal that is being attempted' (p. 61). He conceded that scholars since Dibelius have demonstrated that there is more continuity of thought and coherence than Dibelius asserted, but there may be problems with the nature of the current discussion. Bauckham noted that one must distinguish between a 'carefully composed structure' and 'coherence of thought' (pp. 61-62). In other words, a completely random assembly of sections could all still be coherent in their content by virtue of the concerns and ideas of one author or even by a school. A more realistic approach, according to Bauckham, is 'to recognize that Dibelius was wrong about the lack of coherence of thought in James, but right to recognize that James does not exhibit the kind of coherence that is provided by a sequence of argument or logical progression of thought encompassing the whole work' (p. 62). For Bauckham, James is best viewed as a loosely structured composition, and he also thought that any impact that structure gives to the interpretation of the letter should be one with clear changes in themes and argument that the original readers could have recognized (p. 63).

Bauckham proposed a simple three-part outline: Prescript (1.1), Introduction (1.2-27) and Exposition (2–5). Based upon clear formal markers and considerable agreement among commentators, he divided the 'Exposition' into twelve units (2.1-13; 2.14-26; 3.1-12; 3.13-18; 4.1-10; 4.11-12; 4.13-17; 5.1-6; 5.7-11; 5.12; 5.13-18; 5.19-20). These twelve sections are 'carefully crafted as self-contained entities with strong indications to readers that they are to be read as such' (1999: 66). Bauckham believed that most rhetorical approaches are misguided by supposing that James must have a single communicative goal that is pursued by means of sequential argument. Indeed, James has a skillful rhetorical structure but 'only within each section is he concerned to lead the reader on through a continuous train of thought' (p. 67). The manner in which these sections are placed in sequence are of much less consequence. This does not mean that their arrangement is entirely random, but rather that even if they were it would not detract from the overall goal of the composition (p. 68). Bauckham himself did discern some principles of ordering in the arrangement of sections, but only loosely structured and of such design as 'to help readers read, ponder, and assimilate each of the twelve sections in itself' (p. 69). He also agreed with others regarding ch. 1 as a carefully compiled collection of aphorisms, although not necessarily systematic, that introduce the themes of the main exposition in 2–5. The most significant part of the arrangement is the 'perfection' theme introduced in the first section (1.2-4) which, for James, is the 'inclusive goal of the Christian life' (p. 73).

In his recent commentary on James, a significant expansion of his previous volume in the Tyndale series, Moo offered a similar mediating position regarding the issue of structure. He, like Bauckham, argued for more structure than Dibelius allowed but at the same time was not convinced of the more elaborate schemes discovered by others. Moo's own proposal recognized several key motifs central to James's concern mixed together in a fashion that defies neat labels. Specifically, he identified 1.2–5.11 as the body of the letter which he divided into five sections: 1.2-18; 1.19-26; 3.1-12; 3.13–4.3; 4.4-10; 4.13–5.11. He did, however, identify the central concern of the letter as 'spiritual wholeness'. According to Moo, 'Basic to all James says in his letter is his concern that his readers stop compromising with worldly values and behavior and give themselves wholly to the Lord' (2000: 46).

Taylor/Guthrie

Taylor's recent textlinguistic analysis of James represents yet another look at the structure of the letter (Taylor 2001). The dissertation employed a textlinguistic model developed by Guthrie in his analysis of Hebrews (Guthrie 1994). The study confirmed and synthesized key insights of others and suggested that there are still some yet unexplored dynamics of the letter and 'keys' to the structure of James that show promise for continuing the discussion. In addition to the discoveries of others, Taylor's study highlighted four dynamics that are important for understanding James's structure. These include (1) notable uses of *inclusio*; (2) the important function of proverbial transitions throughout the letter that link larger units together and work in conjunction with key uses of *inclusio*; (3) the prominence of the opening essay (2.1-13); and (4) the thematic, cohesive role of key Old Testament texts (Lev. 19; Deut. 6.4-6; and Prov. 3.34). These dynamics, when considered in conjunction with each other, clarify the major purposes and concerns of the composition. A brief summary of each of these observations follows.

The first two, *inclusio* and *proverbial transitions*, can be considered together because of their overlapping functions. The proverbial style of various units in James has contributed to the difficulty in identifying a sensible structure. Several of these maxims appear isolated from their immediate context and independent of the more extended essays (1.12; 1.26-27; 2.12-13; 3.13-18; 4.11-12; and 5.12). However, upon closer examination, these 'isolated' units serve an important transition function by uniting the larger essays within the body of the letter (Taylor 2001: 111-19). This is

all the more significant in light of the fact that some of them function as part of an *inclusio* as well.

In the recent discussion of James's structure as noted above, many have appealed to the use of *inclusio* as an indication of some intentional structuring. Of all the possible occurrences discovered by Taylor in his analysis (2001: 82-98), four emerged as significant structural indicators. These include *inclusios* crafted at 1.2-4//1.12; 1.12//1.25; 2.12-13//4.11-12; and 4.6//5.6. The first two uses shed new light on the structure of the opening chapter and provide a compelling structural reason for isolating 1.2-25 as an introduction to the whole. The last two extend this structuring technique to the entire letter when considered in conjunction with other textual phenomena.

The first *inclusio* (1.2-4 and 1.12) was noted by Penner, but there is an equally important occurrence at 1.12 and 1.25 built around the themes of 'blessing' (μακάριος [*makarios*, 'blessed']) and 'endurance' (1.12, ὑπομένω [*hupomenō*, 'to endure']; 1.25, παραμένω [*paramenō*, 'to remain']). This indicates a somewhat balanced structure for the opening chapter with thematic solidarity. The concerns raised in 1.2-4, 1.12 and 1.25 embody the idea of 'blessing' upon those who endure the test, an endurance that is manifested primarily in an obedience that defines their love for God. All three texts are eschatologically oriented (outcome of trials in 1.2-4, reception of the crown of life in 1.12, and future blessing resulting from obedience in 1.25). The central proposition of the chapter is 1.12 by virtue of the overlapping of the *inclusio*; the one who endures the test manifests a love for God and will be 'blessed' with the crown of life. In this arrangement, 1.12 serves a unifying function, both structurally and thematically (Taylor 2001: 85-86, 131-32).

In the body of the letter, two significant uses of *inclusio* occur at 2.12-13//4.11-12 and 4.6//5.6. The latter was articulated by Schökel (1973). He noted the occurrence and reappearance of the rare term ἀντιτάσσω (*antitassō*, 'to resist') and argued that the section that runs from 4.6 to 5.6 was commentary on Prov. 3.34 (God resists the proud but gives grace to the humble). To this writer's knowledge, the former has not been recognized or probed in light of its strategic placement in the letter and its unifying function. The *inclusio* is crafted around a cluster of important thematic terms (e.g. 'speaking', 'doing/doers', 'law', 'judgment' and 'neighbor'; cf. 2.8 and 4.12) (see Taylor 2001: 90). This is all the more significant in light of the contextual function of each end of the inclusion, that is, there are also key proverbial transition statements that link more extended units.

This provides solid evidence of some intentional sequencing and thematic coherence.

The opening essay of the letter body (2.1-13) is prominent and significant by virtue of its placement and content. While it has been repeatedly observed that the opening chapter introduces themes that are expanded in the letter body, nothing parallels the opening chapter like 2.1-13. Key motifs, words and phrases give every appearance of some sequential, intentional arrangement (e.g. 'faith', 'doubting' [διακρίνω, *diakrinō*], 'poverty/wealth', 'love for God', 'law of liberty'). Themes, words and phrases from ch. 1 are utilized throughout, yet the essay is focused specifically on partiality, and notably, the Lev. 19.18 quote is integrated here as well. Additionally, 1.22-25 and 2.8-13 share common terms ('law' and 'doing'), terms that reappear in 4.11-12. The essay concludes with the proverbial transition (2.12-13) emphasizing 'speaking' and 'doing', precisely the topics of 2.14-26 (doing) and 3.1-12 (speaking), albeit in reverse order. A significant pattern emerges as one considers all of these links collectively: the letter opening (1.2-4//1.12//1.25); unique parallels between 1.2-25 and 2.1-13; and the relationship between 1.22-25//2.8-11//2.12-13//4.11-12 (Taylor 2001: 120, 140-41, 164).

But what about the remainder of the letter? This is answered, in part by the *inclusio* framed by the rare term ἀντιτάσσω (*antitassō*, 'to resist') at 4.6 and 5.6 as noted by Schökel and picked up by Penner in his structural analysis (1996: 156-57). The inclusion introduces a key Old Testament text, Prov. 3.34, which announces thematically the exposition from 4.7–5.6 (God resists the proud, 4.13–5.6; God gives grace to the humble, 4.7-10). This appears to leave 4.11-12 unaccounted for. However, if one recognizes that 4.11-12 has multiple functions, both a proverbial transition and forming a major *inclusio* with 2.12-13, a remarkable coherence of themes emerges. The reoccurrence of the term 'πλησίον' (*plēsion*, 'neighbor') in 4.12 recalls the quotation of Lev. 19.18 in Jas 2.8. Therefore, overlapping *inclusios*, one at 2.12-13//4.11-12 and the other at 4.6//5.6, are both structured around key Old Testament texts working together in the service of the author's argument. Since 5.7-20 has been widely recognized as the conclusion of the main body, all of the aforementioned dynamics account for the entire organization of the letter and suggest a highly coherent progression and unity of thought.

The strategic placement of these key *inclusios* raises the significant question regarding the role of Old Testament quotations and allusions in the structuring of the letter, namely Leviticus 19, Deuteronomy 6 and

Prov. 3.34. In 1982, Johnson offered important insights on the use of Leviticus 19 in the letter of James. He noted the similarities of James with *The Sentences of Pseudo-Phocylides* and their similar appropriation of the Leviticus text. Collectively, Johnson noted numerous connections and/or allusions between James and Leviticus 19 that suggest that 'James made conscious and sustained use of Lev. 19.12-18' (1982: 399). Specifically, he noted the following connections.

Lev. 19.12	Jas 5.12
Lev. 19.13	Jas 5.4
Lev. 19.15	Jas 2.1, 9
Lev. 19.16	Jas 4.11
Lev. 19.17b	Jas 5.20
Lev. 19.18a	Jas 5.9
Lev. 19.18b	Jas 2.8

This same type of analysis might also apply to the other half of the 'double-love' command as found in Mt. 22.34-40, where Jesus responded to a question by combining two texts, Leviticus 19 and Deuteronomy 6, the central Jewish confession. Does James include 'love for God' in his letter as well as 'love for neighbor'? There are significant indications that he does. Allusions to Deuteronomy 6 occur at two places, 2.19 and 4.12. The first is parallel to the Leviticus 19 quote by virtue of the phrase 'you do well' (καλῶς ποιεῖτε, 2.8 [*kalōs poieite*]; καλῶς ποιεῖς, 2.19 [*kalōs poieis*]). The second is found in 4.12 in the phrase 'εἷς ἐστιν [ὁ] νομο-θέτης καὶ κριτής' (*heis estin ho nomothetēs kai kritēs*, 'there is one lawgiver and judge'), a section of structural significance as indicated above. The phrase 'love of God' occurs twice in the letter, both in significant places. The first occurrence is 1.12, the central proposition of the double *inclusio* that frames the opening chapter. The second is 2.5, a text in close proximity to 2.8. Furthermore, the 'love of God' theme works thematically throughout James's admonition and exhortation. James rebukes those with divided loyalties (1.8, 4.8) who have become 'friends of the world' (4.4). Rather, they should demonstrate a commitment to true religion that is pure before God (1.26-27) and should pattern their life after Abraham, a 'friend of God' (2.23). An emphasis on whole-hearted devotion to God resonates throughout the letter. This, along with James's focus on the 'whole law' indicates strong allusion to Jesus' double-love command found in Matthew 22. Thus, these texts, Lev. 19.18 and Deuteronomy 6, along with Prov. 3.34 as indicated above, provide thematic cohesion drawn from the Old Testament and filtered through the

life and teaching of Jesus (Taylor 2001: 144-47; see also Bauckham 1999: 145). The role of the Old Testament and how James appropriates texts might be an important key to the riddle of James's structure.

Guthrie, in his forthcoming commentary on James in the Expositor's Bible Commentary series, has adopted and refined some of the emphases of Taylor's work in his own depiction of the structure of James. Guthrie's approach corresponds to the chiastic schemes of Cladder, Francis and Davids but understands the development differently at numerous points. Guthrie detected three primary movements in the letter: 1.2-27, 2.1–5.6; 5.7-20. He followed Francis/Davids in seeing the opening chapter as a double introduction but organized the contents differently according to the *inclusio* noted by Taylor at 1.2-4//1.12//1.25. James 1.2-11 introduces the topics of trials (1.2-4), wisdom (1.5-8) and rich/poor (1.9-11) that is echoed in 1.13-27 and given thematic cohesion by the recurring theme of self-deception: deceived by temptation (1.13-16), deception regarding righteous living (1.17-25) and deception regarding religious practice (1.26-27).

Guthrie detected a symmetrical development within the letter body that develops the themes of right action and right speech introduced in 1.26-27 and that takes into account the significant *inclusio* identified by Taylor at 2.12-13//4.11-12. The chiastic structure unfolds as follows.

A 2.1-11 Violating the royal law through judging the poor

    B 2.12-13 So speak and act as one being judged by the law of liberty

        C 2.14-26 Wrong action toward the poor

            D 3.1-12 Wrong speaking toward one another in principle

                E 3.13-18 Righteous vs. worldly wisdom

            D 4.1-5 Wrong action and speaking in practice

        C 4.6-10 A call to humility and repentance

    B 4.11-12 Do the law, do not judge it

A 4.13–5.6 Twin calls to the arrogant rich (presumption and judgment)

Conclusion: Consensus and the Prospect for Further Dialogue

Has all of the scholarly attention focused on the structure of James been a worthwhile pursuit since there seems to be no unanimity concerning the fundamental questions of the letter's coherence and interpretation? Could Bauckham's mediating assessment represent a trend back in the direction

of Dibelius? It is certainly possible that scholarship could move back toward a more unstructured or loosely structured view of James. This, however, would be an unfortunate turn of events. Amidst the diversity there are significant areas of consensus to be found in the recent trends surveyed above, and much has been done to clarify and draw focus to the literary dynamics of the letter.

Consensus may be found in the following areas. First, the older paraenetic presupposition of Dibelius has been either abandoned altogether or significantly revised by current scholarship. This has occurred because of an increased focus on the literary aspects of biblical texts and a serious reassessment of assumptions held by Dibelius regarding the inherent lack of structure and social setting of paraenesis. Second, while it would be incorrect to assert that there is a scholarly consensus regarding the details of the structure of James, there is a growing sense that the text of James is a literary, coherent whole. The obvious literary connections within the text such as catchwords, theme expansion, and recapitulation have been observed and confirmed by numerous studies using various methods and working with different presuppositions. The text of James simply bears the marks of intentionality, even a sequential progression at points, when analyzed closely. Third, in light of the foregoing, many are convinced that ch. 1 holds the key to the letter's structure. The contributions of Francis, Davids, Vouga, Martin, Johnson, Penner, Frankenmölle, Wuellner, Bauckham, Taylor, Guthrie and others point in this direction. All agree that ch. 1 functions to introduce major themes that are subsequently expanded in the letter body. Fourth, there is virtually unanimous agreement that major blocks such as 2.1-13, 2.14-16, 3.1-12 and 4.1-10, and smaller units such as 1.2-4, 3.13-18 and 5.1-6 exhibit a discernible structure and a sustained treatment of a unified topic.

The major question that still remains is how the units in James relate to one another in order to accomplish James's purpose for writing. This relationship is obviously very complex. Any convincing analysis will need to take seriously the surface syntactical structure in the text itself and demonstrate how the major themes of perfection, law, judgment, speech and action in James work together. More attention needs to be given to James's use of the Old Testament, both by way of quotation (explicit and implicit) and allusion and how James appropriates the 'law' in light of the teaching and ministry of Jesus. The attention given thus far has been productive and has renewed interest in a much neglected epistle. Discussion of the letter will no doubt continue. One thing is certain: any interpretation of James cannot ignore the issue of the letter's structure.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Baasland, E.
    1988   'Literarische Form, Thematik, und Geschichtliche Einordnung des Jakobus-
                briefes', in W. Haase and H. Temporini (eds.), *ANRW* 25.5 (Berlin: W. de
                Gruyter): 3646-84.
Barclay, W.
    1960   *The Letters of James & Peter* (Edinburgh: St. Andrews, 2nd edn).
Bauckham, R.
    1999   *James: Wisdom of James, Disciple of Jesus the Sage* (NTR; London: Routledge).
Bengel, J.A.
    1877   *Bengel's New Testament Commentary* (2 vols.; trans. C. Lewis and M.M.
                Vincent; Grand Rapids: Kregel).
Cantinat, J.
    1973   *Les Épîtres de Saint Jacques et de Saint Jude* (Paris: J. Gabalda).
Cargal, T.
    1993   *Restoring the Diaspora: Discursive Structure and Purpose in the Epistle of
                James* (SBLDS; Atlanta: Scholars Press).
Cladder, H.J.
    1904   'Die Anfang des Jakobusbriefes', *ZKT* 28: 37-57.
Crotty, R.B.
    1992   'The Literary Structure of James', *ABR* 40: 45-57.
Davids, P.
    1982   *A Commentary on the Epistle of James* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans).
Dibelius, M.
    1976   *A Commentary on the Epistle of James* (trans. M. Williams; Hermeneia; Phila-
                delphia: Fortress Press).
Easton, B.S.
    1957   *The Epistle of James* (New York: Abingdon Press).
Edgar, D.H.
    2001   *Has God Not Chosen the Poor? The Social Setting of the Epistle of James*
                (JSNTSup, 261; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).
Elliot, J.H.
    1997   'The Epistle of James in Social Scientific Perspective: Holiness-Wholeness and
                Patterns of Replication', *BTB* 23: 71-72.
Francis, F.O.
    1970   'The Form and Function of the Opening and Closing Paragraphs of James and I
                John', *ZNW* 61: 110-26.
Frankenmölle, H.
    1990   'Das semantische Netz des Jakobusbriefes: Zur Einheit eines umstrittenen
                Briefes', *BZ* 34: 161-97.
Fry, E.
    1978   'The Testing of Faith: A Study of the Structure of the Book of James', *BT* 29:
                427-35.
Guthrie, G.H.
    1994   *The Structure of Hebrews: A Text-Linguistic Analysis* (NovTSup, 73; Leiden:
                E.J. Brill).
    forthcoming *James* (EBC; Grand Rapids: Zondervan).
Holtzmann, H.J., *et al.*
    1890   *Hand-Commentar zum Neuen Testament*, III/2 (Freiburg: J.C.B. Mohr).
Johnson, L.T.
    1978–79   'II Timothy and the Polemic against False Teachers: A Re-examination', *JRS*
                6.7: 1-26.

1982   'The Use of Leviticus 19 in the Letter of James', *JBL* 101: 391-401.

1985   'Friendship with the World/Friendship with God: A Study of Discipleship in James', in F.F. Segovia (ed.), *Discipleship in the New Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press): 166-83.

1996   *The Letter of James* (AB; New York: Doubleday).

Jülicher, A.

1904   *An Introduction to the New Testament* (trans. J.P. Ward; London: Smith, Elder & Co.).

Laws, S.

1980   *A Commentary on the Epistle of James* (HNTC; San Francisco: Harper & Row).

Martin, R.

1988   *The Epistle of James* (WBC; Waco, TX: Word Books).

Marxen, W.

1968   *Introduction to the New Testament: An Approach to its Problems* (trans. G. Buswell; Philadelphia: Fortress Press).

Mayor, J.

1910   *The Epistle of St. James: The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes, and Comments* (London: Macmillan, 3rd edn [1st edn, 1892]).

Mitton, C.L.

1966   *The Epistle of James* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans).

Moo, D.

2000   *The Letter of James* (PNTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans).

Mussner, F.

1964   *Der Jakobusbrief* (HTKNT; Freiberg: Herder).

Penner, T.C.

1996   *The Epistle of James and Eschatology: Re-Reading an Ancient Christian Letter* (JSNTSup, 331; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).

Perdue, L.

1981   'Paraenesis and the Epistle of James', *ZNW* 72: 241-56.

1990   'The Social Character of Paraenesis and Paraenetic Literature', *Semeia* 50: 5-39.

Perelman, C., and L. Olbrechts-Tyteca

1971   *The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation* (Notre Dame: Notre Dame University Press).

Perrin, N.

1974   *The New Testament, an Introduction: Proclamation and Paraenesis, Myth and History* (New York: Harcourt Brace Javanovich).

Pfeiffer, E.

1850   'Der Zusammendhang des Jakobusbriefes', *TSK* 1: 163-80.

Popkes, W.

1995   'James and Paraenesis Reconsidered', in T. Fornberg and D. Hellholm (eds.), *Texts and Contexts: Biblical Texts in their Textual and Situational Contexts* (Oslo: Scandinavian University Press): 535-61.

Reese, J.M.

1982   'The Exegete as Sage: Hearing the Message of James', *BTB* 12: 82-85.

Reicke, B.

1964   *The Epistle of James, Peter, and Jude* (AB; New York: Doubleday).

Ropes, J.H.

1916   *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle of St. James* (ICC; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons).

Schökel, A.

1973   'James 5.2 [*sic*] and 4.6', *Bib* 54: 73-76.

Stowers, S.

1986   *Letter Writing in Greco-Roman Antiquity* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press).

Taylor, M.E.
    2001   'A Textlinguistic Investigation into the Discourse Structure of James' (PhD dissertation, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary).
Terry, R.B.
    1992   'Some Aspects of the Discourse Structure of the Book of James', *JTTL* 5: 106-25.
Thurén, L.
    1995   'Risky Rhetoric in James?', *NovT* 37: 262-84.
Tollefson, K.
    1997   'The Epistle of James as Dialectical Discourse', *BTB* 21: 66-69.
Verner, D.
    1983   *The Household of God: The Social World of the Pastoral Epistles* (SBLDS; Chico, CA: Scholars Press).
Vouga, F.
    1984   *L'Épître de Saint Jacques* (CNT; Genève: Labor et Fides).
Wachob, W.
    2000   *The Voice of Jesus in the Social Rhetoric of James* (SNTSMS; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
Wall, R.
    1990   'James as Apocalyptic Paraenesis', *RQ* 32: 11-22.
    1998   *Community of the Wise: The Letter of James* (New Testament in Context; Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International).
Watson, D.
    1993a   'James 2 in Light of Greco-Roman Schemes of Argumentation', *NTS* 39: 94-121.
    1993b   'The Rhetoric of James 3.1-12 and a Classical Pattern of Argumentation', *NovT* 35: 48-64.
Wuellner, W.
    1978   'Der Jakobusbrief im Licht der Rhetorik und Textpragmatik', *LB* 43: 5-66.

PAUL AND THE BACKGROUND OF SLAVERY:
THE *STATUS QUAESTIONIS* IN NEW TESTAMENT SCHOLARSHIP[*]

John Byron

Ashland Theological Seminary
Ashland, Ohio, USA
jbyron@ashland.edu

ABSTRACT

Over the last thirty years studies of slavery in the Pauline Epistles have tended to follow two different methodological approaches. Some have considered slavery in Paul based on legal definitions while others have gravitated towards sociological definitions. While some have portrayed Greco-Roman slavery as an almost benevolent institution, others have preferred to highlight its more brutal aspects. This article traces the major shifts in New Testament scholarship and how these two contrasting definitions have helped to shape our understanding of Paul and slavery. It concludes with a brief examination of four areas that New Testament scholarship has begun to reconsider as a result of these sifting opinions about Greco-Roman slavery.

Over the last thirty years there has been a perceptible shift in the understanding of Paul and the background of slavery against which he wrote. From the early 1970s until the early 1990s, New Testament scholars tended to portray slavery in the Greco-Roman world as a benign form of mass employment for the under classes as well as an effective means of integrating foreigners. In the last ten to fifteen years, however, the pendulum has swung to such a degree that any portrayal of slavery in a positive light is usually criticized. What follows is a review of the literature charting this shift and the major players involved. It is by no means exhaustive.

To cover the topic of Paul and slavery is not a simple task. As well as issues of slavery as an institution, there is also the area of Paul's metaphorical usage of slavery terminology and imagery. The Epistle to Philemon is yet another matter in itself. Consequently, I have imposed an artificial framework that divides the topic into five sections. These are not precise categories and they often overlap with one another.

In the first section I provide an overview of the two different approaches that slavery studies followed between 1973 and 1990. This survey will serve as a reference point from which many other studies have proceeded. In the second section I examine how scholarship has developed in relation to Paul's metaphorical usage of slavery from either of the two approaches overviewed in section one. In section three I examine how these approaches in New Testament scholarship have viewed Paul's opinion concerning institutional slavery, particularly in relation to his statements in 1 Cor. 7.21-22. In section four I cover the Epistle to Philemon in the same format as the previous two sections. Finally, in section five, I offer some observations on what New Testament scholarship has learned and what issues we must be aware of as we continue to research.

1. *Defining Slavery: Two Contrasting Approaches*

1.1. *Legal Definitions of Slavery*

With the 1973 publication of his dissertation *First-Century Slavery and the Interpretation of 1 Corinthians 7.21*, Bartchy provided the first comprehensive examination of Greco-Roman slavery in relation to the New Testament. Focusing on the elliptical phrase at the end of 1 Cor. 7.21b, he demonstrated how New Testament scholars usually completed Paul's thought by inserting either 'use slavery' or 'use freedom' depending upon their particular theological, historical or philological approach. He also observed that scholars did not 'seem to have been concerned to establish the actual social and legal situation of slaves in Corinth in the middle of the first century' (p. 24). The challenge confronting Bartchy, and those who had preceded him, was the 'lack of any serious, full-scale history of slavery in the Greco-Roman world' (p. 30).

Bartchy's portrayal of Greco-Roman slavery was based on an analysis of Greek, Roman and Jewish legal texts. Supplementing these was a variety of philosophical, historical and satirical literature. The result was a depiction of slavery which was decidedly benign. While acknowledging that slavery was far from the ideal situation (1973: 46), Bartchy concluded that the first century 'was a time in which living conditions for those in slavery

was improving; legal action and public opinion supported better treatment of slaves' (p. 71). Slaves were said to have the advantage of 'job security' over poor free persons (p. 75) and could expect to be freed by the age of thirty (p. 85). Life as a slave was attractive enough that many persons willingly sold themselves into slavery with the intention of climbing socially and to gain personal and social security (p. 116). Bartchy asserted that the treatment of slaves living under Jewish law was so good that Jews anxious to sell themselves were unable to find Jewish purchasers (p. 52). The lack of any serious slave revolt in the first century was presented as evidence that slaves had become relatively content with their role in society (pp. 85-87).

In relation to 1 Cor. 7.21, Bartchy concluded that it was impossible for slaves to reject manumission and that, consequently, the 'use slavery' interpretation was impossible (p. 106). Furthermore, because slaves had no choice in regards to their future, choosing to 'use freedom' was not an option either (p. 110). Instead, Bartchy suggested that in the context of Paul's theology of calling in 1 Corinthians, 7.21b should be understood as an exhortation to newly freed slaves to continue keeping the commands of God as they did when enslaved and as befitted their calling in Christ (pp. 155-59). Consequently, Paul was not addressing any particular problems of slaves in Corinth, but was providing an example of how neither social nor religious statuses were influenced by the new life in Christ.

The far-reaching influence of Bartchy's representation of ancient slavery cannot be overstated. One merely need open a variety of commentaries and other New Testament works written in the 1970s and 1980s which deal with some aspect of slavery to discover the degree to which his influence extended. This is in spite of the fact that some, like Barrett, questioned not only the positive social setting for slavery which Bartchy had sketched, but also his solution to the elliptical phrase in 1 Cor. 7.21b (Barrett 1975). Bartchy's positive view of slavery was given further prominence in his 1992 contributions on slavery and Philemon in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*.

A second work that also received much attention was that of Lyall, *Slaves, Citizens, Sons* (1984). His volume was an expansion of publications from the 1970s and 1980s in which he sought to correlate various legal metaphors in the New Testament with extant Roman laws (p. 23). Lyall seems to have assumed that if an echo of Roman law could be detected in a text, then the text should be interpreted in light of that law and its implications. Using the Roman legal system as a hermeneutical grid, he examined a variety of topics including slavery, citizenship, adoption, inheritance and trade as they were regulated in Imperial Rome. Lyall

surmised that because slavery was widespread in the first century, Paul must have drawn upon such images in his letters. Thus in the case of Paul's statements in Rom. 6.16-22, Lyall concluded that the background must be the Roman practice of individuals selling themselves into slavery (p. 35).

A particular inadequacy of Lyall's study was the uncritical way in which he approached not only the New Testament, but also Roman, Greek and Jewish legal texts. His methodology consisted of observing a Pauline statement or allusion to slavery and then deciding which law may have been in Paul's mind depending upon which law strengthens the imagery. Moreover, Lyall's area of expertise was not ancient law but modern legal practices and he seemed to be unaware of the difficulties involved with dating Jewish traditions in rabbinic literature (p. 9). He also seemed to have been unaware of Bartchy's work. Similar criticisms were made in a review by Aune (1987). Others, however, praised it as a highly informative example of an interdisciplinary work (Hock 1986). Similar to Bartchy, many New Testament scholars uncritically accepted Lyall's treatment of Paul and slavery. Once again, a perusal through numerous New Testament commentaries will demonstrate the lasting influence of Lyall's work.

1.2. *Sociological Definitions of Slavery*

During the time in which Bartchy and Lyall were forming New Testament scholars' perspective on slavery in the Greco-Roman world, two other important contributions were made that would also have lasting significance. Neither of these was from a New Testament scholar. One was a sociologist, and the other a Roman historian.

In 1982 Patterson published his landmark work *Slavery and Social Death*. Patterson was guarded about using legal texts as the basis for defining slavery because he believed that Roman laws of slavery amounted to a 'legal fiction'. Rather than understanding property as a relationship, the Romans transformed the legal understanding to one of the power of an owner over a thing. Previously an ambiguity had existed between the definition of slaves as property and an inanimate object. The consequence of this new legal paradigm, however, was that slaves, as human beings, were now classified as 'things' which placed a tremendous amount of control into the hands of the owner (pp. 30-31).

For Patterson, slavery was far from a positive experience. It was a matter of the master's power over that of the enslaved (1982: 26). Slavery was created and maintained by violence and in many ways was nothing more than a substitute for a violent death (p. 3). Slavery was a sentence of

execution 'suspended only as long as the slave acquiesced in his power-lessness' to the master (pp. 3, 5). Patterson demonstrated that slaves and former slaves were persons without honor (p. 306) who had been robbed of their former identity through a process he termed natal alienation.

> Slaves differed from other human beings in that they were not allowed freely to integrate the experience of their ancestors into their lives, to inform their understanding of social reality with the inherited meanings of their natural forbears, or to anchor the living present in any conscious community of memory (1982: 5).

Slaves were estranged from their family and ethnic background to such a degree that they had effectively undergone a death experience on the social level.

In the context of the New Testament, Patterson considered the death of Christ as a symbolic example of slavery and freedom. In the power-dominated world of antiquity, the choice to be enslaved often meant another chance at life while freedom could quickly lead to death. This was a choice that few were willing to make. For Christians, however, Patterson argued that Christ had made the choice for them by dying and then becoming their new master.

> The slave, it will be recalled, was someone who by choosing physical life had given up his freedom. Although he could, of course, have kept his freedom and died, man lacked the courage to make this choice. Jesus, 'his savior,' by his death made this choice for him (p. 71).

Consequently, Christians were able to live a life of 'freedom' while escaping the consequences of death which had already been nullified by Christ's death for them.

The second influential work was Bradley's *Slaves and Masters in the Roman Empire* (1987). Although unaware of Patterson's sociological work, Bradley reached very similar conclusions (in the preface to the second edition Bradley notes that his original manuscript went to the publisher in early 1982, at about the time that Patterson's work was being published). Acknowledging that only recently did scholarship view slavery as something unpalatable (p. 19), he observed that by definition slavery is the securing and monopolizing of an involuntary work force by those who monopolize economic power (p. 18). As an institution, slavery required controls that would guarantee the stability and perpetuation of a system that the entire Roman Empire depended upon economically (p. 30). These controls were presented as rewards and incentives which were used as a way to encourage a feeling of connectedness with society in spite of the

reality of the slave's situation (pp. 24, 35, 39). Two particular incentives were the semblance of family life and the promise of eventual freedom (pp. 51, 59, 83).

Bradley also challenged the commonly held notions that slavery could be a vehicle for upward mobility (p. 82) and that the lack of a slave revolt in the first century, as argued by Bartchy, was evidence of slave contentment with the status quo (p. 43). He argued cogently that the system and controls were such that slaves were hemmed in and that very few acted on any of their aspirations for escape and freedom.

In the New Testament, Bradley observed that although Christianity presented itself as a religion of equality, it continued to perpetuate the inequalities that supported the slavery system. Commandments for slaves to obey masters and treat them deferentially would have only reinforced the current societal controls. The New Testament, by nature, is not a set of documents produced for or by the aristocracy. Bradley noted that such commandments reveal how engrained these controls had become in society; not just among the ruling class but also among those being ruled (1987: 38).

While there were other studies that appeared during this time, the above four represent the most influential works to be published over the ten-year period. Bartchy was the most prominent in New Testament circles and Patterson was increasingly challenging the status quo in classical studies. It would be more than ten years until Patterson's work began to influence New Testament scholars and, as will be seen below, eclipse Bartchy.

2. *Paul's Slavery Metaphors*

One of the complications we encounter when discussing Paul and slavery is the question of which epistles should be used to inform our understanding. If, with the majority of New Testament scholars, we deem Colossians, Ephesians and the Pastoral Epistles to be Deutero-Pauline, we discover that Paul had very little to say about slavery as an institution. Apart from the Epistle to Philemon and 1 Cor. 7.21-23, all of Paul's slavery language belongs to the realm of metaphor. As a result, there have been many attempts to understand the source of the metaphor as it appears in Paul and what meaning he intended to convey when he identified himself as a slave of Christ.

Probably one of the more well-known works examining Paul's slavery metaphors has been Martin's 1990 monograph *Slavery as Salvation*. Martin sought to discover why early Christianity accepted the phrase 'slave of

Christ' as a positive designation. Although aware of the contribution by Bradley, Martin does not appear to have been influenced by Patterson. This is not to suggest that he was unacquainted with Patterson, but Patterson does not appear in Martin's bibliography and Bradley is referenced only once in a note where Martin voices disagreement with Bradley's portrayal of slavery (p. 181 n. 1).

Working under the tutelage of Meeks, Martin used a sociological rather than a legal approach. This task was accomplished by using a variety of Greco-Roman literature and non-literary sources such as funerary inscriptions rather than legal codes, which he hoped would allow the recovery of perceptions of slavery at the level of the slaves rather than the aristocracy (1990: xx; 2). Martin acknowledged that there have been some who have tried to portray slavery as a 'rather benevolent institution' (p. 1). In spite of his protest to the contrary, however, Martin perpetuated this portrayal by describing the positive aspects of slavery as 'opportunities' for slaves living within the system.

Martin argued that slavery and slave language meant different things to different people (1990: xx), that the entire system was rather ambiguous, and that it did not matter as much that one was a slave, but whose slave one was (p. 35). Of particular interest to Martin were managerial slaves who sometimes had the opportunity to move up the social ladder while remaining slaves (pp. 15-22). This advancement in society was based upon the unique position of the managerial slave and the high status of the owner. Martin posited that the opportunity managerial slaves had for upward mobility would have been an inspiration of hope for the lower classes. Consequently, while those of higher status held slavery in low esteem lower status society would have regarded it in a positive light (pp. 47-49).

In early Christian usage, Martin suggested that the phrase 'slave of Christ' was a leadership title that denoted the authority of the leader as a slave representative of Christ (1990: 51-55). Using the managerial slave pattern, Martin explained Paul's self-designation of slavery in 1 Corinthians 9 (pp. 65-67). Martin also suggested that parallels exist between Paul and Greco-Roman politicians who gained their authority by appealing to the masses. He argued that by using political speech, Paul was able to assert his authority in Corinth by deriving it not from the higher-class members, but from those of the lower class (p. 87). Paul's declaration that he was a slave would have shocked and offended the higher-class members of the church because he admitted that he was occupying the low position of a slave. On the other hand, this strategy would have appealed to the lower-

class members who regarded him as a managerial slave of Christ. By casting himself this way, Paul presented himself to the higher-class members as a challenging example of how they should relate to others. To the lower class, he embodied upward mobility and salvation through slavery to Christ (p. 134).

In many ways the 1998 work of Combes, *The Metaphor of Slavery in the Writings of the Early Church*, represented a broad challenge to the methodology and conclusions reached by Martin. She observed that most definitions fall into one of two categories. The first is the 'chattel hermeneutic', the second the 'social death hermeneutic'. She attempted to use a combination of both approaches (pp. 21-22). Unconvinced by the arguments for upward mobility, she observed that many attempts to interpret Paul in a legal context ultimately do not yield any convincing parallels (pp. 79-87). Combes argued that a wider range of issues were at stake when determining how slavery language came to occupy an important part of early Christian theology. To achieve this end she examined slavery language as it developed both in an historical and theological context beginning with the LXX and finishing with patristic literature. The breadth of her research also means that her consideration of the New Testament was necessarily limited.

In examination of Paul, Combes observed that Paul's slavery imagery has a strong correlation with the theme of death (e.g. Rom. 6.6-7). She adopted Patterson's hypothesis that slavery is the equivalent of social death and that when entering into slavery people die to their former life and are given a new one by their master. In the case of Paul, individuals who identify with Christ in baptism die to their old master (sin) and receive a new life as slaves of Christ. This, according to Combes, signifies that believers are 'dead to the world and its priorities and are participants in the humiliation and crucifixion of Christ' (1998: 87-89).

A more recent attempt to understand Paul's metaphorical self-identification as a slave of Christ is that of Brown (2001) who focused on Paul's usage of the title in Rom. 1.1. Brown's work reveals an awareness of the variety of approaches taken by New Testament scholars and the pitfalls that are commonly related with these approaches. However, he accepts Lyall's argument that Paul's understanding of slavery was fundamentally from the Greco-Roman institution (2001: 729). Brown argues that those individuals mentioned in Romans 16 are part of Caesar's household similar to those individuals in Phil. 4.2. Because many of the names in Romans 16 are possibly those of slaves or freed persons from the Imperial house, Paul's readers would have understood his title as 'slave' in the same way

as they understood themselves as slaves in Caesar's house. Brown suggests that in Rom. 1.1 Paul was using the term 'slave' in a technical manner. Slaves in the imperial household had a personal stake in promoting the Emperor under which they served. This was also Paul's concern and it is with this type of imagery that he aligns himself; Paul is a slave promoting the message of Christ.

In my own work I have argued against understanding Paul's slavery metaphors from the Greco-Roman perspective (Byron 2003). I consider the assessment of slavery by Bartchy, Lyall and Martin as overly positive and have embraced the more sociological definitions of Bradley and Patterson. I have attempted to demonstrate that Paul's metaphor of slavery should be located within the 'slave of God' traditions of early Judaism rather than Greco-Roman slave practices. This is accomplished through an examination of early Jewish literature that identifies literary traditions surrounding ancient Israel and early Judaism's self-understanding of themselves as the slaves of God. It is within this context that I have interpreted Paul's slavery language. My conclusion is that Paul was not borrowing images from Greco-Roman society but was continuing in the traditions of his Jewish heritage and interacting within a broader discussion about slavery in early Judaism. Resident within this tradition is the imagery of the exodus, a literary motif common to Jewish literature. In the context of Paul and the New Testament, Christ is the paradigmatic slave of God. To follow Christ in loyal obedience is the equivalent of being his slave and ultimately allows one to fulfill obligations of slavery to God. On the individual level this occurs by imitating Christ's pattern as the slave of God found in Phil. 2.6-11. In the context of the wider Pauline community it is manifested when members enslave themselves to one another in the same way that Christ enslaved himself to others. I conclude that the slave of Christ title is not an abstract concept adopted from societal images nor is it an honorific title. Slavery to Christ is Paul's understanding of how the Christ event enables believers to fulfill their obligations of obedience as God's slaves.

3. *Paul and Institutional Slavery*

The most significant challenge to Bartchy's depiction of slavery in the first century as well as his interpretation of 1 Cor. 7.21 appeared in 1995. Harrill's published dissertation *The Manumission of Slaves in Early Christianity* represented fresh thinking on a host of issues related to Paul and slavery. Harrill rejects the framework for understanding slavery constructed

by Bartchy (pp. 94-99) and is acutely aware of the problems that constructing a legal definition of slavery presents (p. 17). Instead his approach is informed by a combination of Roman legal codes, classical literature and the works of Patterson and Bradley (pp. 14-17). For Harrill, slavery in the ancient world was not a positive experience. One would rather die than be enslaved (p. 1).

One objective of Harrill's work, even if unstated, was to deconstruct Bartchy's framework for understanding slavery. He identified numerous methodological problems underpinning Bartchy's conclusions (1995: 94-102) and concluded that Bartchy did not understand how to use legal codes as a source for social conditions. Moreover, he accused Bartchy of uncritically accepting the ancient slaveholder's ideology by suggesting that the lack of slave rebellions in the first century was an indicator of the contentment of slaves within the system (p. 97).

In the context of 1 Cor. 7.21, Harrill argued that Bartchy was incorrect to conclude that slaves could not refuse offers of manumission and provided some examples in which slaves did in fact refuse non-domestic offers of manumission (pp. 88-91). He then outlined a philological analysis of the elliptical phrase in 7.21 which led him to conclude that the 'use freedom' interpretation, previously rejected by Bartchy, is the most satisfying solution (pp. 120-21).

The year 2000 saw yet another challenge to Bartchy's interpretation with the publication of Braxton's dissertation *The Tyranny of Resolution: 1 Corinthians 7.17-24*. Braxton's approach is delineated by his deliberate avoidance of many of the exegetical ambiguities resident in this passage. He argues that those who had previously examined it claimed to resolve the ambiguities but actually created a form of exegetical tyranny by making the text subservient to preconceived notions (p. 1). Instead he contends that the passage is intentionally ambiguous. These ambiguities, according to Braxton, are not only linguistical but also social and cultural. He rejects the suggestion that Paul was promoting a status quo approach to individual social positions as a result of the divine call (p. 63). Paul was not, according to Braxton, condemning the notion of change in social status but change of status as a pre-condition of the call. Paul rejected social change as a requirement to be 'in Christ'.

Rather than employ a methodology based on legal definitions, Braxton adopted Patterson's sociological understanding of slavery (2000: 179). In conjunction with 1 Cor. 7.21-23, Braxton contends that social tensions between a slave and master who were also Christians would easily have spilled over into the church especially if it was meeting in the master's

home. Paul's advice to slaves is not to allow their social situation to adversely affect their experience in the church. Paul does allow for the possibility of social change for a slave, but he is not clear about his position on manumission. Unlike Bartchy and Harrill, Braxton does not suggest how to complete the elliptical phrase in 7.21. Instead, Braxton posits that the verse was purposely left ambiguous because Paul did not want to recommend anything specific concerning slavery and manumission in the context of the church (p. 228). Braxton concludes that it is impossible to discover from the passage exactly what Paul thought on this matter and that ambiguity was how Paul chose to deal with the problem.

In 1998 *Slavery in Text and Interpretation* was published in *Semeia* 83/84. (Although the publication year is listed as 1998, the volume was not actually released until late 2000/early 2001. A special session of the Paul and Politics group discussed the volume at the 2000 SBL meeting in Nashville, but at that time the book had not yet been released.) A compilation of ten essays, the volume represents a *tour de force* intended to challenge how New Testament scholarship considers the topic of Paul and slavery. The stated aim of the editors was to bring Patterson's work to the forefront of New Testament scholarship, which had, for the most part, ignored Patterson's work (Callahan, Horsley and Smith 1998: 8). Many of the contributors not only challenged the prevailing approach to Paul and slavery but drew attention to the numerous problems involved with portraying slavery as a benign institution. Particularly incisive are the comments by Horsley who, influenced by Patterson's work, reacts to the frameworks constructed by Bartchy and later by Martin (pp. 19-66; 153-200). In response to the hypothesis of upward mobility Horsley argued:

> It seems generally doubtful that the low status free population felt much solidarity with slaves, the very persons in the social order that defined them as at least freeborn. The very concept of upward mobility, of course, derives from an individualistic sociological worldview that accepts and presupposes the dominant social system (without fundamental critique let alone challenge) and then focuses on how individuals may be upwardly or downwardly mobile within it (1998a: 175-76).

The volume was complemented by two responses one of which is from Patterson who examines Paul closer than he had previously.

The most recent contribution is that of Glancy, *Slavery in Early Christianity* (2002). Glancy provides a window into an aspect of slavery that is rarely appreciated. Although she includes legal codes in her analysis, she is also aware of the way in which the disparate ancient sources for slavery can distort a modern analysis of the original situation and is careful, there-

fore, not to reduce slavery to a set of legal definitions and regulations (p. 4). Instead her approach examines the rhetoric of ancient slavery that considered slaves not as human beings or even mere chattel but as the 'surrogate bodies' of their master (p. 11). A slave's role in society designated them as the substitutes for free persons who labored, conducted business, and even received punishment on behalf of their master. Slavery denied the enslaved the right to be in command of their own bodies and made them vulnerable to physical control, coercion and a variety of abuses. In particular Glancy focuses on the sexual vulnerability of slaves in relation to their master. Slaves' bodies were unconditionally available to the master for the purposes of sexual gratification and providing enslaved offspring for the future. Obtaining sexual gratification through a slave was considered a legitimate use of one's property.

In the context of Christianity, Glancy argues, as did Bradley (1987: 38), that rather than overturning the Greco-Roman rhetoric of slavery, Christianity accepted and reinforced this rhetoric by making obedience to the master an article of religion as demonstrated by the household codes and the Pastoral Epistles. Consequently, the slave's body remained vulnerable to the master regardless of their mutual association within the church. Instead of challenging societal opinions about slavery, Christianity sanctified the slaveholding morality beyond the standard claims of the Greco-Roman ethos (2002: 147). Being a good Christian slave meant obeying the master and fostering their honor.

4. *The Epistle to Philemon*

Paul's Epistle to Philemon has not been untouched by the debate over legal and social definitions of slavery. Although Paul does not explicitly address matters of institutional slavery in Philemon, numerous questions have been raised by New Testament scholars studying the Epistle. As demonstrated above, legal versus social definitions/understanding of slavery has led to a variety of conclusions surrounding the occasion of the letter and the status of the slave Onesimus.

In 1985 Lampe published a short article in which he compared the definitions of *servus fugitivus* in Roman slave law with the situation of Onesimus. Lampe demonstrated that three Roman jurists were of the same opinion that the case of a *fugitivus* should not be based on the absence of the slave from the house but assessed on the nature of the slave's intention when he or she left the master's house. In particular, Lampe focused on the opinion of Proculos who said that a slave was not legally a *fugitivus* if

'knowing that his master wished physically to chastise him, he left to seek a friend whom he persuaded to plead on his behalf' (p. 136).

In the context of Paul's letter to Philemon, Lampe suggested that such a legal solution may explain how it was that Onesimus came into contact with the imprisoned apostle Paul. Lampe argued that rather than viewing Onesimus as a slave running away from his master he could be viewed as purposely running to the apostle Paul who was a friend of Philemon. The purpose of this 'fleeing' was not with the intention of escaping the bonds of servitude but to obtain the apostle's intercession (1985: 137). Lampe concluded by suggesting that Paul was not asking Philemon to forego punishing the slave for the illegal act of absconding, but for some other unspecified injury alluded to in vv. 18-19 (p. 137).

Lampe's article caught the attention of many New Testament scholars including Rapske who expanded upon Lampe's hypothesis in a 1991 article. Rapske outlined the numerous hypotheses that had been previously offered to explain how it was that a runaway slave could have come into contact with the imprisoned apostle. The chief obstacle, of course, was to explain how or why a runaway slave would or could willingly go to a Roman prison to meet with a prisoner and how the imprisoned apostle could then send the fugitive back to his master carrying a letter without somehow running afoul of the legal authorities (1991: 188-95). Rapske concluded that Lampe's thesis was the most plausible explanation and offered some reasons why Paul would have been an appropriate *Amicus Domini*.

It was fourteen years until Lampe received a response. In 1999 Harrill challenged Lampe's methodology of using Roman jurists to interpret Philemon. His criticism was on three levels: (1) the term *fugitivus* has multiple and conflicting definitions among the Roman jurists. Often the jurists disagreed among themselves and their opinions were often the result of 'hairsplitting' (p. 136); (2) using legal texts as a source for social practice is questionable because legal codes can only provide inexact knowledge and 'build a highly misleading model of slavery' (p. 136); (3) the rulings of the jurists were 'academic' and based upon hypothetical cases rather than the actual cases. Harrill cautioned that: 'The deliberations of the jurists were academic games having little to do with the practice of law' (p. 137).

Harrill's cautions are appropriate and bring yet another corrective to the use of legal texts by New Testament scholars. But the long hiatus between Lampe and Harrill's short articles has meant that many have adopted Lampe's hypothesis in their commentaries on Philemon without having a

more nuanced understanding of how Roman legal codes should be used (See, for example, Dunn 1996: 304-306; Fitzmyer 2000: 20.)

In a 1987 summary article of her master's thesis, Winter suggested an interpretation of the Epistle which was based on neither legal nor sociological approaches. Instead, Winter reached her conclusions through an internal analysis of the letter. The following represent the main points of her argument: (1) The letter never mentions that Onesimus was a fugitive and to conclude such is to read more than Paul intended. (2) Onesimus was with Paul in prison because he was sent there by his owner. After examining the thanksgiving in vv. 4-7, Winter deduced that the letter only mentions Onesimus indirectly because the recipient already knows the whereabouts of the slave. (3) Onesimus *did not* run away and then meet Paul in prison, but was sent there purposely by his owner to report to Paul about the church at Colossae. (4) Paul wrote the letter so that Onesimus might be released from his obligations in the Lycus valley in order to continue in the ministry with him. (5) Paul makes it clear that Onesimus is no longer to be considered a slave in the Christian community and asks that Onesimus be manumitted. Because Winter did not use a legal or sociological approach, neither Patterson nor Bradley figured into her analysis. She also did not include any insights from Bartchy or Lampe.

Nordling responded to Winter in 1991. He bolstered the case for the traditional interpretation of Philemon by examining: (1) extra-biblical texts that mention runaway slaves; (2) passages in Philemon that support the runaway hypothesis; (3) the runaway slave problem in light of Roman law.

Nordling proposed that Paul wrote the letter in such a way as not to describe Onesimus in the normal fashion. The purpose was not to badger Philemon with details and reminders of Onesimus's offense, but to be conciliatory while speaking of the past crimes in an oblique euphemistic manner (1991: 107). Noting that under Roman law runaway slaves often received severe punishment after they had been returned to their master (pp. 116-17), he concluded that enough evidence existed to support a problem with fugitives in the Empire, and that the runaway slave hypothesis should be retained in Philemon. While legal codes were not the only evidence marshaled by Nordling, all of his evidence is based on a reading of documents that would have been related to the legal process. Similar to Winter, the contributions of Patterson, Bradley, Bartchy and Lampe did not figure in his analysis.

Barclay represents the first modern attempt to understand the Epistle to Philemon from a sociological point of view (1991). He notes that there are

'more than enough difficulties in attempting to grasp the true character and significance of slavery in the Graeco-Roman world of the first century' (p. 161). He is also conscious that the task of describing slavery can easily revert to partisan bickering, with each side emphasizing either the benefits or disadvantages of being a slave (p. 166). It is an awareness of these difficulties that helps Barclay to navigate through his investigation. More-over, he does not apply a legal definition to slavery even though he does use legal texts to inform his research. His overall conclusion about the condition of slavery during the first century is that slaves could expect a combination of protection, provision, abuse and exploitation (p. 167).

In the context of Philemon, Barclay noted the ambiguity of Paul's request. He concluded that the letter is so ambiguous that Paul has delib-erately created an open-ended letter partly because he wanted to allow Philemon the opportunity to make his own choices and partly because the apostle did not know what to recommend (1991: 175). In practical terms, a believing slave in the house of a Christian leader created a variety of conun-drums that were not easily solved. Barclay then offered some possible situations where the slave and master relationship might come into conflict with their relationship as Christian brothers. (1) If Onesimus was freed because he was converted would not other slaves be sure that they too were 'converted' (p. 176)? (2) What recourse would a master have if a Christian slave refused to obey an order? Or could a slave dare correct his master as a Christian brother (p. 178)? (3) How would a slave participate in the Lord's Supper; would they eat the fellowship meal with the master or wait until they had finished their duties of serving the table first (p. 179)? These and other similar issues raised by Barclay provided a window into the numerous difficulties that must have confronted Paul and his churches as they struggled with carrying a message of equality in a society that did not easily lend itself to the precepts being preached. Paul's ministry through house churches depended upon large households that were often managed by slaves. Barclay speculates that it must have seemed inconceivable that wealthy patrons in the churches could retain their social status and release all of their slaves. Paul probably could not envision how the abolition of slavery could possibly work and consequently could only provide ambigu-ous advice (p. 184).

Another more recent examination of Philemon is that of A.D. Callahan (1993). His arguments are not informed by Roman legal codes but by Patterson and interpretations of the letter among American antebellum abolitionists. Callahan rejects the traditional interpretation that Onesimus was Philemon's slave and suggests that the two were brothers 'both in the

consanguinary sense and the religious sense' (p. 370). Following Patterson's paradigm of natal alienation, he claimed that Paul had summoned the figure of the slave as the antitype of a blood relative (p. 370). Consequently, when Paul exhorted Philemon to stop treating Onesimus as a slave, he was commanding him to desist from denying him the common virtues of brotherhood which were love, honor and respect (p. 371). Callahan has won few if any supporters over to his interpretation. But in spite of the difficulties with his conclusions, he is the first New Testament scholar to seriously consider Philemon in light of Patterson.

5. *Where We Stand Today*

Instead of now attempting to arbitrate between all of the above scholars and then suggesting a new way forward, I am happy to allow the above literature review to serve as a way of tracing the road that New Testament scholarship has traveled. From this I would like to highlight four areas in which New Testament scholarship has already and continues to change its understanding of ancient slavery and how it helps us to understand Paul.

Sources for Understanding Slavery
One area which has been a particular stumbling block for New Testament scholarship is the problem of what sources should be used to inform our understanding of slavery and how we should use them. The most obvious resource would be Roman legal texts regulating slavery. But using these is problematic for three reasons.

First, the primary source for Roman law is the *Digest of Justinian*, which was not published until 533 CE. The Digest is a compilation of legal excerpts from which all obsolete rulings had been excised and only those still relevant to 533 CE had been preserved (Bradley 1994: 20). While some laws in the *Digest* undoubtedly go back to the first century, many may also be missing. Though the relevance of the *Digest* for New Testament studies cannot be dismissed out of hand, it is not necessarily an accurate indicator of what laws were in vogue in the first century. It is quite possible that there were other laws that did not survive and could shed light on New Testament texts. Thus, while a picture of the legal situation of early Imperial Rome is very good, it is also inherently incomplete.

Second, the use of legal texts to define the nature and practice of slavery is methodologically questionable. The danger is that it results in monolithic claims about Roman slavery; legal texts were not necessarily positive indicators of social practice. Harrill has cautioned: 'legal codes, at

best, provide only inexact knowledge about social practice and, at worst, can build a highly misleading model of slavery. Reading law codes as descriptive rather than prescriptive overlooks the course of juridical decisions in the practice of law' (1995: 14; 1999: 136). Slavery laws were established in response to situations that required some type of legal control. Whether or not they actually mirror social practices and attitudes is debatable.

Third, it is difficult to determine the extent to which Roman laws were fully implemented in Rome's provinces. Roman law applied only to Roman citizens while non-Romans typically retained their own local rules. Provincial governors applied Roman law as part of their official duties, but how effectively and thoroughly are questions difficult to decide (see Garnsey and Saller 1987: 1-4; Harrill 1999: 137). Governors were under no compulsion to hear particular cases, and their authority was probably felt more in cities than in rural areas, where local practices are likely to have predominated. This being the case, it would be difficult for us to determine with any certainty what, if any, Roman laws applied to the case of Onesimus and Philemon.

Other sources for understanding slavery are philosophical and literary works. These are often considered valuable resources that contain opinions and perceptions about slavery from the standpoint of popular culture in antiquity. But it is also true that all of this literature was written by and for those who were members of the aristocracy. Terence and Epictetus notwithstanding, we have very little information about slavery from those who experienced it. Consequently, while this literature certainly provides us information about slavery in antiquity, we must be cautious in the way we interpret and use it.

When reading moral philosophers it is possible to find numerous statements about slavery, some of which even seem to seek to alleviate the plight of the enslaved. But we also have no evidence that these writings represented public opinion or that they affected the ways slaves were treated (Glancy 2002: 7). Even when masters are chastised by Seneca for brutally abusing slaves (*Epistle* 47), the focus of the condemnation is against masters who do not exhibit the self-control of a Stoic rather than a commentary on how slaves should be properly treated (Harrill 1995: 25).

Ancient novels are also replete with depictions of slavery. At times it seems that the authors of these works are encouraging a more mitigated form of slavery. However, these novels can be divided into two categories: ideal novels and satirical (Wills 1998: 118).

In the ideal novels we often have stories of slaves who are able to over-come their circumstances and become successful former slaves. However, many of the slaves in these novels have been enslaved under false pre-tences (i.e a noble person becomes wrongfully enslaved). The point of the story is not to create slave heroes or make social commentary, but to describe how the slave regains his or her rightful position in society (Glancy 2002: 7, 52; Wills 1998: 119). In many of these novels, slavery is represented as one of society's negative values and is contrasted with the positive value of freedom. The point of the novel is to reinforce the established social codes rather than challenge them (Wills 1998: 120, 129).

Even in satirical literature the same goal was present. In order for the literature to be entertaining, social codes had to be turned on their head. Thus characters such as Petronius's freedman Trimalchio is a deliberate overstatement of stereotypes about slaves and is intended to show that a former slave is still no better than a slave (Wills 1998: 121). Moreover, because all of this literature was written as fiction, how does one then determine what is historical fact from fiction (Harrill 1995: 29)? Similar to the legal texts, this literature must be cautiously used in such a way that the scholar is not taken in by the satire of the author and thus confuses ideology for history.

The Conditions of Slavery

If nothing else, the above review of New Testament scholars demonstrates the divergent opinions of how slaves were treated in antiquity. To be sure, Bartchy and others overstated the positive conditions in which slaves lived and worked. Patterson and Bradley have demonstrated that, for most, slav-ery was not a positive experience. Slavery was a relationship of domina-tion. It was the powerful exploiting the powerless. But it also needs to be emphasized that not every slave that lived in the Roman Empire was brutalized and worked to death. Slavery was diverse in practice and ideol-ogy from nation to nation. It was diverse even within the Roman Empire itself. Those who were enslaved in an urban setting experienced a better (or at least improved) quality of life than those who worked on large farms or in the mines. A slave's quality of life depended upon their function, relation to the master and the degree of responsibility carried by the slave. Bradley notes:

> Generalizations about the 'typical' material environment of the slave in the
> central period of Roman history must necessarily be cautious, therefore, yet
> the evidence described so far implies in the face of things a fairly bleak

material regime for most Roman slaves. (But) there were always exceptions (1994: 89).

In light of the above, New Testament scholars must be cautious to avoid either extremes when interpreting Paul's statements on slavery. A slave was a financial investment and it was to the master's advantage to take care of and provide for the slave. Barclay seems to have found the middle ground when he concludes that: 'during the first century…slaves could expect a combination of protection, provision, abuse and exploitation' (1994: 167). That there was a positive view of slavery on some level is most evident by the way in which Paul uses slavery language to describe his relationship with Christ (Rom. 1.1; Gal. 1.10; Phil. 1.1) and the relationship of believers with one another (Rom. 12.10-11; 14.8, 13; Gal. 5.13; 1 Cor. 9.23). Slavery could be a positive image for Paul. Consequently, not all forms of slavery were considered to be undesirable. But the vast majority of them probably were.

The Practice of Self-Sale

Most New Testament scholars are familiar with the thesis that individuals would sell themselves into slavery as a way to relieve themselves of debt, improve their quality of life or even as a means of social improvement (Bartchy 1973: 47; 1992b: 70). This has also been sometimes suggested as the background for Paul's discussion of slavery to sin and God in Rom. 6.16-22 and his understanding of slavery to Christ (Lyall 1984: 35; Meeks 1983: 20-23; Dunn 1988: 341; Barrett 1991: 123; Fitzmyer 1993: 448). However, how frequently this form of enslavement was practiced is not clear. References to self-sale in the Roman jurists indicate that individuals who sold themselves into slavery had not only given up their inalienable right to freedom, but also brought shame upon themselves and their family (*Digest of Justinian* 28.3.6.5; 40.12.1). Apart from two references in the Jurists, references to self-sale are few and obscure (Glancy 2002: 82). Bradley gives little attention to the practice in his work and comments: 'It is generally agreed that self-sale as a mode of enslavement was of negligible importance in the central period of Roman history' (1988: 482).

The only clear allusion to the practice in Christian literature is found in 1 Clem. 55.2. The reference is enigmatic, however, and seems to be referring more to those who were willing to suffer for others rather than suggesting that the author was familiar with the practice of self-sale. The only other allusion is found in Petronius's *Satyricon*, where the freedman Trimalchio claims to have sold himself into slavery in order to improve his

social standing. However, as noted above, satire was intended to distort common social values for the purpose of comedy while reinforcing those values at the same time (Glancy 2002: 82).

This limited evidence for the practice of self-sale should serve as a caution to New Testament scholars. Horsley considers this 'a good illustration of the limitation of uncritical use of Roman law as a historical source' (1998b: 36). Consequently, the questions surrounding the practice of self-sale in antiquity and its influence on Paul is yet another example of how we can unknowingly perpetuate the ideology of the slaveholders through our sources.

Upward Mobility

The belief that manumitted slaves were upwardly mobile individuals has been a common assumption among both classical and New Testament scholarship. In New Testament circles, Bartchy's work was probably the most influential. He was followed by Martin who suggested that only a few individuals in society benefited from this system. This is how Martin understood Paul in 1 Cor. 9.16-23. However, there have been some studies in the last thirty years that have questioned not only the social mobility of slaves and freed persons, but also the social mobility of the free poor (Weaver 1974: 136; 1991–96: 189). When New Testament scholars focus on the social mobility that did occur among the very few who were members of *familia Caesaris* they are analyzing an abnormal pattern and not one that would have been recognized by the slave population as an opportunity for social mobility. 'The experience of the vast majority of slaves cannot be mitigated by focusing on the unusual influence or atypical mobility of a select few' (Horsley 1998b: 57). Moreover, social mobility among slaves suggests the presence of class consciousness among slaves. Bradley points out, however, that the idea of slaves having a 'class consciousness' of their own never developed in antiquity and that rather than admire the master's 'slave representative', all slaves, regardless of their position, would have been competing for the support and favor of the master. While some slaves were of higher rank and influence, this did not exempt them from the same type of abuse and maltreatment that other slaves received (1994: 72-73, 152).

6. *Conclusion*

It is clear that there is not yet, nor may there ever be, a consensus on how we should understand the background of slavery in Paul's letters. While

the overly positive view of ancient slavery has yielded to a model that understands slavery as a brutal institution, this too is susceptible to over simplification. As appalling as the notion of slavery is in any society, the fact remains that, in the context of the New Testament, slavery did take on some positive aspects. This is not to suggest, of course, that Paul was a supporter of slavery. But he and other New Testament authors were able to find something that was of 'redeeming' value for their theology. There is a bit of a conundrum here. An academic reconstruction is always going to be just that, a construction, and, therefore, an abstraction. Reality, especially in dealing with something like slavery, is always complex, and can be extremely messy. Academics tend to like to classify things and put them in order. Because of different foci, New Testament scholars who look at the text of Paul and slavery metaphors emphasize a more positive view. Those who look at the 'reality' of slavery are going to view it very differently. There is a need for some sort of Hegelian synthesis.

A positive result of this ongoing debate has been an enhanced appreciation of the sources used to understand slavery. Just as New Testament scholars have become more cautious about the use of rabbinic materials as a source for Jewish laws and customs in the first century, the application of legal texts and literature to describe slavery in antiquity has also been reconsidered. While there is much to be gained from these sources, we must be cautious that we do not inadvertently perpetuate the ideology of the ancient slave owners.

The last thirty years has held some dramatic changes for our understanding of Paul and slavery. As a variety of new methods for studying the New Testament are discovered and employed, our understanding will undergo still yet more changes. Hopefully this brief article has demonstrated that a line has not yet been drawn under the subject and that there is still more to be said.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aune, D.E.
    1987   'Review of Francis Lyall, Slaves, Citizens: Legal Metaphors in the Epistles',
                CBQ 49: 672-73.
Barclay, J.M.G.
    1991   'Paul, Philemon and the Dilemma of Christian Slave-Ownership', *NTS* 37: 161-
                86.
Barrett, C.K.
    1975   'Review of Μαλλου Χρησαι by S. Scott Bartchy', *JTS* 26: 173-74.
    1991   *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (BNTC; London: A. & C. Black,
                2nd edn [1957]).

Bartchy, S.S.

1973   *First-Century Slavery and the Interpretation of 1 Corinthian 7.21* (SBLDS, 11; Missoula, MT: SBL).

1992a   'Philemon, Epistle To', *Anchor Bible Dictionary*, V (ed. David Noel Freedman; 6 vols.; Garden City, NY: Doubleday): 305-10.

1992b   'Slavery (New Testament)', *Anchor Bible Dictionary*, VI (ed. David Noel Freedman; 6 vols.; Garden City, NY: Doubleday): 65-73.

Barth, M., and H. Blanke

2000   *The Letter to Philemon: A New Translation with Notes and Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans).

Bradley, K.R.

1987   *Slaves and Masters in the Roman Empire: A Study in Social Control* (New York: Oxford University Press).

1988   'Roman Slavery and Roman Law', *Reflexions historiques* 15: 477-95.

1989   *Slavery and Rebellion in the Roman World: 140 B.C.–70 B.C.* (Indianapolis: Indiana University Press).

1994   *Slavery and Society at Rome* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Braxton, B.R.

2000   *The Tyranny of Resolution: 1 Corinthians 7.17-24* (SBLDS, 181; Atlanta: SBL).

Brown, M.J.

2001   'Paul's Use of Δαῦλος Χριστου in Romans 1.1', *JBL* 120: 723-37.

Buckland, W.W.

1970   *The Roman Law of Slavery: The Condition of the Slave in Private Law from Augustus to Justinian* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press [1908]).

Byron, J.

2003   *Slavery Metaphors in Early Judaism and Pauline Christianity* (WUNT 2, 162; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

2004a   'Slave of Christ or Willing Servant? Paul's Self Description in 1 Corinthians 4.1-2 and 9.16-18', *Neot* 37: 1-20.

2004b   'Noble Lineage as a Response to Enslavement in the Testament of Naphtali 1.9-12', *JJS* 50: 1-13.

Callahan, A.D.

1989–90   'A Note on 1 Corinthians 7.21', *Journal of the Interdenominational Theological Center* 17: 110-14.

1993   'Paul's Epistle to Philemon: Toward an Alternative Argumentum', *HTR* 86: 357-76.

1997   *Embassy of Onesimus: The Letter of Paul to Philemon* (Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press).

Callahan, A.D., R.A. Horsley and A. Smith (eds.)

1998   *Slavery in Text and Interpretation* (Semeia, 83/84; Atlanta: Scholars Press).

Callender, Dexter E.

1998   'Servants of God(s) and Servants of Kings in Israel and the Ancient Near East', in Callahan, Horsley and Smith (eds.) 1998: 67-82.

Chirichigno, G.C.

1993   *Debt-Slavery in Israel and the Ancient Near East* (JSOTSup, 141; Sheffield: JSOT Press).

Combes, I.A.H.

1998   *The Metaphor of Slavery in the Writings of the Early Church: From the New Testament to the Beginning of the Fifth Century* (JSNTSup, 156; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).

Dodd, B.J.

1996   'Christ's Slave, People Pleasers and Galatians 1.10', *NTS* 42: 90-104.

Dunn, J.D.G.

1988   *Romans* (ed. Ralph Martin; WBC, 38a, 38b; Dallas: Word Books).

1992   Review of Dale B. Martin, *Slavery as Salvation: The Metaphor of Slavery in Pauline Christianity*, *JSS* 37: 325-26.
1996   *The Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans).

Finley, M.I.
1980   *Ancient Slavery and Modern Ideology* (New York: Viking Press).

Fitzmyer J.A.
1993   *Romans* (AB, 33; Garden City, NY: Doubleday).
2000   *The Letter to Philemon: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB, 34c; New York: Doubleday).

Flesher, P.V.
1988.   *Oxen, Women, or Citizens? Slaves in the System of the Mishnah* (Atlanta: Scholars Press).

Garnsey, P.
1996   *Ideas of Slavery from Aristotle to Augustine* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Garnsey, P., and R. Saller
1987   *The Roman Empire: Economy, Society, and Culture* (Berkley and Los Angeles: University of California Press).

Glancy, J.A.
2002   *Slavery in Early Christianity* (New York: Oxford University Press).

Harrill, J.A.
1992   Review of Dale B. Martin, *Slavery as Salvation: The Metaphor of Slavery in Pauline Christianity*, in *JR* 72: 426-27.
1995   *The Manumission of Slaves in Early Christianity* (HUT, 32; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).
1999   'Using the Roman Jurists to Interpret Philemon', *ZNW* 90: 135-38.

Harris, M.J.
1999   *Slave of Christ: A New Testament Metaphor for Total Devotion to Christ* (Leicester: Apollos Press).

Hock, R.F.
1986   'Review of Francis Lyall, Slaves, Citizens: Legal Metaphors in the Epistles', *Int* 40: 214-16.

Horsley, R.A.
1998a   'Paul and Slavery: A Critical Alternative to Recent Readings', in Callahan, Horsley and Smith (eds.) 1998: 153-200.
1998b   'The Slave Systems of Classical Antiquity', in Callahan, Horsley and Smith (eds.) 1998: 19-66.

Jackson, B.S.
1988   'Biblical Laws of Slavery: A Comparative Approach', in Léonie Archer (ed.), *Slavery and Other Forms of Unfree Labour* (London and New York: Routledge): 86-101.

Kirschenbaum, A.
1987   *Sons, Slaves and Freedmen in Roman Commerce* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press).

Lampe, P.
1985   'Keine "Sklavenflucht" des Onesimus', *ZNW* 76: 135-37.

Lyall, F.
1970   'Roman Law in the Writings of Paul: The Slave and the Freedman', *NTS* 17: 73-79.
1984   *Slaves, Citizens, Sons: Legal Metaphors in the Epistles* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan).

Martin, D.B.
1990   *Slavery as Salvation: The Metaphor of Slavery in Pauline Christianity* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press).

Meeks, W.A.
  1983   *First Urban Christians*: *The Social World of the Apostle Paul* (New Haven: Yale
            University Press).
Mommsen, T., and P. Krueger
  1985   *The Digest of Justinian*, I-IV (ed. Alan Watson; Philadelphia: Pennsylvania
            Press).
Nordling, J.G.
  1991   'Onesimus Fugitivus: A Defense of the Runaway Slave Hypothesis in
            Philemon', *JSNT* 41: 97-119.
Patterson, O.
  1982   *Slavery and Social Death: A Comparative Study* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard
            University Press).
  1998   'Paul, Slavery and Freedom: Personal and Socio-Historical Reflections', in
            Allen Dwight Callahan, Richard A. Horsley and Abraham Smith (eds.), *Slavery
            in Text and Interpretation* (Semeia, 83/84; Atlanta: Scholars Press): 263-79.
Peterson, N.R.
  1985   *Rediscovering Paul: Philemon and the Sociology of Paul's Narrative World*
            (Philadelphia: Fortress Press).
Rapske, B.M.
  1991   'The Prisoner Paul in the Eyes of Onesimus', *NTS* 37: 187-203.
Rollins, W.G.
  1987   'Greco-Roman Slave Terminology and Pauline Metaphors for Salvation', in
            Kent Harold Richards (ed.), *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers 1987*
            (Atlanta: Scholars Press): 100-110.
Saller, R.P., and B.D. Shaw
  1984   'Tombstones and Roman Family Relations in the Principate: Civilians, Soldiers
            and Slaves', *Journal of Roman Studies* 74: 124-56.
Ste. Croix, G.E.M.
  1988   'Slavery and Other Forms of Unfree Labour', in Léonie J. Archer (ed.),
            Slavery and Other Forms of Unfree Labour (London and New York:
            Routledge and Kegan Paul): 19-31.
Weaver, P.R.C.
  1974   'Social Mobility in the Early Roman Empire: The Evidence of the Imperial
            Freedmen and Slaves', in *Studies in Ancient Society* (London: Routledge): 121-
            40.
  1991–96   'Children of Freedmen (and Freedwomen)', in B. Rawson (ed.), *Marriage,
            Divorce and Children in Ancient Rome* (Oxford: Oxford University Press): 166-
            90.
Wiedemann, T.
  1981   *Greek and Roman Slavery* (London: Croom Helm).
Wills, L.M.
  1998   'The Depiction of Slavery in Ancient Novels', in Callahan, Horsley and Smith
            (eds.) 1998: 113-31.
Winter, S.C.
  1987   'Paul's Letter to Philemon', *NTS* 33: 1-15.
Wright, B.G.
  1998   '*EBED/DOULOS*: Terms and Social Status in the Meeting of Hebrew Biblical
            and Hellenistic Roman Culture', in Callahan, Horsley and Smith (eds.) 1998:
            83-111.

THE STRUCTURE OF MARK'S GOSPEL: CURRENT PROPOSALS

Kevin W. Larsen

Associate Professor of New Testament and Theology
Lincoln Christian College
East Coast, Bel Air, MD, USA
klarsen@lccec.com

ABSTRACT

For many decades now Markan scholarship has struggled to uncover the structure of Mark's gospel. With the advent of literary/narrative criticism the struggle has intensified to understand how the gospel unfolds in order to tell its story of Jesus. This article surveys recent and current proposals that have been advanced for Mark's gospel. Some scholars have judged that there is no structure; others have found a highly complex web of inter-related sections. While many proposals use a mixture of principles to derive the alleged structure, an attempt has been made to classify the proposals based upon the primary principle used. These categories include: topography/geography; theological themes; *Sitz im Leben* of the recipients; literary factors.

Tannehill remarks that 'outlining narratives is not a neat endeavor' (1995: 170). His observation can be corroborated by looking at the numerous proposals that Markan scholars offer for the structure of this gospel. Consequently, the variety in the number of proposals has led some Markan scholars to doubt that there even is an explicit structure to the gospel. Nineham made this judgment:

> The very fact that such widely differing principles of arrangement have been attributed to St. Mark perhaps suggests that in searching the Gospel for a single and entirely coherent master-plan, corresponding to a set of clearly formulated practical purposes, scholars are looking for something that is not there and attributing to the Evangelist a higher degree of self-conscious purpose than he in fact possessed (1963: 29).

Despite Nineham's pessimism, trying to understand the structure remains a worthy pursuit. We must recognize and/or remember that the arrangement of the material is the most important clue to the gospel's theological core.

> Our attempt to understand the theological intention that motivated Mark to undertake the kind of reinterpretation of the traditions about Jesus that the creation of a 'gospel' represents would take a long step forward if we could come to some clear understanding of the overall structure into which he placed the individual traditions (Achtemeier 1986: 30).

Thus, discussions of structure often lead to discussions of occasion and purpose. Schweizer wrote, 'Looking at the structure of his [Mark's] book will reveal to us something of the reasons why he wrote it in this way, how he understood his task, and, hence, what his message, and especially his portrayal of the life of faith, is' (1978: 387; see also 1970: 14). However, one must be cautious, for an outline of Mark may tell more about which aspect of the gospel narrative is the outliner's focus than it does about Mark's structure.

What I seek to do in the pages that follow is survey recent past and current proposals concerning the structure of Mark's gospel. The goal is simply to survey the proposals that have been given and offer some observations about the state of the question. What we will notice is that the differences in proposed outlines seem to be in the details of the structure rather than in the broad picture. This is contrary to Gundry (1993: 1048-49) who concludes that the Gospel of Mark is a 'loose disposition of materials' or 'a collage, not a diptych or a triptych or any other carefully segmented portrayal of Jesus'. Unfortunately, not only do individuals dispute the details of an outline, but also there is no consensus on a principle for determining those details. Best, in recounting the proposals for identifying pre-Markan material, says that the material as it existed in the oral tradition did not possess within itself an organizational principle. 'Whoever had to draw together the miracles, parables and sayings would still not have known where and how to relate them to one another' (1983: 6). Thus, he asks the question, 'What principle did he then use when he put them together?' (1983: 100).

While a principle for determining Markan structure is under debate, near unanimous consent exists for a distinct section in the middle of the gospel, beginning at either 8.22 or 8.27 and ending at 10.45 or 10.52. Examples of scholars who hold to a basic three-part division include Ellis (1975), Donahue and Harrington (2002: 23-25), France (2002: 11-15), and others as will become evident below.

Many Markan scholars would consider the Caesarea Philippi episode as the central pericope and turning point of the gospel. Juel (1994: 73) calls Peter's confession 'the great transitional scene', and Stock (1982: 133) calls Peter's confession 'the decisive turning point in Mark's gospel'. Thus in the broadest and simplest of proposed divisions, scholars have divided the gospel into two sections: 1.1–8.26 and 8.27–16.8 (e.g. Edwards 2002: 20-21). Pesch (1984: 39) identifies two halves to the gospel with further subdivisions, but he does not include titles for each major subsection nor does he integrate his admission that the subsections of 1.1–8.26 form the first half of the gospel. Pesch is exemplary of many of the major German commentators (Lohmeyer 1967: 7-8; Klostermann 1971: 1; Lührmann 1987: 23; Gnilka 1998: 30-32) who make an outline but then do not use the outline to aid the interpretive process; they only focus upon the individual episodes.

In order to test the proposal of a basic two-part division, Quesnell (1969) examined the changes in the gospel under a number of headings. In his analysis of Mark, he observed that with 8.27 a number of changes took place. He catalogued changes of vocabulary and style: references to 'bread' cease; explicit references to the nonunderstanding of the disciples cease (though the theme continues in a new form); the amount of space given to words of Jesus rises. The presentation of the figure of Jesus changes in the latter half. Mark begins to present Jesus as a figure of destiny whose fate is entirely marked out for him, beginning with the first 'the Son of Man must suffer' in 8.31. He emphasizes this fate as determined by Scripture. By contrast, if the gospel had stopped at 8.26, Jesus would be a great prophet, teacher, healer, but he would not have been the crucified Messiah. Other changes include a new set of adversaries (chief priests, scribes and elders); apostles begin to speak as individuals for the first time; and the first references to the Father appear.

Quesnell's analysis is met with skepticism by Gundry (1993: 1048) who judges the break between 8.26 and 8.27 as not passing 'muster very well'. He cites as evidence: (1) Jesus does not yet start on his way to Jerusalem for the passion; (2) the forensic victories nor Jesus' magnetism nor the miraculous element cease or even wane; (3) Jesus does not turn from the crowd; in fact, after predicting his passion and resurrection he summons the crowd along with the disciples (8.34-38); (4) Jesus continues to teach in public (10.1-9, 17-22; 11.17, 11.27–12.40) just as there were times of teaching the disciples in private (4.10-20, 34; 7.17-23; 8.14-21).

Broadly speaking though, Quesnell's observations are affirmed by scholars. For example Rhoads *et al.*, commenting on the nonunderstanding of

the disciples, identifies a shift that takes place 'midpoint in the story'. 'The issue shifts from a lack of understanding to misunderstanding. The disciples now understand who Jesus is, but they misunderstand' what Messiah means (Rhoads, Dewey and Michie 1999: 125).

Further proposals beyond these basic two parts are numerous and what follows is an attempt to categorize the various proposals based on the primary principle that scholars have used to reveal Mark's structure, recognizing that some proposals mix categories.

1. *Topography/Geography*

One principle that scholars have traditionally used to outline Mark is topography. Mark typically introduces pericopae with the topographical movement of Jesus. Taylor (1966) has five sections marked off with a geographical designation, excluding the Introduction (1.1-13) and the Passion/ Resurrection (14.1–16.8).

1.14–3.6	Galilean ministry
3.7–6.13	Height of Galilean ministry
6.14–8.26	Ministry beyond Galilee
8.27–10.52	Journey to Jerusalem
11.1–13.37	Ministry in Jerusalem

Hedrick, reacting against those who appeal to content/theology for arriving at a structure of Mark (see below), says that one must first seek Mark's formal or narrative indicators of structure. He finds 'the only evident overall framework given to these independent episodes and the sub-groupings of material' in Mark 1–13 is geographical (1983: 257). Thus, Hedrick outlines Mark into fifteen sections determined by spatial indicators of where Jesus goes (by the sea, in the synagogue, etc.). These are then grouped into larger geographical units (in Galilee, a trip to Tyre and Sidon [1.14b; 4.1, 35; 5.21; 7.24, 31; 8.13; 9.30; 10.1; 11.11, 27; 13.1; 14.1]). Other commentators who use topography to delimit sections of Mark's gospel include Lane (1974) and France (2002).

Arguing against a geographical outline, Gundry demonstrates the inconsistency in Mark's notation of topology by citing examples of topographic movement not by Jesus or his disciples, but topographic movement occurring within a pericope and sometimes too vague to be used for outlining. Gundry concludes, 'Walking through Mark takes us hither and yon with little or no discernible pattern' (1993: 1046). Even on a larger scale, assigning topographical labels to major sections does not work for Gundry (1993: 1047). To cite one example, the alleged second main section, 'A journey

toward Jerusalem (8.27–10.52 [or 10.45 or 11.10])', has Jesus departing northward to Caesarea (8.22, 27) the opposite direction of Jerusalem, up a mountain (9.2), down it (9.9), and then into a house (9.28)—all outside Galilee—and then back through Galilee to Capernaum (9.30, 33) before heading out toward Jerusalem.

Contrary to Gundry, most Markan scholars find some value in using topography to determine general and broad sections within the gospel. For example, Lührmann (1987), after the Introduction (1.1-15), identifies sections based on the geographical focus of the events. Mark 1.16–4.34: Capernaum; 4.35–8.26: Sea of Galilee; 8.27–10.52: Way to Jerusalem; 11.1–12.44: Argument in Jerusalem; 13: Destruction of Jerusalem; 14.1–16.8: Passion narrative.

However, scholars have raised concerns when trying to use topography to determine sub-points within a section. While Mark 1–8 may be judged to be Galilean in focus, the details of a day-to-day itinerary within Galilee cannot be reconstructed from the available material. For example, in Mk 6.45 Jesus instructs his disciples to go to Bethsaida while he remains behind. After Jesus rejoins the disciples, the reader finds them landing at Gennesaret. Interpreters have offered suggestions to explain the discrepancy. Malbon (1984) suggests that the discrepancy is theologically motivated—Bethsaida represents Gentile territory and the fear of the disciples is their reluctance to go to the Gentiles. Achtemeier (1970), followed by Kelber (1974), suggests that the geographical confusion is due to the rearrangement of traditional material. However, these are only suggestions or, as Achtemeier calls them, 'non-Markan guesses' (1986: 13).

Another example of the inability of topography to aid in determining structure within a section is the accounts in Mark of Jesus crossing the Sea of Galilee, with Jesus making successive journeys from west to east without any mention of a return by either sea or land (4.35 and 5.1; 5.21). Hall (1998) suggests that the successive journeys from west to east may not be as problematic as some Markan scholars make them out to be. He compares the edited highlights of a game of football (i.e., soccer) to the possibility of what Mark has done in chs. 4 and 5. 'To make the best use of the limited space available, Mark has not cluttered his narrative with time statements…but has telescoped his highlights into a continuous story-line' (p. 43).

Many commentators have resorted to allegorizing geographical references in an attempt to decipher the theological message (e.g., Lohmeyer 1936; Lightfoot 1938; Marxsen 1969: 54-116). These attempts to allegorize

geographical references have been met with varying degrees of skepticism (e.g., Malbon 1982, 1991). Others have tried to find a mediating position. For example, Anderson (1981: 37) says the structure is in its first instance theological rather than biographical-chronological because of Mk 1.1; however, he concludes, 'it is not necessary to suppose that Galilee and Jerusalem are both theologically loaded terms for Mark' (p. 38). Likewise Telford suggests, 'The narrative[s]…can also be read with regard to their theological and even mythological associations as well as to their historical ones' (1999: 27).

It was Dodd (1932; *pace* Nineham 1955) who suggested that a summary of the life of Jesus was current in the early church and that this provided the structural backbone for the gospel. When Peter talked to Cornelius and his household (i.e., Gentiles), they apparently had a rudimentary knowledge of the life of Jesus (Acts 10.37-41). Besides, if Jesus was from Nazareth of Galilee, in the broadest of strokes his story is going to have to be one of a journey from Galilee to Jerusalem. 'In view of the focus on movement all the way in the Gospel it is not surprising that it should contain certain indications of a rudimentary geographical construction: Galilee; Galilee and surrounding regions; journey to Jerusalem; Jerusalem' (Anderson 1981: 38). As Best grants, the Last Supper had to be set in the immediate context of Jesus' death; the baptism needed to be near the beginning of the story (1983: 101). Since the gospel story involved a life story, at least to some extent, there was a demand for sequence.

2. *Theological Themes*

Another principle that scholars have used to delimit a basic outline of Mark's gospel is to identify an overriding theological theme or concept. One such suggestion has been the title and concept of 'Son of God'. Lane states, 'The initial verse of the Gospel dictates the structure of the account which follows' (1974: 1). This statement, however, is probably best understood generally, for in outlining the gospel, Lane resorts to a geographical scheme. Similar in thought is Achtemeier, '[The title "Son of God"] seems to be the christological frame around which the Gospel was constructed' (1986: 34). Myers has identified three key moments in the gospel where the reader's attention is focused on the identity of Jesus, which then lends support to the thesis statement in 1.1 (Myers 1990: 390-91). Consequently, these three high revelatory episodes strengthen a biographical interest on the part of Mark.

Baptism	Transfiguration	Crucifixion
Heavens rent	Garments white	Veil rent
Dove descends	Cloud descends	Darkness spreads
Voice from heaven	Voice from cloud	Jesus' great voice
'You are my Beloved Son'	'This is my Son'	'Truly, this man was the Son of God'
John the Baptist as Elijah	Jesus appears with Elijah	Is he calling Elijah

Recently Peace (1999: 110-56) argued that the gospel should be divided into two main parts (at 8.30), each of which has three units; each unit is focused on a different title of Jesus (teacher, prophet, Messiah, Son of Man, Son of David, Son of God). This sequence consequently represents the progressive christological enlightenment of the disciples.

Another theme that interpreters have suggested as an organizational principle is that of rejection and misunderstanding. Throughout the gospel, people are called to follow Jesus. In the first half of the gospel, the three 'complexes' (1.14–3.6; 3.7–6.6a; 6.6b–8.21) each begin with a call to follow Jesus and each ends with his rejection (3.6; 6.1-6; 8.14-21). In the second half of Mark's gospel, the call to follow Jesus is formed again and is subdivided by the three predictions of Jesus' rejection in Jerusalem (8.27-32a; 9.30-32; 10.32-34). However, each call and prediction is met with misunderstanding (8.32b–9.1; 9.33-50; 10.35-45). This pattern appears to have originally been noticed by Schweizer (1964, 1978) and later refined by Perrin (1974).

Robbins proposed dividing the gospel around a three-step progression in which Jesus went to a new place with his disciples, engaged in interaction with the disciples or others, and as a result of the interaction summoned his disciples anew (1981; 1984: 19-51). He thus identifies six major blocks, with the introductory three-step progression identified in the parenthesis: 1.14–3.6 (1.14-20); 3.7–5.43 (3.7-19); 6.1–8.26 (6.1-13); 8.27–10.45 (8.27–9.1); 10.46–12.44 (10.46–11.11); 13.1–15.47 (13.1-37).

In a similar fashion, Gnilka (1998: 31-32) uses Jesus' interaction with the disciples as the organizing principle of the gospel. His outline is as follows: the introduction (1.1-15), Jesus works authoritatively before the people (1.16–3.12), Jesus' teaching and miracles (3.13–6.6a), restless wandering (6.6b–8.26), call to follow the cross (8.27–10.45), Jesus' work in Jerusalem (10.46–13.37), passion (14.1–16.8).

Another theological theme used in proposing an outline for Mark's gospel is that of 'The Way'. Few scholars question the importance of the theme in 8.27–10.52 where ὁδός (*hodos*, 'way') occurs no less than ten times. Before 8.27 ὁδός is used in connection with the coming of John the

Baptist (1.2-3) and the parable of the sower (4.4) and its interpretation (4.15).

Heil (1992), without offering any explanation except to cite E. Manicardi (1981) in a footnote, says that one of the major themes is that of 'the way' of the Lord God being actualized and executed by 'the way' of Jesus. 'In fact', Heil goes on to say, 'this dominant theme provides the scheme and framework for the entire narrative' (1992: 18).

I.   Mk 1.1-13: Preparation for the Way of the Lord
II.   Mk 1.14–3.6: Jesus Goes His Way Demonstrating the Arrival of the Kingdom of God
III.   Mk 3.7–5.43: The Mystery of the Kingdom of God is Given to the Followers of the Way of Jesus
IV.   Mk 6.1–8.26: The Followers of the Way of Jesus Do Not Grasp the Mystery
V.   Mk 8.27–10.52: The Way of Jesus Leads to Suffering, Death, and Resurrection
VI.   Mk 11.1–13.37: On His Way Jesus Brings Forth New Teachings in and about the Temple
VII.   Mk 14.1–15.47: Jesus Accomplishes the Way of Suffering and Death
VIII. Mk 16.1-8: The Resurrection of Jesus and the Way of the Lord
IX.   Appendix: Mk 16.9-20

I have questioned, however, if 'the way' is a dominant enough theme to provide the 'scheme and framework' for the entire gospel (Larsen 2002a: 16, 156-57). Without denying that 'the way' is an important theme in 8.27–10.52, the expression appears in a limited fashion outside of this section.

Another theological theme used to suggest an overarching framework for the gospel is the Old Testament theme of the Exodus. Various scholars have proposed such a framework: Farrer (1951), Hobbs (1958), Swartley (1973; 1980: 73-86) and Derrett (1985). Finding these proposals inadequate, because they are more successful in demonstrating Exodus motif influence on individual sections than on the literary structure of the gospel as a whole, Watts (2000) has proposed that the Isaianic New Exodus (hereafter INE) is Mark's organizing theme.

Watts proposes that Mark's presentation of Jesus is best understood against the opening editorial citation of 1.2-3. Here one identifies a positive motif whereby Jesus' identity and ministry is presented in terms of INE; and one identifies a negative motif by which Jesus' rejection by the nation's leaders and his action in the temple is cast in terms of the prophet Malachi's warning; a warning which itself concerned the delay of the INE. 'This dual perspective of salvation and judgement—both within the context of the INE—seems to provide the fundamental literary and theological structure of Mark's gospel' (p. 4).

In a book review, I concluded that Watts offers a provoking, challenging and valid presentation of how Mark may have utilized a theological motif of the Old Testament in order to communicate the life and mission of Jesus (Larsen 2002b). However, a primary question that I am left with concerns the relationship between the three themes of the INE and how the relationship between the three elements impacts the overarching scheme for the literary structure of Mark. Watts presents the INE as having three distinct themes. First, Yahweh delivers and heals his exiled people. Second, Yahweh leads 'blind' Israel on a journey. Third, Yahweh arrives in Jerusalem. Because Isaiah does not present the NE in/as a chronological three-step process, and noting that the citations for each theme are scattered throughout Isaiah, one is left to surmise that the first two elements of the INE are happening simultaneously. Yahweh delivers and heals as 'blind' Israel is on the journey. Watts has proposed that these three themes correspond with the broad literary outline of Mark's gospel. First, Jesus performs powerful words and deeds. Second, Jesus journeys with his 'blind' disciples. Third, Jesus arrives in Jerusalem. Watts writes concerning the first major division of the gospel, 'Jesus' healings of the blind, deaf, and lame likewise echo Yahweh's healing of the exiles in the INE' (2000: 372). However, there are no miracles of sight in the first major division of the gospel. Likewise, in what sense can one say that the exiled people are delivered and healed? The end of the first major section of Mark, 8.14-21, hardly suggests deliverance and healing.

3. Sitz im Leben *of the Recipients*

A third approach to understanding Mark's structure is to see the alleged needs of the early church in the text, thus having those needs dictate the gospel's organization. To put it another way, something outside the text cements it together. See, for example, Bowman (1965) and his proposal that the gospel was related to a Passover liturgy; he characterizes it as a Jewish Christian Passover haggadah for Jews in Rome. Just as the Passover celebration was a narration of how God had redeemed his people in fulfillment of a promise, so Mark retells the new Christian Passover story. Carrington (1952) proposed that the organization was dictated by a Christian liturgical calendar based on that of the Jewish synagogue and intended to be read piece by piece in worship from the New Year in September to the season of Tabernacles. Lewis suggests that Mark used a 'boat source' narrative that was Christian haggadah—'traditions about Jesus explaining how Christ effected the deliverance motifs of the Rosh Hashana psalm' (1978).

Proposals that find their organizational principle in liturgy have been strongly opposed. Martin (1973: 85-86) observes that Bowman has not offered an explanation for Mark addressing Gentile readers for whom he has to explain Jewish customs (3.22; 7.2, 3-4; 12.18, 42; 14.12; 15.32, 42) and translate Aramaic terms (3.17; 5.41; 7.11, 34; 10.46; 14.36; 15.22, 34). Likewise, if Mark was drawing up a liturgical calendar as proposed by Carrington, one has to account for certain gaps and omissions that are hard to explain (see Johnson 1972: 22). Davies (1956; see also 1962) has shown that there is no evidence for primitive Christianity borrowing the lectionary practice of the Jewish synagogue (cf. Col. 2.16). One may also see Aune (1987: 26-27) and Morris (1964; 1983) who have challenged the idea that the primitive church borrowed from the lectionary of the Jewish synagogue.

4. *Literary Factors*

There does not appear to be agreement over what one should classify as a technique of literature and what is a technique of rhetoric. For example, one finds discussions of chiasms as a literary tool and as a rhetorical tool. Therefore, no attempt has been made in this discussion to separate written from oral components for understanding the organization of Mark's gospel. 'Whatever distinctions we may make between narrative- and rhetorical-criticism, there is a considerable degree of overlap too' (Smith 1996: 49).

Guelich focuses on internal considerations and proposes that literary considerations should be used in determining the structure because they are 'more likely coincident with Mark's telling of the story, than with his conscious desire to follow a design' (1989: xxxvi). Guelich uses the basic division into two halves and proposes that 1.16–8.26 (1.1-15 being an introduction) breaks into three subsections (1.16–3.12; 3.13–6.6; 6.7–8.26) with each subsection beginning with the involvement of the disciples (1.16-20; 3.13-19; 6.7-13) and each subsection concluding with a note of rejection followed by a summary relating to Jesus' ministry (3.1-6, 7-12; 6.1-6a, 6b; 8.10-21, 22-26). Guelich's proposal appears to be a variation of that of Schweizer. Evans (2001), who was asked to complete the Mark commentary left unfinished due to Guelich's unexpected death, simply adopts and resumes Guelich's outline. Marcus's (2002: 64) outline is very similar to Guelich's with just minor variation.

One such literary device used by Mark, and long noted by scholars (e.g., Klostermann 1971; Kee 1983: 54-56; Wright 1985; Edwards 1989; Fowler 1989; Van Oyen 1992; Shepherd 1995), is that of intercalation,

the dovetailing or interlacing of one pericope with another in an A-B-A pattern. In each case Mark begins to tell a story, interrupts it by inserting another, and then returns to the original in order to complete it. Shepherd (1993: 388-92) lists the twenty different passages that have been pro- posed as intercalations.

Intercalations not only function in a literary way (to create suspense and tension) but they also invite the reader to draw a theological conclusion from the linked passages by treating them in a mutually interpretative way. Shepherd concludes that the intercalations in Mark are an expression of dramatized irony. For example in Mark 3, Jesus' family goes out to 'save' him and in the process ally themselves with his enemies. Jesus argues that a divided house cannot stand; yet his relatives are divided from him. However, they are not his true relatives (Shepherd 1995: 539). A classic example (see Telford 1980) of intercalation is Jesus' action of cursing the fig tree (11.12-14, 22-25) and his action in the Temple (11.15-19).

Another literary device used by Mark is the asking of questions (Fowler 2001: 132-33). While the questions themselves do not mark the placement of divisions, the nature of the questions do. Some of the questions are real and others rhetorical, some of which go unanswered (cf. 1.27; 2.7; 4.41; 14.4; 16.3). Witherington (2001) identifies a common theme for the ques- tions of 1–8.27, the question of who and why (1.27; 2.7, 16, 24; 4.41; 6.2; 7.5). Mark 8.27-30 answers the 'who' question. 'Once the "who" question is answered, Jesus is able to reveal what his mission is' (2001: 38). Mark 8.31–10.52 reveals what the mission is (8.31; 9.31; 10.32-34). The mission is accomplished in Mark 11–16. Witherington concludes that because of the nature of the questions asked in the gospel, the major concern of the gospel is Christology.

> [This simple outline] supports the theory that we are dealing with a biogra- phy which has as its most basic question not ecclesiological struggles in Mark's church, nor even matters of Christian discipleship (though that is indeed an important secondary item in this Gospel), but rather the big question: who is Jesus? (2001: 38)

Another literary device used by Mark that gives clues to his structure is the use of summary statements (*Sammelberichte*). Schmidt was the first to call attention to these Markan summary reports and analyze them in rela- tion to the evangelist's literary method. Schmidt argues that the introduc- tory and concluding statements attached to the individual stories that bind them together into a continuous narrative are historically worthless, 'his- torische Wertlosigkeit' (1919: 17). His thesis is that Mark's information

came to him in the form of isolated stories, that he had no idea how these stories were related to each other in time or locality, and that the framework that binds them together was an artificial construction of the evangelist. For a critique of Schmidt, see Hall (1998).

There is considerable debate about what verses are in fact summary statements and how these summary statements function. Perrin and Dulling (1982: 239-54) recognize summaries at 1.14-15, 21-22, 39; 2.13; 3.7-12; 5.21; 6.6b, 12-13, 30-33, 53-56; 10.1. Egger (1976), who finds these 'summary statements' useful in identifying the structure of Mark, omits 5.21 and 6.12-13 and includes 1.32-34, 45; 2.1-2; 4.1-2. Perrin says that these statements function as the basic 'pegs' of Mark's overall literary structure. Schmidt says that their significance is to broaden, widen or expand the ministry of Jesus beyond the borders of the individual particularized narratives (1919: 13). Perrin breaks down the literary structure of Mark as follows, with the major divisions occurring where summary statements and geographical notices coincide.

1.1-13	Introduction
1.14-15	Transitional Markan summary
1.16–3.6	First major section: The authority of Jesus in word and deed
3.7-12	Transitional Markan summary
3.13–6.6a	Second major section: Jesus as Son of God and rejection
6.6b	Transitional Markan summary
6.7–8.22	Third major section: Jesus as Son of God and misunderstood
8.23-26	Transitional giving-of-sight story
8.27–10.45	Fourth major section: Christology and Christian discipleship
10.46-52	Transitional giving-of-sight story
11.1–12.44	Fifth major section: the days in Jerusalem prior to the passion
13.1-5a	Introduction to the apocalyptic discourse
13.5b-37	Apocalyptic discourse
14.1-12	Introduction to the passion narrative
14.13–16.8	The passion narrative

Hedrick (1984) has offered a multifaceted critique of Perrin. He argues that the 'summary statements' do not summarize what precedes or follows. He also suggests other verses that 'qualify' as summary statements that have not been properly identified as such: 1.5, 28, 32-34, 45; 2.1-2, 15; 4.33-34; 6.1; 9.30-32; 10.32. He lists other passages that fit Perrin's criteria of geographical shift and summary that Perrin does not cite: 4.33-36; 5.21; 9.30; 10.1. Hedrick concludes that the function of the summary statements is to give 'generalized non-specific descriptions of the ministry of Jesus intended to expand it beyond the few typical episodic incidents described in the Gospel' (1984: 303) and, 'Evidence for the summaries

providing a basic structural framework of the Gospel is still lacking' (1984: 304). Cook (1995: 37) judges Hedrick's article a real contribution because it 'actually attempts to evaluate the methodology of using summaries to build an outline of Mark'.

Kee also has been critical of Perrin's outline along a number of lines (1983: 64). The strongest objection is that the outline gives no hint of the diversity of material in each section. For example, there is no recognition of the lengthy treatment of parables in the section 3.13–6.6a. In addition, three of the titles for sections include christological references, while much more than Christology is presented in those sections. Donahue (1973: 207-208) has observed that the 'summary statements' really are not 'summary' in nature, but rather anticipate and recapitulate at the same time.

Still another approach is that of identifying chiasms. Standaert wrote, 'Mark's gospel is constructed according to concentric schema: prologue and epilogue correspond, while the three parts of the body of the narrative are centered upon the middle part (6.14–10.52)' (1978: 174). Standaert's mentor van Iersel has fine-tuned the approach and proposed a five-part topographic framework, which gives the work an overall concentric structure (1982; 1989: 20-24; 1998: 68-86). Wilderness and tomb are marked by continuity, Galilee and Jerusalem by contrast. These four parts surround the center part, the Way, which stands as the center and the key to the gospel. Brett (1986) proposes in a chapter of Mann's commentary a division of the gospel into two major units (1.16–8.21 and 8.22–16.8) and each major unit into three segments, all in chiastic agreement.

Humphrey also proposes a chiastic structure to Mark (1992: 4). His approach combines a concentric structure of the main points and the linking of the main points with smaller episodes (which are paradigms of discipleship) that act as bridges between the major sections. These 'bridges' are also in a chiastic relationship to one another. Humphrey does not stop there; each major section has a concentric structure also. Thus, we have chiasms within chiasms tied together with a chiasm.

Scott has also proposed a chiastic structure for Mark, arguing that the book is 'both linearly and chiastically arranged' (1985: 17). In Scott's scheme the transfiguration episode is the 'unmistakable center of the whole gospel, with 9.7…as the pivot of the chiasmus' (p. 18). Interestingly, Scott has calculated that the Transfiguration episode is 'one-fifth of one percent' off center (p. 18). For a similar approach see Gardner (1999).

Bryan (1993: 83, 99) and Hooker (1991: 16) caution the reader of the gospel, because of its oral nature, not to hold too firmly to the exactness of the breaks between its major movements. Rather, they suggest that the

introductory or concluding pericope of sections should be viewed as 'hinges' because they look forward and backwards (see also Parunak 1983 and Stock 1985). Pericopae identified as 'hinges' include 1.14-15; 8.22-26; 10.46-52; 15.40-41. Mark 8.22-26 looks ahead and forms an *inclusio* with 10.46-52, with nearly every incident between these two stories demonstrating the 'blindness' of the disciples and their inability to understand Jesus and his teaching (cf. 8.31-33; 9.2-13, 32, 33-37, 38-50; 10.13-16, 23-31, 32-45). Likewise, 8.22-26 also looks back to the feeding of the four thousand and the subsequent discussion by the disciples (8.17-21).

Related to literary concerns (i.e., the focus is upon the written work) is a more developed rhetorical approach (i.e., the focus is on oral work) to understanding Mark's organization. Bryan's proposal for a structure for the Gospel of Mark begins with an attempt to be sensitive to the likely orality of the gospel. Bryan begins his work by suggesting that Mark's contemporaries would have characterized the gospel as a 'life'. What is of concern for us here is the question that introduces the second section of the book, 'Was Mark written to be read aloud?' 'The only real way to understand Mark's structure is to follow it through as it was designed to be followed—indeed, to *listen* to it as it was designed to be heard—and so to experience it as it does its work' (1993: 83). After identifying characteristics of oral composition, Bryan concedes 'that there is nonetheless something to be said for discerning an overall chronological arrangement, and that it constitutes a framework for the whole' (1993: 83). He, like van Iersel, proposes that the gospel falls 'naturally' into five parts (1.1-8 [wilderness]; 1.9–8.21 [Galilee]; 8.22–10.52 [road to Jerusalem]; 11.1–15.41 [in Jerusalem]; 15.42–16.8 [at the tomb]), but he does not recognize the chiastic arrangement as van Iersel does. Bryan then proceeds to survey each pericope or episode in the gospel and identifies hinges, brackets, chiasms, *inclusiones* and summary statements to show how the gospel is a coherent presentation.

Standaert proposes an elementary structure of the Gospel of Mark following the divisions common within classical rhetoric: *exordium* (1.1-13), *narratio* (1.14–6.13), *probatio* (6.14–10.52), *refutatio* (11.1–15.47), *conclusio* (16.1-8) (1978: 42; see also Stock 1982: 49). As seen above, he then goes on to suggest a concentric composition of individual sections and subsections. Sections that have been suggested as having concentric or parallel rhythms include 1.16-45; 2.1–3.6; 4.1-34; 8.27–9.13; 12.1-40; 13.5b-37. Mark 8.27–9.13 provides a good example of this concentric composition with 8.27-30 balancing 9.11-13 and 8.31-33 balancing 9.2-10, and 8.34–9.1 remaining as the center of the passage (Standaert 1978: 174).

Best criticizes Standaert's proposal for a concentric composition. Best (1983: 103) says that if Mark had been competent in this matter it would have been a simple matter in 8.28 to have changed 'one of the prophets' to 'the prophet' to indicate Moses who appears later (9.4). Further, the divine voice in the Transfiguration (9.7) balances Peter's confession in 8.29, yet this does not fit in with a concentric composition (1983: 103). Best (p. 104) is also critical of Dewey's proposal (1980) of concentric parallelism in Mk 2.1–3.6. One argument used by Best to challenge Dewey is that tongue in cheek he proposes a concentric structure of 1.40–2.17 (which interferes with Dewey's 2.1–3.6). Besides, if the gospel was written to be listened to and not just read, it is questionable if a concentric parallelism would be easily detectable by an original hearer (Best 1983: 105).

In trying to understand the gospel's structure, the orality of the early Christian message should not be underestimated. Hooker states, 'The gospel was almost certainly intended to be read aloud in a congregation, not privately' (1991: 15). Perhaps the most significant work to date on the orality of the gospel is that of Kelber (1997). Kelber argues for a sharp division between an oral and a written Gospel, a division so sharp that he proposes Mark wrote the Gospel to challenge the 'authority' of the oral gospel. Kelber argues only for individual episodes containing oral style rather than the gospel as a whole, contra Dewey (1989; see also the articles and accompanying bibliographies in Dewey 1994). For critiques of Kelber's thesis, see Boomershine (1987); Hurtado (1990); Halverson (1994; 1997).

Returning to Best's criticism, I believe that just because Mark chose not to editorialize every possible concentric item does not negate items that are concentric. Thus we should not too hastily reject proposals that challenge one to consider rhetoric. The suggestion that Mark uses 'hinges' may be a valid and helpful way of dividing sections. Simply because Stephon Langton (1150–1228) and Robert Estiene [= Stephanus] (1503–59) divided the text into chapters and verses (respectively), it does not mean Mark must have been so precise in marking off sections or divisions. Storytelling will use literary features such as repetition, foreshadowing and framing to tell the story. Therefore, such words as 'immediately', 'again', 'and' and 'then' will provide the author opportunities to move the plot and subsequently mark transitions. Mark may very well have been a storyteller himself. The process of writing down the story that he told would have preserved modes of oral recitation.

This is apparently the point that Bryan and Dewey both make. Dewey cautions against a single linear outline or structure (1991). A linear outline necessitates ascertaining major division points. Similarly, Rhoads *et al.*

(1999: 47-55) says that it is not possible to make a linear outline of Mark's story, because it is literature that was meant to be heard, it is 'episodic' and makes connections by various forms of repetition. Therefore, Dewey proposes that Kee's metaphor of a fugue is a better model for understanding the structure of Mark (Kee 1983: 64, 75). Stories gain depth and enrichment through repetition and recursion. Thus, multiple overlapping structures and sequences, forecasts of what is to come and echoes of what has already been said, make up the gospel (see also Lang 1977). Dewey illustrates this in her article by examining those portions of the Gospel of Mark that frequently are identified as a break in the gospel: Mark 1, 3, 8, 10–11 and 14. She demonstrates how the various pericopae where breaks are posited consist of forecasts and echoes, variation within repetition, for a listening audience.

5. *Concluding Observations*

Given the multitude of various proposals for Mark's structure, in some ways we are no closer to arriving at a conclusion than we were decades ago. This confusion is tied to the inability of scholars to reach a consensus as to whether a governing principle can be applied to the text in order to suggest definitive breaks. Some principles look to items outside the text to suggest divisions and others look to the text itself to reveal its structure. Rather than limit themselves to just one principle, some scholars have even opted for a truly eclectic approach to arrive at a structure of the text. For example Pesch (1984) uses a number of criteria (collections of material, spatial and temporal changes, different story types, leading concepts, 'Jesus' in the introductory sentence of an episode).

As long as literary concerns remain a focus of current gospel study then the question for the structure of Mark will continue. Though now made thirty years ago, Johnson offers a fitting insight to conclude this survey: 'Only further study on the part of many scholars will bring agreement as to which alleged patterns are real and significant, but surely it is clear that the earliest gospel is not a naïve and fortuitous collection of incidents but the result of a long tradition of preaching and teaching' (Johnson 1972: 23-24).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Achtemeier, P.
  1970   'Toward the Isolation of Pre-Markan Miracle Catenae', *JBL* 89: 265-91.
  1986   *Mark* (Proclamation Commentaries; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 2nd edn [1975]).

Anderson, H.
    1981   *The Gospel of Mark* (NCB; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans).
Aune, D.E.
    1987   *The New Testament in Its Literary Environment* (The Library of Early
                Christianity, 8; Philadelphia: Westminster Press).
Best, E.
    1983   *Mark: The Gospel as Story* (Studies in the New Testament and Its World; Edin-
                burgh: T. & T. Clark).
Boomershine, T.E.
    1987   'Peter's Denial as Polemic or Confession: The Implications of Media Criticism
                for Biblical Hermeneutics', *Semeia* 39: 47-68.
Bowman, J.
    1965   *The Gospel of Mark: The New Christian Jewish Passover Haggadah* (SPB, 8;
                Leiden: E.J. Brill).
Brett, L.F.X.
    1986   'Suggestions for an Analysis of Mark's Arrangement', in C.S. Mann, *Mark: A
                New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB, 27; New York:
                Doubleday): 174-90.
Bryan, C.
    1993   *Preface to Mark: Notes on the Gospel in Its Literary and Cultural Setting* (New
                York: Oxford University Press).
Carrington, P.
    1952   *The Primitive Christian Calendar: A Study in the Making of the Markan Gospel*
                (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
Cook, J.G.
    1995   *The Structure and Persuasive Power of Mark: A Linguistic Approach* (SBLSS;
                Atlanta: Scholars Press).
Davies, W.D.
    1956   'Reflections on Archbishop Carrington's "The Primitive Christian Calendar"',
                in W.D. Davies and D. Daube (eds.), *The Background to the New Testament and
                its Eschatology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press): 124-52.
    1962   *Christian Origins and Judaism* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press).
Derrett, J.D.M.
    1985   *The Making of Mark: The Scriptural Bases of the Earliest Gospel* (2 vols.;
                Shipston-on-Stour: Drinkwater).
Dewey, J.
    1980   *Markan Public Debate: Literary Technique, Concentric Structure, and Theology
                in Mark 2.1–3.6* (SBLDS, 48; Chico, CA: Scholars Press).
    1989   'Oral Methods of Structuring Narrative in Mark', *Int* 43: 32-44.
    1991   'Mark as Interwoven Tapestry: Forecasts and Echoes for a Listening Audience',
                CBQ 53: 221-36.
Dewey, J. (ed.)
    1994   'Orality and Textuality in Early Christian Literature', *Semeia* 65.
Dodd, C.H.
    1932   'The Framework of the Gospel Narrative', *ExpTim* 43: 398-400; repr. in *NTS*
                (1953): 1-11.
Donahue, J.R.
    1973   *Are You the Christ? The Trial Narrative in the Gospel of Mark* (SBLDS, 10;
                Missoula, MT: SBL).
Donahue, J.R., and D.J. Harrington
    2002   *The Gospel of Mark* (Sacra Pagina, 2; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press).
Edwards, J.R.
    1989   'Markan Sandwiches: The Significance of Interpolations in Markan Narratives',
                NovT 31: 193-216.
    2002   *The Gospel according to Mark* (PNTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans).

Egger, W.
1976   *Frohbotschaft und Lehre: Die Sammelberichte des Wirkens Jesu im Markuse-vangelium* (Frankfurt: Knecht).
Ellis, P.F.
1975   'Patterns and Structures of Mark's Gospel', in M. Ward (ed.), *Biblical Studies in Contemporary Thought* (Somerville, MA: Greeno, Hadden & Co.): 88-103.
Evans, C.A.
2001   *Mark 8.27–16.20* (WBC, 34B; Nashville: Thomas Nelson).
Farrer, A.M.
1951   *A Study in Mark* (Westminster: Dacre).
Fowler, R.M.
1989   'The Rhetoric of Direction and Indirection in the Gospel of Mark', *Semeia* 48: 115-34; repr. in Telford (ed.) 1995: 207-27.
2001   *Let the Reader Understand: Reader-Response Criticism and the Gospel of Mark* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International [1991]).
France, R.T.
2002   *The Gospel of Mark* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans).
Gardner, A.E.
1999   'Patterns that Connect: The Transfiguration, the Providence of God, and the Chiasms', *Enc* 60: 355-91.
Gnilka, J.
1998   *Das Evangelium nach Markus* (EKKNT, 2.1; Neukirchen–Vluyn: Neukirchner Verlag, 5th edn [1st edn, 1978]).
Guelich, R.A.
1989   *Mark 1–8.26* (WBC, 34a; Dallas: Word Books).
Gundry, R.
1993   *Mark: A Commentary on His Apology for the Cross* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans).
Hall, D.
1998   *The Gospel Framework: Fiction or Fact? A Critical Evaluation of Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu by Karl Ludwig Schmidt* (Carlisle: Paternoster Press).
Halverson, J.
1994   'Oral and Written Gospel: A Critique of Werner Kelber', *NTS* 40: 180-95.
1997   'Greco-Roman Textuality and the Gospel of Mark: A Critical Assessment of Werner Kelber's *The Oral and the Written Gospel*', *BBR* 7: 91-106.
Hedrick, C.W.
1983   'What is a Gospel? Geography, Time and Narrative Structure', *PRSt* 10: 255-68.
1984   'The Role of "Summary Statements" in the Composition of the Gospel of Mark: A Dialog with Karl Schmidt and Norman Perrin', *NovT* 26: 289-311.
Heil, J.P.
1992   *The Gospel of Mark as a Model for Action: A Reader-Response Commentary* (New York: Paulist Press).
Hobbs, E.C.
1958   'The Gospel of Mark and the Exodus' (PhD dissertation, University of Chicago).
Hooker, M.D.
1991   *The Gospel According to St. Mark* (BNTC, 2; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson).
Humphrey, H.
1992   *He is Risen? A New Reading of Mark's Gospel* (New York: Paulist Press).
Hurtado, L.W.
1990   'The Gospel of Mark: Evolutionary or Revolutionary Document?' *JSNT* 40: 15-32.
Iersel, B.M.F. van
1982   'De betekenis van Marcus vanuit zijn topografische structuur', *TvT* 22: 117-38.
1989   *Reading Mark* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark).
1998   *Mark: A Reader-Response Commentary* (JSNTSup, 164; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).

Johnson, S.
    1972   *The Gospel According to St. Mark* (HNTC; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2nd
                edn [1960]).
Juel, D.
    1994   *A Master of Surprise: Mark Interpreted* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press).
Kee, H.C.
    1983   *Community of the New Age: Studies in Mark's Gospel* (repr.; ROSE, 6; Macon,
                GA: Mercer University Press [1977]).
Kelber, W.H.
    1974   *The Kingdom in Mark: A New Place and a New Time* (Philadelphia: Fortress
                Press).
    1997   *The Oral and the Written Gospel: The Hermeneutics of Speaking and Writing in
                the Synoptic Tradition, Mark, Paul and Q* (Voices in Performance and Text;
                repr.; Bloomington: Indiana University Press [1983]).
Klostermann, E.
    1971   *Das Markusevangelium* (HNT, 3; Tübingen: Mohr, 4th edn [1st edn, 1926]).
Lane, W.
    1974   *The Gospel According to Mark* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans).
Lang, F.G.
    1977   'Kompositionsanalyse des Markusevangeliums', *ZTK* 74: 1-24.
Larsen, K.W.
    2002a   ' "Do You See Anything?" (Mark 8.23): Seeing and Understanding Jesus: A
                Literary and Theological Study of Mark 8.22–9.13' (PhD dissertation, Catholic
                University of America).
    2002b   Review of *Isaiah's New Exodus in Mark*, by R. Watts, in *Stone-Campbell
                Journal* 5: 144-46.
Lewis, P.B.
    1978   'Indications of a Liturgical Source in the Gospel of Mark', *Enc* 39: 385-94.
Lightfoot, R.H.
    1938   *Locality and Doctrine in the Gospels* (New York: Harper).
Lohmeyer, E.
    1936   *Galiläa und Jerusalem* (FRLANT, 34; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).
    1967   *Das Evangelium des Markus* (KEK, 2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht,
                17th edn).
Lührmann, D.
    1987   *Das Markusevangelium* (HNT, 3; Tübingen: Mohr).
Malbon, E.S.
    1982   'Galilee and Jerusalem: History and Literature in Marcan Interpretation', *CBQ*
                44: 242-55; repr. in Telford (ed.) 1995: 253-68.
    1984   'The Jesus of Mark and the Sea of Galilee', *JBL* 103: 363-77.
    1991   *Narrative Space and Mythic Meaning in Mark* (The Biblical Seminar, 13;
                Sheffield: JSOT Press).
Manicardi, E.
    1981   *Il cammino di Gesù nel Vangelo di Marco: Schema narrativo e tema
                cristologico* (AnBib, 96; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute).
Marcus, J.
    2002   *Mark 1–8* (AB, 27; New York: Doubleday).
Martin, R.
    1973   *Mark: Evangelist and Theologian* (Contemporary Evangelical Perspectives;
                Grand Rapids: Zondervan).
Marxsen, W.
    1969   *Mark the Evangelist: Studies on the Redaction History of the Gospel* (Nashville:
                Abingdon Press).
Morris, L.
    1964   *The New Testament and the Jewish Lectionaries* (London: Tyndale Press).

| 1983 | 'The Gospels and Jewish Lectionaries', in R.T. France and D. Wenham (eds.), *Gospel Perspectives*, III (Sheffield: JSOT Press): 129-56. |

Myers, C.
1990   *Binding the Strong Man: A Political Reading of Mark's Story of Jesus* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2nd edn [1988]).

Nineham, D.E.
1955   'The Order of Events in St. Mark's Gospel—An Examination of Dr. Dodd's Hypothesis', in *Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R.H. Lightfoot* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell): 223-39.
1963   *The Gospel of St. Mark* (Penguin New Testament Commentary; New York: Penguin Books).

Parunak, H.V.D.
1983   'Transitional Techniques in the Bible', *JBL* 102: 525-48.

Peace, R.V.
1999   *Conversion in the New Testament: Paul and the Twelve* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans).

Perrin, N.
1974   'Towards an Interpretation of the Gospel of Mark', in H.B. Betz (ed.), *Christology and a Modern Pilgrimage* (Missoula, MT: SBL and Scholars, rev. edn [1st edn, 1971]): 7-13.

Perrin, N., and D.C. Dulling
1982   *The New Testament: An Introduction* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 2nd edn [1974]).

Pesch, R.
1984   *Das Markusevangelium* (HTKNT, 2/1-2; Freiburg: Herder).

Quesnell, Q.
1969   *The Mind of Mark: Interpretation and Method through the Exegesis of Mark 6,52* (AnBib, 38; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute).

Rhoads, D., J. Dewey and D. Michie
1999   *Mark as Story: An Introduction to the Narrative of a Gospel* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2nd edn [1982]).

Robbins, V.K.
1981   'Summons and Outline in Mark: The Three-Step Progression', *NovT* 23: 97-114; repr. in *New Boundaries in Old Territory: Form and Social Rhetoric in Mark* (New York: Peter Lang, 1994).
1984   *Jesus the Teacher: A Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation of Mark* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press).

Schmidt, K.L.
1919   *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu: Literarkritische Untersuchungen zur ältesten Jesusüberlieferung* (Berlin: Trowitzsch & Sohn).

Schweizer, E.
1964   'Die theologische Leistung des Markus', *EvT* 24: 337-55; repr. in *Beiträge zur Theologie des New Testament* (Zurich: Zwingli Verlag, 1970); repr. in Telford (ed.) 1995: 63-87.
1970   *The Good News According to Mark* (trans. D. Madvig; Richmond: John Knox).
1978   'The Portrayal of the Life of Faith in the Gospel of Mark', *Int* 32: 387-99.

Scott, M.P.
1985   'Chiastic Structure: A Key to the Interpretation of Mark's Gospel', *BTB* 15: 17-26.

Shepherd, T.
1993   *Markan Sandwich Stories: Narration, Definition, and Function* (Andrews University Seminary Doctoral Dissertation Series, 18; Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press).
1995   'The Narrative Function of Markan Intercalation', *NTS* 41: 522-40.

Smith, S.
    1996   *A Lion with Wings: A Narrative-Criticism Approach to Mark's Gospel* (Bibli-
                cal Seminar, 38; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).
Standaert, B.
    1978   *L'évangile selon Marc: Composition et genre littéraire* (Bruge: Sint-
                Andriesabdij).
Stock, A.
    1982   *Call to Discipleship: A Literary Study of Mark's Gospel* (Good News Studies, 1;
                Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier).
    1985   'Hinge Transitions in Mark's Gospel', *BTB* 15: 27-31.
Swartley, W.M.
    1973   'A Study in Markan Structure: The Influence of Israel's Holy History Upon the
                Structure of the Gospel of Mark' (PhD dissertation, Princeton Theological
                Seminary).
    1980   'The Structural Function of the Way (*Hodos*) in Mark's Gospel', in W. Klassen
                (ed.), *The New Way of Jesus* (Topeka, KS: Faith and Life Press): 73-86.
Tannehill, R.C.
    1995   'The Disciples in Mark: The Function of a Narrative Role', in Telford (ed.)
                1995: 169-95; repr. from *JR* 57 (1977).
Taylor, V.
    1966   *The Gospel According to St. Mark* (London: Macmillan, 2nd edn [1952]).
Telford, W.
    1980   *The Barren Temple and the Withered Tree: A Redactional-Critical Analysis of
                the Cursing of the Fig-tree Pericope in Mark's Gospel and its Relation to the
                Cleansing of the Temple Tradition* (JSNTSup, 1; Sheffield: JSOT Press).
    1999   *The Theology of the Gospel of Mark* (New Testament Theology; Cambridge:
                Cambridge University Press).
Telford, W. (ed.)
    1995   *The Interpretation of Mark* (Studies in New Testament Interpretation; Edin-
                burgh: T. & T. Clark, 2nd edn [1985]).
Van Oyen, G.
    1992   'Intercalation and Irony in the Gospel of Mark', in F. Van Segbroeck *et al.*
                (eds.), *Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift Frans Neirynck* (BETL, 100; Leuven:
                Peeters): II, 949-74.
Watts, R.
    2000   *Isaiah's New Exodus in Mark* (Biblical Studies Library; Grand Rapids: Baker
                Book House; repr. of WUNT, 88; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck],
                1997).
Witherington, B.
    2001   *The Gospel of Mark: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids:
                Eerdmans).
Wright, G.A., Jr
    1985   'Markan Intercalations: A Study in the Plot of the Gospel' (PhD dissertation,
                Southern Baptist Theological Seminary).